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7. Expanding apa-

7.1. Introduction

7.1.1. General introduction on apa- as emphatic pronoun

In Chapter 5 I discussed apa- in its function as the second person demonstrative pronoun (with Du-Deixis). In part III I will describe apa- in its other function as the accented pronoun. Before continuing with a description of apa- in combination with ja- “and, also” (Chapter 7), -pat “only” (Chapter 8) and -al-ma “and, but, while” (Chapter 9), I will first present a general overview of the current views on accented apa-.

Following Friedrich (HE), apa- is not only a demonstrative but also the accented pronoun (betontes Pronomen, § 98) of the third person. As such it is opposed to the enclitic, unaccented pronoun -a-. According to him another accented pronoun is šiia- (§ 105). The difference between apa- and šiia- was not discussed in his grammar, which is be due to the scarce material of šiia-.

Kammenhuber (HW 2 130b ff.) listed apā- as a demonstrative pronoun, in opposition with kā- “this”. According to her, this is the original function, and only after the decline of the accented pronoun a- the demonstrative apā- could take over the role of accented pronoun (but see my discussion of aši, which includes a-, in Chapter 4). She observed that in emphatic context adjectively used apā- is placed behind its Head (p. 133b etc.). Obviously Kammenhuber assumed a difference between the usual demonstrative use and the emphatic use289. However, as we have seen in Chapter 5 and will also see in Chapter 8, preposed apa- is ‘emphatic’ too.

In this chapter and the following ones I will not contest the fact that apā- is an accented pronoun. However, classifying something as an accented or emphatic pronoun does not mean that it is understood why and when one uses such a pronoun. It is clear though that accented pronouns have often to do with Topic and Focus (see Chapter 2), which makes it worthwhile to study how apā- behaves when the Focal particles -ja “and”, -pat “only” and -ma “and, but, while” are cliticized to it. Besides that, also position in the clause can say something on Topic and Focus-footh (Dik 1997a: 420ff.).

---

289 According to Kammenhuber 1969: 212 the demonstrative apā- developed from “jener” into an accented pronoun in New Hittite (“jungheth. auch betont “er, sie, es” ”). One must conclude from her description that in Old Hittite apa- was not yet accented. However, the majority of the attestations of the Old Hittite pronoun apa- is in Focus, and only a very few examples can be considered demonstrative (see Chapter 5). If anything at all can be concluded from this observation, then accented apā- should be original and demonstrative apā- a later development, with a gradual increase in attestations of demonstrative apā-. However, demonstratives only develop from other demonstratives, sometimes in combination with some lexical element (Diesse 1999: 115ff.). Besides that, accented pronouns usually are derived from demonstratives. Thus, the development of apa- from demonstrative to accented pronoun must have taken place in prehistoric Hittite.
The main focus of the chapters in Part III is therefore to concentrate on the search for a functional classification of the occurrences of apā- based on contextual considerations and to see whether there are formal characteristics which could be connected with the thus derived (pragmatic) functions of apā-, such as position in the clause, the use of particles like -ja, -al-, ma,-pat or not.

7.1.2. Introduction to this chapter

At first sight the use of the pronoun apā- followed by the enclitic particle -ya as the coordinating conjunction²⁹⁰ "and" or as the Focus particle "also" is rather easily explained. By its nature the enclitic -ya requires an accented word form as host. In order to express "he / she / that too" or "and he / she / it", the use of the enclitic, unaccented pronoun -a- is excluded and one has to resort to the accented pronoun apā-. A comparable phenomenon for a modern language is cited in Dik (1968: 280-1). In French one has to say *Moi et toi irons plus tard instead of Moi et toi irons plus tard: je and tu as dependent, or clitic pronouns cannot be coordinated. For coordination the set of independent pronouns, here moi and toi, is available. As Dik concludes there are no semantic reasons for excluding *Je et tu irons plus tard, so the unacceptability of this clause must be a grammatical fact.

Thus, the only argument for using apā- could be a rule of grammar, without further need for a semantic or pragmatic explanation. Referential distance, topic shift, saliency of the intended referent in the discourse model of Speaker and Addressee, that is, all the discourse oriented and deictic motivations for using apā- do not appear to have any influence on the choice between apā- and -a- in connection with -ya. However, as we will see, the use of apā-in for example coordinated sentences or clauses is more complicated than that. Besides the use of apā- according to the rule stated above (i.e., one needs an accented host for the particle)²⁹¹, the material in my corpus shows that a totally unexpected apā- appears in coordinated clauses while the coordinator -ya is cliticized to another host. Why should we have an apā- in a coordinated construction if apā- is not the host of the coordinator -ya? A typical example of apā- in a coordinated construction (with -ma (17) instead of -ya) is:

7.1 KBo 6.2 16-18, § 10 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 24
§ 16 [(takk)]u LŪ₁₉.LU-an kuiški ḥuńikzi tṣan ištarnikzi nu a-pu-u-un
šāktāizzu pēdi šši ū ma LŪ₁₉.LU-an pāi nu ē-ri šši anniškizzi kuitmān aš lāzialattá

If anyone injures a (free) person and incapacitates him, he shall provide medical care for that one (apun), while in his place he shall give a(nother) man. He (the person who has been given) shall work on his estate, until he recovers.

The offender has to provide medical care for the injured one (apun). Since there is only one person injured and other persons are not available in this context, the contrastive (or Focal) interpretation of apā- is excluded. There is simply nothing to be contrasted with. The other possibility, signalling a new orientation in the discourse is also uncalled for since the offender is the Discourse Topic throughout the paragraph. Obviously the anaphoric enclitic pronoun

---
²⁹⁰ I will use the term 'coordinator' instead of 'conjunction' for -ya "and".
²⁹¹ As we will see in section 7.2, there is another factor besides morpho-phonology that plays a role: word order. The syntagm apā- + -ya occurs only in certain positions in the clause.
-an could, and according to the current views on the use of anaphoric pronouns, should have been used. The solution for this problem of a seemingly unmotivated apa- will be presented in section 7.3.

In section 7.2 I will discuss the pronoun apa- with -ya attached to it, and distinguish between “also” and “and” on the basis of several criteria described in 7.2.2. Section 7.4 discusses the use of the adverseeative particle -mal-a and apa- in coordinated clauses (see chapter 9 for other uses of -mal-a and apa-). In sections 7.5 and 7.6 the Focus Structure of apa- + -ya “also he/she/it” and apa- in coordinated clauses will be addressed respectively.

7.2. Expanding apa-: ‘also he, she, it’ or ‘and he, she, it’

7.2.1. Introduction

To return to the two meanings of -ya, “and” and “also”, as far as I am aware of there are no heuristics in Hittitology to distinguish between these two values. Usually the Hittite clauses containing -ya are translated according to the possibilities which the target language offers. There are however instances of doubtful interpretation which call for a solution. This can be exemplified by one of the Hittite laws (§ 198, Hoffner 1997: 156-7): “If he brings them (= his wife and her lover) to the palace gate and says: “Let my wife not be put to death”, n[u] DAM-SU huışnuzi L0pupuanna huîšn[u]zı”. Hoffner translates “... , and spares his wife, he must also spare the lover (italics mine)”. But why not translate: “If he brings them to the palace gate and says: “Let my wife not be put to death”, then he shall spare his wife and he shall spare the lover”? In this case the choice for “and” or “also” is not just a mere semantic difference, but it also has important consequences for the question where the protasis ends. In this example it is relevant to distinguish between these two meanings, but do we have to extend the difference to Hittite in general or is it usually a question of translation? It will be concluded in this chapter that there is indeed a difference, independent from subjective interpretation. As we will see in section 7.2.6, the particle -ya functioning as coordinator “and” correlates with a certain sentence pattern, whereas -ya as Focus particle “also, too” correlates with another sentence pattern.

7.2.2. Method

A first indication for establishing the correct interpretation might be the position of -ya in the clause. And indeed, to anticipate my conclusions, -ya as the coordinator on sentence level “and” appears cliticized to apa- in initial position and the focal particle “also, too”, functioning on word level, appears cliticized to apa- in initial or first position, hardly ever

292 For attestations and discussions of the use and translation of -ya see Friedrich’s grammar (1960: 154-5), Kammenhuber HW², A p. 42ff., Puhvel HED, Vol. 1, 7ff. Luraghi 1990: 137 n. 16 notes that -ya “can, under certain circumstances, have the meaning ‘also’, ‘...’” but she does not pursue this matter.

293 The notions of initial and first position in Hittite require some explanation. It is generally accepted in Hittitology to use the term ‘Initial Position’ for the first accented word or constituent, including the sentence connectives. ‘First Position’ is used for the first accented word following an accented connective with its possible clitics. ‘Initial position’ is reserved for topicalized and contrastive constituents, settings, and emphatic or contrasting predicates.
later in the clause. Thus, -ya in first position always has the meaning "also, too", and initial position is usually reserved for "and" but may sometimes be "also". But why should this be so? It is actually surprising to find that -ya in first position is never "and". This observation that nu Noun-ya with -ya as the coordinator "and" does not occur and also that the combination *nu-ya has not been attested in Hittite can be explained on the basis of the nature of connectors and coordinators.

As I will present below sub criterium 4, true coordinators do not connect clauses that follow each other in time. If we assume that nu is a temporal sequencer "and then" (or sentence connective with Luraghi 1990, CHD L-N 460ff.), it could never be combined with a coordinator such as -ya because their functions would be contradictory: pushing the narration forward versus combining two clauses without a temporal sequence. Therefore the combination *nu-ya is impossible. For the same reason nu Noun-ya with -ya as "and" is impossible. The particle -ya in *nu-ya could neither be "also" because it has to be criticized to a noun which is then focused upon. The only interpretation left for this combination is focal -ya: "then also the N ...". And if nu would be a coordinator (which it is not), then the combinations *nu-ya and nu N-ya with -ya as "and" would be likewise forbidden given criterium 3 (see below). The results are schematized in the next table:

As I will present below sub criterium 4, true coordinators do not connect clauses that follow each other in time. If we assume that nu is a temporal sequencer "and then" (or sentence connective with Luraghi 1990, CHD L-N 460ff.), it could never be combined with a coordinator such as -ya because their functions would be contradictory: pushing the narration forward versus combining two clauses without a temporal sequence. Therefore the combination *nu-ya is impossible. For the same reason nu Noun-ya with -ya as "and" is impossible. The particle -ya in *nu-ya could neither be "also" because it has to be criticized to a noun which is then focused upon. The only interpretation left for this combination is focal -ya: "then also the N ...". And if nu would be a coordinator (which it is not), then the combinations *nu-ya and nu N-ya with -ya as "and" would be likewise forbidden given criterium 3 (see below). The results are schematized in the next table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

294 These observations are based on the contexts in my corpus in which both the pronoun apat and the particle -ya occur. As a test I also checked the OH corpus on the occurrence of -ya in all other contexts, with the same results.

295 Rosenkranz 1973: 323 does not seem to object against a "satzeinleitende "und" " following nu in his discussion of my example 7.16. His choice for "auch" in apat=a depends solely on the context, not on considerations of word order ("Das scheinbar satzeinleitende "und" in a-pa-at-ta IV 32 ist schon oben bei der Behandlung von IV 30ff. als "auch" in einer Kette von Objekten gedeutet worden").

296 Instead of * I will use # to indicate that a form is non-existent or not possible. * is reserved for reconstructed forms.

297 Luraghi 1990: 47ff. discusses the Hittite sentence connectives. Categorized amongst the additive conjunctions, also called the non-subordinating, accented connectives, is the particle nu. It functions mainly as a temporal sequencer when linking independent clauses (then). The conjunction -ya on the other hand is the only coordinating conjunction in Hittite (-ma and -a belong to the adversative conjunctions). The members of the syntactic unit coordinated by -ya stand in a symmetric relation to each other and can be rearranged, which is impossible for clauses or sentences connected by nu. Luraghi's view on the function of the connectives is, basically, that the additive conjunctions are semantically conditioned whereas -ya, having no meaning of its own, is simply a marker of syntactic coordination. A contradictory view is expressed by Weitenberg 1992 (who could at that time not have known about Luraghi's analysis). He concludes that "the semantic load of the particles (i.e. nu, ta, su, PG) in unmarked simple sentences has developed to an extremely low degree, if not even zero" (p. 319). These particles should be studied on the basis of syntactic constraints. Weitenberg remarks about the enclitic conjunctions -ya and -mal-a that "... the enclitics possess a meaning in the sense that they are consciously used by the speaker to add a semantic factor, to emphasize or to topicalize an utterance. The study of the use of the enclitic conjunctions basically is a study of meaning, of stylistics, an interpretation in retrospect of the utterance of a Hittite speaker" (p. 323).

Whatever the nature of these particles turns out to be, at least it can be noted that they are highly different from each other. I would like to suggest that -ya "and", with Luraghi, is a syntactic coordinator combining clauses, thereby forming a relation "between states of affairs ... that make up the represented world" (Kroon 1995: 69). Following Kroon's model of the layered structure of discourse (1995, Ch. 4), -ya functions on the representational level. But by its nature as an enclitic to a word in initial position, it indeed adds an extra value, following Weitenberg. The sentence connective nu seems to function on the presentational level: it is one of the devices the speaker/writer may use to organize and present his information.

247
So in both cases *nu-ya is always impossible, and *nu N-ya with -ya as “and” is also impossible, but nothing prevents nu N-ya with -ya as “also”. The possible patterns emerging from the different discourse functions of nu and -ya perfectly match with what I have noticed based on other criteria below. However, I have only dealt here with nu. We still do not know whether there is a same type of patterning for -ma and -ya298, or asyndeton and -ya (for example, does -ya in ## N N-ya ... , ## N-ma N-ya ... translate as “and” or not?). Another point is that -ya in initial position may function as the non-coordinating focal particle “also, too”. So one should not beforehand take ‘position in the clause’ as the determining factor, since there does not seem to be a convincing argument that predicts which pattern may occur. Therefore, in order to distinguish between “and” and “also”, other criteria than position in the clause are needed. I have collected the following criteria from the linguistic literature on coordination:

(1) *Structural factors
   A coordinator never connects its clause with the preceding subordinate clause (unless this clause is subordinate as well)299. If the particle -ya appears in the main clause of a complex sentence, it has to have the focal function “also, too”.

(2) *Scope and distance
   Depending on its function the scope of -ya is different. The coordinator “and” connects clauses, it has a whole clause in its scope. In coordinated clauses the particle could be also translated with “also”300, but then its scope is still the whole clause. As Focus particle -ya “also, too” has only scope over one word. Compare for example the following constructed dialogue: “I am going to buy this book! — Me too!” / “I am going to buy it too!” with “I am going to buy that book and I am going to sell this bike too” / “I am going to buy that book and to sell this bike!”. In the first example the scope of the particle is me, the rest of the clause is presupposed, either because it already is mentioned during the discourse or because it is easily retrievable from the context or common knowledge shared by the discourse participants. In the second example no such presupposition exists.

   Having a narrow scope, the Focus particle -ya appears in a clause which shares the remaining part of the clause with a previous part of the discourse. However, in Hittite two coordinated clauses may also have the same predicate: “I am going to the city and John is going to the city”. The difference with -ya “also” is that the shared part of the clause is often found at a relatively large distance from its counterpart. This means

---

298 The same type of patterning as nu and ya could for example occur when -ma functions as a particle indicating a new or unexpected topic. In that case one should discuss how topicalizers and coordinators are distributed. As far as I know, the particle -ma as topicalizer should not prevent a true coordinator from occurring in the same clause.

299 See also Luraghi 1990: 57, from the viewpoint of sentence connectives.

300 I often translate coordinate -ya as “and also,” to prevent confusion with English sequential “and (then)".
that when the predicate is 'shared' over a large distance, the particle -ya is not "and" but "also". When the shared-predicate clause immediately follows the other one, -ya can theoretically be either "also" or "and".

(3) **Combination of particles**
A coordinator cannot co-occur with another coordinator (Dik 1968: 34-41). For example, when the particle -ma in its function as adversative coordinator co-occurs with -ya, -ya must be the focal "also".301 Also, when it is clear that -ya ... -ya does not mean "both ... and", initial -ya is the coordinator and -ya in first position is Focal.

(4) **Symmetry of semantics**
(a) The members of a coordination are symmetrical, they can be rearranged without changing the information contained in the coordination structure (Luraghi 1990: 56). A coordinator connects two clauses within one discourse-act, whereas connectives join two independent discourse acts. To cite Jeffers (1987: 314) on this subject: "On the other hand, Hittite -ia (and its alternant -a) generally connects two clauses in which the described actions or states are intimately connected in time and space (i.e., where the two clauses describe two components of a single situation), or where the connected clauses refer to parallel notions."302

Less general in his description of coordinated clauses is Moutaouakil 1988. Besides the pragmatic identity mentioned sub (5) below, he formulates two other constraints on the coordination of predications in Arabic:
(b) Constraints on propositional contents (o.c. 342): the members of the coordination need to express the same type of state of affairs, the predicates have to belong to the same semantic field, and the topic-arguments have to be derived from the same discourse universe. It is possible to say (his example 97a, p. 341)

```
Zaydun wāqifun wa 'Amrun jālisun
Zayd-nom standing-nom and 'Amr-nom sitting-nom
Zayd is standing and 'Amr is sitting
```

but not (his example 98a, l.c.)

```
*Zaydun wāqifun wa 'Amrun šā'irun
Zayd-nom standing-nom and 'Amr-nom poet-nom
*Zayd is standing and 'Amr is a poet.
```

---

301 Weitenberg (1992: 338 fn. 14) observes the co-occurrence of nu, ta and su with the enclitic conjunctions -ma, -a and -ya, and concludes that our knowledge of Hittite is not yet sufficient to use this test. But as I have suggested in fn. 297, nu, ta and su are not coordinators but discourse connectives. If so, the test should not be applied to clauses where nu and -ya co-occur, but only where -mal-a and -ya co-occur. The test then allows to distinguish between -ma as topicalizer and -ma as coordinator. (See Chapter 9 for more on -ma.)

302 Kammenhuber (HW2 42b) noted that the particle -ya "leichten zeitlichen Fortschritt der Handlung implizieren [kann], da (y)a-Sätze nicht in jeder Position mit dem vorausgehenden Satz vertauschbar sind". To support this HW2 cites KUB 12.31+ obv. 8 (CTH 486): nu=m[(u=kan)]8 [(za)]zhi anda šu DINGIR-LIM [(ār)]aš KAXUšša=ašmu=((kan))9 tapāša pait "In a dream the hand of a god reached out to me and my mouth ceased to function". The second clause however is not necessarily sequential in time but might be an explication of what the touch of a god actually does to you. Also, we simply do not know whether 'my mouth ceased to function and in a dream the hand of a god reached out to me' is possible or not. We do not know whether the speech problems are a result of the dream or not.
(c) the Constraint on identity of illocutionary force (o.c. 344): coordinated predications need to have the same illocutionary force, that is, they are both interrogative, imperative, declarative etc.\textsuperscript{303} Kroon (1995: 108) also provides us with tests to distinguish between symmetrical and non-symmetrical structures. First, (d) a change in sentential mood breaks the parallelism. Secondly, (e) the presence of modal adverbs and comparable devices might indicate whether two clauses are symmetrical and therefore coordinated or not. When clauses are coordinated, the entire complex falls within the scope of the modal expression, which means that for example a modal adverb does not have to be repeated.

(5) \textit{Symmetry of pragmatics}

Coordinated sentences or clauses should be pragmatically congruent, which is the so called constraint on identity of Pragmatic Focus (Moutaouakil 1988: 348, Dik 1997: 199). It is for example possible to say in Arabic (Moutaouakil's example 113f, p. 347)

\begin{verbatim}
daj\textsuperscript{\textbf{i}a\textsuperscript{j}an} 'akala 'Amrun wa \textsuperscript{\textbf{i}a}sayan \textsuperscript{\textbf{i}a}sariba H\textsuperscript{\textbf{i}a}lidun
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
chicken has-eaten 'Amr-nom and tea has-drunk H\textsuperscript{\textbf{i}a}lid-nom
contr. Focus contr. Focus
\end{verbatim}

'It is chicken that 'Amr has eaten and it is tea that H\textsuperscript{\textbf{i}a}lid has drunk'

but not (his example 114b, l.c.)

\begin{verbatim}
* 'akala 'Amrun daj\textsuperscript{\textbf{i}a}jan wa \textsuperscript{\textbf{i}a}sayan \textsuperscript{\textbf{i}a}sariba H\textsuperscript{\textbf{i}a}lidun
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
has-eaten 'Amr-nom chicken and tea has-drunk H\textsuperscript{\textbf{i}a}lid-nom
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
NewFocus on predicate contr. Focus on noun
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
* ' 'Amr has eaten chicken and it is tea that H\textsuperscript{\textbf{i}a}lid has drunk'
\end{verbatim}

Clauses must carry the same type of Focus function or the same kind of internal focus distribution. Focus on a NP in only one of the members of the coordinate clauses is therefore excluded. But since we do not know anything definite about Focus distribution in Hittite\textsuperscript{304}, this argument cannot be used as a test.

(6) \textit{Semantic incompatibility}

This is more or less the dust bin for clauses with -ya that could not be fit in in one of the classes described above. By comparing the clauses in which -ya occurs one can for example exclude -ya "also" if the contents of remainder of the clause (clause minus N-ya) is not somehow presupposed.

The remainder of this section is organized as follows. The examples in my corpus are listed following the criteria discussed above. Criterion (5) could not be used. (1) is straightforward, but is combined with test (2) in the discussion of each example (section 7.2.3). In 7.2.4. I present the only example in my corpus with a combination of particles (3). Semantic symmetry versus non-symmetry (4) is discussed in 7.2.5, again combined with (2). In 7.2.6 I present an example for (6). The evaluation takes place in section 7.2.7. And finally, the Focus structure is discussed in section 7.5.

\textsuperscript{303} These criteria are based upon Arabic. It is of course possible that some are language specific. The identity of illocutionary force and of pragmatic functions are accepted by Dik 1997: 198-199.

\textsuperscript{304} In this study I hope to uncover some of the Focus structures in Hittite (this Chapter sections 7.5 and 7.6, and Chapters 8 and 9).
7.2.3. The interpretation of *apa*- with *-ya* depending on structural features

Whenever a clause containing the particle *-ya* is preceded by a subordinate clause, the meaning of *-ya* can only be "also, too" (test 1). When the complex sentence itself has to be coordinated with the preceding clause, the coordinator *-ya* "and" (or the adversative coordinator *-ma*) is cliticized to the first word of the subordinate clause of the complex sentence (as is shown by examples 7.2, 7.3, 7.5). Although the structure of the complex sentence only allows the meaning "also, too", I will still provide that part of the text with which the "also" clause is compared (test 2).

The following types of subordinate clauses contain *apa*- with *-ya* in their main clauses: relative clauses (7.2.3.1), conditional clauses (7.2.3.2), clauses of comparison (7.2.3.3), temporal clauses (7.2.3.4) and *kuit* clauses (7.2.3.6). In 7.2.3.5 I present the clauses following upon a stretch of Reported Speech, and in 7.2.3.7 I discuss what could be called 'parallel stretches of discourse' (see there for an explanation).

7.2.3.1. Relative Clauses and *-ya*

7.2  

KBo 32.14 ii 26-30 (MH/MS wisdom text), ed. Neu 1996: 79

§ 26 ališanaš *n=ša* 1Da-an tapuša kuieš 27 *yešš* *nu* *apuš* yeššiattari 28 kéziš *ja=*

ko[n] kuieš yešš *nu=šš* an-pé-e-da-šaš-*ša* 29 š[ašš*ša*] zikkizi *n=šš* šan tapušaš yeššiaš 30 áraš OL. *kí=ma* *ye*šš OL.

A deer: the meadows which are alongside the river, those he grazes, and the meadows which are on the other side, on those too (*apedaš=ša*) he lays (his) eššes. But he did not reach the alongside meadows, while these (= the meadows on this side) he did not find.

Although the clause with the pronoun *apa*- + *-ya* is not paralleled by a comparable clause in the preceding text, it is clear that the deer not only wants to graze the meadow he is on right now, but also the meadow on the other side. Unlucky for him, he ends up with nothing.

7.3  

KUB 19.20 + obv. 9'-13' (NH letter, Suppiluliuma I, CTH 154), ed. Van den Hout 1994: 64, 72

9* [Mē lan kuit *š*A LUGAL KUR *URU*Hurri edez tapuša *ēšta* 10* [n=at ISTU

NAM.RA GU₂.[H₂.I₄.A] STE.[H₂.A] *āššu*šša šara *dahhun* 11* [n=at za ANA KUR

*URU*][a]ti *udaḥhun* kéziš *ja=kan* kuit 12* [šA LUGAL KUR *URU*Hurri *lapuša* *ēšta*

*n=za* *a-pa-a-at-ta* ANA KUR *URU*Hatti 13* [udaḥhun][What] was alongside [the Mala-river] on the other side belonging to the king of Hurri, I took [it] up, including deportees, oxen, sheep, and possessions, and I brought [them to] Hatti. And also, what was alongside on this side [belonging to the king of Hurri], that too (*apatt=ša*) [I brought] to Hatti.

---

305 The other (late) Middle Hittite attestations are HKM 17 obv. 19 (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199)  

kuššaš *URU*Marēšša 19 manninku[nšš *nu*] *a-pu-u-šaš-* ša 20 yalḫušani, HKM 30 rev. 23 - left edge 2 21  

[kšš][šš]ša GEME kuit 19 [kui] dān *daššan* *ašša* 22 harzi (lower edge) 1 n=šša *a-pa-a-at-ta* 23 III=SU dá,  

KBo 5.3 + ii 1-6 (MH/NS treaty, CTH 42) *zik* kuëdani EGIR-an *tišši* *nu* *a-pu-u-un-na* ḫarniššu[du]
The parallel clause occurs in obv. 11'.

7.4 **KBo 3.4+ i 10-13** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 I), ed. Grélois 1988: 55

\[\text{ABU} \times \text{SU} = \text{ya} - \text{tis} \quad \text{kuiti} \quad \text{LUGAL KUR HATTI eštä nu} \times \text{yar} = \text{aš URSAG-IŠ LUGAL-uš eštä}^1 \quad \text{nu} \times \text{ya} = \text{za KUR.KUR.MES LÜKUR tar(a)ḫiyan harta nu} \times \text{yar} = \text{aš} = \text{za DINGIR-LIM-IŠ DÛ-at DUMU-SU = ma} \times \text{ya} - \text{tis} = \text{za} = \text{kan}^2 \quad \text{kuiti} \quad \text{ANA GŠ.GU.ZA ABI} = \text{SU eštät} \quad \text{nu} \times \text{ya} = \text{a-pa-a-aš-ša kari} \quad \text{LÜKAL-anza eštä}^3 \quad \text{nu} \times \text{yar} = \text{an irmalijattat} \quad \text{nu} \times \text{ya} = \text{za a-pa-a-aš-ša DINGIR-LIM-IŠ kisat}
\]

This father who was the king of the Hittites was a heroic king, and he held the enemy countries under control. (But) he became a god. And his son who sat on the throne of his father, he too (apass-a) was in the past a strong man. He became ill, and he too (apass-a) became a god.'

The parallel clauses of i 12 nu = ya a-pa-a-aš-ša karū LÜKAL-anza eštä and i 13 nu = ya a-pa-a-aš-ša DINGIR-LIM-IŠ kisat are respectively i 10 nu = ya aš UR.SAG-Iš LUGAL-us eštä and i 11 nu = ya aš = za DINGIR-LIM-IŠ Dû-at.

7.5 **Bo 86/299 i 69-77** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106.1), ed. Otten 1988: 14-15

\[§ 69 \quad \text{SA-BI KUR URU-tashša = iškan kiuēš URU.DIDLI.HLA ŠA LUGAL KUR URU HATTI ešer [followed by names of cities]^7} \quad \text{a-pu-uš-ša-aš-ši píanētes}
\]

And the cities in the midst of Tarhuntassa which belonged to the king of Hatti: 

Although the preceding context does not literally state that some cities are given to the king of Tarhuntassa, the "And if the king of Hatti starts a campaign against him, and takes also the land of Parha with arms, (then) that one too belongs to the king of Tarhuntassa" in i 63-64 (see fn. 308) which precedes our passage is obviously another way of stating that something is given to the king.

7.2.3.2. Conditional Clauses and -ya

7.6 **KUB 21.1+ iii 4-10** (NH treaty, Muwatalli II, CTH 76), ed. Friedrich 1930: 66, 68

---

306 The other attestations are NH (Mursili II) KBo 3.4+ i 8-9 (NH Annals, CTH 61 I) nu KUR.KUR LÜKUR ŬL-ša kišēš kururiḫaḫetšir^9 nu a-pu-ša ša KUR.KUR.MES LÜKUR kururiḫhīr, KBo 3.4+ i 8-9 (NH Annals, CTH 61 I) KUB 31.121 i 18'-2'0" (NH Prayer, CTH 379) § 18 nu = naš IŠTU 4ISKUR-ša kuiēš^19 ZAG.HL.A píanētes nu a-pē-da-aš-ša^20 ANA ZAG.HLA EGR-an ŬL iškant[un], KUB 48.100+ rev. 7-10 (NH Prayer, CTH 486) ir nu a[mnu]k (TUG.NÍG.LAM.MEŠ)^4 [(apēd)ani UD-TI aššan k[u]e ḫarkun (nu kan a-pē-e-ia)]^9 [(TUG.NÍG.LAM.MEŠ)EŠ anda [ap[pan]da-eš]) O((ADU TUG.EB GIR KUŠ.ESIR)]^10 (ITTI) X-TI parā nā'īr.; Hattusilis III: KUB 1.1+ i 57-58 (Egodocument, CTH 81) [(KUR.KUR.MES-ša kue dannaṭṭa am)]muk EGR-pa^58 [(aššēkānunū nu mē-a-k an a-pē-e-ia ḫumān]u) arha dāš, KUB 21.15 i 17-18 (NH, CTH 85) ^17 ARAD-an-nišu šu k[i]e KUR.KUR.MES pían [eštä]^18 nu = mē-a-k an a-pē-e-ia arha dat[a[r], KUB 1.1+ iv 69-70^69 amuqq-a kuié šarkun a-pē-da-eš para pīḫiḫun^70 n-ats-ša kia EGR-an tarnation, KUB 21 38 obv. 61-62 (NH letter, Fuduhepa, CTH 176) karū-ša kišēš ḫasšanteš [u]emīšānu nu a-pu-u-ša ša^70 [sallanunū ...]

307 See also from Hattusilis III: KUB 14.7 i 12 (CTH 383): nu a-pa-a-at-a-ja uttar ŠA 'Danuhepa ijannaiš
If I, My Majesty, undertake a campaign from that country, either from Karkisa, Luqqa or Warsiyalla, then you too with troops and horses shall go on campaign together with me. Or if I send some lord to go on campaign from this country, then with him too (apedani-ya) you shall go on campaign.

The parallel clause occurs in iii 6-7.

7.7 KBo 4.10+ rev. 15-17 (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106), ed. Van den Hout 1995: 46-47

§ 15 mān 4U TU-SI ANA Ṣulmi-4U-up 1 URU-ŁUM našma 1 ASRU kukti ūekzi n=at=ši SILIM-li pāi GESHPU-ahhi[āš] 16 n=at ANA NIṢ DINGIR-LĪM kattan arḥa GAR-ru našma mān 4U Ṣulmi-4U-šaq kukti ANA 4U TU-SI ūekzi[i] 17 n=at=ši 4U TU-SI pāi n u a-pa-a-at-ta-ia ANA NIṢ DINGIR-LĪM kattan arḥa GAR-ru

If My Majesty asks from Ulmi-Tessub one city or one area, whichever (it is), and he gives it wholeheartedly to him, without violence, then that shall be excluded from the Oath of the gods. Or if Ulmi-Tessub asks something from My Majesty, and My Majesty gives it to him, then that too (apatta-ya) shall be excluded from the Oath of the gods.

The parallel clause of rev. 17 nu a-pa-a-at-ta-ia ANA NIṢ DINGIR-LĪM kattan arḥa GAR-ru is rev. 16 n=at ANA NIṢ DINGIR-LĪM kattan arḥa GAR-ru.

Belonging here too is the bulk of expressions describing the warning that a vassal is somehow transgressing the stipulations of a treaty:

7.8 KUB 19.50+ iii 12-14 (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 69), ed. Del Monte 1980: 60


And (if) you Manapa-Tarhunta lis[ten] to him for some reason, and you become his, and turn away from My Majesty, then that too (apadd-a) shall be put under oath of the gods!

The first parallel line of iii 14 nu a-pā-dā 4SAPAL NES DINGIR-LĪM [kit]taru is n=ē =tta lingai kattan kītāru "let it be put under oath for you" in KUB 19.49 i 61-62.

---

308 See also from Tudhaliya IV: Bo 86/299 i: 63-64 62 mān=ā=šši LUGAL KUR URU 4HATTI šará laḫḫi aisszi 63 nu KUR URU Parbānsa a IŠTU GIŠTUČUL ūḫi=n=ku a-pa-a-šša 64 ANA LUGAL KUR URU 4U tašša ăššanza, Bo 86/299 iii 18-19 n=at mān arášniniš=ja KUR-e 19 n=at a-pē-š-zī-ia EΓIR-pa uyadandu, KBO 4.10+ obv. 13'-14' mān=ā=šši arášniniš=ja KUR-e n=an a-pē-š-zī-ia 14' EGIR-pa uya[da]ndu

309 Similar formulations in KBo 5.4 rev. 32' (CTH 67, written nu a-pa-a-at-ta ...), KUB 19.49 iii 36' (CTH 69, a-pā-dā 4SAPAL NES DINGIR-LĪM kītāru, with apadda in initial position), KUB 21.1 iii 55-65 (CTH 76, nu a-pā-dā-ia NES DINGIR-LĪM GAM-an kītāru), iii 59 (nu a-pa-a-šša memiaš 4SAPAL NES DINGIR-LĪM kītāru), iii 72 (nu) a-pā-dā 4SAPAL NES DINGIR-LĪM kītāru §).
Other examples from the treaties, but this time with *apatta* = ya “thus too, also for that reason”:

7.9  **KUB 6.41+ iv 6-7** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68)\[^{310}\], ed. Friedrich 1926: 132-133

6  [(mân)] kâšma a-pa-a-at-ta-ia NEŠ DINGIR-LIM šarratti
   But if you do not bring troops and horses instantly to my aid, then, see!, you break the oath of the gods also for that reason (*apatta*-ya).

Kammehuber HW\[^{2}\] 135a observed that it is only possible to choose between *apatta* = a “also that” and *apadda* = *apatta* “therefore” in unambiguous contexts (clauses with transitive verbs). Besides this we now also have another structural argument: first position is often reserved for *apa* - + ya, so at least we can say that *a-pa(-a)-at-ta*, *a-padda* in first position is more likely to be *apatt=a* then *apadda*.

In the next example a conditional clause follows upon a main clause, excluding coordination:


7  mân = ma = kan DINGIR.MEŠ = ma BELU.MEŠ hînkam išt[U KUR URU]HATTI ... 6  šarrâjalliaš = kan išpantužijaš[lišaš akkiškantar?] 9’’ nu mân a-pu-u-aš-ša arha
   akkanzi nu ANA DINGIR.MEŠ BE[LU.MEŠ = Y A NINDA.KUR₄ RA ... ] 10  išpantuzzi
   kar(a)šari

Now, when the gods, lords […] plague fr[om Hattusa], (the ones) of the harsi-vessels [and] libationvess[els will die]. When they too (apuss-a) die off, [harsi bread and] libation to the gods [my] lor[ds] will stop.

The preceding paragraphs describe the massive dying in Hatti.

7.2.3.3. **Clauses of Comparison and -ya**

7.11  **KBo 6.3 iii 69**, § 73 (OH/NS law, with duplicate OS KBo 6.2 iii 65, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 80-81

§ 69  takku GU₄ huišuandar kuiški ārki maḫḫan daiažilâš a-pa-a-aš-ša QATAMMA

§ 7  If anyone … s a living ox, as (a person) of theft, so he too (apass-a) (shall be).

7.12  **KUB 19.26 i 10'-11’** (NH treaty, Suppiluliuma I, CTH 44)\[^{311}\]

\[^{310}\] Similarly KBo 5.4 obv. 23\(^{\prime}\), 27\(^{\prime}\), rev. 54\(^{\prime}\) (CTH 67, nu-kan kasm a a-pa-at-ta-ya … ), obv. 33\(^{\prime}\), rev. 23\(^{\prime}\), 49\(^{\prime}\) (nu-kan kasma a-pa-a-at-ta-ya … ), KUB 6.41+ iv 14 (NH Treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68) nu kâšma a-pa-a-at-ta-ia ANA PANI DINGIR.MEŠ ŋatasi nu z kan NIS DINGIR-LIM šarratti.

\[^{311}\] And from the same text: i 13’-16’ nu z a LÚŠANGA našma katta DUMU LÚŠANGA maḫḫan 14’ apēl ḫannešni kar(a)[šši] memiškizzi 15’ a-pē-e-da-ni-ia anuhsi menaḫḫanda 16’ QATAMMA karši memiškiddu.
As he is an enemy to His Majesty, in the same way let him be an enemy to him too (=The Priest, apedani-ya)

Although the particle -ya is not a necessary feature of a QATAMMA clause, it is very likely that the -ya in a-pé-e-da-nil-ya-as is not a glide but the particle -ya.

7.13 KBo 11.1 obv. 36-37 (NH prayer, Muwattalli, CTH 382), ed. Houwink ten Cate & Josephson 1967: 107, 117
36 mán dannadušs mu kiičš URU.DIDLI.HI.A šinapiš kuđaš ANA URU.DIDLI.HI.A ešzi nu=šmaš=at m[āḥšan ēššēškanzi] 37 nu a-pu-u-uš-ša QATAMMA ēššušu QATAMMA tianzi

If there are some deserted towns that have a sinapsi(-structure), [s they usually honor] those (buildings), they shall also start to honor them (apuss-a, the cities including the sinapsi) in that same manner.

7.2.3.4. Temporal clauses and -ya

In my corpus there is only one example of a temporal clause which has apa- + -ya in the following main clause:

7.14 KUB 1.1+ iii 14-16 (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 18-19
§ 14 [GIM(-an sna)] uit İSTU E.LUGAL DI-eššar ku[(itki EGR-pa)] 15 [(huiiti)]aitat nu=za aŠTAR GAŠAN-YA [(parā ḫandandatar)] 16 [(a-pé-e-d)a-ni-ja mehuni tikkūšan[nut

Now, when it happened that the lawsuit was somehow withdrawn from the palace, Istar, my Lady showed (her) guiding wisdom also/even at that time (apedani-ya)!

Anticipating the results, Focal -ya generally takes initial or first position. Here however it occurs in preverbal position. One gets the impression that -ya in other than initial or first position means "even", although I have not studied this further.

7.2.3.5. Reported Speech and -ya

I have three examples of apa- + -ya clauses in my corpus which follow directly upon a citation from another letter, thus excluding coordination.


313 See further KUB 21.1+ i 76'-77' (NH Treaty, CTH 76) 76 [(nuššaškkan)] 4UTU·št kinun GIM-an anda ĻL daššuqun 77 [(a-pi-ša-ia-ia)]ššaškkan anda [(őL d)ššišami; lateNH KUB 23.103 rev. 6’-7’ (NH Letter, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 178A) amsšmašša ANA ENšKUNU māḥšan SĪG-anu x[...] n=za a-pé-e-da-nil-ja QATAMMA špat SĪG-anu n=an pahh̃ašten.

313 And two examples from Hattusili III: KUB 22.70 obv. 38 (NH Oracle, CTH 566): 34 nu memir apūn=ya memian ĻL škkueni nuššaš kan a-pa-a-aš-ša memiaš EGR-pa kitiši, KUB 1.1 iv 23-24 (NH Egodocument, CTH 81) nu=za ša aŠTAR pl[(arā ḫan)]dandatar a-pi-ša-šš (a) 34 mekki uḥuun

255
The letter discusses what has to be done with the men, UDU-siwalı and Iyarappiya, who keep destroying the property of Tarhumniya. Although the nature of the damaged goods and the retribution of the damage is not mentioned, one can infer from this example that at least the other damaged goods had to be repaired or replaced.

7.2.3.6. kuit-clauses and -ya

For subordinate clauses containing kuit “as for (the fact that)” we have:


24 GIS\_\text{harpa}\_\text{ma} I-\text{anta} LUGAL-\text{aš} GIR=\text{ši} kita MUNUS.LUGAL-\text{ša} I-\text{anta} 26 kitta ta šini šemī dā LUGAL-\text{aš} MUNUS.LUGAL-\text{ša} aīn yāin pittulti(š)=šmusša a ta hāhalkiš 28 gāpinan dāhhē kalulupiššmi hulallian kuit\text{-a} 314 andā 29 ŝalkiš=ša ŽJ\_\text{I.A-ša} ŝaršārr=ša 315 nu a-pa-at-ta GIR=\text{SUNU} kita

But (as for) the woodpiles, one set is lying at the feet of the king, and one set is lying (at the feet) of the queen, and I say to the figure: “Take the king’s and queen’s woe, pain and and their worries.” With the brush I take the thread, wound around their fingers. Now, as for the ‘heads’ of both barley and wheat inside (the basket), those too (apatt-a) lie at their feet.

This passage has always been translated differently. Usually the kuit\text{-a} is taken as a neuter relative pronoun in a relative clause kalulupiššmi hulallian kuit\text{-a} andā. The relative pronoun kuit is then coordinated with gāpinan by means of -a, the allomorph of -ma. The translation is accordingly something like “I take the thread with the brush, and what is wound around their fingers, that is, the heads too of both barley and wheat, those too lie at their feet.” (Rosenkranz 1973: 322 suggests that the grain crumbs were wound around the fingers, but this seems physically impossible.) It makes actually more sense to imagine the thread wound around their fingers, instead of some indefinite thing which has not been referred to before and only identified now as heads of barley and wheat. Earlier the text indeed only states (iv) 23 ta kalulupišš(š)muš gāpin+ ŝhalt+ hutīlāmi “I wind their fingers with the thread(s)”. The grains etc. are mentioned in iv 15-16 ŝalkijš ŝaršār iššijanda 16 [ZI.Z.U.I.A-ša ŝaršār iššijanda keššan ħumanda] 17 [(pa)ittani tēhhe “The heads of grain are tied together, and the heads of wheat are tied together. I put these all in a basket.” The local adverb andā in iv 28 refers to the fact that the heads are put in a basket.

And a late Hittite example:

314 In Old Hittite one can isolate a Topic-introducing kuit\text{-a} construction, related to the clauses in later Hittite that contain a non-pronominal kuit ‘as for the fact that’. I will treat this phenomenon elsewhere.

315 I have the impression that sometimes Focal -ya “also” is announced as it were in the preceding subordinate clause, see the beginning of 7.2.3.
7.17 **Bo 86/299 ii 53-55** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106.1), ed. Otten 1988: 18-19

§ 53 mah[han = ma]za ABU = YA kuyapi DINGIR-LIM-iš kišat nu KUR.KUR.HI.A kuit 54 ārša tišat mšLAMMA-aš = ma = mu a-pē-e-da-ni-ja mēhuni 55 šer akta nu = mu paḥḥašta

But when my father became a god, given that the (other) countries stood aside, Kurunta was ready to die for me also at that time (apedani-ya), and he protected me.

7.2.3.7. Parallel stretches of discourse and -ya

In a few instances not just the part which contains the apa- + -ya is parallel to a clause earlier in the discourse, but also the larger part of discourse to which the apa- clause belongs is virtually a repetition of the larger part containing the parallel clause. I claim that it is impossible, or at least very unlikely, that when clauses A and B in such a larger part of the discourse are not coordinated by means of -ya, the parallel clauses A' and B' (containing the apa- + -ya), are coordinated. The couples A & B and A' & B' are either both coordinated or both not coordinated. So in those cases where -ya is absent in one of the discourse pieces, -ya in the other one can only be focal.

Since there is hardly any research on cohesion of larger parts of discourse in Hittite, I here discuss each example from my corpus. Starting with Middle Hittite:

7.18 **KUB 14.1+ obv. 54-56** (MH/MS narration, CTH 147), ed. Götze 1928: 14-15


[But] when they came down?? to him, [they] found the [wive]s, <children>, deportees and possessions of Madauwa in Sallawassa, and [they gave] them back to him, and also, [they] found the wives, children, deportees and possessions of Kupanta-Kurunta in Sallawassa, and these too (apatt-a) they gave [to Mad]uwa.

The parallel clauses are given below:

A 54 n = ašši ŠA mšMad[duytat]ta DAM.MES = SU ... ye[mer]
B 55 n = at = ši āppa pišer (no coordination)

A' 55 ŠA mšKupanta-d[lAMMA]-ja = ja = kan DAM.MES = SU ... ye[mer = pišer??]
B' 56 nu a-š-š-š-š-š-š-š-š sahdomЯрda pišer

---

316 The other examples are KUB 50.6+ ii 53-55 (NH Oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 569) É-[ir = ma] 54 kuit tamēdāš para SUM-[an] 55 n = ašši a-pē-da-ni-ja EGR-an S[IXSA-]a. From Hattusili III: KUB 22.70 obv. 85-rev. 1 (NH Oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566) DUMU.MUNUS iPaṭii-a = kuit MINUS.LUGAL.ANA dUTU -ŠI aššu pišer 86 ši huartyaš = ma = an OL SAC.DU.MES = ašša kuit INA ŠA É = ziyin [...] 111 [a]-pu-u- uš-ša punuštug[y].
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This example shows the way coordination of the larger text fragments themselves (SA mKupanta-LAMMALAMMaintya z kan). This clause is not coordinated to the previous clause, but to the larger discourse unit n=aṣṭa SA mMadduwayyata DAM. MEŠ=SU ... uemer n=at=ši ṭappa pijer. One could describe this structure schematically as (A, B) & (A', B',too).

§ 43 män=za=kan gamaruṣwaŋa=ma kuin tamašzi nu araš ari tezzi 44 nu=ššan a-pa-at-ta ANA GAL MESEDI ari
But if a bowel movement (?) bothers someone, then one tells (it) to another, (so that) that (matter) too (apatt-a) reaches the chief-of-guards.

The context in which this passage appears discusses the instructions concerning the ‘going to the pot’. The preceding lines describe the actions which have to be taken before one can go to urinate, i 33-42 ‘If a bodily urge (šeñunanza) bothers him, he will walk behind all (other) guards, and will say to the guard who stands in front of him: “I have to go to the pot”. Now that one will pass (the word) to another guard, and that one in turn will pass (it) on to a man of third rank, the man of third rank will pass (it) on to a man of second rank, LÜdianalliliš=ma ANA UGULA.10.MESEDI tezzi ‘and the man of second rank will pass (it) on to the commander-of-ten of the guards’. If also the chief-of-guards is present — he is in the guard’s court — n=az[ UGULA.[10.MESEDI] 41 ANA GAL MESEDI=ja arnuzzi ‘then the commander-of-ten of the guards communicates it even to the the chief-of-guards: “He has to go to the pot!” The chief-of-guards will say: “Go he must!”’, followed by the example above.

The parallel discourse structures are:

A LÜdianalliliš=ma ANA UGULA.10.MESEDI tezzi ...
B nu=at UGULA.10.MESEDI ANA GAL MESEDI=ja arnuzzi (no coordination)

A' nu araš ari tezzi
B' nu=ššan a-pa-at-ta ANA GAL MESEDI ari

LÜ MEŠ MESEDI=ma ku[ap]i iijanta nu 2 LÜ MEŠ MESEDI piran ḫujante[š] 33
GIŠUKUR.HLASEja ḫarka[nz]i n=at=kan ḫandānteš [GÜB?-la?][e=ma?]
DUMU.É.GAL 34 iijanta nu GIŠ kalmuš ḫarzi n=aṣṭa a-pa-aš-ša ANA 2
LÜ MEŠ MESEDI] 35 [ha]ndānza
When the guards march, two guards are walking in front, holding spears; and they are lined up. [But to their] left marches a palace attendant. He hold a lituus. He too (apass-a) is lined up with the two guards.

The n=at=kan ḫandānteš, the two guards with spears who are lined up, is paralleled by n= aṣṭa apašš=a ANA 2 LÜ MEŠ MESEDI ḫandānza, the palace attendant with a lituus who has to be lined up with them. This example, and others (see below), show that the remaining part of the clause (the clause without apa- + ya) is not necessarily presupposed in its entirety. The parallel structures are:

A GIŠUKUR.HLASEja ḫarkanzi
7.21 KBo 6.28 + obv. 6-9 (NH edict, Hattusili III, CTH 88), ed. Goetz 1940: 21-22
§ 6 karâ KUR.KUR.MEŠ URUHATTI[ l]STU LÜKÜR arba ḫarganuṭan ēṣa edez kui[r]7 nu LÜKÜR URUGašgaš ui[τ] nu [KUR.KUR.MEŠ URUHATTI ḫarganuṭ nu =za URUNenaššan ZAG-an 8 iquat edez=ma IST[U KUR URUSAPLITI LÜKÜR URUArzauaš uit nu a-pa-a-āš-ša 9 KUR.KUR.MEŠ URUHATTI ḫarganuṭ
In the past the countries of Hatti were completely destroyed by the enemy. Concerning the other side (of the border), the Gasgaean enemy came, and destroyed the countries of Hatti, and established Nenassa as the border. But from another direction (across the border), from the direction of the Lower Lands, the Arzawaean enemy came, and he too (apass-a) destroyed the countries of Hatti.

7.22 KBo 6.28 + obv. 13 (NH edict, Hattusili III, CTH 88), ed. Goetz 1940: 21-22
§ 13 edez=ma LÜKÜR URUArmatanaš[ uiτ] nu a-pa-a-āš-ša KUR.KUR.MEŠ URUHATTI ḫarganuṭ
But from another direction the enemy from Armatana [came], and he too (apass-a) destroyed the countries of Hatti.

These two examples are part of a larger piece of text describing the weakened strength of Hatti somewhere in the past. The provinces belonging to the heartland of Hatti however were not the only ones attacked by the enemy. Not one of the sentences in this text describing the destruction of another area contains the expression a-pa-a-āš-ša. This is a rather important observation for the establishment of the necessary conditions for the use of -ya as ‘too, also’ (see the discussion of Focus in section 5). Obviously most elements in these ‘too’ clauses should be constant, with the only variable the apa-expression. For why else do we have obv. 10 nu KUR URUGaššiya hūman ḫarganuṭ ‘(But from another direction the enemy from Araūnna came), and destroyed the country of Gassiya’, and obv. 12 [nu URUṬegarama ḫarganuṭ ‘ (But [the enemy] from Isuwa came), and destroyed Tegarama’ instead of nu a-pa-a-āš-ša X ḫarganuṭ? Only when the destruction of Hatti by different enemies is involved, a-pa-a-āš-ša may be used. The parallel structures are:

A  edez kuit nu LÜKÜR URUGašgaš uit
B  nu KUR.KUR.MEŠ URUHATTI ḫarganuṭ (no coordination)

A'  edez=ma ISTU KUR URUSAPLITI LÜKÜR URUArzauaš uit
B'  nu a-pa-a-āš-ša 9 KUR.KUR.MEŠ URUHATTI ḫarganuṭ

7.2.4. The interpretation of apa- with -ya in combination with other coordinators

In the following example -ya occurs besides another coordinator:
7.23  

**KBo 19.44+ rev. 14-16** (MH/MS treaty, with duplicate KBo 5.3+ iii 42', CTH 42)

§ 14  

\[ \text{nammazta} {\text{dITU-SI kuin kün NIN=YA ANA DAM-U[TTI=K(A AD)]DIN}} \text{ nu=šši} \]  

\[ \text{NIN.MES-SU ŞA MĂŞ-SU ŞA NUMUN-SU meqaqēš [(aš)lanzi} \text{ 16 ŞA N[UMUN-K(A-a=t)]]a}^{317} \text{ a-pē-e-ia ziq=a=šmaš=za NIN-ZU kuit harsī} \]  

Furthermore, this sister of mine which I have given to you as your wife has many sisters belonging to her family and clan. And they too (ape-ya) belong to your clan, since you have taken their sister.

The -ya in ape-ya has to be interpreted as “also”, because the clause already contains the coordinator -ya in SA NUMUN-KA-at-ta.\(^{318}\)

7.2.5. The interpretation of apa- with -ya depending on non-structural features

The remainder of the examples of apa- with -ya has to be studied using other criteria than the structural ones listed above. The first non-structural criterium is symmetry (test 4). When two clauses, of which the second one contains -ya, are rearrangeable without changing the information contained in the message, they are coordinated and moreover, they are parallel: the particle -ya has to be translated as “and”. From this parallelism Moutaouakil has derived some constraints on the structure of coordinated clauses, as I mentioned in section 7.2.2. Besides following Moutaouakil’s constraints, all the examples listed in section 7.2.5.1 are also non-sequential in time. Supporting the analysis of -ya in 7.2.5.1 as coordinator is the absence of a parallel clause in the preceding context in several of the examples in the symmetry section. Lack of symmetry on the other hand is discussed in section 7.2.5.2.

7.2.5.1. Symmetrical clauses and -ya

7.24  

**KBo 17.11+ obv. i 36'-38',** with dupl. KBo 17.74+ (OS ritual, CTH *631), ed. Neu 1980a: 65

\[ \text{LÜMES GISBANSU RÜMES MUHALDIM}^{37} [\text{XXX harsī}(n karpanzi harsīja](li=ma)] \]  

\[ \text{Il-e a-pī-ia XV harsīš GE₆ kīt[(a)] 38 [(a-pī-ia-e-a XV harsīš)GE₆ (kitta)] udanzi tsan ti(an)zi (compare udanzi ta ti(an)zi in obv. i 43') } \]  

The table-people and the cooks pick up [30 hars]i-breads. There (are) two harsiyalli-bowls. In the one (apiya) lie 15 dark harsi-breads, and in the other (apīya=ya) lie 15 dark harsi-breads. They bring (them), and put (them) inside (?)

The following examples from KBo 3.34 cannot be trusted all together, because the Old Hittite text was sometimes not completely understood by the New Hittite copyist. It is possible that in certain cases the particle -ya is a substitute for the adversative particle -a, a variant of -ma\(^{319}\) which became extinct in New Hittite. In that case the examples should be treated in section 7.4 where I discuss the use of -ma in coordinated clauses.

\[^{317}\text{Neu 1968: 24 n. 1 read in the duplicate KBo 5.3+ iii 42'} \text{[EG]IR-pa-at-ta-at a-pī-e-ia "hinterher sind auch sie es dir (nämlich Schwestern)." What Neu read as EG]IR-pa could also be read as -K'rA I believe.}^{318}\]

\[^{318}\text{See Rieken 2000: 413 for the writing of -ya and -ma after ideograms.}^{319}\]

\[^{319}\text{Rieken 2000: 413.}^{320}\]
In this example we see for the first time a contrast between the states of affairs. The clauses may be switched without loss of discourse coherence. Whether the contrast is inherent to the demonstrative itself independent of the contrastive predicates “delivering good wine” and “giving of other wine” will be discussed in section 7.3. That is, the question is whether the contrastive interpretation is part of the semantics of the pronoun apa-, whether the contrast depends on the meaning of the predicates or even on the entire structure of coordinated clauses.

The meaning of this passage is not completely understood. The high barber-seats are probably set up for the two men in order to follow the exercises of the young men which they are supposed to train for the army. In this example it really does not matter which clause comes first because both clauses contain apa- to refer to both men.

Asgaliya was lord in (the city of) Hurma and he (apass-a) was an honourable (?) man in every aspect.
The meaning of the clauses does not change, the symmetry of the clauses is not broken if we say: "Asgaliya was an honourable man and he was lord in (the city of) Hurma." It only may sound strange because social (or discourse) convention usually requires us to introduce a person by means of name or provenance before assigning other epithets to him/her. One is more inclined to say "Hi, I'm Marie from Holland and I'm a physician" instead of "Hi, I'm a physician and I'm Marie from Holland". Hittite convention probably also leads to the mentioning of the king first in ex. 7.25. On the other hand, it is possible that we are actually not dealing with the coordinator -ya but with the non-coordinating adversative particle (of surprise) -a/-ma(see chapter 9).

The following examples contains the pattern -ya ... -ya "both ... and". (See Friedrich 1960: 155 (§ 304 b1).):

7.28 KBo 19.44+ rev. 47-48 (MH/MS treaty, CTH 42)

\[\text{SA KUR UR\textsuperscript{\text{"}}Az\text{'}ja\text{'}za MUNUS namma ANA DAM-UTTIM l[(\text{"})]} \text{ } \text{ } \text{ } \text{ } \text{ } \text{ } tatti a-pu-u-un-na\text{'}za ar\text{'}ha dali kar\text{'}\text{"}za ku\text{"}in \text{"}ar}[\text{"}si\text{']}]\]

You shall not take a woman from Azzi as wife anymore, and also, you shall divorce the one which you already have.

This example is part of a passage in a treaty which describes how the new, barbarian, son-in-law of the Hittite king has to behave when dealing with women. Being married to a Hittite princess means that he is not allowed anymore to marry a woman from his own country. Furthermore, he has to divorce the one he already has. Again, no comparable clause can be found in the preceding text.

7.29 KBo 22.1 obv. 21' (OS instruction, CTH 272), ed. Archi 1979: 46-47, Neu 1984: 99\footnote{Also see example 7.25, with ap\text{"}a\text{"}s\text{"}a ... ap\text{"}a\text{"}s\text{"}a in ii 4 and 6.}

\[\text{zikkzaz a = ya GIS\textsuperscript{\text{"}}TUKUL a-pa-a\text{"}s\text{"}a GIS\textsuperscript{\text{"}}TUKUL}\]

Both you and he are tools!\footnote{Archii translates "Tu (es) un travailleur, lui aussi (est) un travailleur!" , not taking into account the -ya ... -ya construction. For 'tool', see Neu 1984: 99.}

7.2.5.2. Non-symmetrical clauses and -ya

The following examples are all non-symmetrical, because the illocutions, the states of affairs, semantic fields etc. of the clause containing apa- + -ya and the preceding clause are different (see test 4 in section 7.2.2). In such non-symmetrical clauses -ya has to be "also, too". Besides, in all cases the clauses follow each other temporally.

7.2.5.2.1. Different Illocutions

7.30 KBo 5.4 rev. 15' (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 67), ed. Friedrich 1926: 62-63\footnote{Also KUB 1.1+ iv 78-79 (NH Egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81) nu\text{"}za ammuk ARAD DINGIR-LIM 79 [(a-pa-)]a-a\text{"}s\text{"}a ARAD DINGIR-LIM \text{"}e\text{"}\text{"}du.}

\[\text{[n-\text{"}a\text{"}] dUTU-SI L\text{"}UKUR-a\text{"} i\text{"}jar za\text{"}hhi\text{"}kimi nu a-pa-a\text{"}s\text{"}a memia\text{"}q SAPAL NIS DINGIR-LIM k\text{"}ittaru }\]

\footnote{In case the New Hittite scribe misunderstood a-pa-a-\text{"}s\text{"}a.}
I, My Majesty, shall fight him like an enemy. Let this case too (apass-a) be placed under the Oath of the Gods.

7.2.5.2.2. Different States-of-Affairs

7.31 KBo 17.1+ i 26'-33' (OS ritual, CTH 416.1A), ed. Otten & Souček 1969: 20-21, Neu 1980a: 6 § 26 andazakan haliqan tešsummiš tarlipit šū̃amuš 37 2-TAM pētumini ... 30 NINDAšarrui=m[(a=šš)]an ĖRINMEŠ-az ėšzi
§ 31' šer=šemet=a [G]IR ZABAR kita a-pa-at-ta-[a]\n anda 32 pētumini
We bring in two clay cups filled with tarlipa. ... On top of the sarru bread lie troops. On top of them (= bread with troops) lies a bronze dagger. We bring in also those (apatt=a(=an)).

Besides the fact that the clause preceding the apatt-a clause expresses a different State-of-Affairs, also the semantic fields of the predicates are different.

[Furthermore], as for you eunuchs, who regularly approach the king’s sacred [body], be aware of that sacredness, also, if some eunuch has an evil desecration, and then he too (apass-a) approaches the king’s body, let (that fall) under the Oath.

This example could have started with nu in iv 37. The scope of the conditional particle mān extends over the clause a-p[a-a-aš-ša ANA LUGAL NÍ.TE.MEŠ-ŠU šaligai.

7.2.5.2.3. Different Semantic Fields

Also then/there (apiya-ya) Istar, my Lady, ran in front of me, and also then/there (apiya-ya) I conquered the enemy on my own.

This complex of two clauses is comparable to ii 24-5.

327 See also KUB 1.1 ii 44-45 (NH Egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81) 44 ŠU-an=ma INA URUUišša[(ndu u)]edabhu 45 nu=mu a-pl-ia-ja ŠA diIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA kan[(esš)]ūyaru ėšta.
328 See also KBo 14.3 + KBo 40.293 iv 11'-12' (CTH 40) § 11' parašma namma 6 S[(UTI IN)]A URUHŨsana-x-[x] (IKSUĐ) 12' nu=kan a-pu-u-un-na kue[(nta, KUB 1.1 iv 17-18 (CTH 81) nu=mu memiškiš GIM-an kišat=ia=za nu=za diIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA para ē handandatar a-pl-ia-ja mekki tekuš[(šanu)], KUB 14.7 ii 13 (CTH 383) nu=za a-pa-a-š-ša DINGI-šLIMP-iḫ karū kišat
7.34 KUB 50.6+ iii 37 (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 569), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 186-187,

araḫḫaniya =aš₃₃ [tiyat]aniya šer SÌXSA-AT nu=kan ABI dUTU-SI 36 [ o ] x²-x kuitki šer arha pait n=at=kan zāš₃ 37 [a-pād]-[da]₁ SÌXSA-AT
... he was ascertained in connection with perjury (and) [ cursing. The father of His Majesty has somehow ignored [...] ... and he has transgressed it. [That too (apadd-a) was ascertained.]

The neuter apadd-a refers to the content of the two preceding clauses. Given the fact that the beginning of iii 37 is destroyed, it is possible that it could have started with nu. In oracle texts parallel clauses containing SÌXSA-AT are found everywhere, in this text for example in iii 35.

7.2.6. Semantic incompatibility

In 7.2.3.7. I already discussed Focal -ya in parallel stretches of discourse. Sometimes however the coordinator -ya is used to combine larger stretches of discourse, for example in the man NP=ya construction. The concessive interpretation "even if ..." given by Friedrich 1960: § 332, p. 167 and CHD p. 155a (with a preterite or in nominal sentences) does not apply to the following example (see further Stememann 1965: 234). Instead, man NP=ya may be compared to man NP=ma, but without the adversative meaning.

7.35 KUB 23.72+ rev. 61-64 (MH/MS indictment, CTH 146),

And [if] some city of the enemy comes in peace, now you (pl.) shall [not mock?] the land of Hatti in front of him. (You shall not turn his eyes to the mountains and you shall [not] humiliate the land of Hatti [...] before the countries.) [That?] (??) you may not say [to him (??)]. And if from there (apezzi-ya) someone becomes [hostile] towards your country, [as long as] the troops of My Majesty have not yet arrived, now, you [must fight] that enemy.

The interpretation of -ya as 'also, too' is unlikely, because that would mean that the parallel clause should have stated that hostilities were undertaken from some other place. The preceding context (rev. 61) however shows that actions of peace instead were undertaken by the enemy. The main point of the clause is that the enemy is hostile, and not that he comes from 'there'. Therefore we are dealing here with coordination of two larger discourse units, contrasting actions of peace with actions of hostility.

329 See also KUB 31.68: 7-8 (NH, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 297) ANA =Lilawantazi[a] 8 GISIḪUR uter nu=ya a-pē-e-dā-ni-ja QATAMMA ḫatraš₃.

330 See also KUB 23.77+ rev. 52'-54' (MH/MS Treaty, Amuwanda I, CTH 138): 52' [mân=kaš lŠTU KUR URU HATTI] pitejanza INA KUR KAšGa takšulaš URU-ja uizzī ... 54' [nu dâššu EGIR-pa] pîšten apâš=s a pitejanza šumâš ēštu mân=kan a-pē-e-ez-zi-ja takšulaš 55' [INA KUR URU HATTI uizz[i ... nu] UNUTE.MEŠ EGIR-pa pîšenî] piteandann=s a šmaš EGIR-pa ŬL pîšenî
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7.2.7. Evaluation of *apa-* and *-ya*

In this section the examples presented above are evaluated. The tables given below present the material ordered according the position of *apa-* + *-ya* in the clause:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Broken</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relatively</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clause</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clause of Comparison</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporal Clause</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After Reported Speech</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kuit Clause</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parallel Structures</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other coordinators</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Symmetrical</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2: The particle *-ya* “also, too” and its position in the clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Broken</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symmetrical</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>man NP + -ya</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3: The particle *-ya* “and” and its position in the clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Broken</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symmetrical</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4: The combination *-ya ... -ya* “both ... and” and their position in the clause

When we leave out the broken examples, the examples with *-ya* in other positions and the *man ... -ya* construction (which I will discuss below), the following figures appear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Too</em></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>And</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.5: Initial *-ya* versus First *-ya*

This means that First position is 100% connected with *-ya* as “also, too”, whereas *-ya* in Initial position may mean both “and” and “also”. It is however more likely to have the semantic value “and”.

A word is in order about the occurrence of *apa* + *-ya* “also” in first position. When the clause only consists of the elements *nu*+ enclitics, the pronoun *apa-* and a verb (*nu apa-V*), the question cannot be answered whether *apa-* is in first or preverbal position. All that can be said is that it is not in *initial* position. Secondly, when *apa-* is the Subject, a position preceding all other NP’s in the clause is expected given the basic SOV wordorder (*nu apas*
...V, see for example exx. 7.4, 7.7, 7.8, with fn., etc.). However, when the pronoun *apa*- is not the Subject and moreover the Subject is expressed by a substantive, it always takes a position after the pronoun *apa*- (*nu apa- S ... V*, see for example ex. 7.33). But also when the Subject is not lexically expressed but indicated by the verbal ending, the non-Subject *apa*- is followed by all other constituents, either arguments or satellites (*nu apa- ... V*, see for example ex. 7.2, 7.3, 7.6, etc.). It is therefore safe to conclude that -*ya* “also, too” is in First Position in the ambiguous examples too.

Four of the nine clauses with “also” in Initial position are clauses of comparison. Ex. 7.12 “As he is an enemy of His Majesty, in the same way let him be an enemy to him too” is not far removed from “He is an enemy of My Majesty and — in the same way — he shall be an enemy to him (the Priest)”. The boundaries between “and” and “also” are, at least semantically, vague here. Clauses of comparison occupy an intermediate position between clauses with the focal value of -*ya* and clauses with the coordinating value of -*ya*.

There are however 12 examples where *apa*- with *ya* “also” appears in another position. Eight of those (ex. 7.9 with fn.) are clauses containing the interjection *kasma* “see!, hereby ...”, followed by the pronoun *apa*. As the nature of interjections is, they constitute a clause of its own and do not interfere with the host clause. Therefore, the second position of *apa*-in these clauses is in reality a first position.

The three examples that are left are all more or less the same (see for example ex. 7.14) ‘Istar showed me her guiding wisdom *apedani=ya mehuni* (even at that time) / *apiya=ya* (even then)’. These *apa*-s all occur in the Apology of Hattusili and take positions further in the clause. As I stated at ex. 7.14, I believe that in such a case -*ya* might mean “even”.

Several examples from my corpus could not be interpreted correctly, either because of missing context, because the example itself was not understood, or for other reasons. Based however on the position of *apa*- + -*ya* it is possible to translate -*ya* correctly. A few are selected here.

7.36  *KBo 17.1+ ii 11'-14', 23'-25' (OS ritual, with dupl. KBo 17.6 ii, CTH 416.1A)*, ed. Otten & Souček 1969: 24-27, Neu 1980a: 7


*DUMU.É.GAL 24* LUGAL-aš MUNUS.LUGAL-ašš-a kiššar[az-ša(met te)][šummiuš dāl(i)] 25* *halmaššuittaz hašš[az a-pé-e-a] d|āi*

[When] at the *misitiša*-time I carry in the eagle, I carry in the troops and I carry in the cups, (then) [on]e cup I give to the king, one cup I give to the queen, one cup I give to the throne and one cup [I give] to the hearth. ...

---

331 The other attestations from my corpus are: *KBo 5.3 + ii 5* (CTH 42): *nu=š[t[a] a-pu-u-un-na a[n]uḫšan lē dalijan[z], KUB 26.38+ 11’ a-pé-e-da-ni-ja-šat E[IGIR-a(n lē iaru)ja]; KUB 23.72+ (CTH 146) obv. 12: nu=š [a pa-a-at-ta a[n]a], obv. 37: *NIŠ DINGER-LUMš kan a pa-a-aš ša šarrakšik, obv. 62: nu=š kan a pa-a-at-ta IŠTU KUR=S[U] āppa āšīten, rev. 9: nu=š-pé-e-[a ... , KUB 21.38 (CTH 176) obv. 33’: nu sšmašš kan a pu-u-usš-a ša 1 URU-LUM DIB-anza a-pu-u-šš-ša[a ... , obv. 46’ nu=š [a pa-a-da-ni-ja] SIG[-attarru ; KUB 23.103 obv. 12’ (CTH 178A) nu=š mu a-pa-da-ja ŠUPUR; KUB 19.5 + KBo 19.79 (CTH 191) nu=š kan a pu-u-ušš-a ša ana SIKSÁ-at; KUB 11.1 rev. 6 (CTH 382) nu a-pé-j[a]a EGIP-ja SIG-ahḫanzi; KUB 15.3 (CTH 584) iv 4’ nu a-pé-e-ja hališšiama; KUB 31.77 ii 18 (CTH 584) nu=š a-pé-e-ja LÚ.MEŠšalaḫšuš šekanzi

The palace-attendant takes the cups from the hands of the king and queen. He takes also the ones (ape-ya) from the throne (and) hearth.

The next example is included because of its age, although it remains unclear what the interpretation of -ya is.

7.37  
KBo 22.1  obv. 3'-4' (OS instruction, CTH 272), ed. Archi 1979: 45-46, Neu 1984: 99  
3' šumeš LÚ.MEŠ GIS-TUKUL tameškatteni a-pé-e-ia kattan 4' dameškīyan dāir  
You are oppressing the craftsmen and they, (or: they too) have started to oppress (the ones) “below” (them).

The previous context is destroyed but it is clear that there are two groups of nobles who have been maltreating their servants. The context is too broken to know for certain whether the ‘they’ start to oppress as a result of the actions of the ‘you’, which would imply “also”. Or maybe the aspect of ‘starting to oppress’ already indicates that -ya is “also” and not “and”.

The next example is the only one in my corpus that has man ... -ya, “even if”:

7.38  
KUB 23.82+ obv. 23'-26' (MH/MS Instruction, CTH 268) ed. Košak 1990: 79, 81  
§ 23' mān=mu idalawanni=ja kuiš yaggariya=anza šanḥazi šumāš=sa 24' ḥatrāmi  
nu=mu=ššan mān īarı lamni OL ērtēni našma=at šumeš=ma 25' ištamaštani n=z  
at mān ANA ḏTU-Šī hi[d]āk OL memattenti 26' a-pa-a-āš-ša=šmaš mān OL LÚ.KUR  
n=an laḫḫiṭtēni OL ...

And/even if someone plans with evil intent to rebel against me, and I write to you (pl.), if you do not instantly come to help me, or, (if) you hear about it, and if you do not tell it to His Majesty immediately, —even if he (apass-a) (is) not your enemy, (so) that you do not march against him — (let that be put under Oath for you!)

The next example contains an insertion introduced by the proximal demonstrative pronoun ka-. I have discussed this type of clause in Chapter 6(.5.3.1.) where I showed that ka- clauses are sometimes used as insertions in the narration.

7.39  
KUB 48.100+ rev. 18-22 (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 486), ed. Lebrun 1985: 107, 112  
18' dU-aš kuedani UD-ti ḥatuga tethiškit 19' ḫarṣiḫarṣi=ja udaš nu  
TÜ.G.NIG.LAM.MEŠ kue apēdani UD-TI 20' yaššan ḫarkun ANA GIS.GIGIR=ja=kan  
kuedani apēdani UD-TI[1] 21' ārḫaḫat nu ké TŪ.G.NIG.LAM.MEŠ anda appenda  
GIS.GIGIR=ja 22' tūrijan a-pa-a-at-ta dāir  
On the day at which the Stormgod terribly thundered and caused the thunderstorm, the clothes I had worn on that day, and the wagon on which I had stood on that day — these clothes, tied together and the hitched-up wagon — those too (apatt-a) they have taken.

Contrary to Kammenhuber HW²: 135b a-pa-a-at-ta is not in emphatically postposed position (see Chapter 8 for more discussion on postposed apa-). Instead, it occurs in First Position and

333 Košak differently: ‘and if you do not treat him as your enemy and do not even fight him’.
334 Following the translation of Götzé & Pedersen 1934: 11. Compare Beckman 1995; 2010: “... they took these packed-up sumptuous garments and that hitched-up chariot (for the god)”, Lebrun 1985: 112: “... donc cette toilette empaquetée et la voiture attelée on les prit telles quelles”.
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resumes the clothes and wagon introduced in the relative clause. The parallel of rev. 22 is underlined in the next translation of the text preceding our example: “When they sent off the substitute ox, they sent off also those splendid garments, tied together, including the belt, the dagger, the shoe(s), (those splendid garments) which I had worn on the same day that I put my hand on the substitute ox and drove them forth. And they sent off the hitched-up wagon, with bow, quiver, horses and drove them forth. But as for the table from which I used to eat and the cup from which I used to drink and the bed in which I used to sleep, and the waterbowl from which I used to wash myself and whatever utensil was mentioned in connection (with that day), nothing was taken. Thus it was ascertained by the deity. The clothes, wagon and horses were taken for this affair.”

And last but not least, the only example in my corpus of *apa-* with *-ya* as a word coordinator:

7.40  KUB 23.72+ obv. 39 (MH/MS treaty, CTH 146)

$m\text{ŠA}^3\text{UTU}^2\varepsilon^2\text{ŠI}^1\text{kui}^2\text{š}^7\text{URU}^2\text{D}^3\text{IL}^2\text{H}^{à}\text{IA}^2$m\text{Mitaš}^2\text{apàšš}=a^1\text{ḥarkanzi}$

The cities of My Majesty which Mita and he (apass-a) hold, ....

7.2.8. Chronological development

On the chronological development one can be short: the use of *-ya* “also” in First (or Initial position) is attested in each stage of Hittite. One of the consequences is that First position was already used for this purpose in prehistoric Hittite.\footnote{A quick scan through the Hieroglyphic Luvian corpus showed that *(a)pa-* + *-ha* “also he/she/it” indeed seems to occur in First Position. This should mean that already in Proto-Anatolian First Position is connected with Expanding Focus (see section 7.5 for Expanding Focus).}

7.3. The pronoun *apa-* in the first member of a coordinate structure

7.3.1. Introduction

In the corpus of the Hittite Laws a rather large number of clauses contains the demonstrative pronoun *apa-* referring to a highly salient discourse entity. In cases like these the demonstrative pronoun, according to the theories, should indicate a new orientation within the discourse, meaning that the former Discourse Topic is replaced by a new one (Comish 1999: 53-4, 60, for French and English, and Giora & Lee 1996: 113 ff. for Chinese. See also Chapter 5). But not only does this re-orienting function of *apa-* fail to explain its occurrence in the Laws, neither can the other function of *apa-*., i.e., indicating the Focus or Unestablished Topic (see section 7.5, chapters 2, 8 and 9), account for the use of *apa-* referring to a highly salient discourse entity as is illustrated by ex. 7.1.

7.3.2. Three types of punishment in the Laws

In order to shed some light on the use of *apa-* in constructions like ex. 7.1 a discussion of the punishment in the Laws is necessary. In my view, the punishments in the Hittite Laws can be
divided into three classes. The first and largest group consists of the crimes for which the penalty is a fine that has to be paid either in money or, rarely, by means of persons (class I). The following two laws are exemplary for this type:

7.41 **KBo 6.2 i 11-12 § 8 (OS laws, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 21**

§ 11 *takku* ARAD-nan našma GĔME-an kuiški dašuqaḥhi našma ZU₃ STU lāki 12 10 GĬN KŬ.BABBAR pāi parna ššeša šuṣaiezišzi §

If anyone blinds a male or a female slave or knocks out his tooth, he shall pay 10 shekels of silver, and he shall look to his house for it.

7.42 **KBo 6.2 ii 33, § 44a (OS laws, CTH 291, with duplicate KBo 6.3 ii 54), ed. Hoffner 1997: 52**

§ 33 *takku* LŬ-an paḥhueni kuiški peššiezi n=as aki ālppa(šše) (DUMU.NITA-an pāi)] §

If anyone makes a man fall into a fire, so that he dies, (the guilty party) shall give him a son in return.

The Laws in the next group do not only involve the payment of a fine but they also specify a second obligation which has to be performed by the offender. This can be the organization of the burial of the victim of a fight or murder, as in ex. 7.45, or for example the return of stolen items as in ex. 7.43 (class II):

7.43 **KBo 6.2 iii 56-57, § 70 (OS laws, with duplicate KBo 6.3 iii 60-62, CTH 291), ed.Hoffner 1997: 79**

§ 56 *takku* GU₄-an ANŠE.KUR.RA ANŠE.GĬR.NA ANŠE kuiški tāiezišzi išha(šš) = šiš ašan [(ganešzi)] 57 n=an za saškušaššaran [(dāi an)] da=šše 2-ki pāi parna ššeša šuṣaiezišzi §

If anyone steals an ox, a horse, a mule or an ass, and its owner identifies it, he (= the owner) shall take it (back) in full value. In addition (the thief) shall give to him twice/double, and he shall look to his house for it.

The last group consists of laws which do not impose a fine, but another kind of punishment, for example losing one's freedom (class III):

7.44 **KBo 6.2 ii 30-32, § 43 (OS laws, with duplicate KBo 6.3 ii 52-53, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 52**

336 The following Laws are excluded from this first selection of contexts where apa- can appear, but will be studied later. They do not involve crimes but set prices, regulate land tenureship, marriage etc. (§§ 27, 32-42, 46, 47A, B, 50-56, 79, 80, 90, 112, 149-152, 157-162a, 163, 171, 175, 176a, 177-186, 192-194, 200a, b), fragmented laws (§ 26, 105, 118, 123, 130, 133, 146a, 162b), additions in later period (§§ 29-31), or laws which are ‘a case for the king’ (§ 44b, 111).

337 The Laws belonging to this class are §§ 5 (first part), 7, 8, 11-19b, 20, 22, 23 (a), 24, 28, 44a, 57-65, 67-69, 72, 73, 77, 78, 81-89, 91-93, 98, 101, 102, 104, 107-110, 119-122, 124-126, 128, 129, 131, 132, 142-145, 147, 148, 172, 174.

338 See also §§ 1-5 (second part), 10, 70, 74, 76, 94-97, 100, 103, 106, 113, 127, 146 b, 164-169, 196.

339 See also §§ 5 (last part), 19a, 21, 23 (b), 43, 45, 48, 49, 75, 95 (last part), 99 (last part), 170, 173a, b, 187-191, 195, 197-199.
As can be seen from footnotes 337 to 339 most of the laws that include punishments are found in the first two classes described above, that is, they at least contain the payment of a fine. Both the payment of the fine and the other punishment or obligation in class II are usually expressed in two coordinated clauses of the type: “the offender is involved both in some kind of non-financial obligation and pays a fine”. All coordinators are attested: Hittite -ya “and” and -mal-a “but” and their Akkadian variant ū. 341

The non-reorienting, non-Focal use of the pronoun apa- which is unaccounted for by the existing theories (see 7.3.1.) shows a marked distribution. The pronoun apa- only appears in the last two classes involving either the payment of a fine and another obligation (class II) or, instead of a payment, another kind of punishment (class III). Class III will be discussed in Chapter 8.

7.3.3. The use of the pronoun apa- in the coordinate structure

7.3.3.1. In the Laws

Below all examples are presented from the Laws in class II which contain the object pronoun apun (Laws §§ 1-4, 10, 74, 76), compared with the remaining coordinated clauses in the Laws in this class (§§ 5, 96, 97, 103, 106, 113, 127). The examples containing also the subject pronoun apas (§§ 10, 74, 106, 113) I will discuss separately. 342 Besides ex. 7.1 we have apun in:

7.45 KBo 6.2 i 1-2, § 4 (OS law, with duplicate KBo 6.3 i 8-9, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 18

§ 1 [(takku ARAD-an našma GÉME-an kuis)]ki yalaḫi n-aš  aki QASSU yaštau
[(a-pu)]-u-un armuzi ū 1 SAG.DU pāi parn[(a-zēšu)]e-a šuwaiezzi

340 Hoffner reads “that very man”. For a discussion of the pronoun apa- with the restrictive particle -pat, see chapter 9.

341 For the use of the Akkadian conjunction ū “and” in the Laws see Hoffner 1997: 167. See Rieken 2000 for a discussion of the three conjunctions. Here I use the term coordinator in anticipation of their function in the type of clauses studied here.

342 The pronoun apa- in class III Laws and the remaining apa-‘s will be discussed in Chapter 8.

343 Similar Laws are: §§ 1-3.

344 For a discussion of the expression parna zēšu šuwaiezzi see Hoffner 1997: 168 with literature.
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If anyone strikes a male or female slave so that he dies, but his hand sins (= it is an accident), he shall bring him (apun, for burial) and he also shall give one person, and he shall look to his house for it.

7.46 KBo 19.1a iii 66-68, § 74 (OS law, additions from KBo 6.3, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 81
§ 66 [(takku SI GU₄ naš)]ma GIR GU₄ kuiški tuqar[(nizi apun=za apāš)] 67 [(dāī U GU₄ SIG₄)] BEL GU₄ päi takku BE[(L GU₄ tezzi ammel=pat=ya=sza)] 68 [(GU₄ un dāhhi)] GU₄=SU dāi U 2 GL[(N KÜ. BABBAR pāī)] §
If anyone breaks a horn or leg of an ox, (then) he shall take that (ox) himself and he also shall give an ox in good condition to the owner of the (injured) ox. If the owner of the ox says: “I will take my own ox instead”, he shall take his ox and he (the offender) also shall pay 2 shekels of silver.

7.47 KBo 6.2 iv 4-5, § 76 (OS law, duplicate KBo 6.3 iii 76-77, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 82
§ 4 [(takku GU₄-u)]n ANŠE.KUR.RA ANŠE.GIR.NUN.NA ANŠE-in kuiški appatariezi [(n=š ped)]i šši aki apun arnuzzi kuššan+šett=a päi §
If anyone commandeers an ox, a horse, a mule (or) an ass, and it dies at his place/on the spot (?), (then) he shall bring it (for burial) and he also shall pay its rent.

The referents of apun in all these examples are maximally accessible and highly salient for the addressee since they have been mentioned in the immediately preceding clauses. The need for an accented pronoun to re-activate the referent and promote it from a level of medium saliency to high saliency is absent. Another possible motivation for using the accented pronoun is to disambiguate between two or more possible referents, but that obviously does not apply to these examples either. Contrast in the sense of selecting one entity from a set of entities, and the marking of the beginning of a new discourse segment also do not apply, which leaves us with the question why the enclitic pronoun -an has not been used. This same question can also be asked for the following examples where a full lexical NP appears instead of the pronoun apun (or the enclitic -an):

7.48 KUB 29.23+ 17-20, § 106 (OH/NS law, CTH 292), ed. Hoffner 1997: 102-3
§ 17 [(takku p)]aḥḥur AN[(A A.Š Az)]SU kuiški pēdai [(ta tame)]ll=š a 18 [(A.Š Az)]= SU lukke[(zz)]i kuišš at lu[kezzi nu=za lu]kk 19 [(A.Š Az-L)]AM apāš dā[(i sl)]G₄-andan=š-a [(A.Š A ANA EN)] A.Š Az 20 [(pā)]i iz az [(yar)]šię[(zz)]i §
If anyone carries embers (lit. fire) into his field, and he ignites the field of also another one, the one who ignites it shall take the burnt-over field himself and also, a good field he shall give to the owner of the field, 347 and he will reap it.

7.49 KUB 29.24 i 3-6, § 113 (OH/NS law, CTH 292), ed. Hoffner 1997: 108-109

345 The translations basically follows Hoffner 1997. However, to do justice to the nature of the coordinator -ya and U I translate it with “and (...) also” where Hoffner usually uses “and”. This difference will not be noted anymore in the remainder of the examples from the Laws.
346 See ex. 8.20 for an explanation of the translation “instead”.
347 Hoffner l.c. translates with two independent clauses.
If anyone cuts down a [fruit-bearing] vine, he shall take the cut-down [vine] and he also shall give a good vine to the owner of the vine. He shall gather fruit from it [until] his own vine recovers.

7.50 KBo 6.2 iv 49-50, § 96 (OS law, duplicate KBo 6.3 iv 48-49, CTH 291), comparable § 97, ed. Hoffner 1997: 94-5

§ 49 [takku LÚ-aš ELLUM halkiaš ÉSAG-an ḫ(āiezi ÉSAG-š) = a halki]n ɣemiezi ÉSAG-an halkit šunnai ū 12 [(GIN KÚ.BABBAR pāi p)arna = šše = a] šuyaiezzi §

If a free man burglarizes a grain storage pit, and finds the storage pit's grain, he shall fill the storage pit with grain and he also shall pay 12 shekels of silver. He shall look [to his] house for it.

7.51 KBo 6.2 i 3-6, § 5 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 19

§ 3 takku LÚ-DAM.GÁR kuiški kuënzi 1 ME MANA KÚ.BABBAR pāi parna = ššē = a šuṣaiezzi 4 takku 1NA KUR Luṣṣija našma 1NA KUR URUPalâ 1 ME MANA KÚ.BABBAR pāi 5 gesture = ššētt = a šarnikzi našma 1NA KUR URUHatti 6 5.7.66 nu = zza unattallan = pat arnuiezzi §

If anyone kills a merchant, he shall pay 100 minas of silver, and he shall look to his house for it. If (it is) in the land of Luwiyā or Pala, he shall pay the 100 minas of silver and he also shall replace his goods, or (if) (it is) in the land of Hatti, he shall bring the merchant (for burial) instead.

And again ex. 7.46 repeated here as 7.52:

7.52 KBo 19.1a iii 66-68, § 74 (OS law, additions from KBo 6.3, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 81

§ 66 [(takku SI GU₄ naṣ̱)][ma GĪR GU₄ kuiški τukar[(nizi apūn = za apāš)] 67 [(dāi ū GU₄ SIG₃)] BEL GU₄ pāi takku BĒ[(L GU₄ iezzi ammel = pat = ya = za)] 68 [(GU₄ un daḫhi)] GU₄ 26 ū 2 GIL[(N KÚ.BABBAR pāi)] §

If anyone breaks a horn or leg of an ox, (then) he shall take that (ox) himself and he shall give an ox in good condition to the owner of the (injured) ox. If the owner of the ox says: “I will take my own ox instead”, he shall take his ox and he (the offender) also shall pay 2 shekels of silver.

In exx. 7.48 and 7.49 the offender takes the damaged asset himself and gives a replacement to the injured party. The goods are explicitly contrasted by means of the adjectives “burnt” or “cut” versus “good”. The contrasted constituents are both part of the two members of the coordinate structure, which means that the contrast only depends on the internal structure, in this case the semantic structure, of the coordinate members and not on the discourse preceding these clauses. This provides the clue-as we will see later-for the correct interpretation of the first four examples where apun was used instead of a full lexical NP. Real contrast is also found in ex. 7.46, where the offender keeps the hurt ox and substitutes it with a perfect exemplar for the owner. In ex. 7.44 and ex. 7.45 the deaths are compensated by the giving of one person, a “damaged asset” versus a “good asset”. The arguments of the predicates in the

34 For the translation of -pat as “instead” see Chapter 8.
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exx. 7.47 (with *apun*), 7.50, 7.51 and 7.52 (with a lexical NP) do not seem to contrast which each other. The reason for including the last three examples in the discussion is the rather unexpected repetition of the NP. Especially the NPs *ESAG-an* in ex. 7.50 and *GU₄=ŠU* in ex. 7.52 are repeated immediately after being mentioned in the previous clause. This is as unexpected as the use of the pronoun *apun* instead of the enclitic pronoun *-an*.

Although some examples can be interpreted as contrasting the syntactic objects in both members of the coordinate structure, contrastiveness is not the common denominator given the existence of non-contrastive pairs of nouns. The only thing they have in common is a vaguer kind of juxtaposition. Not the entities itself but the actions, the state of affairs expressed in these clauses are ‘contrasted’ on a rather abstract level. Not only does the guilty party have to perform action A, he also has to perform action B, where action A and action B do not have to be semantically related. The unrelatedness of the actions is maybe not typical for coordinated clauses in English, but it is not excluded either. As one can see, the examples are all symmetrical (see test 4 in section 2.2). For some reason the use of *-an* is not allowed in a coordinate structure like this.

On the other hand one could object that the enclitic pronoun *-an* is attested in the coordinate construction in:

---

7.53 KBo 6.12 i 11-14, § 103 (OH/NS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 100

§ 11 [takku aršī]n kuiški taiįazi takku 1 gipeššar 12 [aršīš]t=an EGIR-pa aršezzi Ū
1 GIN GIN KŪ.BABBAR 13 [pāi takku] 2 gipeššar aršiš t=an EGIR-pa 14 [aršezzi]t= Ū
2 GIN GIN KŪ.BABBAR pāi §

[If] anyone steals plants, if it is one *gipessar* [of planting], he shall re-plant it and also [pay] one shekel of silver. [If it is 2] *gipessar* of planting, he shall re-[plant] it and he also shall pay 2 shekels of silver.

7.54 KUB 29.28 i 8-9, § 127 (OS law, duplicate KBo 6.10 ii 17-19, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 116

§ 8 [(takku GIŠIG šullannah kuiški tajezi ku)üt kuit É-ri andan 9 [(harakzi t=at šarnikzi Ū 1 MA.NA KŪ.BABBAR pā])ji parna=tšše=ja šuṣajazzi §

If anyone steals a door as a result of a quarrel, he shall replace whatever might get lost in the house and he shall also pay one mina of silver, and he shall look to his house for it.

---

The difference of the last two examples with the other ones from the scheme “the offender both performs something and also pays a fine” lies in the introduction of the referent of the first clause of the coordinated structure. Normally the referent is represented by a full NP or *apun* but here the referent has first to be specified in a subordinate clause (conditional *takku*-clause or a relative *kuit* *kuit* clause) before it can appear in the bi-clausal coordinate sentence. Unlike the other examples, the referent has not been introduced in the proatis of the Law, which makes it necessary to introduce the referent in the apodosis. Instead of

protasis | apodosis 1 | apodosis 2
---|---|---
**discourse entity:** | *apun* / NP | *V*

we now have

protasis: | apodosis 1 | apodosis 2
---|---|---
*takku 1 gipeššar aršiš;* | *t=an* | *V*
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The subordinate clauses are the representatives of the referents in the first clause of the bi-clausal construction (called ‘discourse entity’ here). Therefore this occurrence of -an cannot be equated with a clause where only “ *t-an  X  V  Ü ...” would have been used after the introduction of the referent in the protasis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>protasis</th>
<th>apodosis 1</th>
<th>apodosis 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>discourse entity</td>
<td>*t-an_i ... V</td>
<td>Ü ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This coordinate construction, whereby the sentence connective with -an follows immediately upon the protasis, does not exist in the Laws.

Thus, coordinate clauses in the punishments of the Laws require that the two apodoses are in balance, without necessarily contrasting them.

7.3.3.2. In other texts

In the later Hittite texts of my corpus only a very few examples of the coordinate structure with apa- were found:

7.55  **KBo 5.3** + ii 1-5 (MH/NS treaty, CTH 42), ed. Friedrich 1930: 112-115

1 [n=a]n=mu OL mematti n=an anda imma[ munnäši] § ² našma a-pé-e-da-ni
imma EGIR-an tiiaši ANA 4UTU-SI[=ma] ³ ayan arha tiiaši nu män kiššan utter
le[šš] ⁴ nu=ttu kē NIŠ DINGIR.MES lē dalijanzı nu=ta[ta] ⁵ apün=a antuḫšan lē
dalijan[zi]
And you do not tell about him to me and you even [hide] him, § or you even support
him, [while] from My Majesty you move away, if [you] act thus, (then) may these
oath-Deities not let go of you, and may they not let go of that man of yours either.

Here we see again the pronoun apedani immediately following upon a clause which contains
the enclitic pronoun -an, referring to the same referent. And with the unique writing a-pa-a-
an instead of a-pu-u-un:

7.56  **KUB 26.12**+ ii 23-28 (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.1), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 25

§ ²³ našma=kan ANA dUTU-SI kuišši yatkuşanza ²⁴ [n]=aš=kan ANA ZAG
kuedanikki anda ²⁵ [š]=ašš=šš=kan memian
GAM-an arha yatarnahzi ²⁷ nu a-pa-a-an ZAG-na dāī dUTU-SI=ma GÜB-la dāī
n=an=kıš DINGIR.MES ḫarninkandu §
Or (if) someone leaps from His Majesty, (and) stays at some border, while being at
good terms with someone amongst you, and he communicates the matter/incident to
him, and he puts him to the right, while he puts My Majesty to the left, ...

Instead of Ü or -ya ex. 7.56 has -ma. For the use of -ma in coordinated clauses see section 7.4
and Chapter 9.4.1. The particle -ma seems to appear when the predicates of the coordinated
structure are semantically juxtaposed.
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7.3.4. Evaluation

The table below lists all the relevant passages from the examples given in section 7.3.3. The underlined arguments in the column of clause 1 are (pronominal) NPs of which the referent could have easily been referred to by means of an enclitic pronoun. The underlined arguments in the column of clause 2 are the counterparts of the underlined elements in the first column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause 1</th>
<th>Clause 2</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 nu apûn šaktâizzi</td>
<td>pêdi sši sma L.U.19.LU-an pâi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 apûn arnuzi</td>
<td>U 1 SAG.DU pâi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 apûn za apâš dâi</td>
<td>U GU SIG BEL GU4 pâi</td>
<td>1, 45, 46, 47, 55, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 apûn arnuzi</td>
<td>kuškaš ssett s a pâi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 kuiš s at lukkezzi</td>
<td>SIG-ann a A.SÂ ANA EN A.SÂ pâi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu za lukkan A.SÂ-LAM apâš dâi</td>
<td>SIG-ann a GESTIN ANA BEL GÎSÈSTIN pâi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 karšandan GÎSÈSTIN-an apâš dâi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 ÊSAG-an haikit šunnai</td>
<td>U 12 GÎN KÜ.BABBAR pâi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 ME MA NA KÜ.BABBAR pâi</td>
<td>A.SA ANA ENA BEL GÎSÈSTIN pâi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 GUÈ Sî t dâi</td>
<td>U 2 GÎN KÜ.BABBAR pâi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 takku 1 gipeššar aršiš</td>
<td>U 1 GÎN.GÎN KÜ.BABBAR pâi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 kuit kuit E-rì andan šarâkzi</td>
<td>U 1 MA.NA KÜ.BABBAR pâi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 našma apêdani inma EGIS-an tijâşi</td>
<td>ANA dUTU-Śi [s]ma ayan aha tijâşi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 nu apûn ZAG-na dâi</td>
<td>dUTU-Śi sma GÜB-la dâi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table gives a summary and abstraction of the possible constructions, ranking from the weakest linguistic expression of the referent in the first clause of the “and” construction to the heaviest expression, the subordinate one (Coord. stands for -ya, -ma or U, X is the NP which is the mirrored argument of the (pro)nominal expression in the first member):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause 1</th>
<th>Clause 2</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>enclitic pronoun</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>coord. X Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>apa</em></td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>coord. X Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>coord. X Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-clause ta+enclitic</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>coord. X Verb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preliminary conclusion which can be drawn from this table is that the coordinate structure in which both clauses have the same semantic structure, and usually the same syntactic structure, and, finally, are of equal importance can not contain an enclitic pronoun while the counterpart of this pronoun in the other clause is a full lexical NP. A lexical NP carries necessarily more accent than an enclitic pronoun, and the “next linguistic expression in line” which is accepted is the demonstrative *apa*. The use of this pronoun restores the intonational symmetry of the clauses. The question is now, is only an independent pronoun needed, sharing its independent status with a lexical NP, or does it have anything to do with Focus or the function generally assigned to accented pronouns, i.e., indicating something that something unexpected is occurring. I will address this question in section 7.6.

275
7.4. The pronoun *apa- + -al-ma* in the second member of a coordinate structure

In section 7.2.4.1 I already discussed the occurrences of *apa-* with *-ya* in the second member of a coordinate structure. Here I will present the occurrences of *apa-* with the particle *-al-ma* in its function as coordinator. This time one can really perceive a contrast, which was not always the case with the clauses coordinated by *-ya*. In such a contrastive context *-al-ma* is best translated as “while”.

Below follows a summary of the features indicative of coordinated clauses as discussed in section 7.2.2. sub 4, *Symmetry of semantics*:

a) Coordinated clauses may be switched without loss of coherence
b) The clauses describe the same State of Affairs, the predicates belong to the same semantic field
c) The clauses have the same illocutionary force
d) The clauses have the same mood
e) The scope of modal adverbs extends over both clauses

As the reader can easily check, each example below passes the test. The element corresponding (or contrasting) with the referent of *apa-* is also underlined.

7.57  **KBo 6.2 iv 14-15, § 80** (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 85

§ 14 *takku UDU-un UR.BAR.RA-ni kuiški peššizz iššaš-šiš UZU.1 dāi 15 a-pa-a-ša KUŠ UDU dāi §*

If anyone abandons a sheep to a wolf, its owner shall take the meat, while *he* (*apas=a*) shall take the sheepskin.

7.58  **KUB 23.77+ rev. 52'-54'* (MH/MS treaty, Arnuwanda I, CTH 138)

52' *[mān=kan IŠTU KUR URU [HAT]T]i pittejanza INA KUR URU Kašga takšulaš URU-ja uätzzi 53 [n=aš mān ARAD-iš nu ] ŠA BELI=SU aššū udai našma=aš LÚ GIŠTUKUL nu ŠA LÚTAPPI=SU aššū udai 54' [nu aššū EGIS-pa pišten a-pa-a-ša pittejanza šumāš ēštu*

[If from the land of Hat[i] someone on the run comes to an allied city in Kasga land, [either a slave], carrying possessions from his master or a craftsman, carrying possessions from his associate, [(then)] you must gi[ve back the possessions], while that escapee (*apas=a pitteyanza*) shall be yours.

The next example shows how contrasts occur both inside the clause, on clause level, and on discourse level:

7.59  **KBo 5.4 rev. 6-8** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 67), ed. Friedrich 1926: 60-61

\[\text{See also KUB 21.5+ ii 6-10 (NH Treaty, Muwattalli, CTH 76) 4UTU-ŠE=ma _t_)sk m[(Alakš)]and([un]) (KUB 21.5 ii) 7 arba OL=pat peššejami a-pu-ur=ma OL 8 [(tahhi i)]tuk=aš maḫḫan (…) 9 [nu za dUTU-[Š]) tuk=pat ṣaAlakšandun ṣaggaḫḫi a-pu-ur=ma=za 10 [OL ṣaggaḫḫi, KUB 21.1+ iii 38-40 (NH Treaty, Muwattalli, CTH 76) nu=za sik mAlakšandu ANA mKupanta]-LA.MMA 39 NARARUM šardijaš ŠU.BULUG-ašš-a ēš n-san pahšti 40 a-pa-a-ša=ma tuk paḫšaru. See also the broken KUB 21.37 obv. 19']\]
nu mân zik ḏTargašnalliš a-pé-e-d[a-]aš menahḥanda 7 [idalauq]ahiti nu a-pé-e-

If you (zik), Targasnalli [perform] evil against them (apedas), then I will support them (apedas), while you (zik-ma) shall be my enemy! But if they (apus-ma) become evil [against you (tuk)], then I shall support you (tuk), while they (apus-ma) [shall be] my enemy!

On discourse level the units nu mân zik ... and mân apūš=ma ... are contrasted. This is, among other things, indicated by the particle -ma. As for contrast inside the clause, in both conditional clauses the subject is contrasted with the indirect object: zik versus apedas and apus versus tuk. The level of coordination which is discussed in this section occurs in nu a-
pé-e-da-aš EGIR-an ti̇jami zik=ma=mu=za kürur ēs and nu tuk EGIR-an ti̇jami a-[p]u-
u̇-uš?=ma=mu kürur [Əšanda].

7.60 KUB 23.1+ iv 14-16 (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 105), ed. Kühne & Otten 1971: 14-17

Your (tuel) merchant shall not go into the country of Assur, while his (apel) merchant you shall not let (enter) your country.

7.5. Focus Structure of the ‘also’ clauses

The type of Focus expressed by “also” is described by Dik 1997a, who dubs it Expanding Focus. The particle is used when the speaker assumes that the addressee might have some information, that it is correct, but not complete (o.c. 333). Expanding Focus expands the incomplete information by the correct information. The following example of this type of Focus is adapted from Dik 1989: 284 (his ex. 49):

S assumes that A might think: John bought apples.
S corrects: He not only bought APPLES, he also bought BANANAS.

The only information that is new in the second clause of the correcting statement is the rice, the rest of the clause is presupposed. This is most clearly seen in the exx. 7.21 and 7.22. These pieces of text deal with the destruction of Hatti, and in the case of apass-a we could also paraphrase the clauses as “he too did it”. The Focus structure of the clause is Argument Focus (See Chapter 2 for the discussion on Focus Structure). This is true for all clauses where the subject apa- carries the Expanding Focus marker -ya. But is the same true for Focus on a non-subject, that is, can we decide whether we have Focus on a noun in the predicate or whether we have simple Predicate Focus? As explained in Chapter 2, when the Focus falls somewhere in the VP, in many languages there is no (word order) distinction between Argument Focus on a noun in the VP and Predicate Focus. Only the complete lack of accent on the VP might indicate the difference between Argument and Predicate Focus. However, in
Hittite everything moves to First position (or Initial in a few cases), which means that not only prosody is involved in this type of Focus Structure, but also word order. Thus, it is always possible in Hittite to distinguish between Expanding Argument Focus and Predicate Focus.

The basic pattern for *apa-* with Expanding Focus reading is:

```
## X apa- + -ya .......... V
```

where X is *nu* or a noun(phrase). It should be tested whether this pattern is limited to *apa-* alone or whether this word order pattern for Expanding Focus is more general.

To conclude the discussion on Focal -ya, I present here an example with interesting implications if the above said on word order and Focus is accepted:

7.6.1 KBo 6.29 + i 16-21 (NH edict, Hattusili III, CTH 85), ed. Götte 1925: 46-47


Now, Puduhepa, servant of Istar of Layazantiya was the daughter of Pentip-sarri, priest of Istar. Also her I did not take in marriage out of my own will. At the command of the goddess I took her. The goddess assigned her to me in a dream.

We now know that -ya in first position has to be “also”. Moreover, the remainder of the clause has to be presupposed which is necessary given the fact that we are dealing with Focus on a noun. But this implies that there is a presupposition “I did not take X in marriage out of my own will”, meaning that Hattusili had an earlier wife not of his own choosing.

7.6. Focus structure of the Coordinated Clauses

7.6.1. Introduction

We have already seen above that Expanding Focus may be connected with a special position in the clause. What I want to investigate here is whether something similar can be said about the Focus Structure in coordinated clauses.

First let me recall what Lambrechts has said about accented pronouns (1994: 323f.). Accented pronouns refer to discourse entities that are already discourse active, which means that they already have been introduced into the discourse. In Cornish's terms they are salient (see Chapter 2). Furthermore, the Addressee is able to correctly identify the intended referent. The accent on the pronoun therefore does not activate the referent somehow. Instead, it establishes the pragmatic role of the referent as either a Topic or Focus in the sentence. The Addressee may infer from the use of the accent that the referent of the pronoun is not the established Topic. This interpretation might work for the referents of *apa-* in the second clause of a coordination since *apa-* usually (but not always!) refers to a discourse entity more than one clause away, but does the same explanation account for the use of *apa-*

350 Resulting from the theory of Focus, the elements following *apa-* + -ya are necessarily without stress.

351 The CHD L-N 185a does not translate the -ya in *apunn-a.*
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in the first clause of the coordination? In section 7.3.4 I already noted that the use of *apun* in the first member of a coordination structure has nothing to do with topicality, but seems to be connected with the structure itself. I will further investigate this use of *apa-* in section 7.6.2, followed by a discussion of the pattern involved in coordinated clauses (7.6.3).

7.6.2. When *apa-* occurs in the first clause of the coordination structure

According to Dik (1997a: 199), following Moutaoukil, coordinated clauses must have the same kind of Focus function or the same kind of internal Focus distribution. All second clauses in the coordinate structures of section 7.3 are Topic-Comment clauses. The subjects are expressed by the preferred Topic expression ø, that is, the subject is expressed in the verbal ending, and are therefore Topics. The Focus type expressed in these clauses is New Focus. This same Focus structure must also appear in the first clause of the structure, and indeed, each clause is a Topic-Comment clause. Furthermore, besides the presence of a Subject-Topic expressed in the verbal ending, also the referent of *apa-* is an Established Topic. So why is an accented pronoun used when the referent is an Established Topic? Lambrecht 1994 presents a kind of Topic which could explain the occurrence of accented *apa-* here. He discusses a situation where the Topics are indeed already established: Contrastive Topics (o.c. 291f.). To cite an example (his 3.20b, l.c.):

7.62 I saw Mary and John yesterday. SHE says HELLO, but HE’s still ANGRY at you.

The predicates ‘say hello’ and ‘be angry’ comment on the Topics, who are contrasted with each other. The problem is that the second clause in this example also requires an Established Topic, which is not compatible with what we have seen in exx. 7.1, 7.45, 7.46 and 7.47. Furthermore, there was no perceivable contrast in 7.1, 7.45 and 7.47. Another example of an Established Topic that is still expressed by means of an accented pronoun is (o.c., p. 328, ex. (5.86')):

7.63 A: What is Mary’s job going to BE?
B: SHE’s going to do the COOKING

The referent of ‘she’ is already an Established Topic, so according to Lambrecht (o.c. 328-329) “the accent gives rise to an implicature: “Mary” is selected over some potential alternative candidate in the universe of discourse” because “the accented pronoun says more than is needed to designate the given referent”. This means that there are some other persons who might be doing something else, or at least, that something else is happening too. This becomes clearer when we adjust example 7.62 to be more similar to 7.63:

7.64 I saw Mary and John yesterday. SHE says HELLO.

The implicature in this case is that John is doing something else. I suggest that this is also the solution for the occurrence of *apun* referring to an Established Topic. The implicature is that besides the action around *apun* also something else is expected to happen as a concomitant action. This concomitant action is expressed in the coordinated clause. Thus, the accented pronoun gives rise to the implicature that the clause containing *apun* is not the end of the message and that the Addressee therefore has to be prepared for a following, coordinated

332 But that should actually not be a problem because Lambrecht (l.c.) explains that contrast is not a feature of grammar, but "the result of the general cognitive processes referred to as "conversation implicatures.""
This conclusion is supported by research on pitch accent (Terken 1984). One of the questions addressed by Terken is why a Speaker uses accented topical expressions (topical in the sense of discourse topical). She concludes that “the distribution of accents in the initial part of a contrastive construction is determined more by relations with what he will say later on, than (as in other uses of accentuation) on relations with the preceding linguistic context. One might suggest that this account of contrastive accentuation should be generalized to all cases of accentuation; one argument in favor is that it is not possible to make a clear distinction between what is and what is not contrastive” (o.c. 286).

But how about the accented corresponding member in second part of the coordination structure? It is possible that, since the second member has to be able to change place with the first member, one also needs an accented (pro)noun in the second member of the coordination.

The implicature that a coordination will follow explains an otherwise incomprehensible repetition of pronouns, i.e., why apa- can be followed by apa- referring to the same referent. We already have been seen in ex. 7.59 that apedas in rev. 7 follows upon apedas in rev. 6. Another example is:

7.65 KBo 3.34 ii 29-32 (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 52-53

The arrow, the sharpening-wheel (?), the holding of the weapon, he (apas) taught them (= the young chariot-fighters). One he (apas) taught (= continued to train), and also, some others the father of the king gave to Nakaklit, head of the cupbearers, and still others he gave to Huzzi, head of the heralds, (finally) some to Kizzu, head of the royal bodyguards, so that they completed their training.

353 The reason could also lie in the prosodic structure of the clauses. Although we do not know much about prosody in Hittite, a discussion of Focus accent might shed some light on the problem. The Comment, or Predicate, is the domain of the Focus, and the prosodic peak indicating the locus of the Focus accent lies on the preverbal constituent, if present. For placing the Focus accent on the preverbal constituent and not on the verb itself see the general discussion in Lambrecht (1994: 266ff.) and especially for SOV languages Herring and Paolillo (1995: 164). However, Focus falls by default on the verb if there is no other accented element present. This means that a clause like “I did it” necessarily carries accent on the verb, because both “I” and “it” are preferred topics and therefore unaccented. That means that if in Hittite the referent of the pronoun apun or the full NP were expressed as an unaccented, enclitic pronoun, the Focus accent would by default fall on the verb, while the Focus accent in the second clause falls on the lexical Object NP. But despite this difference in prosodic peak the Focus structure is unaffected, whether or not both objects are enclitically or lexically expressed. So, although the predicates do not always belong to the same semantic field, every other criterion of Moutouakil seems to be met, including the same Focus structure. So why do we have the accented pronoun? For now, it seems as if the corresponding Arguments involved in a coordinate structure require the same amount of stress. That is, at least it is not allowed to have one argument expressed as unaccented whereas the other one is accented. One should therefore conclude that a coordinate structure requires a balanced Intonation Contour besides a balanced semantic, syntactic and Focus distribution.

354 I believe that what I have described here is not restricted to pronouns but is a general feature of noun phrases. It should be investigated whether occurrence in a coordination structure explains at least some repeated nouns.

355 Dardano i.e. translates nu annanut ...... etc. as “Quello li istruiva, quell’altro lo istruiva (?) ; alla fine il padre del re affidò alcuni a Nakaklit, ..., altri a Huzziya, ... e altri ancora a Kizzuwa ... e (costoro) completarono a loro preparazione." She takes the two apa- clauses together, and separates them from the following clauses. Probably in order to avoid two references of apa- to the same person she has chosen to introduce two different refers for the two apa-s. This solution introduces an unknown referent, not mentioned in the discourse. The pronoun apa-referring to an unspecified entity is not attested in my material.
The meaning of the passage is that the ‘he’ (Suppiuman) provides the trainees with a basic education. After that, Suppiuman keeps one apprentice (kun), while the rest of the class is split up (kuss-a ... kus ... kus) to receive their higher education in other fields of warfare. Thus, the first member of the coordination is kûn apâš annanut and the second member starts with kûn̂û s a A BÎ LUGAL ANA Nakkitî GAL A Lû-MEŠAGI pašš.

The exact meaning of the accented pronominal subject (here apas, see also exx. 7.46, 7.48, 7.49) will be further discussed in Chapter 8.

7.6.3. When apa- occurs in the second clause

The clauses with apa- in the second member of a coordination structure were presented in sections 7.2.4.1 and 7.4. Usually the referents of apa- can be conceived of as contrasting with another element in the first member of the coordinate structure, but this is not always the case. There is one example, 7.27, repeated here, which cannot be explained as contrastive, or as somehow unexpected (see 7.6.1.).

7.6.4. Patterns

If one looks at the distribution of the apa- constituents in the different language phases, one notices a difference between Old Hittite and Middle Hittite (the index on the verb indicates ‘same subject’ (i ...i)):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-OH</th>
<th>nu</th>
<th>apun</th>
<th>V_i</th>
<th>X=ma</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>V_i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24-OH</td>
<td>apija</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>apija=ja</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>V_i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-OH</td>
<td>apass-a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>apun=as</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V_i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-OH</td>
<td>apun</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td>apun=sa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V_i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-OH</td>
<td>apun</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>apass-a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V_i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-OH</td>
<td>zikk=as=ya</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>apass-a</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-OH</td>
<td>apun</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td>U-O</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-OH</td>
<td>apun=sa</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td>U-O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V_i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-OH</td>
<td>apun</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td>O=ja</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-OH</td>
<td>nu=za</td>
<td>O+O</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O=ja+O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V_i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-OH</td>
<td>O+O</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td>O=ja+O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V_i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-OH</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td>U-O</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-OH</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td>O=ja</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-OH</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td>U-O</td>
<td>V_i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-OH</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>apass-a</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Old Hittite the boldface constituents in the first member of the coordination structure usually occur in Initial position, whereas in Middle Hittite and New Hittite it generally occurs in First position, only preceded by \( nu \). This is in agreement with the observation that \( nu \) is still sparingly used in Old Hittite. So if we, for the time being, consider asyndeton in Old Hittite and clauses introduced by \( nu \) in later Hittite the same, then we see that the boldface constituents stand as far as possible to the beginning of the clause. The semantic, syntactic, pragmatic, illocutionary (and intonational?) symmetry of coordinated clauses finds its expression in the wordorder pattern

\[\text{## } (\text{nu}) \ A \ W \ V \ N, \ N, -\text{ya/-ma} \ W \ V\]

7.7. Summary

In this chapter I discussed the use of the accented pronoun \( apa- \) with the enclitic focus particle -ya “also” and with the coordinators -ya “and” and -al-ma “and, but, while”. It was possible to correlate the Expanding Focus expression \( apa- + -ya \) “he/she/that too” with First Position in the clause, while -ya as the coordinator “and” cliticized to \( apa- \) turned out to be restricted to Initial position.

However, \( apa- \) also appeared unexpectedly in some of the laws. In order to explain its occurrence it was necessary to classify the laws according to the types of punishment:

- class I: the punishment consists of payment of a fine or substitute.
- class II: the punishment consists of payment of a fine or substitute and another action to be undertaken by the offender.
- class III: the punishment consists only of the action to be undertaken by the offender, without payment of a fine.

The punishment in class II was always expressed in a coordinate structure, and in such a situation the independent pronoun \( apa- \) or a full lexical noun(phrase) could appear where it was not expected (high saliency, no preceding discourse entities to contrast with, no new topic in case of \( apa- \)). I concluded that this highly unexpected \( apa- \) or noun signals the addressee that s/he must be prepared for a following coordinated clause where two propositions are juxtaposed. Contrast was not a necessary feature of the coordination with -ya. On the other hand, the clauses containing the mildly adversative coordinator -al-ma all showed contrast (as was expected given the semantics of -al-ma).