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9. Surprising apa-

9.1. Introduction

In this chapter I will discuss the use of the accented pronoun apa- with the conjunction -ma and its Old and early Middle Hittite allophone -a. A first step in understanding the purpose of apa- with -al-ma is to understand how -al-ma functions in the discourse. The discussion therefore starts with an overview of the different contexts in which this conjunction appears (9.1.1.), followed by a discussion of apa- with -al-ma in view of the major functions of -al-ma (sections 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4). The results are presented in 9.5. These results will be used to explain some hitherto ambiguous occurrences of apa- with -al-ma and some difficult texts.

9.1.1. The particle -ma / -a

Rieken 2000: 412ff. provides an overview of the different functions of -al-ma, mainly concentrating on the development of its functions in Old Hittite. Since her perception of the functions of -al-ma is important for the understanding of apa- with -al-ma, I will summarize her findings and use her categorization as a basis for the discussion of apa- with -al-ma. Rieken discerns three different contexts in which -al-ma is used:

1. In the earliest texts -al-ma is not a conjunction with sentence scope but a particle with only word scope, and still without the adversative meaning which it later acquires. The particle could be attached to a Topic (which is often the subject, but sometimes also an object or indirect object), or a Setting (an expression of location or time) (o.c. 414). In both cases the word marked by -al-ma can be thought of as a new orientation in the discourse. An example of -al-ma as Topic shifting device is:

9.1 KBo 17.1+ i 35'-36' (OS ritual, CTH 416), ed. Neu 1980a: 6


403 The alternation of -ma following vowels and logograms and -a following consonants is mentioned by Melchert 1984: 30 with fn. 9, Garrett 1990: 18f. and Rieken 2000: 412.

404 The work of Michael-David Meacham on -mal-a: A synchronic and Diachronic Functional Analysis of Hittite -ma, Ann Arbor 2001 was not available to me.

405 The marking of a Topic and new Setting is also found in the CHD L-N, p. 96 sub d, 'marking anaphora (to resume and more completely describe or define a word just mentioned; on the resuming word at the head of its clause)' (l.c.). In all the examples cited in this section of the CHD, the resuming word is part of the Focus of the preceding clause and is not expected to function as some Topic in the -ma clause. The preceding Sentence Topic is always different, so -ma indicates a (temporary) Topic shift, a new starting point.
The king sp[its] thrice on the soldier and the queen sp[its] (on him) thrice. The hornblower\textsuperscript{406} calls.

As a result of the general reorientating function -\textit{al-ma} may also mark the boundary of a digression from the main story line (o.c. 415: "Einschub"). Such a digression often provides some background information on a person or object in which the attention is temporarily directed from the Discourse Topic to a Sub-Topic\textsuperscript{407}. Of these three sub-functions of marking a reorientation —indication of a new Topic, a new Setting or a digression containing a Sub-Topic— only the new Topic and New Setting are found with pronominal \textit{apa}- in my corpus (see 9.2.).

(2) Already in Old Hittite the particle widened its scope to mark not only words that indicate a new orientation in the discourse but also sentences, with the same function (o.c. 416). These sentences are usually conditional, temporal or sometimes relative clause with conditional connotation (\textit{takku, män, naśma} and \textit{kui}-clauses), with -\textit{al-ma} generally attached to the second accented word\textsuperscript{408}:


\begin{quote}
76 män āppa\textsuperscript{ma} \textsuperscript{URU}Nēša [\textit{u̯a}n\textit{(un)}] \textsuperscript{77} nu \textsuperscript{LU} \textsuperscript{URU}Puruś\textit{anda katti\textsuperscript{mmi}} [(\textit{pëhutenun})] \textsuperscript{78} män tunnak\textit{išna\textsuperscript{ma}} paizzi \textit{ap[\textit{(dāš\textit{a})]} \textsuperscript{79} përa\textsuperscript{mmi} kunnaz ešari} (end of text)
\end{quote}

But when I came back to Nesa, I brought the man of Purushanda with me. Now, when he goes into the inner chamber, he sits before me at my right.

(3) The final stage in Old Hittite is reached when -\textit{al-ma} has further evolved into a conjunction with contrastive meaning ("satzverbindende Adversativ-konjunktion", o.c. 417-418)\textsuperscript{409}.\textsuperscript{410} In that context it is often not possible to find any trace of its earlier reorientation marking function.

\textsuperscript{406} The German translation "Der Hornist aber" does more justice to the use of -\textit{a}. In English Topic shifts are not necessarily indicated.

\textsuperscript{407} This is described in the CHD L-N p. 96, c as ‘marking an explanation or elaboration (which interrupts the normal flow of the context)’. Here -\textit{ma} is structuring the discourse, introducing an embedded discourse unit.

\textsuperscript{408} See also CHD L-N p. 94, b 2', and p. 97f., f 2'.

\textsuperscript{409} According to Rieken 2000: 417 -\textit{al-ma} acquired a contrastive meaning when for example a Topic marked by the particle was semantically contrastive to an earlier Topic. Most examples from category (a) in the CHD L-N p. 92 ‘marking the correlation of single words within adjacent clauses’ belong to this type. The particle -\textit{ma} is attached to a new entity, location or verb that is semantically related to its parallel in the preceding clause. It does not continue a preceding Discourse Topic or Sentence Topic, but introduces a new Topic or Setting, contrasting it with the previous topic in a parallel sentence. In all the cited examples the correlated clauses are similar in syntax and semantics, so not only single words are correlated but also the clauses that contain them: the narration is never pushed forward in these sequences. The correlated clause is not backgrounded or subordinate to the first clause. Rather, the couple is a coordinate construction as I have described in Chapter 7 for the conjunction -\textit{ya ‘and’}. The two clauses form a single discourse unit with equal importance for both members. One might as well describe the actions or states expressed in these clauses —lacking progress— as concurrent (see also sub -\textit{ma}, b 7', p. 93).

\textsuperscript{410} This function of -\textit{ma(\textit{f-a})} is represented by the examples in the CHD L-N sub b. (1', 3', and 4') ‘marking correlation of clauses without focus on a particular pair of words’ (o.c. 93). The second clause as a whole is often contrasted with the first clause. Again, the conjunction -\textit{ma} binds two clauses in a coordinate structure, functioning as a unit on discourse level. In b. 1’ the particle -\textit{ma} is attached to the New (or Unexpected) Topic.
9.3  **KBo 17.43 i 11'-13'** (OS ritual, CTH *649), ed. Neu 1980a: 105

LUGAL-i *parā* I-SU¹² *paizzi* ṣapp = ṣam = ṣaš = ṣa nēa ...¹³ *parā* = [m]a = aš paizzi

He goes forward to the king once. But (then) he turns back (and strikes the archer (?) with the water bag(?)). But (then) he goes forward (and strikes the performers).

9.1.2. The particle *-ma / -a* and *apa-*: preliminary discussion

The three uses of *-al-ma* as a marker of a new orientation in the discourse with either word or clause scope or as an adversative conjunction also occur with the anaphoric pronoun *apa-*.

Therefore Rieken's remark (2000: 416) that the marked constituent often contains new information should be refined. The use of *-al-ma* with an anaphoric pronoun, in this case *apa-*, is not marginal⁴¹¹ but occurs as often as *apa-* with *-ya* in my corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>MH/MS</th>
<th>NH</th>
<th>lateNH</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>-al-ma</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>-ya</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9.1**: Distribution of *apa-* with *-al-ma 'but, while' and *-ya 'and, also'.

One of the functions of *apa-* with *-al-ma* follows from Rieken's description of the use of *-al-ma*. If the preceding Subject-Topic is replaced by a new Subject-Topic that is already salient in the discourse, then the accented pronoun *apa-* may be used instead of a lexical noun phrase. The 'newness' is not connected with a new referent, but simply with a new pragmatic and/or syntactic role. Thus, *-al-ma* marks a Topic shift (category (1), see also section 9.2.1.):


*mān = an zazakan* ³⁴  *šēhunanza* = *pat* tamāšzi *n = a[A]NA* LÚMESSEDUTIM hūmandāš ³⁵  EGISR-arši *nu = šši* kúši ³⁶ LÚMESE[DI] pirāššit artari  *du[kīti][a]ša* kan *paimi* *apa-aša* parā dametani ³⁷ LÚMESEDI tezi *apa-ša* *parā* LÚarriplanall tezi

Only if a bodily urge bothers him, he will move behind all the guards. He will say to (one of) the bodyguard(s) who stands before him: "I will go to the pot." He then *(apas=a)* tells (it) forth to another bodyguard, *he* then *(apas=a)* tells (it) forth to a man of third rank.

---

or Setting. (Sections b. 3' and 4' deal with the hosts *naššu* "or" and *natta* "not" respectively.) The few occurrences of *apa-* with *-ma* in a coordinate structure are discussed in Chapter 7. See also section 9.4.1.

⁴¹¹ Rieken l.c. "Dementsprechend muß die Verwendung von *-al-ma* an einem anaphorischen Pronomen, das keine andere Aufgabe hat, als eine Konstituente zum Zwecke der Festlegung ihrer syntaktischen Funktion wiederaufzunehmen, marginal bleiben". Although Rieken does not specify what anaphoric pronoun is meant, I assume that she refers to *apa-* The CHD L-N p. 91ff. does not mention the use of *apa-* with *-ma* either.
Each time the Primary Topic is replaced by a new one. In i 36 (nu=sši tezzi) the Primary Topic is the Subject, and the Secondary Topic is -šši. The Secondary Topic is promoted to Primary Topic by means of the pronoun apa-. In the other sentences not some Topic referents but referents in the Predicate Focus are promoted to Primary Topic (i 36-37: the focal syntagm dametani LÜMESEDI is promoted to Subject-Topic apāš=a). But Topic shift alone cannot explain everything, for apa- + -al-ma also occurs when the (Subject-)Topic remains the same. It might follow from Riecken’s analysis that in that case -al-ma marks a whole clause as a new orientation (2), or that it is a conjunction with contrastive function (3). But none of this explains how apa- with -al-ma functions in the following example:

9.5 KUB 36.104 obv. 9'-10' (OS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 32-33
9 KUR Arzayija mNunnu LÜURHurm((a)) ṣiša [(KUBABBAR=ṣ)a GUŠKI(N)]
[n]atta udai kuit ūemizz[(i a-pa-)][a]-ša p[ar-na=šša pittaizzi]]
In Arzawa Nunnu was the man from Hurma (= ambassador). But he does not collect the silver and gold. Whatever he finds, he (apas=a) carries (it) to his house.

Nunnu is the Discourse Topic of this paragraph, there are no other referents that might compete for Topic function, and the clause containing apa- + -a is not a digression but actually the reason why this paragraph is written at all. The preceding relative clause prevents the interpretation of -a as a contrastive conjunction, unless we assume that the relative clause does not interfere with the superordinate structure of the discourse. In the latter situation the basic structure would be KUBABBAR=ṣa GUŠKI natta udai apāš=a parna=šša pittaizzi meaning ‘he does not collect the silver and gold (for the palace), (instead), he takes it to his house’, and the second phrase would be an elaboration of the first, explaining what he did do with it. One might consider this as ‘contrastive’, although according to Lambrecht 1994: 291 contrastiveness is not a category of grammar but a conversational implicature. Let us for the moment assume that -al-ma is a contrastive or adversative conjunction here. Why is it not simply attached to parna=šša? The clause parna=šša=ma pittaizzi “he brings it to his house” would ‘feel’ better because the contrast between taking the silver and gold to the (implied) palace with bringing it to his house would even become more explicit. The fact that the nominative apa- is used where it does not seem to be necessary means that we have to look for another explanation besides contrast with a preceding clause.

Summarizing, apa- with -al-ma can signal that the Topic of the preceding clause is not continued, in other words, that apa- with -al-ma is an Unestablished Topic. But there are also examples of apa- with the conjunction that still indicate the Established Topic. In ex. 9.5 the other functions of -al-ma, marking a whole clause as a new orientation in the discourse or marking contrast with a preceding clause, did not suit the context. However, contrast seemed to be possible if the preceding relative clause was left out of account. But this contrast does not explain the use of the accented pronoun apāš since -al-ma could have been cliticized to other noun phrases. The latter observation must be kept in mind whenever the nominative of apa- appears.

412 For the terms Primary and Secondary Topic see Lambrecht 1994: 147. The Primary Topic often coincides with the Discourse Topic whereas the Secondary Topic is more marginal. Still, -šši is a Topic since the clause nu=šši tezzi is both about the guard in front, introduced in the relative clause, and about the one who needs to go.

413 It is also possible that the relative clause is postposed to the preceding main clause. Also then -a does not connect its hosting clause with the relative clause.
9.2. The particle -al-ma with word scope and apa-

9.2.1. Topic shift

When the particle -al-ma has word scope, it often indicates that there is a new Sentence Topic (see section 9.1.1., category (1)). Sentence Topics, whether established or unestablished, are very often also the Subject. The first question is whether this is also true for apa-. In the next tables I present the distribution of the grammatical cases of apa- with -al-ma (independent of the three functions of -al-ma) and apa- with -ya:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-al-ma</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>MH/MS</th>
<th>NH</th>
<th>lateNH</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2: Distribution of grammatical case of apa- with -al-ma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-ya</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>MH/MS</th>
<th>NH</th>
<th>lateNH</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.3: Distribution of grammatical case of apa- with -ya

The counts show that apa- with -al-ma is very often a nominative and therefore the Subject of a clause. If we compare this with the counts on apa- with -ya where the figures of the nominative and accusative (Subject and Object) are of the same order (30 versus 24), one must conclude that -al-ma indeed has something to do with the Subject and therefore probably also with the Topic. Although ex. 9.5. shows that apa- with -al-ma not necessarily indicates a Subject or Topic shift, the Subject or Topic must somehow still be of importance (this will be discussed in 9.4.3.).

Sometimes apa- occurs when there are several candidates in the preceding discourse for Subject-Topic-hood (see ex. 9.4). One could therefore argue that apa- is used to avoid referential ambiguity. In the next example (already discussed as ex. 5.28) a simple nu apat memai “he says that” would lead the Addressee to the unintended “Or if someone say this: “Step behind me”, and says that: “…” 414. This is prevented by the occurrence of accented apa-:


414 See also KUB 26.12+ iv 13, 41 (CTH 255.1).
an=ya=mu  ti[ja] 6  apāš=ma  a-pa-a-at  memai  EGIR-an=ya=ta 7 OL tişami  ḫantı=ja=ya=ṣṣī 8 OL tişami  ḫuḫuṣapaš=sal=ya=ṣṣī? 0]L 9 kīṣḥaḥari  ...

Or (if) [……] or a brother of [My Majesty], o[ffspring or] brothers [of the Queen], [listen] to sons of cons[cubine]s, (and) says this (this): “Side with me”, but he says this instead (apat): “I do not step behind you, and I do not step before him, and I [do no]t become evil [against him?]”  …

But referential ambiguity is not the issue in ex. 9.7 with singular and plural subjects415:

9.7  KBo 20.26+ obv. 13'-17' (OS ritual, CTH 649.7A), ed. Neu 1980a: 89

[The zinnuḫi-women take their place, stand (still), and [si]ng as follo[ws].] [One c]alls out:  uliḫā  ulin, and they (ape=ma) pray to her in that [same] way. She then (apas=ma) continues calling as follows: teuiarate  …[…  taštemû  uliḫāliṉa  taštemû. The others (ape=ma) pray to her in that [same] wa[y]. She furthermore calls: lamā  ziuijallināja. The others (ape=ma) [pray to her in that same way.]

Also in the next example referential ambiguity is completely absent416.

9.8  KUB 1.1+ iii 61-63 (NH egodocument, Hittusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 22-23
nu  ŠA  [(ŠEŠ=YA)] 62  [(nakkiṭanni  ḫandaš)]  OL  mana qa  DŪ-nun[ n(u  IN  A MU.VII.KAM  dahusijaḥha)] 63  [(a-pa-a-ša-mu  ḫarkanna)]  IŠTU  INIM  DINGIR-
[(LIJ  Ü  IŠTU  INIM  LÜ  šan(a)ḫta)]  I did not do anything out of reverence for my brother. For seven years I complied, but he (apas=ma, Urhi-Tessub) sought to destroy me at the command of god and the suggestion of man417.

In example 9.9 we have both types: shift from first person to third person Subject-Topic and shift from third person to third person Subject-Topic:

9.9  KUB 26.1 iii 58-66 (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.2) ed. Von Schuler 1957: 14, transl. CHD L-N, p. 54b
§ 58 ANA  dUTU-Ši=ja  ŠEŠ.MEŠ=ŠU  maįqaquš 59  parā  ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ušš=sa=mu  meqqajčiš 60  LUGAL.MEŠ  arḫezunušš=sa  meqqauš 61  šummaš=ma  kuješ  LÛ.MEŠ.SAG 62 nu=za  parā  kuink kiudeaniķi 63  uįiami  a-pa-a-ša-ma=an  SIG=aḫḫi 64  a-pa-a-ša-ma  KAXU-iš  duųanāni 65  nu=šši  INIM.MEŠ  LUGAL  parā  memai 66  n=at  GAM  NES DINGIR-LIM  [GAR-ru]  §

And I, My Majesty, have many brothers and I have many half-brothers and many kings abroad. Now, you who are courtiers, (if) I send someone (of you) out to

415 See also KUB 26.12+ iii 16 (CTH 255.1).
416 See also KBo 6.29 ii 18 (NH edict, Hattusili III, CTH 85), KUB 14.4 ii 10' (NH indictment, Mursili II, CTH 70).
417 Translation follows CHD Š: 166b-167a.

325
someone (of my brothers etc.), and that one (apas=ma) shows favor to him, so that he (apas=ma) breaks confidence, and blurs out to him the words of the king, [let] it [be put] under divine oath.

The relations between the referential expressions are elucidated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>courtier</th>
<th>brother etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kuinkti (obj.)</td>
<td>kuedanikki (indirect obj.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-an (obj.)</td>
<td>apāš=ma (subj.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apāš=ma (subj.)</td>
<td>zšši (indirect obj.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(subj.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.4: Referent chains in ex. 9.9

If apāš were not used, the referents of the third person pronouns of the resulting clauses n=an SIG7-ahhi nu KAXU-iš duyarnaš “and he shows favor to him, and he breaks confidence ...” would be harder to establish. It is very well possible that apa- with -ma is needed to alert the Addressee that something unexpected is at hand.

In all these cases there is a Subject shift and (Sentence) Topic shift. But before we conclude that Subject-Topic shift explains the use of apa- with -al/-ma we need to compare the preceding examples with the following law (already cited earlier as ex. 8.18):

KBo 6.2 i 16-19, § 10 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 24

§ 16 [(takk)] lü LÜ.U19.LU-an kuiski ḫünikzi t=an ištarnikzi nu apāš 17 šaktaižzi pēdi šši ma LÜ.U19.LU-an pāi nu É-ri šši 18 anniškizzi kuitmán=aš lázialta män=aš lazialta=ma 19 nu šše 6 GIN KU.BABBAR pái LÜ.A.ZU ša kuššan apāš= pat pāi §

If anyone injures a (free) person and incapacitates him, he shall provide medical care for him, while in his (the injured) place he (the guilty party) shall give a (another) man. He (the person who has been given) shall work on his (the injured man’s) estate, until he (the injured one) recovers. When he recovers, he (the offender) shall pay him 6 sheqels and the doctor’s fee, he shall pay (it) instead (of the patient).418

Although there are several Subject-Topic shifts in this law none of them is indicated by means of apa- with -al/-ma.419 In the following table I list the three persons involved and their syntactic roles in the discourse:

418 Hoffner I.e.: “and shall pay the physician’s fee as well”.

419 Also Luraghi 1990: 87 discusses this law from the point of view of Topic, concentrating on the use versus non-use of pronominal clitics. She assumes that the use of clitics versus omission is governed by the syntactic role of the participants when they are first introduced. The offender is introduced as a Subject-Agent (kuiski) and the injured as Object-Patient (LÜ.U19.LU-an). Although Luraghi does not use the terms Primary and Secondary Topic, I believe that she wants to claim that the Primary Topic (the Subject-Agent) usually governs the omission of clitics, whereas the Secondary Topic is expressed by means of clitics of different kinds (subject clitic, object clitic, enclitic possessive pronoun, dative clitic). However, as she herself notes, the use of subject clitics is governed by structural, not pragmatic, factors. The use of the clitic -as in clause 6 and 7 depends on the fact that the verb is intransitive. It could not happen been omitted at all. With a transitive verb we would not have -as, thus breaking the pattern noted by Luraghi. One of her other arguments supporting the distribution ‘Primary Topic & no clitics — Secondary Topic & clitics’ does not hold either. She states that the third participant is not referred to by means of -as in 5 in order to prevent confusion, since all clitics refer to the injured person. The problem with her argument is that anniya-annisk- is a transitive verb, even though the object is not expressed. Only verbs that never take an Object should be considered intransitive (see Garrett
Subject-Topic shifts occur in clauses 5, 6 and 8 without any warning. But when looking at the rest of the clauses, it becomes clear that from a semantic point of view it is not necessary to mark a topic shift. For example, in 4-5 ‘while in his place he shall give a(nother) man. He shall work on his estate’ the only sensible interpretation given one’s knowledge of the world is that the offender does not first provide a stand-in and then goes himself to work on the estate, or that the stand-in has to work on the offender’s estate.

Summarizing, the enclitic pronouns or zero can be used when the semantics of the verb force an interpretation that excludes referential ambiguity. On the other hand, apa- with -ma can (or must?) be used when the semantics of the verb allow referential ambiguity. Thus, Subject-Topic shift in isolation does not explain the use of apa-. Moreover, referential ambiguity is out of the question when non-third persons are involved.

So the question remains: if a Subject-Topic shift does not need to be expressed by means of apa- while apa- is in most cases connected with Subject-Topic shift, then what extra information does apa- with -al-ma provide the Addressee with in case of Subject-Topic shift? In order to find that extra information we will turn to the unexpected appearance of apa- with -al-ma when the Subject-Topic does not change in 9.4.3. But first the other categories of the use of -al-ma in connection with -al-ma will be discussed.

9.2.2. New setting or orientation in the discourse

The syntagm apesz=ma marking a new setting is attested in KUB 19.13420: 1990 : Chapter 3). Concluding, the fact that in this law the Object is referred to by clitics and the Subject not is coincidental and just depends on the valency of verbs used here.

9.2.2. New setting or orientation in the discourse

The syntagm apesz=ma marking a new setting is attested in KUB 19.13420:

9.11 KUB 19.13+ i 37'-38' (NH annals, CTH 40), ed. Güterbock 1956: 110 nu KUR URU Hinariyanda URU Iwatallisha arha 38' urnut a-pé-e-[e]z=ma=aš URU Šapidduwa šešta He burnt down the country of Hinariyanda and Iwatallissa. But from the[re] (apesz=ma) (he went on and) slept in Sapidduwa.

9.3. The particle -al-ma with clause scope and apa-: a new orientation

1990: Chapter 3). Concluding, the fact that in this law the Object is referred to by clitics and the Subject not is coincidental and just depends on the valency of verbs used here.

420 See also KUB 19.13+ i 34', 36'.

Table 9.5: Referent chains in ex. 9.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>injured</th>
<th>guilty party</th>
<th>replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 LÜ U₁₉LU-an (obj.)</td>
<td>kuiški (subj.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 t=an (obj.)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 apšin (obj.)</td>
<td>ø (subj.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pêdizšsė (gen.)</td>
<td>ø (subj.)</td>
<td>LÜ U₁₉LU-an (obj.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 É-rišši (gen.)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ø (subj.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 kuitmän=as (subj.)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 mān≡as (subj.)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 nu ≡šše</td>
<td>ø (subj.)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 —</td>
<td>apāš=pat (subj.)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Besides word scope the particle -al-ma can also have scope over a clause (see 9.1.1., category (2)). Clauses with this type of -al-ma often contain background information that is supportive to the main story line. This use of apa- with -al-ma is very rare, and there was not one example in my corpus. Instead I will illustrate this use of -al-ma with apa- by means of a copied Middle (?) Hittite example:

9.12  KUB 13.4 iii 74-77 (pre-NH/NS instruction, CTH 364)

mân=ma=za ITTI MUNUS-TI kuis šešzi 75 [n=an]=kan MAHRI=SU LÔ GAL-ŠU EGR-an tamašzi nu memau=pat 76 [mân]=kan a-pa-a-aš=ma memiųauanzi UL mazzazzi 77 nu LÔ ari=šši memâu nu=za ūar(a)=ptu=pat

But if someone sleeps with a woman, [and] his head chief puts [him] under pressure, he just has to tell it. But if he (man apas=ma) does not dare to tell (him), he must tell his colleague, and he just washes himself.

There is no Topic shift which might explain the use of apa-. One would think that man memiųauanzi=ma … would have been correct as well. Therefore the combination apa- with -al-ma must indicate something else besides Topic shift or a new orientation in the discourse. Besides that, the propositional content of these clauses allows a contrastive nuance. The ritual impure man does not do what he is supposed to do, which is contra the expectations of the Audience. Still, one would like to know why we have man apas=ma … instead of man memiųauanzi=ma ….

9.4. The particle -al-ma as adversative conjunction and apa-

The function of -al-ma as an adversative conjunction is already partially discussed in Chapter 7.7.4. in the framework of coordinated clauses (see now section 9.4.1.). A few remaining examples of clauses with -al-ma in a temporal sequence are presented in 9.4.2. In 9.4.3. I will discuss the attestations of apa- with -al-ma that refer to an Established Topic without contrast with a preceding clause.

9.4.1. The particle -al-ma as adversative coordinator and apa-

The particle -al-ma as adversative coordinator and apa- occurs for example in ex. 9.13, already discussed as ex. 7.57:


§ 14 takku UDU-un UR.BAR.RA-ni kuisši peššizzi išhaš=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.

Both the Subject-Topics and the Objects are juxtaposed. The translation of -al-ma in coordinate clauses is “while”.

9.4.2. The particle -al-ma as adversative sentence connective and apa-
Rieken 2000: 417 cites some examples of -al-ma with adversative function in contexts which exclude a Topic-switch or new orientation in the discourse. One example was already cited above as ex. 9.3, here I will present another one (Rieken cites the parallel KBo 17.43 i 3'):

9.14 KBo 17.43 i 10'-11', with duplicate KBo 17.44+ (OS ritual, CTH *649), ed. Neu 1980a: 105

\[ \text{këtt}=a \text{këtt}=a \text{G}[\text{1-an}] \] 11' \text{huttiannai tarna}=s\text{ma}=s\text{an natta} \\
He draws the arrow on this side and that side, but does not release it.

Here we see the temporal progression which is absent in the clauses where -al-ma functions as a coordinator. This type of -al-ma one can translate with “but (then)”. The adversative function with temporal progression might also explain the use of -al-ma in the following example:


\[ \text{lušnanija}=\text{ma}=\text{aš} \text{ari nu GİŞUKUR} \] 52 \text{ITTI} \text{LÜDU₈ dāi a-pa-ša}=\text{kan kat[t]a paizzi} \\
\ldots, but (when) he reaches the postern he shall deposit the spear with the gatekeeper, while/but then he (himself) (apas=a) walks down.

The preceding discourse pictures how the guard walks through the portico while explicitly stating that he keeps his spear with him. When the next setting is introduced (“But when he reaches the postern”), it is reasonable to expect that the next clause is about the guard, the spear or both. They are both topical in the discourse and also expected to function as Sentence Topics. The contrast resides in the remaining behind of the spear versus the passing of the man through the gate, so the two topics and their comments are contrasted with each other. If it were not for the temporal sequence (one does not first pass through the postern and then returns to deposit the spear), I would classify these two clauses as a coordinate structure as explained in Chapter 7.4.

9.4.3. The referent of apa- + -al-ma and surprising action

Sometimes the particle -al-ma is cliticized to a Subject-Topic that continues the preceding Subject-Topic, so the noun phrase apa- with -al-ma indicates the Established Topic. The motivation for the use of -al-ma could then be the marking of a digression from the main story line or marking some contrast with the preceding clause. However, the next examples exclude the interpretation of -al-ma both as a marker of digression or as adversative conjunction:


\[ \text{kāša}=\text{ya} \text{LUKÜR u} \text{it} \] 5 \text{nu}=\text{ya}=\text{za} \text{URU} \text{Haparan in} \text{išsÇan} \text{6 tamašṭa} \text{URU} \text{Kašipuran}=\text{ma}=\text{ya}=\text{kan} \text{7 kēz tamašṭa a-pa-a-aš-ma} \text{421}=\text{ya}=\text{kan} \text{8 i} \text{ṭarna ar} \text{ha u} \text{it} \text{9 namma}=\text{wa}=\text{r}>\text{aš} \text{ku} \text{ṣapi pait} \text{10 nü}=\text{yar}=\text{aš} \text{DI} \text{ID1} \\

\[ \text{421}-\text{ma} \text{is not present in Alp's transliteration, but drawn in his hand copy.} \]
“The enemy just arrived. He besieged the city of Hapara in that manner (as earlier described), but Kasipur he besieged from this side. He (then), surprisingly, (apas=ma) came right through. Where he went next, I have no idea.”

The particle -al-ma cannot indicate a topic shift, the clause containing it is not a digression but continues the narration, and it is rather farfetched to see any contrast with the preceding action. The main message of this letter is that the enemy somehow got through while covering his tracks. Since it was already known where the enemy was, his passing through and disappearance is a quite unexpected turn in the narration. I have indicated this by means of ‘surprisingly’.

A very interesting example of apa- with -al-ma occurs in the Barga dispute. After Abiradda bans the enemy of the king from his country (KBo 3.3+ i 10-11, ex. 9.17), the text continues with ‘he came to the land of Hatti’. In this case one could think (that is, we could) that the enemy would have fled to Hatti to subject himself, since changing sides was not very uncommon. This interpretation would mean that the Subject-Topic had changed, with further support fromapas=ma. However, the rest of the story shows that it must have been Abiradda who went to the king. So even in a context where apa- with -ma could have been used to indicate a Subject-Topic shift, it does not:

9.17 KBo 3.3+ i 7-11 (NH edict, Mursili II, CTH 63), ed. Klengel 1963: 33

yer=ma nTetteis mEN-urtaš=e a ITTI dUTU-SI kururijahhir 9 mAbiraddaš=ma ISTU ŠA dUTU-SI tiyat 10 nuzkan mEN-urtan ŠA dUTU-SI LÓKUR KUR-az 11 arha ʔatkunut a-pa-a-َا=ma INA KUR URUHATTI 12 ITTI dUTU-SI uit

But thereupon Tette and EN-urta became hostile towards My Majesty. Abiradda however, stood at the side of My Majesty and expunged EN-urta, the enemy of My Majesty from (his) country. He (then), surprisingly, (i.e., Abiradda, apas=ma) came into the land of Hatti to My Majesty.

The Subject-Topic is the same as in the preceding clause, there is no digression and the clause is not contrasted with the preceding clause. As in ex. 9.16, the action of Abiradda is surprising. One should expect that someone who just has beaten the leaders of his country should stay there and establish his own leadership. Instead, he leaves his country to go to Hatti in order to request from the king control over the city Iyaruwadda which had been given to the grandfather of Tette.

When discussing ex. 9.5 I observed that the occurrence of -al-ma could not be explained by any of its three uses if the subordinate clause was treated as a having equal weight as a main clause from the point of view of topic continuance and discourse connectivity. On the other hand, option 3 (-al-ma as contrastive conjunction) was possible in ex. 9.5 if the subordinate clause was not taken into account at all. Only if one is allowed to skip the subordinate clause the particle -al-ma might be a contrastive conjunction. The problem is that Hittite subordinate clauses are not yet studied from the viewpoint of discourse structure and topic continuance. As a result there are no means to solve this problem. But whether the subordinate clause may be neglected or not, like in ex. 9.16 and 9.17 Nunnu’s action (in ex. 9.5.) is quite unexpected and must have been surprising. One does not expect a tax collector to keep the taxes for private purposes.

The following Old Hittite example is more ambiguous because we can now also have Topic switch besides surprising action (see also ex. 9.2):

9.18 KBo 3.22 rev. 76-78, with duplicate KUB 36.98b rev. 6’ (OS Narration, Anitta, CTH 1), ed. Neu 1974: 14-15
If the subordinate clause should be taken into account one notices two things. The Subject-Topic of the apa-clause is the same as the Subject-Topic of the subordinate clause, thus excluding Topic shift, and -al-ma cannot be an adversative or contrastive conjunction. But the apa-clause is neither a digression from the main narration. None of the functions attributed to -al-ma apply.

One can also skip the subordinate clause. In that case the subordinate clause is just some background information needed to help the Addressee understand what the main clause is about. The Subject-Topic is now different (‘I’ versus ‘he’) so -al-ma might indicate a Topic shift.

In the next example the situation is different:


Do you gods not see that also then I did not say anything to her? On that occasion I judged favorably. She however, tied the mouths. What was even not made, she (apas=ma) handed it over to you (sg.).

Besides indicating a Topic shift the first apa- with -(ii 10') also occurs in a clause with a contrastive action and thus behaves as expected in the framework of Rieken 2000 and the CHD. The second apa- + -ma is however different. In this situation one should choose to ignore the relative clause. Although the relative clause does not mention the queen one should not treat apas=ma as Unestablished Topic. The indefinite non-agent neuter Subject kuit is not a very likely candidate for Sentence Topic-hood, so apas=ma does not indicate a Topic shift.

Furthermore, the clause ‘she handed it over to you’ is not in any way contrastive with the preceding main clause, excluding the third meaning of -al-ma as adversative conjunction. The resulting problem cannot be solved unless we turn again to the suggestion that apa- with -al-ma indicates surprising action. In ex. 9.19 the action performed by the queen is utterly surprising: how can one give something away which does not exist yet? Also, in ex. 9.18 the action in the apa-clause is quite unexpected since a conquered enemy generally does not occupy the seat of a favorite of the king.

More surprising behavior of the referent of apa- is seen in Hattusili’s Apology423.

9.20 KUB 1.1+ iii 78 - iv 3 (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 22-23

---

422 Parsing follows partially Hoffner 1983: 191 (apās=ma=at=s=kan) and partially De Martino 1998: 34 n. 117 (apās=ma=at=s=kan).

423 See also the comparable but broken KUB 14.16 iii 32 (CTH 61 II): (I wrote to the people of Puranda: “...Hand over to me my subjects! ...”) 32 a-pu-u-uš=ma EGIR-pa kišša[n ḫatrā’īr ‘But they, surprisingly, [wrote] back as foll[ows:] (“...we will not return them to you”).
Urhi-Tessub flees after Hattusili orders him to come. Hattusili expresses by means of apas=ma that the Subject-Topic acts contrary to what is expected from him.

There is another surprising action in ex. 9.21 (already discussed as 8.46):


Now the cities [Ura] (and) Mudamutasi were mine in the past. But when Huhazalma became hostile, they (apas=ma) became his (instead).

The contrast is not part of the ape=ma clause but of the following one: ‘Now the cities [Ura] (and) Mudamutasi were mine in the past’ versus ‘They became his (instead)’.

In later Hittite we have

9.22 KUB 26.1 i 56-60 (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.2), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 10-11

Here the expected behavior is explicitly mentioned. But instead of not breaking confidence the courtier does break it.

With the next example we enter the field of contrastive Topics. Now not only the action of releasing from garrison might be unexpected given the usual practice, but there might also be some contrast between regular help troops and the persons described here: ‘the help troops are garrisoned, but they are released’. The only thing which prevents the contrastive Topic interpretation is the fact that the clauses are not coordinated. A comparable problem was noted at ex. 9.15.


But they (the men from the Pirwa house) must [go] as help (against) the enemy. If the auxiliary men are on garrison duty, they (on the other hand) (apus=ma) must be released. Let there be no construction work [for them] in the army camp.
9.5. Summary and conclusions

In 9.5.1. I will summarize the results from the preceding sections, after which I will present *apa*- with *-al-ma* as the Unestablished Topic in the framework of Lambrecht 1994 (9.5.2.). In view of these results I will finally discuss some difficult or ambiguous examples in section 9.5.3.

9.5.1. Summary and conclusions

The point of departure for the study of *apa*- with *-al-ma* was whether its occurrence could be explained on the basis of the three uses of *-al-ma* as established by Rieken 2000 ((1) marking a new Topic, Setting or Digression (section 9.2.), (2) marking a clause as a new orientation (section 9.3.), (3) marking some kind of contrast with the preceding clause (section 9.4.). Although some attestations of *apa*- with *-al-ma* fell within these three groups, a large number could not be explained.

The use of *apa*- with *-al-ma* in exx. 9.16 and 9.17 (and 9.18-9.23) occurred in contexts where the action undertaken by the Established Subject-Topic was highly surprising (9.4.3.). At the end of 9.2.1. I concluded that Subject-Topic shift was not necessarily accompanied by *apa*- with *-al-ma* because the context often provided the clues for finding the correct Subject-Topic. The question therefore was what extra information had to be part of the meaning of *apa*- with *-al-ma*. If the extra information is ‘surprising action performed by the Subject-Topic’ then the examples in section 9.2.1. should exhibit this feature too. This is indeed the case in exx. 9.6, 9.8 and 9.9. In ex. 9.8 the actions of Urhi-Tessub are highly unexpected because Hattusili was very kind to him for seven years. What one should expect after such behavior, according to Hattusili, is that he would be well treated himself: ‘I do nothing evil so I expect good treatment. But what does he do? To my surprise he tries to destroy me!’ In 9.8 the actions described of the brothers etc. of the king and the courtier are not supposed to happen at all. If the king sends a courtier out to one of his relatives he, first, does not expect that his relative shows favor to one of his courtiers, and secondly, he certainly does not expect that the courtier breaks confidence in reaction to that. In ex. 9.6 the reaction of the one addressed by a relative of the king us also unexpected in the light of what has been said before. Only ex. 9.7 is hard to explain from the point of view of surprising action.

Also when *-al-ma* marked a new, more or less contrastive orientation in the discourse (section 9.3) it could not be explained why the nominative *apas* was used. The solution is again the notion of surprising action of the Subject-Topic.

Still, one needs to take into account that sometimes the context does not provide enough clues to find the intended Subject-Topic as in exx. 9.4, 9.6 and possibly 9.9. In exx. 9.4 and 9.6 the verbs belong to the same semantic field so one could expect continuance of the Subject-Topic (he says ..., and then he says ...). It therefore seems that *apa*- is not used each time the Subject-Topic shifts, but only when that shift is accompanied by verbs that could create confusion. When the verb itself guides the Addressee in finding the intended referent of the (shifted) Topic *apa*- does not have to be used (ex. 9.10).

To conclude this section, *apa*- with *-al-ma* indicates either (1) that the Subject-Topic has shifted when the context would lead to Topic continuance in ambiguous contexts or (2) it indicates that the action undertaken by the Subject-Topic, shifted or not, is surprising in view of the context. In the latter situation there does not need to be a contrast with the preceding clause. This use of *-al-ma* indicating surprise without necessary contrast with a previous clause is not covered by Rieken but seems to occur rather often with *apa*- (though the CHD
does not mention even a single phrase with *apa-* \(+\-ma\). However, if one understands the notion ‘contrast’ not as indicating *semantic* contrast with the preceding clause but as contrasting with a certain behavior which could be expected given some cultural or general presuppositions then one may indeed classify the particle \(-al-ma\) as an adversative conjunction. Thus, the particle \(-al-ma\) with *apa-* does not simply mark the Subject-Topic in isolation as being somehow unexpected, it marks the *relation* between the Subject-Topic and the action as not established. In Lambrecht’s framework (1994) *apa-* with \(-al-ma\) is the *Unestablished Topic*.

9.5.2. The pronoun *apa-* with \(-al-ma\) indicates the Unestablished Topic

Lambrecht 1994: 328 presents an nice example of some surprising action (his ex. 5.85):

9.24 The American travel writer Paul Theroux once defined an Englishman as someone who apologizes if YOU tread on HIS foot. To extend the analogy, a Frenchman could be defined as someone who expects you to apologize if HE treads on YOUR foot.

The Topic ‘he’ is accented, not because there is a topic shift but because in this particular message the relationship between the elements in the clause is not expected, with the result that the Topic has to be considered as Unestablished. In Lambrecht’s words (o.c. 331) “... the contrastiveness effect conveyed in (5.85) is a consequence of the unusual state of affairs described”. This accurately describes the situation in many of the examples cited above. Thus, both in English and in Hittite one uses an accented pronoun if in an unusual state of affairs the relationship between the (Subject-)Topic and comment is not yet established. There is some sort of discontinuity in the pragmatic relations in the clause and in relation to general and cultural knowledge. Ex. 9.24, paraphrased as ‘Someone steps on your foot. Whereas *others* would have apologized, *he* expects you to do so’ is for example matched by what is implied in ex. 9.20 ‘I order him to come. But whereas *others* would have come, *he* ran away’. In such cases the unestablished Topic may also be described as an *implicitly contrastive Topic* (see sections 2.2.3.2.1., 2.3.3.2.3.2. and 3.3.2.).

So, how should one proceed if one encounters *apa-* with \(-al-ma\)? First, one should realize that somehow the combination of this specific Subject-Topic with this specific VP or comment should not be taken for granted. In order to find what type of unexpectedness one is dealing with one should next look at the preceding clause. When for example the verb of the preceding clause belongs to the same semantic field as the verb of the *apa-* clause, one could come to expect Topic continuance. But if the Subject-Topic is not continued, then the accented pronoun *apa-* needs to be used. Thus, *apa-* with \(-al-ma\) indicates Topic shift.

If on the other hand the predicates do not cause referential ambiguity and/or the Topic does not shift, one should try to imagine the most logical reaction on the state of affairs described in the preceding clause. This reaction should be based on general and cultural knowledge. If instead another action is described that goes against what one could expect given general or cultural knowledge, then the Speaker may (or must?) use *apa-* with \(-al-ma\). Of course, our knowledge of the Hittite world can never compete with that of a Hittite, so we should not expect to understand each occurrence of *apa-* with \(-al-ma\).

9.5.3. Difficult and ambiguous cases

334
There were several attestations of *apa-* with *-al-ma* which I could not use in the preceding discussion because I either did not understand the text itself or because there was some ambiguity. Here I will try to solve these difficulties with the procedure described at the end of 9.5.2.

First, a broken Old Hittite example:

9.25 KBo 3.22 rev. 68-72 (OS ‘building inscription’, Anitta, CTH 1), ed. Neu 1974: 14-15 § 68 \( \text{URU} \) Neššaš-a ANA LÚ \( \text{URU} \) Salatiyara\( ^{424} \) E(GIR-pan arha pait)\( ^{69} \) n u \( \text{URU} \) DIL-I\( ^{70} \) šš[ulu] \( \text{LÜ} \) \( \text{ANCA} \) a da\( ^{71} \) 0-o-o-o-0-o-o-o \( \text{URU} \) ri[a]\\( ^{72} \) h(ualeššar-\( ^{73} \) šet I \( \text{LIM IV ME ERIN.MES} \)) \( ^{74} \) nu XL \( \text{SI} \) \( \text{MTI} \) \( \text{ANSE.KUR.RA.JI.A KU} \) BABBAR? \( ^{75} \) GUŠKIN? ... \( ^{76} \) a-pa-ša \( ^{425} \) [(huiittiti jš-aš ijanneš)] \( ^{77} \) §

But Neš[a] passed behind [the man of Salatiwara] and set his cities on fire. Then too (?) [...]. The protection of the city was 1400 troops. 40 couples of horses, sil[ver and gold (?) ...], but he surprisingly (*apas=a*) withdrew and went (away).

The context is not too clear, but given the fact that *apas=a* in combination with the rest of the clause might indicate surprising action, one could imagine that the man of Salatiwara withdrew despite the fact that his (own?) city was very well protected.

9.26 KBo 3.3+ 126-31 (NH edict, Mursili II, CTH 63), ed. Klengel 1963: 34 § 26 \( \text{män OL = ma kuitman=za} \) \( \text{URU} \) jaruwaddan \( \text{URU-an} \) \( ^{27} \) UTU-SI nāqi tara(h)mī nu \( \text{DUMU} \) mTette 28 našma \( \text{ŠEŠ} \) mTette piran yaḥnuyanzi 29 nu mTetten ku[(en)]\( ^{30} \) nāšma=an ēpzi 30 n=an mu parā p[ā]\( ^{31} \) a-pa-aš-ma memai ARAD \( ^{32} \) UTU-SI=ya=az \( ^{33} \) kā=pat pēd[ī] [(ēšmi)] nu=ššī=ššan \( ^{34} \) UTU-SI 32 \( ^{35} \) [URU] laruy\( ^{426} \) (attan URU)]-an arha OL dahhi

But if not, as long as My Majesty has not yet conquered the city Iyaruwadda, and the son or brother of Tette switches sides and kills Tette, or he arrests him and ha[nds] him over to me, but he surprisingly (*apas=ma*) speaks: “I shall be a servant to My Majesty, right here, on the spot!” , then I, My Majesty, shall not take the city [Iaruw]atta away from him.

The one who is expected to talk to the king is the son (or brother) of Tette since he has just handed over his father (or brother) to the king. If in that situation the Subject-Topic is expressed by means of an accented pronoun, then the Addressee should be alerted that something unexpected will follow. The first possibility is Topic switch: Tette suddenly and surprisingly subjects himself to the king. The other possibility is that the relative of Tette surprisingly subjects himself to the Hittite king. But is that so surprising? I think that submission is what one would expect when you kill or hand over your relatives to a hostile king. Therefore the first option is more likely. This is supported by what follows after the direct speech. The king states that in that case he shall not take away the city from him. However, the city was in the hands of Tette at that time, and not in the hands of either his brother or his son (see i 6-7), therefore Tette must be the referent of *apa-*.

\( ^{424} \) The restorations are highly uncertain.

\( ^{425} \) B 15: a-pa-aš-ša. The NH duplicate shows the coordinator -ya instead of -a. This means that copied New Hittite texts with -ia after a consonant are not very reliable, because the original Old Hittite or Middle Hittite original might have had -a.
The following example is contextually clear, but the reason for the use of -al-ma escapes me. Is it somehow surprising that the guard of the outside passes behind the defendant?


*ařaḫzi=ša-az kuiš 17 LŪ.MEŠEDI ūarıš 16 māḥḫan=ma šarkantin tamain uṣatezi § 18 nu ANA GAL MEŠEDI kuišš 2 BELUTI EĞIR-an aranta n=at šarkantı 19 andurza tapuša iṣanta a-raḫza=ma=az kuiš LŪ.MEŠEDI ūarıš 20 n=ażta māḥḫan šarkantin ANA LŪ.MEŠEŠEDUTIM ḫandānzi 21 a-pa-ša=kan šarkantin EĞIR-an arha paizzi 22 n=âš šarkantı a-raḫza ZAG-az iṭennai

And as for the guard who holds the outside: when he brings in another defendant, two officials who stand behind the chief-of-guards walk beside the defendant on the inside, while the guard who holds the outside, when they line up the defendant away from the guards, he (apas=a) passes behind the defendant. He walks on the outside of the defendant on the right.

There are also some examples of apa- which may or may not be followed by -a. For example, has a-pa-ša-az to be parsed as apaš=az or as apaš=a=az?


29 nu=šši=kan māḥ[ba]n LŪ.MEŠ MEŠEDI DUM.U.MEŠ.É.GAL=ša ḫandāntı 30 nu GİŞGU.ZA ANA L[Ū.GU]ZA parā pāi a-pa-ša-az GİŞŠUKUR 31 ṭāī

When the bodyguards and the palace attendants are lined up with him, he hands over the stool to the man-of-the-stool, while he himself (apas=a) takes the spear.

It seems to me that this example is rather similar to ex. 9.15, with the possibility that it belongs actually in chapter 7. Even more than ex. 9.15 it looks like a coordinate structure.

In the following Middle Hittite text the actions of Mida are not what one would expect since breaking a divine oath was quite dangerous in the Hittite religious context:

9.29 KUB 23.72+ rev. 2-3 (MH/MS treaty, CTH 146)

*aša *Mitaš uṣata[škit nu=kan? SÄPAL NIS DINGIR.MEŞ] 3 kue uddār tija[n] ešta a-pa-a-aš-at=kan hümanta šarraš

Look, Mita [regularly] sin[ned]. The stipulations that were put [under oath], he surprisingly broke them (apas=a=at) all.

The particle -al-ma is very often attested with the nominative of apa-. Only rarely does it occur with another case. One of the few examples of non-subject apa- with -ma is the following excerpt from an text discussing the defeat of Urhi-Tessub:


426 See also KUB 14.1 rev. 49 (MH/MS indictment, CTH 147).
427 See also KUB 14.1 obv. 48 (MH/MS indictment, CTH 147). KBo 5.9 iii 24 (NH treaty, CTH 62).
At the time I reached him, a wooden wall of 40 gipessar came down, and Istar of Samuha, my Lady, caught him (apun=ma) like a fish in a net, bound him, and handed him over to me!

It would have been possible to use n=an instead of apun=ma, but in view of the results in this chapter I suggest that apun=ma is used to express the surprising way Urhi-Tessub fell in the hands of Hattusili.