

Reference, Deixis and Focus in Hittite

The demonstratives *ka*- "this", *apa*- "that" and *asi* "yon"

ACADEMISCH PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor
aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus
prof.mr P.F. van der Heijden

ten overstaan van een door het college van promoties ingestelde
commissie, in het openbaar te verdedigen in de Aula der Universiteit
op woensdag 18 juni 2003, te 10.00 uur

door

Petra Marian Goedegebuure
geboren te Bussum

Promotor:
Prof.dr. T.P.J. van den Hout

Faculteit der Geesteswetenschappen

Front page: the Sphinx Gate in Alaca Höyük.
Photograph taken by the author, September 2002.

Voor Jan, hkrbl wnrkz

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Preface | 1 |
| 1. Introduction..... | 3 |
| 1.1. Many questions | 3 |
| 1.2. Scope of the study | 4 |
| 1.3. Outline and Method | 5 |
| 1.4. The Corpus | 7 |
| 1.4.1. Old Hittite in Old script | 7 |
| 1.4.2. Middle Hittite in Middle Script | 8 |
| 1.4.3. New Hittite | 9 |
| 1.4.4. Late New Hittite..... | 11 |
| PART I..... | 13 |
| REFERENCE..... | 13 |
| 2. Deixis, Discourse and Reference | 15 |
| 2.1. Introduction | 15 |
| 2.2. Discourse, Reference and Information Structure | 16 |
| 2.2.1. The ‘geographical’ approach..... | 17 |
| 2.2.2. The ‘cognitive’ approach | 18 |
| 2.2.2.1. Introduction..... | 18 |
| 2.2.2.2. Memory and cognitive procedures | 19 |
| 2.2.2.3. The cognitive status of referring expressions | 20 |
| 2.2.3. Topic and Focus on sentence level | 22 |
| 2.2.3.1. Introduction..... | 22 |
| 2.2.3.2. The notions Topic and Focus | 23 |
| 2.2.3.2.1. Predicate-Focus..... | 24 |
| 2.2.3.2.2. Argument-Focus | 25 |
| 2.2.3.2.3. Sentence-Focus | 26 |
| 2.3. A Combinatory Approach to Referential Expressions..... | 26 |
| 2.3.1. Deixis and the centering procedure | 28 |
| 2.3.1.1. Situational Reference | 28 |
| 2.3.1.2. Recognitional Reference | 31 |
| 2.3.1.3. Summary and conclusions | 33 |
| 2.3.2. Deixis and the continuity procedure | 34 |
| 2.3.3. Anaphora and the continuity procedure..... | 36 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 2.3.3.1. Introduction..... | 37 |
| 2.3.3.2. Unaccented pronouns, clitics and zero as Established Topics..... | 38 |
| 2.3.3.3. Accented pronouns | 38 |
| 2.3.3.3.1. Accented pronouns as Unestablished Topics | 39 |
| 2.3.3.3.2. Accented pronouns as Contrastive Topics | 41 |
| 2.3.3.3.3. Accented pronouns as Focus..... | 42 |
| 2.3.3.3.4. Accented pronouns and discourse units..... | 42 |
| 2.3.3.4. Demonstratives | 43 |
| 2.3.3.4.1. Immediate anaphora after first mention..... | 44 |
| 2.3.3.4.2. Demarcating discourse units | 47 |
| 2.3.3.5. Summary | 48 |
| 2.3.4. Anaphora and the centering procedure | 49 |
| 2.3.4.1. Introduction..... | 49 |
| 2.3.4.2. Demonstratives with the status ‘familiar’..... | 50 |
| 2.3.4.3. Demonstratives with the status ‘activated’ | 52 |
| 2.3.4.4. Summary and table | 53 |
| 2.3.5. Discourse Deixis and the centering procedure | 55 |
| 2.3.6. Discourse Deixis and the continuity procedure | 56 |
| 2.4. Summary and conclusions | 57 |
| 3. Deixis, Discourse and Reference in Hittite | 60 |
| 3.1. Deixis and the centering procedure — The situational use of demonstratives | 60 |
| 3.1.1. Introduction..... | 60 |
| 3.1.2. True Situational Use | 60 |
| 3.1.3. Direct Speech | 63 |
| 3.1.4. Linguistic Selfreference | 66 |
| 3.1.5. Summary and conclusions..... | 67 |
| 3.2. Deixis and the centering procedure — Recognitional Use of Demonstratives..... | 68 |
| 3.2.1. Introduction..... | 68 |
| 3.2.2. Recognitionally used <i>ka-</i> , <i>apa-</i> , <i>aãi</i> | 69 |
| 3.2.3. Summary | 71 |
| 3.3. Anaphora and the continuity procedure | 72 |
| 3.3.1. The enclitic pronoun <i>-a-</i> and zero indicating the Established Topic..... | 72 |
| 3.3.2. The accented pronoun <i>apa-</i> as Unestablished Topic expression..... | 72 |
| 3.3.3. The accented pronoun <i>apa-</i> as Argument Focus expression..... | 73 |
| 3.3.3.1. Replacing Focus | 74 |
| 3.3.3.2. Expanding Focus | 74 |
| 3.3.3.3. Restricting Focus..... | 75 |
| 3.3.4. The demonstratives | 76 |
| 3.3.4.1. Introduction..... | 76 |
| 3.3.4.2. Enclitics versus free forms..... | 77 |
| 3.3.4.3. Accented pronouns versus lexical noun phrases | 78 |
| 3.3.4.4. ‘Definite’ noun phrases and the three demonstratives versus each other..... | 81 |
| 3.3.5. Summary and conclusions..... | 82 |
| 3.4. Anaphora and the centering procedure — Demonstratives again..... | 83 |
| 3.4.1. Introduction..... | 83 |
| 3.4.2. Demonstratives and discourse boundaries..... | 83 |
| 3.4.2.1. Some attestations of demonstratives on discourse boundaries | 83 |
| 3.4.2.2. Do anaphoric demonstratives and discourse nodes belong together? | 87 |
| 3.4.3. Demonstratives and text genres | 87 |
| 3.4.4. Summary | 88 |
| 3.5. Discourse Deixis | 89 |
| 3.5.1. Introduction: ‘placing under Oath’ | 90 |
| 3.5.2. Discourse deixis and the centering procedure | 92 |
| 3.5.2.1. Introduction..... | 92 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 3.5.2.2. The demonstrative adverbs of manner..... | 94 |
| 3.5.2.3. The forward referring discourse deictic demonstratives | 96 |
| 3.5.2.4. The backward referring discourse deictic expressions | 99 |
| 3.5.3. Discourse deixis and the continuity procedure | 100 |
| 3.5.4. Summary and conclusions | 102 |
| 3.6. Summary and conclusions | 103 |
| PART II | 105 |
| DEIXIS..... | 105 |
| 4. The distal demonstrative <i>asi</i>, <i>uni</i>, <i>eni</i> etc. | 107 |
| 4.1. Status Quaestionis | 107 |
| 4.1.1. Introduction..... | 107 |
| 4.1.2. Friedrich's different paradigms, similar function | 107 |
| 4.1.3. Laroche's one paradigm, one function | 108 |
| 4.1.4. Kammenhuber's criticism | 109 |
| 4.1.5. Summary and Fragestellung | 110 |
| 4.2. The Situational Use of <i>asi</i> | 112 |
| 4.2.1. Introduction..... | 112 |
| 4.2.2. True Situational Use | 113 |
| 4.2.3. Direct Speech | 116 |
| 4.2.3.1. The continuity procedure: the demonstrative pronoun <i>asi</i> | 117 |
| 4.2.3.2. The centering procedure: the demonstrative description <i>asi</i> + noun..... | 120 |
| 4.2.3.3. The demonstrative <i>asi</i> refers to an entity in the presence of Speaker and is disassociative .. | 125 |
| 4.2.4. Linguistic Selfreference | 127 |
| 4.2.5. Numbers and figures, other observations and preliminary conclusion..... | 127 |
| 4.2.5.1. The deictic value of <i>asi</i> etc..... | 128 |
| 4.2.5.2. The chronological distribution of <i>asi</i> etc..... | 129 |
| 4.2.5.3. The attention-levels and Information Structure of <i>asi</i> etc. | 130 |
| 4.3. The Recognitional Use of <i>asi</i> etc. | 131 |
| 4.3.1. Introduction..... | 131 |
| 4.3.2. Material..... | 132 |
| 4.3.3. Statistics and other observations | 142 |
| 4.3.3.1. The Recognitional value of <i>asi</i> etc..... | 142 |
| 4.3.3.2. The chronological distribution of <i>asi</i> etc..... | 142 |
| 4.3.3.3. Attention-levels and Information Structure | 143 |
| 4.4. The Discourse Deictic Use of <i>asi</i> etc..... | 143 |
| 4.4.1. Introduction..... | 144 |
| 4.4.2. The adverb of manner <i>enissan</i> | 144 |
| 4.4.3. Evaluation of <i>enissan</i> | 147 |
| 4.4.4. The Discourse Deictic syntagms <i>eni uttar</i> , <i>asi memias</i> and <i>eni</i> | 148 |
| 4.4.5. Evaluation of the syntagms <i>eni uttar</i> , <i>asi memias</i> and <i>eni</i> | 152 |
| 4.4.5.1. Function of the discourse deictic <i>asi</i> etc..... | 152 |
| 4.4.5.2. Chronological distribution of the discourse deictic <i>asi</i> etc. | 153 |
| 4.4.5.3. Attention-levels and Information Structure | 153 |
| 4.5. The Tracking (= anaphoric) Use of <i>asi</i> with noun..... | 153 |
| 4.5.1. Introduction..... | 153 |
| 4.5.2. The centering procedure | 155 |
| 4.5.2.1. Reference across a paragraph line | 155 |
| 4.5.2.2. From Direct Speech to Narration | 162 |
| 4.5.2.3. Change of episode | 163 |
| 4.5.3. The continuity procedure | 163 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 4.5.3.1. asi plus noun indicating a digression from the main story line..... | 163 |
| 4.5.3.2. asi plus noun indicating a return to the main story line | 166 |
| 4.5.3.3. asi plus noun indicating a new discourse unit | 169 |
| 4.5.4. Evaluation of tracking <i>asi</i> | 171 |
| 4.5.4.1. The function of tracking asi | 171 |
| 4.5.4.2. Chronological distribution of tracking asi | 171 |
| 4.5.4.3. Attention levels and Information Structure..... | 172 |
| 4.6. Conclusions..... | 173 |
| 4.6.1. The New Hittite material..... | 173 |
| 4.6.2. The Middle Hittite material | 175 |
| 4.6.3. The Old Hittite material | 176 |
| 4.6.4. An answer to Kammenhuber's criticism..... | 178 |
| 4.6.4.1. Is unis Old Hittite?..... | 178 |
| 4.6.4.2. Does e(-) 'they' together with edani, etc. build a separate defective paradigm a-?..... | 179 |
| 4.6.4.3. The so-called useless vocabularies | 182 |
| 4.6.5. Information structure and attention levels..... | 182 |
| 5. The medial demonstrative <i>apa-</i>..... | 184 |
| 5.1. Status Quaestionis | 184 |
| 5.1.1. Introduction..... | 184 |
| 5.1.2. Previous literature on the deictic force of <i>apa-</i> | 184 |
| 5.2. The Situational Use of <i>apa-</i> | 185 |
| 5.2.1. Introduction..... | 185 |
| 5.2.2. True Situational Use | 185 |
| 5.2.3. Direct Speech | 187 |
| 5.2.3.1. Introduction..... | 187 |
| 5.2.3.2. The demonstrative pronoun <i>apa-</i> and adverb <i>apiya</i> | 188 |
| 5.2.4. Linguistic Selfreference | 190 |
| 5.2.5. Summary and conclusions..... | 190 |
| 5.3. The Recognitional Use of <i>apa-</i> | 191 |
| 5.4. The Discourse Deictic Use of <i>apa-</i> | 193 |
| 5.4.1. Introduction..... | 193 |
| 5.4.2. The adverb of manner <i>apenissan</i> | 193 |
| 5.4.3. The Discourse Deictic syntagms <i>apat</i> <i>uttar</i> , <i>apas</i> <i>memias</i> and <i>apat</i> | 195 |
| 5.4.3.1. The expression <i>apa-</i> (+N) referring forward | 195 |
| 5.4.3.2. The expression <i>apa-</i> (+N) referring backward..... | 197 |
| 5.4.3.2.1. Referring to salient entities..... | 197 |
| 5.4.3.2.2. Referring to non-salient entities..... | 198 |
| 5.4.3.2.2.1. Non-saliency and Focus | 198 |
| 5.4.3.2.2.2. No saliency and no Focus | 199 |
| 5.4.4. Summary and conclusion | 200 |
| 5.5. The Tracking (= Anaphoric) Use of <i>apa-</i> with noun | 201 |
| 5.5.1. Introduction..... | 201 |
| 5.5.2. The centering procedure | 201 |
| 5.5.2.1. Reference across a paragraph line | 202 |
| 5.5.2.2. From Direct Speech to Narration | 203 |
| 5.5.2.3. From modifier to argument..... | 203 |
| 5.5.2.4. Other contexts..... | 204 |
| 5.5.3. The continuity procedure | 205 |
| 5.5.4. Summary and conclusion | 205 |
| 5.6. Conclusions..... | 206 |
| 6. The proximal demonstrative <i>ka-</i>..... | 207 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 6.1. Status Quaestionis | 207 |
| 6.1.1. Former views on the proximal demonstrative <i>ka</i> - | 207 |
| 6.1.2. Fragestellung | 208 |
| 6.2. The Situational Use of <i>ka</i> - | 208 |
| 6.2.1. Introduction | 208 |
| 6.2.2. True situational use | 208 |
| 6.2.2.1. The place deictic adverbs <i>ket</i> , <i>kez</i> , <i>ka</i> and <i>kani</i> | 209 |
| 6.2.2.2. The demonstrative pronoun and determiner <i>ka</i> - | 213 |
| 6.2.3. Direct Speech | 215 |
| 6.2.3.1. The continuity procedure: the demonstrative pronoun <i>ka</i> - | 215 |
| 6.2.3.2. The centering procedure: the demonstrative description <i>ka</i> - + noun | 217 |
| 6.2.4. Linguistic Selfreference | 218 |
| 6.2.5. Summary and conclusions | 219 |
| 6.3. The Recognitional Use of <i>ka</i> - | 220 |
| 6.4. The Discourse Deictic Use of <i>ka</i> - | 220 |
| 6.4.1. Introduction | 220 |
| 6.4.2. The adverb of manner <i>kissan</i> | 221 |
| 6.4.3. The Discourse Deictic syntagms <i>ki uttar</i> , <i>kas memias</i> and <i>ki</i> | 223 |
| 6.4.3.1. Referring forward | 223 |
| 6.4.3.1.1. To an event, proposition or speech-act | 223 |
| 6.4.3.1.2. To a list of first order entities? | 225 |
| 6.4.3.2. Referring backward | 226 |
| 6.4.3.2.1. Across a discourse node | 227 |
| 6.4.3.2.2. <i>ki kuit</i> clauses | 229 |
| 6.4.3.2.3. Remaining cases | 229 |
| 6.4.4. How about Focus structure and Discourse Deixis? | 230 |
| 6.4.5. Summary and conclusions | 231 |
| 6.5. The Tracking (= Anaphoric) Use of <i>ka</i> - | 231 |
| 6.5.1. Introduction | 231 |
| 6.5.2. The centering procedure | 231 |
| 6.5.2.1. Reference across a paragraph line | 232 |
| 6.5.2.1.1. Reference to a NP | 232 |
| 6.5.2.1.2. Reference to a list | 232 |
| 6.5.2.2. From Direct Speech to Narration | 233 |
| 6.5.2.3. Change of episode | 234 |
| 6.5.2.4. Relative clauses | 234 |
| 6.5.2.5. Genitives | 235 |
| 6.5.3. The continuity procedure | 235 |
| 6.5.3.1. <i>ka</i> - (plus noun) indicating a digression from the main story line | 235 |
| 6.5.3.2. <i>ka</i> - (plus noun) indicating a new discourse unit | 237 |
| 6.5.4. Both Tracking and Situational <i>ka</i> - | 238 |
| 6.5.5. Summary and conclusions | 239 |
| 6.6. The cataphoric use of <i>ka</i> - | 240 |
| 6.7. The contrastive use of <i>ka</i> - ... <i>ka</i> - ‘this (one) ... that (one)’ | 241 |
| 6.7.1. Introduction | 241 |
| 6.7.2. Situational contrastive pairs | 241 |
| 6.7.3. Anaphoric contrastive pairs | 242 |
| 6.7.4. Summary and conclusions | 244 |
| 6.8. Summary and conclusions | 244 |
| PART III | 246 |
| FOCUS | 246 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 7. Expanding <i>apa-</i> | 248 |
| 7.1. Introduction..... | 248 |
| 7.1.1. General introduction on <i>apa-</i> as emphatic pronoun..... | 248 |
| 7.1.2. Introduction to this chapter..... | 249 |
| 7.2. Expanding <i>apa-</i> : ‘also he, she, it’ or ‘and he, she, it’ | 250 |
| 7.2.1. Introduction..... | 250 |
| 7.2.2. Method..... | 250 |
| 7.2.3. The interpretation of <i>apa-</i> with <i>-ya</i> depending on structural features | 255 |
| 7.2.3.1. Relative Clauses and <i>-ya</i> | 255 |
| 7.2.3.2. Conditional Clauses and <i>-ya</i> | 257 |
| 7.2.3.3. Clauses of Comparison and <i>-ya</i> | 259 |
| 7.2.3.4. Temporal clauses and <i>-ya</i> | 259 |
| 7.2.3.5. Reported Speech and <i>-ya</i> | 260 |
| 7.2.3.6. <i>kuit</i> -clauses and <i>-ya</i> | 260 |
| 7.2.3.7. Parallel stretches of discourse and <i>-ya</i> | 261 |
| 7.2.4. The interpretation of <i>apa-</i> with <i>-ya</i> in combination with other coordinators..... | 264 |
| 7.2.5. The interpretation of <i>apa-</i> with <i>-ya</i> depending on non-structural features | 265 |
| 7.2.5.1. Symmetrical clauses and <i>-ya</i> | 265 |
| 7.2.5.2. Non-symmetrical clauses and <i>-ya</i> | 267 |
| 7.2.5.2.1. Different Illocutions..... | 267 |
| 7.2.5.2.2. Different States-of-Affairs..... | 267 |
| 7.2.5.2.3. Different Semantic Fields..... | 268 |
| 7.2.6. Semantic incompatibility | 269 |
| 7.2.7. Evaluation of <i>apa-</i> and <i>-ya</i> | 270 |
| 7.2.8. Chronological development | 273 |
| 7.3. The pronoun <i>apa-</i> in the first member of a coordinate structure | 273 |
| 7.3.1. Introduction..... | 273 |
| 7.3.2. Three types of punishment in the Laws | 274 |
| 7.3.3. The use of the pronoun <i>apa-</i> in the coordinate structure..... | 275 |
| 7.3.3.1. In the Laws | 275 |
| 7.3.3.2. In other texts..... | 279 |
| 7.3.4. Evaluation..... | 280 |
| 7.4. The pronoun <i>apa-</i> + <i>-a/-ma</i> in the second member of a coordinate structure | 281 |
| 7.5. Focus Structure of the ‘also’ clauses..... | 282 |
| 7.6. Focus structure of the Coordinated Clauses..... | 283 |
| 7.6.1. Introduction..... | 284 |
| 7.6.2. When <i>apa-</i> occurs in the first clause of the coordination structure | 284 |
| 7.6.3. When <i>apa-</i> occurs in the second clause | 286 |
| 7.6.4. Patterns | 287 |
| 7.7. Summary | 287 |
| 8. Limiting <i>apa-</i> | 289 |
| 8.1. Introduction..... | 289 |
| 8.2. The Focal particle <i>-pat</i> in legal texts..... | 291 |
| 8.2.1. One expects to pay compensation, but is punished differently | 291 |
| 8.2.1.1. The Homicide Laws (§§ 1-6 and §§ 42-44)..... | 291 |
| 8.2.1.2. Abduction/harboring runaway slaves (§§ 19-24) | 293 |
| 8.2.1.3. Arson Laws (§§ 98-100) | 295 |
| 8.2.1.4. Burglary Laws (§§ 93-97) | 296 |
| 8.2.1.5. Theft or injury to animals (§§ 57-92)..... | 297 |
| 8.2.1.6. Certain offences requiring sacred sanctions (§§ 164-170) | 297 |
| 8.2.1.7. Preliminary conclusion | 298 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 8.2.2. Other <i>-pat</i> 's in the laws..... | 299 |
| 8.2.2.1. The particle <i>-pat</i> in the remaining apodoses | 300 |
| 8.2.2.2. The particle <i>-pat</i> in the protasis..... | 303 |
| 8.3. The Focal particle <i>-pat</i> with <i>apa-</i> in non-legal texts | 303 |
| 8.3.1. Introduction..... | 303 |
| 8.3.2. The particle <i>-pat</i> has scope over a NP, indicating Argument Focus..... | 303 |
| 8.4. Formal discussion of the particle <i>-pat</i> | 308 |
| 8.4.1. The scope of the particle <i>-pat</i> | 308 |
| 8.4.2. The position of <i>-pat</i> in the clause..... | 309 |
| 8.5. Limiting <i>apa-</i> without <i>-pat</i> | 311 |
| 8.5.1. Introduction..... | 311 |
| 8.5.2. Replacing <i>apa-</i> : explicit 'not X, but Y!' | 311 |
| 8.5.3. Replacing <i>apa-</i> : implicit '(not X,) but Y!' | 315 |
| 8.5.4. Limiting <i>apa-</i> in relative sentences | 319 |
| 8.5.5. Postposed adjectival <i>apa-</i> | 321 |
| 8.6. Formal discussion of Limiting <i>apa-</i> without <i>-pat</i> | 323 |
| 8.7. Conclusion | 325 |
| 9. Surprising <i>apa-</i>..... | 327 |
| 9.1. Introduction..... | 327 |
| 9.1.1. The particle <i>-ma</i> / <i>-a</i> | 327 |
| 9.1.2. The particle <i>-ma</i> / <i>-a</i> and <i>apa-</i> : preliminary discussion..... | 329 |
| 9.2. The particle <i>-a/-ma</i> with word scope and <i>apa-</i> | 331 |
| 9.2.1. Topic shift | 331 |
| 9.2.2. New setting or orientation in the discourse | 334 |
| 9.3. The particle <i>-a/-ma</i> with clause scope and <i>apa-</i> : a new orientation | 335 |
| 9.4. The particle <i>-a/-ma</i> as adversative conjunction and <i>apa-</i> | 335 |
| 9.4.1. The particle <i>-a/-ma</i> as adversative coordinator and <i>apa-</i> | 335 |
| 9.4.2. The particle <i>-a/-ma</i> as adversative sentence connective and <i>apa-</i> | 336 |
| 9.4.3. The referent of <i>apa-</i> + <i>-a/-ma</i> and surprising action..... | 336 |
| 9.5. Summary and conclusions | 340 |
| 9.5.1. Summary and conclusions..... | 340 |
| 9.5.2. The pronoun <i>apa-</i> with <i>-a/-ma</i> indicates the Unestablished Topic | 341 |
| 9.5.3. Difficult and ambiguous cases..... | 342 |
| 10. Summary..... | 345 |
| References | 350 |
| Index | 362 |
| Samenvatting | 368 |

Preface

The subject for this dissertation was suggested to me by my “Doktorvater” Theo van den Hout. So first of all I want to thank him. But not only for the subject, also for keeping an eye on me through difficult years, and for patiently guiding me while my thoughts on the demonstratives and pronouns of Hittite were developing.

On the more personal level I owe much to Marcel, who suddenly appeared in my life and created peace these last two years. For ever there has been my family: mother, brother, aunt and the Oklahoma branch. Thanks for providing me with refuge! And also important was and is my music teacher, Ilda Simonian, who really ‘pushed’ me to relax by using my voice.

Kees Hengeveld kept an eye on my progress after Theo left for Chicago. And since there were not many Hittitologists around, I found a place in the Functional Grammar discussion group for the badly needed intellectual food.

Even Hittitologists travel, although mostly to Chicago. There I was granted access to the lexical files of the Hittite Dictionary Project of the Oriental Institute, for which I am very grateful to the editor, Theo van den Hout. Besides that, my stay in Chicago in 2002 could never have been as fruitful as it was without the generosity of Kathleen Mineck for letting me use her laptop and sharing a very tight space to work in, sitting back to back. I also owe much to the discussions with and hospitality of Prof. Harry Hoffner, Richard Beal, Oğuz Soysal and the temporary Dutch colony, the only Dutch student Hittitology Willemijn Waal, and Wouter Henkelman, the only Dutch Ph.D. student of Elamite.

This dissertation is written in honour of my buddy Jan. Still thinking that there was a future, we decided to conquer our world. Sadly, I had to do it alone, for you had to go young. So I have worked for two. I hope you like the result.

Amstelveen, May 2003

1. Introduction

1.1. Many questions

“Die Unmöglichkeit einer schärferen Entscheidung liegt nur an der Verschwommenheit des Pronomens *apā-*”. This complaint was uttered by Ferdinand Sommer when he realized that he could not unambiguously determine the referent of several substantively used forms of the demonstrative *apā-* in a letter on the Piyamaradu affair¹. On another occasion he wondered why distal *apā-* was used to refer to the contents of a letter instead of the usual proximal *kā-* (1932: 164).

This was written in 1932, but although since then a grammar appeared (Friedrich’s *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*) and a few dictionaries that contained *apā-* or *kā-* (Kammenhuber - Friedrich 1975ff., Tischler 1977ff., Puhvel 1984ff.) questions like those of Sommer have never been answered.

But what *do* we know? The expression *apā-* is an accented pronoun of the third person, contrasting with accented *uk / ammuk* “I” and *zik / tuk* “you”. It is also a demonstrative which shows a deictic contrast with *kā-* “this”. But here opinions already differ. According to some *apā-* has only “Jener-Deixis” (Kammenhuber - Friedrich o.c.), whereas others tend to include “Du-deixis” (Friedrich HE, Puhvel o.c.) or even only allow “Du-Deixis” (Kronasser 1956: 147). When the demonstratives are used to refer to linguistic expressions and not to the outside world then *apā-* usually refers backward and *kā-* refers forward, more or less matching the use of the English demonstratives *that* and *this*, although these roles may be reversed.

Some of these scholars have reconstructed the original meaning of *apā-* as only deictic, only later acquiring the status of accented pronoun. According to Kammenhuber (HW² 130b ff.) this happened after the decline of the accented (demonstrative) pronoun *a-* (with the forms *e-*, *edani*, *edaš*, *edi*, *edez*). The same position was taken by Laroche in his article of 1979 where he presented his discovery of the paradigm of anaphoric (not demonstrative!) *aši*, which included Kammenhuber’s *a-*. He claimed that the anaphoric (backward referring) function of *aši* was taken over by *apā-* and the cataphoric (forward referring) function by *kā-* (o.c. 152). The development of the pronominal and demonstrative system can therefore be tabulated as follows:

| | deictic demonstratives | | accented pronouns | |
|---------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| | proximal | distal | anaphoric | cataphoric |
| proto-Hittite | <i>kā-</i> | <i>apā-</i> | <i>aši</i> | <i>aši</i> |
| Hittite | <i>kā-</i> | <i>apā-</i> | <i>apā-</i> (<i>aši</i>) | <i>kā-</i> (<i>aši</i>) |

Table 1.1: The system of demonstratives and accented pronouns in proto-Hittite and attested Hittite according to current views.

¹ 1932: 154, his commentary on KUB 14.3 iii 45-49.

But what do we really know about the use of the demonstratives *kā-*, *apā-* and the alleged accented anaphoric pronoun *aši* in Hittite? If the demonstrative *apā-* really acquired the functions of *aši* then we should at least find some residual *aši*-s in contexts where later accented *apā-* appeared.

Instead of an anaphoric pronoun, as I will show especially in Chapter 4, *aši* is a true deictic demonstrative. The addition of a third term to the Hittite demonstrative system necessarily results in a shift in the deictic values for *kā-* and/or *apā-*. Besides that, there are other problems that need to be solved. Is *apā-* indeed emphatic or deictic or both and when does it have which interpretation? Could *kā-* and *aši* be emphatic too or are they only deictic? If they can be both, what is in that case the difference with *apā-*? Can they all appear in the same contexts? Another problem is that the notion ‘emphasis’ is very vague. What does it mean that *apā-*, and maybe the others, is used emphatically? Are there different forms of ‘emphasis’? In the remainder of this book I hope to answer these questions.

The basic question is: what leads the Speaker to choose between *kā-*, *apā-* and *aši*.

1.2. Scope of the study

The expressions that will be studied from a synchronic point of view but with an eye on diachronic developments are the demonstratives *kā-*, *apā-* and *aši* and the related adverbs *kā* “here”, *apija* “there”, *ket* “on this side”, *edi* “on yonder side”, *kiššan* “in this way”, *apeniššan* “in that way”, and *eniššan* “in that way”². The other expressions that are possibly demonstratives, *šija-* and *anni-* cited in Friedrich HE §§ 105, 117 are too badly attested for a functional description. The only observation that can be made here with Friedrich is that *anni-* seems to behave like a demonstrative, whereas *šija-* (or *ša-/ši-*) seems to behave more like *apā-* in its function as accented pronoun (Friedrich HE § 105, 117).

The Hittite pronominal clitics *-a-* have already been studied by Garrett 1990. They include the enclitic pronoun *-a-* “he, she, it” and the enclitic possessive pronoun *-ši-* “his, her, its”. Garrett did not study the enclitic pronoun *-a-* from the point of view of discourse structure, but assumed that omission of these pronominal clitics was governed by some not yet understood discourse-conditioned processes (o.c. 130, 133f.). Some preliminary work (Goedegebuure 1999) revealed that the use or non-use of nominative *-a-* in intransitive clauses was based more on semantic factors than on discourse factors³. From a methodological point of view the study of *-a-* therefore falls outside the framework on Deixis and Focus presented here.

Since Garrett also treated the free standing possessive pronouns including *apā-* (o.c. 164ff.) I have refrained from discussing the accented genitive of *apā-*. Garrett found that in younger Hittite the free standing genitive could also be used in unemphatic contexts. Methodologically this raised for me the same problems as for Garrett, but then on the opposite side. Just as Garrett studied unemphatic pronouns and had to deal with inadvertent

² There are no attempts here to compare the Hittite demonstratives and pronouns with those of the other Anatolian languages. I will study them elsewhere.

³ In short, especially in Old Hittite the subject enclitic pronoun in intransitive clauses can be omitted when the intransitive verb is a verb of motion. Verbs of change-of-state or state verbs on the other hand always need the subject enclitic pronoun. This seems to be a matter of control of the subject. If the latter is true, then Hittite would share this feature with the so-called active languages (as opposed to the accusative or ergative languages).

inclusion of emphatic genitives in his material, I could not be sure whether the free standing genitives in my corpus were not unemphatic. However, combining Garrett's results on unemphatic pronouns and the results of this study on the accented pronoun *apā-* (see especially part III) one should be able to describe the use of both unemphatic and emphatic genitives.

I have also excluded the lemma *kāša*, *kāšma*, *kāšat(t)a* "behold, look here!" although it is based on the proximal demonstrative *kā-*. As Hoffner 1968: 532 showed, *kāša* etc. is often used as a marker of the perfect aspect. Therefore *kāša* and its variants should first be studied as part of the system of verbal aspect before discussing its ties with the demonstrative system.

Finally, the adjectives *kiššuuant-*, *apeniššuuant-* and *eniššuuant-* were not treated because they barely occurred in my corpus.

1.3. Outline and Method

The use of demonstratives and pronouns that refer across sentence boundaries belongs to the performance of the Speaker. Performance deals with the question how the Speaker uses his language competence in order to communicate. In order to understand deictically used demonstratives one needs for example an overview of the speech situation, which might include the persons present, the time the expression was uttered and the location where it all occurred. The same is true of pronouns. If one wants to study pronouns, isolated clauses will yield some information, but in order to find the referent of a pronoun the preceding or sometimes following context must be taken into account.

One of the immediate results of the influence of the context is that the examples in this study usually contain several clauses. Moreover, in order to show that a demonstrative or pronoun is used in a certain way, a single example would never do because especially in the field of language use one often deals with tendencies, not with strict rules. A claim about a particular use that is illustrated by means of one or two examples could therefore easily lose its validity. However, conclusions based on 10 (or 100) examples that illustrate some feature strengthen the case for a tendency or pattern. So, besides elaborate examples one also will encounter *many* examples in this study.

To return to language performance, theories that deal with language use are for example the functional and cognitive linguistic theories. To mention but a few, Functional Grammar (Dik 1997a & b) and Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 1987, 1991) not only deal with phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax, but also with pragmatics and discourse reference.

Besides these linguistic theories one also needs approaches that deal with the analysis of higher communicative units, for example Discourse Analysis, Conversational Analysis in case of spoken language (Brown and Yule 1983), Rhetorical Structure Analysis, etc. etc. Fundamental works are still Levinson 1983 and Brown and Yule 1983.

Although most methodological issues are discussed in the separate chapters, especially the chapters 2, 4 and the chapters on Focus (7, 8, 9), a few words can be said on the methodologies and literature used in each of the three parts of this work:

PART I: REFERENCE

Chapter 2 presents an overview of the framework of reference which will be used in the remainder of this work. The theory of reference presented here is not found in this form in the linguistic literature but is based on a combination of three major approaches to reference. For reference in general I will use Cornish 1999. The sub-fields of Deixis and demonstratives

are covered by the typological studies of Himmelmann 1996 and Diessel 1999 whereas the sub-field of pronouns in relation with two pragmatic notions Topic and Focus is covered by Lambrecht 1994. The main interest of this Chapter is how unaccented pronouns, accented pronouns, demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative noun phrases are used.

In **Chapter 3** the system set up in Chapter 2 will be applied to the Hittite pronominal and demonstrative system. This Chapter draws on the results of the more detailed accounts of part II on Deixis and part III on Focus. This does not mean that Chapter 3 is a summary of the other chapters. Although it necessarily repeats the major results of the other individual chapters, the main focus of chapter 3 is the (contrastive) relation of each expression to the other expressions and the larger framework they together build. This contrastive discussion is usually absent in the chapters on the individual expressions.

PART II: DEIXIS

Chapter 4 is the first chapter dealing with the demonstratives, in this case the Distal demonstrative *ašī*. The fact that *ašī* is a distal demonstrative and not an anaphoric pronoun as formerly assumed (see section 1.1.) is one of the surprising results which followed from the application of methods used in the typological studies of Himmelmann 1996 and Diessel 1999.

As the first Chapter on demonstratives it contains an elaborate introduction to each of the categories for demonstrative use as defined by Himmelmann 1996. These categories are also discussed in Chapter 2 in the larger framework of reference.

Chapter 5 deals with *apā-* as demonstrative pronoun. The pronominal use of *apā-* will be discussed in Part III. The outline of this chapter follows the outline of chapter 4. Since most concepts are explained in Chapters 2 and 4 it does not contain much discussion on the different categories of demonstrative use.

In the same way **Chapter 6** deals with the demonstrative *kā-*. Here I discuss some uses which were not found with the other two (on account of this fact alone one can already conclude that *kā-* is the only Proximal demonstrative). With this chapter the discussion of the demonstratives comes to an end.

The structure of these chapters is such that it is rather easy to compare the same uses of the different demonstratives with each other.

PART III: FOCUS

Chapter 7 starts the discussion of the accented pronoun *apā-*. In this chapter *apā-* with the particle *-ja* “and, also” is discussed. The fact that *-ja* as “also” is a Focus particle leads to the question whether *apā-* with *-ja* indicates Focus or not. This and other questions related to coordination are addressed here. The framework for Topic and Focus used here is Lambrecht 1994.

Chapter 8 continues with the combination of *apā-* with another Focal particle *-pat*, basically meaning “only”. The discussion of *apa-* with the restrictive particle *-pat* leads to a discussion of other types of Focus in combination with *apā-*.

Chapter 9 finally, discusses the use of *apā-* with the adversative particle *-a/-ma*. The work of Rieken 2000 on *-a/-ma* will provide the starting point for the description of *apā-* with *-a/-ma*.

Although most attestations of accented *apā-* in my corpus are covered by these chapters, I do not claim to provide a full description of *apā-*. However, I hope to provide an overview of the basic use of the pronoun, from which future research on *apā-* for example in contrast with *-a-* might profit.

1.4. The Corpus

In order to gain a clear picture of the use and development of the demonstratives and pronouns only texts can be used that are originally composed in Old, Middle or New Hittite, preferably without archaizing language. For example, even if we are certain that a New Hittite ritual is composed in New Hittite times, one still should be aware of archaizing tendencies to copy Old Hittite language use. Therefore I have used texts that were composed and written down in the same period.

Whenever possible I will assign the examples to a king (or queen), especially in New Hittite. For the overall picture however I discern four large periods: OH/OS (until Telipinu), MH/MS (until Suppiluliuma I), NH (Mursili I to Hattusili III) and lateNH (Tudhaliya IV and later).

The corpus is based on Melchert 1977: 40-131, Oettinger 1979: 574-577, Weitenberg 1984: 13-21.

1.4.1. Old Hittite in Old script

| Text genre | CTH no. | Text |
|---|----------------|---|
| <i>Narrations</i> | 1A | KBo 3.22 |
| | 2.2 | KUB 36.99 |
| | 3.1.A. | KBo 22.2 |
| | 8D | KUB 36.104 |
| | 8J | KUB 36.105 |
| | 9.5 | KBo 8.42 |
| | 12C | KBo 13.52 |
| | 15A | KBo 7.14 + KUB 36.100 |
| | 39.10 | KUB 36.107 |
| <i>Treaties</i> | 25 | KUB 36.108 |
| | 27 | KBo 9.73 (+) KUB 36.106 |
| <i>Instructions</i> | 272 | KBo 22.1 |
| <i>Legal texts</i> | 291A | KBo 6.2 + KBo 19.1 + KBo 22.62 + KBo 22.61 + KBo 19.1a |
| | 291B | KUB 29.16 + KBo 19.2 |
| | 292A | KUB 29.25 + KUB 29.28 + KUB 29.29 + KUB 29.30 + KUB 29.32 + KUB 29.35 + KUB 29.36 + KUB 29.38 + KBo 25.5 + KBo 25.85 |
| <i>Myths</i> | 336.5.C | KUB 43.25 |
| <i>Rituals, Religious administration, festivals</i> | | see StBoT 25, 26 |
| <i>Liver omina</i> | 547 II 1 | KUB 4.72 |
| | 547 II 2 | KUB 37.223 |
| | 547 II 3 | KBo 9.67 |
| | 547 II 4 | KBo 25.1 |

| | | |
|---------------------|-------|-----------|
| <i>Benedictions</i> | 820.7 | KUB 43.23 |
|---------------------|-------|-----------|

1.4.2. Middle Hittite in Middle Script

| | | |
|----------------------|----------|---|
| <i>Treaties</i> | 28 | KBo 16.47 |
| | 41IIA | KUB 8.81 + KBo 19.31 |
| | 41IIB | (= CTH 131) KUB 36.127 |
| | 134C | KUB 40.28 |
| | 137 | KBo 16.27 |
| | 138.1 | KUB 23.77a (+) KUB 13.27 + KUB 23.77 + KUB 16.40 |
| | 138.2 | KUB 31.105 |
| | 139.A | KBo 8.35 |
| | 139.B | KUB 40.36 + KUB 23.78b + KUB 26.6 + KBo 22.20 |
| | 140.1 | KUB 26.19 |
| | 140.2A | KUB 26.20 + KBo 12.132 |
| | 146 | KUB 23.72 + KUB 40.10 + 1684/u |
| | | |
| <i>Annals</i> | 142.2.B. | KUB 23.12 |
| | | |
| <i>Indictment</i> | 147 | KUB 14.1 + KBo 19.38 |
| | | |
| <i>Letters</i> | 151 | VBoT 1 |
| | 152 | VBoT 2 |
| | 154 | KUB 19.20 + KBo 12.23 |
| | 199 | HKM 1-116 |
| | 199 | ABoT 65 |
| | | |
| <i>Landgrant</i> | 223 | KBo 5.7 |
| | | |
| <i>Instructions</i> | 251.A | KBo 16.24 (+) KBo 16.25 |
| | 253.1 | KUB 26.57 |
| | 253.2 | KUB 21.41 |
| | 259.1 | KUB 26.17 |
| | 261.3 | 885/z (+) KUB 13.1 + 31.87 + 31.88 + 40.56 (+) 40.55 + 1236/u |
| | 262 | IBoT 1.36 |
| | 270 | KBo 16.50 |
| | 271 | KUB 34.40, 41; 36.109, 36.112, 113, 114, 116, 118 + 119 |
| | 275 | KUB 31.103; KUB 13.10 |
| | | |
| <i>Horsetraining</i> | 286 | Tablet I = KUB 29.45 (+) KUB 29.43 Tablet II = KUB 29.40 |
| | | Tablet III = KUB 29.46 + KUB 29.53 (+) KUB 29.42 |
| | | Tablet IV = KUB 29.52 (+) KUB 29.49 + KBo 14.62 + KBo 8.51 |
| | | Tablet V = KUB 29.51 (+) KBo 8.49 (+?) KBo 16.92 |
| | | Tablet VI = KUB 29.50 |
| | | Tablet VII = KBo 8.52 + KBo 14.63 (+) KBo 14.63a |
| | | Fragments: KBo 16.88, KBo 16.89, KBo 16.90, KBo 16.91 |
| | 287.1 | KUB 29.54 |
| | | |
| | | |

| | | |
|--------------------|-------|---|
| <i>Legal texts</i> | 295.5 | KUB 34.45 + KBo 16.63 |
| | 295.6 | KBo 16.59 |
| <i>Prayers</i> | 375.A | KUB 17.21+ 545/u + 577/u + 1619/u + 768/v |
| | 375.B | KUB 31.124 + 48.28 + Bo 8617 |
| | 376.C | KUB 24.4 + 30.12 |
| <i>Ritual</i> | 443 | KBo 15.10 + KBo 20.42 |

1.4.3. New Hittite

| | | |
|-----------------|--------|---|
| <i>Treaties</i> | 44.1 | KUB 19.25 |
| | 44.2 | KUB 19.26 |
| | 49II | KBo 10.13 (+) 12 + 12a |
| | 50 | KUB 19.27 |
| | 51II | KUB 21.18 (+ [?]) 26.34 |
| | 52II | HT 21 + 8.80 + 23.50 + 219/w + 1472/u |
| | 57 | KBo 1.28 |
| | 58 | KBo 12.33 |
| | 62II.A | KBo 5.9 |
| | 62II.B | KUB 3.119 (+) 14.5 (+) 19.48 + 23.6 |
| | 62II.C | KUB 21.49 |
| | 62II.B | KBo 22.39 |
| | 63.A | KBo 3.3 + KUB 23.126 + 31.36 |
| | 63.B | KUB 19.41 + 31.12 |
| | 63.C | KUB 19.42 (+ [?]) 21.30 |
| | 63.D | KUB 19.44 |
| | 63.E | KUB 19.45 |
| | 63.F | KBo 16.23 |
| | 63.G | KUB 19.43 |
| | 67 | KBo 5.4 |
| | 68.A | 854/v + KBo 4.7 + KBo 19.65 + KBo 22.31 |
| | 68.B | KBo 5.13 |
| | 68.C | KBo 19.62 + 63 + 64 + 64a + KBo 4.3 + 40.34 |
| | 68.D | KUB 6.44 + 19.53 + 6.43 (+) 6.42 |
| | 68.E | KUB 6.41 + KBo 19.66 + 67 (+) 69 |
| | 68.F | KUB 19.51 + HFAC 1 |
| | 68.G | KUB 19.54 |
| | 68.H | KUB 6.48 |
| | 68.I | KUB 19.52 + 242/w + 40.53 + 40.41 |
| | 68.J | KUB 40.42 |
| | 69.A | KUB 19.49 + 26.36 + 23.25 + KBo 22.41 + KBo 19.71 + KBo 19.70 + KBo 19.72 + KBo 22.34 |
| | 69.B | KUB 19.50 + 26.59 + 14.26 + 48.74 + 40.39 |
| | 76.A | KUB 19.6 + 21.1 + KBo 19.73 + 73a + FHL 57 |
| | 76.B | KUB 21.5 + KBo 19.74 |
| | 76.C | KUB 48.95 + 21.2 + 21.4 + KBo 12.36 |
| | 76.D | KUB 21.3 |
| | 76.E | HT 8 |
| | 76.F | 97/w |
| | 96 | 544/f |

| | | |
|-----------------------|----------|--|
| <i>Annals/History</i> | 40 | see list in CTH |
| | 61 I | see list in CTH |
| | 61 II | see list in CTH |
| | 61III | see list in CTH |
| | 81 | see StBoT 24 |
| | 82.1 | KUB 21.6 |
| | 82.2 | KUB 21.6a |
| | 83.1A | KUB 19.9 |
| | 83.1B | KUB 19.8 |
| | 83.2 | KBo 12.44 |
| | 83.3 | KUB 31.20 + KBo 16.36 + Bo 5768 |
| | 83.4 | FHL 61 |
| | 83.7 | KUB 48.87 |
| | 84.1 | KUB 21.16 |
| | 84.2 | KUB 21.24 |
| | 90.1 | KUB 21.8 |
| | 90.3 | KUB 21.11 |
| | 98 | KUB 21.39 |
| <i>Edicts</i> | 85.1.A | 1380/u + KBo 6.29 + 21.12 + 23.137 + Bo 2026b |
| | 85.1.B | 509/u + 21.15 + 186/v + 715/v |
| | 85.2 | KUB 21.37 |
| | 85.3 | KBo 14.45 |
| | 85.4 | KBo 8.43 |
| | 85.5 | FHL 110 (?) |
| | 86.1.A. | KUB 21.17 |
| | 86.1.B. | KUB 31.27 |
| | 86.2. | KUB 31.26 |
| | 87 | KBo 4.12 |
| | 88 | KBo 6.28 + KUB 26.48 |
| | 89.A | KUB 21.29 |
| | 89.B | KUB 23.123 |
| | 89.C | KUB 31.15 |
| <i>Letters</i> | 171 | KUB 23.102 |
| | 175 | KUB 23.88 |
| | 176 | KUB 26.89, 21.38, 21.36, 26.53, 57.125, KBo 18.23, 23.105, KBo 18.21 |
| | 181 | KUB 14.3 |
| | 191 | KUB 19.5 + KBo 19.79 |
| <i>Prayers</i> | 70 | KUB 14.4 |
| | 71.A | KBo 4.8 + Izmir 1277 |
| | 71.B | 1206/u + 245/w |
| | 378 I.A | KUB 14.14 + 19.1 + 19.2 + 1858/u |
| | 378 I.B | KUB 23.3 |
| | 378 II.A | KUB 14.8 |
| | 378 II.B | KUB 14.11 + 650/u |
| | 378 II.C | KUB 14.10 + 26.86 |
| | 378 III | KUB 14.12 |
| | 378 IV.A | KUB 14.13 + 23.124 |
| | 378 IV.B | KBo 22.71 |
| | 379 | KUB 31.121 + 48.111 |
| | 380.A | KBo 4.6 |
| | 380.B | 161/v |
| | 380.C | 638/v |
| | 380.D | 355/e |
| | 381.A | KUB 6.45 + 1111/z + KUB 30.14 |
| | 381.B | KUB 6.46 |

| | | |
|----------------|-------|--|
| | 381.C | KUB 12.35 |
| | 381.D | 1785/u |
| | 382 | KBo 11.1 |
| | 383 | KUB 21.19 + 1303/u + 338/v + 1193/u (+) KUB 14.7 |
| | 384.A | KUB 21.27 + 546/u + 676/v + 695/v |
| | 384.B | IBoT 4.225 |
| | 486.A | KUB 48.50 + 15.36 + 12.27 |
| | 486.B | IBoT 2.112 + KUB 12.31 + 43.51 + 48.100 |
| | 486.C | KBo 4.2 iii 40ff. |
| | 486.D | IBoT 4.26 |
| <i>Oracles</i> | 566 | KUB 22.70 |
| <i>Vows</i> | 583 | KUB 15.5 + 48.122 |
| | 584 | KUB 15.1, 15.3, 15.11, 15.23, 31.77, 48.119 |
| | 585 | see StBoT 1 |
| | 590 | KBo 9.96 (+ [?]) KBo 8.63, KUB 31.67, 15.4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 28, 29, 30, 31.69, IBoT 3.123, KBo 8.61, 48.118, 121, 125, 123, VBoT 75 |

1.4.4. Late New Hittite

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------|---|
| <i>Treaties</i> | 105.A | KUB 23.1 (+) 1a (+) 1b + 31.43 + 23.37 + 670/v + 720/v + 93/v |
| | 105.B | KUB 8.82 + 1198/u + 1436/u + Bo 69/821 |
| | 106.1 | Bo 86/299 |
| | 106.B1 | ABoT 57 |
| | 106.B2 | KBo 4.10 + 1548/u |
| | 123.1 | KBo 4.14 |
| | 123.2 | KUB 40.38 |
| <i>Letters</i> | 177.1 | KUB 3.74 |
| | 177.2 | KUB 23.99 |
| | 177.3 | KUB 23.101 |
| | 178.1A | KUB 23.103 |
| | 178.1B | KUB 23.92 |
| | 178.1C | KUB 40.77 |
| | 178.2 | KUB 23.92, KUB 23.103 |
| | 182 | KUB 19.55 + 48.90 |
| | 187 | KBo 18.2, 6, 25 + Güterbock, FsLaroche 144, KUB 57.8 |
| | 209.18 | KUB 23.109 |
| | 209.21 | KUB 26.70 |
| <i>Historical texts</i> | 121 | KBo 12.38 |
| | 122.1 | KBo 12.41 |
| | 122.2 | KUB 40.37 |
| | 124.A | KUB 26.32 + 23.44 + 31.106 |
| | 124.B | KBo 14.113 |
| | 125 | KUB 26.33 |
| | 126.1 | KUB 21.7 |
| | 126.2 | KUB 26.25 |
| | 126.3 | KUB 26.68 |
| | 126.4 | KBo 12.30 |
| | 126.5 | KBo 14.112 |

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------|---|
| | 141 | KBo 12.39 |
| | 211.4 | KUB 23.13 |
| | 214.2 | KUB 31.14, KUB 23.61 + 26.78 |
| | 214.3 | KUB 6.47 |
| | 214.8 | KBo 16.35 |
| | 214.9 | KUB 23.29, 31.32 |
| | 214.20 | KBo 22.10 |
| <i>Landgrant</i> | 225.A | KUB 26.43 + KBo 22.56 |
| | 225.B | KUB 26.50 + KBo 22.55 + KBo 22.57 + KBo 22.58 + KBo 22.59 + KBo 22.60 |
| <i>Instructions</i> | 255.1A | KUB 21.42 + KUB 26.12 + VBoT 82 |
| | 255.1B | KUB 21.43 + KUB 26.13. |
| | 255.1C | KUB 40.24 |
| | 255.2A | KUB 26.1 (incl. KUB 21.13 + KUB 21.45 + KUB 13.22) + KUB 23.112 |
| | 255.2B | KUB 26.8 |
| | 255.2C | KUB 31.97 |
| | 255.2D | KUB 23.67 |
| | 255.2E | KUB 26.1a |
| | 256 | ABoT 56 |
| <i>Legal texts</i> | 295.2 | KUB 13.34 + 40.84 |
| | 297.8 | KUB 31.68 |
| <i>Prayers</i> | 385.1 | KUB 14.27 |
| | 385.2 | KUB 24.6 |
| | 385.3 | KUB 31.137 |
| | 385.4 | KUB 34.55 |
| | 385.5 | IBoT 3.82 |
| | 385.6 | IBoT 3.113 |
| | 385.7 | IBoT 3.127 |
| | 385.8 | IBoT 3.128 or KUB 36.84 |
| | 385.9 | KBo 12.58 + KBo 13.162 |
| <i>Cult inventories</i> | 506.1 | KUB 7.24 |
| | 524 | KUB 25.21 |
| | 525.4 | KUB 38.35 |
| | 525.9 | KBo 20.90 |
| | 525.11 | KUB 31.122 + FHL 42 |
| <i>Oracles</i> | 561 | KUB 5.1 + KUB 52.65 |
| | 569 | see Van den Hout 1998 |
| | 577 | KBo 16.98 (+ [?]) KUB 49.49 |
| | 579 | KUB 22.40 |
| <i>Vows</i> | 590 | KUB 48.119, KBo 33.216 |

PART I

REFERENCE

2. *Deixis, Discourse and Reference*

2.1. Introduction

This chapter provides the necessary theoretical background for the description of Hittite referring expressions⁴. In recent theoretical literature on reference two different models are employed to explain the use of referring expressions in natural language. In outline they can be described as the *geographical*⁵ (2.2.1) and the *cognitive* approach (2.2.2.)⁶. In this chapter I will present both approaches. As we will see, both ways of viewing the use of referring expressions can easily be combined, without the need to reject the one or the other (2.3.). In addition I will present the theory of information structure of the sentence as advocated and further developed by Lambrecht 1994 (2.2.3.) and discuss it together with the other approaches in 2.3. This theory, which concentrates on certain pragmatic functions at sentence level, is of great use for a more complete description of the Hittite pronominal system. The resulting modular theory as outlined in this chapter will be applied to the Hittite pronominal and demonstrative system in chapter 3. The information on the expressions contained in chapter 3 is collected from the chapters on the individual pronouns and demonstratives in part II *Deixis*, the chapters 4 (The Distal Demonstrative *asi*), 5 (The Medial Demonstrative *apa-*), 6 (The Proximal Demonstrative *ka-*), and part III *Focus*, chapters 7, 8 and 9 (On *apa-* as Emphatic Pronoun).

Before continuing with the description of the approaches on reference, I here present a global introduction to the subject based on the traditional account of deixis as discussed by Levinson 1983: 61ff.

Prototypically, a linguistic expression which refers to the context of the utterance, the speech-setting, is called *deictic*. According to Lyons 1977: 637 deixis consists in ‘the location and identification of persons, objects, events, processes and activities being talked about, or referred to, in relation to the spatio-temporal context created by the act of utterance and the participation in it, typically, of a speaker and at least one addressee’. Take the following part of a conversation:

2.1 There you are! I have been waiting here for an hour.

The context of the utterance is necessary in order to establish the intended referents. We cannot correctly interpret this utterance if we do not know who the Addressee and the

⁴ For an overview of studies on reference in discourse from different kinds of angles and frameworks see Yan Huang 2000.

⁵ Term coined by Ariel 1990: 5.

⁶ Yan Huang 2000 discusses several models dealing with discourse anaphora: the topic continuity or distance-inference model (o.c. 303-309), the hierarchy model (o.c. 309-314) and the cognitive model (o.c. 314-318). Before presenting his own pragmatic model (o.c. 318-329) he concludes that underlying all these models are some cognitive or pragmatic principles (o.c. 308, 314). I therefore only distinguish between the geographical and cognitive approaches.

Speaker are. Furthermore, *here* and *for an hour* only have meaning if we know where and at what time the utterance took place. Familiarity with the Speaker, Addressee, Time and Place, that is, the context of the utterance, is necessary for recovering the referents. *Anaphorically* used expressions on the other hand, refer to entities or referents which have been mentioned or are going to be mentioned in the utterance or text itself. Knowledge of the speech situation is not necessary in order to find the entity to which the expression refers:

- 2.2 Unprepared for the speed and ferocity of the Hittite advance, Tusratta could offer no resistance. He had no option but to flee the capital, with whatever troops he could muster, before it fell to the Hittites (Bryce 1998: 175)

The pronouns *he* and *it* both refer to entities which have been referred to before in this piece of narration. The masculine pronoun *he* points at the person named Tusratta, and the neuter pronoun *it* to the referent of the definite Noun Phrase *the capital*. The latter expression is also anaphoric, and refers to the city Wassuganni, mentioned in the clause preceding this passage.

Example 2.1 shows already three types of deixis. *Personal deixis*, seen in the expressions *you* and *I*, deals with the encoding of the roles of the participants in the speech event. In Hittite the role of the Speaker is grammaticalized in the pronoun *uk / ammuk* ‘I’ and in the verbal ending if the Speaker is the subject of a clause, the role of the Addressee in *zik / tuk* ‘you’, and *apas* and *asi* ‘he, she, it’ are used for persons who are neither speaker nor addressee. When we are dealing with spatial locations relative to the speech participants, it is called *Place deixis*. English *this* and *that*, and *here* and *there* are grammaticalizations of proximal location (near the speaker) and distal location (not near speaker). Some Hittite equivalences are the deictic adverbs *ka* ‘here’, *apiya* ‘there’, and *kas* ‘this one (nom.)’ as the proximal demonstrative, *apas* ‘that one (nom.)’ as a non-proximal demonstrative⁷. *Time deixis* is concerned with the location of entities or events in time relative to the time at which the utterance is expressed. Languages may grammaticalize this relative location in time by means of deictic adverbs of time, like English *now*, *then*, Hittite *kinun(a)* ‘now’, *apiya* ‘then’, or tense. Two further types of deixis are *Discourse Deixis* and *Social Deixis*. Expressions belonging to the field of Discourse Deixis refer to parts of the discourse itself: English *this* in *Listen to this: ...* and Hittite *kissan* ‘in this (as will be described) manner’ and *enissan* ‘in that (as just described) manner’ are discourse deictic expressions. Levinson also includes such discourse notions as topic/comment, main storyline etc. (Levinson 1983: 77n, 88-9). The final type of deixis, *Social deixis*, has to do with the encoding of social distinctions between Speaker and Addressee. In Hittite official correspondence we often encounter the use of family terms to address persons who are not (necessarily) family members. Persons of equal rank call each other *ŠEŠ-YA* ‘my brother’, and someone who occupies a relatively higher position in society is addressed with *ABI-YA* ‘my father’ or *AMA-YA* ‘my mother’.

In the following discussion I will concentrate on Anaphora, Place Deixis, Discourse Deixis and Personal Deixis, but the latter only in so far as it concerns third person reference.

2.2. Discourse, Reference and Information Structure

⁷ The use of *apa-* as a demonstrative will be discussed in chapters 3 and 6, and as an emphatic pronoun in chapters 3 and 7-9.

In this section the two main approaches to reference in discourse are introduced, together with a theory on Topic and Focus on sentence level. A more detailed description of a combination of the three approaches will be presented in 2.3.

A major problem in the study of reference is the fact that especially the anaphoric demonstratives are rather neglected. This is quite problematic if one needs a framework describing the use of demonstratives. In most reference works and descriptive grammars the discussion is restricted to the deictic use of demonstratives and to the observation that demonstratives can also be used anaphorically (Himmelman 1997: 2). In the same vein studies that focus on reference in discourse have noted the same without explaining how these demonstratives are posited in relation to the other referential expressions, although Diessel 1999: 96 lists several studies which shed some light on this problem. However, most of these studies focus on a sub-set of referring expressions (Linde 1979⁸; Ehlich 1982⁹; Givón 1983¹⁰; Lichtenberk 1996¹¹). As a result, the theoretical part on anaphoric demonstratives (sections 2.3.3.4. and 2.3.4.) remains somewhat eclectic and should only be considered a preliminary outline. Another problem is that it is virtually impossible to find literature on the differences and similarities between the different anaphoric demonstratives themselves. Exceptions are Sidner 1983, Gundel et al. 1993, Himmelman 1996 and Diessel 1999. But even these works cannot provide a background for the use of the Hittite demonstratives. In the conclusion, 2.4., I present my own view on demonstratives and pronouns, but this too must be considered highly theoretical and needs to be tested typologically.

2.2.1. The ‘geographical’ approach

As the name already indicates, the geographical approach, which is also the traditional approach followed by for example Lyons (1977, Ch. 15) and Levinson (1983, Ch. 2), Himmelman 1996, Diessel 1999 and others, derives its classification of referring expressions from the location of the ‘target’ (referent) of the referring expression. In the case of *deixis*, the referent is located outside the text in the physical environment, whereas an *anaphor* is related to an accompanying antecedent in the preceding text. Both types of location were described by Bühler (1934) as *Zeigfeld* and *Symbolfeld* respectively.

Besides the *Zeigfeld*, i.e., the speech situation (Bühler’s *deixis ad oculos*) and the *Symbolfeld*, i.e., the discourse or the text, other deictic spaces have been identified. Lingering between *deixis* for the *Zeigfeld* and *anaphora* for the *Symbolfeld* is discourse *deixis*. This time the referent is not an entity, as with *deixis* and *anaphora*, but a segment of the discourse itself. More types of *deixis* are discussed in Cornish 1999: 21.

Although the geographical approach concentrates on the different contexts in which referential expressions occur, attention is also paid to the mental effort needed when

⁸ Linde discusses the use of *it* and *that* in apartment descriptions. Her main conclusion is that *it* refers within a discourse node whereas *that* refers across a discourse node to the same type of entity.

⁹ Ehlich introduces the terms *deictic procedure* and *anaphoric procedure*, which we will encounter later again. Within this framework he mainly discusses the Hebrew demonstrative *ze* ‘this’.

¹⁰ Most contributors to Givón 1983 exclude the demonstratives from referring expressions, I assume because their corpora generally did not contain that many demonstratives. The general framework set up by Givón 1983: 5ff. does discuss the demonstrative pronouns and determiners among the topic (dis)continuity markers.

¹¹ Lichtenberk discusses what he calls *immediate anaphora after first mention* in To’aba’ita narrative discourse. When a discourse participant will become thematically prominent, To’aba’ita uses a lexical NP (which includes the ‘proximal’ demonstrative ‘*eri*’), otherwise dependent pronominals are used.

accessing some referent (Lyons 1979: 94). Especially the demonstratives are capable of placing a referent in the center of attention besides simply pointing to an element in the physical surroundings (Diessel 1999: 94, 96).

2.2.2. The ‘cognitive’ approach

2.2.2.1. Introduction

Another approach to deixis and anaphora has been developed during the past 20 years. The central theme of studies like Apollonius Dyskolus¹², Ehlich 1979, 1982, Bosch 1983, Ariel 1990, 1996¹³, Gundel et al. 1993, Lambrecht 1994, Van Hoek 1997, Cornish 1999, Givón 1983, 2001 consists of emphasis on the *cognitive* motivation underlying the use of referring expressions. There is no clearcut difference between the use of expressions referring to the outside world or the textual world, although these different worlds are of course acknowledged. Just as the geographical approach includes the cognitive notion of ‘bringing something into the focus of attention’, the cognitive approach includes references to the different *Zeigfelder*. However, the explanation of the use of deictic and anaphoric expressions lies in the ways Speaker and Addressee communicate: ‘The object of both deixis and anaphora is to ensure that the speech participants are ‘on the same wavelength’ with respect to

¹² Bosch 1983: 4-9 provides an account of Apollonius’ views on deixis and anaphora.

¹³ Ariel 1990, 1996 states that various referring expressions mark different degrees of accessibility in memory (1996: 15). The form of a referring expression guides the Addressee in searching his or her memory for an earlier expression (antecedent) which bears the memory status in accordance with the status indicated by the referring expression: the form of the anaphor signals the degree of cognitive accessibility and thus leads the Addressee to the correct antecedent among the set of referents in his memory. Based on these assumptions, which I do not want to contest, Ariel has set up a scale. The *high* accessibility markers are arranged as follows (with higher accessibility to the left): zero < reflexive < agreement marker < cliticized pronouns < unstressed pronouns < stressed pronouns < stressed pronouns + gesture. They are followed by the *intermediate* accessibility markers: < proximal demonstrative (+ NP) < distal demonstrative (+ NP) < proximal demonstrative (+ NP) + modifier. And finally the *low* accessibility markers: < distal demonstrative (+ NP) + modifier < first name < last name < short definite description < long definite description < full name < full name + modifier. The material discussed in this study fall mainly in the intermediate group (*ka-* (+ N), *apa-* (+ N), *asi* (+ N)). The emphatic pronoun *apa-* is a high accessibility marker, whereas *asi* (+ N) + modifier is a low accessibility marker. Although I mainly agree with this categorization of the Hittite pronouns and demonstratives, my material does not support the cline inside each category. The demonstrative *ka-* is not more accessible than *apa-*, which in turn is not more accessible than *asi*. Furthermore, the emphatic pronoun *apa-* refers generally to a referent which is as accessible as zero or the enclitic pronoun when it indicates Argument Focus. Among the arguments one could provide against this part of her theory is the following. Ariel 1990: 53 correctly states that in English ‘*that* requires identifiability by both speaker and addressee, whereas *this* sometimes refers to objects accessible only to the speaker.’ However, I should think that this would imply that *this* is a lower accessibility marker than *that*, because the speaker assumes that the addressee does not yet know what the discourse topic is going to be. Ariel however claims that, since the Speaker is ‘egocentric’, a topic is more accessible to her than to the Addressee, so that *this* as higher accessibility marker is used. However, cognitive models all focus on the assumptions which the Speaker holds of the Addressee’s awareness about some subject. Speaker should therefore adapt her language to her estimation of Addressee’s state of mind. I do not understand Ariel’s move to centering on the Speaker instead of on the Addressee. In this respect I prefer the analysis of Gundel et al. who have created a category for this type of *this* with a lower cognitive status than the other demonstratives (see table 2.2). Furthermore, they group *this*, *that* and *this* N together under the heading ‘activated’, which is more in accordance with my material.

their center of attention at any one point in the discourse' (Cornish 1999: 25ff.). An extensive treatment of anaphora and deixis within the cognitive framework is presented by Cornish 1999, whom I will follow when discussing the cognitive approach in the remainder of this chapter.

2.2.2.2. *Memory and cognitive procedures*

From a cognitive viewpoint the manner in which discourse entities are referred to depends on the part of the memory in which their mental representations are located. Cornish 1999 Chapter 6 sketches the following tripartite structure (o.c. 207ff.). First, long-term memory: this part of memory contains among other things lexical meaning and encyclopaedic knowledge, i.e., knowledge of the world. Second and third, a working memory divided into two parts, the implicit focus space and the explicit focus space. The latter focus space is also called the 'cache'. The cache is a highly active, 'spotlighted' region which contains at least the proposition which is being expressed or processed and the preceding proposition. Every information contained in the cache is salient, although there are different levels of cognitive activation within the salient information. Besides the spotlighted region the implicit focus space contains less active, supportive background information, such as the partial discourse model constructed by Speaker and Addressee. The limitations of working memory not only cause differences in cognitive activation but also have to do with the episodic structure of discourse.

The propositions of a discourse episode or paragraph are kept in working memory (Van Dijk 1982: 191). Within an episode reference is often done by pronouns, whereas NPs and names are generally used at episode boundaries (or discourse nodes). (Van Dijk & Kintsch 1983, Fox 1987, Ariel 1990, Van Hoek 1997, among others).

Elements in the three memory compartments and also elements from the extra-linguistic context have to be accessed somehow. According to Cornish (see already Ehlich 1982) the *deictic procedure* draws an element into the immediate attention of the Addressee, either from long-term memory or from the surroundings, and gives it a place in the discourse, whereas the *anaphoric procedure* instructs the Addressee to maintain the focus of attention on the mental representation of some referent, thus ensuring the retrieval of salient, already recorded information located in the cache. The next example illustrates both procedures:

2.3 [It is dusk, and John and Mary are returning from a shopping trip. As John is parking the car, Mary exclaims:]

Good God! Look at that incredibly bright light [Mary gestures towards a point in the evening sky]! What on earth do you think it could be? (Cornish' ex. 2.6a, p. 27)

The expression *that incredibly bright light* serves to draw John's attention towards some object in the sky. The next reference is done by the unaccented pronoun *it*, indicating that the referent of *it* is already in the center of attention of the Addressee.

The difference between the geographical approach and the cognitive approach cannot be explained by means of ex. 2.3: *That incredibly bright light* is a typical example of the deictic properties of demonstratives -reference to the extra-linguistic world- whereas *it* is referring anaphorically, to the text-internal world. This one-to-one mapping of deixis and the deictic procedure and anaphora and the anaphoric procedure is invalidated however by the next example:

- 2.4 [A and B turn a corner on the pavement, and suddenly find themselves face to face with a rather large dog]
A to B: Do you think it's friendly? (Cornish' ex. 4.1, p. 112)

The unaccented pronoun *it* refers to an entity in the text-external world, without the mediation of an antecedent in the form of a lexical noun phrase. The situation in ex. 2.4 is such that the dog cannot fail to be in the center of attention of A and B. Being in the center of attention, any further reference to the dog has to be done by the anaphoric procedure, in this case in the form of *it*.

The opposite of Deixis and the anaphoric procedure is Anaphora and the deictic procedure, illustrated by an example from English (Moyer 1969: 104):

- 2.5 Specifically this included being bathed, dressed in clean garments, and having the nails and body hair removed. (Followed by 6 sentences about the bathing, then a new paragraph consisting of 3 sentences on the extent of washing. The next paragraph starts with:)
The clean garments are not specified in any way. ...

To access and reactivate the clean garments after 9 sentences and two paragraph breaks dealing with the ritual bathing the definite noun phrase 'the clean garments' is used.

The referring expressions from the preceding examples can roughly be tabulated as follows:

| <i>Geographic approach</i> | <i>Cognitive approach</i> | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| | Deictic procedure | Anaphoric procedure |
| Deixis | <i>this/that NP</i> | <i>it</i> |
| Anaphora | <i>the NP</i> | <i>it</i> |

Table 2.1: geographical-cognitive matrix

It might be concluded from table 2.1 that the cognitive approach should prevail over the geographical one, but as we will see in the following discussion (and in 2.3.) the division of labor of these referring expressions is not as clear-cut as it may seem here. On the level of Anaphora one could also conclude that the anaphoric procedure is used within a discourse unit or episode, while the deictic procedure is used at the beginning of a new episode. However, also this match does not cover the phenomena described in this chapter. It has been noted that salient entities, requiring the anaphoric procedure, are sometimes still referred to by means of NPs (more on this in 2.3.3.4.).

In order to avoid confusion with the traditional meanings of deixis and anaphora, I will use a different terminology: The *deictic procedure* is required when some element needs to be brought in the center of attention, so I will call this procedure the *centering procedure*. The *anaphoric procedure* is required when something needs to be continued in the center of attention. I will call this procedure the *continuity procedure*.

2.2.2.3. The cognitive status of referring expressions

Within the framework presented by Cornish, referring expressions are not inherently centering or continuing. Instead, they are *used* as centering or continuing (o.c. 23). However, referring expressions still have some inherent, 'basic' meaning, be it almost empty for enclitic

pronouns or rather full for demonstrative descriptions. The intrinsic referential-semantic character of referring expressions is described by Gundel et al. 1993 and Cornish 1999: 52ff. The following Givenness Hierarchy contains the six cognitive statuses that are relevant to the form of English referring expressions (Gundel et al. o.c. 275)¹⁴:

| in focus › | activated › | familiar › | uniquely identifiable › | referential › | type identifiable |
|------------|--|---------------|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| (it) | <i>that</i> <i>this</i> <i>this N</i> stressed pronouns | <i>that N</i> | <i>the N</i> | indef <i>this N</i> | <i>a N</i> |

Table 2.2: The Givenness Hierarchy (Gundel et al. 1993: 275)

Every status entails all lower statuses: the expression *that N* bearing the status ‘familiar’ is also ‘uniquely identifiable’, ‘referential’ and ‘type identifiable’. Furthermore, for example *that N* may be used higher (that is, to the left) in the hierarchy, because all positions to the left of ‘familiar’ necessarily contain the feature ‘familiar’. It may not be used lower in the hierarchy because *that N* indicates at least familiarity. Basically, most expressions seem to stick to their category (o.c. 290-294).

Gundel et al.’s examples illustrating the hierarchy are variants of *I couldn’t sleep last night. A dog (next door) kept me awake*¹⁵, ‘a dog’ (or the/that/this dog etc.), in which ‘x (dog)’ is the first reference to an extra-linguistic entity. Although their discussion is exemplified by means of deictic expressions, they do not differentiate between extra-linguistic and intra-linguistic use of referring expressions. Gundel et al. indeed emphasize the necessity to distinguish between cognitive status of an entity and the context through which that status is acquired (by being linguistically introduced, derived from general or encyclopaedic knowledge, or prominence in the physical surroundings, o.c. 275), but by focusing on the cognitive status they are not in a position to describe the difference between *this*, *that* and *this N* or the emphatic pronouns in the category ‘activated’. Their approach posed problems for me because the material described in this study includes the zero, enclitic, emphatic and demonstrative pronouns and determiners. Therefore I will not take the cognitive states as a leading principle, but will treat them when appropriate.

Cornish provides a different classification of the referential expressions. As said above the *centering* (or deictic) procedure brings elements into the cache that have a low degree of familiarity or are not (or no longer) cognitively salient in the discourse (o.c. 206). The *continuity* (or anaphoric) procedure maintains the center of attention. No particular effort is required to retrieve these referents since they are already salient. Within the cache different levels of saliency may be discerned: globally we have high and mid-level saliency. This means that the continuity procedure is used to promote an entity from mid to high level, or to maintain it on high level, whereas the centering procedure is required when promoting something from low to high level. The distribution of the different referring expressions in English over the procedures and levels according to Cornish (o.c. 52ff., 206, 227) can be tabulated as follows, although we have to keep in mind that the table below presents the preferred use of these expressions. They may also be used in the other procedure, indicated by +:

¹⁴ Gundel et al. claim that the Hierarchy is universal (o.c. 283ff.).

¹⁵ ‘A dog’ is every time replaced by one of the other expressions like ‘this/the/that dog’ etc.

| Centering procedure | Continuity procedure | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------|
| low → high saliency | mid → high saliency | high → high saliency |
| Definite descriptions | + | + |
| Accented 3rd person pronouns | + | + |
| Demonstrative pronouns | Demonstrative pronouns | + |
| Demonstrative descriptions | Demonstrative descriptions | + |
| — | — | Zero |
| — | — | Unaccented pronouns |
| implicit focus long term memory physical environment | cache | |

Table 2.3: Distribution of referential expression as derived from Cornish 1999.

Both in Cornish' and Gundel et al.'s framework problems occur with the demonstratives: within their theories they seem either not to be distinguished from each other or to occur in more contexts than can be accounted for. In both theories the accented pronouns occur in the same slot as the demonstratives without explaining how that is possible. There has to be a difference. I believe that the difference can be explained by 1) combining the geographical and cognitive approaches and 2) by combining both these approaches with the Information structure of the sentence. The Information structure of sentences will be presented in the next section. Discourse episodic structure is seemingly only related to Anaphora and will be discussed in 2.3.3. (although in 2.4. I will propose to extend discourse structure also to non-linguistic information).

2.2.3. Topic and Focus on sentence level

2.2.3.1. Introduction

Information structure deals with the differences between the following clauses (small caps indicate main stress):

- 2.6
- a. John was eating an APPLE
 - b. John was EATING an apple
 - c. John WAS eating an apple
 - d. JOHN was eating an apple

The different stress patterns imply something like the following:

- 2.7
- a. John was eating an APPLE (not a PEAR)¹⁶
 - b. John was EATING an apple (not LOOKING AT an apple)
 - c. John WAS eating an apple (not IS)
 - d. JOHN was eating an apple (not MARY)

¹⁶ This sentence might also simply be a statement about John, without any contrast with some other fruit.

Much work has been done on information structure since the 1920s (for references see Van Valin & LaPolla 1997: 199), but in this study I will mainly refer to Lambrecht 1994 for the overall picture and to Dik 1997a for several important details. The key concepts in information structure are the pragmatic functions Topic, Focus and some related notions as presupposition and comment. How these notions relate to the cognitive states and procedures described in 2.2.2. will be discussed in the appropriate subsections of 2.3. For the moment I refer to Lambrecht's notion (o.c. 160ff.) that the cognitive state of the mental representation of a referent is only a *precondition* of the pragmatic relations Topic and Focus. One cannot predict on the basis of these states alone what referential expression will be chosen. However, Lambrecht describes the pragmatic difference between accented and unaccented constituents, without reference to demonstratives.

2.2.3.2. *The notions Topic and Focus*

Lambrecht's understanding of Topic is summarized as follows:

- 2.8 “A referent is interpreted as the topic of a proposition if IN A GIVEN DISCOURSE the proposition is construed as being ABOUT this referent, i.e. as expressing information which is RELEVANT TO and which increases the addressee's KNOWLEDGE of this referent. ... Topic is a PRAGMATICALLY CONSTRUED SENTENCE RELATION” (1994: 127).

Only referring expressions can be topics. Referents of discourse topics must be *discourse* referents. *It* in “it is raining” and *there* in “there's nobody in the room” are not referential expressions and therefore not Topics. This also applies to the indefinite pronouns and other quantified expressions like *nobody*, *everybody*, *many people* etc. (o.c. 156).

The Focus of a sentence is described as follows:

- 2.9 “The focus of a proposition is that element of a pragmatically structured proposition which makes the utterance of the sentence expressing the proposition into a piece of information. It is the balance remaining when one subtracts the presupposed component from a given assertion. [...] Like the topic, the focus is an element which stands in a pragmatically construed relation to a proposition. But while the pragmatic relation between a topic and a proposition is assumed to be predictable or recoverable, the relation between the focus element and the proposition is assumed to be unpredictable or non-recoverable for the addressee at the time of the utterance” (o.c. 217-8). As a result “a constituent in focus can by definition not be omitted without depriving the utterance of some or all of its information value.” (o.c. 224).

Lambrecht distinguishes three basic types of clauses with a certain information structure:

- 2.10 a. Topic-Comment or Predicate-Focus structures
b. Identificational or Argument-Focus structures
c. Event-reporting or Sentence-Focus structures

These three types are illustrated by means of the following examples. The questions preceding them suggest a discourse situation in which the clauses can occur (o.c. 223).

2.11 **Predicate-Focus structure**¹⁷

What happened to your car?

- a. My car/it broke DOWN
- b. (La mia macchina) si è ROTTA
- c. (Ma voiture) elle est en PANNE
- d. (Kuruma wa) KOSHOO-shi-ta

2.12 **Argument-Focus structure**¹⁸

I heard your motorcycle broke down?

- a. My CAR broke down
- b. Si è rotta la mia MACCHINA./E la mia MACCHINA che si è rotta
- c. C'est ma VOITURE qui est en panne.
- d. KURUMA ga koshoo-shi-ta

2.13 **Sentence-Focus structure**

What happened?

- a. My CAR broke down
- b. Mi si è rotta (ROTTA) la MACCHINA
- c. J'ai ma VOITURE qui est en PANNE.
- d. KURUMA ga KOSHOO-shi-ta

These three types of Focus structure and their expression in the different languages are discussed in the next three sections (2.2.3.2.1, 2 and 3).

2.2.3.2.1. *Predicate-Focus*

The proposition provides relevant information about the car, which is a standing current interest given the question (or preceding context). 'My car/it' in ex. 2.11 is the Topic of the clause and the comment on this Topic is the rest of the clause, the predicate. The comment contains the assertion 'broke down' which is the unrecoverable part of the message and therefore the Focus.

Predicate-Focus structures are minimally characterized by a focus accent on some element of the predicate. However, Predicate-Focus structures are unmarked for information structure, meaning that this structure is also compatible with other pragmatic construals (Lambrecht 1994: 226-228).

The Topic may be expressed by means of an unaccented pronoun or zero, an accented pronoun or a lexical noun phrase. When the Topic was already the center of the attention of the preceding discourse, the preferred topic expression is an unaccented pronominal, inflectional or zero (depending on the language)¹⁹. Lambrecht calls this type of Topic an *Established Topic* (see also Dik's *Given Topic* (1997a: 318f.)):

- 2.14 But this was not the end of the matter. Brooding further over his wife's offence, Ammistamru refused to accept that justice had been done. He demanded that the princess be extradited to Ugarit, for punishment, ... (Bryce 1998: 346)

¹⁷ See also ex. 2.7.a. without the contrastive reading.

¹⁸ See also ex. 2.7.a. and d.

¹⁹ To make things more complicated: Lambrecht also includes possessive and demonstrative pronouns in this category.

He refers back to Ammistamru, who is highly salient and in the center of attention at the moment of expressing *he*. In the clause containing the expression *he* itself, Ammistamru is also the Topic because the clause is about Ammistamru.

In the following example the lexical noun phrases ‘the napkin feeder’ and ‘the straw feeder’ are inferred from the preceding discourse and not the center of attention:

- 2.15 Sunday I was taking paper and pasting it together and finding a method of how to drop spoons, a fork, a napkin, and a straw into one package. The napkin feeder I got. The straw feeder we made already. That leaves us the spoon and the fork. (Lambrecht’s ex. 4.32, p. 160)

Although the feeders, inferred from the context, have low accessibility under Ariel’s analysis and are uniquely identifiable under Gundel’s analysis, they are a Topic²⁰ of the two sentences containing them. But not being expected in this role, they are *Unestablished* or *Unexpected Topics* (see also Dik’s *Sub-Topic* (1997a: 323f.)).

Sometimes however, while everything seems to favor an unaccented pronoun, a semantically heavier expression is used, as in:

- 2.16 a. What is she going to DO?
b. SHE’s going to do the COOKING (adapted from Lambrecht o.c. 328, ex. 5.86’).

The referent of *she* is ‘in focus’, and actually the established Topic, so we expect an unaccented pronoun. This Topic is accented, not because there is a topic shift but because the speaker wants to imply that there are other possible Topic referents although the questioner did not ask for that information. The message thus conveyed is that the relationship between the elements in the clause is not expected, with the result that the Topic has to be considered as *Unestablished*.

A special category of accented Topic are the *Contrastive Topics* (Lambrecht 1994: 291ff., his ex. 3.20b.)²¹:

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

This time the referents are already in the center of attention but are contrasted with each other.

2.2.3.2.2. *Argument-Focus*

When the Focus rests on an argument of the predicate, in the examples the subject, the proposition ‘something broke down’ in ex. 2.12 is pragmatically presupposed. Only the ‘something’ has to be filled in. That is, the missing part has to be identified, which is why this type of structure is also called an identificational sentence (ex. 2.10.b.). In each language the non-topic status is marked by prosodic prominence, the presupposition is marked via absence of prominence on the verb phrase. Besides prosodic prominence, Italian and French use cleft-sentences, and Japanese *ga*-marking of the subject (Lambrecht 1994: 228ff.).

²⁰ ‘I’ is also a Topic. The predicate ‘got’ says something about the relation that holds between the two Topics. The difference between the two Topics is that ‘I’ is expected as such, but not the feeder. The feeder is therefore referred to by means of a definite NP in Initial position.

²¹ For Dik 1997a: 326, 332 this is Parallel Focus.

In 2.12 a wrong piece of information was corrected. This correction however is not a necessary feature of Argument Focus. Ex. 2.12 could as well have been the answer to ‘What broke down?’. The latter type of Focus is called New or Completive (Dik 1997a: 332) whereas the correcting Focus is one the five counter-presuppositional Focus types distinguished by Dik l.c., Rejecting, Replacing, Expanding, Restricting and Selecting Focus.

The type of Argument-Focus in 2.12 is called *Replacing Focus* (Dik 1997a: 332). The following example is adapted from Dik o.c. 333 (ex. 48):

- 2.18 S assumes that A might think: John bought apples.
S corrects: He didn’t buy APPLES, he bought BANANAS.

In *Expanding Focus* the incomplete information is replaced by the correct information. The following example of this type of Focus is adapted from Dik o.c. 334 (his ex. 49):

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

In case of *Restricting Focus* the speaker assumes that the addressee might have some correct information, but also thinks that something else is true. This last part of information needs correction (l.c.). Restricting Focus replaces that part of the information by the correct information. The following example is adapted from Dik l.c. (ex. 50):

- 2.20 S assumes that A might think: John bought apples and bananas.
S corrects: He **only** bought APPLES.

The last type, *Selecting Focus*, occurs when the speaker assumes that the addressee believes that one of two pieces of information is correct, but does not know which one. The following example is adapted from Dik l.c. (ex. 51):

- 2.21 A asks: Would you like coffee or tea.
S: COFFEE, please.

All these types of Focus can also apply to other elements than nouns, as exemplified in 2.7. b and c. I will not discuss them further.

2.2.3.2.3. Sentence-Focus

A Sentence Focus clause informs the addressee of some event: it is event-reporting (ex. 2.13). Sentences like this are contextually relatively independent and could be uttered “out of the blue”. Most important is that the proposition is not construed as a statement about the referent of the Subject phrase, in contrast with Topic-Comment/Predicate Focus structures.

The non-topical status of the Subject phrase is not unambiguously marked with a prosodic peak in English. Although the Subject phrase carries an accent, it still could be a topic (for example, contrastive topics). In other languages the non-topical status of the subject in event reporting sentences is consistently marked, in Japanese for example by means of the particle *ga* (see ex. 2.13.d.).

2.3. A Combinatory Approach to Referential Expressions

The main goal of this chapter is to provide a framework based on the approaches presented above that might describe the use of referential expressions. I will try to reconcile their results and hope thereby also to circumvent the problems resulting from each individual approach.

In the description of the use of referential expressions the different approaches focus on separate parameters. The geographical approach bases its classification mainly on the different types of context in which the entity or event is located, but takes also the type of entity into account. Reference to an object in the physical surroundings is called *deixis*, exophora or situational use, while reference to an event or proposition in the preceding discourse is called *discourse deixis*. Reference to entities in the ongoing discourse is called *anaphora* (both backward and forward referring). A special type of reference restricted to the demonstratives is *recognitional* reference (see 2.3.1.2).

Approaches as advocated by Cornish (1999), Gundel et al. (1993), Ariel (1990, 1996), Givón (2001) concentrate on the effort an addressee has to make in order to retrieve the correct antecedent or referent. This retrieval can be achieved by exploiting the inherent semantic-pragmatic load of the referring expressions, and not so much by exploiting the different context types. In a simplification of Cornish' view the retrieval is either easy or difficult, and the procedures matching these efforts are the continuity (or anaphoric) procedure or the centering (or deictic) procedure.

Both parameters, the geographical and the cognitive, function on discourse level. In my view, at least a third exponent on sentence level has to be added in order to describe and explain the use of referring expressions: the Topic - Focus distribution as described by Lambrecht 1994, Dik 1997a, Erteschik-Shir 1997 etc. Although Established Topics are necessarily 'in focus', entities 'in focus' are not necessarily Established Topics. They may be an Unestablished Topic, or a Focus entity. As a result, different expressions can be used for entities that are 'in focus', such as unaccented pronouns, accented pronouns, demonstratives, names or definite NPs.

The final parameter, the episodic structure of discourse, gains importance when dealing with Anaphora and will be dealt with in the section on Anaphora (2.3.3.).

Combining the first three parameters results in the following table:

| | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|
| | continuity procedure | | centering procedure | |
| | Topic | Focus | Topic | Focus |
| <i>geographical parameter</i> | | | | |
| Deictic | | | | |
| Recognitional | | | | |
| Anaphoric | | | | |
| Discourse deictic | | | | |

Table 2.4: Geographical-Cognitive-Information structure matrix

Some slots will not be filled given the incompatibility of some parameters. For example, demonstratives in recognitional use serve to *introduce* an entity that is familiar to the addressee (see 2.3.1.2). The slots belonging to the continuity procedure are therefore not filled in.

In the next sections I will discuss the 16 slots and fill them in accordingly. This table is only intended as an attempt to elucidate the distribution of the referring expressions. In section 2.4. (Summary and conclusions) it will become clear whether these features describe the use of these referential expressions or whether other features are more important.

2.3.1. Deixis and the centering procedure

In this section the following slots of Table 2.4. will be discussed:

| | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|
| | continuity procedure | | centering procedure | |
| | Topic | Focus | Topic | Focus |
| <i>geographical parameter</i> | | | | |
| Deictic | | | x | x |
| Recognitional | | | x | x |

2.3.1.1. Situational Reference

When a Speaker wants to draw the attention of the Addressee to an object in the surrounding area which was hitherto not in the center of attention, he should restrict himself to a limited set of signs specialized in ‘pointing’. This pointing, or *Situational reference*, can be achieved by a gesture (such as the pointing finger, a nod of the head), prosody (high level of pitch and accent in spoken medium), or certain linguistic referring expressions (demonstrative pronouns, adverbs or particles, demonstrative descriptions, but also the accented pronouns) (see Levinson 1983: 65ff, Diessel 1999: 2, 93ff.). Of these pointers only the deictic demonstratives indicate a distance contrast. Fillmore 1982 states that there are two types of distance contrast: a two-way contrast, like in English *this, here* for ‘relatively close to the Speaker’ and *that, there* for ‘relatively remote from speaker’, and a three-way contrast, with Proximal, Medial and Distal demonstratives (measured in distance from Speaker), as in Latin, Greek, Japanese, Turkish, etc. Other, sometimes additional contrasts are according to Fillmore (o.c. 49) based on non-distance criteria, such as Pivot contrast (taking Speaker or Addressee as the Pivot), or visibility. The three-way system can be presented as follows:

- *Distal Demonstrative* (Fillmore 1982: 50-1): Prototypically the distal demonstrative alternates between two features, (a) it points to an entity at a great distance from both Speaker and Addressee’s visual field or (b) to an entity being outside the Speaker’s and Addressee’s visual field. In some languages both conditions need to be satisfied for the demonstrative in order to be classified as distal, in other languages only one of them is criterial.
- *Medial Demonstrative* (Fillmore 1982: 49): Prototypically a medial demonstrative alternates between two features, (a) it points to an entity at a relatively small distance from Speaker (Speaker Pivot) or (b) to an entity being near the Addressee (Hearer Pivot). In some languages both conditions need to be satisfied for the demonstrative in order to be classified as medial, in other languages only one of them is criterial. When only (b) is satisfied, the language has a person-based demonstrative system, when only (a) is satisfied, it has a distance-based system.
- *Proximal Demonstrative*: A proximal demonstrative is characterized as indicating the closest distance to the Speaker.

The origin against which everything is measured, distance but also time and social rank for example, is called the *Deictic Center*. One can distinguish two types of pointing at an entity present in the speech-situation. The first type, *gestural deixis*, requires the monitoring of the

situation because the situation provides the Addressee with the only clues from which to derive the correct interpretation of what the Speaker means:

2.22 This finger hurts (Levinson 1983: 66, ex. 31a)

2.23 [It is dusk, and John and Mary are returning from a shopping trip. As John is parking the car, Mary exclaims:]
Good God! Look at that incredibly bright light [Mary gestures towards a point in the evening sky]! What on earth do you think it could be? (Cornish' 1998: 27, ex. 2.6a, and my example 2.3)

Less restricted than gestural deixis is *symbolic deixis*. With only general knowledge of the 'here and now', an Addressee is very well capable of interpreting an expression like

2.24 This city stinks (Levinson 1983: 66, ex. 31b)

However, locating an object²² in the physical world is not the only function of the 'pointers'. As Diessel (1999: 94) explains, the pointing expressions can also be used to refer to entities that are not visible or present in the immediate surroundings, as in Levinson's example (1983: 66, ex. 34b):

2.25 Hello, is Harry there? (on the telephone)

where the possible location of Harry is not visible or in the presence of the Speaker. Still more abstract is *Deixis am Phantasma*. This type of deixis is mainly found in narratives and descriptions. The Deictic Center is transferred from the Speaker to a character in the story or description. In that case demonstratives like 'here' and 'there', 'this' and 'that' may be used in order to relate a position as described in the discourse to the Deictic Center as given in the discourse:

2.26 And he's heading . . you see a scene where he's . . coming on his bicycle this way, (Himmelman 1996: 222)

This way has not to be interpreted in relation to the Speaker but in relation to the person on the bike.

A special type of *Deixis am Phantasma* is, according to Himmelman (1996: 222), *new-this* (Gundel et al.'s 'referential' category). The English proximal demonstrative may be used in colloquial speech to both introduce and firmly establish a referent in the universe of discourse at the same time. The latter feature leads Himmelman to the inclusion of *new-this* in Situational Use, because in Situational Use the demonstrative both introduces a referent and establishes it as a possible discourse topic.²³

²² Not only objects but also *events* in the physical surroundings may be referred to by demonstratives. Take 'Did you *see* that?' The speaker refers to some event in the situation, so this use should be called deictic and not discourse deictic (see 2.3.5. and 2.3.6. for discourse deixis). It is even possible to refer to propositions by means of deictics, as in 'Can you *believe* that', after accidentally picking up some conversation from your neighbouring table.

²³ Wald 1983: 93ff. on the other hand denies any ties with the situationally used 'this', and equates it to introductory NPs with an indefinite article although on p. 95 he says that *new-this*: 'reflects the continuity of its character as a demonstrative'. Gundel et al. 1993: 275-6, although referring to *new-this* + NP as 'indefinite *this*

- 2.27 Because there's this guy Louie Gelman, he went to a BIG specialist, and the guy ... analyzed it WRONG (Cornish 1999: 26, ex. 2.5)

If one treats a demonstrative expression referring to an entity that is not present at the moment the speech-act takes place as Situational, one should also look at another specific use of the demonstratives, the so-called *Recognitional* use as defined by Himmelmann 1996: 230ff. and Diessel 1999: 105ff. (see 2.3.1.2. for discussion).

Whether or not the Recognitional demonstrative is connected with Situational use, I will discuss the Recognitional demonstratives separately from the Situational Use in the Hittite section for, as we will see, recognitional demonstratives are often accompanied by some typical linguistic phenomena which are absent from Situationally used demonstratives.

Another important category in which deixis may be found is *Reported Speech* cited in narration (Himmelmann 1996: 221-2, see 3.1.2. with Hittite examples). Finally, a rather specific type is *Self-reference to a linguistic unit or act* (o.c. 221, also see 3.1.4.). Himmelmann's ex. on p. 221 comes from the Pear Stories (Chafe 1980):

- 2.28 XII.16. it's very funny to make this {.35}
XII.17. telling.

where *this* *telling* refers to the speech-act itself.

Returning to the categorization of Fillmore 1982, demonstratives either express distance or speech participant contrasts, or both. English is usually considered a distance based system, but there are indications that this is not completely true. Lyons 1999: 18 gives some examples that show speech participant orientation:

- 2.29 Show me that (?this) letter you have in your pocket (Lyons' ex. 61).
2.30 Tell her to bring that (?this) drill she has (Lyons' ex. 62).

Lyons states that *this* is certainly possible, but that 'it would imply that the letter or drill is in some way associated with the speaker' (l.c.).

Another type of orientation on the speech participants is the emotional use of demonstratives, also called *Empathetic Deixis*. Levinson 1983: 81 recalls that English *that* may shift to *this* to show empathy, and that *this* may shift to *that* to show emotional distance.

NP', do not equate it with indefinite NPs. The main difference with the latter is the likelihood of continuance in further discourse of the referent thus introduced (p. 277 n. 3). They derive indefinite *this* from the cataphorically used proximal demonstrative. But while assuming a close connection, they explicitly distinguish two different forms of 'this', a demonstrative and an indefinite *this* (p. 275 n. 1). It seems that they distinguish between a proximal demonstrative and a cataphoric demonstrative, and that these demonstratives do not have the same cognitive status. Cornish 1999: 27 connects 'presentational' *this* (or *new-this*) with the proximal-demonstrative *this*, and compares its function to 'cataphoric' *this*. In my view *new-this* + N and the cataphoric demonstrative pronoun *this* have the same function: 1) they both announce a new entity. *New-this* introduces a first order entity on stage, whereas pronominal *this* introduces a higher order entity on stage, and 2) in both cases the clause containing the demonstrative provides a kind of link, a stepping stone, for what follows. Thus, the only difference between *new-this* and discourse deictic *this* is their entity order. For the same reason I would like to give up the category of Discourse Deixis and let it collapse with Anaphora. I assume that the only difference between the two is entity order. However, the typological works on which I build the discussion of the Hittite demonstratives in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 consider this category as one of the four basic uses of demonstratives. I therefore also include Discourse deixis as a separate category.

See Chen 1990: 148-151 for a discussion of distancing-*that*, sympathy-*that* and camaraderie-*that* and -*this*. Besides these few references the empathetic use of demonstratives has not received much attention. Rauh 1983: 40-41 considers the transference of deictic contrasts to the emotional level even problematic given the fact that for example *that* may be used both negatively and positively.

2.3.1.2. *Recognitional Reference*

A specific case of reference to an entity somewhere in the outside world in combination with the centering procedure is the introduction of a referent which is discourse new (unactivated) but hearer old (pragmatically presupposed) (Diessel 1999: 106). In English the distal demonstrative adnominal *that* can serve to introduce a new referent, but then always carries the assumption of prior potential familiarity, either because of co-presence of the referent in the context or because of prior experience (Cornish 1999: 27). The notion of prior experience is crucial here. Potential familiarity caused by *co-presence* in the context belongs to the Situational Use as defined in the geographical approach, whereas *prior experience* excludes the presence of a referent in the utterance context. As mentioned earlier, Cornish gives priority to the cognitive approach, but in doing so is unable to distinguish between these two types of adnominal *that*. That this distinction is relevant is shown at least by Himmelmann 1996 and Diessel 1999. A typical example is

- 2.31 I couldn't sleep last night. That dog (next door) kept me awake. (Gundel et al. 1993: 278.)

The speaker uses a distal demonstrative adnominal for first mention of the dog, not in order to point at the dog, not being present, but to activate the knowledge about a certain dog in the mind of the hearer (speaker and hearer might have discussed the subject in the past).

Typological research, conducted by Himmelmann and Diessel, the latter using data from 85 languages, shows that introducing referents which are familiar to speaker and addressee but also discourse new, is done solely by means of demonstrative descriptions (demonstrative + Noun(phrase)). The example above shows the situation in English, where only the non-proximal demonstrative *that* is allowed. The following German example with the demonstrative *dies-* is taken from Himmelmann 1996: 231:

- 2.32 01 X: was isn eigentlich mit diesem: Haustelephon was mir immer khabt ham;
I'm wondering what happened to that internal phone we used to have.
- 02 N: des haut nimmer hin,
it doesn't work anymore

This specialized use of the demonstratives, called *Recognitional*, has been described systematically for the first time by Himmelmann 1996: 230ff. (with note 25 for the term *Recognitional*), followed by Diessel 1999: 105ff. The following is mainly based on their account. Himmelmann (1996: 240) thus presents

- 2.33 'the *recognitional use*, which involves reference to entities assumed by the speaker to be established in the universe of discourse and serves to signal the hearer that the speaker is referring to specific, but presumably shared, knowledge. It invites the

hearer to signal the need for further clarification regarding the intended referent or to acknowledge that he or she, in fact, knows what the speaker is talking about.’

The invitation to the hearer to acknowledge the presented information or to ask for clarification is of course not applicable to the written Hittite corpus. There are however safeguards preventing a possible failure in identification by the hearer. One of the features often involved in a recognitional mention is the inclusion of a relative clause or other likewise elaborate modifiers. This usually presents the addressee with enough information to be able to correctly identify the referent intended by the speaker.

A second feature mentioned in 2.33, *specific, shared* knowledge, is another typical aspect of the recognitional use of demonstratives. The definite article also requires prior familiarity, but on a more general level. The referent expressed by means of a definite article plus noun, such as *the queen, the moon*, usually belongs to the general, shared knowledge of a speech community. A speaker might need to describe a certain telephone as (*you know,*) *that telephone of yours that doesn’t work*, but he is ‘over identifying’ when saying (*you know,*) *that moon that stands in the sky*.

Recognitional use of the demonstrative usually involves first mention. Himmelmann (1996: 236ff.) however also subsumes some later mentions under recognitional use rather than under tracking (or anaphoric) use. In that case the demonstrative serves to remind the hearer of a preceding participant or episode rather than to keep track of it. This method is used by the Speaker when s/he doubts whether the Addressee can recover the correct referent, especially when that referent appeared in the discourse several units (pause units, paragraphs) earlier.²⁴

In 2.3.1.1. I mentioned that, if *new-this* is considered a special case of Situational Use, Recognitional use (Hearer old, Discourse new) might also be connected with Situational Use. Indeed, both Wald (1983: 113-4) and Chen (1990: 142-3) compare *new-this* with *old-that*, the difference being that *new-this* introduces non-presupposed information whereas *old-that* retrieves presumably shared information. Another reason to view the Recognitional demonstrative as a special type of Situational Use, is the existence of so-called invisible demonstratives, used for referents out of sight and therefore not really present in the speech situation (Diessel 1999: 42). Invisible demonstratives referring to entities that are not present are for example attested in Lillooet (Salish). The following table lists the Lillooet demonstratives (Van Eijk 1985: 198):

| | visible | | | invisible | | |
|----------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| | ‘this’ | ‘that’ | ‘that’ (farther) | ‘this’ | ‘that’ | ‘that’ (farther) |
| singular | <i>c?a</i> | <i>ti?</i> | <i>t?u</i> | <i>k^w?a</i> | <i>ni?</i> | <i>k^wu?</i> |
| plural | <i>?izá</i> | <i>?iz’</i> | <i>?izú</i> | <i>k^wla</i> | <i>n^el</i> | <i>k^wl</i> |
| | ‘these’ | ‘those’ | ‘those’ | ‘these’ | ‘those’ | ‘those’ |

Table 2.5: The demonstratives in Lillooet.

In 2.34a the demonstrative *k^wu?* is used to refer to a sound of which the source is invisible but still considered to be present. In 2.34b a visible object is referred to by means of medial *ti?*. But the same entity can be accompanied by a demonstrative even if the object is not present

²⁴ Gundel et al. also identify this type of use for the demonstrative, naming it ‘reminder *that*’ as ‘a demonstrative determiner that requires familiarity but not activation (...) often facilitates comprehension by serving as a signal to the addressee to search long-term memory for a familiar referent’ (1993: 301-2). See also 2.2.5.2.

(2.34c). In such a case the Speaker uses a member from the set of invisible demonstratives, in this case *ni?*, the counterpart of visible *ti?* (all examples from Van Eijk o.c. 199):

- 2.34 a. *stám=k^wu'*
What is that? (when hearing a noise)
- b. *níl=ti? k^wu=cítx^w ^{cw}elp*
that is the house (*cítx^w*) that burned down (*^{cw}elp*) (when pointing at the ruins)
- c. *^{cw}elp=tu' ní?=k^wu=cítx^w*
that house burned down (when talking about the house, while it is completely absent from the situation of speech).

Thus, entities that are not visible but present and entities that are not present at all can be indicated by means of the invisible set. So at least we have an example of a deictic demonstrative referring to something that is not only not visible but also not present.²⁵

2.3.1.3. Summary and conclusions

Entities that are present in the speech situation but need to be brought under the attention of an Addressee are often referred to by means of demonstratives. The choice for a specific demonstrative depends either on relative distance from the Speaker in a distance-based system or on location near one of the speech participants in a person-based system.

Three types of deixis are distinguished: gestural deixis, symbolic deixis and 'Deixis am Phantasma', mainly found in narratives. These types of deixis can, and regularly are, accompanied by pointing gestures. It is therefore often said that demonstratives are pointers or localizers, although not everyone agrees with this characterization²⁶. I believe that the demonstrative expression simply *links* a mental representation to the speech situation, without being capable of further identifying the referent. The identification is performed by the gesture.²⁷

Another way of referring to an element in the non-linguistic world belongs to the competence of recognitionally used demonstratives. Their sole purpose is to introduce a referent into the discourse that contains shared, private information. Such a demonstrative NP is often accompanied by a modifier providing more information if the head noun is not informative enough itself. I believe that this modifier is the linguistic pendant of the almost obligatory gesture in the case of deixis: it helps identify the intended referent. Again the demonstrative could be considered a linker. This time however the demonstrative links a mental representation to an entity in the memory of both Speaker and Addressee. In other words, in both non-linguistic uses the demonstrative instructs the Addressee to link a mental representation of some as yet unidentified referent to an entity in some non-linguistic search domain. In case of deixis the search domain is the speech situation, in case of recognitionally

²⁵ If Recognitionally Used and Situationally Used can be partially equated somehow, and if Recognitionally Used Demonstratives can also be Anaphoric (as Himmelmann assumes), then the system of the geographical approach partially collapses. Which is one of the reasons why the geographical approach alone will not do.

²⁶ See for example De Mulder 1996. De Mulder concludes that the French demonstrative determiner is neither a pointer nor a localizer since it does not identify the referent on its own. Instead, the demonstrative determiner simply signals the Addressee to search for the referent in a certain region of the speech situation.

²⁷ One should try to find the referent of 'look at that man over there' if the Speaker keeps his eyes closed and does not point. It will only work if the man is the only member of his class present.

use the search domain is private, shared long term memory. The latter memory partition by the way is also accessed when an entity mentioned a long time ago has to be retrieved (this is actually Anaphora in the geographical approach). More on that in the appropriate sections. In table form:

| Demonstrative use | Search domain | more identifying information |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Situational use | the speech situation | pointing gesture |
| Recognitional use | private, shared long term memory | modifier |

Table 2.6: Comparison of Deictic and Recognitional Use of demonstratives.

Turning to Information structure, recognitional demonstratives are always Focus. Given the characteristics -the entity is not present in the speech situation and the reference is a first mention in the discourse- the referents of such demonstratives can never be a Topic in the clause containing them. Entities that are present in the speech situation and also mentioned for the first time are often Focus, either because they are introduced in the focal part of a Predicate Focus clause (see 2.2.3.2.1.), or because they are introduced as the subject in an ‘out-of-the-blue’ sentence, or Sentence Focus clause (see 2.2.3.2.3.).

The question is now: does the combination of Topic and Situational Use & the centering procedure exist? If it does, it should only concern Unestablished Topics, because Established topics are always part of the continuity procedure (see the next section). We have to look for non-salient entities that have not been mentioned before, but which the speaker places in subject position in order to comment on it. Following the definition in ex. 2.8, the comment *increases* the addressee’s knowledge of the Topic referent. But since the referent was not salient and not mentioned before nor present, the addressee has no knowledge to increase. Furthermore, a Topic in Situational Use & centering procedure would violate the *Principle of Separation of Reference and Role* (Lambrecht 1994: 184) which says “Do not introduce a referent and talk about it in the same clause” (o.c. 185).²⁸

Combining this last remark with the findings in this paragraph and the preceding one, the table is filled in as follows (U-Top = Unestablished Topic):

| | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | continuity procedure | | centering procedure | |
| | Topic | Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| <i>geographical parameter</i> | | | | |
| Deictic | | | — | <i>this/that N</i> |
| Recognitional | — | — | — | <i>that N</i> |

Table 2.7: The matrix: Centering & Deictic and Recognitional

The remaining empty slots will be discussed in the next paragraph.

2.3.2. Deixis and the continuity procedure

In this section the following slots of the table will be discussed:

| | <i>cognitive parameter</i> |
|--|----------------------------|
|--|----------------------------|

²⁸ It is possible of course that Speakers actually sometimes use this kind of expression. I believe however that this would require a lot of accommodating by the Addressee (see Lambrecht 1994: 195ff. for pragmatic accommodation).

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | continuity procedure | | centering procedure | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | Topic | Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| Deictic | x | x | — | <i>this/that N</i> |
| Recognitional | — | — | — | <i>that N</i> |

Introducing an entity linguistically into the discourse does not automatically imply that the entity is not yet in the center of attention. It is very well possible, as Cornish 1999, Chapter 4 argues, that entities are present in the center of attention of a Speaker and Addressee without being introduced in the discourse by linguistic means. A gesture, a nod of the Speaker to some entity often will do to bring that entity in the center of attention of the Addressee. After having done so, both may use unstressed, anaphoric pronouns, the so-called antecedentless anaphors, referring to the entity in the discourse following the gesture. The following example shows that even such an attention drawing non-linguistic act is not necessary if the referent on its own account stands out from the background:

- 2.35 [A and B turn a corner on the pavement, and suddenly find themselves face to face with a rather large dog]
A to B: Do you think it's friendly? (Cornish 1999: 112, ex. 4.1)

By its sudden appearance the dog is immediately in the center of attention, and reference may therefore be made to it by an anaphoric pronoun (anaphoric as understood in the geographical approach). The speaker maintains or continues the center of attention on the dog as s/he may similarly maintain the focus on a referent which has been mentioned before in the discourse.

This time the pronoun in deictic context (*it*) stands in a Topic relation with the sentence, the sentence being a comment on the dog. Although the correlation between Continuity and Topic is very strong, it is possible to react on the appearing of the dog as follows with a Focus expression:

- 2.36 A to B: THAT's²⁹ the dog that bit my leg yesterday (in contrast with other dogs)

The only other requirement that validates this reaction in this context is the assumption the Speaker makes about the state of knowledge of the Addressee. Speaker assumes that Addressee knows that some dog has bitten the Speaker. The lack of accent on *dog* and the following relative clause indicates the presupposedness of this part of the clause, that is, the fact that some dog has bitten Speaker's leg yesterday. The unpredictable part from the point of view of the Addressee, and thus the Focus, is the fact that it is exactly *that* dog and no other.

It is even possible to think of Unestablished Topics in connection with the speech situation. As Lambrecht explains, Topics when unexpected have to be accented:

- 2.37 [(This example is invented). Someone enters a room and notices that the children did something wrong. Another person is asked:]
What did they do? — Well, HE ate the COOKIES, and HE ate the CAKE! (gestures are necessary.)

²⁹ In this example accented *that* is the accented counterpart of *it*, not simply the demonstrative *that*. Compare with the following situation: Who ate the cake? — HE did! (with pointing gesture). The gesture is the physical correlate of the centering procedure, causing the person to be salient. The missing Focus argument is now provided by accented *he*.

The answer provides the missing part of information about the children, and the children are therefore the Topic on which the predicates comment (compare with the possible answer with unaccented pronoun ‘they ate the COOKIES’). It is however not clear which of the children did what, and this unpredictability is indicated by using accented pronouns. So although the children together are already the most salient referent, thus requiring the continuity procedure, the Addressee still needs to establish a Topic relation due to the two different predicates.

The reason that I include expressions as in 2.36 and 2.37 under the heading of Continuity is the fact that the entities in both contexts are already in the center of attention. The centering procedure is therefore not required.³⁰ On discourse level the center of attention is maintained, on sentence level however other mechanisms are at work that depend on the way the Speaker wants to highlight his/her most important point in an information unit. The most conclusive evidence for the fact that saliency and for example Focus-hood do not exclude each other are of course Focus expressions referring to entities that are clearly salient in the discourse. If I say

2.38 Pat_i said SHE_i was called. (example 3.30 in Lambrecht 1994: 286)

then the referent of *she* is in Focus, but still salient. I will illustrate below that especially pronouns in Focus refer to entities that are in the center of attention. Also Givón 2001: 230 notes ‘that a constituent under contrastive focus is also an anaphorically accessible topic’.

Summarizing, we have seen combinations of Deixis, Centering and Focus (exx. 2.22, 2.23, 2.24, 2.5, 2.27, 2.32, 2.33), Deixis, Continuity and Topic, either established (2.35) or unestablished (2.37), and finally Deixis, Continuity and Focus (2.36).

The unexpected combination is Continuity & Focus. Only Argument Focus (A-Focus) is possible here (see 2.2.3.2.2). Continuity & Topic covers both Established Topic (E-Topic) and Unestablished Topic (U-Topic), whereas Centering & Focus covers Predicate Focus and Sentence Focus:

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | continuity procedure | | | centering procedure | |
| | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| Deictic | <i>s/he</i> | S/HE | S/HE | — | <i>this/that N</i> |
| Recognitional | — | — | — | — | <i>that N</i> |

Table 2.8: The matrix: continuing & Deictic and Recognitional

2.3.3. Anaphora and the continuity procedure

³⁰ Cornish 1999: 63 & 206 n. 1 takes accented pronouns generally as centering. The examples (4.5 and 4.7) he adduces to illustrate his view indeed refer to entities that are neither anaphorically nor situationally accessible. They are however made salient, triggered, through inference from the discourse context and then contrastively referred to. Cornish refers to Knud Lambrecht who analyzes these examples with accented pronouns as Contrastive Focus expressions (o.c. 123). In my view, his examples do not convincingly prove that accented pronouns are centering.

2.3.3.1. Introduction

Anaphora as defined in the geographical approach is the phenomenon of reference to an earlier mentioned entity. The anaphoric expression links its referent to the referent of a textual antecedent:

- 2.39 Thus, from the Middle Hittite period on **foreign elements**_i played a great role in Anatolian magic. They_i were brought in by the newcomers from foreign lands, most often by the Hurrians. These elements_i were creatively transformed and absorbed into the local tradition. (Popko 1995: 108)

The most common anaphoric expressions are the unemphatic third person pronoun (*they* in the example above), enclitics or zero (see 2.3.3.2.) and the emphatic pronoun (see 2.3.3.3.). However, in most languages also demonstratives (*these elements* in the example above) can be used to refer to referents of preceding textual antecedents³¹. Instead of focusing the Addressee on an element of the outside world, demonstratives are somehow needed to keep track of participants in the preceding discourse (Diessel 1999: 96, Himmelmann 1996: 226). The main characteristic of these participants is that they often are not in the current center of attention and need to be made salient again. Thus, the geographical approach is not able to explain the difference between zero, pronouns and demonstratives. This leads us to a combination with the cognitive approach as a possible model which might explain the differences between these anaphoric expressions.

Discourse referents may be subjected to either the continuity or the centering procedure. To recapitulate:

- 2.40 The ‘continuity procedure’ *maintains* the current center of attention on a referent, whereas the ‘centering procedure’ *introduces* a referent into the center of attention.

The third distinguishing feature is whether an expression stands in a Topic or Focus relation to the rest of the clause.

And the other factor which has to be taken into account when describing the anaphoric use of referring expressions is *discourse structure*. The objective is now also to establish the distribution of referential expressions, either continuing or centering, in relation to the location of their antecedents (i.e., inside the same discourse unit or in different discourse units). I will therefore split up the anaphora row in an in-node and across-node row.

This section discusses the use of unaccented pronouns (2.3.3.2.), accented pronouns (2.3.3.3.) and demonstratives (2.3.3.4.) referring to entities that are salient at the moment the clause containing the pronoun or demonstrative is expressed (Anaphora and the centering procedure, i.e. the demonstratives, are discussed in 2.3.4.). Anaphora and continuity is the most heterogeneous group of all, both in form and function. Cornish 1999 finishes his book with a remark on salient anaphoric definite descriptions and demonstratives: ‘such forms always convey something other than the default ‘continue the representation currently in explicit focus’, even when their intended referent *is* in fact one of the discourse entities in current focus. But this is to begin another story ...’ (o.c., 250). Here discourse structure kicks in:

³¹ And definite descriptions. But since definite descriptions are not formally marked in Hittite, I will not further discuss them.

| | | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------------------|-------|
| | | continuity procedure | | | centering procedure | |
| | | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| <i>geographical parameter</i> | Anaphora in-node | x | x | x | | |
| | across-node | x | x | x | | |

2.3.3.2. Unaccented pronouns, clitics and zero as Established Topics

Unaccented pronouns, clitics, and zero are the only expressions on which everyone agrees. They are specialized in referring to entities that are in the absolute foreground of thought, in the highest focus of attention. For Gundel et al. (1993: 279) being ‘in focus’ means that a referent is at the current center of attention. Elements in focus include at least the topic of the preceding utterance and other still-relevant higher order topics. Cornish (1999: 63) notes on ordinary third person pronouns: ‘their chief discourse function is to signal referential and attentional continuity, thereby marking the stability of a given referent’s existence within a given discourse model’. They are among Ariel’s (1990: 56ff.) highest accessibility markers. Within the Topic-Focus framework, unaccented constituents, and thus pronouns, are used by a Speaker who assumes that the referent is both active in the mind of the Addressee (in the sense of being in the center of attention) *and* expected by the Addressee to be a Topic (Lambrecht 1994: 324). The unaccented constituent is the *Established Topic*.³²

- 2.41 After some initial delay, Madduwatta_i launched an attack on Hapalla_j. He_i conquered it_j and (\emptyset _i) added it_j to his_i own kingdom, ... (Bryce 1998: 146)

After uttering the initial sentence, the story is expected to continue the dealings of Madduwatta with the state Hapalla. Both are now in the center of attention, and a link has been established between the two. The only new element is the type of relation as expressed by the verb that exists between them, so both may be referred to by unaccented pronouns (or zero in the case of Madduwatta). And when used indeed, they trigger the assumption that the referent has to be the most salient entity and an established Topic so that the Addressee looks for a candidate in the preceding clause with the most fitting properties (with preference of Subject over non-Subject, human over non-human/inanimate, head over modifier, and discourse topic over non-discourse topic).

2.3.3.3. Accented pronouns

How do the accented pronouns fit into the system? According to Cornish 1999: 63 accented pronouns are capable of referring to entities that are still easily recoverable by the addressee but not in the highest focus of attention (see table 2.3). Moreover, they refer generally to entities that are not salient. The difficulty with Cornish’ view is that the examples that he adduces are not unambiguously centering (see fn. 30). Cornish’ view seems to coincide with Bosch 1983: 58ff. who classifies all accented referential pronouns as ‘deictic’, as re-orienting the listener’s attention. But Bosch’ definitions of salience and anaphoric and deictic procedures have everything to do with the Topic or Focus of a sentence: ‘... salience, with

³² This includes according to Cornish also unaccented demonstratives, but I have no material in English on this subject.

respect to discourse, is *aboutness*: Within a discourse, the most salient object at any point is always the object the discourse at that point is about' (Italics in the original work). And 'what the discourse is about' is actually 'what a sentence is about': 'anaphoric pronouns refer to the objects which the *sentences* (of which the pronouns form a part) are about, provided the objects are semantically suitable with respect to the pronoun form' (o.c. 58; Italics mine). Thus, anaphoric pronouns are within Lambrecht's framework Topic pronouns, and deictic pronouns indicate the Unestablished Topic or the Focus.

Besides the possibility that Cornish' centering accented pronouns actually refer to referents that are already salient, most other instances of accented pronouns which I found in the literature are indeed salient within Cornish' framework. Recalling what saliency means, elements in the explicit focus region of working memory or cache are salient (Cornish 1999: 223). The cache can contain no more than 2 or 3 sentences or 7 propositions (o.c. 222). If we combine this with the findings of Givón 1983 that the referential distance of accented (or independent) pronouns is generally 1-2 clauses to the left, it follows that accented pronouns are generally salient.

2.3.3.3.1. *Accented pronouns as Unestablished Topics*

Although I consider all 3rd person pronouns salient, they do not necessarily have the same degree of accessibility. Gundel et al. 1993: 278 classify the stressed pronouns as 'activated' and not in 'the focus of attention', as less salient (see also Van Hoek 1997: 62) but still in short-term memory (without presenting examples). The high accessibility of stressed pronouns is also discussed by Ariel 1990: 65ff. But as we will see later, accented pronouns can also be used when the referent *is* in focus. So what is the difference between activated and in focus accented pronouns? The answer is provided by the framework set up by Lambrecht. In this section I will treat the accented pronouns that indicate Unestablished Topics, in the next section those that indicate Contrastive Topics (2.3.3.3.2.), followed by the Argument Focus pronouns (2.3.3.3.3.).

Accented pronouns can be used to indicate that another element comes 'in focus' (Givón 1983: 30, Ariel 1990: 64ff., Gundel et al 1993: 299 fn. 30, Cornish 1999: 63). This means that the Topic of the preceding clause is replaced by a new Topic. See for example:

2.42 John hit BILL and then HE hit HIM. (Lambrecht 1994: 327, ex. 5.84)

The accented *he* has to refer to Bill, indicating a Topic-shift. Unaccented *he* should have referred to John, because an unaccented pronoun triggers the assumption that the referent has to be 'in focus' and an established Topic (see 2.3.3.2.). When a salient element in the preceding clause that was not already the Subject-Topic becomes a Topic in the next clause, an accented pronoun can be used (although I wonder whether 'and then Bill hit John' would have been more natural). Similarly, John is moved from Established Topic to an unexpected position in the focus domain of the clause, indicated by accented *him* (for a more elaborate explanation see Lambrecht l.c.). In 2.42 the new Topic also is a new agent-Subject. The next example shows that the Subject does not need to switch:

2.43 John hit BILL and then HE was hit by IRA. (Ariel 1990: 65, ex. 17)

The unaccented pronoun *he* would have implied that Bill was hit by Ira. This time the role of the comment 'was hit (by Ira)' forces the interpretation that Bill was hit given the fact that that was what happened before. This role of the comment is one of the other factors beside

Established Topic-hood and cognitive status that guide the addressee at referent resolution³³. To avoid the expected pragmatic relation between Bill and ‘being hit’, the speaker has to avoid the unaccented pronoun.

One might think that the change in semantic role causes the use of the accented pronoun, but Ariel 1990: 66, who argues that accented pronouns have lower accessibility than unaccented pronouns, suggests something which perfectly fits in the Topic-Focus framework: ‘I suggest that lower accessibility is marked by stress, usually reserved for focus marking, because both have in common the indication that the referent intended is not the one to be expected’. This is also what Lambrecht has found: ‘The function of an accent on constituents with active referents³⁴, whether pronominal or nominal, is then to establish the role of a given referent as a topic or a focus argument in a pragmatically structured proposition’ (o.c. 323). Thus, in 2.42 and 2.43 the accented pronoun *establishes* the referent as Topic in relation to that specific comment.

The formulation of Lambrecht does not distinguish between pronominal and nominal expressions. As I stated above, it seems to me that the Unestablished Topics in ex. 2.42 (and 2.43) are more naturally expressed by means of accented names. Also, I believe that accented pronouns have more often ‘in focus’ referents than generally assumed (see 2.3.3.3.2. and 2.3.3.3.3.).³⁵ For the moment this has to remain an assumption and should be tested on a corpus of recorded English conversation.

Before we move to the ‘in focus’ accented pronouns, a word is in order about Topic-shift in other languages than English. Topic-shifts in other languages may not be indicated by accented pronouns³⁶, but by demonstrative pronouns, as in French (Cornish 1999: 66, ex. (2.28)):

2.45 *L’ouvrière redit naïvement son mensonge à M^{elle} Vatnaz; celle-ci en vint à parler au brave commis.* (Flaubert)

The female worker naïvely repeated her lie to M^{elle} Vatnaz; the latter (f.sg.) ended up speaking to the good clerk (about it).

Cornish’ translation into English shows that *the latter* is preferred instead of an accented pronoun, which would support my impression that accented pronouns as Unestablished Topics are rather odd. For the use of the French demonstrative determiner *ce* as a salient demonstrative capable of structuring the discourse, see 2.3.3.4.2.

³³ Cornish 1999: 69ff. has devoted a chapter to the role of what he calls the indexical segment.

³⁴ Lambrecht’s category ‘active’ (1994: 93ff.) corresponds with high saliency.

³⁵ In order to support this I list the findings of Gundel et al 1993: 291. The Chinese accented *ta* ‘he’ did not occur on a total of 240 referring expressions. For English there was only one accented 3rd person pronoun on 655 referring expressions. This pronoun had the status ‘activated’. The Russian accented *ono* ‘he’ occurred once as ‘activated’ on a total of 284 referring expressions. The Spanish accented pronoun *el* was not attested on a total of 331 referring expressions. The cognitive status of Japanese *kare* ‘he’ is ‘activated’ according to Gundel et al. o.c. 284, but in their material *kare* occurs 4 times on a total of 363 referring expressions, each time ‘in focus’. Thus, we have 4 ‘in focus’ and 2 ‘activated’ accented pronouns on 1873 referring expressions. Any conclusion based on 6 out of 1873 is statistically irrelevant. Assigning the cognitive status ‘activated’ to the accented pronouns seems therefore premature: one would like to examine the examples. In Hittite the referent of the accented pronoun *apā-* is almost always ‘in focus’.

³⁶ As Ariel 1990: 65 notes, ‘High Accessibility Markers are the hardest to correlate cross-linguistically’. This means that different languages can use different types of expressions to state the same and vice versa.

Interestingly, contrary to French the Latin distal demonstrative pronoun *ille* is more or less restricted to the environments described in this paragraph, and does not occur in the discourse structuring function of the other demonstratives *hic* and *is* (see 2.3.3.4.2.). As is the case with the Hittite medial demonstrative pronoun *apa-* in anaphoric use, the Latin distal demonstrative pronoun *ille* seems to be specialized in signalling Unestablished Topics and Argument Focus. An example of an Unestablished Topic and *ille* is (from Bolkestein & Van de Grift 1994: 289, 294, ex. 5b' combined with ex. 10a):

2.46 *Erat unus intus Nervius, nomine Vertico, loco natus honesto, qui ... Hic servo ... persuadet ... ut litteras ad Caesarem deferat. Has ille in iaculo illigatas effert* (Caes. Gall. 5.45.3-4)

There was a Nervian in the camp, named Vertico, born to an honourable estate, who He (*hic*) persuaded a slave (*servo*) to deliver a despatch to Caesar. The man (*ille*) carried forth the despatch bound on a javelin.

2.3.3.3.2. Accented pronouns as Contrastive Topics

To recapitulate, the dominant opinion is that the accented pronoun in English is basically not 'in focus'. However, accented pronouns may also be used to refer to elements that are already highly salient. First, accented pronouns may indicate that the most salient referent is in counter-presuppositional Focus (see the next section). Secondly, Contrastive Topics are almost always highly salient. Example 2.17 (2.2.3.2.1.) provided an illustration of salient entities that are referred to by accented pronouns, repeated here as 2.47.b.:

- 2.47 a. I saw MARY yesterday. She says HELLO.
b. I saw MARY and JOHN yesterday. SHE says HELLO, but HE's still ANGRY at you.

In both a. and b. Mary is equally salient and accessible (or active in Lambrecht's terms), and in both cases the predicate is about Mary, providing some new information about her. Therefore Mary is the Topic. In the b. part however both Mary and John are introduced. Both may now be topics but with what comment? This unexpectedness is indicated by means of accented pronouns.³⁷ Both Topics are *Contrastive Topics* (Dik 1997a: 326 classifies the accented elements in this type of construction as Parallel Focus.)

The accented pronouns are not centering because the cognitive effort in retrieving the correct antecedent is minimal, especially when one realizes that *she* may only refer to females, and *he* to males. The use of accented pronominal Contrastive Topics is only possible in English when the referents are male and female. Otherwise one again has to use the names:

- 2.48 John and Bill came to see me. JOHN was NICE, but BILL was rather BORING (Dik 1997a: 326, ex. 36).

Sometimes however, highly salient referents that are also expected to become the Topic in the next clause are still expressed by means of an accented pronoun although there is no explicit contrast (ex. 2.16 repeated as 2.49):

³⁷ There is however another possibility. As I discuss in chapter 7.6, parallel constructions like these with accented salient expressions might have nothing to do with Topic or Focus, but everything with the intonation contour required by coordinate clauses.

- 2.49 a. What is she going to DO?
b. SHE's going to do the COOKING (adapted from Lambrecht (5.86'))

As I described *sub* 2.16, the accented pronoun indicates that the referent is to be considered an Unestablished Topic. I would like to call this kind of Topic an *Implicitly Contrastive Topic* given the implicature that the referent of *she* is 'selected over some potential alternative candidate in the universe of discourse' (Lambrecht 1994: 328). Still, the accessibility and 'in focusness' of *she* are the same whether *she* is accented or unaccented. The hierarchies of Gundel et al. (1993) and Ariel (1990) do not account for such a situation because they concentrate on the cognitive status and identifiability of referents throughout the flow of discourse. Neither can Cornish explain this type of use. He only points at the topic-shifting powers of the accented third person pronoun (1999: 63).

2.3.3.3.3. Accented pronouns as Focus

Lambrecht has shown that Focus and saliency are independent parameters (1994: 257ff., 286). He illustrates this by means of the following examples (his (3.29) and (3.30), o.c. 115)

- 2.50 A: Has Pat been called yet?
B: Pat said she was called TWICE.
- 2.51 A: Who did they call?
B: Pat said SHE was called

In the first example *she* referring to Pat is clearly in the center of attention, and also the Established Topic. In the second example the requested information is provided by accented *she* which is therefore the Focus. (I assume that pronouns in Focus can only appear as Argument Focus.) However, in both cases the pronoun is referring anaphorically to Pat and there is no reason to assume that the cognitive effort in retrieving the correct antecedent of *SHE* is more difficult than for *she*, or in other words that the referent of *SHE* is less accessible than the one of *she*.

Summarizing, the use of accented 3rd person pronouns and the difference with unaccented pronouns can be more satisfactorily be described by the requirements of the Information Structure of the clause than by the cognitive status or the accessibility of the respective referents.

2.3.3.3.4. Accented pronouns and discourse units

I will be short on the correlation of 3rd person anaphoric pronouns and discourse structure: it is very likely that these pronouns mainly refer to discourse entities inside a discourse unit (see for example Van Dijk & Kintsch 1983, Fox 1987, Ariel 1990, Van Hoek 1997). More discussion on the influence of discourse structure on referring expressions and vice versa follows in the sections on the anaphoric demonstratives.

In the next section anaphoric demonstratives referring to salient entities will be discussed.

2.3.3.4. Demonstratives

As cited in 2.3.3.1., Cornish observes that definite descriptions and demonstratives signal something else than ‘maintain the referent in the center of attention’, especially when the referent *is* in the center of the attention. Others of course have noticed the same. Before presenting a description of the different uses of salient demonstratives in discourse, I will summarize the views of several scholars on the subject of anaphoric demonstratives (whether referring to salient or non salient entities), starting with the typological research of Diessel and Himmelmann and followed by what Cornish has collected on anaphoric demonstratives.

Diessel 1999: In line with the views of Gundel et al. 1993 and Ariel 1990, Diessel (o.c. 96) states that ‘anaphoric demonstratives are often used to indicate a referent that is somewhat unexpected and not currently in the focus of attention’ and on p. 99: ‘What all anaphoric demonstratives have in common is that they do not just continue the focus of attention; rather, they indicate that the antecedent is not the referent that the hearer would expect in this context (i.e. the most topical NP)’. He has isolated the following uses of anaphoric demonstratives:

1. They may indicate a *topic shift* (p. 96). Although in English and certainly in Hittite topic shifts are expressed by means of accented pronouns (see 2.3.3.3.1. above), in languages like German, French and Latin demonstrative pronouns are used.
2. They may *reactivate* a participant mentioned some time ago in the discourse (p. 99). This belongs to the centering procedure, see 2.3.4.
3. They may be used to establish a newly introduced discourse referent more firmly as a thematically prominent discourse topic (p. 96ff.). This is called *Immediate Anaphora after first mention* and will be discussed in this section.

Himmelmann 1996: Himmelmann o.c. 226 discards the approaches that treat demonstratives as markers of intermediate topicality, accessibility (Ariel 1990: 73) and activation state (Gundel et al. 1993: 275). Instead, ‘demonstratives are used for tracking only if other tracking devices fail’ (p. 227). Crucial use is made of discourse nodes: demonstratives may track in-node, across node, and at a node boundary. Himmelmann restricts himself to in-node tracking: ‘Demonstrative expressions ... are used whenever a second full definite NP mention is necessary for a given referent within a given discourse node — for whatever reason.’ (p. 227). So if the third person pronouns fail, then only a demonstrative may be used inside a discourse node, excluding the use of NPs with definite articles from in-node tracking. Third person pronouns may fail because of:

1. Danger of *ambiguity* (p. 227-8). The examples presented by Himmelmann show topic-shift, so this category coincides with Diessel’s category 1.
2. The *restriction* of third person pronouns to rationals in some languages (p. 228-9). Inanimate participants have to be tracked by demonstratives, as in Tagalog. I will not discuss this further.
3. *Immediate anaphora after first mention* (p. 229). See below.

Cornish 1999: Finally, Cornish describes the following effects of demonstrative *descriptions* referring to salient entities (English demonstrative pronouns often refer to propositions and are therefore discussed in 2.3.5. and 2.3.6.):

1. The demonstrative description may be *(re)classifying* (p. 57). This is a case of Immediate anaphora after first mention.
2. The demonstrative description may indicate a *new orientation*, a *shift in perspective* within the discourse (p. 56). This could also be subsumed under Immediate anaphora (after first mention).
3. The demonstrative description (and pronoun) may signal a transition to a *new discourse unit*, replacing its salient discourse referent for a new object of focus (p. 27). See Apothéloz 1995: 291-300 for French.

Summarizing, on the level of (discourse) semantics salient demonstratives descriptions are (re)classifying (Cornish 1), while the demonstrative pronouns indicate a topic shift (Diessel 1). On the level of structuring the discourse, they may either firmly establish a referent as the discourse topic (Immediate anaphora after first mention, Diessel 3, Himmelmann 3, Cornish 2, see section 2.3.3.4.1.), or, more generally, demarcate discourse units (Cornish 3, and section 2.3.3.4.2). In a few very simplified words, demonstratives add something new to either the (salient) referent or to the discourse.

2.3.3.4.1. Immediate anaphora after first mention

When a referent is introduced into the discourse as locally or globally thematically prominent, it is often referred to after this first mention by means of a demonstrative expression (see for example Apothéloz 1995: 291f. for French, Bolkestein & Van de Grift 1994: 287ff. for Latin, Lichtenberk 1996: 386ff. for To'aba'ita³⁸, Terken 1984: 282, 286 for Dutch³⁹). This is especially common in languages that lack a definite article. The function of this demonstrative is to establish the referent more firmly in the discourse. Bolkestein & Van de Grift 1994 distinguish two types of pragmatic function for the antecedent of the demonstrative expression in Latin:

1. The antecedent is expected to function as the Discourse Topic. The referent, a Future Topic in their terms, is often introduced by means of a staging predicate (o.c. 287).
2. The antecedent is in the Focus part of the antecedent clause, and is thus not the expected Discourse (and Sentence) Topic because there are other candidates that are preferred for Topic-hood (o.c. 293ff.).

The situation described under 2. has been discussed for Latin and French in 2.3.3.3.1., *Unestablished Topics*, ex. 2.46. For 1. we have in Latin (from Bolkestein & Van de Grift 1994: 289, ex. 5b'):

- 2.52 *Erat unus intus Nervius, nomine Vertico, loco natus honesto, qui ... Hic servo ... persuadet ... ut litteras ad Caesarem deferat.* (Caes. Gall. 5.45.3-4)
 There was a Nervian in the camp, named Vertico, born to an honourable estate, who He (*hic*) persuaded a slave (*servo*) to deliver a despatch to Caesar.

In To'aba'ita demonstrative NPs are often used to firmly establish the discourse topic:

³⁸ To'aba'ita is a member of the Oceanic subgroup of Austronesian (Lichtenberk 1996: 408, fn. 1)

³⁹ Terken studies the distribution of unaccented and accented expressions in relation to discourse structure. She observed that accented expressions (demonstratives, noun phrases) are often used immediately after they have been introduced.

- 2.53 ... *nia* *ka* *toda-a* *te'e* *thaari.* *Thaari* *'eri,*
 he he:SEQ meet-her one girl. Girl this,
- rikila* *-na* *'e* *le'a* *mamana* *bo'o*
 appearance-her it:FACT be.nice really INT

... he met a girl. The girl, she (lit.: her appearance) was really beautiful. (Ex. (9) from Lichtenberk 1996: 387)

Cornish (1999: 56) does not explicitly mention Immediate Anaphora after first mention, but states that the demonstrative description may indicate a *new orientation*, or a *shift in perspective*. He cites the following reclassifying example:

- 2.54 Jacques Toubon a présenté, mercredi 25 octobre, devant le conseil des ministres, un projet de loi visant à renforcer la législation antiterroriste. Ce texte, qui a suscité plusieurs réserves du Conseil d'Etat, prévoit de considérer de nouvelles infractions comme 'actes de terrorisme . . .' (*Le Monde*, 27 oct. 1995, p. 1, from Cornish 1999: 54).

After introducing a 'projet de loi' in the next example, the text continues with a description with the internal make-up of the bill. It is not exactly clear to me whether the *projet de loi* is a Future Topic, or whether it is in Focus without the connotation of becoming a Discourse Topic. The fact that a kind of staging predicate *présenter* is used brings this example close to example 2.53, where the girl is introduced as the object of *meet*. On the other hand, why are the *he* in 2.53 and Jacques Toubon in 2.54 not the expected Discourse Topics? After all, they are both the Subject, and in 2.53 also the Sentence Topic. So it seems that these two examples represent *Unestablished Topics*. But this is not the case in the next example:

- 2.55 Un avion s'est écrasé hier. Cet avion relie habituellement Miami à New York (De Mulder 1996: 42, ex. 11).

De Mulder discusses this piece of text in order to explain the difference between demonstrative NPs and definite NPs in French. He compares it with

- 2.56 Un avion s'est écrasé hier. L'avion/Cet avion venait de Miami (his ex. 9)

where both NPs are allowed. The difference between the two is that in 2.56 the discourse is more coherent than in 2.55. De Mulders refers to Kleiber (1986) for the correlation between discourse coherence and demonstratives: a demonstrative NP is the preferred anaphoric expression for creating the necessary discourse coherence. This also noted by Cornish 1999: 56 who observes that the two sentences in 2.54 are performing different discourse functions. The first sentence introduces the discourse topic whereas the second one considers the 'internal make-up of the bill'. He concludes with: 'Use of the definite description *Le texte* would have led to relative incoherence in this context' (l.c.).

One of the means of creating discourse coherence consists of Tail-Head linking (Dik 1997b: 438f.). In a Tail-Head linking construction a crucial part of the preceding clause is summarized:

- 2.57 After a long journey they came to a small village. In that village/There they found a place where they could spend the night. (Dik's ex. 29).

In my opinion the demonstrative determiner in 2.55 functions as a shorthand for a Tail-Head linking device which could be a relative clause in the case of a Subject Topic:

- 2.58 Un avion s'est écrasé hier. L'avion qui est écrasé hier relie habituellement Miami à New York (De Mulder 1996: 42, ex. 11).

When a relative clause (or some other modifying expression) is present it is not necessary to use a demonstrative determiner. This becomes even clearer when viewing the following examples (Maes & Noordman 1995: 265, ex. 15 & 15c⁴⁰):

- 2.59 In the big cities, air pollution is increasing. {This / that / the}⁴¹ air pollution is a result of bad policy.
- 2.60 In the big cities, air pollution is increasing. {The / ?this} increasing air pollution in the big cities is a result of bad policy.

In 2.60 the use of the demonstrative is questionable whereas it is preferred in 2.59. Thus, the demonstrative replaces a more elaborate description that links a clause to its preceding clause by partial repetition of that preceding clause. This mechanism is necessary in order to link discourse units that are not thematically coherent. A similar linking is observed by Apothéloz 1995: 292 in a different context (although he uses the term 'ancrer', to anchor). This time the demonstrative is used to connect one speech-act/discourse move with a speech-act/move of another person (his ex. 39):

- 2.61 Question: Que pensez-vous du succès d'un feuilleton comme Dallas?
Written answer: Je pense que le succès de ce feuilleton est dû au fait que ...

Finally, the linking mechanism of demonstratives becomes apparent when a referent is redescribed or classified in such a way that it is not immediately clear that the description is connected with the antecedent.

- 2.62 On apprend la mort hier de John Sowers. Cet Américain, âgé de 55 ans, était à l'origine de la photocopieuse ...
'We hear of the death yesterday of John Sowers. This American, aged 55, was the inventor of the photocopier ...' (from Cornish 1999: 57, ex. 2.21).

One cannot take it for granted that everyone knows that John Sowers was an American. The classification of Sowers as such needs therefore to be linked to the preceding clause. According to Gundel et al. 1993: 302 this redescription of an activated referent 'provides a compelling example of a stronger than strictly necessary form being required'. The use of 'ce' explicitly signals that the referent is activated (salient in Cornish' framework), information that would be harder to retrieve without the demonstrative.

⁴⁰ Besides Himmelmann, Maes & Noordman (o.c. 257) also contest the claim made by Ariel (1988, 1990) that demonstrative descriptions refer to discourse entities with a relatively low degree of accessibility.

⁴¹ 'This' is the most preferred, 'the' the least.

Summarizing, I believe that the principle behind Immediate Anaphora after first mention by means of demonstratives might be that the clause containing the demonstrative NP is not thematically connected with the preceding clause. In order to restore discourse coherence a demonstrative NP -a Tail-Head linking device in disguise- can be used, even if the referent of that phrase is highly salient and already expected to become the Discourse and Sentence Topic. On the level of discourse, the initial clause is the introduction or announcement, after which the true story starts. One could even consider this an instantiation of the *Principle of the separation of reference and role* on discourse level. Lambrecht 1994: 184 formulates this principle in relation to Sentence Topics: “Do not introduce a referent and talk about it in the same clause”. In terms of discourse topics and units this could be paraphrased as: “Do not announce a discourse topic and start talking about it in the same discourse unit”.

2.3.3.4.2. Demarcating discourse units

Fox 1987 found that lexical noun phrases instead of pronouns (i.e., an overspecified expression) referring to salient entities demarcate rhetorical units and Apothéloz 1995: 291ff. (with references) noticed the same for the French demonstrative description. This has been experimentally confirmed by Vonk 2001: 272f. for Dutch overspecified expressions (a name with modifier). The outcome of her experiments showed that overspecified expressions *create* a discourse discontinuity.⁴² So, as with probably Immediate anaphora after first mention, lexical NPs occur on discourse nodes.

The transition to a new discourse unit or rhetorical unit includes two different type of discourse structuring. The first type, entering a new unit and closing the preceding one, assumes that both units function on the same level, they are sequential so to speak. Most examples from Fox and Apothéloz are of this type. To cite part of an example from Fox 1987: 111:

- 2.63a (4) *Albertson* will be responsible for academic planning and program review, ...
 (5) *He* also is responsible for UC extension, ...
 (6) *Albertson* has been special assistant to Swain since 1978.

Clauses 4 and 5 form a list describing the responsibilities of Albertson. After that, the description continues with a narration of the past positions of Albertson. This new discourse unit is marked by the lexical NP *Albertson*.

The other type involves the switch between embedded and main discourse units, between background and foreground units. This can be illustrated by means of Latin (Bolkestein & Van de Grift 1994: 292, ex. 8b):

- 2.63b *Eidem Alexandro et equi magna raritas contingit. Bucephalan eum vocaverunt sive ab ... sive ab ... XVI talentis ferunt ex Philonici Pharsalii grege emptum etiam tum puero capto eius decore. Neminem hic alium quam Alexandrum regio instructus ornatu recepit in sedem* (Plin. Nat. 8.154)

⁴² I wonder though what came first. Do we come to expect a discontinuity because discontinuity is part of the semantics of a lexical NP or does a new unit require, among other things, a lexical NP, with the result that a lexical NP is expected to occur on a discourse boundary. In the latter situation discontinuity might not be part of the semantics of a lexical NP.

Alexander also had the good fortune to own a great rarity in horseflesh. They called the animal Bucephalas, either because of ... or because of ... It is said that he was bought for 16 talents from the herd of Philonicus of Pharsalus, while Alexander was still a boy, as he was taken by his beauty. This horse (*hic*), when adorned with the royal saddle would not allow itself to be mounted by anybody except Alexander.

As Bolkestein & Van de Grift explain, the ‘great rarity in horseflesh’ is not constituted by the horse’s name, but by its refusal to accept anyone else but Alexander in the saddle. The namegiving is a subsidiary passage, and only the clause with *hic* returns to the first sentence (o.c. 292). For *is* resuming an earlier topic after a digression see Bolkestein 2000: 123.

2.3.3.5. Summary

Demonstrative NPs in English (and demonstrative pronouns in a language like Latin) referring to salient entities, i.e. overspecified NPs, occur generally in two types of context: Immediate anaphora after first mention, and on discourse boundaries. It has generally been accepted that demonstrative NPs and lexical NPs in general are capable of demarcating discourse units, but this has not been asserted of Immediate anaphora after first mention. According to the literature, the function of Immediate anaphora after first mention is to more firmly establish a referent as a global or local discourse topic. However, I believe that the demonstrative expression also here appears on the boundary of a discourse unit. In the case of Immediate anaphora after first mention the new unit is the beginning of the actual narration after the introduction of the referent in the first clause.

But what is the difference between a definite NP and a demonstrative NP? In my view the demonstrative in the demonstrative NP functions as a kind of Tail-Head linking device in disguise. Whereas a NP generally begins a new discourse unit, the demonstrative is capable to link this unit to the rest of the preceding discourse in order to restore the broken discourse coherence. At least, this is how it could work in languages with definite articles.

When discussing the examples I sometimes referred to the Information structure inside the sentence. For example, in 2.52 and 2.63 the Latin demonstrative pronoun is an Established Topic, and the same goes for the French 2.55, 2.56 and English 2.60. The demonstrative NPs in To’aba’ita, 2.53 and French, 2.54, are Unestablished Topics. The question remains whether demonstrative NPs can also occur in Argument Focus.

Combining these results with the results from 2.3.3.3. in Table 2.9, it turns out that (1) within a discourse unit accented pronouns can appear in every slot except the one for Established Topic, and that (2) demonstrative descriptions, referring across node, can be both kind of Topics. If it is indeed true that demonstrative NPs occur when the discourse coherence is not very strong, then the answer to the question about Argument Focus is clear. Argument Focus clauses require that the rest of the clause is presupposed, which means that the connection with the preceding discourse is maximal. If that is the case, the stimulus for using the demonstrative NP is absent. Therefore, demonstrative NPs probably do not occur in Argument Focus. The ultimate consequence might be that Information Structure is not important at all for across node reference. Leaving this consideration aside, the table is filled in as follows:

| | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------|
| | continuity procedure | centering procedure |

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
|-------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|-------|
| Anaphora | in-node | <i>s/he</i> | S/HE | S/HE | | |
| | across-node | <i>this/that N</i> | <i>this/that N</i> | — | | |

Table 2.9: The matrix: continuing & Anaphora

2.3.4. Anaphora and the centering procedure

This section will deal with the centering expressions. The only anaphoric expressions referring to non-salient discourse referents discussed here are the demonstratives. As I said in the introduction, I do not include definite NPs in the discussion. Furthermore, accented pronouns are not discussed here since I disagree with scholars who assume that accented pronouns can refer to non-salient entities (see section 2.3.3.3.).

The slots to be filled in are:

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------|-------|
| | | continuity procedure | | | centering procedure | |
| | | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| Anaphora | in-node | <i>s/he</i> | S/HE | S/HE | x | x |
| | across-node | <i>this/that N</i> | <i>this/that N</i> | — | x | x |

2.3.4.1. Introduction

The function of demonstratives in discourse is quite complicated (see the preceding section), not in the least because demonstratives in discourse have been studied only partially. Two main works on demonstratives, Diessel 1999 and Himmelmann 1996, focus on in-node use of demonstratives in discourse but hardly discuss them when the antecedents are found across a discourse node. Similarly, Cornish 1999: 54 restricts himself to demonstratives referring to the preceding clause. His framework however is clear in this matter: any expression that refers to an entity that is not in the center of attention is centering. Ariel 1990: 18-19 is the only one that gives statistics on the use of anaphoric expressions including demonstratives at different distances in the discourse. However, she restricts her examples to demonstratives in first mention or in reference to the previous clause. In the next discussion I will refer frequently to Gundel et. al (1993) although I will eventually not use their model as an explanation of the use of demonstratives in discourse.

Despite this lack of verifiable material, what is claimed about demonstratives? Gundel et al. (1993) show that demonstrative descriptions from samples of English, Japanese, Russian and Spanish spoken and written texts are distributed according to the highest cognitive status they had in their particular contexts in the following way (o.c. 291-292)⁴³:

| | IN FOCUS | ACTIVATED | FAMILIAR |
|---------------|----------|-----------|----------|
| ENGLISH | | | |
| <i>this N</i> | 1 | 11 | |

⁴³ In the following I will only discuss demonstrative descriptions. English demonstrative pronouns are almost always used to refer to propositions and are therefore discourse deictic, not anaphoric. This may of course be different in other languages, as it is in Hittite.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|----|----|---|
| <i>that</i> N | | 10 | 7 |
| <hr/> | | | |
| JAPANESE | | | |
| <i>kono</i> 'this' N | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| <i>sono</i> 'that' N (medial) | 18 | 15 | 1 |
| <i>ano</i> 'that' N (distal) | | 1 | 1 |
| <hr/> | | | |
| RUSSIAN | | | |
| <i>èto</i> 'this' N | 1 | 7 | 2 |
| <i>to</i> 'that' N | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| SPANISH | | | |
| <i>este</i> 'this' N | | | |
| <i>ese</i> 'that' N (medial) | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| <i>aquel</i> 'that' N (distal) | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |

Table 2.10: Distribution of English, Japanese, Russian and Spanish demonstratives according to highest status (Gundel et al. 1993: 291-292)⁴⁴.

For the moment I will not discuss the status 'in focus' because it obviously does not apply to referents that have not been referred to for some time.

'Familiar' means that the Speaker refers to an entity that is presumably already represented somehow in the mind of the Addressee, either because it is stored in long-term memory⁴⁵ or because it is in short-term memory through recent mention or perception (1993: 278). Also representations of referents with 'activated' status can be retrieved from long-term memory or may arise from the immediate linguistic or extra-linguistic context. An activated referent is represented in current short-term memory (l.c.). It seems that Gundel et al. differentiate between working memory and current working memory although I do not know how to distinguish 'familiar' from 'activated' in this case. However, in order to describe anaphoric reference of demonstratives over larger distances or across a discourse node I think we only need to be concerned with long-term memory and with the status 'familiar'.

Gundel's et al. thesis is that there is generally a difference in status between proximal and medial or distal demonstrative determiners, proximal often being at least activated and distal being familiar (o.c. 284). The same idea is advocated by Ariel 1990: 51ff., 75: proximal demonstrative determiners indicate higher accessibility of the referent than non-proximal demonstrative determiners. But as can be seen from table 2.10, for example *all* Japanese demonstratives can refer to entities that are only familiar, albeit infrequently.⁴⁶ The question I want to discuss is this: given the fact that all demonstratives can be familiar but not activated, what is the condition that governs the choice of demonstratives with the status familiar?

2.3.4.2. Demonstratives with the status 'familiar'

The answer can only be based on my discussion of the Hittite material, since (in-depth) studies in other languages dealing with this particular question are not available. In order to exclude entities that are in focus or activated, I limited the Hittite material containing anaphoric demonstrative determiners to those contexts where the demonstrative refers to an entity residing either in a preceding paragraph or in a citation of direct speech. In the latter

⁴⁴ The figures refer to the number of attestations of referential expressions in a corpus of spoken and written sources. See Gundel et al. 1993: 290 n. 20 and 21.

⁴⁵ This is the same as the Recognition Use of demonstrative descriptions. Gundel et al o.c. 302 call this use 'reminder *that*'.

⁴⁶ This contradicts their explicit statement on p. 287 that Japanese proximal and medial demonstrative determiners require activation.

context the boundary between narration and direct speech constitutes a very important discontinuity. Both boundaries, the paragraph line⁴⁷ and the direct speech versus narration boundary, signal the closure of a discourse unit and the de-activation of the referents inside those units. In order to ‘pick them up’, to re-activate them, in Hittite —as in Japanese— all three demonstratives may be used.⁴⁸ The factors that decide which Hittite demonstrative is used, are their inherent properties: the proximal *ka-* denotes that a referent is considered as being part of the cognitive space of the Speaker, *apa-* points at the cognitive space of the Addressee, and *asi* refers to an entity which is not considered as part of the Speaker’s (+ Addressee’s) cognitive space but lies outside it. The main difference with the use of definite noun phrases⁴⁹ is the intent of the Speaker to state explicitly that some entity belongs to one of the possible cognitive spaces. The discussion with examples follows in section 3.4.

This result is very interesting in view of the different types of deictic systems. As I will show in chapter 3 the Hittite deictic system is person-oriented like Japanese, as contrasted with distance-oriented systems like Spanish or Lezgian (Anderson & Keenan 1985: 282-6, Fillmore 1982: 49-50, Lyons 1999: 108). It has generally been accepted that deictic distance contrasts can be transferred from the real world to the discourse (Lyons 1977: 669ff., Ariel 1990: 51, Lyons 1999: 113). Proximal forms tend to refer to discourse entities at a relatively short distance, non-proximal forms refer to elements that are mentioned further away. Person-oriented systems allow this same kind of use (Lyons 1999: 113). Thus, the speaker oriented demonstrative indicates short distance, and the hearer and non-speaker/hearer oriented demonstratives denote a distance further back in the discourse. This seems to work in a person-oriented system like Latin, where the contrastive couple *hic ... ille* is to be interpreted as ‘the latter ... the former’⁵⁰. But contrastive couples like these do not constitute the main use of anaphoric demonstratives, and it remains to be seen whether the other uses of the anaphoric demonstratives correlate with recentness of mention in the discourse. Indeed, some correlations with-person based, not distance-based, deixis have been observed.

The most important representative of a person-based contrast in discourse is the Speaker-Hearer boundary. Proximal or first person forms can refer to something mentioned by the Speaker, whereas non-proximal forms are used by a Speaker to refer to something that was mentioned by the Addressee (Lakoff 1974: 74, Ariel 1990: 52, Gundel et al. 1993: 279, Lyons 1999: 114). An example from Gundel et al. o.c. 279, their ex. (7):

2.64 A: Have you seen the neighbour’s dog?

⁴⁷ I suspect that visible discourse node markers such as paragraph lines are generally accompanied by linguistic markers of discourse discontinuity. With literacy not too widespread, combined with the fact that even kings could not write and read, the texts that have come down to us were read aloud. As a result paragraph lines should have been made audible to the addressee. Although one cannot exclude the possibility that the scribe said ‘next section’ each time he came across a paragraph line, or just took a deep breath, it is more likely that linguistic expressions in the text itself indicate discourse boundaries.

⁴⁸ For Himmelmann 1996: 237 demonstratives that refer across a node do not keep track of a participant, but *remind* the hearer of the participant. Moreover, this anaphoric use of the demonstrative is similar to or even the same as the *recognitional* use of demonstratives (l.c.).

⁴⁹ Although Hittite does not have a definite determiner, it still may be inferred that noun phrases are definite. The main criteria (for the present discussion) are 1) second mention in the discourse: noun phrases have become definite after being introduced in the discourse, 2) indefinites never appear in Initial position in the clause, with the exception of ‘conditional’ Relative clauses, 3) definites referring to generics, as ‘the gods’.

⁵⁰ However, Bolkestein 2000: 109 noted that ‘the former ... the latter’ can be expressed both by *hic ... ille* and by *ille ... hic*.

B: Yes, and that dog/ ?? this dog kept me awake last night.

The use of *this dog* seems extremely odd in a situation like this.

In Hittite this person-based deictic contrast does not cover only Speaker-Addressee boundaries but pervades the whole system, as will be amply illustrated. As far as the theoretical literature on deixis and demonstratives is concerned, this type of transferral of deictic contrasts from world to discourse has not been noted before.

2.3.4.3. Demonstratives with the status ‘activated’

In the preceding paragraphs the objective was to discuss demonstratives that had the status ‘familiar’ and referred across node. Now the status ‘activated’ will be considered. This status does not coincide with a particular level of saliency. In Cornish’ analysis referents with both high-focus and mid-focus attention levels are salient. But in Gundel’s et al. analysis high focus is ‘in focus’, and mid-focus is ‘activated’. But this is not all: Cornish provides some examples of referents referring to elements in the immediate preceding linguistic context that are not salient, but which Gundel et al. would call activated (I assume). The following table of equations results:

| level of attention focus | Cornish | Gundel et al. |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| high focus | salient | in focus |
| mid focus | salient | activated |
| low focus | non-salient | activated - familiar |

Table 2.11: Comparison of cognitive states

A referent that is derived from the immediate linguistic or extra-linguistic context, an activated referent, does not *have* to be salient. A clear example is Cornish’ ex. 2.8b, o.c. 31:

2.65 [Personal letter to Cornish, 1989]

Could you send me your *Journal of Semantics* article? We don’t have that in our library [the writer is referring here to the University of Bradford library]

The focus of this part of the letter is on the article written by Cornish. The second clause however does not talk about the article but about the journal. Though already introduced and therefore activated, the journal has to be brought in the center of attention which is done by *that*. Maybe the writer could have been more explicit by using *that journal*. But he could not have used the unaccented pronoun *it* which would have referred to the article. The use of a demonstrative pronoun often implicates a shift in the center of attention and therefore also a shift in discourse topic (Gundel et al. 1993: 297). But why is the *Journal of Semantics* itself not in explicit focus, or salient? After all, it is mentioned in the immediate preceding clause and the elements in those clauses are generally in explicit focus (see 2.2.2.2.). The reason is that modifiers (and presupposed propositional contents) tend to be in low focus (see Cornish o.c. 162 ff. for discussion and references). Thus, activated referents can not only be salient, but also non-salient.

In Gundel’s hierarchy we find under the heading ‘activated’ for English the demonstrative pronouns *this* and *that*, *this N*, and the stressed pronouns and similar combinations in the other languages. Again, table 2.10 shows that also *that N* may be used in the category ‘activated’. The question is again: what explains the choice for one of these expressions if the status is the same? Above we have seen that the person-based and distance-

based deictic contrasts can be transferred to the discourse. For Hittite the answer is the same as earlier: the choice for a demonstrative depends on the cognitive space -Speaker's, Addressee's or Other's- that is deemed appropriate by the Speaker.

Besides activation that is induced through mention in the immediate preceding discourse, again the structuring of discourse has to be taken into account (Fox 1987, Cornish 1999: 221ff., Bolkestein 2000: 110, 128ff.. Gundel et al. do not incorporate discourse structure in their discussion). In example 2.65 the referent of *that* is linearly recent, but in the next example the phrase *as well as her uh husband* is hierarchically recent (from Cornish o.c. p. 221, ex. 6.7):

- 2.66 (1) C: Okay Harry, I have a problem that uh my — with today's economy my daughter is working,
 (2) H: I missed your name.
 (3) C: Hank.
 (4) H: Go ahead Hank.
 (5a) C: as well as her husband.
 (5b) They have a child
 (5c) and they bring the child to us every day for babysitting.

(5a) follows hierarchically immediately after (1). The sequences (2)-(4) are a digression from the main line of thought which is kept 'on hold' during the time the digression is processed. This example actually shows that even referents in focus, in the center of attention do not necessarily lose their 'in focusness' after a digression.

Usually however, topics have to be resumed somehow instead of just being continued (see ex. 2.67 = ex. 7b from Bolkestein 2000: 123, see also Dik 1997a: 325 for the notion Resumed Topic). The discourse is not 'on hold' as in ex. 2.66:

- 2.67 *L. Cassium L. ... in Thessaliam, C. Calvisium S. ... in Aetoliam misit; Cn. Domitium C. cum legionibus duabus in Macedoniam proficisci iussit. Cuius provinciae ab ea parte quae ..., Menedemus studium profitebatur. Ex his Calvisius ... potitus est, Cassius ... pervenit, ... Domitius ... venit*
 He sent L. Cassius to Thessalia, C. Calvisius to Aetolia; he ordered Cn. Domitius to leave for Macedonia. And in that part of that province which ..., Menedemus professed his allegiance. Of these people, Calvisius conquered ..., Cassius arrived ..., Domitius reached ... *Civ.*3.34-36

The clause starting with *ex his* returns to the main story line, broken off after *iussit*. It is not possible to deduce from the discussion in Gundel et al. whether the referent of *his* 'these' should be activated or familiar.

Summarizing, (1) it is sometimes very difficult to distinguish between the statuses 'activated' and 'familiar', (2) all demonstratives seem to occur in both categories, and (3) it is not clear which place discourse structure holds in the framework of Gundel et al. I therefore choose not to follow Gundel et al. in distinguishing between the statuses 'familiar' and 'activated' as far as Anaphora is concerned.

2.3.4.4. Summary and table

The general opinion on deictic demonstratives is that proximal demonstratives refer to entities that are somewhat more accessible than non-proximal demonstratives. This difference is believed to be sustained in the discourse as well. As a result, proximal demonstratives should refer to discourse entities that were recently mentioned and non-proximal demonstratives to entities mentioned longer ago. Although this might be true for some languages, especially those with a distance-based demonstrative system, it should not be considered a universal rule. In Hittite for example the structure of the discourse is more important than anaphoric distance: the demonstratives as a class are used to refer to entities across major discourse nodes, irrespective of distance. The difference between the demonstratives themselves depends on whether the referent belongs to the domain of the speaker, addressee or other, from the viewpoint of the speaker (see Chapter 3).

The common denominator in the anaphoric ‘familiar’ and ‘activated’ situations described here is that in both cases the demonstrative pronouns or descriptions refer to elements that are textually accessible but not in the center of attention, not salient. Therefore the demonstratives are here exponents of the centering procedure. Not being centered upon means in this case: not being in the same discourse unit (unless the antecedent is a modifier or presupposed proposition). According to Himmelmann this type of demonstrative NP must be considered Recognitional and not Tracking (Anaphoric). In that case there is no difference between retrieving private, shared information that is discourse new and private, shared information that is discourse old. Both have to be retrieved from long-term memory. For non-salient information we would get the next picture (also see table 2.6):

| Demonstrative use | Search domain | More identifying information |
|-------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Situational use | the speech situation | pointing gesture |
| Recognitional use | private, shared long term memory (discourse new) | modifier |
| Recognitional use | private, shared long term memory (discourse old) | modifier (?) |

Table 2.12: Use of non-salient demonstratives.

Demonstratives and the continuity procedure have already been described in 2.3.3.4.

It is not clear to me how the Topic-Focus distribution combines with the Anaphoric centering procedure. The few examples I encountered in the literature seem to allow both the Unestablished Topic and Sentence Focus reading^{51 52}.

| | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|--|
| | continuity procedure | | | | centering procedure | |
| | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus | |
| <i>geographical parameter</i> | | | | | | |
| Anaphora in-node | <i>s/he</i> | <i>S/HE</i> | <i>S/HE</i> | — | — | |
| across-node | <i>this/that N</i> | <i>this/that N</i> | — | <i>that</i> | <i>that N</i> | |

Table 2.13: The matrix: Anaphora

⁵¹ Lambrecht 1994 does not discuss the demonstratives in the framework of Topic and Focus.

⁵² As this theoretic introduction is not concerned with reference in English but merely sketches the framework for the Hittite system, I only will fill the slots with those elements that were found in the literature. For non-salient anaphoric reference this means that I did not find examples of *this (N)*. That does not mean that non-salient anaphoric *this (N)* does not exist.

2.3.5. Discourse Deixis and the centering procedure

In this section and the next one I will discuss the following slots:

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------------------|-------|
| | continuity procedure | | | centering procedure | |
| | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| Discourse deictic | x | x | x | — | x |

Starting with Levinson 1983: 62, “Discourse deixis has to do with the encoding of reference to portions of the unfolding discourse in which the utterance (which includes the text-referring expression) is located”: discourse deictic expressions refer to propositions or events, expressed by clauses, sentences, paragraphs, or an entire story, usually introducing those propositions or events as referents into the universe of discourse. They are not referring to an event or proposition already referred to by a prior noun phrase, which would be anaphoric reference.⁵³

Two examples (Diessel 1999: 102) illustrate both backward and forward discourse deixis⁵⁴:

- 2.68 a. A: I’ve heard you will move to Hawaii?
 B: Who told you that?
 b. A: Listen to this: John will move to Hawaii.

Many authors discussing discourse deixis point out that expressions referring to the discourse itself or to the contents of the discourse usually serve to center the attention of the addressee on the referent of that expression (Ehlich 1982, Levinson 1983, Himmelmann 1996, Diessel 1999). However, sometimes an anaphoric pronoun is used to refer to the contents of a linguistic expression. In such a case the content of the expression is already in the center of attention (see 2.3.6.).

An important feature which distinguishes discourse deictic use from other types of reference, such as anaphoric or recognitional use (for demonstratives, see 2.3.3.4., 2.3.4. and 2.3.1.2.), is referential distance. Discourse deictic expressions always refer to the immediately adjacent segment, whereas for example tracking or recognitional demonstratives usually refer to referents further away (Himmelmann 1996: 224, Fillmore 1997: 104). Another difference between discourse deixis and the other types is that referents of discourse deictic expressions usually do not persist in subsequent discourse⁵⁵. They are mainly used to provide a link between two pieces of discourse (Diessel 1999: 102). In other words, they set up a discourse

⁵³ Cornish (1999: 54) uses for Discourse Deixis a definition different from the traditional account: when a referent of any entity order is presupposed in the discourse universe but has low salience, the centering procedure is required to bring the referent in the center of attention. This coincides with the slot Anaphora & Centering procedure.

⁵⁴ In the following I will mainly concentrate on the discourse deictic use of place deictic words like *this* and *that*. As has been noted by many authors, also time deictic words can be re-used, as in ‘the *last* paragraph’ and in ‘the *next* chapter’. Other discourse deictic expressions are utterance-initial uses of *but*, *therefore*, *anyway*, *to the contrary* etc. (Levinson 1983: 85ff.). Levinson also includes topic/comment marking devices under the heading ‘Discourse Deixis’.

⁵⁵ But see Diessel 1999: 109 who notes that the referents of Recognitional demonstratives are usually not persistent in the discourse.

node (Cornish 1999: 21). The demonstrative *this* in ex. 2.68b sets up a node corresponding to a narrated event. Sequences of the type *This fact ... it ... it ...* are very rare (Himmelman 1996: 225).

Discourse nodes can take different shapes. Already mentioned are nodes like *Listen to this*, introducing a narrated event. Another type of boundary marking is discussed in Ehlich 1982: 331ff. In Genesis 36:15-19 the Hebrew proximal demonstrative *ellè* (plural of *zè*) is used to introduce and conclude name lists. In this use the demonstratives establish frames and mark boundaries of text units. Both the introducing and concluding demonstratives announce a shift of the center of attention, a discourse topic shift.

In the preceding paragraphs the discourse deictic unaccented pronoun *it*, and the demonstrative pronouns *this*, *that* and *ellè* were presented in discourse deictic function. Two types of discourse deictic expressions still need to be mentioned. The first type is the demonstrative determiner with noun, the other one the demonstrative adverb. An example of the demonstrative determiner is:

2.69 then he goes off, . . and that's the end of that story, ... (Himmelman 1996: 224)

The main difference with the demonstrative pronoun is according to Myers 1988: 4 (quoted by Cornish 1999: 59), that: 'the pronoun nearly always refers to a proposition expressed or implied in the previous sentence, while the [determiner + noun] can refer to a proposition expressed or implied in any immediately preceding segment, even in the entire text up to that point'.

The last type of discourse deictic expressions I will discuss is the demonstrative adverb of Manner. According to Diessel (1999: 74), manner demonstratives have not yet received attention in the literature on deixis, apart from being glossed as 'in this/that way' or 'like this/that'. It seems that they are involved in some sort of comparison. As I will show in Chapter 3.5.2.2., this turns out to be valid for only one of the three demonstrative manner adverbs in Hittite.

2.3.6. Discourse Deixis and the continuity procedure

As mentioned above, sometimes an anaphoric pronoun is used to refer to the content of a linguistic expression. The use of such a pronoun means that the content of the expression is already in the center of attention:

2.70 Henry speaks perfect Hungarian - and he knows it! (Cornish 1999: 80)

The predicate 'know' requires a third order referent (Dik 1997b: 106ff.), i.e. a proposition as its argument, and the proposition that is in the center of attention is always the immediate preceding one. For more discussion of pronouns and predicates of second, third and fourth order, see Cornish 1999: 79ff.

I assume that the following sentence in the invented, strange dialogue could be expressed:

2.71 A: Does Henry know that he speaks perfect Dutch?
B: Henry speaks perfect Hungarian - THAT's what he knows!

The only point I want to make is that it is probably possible to use accented Focus pronouns (this is not the demonstrative but the form replacing non-existent IT (accented it)) in Discourse Deixis - continuing context.

Usually discourse deictic expressions set up a discourse node, that is, they link the unit they are part of with the preceding one. An exception might be the rare use of discourse deictic *it* (and accented THAT). As with anaphoric expressions one can therefore distinguish between in-node and across-node reference. I have not found any examples in the literature of events and propositions as Unestablished Topics. Its slot is therefore filled by a question mark.

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | continuity procedure | | | centering procedure | |
| | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| Discourse Deictic | | | | | |
| in-node | <i>it</i> | ? | THAT | — | — |
| across-node | — | — | — | — | <i>this, that N</i> |

Table 2.14: The matrix: Discourse Deixis

2.4. Summary and conclusions

In this chapter I have given an overview of the uses of certain referential expressions: pronouns, demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative noun phrases. It turned out that not only text versus world or the cognitive state/saliency of an entity (Ariel 1990, Gundel 1993, Cornish 1999) but also other notions such as the pragmatic relations on sentence level (Lambrecht 1994) or the structure of the discourse (Fox 1987) influence the choice of linguistic expressions. In order to describe these expressions I have set up a matrix that combines these four parameters:

- the geographical parameter (2.2.1.). Key words: text versus situation
- the cognitive parameter (2.2.2.). Key words: saliency, memory
- the Topic-Focus parameter (2.2.3.). Key words: Topic, Focus-structure of the clause
- the discourse structure parameter (not treated separately, but see 2.3.3.4.). Key words: discourse units and cohesion.

A combination of these parameters results in the following table for English, although the distribution of English referential expressions is by no means complete and only serves as an illustration. The Hittite material on the other hand will be discussed exhaustively.

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------|---------------------|---------------|
| | continuity procedure | | | centering procedure | |
| | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| Deictic | <i>s/he</i> | S/HE | S/HE | — | <i>dem N</i> |
| Recognitional | — | — | — | — | <i>that N</i> |
| Anaphora in-node | <i>s/he</i> | S/HE | S/HE | — | — |
| across-node | <i>dem N</i> | <i>dem N</i> | — | <i>that</i> | <i>that N</i> |
| Discourse Deictic | | | | | |
| in-node | <i>it</i> | ? | THAT | — | — |
| across-node | — | — | — | — | <i>dem N</i> |

Table 2.15: The matrix: complete

Obviously not one of the parameters can explain the use of referential expression standing on its own.

The Topic-Focus parameter for example, is important when it comes to *salient* entities, whether they are Deictic, Anaphoric or Discourse Deictic. This parameter explains the difference between accented and unaccented pronouns, with reference *inside* a discourse unit in case of Anaphora or Discourse Deixis. For the Deictic situation it should follow that the ‘discourse unit’ consists of both an object that is considered salient through non-linguistic means (dog turning the corner in ex. 2.35) and the expression commenting on it.

Lack of saliency is important because it excludes pronominal reference: the centering procedure slots contain the demonstrative expressions. In other words, demonstratives (re-)introduce non-salient elements from the speech situation, shared memory, or the discourse itself into the discourse. In case of re-activation of an element of the discourse, one could think of demonstratives as linkers. They evoke, re-activate an entity together with the memory representation of the entity’s closed discourse unit, thus creating a link between the new unit and an older one. In the section on non-salient demonstratives (2.3.4.2.) I addressed the question of the difference between proximal and non-proximal demonstratives but could only answer on the basis of Hittite. In Hittite the choice for a demonstrative depends on Speaker attitude: does, in the opinion of the Speaker, the entity belong to the Speaker, Addressee or Other. In order to express this assignment, the Speaker uses *ka-* ‘this’, *apa-* ‘that’ and *asi* ‘that, yon’ respectively.

From the preceding paragraph it does not follow that salient referents are only referred to by means of pronouns. Clearly saliency alone cannot explain the difference between pronouns and demonstratives. Here the notion of discourse structure becomes necessary: Salient anaphoric demonstratives, like salient definite NPs, occur on discourse nodes (2.3.3.4.2.). The same probably applies to *Immediate Anaphora after first mention* (2.3.3.4.1.). The difference between demonstrative NPs and definite NPs is probably whether the Speaker wants to create discourse coherence or not. For example Kleiber (1986) noted that in certain contexts the definite article in French can cause relative incoherence, whereas the demonstrative determiner *ce* in the same position restores a coherent reading. From that I concluded that a demonstrative links an entity explicitly to the preceding unit as a kind of Tail-Head linking device.

Turning to situationally used demonstratives as linkers, in 2.3.1.3. I followed De Mulder 1996 in his view that deictic demonstratives do not identify or localize an object but simply cue the Addressee to search through the speech situation. They link the attention of the Addressee to the speech situation, and I proposed the same for Recognitionally used demonstratives: linking to memory. Discourse Deictic demonstratives were described as linking discourse units anyway (2.3.5.).

Summarizing, demonstratives, as linkers, create cohesion between elements where that cohesion is not naturally present, independent of the saliency status of the referent. They signal the Addressee to link a referent to the world, a referent to shared memory, and a referent to the same referent in the preceding or following discourse.⁵⁶ Pronouns on the other hand occur when cohesion is present. Cohesion may exist between a linguistic expression and the linguistic context containing the antecedent, but also between an expression and a non-linguistic context (see 2.3.2. and above).

⁵⁶ This linking could be the elusive [+ dem] feature described in Lyons 1999: 20 which is unique to demonstratives but not to definites. As Lyon l.c. and his Chapter 2 shows, deixis, although very important, is not basic to demonstratives and can also be found with definite markers.

To conclude with a hypothesis, in my view one can explain the use of referring expressions by means of two basic factors: (1) cohesiveness of the discourse, where discourse may also denote the domain of non-linguistic mental representations, and (2) spatial domain (world, memory, text).

When the discourse is not cohesive, demonstratives, as linkers, are used to restore cohesion. Definite NPs on the other hand may be used when the discourse is not and should not be cohesive (see the discussion below ex. 2.55). Inside discourse units, that is, when the discourse is already cohesive, the Topic-Focus distinction becomes important when one has to choose between zero, unaccented or accented pronouns.

The two factors allow a reshuffled matrix (Bold face expressions are likely to be the preferred ones for the geographical the domain):

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | <i>discourse parameter</i> | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|
| | reference inside discourse unit | | reference across discourse node (including first mention) | |
| | E-Top | Other | creates cohesion | no cohesion |
| world | \emptyset , <i>s/he</i> | <i>S/HE</i> | <i>demNP</i> | <i>defNP</i> |
| text | \emptyset , <i>s/he</i> | <i>S/HE</i> | <i>demNP</i> | <i>defNP</i> |
| memory | — | — | <i>demNP</i> | <i>defNP</i> |

Table 2.16: Reshuffled matrix

Major differences with table 2.15 are that Topic-Focus is only important for reference inside discourse units, that Anaphoric and Discourse Deictic reference are two sides of the same domain, text, and that saliency is less important as a parameter (demonstratives may refer to salient and non-salient entities). Regarding the latter remark, it might be possible that the notion of saliency used here should be redefined. When a clause is uttered that is relatively incoherent in relation to the preceding discourse, it is likely that the entities mentioned in the preceding discourse, including the antecedent of an expression in the new clause, have lost their saliency. Thus, the use of demonstratives as described in 2.3.3.4. might not belong to the continuing procedure at all. The only difference with definite NPs would be that demonstratives restore saliency where it was lost on account of the context.

From a cognitive point of view, cohesive discourse units correlate with working memory so reference inside units and across discourse nodes should correlate with retrieval of mental representations of some referent from working memory (salient entities) and long-term memory respectively (non-salient entities). Thus, cohesion and saliency might be two names for the same phenomenon.

However, since I have set up table 2.16 as a hypothesis, for Hittite I will only use the method which led to table 2.15. In the next chapter the Hittite pronouns and demonstratives will be presented within the order of the framework sketched here.

3. *Deixis, Discourse and Reference in Hittite*

3.1. Deixis and the centering procedure — The situational use of demonstratives

In this chapter I will follow the scheme as set out in Chapter 2. The headings of the main sections (3.1. etc.) match with the main headings *sub* section 2.3.

3.1.1. Introduction

Given the nature of the Hittite material -written texts- we do not expect to find that many examples of situational use of demonstratives and third person pronouns, since we need, by definition, the situational context of the utterances. The main exceptions are the Local Adverbs derived from the demonstrative stems denoting the location (and time) of some event. The rare Situational use of demonstrative pronouns, determiners and adverbs referring to entities and locations will be presented in 3.1.2.

There is however an important extension of the pure situational use: *Direct Speech*, cited in narration (Himmelfmann 1996: 221-2). As Ehlich 1982: 33 n. 6 notes: ‘In so-called ‘dead’ languages, the quotations of direct language enables us to identify uses of deixis in the standard way’. This category allows us to observe that the pronouns *ka-* and *apa-* are not the only demonstratives in Hittite (3.1.3.).

Another type of situational use is self-reference to a linguistic unit or act, as *in this book, this is a story* (Himmelfmann 1996: 221), for which see 3.1.4.

Apart from establishing which elements may serve as demonstratives, we also need to establish how many distance contrasts are expressed, and whether Hittite has a distance-based or person-based demonstrative system. There are five Hittite non-anaphoric expressions that might be demonstrative: *ka-*, *apa-*, *aši / uni / eni*, *šiya-* and *an(n)i-*. The last two are extremely rare in the Hittite texts, which means that it is nearly impossible to pinpoint their semantics. This leaves us with three rather well attested expressions, *ka-*, *apa-* and *aši / uni / eni*, which need to be tested for their status as demonstratives. And if they are indeed demonstratives, it should be possible to determine the distance-based or person-based contrasts they are involved in.

3.1.2. True Situational Use

When searching for references to the physical surroundings, we should look for texts that -in order to fulfill their communicative function- somehow require the presence of the participants and the objects mentioned in the texts. In such a situation references may occur to persons, entities or places related to the participants engaging in the acts that were performed by reading or writing the texts. Genres that fall within this class are vows, oracles, prayers, rituals, treaties and some ‘instructions’ (mainly the ones that serve to (re)establish the allegiance of persons or groups to the king). In all these genres the participants are the

king or a representative of the king, and a second party, either divine or human. This is nicely illustrated by a text which discusses the opposite, absence of one of the parties at the conclusion of a treaty:

- 3.1 As for the reason why this tablet (*ki* ϕ UPPU) containing the stipulations has not been sealed now (*kinuna*): given that the king of Kargamis, Duthaliya and Halpahi could not be present before My Majesty, *that's* why this tablet (*ki* ϕ UPPU) has not been sealed now (*kinun*). However, when the king of Kargamis, Duthaliya and Halpahi and also Duppi-Tessup appear before My Majesty, coming together in front of My Majesty, I, My Majesty, will interrogate them under the laws. I will listen to the request anyone makes. Then (*apiya*) this tablet containing the stipulations will be sealed' (KBo 3.3+ iv 2' ff., CTH 63).

This passage contains a few expressions that are only interpretable when the 'here and now' of the text are considered. The adverbs *kinuna* 'now' and *apiya* 'then' refer to the moment the text was created and to the future respectively as seen from that moment, thus being purely deictic. Another deictic expression is *ki* TUPPU 'this tablet', pointing to its own existence in the physical surroundings. Self-reference is treated in 3.1.4.

An instructive example of reference to an object in the physical surroundings of the text at the moment of its inception is the following prayer in which Gassulawiya, wife of Mursili II presents the goddess Lelwani with a substitute statue, 'this woman', in order to be relieved from her illness:

- 3.2 **KBo 4.6 rev. 7'-15'** (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 380), ed. Tischler 1981: 16-17, with remarks from De Roos 1985: 130, 132

nu=za zik ^d*Le[l̥]aniš* ^{8'} [*apel* *ša* ^{GU₄}ÁB.NIGA] *ù* *ša* UDU.NIGA MÁŠ-*ja* ^{UZU}Ì *ēt* ^{9'}
[*nu=za išpāi ēšhar=ma*] *apāt eku nu=za ninga* ^{UZU}Ì ^{10'} [... *ke-e-el* ?] *ša*
^{GU₄}ÁB.NIGA *ke-e-el* *ša* UDU. "SÍG+MUNUS" MÁŠ-*ja* ^{11'} [...] *kāša tuēl ANA DINGIR-*
LIM ^{12'} [*Gaššulau*]*iaš tuēl GEME-TUM ku-u-un MUNUS-an* ^{13'} [*uppešta n=an?*]
IŠTU ^{TÚG}NÍG.LAM.MEŠ *uāššijat nu=za apēl* ^{14'} [*tarpal*]*lin uppešta nu māt*
DINGIR-LIM kuitki ^{15'} *kappuūt nu=tta ka-a-aš MUNUS-TUM pedi artari*
You Lelwani, eat the fat of her fat cow, of her fat sheep, and of her goat! Eat until satisfaction! Now, drink that blood! Drink until satisfaction! The fat [...] of [*this*? (*kel*)] *fat cow*, of *this* (*kel*) *ewe* and goat [... Gassulaw]iya your servant has just [brought] to your god (= the statue representing Lelwani) *this* (*kun*) *woman*. She clothed [her] with beautiful clothes. She has sent her [substitu]te. If you, god, notice (anything) at all, *this* (*kas*) *woman* stands on the spot, before you.

In my corpus only the Proximal demonstrative *ka-* is used to refer to entities in the physical surroundings of the text contained on the tablet.

Oracles, treaties and vows are usually created for very specific single events. Rituals, prayers, and instructions on the other hand can be used on several occasions, but that occasion still has to serve a very specific purpose. In rituals we expect to find references to *this illness*, the reason for performing the ritual, *these objects*, needed for the performance of the ritual, and *this / that patient*. Letters take an intermediate position in that the trigger for writing the text is specific and unique, while at the same time the participants are not located in the same area:

- 3.3 **HKM 4 obv. 4-9** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 124-125

§ ⁴ *a-pé-e-[d]a-[n]i* KUR-*e* ⁵ Š[A GE]ŠTIN ŠA GUD.ĦI.A UDU.ĦI.A ⁶ *uttar kui[t]* ⁷ *maḥḥan nu=[m]u* ⁸ *liliuaḥḥūanz[i]* ⁹ *ḥatrāi* § (end of letter)

Write to me hastily how the situation of the wine, cattle (and) sheep is in that country (of yours, *apedani* KUR-*e*).

There is no textual antecedent of *apedani* in this letter. The only option given the context is that it refers to the country where the addressee stays at the time of writing: “in that country (where you are)”. So what we have here then is the deictic use of *apa-* in relation to the Addressee.

It is not likely to find references to the outside world in historical texts, laws or narrations (myths, literature) given their independence from time, place and person. The exception concerns the only constant factor during the period that we have historical material: the capital Hattusa. When dealing with locations in historical texts etc. it is therefore likely that we will sometimes find deictic references in relation to the unexpressed Deictic Center Hattusa (or Hatti)⁵⁷. The following example, a narration in a letter, illustrates the dependency of Spatial Deictic expressions on the center Hattusa:

3.4 **KUB 19.20 + obv. 9'-13'** (lateMH/MS letter, Suppiluliuma, CTH 154), ed. Van den Hout 1994: 64, 72

^{9'} [^{1D}*Mālan kuit* Š]A LUGAL KUR ^{URU}*Hurri e-de-ez tapuša ēšta* ^{10'} [*n=at IŠTU* NAM.RA GU₄.ĦI.A] UDU.ĦI.A *āššuitt=a šarā dahḥun* ^{11'} [*n=at=za ANA KUR* ^{URU}*Ha*]tti *udahḥun ke-e-ez-zi-ja=kan kuit* ^{12'} [ŠA LUGAL KUR ^{URU}*Hurri t*]apuša *ēšta nu=za apātt=a ANA KUR* ^{URU}*Hatti* ^{13'} [*udahḥun* [What] was alongside [the Mala-river] on the other side (*edez*) belonging to the king of Hurri, I picked [it] up[, including deportees, oxen], sheep, and possessions, and I brought [them to Ha]tti. And also, what was alongside on this side (*kez*) [belonging to the king of Hurri], that *too* [I brought] to Hatti.

This side and *that side* of the river only gain meaning when we take into account that the point from which the world is viewed is Hatti. This combination is only used when there is a border or landmark dividing the (mental) world in a Speaker (+ Addressee) region and an Others region. The proximal demonstrative *ka-* does not refer to entities or location at a short distance from the Speaker but to the area that the Speaker considers as his or hers. The distal demonstrative *asi* is used when the Speaker considers the entity or location as not belonging to his mental or cognitive space but outside of it. On the other hand, the combination *ka-* ... *apa-* is only used when the Speaker wants to divide his/her mental space in an area belonging to him/herself, and an area belonging to an Addressee. Cognitively, the Speaker considers the Addressee as part of his/her mental world, and both are opposed to the Other.

The distinction sketched above seems only to apply to the ablative forms of *ka-*, *apa-* and *asi* denoting relative position or ‘Source from which’. When the location where the action takes place has to be referred to, only the adverbs *ka* ‘here’ and *apiya* ‘there’ are available. A corresponding deictic adverb based on the demonstrative *asi* has not been

⁵⁷ The transfer of the seat of government to Tarhuntassa during the reign of Muwattalli does not concern us here because all the tablets that have been found are related to Hattusa. The situation will of course drastically change when the temporary capital Tarhuntassa with its archives is found.

attested⁵⁸. But that is likely to be coincidence, because every *apiya* referring to a location without textual antecedent is connected with the Addressee and means therefore ‘there, with you’:

3.5 **HKM 18 left edge 2-5** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 148-149

² *halkiš= (š)maš a-pí-ia aniḫanza* ³ *kuit nu EGIR-an tiḫatten* ⁴ *n=an anda ēpten*
*n=an=kan ARÀḫ-ḫi*⁵⁹ ⁵ *anda išḫūitten nu ANA dU[TU-ŠI ḫatrādden]*

Now, given that the grain has been sown over there (*apiya*) with you (pl.), you must lend a hand! You must collect it, shed it in a silo, and [write] to [My] Ma[jesty.]

Every other non-Addressee, third person mention of *apiya* is anaphoric.⁶⁰ This is perfectly in concordance with the dual nature of *apa-*. The expression *apa-* as a demonstrative is Medial (see chapter 5), whereas *apa-* as anaphoric pronoun refers to the third person (see chapters 7, 8 and 9). Just as the third person demonstrative *asi* is not used anaphorically (in the sense of anaphora and continuing the center of attention) and has to be replaced by *apa-* in anaphoric and continuing context, the not attested locative adverb of *asi* is replaced by *apiya* in anaphoric use. More on this in 4.2.2. and 5.2.2.

3.1.3. Direct Speech

Direct Speech is the narrative equivalent of the utterance expressed by a Speaker. The only difference between Direct Speech and an actual utterance is that Direct Speech is anchored within a narrative which is the linguistic, mental, construction of the actual surrounding context. (Schematized in the following table, ‘=’ means ‘corresponds to’.)

| | | |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Real world | = | Mental world evoked by text |
| Utterance Situation | = | Narrated Situation |
| Utterance | = | Reported / Direct Speech |

The narration creates a mental world for the Speaker and Addressee, and within this setting the Direct speech can be compared with a dialogue or monologue. Therefore, the referring expressions in Direct Speech do not refer to elements in the preceding *text*, but to elements of a non-linguistic *context*, set up by means of the story.⁶¹ The narration serves to create a situation in the mind, a mental world, from which the speech act derives its interpretation. Most importantly, “direct speech preserves the orientation to the parameters of the deictic center of the original speech act reported” (Dik 1997a: 96)⁶². For the demonstratives this

⁵⁸ But we do have adjectively used *edi* or *edani* referring to the Location where some event takes place (see Chapter 4).

⁵⁹ Alp reads ARÀḫ-*ten*. The sign is however clearly a ḪI with four ‘Winkelhaken’, whereas TEN only has three. The translation should be adjusted accordingly.

⁶⁰ This distinction between situational and anaphoric use of *apiya* has not been noted anywhere in the Hittitological literature.

⁶¹ It is important to stress this aspect, because I believe that this is one of the reasons why until now the Demonstrative *asi* / *uni* / *eni* has been considered an *anaphoric* pronoun. See Chapter 4.

⁶² See Coulmas 1986, Lucy 1993 for Direct and Indirect Speech.

means that the original deictic distinctions are preserved in the Direct Speech, and that the surrounding narration may provide information on the nature of these deictic distinctions.

In order to establish which expressions in Hittite serve as demonstratives in Situational Use in Direct Speech, I have established the following criteria:

- The Direct Speech containing the expression under investigation should not be a quotation, taken from a larger piece of discourse, as occurring in letters.⁶³ The Direct Speech has to be a closed speech unit, without reference to earlier speech not expressed in the narration. This is necessary in order to avoid drawing conclusions based on incomplete evidence: a partially quoted letter for example may contain an anaphoric reference.
- The Direct Speech has to refer to the world created in the immediate preceding clauses, unless there are very clear clues which lead to earlier referents.
- Only expressions which are first mention of the intended referent are discussed. It is very well possible that demonstratives are used as second mention, as several studies of a variety of languages, and also Hittite, show, but the proto-typical use of demonstratives is the introduction of a referent in the discourse (the centering procedure).

The following two examples illustrate Direct Speech in a narrated situation, showing both the Proximal Demonstrative *ka-* and the Distal Demonstrative *aši*:

3.6 KBo 22.2 obv. 1-2 (OS myth, CTH 3.1A), ed. Otten 1973: 6-7

¹ MUNUS.LUGAL ^{URU}Kaniš XXX DUMU.MEŠ I-EN MU-anti *hāšta UMMA ŠI=MA* ²
[*ki-*]i=ua kuit ualkuan *hāšhun*

The queen of Kanes gave birth to 30 sons in one year. Thus she (said): ‘What is this (*ki*)!? I have given birth to a gang⁶⁴!’

The Queen of Kanesh is looking at her thirty sons which she delivered at the same time. In order to express her horror about the mass of babies⁶⁵ in her immediate vicinity, she shouts: “What is this!”, using the Proximal Demonstrative *ki* (neuter sg.). This is beautifully contrasted with a comparable exclamation in a comparable situation, this time however at a large distance from the newly-born:

⁶³ A nice example of what might dictate the use of demonstratives in citations from a letter is the following Mašat letter (HKM 10). The king answers a letter from Gassu, but before giving his instructions he each time repeats the relevant part of Gassu’s letter. In obv. 17-22 the king reacts on the information Gassu sends him: ‘Given that you wrote to me as follows: “The Gasgaeans are just arriving in large numbers in peace at the moment you, My Majesty, are writing to me”. Send the Gasgaeans that arrive in peace over to My Majesty.’ The next paragraph deals with a comment on an action of Gassu dealing with the peace business: ‘Given that you wrote to me as follows: “Until you, My Majesty, write to me (about) *ki-i* ŠA LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}Gašga takšulaš *uttar*, this peace business of the Gasgaeans, I shall wait for instructions in Ishupitta”. Because the gods already [...], you keep exhausting me, in that you keep writing to me the same thing!’ (ed. Alp 1991: 134, translation follows CHD P: 117). Obviously the two citations belong together. The demonstrative description *ki ... uttar* is therefore not Deictic, but refers to a part of the preceding discourse and is therefore Discourse Deictic. Thus, first mentions of demonstratives in citations of letters cannot be taken as examples of Situational use.

⁶⁴ For *walkuan* as ‘gang’, see Hoffner 1980: 290 + n. 27.

⁶⁵ The neuter demonstrative *ki* could also refer to the situation the queen perceives, the event itself.

3.7 **KUB 44.4+ rev. 9** (MH birth ritual, CTH 767), ed. Beckman 1983: 176-177

⁹ AMA DUMU.NITA *taškupait nu=ššan* GAM AN-za ^dU-aš *aušta e-ni=ma=ua* *kuit*
The mother of the male child cried out (after the birth of her child), and the Stormgod
looked down from heaven: “What is that (*eni*)!?”

Here, the distance between the referent (the child) and the Speaker (the Stormgod), is maximally large (earth versus heaven). Contrary to common opinion in the literature on Hittite, *aši/uni/eni* functions as a Distal Demonstrative. The Stormgod reacts on a noise from far away, and this example may therefore be compared with the use of the Lillooet invisible distal demonstrative *k^wu*: *stám=k^wu* ‘What is that?’ (when hearing a noise), see ex. 2.34. Another example of Distal *aši*, also referring to a non-visible entity, is⁶⁶:

3.8 **KBo 4.14 ii 73-80** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 123), ed. Van den Hout 1989: 290 (with collation from CHD L-N: 129)

§ ⁷³ [*m*]*ann=a=mu=kan* 1 KUR-TUM *kuitki* GAM-an *niḫari* ⁷⁴ [*n*]*ašma=mu=kan*
EN.MEŠ *kuiēšqa* ṣ *allallā pānzi* ⁷⁵ [*z*]*ik=ma=šmaš=kan anda ḫandāši nu kišan* ⁷⁶
mematti GÉŠPU-*aḫḫir=ua=mu n=at lē DÜ-ši* ⁷⁷ GAM-an MAMIT GAR-ru
§ ⁷⁸ *našma=at zik* ṣ *mališi a-ši=man=ua=kan* ZAG[-*aš* GAM-an] ⁷⁹ *niḫari*
našma=<m>an=ua=kan u-ni-uš E N.MEŠ *alla[llā]* ⁸⁰ *pānzi ūqq=a=man=ua*
pēḫudanzi ...

And if some single country turns away from me, or some lords commit treason against me, (if then) *you* join with them, and you speak in this way: “They *forced* me!”, you may not do it! Let (it) be put under Oath. § Or, (if) *you* contemplate it: “Would that border (*asi* ZAG-*as*) but fall away, or would those lords (*unius* EN.MES) but commit treason and would they but lead *me* off (with them)!” ...

One could object that *aši* is not necessarily a Distal Demonstrative here. The alternative, a Medial interpretation, would mean that the entity referred to by *aši* is either close to an Addressee (and not close to Speaker), or at a distance near, but not proximal, to the Speaker, or both. A distance near but not proximal to Speaker is very unlikely when the referent is a border country of Hatti. One would then have to assume that the Speaker is looking at this border country from a short distance, still standing in Hatti. Nothing in the text points at this very specific situation. The other option, close to Addressee, does not apply to this direct speech, simply because there is no Addressee. The demonstrative *asi*, and its acc.pl. *unius*, is therefore Distal. Further elaborations are found in the chapters on the individual demonstratives (Chapters 4, 5 and 6).

There are not many occurrences of Situational *apa-* in Direct Speech, but each time there exists a connection with the Addressee and never with the Other. Generally the demonstrative *apa-* is described as having both ‘Du-Deixis’ (Medial, near Addressee) and ‘Jener-Deixis’ (Distal) (Friedrich HE, 66, 134-5), or only Distal Deixis (‘jener, dér (erwähnte)’, Friedrich & Kammenhuber 1975: 130)⁶⁷. However, there is no evidence which

⁶⁶ For *aši* referring to visible entities, see the examples in chapter 4.

⁶⁷ Puhvel 1984: 86 does not describe *apa-* in terms of deixis. He notices however that *apa-* is the opposite of *ka-*, and also that *apa-* may refer to the second person: one of the meanings of *apa-* is ‘thy, thine, your(s)’ (vs. *ka-* ‘this; my, mine’, like Lat. *iste* vs. *hic*). He lets *apa-* correspond with *is*, *iste* and *ille* (p. 90).

supports the ‘Jener-Deictic’ aspect of *apa-*. On the contrary, the few attestations of Situational *apa-* in True Situational Use and Direct Speech point at the Addressee⁶⁸ (see also ex. 3.5 above, and 3.9 below):

3.9 **KBo 19.44+ rev. 38-42** (MH/MS treaty, CTH 42), transl. Beckman 1996: 28

^mMarijaš kuiš ēšta n=aš kuedani uddanī³⁹ BA.ÚŠ ŪL fS UḪUR.LAL ṛiḷattat
apāš=a=kan anda aušzi⁴⁰ ABI dUTU-ŠI=ma=kan imma GIŠAB-az arḫa aušzi
n=an uāštul IŠBAT⁴¹ zik=uā=kan a-pu-u-un anda kuuat aušta n=aš apēdani
uddanī⁴² šer BA.ÚŠ

Who was Mariya, and for what reason did he die? Did not a lady’s maid walk by? So he makes eye contact (with her), while, of all people, the father of His Majesty looks out the window⁶⁹, and catches him in the act: “You! why did you make eye contact with her (*apun*)?” So he died for *that* reason.

Obviously the woman is near the Addressee. Not surprisingly, the main text genres which contain this Medial *apa-* are letters, treaties, instructions and Direct Speech with an active Addressee.

As will be discussed in Chapters 7, 8 and 9, the major use of demonstrative *apa-* is anaphoric, emphatic reference⁷⁰.

3.1.4. Linguistic Selfreference

As Himmelmann (1996: 221) points out, self-referential expressions of the kind of *in this book, this is a story* are usually subsumed under Discourse Deixis, or reference to propositions or events. Although expressions like *this is a story* are indeed referring to propositions, events or larger parts of discourse, the main difference between discourse deixis and situational self-reference is the equivalence of the latter expression with the pure situational use of demonstratives as in *this is a dog*.

Given the specialized context, self-reference to a linguistic unit or act, we expect to find only words like ‘book’, ‘article’, ‘story’, ‘words’ in this category of situational use. The possible candidates for Hittite then, are *tuppi* ‘tablet’, *memiya(n)-* ‘word, affair’, *lingai-* ‘oath (as text genre)’, *ishiul* ‘treaty’. The main problem here is to define whether an expression is discourse deictic or situational. Clearcut expressions like ‘on this tablet’ are self-referential: the expression is contained on the referent itself. Given the immediate presence of the entity referred to, it is hardly surprising that the Proximal Demonstrative *ka-* is the only one attested in this type of situational use:

3.10 **KUB 21.1+ iii 73-75** (NH treaty, Muwatalli, CTH 76), ed. Friedrich 1930: 76-77

⁶⁸ Of course, when *apa-* is used non-situationally, it always refers to an earlier mentioned third person or location, most of the time emphatically, see Chapters 7, 8 and 9.

⁶⁹ Beckman 1996: 28 different: “Did not a lady’s maid walk by and he look at her? But the father of My Majesty himself looked out the window ...”.

⁷⁰ This might be in accordance with the view of Keenan & Anderson (1985: 283ff.) that in both distance-oriented and person-oriented systems the middle term is often used for anaphoric reference, if it were not for the fact that in Hittite *all* demonstratives can be used anaphorically.

§ ⁷³ *namma ki-i kuit TUPPU tuk* ^m*Ala[kšandu ijan]ūn* ⁷⁴ *n=e=ta=kkan* MU.KAM-ti MU.KAM-ti *peran* 3-š[U *halzeššan*]du ⁷⁵ *n=at=za=kan zik* ^m*Alakšanduš šaki*
 Furthermore, this tablet (*ki TUPPU*) that I have [made] for *you* Ala[ksandu], let the[m read] it to you every year three ti[mes]. *You*, Alaksandu, have to be familiar with it!

‘This tablet’ refers to the physical tablet on which the treaty between Muwatalli II and Alaksandus of Wilusa has been written down.

But problems arise when studying clauses containing, for example, *memiya(n)*- ‘word, affair, business’. Both discourse deixis and linguistic self-reference are possible. I quote two of Himmelmann’s examples, one, 3.11, listed under linguistic self-reference, the other, 3.12, under discourse deixis:

3.11 it’s very funny to make this telling

3.12 then he goes off, . . . and that’s the end of that story, . . .

In 3.12, ‘that story’ refers to the preceding utterances that together build the story. The reason why it does not refer to itself, is that the Head (= the noun) of the noun phrase ‘the end of that story’ can only refer to the preceding clause because of the phrase ‘that’s’. This phrase can only be used to refer to a *preceding* proposition, excluding self-reference of *that story*. Usually however, it is problematic to distinguish between these two types unless the demonstrative refers to a physical entity which is present in the surrounding situation, as *tuppi* ‘tablet’ above. I therefore consider all references to non-physical linguistic units in Hittite as discourse deictic.

3.1.5. Summary and conclusions

Hittite has a three-way person-based demonstrative system. The Proximal demonstrative is *ka-*, the Distal demonstrative is *asi*, and the Medial one is *apa-*. The middle term denotes ‘location near Hearer/Addressee’, and not ‘medial distance from Speaker’. Visibility or non-visibility is probably not a part of the semantics of the Distal Demonstrative.

Most examples in this section are centering (see also Chapter 4, 5 and 6 in the Situational sections). There are however two examples of deictic demonstratives referring to something that is already in the center of attention: the mother looking at her 30 babies in ex. 3.6 and the stormgod who is alerted after hearing the cries in ex. 3.7. But since these referents are not an already established Topic, they have to be Unexpected Topics (see Chapter 4 for more discussion). Not surprisingly the expressions that were chosen to refer to something in the center of attention are demonstrative *pronouns*. This distinction between demonstrative pronouns referring to salient entities and demonstrative descriptions (*dem* + N) referring to non-salient entities is discussed in Chapters 4 and 6.

For the deictic or situational use we have:

| <i>Deictic / Situational Use</i> | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------------------------------|
| Continuity procedure | | | Centering procedure |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus |
| <i>dem</i> | <i>dem</i> | <i>dem</i> | <i>dem N</i> <i>dem. adverb</i> |

Table 3.1: The Deictic/Situational matrix.

The details of this matrix have not been discussed in 3.1. but come from the concluding sections in chapters 4, 5 and 6. Slots that could theoretically be filled but for which we have no Hittite evidence given the preserved contexts, will be indicated in the tables by \emptyset .

3.2. Deixis and the centering procedure — Recognitional Use of Demonstratives

3.2.1. Introduction

As discussed in 2.2.1.2., demonstrative adnominals are used when the Speaker needs to activate some shared private information which is stored in the long-term memory of the Hearer. I assume that the recognitional use of the demonstratives appears mainly in contexts where an active role of the Addressee/Hearer is to be expected. This remains implicit in the literature on this subject, although all examples are taken from conversation or oral narration, but it needs to be stressed because it delimits the text genres in which to expect the recognitional use of demonstratives in Hittite. Of the genres available to us (judicial, narration, myth, vows, letters, historical narrative, administrative, treaty, instruction, oracle), I suggest that the genres involving more or less active Hearers or Addressees, are letters, vows (which can be considered as a ‘dialogue’ between the person promising something and the deity), narration addressing an audience, Direct Speech —either monologue or dialogue— and oracles (a true dialogue between deity and man).

The following criteria were used to identify recognitionally used demonstratives in Hittite:

- *The demonstrative is adnominal.* In most languages demonstratives in recognitional use can only appear adnominally.
- *The information contained in the demonstrative expression must be private.* This means that expressions obeying all other criteria, while at the same time referring to kings, countries and other referents that may be understood as belonging to general or cultural knowledge of the Hittite speech community are excluded.
- *The demonstrative expression may not refer to something in the presence of the Speaker.*

These three criteria are essential for all types of recognitionally used demonstratives. The following ones are not as important, but add to the likelihood that a demonstrative expression is recognitional.

- *The demonstrative expression is the first mention in the discourse.* This poses a problem for Hittite given the sometimes pitiful state of the tablets.
- *The demonstrative expression includes a relative clause or other equally complex modifier.* The inclusion of additional information in order to better guide the addressee in identifying the intended referent is however not necessary.
- *The demonstrative expression does not serve to resolve a possible ambiguity.* Ambiguity resolution is a task belonging to the domain of anaphoric (or tracking)

demonstratives. In order not to include possible anaphoric demonstratives in this category, the preceding text should be free of competing discourse entities. (But let me note here that ambiguity resolution is hardly attested in relation to Hittite demonstratives.)

3.2.2. Recognitionally used *ka-*, *apa-*, *aši*

The demonstrative thus used is usually the distal demonstrative *aši*. However, also the other two may be used in this way, although this is rare. The following examples are illustrative for the recognitional use of the three demonstratives.

3.13 KUB 15.3 i 17-19 (NH vow, Hattusili III, CTH 584), ed. De Roos 1984: 198, 337

§ ¹⁷ Û -TUM MUNUS.LUGAL *zašḫija=ua=mu kuiški memiškizzi* ¹⁸ ANA
^dNIN.GAL=ua=za=kan *kišan maldi mān=ua* ANA ^dUTU-ŠI ¹⁹ *e-ni IZI ŠA GÌR.MEŠ-*
ŠU nuntaraš SIG₅-ri ...

A dream of the Queen. “Someone tells me in a dream: “Make Ningal the following vow: If that (*eni*) burning of My Majesty’s feet (lit: that fire of his feet for My Majesty) will subside soon, ...”

The Addressee of the Direct Speech reported in the dream is Puduhepa, the wife of Hattusili. We can safely assume that the inflammation of her husband’s feet belongs to the domain of private knowledge, and that her husband and his painful feet are not present when she is stating her vow. The reference to this particular illness is made for the first time in this text, so the information presented here is ‘Discourse new, Hearer old’. The expression *eni IZI ŠA GÌR.MEŠ-ŠU* is accompanied by the possessive clitic *-ŠU* ‘his’ and a further modification ANA ^dUTU-ŠI ‘for My Majesty’. The last feature of recognitional use of the demonstrative, absence of ambiguity due to lack of competing participants, is also present.

Another example of Recognitionally used *aši* in an oracle is:

3.14 KUB 5.1 rev. iii 48-49 (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 561⁷¹), ed. Ünal 1974: 72-73

§ ⁴⁸ *u-ni-uš=za=kan kuēš Û.MEŠ ḪUL-luš uškizzi* ISKIM.ḪI.A=ia=za *arpuuanta* ⁴⁹
kikištari ...

As for those (*unius*) evil dreams which he keeps seeing and the negative premonitions that keep occurring, ...

The Addressee is the deity. The oracle inquirer refers to some nightmares the king is having, which obviously does not belong to general knowledge.

Although in many languages the distal demonstrative is used (Himmelman 1996: 235), Himmelman 1997: 71 remarks that also non-distal demonstratives can be used in this way. And indeed, there are a few examples of Medial *apa-* functioning as a recognitional demonstrative in my corpus (see also Chapter 5):

3.15 KUB 15.1 iii 7’-14’ (NH vow, CTH 584, Hattusili III), ed. De Roos 1984: 186, 328-9

⁷¹ For the dating on Tudhaliya IV see Orlamünde 2001: 511ff.

§ 7' [Û-TUM MUNUS.LUGA]L INIM ^dGur_uaš_u=kan ku_uapi [anda] ^{8'}
^[dGu]r_uaš_uš=kan GIM-an ŠÀ Û-TI ^{9'} [AN]A MUNUS.LUGAL IQBI a-pu-u-un=ua kuin
^{10'} ŠA L ÚMUDI=KA INIM-an ZI-za ħarti ^{11'} nu=ur=aš TI-anza 1 ME
 MU.KAM.ĤI.A=ia=ua=šši ^{12'} piħhi MUNUS.LUGAL=ma=za=kan ŠÀ Û-TI kišan
 IKRUB ^{13'} mān=ua=mu apēnišš_uan ijaši ^{14'} nu=ua LUGAL MUDI=YA TI-anza ...
 [Dream of the Queen]n: When the affair of Gurwasu [...], after [Gu]rwasu had
 said [to] the Queen in a dream: “As for that (*apun*) situation of your husband which
 has your attention, he will live and I will give him a 100 years”, the Queen promised
 as follows in a dream: “If you do like *that*, and the King, my husband will live, ...

Given that every paragraph in the vows stands on its own, it is very probable that the previous, broken, paragraph, has no ties to this one. The clause *apūn=ua kuin ŠA LÚMUDI=KA INIM-an* is therefore a first mention. The situation of the queen's husband is private and not cultural knowledge. A possible hint in that direction is the use of the term ‘my husband’ instead of ‘the king’. As in the preceding example, the Hittite population is not likely to be aware of the affairs current in the palace, either concerning the health of the royal family or state affairs.

The use of Medial *apa-* as a Recognitional demonstrative can be explained by the fact that the Hittite demonstrative system is person-based⁷². As the exx. 3.13 and 3.14 show, the referents of ‘burning’ and ‘dreams’ do not belong to the domain of either Speaker or Addressee, whereas the ‘husband’ in ex. 3.15 is intimately connected with the Addressee. This raises the question whether also the proximal demonstrative *ka-* can be used Recognitionally.

There are a few examples of the proximal demonstrative *ka-* obeying several of the criteria described above (see 6.3.). In these cases the person referred to by *this* is not present in the physical context and the demonstrative is used adnominally:

3.16 **KBo 4.14 ii 22-23** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 123), ed. Van den Hout 1989: 284-285

²² LÚKÚR=ia=mu kuiš ka-a-aš LUGAL K[UR AŠŠUR GUB-a]nza n=aš=mu=kan ²³
 mān ŠÀ KUR.URU uizzi nu=tt[a ħink]an ZAG-aš ēšdu
 And concerning this (*kas*) enemy, the king of [Assur who is ris]ing up against me, if
 he comes into my country, let [dea]th be your end.

The enemy has already been mentioned before several times and is therefore not ‘Discourse new, Hearer old’ in Diessel's terms. However, there seems to be some overlapping between Recognitional demonstratives and Anaphoric demonstratives referring to referents that are no longer salient (see Himmelman 1996: 236-239). The existence of a Recognitional *ka-* would certainly fit in the personal-based system of Hittite where Recognitional *apa-* already indicates that something belongs to the domain of the Addressee, and Recognitional *aši* that something belongs to the domain of the Other.

I wonder whether a constructed example like the following represents a recognitional use of the English proximal demonstrative:

3.17 You know, this friend of mine that visited me last year?

⁷² Himmelman 1996, 1997 does not explain why also non-distal demonstratives can be used recognitionally.

In the preceding examples the referents of the recognitional demonstratives were restricted to objects or persons. The following texts show us how the distal demonstrative can be used to refer to *events*⁷³ that were both familiar to Speaker and Addressee, but not yet introduced in the discourse:

3.18 **KUB 22.70 obv. 61-63** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 74-75

§⁶¹ *e-ni=ma kuit* MUNUS.LUGAL UN.MEŠ-šuš *katta* GUL-anteš ANA ^dUTU-ŠI IŠPUR
^dUTU-ŠI=ma=kan *memian menahḫanda kaništa* ⁶² *nu kiššan IQBI lē=ua=mu*
kuitki mematteni n=aš=kan šer karuššijāt nu mān ANA DINGIR-LIM ⁶³ *apāt kuitki*
TUKU.TUKU-az DÙ-at ...

As for that (fact) (*eni*), that the queen wrote to the king about the people who were beaten up, and (that) the king recognized the affair facing (him), and thus said: “You (pl.) must not tell me anything!”, and (that) he became silent (about it), if *that* became (a reason for) some anger for the deity, ...

This whole project of covering something up has not been mentioned before in this completely preserved oracle text. The *eni kuit* clause obviously introduces an event into the discourse that happened somewhere in the past. This passage makes furthermore clear that the deity is well aware of what happened, and that the affair might even have disturbed the deity. The event is not only not part of the physical surroundings and part of the shared knowledge of speaker (oracle inquirer) and addressee (deity), but is also private information. As with the example of the painful feet of the king (ex. 3.13), the assumption that the cover-up operation belongs to general knowledge is unlikely.

3.2.3. Summary

The organization of the Hittite deictic demonstrative system around Speaker, Addressee and Other is mirrored in the recognitional use of demonstratives. The proximal *ka-*, medial *apa-* and distal *aši* are all allowed in constructions where the Speaker wants to evoke in the mind of the Addressee some pre-existing mental representation of an entity or event. The knowledge thus derived from the memory of the Addressee has to be shared and private, otherwise Recognitionals are not used (see 2.2.1.2.). Recognitional demonstratives already occur in Old Hittite (see Chapter 4).

In 3.2.1. I stated that the nature of Recognitionally used demonstratives requires more or less active Addressees. The appropriate genres in Hittite could be letters, vows, narration addressing an audience, Direct Speech and oracles. Indeed Recognitional demonstratives are attested in vows, narration addressing an audience (which includes treaties), Direct Speech and oracles.

It has not been recognized before in linguistic or typological literature that in a person-based system all demonstratives can be used recognitionally.

Recognitionally used demonstratives are always centering and Focus.

| |
|--------------------------|
| <i>Recognitional Use</i> |
|--------------------------|

⁷³ Reference to events should actually fall under Discourse Deixis. The similarities however between the *eni kuit* syntagm and Recognitional *aši kuis* N are such that I believe that in this case the distinction between Discourse Deixis and Recognitional Use cannot be upheld.

| Continuity procedure | | | Centering procedure |
|----------------------|---------|---------|---------------------|
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus |
| — | — | — | <i>dem N</i> |

Table 3.2: The Recognitional matrix.

3.3. Anaphora and the continuity procedure

In this section I will discuss reference to discourse entities that are salient. As explained in 2.2.3.2, salient entities are usually referred to by zero, enclitics or unaccented pronouns. In these cases the entity referred to is the Established Topic. However, salient entities can also be referred to by accented pronouns. The difference with the other expressions is that the entity is now either an Unestablished Topic or in Focus. This works perfectly for Hittite.

3.3.1. The enclitic pronoun *-a-* and zero indicating the Established Topic

Enclitic pronouns and zero's (usually the subject), being Established Topics, are always in the highest focus of attention (see also 2.2.3.2.):

3.19 **KBo 3.34 ii 1-7** (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 44-45

¹ *mZidi* ^{LÚ}ZABAR.DAB *ēšta* ABI LUGAL ^{DUG}[*har*]*harān* [GEŠTIN-*it*] ² *ANA* ^f*Hišta-*
ijara ^m*Maratti* *ja* *manijahhiš* ³ LUGAL-*i* SIG₅-*antan* GEŠTIN-*an* *hinkatta* (*ø*)
apēdašš=a ⁴ *tamain* GEŠTIN-*an* *pijer* *apāšš=a* *uit* LUGAL-*i* *tet* ⁵ *natta* *apūn*
GEŠTIN-*an* *pijer* LUGAL-*uš* *kuin* ⁶ *aušta* *apāšš=a* *uit* QATAMMA IQBI *š=a* *an=ašta*!
⁷ *arha* *pēhuter* *š=a* *an* *ēššikir* *š=a* *aš* BA.ÚŠ

Zidi was a 'bronze bowl keeper'. The father of the king assigned a *harhara*-vessel with wine to Histayara and Maratti. He (Zidi, *ø*) provided the *king* with good wine, (but) to *them* other wine was given! Thereupon one said to the king: 'They did not give *that* wine which the king has seen'. And the other came and spoke likewise. So they brought him (*-an*) away, worked him (*-an*) over, and he (*-as*) died.

Zidi is introduced as the discourse topic in the first clause. He is therefore highly salient throughout the paragraph. This is probably the reason that there is no need to use his name at the end of line 6 after a break of four sentences. The other participants, the king, Histayara and Maratti are either referred to by a definite noun phrase or accented pronouns.

As we have seen in 2.1.3.2.1. (ex. 2.16), a highly salient entity may still be expressed as an accented pronoun if the referent is not expected as an argument of the predicate (in FG terms) of the clause. But here all predicates occurring with Zidi as an argument stand in a logical relation with what Zidi actually did: deceiving the king.

3.3.2. The accented pronoun *apa-* as Unestablished Topic expression

In the preceding example Zidi remained a highly salient topic and the predicates in which he appeared as an argument were not contra-expectational. The following example differs in the aspect of contra-expectation only:

3.20 **KUB 36.104 obv. 9'-11'** (OS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 32-33

§ ^{9'} KUR Arzauīa mNunnu LÚ ^{URU}Hurm[(a)] ʾēšta[(KÙ.BABBAR=ī)a GUŠKI(N)] ^{10'}
[n]atta udai kuit ūemizz[(i a-pa-)] ʾa-l-ša p[ar(na=šša pittaizzi)] ^{11'} [(š=)]an LÚ
^{URU}Hundarā išiaḥḥiš

In Arzawa Nunnu was the representative of Hurma. But he did not bring in the silver and gold. Whatever he found, *he* (surprisingly) carried (it) to his estate. The representative of Hundara denounced him.

Again, the referent, Nunnu, is the discourse topic and remains in the center of attention, so nothing should have prevented a zero for the subject 'he'. The Topic *apas* of the clause *a-pa-a-ša parna=šša pittaizzi* is selected from an implied set of competing referents, as in the Implicitly Contrastive Topic in 2.2.3.3.2. The implication is that *he* takes the collected taxes to his own estate while *other* ambassadors would have taken it to the palace. In other words, the content of the VP in relation to the Subject-topic is highly unexpected. This is indicated by *-a/-ma*. The use of *apa-* with *-a/-ma* is described in 9.4.3.

Another, more familiar, context for the accented pronoun is topic-shift. The pronoun *apas* is in that case referring to the less topical, but still salient entity (2.2.3.3.1.).

3.21 **IBoT 1.36 i 33-37** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991: 8-9

mān=an_i=za=kan ³⁴ šēḥunanza=pat tamāšzi n=a[š_i A]NA LÚMEŠEDUTIM
hūmandāš ³⁵ EGIR-an hūuāi nu=šši_i kuiš LÚ[MEŠE]DI_j piraššit artari ³⁶ nu=šši_j
tezzi_i DUGkaltija=ua kattan paimi_i a-pa-a-ša_j parā dametani ³⁷ LÚMEŠEDI_k tezzi
a-pa-ša_k parā LÚtarriianalli tezzi

Only if a bodily urge bothers him_i, he_j will move behind all the guards, and the bodyguard_j who stands before him_i, to him_j he_i will say: "I_i will go to the pot." *He_j* then says (it) forth to another bodyguard_k, *he_k* then says (it) forth to a man of third rank.

There are several persons that are salient at some point of the discourse. The first topic switch occurs after *nu=šši tezzi* (+ Direct speech) 'to him he will say: ...'. The bodyguard has expressed his needs to his fellow guard who then has to pass the message to his neighbour in turn. This switch of topic-subject is indicated by means of the accented pronoun *apa-* with *-a/-ma*.

3.3.3. The accented pronoun *apa-* as Argument Focus expression

The pronoun *apa-* is also used to indicate the Focus in a clause. Typically, in Hittite the referents of Focal *apa-* are highly salient and sometimes even the Topic of the preceding clause (see 2.2.3.3.3.).

In the following I will concentrate on Counter-presuppositional Focus. The main function of this type of Focus is countering a possible existing representation in the mind of an Addressee. Dik 1997: 332 distinguishes five types of Counter-presuppositional Focus: Rejecting, Selecting, Replacing, Expanding and Restricting Focus. The last three are

illustrated by means of some Hittite examples. There were no examples of Rejecting Focus in my corpus, and for Selecting Focus I refer to chapter 8.

3.3.3.1. Replacing Focus

The speaker assumes that the addressee might have some incorrect information. Replacing Focus replaces that information by the correct information. The following example is adapted from Dik 1997: 333 (ex. 48):

- 3.22 S assumes that A might think: John bought apples
S corrects: (He didn't buy APPLES,) he bought BANANAS

In the second part of the construction the idea that he bought something is presupposed. BANANAS is the Replacing Focus. Similarly, in Hittite the predicate containing the Replacing Focus is also presupposed:

- 3.23 **IBoT 1.36 i 20-21** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991: 4 -5

... *n=ašta mān* ²¹ *appizziš* DUMU.É.GAL *parā uizzi n=an=ši* LÚ.ŠUKUR.GUŠKIN
ŪL pāi n=ašta kuuapi parā GAL-iš DUMU.É.GAL *uizzi naššu* UGULA.10 *našma*
NIMGIR.ÉRIN.MEŠ [^{LÚ}MEŠ]EDI *uizzi nu* GI *a-pe-e-da-ni pianzi*

If a low-ranking palace-attendant comes forth, the golden-spear man does not give it (a key) to him. When a high-ranking palace attendant comes forth, or an overseer of 10 or an army-bailiff (or) [a gua]rd, they give the key to him (*apedani*).

The negating part is *n=an=ši* LÚ.ŠUKUR.GUŠKIN *ŪL pāi* 'the golden-spear man does not give it (a key) to him', the correcting part is *nu* GI *a-pe-e-da-ni pianzi* 'they give the key to him.' The *nu* GI ... *pianzi* is presupposed (and therefore has to be unaccented), so that the Focus information 'to him' has to be expressed by means of an accented pronoun. Note that *=ši* 'to him' could have been used if just the cognitive status of the referent is taken into account and not also the Topic-Focus distribution in the clause: the referent is introduced in the immediately preceding clause by means of a 'staging' predicate 'to come' (as in i 21). Typically, the accented pronoun indicating Replacing Focus holds *preverbal position* (see further chapter 8).

3.3.3.2. Expanding Focus

The speaker assumes that the addressee might have some correct information, but that it is not complete (Dik 1997: 333-334). Expanding Focus replaces that information by the correct information. The following example is adapted from Dik 1997: 284 (ex. 49):

- 3.24 S assumes that A might think: John bought apples
S corrects: Not only JOHN bought apples, also PETE did.

Hittite is somewhat different, because the predicate is necessarily repeated:

- 3.25 S assumes that A might think: John bought apples

S corrects: Not only JOHN bought apples, also PETE bought apples/something to eat.

For more discussion see chapter 7.

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

*ABU=ŠU=ua=šši kuiš LUGAL KUR HATTI ēšta nu=uar=aš UR.SAG-iš LUGAL-uš ēšta*¹¹ *nu=ua=za KUR.KUR.MEŠ LÚKÚR tar(a)hhan harta nu=uar=aš=za DINGIR-LIM-iš DÙ-at DUMU-ŠU=ma=ua=šši=za=kan*¹² *kuiš ANA GIŠGU.ZA ABI=ŠU ešat nu=ua a-pa-a-aš-ša karū LÚKAL-anza ēšta*¹³ *nu=uar=an irmaliḫattat nu=ua=za a-pa-a-aš-ša DINGIR-LIM-iš kišat*

His father, who was the king of the Hittites, was a heroic king, and held the enemy countries under control. (Then) 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, but he became ill, and he too (*apass=a*) became a god.

The information that needs to be expanded upon is *nu=uar=aš UR.SAG-iš LUGAL-uš ēšta* ‘(he) was a heroic king’ and *nu=uar=aš=za DINGIR-LIM-iš DÙ-at* ‘He became a god’. But this information does not only apply to the father of the king, as one might think, it also applies to his son Arnuwanda: *nu=ua a-pa-a-aš-ša karū LÚKAL-anza ēšta* ‘he too was in the past a strong man’ and *nu=ua=za a-pa-a-aš-ša DINGIR-LIM-iš kišat* ‘He too became a god’. Again, the Focus pronoun *apa-* with additive focus particle *=ya* ‘also, too’ refers to a referent that is salient and the expected Topic. The accented pronoun indicating Expanding Focus always holds *first position* (Initial Position is defined as the position preceding the clitic chain in Wackernagel’s position, First Position follows Wackernagel’s position).

3.3.3.3. Restricting Focus

The speaker assumes that the addressee might have some correct information, but also thinks that something else is true. This last part of information needs correction (Dik 1997: 334). Restricting Focus replaces that part of the information by the correct information. The following example is adapted from Dik l.c. (ex. 50):

3.27 S assumes that A might think: John bought apples and bananas

S corrects: He only bought APPLES

3.28 **KBo 6.2 i 16-19** (OS laws, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 24

§¹⁶ [(*takk*)]u LÚ.U₁₉LU-an *kuiški hūnikzi t=an ištarnikzi nu apūn*¹⁷ *šāktāizzi pēdi=šši=ma LÚ.U₁₉LU-an pāi nu É-ri=šši*¹⁸ *anniškizzi kuitmān=aš lāzziatta mān=aš lazziatta=ma*¹⁹ *nu=šše 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi LÚA.ZU=ja kuššan a-pa-a-aš-pat pai §*

If anyone injures a (free) person and incapacitates him, he shall provide medical care for him, 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. When he recovers, he (the offender) shall pay him 6 sheqels and the doctor’s fee, he shall pay (it) instead (*of the patient*)⁷⁴.

⁷⁴ Hoffner l.c.: “and shall pay the physician’s fee as well”.

As we can see, the Hittites in the older period did not bother to indicate what person was meant by *he*. We can only assume that the semantics of the predicate restrict the possible referents, and that subject-switches need therefore not to be indicated by lexical noun phrases.

One might expect that the one who is injured pays part of the doctor's fee, and that the injurer shares the bill. The restrictive particle *pat* indicates that the bill is not supposed to be paid by the injured party. Again, the referent of *apas-pat* is highly salient and both the sentence and discourse topic.

3.3.4. The demonstratives

3.3.4.1. Introduction

In 2.3.3.4. I listed two uses of salient demonstratives that are considered typologically valid:

- Immediate anaphora after first mention
- Demarcating discourse units

I tentatively proposed to consider Immediate anaphora after first mention also as a variant of demarcating a discourse unit. In this section (3.3.4.) I want to see whether the same conclusions can be reached for the Hittite salient demonstratives. Moreover, I will discuss the differences between demonstrative NPs and 'definite' NPs on the one hand, and between the demonstrative NPs themselves.

A first clue to the understanding of the use of salient anaphoric demonstratives in Hittite is hidden in the Bronzetablet, a treaty which describes -among other things- the establishment of the borders between Hatti and the vice-kingdom of Tarhuntassa. The border description is usually expressed as: 'His border (as seen) from city X is city Y₁ (,Y₂ ...). City Y₁ (,Y₂ ...) lie(s) in Hulaya riverland'. The expression of the second mention of Y₁ (,Y₂ ...) depends on the number of cities mentioned in the preceding clause. When the number of cities is just one or two, the names are repeated:

3.29 **Bo 86/299 i 32-33** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 12-13

³² URU *Uššaz* = šši URU *Zarataš* ZAG-aš URU *Zarataš* = ma = kan ³³ INA KUR ^{ID} *Hūlaia*
āššanza

His border (as seen) from Ussa is Zarata. *Zarata* lies in Hulaya riverland.

3.30 **Bo 86/299 i 26-28** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 10-11

²⁶ *nu* = šši IŠTU KUR URU *Pitašša* IŠTU ZAG URU *Arimatta* ²⁷ URU *Nahhantaš*
URU *Hauttaššašša* = a ZAG-aš URU *Nahhantaš* = ma = kan ²⁸ URU *Hauttaššašša* = a INA KUR
^{ID} *Hūlaia* *āššanteš* §

His border (as seen) from the country Pitassa, from the border of Arimatta, is Nahhanta and Hauttassa. *Nahhanta* and *Hauttassa* lie in Hulaya riverland.

But when the number of cities exceeds two, the repetition of names is replaced by the phrase *kus* URU^{DIDLI.HIA} 'these cities':

3.31 **Bo 86/299 i 50-52** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 12-13

^{URU}Ušaulaz=ma=šši ZAG-za ^{URU}Haššuwantaš ⁵¹ ^{URU}Milaš ^{URU}Palmataš ^{URU}Hašhašaš
^{URU}Šuraš ^{URU}Šimmuwantaš ⁵² ZAG-aš ku-u-uš=ma=kan ^{URU}^{DIDL.HIA}INA KUR
^{ID}Hūlaia āššanteš §

His border (as seen) from the border of Usaula, is Hassuwanta, Mila, Palmata, Hashasa, Sura, (and) Simmuwanta. These (*kus*= ...) cities lie in Hulaya riverland.

The replacement of a list of nouns by means of a demonstrative description occurs also in other texts. Example 3.32 shows a list of similar entities, persons, replaced by a demonstrative description, whereas example 3.33 illustrates the use of a demonstrative *pronoun* when the list consists of nouns not belonging to the same class:

3.32 KUB 23.72+ obv. 32-35 (MH/MS treaty, CTH 146)

§ ³² ^mWalūa-LÚ-iš LÚ ^{URU}Šullamma ^mKāšījaraš LÚ ^{URU}Zanzaliya ^mAritku LÚ
^{URU}Lillima ³³ ^mMa<š>hūilū LÚ ^{URU}Hinzūta ^mŠantaš LÚ ^{URU}Wattarušna ^mHalpaš
^mŠiušaš LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}An[.....] ³⁴ ^mUšapaš LÚ ^{URU}Tahhīša ^mPaḥāuwaš LÚ
^{URU}Alatarma ^mAkarkiš LÚ ^{URU}Pališna ^mPi[gganaš LÚ ^{URU}.....] ³⁵ ^mHūruš LÚ
^{URU}Mararḥa ^mAggaš LÚ ^{URU}Taḥišna ^mTaḥišalliš LÚ ^{URU}Halma ke-e LÚ.M[EŠ]
 §

Walwaziti from Sullamma, Kasiyara from Zanzaliya, Aritku from Lillima, Mashuila from Hinzuta, Santa from Wattarusna, Halpa (and) Siusa from An[.....], Usapa from Tahhisa, Pahauwa from Alatarma, Akarki from Palisna, Pi[ggana from ...], Huru from Mararha, Agga from Tahisna, Tahisalli from Halma. These (*ke*) me[n]

3.33 KBo 17.1+ iv 19-22 (OS ritual, CTH 416.1A), ed. Otten & Souček 1969: 36-39

ḥalkiaš ḥarš[(ā)]r išḫiḫanda ²⁰ [Z]ÍZ^{HIA}-ašš=a *ḥaršār išḫiḫanda ke-e=šan*
hūmand[(a)] ²¹ [p]addanī *tēḫḫi n=e* LUGAL-aš MUNUS.LUGAL-ašš=a
 [(ki)]tkar=šamet *tēḫḫi* ²² *šēr=a=ššan* GAD-an *peššiemi š=uš* [(LÚ-aš)] *natta*
aušzi

... the heads of grain, tied together and the heads of barley, tied together, all (*ke*=...) these (objects) I put on a sieve, and I place them near the heads of king and queen. On top (of the sieve with its contents) I throw a linen-cloth. No man shall see them.

As can be derived from the examples above, a demonstrative description may be used instead of the repetition of a list of names or objects, indicating the superordinate class to which these entities belong (i.e., the classifying use of salient demonstratives, see Maes & Noordman 1995: 262f., Cornish 1999: 57, and 2.3.3.4.). Three questions now have to be answered. One, why are the enclitics not used? The answer to this question discusses the difference between enclitics on the one hand, and accented pronouns, demonstrative descriptions and definite noun phrases on the other hand (3.3.4.2.). Two, why are the accented pronouns not used? This answer delimits and defines the field of both types of noun phrases (3.3.4.3.), and finally, three: what is the difference between a definite noun phrase and a demonstrative description, including the difference between the demonstratives themselves (3.3.4.4., see also 3.4.)?

3.3.4.2. Enclitics versus free forms

The first question is relatively easy to answer. As was discussed in 3.3.1., enclitics in Hittite, the cognates of unaccented pronouns in English, are only used to indicate the Established Topic. In none of the examples above are the discourse referents, though salient, expected as Topics. The border descriptions (exx. 3.29-3.31) do not deal with the individual cities, but with the borders. The borders are the Sentence Topic, the element that the clause is about, and also the main discourse topic. Given the list structure, a new member of the list is expected, not an elaboration on the cities. (A discussion on the structure of the discourse follows in the answer to the second question.) The unexpectedness as a Sentence Topic in contrast with the Topic of the preceding clause, the border, is also indicated by the adversative marker *ma*.

In ex. 3.32 the men are introduced as an extra clausal constituent whose pragmatic function in the following clause is not yet established at the moment of the utterance. But being the only discourse referents in the paragraph, they are on the other hand expected to take up their role in the discourse somehow. I would like to classify this type of use as the *Immediate anaphora after first mention* (see 2.3.3.4.1.).

Ex. 3.33 also starts with an enumeration. (The other members of the list are not cited here.) The next clause returns to the actions of the ritual practitioner, the I person who is the Sentence Topic. This time the elements of the list appear in object function in the Focus domain. Again, it is not clear what role the elements of the list are going to perform in the clause after the enumeration. So although the lists in the last two examples are expected to function as discourse topics, they are not necessarily the Established Topic in the following clause. This prevents the use of enclitic pronouns.

3.3.4.3. Accented pronouns versus lexical noun phrases

If a salient discourse entity does not function as an Established Topic, it may be referred to by means of an accented pronoun (see 2.3.3.3. and for Hittite 3.3.2., 3.3.3.). We actually have an example from the border description above where the cities are not referred to by *kus* N but by the accented pronoun *apus* ‘they (subj.pl.comm.)’. The question is therefore, what is the difference between *kus* N and *apus* if the only factor influencing the choice of expressions could be Established Topic versus the Unexpected Topic and the Focus?

3.34 **Bo 86/299 i 68-77** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 14-15
 §⁶⁸ ŠÀ^{BI} KUR^{URU}U-tašša=ja=kan kuješ URU^{DIDLİ.ḪLA} ŠA LUGAL KUR^{URU}HATTI⁶⁹
 ešer (followed by 8 lines of names of cities)⁷⁷ a-pu-u-uš-š=a=šši piḫanteš
 And as for the cities belonging to the king of Hatti that lie in Tarhuntassa, ..., they too
 (*apuss=a*) are given to him (= Kurunta, king of Tarhuntassa).

Here *apus* functions as an Expanding Focus pronoun (3.3.3.2.). The preceding text made it clear that Tudhaliya has decided to give several border cities to Kurunta, so the idea of giving is presupposed. The amazing thing is that also some Hittite cities *inside* Tarhuntassa are handed over to Kurunta. The difference with the preceding examples is that the cities in this example already function as part of a discourse unit, their discourse topic-hood is already established through the *as for* clause (the relative clause in i 68).

To sum up for salient entities, enclitics are used for Established Topics, and accented pronouns are used to indicate Argument Focus and Unexpected or Contrastive Topics. What they have in common is that they function *inside* discourse units. This leads us to the domain of discourse borders and new discourse units, or the hierarchical structure of discourse. We already have seen in ex. 3.29-3.31 that names and demonstrative descriptions could alternate

in the same environment, that is, the digression from the main discourse structure⁷⁵. Ex. 3.32 can be considered as Anaphora after first mention, and 3.33 as a return to the main line of the discourse, to the actions of the practitioner. I here adduce an example of Anaphora after first mention (comparable to ex. 3.32) where the anaphor is a ‘definite’ noun phrase to show that this type of anaphora is not restricted to demonstrative descriptions:

3.35 **KBo 3.1+ i 10-11** (OH/NS narration, CTH 19), ed. Hoffmann 1984: 14-15

§¹⁰ [(^{URU}H)]^{URU}ūpišna ^{URU}Tūū[(an)]^{URU}uūa ^{URU}Nenašša ^{URU}Lānda ^{URU}Zallara¹¹
 [(^{URU})]^{URU}Paršuḫanta ^{URU}Lušna nu utnē maniḫaḫheškir
 Hupisna, Tuwanuwa, Nenassa, Landa, Zallara, Parsuhanta (and) Lusna: they (the emperor’s sons) administered these lands (*utne*, in Hittite no demonstrative).

In the remainder of this section I will discuss the occurrence of demonstrative NPs at discourse nodes.

Fox (1987) found that the rhetorical structure of a text influenced the choice of referring expressions. She noted that ‘full NPs in expository written texts are often used at the beginning of rhetorical units where pronouns could have been appropriate’ (o.c. 143), that is, those NPs refer to entities that are salient. In Hittite we have examples of both demonstrative descriptions and ‘definite’ noun phrases in the first clause of a digressing discourse unit. In the two following examples, the description of the area is an aside and serves to explain how difficult the actions of the king are:

3.36 **KUB 14.15 iii 39-44** (NH Annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 54-55

³⁹ [nu ^dUTU-ŠI (IN)]^A ^{HUR.SAG}Arinnanda pāun a-ši=ma [(^{HUR.SA})^GAri(nnanda)]^š
 mekki] ⁴⁰ [(n)]akkiš aruni=ia=aš=kan parranda pānza na[(mma=aš mekki
 parkuš)] ⁴¹ uarḫuiš=aš ⁴² namma=aš ^{NA}pērunanza nu=kan IŠTU ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ
 š[(arā pennuma)]nzi ŪL DÜ-ri ⁴³ NAM.RA.MEŠ=ma=an pankuš ḫarta ÉRIN.MEŠ-
 ia=kan pank[(uš šer ēšta)] nu=kan IŠTU ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ⁴⁴ kuit šarā
 pennumanzi Ū[(L kišat nu ^dUTU-ŠI A)]^{NA} KARAŠ.ḪI.A GİR-it ⁴⁴ peran ḫūiḫanun
 I [My Majesty] went to mount Arinnanda. — Now, that mount Arinnanda (*asi=ma*
^{HUR.SAG}Arinnandas) is [very] steep and it goes down into the sea. Further, it is very
 high and bush-grown. (And) moreover, it is rocky, and it is not possible to drive up
 (to it) with horses. — Now, the refugees all held it and the soldiers all were on top (of
 it). And given the fact that it was impossible to drive up with horses, I, My Majesty
 led the troops by foot.

The mountain is salient, being explicitly expressed in the preceding clause, but not the Established Topic. Reference with an enclitic is therefore not possible. The accented pronoun *apa-* on the other hand indicates Unexpected Topics. As we will see in the Chapters 7, 8 and 9 on *apa-* however, the clauses containing *apa-* are almost always pushing forward the narration, and are never found in subordinate discourse units. Therefore, given that the mountain-section is a description, a real background (see also the switch from past tense to

⁷⁵ In this part of the Bronze Tablet the main structure is a list, an enumeration of borders following the general pattern ‘Seen from X, Y is the border,’ rephrased ‘the border as seen from X = Y’. The border is the main discourse topic, and the Subject Y is not a topical Subject, but a predication Subject, a Subject in New Focus. In terms of Rhetorical Structure Analysis, the list part ‘Seen from X, Y is the border’ is the Issue, whereas the second part is a background or elaboration adjunct. The demonstrative description or the name is part of a background node.

present tense nominal clauses), we do not expect to find the emphatic pronoun *apa-*. In fact, *-ma* should have been enough, like in 3.29 and in the next example, indicating the new Topic in a background unit.

3.37 **KBo 5.8 ii 18-26** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 152-153

¹⁹ *mHūtupianzan=ma* DUMU.LUGAL DUMU *mZidā* GAL LÚ *MEŠEDI mZidāš kuiš* ²⁰
ANA ABI=YA ŠEŠ=ŠU ēšta nu ABU=YA ²¹ *uni mHutupijanzan* DUMU *mZidā* GAL
 LÚ *MEŠEDI INA KUR URUPalā* ²² *uatarñahta KUR URUPalā=ma ŪL kuitki* ²³
pahḫaššanuṣan KUR-TUM ēšta ²⁴ *URU.BÀD EGIR-pa appannaš AŠRU NU.GÁL*
kuiški ²⁵ *ēšta dagān ešantat KUR-e ēšta* ²⁶ *mHutupijanzaš=ma KUR URUPalā*
pahḫaštat

Now, Hutupianza (acc.) Prince, son of Zida, the Head of the Bodyguard -Zida who was a brother of my father-, that Hutupianza, son of Zida, the Head of the Bodyguard, my father summoned to Pala. —Pala however was a completely unprotected country: there was no fortified city, no place to retreat to. (It) was a ‘they were living (straight) on the land’⁷⁶ country.— Hutupianza however protected Pala (by building fortresses and retreats in the mountains).

I will return to the difference between a name or definite noun phrase and a demonstrative description in 3.3.4.4.

In the same vein, a return to the main line after a digression can be indicated by means of a demonstrative description:

3.38 **KBo 3.4+ iii 42-44** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 I), ed. Grémois 1988: 66

§ ⁴² *MU.KAM-anni=ma INA HUR.SAGAšharpaia pāun nu=za HUR.SAGAšharpaian*
kuin ⁴³ *URUGašgaš ešan ḫarta nu ŠA KUR URUPalā KASKAL.MEŠ karaššan ḫarta*
⁴⁴ *nu u-ni ŠA HUR.SAGAšharpaia URUGaškan zahḫijianun*

Now, in that year I went to mount Asharpaya. —Asharpaya, which was settled by a Gasga city, had (its) roads of the country of Pala cut off (by them).— I fought that (*uni*) Gasga-city of mount Asharpaya

3.39 **KUB 14.17 obv. ii 31-35** (NH Annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 88-89

³¹ [*nu mPihḫuniyaš kuiš* LÚ URUGašga LÚ URUTipija ēšta] ³² [*kuitm*] *an=kan*
ABU=YA INA KUR.KUR.MEŠ Hurri ēšta mPihḫuniyaš=ma ³³ [*KUR UGU-T*] *I*
 URUIštitina=ia GUL-anneški[t] *n=aš parā* ³⁴ [*INA URUZa]zziša ar[aškit] nu=kan*
a-ši mPihḫuniyaš ³⁵ [*ŪL ŠA ...*] *×-ga-ni-× [iṣa]r taparta*

Pihhuniya, who was a Gasgaean, a man from Tipiya, — as long as my father was in the Hurrian countries, Pihhuniya attacked the Upper Country and Istitina, and he reached out [to Za]zzisa — that Pihhuniya [did not] rule like [.....]

Although the rest of the text is broken, it is likely that Pihunniya and his hostile actions are the local discourse topic, because Pihhuniya is assigned topic-hood through his introduction in a *kui*-clause in ii 31. After this introduction an embedded digression describes how also Mursili’s father had had his difficulties with Pihunniya. Then Mursili returns to the description of Pihhuniya, which had started in ii 31. Interesting here is that, contrary to the

⁷⁶ Compare Houwink ten Cate 1967: 46 n. 9: “(and) they were lowland (countries)”.

preceding two examples, *asi Pihhuniya* refers back to the preceding clause where he was the Subject *and* the Topic. The referent of *Pihhuniya* is therefore the Established Topic, and nothing should have prevented the use of a zero or an enclitic pronoun. The only reason left for using a demonstrative adnominal with a name for an Established Topic, is the structure of the discourse.

The next example shows that also the medial demonstrative determiner *apa-* may be used to indicate a boundary in the discourse:

3.40 **KUB 14.14 + rev. 21'-23'** (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 378 I), ed. Lebrun 1980: 198, 201.

§ 21' DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ = YA ŠA ^mDudhaliija kuit ēšhar EGIR-an šanhat[teni] 22'
 nu = kan ^mDudhaliian kuiēš kuennir nu ēšhar apūš šarnin[kir] 23' nu KUR
^{URU}Hatti = ja a-pa-a-aš išhananza arha namma zinne[šta]

As for the blood of Dudhaliya that you, o gods, my lords, are seeking, — (but mind this:) the ones who killed Dudhaliya, it is *they* who [have] retributed the blood —, that blood (you're seeking) further ende[d] the land of Hatti *too*.

In the first clause, the *eshar* 'blood' is introduced as the discourse topic in a *kui*-clause. Immediately after this introduction however, a new unit is started, again by means of a *kui*-clause. The new local discourse topic is not the seeking of the blood, but the persons who committed a murder, and the fact that they already paid for their crime a long time ago. The problem Mursili is dealing with is why the gods are still seeking revenge, thereby destroying the land of Hatti. Like in example 3.39, the initial relative clause with *kuit eshar* 'what blood' is picked up after a digression by means of the demonstrative description *apas išhananza* 'that blood'.

3.3.4.4. 'Definite' noun phrases and the three demonstratives versus each other

In the preceding discussion we have seen several examples of the proximal demonstrative *ka-*, the medial demonstrative *apa-* and the distal demonstrative *aši* marking a discourse boundary (for figure see 3.4.2.2.). The next and last question to be addressed is, what is the difference between noun phrases without demonstrative and those with *ka-*, *apa-* or *aši*? The proposal made here for the difference between Hittite definite NPs and names on the one hand and demonstrative NPs on the other hand should be further investigated, but I will here present a hint towards a possible solution.

In 3.1. I presented the deictic demonstratives with their deictic contrasts: proximal *ka-* refers to a referent viewed as belonging to the cognitive space of Speaker, medial *apa-* is viewed as belonging to the cognitive space of the Addressee and finally, distal *aši* refers to a third party which is outside the cognitive space of Speaker and Addressee. The examples above and the discussion in the chapters on the individual demonstratives show that also the use of the demonstratives when structuring the discourse depends on the cognitive space to which a referent belongs. This membership is not required by some linguistic rule but depends on how the Speaker views the world and what s/he intends to convey to the Addressee. The difference is therefore part of the rhetorical toolbox of the Speaker.

For example, why should mount Arinnanda in ex. 3.36 be referred to by *asi Arinnandas* or Gasga by *uni Gasgan* in ex. 3.38, but Pala simply by *Pala* in ex. 3.37? The solution lies in the political constellation at the time. Pala belongs to the land of Hatti at the

time of Suppiluliuma, whereas Mount Arinnanda in the far west, close to Millawanda (Milete), is a hostile area and to be attacked by Mursili. Arinnanda belongs to the cognitive space of the Other, and Mursili stresses this fact, in case one might not know this. With ex. 3.38 the Gasga are depicted as hostile, and therefore not belonging to the space of the Speaker and Addressee (the audience or reader), and the same of course is true of Pihhuniya in ex. 3.39.

Similarly, the medial demonstrative determiner *apa-* is used to indicate that the Speaker stresses the localization of the referent in the cognitive space of the Addressee. This can be seen in ex. 3.40. This example is part of a prayer of Mursili to the gods, the Addressees. The demonstrative *apa-* stresses the fact that the blood the gods are seeking is really not the matter anymore of Mursili, since the culprits have already been found. Therefore, the blood seems to be a matter of the gods only, not of the Speaker and not of the Others.

The proximal demonstrative *ka-* is often used to refer to an enumeration (exx. 3.31, 32, 33). But that is not necessary, as can be illustrated by means of ex. 3.35. The proximal *ka-* also indicates that the entities are relevant for the Speaker in the here and now.

The same division of labor as described here occurs when we observe the use of demonstratives when referring to entities that are not salient, as section 3.4. will show.

But what happens if the Speaker does not want to make use of his/her rhetorical toolbox? If his/her attitude is neutral? It could be that in that case a bare NP is used. There is a possibility however that *ka-* is the most neutral, the least marked, of the three demonstratives (see sections 6.5.5. and 6.8.). This would lead to the following division of functions:

1. If the cohesion of the discourse does not need to be restored, use a bare NP.
2. If the cohesion of the discourse needs to be restored: use a demonstrative NP.
 - a. If the Speaker attitude is neutral, use *ka-*.
 - b. If not, use either *ka-*, *apa-* or *aši*, depending on assignment to cognitive space of Speaker, Addressee or Other.

3.3.5. Summary and conclusions

When the referent of an anaphoric expression is salient, everything could be used: \emptyset , *-a-*, *apa-*, *ka-* + N, *apa-* + N, *aši* + N. There is clear difference however between in node and across node reference. Inside a node only \emptyset , *-a-* and Focal *apa-* were used, whereas the demonstrative descriptions (and not the demonstrative pronouns!) usually occurred when the thematic continuity had somehow diminished.

The demonstrative *ka-* was used in connection with the Speaker, *apa-* with the Addressee and *aši* with the Other.

| <i>Anaphora- Continuity procedure</i> | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| in node | | | across node | |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | U-Topic |
| \emptyset , <i>-a-</i> | <i>apa-</i> | <i>apa-</i> | <i>dem</i> N | <i>dem</i> N |

Table 3.3. The Anaphora-continuity matrix.

3.4. Anaphora and the centering procedure — Demonstratives again

3.4.1. Introduction

A completely different context for demonstratives is the retrieval of a referent that is not salient at the moment of the utterance. Usually the antecedent is found some clauses or larger discourse units earlier. Clearly, pronouns are excluded in such a context, but what conditions the choice between a definite noun phrase and a demonstrative noun phrase? And is there a difference between the proximal and non-proximal demonstratives? As I proposed above, both Hittite ‘definite’ noun phrases and demonstrative descriptions are used in the same environment if we consider the combination of the parameters ‘salience’ and ‘topic-hood’. Discourse referents that are salient but were not expected to be the topic of the next clause, are not expressed by pronouns but by a noun phrase. Whether a demonstrative determiner is used depends on the extra information a Speaker wants to provide. The Speaker emphasizes the cognitive space -his own space, the space of the Addressee, the space of the Other- in which a referent resides by adding the appropriate demonstrative. For consistency reasons we expect this to function also with respect to discourse referents that are not salient anymore. Each of the following examples will be discussed according to this parameter, sometimes in comparison with a similar passage with noun phrase but without demonstrative.

3.4.2. Demonstratives and discourse boundaries

3.4.2.1. Some attestations of demonstratives on discourse boundaries

Generally, lexical noun phrases, including the ones with a demonstrative determiner, are used to refer to antecedents that are separated from the noun phrase by a major discontinuity in the discourse. Discontinuities are caused by episodic changes, shifts in location, and intervention by direct speech (see for example Lichtenberk 1996: 386 with references). In this section I will discuss the connection between demonstratives that refer to non-salient demonstratives and discourse boundaries (for salient referents see section 3.3.).

The discontinuities that are easiest to detect in Hittite are paragraph boundaries and insertions of direct speech. Of each of the two types I will give examples of the three demonstratives, if possible. First some of the examples with reference across paragraph boundaries:

- 3.41 **KUB 1.1 ii 66-71** (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 16-17
nu=za kē KUR.KUR.MEŠ [†] *dannatta* ⁶⁷ *IŠTU NÍ.TE=YA EGIR-pa ašešanunun* ⁶⁸
n=at EGIR-pa ^{URU} *Hattušan ijanun*
§ ⁶⁹ *GIM-an=ma uit Š[(EŠ=Y)]A kuyapi INA KUR Mizrī pait* ⁷⁰ *nu=za*
KUR.KUR.MEŠ kue ke-e EGIR-pa ašešanu[(nu)]n nu KARAŠ ANŠE.KUR.R[(A.MEŠ)]
⁷¹ *kēl ŠA KUR-TI ANA ŠEŠ=YA lahhi INA KUR Mizrī* ⁷² *GAM-an pēhutenun*
I resettled these empty countries on my own and made them Hittite again.
§ But when it happened that my brother went at a certain moment to Egypt, as for these countries (KUR.KUR.MEŠ *kue kē*) that I had resettled, I led the army and the horses of these countries (actually sg.!) down to my brother on campaign to Egypt.

The countries in ii 70 are completely identifiable by means of the relative clause. Actually every reference to these countries is done with *ka-*: in ii 55-56 ‘He let *me* to these countries. These unpopulated countries he gave to me in control: ...’, ii 63 ‘These unpopulated countries which my brother had placed in my hand, ...’. The following references are cited in the example above, ii 66 ‘I resettled these empty countries on my own and made them Hittite again’ and ii 70 ‘as for these countries that I had resettled’. Clearly Hattusili stresses every time his control over these countries by using the Speaker-demonstrative *ka-*. The only time that these countries are *not* in his control he simply uses a definite noun phrase:

3.42 **KUB 1.1 iii 57-58** (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 20-21

[(KUR.KUR.MEŠ =*ia* *kuē dannatta amm*)]uk EGIR-*pa*⁵⁸ [(*ašešanunun nu=mu=kan apē=ia hūmanda*)] *arḫa dāš*

Also the unpopulated countries that I had resettled, all of them *too* he took away from me!

Hattusili’s nephew Urhi-Tessub, Great-King by now, has decided to take all his uncle’s lordships away from him, even the ones Hattusili had populated himself. Notice the stressed first person pronoun *ammuk* in Replacing Focus position, indicating that not Urhi-Tessub but Hattusili repopulated these countries, in case one might think otherwise. Obviously the countries are not in his control anymore, so they cannot be referred to by means of *ka-*.

In the next example it is *apa-* N that refers across a paragraph boundary.

3.43 **HKM 27 obv. 3-10** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 166-167

§³ [š]A^{LÚ} KÚR *kuit uttar* §⁴ *ḫatrāeš* LÚKÚR-*za=kan* §⁵ *maḥḥan* URU *Kāšašan* §⁶ URU *Taḥazzimunann=a* §⁷ *zīkizzi n=at AŠME*

§⁸ *n=ašta a-pa-a-aš* LÚKÚR *kuuapi* §⁹ *naiškittari* §¹⁰ *nu=mu ḫatreški* §

As for the affair of the enemy that you wrote about, how the enemy keeps laying (his hands on) Kasasa and Tahazzimuna, I have taken notice of it.

§ Wherever that enemy (*apas* ^{LÚ}KÚR) turns away to, write (it) to me.

That enemy refers back across a paragraph line to ^{LÚ}KÚR ‘the enemy’ in obv. 4. The enemy is clearly in the domain of the Addressee of the letter, Himuili, the governor of the district, and not considered to be part of the domain of the king as the sender of the letter: it is Himuili’s responsibility to track the movements of the enemy. In the next example we see again reference across a paragraph line, but this time the writer did not feel the need to add a demonstrative:

3.44 **HKM 46 rev. 8-17** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 200-201

§⁸ *n=aš=kan mān* INA KUR^{HUR.SAG} *Šakaddunuṽa* §⁹ *parēan paizzi* §¹⁰ *mān* EGIR-*pa* *kuuatga* §¹¹ *uḥnuzi n=aš=kan* KUR-*ja* §¹² *anda uizzi nu=šši* EGIR-*an* §¹³ *naṽi* *kuitki* §¹⁴ *tekkuššijaizzi*

§¹⁵ *man=kan* dUTU-ŠI BELI=YA BELU §¹⁶ *kuinki parā naitti* §¹⁷ *man=a* KUR-*i* LÚKÚR *ūL dammišḫaizzi* §

Whether he (the enemy) comes across the Sakaddunuwa-mountain or whether he perhaps will turn back and enter the countryside, nothing yet shows up behind it (the mountain)⁷⁷.

§ (If) you, My Majesty, my Lord, would send over some general, the enemy (^{LÚ}KÚR) would not damage the country.

In this example no demonstrative is used, although reference is made across a paragraph boundary. The letter is written by Adadbeli to the king. He reports the movement of the enemy towards the area he, but not the king, stays in. The enemy is therefore only in Adadbeli's area. According to my theory the Addressee oriented *apa-* is therefore excluded, and the only possibility is that the sender wants to stress that the enemy is in his own area by means of *ka-*. But this is not likely since the sender tries to share the responsibility with the king by asking him to send a general.

And also the distal *aši* + N can refer to another paragraph.

3.45 **KUB 14.8 obv. 31'-32'** (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 378 II), ed. Lebrun 1980: 206, 212.

nu=za mahḥan e-ni TUPPA ^{32'} ŠA KUR ^{URU}Mizri piran ūemījanun n=at IŠTU DINGIR-LIM arijanun

After I had come across that tablet (*eni TUPPA*) dealing with Egypt, I performed an oracle inquiry through a deity.

The demonstrative description *eni TUPPA* 'that tablet' refers back to the tablet which is mentioned in obv. 13': the tablet containing the Kurustamma treaty. In the present clause the tablet is described as 'the tablet dealing with Egypt', which should be enough to distinguish it from all other possible tablets. So why use the demonstrative *eni* if the phrase *TUPPA ŠA KUR* ^{URU}Mizri would have been sufficient? The participants that are involved with the prayer are Mursili II and the deity. The treaty with Egypt on the other hand was broken by Suppiluliuma, the father of Mursili II. Resulting from this violation a severe plague had been sweeping the land far into the reign of Mursili. Mursili takes the blame although he explicitly states that it did not happen in his time, but rather in his father's time. So in order to stress the fact that the tablet containing the treaty did not belong to his own cognitive space, and certainly not to the deity's, he uses the distal demonstrative *eni*, referring to the cognitive space of the Other and thus distancing himself from it.

In my corpus I have also a few references of *ka-* + Noun, *apa-* + Noun and *asi* + Noun crossing direct speech boundaries. The clearest example of the connection between the domain of responsibility and the use of the demonstratives is provided by the next example where we even have an alternation of two demonstratives:

3.46 **KUB 6.41 i 34-38** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68), ed. Friedrich 1926: 110-111

§ ³⁴ *mahḥan=ma* ^dUTU-ŠI uni memian AŠME nu ^dUTU-ŠI ^mPÍŠ.TUR-an ³⁵ ŪL kuitki
^HUL-uanni šanḥun n=an piran parā [ŪL kuitki] ³⁶ ^HUL-aḥḥun nu kiššan AQBI
paimi=ua u-ni memian [EGIR-pa anda] ³⁷ tittanumi nu šarā tijanun nu ke-e-da-
ni memi[(i)ani EGIR-pa] ³⁸ anda tittanumanzi pāun

⁷⁷ CHD L-N 421 differently: 'He has not yet left any indication behind'. Alp 1991: 202: 'Hinter ihm lässt sich noch nichts bemerken'.

But when I, My Majesty, heard about that affair, I, My Majesty, did not seek for evil against Mashuiliwa at all. I had [not] acted evilly [at all] before towards him. I spoke in this way: “I will go set that (uni) affair [right again].” I arose and went to settle this (kedani) affair.

In the preceding paragraph of this treaty between Mursili and Kupanta-Kurunta it is described how Mashuiliwa started to alienate the people of Pitassa and even some Hittite subjects from the Hittite empire, trying to engage into fight. The first *uni memian* in i 34 refers to this affair. When the King speaks about it, he uses *uni memian*, but in the following narrative part he uses *kedani memiani*. So why this alternation? The decision to straighten out the problems means that the King has drawn the problem into his sphere of influence, and considers it his responsibility. In the first two examples of *memiya-* on the other hand, the affair is still the result of the actions of Mashuiliwa. In order to stress this fact, Mursili uses the Distal demonstrative. Notice that *apa-* could not have been used. The use of the medial demonstrative would imply that the Addressee Kupanta-Kurunta was responsible, which is not true: the whole idea of the following paragraphs is to emphasise that Mursili does not blame Kupanta-Kurunta for the deeds of his stepfather Mashuiliwa.

- 3.47 **HKM 36 obv. 3-9** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 182-183
 §³ ŠA [LÚKÚR *kuit*] *uttar* *ḫatrāēš* ⁴ ANA TÙR.ḪI.A *ṣu* *kattan arantari* ⁵
nu *ṣu* *ṣu* *ṣu* *kan* ÉRIN.MEŠ *parā nai* ⁶ *n* *ṣašta* *kā[š]a* ÉRIN.MEŠ *pangarīt* ⁷ *parā*
ne[ḫhu]n *nu* *a-pu-u-uš* TÙR.ḪI.A ⁸ *anda* SIG₅[-*aḫḫeškit*] *ten*⁷⁸ *n* *at* *kan* ⁹ SIG₅-*in*
*ašnuu[antaru]*⁷⁹§
 [As for what] you wrote about the affair of [the enemy]: ‘(People) are standing at the
corrals. Send off troops to me!’ I have ju[s]t se[nt] off troops in large numbers. You
 (pl.) must [keep rep]airing those (apus) corrals! They [have to be] taken well care of!

The corrals belong to the domain of the Addressee and the king stresses his responsibility concerning the corrals by means of the Medial or Addressee oriented demonstrative *apa-*.

And finally the use of the distal demonstrative *aši* referring across a discourse node to something mentioned in direct speech:

- 3.48 **KUB 31.77 i 14-19** (NH vow, Hattusili III, CTH 584), ed. De Roos 1984: 266, 404
nu *ṣu* *memiškizzi* ¹⁵ *kuit* *ṣu* *an* *zaḫḫiškinun* *kuit* *ṣu* *an* ¹⁶ *zaḫḫiškinun*
nu *ṣu* *an* *kan* *ūnhun* ¹⁷ *namma* UR.BAR.RA *ṣu* *ṣu* *an* *kuiš* *anda* [ē]šta ¹⁸
[nu *ṣu* *an* *kan* *šarā* *ḫūittiḫanun* ¹⁹ *mān* *ma* *a-ši* UR.BAR.RA *TI-anza* ...
 “He said: ‘Why did I fight him? Why did I fight him? Then I fed him, and the wolf
 that was inside, I hauled him up.’ That (asi) wolf is either alive, ...

This text citation is part of a dream of queen Puduhepa. In the dream she sees her dead father, who is the one speaking here. After the speech ends, the queen refers to the wolf using the

⁷⁸ Alp’s restoration SIG₅[-*in pa-ah-ha-as-nu-ut*] *ten* requires too much space, and even SIG₅[-*in pa-ah-ha-as*] *ten* does not seem to fit. I therefore suggest SIG₅[-*aḫ-ḫe-eš-ki-it*] *ten* instead.

⁷⁹ Alp’s restoration *as-nu*[-*ut-ten*] causes incongruency because the commune TÙR is referred to by a neuter object *ṣu*. Although incongruency sometimes occurs, I would like to suggest something like *as-nu-w[a-an-ta-ru]*. This makes *ṣu* the subject commune/neuter plural enclitic pronoun in an intransitive clause.

demonstrative *aši*. The dream itself is part of a Vow, a promise made by the Speaker to the deity, the Addressee. The world is therefore divided in two parts, the part containing Speaker and Addressee and the part outside this area, the world of the Others. The father of the queen is already dead and does not belong to her world anymore, so the wolf he is talking about is in his domain and therefore outside his daughter's. Likewise there is no connection with the deity, the Addressee. The rest of the text is badly damaged which prevents any further thoughts on the reason for using a demonstrative description instead of a definite noun phrase.

3.4.2.2. Do anaphoric demonstratives and discourse nodes belong together?

In chapter 2.4. I suggested that demonstratives in languages with definiteness markers are linkers, used to create cohesion when the segment containing the demonstrative did not already provide that cohesion. But since Hittite does not have definiteness markers, and more generally, since definiteness in Hittite has not been studied yet, it is not possible to adequately compare 'definite' NPs with demonstrative NPs.

Despite this problem, there are a few contexts where Hittite demonstrative NPs should appear when they are indeed linkers, independent of saliency: (1) at paragraph initial clauses; (2) in complex sentences with preposed adverbial clauses. Since preposed adverbial clauses are generally associated with discourse boundaries, they naturally cause a discourse discontinuity; (3) at discourse nodes which can be identified on semantic grounds (these include nodes of digressions, and switch from Direct Speech to Narration, see for example the discussions in 3.3.4., and sections 4.5.2.2. and 4.5.3.1.). Indeed there is a strong correlation between discourse nodes and the occurrence of anaphoric demonstratives:

| demonstrative NP occurs | <i>kā-</i> | <i>apā-</i> | <i>aši</i> | Total |
|--|------------|-------------|------------|-----------|
| in paragraph initial clause | 7 | 6 | 10 | 23 |
| in preposed adverbial clause | 10 | 4 | 6 | 20 |
| at semantically defined discourse node | 17 | 1 | 11 | 29 |
| Total | 34 | 11 | 27 | 72 |
| <i>versus</i> | | | | |
| other | 6 | 5 | 8 | 19 |

Table 3.4. Distribution of demonstrative NPs over discourse nodes and other positions.

The fact that Hittite anaphoric demonstratives often occur on these discourse nodes might indicate that they are needed to create more cohesion with the preceding unit. They evoke, re-activate an entity together with the memory representation of the entity's closed discourse unit, thus creating a link between the new unit and an older one. Of course one should study all Hittite adverbial clauses with and without demonstratives in order to substantiate this claim.

3.4.3. Demonstratives and text genres

Based on the observation that the demonstratives are related to person, one can predict when the Speaker is 'allowed' to use a particular anaphoric demonstrative. First, proximal *ka-* can occur whenever the Speaker is actively engaged in the events described in the texts. This includes basically every genre. Only excluded are the laws and other administrative texts with prescriptions. The anaphoric medial *apa-* on the other hand should only occur in texts that

have an Addressee, such as letters, vows and oracles. The anaphoric distal demonstrative *aši* should occur in contexts with a well defined Other. One could think of narrations dealing with an enemy.

In the table below I have collected all anaphoric demonstratives in my corpus (both salient and not salient) and listed them according to the genres in which they appeared.⁸⁰ The grouping of the genres themselves is based on the following considerations. An Addressee is, actively or passively, present in the following genres: letter, oracle, prayer, landgrant, instruction, oath, treaty, vow. Of these the letter, instruction, oath, treaty and oracle require an active Addressee. The other ones were grouped with the ritual where there likewise is only an active Speaker. The narration in all its forms only requires an Audience that does not participate in the narration. Contrary to the other genres, narrations deal mainly with Others beside the Hittite king and his entourage.

| | <i>ka-</i> | <i>apa-</i> | <i>aši</i> |
|--------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| Passive or no Addressee | | | |
| Ritual | 6 | — | 3 |
| Landgrant | 4 | — | — |
| Prayer | 5 | — | 2 |
| Vow | 1 | — | 2 |
| Active Addressee | | | |
| Treaty | 13 | 2 | — |
| Letter | 1 | 10 | — |
| Instruction, Oath | — | 1 | — |
| Oracle | 1 | — | 16 |
| Active Other | | | |
| Narration | 17 | — | 23 |

Table 3.5. Distribution of the anaphoric demonstratives over text genres, based on my corpus.

The table allows the following observations. The medial anaphoric demonstrative indeed only occurs in genres with an active Addressee. The lack of *apa-* and the overwhelming use of *asi* in oracles is possibly on account of the fact that one does not assign responsibility to the gods for the events questioned in the oracle. It is much more likely to use a distal demonstrative in its disassociating function: distancing a referent from both Speaker and Addressee.

The distal demonstrative occurs in narrations (including myths) which necessarily deal with the Other. But since the king is one of the active participants, one finds as often the proximal demonstrative. This is also the reason why the tracking proximal demonstrative occurs in treaties but not in instructions in my corpus. The actions described in instructions and oaths mainly concern the responsibilities of the Addressee(s), whereas treaties also contain references to responsibilities of the King.

3.4.4. Summary

After a break in the thematic continuity of the discourse, discourse referents lose their saliency. In order to ‘retrieve’ those referents it is not possible anymore to use pronouns, so the speaker has refer to them by means of definite noun phrases instead. Not surprisingly the same occurs in Hittite too. We have seen that both definite and demonstrative noun phrases

⁸⁰ The totals are different from those in table 3.3. because this time all broken and unclear examples could be included.

could be used to refer to discourse entities across a paragraph line or a direct speech boundary. Again, as in the section on salient demonstratives, it appeared that the difference between the demonstrative NPs was based on the person-based qualities of the demonstratives. If the Speaker wants to express his/her opinion on the association of the discourse entity with one of the speech participants or the Other, s/he can choose the appropriate demonstrative. The proximal demonstrative *ka-* is viewed as referring to the cognitive space of Speaker, the medial *apa-* is viewed as belonging to the area of the Addressee. Finally *aši* refers to the cognitive space of a third party, the Other, outside the domain of both of Speaker and Addressee (or Audience). This assignment to cognitive space was supported by the correlation between demonstratives and text genres. Only genres with active Addressees contained the medial demonstrative *apa-*, whereas genres with an active Other were responsible for the majority of the distal *aši*-s.

Thus, discourse grammar prescribes the use of pronouns versus lexical noun phrases, while the choice for anaphoric demonstratives or not rests solely with the Speaker. The anaphoric demonstratives are part of the rhetorical toolbox of the Speaker.

Before filling the slots in table 3.6., the Focus structure of the clauses containing the demonstratives needs to be addressed. In the examples presented here most demonstratives occurred in a subordinate clause: a relative clause in ex. 3.42, 3.43, a temporal clause in 3.45, and a conditional clause in 3.48. In such clauses the Focus structure is not important since they provide a background for the narration or introduce a discourse topic. Therefore I consider all these clauses as Sentence Focus clauses. They are so to speak ‘out-of-the-blue’. As one can read in the chapters on the individual demonstratives and in 3.4.2.2., anaphoric demonstratives, like the discourse deictic and recognitional demonstratives, often occur in subordinate clauses that form the start of a new unit. Only in a few examples the anaphoric demonstratives occur in a main clause, as in ex. 3.46 and 3.47. The referents of these two examples are also in the Focus of the clause.

| <i>Anaphora-Centering procedure</i> | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|---------|--------------|--|
| in node | | | across node | |
| E-Top | U-Top | A-Focus | Focus | |
| — | — | — | <i>dem N</i> | |

Table 3.6 .The Anaphora-centering matrix

3.5. Discourse Deixis

Before discussing the anaphoric or demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative adverbs of manner in their Discourse Deictic function, I will discuss the ways in which a Hittite could express the phrase ‘to place under Oath’. The results provide a preliminary framework for the function of the different pronouns, demonstrative pronouns and noun phrases and provides more support for the outline of the functioning of the demonstratives as described in 3.1, that is, *ka-* is the Proximal demonstrative and *aši* is the Distal demonstrative. The demonstrative *apa-* now also occurs in its function as the emphatic or Focus pronoun, and only rarely in connection with the Addressee.

3.5.1. Introduction: ‘placing under Oath’

In Hittite, all pronouns can be used as discourse deictic expressions. In order to distinguish especially the demonstratives in discourse deictic use from the other demonstrative uses, I use the following criteria as specified by, among others, Diessel 1999: 100ff. (see further 2.3.5.):

- Discourse deictics refer to the contents of a chunk of discourse: an event, a proposition, or a speech-act.
- Discourse deictics often provide a link between two discourse units.
- The referent of a discourse deictic expression is immediately adjacent to the clause containing the discourse deictic expression.

The discourse deictic use of referential expressions can be exemplified by the Hittite phrase ‘placing under Oath’. This formulation generally occurs as the conclusion of a stipulation in a treaty. The divine oath is used as a safeguard against transgressing that stipulation. The oath expression can take the form *linkiya kattan dai-* ‘place under oath’ or *linkiya kattan ki-* ‘to be placed under oath’ (CHD L-N p. 65). Both persons and words can be placed under oath, but our concern is only the latter formulation with words or conduct as subject. The expression referring to the words of the stipulation or treaty can take the form \emptyset , *-at*, *apāt*, *kāš memiaš* and *apāš memiaš*. The question I want to answer is why all these different forms can be used in the same construction.

The oath formula is either preceded by a conditional clause or by a main clause. As we already know, demonstratives often bring an object into the center of attention. Conditional clauses do the same for propositional contents, they create a mental world which provides a framework in which the apodosis holds (Dik 1997b: 396. See Erteschik-Shir 1997: 84ff. for conditionals as stage topics). In cognitive terms, the semantic content of the conditional clause has already entered the center of attention by being expressed in a conditional clause. This means that if the content of the clause is subsequently referred to, the continuity procedure may be used. In the apodosis of a conditional clause we therefore expect to find an anaphoric pronoun, not a demonstrative pronoun. When on the other hand the preceding clause is *not* presented as a conditional clause, the propositional content of the clause is not yet in the center of attention. Therefore we expect to find a demonstrative expression in the ‘oath’-clause. One could even consider the ‘oath’ clause as thematically disconnected from the stipulations preceding it. The new discourse unit, consisting of only one clause, is then connected with the preceding unit by means of a demonstrative. Whether or not the latter applies, in both cases one needs a demonstrative.

This is indeed the case. After conditionals we find \emptyset , *n=at*, *nu apatt=a*, *nu apāšš=a memiaš* (remember that *apa-* is often used as the Focus pronoun and not as a demonstrative).⁸¹ The conditional clause with apodosis is often of the form ‘If you act evil, let it (etc.) be put under oath’. But sometimes one encounters ‘If you (want to) act evil, don’t do it! Let (it) be placed under oath’. In such a situation the underlined *it* is anaphoric, not discourse deictic:

3.49 **KBo 4.14 ii 73-77** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 123), ed. Van den Hout 1989: 290-291

⁸¹ One unclear example with *ka-* is discussed in chapter 6.

§ ⁷³ [m]ānn=a=mu=kan 1 KUR-TUM kuitki GAM-an niġari ⁷⁴ [n]ašma=mu=kan
 EN.MEŠ kuiēšqa 𐎶 allallā pānzi ⁷⁵ [z]ik=ma=šmaš=kan anda handāši nu kišan ⁷⁶
 mematti GÉŠPU-aḥḥir=ya=mu n=at lē DÙ-ši ⁷⁷ GAM-an MAMIT GAR-ru §
 And if some single country turns away from me, or some lords commit treason against
 me, (if then) *you* join them, and you speak in this way: “They *forced* me!”, you may
 not do it! Let (it) be placed under Oath.

In this case the neuter subject is not even expressed at all. The next example shows the regular conditional formula without the ‘don’t do it’ clause:

- 3.50 **KBo 19.44+ rev. 10-13**, with duplicate KBo 5.3+ iii 38’-39’ (MH/MS treaty, Suppiluliuma I, CTH 42)

našma=za mān apāt[(KUR-e našma URU-an)] ¹¹ aššuli našma idālu parā
 ḥuitt[(iġan) ḥ(armi)] ¹² zig=a=šmaš=at mān paitti EGIR-pa[(me)mat(ti)] ¹³
 n=e=ttā ŠAPAL NIŠ DINGIR.MEŠ k[ittaru] §

Or (if) I have singled out that land or city for favor or for harsh treatment, if *you* go repeat that (lit. it) to them — [let] it [be] p[placed] under Oath for you.

Treaties always contain several stipulations which are concluded by oath. The author of the treaty therefore often uses the phrase ‘let that (conduct) too be placed under oath’, with Expanding Focus (see 2.3.3.3.3.).

- 3.51 **KUB 21.1+ iii 53-56** (NH treaty, Muwattalli, CTH 76), ed. Friedrich 1930: 74-75

našma=kan ^{LÚ}KÚR=ma KUR=KA ištarna ⁵³ arḥa iġatari zigga=an ŪL zahḥiāši ⁵⁴
 nu kišan mematti ... nu a-pád-da-ia NEŠ DINGIR-LIM GAM-an ⁵⁶ kittaru
 Or (if) the enemy marches through your country and you do not fight him, saying:
 “...”, let that too (apadda=ya) be placed under Oath.

- 3.52 **KUB 21.1+ iii 56-59** (NH treaty, Muwattalli, CTH 76), ed. Friedrich 1930: 74, emendations Otten 1957: 29

našma ÉRIN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ⁵⁷ ANA ^dUTU-ŠI uēkti ^{LÚ}KÚR kui[nk]i GUL-aḥti
 nu=ttā ^dUTU-ŠI ⁵⁸ ÉRIN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.R[(A.ME)]Š pāi zik=man[=m]a=an ḥantezzi
 ANA ^{LÚ}KÚR ⁵⁹ GAM-an pešti nu a-pa-a-aš-ša memiaš ŠAPAL NEŠ DINGIR-LIM
 kittaru

Or (if) you request infantry and chariotry from My Majesty to fight some enemy, and My Majesty gives you the infantry and chariotry, but *you* would like to betray them to the enemy at the first opportunity, let also that (apass=a) conduct be placed under Oath.

After main clauses we find the proximal demonstrative *ka-*. When a main clause is processed by the Addressee, the element that might be a further topic of discourse is usually not the propositional content of the clause, but one of the entities expressed in the Subject or the Object. The propositional content of the clause is not in the center of attention, and a demonstrative description is required in order to make the content a discourse topic. The only sentence type is with the proximal demonstrative *ka-* in initial position:

3.53 **KUB 23.1+ ii 6-7** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 105), ed. Kühne & Otten 1971: 8-9

⁶ *tamai=za* EN-UTTA *lē ilali[ias̄]i* ⁷ *ka-a-aš=ta memiaš ŠAPAL NEŠ DINGIR-LIM kittaru §*

Do not desire another Ruling House. Let this (*kas*) conduct be put under Oath.

Summarizing, the conditional clause introduces its propositional content as a discourse topic. That means that the contents of the clause are already salient when the apodosis is expressed, which means that the continuity procedure is used. When the propositional content is not yet salient, it can either be an Unestablished Topic or in Sentence Focus. In this case I believe that the fact that the adversative particle *-a/-ma* is absent indicates that we have to do with Sentence Focus⁸².

On the other hand, when the contents are already salient, the Speaker has two options. Either s/he expresses the contents by means of \emptyset or *-a-*, the preferred Established Topic expressions, or s/he chooses ‘that conduct too’, an Argument Focus expression. This can only be done when there already have been other stipulations concluded by an oath (see Chapter 8.). In table form:

| <i>Discourse Deixis</i> | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Continuity procedure | | Centering procedure |
| E-Top | A-Focus | Focus |
| \emptyset , <i>-a-</i> | <i>apa-</i> (N) | <i>ka-</i> N |

Table 3.7. The Discourse deictic Oath matrix

3.5.2. Discourse deixis and the centering procedure

3.5.2.1. Introduction

Before separately discussing the forward and backward referring discourse deictic expressions, I will first compare the distribution of the Hittite forward and backward referring discourse deictic expressions with those in English. As described by Chen 1990, discourse deictic *that* may only be used to refer backward (anaphoric), whereas discourse deictic *this* may refer both backward and forward (cataphoric) (o.c. 140). Chen explains the exclusion of *that* from cataphoric reference to the ‘distancing’ effect of the distal demonstrative. This effect would counter the intention of a cataphoric pronoun, which is centering the attention on a new piece of discourse. The cataphoric deictic puts the event or proposition expressed in the following clause(s) on the ‘discourse counter, right before the speaker and the hearer.’ The distancing effect of *that* and the centering effect of *this* also explains their different discourse functions in backward reference:

3.54 there at that little spot I have never been there since the war. well there was one street and *that’s* it (Chen 1990: 140).

⁸² To substantiate my belief it would be necessary to study Initial position with and without *-a/-ma*. In Chapter 9 I will only study *apa-* with *-a/-ma*.

The distancing effect of *that* (and *those*) allows it to be used in constructions like in the above example. ‘The speaker uses *that* to signal that he will not dwell any more on the subject.’ (Chen 1990: 141). On the other hand, backward referring *this* or *these* are employed when the referent, already somehow present in the preceding discourse, needs to be centered upon in order to serve as a discourse topic:

3.55 Last year at this time I talked about some of the rules governing politeness, and I pointed out that *these* rules, apparently pragmatic ... (Chen 1990: 141)⁸³

Chen’s explanation seems plausible, but does it also work for Hittite? Theoretically a cognitive motivation based on the person-based demonstrative contrasts could also explain the differences between forward and backward referring expressions in Hittite. Indeed, the proximal demonstrative is used 1) to introduce something into the discourse, as we will see below, and 2) to center upon a new topic, as already discussed in 3.5.1. The distal (and medial?) demonstrative should on the other hand not be able to refer forward. In order to investigate this for Hittite I present the distribution of all the discourse deictic expressions in my corpus:

| Expression | Backward | | | | Forward | | | |
|--------------------|----------|-------|----|--------|---------|-------|----|--------|
| | OS | MH/MS | NH | LateNH | OS | MH/MS | NH | LateNH |
| <i>Continuing</i> | | | | | | | | |
| ∅ | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | — | — | — | — |
| -at | 1 | 10 | 3 | 20 | — | — | — | — |
| apat (Foc) | — | 2 | 16 | 6 | — | — | — | — |
| apa- N (Foc) | — | 2 | 8 | 4 | — | — | — | — |
| <i>Centering</i> | | | | | | | | |
| ki/ke | 5 | — | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| ka- N | 1 | 10 | 24 | 14 | — | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| apat (Foc) | — | — | — | 3 | — | — | 4 | 9 |
| apat ⁸⁴ | — | — | — | 2 | — | — | — | — |
| apa- N (Foc) | — | — | — | — | — | — | 1 | — |
| apa- N | — | 5 | 5 | — | — | — | — | — |
| eni | — | — | 1 | — | — | — | — | 1 |
| asi N | — | — | 1 | 7 | — | — | 1 | — |

Table 3.8. Distribution of discourse deictic expressions.

As the table shows clearly, almost anything can be used almost anywhere, which already shows the difference between Hittite and English discourse deixis. When the referent is not salient, *ka-*, *apa-* and *aši* can all be used to refer both forward and backward, with a preference for *ka-*.

The lack of texts in the Old Hittite and Middle Hittite periods makes it difficult to draw any conclusions about the absence of some of the expressions. Especially in the case of *eni* or *aši* + NP one should not jump to conclusions. This demonstrative is already poorly attested compared to the others, and given the fact that the discourse deictic demonstratives

⁸³ This non-discourse deictic example is also an instance of anaphora after first mention, which was discussed in 2.3.3.4.1. I cite it here in order to show the difference with backward referring ‘that’.

⁸⁴ With *apat* or *apa-N* I mean Addressee oriented *apa-*, not Focal *apa-*

form only a small part of the total, it is even likely that nothing whatsoever survived in the early periods.

The discussion below starts with a description of the demonstrative adverbs of manner *kiššan*, *apeniššan* and *eniššan*. The hypothesis is that these adverbs do not differ that much from the use of discourse deictic *ka-*, *aši* and *apa-*. After that the forward and backward expressions will be treated. The discussion of the backward referring expressions links back to the introduction, where it was proposed that demonstratives are used when the content of the discourse is not salient, and anaphoric pronouns (zero, enclitics, Focus-pronouns) when the propositional content is salient.

3.5.2.2. The demonstrative adverbs of manner

The first type of discourse deictic expressions to be treated is the demonstrative adverb of Manner. According to Diessel (1999: 74), manner demonstratives have not yet received attention in the literature on deixis, apart from being glossed as ‘in this/that way’ or ‘like this/that’. It seems that they are involved in some sort of comparison. As I will show here, this only turns out to be valid for the adverb *apeniššan*, related to *apa-*.

The demonstrative adverb of manner referring forward in all periods is *kiššan*⁸⁵, while *eniššan* refers backwards (see already Hrozný 1917: 135, Friedrich 1926: 73, 1974: 134). Both adverbs can modify verbs of communication (*memiya-*, *te-/tar-*, *hatrai-*), perception (*istamass-*, *aus-*), treaty or oath establishing verbs (*link-*, *ishiya-*), and a rest class of verbs (*iya-*, *pahs-*, *hark-*). The clauses containing these adverbs always form a link, a discourse node, between the preceding and following text, and do not constitute themselves relevant information pushing the discourse forward. These clauses therefore are usually very short:

3.56 KBo 3.4+ iii 82, 86-87 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 I), ed. Grélois 1988: 69

⁸² *mPihhuniiaš=ma=mu EGIR-pa ki-iš-ša-an hatraēš ... nu=mu ma[h]han* ⁸⁷
mPihhuniiaš e-ni-iš-ša-an EGIR-pa IŠPUR

Pihhuniya wrote to me in return in this way (*kissan*): ‘...’. After Pihhuniya had written to me in return in that way (*enissan*), ...

This example nicely shows the division of labor between both adverbs. Another opposition of adverbs can be found in the letter of the widow of Tutanchamon from Egypt to King Suppiluliuma of Hatti, in which she expresses her disappointment in Suppiluliuma’s reaction on her request for a Hittite husband:

3.57 KBo 5.6 iii 45 - iv 4 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40), ed. Güterbock 1956: 96

nu ABU=YA kuṽapi m^{GIŠ}GIDRU.LÚ-in ⁴⁶ *INA KUR URU^{URU}Mezri IŠPUR n=an kiššan* ⁴⁷
kuit ṽatarnaḥta DUMU EN-ŠUNU=ṽa=šmaš ⁴⁸ *kuṽatqa ēšzi ammuk=ma=ṽa* ⁴⁹
appaleškanzi nu=ṽa=mu DUMU=YA LUGAL-uēznanni ⁵⁰ *ŪL ṽekiškanzi nu ANA*
ABU=YA ⁵¹ *MUNUS.LUGAL URU^{URU}Mizri tuppiṽaz EGIR-pa ki-iš-ša-an* ⁵² *hatraizzi*
kuṽat=ṽa a-pé-ni-iš-ša-an TAQBI ⁵³ *appaleškanzi=ṽa=mu ammuk=man=ṽa* ⁵⁴
kuṽapi DUMU-YA ēšta ammuk=man=ṽa ammel // iv ¹ *[R]AMANI=YA ammel=a*

⁸⁵ With a very few exceptions. See chapter 6.

KUR-eaš tepnumar ² tametani KUR-e ḥatranun ³ nu=ūa=mu=kan parā ŪL ijašḥatta ⁴ nu=ūa=mu e-né-eš-ša-an imma TAQBI

When my father had sent Hattusaziti to Egypt, given that he had ordered him in this way: “Is there somehow a son of their lord to them? Do they deceive *me* (somehow) and do they not want my son for kingship?”, the Queen of Egypt wrote back to my father on a tablet in this way (*kissan*): “Why have you spoken in that way (*apenissan*): “Do they deceive me?”. Would I have had a son, would I have written my own and my country’s shame to another country? You did not believe me and have spoken to me in that way (*enessan*)!”

This time not *kiššan* but *apeniššan* refers forward in iii 52 while *eniššan* refers backward to the same piece of text: “Do they deceive me?”. As I will discuss below, *apeniššan* is the Focus form of the demonstrative manner adverb, and can as such be used instead of either *kiššan* or *eniššan*, that is, it may refer forward and backward. As for the justification of my interpretation of *apeniššan* as a Focus adverb: of course the Queen of Egypt would never have dreamt of receiving such a distrustful answer on her unique request. The answer of Suppiluliuma must have been completely contra-expectational: ‘Why did you write like *that* (Focus) instead of ...’.

3.58 **KBo 16.98 ii 10** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 98-99

§ ¹⁰ dUTU URUPÚ-na kuit e-né-eš-ša-an tešḥaneškittari

Concerning the fact that the Sungoddess of Arinna thus (*enessan*) keeps showing herself in my dreams: (If I, My Majesty, will come up from the country of Kummanni, will I sit down in kingship, ...).

Although *eniššan* usually refers to the preceding discourse, this paragraph is the first one dealing with the accession ceremony of Tudhaliya IV and his journeys to Kummanni and Nerik. Being a *Sammeltafel* (Van den Hout 1998: 95), this is an excerpt from a probably much larger oracle inquiry, so we might conclude that the dreams referred to are described in the larger oracle inquiry. It is therefore possible to interpret *eniššan* as a backward discourse deictic adverb, referring to a portion of discourse on the original tablet.

Not one attestation of *kiššan* and *eniššan* in my corpus is used in a setting involving comparison. This is however completely different for the clauses containing *apeniššan* and its Akkadographic writing *QATAMMA*. Another important feature that distinguishes *apeniššan* from the others is the fact that *kiššan* and *eniššan* usually refer to Direct Speech whereas *apeniššan* does not. The following examples show both properties at the same time, comparison and the reference to preceding narration as opposed to Direct Speech:

3.59 **KBo 6.2 iii 16-20** (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 67

§ ¹⁶ mān DUMU.MEŠ ^{URU}HATTI LÚ.MEŠ ILKI ūer ANA ABI LUGAL aruū[ānzi] ¹⁷ nu taršikanzi kūšan=naš=za natta kuiški jez[zi] ¹⁸ nu=ūa=naš mimmanzi LÚ.MEŠ ILKI=ūa šumeš nu ABI LUGAL [(tuliija an)da tija] ¹⁹ n=uš anda šittariet itten māhanda are[(š=(š)meš)] ²⁰ šumešš=a a-pé-ni-iš-ša-an ište[n] §

When (a delegation) of Hittites, men owing *sahhan*-services, came, they did rever[ence] to the father of the king, and said: “Not one of us makes wages!⁸⁶ They refuse us (saying): ‘You are men required to perform your jobs as a *sahhan*-service!’” The father of the king [stepped] into the assembly and instructed (?) them: ‘Go! Just as (*mahhanda*) your colleagues (do), so (*apenissan*) you too must do⁸⁷!

3.60 **KBo 15.10+ ii 12-16** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szábo 1971: 22-23

¹² [QAD]U kurdāli idalāmuš EME.ḪI.A arḫa šuhḫair ¹³ [nu k]iššan mēmīr kē māḫḫan ḫarkanzi ¹⁴ [fZ]iś=a BELAM QADU DAM-ŠU DUMU.ME[Š-]ŠU kuit iššišta ¹⁵ [nu š]A fZi alyanzatar=šet idālu uddār=šet QA-TAM-MA ¹⁶ [ḫara]kdu n=at=apa EGIR-pa lē uizzi §

[Wit]h the *kurdali*-vessel they threw away the ‘evil tongues’. They spoke as [f]ollows: “Just as (*mahhan*) these ones are destroyed, now, given the fact that Zi(plantawiya, the sister of the lord) regularly acted against the lord, his wife (and) children, may likewise (*QATAMMA*) the sorcery [o]f Zi (and) her evil words [be destroy]ed, let them not come back!”

Besides the construction *mahhan* ... *apenissan* ‘Just as ... likewise/in that same way’ there are also several examples of comparison without *mahhan*, although the sense is not altered⁸⁸.

The ‘Just as ... likewise/in that same way’ construction is an example of Expanding Focus (see 2.2.3.2.2.). The contents of the remainder of the clause containing *apenissan* is usually presupposed, either because it is literally mentioned before or derivable from the context. What needs to be stressed is the promise, wish or warning that some kind of behaviour should be expected of a second party ‘just in that same way’. As a result of this type of discourse function, *apenissan* is not restricted to the verbs mentioned above.

A last remark about the demonstrative adverbs of manner: there are no attestations of adverbs of manner accompanying the possible demonstratives *šija*- and *anni*-. There exists an adverb *annišan* (single -š) ‘in the past, in his time’, but it is unlikely that it may be compared to *ki-ššan* (neuter sg. of the demonstrative *ka*- and suffix -ššan), *eni-ššan* (neuter of demonstrative *asi*) and *apeni-ššan* (not attested neuter **apeni*- of the demonstrative *apa*-). Both form and function are different from the other demonstrative adverbs.

Summarizing, *kiššan* refers forward, *eniššan* refers backward, and *apeniššan* can do both as a Focus adverb. The latter is a true demonstrative adverb of comparison and can therefore occur with every predicate.

3.5.2.3. The forward referring discourse deictic demonstratives

Table 3.8. showed that all demonstrative pronouns and noun phrases can refer both forward and backward, and are therefore somehow different from the demonstrative adverbs of manner *kiššan* and *eniššan*. The question which will be addressed in this section is: what distinguishes the three forward referring demonstrative pronouns and noun phrases from each

⁸⁶ Hoffner differently: ‘No one pays us a wage.’

⁸⁷ Hoffner: ‘You too must perform (*sahhan*-services) just like your colleagues!’.

⁸⁸ See chapter 5.4.2.

other. In trying to solve this question however, we must keep in mind that the discourse deictic demonstratives are rarely used compared with the adverbs.

The forward referring discourse deictic expressions occur with the following predicate types: of speaking or writing (*memai-* ‘to speak’, *hatrai-* ‘to write’), of knowledge (*sak-* ‘to know’), achievement predicates (*iya-* ‘to do, make’), directive predicates (*watarnahh-* ‘to order’) etc. These predicate types are generally the same as the ones of the manner adverbs *kiššan* and *eniššan*.

The first question is, can forward referring discourse deictic *ka-* be used with all speech participants, and in all kinds of emphatic environments. In the following example *ka-* is Speaker oriented, but Speaker orientation does not explain why *ka-* is used in connection with the Other in ex. 3.62 and the Addressee in ex. 3.63.

- 3.61 **KUB 1.1 i 36-37** (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 6-7

^d*IŠTAR=ma=mu GAŠAN=YA Û-a[(t)]* ³⁷ *nu=mu Û-it ki-i memišta*

But Istar, My Lady, appeared to me in a dream. She told me this (*ki*) by means of the dream: (‘I will leave you to a Deity. Do not fear.’)

- 3.62 **KBo 2.6+ iii 60** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 210-211

§ ⁶⁰ *nu ki-i=ma kišan DÛ-anzi*

Or will they do this (*ki*) as follows: ...

- 3.63 **KUB 26.1 iv 49-50** (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.2), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 17

§ ⁴⁹ *našma ki-i kuiški memai kēdani=ua=kan tuppi* ⁵⁰ *kē INIM.MEŠ ÛL GAR-ru ...*

Or (if) someone (of you) says this (*ki*): “on this tablet these affairs are not put down, ...

Besides the fact that *ka-* may occur in combination with the Speaker, Addressee or Other, it is also used in neutral (3.62), positive (3.61) and negative contexts (3.63). It is therefore possible that discourse deictic forward referring *ka-* is unmarked both in respect to person and to emotional attitude.

However, in almost every case discourse deictic *ka-* introduces something that is of importance for the Speaker. It is therefore also possible that *ka-* has become more or less neutral and that the Speaker only uses another demonstrative to express strong disassociation. There are two clear examples of forward referring *aši* illustrating this, of which one is cited here (both are discussed in chapter 4).

- 3.64 **KUB 19.29 iv 11-15** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 18-19

kēz=ma mHannuttiš kuiš KUR.KUR.MEŠ Š[APLITI] ¹² *manijahhiškit nu INA KUR URU Išhupitta kuṣap[i ...]* ¹³ *n=aš apija BA.ÚŠ nu mahhan eni=ia ŠA mHannutt[i*
ÚŠ-an[?]] ¹⁴ *ištamaššir n=at=za=kan apēzzi=ia EGIR-an [EGIR-pa^{??}]* ¹⁵ *ešandat*
nu=mu e-ni AWATE.MEŠ apadda hatreš[kir] §

(“Now the one who would have impressed me, [would have] be[en] your eldest brother, [who] managed the troops and charioteers for his father and (who) knew the treaties of his father. [He used to be] a h[ero]. If you would impress me, [you] would [be] *he* for me.” [But when] they saw [my brother] ill,)

Hannutti who managed the L[ower] Lands at this time, when he [...] in Ishupitta, he died over there/then. When they heard of also *that* [death] of Hannutti, because of that *too* they became rebellious. Because of that they wrote those (= the following, *eni*) words: ...

The ‘following words’ refer to the contents of the next paragraph: “You are a child, and you know nothing. [You do not] imp[ress (me).] At this time your country is devastated and [your] troo[ps and horses] have dwindled. I have more troops than you, I have more horses than you. [Your father on the other hand] had many troops and horses. As for [you] who are a child, when will you go *taparuna* him (= them)?”. These are clearly statements the Speaker would want to disassociate himself from.

The difficulty with discourse deictic *apa-* is that it can be Addressee oriented or Focal, or both at the same time. In favor of Addressee orientation is that forward referring *apa-* only occurs in an Oath (CTH 255) and a Letter (CTH 177) in my corpus, that is, genres with active Addressees (see also section 3.4.3.). It is remarkable that both texts are from the time of Tudhaliya IV, and that CTH 255 contains all but one attestation of forward referring *apa-*.

An example of Focal *apa-* is:

3.65 **KUB 26.12+ ii 2-9** (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.1), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 24, with emendations from Otten 1958: 389.

§ ² *našma=kan* [...] ³ *našma* ŠEŠ d[UTU-ŠI ŠA MUNUS.LUGA]L *h[aššanza našma]* ⁴ ŠEŠ.MEŠ DUMU.MEŠ ^{MUNUS}NA[PTA]R[T]I *anda i[štamašzi]* ⁵ *nu ki-i memai* EGIR-*an=ua=mu* *tī[ia]* ⁶ *apāš=ma a-pa-a-at memai* EGIR-*an=ua=ta* ⁷ *ŪL tījami* *hanti=ia=ua=šši* ⁸ *ŪL tījami* ⁹ *kišhahari* ...

Or (if) [...] or a brother of [My Majesty], o[ffspring or] brothers [of the Queen], I[stems] to sons of con[cubine]s, (and) says this (*ki*): “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 not] become evil [against him ?]”

Instead of *ki* as in ii 5, *apat* is used in ii 6. This is not the same as the contrast which can be expressed in English by means of ‘this and that’ because in Hittite such contrasts are expressed by means of *apa-* ... *apa-* or *ka-* ... *ka-* (see chapters 5 and 6). Of course there is some notion of contrast, but this is inherent to the Focal function of *apa-* and would also have been present without the *nu ki-i memai* clause. The discourse deictic *apat* is used in its function of Replacing Focus pronoun, as explained in chapter 8. In order to express the difference with English ‘this and that’ I have translated *apat* as ‘this’, with the italics indicating stress, in contrast with unstressed *ki* in ii 5. Addressee orientation of *apa-* is unlikely. It might explain the use of *apa-* but not of *ki*.

A possible example of Addressee orientation might be the following example, although it could also, or just, be Focus (indicating a surprising, unexpected action).

3.66 **KUB 26.12+ ii 29-32** (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.1), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 25

²⁹ *namma a-pa-a-at* *kuit ēššatteni* *nu* KUR.KUR.ḪI.A ³⁰ BA[L d]apianda *l-ētta* *naiškittin* ³¹ *nu* K[UR.KUR].ḪI.A ^{LÚ}KÚR *daššanuškittin* ³² KUR.KUR ^{URU}ḪATTI=*ma mališkunuttin*

Furthermore, as for *that* (*apat*) what you do: You turned [a]ll defectiv[e] countries into one, you made the c[ountr]ies of the enemy powerful, while the countries of Hatti you made weak, ...

Summarizing, forward referring *ka-* is, like *kiššan*, unmarked for person and emotional connotation. The demonstrative *aši* is used in disassociating context, in line with the temporal distance expressed by *eniššan*, and *apa-* can occur as the Focus pronoun in contrast with Focus neutral *ka-*, thus paralleling Focal *apeniššan*.

3.5.2.4. The backward referring discourse deictic expressions

In 2.3.5. I referred to the difference between the English demonstrative pronouns *that*, *this* versus the demonstrative description *that*/*this* story etc. It seems that the pronoun is used to nominalize the contents of the immediately preceding proposition, whereas the demonstrative description refers to larger parts of discourse. For Hittite I could not find a difference between the demonstrative pronoun and the demonstrative description (see chapters 5 and 6).

The next question is, is the choice for one of the demonstratives dictated by assignment to a cognitive domain as with the Anaphoric use? First, it must be noted that the attestations of the proximal demonstrative far outnumber the other two.

Every propositional content or each act of behavior described in treaties, instructions, prayers, oaths, rituals etc. almost always concerns the Speaker. Only text genres where other people act or speak without being explicitly related to the Speaker should provide us with discourse deictic expressions that can be compared with each other.

Besides the influence of genre, also Focus is important. As we will see in Chapter 8, *apa-* usually functions as the emphatic pronoun, occurring in Focus function. In backward referring discourse deictic use it usually is accompanied by the enclitic *ɛya*, ‘also’, the Expanding Focus marker. It is the equivalent of English *that* as the emphatic form of *it*, and of the English emphasized demonstrative *that*. Most, and possibly all, attestations of discourse deictic *apa-* (+ N) are Focal, or at least emphatic:

3.67 KBo 19.44+ rev. 26-27 (MH/MS treaty, CTH 42)

²⁶ *danna=ma=an=za lē ilalijaši ŪL=at āra apē[(z=kan)]* ²⁷ *uddanaz arḫa akkiškanzi*

(If at some time a sister ... of your wife comes to visit you, give her to eat and to drink. Eat, drink and have fun (pl.),) but do not desire to take her. That (lit. it) is *not* right! Because of that (*apez*) behavior people die.

After restricting ourselves to non-Focal, non-Speaker genres only a few examples remain. Only in letters, oracle and annals we might find references to people who act on their own responsibility. In the end everything relates to the Speaker, usually the king, but in these genres the king can decide to consider an event of speech as being outside his domain. A very clear example of this was already presented in ex. 3.46, partially repeated here:

3.68 KUB 6.41 i 34-35 (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68), ed. Friedrich 1926: 110-111

§ ³⁴ *maḥḥan=ma* ^dUTU-ŠI *u-ni memian AŠME nu* ^dUTU-ŠI ^mPIŠ.TUR-an ³⁵ *ŪL kuitki*
HUL-uanni *šanḫun*

But when I, My Majesty, heard about that (*uni*) affair, I, My Majesty, did not seek evil against Mashuiluwa at all.

The conclusion was that *uni memian* was used to indicate that the affair described in the preceding paragraph did not concern the king at all at first sight. This is one of the very few examples of the distal demonstrative in discourse deictic use.

In letters we find a few discourse deictic *apa*-s that are possibly not Focal. The Medial demonstrative *apa*- might be used here to indicate that something done or said by the Addressee is not of further importance for the Speaker (see further 5.4.3.2.2.2.):

- 3.69 **HKM 54 obv. 4-24** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 220-221
 §⁴ ŠA NUMUN.ĤI.A=mu *uttar kuit* §⁵ *ḥatrāeš* NUMUN.ĤI.A=ua §⁶ A.ŠÀ *terippijaš* §⁷ NU.GÁL
 §⁸ nu^{URU} *Tapigga* §⁹ URU *Anziliia* §¹⁰ URU *Hariia* §¹¹ Û ANA^{URU} *Haninqauuaia* §¹² ŠE-AM Û
 ZÍZ=ia §¹³ [k]ue *annijan* §¹⁴ ēšta *man ŪL* §¹⁵ *apēz datta* §¹⁶ *man apē* A.ŠÀ *terip[p]i*
 §¹⁷ *anīr*
 §¹⁸ ŠA^{URU} *Kašipūra* GUD.ĤI.A §¹⁹ *kue* A.ŠÀ *terippi* §²⁰ A.Š[À] *terippijat* §²¹ *nu=tta*
uuanzi §²² *a-pé-e-d[a]-ni uddanī* §²³ IŠT[U] É.[GA]L-LIM ŪL §²⁴ *punu[šš]a[n]zi*
 §²⁵ *kinuna apēz dā* §²⁶ *nu apē* NUMUN.ĤI.A *annija*

As for the fact that you wrote to me about the affair of the seed: “There is no seed for the plowed fields”.

As for the grain and wheat which were (to be) sown in Tapigga, Anziliya, Hariya and Haninqauwaya, had you *not* taken (it) away from there, they would have sown those plowed fields!

As for the oxen from Kasipura with which you plowed the plowed fields, it won’t happen that they will question you from the palace in that (*apedani*) matter (of yours).

Take now from *there/that*, sow those seeds (you have)!

Compare this with the next story which deals with people other than the Speaker but which is taken up by her and acted upon:

- 3.70 **KUB 21.38 rev. 7-11** (NH letter, Hattusili III, CTH 176), ed. Edel 1994: 222-223
 §⁷ ŠEŠ=YA=ma=mu *kuit kišan TAŠPUR* NIN-YA=ua=mu *IŠPUR* DUMU.MUNUS KUR^{URU}
 KARDUNIYAŠ=ua *kuiš* KUR^{URU} MIŠRI §⁸ [p]iianza *ēšta nu=ua=šši* GIM-an^{LÚ.MEŠ}
 TEME EGIR[an]da *pāir nu=uar=at* EGIR-pa *IŠTU* IKU *arantat* §⁹ [nu=m]u *ku-*
u-un memiian §¹⁰ TEMU LUGAL KUR^{URU} KAR-ΦDUNI[Y]A<Š>^{md}EN.LÍL.EN.UKÙ.MEŠ
memišta §¹⁰ [ammu]k=ma *memiian kuit AŠMI mān=an* ANA ŠEŠ=YA ŪL AŠPUR
kinun=ma=mu=za ŠEŠ=YA *kuit markijat* §¹¹ [n]=at ŪL *namma ijami*

As for the fact that my [br]other wrote to me thus: “My sister wrote to me: ‘The daughter of Babylon who was given to Egypt, when the messengers later went to (visit) her, they had to stay back by an IKU (= 150 mtrs.)!’ ”. The messenger of the king of Babylon, Enlil-bel-nise, told me this (*kun*) story. As for the fact that I (only) heard the story, I should not have written it to my brother. But now that my brother has expressed disapproval to me, I won’t do it again.

3.5.3. Discourse deixis and the continuity procedure

As was illustrated in 3.5.1., the enclitic pronoun *-a-* and the Focal pronoun or determiner *apa-* occurred mainly in the matrix clause of a preceding conditional clause. Conditionals enhance the saliency of the propositional content of their clause, and as a result the propositional content may be denoted by means of expressions that indicate a high cognitive status, such as \emptyset , *-a-* or Focal *apa-*.

But not only the presence of a conditional clause conditions the use of referential expressions, also the nature of the verb should be taken into account. If the verb requires a 4th, 3rd, or 2nd order entity, then the Addressee immediately searches for respectively a speech-act, propositional content or event in the adjacent preceding discourse (see 2.3.6.).

To repeat from earlier sections, verbs that take speech-acts (4th order verbs) as its complement are *te-/tar-* ‘to speak’, *memai-* ‘to tell’, *hatrai-* ‘to write’. Verbs that take propositions as complement (3rd order verbs) are *sak-* ‘to know’, *mali-* ‘think, contemplate’, but also verbs of mental perception as *istamass-* ‘hear’. In the next example we have both a verb of speaking and a verb of knowing⁸⁹:

3.71 **KBo 6.26 i 22-27** (OH/NS law, CTH 292), ed. Hoffner 1997: 130

§ ²² *takku šuppala=ššet kuēlqa šieuniahta* ²³ *t=at parkunuzi n=at arha pēnnai*
²⁴ *išuu~~an~~alli=ma=kan išu~~uan~~ dāi* ²⁵ *ari=šši=ma=at ŪL tezzi* ^{LÜ} *arašš=a* ²⁶ *ŪL*
²⁷ *šakki šuppala=ššet pennai* *n=at aki šarnikzil* §

If anyone's animals are smitten (with disease) by a god, and (the owner) performs a purification ritual upon them, and leads them away, but puts the mud (?) on the mud pile (?), while he doesn't mention it (*-at*) to his colleague, and also⁹⁰, the colleague doesn't know (about it) so drives his animals (there), and they die, there shall be compensation.

The verb *te-/tar-* ‘to mention, say’ in i 25 requires 4th order entity. The only possibility is ‘he does not mention *that he has put the mud on the mud pile*’. In the next clause the verb *sak-* ‘to know’ appears. The interpretation ‘the colleague does not know *him*’ is impossible in view of the context, which leaves only ‘the colleague does not know *that he has put the mud on the mud pile*’.⁹¹

In the preceding section I listed some examples of *ka-* N, *asi* N and *apa-* N with verbs of speaking, writing and perception. The difference with *-a-* in the same environment is that the demonstrative description *only* occurs on discourse nodes. And as we have seen, discourse nodes dramatically lower the saliency of a discourse entity. So even if the verb would lead the Addressee to expect a 4th or 3rd order entity, there is no one salient enough to be referred to by means of *-a-*.

⁸⁹ See for example also **MH** *te-/tar-* IBoT 1.36 i 35-37 (instruction, CTH 262), *istamass-* ‘to hear’ KBo 5.3 + ii 30 (treaty, CTH 42), **lateNH** *sak-* KUB 26.12+ i 30 (CTH 255).

⁹⁰ See Chapter 7 for the translation of the clausal coordinator *-ya* as ‘and also’.

⁹¹ It seems that in older language $\neq a$, the allophone of $\neq ma$, conditions the use or non-use of the enclitic pronoun *-a-*. A sequence *apas + a + at* gives *a-pa-(a-)ša-at*, which is indistinguishable from the sequence *apas- + at > a-pa-(a-)ša-at*. I think that the need to structure the discourse, which is one of the functions of *-a/-ma*, overrules the need for an enclitic pronoun, especially when the verb itself already delimits the possible referents.

Besides after conditionals and as objects of 4th or 3rd order verbs, salient discourse deictic expressions are also attested in other contexts. In most cases the saliency of the referent of the pronoun can be determined on the basis of the preceding context, as in the next examples:

- 3.72 **KUB 16.32 ii 14-18** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 569), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 178-181

§¹⁴ ANA dUTU-šI *kuit* ANA DUMU.MEŠ mUrhi-dU-up š SISKUR *manta*[*llii*]a¹⁵ IGI-*anda arḥa* BAL-*uanzi* UL SIXSÁ-at UL *≠aš* *kuit* [dUTU-š]I ḪUL-*aḥhun*¹⁶ ḪUL-*aḥta* *≠aš* *kuiš* UN-*aš* *n* *≠aš* *nūya* *kuit* TI-za nu [ap]el *kuit*¹⁷ TI-za UL *uaršijan*za nu SISKUR *mantalli arḥa* B[AL-u(*anzi*)]¹⁸ *a-pé-ez* UL SIXSÁ-at §

Why has it not been ascertained for His Majesty to complete *mantalli*-rituals to the sons of Urhi-Tessub? Because I, [M]y [Majesty] had not wronged them, (and) because the person who did wrong them is still alive, and because h[i]s soul (has) not (been) pacified, because of *that* it was not ascertained to complete the *mantalli*-ritual.

The reason why the rituals were not completed is given in the three explanatory *kuit* clauses, following a question, the first *kuit* clause. The propositional contents of the *kuit* clauses are the most important information, and *not* one of the persons mentioned in these clauses. The ablative *apez* therefore refers to salient information. The emphatic pronoun is used because it provides and summarizes the requested information: *apez* is the Completive Focus. The rest of the clause is presupposed, and a repetition of ii 14-15. The question was: ‘Why was there no ritual?’, and the answer was: ‘*apez* = Because of *that* (referring to the three *kuit* clauses) (there was no ritual)’.⁹²

In the following example the propositional content of the clause preceding the clause with *-at* is salient because it is expressed as a (rhetorical) question.

- 3.73 **KUB 21.38 obv. 16’** (NH letter, Hattusili III, CTH 176), ed. Edel 1994: 216-217

ŠEŠ *≠YA* *≠ma ammedaza* NÍG.TUKU-ti *kuitki* ŪL *≠at* ŠUM-an *išḥaššaru*atarr *≠a*
Will my brother somehow become rich on my account? That (lit. it) is *neither* (good) reputation *nor* lordly behavior.

3.5.4. Summary and conclusions

Of the demonstrative adverbs of manner *kiššan* referred forward, *enissan* referred backward, and *apeniššan* could do both as a Focus adverb. As a true demonstrative adverb of comparison *apeniššan* could occur with every predicate. The adverbs were not marked for person.

Forward referring *ka-* was like *kiššan* unmarked for person and emotional connotation. The demonstrative *aši* was used in disassociating context, in line with the temporal distance expressed by *eniššan*, and *apa-* could occur as the Focus pronoun in contrast with Focus neutral *ka-*, parallelling Focal *apeniššan*.

⁹² See also for example NH KUB 1.1 iii 61 (Egodocument, CTH 81).

With backward reference one needed to distinguish between reference to salient and non-salient propositions. I used the following criteria to distinguish between salient and non-salient discourse propositions.

- Conditional clauses and questions can raise the level of saliency of propositional contents
- Verbs that require 3rd and 4th order complements raise the saliency of propositional contents.

After applying these criteria it became clear that demonstratives were used if an event or proposition of the preceding discourse needed to be put in the center of attention. If the discourse content was already centered upon, the enclitic pronoun *-a-* or its Focus counterpart *apa-* were used.

There seemed to be a correlation between demonstrative and cognitive domain. This was especially seen with *aši* in contexts where the Speaker explicitly stated his non-commitment.

The distribution of demonstratives and pronouns is:

| <i>Discourse Deixis</i> | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Continuity procedure | | Centering procedure |
| E-Top | A-Focus | Focus |
| ∅, <i>-a-</i> | <i>apa-</i> (+ N) <i>apeniššan</i> | <i>dem</i> (+ N) <i>kiššan</i> (forward) <i>eniššan</i> (backward) |

Table 3.9. The Discourse deictic matrix.

3.6. Summary and conclusions

Hittite has a three-way person-based demonstrative system (3.1). The Proximal demonstrative is *ka-*, the Distal demonstrative is *asi*, and the Medial one is *apa-*. The middle term denotes ‘location near Hearer/Addressee’, and not ‘medial distance from Speaker’. Visibility or non-visibility is probably not a part of the semantic contents of the Distal Demonstrative.

The organization of the Hittite deictic demonstrative system around Speaker, Addressee and Other is mirrored in the recognitional use of demonstratives (3.2). The proximal *ka-*, medial *apa-* and distal *asi* are all allowed in constructions where the Speaker wants to evoke in the mind of the Addressee some pre-existing mental representation of an entity or event.

The same could be observed for the Tracking demonstratives. These demonstratives occurred both in salient (3.3) and non-salient contexts (3.4.). Non-salient contexts were those where there was a clear marker present that a discourse unit was closed. In order to refer again to something in a closed unit, or even across one, demonstrative descriptions were used. However, the choice for a demonstrative depended on assignment to the cognitive space of Speaker (*ka-*), Addressee (*apa-*) or Other (*asi*).

Tracking demonstratives in salient context also signalled that a new discourse unit had started. Thus, tracking demonstratives were clearly connected with new discourse units, independent of the level of saliency.

In-node reference on the other hand was the domain of \emptyset , *-a-* and *apa-* (3.3.) The difference between \emptyset , *-a-* and *apa-* was that \emptyset and *-a-* only denoted Established Topics, whereas *apa-* denoted all types of Argument Focus and the Unestablished Topic.

Finally, discourse deictic demonstratives (3.5.2.) followed more or less the same pattern, although the assignment to cognitive domains was not as clear as with the Recognitional and Tracking use of demonstratives. By their nature demonstrative discourse deictic expressions are linkers and occurred therefore on discourse nodes.

Sometimes however propositional contents were salient (3.5.3.). The expression used in such a case was again \emptyset , *apa-* or *apa- N*. Reference to salient propositional contents always occurred in-node.

Combining all the tables results in (more detailed tables are found in the chapters 4,5 and 6):

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| | continuity procedure | | | centering procedure | |
| | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| Deictic | <i>dem</i> | <i>dem</i> | <i>dem</i> | — | <i>dem N</i> <i>dem. adverb</i> |
| Recognitional | — | — | — | — | <i>dem N</i> |
| Anaphora in-node across-node | <i>(-a-)</i> <i>dem N</i> | <i>apa-</i> <i>dem N</i> | <i>apa-</i> <i>(dem ?)</i> | — <i>dem N</i> | <i>dem N</i> |
| Discourse Deictic in-node | <i>(-a-)</i> | \emptyset | <i>apa- (N)</i> <i>apenissan</i> | — | — |
| across-node | — | — | — | <i>dem (N)</i> | <i>dem (N)</i> <i>dem. adv.</i> |

Table 3.10. The Hittite referential matrix.

This concludes part I. In part II I will present the individual demonstratives (chapters 4, 5 and 6). In part III I will present the accented pronoun *apa-* and start with a description of the Topic-Focus structure of Hittite.

PART II

DEIXIS

4. The distal demonstrative *asi*, *uni*, *eni* etc.

4.1. Status Quaestionis

4.1.1. Introduction

Two opposing views on the form and function of the lexemes *asi*, *eni*, *uni* etc. have been competing during the past 70 years. One theory, originating from Friedrich 1925, distinguishes separate pronouns with more or less similar functions, whereas Laroche 1979 united all forms in one paradigm, naturally with one function. Building on the insights of these scholars but opposing them on major points, I accept Laroche's unitary paradigm, but expand on the idea of Friedrich that the forms built on the stem *ed-* are deictic. In this chapter I will present the evidence for *asi*, *uni*, *eni* etc. as a true deictic demonstrative pronoun. This demonstrative is the distal member of a three-way deictic system in which *ka-* is the proximal term (see Chapter 6) and *apa-* is the medial term (see Chapter 5)⁹³.

4.1.2. Friedrich's different paradigms, similar function

Friedrich 1925⁹⁴ was the first to recognize that undeclined *asi* functions as a nom.sg. and acc. sg. pronoun with the meaning "selbiger, besagter, erwähnter". He derived this meaning from the observation that *asi* very often occurs adnominally with a substantive that is mentioned before. He did however not distinguish true anaphoric reference from mention of *asi* in Direct Speech referring backwards across a Direct Speech boundary to an object in the preceding narration⁹⁵ (for examples, see sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3). Friedrich was not able to find a difference between *asi* and the other pronouns: "Auch wie sich *aši* von den anderen rückweisenden Demonstrativen *apāš*, *eniš* und *uniš* unterschied, kann ich nicht sagen." (1925: 289). So obviously he classified *asi* as a demonstrative (see also his grammar § 118), albeit an anaphoric one.

⁹³ Contrary to current views. For a discussion see Chapter 5.

⁹⁴ The first attempt to categorize several of the forms discussed here is found in Forrer 1922: 207-8. At this early stage in Hittite studies his categorization necessarily contains much that has been later discarded. I will therefore not extensively discuss Forrer's views. Forrer distinguished three non-proximal demonstratives: cataphoric *eni-* 'jener (vordeutend)', anaphoric *uni-* 'jener, (rückdeutend)' and *anni-* 'jener (in größere Entfernungweisend)'. It seems that he considered *eni-* and *uni-* as anaphoric demonstratives, *anni-* as a situational demonstrative.

⁹⁵ The distinction between true anaphoric reference and reference to an entity both in narration and embedded Direct Speech is crucial for understanding the true nature of a demonstrative pronoun.

In 1926 Friedrich discussed the meaning of *eni*, the nom.-acc.neuter sg. of a pronoun *enis* and its adverb *enissan*. This adverb refers backward to a citation, and from the meaning of *enissan* Friedrich derived for *eni* ‘der eben erwähnte, der kurz vorher genannte’ (1926: 73 and n. 3. Also see Sommer 1938: 161). Although Forrer 1922: 207-208 proposed to unite *eni* with *edas*, *edani*, *edi* and *edez*, Friedrich rejected this connection on formal and functional grounds. Formally one should expect a stem **a-*, not **e-* in the nominative and accusative (1926: 74 n. 1), and functionally the *edas* group seemed to be rather close to *ka-*, the proximal demonstrative. He assumed that the deictic force of the *edas* group was somewhat weaker (‘Der’-Deixis). Furthermore, the meaning ‘der (eben) erwähnte’ did not fit in the contexts where *edas* etc. was used.⁹⁶

In the same work (1926: 155) Friedrich discussed *uni*, the accusative of a demonstrative *uni-*. All that he could say about *uni*, *unin* and *unius* was that they refer backwards to something that is mentioned earlier. Semantically *uni-* seemed to be connected with the enemy. Again Friedrich states that he has not yet found any difference with the other anaphoric demonstratives *apas*, *enis* and *asi*.

Summarizing, Friedrich distinguished five demonstrative stems besides *ka-* ‘this’, (i) a deictic **a-* with the attested forms *edas*, *edani*, *edi* and *edez*, more or less similar in function to *ka-*, the proximal deictic demonstrative, (ii) *asi*, an anaphoric demonstrative without inflection, (iii) an anaphoric demonstrative *eni-*, attested as *enis* and *eni*, (iv) an anaphoric demonstrative *uni-* with the forms *uni*, *unin*, and *unius*, and finally (v), the anaphoric demonstrative *apa-* ‘is’.

The same view was expressed by Friedrich in his dictionary (1952-1966 [1991]) and grammar (1960). There are: (i) *edani*, *edas*, *edi* and *etez* and now also *e-*, nom.pl.comm., belonging to the defective pronoun *a-* ‘er, sie, es’ (1991: 17, 44; 1974: 68 (§ 116)), (ii) the undeclinable *asi-* ‘der betreffende’ (but see the lexical entry *asis* in KUB 3.99 ii 18, Friedrich 1960: 68), (1991: 36; 1974: 68 (§ 118)), (iii) *eni-* ‘der (eben) erwähnte’, with *enis*, *eni* and *enius* (1991: 41; 1974: 68 (§ 117)), and (iv) *uni-* ‘jener, der da, der erwähnte’ with *unin*, *uni* and *unius* (1991: 234; 1974: 68 (§ 117)). This distribution is also found in Friedrich-Kammenhuber (1975ff.) sub the lemmata *a*¹, *asi*, *eni*, *edi* and *ediz*, but now in view of the united paradigm established by Laroche 1979. Friedrich-Kammenhuber’s view will therefore be discussed after the presentation of the united paradigm theory.

4.1.3. Laroche’s one paradigm, one function

The beginning of a unification of several of these pronouns can be attributed to Pedersen 1938. Triggered by Old Irish *inti* (o.c., p. 59) he understood *asi* and *uni* als frozen case endings of the stem *e-*, with deictic *-i* (o.c., p. 60). The form *asi* was originally a nom.sing.c., *uni* an acc.sing.c. meaning ‘jener, dieser, der, besagter’. Although this division of labor must have been original, he also pointed at the signs of petrification by noting the existence of forms as *unius*, but also the use of *asi* as acc. (o.c., p. 61).

⁹⁶ This observation turns out to be important. As I will prove in this chapter, the suppletive paradigm *asi*, *uni*, *eni* etc. functions as a distal demonstrative. Although a distal demonstrative may be used anaphorically, allowing the translation ‘the aforementioned’, *aši* is also used deictically. In that case the translation ‘the aforementioned’ is impossible.

Besides the attribution of *asi* and *uni* to a stem *e-*, Pedersen also assumed that the orthotonic forms *edani*, *edez* and *edi* and the enclitic *-as* etc. belong to a stem *e-*. It is not clear from his description whether he assumed two different stems *e-*, one pronominal and one deictic, or a single paradigm *e-*. Given his discussion of these forms in two separate paragraphs (§§ 52 and 53), it seems safe to conclude that Pedersen did not want to unite them explicitly. More surprisingly however he did not include *eni* in the paradigm of *asi* and *uni*, although he mentioned the comparable function of neuter *eni* (o.c., p. 61-2).

Sturtevant 1951 moved one step further. He distinguished two groups: {*edi*, *edani* ‘ei’, *etez*, *etas*}, o.c. 109, and {*asi*, *uni*, *eni*}, o.c. 110. (see also Tischler 1977: 80 for the same position).

It was Laroche 1979 who really united the two (Sturtevant), three (Pedersen) or four (Friedrich) different stems into one paradigm. He did so by comparing the syntactic distribution of the different forms and by contrasting the resulting anaphoric pronoun {*asi*, *eni*, *uni*, *edani*, *edi*, *edez*, *unius*, *edas*, **ea*⁹⁷} with the anaphorically used demonstrative *apa-*. Laroche showed that all forms occurred in the same syntagmatic environments (referring to Kammenhuber 1975: 41, sub *a*⁻¹ for *edani* and *edas*):

- *asi*, *eni*, *uni* and *unius* function as antecedent of resp. the relative *kuis*, *kuit*, *kuin* and *kuies*.
- *asi*, *eni*, *uni* and *unius* function anaphorically as determiners of a NP.
- *asi*, *eni* and *uni* function as independent pronouns.

The unitary proposal of Laroche and the origin of the paradigm in Indo-European are generally accepted (see Bader 1981: 31, Puhvel 1984: 3ff. sub *a-*, Neu 1997: 139).

Laroche also discussed the competition between *asi* and the demonstrative *apa-*. According to him, the original opposition *kali-* ‘hic’ ... *apa-* ‘ille’ disappeared, thereby assigning to *apa-* the function of anaphoric pronoun in the matrix clause of a relative clause (*anaphore relative*) and in the discourse in general (*anaphore coordonnante*) (1979: 148). This invasion of *apa-* in the anaphoric domain caused a decline in the use of the ‘seul vrai pronom/adjectif anaphorique du hittite’ *asi* (p. 148, followed by Puhvel 1984: 5).

Although Laroche 1979: 150 recognized the ‘valeur de deictique lointain’ of *edi*, he still contrasted the anaphor *a/u/e(n)* (our *asi*, *eni*, *uni*) with the two demonstratives *kas* and *apas* (o.c. 152). Opposing Laroche in his understanding of the function of *asi*, I will show below that *asi* is not anaphoric, but truly deictic, and that *apa-* never invaded the territory of *asi* (see Chapter 7, 8, 9 for Focal *apa-*). The relative infrequency of *asi* is caused by its distal semantics, while the relative frequency of *apa-* is caused by its main function as an emphatic (or Focus) pronoun. The environments of *asi* and *apa-* are generally different, even in their shared area, the anaphoric domain (compare 4.5. below with chapter 5.5.).

4.1.4. Kammenhuber’s criticism

Kammenhuber 1975ff: 400 sub *asi* observed that the paradigm set up by Laroche 1979 only describes the situation in the 13th century although he projected this paradigm back into Indo-

⁹⁷ For a neuter plural Laroche refers to HW. But as Beekes 1980: 207a notes, *ea* is not mentioned in either HW or HW².

European. First of all, she noted that *uni-* is already inflected in OH (see the discussion in 4.6.4.1. for a different view) and that *asi* is both nom.sg.c. and n., acc.sg.c. and n. in NH⁹⁸. Second, *edani* and the other obliqui of the defective Old Hittite demonstrative pronoun *a-* “is; jener” were understood as obliqui to *eni* from the time of Mursili II (see also Kammenhuber 1975ff.: 38-9 sub *eni*) (see 4.6.4.2.). Third, she understood *asi*, *uni* and *eni* as synonyms: *eni* “Entwickelt sich ebenso wie synonymes 𐎶 *aši* (meistens Sg. N. c.) und 𐎶 *uni(-)* (meistens Sg. A.c.) im Aheth. neben den schon in Aheth. voll flektierten Pronomina 𐎶 *apa*-² [...] “jener, dér (erwähnte)” und 𐎶 *ka-* (*ki*) “dieser”.” (l.c.). Fourth, the OH material is too restricted to say anything on the paradigm in the older language phases, and certainly nothing about Indo-European roots unless cognates can be found in the other Anatolian languages (sub *asi*, p. 400). Finally her conclusion: “paradigma-artige Entfaltung der drei Formen zusammen mit Obliqui *edani* usw. ab Murs. II. (nach 1350 v. Chr.) und vor allem im 13. Jh.” (sub *eni*, p. 41). Each one of these objections against Laroche has to be taken seriously since some of them indeed might undermine his hypothesis.

The picture emerging from Kammenhuber 1975ff. is as follows. There are originally four pronominal stems, (i) the defective demonstrative pronoun *a-* “is; jener⁹⁹, er”, with pl.nom.c. *e-*, and the obliqui *edani*, *edas*, *edez* and *edi* (from which the defective personal pronoun *-a-* is derived, o.c. 42, sub *-a*-²), (ii) a form *asi* “der betreffende”, (iii) a form *uni(-)*, and (iv) a form *eni* “jenes (zuvor erwähnte)”, in oracles “jenes (andersweitig bekannte)”. From the time of Hattusili III *eni* and *a-* are seen as belonging to the same stem, and the three remaining ‘stems’, *a-*, *asi* and *uni* now form one paradigm.

4.1.5. Summary and Fragestellung

Kammenhuber accepted Laroche’s unitary paradigm only for the 13th century and later. Her main criticism concerned the earlier periods in which the attestation of the different forms is minimal and she therefore did not accept Indo-European roots unless cognates in the other Anatolian languages were found. The first question to be answered is:

- (i) *Is there enough textual support for a unitary paradigm in the older language phases?*

Besides disagreement on the age of the paradigm there is also disagreement on the nature of *asi*. Laroche was clear in his description. The pronoun *asi* is anaphoric, in contrast with the deictics *apa-* ‘ille’ and *ka-* ‘hic’. But according to Neu (1997: 139) *asi* is deictic. At least, that is what I infer from his remark on the paradigm of *asi* as a “sehr archaischen Pronominalparadigmas, dessen Deixisfeld auf der Vokaltrias idg. **o-* (heth. *a-*), **u-*, and **e-* beruht”¹⁰⁰. Puhvel 1984: 3 translates *a-* as ‘this (one), that (one), the aforementioned (one)’

⁹⁸ Kammenhuber 1975: 400 lists *asi* also as neuter. However, the alleged neuter *asi* in the lexical list KBo 26.20 ii 21 (l.c.: *a-š[i k]u!-it memiiauyar*) does not exist. Read with Güterbock & Civil 1985: 107 *a-i[š-š]i-it memiayuar*.

⁹⁹ Given the translation “jener” Kammenhuber HW² must have thought that *a-* was a non-proximal demonstrative although Friedrich assumed that it behaved more like a proximal demonstrative. Why Kammenhuber o.c. 130b remarked about *apa-*: “Nach Aussterben von *a*-¹ auch als betonte Form zu *-a*-² “er, sie, es” möglich” although *a*-¹ was in use until the end of Hittite is not clear to me.

¹⁰⁰ Without further explaining himself. He did not classify *asi* as a demonstrative but simply as a pronoun (therefore anaphoric?), in contrast with *šija-* (o.c. 145) and *an(n)i-* (o.c. 156). Neither did he explain how he

and follows Laroche in the anaphoric interpretation. Although Kammenhuber treated *asi*, *uni* and *eni* as synonyms, her translations were not uniform. As already mentioned, she more or less united *eni* with *a-*, resulting in ‘jener, er’, ‘jenes (zuvor erwähnte)’, and in oracles (*eni*) ‘jenes (andersweitig bekannte)’. The pronoun *asi* received the translation ‘der betreffende’. Interestingly enough she did not give any grammatical classification of *asi* and *eni*, whereas *a-* was classified as a defective demonstrative pronoun. It seems to me that Kammenhuber did not find enough contextual evidence to confirm or disprove Laroche’s functional analysis of *asi* as the only true anaphoric pronoun. So the second question is:

(ii) *Is the pronoun/adjective asi etc. only an anaphoric demonstrative or deictic or both?*

In order to answer both questions I will proceed as follows:

- (a) the main source for Deixis in dead languages is the use of deictic forms in Direct Speech. In section 4.2 I will discuss which forms occur in Direct Speech, and what spatial contrast is indicated by these forms.
- (b) After this has been established, three other contexts of *asi* etc., recognitional deixis (section 4.3), discourse deixis (section 4.4) and anaphora (section 4.5) —all three are typical uses of demonstratives (see Chapter 2)— will be discussed. Especially interesting is the use of the different forms of the proposed paradigm in the *same* function in the same text. If we have different forms in the same function, they probably belong to the same paradigm.
- (c) The paradigmatic 13th century is either the endpoint of some diachronic development which brought together different stems in one paradigm or it simply continued the situation of the older periods. Although there is not enough material in the earlier phases, we may assume the existence of a paradigm also in these periods if the functions of the different attested forms are similar to their corresponding younger Hittite forms. That is, if Old Hittite *asi* functions for example as a deictic demonstrative with negative emotional connotation just like its younger counterpart, and if Old Hittite *uni* functions as a recognitional demonstrative with distancing effect just like New Hittite *uni*, and given the fact that *asi* and *uni* belong to the same paradigm in New Hittite, then I assume that they also belong together in Old Hittite.
- (d) The vocabulary fragments KUB 3.99 ii 18 and KBo 1.42 iii 33ff. were discarded by Laroche 1979: 148: “*asis*, l’hapax de vocabulaire [...], est une fabrication artificielle sans valeur linguistique”. Kammenhuber thought so too (1975ff. p. 39 sub *eni*, p. 400 sub *asi*). Although the form *asis* may be coined by the writer of the vocabulary, it is still possible to compare its function with the Sumerian and Akkadian demonstratives in order to see whether the function as described in this Chapter is supported or contradicted (section 4.6.4.3).

A general issue in Deixis and Anaphora is the connection between deictic or anaphoric expressions and attention level. Though this issue is not very important for the questions formulated above, I will discuss the attention level of the referents in order to test whether the

used the term Deixis. One should be aware of the variation in the literature on the use of this term (Lyons 1999: 20 n. 11). For example, ‘deictic’ can be equivalent to ‘demonstrative’, or it can denote reference to the speech surroundings.

Hittite material supports the scheme outlined in Chapter 2. Besides the attention levels I will also pay attention to the Information Structure of the main clauses containing *asi* etc.¹⁰¹

For reasons I have given in Chapter 2, I follow Cornish 1999 in distinguishing two modes of attention level concerning mental representations of entities: they are either salient or not salient. Salient entities reside in working memory, whereas non-salient entities reside either in long-term memory or are part of the physical environment but not yet noted by the Addressee, as estimated by the Speaker. Also modifiers (adjectives, genitives) and presupposed propositional contents are thought to be non-salient.

Reference to non-salient (and sometimes salient) entities in the physical surroundings falls under the Situational Use of expressions (here discussed in section 4.2). The Recognitional Use of demonstratives (section 4.3) is a typical example of reference to non-salient entities that reside in long-term memory, with the extra requirement that the entity has to be discourse-new. Non-salient presupposed propositional contents are captured by Discourse Deixis (section 4.4).¹⁰² The two remaining types of non-salient entities are those expressed by modifiers and the ones residing in long-term memory while being discourse-old. The latter ones will be discussed under the heading of Anaphora, together with the salient discourse-old entities (section 4.5).

4.2. The Situational Use of *asi*

4.2.1. Introduction

In order to show that *asi* is a deictic instead of an anaphoric pronoun or determiner, the obvious environment to look at is the Situational Use. As described in 2.3.1., generally three sub-areas are recognized as situational: true situational use, Direct Speech, and linguistic selfreference.

For situational use and Direct Speech we can use Fillmore's criteria in order to decide what type of situational deixis is involved (see also 2.3.1.1.):

- *Distal Demonstrative* (Fillmore 1982: 50-1): Prototypically the distal demonstrative alternates between two features, (a) it points to an entity at a great distance from both Speaker's and Addressee's visual field or (b) to an entity being outside the Speaker's and Addressee's visual field. In some languages both conditions need to be satisfied for the demonstrative in order to be classified as distal, in other languages only one of them is criterial.
- *Medial Demonstrative* (Fillmore 1982: 49): Prototypically a medial demonstrative is represented by two features, (a) it points to an entity at a small distance from Speaker (Speaker Pivot) and (b) to an entity being near the Addressee (Hearer-Pivot). In some languages both conditions need to be satisfied for the demonstrative in order to

¹⁰¹ I do not discuss subordinate clauses from the point of view of Information Structure. Often the contents of these clauses are presented to the Addressee as presupposed, providing the background for the matrix clause. Presupposed clauses are therefore outside the field of sentence topic and focus (Lambrecht 1994: 67-69, et passim).

¹⁰² Salient presupposed propositional contents are referred to by means of the enclitic neuter pronoun *-at* (see Chapter 2) and the Focus pronoun *apa-* (see Chapter 2 and 8).

be classified as medial, in other languages only one of them is criterial. When (b) is satisfied, the language has a person-based demonstrative system, when (a) is satisfied, a distance-based system.¹⁰³

- *Proximal Demonstrative*: A proximal demonstrative is characterized as indicating the closest distance to the Speaker.

4.2.2. True Situational Use

The only real Situational use of *asi* is encountered in the expressions containing adverbially used dative-locative *edi* (Old Hittite) and ablative *edez* (New Hittite). The main characteristic of these expressions is to point at a location at the other side of some point of reference, viewed from the Deictic Center, which in every case is the capital Hattusa. Melchert 1977: 151ff described this type of location as ‘relative position’. The frequent use of *edi* / *edez* in combination with *ket* / *kez* (from the proximal demonstrative *ka-*) allows the conclusion that *edi* / *edez* is at least a non-proximal demonstrative. In combination with the fact that deictic *apiya* / *apez* is the Medial term in a three-term system (see chapter 5), *edi* / *edez* must be the Distal term.

Generally the point of reference, viewed from the Deictic Center, is a prominent landmark in the countryside, such as a river, mountain range or mountain top or some other prominent object in the deictic space of the Speaker:

4.1 **KBo 6.2 i 48-50, § 22** (OS laws, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 31-32

§⁴⁸ [ta]kku ARAD-aš hūuāi n=an āppa kuiški uuatezzi takku manninkuuan ē[pz]i
⁴⁹ nu=šše^{KUŠ} E.SIR-uš pāi takku ke-e-et ÍD-az 2 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi⁵⁰ takku e-di ÍD-az nu=šše 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi §

If a male slave runs away and someone brings him back, if he captures (him) nearby, he gives him shoes. If (he captures him) on this side (*ket*) of the river, he gives 2 sheqels of silver. If (he captures him) on that side (*edi*) of the river, he gives him 3 sheqels of silver.

4.2 **KUB 19.20 + obv. 9'-12'** (lateMH/MS letter, Suppiluliuma, CTH 154), ed. Van den Hout 1994: 64, 72

^{9'} [ÍDMālan kuit š]A LUGAL KUR URUHurri e-de-ez tapuša ēšta^{10'} [n=at IŠTU
 NAM.RA GU₄.HĪ.A] UDU.HĪ.A āššuit=a šarā dahhun^{11'} [n=at=za ANA KUR
 URUHa]tti udahhun ke-e-ez-zi-ia=kan kuit^{12'} [šA LUGAL KUR URUHurri t]apuša
 ēšta nu=za apāt=a ANA KUR URUHatti^{13'} [udahhun

[What] was alongside [the Mala-river] on the other side (*edez*) belonging to the king of Hurri, I picked [it] up[, including deportees, oxen], sheep, and possessions, and I brought [them to Ha]tti. And also, what was alongside on this side (*kez*) [belonging to the king of Hurri], that too [I brought] to Hatti.

¹⁰³ There are even languages that combine both systems (Lyons 1999: 109).

The locations indicated by *edi* / *edez* are often at a great distance from the Deictic Center and invisible (see Fillmore's criteria above). The two following examples show a situation where large distance is not involved, but I wonder whether invisibility is the issue here:

4.3 **KBo 17.15 rev. 14'-16'** (OS ritual, CTH *645.6), ed. Neu 1980a: 73-74.

[(UGULA LÚ.MEŠMUḪALDIM)]^{15'} *ḥaššāš katta ke-e-et arta* VI ḪAR-n[ā]^{iSAR}

ḥarzi L[Ú *ḥeštā*]^{16'} *ḥaššāš katta e-di paršanān ḥarzi* VI ḪAR-n[ā]^{iSAR} *ḥarzi*

The Head of the cooks stands near the hearth on this side (*ket*). He is holding 6 *harnai*-plants. The *hesta*-man is squatting near the hearth on the other side (*edi*). He is holding 6 *harnai*-plants.

4.4 **KUB 43.30 obv. ii 6'** (OS ritual, CTH *645.7), ed. Neu 1980a: 77

§^{6'} [LÚ.M]EŠMUḪALDIM *išpantuziaššaruš e-di taršanzipaz pēdanzi* §

The cooks carry the libation vessels to the other side (*edi*) of the 'Bühne'.

In ex. 4.3 one person is *standing* at the near side of the hearth, in view of the Speaker, whereas the other person is *squatting* at the other side of the hearth. The fact that he is squatting might indicate that he is not visible behind the fire, or, if the fire is not burning, behind the hearth. In ex. 4.4 the vessels might not be visible behind the elevated structure. In any case, each time *edi* / *edez* refers to a location at the other side of a landmark. This landmark divides the space in two parts: an area seen as belonging to the Speaker, however large that area is, and an area seen as not belonging to the Speaker. In view of what follows in the remainder of this chapter it seems to me that this division of space is more important in Hittite than visibility or invisibility.¹⁰⁴

In the above examples *edi* or *edez* referred to locations not mentioned before. But when the area located at the other side of a point of reference is already salient in the discourse¹⁰⁵, *edi* / *edez* is immediately replaced by *apiya* in Old Hittite or *apez* in Newer Hittite:

4.5 **KBo 7.14 + obv. 7-9** (OS narration, CTH 15), ed. Rosi 1984: 118

§⁷ [LÚ] URUḪAŠŠI LUGAL-i *menaḥanda zaḥḫija uit* §⁸ [*n=a*]^{n?} ^mLi-KASKAL-iš *mazze nu a-pi-ia takkalit* §⁹ [*ke-*]^le^l-da LUGAL-uš *takkalit*

[The man] from Hassi came for battle against the king. Lipalsi withstood [hi]m. He closed in on[?] (him) on that (= his) side (*apiya*), while the king closed in on[?] (him) on this side (*ked=a*).¹⁰⁶

This time 'the other side' is not simply beyond the point of reference, i.e. the enemy, it is also connected with the location of Lipalsi who has just been mentioned. This anaphoric

¹⁰⁴ The other attestations of the distal adverb of relative position are KBo 25.112 obv. ii 4'-6', with duplicate KBo 25.114 (OS ritual, CTH 733 II 4), KUB 19.37 ii 20-34 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), KUB 19.9 i 10'-15' (NH annals, Hattusili III, CTH 83.1) and KBo 6.28 obv. 6-14 (NH annals, Hattusili III, CTH 88).

¹⁰⁵ An area does not have to be mentioned explicitly in order to be salient. For this cognitive interpretation of anaphora see Chapter 2.

¹⁰⁶ The fact that the locative *apiya* is used to indicate (anaphoric) relative position leads by analogy to the conclusion that also *ked* is a locative. In later Hittite the function of denoting relative position was taken over by the ablatives. Thus, the triad *ked* — *apiya* — *edi* became *kez* — *apez* — *edez*.

connotation is completely absent from the meaning of *edi* / *edez*. That *apezza* is the anaphoric counterpart of *edez* is also illustrated by the next example:

4.6 **KUB 1.1 + ii 31-33** (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 12-13¹⁰⁷

§³¹ *uit=ma* LÚKÚR [(*Pišhuruš anda āraš*)] URUKarahn[(*a*)š]š=a³² URUMarištaš
 š[(*À* LÚKÚR) *ēšta* (*nu=šši a-pé-e-ez* KUR URUTaqqast)]aš ZAG-aš *ēšta* ³³ *ke-e-ez-*
za=ma=šši [(URUTalmaliyaš ZAG-aš *ēš*)]ta

It happened that the enemy of Pishuru barged in and the cities Karahna and Marista [were] in the midst of the enemy. On the other (= the enemy's) side (*apez*) the country Taqqasta was its border, but on this side (*kezza=ma*) Talmaliya was its border.

The 'other side' does not come out-of-the-blue. From an area not controlled by the Hittites, the enemy floods in to the countries of Karahna and Marista surrounding these cities. In order to describe the extent of the newly conquered hostile land the border towns are given, one each on opposite sides of the new hostile area. The city denoting the border on the Hatti-side is Talmaliya, and the city denoting the border on the enemy side is Taqqasta. Usually the other side is indicated by means of *edez*, but in this case the Reader of the tablet was already made aware of the other side, the area of Pishuru, through the preceding lines.

Besides the adverbs of relative position one also should expect a locative distal adverb like *ka* 'here' (see chapter 6) and *apiya* 'there (with you)' (see chapter 5). Although the dictionaries and grammars imply that *apiya* is also a distal demonstrative adverb, this is not substantiated by the evidence of situational *apiya*. In each case where *apiya* is truly situational, it always refers to the location of the Addressee (see 5.2). But whenever reference is needed to a location that has already been mentioned before, *apiya* is used. Indeed, such a location is often connected with the Other, but this is almost always the case with anaphoric reference in general. To conclude, the locative adverb of *asi* that corresponds with proximal *ka* and medial *apiya* is not attested in our texts.

The only deictic notion connected with anaphoric *apiya* is that it cannot mean 'here'. Levinson 1983: 67 discusses an example where a deictic adverb is used both anaphorically and deictically (his example 40):

4.7 I was born in *London* and have lived *there* ever since

'There' refers anaphorically to London, but at the same time indicates that the discourse is expressed in a location outside London. In the next two examples *apiya* is both anaphoric and deictic. It is anaphoric because it refers to a location mentioned before, but it is also deictic because it refers to a location different from the Speaker. This becomes especially clear when *apiya* is contrasted with purely deictic *ka*:

4.8 **HKM 58 obv. 5-14** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 230-231

§⁵ ŠA LÚ.MEŠIGI.NU.GÁL=mu *kuit uttar hatrāēš* ⁶ *nu=kan* LÚ.MEŠIGI.NU.GÁL.ĪI.A
hūmanteš ⁷ URUŠapinuūa *šarā pēhuter* ⁸ *ka-a=ma* X LÚ.MEŠIGI.NU.GÁL.ĪI.A *INA*

¹⁰⁷ See also KUB 19.9 ii 13-15 (NH Annals, Hattusili III, CTH 83.1) LÚ.MEŠ URUGa[šga=]ma hū[manteš] ¹⁴
anda aranteš e[šir nu=šši] a-pé-e-ez-[za] [URU ...] ¹⁵ ZAG-aš *ēšta* *ke-e-[ez-za=]ma* (or *ke-e-[z-za=]*)
 URUTakuruūa[š ZAG-aš *ēšta*]

É.ĤI.A NA₄ARÀ-RU ⁹ arĥa tāliēr n=aš kāša punuššun ¹⁰ [n]u=mu zik kuiēš lamnit
 ĥatrāēš ¹¹ n=ašta NU.GÁL kuiški anda ¹² nu mān ĥatrāši nu INA URUŠapinuwa ¹³
 ANA mŠarpa ĥatrāi ¹⁴ LÚ.MEŠIGI.NU.GÁL ĥūmanduš a-pí-ia §
 The affair of the blind men about which you wrote to me, all blind men were brought
 up to Sapinuwa. Here (*ka*) on the other hand, 10 blind men were left behind in the
 houses of the mills. I have just questioned them. The ones about which *you* have
 written to me with (their) names, not one (of those) is among (them). If you write
 (again), write to Sarpa in Sapinuwa. All blind men are there (*apiya*).

4.9 **KBo 2.2 i 12-14** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 124-125

§ ¹² mān dUTU-ŠI ṣ tapasšas ¹³ a-pí-ia-pát ŠÀ KUR URUNerikka ¹⁴ ūemijazi kā=ma
 ŪL ...

If the fever will befall My Majesty only there (*apiya=pat*), in the country of Nerik,
 but not here (*ka*), ...

4.2.3. Direct Speech

A very important context providing us with demonstratives is *Direct Speech*. As Ehlich (1982: 33 n.6) noted, ‘In so-called ‘dead’ languages, the quotations of direct language enables us to identify uses of deixis in the standard way’, meaning that, (i), we can identify deictic terms referring to the outside world because there is no referent in the preceding clauses in the Direct Speech, and (ii), that it may be possible to deduce the distance towards the deictic center (the Speaker) from the narration preceding the Direct Speech or the orientation on Speaker, Addressee or Other. However, this is not always possible due to our unfamiliarity with the actual situation.

The criteria established in 3.1.3. for identifying a suitable context are repeated here:

- The Direct Speech should be self contained, that is, it has to be a closed speech unit, without reference to earlier discourse which is not expressed in the narration. A partially quoted letter for example may contain anaphoric references not known to us. Self-contained speech is found in treaties and rituals. This type of speech is either invented for a specific stipulation or highly ritualized for religious purposes. Letters are excluded for the above reasons.
- The Direct Speech has to refer to the world created in the immediate preceding narrative clauses.
- Only indexicals in Direct Speech which are a first mention of the intended referent are discussed. Second mentions are always anaphoric, whether in narration or Direct Speech.

The following examples provide forms of the expression *asi* referring to an entity in the surrounding world, thereby clearly illustrating the deictic force of *asi*. Wherever possible, the nature of the deixis (proximal, distal or other) is discussed.

Besides isolating deictic references in Direct Speech, one can establish whether the extra-linguistic object is salient or not. Often the narration preceding the Direct Speech provides some comments on the entity that will be referred to in the Direct Speech. In that case one can be rather certain that the entity is already salient before it is mentioned. Otherwise, one should consider the entity not-salient.

Using this criterium, a pattern appears: usually the pronominal demonstrative *asi* is used when an object is salient, and the demonstrative description *asi* + *N* is usually used when the object is not salient.

4.2.3.1. The continuity procedure: the demonstrative pronoun *asi*

The clearest example of the distal value of *asi* is:

4.10 KUB 44.4+ rev. 9 (MH birth ritual, CTH 767), ed. Beckman 1983: 176-177

⁹ AMA DUMU.NITA *taškupait nu=ššan* GAM AN-za ^dU-aš *aušta e-ni=ma=ua*
*kuit*¹⁰⁸

The mother of the male child cried out (after the birth of her child), and the Stormgod looked down from heaven on (her, -*san*): “What is that (*eni*)!?”

The distance between the referent (the sound produced by the mother) and the Speaker (the Stormgod), is maximally large (earth versus heaven). The neuter *eni* therefore functions as a Distal Demonstrative. A medial interpretation would require either that the distance to the Deictic Center, the Stormgod, is medial (whatever that would be) or that the event takes place near the Addressee. That the distance was maximal is already mentioned, leaving us with a possible Addressee oriented interpretation. There is however no Addressee, unless we consider the mother of the child as such. This is however not supported by the remainder of the text. The sentence uttered by the Stormgod is an exclamation about something that he hears from far away, happening to the Other. In addition to the maximal distance, *eni* refers to something, a sound, that is invisible to the Stormgod.

The exclamation follows the cry of the mother, so at the moment of speech the cry is already in the center of attention. The utterance is therefore not an out-of-the-blue sentence, which excludes Sentence Focus. We are left with Predicate Focus or Argument Focus. Argument Focus would mean that only the question word *kuit* is the Focus. In that case the rest of the clause has to be de-accented. However, the initial position of *eni*, followed by the slightly adversative particle *-ma* shows otherwise. Now only Predicate Focus with an accented subject Topic is left as the only possibility. Although the sound is in the center of attention, and the Stormgod requests information about the referent of *eni*, it is not necessarily the *established* topic. Its unexpectedness is underlined by the use of *-ma*.

Another example of Distal *asi*, also to a non-visible entity, is:

4.11 KBo 5.3 + ii 32-38 (MH/NS treaty, CTH 42), ed. Friedrich 1930: 116-117

§ ³² *našma=mu=za māt* LÚ URU^UḪATTI [*n*]amma *kuiški idālu* ³³ *menahḫanda šarā*
dāi kuješ=aš imma kuiš antuḫšaš ³⁴ *zig=an* GIM-an *ištamašti n=an=mu māt*

¹⁰⁸ Similarly, though the preceding context is destroyed: KBo 12.89 iii 9-10 (MH/MS?, CTH 765) *n=ašta* ^d*Kamrušepaš* ¹⁰ [*nepišaz katt*]a *aušta i-ni=ma=ua* *kuit* ‘Kamrusepa looked [dow]n [from heaven]: “What is that?” and KBo 9.127+ i 12 (CTH 764), *i-ni=ua* *kuit*.

apēdani ³⁵ *lamnī ŪL mematti n=an parā imma šamenuši* ³⁶ *nu kiššan teši*
ammuk=ua=za l[i]nganuuanza ³⁷ *nu=ua ŪL kuitki memahhi i[iami=i]a=ua ŪL*
kuitki ³⁸ *a-ši=ma=ua [ma]hhan ie[zzi QATAMMA] jeddu*

Or if some man of Hatti furthermore plans evil against me, whatever person he may be, if, as soon as *you* hear about him/listen to him, you do not report him to me at *that* instant, and you even let him go by, and say as follows: “*I* am sworn in, (so) I do not say anything (evil) and also, I do not *do* anything (evil either). But *he* (*asi*) will do as he likes (Lit.: Now, as *he* does, let him do likewise)”.

The referent of *asi* is not near Speaker anymore: he has gone away and is therefore not in the presence of either Speaker or some unexpressed Hearer, excluding Proximal and Medial reference. The Demonstrative *asi* must therefore be distal and refers at least to an invisible person, although the context does not provide any clues how far he is removed from Speaker (and Addressee). As far as cognitive status is concerned, *asi* refers to a person who has clearly been represented in the mind of the Speaker, so besides being deictic, *asi* is also used to indicate that the attention is continued.

Additionally, *asi* is contrasted with *ammuk* “I”. Both are accented, full pronouns, indicating contrasting subjects in contrasting actions: “*I* am sworn in and shall do nothing, but *he* may do as he likes”. The clauses are Topic Comment clauses and their subjects are Contrastive Topics (see 2.2.3.2.1.).

And an example from the Song of Ullikummi:

4.12 **KUB 33.87+ i 30’-34’** (NH myth, CTH 345), ed. Güterbock 1952: 12

nu ^dU-aš IGI.ĤI.A-ua ^{31’} [*išh*]ahruuanza *memiān memiškizzi kuiš=uar=an* ^{32’}
[namm]a uškizzi u-ni-ia-aš halluūain nu=ua kuiš namma ^{33’} [*za*]hhiškizzi
nu=uar=aš kuiš namma uškizzi ^{34’} [*u-ni*]-ia-aš *naḥšarraduš*

The Stormgod, [te]arful of eye, speaks: “Who can behold it [agai]n, that one’s (*uniyas*) violence? Who can [f]ight again, who can behold them again, [that o]ne’s (*uniyas*) fearsome qualities?”

Tessub, the Speaker, has just laid eyes on the frightful *kunkunuzzi*-stone (Basalt), the destroyer of the Gods. The stone was originally placed on the shoulder of Upelluri, the Atlas-like figure carrying Heaven and Earth, invisible to the Gods. But soon he rises from the sea and becomes visible. The Stormgod Tessub has just arrived at a mountaintop and can now see the *kunkunuzzi*. The shock has made him cry. The only possible deictic value expressed by *uniyas* is the distal one since Tessub is standing on a mountaintop, looking out over sea to the Basalt.

By looking at it, the Basalt is already in the center of attention. The Basalt is however not the Topic or Focus of the clause. As an adnominal it is outside the Topic-Focus structure of the clause.

A rare example of a Place Deictic form of *asi*, *edaza* is:

4.13 **KBo 4.14 iii 32-34** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 123), ed. Van den Hout 1989: 294-295

³² ANA ZI LUGAL GIM-an ṣ *naḥḥūyai arḥa=man=ua=kan* ³³ *ārḥi tuqq=a*
 QATAMMA ṣ *naḥḥūyaddu* ³⁴ EN=YA=ua=kan *e-da-za arḥa aru*

Just as there is concern to the king: “Could I but get away!”, then also to *you* there must likewise be concern: “Let My Lord get away from there (*edaza*)!”

These hypothetical thoughts refer to a situation in which the king has met grave difficulties in battle, either caused by the defection of a vassal state, an invasion of the enemy or a rebellion in Hatti. The question is now: is the Addressee of this letter accompanying the king in the hypothetical battle or not. It seems that the Addressee is supposed to be present in times of distress (ii 7-16, 22-25, 26-29 etc.) so the deictic *edaza* should then be understood as Proximal or Medial and not as Distal¹⁰⁹. On the other hand, the context shows that the Speaker is simply aware of the king’s concerns. His speech repeats more or less the concerns of the king and no information is added except the ablative *edaza*. Why should the echoing phrase contain more information than the original one if both were at the same place? The only reason to do so is because they are *not* at the same place.

The location of the king is already salient in the mind of Speaker (and Reader), therefore requiring the continuity procedure. Moreover, the relation between king and location is a given fact, only the kind of relation, the “getting away” is unexpected and therefore the Focus. Both the king and the location are Established Topics.

From Tudhaliya IV we have

4.14 **KUB 26.1 iii 37-40** (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.2), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 13

§³⁷ *našma=kan ANA dUTU-ŠI āššūyanni kuiški* ³⁸ *a[nd]an neanza tuk=ma=kan ŠA dUTU-ŠI LÚKÚR-aš* ³⁹ *EGIR-pa UG[U] dāi a-ši=ua=kan PAN dUTU-ŠI* ⁴⁰ *laknut zik=ma=a[t i]aši*

Or (if) someone is turned toward My Majesty in favor, *you* however, are solicited (?) by an enemy of My Majesty: “Make that one (*asi*, acc.!) fall out from His Majesty’s favor”, and *you* do it, (you make him fall out of favor,) ...

There are five participants: the king as Speaker/Narrator, the hypothetical enemy as the Speaker of the Direct Speech, the Addressee of the instruction as both the Addressee of the king and of the Direct Speech of the enemy (the Addressee is counted twice), and finally the hypothetical ally of the king, referred to by *asi* in the Direct Speech. Since the king does not utter the Direct Speech, only the enemy, the Addressee and the ally are important. The constellation of persons at the moment of the Direct Speech is as follows: the enemy Speaker and the Addressee take up one position in space. It seems rather logical to assume that the ally is not included in that space. Therefore a proximal interpretation of *asi* is excluded. A medial interpretation would mean that the referent of *asi*, the soon to be disfavored ally, would have been present in the space of the Addressee, which is also a very unlikely situation because that would also imply being near Speaker. The ally could of course still be not too far removed from Speaker and Addressee. Thus, a medial interpretation of *asi* in a person oriented system is excluded, but a medial interpretation in a distance based system not. Finally, the ally may be considered outside the domain of both Speaker and Addressee, irrespective of distance, he may be considered far removed from both, and he may be visible or invisible. Whatever the situation, in these cases *asi* is a distal demonstrative.

¹⁰⁹The CHD L-N sub 𐎠 *nahhuwa-* p. 347 translates *edaza* as “from (t)here”, therefore not choosing between Proximal and non Proximal. Puhvel 1984: 4 has ‘from there’.

It is not clear to me whether the favorite ally of the king is in the center of attention of the Addressee or not. If the person is visible, than a pointing gesture with *asi* is enough to identify him. The gesture alone would have brought him in the center of attention.

4.2.3.2. The centering procedure: the demonstrative description *asi* + noun

When the entity referred to is not salient, not *asi* is used but *asi* + N.

4.15 **KBo 4.14 ii 73-80** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 123), ed. Van den Hout 1989: 290 (with collation from CHD L-N: 129)

§ ⁷³ [m]ann=a=mu=kan 1 KUR-TUM *kuitki* GAM-an *niḫari* ⁷⁴ [n]ašma=mu=kan
EN.MEŠ *kuiēšqa* 𐎶 *allallā pānzi* ⁷⁵ [z]ik=ma=šmaš=kan *anda ḫandāši nu kišan* ⁷⁶
mematti GÉŠPU-*aḫḫir*=u=mu n=at lē DÙ-ši ⁷⁷ GAM-an MAMIT GAR-ru
§ ⁷⁸ *našma=at zik* 𐎶 *mališi a-ši=man=u=kan* ZAG[-aš GAM-an] ⁷⁹ *niḫari*
našma=<m>an=u=kan u-ni-uš EN.MEŠ *alla[llā]* ⁸⁰ *pānzi ūqq=a=man=u*
pēḫudanzi ...

And if some single country turns away from me, or some lords commit treason against me, (if then) *you* join with them, and you speak in this way: “They *forced* me!”, you may not do it! Let (it) be put under Oath. § Or, (if) *you* contemplate about it: “Would that (*asi*) border (country) but fall away, or would those (*unius*) lords but commit treason and would they but lead *me* off with them!” ...

A proximal interpretation is not very likely, it would necessitate the assumption that the Speaker himself was in the border country at the time of his treacherous speech. We would then have to assume that the king, who is the actual author of these clauses, while speaking to the Addressee in this text, envisages a situation where the Addressee is inside some unknown country, in the presence of some unknown lords. Why *asi* cannot be medial has already been explained in the discussion of this example in Chapter 3, as ex. 3.8.

The demonstrative *asi* (and the acc.pl. *unius*) as the distal demonstrative refers either to an entity at a great distance from the visual field of Speaker (and Addressee) or outside that field, or both. Borders are usually far away, and also out of sight, so both criteria, invisibility and large distance, are applicable.

The noun phrases *asi* N and *unius* N seem to be centering. The preceding context does not provide any information in order to conclude that the countries and lords were already in the center of attention of the Speaker. As centering, the referents of these noun phrases can only be an Unestablished Topic, or subjects under Sentence Focus. Unestablished Topics generally imply a contrast, and this does not seem to be the case. Therefore I assume that the clauses carry Sentence Focus, being out-of-the-blue sentences. In the following I will consider each deictic noun phrase as being under Sentence or Predicate Focus, if the context does not explicitly show that the referent was under discussion or in the center of attention of the Speaker (and Addressee).¹¹⁰

¹¹⁰ This example illustrates that the imaginative Direct Speech cannot really be compared to true Direct Speech. In a realistic situation the treacherous subject of the king would probably have mentioned at least the name of a specific country and therefore the location relative to the Deictic Center. In an unspecific situation like this, names cannot be used while the Addressee still has somehow to be informed. Border countries are located at a large distance of the Deictic Center, and this is indicated to the Speaker by means of a distal demonstrative.

A clearer and less elaborate example is:

- 4.16 **KBo 4.14 iii 72-73** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 123), ed. Van den Hout 1989: 297

⁷² *mānn=a=du=za LUGAL-uš kuedaniki ANA [ZAG-]i parā* ⁷³ *uīazi it=ua=mu a-*
ši ZAG iia z[i]k=ma pā[iši] ...

And if the king sends you forth to some [border (country)] (saying): “Go make me that (*asi*, acc.!) border (country)”, and you go,,

Obviously the border is neither proximal nor medial, otherwise the Addressee would already be located in the border country and the king could never have spoken these words.

Several examples from outside my corpus provide some more evidence that *asi* etc., is a distal demonstrative:

- 4.17 **KUB 17.12 obv. ii 11-17** (MH?/NS ritual, CTH 431)

¹¹ *n=ašta anda kiššan memāi kuiš=ua* ¹² *mienuš GÙB-za iḫaddari* ¹³ *nu=ua=šši*
mienu ēšdu nu=ua e-da-ni ¹⁴ *antuḫši e-ni GIG mienuddu* ¹⁵ *nu=ua kāšma*
^dGAZ.BA.A.A GAŠAN-YA ¹⁶ *uiizzi* ¹⁷ *MAḪIRI=YA KASKAL-za arḫa tījatten §*

(He speaks as follows: “Anyone who is right, let him eat right. Let this offer be right.” Afterwards there are 3 *warmanninzi*-breads, 2 small fresh thick loaves. He carries them to the fork in the road and crumbles them to the left,) while speaking as follows: “Any mild one who walks at the left, let there be mildness to it/him, let him assuage that (*eni*) illness for that (*edani*) man. Huwassana, my Lady, has just come! (So) *you*, terrifying ones, my adversaries, must step off the road!”

The Speaker is the ritual practitioner who talks to the *mienu*-deities, the ‘mild ones’ walking at the fork of the road. These ‘mild ones’ have to heal the illness of a third party, the man in whose name this ritual is practiced. The preceding context does not provide any clues about the position of the ill man with respect to the Speaker, nor about his presence at the scene so theoretically the man could be in the vicinity of the Speaker. The next scene however shows that the patient does not accompany the practitioner when he performs his ritual. Only the practitioner goes to the gate:

- 4.18 **KUB 17.12 obv. ii 24-27** (MH?/NS ritual, CTH 431)

²⁴ *n=aš āšga parā paizzi* ¹*nu* 2 NINDA.GUR₄.RA ²⁵ *kuḫalīti n=ašta anda*
kiššan memāi ²⁶ *mān=ua a-ši antuḫšaš* TI-ešzi ²⁷ [o-o-o-o]-x-x
NINDA.GUR₄.RA.ḪI.A *šarā neḫandarū*

He goes to the gate. He turns two fat thick-breads, while speaking: “If that (*asi*) man stays alive, let the [.....] breads be turned up”.

The patient, not being near, is referred to by means of *asi* N, which means that *asi* is distal here too. A further connotation of *asi* might be that the patient is literally a patient, that is, not an active participant during the ritual which is essentially an interaction between ritual practitioner and deity.

Furthermore, if *asi* (N) indeed replaces a name, the allocation to the centering procedure would gain more support, because names are often used to refer to entities that are not in the center of attention.

As a first sentence in Direct Speech in a new situation on another day, the phrase *asi antuhsas* as initial reference belongs to the centering procedure. As part of a conditional clause it is however in the presupposition, which means that the information is taken for granted. The main information is contained in the following matrix clause on the turning of the breads, given that the man stays alive. The Topic-Focus distinction is therefore not relevant.

The preceding examples have shown that *asi*, *eni*, *edani*, *uniyas* and *unius* all have distal value. Fillmore used two criteria for defining a distal demonstrative, (a) the entity referred to is at a large distance from both Speaker and Addressee's visual field, or (b) the entity is invisible. In one case criterium (b) does not apply (see ex. 4.12), unless the Stormgod is temporarily blinded by his tears. In ex. 4.3 and 4.4 on the other hand *edi* refers to a location not too far removed from the Speaker. But in ex. 4.18 the patient may be present (and visible?) but not involved. We simply do not have enough material to decide whether *asi* refers to visible or invisible entities. For more metaphorical uses of *asi* see 4.2.3.3.

It is however not always clear whether an entity is at a large distance from Speaker and Addressee. In the next examples it is maybe not possible to indicate the deictic contrasts, but simply the fact that the pronouns appear as first mentions in Direct Speech already indicates their deictic, and not anaphoric, force.

- 4.19 **KBo 5.3+ iii 24'-28'** with duplicate KBo 19.44+ rev. 1 (MH/NS treaty, CTH 42), Friedrich 1930: 122-123

^{24'} ... [nu=z]a m^{25'} antuḥṣan kuinki aššuli [parā huittiia]n ḥarmi ^{26'} a-ši=ua
antuuaḥḥaš SIG₅-in i[(š)]ša[(i nu=ua)r=an] ^{27'} dUTU-ŠI=ia SIG₅-in iḡami
 zig=a[(=šši m^{28'}ān pāiši)] ^{28'} apūn memiian EGIR-pa mematti

If I have singled out some man favorably: “That (asi) man does well, I My Majesty too will treat him well”, if thereupon *you* however tell him that decision, ...

- 4.20 **KBo 19.44+ rev. 3-4**, with duplicate KBo 5.3+ iii 30' (MH/MS treaty, CTH 42).

[n]ašma=za apūn LÚ-LUM idāl[(auuanni)] ⁴ [(parā huittiia]n ḥarmi a-ši=ua
antuuaḥḥaš idāl[(luš)] ⁵ [(idalauu)ahzi (nu=uar))=an dUTU-ŠI idalauaḥmi

or (if) I have singled out that person unfavorably: “That (asi) evil man behaves badly, I My Majesty will treat him badly”, ...

There is no reason to assume that the person is in the vicinity of the King, but the opposite cannot be proven as well.

Also see

- 4.21 **KUB 29.7 + KBo 21.41 rev. 23-27** (MH/MS ritual, CTH 480)

nu UNUT MUNUS.LUGAL kuiš EGIR SÍSKUR ḥarzi ²⁴ nu=šši ḥašuuā[i]^{SAR} pianzi
 n=at anda pušš[a]izzi anda=ma=kan kiššan m[emai] ²⁵ m²⁶ān=ua ANA PA[NI]
]DINGIR-LIM kuiški EN.SÍSKUR idāl[a]uanni memian ḥarzi paiddu=ua=kan e-da-ni
²⁶ DINGIR-LIM-aš parni andan ḥurtaiš ling[a]iš paprātarr=a ḥašuuāiaš iuar
 kišaru ²⁷ nu=uar=at ḥašuuāiaš^{SAR} iuar [mij]ān ēšdu

The one who holds the utensils of the Queen behind the offering, they give him soapwort and he crushes it while sa[ying]: “If some ritual-practitioner has spoken with evil intent befo[re] the deity, then let the curse, perjury and uncleanness inside that

(*edani*) house of the deity become like the soap-wort. Let it be *miya*- like the soap-wort.”

The expressions with *asi* could be out-of-the-blue sentences with Sentence Focus. The following text however seems to indicate that the subject in the Direct Speech is an Established Topic because the subject is only expressed in the verb ending.

- 4.22 **KBo 5.3+ iii 32'-34'** with duplicate KBo 19.44+ rev. 6-9 (MH/NS treaty, CTH 42), Friedrich 1930: 122-123

[*našma* = *z*]a KUR-*e* ^{33'} *kuitki našma URU-an kuinki āššu parā hū[(itt)]iian*
 [(*har*)]*mi* ^{34'} SIG₅-*in* = *ua iššāi nu = uar = an* ^dUTU-*ši* = *ia* SIG₅-*i*[(*n*)] *iīami*
 [or (if)] I have singled out some country or some city favorably: “It acts well, I My Majesty too will treat it well”, ...

Is it possible that the author of this text wished to avoid incorrect reference? The alternatives presented in the narrative part are unlikely to appear in the same way in the Direct Speech. The king can hardly say: ‘That country or that city acts well, I will treat one of them well’. Not expressing the referent at all avoids this problem, so this has probably nothing to do with Established Topic-hood.

And a final example from my corpus referring to a first order entity:

- 4.23 **KUB 6.45+ iii 54-58** (NH prayer, Muwattalli, CTH 381), ed. Singer 1996: 23

⁵⁴ *nu uyanzi zilatija* DUMU = *YA* DUMU.DUMU = *YA* LUGAL.MEŠ MUNUS.LUGAL.MEŠ
⁵⁵ *ša URU* ^{HATTI} DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL *BELU* ^{MEŠ} = *ia* ANA ^dU *pihaššašši* ⁵⁶ EN = *YA*
našsarriškiuan tijanzi ⁵⁷ *nu kiššan memanzi handan = ua a-ši DINGIR-LIM* ⁵⁸
šarkuš UR.SAG-*iš* ^{parā} *handan*[(*nza* DINGIR)-*LU*]M

And, thereupon, in the future my son, grandson, kings (and) queens of Hatti, princes and lords will start showing reverence to the Storm-god of Lightning, my lord, and they will speak like this: “Truly that (*asi*) god is a mighty hero, a rightly guiding god!”

Not only persons (first order entities) are deictically referred to, also abstract entities and events (second order entities) are found with *eni*, older *ini*. Here it is even more difficult to pinpoint the deictic semantics given the problems one encounters in locating an event or abstract idea in space. Sometimes however the context provides some clues. There are several instances of a person *hearing* about an event, meaning that the event did not take place in the visual field of the Speaker. In these instances a proximal interpretation of *ini* / *eni* is excluded, as in the following excerpts from several treaties:

- 4.24 **KBo 5.4 obv. 10-14** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 67), ed. Friedrich 1926: 54-55

§ ¹⁰ [*nam*]ma = *kan mān* *IŠTU* KUR ^{URU} *HATTI* = *ia* *kuiški idāluš memia*[š *š*]A BAL
šarā iš[*parz*]azzi ¹¹ [*zig*] = *an ištamašti nu = ššan* ANA ^dUTU-*ši* *uarri lamm*[*ar*
a]rhu[*t mān*] *tuk = ma Ū*[*L ZAG-an*] ¹² [*nu ÉRIN.ME*]Š ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ANA
^dUTU-*ši* *uarri uppi n = an BELUM* *kuiš*[*ki uū*]atedd[*u mān = m*]a = *ššan idā*[*laui*] ¹³
[kuūa]tqā *parā uškiši nu kiššan mematti i-ni = ū*[*a i*]dālu *kīša*[*ru nu*] *kāšma*
[apatta = ia] ¹⁴ [*NI*]Š DINGIR-LIM *zik šarratti*

[Fu]rthermore, also if some evil word of rebellion ri[s]es up from Hatti, (and) [you] hear it, then instantly stand by My Majesty for help. But [if] you yourself are not ..., send soldiers (and) horses to My Majesty for support, and some (other) lord must bring them (here). [But if] you disregard the ev[il for some reas]on, and say as follows: “Let that (*ini*) evil happen!”, then it is *you*¹¹¹ who thereby breaks [the oath]s of the gods [because of that too].

- 4.25 **KBo 5.13 iii 22-28, KUB 6.41 iii 47** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68), ed. Friedrich 1926: 128-129

§²² *mān=ma* ḪUL-lun *memian* *kuinki* ŠA BAL *piran*²³ *parā* *ištamašti* *naššu* LÚ URUḪATTI *kuiški*²⁴ *našma* LÚ URUArzauwa *kuiški* BAL *ēššai*²⁵ *kinun=ta* *kuiēš* *kūš* LÚ.MEŠ *kuiṛyanaš*²⁶ *memian=ma* ANA dUTU-ŠI *piran* *parā* ḫūdāk²⁷ ŪL ḫatrāši *nu=ššan* *apēdaš* *kuuatqa*²⁸ *antuḫšaš* *parā* *uškiši* *nu* *kiššan* *mematti* (continued with duplicate KUB 6.41 iii)⁴⁷ [(*e*)]-*ni=ua* *idālu* *kišaru*

If you beforehand hear about some evil word of rebellion, either some man from Hatti or some man from Arzawa causes a revolt — these men who are now your allies — and you do not write the affair instantly to My Majesty in advance, and you disregard those men for some reason, and you speak in this way: “Let that (*eni*) evil happen”,
...¹¹²

- 4.26 **KUB 6.41 i 34-38** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68), ed. Friedrich 1926: 110-111

§³⁴ *mahḫan=ma* dUTU-ŠI *uni* *memian* AŠME *nu* dUTU-ŠI mPÍŠ.TUR-an³⁵ ŪL *kuitki* ḪUL-uanni *šanḫun* *n=an* *piran* *parā* [ŪL *kuitki*]³⁶ ḪUL-aḫḫun *nu* *kiššan* AQBI *paimi=ua* *u-ni* *memian* [EGIR-pa *anda*]³⁷ *tittanumi* *nu* *šarā* *tiḫanun* *nu* *kēdani* *memi[(i)ani* EGIR-pa]³⁸ *anda* *tittanumanzi* *pāun*

But when I, My Majesty, heard about that affair, I, My Majesty, did not seek for evil against Mashuiliwa at all. I did [not] act evilly [at all] towards him. I spoke in this way: “I will go set that (*uni*) affair [right again].” I arose and went to settle this affair.

In the preceding paragraph of this treaty between Mursili and Kupanta-Kurunta it is described how Mashuiliwa started to alienate the people of Pitassa and even some Hittite subjects from the Hittite empire, trying to engage into fight. As in the preceding examples, the affair did not take place in the vicinity of either Speaker or Addressee. Moreover, in the current example the affair lies in the past, therefore distancing the rebellion also on the time-axis, not only on the spatial one.

In these three examples the Speaker does not seem to have an audience in the narration, so their speech could be considered a soliloquy. The text is however written with an audience in mind, so the speech must be somewhat changed to fulfill the communicative needs of the Addressee.¹¹³ The Writer makes the Speaker talk to the reader, who is not capable of looking into the Speaker’s mind. In other words, the referent of *uni memian* is not

¹¹¹ In Chapter 8 I will show that a (definite) Subject in preverbal position expresses Replacing Focus, implicating ‘not X does something, Y does something’. A possible paraphrase might be ‘it is Y who ...’.

¹¹² Similar passage in the treaties KBo 5.4 obv. 14-17, with obv. 17: *nu* *kiššan* *mematti* *i-ni=ua* *idālu* *kišaru* and KUB 21.1 + ii 80 (NH treaty, Muwattalli, CTH 76), ed. Friedrich 1930: 64, emendations Otten 1957:28: *nu* *kiššan* *tēši*]]⁸⁰ *e-ni=ua* ḪUL-lu DÛ-ru

¹¹³ The original deictics however are always retained.

yet centered upon by the Addressee, and the demonstrative noun phrase is therefore exploited for the centering procedure. Moreover, the phrase *uni memian* is not the Established Topic, it is not expected at all in relation with the Subject “I”. It is therefore in the Focus of the clause.

4.2.3.3. The demonstrative *asi* refers to an entity in the presence of Speaker and is disassociative

The demonstrative *asi* in the preceding examples was explained as distal deictic, while in some cases the context did not provide any clues. The next five examples on the other hand only allow a Proximal interpretation of *asi*. For the explanation of this conflicting use of *asi* we have to turn to *Empathetic Deixis*. Levinson 1983: 81 recalls that English *that* may shift to *this* to show empathy, and that *this* may shift to *that* to show emotional distance (see Chen 1990: 148-151 for a discussion of distancing-*that*, sympathy-*that* and camaraderie-*that* and -*this*). In most examples cited below the context is clearly very negative, and it is very likely that the Speaker of the utterances wants or needs to distance himself from whatever is introduced by means of *asi* / *ini*:

- 4.27 **KBo 16.24+ i 46'-49'** with duplicate KBo 16.102 1'-5' (MH/MS instruction, CTH 251), ed. Rizzi Mellini 1979: 522-523

§ ^{46'} [našma[?]]=ššan¹¹⁴ kuiš kūruri parā galankanza nu kiššan ^{47'} [imma t]ezzi man=ya i-ni¹¹⁵ kūrur arḥa ḥar(a)kzi nu kiššan ^{48'} [(imma t)]ezzi man=ya i-ni [kūrur] [p] [ar(ā)] ^{49'} [(a)]lpuēšzi [nu] apūn kē NIŠ DINGIR.MEŠ appandu [Or] (if) someone is completely fed up with war and [s]peaks as follows: “Would but that (*ini*) war utterly disappear!”, and even speaks as follows: “Would but that (*ini*) [war] become”, (then) let these oath gods grab *that* one, ...

On the spatial level the soldier is probably on the battlefield, so he is actually in the midst of the war, and could therefore have said: ‘Would but this war (*ki kūrur*) utterly disappear!’. By using the distal deictic *asi* however, he emphasizes his emotional distance from the war he is involved in and stresses the fact that he wishes it would not be his business anymore. The clause containing *ini* is an out-of-the-blue sentence, with Sentence Focus.

Another example of the distancing effect of *ini* is:

- 4.28 **KBo 5.6 iii 16-19**, with duplicate KBo 14.9 (NH annals, CTH 40, Mursili II), ed. Güterbock 1956: 94-95

¹⁶ nu maḥḥan ABU=YA eniššan IŠME ¹⁷ [(nu)]=za LÚ.MEŠ GAL-TI memiani parā ḥalzāiš ¹⁸ i[(-ni=ya=mu uttar karuui)]liḫaz piran ¹⁹ ŪL [(kuḫapikki kiša)]t
After my father had heard in that way, he called forth the leaders for council: “Such a (*ini*) thing has never happened to me in my whole life!”

Suppiluliuma’s exclamation is a response to the letter sent by the widow of Tut-anch-Amon: “My husband died while I have no son. It is said however that *you* have many sons. If you

¹¹⁴ Rizzi Mellini 1979: 522 emends *še-er*]-aš-ša-an.

¹¹⁵ Rizzi Mellini 1979: 522 reads *e-ni* instead of *i-ni* twice.

would give me one of your sons, he would become my husband. I do not want to take a servant of mine and make him my husband. I fear *tekri-* (?)”. Suppiluliuma cannot believe that one of his sons will become pharaoh, so he sends a messenger to find out whether he is being deceived. Not believing the request of the widow, he uses *ini* to express emotional distance although the letter is read aloud in his presence.

Suppiluliuma refers with *ini uttar* to something he has just heard, so the event is at the forefront of his attention. However, this information is not yet known to the council who is called in afterwards. For them this is an Out-of-the-blue sentence.

Outside my corpus some other examples of Proximal *asi* occur in the Kumarbi-myth. They deal with the Basalt monster Ullikummi, threat to heaven and earth, and therefore obviously something most of the gods want to distance themselves from. This distancing, I believe, should be seen as an instantiation of the more neutral ‘belonging to the cognitive space of the Other’, that is, outside of the cognitive space of Speaker and Addressee. As I have described in 3.1 *et passim*, the difference between the three demonstratives lies in the cognitive domain as perceived by the Speaker. The speaker will use *ka-* + N to indicate that something is his responsibility, *apa-* + N to indicate that something is the responsibility of the Addressee, and *asi* + N for responsibility belonging to the Other, or at least that it is not his or the Addressee’s responsibility. This more encompassing notion is needed, because the emotional aspect of the Distal demonstrative pronoun explains the occurrence of *asi* in 4.29, but not in 4.30 and 4.31:

4.29 **KUB 17.7+ iv 13’-19’** (NH myth, CTH 345), ed. Güterbock 1951: 156

§^{13’} *nu=za* ^dElliluš *PANI* *Z[I=š]U* *memiškiuṽan* *dāiš*^{14’} *kuiš=ṽar=aš* *a-ši* *DUMU-aš* *ku[in]* *namma* *šallanuēr* ^dGUL-šuš^{15’} *DINGIR.MAḪ.MEŠ-uš* *kuiš=ṽar=aš*
[*namma*] *uškizzi* *šallajāš* *DINGIR.MEŠ-aš*^{16’} *daššauēš* *zahḫau[š nu=ṽ]a* *ṼL* *kuēlqa*
^{17’} *ša* ^dKumarbi=*pat=ṽar=a*[*t ida*]lutar ^dKumarbiš=*ṽa* *GIM-an* ^dU-an^{18’} *šallanut*
IGI-anda=ma=ṽa=š[ši (k)]ān ^{NA4}kunkunuzin^{19’} *tarpanallin* *šalla[nut]* §

Enlil started to talk to himself: “Who is he, that¹¹⁶ (*asi*) child?, whom they raised again, the Fate-goddesses and the Mother-goddesses. Who shall further attend to them, the mighty battles of the great gods? Of noone, of only Kumarbi it is an evil plan! Just as Kumarbi raised the Stormgod, against him he has raised this basalt stone as (his) supplanter!”

The preceding paragraph recounts how the child was placed on his knees, so the child is clearly proximal to the Speaker. Here Enlil shows his concern, and *asi* is used to express his emotional distance, but in the next example it is Kumarbi, the father of the rebel who uses *asi* to refer to his son. Given the fact that in iv 12’ of ex. 4.31 (where the demonstrative is used anaphorically, see section 4.5.) is described how Kumarbi happily plays with the child, *asi* does not indicate emotional distance.

4.30 **KUB 17.7+ iii 27-28’** (NH myth, CTH 345), ed. Güterbock 1951: 152-153

^{27’} *nu=za* *PANI* *ZI=šU* *memiškiuṽan* [*dāiš* *kued*]*ani=ṽar=an*^{28’} *peḫḫi* *a-ši* *DUMU-an*

He started to talk in himself: “To whom shall I give him, this (*asi*) son?”

¹¹⁶ CHD Š p. 87b translates *asi* as “this” as a result of the proximity of the child.

4.31 **KUB 17.7+ iii 11'-13'** (NH myth, CTH 345), ed. Güterbock 1951: 152-153

[n=an ANA ^dK]um[arbi] ^{12'} ginu_uaš halāi[r ^dKumar]biš=za a[-ši] DUMU.NITA-an
^{13'} duškiškiu_uan dā[iš n]=an kunkeškiu_uan d[āiš]

They placed [him] on Kumarbi's knees. [Kumar]bi started to rejoice over th[at] (*asi*) son, and started to fondle him.

As we will see in section 4.4 on the discourse deictic use of *asi* and section 4.5 on the tracking (= anaphoric) use, *asi* is not only used to express distance from the Deictic Center, but also to express cognitive psychological distance. In exx. 4.27-29 this was narrowed down to emotional distance, in 4.30 and 4.31 however not emotional distance is expressed, but the idea that something is not the responsibility of the Speaker. In ex. 4.30 Kumarbi is deliberating about who will raise his child. Clearly he will not take responsibility for his own child.

Finally there are two broken passages with *ini* and *edani*. Although nothing can be said on the situational context and the deictic or cognitive contrasts, the appearance of these forms in the first clause of a Direct Speech classifies them as Deictic.

4.32 **KUB 23.74 (+)** with duplicate KUB 26.38 + iii 13'-16' (MH/MS treaty, CTH 42)

§ ^{12'} [(naš)]ma kišš_uu_a[(n utt)ar ...]zikila ZI-i[t (ēp)]ši ^{13'} [(našm)]a=at ieši [...]namma kuitki parā [(d)]amai ^{14'} [(šanhatt)]i [nu kiššan teš]i i-ni=ua i_uami
^{15'} [(nu=ua=za apel) ...]

Or (if) you yourself plan a thing like this, or (if) you perform it [...], furthermore you seek something else [..., and you sa]y [as follows:] 'I will do that (*ini*). [I will become??] *his*.[...].

The reference of *ini* is not very clear. It might be *kišš_uu_a uttar* 'a thing like this', but it might also refer forward.

4.33 **KBo 14.1 ii 5'-6'**, with duplicates KBo 8.29, KUB 26.84 ii (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40), ed. Güterbock 1956: 63

UMMA AB[U=Y(A ANA ABI ABI=YA)] ^{6'} e-da-ni=ua ANA [KASKA(L(?) EN=YA ammuk u_iia)]

Thus (said) my father to my grandfather: "Send *me*, my lord, on that campaign".

The broken context does not allow anything to say on the value of *edani*.

4.2.4. Linguistic Selfreference

Expressions referring to an entity containing that expression as 'In this dissertation I claim ...' are not attested for *asi* etc. As I explained in 3.1.4., linguistic selfreference is only expressed by *ka-*. This in itself is enough proof that *asi* etc. is not a Proximal deictic demonstrative.

4.2.5. Numbers and figures, other observations and preliminary conclusion

4.2.5.1. The deictic value of *asi* etc.

Collecting the facts from the preceding paragraphs results in the following table if we only look at the spatial distance and not at the cognitive connotation:

| | Distal | Proximal | Indeterminate |
|------------------|---|-----------------|---------------------|
| <i>asi</i> | 5 (exx. 11, 14-16, 18) | 2 (exx. 29, 30) | 3 (exx. 19, 20, 23) |
| <i>ini / eni</i> | 7 (exx. 10 (incl. fn.), 17, 24, 25 (incl. fn.)) | 3 (exx. 27, 28) | 1 (ex. 32) |
| <i>uniyas</i> | 2 (ex. 12) | | |
| <i>uni</i> | 1 (ex. 26) | | |
| <i>unius</i> | 1 (ex. 15) | | |
| <i>edani</i> | 1 (ex. 18) | | 2 (exx. 21, 33) |
| <i>edaza</i> | 1 (ex. 13) | | |
| <i>edi/edez</i> | 14 (exx. 1-4, with notes) | | |
| Total | 32 | 5 | 6 |

Table 4.1: Spatial distribution of *asi* etc.

For the sake of the argument I treat the demonstratives separately, as four groups: *asi*, *eni*, *ed-* and *uni-*. Only the forms *asi* and *ini / eni* occur with Distal and Proximal value, *uniyas*, *uni*, *unius*, *edani*, *edi / edez* and *edaza* all have Distal value. The Distal value of the *ed-* group is strongly supported by the use of *edi / edez* as the opposite of proximal *ket / kez* (4.2.2.). The *uni-* group as a whole also has Distal deictic value. If there is a deictic contrast, demonstratives always have one deictic value, and any seemingly other deictic value must mean that the primary value is used figuratively, e.g. in emphatic deixis. So either *asi* and *eni* are Proximal demonstratives that are sometimes used to create emotional or cognitive proximity in a Distal context, or they are Distal and used to indicate emotional or cognitive distance in a Proximal context.

As I have stated in 3.1.4. and will state in 6.2.4., only the Proximal demonstrative *ka-* is used for linguistic selfreference. A clear example of linguistic selfreference is ‘the words on this tablet, *ki TUPPU*’. The distal value of each form cited above is strengthened by the non-existence of selfreferring expressions (see 4.2.4.).

Nonetheless, we still need to investigate whether *asi* and *ini / eni* are possibly Proximal deictics, sometimes secondarily used to indicate emotional closeness irrespective of distance. The proximal column (exx. 27-30) is not problematic under this assumption, the indeterminate column (exx. 19-21, 23, 32, 33) is not conclusive, only the distal column (exx. 10, 11, 14-18, 24, 25) has to be discussed.

In ex. 15 (CTH 123, NH) *asi* ZAG-as and *unius* EN.MEŠ occur in the same context. If *unius* is distal deictic, then *asi* must be too.

In ex. 17 and 18 (CTH 431, NH) *asi* and *edani* refer to the same person. If *edani* is distal, then *asi* must be too. The neuter *eni* in ex. 17 cooccurs with *edani*, and refers to the illness belonging to the patient. If the patient is positioned as distal, then his illness must be too.

The other examples where the referents were clearly located at a large distance of the Speaker, are exx. 10, 11, 14, 16, 24 and 25.

In ex. 10 (CTH 767, MH) *eni* refers to the crying of a woman in childbirth that suddenly draws the attention of a deity. It is unlikely to read emotional closeness here.

The exx. 11 (*asi*, CTH 42, MH), 24 (*ini*, CTH 67, NH) and 25 (*eni*, CTH 68, NH) have a context which clearly expresses carelessness. This contradicts the alleged emotional proximity of a distal referent.

In ex. 14 (*asi*, CTH 255.2) we would have to assume that the referent of *asi* is emotionally close to the Speaker, in this case the enemy of the king. Contextually nothing speaks for or against this interpretation. The same can be said of ex. 16 (*asi*, NH, CTH 123). The other example belonging to Tudhaliya IV is ex. 15. Here it was concluded that *asi* indicated distal deixis without any emotional connotation. The deictic *asi* cannot at the same time be a Distal deictic and a Proximal deictic indicating emotional closeness in a distal environment. Summarizing, not only the *ed-* and *uni-*groups are distal, also *asi* and *eni* are.

Besides the fact that a demonstrative has one deictic value, it is also very unlikely that one deictic value, in this case the distal one, is expressed by means of four different demonstratives (i.e. *asi*, *eni*, the *uni-*group, and the *ed-* group). Laroche (1979: 148) already came to the same conclusion and proved on syntactic grounds that all these forms constituted one paradigm (although he considered *asi* etc. as an anaphoric pronoun). The same can now be concluded on functional-pragmatic considerations.

Kammenhuber only accepted Laroche's proposal for the 13th century but stated that more research was needed for the older phases. In the next paragraph a beginning will be made with the chronological investigation.

4.2.5.2. The chronological distribution of *asi* etc.

In the preceding paragraph it was concluded that the four demonstrative stems all were distal and therefore presumably belong to one paradigm. In order to judge the earlier periods, it is necessary to reassess the material from the chronological point of view. Table 4.2 lists the distribution of distal deictic *asi* etc. from OH until the end of the Hittite empire (the NH column contains the material that could not be assigned to a specific king):

| | OS | OH | MS | MH | Supp | Murs II | Muw | Hatt III | Tud IV | NH |
|------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|------|---------|-----|----------|--------|----|
| nom.s.c. <i>asi</i> | | | + | + | | | + | | + | + |
| acc.s.c. <i>uni</i> <i>asi</i> | | | | | | + | | | + | + |
| n.-a.s.n. <i>ini</i> <i>eni</i> | | | + | + | | + | + | | | |
| gen.s. <i>uniyas</i> | | | | | | | | | | + |
| dat.s. <i>edani</i> | | | + | + | | | | | | |
| nom.pl.c. <i>unius</i> | | | | | | | | | + | |
| abl. <i>edaza</i> | | | | | | | | | + | |
| Loc.adv. <i>edi</i> <i>edez</i> | + | + | | | + | + | | + | | |

Table 4.2: Chronological distribution of Deictic *asi* etc.

Distal deictic *uniyas*, *uni*, and *unius* all belong to the period of Mursili and later. The distal group **ed-* is attested from Old Hittite (Old script!) on, so it is safe to assume that the **ed-* group had distal deictic reference in the whole attested period of Hittite.

The distal neuter *ini* / *eni* is attested in a MH copy (ex. 10), a NH ritual (ex. 17), and in treaties of Mursili and Muwattalli (exx. 24 & 25). It is however referring to a proximal referent in MS (ex. 27) and in a citation from Suppiluliuma in a Mursili text (ex. 28), both with the connotation of emotional distance.

The distal *asi* occurs in MS (ex. 11), NH (ex. 18) and texts from Tudhaliya IV (exx. 14, 15 & 16). Deictic *asi* referring to a proximal referent with the added meaning of emotional distance is twice found in a NH myth (ex. 29, 30). Indeterminate *asi* is found in MH (ex. 19, 20), Muwattalli (ex. 23) and possibly one in Old Script¹¹⁷:

4.34 **KBo 17.17 (+?) KBo 30.30 obv. 6'-7'** with duplicate KUB 43.53 obv. i 16'-18' (OS ritual), ed. Goedegebuure 2002: 64, 70.

§ 6' [(DINGIR.MEŠ-*nan* ^dUTU-*i*)] *kāša* DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš* *a-ši* *p*[(*eškimi* ^dUTU-*šumman* *laba*)]*r*^{??}[(*nan*)] 7' [(DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš* *a-ši* *piškimi*)]×¹¹⁸ *ānda*=*ššan*[(*pi*)*škimi* *ā*(*zaš*=*šiš* T)]^I*I-anza*¹=*šši*[(*š* *kāša*)] §

O Sungod amongst the gods, I hereby give that one (*asi*) to the gods, i.e., Our Sun Labarna. I shall give that one (*asi*) to the gods. [I shall] giv[e] his equal. Here (is) his [eq]ual, his living (substitute)!

The demonstrative *asi* might be used here to indicate non-involvement of the patient (the king) (compare with ex. 4.18).

So from the moment each form is attested, it either indicates spatial remoteness or cognitive distance. The other sections will provide more examples in earlier periods.

4.2.5.3. The attention-levels and Information Structure of *asi* etc.

In the section on salient discourse entities (4.2.3.1.) we saw that *asi* (ex. 4.11) and *eni* (ex. 4.10) were attested as Unestablished Topics, and *edaza* as Established Topic. The genitive *uniyas* (ex. 4.12) was outside the Topic-Focus structure of the clause. The other examples of *asi* + noun were all centering, and either found in out-of-the-blue sentences (Sentence Focus) or in the predicate of the clause (Predicate Focus). For the terminology see chapter 2. The table will only contain *asi* (+ N) as a shorthand for the paradigm. I only cite the Locative adverbs of relative position separately. They are always centering and part of the Focus, but as pronouns they have to be listed separately.

| Situational/Deictic Use | | | |
|-------------------------|------------|---------|--|
| Continuity procedure | | | Centering procedure |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus |
| <i>asi</i> | <i>asi</i> | ∅ | <i>asi</i> N <i>edi</i> / <i>edez</i> |

Table 4.3: The Deictic *asi* matrix.

¹¹⁷ I did not discuss this example before because *asi* could be both Situational and Tracking. I opt for the former given the fact that Tracking *asi* is otherwise adjectively used.

¹¹⁸ In KUB 43.53 *a-a-an-da-aš-ša-an* is preceded by *nu*. The sign in A does not look like *nu*.

4.3. The Recognitional Use of *asi* etc.

4.3.1. Introduction

Recalling from 2.2.1.2 (general linguistics) and 3.2 (applied to Hittite), demonstratives may be used in order to introduce information that is ‘Hearer old / Discourse new’. If the Speaker wants to activate some information which s/he assumes is already stored in the memory of the Addressee, s/he may use an adnominal demonstrative instead of just a noun for reference to that information.

I repeat here the list of criteria 3.2.1. in order to identify recognitionally used demonstratives in Hittite:

- 1) *The demonstrative is adnominal.*
- 2) *The information contained in the demonstrative expression must be private.* The information expressed in the NP should not be part of the general or cultural knowledge of the Hittite speech community.
- 3) *The demonstrative expression may not refer to something in the presence of the Speaker.* If it did, this would make it Deictic (= Situational).

These three criteria are essential for all types of recognitionally used demonstratives. The following ones are not as important, but add to the likelihood of a demonstrative expression being recognitional.

- 4) *The demonstrative expression is the first mention in the discourse.* This poses a problem for Hittite given the sometimes pitiful state of the tablets. In case of damaged tablets, I therefore will mention the distance in paragraphs from the broken beginning.
- 5) *The demonstrative expression includes a relative clause or other equally complex modifier.* This inclusion is however not necessary.
- 6) *The demonstrative expression does not serve to resolve a possible ambiguity.* Ambiguity resolution is a task belonging to the domain of anaphoric (or tracking) demonstratives. In order not to include possible anaphoric demonstratives in this category, the preceding text should be free of competing participants.

Using these criteria, we find the following examples. First the clauses containing referents to entities (1st order) are listed, followed by clauses with reference to events (2nd order) and propositions (3rd order). This distinction is upheld in order to show that also higher order entities are recognitionally referred to, something which was not pointed at in the literature on demonstratives (Diessel 1999, Himmelmann 1996). Each example is followed by an enumeration in parentheses of the criteria that do not require a discussion, usually the formal criteria, and a discussion of the remaining criteria. The information contained in the Recognitional clauses is not salient.

4.3.2. Material

We will start with an example from Chapter 3 (ex.3.13):

- 4.35 **KUB 15.3 i 17-19** (NH vow, Hattusili III, CTH 584), ed. De Roos 1984: 198, 337

§¹⁷ Û-TUM MUNUS.LUGAL *zašḫiia=ua=mu kuiški memiškizzi*¹⁸ ANA
^dNIN.GAL=ua=za=kan *kišan maldi mān=ua* ANA ^dUTU-ŠI¹⁹ *e-ni IZI ŠA GÌR.MEŠ-ŠU nuntaraš* SIG₅-ri ...

A dream of the Queen. ‘Someone tells me in a dream: “Make Ningal the following vow: If the¹¹⁹ (*eni*) burning of My Majesty’s feet (lit: that fire of his feet for My Majesty) will subside soon, ...

(adnominal, not present, first mention, modifier, no ambiguity).

As discussed in 3.2.2., it is not very likely that the physical troubles of the Hittite king in all its details are part of the general and cultural knowledge of the Hittites. This makes it private knowledge, shared by the Speaker, the queen, and the Addressee, the deity Ningal.

- 4.36 **KUB 48.119 rev. 11-13** (lateNH vow, CTH 590, Tudhaliya IV¹²⁰), ed. De Roos 1984: 298.

¹¹ § [kinun]a *e-ni kue KARAS* ^mŠahurunuwaš ^mLUGAL-aš-^dLAMMA-ašš=a *pēhuter*
¹² [n=a]t¹²¹ *mān arḫa* SIG₅-in *uizzi*

[No]w, concerning those (*eni*) armies which Sahurunuwa and LUGAL-as-^dLAMMA have led away, if [th]ey come away well, ...

(adnominal, not present, relative clause, no ambiguity)

Although the text is rather damaged and part of the preceding text is lacking, it is likely that ‘those armies’ are first mention given the circumstance that each paragraph in the Vow-genre is usually independent from the others.

As for the status of the type of knowledge, we can safely assume that it is shared, but not common knowledge between Speaker (the King) and Addressee (a Deity) because every pending military action had to be discussed extensively with the gods by means of oracles.

A comparable example from the same text-genre, dating back to the earlier king Muwattalli is

- 4.37 **KBo 9.96 obv. 7’-9’** (NH vow, Muwattalli, CTH 590), ed. De Roos 1984: 286

§⁷ *e-da-ni ku<e>dani KASKAL-ši* ^dUTU-ŠI GIN-ri *nu=mu mān DINGIR.MEŠ piran*
⁸ *ḫuuijatteni nu=za KUR URUAMURRA tar(a)ḫmi*⁹ *n=an=za=an [... IŠT]U*
 GIŠTUKUL *tar(a)ḫmi* ...

¹¹⁹ English does not seem to use a demonstrative in this context.

¹²⁰ Following Van den Hout 1995: 151, contra Kammenhuber HW2 E 39b (Hattusili III).

¹²¹ De Roos 1984: 298 reads tentatively (n. 11) [nam-m]a. However, it was not known at the time that the intransitive verbs (like *uwa-*) require the expression of the intransitive subject. This means that we need here the enclitic neuter plural =at.

About that (*edani*) road/campaign on which My Majesty goes, if you, o gods, run in front of me, (so that) I shall conquer Amurra, conquer it with force ...

(adnominal, not present at the Deictic Center, relative clause, no ambiguity, first mention, shared, private knowledge)

An Old Hittite Recognitional use of *uni* is once¹²² attested in the copied Puhanu Chronicle:

4.38 **KBo 3.41 + KUB 31.4 obv. 10'-11'** (OH/NS Narration, Hattusili I, CTH 16), ed. Soysal 1987: 174-175, 179

§ 10' [(^{URU}A)]rinna^{K1} kuin pēhutetten u-ni ħurtalim=man n[atta=aš] 11' [(ANŠE-i)]š=miš nu=šše=ššan ēškaḫḫa nu ammu pēhutette[n] §

The one you conducted to [A]rinna, that (uni) contestor of mine, (is) [he] n[ot] my [(donkey)]? I will sit on him!¹²³ You shall lead *me* (there instead)!

(adnominal, not present at the Deictic Center, relative clause, no ambiguity, first mention)

Whether or not the leading of an opponent to Arinna is shared, private knowledge cannot be deduced from the text. My translation differs from Otten 1963: 159, “Wen habt ihr nach Arinna geführt? Ausgerechnet meinen Widersacher. <Ist es> nicht mein []? Ich werde mich ihm widersetzen, nun führt mich <dorthin>!”, and, with additional duplicates Soysal 1987: 179: “Wen habt ihr nach Arinna geführt? Jenen, meinen Widersacher! Ist [er] n[icht] mein Esel? Ich werde mich ihm widersetzen, nun führ[t] mich (dorthin)!” Contra Otten and Soysal I propose to consider *uni ħurtalim=man* as an afterthought to the Relative Clause and not as the answer to a rhetorical question. In my view, the rhetorical question is only ‘is he not my donkey?’¹²⁴.

A possible copied Old Hittite Recognitional *asi* occurs in an edict of Hattusili I:

4.39 **KBo 3.28 obv. ii 20-21** (OH/NS edict, Hattusili I, CTH 9), ed. Cohen 2002: 154 n. 662

§ 20 kinuna LUGAL-uš idalu mekki ūḫhun ta LUGAL-ūa<š> uddār(ra)=met 21 lē šarrattuma a-ši MUNUS.LUGAL^{URU} Huruma É.GI₄.A 22 ēšta addaš=miš=a=šše kēdani ara iian ħarta §

Today, I, the king, have seen much evil, so(?) you may not transgress my, the king’s, words. That (asi) queen of Hurma was an eligible bride¹²⁵. My father had considered (it) permissible for her in this (matter)¹²⁶.

¹²² It is possible that there is a second Recognitional *uni* in CTH 16: KBo 3.40 6’ § 6’ [(u-ni)] ĤUR.SAG-an kuin karšikanzi nu natta SIG₅-[in?

¹²³ CHD Š, p. 133 (with references) translates ‘Is he not my donkey on whom (lit. on him) I regularly sit down?’ But see now also Steiner 2002: 812-814: “Den ihr nach Arinna geführt habt, jenen meinen Verleumder, [ist er ni]cht mein esel? Ich werde mich auf ihn setzen!”

¹²⁴ For a discussion of negated sentence questions being rhetorical, see Hoffner 1995: 91-92.

¹²⁵ Cohen l.c.: “This queen was a bride from the city of Hurma”.

¹²⁶ If the text is to be read as translated here, there are two omissions. First, an unidentified *it*, and second, *uddani* ‘matter’. The sense of the passage remains obscure. Maybe one should read *addaš=miš=a=mu* instead. This would lead to ‘My father had considered me right for this one’. The demonstrative *kēdani* refers to the queen, and *-mu* is the object.

(adnominal, modifier, no ambiguity).

The queen might have been mentioned in the lost part of the text (the distance to the beginning of the text is three paragraphs). If she is mentioned before, this example belongs to the section on Anaphora (although Himmelmann calls across node reference also Recognitional). Other uncertainties are 1) that it is not clear whether the queen is present or not, 2) whether the fact that she is a bride is general knowledge or private knowledge, only known to the king and his audience. A favorable circumstance for a recognitional interpretation is that this clause seems to be the beginning of a story about the queen, although the text breaks off after two clauses. One could paraphrase colloquially ‘Remember the queen of Hurma who was a bride? She ...’.

Especially oracles provide us with large quantities of recognitionally used distal demonstratives, as in the next example (with a second order entity):

- 4.40 **KUB 5.1 rev. iii 48-49** (lateNH Oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 561), ed. Ünal 1974: 72-3
§⁴⁸ *u-ni-uš=za=kan kuēš Û.MEŠ HUL-luš uškizzi ISKIM.HI.A=ia=za arpuuanta*⁴⁹
kikištari ...

As for those (*unius*) evil dreams which he keeps seeing and the negative premonitions that keep occurring, ...

(adnominal, not present at the Deictic Center, relative clause, no ambiguity, first mention)

The dreams of the King have not been mentioned before in this text. Again, the contents of the king’s dreams are not very likely to belong to the general or cultural background of the Hittites.

In Middle Hittite we have:

- 4.41 **KUB 50.1 ii 15’-16’** (MH/MS oracle, CTH 573), ed. CHD P: 25
§^{15’} *n=uš*¹²⁷ *u-ni KASKAL-an=ma kuin paizzi nu DINGIR-LUM apiia[-ia?]*^{16’}
idālu uškiši

As for that road which he will travel, do you, o god, see evil there [too?].¹²⁸

(adnominal, relative clause, no ambiguity, shared, private knowledge)

The tablet is broken so it is not possible to decide between a Tracking or Recognitional use, although the relative clause seems to favor the latter. Also, as with Vows, each paragraph deals with one oracle question.

Besides objects also higher order entities may appear in recognitional use:

- 4.42 **KBo 16.97 rev. 7** (MH/MS oracle, CTH 571), ed. Schuol 1994: 104, 108
§⁷ *i-ni ŠA*^{URU} *Išgazzuwa uttar mahhan memir nu dUTU-ŠI ukila*⁸ *paimi ...*
When they have reported that (*ini*) affair of (the city) Isgazzuwa, shall I, My Majesty, go myself?

¹²⁷ *nu-uš* mistaken for *na-aš*?

¹²⁸ Contra CHD P 25 ‘Do you, O god, see them as an evil on the aforementioned road which he will travel?’

(not present at the Deictic Center, adnominal, subordinate clause, no ambiguity, shared, private knowledge)

The following example deals with the conclusion of an oracle inquiry concerning what gifts the offended deity should receive in order to be appeased. At this moment the inquirers would like to know whether that matter of giving is already supervised by someone else, probably as a result of the outcome of another oracle inquiry.

4.43 **KBo 2.2 iv 22-24** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 136

§²² *eni* INIM SUM-annaš *kuit* SI×SÁ-at²³ *e-ni* *kuit* INIM SUM-annaš²⁴ mKatapa-DINGIR-LIM IDE

Concerning the fact that this affair of giving was ascertained, (is it the same as) that (*eni*) case of giving, which Katapaili is overseeing/oversaw?

(adnominal, not present at the Deictic Center, relative clause, no ambiguity)

The case of giving which Katapaili oversaw has not been mentioned before in this oracle inquiry, and we are dealing again with shared knowledge between Speaker (the oracle inquirer) and the addressed Deity.

The preceding clause (iv 22) also contains the same syntagm *eni kuit*, but this time it refers back two paragraphs and may be considered to exploit the tracking function of the demonstrative (see 4.5.2). It only serves to establish a link between the case of giving that was ascertained earlier and the possibly identity with a case of giving under the supervision of Katapaili.

Example 4.43 leads us to the *eni kuit* syntagm that was already correctly recognized by Kammenhuber HW² E p. 40 in 13th c. oracles as referring to something that is already known but not yet mentioned in the text. Here I will present mainly examples from KUB 22.70, an oracle text edited by Ünal 1978, and dating from the time of Hattusili III. This text, which is almost fully preserved, provides 16 examples of *eni kuit/kue* (+ NP).

Assuming that *eni* had to be anaphoric (see 4.1.), referring to something that was mentioned before in the text, Ünal (1978: 104-5) discerned four types of use of *eni kuit*: 1) it refers back to something mentioned before, nearby or far away (obv. 51, rev. 28, 44, 51, 54); 2) it is mistakenly placed instead of *ki kuit* “as for this fact that”¹²⁹ when introducing some theme for the first time. The scribe of the oracle-text was so confused by the number of themes that he could not keep track of what was already mentioned or not and therefore sometimes used *eni kuit* for something that had *not* been mentioned before (obv. 23, 25, 31, 61, rev. 38); 3) ‘fragend und auf den mutmaßlichen Zorn der Gottheit Bezug nehmend’ (obv. 7, 12); and 4) *eni* alone refers back to something mentioned before (obv. 19, 47 (?), rev. 22, 55). As will be clear from the properties of recognitively used demonstratives described above and in Chapter 2, the second group is a likely candidate for being classified as recognitional¹³⁰. I will also discuss category 3 in light of the recognitional use, and some examples from the other categories.

¹²⁹ See also Laroche 1979: 149: ‘*eni kuit* alterne librement avec *ki kuit*; cf. Ro 12, 23, 25, 51, etc.’.

¹³⁰ It seems that Kammenhuber ascribed the uses of *ki kuit* and *eni kuit* to stylistic variety, thereby disagreeing with Ünal’s explanation. It is not clear to me whether Kammenhuber limits the recognitional use to KUB 5.1.

The following example (obv. 31, and in the footnotes obv. 61, rev. 38, category 2) discusses an event that happened in the past and was not mentioned before in the preceding text. An evaluation of the contexts in which they are used will shed light on the difference between *eni kuit* and *ki kuit*: according to Ünal *ki kuit* should not refer to something that is known from the past, whereas *eni kuit* does.

As for a possible recognitional use, the information in the following *eni kuit* clauses is not very likely to be general or cultural knowledge, but part of shared experiences between the oracle inquirers and the deity:

- 4.44 **KUB 22.70 obv. 31-32** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 62-63¹³¹
 § ³¹ *e-ni-ia kuit* ^f*Ammattallaš IQBI punuššuuēni=ma nāyi mān memiaš ašanza*
mān mahḥan ³² *ANA IR=ma=kan anda ŪL appiškir nu mān zilaš apēz kišat nu*
KUŠ.MEŠ NU.SIG₅-du SAG.ME NU.S[IG₅] §
 And about that (*eni*) (fact), that Ammattalla has made a statement (lit. has spoken)¹³²:
 on the one hand (*-ma*) we have not yet inquired whether (her) statement is true, or
 how (it is), on the other hand (*-ma*), they have not submitted (it) to an oracle inquiry.
 If the oracle outcome has happened because of *that*, (then) let the exta be unfavorable.
 SAG.ME. Unfavorable.

And from category 3:

- 4.45 **KUB 22.70 obv. 7-8** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 56-57
 § ⁷ *kī kuit* DINGIR-LIM URU*Arušna ITTI* dUTU-ŠI [TUKU.TUK]U-atti SI×SÀ-at nu *e-*
ni kuit MUNUS.LUGAL ^f*Ammattallan* ⁸ *ANA DINGIR-LIM URU*Arušna *hurtaš*
^f*Ammat[tal]lašš=a=za=kan kuit* DINGIR-LIM IGI^{HI.A}-*ua ēpta ... nu=*]za mān
 DINGIR-LIM *apadda šer* TUKU.TUKU-*uanza ...*
 About this (*ki*) (fact), that the deity of Arusna has been determined in anger with the
 king: about that (*eni*) (fact), that the queen cursed Ammattalla before the Deity of
 Arusna, and also, that Ammattalla took the eyes of the Deity, ... , if the Deity is angry
 because of *that*, ...¹³³

The syntagm *ki kuit* ‘this (fact), that’ resumes something which has happened just now. Almost each time it refers to something which has been ascertained by oracle in the preceding paragraph and is repeated at the beginning of the new paragraph to give the setting for the next oracle question (see also Chapter 6.4.3.2.2.). So *ki kuit* does not introduce a new theme as Ünal assumed, but provides a *link* between a just finished theme and a new one building

¹³¹ See also KUB 22.70 obv. 61-63 § ⁶¹ *e-ni=ma kuit* MUNUS.LUGAL UN.MEŠ-šuš *katta* GUL-*anteš* ANA dUTU-ŠI *IŠPUR* ‘About that (*eni*) (fact), that the queen wrote about the ‘downbeaten’ people to the king’; KUB 22.70 rev. 38-39 § ³⁸ *e-ni=kan kuit* mZarniya-LÚ-iš UNUTE^{MEŠ} INA ŠÀ É^{NA} *hekur* dLAMMA *pēdaš* ‘About that (*eni*) (fact), that Zarniyaziti had brought the utensils into the Rock-Sanctuary of Kurunta’.

¹³² Ünal differently: ‘Auch das, was Ammatalla erzählt hat, ...’. I do not agree with an interpretation of *eni* as the object of *IQBI*, ‘has spoken’. In the majority of cases, *eni kuit* serves to introduce a whole clause or proposition into the discourse, instead of introducing some entity (with which it then may agree in case).

¹³³ Ünal differently: ‘(ist) es jenes (Erwähnte), daß die Königin Frau Ammattalla vor der Gottheit von Arušna verfluchte und weil Ammat[tal]la die Augen der Gottheit faßte ...? Wenn du, o Gott, deswegen erzürnt bist, ...’.

upon the old one. The clause containing *ki kuit* does not add some new information to the discourse, contrary to the *eni kuit* clauses in which *eni kuit* refers to an event which lies in the past and needs to be introduced into the discourse: “is it that (past) fact that the queen ...”.

Now that it is clear that *eni kuit* contains information that is Discourse New, is there proof that it is also Hearer Old, with the Hearer being the deity? Obviously there is, because the information contained in the *eni kuit* clauses is usually the reason for divine anger. The same can be said about ex. 4.46 (also from category 3):

4.46 **KUB 22.70 obv. 11-12** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 56-57

§¹¹ *mān=za* DINGIR-LIM *apadda=pat šer* TUKU.TUKU-*uanza nu* MUŠEN *HURRI*
SIG₅-*ru* NU.SIG₅

§¹² *kī kuit namma* NU.SIG₅-*ta nu e-ni=ja*¹³⁴ *kuit* ^f*Mālaš kiššan IQBI*

If you, o deity, are angry only because of *that*, then let the *hurri*-birds be favorable.
(Outcome:) Unfavorable.

About this fact, that (it) was unfavorable again: (is it) also that (*eni*) (fact), that Mala said as follows: ...

The result of the oracle question in obv. 11 shows that only part of the reason for divine anger was found. The negative outcome is repeated in a *ki kuit* linking clause “About this, that (the outcome) was unfavorable again”. Then the new question starts: “(is it) also that, that Mala told as follows: ...”. According to these lines Mala mentioned in the past that the queen did not give the two golden headbands to the deity which were promised to her. The contents of Mala’s words are both Discourse New and Hearer Old. The text following our lines extensively discusses the actions surrounding the two headbands. The result of this oracle question is that this is indeed one of several events that caused the anger of the deity.

The *eni kuit*-s in obv. 23 (ex. 4.47) and 25 (footnote of 4.47), operate on the same level as the *eni kuit* in ex. 4.46, namely as a frame for a sequence of Direct Speeches and as a remark by the oracle inquirers themselves, leading up to the question for the deity. First I will present the examples, followed by my interpretation of the whole passage obv. 12-27:

4.47 **KUB 22.70 obv. 23** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 60-61¹³⁵

nu e-ni kuit kiššan memir

And as for that (*eni*) (fact), that they had spoken as follows: “ ...”

This is the first mention of the affair discussed in the quotation marks (see below for the contents of the Direct Speech). It is therefore possible to interpret *eni* as a cataphoric substitute Object complement of the verb *memai*- ‘speak’, followed by the real object, the Direct Speech itself. In that case the translation should be “As for the fact that they had said that (*eni*) as follows”. Indeed we have an example of *eni* functioning as the Object of a third order verb (see 4.4.4.). But in that case the complement *kuit* is lacking, so I prefer to

¹³⁴ I do not follow Ünal o.c. p. 12 in emending the text to *eni* without *-ya*. From the preceding paragraph it is clear that there is another reason for the deity to be angry. The oracle inquirers therefore phrase their next question as “Is it also (*-ya*) that (fact) that ..., that you, o deity, are angry?”

¹³⁵ KUB 22.70 obv. 25²⁵ *anzāš=ma e-ni kuit* 1-EN SUR₁₄.DÙ.A^{MUŠEN} GUŠKIN GEŠTIN GARA.A.AN NA₄ 8 AYARI *penkita ŠUR ĒNI KAPPI ĒNI ŪL šekkuēn* And as for that (*eni*) (fact) that *we* did not know about the one golden falcon, the bunch of grapes of precious stones, the 8 rosettes, the *penkita*-s, the eyebrow (?), the eyelid of precious stone, ...

understand our example of *eni* here as the syntagm *eni kuit* ‘as for that (known) fact, that’. The three *eni kuit* clauses obv. 12, 23 and 25 form the framework of a very long introduction to an oracle question:

| | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| <i>Link</i> | <i>ki kuit</i> | About this, that (it = the oracle outcome) was unfavorable again: |
| <i>Question 1</i> | <i>nu eni=ia kuit</i> (4.44) | (is it) also <u>that</u> , that Mala said as follows: |
| <i>Direct Speech</i> | | <p>“The queen made a golden headband in the Stone-house of Kurunta. Then the deity of Arusna asked the queen for it in a dream. The queen however did not give it, and hid it in the house of a chamberlain. Instead, the queen made two other headbands of silver. As long as she has not sent it (the golden one) to the deity of Arusna, the matter has been causing trouble to the queen, and she was banned from the palace. Thereupon the queen wrote from the city Utruli to the king: “The golden headband that the deity of Arusna requested from me in a dream, it has been lying in the house of the chamberlain up till now. The <i>takkisra</i> and the precious stones that remained behind, they are lying in the <i>atupalassa</i> up till now. Send them to the Deity!”</p> <p>¹³⁶They have found that (<i>eni</i>) golden headband. Next to it there lay a golden falcon, a bunch of grapes of precious stones, 8 rosettes, <i>penkita</i>-s, an eyebrow (?), an eyelid of precious stone. It was brought to the Stone-house of Kurunta to the statue of the queen. The <i>takkisra</i> however that were supposed to be lying in the <i>atupalassa</i> were not found. The two golden headbands that the queen had made as a vow for the deity, one of them was found and was sent to the deity.”</p> |
| <i>Question 2</i> | <i>nu eni kuit</i> (4.45) | and (is it) <u>that</u> (fact), that they said as follows: |
| <i>Direct Speech</i> | | “Whatever lies with the utensils of the Deity, they shall just give it to the deity and <i>not</i> turn it back.” |
| <i>Question 3</i> | <i>anzāš=ma eni kuit</i> (fn., at 4.45) | and (is it) <u>that</u> (fact) that <i>we</i> did not know about the one golden falcon, the stone wine, the 8 rosettes, ..., and (that) they were brought to the Stone-house of Kurunta to the statue of the queen, but that they did not find the <i>takkisra</i> , |
| <i>Concluding Question</i> | <i>apadda šer</i> | If you, o Deity, are angry because of (all) <i>that</i> , the let the exta be unfavorable. (Outcome: unfavorable) |

Another attestation of *eni* in this oracle text which I want to interpret differently from Ünal is obv. 51 from category 1, *eni kuit* as a reference to what was said before. We will see that *eni kuit* does not refer back:

4.48 **KUB 22.70 obv. 49-52** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 70-71
 § ⁴⁹ *kī kuit namma* NU.SIG₅-*ta nu=kan* ʾ *uaštanza kuit* ŠÀ É NA₄*hekur* dLAMMA
āššan n=at ariḡaḡeni ⁵⁰ *nu kuit* SI×SÁ-*tari n=at* ANA DINGIR-LIM *pianzi*
mān=ma=za DINGIR-LIM QATAMMA *malān ḫarti nu* KUŠ.MEŠ SIG₅-*ru* ...

¹³⁶ Contra Ünal o.c. p. 59 and fn. d) the following clauses are probably still part of the oracle question that started in obv. 12.

§ ⁵¹ *e-ni=kan kuit* √ *uaštanza* ŠÀ É NA₄ *hekur* dLAMMA *āššuu_uanzi* SI×SÁ-at *n=at*
pānzi ANA DINGIR-LIM IŠTU NA₄ ⁵² *pianzi* KI.MIN ...

As for this (*ki*) (fact), that it was again unfavorable: the sin that remains inside the stone-house of the Tutelary deity, we will perform an oracle inquiry about it. What shall be established they shall give to the deity. If you, o god, agree in that way, let the extra be favorable (Outcome: favorable)

As for that (*eni*) (fact), that sin was established as remaining inside the stone-house of the Tutelary deity, and (that) thereupon they shall give it to the deity together with a precious stone, (if) ditto, (then let the *hurri* birds be favorable. Outcome: unfavorable)

The first paragraph states clearly that the oracle inquirers still have to perform an inquiry about the sin in the Stone-house and the fine to be paid, so in this text only the announcement of an oracle inquiry has been written down and not the outcome of that inquiry itself. As a result, the next paragraph cannot refer back to this outcome because there *is* no outcome here. The paragraph starts with the observation that the oracle has indicated that sin remained and that that sin has to be given to the deity. Given that this oracle inquiry with its outcome has not been inscribed on this tablet, we do not know what the ‘sin’ is about, and moreover, nowhere it has been stated that some precious stones have to be given as an extra gift. So the second paragraph gives us the summary of what has been established elsewhere, with the final request for divine consent. This summary is Discourse new and necessarily Hearer old, requiring a demonstrative that can be recognitionally used. Therefore *eni* is used and not *ki*, which generally links to the immediately preceding text.

Concluding, Ünal’s category 2 and 3 merge to form the Recognitionnal Use category. The writer knew very well what he was doing, so the idea posited by Ünal about confusion of the writer and the stylistic variation interpretation of Kammenhuber are both besides the point. In the case of Kammenhuber this is surprising given her correct analysis of the “jenes (andersweitig bekannte)”.

The same recognitionnal use occurs in another oracle from Tudhaliya IV:

4.49 **KUB 5.1 obv. i 7** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 561), ed. Ünal 1974: 32-33

§ ⁷ *e-ni=kan kuit* m*Temetiš* INIM URU *Taptena* URU *Huršama=ia* RA-uanzi EGIR *tijat*
 As for that (*eni*) (fact), that Temeti returned to attack in the matter of Taptena and Hursama, ...

This passage is explicitly mentioned by Kammenhuber as an instance of ‘einen dem Orakler bekannten, aber noch nicht im Text erwähnten Kampfplan’ (o.c. 40a). In the same oracle we already saw a Recognitionnal *unius* (ex. 4.40).

Another example of the introduction to an oracle inquiry is in Direct Speech in a Plague prayer:

4.50 **KUB 14.8 obv. 31’-37’** (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 378 II), ed. Lebrun 1980: 206, 212

nu=za mahḥan eni ṬUPPA ^{32’} ŠA KUR URU *Mizri* *piran* *uemi_ujanun* *n=at* IŠTU
 DINGIR-LIM *ari_ujanun* ^{33’} *a-ši=ua* *kuiš* *memi_uaš* IŠTU dIM URU *HATTI* *i_uanza* LÚ.MEŠ
 URU *Mizri* *kuit* ^{34’} LÚ.MEŠ URU *HATTI=ia* IŠTU dIM URU *HATTI* *linganuanteš* § ^{35’}
 d*Damnaššaruš=kan* *kuit* INA ŠÀ-BI É dIM URU *HATTI* *BELI=YA* ^{36’} *memi_ujan=ma=kan*
 LÚ.MEŠ URU *HATTI=pat* *hūdāk šarrēr* ^{37’} *nu=uar=aš mān* ANA dIM URU *Hatti*
BELI=YA *kardimmijaz* *kišat* *n=at* *handāittat*

But after I had come across that tablet concerning Egypt, I performed an oracle inquiry of the god: “As for that (*asi*) word (i.e. treaty) which is made by the Stormgod of Hatti, (namely) that the Egyptians and the Hittites were put under oath by the Stormgod of Hatti, that (while) the Damnassara-deities are inside the temple of the Stormgod of Hatti, my Lord, *only* the people of Hatti quickly transgressed the word (i.e. treaty), if that (lit. it) became a reason for anger to the Stormgod of Hatti, my lord, (then let the outcome be ...).” It was ascertained.¹³⁷

(adnominal, relative clause, no ambiguity, first mention)

The tablet with the treaty is probably not present at the location where the oracle inquiry is conducted, and therefore not present at the Deictic Center. As far as private knowledge is concerned: if even the deity needs an elaboration in the *kuit* clause in order to identify the correct treaty, then it is very unlikely that the treaty belongs to the general and cultural knowledge of the Hittites, especially since the treaty was concluded in the past.

Leaving the oracle questions, the possibly earliest attestation of *eni* introducing Hearer old, Discourse new information is found in Hattusili’s (I) Testament:

- 4.51 **KUB 1.16 iii 40-41** (OH/NS egodocument, Hattusili I, CTH 6), ed. Sommer 1938: 12.
*i-e-ni*¹³⁸ *huhḫa(n)=man*⁴¹ [... *ud*] *dār=šet U[L]* DUMU.MEŠ *=ŠU edi nāir*
That¹³⁹ (*ini*) (known fact): did not his sons turn away my grandfather, (i.e.,) the words of [the king (?)]?¹⁴⁰

One has to admit that this is not a standard example of Recognitionally used demonstratives.

Another example of Recognitionally used *asi*, this time in Direct Speech, is:

- 4.52 **KUB 15.5 + i 10-13** (NH vow, Urhi-Tessub, CTH 583), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 49 with n. 36
 §¹⁰ *Û-TUM EGIR-an parā damaiš*¹¹ *parā=ma* *fArumuraš memiškizzi*¹² *a-*
*ši=ua=kan AMA.AMA-KA kuuat=pat HUL-lu tiḫan ḫarzi*¹³ KASKAL-
ši=ma=uar=an=kan ŪL daitti
 Later on yet another dream. Arumura keeps further saying: “Just why is that (*asi*) grandmother of yours holding a grudge? Shouldn’t you appease her? (lit.: put her on the road)”¹⁴¹

¹³⁷ Beckman’s translation 1997: 158 “Has this matter discussed earlier been brought about by the Storm-god of Hatti because the Egyptians and the Hittites had been put under oath by the Storm-god of Hatti?” does not take into account the relative pronoun *kuis* in obv. 33’. CHD L-N p. 270a does not consider the Direct Speech particles and therefore translates *n=at ḫandāittat* wrongly as the resumptive clause of the relative clause *aši=ua kuiš memijaš*.

¹³⁸ With CHD P 346b, *i-e-ni* is a conflation of *eni* and *ini*. The new Hittite scribe replaced the older form *ini* with the *eni* of his own time.

¹³⁹ I follow HW² E p. 39 in disconnecting *eni* from *uddar-set*.

¹⁴⁰ Contra Sommer, l.c., CHD L-N p. 218b “the words (lit. his words) of my grandfather”, CHD L-N, p. 361b “Did not his sons set aside these words of my grandfather [PN]”. I do not accept the existence of a gen.sg. *-an*. Either *huhḫa(n)=man* [... *ud*] *dār=šet* is a partitive apposition or it means that the sons turned aside both their father and his stipulations.

(adnominal, genitive modifier, no ambiguity, first mention in Direct Speech)

The information about the grandmother is necessarily private, shared knowledge between the Speaker Arumura and the Addressee Urhi-Tessub. About the presence of the grandmother, it is very unlikely to assume that she is present when the dream of Urhi-Tessub is discussed.

The last two examples do not belong to my corpus. They are included because Laroche 1979 tried to explain *asi* in ex. 4.54 as a nom.sg.c. whereas I believe that it is an acc.sg.c. Above we already encountered some examples of accusative *asi* in ex. 4.14, 4.16 (not mentioned by Laroche), 4.30 (id.) and 4.31 (id.) and also below in 4.53 (id.).

4.53 **KUB 33.106 + KBo 26.65 i 25'-29'** (NH myth, CTH 345), ed. Güterbock 1952: 18 (without join), collated by CHD L-N p. 365b.

§^{25'} ^dHebadduš ANA ^dTakiti IN[IM.MEŠ] *memiškiuan dāi[š kuū]at=ua ŠA dU EN[-YA]* ^{26'} *nakkin memian ŪL išta[mašmi] ŪL=ma=ua dŠuū[ali]attaš* ^{27'} DINGIR.MEŠ-*ašš=a hūmandaš ḫaluga[n išta]mašmi a-ši-ua kuin dUllikummi* ^{28'} ^{NA}*kunkunuzin memišk[anzi nu]=uarr=an=za=an taraḫta kuūatqa* ^{29'} *ammel LÚ-an nakkin* ×[.....]×-an §

Hebat began to speak the wo[rds] to Takiti: [“Wh]y do [I] not hear the important word of the Stormgod, [my] lord and do I not [he]ar the message of Suwaliyatta and all the gods? That (asi) Ullikummi, the Basalt, about whom they keep talking, did he (Ullikummi) conquer him somehow, my husband, the important [king, the Stormgo]d?”

(adnominal, first mention in speech, relative clause, no ambiguity)

In this part of the story, the goddess Hepat is talking. She is blocked from news from the gods by the Basalt monster Ullikummi, although she does not seem to be aware of the fact that Ullikummi causes the blockade. She tries to figure out why the gods do not send her word, and she even fears that Ullikummi may have overcome them. Her thoughts clearly state that she has heard of the monster, but has not seen him yet. Obviously, Ullikummi is not in her presence, and additionally, knowledge about him is not yet general or cultural but still belongs to the private domain.

4.54 **KUB 33.112 + 114 + 36.2 iii 10'-17'**, with parallel text HT 25 + KUB 33.111 (NH/NS myth, CTH 343), ed. Laroche 1968: 34

^{10'} KASKAL-*an=ma k[uin] iḡantari nu KASKAL-[an kuin (?) ...]* ^{11'} *uḡanzi n[u a(mmu)]k dLAMA-aš nepiš[(aš LUGAL-uš)]* ^{12'} DINGIR.MEŠ-*aš ḫin(i)km[(i IM.ḪI.)A-uš ualliḡa[(lliūš dLAMA-aš idalauḡa uddār)]* ^{13'} ANA ^dÉ.A-*aš KASKAL-š[(i) men]aḫḫanda p[(eter)]* ^{14'} ^dÉ.A-*aš dKumarbiḡa [(memi)škiuḡan d[āiš (eḫu)]* ^{15'} EGIR-*pa pāueni nu a-š[(i ku)]in d[(LAMA-an nepiš LUGAL-un)]* ^{16'} *iḡauen nu apāš GIM-an [(š)]n[(iḡaralliš)]* ^{17'} KUR.KUR.MEŠ-*ḡa QATAMMA š niḡaral[(la)]*

¹⁴¹ The preceding paragraph describes how Danuhepa, wife of Mursili, was supposed to receive a cloth or garment (Ū-it *kuit memir* TÚG-*ma=ḡa[=ua ANA] dDanuhepa piandu* ‘as for the fact that was said by means of a dream: “Let them also give a cloth [to] Danuhepa, ...’).

Which road they march, [which?] road they come, *I*, Kurunta, king of Heaven will assign (that road) to the gods”. The blustering/rushing (?) winds carried the evil words of Kurunta to Ea on the road. Ea started to speak to Kumarbi: “Come, let’s go back. That¹⁴² (*asi*) Kurunta whom we made king in heaven, just as *he* is improper (?), so in the same way he also has made the countries improper (?)”

(adnominal, first mention in speech, relative clause, no ambiguity, not present, private knowledge?)

Laroche 1979: 149 stated that “il n’y a nulle raison de faire cet *asi* un acc.sg. en accord avec *kuin*”. He continues with a Latin translation of the *asi* clause: *is, quem regem fecimus, ille sicut debilis (est)*. First of all, even if *asi* is the head of a preposed relative clause, then *asi* either still has to have a function in some main clause or it is an extraposed constituent followed by a main clause in which *asi* is resumed by another pronoun. The latter option is what Laroche indicated by means of his Latin translation. This means that we have to accept an extraposed *asi* preceded by *nu*, followed by the main clause introduced by *nu*: *nu asi nu apas* So instead of accepting a very legitimate accusative *asi*, Laroche introduced a new topic introducing construction in Hittite.

4.3.3. Statistics and other observations

4.3.3.1. The Recognitional value of *asi* etc.

We already concluded in 4.2. that *asi* etc. functions as a distal demonstrative. This conclusion was mainly based on the occurrence of these forms in Direct Speech, the only context which provides direct evidence for deictic contrasts in a dead language. The fact that *asi*, *eni*, *edani*, *uni* and *unius* could be classified as Recognitional is other proof that all these forms are true demonstratives.

And as the reader can check for him/herself, most examples of Recognitional *asi* denote an entity that is outside the cognitive domain of the Speaker. One example (4.38) is connected with the Speaker but can be understood as disassociating (‘that contestor of mine’), another one is at first sight connected with the Addressee (4.52), ‘that grandmother of yours’. The grandmother is already dead however and therefore outside the domain of the Addressee (contrast this with 5.15 ‘that husband of yours’, with the Addressee oriented demonstrative *apa-*). The only exception is 4.37.

These two results constitute the proof that *asi* etc. is the distal demonstrative pronoun. In the next sections (4.4. and 4.5.), the distal value of all forms will be considered a given fact.

4.3.3.2. The chronological distribution of *asi* etc.

Recognitional *asi* etc., is attested in the following periods:

¹⁴² CHD L-N: 460a translates *asi* with “this”.

| | OS | OH | MS | MH | Supp | Murs II | Muw | Hatt III | Tud IV | NH |
|------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|------|---------|-----|----------|--------|----|
| nom.s.c. <i>asi</i> | | + | | | | + | | | | |
| acc.s.c. <i>uni</i> <i>asi</i> | | + | + | | | | | | | + |
| n.-a.s.n. <i>ini</i> <i>eni</i> | | + | + | | | | | + | + | |
| dat.s. <i>edani</i> | | | | | | | + | | | |
| acc.pl.c. <i>unius</i> | | | | | | | | | + | |
| n.-a.pl.n. <i>eni</i> | | | | | | | | | + | |

Table 4.4: Chronological distribution of Recognitional *asi* etc.

The recognitional use is assured for *ini* and *uni* in Middle Hittite, and from Mursili II on for *asi*, nom. and acc., *eni* pl., *edani*, and *unius*. Possibly it is already attested in OH copy for *asi*, *uni* and *eni*. The scarce attestation of OH and MH Recognitional deictics is caused by the distribution of the text genres over the periods. The definition of Recognitional Deixis requires not only a Speaker, but also an Addressee, and moreover, both have to be familiar with the topic under discussion. It is therefore not surprising to see that we encounter the Recognitional demonstratives mainly in Vows and Oracles. These text types always have the deity as Addressee, and in both text types the deity is always aware of the topic under discussion. To return to the language phases, Vows are non-existent in Old and Middle Hittite, and Oracles are extremely scarce in both periods. As we have seen, there exist two Middle Script oracles (KUB 50.1 and KBo 16.97) in which there is a Recognitional *uni* / *ini*. Besides the virtual non-existence of Vows and Oracles in the earlier periods we also have to take into account that the majority of texts is from the New Hittite period. Given these considerations, it is very surprising that we even *have* a few Recognitional demonstratives in Old and Middle Hittite.

4.3.3.3. Attention-levels and Information Structure

In the majority of the examples the recognitionally used *asi* etc. is part of a relative clause. The discourse function of such a clause is to introduce a discourse topic for further discussion, but the clause itself does not add anything new on the subject. All it does is recalling the referent. Therefore the Topic-Focus distinction is useless.

As far as saliency is concerned, the nature of this type of use requires that the entity referred to is not salient.

| <i>Recognitional Use</i> | | | |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|---------------------|
| Continuity procedure | | | Centering procedure |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus |
| — | — | — | <i>asi N</i> |

Table 4.5: The Recognitional *asi* matrix.

4.4. The Discourse Deictic Use of *asi* etc.

4.4.1. Introduction

Discourse Deixis was discussed in 2.3.5., 2.3.6. and 3.4. I will therefore only list the main characteristics of Discourse Deictic expressions.

Discourse Deictic expressions encode portions of the spoken or written discourse. In this aspect it is similar to Anaphora. The main difference however is that Anaphora refers to a prior noun phrase -whatever its entity order- while a Discourse Deictic expression encodes an event or proposition for the first time (never a first order entity), thereby introducing the event or proposition into the discourse. Discourse deictic expressions always refer to the immediately adjacent segment, and the referents hardly ever persist in the discourse. They are mainly used to provide a link between two pieces of discourse and do not usually become a topic for further discussion themselves. Summarizing:

- Discourse deictics refer to the contents of a chunk of discourse: an event, a proposition, or a speech-act.
- Discourse deictics provide a link between two discourse units.
- The referent of discourse deictics is immediately adjacent to the segment containing the discourse deictic expression.¹⁴³
- The referent was not nominalized before.

In Hittite we find the neuter pronouns *ki*, *apat*, *eni* or a form of these three connected with *memiya*- or *uttar* for Discourse Deixis. Related to them are the demonstrative adverbs of manner *kissan*, *enissan* and *apenissan*. The adverb of manner *enissan* is discussed in 4.4.2, the Discourse Deictic *asi* etc. in 4.4.3.

4.4.2. The adverb of manner *enissan*

The meaning of the discourse deictic adverb *enissan* “in that way, as mentioned above, in solcher Weise” was established by Friedrich (1926: 75, 1974: 68 § 117b, 134 § 250) as the opposite of *kissan* “folgendermaßen”. The earliest attestation of *enissan* probably occurs in a damaged festival text¹⁴⁴:

4.55 **IBoT 2.121 rev. 12'** (OS festival, CTH 676.1), ed. Haas 1970: 136

^{12'} *ta=kkān e-ne-i[š-ša-an]*

The next time it is found in the Mašat letters, spelled *inissan*:

4.56 **HKM 6 obv. 3-6** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 126-127

¹⁴³ This requirement does not seem to count for the demonstrative adverbs of manner in Hittite. See ex. 4.62.

¹⁴⁴ Contra Kammenhuber HW² E 41b who remarked that *enissan* occurs ‘ab Murš. II’.

§³ *kiššan=mu kuit hatrāēš*⁴ *kāša=ua* LÚKÚR *uit*⁵ *nu=ua=za* URU *Haparan i-ni-iš-ša-an*¹⁴⁵ ⁶ *tamašta*

Concerning that you have written to me like this: “The enemy has just arrived. He besieged the city Hapara in that way (*inissan*), (but Kasipura he besieged from this side.)”

The adverb *inissan* is quoted in a citation from another letter. The larger context of the letter is therefore lacking, so the meaning of *inissan* in Middle Hittite cannot be illustrated by means of this example.

Generally *enissan* refers backwards to the contents of Direct Speech or Quotation from a letter. The division of labor between forward referring *kissan* and backward referring *enissan* (see already Friedrich 1926: 75) is especially clear in ex. 4.57 where both refer to the same Quotation from a letter:

4.57 **KBo 3.4+ iii 86-87** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 I), ed. Grélois 1988: 69

⁸² *mPihhuniyaš=ma=mu EGIR-pa ki-iš-ša-an hatrāēš ... nu=mu ma[h]han*⁸⁷

mPihhuniyaš e-ni-iš-ša-an EGIR-pa IŠPUR

Pihhuniya wrote to me in return in this way (*kissan*): ‘...’. After Pihhuniya had written to me in return in that way (*enissan*), ...

Other examples of *enissan* referring backwards to the contents of a letter are KUB 19.30 rev. iv 11 (NH, Mursili II, CTH 61 II)¹⁴⁶, KUB 1.1 iii 74 (NH, Hattusili III, CTH 81)¹⁴⁷. The letters were often read aloud, in which case the verb accompanying *enissan* is *istamass-* “hear”:

4.58 **KBo 5.6 iii 8-16** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40), ed. Güterbock 1956: 94

*nu MUNUS.LUGAL URU Mizra kuiš fDahamunzuš*⁹ *ēšta nu ANA ABU=YA LÚ TEMI uijāt*¹⁰ *nu=šši ki-iš-ša-an IŠPUR LÚ-aš=ua=mu=kan BA.ÚŠ*¹¹

*DUMU=YA=ma=ua=mu NU.GÁL tuk=ma=ua DUMU.MEŠ=KA*¹² *meggauš memiškanzi mān=ua=mu*¹³ *1-an DUMU=KA paišti man=uar=aš=mu* LÚ *MUTI=YA kišari*¹⁴ *ARAD=YA=ma=ua nūuān parā dahhi*¹⁵ *nu=uar=an=za=kan* LÚ *MUTI=YA ijami tekri[=u]a nahmi*¹⁶ *nu mahhan ABU=YA e-ni-iš-ša-an IŠME*

The Queen of Egypt who was *dahamunzu* sent my father a messenger. She wrote as follows (*kissan*): “My husband died while I have no son. It is said however that *you* have many sons. If you would give me one of your sons, he would become my

¹⁴⁵ The adverb *inissan* with initial *i-* also occurs in two other MH/MS texts, KBo 22.192 (+) 192a obv. 1 (2x), KBo 18.86 obv. 17’ and 29’.

¹⁴⁶ §¹¹ *nu=mu GIM-an LÚ.MEŠ URU Haiša e-né-eš-ša[-an EGIR-pa]*¹² *hatrāir kēzza=ma=mu dHepat URU Kummanni*¹³ *ANA EZEN halzīauuāš nakkēšta* “After the people of Hayasa had written to me in return in that way (*enissan*), at this time Hepat of Kummanni troubled me with regard to the festival of invocation.”, ed. Götze 1933: 104. The translation follows CHD L-N p. 371b.

¹⁴⁷ *nu ANA mUrhi-dU-up kuuapi*⁷³ *[(e-ni-iš-ša-an ha)]treškinun nu mān kišan kuiš*⁷⁴ *[(memai)* “After I had written to Urhi-Tessup in that way (*enissan*), if someone speaks in this way: “...”” ed. Otten 1981: 22

husband. I do not want to take a servant of mine and make him my husband. I fear *tekri-* (?)”. After my father heard as just mentioned (*enissan*) ...

Similarly KBo 5.6 iv 4 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40)¹⁴⁸, KBo 5.13 i 9 (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68)¹⁴⁹, KUB 33.87+ ii 18’ (NH myth, CTH 345)¹⁵⁰, KUB 19.11 iv 1 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40)¹⁵¹.

In the next example *enissan* refers backwards to Direct Speech. The verb accompanying *enissan* is *mema-* ‘speak’:

- 4.59 **KUB 14.4 rev. iv 10-14** (NH, Mursili II, CTH 70), ed. De Martino 1998: 29
¹⁰ [..... A]NA LUGAL URUKargamiš AQBI ANA KÙ.BABBAR URUAštata=ūa=mu ¹¹
 [..... MU]NUS.LUGAL ḫarzi nu=ūa karuššijan ḫarak ¹² [.....]
 MUNUS.LUGAL šākdu našma AWAT KÙ.BABBAR LUGAL URUKargamiš ¹³
 [.....] mān ammuk e-ni-iš-ša-an AQBI nu šumēš ¹⁴ [DINGIR.MEŠ šekteni
 I said [t]o the king of Kargamis: “It is the Queen who holds me [.....] for
 the silver of Astata. Be quiet!” [.....] the queen must know. Either the king of
 Kargamis [.....] the case of silver. Whether I spoke as mentioned above (*enissan*),
 you [gods, know].

Similarly KUB 17.7+ iv 51’ (NH myth, CTH 345)¹⁵².

The following examples present the use of *enissan* referring to the State of Affairs described in the narration, and not to the propositional contents of a Quotation or Direct Speech. The verb in the clause containing *enissan* is *au(s)-* “see”.

- 4.60 **KBo 4.4 iii 68-72** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 132
⁶⁸ nu=za dUTU-ŠI KARAS.ḪI.A išḫiullahhun [KARAS.ḪI.A] ⁶⁹ mahḫan UD.KAM-ti
 putallijanda iḫatta[ri] ⁷⁰ GE₆.KAM-az=ma=at=kan šēnaḫaš QATAMMA ēšzi ⁷¹ nu
 mahḫan LÚ.MEŠ URUAzzi e-ni-iš-ša-an paḫša[nuḫan- ...] ⁷² auēr
 I, My Majesty, instructed the army: Just as [the army] marches battle-ready by day,
 similarly (QATAMMA) it shall be towards ambushes at night. When the men of Azzi
 saw [the army] prote[cted] that way (*enissan*), ...

The adverb *enissan* refers back to the description of the way the army has been prepared for war. Note the difference with QATAMMA = *apenissan*, ‘that way’. The latter is mainly used in

¹⁴⁸ 4 nu=ūa=mu e-né-eš-ša-an imma TAQBI “You even spoke to me in that way (*enessan*)”, ed. Güterbock 1956: 96. For more discussion of these lines, see Chapter 3, ex. 3.57.

¹⁴⁹ nu mahḫan LÚ.MEŠ URUMāša e-né-eš-ša-an ištamaššir “After the men of Masa had heard as mentioned above (*enessan*), ...”, ed. Friedrich 1926: 112

¹⁵⁰ § 18’ nu GIM-an dIŠTAR e-né-eš-ša-an IŠME “After Istar heard thus (*enessan*)”, ed. Güterbock 1952: 14 (not in my corpus).

¹⁵¹ § 1 e-né-eš-ša-an išd[amašta “[When my father] heard thus (*enessan*), ...”, ed. Güterbock 1956: 63. Broken context.

¹⁵² § 51’ kuitman e-né-eš-ša-an memiškir “While they were speaking in that way (*enessan*), ...”, ed. Güterbock 1951: 160. Not in my corpus.

comparative constructions, whereas *enissan* (and *kissan*) never are (Kammenhuber HW² E: 41b). Generally, *enissan* carries the notion ‘as mentioned before’, *apenissan* ‘just as mentioned before’. Similarly KUB 1.1 iii 54-55 (NH, Hattusili III, CTH 81)¹⁵³.

I finally present two examples¹⁵⁴ in which *enissan* is not accompanied by the verbs *istamass-*, *mema-* or *au(s)-* but still refers to some State of Affairs:

4.61 **KBo 4.4 iv 50-51** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 140-141

⁵⁰ [nu=m]u e-ni-iš-ša-an kuit [mM]uttin LÚ URUHalimanā ⁵¹ [me]nahhanda uīēr

Given that they sent Mutti, man of Halimana, ahead in that way (*enissan*) (and that they returned to me [the refugees] from Hatti, I, My Majesty did not go into Azzi again), ...

The adverb *enissan* refers back to the envoy of Mutti with his message: “But when the men of Azzi heard “My Majesty will come!”, the men of Azzi sent Mutti, man of Halimana, ahead. They sent the following message: “Given the fact that you, our lord, have already destroyed us, please do not come again, our lord. Take us as your subjects, our lord, and we will start to send our lord soldiers and horses. And also, the refugees of Hatti that are with us we will hand over.” They returned to me 1000 refugees from Hatti”, followed by the citation above.

In the next example the second order referent of *enissan* is not immediately preceding the clause containing *enissan*. The way the ambush is laid is described in the preceding paragraph, i 10-11.

4.62 **KBo 5.8 i 14-17** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 148

nu=kan mahhan ¹⁵ ANA KASKAL URUTaggašta tījanun mān ijanūjanun ¹⁶ nu=mu e-ni-iš-ša-an kuit LÚ.MEŠ URUTaggašta šēnahha ¹⁷ piran teškanzi nu=mu MUŠEN arān harta

When I took the road to Taggasta, I would have marched. (However,) because the people of Taggasta were laying an ambush before me as mentioned above (*enissan*), a bird rose for me.

4.4.3. Evaluation of *enissan*

In all clear examples the adverb of manner *enissan* “in that way, as mentioned before, thus” refers backward to a second order entity (State of Affairs, ex. 4.60- 4.62) or a third order entity (Proposition, ex. 4.57-4.59).

In all examples but two (ex. 4.56) *enissan* occurs in a subordinate clause containing temporal *mahhan* (exx. 4.57, 4.58, 4.59), *kuitman* (fn. 152), *kuwapi* (fn. 147), conditional

¹⁵³ GIM-an[(=ma=mu=kan mUrhi-dU-uppaš e-)]ni-iš[(-ša-)]an ⁵⁵ [š(A DINGIR-L)]IM aššu[(an aušta n=aš=mu arš)]anijat “But when Urhi-Tessup saw the blessing of the Deity upon me in that way, he became envious with me”, ed. Otten 1981: 20

¹⁵⁴ The two remaining examples from my corpus are KBo 16.98 ii 10 (NH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577) § ¹⁰ dUTU URUPU-na kuit e-né-eš-ša-an tešhaneškittari “Concerning the fact that the Sungoddess of Arinna thus (*enissan*) keeps appearing in my dreams: ...”, ed. Van den Hout 1998: 98, discussed in 3.5.2.2. and a broken example KBo 4.4 obv. i 20 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II) ²⁰ e-ni-iš-ša-an, , ed. Götze 1933: 110.

man (ex. 4.59), or causal *kuit* (ex. 4.60, 4.62), as was noted by Kammenhuber HW² E 41b. This is not surprising given the main characteristic of a discourse deictic expression: providing a link between adjacent chunks of discourse. When the above clauses do not close a Direct Speech unit or a Quotation from a letter, they contain material that is sometimes repeated literally from the piece of text *enissan* is referring to. In both cases -Direct Speech closure or repetition of a chunk of discourse- the narration is not pushed forward. No new information is added on any topic, the discourse deictic expression and its host clause are simply structuring the discourse by providing the background for a new discourse unit.

The Middle Hittite examples all contain *inissan*, not *enissan*. This corresponds with *ini* in Middle Hittite versus *eni* in New Hittite.

4.4.4. The Discourse Deictic syntagms *eni uttar, asi memias* and *eni*

Discourse deictic use of *asi* etc. is rare compared with *enissan*. The application of the criteria listed above, nominalization of the verbal content of immediately preceding or following discourse resulted in 6 examples. There is actually only one example in my corpus in line with the use of *enissan*, ex. 4.26 repeated here:

4.63 KUB 6.41 i 34-38 (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68), ed. Friedrich 1926: 110-111

§³⁴ *mahhan=ma* ^dUTU-ŠI *u-ni memian* AŠME nu ^dUTU-ŠI ^mPIŠ.TUR-an ³⁵ *ŪL* *kuitki*
^HUL-uanni *šanhun n=an piran parā* [*ŪL* *kuitki*] ³⁶ ^HUL-a^hhun nu *kiššan AQBI*
paimi=ya uni memian [EGIR-pa anda] ³⁷ *tittanumi nu šarā tiḡanun nu kēdani*
memi[ḡani EGIR-pa] ³⁸ *anda tittanumanzi pāun*

But when I, My Majesty, heard about that (*uni*) affair, I, My Majesty, did not seek evil against Mashuiliwa at all. I did [not] act evilly [at all] towards him. I spoke in this way: “I will go set that affair [right again].” I arose and went to settle this affair.

As already discussed at ex. 4.26, in the preceding paragraph of this treaty between Mursili and Kupanta-Kurunta is described how Mashuiliwa started to alienate the people of Pitassa and even some Hittite subjects from the Hittite empire, trying to engage into fight. This series of events is nominalized for the first time in i 34 by means of *uni memian*. This nominalization takes place in a *mahhan* clause. The construction as a whole serves to connect the reaction of Mursili with the acts of Mashuiliwa: the clause forms a discourse boundary between two discourse units -also indicated by the paragraph line- and forms a logical connection between the two. The noun phrase *uni memian* is therefore truly Discourse Deictic, referring backwards.

In another text from Mursili II with *asi* (acc.) *memian* instead of *uni memian*:

4.64 IBoT 2.112 + obv. 1-7 (NH egodocument, Mursili II, CTH 486), ed. Lebrun 1988: 104

§¹ [(UMMA ^dUTU-ŠI)] ^mMurši-DINGIR-LIM LUGAL.GA[(L)] INA URU.DU₆ ^mKunnū²
 [(*nannahhun*)] nu *ḡaršiḡarši udaš namma* ^dU-aš [(*ḡatug*)a] ³ [(*tetḡiški*)]t nu
nāhun nu=mu=kan memiaš K[(A×U-i and)a] ⁴ [(*tepauēšt*)]a nu=mu=kan *memiaš*
t[(epu)] *kuitki šarā* [(*iḡattat*)] ⁵ [(*nu=kan*)] *a-ši memian* *arḡa=pat*

pa[(škuu)]ānun mahḥan=ma⁶ ūer MU.ḪI.A-uš EGIR-anda p[(āir n)]u=mu u[(it)]
⁷ [(aš)]i memiaš tešḥaniš[(kiuua)]n tiḡat

Thus (speaks) My Majesty Mursili Great-King: I was driving to the ruined town of Kunnu (when) a storm came up. Moreover, the Stormgod repeatedly thundered terribly. I was frightened: the speech in my mouth became hesitant, speech came up somewhat hesitantly. I neglected that (*asi*) incident entirely.¹⁵⁵ But when the years passed by, it happened that that incident (*asi memias*) began to appear in my dreams regularly. (In my dream the hand of a god touched me and my mouth went to the side.)

The series of events of thunder, fright and impairment of speech is nominalized for the first time in obv. 5 as *asi* (acc.!) *memian* ‘that incident’. The noun phrase *asi memian* does not refer anaphorically to *memias* ‘speech’ mentioned in obv. 4 in view of the second *asi memias* in obv. 7. The latter noun phrase refers to the projection of the incident in the dream: ‘In my dream the hand of a god touched me and my mouth went to the side’ and not to the speech itself. The noun phrase *asi memias* of obv. 7 refers anaphorically to the *asi memian* in obv. 5 and will be discussed in section 4.5 (the tracking use of *asi*).

Unlike in ex.4.63 *asi memian* is not included in a subordinate backgrounding clause. As such, it is not truly linking. It does however close a discourse unit on the discourse level and a series of events on the semantic level, so it seems to be structuring the discourse somewhat. This is however not all.

The conclusions from the part on demonstratives in Chapter 3 are (i) that demonstratives are used to structure the discourse, as simple nominals do, and (ii) that the difference between the three demonstratives lies in the cognitive domain as estimated or decided by the Speaker. The speaker will use *ka-* + NP to indicate that something is his responsibility, *apa-* + NP to indicate that something is the responsibility of the Addressee, and *asi* + NP for responsibility belonging not to Speaker and/or Addressee but to the Other. This is especially clear in the examples 4.63 and 4.64. In ex. 4.63 Mashuiluwa performs some hostile acts. When the king hears about them, he uses *uni memian*, indicating that it is still Mashuiluwa’s domain. However, in i 37 he uses *kedani memiyani*, after stating that he will solve the affair. The changing of responsibility is mirrored by the change from *uni memian* to *kedani memiyani*. In ex. 4.64 the king says that he did not pay any attention to the incident. The avoidance of his responsibility, i.e. to find out what the incident meant to say, is clearly expressed by means of the verb *paskuwai-* ‘neglect’. So in both cases the context favors an interpretation of *asi* as indicator of ‘not belonging to me (, but to the other)’.

The next example is closer to the use of *enissan* as referring to Quotation from a letter, but with a major difference, forward or cataphoric reference.

4.65 **KUB 19.29 iv 11-15** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 18-19

kēz=ma¹² ḡHannuttiš kuiš KUR.KUR.MEŠ Š[APLITI]¹² maniḡahḡhiškit nu INA KUR
 URU Iḡḡhupitta kuḡap[i ...]¹³ n=aš apiḡa BA.ÚŠ nu mahḥan eni=ḡa ŠA ḡHannutt[i
 ÚŠ-an¹⁴] iḡtamaššir n=at=za=kan apēzzi=ḡa EGIR-an [EGIR-pa¹⁵?] ešandat
 nu=mu e-ni AWATE.MEŠ apadda ḡatreš[kir] §

(“Now the one who would have impressed me, [would have] be[en] your eldest brother, [who] managed the troops and charioteers for his father and (who) knew the

¹⁵⁵ The translation of these three clauses is based upon CHD P 209. See however CHD P 34: “And my mouth went to the side”.

treaties of his father. [He used to be] a h[ero]. If you would impress me, [you] would [be] *he* for me.” [But when] they saw [my brother] ill,)

Hannutti who managed the L[ower] Lands at this time, when he [...] in Ishupitta, he died over there/then. When they heard of also *that* [death] of Hannutti, because of that *too* they became rebellious. Because of that they wrote those (= the following, *eni*) words: ...

The ‘following words’ refer to the contents of the next paragraph: “You are a child, and you know nothing. [You do not] imp[ress (me).] At this time your country is devastated and [your] troo[ps and horses] have dwindled. I have more troops than you, I have more horses than you. [Your father however] had many troops and horses. As for [you] who are a child, when will you go *taparuna* him (= them)?”.

The unexpected appearance of *eni* instead of *ke* ‘these’ is explained by Sommer 1938: 161 as follows: ‘*eni* nimmt auf das V o r h e r g e h e n d e Bezug [...]. So auch, dem äußeren Anschein zum Trotz, XIX 29 IV 15 “Worte der gleichen Art, wie sie vorher schon geschrieben worden waren” (nähmlich bis Z. 10).’ The lines to which Sommer refers are presented in the translation above in parentheses. Although Sommer’s solution is attractive, it raises the issue of (partial) comparison. Comparison is not part of the semantics of *eni* and *enissan* but of *apenissan* (see Chapter 5). On the other hand, he connects it with the use of *eni* (*kuit*) in KUB 22.70. Also there *eni* seems to refer forward, but actually it points at things that happened before, ‘so, wie berichtet’. Sommer clearly does not take *eni* as referring to something that was mentioned in the oracle inquiry itself. It just refers to ‘g e s c h e h e n e Dinge, die zum Zweck der Orakelbefragung vorher g e m e l d e t worden waren’ (l.c.). In the framework presented here this means that *eni* in our example is close to the Recognitional Use: Discourse New, Hearer Old. Indeed, the message ‘you are a child’ is Discourse New, and a bit Hearer Old given the similar but not same message earlier in the text.

Although Sommer’s interpretation partially fits the Recognitional Use, the nuance of comparison remains. This shade of meaning is neither part of the Recognitional Use nor part of the meaning of the backward referring Discourse Deictic adverb of manner *enissan*. Instead, I propose that *eni* AWATE.MES functions similarly as *uni memian* and *asi memian* in the two preceding examples. It is a rhetorical device used by the Speaker to indicate that he distances himself from what is expressed in the message. He signals at the Addressee that something is coming up which he does not agree with at all: that he is a child and not capable of leading an army, and that he will lose. These words are all on account of not the Speaker or the Addressee, but of the Other.

The only other cataphoric discourse deictic *eni* I am aware of occurs in a later text, the Bronze Tablet:

4.66 **Bo 86/299 i 91-98** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106.1), ed. Otten 1988: 14-15.

§ ⁹¹ ANA AWAT ^{NA4}hekur SAG.UŠ-ia=kan ABU=YA ^mMarassantaš KAXU-za ⁹²
karpta ^{md}LAMMA-aš=ua ANA ^{NA4}hekur SAG.UŠ lē manninkuuan ⁹³ nu ABU=YA ANA
^mMarassantaš ^øUPPU iiat n=at ^mMarassantaš ⁹⁴ harzi e-ni=ma ABU=YA ŪL
šakta AWAT ^{NA4}hekur SAG.UŠ=kan ⁹⁵ mahhan šA ^{dU}kuntarra andan gulšanza ⁹⁶
^{NA4}hekur SAG.UŠ=kan mahhan zilatija ANA ^{md}LAMMA ⁹⁷ parkijauuanzi ŪL kišari
uit=ma mahhan ABU=YA ⁹⁸ memian IŠME nu memijan ABU=YA=pat hullaš

And in the matter of the permanent *hekur* my father accepted from the mouth of Marassanta: “Kurunta may not (come) near the permanent *hekur*”. So my father made a tablet for Marassanta, and Marassanta (still) holds it. But this (*eni*) my father did

not know: how the matter of the permanent *hekur* (is) inscribed in the *kuntarra* of the Stormgod, how in the future the permanent *hekur* shall not be taken away from Kurunta¹⁵⁶. When it happened that my father heard of the situation, it was my father himself who contested the situation.

The question is: why is *eni* used instead of the regular forward referring discourse deictic pronoun *ki*? Contrary to the previous example, *eni* cannot refer to anything indicated before, it is not ‘so, wie berichtet’. The only solution is that *eni* emphasises that the knowledge contained in the message does not belong to the cognitive space of the father of the king.

Of course this shade of meaning is already contained in the negated predicate itself, but one has to be aware that the choice for one demonstrative or the other -when there is a choice- is a rhetorical device that adds something extra to the semantics of the clause. This is illustrated by means of i 97-98: *uit=ma maḥḥan ABU=YA* ⁹⁸ *memian IŠME nu memiian ABU=YA=pat ḥullaš* ‘When it happened that my father heard of the situation, it was my father himself who contested the situation’. Compare this with ex. 4.63 i 34, 37-38 *maḥḥan=ma dUTU-ŠI uni memian AŠME ... nu kēdani memi[iani EGIR-pa]* ³⁸ *anda tittanumanzi pāun* ‘But when I, My Majesty, heard about that affair, ... I went to settle this affair’. As I discussed earlier, the use of *uni*, changing to *kedani*, indicates that the king wants to emphasize that responsibilities have changed. This emphasis is however not a necessary part of the semantics or syntax of the clause, it solely depends on the freedom a speaker has in using his/her language. In our present example the Speaker decided not to use a demonstrative, but simply the bare nominal *memian*, taking a neutral stance.

A possible Discourse Deictic expression *eni uttar* ‘that affair’ occurs in an Oracle¹⁵⁷ from Tudhaliya IV:

4.67 **KBo 2.2 iv 34-39** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 79-80, 136

§ ³⁴ *pānzi aši INIM SUM-annaš* ³⁵ *kišan išḫiulahḥanzi* ³⁶ *mān=ma=kan šakti* ³⁷ *e-ni=naš=kan uttar*¹⁵⁸ *laittari* ³⁸ *nu TE*^{ME.EŠ} *SIG₅-ru ZAG-za RA*^{IS} *NU.SIG₅ §§*
They will go and thus enjoin this (*asi*) affair of giving. If you then acknowledge (it), will that (*eni*) affair be solved for us?

This oracle is concerned with the illness that will befall Tudhaliya IV before his accession to the throne. The fever is caused by the Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny because she is angry about some unfulfilled vows and promises. In order to appease her, it is established that she will receive some gifts. The oracle inquiry is concluded with the paragraph cited here. In the last question they ask: ‘will that affair be solved for us’, probably referring to the whole conglomerate of problems surrounding the disease of Tudhaliya and not just the affair of giving. If this is true, then *eni uttar* is an example of a Discourse Deictic expression referring to a whole discourse. If it refers only to the affair of giving, the expression is Anaphoric. I tend to believe that *eni uttar* refers to the whole affair, based on its appearance in a concluding question.

¹⁵⁶ Otten 1988: 15: ‘und wie (es) für alle Zeit dem Kurunta nicht zusteht, (zur) beständigen Felsanlage hinaufzusteigen.’ My translation follows CHD P p. 157a.

¹⁵⁷ See for another oracle with *eni* (besides *eni kuit*) KUB 22.70 obv. 47 (NH oracle, CTH 566) *nu mān DINGIR-LIM e-ni* [*šak*] *ijaḥta* KIMIN.

¹⁵⁸ In KBo 2.2 ii 9 there is another *eni uttar* with unclear reference due to the broken context.

Finally, there is one example of Time deixis, a subcategory of Discourse Deixis:

4.68 **KBo 19.76 + KUB 14.20 i 8'-9'** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Houwink ten Cate 1979: 161

⁸ [..... LÚKÚR (URUG)]ašgaš=ma e-da-aš UD.K[AM.HI.A-aš] ⁹ [.....
t(iiat)] §

But in those (*edas*) days the Gasgæan enemy stepped [...].

4.4.5. Evaluation of the syntagms *eni uttar*, *asi memias* and *eni*

4.4.5.1. Function of the discourse deictic *asi* etc.

In each example the noun phrase *asi*, *uni* and *eni* + N refers to a sequence of propositions in the preceding or following discourse, adjacent to the clause containing the demonstrative. In all these cases the proposition was not nominalized before. Just as *enissan*, the demonstratives occur on the borders of a Discourse unit. In ex. 4.63 *uni memian* occurs in a temporal *mahhan* clause at the beginning of a paragraph; *asi memian* in ex. 4.64 closes a unit describing the frightening experience of Mursili, followed by a new unit starting with a *mahhan* clause; the cataphoric *eni AWATE.MEŠ* in ex. 4.65 is part of a clause both closing a paragraph and introducing Direct Speech; the cataphoric *eni* in ex. 4.66 introduces a Discourse unit that is a comment of the Speaker on the state of the knowledge of Hattusili, Tudhaliya's father. This unit disrupts the sequence of the actions of Hattusili. The textual sign indicating the diversion from the main story line to the comment and back is each time the discourse marker *-ma*; the last example, ex. 4.67, shows *eni uttar* in a question that is the last question in the oracle inquiry.

All features listed here clearly show that *asi*, *uni*, *eni* and *edas* are discourse deictic demonstratives and *not* anaphoric. They introduce entities in the discourse that were not referred to before, and therefore this use is rather close to deictic and recognitional use. In each case the referent of the demonstrative is Discourse New. The Deictic and Discourse Deictic demonstratives are also Hearer New, whereas the Recognitional demonstrative is Hearer Old. But unlike Deictic and Recognitional demonstratives, Discourse Deixis excludes reference to first order entities.

Another feature in common with the other two demonstrative uses is the occurrence of the discourse deictic demonstrative on the borders of a discourse unit. The Deictic and Recognitional demonstratives (almost) always appear in discourse initial clauses, whereas the discourse deictic demonstrative appears on discourse nodes. This raises an important question: what is the difference with simple noun(phrase)s? Noun phrases are used to introduce new entities into the discourse or to mark new discourse units (see 2.3.3. and section 4.5 below) so the addition of a demonstrative should indicate something more than just the structure of the discourse. As I have explained above, *asi* etc. in combination with a noun indicates that an entity belongs explicitly to the Cognitive Space of the Other. The Speaker needs to stress that he and the Addressee have nothing to do with the entity indicated by *asi* + N. This again shows that *asi* etc. is the distal demonstrative.

The distancing effect just described is not found with *enissan*. I suspect that the Otherness of *enissan* lies in the fact that *enissan* refers backward in the discourse, to something which lies behind the Speaker. The manner adverb *kissan* on the other hand refers

to something which still has to come and which is therefore of importance for the Speaker (and Addressee).

4.4.5.2. Chronological distribution of the discourse deictic *asi* etc.

Discourse deictic *asi* etc. is mainly attested in texts from Mursili II (table 4.6). The low number of attestations even in New Hittite should warn us against the conclusion that discourse deictic use of these forms did not occur in earlier periods. However, we can only be certain for the time from Mursili on that *asi*, *uni* and *eni* function within one paradigm as a discourse deictic demonstrative with distal value.

| | OS | MS | Murs II | Hatt III | Tud IV | NH |
|-------------------------|----|----|---------|----------|--------|----|
| acc.s.c. <i>uni</i> | | | + | | | |
| <i>asi</i> | | | + | | | |
| n.-a.s.n. <i>eni</i> | | | | | + | |
| n.-a.pl.n. <i>eni</i> | | | + | | | |
| dat.pl. <i>edas</i> | | | + | | | |
| Man.adv. <i>inissan</i> | | + | | | | |
| <i>enissan</i> | | | + | + | | |
| <i>enessan</i> | + | | + | | + | + |

Table 4.6: The chronological distribution of discourse deictic *asi* etc.

4.4.5.3. Attention-levels and Information Structure

When looking from the cognitive viewpoint of saliency, the entities referred to by discourse deictic *asi* etc. are never salient. Not being mentioned before, they were not at the forefront of the Addressee's mind, not salient (see Table 4.7). Most discourse deictic expressions occur in background clauses. The Topic-Focus distinction is not relevant in these cases.

| Discourse Deictic Use | | | |
|-----------------------|---------|---------|--|
| Continuity procedure | | | Centering procedure |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus |
| — | — | — | <i>asi</i> <i>asi</i> N <i>enissan</i> |

Table 4.7: The Discourse Deictic *asi* matrix.

4.5. The Tracking (= anaphoric) Use of *asi* with noun

4.5.1. Introduction

Laroche maintained that *asi* etc. was the only true anaphoric pronoun in Hittite, later to be replaced by *apa-*. It has become clear however that *asi*, *uni*, *eni* etc. function as true demonstrative pronouns, appearing in all demonstrative contexts: deictic, recognitional and discourse deictic. The last area to be surveyed, the tracking or anaphoric use of *asi* etc. is the one which supposedly led Laroche to his conclusions. The anaphoric use of *asi* etc. is however basically different from the anaphoric use of *apa-*. This is caused by the fundamental differences between *asi* and *apa-*. Although *apa-* sometimes functions as a demonstrative (see Chapter 5), it is mainly used as an emphatic pronoun (see Chapter 7, 8, 9). The pronoun *asi* on the other hand is a demonstrative without the special characteristics of emphatic pronouns. The difference between the two also becomes apparent when the structure of the discourse is taken into consideration. The tracking demonstrative *asi* (and *apa-*) often refers to an entity in another discourse unit, whereas the emphatic pronoun *apa-* mainly refers to an entity in the same discourse unit. Related to emphasis is the function of *apa-* to refer to one of competing referents, often the one that is not topical. The demonstrative *asi* is *never* used in ambiguous contexts, as is for example illustrated by the use of *asi* with personal names.

Anaphoric demonstratives may refer to both salient and non salient entities, residing respectively in working memory and long term memory. Given that saliency and non-saliency are cognitive notions dealing with the storage capacities of the brain, how do these notions translate to spoken or written discourse? A very important insight comes from Fox 1987. She discovered that anaphora depends on discourse structure, and not so much on saliency and non-saliency alone. It is not true that only pronouns refer to salient entities and that only noun phrases refer to non-salient entities. The question has therefore to be: how do saliency and discourse structure work together in Hittite for the correct choice of an anaphoric expression?

The easiest combination to investigate is non-saliency and discourse structure (4.5.2.). Entities lose their saliency after a major discontinuity in the discourse. These discontinuities are caused by episodic changes, shifts in location, intervention by Direct Speech, and textual unit boundaries. In such situations reference is done by lexical noun phrases, including the ones with a demonstrative determiner. The clearest contexts for Hittite are reference across a paragraph line (section 4.5.2.1.), and reference across Direct Speech boundaries (section 4.5.2.2.). There is only one example with an episodic change (section 4.5.2.3.).

In Hittite discourse nodes are often indicated by overt signs that are independent of the occurrence of a noun phrase, with or without demonstratives. The paragraph boundary is indicated by a line, the crossing of a Direct Speech border to narration by the absence of the Direct Speech particle *-wa(r)-*, and lapse of time by a temporal *mahhan* clause and the contents of the clause itself. In case of salient entities however, these signs are absent (4.5.3.). According to Fox 1987 lexical noun phrases referring to salient entities (entities that are referred to in the preceding clause(s)) demarcate rhetorical units. In other words, lexical noun phrases may also indicate a discourse boundary or node.

Discourse units can be connected in two ways. They are either joined linearly or hierarchically. In the latter case one discourse unit is embedded into another one, providing a background for the narration. In the former case the discourse units function on the same level, they are sequential so to speak. Generally, linearly arranged units provide new information on the discourse theme, but contrary to the hierarchically organized units the new information is foregrounded and pushes the narration forward. Most examples from Fox are of this type. In my Hittite corpus the roles are reversed. Most examples of the demonstrative noun phrase referring to a salient discourse entity occur in the sentence that indicates the border of hierarchically structured discourse units. The crossing from main unit to embedded

unit will be discussed in section 4.5.3.1., the crossing from embedded unit to main unit in section 4.5.3.2.. Finally, the crossing between linearly organized discourse units is discussed in section 4.5.3.3.

Besides this categorization which serves to prove that also in the domain of anaphora *asi* etc. behaves as a true demonstrative, I will extensively discuss the extra pragmatic load of *asi* as a means of referring to the domain of the Other. While it was possible in the cases of Deixis and Recognitional deixis to simply call *asi* the distal demonstrative, with Discourse deixis and Anaphora (or Tracking use) the motivation for the use of *asi* is harder to establish. As the chapters on *ka*- and *apa*- show, all demonstratives may refer backwards. The most common explanation for the anaphoric use of these demonstratives, is that the proximal demonstrative refers back to referents closer to the expression containing the demonstrative than the medial and distal demonstratives. In Hittite however distance does not motivate the choice for one or the other demonstrative.

4.5.2. The centering procedure

4.5.2.1. Reference across a paragraph line

Discourse entities lose their salience when a discourse unit is closed. The paragraph lines on the Hittite tablets are the clearest, visual signals of the closure of a discourse unit. When referring to these entities in a new unit, they have to be treated as if they are mentioned for the first time. The difference with true first mentions is that contrary to true first mentions the noun is definite.

In section 4.4 I have already indicated that the use of *asi* etc. is a rhetorical means of the Speaker to indicate that something is not part of his/her responsibility, or at least that s/he does not consider it as part of his/her cognitive space but as part of somebody else's space besides Speaker and Addressee. The following three examples are especially clear on this matter. Mursili emphasizes that he did not attack the countries, that he was still a child, that he did not know anything (ex. 4.70), that he did not change anything on the tablet containing the treaty (ex. 4.69). He desperately tries to convince the deity that it was not *his* fault that the countries were attacked and the treaty broken, that it was not *his* responsibility (and of course neither the deity's responsibility).

4.69 **KUB 31.121 ii 6'-17'** (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 379), ed. Sørenhagen 1985: 10

^{6'} \ nu=uar=a[t?? ŠA KUR^{UR}]UMizri Ṭ[UPPI ēšta?]

§ ^{7'} e-da-[ni=ma]=kan ANA ṬUPPI me[mijan] ^{8'} am[muk a]nda ŪL kuink[i] ^{9'}

tehh[u]n arḫa=ia=kan ŪL [kuinki] ^{10'} dah[hu]n DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ=YA

uškatte[n] ^{11'} ŪL [š]aggahḫi karū=[ma] ^{12'} kuiēš LUGAL.MEŠ ešir nu=kan mā[n]

^{13'} apiḫa kuiški anda dai[š] ^{14'} našma[...]×=kan arḫa dāš ^{15'} ammuk=ma ŪL

kuitki šagg[ahḫi] ^{16'} memiḫann=a=kan EGIR-anda arḫa ^{17'} ŪL ištamaššan ḫarmi

§

‘[t was] a t[ablet of the country o]f Egypt.’ § I did not add any wo[rd] to that (*edani*) tablet, and also, I did not take any (word) away. O Gods, my Lords, you have to see (that) I don’t know! The kings that ruled (lit. were) in the past, whether one of them then added (a word), or whether he took (one) away, neither do I know anything nor have I heard afterwards about the affair.

4.70 **KUB 31.121a ii 34'-42'** (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 379), ed. Sørenhagen 1985: 14
 ...] ^mLupa[k]kin [m]^dU-zalmanⁿ=a ^{36'} uīia[t nu]¹⁵⁹ I^el-ni¹⁶⁰ KUR.KUR.[ME]Š GUL-
 a[h]hir

§ ^{37'} LUGAL KUR URUMizri=ma apēdaš [UD.KAM]^{HL.A}-aš ^{38'} akta=pat ammu^k=ma
 kuit nū[^ua] TUR-aš ^{39'} ešun nu ŪL šakgaḥ[^hu]n ^{40'} mān=za LUGAL KUR
 URUMizri ANA [ABU]=YA ^{41'} e-da-aš ANA KUR.KUR.MEŠ šer a[rkuu]a[r] ^{42'} iiat
 mān=za ŪL kuitk[i iiat?] §

[He] sent Lupakki and Tarhunta-zalma[, and] they beat those (*eni*) countries.

But the king of Egypt died in those [day]s. Because I was sti[ll] a child, I did not know whether the king of Egypt had made a plea against my father because of those (*edas*) countries, or whether he had not [done?] anything.

And discussing the same events, i.e. the attack on countries in the sphere of influence of Egypt and the plagues following from that attack:

4.71 **KUB 14.8 obv. 31'-32'** (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 378 II), ed. Lebrun 1980: 206, 212.

nu=za mahḥan e-ni TUPPA ^{32'} ŠA KUR URUMizri peran uemīianun n=at IŠTU
 DINGIR-LIM ariīanun

But first, after I had found that (*eni*) tablet from Egypt, I performed an oracle inquiry of a god.

The demonstrative *eni* refers back two paragraphs to the tablet which is mentioned in obv. 13', the tablet containing the Kurustamma Treaty.

The following two examples deal with the enemy. As we will also see in other sections (sections 4.5.3.1., 4.5.3.2.), Mursili uses *asi* etc. in similar contexts, probably distancing himself from the enemy.

4.72 **KBo 5.8 iii 24'-25'** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 158-159

nu u-ni kuin 9 LIM ÉRIN.MEŠ ^{25'} ^mPitaggatalliš uūatet n=aš=mu zahḥiia tiīat

And those (*uni*) 9000 soldiers that Pitaggatalli had led (to Sappidduwa) began battle with me.

The noun phrase refers to iii 3: 9 L]IM ÉRIN.MEŠ A[NA] LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}[Šapi(du)]^ua⁴ [(^uarri uū)ate]t 'He le[d 90]00 soldiers t[o] the people of the city [Sapi]dduwa for help'¹⁶¹, at the beginning of the preceding paragraph (ca. 25 clauses earlier).

In Himmelman's (1996) view this could be called Recognitional but I prefer to follow Diessel that Recognitionals are discourse new. Cognitively however the same procedure is at work. The distance is probably such that a (demonstrative) noun phrase does not suffice to bring back the referent into the center of attention. Therefore a heavier relative

¹⁵⁹ Despite Sørenhagen's remark (p. 14 note v) on available space, the emendation *na-at* is to be discarded. Transitive verbs do not take enclitic subjects.

¹⁶⁰ The preceding text is broken off, so the exact type of reference of *eni* is not clear. It must however be at least Tracking. Situational and Discourse Deictic use are excluded, and it seems not to be Recognitional either. The most likely situation is that the countries have been mentioned by name before in the text.

¹⁶¹ Restorations from duplicate KBo 16.8 iii 9.

clause is used. This relative clause does not add any new information to the 9000 soldiers, it just reminds the Addressee of what was mentioned before. After the reintroduction by means of a relative clause, the 9000 soldiers may function as the Topic. This is exactly what a Recognitional demonstrative does: it introduces some known referent into the Discourse for further reference.

And from the annals about Mursili's father:

4.73 **KBo 14.3 iv 28'-31'** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40), ed. Güterbock 1956: 76

*nu ABU=YA [(mahhan)]^{29'} [(nan)]nai nu=kan e-da-ni pangau L[(^{LÚ}KÚR I-
anki=pat)]^{30'} [(anda h)]andaizzi n=an=za=an ABU=YA [(zahhijauyanzi=pat)]^{31'}
[(ēp)]zi*

As my father was driving, he lined himself up with that (*edani*) entire enemy(force) at once. My father started to fight it.

'That entire enemyforce' refers to the Arzawaeen enemy in the previous paragraph (^{LÚ}KÚR^{URU} *Arzauya* iv 16').

The last paragraph crossing reference to a first order entity in my corpus is found in an oracle from Tudhaliya IV:

4.74 **KBo 2.2 iii 30-31** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 134-135

§³⁰ *a-ši kuiš dUTU URUPÚ-na DUMU-annaš*³¹ *ANA IKRIBI^{HIA} šer SI×SÁ-at*

Concerning that (*asi*) Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny who was ascertained because of the vows: (they will ask His Majesty which vow is to be fulfilled, and that (one) they will fulfill).

The demonstrative NP refers back three paragraphs to iii 10-11 (and maybe also to the following one iii 13-17) where the Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny was established as the one who was angry because of the vows: §¹⁰ *dUTU URUPÚ-na kuit DUMU-annaš SI×SÁ-at*¹¹ *ANA IKRIBI^{HIA} šer* "Concerning the fact that the Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny has been ascertained, (is it) because of the vows? (Answer: yes)". Usually a simple noun will do, for in similar context we have:

- *dUTU URUPÚ-na kuiš SI×SÁ-at* (obv. ii 50) 'Concerning the Sungoddess of Arinna who was ascertained', referring to the deity mentioned in the preceding paragraph.
- *tapaššaš kuiš ANA dUTU-ŠI SI×SÁ-at* (obv. i 5) 'Concerning the fever' which was ascertained for His Majesty', referring to the fever mentioned in the preceding paragraph.
- *tapaššaš kuiš ANA dUTU-ŠI SI×SÁ-at* (obv. i 30) 'Concerning the fever' which was ascertained for His Majesty', referring to the fever mentioned two paragraphs earlier.

On the basis of these examples alone the reason for the use of *asi* etc. cannot be established.

The remaining occurrences of *asi* etc. all refer to higher order entities:

4.75 **KBo 2.2 ii 25-26** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 130

§ ²⁵ *nu dammaiš kuiški* DINGIR-LUM kardimmijauanza ²⁶ *nu a-ši INIM GIG apāš iīazi*

Is some other god angry, does *he* (instead of others) cause that (*asi*) matter of the illness?

‘That matter of the illness’ refers back four paragraphs to the entire discussion about the fever which may befall the king. This includes the place and time of the occurrence of the fever. Therefore not simply *tapassa-* ‘fever’ is used, but the more general INIM GIG ‘matter of the fever’. Other references to the fever are found in ii 55 and iii 5, this time simply referred to by *edani memiyani* ‘that matter (dat.)’:

4.76 **KBo 2.2 ii 54-56** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 132-133

§ ⁵⁴ *nu dUTU URUPÚ-na> šA URUHATTI=ma kuiš* ⁵⁵ *nu=kan e-da-ni memijani zik*
⁵⁶ *parrianta šalikti* §

(Or) is it the Sungoddess of Arinna of Hatti? Will *you* press on beyond that (*edani*) matter?

‘That matter’ refers back four paragraphs to the illness of the king (ii 29), or, more likely, to the entire situation as in ex. 4.75. The next reference to the affair occurs two paragraphs later:

4.77 **KBo 2.2 iii 5-7** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 132-133

§ ⁵ *mān=kan e-da-ni memijani* ⁶ *dUTU URUPÚ-na DUMU-annaš=pat* ⁷ *piran tiīazi*
If in that (*edani*) matter the Sungoddess of Arinna of only¹⁶² Progeny steps forward,
...

The other references by means of *asi* etc. in this oracle all concern the matter of giving compensation for not fulfilling the vows in ex. 4.74.

4.78 **KBo 2.2 iv 22-24** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 136-137

§ ²² *e-ni INIM SUM-annaš kuit SI×SÁ-at* ²³ *eni kuit INIM SUM-annaš* ²⁴ *mKatapa-DINGIR-LIM IDE*

Concerning the fact that that (*eni*) affair of giving was ascertained, (is it) that affair of giving which Katapaili oversaw? (iv 25-26: yes)

‘That affair of giving’ refers to the affair of giving mentioned in the preceding paragraph in iv 17: INIM SUM-a[nnas]. The second *eni kuit INIM SUM-annas* refers to a different affair of giving supervised by Katapaili, not mentioned before in this oracle. See for a discussion section 4.3.2 above, ex. 4.43.

The answer to the oracle question is yes, and the next step for the inquirers is to ask for more certainty:

¹⁶² Van den Hout 1998: 137 translates *-pat* as ‘indeed’.

4.79 **KBo 2.2 iv 27-28** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 136-137

§ ²⁷ *mān e-ni=pat INIM SUM-annaš* ²⁸ *mKatapa-DINGIR-LIM kuin* ¹⁶³ *IDE* ²⁹
namma=ma KI.MIN ...

If (it is) indeed this (*eni*) affair of giving, which Katapaili oversaw, but further etc., (iv 29-33: yes)

4.80 **KBo 2.2 iv 34-37** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 136-137

§ ³⁴ *pānzi a-ši INIM SUM-annaš* ³⁵ *kišan išhiulahhanzi* ³⁶ *mān=ma=kan šakti* ³⁷
eni=naš=kan uttar laittari §§

They will go and thus enjoin that (*asi*) ¹⁶⁴ affair of giving. Now, if you acknowledge (it), will this (whole) affair be solved for us? (iv 38: no).

If all the examples from KBo 2.2 obey the rule that *asi* etc. refers to something belonging to the domain of the Other, excluding the Speaker and Addressee, then the context should positively identify the correct domain. The Speakers are the oracle inquirers, the Addressee is the angry deity, and everyone else, including the king, is the Other. This means that *asi* etc. should be used in contexts dealing with referents outside the sphere of influence of the oracle inquirers and the deity, such as the king and other deities. In order to demonstrate this, I will not only discuss the occurrences of *asi* etc. but also occurrences of all other noun phrases referring across a paragraph border. I hope to show that in those cases the non-expression of *asi* etc. can be explained by the fact that the referent cannot possibly be assigned to the Other. Also some attestations of *ka-* will be referred to. In these cases *ka-* should refer to the domain of the Speaker(s), i.e. the oracle inquirers.

- The fever is only referred to by means by a simple noun phrase *tapassa-* in i 5, 12, 23, 30, 52 and ii 18. Diseases are often caused by some angry deity so we would expect the assignment of *tapassa-* to the domain of the deity, the Addressee, by means of the medial demonstrative *apa-*. Upon closer look however, it becomes clear that the fever is discussed while the angry deity has not been identified yet. This identification takes only place in ii 21 and further. There is therefore no deity to which this fever can be assigned.
- In i 21 there is a reference to the *hurri-* birds in i 15-16 by means of *kuš MUŠEN HURRI* “these *hurri*-birds”. The oracle birds belong clearly to the domain of the Speakers, the oracle inquirers, thus explaining the use of the proximal demonstrative instead of the others. The two occurrences of *ki kuit* (i 21, iii 18) will be discussed in Chapter 6.
- The angry deity is identified as the Sungoddess of Arinna in ii 23 who then takes over the position as Addressee. There is however also another deity involved, and she is the one causing the fever. In anticipation of the possible assignment to another deity, a third party, the inquirers’ question contains the phrase *aši INIM GIG* “that (*asi*) matter of the illness” in ii 26 (see ex. 4.75), with *asi* referring to the domain of the other. In their search for the other deity, a hypostasis of the goddess, the inquirers each

¹⁶³ Neuter *kuit* should have been expected.

¹⁶⁴ Note the alternation between neutral *eni* INIM in ex. 4.78, commune *asi* INIM in ex. 4.80 and neutral/commune *eni ... kuin* in ex. 4.79.

time refer to the affair of the illness with *asi* etc.: *edani memiyani* in ex. 4.76 and 4.77. After these questions the Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny is identified as the angry deity.

- Another entity that is mentioned regularly are the vows (*IKRIBI*) (iii 11, 15, 31, 33, 39, 45, iv 7). Vows belong both to the domain of the king, and to the domain of the deity, the king as the ‘vowee’ and the deity as the ‘voweed’ who has to act upon the vow. Given this shared ‘responsibility’ it is not expected to see here either *apa-* which would assign the vows solely to the deity, or *asi* which would assign them solely to the king.
- In iv 10 a gift, *maskan*, is introduced. The next reference, two paragraphs later, is done in iv 22 with *eni* INIM SUM-*annas*, ‘that affair of giving’ (ex. 4.78). The affair of giving belongs to an unidentified ‘they’, who are not the oracle inquirers and the deity. Then it is asked whether Katapaili is overseeing this affair of giving, so now the inquirers mention the Other by name. Therefore the references to INIM SUM-*annas* is from now on done with *eni* in iv 27 (ex. 4.79) and *asi* in iv 34 (ex. 4.78). Clearly, the oracle inquirers wanted to indicate that the affair of giving fell completely outside their domain.
- The only *asi* that cannot be explained is the one in connection with the Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny (iii 30).

The following four examples with *eni kuit* are all taken from KUB 22.70. The difference with the Recognitional *eni kuit* phrase discussed in section 4.3 is that in the latter situation *eni kuit* introduces already known information into the discourse which was not mentioned before, whereas *eni kuit* in the following examples refers to something that has been mentioned before. As in the Discourse Deictic situation, *eni* may alternate with *ki*. This is contrary to the common opinion that *ki* refers forward and *eni* backward. As we have seen above in ex. 4.63, *uni memian* and *kedani memiyani* both refer backward to the same discourse entity, the difference lying in the assignment to different cognitive domains.

4.81 **KUB 22.70 rev. 28-29** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 88-89

§²⁸ [*e*]-*ni*=*za*=*kan kuit* ^f*Ammatallaš* DINGIR-LUM I[GI.ḪI.A-*ūa* *ēpta n=aš* ANA DINGIR-LIM *p*]iran EGIR-*pa* *ŪL iḫattari nu mān* DINGIR-LUM *apaddan šer*²⁹ *šarnikzel* INA É.GAL-LIM *ŪL kuitki šan(a)ḫta* ...

As for [th]at (*eni*) (fact) that Ammatalla [had taken the] e[yes] of the deity, (and that) she] did not take care of [the deity], if the deity does not seek any fine in the palace at all because of *that*, ...

The affair that is recalled here refers back 35 paragraphs to obv. 8-9 (see ex. 4.45). There the event is also part of an *eni kuit* syntagm, this time Recognitional. Is it possible that here the notion of ‘that fact, known to both the oracle inquirers and the deity’ is retained? In both cases we could say that neither the inquirers nor the deity has anything to do with the events concerning Ammatalla and that the inquirers therefore use *eni*, explicitly stating that the events are outside their domain. The same counts for:

4.82 **KUB 22.70 rev. 44-45** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 92-93

§ ⁴⁴ *e-ni=za kuit* ^dUTU-ŠI AWAT MUNUS.LUGAL *antuḥšaš katta* GUL-aḥḥandaš
parā ŪL tarnaš lē=ya=mu kuitki mematteni ⁴⁵ *kinun=ma=at* SI×SÁ-at *nu apadda*
šer zankilatar SI×SÁ-at *n=at pianzi* ^dUTU-ŠI=ma *apaddan šer duddu ḥalzāi*
That (*eni*) (fact), that the king would not resolve the problem of the queen concerning
the ‘downbeaten’ people: “Do (pl.) *not* tell me anything”, it has *now* been ascertained,
and retribution has been ascertained because of that, and they shall give it. The king
however, calls for mercy because of that, ...

The events described here have been discussed in obv. 61-62, 29 paragraphs earlier. Also
there the events were introduced by Recognitional *eni kuit*.

The next example (with fn.) refers seven paragraphs back to rev. 38 where it is told that
Zarniyaziti carried some utensils into the Rock-Sanctuary of Kurunta: *eni=kan kuit*
^mZarniia-LÚ-iš UNUTE^{MEŠ} INA ŠÀ É NA₄ḥekur ^dLAMMA *pēdaš* ‘About that (fact), that
Zarniā-ziti had brought the utensils into the Rock-Sanctuary of Kurunta’. The situation is
therefore similar to the two preceding examples:

4.83 **KUB 22.70 rev. 51-53** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 94-95¹⁶⁵

§ ⁵¹ *e-ni=kan kuit* UNUTE^{MEŠ} INA ŠÀ É NA₄ḥekur ^dLAMMA *pēdan n=at nāui kuit* 1
u^{al}antalamman UN.MEŠ-tar=pat=kan ⁵² *kuit šaknuuanteš anda šališkir*
kinuna=at=kan MÁŠ.GAL IZI=ia *ištarna arḥa pēdanzi namma=at šuppijahḥazi* ⁵³
n=at ANA DINGIR-LIM QATAMMA pianzi DINGIR-LIM=za QATAMMA malan ḥarti
As for that (*eni*) (fact), that the utensils were carried into the Rock-Sanctuary of the
Tutelary Deity, that they have not yet been *wantalamma-*, that only¹⁶⁶ impure men
have approached (them), so now they carry them through between a he-goat and fire,
and then they cleanse them, and give them in that manner to the deity, do you, o god,
agree in/with that manner? (Answer: no)

A problematic attestation of *eni* is:

4.84 **KUB 22.70 rev. 4-7** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 82-83

§ ⁴ *kī=kan kuit* ^fPattiiaš INA É.GAL-LIM *šarā ištātāit nu=kan pānzi* ANA ^fPattiia
šarni[kzel] ⁵ *anda tiianzi* ...

§ ⁶ *e-ni=kan kuit* ^fPattiia INA É.GAL-LIM *šarā ištātāit* ANA KIN É.GAL-LIM *parā*
šalikiški[t] ⁷ *nu mān* DINGIR-LIM *apadda šer šarnikzel ŪL kuitki šan(a)ḥta* ...

As for this (fact), that Pattiya lingered up in the palace, they shall go (and) pose a fine
on Pattiya. (Do you agree? No)

As for that (*eni*) (fact), that Pattiya lingered up in the palace and repeatedly meddled
with the affairs of the palace, if you, deity, did not seek a fine at all because of *that*,
(then let the sign be favorable: unfavorable).

The lingering of Pattiya in the palace has been discussed before in this text (obv. 35, 68), the
meddling in palace affairs in obv. 76. The problem with obv. 76 is that it is a summary which

¹⁶⁵ See also KUB 22.70 rev. 54 *e-ni=kan kuit* UNUTE.MEŠ INA ŠÀ É NA₄ḥekur ^dLAMMA *pēdan*

¹⁶⁶ CHD Š p. 48a translates *-pat* as ‘the above mentioned (impure people)’. The people have not been
mentioned before.

already presents the results of the oracle question in rev. 6ff., namely the fact that a fine is required because of the meddling in the palace affairs. So what came first, the summary with the outcome in obv. 76 or the oracle question itself in rev. 6? If this oracle is a collection of different inquiries performed at different times, then the impossible order of a summary of the outcome before the actual question is not problematic anymore. As a result, the phrase *eni kuit* would be Recognitional because rev. 6 would be the first mention of Pattiya's meddling.

As said in the beginning of section 4.5.2., discourse entities lose their salience when a discourse unit is closed, so the demonstrative noun phrases in this section are used to center the attention of the Addressee on their referents. The demonstratives in the exx. 4.71, 4.72, 4.77, 4.78, 4.79, 4.81, 4.82, 4.83 and fn. and 4.84 are part of a subordinate clause, the Topic-Focus distinction is therefore not relevant. Only the exx. 4.69, 4.70, 4.73, 4.75, 4.76 and 4.80 need to be discussed from the viewpoint of Information Structure. Being centering, the demonstrative phrases can either be a non-established Sentence Topic (= Unexpected Topic) or Focus. Generally elements that are part of the predicate are Focus (exx. 4.70, 4.73, 4.80). Sometimes however the Subject is in Argument Focus. This is the case in ex. 4.75 and ex. 4.76. The subjects *apa-* and *zik* are in preverbal position, indicating their status as Focal Subjects (see for this concept Chapter 2, and Chapter 8 for Focal *apa-*). The remainder of the clause is presupposed, assumed to be known to the Addressee. The noun phrases in the remainder of the clause are therefore topical, but given their lack of saliency not expected as such. Another situation occurs in ex. 4.69. Here the demonstrative noun phrase is fronted, while the Subject *ammuk* is the primary Topic. However, the tablet is a discourse topic, which means that it may function as a Sentence Topic. The fronting in ex. 4.69 indicates that it is an Unexpected Topic.

4.5.2.2. From Direct Speech to Narration

The crossing of the boundary from Direct Speech to Narration diminishes the saliency of a discourse entity. Therefore, even if a discourse entity is mentioned in the preceding clause, a full noun phrase is still needed.

- 4.85 **KUB 31.77 i 14-21** (NH vow, Hattusili III, CTH 584), ed. De Roos 1984: 266, 404
nu=̣a memiškizzi ¹⁵ *kuit=̣ar=an zaḥhiškinun kuit=̣ar=an* ¹⁶ *zaḥhiškinun*
nu=̣ar=an=kan ūn̄hun ¹⁷ *namma UR.BAR.RA=̣a=̣a=kan kuiš anda* ¹⁸ *[ē]šta*
[nu=̣ar]=an=kan šarā h̄ūittiānun ¹⁹ *mān=ma a-ši UR.BARRA TI-anza mān(-) ×?*
²⁰ *[.....]× ʼ šanduri[š]a mān* ²¹ *[ŪL TI-a]nza ...*
 He said: 'Why did I fight him? Why did I fight him? Then I fed him, and the wolf that was inside, I pulled him up.¹⁶⁷ Whether that (*asi*) wolf is alive, or [...] is *sandurisa*, or whether (it is) [not al]ive, ...

The wolf has been introduced in the preceding complex clause. I assume the speech of the father has ended here and now the Queen is telling her dream again. The phrase *asi* UR.BARRA refers to the immediately preceding sentence so the entity should be salient. The discourse boundary however lowers its saliency. In such a case a full noun phrase should be

¹⁶⁷ De Roos o.c. 404 takes *nu=̣ar=an=kan ūn̄hun* ¹⁷ *namma UR.BAR.RA=̣a=̣a=kan kuiš anda* ¹⁸ *[ē]šta* ¹⁹ *[nu=̣ar]=an=kan šarā h̄ūittiānun* as dependent on the preceding *kuit* clauses: Waarmee bestreed ik hem, waarom bestreed ik hem, en voedde ik hem voorts, (en) haalde ik ook een wolf die erin zat omhoog?

enough, so why is *asi* used here? In line with the discussion in the preceding paragraph we can explain the occurrence of *asi* by looking at the domain to which the wolf belongs. The father of the Queen whose dream is told here hauls the wolf up from the well, so the wolf belongs to his, the Other's domain, and not to the Queen's or the deity's domain.

Similarly in the above discussed oracle of Hattusili III:

4.86 **KUB 22.70 obv. 17-19** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 58-59

DINGIR-LIM ^{URU} *Arušna=ua=mu kuit* GILIM GUŠKIN *tešhaz uēkta nu=uar=at*
kāšma ¹⁸ *INA É* ^{LÚ} *ŠĀ.TAM GAR-ri ʾ takkišra=ua=kan kue* NA₄.HI.A-*ja* EGIR-*pa*
āštat nu=uar=at kāšma ʾ atupalaššan ¹⁹ *anda GAR-ri nu=uar=at ANA DINGIR-*
LIM arha uppi nu e-ni GILIM GUŠKIN *uemir*

“About the golden headband that the deity of Arusna requested from me through a dream: Just now it is lying in the house of the chamberlain. About the *takkisra* and precious stones that stayed behind: Just now it is lying in the *atupalassa*. Send them out to the deity!” They have found that (*eni*) golden headband.

4.5.2.3. Change of episode

In my corpus there is only one clear example of a change of episode (see also ex. 4.64, repeated here). Mursili recounts how he was ‘struck by lightning’ and consequently lost his ability to speak. After his partial recovery he tells how he forgot all about it. Then the story moves years ahead to the moment he starts to dream about his experience.

4.87 **IBoT 2.112 + obv. 5-7** (NH egodocument, Mursili II, CTH 486), ed. Lebrun 1988: 104

⁵ [(*nu=kan*)] *aši memian arha=pat pa[(škuu)]ānun mahhan=ma* ⁶ *uer* MU.HI.A-
uš EGIR-*anda p[(āir n)]u=mu u[(it)]* ⁷ [(*a-š*)]*i memiaš tešhaniš[(kiuu)]n tijat*
 I neglected that incident entirely. But when the years passed by, it happened that that (*asi*) incident began to appear in my dreams regularly. (In my dream the hand of a god touched me and my mouth went to the side.)

In the new episode the incident is referred to by a demonstrative noun phrase although it should have been salient given its mention in the preceding clause. But the fact that the new clause starts with ‘when the years passed by’ indicates that the episode about the incident is closed, thereby lowering the attention levels of all the entities involved. In such a situation a re-opening of a ‘closed case’ requires at least a noun phrase.

The participants in this narration are Mursili, the king, his Audience and the deity who is this time the Other. Either Mursili wants to express that he did not think the affair was his responsibility (see ex. 4.64) or that he assigns it solely to the area of the deity.

The affair is re-introduced in the discourse by means of a staging predicate, so one could call the clause an out-of-the-blue sentence. Every part of the clause is therefore in Focus.

4.5.3. The continuity procedure

4.5.3.1. *asi* plus noun indicating a digression from the main story line

As I already explained in the introduction (section 4.5.1), lexical noun phrases may be used to indicate the beginning of a new discourse unit without the support from any formal features such as a paragraph boundary, Direct Speech boundary or change of episode. In this paragraph the transition from main story line to a digression or sub-plot will be discussed. I will cite all the examples in my corpus in which the discourse entity referred to is found in the immediate preceding clause. This means that the entity referred to is in the forefront of the attention, although it is in most cases neither the topic of the preceding clause nor the theme of the paragraph. Of course, the non-topic-hood and non-thematicity might be reason enough for the use of a topic switching device if it were not for ex. 4.92 below. In that example Pihhuniya is both the topic of the preceding clause and a sub-theme of the paragraph. This shows that the demonstrative noun phrase *asi Pihhuniyas* is used for other reasons than topic or theme switch. The examples will make clear that it is indeed one of the purposes of the demonstrative noun phrase to indicate the demarcation of an embedded discourse unit.¹⁶⁸

As for the use of the distal demonstrative *asi*, the two examples with enough context, exx. 4.88 and 4.89, allow the conclusion that *asi* is added to point out to the Addressee that the mountain Arinnanda and the city Aripa are not (yet) in the sphere of influence of Mursili. In both cases only the clauses cited here contain the names preceded by the demonstrative *asi*. Elsewhere only the bare names are used. After the embedded units the narration continues with the conquest of these objects, which explains why *asi* is not used anymore. From the preparations of warfare until the conquest Arinnanda and Aripa are considered part of the cognitive space of the King (and others) although they are not under his control. It is therefore not warranted to use *asi*, which explicitly states that something is outside the cognitive space, sphere of influence or responsibility of both Speaker and Addressee.

All examples listed here and in section 4.5.3.2. are found in the Annals of Mursili. In Annals it is very likely that the Addressee is not involved, so *apa-* as demonstrative is not expected to occur very often, unless it is part of Direct Speech (which often requires an Addressee). Restricting ourselves to *apa-* with noun in the Tracking use, there are none to be found in the Annals. The other uses of *apa-* are either Focal (see Chapter 7, 8, 9), or indeed refer to some element in the sphere of influence of the Addressee (see the next Chapter).

In order to indicate that the discourse unit containing *asi* etc. is not part of the main story line I use hyphens, both in the transliteration and the translation:

4.88 **KUB 14.15 iii 39-42** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 54-55

³⁹ [nu dUTU-ŠI (IN)]A HUR.SAG Arinnanda pāun —a-ši=ma [(HUR.SA)GAri(nnanda)š mekki] ⁴⁰ [(n)]akkiš aruni=ja=aš=kan parranda pānza na[(mma=aš mekki parkuš)] uarhuiš=aš ⁴¹ namma=aš NA₄pērunanza nu=kan IŠTU ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ š[(arā pennuma)nzi ŪL DÙ-ri— ⁴² NAM.RA.MEŠ=ma=an pankuš ħarta ÉRIN.MEŠ-ja=kan pank[(uš šer ēšta)]

I [My Majesty] went to mount Arinnanda. — Now, that (*asi*) mount Arinnanda is [very] steep and it stretches into the sea. Further, it is very high, it is bush-grown. Moreover, it is rocky, (so) it is not possible to drive up (to it) with horses. — Now, the refugees all held it and soldiers were all on top (of it).

¹⁶⁸ That does not mean that the reverse is true, that embedded discourse units can only be marked by demonstrative noun phrases. Relative clauses may cause the same effect, but also repeated simple noun phrases such as names or nouns.

If a chunk of discourse is a digression, it may be possible to leave out the digression without disrupting the narration.¹⁶⁹ Here we would get: *nu* ^dUTU-ŠI INA ^ḪUR.SAG Arinnanda *pāun* NAM.RA.MEŠ *ma=an pankuš* “I [My Majesty] went to mount Arinnanda. Now, the refugees all held it and soldiers were all on top (of it)”. A more formal indication for the different status of the embedded unit is the use of nominal clauses and present verb forms versus the use of the preterite in the main narration. The same is true for the next example.

4.89 **KBo 4.4 iv 4-8** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 132-133

⁴ *nu* INA URU Aripšā anda[n zahḫiia iḫanniianun] ⁵ — *a-ši=ma=kan* URU Aripšāš Š[À A.A]B.BA kittari ⁶ *namma=šši* URU-riašeššar *kuit n=aš* ^ḪUR.SAG NA₄ *pērunu[š ḫarzi*¹⁷⁰] ⁷ *namma=at mekki parku— nu=kan* KUR-e *kuit ḫūman šarā pā[n]* ⁸ *ēšta n=an* ÉRIN.MEŠ *pankuš ḫarta n=an* ^dUTU-ŠI zahḫiianu[n]
[I marched on campaign] against Aripša. — Now, that (*asi*) Aripša lies i[n the s]ea. Furthermore, what population it has, it [holds] them (namely) the mountain(s) (and) the cliffs. Moreover, it is very steep — Although the whole population had gone up, and the entire army held it, I, My Majesty fought it.

Without the embedded unit the main narration is “[I marched on campaign] against Aripša. Although the whole population had gone up, and the entire army held it, I, My Majesty fought it.” In this example and the previous one the embedded unit can be left out without disrupting the narration.

In the next example the demonstrative noun phrase referring to the city Ura does not immediately follow an earlier mention of Ura, but we still have to assume that Ura is the topic and the theme of this part of discourse since the city has been under discussion for two clauses.

4.90 **KUB 14.17 iii 21-25**, with duplicate KUB 26.79 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 98-99

nu=šši pāun nu URU Uraš *kuiš* URU-aš ²² [ŠA KUR URU(Azzi ḫantezziš)] *auriš* *ēšta n=aš=kan nakkī pēdi* ²³ [*aš(anza —nu kuiš kē* ^ḪUPPA.ḪI.A)] × × ×-*ia* *ištamašzi nu uḫaddu* ²⁴ [(*nu a-ši* URU Uran URU-an) *aušdu maḫḫan=aš u*] *edanza* *ēšta—* ²⁵ [*maḫḫan(=ma=kan* ^mAnnijaš EN KUR Azzi) ...
I went to him. As for Ura, a city which was a borderpost of the country of Azzi, it lies at a steep place. —Whoever hears these tablets and x x x, must send out to [investigate] that (*asi*)¹⁷¹ city Ura, [how it] was built—. But when Anniya, Lord of Azzi [.....] (both tablets break off).

¹⁶⁹ This should not be considered as a necessary criterium.

¹⁷⁰ Contrary to CHD P, p. 314 and Götze l.c. I prefer *ḫarzi* instead of *ḫarkir*. The singular corresponds with the singular URU-riašeššar, and the present tense is in line with the other present *kittari* and the nominal clauses.

¹⁷¹ Laroche 1979: 149 takes *asi* to be the resumptive pronoun (nom.sg.) of *kuis* in the preceding relative clause: ‘Il vaut mieux prendre *asi* pour anaphore de la proposition relative précédente, et traduire: “quiconque lira cette tablette, qu’il (*asi*) visite la ville d’Ura”’. His translation shows that Laroche has overlooked the crucial verb *wiya-* ‘to send’. The referent of *kuis* does not visit Ura himself, but sends some unspecified person. This unknown person, not introduced in the text by any expression, can never be referred to by a semantically empty form such as *asi* (or *apa-* or *-a-*). Therefore *asi* is used as an acc. sg. adjective to Ura.

Here it is even clearer that the stretch of discourse containing the demonstrative noun phrase is inserted in the main narration. Contrary to the two preceding examples the noun phrase is not located on the discourse node, unless it is assumed that 1) subordinate clauses are not counted as an independent clause¹⁷², and 2) that the verb *wiya-* ‘to send’ is semantically connected with the following clause, almost similar to the phraseological *pai-* ‘to go’ and *uwa-* ‘to come’.

In exx. 4.88 and 4.89 the king is the Established Topic. Therefore, the switch to a discourse unit discussing some properties of the locations is quite unexpected. The mountain Arinnanda and the place Aripisa are therefore Unestablished Topics.

Ex. 4.90 is different from the other two because the city Ura is already topical. Although at first sight the reference chain of Ura is broken by means of a relative clause, the city is still an Established Topic. Relative clauses are often used to introduce new elements into the discourse, but do not necessarily break the topic chain.

4.5.3.2. *asi* plus noun indicating a return to the main story line

Not only is the beginning of a digression sometimes marked by a demonstrative noun phrase, but also the return to the main story line.

In ex. 4.91 a parenthetical remark about the identity of Zida is inserted, after which the narration picks up the unfinished statement (ii 18-19) about Hutupianza in ii 20-21, not only by repeating the accusative *Hutupianzan*, but also by adding the demonstrative *uni*. Furthermore, Hutupianza is the Established Topic, since it was already introduced in fronted position in ii 18:

4.91 **KBo 5.8 ii 18-27** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 152-153

*mHūtupianzan=ma*¹⁹ DUMU.LUGAL DUMU *mZidā* GAL LÚMEŠEDI —*mZidāš kuiš*²⁰
*ANA ABI=YA ŠEŠ=ŠU ēšta— nu ABU=YA*²¹ *u-ni mHutupianzan DUMU mZidā GAL*
*LÚMEŠEDI INA KUR URUPalā*²² *uataruhta KUR URUPalā=ma ŪL kuitki*²³
*pahḫaššanuuan KUR-TUM ēšta*²⁴ URU.BÀD EGIR-pa *appannaš AŠRU NU.GÁL*
*kuiški*²⁵ *ēšta dagān ešantat KUR-e ēšta*²⁶ *mHutupianzaš=ma KUR URUPalā*
pahḫaštat

Now, Hutupianza (acc.) Prince, son of Zida, the Head of the Bodyguard —Zida who was a brother of my father—, *that (uni) Hutupianza*, son of Zida, the Head of the Bodyguard, my father summoned to Pala. Pala however was a completely unprotected country: there was no fortified city, no place to retreat. (It) was a ‘they were living (straight) on the land’ country. Hutupianza however protected Pala (by building fortresses and retreats in the mountains).

Concerning the choice for *uni*: the use of the proximal demonstrative *ka-* would indicate that Hutupianza belonged to the sphere of Mursili, the use of the medial demonstrative *apa-* would mean that the man belonged to the sphere of the Addressee. Both are not true since the context explicitly states that Hutupianza was an officer of Mursili’s father. Later the broken narration indicates that 20 years later Hutupianza and Mursili work together. Is *asi* used as a signal for the Addressee to draw the attention to the fact that Hutupianza was first Supiluliuma’s officer, without any ties with Mursili, thereby avoiding confusion?

¹⁷² For this view see also Rieken 1999: 68.

Not dealing with an ally but with the enemy is ex. 4.92:

4.92 **KBo 3.4 iii 67-79** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 I), ed. Grélois 1988: 86¹⁷³

§ ⁶⁷ MU-*anni=ma* INA KUR ^{URU}Tipiia pāun —nu *kuitman* ABU=YA ⁶⁸ INA KUR
Mittanni ēšta ^mPihhuniiaš=ma LÚ ^{URU}Tipiia iḡattat ⁶⁹ nu KUR UGU GUL-anneškit
n=aš parā INA ^{URU}Zazziša ⁷⁰ āraškit nu KUR UGU šarā dāš n=at=kan INA KUR
Qašqa ⁷¹ kattanda pēdaš KUR ^{URU}Ištitina=ma=za hūman dāš ⁷² n=at=za apēl
uīšūauuāš pēdan iḡat
§ ⁷⁶ namma ^mPihhuniiaš ŪL ŠA ^{URU}Gašga iḡar ʾ taparta— ⁷⁷ hūdāk mahḡhan INA
^{URU}Gašga ŪL ŠA 1-EN tapariiaš ⁷⁸ ēšta a-ši=ma ^mPihhuniiaš ŠA LUGAL-UTTİM
iḡar ⁷⁹ taparta nu=šši dUTU-ŠI pāun

In the (next) year I went to the country of Tipiya. —As long as my father stayed in Mittanni, Pihhuniya the Tipiyan marched and attacked the Upper Land. He reached as far as Zazzisa. He gathered the Upper Land and carried it down to Gasga-land. The land of Istitina on the other hand he annexed completely and made it his own (instead of Hittite) grazing place.

Furthermore, Pihhuniya did not rule like a Gasgaean.— Suddenly —when there was no unified overlordship in Gasga— that (*asi*) Pihhuniya ruled as a king, and I, My Majesty, went against him.

Mursili starts to tell about his campaign to Tipiya, but first he has to sketch the background in order to inform the Addressee of the extraordinary circumstances in that area. The background unit recounts some events during the time of his father, introducing the Gasga-leader Pihhuniya. In iii 78 Pihhuniya is referred to by means of his name, although he is the sub-theme of these paragraphs and also the Established Topic. The repetition of the name indicates the shift to a new discourse unit, moving from the time of Suppiluliuma to Mursili, dealing with the fight against this enemy. The distancing effect of *asi* seems to be strengthened by the king-like rule of Pihhuniya. Mursili certainly could never allow the presence of a such strong leader in these rebellious regions. It is possible that he wanted to express his disapproval by using the distancing Otherness of *asi*.

Also in a negative context:

4.93 **KBo 3.4 + iii 42-47** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 I), ed. Grélois 1988: 66¹⁷⁴

¹⁷³ With the parallel text from the extensive annals: KUB 14.17 ii 31-35 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 88:³¹ [nu ^mPihhuniiaš kuiš LÚ ^{URU}Gašga LÚ ^{URU}Tipiia ēšta ³² [—kuiṯm]an=kan ABU=YA INA KUR.KUR.MEŠ Hurri ēšta ^mPihhuniiaš=ma ³³ [KUR UGU-T]I ^{URU}Ištitina=ia GUL-anneški[t] n=aš parā ³⁴ [INA ^{URU}Za]zziša ar[aškit—] nu=kan a-ši ^mPihhuniiaš ³⁵ [ŪL ŠA ^{URU}Gašga(?) [iḡa]r taparta “[Pih]huniya, who was a Gasgaean, a man from Tipiya, [— as lon]g as my father was in the Hurrian countries, Pihhuniya attacke[d] the [Upp]er [Country] and Istitina, and he rea[ched] as far as [Za]zzisa — that Pihhuniya [did not] rule like [a Gasga(?) (Afterwards the tablet is hardly preserved).”

¹⁷⁴ An uncertain example of *uni* with a geographical referent is KBo 19.76 + KUB 14.20 i 13'-17' (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Houwink ten Cate 1979: 161, 163: GIM-an=ma ^{URU}Mal(azzia)z EG]IR-pa tūya lukatta ^{14'} piran[=ma=mu ^{HURSA}G Kuwatelšaš kišat) —n=aš par]kuš arpuḡanzašš=a— ^{15'} nu=kan kuitman u-n[i ^{HUR.SAG}Kuwatelši (?) anda]ā[r]hūn nu UD.KAM-az takšan ^{16'} tiḡat kuitman=ma=ka[n šarā pāun nu neku]tta nu=ššan ×-(×) ^{17'} INA ^{HUR.SAG}Kuwatelša [š]an[aḡhun “[But af]ter it had dawned far behind [Mal]azziya, Mount Kuwatelsa rose up before [me]. [—It is st]eep and inaccessible—. Before I had

§ ⁴² MU.KAM-anni=ma INA HUR.SAG Aššarpaia pāun — nu=za HUR.SAG Aššarpaian
kuiš ⁴³ URUGašgaš ešan ħarta nu ŠA KUR URUPalā KASKAL.MEŠ karaššan
ħarta— ⁴⁴ nu u-ni ŠA HUR.SAG Aššarpaia URUGaškan zahḫiianun nu=mu ^dUTU
^{URU}PÚ-na GAŠAN=YA ⁴⁵ ^dU NIR.GÁL BELI=YA ^dMezzullaš DINGIR.MEŠ=ia ḫūmanteš
peran ⁴⁶ ḫūiēr nu=za HUR.SAG Aššarpaian kuiš URUGašgaš ešan ħarta ⁴⁷
n=an=za=an tarahhun n=an=kan kuenun

In the (next) year I went to mount Asharpaya. —The Gasga who had settled (on) mount Asharpaya had cut off the roads of the country Pala.— I fought those (*uni*) Gasga of mount Asharpaya, ¹⁷⁵ and the Sungoddess of Arinna, My Lady, the powerful Stormgod, My Lord, Mezulla and all the gods ran before me. I conquered the Gasga who had settled (on) mount Asharpaya and killed them.

The main line of the narration is broken off by a background clause which probably presents the reason for the campaign against mount Asharpaya. The narration is continued in iii 44, referring to the salient Gasga by means of a rather elaborate noun phrase, not simply sticking to a demonstrative, but even adding a genitive. Also in this example the crossing of a discourse node is indicated by means of a lexical noun phrase. The demonstrative *uni* could have been used to strengthen the negative character of the Gasga, in this case their inherent Otherness (they are not conquered and incorporated into the Empire, but killed).

The Gasga are the Established Topic. The writer could easily have said something like “The Gasga who ... cut off the roads of Pala, (so) I fought them”. Only the fact that the writer starts a new discourse unit made him use a demonstrative noun phrase.

The next examples, ex. 4.94 with three more in the footnote, all contain a distal demonstrative noun phrase in a clause following a remark of the type ‘the gods ran before me/him’. Although I am not certain, it is possible that this remark about the support of the gods, is an insertion intended for the Addressee instead of an event that is part of the ongoing narration.

4.94 **KBo 19.76 +: 17’-23’** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Houwink ten Cate 1979: 161, 163¹⁷⁶

... nu=mu kēz ^{URU}Šunup]aššiš kezza=ma=mu ^{18’} ^{URU}Išdupištaš kez=ma=mu
[LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}Pittagalaišša Š]EŠ.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}Malazziia=pat ^{19’} nu=mu tūuaz
uškīr —nu<=za> ^d[U NIR.GÁL EN=YA par]ā ḫandandatar tekkušnut— ^{20’} nu=mu
u-ni-uš kuiēš LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}Šūnupa[šši LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}Išdupi]šta Û LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}Pittagalaišša

arrived at tha[t Mount Kuwatelsi (?)], the day had passed halfway. And before [I had gone u]p, night fell so I searched ... on mount Kuwatelsa.”

¹⁷⁵ Götze 1933: 77, different translation: ‘Und welche Kaškäer-Stadt das Bergland Aššarpaja besetzt hielt und die Wege nach dem Lande Palā abgeschnitten hatte, mit dieser Kaškäer-Stadt im Berglande Aššarpaja kämpfte ich’.

¹⁷⁶ See also KBo 14.3 iii 16’-18’ (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40) —nu ANA ABU=YA ^{17’} [DI]NGIR.MEŠ piran ḫuūier— nu=kan u-ni LÚKÚR ^{URU}Gašgan ^{18’} ÉRIN.MEŠ ŠUTI kuin kuūapi damaškit; KBo 14.3 iv 7’-9’ (—nu ANA) ABU=YA DINGIR.MEŠ p[(iran ḫuūer)]^{8’} [(^dUTU ^{URU}Arinna ^dU ^{URU})]Hatti ^dU [(KARŠ)]^{9’} [^dGAŠ(AN LÍL=ia— nu=kan u-ni p)]ankun ŠUTI [(kuenta)]; KBo 14.3 iv 28’-33’ —nu ANA A[B]U=YA DINGIR.MEŠ peran ḫūiēr ^{32’} [(^dUTU ^{URU})]Arinna ^dU ^{URU}HATTI ^dU [(KARŠ)]^{33’} [^dGAŠAN LÍ]L=ia— nu u-ni-in LÚKÚR ḫullijāt.

21' ŠEŠ.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ^{URU} Malazzija tūya[z uškir nu=ka]n¹⁷⁷ namma <ANA> LÚ.MEŠ^{URU} Malazzija^{22'} memiian kattan arha Ū[L pēte]r nu=kan^{LÚ} KÚR ŪL paršanuir^{23'} dUTU-ŠI=ma pāun INA^{URU} Pittagal[aišša še(r t)]uzziianun ...

[On one side of me was Sunup]assi, on another was Isdupista, and on still another were [the people of Pittagalaissa, b]rothers of in fact the people of Malazziya. They saw me from afar. —The [mighty Stormgod, my Lord], showed his divine guidance.— These (unius) people from Sunapa[ssi, the people from Isdupi]sta and the people of Pittagalaissa, brothers of the people of Malazziya, who [saw] me from afar, they thereafter did n[ot brin]g word to the people of Malazziya. They did not induce the enemy to flee. Now I My Majesty went up to garrison at Pittagalaissa.

The return to the main narration is supported by the fact that the distal demonstrative noun phrase is used in a relative clause repeating the predicate of l. 19'. If the clause about the deity was not considered as a digression from the main story line, then such strong markers redirecting the attention to the people of these cities would not have been necessary.

In each of these examples it is also possible to consider the 'helping-god clause' as part of the main story line. In that case I do not have an explanation for the use of the demonstrative noun phrases. In each situation the enemy is a discourse topic, and therefore salient. More important is that the enemy is expected to be in some kind of relationship with the father of the king given the fact that that relation is already established in the preceding clauses. In the framework described in Chapter 2, this means that the enemy is not only a discourse topic but also an expected sentence topic. Reference in such a situation is typically done by means of an enclitic pronoun and certainly not by means of a lexical noun phrase. Because of these considerations I hesitantly consider the use of a demonstrative noun phrase after a 'helping-god clause' as an indicator of a discourse boundary.

4.5.3.3. asi plus noun indicating a new discourse unit

There are a few examples of the distal demonstrative noun phrase referring to a salient entity, indicating a new line of thought or a new sub-theme without returning to a previous theme. This new discourse unit follows the preceding one linearly and not hierarchically as was the case in the preceding paragraphs.

4.95 KBo 3.4+ i 23-26 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 I), ed. Grélois 1988: 55

²³ nu kiššan AQBI dUTU^{URU} Arinna GAŠAN-YA arahzenaš=ua=mu=za KUR.KUR LÚKÚR kuješ²⁴ DUMU-lan halzeššir nu=ua=mu=za tepnuškir nu=ua tuel ŠA dUTU^{URU} Arinna²⁵ GAŠAN-YA ZAG.ĪI.A danna šanḫiškiuan dāir nu=ua=mu dUTU^{URU} Arinna GAŠAN-YA²⁶ kattan tiia nu=ua=mu=kan u-ni arahzenaš KUR.KUR LÚKÚR peran kuenni

I spoke like this: "O Sungoddess of Arinna, my Lady, the surrounding countries of the enemy which called me a child, they have humiliated me. They have started to seek to take *your* territories, (the territories) of the Sungoddess of Arinna, my Lady, a second time. O Sungoddess of Arinna, my Lady, stand by my side! Kill those (uni) surrounding countries of the enemy on my behalf!

¹⁷⁷ Houwink ten Cate l.c. and Alp 1991: 24 read differently *na-at-ká]n*. However, the use of an enclitic subject with a transitive verb is prohibited.

After the description of the evil deeds of the enemy, the Speaker requests help from the deity. In this new unit the enemy is referred to by means of a full noun phrase. The distal demonstrative expresses the negative emotional attitude of the Speaker.

In the next example the demonstrative noun phrase “those utensils” indicates the closure of a series of background *kuit* clauses and the beginning of a series of clauses describing the actions resulting from that background:

4.96 **KUB 22.70 rev. 54-57** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 96-97

§⁵⁴ *eni=kan kuit UNUTE.MEŠ INA ŠÀ É^{NA4}hekur^dLAMMA pēdan n=at nāui kuit*
u¹alantalaman UN.MEŠ-tar=pat=kan⁵⁵ kuit šaknu^uan anda šalikiškir nu=kan e-
ni UNUTE.MEŠ ŠÀ IZI peššijan^z namma=at^{NA4}kunkunuzzit⁵⁶ GUL-anzi
namma=at=kan MÁŠ.GAL IZI=ia ištarna arḫa pēdanzi namma=at šuppi^hahḫan^z
⁵⁷ *n=at ANA DINGIR-LIM QATAMMA pianzi KI.MIN*

As for that (fact), that the utensils were carried into the Rock-Sanctuary of Kurunta, that they have not yet been *wantalama-*, that only impure men have approached (them), so they throw those (*eni*) utensils into the fire, next they beat them with a *kunkunuzzi*-stone, next they carry them through between a he-goat and fire, and then they cleanse them, and give them in that manner to the deity, ditto? (Answer: no)

This example shows clearly that salient and topical entities in new discourse units may (or must?) be referred to by means of a full noun phrase.

The only example of tracking *asi* in Old Hittite occurs in a copied text:

4.97 **KBo 3.41 + KUB 31.4 obv. 16'-19'** (OH/NS Puhanu Chronicle, CTH 16), ed. Soysal 1987: 175

UMMA=ŠU=MA^{17'} [o-o-]× mān lahḫeškinun nu=nnaš HUR.SAG-aš nakkiēt kās=a
GUD.M[Aḫ]^{18'} [dašš]uš (?) ēšta mān=aš uēt nu u-ni HUR.SAG-an karapta
š=an=ašta^{19'} [edi n]ā(?)eš arunan=a tarḫun nu karauar=šet apēda lipšan §
 Thus said he: Always when I roamed/fought the ...[...], the mountain was an obstacle for us. This bull however, was [stron]g (?). When he came, he lifted that (*uni*) mountain, he [tu]rned it [away], so that I conquered the sea. Because of *that* his horn is chipped off (?).

The mountain is mentioned for the first time in obv. 17'. The clause containing this reference is followed by a new unit which introduces a bull in the Direct Speech. The next reference to the mountain in this new unit is done by means of a full noun phrase. The distal demonstrative is used because the Speaker wants to emphasize that the mountain is to be seen as something which should not be part of his world.

And finally, with Topic switches indicated by *-ma*

4.98 **KUB 31.71 iii 1-25** (NH vow, Hattusili III (?), CTH 584/297), ed. Van den Hout 1994: 310-1, 313

§¹ *Û MUNUS.LUGAL INA^{URU1} Anku^ua I[MUR]² nu=ua=kan zašḫi^ha DUMU.LUGAL*
mān³ kuiški anda uit⁴ nu=ua=mu memeš^hkizzi eḫu=ua=tta⁵ manijaḫmi ŠÀ É-
TI=KA=ua=ta=kkan⁶ kuit ne^hjattat⁷ nu=ua=mu=kan anda kuedanikki⁸ pedi
pēḫutet nu=ua=kan imma⁹ É.SAG.ḪI.A kuiēšqa ḫalluš¹⁰ e-ni-uš=ma=ua=kan

É.SAG.ĤI.A *karū*¹¹ *mān šarā šannapilahhanteš*¹² *nu=ya*^{GIŠ} KAXGIŠ.ĤI.A *mān*
*kueqa*¹³ *kittari e-da-aš=ma=kan*¹⁴ ANA^{GIŠ} KAXGIŠ.ĤI.A *anda* GA.KIN.AG ÉRIN
 LIBIR.RA¹⁵ PÈŠ LIBIR.RA^{GIŠ} GEŠTIN.ĤAD.DU LIBIR.RA *harran* ...

The Queen h[ad] a dream in Ankuwa: “In (my) dream someone like a prince entered. He said to me: ‘Come, I will show you what has happened in your house.’ He brought me into some place. There are some deep grain silos there. These (enius) grain silos are like already emptied. There are standing something like boxes. In(side) these (edas) boxes old army cheese, old figs (and) old raisins are decaying. ...

In the next example there is no new discourse unit. The distal demonstrative probably simply indicates disassociation:

4.99 **KBo 4.6 obv. 15’-17’** (NH prayer, Gassulawiya, CTH 380), ed. Tischler 1984: 12-13
nu PANI DINGIR-LIM EN-YA kāš MUNUS-aš uēhattaru^{16’} ANA

DUMU.MUNUS.GAL=ma=kan *anda aššuli namma nešhut n=an kēz*^{17’} GIG-za TI-
nut nu=šši e-ni GIG *ayan arha namma tittanut*

Let be turned towards the god My Lord this woman and toward the Great Daughter turn again in favor and save her from this sickness, lift that (eni) sickness completely off from her.

4.5.4. Evaluation of tracking *asi*

4.5.4.1. The function of tracking *asi*

For each tracking *asi* in my corpus it could be established that it refers across a discourse boundary. The discourse boundary could be indicated by means of a paragraph line (section 4.5.2.1.) or a change from Direct Speech to Narration (section 4.5.2.2.). Contextual indications of change of discourse unit were change of episode (section 4.5.2.3.) or the switch between a digression and the main story line (sections 4.5.3.1. and 4.5.3.2.). In the latter sections the referent of the demonstrative noun phrase is salient. Finally, a demonstrative noun phrase referring to a salient entity may also appear in a new discourse unit which follows linearly upon the preceding unit (section 4.5.3.3.).

Although I subdivided the material into two groups, i.e., demonstratives referring to salient and non-salient entities, the main criterium for using a demonstrative noun phrase is reference across a discourse boundary. This means that saliency alone is not the only factor influencing the choice of referential expression. I even believe that saliency is not important at all in this respect. Only the structure of the discourse influences the choice of a tracking device.

Turning to the use of the distal demonstrative instead of the others, it is clear from the examples in section 4.5. that *asi* etc. always occurs in contexts with a negative emotional load or with a clear indication of ‘belonging to the domain of the Other’. In the latter situation the emotional load is not necessarily negative.

4.5.4.2. Chronological distribution of tracking *asi*

The following table lists the chronological distribution of *asi*.

| | OS | OH | MS | MH | Supp | Murs II | Muw | Hatt III | Tud IV |
|----------------------|----|----|----|----|------|---------|-----|----------|--------|
| nom.s.c. <i>asi</i> | | | | | | + | | + | + |
| acc.s.c. <i>uni</i> | | + | | | | + | | | |
| <i>asi</i> | | | | | | + | | | + |
| <i>unin</i> | | | | | | + | | | |
| n.-a.s.n. <i>eni</i> | | | | | | + | | + | + |
| dat.s. <i>edani</i> | | | | | | + | | | + |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| nom.pl.c. <i>unius</i> | | | | | | + | | | |
| <i>enius</i> | | | | | | | | + | |
| dat.pl. <i>edas</i> | | | | | | + | | + | |

Table 4.8 Chronological distribution of Tracking *asi* etc.

Most attestations of tracking *asi* are encountered in narrative texts and oracles: the majority occurs in the Annals of Mursili II, and in the oracles of Hattusili III and Tudhaliya IV. Luckily we have also an example of copied Old Hittite tracking *uni*. So at least *uni* functioned as a typical demonstrative in Old Hittite.

4.5.4.3. Attention levels and Information Structure

The remarks concerning the pragmatic status of the demonstrative noun phrases have been collected in the following table. Two points must be emphasized. First, there were no examples of Tracking *asi* referring to a referent in the same discourse unit. This is of course not accidental since one of the functions of demonstrative noun phrases is to refer across a discourse boundary. It also explains why argument Focus is absent. Argument Focus is only possible when the rest of the clause is presupposed given the preceding context. This means that the ties between the clauses must be very strong, which is incompatible with reference across discourse boundaries.

The second point is the large number of demonstrative noun phrases occurring on the discourse boundary itself. They occur on a boundary¹⁷⁸ in exx. 4.69, 4.74, 4.77-4.83, 4.85-4.94, 4.96, 4.97. But this was not a criterium for setting the boundaries of the discourse units. In sections 4.5.2.1, 2 and 3 formal markers such as a paragraph line and the presence or absence of the direct speech particle *-war-* were used, and once the propositional content of a clause. But even in the case where only the demonstrative noun phrase indicated a boundary, there were other signs, such as the use of participles or a present tense in an otherwise past narration. (ex. 4.88-90). Moreover, in almost every case there was a clear break in the narration. The relevance of this remarkable distribution will become clearer in the conclusion of the chapter (4.6.5.) when the tracking use will be united with the other demonstrative uses.

| Tracking Use, across node | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------------------|-------|
| Continuity procedure | | | Centering procedure | |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |

¹⁷⁸ I consider a complex sentence as one unit. This means that if a main clause is preceded by a subordinate clause on a discourse boundary, also the main clause is on the boundary.

| | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|---|--------------|--------------|
| <i>asi</i> N | <i>asi</i> N | — | <i>asi</i> N | <i>asi</i> N |
|--------------|--------------|---|--------------|--------------|

Table 4.9: attention levels and information structure of tracking *asi*

4.6. Conclusions

4.6.1. The New Hittite material

It is generally accepted that *asi*, *eni*, *uni* and the obliqui *edani* etc. form a paradigm from Mursili II on (see section 4.1). However, the interpretation of *asi* etc. as an anaphoric pronoun versus the deictics *ka*- and *apa*- cannot be upheld anymore. Summarizing the findings of sections 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5, *asi* etc. turned out to be the distal demonstrative. The distribution of forms and grammatical case in New Hittite is as follows¹⁷⁹:

| | Mursili | Muwatalli | Hattusili | Tudhaliya | NH |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| S | <i>uni</i> (acc.s.c.) <i>ini</i> , <i>eni</i> (n.-a.s.n.) <i>edez</i> (Loc.adverb) | <i>asi</i> (nom.s.c.) <i>eni</i> (n.-a.s.n.) | <i>edez</i> (Loc.adverb) | <i>asi</i> (nom.s.c.) <i>asi</i> (acc.s.c.) <i>edaza</i> (abl.) | <i>asi</i> (nom.s.c.) <i>asi</i> (acc.s.c.) <i>uniyas</i> (gen.s.c.) |
| R | <i>asi</i> (nom.s.c.) | <i>edani</i> (dat.s.) | <i>eni</i> (n.-a.s.n.) | <i>eni</i> (n.-a.s./pl.n.) <i>unius</i> (acc.pl.c.) | <i>asi</i> (acc.s.c.) |
| D | <i>asi</i> , <i>uni</i> (acc.s.c.) <i>eni</i> (n.-a.pl.n.) <i>edas</i> (dat.pl.) | | | <i>eni</i> (n.-a.s.n.) | |
| T | <i>asi</i> (nom.s.c.) <i>asi</i> , <i>uni</i> , <i>unin</i> (acc.s.c.) <i>edani</i> (dat.s.) <i>eni</i> (n.-a.s.n.) <i>unius</i> (nom.pl.c.) <i>uni</i> (acc.pl.c.) <i>edas</i> (dat.pl.) <i>edez</i> (abl.) | | <i>asi</i> (nom.s.c.) <i>eni</i> (n.-a.s.n.) <i>enius</i> (nom.pl.c.) <i>edas</i> (dat.pl.) | <i>asi</i> (nom.s.c.) <i>asi</i> (acc.s.c.) <i>eni</i> (n.-a.s.n.) <i>edani</i> (dat.s.) | |

Table 4.10: Distribution of forms and grammatical case in New Hittite

Before listing the paradigms of Mursili/Muwattalli, Hattusili/Tudhaliya and later, a few forms have to be added whose function could not be discussed because of the broken context. For Hattusili may be added the nom.s.c. *enis* (KUB 31.77 ii 8 (CTH 590) *e-ni-iš* = *uar* = *at* *zašhija* × [“That one [...] it in a dream”) and the ablative *ediz* (KUB 15.3 iv 7’ (CTH 584) ⁷ *mān* = *uar* = *aš* *e-di-iz* G[IG-*az* TI-*ešzi* “If he recovers from that illness, ...”). The only attestation of the distal demonstrative in post-Tudhaliya times is *unis* (ABoT 56 i 21 (CTH

¹⁷⁹ S, R, D and T stand for Situational, Recognitional, Discourse Deictic and Tracking respectively.

256), *nu=ua=mu u-ni-iš* []). There is one other attestation of *unis* in the whole corpus of Hittite texts, KUB 49.56 obv. 13' (CTH 573) : § 13' *u-ni-iš kuiš maršana[ššiš ...*, maybe referring backwards across a discourse boundary to *maršanaššiš* in obv. 6'. The alleged nom.s.c. *u-ni-iš* in a copied Old Hittite text should be canceled in favor of a reading *ki-iš-ša-an* (see 4.6.4.1.).

In the Ullikummi myth the gen.sg. *uniyas* built on the stem *uni-* is attested (ex. 4.12). As with the other forms *unis*, *unin* and *unius* this genitive must be a new form, created as part of the process of replacing an ancient paradigm. I believe to have found the original genitive sg.:

4.100 **KUB 49.70 rev. 20'-21'** (lateNH (?) oracle, CTH 572)

§ 20' [BE-*an=kan*] *kēdani* MU-[*t*]i *e-el* ŠA LÚ URU Azz[i] GIŠ TUKUL ŠÀ KUR.MEŠ URU GIDRU-TI ŪL *uizz*]i¹⁸⁰ DINGIR.MEŠ *aši* LÚ URU Az[zi]^{21'} [.....

[When] in this year [the weapon] of that (*el*) man of Azz[i] does [not come to the lands of Hatti,] (and) the gods [...] that man of Azzi, ...

The sign EL (HZL 307) is a little damaged, but only the upper horizontal is not visible. Given the fact that *asi* occurs adjectively with LÚ URU Az[zi] one expects by analogy that the genitive ŠA LÚ URU Azz[i] is also preceded by the genitive of the distal demonstrative. Although the tablet is very damaged, it is possible that this is a new oracle question. In that case *e-el* is a first mention and therefore Recognitional, with a negative connotation given the context. The construction of *e-el* ŠA LÚ URU Azz[i], i.e., of the adnominal demonstrative followed by an Akkadian prepositional phrase is matched by *e-da-ni*⁴² ANA LÚ KÚR (KBo 4.4 ii 41-42, CTH 61 II), also in combination with an enemy.

The largest collection of different forms of *asi* on one tablet is found in KUB 5.24 + 16.31 + 18.57 (CTH 577) from Hattusili/Tudhaliya, edited by Van den Hout 1995: 245ff.: nom.sg. *asi*, acc.sg. *asi*, *uni*, *unin*, dat.sg. *edani*, nom.pl.c. *unius*, acc.pl.c. *unius*, abl. *ediz*, *etez*.

With these forms added, the paradigms are:

| | Mursili II/Muwattalli | |
|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | singular | plural |
| nom.c. | <i>asi</i> | <i>unius</i> |
| acc.c. | <i>uni(n)</i> , <i>asi</i> | <i>uni</i> |
| nom.-acc.n. | <i>ini</i> , <i>eni</i> | <i>eni</i> |
| gen. | ∅ | ∅ |
| dat. | <i>edani</i> | <i>edas</i> |
| abl. | | <i>edez</i> |
| loc.adv. | | <i>edez(za)</i> , <i>etez</i> |
| Man.adv. | | <i>enissan</i> , <i>enessan</i> |

Table 4.11: The paradigm of *asi* at the time of Mursili II/Muwattalli.

During Mursili's reign the old nom.-acc.neuter *ini* disappears to make place for *eni*. The accusatives *uni*, *unin* and *asi* coexist, with a preference for *uni*. There is only one text in this period where accusative *asi* and *uni* cooccur: KUB 14.17 (CTH 61 II).

¹⁸⁰ Restoration on the basis of KUB 49.70: 10'-11'.

| Hattusili III / Tudhaliya IV and later | | |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------|
| | singular | plural |
| nom.c. | <i>asi, enis, unis</i> | <i>unius, enius</i> |
| acc.c. | <i>uni(n), asi</i> | <i>unius</i> |
| nom.-acc.n. | <i>eni</i> | <i>eni</i> |
| gen. | <i>el, uniyas</i> | ø |
| dat. | <i>edani</i> | <i>edas</i> |
| abl. | <i>edez, edaza, eteza</i> | |
| loc.adv. | <i>edez, eteza</i> | |
| Man.adv. | <i>enissan, enessan</i> | |

Table 4.12: The paradigm of *asi* at the time of Hattusili III/Tudhaliya IV and later.

By the time of Tudhaliya the acc. *asi* has replaced *uni* etc. As said earlier, in one text (KUB 5.24+) the acc.sg. *asi*, *uni* and *unin* cooccur. Besides that, in this period *uni* and *unin* are only attested in KUB 5.24+.

4.6.2. The Middle Hittite material

Does the paradigm already exist in Middle Hittite? The study of the Situational use (4.2, see also the table below) showed that *asi*, *ini* / *eni*, *edani* and *edez* have to be demonstratives, whatever their deictic contrast (a)¹⁸¹. The existence of a non-first person oriented recognitional *uni* and *ini* in original MH proved that *uni* and *ini* had to be non-proximal demonstratives like their New Hittite counterparts (b).

| | MH/MS | MH copy |
|---|--|---|
| S | <i>asi</i> (nom.s.c.) <i>edani</i> (dat.s.) <i>ini</i> (nom.-acc.n.s.) <i>edez</i> (Loc.adverb) | <i>asi</i> (nom.s.c.) <i>edani</i> (dat.s.) <i>ini, eni</i> (nom.-acc.n.s.) |
| R | <i>uni</i> (acc.s.c.) <i>ini</i> (nom.-acc.n.s.) | |
| D | <i>inissan</i> | |
| T | ø | <i>asi</i> (nom.s.c.) <i>edani</i> (dat.s.) |

Table 4.13: Distribution of forms and grammatical case in Middle Hittite.

A further clue for the deictic contrast of the demonstratives is provided by reference of different forms in one text to the same entity.¹⁸² In the copied CTH 431 *asi* and *edani* both refer to a person who is not close to the Speaker. Moreover, the Speaker should be neutral

¹⁸¹ The letters (a), (b) etc. refer to the procedure set out in 4.1.5.

¹⁸² Of course one could imagine that different demonstratives are used for the same entity. In that case the context should be clear whether the emotional stance towards the entity is of importance, and changing. An entity proximal to the Speaker may be referred to by *ka-* to indicate proximity, and by *asi*, to indicate emotional distance. Similarly, an entity distal to the Speaker may be referred to by *asi* to indicate distance, and by *ka-*, to indicate emotional closeness.

towards the patient, so *asi* and *edani* indicate a primary deictic contrast, which is non-proximity. Furthermore, *eni* is used to refer to the illness of the patient. Here it is possible to view the illness with a negative emotional attitude. Thus, in this text the demonstratives *asi*, *edani* and *eni* are all non-proximal demonstratives (c).

Another text in which different forms refer to the same object is the Middle script CTH 480. Here *ini* and *edani* refer to a temple. The distance contrast cannot be deduced from the context, although it is likely that the person uttering the phrases containing these forms is inside the temple. But given the fact that he curses the temple, his emotional stance towards it is very negative. It seems to me that *ini* and *edani* are again distal (c).

Furthermore, we have seen that MH/NS *eni* in ex. 4.10 had to be distal, which was also true for several *asi*-s (CTH 42).

Given these facts the conclusion must be that all these forms belong to one paradigm, the paradigm of the distal demonstrative:

| | Middle Hittite | |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| | singular | plural |
| nom.c. | <i>asi</i> | ∅ |
| acc.c. | <i>uni</i> | ∅ |
| nom.-acc.n. | <i>ini</i> | ∅ |
| gen. | ∅ | ∅ |
| dat. | <i>edani</i> | ∅ |
| abl. | | ∅ |
| loc.adv. | | <i>edez</i> |
| Man.adv. | | <i>inissan</i> |

Table 4.14: The paradigm of *asi* in Middle Hittite.

All Middle Hittite texts in Middle script have neuter *ini*. Only the copied texts show the writing *eni*, which must be the influence of the New Hittite scribes.

Plural forms are not attested, which is not odd given the fact that in New Hittite singular forms are also much more attested than plural forms.

4.6.3. The Old Hittite material

Even less forms are attested in Old Hittite. There are only two forms in Old script, *edi* and *asi*: *edi* is a distal demonstrative but the function of *asi* is very unclear (situational or tracking). The other forms are only attested in copies.

| | OS | OH copy |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| S | <i>edi</i> (loc. adverb) | <i>asi</i> (nom.s.c.) <i>uni</i> (acc.s.c.) <i>ini, eni</i> (nom.-acc.s.n.) <i>edi</i> (loc. adverb) |
| R | ∅ | <i>asi</i> (nom.s.c.) <i>uni</i> (acc.s.c.) <i>ini, i-e-ni</i> (nom.-acc.s.n.) |

| | | |
|--------|---------------------|--|
| D | <i>enessan</i> | ∅ |
| T | ∅ | <i>asi</i> (acc.s.c.) <i>uni</i> (acc.s.c.) |
| T or S | <i>asi</i> (acc.s.) | — |

Table 4.15: Distribution of forms and grammatical case in Old Hittite

There is only one text where different forms cooccur. KUB 43.75 (OH/NS) contains Situational *eni* and *uni* but the context is too vague to understand the use of these forms (b).

We also have both a recognitional and tracking *uni* in the copied CTH 16. The Recognitional *uni* is used in negative context (c). Therefore *uni* is a non-proximal demonstrative in Old Hittite, unless we assume that all the copied texts have replaced an at the time unknown demonstrative by means of the more current distal forms of *asi*. This is unlikely in the view of the original Old Hittite *asi*, although its precise demonstrative function is far from clear. Therefore, the copied forms may be used to represent Old Hittite use. Besides the copied examples cited in this chapter we also have a demonstrative *asi* in Direct Speech in KUB 11.6 iii 11 (OH/NS, CTH 19) *a-ši=man=ua* URU-*aš ammel kišari* “I wish that (*asi*) city were mine!”. The context does not give any clues on the location of the Speaker, but it is reasonable to assume that the Speaker uses a distal demonstrative to refer to a city that is not yet his but somebody else’s (c).

The local adverb *edi* is already a distal deictic demonstrative in Old Script. The replacement of the adverb of relative position *edi* by *edez* took place in Middle Hittite times, before Suppiluliuma I. However, *edi* is also an adjectively used dative-locative in OH/NS KBo 16.49 i 9: *t=uš e-di lūliaš arḫi* LUGAL-*i* [...] ¹⁰ *iškaranzi* “(The cooks seize the sheep) and line them up on the far side (*edi* ... *arḫi*) of the pond [opposite/before] the king” (see CHD L-N: 81, but HW² E 139a differently). For a similar word order ‘adnominal demonstrative - genitive - noun’ see MH/MS KUB 29.7+ rev. 25-26: *edani* ²⁶ DINGIR-LIM-*aš parni andan* “in that house of the deity” (ex. 4.21).

Given that (1) *edi* is a distal demonstrative, (2) that *asi*, *uni* and *eni* are demonstratives given their use in Direct Speech, (3) that both *asi* and *uni* refer to something that does not belong to the domain of the Other or to something negative respectively, I conclude that also in Old Hittite *asi* etc. is the distal demonstrative. Admittedly *aši* in these examples often refers to entities that are present, and therefore probably proximal to the Speaker. But if one should wish to conclude that *aši* was therefore a proximal demonstrative in Old Hittite, changing to a distal one in Middle Hittite, one should also explain the existence of two proximal demonstratives (*ka-* and *aši*) and a medial demonstrative (*apa-*, see chapter 5) in Old Hittite, but no distal one. Furthermore, one should also have to explain the fact that *aši* is never used to denote “this tablet” whereas there are examples for *kā-* in this use in Old Hittite (see chapter 6).

The Old Hittite paradigm is:

| | Old Hittite | |
|-------------|-----------------|--------|
| | singular | plural |
| nom.c. | <i>asi</i> | ∅ |
| acc.c. | <i>asi, uni</i> | ∅ |
| nom.-acc.n. | <i>ini</i> | ∅ |
| gen. | ∅ | ∅ |
| dat.-loc. | <i>edi</i> | ∅ |

| | |
|------------------|----------------|
| abl. loc.adv. | ø edi / idi |
| Man.adv. | enessan |

Table 4.16: The paradigm of *asi* in Old Hittite.

It is important to note that original Old Hittite *asi* appears in object function, whereas copied OH, MH and NH till Mursili generally use *uni* for the accusative besides a few *asi*-s in Mursili's times. The New Hittite cooccurrence of *asi* and *uni* at the time of Tudhaliya IV is therefore not an innovation. The coincidence of the nominative - accusative forms should then already have started in Old Hittite. However, the number of attestations is that small that nothing definitive can be said.

Now it is time to return to the questions formulated in 4.1.5.:

- (i) *Is there enough textual support for a unitary paradigm in the older language phases?*
- (ii) *Is the pronoun/adjective *asi* etc. only an anaphoric demonstrative or deictic or both?*

There is not enough material to present each form in each function in Old Hittite, but there is enough evidence that *asi* etc. functioned as one paradigm in Old Hittite. It is certain that that paradigm belonged to a true distal deictic demonstrative, attested with its other functions as anaphoric and recognitional demonstrative. Not discourse deictic (although we have *enissan*), but that is not surprising given the scarcity of discourse deictic *asi* in general.

4.6.4. An answer to Kammenhuber's criticism

4.6.4.1. *Is *uni* Old Hittite?*

The first objection (see section 4.1.4.) of Kammenhuber against projecting the 13th century paradigm onto earlier language phases was that —according to her— *uni*- is already inflected in OH copy: «*u-ni-l-iš-ša* in KUB 31.64 (+) 64a + KBo 3.55 ii 24'' (CTH 12) (Kammenhuber 1962: 377, see also Laroche 1979: 150). The relevant passage is part of a larger complex of repetitive Direct Speech. The first sequence of Direct Speech which is directed at a group of people including the inhabitants of Habara, is probably preceded by an introduction to the speech in ii 16:

4.101 **KUB 31.64 (+) ii 16-26** (OH/NS narration, Mursili I, CTH 12), ed. De Martino 1995: 285-286, Soysal 1998: 9, 17-18 (emendations with double question marks are mine).

§¹⁶ [nu (??) AN]A LÚ.MEŠ MEŠEDI [U] [keda]š (??) ANA LÚ.MEŠ^{URU} Habara
[memišta (??)]¹⁷ [URU=]KUNU ŪL paḥšan[utte]n^{URU} Habara nu URU=ma[n]¹⁸
[ē]štumati ḫalmašš[uiitti=mi] LUGAL-aš āššu=met [ø]¹⁹ [me]kki kitta a[zzikatten
akk]uškatten [ø]²⁰ [DAM].MEŠ=KUNU DUMU.MEŠ=KUNU ḫ[ušnuttēn apē=m]a
memmi[r]²¹ [k]ā=pat=ua paḥšanu[mmen]× kunanzi [ø]²² [mḫ]anīš^{LÚ} ḫalipī[š
pait]¹⁸³ LUGAL-uš (??) ap]āšila [ø]²³ [URU]Habara pait nu-uš[-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o]n]u
LUGAL-ušš=a [ø]²⁴ [u-ni-l-iš-ša-×[...]×[.....]]²⁵ šumešš=a kui[eš
.....]²⁶ URU=KUNU ŪL [paḥšanuttēn.....]

¹⁸³ See ii 31: LUGAL-ušš=a pait “also the king went.

[He (?) spoke] to the Royal Guards, and [to thes]e (??) people of Habara. [“You] did not protect your [city], Habara. You populate my city. Many goods of mine, of the king, lie [on my] throne. E[at, dri]nk! [Let] your [wife]s and children l[ive!”] But [they] said/refused: [We have] protect[ed th]is place allright! (lit. here). [.....] they kill [...]. Hanis the *halipi* [went and the king (??)] himself went to Habara. ... [.....] and/also the king and that one (*unis* (??)) [...] [“] and you who[are], you] did not [protect] your city.

The lines ii 17-20 contain the speech of the one who calls himself king (ii 18, maybe the father of the king?), or Hani as a messenger of the king, ii 21 the answer of the people of Habara. Then a Hani, the *halipi* does something, which act is followed by someone who himself goes to Habara (ii 22-23). At the end of ii 23 the king appears as subject. According to the opinion of Kammenhuber and Laroche the next clause (ii 24) should start with *u-ni-is-sa*, which gives a complex subject: LUGAL-*uss-a uniss-a* ‘both the king and that one’. The predicate of this clause should contain a verb of speaking since ii 25 already is the speech itself. Moreover, that line probably does not contain the beginning of the Direct Speech given the conjunction *-ya* ‘and’ at the beginning of ii 25. This means that the end of ii 24 at least contains the beginning of the Direct Speech in the form of something like *sumes kuies* NP ‘you who are the Royal guard’, followed by ‘and you who are [the people of Habara ...]’. We have then the unique situation that the king addresses a crowd simultaneously with another person (Hani?). To avoid this, I propose to read ¹*ki*’-*iš-ša-a*[*n* instead of ¹*u-ni*’-*iš-ša* ×[. The U could be the lower ‘Winkelhaken’ of KI, and the lower part of NI could be the lower horizontal of KI. Collation should decide in favor of the one or the other. The adverb of manner *kissan* ‘thus’ would lead to:

4.102 **KUB 31.64 (+) 64a + ii 23-30** (OH/NS narration, Mursili I, CTH 12), ed. De Martino 1995: 286, Soysal 1998: 9

n]u LUGAL-*ušš=a* [ø] ²⁴ ¹*ki*’-*iš-ša-a*[*n* *me-mi-i*]’[*š*]-[*ta šumeš kuieš* LÚ.MEŠ *MEŠEDI* (??)] ²⁵ *šumešš=a* *kui*[*eš* LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU} *Habara* (??)] ²⁶ URU=*KUNU ŪL* [*paḥšanutten*.....] ²⁷ *našma* URU=*KA* ×[..... LUGAL-*aš āššu=met*] ²⁸ *mekki kitt*[*a azzikatten akkuškatten* DAM.MEŠ=*KUNU DUMU.MEŠ*=*KUNU*] ²⁹ *ḥušnutten ape*[=*ma memmir* ...] ³⁰ *kunanzi e=št*[*a*] §

Also the king [sa]id thus: [“You who are the royal guard (?)] and you who[are the people of Habara, you] did not [protect] your city. [...] or your city [.....]. Many [goods of mine, of the king] lie [... ...]. Protect [your wives, your sons]. [But] they [refused/said ...: “]they kill [...]. They [...] §

Given the alternative presented here, *u-ni-iš* should not be incorporated in the Old Hittite paradigm.

4.6.4.2. Does e(-) ‘they’ together with *edani*, etc. build a separate defective paradigm a-?

Kammenhuber’s second objection was that *edani* and the other obliqui of the defective Old Hittite demonstrative pronoun *a-* “is; jener” were understood as Obliqui to *eni* from the time of Mursili II (see Kammenhuber 1975ff.: 38-9 sub *eni*). However, as we have seen in section 4.6., the distal *edani* is attested in Middle Hittite, and the locative adverb of relative position *edi* already in Old script. I concluded that already in Old Hittite *ed-*, *eni* (and *asi* and *uni*)

functioned in one paradigm. However, there is another problem with the pronoun *a-* if we want to follow Kammenhuber.

Another member of the demonstrative pronoun *a-* is according to Kammenhuber the nom.pl.c. *e(-)* ‘they’. If *e(-)* ‘they’ belongs to the distal demonstrative, then we should find some correspondence in use. First I will present the possible attestations of *e(-)*, then I will discuss them in view of the Situational, Recognitional, Discourse Deictic and Anaphoric use. As Kammenhuber noted, all occurrences of *e(-)* are substantives. This excludes the Recognitional and Discourse Deictic use, but possibly also the Anaphoric use. The Recognitional use of a demonstrative requires at least a noun, and only the neuter can be substantively used as a Discourse deictic. Furthermore, all attestations of *e(-)* are Anaphoric. But as the examples in section 4.5 show, there are no attestations of substantive anaphorical *asi* etc. So, unless we assume that only in old Hittite the demonstrative may occur as a substantive in anaphoric use, *e(-)* cannot be part of the demonstrative paradigm. For the sake of the argument I accept for the moment that this might still be the case and that for some reason there is no substantive distal demonstrative in anaphoric use in later times.

But before discussing the use of *e(-)*, it is necessary to sift through the material because not every *e(-)* cited in HW² A belongs there.

Very doubtful is KBo 3.55 ii 7 (OH/NS, CTH 12) *e-e]š-ta katta utir* §. First of all, it is likely that the predicate requires an object: “They brought sthg down from there (*-sta*)”. This object can only be *-e-*, neuter plural. A substantive neuter *e(-)* is not attested although our text could provide the first example. However, as long as the emendation *te-eš-ta* is possible, this example is not to be used.¹⁸⁴

Also useless is KBo 3.28 ii 5 (OH/NS, CTH 9)] ⁵ [*e]-eš-ta* DUMU URUPurušḫandumnan dāir “They took the son of the city Purushandu away”. It is impossible to decide whether *e-eš-ta* is the 3rd person sg. pret. of the verb ‘to be’, or *e(-)* with the local particle *-sta*. Moreover, in HW² E *sub ešta* p. 127 a difference is made between the writing *eš-ta* and *e-eš-ta*, the latter belonging to ‘to be’ (but see below for a counter example).

The only Old script passage is very unclear and probably does not have *e(-)*.

4.103 KBo 22.2 rev. 5’-6’ (OS narrative, CTH 3.1A), ed. Otten 1973: 10-11

šu=ya^{URU} Hattuša ḫengani pāun⁶ Û DUMU.MEŠ^{URU} Zalpa katti=mmi 1 ME
ERÍN^{MEŠ}-za(-) *e-a* natta šu=ya kuit natta akir

Otten l.c. translates ‘(Dennoch?) ging ich nach Hattuša zum Tode und die Einwohner von Zalpa bei mir, (sind) das nicht einhundert Mann, die doch nicht omgekommen sind?’ Otten distinguishes two clauses: Û DUMU.MEŠ^{URU} Zalpa katti=mmi and 1 ME ERÍN^{MEŠ}-za(-) *e-a* natta. If *e-a* is to be parsed as *e-* + *-ia*, then *-ia* must be ‘too’: ‘But the sons of Zalpa with me, are they too not a hundred soldiers?’ However, the use of *-ya* indicates comparison with another group of 100 men. This comparison cannot be derived from the context. A different solution is to read the sequence *-za-e-a* as *-za=ia*, resulting in one clause: Û DUMU.MEŠ^{URU} Zalpa katti=mmi 1 ME ERÍN^{MEŠ}-za=ia natta ‘And are there not the sons of Zalpa with me, and 100 soldiers?’ The whole passage reads now: ‘I went to Hattusa to death! (meaning: I thought I should die because of a curse) But are there not the sons of Zalpa with me, and 100 soldiers, since there was no dying?’ (But see: it didn’t work!).

¹⁸⁴ See Rieken 1999 for *ta* concluding a discourse unit.

Three broken but real attestations of *e(-)* are KUB 31.64+ 64a ii 30 (OH/NS, CTH 12), KBo 3.38 obv. 15 (OH/NS, CTH 3), and KBo 12.3 iii 10 (OH/NS, CTH 2). KBo 12.3 iii 10': ^{10'} *e-eš-[ta]* *anijair* ÉRIN.MEŠ-ŠU ×[is too broken to say anything conclusive. All that can be said is that *e(-)* is substantively used, either as a subject or as an object. KUB 31.64+ 64a ii 30 has more context: *ape[=ma memmir ...]* ³⁰ *kunanzi eš-t[a]* § "[But] they [refused/said They] kill [...]. They [...] off." If this passage is parallel to the earlier Direct Speech, then *kunanzi* is the last word of the speech. The possibly plural com. *e(-)* could refer in that case to the Speakers, crossing a unit of Direct Speech. This behaviour might be in line with anaphorically used demonstratives, but there are also some examples of the accented pronoun *apa-* crossing a Direct Speech unit. In that case *e-* could be an emphatic anaphoric pronoun and not a distal demonstrative. On the other hand, the Direct Speech might continue as well.

A substantive *e(-)* occurs in KBo 3.38 obv. 15: *Alluwašš=[a]* ^{1 4'} [*hu*]llanzanni=pat BA.ÚŠ ŠA ×[] URU^{15'} *Zalp[a ...]* ^{15'} [*hu*]llit *eš-ta* I ŠUŠI É[.HI.A *dāir* (?)]. "And Alluwa [...]. [he] died in that same [r]evolt. Zalpa won the battle [...] of [...]. They [took ?] 60 households away." This tentative translation seems to do justice to the anaphoric relations in these clauses. If Zalpa is not the Subject in i 14', then *e(-)* would be without referent unless some plural entity is hidden in the breaks in 14'. It is also possible that *e(-)* is used adjectively to the 60 houses, 'those 60 houses'. In that case the 60 houses should have been mentioned before.

One of the clearer attestations is KBo 3.34 ii 34 (OH/NS, CTH 8): ³³ *mān* LUGAL-*uaš* *peran šieškanzi kuiš ḥazzizzi nu=šše* GEŠTIN-an *akuuanna pianzi* ³⁴ *e-az* [ÉR]IN LUGAL *kuiš natta=ma ḥazzizzi nu=šše iyara* GAL-ri *pianzi* 'Whenever they shoot before the king, if anyone hits the mark, they give him wine to drink, and he/they is/are [soldi]er(s) of the king. But if anyone does not hit the mark, they give him *iyara* in a cup.' The form *e-az* provides a clue for the possible interpretation. We should expect *e-ez* for *e-* with the reflexive *-z*, so the vowel *-a-* probably marks the particle *-ya*, resulting in *e-(y)a-z*. If *-ya* indicates 'and', the clause should be coordinated to the clause 'they give him wine to drink' and have a similar structure. An important criterium is that both clauses can trade places without disrupting the semantics of the construction (see Chapter 7). This seems possible indeed. But in that case a switch from singular *-se* to plural *e(-)* is not at all expected, so we have to assume that *e(-)* is singular. The other option is that *-ya* means 'also'. But also then *e(-)* is more likely to be singular. Although *e(-)* is often interpreted as plural, not one of the other examples provides conclusive evidence for plural. But whatever its number, this use of *e(-)* does not correspond with any of the anaphoric uses of *asi*. Instead, the particle *-ya* allows another interpretation: *e(-)* is an accented anaphoric pronoun, similar in function to *apa-*. Since it only occurs in the oldest texts (CTH 2, 3, 8, 12) I wonder whether accented *e(-)* is a remnant of an earlier accented anaphoric paradigm, which was already in prehistoric Hittite being replaced by accented anaphoric *apa-*.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁵ One could imagine the following development: originally there were three demonstratives **ka-*, **apa-*, **asi*, of which **asi* slowly grammaticalized as an accented pronoun besides being used as a distal demonstrative (for the emergence of third person pronouns from demonstratives see Diessel 1999: 120). Anaphoric **asi* might have lost its deictic marker *-i* in the process, thus leading to the following system: three demonstratives **ka-*, **apa-*, **asi* and an accented pronoun **ás*. The next step might be further grammaticalization of accented **ás* to unaccented or clitic **-as*. With the resulting loss of an accented pronoun the second person demonstrative **apa-* came to take over that position. It is possible that the oldest texts still have *e* as a residue of the accented pronoun and that not too long before Hittite was written down the demonstrative *apa-* was 'installed' as the

4.6.4.3. The so-called useless vocabularies

As discussed in section 4.1, the vocabulary fragments KUB 3.99 ii 18 (*asis*) and KBo 1.42 iii 35 (*enis*) were discarded by Laroche 1979: 148: “*asis*, l’hapax de vocabulaire [...], est une fabrication artificielle sans valeur linguistique” (also see Kammenhuber 1975ff. p. 39 sub *eni*, p. 400 sub *asi*). Although the form *asis* may be forced through too much *Systemzwang* by the writer of the vocabulary, it is still possible to compare its function with the Sumerian and Akkadian demonstratives.

The clearest vocabulary is:

4.104 **KBo 1.50 + KUB 3.99 ii 18-19** (Erim-hus, Lexical list, CTH 301), ed. Güterbock & Civil 1985: 121-122)

| | Sumerian ¹⁸⁶ | Babylonian | Hittite | |
|----|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|------------|
| 18 | ne.re | <i>ul-lu[-u]</i> | <i>a-ši-iš</i> | “that one” |
| 19 | ne.re.re | <i>an-nu[-u]</i> | <i>ka-a-aš</i> | “this one” |

The Babylonian non-proximal demonstrative (‘Dort-Deixis’, Von Soden 1969: 47, § 45.2) *ullû* ‘jener’ corresponds with *ašiš*, the Babylonian proximal demonstrative (‘Hier-Deixis’, Von Soden o.c., p. 46, § 45.1) *annû* ‘dieser’ corresponds with *kas*. If the Babylonian evidence had been taken seriously, the distal demonstrative function of at least *aši* could have been established already very early. Güterbock l.c. actually already translated *ašiš* with “that one”, without commentary.

4.6.5. Information structure and attention levels

Entities in the speech surroundings are either salient or not-salient. When the entity was salient, the pronoun *asi* was used. When the entity was not salient a demonstrative description *asi N* had to be used. Salient entities could be Established or Unestablished Topic (4.2.5.3.). The lack of *asi* in Argument Focus is coincidental.

When an entity is not present in the speech situation but already familiar to the Addressee, the Speaker could use *asi N* with a modifier to bring it under the attention of the Addressee (‘You know, that store across the road ...’). Such entities are necessarily not salient, and Focus (4.3.3.3.). Recognition *asi* was often found on discourse nodes, i.e., at the beginning of a new discourse unit.

Propositional contents are hardly ever salient. When they are not salient, demonstratives have to be used to bring them in the center of attention. Also discourse deictic *enissan* and *asi* generally occurred on a discourse node. Discourse deictic expressions usually link to a piece of discourse but do not make that discourse a topic for further comment. The discourse deictic expressions are therefore only part of the Focus domain (4.4.5.).

Tracking *asi N* could be used to refer to both salient and non-salient entities. Tracking *asi N* referring to non-salient entities occurred usually on discourse nodes, whereas *asi N* referring to a salient entity set up a new node on its own account. Thus, tracking *asi N* was intimately connected with discourse nodes: whether salient or not salient, they referred to

accented pronoun. From this point of view *apa-* indeed replaced a pronoun that was ultimately related to *asi* but it never replaced *asi* itself as Kammenhuber and Laroche imagined.

¹⁸⁶ The Sumerian forms *ne-re* and *ne-re-re* are mistakenly equated with *ullu* and *annu* respectively (Woods 2001: 215-216). The Hittites obviously followed the Babylonian sequence.

something in a preceding discourse unit (4.5.4.). Argument Focus was not attested with Tracking *asi N*. This is explained by the fact that *asi N* occurs in a new unit. But AF is only possible *within* a unit because it requires at least the presupposition of the verb, which is only derivable from the immediate *salient* context. And as we know, discourse boundaries lower the saliency of the preceding discourse entities.

The discourse node seemed to be crucial for Discourse deixis and Anaphora. In all cases *asi N* referred across a node, either forward or backward. From this pattern one can conclude that the demonstrative noun phrase (demN) is necessary in order to link rather unrelated domains with each other. In case of Situational use the demN links the discourse domain to the world, in case of Recognitional use it links the discourse domain to shared information stored in the memory of the Addressee. Within the discourse itself, in case of Discourse Deixis the demN links to the contents of an old or new unit, and in case of Anaphora, demN links to a previous discourse entity in another discourse unit. The demonstrative *asi* on the other hand could only be used when the entity it referred to was already salient. I assume that in this situation the discourse is only a natural continuation of what was signalled by non-linguistic means. Thus, the signalling in the speech situation and the linguistic signalling form one ‘discourse unit’.

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | continuity procedure | | | centering procedure | |
| | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| Situational | <i>asi</i> | <i>asi</i> | ∅ | — | <i>asi N</i> <i>edi / edez</i> |
| Recognitional | — | — | — | — | <i>asi N</i> |
| Discourse Deictic | — | — | — | — | <i>eni, asi N,</i> <i>enissan</i> |
| Tracking | <i>asi N</i> | <i>asi N</i> | — | <i>asi N</i> | <i>asi N</i> |

Table 4.17: The *asi* matrix

5. The medial demonstrative *apa-*

5.1. Status Quaestionis

5.1.1. Introduction

In the preceding Chapter I concluded that *asi* etc. was the distal demonstrative besides proximal *ka-*, forcing *apa-* out of the position which it held since the beginning of Hittite studies. But that does not necessarily mean that *apa-* is ousted from the deictic system. Instead, it is now limited to the medial position in a person-based system, and it still remains the emphatic pronoun *par excellence*. In this chapter I will concentrate on the deictic value of *apa-*, and leave a detailed discussion of the emphatic use of *apa-* to chapters 7, 8 and 9.

5.1.2. Previous literature on the deictic force of *apa-*

As noted above, the general opinion on the deictic system is that it consists of only two terms, *ka-* ‘this’ and its opposite *apa-* ‘that’. In this section I will collect the remarks on the deictic force of *apa-*, but one has to keep in mind that there has never been an elaborate discussion of the function of *apa-*. Sometimes the place of *apa-* in the Hittite deictic system is compared with the Latin system, but since that system is still under discussion, this habit should immediately be discarded.

The opinions differ on whether *apa-* has both Du- and Jener-deixis or only Jener-deixis¹⁸⁷. Friedrich 1991: 24, and 1960: § 111 (p. 66), § 251 (p. 134-135) translated *apa-* with “jener, er, der betreffende; *is*”, but also allowed Du-Deixis (§ 111, § 251) in KUB 21.1 iii 4 (CTH 76, see ex. 5.39)), and also in *ka* ‘hier bei mir’, versus *apiya* ‘dort bei dir’ (or ‘dort bei ihm’) (§ 251, p. 135). Friedrich is followed by Puhvel 1984: 86: “that (one); thy, thine, your(s) (vs. *ka-* ‘this; my mine’, like Lat. *iste* vs. *hic*)”. According to Puhvel *apa-* corresponds in meaning to Lat. *is, iste, ille*, vs. *hic*. Kammenhuber HW² A: 141b explicitly rejected the Du-deixis of *apa-*, whereas Kronasser (1956: 147) translates *apa-* with “*is*” but notes that it has Du-Deixis: “(mit Du-Deixis wie Lat. *iste*)”.

¹⁸⁷ Hrozný 1917: 137 translated *apa-* with “der, dieser, jener, er”, with unclear deixis therefore. With the knowledge at that time available he concluded that the semantic distinctions of the demonstratives were completely bleached: “auch sonst erscheinen die Bedeutungsunterschiede zwischen den einzelnen Demonstrativa im Hethitischen sehr stark verwischt, wohl wiederum ein Anzeichen für fremdsprachige Einflüsse auf das Hethitische.” (o.c. 134 n. 1). Forrer 1922: 208 only saw the emphatic use of *apa-* which he translated with “derselbe”. He must have come to this translation because *apa-* indeed often refers to a preceding discourse entity without interference from another entity.

No distinction whatsoever has been made between the anaphoric and deictic uses of *apa-*. As a result, there were no means to distinguish between emphatic and non-emphatic *apa-* or between “Du-deixis” or “Jener-Deixis”. Neither has the difference between the demonstrative pronoun *apa-* and the demonstrative adjective *apa-* received any attention. In this Chapter I will follow the pattern set out in the previous chapter on *asi* in order to address these questions and others.

5.2. The Situational Use of *apa-*

5.2.1. Introduction

In order to show that *apa-* is related to the Addressee, there are two environments to investigate, True Situational Use (5.2.2.) and Direct Speech (5.2.3.) In both cases I cite all examples in my corpus that obey the following restriction. The demonstrative *apa-* is a first mention. For Direct Speech needs to be added that the referent of *apa-* is present in the speech situation.

5.2.2. True Situational Use

Only those occurrences of *apa-* without any preceding reference to an entity or location are considered situational or deictic. In all attestations of truly situational *apa-*, the demonstrative refers to the location of the Addressee, independent of the distance of the Addressee to the Speaker. This means that the medial term depends on person and not on distance. The exclusive connection of Situational *apa-* with the Addressee has not been noted before.

There are no certain attestations of truly situational *apez(za)* indicating relative position in my corpus. The next example is the only one that might belong to this class, although *kezza* and *apezza* might be simply ablatives ‘fight from there’, instead of ‘fight on that side’.

5.1 KBo 16.47 obv. 9’ (MH/MS treaty, CTH 28), ed. Otten 1967: 56

[*n=*u]š ^dUTU-ŠI *ke-e-ez-za zahhijami zik=uš a-pé-ez-za zahhija*

I, My Majesty, shall fight [t]hem from here (from my place, *kezza*), *you* must fight them from there (from your place, *apezza*).¹⁸⁸

The preceding lines discuss the possibility of hostile actions of the troops of Ura and Mutamutasi, the referents of *-us* ‘them’. If *apez* were to refer anaphorically to their location, the Addressee must be part of that location. In order to ‘fight them from there’, the Addressee has to leave his location, removing himself from the enemy which he is supposed to fight. Thus, *apez* is not anaphoric, but deictic (or situational) and therefore refers to the location of the Addressee. In the case of *apez* as adverb of relative position the problem of anaphoric versus deictic reference is non-existent. If *apez* were to mean ‘fight them on their side’ versus ‘fight them on my side’, there would be no one in between to fight.

¹⁸⁸ Similarly KBo 16.47 obv. 11’-12’.

Besides possibly relative position *apez(za)* can denote the ‘Source from which’:

- 5.2 **HKM 56 obv. 7-10** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 224-225
 § ⁷ *ammel* [k]uit ^{LÚ}TEMU ⁸ *a-pé-ez* uit ŠEŠ.DÙG.GA=YA=ma=mu ⁹ *aššul kuuat ŪL*
¹⁰ *ḥatrāeš* §
 Given that my messenger came from there (from your place, *apez*), why have you, my dear brother, not written (your) greetings to me?

The locative adverb *apiya* ‘there’ refers always to the location of the Addressee when there is no textual antecedent¹⁸⁹. In the next example the enclitic pronoun *-smas* ‘you (pl.)’ strengthens the medial interpretation of *apa-*:

- 5.3 **HKM 18 left edge 2-5** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 148-149
² *ḥalkiš=(š)maš a-pí-ia anijanza* ³ *kuit nu EGIR-an tiḡatten* ⁴ *n=an anda ēpten*
*n=an=kan ARÀḪ-ḫi*¹⁹⁰ ⁵ *anda išḫūitten nu ANA dU[TU-ŠI ḥatrāten]*
 Now, given that the grain has been sown over there (*apiya*) with you (pl.), you must lend a hand! You must collect it, shed it in a silo, and [write] to [My] Ma[jesty.]

- 5.4 **HKM 16: 5-15** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 142-143
 § ⁵ *maḥḥ[a]n=š(a)maš* ⁶ *kāš tuppianza* ⁷ *anda uemizzi* ⁸ *nu MAḪAR dUTU-ŠI* ⁹
liliuaḥḥūanzi ¹⁰ *ūnništen*
 § ¹¹ *mān ŪL=ma* ¹² *nu=šmaš=šan* ¹³ *uḡanzi* ¹⁴ *a-pí-ia pedi* ¹⁵ *tašuaḥḥanzi* § (end of letter)
 When this tablet reaches you, you must drive quickly to My Majesty. But if not, they shall come to blind you over there (where you are, *apiya*), on the spot (*pedi*)¹⁹¹!

- 5.5 **KUB 21.38 obv. 10'-12'** (NH letter, Hattusili III, CTH 176), ed. Edel 1994: 216-217, emendation follows Singer 1998: 538.
^{10'} É KUR ^{URU}HATTI=za ŠEŠ=YA GIM-an šakti n=at=za ammuḫ ŪL ša[ggahḫi n=at arḫa a]rnuḡan É-e[r] ^{11'} *āšta=ma=kan kuit n=at=kan mUrḫi-dU-upaš ANA DINGIR.GAL pešta nu m[Urḫi-d]U-uppaš kuit a-pí-ia* ^{12'} *n=an punuš mān kišan mān ŪL kišan*
 As you, my brother, know (well) the House of Hatti, do I not kn[ow] it (too)? [It is] a [t]ransferred house. That which remained however, Urhi-Tessub gave it to the Great God. Given the fact that [Urhi]-Tessub (is) there (with you; *apiya*), ask him, whether (it is) so, or whether (it is) not so!

Finally, there is a situational *apa-* + N referring to the Addressee¹⁹²:

¹⁸⁹ The other attestations of truly situational *apiya* besides the ones presented here are **MH** HKM 14 lower edge 13, HKM 19 lower edge 30, HKM 21 obv. 5, HKM 52 obv. 10, HKM 68 rev. 13 (letters, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199). There is not one example of non-anaphoric *apiya* that does not refer to the Addressee.

¹⁹⁰ Alp reads ARÀḪ-ten. The sign is however clearly a ḪI with four ‘Winkelhaken’, whereas TEN only has three. The translation should be adjusted accordingly.

¹⁹¹ For *pedi* and *pedi-ssi* as ‘on the spot’, see CHD P 341-2.

- 5.6 **HKM 4 obv. 4-9** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 124-127
 §⁴ *a-pé-e-[d]a-[n]i KUR-e* §⁵ Š[A GE]ŠTIN ŠA GUD.ḪI.A UDU.ḪI.A §⁶ *uttar kui[t]* §⁷
maḥḥan nu=[m]u §⁸ *liliḡaḥḥūanz[i]* §⁹ *ḥatrāi* §§
 Write to me hastily how the situation of wine, cattle, sheep is in that (*apedani*)
country (of yours).

5.2.3. Direct Speech

5.2.3.1. Introduction

The criterium for inclusion of *apa-* (+N) in the category of Direct Speech is first mention, with the further restriction that the Direct Speech is not part of a larger citation. Both non-first mention and citation from a larger part of text are not necessarily deictic. For more information on these criteria see 3.1.3. and 4.2.3.

The major problem with *apa-* in Direct Speech is that besides being simply Situational it may also be emphatic, indicating for example a Contrastive Topic or Focus (see chapters 7, 8 and 9). The question is, does the Topic or Focus status overrule the choice for proximal *ka-*, distal *asi* or a possibly medial *apa-*? The following examples show that the Topic or Focus status are not reserved for *apa-* but can also occur with Situational *ka-* and *asi*. For *ka-* as Focus pronoun I repeat from chapter 6 ex. 6.24 as:

- 5.7 **KBo 14.12 iv 35-39** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40), ed. Güterbock 1956: 98
³⁵ [k]aruḡiliḡaz=*ḡa*=*kan* URUḤattušaš³⁶ [UR]UMizrašš=*a* ištarni=*šummi* āššīḡanteš
³⁷ [e]šir kinuna=*ḡa*=*nnaš*=*kan* ki-i-ḡa ištarni=*šu*[mmi]³⁸ [kiš]at nu=*ḡa*=*kan* KUR
 URUḤATTI KUR URUMizr[i=ḡa]³⁹ [ukt]uri namma ištarni=*šummi* āššīḡ[anteš] §§
 “Of [o]ld, Hattusa and Egypt [w]ere friendly with each other. Today, this too (*ki=ya*)
 has occurred amongst us. The lands of Hatti [and] Egypt[t] will continue [to be]
 friendly with each other [for]ever!”

And from Chapter 4 I adduce ex. 4.11 with *asi* as Contrastive Topic pronoun:

- 5.8 **KBo 5.3 + ii 36-38** (MH/NS treaty, CTH 42), ed. Friedrich 1930: 116-117
 ... nu kiššan teši ammuk=*ḡa*=*za* l[i]ḡnganuḡanza³⁷ nu=*ḡa* ŪL kuitki memaḥḥi
 i[ḡami=ḡ]a=*ḡa* ŪL kuitki³⁸ a-šī=*ma*=*ḡa* [ma]ḥḡan ḡe[zzi QATAMMA] ḡeddu
 ... and you say as follows: “I am sworn in, (so) I do not say anything (evil) and also, I
 do not *do* anything (evil either). But he (*asi*) will do as he likes (Lit.: Now, as *he*
 does, let him do likewise).”

The next example has to be contrasted with the preceding two.

- 5.9 **KUB 26.12+ ii 29-35** (lateNH instruction, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.1), ed. Von
 Schuler 1957: 25

¹⁹² And possibly another attestation in HKM 53 obv. 5 (MH letter, CTH 199).

§ ²⁹ *namma apāt kuit ēššatteni nu* KUR.KUR.ĤI.A ³⁰ BAL [d]apianda l-ētta
naiškittin ³¹ *nu* K[UR.KUR].ĤI.A LÚKÚR *daššanuškittin* ³² KUR.KUR URUĤATTI=*ma*
mališkunuttin ³³ *nu apāt memiškatteni mān=ua=nnaš* ³⁴ *nakkešzi nu=ua=kan a-*
pé-e-da-ni EGIR-a[nd]a ³⁵ *tijaŋeni*

Furthermore, why are you doing *that*: You have united all the rebellious lands, you have strengthened the lands of the enemy, while you have weakened the countries of Hatti, and you say *that*: “If it becomes difficult for us, we will join that one (*apedani*) instead”, ...

The Addressees are the persons that have to take an oath of loyalty on the new king, Tudhaliya IV. But their acts have not been very loyal, and they even plan to change sides when troubles arise. In their speech they refer to the enemy by means of *apedani* in Replacing Focus (see chapter 8), a first mention.

The difference with the other examples is that we know that the event occurs in the here-and-now (ex. 5.7), or that the referent is certainly not present (ex. 5.8). For ex. 5.9 however, the location of *apedani* cannot be established. This could mean that Focal *apa-* is used in Direct Speech when the location of the referent is not relevant. To avoid ‘contamination’, I will therefore only discuss attestations of *apa-* in Direct Speech when the referent of *apa-* can be located in space with a reasonable certainty. In other words, when *apa-* is really Deictic.

5.2.3.2. The demonstrative pronoun *apa-* and adverb *apiya*

The locative adverb *apiya* appears also in Direct Speech denoting the location of the Addressee:

- 5.10 **KUB 19.5 +: 24-27** (NH letter, Muwattalli, CTH 191), ed. Houwink ten Cate 1983-84: 39

k[in]una=kan GIM-an ^mGaššūš ²⁵ [*kā anda*] *āraš* ^mKupanta-d_L[AMMA-aš=*m*]a
 ANA ^mAtpā IŠPUR ²⁶ [LÚ.MEŠŠARIPUT]^{HIA}=ua *kuēš* ŠA ^dU[TU-ŠI] *a-pí-ia* ²⁷
 [*nu=uar=aš arḥa t*]arni

Now, after Gassus had arrived [here], Kupanta-K[urunta] wrote to Atpa: “[The ŠARIPUT]U-men of His Majesty that are there (with you) (*apiya*), release [them]!”

In the next example the referent of *apun* is clearly present (already discussed as ex. 3.9):

- 5.11 **KBo 19.44+ rev. 38-42** (MH/MS treaty, CTH 42), transl. Beckman 1996: 28

^mMarijaš *kuiš ēšta n=aš kuedani uddanī* ³⁹ BA.ÚŠ ŪL ^fS UḤUR.LAL ^fiḥattat
apāš=a=kan anda aušzi ⁴⁰ ABI ^dUTU-ŠI=*ma=kan imma* GIŠAB-az *arḥa aušzi*
n=an uaštul IŠBAT ⁴¹ *zik=ua=kan a-pu-u-un* *anda kuuat aušta n=aš apēdani*
uddanī ⁴² *šer* BA.ÚŠ

Who was Mariya, and for what reason did he die? Did not a lady’s maid walk by? So he makes eye contact (with her), while, of all people, the father of the His Majesty

looks out the window¹⁹³, and catches him in the act: “You! why did you make eye contact with her (*apun*)?” So for *that* reason he died.

Obviously the woman is near the Addressee. The same is probably true of the following Old Hittite example where again *zik* ‘you’ and *apas* ‘he’ are combined.

5.12 **KBo 22.1: 16’-21’** (OS instruction, CTH 272)

^{16’} *mān ABI tulijaš ḫalzai nu=šmaš* ^{17’} *gullakkuṽan šaḫzi natta* ^{18’} LÚ.MEŠ *NAŠI*
^{19’} LÚ.MEŠ *NAŠI ŠIDITI=KUNU dameškatteni* ^{20’} *ta LUGAL-i*
kardimijattuš piškatteni §
^{21’} *zikk=a=ṽa* ^{GIŠ} TUKUL *a-pa-aš-ša* ^{GIŠ} TUKUL

When my father summons to the assembly, he will investigate your corrupt behaviour¹⁹⁴, not your provision bearers: “Look, you (pl.) always oppress your provision bearers, and therefore always give the king fits of anger”. § “Both you (sg.) and he (*apass=a*) are workers!”

It seems that the personnel is around when the king calls his assembly together. Could it be possible that each member of the assembly has his own staff at hand? In that case the demonstrative *apa-* could refer to a servant in the vicinity of the Addressee.

A final collection of Situational *apa*-s in Direct Speech is found in the substitute ritual for Tudhaliya III, edited by Taracha 2000. The interesting aspect of these occurrences is that *apa-* is each time found in the vicinity of *ka-*. An example which is cited by both CHD Š: 29 and Puhvel A: 90 is

5.13 **KUB 7.10 i 1-5** (MH/NS ritual, Tudhaliya III, CTH 448), ed. Kümmel 1967: 129-130

¹ *kāša<ṽa> apēdani uddani* ² *pedi kūš tarpalliēš* ³ *karū arandari* ⁴ *nu=ṽa=za*
ku-u-uš šikten a-pu-u-uš=ṽa=za ⁵ *namma lē šekteni* ...

“See! On account of that matter these substitutes are already standing (here) in place. Take note of these (*kus*) (i.e., the substitutes)! But don’t take note of them (*apus*) (i.e., the king and queen) anymore!” ...

The CHD o.c. translates “Take note of these (latter). But don’t take note of those (earlier) ones anymore”. The “latter ... the earlier” is very close to “the latter ... the former”, which is a common translation for contrastively used demonstratives in discourse (see 2.3.4.2.). The first problem with this translation is that *apus* does not refer within the direct speech.

The second problem is that ‘the latter ... the earlier’ implies that both *kus* and *apus* are referring to substitutes. That *apa-* refers to the king (and queen) instead is illustrated through the parallel KUB 42.94 + HHT 80 rev. 10’-12’ (Taracha 2000: 50-51): ^{10’} *kāša=ṽa apēdaš kattan* [*k(arū kūš)*] ^{11’} *tarpalliš ara[(nt)]ari nu=ṽa=za kū[(š šekten)]* ^{12’} LUGAL-*un=ma=ṽa=za lē [(namma š)]ekteni* “Look, in *their* place (*apedas kattan*) are already standing these substitutes. Take note of *these*, but do [n]ot take note of the king anymore”.

The final problem with the translation of the CHD is that the deictic contrasts in the discourse “the one ... the other, the former ... the latter” are not expressed by *ka-* ... *apa-*, as

¹⁹³ Beckman 1996: 28 different: “Did not a lady’s maid walk by and he look at her? But the father of My Majesty himself looked out the window ...”.

¹⁹⁴ The translation follows CHD Š p. 164b.

Latin *hic ... ille*, but by *ka- ... ka-* (see 6.7.) or *apa- ... apa-* (7.2.4.1.). Whatever contrast there is depends on the situation, not on the discourse.

The next question is whether the use of *apa-* is triggered by the fact that some entity in the surroundings is emphatically referred to because it is in Focus, thereby overruling an otherwise used deictic demonstrative (*ka-* or *asi*), or whether *apa-* indeed denotes some kind of distance or person based contrast besides Focus. If only the first option would be valid, then we would not find Focal *ka-* or *asi* for they would have been replaced by *apa-*. The fact that *ka-* and *asi* can occur as Focus or Unestablished Topic proves that *apa-* does not necessarily replace them but has a deictic value of its own in Direct Speech.

It is impossible to decide at what distance the King and Queen stand from the Speaker, but we know one thing. The King and Queen are somehow unfavorably looked upon by the deity. They are considered as part of the cognitive space of the (angry) Addressee, and I believe that that is indicated by means of *apa-*. In contrast with this, the Speaker uses *ka-* to indicate that the substitutes are part of his own cognitive domain.

There is one example in my corpus where *apa-* in connection with a proposition might be related to the Addressees, the oracle inquirers:

5.14 **KUB 22.70 obv. 36-38** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 62-63

³⁶ *AWAT mPallā=ia IQBI MUNUS.LUGAL=ua IQBI ANA mPallā=ua kuit ammuk peškinun* ³⁷ *nu=uar=at=za DINGIR-LIM šāk mPallānn=a=ua=kan EGIR-an ijaḥḥut LÚ.MEŠ TAPPI^{HLA} mPallā=ma punuššuuen* ³⁸ *nu memir a-pu-u-un=ua memian ŪL šekkueni*

..., and that she said about the case of Palla: “The queen said: ‘whatever *I* have given to Palla, you, o god, must note it and you must go after Palla.’ ” We questioned the associates of Palla. They said: “We do not know about that (*apun*) case (you just told us about).”

5.2.4. Linguistic Selfreference

Expressions referring to an entity containing that expression as ‘In this dissertation I claim ...’ are not attested for *apa-*. As explained in 3.1.4., linguistic selfreference is only expressed by *ka-*.

5.2.5. Summary and conclusions

The strict application of the criterium of first mention has led to the observation that in first mention the demonstrative *apa-* referred to the Addressee and never to the Other. This changes when *apa-* is used anaphorically (see 4.2.2. for that discussion). The failure to distinguish between Situational and Anaphoric reference in the past has led scholars to believe that *apiya* and *apa-* were simply the non-proximal demonstratives and that they could freely be used to refer to both Addressee and Other.

Not surprisingly the situationally used *apa-* is only found in letters, treaties, instructions and Direct Speech. All these genres have an active Addressee.

In all examples the referents of *apa-* were in the center of attention before they were mentioned in the Direct Speech (besides maybe ex. 5.14). The referents of *apa-* in ex. 5.11

and 5.13 are probably Established Topics. In ex. 5.11 because the fact that there is a relation between Mariya and the woman is pragmatically clear. The king simply questions the *type* of relation. Ex. 5.13 could be paraphrased as: ‘but as for *them*, don’t take note of them’. There is a Topic switch, and *apus* is the Unestablished Topic. In ex. 5.12 *apass=a* was Expanding Focus (see chapter 7). The locative adverb is never in the center of attention here, and never a Topic.

| Deictic / Situational Use | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|
| Continuity procedure | | | Centering procedure |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus |
| ∅ | <i>apa-</i> | <i>apa-</i> | <i>apez, apiya</i> |

Table 5.1: The Deictic *apa-* matrix.

5.3. The Recognitional Use of *apa-*

Usually the distal demonstrative *asi* is used in order to introduce an element into the discourse that is Hearer old (see also 2.3.1.2. (general), 3.2 (Hittite), 4.3 (*asi*) and 6.3 (*ka-*)) for a discussion of the recognitional use of demonstratives). In my corpus there is only one¹⁹⁵ clear Recognitional *apa-*:

- 5.15 **KUB 15.1 iii 7’-13’** (NS vow, Hattusili III, CTH 584), ed. De Roos 1984: 186, 328-329
- § 7’ [Û-TUM MUNUS.LUGA]L INIM ^dGur_uaš_u=kan ku_uapi [anda] 8’
^{[d}Gu]r_uaš_uš=kan GIM-an ŠÀ Û-TI 9’ [AN]A MUNUS.LUGAL IQBI a-pu-u-un=ua kuin
 10’ ŠA ^LÚ MUDI=KA INIM-an ZI-za ḫarti 11’ nu=uar=aš TI-anza 1 ME
 MU.KAM.ḪI.A=ia=ua=šši 12’ piḫhi MUNUS.LUGAL=ma=za=kan ŠÀ Û-TI kišan
 IKRUB 13’ mān=ua=mu apēniššuyan iiaši 14’ nu=ua LUGAL MUDI=YA TI-anza ...
 [Dream of the Queen]: When the affair of Gurwasu [.....], after [Gu]rwasu had said [to] the Queen in a dream: “As for that (*apun*) situation of your husband which has your attention, he shall live and I will give him a 100 years”, the Queen promised as follows in a dream: “If you do like *that*, and the King, my husband shall live, ...

All the requirements for the recognitional use are fulfilled. The demonstrative is adnominal, the referent of the demonstrative phrase is not present at the deictic center, and the knowledge contained in the phrase is private knowledge. Furthermore, the situation of the husband is mentioned for the first time, and the demonstrative phrase is part of a relative clause.

The difference with the distal demonstrative *asi* is that in this case *apa-* refers to the domain of the Addressee, the Queen. The demonstrative *asi* is often connected with either someone other than the Speaker and the Addressee, or it is used in a negative context. Here the situation of the king is not in the sphere of interest of the speaker or someone else, but

¹⁹⁵ Broken HKM 24 rev. 37 (MH/MS letter, CTH 199) § 37 [..... a-p[u-u-uš [k]u_uuš III URU[.ḪI.A.] could belong here too.

only of the queen. Another indication of the connection with only the Addressee might be that the word ‘husband’ is used instead of ‘king’.

Another example from outside my corpus is:

5.16 **KBo 3.34 ii 1-7** (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 44-45

¹ *mZidi* LÚZABAR.DAB *ēšta* ABI LUGAL DUG[*har*]harān [GEŠTIN-*it*] ² ANA [*Hišta-ijara* *mMaratti=ia* *manijahhiš* ³ LUGAL-*i* SIG₅-*antan* GEŠTIN-*an* *hinkatta* *apēdašš=a* ⁴ *tamain* GEŠTIN-*an* *pijer* *apāšš=a* *uit* LUGAL-*i* *tet* ⁵ *natta* *a-pu-u-un* GEŠTIN-*an* *pijer* LUGAL-*uš* *kuin* ⁶ *aušta* *apāšš=a* *uit* QATAMMA IQBI *š=an=ašta*! ⁷ *arḫa* *pēhuter* *š=an* *ēššikir* *š=aš* BA.ÚŠ

Zidi was a cup-bearer. The father of the king assigned a *harhara*-vessel with wine to Histayara and Maratta. To the king he handed over good wine, but to them they gave other wine. One (of them) came and said to the king: “They have not given (me) that (*apun*) wine which the king has seen.” And the other came and spoke likewise.

In order to evoke the correct referent in the mind of the King (‘you know, that wine which was shown to you and which you promised us’) the Speaker uses a demonstrative adnominal in combination with a relative clause. The demonstrative *apa-* points at the fact that the wine only belongs to the domain of the Addressee, the king. The Speakers themselves never saw the wine again.

Recognitional *apa-* is possibly attested in 5.17¹⁹⁶:

5.17 **KUB 14.4 iv 17-19** (NH indictment, Mursili II, CTH 70), ed. De Martino 1998: 30, 38

¹⁷ [MUNUS.LUGAL=*ma* ¹⁹⁷ ANA *dIšḫ*]ara URU*Aštata* *kiššan* *memiškit* DINGIR-LUM *a-pa-a-at=ua* ¹⁸ [KÙ.BABBAR URU*Aštata*] [ŪL] *ammuk* *ḫarmi* *tuel=ua* ŠA DINGIR-LIM KÙ.BABBAR *kuiš* *ḫarzi* ¹⁹ [*nu=ua* *apēl* É-Š]U¹⁹⁸ *kuiš* *šunniškit* *nu=ua* DINGIR-LUM *apūn* ŪL *ēpti*

[The queen] spoke as follows [to Ish]ara of Astata: “O god, it is not *I* who keep that (*apat*) [silver of Astata]. The one who holds *your* silver, god, the one who fills h[is own house] (with it), *that* one you, o god, do not take. ...

Summarizing, also the demonstrative *apa-* is used to refer to information that is Discourse New but Hearer Old. The difference with *asi* is that here *apa-* N denotes an entity connected with the Addressee whereas *asi* N was disconnected from both Speaker and Addressee.

As discussed in 4.3., Recognitionals are always in Sentence Focus:

| Recognitional Use | | | |
|----------------------|---------|---------|---------------------|
| Continuity procedure | | | Centering procedure |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus |

¹⁹⁶ And maybe also in KBo 4.4 ii 56 (61 II) *a-pu-u-un=ma=ua=ta* LÚKÚR URU*Ḫaiša*n 57 dU BELI=YA *karū* *paiš* “The Stormgod, My Lord has already given that enemy, i.e. Hayasa, to you”.

¹⁹⁷ De Martino o.c. 30 restores *na-aš*. This is not possible because transitive verbs never take the nom. enclitic pronoun.

¹⁹⁸ De Martino o.c. 30 reads *-ma* in the break. One can make sense of this clause if *-šU* is read instead, together with the restoration proposed here.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------|
| — | — | — | <i>apa- N</i> |
|---|---|---|---------------|

Table 5.2: The Recognitional *apa-* matrix.

5.4. The Discourse Deictic Use of *apa-*

5.4.1. Introduction

With discourse deixis we leave the field of situational reference. Like anaphoric demonstratives, discourse deictic demonstratives refer to a part of the discourse. But unlike anaphoric demonstratives, a discourse deictic expression is not coreferential with a NP, but draws the attention to the propositional content of a stretch of discourse. (Diessel 1999: 100f. For more discussion see 2.3.5 and 2.3.6, 3.5.). Moreover, discourse deictic demonstratives often provide a link between two discourse units (Diessel o.c. 102¹⁹⁹). In this section I describe the use of the adverb of manner *apenissan*, and forward and backward reference of *apa-* (+ N). Anticipating the results somewhat, in contrast with discourse deictic *ka-* and *asi*, discourse deictic *apa-* is often found in Focal environments. This is not totally unexpected in view of one of the major functions of Anaphoric *apa-*, denoting Focus (see part III).

5.4.2. The adverb of manner *apenissan*

The adverb of manner *apenissan* is not especially connected with the Addressee, just as *kissan* ‘in this, the following way, thus’ is not connected with the Speaker (see 6.4.) and *enissan* ‘in that way, just mentioned’ not with the Other (see 4.4.). The difference between the latter two is that *kissan* refers forward and *enissan* backward. This leaves no place for *apenissan* as a third term of equal semantics. And indeed, *apenissan* is different. Whereas *kissan* and *enissan* simply introduce or close a piece of discourse, *apenissan* (*QATAMMA*) is used in a different context. It is therefore not in opposition with *kissan* as Kammenhuber assumed (HW² A 171). Almost every example of *apenissan* occurs in the construction *mahhan ... apenissan* ‘just as ..., likewise’, in a comparison with something that is described earlier (see Kammenhuber l.c. for the different types of ‘Vergleichssätze’), whereas *kissan* and *enissan* never do.

I will cite one example for each language phase. For more references see Kammenhuber HW² A 171ff., and the examples in 3.5.2.2.

5.18 KBo 6.2 + KBo 19.1 iii 44-46 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 75-76

§ ⁴⁴ *takku* MÁŠ.GAL *enandan takku* DÀRA.MAŠ *annanuḥḥan takku* UDU.KUR.RA *ena[ndan]* ⁴⁵ *kuiški tāiezzi māḥḥanda* ŠA GU₄.APIN.LÁ *tajazilaš* ⁴⁶ *kinzan[n=a u]t²[tar?]* *QA-TAM-MA* §

If anyone steals a trained he-goat or a trained deer or a trained mountain goat, as (*mahhanda*) the theft of a plow ox (is), likewise (*QATAMMA*) (is) the [c]a[se] of these [too] = their disposition is the same as of the theft of a plow ox.

¹⁹⁹ Diessel uses ‘proposition’ instead of ‘discourse unit’.

- 5.19 **KBo 12.62 obv. 10'-12'** (MH/MS letter, CTH 209.14), ed. Hagenbuchner 1989: 120
 § ^{10'} [nu m]āhhan tuppi ūhḫun nu=za ammuk māhhan ^{11'} kišḫat nu DINGIR.MEŠ
 mDuddumin=pat QADU DAM=ŠU ^{12'} [DUM]U.MEŠ=ŠU QA-TAM-MA ḫarninkandu §
 [W]hen I looked at the tablet, just as (mahhan) I felt (lit. became), may the gods
 destroy Duddumi with his wife (and) children in the same way (QATAMMA).
- 5.20 **KBo 5.4 obv. 24-26** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 67), ed. Friedrich 1926: 56-57
 § ^{2 4} namma=za zik mTargaššanalliš tuel ZI-a[n t]uel É-KA tuell=a
 LÚAMA.A.AT=kan ²⁵ mahhan uškiši dUTU-ŠI=ia=ttā kuin ÉRIN.MEŠ a[šand]ulin
 katta dālijanun ²⁶ n=an=za=an kattan QA-TAM-MA uški
Just as (mahhan) you Targasnalli care for your soul, your house and your 'room
 mate', take in the same way (QATAMMA) care of the garrison troops which I, My
 majesty, have left with you.
- 5.21 **KUB 23.103 rev. 6'-7'** (lateNH letter, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 178), ed. Hagenbuchner
 1989: 252
^{6'} nu EN=KUNU BA.ÚŠ ammuk=ma=za ANA EN=KUNU mahhan SIG₅-anza ×[...] ^{7'}
 nu=za apēdani=ia QA-TAM-MA=pat SIG₅-anza n=an pahḫaštin
 Your (pl.) lord has died. Now, as (mahhan) I [was?] good for your lord, I am good
 exactly in that same way (QATAMMA) for him too. Protect him!

In a few cases the *mahhan* part is not present, but still the comparison with an earlier situation is intended in the *QATAMMA* clause:

- 5.22 **KUB 14.1+ rev. 87-88** (MH/MS indictment, CTH 147), ed. Götze 1928: 38-39
 ABI dUTU-ŠI=ma[=ua=mu ŪL] kuḫapikki uatarnaḫta ⁸⁸ KUR URUAlašija=ua
 ammel nu=uar=at QA-TAM-MA dāla
 "The father of My Majesty [n]ever ordered [me]: 'Alasiya (=Cyprus) is mine! Let it
 stay like that/so (QATAMMA)!' "

These examples show that *apenissan* can be used in Speaker context (ex. 5.21), Addressee context (ex. 5.20, 5.22) and Other context (5.18, 5.19).

I take *apenissan* as an adverbial marker of Expanding Focus. Regular Expanding Focus is of the form (Dik 1997a: 334 (his ex. 49)):

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

We can modify this to:

- 5.24 S assumes that A might think: John bought apples in a happy mood.
 S corrects: Just as he bought APPLES in a happy mood, he **likewise** bought BANANAS.

Anticipating the forward reference of *apat* in 5.4.3.1., forward referring *apenissan* is only attested in a few texts²⁰⁰:

- 5.25 **KUB 14.11+ iii 26** (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 378 II), ed. Lebrun 1980: 208, 213.
kikkištari QA-TAM-MA ūašteškanzi
 (So it) happens like this (*QATAMMA*): People sin.

The next example is unique because instead of *apenissan* we have *apat mahhan*:

- 5.26 **HKM 71 obv. 3-9** (MH/MS, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 254-255
 § ³ *kiššan=mu kuit hatrāeš* ⁴ *BELU man=ua ūnnatti kat[t]an* ⁵ *LÚ.MEŠ URUGašga=ua kišš[a]n* ⁶ *memiškanzi man=ua GA[L] LÚ.MEŠKUŠ* ⁷ *ūnnai nu=ua takšulaeni* § ⁸ *nu=mu a-pa-a-at mahhan hatriš[k]i[š]i* ⁹ *zik=za ŪL BELU*
 Given that you wrote to me this way: “My lord, would you drive down, the Gasga people will speak thus: ‘Would the Head of the Chariot fighters drive (down), (then) we will make peace’ ”.
 You keep writing like that (*apat*). Are you not a lord?

5.4.3. The Discourse Deictic syntagms *apat uttar*, *apas memias* and *apat*

5.4.3.1. The expression *apa-* (+N) referring forward

Forward referring discourse deictic *apa-* is very rare and occurs mainly in a Tudhaliya IV oath (CTH 255) and often in connection with the Addressee²⁰¹:

- 5.27 **KUB 26.12+ ii 29-35** (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.1), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 25
²⁹ *namma a-pa-a-at kuit ēššatteni nu KUR.KUR.ḪI.A* ³⁰ *BA[L d]apianda l-ētta naiškittin* ³¹ *nu K[UR.KUR].ḪI.A LÚKUR daššanuškittin* ³² *KUR.KUR URUḪATTI=ma mališkunuttin* ³³ *nu a-pa-a-at memiškatteni mān=ua=naš* ³⁴ *nakkešzi nu=ua=kan a-pé-e-da-ni EGIR-a[nd]a* ³⁵ *tijaeni n=at kuiš ijazi ...*
 Furthermore, as for that (*apat*) what you do: You turned [a]ll defectiv[e] countries into one, you made the c[ountr]ies of the enemy powerful, while the countries of Hatti you made weak, and you say that (*apat*): “If it becomes difficult for us, we will step behind that one”, (if) anyone does that, ...

But in the same text we find an alternation between *apat* and *ki* in connection with a third person (already discussed as ex. 3.65)²⁰²:

²⁰⁰ See also **NH KUB 14.11+ rev. 29** (prayer, CTH 378 II); **LateNH KBo 4.14 iii 42, 47** (treaty, CTH 123).

²⁰¹ See also **lateNH KUB 26.12+ i 13, 23** (oath, CTH 255.1), **KUB 26.1 iii 19** (oath, CTH 255.2).

²⁰² See also **NH KUB 14.3 i 14** (CTH 181); **lateNH KUB 23.1+ i 30** (treaty, CTH 105), **KUB 26.1 iii 16** (oath, CTH 255.2)

- 5.28 **KUB 26.12+ ii 2-9** (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.1), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 24, with emendations from Otten 1958: 389.

§ ² *našma=kan* [...] ³ *našma* ŠEŠ ^d[UTU-ŠI ŠA MUNUS.LUGA]L *h[aššanza našma]* ⁴ ŠEŠ.MEŠ DUMU.MEŠ MUNUS_{NA}[PTA]R[T]I *anda i[štamašzi]* ⁵ *nu ki-i memai* EGIR-*an=ua=mu tī[ia]* ⁶ *apāš=ma a-pa-a-at memai* EGIR-*an=ua=ta* ⁷ *ŪL tijami hanti=ia=ua=šši* ⁸ *ŪL tijami* ⁹ *huhhupašš=a[=ua=šši? Ū]L* ⁹ *kišhahari* ...
Or (if) [...] or a brother of [My Majesty], o[ffspring or] brothers [of the Queen], I[stems] to sons of con[cubine]s, (and) says this (*ki*): “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 ?]”

The pronoun *apa-* denotes Replacing Focus (see chapter 8), “not X, but Y instead!”.
And with a first person and Focus²⁰³:

- 5.29 **KUB 21.38 obv. 63'-65'** (NH letter, Hattusili III, CTH 176), ed. Edel 1994: 220-221
nu ANA ŠEŠ=YA kuin DUMU.MUNUS peḫḫi nu=šši=[ka]n ŠA MUNUS.LUGAL annān tiššān ⁶⁴ [DINGIR.MEŠ QATAMMA] GAM *hamankandu nu* MUNUS LUGAL *a-pád-da-ia AQBI* ŠEŠ.MEŠ=ŠUNU=ua=šši EGIR-*anda* ⁶⁵ [*tiianz*]i ...

As for the daughter that I will give to my brother, may [the gods] grant her [the same] experience and the power to raise children [as] the Queen (lit. ... of the Queen in that same way). And I, the Queen, said also/even that (*apadda=ya*): “Her brothers will [take] care of her”. ...

- 5.30 **KUB 1.1+ iii 66-68** (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 22-23
⁶⁶ [(*kururiḫahun=ma=šši GIM-an nu*)] *a-pa-a-[(at papratar ŪL DŪ-nun* ⁶⁷ *n=an=kan ANA GIŠGIGIR uaggariḫanun našma=an=kan ŠÀ É^T)^I]* ⁶⁸ [(*uqqariḫanun* ...

Now, when I became his enemy, I did not do this (*apat*) treacherous act, (that) I revolted against him on the chariot or (that) I revolted against him in the (Royal) House.²⁰⁴

Summarizing, like *ka-*, forward referring discourse deictic *apa-* can occur with all persons. The difference between the two is that *apat* / *apa-* N is Focal (more specific, in Argument Focus). Therefore Sommer’s attractive solution for the alternation between *apat* and *ki* cannot be maintained. Commenting on KUB 14.3 iii 63 (see below) he concluded: “Man kann und wird die in *a-pa-a-at* liegende “Ferndeixis” von der Psyche der Briefschreibers aus verstehen, wenn man sie vergegenwärtigt, daß die folgenden Worte als weder von ihm noch an ihn geschrieben zu denken sind, sondern von einem andern an einen Dritten gehen sollen” (Sommer 1932: 164):

- 5.31 **KUB 14.3 iii 63-65** (NH letter, Hattusili III, CTH 181), ed. Sommer 1932: 14-15

²⁰³ See also KUB 23.101 obv. ii 17 (lateNH letter, CTH 177.3).

²⁰⁴ Otten l.c. differently, followed by CHD P: 104 “... tat ich jenes nicht <im Sinne> eines Vergehens”, with backward reference of the pronoun *apa-*, whereas I take *apat papratar* together in forward reference.

§ ⁶³ *nu=šši ŠEŠ=YA a-pa-a-at I-an ḥatrāi* ⁶⁴ *mān ŪL nu=ṽa šarā tīja* ⁶⁵ *nu=ṽa*
 INA KUR *Ḥatti arḥa īt*

My brother, write him at least this (*apat*), if (he has) not (already done as written above (??)): “Get up and go forth to Hatti!, ...

5.4.3.2. The expression *apa-* (+N) referring backward

In the previous section I concluded that forward referring *apa-* is used in Argument Focus context. The same question can be asked for backward reference. When the propositional content is salient and still referred to by *apa-*, it seems reasonable to assume that *apa-* is here Focal too. The material to support this is presented in 5.4.3.2.1.

But usually propositional contents are not salient. In that situation one may use *apa-N* (besides *ka-N* and *asi N*). This will be discussed in 5.4.3.2.2.

5.4.3.2.1. Referring to salient entities

When a main clause is processed by the Addressee, the element that might be a further topic of discourse is usually not the propositional content of the clause but one of the entities expressed in the Subject or the Object. There are however exceptions. Conditional clauses make their propositional content salient for further discourse besides simply introducing some first order entity. This means that if the content of the clause subsequently is referred to, the continuity procedure may be used. In the apodosis of a conditional clause we therefore expect to find anaphoric pronouns, not only for first order but also for higher order entities. In case of *apa-* we always have Argument Focus (usually Expanding Focus, see Chapter 7). With the Focal pronoun²⁰⁵:

5.32 **KUB 6.41 iv 6-7** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68), ed. Friedrich 1926: 132-133

⁶ [(*mān*)] = *kan* ÉRIN.MEŠ = *ma* ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ *warri lammar ŪL a[rn(utti)]* ⁷
 [(*nu=kan*)] *kāšma a-pa-a-at-ta-ia* NEŠ DINGIR-LIM *šarratti*

But if you do not bring troops and horses *warri lammar*, you hereby break the oath of the gods also for that reason (*apatta=ya*).

Like conditional clauses also the propositional content of a *kuit* clause may be considered salient²⁰⁶:

5.33 **KUB 1.1 iii 59-61** (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 22-23

[(^{URU}*Hak*)] *piššan=m[(a=mu=)]kan IŠTU INIM DINGIR-LIM* ⁶⁰ *arḥa ŪL dāš ANA* ^{dU}
^{URU}*Neriqqa=za kuit* ^{LÚ}*SANGA ešun* ⁶¹ [(*n=an=mu=kan a-pé-e-ez-za*)] *arḥa ŪL dāš*
 Hakpissa on the other hand he did not take away from me on divine command.
 Because I was priest of the Stormgod of Nerik, because of that (*apezza*) he did not take it (the city) away from me”

²⁰⁵ See also **NH** KBo 5.4 obv. 23', 27', 33', rev. 23', 32', 42', 49', 54' (treaty, CTH 67), KUB 6.41 iv 14, KUB 19.54 i 6 (treaty, CTH 68), KUB 21.2+ iii 55, 72 (CTH 76); **lateNH** KBo 4.10+ rev. 17 (CTH 106), KUB 26.12+ ii 10 (oath, CTH 255.1).

²⁰⁶ Also see KUB 16.32 ii 18, 23 (lateNH oracle, CTH 569).

Not only the pronoun *apa-* may be used to refer to salient discourse propositions in Focus, also *apa-memiya-/uttar* is attested. The difference between *apat/apéz* and *apa-memiya-/uttar* is not clear to me²⁰⁷:

5.34 **Bo 86/299 iii 3-8** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106.1), ed. Otten 1988: 20-21
zilatiya=kan ⁴ LUGAL-UTTA ŠA KUR URU^dU-tašša ANA NUMUN ^mNIR.GÁL *lē kuiški*
⁵ *arḫa dāi nu a-pa-a-at kuiški ijazi* ⁶ *n=at damēdani uarḫalani ŠA ^mNIR.GÁL pāi*
⁷ ANA NUMUN ^{md}LAMMA=*ma=at=kan arḫa dāi nu kuiš a-pu-u-un memian* ⁸
ijazi

In the future let noone take away the kingship of Tarhuntassa from the offspring of Muwatalli. (If) someone still does that (*apat*), (that is,) he gives it to some other relative of Muwatalli and takes it away from the offspring of Kurunta, anyone who does that (*apun*) deed, (may the gods destroy him ...)

5.4.3.2.2. Referring to non-salient entities

In this section I present the expression *apa-* + N referring to discourse propositions not in the center of attention. I consider referents as not in the center of attention if it does not fall into the classes described above.

Until now all discourse deictic *apa-s* appeared in Focal contexts, irrespective of Speaker, Addressee or Other. In order to investigate whether non-Focal *apa-* is connected with the Addressee or not we first need to distinguish between Focal and non-Focal *apa-* N. The method used here is quite provisional since the Hittite Focus structure is not completely understood, but there are some certain criteria which can be derived from part III. All *apa-* + N expressions with one of the Focus markers *-ya* (chapter 7) and *-pat* (chapter 8) and the Unexpectedness marker *-ma* (chapter 9) can be safely ignored here. In chapter 8 I also describe *apa-* in preverbal position indicating Replacing Focus ('not X, but Y').

5.4.3.2.2.1. Non-saliency and Focus

The description of the Focus structure of Hittite in relation with *apa-* in part III does not cover every Focus expression. In order to find some others here I use the following rather subjective method. Each time I will try to decide whether *apa-* N corresponds to English 'that N' with accent on the demonstrative and 'that N' with accent on the substantive. The idea behind this is that the expression 'that N' implies that the referent of the substantive is somehow presupposed, whereas in 'that N' the referent of the substantive is asserted, presented as new. Besides that, accented *that* carries a notion of contrast or limitation. It must be clear from the

²⁰⁷ Salient Focal *apa-memiya-/uttar* is also attested in **MH** KBo 5.3+ iv 32 (treaty, CTH 42); **NH** KBo 3.3+ ii 28 (edict, CTH 63), KBo 5.4 rev. 15 (treaty, CTH 67), KBo 4.3 iv 18 (treaty, CTH 68), KUB 21.1+ iii 59 (treaty, CTH 76); **lateNH** Bo 86/299 ii 89 (treaty, CTH 106.1), KUB 26.12+ i 10 (oath, CTH 255.1), KUB 26.1 i 23, ii 53, iv 51 (oath, CTH 255.2).

context that there are other options possible. Thus, I take ‘*that* N’ as a Focus expression, and ‘*that* N’ not. See for example for ‘*that* N’ as Focus expression:²⁰⁸

5.35 **KBo 19.44+ rev. 26-27** (MH/MS treaty, CTH 42)

²⁶ *danna=ma=an=za lē ilaliḫaši ŪL=at āra apē[(z=kan)]* ²⁷ *uddanaz arḫa akkiškanzi*

(If at some time a sister ... of your wife comes to visit you, give her to eat and to drink. Eat, drink and have fun (pl.),) but do not desire to take her. That (lit. it) is *not* right! Because of *that* (*apez*) behavior people die.

The initial position of *apez* already requires accentuation. But besides that, this rule of conduct states that desiring your sister-in-law sexually is exactly that kind of behavior that gets you killed. But being a good host does not.

5.36 **HKM 43 obv. 1’-7’** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 194-195.

^{1’} *n[=ašt]a mTarul[ie]š-x[]* ^{2’} *tuzzin mZilapiḫašš=a* ^{3’} *ÉRIN.MEŠ GIBIL maḫḫan šarā uḫater* ^{4’} *KUR-ḫa=kan kuḫeš anda URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A* ^{5’} *arnumanzi taranteš* § ^{6’} *nu apūš URU.DIDLI.ḪI.A karū* ^{7’} *arnuir n=ašta a-pa-a-at uttar* ^{8’} *karū ašnuir n=ašta mān* ^{9’} *tuzzin š[arā]* ^{10’} *uḫater nu [...]* §

How could Taruli (?) have brought up the army and Zilapiya the new troops?²⁰⁹ The cities in the country that (were) promised to be displaced, *those* cities they have already displaced. They already have taken care of *that* (*apat*) business. If they have brought up the army, then [...]

The two men mentioned in obv. 1’-2’ have performed one of the tasks they promised to do: ‘*that* they already did’ in contrast with the other task which could not yet be performed.

5.4.3.2.2.2. *No saliency and no Focus*

I could not subsume the *apa-* + N expressions in the following examples under Focus, which means that there were no other entities that could compete with *apa-* N. What they all have in common is that the referent of the expression is somehow related to the Addressee²¹⁰.

5.37 **HKM 7 obv. 3-15** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 128-131

²⁰⁸ See also **MH** KBo 32.14 ii 23, 39, iii 6 (wisdom text), KBo 19.44+ rev. 2, 6 (treaty, CTH 42); **NH** KUB 14.4 iii 17 (indictment, CTH 70), KUB 21.38 obv. 2 (letter, CTH 176); **lateNH** KUB 50.6+ iii 43 (oracle CTH 569). An unclear example of *apat* with *-ma* probably referring to the propositional content of the previous broken context is KUB 14.4 ii 5’-6’ (CTH 70). For a discussion of the different proposals concerning these lines see De Martino 1998: 41-43. I do not further discuss this example because the referent of *apat* cannot be established with certainty. It could for example refer to the story told in the lost part of the tablet, or everything.

²⁰⁹ Alp l.c. differently: “Dann als Taruli (?) [] das Heer und Zilapiya [] die neuen Truppen heraufbrachten, welche Städte ...’ etc.

²¹⁰ Also **MH** HKM 10 obv. 13, HKM 54 obv. 5 (letters, CTH 199); **NH** KBo 5.4 obv. 30 (treaty, CTH 67), KUB 6.41 iv 14 (treaty, CTH 68), KUB 21.1+ iii 20 (treaty, CTH 76).

§ ³ kiššan=ma=mu kuit hatrāēš ⁴ kāša=ua ^{LÚ.MEŠ} šapašallēš [] ⁵ piienun nu=ua
pāir URUTaggašt[an] ⁶ URU Ukuduip[u]nann=a šapašijaua[n²¹¹ dāir] ⁷ nu=uar=at
lattarijantiaš [o]-× ⁸ ÍD-š=a=ua²¹² katta huittijian harzi § ⁹ nu=ššan a-pé-e-[d]a-
ni uddanī ¹⁰ ueranza=pat ēš nu ^{LÚ.MEŠ} šapašalliu[š] ¹¹ pejeia nu SIG₅-in
šapašijandu nu ×-[o] ¹² kāšma=tta karū=ja ¹³ kuit hatrānun ^{dUTU=š[I]} ¹⁴ a-pé-e-
da-ni KASKAL-ši EG[IR]-an ¹⁵ arha hu[i]tt[ijatte]n

As for the fact that you wrote as follows: “I have just sent the scouts [...]. So they have [begun] scouting the cities Taggasta and Ukuduipuna. They (= the population of the cities?) [are at the harvest (?)] of the *lattariyant*-wheat. The river has withdrawn.”

§ Be called upon as before in this (apat) matter (of yours): Send out scouts, let them scout well. [...]. Look, as for what I, My Majesty, already wrote to you: you must follow that (apedani) road (of yours) completely.

The matter of the cities is the responsibility of the Addressee and it stays so for a while because the king tells him to continue his original actions without interfering himself.

The second *apa-* in *apedani* KASKAL-*si* is a first mention of the road and also probably connected with the Addressees.

In the next example ‘that matter’ refers to the appearance of the deity Lelwani in a dream. Lelwani is the Addressee of this prayer and because the princess did not perform a ritual the deity has made her ill:

5.38 **KBo 4.6 obv. 21’-26’** (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 380), ed. Tischler 1981: 14-15

§ ^{21’} INA ^{URU} Šamūha kuṣapi tuk ^{dLelwanin} ^{fGaššulijauiaš} ^{22’} tuēl GEME-TU₄ Û-az
aušta nu tuk ANA DINGIR-LIM apēdaš UD.KAM^{HIA}-aš ^{23’} ^{fGaššulauiāš} tuēl GEME-
TU₄ SÍSKUR ŪL kuitki pešta ^{24’} [k]inuna kāša ^{fGaššulijauiaš} tuēl GEME-TU₄
ištarkiat ^{25’} [n]=an GIG-anza tamaštat namma=šši a-pa-a-at ^{26’} [n]akkijahtat
At the time Gassuliyawiya, your servant, (while being) in Samuha, saw you, Lelwani in a dream, Gassulawia did not perform for you, o god, any ritual at all in those days. But now Gassuliyawia, your servant, has fallen ill, and illness has kept her down. So then that (apat) matter (concerning you) came to haunt her.

5.4.4. Summary and conclusion

In 5.4.2 it was described how the adverb of manner *apenissan* ‘likewise’ was basically used in the comparative structure *mahhan ... apenissan* ‘just as ... likewise’. This construction was related to Expanding Focus: ‘just as X, likewise Y’ ≈ ‘X occurs in a certain way, also Y occurs in a certain way’. As a Focus adverb, *apenissan* was not limited to the cognitive domain of the Addressee but could also be used for the Speaker or the Other, often in backward reference and rarely in forward reference. The same was concluded for forward referring *apa-* (+ N).

The results for backward referring *apa-* (+ N) were twofold. When the propositional content was salient, the phrase *apa-* (+ N) was each time Focal, irrespective of cognitive

²¹¹ Restoration follows CHD S: 205a.

²¹² Alp o.c. 130 transliterates *a-pa-ša-ua* “Auch jener (Feind)?”. The sign PA in the handcopy looks more like MA, but could also be ENGUR (HZL 216) in view of the surface damage, thus leading to A.ENGUR = ÍD “river”.

domain. The non-salient remainder consisted of two groups: the Focal *apa-* + N group and a very small number of non-Focal *apa-* + N. In the latter group *apa-* + N cooccurred with the Addressee. This fits the overall picture of the Addressee oriented semantics of *apa-* as described in the Situational and Recognitional sections. However, it is still possible that the examples which I could not explain by means of Focus are just that. In that case Discourse Deictic *apa-* is simply the Focal counterpart of *ka-* (+ N) and *asi* (+ N).

| <i>Discourse Deictic Use</i> | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Continuity procedure (in-node) | | | Centering procedure (across-node) | |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus | |
| — | — | <i>apat</i> | <i>apat</i> | |
| | | <i>apa- N</i> | <i>apa- N</i> | |
| | | <i>apenissan</i> | <i>apenissan</i> | |

Table 5.3: The Discourse deictic *apa-* matrix.

5.5. The Tracking (= Anaphoric) Use of *apa-* with noun

5.5.1. Introduction

The tracking use of demonstratives is discussed in 2.3.3.4., 2.3.4. (both general discussions), 3.3.4., 3.4. (overview of Hittite) and 4.5. (the distal demonstrative *asi*).

The use of backward referring *apa-* N must be compared with backward referring *ka-* and *asi*. Only then the true nature of each backward referring demonstrative can be appreciated (see chapter 3.3.4. and 3.4.). Argument-Focal Tracking *apa-* N will be discussed in Chapters 7, 8 and 9.²¹³

The hypothesis is that non-Focal *apa- N* is each time explicitly connected with the Addressee(s). In the next sections it will be tested whether this hypothesis is falsified or not.

5.5.2. The centering procedure

²¹³ The following enumeration contains all Focal *apa-* N-s in my corpus. For *Restricting Focus* we have: **MH** IBOT 1.36 iii 28 (instruction, CTH 262), KUB 24.4 rev. 13 (prayer, 376C); **NH** KBo 11.1 obv. 6, 7 (prayer, CTH 382).

Expanding Focus: **NH** KBo 3.4+ i 9 (annals, CTH 61 I), KUB 1.1+ iii 57-58 (egodocument, CTH 81), KUB 31.121 ii 18' (prayer, CTH 379), KUB 48.100+ rev. 8 (egodocument, CTH 486).

Replacing Focus: **MH** KUB 23.77+ rev. 54' (treaty, CTH 138), KBo 15.10+ i 17, 18 (ritual, CTH 443); **NH** KUB 19.49 i 64, iii 16, 18 (treaty, CTH 69).

What N ... *that* N: **MH** KUB 19.26 i 7' (or NH? treaty, CTH 44), KUB 23.72+ obv. 47 (treaty, CTH 146), HKM 18 obv. 26, HKM 43 obv. 6' (letters, CTH 199); **NH** KBo 5.4 rev. 43 (treaty, CTH 67), KUB 6.41: 19 (treaty, CTH 68), KUB 21.1+ iii 46 (treaty, CTH 76), KUB 1.1 iv 63 (egodocument, CTH 81), 31.121 ii 22' (prayer, CTH 379).

Some N ... *that* N: **MH** KBo 19.44+ rev. 3, 9, 10 (treaty, CTH 42), KBo 5.3 + i 29 (MH/NS treaty, CTH 42), KUB 23.77+ rev. 60' (treaty, CTH 138), KUB 14.1 obv. 24 (indictment, CTH 147); **NH** KBo 3.3+ iii 17' (edict, CTH 63), KBo 5.13 ii 33, KUB 6.41 iii 61, iii 25 (treaty, CTH 68), KUB 21.1+ ii 64 (treaty, CTH 76), KBo 11.1 obv. 38 (prayer, CTH 382).

Otherwise contrasted with something in the text: **NH** KUB 19.11 iv 33 (annals, CTH 40).

Major discourse discontinuities diminish the saliency of discourse entities. These discontinuities are caused by episodic changes, shifts in location, intervention by Reported Speech, and textual unit boundaries. In order to restore the saliency of a discourse entity lexical nounphrases are used, including the ones with a demonstrative determiner. The clearest indicators of discourse continuity in Hittite are reference across a paragraph line (5.5.2.1), the switch from Direct Speech to Narration (5.5.2.2.), the switch from modifier to argument (5.5.2.3.) and a rest group (5.5.2.4.).

5.5.2.1. Reference across a paragraph line

The next example was explicitly noted by Friedrich as an example of Du-Deixis (1991: 134, § 251), but rejected by Kammenhuber HW² A: 141b. The contrast with *kez* however reminds us of ex. 5.1 (*kezza ... apezza* “from here (from me) ... from there (from you)”). As with the category of discourse deixis, Addressee oriented Tracking *apa-* occurs in treaties, letters and instructions. Instead of explaining each time why I assume that *apa-* is Addressee oriented, I will present some additional information in parentheses in the translations.²¹⁴

- 5.39 **KUB 21.1 iii 4-9**, with duplicate KBo 12.36 (NH treaty, Muwattalli II, CTH 76), ed. Friedrich 1930: 66-69

mān ^dUTU-ŠI *a-pé-ez*²¹⁵ KUR-ea[(z)]²¹⁶ ⁵ [(naššu URUK)]arkišaz URULuqqāz
naš[(ma URUWarsiḫallaz)a] ⁶ [(lahḫiḫam)]i nu=mu ziqq=a QADU ÉRIN.MEŠ
 ANŠE.KUR.[(RA.MEŠ)] ⁷ [(kattan laḫḫ)]iḫaši našma mān BELU kuinki [(k)e(-e-ez-
 za)] ⁸ [(KUR-aḫ)] laḫḫiḫauuanzi uḫiḫami nu ap[(ēdani=ja)] ⁹ [(kattan laḫ)]heškiši
 If I, My Majesty, undertake a campaign from that (*apez*) country (of yours), or from
 Karkisa, Luqqa or Warsiyalla, then you *too* with troops and horses shall fight together
 with me. Or if I send some lord from this (*kezza*) country (of mine) to campaign,
 then also together with *him* you shall fight.

- 5.40 **KUB 13.20 i 16-17, 26-27** (MH/NS instruction, Tudhaliya II, CTH 259), ed. Alp 1947: 390-393, 405-407.

§ ¹⁶ *mān* ^dUTU-ŠI=ma laḫḫi ukila ŪL pāimi nu tuzziḫa kuin DUMU.LUGAL našma
 BE[L GAL] ¹⁷ uātarnaḫmi nu tuzzin laḫḫi apāš pēḫutezzi ... § ... § ²⁶ *mān=kan a-
 pa-a-aš-ma* DUMU.LUGAL našma BELUM tuzziḫa peran idālu uttar pēḫute[zzi] ²⁷
n=ašta ^dUTU-ŠI zammurāizzi šumašš=an ēpten n=an MAḪAR ^dUTU-ŠI uḫatetten
 But if I, My Majesty, do not go on campaign myself: the prince or [high] lord that I
 order to the army, *he* (instead) shall lead the army. ... § ... § But if that prince or lord
 (as your commander) parades bad words for the army and offends My Majesty, then
you must seize him and lead him before My Majesty.

²¹⁴ See also **MH** HKM 24 rev. 48, rev. 53 (letter, CTH 199), HKM 27 obv. 8 (letter, CTH 199), discussed in chapter 3, ex. 3.43; KBo 5.3 + ii 54 (treaty, CTH 42); **NH** KUB 14.14 + rev. 23' (prayer, CTH 378 II), discussed in chapter 3, ex. 3.40.

²¹⁵ Written *a-pé-ma*.

²¹⁶ Duplicate KBo 12.36+ ii 24', 29': *a-pé-ez-za* KUR-eza.

A Focal interpretation would mean ‘that prince’, implying that other princes should be left in peace when offending the king.

5.41 **HKM 5 lower edge 3-14** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 126-127

§³ [š]A URUGašipūra kuit⁴ GUD.HI.A datt[a] n=an=šan⁵ šA mE[N-t]arauya
maniāḥḥiia⁶ išḥuāitta

§⁷ kinuna=kan šA mEN-tarauya⁸ maniāḥḥiiaz ÉRIN.MEŠ annallin⁹ ÉRIN.MEŠ
uarraiša¹⁰ lē n[i]nikši¹¹ nu=ššan a-pu-u-un¹² GUD.HI.A EGIR-an ēpdu¹³
n=aš=kan KIN-az lē¹⁴ šamēzzi §

As for the fact that you have taken the oxen from Gasipura: you shall disperse them (lit. it) to the administrative unit of Ishatarauwa.

You shall not mobilize veterans and auxiliary troops now from the unit of mr. Ishatarauwa. He must take back those (apun) oxen (which are your responsibility). He must not refrain from work.

A Focal interpretation would mean ‘that oxen’, implying that there are other oxen to choose from which Ishatarauwa might take back.

5.5.2.2. From Direct Speech to Narration

Another major discourse boundary is the transition from Direct Speech to Narration²¹⁷:

5.42 **HKM 6 obv. 3-10** (MH/MS Letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 126-129

§³ kiššan=mu kuit ḥatrāeš⁴ kāša=ya LÚKÚR uit⁵ nu=ya=za URUHaparan iniššan⁶
tamašta URUKašipuran=ma=ya=kan⁷ kēz tamašta apāš=ma²¹⁸=ya=kan⁸ ištarna
arḥa uit⁹ namma=wa<r=>aš kuḥapi pait¹⁰ nu=uar=aš ŪL IDI

§¹¹ nu a-pa-a-aš LÚKÚR¹² alyanzahhanza imma¹³ ēšta n=an ŪL¹⁴ šākta«š»

Concerning that you have written to me like this: “The enemy has just arrived. He besieged the city Hapara in that way, but Kasipura he besieged from this side. He (then), surprisingly²¹⁹, came right through. Where he went next, I have no idea.”

Was that (apas) enemy (under your responsibility) perhaps bewitched, that you did not know about him?

5.5.2.3. From modifier to argument

In 2.3.4.3. I mentioned that modifiers, including genitives are not salient, see ex. 2.65, repeated here (see Cornish o.c. 162 ff. for discussion and references):

5.43 [Personal letter to Cornish, 1989]

²¹⁷ See also **MH HKM 36 obv. 7** (letter, CTH 199), treated in Chapter 3 as ex. 3.47; **HKM 54 obv. 26** (letter, CTH 199), treated in Chapter 3 as ex. 3.69.

²¹⁸ The sign -ma is not present in Alp’s transliteration, but drawn in his hand copy.

²¹⁹ See Chapter 9 for -a/-ma and apa- indicating surprise.

Could you send me your *Journal of Semantics* article? We don't have that in our library [the writer is referring here to the University of Bradford library]

A similar situation is encountered in the next letter:

- 5.44 **HKM 21 obv. 8-13** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 152-153
 §⁸ [š]A LÚKÚR=ia=mu kuit uttar⁹ [h]atrā<eš>²²⁰ nu=za¹²⁰ a-pé-e-da-ni¹⁰ [P]ANI
 LÚKÚR mekki¹¹ [p]ahḥaššanuḥanza ēš¹² [k]aša=za kuitman¹³ ... arḥa a[r]iḥami
 §
 And what you [w]rote to me about the case [o]f the enemy, be very [a]lert toward that
 (apedani) enemy until I have finished the oracle inquiry (about it) [...]

There are however other clauses of the same type in which only LÚKÚR is expressed (HKM 1 rev. 11-13, HKM 6 rev. 15-16, rev. 24-left edge 1, HKM 8 rev. 18-19, HKM 22 obv. 6-7, HKM 30 obv. 5-6). The difference with the expression with *apa-* is that the others are either neutral in regard to speech-participant or clearly not only a matter for the Addressee but also for the king. In ex. 5.44 the king orders the Addressee to be alert toward the enemy until he knows what to do himself. The king cannot yet undertake any action before the oracle has spoken, and therefore the enemy is for the moment only the responsibility of the Addressee. Compare this with the next example:

- 5.45 **HKM 1 obv. 4-13** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 121-122
 §⁴ šA LÚKÚR=[m]u [k]uit⁵ uttar ḥatrā[e]š⁶ LÚKÚR=ua^U [RU]Gašaš⁷ an⁷ ḥarzi ×
 §⁸ nu=kan kāšma⁹ ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḪI.A¹⁰ parā nehḥun¹¹ nu=za PANI LÚKÚR¹²
 mekki pahḥaš[a]nuanza¹³ ēš §§
 What you wrote to me about the case of the enemy: “The enemy holds [Gasas]a ... § I
 have just send out the cavalry. Be very alert toward the enemy.

This time the king already has taken some actions, so the enemy is not the responsibility of the Addressee alone. The same is true of HKM 8 where the king has given some advice and HKM 22 where the king has sent some troops. HKM 30 is neutral, there are no other statements connected with our phrase.

5.5.2.4. Other contexts

Finally there are some attestations that fall outside the other categories, all from CTH 63. This treaty is remarkable given the clustering of *apa-* NAMRA.MEŠ “those deportees” (KBo 3.3+ iii 4', 6', 8', 12', 20', 25').

- 5.46 **KBo 3.3+ iii 3'-5'** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 63), ed. Klengel 1963: 37
 nu kūn memijan⁴ kuḥat iḥatten QATAMMA nu=šši=kan a-pu-u-uš⁵ NAM.RA.MEŠ
 ANA mDuppi-dU arḥa daškitteni

²²⁰ Alp o.c. 152 reads [h]atrā[e]š¹ apēdani With this reading the reflexive particle -za is lacking which is generally present in this type of clause (see for example HKM 6 rev. 15) and in 2nd person nominal clauses in general. I therefore propose [h]atrā<eš>¹ nu=za¹ apēdani

Why have you (pl.) done this (following) deed like *this* (*QATAMMA*)? You keep taking those (*apus*) deportees away from him, from Duppi-Tessup.

This group of *apa*-s seems to contradict what I have said about the Addressee orientation of *apa*- since *apa*- is clearly not connected with the ‘you’ but with Duppi-Tessub. However, Duppi-Tessub is also one of the Addressees of this treaty. If one compares this with ex. 5.12 we see a Situational *apa*- referring to some person in relation to the Addressee ‘you’. Just as in ex. 5.12 the *apa*- person is maybe not directly addressed, but still a member of the larger group of Addressees.

5.5.3. The continuity procedure

I already listed the Focal *apa*-‘s which needed to be excluded from the discussion in order to find out to what cognitive domain *apa*- belonged. There are very few examples of *apa*- N referring to salient entities which were not listed there but which still are Focal. These few cases are not only Focal but also Addressee oriented. A remarkable fact about these examples is that *apa*- is *postposed* to its substantive (see also Chapter 8.5.5.).²²¹

5.47 **KUB 21.38 rev. 11-12** (NH letter, Hattusili III, CTH 176), ed. Edel 1994: 222-223.

ANA ŠEŠ=YA kuiš ZI[-ni 𐎶 l]umpas̄tiš ammuk=ma=an ANA ŠEŠ=YA UL namma iḫami¹² [m]ān ŪL kuit IDI nu ANA ŠEŠ=YA 𐎶 lum[pašti]n a-pu-u-un DÙ-mi

As for the annoyance [to the] soul of my brother, I shall not inflict it anymore upon my brother. If I don’t know anything, I will inflict that (*apun*) annoyance upon my brother.

The annoyance was already inflicted upon the Addressee, the pharao, and therefore *apa*- can indicate Addressee orientation besides Focus. The next example is similar:

5.48 **KBo 11.1 obv. 14** (NH prayer, Muwattalli II, CTH 382), ed. Houwink ten Cate & Josephson 1967: 106, 115.

§¹⁴ mān=kan dU DINGIR-LUM KUR-TI kuiški TUKU.TUKU-nut kinuna dA.NUN.NA.KI₄ dU-an ANA DINGIR-LIM a-pé-e-da-n[i mena]hḫanda takšulāndu

If some god of the country has angered the Stormgod, (then) let now the netherworld deities reconcile the Stormgod with that (*apedani*) god.’

Here the Addressee, the Stormgod is already angry because of some other deity, which is therefore in his cognitive domain.

5.5.4. Summary and conclusion

All attestations of non-Argument Focal *apa*- N were connected with the Addressee. Most of these *apa*- N referred across node, and were therefore not salient. The *apa*-Ns in Argument Focus on the other hand occur always inside a discourse unit and are therefore salient.

²²¹ According to Kammenhuber 1975: 133b postposed adjectival *apa*- occurs in “emphatischer Sprache”. The problem with this formulation is that also preposed *apa*- is usually ‘emphatic’ as we have seen.

Besides these two groups there is possibly a third one which combines the two: Addressee orientation and Focality. Where this was noticed, *apa-* occurred postposed to its substantive.

| <i>Anaphoric Use</i> | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Continuity procedure (in node) | | | Centering procedure (across node) | |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus | |
| — | — | <i>apa- N</i> <i>N apa-</i> | <i>apa- N</i> | |

Table 5.4: The Anaphoric *apa-* matrix.

5.6 Conclusions

Based on the material of the four sections on Situational Use, Recognitional Use, possibly Discourse Deictic Use, and Tracking Use it can be concluded that non-Argument Focal *apa-* is the Medial demonstrative, belonging to the domain of the Addressee. This is at least certain in Middle Hittite times, but there is also some evidence for Addressee orientation in Old Hittite. The latter evidence strenghtens the case for Distal or Other oriented *asi* in Old Hittite.

Table 5.5. combines all previous tables (in the NPs the accented elements are underlined).

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| | continuity procedure | | | centering procedure | |
| | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| Situational | ∅ | <i>apa-</i> | <i>apa-</i> | — | <i>apez, apiya</i> |
| Recognitional | — | — | — | — | <i>apa- <u>N</u></i> |
| Discourse Deictic in node | — | — | <i>apat, <u>apa-</u> N</i> | — | — |
| across-node | — | — | <i>apenissan</i> — | — | <i>apat, apa- N</i> <i>apenissan</i> |
| Tracking in node | — | — | <i><u>apa-</u> N, N <u>apa-</u></i> | — | — |
| across node | — | — | — | — | <i>apa- <u>N</u></i> |

Table 5.5: The *apa-* matrix.

6. The proximal demonstrative *ka-*

6.1. Status Quaestionis

6.1.1. Former views on the proximal demonstrative *ka-*

In contrast to the morphology and etymology of *ka-* ‘this’, the different uses of this proximal demonstrative have never been the subject of extensive study, probably because its meaning has been clear from the beginning (Hrozný 1917)²²². Remarks on the use of *ka-* hardly ever exceeded references to the Latin deictic system.²²³ Usually the demonstrative *ka-* is seen as the functional opposite of *apa-*, but as I have shown in chapter 3, 4 and 5, the Hittite productive demonstrative system consists of at least three terms: proximal *ka-*, medial *apa-* (see chapter 5) and distal *asi* (see chapter 4). The existence of an additional term for remote deixis raised the question whether Hittite had a distance-based or person-based system (with two terms this is impossible to decide). I concluded that the medial term *apa-* indicated position near the Addressee, wherever that Addressee was located in relation to the Speaker. The person orientation of *ka-* and *apa-* was also noted by Friedrich 1960 and Puhvel 1984ff. (for more discussion see 3.1.3. and 5.1.2.).

Most information on the use of *ka-* is to be gained from Friedrich 1960: 134. Aside from the comparison with Latin, Friedrich made three observations:

1. *ka-* refers forward, *apa-*, *eni-* and *asi* refer backward (o.c. 134, §§ 249, 250, 251). He did not state this literally but the reader has to infer it from § 249-251, of which § 251 is conclusive: “Mit dieser Verteilung der beiden Gruppen auf Vor- und Rückdeutung ...”.
2. At the same time *ka-* can also refer to the first person (Ich-Deixis) and *apa-* to the second and third person (Du-Deixis and Jener-Deixis) (§ 251, see also Friedrich 1930: 94f., 141f.). Thus, the combination *ka-* N ... *apa-* N means something like ‘my N ... your N’. Similarly, *kā* means ‘here with me’ and *apiya* ‘there with you’ or ‘there with him’.

²²² Hrozný 1917: 140 (“dieser”, selten “jener”. The latter translation is not supported by the Hittite material), Forrer 1922: 207-208 (“dieser da”, still mistakenly assuming the existence of *taš*, “dieser hier”), Pedersen 1938: 48 (“dieser”), id. Kammenhuber 1969: 213, 310 etc. etc.

²²³ *ka-* = ‘hic’ versus *apa-* = ‘is’ (Benveniste 1953: 255); *ka-* = ‘dieser, hic’, *apa-* = ‘jener, der, is’ (Friedrich HE: 66), and *ka-* = ‘hic’, *apa-* = ‘is’, *eni-* = ‘ille’, *aši-* = ‘iste’ (o.c. 134); *ka-* = ‘dieser, hic’, *apa-* = ‘jener, er, der betreffende; is’ (Tischler 1977f.: 39, 456); *ka/ki-* = ‘hic’, *aba-* = ‘ille’ (Laroche 1979: 148, 152); *ka-* = ‘this (one), the (following) one; my, mine, our(s)’, *apa-* = ‘that, thy, thine’ “like Lat. *hic* vs. *iste*” (Puhvel K: 3); *ka-* = ‘hic’, *sya-* = ‘iste’, *apa-* = ‘ille’, *-a-* = ‘is’, *apasila* = ‘ipse’ (Neu 1997: 148 n. 39).

3. As a result of this orientation on person it is even possible that *ka-* and *kissan* refer backwards in connection with first person. From Friedrich 1930: 141 I quote:

ki-iš-ša-an übersetzen wir gewöhnlich “folgendermaßen”, da es oft auf etwas erst zu Erwähnendes v o r a u s d e u t e t ... Das ist jedoch nicht die einzige Verwendung des Adverbs; entsprechend seiner Verwandschaft mit dem ich-deiktischen Pronomen *kāš* = lat. *hic* bedeutet es allgemein “in dieser Weise”, meist mit deutlicher Beziehung auf die s p r e c h e n d e Person, und kann so unter Umständen auch auf etwas schon Erwähntes z u r ü c k v e r w e i s e n.

6.1.2. Fragestellung

That *ka-* is the proximal demonstrative ‘this’ is without doubt. However, much more can be said on the function of *ka-*. First I will classify *ka-* according to the four categories of demonstrative use (Situational, Recognitional, Anaphoric and Discourse Deictic) which are familiar by now (sections 6.2 to 6.5.). For an explanation of this terminology see the preceding chapters. Besides these four categories we have also forward reference to objects by means of *ka-*, which was not attested for the other demonstratives (section 6.6.)

One of the questions that will be addressed is to what extent the proximal demonstrative is Speaker oriented. Of course the other chapters already have shown that Hittite has a person-based demonstrative system, but one should still want to find independent proof of this for *ka-*. Another question is whether it is indeed surprising that *ka-* refers backward, compared to its forward referring function.

Another point which needs to be discussed is how contrastive pairs are expressed in Hittite. In English contrastive pairs are expressed as ‘this and/or that’, but cross-linguistically this is not the only way to do so (section 6.7).

6.2. The Situational Use of *ka-*

6.2.1. Introduction

There are three situational contexts for *ka-*: true situational use (6.2.2.) and Direct Speech (6.2.3.), and linguistic selfreference (6.2.4.). The Topic-Focus distribution will be described in the conclusion (6.2.5.).

6.2.2. True situational use

There are many examples of true situational use of *ka-*. When one wants to refer to a location in association with the Speaker, the Place Deictic adverbs *kez* (older *ket*) ‘on this side’ and *ka* ‘here’ are used (6.2.2.1.). But naturally not only places are referred to, also objects located in an area associated with the Speaker can be indicated by means of *ka-* (6.2.2.2.).

6.2.2.1. The place deictic adverbs *ket*, *kez*, *ka* and *kani*²²⁴

The adverb of relative position *ket* / *kez* ‘on this side (of)’, often in relation with *edi* / *edez* ‘on the other side’ indicates an area relative to some point of reference. This point of reference is not necessarily the same as the deictic center. In the next two examples the point of reference is a river. The place deictic adverbs refer to locations at both sides of the river in case of ex. 6.1. and one side of the river in ex. 6.2 as seen from the deictic center.

6.1 KBo 6.2 i 48-50, § 22 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 31-32

§⁴⁸ [ta]kku ARAD-aš huuāi n=an āppa kuiški uuatezzi takku manninkuuan ē[pz]i
⁴⁹ nu=šše^{KUŠ} E.SIR-uš pāi takku ke-e-et ÍD-az 2 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi⁵⁰ takku e-
di ÍD-az nu=šše 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi §
 If a male slave runs away and someone brings him back: if he captures (him) nearby,
 he gives him shoes. If (he captures him) on this side (*ket*) of the river, he gives 2
 sheqels of silver. If (he captures him) on that side (*edi*) of the river, he gives him 3
 sheqels of silver.

The river mentioned in this law must be the Marrasantiya river (Halys) surrounding the central country of Hatti. The deictic center is Hatti (Melchert 1977: 154). Another example where the point of reference is a river, this time with only *kez*, the NH counterpart of *ket*:

6.2 KBo 4.3 i 30-32 (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68), ed. Friedrich 1926: 118-119

našma=tta^{dUTU-ŠI} ³¹ [ku]it ke-e-ez IŠTU ÍD Aštarpa Û IŠTU ÍD Šianna ŪL³² [k]uitki
 ADDIN zik=ma=kan ZAG-an šarratti nu=za datti kuitki
 Or (if), though (*kuit*) I, My Majesty, have not given you anything on this side (*kez*) of
 the rivers Astarpa and Siyanda, you (still) violate the border and take something ...

In both examples the adverb *ket* / *kez* points at an area in the sphere of influence of the Speaker, i.e., the king or Hatti.

Summarizing, areas relative to some location other than the Deictic Center are often referred to by means of *ket* ... *edi*, *kez* ... *edez*. In one case (ex. 6.3) Melchert believes that the deictic force of *ket* ... *edi* should not be taken seriously (1977: 171). He assumes that, as in English, ‘on this side and that’ may evolve into ‘on one side and the other’. But as we will see, this type of deictic contrast is expressed by *ket* ... *ket* / *kez* ... *kez* and, when referring to objects, by *ka*- ... *ka*-. To return to Melchert’s example, cited below, what then does *ket* ... *edi* mean in ex. 6.3?

6.3 KBo 17.15 rev. 14’-16’ (OS ritual, CTH *645.6), ed. Neu 1980a: 73-74

[(UGULA LÚ.MEŠ MUHALDIM)]^{15’} haššāš katta ke-e-et arta VI 𒀭AR-n[ā]i^{SAR} harzi
 L[Ú heštā]^{16’} haššāš katta e-di paršanān harzi VI 𒀭AR-n[ā]i^{SAR} harzi
 The Head of the cooks stands near the hearth on the near side (*ket*). He holds 6
harnai-plants. The *hesta*-man is squatting near the hearth on the far side (*edi*). He
 holds 6 *harnai*-plants.²²⁵

²²⁴ The formal aspects of *ket*, *kez*, *ka* and *kani* will not be discussed here. For literature and discussion see for example Melchert 1977, Puhvel K, Neu 1980b, 1997.

Although the actions described in the rituals often elude us, one could imagine the following: There are two persons who have to stand besides the hearth. The cook is allowed to stand upright on the side of the hearth towards the Speaker, who is the main participant in the ritual and therefore the Deictic Center. For some reason the *hesta*-man has to squat at the far (yonder) side of the hearth. Like the rivers in exx. 6.1 and 6.2 the hearth is a point of reference with a near and a far side from the viewpoint of the Speaker.

When there is only one point of reference without the involvement of the Deictic Center or when the Deictic Center itself is the only point of reference, its sides are expressed by means of *ket ... ket*, or *kez ... kez*. The proper translation in this case is ‘one side (of ...), the / another side (of ...)’:

6.4 **KBo 8.74 + rev. iii 16’-18’** (OS ritual, CTH *752.1A), ed. Neu 1980a: 223

^{16’} [MAR[?].G]ÍD.DA ^dIM-ni ZAG-a[z *dā*]i *harši*harši II-šU *hattaran* ^{17’} III-šU *hattaran* išt[an]anaš *ke-et-ta ke-e-et-ta* ^{18’} *dāi* GIŠBANŠUR-ia=ššan *dāi*
He [place]s the [char]iot [a]t the right side of the Stormgod. He places a twice-engraved (and) a thrice-engraved jar both at one side (*kett=a*) and at another side (*kett=a*) of the altar (gen.sg.), and he places a table on (it).

Puhvel H: 198f. translates the construction as ‘hither and yon *upon* altars’ (italics mine). But as Melchert notes (1977: 154ff.), a directional ablative or an instrumental (or endless locative?) demonstrative pronoun is either combined with a dative or genitive in Old Hittite if there is no other point of reference.²²⁶ In all examples with *ket ... ket* or *kez ... kez* the demonstratives denote position at the side of an object and not on top of it, as the following example clearly shows:

6.5 **KBo 19.76 +: 16’-19’** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Alp 1991: 24, 26-27, Houwink ten Cate 1979: 161-3

^{15’} *nu=kan kuitman un*[i ^{HUR.SAG} *Kuṣatēlši* (?) *anda*]ā[r]hūn *nu* UD.KAM-az *takšan*
^{16’} *tijat kuitman=ma=ka*[n *šarā pāun nu neku*]tta *nu=ššan* ×-(×) ^{17’} *INA*
^{HUR.SAG} *Kuṣatēlša* [š]an[ahhun *nu=mu ke-e-ez* ^{URU}Šunap]aššiš *ke-ez-za=ma=mu* ^{18’}
^{URU}Išdupištaš *ke-ez=ma=mu* [LÚ.MEŠ ^{URU}Pittagalaišša Š]EŠ.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ
^{URU}Malazziia=pat ^{19’} *nu=mu tūuaz uškir*

Before I had arrived at tha[t Mount Kuwatelsi], the day had passed halfway. And while [I went u]p, night fell. [I s]earc[hed] for ... on mount Kuwatelsa. [At one side (*kez*) of me was (the town of) Sunap]assi, on another side (*kezza*) of me (the town of) Isdupista, (and) on a third side (*kez*) of me [the inhabitants of (the town of) Pittagalaissa, br]ethren of in fact the inhabitants of (the town of) Malazziya. They could see me from afar.

²²⁵ The translation follows Starke 1977: 183f. “Der Anführer der Köche steht diesseits zusammen mit (= neben) dem Herd. Er hält sechs *harnai*- Pflanze. Der *hešta*-Mann hält sich jenseits zusammen mit (= neben) dem Herd niedergehockt”, contra Neu 1980b: 20: “neben dem Herd steht er hier”.

²²⁶ Melchert l.c.: “In general, when a directional ablative is construed with a preceding dative (or genitive in Old Hittite), the latter is the sole point of reference for defining the direction expressed by the ablative: *haššaš* / *hašši tapuša* ‘to the side of / beside the hearth’. When the directional ablative is accompanied by another ablative, the direction expressed is also defined in terms of another, unexpressed reference point: ^{NA}₄*huušašiaz arahza* ‘outside of (= beyond) the *huušaš*-stone’ (as viewed from the city X)”.

Melchert assumes for cases like the ones mentioned above that the deictic force of *kez* ‘on this side’ had bleached to come to mark any direction of an object (o.c. 197).

The adverb of relative position *ket* can also occur without its counterpart:

- 6.6 **KBo 17.3+ iii 25-27**, with OS duplicate KBo 17.1+ iii 25ff. (OS ritual, CTH 416.1A), ed. Neu 1980a: 15

[(I MÁŠ.GAL-)]*ri garauni*≠š[(i)]²⁶ *muriiale*[(š *gangante*)]š *ke-e-et-ta* *gar*[*auni*≠š*i*]
]²⁷ *muriialaš* [g]*anganteš*

At the horn of a he-goat grape-breads are hanging, and also, grape-breads are hanging on [his] hor[n] on the other side (*kett=a*)²²⁷.

Starke (1977: 138, with discussion on p. 73) interprets *kett-a* as the instrumental in causal function: ‘und (zwar) dadurch’ instead of locational ‘on this side’. One argument in favor of his interpretation would be that this is the only case where *kett-a* is not part of a couple (Starke o.c. p. 73²²⁸). However, all clauses in my corpus that contain *ket ... ket* / *kez ... kez* have the same predicates. The only thing in ex. 6.6 that is different from *ket ... ket* / *kez ... kez* clauses, is that the first *ket* is not expressed, otherwise both clauses have the same predicates. As I will discuss in Chapter 7 on *apa-*, coordinated clauses with *≠ya* cliticized on the first NP have to be symmetrical. In such a case one clause cannot be subordinate to the other, either syntactically or semantically. It is therefore impossible to assign a causal relation or any other semantically subordinate relation to the members of a coordination as Starke does.²²⁹

A later example which is similar to ex. 6.6. is:

- 6.7 **KBo 32.14 ii 26-30** (MH/MS wisdomtext), ed. Neu 1996: 79

§²⁶ *aliġanaš n=ašta* *ÍD-an tapuša kuiēš*²⁷ *uešeš nu apūš uešġiattari*²⁸ *ke-e-zi-ia*=*ka*[*n*] *kuiēš uešeš nu=ššan apēdašš=a*²⁹ *š[ākuuā] zikkizzi*

A deer: he is allowed to graze (only) those meadows that are alongside the river. But as for the meadows that are on the other side (*kezi=*), on those *too* he sets (his) e[yes].

From these examples one can conclude that distance was not of importance for the couple *ket ... ket* / *kez ... kez*. However, as explained in Chapter 2, deixis is not necessarily based on distance. In a person-based deictic system one expects that orientation around the Speech participants is much more important than distance from the Speaker. Thus, *ka- ... ka-* can indicate any side of the Speaker (or temporarily shifted Deictic Center). In contrast with orientation on the Speaker only, the expression *ka- ... apa-* points at locations in the domain of the Speaker (*ka-*) and Addressee (*apa-*) respectively, and *ka- ... asi* at the domain of the Speaker (and Addressee or Audience) versus outside the domain of Speaker + Addressee.

²²⁷ Contra Neu 1980b: 21 “bei einem Ziegenbock, an seinem Horn . . . und hier an seinem Horn”.

²²⁸ “Im übrigen gibt die Übersetzung “auf dieser Seite” hier überhaupt keinen Sinn, weil das Pendant fehlt.”

²²⁹ On p. 74 Starke indeed refers to the necessarily symmetrical property of clauses joined by *≠ya*. He does not seem to apply this symmetry to the semantic level and therefore translates *kett-a* as an instrumental ‘und (zwar) dadurch’.

The preceding examples illustrated location at the sides of some point of reference. But points of reference themselves have to be located too. The location of the Speaker and his audience is expressed by means of Old Hittite *kani*²³⁰ and Middle and New Hittite *ka* “here”:

- 6.8 **KBo 22.1 obv. 4'-6'** (OS instruction, CTH 272), ed. CHD Š: 23
kiššan AWĀT ABI=YA ^{5'} *paḥšanutten takku šumeš natta šaktēni* ^{6'} *ka-a-ni* LÚŠU.GI-
ešš=a NU.GÁL *nu=šmaš memai AWAT ABI=YA*
 Is this the way you have protected the word of my father?!²³¹ If *you* do not know, are there not old men here (*kani*)²³² too? (One of them) can tell you my father's word.
- 6.9 **KBo 2.2 i 12-14** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 124-125
 § ¹² *mān* dUTU-ŠI ¹³ *apaššaš* ¹⁴ *a-pí-ia-pát* ŠÀ KUR URUNerikka ¹⁵ *uemiāzi ka-*
a=ma ŪL...
 If the fever will befall My Majesty only there (*apiya=pat*), in the country of Nerik, but not here (*ka*), ...

If the general location expressed by *ka* needs to be more specified, *ka* can be accompanied by an apposition:

- 6.10 **HKM 18 rev. 17-20** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 148-149
 § ¹⁷ ŠA ÉRIN.MEŠ *=ma=mu* *kuit uttar ḫatrāeš* ¹⁸ *nu=mu ka-a katti=mi* ÉRIN.MEŠ
 KUR.UGU ¹⁹ ÉRIN.MEŠ KUR URU*Išhūpitta* *kuiški* ²⁰ *n=an=da uppaḫḫi* §
 Now, as for the affair of the soldiers about which you wrote to me, some soldiers of the Upper Country (and some) soldiers of the country of Ishupitta (are) here (*ka*), with me (*katti=mi*). I will send them to you.
- 6.11 **HKM 2, left edge 1-2** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 122-123
 § ¹ *ka-a-ia* INA É-K[A] ² [h]ūman SIG₅-in
Also here (*ka=ya*), in your house (INA É-K[A]), everything is well.

²³⁰ Otten 1973: 27 tries to relate *kani* “hier” to an alleged *kān* which should mean something like “thus”. In this he is followed by Puhvel K: 47 who lists *kan* under *kani*. Otten o.c. 27-28 reads *ka-a-na-at* (*kan(-at)*) “thus it” in KUB 41.23 ii 20' (see below for a transcription of lines 18'-21' with a new reading for *ka-a-na-at*). The adverb *kan* ‘thus, likewise’ would replace the expected *QATAMMA* ‘likewise’. Besides the introduction of an otherwise not attested demonstrative adverb of manner, one also must assume that the enclitic neuter pronoun -*at* in *ka-a-na-at* refers proleptically to two concepts of common gender *ištanzana(š)=šmiš* (mistakenly written -*šmit*) *karaz=šmiš=a* ‘their soul and their innards (= their inmost soul)’. These problems may be avoided if one reads *ka-a* UD¹-*at* instead of *ka-a-na-at*. KUB 41.23 ii 18'-21' (OH/NS) now becomes ^{18'} *šiuṇan* dUTU-*ui* *marnuṇan mān šieššarr=a* ^{19'} *an<da> kulamtati ištazana(š)=šmiš* *karaz=(š)mišš=a* ^{20'} *1-iš kišat ka-a* UD¹-*at* DINGIR *šiuṇan* dUTU-*aš* *labar[našš=a]* ^{21'} *ištazana(š)=šmit* *karaz=zamišš=a* *1-iš kišaru* ‘O Sungod of the gods, as *marnu*-drink and beer have been blended (and) their mind and heart (lit. innards) have become one, let to-day the mind and heart of the Sungod of the gods [and of]the Labar[na] become one!’ The closely related texts KUB 43.61 and its duplicate KUB 43.63 also contain the expression *ka-a* UD-*at* ‘today’.

²³¹ See example 6.38 for this translation.

²³² CHD Š p. 23 translates *kani* as ‘there’.

Finally, *ka* ... *ka*, ‘here(to) ... there(to)’ (literally ‘here(to) ... here(to)’) is used to express different locations near the (shifted) Deictic Center.

6.12 **KBo 3.5 i 45-47** (MH/MS), ed. Kammenhuber 1961: 83-85

ḫalziššanzi=ma ⁴⁶ *me-i-ni-ši-el-la-a-ú-za mi-e-ua_a tarkummanzi=ma kiššan* ⁴⁷ *ka-a=ua* 20 IKU.ḪI.A *parḫāi ka-a=ma=ua!* 7 IKU.ḪI.A *parḫāi*
They call “*meinišellāuza mieua*”. They translate as follows: “He makes (them) gallop 20 IKU in one direction (*ka*), and 7 IKU in another direction (*ka*)”.

6.2.2.2. *The demonstrative pronoun and determiner ka-*

In this section I will discuss reference to objects in the speech situation. In order to find textual references to the outside world, it should first be clear that the object referred to by *ka-* was present when the text/utterance was produced and second, the expression *ka-* (+ noun) should be a first mention. Nothing prevents a Speaker from referring deictically a second time, but with only textual evidence at hand one cannot easily distinguish between a second deictic or anaphoric reference (Anaphoric reference will be discussed in 6.5.). Another complication is the often sad state of the tablets. Especially when the tablet is damaged, which is often the case, the first mention criterium is hard to uphold. The examples in this section without commentary on the state of the tablet are all broken but whenever I present a true first mention I will say so explicitly.

A unique example of a text referring to an object with which the text is closely connected, is the cuneiform Hittite draft of the Hieroglyphic Luvian Nišantaš inscription. The Nišantaš text seems to be a building inscription accompanying an elevated *hekur*, a stone sanctuary, constructed by Suppiluliuma (II). In the cuneiform draft we find references to both the *hekur* and a statue of Tudhaliya IV which resides inside this structure:

6.13 **KBo 12.38 ii 4'-10'** (lateNH draft for statue inscription, Suppiluliuma, CTH 121), ed. Güterbock 1967: 76, 78

§ ^{4'} *ki-i=ma=za ALAM* [*ABU=YA (?)*] ^{5'} *mTudḫaliyaš U[L 1-aš DÜ-at (?)*] ^{6'} *ūqq=a=at* ^mKÜ.GA.P[*Ú-aš LUGAL.GAL*] ... ^{10'} *ījanun* §
Now, this (*ki*) statue [my father] Tudhaliya did n[ot make] (it) [alone (?)], also I, Suppiluliuma, ..., made it.²³³

6.14 **KBo 12.38 iv 3'-4'** (lateNH draft for building inscription, Suppiluliuma, CTH 121), ed. Güterbock 1967: 77-78

*nu=šši ku-u-un*²³⁴ ^{NA₄}*hekur SAG.UŠ* ^{4'} [*ūk*] ^mKÜ.GA.P[*Ú-aš LUGAL.GAL*] *ṽedahhun* §
It is [I], Suppiluliuma, Great King, who built this (*kun*) Everlasting Stone Sanctuary for him.

Besides this unique draft we have otherwise only texts that were spoken aloud in the presence of an object or person or at some location. This is not very different from direct speech

²³³ In order to account for the particle *-ya* “also” in *ú-uq-qa-at* I have inserted ‘1-aš’ in the break to express that also Suppiluliuma worked on the statue. It is possible that the statue was erected by Tudhaliya but that his son inscribed Tudhaliya’s deeds on it.

²³⁴ Note the regular common gender for *hekur* (Rieken 1999: 287f.).

reference to an object or location described in the preceding text (see section 6.2.3.). Ex. 6.16 is comparable to the symbolic deixis of ex. 2.24, repeated here as 6.15:

6.15 This city stinks (Levinson 1983: 66, ex. 31b)

6.16 **KUB 43.23 rev. 19'-21'** (OS benediction, CTH 820), ed. Archi 1979a: 34

nu=za 1 ŠAḪ māḥḥan^{20'} ŠAḪ.TUR.ḪI.A mekkuš ḥaškizzi ke-e-el-la-az ŠA^{GIŠ}KIRI₆.G[EŠTIN]^{21'} 1-ašš=a^{GIŠ}māḥlaš ŠAḪ-aš iṭar mūriuš^{22'} mekkuš ḥaškiddu
Just as one sow bears many piglets, let also every single branch of this (*ke*)
[vine]yard, like the sow, bear many (grape) clusters.

Although the objects and locations in the preceding examples might also be anaphoric, the person referred to by *ka-* in ex. 6.17 is truly mentioned for the first time:

6.17 **HKM 57 obv. 10-13** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 226-227

§¹⁰ *ka-a-aš kuiš mKaštanda¹¹ ARAD LÚ DUMU SANGA URUUrišta¹² ēšzi*
nu=za=kan MUNUS URUGašša¹³ ūašta<š?>

As for this (*kas*) Kastanda who is the servant of the man of the son of the priest of Urista: he has sinned with a woman from (the city) Gassa.

That Kastanda is really present when the tablet is read to the Addressees (a military governor and one Huilli) is clear from the following lines, obv. 13-24: 'Himmuili and Tahumuwa, two men from Hassarpanda, have taken her away from him. § Now, I have just sent you Kastanda, servant of the man of the son of the priest. Judge his case and bring it to conclusion!'

But also something as elusive (to us) as an oath deity²³⁵ is considered present at the conclusion of a treaty or instruction:

6.18 **KBo 16.24+ i 46'-49'** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 251), ed. Rizzi Mellini 1979: 522-523

§^{46'} *[našma?]=ššan kuiš kūruri parā galankanza nu kiššan^{47'} [imma t]ezzi*
man=ua ini kūrur arḥa ḥarakzi nu kiššan^{48'} [(imma t)]ezzi man=ua ini [kūru]r
^{49'} [par(ā a)]lpuēšzi [nu] apūn ke-e NIŠ DINGIR.MEŠ appandu

Or (if) someone is completely fed up with war and speaks as follows: "Would but that war utterly disappear!", and speaks as follows: "Would but that war", (then) let these (*ke*) oaths deities grab *that* one, ...

Finally I present some instances of Time Deixis although expressions of time are not of major concern in this study. The moment, day or year of the text is referred to by means of *ka-*²³⁶:

6.19 **KUB 43.23 obv. 3-5** (OS benediction, CTH 820)

²³⁵ Besides the cited example, also in **OH** KBo 9.73+ obv. 9' (treaty, CTH 27); **MH** KBo 5.3+ ii 4, 11, 31, 43, 54, iv 33', KUB 26.37 12', 14', KUB 23.74+ 9', KUB 26.38 10' (treaty, CTH 42), KBo 16.46 obv. 12', 18' (CTH 212), KBo 16.24+ i 5', 13', 75', ii 20', iv 6 (instruction with oath, CTH 251A), KUB 31.114 ii 15' (CTH 271); **NH** KUB 21.1+ iv 33, 38 (treaty, CTH 76); **lateNH** Bo 86/299 iv 10, 16, 28 (treaty, CTH 106A), KBo 4.10+ rev. 5, 12, 19 (treaty, CTH 106B), KUB 26.43 + rev. 20, 21 (landgrant, CTH 225), KUB 26.12+ i 30, ii 11, 22, 28 (instruction with oath, CTH 255.1), KUB 26.1 iii 44 (instruction with oath, CTH 255.2).

²³⁶ And in Direct Speech: KBo 4.14 ii 33 (lateNH treaty, CTH 123).

mān=aš kardimijanza ⁴ [] *kardimijattan ke-e-ti UD-ti arḥa peššeaddu* ⁵ *mān=aš tamatta=ma* KUR-*ia n=an tamētaš* ⁶ [KU]R-*az uṣatetten*

If he is angry, let him throw away (his anger) on this (*keti*) day. But if he is in another country, you must bring him from (that) other country.

- 6.20 **1043/u iv 11-12** (NH vow, Puduhepa & Hattusili, CTH 585), ed. Otten & Souček 1965: 34-36²³⁷

¹¹ MU V.KAM *ka-a-aš kuiš* MU.KAM-z[(*a parā uiz*)zi *n=aš=kan*] ¹² [*k*]arū *anda appānza* [

..., fifth year. This (*kas*) year that is (still) going on, has [a]lready been included.

6.2.3. Direct Speech

The criterium for inclusion of *ka-* (+N) in the category of Direct Speech is first mention, with the further restriction that the Direct Speech is not part of a larger citation. Both non-first mention and citation from a larger part of text are not necessarily deictic. Given the fact that anaphoric references of *ka-* are widely attested (see section 6.5.), one cannot be certain whether second mentions in citations are truly deictic. However, for some likely attestations of this type of mixed deictic/anaphoric reference, see section 6.5.4.

Besides isolating deictic references in Direct Speech it is possible to establish whether the extra-linguistic object is salient or not. Often the narration preceding the Direct Speech provides information on the cognitive status of the object(s) in the situation. If for example the object is described and clearly manipulated by the Speaker or someone in the presence of the Speaker, one can be rather certain that the object is already salient, in the center of attention before it is mentioned. If such clues are absent on the other hand, one should consider the object not-salient.

Using this criterium, a pattern appears: the pronominal demonstrative *ka-* is used when an object is salient, and a demonstrative description *ka-* + *N* is used when the object is not salient.

6.2.3.1. The continuity procedure: the demonstrative pronoun *ka-*

In all the following examples the referent of *ka-* is salient. Giving birth to 30 children at once necessarily brings this event in the center of attention:

- 6.21 **KBo 22.2 obv. 1-2** (OS narration, CTH 3.1A), ed. Otten 1973: 6-7

¹ MUNUS.LUGAL URU *Kaniš* XXX DUMU.MEŠ *I-EN* MU-*anti ḥāšta UMMA ŠI=MA* ² [*ki-*]i=*ṣa* *kuit ṣalkuan ḥāšḥun*

The queen of Kanes gave birth to 30 sons in one year. Thus she (said): “What is this (*ki*)!? I have given birth to a gang!”

²³⁷ Time expressions occur also in KUB 6.45+ iii 20, 21 (prayer, CTH 381), KBo 11.1 rev. 17 (prayer, CTH 382).

In the following two examples the referent of *ka-* is manipulated by the Speaker and obviously in the center of attention:

- 6.22 **KBo 15.10+ ii 12-16** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szábo 1971: 20-21

¹² [QAD]U kurdāli idalāmuš EME.ĤI.A arḥa šuḥḥair ¹³ [nu k]iššan mēmīr ke-e māḥḥan ḥarkanzi ¹⁴ [fZ]iš=a BELAM QADU DAM-ŠU DUMU.ME[Š-]ŠU kuit iššišta ¹⁵ [nu Š]A fZi alyanzatar=šet idālu uddār=šet QATAMMA ¹⁶ [ḥara]kdu n=at=apa EGIR-pa lē uizzi §

[Wit]h the *kurdali* vessel they threw away the evil tongues. They spoke [as f]ollows: “Just as these (*ke*) are destroyed, given the fact that Zi regularly acted against the lord, his wife (and) children, may likewise the sorcery of Zi (and) her evil words [peris]h, let them not come back!”

- 6.23 **KBo 15.10+ ii 23-26** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szábo 1971: 24-25

nu tūruppuš ḥappinit zanuzi n=uš arḥa ²⁴ tuḥšannai nu ANA dIM Û DINGIR.LÚ.MEŠ-ŠU ANA dUTU Û DINGIR.LÚ.MEŠ-ŠU ²⁵ piran zikizzi nu kiššan mēmiškizzi ²⁶ dUTU-uš dUTU-yaš DINGIR.LÚ.MEŠ dIM dIM-naš DINGIR.LÚ.MEŠ ku-u-uš tuḥšumen ...

He roasts the *turuppu*-breads in a flame, and cuts them to pieces. He puts (each of them) in front of the Stormgod and his male gods and the Sungod and his male gods. He speaks as follows: “Sungod, male gods of the Sungod, Stormgod, male gods of the Stormgod, we have cut off these (*kus*, pieces). ...”

The demonstrative *ki* in the following excerpt from the deeds of Suppiluliuma refers to an event: the actions concerning the marriage of a Hittite prince with Tut-anch-amon’s widow. These events have been the discourse topic for some time:

- 6.24 **KBo 14.12 iv 35-39** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40), ed. Güterbock 1956: 98

³⁵ [k]aruḫiliiaz=ya=kan URUḤattušaš ³⁶ [UR]UMizrašš=a ištarni=šummi āššijanteš ³⁷ [e]šir kinuna=ya=nnaš=kan ki-i-ia ištarni=šu[mmi] ³⁸ [kiš]at nu=ya=kan KUR URUḤATTI KUR URUMizr[i=ia] ³⁹ [ukt]uri namma ištarni=šummi āššij[anteš] §§

“Of [o]ld, Hattusa and Egypt [w]ere friendly with each other. Today, this too (*ki=ya*) has occurred amongst us. The lands of Hatti [and] Egyp[t] will continue [to be] friendly with each other [for]ever!”

Summarizing, when the object or event mentioned for the first time in Direct Speech is salient, the Speaker uses the pronoun *ka-*. It is interesting to see that *ka-* in all cases is either in initial position or in first position. The first position is easily explained: in those cases the Expanding Focus particle *-ya* “also” is attached to *ka-*²³⁸. As I will explain in chapter 7, there is a clear correlation between first position and *-ya* “also”. The initial position of *ka-* in

²³⁸ The other examples with salient *ka-* + *-ya* are **NH**: KBo 14.12 iv 37 (annals, CTH 40), KBo 4.6 rev. 20’ (CTH 380), **lateNH**: KUB 26.32+ iii 15’ (oath, CTH 124).

6.23²³⁹, without the topic switching device *-ma*, is, I believe, connected with the fact that the object is not only salient, but also a Discourse Topic.

6.2.3.2. The centering procedure: the demonstrative description *ka-* + noun

When the referent of *ka-* is not yet manipulated in the speech situation and thus not the most salient element around, the Speaker uses a demonstrative noun phrase. Rituals abound with references to different entities in the speech situation. These entities are for example the patient, his or her disease, substitutes, the objects manipulated by the ritual practitioner, food offered to the deity etc. Therefore reference with only *ka-* would not be sufficient to identify the intended object.

6.25 **KBo 15.10+ i 12-14** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szábo 1971: 14-15

§¹² [*nu=*] *kan anda INA É BELI pedanzi nu 1 kurdāli išnāš*¹³ [*Q*] *ADU <EME.HI.A> dāi nu kiššan memai ke-e-ua idālaueš*¹⁴ *[-X-] ešiianteš EME.HI.A iššišta=ma=aš*^f *Ziplantaui[aš]* ...

They carry (it) into the house of the lord. He takes one *kurdali*-vessel of dough with <the tongues>, and speaks as follows: “These evil ... tongues, Ziplantawiy[a] has made them. ...”

In i 12 not the tongues are manipulated, but the vessel. Therefore the tongues are not the most salient and need to be further identified by means of a noun. Many other examples of *ka-* + Noun are cited in Puhvel K: 3ff.

In ex. 6.26 the 600 soldiers are mentioned in the preceding narrative text. The difference with the salient situation is that we are probably dealing here with a performative act (“I hereby give ...”): the giving, i.e., the ‘manipulation’ of the soldiers and speech occur at the same time. If not, this would be the only example in my corpus breaking the pattern.

6.26 **KUB 14.15 iv 46-48** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 74-75

§⁴⁶ [*namma=šši* 6]00 *ÉRIN.MEŠ ANA SAG.DU-ŠU uškišqattallanni peḥhun*⁴⁷ [*nu=šši kišš*] *an memaḥhun LÚ.MEŠ*^{URU} *Mirā=ua kuit maršanteš*⁴⁸ [*nu=ua=tta*] *ka-a-aš 600 ÉRIN.MEŠ SAG.DU-i uškišqatallaš ēšdu* ...

[Furthermore,] I gave [him 6]00 soldiers for keeping constant watch over his person. I told [him as follo]ws: “Given the fact that the people of Mira are treacherous, let these (*kas*) 600 soldiers be [your] personal constant watch! ...”

And finally, a late Hittite example²⁴⁰:

6.27 **KUB 26.1 iv 49-50** (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.2), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 17

²³⁹ Vocatives are usually extraposed constituents. Other salient *ka*-s occur in **MH**: KBo 5.3 + i 9 (CTH 42), KBo 15.10+ iii 55² (CTH 443).

²⁴⁰ Other references with *ka-* referring to entities that are not salient in the extra-linguistic context: **MH**: KUB 26.37 obv. 10² (treaty, CTH 42), KUB 31.127 rev. 16² (?) (treaty, CTH 131), HKM 48 obv. 7 (letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ABoT 60 obv. 16² (letter, CTH 200), KBo 15.10+ ii 5 (ritual, CTH 443).

§ ⁴⁹ *našma kī kuiški memai ke-e-da-ni=ua=kan øUPPI* ⁵⁰ *kē INIM.MEŠ ŪL GAR-ru*
 ...
 Or (if) someone says this: ‘on this (*kedani*) tablet these affairs are not written down,
 ...

6.2.4. Linguistic Selfreference

Linguistic selfreference or reflexive language is the type of situational deixis where an expression refers to the speech act itself or, in written language, to the object containing the expression (for more information on this subject see 2.3.1.1. and 3.1.4.). In Hittite the only clear examples of linguistic selfreference are *tuppi* ‘tablet’, although the text types *lingai-* ‘oath (as text genre)’, *ishiul* ‘treaty’ and the more general *memiya(n)-* ‘word, affair’ could also supply evidence for selfreference. The problem with these non-material designations is how to separate linguistic selfreference from discourse deixis.

For linguistic self-reference to a tablet see for example²⁴¹

- 6.28 **HKM 14 obv. 3-4** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 140-141
 § ³ *māḥhan=ta ka-a-aš tuppianza anda* ⁴ *uemiāzzi*
 When this (*kas*) letter finds with you, ...

In the next example not only the tablet is referred to, but also the oath (*lingai-*) and the stipulations of the oath:

- 6.29 **KUB 8.82 rev. 23’-25’**, emendations from KBo 12.31 (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 105), ed. Kühne & Otten 1971: 20-21
 List of Gods [*n=at (ḥūmant)*]eš *ke-e-da-aš memiānaš* [...] ^{24’} [(*ke-e-da-ni lingai ku*)truenesš *ašandu (nu=kan mān ke-e-)]el tuppiaš* INIM.MEŠ *uāḥnuš[(i)]* ^{25’}
 [(*nu=ta=kan k*)ūš *NEŠ DINGIR-LIM arḥ(a ḥ)arninkandu*]
 ..., let them] all [be] witne[ss] to this (*kedani*) oath concerning these (*kedas*) matters.
 And if you change the words of this (*kel*) tablet, then [may] th[ese oath-deities]
 d[estroy] you [completel]y!

The dative *kedas* in ‘these words, matters’ refers backwards to the stipulations of the treaty and is therefore discourse deictic. Oath (*kedani lingai*)²⁴² on the other hand may be reflexive or discourse deictic.

One of the few cases where a reflexive expression other than ‘tablet’ can be isolated is the following *arkuwar* ‘plea’²⁴³:

²⁴¹ Other attestations of reflexive *tuppi* in **OH** KBo 3.22 obv. 34 (?) (‘building inscription’, CTH 1A); **MH**: KBo 5.3+ ii 61 (treaty, CTH 42), VBoT 2: 14 (letter, CTH 152), HKM 15 obv. 4, 16 obv. 5, 20 obv. 5, 25 obv. 11, 34 obv. 5, 71 rev. 24, 81 rev. 29, 89 rev. 26 (letters, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199); **NH**: KUB 14.17 rev. iii 23 (annals, CTH 61 II), KBo 3.3+ iv 2’, 5’, 12’ (? CTH 63), KUB 21.1+ iii 73, iv 32 (treaty, CTH 76); **lateNH**: KUB 8.82 rev. 24’ (treaty, CTH 105), Bo 86/299 iii 74, 78, iv 19, 44 (treaty, CTH 106A), KBo 4.10+ obv. 38’, 50’, rev. 12, 26 (treaty, CTH 106B), KUB 26.43 + rev. 6, 35, 36 (landgrant, CTH 225).

²⁴² Possibly reflexive *lingai-* also in **MH**: KUB 23.77+ obv. 10 (treaty, CTH 138.1), KBo 8.35 i 14’, 16’, ii 13’ (treaty, CTH 139), KBo 19.58+ rev. 17’ (instruction, CTH 268); **NH**: KUB 19.49 iii 48’ (treaty, CTH 69); **lateNH**: KBo 4.14 iii 5 (treaty, CTH 123), KUB 26.25 ii 2’, 5’, 7’ (? CTH 126.2), KUB 26.1 iv 46 (instruction, CTH 255.2).

6.30 **KBo 11.1 obv. 12-13** (NH prayer, Muwattalli, CTH 382), ed. Houwink ten Cate & Josephson 1967: 106

nu=za KUR.KUR.ḪI.A-*aš* *uāštul*^{ḪI.A} *maḥḥan* EGIR-*pa* *lāmi* [*n=at=za* *k*]*i-i* *arkuūar*
iḫami ¹³ *n=at* ^{dU} EN=YA *ištamašdu* §

How I again remove the sins of the countries and make [that (=at)] into [t]his (*ki*)
plea, let the Stormgod, my Lord, hear that (=at)!

One of the criteria of Discourse deixis is that the discourse deictic expression refers to a piece of discourse that is immediately adjacent. This is not the case in ex. 6.30. The only option left is reference to the prayer or plea itself.

6.2.5. Summary and conclusions

In each language phase of Hittite *ka-* was the proximal demonstrative. It did not simply refer to a location in the vicinity of the Speaker and his possible Audience, but referred to the domain of the Speaker, whether the object was near or not.

The sides of a point of reference could be denoted in two ways. When the point of reference was viewed from the Deictic Center (the Speaker), then *ket* / *kez* referred to the side towards the Deictic Center and *edi* / *edez* to the other side. When the point of reference was the Deictic Center itself, the sides were denoted by *kez* ... *kez* ... (*kez* ...). Thus, ‘this side ... that side of me’ is always expressed by means of *kez* ... *kez* but never by *kez* ... *apez* or *kez* ... *edez*. The expression of deictic contrast will be further discussed in section 6.7.

When an object in the speech situation is salient, the pronoun *ka-* was used, otherwise the Speaker chose *ka-* + N.

We have Established Topics in exx. 6.21 (‘what is this’, where ‘what’ is the requested information, not the ‘this’), 6.23. In 6.24 *ki* is in Expanding Focus.

As for the centering section, *ka-* N in 6.25 is part of an extraposed constituent, and thus not part of the Topic-Focus distribution of the clause. Ex. 6.26 is out-of-the-blue and so is ex. 6.27.

Genitives are outside the Topic-Focus structure (ex. 6.16), and so is *ka-* in subordinate clauses (ex. 6.17, 6.20, 6.22, 6.28, 6.29). In ex. 6.18 the Oaths are not expected as Topic at all (they are not centered upon anyway), and are probably even part of the Predicate Focus. I believe that this is expressed by the preverbal position of the Subject, which is also the place for indefinites and Replacing or Restricting Focus expressions (see Chapter 8). In ex. 6.30 *ka-* N is part of the Predicate Focus too.

| Situational Use | | | |
|----------------------|---------|------------|---|
| Continuity procedure | | | Centering procedure |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus |
| <i>ka-</i> | ∅ | <i>ka-</i> | <i>ka-</i> N <i>ket</i> / <i>kez</i> |

Table 6.1: The Deictic *ka-* matrix.

²⁴³ And *ishiul* ‘treaty’ in KUB 19.49+ i 60-61 (NH treaty, CTH 69).

6.3. The Recognitional Use of *ka-*

It is very unusual to find a recognitionally used *ka-* (see also 2.3.1.2. and 3.2. for a discussion of this type of demonstrative use and the criteria). In the following examples the information contained in the demonstrative noun phrase is private and shared, and the referent of *ka-* is not present:

- 6.31 **KBo 19.44+ rev. 14-15** (MH/MS treaty, with duplicate KBo 5.3+ iii 42', CTH 42), transl. Beckman 1996: 27

§ ¹⁴ *namma=tta* ^dUTU-ŠI *kuin ku-u-un* NIN-YA ANA DAM-U[TTI=K(A AD)]DIN ¹⁵
nu=šši NIN.MEŠ-ŠU ŠA MÁŠ-ŠU ŠA NUMUN-ŠU *meqqaēš [(aš)]anzi*

Furthermore, as for this (*kun*) sister which I have given to you as your wife, she has many sisters belonging to her family and clan.

- 6.32 **KBo 4.14 ii 22-23**²⁴⁴ (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 123), ed. Van den Hout 1989: 284-285

²² LÚKÚR=*ja=mu* *kuiš ka-a-aš* LUGAL K[UR AŠŠUR GUB-a]nza *n=aš=mu=kan* ²³
mān ŠĀ KUR.URU *uizzi nu=tt[a ħink]an* ZAG-aš *ēšdu*

And concerning this (*kas*) enemy, the king of [Assur who is ris]ing up against me, if he comes into my country, let [dea]th be your end.

Both times the persons are connected with the Speaker, positively in 6.31 and negatively in 6.32.

Recognitional demonstratives always refer to non-salient entities and are always in Sentence Focus. The table thus becomes:

| Recognitional Use | | | |
|----------------------|---------|---------|---------------------|
| Continuity procedure | | | Centering procedure |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus |
| — | — | — | <i>ka- N</i> |

Table 6.2: The Recognitional *ka-* matrix.

6.4. The Discourse Deictic Use of *ka-*

6.4.1. Introduction

With discourse deixis we leave the field of situational reference. Like anaphoric demonstratives, discourse deictic demonstratives refer to a part of the discourse. But unlike anaphoric demonstratives, a discourse deictic expression is not coreferential with a NP, but draws the attention to the propositional content of a stretch of discourse. (See Diessel 1999:

²⁴⁴ See for a similar use of *ka-* the same text, KBo 4.14 ii 66.

100f. For more discussion see 2.3.5 and 2.3.6, 3.5.). Moreover, discourse deictic demonstratives often provide a link between two discourse units (Diessel o.c. 102²⁴⁵).

In the following sections I will describe the use of the demonstrative adverb of manner *kissan* (6.4.2.) and of *ki* and *ka- memiya(n)-, uttar* etc. (6.4.3.).

6.4.2. The adverb of manner *kissan*

Although Hrozný (1917: 135) believed that *enissan* and *kissan* were demonstrative pronouns like *ka-* and *eni*²⁴⁶, he already saw correctly that *enissan* referred backward and *kissan* “in der Regel” forward. Since Forrer (1922: 208)²⁴⁷ the meaning of *kissan* as “folgendermaßen, in dieser Weise, so” has been accepted (Friedrich HW, p. 111, Puhvel K: 10f.). The division of labor between *enissan* and *kissan* as established by Hrozný l.c. has also been accepted (Friedrich 1960: 134 (§ 250)) although *kissan* sometimes refers backward (Friedrich o.c. 135 (§252)). According to Friedrich 1930: 141 backward referring *kissan* is found in connection with the Speaker. This would indeed fit a person-based deictic system.

Generally *kissan*²⁴⁸ refers forward to the contents of Reported Speech or Quotation from a letter. As with *apenissan* in Chapter 5 I will only present a few attestations because there is not much variation in the use of *kissan*. Besides simply listing some examples I will also discuss whether especially backward referring *kissan* is connected with the Speaker or not.

6.33 KBo 17.1+ rev. iii 8-12 (OS ritual, CTH 417), ed. Neu 1980a: 9

§ ⁸ *uīlnaš* ÉRIN^{MEŠ}-*an* *teššummiušš=a taknā* ⁹ *hariemi t=uš tarmaemi ta ki-iš-ša-an* *tēmi* ¹⁰ *dUTU-uš dIM-aš kāš[(a LU)]GAL-i MUNUS.LUGAL-ri DUMU^{MEŠ}-mašš=a* ^{URU}*Hattuši* ¹¹ *ērma(n)=šmet ēšh[(ar=š)]amet idālu=šmet* ¹² [*hatuka=šmet hari[(enun)]*] ...

I bury the clay soldier and the cups in the earth. I fasten them. I say as follows (*kissan*): “O Sungod, Stormgod, I have just buried on behalf of the king, queen and their children, on behalf of Hattusa their plague, their blood, their evil, their horrors. ...

6.34 HKM 6 obv. 3-4 (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 126-127

§ ³ *ki-iš-ša-an=mu* *kuit hatrāeš* ⁴ *kāša=ua* ^{LÚ}*KÚR uit* ...

As for the fact that you wrote as follows (*kissan*): ‘The enemy just arrived, ...

6.35 KUB 21.38 obv. 7’ (NH letter, Hattusili III, CTH 176), ed. Edel 1994: 216

§ ^{7’} [*ŠE*]*Š=YA=ma=mu* *kuit kiš-an* *TAŠPUR NIN=YA=ua=mu* *IŠPUR DUMU.MUNUS=ua=ta* [*pihhi*] ...

²⁴⁵ Diessel uses ‘proposition’ instead of ‘discourse unit’.

²⁴⁶ But see his remark o.c. 140 n. 3 that *kissan* “vielleicht auch “so, folgendermaßen” o. ä. bedeutet”.

²⁴⁷ *kissan* “etwa diese, folgendermaßen”.

²⁴⁸ A unique *ki-i-ni-iš-ša-an* is attested in KUB 28.4 obv. 16b (Laroche 1965b: 75). There also exists a neuter *ki-i-ni* besides *ki-i* (KBo 34.142 obv.? i 7’ + KBo 8.55: 16’: § ^{7’} *ki-i-ni* *kui[t]* *INA KUR^{URU}Išua NIŠME*), see Neu 1997: 156 with reference to Košak 1995: 53 for the join.

As for the fact that my [br]other wrote to me thus (*kissan*): ‘My sister wrote to me: ‘[I shall give] you a daughter (of mine)’, ...

One can also swear (*link-*), act (*iya-*), protect (*pahs-*), perish (*hark-*), conclude a treaty (*ishiul ishiya-*) etc. ‘as follows, in this (following) way’.

As already noted by Friedrich 1930: 141, once in a while *kissan* may refer backwards, like *ka*²⁴⁹:

6.36 **KBo 6.26 i 38-40** (OH/NS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 133

LÚ-eš₁₇ aki GU₄.HI.A =*ja* akkanzi³⁹ Û A.ŠÀ-LAM karū=pat kuiš šūniet⁴⁰ t=az apāš dāi karū ki-iš-ša-an ēššer

(They shall turn the face of one (team) in one direction and of the other in the other direction.) The man dies and the oxen die. But the one who sowed the field first, *he* shall take (it). This is the way (*kissan*) they used to proceed.

6.37 **KUB 21.38 obv. 10'-12'** (NH letter, Hattusili III, CTH 176), ed. Edel 1994: 216-217, emendation follows Singer 1998: 538.

^{10'} É KUR^{URU} HATTI=za ŠEŠ=YA GIM-an šakti n=at=za amruk ŪL ša[ggahhi n=at arha a]rnuuan É-e[r]^{11'} āšta=ma=kan kuit n=at=kan^m Urhi-dU-upaš ANA DINGIR.GAL pešta nu^m [Urhi-d]U-uppaš kuit apija^{12'} n=an punuš mān kiš-an mān ŪL kiš-an

As you, my brother, know (well) the House of Hatti, do *I* not kn[ow] it (too)? [It is] a [t]ransferred house. That which remained however, Urhi-Tessub gave it to the Great God. Given the fact that [Urhi]-Tessub (is) there (with you; *apiya*), ask him, whether (it is) so, or whether (it is) not so (*kissan*)!

With CHD P: 9 one should let *kissan* refer backwards in the next example:

6.38 **KBo 22.1 3'-6'** (OS instruction, CTH 272), ed. CHD P: 9, Š: 23

^{3'} šumeš LÚ.MEŠ GIŠTUKUL tameškatteni apē=ja kattan^{4'} dameškiyan dāir ki-iš-ša-an AWAT ABI=YA^{5'} paḥšanutten takku šumeš natta šaktēni^{6'} kāni LÚŠU.GI-ešš=a NU.GÁL nu=šmaš memai AWAT ABI=YA

You are oppressing the craftsmen and (as a result) they *too* started to oppress. Is this the way (*kissan*) you have kept my father's word?! If you do not know (how to protect them), are there here not old men too? (One of them) can tell you my father's word.

If *kissan* were to refer forward, a description of how to protect the words of the king should have followed, which is not the case. But if we interpret *paḥšanutten* as a past tense instead of an imperative²⁵⁰, then *kissan* can very well refer to the immediate preceding discourse.²⁵¹

Friedrich 1960: 134-135 assumed that there were two parameters explaining the use of *kissan* versus *enissan*. The most important parameter was ‘direction’: the demonstrative *ka*-

²⁴⁹ See Götze 1928: 164 on *ka*-: “auf das unmittelbar folgende oder vorausgehendeweisend”.

²⁵⁰ Despite their translation on p. 9, CHD P: 7 classifies *paḥšanutten* as imp. 2.pl. This is followed through in CHD Š: 23 ‘Keep the word of my father’. See also CHD L-N: 224 for the imperative. Interestingly, in both ‘imperative cases’ the adverb *kissan* is not translated.

²⁵¹ See Beal 1988: 280. The same might be true for KBo 22.1 obv. 29’.

and its manner adverb *kissan* referred forward, whereas *eni* and *enissan* referred backward. The second parameter was the relation with the Speaker. That relation allowed backward reference despite the more regular forward referring use. This seems reasonable, because forward referring *kissan* is indeed often attested with the Speaker and according to Friedrich this should even more be true of backward referring *kissan*. In ex. 6.36 however *kissan* is connected with punishments in the past, whereas ‘we’ now judge differently. And in ex. 6.38 *kissan* clearly belongs to the domain of the Addressees, while at the same time the Speaker condemns their acts.

The motivation for the use of *kissan* instead of *enissan* is therefore not clear. The number of attestations of backward referring *kissan* does not allow a satisfying explanation, but they show one thing: backward *kissan* is not necessarily connected with the Speaker and one should therefore separate the two.

6.4.3. The Discourse Deictic syntagms *ki uttar*, *kas memias* and *ki*

6.4.3.1. Referring forward

6.4.3.1.1. To an event, proposition or speech-act

Like *kissan* the demonstrative expressions *ki*, *ki uttar*, *kas memias* can refer forward to a stretch of discourse. It is their function to introduce an event, proposition or speech act into the discourse. But they occur far less frequently than *kissan*.²⁵² To give an indication, in the Madduwatta text alone *kissan* occurs 20 times, whereas forward referring *ki* only twice. In Old Hittite texts (Old script) *kissan* occurs 19 times with a verb of speaking, whereas *ki* only four times.

In this section I present the different constructions in which forward referring *ka-* occurs. A typical example of a cataphoric discourse deictic expression is

6.39 Listen to **this**: John will move to Hawaii (Diessel 1999: 102, ex. 15).

Hittite forward referring discourse deictic *ka-* (+N) occurs with the following verbs: verbs of communication *memai-* ‘to speak’, *šir* ‘to sing’, *lingai-* ‘to swear’, *hatrai-* ‘to write’, *watarnahh-* ‘to order’; verbs of mental perception *aus-* ‘see, take note of, contemplate’, *istamass-* ‘hear’; two other verbs *linkiya kattan dai-* ‘place under oath’, *iya-* ‘to perform an act’. Discourse deictic *ka-* also occurs in nominal clauses.

The demonstrative *ka-* (+ N) refers each time to the content of a following proposition or event, independent of person. It refers for example to an act/saying in connection with the Speaker in ex. 6.40, and with the Addressee in 6.43²⁵³.

²⁵² I have not been able to detect a difference between *ki* and *kissan* beside the fact that one is a pronoun and the other an adverb.

²⁵³ Other cataphoric discourse deictic occurrences of *ka-* **OH** KUB 8.41 iii 7, 10 (ritual, CTH 733 II 1), KBo 20.69 +: 8’ (ritual, CTH *832); **MH** KBo 19.44+ rev. 37 (treaty, CTH 42), KUB 14.1 obv. 79 (indictment, CTH 147); **NH** KBo 1.28 obv. 9 (treaty, CTH 57), KUB 1.1 i 37 (egodocument, CTH 81), KUB 21.38 obv.

- 6.40 **KBo 17.1 + iii 3-7** (OS ritual, CTH 416.1), ed. Neu 1980a: 9.

§ ³ *ta namma* MUŠEN^h*hāranan nēpiša tarnahhi* ⁴ *āppan(-)anda=ma=šše ke-e mēmahhi natta=an ūk* ⁵ *t[(arna)]h_hun* LUGAL-š=an MUNUS.LUGAL-š=a *tarnaš nu it* dUTU-i ⁶ dIM=ia *mēm[(i)]ški* dUTU-uš dIM-aš *mān uktūreš* ⁷ LUGAL-uš MUNUS.LUGAL-ašš=a QATAMMA *uktūreš ašantu* §

Then I let the eagle go to heaven. I speak these (*ke*) (words) after him: “Not *I* let him go, the king and queen let him go. Go, speak to the Sungod and the Stormgod: “As the Sungod and the Stormgod (are) forever, let the king and queen be forever likewise!””

- 6.41 **KUB 14.1 i 13-15** (MH/MS indictment, CTH 147), ed. Götze 1928: 4-5

nu=t[ta] linkija ¹⁴ *[ka]ttan ke-e ud-da-a-ar daiš kāša=ua=kan ABI* dUTU-ŠI *[tuk]* m^m*Madduyattan [IŠTU GÍR]* m^m*Attaršija huišnunun* ¹⁵ *nu=ua=za ŠA ABI* dUTU-ŠI *Ū ŠA KUR* ^{URU}*HATTI ēš* ...

He (my father) placed these (*ke*) words for you under oath: “I, the father of My Majesty, have just saved [you,] Madduwatta [from the sword] of Attarsiya. So belong to the father of My Majesty and the land of Hatti! ...”

- 6.42 **KUB 21.17 i 4-8** (NH indictment, Hattusili III, CTH 86), ed. Ünal 1974: 20

⁴ *ḪUL-eššir=ma=at ke-e-da-ni memijani* ⁵ KUR UGU-TIM *kuit ANA* md^{md}SIN.dU AŠŠUM MUIRDUTTIM *pēšta GIM-an=ma=mu* ⁶ m^mNIR.GÁL ŠEŠ=YA KUR UGU-TI AŠŠUM MUIRDUTTIM ⁷ *pēšta* md^{md} SIN.dU-aš=ma=mu=za ANA ŠEŠ=YA GAM-an ⁸ *peškiuuan dāiš*

They became enemies in this (*kedani*) matter: given the fact that he had given Arma-Tarhunza the Upper Land to govern, (therefore), after Muwattalli had given me the Upper Land to govern, Arma-Tarhunza began to betray me to my brother.

- 6.43 **KUB 26.1 iv 49-50** (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.2), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 17 (= ex. 6.27)

§ ⁴⁹ *našma ki-i kuiški memai kēdani=ua=kan tuppi* ⁵⁰ *kē* INIM.MEŠ *ŪL GAR-ru* ...

Or (if) someone (of you) says this (*ki*): “on this tablet these affairs are not written down, ...

Sometimes one finds the expression *ki kuit*²⁵⁴:

- 6.44 **HKM 13 obv. 3-5** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 138-139

§ ³ *ki-i=mu kuit* ŠA m^m*Marrūua* ⁴ LÚ ^{UR}*Ḫimmuua ḫaliatar ḫatrāeš* ⁵ *parā=uar=an=kan neh_hun*, ...

As for this (*ki*) fact that you wrote to me about the surrender of Maruwa, man of Himmuwa: “I have sent him over (to you)”, ...

42’ (letter, CTH 176), KUB 31.77 i 8 (vow, CTH 584); **lateNH** KUB 23.92 rev. 12’ (letter, CTH 178), KUB 26.12+ ii 5, iii 7 (oath, CTH 255.1), KUB 50.5 r.col. 9 (oracle, CTH 569), KBo 2.6+ iii 60 (oracle, CTH 577).

²⁵⁴ Other attestations: **MH**: VBoT 2: 1 (*ki kuit uttar*, letter, CTH 152), HKM 70 obv. 4 (letter, CTH 199); **NH** KUB 22.70 obv. 41 (oracle CTH 566); **lateNH**: KUB 23.103 rev. 20’ (letter, CTH 178), KUB 26.1 iv 3 (instruction, CTH 255.2).

Another type of discourse deictic expression, with *ka-* in a nominal or copula clause, is ‘this is X’, followed by a description of the contents of X²⁵⁵:

- 6.45 **Bo 86/299 ii 95-97** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 20-21
 § ⁹⁵ ANA ^{md}LAMMA = *ia* ANA DUMU = *šU* DUMU.DUMU = *šU* *ki-i išhiūl ēšdu* ⁹⁶ dUTU-
šI DUMU-KA *arḫa piššijami* ŠEŠ-KA = *ma* ⁹⁷ *našma tamain ūL kuinki dahḫi* ...
 And let this (*ki*) be a binding regulation for Kurunta, his son (and) his grandson: I, My Majesty, shall not abandon your son and take your brother or someone else (instead). ...

6.4.3.1.2. To a list of first order entities?

The latter example brings us to the domain of reference to a list. In Hittite the announcement of a list or enumeration can have the same structure as reference to a forthcoming piece of discourse (‘this is X’):

- 6.46 **KBo 22.1 13’-15’** (OS instruction, CTH 272)
 § ^{13’} *ki* = *ma henkuuāš* = *šaš* 50 NINDA.HI.A 10-TA.ÀM É-az ^{14’} 1 LÚ 1 MUNUS
katti = *šši ienta* Û 1 *kapunu* A.ŠÀ ^{15’} *parā dāš* §
This (*ki*) (is) of his gift: 50 breads, 10 each. From (his) estate one man (and) one woman went with him and 1 *kapunu*-measure of field he selected.
- 6.47 **KBo 12.38 i 10’-12’** (lateNH draft for statue inscription, Suppiluliuma, CTH 121), ed. Otten 1967: 75, 77
 § ^{10’} [×] × ANA LUGAL KUR *Alašija* Û ANA LÚ *pidduri* ^{11’} [ITT]I dUTU URUPÚ-na Û
Tabarna LUGAL.GAL ^{12’} [š]A? dUTU URUPÚ-na LÚSANGA *ka-a-aš arkammaš* ēšdu
 § ^{13’} [× ×] × GUŠKIN 1 GUN URUDU 3 BÁN GAYATUM ^{14’} ANA dUTU URUPÚ-na § ...
 [] for the king of Alasiya and for the *pidduri*-men, this (*ki*) shall be the tribute (owed) to the Sungoddess of Arinna and to Tabarna, the great king, priest of the Sungoddess of Arinna: § [...] of gold, 1 talent of copper, 3 *seah* of *gayatum* for the Sun-goddess of Arinna § ...

The problem is how to classify this type of forward reference. The classification of demonstratives in Himmelman 1996 and Diessel 1999 only allows Discourse Deixis for forward referring demonstratives, but while it is stated there that discourse deictic expressions refer to events, propositions or speech acts, in ex. 6.46 and 6.47 we have reference to *first* order entities²⁵⁶. (For more examples see section 6.6.) So it seems that demonstratives that

²⁵⁵ See also **NH**: KUB 21.1+ iii 10 (treaty, CTH 76); **lateNH**: Bo 86/299 ii 67 (treaty, CTH 106A), KBo 4.10+ obv. 42’ (treaty, CTH 106B).

²⁵⁶ Ehlich 1982 considers reference to lists by means of a demonstrative as *text-deixis*. The difference with Himmelman and Diessel is that Ehlich uses a cognitive interpretation of reference: the anaphoric procedure maintains the focus of attention on a referent whereas the deictic procedure shifts the center of attention. When an element in the discourse needs to be focused upon, the deictic procedure is used. This is what Ehlich call *text-deixis*. He illustrates his point by means of name lists in the Old Testament. These lists are usually both introduced and concluded by means of ancient Hebrew *elle* ‘these’: ‘these are the X ...’, indicating a shift in the center of attention. Cornish 1999 on the other hand uses the term *discourse deixis* for the same procedure and more or less equates it with *new-this* in colloquial English: forward referring expressions introduce, shift the attention to an element that is important for the following discourse.

introduce first order referents into the discourse are typologically not very well described.²⁵⁷ In my view this forward reference (below, ex. 6.48) is similar to backward referring demonstrative descriptions, classified as Tracking by Himmelmanm and Diessel, as in ex. 6.49:

6.48 **KUB 23.12 ii 4'-6'** (MH/MS annals, Tudhaliya, CTH 142.2B)

§ 4' [...]^{URU}*Hattuši āppa ʔeh[(un)]* § 5' [(*nu=mu ke-e KUR.KUR.ḪI.A*)] *kūrur ēpp[ir]*
 § 6' [...KUR^{URU}*L(uqqa)* KUR^{URU}*Kišpūʔa* ...
 [When] I turned back to Hattusa, these (*ke*) countries took up hostilities against me: §
 [...the country of L(ukka), of Kispuwa ...

6.49 **KUB 17.21+ ii 26'** (MH/MS prayer, Arnuwanda & Asmunikkal, CTH 375A), ed. Von Schuler 1965: 156-157.

§ 20' KUR^{URU}*Neriqqaz* ... KUR^{URU}*Patallijaz* § 26' *nu ke-e-da-aš A[(NA KUR.KUR.ḪI.A)] šumenzan ŠA É.ḪI.A DINGIR.MEŠ-KUNU kue ēšta n=at LÚ.MEŠ*
^{URU}*Gašga arḫa pippir*
 (All the countries from which they drove the sacrificial animals: fattened bulls, fattened cows, fattened sheep, and fattened goats), § from the country of Nerik
 from the country of Patalli, § that which in these (*kedas*) countries belonged to your temples, the Gasgaeans have destroyed it.

Backward reference to events, propositions and speech-acts is described in the next section, reference to first order entities in 6.5.

6.4.3.2. Referring backward

All forward referring expressions refer necessarily to entities that are not salient. As discussed in 2.3.6. and summarized for Hittite in 3.5., this is not always the case with backward reference. Although the content of a piece of discourse is usually not in the center of attention, with certain predicates the situation is different. The predicates of speaking and knowledge for example require as argument or complement a speech act or proposition. The predicate therefore raises the saliency of the speech act or proposition. In 6.2.4. we saw how saliency and type of expression were connected: the pronoun *ka-* referred to a salient object in the Speech-situation, and *ka-* + N referred to a non-salient object. In order to find out whether *ka-* with or without noun refers to salient stretches of discourse or not, the following contexts are presented. When a discourse unit is closed, all entities in that unit have lost their saliency. There are several types of across node reference, such as crossing a paragraph line, a Direct Speech node. Adverbial clauses also often introduce a new discourse unit (Cumming & Ono 1997: 123.). These are described in (6.4.3.2.1.). A special case of introducing a new unit is the *ki kuit* 'as for this fact that' clause (6.4.3.2.2.). In 6.4.3.2.3. a remaining group is discussed.

²⁵⁷ The reason is probably that demonstratives introducing discourse referents that are a major discourse topic are only encountered in English in the form of colloquial *new-this*, see also the preceding footnote. (Himmelmanm 1996: 222). Himmelmanm does not deny the existence of first mention demonstratives in other languages, but assumes that such first mentions 'may be based on (presumed) shared-knowledge rather than being new, introductory mentions as in English' (o.c. 223). There is no indication that Hittite introducing *ka-* refers to shared knowledge.

6.4.3.2.1. Across a discourse node

Paragraph lines close a discourse unit, lowering the saliency of the entities in it, including the propositional contents of the clauses. The expressions referring across node can take the form *ke uddar*, *ka- memiya*-²⁵⁸, *ka- lingai*-²⁵⁹ or, rarely, *ki*-²⁶⁰. The Old Hittite ex. 6.50 is unique because instead of *QATAMMA* discourse deictic *ki* refers to the punishment described in the preceding law (formerly he gave 15 cattle, but now he shall give 10 cattle ...). The New Hittite duplicate KUB 13.12 obv. 6 also has *ki-i-pát* whereas the other New Hittite copies KBo 6.3 iii 48 and KBo 6.8 ii 2 have *QATAMMA-pát*:

6.50 **KBo 6.2+ iii 43** (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 75

§ ⁴³ *takku* ANŠE.KUR.RA *tūrija*uš *kuiški tāiezzi uttar=šed=a ki-i=pat* §
If anyone steals a draft horse, its disposition is just this (*ki=pat*) (= the same).

6.51 **Bo 86/299 iv 5** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 26-27

nu mān zik ^{md}LAMMA-aš *ki-i tuppiaš uttār ŪL paḥḥašti* ...
..., if *you*, Kurunta, do not protect these (*ki*) words of the tablet, ...

6.52 **KBo 3.4+ i 48** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 I). ed. Grélois 1988: 57

nu ki-i INA MU.1.KAM *iḫanun* §
I did this (*ki*) in one year.

The pronoun *ki* refers back to the actions of Mursili in the same paragraph, but also to the actions described in previous paragraphs.

A special case of reference across a discourse node is reference to the contents of preceding Direct Speech:

6.53 **KUB 21.38 rev. 7-9** (NH letter, Hattusili III, CTH 176), ed. Edel 1994: 222-223 (= ex. 3.70)

§ ⁷ ŠEŠ=YA=ma=mu *kuit kišan TAŠPUR NIN-YA=ua=mu IŠPUR DUMU.MUNUS KUR*
^{URU}KARDUNIYAŠ=ua *kuiš KUR* ^{URU}MIZRI ⁸ [p]iḫanza *ēšta nu=ua=šši GIM-an*
^{LÚ.MEŠ}TEME EGIR[-an]da *pāir nu=uar=at EGIR-pa IŠTU IKU arantat* ⁹ [nu=m]u *ku-*
u-un memiḫan ^{LÚ}TEMU LUGAL KUR ^{URU}KAR-ḫUNI[Y]A<š> ^{md}EN.LÍL.EN.UKÙ.MEŠ
memišta

As for the fact that my [br]other wrote to me thus: ‘My sister wrote to me: ‘The daughter of Babylon who was given to Egypt, when the messengers later went to (visit) her, they had to stay back by an IKU (= 150 mtrs.)!’’. The messenger of the

²⁵⁸ See also **OH** KBo 3.22 obv. 33 (‘building’ inscription, CTH 1A); **MH** KBo 5.3+ i 38, ii 54, iv 50’ (treaty, CTH 42), KUB 14.1 obv. 27 (indictment, CTH 147), KUB 24.4 rev. 22 (prayer, CTH 376C); **NH** KBo 4.4 obv. ii 49 (annals, CTH 61 II), KBo 5.13 iii 20 (treaty, CTH 68), KUB 19.49 iv 40’ (treaty, CTH 69), KUB 21.1+ iii 76 (treaty, CTH 76), KUB 21.15 iv 6 (edict, CTH 85); KUB 21.17 iii 37’ (indictment, CTH 86), KBo 6.28 rev. 40 (edict, CTH 88), KUB 14.8 rev. 38 (prayer, CTH 378 II); **lateNH** KUB 8.82 rev. 23’ (treaty, CTH 105), KBo 4.10+ rev. 5, 48’ (treaty, CTH 106B)

²⁵⁹ KUB 15.1 ii 13 (NH vow, CTH 584).

²⁶⁰ See also **NH** KBo 3.4+ ii 49, iii 41, 59, iv 34’ (annals, CTH 61 I), KUB 22.70 obv. 33 (oracle, CTH 566).

king of Babylon, Enlil-bel-nise, told me this (*kun*) story. (As for the fact that *I* heard the story, I should not have written it to my brother)

6.54 **KUB 8.41 ii 7'-9'** (OS ritual, CTH 733 II 1), ed. Neu 1980a: 183

§ 7' *mān* DUMU-aš dIM-naš *šašanti=šši huekzi* L[ÚNAR *memai*] 8' *dandukišni* *Tašimmetiš zik* DINGIR.MEŠ-naš=a *ištarn[a]* 9' dIŠTAR-iš MUNUS.LUGAL-aš *zik ke-e-aš-ta* ANA AWAT d[IM *handān*] §

When the 'son' incantates to the mistress of the Stormgod, the S[inger says]: 'For mankind you are Tasimmeti, but among the gods you are Istar the Queen'. These (words) too (*ke=ya=*)²⁶¹ [correspond] to the recitation [of the Stormgod (?)].

But *ka-* + N can also jump further back across a discourse unit²⁶²:

6.55 **KUB 1.1 iv 1-2** (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 22-23

¹ [(*nu=šši* GIM-an *ke-e* INIM.MEŠ *u[(atarnahhun)]* ² *eḫu=ua apāš=ma=kan* URU *Marašša[(ntiāza arḫa par(a)šta)]*

When I told him these (*ke*) words: 'Come!', *he* fled away from the city Marassantiya, ...

The order 'come!' summarizes the speech of iii 68-72: 'I told him like a man: "You have started to fight with me. *You* are the Great King, while *I* am (simply) a king of one fortified town, the only fortified town you left me. Come! Istar of Samuha and the Stormgod of Nerik will judge our trial."'. The following lines iii 72-79 are a justification of Hattusili's acts (Otten o.c. 23, fn.).

In the next example the propositions preceding the conditional clause are nominalized as *wasku-* 'wrongdoing'²⁶³. Besides that, also *memiya(n)-* and *uttar* are attested²⁶⁴ in adverbial clauses referring to another discourse unit.

6.56 **KBo 2.6+ iii 4-9** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 206-207

⁴ *mān* EME ŠA f dIŠTAR-atti=pat TI-andaš *kuitman=aš* ⁵ TI-anza *ēšta nu apija kuit arrahḫaniškit* ⁶ GIDIM=ia *kuit* TUKU.TUKU-uanza DUMU.MEŠ=ŠU=ia=šši EME *ēššanzi* ⁷ *nu=za mān* GIDIM *kēdaš=pat uāškuuāš šer* TUKU.TUKU-uanza ⁸ *namma=ma=za* GIDIM *tamēdani memini šer ŪL* ⁹ *kuitki* TUKU.TUKU-uanza

If (it is) the curse of the same Sausgatti (when) alive, because she kept cursing at the time during which she was alive, and (if it is) because the deceased is angry, and her children keep cursing, if you, o deceased, are angry only because of these (*kēdaš=pat*) wrongdoings, but furthermore you, o deceased, are not angry somehow because of another affair, ...

²⁶¹ See Neu 1983: 88 + fn. 331 for this parsing. Compare with the variants KUB 8.41 ii 13': *ke-e-ma-aš-ta* dIM-aš *maltešna ḫant[ān ...]*, KUB 31.143a + VBoT 124 iii 23' *ke-e-a* ANA AWAT [*ḫa*]nd[ān].

²⁶² See also NH KUB 6.41 i 37 (treaty, CTH 68), discussed in chapter 4 as ex. 4.63

²⁶³ See KBo 6.28 rev. 30 (NH edict, CTH 88) for nominalization as *ki-da-aš* *šahḫanaš luz[z]iiaš* of the specifications of duty and corvee (*sahhan* and *luzzi*) mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

²⁶⁴ NH KBo 5.4 rev. 14 (treaty, CTH 67), KBo 5.13 iii 6 (treaty, CTH 68), KUB 19.49+ i 58 (treaty, CTH 69); lateNH KBo 2.6 i 14' (oracle, CTH 577), KBo 16.98 ii 10 (oracle, CTH 577).

6.4.3.2.2. *ki kuit* clauses

A special type of construction containing *ka-* referring across a paragraph line is the *ki kuit* syntagm ‘given this fact that, as for this fact that’. This syntagm is almost always the first clause of a new paragraph. It serves as the introduction to a clause or sequence of clauses that refers as a whole to something that has happened before. There is a difference with a simple *kuit* clause: the simple *kuit* clause provides a general setting, whereas the *ki kuit* repeats some material from a preceding discourse unit. This is best illustrated by oracles. In oracles the *ki kuit* clause, repeating the result of a preceding oracle outcome, is the point of departure for the following oracle question. Thus, the demonstrative both links to the preceding discourse and provides the setting of the new paragraph.

In the next example *ki kuit* links to the preceding result²⁶⁵:

6.57 **KUB 22.70 obv. 4** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 54-55

§ ⁴ *ki-i kuit* DINGIR-LIM URU^UArušna AN[A G]IG š[e]r TUKU.TUKU-atti [SI]×SÀ-at

As for this (*ki*) fact, that the deity of Arusna has been determined in anger because of the illness, ...

But it can also link further back²⁶⁶:

6.58 **KUB 22.70 rev. 31-32** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 90-91

§ ³¹ *ki-i kuit* DUMU ^fAmmatalla INA É.GAL-LIM anda *ueriianza ēšta*
TÚG.ĪI.A=ma=za ŠA ŠU AM[A-ŠU *uāš*]šiškit nu mān DINGIR-LUM apaddan šer ³²
ŠA ^dUTU-ŠI zankilatar ŪL kuitki šan(a)h[ta] ...

As for this (*ki*) fact that the son of Ammatalla was summoned to the palace while [wea]ring the clothes meant for [his] mo[ther], if the deity does not seek any fine at all from His Majesty because of *that* ...

6.4.3.2.3. Remaining cases

In this section I present some examples of the remaining group that did not fall in one of the other categories. They all have in common that *ka-* (*N*) refers inside a paragraph. That does not mean however that the propositional content referred to is necessarily salient. In Chapter 2 I showed how \emptyset , *-a-*, *apa-* and *apa-* + *N* were used when their host clause followed a conditional clause, whereas *ka-* *N* was used when the preceding clause was a main clause. Furthermore, the type of predicate could raise the saliency of the propositional contents, such as verbs of speaking or knowing. The few attestations of *ka-* (*N*) with 3rd and 4th order predicates already refer across node (KBo 4.4 ii 49, KBo 5.13 iii 6, KUB 15.1 ii 30, KUB 21.38 rev. 9), therefore their propositional content is not salient. In the next example the clauses preceding the *kas memias* clause describe what the Addressee is to refrain from. The

²⁶⁵ See also **NH KUB 22.70 obv. 7, 12, 29, 34, 44, 49, 67, rev. 8, 33, 40** (oracle, CTH 566); **lateNH KUB 22.35 ii 10'** (oracle, CTH 569), **KBo 2.2 iii 18** (oracle, CTH 577).

²⁶⁶ See also **NH KUB 22.70 obv. 58, rev. 4** (oracle, CTH 566); **LateNH KBo 2.2 i 21** (oracle, CTH 577).

propositional content that might be salient is ‘not doing X’. However, not the ‘not doing X’ is commented upon in the next clause, but the ‘doing X’ which is not salient^{267, 268}:

6.59 **KUB 23.1+ ii 6-7** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 105), ed. Kühne & Otten 1971: 8-9

⁶ *tamai=za* EN-UTTA *lē ilali[iaš]i* ⁷ *ka-a-aš=ta memiaš* ŠAPAL NEŠ DINGIR-LIM kittaru §

Do not desire another Ruling House. Let this (*kas*) conduct be put under Divine Oath.

6.4.4. How about Focus structure and Discourse Deixis?

Compared with the other demonstratives the number of discourse deictic expressions of the proximal demonstrative is large enough to be able to say something on the Focus structure. Most of the time the discourse deictic expression occurs in the VP. We can safely assume that in those cases the expression is part of the Predicate or Sentence Focus domain. Sometimes however a Focus particle is attached to the expression, leading to the question whether discourse deictic *ka-* can occur in Argument Focus. Another phenomenon that is relevant for the Topic-Focus distinction is Subjecthood. To start with the latter, in ex. 6.54 the clause *ke=(i)a=šta ANA AWAT*^d[IM *handān*] belongs to a series of similar clauses. Each time a few phrases are chanted, after which it is stated that ‘that/that too corresponds to the recitation of some god’. The expression *ke* is in this case in Expanding (Argument) Focus. Another discourse deictic subject is found in clauses of the type of ex. 6.59. This time the rest of the clause could be asserted of the subject. In that case the subject should be an Unestablished Topic. The difficulty here is that Unestablished Topics are probably indicated by means of the particle *-a/-ma* (see chapter 9). Although the Focus structure in Hittite requires far more research than I could provide in the chapters 7 to 9, I opt for the moment for Sentence Focus given the absence of *-a/-ma*.

The next example on the other hand shows *ka-* N as Unestablished Topic:

6.60 **KUB 21.1+ iii 73-77** (NH treaty, Muwattalli, CTH 76), ed. Friedrich 1930: 76-77
§ ⁷³ *namma ki-i* *kuit TUPPU tuk* ^m*Ala[kšandu ijan]ūn* ⁷⁴ *ne=tta=kkan* MU.KAM-ti
MU.KAM-ti *peran* 3-š[U *halzeššan*]du ⁷⁵ *n=at=za=kan zik* ^m*Alakšanduš šaki* ⁷⁶
ki-i=ma AWATE.MEŠ ŪL kuitk[i] 1-edaz 1-edaz ⁷⁷ *IŠTU KUR URUḪATTI=at*

Furthermore, this (*ki*) tablet that I [mad]e for *you* *Ala*[ksandu], let the[m read] it to you every year three ti[mes]. *You*, *Alaksandus*, have to be familiar with it! Now, these (*ki=ma*) stipulations are not at all from the one (or) from the other, they are from *Hatti*!

²⁶⁷ One can see this more clearly by looking at the next mini conversation: A: “I did not eat any cookies today” — B: “You were not supposed to!”. B’s answer would be more sensible following “I ate some cookies today”, not the negation. (Unless it was B’s intention to say that A actually had to eat cookies.) Thus, a negation does not make the opposite salient.

²⁶⁸ For the remaining group see also **MH** KUB 14.1 rev. 27 (indictment, CTH 147); **NH** KUB 6.41 iv 14, KUB 6.44 iv 24 (treaty, CTH 68), KBo 4.12 rev. 12 (edict, CTH 87); **LateNH** KUB 23.1+ i 7, iv 18, 22, l. edge 2 (treaty, CTH 105), Bo 86/299 ii 94 (treaty, CTH 106A), KBo 4.10+ obv. 46’ (treaty, CTH 106B), KBo 4.14 ii 51, iii 51 (treaty, CTH 123), ABoT 56 iii 15 (instruction, CTH 256).

The stipulations, literally words, do not come out-of-the-blue. They are a necessary part of an inscribed tablet and may therefore be legitimately inferred from the Established Topic ‘tablet’. As a Sub-Topic²⁶⁹ they replace the Established Topic ‘tablet’. This Topic-switch is indicated by the particle *-a/-ma*.

Summarizing, *ka-* (*N*) occurs in Sentence Focus clauses or in the Predicate Focus, and as a subject it may be Argument Focus or an Unestablished Topic. The only thing it cannot be is the Established Topic.

6.4.5. Summary and conclusions

The demonstrative adverb of manner *kissan* usually refers forward, rarely backward. Both in the backward and forward situation it can occur with all participants, both in positive and negative contexts. There is therefore no special connection with the Speaker (6.4.2.). The same could be observed for forward and backward referring *ka-* *N* (6.4.3.1 and 6.4.3.2.).

The expression *ka-* (*N*) referred to non-salient entities. It occurred in Sentence Focus clauses, in Predicate Focus, and it was in Argument Focus or an Unestablished Topic. The only pragmatic function that was excluded was Established Topic (6.4.4.).

| <i>Discourse Deictic Use</i> | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------------------------------|------------|--|
| Continuity procedure (in node) | | | Centering procedure (across node) | | |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus |
| — | — | — | <i>ka-</i> <i>N</i> | <i>ka-</i> | <i>ka-</i> (<i>N</i>) <i>kissan</i> |

Table 6.3: The Discourse Deictic *ka-* matrix.

6.5. The Tracking (= Anaphoric) Use of *ka-*

6.5.1. Introduction

The tracking use of demonstratives and the distinctions made below are discussed in 2.3.3.4., 2.3.4. (both general discussions), 3.3.4., 3.4. (overview of Hittite) and 4.5. (the distal demonstrative *asi*).

6.5.2. The centering procedure

Major discourse discontinuities diminish the saliency of discourse entities. These discontinuities are caused by episodic changes, shifts in location, intervention by Reported Speech, and textual unit boundaries. In order to restore the saliency of a discourse entity lexical noun phrases are used, including the ones with a demonstrative determiner. The

²⁶⁹ See Dik 1997a: 324f. for Sub Topic and its relation to a Given (= Established) Topic.

indicators of discourse continuity in Hittite are reference across a paragraph line (6.5.2.1), across a Direct Speech/Narration boundary (6.5.2.2.), adverbial clauses indicating a shift in place, time, or orientation (6.5.2.3.), relative clauses re-introducing a topic (6.5.2.4.) and genitives, which are usually not salient (6.5.2.5.)

6.5.2.1. Reference across a paragraph line

The proximal demonstrative NP can refer anaphorically across a paragraph line to another NP, or to a preceding list or enumeration. The latter type of reference is a specific feature of the proximal demonstrative: in my corpus there were no examples of *apa*- NP or *asi* NP resuming a list. Reference to a NP is illustrated in 6.5.2.1.1., and to a list in 6.5.2.1.2. For reference to lists inside a paragraph, see section 6.5.3.2.

6.5.2.1.1. Reference to a NP

- 6.61 **KUB 1.1+ ii 69-72** (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 16
 § ⁶⁹ GIM-*an*=*ma uit* Š[(EŠ=Y)]A *kuuapi* INA KUR *Mizrī* *pait* ⁷⁰ *nu=za*
 KUR.KUR.MEŠ *kue ke-e* EGIR-*pa ašešanu*[(*nu*)]*n nu* KARAŠ ANŠE.KUR.R[(A.MEŠ)] ⁷¹
kēl ŠA KUR-TI ANA ŠEŠ=YA *lahhi* INA KUR *Mizrī* ⁷² GAM-*an pēhutenun*
 But when it happened that my brother went to Egypt at a certain time, as for these (*ke*)
countries which I had resettled, I led the army and the horses of this country to my
 brother on campaign in Egypt.

The *kē* KUR.KUR.MEŠ ‘these countries’ are mentioned in ii 66.

- 6.62 **KBo 2.2 i 21-22** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 126-127
 § ²¹ *kī* *kuit ku-u-uš* MUŠEN *ḪURRI* *kallaranni* ²² *arḫa appantat*
 Concerning this fact that these *hurri*-birds were taken away in unfavorableness.

The birds have been mentioned before in i 15.²⁷⁰

A remarkable feature of *ka*- *N* referring across node is that each noun phrase occurs in a relative clause.

6.5.2.1.2. Reference to a list

The antecedent of the paragraph crossing demonstrative *ka*- does not have to be a single noun (phrase) but can also be a list of objects or localities. Ex. 6.49 was already a good example of *ka*- *N* referring to a list of countries²⁷¹. But *ka*- *N* may also ‘summarize’ a collection of entities discussed throughout the whole text:

²⁷⁰ See also **MH** HKM 48 lower edge 18 (letter, CTH 199); **NH** KUB 14.14 + rev. 43’ (prayer, CTH 378 I), KUB 14.11 + rev. 41 (CTH 378II).

²⁷¹ See for lists also **OH** KBo 17.3+ iii 29 (ritual, CTH 416.1 B); **NH** KUB 19.13+ i 40’ (annals, CTH 40).

- 6.63 **KBo 3.4+ iv 44'-47'** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 I), ed. Grélois 1988: 72
 § ^{44'} *nu=za=kan ANA GIŠGU.ZA ABI=YA kuṽapi ēšḫat nu karū MU.10.KAM* ^{45'}
LUGAL-uiznanun nu=za ke-e KUR.KUR LÚKÚR INA MU.10.KAM ammedaz ŠU-az
^{46'} *tarahḫun DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL=ma=za BELU.MEŠ=ja kue KUR.KUR LÚKÚR*
tarahḫeškir ^{47'} *n=at=šan ŪL anda*
 After I seated myself on my father's throne and ruled as king during the first ten years,
 I conquered these (*ke*) enemy countries within ten years with my *own* hand. But the
 countries which the sons of the king and the lords conquered are not included.

In the Bronze tablet *ki kuit* in iii 57 refers to everything that Tudhaliya and his father have given to Kurunta²⁷²:

- 6.64 **Bo 86/299 iii 57-59** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV CTH 106.1), ed. Otten 1988: 22-23
 § ⁵⁷ *ki-i=ja kuit ABU=YA ANA mdLAMMA pešta dUTU=ŠI=ja=šši kuit* ⁵⁸ *piḫḫun*
išḫiul=ši kuit iiaṽen n=at=kan zilatija ⁵⁹ *lē kuiški uahnuzi*
 And as for (all) this (*ki*) that my father has given to Kurunta and that I, My Majesty,
 have given to him, the treaty which we made for him, let noone in the future change it.

6.5.2.2. From Direct Speech to Narration

In the next examples (also treated as ex. 4.95 in chapter 4) *kē arahzenaš KUR.KUR.MEŠ LÚKÚR* refers to *uni arahzenaš KUR.KUR LÚKÚR* in the Direct Speech:

- 6.65 **KBo 3.4+ i 23-29** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 I), ed. Grélois 1988: 55-56
²³ *nu kiššan AQBI dUTU URUArinna GAŠAN-YA arahzenaš=ua=mu=za KUR.KUR*
LÚKÚR kuješ ²⁴ *DUMU-lan ḫalzeššir nu=ua=mu=za tepnuškir nu=ua tuel ŠA*
dUTU URUArinna ²⁵ *GAŠAN-YA ZAG.ḪI.A danna šanḫiškiuan dāir nu=ua=mu*
dUTU URUArinna GAŠAN-YA ²⁶ *kattan tiia nu=ua=mu=kan u-ni arahzenaš*
KUR.KUR LÚKÚR peran kuenni ²⁷ *nu=mu dUTU URUArinna memian ištamašta*
n=aš=mu kattan tiia ²⁸ *nu=za=kan ANA GIŠGU.ZA ABI=YA kuṽapi ēšḫat nu=za*
ke-e arahzenaš ²⁹ *KUR.KUR.MEŠ LÚKÚR INA MU.10.KAM tarahḫun n=at=kan*
kuenun §
 I spoke like this: “O Sungoddess of Arinna, my Lady, the surrounding countries of the
enemy which called me a child have humiliated me. They have started to seek to take
your territories, (the territories) of the Sungoddess of Arinna, my Lady, a second time.
 O Sungoddess of Arinna, my Lady, stand by my side! Kill those (*uni*) surrounding
countries of the enemy on my behalf!” The Sungoddess of Arinna listened to my
 prayer (lit. word) and backed me up. After I seated myself on my father's throne, I
 conquered these (*ke*) surrounding countries of the enemy, and destroyed them (lit.
 killed).

²⁷² See also KUB 26.43 + obv. 49 (lateNH landgrant, CTH 225) where *nu ki-i mŠahurunuyaš ... ANA*
DUMU.MEŠ ... pešta refers to everything mentioned before.

As explained in Chapter 4, the distal demonstrative expresses the negative emotional attitude of the Speaker. So why did Mursili use the proximal demonstrative in the narration? The difference with the Direct Speech is that by the time he narrates this history the countries are already conquered and part of the Speaker's cognitive domain.

6.5.2.3. Change of episode

Temporal adverbs indicate a lapse of time, a change of episode. Each time such a lapse occurs the entities in the preceding discourse often lose their saliency and have to be re-activated by means of a full noun phrase:²⁷³

6.66 **KUB 21.38 rev. 3-6** (NH letter, Hattusili III, CTH 176), ed. Edel 1994: 22-23

³ MUNUS.LUGAL *kuit* INA KUR URU^{URU}AMURRI *uizzi manninku_uah_umi=a=tta nu=kan*
ANA MUNUS.LUGAL ⁴ *kui_e AWATE^{MEŠ} ZI-ni n=at* ANA ŠEŠ=YA *apezza hatrāmi ...*

⁵ GIM-ann=a=kan ANA ŠEŠ=YA DUMU.MUNUS ÚR-ši *ari nu=za=kan ke-e*
INIM.MEŠ MUNUS.LUGAL *apiia=ia* ⁶ GAMRATI §

Given that the Queen will come to Amurru and that I (= the Queen) will be in your vicinity: as for the requests that are on the Queen's mind, I will write them from there to my brother (= the pharao). (You, my brother, will not disapprove of them, you will approve of them!) And when (my) daughter arrives under the protection of my brother, these (*ke*) requests of the Queen will be fulfilled then also.

6.5.2.4. Relative clauses

Preposed 'relative' clauses are often used to re-activate a discourse entity. They provide the starting point for a new discourse (sub)theme and can therefore be translated as 'as for ..., given that ...'. Because preposed relative clauses are topic-introducing and scene-setting it is not necessary to resume the relative noun in the following main clause, although this is often the case. In the next example the relative clause is followed by another subordinate clause before the head noun is resumed. Important for the present discussion is the fact that the relative *ka*- clause refers back across some other clauses to a list of names:

6.67 **KUB 1.1+ ii 56, 61-65** (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 14-15

⁵⁶ *nu=mu kē* KUR.KUR.MEŠ *danatta AŠŠUM MUIRDUTTIM pešta* (list of countries)
hūmandan ammuk š taparha KUR URU^{URU}*Hakpišša=ma=mu* ⁶² KUR URU^{URU}*Ištahara=ia*
ARAD-anni *pešta nu=mu* INA KUR URU^{URU}*Hakpišša* ⁶³ LUGAL-un *ijat nu=mu=kan*
ŠEŠ=YA *kue ki-i* KUR.KUR.MEŠ *š dannatta* ⁶⁴ ŠU-i *dāiš nu=mu* ^dISTAR
GAŠAN=YA *kuit ŠU-za harta* ⁶⁵ *nu=za* LÚ^{LÚ}KUR.MEŠ *kuiēš tar(a)h_uhun kuiēš=ma=mu*
takšulāir

He gave me these unpopulated countries in subjecthood. (list of countries), I ruled (them) all. But he gave me Hakpissa and Istahara in servitude and he made me king in Hakpissa. And as for these (*ki*) unpopulated countries which my brother had placed

²⁷³ See also KUB 6.45+ i 8 (NH prayer, CTH 381). Probably also KUB 21.17 ii 8 (NH edict, CTH 86).

in my hand, given that Istar, My Lady held me by the hand, some enemies I beat, but others made peace with me.

6.5.2.5. Genitives

As explained in Chapter 2.3.4.3., modifiers such as genitives tend to be in low focus (see Cornish 1999: 162 ff. for discussion and references).

- 6.68 **Bo 86/299 i 85-88** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 14-15
⁸⁵ *kuiš=kan imma kuiš* ÉRIN.MEŠ *šarikuuāš* EN.MEŠ ŠU^{TI} LÚ.MEŠ ^{GIŠ}TUKUL
 GÍD.DA=*ia* ⁸⁶ ŠĀ^{BI} KUR URU^dU-*tašša* ŠĀ^{BI} KUR^{URU} ^{ID}Hūlaja=*ia* ēšzi ⁸⁷ nu=*šši* *ku-u-*
uš URU^{DIDLI.ĦI.A} ABU=YA *puruttaz pešta* ⁸⁸ *antuḥšaz=ma=aš=šij=aš ŪL pešta*
 (The *dudduḥhialli*-people of city Iyasanta and the *huyantalu*-people ... remain. The
uarpatalu-people and the cup-bearers of city Adara remain), whatever š. troops,
 artisans and men-of-the-long-weapon are inside Tarhuntassa and inside the Hulaya-
 riverland. My father gave these (*kus*) cities to him together with the mud(-brick
 buildings), but he did not give them to him with the population.

6.5.3. The continuity procedure

In this section I will discuss *ka-* (*N*) that follows (almost) immediately upon another reference to the same entity. The difference with 6.5.2. is that this time formal markers of discourse nodes are absent. However, the *ka-* (*N*) clause itself marks the beginning or end of a discourse unit. The same was already concluded in chapter 4 on *asi*.

6.5.3.1. *ka-* (plus noun) indicating a digression from the main story line

As with *asi N*, the proximal demonstrative also occurs on discourse nodes that lead to a digression from the main narration or whatever genre it occurs in. In the Bronzetablet we often encounter the following type of digression (the same example as 3.31)²⁷⁴:

- 6.69 **Bo 86/299 i 50-52** (NH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 12-13
^{URU}Ušaulaz=*ma=šši* ZAG-za ^{URU}Haššuuantaš ⁵¹ ^{URU}Milaš ^{URU}Palmataš ^{URU}Hašḥašaš
^{URU}Šuraš ^{URU}Šimmuwantaš ⁵² ZAG-aš *ku-u-uš=ma=kan* URU^{DIDLI.ĦI.A} INA KUR
^{ID}Hūlaja āššanteš §
 His border (as seen) from the border of Usaula, is Hassuwanta, Mila, Palmata,
 Hashasa, Sura, (and) Simmuwanta. These (*kus*= ...) cities lie in Hulaya riverland.

The main structure of this part of text is a list. The list is built on the pattern ‘His border (as seen) from the border of city X, is city Y’. Additional information of the location of city Y is

²⁷⁴ See also Bo 86/299 i 55, 59, 67 (CTH 106A), KBo 4.10+ obv. 32’ (treaty, CTH 106B).

provided in the next clause, with *-ma* attached to city Y. The particle *-ma* both indicates that a new, subordinate discourse unit has begun and that the city Y is an Unestablished Topic.

Another type of digression is the commentary, a remark made by the narrator that breaks the narration²⁷⁵:

6.70 **KBo 3.34 iii 15'-19'** (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997:

§^{15'} *AHI LUGAL ANA PA[NI ABI] LUGAL kuieš ēškanta m[Am]muna*^{16'} DUMU URUŠukzi[ia] āppann=a mPimpirit URUNinašša^{17'} *ki-i kardijaš=šaš* DUMU.MEŠ *ešer nu=šmaš* [GIŠ]ŠÚ .A^{18'} *kitta* [GIŠ]BANŠUR^{19'} *u(š)=šmaš kitta*^{19'} [GIŠ]*[zaluwaniš]=šmaš* *kitta hapašuš* [GIŠ]*zalu[uan]i zikanzi*

The brothers of the king which are seated in front of father of the king, [Am]muna, son of the city Sukzi[ya] and behind (him) Pimpirit of the city Ninassa — these (*ki*) were the sons of his heart — for them a throne is set up. A table is set up for them. A *zaluwani* is set up for them, and they always place *hapašali-* on the *zaluwani*.

The Speaker steps out of the time line of the narration, which is told in the present and addresses the Audience, telling them that ‘these *were* the sons of his heart’. The next examples are taken from treaties, which by their nature always have relevance for the present. There is therefore no change of tense, but in ex. 6.71 one can still see how the *ka-* clauses are inserted as a commentary in a sequence of conditional clauses²⁷⁶:

6.71 **KBo 5.13 iii 22-28** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68), ed. Friedrich 1926: 128-129

§²² *mān=ma* HUL-lun memian kuinki ŠA BAL piran²³ *parā ištamašti naššu* LÚ URUHATTI kuiški²⁴ *našma* LÚ URUArzaua kuiški BAL ēššai²⁵ *kinun=ta kuiēš* *ku-u-uš* LÚ.MEŠ *kuiruanaš*²⁶ *memian=ma* ANA dUTU-ŠI piran *parā hūdāk*²⁷ *UL* *hatrāši nu=ššan apēdaš kuuatqa*²⁸ *antuššaš parā uškiši nu kiššan mematti ...*

But if you hear some evil affair of revolt in advance, either some man from Hatti or some man from Arzawa is revolting —these (*kus*) men who are now your allies— and you do not write immediately in advance the affair to My Majesty, you look for some reason past those men, and you say as follows: ...

What ex. 6.70 and 6.71 have in common is that the sentence connectives *nu* and *-ma* are absent. This is very rare in later Hittite, and I therefore take this as another sign that these *ka-* clauses behave like interjections. We should therefore also include the next example:

6.72 **KUB 19.49+ i 49-54** (lateNH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 69), ed. Friedrich 1930: 8-9

nu=kan tuk kuiš ŠA KUR URUArzaua⁵⁰ [NAMRA.MEŠ *p*]arranda *u[uan]za* *kuiš=mu=kan kuiš piran arḫa*⁵¹ [parašta] ŠA [K]UR URUMir[ā=i]a=ta=kkan *kuiš* NAMRA.MEŠ⁵² [U Š]A KUR URUHATTI [parr]anda *uanteš ki-i-da-aš*⁵³ [mā]n *kuiš* ŠA [MAMI]TI *nu* NAMRA.MEŠ *hūmandan*⁵⁴ *anda ēp n=aš=m[u par]ā pāi*

What [inhabitant] from the country of Arzawa has c[om]e over to you —(that is), anyone who [has fled] from me—, [and als]o, what inhabitants from the country of Mira [and o]f the country of Hatti have come over to you —(that is), [i]f someone

²⁷⁵ See also Bo 2628 + iii 16 (NH vow, Puduhepa & Hattusili, CTH 585).

²⁷⁶ See also KUB 21.1+ ii 77 (NH treaty, CTH 76).

among these (*kidas*) is a [sworn all]y—, arrest all drifter(s), and hand them over to me.

6.5.3.2. *ka-* (plus noun) indicating a new discourse unit

There are also a few examples of the proximal demonstrative referring to a salient entity indicating a new line of thought or a new sub-theme without returning to a previous theme. This new discourse unit follows the preceding one linearly and not hierarchically as was the case in the preceding section.

In most cases *ka-* (*N*) follows upon a list which itself does not have a clear function in the discourse²⁷⁷.

- 6.73 **KBo 15.10+ i 10-11** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szábo 1971: 12-13

40 ALAM.ḪI.A GIŠ ...¹¹ ... 1 ^{DUG}ḫaniššaš GEŠTIN nu *ki-i* ḫandāizzi

40 wooden statues, ... one *hanissa*-vessel with wine, these (*ki*) he arranges.

- 6.74²⁷⁸ **KBo 17.1+ iv 19-22** (OS ritual, CTH 416.1A), ed. Otten & Souček 1969: 38f.

ḫalkiaš ḫarš[(ā)]r išḫijanda ²⁰ [Z]ÍZḪI.A-ašš=a ḫaršār išḫijanda *ke-e*=šān
 ḫūmand[(a)] ²¹ [p]addanī tēḫḫi n=e LUGAL-aš MUNUS.LUGAL-ašš=a
 [(ki)]tkar=šamet tēḫḫi ²² šēr=a=ššan GAD-an peššiemi š=uš [(LÚ-aš)] natta
 aušzi

... the heads of grain, tied together and the heads of barley, tied together, all (*ke*=...) these (objects) I put on a basket, and I place them near the heads of king and queen. On top (of the basket with its contents) I throw a linen-cloth. No man shall see them.

In Chapter 2(.3.3.4.1.) I discussed the notion of Immediate Anaphora after first mention. I suggested there that Immediate Anaphora after first mention is an instantiation of the of the *Principle of the separation of reference and role* on discourse level: “Do not announce a discourse topic and start talking about it in the same discourse unit”. The preceding examples fall in this category. Especially in rituals objects are used that are needed in the course of the ritual. As far as I am aware of it is not possible in Hittite to say something like “He arranges 40 wooden statues, ... one *hanissa*-vessel with wine” without properly introducing these objects.

Objects can be introduced as a simple list, but one also encounters staging verbs like ‘give’, or presentational clauses like ‘person X was/is Y’²⁷⁹. After an enumeration of countries by name, the following edict continues with the core message²⁸⁰:

²⁷⁷ Also after a list: **OH** KBo 8.42 rev. 6 (narration, CTH 9); **MH** KBo 8.35 ii 28’ (treaty, CTH 139), KUB 23.72+ obv. 4, 35 (see ex. 3.32) (treaty, CTH 146); **NH** KBo 10.13 i 17’ (treaty, CTH 49), KBo 6.28 rev. 40 (edict, CTH 88), KUB 31.51+ 8 (vow, CTH 585); **lateNH** KUB 56.48 iii 24’ (festival, CTH 672B).

²⁷⁸ Also treated in Chapter 3 as ex. 3.33.

²⁷⁹ See also KBo 3.4+ iii 28 (annals, CTH 61 I).

²⁸⁰ Not with a list but with the core message in the *ka-* clause: KUB 1.1+ ii 66 (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81).

- 6.75 **KBo 6.29 i 28-30** (NH edict, Hattusili III, CTH 85), ed. Götze 1925: 46-47
nu=mu KU[R^U] ^{RU}*Hakpissa* ...²⁸ *pešta nu=mu* ^{URU}*Kuruš[tama Z]AG-an iiat* ²⁹
nu=šši kē KUR.KUR.MEŠ *hūman[ta piran]* ³⁰ *maniiaḥḥeškinun*
 He gave me the country of Hakpissa, ..., and he made the city Kurus[tama] my border.
 Al[l] these (*ke*) countries I governed [for] him.

In the copied Old Hittite narration KBo 3.28 (treated in Chapter 4 as ex. 4.37) the Queen of Hurma is introduced, brought ‘on stage’. Then the real story starts. Although there is a paragraph line and the rest of the tablet is lost, the story continues probably with the meddling of the Addressees with the marriage of the king.

- 6.76 **KBo 3.28 ii 20-24** (OH/NS edict, Hattusili I, CTH 9)
 § ²⁰ *kinuna* LUGAL-*uš idalu mekki ūḥhun ta* LUGAL-*uā<š> uddār(ra)=met* ²¹ *lē*
šarrattuma aši MUNUS.LUGAL ^{URU}*Huruma* É.GI₄.A ²² *ēšta addaš=miš=a=mu ke-e-*
da-ni ara iian ḥarta § ²³ [*ap*]₁ *aš=a* MUNUS.LUGAL-*aš* DUMU.MUNUS É-TIM
*kuyāt=an petatteni*²⁸¹ ×[.....] ²⁴ [*o o o o-t*]*eni kuin* LUGAL-*uš* GIŠŠÚ.A=*mi ašašḥe*
 MUNUS.LUGAL[-*aš apaš kiša* (??)]
 Today, I, the king, have seen many evil, so(?) you may not disrupt my affairs of (me),
 the king. That queen of Hurma was an eligible bride. Now, my father had considered
 me (the) right (husband) for her (*kedani*). § Now, [*tha*]_t queen is a ‘daughter of the
 house’. (So) *why* are you carrying her off? You [.....]. Whom(ever) I, the king seat
 on my throne, [*she* shall become] queen!

But ‘stories’ are not only begun, they also end. Just as characters are introduced on stage, they also leave the scene. Leaving the scene is a clear signal that the discourse unit is going to end. As has been observed before, the closure of a discourse unit is often accompanied by demonstratives. This phenomenon is also attested in Hittite:

- 6.77 **KBo 8.74+ iii 13’-15’** (OS ritual, CTH *752.1A), ed. Neu 1980a: 223
 § ^{13’} *nu=za ūk* GIŠ^{14’} *ḥuhupalli dā[hḥ]e* ^{15’} *nu ḥuppēmi* ^{15’} *āraš=miš=a=ššan ištananaš*
^{15’} *āppa ke-e zaškizzi* §
 I take the *huhupalli*-instruments, and I hit (them). My colleague however puts them
 (*ke*) back on the altars.

6.5.4. Both Tracking and Situational *ka-*

Second mentions of a demonstrative are not necessarily restricted to reference inside the discourse. In the next examples the second or later mentions of an entity are also situational²⁸².

- 6.78 **KUB 43.58 i 40-45** (MH/MS purification ritual, CTH 491), ed. CHD P: 170

²⁸¹ CHD P: 349 differently: [*n=*]*a[š]ta* MUNUS.LUGAL-*aš* DUMU.MUNUS É-TIM *kuyātan petatteni* “Where are you taking the queen’s ‘daughter of the house’?”.

²⁸² See also **MH** KBo 15.10+ i 27, 33 (tongues, CTH 443); **NH** KBo 4.6 rev. 10’ (sheep), 12’, 15’ (both woman) (CTH 380), KUB 48.119 obv. 3’ (illness, CTH 590).

§ ⁴⁰ n[=ašt]a anda kiššan memai ki-i uatar ⁴¹ mahhan parkui
^{TUG} NÍG.LÁM.MEŠ=kan ke-e-ez-za arranzi ⁴² n=at parkunuñanzi UNUTE^{MEŠ} ke-e-ez
 arranz[i] ⁴³ n=at parkunuñanzi nu ka-a-aš mahhan ùitena[nza] ⁴⁴ [h]ūman
 parkunuškizzi šuppijahhiškizzi ⁴⁵ [k]inuna šumāš DINGIR.MEŠ QATAMMA
 parkunuddu §

He speaks as follows: “Just as this (*ki*) water is clean—they wash festive garments with this (*kezza*) and clean them, and they wash utensils with this (*kez*) and clean them— so, just as this (*kas*) wat[er] cleans and sanctifies everything, may it now likewise clean you, o gods”.

First, the water is introduced by means of deictic *ki watar* ‘this water’. The next references are done with pronominal *kez*. The proximal demonstrative *kez* is probably used because the clause containing it is a kind of commentary which breaks the comparison (compare with section 6.5.3.1.). The return to the original comparison structure is indicated by the use of a full noun phrase, *kas witenanza* in i 43.

In the next example the substitute, a woman, is several times referred to by means of the anaphoric pronoun *-a-* and *apa-* before *kas* MUNUS-*as* ‘this woman’ is used in obv. 15’:

6.79 **KBo 4.6 obv. 11’-17’** (NH prayer, Gassulawiya, CTH 380), ed. Tischler 1984: 12-13
 nu=ta kāšma am[mel ta]rpašša[n] ^{12’} unuñandan uppañhun n=aš=kan ammuk
 kattan SIG₅-anza ^{13’} parkuiš=aš apāš mišriñanza apāš ħarkiš=aš apāš ^{14’} n=aš=kan
 ħūmandaz ašanuñanza nu=kan DINGIR-LIM EN-YA apūn ^{15’} menaññanda uški nu
 PANI DINGIR-LIM EN-YA ka-a-aš MUNUS-aš uēñattaru ^{16’} ANA
 DUMU.MUNUS.GAL=ma=kan anda aššuli namma nešñut n=an kēz ^{17’} GIG-za TI-
 nut

I have just sent to you m[y] adorned [su]bstitute. She is better than *me*. Pure she (is), that one, shining she is, that one, fair she is, that one. She is endowed with everything. O God, My Lord, look at *her* instead (of me)²⁸³! Let this (*kas*) woman instead (of me) be the most important to the god My Lord. Now, toward the Great Daughter turn again in favor and save her from this (*kez*) sickness.

The fact that real anaphoric pronouns are used does not prevent the occurrence of a demonstrative, as we have seen before. The difference with the other Tracking demonstratives is that *ka-* also points at the substitute in the presence of the Speaker.

6.5.5. Summary and conclusions

Although I subdivided the material into two groups, demonstratives referring to salient (6.5.2.) and non-salient entities (6.5.3.), it became clear that saliency alone is not the only factor influencing the choice of a referential expression. Also in cases where *ka-* referred to salient entities it could always be argued that *ka-* occurred on a discourse node (6.5.3.1. and 6.5.3.2.).

²⁸³ The use of *apa-* denoting Replacing Focus leading to a translation ‘her instead’ is discussed in chapter 8.

One of the questions was whether there was a difference between pronominal and adjectival *ka-*. Although pronominal *ka-* occurred generally in salient contexts, there are also some examples of *ka- N* in salient context. The difference is not clear to me.

Contrary to the situation with *apa-* and *asi*, the texts in which Tracking *ka-* occurs cover almost each Hittite genre. This distribution either means that *ka-* is neutral or unmarked, or that it is Speaker oriented. I tend to think of Tracking *ka-* as unmarked with respect to person (see for example ex. 6.73). Still, there are attestations of full noun phrases in comparable contexts without a demonstrative, who also should be unmarked (see ex. 3.35, 3.42 in Chapter 3). In the conclusion to this Chapter I will present a hypothesis that might explain this.

Many tracking *ka-s* are found in subordinate clauses, in which case the Topic-Focus distinction is not relevant. In main clauses non-salient *ka-* (section 6.5.2.) sometimes occurs in the VP, and is therefore part of the Focus. The non-salient subject *ka- N* in ex. 6.66 however is also necessarily part of the Focus. New discourse units can be compared with discourse initial utterances and therefore usually have Sentence Focus.

In the salient section (6.5.3.) ex. 6.69 showed *ka- N* as Unestablished Topic, and *ka-* in ex. 6.70 as Established Topic. KBo 8.35 ii 28' (list of names, immediately followed by *nu ke-e-a QATAMMA[=pat l]inkir*) seems to be a rare attestation of *ka-* in Expanding Argument Focus. The exx. 6.73-76 shows Immediate Anaphora after first mention. The Topic-Focus structure of such clauses is not clear to me.

| Tracking Use | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|
| Continuity procedure | | | Centering procedure |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus |
| <i>ka-</i> | <i>ka- N</i> | <i>ka-</i> | <i>ka- (N)</i> |

Table 6.4: The Tracking *ka-* matrix.

6.6. The cataphoric use of *ka-*

In 6.4.3.1.2. I already presented some examples of forward referring *ka-* (exx. 6.46, 6.47, 6.48). Here I list another example to show that there is not much difference between forward reference to a stretch of discourse and to a list of first order entities²⁸⁴:

6.80 **KBo 15.10+ i 1-4** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szábo 1971: 12-13

§ ¹ [mā]n iṣḥanāš ^dUTU-un ^dIM-n=a EGIR-pa lilānzi ² [nu ki-]i danzi 2 kurdāli iṣnaš nu=ššan ³ kēdani 7 EME iṣnaš iṣḥuān kēdani=ia=ššan ⁴ 7 EME iṣnaš iṣḥuanteš Ì.UDU ūakšur LĀL ūakšur ...

[Whe]n they conciliate the Sungod of Blood and the Stormgod, they take [th]is (ki): 2 kurdali-vessels, of dough; in one 7 tongues of dough (have been) dropped, and in the

²⁸⁴ Other attestations of forward reference to first order entities: **OH** KBo 17.3 iii 29 (ritual, CTH 416.1 B); **MH** KBo 15.10+ i 2 (ritual, CTH 443); **NH** KBo 3.4+ i 28 (annals, CTH 61 I), KUB 1.1+ ii 56 (egodocument, CTH 81); **GG** iv 15 (vow, CTH 585); **lateNH** KUB 26.43 + obv. 19, 54 (landgrant, CTH 225); KBo 33.216 rev.? 5 (vow, CTH 590), KUB 56.48 ii 31 (festival, CTH 672B).

other one 7 tongues of dough (have been) dropped; a bite of sheep fat; a bite of honey;
...

I do not find much difference between ‘they take these objects’ or ‘he puts these words ...’ (ex. 6.41) besides the different entity orders.

6.7. The contrastive use of *ka-* ... *ka-* ‘this (one) ... that (one)’

6.7.1. Introduction

In section 6.2.2.1. I discussed the couple of adverbs of relative position *ket* ... *ket* / *kez* ... *kez* ‘on this side ... on that side’ and the couple of local adverbs *ka* ... *ka* ‘here ... there’.

The preceding example contained the couple of demonstratives *ka-* ... *ka-* referring to objects, not locations. These two phenomena illustrate two uses of the same principle, expression of contrastive pairs by means of either *ka* ... *ka-* or *apa-* ... *apa-* (see also chapter 7.2.5.1.).

Contrast between referents is not necessarily expressed as in English ‘this and/or that’, or Latin ‘hic ... ille’. Swahili for example does not allow the use of the proximal and distal forms together for contrast. The proximal form is used twice instead: ***Hii*** *yafutika*, ***hii*** *haifutiki* ‘That [sc. sin] can be blotted out, this one cannot be’ (Lyons 1999: 115).

In 6.7.2. I present contrastive pairs in Situational use, and in 6.7.3. in Anaphoric use.

6.7.2. Situational contrastive pairs

In these two examples one can imagine how the Speaker points to different objects or persons in his visual field²⁸⁵:

6.81 **KBo 6.2+ ii 18-20**, § 40 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 48

§ ¹⁸ *takku* LÚ GĪŠ[TUKUL *har(a)kzi*] Û LÚ ILKI *tittianza* LÚ ILKI *tezzi* ¹⁹ *ki-i* GĪŠTUKUL[-*li=met*] *ki-i=ma šahha=met* A.ŠÀ.ĤI.A ŠA LÚ GĪŠTUKUL=*ma anda šittarizzi* ²⁰ GĪŠTUKUL-*li=ia har[zi]* *šahhann=a iššai*

If a man who has a TUKUL-obligation disappears, and a man owing ILKU-services is assigned, and the man owing ILKU-services says²⁸⁶: ‘This (*ki*) is my TUKUL-obligation, while that (*ki*) is my obligation for *šahhan*-services’, (then) he shall secure for himself a sealed deed concerning the land of the man having a TUKUL-obligation. He shall (then) both hold the TUKUL-obligation and perform the *šahhan*-services.

²⁸⁵ See also the next law, § 41.

²⁸⁶ Hoffner l.c. interprets ‘the man owing ILKU-services says: ‘This is my TUKUL-obligation, while that is my obligation for *šahhan*-services’ ’ as part of the apodosis. Given the conditional clause ‘But if he refuses the TUKUL-obligation, ...’, I prefer to include the Direct Speech part in the protasis. The structure of the law thus becomes: ‘If a man who has a TUKUL-obligation disappears, and a man owing ILKU-services is assigned, if the latter accepts both obligations, then ..., but if he refuses, then ...’

- 6.82 **KUB 26.12+ i 13-18** (lateNH instruction, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.1), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 23

... *nu šummaš BELU.ḪI.A a[p]āt* ¹⁴ [*k*]uwatqa *kuiški memai DUMU.MEŠ EN.MEŠ=YA=ua=nn[aš]* ¹⁵ [*and*]a *ūL imma NUMUN EN=YA nu=ua=nnāš ke-e-da-n[i]* ¹⁶ [(GIM)]-an *šer linganuškir ke-e-da-ni=ja=ū[(a=nnāš)]* ¹⁷ [QA]TAMMA *šer linganuškanzi nu=ua=nnāš ka-a[(-aš)]* ¹⁸ EN-aš=pat *n=at=ši GAM NEŠ DINGIR-LIM GAR-ru*

... (if) someone says somehow *that* to you, the lords: “The sons of my lords in us (?) are not among the offspring of my lord. Just as they have sworn us in on this one (*kedani*), on that one too (*kedani=ya*) they shall swear us in likewise. This one (*kas*) (is) our only lord,” (then) let it be put under divine Oath to him.

6.7.3. Anaphoric contrastive pairs

In anaphoric use ‘this one, that one’ becomes ‘the one ... the other’ (see also ex. 6.80).²⁸⁷

- 6.83 **KBo 17.1+ ii 21’-22’**, with duplicate KBo 17.6 ii 15’-16’ (OS ritual, CTH 416.1 A), ed. Neu 1980a: 7

II DUMU.MEŠ.É.GAL [*a(r)*]an[(*dar*)]i *ka-a-aš-ša* ^{GIŠŠUKUR ZAB[AR ḫarzi]} ^{22’} *ka-a-aš-ša* ^{GIŠŠUKUR ZABAR [(ḫarzi)]}

The two palace attendants are standing. Both the one and the other hold a bronze spear.

Compare this with the similar use of *apa-* ... *apa-* (also treated as ex. 7.25 in Chapter 7):

- 6.84 **KBo 3.34 ii 1-6** (OH/NS Narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 44-45

¹ *mZidi* ^{LÚ}ZABAR.DAB *ēšta ABI LUGAL* ^{DUG}[*ḫar*]ḫarān ^{GEŠTIN-it} ² *ANA* ^f*Ḫištaijara* ^m*Maratti=ja manijahhiš* ³ *LUGAL-i* ^{SIG₅-antan} ^{GEŠTIN-an} *ḫinkatta apēdašš=a* ⁴ *tamain* ^{GEŠTIN-an} *pijer a-pa-a-aš-ša uit* ^{LUGAL-i} *tet* ⁵ *natta apūn* ^{GEŠTIN-an} *pijer* ^{LUGAL-uš} *kuin* ⁶ *aušta a-pa-a-aš-ša uit* ^{QATAMMA IQBI}

Zidi was a cupbearer. The father of the king allotted a *harhara*-vessel with wine to Histiyara and Maratti. To the *king* he (= Zidi) delivered good wine, but to *them* they gave other wine. Both the one (*apass=a*) came (and) said to the king: ‘They did not give (to us) that wine, which the king saw’ and the other (*apass=a*) came (and) said the same. ...”

In order to find the difference between *apa-* ... *apa-* and *ka-* ... *ka-* one should find a property which is always present in one case but absent in the other. One factor which can be excluded is present versus past. In the same text one also has *ka-* ... *ka-* ... *ka-*:

- 6.85 **KBo 3.34 ii 28-32** (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 52-53

²⁸⁷ See also KUB 29.30 iii + 2’, KBo 6.26 iii 33, 34, iv 2, 3, 4 (OH/NS laws, CTH 292). Probably also here KUB 14.1 rev. 30, 31 (MH/MS indictment, CTH 147) *ke-e-el ŠA KUR.KUR-TIM* ... *ke-e-el ŠA KUR.KUR-TIM*.

... *n=uš* ^m*Išputaš-inar maniaḥḥeškizzi* ²⁹ *GI-an GIŠUMBIN ḥašḥaššuar* ^{GIŠ}*TUKUL apātar n=uš apāš annanut* ³⁰ *ku-u-un apāš annanut ku-u-uš-ša* *ABI LUGAL ANA Nakkilit* ³¹ *GAL LÚ.MEŠSAGI paiš ku-u-uš* ^m*Huzzi* *GAL LÚ.MEŠNIMGIR* ³² *ku-u-uš* ^m*Kizzui* *GAL LÚ.MEŠMEŠEDI paiš š=uš ulkeššarahḥir*

... Išputasinar instructs them (= the young chariot-fighters). The arrow, the sharpening-wheel (?), the holding of the weapon, *he* taught them. One (*kun*) *he* taught (= continued to train),²⁸⁸ and some others (*kus*) the father of the king gave to Nakkalit, head of the cupbearers, and still others (*kus*) he gave to Huzzi, head of the heralds, (*finally*) some (*kus*) to Kizzu, head of the royal bodyguards, so that they completed their training.

The only difference between the examples with *apa-* ... *apa-* (see also Chapter 7.2.5.1.) and those with *ka-* ... *ka-* is that the persons referred to by *apa-* ... *apa-* have names. I would like to suggest that *ka-* is less specific than *apa-*. That is, if persons have been identified by name, one uses the truly (emphatic) anaphoric pronoun *apa-*, but when one has to single out a person or persons from a group without being able to identify them, one cannot use *apa-* but has to turn to *ka-*. In the following text the proximal demonstrative is barely referential. The couple *ka-* ... *ka-* refers to some members from the class of *hippara*-men but these members have not been identified before.

6.86 **KBo 6.2+ ii 53-57, § 49** (CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 59-60

§ ⁵³ [*tak*]*ku* ^L*Ú ḥi*]pparaš *tājezzi šarnikzil* ^{NU.GÁL} ⁵⁴ [*o*]-×-[*o-i*]*nkanzan nu tuekkanza=šiš=pat šarnikzi mām[=man]* ⁵⁵ *tajazzil piškir man ḥūmanteš=pat maršēr* ⁵⁶ [*man=*]*e* ^{LÚ.MEŠ} ^{NÍ.ZU} *kīšantati ka-a-aš=man ku-u-un epzi* ⁵⁷ [*ka*]-*a-ša=man ku-u-un epzi*

[I]f a *hippara*-man steals, there will be no compensation. ..., and only his body shall give compensation. If they [were] required to give (compensation for) theft, they would all become dishonest, they [would] become thieves. This one (*kas*) would seize that one (*kun*), while that one (*kas=a*) would seize this one (*kun*).

In the following treaty *ka-* ... *ka-* is not referential at all (from the point of view of the Reader of the text).

6.87 **KBo 5.9 iii 1-2** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 62), ed. Friedrich 1926: 19-20

našma=tta mān ^d*UTU-ŠI* ⁱⁱⁱ ¹ *kueka memiānuš ḥarūaši memai kūš=ua memiāš* ² *našma=ua kūn memiān ija* ...

Or if My Majesty somehow tells you secretly some orders: “Do these (*kus*) things or that (*kun*) thing”...

Summarizing, contrastive pairs are denoted by identical demonstratives.

²⁸⁸ Dardano o.c. 53 translates *nu annanut* etc. as “Quello li istruiva, quell’altro lo istruiva (?); alla fine il padre del re affidò alcuni a Nakkilit, ..., 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 referents 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.

6.7.4. Summary and conclusions

Contrastive ‘this one ... that one’ is not expressed by *ka* ... *apa-* or *ka-* ... *asi* but by *ka-* ... *ka-*. This was not only found with the adverbs of relative position *ket* ... *ket* / *kez* ... *kez* ‘this side of X, ... that side of X’ or with the local adverb *ka* ... *ka* ‘here(to) ... there(to)’, but also with adjectival *ka-* ... *ka-*.

The existence of anaphoric *ka-* ... *ka-* raised the question how to explain the difference with contrastive *apa-* ... *apa-*. I observed that *apa-* ... *apa-* occurred when the referents were uniquely identified, they were mentioned by name, whereas this was not so for *ka-* ... *ka-*. I therefore tentatively suggested that *ka-* was less specific, and translated it with ‘one ... others, some’. This would match with the observation made earlier that *ka-* is, at least in anaphoric contexts, the unmarked demonstrative with a wider use than demonstrative *apa-* or *asi*.

I would like to propose the following explanation, although it should be typologically tested on a selection of languages with a person-based deictic system.

The difference between for example English and Hittite in expressing contrastive pairs could be motivated by the differences between distance-based and person-based systems. In Situational use *ka-* refers to the area of the Speaker. One could imagine that a combination *ka-* ... *apa-* would only imply that *ka-* belongs to the domain of the Speaker, and *apa-* to that of the Addressee. But if that specific allocation has to be avoided, the natural thing to do is to use *ka-* ... *ka-* which points at the global area around Speaker. Only if one wants to emphasize the dichotomy between Speaker and Addressee one should use *ka-* ... *apa-* (or *ka-* ... *asi* in case of We (= Speaker + Audience) versus the Other).

6.8. Summary and conclusions

In 6.2.5. I concluded that the situationally used proximal demonstrative *ka-* refers to elements or locations in the domain of the Speaker, irrespective of distance. Salient objects were referred to by pronominal *ka-*, non-salient objects by *ka-* *N*.

The Speaker-orientation was supported by the (rare) use of *ka-* as a Recognitional demonstrative (6.3.).

However, when entering the field of discourse deixis the ties with the domain of the Speaker were loosened. The adverb of manner *kissan* occurred with all persons, and so did *ka-* (6.4.5.). As far as discourse structure is concerned, all discourse deictic *ka-*s occurred on discourse nodes.

The same two features, not being solely Speaker oriented and occurring on discourse nodes (or referring across one), were found with Tracking *ka-* (6.5.5.). Contrary to the situation with *apa-* and *asi*, the texts in which Tracking *ka-* occurred covered almost each Hittite genre.

So either *ka-* is neutral or unmarked, or it is Speaker oriented. But it cannot only be neutral for there are attestations of full noun phrases in comparable contexts without a demonstrative. Although more study on the use of tracking noun phrases with and without demonstratives is necessary, I present the following hypothesis.

Hittite tracking noun phrases with and without demonstratives often occur on discourse nodes. The difference between the two types of noun phrases is twofold. First, ‘bare’ noun phrases are used when a new discourse unit starts that is not strongly connected with the preceding unit. But if one explicitly wants to relate the new unit to the contents of the preceding one, one should use a demonstrative. A Hittite then had three choices: *ka-*, *apa-*

or *asi*. The marked demonstratives are *apa-* and *asi*. These demonstratives assign the referent of a noun phrase explicitly to the domain of the Addressee and the Other respectively. With *ka-* the situation is different. Since the Speaker's viewpoint is often the main point of view in any piece of discourse, the proximal demonstrative *ka-* can evolve into a more neutral demonstrative. But it is still possible to denote the Speaker's domain. One should also compare the tracking noun phrases with the *kuit* clauses. Such clauses often provide a background for what follows. However, when this background is linked to the preceding unit *ki kuit* is used. The preceding unit is still relevant to the present unit, and therefore the unmarked *ki* is chosen, not because it is important to only the Speaker, but to everyone.

When discussing the expression of contrastive pairs, which is done by *ka- ... ka-* or *apa- ... apa-* 'the one ... the other' (6.7.), I suggested that *ka-* was used when the referents of *ka-* were unidentified, whereas *apa- ... apa-* was used when the referents were mentioned by name. If this is correct, then again *ka-* is less specific than *apa-* and *asi*, which would match the observations for tracking *ka-* versus the others.

Collecting all tables, we have:

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| | continuity procedure | | | centering procedure | |
| | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| Situational | <i>ka-</i> | \emptyset | <i>ka-</i> | — | <i>ka- N, ket / kez</i> |
| Recognitional | — | — | — | — | <i>ka- N</i> |
| Discourse Deictic, on/across node | — | — | — | <i>ka- N</i> | <i>ka- (N), kissan</i> |
| Tracking, across node | <i>ka-</i> | <i>ka- N</i> | <i>ka-</i> | — | <i>ka- (N)</i> |

Table 6.5: The *ka-* matrix.

The most important conclusion is that *ka-* as a demonstrative either occurs as first mention in case of situational use and recognitional use (by definition), and that within the discourse itself *ka-* only refers across node. However, contrary to the other demonstratives, both *ka-* and *ka- N* refer to salient and non-salient discourse entities. Only in situational use this is different (see above).

PART III

FOCUS

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 *ia-* “and, also” (Chapter 7), *-pat* “only” (Chapter 8) and *-a/-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 *šija-* (§ 105). The difference between *apa-* and *šija-* was not discussed in his grammar, which is due to the scarce material of *šija-*.

Kammenhuber (HW² 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 *-ia* “and”, *-pat* “only” and -

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 (Diessel 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.

ma “and, but, while” are cliticized to it. Besides that, also position in the clause can say something on Topic and Focus-hood (Dik 1997a: 420ff.).

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*, *-a/-ma*, *-pat* or not.

7.1.2. Introduction to this chapter

At first sight the use of the pronoun *apa-* 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 *apa-*. 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 **Je et tu 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 *apa-* 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 *apa-* do not appear to have any influence on the choice between *apa-* and *-a-* in connection with *-ya*. However, as we will see, the use of *apa-* in for example coordinated sentences or clauses is more complicated than that. Besides the use of *apa-* 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 *apa-* appears in coordinated clauses while the coordinator *-ya* is cliticized to *another* host. Why should we have an *apa-* in a coordinated construction if *apa-* is not the host of the coordinator *-ya*? A typical example of *apa-* in a coordinated construction (with *-ma* (i 17) instead of *-ya*) is:

7.1 KBo 6.2 i 16-18, § 10 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 24

§ ¹⁶ [(*takk*)]u LÚ.U₁₉.LU-*an* *kuiški hūnikzi t=an ištarnikzi nu a-pu-u-un* ¹⁷
šāktāizzi pēdi=šši=ma LÚ.U₁₉.LU-*an* *pāi nu É-ri=šši* ¹⁸ *anniškizzi kuitmān=aš*
lāzziatta

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)

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 *apa-* + *-ya* occurs only in certain positions in the clause.

interpretation of *apa-* 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 *-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 adversative particle *-ma/-a* and *apa-* in coordinated clauses (see chapter 9 for other uses of *-ma/-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.²⁹² 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-ŠÚ *huišnuzi* LÚ *pupunn=a huišn[u]zi*”. 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”,

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.

functioning on word level, appears cliticized to *apa-* in initial or first position²⁹³, hardly ever later in the clause.²⁹⁴ Thus, *-ya* in first position always has the meaning “also, too”, and initial position is usually reserved for “and” but may sometimes be “also”.²⁹⁵ 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*²⁹⁶ 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 1990²⁹⁷, 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 cliticized to

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.

²⁹⁴ These observations are based on the contexts in my corpus in which both the pronoun *apa-* 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 *apatt=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*, *šu*, 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 *-ma/-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.

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:

| - <i>ya</i> | <i>nu</i> | |
|-------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | connective | coordinator |
| coordinator | <i>#nu-ya</i> <i>#nu N-ya</i> | <i>#nu-ya</i> <i>#nu N-ya</i> |
| focal | <i>#nu-ya</i> <i>nu N-ya</i> | <i>#nu-ya</i> <i>nu N-ya</i> |

Table 7.1. Combinations of coordinators and connectives

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 -*ya*²⁹⁸, 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

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)”.

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 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 |

³⁰¹ Weitenberg (1992: 338 fn. 14) observes the co-occurrence of *nu*, *ta* and *šu* 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 *šu* 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 *-ma/-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)]zḫī anda ŠU DINGIR-LIM [(ār)]aš KA×U-išš=a=mu=[(kan)]⁹ tapūša 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.

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

(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.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.

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)

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

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 Hittite³⁰⁴, this argument cannot be used as a test.

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

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).

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. Criterium (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.

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: 79³⁰⁵

§ ²⁶ *alijanaš n=ašta ÍD-an tapuša kuješ* ²⁷ *uešeš nu apūš uešijattari* ²⁸
kēzi=ia=ka[n] kuješ uešeš nu=ššan a-pé-e-da-aš-ša ²⁹ *š[ākuu]a zikkizzi*
n=aš=šan tapušaš uešijaš ³⁰ *āraš ŪL ki=ma ūemit ŪL*

A deer: the meadows which are alongside the river, those he grazes, and the meadows which are on the other side, on those too (*apedass=a*) he lays (his) e[yes]. 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.

³⁰⁵ The other (late) Middle Hittite attestations are HKM 17 obv. 19 (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199) *ku[eš URU]Marešta* ¹⁹ *manninku[anteš nu?]* *a-pu-u-uš-ša* ²⁰ *u[al]hū[ani]*, HKM 30 rev. 23 - left edge 2 ²³ *[kā]ša=za GEME kuit* ²⁴ *[kui]t dān dajan=a* ²⁵ *harzi* (lower edge) ¹ *n=ašta a-pa[-a-]at-ta* ² *III=ŠU dā*, KBo 5.3 + ii 1-6 (MH/NS treaty, CTH 42) *zik kuedani EGIR-an tijaši nu a-pu-u-un-na harninkan[du]*

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

^{9'} [ÍD *Mālan kuit š*]A LUGAL KUR URU *Hurri edez tapuša ēšta* ^{10'} [*n=at IŠTU NAM.RA GU₄.HI.A*] UDU.HI.A *āššuit=a šarā dahhun* ^{11'} [*n=at=za ANA KUR URU Ha*]tti *udahhun kēzzi=ja=kan kuit* ^{12'} [*ša LUGAL KUR URU Hurri t*]apuša *ēšta nu=za a-pa-a-at-ta ANA KUR URU Hatti* ^{13'} [*udahhun*
[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 Ha]tti. And also, what was alongside on this side [belonging to the king of Hurri], that *too* (*apatt=a*) [I brought] to Hatti.

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: 55³⁰⁶

ABU=ŠU=ua=šši kuiš LUGAL KUR HATTI ēšta nu=uar=aš UR.SAG-iš LUGAL-uš ēšta ¹¹ *nu=ua=za KUR.KUR.MEŠ LÚKÚR tar(a)hhan harta nu=uar=aš=za DINGIR-LIM-iš DÛ-at DUMU-ŠU=ma=ua=šši=za=kan* ¹² *kuiš ANA GIŠGU.ZA ABI=ŠU ešat nu=ua a-pa-a-aš-ša karū LÚKAL-anza ēšta* ¹³ *nu=uar=an irmaliḫattat nu=ua=za a-pa-a-aš-ša DINGIR-LIM-iš kišat*
'His 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=ua a-pa-a-aš-ša karū LÚKAL-anza ēšta* and i 13 *nu=ua=za a-pa-a-aš-ša DINGIR-LIM-iš kišat* are respectively i 10 *nu=uar=aš UR.SAG-iš LUGAL-uš ēšta* and i 11 *nu=uar=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 *š-À-BI KUR URUDU-tašša=ja=kan kuiješ URU.DIDLI.HI.A šA LUGAL KUR URU HATTI ešer* [followed by names of cities] ⁷⁷ *a-pu-u-uš-ša-aš-ši piḫanteš*

³⁰⁶ The other attestations are **NH** (Mursili II) KBo 3.4+ i 8-9 (NH Annals, CTH 61 I) *nu KUR.KUR LÚKÚR ŪL=ja kuiješ kūrurijaḫheškir* ⁹ *nu a-pu-u-uš-ša KUR.KUR.MEŠ LÚKÚR kūrurijaḫhir*, KBo 3.4+ i 8-9 (NH Annals, CTH 61 I) KUB 31.121 ii 18'-20' (NH Prayer, CTH 379) § ^{18'} *nu=nnaš IŠTU 𐎶ŠKUR=ja kuiē[š]* ^{19'} *ZAG.HI.A tiḫanteš nu a-pé-da-aš-ša* ^{20'} *ANA ZAG.HI.A EGIR-an ŪL tiḫanu[n]*, KUB 48.100+ rev. 7-10 (NH Prayer, CTH 486) *ir nu a[mmuk (TÚG.NÍG.LÁM.MEŠ)]* ⁸ [(*apēd*)]ani UD-TI *uaššan k[ue ḫarkun (nu=kan a-pé-e-ia)]* ⁹ [(TÚG.NÍG.LÁM.M)IEŠ anda [a]ppanda«š» Q[(ADU TÚG.EÍB GÍR KUŠE.SIR)] ¹⁰ [(ITTI)] ×-TI *parā nā[ir.;* **Hattusili III**: KUB 1.1+ iii 57-58 (Egodocument, CTH 81) [(KUR.KUR.MEŠ=ja kue dannatta am)]muk EGIR-pa ⁵⁸ [(*ašešanunun nu=mu=kan a-pé-e-ia hūmanda*)] *arḫa dāš*, KUB 21.15 i 17-18 (NH, CTH 85) ¹⁷ *ARAD-anni=ja=mu kue KUR.KUR.MEŠ piḫan [ēšta]* ¹⁸ *nu=mu=kan a-pé-e-ia arḫa datta[t]*, KUB 1.1+ iv 69-70 ⁶⁹ *amuqq=a kuit ḫarkun a-pád-da-ia parā piḫhun* ⁷⁰ *n=at=kan EGIR-an tarnahhun*, KUB 21.38 obv. 61'-62' (NH letter, Puduhepa, CTH 176) *karū=ma kuiješ ḫaššanteš [u]emijanan nu a-pu-u-uš-ša* ^{62'} [*šallanunun ...*]

And the cities in the midst of Tarhuntassa which belonged to the king of Hatti:
....., these too are given to him.

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 (seen 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, Muwattalli II, CTH 76), ed. Friedrich 1930: 66, 68³⁰⁷

mān ^dUTU-ŠI *apez*¹ KUR-*ea*[(z)] ⁵ [(*naššu* URUK)]*arkišaz* URULuqqāz *naš*[(*ma* URUWaršijallaz)*a*] ⁶ [(*laḥḥiām*)]*i nu=mu ziqq=a QADU* ÉRIN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.[(RA.MEŠ)] ⁷ [(*kattan laḥḥ*)]*iāši našma mān BELU* *kuinki* [(*kēz*)] ⁸ [(KUR-*az*)] *laḥḥiāuuanzi uīiami nu a-p*[(*é-e-da-ni-ia*)] ⁹ [(*kattan laḥ*)]*heškiši* URUHaddušaz=*ma=ua=tta* ¹⁰ [(*kē la*)]*hḥiatar* ...

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: 46-47³⁰⁸

§ ¹⁵ *mān* ^dUTU-ŠI ANA ^mUlmi-^dU-up 1 URU-LUM *našma* 1 AŠRU *kuitki* *uekzi* *n=at=ši* SILIM-li *pāi* GÉŠPU-*aḥḥu*[*aš*] ŪL ¹⁶ *n=at* ANA NIŠ DINGIR-LIM *kattan arḥa* GAR-ru *našma mān* ^mUlmi-^dU-up^{aš} *kuitki* ANA ^dUTU-ŠI *uekz*[*i*] ¹⁷ *n=at=ši* ^dUTU-ŠI *pāi nu a-pa-a-at-ta-ia* ANA NIŠ DINGIR-LIM *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 NIŠ DINGIR-LIM *kattan arḥa* GAR-ru is rev. 16 *n=at* ANA NIŠ DINGIR-LIM *kattan arḥa* GAR-ru.

³⁰⁷ See also from Hattusili III: KUB 14.7 ii 12 (CTH 383): *nu a-pa-a-at-ta-ia uttar* ŠA ^fDanuḥepa *iḡannaiš*

³⁰⁸ See also from Tudhaliya IV: Bo 86/299 i 63-64 ⁶² *mānn=a=šši* LUGAL KUR URUHATTI *šarā laḥḥiāizzi* ⁶³ *nu* KUR URUParḥann=*a IŠTU* GIŠTUKUL *ēpzi nu=kan a-pa-a-aš-ša* ⁶⁴ ANA LUGAL KUR URU^dU-tašša *āššanza*, Bo 86/299 iii 18-19 *n=at mān araḥzeni=ia* KUR-e ¹⁹ *n=at a-pé-ez-zī-ia* EGIR-pa *uḡadandu*, KBo 4.10+ obv. 13'-14' *mān=aš araḥzini=ia* KUR-e *n=an a-pé-ez-zī-ia* ^{14'} EGIR-pa *uḡa[d]andu*

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)³⁰⁹, ed. Del Monte 1980: 60
¹² *ziqq=an mManapa-dU-aš iš[tamašti ku]uatqa* ¹³ *nu=za apel kištati nu A[NA dUTU=šI] EGIR-an arḫa uahnuš[i]* ¹⁴ *nu a-pád-da [š]APAL NEŠ DINGIR-LIM [kit]taru*
 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-pád-da [š]APAL NEŠ DINGIR-LIM [kit]taru* is *n=e=ta lingai kattan kittaru* “let it be put under oath for you” in KUB 19.49 i 61-62.

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 *[(mān)]=kan ÉRIN.MEŠ=ma ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ uarri lammar ŪL a[rn(utti)]* ⁷ *[(nu=kan)] kāšma 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 HW² 135a observed that it is only possible to choose between *apatt=a/apadd=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-pád-da* in first position is more likely to be *apatt=a* than *apadda*.

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

- 7.10 **KUB 14.12 rev. 7'-10'** (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 378 III), ed. Lebrun 1980: 217-218
^{7'} *mān=ma=kan DINGIR.MEŠ=ma BELU.MEŠ ḫinkan išt[U KUR URUḪATTI ...]* ^{8'} *ḫaršijalliiaš=kan išpantuzziiaš[liiaš akkiškantari?]* ^{9'} *nu mān a-pu-u-uš-ša arḫa akkanzi nu ANA DINGIR.MEŠ BE[LU.MEŠ=YA NINDA.KUR₄.RA ...]* ^{10'} *išpantuzzi kar(a)štari*
 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.

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-pád-da ŠAPAL NEŠ DINGIR-LIM kittari*, with *apadd=a* in initial position), KUB 21.1 iii 55-65 (CTH 76, *nu a-pád-da-ia NEŠ DINGIR-LIM GAM-an kittaru*), iii 59 (*nu a-pa-a-aš-ša memiaš ŠAPAL NEŠ DINGIR-LIM kittaru*), iii 72 ([*nu*] *a-pád-da ŠAPAL NE[š DINGIR-LIM k]ittaruš*).

³¹⁰ Similarly KBo 5.4 obv. 23', 27', rev. 54' (CTH 67, *nu-kan kasma a-pa-at-ta-ya* ...), obv. 33', rev. 23', 49' (*nu-kan kasma a-pa-a-at-ta-ya* ...), KUB 6.41+ iv 14 (NH Treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68) *nu kāšma a-pa-a-at-ta-ia ANA PANI DINGIR.MEŠ uštaši nu=kan NIŠ DINGIR-LIM šarratti*.

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 huišyandan kuiški ārki maḥḥan dajazilaš a-pa-a-aš-ša QATAMMA §

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

n=aš AN[A LU]GAL maḥḥan¹¹ LÚKÚR=ŠU a-pé-e-da-ni-ia=aš QATAMMA[A]
LÚKÚR=ŠU ēšdu

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-ni-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, 117³¹²

³⁶ mān dannadduš=ma kuiēš URU.DIDLI.ḪIA šinapši kuedaš ANA URU.DIDLI.ḪIA ēšzi nu=šmaš=at m[aḥḥan ēššeškanzi]³⁷ nu a-pu-u-uš-ša QATAMMA ēššuyan tianzi

If there are some deserted towns that have a *sinapsi*(-structure), a[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

³¹¹ And from the same text: i 13'-16' nu=za LÚSANGA našma katta DUMU LÚSANGA maḥḥan¹⁴ apēl ḥannešni kar(a)[šš]i memiškizzi¹⁵ a-pé-e-da-ni-ia antuhsi menaḥḥanda¹⁶ QATAMMA karši memiškiddu.

³¹² See further KUB 21.1+ i 76'-77' (NH Treaty, CTH 76)⁷⁶ [(nu=tta=kkan)]^dUTU-ŠI kinun GIM-an anda ŪL dalaḥhun⁷⁷ [(a-pí-ia-ia)]=ta=kkan anda [(ŪL d)ālijami; lateNH KUB 23.103 rev. 6'-7' (NH Letter, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 178A) ammuk=ma=za ANA EN=KUNU maḥḥan SIG₅-anza ×[...]⁷ nu=za a-pé-e-da-ni-ia QATAMMA=pat SIG₅-anza n=an paḥḥašten.

§ ¹⁴ [GIM(-an=ma)] uit IŠTU É.LUGAL DI-eššar ku[(itki EGIR-pa)] ¹⁵ [(huitti)]iattat nu=za ¹⁶ IŠTAR GAŠAN-YA [(parā handandatar)] ¹⁶ [(a-pé-e-d)]a-ni-ia meḥuni tikkuššan[(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.

7.15 **HKM 60 rev. 21-26** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 234-235³¹³

§ ²¹ kiššann=a=mu memiš[ta] ²² mUDU-siḫališ=ḫa=za GIŠGIGIR ²³ tūriḫazzi namma=ḫar=at ²⁴ arḫa [d]uḫarnizzi ²⁵ nu=šši a-pa-a-at-ta GIŠGIGIR ²⁶ EGIR-pa SIG₅-in iḫaddu §

And he (Tarhunmiya) said to me as follows: ‘UDU-siwali harnesses the wagon, then he breaks it.’ He (UDU-siwali) must repair that wagon too (apatt-a)!

The letter discusses what has to be done with the men, UDU-siwali and Iyarappiya, who keep destroying the property of Tarhunmiya. 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:

7.16 **KBo 17.3+ rev. iv 25-29** (OS ritual, CTH 416), ed. Otten & Souček 1969: 38-39, Neu 1980a: 17

²⁵ GIŠḫarpa=ma I-anta LUGAL-aš GÌR=ši kitta MUNUS.LUGAL-š=a I-anta ²⁶ kitta ta šīni tēmi dā LUGAL-aš MUNUS.LUGAL-š=a aīn ḫāin pittuliu(š)=šmušš=a ta

³¹³ And two examples from Hattusili III: KUB 22.70 obv. 38 (NH Oracle, CTH 566): ³⁸ nu memir apūn=ḫa memian ŪL šekkueni nu=kan a-pa-a-aš-ša memiaš EGIR-pa kittari, KUB 1.1 iv 23-24 (NH Egodocument, CTH 81) nu=za ŠA ¹⁶ IŠTAR p[(arā ḫan)]dandatar a-pí-ia-i[(a)] ²⁴ mekki uḫḫun

hāhallit ²⁸ *gāpinan dāhhe kalulupi=šmi hūlalian kuit=a*³¹⁴ *anda* ²⁹ *halkiaš=a*
ZÍZ^{HI.A-š=a} *haršārr=a*³¹⁵ *nu a-pa-at-ta* *GÌR=ŠUNU kitta*

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=a* is taken as a neuter relative pronoun in a relative clause *kalulupi=šmi hūlalian kuit=a anda*. 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 kalulupuš=(š)muš gāpinit hūlāliemi* “I wind their fingers with the thread(s)”. The grains etc. are mentioned in iv 15-16 *halkiāš haršār išhīanda* ¹⁶ [*ZÍZ*.*HI.A-š=a* *haršār išhīanda kē=ššan hūmanda* ¹⁷ [(*pa*)]*ttanī 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 *anda* in iv 28 refers to the fact that the heads are put in a basket.

And a late Hittite example:

7.17 **Bo 86/299 ii 53-55** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106.1), ed. Otten 1988: 18-19³¹⁶

§ ⁵³ *maḥḥan=ma=za ABU=YA kuṽapi DINGIR-LIM-iš kišat nu KUR.KUR.HI.A kuit* ⁵⁴
ārša tijať ^{md}*LAMMA-aš=ma=mu a-pé-e-da-ni-ia mēḥuni* ⁵⁵ *šer akta nu=mu*
pahḥašta

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

³¹⁴ In Old Hittite one can isolate a Topic-introducing *kuit-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.

³¹⁶ The other examples are KUB 50.6+ ii 53-55 (NH Oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 569) *É[-ir=ma]* ⁵⁴ *kuit tamēdaš parā* ⁵⁵ *sum[-an] n=aš a-pé-da-ni-ia EGIR-an S[ksÁ-at]*. From **Hattusili III**: KUB 22.70 obv. 85-rev. 1 (NH Oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566) *DUMU.MUNUS* ^f*Pattija=ia kuit* *MUNUS.LUGAL ANA* ^d*UTU-ŠI aššuli pešta* ⁸⁶ *hūartaš=ma=an ŪL SAG.DU.MEŠ-azz=a kuit INA ŠÀ É* ^m*Ziṽini [...]* // ¹ [*a*]-*pu-u-uš-ša punuššuṽeni*.

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

⁵⁴ *maḥ[han=ma=]šši [katta uer?? n=aš]ta šA mMa[d]duyatta [DAM.]MEŠ=ŠU*
 NAM.RA.ḪI.A=SUNU *āššū=ia šēr URUŠallauyašši ue[mier]* ⁵⁵ *n=at=ši āp[pa pijer*
šA] mKupanta-d[LAMMA]-ia=ia=kan [DAM.MEŠ=ŠU DUMU.MEŠ]-ŠU NAM.RA.ḪI.A-
ZU āššū=ia šer URUŠallauyašši u[emier=pat??] ⁵⁶ *nu a-pa-a-at-ta [ANA*
mMad]duyatta pi[ie]r

[But] wh[en they came down??] to him, [they] fo[und] the [wife]s, <children>, deportees and possessions of Madduwatta up in Sallawassa, and [they gave] them ba[ck] to him, and also, [they] f[ound the wives, childre]n, deportees and possessions of Kupanta-Kurunta up in Sallawassa, and these too (*apatt-a*) they gave [to Mad]duwatta.

The parallel clauses are given below:

- | | |
|----|--|
| A | ⁵⁴ <i>n=ašta šA mMadduyatta DAM.MEŠ=ŠU ... uemer</i> |
| B | ⁵⁵ <i>n=at=ši āppa pijer</i> (no coordination) |
| A' | ⁵⁵ <i>šA mKupanta-d[LAMMA]-ia=ia=kan DAM.MEŠ=ŠU ... uemer=pat??</i> |
| B' | ⁵⁶ <i>nu a-pa-a-at-ta ANA mMadduyatta pijer</i> |

This example shows by the way coordination of the larger text fragments themselves (*šA mKupanta-d[LAMMA]-ia=ia=kan*). This clause is not coordinated to the previous clause, but to the larger discourse unit *n=ašta šA mMadduyatta DAM.MEŠ=ŠU ... uemer n=at=ši āppa pijer*. One could describe this structure schematically as (A, B) & (A', B'_{too}).

7.19 **IBoT 1.36 i 43-44** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991: 8-9

§ ⁴³ *mān=za=kan gamaršuyan=ma kuin tamašzi nu araš ari tezzi* ⁴⁴ *nu=ššan*
a-pa-at-ta ANA GAL MEŠEDI 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 (*šeḫunanza*) 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, LÚdujanalliš=ma ANA UGULA.10.MEŠEDI 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=a[t UG]ULA[.10.MEŠED]I⁴¹ ANA GAL MEŠEDI=ia 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 LÚdujanalliš=ma ANA UGULA.10.MEŠEDI tezzi ...
 B n=at UGULA.10.MEŠEDI ANA GAL MEŠEDI=ia arnuzzi (no coordination)
- A’ nu araš ari tezzi
 B’ nu=ššan a-pa-at-ta ANA GAL MEŠEDI ari

7.20 **IBoT 1.36 ii 32-35** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991: 18-19

LÚ.MEŠMEŠEDI=ma kuṽ[ap]i iṽanta nu 2 LÚ.MEŠMEŠEDI piran ḫuiante[š]³³
 GIŠŠUKUR.ḪI.A=ia ḫarka[nz]i n=at=kan ḫandānteš ‘GÜB?-la?’[z=ma?]
 DUMU.É.GAL³⁴ iṽatta nu GIŠkalmuš ḫarzi n=ašta a-pa-aš-ša ANA 2
 LÚ.MEŠMEŠED]I³⁵ [ḫa]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=ašta apašš=a ANA 2 LÚ.MEŠMEŠEDI 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 GIŠŠUKUR.ḪI.A=ia ḫarkanzi
 B n=at=kan ḫandānteš (no coordination)
- A’ nu GIŠkalmuš ḫarzi
 B’ n=ašta a-pa-aš-ša ANA 2 LÚ.MEŠMEŠEDI ḫandānza

7.21 **KBo 6.28 + obv. 6-9** (NH edict, Hattusili III, CTH 88), ed. Goetze 1940: 21-22

§⁶ karū KUR.KUR.MEŠ URUḪATTI[I]šTU LÚKÚR arḫa ḫarganuṽan ēšta edez kui[t]⁷ nu LÚKÚR URUGašgaš uit nu[KUR.]KUR.MEŠ URUḪATTI ḫarganut nu=za URUNenaššan ZAG-an⁸ iṽat edez=ma IŠT[U KU]R URUŠAPLITI LÚKÚR URUArzauṽaš uit nu a-pa-aš-ša⁹ KUR.KUR.MEŠ URUḪATTI ḫarganut

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 Arzawaeen 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. Goetze 1940: 21-22
 § ¹³ *edez=ma* LÚKÚR URUArmatanaš[*uit*] *nu a-pa-a-aš-ša* KUR.KU[R.MEŠ
 UR]U^UHATTI *harganut*
 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-aš-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 URUGaššija *hūman harganut* ‘(But from another direction the enemy from Araūna came), and destroyed the country of Gassiya’, and obv. 12 [*nu* UR]UTegarama *harganut* ‘(But [the enemy] from Isuwa came), and destroyed Tegarama’ instead of *nu a-pa-a-aš-ša* X *harganut* ? Only when the destruction of Hatti by different enemies is involved, *a-pa-a-aš-ša* may be used. The parallel structures are:

- A *edez kuit nu* LÚKÚR URUGašgaš *uit*
 B *nu* KUR.KUR.MEŠ URUHATTI *harganut* (no coordination)
- A’ *edez=ma iŠTU* KUR URUŠAPLITI LÚKÚR URUArzauyaš *uit*
 B’ *nu a-pa-a-aš-ša* ⁹ KUR.KUR.MEŠ URUHATTI *harganut*

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 *namma=tta* dUTU-ŠI *kuin kūn* NIN=YA ANA DAM-U[TTI=K(A AD)]DIN ¹⁵ *nu=šši*
 NIN.MEŠ-ŠU ŠA MÁŠ-ŠU ŠA NUMUN-ŠU *meqqaēš [(aš)]anzi* ¹⁶ ŠA N[UMUN-K(A-
 a=t)]ta³¹⁷ *a-pé-e-ia* *zig=a=šmaš=za* NIN-ZU *kuit harši*
 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 c[lan],
 since you have taken their sister.

³¹⁷ Neu 1968: 24 n. 1 read in the duplicate KBo 5.3+ iii 42 [EG]IR-*pa-at-ta-at a-pí-e-ia* “hinterher sind auch sie es dir (nämlich Schwestern)”. What Neu read as EG]IR-*pa* could also be read as -K]A I believe.

The *-ya* in *ape-ya* has to be interpreted as “also”, because the clause already contains the coordinator *-ya* in ŠA 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 parallellism 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

LÚMEŠ GIŠBANŠUR LÚMEŠ MUḪALDIM ^{37’} [XXX ḫarši(n karpanzi ḫaršiia)l(li=ma)]
 II-e a-pí-ia XV ḫaršiš GE₆ kitt[(a)] ^{38’} [(a-pí-ia-e-a XV ḫarši)š GE₆ (kitta)]
udanzi t=an tiianzi (compare *udanzi ta tianzi* 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 (*apiya=ya*) lie 15 dark *harsi*-breads. They bring (them), and put (them) inside (?)

The following examples from KBo 3.34 can not 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.

7.25 **KBo 3.34 ii 1-7** (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 44-45

¹ mZidi LÚZABAR.DAB ēšta ABI LUGAL DUG[ḫar]ḫarān [GEŠTIN-it] ² ANA
 fHištaijara mMaratti=ja manijahḫiš ³ LUGAL-i SIG₅-antan GEŠTIN-an ḫinkatta a-
pé-e-da-aš-ša ⁴ tamain GEŠTIN-an pijer apāšš=a uit LUGAL-i tet ⁵ natta apūn
 GEŠTIN-an pijer LUGAL-uš kuin ⁶ aušta apāšš=a uit QATAMMA IQBI š=an=ašta!
⁷ arḫa pēḫuter š=an ēššikir š=aš BA.ÚŠ³²⁰

³¹⁸ See Rieken 2000: 413 for the writing of *-ya* and *-ma* after ideograms.

³¹⁹ Rieken 2000: 413.

³²⁰ It is interesting to see that although a subject-switch has taken place after the introduction of Zidi in ii 1, the discourse topic Zidi is referred to with a zero-subject in ii 3: LUGAL-i SIG₅-antan GEŠTIN-an ḫinkatta “To the king he (= Zidi) delivered good wine,” The enclitic accusative pronoun *=an* referring to Zidi is even

Zidi was a cup bearer. The father of the king allotted a *harhara*-vessel with wine to Histiyara and Maratti. To the king he (= Zidi) delivered good wine, but to them (*apedass-a*) they gave other wine. Both the *one* came (and) said to the king: ‘They did not give (to us) that wine, which the king saw’ and the *other* came (and) said the same. They brought him (= Zidi) away and beat him all over, so that he died.”

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.

7.26 **KBo 3.34 ii 24-26** (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 50-51

kuid=a mŠuppiumni mMarasša=ja ²⁵ *GIŠŠÚ.A LÚŠU.I parku iēr a-pu-u-un ubatijaš=šaš piran ašešer* ²⁶ *a-pu-u-un-na ubatijaš piran ašešer* §
Now, as for Suppiuman and Marassa, (for them) they set up a high barber seat.³²¹
They seated the one (*apun*) in front of his military unit and they seated the other (*apunn-a*) in front of the military unit.³²²

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.

7.27 **KBo 3.34 ii 8-9** (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 46-47

§ ⁸ *mAšgaliyaš URUHurmi EN-aš ēšta a-pa-a-aš-ša* ⁹ *kuyatt=a kuyatt=a LÚ-eš ēšta*
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

used after a break of seven clauses in which he has not been mentioned. Of course this is only possible when the anaphoric predicate, here *arḫa peḫuter* “they brought away”, does not allow any ambiguity in the choice of the correct antecedent. It is to be expected that the only possible candidate for arrest is the evil-doer Zidi. He is the discourse topic of this paragraph, and therefore for the duration of this segment always highly salient.

³²¹ My translation differs from Dardano who has “Dopo aver innalzato la sedia del barbiere per Šuppiuman e per Marasša ...”. The *kuid=a NP* construction is typically Old Hittite. I will treat this phenomenon elsewhere.

³²² For *ubati* as “military unit”, or “association/group”, see Beal 1992: 539ff.

not dealing with the coordinator *-ya* but with the *non*-coordinating adversative particle (of surprise) *-a/-ma*³²³ (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)

ša KUR URU³²⁴Az³²⁵ ia za MUNUS *namma* ANA DAM-UTTİM l[(ē)]⁴⁸ *tatti* a-pu-u-un-na za arḫa dali karū za kuin ḫar[(ši)]

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: 99³²⁴

^{21'} zikk a ua GIŠTUKUL a-pa-aš-ša GIŠTUKUL
Both *you* and *he* are tools!³²⁵

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: 62-63³²⁶

¹⁵ [n=an] dUTU-ŠI LÚKÚR-aš iṭar zaḫḫiškimi nu a-pa-a-aš-ša memiaš šAPAL NIŠ DINGIR-LIM kittaru §

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

³²³ In case the New Hittite scribe misunderstood *a-pa-a-ša*.

³²⁴ Also see example 7.25, with *apāšš=a ... apāšš=a* in ii 4 and 6.

³²⁵ Archi translates “Tu (es) un travailleur, lui aussi (est) un travailleur!” , not taking into account the *-ya ... -ya* construction. For ‘tool’, see Neu 1984: 99.

³²⁶ Also KUB 1.1+ iv 78-79 (NH Egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81) *nu=za ammuk ARAD DINGIR-LIM*⁷⁹ [(*a-pa-*)]*a-aš-ša* ARAD DINGIR-LIM ēšdu.

7.31 **KBo 17.1+ i 26'-33'** (OS ritual, CTH 416.1A), ed. Otten & Souček 1969: 20-21, Neu 1980a: 6

§ ^{26'} *anda=kan ḫalīnaš teššummiuš tarlipit šūuamuš* ^{27'} 2-TAM *pētumini ...* ^{30'}
NINDAšarrui=m[(a=šš)]an ÉRIN^{MEŠ}-az ēšzi

§ ^{31'} *šer=šemet=a* [G]ÍR ZABAR kitta a-pa-at-ta-[a]n *anda* ^{32'} *pētumeni*

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.

7.32 **KUB 26.12+ iv 33-37** (NH instruction, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.1), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 2³²⁷

§ ³³ [*namm*]*a=šmaš šumeš kuiēš* LÚ.MEŠSAG ANA LUGAL=kan ³⁴ [NÍ.T]E-i *šuppai šalikiškatteni nu=šmaš šuppešni* ³⁵ [IGI-an]*da tišḫanteš ēšten mānn=a=kan* ANA LÚSAG ³⁶ [*kue*]*danikki ḫUL-luš maršaštarriš* ³⁷ [*nu?* a-p]a-a-aš-ša ANA LUGAL NÍ.TE.MEŠ-ŠU *šaligai* GAM MAMITI §

[Furtherm]ore, as for *you* eunuchs, who regularly approach the king's sacred [bod]y, 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

7.33 **KUB 1.1+ ii 37-39** (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 12-13³²⁸

nu=mu a-pí-ia-ia ³⁸ [(^dIŠTA)]R GAŠAN-YA *piran ḫū[(uāiš nu=za a-p)]í-ia-ia* LÚKÚR ³⁹ [(IŠT)]U NÍ.TE-YA *tar(a)ḫḫun*

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 URU^Uišṭaya[(*nda u*)]*edahḫun* ⁴⁵ *nu=mu* a-pí-ia-ia ŠA ^dIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA *kan[(ešš)]ūuār ēšta*

³²⁸ See also KBo 14.3 + KBo 40.293 iv 11'-12' (CTH 40) § ^{11'} *parā=ma namma* 6 Š[(UTI IN)]A URU^Uḫuana-×[× (IKŠUD)] ^{12'} *nu=kan* a-pu-u-un-na *kue[(nta, KUB 1.1 iv 17-18 (CTH 81) nu=mu memiškit GIM-an kišat=ia=za* ¹⁸ *nu=za* ^dIŠTAR GAŠAN-YA *parā ḫandandatar* a-pí-ia-ia *mekki tekkuš[(šanu)]t, KUB 14.7 ii 13 (CTH 383) nu=za a-pa-a-aš-ša DINGIR-LIM-iš *karū kišat**

7.34 **KUB 50.6+ iii 37** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 569), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 186-187³²⁹

arāḥḥaniija=aš ³⁵ [*tiyat*]*aniija šer* SIXSÁ-at *nu=kan ABI* ^dUTU-ŠI ³⁶ [o]×?-× *kuitki šer arḥa pait n=at=kan zāiš* ³⁷ [*a-pád-]*[*da*] SIXSÁ-at
... he was ascertained in connection with perjury[?] (and) [cu]rsing. The father of His Majesty has somehow ignored[?] [...] ... and he has transgressed it. [*Tha*]t *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 SIXSÁ-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 Sternemann 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)³³⁰

§ ⁶¹ [*mān šA* ^{LÚ}]KÚR=*ia* *kuiš* URU-*aš takšuli uizzi šumeš=a=šši* KUR URU^UHATTI *pira*[*n ... lē ...*]×-*atteni* ⁶² (...) ⁶³ [*nu=šši apā*]*t*^{??} *lē memiškiteni mān a-pé-e-ez-zi-ia* *kuiš* ANA KUR-KUNU ×[*kūru*]*r ēpzi* ⁶⁴ [*kuitman*] *šA* ^dUTU-ŠI ÉRIN.MEŠ ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḪI.A *nāui ari šumeš=a apūn* ^{LÚ}KÚR[*-an zahḥiadduma*]
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 .) [*Tha*]t (?) you may not say [to him (?)]. And if from there (*apezzi-ya*) someone becomes [hostil]e 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

³²⁹ See also KUB 31.68: 7-8 (NH, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 297) ANA ^mLilauyanta=*i*[*a*] ⁸ GIŠ^{HUR} *uter nu=ua a-pé-e-da-ni-ia* QATAMMA *ḫatraeš*.

³³⁰ See also KUB 23.77+ rev. 52'-54' (MH/MS Treaty, Arnuwanda I, CTH 138) ^{52'} [*mān=kan* *šTU* KUR URU^UHAT]TI *pitteianza* INA KUR URUKašga *takšulaš* URU-*ia* *uizzi ...* ^{54'} [*nu āššū* EGIR-*pa pi*]šten *apāš=a pitteianza šumāš ēštu mān=kan a-pé-e-ez-zi-ia takšulaš* ^{55'} [INA KUR URU^UHATTI *uizz*]*i ... nu*] UNUTE.MEŠ EGIR-*pa pi*[*ueni*] *pitteandann=a=šmaš* EGIR-*pa ŪL* *pīuēni*

from ‘there’. Therefore we are dealing here with coordination of two larger discourse units, contrasting actions of peace with actions of hostility.

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:

| <i>-ya</i> “also, too” | Broken | Initial | First | Other | Total |
|------------------------|--------|---------|-------|-------|-------|
| Relative Clause | 1 | 2 | 12 | — | 15 |
| Conditional Clause | 1 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 21 |
| Clause of Comparison | — | 4 | 2 | — | 6 |
| Temporal Clause | — | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| After Reported Speech | — | — | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| <i>kuit</i> Clause | 1 | — | 3 | — | 4 |
| Parallel Structures | — | — | 5 | — | 5 |
| Other coordinators | — | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| Non-Symmetrical | 2 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 11 |
| Total | 5 | 9 | 41 | 12 | 67 |

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

| <i>-ya</i> “and” | Broken | Initial | First | Other | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------|---------|-------|-------|-------|
| Symmetrical | — | 4 | — | — | 4 |
| <i>man NP_zya</i> | — | — | 2 | — | 2 |
| Total | — | 4 | 2 | — | 6 |

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

| <i>-ya ... -ya</i> “both ... and” | Broken | Initial | First | Other | Total |
|-----------------------------------|--------|---------|-------|-------|-------|
| Symmetrical | — | 2 | — | — | 2 |
| Total | — | 2 | — | — | 2 |

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:

| | First | Initial | Total |
|------------|-------|---------|-------|
| <i>Too</i> | 41 | 9 | 50 |
| <i>And</i> | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| Total | 41 | 15 | 56 |

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 here³³¹:

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

11' [mā]n mištili_{ja} mē[(hur MUŠEN_hhāranan anda)] 12' [pēta]h_{hi} ÉRIN^{MES}-nan pē[(ta)h_{hi} teššummeušš=a pēta)h_{hi}] 13' [1-E]N tešš[u]mmin ANA LUGA[L p(ē)h_{hi} 1-EN ANA MUNUS.LUGAL pēh_{hi}] 14' 1-EN ANA h_{al}maššuit_t[i pē(h_{hi} Û 1-EN ANA h_aššī) pēh_{hi}] ...
DUMU.É.GAL 24' LUGAL-aš MUNUS.LUGAL-ašš=a kiššar[az=ša(met te)]ššummiuš dā[(i)] 25' h_{al}maššuit_taz h_ašš[az a-p(ē-e-a)³³² d)]āi

³³¹ The other attestations from my corpus are: KBo 5.3 + ii 5 (CTH 42): *nu=t[ta] a-pu-u-un-na antu_hšan lē dali_{ja}n[zi*, KUB 26.38+ 11' *a-pé-e-da-ni-ja=at* E[GIR-a(n lē tarn)anzil]; KUB 23.72+ (CTH 146) obv. 12: *nu=ya a-pa-a-at-ta a[nd]a*, obv. 37: *NIŠ DINGIR-LIM=kan a-pa-a-aš-ša šarraškit*, obv. 62: *nu=kan a-pa-a-at-ta IŠTU KUR=Š[U] āppa uāšten*, rev. 9: *nu a-pé-e-ja ...*, KUB 21.38 (CTH 176) obv. 33' : *nu=šmaš=kan a-pu-u-uš-ša* 1 URU-LUM DIB-anza *a-pu-u-uš-šd*..., obv. 46' *nu=uar=at a-pé-e-da-ni-ja* [SIG₅-attaru; KUB 23.103 obv. 12' (CTH 178A) *nu=mu a-pád-da-ja ŠUPUR*; KUB 19.5 + KBo 19.79 (CTH 191) *nu=kan a-pu-u-uš-ša anda* SIXÁ-at; KBo 11.1 rev. 6 (CTH 382) *nu a-pí-ja-ja EGIR-pa SIG₅-ah_han_{zi}*; KUB 15.3 (CTH 584) iv 4' *nu a-pé-e-ja h_{al}i[ššijami*; KUB 31.77 ii 18 (CTH 584) *nu=ya a-pé-e-ja LÚ.MEŠšalaš_huš šekan_{zi}*

³³² Otten & Souček 1969: 26 fn. 2, and Neu 1980a: 20 fn. 52: The restoration of *ape-ya* is not certain.

[Whe]n at the *mistiliya*-time I [car]ry 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 [gi]ve to the hearth. ...

The palace-attendant takes the cups from the hands of the king and queen. He takes also [the o]nes (*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 ^{GIŠ}TUKUL *tameškatteni a-pé-e-ia kattan* ^{4'} *dameškiyan 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 idalauyanni=ia kuiš uaggariyauyanzi šanhazi šumāš=a* ^{24'} *hatrāmi nu=mu=ššan mān uarri lamnī ŪL ērtēni našma=at šumeš=ma* ^{25'} *ištamaštani n=at mān ANA* ^{dUTU-ŠI} *hū[d]āk ŪL mematteni* ^{26'} *a-pa-a-aš-ša=šmaš mān ŪL LÚKUR n=an lahhijatteni ŪL ...*
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 him³³³ — (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 hatuga tethiškut* ¹⁹ *haršiḥarši=ia udaš nu TÚG.NÍG.LÁM.MEŠ* *kue apēdani UD-TI* ²⁰ *uāššan ḥarkun ANA* ^{GIŠ} *GIGIR=ia=kan kuedani apēdani UD-T[I]* ²¹ *ārḥaḥat nu kē TÚG.NÍG.LÁM.MEŠ* *anda appanda* ^{GIŠ} *GIGIR=ia* 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 —

³³³ Košak differently: ‘and if you do not treat him as your enemy and do not even fight him’.

these clothes, tied together and the hitched-up wagon — those too (*apatt-a*) they have taken.³³⁴

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 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)

] ŠA ^dUTU = ŠI *kuiuš* URU.DIDLI.ĜI.A ^mMītaš *apāšš=a ḫarkanzi*

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.³³⁵

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 (Cornish 1999: 53-4, 60, for French and English, and Giora & Lee 1996: 113 ff. for Chinese. See also

³³⁴ Following the translation of Götze & 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”.

³³⁵ A quick scan through the Hieroglyphic Luvian corpus showed that (*a*)*pa-* + *-ḫa* “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).

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.³³⁶ 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 type³³⁷:

- 7.41 **KBo 6.2 i 11-12 § 8** (OS laws, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 21
 § ¹¹ *takku* ARAD-nan našma GÉME-an kuiški dašuyahhi našma ZU₉=ŠU lāki ¹² 10
 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi parna=šše=a šuuaiezzi §
 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* LÚ-an pahhueni kuiški peššiezzi n=aš aki ā[ppa(=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):³³⁸

- 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.GÌR.NUN.NA ANŠE kuiški tāiezzi išha(š)=šiš=an [(ganešzi)] ⁵⁷ n=an=za šakuuāššaran [(dāi an)]da=šše 2-ki pāi
 parna=šše=a šuuaiezzi §

³³⁶The 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).

³³⁷The 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.

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

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 freedom³³⁹ (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

§ ³⁰ takku LÚ-aš GU₄ŠU ÍD-an zīnuškišzi tamaiš=an šu[uezi] ³¹ nu GU₄-aš KUN-an ēpzi ta ÍD-an zāi Û BEL G[(U₄ ÍD-aš pēdai)] ³² nu=zza apūn=pat dan[(zi)] §

If a man is crossing a river with his ox, and another man pu[sh]es him off, grasps the tail of the ox, and crosses the river, while the river carries off the owner of the ox, (the dead man's heirs) shall take that (man).³⁴⁰

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 -ma/-a "but" and their Akkadian variant Û.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:

³³⁹See 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.

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

³⁴¹For the use of the Akkadian conjunction Û "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.

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

- 7.45 **KBo 6.2 i 1-2, § 4** (OS law, with duplicate KBo 6.3 i 8-9, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 18³⁴³

§ ¹ [(*takku* ARAD-*an* *našma* GÉME-*an* *kuiš*)]*ki* *u*alahzi *n=aš* *aki* QASSU *u*aštai ² [(*a-pu*)]-*u-un* *arnuzi* Û 1 SAG.DU *pāi* *par*n[(*a=šš*)]*e=a* *šuuaijezzi*³⁴⁴ §

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 also³⁴⁵ 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* GÌR GU₄ *kuiš*ki *tu*ar[(*nizi* *apūn=za* *apāš*)] ⁶⁷ [(*dāi* Û GU₄ SIG₅)] *BEL* GU₄ *pāi* *takku* *BE*[(*L* GU₄ *tezzi* *ammel=pat=ua=za*)] ⁶⁸ [(GU₄-*un* *dahhi*)] GU₄=*šU* *dāi* Û 2 GÍ[(*N* KÙ.BABBAR *pāi*)] §

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 instead³⁴⁶”, 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.GÌR.NUN.NA ANŠE-*in* *kuiš*ki *appatariezzi* ⁵ [(*n=aš* *ped*)]*i=šši* *aki* *apūn* *arnuzzi* *kuššan+šett=a* *pāi* §

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*)]*aḥhur* AN[(*A* A.ŠÀ=)]*šU* *kuiš*ki *pēdai* [(*ta* *tame*)]*l=a* ¹⁸ [(*A.ŠÀ*)]=*šU* *lukke*[(*zzi*)] *kuiš*=*at* *lu*[(*kkezzi* *nu=za* *lu*)]*kkan* ¹⁹ [(*A.ŠÀ-L*)]*AM* *apāš* *dā*[(*i* SI)]*G₅-andann=a* [(*A.ŠÀ* ANA EN)] *A.ŠÀ* ²⁰ [(*pā*)]*i* *t=az* [(*u*ar)]*šīa*[(*zzi*)] §

³⁴³Similar Laws are: §§ 1-3.

³⁴⁴For a discussion of the expression *parna=šše=a šuuaijezzi* see Hoffner 1997: 168 with literature.

³⁴⁵The translations basically follows Hoffner 1997. However, to do justice to the nature of the coordinator *-ya* and Û 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.

³⁴⁶See ex. 8.20 for an explanation of the translation “instead”.

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

§³ [*takku miḫanda*]*n*? ^{GIŠ}GEŠTIN-*an* *kuiški karašzi karš[(andan)]* ⁴ [^{GIŠ}GEŠTIN-*an*] *apāš dāi* ^{SIG₅-ann=a} ^{GEŠTIN} ⁵ [(ANA) BE)]*L* ^{GIŠ}GEŠTIN *pāi t=an=za tuḫšannai* ⁶ [*kui(t)m(an? apē)*]*l* ^{GIŠ}GEŠTIN ^{SIG₅-atta} ...

If anyone cuts down a [fruit-beari]ng 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 [un]t[i]l 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 ḫalkiaš ÉSAG-an t[(āiezzi ÉSAG-š)=a ḫalki]**n* *uēmiezzi* ⁵⁰ *ÉSAG-an ḫalkit šunnai Û 12 [(GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi p)arna=šše=a]* *šuaiezzi* §

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] ho[use for it].

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

§³ *takku* LÚDAM.GÀR *kuiški kuēnzi* 1 ME MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR *pāi parna=šše=a šuaiezzi* ⁴ *takku* INA KUR Luwija *našma* INA KUR URUPalā 1 ME MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR *pāi* ⁵ *āššu=ššett=a šarnikzi* *našma* INA KUR URUHatti ⁶ *nu=zza unattallan=pat arnuzzi* §

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 Luwiya 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) instead³⁴⁸.

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 *naš*)]*ma* GÌR GU₄ *kuiški tuḫar[(nizi apūn=za apāš)]* ⁶⁷ [(*dāi* Û GU₄ ^{SIG₅})] *BEL* GU₄ *pāi takku* BE[(*L* GU₄ *tezzi ammel=pat=ḫa=za*)] ⁶⁸ [(GU₄-*un dahḫi*)] *GU₄=ŠU dāi Û 2 GÍ[(N KÙ.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

³⁴⁷ Hoffner l.c. translates with two independent clauses.

³⁴⁸ For the translation of *-pat* as “instead” see Chapter 8.

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 exx. 7.47 (with *apun*), 7.50, 7.51 and 7.52 (with a lexical NP) do not seem to contrast with each other. The reason for including the last three examples in the discussion is the rather unexpected repetition of the NP. Especially the NPs ÉSAG-*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 arši*]n *kuiški taijazi takku* 1 *gipeššar* ¹² [*aršiš t*]=*an EGIR-pa aršezz*i Û
1 GÍN .GÍN KÙ.BABBAR ¹³ [*pāi takku*] 2 *gipeššar aršiš t*=*an EGIR-pa* ¹⁴ [*aršezz*]i Û
2 GÍN .GÍN KÙ.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* ^{GIŠ}IG *šullannaz kuiški tajezzi ku*)]it *kuit É-ri andan* ⁹ [(*ḥarakzi t*=*at šarnikzi* Û 1 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR *pā*)]i *parna*=*šše*=*ja šuuajazzi* §

If anyone steals a door as a result of a quarrel, he shall replāce 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 protasis of the Law, which makes it necessary to introduce the referent in the apodosis. Instead of

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| protasis | apodosis 1 | apodosis 2 |
| <u>discourse entity</u> _i | <i>apun</i> _i / NP _i ... V | <i>Û</i> ... |

we now have

| | | | |
|-----------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| protasis | apodosis 1 | | apodosis 2 |
| | <i>takku</i> ¹ <i>gipeššar aršiš</i> _i | <i>t=an</i> _i ... V | <i>Û</i> ... |
| | <i>kuit kuit</i> _i <i>É-ri andan harakzi</i> | <i>t=at</i> _i V | <i>Û</i> ... |

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 Û* ...” would have been used after the introduction of the referent in the protasis:

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| protasis | apodosis 1 | apodosis 2 |
| <u>discourse entity</u> _i | <i>*t=an</i> _i ... V | <i>Û</i> ... |

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 ÛL mematti n=an anda imma* [*munnaš*_i] § ² *našma a-pé-e-da-ni imma EGIR-an tijaš*_i ANA ^dUTU-ŠI [*=ma*] ³ *ayan arḥa tijaš*_i *nu mān kiššan uttar ie* [*š*_i] ⁴ *nu=tta kē NIŠ DINGIR.MEŠ lē daliānzi nu=t* [*ta*] ⁵ *apūnn=a antuḥšan lē daliān* [*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 yo[urs] 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-ŠI *kuiški yatkuuanza* ²⁴ [*n*]=*aš=kan ANA ZAG kuedanikki anda* ²⁵ [*š*]*umēšš=a=aš āššuš kuedanikki* ²⁶ *nu* [*=šš*]*i=kan memian*

GAM-*an arḥa uatarnahzi* ²⁷ *nu a-pa-a-an ZAG-na dāi* ^dUTU-ŠI=*ma* GÚB-*la dāi*
²⁸ *n=an=kan kūš* DINGIR.MEŠ *ḥarninkandu* §
 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 *Ù* 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.

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.

| | Clause 1 | Clause 2 |
|----|--|--|
| OH | | |
| 1 | <i>nu apūn šāktāizzi</i> | <i>pēdi=šši=ma LÚ.U₁₉.LU-an pāi</i> |
| 45 | <i>apūn arnuzi</i> | <i>Ù 1 SAG.DU pāi</i> |
| 46 | <i>apūn=za apāš dāi</i> | <i>Ù GU₄ SIG₅ BEL GU₄ pāi</i> |
| 47 | <i>apūn arnuzzi</i> | <i>kuššaⁿ=šett=a pāi</i> |
| 48 | <i>kuiš=at lukkezzi</i> | |
| | <i>nu=za lukkan A.ŠÀ-LAM apāš dāi</i> | <i>SIG₅-andann=a A.ŠÀ ANA EN A.ŠÀ pāi</i> |
| 49 | <i>karšandan GIŠGEŠTIN-an apāš dāi</i> | <i>SIG₅-ann=a GEŠTIN ANA BEL GIŠGEŠTIN pāi</i> |
| 50 | <i>ÉSAG-an ḥalkit šunnai</i> | <i>Ù 12 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi</i> |
| 51 | <i>1 ME MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR pāi</i> | <i>āššu=šsett=a šarnikzi</i> |
| 52 | <i>GU₄=ŠU dāi</i> | <i>Ù 2 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi</i> |
| 53 | <i>takku 1 gipeššar aršiš</i> | |
| | <i>t=an EGIR-pa aršezzi</i> | <i>Ù 1 GÍN.GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi</i> |
| 54 | <i>kuit kuit É-ri andan ḥarakzi</i> | |
| | <i>t=at šarnikzi</i> | <i>Ù 1 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR pāi</i> |
| MH | | |
| 55 | <i>našma apēdani imma EGIR-an tijaši</i> | <i>ANA ^dUTU-ŠI[=ma] aḡan arḥa tijaši</i> |
| NH | | |
| 56 | <i>nu apān ZAG-na dāi</i> | <i>^dUTU-ŠI=ma GÚB-la dāi</i> |

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 *Ù*, X is the NP which is the mirrored argument of the (pro)nominal expression in the first member):

| Clause 1 | | Clause 2 | Examples |
|------------------|------|---------------|-----------------------|
| enclitic pronoun | Verb | coord. X Verb | — |
| <i>apa-</i> | Verb | coord. X Verb | 1, 45, 46, 47, 55, 56 |

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------|---------------|--------------------|
| NP | Verb | coord. X Verb | 48, 49, 50, 51, 52 |
| S-clause <i>ta</i> +enclitic | Verb | coord. X Verb | 53, 54 |

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 accented 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.

7.4. The pronoun *apa-* + *-a/-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 *-a/-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 *-a/-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* *peššizzi* *išhaš=šiš* UZU.ì *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*]TI *pittejanza* *ina* KUR ^{URU} *Kašga* *takšulaš* URU-
ja *uizzi* ^{53'} [*n=aš* *mān* ARAD-*iš* *nu*] ŠA *BELI=šU* *āššū* *udai* *našma=aš* LÚ
GIŠTUKUL *nu* ŠA LÚTAPPI=ŠU *āššū* *udai* ^{54'} [*nu* *āššū* EGIR-*pa* *pi*]šten *a-pa-a-ša*
pittejanza *šumāš* *ēštu*

[If from the land of Hat]ti someone on the run comes to an allied city in Kaska 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: 60-61³⁴⁹
nu mān zik ^m*Targašnalliš a-pé-e-d[a-]aš menahḫanda* ⁷ [*idalauu*]aḫti *nu a-pé-e-da-aš* EGIR-an *tiḫami zik=ma=mu=za kūrur ēš mān a-pu-u-uš=ma* ⁸ [*tuk* men]aḫḫanda *idalāueššanzi nu tuk* EGIR-an *tiḫami a-[p]u-u?-uš?=ma=mu kūrur [ašandu]* §
 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 [ag]ainst [you (*tuk*)], then I shall support you (*tuk*), while they (*apus=ma*) [shall be] my enemy!

On discourse level the units *nu mān zik ...* and *mān 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 *tiḫami zik=ma=mu=za kūrur ēš* and *nu tuk* EGIR-an *tiḫami a-[p]u-u?-uš?=ma=mu kūrur [ašandu]*.

- 7.60 **KUB 23.1+ iv 14-16** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 105), ed. Kühne & Otten 1971: 14-17
¹⁴ *tuel=kan LÚDAM.GÀR ŠÀ KUR Aššur lē* ¹⁵ *paizzi a-pé-el=ma=kan LÚDAM.GÀR*
¹⁶ *ŠÀ KUR=KA lē tarnatti*
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):

³⁴⁹ See also KUB 21.5+ ii 6-10 (NH Treaty, Muwattalli, CTH 76) ^dUTU-ŠI=*ma t*]uk ^m[(*Alakš*)]and[(*un*)] (KUB 21.5 ii) ⁷ *arḫa ŪL=pat peššeḫami a-pu-u-un=ma ŪL* ⁸ [(*dahḫi t*)]ukk=*aš mahḫan* (...) ⁹ [*nu=za* ^dUTU-(*ŠI*)] *tuk=pat* ^m*Alakšandu šaggahḫi a-pu-u-un=ma=za* ¹⁰ [*ŪL šaggahḫi*], KUB 21.1+ iii 38-40 (NH Treaty, Muwattalli, CTH 76) *nu=za zik* ^m*Alakšandu ANA* ^m*Kupanta-dLAMMA* ³⁹ *NARARUM šardijaš ŠU.BULUG-ašš=a ēš n=an paḫši* ⁴⁰ *a-pa-a-aš=ma tuk paḫšaru*. See also the broken KUB 21.37 obv. 19’-20’ (NH, Hattusili III, CTH 85) *nu=šši ammuk* K[UR.KUR.MEŠ URUḪatti ŠU-i *teḫhun*] ^{20’} *a-pa-a-aš=ma ammuk tepnummanzi šer lūrija[hḫeškit]* (The latter restoration according to CHD L-M 87).

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 prosody³⁵⁰ 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 <i>apa-</i> + <i>-ya</i> 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:

7.61 **KBo 6.29 + i 16-21** (NH edict, Hattusili III, CTH 85), ed. Götze 1925: 46-47
^f*Puduḥepaš=ma* ¹⁷ *ša dIŠTAR URULawazantiya GEME-aš DUMU.MUNUS mPentip-*
LUGAL ¹⁸ *LÚSANGA dIŠTAR ēšta nu=za a-pu-u-un-na* ¹⁹ *AŠŠUM DAM-UTTIM*
marri ŪL dahḥun ²⁰ *IŠTU INIM DINGIR-LIM=za=an dahḥun DINGIR-LIM=an=mu*
ù-it ²¹ *ḥenkta*
 Now, Puduhepa, servant of Istar of Lawazantiya was the daughter of Pentip-sarri, priest of Istar. Also³⁵¹ 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

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*.

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 Lambrecht 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-* 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 Moutaouakil, 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 \emptyset , 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 7.47.³⁵² 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?

³⁵² 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 "conversational implicatures." "

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 clause. 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.³⁵³

The implicature that a coordination will follow explains an otherwise incomprehensible repetition of pronouns³⁵⁴, i.e., why *apa-* can be followed by *apa-* referring to the same

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 criterium of Moutaouakil 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.

referent. We already have 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

²⁹ GI-an GIŠUMBIN *hašhaššuar* GIŠTUKUL *appātar n=uš a-pa-a-aš annanut* ³⁰
kūn a-pa-a-aš annanut kūšš=a ABI LUGAL ANA Nakkilit ³¹ GAL LÚ.MEŠSAGI *paiš*
kūš mHuzzi GAL LÚ.MEŠNIMGIR ³² *kūš mKizzui GAL LÚ.MEŠMEŠEDI paiš š=uš*
ulkeššarahhir

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),³⁵⁵ and also, some others the father of the king gave to Nakkalit, 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.

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 *kūn apāš annanut* and the second member starts with *kūšš=a ABI LUGAL ANA Nakkilit GAL LÚ.MEŠSAGI paiš*.

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.).

7.66 **KBo 3.34 ii 8-9** (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 46-47

§ ⁸ mAšgaliyaš URUHurmi EN-aš *ēšta a-pa-a-aš-ša* ⁹ *kuuatt=a kuuatt=a LÚ-eš ēšta*
Asgaliya was lord in (the city of) Hurma and *he* (*apass-a*) was a honourable(?) man in every aspect.

But if *-ya* is actually a mistake for *-a/-ma* and *kuwatta kuwatta* is the opposite of ‘honourable’, then surprise is indeed possible: Askaliya was the lord of Hurma, but surprise, he was a man of low character.

³⁵⁵ Dardano l.c. translates *nu annanut* etc. as “Quello li istruiva, quell’altro lo istruiva (?); alla fine il padre del re affidò alcuni a Nakkilit, ..., 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 referents 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.

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)):

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------------|--------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------------|----------|----------------------|
| 1-OH | <i>nu</i> | <i>apun</i> | | <i>V_i</i> | <i>X=ma</i> | O | <i>V_i</i> |
| 24-OH | <i>apiia</i> | S | | <i>V</i> | <i>apiia=ia</i> | S | <i>V</i> |
| 25-OH | IO | O | | <i>V</i> | <i>apedašš=a</i> | O | <i>V</i> |
| 25-OH | <i>apass=a</i> | | | <i>V</i> | <i>apass=a</i> | | <i>V</i> |
| 26-OH | <i>apun</i> | X | | <i>V_i</i> | <i>apun=a</i> | X | <i>V_i</i> |
| 27-OH | S | X | | <i>V_i</i> | <i>apass=a</i> | X | <i>V_i</i> |
| 29-OH | <i>zikk=a=ua</i> | | | <i>V</i> | <i>apass=a</i> | | <i>V</i> |
| 45-OH | <i>apun</i> | | | <i>V_i</i> | <i>Ü-O</i> | | <i>V_i</i> |
| 46-OH | <i>apun=a</i> | S | | <i>V_i</i> | <i>Ü-O</i> | X | <i>V_i</i> |
| 47-OH | <i>apun</i> | | | <i>V_i</i> | <i>O=ia</i> | | <i>V_i</i> |
| 48-OH | <i>nu=a</i> | O+O | S | <i>V_i</i> | <i>O=ia+O</i> | X | <i>V_i</i> |
| 49-OH | O+O | S | | <i>V_i</i> | <i>O=ia+O</i> | X | <i>V_i</i> |
| 50-OH | O | X | | <i>V_i</i> | <i>Ü-O</i> | | <i>V_i</i> |
| 51-OH | O | | | <i>V_i</i> | <i>O=ia</i> | | <i>V_i</i> |
| 52-OH | O | | | <i>V_i</i> | <i>Ü-O</i> | | <i>V_i</i> |
| 57-OH | S | O | | <i>V</i> | <i>apas=a</i> | O | <i>V</i> |
| 65-OH | <i>kun</i> | S | | <i>V</i> | <i>kuss=a</i> | S X | <i>V</i> |
| 66-OH | S | X | | <i>V_i</i> | <i>apašš=a</i> | X | <i>V_j</i> |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|--------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 28-MH | [G=a O] | X | | <i>V_i</i> | <i>apun=a=a</i> | | <i>V_i</i> |
| 55-MH | <i>nasma</i> | <i>apedani</i> | X | <i>V_i</i> | IO=ma | X | <i>V_i</i> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----|----------------------|-------------------------|------------|----------------------|
| 56-NH | <i>nu</i> | <i>apan</i> | X | <i>V_i</i> | O=ma | X | <i>V_i</i> |
| 59-NH | <i>nu</i> | <i>apedas</i> | | <i>V</i> | <i>zik=ma=a</i> | | <i>V</i> |
| | <i>nu</i> | <i>tuk</i> | | <i>V</i> | <i>apus=ma=a</i> | | <i>V</i> |
| fn.-NH | <i>S=ma</i> | <i>tuk</i> | Neg | <i>V</i> | <i>apun=ma</i> | Neg | <i>V</i> |
| fn.-NH | <i>nu=a</i> | <i>zik</i> | IO | <i>V</i> | <i>apas=ma</i> | <i>tuk</i> | <i>V</i> |
| 60-NH | <i>tuel=kan+O</i> | X | | <i>V</i> | <i>apel=ma+O</i> | X | <i>V</i> |

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

| |
|------------------------------------|
| ## (nu) N V N-ya/-ma 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 *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* all showed contrast (as was expected given the semantics of *-a/-ma*).

8. Limiting *apa-*

8.1. Introduction

When discussing the ‘emphatic’ pronoun *apa-* one should always ask why it is used at all. As we will see, in many cases the referent of *apa-* is highly topical. This is most clearly seen when the referent of *apa-* is introduced in a relative clause that prepares the Addressee to accept the referent as the new topic of discourse. Especially in the relative clause context there is often no competing referent. So why is *apa-* used when not to disambiguate or to enhance the topic status of a referent?

The previous chapter discussed among other things clauses containing the pronoun *apa-* referring to highly topical, non contrastive referents. The conclusion was that this *apa-* only appeared in coordinate structures and that it needed to be used in order to signal to the Addressee that the clause would not be finished. The coordinate structure belonged to class II of the Laws, the class dealing with complex punishments with the format “the offender does not only have to pay a fine, but he also has to fulfill some other requirement.”

However, as I stated there, *apa-* does not only appear in class II, but also in class III, as in ex. 7.44, repeated here:

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

§ ³⁰ *takku* LÚ-*aš* GU₄-*šU* ÍD-*an* zīnuš*kizzi tamaiš-*an* šu[*uez*(*zi*)]* ³¹ *nu* GU₄-*aš* KUN-*an* ē*pzi ta* ÍD-*an* zāi Û BEL G[(U₄ ÍD-*aš* pē*dai*)] ³² *nu-*zza a-pu-u-un-pát** *dan[(*zi*)]* §

If a man is crossing a river with his ox, and another man pushes him off, grasps the tail of the ox, and crosses the river, while the river carries off the owner of the ox, (the dead man's heirs) shall take that (man)

In order to understand why *apa-* with *-pat* is used here, I will study all occurrences of *-pat* in the apodoses of the Laws. The laws of class III do not impose a fine as in class I or a fine and something else as in class II, but require another kind of punishment. A first investigation of this group shows that 11 out of the 23 laws in this class³⁵⁶ contain the limiting particle *-pat* “only, even, the same (etc.)” (CHD P 212ff.). The punishments in this group of 11 are of a heterogeneous kind, whereas the remaining 12 without *-pat* are rather homogeneous. The following table lists the types of punishments in class III laws without the particle *-pat*:

| Type of punishment | Without <i>-pat</i> |
|--------------------|---------------------|
|--------------------|---------------------|

³⁵⁶ §§ 5, 19a, 21, 23 (b), 43, 45, 48, 49, 75, 95 (last part), 99 (last part), 170, 173a, b, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 195, 197, 198, 199.

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| No punishment at all | law 48 |
| Punishment not expressed | laws 189, 190, 191, 195 (incest, necrophily) |
| Punishment is death | laws 173 a, b (rejection of a judgment of the king or a magistrate), 187, 188, 199 (sexual offences with animals), 197, 198 (rape or adultery) |

Table 8.1: Class III laws without *-pat*

This is a rather marked distribution. As we will see in the examples presented below, the crimes in the group containing the particle *-pat* are usually not punishable by death, unless in certain cases the otherwise required punishment cannot be fulfilled. This is in contrast with the laws in the table above, where in some cases death is the expected punishment or where there is no punishment at all.

Taking the function of the particle *-pat* as a point of departure, it is possible to set up a hypothesis to explain the connection between *-pat* and class III Laws with punishments other than death. According to the CHD (P 212ff.) *-pat* is³⁵⁷:

1. Anaphoric: ‘the same, the aforementioned, likewise’ (CHD *sub -pat* 1, 2 and 3).
2. Counter-presuppositional. The meanings of *-pat* cited in the CHD lead to the following sub-division:
 - a. Replacing Focus: ‘-self’ as in ‘himself’ etc. (CHD *sub -pat* 4), ‘own’ (*-pat* 5), ‘rather’ (*-pat* 9), ‘even, nevertheless’ (*-pat* 10).
 - b. Restricting/Selecting Focus: ‘only, exclusively’ (CHD *sub -pat* 6).
 - c. Expanding Focus: ‘likewise, also, in addition’ (CHD *sub -pat* 7, 8).
3. Emphasizing: ‘surely, certainly’ (CHD *sub -pat* 11).

Summarizing, the core function of *-pat* is to indicate counter-presuppositionality of some kind. Applying this to the Laws, we expect to find some kind of countering an expected punishment when *-pat* is used. Two types of countering come to mind given the typology based on punishments:

1. One expects a class I punishment, payment of a fine or person. But instead, another type of punishment is required. Or,
2. One expects a class II punishment, payment of a fine or person and another obligation. Instead, only one of them applies, the financial compensation is left out and the other obligation remains.

In both situations the resulting type of punishment consists of only one punishment that is non-financial. Since the determining factor of class III laws is the absence of a financial retribution, laws with *-pat* and class III laws therefore coincide. Possibly the class III laws are secondary laws³⁵⁸ digressing from the regular pattern of a financial punishment with or without an extra requirement. The starting point of the discussion of *apa-* with *-pat* in this chapter will therefore be the comparison of ‘*-pat*’ laws with the other laws in the same category (see section 8.2).

³⁵⁷ The classification presented here is mine. CHD does not use the terms ‘focus’ or ‘emphasis’.

³⁵⁸ Excluding the capital crimes for incest, rape and denying the authority of the royals listed in Table 8.1.

Some remarks on Focus are required. As presented in Chapter 2 I generally follow Dik 1997a: 332 in his description of the different types of Focus. After the description of the Expanding Focus phrase *apa-* with *-ya* ‘also’ in the preceding chapter there still remain Replacing, Restricting and Selecting Focus. They may be represented schematically as follows (Dik l.c.)³⁵⁹:

| Type of Focus | (P _A) _s | P _s | Expression type |
|---------------|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Replacing | X | Y | Not X, but Y! |
| Restricting | X and Y | X | Only X! |
| Selecting | X or Y | X | X! |

Table 8.2: Focus types

The Focal use of *apa-* both with (sections 8.2, 8.3) and without the clitic *-pat* (section 8.5), which is the main interest of this chapter, cannot be classified satisfactorily as one of the three remaining types of Focus. All three seem to occur indiscriminately, and sometimes it is even impossible given the context to decide which type of Focus was intended by the author. I therefore introduce the notion Limiting Focus, although this certainly does not cover Replacing Focus. However, I have not been able to coin a term which contrasts the three types with Expanding Focus.

The correlation between class III laws and the occurrence of the particle *-pat* is the focus of the next section (8.2). The conclusion which can be drawn from section 8.2 and other, non-legal, texts (section 8.3) in section 8.4 will serve as a basis for the discussion of a particular Focal use of *apa-* without *-pat* in section 8.5. The scope of *-pat* and word order patterns emerging from the use of *-pat* and the Focal *apa-* will be described in the sections 8.4 and 8.6 respectively. The overall conclusion will be presented in section 8.7.

8.2. The Focal particle *-pat* in legal texts

8.2.1. One expects to pay compensation, but is punished differently

In this section I will discuss the situation where one expects a replacement and/or a fine, but is instead given another type of punishment. In each case the law containing the alternative punishment is studied against the background of the category to which the law belongs. For example, given the regular punishment for homicide, -burial and replacement of the victim-, the addressee comes to expect this kind of double punishment. Instead only a non-financial punishment is prescribed. In order to show that *-pat* indeed indicates a replacement or a restriction on the punishments in other cases, I will also summarily discuss the expected punishment given the other laws in the categories. The categories follow Hoffner 1997: 13f.

8.2.1.1. The Homicide Laws (§§ 1-6 and §§ 42-44)

³⁵⁹ (P_A)_s means ‘the information that the Addressee takes for granted as estimated by the Speaker’. P_s means ‘the information that the Speaker wants to communicate’.

The expected punishment in the homicide laws is burial of the victim and his replacement (compensation) by means of one or more persons (§§ 1 to 4, class II), compensation with land (§ 6, class I), or compensation with a person or a son (§ 42, 44, class I). The remaining laws §§ 5 and 43 belong to class III and are also the only ones in the homicide laws with the particle *-pat*.

The law on homicide of a merchant falls apart in two parts, of which only the last one contains the particle *-pat*:

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

§ ³ *takku* LÚDAM.GÀR *kuiški kuēnzi* 1 ME MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR *pāi parna=šše=a šuūajezzi* ⁴ *takku* INA KUR Luwija *našma* INA KUR URUPalā 1 ME MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR *pāi* ⁵ *āššu=šsett=a šarnikzi našma* INA KUR URUHatti ⁶ *nu=zza unattallan=pat arnuzzi* §

If anyone kills a merchant, he shall pay 100 minas of silver, and he shall look to his house for it. If (it occurs) in the land of Luwiya or Pala, he shall pay the 100 minas of silver and also, he shall replace his goods; or (if) (it occurs) in the land of Hatti, he only³⁶⁰ shall bring the merchant (for burial) (and shall not also replace his goods)³⁶¹.

The payment in silver applies to all settings, that is, Luwiya, Pala and Hatti. The further specifications depend on where the killing took place, either abroad (Luwiya or Pala) or within the state borders (Hatti). If it occurred abroad the offender had to pay one hundred mina and replace the merchant's ware. At home, in Hatti, the usual punishment for homicide applies: pay a price (100 minas) and bury the merchant (Hoffner o.c. 171). But given the addition of replacing the merchant's goods in the preceding clause, one might think that besides the fine and the burial also the replacement was required. In order to explicitly express that the burial is the additional punishment besides the fine and that not also the replacement of the goods is required, the restrictor *-pat* 'only' is added.

In Laws § 42, 43 and 44 the burial of the deceased is impossible and therefore not to be expected because the body is lost on a journey (§ 42), has been carried away by the river (§ 43) or is destroyed in a fire (§ 44). However, we might expect the offender to give compensation as in § 42. In that law someone hires a person to go on a journey. If the man dies on his journey while his rent was not paid, then the one who hired him has to give a slave as a substitute. In § 44 the offender throws someone in a fire (accidently?) and has to compensate the dead person by means of his son. This is different however in § 43:

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

³⁰ *takku* LÚ-aš GU₄=ŠU ÍD-an *zīnuškizzi tamaiš=an šu[uezi]* ³¹ *nu* GU₄-aš KUN-an *ēpzi ta* ÍD-an *zāi* Û BEL G[(U₄ ÍD-aš *pēdai*)] ³² *nu=zza a-pu-u-un-pát dan[(zi)]*

If a man is crossing a river with his ox, and another man pushes him off, grasps the tail of the ox, and crosses the river, while the river carries off the owner of the ox, (the

³⁶⁰ Hoffner o.c. 19 and n. 14 takes *-pat* as 'aforementioned' contra Güterbock 1961b: 66: 'himself'; Friedrich 1959 with 'nur den Kaufmann' is closest to my interpretation of *-pat*.

³⁶¹ Hoffner l.c. translates '...shall (also) bring...'. CHD P p. 220: 'He must bring the merchant himself for burial'.

dead man's heirs) shall take *him* instead (*apun-pat*)³⁶² (*instead of someone from his household*).

The offender himself has to pay by means of his freedom, instead of providing the heirs of the deceased with one or more persons from his household. Translations of *-pat* might be 'instead' or 'himself'. The particle *-pat* now indicates replacement and not restriction as in ex. 8.2.

One could object that this interpretation (he is taken instead of someone from his household) is rather far-fetched. But as I have explained in the Introduction, the interpretation of *-pat* does not only depend on the meaning we might assign to one clause in isolation, but actually depends more on the inferences one can draw from the context. More support is gained from the following examples.

8.2.1.2. Abduction/harboring runaway slaves (§§ 19-24)

The laws 19 to 21 deal with abducting people, either free persons or slaves. The punishments for abduction are presented in declining order, the severity depending on both the social rank of the offender, the rank of the abducted person and the location of abduction. A summary of these laws is given in the next table:

| Law | Offence | Punishment |
|-----|---|--|
| 19a | Luwian abducts free person from Hatti to Luwian | His estate is confiscated |
| 19b | Hittite abducts Luwian from Hatti to Luwian | He pays 6 persons |
| 20 | Hittite abducts slave of Hittite from Luwian to Hatti | He pays 12 shekel |
| 21 | Someone abducts slave of Luwian from Luwian to Hatti | The owner takes his slave back, there is no compensation |

Table 8.3. Laws 19-21

The next laws, §§ 22 to 24 deal with runaway slaves:

| Law | Offence | Punishment |
|-----|---|---|
| 22 | If a slave runs away to a rather nearby area, and someone brings him back | The finder is rewarded with either shoes, or 2 or 3 shegels |
| 23a | If a slave runs away to Luwian, and someone brings him back | The finder is rewarded with 6 shegels |
| 23b | If a slave runs away to enemy country, and someone brings him back | The finder may keep the slave |
| 24 | If a slave runs away and someone harbors him | The offender pays one month's wages to the owner |

Table 8.4. Laws 22-24

In both groups, the punishment or reward is generally financial (§§ 19b, 20, 22, 23a, 24, all class I). I am interested in the paragraphs which express another kind of punishment or reward: the laws 19a, 21, and 23b (class III). In the apodoses of only these paragraphs in this category the particle *-pat* appears:

³⁶² Hoffner l.c. 'that very man'; Friedrich 1959:31 'eben diesen'.

- 8.4 **KBo 6.2 i 36-38, § 19a**, emendations from KBo 6.3 i 45-47 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 29-30

§ ³⁶ [(takku LÚ.U₁₉)] LU-an LÚ-n=aku MU[(NUS-n=aku URU^UHattušaz kuiš)ki (LÚ URULuī)š] ³⁷ [(tā)]iezzi n=an ANA KUR Luuī[a (p)]ēhutezzi [i(šhaš=šiš=an)] ³⁸ ganešzi nu É-er=šet=pat arnuzzi §
If some Luwian abducts a (free) person, man or woman, from the land of Hatti, and leads him away to the land of Luwiya, and his owner (= head of household, Hoffner 1997: 30 fn. 45) recognizes him, he shall bring (in) his estate instead³⁶³ (-pat) (of paying a fine).

- 8.5 **KBo 6.2 i 45-47, § 21** (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 31

§ ⁴⁵ [takku]u ARAD LÚ URULuuiumanaš IŠTU KUR Luuīaz kuiški tāiezzi ⁴⁶ n=an ANA KUR URU^UHatti uuatezzi išhaš=šiš=an ganešzi ⁴⁷ nu=zza ARAD-SÚ=pat dāi šarnikzil NU.GÁL §
If anyone abducts the male slave of a Luwian man from the land of Luwiya, and brings him to the land of Hatti, and his owner recognizes him, he only (-pat) shall take his slave: there shall be no compensation.

Given the declining severity of the punishments, law 19a is the most severe one: the offender loses his estate. The expected fine is generally financial (money or slave), but given the strict formulation in the laws this implicit presupposition is made explicit by adding the particle -pat to nu É-er=šet arnuzzi. The Addressee is instructed to infer ‘he shall bring his house instead of paying compensation’. Law 21 is more explicit. The particle -pat again instructs the Addressee not to expect a clause like ‘he pays ... sheqel’. And indeed, this clause is immediately followed by ‘there shall be no compensation’. This explicit denial is probably needed in order to strengthen the restriction already given by -pat because one should at least expect some compensation for the temporary loss of a slave.

The following law deals with returning a runaway slave to his owner. Usually the finder gains a financial reward by returning a slave, but in the last part of the law the reward is the slave itself. (For an explanation, see Hoffner 1997: 181.)

- 8.6 **KBo 6.2 i 51-53, § 23** (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 32

§ ⁵¹ [t]akku ARAD-aš huūāi n=aš ANA KUR Luuīa paizzi kuiš=an āppa uuat[ezzi] ⁵² nu=šše 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi takku ARAD-aš huūāi n=aš ANA KUR kūruri an[da] ⁵³ paizzi kuiš=an āppa=ma uuatezzi n=an=za a-pa-a-aš-pát dāi §
If a male slave runs away and goes to the land of Luwiya, (his owner) shall pay 6 sheqels of silver to whomever brings him back. If a male slave runs away and goes into an enemy country, whoever brings him back, he (and not the owner) shall take him instead³⁶⁴.

Given the two other laws (22, 23a) dealing with finding runaway slaves, one could come to expect some financial reward after the delivery of the slave. But instead of the expected return of the slave to his owner, the finder may keep him.

³⁶³ Hoffner: ‘own estate’.

³⁶⁴ Hoffner: *apas-pat* not translated; Friedrich 1971: 23 ‘eben der’.

Contrary to the preceding examples, ex. 8.6 contains the nominative *apas*. Translating *-pat* as ‘only’ with scope over the subject does not make any sense here because it would imply a countering of the presupposition that both finder and owner keep the slave (“The owner and the finder keep the slave” — “No, only the finder does”). Therefore *-pat* must be replacing if it only has scope over the noun. But there is another possibility. In several of the other examples *-pat* has scope over the predicate, as I will show in section 8.4. If we assume that *-pat* has this function also here, that is, it indicates that the assertion of the apodosis is replacing a presupposition ‘the finder receives a reward’ by means of ‘the finder does X instead’, then it needs to be explained why the clause is formed as *n=an=za apāš=pat dāi* instead of **nu=zza apūn=pat dāi*. The solution is that there might rise some confusion about the referent of the subject: does the *owner* just take back the slave, without paying a reward or does the *finder* take the slave instead of receiving a reward. The first possibility obviously is senseless, but given the explicitness in legal texts I believe that replacing *apa-* has been used to eliminate any possible ambiguity. Proof for interpreting preverbal *apa-* without enclitics as indicating Replacing Focus will be given in section 8.5.

Belonging to the same category of harboring some escapee is a draconian stipulation in the treaty with Sunassura of Kizzuwatna:

- 8.7 **KUB 8.81 + ii 13’- iii 2** (MH/MS treaty, CTH 41/131), ed. Petschow 1962: 242-243.
mān ^{LÚ}*pittean*[*t*]*an=ma* ^{14’} *kuiški munnaizzi n=an* *INA É-ŠU* ^{15’} *uemijanzi* ^{iii 1} ¹²
SAG.DU.ĤI.A pāi mān ¹² *SAG.DU.[ĤI.A]* ² *ŪL uemiezzi nu=kañ a-pu-un-pát*
k[una]nz[i]
 If someone conceals a fugitive, (and) they find him in his house, (then) he shall give
 12 persons. If he does not find 12 persons, they shall kill him instead (*apun-pat*).³⁶⁵

Within the framework of the laws this stipulation may be considered a class III law. Because the laws show that this type of crime usually does not require the death of the offender, the addressee might still expect something else. The particle *-pat* indicates explicitly that the existing presupposition in the mind of the Addressee has to be replaced.

8.2.1.3. Arson Laws (§§ 98-100)

The punishment for arson is to rebuild the house destroyed by the fire and compensate for what was lost (§ 98, class II), or, in case of burning a shed, rebuild the shed and feed the cattle if there was straw in the shed (§ 100, class II). Law 99 is very interesting for our discussion because it shows us again a clause containing the particle *-pat*. The first part of the law is comparable to the other laws in this category. If a slave sets fire to a house, the punishment is twofold. First, the owner has to compensate instead of the slave and the slave returns to him mutilated. The situation in the last part of the law however is different:

- 8.8 **KBo 6.2 iv 56-58**, § 99 (OS law, CTH 291, emendations from KBo 6.3), ed. Hoffner 1997: 96
⁵⁶ [(*takk*)]*u* *ARAD-aš É-er lukkezzi išhāš=šiš[(=a š)ēr=š]it šarnikzi* ⁵⁷ [(*ARAD-*
n)]*=a* *KIR*₁₄*=ŠU UZNĀ=ŠU kukkur[(a)škanzi n(=an EG)]IR-pa išhi=šši* ⁵⁸
 [(*pian*)]*zi takku natta=ma šarnik[(zi nu a-pu-u-un=pat šuui)]zzi §*

³⁶⁵ CHD S: 156b ‘that same person’.

If a slave sets fire to a house, his owner shall make compensation in his place, and, also, they shall cut off the nose (and) ears of the slave, and return him to his owner. But if he (the owner) does not make compensation, he shall forfeit him (*apun-pat*) instead.³⁶⁶

The owner is obviously allowed to refuse compensation, but in that case he also loses the right to keep his slave. As in law 21, it is explicitly stated that there will be no compensation. So instead of an expected twofold punishment, there is only one which replaces both. The clause containing the punishment therefore shows the particle *-pat*.

8.2.1.4. Burglary Laws (§§ 93-97)

In the burglary laws the punishment generally consists of returning or replacing the stolen goods and paying a fine (class II). The only exception is law § 93 where the burglar has not yet entered the house (class I).

| Law | Offence | Punishment |
|-----|---|--|
| 93 | If a man/slave is caught at the outset, | He pays 12/6 sheqels. |
| 94 | If a man burglarizes a house, | He returns the stolen items and pays 12 sheqels. |
| 95a | If a slave burglarizes a house, | He returns the stolen items and pays 6 sheqels, and is mutilated |
| 95b | If a slave burglarizes a house, but the owner refuses to pay compensation | He returns the stolen items, and the owner loses the slave. |
| 96 | If a man burglarizes a grain storage pit, | He fills the pit with grain, and pays 12 sheqels |
| 97 | If a slave burglarizes a grain storage pit, | He fills the pit with grain, and pays 6 sheqels |

Table 8.5: Laws 93-97

A situation comparable to ex. 8.8, forfeiting a slave if the owner refuses to make compensation is described in § 95b. This is different from §§ 94 and 95a where the thief has to return the stolen items in full value and also pay a fine. (An extra punishment in § 95a is the mutilation of the slave.)

8.9 KBo 6.2 iv 47-48, § 95 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 93-4

§⁴⁴ *takku* ARAD-aš É-er *taiezzi šakuu*[aššar]=*pat pāi tajazilaš* 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *pāi*⁴⁵ ARAD-ša KIR₁₄=ŠU *išt[āmanuš=šuš kukkur]iškizzi n=an āppa išhi=šši*⁴⁶ *pianzi* ... [*takku BEL=Š*]U *tezzi šer=šit=ua*⁴⁸ *šarnikmi nu šarnikz[i takku mimmai=ma nu]* ARAD-an=*pat šuūizzi* §

If a slave burglarizes a house, he shall give back (the stolen items) precisely in full value. He (the owner?) shall pay six shekels of silver for the theft, and, also, he shall cut off the nose (and) ears of the slave, and they will give him back to his owner. If his owner says: “I will make compensation for him,” then he shall compensate. But if he refuses, he shall forfeit the slave instead (*of making compensation*).³⁶⁷

³⁶⁶ Hoffner: ‘that very slave’; Friedrich 1959: 49 ‘eben den betreffenden’.

³⁶⁷ Hoffner: ‘that slave’; Friedrich: ‘eben den Sklaven’; CHD P p. 214: ‘the aforementioned slave’.

Again, the *-pat* clause³⁶⁸ is explicitly connected with a statement about non-payment of a fine.

8.2.1.5. Theft or injury to animals (§§ 57-92)

The punishment for stealing or purposely injuring or killing an animal is compensation by means of a number of animals or an amount of silver (§§ 57-65, 67-69, 72, 73, 77, 78, 82-85, 87-89, 91, 92, all class I), or return of the body and payment of rent (§ 76, class II). If we leave out the legal killing (§ 79) or legal use of an animal (§§ 86, 90), there remain a few laws without punishment or with a punishment different from what is expected.³⁶⁹

Starting with the former, we have laws §§ 66 and 71, inserted in a collection of laws discussing theft. The key phrase in both laws is:

- 8.10 **KBo 6.2+ iii 49-50, § 66**, emendations from KBo 6.3 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 76-7

išha(š)=šiš=an ũemiezzi n=an=za šakuuāšara[(n=pat³⁷⁰ d)]āi^{5 0} LÚ.NÍ.ZU=an natta ēpzi §

(If a plow ox ... strays into another corral...) and its owners finds it, he shall take it in full value instead (of receiving compensation). He shall not have him arrested as a thief.

The usual punishment for theft is a large fine. But here the owner of the corral may not be considered a thief. The particle *-pat* again explicitly counters the existing presupposition of paying a fine. One could also translate: “he just takes it in full value”. A similar example is:

- 8.11 **KBo 6.2+ iv 1-3, § 75**, emendations from KBo 6.3 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 81

§¹ [(takku GU₄-un AN)]ŠE.KUR.RA ANŠE.GÌR.NUN.NA ANŠE-in kuiški tūriezzi n=aš aki² [(našma=an U)]R.BAR.RA-aš karāpi našma=aš ḫarakzi n=an šakuuāššaran=pat pāi

If anyone hitches up an ox, a horse, a mule or an ass, and it dies, or a wolf devours it or it gets lost, he shall just replace it at full value (instead of paying compensation).

8.2.1.6. Certain offences requiring sacred sanctions (§§ 164-170)

Almost every law in this section discusses an offence which requires a reconsecration (§§ 164-168, class I) or payment of a fine (§ 170, first part, class I). The second part of the last

³⁶⁸ The *-pat*'s on *šakuuāššar* in § 94 and § 95a are not clear to me. CHD Š, sub *šakuuāššar(ra)* 63 does not translate *-pat* in § 95.

³⁶⁹ Law § 74 will be discussed in section 8.2.2.1.

³⁷⁰ In law § 71 we do not find *-pat* here. One has to keep in mind that the use of pragmatic function words depends on the attitude of the Speaker. Only if he thinks it necessary to make explicit that some statement counters an already existing one, he shall use a pragmatic word (or construction).

mentioned law deals with a slave who tries to perform some black magic on a person by mentioning the name of that person while killing a snake:

8.12 **KBo 6.26 ii 1-2**, § 170 (OH/NS law, CTH 292), ed. Hoffner 1997: 136

¹ [(*takk*)]u LÚ ELLAM MUŠ-an kuenzi damēll=a ŠU[(M-an)] ² tezzi 1 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR pāi takku ARAD-š=a a-pa-a-aš-pát aki §
If a free man kills a snake and speaks another's name, he shall pay one mina of silver.
But if it is a slave, he shall be put to death instead³⁷¹.

While the free man is allowed to pay an amount of silver, the slave is sentenced to death. As in exx. 8.8 and 8.9, the owner of the slave might have been expected to pay a fine and keep the slave albeit mutilated. The particle *-pat* indicates that contra expectations the punishment is not a fine.

8.2.1.7. Preliminary conclusion

The immediate context of the examples above allows the following conclusion. The particle *-pat* often indicates that its host noun is replacing some possible other punishment, contrary to the expectations of the addressee. In such cases one could add to the translation that there is no compensation, as I have sometimes indicated in parentheses. There are even some laws where this is stated explicitly (exx. 8.5, 8.7, 8.8, 8.9).

There were also two examples (exx. 8.2 and 8.5) where the punishment could be interpreted as a restriction on what was expected. In such a case there might be an explicit negation of the expected punishment.

The use of *-pat* described here falls under the heading of ‘expressing the limits of liability’ (CHD P, p. 221f.)³⁷². The two types of limiting as exemplified above may be schematized as follows:

| expected punishment | actual punishment | Focus type |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| X & Y | only Y | restricting |
| X | instead, Y | replacing |

In order to show that this type of use for *-pat* is not restricted to legal texts, a few examples have been collected from the CHD *sub -pat* which might be more plausibly interpreted within the framework described here. The examples are taken from meaning 1 ‘the same, the aforementioned’. I believe that this anaphoric interpretation of *-pat* is often besides the mark and that in most cases the counter-expectational interpretation is more likely:

8.13 **KBo 3.4 ii 50-54** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61), ed. Grélois 1988: 62

§ ⁵⁰ mahḥan=ma ḥamešḥanza kišat nu m⁵¹Ūḥḥa-LÚ-iš kuit GIG-at ⁵¹ n=aš=kan aruni anda ēšta DUMU.MEŠ-ŠUNU=ia=šši kattan ešir ⁵² nu=kan m⁵³Ūḥḥa-LÚ-iš aruni anda BA.ÚŠ DUMU.MEŠ-ŠUNU=ma=za arḥa ⁵³ šarrandat nu=kan 1-aš ŠÀ A.AB.BA=pat ēšta 1-aš=ma=kan ⁵⁴ mTapalazunauliš arunaz arḥa uit

³⁷¹ Hoffner l.c.: “He himself”.

³⁷² But as one can see in the footnotes to the examples above, the CHD regularly interprets the particle differently.

When it became spring, given that Uhhaziti had fallen ill, he remained at sea while his sons were with him. Uhhaziti died at sea. His sons however split up: one just remained at sea, while the other, Tapalazunauli, came out of the sea.

The illness of Uhhaziti forced the sons to remain at sea, on some island. After his death one could plausibly assume that both sons would return to their land to fight the Hittites. Instead, one son decided not to go back, whereas the other acted as expected. The unexpectedness of the act of the first son is expressed by using *-pat*.

Two contrastive actions of which one is not expected given the context is also encountered in the Bodyguard text:

- 8.14 **IBoT 1.36 iii 13-16** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991: 25

māḥhan=ma šarkantin ¹⁴ *arḥa tarnanzi nu=za GAL MEŠEDI pētan=pat ḥarzi 2 BELUTI=ma=šši* ¹⁵ *kuješ EGIR-an aranta* (added) *mānn=a=at BELUTIM mā[n LÚ.MEŠ]MEŠEDI* (on line) *n=at EGIR-pa pānzi nu EGIR-pa* ¹⁶ *LÚ.MEŠ MEŠEDI uemīianzi §*
When they release the defendant, the chief-of-guards just keeps his place, while the two officials who stand behind him (added: either officials or guards,) go back and join the guards.

In iii 1-11 it is described how the chief-of-guards and two officials following him walk toward the king to bring him a legal case of a defendant. After the case is concluded, one might infer that the chief-of-guards and his two companions all return. Instead, the chief-of-guards remains with the king and only the other two return to take their original position. Again, the particle *-pat* indicates the counter-expectedness of ‘keeping his place’.

In the next and final example the expected act is not expressed, but has to be inferred from the context:

- 8.15 **KBo 3.34 ii 15-20** (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 48-49

§ ¹⁵ *mIšpudaš-inaraš LÚḥupralaš ēšta š=an mĀškalijaš LÚ URUḤurma* ¹⁶ *dāš š=an INA URUUdahzumi LÚmaniahḥatallan ijet* ¹⁷ *man=an=kan mĀškalijaš kuienzi š=an ANA É.EN.NU.UN daiš* ¹⁸ *mĀškali=ma uddār arāiš mIšputaš-inari=ma peīr* ¹⁹ *š=an=ašta IŠTU É.EN.NU.UN tarnir š=aš mĀškili=pat tijet* ²⁰ *maršanza=ua zik §*

Ispudas-inara was a potter. Askaliya, the man of Hurma, took him and made him (his) deputy in Uдахzuma. Askaliya wanted to kill him and put him in prison. Then rumours rose against Askaliya, and they sent for Ispudas-inara. They released him from prison, and he just stepped to Askaliya (saying): ‘It is *you* who are dishonest!’

Again, the evil plotting of Askaliya might encourage one to think that Ispudas-Inara was entitled to some kind of counter act. But instead, he just calls him dishonest, without asking for punishment.

Summarizing, in these three examples the particle *-pat* indicates replacing Focus on the proposition contained in the predicate³⁷³.

8.2.2. Other *-pat*’s in the laws³⁷⁴

³⁷³ Predicate is defined here as the part of the clause without the subject.

In section 8.2.1 I have discussed the class III laws, where the particle *-pat* indicated that, given the other laws in the same category, some unexpected punishment occurred. In this section I will discuss the remaining *-pat*'s in the apodoses of some laws (8.2.2.1), and the few *-pat*'s in the protases (8.2.2.2).

8.2.2.1. The particle *-pat* in the remaining apodoses

In section 8.2.1 the type of Focus indicated by *-pat* was mainly replacing, and the scope of the particle was often the predicate (the clause minus the Subject). That both scope and type of Focus may be different is shown in the next examples:

8.16 **KBo 6.2 i 13-15, § 9** (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 22

§ ¹³ [takku]u LÚ.U₁₉.LU-aš SAG.DU-SÚ kuiški hūnikzi karū 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR piškir
¹⁴ hūninkanza 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR dāi ANA É.GAL 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR da<š>kēr ¹⁵
kinuna LUGAL-uš ŠA É.GAL-LIM peššiet nu=za hūninkanza=pat 3 GÍN
KÙ.BABBAR d[āi] §

If anyone injures a person's head, they used to pay 6 sheqels of silver: the injured party takes 3 sheqels of silver, and for the palace they used to take 3 sheqels of silver. But now the king has waived the palace (share), and only the injured party takes 3 sheqels of silver.

In former times both the injured party and the palace took 3 sheqels of silver. In modern times the king decides to waive the palace share, leaving only the injured party to receive money. The payment of money in the final clause is presupposed given the preceding context. The Focus of the clause is only on the Subject (Argument Focus in Lambrecht's terms), and moreover, the Focus is clearly restricting. Instead of two parties only one remains. Therefore we have Restricting Focus on the Subject instead of Replacing or Restricting Focus on the Predicate.

8.17a **KBo 6.2 i 56-59, § 25** (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 33

§ ⁵⁶ [takku] LÚ.U₁₉.LU-aš DUGÚTUL-i našma luliā paprezzi karū ⁵⁷ [6 GÍN]N
KÙ.BABBAR piškir paprezzi kuiš 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pāi ⁵⁸ [LUGAL-u]ann=a parna
3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR dašker kinuna LUGAL-uš ŠA É.GAL-LIM ⁵⁹ [pešši]et kuiš
paprezzi nu a-pa-a-aš=pat 3 G[([ÍN KÙ.BA)]BBAR pāi ...

[If] a person becomes impure in a vessel or a vat, formerly they used to pay [6 sheq]els of silver: the one who is impure pays 3 sheqels of silver, and they used to take 3 sheqels of silver for the [king]s' house. But now the king has [waiv]ed the palace's share, (so) one who is impure, he only pays 3 sheqels of silver. ...

It seems very unlikely to interpret *-pat* as indicating Restricting Focus on the Subject, for this would mean that formerly both the offender and some other party should pay 3 sheqels each. The preceding context however seemingly shows that instead of paying 6 sheqels to two parties the offender now only pays 3 sheqels to one party. Seemingly, because the Law is not very clear on who pays the part of the palace. If the law states that the impure person paid three sheqel in the past, and pays three sheqel in the present, what then is the difference?

³⁷⁴ Excluded are the broken Laws 26a, 49 and 146.

Version A (KBo 6.2) was probably corrupted and should have been read as something similar to “the one who is impure pays 3 sheqels of silver, and he used to give 3 sheqels of silver to the [king]s’ house.”. The solution of version L₂ (KBo 12.49) was to adjust the law to the wording in § 9 (ex. 8.16):

8.17b **KBo 12.49 ii 1-6, § 25** (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 34

§¹ [*takku* LÚ.U₁₉.LU-*aš* DUGÚTUL-*i n*]*ašma l[ulija]* ² [*paprezzi kar*]*ū* 6 GÍN.GÍN KÙ.BA[BBAR *peškir*]³ [*kuiš parkuēšz*]*i* 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *d[āi]* ⁴ [*ANA É.GAL-LIM* 3 GÍN.GÍ]N KÙ.BABBAR *daške[r]* ⁵ [*kinuna*] *kuiš parkuēšz[i nu a-pa-a-aš=pat]* ⁶ [3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *dāi* ...

[If a person becomes impure in a vessel o]r a v[at, former]ly [they used to pay] 6 sheq[els of silver: the one who is found innocen]t t[akes] 3 sheqels of silver, [and they] used to take [3 she]qels of silver [for the palace]. [But now the king has waived the palace’s share], (so) one who is found innocent, [only he takes 3 sheqels of silver ...]

The fact that the law had to be adjusted means that the Old Hittite manuscript might have been corrupted. I will therefore not use this example in the discussion in section 8.4.

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

§¹⁶ [(*takk*)]*u* LÚ.U₁₉.LU-*an* *kuiški hūnikzi t=an ištarnikzi nu apūn* ¹⁷ *šāktāizzi pēdi=šši=ma* LÚ.U₁₉.LU-*an* *pāi nu É-ri=šši* ¹⁸ *anniškizzi kuitmān=aš lāzziatta mān=aš lazziatta=ma* ¹⁹ *nu=šše* 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *pāi* LÚA.ZU=̣*ia kuššan a-pa-a-aš-pat* *pai* §

If anyone injures a (free) person and incapacitates him, he shall provide medical care for him, 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. When he recovers, he (the offender) shall pay him 6 sheqels and the doctor’s fee, he shall pay (it) instead (of the patient)³⁷⁵.

Usually the person needing medical support pays the doctor, but here it is part of the retribution that the injurer pays the doctor’s fee instead. This is indicated by the particle *-pat* in its replacive function.

The word order in this clause is quite remarkable: O - S - V. I believe that the phrase LÚA.ZU *kuššan* is topicalized to indicate that it is an unexpected Topic. The implied question “and what about the doctor’s fee” is unexpected since there is nothing in the preceding clauses which announces the fee as a Topic. The rest of the clause, the assertion, is a comment on the Unexpected Topic and necessarily contains the focus. The assertion itself also consists of two parts: part of the presupposition is the fact that doctor’s fees have to be paid, so the only part that is actually asserted is the subject. This means that the subject, being unexpected, is in Focus. Of course, the unexpectedness is that not the patient pays, but the injurer. This is indicated by the use of *apa-* + *-pat*. The particle *-pat* has scope over the subject, but not over the remainder of the clause. Concluding, we have Replacing Focus on the Subject.

In the next example the predicate *arāuayan* “(be) exempt” is explicitly mentioned before, paving the way for Focus with scope over a noun:

³⁷⁵ Hoffner l.c.: “and shall pay the physician’s fee as well”.

8.19 **KBo 6.2 iii 1-4, § 51**, with emendations from KBo 6.6, KBo 6.9 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 62

§ ¹ [(*k*)]*arū ku*[(*iš* ^{URU}*Arinna*)] ^{LÚ}*UŠ.BAR kī*[*šat* (*ù É-SÚ arāuṣan*)] ²
 [(^{LÚ.ME})]^Š*HA.LA=ŠU ù* ^{LÚ.MEŠ}*NIŠŪ=ŠU ar*[(*āuēš kinuna É-SÚ=pat ELLUM*)] ³
 [(^{LÚ.ME})]^Š*HA.LA=ŠU ù* ^{LÚ.MEŠ}*NIŠŪ=ŠU šahḥa*[(*n luzz*)*i (karpiēzzi)*] ⁴
 [(^{URU})]*Ziplantiia QATAM*[(*MA=pat*)] §

Formerly, if anyone became a weaver in Arinna and his house(hold) was exempt, (then) his associates and relatives were exempt. But now, only his house(hold) is exempt, his heirs and relatives shall render the *šahḥan* and *luzzi* services. In Zippalanta (it is) just the same (*and nothing else*).

The particle *-pat* indicates Restricting Focus on a noun according to the scheme ‘S assumes that A thinks “X and Y”, and uses “only X!” to correct this existing piece of knowledge’.

Also contra expectations is ex. 8.20 (= ex. 7.46):

8.20 **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* GÌR GU₄ *kuiški tuṣar*[(*nizi apūn=za apāš*)] ⁶⁷ [(*dāi* ù GU₄ SIG₅)] *BEL* GU₄ *pāi takku BE*[(*L* GU₄ *tezzi ammel=pat=ua=za*)] ⁶⁸ [(GU₄-*un dahhi*)] GU₄=*ŠU dāi* ù 2 GÍ[(*N KÙ.BABBAR pāi*)] §

If anyone breaks a horn or leg of an ox, (then) *he* shall take that one 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.

The owner says: ‘Do not give me another ox, give me my *own* ox’. The type of Focus is Replacing, and the scope is on a restrictor, the possessive pronoun *ammel* “my”. The rest of the clause, the taking of an ox by the owner is presupposed.

The last category of *-pat* in the apodosis is the combination with *apeniššan* / *QATAMMA* “likewise”, ³⁷⁶ generally translated with “in the very same way” by Hoffner (o.c., 293). One example will do ³⁷⁷:

8.21 **KBo 6.3 iii 48, § 64** (OH/NS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 75

§ ⁴⁸ *takku* ANŠE.KUR.RA *tūriṣauṣ* *kuiški tāiezzi uttar=šet QA-TAM-MA-pát* §
 If anyone steals a draft horse, its disposition is just likewise ³⁷⁸.

The Addressee is directed to the preceding law for the punishment. There is no replacement or restriction. Instead, the fact that it is similar to the preceding law is stressed, hence the translation in CHD *sub -pat* 2f, p. 218f. “the same as before”. I believe that the meaning “the same” is derived from the limiting “just like that and nothing else”. This specific use of *-pat* remains counter presuppositional, although it is not replacing or restricting. The type of Focus that comes closest to what is implied here, is Selecting Focus. The Addressee expects a certain type of punishment but does not know which one. The particle *-pat* tells the Addressee: “exactly like that, in case you might think differently”.

³⁷⁶ Occurring eight times in the laws.

³⁷⁷ Not one example has survived in the OS copy KBo 6.2.

³⁷⁸ Hoffner l.c.: “is the same”.

A similar use is found in a Middle Hittite treaty:

8.22 **KBo 8.35 ii 30'-31'** (MH/MS treaty, CTH 139)

§ ^{30'} *mPījaš mŠunupaššiš 5 LÚ.MEŠ katti=šmi URUTalmalijaz ^{31'} nu=za linkija takšulaš uttar kattan QA-TAM-MA-pát daiēr*³⁷⁹

Piya, Sunupassi, 5 men with them from Talmaliya: they placed 'the words of alliance' under oath in exactly that way.

After the description of the stipulations of the treaty, the text continues in ii 25' with the taking of the Oath: "Hatipta, Sunapassi, Qanu, [etc.], these too swore as mentioned, and placed themselves under the Oath as mentioned," followed by our lines.

8.2.2.2. The particle *-pat* in the protasis

The last example concludes the discussion of *-pat* in legal texts. There is only one example of *-pat* with *apa-* in a protasis in the laws³⁸⁰:

8.23 **KBo 6.26 iii 26-27, § 189** (OH/NS law, CTH 292), ed. Hoffner 1997: 149

§ ²⁶ [*takku LÚ-i*]š *a-pé-e-el-pát anna=šaš katta uštai* ²⁷ *hū[rk]il*

If a man sins (sexually) with his own mother, (it is) an unpermitted sexual pairing.

The scope of *-pat* is only over the possessive pronoun *apel* "his", as noted by CHD P *sub -pat* 5, p. 220. The type of Focus is Replacing: 'if one sins with his own mother (instead of someone else's, which is allowed if it is not your mother-in-law)'.

8.3. The Focal particle *-pat* with *apa-* in non-legal texts

8.3.1. Introduction

In the preceding section on legal texts I discussed that *-pat* could have scope over restrictors, noun(phrase)s and predicates with Replacing Focus, less often with Restricting Focus, and rarely with Selecting Focus. In section 8.3.2 the discussion will be restricted to the occurrences of *apa-* with *-pat* in non-legal texts and concentrate on the occurrences of *-pat* with scope over only *apa-*.

8.3.2. The particle *-pat* has scope over a NP, indicating Argument Focus

³⁷⁹ Similar KBo 8.35 ii 33'.

³⁸⁰ The other occurrences of *-pat* in protases are not discussed, because it is outside the scope of this dissertation to explain *all -pat*'s. The preceding discussion was needed, first of all, to pave the way for *apa-* with *-pat* in other texts, and secondly, to present a framework in which Limiting *apa-* without *-pat* could be fit in.

When *-pat* has scope over a noun phrase, it is not necessarily meant that the Focus of the clause is restricted to that noun phrase only. Theoretically there could exist a clause that has another type of Focus besides the one indicated by *-pat*. On the other hand, in my corpus of *apa-* with *-pat* it seems that *-pat* indicates the only locus of Focus. This is most clearly seen in those contexts where the remainder of the clause, including the verb, is more or less literally repeated. The first two examples (8.24 and 8.25) are relative sentences in which the predicate of the matrix clause is similar to the predicate in the relative clause. The only ‘new’ element is therefore the *apa-* with *-pat* term. But since the referent of this term is already introduced in the preceding relative clause, it can not be considered ‘new’ or asserted itself, thus excluding New Focus. The Focus on *apa-* has to be counter-presuppositional.

8.24 **KBo 17.11+ iv 26’-27’** (OS ritual, CTH *631, StBoT 25.25), ed. Neu 1980a: 68³⁸¹

^{26’} [(... LUGA)]L-uš eša šuuāru kue GAL^{HLA} akkušizi ^{27’} [(ta a-pé-e-pát)] ekuzi
The king sits down. What true³⁸² cups he usually drinks, only those (*ape-pat*) he drinks.

The true cups are not the only cups available to the king, but in this ritual the king seems to be obliged to limit himself to these cups. The context, either textual or cultural, does not present any clues whether we are dealing with Restricting, Replacing or Selecting Focus.

8.25 **KBo 11.1 obv. 5-7** (NH prayer, Muwattalli, CTH 382), ed. Houwink ten Cate & Josephson 1967: 105

AN *apija k[uit šer artat]* ⁶ *kinuna a-pa-a-at-pát* AN *šer artari* KI-
aš=ma kuiš apija kattan [kittat kinuna apāš=pat KI-*aš kattan kittari]* ⁷ AN-*aš*
^dUTU-*uš apija kuiš* ANA AN-E *šer artat kinuna=ja a-pa-a-aš-p[át* AN-*aš* ^dUTU-*uš*
ANA AN-E *šer artari]*

What heaven at that time [..... stood above], let that same (*apat-pat*) heaven stand above now. Now, what earth laid flat at that time, [let that same earth lay flat now]. What Sungod of Heaven stood above in the sky at that time, [let] that s[ame (*apas-p[at]*) Sungod of Heaven stand above in the sky also now.]

The Counter-presuppositional Focus of these clauses rests on *apa-* + *-pat* with noun. Our knowledge of the beliefs of the Hittites is too limited to grasp the exact meaning of these phrases. The fact that Counter-presuppositional Focus is used, indicates that there must be other Heavens, Earths and Sungods to choose from. It seems to me that these lines are referring to the concept that everything changes with time and that they express the wish to return to earlier and better times. In the context just sketched a translation of *-pat* with scope over the adjectively used *apa-* as ‘same (and nothing else)’ (without the connotation of ‘the aforementioned’ in CHD P 213) or ‘only’ seems possible. I prefer to translate ‘same’ because the question is now left open whether we deal with Restricting, Replacing or Selecting Focus, whereas ‘only’ only allows Restricting Focus.

In the next examples the indexical clause is preceded by a conditional clause, a temporal clause or a clause of comparison with the same pattern of repetition as the relative sentences above.

A conditional clause:

³⁸¹ See also the parallel phrase KBo 17.11+ rev. iv 34’ ^{34’} [LUGAL (Û MUNUS.LUGAL ešanda)] šuuāru kue GAL^{HLA} akku[(škanzi)] ^{35’} [ta (*apūš=pat*)] akuanzi

³⁸² CHD P: 226.

- 8.26 **KUB 48.119 obv. 3'-8'** (NH vow, Hattusili III, CTH 584), ed. De Roos 1984: 297
 § 3' [mān i]NA MU³⁸³ DINGIR-LUM kī ŪL šekkan GIG SIG₅-aḫti 4' [nu=za=kan] ANA
 DINGIR-LIM EZEN dammelin kuinki teḫḫi 5' [EZ]EN purullijann=a=tta INA
 URUḪakmiš iḫami 6' [IN]A URUNeriqqa=a=ia=tta ḫantī iḫami 7' [m]ānn=aš=mu INA
 URUNeriqqa 1-edani pedi DÙ-uanzi 1SIXSÁ1-ri 8' [n=a]n a-pí-ia-pát iḫami §
 [If] you, o god, will cure this unknown illness this year, then I shall install another
 festival for the god, whichever (it may be), and also, the *purulli* festival I shall
 perform for you in Hakmis, and also, in Nerik I shall celebrate you separately. And if
 it is ascertained (by oracle inquiry) to celebrate them in Nerik, in a single location, I
 shall perform it only there (*apiya-pat*)³⁸⁴.

This time *-pat* is really restricting, allowing the translation 'only': the preceding clauses
 present both Hakmis and Nerik as locations for the celebration of the festivals, but in obv. 8'
 only one of them, Nerik, might be preferred by the deity.

A clause of comparison:

- 8.27 **KUB 14.4 i 7'-12'** (NH plea, Mursili II, CTH 70), ed. De Martino 1998: 23
 7' [É.LUGA]L Û KUR URUḪATTI ANA PANI ABI=YA mahḫan 8' [taparta n=at ANA
 PANI ŠEŠ-YA] QATAMMA-pát taparta mahḫan=ma=za ŠEŠ-YA=a=ia 9' [DINGIR^{LIM}-iṣ
 kiṣat 1Taḫan]nannan=ma ammuqq=a ŪL kuitki 10' [idalauyaḫḫun tepnunu]n=an
 ŪL kuitki É.LUGAL Û KUR URUḪATTI 11' [ANA PANI ABI=YA Û ANA PAN]I ŠEŠ=YA
 mahḫan taparta apiia=a=ia=at 12' [QATAMMA=pat taparta]³⁸⁵
 Just as the [palac]e and the land of Hatti [were governed] at the time of my father, in
exactly that way (*QATAMMA-pat*) [it] was governed [at the time of my brother]. After
 also my brother [had become a god], also I did not [harm Tawan]nanna at all. I did not
 [demote] her at all. Just as the palace and the land of Hatti were governed [at the time
 of my father and o]f my brother, also then (= in my time) it [was governed in exactly
 that way].

Mursili describes how the rule of government in Hatti remained the same under successive
 kings, including himself. Stating this is very important, for this text tries to convince the
 divine world that change in policy could not have been the reason for the evil behaviour of the
 Tawananna toward him and his family. In a comparison construction Mursili could have used
 the phrase *QATAMMA-ya* 'in that way too' (see Chapter 7), but in order to emphasize the fact
 that he governed in exactly the same way and *no other*, he used the limiting particle *-pat*
 instead. So again, we have a kind of Selecting Focus, this time on the adverb of manner
apenissan/QATAMMA (see also *QATAMMA* in the legal texts above).

The preceding examples contained complex clauses where both the dependent and the
 matrix clause contained the same material. In the examples that will be discussed next the
 repeated material is often a few clauses removed from the indexical segment.

³⁸³ Reading of MU follows CHD Š: 27a.

³⁸⁴ Cf. De Roos 1984: 436: 'zeker daar (definitely there)'.

³⁸⁵ See for *mahhan* ... *apenissan-pat* also KUB 23.103 rev. 6'-7' (lateNH letter, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 178) 6' *nu*
 EN=KUNU BA.ÚŠ *ammuk=ma=za* ANA EN=KUNU *mahḫan* SIG₅-anza x[...] 7' *nu=za apēdani=a=ia QA-*
TAM-MA=pat SIG₅-anza *n=an pahḫaštin* "Your (pl.) lord has died. Now, as I [was?] good for your lord, I
 am good exactly in that same way for *him* too. You must protect him."

8.28 **KUB 14.1 obv. 17-19** (MH/MS indictment, CTH 147), ed. Götze 1928: 4-5

ABI dUTU-ŠI=ma tuk ANA mMadduwatta kiššann=a memiškit ehu=ua=za INA KUR
 HUR.SAG[Hari]jati ēšhut¹⁸ nu=[ua]=za ANA KUR URUHATTI=ia manninkuuan
 mMadduwattaš=a=z KUR HUR.SAGHārijati ašānna mimmaš nu uit¹⁹ ABI dUTU-ŠI
 ANA mMadduwatta kiššan namma memišta [k]āša=ua=tta KUR HUR.SAGZippašlā
 AD[DIN] nu=ua=za a-pu-u-un-pát eši

The father of My Majesty even said to you, Madduwatta as follows: “Come! You must live in the mountain land Hariyati, then you (are) also close to Hatti.” But Madduwatta refused to live in the mountain-land Hariyati. Thereupon my father, My Majesty, again spoke to Madduwatta as follows: “I have just given you the mountain-land Zippasla. Live in that one instead (*apun-pat*)³⁸⁶!”

In his speech preceding this example the father of the king already stated that he has given the mountainland Zippasla to Madduwatta and his people in order to live there (obv. 15-16). But now he wants Madduwatta to live in another area. This however is refused by Madduwatta, so the king mentions Zippasla again as a replacement. The noun *apun-pat* carries Replacing Focus.

The next three examples show a similar use of *apa-* with *-pat* in new Hittite:

8.29 **KBo 2.2 i 12-14** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 124-125.

§¹² mān dUTU-ŠI š tapaššaš¹³ a-pí-ia-pát ŠÀ KUR URUNerikka¹⁴ uemijazi ka-a-ma ŪL ...

If the fever will befall My Majesty only there³⁸⁷ (*apiya-pat*) within the country of Nerik, but not here (*ka*), ...

The clause containing *apiya-pat* is a repetition of what was concluded before, that a fever would befall the king in Nerik (i 6-8). Here we have a rare occurrence of the explicit negation of one of the members of a possible presupposition. The Speakers need to know whether the assumption ‘X and Y’ is valid or not. They therefore ask whether it is the case that ‘Only X, not Y’, which is a typical case of Restricting Focus. A similar situation, this time with an expression of time, is found in:

8.30 **KBo 2.2 i 52-55** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 128

§⁵² mān DINGIR-LUM š tapaššan⁵³ ANA dUTU-ŠI ŠÀ UD.KAM huppiallaš=kan⁵⁴ uškiši dUTU-ŠI š tapaššaš⁵⁵ a-pé-e-da-aš-pat UD.KAM-aš anda KAR-iazi

If you, o god, see fever for My Majesty on the day of *huppialla*, will fever befall My Majesty only on those (*apedas-pat*) days, ...

8.31 **KBo 2.2 iii 24-25** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 132

§²⁴ mān=za DINGIR-LUM a-pád-da-an-pát šer²⁵ kardimmijauanza³⁸⁸

³⁸⁶ The particle is not translated by Götze l.c.

³⁸⁷ Van den Hout l.c.: “right there”.

If the deity is angry because of only that (*apaddan-pat*), ...

In iii 21 the oracle inquirer asks *nu=za* [DINGIR]-LUM *apaddan šer 22 kard[i]mmijauanza* “(are) you, o [godd]ess, for that reason angry? (Then let the exta be unfavorable. (...); unfavorable)”. In our lines the inquirer wants to be certain that there is no other reason so repeats the clause with the addition of the restrictor *-pat*: ‘only that and nothing else’.

8.32 **IBoT 1.36 iii 27-30** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991: 26-27.

§ ²⁷ LÚ *MEŠEDU=ia* *kuiš* EGIR-*anda* *paizzi* *n=aš* ZAG-*az* IŠTU LÚ.MEŠ *MEŠEDI* ²⁸ EGIR-*anda* *paizzi* EGIR-*pa=ia=aš* ZAG-*az* *a-pu-u-un-pát* KASKAL-*an* *paizzi*
And the guard who passes behind, passes behind to the right of the guards, and also, on (his) return he passes on the right, just that (*apun-pat*) route.

The route the guard takes is described explicitly. It seems that the author of the texts wants to state explicitly that it has to be ‘that same route’ (Güterbock & Van den Hout l.c.) and nothing else. Again, *-pat* is limiting the choices to only one option.

In all the preceding examples in this section a major part of the clause was already mentioned before, leaving only the noun phrase with *-pat* as the sole carrier of Focus. In the next examples the part of the clause minus the noun phrase with *-pat* has not been mentioned before. But that does not mean that the clause is not expected given the context. In the three remaining texts it may safely be assumed that the contents of the clause containing *-pat* are somehow presupposed.

8.33 **KUB 24.4+ rev. 10-13** (MH/MS prayer, Arnuwanda, CTH 376C), ed. Carruba 1969: 339f. (translit.)³⁸⁹

¹⁰ *nu mān* DINGIR.MEŠ-*naš* *kardimmijaz* *kuiš* [AN]A DINGIR.MEŠ *ŪL naḥḥ[(anza)]*
¹¹ *n=apa lē āššāuēš i[d]ā[(lauyaš anda)]* *ḥarkanzi* *n=aš mā[(n)]* ¹² 1-EN URU-
LUM *našma=at* 1[(-EN É-TUM *našma*)] 1-EN LÚ *nu* DINGIR.MEŠ ¹³ *a-pu-u-un-pát*
1-EN *ḥa[(r)ninkandu]*

If the gods feel anger, -given that someone is not reverent to the gods,- let *not* the good perish among the bad. If it concerns one city, or one estate, or one man, [let] the gods des[troy] only that one (*apun-pat*) (*and not everything else*)!

The idea behind the phrase containing *apa-* is that the gods are destroying the whole country, good and bad, but that they should only destroy the culprits, so the particle *-pat* indicates Restricting Focus.

8.34 **KUB 14.14 + obv. 32-37** (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 378 I), ed. Lebrun 1980: 194-195.

nu=kan *uḡatten* DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ=YA ³³ *apun*³⁹⁰ AWAT^m*Dudḥaliia* DUMU-RI
ANA ABI=YA *kinun* *appezz[ijaz]* ³⁴ *anda* *šanḥatten* *nu=kan* ABU=YA IŠTU ŠA

³⁸⁸ See also § ¹¹ *mān=za* DINGIR-LIM *a-pád-da-pát* *šer* TUKU.TUKU-*uanza* in KUB 22.70 obv. 11, 28 (CTH 566).

³⁸⁹ See also KUB 14.7 ii 21-22 (CTH 383) ŠA ^f*Danuḥepa=ma* *uttar* [*kuiš*] ²² *parā iḡat karū* *a-pa-a-aš-pát* *šarnikt[a]* §

³⁹⁰ Lebrun o.c. mistakenly reads A-BU-YA.

^mDudhaliya išhana[z.....ANA ABI=YA] ³⁵ kuēš DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL BELU.MEŠ UGULA LÚ.MEŠ LIM LÚ.MEŠ DUGUD anda kišantat nu a[pūšš=a (?)] ³⁶ memiianaz akir ANA KUR ^{URU}Hatti=ia=kan a-pa-a-aš-pát memiaš ār(a)š nu KUR [^{URU}Hatti=ia apēz] ³⁷ memiianaz akkiškiuan tī[i]at

Then the moment came that you, O Gods, after [the fact], sought revenge for that matter of Tuthaliya the Younger from my father: my father [died] because of the bloodshed of Tuthaliya, and the princes, commanders, chiefs-of-thousand (and) officials who had joined [my father,] th[ey too] died because of the affair, and exactly that same (apas-pat) affair arose against the land of Hatti. [Also] the land [of Hatti] started to die because of [that] affair.

Mursili emphasizes that he has found the reason for the plagues in Hatti: it was the killing of Tudhaliya Junior and nothing else that caused them.

8.35 KUB 21.1+ i 65'-69' (NH treaty, Muwattalli, CTH 76), ed. Friedrich 1930: 54-57

^{65'} [DUMU]=KA=ma kuin LUGAL-iznanni zik taparrijaši n[=aš māt] ^{66'} [š]A DAM=KA māt=aš=ta šA MUNUS^{NAP<TAR>TI=GA} n=aš māt nūya=ia [DUMU-aš] ^{67'} [n]=an=za=an KUR-anza ŪL memāi nu kišan tezzi NUMUN=ur=aš DU[MU.LUGAL ēšdu] ^{68'} [d]UTU-ŠI=ma=za ŪL memaḥḥi katta DUMU-YA DUMU.DUMU-YA ḥašša ḥanza[šša] a-pu-u-un-pát ^{69'} paḥšanzi

Now, as for [your son] that you ordain in kingship, be [he] by your wife, or by your concubine, even if he is still [a child], (if) the country refuses him and says as follows: “Offspring of a pri[nce (??)] he [must be!]”, then I My Majesty will not agree (with them)! Later my son and grandson and offspring shall protect only him (apun-pat).

The king promises Alaksandu to protect only the son he himself designates as his successor, and not the one that might be preferred by the population.

8.4. Formal discussion of the particle -pat

In the preceding sections -pat was described as an indicator of Restricting, Replacing, or Selecting Focus. The anaphoric interpretation of the particle was rejected although the translation ‘the same’ might still be used, but then only in the sense of ‘exactly that same and nothing else’. In this section I concentrate on the formal aspects of clauses and noun phrases with -pat. Two connected aspects will be highlighted: 1) the scope of -pat, and 2) the position of -pat in the clause.

8.4.1. The scope of the particle -pat

In the law apodoses the punishment containing the particle -pat is always contra expectations. In one case (ex. 8.2) the type of Focus is Restricting: the reader assumes that both X and Y happen given the other laws in the category. Both propositional contents are presupposed, but only one of them actually occurs. Thus, the particle has scope over the propositional content of the clause instead of over only a part of the clause. In several other instances the propositional content of the clause is not presupposed but asserted (exx. 8.4, 8.7-10, 8.12-15). The punishment could not have been expected and is replacing some other type of

punishment, usually a financial one. So the Focus domain does not only include the noun to which the particle *-pat* is attached, but also the verb and possibly some other arguments. In most cases the subject is the Established Topic, which is therefore excluded from the Focus domain. In short, these clauses have Replacing Predicate Focus.

This should be distinguished from those cases where the Focus rests on a noun phrase or restrictor while the remainder of the clause is presupposed (ex. 8.3, 8.16, 8.18-20, 8.23). Outside the laws this is the type we usually encounter (exx. 8.24-35).

Summarizing, the particle may have the following scopes, indicated by the brackets. The non-bracketed parts are presupposed:

| -pat has scope over | scheme | example |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| a VP | S [Pred] | <i>nu Ē-er=šet=pat arnuzzi</i> (8.4) <i>apāš=pat aki</i> (8.12) |
| a NP | S [X] Pred [S] Pred | <i>nu=zza [apūn=pat] danzi</i> (8.3) <i>nu=za [hūninkanza=pat] 3 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR dāi</i> (8.16) ^{LU} <i>A.ZU=ia kuššan [apāš=pat] pai</i> (8.18) |
| a restrictor (a genitive, adjective) | [Restr] Pred | <i>[ammel=pat]=ua=za GU₄-un dahhi</i> (8.20) |

Table 8.6.: The scope of *-pat*

In ex. 8.12 the particle *-pat* is attached to the subject *apāš*: *apāš=pat aki*. The appearance of this clause is similar to the clauses with only the noun in Focus, but as I explained in the commentary on 8.12, the predicate “be put to death” is not yet known to the Addressee. This means that the Focus cannot be limited to the Subject. If we assume that without particle the clause could have been *n=aš aki*, the only host available to *-pat* would have been the verb. Although the verb with *-pat* is not studied here, it seems that in such a situation *-pat* only focusses on the verb, just as it might focus on a noun with the exclusion of the rest of the clause. According to the CHD P 213, *-pat* on the verb means ‘likewise’ (which is in my view ‘just like that and nothing else’), ‘to continue to ...’, and ‘in addition’. But since the verb ‘to die’ is not repeated, presupposed or an additional action in any way, *-pat* could not be cliticized to the verb. The only option remaining is therefore *n=aš* as host for *-pat*. However, *-pat* needs an accented host, therefore excluding **n=aš=pat aki* (see for a list of possible hosts CHD P *sub -pat* 12, p. 227f.). Thus, I believe, the nom.sg. enclitic pronoun *-aš* was changed into the independent form *apāš* which could host the particle *-pat*.

8.4.2. The position of *-pat* in the clause

The next table presents the clauses with Predicate Focus. The particle *-pat* is used here to express the fact that the VP is replacing another, expected punishment. Only in ex. 8.2 the particle indicates Restriction (S = Subject, O = Object, L = locative).

| Ex. | wordorder | | |
|------|---------------|--------------|---|
| 8.2 | <i>nu-za</i> | <i>O-pat</i> | V |
| 8.4 | <i>nu</i> | <i>O-pat</i> | V |
| 8.7 | <i>nu-kan</i> | <i>O-pat</i> | V |
| 8.8 | <i>nu</i> | <i>O-pat</i> | V |
| 8.9 | <i>nu</i> | <i>O-pat</i> | V |
| 8.10 | <i>n-O-za</i> | <i>O-pat</i> | V |

| | | | | |
|------|---------------|---|--------------|---|
| 8.12 | | | <i>S-pat</i> | V |
| 8.13 | <i>nu-kan</i> | S | <i>L-pat</i> | V |
| 8.14 | <i>nu-za</i> | S | <i>O-pat</i> | V |
| 8.15 | <i>s-S</i> | | <i>L-pat</i> | V |

Table 8.7: Wordorder patterns with VP scope of *-pat*

The pattern emerging from the list shows that the particle *-pat* is either attached to the preverbal noun or to the first full noun of the VP, excluding the Topic-Subject.³⁹¹

The next table lists the examples where *-pat* indicated Focus on the noun while the rest of the clause is topical or presupposed (IO = Indirect Object, A = Adverb, T = temporal expression).

| Ex. | wordorder | | | |
|------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|---|
| 8.3 | <i>nu-za</i> | | O-pat | V |
| 8.16 | <i>nu-za</i> | S-pat | O | V |
| 8.18 | <i>O-ya</i> | O | S-pat | V |
| 8.19 | <i>kinuna</i> | | S-pat | V |
| 8.24 | <i>ta</i> | | O-pat | V |
| 8.26 | <i>n-O</i> | | L-pat | V |
| 8.27 | <i>n-S</i> | T | A-pat | V |
| 8.28 | <i>nu-wa-za</i> | | O-pat | V |
| 8.29 | <i>man</i> | IO S | L-pat | V |
| 8.31 | <i>man</i> | S | A-pat | V |
| 8.35 | <i>katta</i> | S | O-pat | V |

Table 8.8: Wordorder patterns with NP scope of *-pat*

This time there is an example that might indicate that the Focus noun has to be preverbal. In ex. 8.18 the Focus-Subject follows the other arguments of the clause, which makes a strong case for preverbal position. More evidence for the hypothesis that Replacing or Restricting Focus is connected with preverbal position will come from section 8.5. The only exception to this ordering rule is example 8.16. The explanation might be that indefinites always take precedence over definites when preverbal position is involved. For example, *kuiški* even pushes the negation out of the preverbal position.

When *-pat* is attached to a restrictor (i.e., a genitive or adjective) the word order does not change:

| Ex. | wordorder | | | |
|------|-----------------------|----|-------------------|---|
| 8.20 | [G-pat -wa-za | O] | | V |
| 8.23 | <i>takku</i> | S | [G-pat G] | V |
| 8.30 | | S | [L-pat L] | V |
| 8.33 | <i>nu</i> | S | [O-pat O] | V |
| 8.34 | <i>IO-ya</i> | | [S-pat S] | V |

Table 8.9: Wordorder patterns with restrictor scope *-pat*

The word orders in the first two tables show that when the Focus does not rest on the Subject, it was not possible to distinguish between Limiting Focus on the VP or Limiting Focus on a noun in the VP, that is, between Predicate Focus and Argument Focus. This observation seems to correspond with the distinction between marked and unmarked Focus structure

³⁹¹ Ex. 8.12 was already discussed in section 8.4.1.

(Lambrecht 1994: 296ff.). The unmarked structure is Predicate Focus, which means that a clause with this type of Focus might also be understood as having Argument Focus within the predicate. However, the examples in Table 8.7 only have one or two arguments. We do not know what the word order would have been if extra arguments or satellites would have been present. Only in that situation it will be possible to decide whether *-pat* with VP scope is attached to the first full noun (phrase) of the VP or to the noun (phrase) in preverbal position.

8.5. Limiting *apa-* without *-pat*

8.5.1. Introduction

Besides Limiting *apa-* with *-pat* there also exists a Limiting *apa-* without particle which may be compared with the examples in section 8.3.2, with Focus on a noun phrase. Again, the method for finding Focus is based on an analysis of the context. If a clause contains a noun phrase in Focus, the rest of the clause should to a large extent be presupposed. In written texts this means that the presupposed parts are somehow to be found in the preceding discourse. In section 8.5.2 I have collected all examples in my corpus which contain both elements of the pattern for Replacing Focus, ‘not X, but Y!’ (see section 8.1). In section 8.5.3 the material with only the second member present is presented (‘(not X), but Y!’).

Section 8.5.4. presents Focal substantival or adjectival *apa-* occurring in the main clause of a relative sentence. Whereas in the sections 8.5.2. and 8.5.3. contextual clues are used to establish the type of Focus, these clues are not present in case of *apa-* in relative sentences. The same situation applies to adjectively used *apa-* in simple main clauses (section 8.5.5.).

8.5.2. Replacing *apa-*: explicit ‘not X, but Y!’

When an assumed presupposition is explicitly denied, some elements in the assertion (Y) should be repeated in the negated part (X). The clause elements in Y that are not repeated should then constitute the Focus. In the following examples the negated clauses are completely underlined, while in the clause containing the corrected information only the Focal part is underlined.

The list below contains all the clauses in my corpus that exhibit this pattern. Two more representative examples were taken from outside my corpus (exx. 8.37, 8.42).

8.36 **KBo 6.2 iii 23-24, § 57** (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 68-9, (translating differently³⁹²).

³⁹² Hoffner translates *takku* GU₄ *šaudišza natta* G[U₄MAḪ]-aš ²⁴ [tak]u GU₄ *iugaš natta* GU₄.MAḪ-aš *takku* GU₄ *tāiugaš apaš* GU₄.MAḪ-aš as ‘if (it is) a weanling calf, (it is) not a bull, if (it is) a yearling calf, (it is) not a bull, if (it is) a two-year-old bovine, *that* (is) a bull’. The *takku*-clauses in § 57 and 58 are different from the other ones in the Laws because they do not function as the condition for the penalty in a protasis. The Law is only about the stealing of a bull and there are no alternatives offered with a different penalty as in the other Laws. Instead, the conditional sentence is inserted to define what exactly may be considered a bull. Hoffner indicates this by using hyphens. This interjection has to be disconnected from the rest of the Law and is completely independent. It has therefore to be translated as ‘if a bovine (is) a weanling, (it is) not a bull, if a bovine (is) a yearling, (it is) not a bull, if a bovine (is) a two-year-old, *that* (is) a bull’.

§ ²³ takku GU₄.MAḤ-an kuiški dāiezzi takku GU₄ šaudišza natta G[U₄.MAḤ]-aš ²⁴ [takku]u GU₄ iugaš natta GU₄.MAḤ-aš takku GU₄ tāiugaš a-pa-aš GU₄.MAḤ-aš ²⁵ [(karū 30 GU₄)].ḤI.A pišker kinuna 15 GU₄.ḤI.A pāi ...

If anyone steals a bull —if a bovine (is) a weanling, (it is) not a bull, if a bovine (is) a yearling, (it is) not a bull, if a bovine (is) a two-year-old, *that* (*apas*) (is) a bull—, formerly they gave 30 cattle. But now he shall give 15 cattle: ...³⁹³

8.37 **KBo 3.1 ii 36'-39'** (OH/NS, Telipinu, CTH 19), ed. Hoffmann 1984: 32-33

§ ^{36'} LUGAL-uš=šan hantezziš=pat DUMU.LUGAL DUMU-RU kikk[(iš)]taru takku DUMU.LU[GAL] ^{37'} hantezziš NÚ.GAL nu kuiš tāt pēdaš [DU]MU-RU nu LUGAL-u[š] a-pa-a-aš ^{38'} kišaru māt DUMU.LUGAL-ma DUMU.NITA NÚ.GAL nu kuiš DUMU.MUNUS hantezziš ^{39'} nu=šši=ššan LÚ antijantan appāndu nu LUGAL-uš a-pa-a-aš kiš[(aru)] §

Only the first ranking prince (and) son shall become king. If there is no first ranking prince, then one who is a son of second rank, *he* (*apas*) shall become king. If there is no prince (or) heir, then they must take the husband of a daughter of first rank, so that *he* (*apas*) shall become king.

8.38 **IBoT 1.36 i 20-21** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991: 4-5

... n=ašta māt «GI» ²¹ appizziš DUMU.É.GAL parā uizzi n=an=ši LÚ.ŠUKUR.GUŠKIN ŪL pāi n=ašta kuuparā parā GAL-iš DUMU.É.GAL uizzi naššu UGULA.10 našma NIMGIR.ÉRIN.MEŠ [LÚMEŠ]EDI uizzi nu GI a-pé-e-da-ni pianzi

If a palace attendant of the lowest rank comes out, the gold-spear-man does not give it (the key) to him. When a high palace attendant comes out — either a commander-of-10 or an army-bailiff (or) a [gu]ard comes— they give the key to *him* (*apedani*).

8.39 **IBoT 1.36 i 60-63** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991: 10-11

§ ⁶⁰ LÚ.MEŠMEŠEDUTI=ma=kan DUMU.MEŠ.É.GAL-TIM GAL-iaz KÁ.GAL-az katta ŪL paiškanda ⁶¹ n=at=kan lušdaniaz katta paiš[kand]a nu 1 LÚMEŠEDI kuiš šarkantin ⁶² uidāizzi UGULA.DUMU.MEŠ.KIN-za kuin par[ā pi]ješkizzi nu=kan GAL-iaz katta ⁶³ a-pa-aš paiškitta

The guards and the palace attendants shall not go down the main gate; they shall go down through the postern. The one guard that brings a defendant, the one whom the chief-of-messengers dispatches, *he* (*apas*) shall go down through the (main) gate.

8.40 **IBoT 1.36 iii 42-48** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991: 26-27

⁴² LÚ.MEŠMEŠEDUTI=ma=kan kuiēš āššanzi nu māt GIŠŠUKUR kuiš ⁴³ ŪL harzi nu=za GIŠPA.ḤI.A kuit tanzi n=at=kan ŠA GIŠkalmušaš ⁴⁴ DUMU.É[GAL] ŪL handā[n]t[ar]i parā damāēš 2 DUMU.É.GAL ⁴⁵ tienzi nu=šši=kan a-pé-e

Without the interjected definitions the Law reads as takku GU₄.MAḤ-an kuiški dāiezzi karū 30 GU₄.ḤI.A pišker kinuna 15 GU₄.ḤI.A pāi 'If anyone steals a bull, formerly they gave 30 cattle. But now he shall give 15 cattle: ...', with the same patterning as for example Law § 7 and 9.

³⁹³ See also the parallel law § 58.

ha[ndā]nzi LÚ.MEŠ MEŠEDI=ma kuieš⁴⁶ GIŠPA.ĦI.A ħarkanzi n=at=šmaš [EGIR-an (?) iia(?)a]nta

§⁴⁷ *mān L ÚHAZANNU=ma našma UGULA NIMGIR.ÉRIN.ME[Š ħandaitt]ari nu=šmaš=kan⁴⁸ a-pé-e ħandānzi a-pé-e-da-aš ār[a]*

As for the guards that remain behind, if someone (among them) has no spear, since they take staffs, they will not be lined up with the palace attendant of the lituus. Two other palace attendants will step forward. They (ape) will line up with him. As for the guards that hold staffs, they will [walk behind (?)] them.

But if a *ħazannu* or an overseer-of-army-bailiffs [is presen]t, they (ape) will line up with them. For them (apedas) it is rig[ht].

The last clause of ex. 8.39 contains a pronoun in replacing Focus, without the explicit negation that it was not right for the others to be lined up with the palace attendant holding the lituus. Other examples where the negation remains implicit are discussed in section 8.5.3.

In the next example the predicate is not literally repeated, but the intention is the same:

8.41 **KUB 14.1 rev. 29-32** (MH/MS indictment, CTH 147), ed. Götze 1928: 26-27

§²⁹ *E[GIR]??-az ŠA dUTU-ŠI namma ašānta KUR.KUR-TIM dāš KUR URUZūmanti KUR URUWallarimma KUR URUYalanti KUR URU[Zūmarri]³⁰ KUR URUMūtamūtašša KUR URUAttarimma KUR URUŠurūta KUR URUHūršanašša nu namma kēl ŠA KUR.KUR-TIM LÚ[.MEŠ TEMI]³¹ M[A]HAR dUTU-ŠI uūauanzi ŪL tarn[a]i ÉRIN.MEŠ-ia? kēl ŠA KUR.KUR-TIM MAHAR dUTU-ŠI uūauanzi ŪL tarnai kuedani=ia ku[it ēšta??]³² nu namma MAHAR dUTU-ŠI argamušš=a [u]tummanzi ŪL tarnai n=uš=za a-pa-a-aš daškit*

Afterwards he (= Madduwatta) moreover took the countries belonging to My Majesty: Zumanti, Wallarimma, Yalanti, Zumarri, Mutamutassa, Attarimma, Suruta, Hursanassa. No longer he lets the mes[sengers] of these countries go to My Majesty, and no longer he lets the troops of these countries go to My Majesty, and to whom wha[tever was (??)], no longer he lets (them) bring tribute to My Majesty. (Instead,) he (apas) takes them.

The negations clearly imply that the king should take all the goods and tributes. But instead, Madduwatta takes it all. So the ‘taking of the messengers, troops and tributes’ has to be considered as presupposed, and only the Subject is changed from the expected ‘My Majesty’ to the unexpected ‘Madduwatta’.

The next examples speak for themselves:

8.42 **KUB 13.20 obv. 16-18** (MH/NS instruction, Tudhaliya I, CTH 259), ed. Alp 1947: 390, 406

§¹⁶ *mān dUTU-ŠI=ma laħħi ukila ŪL pāimi nu tuzziia kuin DUMU.LUGAL našma BE[L GAL]¹⁷ uātarnaħmi nu tuzzin laħħi a-pa-a-aš pēħutezzi*

If I, My Majesty, myself do not go on campaign, then the prince or [great] lor[d] that I appoint as commander in the army, he shall lead the army on campaign.

8.43 **KBo 11.1 obv. 37-39** (NH Prayer, Muwattalli II, CTH 382), ed. Houwink ten Cate & Josephson 1967: 108³⁹⁴

³⁹⁴ Similarly KBo 11.1 rev. 7-8: ⁷ *n=at=kan dU EN-YA a-pé-e-da-ni ANA É-TI anda šanaħ [.....]* ⁸ *KUR-e=ma=at=kan anda lē [šanaħti]*

mān 1-EN URU-LUM=ma *kuiški našma* 1-EN É-TUM *kuiški* [.....] ³⁸ HUL-aḫzi
n=at=kan DINGIR-LUM *a-pé-e-da-ni* ANA 1-EN URU-LIM 1-EN É-TI *anda šanḫi nu*
apat ×[.....] ³⁹ ANA KUR-TI=ma=at=kan *lē anda šanaḫti*
 Or, if some single city or some single estate [.....] harms [.....], then, O god,
 avenge it on that (apedani) one city, (or) on (that) one house. *That* (neuter)
 [.....], but do not avenge it on the country.

The following example contains the pronoun *apa-* in the negating clause instead of in the correcting one:

- 8.44 **KUB 14.4 iv 17-21** (NH plea, Mursili II, CTH 70), ed. De Martino 1998: 30, 38³⁹⁵
¹⁷ [MUNUS.LUGAL=ma ANA ^dIšḫ]ara URU^Aštata *kiššan memiškit* DINGIR-LUM
apāt=ūa ¹⁸ [KÙ.BABBAR URU^Aštata]¹UL¹ *ammuk ḫarmi tuel=ūa* ŠA DINGIR-LIM
 KÙ.BABBAR *kuiš ḫarzi* ¹⁹ [*nu=ūa apēl É=š*]U *kuiš šunniškit nu=ūa* DINGIR-LUM
a-pu-u-un ŪL ēpti ²⁰ [*ŪL=ma=ūa=šši* DA]M-ZU DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU *ēpti nu=ūa am-*
mu-uk niuallin ēpti ²¹ [*naššu=ūa apū*]n *ēp našma=ūa* DAM-ZU DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU *ēp*
 [The queen] spoke as follows [to Išḫ]ara of Aštata: “O god, it is not *I* who keep that
 [silver of Aštata]. The one who holds *your*, the deity’s silver, the one who fills h[is
 own house (with it)], *that* one (*apun*) you, o god, do not take. You do [*not*] take his
 [wi]fe, his sons [from him]. You take *me*, the innocent! Please take [either *hi*]m, or
 take his wife (and) his sons (instead).

The negating clause could never be expressed in the next example, because if there is no offspring one cannot say that he cannot be placed in kingship:

- 8.45 **Bo 86/299 iii 17-20** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 20-21
¹⁷ *mān=ši* NUMUN DUMU.NITA=ma *ŪL ēšzi nu* NUMUN DUMU.MUNUS ŠA
 mdLAMMA ¹⁸ EGIR-an *šanḫandu n=at mān arahzeni=ia* KUR-e ¹⁹ *n=at apezzi=ia*
 EGIR-pa *uṣadandu nu* INA KUR ^dU-tašša ²⁰ LUGAL-iznani *a-pu-u-un tittanuṣandu*
 §
 If he has no offspring of son(s), they must look for offspring of the daughter(s) of
 Kurunta. Even if he (lit. it) is (located) in a foreign country, they must bring him (lit.
 it) even from there, and they must place *him* (*apun*) in Kingship in Tarhuntassa.

Sometimes there is no negation but a paraphrase instead:

- 8.46 **KBo 16.47 obv. 1’-3’** (MH/MS treaty, CTH 28), ed. Otten 1967: 56.
 URU^Uraš=a URU^UMūd[am]ut[ašišš=a] *karū ammel eš[er]* ² [*mān?* m]Hūḫazalmaš=a
kūrur ēpta apē=ma=mu=kan ³ [EGIR-an *arḫa na*]ir *n=at=za a-pé-e-el kišantat*
 Now the cities [Ura] (and) Mudamutasi were *mine* in the past. But [when] Huhazalma
 became hostile, *they* [defect]ed [from] *me*. They became *his* (*apel*) (instead).

In a similar context:

- 8.47 **KUB 14.1 obv. 73-74** (MH/MS indictment, CTH 147), ed. Götze 1968: 18-19

³⁹⁵ The emendations are mine, see De Martino l.c. with different emendations and literature.

§ ⁷³ *namma=kan mMadduwat[taš L]Ú?M[EŠ UR]U Dalauwa ANA KUR URUHATTI EGIR-an arḥa=pat naiš n=at IŠTU LÚ.MEŠ ŠU.GI-TIM kattan a-pé-e-da-ni* ⁷⁴ *iḡanniyan [dāi]r*
 Then Madduwa[tta] turned [the p]eople of Dalauwa away from Hatti. And following the decision of the elders they [too]k to march with *him* (*apedani*) (instead).

8.5.3. Replacing *apa-*: implicit ‘(not X,) but Y!’

The examples in this section only contain the second member of the Replacing Focus construction, the negating member is not explicitly mentioned in the preceding text. Despite that omission, it is often very clear that the entity referred to by *apa-* replaces an earlier mentioned entity.

The first two examples show the use of *apa-* in a coordinate structure:

8.48 **KBo 6.3 iii 70-71, § 74** (OH/NS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 81

§ ⁷⁰ *takku SI GU₄ našma GİR GU₄ kuiški duḡarnizi apūn=za a-pa-a-aš dāi* ⁷¹ *Ù GU₄ SIG₅ <ANA> BEL GU₄ pāi ...*

If anyone breaks the horn or leg of an ox, *he* (*apas*) shall take him, and also³⁹⁶, he shall give an ox in good condition to the owner of the (injured) ox.

In a case like this one would expect that the owner takes the ox while the offender pays some compensatory money. This type of fine is actually mentioned in the second part of the law: “If the owner of the ox says: “I will take my own ox,” he shall take his ox, and also, he (the offender) shall pay two sheqels of silver”. Therefore, the taking of the ox is a presupposed action while the one who takes it, the offender, is unexpected. The pragmatic role of the subject *apas* is therefore Replacing Focus. The next law is similar:

8.49 **KUB 29.24 i 3-6, § 113** (OH/NS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 108-109

§ ³ *[takku miḡanda]n?* ^{GIŠGEŠTIN-an} *kuiški karašzi karš[(andan)]* ⁴ *[GIŠGEŠTIN-an] a-pa-a-aš dāi* ^{SIG₅-ann=a GEŠTIN} ⁵ *[(ANA) BE)]L* ^{GIŠGEŠTIN} *pāi*

If anyone cuts down a [fruit-beari]ng vine, *he* (*apas*) shall take the cut-down [vine] and he also shall give a *good* vine to the owner of the vine.

In the preceding two laws the referent of *apas* is highly salient and in fact expected as the Topic of the clause. But since the relationship between the predicate and this salient entity is not to be expected, the subject appears in Focus. In the next example the legislator again uses the independent pronoun *apa-* where it could easily be left out if only saliency were taken into account.

8.50 **KBo 25.5: 5'+ iii 1'-4', § 166** (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 133

^{5'} *[(takku) o o o o o o o o o (NUMUN-ni)] NUMUN-an šēr kuiški* ^{1'} *[(šūniezzi) o o o o o (GÚ-SÚ* ^{GIŠAPIN)-i?} *(šēr) t]ianz[i]* ^{2'} *[2 (ŠIMDI GU₄.ḪI.A turiḡanzi kēl mēni=ššit)] tuḡān kēll[(=a)]* ^{3'} *[(mēni=ššit duḡān nēḡanzi LÚ-eš₁₇ aki*

³⁹⁶ See Chapter 7 for the translation of the coordinator *-ya* as ‘and also’.

GU₄.)ME]Š-š=a akkanzi ⁴ [(Û A.ŠÀ-LAM karū=pat kuiš šūniet t=az a-)]pa-a-aš uarašše

If anyone sows (his own) seed on top (of another man's seed) [...], they shall place his neck on a plow. They shall hitch up [two] teams of oxen. They shall turn the face of one (team) in one direction and of the other in the other direction. The man dies and the oxen die. But the one who sowed the field first, he (*apas*) shall reap (it).³⁹⁷

In this case it is not necessary to express that the offender does not reap the field given his rather gruesome death. Still, the legislator found it necessary to stress the fact that the first sower and the not the second one reaps the field.

8.51 **IBoT 1.36 iv 18-23** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991: 34-35

§ ¹⁸ māḥḥan=ma=kan LUGAL-uš ^{GIŠ}ḥuluganaz katta tīēzzi nu mān ¹⁹ GAL MEŠEDI arta nu GAL MEŠEDI EGIR-anta UŠGEN nu LUGAL-un EGIR-pa ²⁰ ANA GAL DUMU.MEŠ.É.GAL ḥikzi mān ta[m]aiš=ma kuiški BELUM ²¹ ḥandāitta kuiš ḥantezzi[a]nni arta nu a-pa-aš UŠGEN ²² mān BELU GAL=ma ŪL kuiški ḥandāittari nu kuiš ²³ LÚMEŠEDI=ma arta nu a-pa-aš UŠGEN

When the king steps down from the cart, if there stands the chief-of-guards, the chief-of-guards prostrates himself behind (the king). He entrusts the king back to the chief-of-palace-attendants. But if some other official is available who stands in the front line, (then) he (*apas*) prostrates himself. But if there is not any high official available, (then) whichever guard stands (there), he (*apas*) prostrates himself.

In this example it is not necessary to negate that someone prostrates himself behind the king. The context itself makes it very clear that the subject of 'to prostrate' is each time replaced.

8.52 **KBo 15.10+ ii 20-21** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikkalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szabó 1971: 22-23

nu=ššan kuit ^fZi ANA BELI ²¹ [tak]kiškit n=at=šan EGIR-pa a-pé-da-ni takšan ēštu
What Zi(plantawiya) kept [as]signing to the lord, let that be assigned in return to her (*apedani*).

Ziplantawiya has been trying to curse the royal family. In this ritual the ritual practitioner tries to undo the evil magic of Ziplantawiya. The basic idea is that, first, the evil directed towards the royal family has to be undone, and secondly, to reverse the evil toward Ziplantawiya. The undoing of the evil deeds is not explicitly mentioned here, but paraphrased in ii 13-16.

The scope of Focus is only *apedani*. The rest of the information in the clause is already presupposed since it is almost completely expressed in the preceding relative clause.

Limiting *apa-* is often found in stipulations concerning the succession of a vassal king. Usually the future king has to be a son of the vassal king, in order to secure a dynasty that is loyal to the Hittites. In each of the following examples (8.53-55) *apa-* could have been left out without disrupting the syntax or the semantics of the clause. The fact that *apa-* is used in each case in this context means that the Addressee should infer that the successor is exactly *that* person instead of anyone else he might think of. Another option might be that the

³⁹⁷ See also the parallel law § 167.

Speaker assumes that the Addressee considers more than one successor to the throne. In that case we are dealing with Selecting Focus.

- 8.53 **KBo 5.3 i 8-11** (MH/NS treaty, Suppiluliuma I, CTH 42), ed. Friedrich 1930: 106-7, CHD Š p. 29
⁸ *nu=za zik ^mHuqqanāš dUTU-ŠI=pat AŠŠUM BELUTIM šāk* ⁹ *DUMU-YA=ja kuin dUTU-ŠI temi kūn=ua=za hūmanza šākdu* ¹⁰ *n=an=kan ištarna tekkuššami nu=za ziqq=a ^mHuqqanāš* ¹¹ *a-pu-u-un šāk*
 You, Huqqana, must recognize only My Majesty as to sovereignty and also, my son of whom I, My Majesty, say: “This one (here) everyone must recognize”, and I introduce him, you *too*, Huqqana, must recognize *him* (*apun*).
- 8.54 **KBo 5.9 i 24-26** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 62), ed. Friedrich 1926: 12
maḥḥann=a DAM=KA tatti ²⁵ *nu=za mān DUMU.IBILA ijaši nu katta INA KUR URUAmurri a-pa-a-aš* ²⁶ *LUGAL-uš ēšdu*
 And when you take your wife, if you beget a son, (then) later *he* (*apas*) shall be king in Amurru.
- 8.55 **Bo 86/299 ii 90-93** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 20-1
⁹⁰ *kuin=za imma DUMU-an mdLAMMA-aš malaizzi mān=aš apel* ⁹¹ *ŠA MUNUSTI DUMU-aš mān=aš tamēl kuēlqa MUNUS-aš DUMU-aš* ⁹² *nu kuiš DUMU-aš ANA mdLAMMA ZI-anza kuin=za DUMU-an mdLAMMA-aš malaizzi* ⁹³ *nu INA KUR URU dU-tašša LUGAL-iznani a-pu-u-un tittanuddu*
 Whatever son Kurunta might approve of —be he the son of that woman, be he the son of any other woman, any son that is favorable to Kurunta— whatever son Kurunta might approve of, he shall install *him* (*apun*) in Kingship in Tarhuntassa.

Here *apa-* might indicate Replacing Focus because in the preceding example it was stated that Kurunta was obliged to designate the son of his appointed fiancée as his heir:

- 8.56 **Bo 86/299 ii 85-86** (NH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 20-1
 MUNUS.LUGAL=ua=tta kuin MUNUS^{TUM} DAM-anni pāi nu=ua INA KUR URU dU-tašša ⁸⁶ *LUGAL-iznani a-pé-el DUMU=ŠU dāi*
 “As for the woman which the queen shall give you in marriage, you must place a son of *her’s* (*apel*) in kingship in Tarhuntassa!”

This prospective heir is now replaced by anyone Kurunta might consider fit. The use of Limiting *apel* in ii 85 implies Kurunta should only choose one specific son from one wife as his heir, with the rest of the candidates implicitly present at the background. This is made explicit later, in ex. 8.55 where the restriction is lifted. In section 8.5.4 I present some examples of the use of *apa-* following a relative clause. The interpretation given there is that in that case *apa-* seems to carry Selecting Focus, and our example here supports that analysis.

- 8.57 **KBo 2.2 ii 25-26** (lateNH Oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 130-131.
 § ²⁵ *nu dammaiš kuiški DINGIR-LUM kardimmijauanza* ²⁶ *nu aši INIM GIG a-pa-a-aš ijaši*
 Is some other deity angry, does *s/he* (*apas*) cause that matter of the illness?

This is one of the very few examples which has *aši* and *apa-* in the same clause. Here we can see how they have completely different functions. The pronoun *apa-* referring to a topical entity is used to indicate (implicit) Replacing Focus, whereas the adjectively used demonstrative *aši* refers further backward, across a paragraph boundary, having nothing to do with counter presuppositional Focus.

- 8.58 **KUB 26.12+ ii 29-35** (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.1), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 25 (see also 5.9, 5.27)

²⁹ *namma apāt kuit ēššatteni nu KUR.KUR.ḪI.A* ³⁰ *BA[L d]apianda l-ētta naiškittin* ³¹ *nu K[UR.KUR].ḪI.A* ^{LÚ} *KÚR daššanuškittin* ³² *KUR.KUR* ^{URU} *ḪATTI=ma mališkunuttin* ³³ *nu apāt memiškatteni mān=ūa=nnaš* ³⁴ *nakkešzi nu=ūa=kan a-pé-e-da-ni* EGIR-a[nd]a ³⁵ *tijaueṇi ...* §

Furthermore, as for that what you do: You turned all defective countries into one, you made the countries of the enemy powerful, while the countries of Hatti you made weak, and you say *that*: “If it becomes difficult for us, we shall step behind that one (*apedani*)”,

Leaving Tudhaliya, we turn to a prayer in which a princess in bad health tries to convince a deity that her substitute would be a much better object for divine anger:

- 8.59 **KBo 4.6 obv. 11’-16’** (NH prayer, Gassulawiya, CTH 380), ed. Tischler 1984: 12-13

nu=tta kāšma am[mel ta]rpašša[n] ^{12’} *unuṽandan uppaḫḫun n=aš=kan ammuk kattan* SIG₅-anza ^{13’} *parkuiš=aš apāš mišriṽanza apāš ḫarkiš=aš apāš* ^{14’} *n=aš=kan ḫūmandaz ašanuṽanza nu=kan* DINGIR-LIM EN-YA *a-pu-u-un* ^{15’} *menaḫḫanda uški nu PANI DINGIR-LIM EN-YA ka-a-aš MUNUS-aš ueḫattaru*

I have just sent you m[y] adorned [su]bstitute. She is better than *me*. Pure she (is), that one (*apas*), shining she is, that one (*apas*), fair she is, that one (*apas*). She is endowed with everything. O God, My Lord, look at *her* (*apun*, instead of me)! Let *this* woman (instead of me) be the most important to the god My Lord.

The accusative *apun* in obv. 14’ is obviously used in replacing Focus: ‘look at *her*, not me!’ and the same applies to the preverbal Subject *kāš* MUNUS-*aš* in obv. 15’. The function of the three nominatives *apas* in obv. 13’ might be different, although it could be argued that the Speaker simply wants to say: ‘*She* is pure (not me), *she* is shining (not me), etc.’. (See also section 8.5.5. and the treatment of this example as ex. 6.79)

The same might count for the next example where the ones who killed Duthaliya already paid the price for that murder. Mursili’s implicit question is ‘why do *we* have to pay with our lives if *they* have already done so?’:

- 8.60 **KUB 14.14 + rev. 21’-22’** (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 378 I), ed. Lebrun 1980: 196 § ^{21’} DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ=YA ŠA ^m*Dudḫaliṽa kuit ēšḫar* EGIR-an *šanḫat[teni]* ^{22’} *nu=kan* ^m*Dudḫaliṽan kuiēš kuennir nu ēšḫar a-pu-u-uš šarnin[kir]*

As for the fact that you, o gods, my lords, are seeking the blood of Dudhaliya, the ones who killed Dudhaliya, they (*apus*) pai[d] for the blood.

In all cited examples *apa-* referred to a first order entity. Reference to higher order entities occurs in KUB 22.70³⁹⁸:

- 8.61 **KUB 22.70 obv. 31-32** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 62-63
 § ³¹ *eni=ia kuit* ^f*Ammattallaš IQBI punuššuyeni=ma nāyi mān memiaš ašanza mān mahhan* ³² *ANA IR=ma=kan anda ŪL appiškir nu mān zilaš a-pé-e-ez kišat nu* KUŠ.MEŠ NU.SIG₅-du SAG.ME NU.S[IG₅] §
 And about that (fact), that Ammatalla has made a statement (lit. has spoken)³⁹⁹: on the one hand (-*ma*) we have not yet inquired whether (her) statement is true, or how (it is), on the other hand (-*ma*), they have not submitted (it) to an oracle inquiry. If the oracle outcome has happened because of that (*apez*), (then) let the exta be unfavorable. SAG.ME. Unfav[orable].
- 8.62 **KUB 22.70 obv. 61-63** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 74-75
 § ⁶¹ *eni=ma kuit* MUNUS.LUGAL UN.MEŠ-šuš *katta* GUL-anteš *ANA* ^dUTU-ŠI *IŠPUR* ^dUTU-ŠI=*ma=kan memian menahhanda kaništa* ⁶² *nu kiššan IQBI lē=ua=mu kuitki mematteni n=aš=kan šer karuššijāt nu mān* *ANA* DINGIR-LIM ⁶³ *a-pa-a-at kuitki* TUKU.TUKU-az DÙ-at ...
 As for that (fact), that the queen wrote about the ‘downbeaten’ people to the king, but (that) the king recognized the matter facing (him) and spoke like this: “you (pl.) must *not* tell me anything!”, and (that) he became silent about (it), if that (*apat*) became somehow (a reason for) anger for the deity, ...

Summarizing, the classification of *apa-* as a pronoun with Replacing Focus reading was based on contextual considerations. In section 8.5.2. the expression type was “Not X, but Y!” whereas it was “(Not X), but Y!” in section 8.5.3.

The extensive list of examples serves to illustrate a pattern: the pronoun *apa-* with Replacing Focus reading is connected with preverbal position. This will further elaborated upon in section 8.6.

8.5.4. Limiting *apa-* in relative sentences

In the preceding sections several examples with Replacing *apa-* contained a relative clause immediately preceding the *apa-* clause (for example, exx. 8.37, 8.39). In those cases the context provided clear clues for the type of Argument Focus that was indicated by *apa-*. In this section I will present some other examples of *apa-* following a relative clause which contains the referent of *apa-* introduced by *kui-*. The difference however with the preceding sections is that it is not possible to more narrowly define the type of Focus. It seems to me that there is a general sense of ‘exactly this ... and nothing else’, implying Selecting Focus although in most examples there are no clear indications in the context which support this interpretation.

³⁹⁸ See also KUB 22.70 obv. 43 (NH oracle, CTH 566).

³⁹⁹ Ünal differently: ‘Auch das, was Ammatalla erzählt hat, ...’. I do not agree with an interpretation of *eni* as the object of *IQBI*, ‘has spoken’. In the majority of cases, *eni kuit* serves to introduce a whole clause or proposition into the discourse, instead of introducing some entity (with which it then may agree in case.)

There are two patterns: “*kui- N ... apa- N*” and “*kui- ... apa-*”. In the next examples⁴⁰⁰ the pattern is “*kui- N ... apa- N*”.

- 8.63 **HKM 43 obv. 4'-7'** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 182-183
^{4'} KUR-*ia* = kan *kuiēš* anda URU.DIDLI.ĪI.A ^{5'} arnumanzi taranteš § ^{6'} nu *a-pu-u-uš*
 URU.DIDLI.ĪI.A *karū* ^{7'} arnuir
 What cities in the country are promised to be displaced, those (*apus*) cities they have already displaced.

- 8.64 **KUB 19.26 i 7'-10'** (pre-NH/NS treaty, Suppiluluma, CTH 44)
^{7'} [*k*]uiš = a *antuahhaš* ITT[*i*] MUNUS.LUGAL *našma katta* ^{8'} [*i*]TTI DUMU.LUGAL
uštai nu = kan a[-pu-]u-un antuḥšan ^{9'} LÚSANGA *našma katta* DUMU LÚSANG[A
a]ššuli anda *lē* ^{10'} *huittiianzi*
 (If) any man sins against the queen or later the prince, then *that* (*apun*) man the Priest or later the son of the Priest may not haul in favorably.

- 8.65 **KUB 1.1+ iv 62-64** (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 28-29
nu = za ŠEŠ-YA mNIR.GÁL-i[(š)] ⁶³ [(*kuit* AŠ)]RU URU^dU-aššan *parnauiškit n = an a-*
pí-ia pí[(di)] ⁶⁴ [(LUGAL-i)]znanni *tittanunun*
 What place, Tarhuntassa, my brother Muwatalli made into property of the royal house, in *that* (*apiya*) place I installed him (= Kurunta) in kingship.

- 8.66 **Bo 86/299 ii 59-60** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106.1), ed. Otten 1988: 18-19
 ANA ṬUPPI RIKILTÍ ŠA ABI = YA = kan *kuiēš* URU^dDIDLI.ĪI.A ŪL ⁶⁰ *kijantari nu a-pu-u-*
uš URU^dDIDLI.ĪI.A IŠTU AŠA.GÀR NAM.RA *humantaza* ANA ^{md}LAMMA LUGAL KUR
^dU-tašša ARAD-anni ADDIN
 The cities which are not laid down on the sealed tablet of my father, those (*apus*) cities, including all the fields (and) deportees, I have given to Kurunta, King of Tarhuntassa in subjection.

In the pattern “*kui- N ... apa- N*” the noun is repeated, and the only new element is *apa-*, which therefore carries the main accent of the noun phrase. In English one would say “which cities ... those cities” and not *“which cities ... those cities”, with the accent on cities. The accent on “those” probably implies some contrast with or selection from a non-specified group of candidates, which led me above to the paraphrase ‘exactly this ... and none other’.

The relative sentence occurs also without noun: “*kui- ... apa-*”. Two examples from earliest and latest Hittite are:

- 8.67 **KBo 17.3+ ii 12'-13'** (OS ritual, CTH 416.1), ed. Neu 1980a: 14
nu kuit ^{13'} [LU]GAL-uš *tezzi nu a-pa-a-at ijam*
 Whatever the king says, *that* (*apat*) I will do.
- 8.68 **KBo 2.2 ii 32-34** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 130
³² *nu kuit* SI×SÁ[-*ta*]ri ³³ *nu* ANA ^dUTU URU^UPÚ-na *a-pa[-a-at]* ³⁴ SUM-anzi
 What will be established, *that* [*t*] (*apat*) they shall give to the Sungoddess of Arinna.

⁴⁰⁰ The examples cited here are only a small selection of the *kui- ... apa-* clauses in my corpus.

Contrary to the examples in the preceding sections, preverbal position does not seem to come into play. In exx. 8.67 and 8.68 the pronoun is preverbal, but in the other examples presented here *apa-* occurs in first position.

8.5.5. Postposed adjectival *apa-*

Although most adjectival *apa-s* precede the head noun, Kammenhuber HW² 133b observed that sometimes adjectival *apa-* is postposed to its head noun. According to her postposed adjectival *apa-* occurs in “emphatischer Sprache” (l.c.).⁴⁰¹ The problem with this formulation is that *apa-* is almost⁴⁰² always ‘emphatic’, that is, in Focus in the framework presented here. Focal *apa-* with *-pat* preceding its head noun is found in ex. 8.25, 8.30, 8.32-34, and without *-pat* in exx. 8.62-65. The question therefore is, assumed that position in the clause is correlated with (pragmatic) function, does postposed *apa-* indicate something else besides the Focus already discussed in the preceding sections? The following overview of the examples of postposed *apa-* in my corpus and one example from Kammenhuber (o.c.) does not seem to indicate Replacing or Restricting Focus, although the notion of Selecting Focus is vaguely present. A similar problem one encounters with *apa-* resuming the referent of a relative (pro)noun. The examples from my corpus are:

8.69 **KBo 4.6 obv. 11’-17’** (NH prayer, Gassulawiya, CTH 380), ed. Tischler 1984: 12-13 (see also 8.58)

nu=tta kāšma am[mel ta]rpašša[n] ^{12’} *unuṣandan uppaḥhun n=aš=kan ammu*
kattan SIG₅-anza ^{13’} *parkuiš=aš a-pa-a-aš mišriyanza a-pa-a-aš ḥarkiš=aš a-pa-a-*
aš ^{14’} *n=aš=kan ḥūmandaz ašanuṣanza*

⁴⁰¹ Some of the examples cited by Kammenhuber can now be explained on the basis of the general rules formulated in the Chapters on *apa-*. Two examples contain the Expanding Focus particle *-ya* “also”: Mursili Sprachlähmung rev. 27 and KUB 41.23 ii 6. The former Kammenhuber (o.c. 135) translated as “und den bespannten Wagen, auch den nahmen sie”, see my different parsing of the clause in Ch. 7 ex. 7.39. The other attestation of *apa-* with *-ya* occurs in First position following its head noun: § 6 *ši-e-eš-šar a-pa-a-at-ta QATAMMA* ie[zzī] “[He] br[ews ?] that beer too in the same way.” Only rarely the Focal particle *-ya* occurs in initial position, and even then in very specific contexts. I certainly do not expect Focal *-ya* in Initial position after a paragraph line. Therefore *apatt-a* takes its regular position in the clause, without indicating more than if the head noun ‘beer’ would follow *apatt-a*. Most of the other examples cited in Kammenhuber o.c. are too broken to allow any conclusions concerning emphasis or Focus: KBo 16.25+ i 78 KIN-az *a-pí-e-iz anne[sk-*, KUB 46.42 iii 7 DINGIR-LIM-za-ma-smas-kan *a-pí-iz-za*. With *-pat*: KBo 22.254 obv. 3: *ud[d]ā[r]* ³ *[lú-u?]-li a-pé-e-pát m[e]miškiizzi šummant[...]* §; KUB 45.22 v 12: *uddā[r]ma a-pé-e-pát memai*; VBoT 32 i 7f. § 7’ [... ..]x-zi DINGIR.MEŠ-uš *a-pu-u-uš-pát* 8’ [...] *eukzi*; KUB 26.69 vi 15 :]x *ḥalkiuš a-pu-u-uš-pát* §. The pronoun *apa-* is probably not used adjectively in KUB 5.1+52.65 i 11 (with Ünal 1974): DINGIR.MEŠ-za-kan *zilan a-pa-a-at mālan* “(If) *that* is approved of subsequently (*zilan*) by the gods, ...”. *apat* is used here in Replacing Focus in preverbal position. Compare with the preceding oracle question with negative outcome in i 8: DINGIR.MEŠ-za-kan *zilan mālan*. The idea is: “since not this action is approved of, will *that* then be approved of?”.

⁴⁰² In Chapter 5 I have discussed the use of *apa-* as a Medial demonstrative. In that role *apa-* is often not ‘emphatic’.

I have just sent you m[y] adorned [su]bstitute. She is better than *me*. Pure she (is), that one (*apas*), shining she is, that one (*apas*), fair she is, that one (*apas*). She is endowed with everything.

Although *apas* is not an adjective, it seems somehow to modify the enclitic pronoun *-as*.

- 8.70 **KBo 4.6 rev. 7'-9'** (NH prayer, Gassulawiya, CTH 380), ed. Tischler 1984: 16-17
nu=za zik ^dLe[l_y]aniš ^{8'} [(apel šA GU₄.ÁB ŠE)] Û šA UDU ŠE MÁŠ-ja ^{UZU} ēt ^{9'}
 [(*nu=za išpāi ēšhar=ma*)] a-pa-a-at eku *nu=za ninga*
 You Lelwani, eat the fat of her fattened cow, of her fattened sheep, and of her goat!
 Eat until satisfaction! Now, drink that (*apat*) blood! Drink until satisfaction!

- 8.71 **KBo 11.1 obv. 14** (NH Prayer, Muwattalli II, CTH 382), ed. Houwink ten Cate & Josephson 1967: 106, 115.
 § ¹⁴ *mān=kan ^dU DINGIR-LUM KUR-TI kuiški TUKU.TUKU-nut kinuna*
^dA.NUN.NA.KI₄ ^dU-an ANA DINGIR-LIM a-pé-e-da-n[i mena]hḫanda takšulāndu
 If some god of the country has angered the Stormgod, (then) let now the netherworld
 deities reconcile the Stormgod with that (*apedani*) god.

- 8.72 **KUB 21.38 rev. 11-13** (NH letter, Puduhepa, CTH 176), ed. Edel 1994: 222-223.
 ANA ŠEŠ=YA kuiš ZI[-ni ṣ l]umpaštiš ammuk=ma=an ANA ŠEŠ=YA UL namma
 iḫami ¹² [m]ān ŪL kuit IDI nu ANA ŠEŠ=YA ṣ lum[pašti]n a-pu-u-un DÙ-mi
 karū=ma kuit IDI ¹³ nu ANA ŠEŠ=YA ṣ lumpaštin ŪL=pat iḫ[ami]
 As for the annoyance [to the] soul of my brother, I shall not inflict it anymore upon
 my brother. (But) since I didn't know, I could inflict that (*apun*) annoyance upon my
 brother. But since I (now) already know, I shall *not* annoy my brother (anymore).

And an example mentioned by Kammenhuber:

- 8.73 **KUB 36.75+ ii 9'-12'** (OH/MS Prayer, CTH 374), ed. Lebrun 1980: 123-124
 § ^{9'} *kuiš=mu DINGIR-LUM kī inann=a paiš ^{10'} nu=ššan DINGIR-LUM a-pa-a-aš*
mān nep[(iši)] ^{11'} mān=aš taknī zig=a ^dUTU-uš katti=šši [(pāiši)]
 § ^{12'} *nu īt ANA DINGIR-LIM a-pé-e-da-ni mēm[i]*
 (I say to you:) § If some deity might have given me this illness too, whether that
 (*apas*) deity is in heaven or on earth, *you*, o Sungod, accompany him. Go and tell that
 (*apedani*) deity: "..."

It is striking that these examples occur in prayers and a letter. It is therefore possible that we might have to take the type of genre into account. These examples of postposed *apa-* could belong to a colloquial register which is otherwise not known to us.

However, the fact that these postposed adjectives occur only in genres with an active Addressee could also point at something else. One of the major problems of *apa-* is how to distinguish Focal adjectival *apa-* from non-focal Medial adjectival *apa-*, especially since it should be possible to have Focal medial *apa-*. Is it possible that postposed *apa-* indicates emphasis on Medial *apa-*? Then we would have the following pattern (see also 5.5.3.):

| Focal N | Medial N | Medial Focal N |
|---------|----------|----------------|
|---------|----------|----------------|

| | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| 'that object' | 'that <i>object</i> of yours' | 'that object of yours' |
| <i>apa- N</i> | <i>apa- N</i> | <i>N apa-</i> |

8.6. Formal discussion of Limiting *apa-* without *-pat*

The attestations of *apa-* with Replacing Focus were selected according to contextual criteria. In the clearest situations both members of the replacing Focus type, the negated statement and the correcting piece of information 'Not X, but Y!' were present. In a number of cases the negated part was missing, but the context provided enough information to allow the conclusion that some piece of information was implicitly contradicted: '(not X,) but Y!'.

If the attestations are listed in abstract form, a pattern emerges. With both members explicitly mentioned or paraphrased:

| ex. | wordorder | | | | |
|-------|------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| 8.36 | | | | S | NomPred |
| 8.37 | <i>nu</i> | | NomP | S | V |
| 8.38 | <i>nu</i> | | O | IO | V |
| 8.39 | <i>nu-kan</i> | | Source | S | V |
| 8.40a | <i>nu-IO-kan</i> | | | S | V |
| 8.40b | <i>nu-IO-kan</i> | | | S | V |
| 8.41 | <i>nu-O-za</i> | | | S | V |
| 8.42 | <i>nu</i> | O | IO | S | V |
| 8.44 | <i>nu-wa</i> | S | | O | Neg+V |
| 8.45 | <i>nu</i> | Loc | Loc | O | V |
| 8.46 | <i>nu-S-za</i> | | | G | V |
| 8.47 | <i>n-S</i> | Abl | LocA | IO | V |

Table 8.10: With both members expressed or paraphrased: 'not X, but Y'

With an implicit negation:

| | | | | | |
|-------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------|---------|
| 8.48 | <i>apun-za</i> | | | S | V |
| 8.49 | | O+O | | S | V |
| 8.50 | <i>ta-z</i> | | | S | V |
| 8.51 | <i>nu</i> | | | S | V |
| 8.52 | <i>nu-S-san</i> | Adv | | IO | V |
| 8.53 | <i>nu-za</i> | S-ya | S | O | V |
| 8.54 | <i>nu</i> | Adv | Loc | S | V |
| 8.55 | <i>nu</i> | Loc | Loc | O | V |
| 8.57 | <i>nu</i> | [O+O] | | S | V |
| 8.58 | <i>nu-wa-kan</i> | | | IO+LA | V |
| 8.59a | <i>nu-kan</i> | S | | O | V |
| 8.59b | <i>nu</i> | Loc | | [S+S] | V |
| 8.60 | <i>nu</i> | O | | S | V |
| 8.61 | <i>nu man</i> | S | | Abl | V |
| 8.62 | <i>nu man</i> | IO | | S | Adv O+V |
| 8.67 | <i>nu</i> | | | O | V |
| 8.68 | <i>nu</i> | IO | | O | V |

| | | |
|------|-----|---|
| 8.69 | V-S | S |
|------|-----|---|

Table 8.11: With only one member expressed: ‘(not X,) but Y’

And combining with the adjectively used *apa*-:

| | | | | | |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|-----|---------|---------|
| 8.43 | <i>nu-O-kan</i> | S | | [IO+IO] | V |
| 8.56 | <i>nu-wa</i> | Loc | Loc | [G+O] | V |
| 8.63 | <i>nu</i> | | | [O+O] | V |
| 8.64 | <i>nu-kan</i> | [O+O] | S | IO | V |
| 8.65 | <i>nu-O</i> | [Loc+Loc] | | O | V |
| 8.66 | <i>nu</i> | [O+O] | IO | Loc | V |
| 8.69 | [O- <i>ma</i> + O] | | | | V |
| 8.71 | Adv | S | O | [IO+IO] | V |
| 8.72 | <i>nu</i> | IO | | [O+O] | V |
| 8.73a | <i>nu-ssan</i> | | | [S+S] | NomPred |
| 8.73b | <i>nu V</i> | | | [IO+IO] | V |

Table 8.12: Position of restrictors in the implicit ‘(not X,) but Y’

The tables show that the argument with Replacing Focus occurs in preverbal position, irrespective of its grammatical or semantic role in the clause. If we only had clauses with preverbal object, indirect object or other, the pattern would not deviate from the regular SOV wordorder. However, there are several examples (exx. 8.36, 8.37, 8.39, 8.42, 8.48, 8.54, 8.57, 8.59b, 8.60) where the preverbal Subject is preceded by all other arguments, which is highly remarkable. The conclusion must be that the preverbal position is reserved for Replacing Focus in case of topical discourse entities. As we already have seen in Chapter 7, also Expanding Focus has its own place in the Hittite clause, that is, first position after the sentence clitics.

Some other examples might be understood better now:

8.74 **KBo 3.34 ii 27-29** (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 52

kuid=a LÚ.MEŠKUŠ₇ ²⁸ *āmmijantuš=šmuš n=uš* ^m*Išputaš-inar manijaḫḫeškizzi* ²⁹
GI-an ^{GIŠ}UMBIN *ḫašḫaššuar* ^{GIŠ}TUKUL *apātar n=uš apāš annanut*
 Now, as for their young Chariot-Fighters, Ispudasinar is in charge of them. The arrow, the sharpening-wheel (?), the holding of the weapon, *he* (*apas*) taught them (= the young chariot-fighters).

The preverbal subject *apa*- implies that someone else was supposed to teach the young chariot fighters. And indeed, Suppiuman and Marassa, their original trainers, were punished for some mistakes and released of their duty. Therefore we should translate: ‘*he* taught them’, or paraphrasing ‘it is *he* who (now) taught them’.

Maybe belonging here too is

8.75 **KBo 15.10+ i 13-18** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikkalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szabó 1971: 14-15

nu kiššan memai kē=ūa idālaueš ¹⁴ [×-]ešijanteš EME.ḪI.A *iššišta=ma=aš*
^f*Ziplantaui[aš]* ¹⁵ [ki]nuna idālaueš EME.ḪI.A *nu=ūar=at=kan iššaz kuedani* ¹⁶ [×]-
 ×-×-[t]a ^f*Zi kinuna=ūa* ANA ^f*Zi addeš=šeš palḫāeš* ¹⁷ [tu]ekkeš=šeš SIG₅-anteš
^{mišriyanteš} *aiš a-pé-el* ¹⁸ [SIG₅-]in EME *a-pé-el* SIG₅-anza

(He takes one *kurdali*-vessel of dough with <the tongues>,) and speaks as follows: “These evil ... tongues: Ziplantawiya has currently made them as evil tongues, she has [...] them (neut.!) from someone’s mouth, (that) Zi! Currently for Zi her *adda*-s are broad, her members are well (and) perfect, *her* (*apel*) mouth is well, *her* (*apel*) tongue is well.

It is possible that this construction means that *her* tongue and mouth is well and not the tongue and mouth of someone else. Indeed it seems that Ziplantawiya has (magically) done something to someone’s mouth and tongue, which explains that her own mouth and tongue are accompanied by *apel* but not her other body parts. If my interpretation is correct, then the postposed genitive carries Replacing Focus with the implication: ‘Not *his* mouth, tongue is well, but *her*’s are’.

The subject *apa*- in the next example also implies that someone else was expected to take care of (?) the deceased:

8.76 **KUB 16.32 ii 24-26** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 569), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 180-181

§ ²⁴ [UR]U *Kijutan* = *kan* URU-*an* ANA ^mGAL.^dU *arḥa* ME-*anzi* ²⁵ [*n*] = *an* ANA GIDIM SUM-*anzi* ^m*Katapa*-DINGIR-LIM-iš *karū* ²⁶ [*u*] *atarnahḥanza nu* GIDIM *a-pa-a-aš* 𐎶 *aršul*[*a*] *izzi* §

They shall take away Kiyuta, the city, from Talmitessub, and give it to the deceased. Katapaili has already been given orders: it is *he* who will *arsulai*- the deceased.

8.7. Conclusion

In none of the examples in this chapter *apa*- is needed to clarify some ambiguous referent. In almost all cases the referent of *apa*- was already the Discourse topic and the Sentence topic in the preceding clause, which means theoretically that one could have done without *apa*-. But given that it is there, something else is meant. In all these cases *apa*- is used to counter some assumed/presupposed opinion possibly held by the Addressee. With very few exceptions this counterpresuppositional *apa*- and *apa*- + *-pat* occur in preverbal position. When *apa*- (without *-pat*) is used adjectivally, it may occur both before and after the head noun. It seems that postposed *apa*- (+ *-pat*) occurs in a more colloquial language in prayers and a letter in an emotional context: since pronominal Limiting *apa*- is preverbal, in colloquial speech also the adjective became preverbal? It is also possible that postposed *apa*- is actually the medial demonstrative in Focus.

The particle *-pat* is contra-expectational, and indicates more often Replacing Focus than Restricting Focus in the texts studied here. When it is Replacing, I suggest a translation ‘instead’, when Restricting ‘only’. When *-pat* is used with *apa*-, the question is how it differs from preverbal *apa*-. Combining the results of this chapter, *apa*- + *-pat* restricts both a predicate (clause minus subject) and a noun, whereas *apa*- without *-pat* only indicates Focus on a noun. The difference of *apa*- with *apa*- + *-pat* is that the negation is often explicit with the former, and if it is not explicit, the negation is immediately derivable from the context. With *apa*- + *-pat* the larger context has to be taken into account including more general (or encyclopaedic knowledge). And finally, *apa*- + *-pat* indicates Restricting and Replacing Focus, while simple *apa*- is only Replacing. Thus, *-pat* attached to *apa*- is a stronger sign of

Focus than simply *apa-*, which is more limited, both in scope and in function. Summarized in the following table:

| | <i>apa- + -pat</i> | <i>apa-</i> |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| scope | noun and predicate | noun |
| type of Focus | Restricting and Replacing | Replacing |
| inference from context | wider context, general knowledge | immediate context |

Table 8.13: The differences between Focal *apa- + -pat* and Focal *apa-*.

As last remark on the chronological distribution: Limiting *apa-* with and without *-pat* is attested in all language phases.

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*⁴⁰³. A first step in understanding the purpose of *apa-* with *-a/-ma* is to understand how *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* in view of the major functions of *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* and some difficult texts.

9.1.1. The particle *-ma* / *-a*

Rieken 2000: 412ff.⁴⁰⁴ provides an overview of the different functions of *-a/-ma*, mainly concentrating on the development of its functions in Old Hittite. Since her perception of the functions of *-a/-ma* is important for the understanding of *apa-* with *-a/-ma*, I will summarize her findings and use her categorization as a basis for the discussion of *apa-* with *-a/-ma*. Rieken discerns three different contexts in which *-a/-ma* is used:

(1) In the earliest texts *-a/-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)⁴⁰⁵. In both cases the word marked by *-a/-ma* can be thought of as a *new orientation* in the discourse. An example of *-a/-ma* as Topic shifting device is:

9.1 **KBo 17.1+ i 35'-36'** (OS ritual, CTH 416), ed. Neu 1980a: 6
 ^{35'} LUGAL-*uš* ÉRIN.MEŠ-*an* III-š[U *alla*]ppah^{hi} MUNUS.LUGAL-*ašš=a* III-šU
 all[appah^{hi}] šāuataras^h=*a* halzāi

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 *-ma/-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 spi[ts] thrice on the soldier and the queen sp[its] (on him) thrice. The hornblower⁴⁰⁶ calls.

As a result of the general reorientating function *-a/-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-Topic⁴⁰⁷. 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 *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 a conditional, temporal or sometimes relative clause with conditional connotation (*takku*, *mān*, *našma* and *kui*-clauses), with *-a/-ma* generally attached to the second accented word⁴⁰⁸:

9.2 **KBo 3.22 rev. 76-78**, with duplicate KUB 36.98b (OS ‘building inscription’, Anitta, CTH 1), ed. Neu 1974: 14-15

⁷⁶ *mān āppa=ma* ^{URU}*Nēša* [*uṣan(un)*] ⁷⁷ *nu LÚ* ^{URU}*Purušḫanda katti=mmi*
[*(pēḫutenun)*] ⁷⁸ *mān tunnakišna=ma paizzi* *ap[(āš=a)]* ⁷⁹ *pēra=mmi* *kunnaz*
ešari (end of text)

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 *-a/-ma* has further evolved into a conjunction with contrastive meaning (“satzverbindende Adversativ-konjunktion”, o.c. 417-418)⁴⁰⁹.⁴¹⁰ In that context it is often not possible to find any trace of its earlier reorientation marking function.

⁴⁰⁶ The German translation “Der Hornist aber” does more justice to the use of *-a*. In English Topic shifts are not necessarily indicated.

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 *-ma* is structuring the discourse, introducing an embedded discourse unit.

⁴⁰⁸ See also CHD L-N p. 94, b 2’, and p. 97f., f 2’.

⁴⁰⁹ According to Rieken 2000: 417 *-a/-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 *-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 *-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 -ma*, b 7’, p. 93).

⁴¹⁰ This function of *-ma(/-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 *-ma* binds two clauses in a coordinate structure, functioning as a unit on discourse level. In b. 1’ the particle *-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-ŠU^{12'} *paizzi āppa=ma=aš=šta 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 *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* with an anaphoric pronoun, in this case *apa-*, is not marginal⁴¹¹ but occurs as often as *apa-* with *-ya* in my corpus.

| | OS | MH/MS | NH | lateNH | Total |
|---------------|----|-------|----|--------|-------|
| <i>-a/-ma</i> | 9 | 14 | 24 | 13 | 60 |
| <i>-ya</i> | 4 | 18 | 35 | 14 | 71 |

Table 9.1: Distribution of *apā-* with *-a/ma* 'but, while' and *-ya* 'and, also'.

One of the functions of *apa-* with *-a/-ma* follows from Rieken's description of the use of *-a/-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, *-a/-ma* marks a Topic shift (category (1), see also section 9.2.1.):

9.4 **IBoT 1.36 i 33-37** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991: 8-9

*mān=an=za=kan*³⁴ *šēhunanza=pat tamāšzi n=a[š A]NA* LÚMEŠEDUTIM *hūmandāš*
³⁵ EGIR-an *hūuāi nu=šši kuiš* LÚ[MEŠE]DI *piraššit artari* ³⁶ *nu=šši tezzi*
 DUG^{kaltija=ua} *kattan paimi a-pa-a-ša parā dametani* ³⁷ LÚMEŠEDI *tezzi a-pa-ša*
parā LÚtarrijanalli *tezzi*

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.

Each time the Primary Topic is replaced by a new one. In i 36 (*nu=šši tezzi*) the Primary Topic is the Subject, and the Secondary Topic is *-šši*.⁴¹² The Secondary Topic is promoted to

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 *-a/-ma* an einem anaphorisches 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.

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

9.2. The particle *-a/-ma* with word scope and *apa-*

9.2.1. Topic shift

When the particle *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* (independent of the three functions of *-a/-ma*) and *apa-* with *-ya*:

| <i>-a/-ma</i> | OS | MH/MS | NH | lateNH | Total |
|---------------|----|-------|----|--------|-------|
| nom. | 9 | 10 | 12 | 10 | 41 |
| acc. | | 3 | 6 | 1 | 10 |
| dat. | | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| abl. | | | 3 | | 3 |
| gen. | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | 9 | 14 | 22 | 13 | 58 |

Table 9.2: Distribution of grammatical case of *apa-* with *-a/-ma*

| <i>-ya</i> | OS | MH/MS | NH | lateNH | Total |
|------------|----|-------|----|--------|-------|
| nom. | 3 | 6 | 16 | 5 | 30 |
| acc. | 1 | 7 | 14 | 2 | 24 |
| dat. | | 2 | 5 | 5 | 12 |
| abl. | | 3 | | 2 | 5 |
| Total | 4 | 18 | 35 | 14 | 71 |

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

The counts show that *apa-* with *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* indeed has something to do with the Subject and therefore probably also with the Topic. Although ex. 9.5. shows that *apa-* with *-a/-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-*:

9.6 **KUB 26.12+ ii 2-9** (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.1), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 24, with emendatins from Otten 1958: 389.

§ ² *našma=kan* [...] ³ *našma* ŠEŠ ^d[UTU-ŠI ŠA MUNUS.LUGA]L *h[aššanza našma]* ⁴ ŠEŠ.MEŠ DUMU.MEŠ MUNUS_{NA}[PTA]R[T]I *anda i[štamašzi]* ⁵ *nu ki-i memai* EGIR-

⁴¹⁴ See also KUB 26.12+ iv 13, 41 (CTH 255.1).

an=ua=mu tī[ia] ⁶ *apāš=ma a-pa-a-at memai EGIR-an=ua=ta* ⁷ *ŪL tiāmi*
hanti=ia=ua=šši ⁸ *ŪL tiāmi* ⁹ *huhhupašš=a[=ua=šši? Ū]L* ⁹ *kišhahari ...*
 Or (if) [...] or a brother of [My Majesty], offspring or] brothers [of the Queen,
 I[stems] to sons of concubine[s], (and) says this (*ki*): “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 not]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

§ ^{13'} [MUNUS.MEŠ *zint*] *uheš AŠAR=ŠUNU appanzi [t=]e tienzi ta kišš[an]* ^{14'}
 [S]IR-RU [1-aš *h*] *alzāi uliūā ulin a-pé-e-ma=šše QATAMMA=[pat]* ^{15'} *arkuūanzi a-*
pa-a-ša namma kiššan halzāi teuiarate-×[...] ^{16'} [*t*] *aštemū uliūālinā taštemū a-*
pé-e-ma=šše QATAMM[A=pat] ^{17'} *arkuūanzi namma halzāi lamā ziūiiallināia a-pé-*
e-ma[=šše ...
 [The *zint*] *u*hi-women take their place, stand (still), and [si]ng as follo[ws]. [One c]alls
 out: *uliūā ulin*, and they (*ape=ma*) pray to her in that [same] way. She then
 (*apas=a*) continues calling as follows: *teuiarate ...* [... *t*] *aštemū uliūālinā taštemū*.
The others (*ape=ma*) pray to her in that [same] wa[y]. She furthermore calls: *lamā*
ziūiiallināia. 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, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 22-23
nu ŠA [(ŠEŠ=YA)] ⁶² [(*nakkijanni handaš*)] *ŪL manqa DÜ-nun[n(u INA*
 MU.VII.KAM *daḥušijahḥa)]* ⁶³ [(*a-pa-a-aš-ma=mu harkanna*)] *IŠTU INIM DINGIR-*
[(LIM Ū IŠTU INIM LÚ šan(a)hta)]

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=ia ŠEŠ.MEŠ=ŠU *maiqqauš* ⁵⁹ *parā ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ušš=a=mu meqqaješ*
⁶⁰ LUGAL.MEŠ *arahzenušš=a meqqauš* ⁶¹ *šummaš=ma kuieš* LÚ.MEŠSAG ⁶² *nu=za*
parā kuinki kuedanikki ⁶³ *uijiami a-pa-a-aš-ma=an* SIG₅-*aḥḥi* ⁶⁴ *a-pa-a-aš-ma*
 KA×U-iš *duuarnāi* ⁶⁵ *nu=šši* INIM.MEŠ LUGAL *parā memai* ⁶⁶ *n=at* GAM NEŠ
 DINGIR-LIM [GAR-ru] §

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.

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 someone (of my brothers etc.), and *that one* (*apas=ma*) shows favor to him, so that *he* (*apas=ma*) breaks confidence, and blurts 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:

| courtier | brother etc. |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>kuinki</i> (obj.) | <i>kuedanikki</i> (indirect obj.) |
| <i>-an</i> (obj.) | <i>apāš=ma</i> (subj.) |
| <i>apāš=ma</i> (subj.) | — |
| \emptyset (subj.) | <i>=šši</i> (indirect obj.) |

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* SIG₅-*aḥḥi nu KA×U-iš duḡarnāi* “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 *-a/-ma* we need to compare the preceding examples with the following law (already cited earlier as ex. 8.18):

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

§ ¹⁶ [(*takk*)]*u* LÚ.U₁₉.LU-*an* *kuiški ḥūnikzi t=an ištarnikzi nu apūn* ¹⁷ *šāktāizzi pēdi=šši=ma* LÚ.U₁₉.LU-*an* *pāi nu É-ri=šši* ¹⁸ *anniškizzi kuitmān=aš lāzziatta mān=aš lazziatta=ma* ¹⁹ *nu=šše* 6 GÍN KÙ.BABBAR *pāi* LÚA.ZU=*ja* *kuššan apāš=pat pai* §

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(nother) 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 *-a/-ma*.⁴¹⁹ In the following table I list the three persons involved and their syntactic roles in the discourse:

⁴¹⁸ Hoffner l.c.: “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 (*kuiški*) and the injured as Object-Patient (LÚ.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 have 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

| | injured | guilty party | replacement |
|---|--|-------------------------|--|
| 1 | LÚ.U ₁₉ .LU- <i>an</i> (obj.) | <i>kuiški</i> (subj.) | |
| 2 | <i>t=an</i> (obj.) | — | |
| 3 | <i>apūn</i> (obj.) | ∅ (subj.) | |
| 4 | <i>pēdi=šši</i> (gen.) | ∅ (subj.) | LÚ.U ₁₉ .LU- <i>an</i> (obj.) |
| 5 | <i>É-ri=šši</i> (gen.) | — | ∅ (subj.) |
| 6 | <i>kuitmān=aš</i> (subj.) | — | — |
| 7 | <i>mān=aš</i> (subj.) | — | — |
| 8 | <i>nu=šše</i> | ∅ (subj.) | — |
| 9 | — | <i>apāš=pat</i> (subj.) | — |

Table 9.5: Referent chains in ex. 9.10

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 *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* when the Subject-Topic does *not* change in 9.4.3. But first the other categories of the use of *-a/-ma* in connection with *-a/-ma* will be discussed.

9.2.2. New setting or orientation in the discourse

The syntagm *apez=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}*Iwatallišša* *arḥa* ^{38’} *uarnut* *a-pé-e-[e]z=ma=aš* ^{URU}
Šapidduya *šešta*
 He burnt down the country of Hinariwanda and Iwatallissa. But from the[r]e
 (*apez=ma*) (he went on and) slept in Sapidduwa.

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-lannisk-* is a transitive verb, even though the object is not expressed. Only verbs that *never* take an Object should be considered intransitive (see Garrett 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’.

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

Besides word scope the particle *-a/-ma* can also have scope over a clause (see 9.1.1., category (2)). Clauses with this type of *-a/-ma* often contain background information that is supportive to the main story line. This use of *apa-* with *-a/-ma* is very rare, and there was not one example in my corpus. Instead I will illustrate this use of *-a/-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)

mān=ma=za ITTI MUNUS-TI kuiš šešzi ⁷⁵ [*n=an*]=*kan* MAḪRI=ŠU ^{LÚ}GAL-ŠU EGIR-
an tamašzi nu memau=pat ⁷⁶ [*mān*]=*kan* *a-pa-a-aš-ma* *memiyauanzi UL mazzazzi*
⁷⁷ *nu* ^{LÚ}*ari=šši memāu 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 memiyauanzi=ma* ... would have been correct as well. Therefore the combination *apa-* with *-a/-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 ritually 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 memiyauanzi=ma*

9.4. The particle *-a/-ma* as adversative conjunction and *apa-*

The function of *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* in a temporal sequence are presented in 9.4.2. In 9.4.3. I will discuss the attestations of *apa-* with *-a/-ma* that refer to an Established Topic without contrast with a preceding clause.

9.4.1. The particle *-a/-ma* as adversative coordinator and *apa-*

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

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

§ ¹⁴ *takku* UDU-un UR.BAR.RA-ni *kuiški peššizzi išhaš=šiš* UZU.Ì *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 *-a/-ma* in coordinate clauses is “while”.

9.4.2. The particle *-a/-ma* as adversative sentence connective and *apa-*

Rieken 2000: 417 cites some examples of *-a/-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

kētt=a kētt=a G[(I-an)]^{11’} ḫuttiannāi tarnāi=ma=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 *-a/-ma* functions as a coordinator. This type of *-a/-ma* one can translate with “but (then)”. The adversative function with temporal progression might also explain the use of *-a/-ma* in the following example:

- 9.15 **IBoT 1.36 i 51-52** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991: 10-11.

luštaniija=ma=aš ari nu GIŠŠUKUR⁵² ITTI LÚĪ.DU₈ dāi a-pa-ša=kan kat[t]a paizzi §

..., 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-* + *-a/-ma* and surprising action

Sometimes the particle *-a/-ma* is cliticized to a Subject-Topic that continues the preceding Subject-Topic, so the noun phrase *apa-* with *-a/-ma* indicates the Established Topic. The motivation for the use of *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* both as a marker of digression or as adversative conjunction:

- 9.16 **HKM 6 obv. 4-10** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 128-129

⁴ *kāša=ya* ^{LÚ} KÚR *uit* ⁵ *nu=ya=za* ^{URU} *Haparan* *iniššan* ⁶ *tamašta*
^{URU} *Kašipuran=ma=ya=kan* ⁷ *kēz tamašta a-pa-a-aš-ma*⁴²¹ *=ya=kan* ⁸ *ištarna arḥa*
uit ⁹ *namma=wa<r>=aš* *kuuapi pait* ¹⁰ *nu=ur=aš* *ŪL IDI*

“The enemy just arrived. He besieged the city of Hapara in that manner (as earlier described), but Kasipura he besieged from this side. He (then), surprisingly, (*apas=ma*) came right through. Where he went next, I have no idea.”

The particle *-a/-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 *-a/-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 from *apas=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

uēr=ma ^m *Tetteiš* ⁸ *mEN-urtašš=a* *ITTI* ^d *UTU-ŠI* *kururijahḥir* ⁹ *mAbiraddaš=ma* *IŠTU*
^{ŠA} ^d *UTU-ŠI* *tijāt* ¹⁰ *nu=kan* *mEN-urtan* ^{ŠA} ^d *UTU-ŠI* ^{LÚ} KÚR *KUR-az* ¹¹ *arḥa* *uatkunūt*
a-pa-a-aš-ma *INA* *KUR* ^{URU} *HATTI* ¹² *ITTI* ^d *UTU-ŠI* *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 *-a/-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 (*-a/-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 *-a/-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

⁴²¹ *-ma* is not present in Alp’s transliteration, but drawn in his hand copy.

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

⁷⁶ *mān āppa=ma URUNēša [uḡan(un)]* ⁷⁷ *nu LÚ URUPurušḫanda katti=mmi [(pēḫutenun)]* ⁷⁸ *mān tunnakišna=ma paizzi a-p[(a-a-ša)]* ⁷⁹ *pēra=mmi kunnaz ešari* (end of text)

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

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 *-a/-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 *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* might indicate a Topic shift.

In the next example the situation is different:

- 9.19 **KUB 14.4 ii 8'-11'** (NH plea, Mursili II, CTH 70), ed. De Martino 1998: 25, 33-34.

nu DINGIR.MEŠ Ū L uškattēni nu=šši apiḡa=ḡa ^{9'} *Ū L kuitki memaḫhun apaddan=kan šer aššuli ḫannaūn* ^{10'} *apāš=ma KAḫUḫIA-uš anda ḫamanakta nu ŪL=ḡa kuit* ^{11'} *iḡan ēšta a-pa-a-aš-ma=at=ta=kkan* ⁴²² *parā pešta*

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 *-ma* (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 *-a/-ma* as adversative conjunction. The resulting problem cannot be solved unless we turn again to the suggestion that *apa-* with *-a/-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.

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

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

⁷⁸ [(kinuna=aš=mu=kan š)]ul[(liiat k)]uit n=an[(=mu)] ⁷⁹ [(DINGIR.MEŠ DI-ešnaza)(katterrahhir)] ^{iv 1} [(nu)]=šši GIM-an kē INIM.MEŠ ūatarnahhun ² ehu=ua a-pa-a-aš-ma=kan URUMarašša[(ntijaza arha par(a)šta)] ³ n=aš INA KUR UGU-TI uit

Given the fact that he now started to fight me, the gods let him lose the legal dispute from me. When I ordered him these words: “Come!”, he, surprisingly, (*apas=ma*) fled from Marassantiya and went to the Upper Land.

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):

- 9.21 **KBo 16.47 obv. 1'-3'** (MH/MS treaty, CTH 28), ed. Otten 1967: 56.

URU Uraš=a URUMūd[am]ut[ašišš=a] karū ammel eš[er] ² [mān? m]Hūhazalmaš=a kūrur ēpta a-pé-e-ma=mu=kan ³ [EGIR-an arha na]ir n=at=za apēl kišantat
Now the cities [Ura] (and) Mudamutasi were *mine* in the past. But [when] Huhazalma became hostile, they (*ape=ma*) [defect]ed [from] me. They 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

§ ⁵⁶ [našma dUTU-šI k]uedanikki kuinki ⁵⁷ [memian ayan katt]a memahhi n=an=za=an=kan piran ⁵⁸ [uatarn?]ahmi lē=uar=an=za=an kuedanikki ⁵⁹ [parā] mematti n=an=za=an kuitman apēl ⁶⁰ [UD-za?] arha pēdai a-pa-a-aš-ma=an=za=an ⁶¹ [par]ā memāi n=at=šij=at ⁶² [GAM] NEŠ DINGIR-LIM kittaru §
[Or (if)]I, [My Majesty,] confide some [affair] to [s]omeone, and I [order] him beforehand: “Do *not* [rev]eal it to anyone!” until his [death (lit. [day])] carries him away, but he (*apas=ma*) [re]veals it, let it be put under the Oaths of the Gods for him.

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.

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 hatrāir ‘But they, surprisingly, [wrote] back as foll[ows:] (“...we will not return them to you”).

9.23 **KBo 6.28 rev. 25-27** (NH edict, Hattusili III, CTH 88), ed. Götze 1930: 54

ANA NARARI LÚKÚR=ma=at i[iant]aru ²⁶ mān LÚ.MEŠ NA«RA»RI aša[n]dulanzi a-
pu-u-uš=ma[arh]a tarnandu INA KARAŠ[=ma=šma]š ²⁷ ūedumaš KIN lē ēšzi
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 th]em 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 *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* was whether its occurrence could be explained on the basis of the three uses of *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* fell within these three groups, a large number could not be explained.

The use of *apa-* with *-a/-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 *-a/-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 *-a/-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 is 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 *-a/-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 *-a/-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 *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* as an adversative conjunction. Thus, the particle *-a/-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 *-a/-ma* is the *Unestablished Topic*.

9.5.2. The pronoun *apa-* with *-a/-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., 2.3.3.3.2. and 3.3.2.).

So, how should one proceed if one encounters *apa-* with *-a/-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 *-a/-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 *-a/-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 *-a/-ma*.

9.5.3. Difficult and ambiguous cases

There were several attestations of *apa-* with *-a/-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 URU *Ne[šaš=a ANA LÚ URUŠalatiwara⁴²⁴ E(GIR-pan arḫa pait)]* ⁶⁹ nu
 URUDIDL *ŠU[(lukkit apūšš=a an)da[?] o-o-o-o-o-o-o]* ⁷⁰ URU *rija[š*
h(ulaleššar=šet I LIM IV ME ÉRIN.MEŠ)] ⁷¹ nu XL *šI[MTI (ANŠE.KUR.RA.ḪI.A*
KU)BABBAR? GUŠKIN? ...] ⁷² *a-pa-ša⁴²⁵ [(ḫuittitti š=aš iḫanneš)]* §
 But Ne[ša] passed behind [the man of Salatiwara] and set his cities on fire. Them *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+ i 26-31** (NH edict, Mursili II, CTH 63), ed. Klengel 1963: 34
 § ²⁶ *mān ŪL=ma kuitman=za URU Iyaruwaddan URU-an* ²⁷ dUTU-ŠI *nāui tar(a)ḫmi*
nu DUMU mTette ²⁸ *našma ŠEŠ mTette piran uḫnuuḫanzi* ²⁹ nu mTetteḫ *ku[(enz)]i*
našma=an ēpzi ³⁰ *n=an=mu parā p[āi] a-pa-a-aš-ma memai* ARAD dUTU-
 ŠI *=ua=az* ³¹ *kā=pat pēdi [(ēšmi)] nu=šši=ššan* dUTU-ŠI ³² [URU *Iaruu(attan URU)]-*
an arḫa ŪL dahḫi
 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.

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 *-ja* after a consonant are not very reliable, because the original Old Hittite or Middle Hittite original might have had *-a*.

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-*.

The following example is contextually clear, but the reason for the use of *-a/-ma* escapes me. Is it somehow surprising that the guard of the outside passes behind the defendant?

9.27 **IBoT 1.36 iii 16-22** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991: 24-25

arahzi=ja=az kuiš LÚ.MEŠEDI ḫarzi 17 māḫḫan=ma šarkantin tamain uyatezzi § 18 nu ANA GAL MEŠEDI kuiēš 2 BELUTI EGIR-an aranta n=at šarkanti 19 andurza tapuša iḫanta arahza=ma=az kuiš LÚ.MEŠEDI ḫarzi 20 n=ašta māḫḫan šarkantin ANA LÚ.MEŠ.MEŠEDUTIM ḫandānzi 21 a-pa-ša=kan šarkantin EGIR-an arḫa paizzi 22 n=aš šarkanti arahza ZAG-az iḫannai

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=z*?

9.28 **IBoT 1.36 ii 29-31** (MH/MS instruction, CTH 262), ed. Güterbock & Van den Hout 1991:16-17

29 nu=šši=kan māḫ[ḫa]n LÚ.MEŠ.MEŠEDI DUMU.MEŠ.É.GAL=ja ḫandāntari 30 nu GIŠGU.ZA ANA L[Ú.GU].ZA parā pāi a-pa-ša-az GIŠŠUKUR 31 dāi

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 context⁴²⁶:

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

kāša mMišaš yašta[škit nu=kan? ŠAPAL NIŠ DINGIR.MEŠ] 3 kue uddār tiā[n] ēšta a-pa-a-aš-at=kan ḫūmanta šarraš

⁴²⁶ See also KUB 14.1 rev. 49 (MH/MS indictment, CTH 147).

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

The particle *-a/-ma* is very often attested with the nominative of *apa-*. Only rarely does it occur with another case⁴²⁷. One of the few examples of non-subject *apa-* with *-ma* is the following excerpt from an text discussing the defeat of Urhi-Tessub:

9.30 **KBo 6.29 ii 31-35** (NH edict, Hattusili III, CTH 85), ed. Götze 1925: 50-51

³¹ *nu=šši kattan EGIR-pa kuedani meḥuni* ³² *arḥun BÀD-eššar ŠA GIŠŠI 40*
gipeššar ³³ *katta uit a-pu-u-un=ma* ^d*IŠTAR URUŠamuḥa GAŠAN=YA* ³⁴ *KU₆-un*
GIM-an ṽ ḥūpalaza EGIR-pa ištapta ³⁵ *n=an iṣḥiṣat n=an=mu parā pešta*

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.

⁴²⁷ See also KUB 14.1 obv. 48 (MH/MS indictment, CTH 147), KBo 5.9 iii 24 (NH treaty, CTH 62).

10. Summary

In this book I have tried to describe the Hittite demonstrative system and the use of the accented third person pronoun. Starting with the latter, it could be observed that accented *apā-* was not very often used in contexts with referential ambiguity. On the contrary, many times we saw *apā-* appear when it seemed unnecessary. The usual procedure in the past was in such a case to translate *apā-* by means of an accented pronoun in one's own language and assume some pre-theoretical notion of contrast without being able to define what contrast was meant.

Contrast is often connected with counter-presuppositionality. In other words, something happens which does not match with the knowledge the Addressee has gathered from the preceding discourse. For example, this mis-match might have to do with behavior that is not expected given the usual rules of conduct in society, or it might simply be that the Addressee holds some wrong information which needs to be corrected.

The first type, surprising behaviour in connection with *apā-* with *-a/-ma* was the outcome of Chapter 9 (Surprising *apā-*). Rieken 2000 explained that the particle *-a/-ma* marked some kind of re-orientation. The point of departure for the study of *apā-* with *-a/-ma* was whether its occurrence could be explained on the basis of the three uses of *-a/-ma* as established by Rieken 2000 ((1) marking a new Topic, Setting or Digression, (2) marking a clause as a new orientation, (3) marking some kind of contrast with the preceding clause). Although some attestations of *apā-* with *-a/-ma* fell within these three groups, a large number could not be explained.

In almost all remaining cases the State of Affairs expressed in the clauses with *apā-* + *-a/-ma* was unexpected in view of the usual State of Affairs given cultural or general presuppositions. To recall the case of the representative of the king who kept the taxes which he collected for the Hittite state: one would never expect a representative of the state to steal from his king. Thus, the particle *-a/-ma* with *apā-* did not simply mark the Subject-Topic in isolation as being somehow unexpected, it marked the *relation* between the Subject-Topic and State of Affairs expressed through the clause as not established. The combination *apā-* with *-a/-ma* indicated the *Unestablished Topic*, covering both Topic shift and surprising action.

The occurrence of *apā-* on certain points in the discourse where some information held by the Addressee needed to be rejected or corrected, was the subject of Chapter 8 (Limiting *apā-*) and partially of Chapter 7 (Expanding *apā-*). The referent of *apā-* was almost always the Sentence Topic of the preceding clause and expected to function as Topic in its own clause. Here *apā-* did not mark the pragmatic relation Topic but the pragmatic relation Focus, especially Replacing or Restricting Focus. The point of departure for the study of *apā-* and Focus was the particle *-pat*. The particle *-pat* is contra-expectational, and indicated more often Replacing Focus than Restricting Focus in the texts studied in this book. For *apā-* with *-pat* in Replacing Focus I suggested the translation 'instead', for *apā-* with *-pat* in Restricting Focus 'only'. But Focal *apā-* could also appear without *-pat*. I concluded that in that case the type of Focus was mostly Replacing. The two types of Focal *apā-* both occurred in preverbal position.

The difference between preverbal *apā-* and preverbal *apā-* with *-pat* was probably that *-pat* was needed to strengthen the Focal force of preverbal *apā-* in contexts where it was

harder to infer that something had to be countered or corrected. A stronger signal of Focus was needed in more ambiguous contexts.

The other Focal particle in Hittite is *-ia* “also”. This was the subject of Chapter 7 (Expanding *apa-*). However, I did not only discuss Focal *-ia* “also”, but also the coordinators *-ia* “and” and *-a/-ma* “while”. It was possible to correlate the Expanding Focus expression *apā-* + *-ia* “he/she/that too” with First Position in the clause, while *-ia* as the coordinator “and” cliticized to *apā-* turned out to be restricted to Initial position.

However, *apā-* without any clitics 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 *apā-* 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 *apā-*). I concluded that this highly unexpected *apā-* or noun signalled the Addressee to be prepared for a following coordinated clause where two propositions were juxtaposed.

Table 10.1 summarizes the results of Topic and Focus and the correlations between position in the clause:

| Type of Topic or Focus | Position in the clause | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|----|---|---|
| Limiting Focus | Preverbal | ## | <i>apa-</i> + <i>(-pat)</i> | V |
| Expanding Focus | First | ## | <i>nu/NP</i> <i>apa-</i> + <i>-ia</i> | V |
| Unestablished Topic | Initial | ## | <i>apa-</i> + <i>-a/-ma</i> | V |
| Established Topic in Coordination | First/Initial | ## | <i>(nu)</i> <i>apa-</i> | V |
| | | ## | <i>(nu)</i> NP | V |
| | | | <i>apa-</i> + <i>-ia/-ma</i> ... | V |

Table 10.1: relation between type of Pragmatic function and position in the clause.

Most attestations of accented adjective or substantive *apā-* in my corpus were covered by these three chapters.

All types of Topic or Focus were attested in each language phase. From the earliest times of Hittite scribal tradition until the end the pronoun *apā-* was firmly established as the accented pronoun marking the Unestablished Topic and Focus.

Phrasing the results of Part III in one clause:

10.1 *The Topic-Focus structure of the Hittite clause finds its expression in the word order of the clause.*

In Part II I discussed the demonstratives *kā-*, *apā* and *aši*. I concluded that Hittite had a person-based demonstrative system with three deictic contrasts: a first person demonstrative *kā-* (“Ich-Deixis”), a second person demonstrative *apā-* (“Du-Deixis”) and a third person demonstrative *aši* (“Jener-Deixis”). The orientation on person means that not distance to the Deictic center (usually the Speaker) is important but location in the area of the speech participants, i.e., the Speaker, Addressee or Other. Besides that, the demonstratives could also be used metaphorically to indicate that something belonged to the cognitive domain of one of the speech participants. For example, *aši* could have a negative emotional connotation or it could mean that something was not the responsibility of the Speaker (anymore).

Another result was that there was a difference between reference to objects in the surroundings that were already in the center of attention of reference to objects that were not. In the first situation substantive *kā-*, *apā-* or *aši* were used, in the latter case *kā- N*, *apā- N* or *aši N*.

But demonstratives are not only used to refer to the Situation, they can also be Recognitional, Discourse Deictic or Tracking/Anaphoric. These concepts were explained in part I and applied in part II.

The organization of the Hittite deictic demonstrative system around Speaker, Addressee and Other was also found with recognitional demonstratives. The proximal *ka-*, medial *apa-* and distal *asi* were all allowed to mark referents as ‘Hearer Old - Discourse New’.

The same could be observed for the Tracking demonstratives. These demonstratives occurred both in salient and non-salient contexts. Non-salient contexts were those where there was a clear marker present that a discourse unit was closed. In order to refer again to something in a closed unit, or even across one, demonstrative descriptions were used. Again the choice for a demonstrative depended on assignment to the cognitive space of Speaker (*ka-*), Addressee (*apa-*) or Other (*asi*). A ‘side effect’ of the study of the Tracking demonstratives is that there are clear correlations between text genre and demonstratives. For example, medial *apa-* was not quite unexpectedly found in texts with active Addressees, such as letters.

Discourse Deictic demonstratives followed more or less the same pattern as the others, although the assignment to cognitive domains was not as clear as with the Recognitional and Tracking use of demonstratives.

Thus:

10.2 *The demonstrative system of Hittite is person-based and consists at least of three terms: proximal or 1st person ka-, medial or 2nd person apa-, distal or 3rd person aši. The person orientation of the demonstratives is not limited to deixis but is kept in the other demonstrative uses.*

10.3 *Text genres influence the choice of referential expressions, especially demonstratives.*

In Part I I set up a matrix which combined several parameters which are usually treated separately in the literature on reference: the parameter of *Zeigfeld* (basically world versus text), of pragmatic relation (Topic and Focus) and of saliency (working memory versus long term memory, corresponding with the continuity procedure and the centering procedure respectively). Another factor which is important when dealing with texts is the notion of discourse unit. If the current discourse unit is held in working memory and closed units are

stored in episodic or long term memory, then the notions salient and non-salient should be replaced by the notions in node or across node.

Entering the Hittite referential expressions treated in this book in the matrix resulted in the following table (*dem* stands for demonstrative, *apa-* for the accented pronoun):

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | <i>cognitive parameter</i> | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| | continuity procedure | | | centering procedure | |
| | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| Deictic | <i>dem</i> | <i>dem</i> | <i>dem</i> | — | <i>dem N</i> <i>dem. adverb</i> |
| Recognitional | — | — | — | — | <i>dem N</i> |
| Anaphora in-node across-node | (-a-) <i>dem N</i> | <i>ápa-</i> <i>dem N</i> | <i>ápa-</i> (N) (<i>dem?</i>) | — <i>dem N</i> | <i>dem N</i> |
| Discourse Deictic in-node | (-a-) | ∅ | <i>apa-</i> (N) <i>apenissan</i> | — | — |
| across-node | — | — | — | <i>dem N</i> | <i>dem (N)</i> <i>dem. adv.</i> |

Table 10.2 The referential matrix

I concluded that in node reference was the domain of ∅, -a- and accented *apa-* (also *apa- N* for discourse deictic expressions). The difference between ∅, -a- and *apa-* was that ∅ and -a- only denoted Established Topics, whereas *apa-* denoted all type of Argument Focus and Unestablished Topic. Tracking or anaphoric demonstratives in salient context on the other hand signalled that a new discourse unit had started. Thus, tracking demonstratives were clearly connected with new discourse units, independent of level of saliency.

But if indeed saliency and discourse unit are related parameters, then the matrix could come to look like this:

| <i>geographical parameter</i> | <i>discourse parameter</i> | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| | reference inside discourse unit | | reference across discourse unit (including first mention) |
| | E-Top | Other | |
| Deictic | <i>dem</i> | <i>dem</i> | <i>dem N, dem. adverb</i> |
| Recognitional | — | — | <i>dem N</i> |
| Anaphora | (-a-) | <i>apa-</i> (N) | <i>dem N</i> |
| Discourse Deictic | (-a-) | <i>apa-</i> (N) <i>apenissan</i> | <i>dem (N), dem adverb</i> |

Table 10.3: Reshuffled matrix

Returning to the demonstratives, I concluded that the three term person based oriented demonstrative system existed already in Old Hittite. There was however not much material in Old Hittite, especially for *apā-* and *aši*. As far as *aši* is concerned however, besides the fact that *edi* meant “on yonder side”, the other contexts where Old Hittite *aši* was used could be subsumed under the metaphorical use of *aši* as third person or distal demonstrative, i.e., with a negative emotional or generally disassociating nuance.

In the introduction I mentioned that some scholars assumed that *apā-* acquired the status of accented pronoun after the decline of the accented anaphoric pronoun *aši*. The development was sketched as follows: the anaphoric (backward referring) function of *aši* was taken over by *apa-* and the cataphoric (forward referring) function by *kā-*. The development of the pronominal and demonstrative system could be tabulated as follows:

| | deictic demonstratives | | accented pronouns | |
|---------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| | proximal | distal | anaphoric | cataphoric |
| proto-Hittite | <i>kā-</i> | <i>apā-</i> | <i>aši</i> | <i>aši</i> |
| Hittite | <i>kā-</i> | <i>apā-</i> | <i>apā-</i> (<i>aši</i>) | <i>kā-</i> (<i>aši</i>) |

Table 10.4: The system of demonstratives and accented pronouns in proto-Hittite and attested Hittite according to current views.

I conclude that there was no such development in attested Hittite. Instead, the system functioned from Old Hittite on, and probably also earlier, as follows:

| | deictic demonstratives | | | accented pronoun |
|---------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| | 1 st person | 2 nd person | 3 rd person | |
| Hittite | <i>kā-</i> | <i>apā-</i> | <i>aši</i> | <i>apā-</i> |

Table 10.5: The system of demonstratives and accented pronouns in attested Hittite according to the author's views.

References

Linguistic references

- Anderson, S.R. and Keenan, E.L.
1985 'Deixis'. In Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*.3, 259-308.
- Apothéloz, D.
1995 *Rôle et fonctionnement de l'anaphore dans la dynamique textuelle*. Genève-Paris: Librairie Droz.
- Ariel, Mira
1988 'Referring and accessibility'. *Journal of Linguistics* 24, 65-87.
1990 *Accessing Noun-Phrase antecedents*. London & New York: Routledge.
1996 'Referring expressions and the +/- Coreference Distinction'. In Fretheim & Gundel (eds.), 13-35.
- Bolkestein, A.M. and M. van de Grift
1994 'Participant tracking in Latin discourse'. In József Herman (ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Latin*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 283-302
- Bolkestein, A.M.
1998 'What to do with Topic and Focus? Evaluating pragmatic information'. In: M. Hannay & A.M. Bolkestein (eds.), *Functional Grammar and Verbal Interaction*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 193-214
2000 'Discourse organization and anaphora in Latin'. In: S.C. Herring, P.T. van Reenen, and L. Schøsler (eds.), *Textual parameters in older languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 107-137.
- Bosch, P.
1983 *Agreement and Anaphora. A Study of the Role of Pronouns in Syntax and Discourse*. London: Academic Press.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule
1983 *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bühler, Karl
1934 *Sprachtheorie: die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Jena: Gustav Fisher
- Chafe, Wallace L.
1980 *The pear stories: cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. Norwood, N.J: Ablex Pub. Corp.
- Cornish, Francis
1999 *Anaphora, Discourse, and Understanding*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Coulmas, Florian
1986 (ed.) *Direct and Indirect Speech*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Cumming, Susanna & Tsuyoshi Ono

- 1997 'Discourse and Grammar'. In: Dijk, Teun A. van (ed.), *Discourse as Structure and Process*, 112-137.
- David, Jean and Georges Kleiber
1986 (eds.) *Déterminants: syntaxe et sémantique*. Paris: Klincksieck
- De Mulder, Walter
1996 'Demonstratives as Locating Expressions.' In: Pütz and Dirven (eds.), 29-48.
- Diessel, Holger
1999 *Demonstratives. Form, Function, and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Dik, S.C.
1968 *Coordination. Its implications for the theory of general linguistics*. North-Holland Publishing Company: Amsterdam.
- Dik, S. & K. Hengeveld
1997a *The Theory of Functional Grammar, Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Second, revised edition. (Functional Grammar Series 20). Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
1997b *The Theory of Functional Grammar, Part II: Complex and Derived Constructions*. (Functional Grammar Series 20). Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dijk, Teun A. van
1982 'Episodes as units of discourse'. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press., 177-195.
1997 (ed.) *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Sage Publications: London.
- Dijk, Teun A. van and Walter Kintsch
1983 *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ehlich, Konrad
1979 *Verwendungen der Deixis beim Sprachlichen Handeln*. 2 vols. Bern: Lang.
1982 'Anaphora and Deixis: Same, Similar, or Different?'. In: R.J. Jarvella and W. Klein, *Speech, Place and Action*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 315-338.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi
1997 *The dynamics of focus structure* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 84). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eijk, Jan van
1985 The Lillooet language [Ph.D. dissertation, University of Amsterdam].
- Fretheim, Thorstein & Jeanette K. Gundel (eds.)
1996 *Reference and Referent Accessibility*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Fillmore, Ch.J.
1982 'Towards a Descriptive Framework for Spatial Deixis'. In: R.J. Jarvella and W. Klein, *Speech, Place and Action*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 31-59.
1997 *Lectures on Deixis*. (CLSI Lecture Notes 65). Stanford: CLSI Publications.
- Fox, Barbara A.
1987 *Discourse structure and anaphora. Written and conversational English*. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 48). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1996 (ed.) *Studies in Anaphora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Giora, Rachel & Cher-Leng Lee
1996 'Written Discourse Segmentation: The Function of Unstressed Pronouns in Mandarin Chinese'. In: Fretheim & Gundel (eds.), 113-140.

- Givón, T.
 1983 *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-Language Study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
 2001 *Syntax. An Introduction*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., Hedberg, Nancy & Zacharski, Ron
 1993 'Cognitive Status and the Form of Referring Expressions in Discourse'. *Language* 69, 274-307.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P.
 1996 'Demonstratives in Narrative Discourse: A Taxonomy of Universal Uses'. In: B.A. Fox (ed.) *Studies in Anaphora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 205-254.
 1997 *Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase. Zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Hoek, Karen van
 1997 *Anaphora and conceptual structure*. Chicago and London: The Chicago University Press.
- Jarvella, R.J. and W. Klein
 1982 *Speech, Place and Action*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Kleiber, Georges
 1983 'Les démonstratifs démontrent-ils? Sur le sens des adjectifs et pronoms démonstratifs'. *Le français moderne* 51/2, 99-117.
 1986 'Adjectif démonstratif et article défini en anaphore fidèle'. In: David, Jean and Georges Kleiber (eds.). *Déterminants: syntaxe et sémantique*. Paris: Klincksieck, 169-185.
- Kroon, Caroline
 1995 *Discourse particles in Latin* (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 4). Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Kuno, S.
 1973 *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. The MIT Press: Cambridge MA.
- Lakoff, Robin
 1974 'Remarks on *This* and *That*'. In: M.W. Lagaly, Robert A. Fox and Anthony Bruick (eds.), *Papers from the Tenth Regional Meeting*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 345-356.
- Lambrecht, Knud
 1994 *Information structure and sentence form. Topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W.
 1987 *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume I. Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
 1991 *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Volume II. Descriptive Application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Levinson, S.C.
 1983 *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek
 1988 'The Pragmatic Nature of Nominal Anaphora in To'aba'ita.' *Studies in Language* 12, 299-344.
 1996 'Patterns of Anaphora in To'aba'ita Narrative Discourse'. In: B.A. Fox (ed.), *Studies in Anaphora* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 379-411.
- Linde, Charlotte

- 1979 'Focus of Attention and the Choice of Pronouns in Discourse'. In: *Syntax and Semantics* 12, 337-354.
- Lucy, John
1993 *Reflexive language : reported speech and metapragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, Ch.
1999 *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J.
1977 *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1979 'Deixis and Anaphora'. In: T. Myers (ed.) *The Development of Conversation and Discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 88-103.
- Maes, Alfons A. and Leo G.M. Noordman
1995 'Demonstrative nomina anaphors: a case of nonidentificational markedness'. *Linguistics* 33, 255-282.
- Moutaouakil, A.
1989 *Pragmatic Functions in a Functional Grammar of Arabic*, Foris Publications: Dordrecht.
- Pütz, M. & Dirven, R.
1996 *The Construal of Space in Language and Thought*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rong Chen
1990 'English Demonstratives: A Case of Semantic Expansion'. *Language Sciences* 12 (2/3), 139-153.
- Rauh, Gisela
1983 'Aspects of Deixis'. In: Gisela Rauh (ed.), *Essays on Deixis*, Tübingen: Narr, 9-60.
- Shopen, T.
1985 (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidner, Candace L.
1983 'Focusing in the Comprehension of Definite Anaphora'. In: Michael Brady and Robert C. Berwick, *Computational Models of Discourse*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 267-330.
- Terken, J.M.B.
1984 'The distribution of pitch accents in instructions as a function of discourse structure'. *Language and Speech* 27 (3), 269-290.
- Van Valin, Jr., Robert D. & Randy J. LaPolla
1997 *Syntax. Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vonk, Wietske
2001 'Zin in tekst. Psycholinguïstisch onderzoek naar het begrijpen van tekst'. *Gramma/TTT, tijdschrift voor taalwetenschap* 8/3, 267-285.
- Yan Huang
2000 *Anaphora. A Cross-Linguistic Study*. (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hittitological references

- Alp, Sedat
 1947 'Hitit kralı IV. (?) Tuthaliya'nın askerî - fermânı'. *Belleten* 11, 383-414.
 1991 *Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük*. Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi: Ankara.
- Archi, A.
 1979a 'Auguri per il labarna'. In: Carruba, O. (ed.), 27-51.
 1979b 'L'Humanité des Hittites', in: *Florilegium Anatolicum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*. Éditions E. de Boccard: Paris, 37-48.
- Bader, F.
 1981 'Anaphoriques du type nin en hittite'. In: Yoël L. Arbeitman, Allan R. Bomhard (eds.), *Bono homini donum. Essays in historical linguistics in memory of J.A. Kerns* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 16,1), 31-45.
 2000 'On pronouns'. In: Y. Arbeitman (ed.) *The Asia Minor Connection: studies on the Pre-Greek languages in memory of Charles Carter*. Leuven [etc.]: Peeters, 19-33.
- Beal, Richard. H.
 1988 'The ^{GIŠ}TUKUL-institution in Second Millennium Hatti.' *AoF* 15(2), 269-305.
 1992 *The organisation of the Hittite military*. (Texte der Hethiter 20). Winter: Heidelberg.
- Beckman, Gary
 1983 *Hittite birth rituals*. StBoT 29, Wiesbaden.
 1996 *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series 7). Scholars Press: Atlanta, Georgia.
 1997 'Prayers'. In: W. Hallo & K. Lawson Younger, *The Context of Scripture*, Vol. I, 156-160.
- Beekes, R.
 1980 Review of E. Neu and W. Meid (eds.) *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*. In: *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 37 (3/4), 205-210.
- Benveniste, Emile
 1953 'La flexion pronominale en hittite'. *Language* 29, 255-262.
- Boley, Jacqueline
 1989 *The Sentence Particles and the Place Words in Old and Middle Hittite*, Innsbruck.
- Bryce, Trevor
 1998 *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Carruba, Onofrio
 1969 'Die Chronologie der heth. Texte und die heth. Geschichte der Grossreichszeit'. *ZDMG Suppl.* 1, 226-249.
 1977 'Beiträge zur Mittelhethitischen Geschichte I. Die Tuthalijas y=und die Arnuwandas'. *SMEA* 18, 137-174.
 1979 (ed.). *Studia Mediterranea Piero meriggi dicata II*. Pavia
- Cohen, Y.
 2002 *Taboos and Prohibitions in Hittite Society. A Study of the Hittite Expression natta āra ('not permitted')*. Texte der Hethiter 24. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Dardano, P.
 1997 *L'aneddoto e il racconto in età antico-hittita: la cosiddetta "cronaca di palazzo"*. (Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche 43). "Il Calamo": Roma.
- De Martino, S.

- 1995 'Die Unternehmungen des Muršili I. im südöstlichen Anatolien nach KUB XXXI 64+ (CTH 12)'. *AoF* 22, 282-296.
- 1998 'Le accuse di Muršili II alla regina Tawananna secondo il testo KUB XIV 4.' *Eothen* 9, 19-48.
- Del Monte, G.F. and J. Tischler
- 1978 *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte*. (Repertoire géographique des textes cuneiformes 6). Reichert: Wiesbaden.
- Edel, E.
- 1994 *Die ägyptisch-hethitische Korrespondenz aus Boghazköy in babylonischer und hethitischer Sprache*. (Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 77). Opladen.
- Forrer, E.
- 1922 'Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Hatti-Reiches'. *ZDMG* NF 1 (Bd. 26).
- Friedrich, Johannes
- 1925 'Zwei neue hethitische pronominalformen'. *ZA* 36, NF 2, 286-289.
- 1926 *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, 1. teil. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung 1926.
- 1960 *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*, 1. Teil, Kurzgefaßte Grammatik. Dritte, unveränderte Auflage. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- 1971² *Die hethitischen Gesetze. Transskription, Übersetzung, sprachliche Erläuterungen und vollständiges Wörterverzeichnis*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- 1991 *Kurzgefaßtes Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Unveränderter Nachdruck der Ausgabe 1952-1966. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Friedrich, J., A. Kammenhuber
- 1975ff. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Garrett, Andrew. J.
- 1990 *The syntax of Anatolian pronominal clitics*. Dissertation.
- Giorgieri, Mauro
- 1992 'Un rituale di scongiuro antico ittita per Labarna-Ḫattušili'. *SMEA* 29, 46-98.
- Goedegebuure, Petra
- 1999 *The Use and Non-use of the Enclitic Subject Pronoun in Old Hittite*, paper presented at the IVth International Congress of Hittitology, Würzburg, October 1999.
- 2002 'KBo 17.17+. Remarks on an Old Hittite Royal Substitution Ritual'. *JANER* 2, 61-75.
- Götze, A.
- 1925 *Hattusilis: der Bericht ueber seine Thronbesteigung nebst den Paralleltexen*. (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft ; Jg. 29 (1924), 3). Leipzig : Hinrichs
- 1928 *Madduwattaš*. (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft; Jg. 32 (1927), 1). Leipzig : Hinrichs
- 1933 *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft (1967²).
- Goetze, A.
- 1940 *Kizzuwatna and the problem of Hittite geography*. (Yale oriental series; researches; 22) Yale University Press: New Haven
- Grélois, J.-P.
- 1988 'Les Annales Decennales de Mursili II (CTH 61.1)', *Hethitica* 9, 17-145.
- Güterbock, H.G.

- 1951 'The Song of Ullikummi. Revised Text of Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth'. *JCS* 5, 136-161.
- 1952 'The Song of Ullikummi. Revised Text of Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth'. *JCS* 6, 8-42.
- 1956 'The deeds of Suppiluliuma as told by his son, Mursili II'. *JCS* 10, 41-98, 107-130.
- 1987 'Hittite Liver Models'. In: F. Rochberg-Halton (eds.), *Language, Literature, and History (Fs. E. Reiner)*. New Haven, 147-153.
- Güterbock, Hans G. & Miguel Civil
- 1985 *The series Erim-ḫuš in Boghazköy*. In: *MSL* 17.
- Güterbock, H.G. & Th. P.J. van den Hout
- 1991 *The Hittite instruction for the royal bodyguard*. (Assyriological studies ; no. 24). Chicago, Ill. : The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Güterbock, H.G., H.A. Hoffner, Th. P.J. van den Hout
- 1980f. (eds.) *The Hittite dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*.
- Haas, Volkert
- 1970 *Der Kult von Nerik. Ein Beitrag zur hethitischen Religionsgeschichte* (StPohl 4).
- 1971 'Ein hethitisches Beschwörungsmotiv aus Kizzuwatna'. *OrNS* 40, 410-430.
- Hagenbuchner, A.
- 1989 *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter*. (THeth 15 & 16).
- Hallo, William W. and K. Lawson Younger, Jr.
- 1997 (eds.) *The Context of Scripture. Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*. Vols. I, II and III. Brill: Leiden [etc.].
- Hoffmann, Inge
- 1984 *Der Erlaß Telipinus*. (THeth 11).
- Hoffner Jr., Harry. A.
- 1968 Review of Onofrio Carruba, *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišuriyanza* (StBoT 2). In: *JAOS* 88, 531-534.
- 1980 'Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: the Hittites'. *Orientalia* 49, 283-332.
- 1983 'A Prayer of Muršili II about his Stepmother', *JAOS* 103, 187-192.
- 1995 "About Questions". In: Theo P.J. van den Hout and Johan de Roos (eds.), *Studio Historiae ardens. ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwing ten Cate on the occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Istanbul: NINO, p. 87-104.
- 1997a *The laws of the Hittites : a critical edition*. (Documenta et monumenta orientis antiqui, vol. 23). Brill: Leiden [etc.]
- 1997b 'Proclamation of Anitta of Kuššar'. In Hallo & Lawson Younger (eds.), *Context of Scripture*, 182-184.
- Hout, Th.P.J. van den
- 1989 *Studien zum Spätjunghethitischen: Texte der Zeit Tudhaliyas IV. KBo IV 10+ (CTH 106)*. Amsterdam.
- 1994 'Der Falke und das Kücken : der neue Pharao und der hethitische Prinz?' *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 84, 60-88
- 1995 *Der Ulmitesub-Vertrag: eine prosopographische Untersuchung*, StBoT 38, Wiesbaden

- 1998 *The purity of kingship: an edition of CTH 569 and related Hittite oracle inquiries of Tuthaliya IV.* (Documenta et monumenta Orientis antiqui, vol. 25) Leiden [etc.] : Brill
- Houwink ten Cate, Philo H.J.
- 1966 'The ending -d of the hittite possessive pronoun', *RHA* 24/79, 123-132.
- 1967 'Mursili's North Western Campaigns - a Commentary'. *Anatolica* 1, 44-61.
- 1979 'Mursili's North Western Campaigns = Additional Fragments of his Comprehensive Annals Concerning the Nerik Foundation'. *Fs Laroche*, 157-167.
- Houwink ten Cate, Philo H.J. & Folke Josephson
- 1967 'Muwatallis' Prayer to the Storm-God of Kummanni (KBo XI 1)'. *RHA* 25/81, 101-140.
- Hrozný, F.
- 1917 *Die Sprache der Hethiter*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Imparati, F.
- 1974 *Una concessione di terre da parte di Tudhaliya IV*, *RHA* 32 (whole issue).
- Ivanov, V.
- 1979 'Syntactical Archaisms of Old Hittite', in: Neu, E. - Meid, W. (eds.), *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, Innsbruck, 73-78.
- Jeffers, Robert J.
- 1977 'Hittite conjunctions', *KZ* 90, 152-165.
- 1987 'On Methodology in Syntactic Reconstruction: Reconstructing Inter-clause Syntax in Prehistoric Indo-European'. In: P. Ramat, O. Carruba (ed.) *Papers from the 7th ICHL*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kammenhuber, A.
- 1961 *Hippologia hethitica*. Wiesbaden.
- 1962 Review of Johannes Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. In: *Orientalia NS* 31, 371-380.
- 1969 'Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch, und Hieroglyphenluwisch'. In: *Handbuch der Orientalistik* I.2.1./2.2, 119-357, 428-546.
- Klengel, Horst
- 1963 'Der Schiedsspruch des Muršili II. hinsichtlich Barga und seine Übereinkunft mit Duppi-Tešub von Amurru (KBo III 3)'. *Orientalia* 32, 32-55.
- Košak, Silvín
- 1990 'Night and Day, In War and in Peace'. *JAC* 5, 77-86.
- 1995 *Konkordanz der Keilschrifttafeln II. Die Texte der Grabung 1932*. StBoT 39.
- Kronasser, H.
- 1956 *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen*, Heidelberg.
- Kühne, C. & H. Otten
- 1971 *Der Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag*. StBoT 16, Wiesbaden.
- Kümmel, H.-M.
- 1967 *Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König*. StBoT 3, Wiesbaden.
- Laroche, E.
- 1965a 'Études de linguistique anatolienne'. *RHA* 23/76, 33-54.
- 1965b *Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription. Première partie Mythologie anatolienne*. *RHA* 24/77.
- 1968 *Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription. Deuxième partie. Mythologie d'origine étrangère*. *RHA* 26/82.

- 1971 *Catalogue des textes hittites*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- 1979 'Anaphore et deixis en anatolien'. In E. Neu & W. Meid (eds.), *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch* (IBS 25), Innsbruck, 147-152.
- Lebrun, René
- 1980 *Hymnes et prières hittites* (Homo Religiosus 4). Louvain-la-neuve.
- 1985 'L'Aphasie de Mursili II = CTH 486'. *Hethitica* 6, 103-137.
- Luraghi, S.
- 1990 *Old Hittite Sentence Structure*, Routledge: London - New York.
- Melchert, H.C.
- 1977 *Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite* (diss., Harvard University). Cambridge, Mass.
- 1984 'Notes on Palaic'. *HS* 97, 22-43.
- 1994 *Anatolian Historical Phonology* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 3). Amsterdam, Atlanta.
- Moyer, J.
- 1969 *The concept of ritual purity among the Hittites*. (diss., Brandeis University). Waltham, Mass.
- Neu, E.
- 1970 *Ein althethitisches Gewitterritual*, StBoT 12, Wiesbaden.
- 1974 *Der Anitta-text*, StBoT 18, Wiesbaden.
- 1979 'Einige Überlegungen zu den hethit. Kasusendungen'. In Neu & Meid (eds.) *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, 177-196.
- 1980a *Althethitische Rituale in Umschrift*, StBoT 25, Wiesbaden.
- 1980b *Studien zum endungslosen "Lokativ" des Hethitischen* (IBS-VKS 23). Innsbruck.
- 1983 *Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten*. StBoT 26, Wiesbaden.
- 1984 review of *Florilegium Anatolicum*, in: *AfO* 31, p. 97-100
- 1996 *Das Hurritische Epos der Freilassung I: Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Hattuša*, StBoT 32, Wiesbaden.
- 1997 'Zu einigen Pronominalformen des Hethitischen'. In: *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel. Part One: Ancient Languages and Philology*. Edited by Dorothy Disterheft, Martin Huld and John Greppin. (Washington DC, Institute for the Study of Man), 139-169.
- Neu, E. and W. Meid (eds.)
- 1979 *Hethitisch und indogermanisch : vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Oettinger, Norbert
- 1979 *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nurnberg.
- Orlamünde, Julia
- 2001 'Zur Datierung und historische Interpretation des hethitischen Orakelprotokolls KUB 5.1+'. StBoT 45, 511-523.
- Otten, H.
- 1958 'Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Instruktionen für die LÚ.MEŠ SAG'. *AfO* 18, 387-390.
- 1967 'Ein hethitischer Vertrag aus dem 15./14. Jahrhundert v. Chr. (KBo 16.47)'. *IM* 17, 55-62.

- 1973 *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa*, StBoT 17, Wiesbaden.
- 1981 *Die Apologie Hattušiliš III. Das Bild der Überlieferung*. StBoT 24, Wiesbaden.
- 1988 *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthalijas IV*. StBoT Beih. 1, Wiesbaden.
- Otten, H. and V. Souček,
1969 *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar*, StBoT 8, Wiesbaden.
- Pedersen, H.
1938 *Hittitisch und die anderen Indoeuropäischen Sprachen*. København: Levin & Munksgaard.
- Petschow, H.
1962 'Zur Noxalhaftung im hethitischen Recht'. ZA 55, 237-250.
- Popko, M.
1995 *Religions of Asia Minor*. Warsaw: Academic Publications Dialog
- Puhvel, J.
1984f. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin.
- Rieken, Elisabeth
1999 'Zur Verwendung der Konjunktion *ta* in den hethitischen Texten.' *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 59, 63-88.
1999 *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. StBoT 44. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
2000 'Die Partikeln *-a*, *-ja*, *-ma* im Althethitischen und das Akkadogram *Ù*'. In: M. Ofitsch & Ch. Zinko (eds.), *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz*, Leykam.
- Rizzi-Mellini, A.M.
1979 'Un'istruzione etea di interesse storico: KBo XVI 24+25'. In: Carruba, O. (ed.), *Studia Mediterranea Piero meriggi dicata II*, 509-554.
- Roos, Johan de
1984 *Een teksteditie van hettitische geloften met inleiding, vertaling en critische noten*. Amsterdam.
1985 Review of Johann Tischler, *Das hethitische Gebet der Gassulijawija*. In *BiOr* 42 (1/2), 128-133.
- Rosenkranz, B.
1973 'Die hethitischen Schreibungen für "und" '. In: M.A. Beek, A.A. Kampman et al. (eds.), *Symbolae biblicae et Mesopotamicae: Francisco Mario Theodoro de Liagre Böhl dedicatae*. Leiden: Brill, p. 320-326
- Rosi, Susanna
1984 'Il ruolo delle "Truppe" UKU.UŠ nell'organizzazione militare ittita'. *SMEA* 24, 109-129.
- Rüster, Christel
1988 'Materialien zu einer Fehlertypologie der hethitischen Texte', in Fs Otten 2, 295-306.
- Rüster, Christel and Erich Neu
1989 *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon. Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten*. (StBoT Beiheft 2). Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Schuol, Monika
1994 'Die Terminologie des hethitischen SU-Orakels'. *AoF* 21 (1), 73-124.
- Singer, Itamar
1996 *Muwatalli's prayer to the assembly of gods through the storm-god of lightning (CTH 381)*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

- 1998 'From Hattuša to Taḫuntašša: Some Thoughts on Muwatalli's Reign'. In: *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, September 16-22, 1996*, 535-541.
- Soysal, Oğuz
1987 'KUB XXXI 4 + KBo III 41 und 40 (Die Puḫanu-Chronik). Zum Thronstreit Hattušilis I.' *Hethitica* 7, 173-253.
1998 'Beiträge zur althethitische Geschichte (II). Zur Textwiederherstellung und Datierung von KUB XXXI 64+ (CTH 12)'. *AoF* 25/1, 5-33.
- Sommer, F.
1932 *Die Aḫḫijavā-Urkunden*. München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
- Sommer, F. & A. Falkenstein
1938 *Die Hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I* (ABAW, NF 16). München.
- Starke, Frank
1977 *Die Funktionen der dimensionalen Kasus und Adverbien im Althethitischen*, StBoT 23, Wiesbaden.
- Steiner, G.
1984 'Struktur und Bedeutung des sog. Anitta-Textes', *Oriens Antiquus* 23, p. 53-73.
2002 'Ein Missverständener althethitischer Text: Die sog. Puḫanu-Chronik (CTH 16)'. In: *Anatolia antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*. (Eothen 11). LoGisma editore: Firenze, 807-818.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H.
1951 *A Comparative grammar of the Hittite language*, Vol. 1 (revised edition).
- Sürenhagen, D.
1985 *Paritätische Staatsverträge aus hethitischer Sicht: zu historischen Aussagen und literarischer Stellung des Textes CTH 379* (Studia Mediterranea 5). Pavia.
- Szábo, G.
1971 *Ein hethitisches Entsühnungsritual für das Königspaar Tuthaliya und Nikalmati*. THeth 1.
- Taracha, Piotr
2002 *Ersetzen und Entsühnen. Das mittelhethitische Ersatzritual für den Großkönig Tuthaliya (CTH *448.4) und verwandte Texte*. (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 5). Leiden: Brill.
- Tischler, J.
1977f. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* (IBS 20). Innsbruck.
1981 *Das hethitische Gebet der Gassulijawija* (IBS 37). Innsbruck.
- Ünal, Ahmet
1974 *Hattušili III*. THeth 3, 4
1978 *Ein Orakeltext über die Intrigen am hethitischen Hof (KUB XXII 70 = Bo 2011)*. THeth 6.
- Von Schuler, Einar
1957 *Hethitische Dienstanweisungen für höhere Hof- und Staatsbeamte. Ein Beitrag zum antiken Recht Kleinasiens*. AfO, Beiheft 10, Graz.
1965 *Die Kaškäer. Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasiens*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Von Soden, W.
1952/1969 *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*.
- Weitenberg, J.
1984 *Die hethitischen U-Stämme*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

- 1992 'The Uses of Asyndesis and Particles in Old Hittite Simple Sentences', in: *Per una grammatica ittita*, StudMed 7, Pavia, 307-353.
- Woods, Christopher
- 2001 *The Deictic Foundations of the Sumerian language*. Harvard University: Cambridge (pdf.file).

Index

| | |
|--|---------------|
| 1043/u iv 11-12 | 206 |
| Bo 86/299 i 26-28 | 72 |
| Bo 86/299 i 32-33 | 72 |
| Bo 86/299 i 50-52 | 73, 226 |
| Bo 86/299 i 68-77 | 74 |
| Bo 86/299 i 69-77 | 247 |
| Bo 86/299 i 85-88 | 226 |
| Bo 86/299 i 91-98 | 143 |
| Bo 86/299 ii 53-55 | 251 |
| Bo 86/299 ii 59-60 | 306 |
| Bo 86/299 ii 85-86 | 303 |
| Bo 86/299 ii 90-93 | 303 |
| Bo 86/299 ii 95-97 | 216 |
| Bo 86/299 iii 3-8 | 190 |
| Bo 86/299 iii 17-20 | 300 |
| Bo 86/299 iii 57-59 | 224 |
| Bo 86/299 iv 5 | 218 |
| HKM 1 obv. 4-13 | 196 |
| HKM 2, left edge 1-2 | 204 |
| HKM 4 obv. 4-9 | 58, 179 |
| HKM 5 lower edge 3-14 | 195 |
| HKM 6 obv. 3-4 | 213 |
| HKM 6 obv. 3-6 | 137, 195 |
| HKM 6 obv. 4-10 | 322 |
| HKM 7 obv. 3-15 | 192 |
| HKM 13 obv. 3-5 | 216 |
| HKM 14 obv. 3-4 | 209 |
| HKM 16: 5-15 | 179 |
| HKM 18 left edge 2-5 | 59, 179 |
| HKM 18 rev. 17-20 | 204 |
| HKM 21 obv. 8-13 | 196 |
| HKM 27 obv. 3-10 | 80 |
| HKM 36 obv. 3-9 | 82 |
| HKM 43 obv. 1'-7' | 191 |
| HKM 43 obv. 4'-6' | 305 |
| HKM 46 rev. 8-17 | 80 |
| HKM 54 obv. 5-24 | 94 |
| HKM 56 obv. 7-10 | 178 |
| HKM 57 obv. 10-13 | 205 |
| HKM 58 obv. 5-14 | 109 |
| HKM 60 rev. 21-26 | 250 |
| HKM 71 obv. 3-9 | 187 |
| IBoT 1.36 i 20-21 | 70, 298 |
| IBoT 1.36 i 33-37 | 69, 315 |
| IBoT 1.36 i 43-44 | 252 |
| IBoT 1.36 i 51-52 | 320, 322 |
| IBoT 1.36 i 60-63 | 299 |
| IBoT 1.36 ii 29-31 | 329 |
| IBoT 1.36 ii 32-35 | 253 |
| IBoT 1.36 iii 13-16 | 286 |
| IBoT 1.36 iii 16-22 | 328 |
| IBoT 1.36 iii 27-30 | 294 |
| IBoT 1.36 iii 42-48 | 299 |
| IBoT 1.36 iv 18-23 | 302 |
| IBoT 2.112 + KUB 48.100 obv. 1-7 | 141, 155 |
| IBoT 2.121 rev. 12' | 137 |
| KBo 1.50 + KUB 3.99 ii 18-19 | 173 |
| KBo 2.2 i 12-14 | 109, 204, 293 |
| KBo 2.2 i 21-22 | 223 |
| KBo 2.2 i 52-55 | 293 |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| KBo 2.2 ii 25-26 | 150, 303 |
| KBo 2.2 ii 32-34 | 306 |
| KBo 2.2 ii 54-56 | 150 |
| KBo 2.2 iii 5-7 | 150 |
| KBo 2.2 iii 24-25 | 293 |
| KBo 2.2 iii 30-31 | 149 |
| KBo 2.2 iv 22-24 | 128, 150 |
| KBo 2.2 iv 27-28 | 151 |
| KBo 2.2 iv 34-37 | 151 |
| KBo 2.2 iv 34-39 | 144 |
| KBo 2.6+ iii 4-9 | 219 |
| KBo 2.6+ iii 60 | 91 |
| KBo 3.1 ii 36'-39' | 298 |
| KBo 3.1+ obv i 10-11 | 75 |
| KBo 3.3+ i 26-31 | 328 |
| KBo 3.3+ i 7-11 | 323 |
| KBo 3.3+ iii 3'-5' | 197 |
| KBo 3.4 + iii 44 | 159 |
| KBo 3.4 ii 50-54 | 286 |
| KBo 3.4 iii 67-79 | 159 |
| KBo 3.4+ i 10-13 | 71, 246 |
| KBo 3.4+ i 23-26 | 161 |
| KBo 3.4+ i 23-29 | 224 |
| KBo 3.4+ i 48 | 218 |
| KBo 3.4+ iii 42-44 | 76 |
| KBo 3.4+ iii 82, 86-87 | 89 |
| KBo 3.4+ iii 86-87 | 138 |
| KBo 3.4+ iv 44'-47' | 224 |
| KBo 3.5 i 45-47 | 204 |
| KBo 3.22 rev. 68-72 | 327 |
| KBo 3.22 rev. 76-78 | 314, 323 |
| KBo 3.28 obv. ii 20-21 | 126 |
| KBo 3.28 obv. ii 20-24 | 229 |
| KBo 3.34 ii 15-20 | 287 |
| KBo 3.34 ii 1-6 | 233 |
| KBo 3.34 ii 1-7 | 68, 184, 255 |
| KBo 3.34 ii 24-26 | 255 |
| KBo 3.34 ii 27-29 | 309 |
| KBo 3.34 ii 28-32 | 233 |
| KBo 3.34 ii 29-32 | 273 |
| KBo 3.34 ii 8-9 | 256, 274 |
| KBo 3.34 iii 15'-19' | 227 |
| KBo 3.41 + KUB 31.4 obv. 10'-11' | 126 |
| KBo 3.41 + KUB 31.4 obv. 16'-19' | 162 |
| KBo 4.10+ rev. 15-17 | 247 |
| KBo 4.14 ii 22-23 | 67, 211 |
| KBo 4.14 ii 73-77 | 85 |
| KBo 4.14 ii 73-80 | 61, 113 |
| KBo 4.14 iii 32-34 | 112 |
| KBo 4.14 iii 72-73 | 114 |
| KBo 4.3 i 30-32 | 201 |
| KBo 4.4 iii 68-72 | 139 |
| KBo 4.4 iv 4-8 | 157 |
| KBo 4.4 iv 50-51 | 139 |
| KBo 4.6 obv. 11'-16' | 304 |
| KBo 4.6 obv. 11'-17' | 230, 307 |
| KBo 4.6 obv. 15'-17' | 163 |
| KBo 4.6 obv. 21'-26' | 192 |
| KBo 4.6 rev. 7'-15' | 58 |
| KBo 4.6 rev. 7'-9' | 307 |

| | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| KBo 5.13 iii 22-28 | 117, 227 |
| KBo 5.3 + ii 1-5 | 267 |
| KBo 5.3 + ii 32-38 | 111, 180 |
| KBo 5.3 i 8-11 | 303 |
| KBo 5.3+ iii 24'-28' | 115 |
| KBo 5.3+ iii 32'-34' | 116 |
| KBo 5.4 obv. 10-14 | 116 |
| KBo 5.4 obv. 24-26 | 186 |
| KBo 5.4 rev. 15' | 257 |
| KBo 5.4 rev. 6-8 | 270 |
| KBo 5.6 iii 16-19 | 118 |
| KBo 5.6 iii 45 - iv 4 | 89 |
| KBo 5.6 iii 8-16 | 138 |
| KBo 5.8 i 14-17 | 140 |
| KBo 5.8 ii 18-26 | 76 |
| KBo 5.8 ii 18-27 | 158 |
| KBo 5.8 iii 24'-25' | 149 |
| KBo 5.9 i 24-26 | 303 |
| KBo 5.9 iii 1-2 | 234 |
| KBo 6.2 iv 14-15 | 269, 321 |
| KBo 6.2 + KBo 19.1 iii 44-46 | 186 |
| KBo 6.2 i 11-12 | 263 |
| KBo 6.2 i 1-2 | 264 |
| KBo 6.2 i 13-15 | 287 |
| KBo 6.2 i 16-18 | 240 |
| KBo 6.2 i 16-19 | 71, 288, 319 |
| KBo 6.2 i 3-6 | 265, 279 |
| KBo 6.2 i 36-38 | 281 |
| KBo 6.2 i 45-47 | 281 |
| KBo 6.2 i 48-50 | 107, 201 |
| KBo 6.2 i 51-53 | 282 |
| KBo 6.2 i 56-59 | 288 |
| KBo 6.2 ii 30-32 | 263, 277, 280 |
| KBo 6.2 ii 33 | 263 |
| KBo 6.2 iii 1-4 | 289 |
| KBo 6.2 iii 16-20 | 90 |
| KBo 6.2 iii 23-24 | 298 |
| KBo 6.2 iii 56-57 | 263 |
| KBo 6.2 iv 4-5 | 264 |
| KBo 6.2 iv 47-48 | 284 |
| KBo 6.2 iv 49-50 | 265 |
| KBo 6.2 iv 56-58 | 283 |
| KBo 6.2+ ii 18-20 | 232 |
| KBo 6.2+ ii 53-57 | 233 |
| KBo 6.2+ iii 43 | 218 |
| KBo 6.2+ iii 49-50 | 284 |
| KBo 6.2+ iv 1-3 | 285 |
| KBo 6.3 iii 48 | 289 |
| KBo 6.3 iii 69 | 249 |
| KBo 6.3 iii 70-71 | 301 |
| KBo 6.12 i 11-14 | 266 |
| KBo 6.26 i 22-27 | 95 |
| KBo 6.26 i 38-40 | 213 |
| KBo 6.26 ii 1-2 | 285 |
| KBo 6.26 iii 26-27 | 290 |
| KBo 6.28 + obv. 13 | 253 |
| KBo 6.28 + obv. 6-9 | 253 |
| KBo 6.28 rev. 25-27 | 325 |
| KBo 6.29 + i 16-21 | 271 |
| KBo 6.29 i 28-30 | 228 |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| KBo 6.29 ii 31-35 | 329 |
| KBo 7.14 + KUB 36.100 obv. 7-9 | 108 |
| KBo 8.35 ii 30'-31' | 290 |
| KBo 8.74 + rev. iii 16'-18' | 202 |
| KBo 8.74+ iii 13'-15' | 229 |
| KBo 9.96 obv. 7'-9' | 125 |
| KBo 11.1 obv. 12-13 | 210 |
| KBo 11.1 obv. 14 | 197, 307 |
| KBo 11.1 obv. 36-37 | 249 |
| KBo 11.1 obv. 37-39 | 300 |
| KBo 11.1 obv. 5-7 | 291 |
| KBo 12.38 i 10'-12' | 216 |
| KBo 12.38 ii 4'-10' | 205 |
| KBo 12.38 iv 3'-4' | 205 |
| KBo 12.49 ii 1-6 | 288 |
| KBo 12.62 obv. 10'-12' | 186 |
| KBo 14.1 ii 5'-6' | 120 |
| KBo 14.12 iv 35-39 | 180, 208 |
| KBo 14.3 iv 5'-9' | 160 |
| KBo 14.3 iii 12'-20' | 160 |
| KBo 14.3 iv 28'-31' | 149 |
| KBo 15.10+ i 10-11 | 228 |
| KBo 15.10+ i 12-14 | 208 |
| KBo 15.10+ i 13-18 | 310 |
| KBo 15.10+ i 1-4 | 231 |
| KBo 15.10+ ii 12-16 | 90, 207 |
| KBo 15.10+ ii 20-21 | 302 |
| KBo 15.10+ ii 23-26 | 207 |
| KBo 16.24+ i 46'-49' | 206 |
| KBo 16.24+25 i 46'-49' | 118 |
| KBo 16.47 obv. 1'-3' | 300, 325 |
| KBo 16.47 obv. 9' | 178 |
| KBo 16.97 rev. 7 | 127 |
| KBo 16.98 ii 10 | 89 |
| KBo 17.1+ i 26'-33' | 257 |
| KBo 17.1+ i 35'-36' | 313 |
| KBo 17.1+ ii 11'-14', 23'-25' | 260 |
| KBo 17.1+ ii 21'-22' | 232 |
| KBo 17.1 + iii 3-7 | 215 |
| KBo 17.1+ iii 8-12 | 212 |
| KBo 17.1+ iv 19-22 | 73, 228 |
| KBo 17.3+ ii 12'-13' | 306 |
| KBo 17.3+ iii 25-27 | 202 |
| KBo 17.3+ rev. iv 25-29 | 250 |
| KBo 17.11+ obv. i 36'-38' | 254 |
| KBo 17.11+ iv 26'-27' | 291 |
| KBo 17.15 rev. 14'-16' | 107, 201 |
| KBo 17.17 (+?) KBo 30.30 obv. 6'-7' | 123 |
| KBo 17.43 i 10'-11' | 322 |
| KBo 17.43 i 11'-13' | 315 |
| KBo 19.1a iii 66-68 | 264, 266, 289 |
| KBo 19.44+ rev. 3-4 | 115 |
| KBo 19.44+ rev. 14-15 | 211 |
| KBo 19.44+ rev. 14-16 | 254 |
| KBo 19.44+ rev. 26-27 | 93, 191 |
| KBo 19.44+ rev. 38-42 | 62, 181 |
| KBo 19.44+ rev. 47-48 | 256 |
| KBo 19.76 + 8'-9' | 144 |
| KBo 19.76 + 16'-19' | 202 |
| KBo 19.76 + 17'-23' | 160 |

| | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|
| KBo 20.26+ obv. 13'-17' | 318 |
| KBo 22.1 3'-4' | 261 |
| KBo 22.1 4'-6' | 204 |
| KBo 22.1 3'-6' | 214 |
| KBo 22.1 13'-15' | 216 |
| KBo 22.1 16'-21' | 181 |
| KBo 22.1 21' | 256 |
| KBo 22.2 obv. 1-2 | 61, 207 |
| KBo 22.2 rev. 5'-6' | 172 |
| KBo 25.5: 5' + iii 1'-4' | 302 |
| KBo 32.14 ii 26-30 | 203 |
| KBo 32.14 ii 26-30 | 246 |
| KUB 1.1 + ii 31-33 | 108 |
| KUB 1.1 i 36-37 | 91 |
| KUB 1.1 ii 66-71 | 79 |
| KUB 1.1 iii 57-58 | 80 |
| KUB 1.1 iii 59-61 | 190 |
| KUB 1.1 iii 74 | 138 |
| KUB 1.1 iv 1-2 | 219 |
| KUB 1.1+ ii 56, 61-65 | 225 |
| KUB 1.1+ iii 61-63 | 318 |
| KUB 1.1+ iii 78 - iv 3 | 324 |
| KUB 1.1+ ii 37-39 | 257 |
| KUB 1.1+ ii 69-72 | 223 |
| KUB 1.1+ iii 14-16 | 250 |
| KUB 1.1+ iii 66-68 | 189 |
| KUB 1.1+ iv 62-64 | 305 |
| KUB 1.16 iii 40-41 | 133 |
| KUB 5.1 obv. i 7 | 132 |
| KUB 5.1 rev. iii 48-49 | 66, 127 |
| KUB 6.41 i 34-38 | 81, 94, 117, 140 |
| KUB 6.41 iii 47 | 117 |
| KUB 6.41 iv 6-7 | 190 |
| KUB 6.41+ iv 6-7 | 248 |
| KUB 6.45+ iii 54-58 | 116 |
| KUB 7.10 i 1-5 | 182 |
| KUB 8.41 ii 7'-9' | 219 |
| KUB 8.81 + ii 13' - iii 2 | 282 |
| KUB 8.82 rev. 23'-25' | 210 |
| KUB 13.20 i 16-17, 26-27 | 195 |
| KUB 13.20 obv. 16-18 | 300 |
| KUB 13.4 iii 74-77 | 321 |
| KUB 14.1 i 13-15 | 215 |
| KUB 14.1 obv. 17-19 | 292 |
| KUB 14.1 obv. 73-74 | 301 |
| KUB 14.1 rev. 29-32 | 299 |
| KUB 14.1+ obv. 54-56 | 251 |
| KUB 14.1+ rev. 87-88 | 187 |
| KUB 14.11+ iii 26 | 187 |
| KUB 14.12 rev. 7'-10' | 248 |
| KUB 14.14 + obv. 32-37 | 294 |
| KUB 14.14 + rev. 21'-22' | 304 |
| KUB 14.14 + rev. 21'-23' | 77 |
| KUB 14.15 iii 39-42 | 156 |
| KUB 14.15 iii 39-44 | 75 |
| KUB 14.15 rev. iv 46-48 | 209 |
| KUB 14.17 iii 21-25 | 157 |
| KUB 14.17 obv. ii 31-35 | 76 |
| KUB 14.3 iii 63-65 | 189 |
| KUB 14.4 i 7'-12' | 292 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| KUB 14.4 ii 8'-11' | 324 |
| KUB 14.4 iv 17-19 | 185 |
| KUB 14.4 iv 17-21 | 300 |
| KUB 14.4 rev. iv 10-14 | 139 |
| KUB 14.8 obv. 31'-32' | 81, 148 |
| KUB 14.8 obv. 31'-37' | 132 |
| KUB 15.1 iii 7'-13' | 184 |
| KUB 15.1 iii 7'-14' | 66 |
| KUB 15.3 i 17-19 | 65, 125 |
| KUB 15.5 + 48.122 obv. i 10-13 | 133 |
| KUB 16.32 ii 14-18 | 96 |
| KUB 17.12 obv. ii 11-17 | 114 |
| KUB 17.12 obv. ii 24-27 | 114 |
| KUB 17.21+ ii 26' | 217 |
| KUB 17.7+ iii 11'-13' | 120 |
| KUB 17.7+ iii 27-28' | 119 |
| KUB 17.7+ iv 13'-19' | 119 |
| KUB 19.5 + KBo 19.79: 24-27 | 181 |
| KUB 19.20 + KBo 12.13 obv. 9'-12' | 107 |
| KUB 19.20 + KBo 12.13 obv. 9'-13' | 59 |
| KUB 19.20 + obv. 9'-13' | 246 |
| KUB 19.26 i 10'-11' | 249 |
| KUB 19.26 i 7'-10' | 305 |
| KUB 19.29 iv 11-15 | 92, 142 |
| KUB 19.30 rev. iv 11 | 138 |
| KUB 19.49+ i 49-54 | 227 |
| KUB 19.50+ iii 12-14 | 248 |
| KUB 21.1 iii 4-9 | 194 |
| KUB 21.1+ i 65'-69' | 295 |
| KUB 21.1+ iii 4-10 | 247 |
| KUB 21.1+ iii 73-75 | 63 |
| KUB 21.1+ iii 73-77 | 221 |
| KUB 21.17 i 4-8 | 215 |
| KUB 21.38 obv. 10'-12' | 179, 213 |
| KUB 21.38 obv. 16' | 96 |
| KUB 21.38 obv. 63'-65' | 188 |
| KUB 21.38 obv. 7' | 213 |
| KUB 21.38 rev. 11-12 | 197 |
| KUB 21.38 rev. 11-13 | 307 |
| KUB 21.38 rev. 3-6 | 225 |
| KUB 21.38 rev. 7-11 | 94 |
| KUB 21.38 rev. 7-9 | 218 |
| KUB 22.70 obv. 11-12 | 129 |
| KUB 22.70 obv. 17-19 | 155 |
| KUB 22.70 obv. 23 | 130 |
| KUB 22.70 obv. 31-32 | 129, 304 |
| KUB 22.70 obv. 36-38 | 183 |
| KUB 22.70 obv. 4 | 220 |
| KUB 22.70 obv. 49-52 | 131 |
| KUB 22.70 obv. 61-63 | 67, 305 |
| KUB 22.70 obv. 7-8 | 129 |
| KUB 22.70 rev. 28-29 | 152 |
| KUB 22.70 rev. 31-32 | 220 |
| KUB 22.70 rev. 44-45 | 153 |
| KUB 22.70 rev. 4-7 | 153 |
| KUB 22.70 rev. 51-53 | 153 |
| KUB 22.70 rev. 54-57 | 162 |
| KUB 23.1+ ii 6-7 | 86, 221 |
| KUB 23.1+ iv 14-16 | 270 |
| KUB 23.103 rev. 6'-7' | 186 |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| KUB 23.12 ii 4'-6' | 217 |
| KUB 23.72+ obv. 32-35 | 73 |
| KUB 23.72+ obv. 39..... | 262 |
| KUB 23.72+ rev. 2-3 | 329 |
| KUB 23.72+ rev. 61-64..... | 258 |
| KUB 23.74 (+) KBo 19.44b obv. 12'-15' | 120 |
| KUB 23.77+ rev. 52'-54'..... | 269 |
| KUB 23.82+ obv. 23'-26' | 261 |
| KUB 24.4+ rev. 10-13..... | 294 |
| KUB 26.1 i 56-60..... | 325 |
| KUB 26.1 iii 37-40..... | 112 |
| KUB 26.1 iii 58-66..... | 318 |
| KUB 26.1 iv 49-50..... | 91, 209, 215 |
| KUB 26.12+ i 13-18 | 232 |
| KUB 26.12+ ii 23-28 | 267 |
| KUB 26.12+ ii 2-9 | 92, 188, 318 |
| KUB 26.12+ ii 29-32 | 93 |
| KUB 26.12+ ii 29-35 | 180, 188 |
| KUB 26.12+ ii 29-36 | 304 |
| KUB 26.12+ iv 33-37 | 257 |
| KUB 29.23+ 17-20..... | 265 |
| KUB 29.24 i 3-6 | 265, 301 |
| KUB 29.28 i 8-9 | 266 |
| KUB 31.121 ii 6'-17' | 148 |
| KUB 31.121a ii 34'-42'..... | 148 |
| KUB 31.64 (+) ii 16-26..... | 170 |
| KUB 31.64 (+) 64a + ii 23-30 | 171 |
| KUB 31.71 iii 1-25..... | 162 |
| KUB 31.77 i 14-21 | 82, 154 |
| KUB 33.106 + KBo 26.65 i 25'-29' | 134 |
| KUB 33.112 + 114 + 36.2 iii 10'-17' | 134 |
| KUB 33.87+ i 30'-34' | 111 |
| KUB 36.104 obv. 9'-10'..... | 316 |
| KUB 36.104 obv. 9'-11'..... | 69 |
| KUB 36.75+ ii 9'-12'..... | 307 |
| KUB 43.23 obv. 3-5 | 206 |
| KUB 43.23 rev. 19'-21'..... | 205 |
| KUB 43.30 obv. ii 6' | 107 |
| KUB 43.58 i 40-45..... | 229 |
| KUB 44.4+ rev. 9..... | 61, 110 |
| KUB 48.100+ rev. 18-22 | 261 |
| KUB 48.119 obv. 3'-8' | 292 |
| KUB 48.119 rev. 11-13 | 125 |
| KUB 49.70 rev. 20'-21'..... | 165 |
| KUB 50.1 ii 15-16..... | 127 |
| KUB 50.6+ iii 37 | 258 |

Samenvatting

Verwijzing, Deixis en Focus in het Hettitisch. The aanwijzende voornaamwoorden *ka-* “dit”, *apa-* “die” en *aši* “gene”

In deze dissertatie heb ik geprobeerd het Hettitische systeem van de aanwijzende voornaamwoorden en het gebruik van het geaccentueerde voornaamwoord van de derde person, *apa-*, te beschrijven. Als we beginnen met de laatste vorm, dan blijkt dat het geaccentueerde *apa-* niet erg vaak wordt gebruikt in contexten waar onduidelijkheid bestaat, hoewel dat laatste vaak als een van de kenmerken van dergelijke voornaamwoorden wordt beschouwd. Het tegenovergestelde is waar: vaak komt *apa-* voor waar het in eerste instantie niet nodig lijkt. Gewoonlijk tracht men dan om *apa-* te vertalen met een geaccentueerd voornaamwoord uit de eigen taal, waarbij men dan uitgaat van een pre-theoretisch begrip van ‘contrast’, zonder te definiëren wat daar mee bedoeld wordt.

Contrast is vaak verbonden met het begrip ‘counter-presuppositionality’, ‘tegen de vooronderstelling ingaand’. Met andere woorden, er gebeurt iets dat niet in overeenstemming is met de kennis die de Aangesprokene uit de discourse opgedaan heeft. Dit gebrek aan overeenstemming kan bijvoorbeeld te maken hebben met (beschreven) gedrag dat niet in overeenstemming is met de normale regels in een bepaalde cultuur, of het kan gewoon zijn dat de Aangesprokene iets verkeerd begrepen heeft dat gecorrigeerd dient te worden.

Het eerste type, verrassend gedrag hangt samen met het voorkomen van *apa-* ‘die’ met *-a/-ma* ‘en, maar’. Dit was het resultaat van hoofdstuk 9 (Surprising *apa-*). Rieken 2000 heeft uitgelegd dat het partikel *-a/-ma* iets van doen heeft met een vorm van heroriëntatie. Rieken’s classificatie van het gebruik van *-a/-ma* was het uitgangspunt van de studie naar *apa-* met dit partikel. Hoewel haar classificatie van *-a/-ma* enkele *apa-s* kon verklaren, viel een groot deel van de *apa-s* toch buiten boord.

In deze gevallen bleek echter dat de stand van zaken die in de zin beschreven werd nog al onverwacht was gezien de voorgaande tekst. In dit kader haal ik het voorbeeld aan van de zaakgelastigde van de koning die de door hem voor de Hettitische staat geïnde belasting zelf hield: “Hij bracht het goud en zilver dat hij inde naar zijn eigen huis!”. Dat hoort een zaakgelastigde niet te doen. In dit geval gaf *apa-* met *-a/-ma* niet aan dat het onderwerp-Topic van de zin op een of andere manier onverwacht was, maar dat de *relatie* tussen het onderwerp-Topic en de handeling onverwacht was. Kort gezegd, de combinatie *apa-* met *-a/-ma* duidt het *Onverwachte Topic*, een begrip dat zowel Topic verandering kan betekenen als de onverwachte handeling van het onderwerp-Topic.

Het gebruik van *apa-* om aan te geven dat de informatie die de Aangesprokene bezit verkeerd is en aangepast moet worden, was het onderwerp van hoofdstuk 8 (Limiting *apa-*), en gedeeltelijk van hoofdstuk 7 (Expanding *apa-*). The referent van *apa-* is in zo’n geval bijna altijd de zins-Topic van de voorgaande zin, en wordt ook nog verwacht als Topic van de volgende zin. Het voornaamwoord *apa-* duidt dan niet een onverwacht Topic aan, maar de Focus, met name *Vervangende* of *Beperkende Focus*. Het vertrekpunt van de studie naar *apa-* in Focus was het partikel *-pat* “slechts, alleen”. Voor *apa-* met *-pat* in vervangende Focus stel ik de vertaling “inplaats van hem/haar/dat” voor, voor *apa-* met *-pat* in Beperkende Focus

“alleen hem/haar/dat”. Wanneer *apa-* zonder partikel voorkomt, is het vaak Vervangende Focus. In beide gevallen staat *apa-* vóór het werkwoord.

Naast het Focus partikel *-pat* bestaat er ook nog *-ia* “ook”. Dit partikel werd behandeld in hoofdstuk 7 (Expanding *apa-*). Maar niet alleen *-ia* als “ook” kwam aan bod, ook *-ia* als “en”, en *-a/-ma* als “terwijl”. Het blijkt dat the *Uitbreidende Focus* uitdrukking *apa-* met *-ia* “ook hij/zij/het” vooral voorkomt op de tweede plaats in de zin, terwijl *-ia* als het voegwoord “en” gekoppeld aan *apa-* alleen op eerste positie mag voorkomen.

Maar daarnaast blijkt er ook nog een *apa-* zonder partikel volkomen onverwacht op te treden in de Wetten. Om dat te kunnen verklaren heb ik de volgende driedeling op basis van het straftype gemaakt:

- klasse I: de straf bestaat uit de betaling van een boete of een vervangend object.
- klasse II: de straf bestaat uit de betaling van een boete of een vervangend object, maar er moet ook nog een andere actie verricht worden door de dader.
- klasse III: de straf bestaat alleen maar uit een te ondernemen actie, zonder dat de dader betaalt.

De straf in klasse II wordt altijd uitgedrukt in twee gecoördineerder, nevengeschikte zinnen. Allen in zo’n geval duikt een totaal onverwacht *apa-* op. Het lijkt erop dat *apa-* (1) nodig is om een gebalanceerde, symmetrische structuur te handhaven, en (2) dat de Aangesprokene op deze manier gewaarschuwd wordt dat er nog een tweede, gelijkwaardige zin aankomt.

De resultaten van deel III kunnen als volgt getabelleerd worden:

| Topic of Focus type | Plaats in de zin | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----|----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Beperkende Focus | Voor werkwoord | ## | | <i>apa- + (-pat)</i> | V | |
| Uitbreidende Focus | Tweede | ## | <i>nu/NP</i> | <i>apa- + -ia</i> | V | |
| Onverwacht Topic | Eerste | ## | <i>apa- + -a/-ma</i> | | V | |
| Verwacht Topic in coordinatie | Eerste/tweede | ## | <i>(nu) apa-</i> | V | ## <i>NP-ia/-ma</i> | V |
| | | ## | <i>(nu) NP</i> | V | ## <i>apa- + -ia/-ma</i> ... | V |

De relatie tussen Topic-Focus type en plaats in de zin.

Al deze Topic en Focus typen komen in alle taalfasen van het Hettitisch voor.

In deel II worden de voornaamwoorden *ka-*, *apa-* en *aši* behandeld. De uitkomst is dat het Hettitisch een persoonsgebaseerd systeem heeft met drie elementen: een 1ste persoons aanwijzend voornaamwoord *ka-* “deze, bij mij”, een tweede persoons *apa-* “die, bij jou”, en een derde persoons *aši* “gene, bij de ander”. Die persoonsgebondenheid houdt in dat niet afstand tot de Spreker belangrijk is maar nabijheid bij een van de gespreksdeelnemers. Meer abstract, de aanwijzende voornaamwoorden geven aan of iets tot het geestelijke of emotionele domein behoort van de Spreker, de Aangesprokene of de Ander. Bijvoorbeeld, *aši* kan aangeven dat iets in de nabijheid van de ander is, en niet bij Spreker en Aangesprokene, en het kan aangeven dat iets negatief is onafhankelijk van persoon, of dat iets buiten de verantwoordelijkheid van de Spreker en Aangesprokene valt.

Verder bleek er een verschil te zijn tussen het aanwijzende voornaamwoord (afgekort *dem*) en het aanwijzende bijvoeglijk naamwoord (afgekort *dem N*). Het voornaamwoord

wordt gebruikt als een object in de omgeving al onder de aandacht van de gespreksdeelnemers is, *demN* wanneer dat niet het geval is.

Maar aanwijzende voornaamwoorden worden niet alleen gebruikt om naar de situatie te verwijzen. Ze kunnen ook Herkendend (Recognitional), Discourse Deictisch of Anafoor zijn. Deze concepten zijn in deel I verklaard en toegepast in deel II.

Die persoonsgebondenheid van de aanwijzende voornaamwoorden en adjectieven blijkt zich te handhaven bij het Herkendend gebruik. Hetzelfde kan gezegd worden van het Anafoor gebruik. Dit is opvallend omdat de literatuur over het gebruik van aanwijzende voornaamwoorden die binnen de discourse verwijzen die persoonsgebondenheid binnen de tekst niet herkent.

Voor tekstverwijzing gebruikt het Hettitisch alleen de aanwijzende adjectieven, onafhankelijk van het feit of iets al onder de aandacht is of niet. Het merendeel bevindt zich op de grens van een kleinere teksteenheid, en verwijst daarbij naar een andere eenheid. Hetzelfde geldt voor het Discourse Deictische gebruik, hoewel daar de persoonsgebondenheid niet echt naar voren kwam.

In deel I heb ik een matrix ontwikkeld die drie parameters combineert die gewoonlijk apart behandeld worden: *Zeigfeld* (wereld versus tekst), pragmatische relatie (Topic en Focus), en mate van attentie (*saliency*, dat wil zeggen, werkgeheugen versus lange termijngeheugen. Binnen het werkgeheugen wordt de continuerende procedure gebruikt, om iets in het werkgeheugen te krijgen de centerende). Een andere factor die van belang is wanneer men met teksten werkt, is de structuur van de discourse. Wanneer een teksteenheid zich nog in het werkgeheugen bevindt, dan is het *salient*, en worden er gewoonlijk voornaamwoorden gebruikt ("hij, zij, het"). Wanneer een teksteenheid daaruit verdwenen is, dan gebruikt met meestal *demN*-s (en definiëte woordgroepen).

Het invullen van de matrix met Hettitische termen levert het volgende plaatje op (*-a-* is het Hettitische 'voornaamwoord' 'hij, zij, het', *ápa-* het geaccentueerde voornaamwoord, en *dem* de aanwijzende voornaamwoorden. *dem.adv.* is een bijwoord dat van de aanwijzende voornaamwoorden wordt afgeleid):

| <i>geografische parameter</i> | <i>cognitieve parameter</i> | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| | continuïteits procedure | | | centerende procedure | |
| | E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | U-Topic | Focus |
| Deictisch | <i>dem</i> | <i>dem</i> | <i>dem</i> | — | <i>dem N</i> <i>dem. adverb</i> |
| Herkennend | — | — | — | — | <i>dem N</i> |
| Anaphora | | | | | |
| binnen eenheid | (<i>-a-</i>) | <i>ápa-</i> | <i>ápa- (N)</i> | — | |
| buiten eenheid | <i>dem N</i> | <i>dem N</i> | (<i>dem?</i>) | <i>dem N</i> | <i>dem N</i> |
| Discourse Deictisch | | | | | |
| binnen eenheid | (<i>-a-</i>) | ∅ | <i>apa- (N)</i> <i>apenissan</i> | — | — |
| buiten eenheid | — | — | — | <i>dem N</i> | <i>dem (N)</i> <i>dem. adv.</i> |

De matrix.

Dit is als volgt te lezen: binnen de teksteenheid worden \emptyset , *-a-* en geaccentueerd *apa-* gebruikt. Het verschil tussen deze drie is dat \emptyset en *-a-* alleen Verwachte Topics (E-Top) kunnen aangeven, terwijl *apa-* voor Focus en het Onverwachte Topic (U-Top) wordt gebruikt. Om naar een andere teksteenheid te verwijzen worden de aanwijzende woordgroepen gebruikt, onafhankelijk of het antecedent er onmiddellijk aan vooraf gaat of niet. *Saliency*, zoals gedefinieerd in hoofdstuk 2, lijkt dus niet van belang te zijn. Als dat zo is, dan kan de matrix herschreven worden:

| geografische parameter | discourse parameter | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| | verwijzing binnen teksteenheid | | verwijzing buiten teksteenheid (inclusief <i>first mention</i>) |
| | E-Top | Ander | |
| Deictisch | <i>dem</i> | <i>dem</i> | <i>dem N, dem. adverb</i> |
| Recognitional | — | — | <i>dem N</i> |
| Anaphora | <i>(-a-)</i> | <i>ápa- (N)</i> | <i>dem N</i> |
| Discourse Deictisch | <i>(-a-)</i> | <i>ápa- (N), apenissan</i> | <i>dem (N), dem adverb</i> |

Herschreven matrix

Wat betreft de aanwijzende voornaamwoorden, het persoonsgebonden systeem met drie termen bestaat al in het Oud-Hettitisch. In de introductie heb ik vermeld dat sommige geleerden van mening zijn dat *apa-* pas een geaccentueerd voornaamwoord werd nadat het geaccentueerde voornaamwoord *aši* verdwenen was. Men schetst deze ontwikkeling als volgt: de terugverwijzende functie van *aši* werd overgenomen door *apa-*, en de vooruitverwijzende functie door *ka-*. In tabelvorm ziet deze ontwikkeling er als volgt uit:

| | aanwijzende voornaamwoorden | | geaccentueerde voornaamwoorden | |
|------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| | nabij | ver | terugverwijzend | vooruitverwijzend |
| proto-Hettitisch | <i>kā-</i> | <i>apā-</i> | <i>aši</i> | <i>aši</i> |
| Hettitisch | <i>kā-</i> | <i>apā-</i> | <i>apā- (aši)</i> | <i>kā- (aši)</i> |

Het systeem van aanwijzende en geaccentueerde voornaamwoorden in proto-Hettitisch en Hettitisch naar huidige opvattingen.

Ik concludeer dat dit niet correct is. Vanaf Oud-Hettitisch en dus ook daarvoor tot aan het einde functioneert het systeem als volgt:

| | aanwijzende voornaamwoorden | | | geaccentueerde voornaamwoord |
|------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | 1 ^{te} persoon | 2 ^{de} persoon | 3 ^{de} persoon | |
| Hettitisch | <i>kā-</i> | <i>apā-</i> | <i>aši</i> | <i>apā-</i> |

Het systeem van aanwijzende en geaccentueerde voornaamwoorden in het Hettitisch volgens de auteur.