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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 (Himmelmann 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 (Himmelmann 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-, ašši / 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 ašši / 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 ṭUPPU) 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 ṭUPPU) 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

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[j]iya your servant has just [brought] to your god (= the statue representing Lelwani) this (kus) woman. She clothed [her] with beautiful clothes. She has sent her [substitute]. 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

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

\(^{9}'\) [\(^{10}\)Mālan kuit Š]A LUGAL KUR \(^{URU}\)Hurri e-de-êz tapuša ēšta \(^{10}'\) [n=at \(^{ISTU}\)NAM.RA GU₄.H.LA] UDU.H.L.A āššuitt=a šarā daḥḥun \(^{11}'\) [n=at=za \(^{ANA}\) KUR \(^{URU}\)Ha]tti udahhun ke-e-êz-i-aš=kan kuit \(^{12}'\) [šA LUGAL KUR \(^{URU}\)Hurri ṭ]apuša ēšta nu=za apātt=a ANA KUR \(^{URU}\)Hatti \(^{13}'\) udahhun

[What] was alongside [the Mala-river] on the other side (red) belonging to the king of Hurri, I picked [it] up[, including deportees, oxen], sheep, and possessions, and I brought [them to Hal]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 attested\(^58\). 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':

\(^{57}\) 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.

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

2 ḫalkiš (§)maš apa-ia anijanza 3 kuit nu ĖGIR-an tiṭatten 4 n=an anda ēpten n=an=kan ARA#-ti 5  anda içhūitten nu ANA 4[U[TU-ST harätten]

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] Majesty.

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’.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real world</th>
<th>=</th>
<th>Mental world evoked by text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utterance Situation</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Narrated Situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utterance</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Reported / Direct Speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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:

59 Alp reads ARĀH-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.

• The Direct Speech containing the expression under investigation should not be a quotation, taken from a larger piece of discourse, as occurring in letters. 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 Hititite, 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 £KR Kaniš XXX DUMU.MEŠ *I-EN MU-anti hāšta UMMMA SīzMA

[k-i-]*ya kuit *yalkuan hāšḥun

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!'

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 babies 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:

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

9 AMA DUMU.NITA taškipait nuššan GAM AN-za dU-aš aušta e-nis-ma=ya 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)??”

---

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 Gasgaean are just arriving in large numbers in peace at the moment you, My Majesty, are writing to me”. Send the Gasgaean 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-š* ŠA LU.MEŠ $	ext{UKUGažga taškulaš} \text{uttar}$, this peace business of the Gasgaean, 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.
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* 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 Lilloet invisible distal demonstrative *k'w*: *stūm=k'w* "What is that?" (when hearing a noise), see ex. 2.34.

Another example of Distal *aši*, also referring to a non-visible entity, is:

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 nijari 74 *[n]ašma=mu=kan EN.MEŠ kujēšqa ʔ allallā pānzi 75 *[z]ik=ma=šmaš=kan anda ḫandāšī nu kišan 76 memāṭti GĒŠPU-ahḫir=ya=mu n=at le DŪ-si 77 GAM-an MAMIT GAR-ru

§ 78 našma=at zik ʔ mališi a=ši=man=ya=kan ZAG-[aš] GAM-an 79 nijari našma= <m>an=ya=kan u-ni-uš EN.MEŠ alla[llā] 80 pānzi uqq=az=man=ya pēhudanzi...

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 (*aši* 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 *aši*, 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, dēr (erwähnte)', Friedrich & Kammenhuber 1975: 130)67. However, there is no evidence which 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

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).

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.
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 window, 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 reference.

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

§ 73 namma ki-i kuit TUPPU tak mAlakšandu ijan]ūn 74 n=ez̄ta=kkan MUKAM-ti MUKAM-ti peran 3-S[U ḥalzeššan]dū 75 n=at=za=kkan zik mAlakšandaš šakī Furthermore, this tablet (ki TUPPU) that I have [made] for you Alakšandu, 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.

---

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.
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 tupp ’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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deictic / Situational Use</th>
<th>Continuity procedure</th>
<th>Centering procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Topic</td>
<td>U-Topic</td>
<td>A-Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dem</td>
<td>dem</td>
<td>dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 φ.

3.2. Deixis and the centering procedure — Recognitiona l 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 recognition 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 recognition 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 recognition 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 recognition.

- **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 recognition 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 Ū-TUM MUNUS.LUGAL zašpija=ya=mu kuiški memiškizzi 18 ANA dNIN.GAL=ya=za=kan kišan maldi màn=ya ANA dUTU-St e-ni IZI ŠA GİR.MEŠ-SU 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 GIR.MEŠ-SU* is accompanied by the possessive clitic -ŠU ‘his’ and a further modification ANA dUTU-St ‘for My Majesty’. The last feature of recognition 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 kušš U.MEŠ HUL-šuš uškizzi ISKIM.IJ.A=ja=za arpušanta 49 kikiššari ... 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 (Himmelmann 1996: 235), Himmelmann 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 recognition 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

§ 7’ Ü-TUM MUNUS.LUGAL ŠA LÚMUDI=KA INIM-an ZI-Za šarti 11’ nu=yar=as ŠTI-anza 1 ME MU.KAM.IJ.A=ja=za=šši 12 pihḫi MUNUS.LUGAL ma=za=kaš ŠA Ü-TTI kišan IKRUB 13 màn=ya=mu apēniššušan ijaši 14 nu=ya LUGAL MUDI=YA ŠTI-anza ... [Dream of the Queen]: When the affair of Gurvasu [………………], 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, …

---

71 For the dating on Tudhaliya IV see Orlamünde 2001: 511ff.
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=μa kuin SA LŪMUDI=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-based. 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:


And concerning this (kas) enemy, the king of [Assur who is ris]ing up against me, if he comes into my country, let [de]ath 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?

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 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

---

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

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.
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 āši 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 Recognationally 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.

Recognationally used demonstratives are always centering and Focus.

| Recognition Use |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Continuity procedure | Centering procedure |
| E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus |
| — | — | — | dem N |

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 | LÜ. ZABAR.DAB | ešta ABL LUGAL | DUGGhar|ərən | GESTIN-ii | 2 | ANA | IlHišta-
| 2 | Marattii =ja | maništahhīš | 3 | LUGAL-i SIG3-antan | GESTIN-an | ūnkatta (Ø) | apēdašš-a | 4 | tamain | GESTIN-an pijer apāss-e a uit | LUGAL-i tet | 5 | natta apūn | GESTIN-an pijer LUGAL-iš kiš 6 | aūsta apāss-e a uit | QATAMMA IQBI | še-an = aštə | 7 | arha pēhuter | še-an ēššikir | ša-an BA.ŪS |

Zidi was a ‘bronze bowl keeper’. The father of the king assigned a harhara-vessel with wine to Histaya and Marattia. 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, Histaya and Marattia 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 Arzawaša | mNunnu LÜ | UBU.Hurm[(a)] | ilešta[(KÜ.BABBAR=š)ja] GUŠKI(N)] 10' | [n]atta udai kuit yemizz[(i a-pa-)] | lalša par(našša pittaizzi)] 11' | [(š=)]an LÜ | URU.Hundara | iššahhīš |

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.
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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-
na ša pittai  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 -al-ma. The use of apa- with -al-ma is described in 9.4.3.

Another, more familiar, context for the accentuated 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).


mān = an, za = kan 34 šēhunanza = pat tamāšzi n = a[ši, A]NA LŪMESEDUTIM ḫumandāš 35 EGIR-an huμāi nu = šši, kuiš LŪ[MESE]DI, pıraššit artarī 36 nu = šši, tezzi, DUG kalītiya = ya kattan paimi, a-pa-aša parā dametani 37 LŪMESEDIk tezzi a-pa-
šk parā L[MESE]DIJ tezzi a-pa-

Only if a bodily urge bothers him, he will move behind all the guards, and the bodyguard, who stands before him, to him, he will say: “I will go to the pot.” He then says (it) forth to another bodyguard, he 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 accentuated pronoun apa- with -al-ma.

3.3.3. The accentuated 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:


... n=äš-ta män 21 appizziš DUMU.É.GAL pará uizzi n=an=ši LÜ.ŠUKUR.GUSKIŅ ŪL pái n=äš-ta kuąapi pará GAL-ıš DUMU.É.GAL uizzi naššu UGULA.10 našma NIMGIR.ÉRIN.MEŠ [L^0.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 gard]rd, they give the key to him (apedani).

The negating part is n=an=ši LÜ.ŠUKUR.GUSKIŅ ŪL pái ‘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 l), ed. Grélois 1988: 55

ABU=ŠU=ya=šši kuiš LUGAL KUR ḤATTI ėšta nu=yaš aš UR.SAG-iš LUGAL-uš ėšta 11 nu=ya=za KUR.KUR.MEŠ LÚKÛR tar(a)ḫan ḫarta nu=yaš aš=za DINGIR-LIM-iš DÛ-at DUMU-ŠU=ma=ya=šši=za=kan 12 kuiš ANA GIS GU.ZA ABI=ŠU ėšat nu=ya a-pa-a-ašša karû LÚKAL-anza ėšta 13 nu=ya=an irimliʃat tu=ya=za a-pa-a-ašša DINGIR-LIM-iš kiʃat

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 ya-a-as *UR.SAG-iš LUGAL-uš ēšta *(he) was a heroic king* and *nu ya-a-as za DINGIR-LIM-iš DŪ-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 ya-a-as-sa karū LŪ.KAL-anza ēšta *he too* was in the past a strong man* and *nu ya-a-as za a-pa-a-as-sa DINGIR-LIM-iš kisat* *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 I.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 LŪ.U₁₉.LU-an kuiški ḫuŋkzi t=an ištankizi nu apūn ṣāktāizzī pēdišša=ma LŪ.U₁₉.LU-an pāi nu É-rišši ḫänūm aš lāzzatā mān aš lazzatā=ma ¹⁹ nuššē 6 ġIN KŪ.BABBAR pāi LŪ.A.ZU=ja kuššan a-pa-aš-pat pāi §  
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.

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 *ət 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

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

\[ Uššaz = šši \text{ URU} \quad Zarataš \text{ ZAG-aš \text{ URU} \quad Zarataš = ma\cdot kan } \text{ INA KUR } \text{id} \text{ Hülaja aššanza } \]

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

\[ nu = šši \text{ IŠTU KUR \text{ URU} \quad Pitašša \text{ IŠTU ZAG \text{ URU} \quad Arimmatta } \text{ 27 URU} \quad \text{Nahhantaš } \text{ URU} \quad \text{Hauttaššašš = a } \text{ ZAG-aš \text{ URU} \quad Nahhantaš = ma\cdot kan } \text{ 28 URU} \quad \text{Hauttaššašš = a } \text{ INA KUR } \text{id} \text{ Hülaja aššanteš } \]

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 \text{kus URU}^{DDDLIHA} 'these cities':

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

\[ Ušaulaz = ma\cdot šši \text{ ZAG-aš } \text{ URU} \quad \text{Haššušantaš } \text{ 51 URU} \quad \text{Milaš } \text{ Palmataš } \text{ URU} \quad \text{Haššašaš } \text{ URU} \quad \text{Suraš } \text{ URU} \quad \text{Simmušantaš } \text{ 52 ZAG-aš ku-u-uš = ma\cdot kan } \text{ URU}^{DDDLIHA} \text{ INA KUR } \text{id} \text{ Hülaja aššanteš } \]

His border (as seen) from the border of Usaula, is Hassuwanta, Mila, Palmata, Hashasa, Sura, (and) Simmuwanta. These \(kus=\ldots\) 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)

\[ \text{§ 32} \text{ mWalua-LÚ-iš LÚ URU} \quad \text{Sullamma } \text{ mKāšijaraš } \text{ LÙ URU} \quad \text{Zanzaliya } \text{ mAritku LÚ URU} \quad \text{Lillima } \text{ 33 mMa<š>huilū LÙ URU} \quad \text{Hinzūta } \text{ mSantass } \text{ LÙ URU} \quad \text{Wattarušnā } \text{ mHalpaś } \]
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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 3.3.3.4.). 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 *za*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 ŠAšī KUR URUDAL-tašša=ša zāk kuieš URUDIDLI-tA ŠA LUGAL KUR URUḪATTI 69 ešer (followed by 8 lines of names of cities) 77 a-pu-u-uš-š=a šši pianteš
And as for the cities belonging to the king of Hatti that lie in Tarhuntassa, ..., they too (apus=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]]ůpišna URUTūy[(an)]uwa URUNenašša URULânda URUZallara 11 [(URU)]Paršuḫanta URULušna nu ute manisḫiššir
Hupisna, Tuwanuwa, Nenassa, Landa, Zallara, Parsuhanta (and) Lusna: they (the emperor’s sons) administered these lands (ute, in Hittite no demonstrative).

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 predicational 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.
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

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 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

Now, Hutupianz a (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 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. Grélois 1988: 66
§ 42 MU.KAM-anni=ma INA ḤUR.SAGAŠharpaia pāun nu=za ḤUR.SAGAŠharpaian kuin 43 URU.Gašgaš ešan ĥarta nu SA KUR URUPalā KASKAL.MEŠ karaššan ĥarta 44 nu u-ni SA ḤUR.SAGAŠharpaia URU.Gaškan zahiňanun

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

§ 31 [nu mPihhuniijaš kuiš LÚ URU.Gašga LÚ URU.Tipiqa āšta 32 [kuitum]an=kan ABU=YA INA KUR.KUR.MEŠ Ḥurri āšta mPihhuniijaš=ma 33 [KUR UGU-T]/ URUŠtitina=ja GUL-anneškit[i] n=aš parā 34 [INA URU.Za]ţziša aš[šiši] nu=kan a-ši mPihhuniiaš 35 [OL SA …]x-sa-ni-x [iu][a]l 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]ţziša — that Pihhuniya [did not] rule like […]

Although the rest of the text is broken, it is likely that Pihhuniya 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 Pihhuniya. Then Mursili returns to the description of Pihhuniya, which had started in ii 31. Interesting here is that, contrary to the 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:

§ 21' DINGIR.MEŠ EN.MEŠ=YA SA mDudhalija kuit āšhar EGIR-an šanhat[teni] 22' nu=kan mDudhalian kuiš[x] kuennir nu āšhar apûš šarkin[kir] 23' nu KUR URU Hatti=ja a-pa-aš ishananza arha namma zin[n]ša
As for the blood of Dudhalia that you, o gods, my lords, are seeking, — (but mind this:) the ones who killed Dudhalia, it is they who [have] retributed the blood —, that blood (you're seeking) further ende[d] the land of Hatti too.

76 Compare Houwink ten Cate 1967: 46 n. 9: "(and) they were lowland (countries)".
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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 ishananza* ‘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 (Milet), 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: φ, -a-, apa-, ka- + N, apa- + N, aši + N. There is clear difference however between in node and across node reference. Inside a node only φ, -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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anaphora-Continuity procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ, -a-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

3.4.1 KUB 1.1 ii 66-71 (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 16-17
nu₇za kē KUR.KUR.MEŠ ² dannatta ⁶⁷ ISTU NI.TE=YA EGIR-pa ašeṣanunun ⁶⁸ n= at EGIR-pa Ḫattuššaŋ ijanun
§ ⁶⁹ GIM-an=ma uit Š[(EŠ=Y)]A kuṣap API KUR Mizri paite ⁷⁰ nu₇za KUR.KUR.MEŠ kue ke-e EGIR-pa ašeṣanul(nu)n nu KARAŠ ANšE.KUR.R[(A.MEŠ)]
⁷¹ kēl SA KUR-TI ANA ŠEŠ=YA läḥḥi API KUR Mizri ⁷² GAM-an pēḫutenun
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:

3.4.2 KUB 1.1 iii 57-58 (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 20-21
[(KUR.KUR.MEŠ=ja kue dannatta amm)]uk EGIR-pa ⁵⁸ [(ašeṣanunun nu₇=mu=kan
apē=ja Ḫumanda)]aṭba daš
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 [S]A ḞUR.SAG.Sakaddunuwa 9 parēn paizzi 10 mān EGlR-pa kuṯatqa 11 ūqunu šu nēškan KUR-ja 12 anda uizzi nūšši EGIR-an 13 naši kuutiš 14 tekuššišaizzi

§ 8 nēškan a-pa-a-aš ḞU.KUR kušapi 9 naiškitari 10 nušmu Ḟatreški §

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

§ Wherever that enemy *(apas ḞU.KUR)* turns away to, write (it) to me.

*That enemy* refers back across a paragraph line to ḞU.KUR ‘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 nēškan mān INA KUR ḞUR.SAG.Sakaddunuwa 9 parēn paizzi 10 mān EGlR-pa kuṯatqa 11 ūqunu šu nēškan KUR-ja 12 anda uizzi nūšši EGIR-an 13 naši kuutiš 14 tekuššišaizzi

§ 15 manēškan ḞU.TUŠI BELI.YA BELU 16 kuinki parā naitti 17 manēša KUR-i ḞU.KUR OL damniššaizzi §

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 *(ḞU.KUR)* 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.

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 SA KUR UR 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
But when I, My Majesty, heard about that affair, I, My Majesty, did not seek for evil against Mashuiluwa 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 Mashuiluwa 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 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 Mashuiluwa. 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 Mashuiluwa.

§ 3 SA [LûKûR kuit] utter ḫatrāēš 4 ANA Tûr.HÎA=ya kattan arantari 5 nu=ya= mu=kan ÉRIN.MEŠ parā nai 6 n=ašta kâ[s]a ÉRIN.MEŠ pangarit 7 parā ne[ḫu]n
nu a-pu-u-us TÜR.HI.A 8 anda SIG₃[-ahheškit|ten]78 n=at=kan 9 SIG₅-in ašnu[antar]u[79]8

[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[n]t 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=ya memiškizzi 15 kuit=yar=an zahhiškinun kuit=yar=an 16 zahhiškinun nu=  
yar=an=kan ūnhun 17 namma UR.BAR.RA=ja=ya=kan kuiš anda [eš]ša 18 [nu=  
yar]=an=kan šarā hiittianun 19 mān=ma a-ši UR.BAR.RA Ti-anza ...  

that was inside, I hauled him up.’ That (aši) 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 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

---

78 Alp’s restoration SIG₃{-in pa-ah-ha-as-nu-ut-}ten requires too much space, and even SIG₃{-in pa-ah-ha-as-}ten does not seem to fit. I therefore suggest SIG₃{-ah-he-es-ki-it-}ten instead.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>demonstrative NP occurs</th>
<th>kā-</th>
<th>apa-</th>
<th>aši</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in paragraph initial clause</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in preposed adverbial clause</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at semantically defined discourse node</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>versus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 adverbal 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passive or no Addressee</th>
<th>ka-</th>
<th>apa-</th>
<th>aši</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritual</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landgrant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Addressee</th>
<th>ka-</th>
<th>apa-</th>
<th>aši</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\(^{80}\) The totals are different from those in table 3.3. because this time all broken and unclear examples could be included.
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 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Treaty</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Instruction, Oath</th>
<th>Oracle</th>
<th>Active Other</th>
<th>Narration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anaphora-Centering procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Top U-Top A-Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, Diesse l 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 ḍ, -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.

89
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 φ, n=at, nu apatt=a, nu apâšš=a memiaš (remember that apa- is often used as the Focus pronoun and not as a demonstrative). 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  
§ 73 [m]ânn=am=mu=kan 1 KUR-TUM kuîtiki GAM-an niîari 74 [n]ašma=mu=kan EN.MEŠ kuîēšqa 2 allallâ pânzi 75 [z]ik=maššaš=kan anda įandâši nu kišan 76 memattî GĒŠPU-aḫhir=aš=mu n=at le DÛ-sî 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)
nâšma=za mân apâ[r(KUR-e našma URU-an)] 11 aššuli našma idâlu parâ įhuit[([i]ián) h(armi)] 12 zig=aššmaš=at mân pâitti EGIR-pa[( me)mat(tu)] 13 n= ešta ŠAPAL NIŠ DINGI.R.MEŠ k[i]tarru] §
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[laced] 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

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

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

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 -al-ma is absent indicates that we have to do with Sentence Focus.

On the other hand, when the contents are already salient, the Speaker has two options. Either s/he expresses the contents by means of ø 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Deixis</th>
<th>Continuity procedure</th>
<th>Centering procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Top</td>
<td>A-Focus</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ø, -a-</td>
<td>apa- (N)</td>
<td>ka- N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To substantiate my belief it would be necessary to study Initial position with and without -al-ma. In Chapter 9 I will only study apa- with -al-ma.
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) (oc. 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).

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)\(^3\)

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Backward</th>
<th>Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>MH/MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>at</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apat (Foc)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\)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’.
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 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-*.

The clause containing theses adverbs always forms 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:

### Table 3.8. Distribution of discourse deictic expressions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>apa-</em> N (Foc)</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Centering</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kīkē</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ka-</em> N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>apat</em> (Foc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>apat</em>&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>apa-</em> N (Foc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>apa-</em> N</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>eni</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>aši</em> N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The demonstrative adverbs of manner

The first type of discourse deictic expressions to be treated is the demonstrative adverb of Manner. According to Diesell (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*, while *eniššan* refers backwards (see already Hrozný 1917: 135, Friedrich 1926: 73, 1974: 134). Both adverbs can modify verbs of communication (*memiya-, te-lar-, hattrai-,*), 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:

<sup>84</sup> With *apat* or *apa-N* I mean Addressee oriented *apa-*, not Focal *apa-*

<sup>85</sup> With a very few exceptions. See chapter 6.
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 Tutanchamun from Egypt to King Suppiluliuma of Hatti, in which she expresses her disappointment in Suppiluliuma’s reaction on her request for a Hittite husband:

KBo 3.6 iii 45 - iv 4 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40), ed. Güterbock 1956: 96

nu ABU=YA kuqapi $^m$GIDRULÜ-in 46 INA KUR $^Ur$ $u$ Mezri ISPUR $n=an$ kiššan 47
kuit yatarnahita DUMU EN-SUNU=ya=šmaš 48 kuqatqa ēšzi ammuk=ma=ya 49
appaleškanzi $n=ya=mu$ DUMU=YA LUGAL-užznanni 50 $ÜL$ yekiškanzi nu ANA
ABU=YA 51 MUNUS.LUGAL $^Ur$ $u$ Mizri tuppijaš EGIR-pa ki-įš-ša-an $^52$ ĥatraizziz
kuqat=ya a-pé-nil-ša-an TAQBI 53 appaleškanzi $u=mu$ ammuk=mam=ya 54
kuqapi DUMU=YA ešta ammuk=man=ya ammel $//$ iv 1 $[R]AMAN=ya$ ammell=s a
KUR-eaš tepnumar 2 tametani KUR-e ĥ̃atranun 3 $n=ya=mu$=kan parâ $ÜL$
ijaštatta 4 $n=ya=mu$ en-e-nil-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 iiii 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 …’.


§ 10 $^dUTU$ URUPU-na kuit e-nil-eš-ša-an tešhaneškittari

Concerning the fact that the Sungoddess of Arinnā 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 eniṣšan as a backward discourse deictic adverb, referring to a portion of discourse on the original tablet.

Not one attestation of kiššan and eniṣšan in my corpus is used in a setting involving comparison. This is however completely different for the clauses containing apenįššan and its Akkadographic writing QATAMMA. Another important feature that distinguishes apenįššan from the others is the fact that kiššan and eniṣšan usually refer to Direct Speech whereas apenįššan 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 URUḪATTI LÛ.MEŠ ILKI yer ANA ABI LUGAL aruḫ(änzi)  
17 nu tarsikanzi kūšan=naš=za natta kuiški ie[z]i  
18 nu=ṣu=naš mimmanzi LÛ.MEŠ ILKI=ya šumeš nu ABI LUGAL [(tuliš an)da tiiaṭ]  
19 n=ṣuš anda šittariṭ itten māhhanda 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 reverence to the father of the king, and said: “Not one of us makes wages! 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 (apenįššan) you too must do!'

3.60 KBo 15.10+ ii 12-16 (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szabó 1971: 22-23
12 [QAD]U kurdăli idalāmuš EMEḪ.LA arḫa šuḥhair  
13 [nu k]iššan mēmir kē māhhan ḥarkanzi  
14 [T]iš=z a BELAM QADU DAM-ŠU DUMU.MEŠ[S.-]SU kuit iššišta  
15 [nu Š]A Zi alyansatar=zet idālu uddār=zet QA-TAM-MA  
16 [ḥara]kdu n=ṣa=apa EGIR-pa lē uiizzi §

[With the kurdali-vessel they threw away the ‘evil tongues’. They spoke as follows: “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 [of] Zi (and) her evil words [be destroyed], let them not come back!”

Besides the construction mahhan ... apenįššan ‘Just as ... likewise/in that same way’ there are also several examples of comparison without mahhan, although the sense is not altered.

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 apenįššan 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, apenįššan 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 šiija- and anni-. There exists an adverb anniššan (single -š) ‘in the past, in his time’, but it is unlikely that it may be compared

---

46 Hoffner differently: ‘No one pays us a wage.’
47 Hoffner: ‘You too must perform (sahhan-services) just like your colleagues!’.
48 See chapter 5.4.2.
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 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

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 i 60 (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 210-211

§ 60 nu ki-i=ma kiššan DÜ=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 këdanizya=kan tuppi 50 kë INIM.MES 9L 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. Götzte 1933: 18-19

kēṣ-ma mḪannuttīš kuiš KUR.KUR.MEŠ Ś[APLITI] 12 manijaḫḫišit nu TNA KUR URU KUR.KUR.MEŠ Š[APLITI] 113 n=as apija BA.ŪŠ nu maḫḫan eni=ja ŠA mḪannuti[i ŠA URU KUR.KUR.MEŠ Š[APLITI] 14 ištamaššir n=at za=kan apēżzi=ja EGIR-an [EGIR-pa?] 15 ešandaṭ nu=nu e-ni AWATEMEŠ apadda šaṭeš[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 hero. If you would impress me, [you] would [be] he for me.” [But when] they saw [my brother] ill,)

Hannuti 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:


§ 2 našma=kan [...] 3 našma ŠES ṣ[TU]-ST ŠA MUNUS.LUGA\L. b[aššanza našma] 4 ŠES.MEŠ DUMU.MEŠ MUNUS ṣ[APT] T[T] anda i[štamašši] 5 nu ki-i memai EGIR-an za=mu ti[i]a 6 apāš=ma ap-a-a-at memai EGIR-an za=ta 7 OL tijami hanti=ja ya=šši 8 OL tijami 2 hůh ŠABA za=[a=šši] 0 OL. 9 kišhāhari ...

Or (if) [...] or a brother of [My Majesty], offspring or brothers [of the Queen], [l]isten[s] 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?]” ....
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

\[\text{namma a-pa-a-at kuit eššatteni nu KUR.KUR.ḪI.A}^{30} \text{ BA[L di]apianda I-ēta naiškittin}^{31} \text{ nu K[UR.KUR].ḪI.A}^{30} \text{ KUR daššanuškittin}^{32} \text{ KUR.KUR ŪRḪATTI=ma malškunuttin}^{31} \]

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 ʔya, ‘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 dannaz maz an za lê ilâi jaši O$L$at âra apê(zê kan) 27 uddanaz arha 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 (apedezi) 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 mahân=ma dUTU-ŠI u-ni memian AŠME nu dUTU-ŠI mP TIM.TUR-an 35 O$L kuıtki HUL-uanni šânı̂n
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.):

§ 4 SA NUMUN.HI.A=mu uttar kuit $ hatrâeš NUMUN.HI.A=ya 6 AŠÂ terippiaš 7 NU,GÂL
§ 25 kinuna apêz dâš 26 nu apê NUMUN.HI.A annı̂ja
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:
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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 φ, -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-/itar- 'to speak', memai- 'to tell', hattrai- '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 knowing):

3.71 KBo 6.26 i 22-27 (OH/NS law, CTH 292), ed. Hoffner 1997: 130
§ 22 takku šuppalaššet kuêlqa šieuniahta 23 tsat parkunuzi nsat arha pennai 24 īšiu-analluššašš = mašš kan īšiu-an dāi 25 ariššiššiššašš = mašš at OL tezzi 12 arašš−šš 26 OL šakki šuppalaššet pennai 27 nsat aki šarnižil §

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 also the colleague doesn't know (about it) so drives his animals (there), and they die, there shall be compensation.

The verb te-/itar- '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-.

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:

§ 14 ANA dUTU-S1 kuit ANA DUMU.MEŠ mUrhi.dU-up 2 SISKUR.manta(1ii)a 15 IGI-anda arba BAL-uanzi UL SIXŠA-at UL-zaš kuit [dUTU-S1] ḤUL-aḫḫuN 16 ḤUL-aḫtu-šaš kuiš UN-aš n-zaš nūya kuit TI-za nu [ap]el kuit 17 TI-za UL ṣaršiyança nu SISKUR.mantalli arba B[AL-u(anz)] 18 a-pé-ez UL SIXŠA-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 his 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 Complete 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.

ŠEŠ zYa ſma ammedaza NIG.TUKU-ti kuntik 0L-ŠAT ŠUM-an iššaššaryatar sa Will my brother somehow become rich on my account? That (lit. it) is neither (good) reputation nor lordly behavior.

91 It seems that in older language =a, the allophone of śma, 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 -al-ma, overrules the need for an enclitic pronoun, especially when the verb itself already delimits the possible referents.
92 See also for example NH KUB 1.1 iii 61 (Egodocument, CTH 81).
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-, paralleling Focal apeniššan.

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 not-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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Deixis</th>
<th>Continuity procedure</th>
<th>Centering procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Top</td>
<td>A-Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>θ,-a-</td>
<td>apa- (+ N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apeniššan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 *φ, -a-*, and *apa-* (3.3) The difference between *φ, -a-*, and *apa-* was that *φ* 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 *φ, 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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>geographical parameter</th>
<th>cognitive parameter</th>
<th>continuity procedure</th>
<th>centering procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Topic</td>
<td>U-Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deictic</td>
<td>dem</td>
<td>dem</td>
<td>dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>φ</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognisational</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaphora</td>
<td>(-a-)</td>
<td>apa-N</td>
<td>apa-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-node</td>
<td>dem N</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across-node</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Deictic</td>
<td>(-a-)</td>
<td><em>φ</em></td>
<td>apa-(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-node</td>
<td>(dem ?)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across-node</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.