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4. The distal demonstrative asi, uni, eni etc.

4.1. Status Quaestionis

4.1.1. Introduction

Two opposing views on the form and function of the lexemes asi, eni, uni etc. have been competing during the past 70 years. One theory, originating from Friedrich 1925, distinguishes separate pronouns with more or less similar functions, whereas Laroche 1979 united all forms in one paradigm, naturally with one function. Building on the insights of these scholars but opposing them on major points, I accept Laroche's unitary paradigm, but expand on the idea of Friedrich that the forms built on the stem ed- are deictic. In this chapter I will present the evidence for asi, uni, eni etc. as a true deictic demonstrative pronoun. This demonstrative is the distal member of a three-way deictic system in which ka- is the proximal term (see Chapter 6) and apa- is the medial term (see Chapter 5)93.

4.1.2. Friedrich's different paradigms, similar function

Friedrich 192594 was the first to recognize that undeclined asi functions as a nom.sg. and acc. sg. pronoun with the meaning "selbiger, besagter, erwähnter". He derived this meaning from the observation that asi very often occurs adnominally with a substantive that is mentioned before. He did however not distinguish true anaphoric reference from mention of asi in Direct Speech referring backwards across a Direct Speech boundary to an object in the preceding narration95 (for examples, see sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3). Friedrich was not able to find a difference between asi and the other pronouns: "Auch wie sich aši von den anderen rückweisenden Demonstrativen apāš, eniš und uniš unterschied, kann ich nicht sagen." (1925: 289). So obviously he classified asi as a demonstrative (see also his grammar § 118), albeit an anaphoric one.

93 Contrary to current views. For a discussion see Chapter 5.

94 The first attempt to categorize several of the forms discussed here is found in Forrer 1922: 207-8. At this early stage in Hittite studies his categorization necessarily contains much that has been later discarded. I will therefore not extensively discuss Forrer's views. Forrer distinguished three non-proximal demonstratives: cataphoric eni- 'jener (vordeutend)', anaphoric uni- 'jener, (rückdeutend)' and anni- 'jener (in größere Entfernung weisend)'. It seems that he considered eni- and uni- as anaphoric demonstratives, anni- as a situational demonstrative.

95 The distinction between true anaphoric reference and reference to an entity both in narration and embedded Direct Speech is crucial for understanding the true nature of a demonstrative pronoun.
In 1926 Friedrich discussed the meaning of *eni*, the nom.-acc.neuter sg. of a pronoun *enis* and its adverb *enissan*. This adverb refers backward to a citation, and from the meaning of *enissan* Friedrich derived for *eni* 'der eben erwähnte, der kurz vorher genannte' (1926: 73 and n. 3. Also see Sommer 1938: 161). Although Forrer 1922: 207-208 proposed to unite *eni* with *edas, edani, edi* and *edez*, Friedrich rejected this connection on formal and functional grounds. Formally one should expect a stem *a-*, not *e-*, in the nominative and accusative (1926: 74 n. 1), and functionally the *edas* group seemed to be rather close to *ka-*, the proximal demonstrative. He assumed that the deictic force of the *edas* group was somewhat weaker ("Der"-Deixis). Furthermore, the meaning 'der (eben) erwähnte' did not fit in the contexts where *edas* etc. was used.\footnote{This observation turns out to be important. As I will prove in this chapter, the suppletive paradigm *asi*, *uni*, *eni* etc. functions as a distal demonstrative. Although a distal demonstrative may be used anaphorically, allowing the translation 'the aforementioned', *aði* is also used deictically. In that case the translation 'the aforementioned' is impossible.}

In the same work (1926: 155) Friedrich discussed *uni*, the accusative of a demonstrative *uni-*. All that he could say about *uni, unin* and *unius* was that they refer backwards to something that is mentioned earlier. Semantically *uni-* seemed to be connected with the enemy. Again Friedrich states that he has not yet found any difference with the other anaphoric demonstratives *apad, enis* and *asi*.

Summarizing, Friedrich distinguished five demonstrative stems besides *ka-* "this", (i) a deictic *a*- with the attested forms *edas, edani, edi* and *edez*, more or less similar in function to *ka-*, the proximal deictic demonstrative, (ii) *asi*, an anaphoric demonstrative without inflection, (iii) an anaphoric demonstrative *eni-*, attested as *enis* and *eni*, (iv) an anaphoric demonstrative *uni-* with the forms *uni, unin, and unius*, and finally (v), the anaphoric demonstrative *apa-* 'is'.

The same view was expressed by Friedrich in his dictionary (1952-1966 [1991]) and grammar (1960). There are: (i) *edani, edas, edi* and *edez* and now also *e-, nom.pl.comm.*, belonging to the defective pronoun a- ‘er, sie, es’ (1991: 17, 44; 1974: 68 (§ 116)), (ii) the undeclinable *asi- ‘der betreffende’ (but see the lexical entry *asis* in KUB 3.99 ii 18, Friedrich 1960: 68), (1991: 36; 1974: 68 (§ 118)), (iii) *eni- ‘der (eben) erwähnte’, with *enis, eni* and *enius* (1991: 41; 1974: 68 (§ 117)), and (iv) *uni- ‘jener, der da, der erwähnte’ with *unin, uni* and *unius* (1991: 234; 1974: 68 (§ 117)). This distribution is also found in Friedrich-Kammenhuber (1975ff.) sub the lemmata *a-*, *asi, eni, edi* and *ediz*, but now in view of the united paradigm established by Laroche 1979. Friedrich-Kammenhuber's view will therefore be discussed after the presentation of the united paradigm theory.

4.1.3. Laroche's one paradigm, one function

The beginning of a unification of several of these pronouns can be attributed to Pedersen 1938. Triggered by Old Irish *inti* (o.c., p. 59) he understood *asi* and *uni* als frozen case endings of the stem *e-*, with deictic *i* (o.c., p. 60). The form *asi* was originally a nom.sing.c., *uni* an acc.sing.c. meaning 'jener, dieser, der, besagter'. Although this division of labor must have been original, he also pointed at the signs of petrification by noting the existence of forms as *unius*, but also the use of *asi* as acc. (o.c., p. 61).

Besides the attribution of *asi* and *uni* to a stem *e-*, Pedersen also assumed that the orthotonic forms *edani, edes* and *edi* and the enclitic *-as* etc. belong to a stem *e-. It is not clear from his description whether he assumed two different stems *e-*, one pronominal and one
deictic, or a single paradigm $e$. Given his discussion of these forms in two separate paragraphs (§§ 52 and 53), it seems safe to conclude that Pedersen did not want to unite them explicitly. More surprisingly however he did not include eni in the paradigm of asi and uni, although he mentioned the comparable function of neuter eni (o.c., p. 61-2).

Sturtevant 1951 moved one step further. He distinguished two groups: \{edi, edani ‘ei’, etez, etas\}, o.c. 109, and \{asi, uni, eni\}, o.c. 110. (see also Tischler 1977: 80 for the same position).

It was Laroche 1979 who really united the two (Sturtevant), three (Pedersen) or four (Friedrich) different stems into one paradigm. He did so by comparing the syntactic distribution of the different forms and by contrasting the resulting anaphoric pronoun \{asi, eni, uni, edani, edi, edez, unius, edas, *ea\} with the anaphorically used demonstrative apa-.

Laroche showed that all forms occurred in the same syntagmatic environments (referring to Kammenhuber 1975: 41, sub a.1 for edani and edas):

- *asi, eni, uni and unius* function as antecedent of resp. the relative *kuis, kuit, kuin and kuies*.
- *asi, eni, uni and unius* function anaphorically as determiners of a NP.
- *asi, eni and uni* function as independent pronouns.

The unitary proposal of Laroche and the origin of the paradigm in Indo-European are generally accepted (see Bader 1981: 31, Puhvel 1984: 3ff. sub a-, Neu 1997: 139).

Laroche also discussed the competition between *asi* and the demonstrative *apa*. According to him, the original opposition *kali- ‘hic’ ... apa- ‘ille’ disappeared, thereby assigning to *apa- the function of anaphoric pronoun in the clause of a relative clause (anaphore relative) and in the discourse in general (anaphore coordonnante) (1979: 148). This invasion of *apa- in the anaphoric domain caused a decline in the use of the ‘seul vrai pronom/adjectif anaphorique du hittite’ *asi* (p. 148, followed by Puhvel 1984: 5).

Although Laroche 1979: 150 recognized the ‘valeur de deictique lointain’ of *edi*, he still contrasted the anaphor *aluien* (our *asi, eni, uni*) with the two demonstratives *kas* and *apas* (o.c. 152). Opposing Laroche in his understanding of the function of *asi*, I will show below that *asi* is not anaphoric, but truly deictic, and that *apa- never invaded the territory of *asi* (see Chapter 7, 8, 9 for Focal *apa-). The relative infrequency of *asi* is caused by its distal semantics, while the relative frequency of *apa- is caused by its main function as an emphatic (or Focus) pronoun. The environments of *asi* and *apa- are generally different, even in their shared area, the anaphoric domain (compare 4.5. below with chapter 5.5.).

4.1.4. Kammenhuber’s criticism

Kammenhuber 1975ff: 400 sub *asi* observed that the paradigm set up by Laroche 1979 only describes the situation in the 13th century although he projected this paradigm back into Indo-European. First of all, she noted that *uni- is already inflected in OH (see the discussion in 4.6.4.1. for a different view) and that *asi* is both nom.sg.c. and n., acc.sg.c. and n. in NH.

\footnote{For a neuter plural Laroche refers to HW. But as Beekes 1980: 207a notes, ea is not mentioned in either HW or HW.}

\footnote{Kammenhuber 1975: 400 lists *asi also as neuter. However, the alleged neuter *asi* in the lexical list KBo 26.20 ii 21 (l.c.: *-ai-[i k]ul-it memiauwar) does not exist. Read with Gütterbock & Civil 1985: 107 a-i-[i-[i-]it memiauwar.}
Second, *edani* and the other obliqui of the defective Old Hittite demonstrative pronoun *a-* "is; jener" were understood as obliqui to *eni* from the time of Mursili II (see also Kammenhuber 1975ff.: 38-9 sub *eni*) (see 4.6.4.2.). Third, she understood *asi, uni* and *eni* as synonyms: *eni* "Entwickelt sich ebenso wie synonymes *aši* (meistens Sg. N. c.) und *uni*(-) (meistens Sg. A.c.) im Aheth. neben den schon in Aheth. voll flektierten Pronomina *apa-* [...], "jener, der (erwähnte)" und *ka-* (ki) "dieser". Fourth, the OH material is too restricted to say anything on the paradigm in the older language phases, and certainly nothing about Indo-European roots unless cognates can be found in the other Anatolian languages (sub *asi*, p. 400). Finally her conclusion: "paradigma-artige Entfaltung der drei Formen zusammen mit Obliqui *edani* usw. ab Murs. II. (nach 1350 v. Chr.) und vor allem im 13. Jh." (sub *eni*, p. 41). Each one of these objections against Laroche has to be taken seriously since some of them indeed might undermine his hypothesis.

The picture emerging from Kammenhuber 1975ff. is as follows. There are originally four pronominal stems, (i) the defective demonstrative pronoun *a-* "is; jener, er", with pl.nom.c. *e-, and the obliqui *edani, edas, edez* and *edi* (from which the defective personal pronoun -*a* is derived, o.c. 42, sub -*a*-2), (ii) a form *asi* "der betreffende", (iii) a form *uni*(-), and (iv) a form *eni* "jenes (zuvor erwähnte)" in oracles "jenes (andersweitig bekannte)". From the time of Hattusili III *eni* and *a-* are seen as belonging to the same stem, and the three remaining 'stems', *a-, asi* and *uni* now form one paradigm.

4.1.5. Summary and Fragestellung

Kammenhuber accepted Laroche's unitary paradigm only for the 13th century and later. Her main criticism concerned the earlier periods in which the attestation of the different forms is minimal and she therefore did not accept Indo-European roots unless cognates in the other Anatolian languages were found. The first question to be answered is:

(i) Is there enough textual support for a unitary paradigm in the older language phases?

Besides disagreement on the age of the paradigm there is also disagreement on the nature of *asi*. Laroche was clear in his description. The pronoun *asi* is anaphoric, in contrast with the deictics *apa-* 'ille' and *ka-* 'hic'. But according to Neu (1997: 139) *asi* is deictic. At least, that is what I infer from his remark on the paradigm of *asi* as a "sehr archaischen Pronominalparadigmas, dessen Deixisfeld auf der Vokaltria von *o*-(heth. *a*), *e-, und *e-be ruth". Puhvel 1984: 3 translates *a-* as 'this (one)', that (one), the aforementioned (one)' and follows Laroche in the anaphoric interpretation. Although Kammenhuber treated *asi, uni* and *eni* as synonyms, her translations were not uniform. As already mentioned, she more or less united *eni* with *a-* resulting in 'jener, er', 'jenes (zuvor erwähnte)', and in oracles (eni) 'jenes (andersweitig bekannte)'. The pronoun *asi* received the translation 'der betreffende'. Interestingly enough she did not give any grammatical classification of *asi* and *eni*, whereas *a-* was classified as a defective demonstrative pronoun. It seems to me that Kammenhuber did not find enough contextual evidence to confirm or disprove Laroche's functional analysis of *asi* as the only true anaphoric pronoun. So the second question is:

(ii) Is the pronoun/adjective *asi* etc. only an anaphoric demonstrative or deictic or both?

In order to answer both questions I will proceed as follows:

109
the main source for Deixis in dead languages is the use of deictic forms in Direct Speech. In section 4.2 I will discuss which forms occur in Direct Speech, and what spatial contrast is indicated by these forms.

After this has been established, three other contexts of asi etc., recognitional deixis (section 4.3), discourse deixis (section 4.4) and anaphora (section 4.5)—all three are typical uses of demonstratives (see Chapter 2)—will be discussed. Especially interesting is the use of the different forms of the proposed paradigm in the same function in the same text. If we have different forms in the same function, they probably belong to the same paradigm.

The paradigmatic 13th century is either the endpoint of some diachronic development which brought together different stems in one paradigm or it simply continued the situation of the older periods. Although there is not enough material in the earlier phases, we may assume the existence of a paradigm also in these periods if the functions of the different attested forms are similar to their corresponding younger Hittite forms. That is, if Old Hittite asi functions for example as a deictic demonstrative with negative emotional connotation just like its younger counterpart, and if Old Hittite uni functions as a recognitional demonstrative with distancing effect just like New Hittite uni, and given the fact that asi and uni belong to the same paradigm in New Hittite, then I assume that they also belong together in Old Hittite.

The vocabulary fragments KUB 3.99 ii 18 and KBo 1.42 iii 33ff. were discarded by Laroche 1979: 148: „asis, l’hapax de vocabulaire […], est une fabrication artificielle sans valeur linguistique“. Kammenhuber thought so too (1975ff. p. 39 sub eni, p. 400 sub asi). Although the form asis may be coined by the writer of the vocabulary, it is still possible to compare its function with the Sumerian and Akkadian demonstratives in order to see whether the function as described in this Chapter is supported or contradicted (section 4.6.4.3).

A general issue in Deixis and Anaphora is the connection between deictic or anaphoric expressions and attention level. Though this issue is not very important for the questions formulated above, I will discuss the attention level of the referents in order to test whether the Hittite material supports the scheme outlined in Chapter 2. Besides the attention levels I will also pay attention to the Information Structure of the main clauses containing asi etc.\(^{101}\)

For reasons I have given in Chapter 2, I follow Cornish 1999 in distinguishing two modes of attention level concerning mental representations of entities: they are either salient or not salient. Salient entities reside in working memory, whereas non-salient entities reside either in long-term memory or are part of the physical environment but not yet noted by the

\(99\) Given the translation „jener“ Kammenhuber HW\(^{6}\) must have thought that \(a\)- was a non-proximal demonstrative although Friedrich assumed that it behaved more like a proximal demonstrative. Why Kammenhuber o.c. 130b remarked about apa: „Nach Aussterben von \(a\)- auch als betonte Form zu \(-a\)- und \(e\)-“ möglich” although \(a\)- was in use until the end of Hittite is not clear to me.

\(100\) Without further explaining himself. He did not classify asi as a demonstrative but simply as a pronoun (therefore anaphoric?), in contrast with \(\bar{\epsilon}ja\)- (o.c. 145) and \(ani\)- (o.c. 156). Neither did he explain how he used the term Deixis. One should be aware of the variation in the literature on the use of this term (Lyons 1999: 20 n. 11). For example, ‘deictic’ can be equivalent to ‘demonstrative’, or it can denote reference to the speech surroundings.

\(101\) I do not discuss subordinate clauses from the point of view of Information Structure. Often the contents of these clauses are presented to the Addressee as presupposed, providing the background for the matrix clause. Presupposed clauses are therefore outside the field of sentence topic and focus (Lambrecht 1994: 67-69, et passim).
Addressee, as estimated by the Speaker. Also modifiers (adjectives, genitives) and presupposed propositional contents are thought to be non-salient.

Reference to non-salient (and sometimes salient) entities in the physical surroundings falls under the Situational Use of expressions (here discussed in section 4.2). The Recognitional Use of demonstratives (section 4.3) is a typical example of reference to non-salient entities that reside in long-term memory, with the extra requirement that the entity has to be discourse-new. Non-salient presupposed propositional contents are captured by Discourse Deixis (section 4.4). The two remaining types of non-salient entities are those expressed by modifiers and the ones residing in long-term memory while being discourse-old. The latter ones will be discussed under the heading of Anaphora, together with the salient discourse-old entities (section 4.5).

4.2. The Situational Use of asi

4.2.1. Introduction

In order to show that asi is a deictic instead of an anaphoric pronoun or determiner, the obvious environment to look at is the Situational Use. As described in 2.3.1., generally three sub-areas are recognized as situational: true situational use, Direct Speech, and linguistic self-reference.

For situational use and Direct Speech we can use Fillmore’s criteria in order to decide what type of situational deixis is involved (see also 2.3.1.1.):

- **Distal Demonstrative** (Fillmore 1982: 50-1): Prototypically the distal demonstrative alternates between two features, (a) it points to an entity at a great distance from both Speaker’s and Addressee’s visual field or (b) to an entity being outside the Speaker’s and Addressee’s visual field. In some languages both conditions need to be satisfied for the demonstrative in order to be classified as distal, in other languages only one of them is criterial.

- **Medial Demonstrative** (Fillmore 1982: 49): Prototypically a medial demonstrative is represented by two features, (a) it points to an entity at a small distance from Speaker (Speaker Pivot) and (b) to an entity being near the Addressee (Hearer-Pivot). In some languages both conditions need to be satisfied for the demonstrative in order to be classified as medial, in other languages only one of them is criterial. When (b) is satisfied, the language has a person-based demonstrative system, when (a) is satisfied, a distance-based system.  

- **Proximal Demonstrative**: A proximal demonstrative is characterized as indicating the closest distance to the Speaker.

---

102 Salient presupposed propositional contents are referred to by means of the enclitic neuter pronoun -at (see Chapter 2) and the Focus pronoun apa- (see Chapter 2 and 8).

103 There are even languages that combine both systems (Lyons 1999: 109).
4.2.2. True Situational Use

The only real Situational use of asi is encountered in the expressions containing adverbially used dative-locative edi (Old Hittite) and ablative edez (New Hittite). The main characteristic of these expressions is to point at a location at the other side of some point of reference, viewed from the Deictic Center, which in every case is the capital Hattusa. Melchert 1977: 15ff described this type of location as 'relative position'. The frequent use of edi / edez in combination with ket / kez (from the proximal demonstrative ka-) allows the conclusion that edi / edez is at least a non-proximal demonstrative. In combination with the fact that deictic apiya / apez is the Medial term in a three-term system (see chapter 5), edi / edez must be the Distal term.

Generally the point of reference, viewed from the Deictic Center, is a prominent landmark in the countryside, such as a river, mountain range or mountain top or some other prominent object in the deictic space of the Speaker:

4.1  KBo 6.2 i 48-50, § 22 (OS laws, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 31-32
§ 48 [ta]kkA ARAD-aš húxâl n=an ãppA kuši kuši uαtēzzA tākkA mānninku{ī}u{ā}n e[ps]i 49 nu=z{s}ē {k}E.SI{r}-u=N pāi tākkA ke-e-et {I}D-az 2 GĪN KŪ.BABBAR pāi 30 tākkA e-di {I}D-az nu=z{s}ē 3 GĪN KŪ.BABBAR pāi §
If a male slave runs away and someone brings him back, if he captures (him) nearby, he gives him shoes. If (he captures him) on this side (ket) of the river, he gives 2 sheqels of silver. If (he captures him) on that side (edi) of the river, he gives him 3 sheqels of silver.

4.2  KUB 19.20 + obv. 9'-12' (lateMH/MS letter, Suppiluliuma, CTH 154), ed. Van den Hout 1994: 64, 72
§ 9 [ID]Mālān kuit ŠA LUGAL KUR ŪRUHurri e-de-εz tāpuša ēšiA 10' [n=at iSTU NAM.RA GU,H]A] UDU,H]A āšsuittsα šārā dāḥbun 11' [n=at=za ANA KUR ŪRU]Hatti udāhbun ke-e-ez-zi-ja=kan kuit 12' ŠA LUGAL KUR ŪRUHurri tāpuša ēšiA nu=za apātt=α ANA KUR ŪRUHatti 13' [udāhbun [What] was alongside [the Mala-river] on the other side (ededez) belonging to the king of Hurri, I picked [it] up, [including deportees, oxen], sheep, and possessions, and I brought [them to Ha]Hatti. And also, what was alongside on this side (kez) [belonging to the king of Hurri], that too [I brought] to Hatti.

The locations indicated by edi / edez are often at a great distance from the Deictic Center and invisible (see Fillmore’s criteria above). The two following examples show a situation where large distance is not involved, but I wonder whether invisibility is the issue here:

4.3  KBo 17.15 rev. 1 14'-16' (OS ritual, CTH *645.6), ed. Neu 1980a: 73-74.
15 haššāš katta ke-e-et arta VI ḤAR-n[ā]îSAR ḫarzi L[ū šeššā] 16 haššāš katta e-di paršanān ḫarzi VI ḤAR-n[ā]îSAR ḫarzi The Head of the cooks stands near the hearth on this side (ket). He is holding 6 harnai-plants. The hesta-man is squating near the hearth on the other side (edi). He is holding 6 harnai-plants.

4.4  KUB 43.30 obv. ii 6' (OS ritual, CTH *645.7), ed. Neu 1980a: 77
§ 6 [LŪ,ME]ŠMUH[ALDI M] ispantuziaššarûs e-di tāršanîpaz pēdanzi §
The cooks carry the libation vessels to the other side (edi) of the ‘Bühne’.
In ex. 4.3 one person is standing at the near side of the hearth, in view of the Speaker, whereas the other person is squatting at the other side of the hearth. The fact that he is squatting might indicate that he is not visible behind the fire, or, if the fire is not burning, behind the hearth. In ex. 4.4 the vessels might not be visible behind the elevated structure. In any case, each time edi / edez refers to a location at the other side of a landmark. This landmark divides the space in two parts: an area seen as belonging to the Speaker, however large that area is, and an area seen as not belonging to the Speaker. In view of what follows in the remainder of this chapter it seems to me that this division of space is more important in Hittite than visibility or invisibility.

In the above examples edi or edez referred to locations not mentioned before. But when the area located at the other side of a point of reference is already salient in the discourse, edi / edez is immediately replaced by apiya in Old Hittite or apez in Newer Hittite:

4.5 KBo 7.14 + obv. 7-9 (OS narration, CTH 15), ed. Rosi 1984: 118
§ 7 [LÜ] URUḪASSI LUGAL-i menaḫanda zabḫiṣa uit 8 [n=]a[4] "Li-KASKAL-iš masze nu a-pi-ia takkalit 9 [ke-]el-da LUGAL-uš takkalit [The man] from Hassi came for battle against the king. Lipalsi withstood [him]m. He closed in on (him) on that (= his) side (apiya), while the king closed in on (him) on this side (ked=a).

This time 'the other side' is not simply beyond the point of reference, i.e. the enemy, it is also connected with the location of Lipalsi who has just been mentioned. This anaphoric connotation is completely absent from the meaning of edi / edez. That apezza is the anaphoric counterpart of edez is also illustrated by the next example:

4.6 KUB 1.1 + ii 31-33 (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 12-13
§ 31 uit=ma LŪKUR [(Pišḫuruš anda āraš)] URUKaraḫn[(a)š]=a 32 URUMarišaš š[(LA] LŪKUR) ešṭa (nušši a-pé-e-ez KUR URUṬaqqašt)šaš ZAG-aš ešṭa 33 ke-e-ez-za=ma šši [(URUtalmališaš ZAG-aš ešš)]a
It happened that the enemy of Pishuru barged in and the cities Karahna and Marista [were] in the midst of the enemy. On the other (= the enemy's) side (apez) the country Taqqasta was its border, but on this side (kezza=ma) Talmaliya was its border.

The other attestations of the distal adverb of relative position are KBo 25.112 obv. ii 4'-6', with duplicate KBo 25.114 (OS ritual, CTH 733 II 4), KUB 19.37 ii 20-34 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), KUB 19.1 i 10'-15' (NH annals, Hattusili III, CTH 83.1) and KBo 6.28 obv. 6-14 (NH annals, Hattusili III, CTH 88).

An area does not have to be mentioned explicitly in order to be salient. For this cognitive interpretation of anaphora see Chapter 2.

The fact that the locative apiya is used to indicate (anaphoric) relative position leads by analogy to the conclusion that also ked is a locative. In later Hittite the function of denoting relative position was taken over by the ablatives. Thus, the triad ked — apiya — edi became kez — apez — edez.

See also KUB 19.9 ii 13-15 (NH Annals, Hattusili III, CTH 83.1) LŪMEŠ URUG[aššaš] ma ḫu[manteš] "anda aranteš e[šši nušši] a-pé-e-ez-zaš [URU ... ] 3 ZAG-aš ešṭa ke-e-e[zaššaš] ma (or ke-e-[zaššaš]) URUṬakuruya[š ZAG-aš ešṭa]"
The ‘other side’ does not come out-of-the-blue. From an area not controlled by the Hittites, the enemy floods in to the countries of Karahn and Marista surrounding these cities. In order to describe the extent of the newly conquered hostile land the border towns are given, one each on opposite sides of the new hostile area. The city denoting the border on the Hatti-side is Talmaliya, and the city denoting the border on the enemy side is Taqqasta. Usually the other side is indicated by means of edez, but in this case the Reader of the tablet was already made aware of the other side, the area of Pishuru, through the preceding lines.

Besides the adverbs of relative position one also should expect a locative distal adverb like ka ‘here’ (see chapter 6) and apiya ‘there (with you)’ (see chapter 5). Although the dictionaries and grammars imply that apiya is also a distal demonstrative adverb, this is not substantiated by the evidence of situational apiya. In each case where apiya is truly situational, it always refers to the location of the Addressee (see 5.2). But whenever reference is needed to a location that has already been mentioned before, apiya is used. Indeed, such a location is often connected with the Other, but this is almost always the case with anaphoric reference in general. To conclude, the locative adverb of asi that corresponds with proximal ka and medial apiya is not attested in our texts.

The only deictic notion connected with anaphoric apiya is that it cannot mean ‘here’. Levinson 1983: 67 discusses an example where a deictic adverb is used both anaphorically and deictically (his example 40):

4.7 I was born in London and have lived there ever since

‘There’ refers anaphorically to London, but at the same time indicates that the discourse is expressed in a location outside London. In the next two examples apiya is both anaphoric and deictic. It is anaphoric because it refers to a location mentioned before, but it is also deictic because it refers to a location different from the Speaker. This becomes especially clear when apiya is contrasted with purely deictic ka:

§ 5 SA LÚ.MES.GI.NU.GÁL=mu kuit utter ḫatráṣ 6 nu=kan LÚ.MES.GI.NU.GÁL.ḪÍ.A ḫúmantēš 7 URU.Sapinuya šará pēḫuteš 8 ka-a=ma X LÚ.MES.GI.NU.GÁL.ḪÍ.A INA ĖḪÍ.A NA.ARĀ-ŘU 9 arba tāliēr n=aš kāša punuššuš 10 [n]u=mu zik kuiēš lamnit ḫatráṣ 11 n=aša NU.GÁL kuiški anda 12 nu mān ḫatráši nu INA URU.Sapinuya 13 ANA mŠarpa ḫatráš 14 LÚ.MES.GI.NU.GÁL ḫúmanduš a-pī-ja §
The affair of the blind men about which you wrote to me, all blind men were brought up to Sapinuwa. Here (ka) on the other hand, 10 blind men were left behind in the houses of the mills. I have just questioned them. The ones about which you have written to me with (their) names, not one (of those) is among (them). If you write (again), write to Sarpa in Sapinuwa. All blind men are there (apiya).

4.9 KBo 2.2 i 12-14 (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 124-125
§ 12 mān dUTU-Šl ẑ tapaššaš 13 a-pī-ja-pāt ŠA KUR URU.Nerikka 14 ūmējiši kā=ma OL…
If the fever will befall My Majesty only there (apiya=pat), in the country of Nerik, but not here (ka), …
4.2.3. Direct Speech

A very important context providing us with demonstratives is Direct Speech. As Ehlich (1982: 33 n.6) noted, 'In so-called ‘dead’ languages, the quotations of direct language enables us to identify uses of deixis in the standard way', meaning that, (i), we can identify deictic terms referring to the outside world because there is no referent in the preceding clauses in the Direct Speech, and (ii), that it may be possible to deduce the distance towards the deictic center (the Speaker) from the narration preceding the Direct Speech or the orientation on Speaker, Addressee or Other. However, this is not always possible due to our unfamiliarity with the actual situation.

The criteria established in 3.1.3. for identifying a suitable context are repeated here:

- The Direct Speech should be self contained, that is, it has to be a closed speech unit, without reference to earlier discourse which is not expressed in the narration. A partially quoted letter for example may contain anaphoric references not known to us. Self-contained speech is found in treaties and rituals. This type of speech is either invented for a specific stipulation or highly ritualized for religious purposes. Letters are excluded for the above reasons.

- The Direct Speech has to refer to the world created in the immediate preceding narrative clauses.

- Only indexicals in Direct Speech which are a first mention of the intended referent are discussed. Second mentions are always anaphoric, whether in narration or Direct Speech.

The following examples provide forms of the expression *asi* referring to an entity in the surrounding world, thereby clearly illustrating the deictic force of *asi*. Wherever possible, the nature of the deixis (proximal, distal or other) is discussed.

Besides isolating deictic references in Direct Speech, one can establish whether the extra-linguistic object is salient or not. Often the narration preceding the Direct Speech provides some comments on the entity that will be referred to in the Direct Speech. In that case one can be rather certain that the entity is already salient before it is mentioned. Otherwise, one should consider the entity not-salient.

Using this criterium, a pattern appears: usually the pronominal demonstrative *asi* is used when an object is salient, and the demonstrative description *asi* + *N* is usually used when the object is not salient.

4.2.3.1. The continuity procedure: the demonstrative pronoun *asi*

The clearest example of the distal value of *asi* is:

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

Similarly, though the preceding context is destroyed: KBo 12.89 iii 9-10 (MH/MS7, CTH 765) *n=as*ta 4'Kamrupepaš " [nepišas kat]ta austa 4'ni=ma=ya kuit 'Kamrusepa looked [down] [from heaven]: “What is that?” and KBo 9.127+ i 12 (CTH 764), 4'ni=ya kuit.
The mother of the male child cried out (after the birth of her child), and the Stormgod looked down from heaven on (her, -san): “What is that (eni)?”

The distance between the referent (the sound produced by the mother) and the Speaker (the Stormgod), is maximally large (earth versus heaven). The neuter eni therefore functions as a Distal Demonstrative. A medial interpretation would require either that the distance to the Deictic Center, the Stormgod, is medial (whatever that would be) or that the event takes place near the Addressee. That the distance was maximal is already mentioned, leaving us with a possible Addressee oriented interpretation. There is however no Addressee, unless we consider the mother of the child as such. This is however not supported by the remainder of the text. The sentence uttered by the Stormgod is an exclamation about something that he hears from far away, happening to the Other. In addition to the maximal distance, eni refers to something, a sound, that is invisible to the Stormgod.

The exclamation follows the cry of the mother, so at the moment of speech the cry is already in the center of attention. The utterance is therefore not an out-of-the-blue sentence, which excludes Sentence Focus. We are left with Predicate Focus or Argument Focus. Argument Focus would mean that only the question word kuit is the Focus. In that case the rest of the clause has to be de-accented. However, the initial position of eni, followed by the slightly adversative particle -ma shows otherwise. Now only Predicate Focus with an accented subject Topic is left as the only possibility. Although the sound is in the center of attention, and the Stormgod requests information about the referent of eni, it is not necessarily the established topic. Its unexpectedness is underlined by the use of -ma.

Another example of Distal asi, also to a non-visible entity, is:

4.11 KBo 5.3 + ii 32-38 (MH/NS treaty, CTH 42), ed. Friedrich 1930: 116-117

§ 32 našma=muz=za mâ-n LÚ URHATTI [n]amma kuiski idâlu 33 menâhbanda šarâ dâi kuiše=aš imma kuiš antuhšaš 34 zig=an GIM-an ištamašši n=an=mu mâ-n apêdani 35 lamnî OL mematti n=an parâ imma šamenüsi 36 nu kîššan tešî ammuk=yà=za i[l]înganwânza 37 nu=yà OL kuiški 38 a-ši=mâ=za [ma]hhan ū[ezzi QATAMMA] jeddu

Or if some man of Hatti furthermore plans evil against me, whatever person he may be, if, as soon as you hear about him/listen to him, you do not report him to me at that instant, and you even let him go by, and say as follows: “I am sworn in, (so) I do not say anything (evil) and also, I do not do anything (evil either). But he (asi) will do as he likes (Lit.: Now, as he does, let him do likewise)”.

The referent of asi is not near Speaker anymore: he has gone away and is therefore not in the presence of either Speaker or some unexpressed Hearer, excluding Proximal and Medial reference. The Demonstrative asi must therefore be distal and refers at least to an invisible person, although the context does not provide any clues how far he is removed from Speaker (and Addressee). As far as cognitive status is concerned, asi refers to a person who has clearly been represented in the mind of the Speaker, so besides being deictic, asi is also used to indicate that the attention is continued.

Additionally, asi is contrasted with ammuk “I”. Both are accented, full pronouns, indicating contrasting subjects in contrasting actions: “I am sworn in and shall do nothing, but he may do as he likes”. The clauses are Topic Comment clauses and their subjects are Contrastive Topics (see 2.2.3.2.1.).

And an example from the Song of Ullikummi:

4.12 KUB 33.87+ i 30'-34' (NH myth, CTH 345), ed. Gütterbock 1952: 12

116
nunu dU-aš IGLI-LA-ya 31' [išš]ahruyanza memijan memiškizzi kušš=ya=ar=an 32' [namm]a uškizzi u-ni-ia-aš halluwaš nus=ya kušš namma 33' [za]bhiškizzi nu= yar=as kušš namma uškizz 34' [u-ni]-ia-aš nahšarraduš

The Stormgod, [te]arful of eye, speaks: “Who can behold it [again], that one’s (uniyas) violence? Who can [f]ight again, who can behold them again, [that o]ne’s (uniyas) fearsome qualities?”

Tessub, the Speaker, has just laid eyes on the frightful kunkunuzzi-stone (Basalt), the destroyer of the Gods. The stone was originally placed on the shoulder of Upelluri, the Atlas-like figure carrying Heaven and Earth, invisible to the Gods. But soon he rises from the sea and becomes visible. The Stormgod Tessub has just arrived at a mountaintop and can now see the kunkunuzzi. The shock has made him cry. The only possible deictic value expressed by uniyas is the distal one since Tessub is standing on a mountaintop, looking out over sea to the Basalt.

By looking at it, the Basalt is already in the center of attention. The Basalt is however not the Topic or Focus of the clause. As an adnominal it is outside the Topic-Focus structure of the clause.

A rare example of a Place Deictic form of asi, edaza is:


32 ANA ZI LUGAL GIM-an ∡ nahšūyai arha=man=ya=kan 33 ārhi tuqq=še
QATAMMA ∡ nahšūyaddu 34 EN=ya=ya=kan e-da-ša arha aru

Just as there is concern to the king: “Could I but get away!”, then also to you there must likewise be concern: “Let My Lord get away from there (edaza)!”

These hypothetical thoughts refer to a situation in which the king has met grave difficulties in battle, either caused by the defection of a vassal state, an invasion of the enemy or a rebellion in Hatti. The question is now: is the Addressee of this letter accompanying the king in the hypothetical battle or not. It seems that the Addressee is supposed to be present in times of distress (ii 7-16, 22-25, 26-29 etc.) so the deictic edaza should then be understood as Proximal or Medial and not as Distal109. On the other hand, the context shows that the Speaker is simply aware of the king’s concerns. His speech repeats more or less the concerns of the king and no information is added except the ablative edaza. Why should the echoing phrase contain more information than the original one if both were at the same place? The only reason to do so is because they are not at the same place.

The location of the king is already salient in the mind of Speaker (and Reader), therefore requiring the continuity procedure. Moreover, the relation between king and location is a given fact, only the kind of relation, the “getting away” is unexpected and therefore the Focus. Both the king and the location are Established Topics.

From Tudhaliya IV we have


109 The CHD L-N sub ∡ nahhwa p. 347 translates edaza as “from (t)here”, therefore not choosing between Proximal and non Proximal. Puhvel 1984: 4 has ‘from there’.
There are five participants: the king as Speaker/Narrator, the hypothetical enemy as the Speaker of the Direct Speech, the Addressee of the instruction as both the Addressee of the king and of the Direct Speech of the enemy (the Addressee is counted twice), and finally the hypothetical ally of the king, referred to by asi in the Direct Speech. Since the king does not utter the Direct Speech, only the enemy, the Addressee and the ally are important. The constellation of persons at the moment of the Direct Speech is as follows: the enemy Speaker and the Addressee take up one position in space. It seems rather logical to assume that the ally is not included in that space. Therefore a proximal interpretation of asi is excluded. A medial interpretation would mean that the referent of asi, the soon to be disfavored ally, would have been present in the space of the Addressee, which is also a very unlikely situation because that would also imply being near Speaker. The ally could of course still be not too far removed from Speaker and Addressee. Thus, a medial interpretation of asi in a person oriented system is excluded, but a medial interpretation in a distance based system not. Finally, the ally may be considered outside the domain of both Speaker and Addressee, irrespective of distance, he may be considered far removed from both, and he may be visible or invisible. Whatever the situation, in these cases asi is a distal demonstrative.

It is not clear to me whether the favorite ally of the king is in the center of attention of the Addressee or not. If the person is visible, than a pointing gesture with asi is enough to identify him. The gesture alone would have brought him in the center of attention.

4.2.3.2. The centering procedure: the demonstrative description asi + noun

When the entity referred to is not salient, not asi is used but asi + N.


§ 73 [m]ann=a=mu=kan 1 KUR-TUM kuiki GAM-an nijari 74 [n]asma=mu=kan EN.MEŠ kujēšqa 2 allallā pānzi 75 [z]ik=ma=šma=kan anda ḫandāši nu kišan 76 memattī GĒŠPU-āḫḫīr=ya=mu n=at le DŪ-ši 77 GAM-an MAMIT GAR-ru

§ 78 našma=at zik 2 malīšī a-ši=man=ya=kan ZAG-[aš GAM-an] 79 nijari našma=<m>an=ya=kan u-ni-ušt EN.MEŠ alla[iš] 80 pānzi  الفنيqq=as=man=ya pēḥudanzi ...

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

A proximal interpretation is not very likely, it would necessitate the assumption that the Speaker himself was in the border country at the time of his treacherous speech. We would then have to assume that the king, who is the actual author of these clauses, while speaking to the Addressee in this text, envisages a situation where the Addressee is inside some unknown
country, in the presence of some unknown lords. Why *asi* cannot be medial has already been explained in the discussion of this example in Chapter 3, as ex. 3.8.

The demonstrative *asi* (and the acc.pl. *unius*) as the distal demonstrative refers either to an entity at a great distance from the visual field of Speaker (and Addressee) or outside that field, or both. Borders are usually far away, and also out of sight, so both criteria, invisibility and large distance, are applicable.

The noun phrases *asi* N and *unius* N seem to be centering. The preceding context does not provide any information in order to conclude that the countries and lords were already in the center of attention of the Speaker. As centering, the referents of these noun phrases can only be an Unestablished Topic, or subjects under Sentence Focus. Unestablished Topics generally imply a contrast, and this does not seem to be the case. Therefore I assume that the clauses carry Sentence Focus, being out-of-the-blue sentences. In the following I will consider each deictic noun phrase as being under Sentence or Predicate Focus, if the context does not explicitly show that the referent was under discussion or in the center of attention of the Speaker (and Addressee).\(^{110}\)

A clearer and less elaborate example is:


\begin{verbatim}
72 mānn-as-du-zza LUGAL-uš kuedaniki ANA [ZAG-][i] parā 73 ši-zzi _MAY-MA-nu a-
ši ZAG ʃi ʃi[i]k=n=ma pa[iš]i] ... And if the king sends you forth to some [border (country)] (saying): “Go make me
that (asi, acc.!) border (country)”, and you go, ......
\end{verbatim}

Obviously the border is neither proximal nor medial, otherwise the Addressee would already be located in the border country and the king could never have spoken these words.

Several examples from outside my corpus provide some more evidence that *asi* etc., is a distal demonstrative:

4.17 \textit{KUB 17.12} obv. ii 11-17 (MH7/NS ritual, CTH 431)

\begin{verbatim}
11 n-ašta anda kiššan memāi kuiš=ya 12 mienuš GÜB-za 1iaddari 13 nu=ya=šši
mienu ešdu nu=ya e-da-ni 14 antušši e-ni GIG mienudu 15 nu=ya kāšma
4GAZ.BA.AA GAŠAN-YA [aiizi] 16 nu=ya=kan šummeš LÜ.MEŠ KALAG.GA LÜ.MEŠ
MAHIRE-ya 17 KASKAL-za arša ti[ə]aten § (He speaks as follows: “Anyone who is right, let him eat right. Let this offer be right.”
Afterwards there are 3 warmanninzi-breads, 2 small fresh thick loaves. He carries them to the fork in the road and crumbles them to the left,) while speaking as follows: “Any mild one who walks at the left, let there be mildness to it/him, let him assuage that (eni) illness for that (edani) man. Huwassana, my Lady, has just come! (So) you, terrifying ones, my adversaries, must step off the road!”
\end{verbatim}

The Speaker is the ritual practitioner who talks to the *mienu*-deities, the ‘mild ones’ walking at the fork of the road. These ‘mild ones’ have to heal the illness of a third party, the man in

\(^{110}\)This example illustrates that the imaginative Direct Speech cannot really be compared to true Direct Speech. In a realistic situation the treacherous subject of the king would probably have mentioned at least the name of a specific country and therefore the location relative to the Deictic Center. In an unspecific situation like this, names cannot be used while the Addressee still has somehow to be informed. Border countries are located at a large distance of the Deictic Center, and this is indicated to the Speaker by means of a distal demonstrative. Furthermore, if *asi* (N) indeed replaces a name, the allocation to the centering procedure would gain more support, because names are often used to refer to entities that are not in the center of attention.
whose name this ritual is practiced. The preceding context does not provide any clues about the position of the ill man with respect to the Speaker, nor about his presence at the scene so theoretically the man could be in the vicinity of the Speaker. The next scene however shows that the patient does not accompany the practitioner when he performs his ritual. Only the practitioner goes to the gate:

4.18 KUB 17.12 obv. ii 24-27 (MH/NS ritual, CTH 431)

\[n=\text{asi ašša parā paizzi [nu]l2 NINDA.GUR₄.RA.1} \]
\[kūyaliti n=\text{ašta anda} \]
\[kiššan memāiβ₂\text{mān}=\text{ya a-ši antuḥšas Tl-ešzi} \]
\[27 \{o-o-o-o\}-x-x \]
\[\text{NINDA.GUR₄.RA.Η.L.A šarā neįandaru} \]

He goes to the gate. He turns two fat thick-breads, while speaking: "If that (asi) man stays alive, let the [...] breads be turned up".

The patient, not being near, is referred to by means of asi N, which means that asi is distal here too. A further connotation of asi might be that the patient is literally a patient, that is, not an active participant during the ritual which is essentially an interaction between ritual practitioner and deity.

As a first sentence in Direct Speech in a new situation on another day, the phrase asi antuḥšas as initial reference belongs to the centering procedure. As part of a conditional clause it is however in the presupposition, which means that the information is taken for granted. The main information is contained in the following matrix clause on the turning of the breads, given that the man stays alive. The Topic-Focus distinction is therefore not relevant.

The preceding examples have shown that asi, eni, edani, uniyas and unius all have distal value. Fillmore used two criteria for defining a distal demonstrative, (a) the entity referred to is at a large distance from both Speaker and Addressee’s visual field, or (b) the entity is invisible. In one case criterion (b) does not apply (see ex. 4.12), unless the Stormgod is temporarily blinded by his tears. In ex. 4.3 and 4.4 on the other hand eda refers to a location not too far removed from the Speaker. But in ex. 4.18 the patient may be present (and visible?) but not involved. We simply do not have enough material to decide whether asi refers to visible or invisible entities. For more metaphorical uses of asi see 4.2.3.3.

It is however not always clear whether an entity is at a large distance from Speaker and Addressee. In the next examples it is maybe not possible to indicate the deictic contrasts, but simply the fact that the pronouns appear as first mentions in Direct Speech already indicates their deictic, and not anaphoric, force.

4.19 KBo 5.3+ ili 24'-28' with duplicate KBo 19.44+ rev. 1 (MH/NS treaty, CTH 42), Friedrich 1930: 122-123

\[n=\text{ašša parā kuinki aššu[ri] parā hūtīti[a]n ḫarmi a-ši=ya \]
\[antuḫšas SIG₅-in i[(f)]škā[(i n=ya)r=an] \]
\[27 \text{U}TU-Śt=ša SIG₅-in ijami zig=ša[\text{a}(=\]
\[šši mān pāšiši)] 28 \text{apūn memišan EGR-pa mematt} \]

If I have singled out some man favorably: “That (asi) man does well, I My Majesty too will treat him well”, if thereupon you however tell him that decision, ...

4.20 KBo 19.44+ rev. 3-4, with duplicate KBo 5.3+ ili 30' (MH/MS treaty, CTH 42).

\[n=\text{ašša apūn LÚ-LUM idāl[auyann]} \]
\[(parā hūtīti[a]n ḫarmi a-ši=ya \]
\[antuḫšas idā[(luš)] 5 \]
\[(idālu[auy]ahzi (n=ya)]r=an] \]

or (if) I have singled out that person unfavorably: “That (asi) evil man behaves badly, I My Majesty will treat him badly”...
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There is no reason to assume that the person is in the vicinity of the King, but the opposite cannot be proven as well.

Also see

4.21 KUB 29.7 + KBo 21.41 rev. 23-27 (MH/MS ritual, CTH 480)


The one who holds the utensils of the Queen behind the offering, they give him soap-wort and he crushes it while saying: “If some ritual-practitioner has spoken with evil intent before the deity, then let the curse, perjury and uncleanness inside that (edani) house of the deity become like the soap-wort. Let it be miya-like the soap-wort.”

The expressions with asi could be out-of-the-blue sentences with Sentence Focus. The following text however seems to indicate that the subject in the Direct Speech is an Established Topic because the subject is only expressed in the verb ending.

4.22 KBo 5.3+ III 32'-34' with duplicate KBo 19.44+ rev. 6-9 (MH/NS treaty, CTH 42), Friedrich 1930: 122-123

[našma=2]a KUR-e 33' kuiški našma URU-an kuinki āššu parā ḫu[i](itt)[i]jan

[(bār)]mi 34' SIG₂-in=ya iššāi nu=yar=an dUTU-Šš =ya SIG₂-[n ]i[jami

[or (if)] I have singled out some country or some city favorably: “It acts well, I My Majesty too will treat it well”, ...

Is it possible that the author of this text wished to avoid incorrect reference? The alternatives presented in the narrative part are unlikely to appear in the same way in the Direct Speech. The king can hardly say: ‘That country or that city acts well, I will treat one of them well’. Not expressing the referent at all avoids this problem, so this has probably nothing to do with Established Topic-hood.

And a final example from my corpus referring to a first order entity:

4.23 KUB 6.45+ III 54-58 (NH prayer, Muwattalli, CTH 381), ed. Singer 1996: 23

54 nu uyanzi zilatiḫa DUMU=YA DUMU.DUMU=YA LUGAL.MEŠ MUNUS.LUGAL.MEŠ 55 SA URUḪATTI DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL BELLMEŠ =ya ANA dU piḫaššašši 56 EN=YA nαḫšarrīšku[n] tiajni 57 nu kīššan manemzi ṣαndan=ya a-ši DINGIR-LIM 58 šarkuš UR.SAG-iš parā ḫandal[(nza] DINGIR)-LU[M

And, thereupon, in the future my son, grandson, kings (and) queens of Hatti, princes and lords will start showing reverence to the Storm-god of Lightning, my lord, and they will speak like this: “Truly that (asi) god is a mighty hero, a rightly guiding god!”

Not only persons (first order entities) are deictically referred to, also abstract entities and events (second order entities) are found with eni, older ini. Here it is even more difficult to pinpoint the deictic semantics given the problems one encounters in locating an event or abstract idea in space. Sometimes however the context provides some clues. There are several instances of a person hearing about an event, meaning that the event did not take place in the visual field of the Speaker. In these instances a proximal interpretation of ini / eni is excluded, as in the following excerpts from several treaties:
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4.24 KBo 5.4 obv. 10-14 (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 67), ed. Friedrich 1926: 54-55
[Fu]thermore, also if some evil word of rebellion r[i]ses up from Hatti, (and) [you] hear it, then instantly stand by My Majesty for help. But [if] you yourself are not ..., send soldiers (and) horses to My Majesty for support, and some (other) lord must bring them (here). [But if] you disregard the ev[i]l for some reason, and say as follows: “Let that (ini) evil happen!”, then it is you 111 who thereby breaks [the oath]s of the gods [because of that too].

4.25 KBo 5.13 iii 22-28, KUB 6.41 iii 47 (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68), ed. Friedrich 1926: 128-129
§ 22 mān-ma ʾu[l]-unu memian kuinki ša bal ṣiṣa ʾlu ʾururuḥatti kuišši 24 našma ʾlu ʾu[l]-arzauwa kuišši bal eššai 25 kinun ta kušeš kašši ʾlu meš kuṣranaš 26 memi-an-an ʾu[l]-si pārā ḫaddāk 27 ʿlu ḫattrāši nūššan apēdaš kuṣaṭqa 28 antuḫṣaš parā uškīši nu kīššan mematti (continued with duplicate KUB 6.41 iii) 47 [(e)š]-ni]-uša ṣišu kīšu
If you beforehand hear about some evil word of rebellion, either some man from Hatti or some man from Arzawa causes a revolt — these men who are now your allies — and you do not write the affair instantly to My Majesty in advance, and you disregard those men for some reason, and you speak in this way: “Let that (eni) evil happen”, ...

4.26 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 Mashuiliwa at all. I did [not] act evilly [at all] towards him. I spoke in this way: “I will go set that (uni) affair [right again].” I arose and went to settle this affair.

In the preceding paragraph of this treaty between Mursili and Kupanta-Kurunta it is described how Mashuiliwa started to alienate the people of Pitassa and even some Hittite subjects from the Hittite empire, trying to engage into fight. As in the preceding examples, the affair did not take place in the vicinity of either Speaker or Addressee. Moreover, in the current example

111 In Chapter 8 I will show that a (definite) Subject in preverbal position expresses Replacing Focus, implicating ‘not X does something, Y does something’. A possible paraphrase might be ‘it is Y who ...’.

112 Similar passage in the treaties KBo 5.4 obv. 14-17, with obv. 17: nu kīššan mematti i-ni]-uša idālu kišāru and KUB 21.1 + ii 80 (NH treaty, Muwattalli, CTH 76), ed. Friedrich 1930: 64, emendations Otten 1957:28: nu kīššan teši) 80 e-ni]-uša ʾulu-ḫu du-ru
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the affair lies in the past, therefore distancing the rebellion also on the time-axis, not only on the spatial one.

In these three examples the Speaker does not seem to have an audience in the narration, so their speech could be considered a soliloquy. The text is however written with an audience in mind, so the speech must be somewhat changed to fulfill the communicative needs of the Addressee.\footnote{113} The Writer makes the Speaker talk to the reader, who is not capable of looking into the Speaker’s mind. In other words, the referent of uni memi\ae\ is not yet centered upon by the Addressee, and the demonstrative noun phrase is therefore exploited for the centering procedure. Moreover, the phrase uni memi\ae\ is not the Established Topic, it is not expected at all in relation with the Subject ‘I’. It is therefore in the Focus of the clause.

4.2.3.3. The demonstrative asi refers to an entity in the presence of Speaker and is disassociative

The demonstrative asi in the preceding examples was explained as distal deictic, while in some cases the context did not provide any clues. The next five examples on the other hand only allow a Proximal interpretation of asi. For the explanation of this conflicting use of asi we have to turn to Empathetic Deixis. Levinson 1983: 81 recalls that English that may shift to this to show empathy, and that this may shift to that to show emotional distance (see Chen 1990: 148-151 for a discussion of distancing-that, sympathy-that and camaraderie-that and -this). In most examples cited below the context is clearly very negative, and it is very likely that the Speaker of the utterances wants or needs to distance himself from whatever is introduced by means of asi / ini:

4.27 KBo 16.24+ i 46.49\ with duplicate KBo 16.102 1'-5' (MH/MS instruction, CTH 251), ed. Rizzi Mellini 1979: 522-523

\( \$ 46'[nasm\tilde{a}]e\tilde{s}an^{114} kui\tilde{s} k\tilde{a}ruri p\tilde{a}r\tilde{a} g\tilde{a}l\tilde{k}a\tilde{n}a\tilde{a} n u \k\tilde{a}\tilde{s}h\tilde{a}n^{47} [i\tilde{m}m\tilde{a} a\tilde{t}]e\tilde{z}zi \ \mbox{man} = ya i-ni^{115} [k\tilde{\ddot{a}}r\tilde{u}r] \ h\tilde{a}r[a\tilde{\ddot{a}}]k\tilde{z}i n u \k\tilde{a}\tilde{s}h\tilde{a}n^{48} [i\tilde{m}m(\tilde{a})]e\tilde{z}zi \ \mbox{man} = ya i-ni \ [k\tilde{u}r\tilde{u}] [p\tilde{u}] [a\tilde{\ddot{a}}]\tilde{a}zzi [n\tilde{u}] \ p\tilde{u}\tilde{\ddot{a}}\tilde{\ddot{a}} \ N\tilde{i}N^{49} \ D\tilde{I}N\tilde{G}\tilde{I}R.\tilde{M}\tilde{E}\tilde{S} \ a\tilde{p}\tilde{\ddot{a}}\tilde{p}\tilde{a}n\tilde{d}u \ [O\tilde{r}] \ (i\tilde{f}) \ \mbox{someone is completely fed up with} \ \mbox{war} \ \mbox{and [s]peaks as follows: “Would but that (ini) \ \mbox{war} \ \mbox{utterly disappear!”}, and even speaks as follows: “Would but that (ini) \ \mbox{[war]} \ \mbox{become ……”}, (then) let these oath gods grab that one, …

On the spatial level the soldier is probably on the battlefield, so he is actually in the midst of the war, and could therefore have said: ‘Would but this war (ki kurur) utterly disappear!’.

By using the distal deictic asi however, he emphasizes his emotional distance from the war he is involved in and stresses the fact that he wishes it would not be his business anymore. The clause containing ini is an out-of-the-blue sentence, with Sentence Focus.

Another example of the distancing effect of ini is:

4.28 KBo 5.6 ili 16-19, with duplicate KBo 14.9 (NH annals, CTH 40, Mursili II), ed. G"uterbock 1956: 94-95

\footnote{113} The original deictics however are always retained.

\footnote{114} Rizzi Mellini 1979: 522 emends 3e-er]-aš-ša-an.

\footnote{115} Rizzi Mellini 1979: 522 reads e-ni instead of i-ni twice.
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After my father had heard in that way, he called forth the leaders for council: “Such a (ini) thing has never happened to me in my whole life!”

Suppiluliuma’s exclamation is a response to the letter sent by the widow of Tut-anch-Amon: “My husband died while I have no son. It is said however that you have many sons. If you would give me one of your sons, he would become my husband. I do not want to take a servant of mine and make him my husband. I fear tekri- (?)”. Suppiluliuma cannot believe that one of his sons will become pharaoh, so he sends a messenger to find out whether he is being deceived. Not believing the request of the widow, he uses ini to express emotional distance although the letter is read aloud in his presence.

Suppiluliuma refers with ini utter to something he has just heard, so the event is at the forefront of his attention. However, this information is not yet known to the council who is called in afterwards. For them this is an Out-of-the-blue sentence.

Outside my corpus some other examples of Proximal asi occur in the Kumarbi-myth. They deal with the Basalt monster Ullikummi, threat to heaven and earth, and therefore obviously something most of the gods want to distance themselves from. This distancing, I believe, should be seen as an instantiation of the more neutral ‘belonging to the cognitive space of the Other’, that is, outside of the cognitive space of Speaker and Addressee. As I have described in 3.1 et passim, the difference between the three demonstratives lies in the cognitive domain as perceived by the Speaker. The speaker will use ka- + N to indicate that something is his responsibility, apa- + N to indicate that something is the responsibility of the Addressee, and asi + N for responsibility belonging to the Other, or at least that it is not his or the Addressee’s responsibility. This more encompassing notion is needed, because the emotional aspect of the Distal demonstrative pronoun explains the occurrence of asi in 4.29, but not in 4.30 and 4.31:

4.29 KUB 17.7+ iv 13'-19' (NH myth, CTH 345), ed. Güterbock 1951: 156

Legend: [N] = noun


Enlil started to talk to himself: “Who is he, that child?, whom they raised again, the Fate-goddesses and the Mother-goddesses. Who shall further attend to them, the mighty battles of the great gods? Of noone, of only Kumarbi it is an evil plan! Just as Kumarbi raised the Stormgod, against him he has raised this basalt stone as (his) supplanter!”

The preceding paragraph recounts how the child was placed on his knees, so the child is clearly proximal to the Speaker. Here Enlil shows his concern, and asi is used to express his emotional distance, but in the next example it is Kumarbi, the father of the rebel who uses asi to refer to his son. Given the fact that in iv 12’ of ex. 4.31 (where the demonstrative is used anaphorically, see section 4.5.) is described how Kumarbi happily plays with the child, asi does not indicate emotional distance.

116 CHD § p. 87b translates asi as “this” as a result of the proximity of the child.
As we will see in section 4.4 on the discourse deictic use of *asi* and section 4.5 on the tracking (= anaphoric) use, *asi* is not only used to express distance from the Deictic Center, but also to express cognitive psychological distance. In exx. 4.27-29 this was narrowed down to emotional distance, in 4.30 and 4.31 however not emotional distance is expressed, but the idea that something is not the responsibility of the Speaker. In ex. 4.30 Kumarbi is deliberating about who will raise his child. Clearly he will not take responsibility for his own child.

Finally there are two broken passages with *ini* and *edani*. Although nothing can be said on the situational context and the deictic or cognitive contrasts, the appearance of these forms in the first clause of a Direct Speech classifies them as Deictic.

The reference of *ini* is not very clear. It might be *kiṣṣuṣaṇ uttar* ‘a thing like this’, but it might also refer forward.

The broken context does not allow anything to say on the value of *edani*.

4.2.4. Linguistic Selfreference

Expressions referring to an entity containing that expression as ‘In this dissertation I claim …’ are not attested for *asi* etc. As I explained in 3.1.4., linguistic selfreference is only expressed by *ka-*. This in itself is enough proof that *asi* etc. is not a Proximal deictic demonstrative.
4.2.5. Numbers and figures, other observations and preliminary conclusion

4.2.5.1. The deictic value of asi etc.

Collecting the facts from the preceding paragraphs results in the following table if we only look at the spatial distance and not at the cognitive connotation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Proximal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Indeterminate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(asi)</td>
<td>5 (exx. 11, 14-16, 18)</td>
<td>2 (exx. 29, 30)</td>
<td>3 (exx. 19, 20, 23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ini / eni)</td>
<td>7 (exx. 10 (incl. fn.), 17, 24, 25)</td>
<td>3 (exx. 27, 28)</td>
<td>1 (ex. 32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uniyas</td>
<td>2 (ex. 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uni</td>
<td>1 (ex. 26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unius</td>
<td>1 (ex. 15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edani</td>
<td>1 (ex. 18)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (exx. 21, 33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edaza</td>
<td>1 (ex. 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ediledez</td>
<td>14 (exx. 1-4, with notes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Spatial distribution of asi etc.

For the sake of the argument I treat the demonstratives separately, as four groups: asi, eni, ed- and uni-. Only the forms asi and ini / eni occur with Distal and Proximal value, uniyas, uni, unius, edani, ed/ edez and edaza all have Distal value. The Distal value of the ed- group is strongly supported by the use of ed/ edez as the opposite of proximal ket / kez (4.2.2.). The uni- group as a whole also has Distal deictic value. If there is a deictic contrast, demonstratives always have one deictic value, and any seemingly other deictic value must mean that the primary value is used figuratively, e.g. in emphatic deixis. So either asi and eni are Proximal demonstratives that are sometimes used to create emotional or cognitive proximity in a Distal context, or they are Distal and used to indicate emotional or cognitive distance in a Proximal context.

As I have stated in 3.1.4. and will state in 6.2.4., only the Proximal demonstrative ka-is used for linguistic selfreference. A clear example of linguistic selfreference is 'the words on this tablet, ki TUPPU'. The distal value of each form cited above is strengthened by the non-existence of selfreferring expressions (see 4.2.4.).

Nonetheless, we still need to investigate whether asi and ini / eni are possibly Proximal deictics, sometimes secondarily used to indicate emotional closeness irrespective of distance. The proximal column (exx. 27-30) is not problematic under this assumption, the indeterminate column (exx. 19-21, 23, 32, 33) is not conclusive, only the distal column (exx. 10, 11, 14-18, 24, 25) has to be discussed.

In ex. 15 (CTH 123, NH) asi ZAG-as and unius EN.MEŠ occur in the same context. If unius is distal deictic, then asi must be too.

In ex. 17 and 18 (CTH 431, NH) asi and edani refer to the same person. If edani is distal, then asi must be too. The neuter eni in ex. 17 cooccurs with edani, and refers to the illness belonging to the patient. If the patient is positioned as distal, then his illness must be too.

The other examples where the referents were clearly located at a large distance of the Speaker, are exx. 10, 11, 14, 16, 24 and 25.

In ex. 10 (CTH 767, MH) eni refers to the crying of a woman in childbirth that suddenly draws the attention of a deity. It is unlikely to read emotional closeness here.
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The exx. 11 (asi, CTH 42, MH), 24 (ini, CTH 67, NH) and 25 (eni, CTH 68, NH) have a context which clearly expresses carelessness. This contradicts the alleged emotional proximity of a distal referent.

In ex. 14 (asi, CTH 255.2) we would have to assume that the referent of asi is emotionally close to the Speaker, in this case the enemy of the king. Contextually nothing speaks for or against this interpretation. The same can be said of ex. 16 (asi, NH, CTH 123). The other example belonging to Tudhaliya IV is ex. 15. Here it was concluded that asi indicated distal deixis without any emotional connotation. The deictic asi cannot at the same time be a Distal deictic and a Proximal deictic indicating emotional closeness in a distal environment. Summarizing, not only the ed- and uni-groups are distal, also asi and eni are.

Besides the fact that a demonstrative has one deictic value, it is also very unlikely that one deictic value, in this case the distal one, is expressed by means of four different demonstratives (i.e. asi, eni, the uni-group, and the ed- group). Laroché (1979: 148) already came to the same conclusion and proved on syntactic grounds that all these forms constituted one paradigm (although he considered asi etc. as an anaphoric pronoun). The same can now be concluded on functional-pragmatic considerations.

Kammenhüller only accepted Laroché's proposal for the 13th century but stated that more research was needed for the older phases. In the next paragraph a beginning will be made with the chronological investigation.

4.2.5.2. The chronological distribution of asi etc.

In the preceding paragraph it was concluded that the four demonstrative stems all were distal and therefore presumably belong to one paradigm. In order to judge the earlier periods, it is necessary to reassess the material from the chronological point of view. Table 4.2 lists the distribution of distal deictic asi etc. from OH until the end of the Hittite empire (the NH column contains the material that could not be assigned to a specific king):

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>Sup</th>
<th>Murs II</th>
<th>Muw</th>
<th>Hatt III</th>
<th>Tud IV</th>
<th>NH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.s.c. asi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.s.c. uni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.-a.s.n. ini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.s. uniyas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.s. edani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.pl.c. unius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl. edaza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.adv. edi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Table 4.2: Chronological distribution of Deictic asi etc.

Distal deictic uniyas, uni, and unius all belong to the period of Mursili and later. The distal group *ed- is attested from Old Hittite (Old script!) on, so it is safe to assume that the *ed- group had distal deictic reference in the whole attested period of Hittite.
The distal neuter ini / eni is attested in a MH copy (ex. 10), a NH ritual (ex. 17), and in treaties of Mursili and Muwattalli (exx. 24 & 25). It is however referring to a proximal referent in MS (ex. 27) and in a citation from Suppiluliuma in a Mursili text (ex. 28), both with the connotation of emotional distance.

The distal asi occurs in MS (ex. 11), NH (ex. 18) and texts from Tudhalia IV (exx. 14, 15 & 16). Deictic asi referring to a proximal referent with the added meaning of emotional distance is twice found in a NH myth (ex. 29, 30). Indeterminate asi is found in MH (ex. 19, 20), Muwattalli (ex. 23) and possibly one in Old Script:

4.34  KBo 17.17 (+?) KBo 30.30 obv. 6'-7' with duplicate KUB 43.53 obv. i 16'-18' (OS ritual), ed. Goedegebuure 2002: 64, 70.
§ 6' [(DINGIR.MEŠ-nan dUTU-i)] kāša DINGIR.MEŠ-aš a-šī p[(eškimi dUTU-šumman laba)]r7[(nan)] 7' [(DINGIR.MEŠ-aš a-šī piškimi)] x118 ānda-ššan[ (pi)škimi ā(zaššišš T)]l-anza[ šši[(š kāša)] §
O Sungod amongst the gods, I hereby give that one (asi) to the gods, i.e., Our Sun Labarna. I shall give that one (asi) to the gods. [I shall] give[e] his equal. Here (is) his [eq]ual, his living (substitute)!

The demonstrative asi might be used here to indicate non-involvement of the patient (the king) (compare with ex. 4.18).

So from the moment each form is attested, it either indicates spatial remoteness or cognitive distance. The other sections will provide more examples in earlier periods.

4.2.5.3. The attention-levels and Information Structure of asi etc.

In the section on salient discourse entities (4.2.3.1.) we saw that asi (ex. 4.11) and eni (ex. 4.10) were attested as Unestablished Topics, and edaza as Established Topic. The genitive uniyas (ex. 4.12) was outside the Topic-Focus structure of the clause. The other examples of asi + noun were all centering, and either found in out-of-the-blue sentences (Sentence Focus) or in the predicate of the clause (Predicate Focus). For the terminology see chapter 2. The table will only contain asi (+ N) as a shorthand for the paradigm. I only cite the Locative adverbs of relative position separately. They are always centering and part of the Focus, but as pronouns they have to be listed separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situational/Deictic 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>asi</td>
<td>asi</td>
<td>φ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>asì N</td>
<td>edi / edez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: The Deictic asi matrix.

117 I did not discuss this example before because asi could be both Situational and Tracking. I opt for the former given the fact that Tracking asi is otherwise adjectively used.

118 In KUB 43.53 a-a-an-da-aš-ša-an is preceded by nu. The sign in A does not look like nu.
4.3. The Recognitional Use of asi etc.

4.3.1. Introduction

Recalling from 2.2.1.2 (general linguistics) and 3.2 (applied to Hittite), demonstratives may be used in order to introduce information that is 'Hearer old / Discourse new'. If the Speaker wants to activate some information which s/he assumes is already stored in the memory of the Addressee, s/he may use an adnominal demonstrative instead of just a noun for reference to that information.

I repeat here the list of criteria 3.2.1. in order to identify recognitionally used demonstratives in Hittite:

1) The demonstrative is adnominal.

2) The information contained in the demonstrative expression must be private. The information expressed in the NP should not be part of the general or cultural knowledge of the Hittite speech community.

3) The demonstrative expression may not refer to something in the presence of the Speaker. If it did, this would make it Deictic (= Situational).

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

4) The demonstrative expression is the first mention in the discourse. This poses a problem for Hittite given the sometimes pitiful state of the tablets. In case of damaged tablets, I therefore will mention the distance in paragraphs from the broken beginning.

5) The demonstrative expression includes a relative clause or other equally complex modifier. This inclusion is however not necessary.

6) The demonstrative expression does not serve to resolve a possible ambiguity. Ambiguity resolution is a task belonging to the domain of anaphoric (or tracking) demonstratives. In order not to include possible anaphoric demonstratives in this category, the preceding text should be free of competing participants.

Using these criteria, we find the following examples. First the clauses containing referents to entities (1st order) are listed, followed by clauses with reference to events (2nd order) and propositions (3rd order). This distinction is upheld in order to show that also higher order entities are recognitionally referred to, something which was not pointed at in the literature on demonstratives (Diessel 1999, Himmelmann 1996). Each example is followed by an enumeration in parentheses of the criteria that do not require a discussion, usually the formal criteria, and a discussion of the remaining criteria. The information contained in the Recognitional clauses is not salient.

4.3.2. Material
We will start with an example from Chapter 3 (ex.3.13):

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

§ 17 Ū-\text{TUM} \text{MUNUS.LUGAL} zaššiqa\text{=}ya\text{=}mu kušši memiškizzi 18 \text{ANA} \text{dNIN.GAL=} \text{ya}\text{=}za\text{=}kan kišan maldı mān\text{=}ya \text{ANA} \text{dUTU-Šl} 19 e-ni \text{IZI ŠA GİR.ME❙SU} nuntaras SÍG₂\text{=}ri ... 

A dream of the Queen. ‘Someone tells me in a dream: “Make Ningal the following vow: If the\text{\textsuperscript{11}} (\text{eni}) burning of My Majesty’s feet (lit: that fire of his feet for My Majesty) will subside soon, ...

(adnominal, not present, first mention, modifier, no ambiguity).

As discussed in 3.2.2., it is not very likely that the physical troubles of the Hittite king in all its details are part of the general and cultural knowledge of the Hittites. This makes it private knowledge, shared by the Speaker, the queen, and the Addressee, the deity Ningal.

4.36 **KUB 48.119 rev. 11-13** (lateNH vow, CTH 590, Tudhaliya IV\textsuperscript{120}), ed. De Roos 1984: 298.

\textsuperscript{11} § [\textit{kinun}]a e-ni kue \text{KARAŚ} \text{Šahurunuyaś} \text{mLUGAL-as-d} \text{LAMMA-ašša} \text{peḥuter}

\textsuperscript{12} [n\text{=}a]\textsuperscript{121} mān arḥa \text{SIG₂\text{=}in uizzi}

[No\textit{w}, concerning those (\textit{eni}) armies which Sahurunuwa and LUGAL-as-d\textit{LAMMA} have led away, if [th]ey come away well, ...

(adnominal, not present, relative clause, no ambiguity)

Although the text is rather damaged and part of the preceding text is lacking, it is likely that ‘those armies’ are first mention given the circumstance that each paragraph in the Vow-genre is usually independent from the others.

As for the status of the type of knowledge, we can safely assume that it is shared, but not common knowledge between Speaker (the King) and Adresssee (a Deity) because every pending military action had to be discussed extensively with the gods by means of oracles.

A comparable example from the same text-genre, dating back to the earlier king Muwattalli is

4.37 **KBo 9.96 obv. 7\textsuperscript{3}-9\textsuperscript{3}** (NH vow, Muwattalli, CTH 590), ed. De Roos 1984: 286

\textsuperscript{3} § e-da-ni ku<e\textit{dani} KASKAL-\text{i} d\text{UTU-Šl} \text{GIN-ri} nu\text{=}mu mān DINGIR.ME❙ piran
\textsuperscript{4} ḫ\textit{huwiati}teni nu\text{=}za KUR URU\text{AMURRA} tar\textit{a}h\text{hi} \text{IŠTUGI} tar\text{a}h\text{hi} ... 

About that (\textit{edani}) road/campaign on which My Majesty goes, if you, o gods, run in front of me, (so that) I shall conquer Amurra, conquer it with force ...

\textsuperscript{119} English does not seem to use a demonstrative in this context.

\textsuperscript{120} Following Van den Hout 1995: 151, contra Kammenhuber HW2 E 39b (Hattusili III).

\textsuperscript{121} De Roos 1984: 298 reads tentatively (n. 11) [\textit{nam-m}]a. However, it was not known at the time that the intransitive verbs (like \textit{uwa-}) require the expression of the intransitive subject. This means that we need here the enclitic neuter plural \textit{at}.
An Old Hittite Recognitional use of *uni* is once\(^{122}\) attested in the copied Puhana Chronicle:

4.38  **KBo 3.41 + KUB 31.4 obv. 10′-11′** (OH/NS Narration, Hattusili I, CTH 16), ed. Soysal 1987: 174-175, 179

\[\text{§ 10′} \quad [(\text{URU})\text{rinna}^k] \text{kin peḫutetten } u-ni \text{ hurtalim zam } n[\text{atta } a\ddash] \quad [\text{11′} \quad [(\text{ANŠE-i} )] s \text{ miš nu } ešše eššan } \text{ēškahha } n u \text{ ammuk peḫutette[n]} \]  

The one you conducted to [A]rinna, that *(uni)* contender of mine, *(is) [he] n*[ot]* *(my [(donkey)])? I will sit on him!\(^{123}\) You shall lead *me* *(there instead)!*

(adnominal, not present at the Deictic Center, relative clause, no ambiguity, first mention)

Whether or not the leading of an opponent to Arinna is shared, private knowledge cannot be deduced from the text. My translation differs from Otten 1963: 159, “Wen habt ihr nach Arinna geführt? Ausgerechnet meinen Widersacher. <Ist es> nicht mein [ .. ]? Ich werde mich ihm widersetzen, nun führt mich <dorthin>!”; and, with additional duplicates Soysal 1987: 179: “Wenn habt ihr nach Arinna geführt? Jenen, meinen Widersacher! Ist [er] nicht mein Esel? Ich werde mich ihm widersetzen, nun führt [ihn] mich (dorthin)!” Contra Otten and Soysal I propose to consider *uni hurtalim zam* as an afterthought to the Relative Clause and not as the answer to a rhetorical question. In my view, the rhetorical question is only ‘is he not my donkey?’\(^{124}\)

A possible copied Old Hittite Recognitional *asi* occurs in an edict of Hattusili I:


\[\text{§ 20} \quad \text{kinuna LUGAL-uš idalu mekki ūḫḫun ta LUGAL-}ua\ddash > \text{uddar(r) } = \text{met 21 lē šarrattuma } a\ddash si MUNUS.LUGAL. [\text{18} \quad \text{Huruma É.GI_4_A} \quad 22 \text{ēšta addaš } miš = a\ddash išše kēdani ara išan ġatta } \]  

Today, I, the king, have seen much evil, so(?) you may not transgress my, the king’s, words. That *(asi)* queen of Hurma was an eligible bride\(^{125}\). My father had considered *(it)* permissible for her in this *(matter)* \(^{126}\).

(adnominal, modifier, no ambiguity).

---

\(^{122}\) It is possible that there is a second Recognitional *uni* in CTH 16: KBo 3.40 6′ § 6′ [(u-ni)] ŠUR.SAG-an kuin karškanzi nu natta SIG₃-in? ....

\(^{123}\) CHD Ș, p. 133 (with references) translates ‘Is he not my donkey on whom (lit. on him) I regularly sit down?’ But see now also Steiner 2002: 812-814: “Den ihr nach Arinna geführt habt, jenen meinen Verleumder, [ist er nicht] mein esel? Ich werde mich auf ihn setzen!”

\(^{124}\) For a discussion of negated sentence questions being rhetorical, see Hoffner 1995: 91-92.

\(^{125}\) Cohen l.c.: “This queen was a bride from the city of Hurma”.

\(^{126}\) If the text is to be read as translated here, there are two omissions. First, an unidentified *it*, and second, *uddani ‘matter’*. The sense of the passage remains obscure. Maybe one should read *addaš miš aš mu* instead. This would lead to ‘My father had considered me right for this one’. The demonstrative *kedani* refers to the queen, and *-mu* is the object.
The queen might have been mentioned in the lost part of the text (the distance to the beginning of the text is three paragraphs). If she is mentioned before, this example belongs to the section on Anaphora (although Himmelmann calls across node reference also Recognitional). Other uncertainties are 1) that it is not clear whether the queen is present or not, 2) whether the fact that she is a bride is general knowledge or private knowledge, only known to the king and his audience. A favorable circumstance for a recognitional interpretation is that this clause seems to be the beginning of a story about the queen, although the text breaks off after two clauses. One could paraphrase colloquially ‘Remember the queen of Hurma who was a bride? She ...’.

Especially oracles provide us with large quantities of recognitionally used distal demonstratives, as in the next example (with a second order entity):

4.40 KUB 5.1 rev. iii 48-49 (lateNH Oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 561), ed. Ünal 1974: 72-3
§ 48 u-ni-uš-za=k-an ku-eš Ú.MEŠ HUL-luš uškizzi ISKIM.HI.A=ja=za arpuqanta 49 kikistari ...
As for those (unius) evil dreams which he keeps seeing and the negative premonitions that keep occurring, ...
(adnominal, not present at the Deictic Center, relative clause, no ambiguity, first mention)

The dreams of the King have not been mentioned before in this text. Again, the contents of the king’s dreams are not very likely to belong to the general or cultural background of the Hittites.

In Middle Hittite we have:

4.41 KUB 50.1 ii 15'-16' (MH/MS oracle, CTH 573), ed. CHD P: 25
§ 15' n=š327 u-ki KASKAL-an=ma kuin paizzi nu DINGIR-LUM api[a]-ja] 16'
idâlu uškîšî
As for that road which he will travel, do you, o god, see evil there [too?].128
(adnominal, relative clause, no ambiguity, shared, private knowledge)

The tablet is broken so it is not possible to decide between a Tracking or Recognitional use, although the relative clause seems to favor the latter. Also, as with Vows, each paragraph deals with one oracle question.

Besides objects also higher order entities may appear in recognitional use:

§ 7 i-ni SA URU 'Isqazzuwa uttar mahhan memir nu dUTU-Sî ukîla 8 paimi ...
When they have reported that (ini) affair of (the city) Isqazzuwa, shall I, My Majesty, go myself?
(not present at the Deictic Center, adnominal, subordinate clause, no ambiguity, shared, private knowledge)

127 nu-uš mistaken for na-aš?
128 Contra CHD P 25 ‘Do you, O god, see them as an evil on the aforementioned road which he will travel?’
The following example deals with the conclusion of an oracle inquiry concerning what gifts the offended deity should receive in order to be appeased. At this moment the inquirers would like to know whether that matter of giving is already supervised by someone else, probably as a result of the outcome of another oracle inquiry.

4.43 **KBo 2.2 iv 22-24** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 136

§ 22  
`eni INIM SUM-annaš kuit SI×SÁ-at 23 e-ni kuit INIM SUM-annaš 24 mKatapa-DINGIR-LIM IDE`

Concerning the fact that this affair of giving was ascertained, (is it the same as) that ("eni") case of giving, which Katapaili is overseeing/oversaw?

(adnominal, not present at the Deictic Center, relative clause, no ambiguity)

The case of giving which Katapaili oversees has not been mentioned before in this oracle inquiry, and we are dealing again with shared knowledge between Speaker (the oracle inquirer) and the addressed Deity.

The preceding clause (iv 22) also contains the same syntagm "eni kuit", but this time it refers back two paragraphs and may be considered to exploit the tracking function of the demonstrative (see 4.5.2). It only serves to establish a link between the case of giving that was ascertained earlier and the possibly identity with a case of giving under the supervision of Katapaili.

Example 4.43 leads us to the "eni kuit" syntagm that was already correctly recognized by Kammenhuber HW² E p. 40 in 13th c. oracles as referring to something that is already known but not yet mentioned in the text. Here I will present mainly examples from KUB 22.70, an oracle text edited by Ünal 1978, and dating from the time of Hattusili III. This text, which is almost fully preserved, provides 16 examples of "eni kuit/kue (+ NP).

Assuming that "eni" had to be anaphoric (see 4.1.), referring to something that was mentioned before in the text, Ünal (1978: 104-5) discerned four types of use of "eni kuit": 1) it refers back to something mentioned before, nearby or far away (obv. 51, rev. 28, 44, 51, 54); 2) it is mistakenly placed instead of "kt kuit" "as for this fact that"¹²⁹ when introducing some theme for the first time. The scribe of the oracle-text was so confused by the number of themes that he could not keep track of what was already mentioned or not and therefore sometimes used "eni kuit" for something that had not been mentioned before (obv. 23, 25, 31, 61, rev. 38). 3) ‘fragend und auf den mutmaßlichen Zorn der Gottheit Bezug nehmend’ (obv. 7, 12); and 4) "eni" alone refers back to something mentioned before (obv. 19, 47 (?), rev. 22, 55).

As will be clear from the properties of recognitively used demonstratives described above and in Chapter 2, the second group is a likely candidate for being classified as recognitional¹³⁰. I will also discuss category 3 in light of the recognitional use, and some
As for a possible recognitional use, the information in the following eni kuit clauses is not very likely to be general or cultural knowledge, but part of shared experiences between the oracle inquirers and the deity:

4.44 KUB 22.70 obv. 31-32 (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 62-63

§ 31 e-ni-ja kuit ḫAmmattallaš IQBI punuššuqenī-sa-nu māni memiaš aššu mān mahāna

§ 32 ANA IR-sa kan anda UL apipšir nu mān zilaš apēz kisat nu KUŠ.uMEŠ NU.SIG₅-du SAG.ME NU.[SIG₅] §

And about that (eni) (fact), that Ammattalla has made a statement (lit. has spoken) on the one hand (-ma) we have not yet inquired whether (her) statement is true, or how (it is), on the other hand (-ma), they have not submitted (it) to an oracle inquiry. If the oracle outcome has happened because of that, (then) let the exta be unfavorable. SAG.ME. Unfavorable.

And from category 3:

4.45 KUB 22.70 obv. 7-8 (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 56-57


About this (ki) (fact), that the deity of Arusna has been determined in anger with the king: about that (eni) (fact), that the queen cursed Ammattalla before the Deity of Arusna, and also, that Ammattalla took the eyes of the Deity, ... , if the Deity is angry because of that, ...

The syntagm ki kuit ‘this (fact), that’ resumes something which has happened just now. Almost each time it refers to something which has been ascertained by oracle in the preceding paragraph and is repeated at the beginning of the new paragraph to give the setting for the next oracle question (see also Chapter 6.4.3.2.2.). So ki kuit does not introduce a new theme as Ünal assumed, but provides a link between a just finished theme and a new one building upon the old one. The clause containing ki kuit does not add some new information to the discourse, contrary to the eni kuit clauses in which eni kuit refers to an event which lies in the past and needs to be introduced into the discourse: “is it that (past) fact that the queen ...”. Now that it is clear that eni kuit contains information that is Discourse New, is there proof that it is also Hearer Old, with the Hearer being the deity? Obviously there is, because the information contained in the eni kuit clauses is usually the reason for divine anger. The same can be said about ex. 4.46 (also from category 3):

131 See also KUB 22.70 obv. 61-63 § 61  e-ni=ma kuit MUNUS.LUGAL UN.MEŠ-šuš petty GUL.-anteš ANA dUTU-SI ISPUR ‘About that (eni) (fact), that the queen wrote about the ‘downbeaten’ people to the king’; KUB 22.70 rev. 38-39 § 38 e-ni=kan kuit =Zarniš-LU-šu UNUTE.MEŠ INA SĀ I NAhekur dLAMMA pēdaš ‘About that (eni) (fact), that Zarniyaziti had brought the utensils into the Rock-Sanctuary of Kurunta’.

132 Ünal differently: ‘Auch das, was Ammatall erzählt hat, ...’. I do not agree with an interpretation of eni as the object of IQBI, ‘has spoken’. In the majority of cases, eni kuit serves to introduce a whole clause or proposition into the discourse, instead of introducing some entity (with which it then may agree in case).

133 Ünal differently: ‘(ist) es jenes (Erwähnte), daß die Königsin Frau Ammatall vor der Gottheit von Arusna verfluchte und weil Ammat[tal]la die Augen der Gottheit faße ...? Wenn du, o Gott, deswegen erzürnt bist, ...’
The result of the oracle question in obv. 11 shows that only part of the reason for divine anger was found. The negative outcome is repeated in a *ki kuit* linking clause “About this, that (the outcome) was unfavorable again”. Then the new question starts: “(is it) also that, that Mala told as follows: ...”. According to these lines Mala mentioned in the past that the queen did not give the two golden headbands to the deity which were promised to her. The contents of Mala’s words are both Discourse New and Hearer Old. The text following our lines extensively discusses the actions surrounding the two headbands. This result of the oracle question is that this is indeed one of several events that caused the anger of the deity.

The *eni kuit*-s in obv. 23 (ex. 4.47) and 25 (footnote of 4.47), operate on the same level as the *eni kuit* in ex. 4.46, namely as a frame for a sequence of Direct Speeches and as a remark by the oracle inquirers themselves, leading up to the question for the deity. First I will present the examples, followed by my interpretation of the whole passage obv. 12-27:

**4.47** KUB 22.70 obv. 23 (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 60-61

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link</th>
<th>ki kuit</th>
<th>About this, that (it = the oracle outcome) was unfavorable again:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td><em>nu e-ni kuit</em></td>
<td><em>(4.44)</em> (is it) also that, that Mala said as follows: ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

This is the first mention of the affair discussed in the quotation marks (see below for the contents of the Direct Speech). It is therefore possible to interpretate *eni* as a cataphoric substitute Object complement of the verb *memai* ‘speak’, followed by the real object, the Direct Speech itself. In that case the translation should be “As for the fact that they had said that *(eni* as follows”. Indeed we have an example of *eni* functioning as the Object of a third order verb (see 4.4.4.). But in that case the complement *kuit* is lacking, so I prefer to understand our example of *eni* here as the syntagm *eni kuit* ‘as for that (known) fact, that”. The three *eni kuit* clauses obv. 12, 23 and 25 form the framework of a very long introduction to an oracle question:

---

134 I do not follow Ünal o.c. p. 12 in emending the text to *eni* without -ya. From the preceding paragraph it is clear that there is another reason for the deity to be angry. The oracle inquirers therefore phrase their next question as “Is it also (-ya) that (fact) that ..., that you, o deity, are angry?”

135 KUB 22.70 obv. 25 *2^ansi$sma e-ni kuit 1-EN SUR$MUD,AMÜSEN GUSKIN GE$TIN GARA,AN NA, 8 AYARI penkita SUR ENI KAPP1 ENI OL šekkuën And as for that *(eni* (fact) that we did not know about the one golden falcon, the bunch of grapes of precious stones, the 8 rosettes, the *penkita*-s, the eyebrow (?), the eyelid of precious stone, ...
"The queen made a golden headband in the Stone-house of Kurunta. Then the deity of Arusna asked the queen for it in a dream. The queen however did not give it, and hid it in the house of a chamberlain. Instead, the queen made two other headbands of silver. As long as she has not sent it (the golden one) to the deity of Arusna, the matter has been causing trouble to the queen, and she was banned from the palace. Thereupon the queen wrote from the city Utruli to the king: "The golden headband that the deity of Arusna requested from me in a dream, it has been lying in the house of the chamberlain up till now. The takkisra and the precious stones that remained behind, they are lying in the atupalassa up till now. Send them to the Deity!"

They have found that (eni) golden headband. Next to it there lay a golden falcon, a bunch of grapes of precious stones, 8 rosettes, penkita-s, an eyebrow (?), an eyelid of precious stone. It was brought to the Stone-house of Kurunta to the statue of the queen. The takkisra however that were supposed to be lying in the atupalassa were not found. The two golden headbands that the queen had made as a vow for the deity, one of them was found and was sent to the deity."

Another attestation of eni in this oracle text which I want to interpret differently from Ünal is obv. 51 from category 1, eni kuit as a reference to what was said before. We will see that eni kuit does not refer back:

4.48 KUB 22.70 obv. 49-52 (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 70-71
§ 49 ki kuit namma NU.SIG₃-ta nu-kan \ yaštanza kuit ŠÂ Ė NA-ḫekur 𒈺_voltage_ LAMMA aššan n=at arijaingeni ₅₀ nu kuit ŚIXŠA-tari n=at ANA DINGIR-LIM pianzi mān= ma₇₃ za DINGIR-LIM QATAMMA malān ḫarti nunu KUŠ.MEŠ SIG₅-ru ... ₅₁
§ ₅₁ e-ni=kan kuit \ yaštanza ŠÂ Ė NA-ḫekur 𒈺_voltage_ LAMMA aššīyaanzi ŚIXŠA-at n=at pānzi ANA DINGIR-LIM IŠTU NA₄₅₂ pianzi KILMIN ... ₅₂
As for this (ki) (fact), that it was again unfavorable: the sin that remains inside the stone-house of the Tutelary deity, we will perform an oracle inquiry about it. What shall be established they shall give to the deity. If you, o god, agree in that way, let the exta be favorable (Outcome: favorable)
As for that (eni) (fact), that sin was established as remaining inside the stone-house of the Tutelary deity, and (that) thereupon they shall give it to the deity together with a precious stone, (if) ditto, (then let the hurri birds be favorable. Outcome: unfavorable)

136 Contra Ünal o.c. p. 59 and fn. d) the following clauses are probably still part of the oracle question that started in obv. 12.
The first paragraph states clearly that the oracle inquirers still have to perform an inquiry about the sin in the Stone-house and the fine to be paid, so in this text only the announcement of an oracle inquiry has been written down and not the outcome of that inquiry itself. As a result, the next paragraph cannot refer back to this outcome because there is no outcome here. The paragraph starts with the observation that the oracle has indicated that sin remained and that that sin has to be given to the deity. Given that this oracle inquiry with its outcome has not been inscribed on this tablet, we do not know what the 'sin' is about, and moreover, nowhere it has been stated that some precious stones have to be given as an extra gift. So the second paragraph gives us the summary of what has been established elsewhere, with the final request for divine consent. This summary is Discourse new and necessarily Hearer old, requiring a demonstrative that can be recognitionally used. Therefore eni is used and not ki, which generally links to the immediately preceding text.

Concluding, Ünal’s category 2 and 3 merge to form the Recognitional Use category. The writer knew very well what he was doing, so the idea posited by Ünal about confusion of the writer and the stylistic variation interpretation of Kammenhuber are both besides the point. In the case of Kammenhuber this is surprising given her correct analysis of the "jenes (andersweitig bekannte)".

The same recognitional use occurs in another oracle from Tudhaliya IV:

4.49 **KUB 5.1 obv. i 7** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 561), ed. Ünal 1974: 32-33
§\textsuperscript{7} \textit{eni} = \textit{kuit} = wTemetiš INIM URUTaptena URUHuršamaja RA-uanzi EGIR ti\textit{t}at
As for that (eni) (fact), that Temeti returned to attack in the matter of Taptena and Huršama, ...

This passage is explicitly mentioned by Kammenhuber as an instance of 'einen dem Orakler bekannten, aber noch nicht im Text erwähnten Kampfplan' (o.c. 40a). In the same oracle we already saw a Recognitional unius (ex. 4.40).

Another example of the introduction to an oracle inquiry is in Direct Speech in a Plague prayer:

4.50 **KUB 14.8 obv. 31'-37’** (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 378 II), ed. Lebrun 1980: 206, 212
\textit{nuzza mahḫan eni ŢUPPA} \textsuperscript{32} ŠA KUR URUMizri piran ṣemijanun \textit{n=at ISTU}
DINGIR-LIM arījanun \textsuperscript{33} \textit{aš=ia kuš memijat} ISTU \textit{dIM URU} ḤATTI ijanza LŪ.MEŠ
\textit{URU} Mizri kuit \textsuperscript{34} LŪ.MEŠ \textit{URU} ḤATTI=ja ISTU \textit{dIM URU} ḤATTI linguants\textsuperscript{35} §
\textit{Damnassaruš=kan} kuit \textit{INA ŠA-BI} \textit{dIM URU} ḤATTI \textit{BELI=YA} \textsuperscript{36} \textit{memijat=ma=kan}
LŪ.MEŠ \textit{URU} ḤATTI=pat ḫudak šarrēr \textsuperscript{37} \textit{nuz=yar=as} mān \textit{ANA dIM URU} ḤATTI \textit{BELI=YA}
kardimmiḏaz kišat n=at ḫandātat

But after I had come across that tablet concerning Egypt, I performed an oracle inquiry of the god: "As for that (asi) word (i.e. treaty) which is made by the Stormgod of Hatti, (namely) that the Egyptians and the Hittites were put under oath by the Stormgod of Hatti, that (while) the Damnassara-deities are inside the temple of the Stormgod of Hatti, my Lord, only the people of Hatti quickly transgressed the word (i.e. treaty), if that (lit. it) became a reason for anger to the Stormgod of Hatti, my lord, (then let the outcome be ...)''. It was ascertained.\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{137} Beckman's translation 1997: 158 "Has this matter discussed earlier been brought about by the Storm-god of Hatti because the Egyptians and the Hittites had been put under oath by the Storm-god of Hatti?" does not take into account the relative pronoun kuis in obv. 33'. CHD L-N p. 270a does not consider the Direct Speech
The tablet with the treaty is probably not present at the location where the oracle inquiry is conducted, and therefore not present at the Deictic Center. As far as private knowledge is concerned: if even the deity needs an elaboration in the kuit clause in order to identify the correct treaty, then it is very unlikely that the treaty belongs to the general and cultural knowledge of the Hittites, especially since the treaty was concluded in the past.

Leaving the oracle questions, the possibly earliest attestation of eni introducing Hearer old, Discourse new information is found in Hattusili's (I) Testament:

4.51 **KUB 1.16 iii 40-41** (OH/NS egodocument, Hattusili I, CTH 6), ed. Sommer 1938: 12.

\[
i-e-\text{nī}^{138} \text{huḫḫa}(n)\text{=}\text{man} \, ^{41}[\ldots \text{ud}][\text{dār}=\text{ṣet} \, \text{U[L]} \, \text{DUMU.MEŠ}=\text{SU} \, \text{edi} \, \text{nāir}
\]

That \(^{139}(\text{nī})\) (known fact): did not his sons turn away my grandfather, (i.e.,) the words of [the king (?)]?

One has to admit that this is not a standard example of Recognitionally used demonstratives. Another example of Recognitional used asi, this time in Direct Speech, is:

4.52 **KUB 15.5 + i 10-13** (NH vow, Urhi-Tessub, CTH 583), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 49 with n. 36

\[
\text{§} \, ^{10} \text{Û-TUM} \text{EGIR-} \text{an} \, \text{parā} \text{damaīt} \, ^{11} \text{parā} \text{=} \text{ma} \, ^{12} \text{Arumuraš} \text{memiškizzi} \, ^{12} \text{a-šī=} \text{ya=} \text{kan} \, \text{AMA,AMA-KA} \, \text{ku yat}=\text{pat} \, \text{ŲL-} \text{lu} \, \text{ti} \text{jan} \, \text{harzi} \, ^{13} \text{KASKAL-šī=} \text{ma=} \text{yar=} \text{an=} \text{kan} \, \text{UL} \, \text{daitti}
\]

Later on yet another dream. Arumura keeps further saying: "Just why is that (asi) grandmother of yours holding a grudge? Shouldn't you appease her? (lit.: put her on the road)".

The information about the grandmother is necessarily private, shared knowledge between the Speaker Arumura and the Addressee Urhi-Tessub. About the presence of the grandmother, it is very unlikely to assume that she is present when the dream of Urhi-Tessub is discussed.

The last two examples do not belong to my corpus. They are included because Laroche 1979 tried to explain asi in ex. 4.54 as a nom.sg.c. whereas I believe that it is an

---

\(^{138}\) With CHD P 346b, i-e-ni is a conflation of eni and ini. The new Hittite scribe replaced the older form ini with the eni of his own time.

\(^{139}\) I follow HW^2 E p. 39 in disconnecting eni from uddar-set.

\(^{140}\) Contra Sommer, l.c., CHD L-N p. 218b "the words (lit. his words) of my grandfather", CHD L-N, p. 361b "Did not his sons set aside these words of my grandfather [PN]", I do not accept the existence of a gen.sg. -an. Either huḫḫa(n) = man [\ldots ud]dār = ṣet is a partitive apposition or it means that the sons turned aside both their father and his stipulations.

\(^{141}\) The preceding paragraph describes how Danuhepa, wife of Mursili, was supposed to receive a cloth or garment (Ū-it kuit memir TŪG=ma = idq[=ya ANA] ŠDanuhepa piandu 'as for the fact that was said by means of a dream: "Let them also give a cloth [to] Danuhepa, ... ").
acc.sg.c. Above we already encountered some examples of accusative asi in ex. 4.14, 4.16 (not mentioned by Laroche), 4.30 (id.) and 4.31 (id.) and also below in 4.53 (id.).

4.53 **KUB 33.106 + KBo 26.65 i 25'-29'** (NH myth, CTH 345), ed. Güterbock 1952: 18 (without join), collated by CHD L-N p. 365b.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{§} & 25' \text{ } \text{d} \text{Hebaduš} \text{ } \text{ANO} \text{ } \text{Takiti} \text{ } \text{IN}{\text|[\text{IM.MES}] \text{ } \text{memiškuan} \text{ } \text{daiti} [\text{§} \text{ku} \text{at} = \text{ya} \text{ } \text{SA} \text{ } \text{DU} \text{ } \text{EN} \text{ } \text{YA}] \text{ } \text{nakkin} \text{ } \text{memian} \text{ } \text{OL} \text{.} \text{ išta}[\text{mašmi}] \text{ } \text{OL} \text{=} \text{ma} = \text{ya} \text{ } \text{DU} \text{ } \text{SUy} [\text{ali}] \text{atat} \text{23'} \text{.} \text{ DINGIR.MES-aš} \text{ } \text{ašš̄} = \text{a} \text{ } \text{ḫumandaš} \text{ } \text{ḫaluga}[\text{n} \text{ išta]} \text{mašmi} \text{ } \text{a-ši-ua} \text{ } \text{kuin} \text{ } \text{DUlikummi} \text{ } \text{28'} \text{.} \text{ NA} = \text{kunkunuzin memišk} [\text{anz} i] \text{nu}] = \text{yarr} = \text{an} = \text{za} = \text{an} \text{ } \text{tarahta} \text{ } \text{kuinatqa} \text{ } \text{29'} \text{.} \text{ ammel} \text{ } \text{L} - \text{an} \text{ } \text{nakkin} \\
& \times[\ldots .]\times-\text{an} \text{ §}
\end{align*}\]

Hebat began to speak the words to Takiti: "["Wh]y do [I] not hear the important word of the Stormgod, [my] lord and do I not [hear] the message of Suwaliyya and all the gods ?? That (asi) Ullikummi, the Basalt, about whom they keep talking, did he (Ullikummi) conquer him somehow, my husband, the important [king, the Stormgod]?"

(adnominal, first mention in speech, relative clause, no ambiguity)

In this part of the story, the goddess Hepati is talking. She is blocked from news from the gods by the Basalt monster Ullikummi, although she does not seem to be aware of the fact that Ullikummi causes the blockade. She tries to figure out why the gods do not send her word, and she even fears that Ullikummi may have overcome them. Her thoughts clearly state that she has heard of the monster, but has not seen him yet. Obviously, Ullikummi is not in her presence, and additionally, knowledge about him is not yet general or cultural but still belongs to the private domain.

4.54 **KUB 33.112 + 114 + 36.2 iii 10'-17'**, with parallel text HT 25 + KUB 33.111 (NH/NS myth, CTH 343), ed. Laroche 1968: 34

\[\begin{align*}
\text{10} \text{ KASKAL-} & \text{an} \text{ma} \text{ } \text{k} [\text{uin}] \text{ ijan} \text{tari} \text{nu} \text{ KASKAL-[an kuin} \text{ (?} \text{ ...}] \text{11'} \text{ } \text{uyanzi} \text{ } \text{n} [\text{u} \text{ a(mmu)k}] \text{ } \text{d} \text{LAMA-aš} \text{ } \text{nepiš} [(\text{aš} \text{ LUGAL-us})] \text{ } \text{12'} \text{.} \text{ DINGIR.MES-aš hin(i)km} [(i \text{ IM.HI.})] \text{ } \text{a-uš} \text{ } \text{ylliu} \text{a} [(\text{liiu} \text{ d} \text{LAMA-aš idalu} \text{ya} \text{ uddar})] \text{ } \text{13'} \text{.} \text{ ANA} \text{ } \text{E.A-aš} \text{ } \text{KASKAL-ši} [(i \text{ men}a)h} \text{anda} \text{ p(eter)}] \text{ } \text{14'} \text{.} \text{ } \text{E.A-aš} \text{ } \text{Kumari} \text{bi} \text{a} [(\text{memi}] \text{ški} \text{u} \text{u} \text{an} \text{ d} \text{daiš} (\text{ehpu})] \text{ } \text{15'} \text{.} \text{ } \text{EGIR-pa} \text{ } \text{pau} \text{eni} \text{ nu} \text{ a-ši} [(i \text{ ku})] \text{ } \text{d} [(\text{LAMA-an} \text{ nepiš} \text{ LUGAL-un})] \text{ } \text{16'} \text{.} \text{ iiauen} \text{ nu} \text{ apaiš} \text{ } \text{GIM-an} [(\text{xi})] \text{ } \text{n} [(\text{iyarališ})] \text{ } \text{17'} \text{.} \text{ KUR.KUR.MES=ja} \text{ } \text{QATAMMA} \text{ } \text{niyaral} [(\text{la})] \text{ }
\end{align*}\]

Which road they march, [which ?] road they come, I, Kurunta, king of Heaven will assign (that road) to the gods". The blustering/rushing (?) winds carried the evil words of Kurunta to Ea on the road. Ea started to speak to Kumari: "Come, let's go back. That(142) (asi) Kurunta whom we made king in heaven, just as [he is] improper (?), so in the same way he also has made the countries improper (?)"

(adnominal, first mention in speech, relative clause, no ambiguity, not present, private knowledge?)

Laroche 1979: 149 stated that "il n'y a nulle raison de faire cet asi un acc.sg. en accord avec kuin". He continues with a Latin translation of the asi clause: *is, quem regem fecimus, ille sicut debilis (est)*. First of all, even if asi is the head of a preposed relative clause, then asi either still has to have a function in some main function or it is an extraposed constituent

---

142 CHD L-N: 460a translates asi with "this".
followed by a main clause in which asi is resumed by another pronoun. The latter option is what Laroche indicated by means of his Latin translation. This means that we have to accept an extrapoosed asi preceded by nu, followed by the main clause introduced by nu: nu asi nu apas ... So instead of accepting a very legitimate accusative asi, Laroche introduced a new topic introducing construction in Hittite.

4.3.3. Statistics and other observations

4.3.3.1. The Recognitional value of asi etc.

We already concluded in 4.2. that asi etc. functions as a distal demonstrative. This conclusion was mainly based on the occurrence of these forms in Direct Speech, the only context which provides direct evidence for deictic contrasts in a dead language. The fact that asi, eni, edani, uni and unius could be classified as Recognitional is other proof that all these forms are true demonstratives.

And as the reader can check for him/herself, most examples of Recognitional asi denote an entity that is outside the cognitive domain of the Speaker. One example (4.38) is connected with the Speaker but can be understood as disassociating (‘that contestor of mine’), another one is at first sight connected with the Addressee (4.52), ‘that grandmother of yours’. The grandmother is already dead however and therefore outside the domain of the Addressee (contrast this with 5.15 ‘that husband of yours’, with the Addressee oriented demonstrative apa-). The only exception is 4.37.

These two results constitute the proof that asi etc. is the distal demonstrative pronoun. In the next sections (4.4. and 4.5.), the distal value of all forms will be considered a given fact.

4.3.3.2. The chronological distribution of asi etc.

Recognitional asi etc., is attested in the following periods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>Supp</th>
<th>Murs II</th>
<th>Muw</th>
<th>Hatt III</th>
<th>Tud IV</th>
<th>NH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.s.c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.s.c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.-a.s.n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Chronological distribution of Recognitional asi etc.

The recognitional use is assured for ini and uni in Middle Hittite, and from Mursili II on for asi, nom. and acc., eni pl., edani, and unius. Possibly it is already attested in OH copy for asi, uni and eni. The scarce attestation of OH and MH Recognitional deictics is caused by the distribution of the text genres over the periods. The definition of Recognitional Deixis requires not only a Speaker, but also an Addressee, and moreover, both have to be familiar
with the topic under discussion. It is therefore not surprising to see that we encounter the Recognitional demonstratives mainly in Vows and Oracles. These text types always have the deity as Addressee, and in both text types the deity is always aware of the topic under discussion. To return to the language phases, Vows are non-existent in Old and Middle Hittite, and Oracles are extremely scarce in both periods. As we have seen, there exist two Middle Script oracles (KUB 50.1 and KBo 16.97) in which there is a Recognitional uni / ini. Besides the virtual non-existence of Vows and Oracles in the earlier periods we also have to take into account that the majority of texts is from the New Hittite period. Given these considerations, it is very surprising that we even have a few Recognitional demonstratives in Old and Middle Hittite.

4.3.3.3. Attention-levels and Information Structure

In the majority of the examples the recognitionally used asi etc. is part of a relative clause. The discourse function of such a clause is to introduce a discourse topic for further discussion, but the clause itself does not add anything new on the subject. All it does is recalling the referent. Therefore the Topic-Focus distinction is useless.

As far as saliency is concerned, the nature of this type of use requires that the entity referred to is not salient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognitional 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>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Focus | ası N |

Table 4.5: The Recognitional ası matrix.

4.4. The Discourse Deictic Use of ası etc.

4.4.1. Introduction

Discourse Deixis was discussed in 2.3.5., 2.3.6. and 3.4. I will therefore only list the main characteristics of Discourse Deictic expressions.

Discourse Deictic expressions encode portions of the spoken or written discourse. In this aspect it is similar to Anaphora. The main difference however is that Anaphora refers to a prior noun phrase -whatever its entity order- while a Discourse Deictic expression encodes an event or proposition for the first time (never a first order entity), thereby introducing the event or proposition into the discourse. Discourse deictic expressions always refer to the immediately adjacent segment, and the referents hardly ever persist in the discourse. They are mainly used to provide a link between two pieces of discourse and do not usually become a topic for further discussion themselves. Summarizing:

- Discourse deictics refer to the contents of a chunk of discourse: an event, a proposition, or a speech-act.
Discourse deixics provide a link between two discourse units.

- The referent of discourse deixics is immediately adjacent to the segment containing the discourse deixic expression.
- The referent was not nominalized before.

In Hittite we find the neuter pronouns ki, apat, eni or a form of these three connected with memiya- or uttar for Discourse Deixis. Related to them are the demonstrative adverbs of manner kissan, enissan and apenissan. The adverb of manner enissan is discussed in 4.4.2, the Discourse Deictic asi etc. in 4.4.3.

4.4.2. The adverb of manner enissan

The meaning of the discourse deixic adverb enissan “in that way, as mentioned above, in solcher Weise” was established by Friedrich (1926: 75, 1974: 134 § 250) as the opposite of kissan “folgendermaßen”. The earliest attestation of enissan probably occurs in a damaged festival text:144

4.55 IBoT 2.121 rev. 12’ (OS festival, CTH 676.1), ed. Haas 1970: 136

\[
\text{ta-\text{kkan} e-ne-i ili-ša-an}
\]

The next time it is found in the Maṣat letters, spelled inissan:


\[
\text{kišša-\text{mu} kuit hatraēš kāša-ya Lū\text{Kûr} uit nuz\text{mu} za \text{UrRu\text{Haparan}}} n-i-iš-ša-an
\]

Concerning that you have written to me like this: “The enemy has just arrived. He besieged the city Hapara in that way (enissan), (but Kasipura he besieged from this side.)”

The adverb inissan is quoted in a citation from another letter. The larger context of the letter is therefore lacking, so the meaning of inissant in Middle Hittite cannot be illustrated by means of this example.

Generally enissan refers backwards to the contents of Direct Speech or Quotation from a letter. The division of labor between forward referring kissan and backward referring enissan (see already Friedrich 1926: 75) is especially clear in ex. 4.57 where both refer to the same Quotation from a letter:

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

\[
\text{m\text{Pihhuniya-\text{š} ma\text{nu}}} \text{EGIR} \text{pa ki-iš-ša-an} \text{hatraēš ... nu\text{mu} ma[\text{h}]an}
\]

\[
\text{m\text{Pihhuniya-\text{e} ni-iš-ša-an} \text{EGIR} \text{pa ISPUR}}
\]

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

143 This requirement does not seem to count for the demonstrative adverbs of manner in Hittite. See ex. 4.62.

144 Contra Kammenhuber HW 2 E 41b who remarked that enissan occurs ‘ab Murš. II’.

145 The adverb inissan with initial i- also occurs in two other MH/MS texts, KBo 22.192 (+) 192a obv. 1 (2x), KBo 18.86 obv. 17’ and 29’.
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Other examples of enissan referring backwards to the contents of a letter are KUB 19.30 rev. iv 11 (NH, Mursili II, CTH 61 II)\(^{146}\), KUB 1.1 iii 74 (NH, Hattusili III, CTH 81)\(^{147}\). The letters were often read aloud, in which case the verb accompanying enissan is istamass-"hear":

4.58 KBo 5.6 iii 8-16 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40), ed. Güterbock 1956: 94

In the next example enissan refers backwards to Direct Speech. The verb accompanying enissan is mema- ‘speak’:


Similarly KBo 5.6 iv 4 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40)\(^{148}\), KBo 5.13 i 9 (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68)\(^{149}\), KUB 33.87+ ii 18’ (NH myth, CTH 345)\(^{150}\), KUB 19.11 iv 1 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40)\(^{151}\).

\(^{146}\) § 11 nu =mu GIM-an LÜ.MEŠ URU\(^{12}\)Mizra kuiš ’Dahamunuzuš’⁹ ēšta nu ANA ABU = YA LÜ.TEMI uijat 10 nu = sši ki-iš-ša-an ISPUR LÜ-aš=ya=mu=kan BA.ÜŠ 11 DUMU = YA = ma= y̆a=mu NU.GÁL tuk=ma=ya DUMU.MEŠ = KA 12 meggaš memiškanzi mān=ya=mu 13 1-an DUMU =KA paišti man=yar=aš=mu LÜ.MUTI=YA kišari 14 ARAD=YA =ma= ya nānān parā dažhi 15 nu =yar=an=za=kan LÜ.MUTI=YA išami tekri|=y̆a nahmi 16 nu maḥhan ABU =YA e-ni-iš-ša-an ISME

The Queen of Egypt who was dahanunzı sent my father a messenger. She wrote as follows (kissan): “My husband died while I have no son. It is said however that you have many sons. If you would give me one of your sons, he would become my husband. I do not want to take a servant of mine and make him my husband. I fear tekri- (?)”. After my father heard as just mentioned (enissan) ...
I said [t]o the king of Kargamis: “It is the Queen who holds me [………………] for the silver of Astata. Be quiet!” [……] the queen must know. Either the king of Kargamis [……] the case of silver. Whether I spoke as mentioned above (enissan), you [gods, know].

Similarly KUB 17.7+ iv 51’ (NH myth, CTH 345)152.

The following examples present the use of enissan referring to the State of Affairs described in the narration, and not to the propositional contents of a Quotation or Direct Speech. The verb in the clause containing enissan is au(s)- “see”.

4.60 KBo 4.4 iii 68-72 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 132

Similarly KUB 1.1 iii 54-55 (NH, Hattusili III, CTH 81)153.

I finally present two examples154 in which enissan is not accompanied by the verbs istamass-, mema- or au(s)- but still refers to some State of Affairs:

4.61 KBo 4.4 iv 50-51 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 140-141

The adverb enissan refers back to the description of the way the army has been prepared for war. Note the difference with QATAMMA = apenissan, ‘that way’. The latter is mainly used in comparative constructions, whereas enissan (and kissan) never are (Kammenhuber HW2 E: 41b). Generally, enissan carries the notion ‘as mentioned before’, apenissan ‘just as mentioned before’. Similarly KUB 1.1 iii 54-55 (NH, Hattusili III, CTH 81)153.

The two remaining examples from my corpus are KBo 16.98 ii 10 (NH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577) § 10

The adverb enissan refers back to the envoy of Mutti with his message: “But when the men of Azzi heard “My Majesty will come!”, the men of Azzi sent Mutti, man of Halimana, ahead. They sent the following message: “Given that the fact that you, our lord, have already destroyed us, please do not come again, our lord. Take us as your subjects, our lord, and we will start to send our lord soldiers and horses. And also, the refugees of Hatti that are with us we will hand over.” They returned to me 1000 refugees from Hatti”, followed by the citation above.

152 § 51’ kuitman e-né-eš-ša-an memiškir “While they were speaking in that way (enissan), …”, ed. Güterbock 1951: 160. Not in my corpus.

153 GIM-an[(e(ma=m)mu(=kan) =Ur hi.4(U-uppaš e-)]ni-ıš([-ša-])an 35 [S(A DINGIR-L)]M aššul[(can aušta n 4 aš=mu ar)]aniš “But when Urhi-Tessup saw the blessing of the Deity upon me in that way, he became envious with me”, ed. Otten 1981: 20

154 The two remaining examples from my corpus are KBo 16.98 ii 10 (NH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577) § 10
In the next example the second order referent of enissan is not immediately preceding the clause containing enissan. The way the ambush is laid is described in the preceding paragraph, i 10-11.

4.62 KBo 5.8 i 14-17 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götz 1933: 148

nu₃ kan maḥḥan ¹⁵ ANA KASKAL URURTaggašta tijanun mān ījannījanun ¹⁶ nu₃ mu e-ni-iš-ša-an kuit LŪ.MEŠ URURTaggašta šēnahha ¹⁷ pīran teškanzi nu₃ mu MUŠEN arān ħarta

When I took the road to Taggasta, I would have marched. (However,) because the people of Taggasta were laying an ambush before me as mentioned above (enissan), a bird rose for me.

4.4.3. Evaluation of enissan

In all clear examples the adverb of manner enissan “in that way, as mentioned before, thus” refers backward to a second order entity (State of Affairs, ex. 4.60-4.62) or a third order entity (Proposition, ex. 4.57-4.59).

In all examples but two (ex. 4.56) enissan occurs in a subordinate clause containing temporal maḥḥan (exx. 4.57, 4.58, 4.59), kuṭman (fn. 152), kuwa.pi (fn. 147), conditional ma næ (ex. 4.59), or causal kuīt (ex. 4.60, 4.62), as was noted by Kammenhuber HW² E 41b. This is not surprising given the main characteristic of a discourse deictic expression: providing a link between adjacent chunks of discourse. When the above clauses do not close a Direct Speech unit or a Quotation from a letter, they contain material that is sometimes repeated literally from the piece of text enissan is referring to. In both cases -Direct Speech closure or repetition of a chunk of discourse- the narration is not pushed forward. No new information is added on any topic, the discourse deictic expression and its host clause are simply structuring the discourse by providing the background for a new discourse unit.

The Middle Hittite examples all contain inissan, not enissan. This corresponds with ini in Middle Hittite versus eni in New Hittite.

4.4.4. The Discourse Deictic syntagms eni uttar, asi memias and eni

Discourse deictic use of asi etc. is rare compared with enissan. The application of the criteria listed above, nominalization of the verbal content of immediately preceding or following discourse resulted in 6 examples. There is actually only one example in my corpus in line with the use of enissan, ex. 4.26 repeated here:

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


But when I, My Majesty, heard about that (uni) affair, I, My Majesty, did not seek evil against Mashuiluw at all. I did [not] act evilly [at all] towards him. I spoke in this way: "I will go set that affair [right again]." I arose and went to settle this affair.

145
As already discussed at ex. 4.26, in the preceding paragraph of this treaty between Mursili and Kupanta-Kurunta 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. This series of events is nominalized for the first time in i 34 by means of uni memian. This nominalization takes place in a mahhan clause. The construction as a whole serves to connect the reaction of Mursili with the acts of Mashuiluwa: the clause forms a discourse boundary between two discourse units -also indicated by the paragraph line- and forms a logical connection between the two. The noun phrase uni memian is therefore truly Discourse Deictic, referring backwards.

In another text from Mursili II with asi (acc.) memian instead of uni memian:

4.64 IBoT 2.112 + obv. 1-7 (NH egodocument, Mursili II, CTH 486), ed. Lebrun 1988: 104

§ 1 [(UMMA dUTU-Ši)] mMurši-DINGIR-LIM LUGAL.GA[(L)] INA URU.DU₄ mKunnu² 
[(nannahhun)] nu ḫarršḫarrši udaš namma ḫU-aš [(ḥatug)a]³ [(tešški)i] t nu nāḫun nu=mu=kan memias šk[(A×U-i anda)]⁴ [(tepašešt)] a nu=mu=kan memias r[(epu)] kušši šarā [(iššat)]³ [(nu=kani)] ašši memian arḫa-pat pat[(šu)]nānu mahhan=ma ṣer MU.Ḫ.Ḫ. uš EGIR-anda p[(āš n)] u=mu u[(it)]
⁷ [(ašši]i memias teššanis[(kišaša)]n tijat

Thus (speaks) My Majesty Mursili Great-King: I was driving to the ruined town of Kunnu (when) a storm came up. Moreover, the Stormgod repeatedly thundered terribly. I was frightened: the speech in my mouth became hesitant, speech came up somewhat hesitantly. I neglected that (asi) incident entirely.¹⁵⁵ But when the years passed by, it happened that that incident (asi memias) began to appear in my dreams regularly. (In my dream the hand of a god touched me and my mouth went to the side.)

The series of events of thunder, fright and impairment of speech is nominalized for the first time in obv. 5 as asi (acc.!) memian 'that incident'. The noun phrase asi memian does not refer anaphorically to memias 'speech' mentioned in obv. 4 in view of the second asi memias in obv. 7. The latter noun phrase refers to the projection of the incident in the dream: 'In my dream the hand of a god touched me and my mouth went to the side' and not to the speech itself. The noun phrase asi memias of obv. 7 refers anaphorically to the asi memian in obv. 5 and will be discussed in section 4.5 (the tracking use of asi).

Unlike in ex.4.63 asi memian is not included in a subordinate backgrounding clause. As such, it is not truly linking. It does however close a discourse unit on the discourse level and a series of events on the semantic level, so it seems to be structuring the discourse somewhat. This is however not all.

The conclusions from the part on demonstratives in Chapter 3 are (i) that demonstratives are used to structure the discourse, as simple nominals do, and (ii) that the difference between the three demonstratives lies in the cognitive domain as estimated or decided by the Speaker. The speaker will use ka- + NP to indicate that something is his responsibility, apa- + NP to indicate that something is the responsibility of the Addressee, and asi + NP for responsibility belonging not to Speaker and/or Addressee but to the Other. This is especially clear in the examples 4.63 and 4.64. In ex. 4.63 Mashuiluwa performs some hostile acts. When the king hears about them, he uses uni memian, indicating that it is still

¹⁵⁵ The translation of these three clauses is based upon CHD P 209. See however CHD P 34: "And my mouth went to the side".
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Mashuiluwa’s domain. However, in i 37 he uses *kedani memiyani*, after stating that he will solve the affair. The changing of responsibility is mirrored by the change form *uni memian* to *kedani memiyani*. In ex. 4.64 the king says that he did not pay any attention to the incident. The avoidance of his responsibility, i.e. to find out what the incident meant to say, is clearly expressed by means of the verb *paskuwai*: ‘neglect’. So in both cases the context favors an interpretation of *asi* as indicator of ‘not belonging to me (, but to the other)’.

The next example is closer to the use of *enissan* as referring to Quotation from a letter, but with a major difference, forward or cataphoric reference.

4.65 **KUB 19.29 iv 11-15** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 18-19

\[\text{készma  mḪannuttiš kuiš KUR.KUR.MEŠ Š[APŁITI]}^{12} \text{maniąahbiškit nu INA KUR URU}^{13} \text{Šḫupitta kuşap[i ...]} \text{n=}\text{aš apiša BA.ÚŠ nu mahḫan eni=}\text{ša SA mḪannutt[i ūš-an]}^{14} \text{ištamaššir n=}\text{ašza=}\text{škan apēziša EĞIR-an} \text{[EĞIR-pa]}^{15} \text{ešandat nu=}\text{mu e-} \text{ni AWATE.MEŠ apadda ūaris}[kir]^{6}
\]

(“Now the one who would have impressed me, [would have] be[en] your eldest brother, [who] managed the troops and charioteers for his father and (who) knew the treaties of his father. [He used to be] a h[ero]. If you would impress me, [you] would [be] he for me.” [But when] they saw [my brother] ill,) Hannuttu who managed the L[ower] Lands at this time, when he […] in Ishupitta, he died over there/then. When they heard of also that [death] of Hannutti, because of that *too* they became rebellious. Because of that they wrote those (= the following, *eni*) words: …

The ‘following words’ refer to the contents of the next paragraph: “You are a child, and you know nothing. [You do not] imp[ress (me).] At this time your country is devastated and [your] troo[ps and horses] have dwindled. I have more troops than you, I have more horses than you. [Your father however] had many troops and horses. As for [you] who are a child, when will you go *taparuna* him (= them)?”.

The unexpected appearance of *eni* instead of *ke* ‘these’ is explained by Sommer 1938: 161 as follows: ‘*eni* nimmt auf das *V o r h e r g e h e n d e Bezug* […]’. So also, when the äußeren Anschein zum Trotz, XIX 29 iv 15 “Worte der gleichen Art, wie sie vorher schon geschrieben worden waren” (nähmlich bis Z. 10).” The lines to which Sommer refers are presented in the translation above in parentheses. Although Sommer’s solution is attractive, it raises the issue of (partial) comparison. Comparison is not part of the semantics of *eni* and *enissan* but of *apingissan* (see Chapter 5). On the other hand, he connects it with the use of *eni* (kuit) in KUB 22.70. Also there *eni* seems to refer forward, but actually it points at things that happened before, ‘so, wie berichtet’. Sommer clearly does not take *eni* as referring to something that was mentioned in the oral inquiry itself. It just refers to ‘geschehene Dinge, die zum Zweck der Orakelbefragung vorher gemacht worden waren’ (l.c.). In the framework presented here this means that *eni* in our example is close to the Recognitional Use: Discourse New, Hearer Old. Indeed, the message ‘you are a child’ is Discourse New, and a bit Hearer Old given the similar but not same message earlier in the text.

Although Sommer’s interpretation partially fits the Recognitional Use, the nuance of comparison remains. This shade of meaning is neither part of the Recognitional Use nor part of the meaning of the backward referring Discourse Deictic adverb of manner *enissan*. Instead, I propose that *eni AWATE.MES* functions similarly as *uni memian* and *asi memian* in the two preceding examples. It is a rhetorical device used by the Speaker to indicate that he distances himself from what is expressed in the message. He signals at the Addressee that something is coming up which he does not agree with at all: that he is a child and not capable
of leading an army, and that he will lose. These words are all on account of not the Speaker or the Addressee, but of the Other.

The only other cataphoric discourse deictic *eni* I am aware of occurs in a later text, the Bronze Tablet:

§ 91 ANA AWAT ANA-hekur SAG.UŠ-ja-kan ABU-šYA mMarâšantaš KAXU-za karpta md.LAMMA-aš-šA ANA ANA-hekur SAG.UŠ lē manninkuiyan nu ABU-šYA ANA mMarâšantaš φUPPU išat n-šat mMarâšantaš šarka e-ni=ma ABU-šYA OL šakta AWAT ANA-hekur SAG.UŠ-kan mahâhan š4 dU kantarra andan gušanza mMarâšantaš SAG.UŠ kan mahâhan zilatiya ANA md.LAMMA parkiâyânzi OL kišâri uit=ma mahâhan ABU-šYA memian IŠME nu memiân ABU-šYA=pat hullâs  

And in the matter of the permanent *hekur* my father accepted from the mouth of Marassanta: “Kurunta may not (come) near the permanent *hekur*. So my father made a tablet for Marassanta, and Marassanta (still) holds it. But this (*eni*) my father did not know: how the matter of the permanent *hekur* (is) inscribed in the *kantarra* of the Stormgod, how in the future the permanent *hekur* shall not be taken away from Kurunta. When it happened that my father heard of the situation, it was my father himself who contested the situation.

The question is: why is *eni* used instead of the regular forward referring discourse deictic pronoun *ki*? Contrary to the previous example, *eni* cannot refer to anything indicated before, it is not ‘so, wie berichtet’. The only solution is that *eni* emphasizes that the knowledge contained in the message does not belong to the cognitive space of the father of the king.

Of course this shade of meaning is already contained in the negated predicate itself, but one has to be aware that the choice for one demonstrative or the other -when there is a choice- is a rhetorical device that adds something extra to the semantics of the clause. This is illustrated by means of i 97-98: uit=ma mahâhan ABU-šYA memian IŠME nu memiân ABU-šYA=pat hullâs “When it happened that my father heard of the situation, it was my father himself who contested the situation”. Compare this with ex. 4.63 i 34, 37-38 mahâhan=ma dUTU-SI uni memian ASME ... nu këdani memiân EGI-PA] 38 anda tittâmanzi pâun “But when I, My Majesty, heard about that affair, ... I went to settle this affair”. As I discussed earlier, the use of *uni*, changing to *kedani*, indicates that the king wants to emphasize that responsibilities have changed. This emphasis is however not a necessary part of the semantics or syntax of the clause, it solely depends on the freedom a speaker has in using his/her language. In our present example the Speaker decided not to use a demonstrative, but simply the bare nominal *memiyan*, taking a neutral stance.

A possible Discourse Deictic expression *eni utter* “that affair” occurs in an Oracle from Tudhaliya IV:


---


157 See for another oracle with *eni* (besides *eni kuit*) KUB 22.70 obv. 47 (NH oracle, CTH 566) nu mân DINGIR-LUM e-ni [3ak]iahtia KL.MIN.
The will go and thus enjoin this (asi) affair of giving. If you then acknowledge (it), will that (eni) affair be solved for us?

This oracle is concerned with the illness that will befall Tudhaliya IV before his accession to the throne. The fever is caused by the Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny because she is angry about some unfulfilled vows and promises. In order to appease her, it is established that she will receive some gifts. The oracle inquiry is concluded with the paragraph cited here. In the last question they ask: ‘will that affair be solved for us’, probably referring to the whole conglomerate of problems surrounding the disease of Tudhaliya and not just the affair of giving. If this is true, then eni uttar is an example of a Discourse Deictic expression referring to a whole discourse. If it refers only to the affair of giving, the expression is Anaphoric. I tend to believe that eni uttar refers to the whole affair, based on its appearance in a concluding question.

Finally, there is one example of Time deixis, a subcategory of Discourse Deixis:

4.68 KBo 19.76 + KUB 14.20 8'-9' (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Houwink ten Cate 1979: 161

\[ \ldots \text{LoKUR (URUG)}a\text{šgaš=ma e-da-aš UD.K[AM.HI.A-aš]} \] \[ t(iiat) \] §

But in those (edas) days the Gasgaean enemy stepped [...].

4.4.5. Evaluation of the syntagms eni uttar, asi memias and eni

4.4.5.1. Function of the discourse deictic asi etc.

In each example the noun phrase asi, uni and eni + N refers to a sequence of propositions in the preceding or following discourse, adjacent to the clause containing the demonstrative. In all these cases the proposition was not nominalized before. Just as enissan, the demonstratives occur on the borders of a Discourse unit. In ex. 4.63 uni memian occurs in a temporal mahhan clause at the beginning of a paragraph; asi memian in ex. 4.64 closes a unit describing the frightening experience of Mursili, followed by a new unit starting with a mahhan clause; the cataphoric eni AWATE.MEŠ in ex. 4.65 is part of a clause both closing a paragraph and introducing Direct Speech; the cataphoric eni in ex. 4.66 introduces a Discourse unit that is a comment of the Speaker on the state of the knowledge of Hattusili, Tudhaliya’s father. This unit disrupts the sequence of the actions of Hattusili. The textual sign indicating the diversion from the main story line to the comment and back is each time the discourse marker -ma; the last example, ex. 4.67, shows eni uttar in a question that is the last question in the oracle inquiry.

All features listed here clearly show that asi, uni, eni and edas are discourse deictic demonstratives and not anaphoric. They introduce entities in the discourse that were not referred to before, and therefore this use is rather close to deictic and recognitional use. In each case the referent of the demonstrative is Discourse New. The Deictic and Discourse Deictic demonstratives are also Hearer New, whereas the Recognitional demonstrative is

\[ ^{158} \text{In KBo 2.2 ii 9 there is another eni uttar with unclear reference due to the broken context.} \]
Hearer Old. But unlike Deictic and Recognitional demonstratives, Discourse Deixis excludes reference to first order entities.

Another feature in common with the other two demonstrative uses is the occurrence of the discourse deictic demonstrative on the borders of a discourse unit. The Deictic and Recognitional demonstratives (almost) always appear in discourse initial clauses, whereas the discourse deictic demonstrative appears on discourse nodes. This raises an important question: what is the difference with simple noun(phrase)s? Noun phrases are used to introduce new entities into the discourse or to mark new discourse units (see 2.3.3. and section 4.5 below) so the addition of a demonstrative should indicate something more than just the structure of the discourse. As I have explained above, asi etc. in combination with a noun indicates that an entity belongs explicitly to the Cognitive Space of the Other. The Speaker needs to stress that he and the Addressee have nothing to do with the entity indicated by asi + N. This again shows that asi etc. is the distal demonstrative.

The distancing effect just described is not found with enissan. I suspect that the Otherness of enissan lies in the fact that enissan refers backward in the discourse, to something which lies behind the Speaker. The manner adverb kissan on the other hand refers to something which still has to come and which is therefore of importance for the Speaker (and Addressee).

4.4.5.2. Chronological distribution of the discourse deictic asi etc.

Discourse deictic asi etc. is mainly attested in texts from Mursili II (table 4.6). The low number of attestations even in New Hittite should warn us against the conclusion that discourse deictic use of these forms did not occur in earlier periods. However, we can only be certain for the time from Mursili on that asi, uni and eni function within one paradigm as a discourse deictic demonstrative with distal value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Man.adv.</th>
<th>inissan</th>
<th>enissan</th>
<th>enessan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acc.s.c.</td>
<td>uni</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.-a.s.n.</td>
<td>eni</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.-a.pl.n.</td>
<td>eni</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.pl.</td>
<td>edas</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: The chronological distribution of discourse deictic asi etc.

4.4.5.3. Attention-levels and Information Structure

When looking from the cognitive viewpoint of saliency, the entities referred to by discourse deictic asi etc. are never salient. Not being mentioned before, they were not at the forefront of the Addressee’s mind, not salient (see Table 4.7). Most discourse deictic expressions occur in background clauses. The Topic-Focus distinction is not relevant in these cases.
Continuity procedure | Centering procedure
---|---
E-Topic | U-Topic | A-Focus | Focus
---|---|---|---
| | | | asi
| | | | asi N
| | | | enissan

Table 4.7: The Discourse Deictic asi matrix.

4.5. The Tracking (= anaphoric) Use of *asi* with noun

4.5.1. Introduction

Laroche maintained that *asi* etc. was the only true anaphoric pronoun in Hittite, later to be replaced by *apa*-. It has become clear however that *asi, uni, eni* etc. function as true demonstrative pronouns, appearing in all demonstrative contexts: deictic, recognitional and discourse deictic. The last area to be surveyed, the tracking or anaphoric use of *asi* etc. is the one which supposedly led Laroche to his conclusions. The anaphoric use of *asi* etc. is however basically different from the anaphoric use of *apa*-. This is caused by the fundamental differences between *asi* and *apa*-. Although *apa-* sometimes functions as a demonstrative (see Chapter 5), it is mainly used as an emphatic pronoun (see Chapter 7, 8, 9). The pronoun *asi* on the other hand is a demonstrative without the special characteristics of emphatic pronouns. The difference between the two also becomes apparent when the structure of the discourse is taken into consideration. The tracking demonstrative *asi* (and *apa*) often refers to an entity in another discourse unit, whereas the emphatic pronoun *apa* mainly refers to an entity in the same discourse unit. Related to emphasis is the function of *apa* to refer to one of competing referents, often the one that is not topical. The demonstrative *asi* is *never* used in ambiguous contexts, as is for example illustrated by the use of *asi* with personal names.

Anaphoric demonstratives may refer to both salient and non-salient entities, residing respectively in working memory and long term memory. Given that saliency and non-saliency are cognitive notions dealing with the storage capacities of the brain, how do these notions translate to spoken or written discourse? A very important insight comes from Fox 1987. She discovered that anaphora depends on discourse structure, and not so much on saliency and non-saliency alone. It is not true that only pronouns refer to salient entities and that only noun phrases refer to non-salient entities. The question has therefore to be: how do saliency and discourse structure work together in Hittite for the correct choice of an anaphoric expression?

The easiest combination to investigate is non-saliency and discourse structure (4.5.2.). Entities lose their saliency after a major discontinuity in the discourse. These discontinuities are caused by episodic changes, shifts in location, intervention by Direct Speech, and textual unit boundaries. In such situations reference is done by lexical noun phrases, including the ones with a demonstrative determiner. The clearest contexts for Hittite are reference across a paragraph line (section 4.5.2.1.), and reference across Direct Speech boundaries (section 4.5.2.2.). There is only one example with an episodic change (section 4.5.2.3.).

In Hittite discourse nodes are often indicated by overt signs that are independent of the occurrence of a noun phrase, with or without demonstratives. The paragraph boundary is indicated by a line, the crossing of a Direct Speech border to narration by the absence of the Direct Speech particle *-wa(r)*-, and lapse of time by a temporal *mahhan* clause and the
contents of the clause itself. In case of salient entities however, these signs are absent (4.5.3.). According to Fox 1987 lexical noun phrases referring to salient entities (entities that are referred to in the preceding clause(s)) demarcate rhetorical units. In other words, lexical noun phrases may also indicate a discourse boundary or node.

Discourse units can be connected in two ways. They are either joined linearly or hierarchically. In the latter case one discourse unit is embedded into another one, providing a background for the narration. In the former case the discourse units function on the same level, they are sequential so to speak. Generally, linearly arranged units provide new information on the discourse theme, but contrary to the hierarchically organized units the new information is foregrounded and pushes the narration forward. Most examples from Fox are of this type. In my Hittite corpus the roles are reversed. Most examples of the demonstrative noun phrase referring to a salient discourse entity occur in the sentence that indicates the border of hierarchically structured discourse units. The crossing from main unit to embedded unit will be discussed in section 4.5.3.1., the crossing from embedded unit to main unit in section 4.5.3.2.. Finally, the crossing between linearly organized discourse units is discussed in section 4.5.3.3.

Besides this categorization which serves to prove that also in the domain of anaphora asi etc. behaves as a true demonstrative, I will extensively discuss the extra pragmatic load of asi as a means of referring to the domain of the Other. While it was possible in the cases of Deixis and Recognitional deixis to simply call asi the distal demonstrative, with Discourse deixis and Anaphora (or Tracking use) the motivation for the use of asi is harder to establish. As the chapters on ka- and apa- show, all demonstratives may refer backwards. The most common explanation for the anaphoric use of these demonstratives, is that the proximal demonstrative refers back to referents closer to the expression containing the demonstrative than the medial and distal demonstratives. In Hittite however distance does not motivate the choice for one or the other demonstrative.

4.5.2. The centering procedure

4.5.2.1. Reference across a paragraph line

Discourse entities lose their salience when a discourse unit is closed. The paragraph lines on the Hittite tablets are the clearest, visual signals of the closure of a discourse unit. When referring to these entities in a new unit, they have to be treated as if they are mentioned for the first time. The difference with true first mentions is that contrary to true first mentions the noun is definite.

In section 4.4 I have already indicated that the use of asi etc. is a rhetorical means of the Speaker to indicate that something is not part of his/her responsibility, or at least that s/he does not consider it as part of his/her cognitive space but as part of somebody else’s space besides Speaker and Addressee. The following three examples are especially clear on this matter. Mursili emphasizes that he did not attack the countries, that he was still a child, that he did not know anything (ex. 4.70), that he did not change anything on the tablet containing the treaty (ex. 4.69). He desperately tries to convince the deity that it was not his fault that the countries were attacked and the treaty broken, that it was not his responsibility (and of course neither the deity’s responsibility).

4.69  KUB 31.121 ii 6'-17' (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 379), ed. Sürenhagen 1985: 10
6' \nu e\char140 yar a[r?? SA KUR UR]\char146 M\char146 Iz\char146 7[UPPI \char146 \char153?

152
And discussing the same events, i.e. the attack on countries in the sphere of influence of Egypt and the plagues following from that attack:

4.70 KUB 31.121a ii 34'-42' (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 379), ed. Sürenhagen 1985: 14 ...


4.72 KBo 5.8 iii 24'-25' (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götzte 1933: 158-159
And those (uni) 9000 soldiers that Pitaggatalli had led (to Sappidduwa) began battle with me.

The noun phrase refers to iii 3: 9 

$\text{LJ}M \, \text{ÉRIN.MES A[NA] LÜ.MES} \, \text{Sap}(\text{ddu})\, \text{ya}^{4}$ [[yarrī uy]aṭe]t 'He led 9000 soldiers to the people of the city [Sap]idduwa for help'\textsuperscript{161}, at the beginning of the preceding paragraph (ca. 25 clauses earlier).

In Himmelmann's (1996) view this could be called Recognitional but I prefer to follow Diesssel that Recognitionals are discourse new. Cognitively however the same procedure is at work. The distance is probably such that a (demonstrative) noun phrase does not suffice to bring back the referent into the center of attention. Therefore a heavier relative clause is used. This relative clause does not add any new information to the 9000 soldiers, it just reminds the Addressee of what was mentioned before. After the reintroduction by means of a relative clause, the 9000 soldiers may function as the Topic. This is exactly what a Recognitional demonstrative does: it introduces some known referent into the Discourse for further reference.

And from the annals about Mursili's father:

4.73 KBo 14.3 iv 28'-31' (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40), ed. Güterbock 1956: 76

$\text{nu ABU} \, \text{YA} \, [(\text{mahhan})]^{29'} \, [(\text{nan})]nai nu z kan e-da-ni pangɔu \, \text{L[UKUR l-anki=} \, \text{pat}]^{30'} \, [(\text{anda h})]\text{andaizzi }n=\text{za z=}\text{an ABU} \, \text{YA} \, [(zahhi} \text{jaw} \text{yanzi=} \, \text{pat}]^{31'} \, [(\text{ep})]zi$

As my father was driving, he lined himself up with that (edani) entire enemy(force) at once. My father started to fight it.

'That entire enemyforce' refers to the Arzawaea enemy in the previous paragraph (\textsuperscript{L0}KUR \textsuperscript{uR}Arzauya iv 16').

The last paragraph crossing reference to a first order entity in my corpus is found in an oracle from Tudhaliya IV:

4.74 KBo 2.2 iii 30-31 (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 134-135

$\text{§ 30} \, a-\text{ṣi kuiš} \, \text{dUTU URUPU-na DUMU-annaš}^{31} \, \text{ANA IKRIBI[HI]A šer SISÁ-at}$

Concerning that (asi) Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny who was ascertained because of the vows: (they will ask His Majesty which vow is to be fulfilled, and that (one) they will fulfill).

The demonstrative NP refers back three paragraphs to iii 10-11 (and maybe also to the following one iii 13-17) where the Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny was established as the one who was angry because of the vows: $\text{§ 10} \, \text{dUTU URUPU-na kuit DUMU-annaš SISÁ-at}^{11} \, \text{ANA IKRIBI[HI]A šer} \, \text{"Concerning the fact that the Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny has been ascertained, (is it) because of the vows? (Answer: yes)"}. \text{Usually a simple noun will do, for in similar context we have:}$

- \text{dUTU URUPU-na kuiš SISÁ-at} (obv. ii 50) 'Concerning the Sungoddess of Arinna who was ascertained', referring to the deity mentioned in the preceding paragraph.
- \text{tapasšaš kuiš ANA dUTU-ŠI SISÁ-at} (obv. i 5) 'Concerning the fever' which was ascertained for His Majesty', referring to the fever mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

\textsuperscript{161} Restorations from duplicate KBo 16.8 iii 9.
Concerning the fever which was ascertained for His Majesty', referring to the fever mentioned two paragraphs earlier.

On the basis of these examples alone the reason for the use of *asi* etc. cannot be established. The remaining occurrences of *asi* etc. all refer to higher order entities:

4.75 **KBo 2.2 ii 25-26** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 130

§ 5 nu dammaiš kuiški DINGIR-LUM kardimmijašanza 26 nu a-ši INIM GIG apāš

ijazi

Is some other god angry, does *he* (instead of others) cause that (*asi*) matter of the illness?

'That matter of the illness' refers back four paragraphs to the entire discussion about the fever which may befall the king. This includes the place and time of the occurrence of the fever. Therefore not simply *tapassa* - 'fever' is used, but the more general INIM GIG 'matter of the fever'. Other references to the fever are found in ii 55 and iii 5, this time simply referred to by *edani memiyanî* 'that matter (dat.)':

4.76 **KBo 2.2 ii 54-56** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 132-133

§ 54 nu dUTU URUrû-na Ša URUrûHATTI=ma kuiš 55 nu=kan e-da-ni memiyanî zik

parrianta šalikti §

(Or) is it the Sungodess of Arinna of Hatti? Will you press on beyond that (*edani*) matter?

'That matter' refers back four paragraphs to the illness of the king (ii 29), or, more likely, to the entire situation as in ex. 4.75. The next reference to the affair occurs two paragraphs later:

4.77 **KBo 2.2 iii 5-7** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 132-133

§ 5 mân=kan e-da-ni memiyanî 6 dUTU URUrû-na DUMU-annaš=pat 7 piran tiązi

If *in that* (*edani*) matter the Sungodess of Arinna of only162 Progeny steps forward, ...

The other references by means of *asi* etc. in this oracle all concern the matter of giving compensation for not fulfilling the vows in ex. 4.74.


§ 22 e-ni INIM SUM-annaš kuit SIŠÀ-at 23 eni kuit INIM SUM-annaš 24 mKatapa-

DINGIR-LUM IDE

Concerning the fact that that (*eni*) affair of giving was ascertained, (is it) that affair of giving which Katapaili oversaw? (iv 25-26: yes)

'That affair of giving' refers to the affair of giving mentioned in the preceding paragraph in iv 17: INIM SUM-a[nnas]. The second *eni kuit INIM SUM-annas* refers to a different affair of

---

162 Van den Hout 1998: 137 translates -pat as 'indeed'.
giving supervised by Katapaili, not mentioned before in this oracle. See for a discussion section 4.3.2 above, ex. 4.43.

The answer to the oracle question is yes, and the next step for the inquirers is to ask for more certainty:


§ 27  *mān e-ni-pat INIM SUM-annaš* 28 *mKatapa-DINGIR-LIM kuin* 163 IDE 29  

*namma=ma KL.MIN ...*

If (it is) indeed this *(eni)* affair of giving, which Katapaili oversaw, but further etc., (iv 29-33: yes)

4.80  **KBo 2.2 iv 34-37** (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 136-137

§ 34  *pānzi a-ši INIM SUM-annaš* 35  *kišan iššiulahšanzi* 36 *mān=ma=kan šakti* 37  

*eni=nāš=kan uttar laittari §§*

They will go and thus enjoin that *(asi)* 164 affair of giving. Now, if you acknowledge (it), will this (whole) affair be solved for us? (iv 38: no).

If all the examples from KBo 2.2 obey the rule that *asi* etc. refers to something belonging to the domain of the Other, excluding the Speaker and Addressee, then the context should positively identify the correct domain. The Speakers are the oracle inquirers, the Addressee is the angry deity, and everyone else, including the king, is the Other. This means that *asi* etc. should be used in contexts dealing with referents outside the sphere of influence of the oracle inquirers and the deity, such as the king and other deities. In order to demonstrate this, I will not only discuss the occurrences of *asi* etc. but also occurrences of all other noun phrases referring across a paragraph border. I hope to show that in those cases the non-expression of *asi* etc. can be explained by the fact that the referent cannot possibly be assigned to the Other. Also some attestations of *ka-* will be referred to. In these cases *ka-* should refer to the domain of the Speaker(s), i.e. the oracle inquirers.

- The fever is only referred to by means by a simple noun phrase *tapassa-* in i 5, 12, 23, 30, 52 and ii 18. Diseases are often caused by some angry deity so we would expect the assignment of *tapassa-* to the domain of the deity, the Addressee, by means of the medial demonstrative *apa-. Upon closer look however, it becomes clear that the fever is discussed while the angry deity has not been identified yet. This identification takes only place in ii 21 and further. There is therefore no deity to which this fever can be assigned.
- In ii 21 there is a reference to the *hurri-* birds in i 15-16 by means of *kuš MUŠEN ḤURRI "these hurri-birds". The oracle birds belong clearly to the domain of the Speakers, the oracle inquirers, thus explaining the use of the proximal demonstrative instead of the others. The two occurrences of *ki kuit* (i 21, iii 18) will be discussed in Chapter 6.
- The angry deity is identified as the Sungoddess of Arinna in ii 23 who then takes over the position as Addressee. There is however also another deity involved, and she is the  

163 Neuter *kuit* should have been expected.  
164 Note the alternation between neutral *eni* INIM in ex. 4.78, commune *asi* INIM in ex. 4.80 and neutral/commune *eni ... kuin* in ex. 4.79.
one causing the fever. In anticipation of the possible assignment to another deity, a third party, the inquirers' question contains the phrase *aši* INIM GIG "that (*asi*) matter of the illness" in ii 26 (see ex. 4.75), with *asi* referring to the domain of the other. In their search for the other deity, a hypostasis of the goddess, the inquirers each time refer to the affair of the illness with *asi* etc.: *edani memiyani* in ex. 4.76 and 4.77. After these questions the Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny is identified as the angry deity.

- **Another entity that is mentioned regularly are the vows (IKRIBI)** (iii 11, 15, 31, 33, 39, 45, iv 7). Vows belong both to the domain of the king, and to the domain of the deity, the king as the 'vowee' and the deity as the 'vowed' who has to act upon the vow. Given this shared 'responsibility' it is not expected to see here either *apa-* which would assign the vows solely to the deity, or *asi* which would assign them solely to the king.

- **In iv 10 a gift, *maskan*, is introduced.** The next reference, two paragraphs later, is done in iv 22 with *eni* INIM SUM-annas, 'that affair of giving' (ex. 4.78). The affair of giving belongs to an unidentified 'they', who are not the oracle inquirers and the deity. Then it is asked whether Katapaili is overseeing this affair of giving, so now the inquirers mention the Other by name. Therefore the references to INIM SUM-annas is from now on done with *eni* in iv 27 (ex. 4.79) and *asi* in iv 34 (ex. 4.78). Clearly, the oracle inquirers wanted to indicate that the affair of giving fell completely outside their domain.

- **The only *asi* that cannot be explained is the one in connection with the Sungoddess of Arinna of Progeny (iii 30).**

The following four examples with *eni kuit* are all taken from KUB 22.70. The difference with the Recognitional *eni kuit* phrase discussed in section 4.3 is that in the latter situation *eni kuit* introduces already known information into the discourse which was not mentioned before, whereas *eni kuit* in the following examples refers to something that has been mentioned before. As in the Discourse Deictic situation, *eni* may alternate with *ki*. This is contrary to the common opinion that *ki* refers forward and *eni* backward. As we have seen above in ex. 4.63, *uni memian* and *kedani memiyani* both refer backward to the same discourse entity, the difference lying in the assignment to different cognitive domains.

### 4.81 KUB 22.70 rev. 28-29 (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 88-89

§ 28 [e]ni zaškan kuit Ammatallāš DINGIR-LUM I[Gl.ḪL.-ya epta n=asi ANA DINGIR-LUM p]iran EGI-pa OL ijattari nu mān DINGIR-LUM apaddan šer 29 šarnikzel INA Ė.GAL-LUM OL kuitki šan(a)hta ...  
As for [th]at (*eni*) (fact) that Ammatalla [had taken the] e[yes] of the deity, (and that) she] did not take care of [the deity], if the deity does not seek any fine in the palace at all because of that, ...

The affair that is recalled here refers back 35 paragraphs to obv. 8-9 (see ex. 4.45). There the event is also part of an *eni kuit* syntagm, this time Recognitional. Is it possible that here the notion of 'that fact, known to both the oracle inquirers and the deity' is retained? In both cases we could say that neither the inquirers nor the deity has anything to do with the events concerning Ammatalla and that the inquirers therefore use *eni*, explicitly stating that the events are outside their domain. The same counts for:

### 4.82 KUB 22.70 rev. 44-45 (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 92-93
The events described here have been discussed in obv. 61-62, 29 paragraphs earlier. Also there the events were introduced by Recognitional eni kuit.

The next example (with fn.) refers seven paragraphs back to rev. 38 were it is told that Zarniyaziti carried some utensils into the Rock-Sanctuary of Kurunta: eniškan kuit mZarniia-LÚ-iš UNUTE MEŠ INA ŠA É NAšekur dLAMMA pēdaš ‘About that (fact), that Zarniya-ziti had brought the utensils into the Rock-Sanctuary of Kurunta’. The situation is therefore similar to the two preceding examples:

4.83  KUB 22.70 rev. 51-53 (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 94-95

A problematic attestation of eni is:

4.84  KUB 22.70 rev. 4-7 (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 82-83

As for this (fact), that Pattiya lingered up in the palace, they shall go (and) pose a fine on Pattiya. (Do you agree? No)

As for that (eni) (fact), that Pattiya lingered up in the palace and repeatedly meddled with the affairs of the palace, if you, deity, did not seek a fine at all because of that, (then let the sign be favorable: unfavorable).

The lingering of Pattiya in the palace has been discussed before in this text (obv. 35, 68), the meddling in palace affairs in obv. 76. The problem with obv. 76 is that it is a summary which already presents the results of the oracle question in rev. 6ff., namely the fact that a fine is required because of the meddling in the palace affairs. So what came first, the summary with

163 See also KUB 22.70 rev. 54 e-niškan kuit UNUTE MEŠ INA ŠA É NAšekur dLAMMA pēdan

166 CHD § p. 48a translates -pat as ‘the above mentioned (impure people)’. The people have not been mentioned before.
the outcome in obv. 76 or the oracle question itself in rev. 6? If this oracle is a collection of different inquiries performed at different times, then the impossible order of a summary of the outcome before the actual question is not problematic anymore. As a result, the phrase eni kuit would be Recognitional because rev. 6 would be the first mention of Pattiya’s meddling.

As said in the beginning of section 4.5.2., discourse entities lose their salience when a discourse unit is closed, so the demonstrative noun phrases in this section are used to center the attention of the Addressee on their referents. The demonstratives in the exx. 4.71, 4.72, 4.77, 4.78, 4.79, 4.81, 4.82, 4.83 and fn. and 4.84 are part of a subordinate clause, the Topic-Focus distinction is therefore not relevant. Only the exx. 4.69, 4.70, 4.73, 4.75, 4.76 and 4.80 need to be discussed from the viewpoint of Information Structure. Being centering, the demonstrative phrases can either be a non-established Sentence Topic (= Unexpected Topic) or Focus. Generally elements that are part of the predicate are Focus (exx. 4.70, 4.73, 4.80). Sometimes however the Subject is in Argument Focus. This is the case in ex. 4.75 and ex. 4.76. The subjects apa- and zik are in preverbal position, indicating their status as Focal Subjects (see for this concept Chapter 2, and Chapter 8 for Focal apa-). The remainder of the clause is presupposed, assumed to be known to the Addressee. The noun phrases in the remainder of the clause are therefore topical, but given their lack of saliency not expected as such. Another situation occurs in ex. 4.69. Here the demonstrative noun phrase is fronted, while the Subject ammuk is the primary Topic. However, the tablet is a discourse topic, which means that it may function as a Sentence Topic. The fronting in ex. 4.69 indicates that it is an Unexpected Topic.

4.5.2.2. From Direct Speech to narration

The crossing of the boundary from Direct Speech to Narration diminishes the saliency of a discourse entity. Therefore, even if a discourse entity is mentioned in the preceding clause, a full noun phrase is still needed.

4.85 KUB 31.77 i 14-21 (NH vow, Hattusili III, CTH 584), ed. De Roos 1984: 266, 404
nu=ya memiškizzi 15 kuit=zar=san zaḫḫiškinun kuit=zar=an 16 zaḫḫiškinun nu= zar=an=kan ūnḫun 17 numma UR.BAR.RA=ja=ya=kan kuiš anda [eš]ta 18 [nu=zar]=an=kan šarā ḫuittījanun 19 mān=ma a-ši UR.BARRA Timanza mān(-) X? 20 [.....]x 'šanduri[š]a mān 21 [UL Timanza ...

He said: ‘Why did I fight him? Why did I fight him? Then I fed him, and the wolf that was inside, I pulled him up.’167 Whether that (asi) wolf is alive, or [...] is sandurisa, or whether (it is) [not all]ive, ...

The wolf has been introduced in the preceding complex clause. I assume the speech of the father has ended here and now the Queen is telling her dream again. The phrase asi UR.BARRA refers to the immediately preceding sentence so the entity should be salient. The discourse boundary however lowers its saliency. In such a case a full noun phrase should be enough, so why is asi used here? In line with the discussion in the preceding paragraph we can explain the occurrence of asi by looking at the domain to which the wolf belongs. The father of the Queen whose dream is told here hauls the wolf up from the well, so the wolf belongs to his, the Other’s domain, and not to the Queen’s or the deity’s domain.

167 De Roos o.c. 404 takes nu=zar=an=kan ūnḫun 17 numma UR.BAR.RA=ja=ya=kan kuiš anda [eš]ta 18 [nu=zar]=an=kan šarā ḫuittījanun as dependent on the preceding kuit clauses: Waarom bestreed ik hem, waarom bestreed ik hem, en voerde ik hem voorts, (en) haalde ik ook een wolf die erin zat omhoog?
Similarly in the above discussed oracle of Hattusili III:


DINGIR-LIM\(\text{\textsuperscript{18}}\) \text{\textit{Arusna\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) ya\(\text{\textsuperscript{4}}\) mu kuit GILIM GU\(\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\) SKIN \text{\textit{tëşhaz yëk\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) at nu\(\text{\textsuperscript{4}}\) yar\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) at kâ\(\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\) ma \text{\textit{IN\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) É \LO\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) \text{\textit{S\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) TAM GAR\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) ri \text{\textit{takk\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) ra\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) kan kue NA\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) HIL-A\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) ja EGIR-pa \text{\textit{aşstat nu\(\text{\textsuperscript{4}}\) yar\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) at kâ\(\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\) ma \text{\textit{IN\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) Ë LU \text{\textit{SA.T\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) M GAR\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) n takk\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) isra z \text{\textit{kue NA\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) 4.\text{\textit{HI.A\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) w\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) r EGIR-pa astat nu\(\text{\textsuperscript{4}}\) yar\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) at ANA DINGIR-LIM ar\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) ëppi nu e-ni GILIM GU\(\text{\textsuperscript{5}}\) SKIN \text{\textit{yemir}}

"About the golden headband that the deity of Arusna requested from me through a dream: Just now it is lying in the house of the chamberlain. About the \text{\textit{takk\(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\) isra}} and precious stones that stayed behind: Just now it is lying in the \text{\textit{atupalassa}}. Send them out to the deity!" They have found that (\textit{eni}) golden headband.

4.5.2.3. Change of episode

In my corpus there is only one clear example of a change of episode (see also ex. 4.64, repeated here). Mursili recounts how he was 'struck by lightning' and consequently lost his ability to speak. After his partial recovery he tells how he forgot all about it. Then the story moves years ahead to the moment he starts to dream about his experience.

4.87 IBoT 2.112 + obv. 5-7 (NH egodocument, Mursili II, CTH 486), ed. Lebrun 1988: 104

\(\text{(nu\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) \text{\textit{kan}})}\) a\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) memian ar\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) ha\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) pat pa\((\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{\textit{št\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) u\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) \text{\textit{nun}}} m\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) h\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) h\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) ma \(\text{\textit{yer MU.HIL-A\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) u\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) EGIR-anda p\((\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{\textit{a\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) \text{\textit{ir}}} n)\u(\text{\textsuperscript{2}}\text{\textit{mu u\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) \(\text{\textit{itu}}\)}}\) \text{\textit{m\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) emia\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) te\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) šhani\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) \(\text{\textit{(ki\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) u\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) a\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) \text{\textit{a\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) n}}} n ti\(\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\) jat I neglected that incident entirely. But when the years passed by, it happened that that (\text{\textit{asi}}) incident began to appear in my dreams regularly. (In my dream the hand of a god touched me and my mouth went to the side.)

In the new episode the incident is referred to by a demonstrative noun phrase although it should have been salient given its mention in the preceding clause. But the fact that the new clause starts with 'when the years passed by' indicates that the episode about the incident is closed, thereby lowering the attention levels of all the entities involved. In such a situation a re-opening of a 'closed case' requires at least a noun phrase.

The participants in this narration are Mursili, the king, his Audience and the deity who is this time the Other. Either Mursili wants to express that he did not think the affair was his responsibility (see ex. 4.64) or that he assigns it solely to the area of the deity.

The affair is re-introduced in the discourse by means of a staging predicate, so one could call the clause an out-of-the-blue sentence. Every part of the clause is therefore in Focus.

4.5.3. The continuity procedure

4.5.3.1. \text{\textit{asi}} plus noun indicating a digression from the main story line

As I already explained in the introduction (section 4.5.1), lexical noun phrases may be used to indicate the beginning of a new discourse unit without the support from any formal features such as a paragraph boundary, Direct Speech boundary or change of episode. In this paragraph the transition from main story line to a digression or sub-plot will be discussed. I will cite all the examples in my corpus in which the discourse entity referred to is found in the
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immediate preceding clause. This means that the entity referred to is in the forefront of the attention, although it is in most cases neither the topic of the preceding clause nor the theme of the paragraph. Of course, the non-topic-hood and non-thematicality might be reason enough for the use of a topic switching device if it were not for ex. 4.92 below. In that example Pihhuniya is both the topic of the preceding clause and a sub-theme of the paragraph. This shows that the demonstrative noun phrase asi Pihhuniyas is used for other reasons than topic or theme switch. The examples will make clear that it is indeed one of the purposes of the demonstrative noun phrase to indicate the demarcation of an embedded discourse unit.\textsuperscript{168}

As for the use of the distal demonstrative asi, the two examples with enough context, exx. 4.88 and 4.89, allow the conclusion that asi is added to point out to the Addresssee that the mountain Arinnanda and the city Aripsa are not (yet) in the sphere of influence of Mursili. In both cases only the clauses cited here contain the names preceded by the demonstrative asi. Elsewhere only the bare names are used. After the embedded units the narration continues with the conquest of these objects, which explains why asi is not used anymore. From the preparations of warfare until the conquest Arinnanda and Aripsa are considered part of the cognitive space of the King (and others) although they are not under his control. It is therefore not warranted to use asi, which explicitly states that something is outside the cognitive space, sphere of influence or responsibility of both Speaker and Addresssee.

All examples listed here and in section 4.5.3.2. are found in the Annals of Mursili. In Annals it is very likely that the Addresssee is not involved, so apa- as demonstrative is not expected to occur very often, unless it is part of Direct Speech (which often requires an Addresssee). Restricting ourselves to apa- with noun in the Tracking use, there are none to be found in the Annals. The other uses of apa- are either Focal (see Chapter 7, 8, 9), or indeed refer to some element in the sphere of influence of the Addresssee (see the next Chapter).

In order to indicate that the discourse unit containing asi etc. is not part of the main story line I use hyphens, both in the transliteration and the translation:

\begin{verbatim}
4.88 KUB 14.15 iii 39-42 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 54-55
39 [nu dUTU-SI (IN)]A HUR.SAG Arinnanda pāun —a-šī=ma [(HUR.SA)GARI(nanda)š mekkī] 40 [(n)akkiš arunī=ja=aš=kan parranda pānza na[(mma=aš mekki parkūš)] yarhuš=aš 41 namma=aš NARPENUNANZA nu=kan IŠTU ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ š[(ara pennuma)ni OL DÙ-ri— 42 NAM.RA.MEŠ=ma=an pankuš ḫarta ĖRIN.MEŠ-ja=kan pank[(uš šer ēšta)]
I [My Majesty] went to mount Arinnanda. — Now, that (asi) mount Arinnanda is [very] steep and it stretches into the sea. Further, it is very high, it is bush-grown. Moreover, it is rocky, (so) it is not possible to drive up (to it) with horses. — Now, the refugees all held it and soldiers were all on top (of it).
\end{verbatim}

If a chunk of discourse is a digression, it may be possible to leave out the digression without disrupting the narration.\textsuperscript{169} Here we would get: nu dUTU-SI INA HUR.SAG Arinnanda pāun NAM.RA.MEŠ=ma=an pankuš "I [My Majesty] went to mount Arinnanda. Now, the refugees all held it and soldiers were all on top (of it)". A more formal indication for the different status of the embedded unit is the use of nominal clauses and present verb forms versus the use of the preterite in the main narration. The same is true for the next example.

\textsuperscript{168} That does not mean that the reverse is true, that embedded discourse units can only be marked by demonstrative noun phrases. Relative clauses may cause the same effect, but also repeated simple noun phrases such as names or nouns.

\textsuperscript{169} This should not be considered as a necessary criterium.
4.89 KBo 4.4 iv 4-8 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götz e 1933: 132-133

nu INA URU-Aripšā anda[n zaḥḥījā iṣānījānun[n —a-ši=ma=kan URU-Aripšā
ēšīa n=an ERIN.MEŠ pankuš ḫartā n=an ḪUTU-Šī zaḥḥījānun[n] 8

[I marched on campaign] against Aripsa. — Now, that (asi) Aripsa lies in[the s]ea. Furthermore, what population it has, it [holds] them (namely) the mountain(s) (and) the cliffs. Moreover, it is very steep — Although the whole population had gone up, and the entire army held it, I, My Majesty fought it.

Without the embedded unit the main narration is “[I marched on campaign] against Aripsa. Although the whole population had gone up, and the entire army held it, I, My Majesty fought it.” In this example and the previous one the embedded unit can be left out without disrupting the narration.

In the next example the demonstrative noun phrase referring to the city Ura does not immediately follow an earlier mention of Ura, but we still have to assume that Ura is the topic and the theme of this part of discourse since the city has been under discussion for two clauses.


nu=šši pāun nu URU-Uraš kuiš URU-aš 22 [ṢA KUR URU(Azzi Ḫantezziš)] auriš
ēšīa n=āš=kan nakki pēdi 23 [aš(anza —nu kuiš kē φUPPA.HL.A)] ×××-ja
ištamašši nu ujāddu 24 [(nu a-ši URU-Uran URU-an[ ] ašdu maḥḥan=āš y]edanza
ēšt[a — 25 [maḥḥan (=ma=kan ṢAnniyaš EN KUR Azzi) ...

I went to him. As for Ura, a city which was a borderpost of the country of Azzi, it lies at a steep place. —Whoever hears these tablets and x x x, must send out to [investigate] that (asi) 171 city Ura, [how it] was built—. But when Anniya, Lord of Azzi […………] (both tablets break off).

Here it is even clearer that the stretch of discourse containing the demonstrative noun phrase is inserted in the main narration. Contrary to the two preceding examples the noun phrase is not located on the discourse node, unless it is assumed that 1) subordinate clauses are not counted as an independent clause, and 2) that the verb wiya- ‘to send’ is semantically connected with the following clause, almost similar to the phraseological pai- ‘to go’ and uwa- ‘to come’.

In exx. 4.88 and 4.89 the king is the Established Topic. Therefore, the switch to a discourse unit discussing some properties of the locations is quite unexpected. The mountain Arinnanda and the place Aripsa are therefore Unestablished Topics.

170 Contrary to CHD P, p. 314 and Götz e I.c. I prefer Ḫarzi instead of  filho. The singular corresponds with the singular URU-riašēššar, and the present tense is in line with the other present kittari and the nominal clauses.

171 Laroche 1979: 149 takes asi to be the resumptive pronoun (nom.sg.) of kuis in the preceding relative clause: ‘Il vaut mieux prendre asi pour anaphore de la proposition relative précédente, et traduire: “quiconque lira cette tablette, qu’il (asi) visite la ville d’Ura”.’ His translation shows that Laroche has overlooked the crucial verb wiya- ‘to send’. The referent of kuis does not visit Ura himself, but sends some unspecified person. This unknown person, not introduced in the text by any expression, can never be referred to by a semantically empty form such as asi (or apa- or -a-). Therefore asi is used as an acc. sg. adjective to Ura.

172 For this view see also Rieken 1999: 68.
Ex. 4.90 is different from the other two because the city Ura is already topical. Although at first sight the reference chain of Ura is broken by means of a relative clause, the city is still an Established Topic. Relative clauses are often used to introduce new elements into the discourse, but do not necessarily break the topic chain.

4.5.3.2. asi plus noun indicating a return to the main story line

Not only is the beginning of a digression sometimes marked by a demonstrative noun phrase, but also the return to the main story line.

In ex. 4.91 a parenthetical remark about the identity of Zida is inserted, after which the narration picks up the unfinished statement (ii 18-19) about Hutupianza in ii 20-21, not only by repeating the accusative Hutupiyanzan, but also by adding the demonstrative uni. Furthermore, Hutupianza is the Established Topic, since it was already introduced in fronted position in ii 18:

4.91 KBo 5.8 ii 18-27 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 152-153

mHutupiyanzan=ma mZiddā GAL LÜMESEDI —mZiddā kuis
ANA ABl=YA ŠEŠ=xSU ešta— nu ABU=YA u-ni mHutupiyanzan DUMU mZiddā GAL LÜMESEDI INA KUR URUPalā 22 yatarnaštta KUR URIPalā=ma Ōl kuiki pahšaššaugan KUR-TUM ešta 24 URU.BAD EGIS-pa appannaš ASR U N.GAL kuiski ešta dagān ešantat KUR-e ešta 26 mHutupiyanzanš=ma KUR URIPalā pahhsatst

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

Concerning the choice for uni: the use of the proximal demonstrative ka- would indicate that Hutupianza belonged to the sphere of Mursili, the use of the medial demonstrative apa- would mean that the man belonged to the sphere of the Addressee. Both are not true since the context explicitly states that Hutupianza was an officer of Mursili’s father. Later the broken narration indicates that 20 years later Hutupianza and Mursili work together. Is asi used as a signal for the Addressee to draw the attention to the fact that Hutupianza was first Supiluliuma’s officer, without any ties with Mursili, thereby avoiding confusion?

Not dealing with an ally but with the enemy is ex. 4.92:

4.92 KBo 3.4 ii 67-79 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 I), ed. Grélois 1988: 86

§ 67 MU-anni=ma INA KUR URURtipiša pāun —nu kuitman ABU=YA INA KUR
Mittanni ešta mPihhuniijaš=ma LÚ URUTipiša ţaštta nu KUR UGU GUL-anneskit

With the parallel text from the extensive annals: KUB 14.17 ii 31-35 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 88:31 [nu mPihhuniijaš kuis LÚ URU Gašga LÚ URUTipiša ešta 32 [—kuim]tan=kan ABU=YA INA KUR.KUR.MEŠ Hurri ešta mPihhuniijaš=ma 33 [KUR UGU-T] URUštinija=ja GUL-anneskit[n]u n-áš parā 34 [INA URU Zai]zišia ar[aškit—] nu=kan a-li mPihhuniijaš 35 [OŁ SA URU]Gašga(?) [iya]r taparta “[Pihhuniya, who was a Gasgaean, a man from Tipiya,— as long as my father was in the Hurrian countries, Pihhuniya attacked the [Upper] Country and Istitina, and he reached] as far as [Za] [zzis — that Pihhuniya [did not] rule like [a Gasga(?) (Afterwards the tablet is hardly preserved).]"
n=əš parā INA URU[Zazziša] 70 āraškit nu KUR UGU šarā dāš n=ət=ankan INA KUR Qašga 71 kattanda pēdaš KUR[Išitina=ma=za ḫūman dāš] 72 n=ət=əkan apēl uyitiyaqša pēdan išat
§ 76 namma mPihhuniša 0L SA [URU]Gašga iyar \ taparta— 77 hūdāk maḫḫan INA URUGašga OL SA 1-EN tapariša 78 ēšta a-ši=ma mPihhuniša SA LUGAL-UTTIM iyar 79 taparta nu=šši dUTFU-SI pā’un

In the (next) year I went to the country of Tipiya. —As long as my father stayed in Mittanni, Pihhuniya the Tipiyani marched and attacked the Upper Land. He reached as far as Zazzisa. He gathered the Upper Land and carried it down to Gasga-land. The land of Istitina on the other hand he annexed completely and made it his own (instead of Hittite) grazing place. Furthermore, Pihhuniya did not rule like a Gasgaean. — Suddenly —when there was no unified overlordship in Gasga— that (asi) Pihhuniya ruled as a king, and I, My Majesty, went against him.

Mursili starts to tell about his campaign to Tipiya, but first he has to sketch the background in order to inform the Addressee of the extraordinary circumstances in that area. The background unit recounts some events during the time of his father, introducing the Gasga-leader Pihhuniya. In iii 78 Pihhuniya is referred to by means of his name, although he is the sub-theme of these paragraphs and also the Established Topic. The repetition of the name indicates the shift to a new discourse unit, moving from the time of Suppiluliuma to Mursili, dealing with the fight against this enemy. The distancing effect of asi seems be strengthened by the king-like rule of Pihhuniya. Mursili certainly could never allow the presence of a such strong leader in these rebellious regions. It is possible that he wanted to express his disapproval by using the distancing Otherness of asi.

Also in a negative context:

4.93 KBo 3.4 + iii 42-47 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 1), ed. Grélois 1988: 66174
§ 42 MU.KAM-anni=ma INA URUR.SAGAšharpaqā pāün — nu=za URUR.SAGAšharpaqān kuiš 43 URU[Gašga] əšan ḫarta nu SA KUR URU.Palā KASKAL.MEŠ karaššan ḫarta— 44 nu u-ni SA URUR.SAGAšharpaqā URUGašqan zabbijānan nu=mu dUTF URU.PU-na GAŠAN=YA 45 URU.NIR.GAL BELL=YA dMEZZU.LAŠ DINGIR.MEŠ=SIA huumanteš peran 46 hūiēr nu=za URUR.SAGAšharpaqān kuiš URUGašga əšan ḫarta 47 n=an= za=an taraḫḫu n=an=kan kuēnu

In the (next) year I went to mount Asharpaya. —The Gasga who had settled (on) mount Asharpaya had cut off the roads of the country Pala. — I fought those (uni) Gasga of mount Asharpaya, 175 and the Sungoddess of Arinia, My Lady, the powerful

174 An uncertain example of uni with a geographical referent is KBo 19.76 + KUB 14.20 i 13’-17’ (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 1), ed. Houwink ten Cate 1979: 161, 163: GIM-an=ma URU.Mal(azziša) EG|IR-pa tūya lukturra 14 piran=ma=mu URUR.SAGaистaš kišša — n=əs par|kuš ərpuṣuašša=ə= — 15 nu=kan kuìman u-n[i URUR.SAGa] kiššaš (ʔ) anda ]a[r]ḫan nu UD.KAM-az tākšan 16 ḫiṯat kuìman=ma=ka[n šarā pāün nu nekušta nu=ššan x-(x) 17] INA URUR.SAGa kiššaš (ʔ) an=ahḫun “But after it had dawned far behind [Mal]ziša, Mount Kwaitesala rose up before [me]. [—li is steep and inaccessible—. Before I had arrived at that Mount Kwaitesala (ʔ)], the day had passed halfway. And before [I had gone up], night fell so I searched... on mount Kwaitesala.”


164
Stormgod, My Lord, Mezulla and all the gods ran before me. I conquered the Gasga who had settled (on) mount Asharpaya and killed them.

The main line of the narration is broken off by a background clause which probably presents the reason for the campaign against mount Asharpaya. The narration is continued in iii 44, referring to the salient Gasga by means of a rather elaborate noun phrase, not simply sticking to a demonstrative, but even adding a genitive. Also in this example the crossing of a discourse node is indicated by means of a lexical noun phrase. The demonstrative uni could have been used to strengthen the negative character of the Gasga, in this case their inherent Otherness (they are not conquered and incorporated into the Empire, but killed).

The Gasga are the Established Topic. The writer could easily have said something like “The Gasga who ... cut off the roads of Pala, (so) I fought them”. Only the fact that the writer starts a new discourse unit made him use a demonstrative noun phrase.

The next examples, ex. 4.94 with three more in the footnote, all contain a distant demonstrative noun phrase in a clause following a remark of the type ‘the gods ran before me/him’. Although I am not certain, it is possible that this remark about the support of the gods, is an insertion intended for the Addressee instead of an event that is part of the ongoing narration.

4.94  KBo 19.76 +: 17'-23' (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Houwink ten Cate 1979: 161, 163

... nu=mu kêz URU Sunu]p]aššiš kezza=ma=mu 18' URU Išdûpištaš kez=ma=mu [LÛ.MEŠ URU]Pittagalaissâ Š]ES.MEŠ LÛ.MEŠ URU]Malazzija=pat 19' nu=mu tûyaz uškir —nu<za> {U NÎR.GAL EN=YA parî] hanandatar tekušnut— 20' nu=mu u-ni-uš kuieš LÛ.MEŠ URU Sûnupa[šši LÛ.MEŠ URU Išdûpištaa U LÛ.MEŠ URU]Pittagalaissâ 21 ŠES.MEŠ LÛ.MEŠ URU Malazzija tûga[z uškir nu=kâ]n 177 namma <ANA> LÛ.MEŠ URU]Malazzija 22 memišan kattan arha 0[L pête]r nu=kan L0.KÜR OL paršanuir 23' UTU ŞÎ=má pāun INÁ Pittagall[ašša še(r t)juzzijanun ... [On one side of me was Sunuppāsī, on another was Isdupista, and on still another were [the people of Pittagalaissa, brothers of in fact the people of Malazziya]. They saw me from afar. —The [mighty Stormgod, my Lord], showed his divine guidance.— These (unius) people from Sunupa[šši, the people from Isdupiśtaa and the people of Pittagalaisa, brothers of the people of Malazziya, who [saw] me from afar, they thereafter did not bring word to the people of Malazziya. They did not induce the enemy to flee. Now I My Majesty went up to garrison at Pittagalaissa.

The return to the main narration is supported by the fact that the distant demonstrative noun phrase is used in a relative clause repeating the predicate of l. 19'. If the clause about the deity was not considered as a digression from the main story line, then such strong markers redirecting the attention to the people of these cities would not have been necessary.

176 See also KBo 14.3 iii 16'-18' (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 40) —nu ANA ABU=YA 17' [DI]NGIR.MEŠ pîra[n huûier— nu=kan u-ni L0.KÜR URU Gasgâš 18' [ERÌN.MEŠ SUTI] kuin kuûapi damaškit; KBo 14.3 iv 7'-9' (-nu ANA) ABU=YA DINGIR.MEŠ p(iran huûier )'K' {UTU URU Arinna Û URU}Hatti di'U [(KARAS)] 9' [AGAS(AN LI]L[iža— nu=kan u-ni p]anûkur SUTI (kuent[a]; KBo 14.3 iv 28'-33' —nu ANA A[8]U=YA DINGIR.MEŠ peran huûer 32' {UTU URU}Arinna Û URU]HATTI Û [(KARAS)] 33' [AGASAN LI]L[iža— nu u-ni-in L0.KÜR hulliat.

177 Houwink ten Cate l.c. and Alp 1991: 24 read differently na-at-kā\n. However, the use of an enclitic subject with a transitive verb is prohibited.
In each of these examples it is also possible to consider the ‘helping-god clause’ as part of the main story line. In that case I do not have an explanation for the use of the demonstrative noun phrases. In each situation the enemy is a discourse topic, and therefore salient. More important is that the enemy is expected to be in some kind of relationship with the father of the king given the fact that that relation is already established in the preceding clauses. In the framework described in Chapter 2, this means that the enemy is not only a discourse topic but also an expected sentence topic. Reference in such a situation is typically done by means of an enclitic pronoun and certainly not by means of a lexical noun phrase. Because of these considerations I hesitantly consider the use of a demonstrative noun phrase after a ‘helping-god clause’ as an indicator of a discourse boundary.

4.5.3.3. **asi plus noun indicating a new discourse unit**

There are a few examples of the distal demonstrative noun phrase referring to a salient entity, indicating a new line of thought or a new sub-theme without returning to a previous theme. This new discourse unit follows the preceding one linearly and not hierarchically as was the case in the preceding paragraphs.

4.95 **KBo 3.4+ i 23-26** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 I), ed. Grélois 1988: 55

```
23 nu kiššan AQBI ③UTU Arinna GAŠAN-YA arahzenaš = ya=mu=za KUR.KUR
Lünkùr kuješ ^4 24 DUMU-lan ṣalzeššir nu=ya=mu=za tepmuškir nu=ya tuel ŠA
③UTU Arinna ^25 GAŠAN-YA ZAG.HI. danra šanhišku₂₅an dair nu=ya=mu
③UTU Arinna GAŠAN-YA ^26 kattan tiša nu=ya=mu=kan u-ni arahzenaš

KUR.KUR Lünkùr peran kuenni
```

I spoke like this: “O Sungoddess of Arinna, my Lady, the surrounding countries of the enemy which called me a child, they have humiliated me. They have started to seek to take your territories, (the territories) of the Sungoddess of Arinna, my Lady, a second time. O Sungoddess of Arinna, my Lady, stand by my side! Kill those (uni) surrounding countries of the enemy on my behalf!

After the description of the evil deeds of the enemy, the Speaker requests help from the deity. In this new unit the enemy is referred to by means of a full noun phrase. The distal demonstrative expresses the negative emotional attitude of the Speaker.

In the next example the demonstrative noun phrase “those utensils” indicates the closure of a series of background kuit clauses and the beginning of a series of clauses describing the actions resulting from that background:

4.96 **KUB 22.70 rev. 54-57** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 96-97

```
§ ^54 eni=kan kuit UNUTE.MEŠ INA ŠA = ḫekur = ③AMMA pēdan n=at nūji kuit
yalantalaman UN.MEŠ-tar=pat=kan ^55 kuit šaknuyan anda šāliškīr nu=kan eni=
UNUTE.MEŠ ŠA IZI pešši₂₄₂₅anzı namma=at ḫkekunuzzit ^56 GUL=anzı namma=at
at=kan MĀŠ.GAL IZI=ja išarna arha pēdanı namma=at šuppi₂₄₂₅aḥanjażı ^57 n=at
ANA DINGIR-LIM QATAMMA pianzi KI.MIN
```

As for that (fact), that the utensils were carried into the Rock-Sanctuary of Kurunta, that they have not yet been wantingama-, that only impure men have approached (them), so they throw these (eni) utensils into the fire, next they beat them with a kunkunuzzi-stone, next they carry them through between a he-goat and fire, and then they cleanse them, and give them in that manner to the deity, ditto? (Answer: no)
This example shows clearly that salient and topical entities in new discourse units may (or must?) be referred to by means of a full noun phrase.

The only example of tracking asi in Old Hittite occurs in a copied text:

4.97  **KBo 3.41 + KUB 31.4 obv. 16'-19'** (OH/NS Puhanu Chronicle, CTH 16), ed. Soysal 1987: 175

> UMMA = SU = MA 17 [o-o-] × män laḫḫeškinun nu = nnaš ḤUŘ.SAG-aš nakkiēt kāš-a GUD.M[AH] 18 [dašš]aš (? ) ōsta män = aš uteₙ u-ni ḤUŘ.SAG-an karapta š = an = ašta 19 [edi n]ā(? )ēš arunan = a tārḥuₙ n_u kāraṣṣer = šet apēda lippaₙ §

Thus said he: Always when I roamed/fought the …[…], the mountain was an obstacle for us. This bull however, was [strong (?)]. When he came, he lifted that (uni) mountain, he [t]urned it [away], so that I conquered the sea. Because of that his horn is chipped off (?)

The mountain is mentioned for the first time in obv. 17’. The clause containing this reference is followed by a new unit which introduces a bull in the Direct Speech. The next reference to the mountain in this new unit is done by means of a full noun phrase. The distal demonstrative is used because the Speaker wants to emphasize that the mountain is to be seen as something which should not be part of his world.

And finally, with Topic switches indicated by -ma


§ 1 Ü MUNUS.LUGAL  INₔ Ankuwa [MUₔ] 2 Ṽ₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉₉•

In the next example there is no new discourse unit. The distal demonstrative probably simply indicates disassociation:

4.99 **KBo 4.6 obv. 15'-17'** (NH prayer, Gassulawiya, CTH 380), ed. Tischler 1984: 12-13

> nu PANI DINGIR-LIM EN-YA kāš MUNUS-.aspect uhattaru 1⁶ AN₄ DUMU.MUNUS.GAL = ma = kan anda aššuli namma nēṣḥuₙ n = an kē₃ 1⁷ GIG-za TI-nuₙ nu = šši e-ni GIG ayan arḥa namma tittanat

Let be turned towards the god My Lord this woman and toward the Great Daughter turn again in favor and save her from this sickness, lift that (eni) sickness completely off from her.

4.5.4. Evaluation of tracking asi    167
4.5.4.1. The function of tracking asi

For each tracking *asi* in my corpus it could be established that it refers across a discourse boundary. The discourse boundary could be indicated by means of a paragraph line (section 4.5.2.1.) or a change from Direct Speech to Narration (section 4.5.2.2.). Contextual indications of change of discourse unit were change of episode (section 4.5.2.3.) or the switch between a digression and the main story line (sections 4.5.3.1. and 4.5.3.2.). In the latter sections the referent of the demonstrative noun phrase is salient. Finally, a demonstrative noun phrase referring to a salient entity may also appear in a new discourse unit which follows linearly upon the preceding unit (section 4.5.3.3.).

Although I subdivided the material into two groups, i.e., demonstratives referring to salient and non-salient entities, the main criterium for using a demonstrative noun phrase is reference across a discourse boundary. This means that saliency alone is not the only factor influencing the choice of referential expression. I even believe that saliency is not important at all in this respect. Only the structure of the discourse influences the choice of a tracking device.

Turning to the use of the distal demonstrative instead of the others, it is clear from the examples in section 4.5. that *asi* etc. always occurs in contexts with a negative emotional load or with a clear indication of 'belonging to the domain of the Other'. In the latter situation the emotional load is not necessarily negative.

4.5.4.2. Chronological distribution of tracking asi

The following table lists the chronological distribution of *asi*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>OH</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>Supp</th>
<th>Murs II</th>
<th>Muw</th>
<th>Hatt III</th>
<th>Tud IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.s.c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.s.c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.-a.s.n.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.pl.c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 Chronological distribution of Tracking *asi* etc.

Most attestations of tracking *asi* are encountered in narrative texts and oracles: the majority occurs in the Annals of Mursili II, and in the oracles of Hattusili III and Tudhalia IV. Luckily we have also an example of copied Old Hittite tracking *uni*. So at least *uni* functioned as a typical demonstrative in Old Hittite.

4.5.4.3. Attention levels and Information Structure

The remarks concerning the pragmatic status of the demonstrative noun phrases have been collected in the following table. Two points must be emphasized. First, there were no
examples of Tracking *asi* referring to a referent in the same discourse unit. This is of course not accidental since one of the functions of demonstrative noun phrases is to refer across a discourse boundary. It also explains why argument Focus is absent. Argument Focus is only possible when the rest of the clause is presupposed given the preceding context. This means that the ties between the clauses must be very strong, which is incompatible with reference across discourse boundaries.

The second point is the large number of demonstrative noun phrases occurring on the discourse boundary itself. They occur on a boundary\(^{178}\) in exx. 4.69, 4.74, 4.77-4.83, 4.85-4.94, 4.96, 4.97. But this was not a criterium for setting the boundaries of the discourse units. In sections 4.5.2.1, 2 and 3 formal markers such as a paragraph line and the presence or absence of the direct speech particle *-war-* were used, and once the propositional content of a clause. But even in the case where only the demonstrative noun phrase indicated a boundary, there were other signs, such as the use of participles or a present tense in an otherwise past narration. (ex. 4.88-90). Moreover, in almost every case there was a clear break in the narration. The relevance of this remarkable distribution will become clearer in the conclusion of the chapter (4.6.5.) when the tracking use will be united with the other demonstrative uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tracking Use, across node</th>
<th>Centering procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Topic</td>
<td>U-Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>asi</em> (N)</td>
<td><em>asi</em> (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-Topic</td>
<td><em>asi</em> (N)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: attention levels and information structure of tracking *asi*

### 4.6. Conclusions

#### 4.6.1. The New Hittite material

It is generally accepted that *asi*, *eni*, *uni* and the obliqui *edani* etc. form a paradigm from Mursili II on (see section 4.1). However, the interpretation of *asi* etc. as an anaphoric pronoun versus the deictics *ka*- and *apa-* cannot be upheld anymore. Summarizing the findings of sections 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5, *asi* etc. turned out to be the distal demonstrative. The distribution of forms and grammatical case in New Hittite is as follows\(^{179}\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mursili</th>
<th>Muwatalli</th>
<th>Hattusili</th>
<th>Tudhaliya</th>
<th>NH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td><em>uni</em> (acc.s.c.)</td>
<td><em>asi</em> (nom.s.c.)</td>
<td><em>asi</em> (nom.s.c.)</td>
<td><em>asi</em> (nom.s.c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ini</em>, <em>eni</em> (n.-a.s.n.)</td>
<td><em>eni</em> (n.-a.s.n.)</td>
<td><em>asi</em> (acc.s.c.)</td>
<td><em>asi</em> (acc.s.c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>edez</em> (Loc.adverb)</td>
<td><em>edez</em> (Loc.adverb)</td>
<td><em>edaza</em> (abl.)</td>
<td><em>uniyas</em> (gen.s.c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td><em>asi</em> (nom.s.c.)</td>
<td><em>edani</em> (dat.s.)</td>
<td><em>eni</em> (n.-a.s.n.)</td>
<td><em>asi</em> (acc.s.c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>uni</em> (n.-a.s.n.)</td>
<td><em>enius</em> (acc.pl.c.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><em>asi</em>, <em>uni</em> (acc.s.c.)</td>
<td><em>enius</em> (acc.pl.c.)</td>
<td><em>asi</em> (acc.s.c.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>eni</em> (n.-a.pl.n.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>edas</em> (dat.pl.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{178}\) I consider a complex sentence as one unit. This means that if a main clause is preceded by a subordinate clause on a discourse boundary, also the main clause is on the boundary.

\(^{179}\) S, R, D and T stand for Situational, Recognitional, Discourse Deictic and Tracking respectively.
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Before listing the paradigms of Mursili/Muwattalli, Hattusili/Tudhaliya and later, a few forms have to be added whose function could not be discussed because of the broken context. For Hattusili may be added the nom.s.c. *enis* (KUB 31.77 ii 8 (CTH 590)  *e-ni-iš*  *yar*  *at*  *zaššija* ×[ "That one [...] it in a dream") and the ablative *ediz* (KUB 15.3 iv 7’ (CTH 584)  *mān*  *yar*  *aš*  *e-di-iz*  *Gil*-*az*  *Ti-ešši* "If he recovers from that illness, ...”). The only attestation of the distal demonstrative in post-Tudhaliya times is *unis* (ABoT 56 i 21 (CTH 256), *nu*  *ya*  *aš*  *mu*  *u-ni-iš* []). There is one other attestation of *unis* in the whole corpus of Hittite texts, KUB 49.56 obv. 13’ (CTH 573) : § 17’ *u-ni-iš*  *kuš*  *maršanašššiš* , ... maybe referring backwards across a discourse boundary to *maršanaššiš* in obv. 6’. The alleged nom.s.c. *u-ni-iš* in a copied Old Hittite text should be canceled in favor of a reading *ki-iš-ša-an* (see 4.6.4.1.).

In the Ullikummi myth the gen.sg. *uniyas* built on the stem *uni-* is attested (ex. 4.12).

As with the other forms *unis*, * unin* and *unius* this genitive must be a new form, created as part of the process of replacing an ancient paradigm. I believe to have found the original genitive sg.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nom.s.c.</th>
<th>acc.s.c.</th>
<th>nom.pl.c.</th>
<th>dat.pl.</th>
<th>abl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>asi</em></td>
<td><em>asi</em></td>
<td><em>unius</em></td>
<td><em>edas</em></td>
<td><em>edez</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nom.c.</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>asi</em></td>
<td><em>unius</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10: Distribution of forms and grammatical case in New Hittite

4.100 **KUB 49.70 rev. 20’-21’** (lateNH (?) oracle, CTH 572)


[When] in this year [the weapon] of that (el) man of *Azz*[i] does [not come to the lands of Hatti,] (and) the gods [...] that man of Azzi, ...

The sign EL (HZL 307) is a little damaged, but only the upper horizontal is not visible. Given the fact that *asi* occurs adjectively with LÚ [URU] *Azz*[i] one expects by analogy that the genitive ŠA LÚ [URU] *Azz* [i] is also preceded by the genitive of the distal demonstrative. Although the tablet is very damaged, it is possible that this is a new oracle question. In that case *e-el* is a first mention and therefore Recognitional, with a negative connotation given the context. The construction of *e-el* ŠA LÚ [URU] *Azz* [i], i.e., of the adnominal demonstrative followed by an Akkadian prepositional phrase is matched by *e-da-ni* 42 ANA LÚKUR (KBo 4.4 ii 41-42, CTH 61 II), also in combination with an enemy.


With these forms added, the paradigms are:

| Mursili II/Muwattalli |
|---|---|
| nom.c. | plural |
| *asi* | *unius* |

180 Restoration on the basis of KUB 49.70: 10’-11’.
During Mursili’s reign the old nom.-acc.neuter ini disappears to make place for eni. The accusatives uni, unin and asi coexist, with a preference for uni. There is only one text in this period where accusative asi and uni cooccur: KUB 14.17 (CTH 61 II).

By the time of Tudhaliya the acc. asi has replaced uni etc. As said earlier, in one text (KUB 5.24+) the acc.sg. asi, uni and unin cooccur. Besides that, in this period uni and unin are only attested in KUB 5.24+.

4.6.2. The Middle Hittite material

Does the paradigm already exist in Middle Hittite? The study of the Situational use (4.2, see also the table below) showed that asi, ini / eni, edani and edez have to be demonstratives, whatever their deictic contrast (a)\(^{131}\). The existence of a non-first person oriented recognitional uni and ini in original MH proved that uni and ini had to be non-proximal demonstratives like their New Hittite counterparts (b).

\(^{131}\) The letters (a), (b) etc. refer to the procedure set out in 4.1.5.
A further clue for the deictic contrast of the demonstratives is provided by reference of different forms in one text to the same entity. In the copied CTH 431 asi and edani both refer to a person who is not close to the Speaker. Moreover, the Speaker should be neutral towards the patient, so asi and edani indicate a primary deictic contrast, which is non-proximity. Furthermore, eni is used to refer to the illness of the patient. Here it is possible to view the illness with a negative emotional attitude. Thus, in this text the demonstratives asi, edani and eni are all non-proximal demonstratives (c).

Another text in which different forms refer to the same object is the Middle script CTH 480. Here ini and edani refer to a temple. The distance contrast cannot be deduced from the context, although it is likely that the person uttering the phrases containing these forms is inside the temple. But given the fact that he curses the temple, his emotional stance towards it is very negative. It seems to me that ini and edani are again distal (c).

Furthermore, we have seen that MH/NS eni in ex. 4.10 had to be distal, which was also true for several asi-s (CTH 42).

Given these facts the conclusion must be that all these forms belong to one paradigm, the paradigm of the distal demonstrative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>asi</td>
<td>uni</td>
<td>ini</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>inissan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14: The paradigm of asi in Middle Hittite.

All Middle Hittite texts in Middle script have neuter ini. Only the copied texts show the writing eni, which must be the influence of the New Hittite scribes.

Plural forms are not attested, which is not odd given the fact that in New Hittite singular forms are also much more attested than plural forms.

4.6.3. The Old Hittite material

Of course one could imagine that different demonstratives are used for the same entity. In that case the context should be clear whether the emotional stance towards the entity is of importance, and changing. An entity proximal to the Speaker may be referred to by ka- to indicate proximity, and by asi, to indicate emotional distance. Similarly, an entity distal to the Speaker may be referred to by asi to indicate distance, and by ka-, to indicate emotional closeness.
Even less forms are attested in Old Hittite. There are only two forms in Old script, *edi* and *asi*: *edi* is a distal demonstrative but the function of *asi* is very unclear (situational or tracking). The other forms are only attested in copies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>OH copy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>edi</em> (loc. adverb)</td>
<td><em>asi</em> (nom.s.c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>uni</em> (acc.s.c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ini, eni</em> (nom.-acc.s.n.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>edi</em> (loc. adverb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td><em>∅</em></td>
<td><em>asi</em> (nom.s.c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>uni</em> (acc.s.c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ini, i-e-ni</em> (nom.-acc.s.n.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><em>enessan</em></td>
<td><em>∅</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td><em>∅</em></td>
<td><em>asi</em> (acc.s.c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>uni</em> (acc.s.c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T or S</td>
<td><em>asi</em> (acc.s.)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15: Distribution of forms and grammatical case in Old Hittite

There is only one text where different forms cooccur. KUB 43.75 (OH/NS) contains Situational *eni* and *uni* but the context is too vague to understand the use of these forms (b).

We also have both a recognitional and tracking *uni* in the copied CTH 16. The Recognitional *uni* is used in negative context (c). Therefore *uni* is a non-proximal demonstrative in Old Hittite, unless we assume that all the copied texts have replaced an at the time unknown demonstrative by means of the more current distal forms of *asi*. This is unlikely in the view of the original Old Hittite *asi*, although its precise demonstrative function is far from clear. Therefore, the copied forms may be used to represent Old Hittite use. Besides the copied examples cited in this chapter we also have a demonstrative *asi* in Direct Speech in KUB 11.6 iii 11 (OH/NS, CTH 19) *a-šī-ša-ma-a₃ auru-a₃ ammel kišarı* “I wish that (*asi*) city were mine!”. The context does not give any clues on the location of the Speaker, but it is reasonable to assume that the Speaker uses a distal demonstrative to refer to a city that is not yet his but somebody else’s (c).

The local adverb *edi* is already a distal deictic demonstrative in Old Script. The replacement of the adverb of relative position *edi* by *edez* took place in Middle Hittite times, before Suppiluliuma I. However, *edi* is also an adjectively used dative-locative in OH/NS KBo 16.49 i 9: *t₃-law₂ e-di lu₃₃₃ arḥi* LUGAL-ı […] 10 *iškaranzi* “(The cooks seize the sheep) and line them up on the far side (*edi* … arḥi) of the pond [opposite/before] the king” (see CHD L-N: 81, but HW² E 139a differently). For a similar word order ‘adnominal demonstrative - genitive - noun’ see MH/MS KUB 29.7+ rev. 25-26: *edanı₂₆ DINGIR-LIM-a₇ parni andan* “in that house of the deity” (ex. 4.21).

Given that (1) *edi* is a distal demonstrative, (2) that *asi*, *uni* and *eni* are demonstratives given their use in Direct Speech, (3) that both *asi* and *uni* refer to something that does not belong to the domain of the Other or to something negative respectively, I conclude that also in Old Hittite *asi* etc. is the distal demonstrative. Admittedly *asi* in these examples often refers to entities that are present, and therefore probably proximal to the Speaker. But if one should wish to conclude that *asi* was therefore a proximal demonstrative in Old Hittite, changing to a distal one in Middle Hittite, one should also explain the existence of two proximal demonstratives (*ka*- and *aši*) and a medial demonstrative (*apa*, see chapter 5) in Old Hittite, but no distal one. Furthermore, one should also have to explain the fact that
\textit{aši} is never used to denote "this tablet" whereas there are examples for \textit{kā-} in this use in Old Hittite (see chapter 6).

The Old Hittite paradigm is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>nom.c.</th>
<th>acc.c.</th>
<th>nom.-acc.n.</th>
<th>gen.</th>
<th>dat.-loc.</th>
<th>abl.</th>
<th>loc.adv.</th>
<th>Man.adv.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>singular</td>
<td>\textit{aši}</td>
<td>\textit{aši, uni}</td>
<td>\textit{ini}</td>
<td>\textit{∅}</td>
<td>\textit{edi}</td>
<td>\textit{∅}</td>
<td>\textit{edi / idi}</td>
<td>\textit{enessan}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>\textit{∅}</td>
<td>\textit{∅}</td>
<td>\textit{∅}</td>
<td>\textit{∅}</td>
<td>\textit{∅}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16: The paradigm of \textit{aši} in Old Hittite.

It is important to note that original Old Hittite \textit{aši} appears in object function, whereas copied OH, MH and NH till Mursili generally use \textit{uni} for the accusative besides a few \textit{aši-}s in Mursili’s times. The New Hittite cooccurrence of \textit{aši} and \textit{uni} at the time of Tudhaliya IV is therefore not an innovation. The coincidence of the nominative - accusative forms should then already have started in Old Hittite. However, the number of attestations is that small that nothing definitive can be said.

Now it is time to return to the questions formulated in 4.1.5.:

(i) \textit{Is there enough textual support for a unitary paradigm in the older language phases?}
(ii) \textit{Is the pronoun/adjective \textit{aši} etc. only an anaphoric demonstrative or deictic or both?}

There is not enough material to present each form in each function in Old Hittite, but there is enough evidence that \textit{aši} etc. functioned as one paradigm in Old Hittite. It is certain that that paradigm belonged to a true distal deictic demonstrative, attested with its other functions as anaphoric and recognitional demonstrative. Not discourse deictic (although we have \textit{enessan}), but that is not surprising given the scarcity of discourse deictic \textit{aši} in general.

4.6.4. An answer to Kammenhuber’s criticism

4.6.4.1. \textit{Is unis Old Hittite?}

The first objection (see section 4.1.4.) of Kammenhuber against projecting the 13\textsuperscript{th} century paradigm onto earlier language phases was that — according to her — \textit{uni-} is already inflected in OH copy: \textit{\textsuperscript{1}uoni\textsuperscript{-}iš-ša} in KUB 31.64 (+) 64a + KBo 3.55 ii 24\textsuperscript{*} (CTH 12) (Kammenhuber 1962: 377, see also Laroche 1979: 150). The relevant passage is part of a larger complex of repetitive Direct Speech. The first sequence of Direct Speech which is directed at a group of people including the inhabitants of Habara, is probably preceded by an introduction to the speech in ii 16:


The lines ii 17-20 contain the speech of the one who calls himself king (ii 18, maybe the father of the king?), or Hani as a messenger of the king, ii 21 the answer of the people of Habara. Then a Hani, the halipi does something, which act is followed by someone who himself goes to Habara (ii 22-23). At the end of ii 23 the king appears as subject. According to the opinion of Kammenhuber and Laroch e the next clause (ii 24) should start with u-ni-is-sa, which gives a complex subject: LUGAL-us-sa uniss-a ‘both the king and that one’. The predicate of this clause should contain a verb of speaking since ii 25 already is the speech itself. Moreover, that line probably does not contain the beginning of the Direct Speech given the conjunction -ya ‘and’ at the beginning of ii 25. This means that the end of ii 24 at least contains the beginning of the Direct Speech in the form of something like sumes kuies NP ‘who are the Royal guard’, followed by ‘and you who are [the people of Habara ...]. We have then the unique situation that the king addresses a crowd simultaneously with another person (Hani?). To avoid this, I propose to read fki-iš-ša-a[n instead of [u-ni]-iš-ša ×. The U could be the lower ‘Winkelhaken’ of K1, and the lower part of NI could be the lower horizontal of K1. Collation should decide in favor of the one or the other. The adverb of manner kissan ‘thus’ would lead to:


Also the king [say]ld thus: [“You who are the royal guard (??)] and you who[ are the people of Habara, you] did not [protect] your city. [...] or your city [.........]. Many [goods of mine, of the king] lie [ ......]. Protect [your wives, your sons]. [But] they [refused/said ....: “]they kill [...]. They [...]. §

Given the alternative presented here, u-ni-iš should not be incorporated in the Old Hittite paradigm.
4.6.4.2. Does e(-) 'they' together with edani, etc. build a separate defective paradigm a-?

Kammenhuber’s second objection was that edani and the other obliques of the defective Old Hittite demonstrative pronoun a- “is; jener” were understood as Obliqui to eni from the time of Mursili II (see Kammenhuber 1975ff.: 38-9 sub eni). However, as we have seen in section 4.6., the distal edani is attested in Middle Hittite, and the locative adverb of relative position edi already in Old script. I concluded that already in Old Hittite ed-, eni( and asi and uni) functioned in one paradigm. However, there is another problem with the pronoun a- if we want to follow Kammenhuber.

Another member of the demonstrative pronoun a- is according to Kammenhuber the nom.pl.c. e(-) 'they'. If e(-) ‘they’ belongs to the distal demonstrative, than we should find some correspondence in use. First I will present the possible attestations of e(-), then I will discuss them in view of the Situational, Recognitional, Discourse Deictic and Anaphoric use. As Kammenhuber noted, all occurrences of e(-) are substantives. This excludes the Recognitional and Discourse Deictic use, but possibly also the Anaphoric use. The Recognitional use of a demonstrative requires at least a noun, and only the neuter can be substantively used as a Discourse deictic. Furthermore, all attestations of e(-) are Anaphoric. But as the examples in section 4.5 show, there are no attestations of substantive anaphorical asi etc. So, unless we assume that only in old Hittite the demonstrative may occur as a substantive in anaphoric use, e(-) cannot be part of the demonstrative paradigm. For the sake of the argument I accept for the moment that this might still be the case and that for some reason there is no substantive distal demonstrative in anaphoric use in later times.

But before discussing the use of e(-), it is necessary to sift through the material because not every e(-) cited in HW² A belongs there.

Very doubtful is KB 3.55 ii 7 (OH/NS, CTH 12) e-e]š-ta katta uitr §. First of all, it is likely that the predicate requires an object: “They brought sthg down from there (-sta)”. This object can only be -e-, neuter plural. A substantive neuter e(-) is not attested although our text could provide the first example. However, as long as the emendation te-eš-ta is possible, this example is not to be used.¹³⁴

Also useless is KB 3.28 ii 5 (OH/NS, CTH 9) 5 [e]-eš-ta DUMU URUPurušhandumman dāir “They took the son of the city Purushandu away”. It is impossible to decide whether e-eš-ta is the 3rd person sg. pret. of the verb ‘to be’, or e(-) with the local particle -sta. Moreover, in HW² E.sub ešta p. 127 a difference is made between the writing eš-ta and e-eš-ta, the latter belonging to ‘to be’ (but see below for a counter example).

The only Old script passage is very unclear and probably does not have e(-).

4.103 KBo 22.2 rev. ⁵'-⁶' (OS narrative, CTH 3.1A), ed. Otten 1973: 10-11

šu=ya URU Ḥattuša hengani pāun ⁶ Ü DUMU.MEŠ URU Zalpa kattizmmi 1 ME ERINMEŠ-zd(-) e-a natta šu=ya kuit natta akir

Ottens l.c. translates ‘(Dennoch?) ging ich nach Ḥattuša zum Tode und die Einwohner von Zalpa bei mir, (sind) das nicht einhundert Mann, die doch nicht omgekommen sind?’ Otten distinguishes two clauses: Ü DUMU.MEŠ URU Zalpa kattizmmi and 1 ME ERINMEŠ-zd(-) e-a natta. If e-a is to be parsed as e- + -iä, then -iä must be ‘too’: ‘But the sons of Zalpa with me,

¹³⁴ See Rieken 1999 for ta concluding a discourse unit.
are they too not a hundred soldiers?’ However, the use of -ya indicates comparison with another group of 100 men. This comparison cannot be derived from the context. A different solution is to read the sequence -za-e-a as -za-ja, resulting in one clause: V DUMU.MEŠ URUZalpa katti=zammi 1 ME ERİN.MEŠ-Za+ja natta ‘And are there not the sons of Zalpa with me, and 100 soldiers?’ The whole passage reads now: ‘I went to Hattusa to death! (meaning: I thought I should die because of a curse) But are there not the sons of Zalpa with me, and 100 soldiers, since there was no dying?’ (But see: it didn’t work!).

Three broken but real attestations of e(-) are KUB 31.64+ 64a ii 30 (OH/NS, CTH 12), KBo 3.38 obv. 15 (OH/NS, CTH 3), and KBo 12.3 iii 10 (OH/NS, CTH 2). KBo 12.3 iii 10’: 10 e-eš-ta1 aniajaran ERİN.MEŠ-SU X[ is too broken to say anything conclusive. All that can be said is that e(-) is substantivally used, either as a subject or as an object. KUB 31.64+ 64a ii 30 has more context: ape[=ma memmir …] 30 kunanzi es-t[a ………] § “[But] they [refused/said ………. They] kill […]. They […] off.”. If this passage is parallel to the earlier Direct Speech, then kunanzi is the last word of the speech. The possibly plural com. e(-) could refer in that case to the Speakers, crossing a unit of Direct Speech. This behaviour might be in line with anaphorically used demonstratives, but there are also some examples of the accented pronoun apa- crossing a Direct Speech unit. In that case e- could be an emphatic anaphoric pronoun and not a distal demonstrative. On the other hand, the Direct Speech might continue as well.

A substantive e(-) occurs in KBO 3.38 obv. 15: Alluwašš[a] 14 [hu]lansanni= pat B A.ÜŠ SA ×[ ] URUZalp[a …] 15 [hu]lili es-t-a I SUSI E[H]LA dā[ir (?)]. “And Alluwa […]. [he] died in that same [r]evolt. Zalpa won the battle [… of […]. They [look ?] 60 households away.”. This tentative translation seems to do justice to the anaphoric relations in these clauses. If Zalpa is not the Subject in i 14’, then e(-) would be without referent unless some plural entity is hidden in the breaks in 14’. It is also possible that e(-) is used adjectively to the 60 houses, ‘those 60 houses’. In that case the 60 houses should have been mentioned before.

One of the clearer attestations is KBO 3.34 ii 34 (OH/NS, CTH 8): 33 màn LUGAL-yaš peran šieškanzi kuiš ḥazzizi nu=zšše GĒSTIN-an akiyanna pianzi 34 e-az [ĒR]IN LUGAL kuiš natta=ma ḥazzizi nu=zšše ijaru GAL-ri pianzi ‘Whenever they shoot before the king, if anyone hits the mark, they give him wine to drink, and he/she is/are [soldier(s)] of the king. But if anyone does not hit the mark, they give him iyara in a cup.’ The form e-az provides a clue for the possible interpretation. We should expect e-ez for e- with the reflexive -z, so the vowel -a- probably marks the particle -ya, resulting in e-(y)a-z. If -ya indicates ‘and’, the clause should be coordinated to the clause ‘they give him wine to drink’ and have a similar structure. An important criterium is that both clauses can trade places without disrupting the semantics of the construction (see Chapter 7). This seems possible indeed. But in that case a switch from singular -se to plural e(-) is not at all expected, so we have to assume that e(-) is singular. The other option is that -ya means ‘also’. But also then e(-) is more likely to be singular. Although e(-) is often interpreted as plural, not one of the other examples provides conclusive evidence for plural. But whatever its number, this use of e(-) does not correspond with any of the anaphoric uses of asi. Instead, the particle -ya allows another interpretation: e(-) is an accented anaphoric pronoun, similar in function to apa-. Since it only occurs in the oldest texts (CTH 2, 3, 8, 12) I wonder whether accented e(-) is a remnant of an earlier accented anaphoric paradigm, which was already in prehistoric Hittite being replaced by accented anaphoric apa-.185

185 One could imagine the following development: originally there were three demonstratives *ka-, *apa-, *asi, of which *asi slowly grammaticalized as an accented pronoun besides being used as a distal demonstrative (for the emergence of third person pronouns from demonstratives see Diesiel 1999: 120). Anaphoric *asi might
4.6.4.3. The so-called useless vocabularies

As discussed in section 4.1, the vocabulary fragments KUB 3.99 ii 18 (*asis*) and KBo 1.42 iii 35 (*enis*) were discarded by Laroch 1979: 148: “*asis*, l'hapax de vocabulaire [...], est une fabrication artificielle sans valeur linguistique” (also see Kammenhuber 1975ff. p. 39 sub *eni*, p. 400 sub *asi*). Although the form *asis* may be forced through too much Systemzwang by the writer of the vocabulary, it is still possible to compare its function with the Sumerian and Akkadian demonstratives.

The clearest vocabulary is:

4.104 **KBo 1.50 + KUB 3.99 ii 18-19** (Erim-hus, Lexical list, CTH 301), ed. Güterbock & Civil 1985: 121-122

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sumerian</th>
<th>Babylonian</th>
<th>Hittite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 ne.re</td>
<td><em>ul-lu</em>-[-u]</td>
<td><em>a-ši-iš</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 ne.re.re</td>
<td><em>an-nu</em>-[-u]</td>
<td><em>ka-a-ši</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Babylonian non-proximal demonstrative (‘Dort-Deixis’, Von Soden 1969: 47, § 45.2) *ullü* ‘jener’ corresponds with *ašiš*, the Babylonian proximal demonstrative (‘Hier-Deixis’, Von Soden o.c., p. 46, § 45.1) *annū* ‘dieser’ corresponds with *kas*. If the Babylonian evidence had been taken seriously, the distal demonstrative function of at least *aši* could have been established already very early. Güterbock l.c. actually already translated *ašiš* with “that one”, without commentary.

4.6.5. Information structure and attention levels

Entities in the speech surroundings are either salient or not-salient. When the entity was salient, the pronoun *asi* was used. When the entity was not salient a demonstrative description *asi* N had to be used. Salient entities could be Established or Unestablished Topic (4.2.5.3.). The lack of *asi* in Argument Focus is coincidental.

When an entity is not present in the speech situation but already familiar to the Addressee, the Speaker could use *asi* N with a modifier to bring it under the attention of the Addressee (‘You know, that store across the road …’). Such entities are necessarily not salient, and Focus (4.3.3.3.). Recognitional *asi* was often found on discourse nodes, i.e., at the beginning of a new discourse unit.

have lost its deictic marker –*i in the process, thus leading to the following system: three demonstratives *ka*-, *apa*-, *asi* and an accented pronoun *ás*. The next step might be further grammaticalization of accented *ás* to unaccented or clitic *-as*. With the resulting loss of an accented pronoun the second person demonstrative *apa* came to take over that position. It is possible that the oldest texts still have *e* as a residue of the accented pronoun and that not too long before Hittite was written down the demonstrative *apa* was ‘installed’ as the accented pronoun. From this point of view *apa* indeed replaced a pronoun that was ultimately related to *asi* but it never replaced *asi* itself as Kammenhuber and Laroch imagined.

186 The Sumerian forms *ne-re* and *ne-re-re* are mistakenly equated with *ullu* and *annu* respectively (Woods 2001: 215-216). The Hittites obviously followed the Babylonian sequence.
Propositional contents are hardly ever salient. When they are not salient, demonstratives have to be used to bring them in the center of attention. Also discourse deictic *enissan* and *asi* generally occurred on a discourse node. Discourse deictic expressions usually link to a piece of discourse but do not make that discourse a topic for further comment. The discourse deictic expressions are therefore only part of the Focus domain (4.4.5.).

Tracking *asi N* could be used to refer to both salient and non-salient entities. Tracking *asi N* referring to non-salient entities occurred usually on discourse nodes, whereas *asi N* referring to a salient entity set up a new node on its own account. Thus, tracking *asi N* was intimately connected with discourse nodes: whether salient or not salient, they referred to something in a preceding discourse unit (4.5.4.). Argument Focus was not attested with Tracking *asi N*. This is explained by the fact that *asi N* occurs in a new unit. But AF is only possible *within* a unit because it requires at least the presupposition of the verb, which is only derivable from the immediate *salient* context. And as we know, discourse boundaries lower the saliency of the preceding discourse entities.

The discourse node seemed to be crucial for Discourse deixis and Anaphora. In all cases *asi N* referred across a node, either forward or backward. From this pattern one can conclude that the demonstrative noun phrase (demN) is necessary in order to link rather unrelated domains with each other. In case of Situational use the demN links the discourse domain to the world, in case of Recognitional use it links the discourse domain to shared information stored in the memory of the Addressee. Within the discourse itself, in case of Discourse Deixis the demN links to the contents of an old or new unit, and in case of Anaphora, demN links to a previous discourse entity in another discourse unit. The demonstrative *asi* on the other hand could only be used when the entity it referred to was already salient. I assume that in this situation the discourse is only a natural continuation of what was signalled by non-linguistic means. Thus, the signalling in the speech situation and the linguistic signalling form one 'discourse unit'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>geographical parameter</th>
<th>continuity procedure</th>
<th>centering procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Topic</td>
<td>U-Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>asi</td>
<td>asi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Deictic</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking</td>
<td>asi N</td>
<td>asi N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17: The *asi* matrix