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5. The medial demonstrative apa-

5.1. Status Quaestionis

5.1.1. Introduction

In the preceding Chapter I concluded that asi etc. was the distal demonstrative besides proximal ka-, forcing apa- out of the position which it held since the beginning of Hittite studies. But that does not necessarily mean that apa- is ousted from the deictic system. Instead, it is now limited to the medial position in a person-based system, and it still remains the emphatic pronoun par excellence. In this chapter I will concentrate on the deictic value of apa-, and leave a detailed discussion of the emphatic use of apa- to chapters 7, 8 an 9.

5.1.2. Previous literature on the deictic force of apa-

As noted above, the general opinion on the deictic system is that it consists of only two terms, ka- 'this' and its opposite apa- 'that'. In this section I will collect the remarks on the deictic force of apa-, but one has to keep in mind that there has never been an elaborate discussion of the function of apa-. Sometimes the place of apa- in the Hittite deictic system is compared with the Latin system, but since that system is still under discussion, this habit should immediately be discarded.

The opinions differ on whether apa- has both Du- and Jener-deixis or only Jener-deixis. Friedrich 1991: 24, and 1960: § 111 (p. 66), § 251 (p. 134-135) translated apa- with "jener, er, der betreffende; is", but also allowed Du-Deixis (§ 111, § 251) in KUB 21.1 iii 4 (CTH 76, see ex. 5.39)), and also in ka 'hier bei mir', versus apiya 'dort bei dir' (or 'dort bei ihm') (§ 251, p. 135). Friedrich is followed by Puhvel 1984: 86: "that (one); thy, thine, your(s) (vs. ka- 'this; my mine', like Lat. iste vs. hic)". According to Puhvel apa-corresponds in meaning to Lat. is, iste, ille, vs. hic. Kammenhuber HW2 A: 141b explicitly rejected the Du-deixis of apa-, whereas Kronasser (1956: 147) translates apa- with "is" but notes that it has Du-Deixis: "(mit Du-Deixis wie Lat. iste)".

No distinction whatsoever has been made between the anaphoric and deictic uses of apa-. As a result, there were no means to distinguish between emphatic and non-emphatic apa- or between "Du-deixis" or "Jener-Deixis". Neither has the difference between the

---

187 Hrozný 1917: 137 translated apa- with "der, dieser, jener, er", with unclear deixis therefore. With the knowledge at that time available he concluded that the semantic distinctions of the demonstratives were completely bleached: "auch sonst erscheinen die Bedeutungsunterschiede zwischen den einzelnen Demonstrativa im Hethitischen sehr stark verwischt, wohl wiederum ein Anzeichen für fremdsprachige Einflüsse auf das Hethitische." (o.c. 134 n. 1). Forrer 1922: 208 only saw the emphatic use of apa- which he translated with "derselbe". He must have come to this translation because apa- indeed often refers to a preceding discourse entity without interference from another entity.
demonstrative pronoun *apa-* and the demonstrative adjective *apa-* received any attention. In this Chapter I will follow the pattern set out in the previous chapter on *asi* in order to address these questions and others.

5.2. The Situational Use of *apa-*

5.2.1. Introduction

In order to show that *apa-* is related to the Addressee, there are two environments to investigate, True Situational Use (5.2.2.) and Direct Speech (5.2.3.) In both cases I cite all examples in my corpus that obey the following restriction. The demonstrative *apa-* is a first mention. For Direct Speech needs to be added that the referent of *apa-* is present in the speech situation.

5.2.2. True Situational Use

Only those occurrences of *apa-* without any preceding reference to an entity or location are considered situational or deictic. In all attestations of truly situational *apa-*, the demonstrative refers to the location of the Addressee, independent of the distance of the Addressee to the Speaker. This means that the medial term depends on person and not on distance. The exclusive connection of Situational *apa-* with the Addressee has not been noted before.

There are no certain attestations of truly situational *apez(za)* indicating relative position in my corpus. The next example is the only one that might belong to this class, although *kezza* and *apezza* might be simply ablative ‘fight from there’, instead of ‘fight on that side’.

5.1 KBo 16.47 obv. 9’ (MH/MS treaty, CTH 28), ed. Otten 1967: 56

[n .u]3 diTu-ST ke-e-ez-za zahhiia zik = uš a-pé-ez-za zahhiia

I, My Majesty, shall fight [t]hem from here (from my place, *kezza*), you must fight them from there (from your place, *apezza*). 188

The preceding lines discuss the possibility of hostile actions of the troops of Ura and Mutamutasi, the referents of -*us* ‘them’. If *apez* were to refer anaphorically to their location, the Addressee must be part of that location. In order to ‘fight them from there’, the Addressee has to leave his location, removing himself from the enemy which he is supposed to fight. Thus, *apez* is not anaphoric, but deictic (or situational) and therefore refers to the location of the Addressee. In the case of *apez* as adverb of relative position the problem of anaphoric versus deictic reference is non-existent. If *apez* were to mean ‘fight them on their side’ versus ‘fight them on my side’, there would be no one in between to fight.

Besides possibly relative position *apez(za)* can denote the ‘Source from which’:

5.2 HKM 56 obv. 7-10 (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 224-225

§ 7 ammel [k]uit ÛTEMU 8 a-pé-ez uit ŞEŞ.DÜ.GA = YA = ma = mu 9 aššul kužat ÖL 10 hatrăeš §

188 Similarly KBo 16.47 obv. 11'-12'.
Given that my messenger came from there (from your place, apez), why have you, my dear brother, not written (your) greetings to me?

The locative adverb apiya ‘there’ refers always to the location of the Addressee when there is no textual antecedent. In the next example the enclitic pronoun -smas ‘you (pl.)’ strengthens the medial interpretation of apa-:

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

3 halkis(s)maš a-pi-ia aniyanza 3 kuit nu EGIS-an tiyatten 4 n=an anda épiten
n=an=kan ARÂH-hi 5 anda išhütten nu ANA d[U-TU-SI haträten]

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


§ 5 mahh[a]n=s(a)maš 6 kāš -tuppianza 7 anda үemizzi 8 nu MAHAR d[UTU-SI] 9
lišiyahhūanzi 10 ünništen

§ 11 mān ŪL=ma 12 nu=šmaš=šan 13 uyanzi 14 a-pi-ia pedi 15 tašuähhanzi § (end of letter)

When this tablet reaches you, you must drive quickly to My Majesty. But if not, they shall come to blind you over there (where you are, apiya), on the spot (pedi)!


10' É KUR UKU HATTI=za ŠEŠ=YA GIM-an šakti n=at=za ammuk ŪL šal[gaahhi n=at arha a]nuyan É-e[r] 11' āšta=ma=kan kuit n=at=kan =Urhi-šU=upaš ANA DINGIR.GAL pešta nu m[Urhi-dU-uppaš kuit a-pi-ia 12] n=an punuš mān kišan mān ŪL kišan

As you, my brother, know (well) the House of Hatti, do I not kn[ow (you)] it (too)? [It is] a [transferred house. That which remained however, Urhi-Tessub gave it to the Great God. Given the fact that [Urhi]-Tessub (is) there (with you; apiya), ask him, whether (it is) so, or whether (it is not) so!

Finally, there is a situational apa- + N referring to the Addressee:

5.6 **HKM 4 obv. 4-9** (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 124-127

mahhan nu=m[u] 8 lišiyahhūanzi[r] 9 haträi §§

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

---

190 The other attestations of truly situational apiya besides the ones presented here are MH HKM 14 lower edge 13, HKM 19 lower edge 30, HKM 21 obv. 5, HKM 52 obv. 10, HKM 68 rev. 13 (letters, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199). There is not one example of non-anaphoric apiya that does not refer to the Addressee.

191 Alp reads ARÂH-ten. The sign is however clearly a H with four 'Winkelhaken', whereas TEN only has three. The translation should be adjusted accordingly.

192 And possibly another attestation in HKM 53 obv.5 (MH letter, CTH 199).
5.2.3. Direct Speech

5.2.3.1. Introduction

The criterium for inclusion of apa- (+N) in the category of Direct Speech is first mention, with the further restriction that the Direct Speech is not part of a larger citation. Both non-first mention and citation from a larger part of text are not necessarily deictic. For more information on these criteria see 3.1.3. and 4.2.3.

The major problem with apa- in Direct Speech is that besides being simply Situational it may also be emphatic, indicating for example a Contrastive Topic or Focus (see chapters 7, 8 and 9). The question is, does the Topic or Focus status overrule the choice for proximal ka-, distal asi or a possibly medial apa-? The following examples show that the Topic or Focus status are not reserved for apa- but can also occur with Situational ka- and asi. For ka- as Focus pronoun I repeat from chapter 6 ex. 6.24 as:

[35][k]aruqilijaz = ya = kan URUHattusaš ] 36 [URU]Mizrašš = a ištarri = šummi āššijanteš
[37][e]šir kinuna = za = nnaš = kan ki-i-ig ištarri = šu[mmi] ] 38 [kiš]at nu = ya = kan KUR
URU HATTI KUR URU Mizr[i = a ] 39 [uki]urri namma iškar = šummi āššijanteš §§
"Of [old], Hattusa and Egypt [were] friendly with each other. Today, this too (ki=ya) has occurred amongst us. The lands of Hatti [and] Egypt[ will] continue [to be] friendly with each other [for]ever!"

And from Chapter 4 I adduce ex. 4.11 with asi as Contrastive Topic pronoun:

5.8 KBo 5.3 + ii 36-38 (MH/NS treaty, CTH 42), ed. Friedrich 1930: 116-117
... nu kiššan teši ammuk = za = [lnganuyanza ] 37 nu = ya Ol kuitki memahu i = [jami] = za = ya Ol kuitki 38 a-si = ma = ya [ma]hän je[zi QATAMMA] jeđdu ...
... and you say as follows: "I am sworn in, (so) I do not say anything (evil) and also, I do not do anything (evil either). But he (asi) will do as he likes (Lit.: Now, as he does, let him do likewise)."

The next example has to be contrasted with the preceding two.

5.9 KUB 26.12+ ii 29-35 (lateNH instruction, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.1), ed. Von Schulé 1957: 25
§ 29 namma apät kuit ėššatteni nu KUR.KUR.HI.A 30 BAL [d]apianda l-ētta naiškitti 31 nu [KUR.KUR].HI.A LÜKUR daššanuškitti 32 KUR.KUR URUHATTI = ma malishkunitin 33 nu apät memiškainen män = za = nnaš 34 nakkeši nu = ya = kan a-pē-e-da-ni EGR-a[n]da 35 tiajuven
Furthermore, why are you doing that: You have united all the rebellious lands, you have strengthened the lands of the enemy, while you have weakened the countries of Hatti, and you say that: "If it becomes difficult for us, we will join that one (apedani) instead", ...
The Addressees are the persons that have to take an oath of loyalty on the new king, Tudhaliya IV. But their acts have not been very loyal, and they even plan to change sides when troubles arise. In their speech they refer to the enemy by means of *apedani* in Replacing Focus (see chapter 8), a first mention.

The difference with the other examples is that we know that the event occurs in the here-and-now (ex. 5.7), or that the referent is certainly not present (ex. 5.8). For ex. 5.9 however, the location of *apedani* cannot be established. This could mean that Focal *apa-* is used in Direct Speech when the location of the referent is not relevant. To avoid ‘contamination’, I will therefore only discuss attestations of *apa-* in Direct Speech when the referent of *apa-* can be located in space with a reasonable certainty. In other words, when *apa-* is really Deictic.

### 5.2.3.2 The demonstrative pronoun *apa-* and adverb *apiya*

The locative adverb *apiya* appears also in Direct Speech denoting the location of the Addressee:

**5.10** KUB 19.5+: 24-27 (NH letter, Muwattalli, CTH 191), ed. Houwink ten Cate 1983-84: 39


Now, after Gassus had arrived [here], Kupanta-[urunta] wrote to Atpa: “[The ŠARIPUT]U-men of His Majesty that are there (with you) (*apiya*), release [them]!”

The demonstrative pronoun *apa-* is clearly present (already discussed as ex. 3.9):

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

> mMarijaš kuēš ēsta n=šaš kuedani uddani 39 BA.ŪŠ ŬL SÚHUR.LAL tlijattat apāš=za=kan anda auēzi 40 ABI dUTU-St=ma=kan imma GISAb-az arba auēzi n= an yaḥtul ISBAT 41 zik=ya=kan a-pu-u-un anda kuyat auēša n=šaš apēdati uddani 42 šer BA.ŪŠ

Who was Mariya, and for what reason did he die? Did not a lady’s maid walk by? So he makes eye contact (with her), while, of all people, the father of the His Majesty looks out the window[^1], and catches him in the act: “You! why did you make eye contact with her (*apun*)?” So for that reason he died.

Obviously the woman is near the Addressee. The same is probably true of the following Old Hittite example where again *zik* ‘you’ and *apas* ‘he’ are combined.

**5.12** KBo 22.1: 16'-21' (OS instruction, CTH 272)

> mán ABI tulijaš halzai nu=šmaš 17 gullakkuyan šahzi natta 18 LÚ.MEŠNASI SIDI Ti KUNU kāšatta=ya 19 LÚ.MEŠNASI SIDI Ti KUNU damekatteni 20 ta LUGAL-i kardimiaṭtu piškatteni § zikk=a=ya GIS.TUKUL a-pa-aš-ša GIS.TUKUL

[^1]: Beckman 1996: 28 different: “Did not a lady’s maid walk by and he look at her? But the father of My Majesty himself looked out the window ...”.

185
When my father summons to the assembly, he will investigate your corrupt behaviour, not your provision bearers: “Look, you (pl.) always oppress your provision bearers, and therefore always give the king fits of anger”. § “Both you (sg.) and he (apass=a) are workers!”

It seems that the personnel is around when the king calls his assembly together. Could it be possible that each member of the assembly has his own staff at hand? In that case the demonstrative apa- could refer to a servant in the vicinity of the Addressee.

A final collection of Situational apa-s in Direct Speech is found in the substitute ritual for Tuhdaliya III, edited by Taracha 2000. The interesting aspect of these occurrences is that apa- is each time found in the vicinity of ka-. An example which is cited by both CHD S: 29 and Puhvel A: 90 is


\[\]

The CHD o.c. translates “Take note of these (latter). But don’t take note of those (earlier) ones anymore”. The “latter … the earlier” is very close to “the latter … the former”, which is a common translation for contrastively used demonstratives in discourse (see 2.3.4.2.). The first problem with this translation is that apus does not refer within the direct speech.

The second problem is that ‘the latter … the earlier’ implies that both kus and apus are referring to substitutes. That apa- refers to the king (and queen) instead is illustrated through the parallel KUB 42.94 + HHT 80 rev. 10'-12' (Taracha 2000: 50-51): 10’ kāṣa<za> āpedas kattan [k(arū kūš)] 11’ tarpalīš ar[a](nt)ari nu<za>za kā[(š šekten)] 12’ LUGAL-un= ma<za>za lē [(namma š)]ekteni “Look, in their place (apedas kattan) are already standing these substitutes. Take note of these, but do [n]ot take note of the king anymore”.

The final problem with the translation of the CHD is that the deictic contrasts in the discourse “the one … the other, the former … the latter” are not expressed by ka- … apa-, as Latin hic … ille, but by ka- … ka- (see 6.7.) or apa- … apa- (7.2.4.1.). Whatever contrast there is depends on the situation, not on the discourse.

The next question is whether the use of apa- is triggered by the fact that some entity in the surroundings is emphatically referred to because it is in Focus, thereby overruling an otherwise used deictic demonstrative (ka- or asi), or whether apa- indeed denotes some kind of distance or person based contrast besides Focus. If only the first option would be valid, then we would not find Focal ka- or asi for they would have been replaced by apa-. The fact that ka- and asi can occur as Focus or Unestablished Topic proves that apa- does not necessarily replace them but has a deictic value of its own in Direct Speech.

It is impossible to decide at what distance the King and Queen stand from the Speaker, but we know one thing. The King and Queen are somehow unfavorably looked upon by the deity. They are considered as part of the cognitive space of the (angry) Addressee, and I believe that that is indicated by means of apa-. In contrast with this, the Speaker uses ka- to indicate that the substitutes are part of his own cognitive domain.

---

194 The translation follows CHD Š p. 164b.
There is one example in my corpus where *apa-* in connection with a proposition might be related to the Addressees, the oracle inquirers:

5.14 **KUB 22.70 obv. 36-38** (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 62-63

36 **AWAT** mPallāšya IQBI MUNUS.LUGALšya IQBI ANA mPallāšya kuit ammuk peškinun 37 nušaratsa DINGIR-LIM šāk mPallānšaškan EGIR-an ijahḫut LŪ.MEŠ TAPPI HTA mPallāšma punuššuṣen 38 nu memir a-pu-u-unša memian ÜL šekkueni

..., and that she said about the case of Palla: “The queen said: ‘whatever I have given to Palla, you, o god, must note it and you must go after Palla.’ ” We questioned the associates of Palla. They said: “We do not know about that (apun) case (you just told us about).”

5.2.4. Linguistic Selfreference

Expressions referring to an entity containing that expression as ‘In this dissertation I claim ...’ are not attested for *apa-* As explained in 3.1.4., linguistic selfreference is only expressed by *ka-*.

5.2.5. Summary and conclusions

The strict application of the criterium of first mention has led to the observation that in first mention the demonstrative *apa-* referred to the Addressee and never to the Other. This changes when *apa-* is used anaphorically (see 4.2.2. for that discussion). The failure to distinguish between Situational and Anaphoric reference in the past has led scholars to believe that *apiya* and *apa-* were simply the non-proximal demonstratives and that they could freely be used to refer to both Addressee and Other.

Not surprisingly the situationally used *apa-* is only found in letters, treaties, instructions and Direct Speech. All these genres have an active Addressee.

In all examples the referents of *apa-* were in the center of attention before they were mentioned in the Direct Speech (besides maybe ex. 5.14). The referents of *apa-* in ex. 5.11 and 5.13 are probably Established Topics. In ex. 5.11 because the fact that there is a relation between Mariya and the woman is pragmatically clear. The king simply questions the type of relation. Ex. 5.13 could be paraphrased as: ‘but as for them, don’t take note of them’. There is a Topic switch, and *apus* is the Unestablished Topic. In ex. 5.12 *apass=a* was Expanding Focus (see chapter 7). The locative adverb is never in the center of attention here, and never a Topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deictic Use</th>
<th>Situational Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Topic</td>
<td>U-Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td><em>apa-</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: The Deictic *apa-* matrix.

187
5.3. The Recognitional Use of apa-

Usually the distal demonstrative asi is used in order to introduce an element into the discourse that is Hearer old (see also 2.3.1.2. (general), 3.2 (Hittite), 4.3 (asi) and 6.3 (ka-)) for a discussion of the recognitional use of demonstratives). In my corpus there is only one clear Recognitional apa-

5.15  KUB 15.1 iii 7'-13' (NS vow, Hattusili III, CTH 584), ed. De Roos 1984: 186, 328-329
§ 7' [U-TUM MUNUS.LUGAL INIM 4 Guryašu-kan kuyapi (anda ...... ) 8' [4Gu]yašuš-kan GIM-AN ŚA U-TI 9' [AN]A MUNUS.LUGAL iqbi a-pu-u-un=ya kuiN 10' ŚA LÖ MUDI=KA INIM-AN ZI-za hartii 11' nu=yar=at TI-anza 1 ME MU.KAM.HI.À á az ya=šši 12' piḫḥi MUNUS.LUGAL-za za kan ŚA U-TI kišan I KRBIB 13' mán=ya=mu apēnistišyan ijašši 14' nu=ya LUGAL MUDI=YA TI-anza ...

[Dream of the Queen]: When the affair of Gurwasu [.............], after [Gu]rwasu had said [to] the Queen in a dream: “As for that (apun) situation of your husband which has your attention, he shall live and I will give him a 100 years”, the Queen promised as follows in a dream: “If you do like that, and the King, my husband shall live, ...

All the requirements for the recognitional use are fulfilled. The demonstrative is adnominal, the referent of the demonstrative phrase is not present at the deictic center, and the knowledge contained in the phrase is private knowledge. Furthermore, the situation of the husband is mentioned for the first time, and the demonstrative phrase is part of a relative clause.

The difference with the distal demonstrative asi is that in this case apa- refers to the domain of the Addressee, the Queen. The demonstrative asi is often connected with either someone other than the Speaker and the Addressee, or it is used in a negative context. Here the situation of the king is not in the sphere of interest of the speaker or someone else, but only of the queen. Another indication of the connection with only the Addressee might be that the word ‘husband’ is used instead of ‘king’.

Another example from outside my corpus is:

5.16  KBo 3.34 ii 1-7 (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 44-45
1 mZidi LÚZABAR.DAB ešša ABI LUGAL DUG harharān GEŠTIN-il 2 ANA 1ḫištar-išša "Marattia-ja maniḫḫiš 3 LUGAL-i SIG-an-an GEŠTIN-an bīntā aššī-a 4 tamain GEŠTIN-an pišer apāšša=ui LUGAL-i tēt 5 natta a-pu-u-un GEŠTIN-an pišer LUGAL-ššu kuiN 6 auša apāšša=ui QATAMMA IQBI š=an=ašša 1 arba pēhušer š=an eššikir š=šaš BA.ŪŠ Zidi was a cup-bearer. The father of the king assigned a harhara-vessel with wine to Histayara and Maratta. To the king he handed over good wine, but to them they gave other wine. One (of them) came and said to the king: “They have not given (me) that (apun) wine which the king has seen.” And the other came and spoke likewise.

In order to evoke the correct referent in the mind of the King (‘you know, that wine which was shown to you and which you promised us’) the Speaker uses a demonstrative adnominal in combination with a relative clause. The demonstrative apa- points at the fact that the wine

only belongs to the domain of the Addressee, the king. The Speakers themselves never saw the wine again.

Recognational *apa-* is possibly attested in 5.17\(^{196}\).

5.17 **KUB 14.4 iv 17-19** (NH indictment, Mursili II, CTH 70), ed. De Martino 1998: 30, 38

17 [MUNUS.LUGAL=ma \(^{197}\) **ANA** **d}š]{\text{a}r}a **URU**\text{Aštata kiššan memiškit DINGIR-LUM a-}

pa-a-at-\(z\)a-ya \(^{18}\) **KÜ**.**BABBAR** **URU**\text{Aštata} \(\text{[GL]}\) ammuk ḫarmi tuel\(z\)a ŠA DINGIR-LIMP

KÜ.BABBAR kuiš ḫarzi \(^{19}\) [nu\(z\)a apēl \(\text{E-S}\)]U \(^{198}\) kuiš šunniškit nu\(z\)a DINGIR-LUM

apûn \(\text{UL}\) ēpti

[The queen] spoke as follows [to Ish]ara of Astata: “O god, it is not I who keep that (apat) [silver of Astata]. The one who holds your silver, god, the one who fills his own house (with it), that one you, o god, do not take. ...

Summarizing, also the demonstrative *apa-* is used to refer to information that is Discourse New but Hearer Old. The difference with *asi* is that here *apa-* N denotes an entity connected with the Addressee whereas *asi* N was disconnected from both Speaker and Addressee.

As discussed in 4.3., Recognitions are always in Sentence Focus:

<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>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>apa-</em> N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: The Recognitional *apa-* matrix.

5.4. The Discourse Deictic Use of *apa-*

5.4.1. Introduction

With discourse deixis we leave the field of situational reference. Like anaphoric demonstratives, discourse deictic demonstratives refer to a part of the discourse. But unlike anaphoric demonstratives, a discourse deictic expression is not coreferential with a NP, but draws the attention to the propositional content of a stretch of discourse. (Diessel 1999: 100f. For more discussion see 2.3.5 and 2.3.6, 3.5.). Moreover, discourse deictic demonstratives often provide a link between two discourse units (Diessel o.c. 102\(^{199}\)). In this section I describe the use of the adverb of manner *apenissan*, and forward and backward reference of *apa-* (+ N). Anticipating the results somewhat, in contrast with discourse deictic *ka-* and *asi*,

\(^{196}\) And maybe also in KBo 4.4 ii 56 (61 II) *a-pu-u-un* = *ma* = *ya* = *tta* \(\text{UNKÜR URU Hajašan 57 DU BEL\text{s} YA karû paiš} “The Stormgod, My Lord has already given that enemy, i.e. Hayasa, to you”.

\(^{197}\) De Martino o.c. 30 restores *na-ashi*. This is not possible because transitive verbs never take the nom. enclitic pronoun.

\(^{198}\) De Martino o.c. 30 reads *-ma* in the break. One can make sense of this clause if *SU* is read instead, together with the restoration proposed here.

\(^{199}\) Diessel uses 'proposition' instead of 'discourse unit'.
discourse deictic *apa-* is often found in Focal environments. This is not totally unexpected in view of one of the major functions of Anaphoric *apa-*, denoting Focus (see part III).

5.4.2. The adverb of manner *apenissan*

The adverb of manner *apenissan* is not especially connected with the Addresssee, just as *kissan* in this, the following way, thus is not connected with the Speaker (see 6.4.) and *enissan* in that way, just mentioned' not with the Other (see 4.4.). The difference between the latter two is that *kissan* refers forward and *enissan* backward. This leaves no place for *apenissan* as a third term of equal semantics. And indeed, *apenissan* is different. Whereas *kissan* and *enissan* simply introduce or close a piece of discourse, *apenissan* (*QATAMMA*) is used in a different context. It is therefore not in opposition with *kissan* as Kammenhuber assumed (HW\(^2\) A 171). Almost every example of *apenissan* occurs in the construction *mahhan ... apenissan* 'just as ..., likewise', in a comparison with something that is described earlier (see Kammenhuber I.c. for the different types of 'Vergleichssätze'), whereas *kissan* and *enissan* never do.

I will cite one example for each language phase. For more references see Kammenhuber HW\(^2\) A 171ff., and the examples in 3.5.2.2.

5.18  **KBo 6.2 + KBo 19.1 iii 44-46** (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 75-76

\[ \text{§ 44} \text{ takku MÄŠ.GAL enandan takku DĂRA.MÄŠ annanūḫhan takku UDUK R.A} \]

\[ \text{ena[ndan]} \text{ 45 kuiški tāiezi māḩhanda ŠA GU₄.APIN.LA tajazilaš 46 kinzan[n=ta u]} \text{]\text{[tar?] QA-TAM-MA}} \text{ §} \]

If anyone steals a trained he-goat or a trained deer or a trained mountain goat, as (*mahhan*) the theft of a plow ox (is), likewise (*QATAMMA*) (is) the [c]ase of these [too] = their disposition is the same as of the theft of a plow ox.

5.19  **KBo 12.62 obv. 10'-12'** (MH/MS letter, CTH 209.14), ed. Hagenbuchner 1989: 120

\[ \text{§ 10'} \text{ [nu m]ahḫan tuppi uḫḫun nu[z=za ammuk māḥḥan} \text{ 11' kiḫḫat nu DINGIR.MEŠ} \]

\[ \text{mDuddumin\text{-}pat QADU DAM=SU} \text{ 12'[D]U.MEŠ=SU QA-TAM-MA harninkandu} \text{ §} \]

[W]hen I looked at the tablet, just as (*mahhan*) I felt (lit. became), may the gods destroy Duddum with his wife (and) children in the same way (*QATAMMA*).

5.20  **KBo 5.4 obv. 24-26** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 67), ed. Friedrich 1926: 56-57

\[ \text{§ 24 namma} \text{za zik} \text{mTargaššanalliš tuel ZI[n] tuel É-KA tuell} \text{a LŪ.AMA.A.AT} \]

\[ \text{kan 25 mahḥan uškiši dUTU-ŠI=z̄ita kuin ĖRIN.MEŠ ô[šand]ulinn katta dālijanun} \text{ 26 n[z=za] an kattan QA-TAM-MA uški} \]

Just as (*mahhan*) you Targasnalli care for your soul, your house and your 'room mate', take in the same way (*QATAMMA*) care of the garrison troops which I, My majesty, have left with you.

5.21  **KUB 23.103 rev. 6'-7'** (lateNH letter, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 178), ed. Hagenbuchner 1989: 252

\[ \text{6' nu EN=SUN BA.ŬŠ ammuk=ma} \text{za ANA EN=SUN mahḥan SIG₅-anza X[...]} \text{ 7} \]

\[ \text{nu[z=za apedani} \text{ja QA-TAM-MA} \text{pat SIG₅-anza n=an pahḥašin} \]

Your (pl.) lord has died. Now, as (*mahhan*) I [was?] good for your lord, I am good exactly in that same way (*QATAMMA*) for him too. Protect him!
In a few cases the mahhan part is not present, but still the comparison with an earlier situation is intended in the QATAMMA clause:

5.22  **KUB 14.1+ rev. 87-88** (MH/MS indictment, CTH 147), ed. Götze 1928: 38-39

\[ ABl \; UTU-SI \; z\mu[a\mu]\; kuyapikki \; \ yi\; t\; n\; \text{at} \; \text{RAKM}\]  

"The father of My Majesty [n]ever ordered [me]: 'Alasiya (=Cyprus) is mine! Let it stay like that so (QATAMMA)!""

These examples show that apenissan can be used in Speaker context (ex. 5.21), Addressee context (ex. 5.20, 5.22) and Other context (5.18, 5.19). I take apenissan as an adverbial marker of Expanding Focus. Regular Expanding Focus is of the form (Dik 1997a: 334 (his ex. 49)):

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

We can modify this to:

5.24  S assumes that A might think: John bought apples in a happy mood.
    S corrects: Just as he bought APPLES in a happy mood, he likewise bought BANANAS.

Anticipating the forward reference of apat in 5.4.3.1., forward referring apenissan is only attested in a few texts:


\[ \text{kikki\; \text{ta}} \; \text{QAT-MA} \; \text{u\; a\; \text{ran\; n\; \text{at}} \; \text{RAKM}} \]  

(So it) happens like this (QATAMMA): People sin.

The next example is unique because instead of apenissan we have apat mahhan:

5.26  **HKM 71 obv. 3-9** (MH/MS, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 254-255

\[ \text{\frac{1}{3}} \; \text{ka\; \text{ka\; mu\; \text{hu\; \text{at\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; au\; \text{t\; a}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}}} \]

Given that you wrote to me this way: ‘My lord, would you drive down, the Gasga people will speak thus: ‘Would the Head of the Chariot fighters drive (down), (then) we will make peace’ ‘.
You keep writing like that (apat). Are you not a lord?

5.4.3. The Discourse Deictic syntagms apat uttar, apas memias and apat

5.4.3.1. The expression apa- (+N) referring forward

---

\[200\] See also NH KUB 14.11+ rev. 29 (prayer, CTH 378 II); LateNH KBo 4.14 iii 42, 47 (treaty, CTH 123).
Forward referring discourse deictic *apa-* is very rare and occurs mainly in a Tudhaliya IV oath (CTH 255) and often in connection with the Addresser:

5.27 **KUB 26.12+ ii 29-35** (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.1), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 25

{nanna a-pa-a-at kuit ēšsateni nu KUR.KUR.ḪI.A BA[|L d|apianda l-ētta}
{naiškittin nu K[|UR.KUR.ḪI.A L][KUR] dāššamuškittin KUR.KUR Uaddockškittin mxn=ya=xnaš nakkešzi nu=ya=kan a-pé-e-da-ni EGlR-a[nd]a} tiyašeni n=at kuš ijaši...

Furthermore, as for *that* (*apat*) what you do: You turned [all] defective[e] countries into one, you made the countries of the enemy powerful, while the countries of Hatti you made weak, and you say *that* (*apat*): “If it becomes difficult for us, we will step behind that one”, (if) anyone does that, ...

But in the same text we find an alternation between *apat* and *ki* in connection with a third person (already discussed as ex. 3.65):


{nunu ANA SESzaYA kuin DUMU.MUNUS L h[āšanza našma]}
{nynu ki-i memai EGlR-an=ya=mu ti[i[a] 6 apāš=ma a-pa-a-at memai EGlR-an=ya=ta} ŪL tiyaši hantii=ja=ya=xši 8 ŪL tiyaši 2 ĥuhluapaš=al=ya=xši? ĪL.9 kışṭahari ...}

Ör (if) [...] or a brother of [My Majesty], offspring or brothers [of the Queen], [listens] to sons of con[cubine]s, (and) says this (ki): “Side with me”, but he says this instead (*apat*): “I do not step behind you, and I do not step before him, and I do not become evil [against him?]” ....

The pronoun *apa-* denotes Replacing Focus (see chapter 8), “not X, but Y instead!”.

And with a first person and Focus:


{nunu ANA ŠEŠ=YA kuin DUMU.MUNUS peḫḫi nu=xši=[ka]n ŠA MUNUS.LUGAL annān}
{tiššān 64 [DINGIR.MEŠ QATAMMA] GAM ḫamankandu nu MUNUS LUGAL a-pád-da-ia}

AQBi ŠEŠ.MEŠ=SUNU=ya=xši EGlR-anda 65 [tišn]I ...}

As for the daughter that I will give to my brother, may [the gods] grant her [the same] experience and the power to raise children [as] the Queen (lit. ... of the Queen in that same way). And I, the Queen, said also/even *that* (*apadda=ya*): “Her brothers will [take] care of her”. ....

5.30 **KUB 1.1+ iii 66-68** (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 22-23

---

201 See also lateNH KUB 26.12+ i 13, 23 (oath, CTH 255.1), KUB 26.1 iii 19 (oath, CTH 255.2).

202 See also NH KUB 14.3 i 14 (CTH 181); lateNH KUB 23.1+ i 30 (treaty, CTH 105), KUB 26.1 iii 16 (oath, CTH 255.2)

203 See also KUB 23.101 obv. ii 17 (lateNH letter, CTH 177.3).
Summarizing, like *ka-* forward referring discourse deictic *apa-* can occur with all persons. The difference between the two is that *apat / apa-N* is Focal (more specific, in Argument Focus). Therefore Sommer’s attractive solution for the alternation between *apat* and *ki* cannot be maintained. Commenting on KUB 14.3 iii 63 (see below) he concluded: “Man kann und wird die in *a-pa-a-at* liegende “Ferndeixis” von der Psyche der Briefschreiber aus verstehen, wenn man sie vergegenwärtigt, daß die folgenden Worte als weder von ihm noch an ihn geschrieben zu denken sind, sondern von einem andern an einen Dritten gehen sollen” (Sommer 1932: 164):

5.31  **KUB 14.3 iii 63-65** (NH letter, Hattusili III, CTH 181), ed. Sommer 1932: 14-15

§ 63 *nu=šši ŠEŠ=YA a-pa-a-at 1-an ḫatrāi 64 màn ÚL nu=ya šara tīqa 65 nu=ya INA KUR Ḥatti arba it*

My brother, write him at least *this (apat)*, if (he has) not (already done as written above (?)): “Get up and go forth to Hatti!, ...

5.4.3.2. The expression *apa-* (+N) referring backward

In the previous section I concluded that forward referring *apa-* is used in Argument Focus context. The same question can be asked for backward reference. When the propositional content is salient and still referred to by *apa-*, it seems reasonable to assume that *apa-* is here Focal too. The material to support this is presented in 5.4.3.2.1.

But usually propositional contents are not salient. In that situation one may use *apa-N* (besides *ka-N* and *asi N*). This will be discussed in 5.4.3.2.2.

5.4.3.2.1. Referring to salient entities

When a main clause is processed by the Addressee, the element that might be a further topic of discourse is usually not the propositional content of the clause but one of the entities expressed in the Subject or the Object. There are however exceptions. Conditional clauses make their propositional content salient for further discourse besides simply introducing some first order entity. This means that if the content of the clause subsequently is referred to, the continuity procedure may be used. In the apodosis of a conditional clause we therefore expect to find anaphoric pronouns, not only for first order but also for higher order entities. In case of *apa-* we always have Argument Focus (usually Expanding Focus, see Chapter 7). With the Focal pronoun205:

---

204 Otten l.c. differently, followed by CHD P: 104 “... tat ich jenes nicht <im Sinne> eines Vergehens”, with backward reference of the pronoun *apa-*, whereas I take *apat papratar* together in forward reference.

205 See also NH KBo 5.4 obv. 23’, 27’, 33’, rev. 23’, 32’, 42’, 49’, 54’ (treaty, CTH 67), KUB 6.41 iv 14, KUB 19.54 i 6 (treaty, CTH 68), KUB 21.2+ iii 55, 72 (CTH 76); lateNH KBo 4.10+ rev. 17 (CTH 106), KUB 26.12+ ii 10 (oath, CTH 255.1).
Like conditional clauses also the propositional content of a kuit clause may be considered salient:

Not only the pronoun apa- may be used to refer to salient discourse propositions in Focus, also apa- memiya-luttar is attested. The difference between apat/apez and apa- memiya-luttar is not clear to me:

In this section I present the expression apa- + N referring to discourse propositions not in the center of attention. I consider refersents as not in the center of attention if it does not fall into the classes described above.

Until now all discourse deictic apa-s appeared in Focal contexts, irrespective of Speaker, Addressee or Other. In order to investigate whether non-Focal apa- is connected with the Addressee or not we first need to distinguish between Focal and non-Focal apa- N. The method used here is quite provisional since the Hittite Focus structure is not completely understood, but there are some certain criteria which can be derived from part III. All apa- + N expressions with one of the Focus markers -ya (chapter 7) and -pat (chapter 8) and the

---

5.32 KUB 6.41 iv 6-7 (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68), ed. Friedrich 1926: 132-133

6 [(mān)]-kan ĖRIN.MEŠ=ma ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ yarri lammar ŬL a[ṛn(uṭṭī)]

7 [(nu+kan)] kāšma a-pa-a-at-ta-ta NEŠ DINGIR-LIM šarratti

But if you do not bring troops and horses warri lammar, you hereby break the oath of the gods also for that reason (apat=ya).

5.33 KUB 1.1 iii 59-61 (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 22-23

[(mān)]-kan ĖRIN.MEŠ=ma ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ yarri lammar ŬL a[ṛn(uṭṭī)]

But if you do not bring troops and horses warri lammar, you hereby break the oath of the gods also for that reason (apat=ya).

5.34 Bo 86/299 iii 3-8 (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106.1), ed. Otten 1988: 20-21

zilatiya=s kan 4 LUGAL-UTTA ŠA KUR URU-UTTA ŠA NUMUN mNIR.GAL 4U k uiški

In the future let noone take away the kingship of Tarhuntassa from the offspring of Muwatallis. (If) someone still does that (apat), (that is,) he gives it to some other relative of Muwatall and takes it away from the offspring of Kurunta, anyone who does that (apun) deed, (may the gods destroy him …)

Salient Focal apa- memiya-luttar is also attested in MH KB o 5.3+ iv 32 (treaty, CTH 42); NH KBo 3.3+ ii 28 (edict, CTH 63), KBo 5.4 rev. 15 (treaty, CTH 67), KBo 4.3 iv 18 (treaty, CTH 68), KUB 21.1+ iii 59 (treaty, CTH 76); lateNH Bo 86/299 ii 89 (treaty, CTH 106.1), KUB 26.12+ i 10 (oath, CTH 255.1), KUB 26.1 ii 23, ii 53, iv 51 (oath, CTH 255.2).
Unexpectedness marker -ma (chapter 9) can be safely ignored here. In chapter 8 I also describe apa- in preverbal position indicating Replacing Focus (‘not X, but Y’).

5.4.3.2.2.1. Non-saliency and Focus

The description of the Focus structure of Hittite in relation with apa- in part III does not cover every Focus expression. In order to find some others here I use the following rather subjective method. Each time I will try to decide whether apa- N corresponds to English ‘that N’ with accent on the demonstrative and ‘that N’ with accent on the substantive. The idea behind this is that the expression ‘that N’ implies that the referent of the substantive is somehow presupposed, whereas in ‘that N’ the referent of the substantive is asserted, presented as new. Besides that, accented that carries a notion of contrast or limitation. It must be clear from the context that there are other options possible. Thus, I take ‘that N’ as a Focus expression, and ‘that N’ not. See for example for ‘that N’ as Focus expression.

The initial position of apa already requires accentuation. But besides this, this rule of conduct states that desiring your sister-in-law sexually is exactly that kind of behavior that gets you killed. But being a good host does not.

The two men mentioned in obv. 1-2’ have performed one of the tasks they promised to do: ‘that they already did’ in contrast with the other task which could not yet be performed.

---

208 See also MH KBo 32.14 ii 23, 39, iii 6 (wisdom text), KBo 19.44+ rev. 2, 6 (treaty, CTH 42); NH KUB 14.4 iii 17 (indictment, CTH 70), KUB 21.38 obv. 2 (letter, CTH 176); lateNH KUB 50.6+ iii 43 (oracle CTH 569). An unclear example of apat with -ma probably referring to the propositional content of the previous broken context is KUB 14.4 ii 5-6 (CTH 70). For a discussion of the different proposals concerning these lines see De Martino 1998: 41-43. I do not further discuss this example because the referent of apat cannot be established with certainty. It could for example refer to the story told in the lost part of the tablet, or everything.

209 Alp l.c. differently: “Dann als Taruli (??) [ ] das Heer und Zilapiya [ ] die neuen Truppen heraufbrachten, welche Städte …” etc.
5.4.3.2.2. No saliency and no Focus

I could not subsume the *apa- + N* expressions in the following examples under Focus, which means that there were no other entities that could compete with *apa- N*. What they all have in common is that the referent of the expression is somehow related to the Addresssee.


As for the fact that you wrote as follows: “I have just sent the scouts […]. So they have [begun] scouting the cities Taggasta and Ukuduipuna. They (= the population of the cities?) are at the harvest (?) of the lattariyant-wheat. The river has withdrawn.” § Be called upon as before in this *(apat)* matter (of yours): Send out scouts, let them scout well. […]. Look, as for what I, My Majesty, already wrote to you: you must follow that *(apedani)* road (of yours) completely.

The matter of the cities is the responsibility of the Addresssee and it stays so for a while because the king tells him to continue his original actions without interfering himself.

The second *apa- in apedani* KASKAL-šī is a first mention of the road and also probably connected with the Addresssees.

In the next example ‘that matter’ refers to the appearance of the deity Lelwani in a dream. Lelwani is the Addresssee of this prayer and because the princess did not perform a ritual the deity has made her ill:

5.38 KBo 4.6 obv. 21'-26' (NH prayer, Mursili II, CTH 380), ed. Tischler 1981: 14-15

§ 21' INA URU Samuḫa kuvapi tik ḫelu[n]in *Gaussulijaujaš* 22 tuēl GEME-TU₄ ʿU-az aušta nū tuk ANA DINGIR-LIM apēdaš UD.KAM 23 ʿGaussulijaujaš tuēl GEME-TU₄ SISKUR ṢL ukiti pešta 24'[k]inuna kāša *Gaussulijaujaš* tuēl GEME-TU₄ ištarkiat 25*[n]=an GIG-anza tamašat namma=ḫši a-pa-a-at uṭtar 26*[n]akkijaḫtat At the time Gaussulijawiya, your servant, (while being) in Samuḫa, saw you, Lelwani in a dream, Gaussulawiya did not perform for you, o god, any ritual at all in those days. But now Gaussulijawiya, your servant, has fallen ill, and illness has kept her down. So then *(apat)* matter (concerning you) came to haunt her.

5.4.4. Summary and conclusion

---

210 Also MH HKM 10 obv. 13, HKM 54 obv. 5 (letters, CTH 199); NH KBo 5.4 obv. 30 (treaty, CTH 67), KUB 6.41 iv 14 (treaty, CTH 68), KUB 21.1+ iii 20 (treaty, CTH 76).

211 Restoration follows CHD S: 205a.

212 Alp o.c. 130 transliterates *a-pa-ša-ya* “Auch jener (Feind)?”. The sign PA in the handcopy looks more like MA, but could also be ENGUR (HZL 216) in view of the surface damage, thus leading to A.ENGUR = ID “river”.

196
In 5.4.2 it was described how the adverb of manner *apenissan* ‘likewise’ was basically used in the comparative structure *mahhan ... apenissan* ‘just as ... likewise’. This construction was related to Expanding Focus: ‘just as X, likewise Y’ = ‘X occurs in a certain way, also Y occurs in a certain way’. As a Focus adverb, *apenissan* was not limited to the cognitive domain of the Addressee but could also be used for the Speaker or the Other, often in backward reference and rarely in forward reference. The same was concluded for forward referring *apa- (+ N)*.

The results for backward referring *apa- (+ N)* were twofold. When the propositional content was salient, the phrase *apa- (+ N)* was each time Focal, irrespective of cognitive domain. The non-salient remainder consisted of two groups: the Focal *apa- + N* group and a very small number of non-Focal *apa- + N*. In the latter group *apa- + N* cooccurred with the Addressee. This fits the overall picture of the Addressee oriented semantics of *apa-* as described in the Situational and Recognitional sections. However, it is still possible that the examples which I could not explain by means of Focus are just that. In that case Discourse Deictic *apa-* is simply the Focal counterpart of *ka- (+ N)* and *asi (+ N)*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Deictic Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: The Discourse deictic *apa-* matrix.

5.5. The Tracking (= Anaphoric) Use of *apa-* with noun

5.5.1. Introduction

The tracking use of demonstratives is discussed in 2.3.3.4., 2.3.4. (both general discussions), 3.3.4., 3.4. (overview of Hittite) and 4.5. (the distal demonstrative *asi*).

The use of backward referring *apa-* *N* must be compared with backward referring *ka-* and *asi*. Only then the true nature of each backward referring demonstrative can be appreciated (see chapter 3.3.4. and 3.4.). Argument-Focal Tracking *apa-* *N* will be discussed in Chapters 7, 8 and 9. 213

213 The following enumeration contains all Focal *apa-* *N*-s in my corpus. For *Restricting Focus* we have: **MH IBoT** 1.36 iii 28 (instruction, CTH 262), KUB 24.4 rev. 13 (prayer, 376C); **NH KBo** 11.1 obv. 6, 7 (prayer, CTH 382).

**Expanding Focus:** **NH KBo** 3.4+ i 9 (annals, CTH 61 I), KUB 1.1+ iii 57-58 (egodocument, CTH 81), KUB 31.121 ii 18' (prayer, CTH 379), KUB 48.100+ rev. 8 (egodocument, CTH 486).

**Replacing Focus:** **MH KUB** 23.77+ rev. 54' (treaty, CTH 138), KBo 15.10+ i 17, 18 (ritual, CTH 443); **NH KUB** 19.49 i 64, iii 16, 18 (treaty, CTH 69).

What N ... *that N: MH KUB* 19.26 i 7' (or NH? prayer, CTH 44), KUB 23.72a+ obv. 47 (treaty, CTH 146), HKM 18 obv. 26, HKM 43 obv. 6' (letters, CTH 199); **NH KBo** 5.4 rev. 43 (treaty, CTH 67), KUB 6.41: 19 (treaty, CTH 68), KUB 21.1+ iii 46 (treaty, CTH 76), KUB 1.1 iv 63 (egodocument, CTH 81), 31.121 ii 22' (prayer, CTH 379).

Some N ... *that N: MH KBo* 19.44+ rev. 3, 9, 10 (treaty, CTH 42), KBo 5.3 + i 29 (MH/NS treaty, CTH 42), KUB 23.77+ rev. 60' (treaty, CTH 138), KUB14.1 obv. 24 (indictment, CTH 147); **NH KBo** 3.3+ i 17' (edict, 197
The hypothesis is that non-Focal apa- N is each time explicitly connected with the Addressee(s). In the next sections it will be tested whether this hypothesis is falsified or not.

5.5.2. The centering procedure

Major discourse discontinuities diminish the saliency of discourse entities. These discontinuities are caused by episodic changes, shifts in location, intervention by Reported Speech, and textual unit boundaries. In order to restore the saliency of a discourse entity lexical nounphrases are used, including the ones with a demonstrative determiner. The clearest indicators of discourse continuity in Hittite are reference across a paragraph line (5.5.2.1), the switch from Direct Speech to Narration (5.5.2.2.), the switch from modifier to argument (5.5.2.3.) and a rest group (5.5.2.4.).

5.5.2.1. Reference across a paragraph line

The next example was explicitly noted by Friedrich as an example of Du-Deixis (1991: 134, § 251), but rejected by Kammenhuber HW² A: 141b. The contrast with kez however reminds us of ex. 5.1 (kezza ... apezza “from here (from me) ... from there (from you)”). As with the category of discourse deixis, Addressee oriented Tracking apa- occurs in treaties, letters and instructions. Instead of explaining each time why I assume that apa- is Addressee oriented, I will present some additional information in parentheses in the translations. 214

5.39 KUB 21.1 iii 4-9, with duplicate KBo 12.36 (NH treaty, Muwattalli II, CTH 76), ed. Friedrich 1930: 66-69


---

214 See also MH HKM 24 rev. 48, rev. 53 (letter, CTH 199), HKM 27 obv. 8 (letter, CTH 199), discussed in chapter 3, ex. 3.43; KBo 5.3 + ii 54 (treaty, CTH 42); NH KUB 14.14 + rev. 23’ (prayer, CTH 378 II), discussed in chapter 3, ex. 3.40.

215 Written a-pé-ma.

216 Duplicate KBo 12.36+ ii 24’, 29’: a-pé-ez-za KUR-eza.
A Focal interpretation would mean ‘that prince’, implying that other princes should be left in peace when offending the king.


§ 3 [S]A URUGasipura kuit 4 GUD.HIA dati[a] n=an=zan 5 ŠA m[E[N-r]arauya manijahhiya 6 išhuyāitta
§ 7 kinuna=kan ŠA mEN-tarauya 8 manijahhiyaz ĖRIN.MEŠ annalin 9 ĖRIN.MEŠ ûrraša 10 le n[i]nikiš 11 nu=ššan a-pu-u-un 12 GUD.HIA EGU-an ēpu 13 n=an=za kan KIN-az le 14 šamēzzi §

As for the fact that you have taken the oxen from Gasipura: you shall disperse them (lit. it) to the administrative unit of Ishatarauwa.

You shall not mobilize veterans and auxiliary troops now from the unit of mr. Ishatarauwa. He must take back those (apun) oxen (which are your responsibility). He must not refrain from work.

A Focal interpretation would mean ‘that oxen’, implying that there are other oxen to choose from which Ishatarauwa might take back.

5.5.2.2. From Direct Speech to Narration

Another major discourse boundary is the transition from Direct Speech to Narration:


§ 3 kiššan=nu kuit ḥatrašš 4 kāššu=ya 1.0 KUR uit 5 nu=ya=za 1.0 Haparan innishšan 6 tamasta 1.0 Kašipuran=ma=ya=za kan 7 kēz tamasta apasi=ma 18=ya=za kan 8 ištarna arha uit 9 namma=wa<->aš kuşapi pait 10 nu=ya=za=šš OL IDI
§ 11 nu ap-a-a-aš LUKUR 12 alyanzahiṣanza imma 13 ēšṭa n=an OL 14 šakta<š>

Concerning that you have written to me like this: “The enemy has just arrived. He besieged the city Hapara in that way, but Kasipura he besieged from this side. He (then), surprisingly219, came right through. Where he went next, I have no idea.”

Was that (apas) enemy (under your responsibility) perhaps bewitched, that you did not know about him?

---

217 See also MH HKM 36 obv. 7 (letter, CTH 199), treated in Chapter 3 as ex. 3.47; HKM 54 obv. 26 (letter, CTH 199), treated in Chapter 3 as ex. 3.69.

218 The sign -ma is not present in Alp’s transliteration, but drawn in his hand copy.

219 See Chapter 9 for -al-ma and apa- indicating surprise.
5.5.2.3. From modifier to argument

In 2.3.4.3. I mentioned that modifiers, including genitives are not salient, see ex. 2.65, repeated here (see Cornish o.c. 162 ff. for discussion and references):

5.43 [Personal letter to Cornish, 1989]
Could you send me your *Journal of Semantics* article? We don’t have that in our library [the writer is referring here to the University of Bradford library]

A similar situation is encountered in the next letter:

And what you [w]rote to me about the case [o]f the enemy, be very [a]ler t toward that (apedani) enemy until I have finished the oracle inquiry (about it) [...]  

There are however other clauses of the same type in which only LUKÚR is expressed (HKM 1 rev. 11-13, HKM 6 rev. 15-16, rev. 24-left edge 1, HKM 8 rev. 18-19, HKM 22 obv. 6-7, HKM 30 obv. 5-6). The difference with the expression with apa- is that the others are either neutral in regard to speech-participant or clearly not only a matter for the Addressee but also for the king. In ex. 5.44 the king orders the Addressee to be alert toward the enemy until he knows what to do himself. The king cannot yet undertake any action before the oracle has spoken, and therefore the enemy is for the moment only the responsibility of the Addressee. Compare this with the next example:

5.45 HKM 1 obv. 4-13 (MH/MS letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 121-122
What you wrote to me about the case of the enemy: “The enemy holds [Gasas]a ... § I have just send out the cavalry. Be very alert toward the enemy.

This time the king already has taken some actions, so th enemy is not the responsibility of the Addressee alone. The same is true of HKM 8 where the king has given some advise and HKM 22 where the king has sent some troops. HKM 30 is neutral, there are no other statements connected with our phrase.

5.5.2.4. Other contexts

Finally there are some attestations that fall outside the other categories, all from CTH 63. This treaty is remarkable given the clustering of apa- NAMRA.MES “those deportees” (KBo 3.3+ iiii 4', 6', 8', 12', 20', 25').

---

200 Alp o.c. 152 reads [h]atrā[es] apēdani ... With this reading the reflexive particle -za is lacking which is generally present in this type of clause (see for example HKM 6 rev. 15) and in 2nd person nominal clauses in general. I therefore propose [h]atrā<es> [nu za] apēdani ....
5.46 **KBo 3.3+ iii 3'-5'** (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 63), ed. Klengel 1963: 37

\[ nu \, k\text{"un} \, m\text{"em\text{"i\text{"an},} \, ku\text{"uat} \, t\text{"i\text{"atten} \, QATAMMA \, nu = s\text{"i\text{"e} = kan} \, a-pu-u-u\text{"i} \, NAM.RA.ME\text{"S} \, ANA \, m\text{"Duppi}{\text{"4}\text{"u} \, ar\text{"ha} \, da\text{"skitteni}} \]

Why have you (pl.) done this (following) deed like this (QATAMMA)? You keep taking those (apus) deportees away from him, from Duppi-Tessup.

This group of *apa-*s seems to contradict what I have said about the Addressee orientation of *apa-* since *apa-* is clearly not connected with the 'you' but with Duppi-Tessub. However, Duppi-Tessub is also one of the Addressees of this treaty. If one compares this with ex. 5.12 we see a Situational *apa-* referring to some person in relation to the Addressee 'you'. Just as in ex. 5.12 the *apa-* person is maybe not directly addressed, but still a member of the larger group of Addressees.

5.5.3. The continuity procedure

I already listed the Focal *apa-*'s which needed to be excluded from the discussion in order to find out to what cognitive domain *apa-* belonged. There are very few examples of *apa-* N referring to salient entities which were not listed there but which still are Focal. These few cases are not only Focal but also Addressee oriented. A remarkable fact about these examples is that *apa-* is *postposed* to its substantive (see also Chapter 8.5.5.).


\[ \text{ANA} \, \text{SH\text{"e} = YA} \, \text{kui\text{"i} = ZI\text{"[-ni \, \text{l\text{"}um\text{"a\text{"shi} \, ammu\text{"x = ma = an} \, ANA \, \text{SH\text{"e} = YA} \, UL \, namma \, i\text{"i\text{"ami} = m\text{"\text{"a\text{"n = UL \, kui\text{"t = IDI = nu = ANA \, \text{SH\text{"e} = YA} \, \text{lum\text{"a\text{"shi} = n\text{"a-pu-u-un} \, D\text{"U = ni} \]

As for the annoyance [to the] soul of my brother, I shall not inflict it anymore upon my brother. If I don’t know anything, I will inflict that (apun) annoyance upon my brother.

The annoyance was already inflicted upon the Addressee, the pharaoh, and therefore *apa-* can indicate Addressee orientation besides Focus. The next example is similar:


\[ \text{\$} \, m\text{"an = kan} \, \text{dU} \, \text{DINGIR-LUM} \, \text{KUR-TI} \, \text{kui\text{"i\text{"ki} \, TUKU.TUKU-nut} \, \text{kinuna} \, \text{dA.NUN.NA.KI} \, \text{dU\text{"an} \, ANA \, \text{DINGIR-LIM} \, a-p\text{"e = e-da-n[i} \, \text{mena} \, h\text{"anda} \, \text{tak\text{"sul\text{"an}du} \]

If some god of the country has angered the Stormgod, (then) let now the netherworld deities reconcile the Stormgod with that (apedani) god.'

Here the Addressee, the Stormgod is already angry because of some other deity, which is therefore in his cognitive domain.

5.5.4. Summary and conclusion

---

\[ 221 \text{According to Kammenhuber 1975: 133b postposed adjectival *apa-* occurs in "emphatischer Sprache". The problem with this formulation is that also preposed *apa-* is usually 'emphatic' as we have seen.} \]

---

201
All attestations of non-Argument Focal *apa- N* were connected with the Addressee. Most of these *apa- N* referred across node, and were therefore not salient. The *apa-Ns* in Argument Focus on the other hand occur always inside a discourse unit and are therefore salient. Besides these two groups there is possibly a third one which combines the two: Addressee orientation and Focality. Where this was noticed, *apa-* occurred postposed to its substantive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anaphoric Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuity procedure (in node)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4: The Anaphoric *apa-* matrix.

### 5.6 Conclusions

Based on the material of the four sections on Situational Use, Recognitional Use, possibly Discourse Deictic Use, and Tracking Use it can be concluded that non-Argument Focal *apa-* is the Medial demonstrative, belonging to the domain of the Addressee. This is at least certain in Middle Hittite times, but there is also some evidence for Addressee orientation in Old Hittite. The latter evidence strengthens the case for Distal or Other oriented *asi* in Old Hittite.

Table 5.5. combines all previous tables (in the NPs the accented elements are underlined).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>geographical parameter</th>
<th>cognitive parameter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continuity procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Deictic in node</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across-node</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking in node</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across node</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5: The *apa-* matrix.