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6. The proximal demonstrative ka-

6.1. Status Quaestionis

6.1.1. Former views on the proximal demonstrative ka-

In contrast to the morphology and etymology of ka- ‘this’, the different uses of this proximal demonstrative have never been the subject of extensive study, probably because its meaning has been clear from the beginning (Hrozný 1917)\(^{222}\). Remarks on the use of ka- hardly ever exceeded references to the Latin deictic system.\(^{223}\) Usually the demonstrative ka- is seen as the functional opposite of apa-, but as I have shown in chapter 3, 4 and 5, the Hittite productive demonstrative system consists of at least three terms: proximal ka-, medial apa- (see chapter 5) and distal asi (see chapter 4). The existence of an additional term for remote deixis raised the question whether Hittite had a distance-based or person-based system (with two terms this is impossible to decide). I concluded that the medial term apa- indicated position near the Addressee, wherever that Addressee was located in relation to the Speaker. The person orientation of ka- and apa- was also noted by Friedrich 1960 and Puhvel 1984ff. (for more discussion see 3.1.3. and 5.1.2.).

Most information on the use of ka- is to be gained from Friedrich 1960: 134. Aside from the comparison with Latin, Friedrich made three observations:

1. ka- refers forward, apa-, eni- and asi refer backward (o.c. 134, §§ 249, 250, 251). He did not state this literally but the reader has to infer it from § 249-251, of which § 251 is conclusive: “Mit dieser Verteilung der beiden Gruppen auf Vor- und Rückdeutung ...”.
2. At the same time ka- can also refer to the first person (Ich-Deixis) and apa- to the second and third person (Du-Deixis and Jener-Deixis) (§ 251, see also Friedrich 1930: 94f., 141f.). Thus, the combination ka- N ... apa- N means something like ‘my N ... your N’. Similarly, kâ means ‘here with me’ and apiya ‘there with you’ or ‘there with him’.
3. As a result of this orientation on person it is even possible that ka- and kissan refer backwards in connection with first person. From Friedrich 1930: 141 I quote:

\(^{222}\) Hrozný 1917: 140 (“dieser”, selten “jener”. The latter translation is not supported by the Hittite material), Forrer 1922: 207-208 (“dieser da”, still mistakenly assuming the existence of taš, “dieser hier”), Pedersen 1938: 48 (“dieser”), id. Kammenhuber 1969: 213, 310 etc. etc.

\(^{223}\) ka- = ‘hic’ versus apa- = ‘is’ (Benveniste 1953: 255); ka- = ‘dieser, hic’, apa- = ‘jener, der, is’ (Friedrich HE: 66), and ka- = ‘hic’, apa- = ‘is’, eni- = ‘ille’, asi- = ‘iste’ (o.c. 134); ka- = ‘dieser, hic’, apa- = ‘jener, er, der betreffende; is’ (Tischler 1977ff.: 39, 456); kalki- = ‘hic’, aba- = ‘ille’ (Laroche 1979: 148, 152); ka- = ‘this (one), the (following) one; my, mine, our(s), apa- = ‘that, thy, thine’ “like Lat. hic vs. iste” (Puhvel K: 3); ka- = ‘hic’, sya- = ‘iste’, apa- = ‘ille’, -a- = ‘is’, apasila = ‘ipse’ (Neu 1997: 148 n. 39).
That ka- is the proximal demonstrative ‘this’ is without doubt. However, much more can be said on the function of ka-. First I will classify ka- according to the four categories of demonstrative use (Situational, Recognitional, Anaphoric and Discourse Deictic) which are familiar by now (sections 6.2 to 6.5.). For an explanation of this terminology see the preceding chapters. Besides these four categories we have also forward reference to objects by means of ka-, which was not attested for the other demonstratives (section 6.6.)

One of the questions that will be addressed is to what extent the proximal demonstrative is Speaker oriented. Of course the other chapters already have shown that Hittite has a person-based demonstrative system, but one should still want to find independent proof of this for ka-. Another question is whether it is indeed surprising that ka- refers backward, compared to its forward referring function.

Another point which needs to be discussed is how contrastive pairs are expressed in Hittite. In English contrastive pairs are expressed as ‘this and/or that’, but cross-linguistically this is not the only way to do so (section 6.7).

6.2. The Situational Use of ka-

6.2.1. Introduction

There are three situational contexts for ka-: true situational use (6.2.2.) and Direct Speech (6.2.3.), and linguistic selfreference (6.2.4.). The Topic-Focus distribution will be described in the conclusion (6.2.5.).

6.2.2. True situational use

There are many examples of true situational use of ka-. When one wants to refer to a location in association with the Speaker, the Place Deictic adverbs kez (older ket) ‘on this side’ and ka ‘here’ are used (6.2.2.1.). But naturally not only places are referred to, also objects located in an area associated with the Speaker can be indicated by means of ka- (6.2.2.2.).
6.2.2.1. The place deictic adverbs ket, kez, ka and kani

The adverb of relative position *ket* / *kez* 'on this side (of)', often in relation with *edi* / *edez* 'on the other side' indicates an area relative to some point of reference. This point of reference is not necessarily the same as the deictic center. In the next two examples the point of reference is a river. The place deictic adverbs refer to locations at both sides of the river in case of ex. 6.1. and one side of the river in ex. 6.2 as seen from the deictic center.

6.1 KBo 6.2 i 48-50, § 22 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 31-32

§ 48 *[takku ARAD-äš huș̄āi n-zān āppa kuiši uyatezzi takku mamminkuuan ē[pzi]i nu-ešše KUB-SIR-uš paî takku ke-e-et Īd-az 2 GIN KU.BABBAR paî 49 takku e-edi Īd-az nu-ešše 3 GIN KU.BABBAR paî §*

If a male slave runs away and someone brings him back: if he captures (him) nearby, he gives him shoes. If (he captures him) on this side (*ket*) of the river, he gives 2 sheqels of silver. If (he captures him) on that side (*edi*) of the river, he gives him 3 sheqels of silver.

The river mentioned in this law must be the Maramsantic river (Halys) surrounding the central country of Hatti. The deictic center is Hatti (Melchert 1977: 154). Another example where the point of reference is a river, this time with only *kez*, the NH counterpart of *ket*.

6.2 KBo 4.3 i 30-32 (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68), ed. Friedrich 1926: 118-119

*nāšma-sta dUTU-šī 31 kuši ke-e-ez ĪSTU ĪdAstarpa Ū ĪSTU ĪdSianna ŪL 32 [k]uški ADDN zik-ma-kan ZAG-an šarrati nu-za datti kuški*

Or (if), though (kušī I), My Majesty, have not given you anything on this side (*kez*) of the rivers Astarpa and Siyanda, you (still) violate the border and take something ...

In both examples the adverb *ket* / *kez* points at an area in the sphere of influence of the Speaker, i.e., the king or Hatti.

Summarizing, areas relative to some location other than the Deictic Center are often referred to by means of *ket* ... *edi*, *kez* ... *edez*. In one case (ex. 6.3) Melchert believes that the deictic force of *ket* ... *edi* should not be taken seriously (1977: 171). He assumes that, as in English, 'on this side and that' may evolve into 'on one side and the other'. But as we will see, this type of deictic contrast is expressed by *ket* ... *ket* / *kez* ... *kez* and, when referring to objects, by *ka-* ... *ka-*.

To return to Melchert’s example, cited below, what then does *ket* ... *edi* mean in ex. 6.3?

6.3 KBo 17.15 rev.¹ 14'-16' (OS ritual, CTH *645.6), ed. Neu 1980a: 73-74

[(UGULA LÜ.MEŠMUHALDIM)15] haššāš katta ke-e-et arta VI ĪJAR-n[ā]iSAR harzi L[U lêštâ] 16' haššāš katta e-di paršanān harzi VI ĪJAR-n[ā]iSAR harzi

The Head of the cooks stands near the hearth on the near side (*ket*). He holds 6 harnai-plants. The hesta-man is squatting near the hearth on the far side (*edi*). He holds 6 harnai-plants.

²²⁴ The formal aspects of *ket*, *kez*, *ka* and *kani* will not be discussed here. For literature and discussion see for example Melchert 1977, Puhvel K., Neu 1980b, 1997.

Although the actions described in the rituals often elude us, one could imagine the following:

There are two persons who have to stand besides the hearth. The cook is allowed to stand upright on the side of the hearth towards the Speaker, who is the main participant in the ritual and therefore the Deictic Center. For some reason the hesta-man has to squat at the far (yonder) side of the hearth. Like the rivers in exx. 6.1 and 6.2 the hearth is a point of reference with a near and a far side from the viewpoint of the Speaker.

When there is only one point of reference without the involvement of the Deictic Center or when the Deictic Center itself is the only point of reference, its sides are expressed by means of ket ... ket, or kez ... kez. The proper translation in this case is 'one side (of ...), the / another side (of ...):'

6.4 KBo 8.74 + rev. iii 16'-18' (OS ritual, CTH *752.1A), ed. Neu 1980a: 223

Puhvel H: 198f. translates the construction as 'hither and yon upon altars' (italics mine). But as Melchert notes (1977: 154ff.), a directional ablative or an instrumental (or endless locative?) demonstrative pronoun is either combined with a dative or genitive in Old Hittite if there is no other point of reference. In all examples with ket ... ket or kez ... kez the demonstratives denote position at the side of an object and not on top of it, as the following example clearly shows:


Melchert assumes for cases like the ones mentioned above that the deictic force of kez 'on this side' had bleached to come to mark any direction of an object (o.c. 197).

The adverb of relative position ket can also occur without its counterpart:

226 Melchert I.c.: "In general, when a directional ablative is construed with a preceding dative (or genitive in Old Hittite), the latter is the sole point of reference for defining the direction expressed by the ablative: haššas / hašši tapušta 'to the side of / beside the hearth'. When the directional ablative is accompanied by another ablative, the direction expressed is also defined in terms of another, unexpressed reference point: Namsahas arahza 'outside of (= beyond) the hašši-stone' (as viewed from the city X)'.
6.6 KBo 17.3+ iii 25-27, with OS duplicate KBo 17.1+ iii 25ff. (OS ritual, CTH 416.1A), ed. Neu 1980a: 15
[(iMÁS.GAL-)]ri garau[ni]zš[(i)] 26 muri[jale]([š gangante])š ke-e-et-ta gar[auni]zši ]
27 muri[jalas] [g]angantē
At the horn of a he-goat grape-breads are hanging, and also, grape-breads are hanging on [his] hor[n] on the other side (kett=a)227.

Starke (1977: 138, with discussion on p. 73) interprets kett-a as the instrumental in causal function: 'und (zwar) dadurch' instead of locational 'on this side'. One argument in favor of his interpretation would be that this is the only case where kett-a is not part of a couple (Starke o.c. p. 73228). However, all clauses in my corpus that contain ket ... ket / kez ... kez have the same predicates. The only thing in ex. 6.6 that is different from ket ... ket / kez ... kez clauses, is that the first ket is not expressed, otherwise both clauses have the same predicates. As I will discuss in Chapter 7 on apa-, coordinated clauses with ŋya cliticized on the first NP have to be symmetrical. In such a case one clause cannot be subordinate to the other, either syntactically or semantically. It is therefore impossible to assign a causal relation to any other semantically subordinate relation to the members of a coordination as Starke does.229

A later example which is similar to ex. 6.6 is:

6.7 KBo 32.14 ii 26-30 (MH/MS wisdomtext), ed. Neu 1996: 79
A deer: he is allowed to graze (only) those meadows that are alongside the river. But as for the meadows that are on the other side (kezi=), on those too he sets (his) [yes].

From these examples one can conclude that distance was not of importance for the couple ket ... ket / kez ... kez. However, as explained in Chapter 2, deixis is not necessarily based on distance. In a person-based deictic system one expects that orientation around the Speech participants is much more important than distance from the Speaker. Thus, ka- ... ka- can indicate any side of the Speaker (or temporarily shifted Deictic Center). In contrast with orientation on the Speaker only, the expression ka- ... apa- points at locations in the domain of the Speaker (ka-) and Addressee (apa-) respectively, and ka- ... asi at the domain of the Speaker (and Addressee or Audience) versus outside the domain of Speaker + Addressee.

The preceding examples illustrated location at the sides of some point of reference. But points of reference themselves have to be located too. The location of the Speaker and his audience is expressed by means of Old Hittite kani230 and Middle and New Hittite ka “here”:

227 Contra Neu 1980b: 21 “bei einem Ziegenbock, an seinem Horn . . . und hier an seinem Horn”.

228 “Im übrigen gibt die Übersetzung „auf dieser Seite“ hier überhaupt keinen Sinn, weil das Pendant fehlt.”

229 On p. 74 Starke indeed refers to the necessarily symmetrical property of clauses joined by ŋya. He does not seem to apply this symmetry to the semantic level and therefore translates kett-a as an instrumental ‘und (zwar) dadurch’.

230 Otten 1973: 27 tries to relate kani “hier” to an alleged kân which should mean something like “thus”. In this he is followed by Puhvel K: 47 who lists kan under kani. Otten o.c. 27-28 reads ka-a-na-at (kan(-at)) “thus it” in KUB 41.23 ii 20’ (see below for a transcription of lines 18'-21’ with a new reading for ka-a-na-at). The adverb kan ‘thus, likewise’ would replace the expected QATAMMA ‘likewise’. Besides the introduction of the instrumental not attested descriptive adverb of manner, one also must assume that the enclitic neuter pronoun -at in ka-a-na-at refers proleptically to two concepts of common gender išansana(š)žmīš (mistakenly written -šmīt) karazžmīš-sa ‘their soul and their innards (= their inmost soul)’. These problems may be avoided if
6.8 KBo 22.1 obv. 4'-6' (OS instruction, CTH 272), ed. CHD S: 23
kiššan AWAT ABI=YA 5 paḫšanuten takku šumeš natta šaktēni 6 ka-ani LUŠU.GI-
ešša NU.GAL nu=smaš memai AWAT ABI=YA
Is this the way you have protected the word of my father? 231 If you do not know, are there not old men here (kani) 232 too? (One of them) can tell you my father's word.

6.9 KBo 2.2 i 12-14 (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 124-125
§ 12 mān dUTU-ST 4 tapaššaš 13 a-pi-ia-pát ŠA KUR URU Nerikka 14 yemižazi ka-a=ma ŪL...
If the fever will befall My Majesty only there (apiya=pat), in the country of Nerik, but not here (ka), ...

If the general location expressed by ka needs to be more specified, ka can be accompanied by an apposition:

§ 17 ŠA ERIN.MEŠ=ma=mu kuit uttar ḫatrāēš 18 nu=mu ka-a katti-mi ĖRIN.MEŠ KUR.UGU 19 ĖRIN.MEŠ KUR URU Išḫāpitta kuṣki 20 n=an=da uppaḫḫī §
Now, as for the affair of the soldiers about which you wrote to me, some soldiers of the Upper Country (and some) soldiers of the country of Ishupitta (are) here (ka), with me (katti=mi). I will send them to you.

§ 1 ka-a-ia INA Ė-K[A] 2 [h]ūman SIG3-in
Also here (ka=ya), in your house (INA Ė-K[A]), everything is well.

Finally, ka ... ka, ‘here(to) ... there(to)’ (literally ‘here(to) ... here(to)’) is used to express different locations near the (shifted) Deictic Center.

ḫalziššaniz=ma 46 me-i-ni-ši-ē-la-a-ū-zä mi-e-ya₃ tarkummanzi=ma kiššan 47 ka-a=ya 20 IKU.ḪI.A parḥāi ka-a=ma=ya! 7 IKU.ḪI.A parḥāi
They call “meinišiellāuza mienya”. They translate as follows: “He makes (them) gallop 20 IKU in one direction (ka), and 7 IKU in another direction (ka)”.

6.2.2.2. The demonstrative pronoun and determiner ka-

one reads ka-a UD' at instead of ka-a-na-at. KUB 41.23 ii 18'-21' (OH/NS) now becomes 14 šiunan dUTU-UI marnu=an mān šūšarr a 19 an<da> kulamāti štazana(s)=šmiš karaz(s)=šmiš =a 20 1-iš kišat ka-a UD' at DINGIR šiunan dUTU-ES labar[našš-a] 21 štazana(s)=šmit karaz(s)=šamišš-a 1-iš kišar 'O Sungod of the gods, as marnu-drink and beer have been blended (and) their mind and heart (lit. innards) have become one, let to-day the mind and heart of the Sungod of the gods [and of ] the Labar[na] become one! ' The closely related texts KUB 43.61 and its duplicate KUB 43.63 also contain the expression ka-a UD-at 'today'.

231 See example 6.38 for this translation.
232 CHD Š p. 23 translates kani as 'there'.
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In this section I will discuss reference to objects in the speech situation. In order to find textual references to the outside world, it should first be clear that the object referred to by ka- was present when the text/utterance was produced and second, the expression ka- (+ noun) should be a first mention. Nothing prevents a Speaker from referring deictically a second time, but with only textual evidence at hand one cannot easily distinguish between a second deictic or anaphoric reference (Anaphoric reference will be discussed in 6.5.). Another complication is the often sad state of the tablets. Especially when the tablet is damaged, which is often the case, the first mention criterion is hard to uphold. The examples in this section without commentary on the state of the tablet are all broken but whenever I present a true first mention I will say so explicitly.

A unique example of a text referring to an object which with the text is closely connected, is the cuneiform Hittite draft of the Hieroglyphic Luvian Nišantaş inscription. The Nišantaş text seems to be a building inscription accompanying an elevated hekur, a stone sanctuary, constructed by Suppiluliam (II). In the cuneiform draft we find references to both the hekur and a statue of Tudhaliya IV which resides inside this structure:

6.13  **KBo 12.38** **ii** 4'-10' (lateNH draft for statue inscription, Suppiluliam, CTH 121), ed. Güterbock 1967: 76, 78

§ 4' **ki-i-mazza ALAM [ABUzYA (?)]** 5' **mTudhaliyaš U[L 1-aš DÜ-at (?)]** 6' **üqq=a z a** 8**mKÜ.GA.P[U-aš LUGAL.GAL] ... 10' **išanun §**

Now, this (ki) statue [my father] Tudhaliya did not make (it) [alone (?)], also I, Suppiluliam, ..., made it.233

6.14  **KBo 12.38** **iv** 3'-4' (lateNH draft for building inscription, Suppiluliam, CTH 121), ed. Güterbock 1967: 77-78

**nu-šši ku-u-un**234 **NAshekur SAG.UŠ** 4' **[ük]**  **mKÜ.GA.PÚ-aš LUGAL.GAL yeđaḥḥun** §

It is [I], Suppiluliam, Great King, who built this (kun) Everlasting Stone Sanctuary for him.

Besides this unique draft we have otherwise only texts that were spoken aloud in the presence of an object or person or at some location. This is not very different from direct speech reference to an object or location described in the preceding text (see section 6.2.3.). Ex. 6.16 is comparable to the symbolic deixis of ex. 2.24, repeated here as 6.15:

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

6.16  **KUB 43.23** rev. 19'-21' (OS benediction, CTH 820), ed. Archi 1979a: 34

**nu-za l ŠA[I] māḥhan 20' ŠA[I].TUR.HI.A mekkus haškizzi ke-e-el-ла-az ṢA gšKIRIĜEŠTIN** 21' **1-ašš=a gšmāḥlaš ŠA-I-aš ijar mūriš 22' mekkus haškiddu**

Just as one sow bears many piglets, let also every single branch of this (kel) [vinelyard, like the sow, bear many (grape) clusters.

---

233 In order to account for the particle -ya “also” in ü-uq-qa-at I have inserted ‘1-aš’ in the break to express that also Suppiluliam worked on the statue. It is possible that the statue was erected by Tudhaliya but that his son inscribed Tudhaliya’s deeds on it.

234 Note the regular common gender for hekur (Rieken 1999: 287f.).
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Although the objects and locations in the preceding examples might also be anaphoric, the person referred to by *ka-* in ex. 6.17 is truly mentioned for the first time:


§10 *ka-a-aš kuis ṭašanda* 11 ARAD LÚ DUMU SANGA *URU Urišta* 12 *ēšzi nu zaškan MUNUS URUGašša* 13 *yašta<š?>*

As for this (kas) *kašanda* who is the servant of the man of the son of the priest of Urista: he has sinned with a woman from (the city) Gassa.

That Kastanda is really present when the tablet is read to the Addresssees (a military governor and one Huillu) is clear from the following lines, obv. 13-24: ‘Himmuili and Tahuamuwa, two men from Hassarpanda, have taken her away from him. § Now, I have just sent you Kastanda, servant of the man of the son of the priest. Judge his case and bring it to conclusion!’.

But also something as elusive (to us) as an oath deity 235 is considered present at the conclusion of a treaty or instruction:

6.18KBo 16.24+ i 46'-49' (MH/MS instruction, CTH 251), ed. Rizzi Mellini 1979: 522-523

§ 46' *našma? ėššan kuis kūrū ṭara galantanka nu kiššan 47' [imma t]ezzi man-ya ini kūrū ṭara ḫarakzi nu kiššan 48' [(imma t)]ezzi man-ya ini [kūrū]r 49' *[par(ā a)]lpuēšzi [nu] apūn ke-e NĪŠ DINGIR.MeasureSpec*

Or (if) someone is completely fed up with war and speaks as follows: “Would but that war utterly disappear!”, and speaks as follows: “Would but that war ……”, (then) let these (ke) oaths deities grab that one, …

Finally I present some instances of Time Deixis although expressions of time are not of major concern in this study. The moment, day or year of the text is referred to by means of *ka-* 236:

6.19KUB 43.23 obv. 3-5 (OS benediction, CTH 820)

*mān-az kardīmijanza* 4 [ ] kardimijat kan ke-e-ṭi UD-ṭi arḥa peššaddu 5 mān-az *tamatattama KUR-ṬA n=an tamēṭa* 6 [KUR-az ụqatetten]

If he is angry, let him throw away (his anger) on this (keti) day. But if he is in another country, you must bring him from (that) other country.

6.201043/u iv 11-12 (NH vow, Puduhepa & Hattusili, CTH 585), ed. Otten & Souček 1965: 34-36237

11 *MU V.KAM ka-a-aš kuš KAM-z[(a) parā uiz]zi n=az=kan* 12 *[k]arū anda appānza [.....]*

*...*, fifth year. This (kas) year that is (still) going on, has [a]lready been included.

---

235 Besides the cited example, also in OH KBo 9.73+ obv. 9' (treaty, CTH 27); MH KBo 5.3+ ii 4, 11, 31, 43, 54, iv 33', KUB 26.37 12', 14', KUB 23.74+ 9', KUB 26.38 10' (treaty, CTH 42), KBo 16.46 obv. 12', 18' (CTH 212), KBo 16.24+ i 5', 13', 75', ii 20', iv 6 (instruction with oath, CTH 251A), KUB 31.114 ii 15' (CTH 271); NH KUB 21.1+ iv 33, 38 (treaty, CTH 76); lateNH Bo 86/299 iv 10, 16, 28 (treaty, CTH 106A), KBo 4.10+ rev. 5, 12, 19 (treaty, CTH 106B), KUB 26.43 + rev. 20, 21 (landgrant, CTH 225), KUB 26.12+ i 30, ii 11, 22, 28 (instruction with oath, CTH 255.1), KUB 26.1 iii 44 (instruction with oath, CTH 255.2).

236 And in Direct Speech: KBo 4.14 ii 33 (lateNH treaty, CTH 123).

237 Time expressions occur also in KUB 6.45+ iii 20, 21 (prayer, CTH 381), KBo 11.1 rev. 17 (prayer, CTH 382).
6.2.3. Direct Speech

The criterion for inclusion of \textit{ka-} (+N) in the category of Direct Speech is first mention, with the further restriction that the Direct Speech is not part of a larger citation. Both non-first mention and citation from a larger part of text are not necessarily deictic. Given the fact that anaphoric references of \textit{ka-} are widely attested (see section 6.5.), one cannot be certain whether second mentions in citations are truly deictic. However, for some likely attestations of this type of mixed deictic/anaphoric reference, see section 6.5.4.

Besides isolating deictic references in Direct Speech it is possible to establish whether the extra-linguistic object is salient or not. Often the narration preceding the Direct Speech provides information on the cognitive status of the object(s) in the situation. If for example the object is described and clearly manipulated by the Speaker or someone in the presence of the Speaker, one can be rather certain that the object is already salient, in the center of attention before it is mentioned. If such clues are absent on the other hand, one should consider the object not-salient.

Using this criterion, a pattern appears: the pronominal demonstrative \textit{ka-} is used when an object is salient, and a demonstrative description \textit{ka-} + \textit{N} is used when the object is not salient.

6.2.3.1. The continuity procedure: the demonstrative pronoun \textit{ka-}

In all the following examples the referent of \textit{ka-} is salient. Giving birth to 30 children at once necessarily brings this event in the center of attention:

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

\begin{verbatim}
  1
  MUNUS.LUGAL URU Kaniš XXX DUMU.MEŠ İ-EN MU-anti ḥāšta UMMA SI=MA
  2
  [ki-]i=ya kuit yalkuan ḥâš Hun
\end{verbatim}

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

In the following two examples the referent of \textit{ka-} is manipulated by the Speaker and obviously in the center of attention:

6.22  **KBo 15.10+ ii 12-16** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szábo 1971: 20-21

\begin{verbatim}
  12 [QAD]U kurdâli idalâmuš EME.ḪA arba šuḫhair \textsuperscript{13} [nu k]iššan mēmir ke-e māḥhan ḥarkanzi \textsuperscript{14} [Z]išša BELAM QADU DAM-SU DUMU.MEŠ\textsuperscript{15} [Z]U kuit iššiša [nu š]A [Z]i alyanzatar=šet idâlu uddâr=šet QATAMMA \textsuperscript{16} [ḫara]kdu n=at=apa
  EGIR-pa lê uizzı §
\end{verbatim}

[With the kurdali vessel they threw away the evil tongues. They spoke [as follows: “Just as these (ke) are destroyed, given the fact that Zi regularly acted against the lord, his wife (and) children, may likewise the sorcery of Zi (and) her evil words [peris]h, let them not come back!”]
6.23 **KBo 15.10+ ii 23-26** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szabó 1971: 24-25

nu tūruppu šah ša a duššanna ni ANA dIM ŠU DINGIR.L ŠU ANA dUTU ŠU DINGIR.LU.ŠU 25 πiran zikizzi ni kiššan mēmiškizzi 26 dUTU-ŠU dUTU-yaŠ DINGIR.LU.ŠU dIM dIM-naŠ DINGIR.LU.ŠU ku-šu-šu tuḫšumen ...

He roasts the turuppu-breads in a flame, and cuts them to pieces. He puts (each of them) in front of the Stormgod and his male gods and the Sungod and his male gods. He speaks as follows: “Sungod, male gods of the Sungod, Stormgod, male gods of the Stormgod, we have cut off these (kus, pieces). . .”

The demonstrative ki in the following excerpt from the deeds of Suppiluliuma refers to an event: the actions concerning the marriage of a Hittite prince with Tut-anch-amun’s widow. These events have been the discourse topic for some time:


Summarizing, when the object or event mentioned for the first time in Direct Speech is salient, the Speaker uses the pronoun ka-. It is interesting to see that ka- in all cases is either in initial position or in first position. The first position is easily explained: in those cases the Expanding Focus particle -ya “also” is attached to ka-238. As I will explain in chapter 7, there is a clear correlation between first position and -ya “also”. The initial position of ka- in 6.23239, without the topic switching device -ma, is, I believe, connected with the fact that the object is not only salient, but also a Discourse Topic.

6.2.3.2. The centering procedure: the demonstrative description ka- + noun

When the referent of ka- is not yet manipulated in the speech situation and thus not the most salient element around, the Speaker uses a demonstrative noun phrase. Rituals abound with references to different entities in the speech situation. These entities are for example the patient, his or her disease, substitutes, the objects manipulated by the ritual practitioner, food offered to the deity etc. Therefore reference with only ka- would not be sufficient to identify the intended object.

6.25 **KBo 15.10+ i 12-14** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szabó 1971: 14-15

---

238 The other examples with salient ka- + -ya are NH: KBo 14.12 iv 37 (annals, CTH 40), KBo 4.6 rev. 20’ (CTH 380), lateNH: KUB 26.32+ iii 15’ (oath, CTH 124).

239 Vocatives are usually extrapolated constituents. Other salient ka-s occur in MH: KBo 5.3 + i 9 (CTH 42), KBo 15.10+ iii 55’ (CTH 443).
The carriers (it) into the house of the lord. He takes one kurdali-vessel of dough with <the tongues>, and speaks as follows:"These evil <tongues>, Ziplantawiy[a] has made them. ..."

In i 12 not the tongues are manipulated, but the vessel. Therefore the tongues are not the most salient and need to be further identified by means of a noun. Many other examples of ka- + Noun are cited in Puhvel K: 3ff.

In ex. 6.26 the 600 soldiers are mentioned in the preceding narrative text. The difference with the salient situation is that we are probably dealing here with a performative act ("I hereby give ...") : the giving, i.e., the 'manipulation' of the soldiers and speech occur at the same time. If not, this would be the only example in my corpus breaking the pattern.

§ 46 [nammaz̄iši] 600 ĖRIN.MEŠ ANA SAG.DU-SU uškišqattallanni pehhün 47 [n̄išši] kiššan memahhun LŪ.MEŠ uru Mirā-ya kuit mārsanteš 48 [n̄ūyāt̄ta] ka-a-aš 600 ĖRIN.MEŠ SAG.DU-i uškišqattallas ēṣdu ...
[Furthermore,] I gave [him 6]00 soldiers for keeping constant watch over his person. I told [him as follows]: "Given the fact that the people of Mira are treacherous, let these (kas) 600 soldiers be [your] personal constant watch! ..."

And finally, a late Hittite example:240.

6.27 KUB 26.1 iv 49-50 (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.2), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 17
§ 49 nāsma ki kuiski memai ke-e-da-nī=ya=kan φUPP̄I 50 kē INIM.MEŠ OL GAR-ru ...
Or (if) someone says this: 'on this (kedani) tablet these affairs are not written down, ...

6.2.4. Linguistic Selfreference

Linguistic selfreference or reflexive language is the type of situational deixis where an expression refers to the speech act itself or, in written language, to the object containing the expression (for more information on this subject see 2.3.1.1. and 3.1.4.). In Hittite the only clear examples of linguistic selfreference are tuppi 'tablet', although the text types lingai- 'oath (as text genre)', ishiul 'treaty' and the more general memiya(n)- 'word, affair' could also supply evidence for selfreference. The problem with these non-material designations is how to separate linguistic selfreference from discourse deixis.

For linguistic self-reference to a tablet see for example 241

---

240 Other references with ka- referring to entities that are not salient in the extra-linguistic context: MH: KUB 26.37 obv. 10‘ (treaty, CTH 42), KUB 31.127 rev. 16’ (?) (treaty, CTH 131), HKM 48 obv. 7 (letter, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199), ABoT 60 obv. 16‘ (letter, CTH 200), KBo 15.10+ ii 5 (ritual, CTH 443).

241 Other attestations of reflexive tuppi in OH KBo 3.22 obv. 34 (?) ('building inscription', CTH 1A); MH: KBo 5.3+ ii 61 (treaty, CTH 42), VBoT 2: 14 (letter, CTH 152), HKM 15 obv. 4, 16 obv. 5, 20 obv. 5, 25 obv. 11, 34 obv. 5, 71 rev. 24, 81 rev. 29, 89 rev. 26 (letters, Tudhaliya III, CTH 199); NH: KUB 14.17 rev. iii 23
In the next example not only the tablet is referred to, but also the oath (lingai-) and the stipulations of the oath:

6.29 **KUB 8.82 rev. 23'-25'**, emendations from KBo 12.31 (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 105), ed. Kühne & Otten 1971: 20-21

List of Gods

| (n=at (hūmant)) | eš ke-e-da-aš memijanas [ ...] 24° (ke-e-da-ni lingai ku)trueneš ašandu (nu=kan mān ke-e-)šel tuppiaš INIM.MEŠ uḫnuš[(i)] 25° [(nu=tta’=kkān k)ûš NES DINGIR-LIM arḫ(a h)arninkandu] ... | let them all [be] witness[es] to this (kedani) oath concerning these (kedas) matters. And if you change the words of this (kel) tablet, then [may] th[ese oath-deities] d[estroy] you [completely]!

The dative kedas in ‘these words, matters’ refers backwards to the stipulations of the treaty and is therefore discourse deictic. Oath (kedani lingai) on the other hand may be reflexive or discourse deictic.

One of the few cases where a reflexive expression other than ‘tablet’ can be isolated is the following arkuwar ‘plea’:

6.30 **KBo 11.1 obv. 12-13** (NH prayer, Muwattalli, CTH 382), ed. Houwink ten Cate & Josephson 1967: 106

| nu=za KUR.KUR.IJ.A-aš ūaštuḫIḪA māḥan EḪIR-pa lāmi | [n=at=za k]i-ḫ i arkuwar ījami 13 n=at 40 EN=YA ištamašdu § How I again remove the sins of the countries and make [that (=at)] into [li]his (ki) plea, let the Stormgod, my Lord, hear that (=at)!

One of the criteria of Discourse deixis is that the discourse deictic expression refers to a piece of discourse that is immediately adjacent. This is not the case in ex. 6.30. The only option left is reference to the prayer or plea itself.

6.2.5. Summary and conclusions

(annals, CTH 61 II), KBo 3.3+ iv 2', 5', 12' (? , CTH 63), KUB 21.1+ iii 73, iv 32 (treaty, CTH 76); lateNH: KUB 8.82 rev. 24' (treaty, CTH 105), Bo 86/299 iii 74, 78, iv 19, 44 (treaty, CTH 106A), KBo 4.10+ obv. 38', 50', rev. 12, 26 (treaty, CTH 106B), KUB 26.43 + rev. 6, 35, 36 (landgrant, CTH 225).

Possibly reflexive lingai- also in MH: KUB 23.77+ obv. 10 (treaty, CTH 138.1), KBo 8.35 i 14', 16', ii 13' (treaty, CTH 139), KBo 19.58+ rev. 17' (instruction, CTH 268); NH: KUB 19.49 iii 48' (treaty, CTH 69); lateNH: KBo 4.14 iii 5 (treaty, CTH 123), KUB 26.25 ii 2', 5', 7' (? , CTH 126.2), KUB 26.1 iv 46 (instruction, CTH 255.2).

And ishiul 'treaty' in KUB 19.49+ i 60-61 (NH treaty, CTH 69).
In each language phase of Hittite ka- was the proximal demonstrative. It did not simply refer to a location in the vicinity of the Speaker and his possible Audience, but referred to the domain of the Speaker, whether the object was near or not.

The sides of a point of reference could be denoted in two ways. When the point of reference was viewed from the Deictic Center (the Speaker), then ket / kez referred to the side towards the Deictic Center and edi / edez to the other side. When the point of reference was the Deictic Center itself, the sides were denoted by kez ... kez ... (kez ...). Thus, 'this side ... that side of me' is always expressed by means of kez ... kez but never by kez ... apez or kez ... edez. The expression of deictic contrast will be further discussed in section 6.7.

When an object in the speech situation is salient, the pronoun ka- was used, otherwise the Speaker chose ka- + N.

We have Established Topics in exx. 6.21 ('what is this', where 'what' is the requested information, not the 'this'), 6.23. In 6.24 ki is in Expanding Focus.

As for the centering section, ka- N in 6.25 is part of an extraposed constituent, and thus not part of the Topic-Focus distribution of the clause. Ex. 6.26 is out-of-the-blue and so is ex. 6.27.

Genitives are outside the Topic-Focus structure (ex. 6.16), and so is ka- in subordinate clauses (ex. 6.17, 6.20, 6.22, 6.28, 6.29). In ex. 6.18 the Oaths are not expected as Topic at all (they are not centered upon anyway), and are probably even part of the Predicate Focus. I believe that this is expressed by the preverbal position of the Subject, which is also the place for indefinites and Replacing or Restricting Focus expressions (see Chapter 8). In ex. 6.30 ka-N is part of the Predicate Focus too.
6.3. The Recognitional Use of *ka-*

It is very unusual to find a recognitionally used *ka-* (see also 2.3.1.2. and 3.2. for a discussion of this type of demonstrative use and the criteria). In the following examples the information contained in the demonstrative noun phrase is private and shared, and the referent of *ka-* is not present:

**6.31** KBo 19.44+ rev. 14-15 (MH/MS treaty, with duplicate KBo 5.3+ iii 42’, CTH 42), transl. Beckman 1996: 27

§ 14 *nammaz* $\text{UTU-SI } \text{kuin } \text{ku-u-un } \text{NIN-YA } \text{ANA } \text{DAM-U[TTI-zK(A AD)]DIN } \text{nu}$ $\text{šši } \text{NIN.MEŠ-SU } \text{ŠA } \text{MÁŠ-SU } \text{ŠA } \text{NUMUN-SU } \text{meqqaš } [(aš)janz]

Furthermore, as for this *(kun)* sister which I have given to you as your wife, she has many sisters belonging to her family and clan.


22 *LÚKUR-ja* $\text{smu } \text{kuš } \text{ka-a-aš } \text{LUGAL K[UR ASSUR GUB-a]nza } \text{n = aš zmu } \text{kan } \text{23 mān } \text{ŠA } \text{KUR.URU } \text{uižzi } \text{nu = } \text{tt[a hint]} \text{an ZAG-aš čšdu}

And concerning this *(kas)* enemy, the king of [Assur who is ris]ing up against me, if he comes into my country, let [deaf]th be your end.

Both times the persons are connected with the Speaker, positively in 6.31 and negatively in 6.32.

Recognational demonstratives always refer to non-salient entities and are always in Sentence Focus. The table thus becomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognational 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>

Table 6.2: The Recognitional *ka-* matrix.

---

[244] See for a similar use of *ka-* the same text, KBo 4.14 ii 66.
6.4. The Discourse Deictic Use of *ka-*

6.4.1. Introduction

With discourse deixis we leave the field of situational reference. Like anaphoric demonstratives, discourse deictic demonstratives refer to a part of the discourse. But unlike anaphoric demonstratives, a discourse deictic expression is not coreferential with a NP, but draws the attention to the propositional content of a stretch of discourse. (See Diesssel 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 (Diesssel o.c. 102245).

In the following sections I will describe the use of the demonstrative adverb of manner *kissan* (6.4.2.) and of *ki* and *ka-memiya(n)*- *utter* etc. (6.4.3.).

6.4.2. The adverb of manner *kissan*

Although Hrozný (1917: 135) believed that *enissan* and *kissan* were demonstrative pronouns like *ka-* and *en*246, he already saw correctly that *enissan* referred backward and *kissan* "in der Regel" forward. Since Forrer (1922: 208)247 the meaning of *kissan* as "folgendermaßen, in dieser Weise, so" has been accepted (Friedrich HW, p. 111, Puhvel K: 10f.). The division of labor between *enissan* and *kissan* as established by Hrozný I.e. has also been accepted (Friedrich 1960: 134 (§ 250)) although *kissan* sometimes refers backward (Friedrich o.c. 135 (§252)). According to Friedrich 1930: 141 backward referring *kissan* is found in connection with the Speaker. This would indeed fit a person-based deictic system.

Generally *kissan*248 refers forward to the contents of Reported Speech or Quotation from a letter. As with *apenissan* in Chapter 5 I will only present a few attestations because there is not much variation in the use of *kissan*. Besides simply listing some examples I will also discuss whether especially backward referring *kissan* is connected with the Speaker or not.

6.33 KBo 17.1+ rev. iii 8-12 (OS ritual, CTH 417), ed. Neu 1980a: 9

§ 8 ūlinsā ĖRINMEṢ-an teššūmmiuṭšš-sa taštā 9 ḫariemi t-uš tarnaemi ta ki-ış-ša-an tēmi 10 dUTU-uš dIM-aš kāš[(a LU)]GAL-i MUNUS.LUGAL-ri DUMUMEṢ-mašš=a URUḪattušši 11 ḫurma(n)=šmet ešh[(ar=š)]amet idālu=šmet 12 [ḫatuka=šmet ḫari[(enun)]]

I bury the clay soldier and the cups in the earth. I fasten them. I say as follows (*kissan*): "O Sungod, Stormgod, I have just buried on behalf of the king, queen and their children, on behalf of Hattusa their plague, their blood, their evil, their horrors. ...

---

245 Diesssel uses 'proposition' instead of 'discourse unit'.
246 But see his remark o.c. 140 n. 3 that *kissan* "vielleicht auch "so, folgendermaßen" o. ä. bedeutet".
247 *kissan* "etwa diese, folgendermaßen".
248 A unique *ki-i-ni-īš-ša-an* is attested in KUB 28.4 obv. 16b (Laroche 1965b: 75). There also exists a neuter *ki-i-ni* besides *ki-* (KBo 34.142 obv. 7' + KBo 8.55: 16': § 7 *ki-i-ni* *ku*[t] INA KUR URUḪṣuju NAŠME), see Neu 1997: 156 with reference to Košak 1995: 53 for the join.
§ 3 ki-iš-ša-an = mu kuit hatrašš 4 kāša = ya 5 ki-iš-ša-an KUR uit ...
As for the fact that you wrote as follows (kissan): 'The enemy just arrived, ...

§ 7' [§E]Š = YA = ma = mu kuit kiš-an TAŠPUR NIN = YA = ya = mu TAŠPUR DUMU.MUNUS = ya = ta p śhi ... 
As for the fact that my [br]other wrote to me thus (kisan): 'My sister wrote to me: '[I shall give] you a daughter (of mine)', ...

One can also swear (link-), act (iya-), protect (pahs-), perish (hark-), conclude a treaty (ishiul ishya-) etc. 'as follows, in this (following) way'.

As already noted by Friedrich 1930: 141, once in a while kissan may refer backwards, like ka-249:

6.36 KBo 6.26 i 38-40 (OH/NS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 133
LÜ-eš,17 aki GU₄.H₂.A = ja akkanzi 39 Ú A.ŠA-LAM karū = pat kuiš šūniet 40 t = az apāš dāi karū ki-iš-ša-an ėššer
(They shall turn the face of one (team) in one direction and of the other in the other direction.) The man dies and the oxen die. But the one who sowed the field first, he shall take (it). This is the way (kissan) they used to proceed.

10' É KUR URU [HATTI = za ŠEŠ = YA GIM-an šakti n = at za ammuk ŪL ša[ggahhi n = at arha a]rnuyan É-e[r] 11' āštā = ma = kan kuit n = at = kan mUrhi- =U-upaš ANA DINGIR.GAL pešta nu m[Urhi-]d]U-uppaš kuit apiša 12' n = an punuš mān kiš-an mān ŪL kiš-an
As you, my brother, know (well) the House of Hatti, do I not kn[ow] it (too)? [It is] a [tel]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 (kissan)!

With CHD P: 9 one should let kissan refer backwards in the next example:

6.38 KBo 22.1 3'-6' (OS instruction, CTH 272), ed. CHD P: 9, Š: 23
3' šumeš LŪ.MEŠ GIŠTU.KUL tameškattien apē-ja kattan 4' dameškiyān dāir ki-iš-ša-an AWAT ABI = YA 5' paḥšanitten takku šumeš natta šaktēni 6' kāni LŪ₄.U.GI-ešš = a NU.GAL nu = šmaš memai AWAT ABI = YA
You are oppressing the craftsmen and (as a result) they too started to oppress. Is this the way (kissan) you have kept my father's word?! If you do not know (how to protect them), are there here not old men too? (One of them) can tell you my father's word.

249 See Gözte 1928: 164 on ka-: "auf das unmittelbar folgende oder vorausgehende weisend".
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If *kissan* were to refer forward, a description of how to protect the words of the king should have followed, which is not the case. But if we interpret *pahšanuten* as a past tense instead of an imperative\(^{250}\), then *kissan* can very well refer to the immediate preceding discourse.\(^{251}\)

Friedrich 1960: 134-135 assumed that there were two parameters explaining the use of *kissan* versus *enissan*. The most important parameter was ‘direction’: the demonstrative *ka-* and its manner adverb *kissan* referred forward, whereas *eni* and *enissan* referred backward. The second parameter was the relation with the Speaker. That relation allowed backward reference despite the more regular forward referring use. This seems reasonable, because forward referring *kissan* is indeed often attested with the Speaker and according to Friedrich this should even more be true of backward referring *kissan*. In ex. 6.36 however *kissan* is connected with punishments in the past, whereas ‘we’ now judge differently. And in ex. 6.38 *kissan* clearly belongs to the domain of the Addressees, while at the same time the Speaker condemns their acts.

The motivation for the use of *kissan* instead of *enissan* is therefore not clear. The number of attestations of backward referring *kissan* does not allow a satisfying explanation, but they show one thing: backward *kissan* is not necessarily connected with the Speaker and one should therefore separate the two.

6.4.3. The Discourse Deictic syntagms *ki uttered, kas memias* and *ki*

6.4.3.1. Referring forward

6.4.3.1.1. To an event, proposition or speech-act

Like *kissan* the demonstrative expressions *ki, ki uttered, kas memiyas* can refer forward to a stretch of discourse. It is their function to introduce an event, proposition or speech act into the discourse. But they occur far less frequently than *kissan*.\(^{252}\) To give an indication, in the Madduwatta text alone *kissan* occurs 20 times, whereas forward referring *ki* only twice. In Old Hittite texts (Old script) *kissan* occurs 19 times with a verb of speaking, whereas *ki* only four times.

In this section I present the different constructions in which forward referring *ka*-occurs. A typical example of a cataphoric discourse deictic expression is

6.39 Listen to this: John will move to Hawaii (Diesel 1999: 102, ex. 15).

Hittite forward referring discourse deictic *ka- (+N)* occurs with the following verbs: verbs of communication *memai-* ‘to speak’, SIR ‘to sing’, *lingai-* ‘to swear’, *hatrai-* ‘to write’, *watarnahh-* ‘to order’; verbs of mental perception *aus-* ‘see, take note of, contemplate’,

\(^{250}\) Despite their translation on p. 9, CHD P: 7 classifies *pahšanuten* as imp. 2.pl. This is followed through in CHD S: 23 ‘Keep the word of my father’. See also CHD L-N: 224 for the imperative. Interestingly, in both ‘imperative cases’ the adverb *kissan* is not translated.

\(^{251}\) See Beal 1988: 280. The same might be true for KBo 22.1 obv. 29’.

\(^{252}\) I have not been able to detect a difference between *ki* and *kissan* beside the fact that one is a pronoun and the other an adverb.
**istamass**- 'hear'; two other verbs **linkiya kattan dai**- 'place under oath', **iya**- 'to perform an act'. Discourse deictic **ka**- also occurs in nominal clauses.

The demonstrative **ka-** (+N) refers each time to the content of a following proposition or event, independent of person. It refers for example to an act/saying in connection with the Speaker in ex. 6.40, and with the Addressee in 6.43:**253**.


§ 3 *ta namma* **MUŠEN-hāranan nēpiša tarnaḫi** 4 āppan(−)anda=ma=šše ke-e
dēmē-hāni natta=an āk 5 t[(arna)]bṭn LUGAL-š=an MUNUS.LUGAL-š=a tarnaš
nu ʔ it ḏUTU-i 6 ɗIM-ša mēm[(i)]bši ḏUTU-uš ɗIM-aš mān uktūrēš 7 LUGAL-uš
MUNUS.LUGAL-ašš=a QATAMMA uktūrēš ašantu §

Then I let the eagle go to heaven. I speak these (ke) (words) after him: “Not let him go, the king and queen let him go. Go, speak to the Sungod and the Stormgod: “As the Sungod and the Stormgod (are) forever, let the king and queen be forever likewise!”’”


nu=l[tä] **linkiña** 14 [ka]ltan ke-e ud-da-ar daši kāšša=ya=kan ABI ḏUTU-š[ī] [tuk]
mMadduwaṭṭa[n] [ISTU GİR] mAttarṣiṭa huṣi[n]unuṇ 15 nu=ya=za ŠA ABI ḏUTU-š[ī] Ū
ŠA KUR **GČU** [HATTI ēš]

He (my father) placed these (ke) words for you under oath: “I, the father of My Majesty, have just saved [you,] Madduwwat [[from the sword] of Attarsiya. So belong to the father of My Majesty and the land of Hatti! ...”

6.42 **KUB 21.17 i 4-8** (NH indictment, Hattusili III, CTH 86), ed. Ünal 1974: 20

4 ḤUL-eššir=ma=at ke-e-da-ni memiiani 5 KUR UGU-TIM kuit ANA ṣdṌN ḏU ASSUM
MUIRDUṬTIM pešṭa GIM-an=ma=mu 6 ṢNIR.GAL ŠEŠ=YA KUR UGU-TI ASSUM
MUIRDUṬTIM 7 pešṭa ṣdṌN ḏU-aš=ma=mu=za ANA ŠEŠ=YA GAM-an 8 peškiušan
daši

They became enemies in this (kedani) matter: given the fact that he had given Arma-Tarhunza the Upper Land to govern, (therefore), after Muwatallili had given me the Upper Land to govern, Arma-Tarhunza began to betray me to my brother.

6.43 **KUB 26.1 iv 49-50** (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.2), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 17 (= ex. 6.27)

§ 49 *našma ki-i kuiski memaik kēdani=ya=kan tuppī* 50 ké INIM.MEŠ ŪL.GAR-ru ...

Or (if) someone (of you) says this (ki): “on this tablet these affairs are not written down, ...

Sometimes one finds the expression **ki kuit**:**254**

---

**253** Other cataphoric discourse deictic occurrences of **ka-** **OH** KUB 8.41 ii 7, 10 (ritual, CTH 733 II 1), **KBo 20.69 + : 8** (ritual, CTH *832); **MH** KBo 19.44+ rev. 37 (treaty, CTH 42), KUB 14.1 obv. 79 (indictment, CTH 147); **NH** KBo 1.28 obv. 9 (treaty, CTH 57), KUB 1.1 i 37 (egodocument, CTH 81), KUB 21.38 obv. 42’ (letter, CTH 176), KUB 31.77 i 8 (vow, CTH 584); **lateNH** KUB 23.92 rev. 12’ (letter, CTH 178), KUB 26.12+ ii 5, iii 7 (oath, CTH 255.1), **KUB 50.5 r.col. 9** (oracle, CTH 569), **KBo 2.6+ iii 60** (oracle, CTH 577).

**254** Other attestations: **MH**: **VBoT** 2: 1 (ki *kuit uttar*, letter, CTH 152), **HKM** 70 obv. 4 (letter, CTH 199); **NH** KUB 22.70 obv. 41 (oracle CTH 566); **lateNH**: KUB 23.103 rev. 20’ (letter, CTH 178), KUB 26.1 iv 3 (instruction, CTH 255.2).
6.4. Another type of discourse deictic expression, with *ka* in a nominal or copula clause, is ‘this is X’, followed by a description of the contents of X:

6.4.3.1.2. To a list of first order entities?

The latter example brings us to the domain of reference to a list. In Hittite the announcement of a list or enumeration can have the same structure as reference to a forthcoming piece of discourse (‘this is X’):

6.4.6. The problem is how to classify this type of forward reference. The classification of demonstratives in Himmelmann 1996 and Diesell 1999 only allows Discourse Deixis for forward referring demonstratives, but while it is stated there that discourse deictic expressions refer to events, propositions or speech acts, in ex. 6.46 and 6.47 we have reference to first order entities. (For more examples see section 6.6.) So it seems that demonstratives that

---

255 See also NH: KUB 21.1+ iii 10 (treaty, CTH 76); lateNH: Bo 86/299 ii 67 (treaty, CTH 106A), KBo 4.10+ obv. 42’ (treaty, CTH 106B).

256 Ehlich 1982 considers reference to lists by means of a demonstrative as *text-deixis*. The difference with Himmelmann and Diesell is that Ehlich uses a cognitive interpretation of reference: the anaphoric procedure maintains the focus of attention on a referent whereas the deictic procedure shifts the center of attention. When
introduce first order referents into the discourse are typologically not very well described. In my view this forward reference (below, ex. 6.48) is similar to backward referring demonstrative descriptions, classified as Tracking by Himmelmann and Diesell, as in ex. 6.49:

6.48 KUB 23.12 ii 4'-6' (MH/MS annals, Tudhaliya, CTH 142.2B) 
§ 4'[... ]Uru Hattuši āppa ye[h((un))] 5'[[(nu=nu ke-e KUR.KUR.HLA)] kūrū ṣep[ir] 
§ 6'[... KUR Uru L(uqqa) KUR Uru Kišpiya ... 
[When] I turned back to Hattusa, these (ke) countries took up hostilities against me: § [... the country of L(ukka), of Kispuwa ...

§ 20' KUR Uru Neriqqaz ... KUR Uru Patalliğaz § 26' nu ke-e-da-aš A[(NA KUR.KUR.HLA)] šumenzan ŠA ŠI H.L.A DINGIR.MEŠ-KUNU kue ēšia n=at L.U.MEŠ URU Gašga arba pippir
(All the countries from which they drove the sacrificial animals: fattened bulls, fattened cows, fattened sheep, and fattened goats), § from the country of Neric …… from the country of Patalli, § that which in these (kedas) countries belonged to your temples, the Gasgaean s have destroyed it.

Backward reference to events, propositions and speech-acts is described in the next section, reference to first order entities in 6.5.

6.4.3.2. Referring backward

All forward referring expressions refer necessarily to entities that are not salient. As discussed in 2.3.6. and summarized for Hittite in 3.5., this is not always the case with backward reference. Although the content of a piece of discourse is usually not in the center of attention, with certain predicates the situation is different. The predicates of speaking and knowledge for example require as argument or complement a speech act or proposition. The predicate therefore raises the saliency of the speech act or proposition. In 6.2.4., we saw how saliency and type of expression were connected: the pronoun ka- referred to a salient object in the Speech-situation, and ka- + N referred to a non-salient object. In order to find out whether ka- with or without noun refers to salient stretches of discourse or not, the following contexts are presented. When a discourse unit is closed, all entities in that unit have lost their saliency. There are several types of across node reference, such as crossing a paragraph line, a Direct

an element in the discourse needs to be focused upon, the deictic procedure is used. This is what Ehlich call text-deixis. He illustrates his point by means of name lists in the Old Testament. These lists are usually both introduced and concluded by means of ancient Hebrew elle 'these': 'these are the X ...', indicating a shift in the center of attention. Cornish 1999 on the other hand uses the term discourse deixis for the same procedure and more or less equates it with new-this in colloquial English: forward referring expressions introduce, shift the attention to an element that is important for the following discourse.

257 The reason is probably that demonstratives introducing discourse referents that are a major discourse topic are only encountered in English in the form of colloquial new-this, see also the preceding footnote. (Himmelmann 1996: 222). Himmelmann does not deny the existence of first mention demonstratives in other languages, but assumes that such first mentions 'may be based on (presumed) shared-knowledge rather than being new, introductory mentions as in English' (o.c. 223). There is no indication that Hittite introducing ka- refers to shared knowledge.
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Speech node. Adverbial clauses also often introduce a new discourse unit (Cumming & Ono 1997: 123.). These are described in (6.4.3.2.1.). A special case of introducing a new unit is the *ki kuit* ‘as for this fact that’ clause (6.4.3.2.2.). In 6.4.3.2.3. a remaining group is discussed.

**6.4.3.2.1. Across a discourse node**

Paragraph line closes a discourse unit, lowering the saliency of the entities in it, including the propositional contents of the clauses. The expressions referring across node can take the form *ke uddar, ka- memiya*—258, *ka- ringai*—259 or, rarely, *ki*—260. The Old Hittite ex. 6.50 is unique because instead of *QATAMMA* discourse deictic *ki* refers to the punishment described in the preceding law (formerly he gave 15 cattle, but now he shall give 10 cattle ...). The New Hittite duplicate KUB 13.12 obv. 6 also has *ki-i-pät* whereas the other New Hittite copies KBo 6.3 iii 48 and KBo 6.8 ii 2 have *QATAMMA-pät*:

6.50 **KBo 6.2+ iii 43** (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 75

| § 43 takku ANŠE.KUR.RA türîjayas kuiški tâiezi uttar šēd=za ki-i-pat § |
| If anyone steals a draft horse, its disposition is just this (*ki-pat*) (= the same). |

6.51 **Bo 86/299 iv 5** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 26-27

| nu mân zik mdıLAMMA-as ki-i tuppiaš uttār ūl pahhašti ... |
| ..., if you, Kurunta, do not protect these (*ki*) words of the tablet, ... |

6.52 **KBo 3.4+ i 48** (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 I). ed. Grélois 1988: 57

| nu ki-i INA MU.1.KAM ijanun § |
| I did this (*ki*) in one year. |

The pronoun *ki* refers back to the actions of Mursili in the same paragraph, but also to the actions described in previous paragraphs.

A special case of reference across a discourse node is reference to the contents of preceding Direct Speech:

6.53 **KUB 21.38 rev. 7-9** (NH letter, Hattusili III, CTH 176), ed. Edel 1994: 222-223 (= ex. 3.70)


---

258 See also OH KBo 3.22 obv. 33 (‘building’ inscription, CTH 1A); MH KBo 5.3+ i 38, ii 54, iv 50’ (treaty, CTH 42), KUB 14.1 obv. 27 (indictment, CTH 147), KUB 24.4 rev. 22 (prayer, CTH 376C); NH KBo 4.4 obv. ii 49 (annals, CTH 61 II), KBo 5.13 iii 20 (treaty, CTH 68), KUB 19.49 iv 40’ (treaty, CTH 69), KUB 21.1+ iii 76 (treaty, CTH 76), KUB 21.15 iv 6 (edict, CTH 85); KUB 21.17 iii 37’ (indictment, CTH 86), KBo 6.28 rev. 40 (edict, CTH 88), KUB 14.8 rev. 38 (prayer, CTH 378 II); lateNH KUB 8.82 rev. 23’ (treaty, CTH 105), KBo 4.10+ rev. 5, 48’ (treaty, CTH 106B)

259 KUB 15.1 ii 13 (NH vow, CTH 584).

260 See also NH KBo 3.4+ ii 49, iii 41, 59, iv 34’ (annals, CTH 61 I), KUB 22.70 obv. 33 (oracle, CTH 566).
As for the fact that my [brother] other wrote to me thus: 'My sister wrote to me thus: 'My brother wrote to me thus: 'The daughter of Babylon who was given to Egypt, when the messengers later went to (visit) her, they had to stay back by an IKU (= 150 mtrs.)' '. The messenger of the king of Babylon, Enlil-bel-nisse, told me this (kun) story. (As for the fact that I heard the story, I should not have written it to my brother)

6.54 KUB 8.41 ii 7'-9' (OS ritual, CTH 733 II 1), ed. Neu 1980a: 183
When the 'son' incantates to the mistress of the Stormgod, the S[inger says]: 'For mankind you are Naššimmeti, but among the gods you are Istar the Queen'. These (words) too (ke=ya=)261 [correspond] to the recitation [of the Stormgod (?)].

But ka- N can also jump further back across a discourse unit262:

[(nu-ēšši ēGIM-an ke-e INIM.MEŠ ū(ataranāḫḫun)] 2 ēhu-ya apāš-ēma-šan URUMarāššā[ntiṭ(a)šṭa)]
When I told him these (ke) words: 'Come!', he fled away from the city Marassantiya, ...

The order 'come!' summarizes the speech of iii 68-72: 'I told him like a man: 'You have started to fight with me. You are the Great King, while I am (simply) a king of one fortified town, the only fortified town you left me. Come! Istar of Samuha and the Stormgod of Nerik will judge our trial.''. The following lines iii 72-79 are a justification of Hattusili's acts (Otte n o.c. 23, fn.).

In the next example the propositions preceding the conditional clause are nominalized as wasku- 'wrongdoing'.263 Besides that, also memiya(n)- and uttar are attested264 in adverbial clauses referring to another discourse unit.

6.56 KBo 2.6+ iii 4-9 (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 206-207
män EME 4INST-attī-šat TI-andaš kuitman-ēaš 5 TI-anza ėšṭa nu apiša kuit arraḫḫaniškīt 6 GIDIM-ēša kuit TUKU.TUKU-ūanza DUMU.MEŠ-ēSU-ēašši ēME ėššanzi 7 nu-ēšši män GIDIM kēdaš-ēpat waškuwaš šer TUKU.TUKU-ūanza 8 namma-ēma-ša GIDIM tamēdanī memiši šer UL 9 kužīk TUKU.TUKU-ūanza If (it is) the curse of the same Sausgattī (when) alive, because she kept cursing at the time during which she was alive, and (if it is) because the deceased is angry, and her children keep cursing, if you, o deceased, are angry only because of these (kedas=pat)

262 See also NH KUB 6.41 i 37 (treaty, CTH 68), discussed in chapter 4 as ex. 4.63
263 See KBo 6.28 rev. 30 (NH edict, CTH 88) for nominalization as ki-da-aš šaḥha-naš luz[zi]jaš of the specifications of duty and corvee (saḥhan and luzzi) mentioned in the preceding paragraph.
264 NH KBo 5.4 rev. 14 (treaty, CTH 67), KBo 5.13 iii 6 (treaty, CTH 68), KUB 19.49+ i 58 (treaty, CTH 69); lateNH KBo 2.6 i 14' (oracle, CTH 577), KBo 16.98 ii 10 (oracle, CTH 577).
wrongdoings, but furthermore you, o deceased, are not angry somehow because of another affair, ...

6.4.3.2.2. ki kuit clauses

A special type of construction containing ka- referring across a paragraph line is the ki kuit syntagm 'given this fact that, as for this fact that'. This syntagm is almost always the first clause of a new paragraph. It serves as the introduction to a clause or sequence of clauses that refers as a whole to something that has happened before. There is a difference with a simple kuit clause: the simple kuit clause provides a general setting, whereas the ki kuit repeats some material from a preceding discourse unit. This is best illustrated by oracles. In oracles the ki kuit clause, repeating the result of a preceding oracle outcome, is the point of departure for the following oracle question. Thus, the demonstrative both links to the preceding discourse and provides the setting of the new paragraph.

In the next example ki kuit links to the preceding result:\n
6.57 KUB 22.70 obv. 4 (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 54-55
§ 4 ki-i kuit DINGIR-LIM URU Arušna AN(A G)IG š[e]r TUKU TUKU-atti [SI] xŚA- at
As for this (ki) fact, that the deity of Arusna has been determined in anger because of the illness, ...

But it can also link further back:\n
6.58 KUB 22.70 rev. 31-32 (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 90-91
§ 31 ki-i kuit DUMU Ammatalla IN A.É.GAL-LIM anda ğerğanza ėsta TŪG.ḪIL.A ūma ūne SA ŠU AM[A-ŠU yašš]iškît nu mān DINGIR-LUM apaddan šer 32 ŠA dUTU-St zankilatar Ot. kuikti šan(a)ḫta ...
As for this (ki) fact that the son of Ammatalla was summoned to the palace while [wearing] the clothes meant for [his] mother, if the deity does not seek any fine at all from His Majesty because of that ...

6.4.3.2.3. Remaining cases

In this section I present some examples of the remaining group that did not fall in one of the other categories. They all have in common that ka- (N) refers inside a paragraph. That does not mean however that the propositional content referred to is necessarily salient. In Chapter 2 I showed how φ, -a-, apa- and apa- + N were used when their host clause followed a conditional clause, whereas ka- N was used when the preceding clause was a main clause. Furthermore, the type of predicate could raise the saliency of the propositional contents, such as verbs of speaking or knowing. The few attestations of ka- (N) with 3rd and 4th order predicates already refer across node (KBo 4.4 ii 49, KBo 5.13 iii 6, KUB 15.1 ii 30, KUB 21.38 rev. 9), therefore their propositional content is not salient. In the next example the clauses preceding the kas memias clause describe what the Addressee is to refrain from. The

265 See also NH KUB 22.70 obv. 7, 12, 29, 34, 44, 49, 67, rev. 8, 33, 40 (oracle, CTH 566); lateNH KUB 22.35 ii 10' (oracle, CTH 569), KBo 2.2 iii 18 (oracle, CTH 577).

266 See also NH KUB 22.70 obv. 58, rev. 4 (oracle, CTH 566); LateNH KBo 2.2 i 21 (oracle, CTH 577).
propositional content that might be salient is 'not doing X'. However, not the 'not doing X' is commented upon in the next clause, but the 'doing X' which is not salient\textsuperscript{267, 268}

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

\textit{tamaizzatamaizza lë ilali\(\text{jaš}\)i ka-a\(\text{aš}\)+ta memiaš SAPAL NEŠ DINGIR-ULM kittaru \$\)}

Do not desire another Ruling House. Let this (\textit{kas}) conduct be put under Divine Oath.

6.4.4. How about Focus structure and Discourse Deixis?

Compared with the other demonstratives the number of discourse deictic expressions of the proximal demonstrative is large enough to be able to say something on the Focus structure. Most of the time the discourse deictic expression occurs in the VP. We can safely assume that in those cases the expression is part of the Predicate or Sentence Focus domain. Sometimes however a Focus particle is attached to the expression, leading to the question whether discourse deictic \textit{ka-} can occur in Argument Focus. Another phenomenon that is relevant for the Topic-Focus distinction is Subjecthood. To start with the latter, in ex. 6.54 the clause \textit{ke=} \(\text{i}a\(\text{aš}\)+\(\text{aš}\)a ANA AWAT \textit{[IM handān]}\) belongs to a series of similar clauses. Each time a few phrases are chanted, after which it is stated that ‘that/that too corresponds to the recitation of some god’. The expression \textit{ke} is in this case in Expanding (Argument) Focus. Another discourse deictic subject is found in clauses of the type of ex. 6.59. This time the rest of the clause could be asserted of the subject. In that case the subject should be an Unestablished Topic. The difficulty here is that Unestablished Topics are probably indicated by means of the particle \textit{-al-ma} (see chapter 9). Although the Focus structure in Hittite requires far more research than I could provide in the chapters 7 to 9, I opt for the moment for Sentence Focus given the absence of \textit{-al-ma}.

The next example on the other hand shows \textit{ka-} N as Unestablished Topic:

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

\textit{namma ki-i kuit TUPPU tak \textit{[f]Ala[ksandu ijan]\(\text{jaš}\)i ne\(\text{aš}\)+\(\text{aš}\)kan MU.KAM-ti MU.KAM-ti peran 3-\(\text{i}a\(\text{aš}\)+\(\text{aš}\)a zikan zik \textit{Ala[ksandu šaki}}} 76 \textit{ki\(\text{aš}\)+\(\text{aš}\)a AWATE.MEŠ OL kuit[f] 1-edaz 1-edaz ISTU KUR UR[U]HATTI\(\text{aš}\)+\(\text{aš}\)at

Furthermore, this (\textit{ki}) tablet that I [mad]e for you \textit{Ala[ksandu], let the}[m] read it to you every year three [mes]. You, Alaksandus, have to be familiar with it! Now, these (\textit{ki\(\text{aš}\)+\(\text{aš}\)a}) stipulations are not at all from the one (or) from the other, they are from \textit{Hatti}!

\textsuperscript{267} One can see this more clearly by looking at the next mini conversation: A: "I did not eat any cookies today" — B: "You were not supposed to!". B’s answer would be more sensible following "I ate some cookies today", not the negation. (Unless it was B’s intention to say that A actually had to eat cookies.) Thus, a negation does not make the opposite salient.

\textsuperscript{268} For the remaining group see also MH KUB 14.1 rev. 27 (indictment, CTH 147); NH KUB 6.41 iv 14, KUB 6.44 iv 24 (treaty, CTH 68), KBo 4.12 rev. 12 (edict, CTH 87); LateNH KUB 23.1+ i 7, iv 18, 22, l. edge 2 (treaty, CTH 105), Bo 86/299 ii 94 (treaty, CTH 106A), KBo 4.10+ obv. 46' (treaty, CTH 106B), KBo 4.14 ii 51, iii 51 (treaty, CTH 123), ABoT 56 iii 15 (instruction, CTH 256).
The stipulations, literally words, do not come out-of-the-blue. They are a necessary part of an inscribed tablet and may therefore be legitimately inferred from the Established Topic ‘tablet’. As a Sub-Topic\(^{269}\) they replace the Established Topic ‘tablet’. This Topic-switch is indicated by the particle \(-al-ma\).

Summarizing, \(ka\)\(^{(N)}\) occurs in Sentence Focus clauses or in the Predicate Focus, and as a subject it may be Argument Focus or an Unestablished Topic. The only thing it cannot be is the Established Topic.

6.4.5. Summary and conclusions

The demonstrative adverb of manner \(kissan\) usually refers forward, rarely backward. Both in the backward and forward situation it can occur with all participants, both in positive and negative contexts. There is therefore no special connection with the Speaker (6.4.2.). The same could be observed for forward and backward referring \(ka\)\(-\)\(N\) (6.4.3.1 and 6.4.3.2.).

The expression \(ka\)\(^{(N)}\) referred to non-salient entities. It occurred in Sentence Focus clauses, in Predicate Focus, and it was in Argument Focus or an Unestablished Topic. The only pragmatic function that was excluded was Established Topic (6.4.4.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Deictic Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuity procedure (in node)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka(-)N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: The Discourse Deictic \(ka\)\(-\) matrix.

6.5. The Tracking (= Anaphoric) Use of \(ka\)\(-\)

6.5.1. Introduction

The tracking use of demonstratives and the distinctions made below are discussed in 2.3.3.4., 2.3.4. (both general discussions), 3.3.4., 3.4. (overview of Hittite) and 4.5. (the distal demonstrative \(asi\)).

6.5.2. The centering procedure

Major discourse discontinuities diminish the saliency of discourse entities. These discontinuities are caused by episodic changes, shifts in location, intervention by Reported Speech, and textual unit boundaries. In order to restore the saliency of a discourse entity lexical noun phrases are used, including the ones with a demonstrative determiner. The indicators of discourse continuity in Hittite are reference across a paragraph line (6.5.2.1), across a Direct Speech/Narration boundary (6.5.2.2.), adverbial clauses indicating a shift in

\(^{269}\) See Dik 1997a: 324f. for Sub Topic and its relation to a Given (= Established) Topic.
place, time, or orientation (6.5.2.3.), relative clauses re-introducing a topic (6.5.2.4.) and genitives, which are usually not salient (6.5.2.5.)

6.5.2.1. Reference across a paragraph line

The proximal demonstrative NP can refer anaphorically across a paragraph line to another NP, or to a preceding list or enumeration. The latter type of reference is a specific feature of the proximal demonstrative: in my corpus there were no examples of apa- NP or asi NP resuming a list. Reference to a NP is illustrated in 6.5.2.1.1., and to a list in 6.5.2.1.2. For reference to lists inside a paragraph, see section 6.5.3.2.

6.5.2.1.1. Reference to a NP

6.6 1. KUB 1.1+ ii 69-72 (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 16
§ 69 GIM-an=ma uït $[(EŠ=y)\overline{\text{A}} \text{kùuapi } \text{INA } \text{KUR } \text{Mizrù } \text{pait }^{70} \text{nu} \text{za } \text{KUR.KUR.} \text{MEš } \text{kue ke-e } \text{Egir-pa } \text{ašešanu}[(\text{nu})]\text{nu } \text{KARAS } \text{ANŠE.KUR.R}[(\text{A.MEŠ})]^{71}$
\text{kël } \text{SA } \text{KUR-TI } \text{ANA } \text{SEŠ=YA } \text{lahhi } \text{INA } \text{KUR.Mizrù }^{72} \text{GAM-an } \text{pēhusenun}
But when it happened that my brother went to Egypt at a certain time, as for these (ke) countries which I had resettled, I led the army and the horses of this country to my brother on campaign in Egypt.

The kē KUR.KUR.MEš ‘these countries’ are mentioned in ii 66.

6.6 2. KBo 2.2 i 21-22 (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 126-127
§ 21 kī kuit ku-u-uš MUŠEN HURRI kallavanni 22 arha appantat
Concerning this fact that these hurri-birds were taken away in unfavorableness.

The birds have been mentioned before in i 15.270
A remarkable feature of ka- N referring across node is that each noun phrase occurs in a relative clause.

6.5.2.1.2. Reference to a list

The antecedent of the paragraph crossing demonstrative ka- does not have to be a single noun (phrase) but can also be a list of objects or localities. Ex. 6.49 was already a good example of ka- N referring to a list of countries271. But ka- N may also ‘summarize’ a collection of entities discussed throughout the whole text:

6.6 3. KBo 3.4+ iv 44'-47' (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 i), ed. Grélois 1988: 72
§ 44' nu=za=kan ANA GIB.GU.ZA ABIZ YA kušapi ežšat nu karā MU.10.KAM 45' LUGAL-uižnanun nu=za ke-e KUR.KUR LÚKUR INA MU.10.KAM ammedaz ŠU-az

270 See also MH HKM 48 lower edge 18 (letter, CTH 199); NH KUB 14.14 + rev. 43' (prayer, CTH 378 I), KUB 14.11 + rev. 41 (CTH 378II).
271 See for lists also OH KBo 17.3+ iii 29 (ritual, CTH 416.1 B); NH KUB 19.13+ i 40' (annals, CTH 40).
46. *taraḫḫun* DUMU.MEŠ LUGAL.ma-za BELU.MEŠ.z̕a kue KUR.KUR LŬKŬR

taraḫḫeškir 47. n=at=z̕an 0L anda

After I seated myself on my father’s throne and ruled as king during the first ten years, I conquered these (ke) enemy countries within ten years with my own hand. But the countries which the sons of the king and the lords conquered are not included.

In the Bronze tablet *ki kuit* in iii 57 refers to everything that Tudhaliya and his father have given to Kurunta272.

6.64 Bo 86/299 iii 57-59 (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV CTH 106.1), ed. Otten 1988: 22-23

§ 57 *ki-i=جا kuit* ABU=YA ANA md.LAMMA pešta dUTU=z̕i=جا=ший kuit 58 pihhun

išḫiûl=šī kuit ijuven n=at=kan zilatiya 59 lē kuiški yaḫnuzi

And as for (all) this (ki) that my father has given to Kurunta and that I, My Majesty, have given to him, the treaty which we made for him, let none in the future change it.

6.5.2.2. From Direct Speech to Narration

In the next examples (also treated as ex. 4.95 in chapter 4) *kē arahzenaš* KUR.KUR.MEŠ LŬKŬR refers to *uni arahzenaš* KUR.KUR LŬKŬR in the Direct Speech:

6.65 KBo 3.4+1 i 23-29 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 1), ed. Grélois 1988: 55-56

23 *nu kiššan AQBI* dUTU URU Arinna GAŠAN-YA arahzenaš=ya=mu-za KUR.KUR

LŬKŬR kuJeš 24 DUMU-lan ḫalzeššir nu=ya=mu-za tepnuškir nu=ya tuel šā
dUTU URU Arinna 25 GAŠAN-YA ZAG.HLA danna šanhīšišianā dār nU=ya=mu
dUTU URU Arinna GAŠAN-YA 26 kattan tiya nu=ya=mu=kan u-ni arahzenaš

KUR.KUR LŬKŬR peran kuenni 27 nu=mu dUTU URU Arinna memian ištamašta n= aš=mu kattan tiyā 28 nu=za=kan ANA GIŠ.GU.ZA ABI=YA kuṣapi ešḥat nu=za ke-e

arahzenaš 29 KUR.KUR.MEŠ LŬKŬR INA MU.10.KAM taraḫḫun n=at=kan kuennu §

I spoke like this: “O Sungoddess of Arinna, my Lady, the surrounding countries of the enemy which called me a child have humiliated me. They have started to seek to take your territories, (the territories) of the Sungoddess of Arinna, my Lady, a second time. O Sungoddess of Arinna, my Lady, stand by my side! Kill those (uni) surrounding countries of the enemy on my behalf!” The Sungoddess of Arinna listened to my prayer (lit. word) and backed me up. After I seated myself on my father’s throne, I conquered these (ke) surrounding countries of the enemy, and destroyed them (lit. killed).

As explained in Chapter 4, the distal demonstrative expresses the negative emotional attitude of the Speaker. So why did Mursili use the proximal demonstrative in the narration? The difference with the Direct Speech is that by the time he narrates this history the countries are already conquered and part of the Speaker’s cognitive domain.

6.5.2.3. Change of episode

272 See also KUB 26.43 + obv. 49 (lateNH landgrant, CTH 225) where *nu ki-i ṣaḫurunuṇaš* ... ANA DUMU.MEŠ ... pešta refers to everything mentioned before.
Temporal adverbs indicate a lapse of time, a change of episode. Each time such a lapse occurs the entities in the preceding discourse often lose their saliency and have to re-activated by means of a full noun phrase:


MUNUS.LUGAL kuit INA KUR URU.AMURRI uįįįį zarria manningkuțahmi za-ṣṣṭa nuṣkan
ANA MUNUS.LUGAL kuęw AWATEMEŠ ZI-tı na-zat ANA ŠES-żYA apezza ḥatrami...
GIM-annuza-ṣkan ANA ŠES-źYA DUMU.MUNUS UR-šį ari nuṣza-ṣkan ke-e
INIM.MEŠ MUNUS.LUGAL apija-šąa GAMRATI§

Given that the Queen will come to Amurru and that I (= the Queen) will be in your vicinity: as for the requests that are on the Queen’s mind, I will write them from there to my brother (= the pharaoh). (You, my brother, will not disapprove of them, you will approve of them!) And when (my) daughter arrives under the protection of my brother, these (ke) requests of the Queen will be fulfilled then also.

6.5.2.4. Relative clauses

Preposed ‘relative’ clauses are often used to re-activate a discourse entity. They provide the starting point for a new discourse (sub)theme and can therefore be translated as ‘as for …, given that …’. Because preposed relative clauses are topic-introducing and scene-setting it is not necessary to resume the relative noun in the following main clause, although this is often the case. In the next example the relative clause is followed by another subordinate clause before the head noun is resumed. Important for the present discussion is the fact that the relative ka- clause refers back across some other clauses to a list of names:


nuṣmu ke KUR.KUR.MEŠ danatta AŠŠUM MURDUTTİM peštā (list of countries) ḥūmandan ammuk ḥetepa KUR URU Ḥakiššā-ṣma-ṣmu 62 KUR URU Iṣṭahara-šia
ARAD-anni peštā nuṣmu INA KUR URU Ḥakišša 63 LUGAL-un ijaṭ nuṣmuṣkan ŠES-źYA kui-ki-ri KUR.KUR.MEŠ ẓi-dannatta 64 SU-i daśi nuṣmu 9IŠTI ARAD-anni
YA kuit SU-za ḥartā 65 nuṣza LŪKUR.MEŠ kuįęš-tar(a)ḥṭun kuįęš-ṣma-ṣmu takšulāīr
He gave me these unpopulated countries in subjethood. (list of countries), I ruled (them) all. But he gave me Hakpissa and Istahara in servitude and he made me king in Hakpissa. And as for these (ki) unpopulated countries which my brother had placed in my hand, given that Istar, My Lady held me by the hand, some enemies I beat, but others made peace with me.

6.5.2.5. Genitives

As explained in Chapter 2.3.4.3., modifiers such as genitives tend to be in low focus (see Cornish 1999: 162 ff. for discussion and references).

273 See also KUB 6.45+ i 8 (NH prayer, CTH 381). Probably also KUB 21.17 ii 8 (NH edict, CTH 86).
6.68 **Bo 86/299 i 85-88** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 14-15

85 kuiš=kan imma kuiš ĖRIN.MEŠ šarikuyaš EN.MEŠ ŠU'TI LÚ.MEŠ GIS-TUKUL

GID.DA=ja 86 ŠA=šši KUR URU4U-tašša ŠA=šši KUR URU100 Hūlāja=ja ēšzi 87 nu=šši ku-u-uš URU1IDLLH.LA ABU=YA puruttaz pešta 88 antuḫšaz=ma=āš=šiš=šiš=UL pešta

(The dudduššiali-people of city Iyasanta and the ẖuyantalu-people ... remain. The ẖarpatalu-people and the cup-bearers of city Adara remain), whatever š. troops, artisans and men-of-the-long-weapon are inside Tarhuntassa and inside the Hulaya-riverland. My father gave these (kus) cities to him together with the mud(-brick buildings), but he did not give them to him with the population.

---

6.5.3. The continuity procedure

In this section I will discuss ka- (N) that follows (almost) immediately upon another reference to the same entity. The difference with 6.5.2. is that this time formal markers of discourse nodes are absent. However, the ka- (N) clause itself marks the beginning or end of a discourse unit. The same was already concluded in chapter 4 on asi.

---

6.5.3.1. ka- (plus noun) indicating a digression from the main story line

As with asi N, the proximal demonstrative also occurs on discourse nodes that lead to a digression form the main narration or whatever genre it occurs in. In the Bronzetablet we often encounter the following type of digression (the same example as 3.31):274

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

URU-Ušaulaz=ma=šši ZAG-za URU-Haššuyantaš Š1 URU-Milaš URU-Palmataš URU-Haššašaš

URU-Suraš URU-Simmuyantaš Š2 ZAG-aš ku-u-uš=ma=kan URU1IDLLH.LA INA KUR

Hūlāja aššanteš §

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

The main structure of this part of text is a list. The list is built on the pattern 'His border (as seen) from the border of city X, is city Y'. Additional information of the location of city Y is provided in the next clause, with -ma attached to city Y. The particle -ma both indicates that a new, subordinate discourse unit has begun and that the city Y is an Unestablished Topic.

Another type of digression is the commentary, a remark made by the narrator that breaks the narration:275

6.70 **KBo 3.34 III 15'-19’** (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997:

§ 15 AHI LUGAL ANA PA[NI ABI] LUGAL kuješ ēškanta m[Am]muna 16 DUMU

URU-Uškzi[ia] āppanna= a mPimpirit URU-Ninašša 17 ki-i kardišaš šaš DUMU.MEŠ

---

274 See also Bo 86/299 i 55, 59, 67 (CTH 106A), KBo 4.10+ obv. 32' (treaty, CTH 106B).

275 See also Bo 2628 + iii 16 (NH vow, Puduhepa & Hattusili, CTH 585).
The brothers of the king which are seated in front of father of the king, [Am]juna, son of the city Sukzi[ya] and behind (him) Pimpiri of the city Ninassa — these (ki) were the sons of his heart — for them a throne is set up. A table is set up for them. A zaluwani is set up for them, and they always place hapasali- on the zaluwani.

The Speaker steps out of the time line of the narration, which is told in the present and addresses the Audience, telling them that ‘these were the sons of his heart’. The next examples are taken from treaties, which by their nature always have relevance for the present. There is therefore no change of tense, but in ex. 6.71 one can still see how the ka- clauses are inserted as a commentary in a sequence of conditional clauses:

6.71 KBo 5.13 iii 22-28 (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68), ed. Friedrich 1926: 128-129
§ 22 män-ma HUL-lun memian kuiñkî SA BAL piran 23 parā īštamašti naśšu LÚ URU HATTI kuiški 24 ŜA naśma LÚ URU Arzauya kuiški BAL īššai 25 kūnas-ta kušēš ku-u-uš LÚ MEŠ kuirynâša 26 memian-ma ANA dUTU-Sî piran parā īhūdâk 27 TIL hârâšî nu-eššan apēdaš kuqatqa 28 antušaš parâ uškšiš nu kīššan mematti ...

But if you hear some evil affair of revolt in advance, either some man from Hatti or some man from Arzawa is revolting — these (kus) men who are now your allies — and you do not write immediately in advance the affair to My Majesty, you look for some reason past those men, and you say as follows: ...
In most cases ka- (N) follows upon a list which itself does not have a clear function in the discourse.

6.73 KBo 15.10+ i 10-11 (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szábo 1971: 12-13
40 ALAM.HI.GIŚ ... 11 1 DUGhaniššaš GESTIN nu ki-i handāizzī
40 wooden statues, ... one hanissā-vessel with wine, these (ki) he arranges.

6.74 KBo 17.1+ iv 19-22 (OS ritual, CTH 416.1A), ed. Otten & Souček 1969: 38f.

In Chapter 2 (.3.3.4.1.) I discussed the notion of Immediate Anaphora after first mention. I suggested there that Immediate Anaphora after first mention is an instantiation of the of the Principle of the separation of reference and role on discourse level: “Do not announce a discourse topic and start talking about it in the same discourse unit”. The preceding examples fall in this category. Especially in rituals objects are used that are needed in the course of the ritual. As far as I am aware of it is not possible in Hittite to say something like “He arranges 40 wooden statues, ... one hanissā-vessel with wine” without properly introducing these objects.

Objects can be introduced as a simple list, but one also encounters staging verbs like ‘give’, or presentational clauses like ‘person X was/is Y’. After an enumeration of countries by name, the following edict continues with the core message:

6.75 KBo 6.29 i 28-30 (NH edict, Hattusili III, CTH 85), ed. Götzte 1925: 46-47
nu=mu KU[R ḫakpissa ... 28 pešta nu=mu 29 ḫuruš[tama] AG-an išat ḫissi kē KUR.KUR.MEŠ hūman[a piraŋ] 30 manițahheškinun
He gave me the country of ḫakpissa, ..., and he made the city Kurus[tama] my border.
All[!] these (ke) countries I governed [for] him.

In the copied Old Hittite narration KBo 3.28 (treated in Chapter 4 as ex. 4.37) the Queen of Hurma is introduced, brought ‘on stage’. Then the real story starts. Although there is a paragraph line and the rest of the tablet is lost, the story continues probably with the meddling of the Addressees with the marriage of the king.

6.76 KBo 3.28 ii 20-24 (OH/NS edict, Hattusili I, CTH 9)

Not worth a list but with the core message in the ka- clause: KUB 1.1+ ii 66 (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81).
§ 20 kinuna LUGAL-uš idalu mekki üñhun ta LUGAL-ya<š> uddär(r)amet 21 lē šarrattum aši MUNUS.LUGAL \^Huruma. E.Gi\^A 22 ēšta addas\^šaš.aš=mu ke-e- da-ni ara īan ārta §[\^ša]š=\^šaš.DUMU.MUNUS É-TIM kuyaš=an petatti[\^ša]\^ni. MUNUS.LUGAL[=\^ša apša kša (??)]

Today, I, the king, have seen many evil, so(?) you may not disrupt my affairs of (me), the king. That queen of Hurma was an eligible bride. Now, my father had considered me (the) right (husband) for her (kedani). § Now, [tha]\^t queen is a ‘daughter of the house’. (So) why are you carrying her off? You (………). Whom(ever) I, the king seat on my throne, [she shall become] queen!

But ‘stories’ are not only begun, they also end. Just as characters are introduced on stage, they also leave the scene. Leaving the scene is a clear signal that the discourse unit is going to end. As has been observed before, the closure of a discourse unit is often accompanied by demonstratives. This phenomenon is also attested in Hittite:

6.77 KBo 8.74+ iii 13'-15' (OS ritual, CTH *752.1A), ed. Neu 1980a: 223

§ 13' nu=za ük Gİ\^shu\^palli dâ[h]he 14 nu \^huppêmi \^araš=miš=aš\^šan īšananaš 15' āppa ke-e zaškizzi §
I take the h\^upalli-instruments, and I hit (them). My colleague however puts them (ke) back on the altars.

6.5.4. Both Tracking and Situational ka-

Second mentions of a demonstrative are not necessarily restricted to reference inside the discourse. In the next examples the second or later mentions of an entity are also situational\(^282\).

6.78 KUB 43.58 i 40-45 (MH/MS purification ritual, CTH 491), ed. CHD P: 170

§ 40 n=zaš\^a anda kiššan memai ki-i watar\(^41\) maḫ\^ahn parkui TÖC NİG.LAM.MEŞ= kan ke-e-ez-za arranz\(^{42}\) n=at parkunua\^nzi UNUTE\(^{43}\) ke-e-ez arranz\(^{44}\) n=at parkunua\^nzi nu ka-a-aš maḫ\^ahn uilenan\^s\^a\] 44 [\^š]üman parkunu\^skizzi ūuppia\^ḫiškizzi\(^{45}\) [\^š]ina\^nra šum\^as\(^{46}\) DINGIR.MEŞ QATAMMA parkunu\^ddu §
He speaks as follows: “Just as this (ki) water is clean —they wash festive garments with this (kezza) and clean them, and they wash utensils with this (kez) and clean them— so, just as this (kas) w\^a\^t[er] cleans and sanctifies everything, may it now likewise clean you, o gods”.

First, the water is introduced by means of deictic ki watar ‘this water’. The next references are done with pronominal kez. The proximal demonstrative kez is probably used because the clause containing it is a kind of commentary which breaks the comparison (compare with

\(^{281}\) CHD P: 349 differently: [n=zaš\^a] MUNUS.LUGAL-aš DUMU.MUNUS É-TIM kuyaš=an petatti[\^ša]\^ni. “Where are you taking the queen’s ‘daughter of the house’?”

\(^{282}\) See also MH KBo 15.10+ i 27, 33 (tongues, CTH 443); NH KBo 4.6 rev. 10’ (sheep), 12’, 15’ (both woman) (CTH 380), KUB 48.119 obv. 3’ (illness, CTH 590).
The fact that real anaphoric pronouns are used does not prevent the occurrence of a demonstrative, as we have seen before. The difference with the other Tracking demonstratives is that ka- also points at the substitute in the presence of the Speaker.

6.5.5. Summary and conclusions

Although I subdivided the material into two groups, demonstratives referring to salient (6.5.2.) and non-salient entities (6.5.3.), it became clear that saliency alone is not the only factor influencing the choice of a referential expression. Also in cases where ka- referred to salient entities it could always be argued that ka- occurred on a discourse node (6.5.3.1. and 6.5.3.2.).

One of the questions was whether there was a difference between pronominal and adjectival ka-. Although pronominal ka- occurred generally in salient contexts, there are also some examples of ka-N in salient context. The difference is not clear to me.

Contrary to the situation with apa- and asi, the texts in which Tracking ka- occurs cover almost each Hittite genre. This distribution either means that ka- is neutral or unmarked, or that it is Speaker oriented. I tend to think of Tracking ka- as unmarked with respect to person (see for example ex. 6.73). Still, there are attestations of full noun phrases in comparable contexts without a demonstrative, who also should be unmarked (see ex. 3.35, 3.42 in Chapter 3). In the conclusion to this Chapter I will present a hypothesis that might explain this.

Many tracking ka-s are found in subordinate clauses, in which case the Topic-Focus distinction is not relevant. In main clauses non-salient ka- (section 6.5.2.) sometimes occurs in the VP, and is therefore part of the Focus. The non-salient subject ka-N in ex. 6.66 however is also necessarily part of the Focus. New discourse units can be compared with discourse initial utterances and therefore usually have Sentence Focus.

281 The use of apa- denoting Replacing Focus leading to a translation 'her instead' is discussed in chapter 8.

235
In the salient section (6.5.3.) ex. 6.69 showed ka- N as Unestablished Topic, and ka-in ex. 6.70 as Established Topic. KBo 8.35 ii 28’ (list of names, immediately followed by *nu ke-e-a QATAMMA[=pat l]inkir*) seems to be a rare attestation of ka- in Expanding Argument Focus. The exx. 6.73-76 shows Immediate Anaphora after first mention. The Topic-Focus structure of such clauses is not clear to me.

### Tracking Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuity procedure</th>
<th>Centering procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Topic ka-</td>
<td>U-Topic ka-N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Focus ka-</td>
<td>Focus ka-(N)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4: The Tracking ka- matrix.

**6.6. The cataphoric use of ka-**

In 6.4.3.1.2. I already presented some examples of forward referring *ka-*(exx. 6.46, 6.47, 6.48). Here I list another example to show that there is not much difference between forward reference to a stretch of discourse and to a list of first order entities.

**6.80 KBo 15.10+ i 1-4** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szabó 1971: 12-13

§ 1 *[män] iššanás **d**UTU-un **d**IM-n=a **F**GIR-pa **līlānzi** 2 *[nu **k**i]-i **d**anzi **2** **kurdāl** išnaš nu-ššan 3 **kēdān** 7 **E**ME išnaš išṣṣuānān **kēdān** 2ššan 4 **7** **E**ME išnaš išṣṣuāntesš 1.UDU **yākšur** LĀL **yākšur** ...

[When] they conciliate the Sungod of Blood and the Stormgod, they take *[th]is (ki): 2 *kurdali*-vessels, of dough; in one 7 tongues of dough (have been) dropped, and in the other one 7 tongues of dough (have been) dropped; a bite of sheep fat; a bite of honey; ...

I do not find much difference between ‘they take these objects’ or ‘he puts these words ...’ (ex. 6.41) besides the different entity orders.

**6.7. The contrastive use of ka- ... ka- ‘this (one) ... that (one)’**

**6.7.1. Introduction**

In section 6.2.2.1. I discussed the couple of adverbs of relative position *ket ... ket i kez ... kez* ‘on this side ... on that side’ and the couple of local adverbs *ka ... ka* ‘here ... there’.

The preceding example contained the couple of demonstratives *ka- ... ka* referring to objects, not locations. These two phenomena illustrate two uses of the same principle.

---

236 Other attestations of forward reference to first order entities: OH KBo 17.3 iiii 29 (ritual, CTH 416.1 B); MH KBo 15.10+ i 2 (ritual, CTH 443); NH KBo 3.44+ i 28 (annals, CTH 61 I), KUB 1.1+ ii 56 (egodocument, CTH 81); GG iv 15 (vow, CTH 585); lateNH KUB 26.43 + obv. 19, 54 (landgrant, CTH 225); KBo 33.216 rev. 5 (vow, CTH 590), KUB 56.48 ii 31 (festival, CTH 672B).
expression of contrastive pairs by means of either *ka* ... *ka* - or *apa* ... *apa* - (see also chapter 7.2.5.1.).

Contrast between referents is not necessarily expressed as in English ‘this and/or that’, or Latin ‘hic ... ille’. Swahili for example does not allow the use of the proximal and distal forms together for contrast. The proximal form is used twice instead: *Hii* *ya* *fu* *ti* *ka*, *hii* *ha* *fu* *ti* *k* *i* *ka* *(see also chapter 7.2.5.1.)*. In 6.7.2. I present contrastive pairs in Situational use, and in 6.7.3. in Anaphoric use.

### 6.7.2. Situational contrastive pairs

In these two examples one can imagine how the Speaker points to different objects or persons in his visual field:

6.81 **KBo 6.2+ ii 18-20, § 40 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 48**

§ 18 *takku* LÜ GİŞ*TUKUL* *har(a)kzi* ]Ū LŪ *ILKI* tittianza LŪ *ILKI* tezzi 19 *ki-i* GİŞ*TUKUL*-li*met* *ki-i=*ma *şahha=met* A.*ŞA.*H.İ.ŞA* ŞA* LÜ GİŞ*TUKUL-*ma* anda *şittarizzi* 20 GİŞ*TUKUL*li*ia* *har*[zi]*şahhann=a* *iššai*

If a man who has a TUKUL-obligation disappears, and a man owing *ILKU*-services is assigned, and the man owing *ILKU*-services says 286: ‘This (*ki*) is my TUKUL-obligation, while that (*ki*) is my obligation for şahhan-services’, (then) he shall secure for himself a sealed deed concerning the land of the man having a TUKUL-obligation. He shall (then) both hold the TUKUL-obligation and perform the şahhan-services.


... *nu* šuma*š* BELU.İ.İ.ŞA *a[p]*aṭ 14 *[k]uwa*tqa *kuviški* memai DUMU.MEŞ EN.MEŞ = YA=ya=nn[aš] 15 *[a]nd*la OL imma NUMUN EN=YA nu=ya=nn[aš] *ke-e-da-n[i] 16 *[(GI*M)]-an* şer linganaş*kir* ke-e-da-ni*ia=ya*[(a=nn[aš])] 17 *[QA]* TAMMA šer linganaş*kanzi* nu=ya=nn[aš] *ka-a*[(a-aš)] 18 *EN-aš*pa*t n=a*at=ši GAM NES DINGIR-**LIM** GAR-ru

... (if) someone says somehow *that* to you, the lords: “The sons of my lords in us (?) are not among the offsprings of my lord. Just as they have sworn us in on this one (*kedani*), on that one *too* (*kedani=*ya) they shall swear us in likewise. *This* one (*kas*) (is) our only lord,” (then) let it be put under divine Oath to him.

### 6.7.3. Anaphoric contrastive pairs

In anaphoric use ‘this one, that one’ becomes ‘the one ... the other’ (see also ex. 6.80). 287

---

285 Hoffner I.e. interprets ‘the man owing *ILKU*-services says: ‘This is my TUKUL-obligation, while that is my obligation for şahhan-services’ … as part of the apodosis. Given the conditional clause ‘But if he refuses the TUKUL-obligation, …,’ I prefer to include the Direct Speech part in the protasis. The structure of the law thus becomes: ‘If a man who has a TUKUL-obligation disappears, and a man owing *ILKU*-services is assigned, if the latter accepts both obligations, then …, but if he refuses, then …’

286 See also KUB 29.30 iii + 2*, KBo 6.26 iii 33, 34, iv 2, 3, 4 (OH/NS laws, CTH 292). Probably also here KUB 14.1 rev. 30, 31 (MH/MS indictment, CTH 147) *ke-e-el* ŞA KUR.KUR-*TIM* ... *ke-e-el* ŞA KUR.KUR-*TIM*.

287 See also KUB 29.30 iii + 2*, KBo 6.26 iii 33, 34, iv 2, 3, 4 (OH/NS laws, CTH 292). Probably also here KUB 14.1 rev. 30, 31 (MH/MS indictment, CTH 147) *ke-e-el* ŞA KUR.KUR-*TIM* ... *ke-e-el* ŞA KUR.KUR-*TIM*.
6.83 **KBo 17.1+ ii 21'-22',** with duplicate KBo 17.6 ii 15'-16' (OS ritual, CTH 416.1 A), ed. Neu 1980a: 7

II DUMU.MEŠ.E.GAL [a(r)an{(dar)}i] ka-a-aš-ša GISŠUKUR ZAB[ar ḫarzi] 22 ka-a-aš-ša GISŠUKUR ZABAR [{Ḫarzi}]

The two palace attendants are standing. Both the one and the other hold a bronze spear.

Compare this with the similar use of *apa- ... apa-* (also treated as ex. 7.25 in Chapter 7):

6.84 **KBo 3.34 ii 1-6** (OH/NS Narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 44-45

1 mZidi LÜZABAR.DAB ēšta ABI LUGAL DUGIhar ḫarān [GEŠTIN-it] 2 ANA ḫiṣṣātā̀ra mMaratti-zja maniāḫḫiš 3 LUGAL-ī SIG₃-antan GEŠTIN-an ḫinkatta apēḏāš-ša 4 tamain GEŠTIN-an piēr a-pa-a-aš-ša īt LUGAL-ī tet 5 nattā apūn GEŠTIN-an piēr LUGAL-uš kuin 6 anūta a-pa-a-aš-ša īt QATAMMA IQBI Zidi was a cupbearer. The father of the king allotted a ḫarāra-vessel with wine to Histiyara and Maratti. To the king he (=Zidi) delivered good wine, but to *them* they gave other wine. Both the one (*apass=a*) came (and) said to the king: 'They did not give (to us) that wine, which the king saw' and the other (*apass=a*) came (and) said the same. ...”

In order to find the difference between *apa- ... apa-* and *ka- ... ka-* one should find a property which is always present in one case but absent in the other. One factor which can be excluded is present versus past. In the same text one also has *ka- ... ka-*:

6.85 **KBo 3.34 ii 28-32** (OH/NS narration, CTH 8), ed. Dardano 1997: 52-53

... nuzu mIsputaš-inar maniāḫḫēškizzi 29 Gī-an GISUMBĪN ḫaššaššar GīšTUKUL apātār nuzu apāš annanut 30 ku-u-ūn apāš annanut ku-u-uš-ša ABI LUGAL ANA Nakkilit 31 GAL LÜ.MEŠ-SAΓI paiš ku-u-uš mḪuzzi GAL LÜ.MEŠ-NIMGIR 32 ku-u-uš mKizzu GAL LÜ.MEŠ-MEŠEDI paiš šu-uš ukēšarāḫēšir ... Isputasinar instructs them (=the young chariot-fighters). The arrow, the sharpening-wheel (?), the holding of the weapon, he taught them. *One* (*kun*) he taught (=continued to train), 288 and some others (*kus*) the father of the king gave to Nakkalit, head of the cupbearers, and still others (*kus*) he gave to Huzzi, head of the heralds, (finally) some (*kus*) to Kizzu, head of the royal bodyguards, so that they completed their training.

The only difference between the examples with *apa- ... apa-* (see also Chapter 7.2.5.1.) and those with *ka- ... ka-* is that the persons referred to by *apa- ... apa-* have names. I would like to suggest that *ka-* is less specific than *apa-*. That is, if persons have been identified by name, one uses the truly (emphatic) anaphoric pronoun *apa-*, but when one has to single out a person or persons from a group without being able to identify them, one cannot use *apa-* but

---

288 Dardano o.c. 53 translates *nu annanut* ..... etc. as "Quello li istruiva, quell'altro lo istruiva (?)"; alla fine il padre del re affidò alcuni a Nakkilit, ..., altri a Huzziya, ... e altri ancora a Kizzuwa ... e (costoro) completarono a loro preparazione." She takes the two *apa-* clauses together, and separates them from the following clauses. Probably in order to avoid two references of *apa-* to the same person she has chosen to introduce two different referents for the two *apa*-s. This solution introduces an unknown referent, not mentioned in the discourse. The pronoun *apa-*referring to an unspecified entity is not attested in my material.
has to turn to *ka-. In the following text the proximal demonstrative is barely referential. The couple *ka- ... *ka- refers to some members from the class of *hippara-men but these members have not been identified before.

6.86 **KBo 6.2+ ii 53-57, § 49 (CTH 291),** ed. Hoffner 1997: 59-60

§ 53 *[tak]ku *L[U] *hipparaš* tājēzzi šarnikzi N.U.GĀL *54* [o]-[o-i]nkanzan nu tuekkanza šīš pat šarnikzi *mām* [e-man] *55* tajazzil piškir man ḫūmanteš =pat maršēr *56* [man[e]] L.U.MES NI.ZU kišantati *ka-a-aš* =man ku-u-un epzi *57* [ka]-a-ša =man ku-u-un epzi

[I]f a *hippara-man* steals, there will be no compensation. ... , and only his body shall give compensation. If they [were] required to give (compensation for) theft, they would all become dishonest, they [would] become thieves. This one (*kas*) would seize that one (*kun*), while that one (*kas=a*) would seize this one (*kun*).

In the following treaty *ka- ... *ka- is not referential at all (from the point of view of the Reader of the text).

6.87 **KBo 5.9 iii 1-2 (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 62),** ed. Friedrich 1926: 19-20

*našma=tta mān* DUTU-SI iii 1 *kueka memijanuš ḫurāši memai kuš=ya memiạš 2* *našma=ya kûn memiàn ija* ...

Or if My Majesty somehow tells you secretly some orders: “Do these (*kus*) things or that (*kun*) thing”...

Summarizing, contrastive pairs are denoted by identical demonstratives.

6.7.4. Summary and conclusions

Contrastive ‘this one ... that one’ is not expressed by *ka ... apa- or *ka- ... *asi but by *ka- ... *ka-. This was not only found with the adverbs of relative position *ket* ... *ket* / *kez* ... *kez* ‘this side of X, ... that side of X’ or with the local adverb *ka* ... *ka* ‘here(to) ... there(to)’, but also with adjectival *ka- ... *ka-. The existence of anaphoric *ka- ... *ka- raised the question how to explain the difference with contrastive *apa- ... apa-*. I observed that *apa- ... apa- occurred when the referents were uniquely identified, they were mentioned by name, whereas this was not so for *ka- ... *ka-. I therefore tentatively suggested that *ka- was less specific, and translated it with ‘one ... others, some’. This would match with the observation made earlier that *ka- is, at least in anaphoric contexts, the unmarked demonstrative with a wider use than demonstrative *apa- or *asi.

I would like to propose the following explanation, although it should be typologically tested on a selection of languages with a person-based deictic system.

The difference between for example English and Hittite in expressing contrastive pairs could be motivated by the differences between distance-based and person-based systems. In Situational use *ka- refers to the area of the Speaker. One could imagine that a combination *ka- ... apa- would only imply that *ka- belongs to the domain of the Speaker, and *apa- to that of the Addressee. But if that specific allocation has to be avoided, the natural thing to do is to use *ka- ... *ka- which points at the global area around Speaker. Only if one wants to emphasize the dichotomy between Speaker and Addressee one should use *ka- ... apa- (or *ka- ... *asi in case of We (= Speaker + Audience) versus the Other).
6.8. Summary and conclusions

In 6.2.5. I concluded that the situationally used proximal demonstrative ka- refers to elements or locations in the domain of the Speaker, irrespective of distance. Salient objects were referred to by pronominal ka-, non-salient objects by ka- N.

The Speaker-orientation was supported by the (rare) use of ka- as a Recognitional demonstrative (6.3.).

However, when entering the field of discourse deixis the ties with the domain of the Speaker were loosened. The adverb of manner kisser occurred with all persons, and so did ka- (6.4.5.). As far as discourse structure is concerned, all discourse deictic ka-s occurred on discourse nodes.

The same two features, not being solely Speaker oriented and occurring on discourse nodes (or referring across one), were found with Tracking ka- (6.5.5.). Contrary to the situation with apa- and asi, the texts in which Tracking ka- occurred covered almost each Hittite genre.

So either ka- is neutral or unmarked, or it is Speaker oriented. But it cannot only be neutral for there are attestations of full noun phrases in comparable contexts without a demonstrative. Although more study on the use of tracking noun phrases with and without demonstratives is necessary, I present the following hypothesis.

Hittite tracking noun phrases with and without demonstratives often occur on discourse nodes. The difference between the two types of noun phrases is twofold. First, 'bare' noun phrases are used when a new discourse unit starts that is not strongly connected with the preceding unit. But if one explicitly wants to relate the new unit to the contents of the preceding one, one should use a demonstrative. A Hittite then had three choices: ka-, apa- or asi. The marked demonstratives are apa- and asi. These demonstratives assign the referent of a noun phrase explicitly to the domain of the Addressee and the Other respectively. With ka- the situation is different. Since the Speaker's viewpoint is often the main point of view in any piece of discourse, the proximal demonstrative ka- can evolve into a more neutral demonstrative. But it is still possible to denote the Speaker's domain. One should also compare the tracking noun phrases with the kuit clauses. Such clauses often provide a background for what follows. However, when this background is linked to the preceding unit ki kuit is used. The preceding unit is still relevant to the present unit, and therefore the unmarked ki is chosen, not because it is important to only the Speaker, but to everyone.

When discussing the expression of contrastive pairs, which is done by ka- ... ka- or apa- ... apa- 'the one ... the other' (6.7.), I suggested that ka- was used when the referents of ka- were unidentified, whereas apa- ... apa- was used when the referents were mentioned by name. If this is correct, then again ka- is less specific than apa- and asi, which would match the observations for tracking ka- versus the others.

Collecting all tables, we have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>geographical parameter</th>
<th>cognitive parameter</th>
<th>continuity procedure</th>
<th>centering procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Topic</td>
<td>U-Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>ka-</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>ka-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitional</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

240
The most important conclusion is that *ka*- as a demonstrative either occurs as first mention in case of situational use and recognitional use (by definition), and that within the discourse itself *ka*- only refers across node. However, contrary to the other demonstratives, both *ka*- and *ka*- *N* refer to salient and non-salient discourse entities. Only in situational use this is different (see above).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse Deictic, on/across node</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>—</th>
<th>—</th>
<th><em>ka- N</em></th>
<th><em>ka- (N), kisan</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracking, across node</td>
<td><em>ka-</em></td>
<td><em>ka- N</em></td>
<td><em>ka-</em></td>
<td>—</td>
<td><em>ka- (N)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5: The *ka*- matrix.