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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). Remarks on the use of ka- hardly ever exceeded references to the Latin deictic system. 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 Addressec was located in relation to the Speaker. The person orientation of ka- and apa- was also noted by Friedrich 1960 and Puhvel 1984ff. (for more discussion see 3.1.3. and 5.1.2.).

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

1. ka- refers forward, apa-, eni- and asi refer backward (o.c. 134, §§ 249, 250, 251). He did not state this literally but the reader has to infer it from § 249-251, of which § 251 is conclusive: “Mit dieser Verteilung der beiden Gruppen auf Vor- und Rückdeutung ...”.

2. At the same time ka- can also refer to the first person (Ich-Deixis) and apa- to the second and third person (Du-Deixis and Jener-Deixis) (§ 251, see also Friedrich 1930: 94f., 141f.). Thus, the combination ka- N ... apa- N means something like ‘my N ... your N’. Similarly, kā means ‘here with me’ and apiya ‘there with you’ or ‘there with him’.

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:

---


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’, abaa- = ‘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’, apasia = ‘ipse’ (Neu 1997: 148 n. 39).
6.1.2. Fragestellung

That *ka*- is the proximal demonstrative ‘this’ is without doubt. However, much more can be said on the function of *ka*-. First I will classify *ka*- according to the four categories of demonstrative use (Situational, Recognitional, Anaphoric and Discourse Deictic) which are familiar by now (sections 6.2 to 6.5.). For an explanation of this terminology see the preceding chapters. Besides these four categories we have also forward reference to objects by means of *ka*-, which was not attested for the other demonstratives (section 6.6.)

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

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

6.2. The Situational Use of *ka*-

6.2.1. Introduction

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

6.2.2. True situational use

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

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

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

§ 48 [ta]kku ARAD-as huuai n-za äppa kuiški uyatezzi takku manninkuan e[pzi]i 49 nu-şše KUS E-SIR-su pāi takku ke-e-et ID-az 2 GIN KÜ.BABBAR pāi 50 takku e-di ID-az nu-şše 3 GIN KÜ.BABBAR pāi §

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

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

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

našma-sta duTU-ši 31 kuši ke-e-ez IŞTU IDAštarpa Ü IŞTU IDşianna ÜL 32 [kui]tik ADDIN zik-ma-ša ZAG-AN ērratti nu-za datti kuški

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

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

Summarizing, areas relative to some location other than the Deictic Center are often referred to by means of ket ... edi, kez ... edez. In one case (ex. 6.3) Melchert believes that the deictic force of ket ... edi should not be taken seriously (1977: 171). He assumes that, as in English, ‘on this side and that’ may evolve into ‘on one side and the other’. But as we will see, this type of deictic contrast is expressed by ket ... ket / kez ... kez and, when referring to objects, by ka- ... ka-. 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.MEŠMUHAŁDIM)] 15 haššāš katta ke-e-et arta VI [JAR-n[a]jSAR ērzi j[Ü heštā] 16 haššāš katta e-di paršanān ērzi VI [JAR-n[a]jSAR ērzi

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.
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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 endingless 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 l.c.: “In general, when a directional ablative is construed with a preceding dative (or genitive in Old Hittite), the latter is the sole point of reference for defining the direction expressed by the ablative: haššāš / hašši tapuša 'to the side of / beside the hearth'. When the directional ablative is accompanied by another ablative, the direction expressed is also defined in terms of another, unexpressed reference point: ḫuwašiaz a-raḫša ‘outside of (= beyond) the ḫuwaši-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
[(IMAS.GAL-i)ri garauni-š(i)]26 murijaš(š gangante)]š ke-e-et-ta gar[auni-ši]
[27 murijalas [g|ganganteš
At the horn of a he-goat grape-breads are hanging, and also, grape-breads are hanging on [his] horn 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 z(ya cliticized on the first NP have to be symmetrical. In such a case one clause cannot be subordinate to the other, either syntactically or semantically. It is therefore impossible to assign a causal relation or any other semantically subordinate relation to the members of a coordination as Starke does.229

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

6.7 KBo 32.14 ii 26-30 (MH/MS wisdomtext), ed. Neu 1996: 79
§26 ališanašt ašši I-da-an tapuša kuješ 27 yeššu nu apūš yešijattari 28 ke-e-zì-
ia=ka[n] kuješ yeššu nuššan apèdašša 29 š[i(ku)]a zikkizzi
A deer: he is allowed to graze (only) those meadows that are alongside the river. But as for the meadows that are on the other side (kezi=), on those too he sets (his) [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 z(ya. 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 an otherwise not attested demonstrative adverb of manner, one also must assume that the enclitic neutral pronoun -at in ka-a-na-at refers proleptically to two concepts of common gender ışanazana(š) șmiš (mistakenly written -šmit) karaz șmišša a ‘their soul and their inners (= their inmost soul)’. These problems may be avoided if
If the fever will befall My Majesty only there (apiya=pat), in the country of Nerek, but not here (ka), ...

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

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.

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

They call "meiniiliawza mieya". 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 43.21 ii 18'-21' (OH/NS) now becomes 19 šiunan 4UTU-ui marnuqan màn šiisarr=s a 19 an<do> kulamtaš išaza(n)=zi šiš karaz=zi mišš=s a 18 1-iš kišat ka-a UD-at DINGIR šiunan 4UTU-aš labar[šašš=s a] 21 išaza(n)=zi šiš karaz=zi amišš=s a 1-iš kišaru 'O Sungod of the gods, as marnu-drink and beer have been blended (and) their mind and heart (lit. innards) have become one, let to-day the mind and heart of the Sungod of the gods [and of the] Labar[na] become one!' The closely related texts KUB 43.61 and its duplicate KUB 43.63 also contain the expression ka-a UD-at 'today'.

21 See example 6.38 for this translation.

22 CHD Ş 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 with which the text is closely connected, is the cuneiform Hittite draft of the Hieroglyphic Luvian Nișantaş inscription. The Nișantaş text seems to be a building inscription accompanying an elevated *hekur*, a stone sanctuary, constructed by Suppiluliuma (II). In the cuneiform draft we find references to both the *hekur* and a statue of Tudhaliya IV which resides inside this structure:

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

§ 4' *ki-* *ma-* *za* ALAM [*ABU* *za* *YA* (?)] 5' *mTudhaliya* *š* U[L 1-aś DŪ-at (?)] 6' *uqq* a *za* m*KÜ.GA.P* [U-aś LUGAL.GAL] ... 10' *išanun* §

Now, this (ki) statue [my father] Tudhaliya did not make (it) [alone (?)], also I, Suppiluliuma, ..., made it.\(^{233}\)

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

*nu-šši ku-u-un*\(^{234}\) *Nāšeur SAG.UŠ* 4' *š* m*KÜ.GA.P* U-aś LUGAL.GAL *ušadahun* §

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

Besides this unique draft we have otherwise only texts that were spoken aloud in the presence of an object or person or at some location. This is not very different from direct speech 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-šši* 1 ŠAḤ *māḥhan* 20' ŠAḤ.TUR.ḪI.A *mekkuš ūšakizzii ke-e-el-la-az* ŠA *gāš*KIRI.GEŠTI N 21' 1-ašš-a G3*māḥlaš ŠA-hašiš* ŠA-aš *išar mūriš* 22' *mekkuš ūshekiddu*

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

\(^{233}\) In order to account for the particle *-ya* "also" in *u-uq-qa-at* I have inserted '1-aś' in the break to express that also Suppiluliuma worked on the statue. It is possible that the statue was erected by Tudhaliya but that his son inscribed Tudhaliya's deeds on it.

\(^{234}\) Note the regular common gender for *hekur* (Rieken 1999: 287f.).
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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-āš kuš*m *Kašanda* 11 ARAD LÚ DUMU SANGA *URU* *Urišta* 12 *ēšzi nu = zas* kan *MUNUS URUGašša* 13 *yašta*<s?>

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

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

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

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

§ 46’ *[našma?]=ššan kuš kūrur parā galānkanza nu kiššan* 47 [imma t]ezzi *man zya* ini kūrur *ḥarakzi nu kiššan* 48 [(imma t)]ezzi *man zya* ini *[kūru]r* 49’ *(parā a)*[puēšzi [nu] apūn ke-e *NIŠ DINGIR.MEŠ* appandu

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

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

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

*mān āš kardīmījanza* 4 [kardimijattn *ke-e-ti UD-ti* arha peššadekku 5 *mān āš* tamatta*ts-*ma KUR-ja n=an tamētaz 6 [KUR-az uyqatetten

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

6.20 **1043/u iv 11-12** (NH vow, Puduhepa & Hattusili, CTH 585), ed. Otten & Souček 1965: 34-36

**11** MU V.KAM *ka-a-āš kuš*M UKAM-[z](a parā uiz)ezi n=āš=ša kan* 12 [k]arū anda appanza [ …, fifth year. This *(kas)* year that is *(still)* going on, has *[a]*ready 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, 36 (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 *ka-* (+N) in the category of Direct Speech is first mention, with the further restriction that the Direct Speech is not part of a larger citation. Both non-first mention and citation from a larger part of text are not necessarily deictic. Given the fact that anaphoric references of *ka-* are widely attested (see section 6.5.), one cannot be certain whether second mentions in citations are truly deictic. However, for some likely attestations of this type of mixed deictic/anaphoric reference, see section 6.5.4.

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

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

6.2.3.1. The continuity procedure: the demonstrative pronoun *ka-*

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

6.21  
\[\text{KBo 22.2 obv. 1-2 (OS narration, CTH 3.1A), ed. Otten 1973: 6-7}\]
\[1^1 \text{MUNUS.LUGAL URU Kaniš XXX DUMU.MEŠ I-EN MU-anti ḫāšta UMMA SlzMA} \]
\[2^2 [ki-]iz-ya kuit yalkuan ḫāšṭu\]
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 *ka-* is manipulated by the Speaker and obviously in the center of attention:

6.22  
\[\text{KBo 15.10+ ii 12-16 (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szábo 1971: 20-21}\]
\[1^12 \text{[QAD]}U kurdaši idalamuš EMEN.LI.A arha šuhhaar}^{13} [nu k]iššan mēmir ke-e māhān ḫarkanzi \]
\[14 [Zliss-a BEŁAM QADU DAM-SU DUMU.MEš-SU kuit iššišia}^{15} [nu S]A \]
\[16 \text{[Zi alyanzatarzšet idalu uddarzšet QATAMMA}^{16} [hara]kdu nəzatəapa}\]
\[\text{EGIR-pa lē uizzì}^{8}\]
[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!”]
He roasts the turuppu-breads in a flame, and cuts them to pieces. He puts (each of them) in front of the Stormgod and his male gods and the Sungod and his male gods. He speaks as follows: “Sungod, male gods of the Sungod, Stormgod, male gods of the Stormgod, we have cut off these (kus, pieces). ...”

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

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-.

As I will explain in chapter 7, there is a clear correlation between first position and -ya “also”. The initial position of ka- in 6.23, 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.

**6.23 KBo 15.10+ ii 23-26** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szabó 1971: 24-25


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 extraposed constituents. Other salient ka-s occur in MH: KBo 5.3 + i 9 (CTH 42), KBo 15.10+ iii 55’ (CTH 443).

They carry (it) into the house of the lord. He takes one kurdali-vessel of dough with 'the tongues', and speaks as follows: "These evil … tongues, Zipplantawiy[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.


[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 našma ki kuššik memai ke-e-da-ni=ya=kan ŽUPPI 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 Župpī ‘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), ABo T 60 obv. 16' (letter, CTH 200), KBo 15.10+ ii 5 (ritual, CTH 443).

241 Other attestations of reflexive Župpī in OH KBo 3.22 obv. 34 (?) ('building inscription', CTH 1A); MH: KBo 5.3+ ii 61 (treaty, CTH 42), VBo T 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\text{\$at} (\text{húmani}) \text{\$e} k\text{-e-da-}a\text{-}s \text{memi}j\text{\$ana}\$ [... ] ²⁴³ \((k\text{-e-da-ni lingai }\text{ku})\text{tru}e\text{ne}\$ a\text{x}\text{an}du \;(n\text{\$at}k\text{\$an} k\text{-e-})\text{el tuppia}x\$ \text{INIM.MES }\text{u\text{\$}\text{\$}\text{\$}nu}\$[i]) \text{²⁵} \((n\text{\$attak\$an }k)\text{\$as DINGIR-LIM ar}\text{b}(a )\text{\$}\text{arnink}\text{\$an}du\$ [...], let them] all [be] witnes\[ss] to this (kedani) oath concerning these (kedas) matters. And if you change the words of this (kel) tablet, then [may] th[ese oath-deities] d[estroy] you [completely]!

The dative *kedas* in 'these words, matters' refers backwards to the stipulations of the treaty and is therefore discourse deictic. Oath (*kedani lingai*)²⁴² on the other hand may be reflexive or discourse deictic.

One of the few cases where a reflexive expression other than 'tablet' can be isolated is the following *arkuwar* 'plea'²⁴³:

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

\[ n\text{\$atza KUR.KUR.JL.a-}a\text{\$u\text{\$}stu}b^{31}\text{a } m\text{a\text{\$}h\text{\$}an }\text{EGIR-pa }\text{l\text{\$}ami \;(n\text{\$at}k\text{\$a} \text{k}\text{\$i-i }\text{arkuwar ijami} \text{²³} n\text{\$at} \text{\$U EN\text{\$}YA }\text{i\text{\$}tama\$\$an}du\$ \text{§}} \]

How I again remove the sins of the countries and make [that (=at)] into [\(k\text{\$i}h\text{\$i}s (k)\text{\$i}\) 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).

²⁴² Possibly reflexive *lingai* also in MH: KUB 23.77+ obv. 10 (treaty, CTH 138.1), KBo 8.35 i 14', 16', ii 13' (treaty, CTH 139), KBo 19.58+ rev. 17' (instruction, CTH 268); NH: KUB 19.49 iii 48' (treaty, CTH 69); lateNH: KBo 4.14 iii 5 (treaty, CTH 123), KUB 26.25 i 2', 5', 7' (? , CTH 126.2), KUB 26.1 iv 46 (instruction, CTH 255.2).

²⁴³ 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 *nammaššu* dUTU-SI *kuin ku-u-un* NIN-YA ANA DAM-UTTI z K(A AD) DIN 15 *nussī* NIN.MES-SU SA MĀŠ-SU SA NUMUN-SU *meqqaššu* ([aš]anzī)
Furthermore, as for this (kuin) sister which I have given to you as your wife, she has many sisters belonging to her family and clan.

22 LUKUR ša *mu* kuiš ka-a-aš LUGAL K[UR AŚŠUR GUB-a]nza n=āš=mu=kan 23 mān SA KUR.URU uizzī nu=tt[a bīnk]an ZAG-aš ēšdu
And concerning this (kas) enemy, the king of [Assur who is ris]ing up against me, if he comes into my country, let [deajt]h be your end.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognitional Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuity procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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. 102).

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

6.4.2. The adverb of manner kissan

Although Hrozný (1917: 135) believed that enissan and kissan were demonstrative pronouns like ka- and eni, he already saw correctly that enissan referred backward and kissan “in der Regel” forward. Since Forrer (1922: 208) 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.c. has also been accepted (Friedrich 1960: 134 (§ 250)) although kissan sometimes refers backward (Friedrich o.c. 135 (§252)). According to Friedrich 1930: 141 backward referring kissan is found in connection with the Speaker. This would indeed fit a person-based deictic system.

Generally kissan 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 ğerñaš ÉRINMEŠ-an teššummiušš-a takēna 9 šariemi t=ūš tarmaemi ta ki-iš-ša-an tēmi 10 dUTU-ūš dIM-aš kāš[(a LU)]GAL-i MUNUS.LUGAL-ri DUMU MEŠ-
mašš-a URU Hattušši 11 ērma(n)=šmet ešš[(ar=š)]amet idašu=šmet 12 [ḥatuka=šmet ḫar[i](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-iš-ša-an is attested in KUB 28.4 obv. 16b (Laroche 1965b: 75). There also exists a neuter ki-i-ni besides ki-i (KBo 34.142 obv.2 17' + KBo 8.55: 16': § 7 ki-i-ni ku[t] INA KUR 1UR\textsuperscript{1}šuyu NISME), see Neu 1997: 156 with reference to Košák 1995: 53 for the join.
§ 3 ki-išša-an=mu kuit hatraēš kāša=ya UKUR uit ...
As for the fact that you wrote as follows (kissan): ‘The enemy just arrived, ...

§ 7' [SE]=V=YA=ma=mu kuit kiš-an TASPUR NIN=YA=ma=mu ISPUR DUMU.MUNUS=ya=ta=pitēhi ...
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 ishiya-) etc. as follows, in this (following) way'.

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

6.36 KBo 6.26 i 38-40 (OH/NS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 133
LÜ-eš17 aki GU₄-I₄.A=ja akkanzi 39 Ú.A.SÀ-LAM kara=pat kuiš šûnit 40 t=az apāš dāi karā ki-îšš-à-an èssèr
(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[HA]TTIA=za ŠÉŠ=YA GIM=an šakti n=at=za ammuk UL ša[ggahhi n=at arhā a]rnuyan É-e[œ]
11' āšta=ma=kan kuit n=at=kan mUrhi=-U-upaš ANA DINGIR.GAL peša nu m[Urhi-]U-uppaš kuit apiša 12' n=an punuš mān kiš-an mān UL kiš-an
As you, my brother, know (well) the House of Hatti, do I not know (it) also? [It is] a [transferred house. That which remained however, Urhi-Tessub gave it to the Great God. Given the fact that [Urhi]-Tessub (is) there (with you; apiya), ask him, whether (it) is so, or whether (it is) not so (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' šunesz LÜ.MEŠ GIS TUKUL tameskattien apēša kattan 4' dameškīyan dāīr ki-išša-an AWAT ABI=YA 5' paḫšanuten takku šumeš nattva šaktēnī 6' kānī LÜŠU.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 Götz 1928: 164 on ka-: "auf das unmittelbar folgende oder vorausgehende weisend". 218
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 *paḥšanuten* 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 uttar, kas memias* and *ki*

6.4.3.1. Referring forward

6.4.3.1.1. To an event, proposition or speech-act

Like *kissan* the demonstrative expressions *ki, ki uttar, kas 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’, *sīr* ‘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 *paḥšanuten* 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.
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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:

§ 3 ta namma Mušenḫarana nēpiša tānašhi 4 āppan(-)anda-ma=šše ke-e mēmāḫi natta=a an 5 ḫḫun Lugal-š=an MUNUS.LUGAL-š=a tānaš nu it dUTU-i 6 dIM=ša mēm[(i)]ški dUTU-uš dIM-aš mān ukiūreš 7 LUGAL-uš MUNUS.LUGAL-āšš=a QATAMMA ukiūreš ašantu §
Then I let the eagle go to heaven. I speak these (ke) (words) after him: "Not I let him go, the king and queen let him go. Go, speak to the Sungod and the Stormgod: "As the Sungod and the Stormgod (are) forever, let the king and queen be forever likewise!""

nu=ti[ta] linkiya 14 [k]tātan ke-e ud-da-ar dāiš kāša=ya=kan ABI 4dUTU-ST [tuk] mMadduwattan [ISTU GIR] mAttaršiāa huššunun 15 nu=ya=za ŠA ABI 4dUTU-ST Ū ŠA KUR KGU HATTU ēš ...
He (my father) placed these (ke) words for you under oath: "I, the father of My Majesty, have just saved [you,] Madduwatta [from the sword] of Attarsiya. So belong to the father of My Majesty and the land of Hatti! ..."

4 TUL-eššir=ma=at ke-e-da-ni memiiani 5 KUR UGU-TIM kukč ŠIN,DU ASSUM MUIRDUTTIM pēšta GIM-an=ma=mu 6 MNIR.GÁL ŠES=YA KUR UGU-TI ASSUM MUIRDUTTIM 7 pēšta ŠIN,DU-aš=ma=mu=za ANA ŠES=YA GAM-an 8 peškiušan dāiš
They became enemies in this (kedani) matter: given the fact that he had given Arma-Tarhunza the Upper Land to govern, (therefore), after Muwattalli had given me the Upper Land to govern, Arma-Tarhunza began to betray me to my brother.

6.43 KUB 26.1 iv 49-50 (lateNH oath, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 255.2), ed. Von Schuler 1957: 17 (= ex. 6.27)
§ 49 našma ki-i kuiški memai kēdani=ya=kan tuppi 50 kē INIM.MEŠ ŪL.GAR-ru ... Or (if) someone (of you) says this (ki): “on this tablet these affairs are not written down, ...

Sometimes one finds the expression ki kuit254:

---

253 Other cataphoric discourse deictic occurrences of ka- OH KUB 8.41 iii 7, 10 (ritual, CTH 733 II 1), KBo 20.69 + 8’ (ritual, CTH *832); MH KBo 19.44+ rev. 37 (treaty, CTH 42), KUB 14.1 obv. 79 (indictment, CTH 147); NH KBo 1.28 rev. 9 (treaty, CTH 57), KUB 1.1 i 37 (egodocument, CTH 81), KUB 21.38 rev. 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 utter, 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).

$^{5}$ ki-i=iš mu kuit SA $^{m}$Marruwa Himmuwa halijatar ḫatrāēš $^{5}$ parāzār $^{z}$ an $^{z}$ kan neḫšun, ...

As for this (ki) fact that you wrote to me about the surrender of Marruwa, man of Himmuwa: "I have sent him over (to you)", ...

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:\n
6.45 **Bo 86/299 ii 95-97** (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 106A), ed. Otten 1988: 20-21

§ $^{95}$ ANA $^{md}$LAMMA $^{z}ja$ ANA $^{SU}$ DUMU $^{z}SU$ DUMU.DUMU $^{SU}$ ki-i $^{iššišūl}$ ēšdu $^{96}$ dUTU-$^{St}$ DUMU-$^{K}a$ arḫa piššijami ŠEŠ-$^{K}a$ $^{z}ma$ $^{97}$ našma taimain UL kuinkī dakhī ... And let this (ki) be a binding regulation for Kurunta, his son (and) his grandson: I, My Majesty, shall not abandon your son and take your brother or someone else (instead). ...

6.4.3.1.2. To a list of first order entities?

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

6.46 **KBo 22.1 13'-15'** (OS instruction, CTH 272)

§ $^{13}$ $^{ki=ma}$ ḫenkuwaš $^{z}$ $^{šaš}$ 50 NINDA.HI.Â.1 10-TA.ÂM É-az $^{14}$ 1 LÛ 1 MUNUS $^{kattī}$ $^{z}$ $^{ššī}$ īentā $^{U}$ 1 $^{kapunu}$ A.Â. $^{15}$ parā $^{dâš}$ §

This (ki) (is) of his gift: 50 breads, 10 each. From (his) estate one man (and) one woman went with him and 1 $^{kapunu}$-measure of field he selected.

6.47 **KBo 12.38 i 10'-12'** (lateNH draft for statute inscription, Suppiluliamu, CTH 121), ed. Otten 1967: 75, 77

§ $^{10}$ $^{[X]IX}$ ANA LUGAL KUR Alāšiyya $^{U}$ ANA Lûpidduri $^{11}$ [İT]$^{[\]}$ dUTU URUPU-$^{na}$ $^{U}$ Tabarna LUGAL.GAL $^{12}$ [Š]$^{[\]}$ dUTU URUPU-$^{na}$ LÚSANGA $^{ka-a-aš}$ arkašmaš ēšdu $^{§}$ $^{13}$ [X$^{[XI]}$ GUŠKIN 1 GUN URUDU 3 BÂN GAYATUM $^{14}$ ANA dUTU URUPU-$^{na}$ § ...

for the king of Alasiyya and for the $^{piššu}$-men, this (ki) shall be the tribute (owed) to the Sungoddess of Arinna and to Tabarna, the great king, priest of the Sungoddess of Arinna: § [...] of gold, 1 talent of copper, 3 seah of gayatum for the Sun-goddess of Arinna § ...

The problem is how to classify this type of forward reference. The classification of demonstratives in 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

\[\text{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).}

\[\text{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' [... ]\textsuperscript{URU} Hattuši ḣappa ʿeh[(un)]\textsuperscript{5'} [(nu=nu ke-e KUR,KUR,H.A)] kūrū ēpp[ir]

§ 6' [...KUR\textsuperscript{URU} L(uqqa) KUR\textsuperscript{URU} Kišpūya ...]

[When] I turned back to Hattusa, these (ke) countries took up hostilities against me: § [...the country of L(ukka), of Kispuwa ...]


§ 20\textsuperscript{'} KUR\textsuperscript{URU} Neriqqaz ... KUR\textsuperscript{URU} Patallījaş § 26\textsuperscript{'} nu ke-e-da-aš A[(N A KUR,KUR,H.A)] šumenzan ŠA E.H.I.A DINGIR.MES-KUNU kue ēšia n=at LÜ.MES

\textsuperscript{URU}Gašga  arha pippir

(All the countries from which they drove the sacrificial animals: fattened bulls, fattened cows, fattened sheep, and fattened goats), § from the country of Neriq ...... from the country of Patalli, § that which in these (kedas) countries belonged to your temples, the Gasgacans 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

\textsuperscript{222}

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

6.50 KBo 6.2+ iii 43 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 75
§ 43 *takku ANŠE.KUR.RA túrijaš kuiški tâiezi uttar=šed=a* *ki-i-pat* §
If anyone steals a draft horse, its disposition is just this (*ki-pat*) (= the same).

nu mān zik mdLAMMA-āš *ki-i tuppiaš uttar OL paḥhašti* ...
..., 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:

§ 7 SEŠ-YA=ma=mu kuit kišan TAŠPUR NIN-YA=mu IŠPUR DUMU.MUNUS KUR
URU KARDUNIYAŠ=ya kuiš KUR URU MIZRI 8 [p]iianza ėšta nu=ya=zšši GIM-an
LU.MEŠ TEME EGR-[ān]da pār nu=yar=at EGR-pa IŠTU IKU arantat 9 [nu=mu] ku-
U-un memiša
LU TEMU LUGAL KUR URU KAR-DUNI[Ya]š <$>
mdEN.LIL.EN.UKÜ.MEŠ memišta

---

258 See also OH KBo 3.22 obv. 33 (‘building’ inscription, CTH 1 A); 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).

223
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 Tašimmeti, 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.


[(nušši GIM-an ke-e INIM.MEŠ ū((atarnahḫun))] 2 ehušya apāšmaškan URUMARAŠA[(nita[tara]ša)]

When I told him these (ke) words: 'Come!', he fled away from the city Marassantiya, ...

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

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

6.56 KBo 2.6+ iii 4-9 (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998: 206-207

4 mān EME ša4diSTAR-attišpat TI-andaš kuitman=as 5 TI-anza ešša nu apiša kuit arrahhānīškit 6 GIĐIM-eša kuit TUKU.TUKU-uanza DUMU.MEŠ =SU=jašši EME eššanzi 7 nu=za mān GIĐIM kēdaššpat waškuwaš šer TUKU.TUKU-ešša 8 namma=mašša GIĐIM tamēdani memiš šer UL 9 kušški TUKU.TUKU-uanza

If (it is) the curse of the same Sausgatti (when) alive, because she kept cursing at the time during which she was alive, and (if it is) because the deceased is angry, and her children keep cursing, if you, o deceased, are angry only because of these (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 šaḥhanas luz[z]ijaš of the specifications of duty and corvee (saḥhan and luṭzi) 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:

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]I şe[l]r TUKU.TUKU-atti SI XSÅ-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:

6.58  
KUB 22.70 rev. 31-32 (NH oracle, Hattusili III, CTH 566), ed. Ünal 1978: 90-91
§ 31  
*ki-i kuit* DUMU 'Annatalla INA E.GAL-LIM anda ğerîanşa ēšta TÜG.HILA= ma=z=za SA ŞU AM[A-ŞU yaš]sikšit nu män DINGIR-LUM apaddan şer 32  ŞA dUTU-St zankilatar Ut. kuški šan(a)h[ta] ...
As for this *(ki)* fact that the son of Annatalla was summoned to the palace while [wea]ring the clothes meant for [his] mo[ther], if the deity does not seek any fine at all from His Majesty because of that ...

6.4.3.2.3. Remaining cases

In this section I present some examples of the remaining group that did not fall in one of the other categories. They all have in common that *ka-* *(N)* refers inside a paragraph. That does not mean however that the propositional content referred to is necessarily salient. In Chapter 2 I showed how *∅, -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.

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

\[ tamâi\text{-}za \ ] \text{EN-UTTA} \ lê \ ilâli\text{-}[i\text{aš}]i \ ka\text{-}a\text{-}a\text{-}š\text{-}ta \ memiaš \ SAPAL \ NES \ DINGIR\text{-}UM \ kíttaru \ §
\]

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

6.4.4. How about Focus structure and Discourse Deixis?

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

The next example on the other hand shows *ka-* N as Unestablished Topic:

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

\[ namma \ ki\text{-}i \ kuit \ TUPPU \ tu\text{[k]} \ Alakšandu \ i\text{jan} \ ün \ ne\text{-}tas\text{[k]}\text{kan} \ MU.KAM-ti \ MU.KAM-ti \ peran \ 3\text{-}[\text{[i\text{u halze\text{[s]}an}]]} \ du \ n\text{-}at\text{[z]a\text{[k]}\text{e\text{[k] kan zik}} \ Alakšandu\text{š}aki \ ki\text{-}i\text{-}ma \ AWATE.MES \ OL \ ku\text{[k]}\text{\text{[i]} 1\text{-}edaz 1\text{-}edaz} \ ISTU \ KUR \ UR\text{[\text{[\text{[HATTI=at} Further more, this (ki) tablet that I [mad]e for you Alakšandu, let the[m read] it to you every year three ti[mes]. You, Alaksandus, have to be familiar with it! Now, these (ki=ma) stipulations are not at all from the one (or) from the other, they are from Hatti!

---

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

268 For the remaining group see also MH KUB 14.1 rev. 27 (indictment, CTH 147); NH KUB 6.41 iv 14, KUB 6.44 iv 24 (treaty, CTH 68), KBo 4.12 rev. 12 (edict, CTH 87); LateNH KUB 23.1+ i 7, iv 18, 22, 1. 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 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></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

---

place, time, or orientation (6.5.2.3.), relative clauses re-introducing a topic (6.5.2.4.) and genitives, which are usually not salient (6.5.2.5.)

6.5.2.1. Reference across a paragraph line

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

6.5.2.1.1. Reference to a NP

6.61 KUB 1 1 + ii 69-72 (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 16
§ 69 GIM-an-ša uitr S((EŠ)z)A kušapi INA KUR Mizri pait 70 nu 7za KUR.KUR.MES kue ke-e EGIR-pa aššanu[(nu)]n nu KARAS ANŠE.KUR.R[(A.MES)] 71 kēl 7SA KUR-TI ANA SESH zY laḥhi INA KUR Mizri 72 GAM-an pēntenun
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.MES ‘these countries’ are mentioned in ii 66.

6.62 KBo 2 2 i 21-22 (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 577), ed. Van den Hout 1998:
126-127
§ 21 ki kuit ku-š uš MUŠEN ḪURRI kallavanni 22 arha appantat
Concerning this fact that these ĥurri-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:

6.63 KBo 3 4 i v 44'-47' (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 1), ed. Grélois 1988: 72
§ 44' nu 7za 7kan ANA GBGU.ZA ABl 7zYA kušapi ēšḥat nu karā MU.10.KAM 45'
LUGAL-ūṣnun nu 7za ke-e KUR.KUR LKUR 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).
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 Kurunta.

6.64 Bo 86/299 iii 57-59 (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV CTH 106.1), ed. Otten 1988: 22-23 § 57 ki-i-ja kuit ABU-YA ANA md-LAMMA pešta dUTU-zi-ja-šši kuit 58 piḫḫun išḫiḫ-šši kuit ija-ken n-zi-kan zilatijā 59 lē kuiški yahmuзи

And as for (all) this (ki) that my father has given to Kurunta and that I, My Majesty, have given to him, the treaty which we made for him, let noone in the future change it.

6.5.2.2. From Direct Speech to Narration

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

6.65 KBo 3.4+ i 23-29 (NH annals, Mursili II, CTH 61.1), ed. Grélois 1988: 55-56 23 nu kiššan AOBI dUTU URU Arinna GAŠAN-YA arahzenaš(mu) za KUR.KUR LŪKŪR kuješ 24 DUMU-lan ḫalzeššir nu=ya=mu=za tepnuškir nu=ya tuel šā dUTU URU Arinna 25 GAŠAN-YA ZAG.HLA danna šaḫšiššu an dār nu=ya=mu dUTU URU Arinna GAŠAN-YA 26 kattan tiša nu=ya=mu=kan u-ni arahzenaš KUR.KUR LŪKūR peran kuenni 27 nu=mu dUTU URU Arinna memían ištamašša n= aš=mu kattan tiša 28 nu=za=kan ANA GIŠ.GU.ZA ABI-ya kušapi eššat nu=za ke-e arahzenaš 29 KUR.KUR MEŠ LŪKūR INA MU.10.KAM terahḫun n-zi-kan kuenun § I spoke like this: "O Goddess 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 Goddess of Arinna, my Lady, a second time. O Goddess of Arinna, my Lady, stand by my side! Kill those (uni) surrounding countries of the enemy on my behalf!" The Goddess 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 šaḫurunuqaš ... 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:273


3 MUNUS.LUGAL kuit INA KUR URUAMURRI uizzi manningyulaḫmi aṣṣatu nus kan
ANA MUNUS.LUGAL

4 kuiten Awate MEŠ Zi-ni nṣat ANA SEŠ Ya apezza ḫatrami ...

5 GIM-anu aṣṣkan ANA SEŠ Ya apezza ḫatrami ...

Given that the Queen will come to Amurrū 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:


56 nuszumu ke KUR.KUR.MEŠ danattu aṣṣum Murduttum pesṭa (list of countries)
hūmandan ammuk ṫ taparna KUR URUḪapšša = ma zm u  62 KUR URUḪistahara = ṫa ARAD-anni pesṭa nuszumu INA KUR URUḪapšša 63 LUGAL-ūn ijaṭ nuszumu kan SEŠ Ya ku-e ki-i KUR.KUR.MEŠ ṫ dannattu 64 ŠU-i ḫarṣu nuszumu 9i Elephant GAŠAN = YA kuit ŠU-za ḫarta 65 nuzuza LUKUR.MEŠ kuḫēš tar(a)ḫun kuḫēš ma zm u takšulāīr

He gave me these unpopulated countries in subjection. (list of countries), I ruled (them) all. But he gave me Hapkissa and Istahara in servitude and he made me king in Hapkissa. 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).
6.5.3. 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:


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 narration275:

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

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 narration275:

---

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 mân=ma ḫUL-lun memian kui̇ni̇k SA BAL piran 23 parâ ištamaši naššu LŬ URŬHATTI kui̇ški 24 našma LŬ URŬArzauya kui̇ški BAL ēššai 25 kinun=ta kui̇š ku=ū=š LŬ MEŠ kuir̄anaš 26 memian=ma ANA dŬTU=Și piran parâ hu̇dâk 27 UR URŬ harrâši nu=ššan apêdaš kuqatqa 28 antuššaš parâ uškiši nu kîššan mematti ...

But if you hear some evil affair of revolt in advance, either some man from Hatti or some man from Arzawa is revolting —these (kus) men who are now your allies—and you do not write immediately in advance the affair to My Majesty, you look for some reason past those men, and you say as follows:

What ex. 6.70 and 6.71 have in common is that the sentence connectives nu and -ma are absent. This is very rare in later Hittite, and I therefore take this as another sign that these ka-clauses clauses behave like interjections. We should therefore also include the next example:

6.72 KUB 19.49+ i 49-54 (lateNH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 69), ed. Friedrich 1930: 8-9


What [inhabitant] from the country of Arzawa has come over to you —(that is), anyone who [has fled] from me—, [and also], what inhabitants from the country of Mira [and of] the country of Hatti have come over to you —(that is), [if] someone among these (kidas) is a [sworn all]y—, arrest all drifter(s), and hand them over to me.

6.5.3.2. ka- (plus noun) indicating a new discourse unit

There are also a few examples of the proximal demonstrative referring to a salient entity indicating a new line of a new sub-theme without returning to a previous theme. This new discourse unit follows the preceding one linearly and not hierarchically as was the case in the preceding section.

276 See also KUB 21.1+ ii 77 (NH treaty, CTH 76).
In most cases ka- \((N)\) follows upon a list which itself does not have a clear function in the discourse\(^{277}\).

6.73 **KBo 15.10+ i 10-11** (MH/MS ritual, Tudhaliya & Nikalmati, CTH 443), ed. Szábo 1971: 12-13

40 ALAM.H.I.A GIŠ ... \(^{11}\) ... 1 DUG hanįššaš GEŠTIN nu \(ki\)-i handaizzi

40 wooden statues, ... one hanissa-vessel with wine, \(these\) \((ki)\) he arranges.

6.74\(^{278}\) **KBo 17.1+ iv 19-22** (OS ritual, CTH 416.1A), ed. Otten & Souček 1969: 38f.

\(halkiaš\) \(haršt((a))\)r išiįįanda \(^{20}\) [Z]I\(Z\)UL.A-\(ašš\)=a \(harštar\) išiįįanda \(ke\)-\(e\)=\(šan\) \(hūmand\)((a)) \(^{21}\) [p]\(addanī\) tēhhi n\(e\) LUGAL-aš MUNUS.LUGAL-\(ašš\)=a \((ki)\)tkar=\(šamet\) tēhhi \(^{22}\) \(šēr\)=\(a\)=\(ššan\) GAD-an peššiemi \(š\)=\(uš\) \([\{LŪ-aš\}]\) nattā aušzi

... the heads of grain, tied together and the heads of barley, tied together, \(all\) \((ke=\ldots)\) these \((objects)\) I put on a basket, and I place them near the heads of king and queen.

On top \((of the basket with its contents)\) I throw a linen-cloth. No man shall see them.

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

Objects can be introduced as a simple list, but one also encounters staging verbs like ‘give’, or presentational clauses like ‘person X was/is Y’\(^{279}\). After an enumeration of countries by name, the following edict continues with the core message\(^{280}\):

6.75 **KBo 6.29 i 28-30** (NH edict, Hattusili III, CTH 85), ed. Götzte 1925: 46-47

\(nu=\text{mu} KU[R \{\text{H}1]\} İstanbul\(\) Hakpissa \ldots \) \(^{28}\) \(pešta\) \(nu=z\text{mu} \{\text{H}1]\) Kuruš[tama] Z]AG-an \(i\}=\text{at} \(^{29}\) \(nu=z\) šiśi \(kē\) KUR.KUR.MEŠ hūman[a pira]n \(^{30}\) maniįahšeši[nu]

He gave me the country of Hakpissa, ..., and he made the city Kuruš[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)

\(^{277}\) Also after a list: OH KBo 8.42 rev. 6 (narration, CTH 9); MH KBo 8.35 ii 28' (treaty, CTH 139), KUB 23.72+ obv. 4, 35 (see ex. 3.32) (treaty, CTH 146); NH KBo 10.13 i 17' (treaty, CTH 49), KBo 6.28 rev. 40 (edict, CTH 88), KUB 31.51+ 8 (vow, CTH 585); lateNH KUB 56.48 iii 24' (festival, CTH 672B).

\(^{278}\) Also treated in Chapter 3 as ex. 3.33.

\(^{279}\) See also KBo 3.4+ iii 28 (annals, CTH 61 1).

\(^{280}\) Not woth a list but with the core message in the *ka-* clause: KUB 1.1+ ii 66 (NH egodocument, Hattusili III, CTH 81).
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

I take the hupapalli-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. 

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

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) water 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: [nē]ā[s]a MUNUS.LUGAL-aš DUMU.MUNUS É-TIM kugatan petatti “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).
section 6.5.3.1.). The return to the original comparison structure is indicated by the use of a full noun phrase, *kas witenanza* in i 43.

In the next example the substitute, a woman, is several times referred to by means of the anaphoric pronoun -*a*- and *apa*- before *kas MUNUS-as* 'this woman' is used in obv. 15':

6.79 KBo 4.6 obv. 11'-17' (NH prayer, Gassulawiya, CTH 380), ed. Tischler 1984: 12-13
nuṣṭa kāšma am[mel tā]paṣṣa[n] 12' unūqandan uppaḥyun n=aš=kan ammuk kattan SIG₂-anza 13' parkuiš=aš apāš mišruanza apāš ḫarkiš=aš apāš 14' n=aš= kan ḫumandaz ašanuṣanza nu=kan DINGIR-LIM EN-YA apūn 15' menaḫḫanda uški nu PANI DINGIR-LIM EN-YA ka-a-aš MUNUS-aš yeḥattaru 16' A N A DUMU.MUNUS.GAL=ma=kan anda aššuli namma nešḥut n=an kēz 17' GIG-zə Ta Ti-nut
I have just sent to you m[y] adorned [su]bstitute. She is better than me. Pure she (is), that one, shining she is, that one, fair she is, that one. She is endowed with everything. O God, My Lord, look at her instead (of me). Let this (kas) woman instead (of me) be the most important to the god My Lord. Now, toward the Great Daughter turn again in favor and save her from this (kez) sickness.

The fact that real anaphoric pronouns are used does not prevent the occurrence of a demonstrative, as we have seen before. The difference with the other Tracking demonstratives is that *ka-* also points at the substitute in the presence of the Speaker.

6.5.5. Summary and conclusions

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

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-* 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.

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuity procedure</th>
<th>Centering procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Topic</td>
<td>U-Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-</td>
<td>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. Szábo
1971: 12-13
§ 1 [mâ]n iššanâš dUTU-un dIM-n-z-a EGIR-pa lilänzi 2 [nu ki]-i danzi 2 kurdâli
išnaš nu-z-sšan 3 kêdani 7 EME išnaš išhuqân kêdani 3a-z-sšan 4 7 EME išnaš
išhuqanteš I.UDU yakšur LÂL yakšur ...

[Whe]n they conciliate the Sungod of Blood and the Stormgod, they take [thjis (ki): 2
kurdâli-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,

284 Other attestations of forward reference to first order entities: OH KBo 17.3 iii 29 (ritual, CTH 416.1 B); MH
KBo 15.10+ i 2 (ritual, CTH 443); NH KBo 3.4+ i 28 (annals, CTH 61 I), KUB 1.1+ ii 56 (egodocument,
CTH 81); GG iv 15 (vow, CTH 585); lateNH KUB 26.43 + obv. 19, 54 (landgrant, CTH 225); KBo 33.216
rev.? 5 (vow, CTH 590), KUB 56.48 ii 31 (festival, CTH 672B).
expression of contrastive pairs by means of either ka ... ka- or apa- ... apa- (see also chapter 7.2.5.1.).

Contrast between referents is not necessarily expressed as in English ‘this and/or that’, or Latin ‘hic ... ille’. Swahili for example does not allow the use of the proximal and distal forms together for contrast. The proximal form is used twice instead: Hii yafutika, hii haifutiki ‘That [sc. sin] can be blotted out, this one cannot be’ (Lyons 1999: 115).

In 6.7.2. I present contrastive pairs in Situational use, and in 6.7.3. in Anaphoric use.

6.7.2. Situational contrastive pairs

In these two examples one can imagine how the Speaker points to different objects or persons in his visual field285:

6.81 KBo 6.2+ ii 18-20, § 40 (OS law, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 48
§ 18 takku LÚ GIS TUkle [har(a)kzi] ň LÚ ILKI tittianza LÚ ILKI tezzi 19 ki-i GIS TUkle [li=met] ki-i=ma šahha=met A.SÁ.HI.A ŠÁ LÚ GIS TUkle ma anda šitarizzi 20 GIS TUkle li=ja [har[zi] šahhann=a iššai

If a man who has a TUKUL-obligation disappears, and a man owing ILKU-services is assigned, and the man owing ILKU-services says286: ‘This (ki) is my TUKUL-obligation, while that (ki) is my obligation for šahhan-services’, (then) he shall secure for himself a sealed deed concerning the land of the man having a TUKUL-obligation. He shall (then) both hold the TUKUL-obligation and perform the šahhan-services.

...
...

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

6.7.3. Anaphoric contrastive pairs

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

285 See also the next law, § 41.

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

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 ŠÁ KUR.KUR-TIM ... ke-e-el ŠÁ 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-āš-ša GISUKUR ZAB[AR ḫarzi] 22' ka-a-āš-ša GISUKUR ZABAR [(harzi)]

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 DUĜ harʿarān GEŠTIN-it

2 ANA ḫišatajarra mMaratti ẓa maniaḥḫiš LUGAL-i SIG3-antan GEŠTIN-an ḫinkatta apēdašš-a tamain GEŠTIN-an pijer a-pa-a-āš-ša uit LUGAL-i tet natta apin GEŠTIN-an pijer LUGAL-uš kuin ašta a-pa-a-āš-ša uit QATAMMA IQBI

Zidi was a cupbearer. The father of the king allotted a harharava-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

... n[uš r]Iṣupatš-inar maniaḥḫeškiẓi 29 Gi-an GISUMBĪN hašhaššar GISTUKUL apātar n[uš r] apāš annanut 36 ku-u-un apāš annanut ku-u-uš-ša ABI LUGAL ANA Nakkālit 31 GAL LÜ.MEŠ.SAGI paiš ku-u-uš mḪuzzi GAL LÜ.MEŠ.-nim Gir 32 ku-u-uš mKizzui GAL LÜ.MEŠ.MESEDI paiš ʿuš-ša ukeššaraḫḫir

... Iṣputasinų 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 Nakkālit, head of the cupbearers, and still others (*kus*) he gave to Ḫuzzi, 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 Nakkālit, .... altri a Ḫuzziya, ... 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


[If a hippocra-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 =ta mān dUTU-ŠI iii 1 kueka memijanuš ḫarušša memai kūš =ya memijaš 2

našma =ya kūn memijan iša ...

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 kissan occurred with all persons, and so did ka- (6.4.5.). As far as discourse structure is concerned, all discourse deictic ka-s occurred on discourse nodes.

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

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

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

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

Collecting all tables, we have:

<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></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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).