Petra Goedegebuure

The Hittite Demonstratives

Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus

2014

Petra Goedegebuure

THE HITTITE DEMONSTRATIVES

Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten

Petra Goedegebuure

The Hittite Demonstratives

Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus

2014

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Contents

            4.5.4 Summary and conclusion 274

     4.6 Final conclusions 275

5 The proximal or first person demonstrative *kā-* 277

     5.1 Status quaestionis 277
            5.1.1 Previous views... 277
            5.1.2 Research questions 278

     5.2 Situational or deictic *kā-*.. 279
            5.2.1 True situational use... 279
                   5.2.1.1 The locative adverb of relative position *kēt / kēz* 279
                   5.2.1.2 The locative adverb *kā* 284
                   5.2.1.3 Adnominal *kā-* referring to objects 286
                   5.2.1.4 Temporal deixis... 288
            5.2.2 Direct speech 289
                   5.2.2.1 The locative adverbs *kāni* and *kā* 290
                   5.2.2.2 Salient referents: pronominal *kā-* 292
                   5.2.2.3 Non-salient referents: adnominal *kā-* 294
            5.2.3 Self-reference 295
            5.2.4 Summary and conclusions.. 296

     5.3 The recognitional use of *kā-* 298

     5.4 The discourse deictic use of *kā-* 299
            5.4.1 Introduction 299
            5.4.2 The adverb of manner *kiššan*... 299
            5.4.3 The phrases *kī uttar*, *kā- memii̯a(n)-* and *kī*.............................. 303
                   5.4.3.1 Cataphoric *kā-* 303
                   5.4.3.2 Anaphoric discourse deictic *kā-* 307
                   5.4.3.2.1 Reference across a discourse node 307
                   5.4.3.2.2 *kī kuit* clauses 310
                   5.4.3.2.3 Remaining cases.. 311
            5.4.4 Summary and conclusions 312

     5.5 Cataphoric and anaphoric *kā-*, managing lists...................................... 313
            5.5.1 Cataphoric "new this" *kā-*, introducing lists.............................. 313
            5.5.2 Anaphoric *kā-*, resuming lists.. 316

     5.6 The tracking use of *kā-* 319
            5.6.1 Introduction 319
            5.6.2 Non-salient referents and discourse structure............................. 319
                   5.6.2.1 Reference across a paragraph line 319
                   5.6.2.2 From direct speech to narration........................ 321

List of tables

Foreword

This book is a heavily revised version of my PhD thesis *Reference*, *Deixis and Focus in Hittite*. *The demonstratives* ka- "*this*", apa- "*that*" *and* asi "*yon*", defended in June 2003 at the University of Amsterdam.

The original work was divided in three parts: Reference, Deixis and Focus, framed by the Introduction (chapter 1) and the Summary (chapter 10). The first part (Reference) contained the theoretical framework (chapter 2, "Deixis, Discourse and Reference") and the application of that framework to Hittite referential expressions (chapter 3, "Deixis, Discourse and Reference in Hittite"). Both the structure of chapter 2 and the theoretical framework itself have been updated, improved and re-applied to Hittite, now chapter 10. As the final chapter, chapter 10 draws upon the data presented in chapters 3-9, and occupies therefore a slightly more logical position in the book than in the dissertation. Chapter 1 has been heavily revised and now also contains the Old, Middle, New and Late New Hittite paradigms of *kā-*, *apā-* and *aši+*.

The chapters of part two, Deixis, that discuss the demonstratives (old chapter 4, "The distal demonstrative *aši*, *uni*, *eni* etc.", old chapter 5, "The medial demonstrative *apa-*", and old chapter 6, "The proximal demonstrative *ka-*") have been slightly (old chapter 6), to moderately restructured, rewritten and brought up-to-date (old chapters 4 and 5). Chapter 3, formerly 4, now also includes a description of the distal demonstrative *anna/i-*.

Part three (Focus) has been heavily revised. It originally consisted of "Expanding *apa-*" (chapter 7), "Limiting *apa-*" (chapter 8) and "Surprising *apa-*" (chapter 9). These chapters have been dissected and reassembled as a new chapter "Pilot study: the use of *apā-* in the laws" (chapter 6), and the completely rewritten chapters "Exclusive focus *apā-*" (chapter 7), "Inclusive focus *apā-*" (chapter 8), and "Topics, contrast and *apā-*" (chapter 9). Especially the last chapter has greatly benefitted from discussions with Craig Melchert and Elisabeth Rieken; I believe it shows a major improvement compared with the original. All remaining errors and differences of opinion are of course my sole responsibility.

New linguistic and Hittitological literature could be worked in until November 2013, although I do not claim exhaustiveness. For the data for this work I am most grateful that I could use the files of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary Project, which is supported by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr. Gernot Wilhelm for accepting my dissertation for publication in the series *Studien zu den*

Boğazköy-Texten and for his close and very helpful reading of the final manuscript.

From my graduate days to my departure to the United States in October 2006, I found an intellectual home in the Functional Discourse Grammar group of the Linguistics Department of the University of Amsterdam. Much thanks go to especially Kees Hengeveld, Evelien Keizer, Lachlan Mackenzie, and Miriam van Staden.

In October 2008 our then four year old daughter Sophie was diagnosed with a highly aggressive brain tumor, and we started a terrible journey with an uncertain outcome. But cancer is not a battle that can be fought alone, and to our great luck we did not only find a wonderful medical team for Sophie, our oncologists Charles Rubin and Navin Pinto and our nurse-practitioner Kelly Kramer, but my husband Marcel and I also received incredible support from our families in Oklahoma and the Netherlands, colleagues and friends. My deep gratitude goes to Gil Stein, Director of the Oriental Institute, Martha Roth, Dean of the division of the Humanities of the University of Chicago, and Theo van den Hout, chair of the department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations and executive editor of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary. Their generosity and support made it possible to fully dedicate my life to our daughter when she needed our constant care. Without hesitation my fall and winter classes of 2008-2009 were taken over by my dictionary colleagues Rich Beal, Dennis Campbell, Theo van den Hout, Kathy Mineck, and Oğuz Soysal. I owe them many, many thanks. But special thanks go to Theo van den Hout for his friendship, and his patience as a mentor and editor of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary.

Without my colleagues and their support during our times of need, I would not have been able to continue working on this book. Finishing this project was yet another story, and for that I thank my husband Marcel for his patience, his good natured acceptation of my impossible work hours and, in general, for keeping life bearable, my mother for "baby-sitting" Sophie for hours over Skype, and my brother Erik for taking care of Sophie and us here in Chicago during the three months preceding the completion of this work. He is a great uncle, brother and brother-in-law, and turned out to be a wonderful cook of Indian food. Also, our place is now filled with all kinds of electronic gadgets.

"There are many people who are clever and fearless, but the trouble is many are small children fighting an ugly disease." (source of quote unknown.) Always happy irrespective of the circumstances, Sophie taught us perseverance in the face of serious adversity. This book is dedicated to her.

Chicago, November 2013

Abbreviations

Bibliographical

ABoT 1   Balkan, Kemal, *Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde Bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri*, İstanbul 1948.

ABoT 2   Akdoğan, Rukiye, *Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde Bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri II*. Katalog ve Dizin / Catalog and Index O. Soysal, Chicago 2011.

CHD   Güterbock, Hans G., Harry A. Hoffner Jr., and Theo P.J. van den Hout (eds.), *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago 1980—.

CLL   Melchert, H. Craig, *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*, Chapel Hill, NC 1993.

CTH   Laroche, Emmanuel, *Catalogue des textes hittites*, Paris 1971.

GHL   Hoffner Jr., Harry A. and H. Craig Melchert, *A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part I: Reference Grammar*, Winona Lake 2008.

FHG   Laroche, Emmanuel, "Fragments hittites de Genève," *Revue d'Assyriologie* 45 (1951), 131-138, 184-194; *Revue d'Assyriologie* 46 (1952), 42-50.

FHL   Durand, Jean-Marie and Emmanuel Laroche, "Fragments hittites du Louvre", in: *Mémorial Atatürk. Études d'archéologie et de philologie anatoliennes*, Paris 1982.

HE   Friedrich, Johannes, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*, 1. Teil, Kurzgefaßte Grammatik. Dritte, unveränderte Auflage, Heidelberg 1974.

HED   Puhvel, Jaan, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, Berlin 1984—.

HEG   Tischler, Johann, *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*, Innsbruck 1977—.

HHw   Tischler, Johann, *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch. Mit dem Wortschatz der Nachbarsprachen*, Innsbruck 2001.

HHCTO   Ünal, Ahmet, *Hittite and Hurrian Tablets from Ortaköy (Çorum), Central Turkey. With two Excursuses on the "Man of the Storm God" and a Full Edition of KBo 23.27*, İstanbul 1998.

HHT   Riemschneider, Kaspar, *Hurritische und hethitische Texte*, München 1974 (unpublished manuscript).

HT   *Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character from Tablets in the British Museum*, London 1920.

HIL	Kloekhorst, Alwin, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5), Leiden / Boston 2008.
HKM	Alp, Sedat, *Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Maşat*, (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları VI / 34), Ankara 1991.
HW	Friedrich, Johannes, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1952-54.
HW²	Friedrich, Johannes, Annelies Kammenhuber, and Inge Hoffmann, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch: Zweite, völlig überarbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte*, Heidelberg 1975—.
HZL	Rüster, Christel and Neu, Erich. *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon: Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten*, (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 2), Wiesbaden 1989.
IBoT	*İstanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri(nden Secme Metinler)*, İstanbul 1944, 1947, 1954, Ankara 1988.
KBo	*Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, Leipzig 1916-1923, Berlin 1954—.
KUB	*Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, Berlin 1921—.
KuT	Kuşaklı Texte.
OBGT	Old Babylonian Grammatical Texts.
Or.	Ortaköy.
TUAT I/1	Kaiser, Otto. *Texte der Umwelt des Alten Testaments. Band I: Rechts- und wirtschaftsurkunden. Historisch-chronologische Texte. Lieferung 1: Rechtsbücher*, Gütersloh 1982.
VBoT	Goetze, Albrecht. *Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte*, Marburg 1930.
VSNF	*Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*, (Neue Folge), Berlin 1971—.

Technical abbreviations and symbols

Akk.	Akkadian	disc.	discussion
abl.	ablative	dupl.	duplicate
acc.	accusative	dupls.	duplicates
adv.	adverb	ed.	edition
col.	column	e.g.	*exempli gratia*
coll.	collated	et al.	*et alii*
c./comm.	common gender	ex.	example
contr.	contrast(ive)	fn.	footnote
cop.	copula	G	genitive
dat.	dative	gen.	genitive

i.e.	*id est*	rev.	reverse
imp.	imperative	S	subject
IndefSPr	indefinite subject pro-noun	sg.	singular
		sing.	singular
instr.	instrumental	subj.	subject
IO	indirect object	Sum.	Sumerian
LA	local adverb	tr.	translation
l.c.	*loco citato*	translit.	transliteration
LD	long distance	VP	verb phrase
LNH	late New Hittite	vs.	versus
Loc, loc.	locative	w.	with
ManA	manner adverb	?	reading of sign is doubt-ful
MH	Middle Hittite		
MS	middle script	!	abnormal or mistaken sign; column number or designation obv. vs. rev. differs from the edition
Neg	negation		
neut.	neuter gender		
NH	New Hittite		
nom.	nominative	*	reconstructed form
NP	noun phrase	†	impossible form or con-struction
NS	new script		
O	object	⸗	clitic boundary
obj.	object	[…]	tablet broken, text lost
obv.	obverse	[(…)]	restored from duplicate
OH	Old Hittite	⸢…⸣	top half of sign(s) dam-aged
OS	old script		
pl.	plural	⸤…⸥	bottom half of sign(s) damaged
plur.	plural		
Pred	predicate	< >	errant scribal omission; sign to be inserted
PredN	predicate noun		
pret.	preterite	« »	errant scribal insertion; sign to be omitted
PV	preverb		

1 Introduction

1.1 Short overview

Demonstratives are among the few word classes that occur in all languages (DIESSEL 1999). They count among the most basic of deictic expressions, and they are among the first ten words that English-speaking children produce (CLARK 1978). In a conversational setting they may be used to draw the attention to an object in the speech setting, accompanying a non-linguistic act such as gesture and gaze. Together with these non-verbal cues, the semantics of demonstratives help the addressee to narrow down the area where to look for an object. Demonstratives also retrieve from memory, focus on the propositional contents of stretches of discourse, and are able to track discourse referents, a feature that is shared with pronouns. The ability of demonstratives to establish joint attention on entities located in the three spaces of situation, memory and text is universal (DIESSEL 1999, 2006).

Despite their universality and omnipresence in individual languages, demonstratives prove difficult to study (ASHMORE 2009: 40f.). In addition to the multifunctionality of demonstratives described above, a recent study of demonstrative semantics identified fifteen features with some 52 values (GERNER 2009: 44). Features include deictic center, distance, visibility, altitude, ostentation, topography, and motion. Because of this complexity, "more than any other word class, demonstrative semantics require lengthy in-depth study, large corpora, and detailed recording of context and accompanying gesture" (EVANS 2003: 291). Such an in-depth study based on a large Hittite corpus has not yet been conducted. Combined with the unavailability of cross-linguistic studies on demonstratives in the past, important aspects of the semantics of Hittite demonstratives have been overlooked.

Of the demonstratives studied here, it is generally accepted that *apā-* is an accented pronoun of the third person, contrasting with accented *uk / ammuk* 'I' and *zik / tuk* 'you', and also that it functions as a demonstrative that stands in a deictic contrast with *kā-* 'this'. But here opinions already differ. According to some, *apā-* has only *Jener-deixis* (for example, HW[2] A, 141b), whereas others tend to include *Du-deixis* (HE §§ 111, 251, HED A, 86) or even allow only *Du-deixis* (KRONASSER 1956: 147).

Some scholars have reconstructed the original meaning of *apā-* as merely deictic, only later acquiring the status of emphatic pronoun. According to HW[2] (A, 130b), this happened after the decline of the accented (demonstrative) pronoun *a-*, attested with the forms *e-*, *edani*, *edaš*, *edi*, and *edez*. The same position

was taken by Laroche in his seminal article of 1979 ("Anaphore et deixis en ana-tolien"), where he presented his discovery of the paradigm of *aši*, consisting of the forms *aši*, *uni*, *eni*, *uniuš*, *ea*, *edani*, *edaš*, *edi*, and *edez*. Laroche assumed that this new pronoun was anaphoric. He also claimed that the anaphoric (back-ward referring) function of *aši* was taken over by *apā-* and the cataphoric (for-ward referring) function by *kā-* (1979: 152). Under this view the development of the pronominal and demonstrative system can be tabulated as follows:

	Deictic demonstratives		**Accented pronouns**	
	proximal	distal	anaphoric	cataphoric
Proto-Hittite	*kā-*	*apā-*	*aši+*[1]	*aši+*
Hittite	*kā-*	*apā-*	*apā-* (*aši+*)	*kā-* (*aši+*)

Table 1.1: Laroche's view on the system of demonstratives and accented pronouns in proto-Hittite and attested Hittite

Assuming that the deictic demonstrative *apā-* indeed acquired the functions of the anaphoric pronoun *aši+*, we should at least find some residual *aši+*-s in con-texts where later accented *apā-* appeared. This is not the case.

Instead of an anaphoric pronoun, *aši+* is a true deictic demonstrative, as I will show especially in chapter 3. The addition of a third term to the Hittite demonstrative system necessarily results in a shift in the deictic value of *apā-*. I will argue that *apā-* in its demonstrative use is not distal but addressee oriented. Supported by a large data set, the most crucial innovations of this book are, therefore, that *aši+* is the third term (with *Jener-deixis*) and *apā-* the second or addressee oriented term (with *Du-deixis*) in a person-based demonstrative sys-tem with a three way deictic contrast. The other member is *kā-* as the first or speaker-oriented term (*Ich-deixis*). Another unexpected result is that addressee oriented *apā-* is no longer attested in texts from the reign of Tutḫaliia IV. We therefore need to assume a two term distance-based system for Late New Hittite with the terms *kā-* and *aši+*, and *apā-* only as emphatic third person pronoun.

As will be amply illustrated, the person-based deictic contrasts do not just cover situational reference but pervade the whole system, including reference within discourse. As far as the theoretical literature on deixis and demonstratives is concerned, this transferral of person-based deictic contrasts from world to discourse has received very little attention.

---

1   I use *aši+* as a designation for the lexeme *aši* (which includes *uni*, *eni* etc.) in order to distinguish it from *aši* as nominative and accusative. This practice was introduced by Melchert (2009a: 151).

In short, the system of Hittite demonstratives and pronouns functioned as follows:

	Deictic demonstratives[2]			Accented pronoun
	1ˢᵗ person	2ⁿᵈ person	3ʳᵈ person	3ʳᵈ person
OH-NH	*kā-*	*apā-*	*aši+*	*apā-*
Late NH	*kā-*	—	*aši+*	*apā-*
	proximal		distal	3ʳᵈ person

Table 1.2: The system of demonstratives and accented pronouns in attested Hittite according to the author's views

Another issue that needs to be addressed is the status of *apā-* as an emphatic pronoun. "Emphasis" is a very vague notion and may cover different phenomena such as contrast, disambiguation, or emotional involvement. It is often connected with information structure and its main pragmatic functions topic and focus; the assumption that this could also apply to *apā-* as an emphatic form seems reasonable. By devising algorithms for especially different kinds of focus I will show that information structure in Hittite, at least for the accented pronoun, is not only marked by means of accentuation, as it is in English, but also by word order:

Type of topic or focus	Position in the clause
Contrastive focus:	
Replacing/selecting focus	Preverbal
Confirmation focus	Pattern position?
Restricting focus (marked by *-pat*)	Preverbal/pattern position
Expanding focus (marked by *-i̯a*)	Preverbal
Non-contrastive focus:	
Expanding focus (marked by *-i̯a*)	Initial/First
Contrastive topic:	
Shifted topic (marked by *-a*/*-ma*)	Initial
Forward looking contrastive topic	Initial/First

Table 1.3: Relation between type of pragmatic function and position in the clause

---

2   The distal demonstrative *anna/i-* was only productive in Middle Hittite and possibly a borrowing from Luwian (see chapter 3.7).

1.2 Scope of the study

The expressions that will be studied here from a synchronic point of view but with an eye on diachronic developments are the demonstratives *kā-*, *apā-*, *anna/i-* and *aši+* and the related adverbs *kā* 'here', *apiịa* 'there', *kēt* 'on this side', *edi* 'on yonder side', *kiššan* 'in this way', *apeništan* 'in *that* way', and *eništan* 'in that way'. Once thought to be a demonstrative, *ši-* (or *šia-*) has now been reclassified as the numeral one (GOEDEGEBUURE 2006a).

The Hittite pronominal clitic *-a-* has already been treated by Garrett (1990). Garrett did not study the enclitic pronoun *-a-* from the point of view of discourse structure, but suggested that omission of *-a-* where it was expected to occur was governed by some not yet understood discourse-conditioned processes (1990: 130, 133f.). Some preliminary work (GOEDEGEBUURE 1999) revealed that the use or non-use of nominative *-a-* in intransitive clauses was based more on semantic factors than on discourse factors. In brief, especially in Old Hittite the subject enclitic pronoun in intransitive clauses can be omitted when the intransitive verb is a verb of motion. Verbs of change-of-state or state verbs on the other hand almost always need the subject enclitic pronoun. This distribution seems to be a matter of agency and control of the subject. If the latter is correct, then Hittite would share this feature with so-called active or semantically aligned languages (as opposed to the syntactically aligned accusative and ergative languages).

From a methodological point of view the study of *-a-* therefore falls outside the pragmatic domain of deixis and information structure discussed here, but in the concluding chapter 10 I will nevertheless compare the uses of discourse deictic and anaphoric demonstratives, and the enclitic pronoun.

Since Garrett also treated the free standing possessive pronouns including *apā-* (1990: 164ff.), I have refrained from discussing *apēl* and *apenzan*, the genitives of *apā-*. Garrett found that in younger Hittite the free standing genitive could be used in both emphatic and unemphatic contexts. Methodologically this raised for me the same problems as for Garrett, but from the opposite perspective. Just as Garrett studied unemphatic pronouns and had to deal with inadvertent inclusion of emphatic genitives in his material, I could not be certain whether the free standing genitives in my corpus were not unemphatic. Nevertheless, combining Garrett's results on unemphatic pronouns and the results of the present study of the accented pronoun *apā-* (see especially the chapters 7, 8 and 9) one should be able to describe the use of both unemphatic and emphatic genitives.

I have also excluded the adverbs *kāša*, *kāšma* and *kāšat(t)a* 'herewith, here (with me/you)' even though they are based on the proximal demonstrative *kā-*.

For the most recent treatment of these adverbs as deictic pragmatic markers relating propositions to the speech participants one should consult RIEKEN 2009. For *āšma*, the formal though not functional counterpart of *kāšma*, see HOFFNER 2002-3.

Finally, the adjectives *kiššuu̯ant-* 'this kind of a …', *apeniššuu̯ant-* '*that* kind of a …' and *eniššuu̯ant-* '*that* kind of a …' were excluded due to very few attestations in my corpus (further see GHL, 147 § 7.18).

1.3 Outline of the book

Chapter 2 presents an overview of the functionalist and typological framework that forms the theoretical basis of this work. The model presented here is not found in this form in the linguistic literature but is based on a combination of three major approaches to reference. For reference in general I will use ARIEL 1990, GUNDEL et al. 1993, and CORNISH 1999. The sub-fields of deixis and demonstratives are covered by the typological studies of HIMMELMANN 1996 and DIESSEL 1999, while the sub-field of pronouns in relation to the two pragmatic notions topic and focus is covered by LAMBRECHT 1994 and DIK 1997a, b. Relying on these studies I set up a matrix which combines several equally important parameters: those of *Zeigfeld* (world, memory, discourse), of pragmatic relation (topic and focus), and of saliency (working memory versus long term memory).

Chapter 3 is the first chapter dealing with the demonstratives, in this case the distal demonstratives *aši+* and *anna/i-*. The fact that *aši+* is a distal demonstrative and not an anaphoric pronoun as formerly assumed (see section 1.1) is one of the surprising results that followed from the application of criteria used to classify demonstratives in the typological studies of HIMMELMANN 1996 and DIESSEL 1999.

As the first chapter on demonstratives, chapter 3 contains an elaborate introduction to each of the four categories for demonstrative use (situational, recognitional, discourse deictic and anaphoric use, also discussed in more general terms in chapter 2).

Chapter 4 deals with *apā-* as addressee oriented demonstrative pronoun. The outline of this chapter follows the outline of chapter 3. The main issue in this chapter is how to separate *apā-* in its information structural use from its demonstrative use and to isolate contexts that allow insight in the semantics of demonstrative *apā-*.

Chapter 5 deals with the proximal demonstrative *kā-*. Here I discuss some uses which were not found with the other two demonstratives, such as marking a type of indefiniteness ("some … others") and self-reference like "in this book" (on account of this fact alone one can already conclude that *kā-* is a proximal

demonstrative). With this chapter the discussion of the demonstratives comes to an end. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 are structured in such a way that it should be easy to compare the use of the different demonstratives in the same categories.

The main focus of the chapters on information structure is on the search for a functional classification of the occurrences of *apā-* based on discourse analysis. The purpose is to investigate whether there are formal characteristics that might be connected with the contextually established pragmatic functions of *apā-*, such as position in the clause, and the use of particles like *-i̯a* 'and, also, even', *-a/-ma* 'and, but', and *-pat* 'only'.

Chapter 6 starts the discussion of the accented pronoun *apā-* in the laws. In order to explain the use of *apā-* in this pilot study it was necessary to classify the laws according to the types of punishment:

- class I: the punishment consists of payment of a fine or substitute;
- class II: the punishment consists of payment of a fine or substitute and another action to be undertaken by the offender;
- class III: the punishment consists only of the action to be undertaken by the offender, without payment of a fine or substitute.

The punishment in class II was always expressed in a coordinate structure, and in such a situation the independent pronoun *apā-* or a full lexical noun phrase could appear where it was not expected (high saliency, no preceding discourse entities to contrast with, no new topic in case of *apā-*). I conclude that this highly unexpected *apā-* or noun phrase signals the addressee to be prepared for a following coordinated clause with two juxtaposed propositions. As for class III laws, whenever they contain *apā-*, they also contain the particle *-pat* in its restricting or limiting functions of 'only, rather'.

This pilot study discusses all the uses of *apā-* that are the subject of the next three chapters, but in a pre-theoretical way. The occurrence of *apā-* on certain points in the discourse where some information held by the addressee needs to be rejected or corrected is the subject of chapter 7 (exclusive *apā-*) and chapter 8 (inclusive *apā-*).

Chapter 7 introduces the framework for topic and focus based on LAMBRECHT 1994 and DIK 1997a. This chapter covers contrastive focus, also known as exhaustive-listing focus. Contrastive focus can be subdivided in replacing ("not X, but Y"), restricting ("not X and Y, only X"), selecting ("of X or Y or Z, just X") and confirmation focus ("(indeed) X!"). I mainly discuss argument or narrow focus expressions, with only the referent of *apā-* in focus. By applying algorithms for detecting focus in texts, I will show that replacing and selecting

focus expressions occur in preverbal position. The limited amount of data for restricting and confirmation focus does not allow drawing any firm conclusions regarding word order, although confirmation focus expressions seem to occur in pattern position.

Chapter 8 continues with inclusive focus. The Hittite particle *-i̯a* functions both as coordinator 'and' and as focus particle 'also, even'. After developing a method to distinguish between the two functions, I show that there is a strong correlation between the inclusive focus expression *apā-* with *-i̯a* 'he/she/that too' and first position in the clause, whereas *-i̯a* 'and' is always cliticized to a word in initial position. When *-i̯a* means 'even', its host occurs in preverbal position.

Chapter 9 discusses the use of *apā-* as contrastive or shifted topic, as such often cliticized with the particle *-a/-ma*. The chapter starts with *apā-* in coordinated clauses, with the coordinators *-i̯a* 'and' and *-a/-ma* 'while', and explains *apā-* in a coordination as a contrastive topic. Following sections discuss *apā-* as shifted topic (with *-a/-ma*).

In chapter 10 the system set up in chapter 2 will be applied to the Hittite third person pronoun and the demonstratives. Although this chapter draws on the results of the far more detailed accounts of deixis, topic and focus in all previous chapters, it does not merely provide a summary: the main focus is the contrastive relations of the expressions to each other and the larger system they together build. This comparison is generally absent in the chapters dealing with the individual expressions.

Although most attestations of accented pronominal *apā-* in my corpus are covered by these chapters, I do not provide a full description of *apā-*. Adnominal *apā-* does not occur very often in argument focus or as contrastive topic, but is mainly found as a topical element in the predicate focus of a clause. This use of adnominal *apā-* is discussed in GOEDEGEBUURE 2013.

1.4 Palaeography and text dating

In order to gain a clear picture of the use and especially the development of the demonstratives, or any linguistic feature for that matter, we should only use texts that were originally composed and written down in the Old, Middle or New Hittite language periods. These texts should also be free from archaizing tendencies.

In view of the ongoing reassessment of scribal practices in the Hittite administration as advocated by for example Popko (2005, 2007) and Miller (2004: 464 fn. 773) for ductus, and van den Hout (2002, 2005) for record keeping, I will sometimes use a classification for ductus that is different from what is currently in use in the *Konkordanz* (http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/) and

the CHD. I follow Klinger (1996), Miller (2004), van den Hout (1989) and Starke (1985) in often referring to the new script ductus with Roman numerals, but still keep the old system for OS and MS in anticipation of Wilhelm's edition of the Landschenkungsurkunden (which has been published in the meantime). I continue to use Old Hittite (OH), Middle Hittite (MH), New Hittite (NH) and late New Hittite (LNH) for the date of the composition.

In order to securely link ductus with language phase, we need contemporary documents that can be conclusively attributed to a single king, preferably to a more narrowly defined period within his reign. Ideal for this enterprise are texts that are *unica* in the terminology of van den Hout (2002) and that contain prosopographical information. This group consists of temporary records (letters, oracle reports, economic records and court depositions), charters (land deeds, original (metal) treaties) and semi-current records (later compilations/summaries of economic texts, depositions, oracle reports and (cult) inventories) (WAAL 2010: 299ff., 304). In addition, it is justified to include all texts that can be attributed to Šuppiluliuma II as the last king to leave records.

This method will work well for NH, but moving back in time we have less and less *unica*, with some exceptions such as the land deeds and the Maşat corpus from Tutḫaliia III. The almost complete absence of *unica* in OH will make it very difficult to set up a scribal and language chronology for a period that could cover about 150 years.

In the absence of a complete study that covers both ductus and language of securely dated *unica*, I will rely on several partial overviews.

I follow Starke's criterion that a modernized sign form provides the *terminus post quem*. Thus, if it can be shown that a sign form occurs for the first time in a contemporary *unicum* from the reign of Muršili II but not in contemporary *unica* from previous reigns, then the previous reign, that of Šuppiluliuma I (and Arnuu̯anda II), provides the *terminus post quem* for this particular sign. Texts with the modern sign form can only be dated during or after Muršili II, irrespective of the linguistic features of the document, which may of course point at a far older composition.

We often encounter the situation that during several reigns in succession the old and new forms of the same sign co-exist in the same document, but that the distribution of old versus new changes, with the highest percentage of older forms in the earliest reign where the two forms co-exist, and the highest percentage of newer forms in the latest reign. Ideally, this should be incorporated in a dating procedure, but since these counts are mostly absent in the text editions, we can only use the *termini post quos*.

Nevertheless, what such a statistical procedure would look like is illustrated by van den Hout (1989). Based on a collation of original compositions from the reign of Tutḫaliịa IV and successive kings, van den Hout (1989: 327f.) introduces a third phase for New Hittite script:

> Die Phase IIIb wird von Starke [StBoT 30, 25] charakterisiert anhand der grundlegenden Neuerung bekannter Zeichen, wie AK, IK, LI, SAR, URU, mit der Hinzufügung, dass diese "Leitzeichen von IIIb kaum noch durch Detailveränderungen charakterisiert sind". Es kommen aber m.E. während des 13. Jhdts andere Zeichen auf, die als Leitzeichen dienen können und die den Ansatz eines neuen Sigels rechtfertigen, das wir nach der Starke-Terminologie IIIc taufen dürfen. Das ergibt für das Junghethitische die folgende Einteilung:

Jungheth.	M./E. 14.Jh.	IIIa
	A. 13.Jh.	IIIb
	M./E. 13.Jh. -	IIIc
	A. 12.Jh.	

Using compositions from Muṷatalli II to Šuppiluliama[3], van den Hout (1989: 338f.) identifies the following signs as undergoing a continuous development whereby later forms increasingly replace the older forms: QA, EN, BI, UN, DA, ḪA, TE (the percentages in the table below represent the ratios of the manuscripts in which these forms occur, not the ratios of old versus new variants of the sign forms):

	Muṷatalli II	Ḫattušili III	Tutḫaliịa IV	Šuppiluliama II
	old/new	old/new	old/new	old/new
QA	100/0	90/10	47/53	17/83
EN	83/17	82/18	53/47	0/100
BI	80/20	78/22	60/40	17/83
UN	100/0	100/0	90/10	45/55

---

3 Van den Hout (1989) used the following manuscripts. For Muṷatalli: CTH 76A (which is probably a later copy) and B, 381A and B, and 382. For Ḫattušili: CTH 81, 87, 383, 561 (nowadays dated to Tutḫaliịa), 583 (except KUB 31.77) and 590 (KUB 15.4, 6, 18, 19, 22, 24, 30). For Tutḫaliịa see the corpus in section 1.5.4.1 (with the exception of all oracles, legal texts, the Bronze Tablet (CTH 106), CTH 275, 385.9, 584, 590). For Šuppiluliama see the corpus in section 1.5.4.2 (except KBo 13.225 (+) KUB 26.33, KBo 18.25 (+) KBo 31.69 (still dated to Tutḫaliịa by van den Hout), KBo 42.60, KBo 49.121, KUB 19.28, KUB 40.38, KUB 51.81).

	Muu̯atalli II	Ḫattušili III	Tutḫalii̯a IV	Šuppiluliama II
	old/new	old/new	old/new	old/new
DA	67/33	58/42	59/41	27/73
ḪA	62/38	81/19	48/52	15/85
TE	57/43	56/44	59/41	22/78

Based on these figures van den Hout (1989: 342) concludes:

> Ein Umbruch findet erst statt zwischen Hattusili und Tudhalija, zwar nicht für DA und TE, die noch im ungefähr gleichen Verhältnis wie bei Muu̯atalli und Hattusili vorkommen, sondern für UN (10%), das zum ersten Male, allerdings noch sehr vorsichtig, in seiner jüngeren Form zu erscheinen beginnt, und vor allem für EN (29%), QA (43%), BI (18%) und HA (33%). Wie wir schon bemerkten, setzt sich diese Entwicklung noch viel stärker fort bei den Manuskripten aus der Zeit Suppilulijamas.

> Somit dürfen wir als charakteristische Zeichen für die zweite Hälfte des 13. Jhdts und für das oben vorgeschlagene Sigel IIIc ansetzen: QA, EN, BI, UN und HA, wobei der Nachweis einer Datierung aufgrund dieser Zeichen möglichst kumulativ zu erfolgen hat. Nur wenn UN in seiner jüngeren Form auftritt, könnte man fast "automatisch" auf ein Manuskript der Zeit Tudhalijas oder Suppilulijamas schliessen. Sonst braucht ein vereinzeltes Beispiel einer der genannten Zeichen oder nur ein von diesen Zeichen in seiner jüngeren Form nichts zu besagen.

To the signs of IIIc listed above we should add DI, KI (KLINGER 1996: 39) and KU with two verticals, and ŠÚ (CHRISTIANSEN 2006: 73). To conclude, script IIIc starts during the reign of Tutḫalii̯a IV, although we should not forget that IIIb is also attested for this king.

Following Starke (1985: 25), phase IIIb, which runs from Muu̯atalli into the reign of Tutḫalii̯a, regularly shows the later forms of AK, GI, IK, KI, LI, SAG, ŠAR, and URU. Van den Hout's study shows that IIIb almost always has old UN and old QA. Weeden (2011: 49) recently noted that late UN is also attested in the Tau̯agalau̯a letter (KUB 14.3, Ḫattušili III)[4], a text which was not considered by van den Hout. As van den Hout has shown, IIIb regularly shows late ḪA (with one Winkelhaken) and late DA (with unbroken central horizontal). The

---

4   The fact that late UN is also attested in the historical texts KUB 26.58, KBo 14.45, KUB 21.19 and KUB 21.8 (WEEDEN 2011: 49 fn. 224) is in my view not relevant. There is no guarantee that the copies of these compositions are contemporaneous with the reign of Ḫattušili III. Weeden also mentions the oracles KUB 22.52 (before the capture of Nerik) and KUB 5.1 (after the capture of Nerik) as belonging to the reign of Ḫattušili III. However, certainly KUB 5.1 could be dated to Tutḫalii̯a IV.

presence of these versions in a text should therefore not automatically lead to a classification as IIIc. In fact, if late DA and ḪA are the only signs that can be used for dating, both IIIb and IIIc are possible, and so is a dating from Muu̯atalli up to Šuppiluliama.

Absence of the late forms of the signs mentioned above in New Hittite compositions points at script IIIa. Late IK is, however, already attested in MS and late AK appears in original documents from Muršili II (KLINGER 1996: 35). Texts in IIIa script date to the reigns of Šuppiluliuma I and Muršili II, although Šuppiluliuma's texts also show IIc (MILLER 2004: 464 fn. 773)

In general, it is important to notice that, with a few exceptions, old forms are attested until Šuppiluliama (Šuppiluliuma II). This applies, for example, to old LI and DA and IT with broken middle horizontals, signs that are often used for palaeographic dating to earlier periods. On the other hand, new ḪA with one wedge is already attested in compositions from Muu̯atalli II, whereas the double wedged ḪA occurs until Šuppiluliama. As has been stressed by others, palaeographic dating is useless for small fragments, even if they are securely dated to a specific reign. It is very well possible that a small fragment mentioning Šuppiluliama could contain old LI, new ḪA, and old EN, which would be consistent with both IIIb and IIIc. Only the fact that phase IIIc covers, by definition, all documents from Šuppiluliama would allow us to conclude that the script has to be IIIc. Based on the fragment alone this would not be possible.

The correlation between century, king and script can be visualized as follows:

1350		1300		1250		1200	
Šuppi I	Murš II	Muu̯at II	Ḫatt III		Tutḫ IV	Šuppi II	
IIc	IIIa		IIIb			IIIc	

Whenever possible I will assign the text examples to a king (or queen), especially in New Hittite. For the overall picture, however, I discern four large periods: OH/OS (until Telipinu), MH/MS (until Šuppiluliuma I), NH (Muršili I to Ḫattušili III) and lateNH (Tutḫalii̯a IV and later), the latter two stages taking IIIa, b and c into account.

1.5 The corpus

The corpus is primarily based on the dating in the Konkordanz version 1.87 (= S. Košak, hethiter.net/: hetkonk (v. 1.87)). It includes all documents in OS, all original Middle Hittite compositions in MS of a historical nature or that can be otherwise dated to this language period, and all datable and original NH and LateNH compositions. As a result, almost all religious documents, with the

exception of the Old Hittite ones, are absent from the corpus. I have also tried to distinguish between late copies (script IIIb and IIIc) and original compositions (script IIIa) from the reign of Muršili II in order to be able to track the changes in the paradigms of *kā-*, *apā-* and *aši+*.

1.5.1 Old Hittite in old script

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Historical narratives	1A	KBo 3.22
	2.2	KUB 36.99
	3.1A	KBo 22.2
	3	KBo 12.19
	8D	KUB 36.104
	9.5	KBo 8.42
	14.IVA	KBo 7.14 + KUB 36.100
	21.II	KUB 31.81
	39	KBo 25.195; KBo 50.9
	39.3	KBo 8.45
	39.4	KBo 8.131
	39.5	KUB 26.35
	39.10	KUB 36.107
Administration	238.4	KBo 16.57
	239	KBo 13.254
Instructions	272	KBo 22.1
Laws	291.I.aA	KBo 6.2 + KBo 19.1 + 1a + KBo 22.61 + 62
	291.I.aB	KBo 19.2 + KUB 29.16
	292.IA	KBo 25.5 + 85 + KUB 29.25 + 28 + 29 + 30 + 32 + 35 + 36 + 38
Myths	323C	KBo 25.107
	336.2	KUB 33.59
	336.5C	KUB 43.25
	370.I.70	FHL 146 (+) KBo 27.15 (+) KUB 36.49
	370.I.72	KBo 25.25

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Rituals	412A	KBo 17.17 + KBo 30.30
	414.1B	KUB 29.3
	414.1E	KUB 60.113
	416A	KBo 17.1[5] + 26 + KBo 25.3 + 148 + KBo 30.33
	416B	IBoT 3.135 + KBo 17.2 + 3 + 4 + 7 + KBo 20.15 + KBo 25.7 + KUB 43.32 + 39
	416C	KBo 17.5 + 6 + KBo 25.8
	438B	KBo 20.31
	457.3	KUB 12.43
	457	KBo 8.67 (+) KBo 17.23
	470	KBo 25.102; KBo 57.76
Distribution lists	523	KBo 16.72 + 73
	530	KBo 25.83
Divination	545.II	KBo 25.2 + 197
	547.II.1	KUB 4.72
	547.II.2	KUB 37.223
	547.II.3	KBo 9.67
	547.II.4	KBo 25.1
	551.1	KUB 8.43
	560.II	KBo 25.108
Festivals		
KI.LAM	627.1hA	ABoT 1.5 + KBo 17.9 + 20 + KBo 20.5 + KBo 25.12
	627.2eA	KBo 25.17
	627.3a	KBo 17.21 + 46 + KBo 20.33 + KBo 25.19 + KBo 34.2
	627A	KBo 20.26 (+) 27 (+) KBo 21.68 (+) KBo 25.20 (+) 34 + 35 + 72 + 145 (+) 154 (+) KBo 38.12 + KUB 39.64 (OS?)
	627	IBoT 4.109; KBo 17.19 + KBo 25.52;

---

5   The hand copy KBo 17.1 includes the transliterations of ABoT 1.4 + 1.4a + FHG 6 + 6a
     + IBoT 1.26 + KUB 34.119 + 121.

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
		KBo 25.61 + KBo 40.79; KBo 30.32; KBo 30.34 + KBo 40.80; KBo 40.200; KUB 43.31
Thunder	631.1A	KBo 17.11 + KBo 20.12 (+) KBo 25.95 (+) KBo 30.25 + 29 (+) KBo 34.5 (+) 11 + KUB 43.26
	631.1B	ABoT 1.9 + KBo 17.74 + KBo 21.25 + KBo 30.66 + KBo 34.10 + KBo 38.32 (+) KBo 39.76 (+) KBo 41.64 (+) KBo 44.167 + KBo 48.128 + KUB 34.123 (OS?)
	631.9	KBo 20.8
	631	FHL 117 + KBo 25.51 + KBo 30.31 + VSNF 12.53
Zippalanda	635.13A	KBo 16.71 + KBo 17.14 (+) KBo 20.2 (+) 3 + 4 + 16 + 24 + KBo 25.13 (+) 15 (+) 24
	635	KBo 20.7 + KBo 25.16; KBo 20.13 + KBo 30.35; KBo 17.30 + KBo 25.86 + 87 + KBo 34.4
Ziparu̯a	643	KBo 17.8
Infernal deities	645.6C	KBo 17.15
	645.6G	KBo 25.29
the Prince	647	Bo 7937 (+) HHT 73 (+) KUB 54.50 (+) KUB 60.41; KBo 25.44; KBo 34.3 (+) KBo 34.17; KBo 34.13; KBo 39.80
	647.3	KBo 30.28 + KUB 34.115
	649	KBo 25.45
	649.I.1A	KBo 25.31
	649.I.2	KBo 20.9
	649.I.3A	KBo 20.14 + KBo 25.33
	649.I.5A	KBo 25.36
	649.I/II.1	KBo 25.39
	649.II.a.2.1A	KBo 17.18
	649.II.a.2.1B	KBo 17.43
	649.II.a.3	KBo 25.37
	654.4	KBo 13.175
	662.6	KBo 17.31

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
	665.1A	ABoT 1.35 + KBo 17.36 + KBo 20.17 + 20 + KBo 25.54
	665.1B	KBo 17.33 + 45 + KBo 20.22 + KBo 25.56+ KBo 30.27
	665.1C	KBo 25.55
	665.1D	KBo 17.12
	665	KBo 25.58
	669	KBo 25.62 + 63
	670	HHT 75; KBo 7.38 + KBo 25.88; KBo 7.41; KBo 8.85 + KBo 20.11; KBo 16.84; KBo 17.13 + KBo 25.68 + 69; KBo 17.16, 28; KBo 17.29 + KBo 20.1; KBo 17.58; KBo 17.59 + KBo 25.99; KBo 20.18 + KBo 25.65; KBo 20.19 + 25; KBo 20.21, 37; KBo 25.22, 23, 28, 40, 73, 82, 84, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 96, 97, 98, 101, 103, 106; KBo 30.36; KBo 34.1, 6, 7, 12, 14, 18; KBo 38.60, 113, 123; KBo 44.142; KBo 54.187; KUB 43.28, 33
	676.I.A	IBoT 2.121
	677	Bo 3123
	677.4	KBo 25.79 (+) KUB 35.126
	678	KBo 20.23
Hattian-Hittite	731	KBo 25.122 (+) 123
	733.II.a.1A	KBo 25.112 (+) KBo 25.116
	733.II.a.1B	KBo 25.114
	733.II.b.1	KBo 25.115 (+) KUB 31.143 (+) 143a (+) KUB 43.27 + VBoT 124
	733.II.c.3	KBo 25.117
	733.III.b.1A	KBo 25.113 (+) 119 (+) KBo 60.217 (+) KUB 8.41
	733.III.b.1B	KBo 25.121 + 132 + 134 + KUB 48.49
	734	KBo 37.26
	736.4	KBo 17.22
	738.I.23	Bo 6594

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
	744.2	HT 95
	744.18	KBo 17.50 + KBo 25.127 + 129 + 147 + KBo 34.8 + 9 + KBo 37.75
	744	KBo 20.69 + KBo 25.142; KBo 25.38, 110, 126, 130; KBo 37.82
	745.7	KUB 43.30
	745	KBo 25.128
Palaic-Hittite	752A	KBo 8.74 + KBo 19.156 + KBo 39.174 + KUB 32.16 + 117 + KUB 35.93
	752B	KBo 17.25
Luwian-Hittite	772.II.2	KBo 25.53
Benedictions	820.1	KUB 36.110
Oracle letter	827	KBo 18.151
Unassigned	832	KBo 16.45; KBo 17.10, 27; KBo 25.21, 93, 100, 196; KBo 37.158

1.5.2 Middle Hittite in middle script

1.5.2.1 Zidanta II

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Treaty *with Pilliịa of Kiz-* *zuịatna*	25	KUB 36.108
Letter	194	KBo 8.18

1.5.2.2 Tutḫaliịa I/II and Nikalmati

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Treaty *with Šunaššura of* *Kizzuịatna*	41.IIA 41.IIB	KUB 8.81 + KBo 19.31 (= CTH 131) KUB 36.127

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Annals	142.2B	KUB 23.12
Loyalty oath[6]		
of all of Ḫatti	251A	KBo 16.24 (+) 25[7]
	259.1	KUB 26.17
of royal family	271	KBo 50.289 + KUB 34.40 + 41 + 36.112 + 113 + 114 + 116[8]; KBo 38.91; KBo 40.16
Ritual		
against Ziplanta-u̯ii̯a	443	KBo 15.10 + KBo 20.42

1.5.2.3 Arnuu̯anda I and Ašmunikal

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Treaty		
with the Gašga	137	KBo 16.27 + KBo 40.330
	138.1	KUB 13.27 + KUB 16.40 + KUB 23.77 (+) 77a
	138.2	KUB 31.105
	138.3	KUB 26.19
	139.1A	KBo 8.35
	139.1B	Bo 5899 + Bo 8668 + KBo 50.67 + KUB 23.78b + KUB 26.6 + KUB 40.36
	139.2	KBo 16.29 (+) KUB 31.104
	140.1	KBo 50.63 (+) 64 (+) 171 (+) 219 (+) KUB 19.17 + KUB 26.62 (+) KUB 31.33 (+) KUB 57.22
	140.2A	KBo 22.132 + KUB 26.20 + KUB 40.31
	140.3	KBo 50.61 + 68
	140.4	KBo 57.2
	140	KBo 50.71

6 For the new designation "loyalty oath" or *Treueid* instead of "instruction," see Giorgieri (2005).
7 Attributed to Tutḫalii̯a I/II by Giorgieri (2005: 330, w. fn. 38 and 39).
8 Attributed to Tutḫalii̯a I/II by Giorgieri (2005: 334).

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Indictment	147	KBo 19.38 + KUB 14.1
Annals	148	KBo 50.4
Letters	209	KBo 18.66
	210	KBo 8.22
Treaty/oath fragment	212	KBo 50.107 (+) KUB 31.45
Historical fragment	214.17	KBo 18.80 + Privat 5
Landgrant	222.91	KBo 5.7
Instructions		
for the ḪAZANNU	257.4A	KUB 31.100
for the BEL MADGALTI	261A	Bo 7192 + KBo 50.280a + b + KUB 13.1 + KUB 31.87 + 88 + KUB 40.55 + 56
Loyalty oath of the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}*DUGUD*	260.7	KBo 50.62
Prayers		
to the Sungoddess of Arinna	375.1A	KBo 51.16 + KBo 52.14 + KBo 55.32 + KUB 17.21
	375.1B	Bo 8617 + KBo 53.10 (+) KUB 31.124 + KUB 48.28
	375.3	FHL 3 + KUB 31.123
	376.IA	KUB 24.4 + KUB 30.12
	376.IB	KBo 53.9 (+) KBo 58.6 (+) 7
Rituals	494	Bo 4186 + KUB 45.47
	778.I	KBo 9.137 + KBo 23.22
Oracles	571	KBo 16.97 + KBo 40.48

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
	571	KBo 8.55 + KBo 34.142 (+) KBo 40.47[9]

1.5.2.4 Tutḫaliịa III

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Treaty		
Mida of Paḫḫuụa	146	KUB 23.72 + KUB 40.10 + KUB 40.11 + KBo 50.66 + KBo 50.216 + KBo 50.218 + KBo 57.238[10]
Letters		
Egypt to Arzaụa	151	VBoT 1
Arzaụa to Egypt	152	VBoT 2
king to subordinates	186	HKM 1-6, 9, 10, 12-28, 30, 32, 33, 35-38, 42, 45
	188	Or. "1" (SÜEL 2001: 671-2)
	190	HKM 7, 8, 11, 16, 29, 31, 34, 39-41, 43, 44, 48, 49, 51, 53, 55, 61, 62, 66, 67, 69, 72, 73, 75-77, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 87, 89, 93-96, 100, 103, 106, 107, 110
from subordinates	195	KBo 15.28[11]
	199	ABoT 1.65
	200	ABoT 1.60
	209	KBo 32.145
	581	HKM 85
Historical fragment	214.13	KBo 16.42
Treaty/oath fragments	212	KBo 16.31, 46; KBo 17.48; KBo 50.103; KUB 13.26
Instructions	271	KUB 36.118 + 119

---

9   Attributed to the co-regency of Tutḫaliịa I/II and Arnuụanda I by Klinger (1998: 110) and Marizza (2007: 40).
10   Attributed to Tutḫaliịa III by Torri (2005).
11   Attributed to Tutḫaliịa III by de Martino (2005: 295), with older literature.

1.5.2.5 Šuppiluliuma I

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Treaty		
with Ḫukkana of	42B	KBo 19.44 + 44b + KBo 22.40 + KBo
Azzi-Ḫaịaša		53.309 + KBo 54.12 + KUB 14.6 +
		KUB 19.24 + KUB 26.37
with Šattiụaza of	51.II	KUB 21.18 (+) KUB 26.34
Mittanni		
of Šattiụaza with	52.II	HT 21 + KBo 50.17 + 18 + KUB 8.80 +
Šuppiluliuma		KUB 23.50
Letter	154	KUB 19.20 + KBo 12.23 (+) KBo 49.13
Loyalty oath	253	KUB 21.41

1.5.2.6 Middle Hittite unassigned

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Treaties		
with the Ḫabiru	27	KBo 9.73 (+) KUB 36.106
	28	KBo 16.47 (Arnuụanda I?)
Kuruštama	134C	KUB 40.28 (Tutḫaliịa I/II?)
Letters	186	HHCTO 3, 4; Or. 90/1400
	188	HHCTO 2; KBo 18.51, 54; KUB
		31.79[12]; Or. 90/800
	190	KBo 18.86; KuT 49, 50
	209	HHCTO 1; KBo 12.62; KBo 18.38, 40,
		57+57a, 69
Treaty fragment	213	KUB 26.30
Historical fragments	214	KUB 23.57
	215	KBo 32.122, 201, 202, 203a-c, 224;
		KUB 23.58; KUB 48.106
Itinerary	230	Bo 2004/1

---

12   Perhaps to be attributed to Tutḫaliịa III (DE MARTINO 2005: 302).

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Instructions	262	IBoT 1.36
	268	KBo 19.58 + KUB 21.47 + KUB 23.82[13]
	269B	IBoT 3.75
	270	KBo 16.50
	275	KBo 12.15; KUB 13.10; KUB 26.7, 16, 22; KUB 31.98; KUB 31.103 (Tutḫaliːa III?); KUB 34.58 (Arnuːanda I?); KUB 36.109
Horsetraining		
Kikkuli	284	KUB 1.1 + KUB 29.57
	286, Tablet I	KUB 29.43 (+) 45
	Tablet II	KUB 29.40
	Tablet III	ABoT 2.13 (+) KUB 29.46 + 53 (+) 42
	Tablet IV	KBo 8.51 + KBo 14.62 (+) KUB 29.49 (+) 52
	Tablet V	KBo 8.49 (+) KBo 16.92 (+) KUB 29.51
	Tablet VI	KUB 29.50
	Tablet VII	KBo 8.52 + KBo 14.63 (+) 63a
	Fragments	KBo 16.89-91, KBo 31.67
	287.1	KUB 29.54
Oracle	573	KBo 22.263 + KUB 50.1
Oracle letter	581	KUB 31.101

1.5.3 New Hittite

1.5.3.1 Muršili II

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Treaties		
with Duppi-	62.IIA	KBo 5.9 (+) KBo 22.39 (+) KBo 50.28
Teššub of Amurru	62.IIB	KBo 50.25 (+) KUB 3.119 (+) KUB 14.5
	62.IIC	KBo 50.26 (+) KUB 19.48 (+) KUB

---

13 According to Christiansen (2012: 336, 338), this oath could belong to the early years of Šuppiluliuma I's reign.

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
		21.49 (+) KUB 23.6
with Targašnalli of Ḫapalla	67	KBo 5.4[14]
with Kupanta-Ku-runta of Mira	68B	KBo 4.7 + KBo 19.65 + KBo 22.38 + KBo 50.42
	68E	KUB 6.42 (+) 43 + 44 + KUB 19.53
	68F	KUB 19.54
	68G	KUB 6.48
	68I	KBo 50.38 + KBo 54.47 + KUB 19.52 + KUB 40.41 + 53
	68J	KUB 40.42
with Manapa-Tarḫunta of Šeḫa	69A	KBo 19.70 + 71 + 72 + KBo 22.34 + 41 + KBo 50.35 + 36 + KUB 19.49 + KUB 23.25 + KUB 26.36
	69C	KUB 31.83
Annals		
of Šuppiluliuma	40.IA	IBoT 4.346 + KUB 14.23
	40.IC	KUB 14.22
	40.IE	KUB 31.34
	40.II.1B	KBo 14.1
	40.II.2D	KBo 22.12 + KBo 50.10 + KUB 19.11
	40.IV.1A	KBo 5.6[15]
	40.IV.1B	KBo 14.9
	40.IV.1C	KUB 31.7
	40.V.1A	KBo 50.13 + KUB 19.13 + 14
10-year Annals	61.IB	KBo 16.1 + KBo 44.2 + 239 + KUB 31.137
	61.IC	KUB 14.21 (+) KUB 19.38
	61.IE	KBo 16.3
Extensive Annals	61.II.2B	KUB 14.16
	61.II.5A	KUB 14.28 + 29 + KUB 19.3
	61.II.5B	KBo 4.4 + KBo 19.46 + KBo 50.174

---

14   Against Konkordanz 1.87, this manuscript is early NS (IIIa), see STARKE 1985: 24 n. 55.
15   Against Konkordanz 1.87, this manuscript is early NS (IIIa), see STARKE 1985: 24 n. 55.

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
	61.II.5C	KBo 10.17
	61.II.5D	KBo 16.7
	61.II.5E	KBo 16.6
	61.II.6A	KBo 19.76 + KUB 14.20 + KUB 19.39
	61.II.6D	KUB 14.24
	61.II.7A	KBo 5.8
	61.II.7	KBo 40.4 (+) 257 (+) KBo 44.25
	61.II.8B	KBo 7.17 + KBo 14.19 + 20 + 44 + KBo 16.9 + 10 + 11 + 13 + 15 + KBo 40.3 + KUB 34.33 + 34[16]
	61.II.8	KUB 14.19
	61.II.9A	KUB 19.37
	61.II.9C	KBo 16.16 + KBo 40.7
	61.II.10A	KBo 2.5 + 5a + KBo 16.17
	61.III.4	KUB 23.36 + KUB 31.35
	61.III.5	KBo 16.18
Edict	63A	KBo 3.3 + KBo 50.77 + KUB 19.31 + KUB 23.126 + KUB 31.21 + 36 + KUB 40.29
	63E	KUB 19.45
Letters	72	KUB 19.15 + KBo 50.24
	202	KBo 18.15
	209	KBo 18.35[17], KUB 57.1
Prayers	70.1A	KUB 14.4
	70.1B	KBo 50.46
	71A	İzmir 1277 + KBo 4.8
	378.IB	KBo 51.19 + KBo 55.24 (+) KUB 23.3
	378.IIA	KUB 14.8
	378.IIB	KBo 55.25 + KUB 14.11
	378.IIC	KUB 14.10 + KUB 26.86

16   According to Konkordanz 1.87 this manuscript shows LNS. However, with mostly older signs such as LI, AK, and IK (but both older and later URU), this manuscript could perhaps be dated towards the end of the reign of Muršili II.

17   According to Konkordanz 1.87 this manuscript shows MS, but de Martino (2005: 305) assigns it to the later reign of Muršili II.

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
	378.IID	KBo 57.21
	378.III	KUB 14.12
	378.IVA	KUB 14.13 + KUB 23.124
	378.IVB	KBo 22.71
	379	KUB 31.121 (+) 121a + KUB 48.111
	380B	KBo 55.23
	380C	KBo 55.21
	380D	KBo 31.80
	380E	KBo 53.11
	486A	IBoT 4.26 + KUB 12.27 + KUB 15.36 + KUB 43.50
	486B	IBoT 2.112 + KUB 12.31 + KUB 43.51 + KUB 48.100
	486C	KBo 4.2 iii 40ff.
Oracles	570	KBo 53.103 + KUB 5.6 + KUB 18.54 + KUB 50.123

1.5.3.2 Muu̯atalli II

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Treaty		
with Alakšan-du of Wiluša	76A	FHL 57 + Gurney 2 + KBo 19.73 + 73a + KBo 50.41 + 124 + 212 + KUB 19.6 + KUB 21.1
	76B	KBo 19.74 + KUB 21.5
	76D	KUB 21.3
	76E	Bo 7159 + HT 8
Letters	171	KUB 23.102
	191	KUB 19.5 + KBo 19.79
Prayers	381A	KBo 57.18 + KUB 6.45 + KUB 30.14
	381B	KUB 6.46
	381C	KUB 12.35
	381D	KBo 53.12
	382	KBo 11.1
Vows		
Ištar of Šamuḫa	590	KBo 9.96 (+) KBo 41.60

1.5.3.3 Urḫi-Teššub (Muršili III)

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Prayer	387	IBoT 3.122 + KUB 31.66
Dreams of the King	583	KBo 43.66 + KUB 15.5 + KUB 48.122

1.5.3.4 Ḫattušili III and Puduḫeba

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Apology	81A	KUB 1.1 + KUB 19.60 + 61 + 62 + 63 + 66 + KUB 26.44 + 46 + 1304/u + 1683/u + 1956/u
	81B	ABoT 1.62 + Bo 68/76 + Bo 68/85 + Bo 69/256 + KBo 3.6 + KUB 1.4 + 7 + KUB 19.70 + KUB 26.45 + 647/v + 832/v
	81C	KUB 1.2 + KUB 19.58 + 59
	81D	Bo 7571 + Bo 69/240 + Bo 69/363 + KBo 26.123 + KBo 60.2 + KUB 1.5 + KUB 2.11 + KUB 19.56 + 57 + KUB 21.28
	81E	KUB 1.6 + KUB 19.65 + 68 + KUB 31.13 + 922/v + 1194/v
	81H	KUB 19.69
	81J	Bo 3726
	81K	KUB 19.71 + 1746/u
	81L	KUB 1.9
	81M	KUB 1.8
	81N	248/w
	81O	236/v
	81P	KUB 21.26
Annals	82	KUB 21.6 (+) 6a + KUB 31.19
	83.2	KBo 12.44
	83.3	Bo 5768 + KUB 31.20 + KBo 16.36
	83.4	FHL 61
	83.7	KUB 48.87
	84.1	KUB 21.16
	84.2	KUB 21.24
	83.1A	KUB 19.9
	83.1B	KUB 19.8

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Conflict with Urḫi-Teššub	85.1A	Bo 2026b + KBo 6.29 + KUB 21.12 + KUB 23.137 + 1380/u
	85.1B	KUB 21.15 + 509/u + 186/v + 715/v
	85.2	KUB 21.37
	85.3	KBo 14.45
	85.4	KBo 8.43
	85.5	FHL 110 (?)
Edict		
Armatarḫunda	86.1A	KUB 21.17
	86.1B	KUB 31.27
	86.2	KUB 31.26
Mittannamuu̯a	87	KBo 4.12
ḫekur of Piru̯a	88	KBo 6.28 + KUB 26.48
Tiliura	89A	KBo 51.1 (+) KUB 21.29
	89B	KUB 23.123
	89C	KUB 31.15
Nerik	90.3	KBo 22.73 (+) KBo 60.3 (+) KUB 21.11
fragm. Nerik	90.1	KUB 21.8
Kuruntii̯a	96	544/f
Letters		
	175	KUB 23.88
Puduḫeba	176	KUB 21.38
'Tau̯agalau̯a'	181	KUB 14.3
	187	KUB 57.125
Puduḫeba	190	KUB 48.88
	180	KUB 23.85
from Ramses II	209	KBo 18.23
	209.5	KUB 26.89
	209.4	KUB 21.36
	209.20	KUB 26.53
Prayers	384A	KBo 51.26 + KUB 21.27 + 676/v + 695/v
	384B	IBoT 4.225
	383	KBo 52.17 (+) KBo 57.19 + KUB 14.7 (+) KUB 21.19 + KUB 40.94 + 338/v
	385.1	KUB 14.27

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
	385.3	KUB 31.137
	385.5-8	IBoT 3.82 (+) 113 (+) 127 (+) 128 or KUB 36.84
	385.9	KBo 12.58 + KBo 13.162
Dreams of the Queen	584	KBo 47.239, KUB 15.1, 3, 11, 23, KUB 31.71 + KUB 60.97, KUB 31.77 + KUB 48.126, KUB 56.14
Oracles	566	KUB 22.70
	577	KUB 5.11[18]
	577	KBo 57.130 + KUB 5.24 + KUB 16.31 + KUB 18.57[19]
	578	KUB 22.61[20]
	582	KUB 52.44[21]
Vow of Puduḫeba	585A	KBo 55.212 + KUB 15.17 + KUB 26.61 + KUB 31.61 + KUB 56.4
	585B	KUB 15.16
	585C	KBo 60.241 + KUB 31.52 + 566/v
	585D	KUB 26.5 + KUB 31.51 + KUB 56.8
	585E	KBo 3.39 + KUB 56.6
	585F	KUB 26.64
	585G	ABoT 1.51 + KUB 31.53 + 585/u + 1320/u
	585H	KUB 31.50
	585J	KUB 31.58 + 75
	585K	KUB 26.60
	585L	VBoT 71
	585M	KBo 51.121 + KBo 55.211 + KUB 26.63 + KUB 31.63 + 73 + KUB 56.9
	585N	KUB 31.56
	585P	KUB 4.33 + KUB 56.10
	585R	KBo 51.123 + KUB 56.2

---

18 Attributed to Ḫattušili III (?), VAN DEN HOUT 1995: 302.
19 Attributed to Ḫattušili III, HOUWINK TEN CATE 2006: 112 w. fn. 12, 114.
20 Attributed to Ḫattušili III, MOUTON 2006: 206.
21 Attributed to either Ḫattušili III or Tutḫaliḭa IV, MOUTON 2007: 239.

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
	585T	KUB 48.116 + KUB 56.3
	585AA	1421/u
	585BB	1384/u
	585CC	KBo 51.122
	585DD	1409/u
	585EE	KBo 52.108 + KUB 56.11
	585FF	1407/u
	585GG	KBo 52.107a + b + 1638/u
	585JJ	1381/u
Vows	590	IBoT 3.123, KBo 8.61, KUB 15.4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 28, 29, 30, KUB 31.69, KUB 31.67, KUB 48.118, 119, 121, 125, 123, KUB 56.13, VBoT 75

1.5.4 Late New Hittite

1.5.4.1 Tutḫalii̯a IV

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Treaties		
Šaušgamuu̯a *of Amurru*	105A	KUB 23.1 + 1a + 1b + 37 + KUB 31.43 + 670/v + 720/v (+) 93/w
	105B	Bo 69/821 + KUB 8.82 + 1198/u + 1436/u
Kuruntii̯a of *Tarḫuntašša*	106A	Bo 86/299
Ulmi-Teššub	106B.1	ABoT 1.57
of Tarḫuntašša	106B.2	KBo 4.10 + KBo 50.60 + KUB 40.69
with ?	123	KBo 4.14
Letters		
to Assyria	177.2	KUB 23.99 (to Salmanasser)
	177.1	KUB 3.74 (to Tukulti-Ninurta)
	209.18	KUB 23.109 + VSNF 12.130 (to Tukulti-Nin-urta)
	209.21	KUB 26.70 (to Tukulti-Ninurta)
	178.1A	KUB 23.103 (to Tukulti-Ninurta)
	178.1B	KUB 23.92
	178.1C	KUB 40.77

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Milaṷata	182	KUB 19.55 + KUB 48.90
Queen Mother	187	KBo 18.2, 6
	187	in GÜTERBOCK 1979: 144
	192	KUB 19.23
Historical texts		
Fragments of	211.4	KBo 6.27 + KUB 23.13
annals	214.2	KUB 31.14, KUB 23.61 + KUB 26.78
	214.9	KUB 31.32
	214.20	KBo 22.10
Landgrant		
to Šaḫurunuṷa	225A	KBo 22.56 + KUB 26.43
	225B	KBo 22.55 (+) 57 (+) 58 + 59 + 60 (+) KBo 50.225 + KUB 26.50
Loyalty oath		
of Kupanta-	275	KUB 6.47 (formerly CTH 214.3)
Kuruntiṷa[22] *of*		
Mira		
	275	KUB 26.18
Instructions	255.1A	KUB 21.42 + KUB 26.12 (inc. VBoT 82)
	255.1B	KUB 21.43 + KUB 26.13
	255.1C	KUB 40.24
	255.2A	KUB 26.1 (incl. KUB 21.13 + 45 + KUB 13.22) + KUB 23.112
	255.2B	KUB 26.8
	255.2C	KUB 31.97
	255.2D	KUB 23.67
	255.2E	KUB 26.1a
	255.2F	KBo 22.46
Legal texts	295.2	KUB 13.34 + KUB 40.84
	297.8	KUB 31.68

---

22 For the classification of this text as a loyalty oath of Kupanta-Kuruntiṷa shortly after Tutḫaliṷa IV's accession to the throne, see VAN DEN HOUT 1995: 146f.

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
	297	KUB 54.1[23]
Prayers	385.9	KBo 12.58 + KBo 13.162
Cult inventories	506.1	KUB 7.24 + KUB 58.29
	524.1	KUB 25.21
	524.2	KUB 25.22
	525	KBo 12.57, KBo 26.179, 188, KBo 48.109; KUB 58.7
	525.1	KUB 13.32
	525.3	KBo 57.113 + KUB 25.23 + KUB 59.34
	525.4	KUB 38.35
	525.9	KBo 20.90
Dreams of the Queen	584	KBo 47.239
Oracles		
Campaigns in Gašga territory	561	KUB 5.1 + KUB 52.65
Cult of Piru̯a	565	KBo 14.21[24]
'Sammeltafel'	577	KBo 16.98 (+) KUB 49.49
Accession	569	KUB 49.73 + KUB 50.77
	572	KUB 16.20
	575	KBo 58.86 + KUB 18.6 (+) KUB 49.2
	578	KBo 44.204 + KUB 6.9 + KUB 18.59
	582	KUB 22.12 (+) 13
	582	KUB 18.36
Illness	577	KBo 2.2
Zau̯alli-gods	570	KUB 16.16
	570	KBo 23.114
	573	KUB 16.46
	578	KUB 50.87
Purity of King-ship	569.I.1	KUB 50.5
	569.I.2	KUB 16.58

---

23   For possible attribution to Tutḫali̯a IV, see VAN DEN HOUT 1995: 184.
24   For attribution to Tutḫali̯a IV, see VAN DEN HOUT 1995: 157.

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
	569.I.3	KBo 2.6 + KUB 18.51
	569.II.1A	KUB 22.35
	569.II.1B	KUB 49.93
	569.II.2	KBo 9.151
	569.II.3A	KUB 16.32
	569.II.3B	KBo 52.101 + KBo 54.99 + KUB 16.41 + KUB 50.6
	569.II.4	KUB 52.92
	569.II.5	Bo 7787 (+) KUB 8.27
	569.II.6	KBo 54.100
	579	KUB 22.40
Vows	590	KBo 33.216, VSNF 12.103
About Nerik	673	KBo 26.181 + KUB 27.68 + KUB 42.100

1.5.4.2 Šuppiluliuma II

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Treaties		
Talmi-Teššub of	122.1A	KBo 12.41 (+) KBo 13.225 (+) KUB 26.33
Kargamiš	122.1B	KUB 40.37
	122.2	KBo 12.30 (+) KUB 26.25
	122.3	KBo 42.60
Alašiịa	141	KBo 12.39
Historical texts		
Conquest of Alašiịa	121	KBo 12.38
Fragments	126.1	KUB 21.7
	126.2	KUB 51.81
	126.3	KUB 26.68
	126.4	KBo 49.121
	214.8	KBo 16.35
Letters	187	KBo 18.25 (+) KBo 31.69[25], KUB 57.8

---

25   For attribution of this letter to Šuppiluliuma II, see FREU 2007: 286.

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
Loyalty Oaths		
of […]-*Šar-ruma*[26]	124A	KUB 23.44 + KUB 26.32 + KUB 31.106 + KUB 40.38
	124B	KBo 14.112 (+) 113
Fragments	145	KUB 19.28
	256	ABoT 1.56

1.6 Paradigms

The following paradigms are based on the texts in the corpus. I have added in square brackets forms that were not attested in original compositions but only in later copies. Paradigms of the demonstratives can also be found in GHL, 143 (§ 7.3), 145 (§ 7.11) and KLOEKHORST 2012. For the most recent version of the paradigm of *aši+*, however, see chapter 3.8.

1.6.1 Old Hittite, old script

OS	***kā-***	***apā-***	***aši+***
Singular			
nom.comm.	*kāš*	*apaš, apāš*	[*aši*]
acc.comm.	*kūn*	*apun, apūn*	[*uni*]
nom.-acc.neut.	[*kīni*][27], *kī, ki⸗*	*apat, apāt*	[*ini*]
gen.	*kēl, kel*	*apel, apēl*	*aši*
dat.-loc.	[*kēti*][28], *kēdani*	[*apētī*][29], *apedani*	*edi*[!]
Plural			
nomm.comm.	*kē*	*apē*	ø
acc.comm.	[*kūši*][30], *kūš*	*apūš*	ø
nom.-acc.neut.	*kē, ke⸗*	*apē*	ø
gen.	*kinzan*	[*apenzan*]	ø
dat.-loc.		[*apēdaš*]	ø

---

26   Perhaps Penti-Šarruma, see SINGER 2006: 244 with n. 7.
27   Attested in VBoT 58 obv. 35 (OH/NS myth, CTH 323).
28   Attested, for example, in KUB 43.23 obv. 4 (OH/MS, CTH 820).
29   Attested in KUB 9.19: 7' (MS?, CTH 470).
30   Attested in VBoT 58 obv. 34 (OH/NS myth, CTH 323), see GOEDEGEBUURE 2010a: 60.

OS	*kā-*	*apā-*	*aši+*
Number indifferent			
abl.	*kēt, ket*	*apez⸗*(?)[31]	*edi*
instr.	*kēdanta*	[*apēdanda*]	ø
Adverbs			
of place	*kāni, kā*	*apiỵa*	*ea* (?)
of cause	ø	[*apēda*][32]	ø
of manner	[*kīniššan*][33],	*apiniššan,*	*ene*[*ššan*]
	kiššan	*QATAMMA*	(?)

1.6.2 Middle Hittite, middle script

Middle Hittite	*kā-*	*apā-*	*aši+*
Singular			
nom.comm.	*kāš*	*apāš*	*aši*
acc.comm.	*kūn*	*apūn, apun*	*uni*
nom.-acc.neut.	*kīni, kī*	*apāt, apat*	*ini*
gen.	*kel, kēl*	*apel, apēl*	ø
dat.-loc.	*kēdani*	*apēdani, apedani*	*edani*
Plural			
nom.comm.	*kē, kī, ki⸗*	*apē*	ø
acc.comm.	*kūš*	*apūš*	ø
nom.-acc.neut.	*kē*	*apē*	*eni*
gen.	*kēl*	*apenzan*	ø
dat.-loc.	*kēdaš, kētaš*	*apēdaš, apedaš*	[*edaš*][34]
Number indifferent			
abl.	*kit-*[35], *kēz, kēzza*	*apēz, apez, apezza*	*ediz*
Adverbs			
of time	(*kinun*)	*apiỵa, apiỵakku*	ø

---

31 Perhaps attested in KBo 20.23 rev. 1' (OS festival fragm., CTH 678), written *a-pé-ˊez-pát*?`.
32 Attested in KBo 3.41 + KUB 31.4 obv. 19' (OH/NS narrative, CTH 16).
33 Attested in, for example, KUB 28.4 obv. 16b (OH/NS myth, CTH 727).
34 Attested in KUB 29.4 iii 27 (MH/NS narrative, CTH 481).
35 Only attested in the phrase *kitpandalaz* 'from this moment on'.

Middle Hittite	*kā-*	*apā-*	*aši+*
of place	*kā*	*apii̯a, apēi̯a*[36]	ø
of direction	*kā*	*apadda*	ø
of cause	ø	*apadda*	ø
of manner	*kiššan*	*apiniššan, QATAMMA*	*iniššan*

1.6.3 New Hittite

The New Hittite paradigm covers the forms attested from Muršili II until and including Ḫattušili III. Rare forms of *aši+* are represented in smaller font, and mainly belong to the reign of Ḫattušili III. The paradigms of *aši+* per reign are presented in chapter 3.8.

New Hittite	*kā-*	*apā-*	*aši+*
Singular			
nom.comm.	*kāš*	*apāš*	*aši, eniš*
acc.comm.	*kūn*	*apūn*	*uni, unin, aši*
nom.-acc.neut.	*kī, kē*	*apāt, apadd(⸗a), apadd(⸗ai̯a)*	*ini, eni*
dat.-loc.	*kēdani, kīdani*	*apēdani, apedani*	*edani*
gen.	*kēl*	*apel, apēl*	*unii̯aš*[37]
Plural			
nom.comm.	*kūš, kēuš*[38], *kueuš*[39]	*apūš*	*uniuš, eniuš*
acc.comm.	*kūš*	*apūš, apuš*	*uniuš*
nom.-acc.neut.	*kē, kī*	*apē*	ø
dat.-loc.	*kēdaš, kīdaš, kidaš*	*apēdaš*	*edaš*
gen.	*kēl*	*apel*	ø
Number indifferent			
abl.	*kēz, kēzza, kezza,*	*apit-*[40], *apez, apēz,*	*ediz, edizza,*

---

36   Attested in HKM 21 obv. 5 (MH letter, CTH 186).
37   This form is not attested in my corpus, but occurs twice in a IIIa manuscript: KUB 33.113 + KUB 36.12 i 32', 34' (NH/IIIa myth, CTH 345).
38   Only attested in KUB 14.8 rev. 18' (NH prayer, Muršili II, CTH 378).
39   Only attested in KUB 21.1 ii 77 (NH treaty, Muu̯atalli II, CTH 76).

New Hittite	*kā-*	*apā-*	*aši+*
	kez⸗	*apēzza, apii̯az*[41]	*etez, eteza*
Adverbs			
of place/direction	*kā*	*apii̯a*	ø
of time	(*kinun*)	*apii̯a*	ø
of cause (often with *šer*)	ø	*apadda(n), apātta, apatta*	ø
of manner	*kiššan, kišan*	*QATAMMA*	*iniššan, eniššan, eneššan*

1.6.4 Late New Hittite

The Late New Hittite paradigm covers the forms attested during the reigns of Tutḫalii̯a IV and Šuppiluliuma II. Rare forms are represented in smaller font.

Late New Hittite	*kā-*	*apā-*	*aši+*
Singular			
nom.comm.	*kāš*	*apāš*	*aši, uniš*
acc.comm.	*kūn, kān*[42]	*apūn, apān*	*aši*
nom.-acc.neut.	*kī*	*apāt*	*eni*
dat.-loc.	*kēdani*	*apēdani, apedani*	*edani*
gen.	*kēl*	*apel, apēl*	*ēl*
Plural			
nom.comm.	*kūš*	*apūš, apuš*	*uniuš*
acc.comm.	*kūš*	*apūš*	*uniuš*
nom.-acc.neut.	*kē, kī*	*apē*	*eni*
dat.-loc.	*kēdaš, kīdaš*	*apēdaš*	ø
gen.	ø	*apel*	ø
Number indifferent			
abl.	*kēz, kēzza*	*apez, apēz, apezza, apēzza*	*ediz, edaza*

---

40   Only attested in the phrase *apitpandalaz* 'from that moment on'.
41   Attested in KUB 57.1: 38: [*n⸗an*? *ap*]*ii̯az laḫḫii̯atteni* (NH letter, CTH 209).
42   This form is not attested in my corpus, but occurs in, for example, KUB 46.37 obv. 45' (lateNH oracle, CTH 570).

Late New Hittite	*kā-*	*apā-*	*aši+*
Adverbs			
of place	*kā*	*apiịa*	ø
of direction	ø	*apadda(n)*	ø
of time	(*kinun*)	*apiịa*	ø
of cause (often with *šer*)	ø	*apadda(n)*	ø
of manner	*kiššan, kišan*	*QATAMMA*	*eneššan*

2 Reference, deixis and discourse

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the theoretical background for the description of the Hittite demonstratives. Recent literature on referring expressions in natural languages can be divided into two major strands of research adhering to different, though not disconnected, approaches[43]: the *geographical*[44] and the *cognitive*[45] approach (see sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3, respectively). Individually, these approaches do not succeed in fully explaining the use of referring expressions, but combined they provide a far more powerful model of description (section 2.3). In addition, I will present the model of information structure as advocated and further developed by Lambrecht (1994) (section 2.2.4) and discuss this model together with the combined geographical-cognitive model in section 2.4. Information structure, which concentrates on certain pragmatic functions at sentence level, is of great use for a more complete description of the Hittite pronominal system. The resulting model as outlined in this chapter will be applied to the Hittite demonstratives and pronouns (chapters 3 "The distal demonstratives *aši+* and *anna/i-*," 4 "The medial or second person demonstrative *apā-*," 5 "The proximal or first person demonstrative *kā-*," and chapters 6, 7, 8 and 9 (on *apā-* as accented pronoun)). The outcomes of these individual chapters will be combined in chapter 10, presenting the system as a whole.

Before starting with the description of the different approaches to reference, I here provide a global introduction to the subject based on the account of deixis and anaphora as presented by Levinson (1983: 61ff., 2004).

A linguistic expression that refers to the context of the utterance, the speech-setting, is called *deictic*. According to Lyons (1977: 637) deixis consists of

> the location and identification of persons, objects, events, processes and activities being talked about, or referred to, in relation to the spatio-temporal context created and sustained by the act of utterance and the participation in it, typically, of a single speaker and at least one addressee.

---

43   For an overview of studies on reference in discourse using different perspectives and frameworks, see YAN HUANG 2000.

44   The term 'geographical' was coined by Ariel (1990: 5).

45   Yan Huang discusses several models dealing with discourse anaphora: the topic continuity or distance-inference model (2000: 303-309), the hierarchy model (2000: 309-314) and the cognitive model (2000: 314-318). Before presenting his own neo-Gricean pragmatic model (2000: 318-329) Yan Huang concludes that all these models are based on cognitive or pragmatic principles (2000: 308, 314).