

Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten

Herausgegeben von der Kommission für den Alten Orient
der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz

Band 55

Petra Goedegebuure

The Hittite Demonstratives

Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus

2014

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

PETRA GOEDEGEBUURE
THE HITTITE DEMONSTRATIVES

Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten

Herausgegeben von der Kommission für den Alten Orient
der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz
Band 55

Petra Goedegebuure

The Hittite Demonstratives Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus

2014

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet
at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our
website <http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2014
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission
of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies
particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage
and processing in electronic systems.
Printed on permanent/durable paper.
Printing and binding: Ⓜ Hubert & Co., Göttingen
Printed in Germany
ISSN 0585-5853
ISBN 978-3-447-10228-5
e-ISBN PDF 978-3-447-19334-4

Contents

List of tables.....	xvii
Foreword	xxi
Abbreviations	xxiii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Short overview.....	1
1.2 Scope of the study	4
1.3 Outline of the book.....	5
1.4 Palaeography and text dating.....	7
1.5 The corpus	11
1.5.1 Old Hittite in old script.....	12
1.5.2 Middle Hittite in middle script	16
1.5.2.1 Zidanta II	16
1.5.2.2 Tuḫaliya I/II and Nikalmati.....	16
1.5.2.3 Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal	17
1.5.2.4 Tuḫaliya III	19
1.5.2.5 Šuppiluliuma I.....	20
1.5.2.6 Middle Hittite unassigned	20
1.5.3 New Hittite	21
1.5.3.1 Muršili II	21
1.5.3.2 Muwatalli II.....	24
1.5.3.3 Urḫi-Tešsub (Muršili III)	25
1.5.3.4 Ḫattušili III and Puduḫeba.....	25
1.5.4 Late New Hittite	28
1.5.4.1 Tuḫaliya IV	28
1.5.4.2 Šuppiluliuma II.....	31
1.6 Paradigms	32
1.6.1 Old Hittite, old script.....	32
1.6.2 Middle Hittite, middle script	33
1.6.3 New Hittite	34
1.6.4 Late New Hittite	35

2 Reference, deixis and discourse	37
2.1 Introduction	37
2.2 Deixis, cognition and information structure	40
2.2.1 Introduction	40
2.2.2 The geographical approach.....	41
2.2.3 The cognitive approach	41
2.2.3.1 Introduction	41
2.2.3.2 Memory and cognitive procedures.....	42
2.2.3.3 Accessibility and cognitive status	46
2.2.3.4 Saliency and discourse nodes.....	53
2.2.4 Information structure	54
2.2.4.1 Introduction	54
2.2.4.2 The notions <i>topic</i> and <i>focus</i>	55
2.2.4.2.1 Predicate focus	57
2.2.4.2.2 Argument focus	59
2.2.4.2.3 Sentence focus.....	60
2.2.5 Summary.....	61
2.3 Demonstratives	62
2.3.1 Introduction	62
2.3.2 Deictic use of demonstratives.....	63
2.3.2.1 Introduction to deixis	63
2.3.2.2 Types of deixis	63
2.3.2.3 Semantic features of demonstratives.....	65
2.3.2.4 Summary and conclusions.....	66
2.3.3 Memory retrieving use of demonstratives	68
2.3.3.1 Introduction	68
2.3.3.2 Recognitional reference: ‘old-that’	68
2.3.3.3 Specific indefinite reference: ‘new-this’	70
2.3.3.4 Summary and conclusions.....	71
2.3.4 Discourse deictic use of demonstratives.....	71
2.3.5 Anaphoric use of demonstratives	73
2.3.5.1 Introduction	73
2.3.5.2 Demonstratives with non-salient referents.....	74
2.3.5.3 Demonstratives with salient referents	77
2.3.5.3.1 Immediate anaphora after first mention	78
2.3.5.3.2 Demarcating discourse units	82
2.3.5.4 Summary	83
2.3.6 Subjective use of demonstratives: speaker stance	84
2.3.7 Summary.....	86
2.4 Third person pronouns.....	87
2.4.1 Introduction	87

2.4.2 Unaccented pronouns, clitics and zero as established topics	88
2.4.3 Accented pronouns	89
2.4.3.1 Accented pronouns and saliency	89
2.4.3.2 The accented pronoun as unestablished topic expression	90
2.4.3.3 The accented pronoun as contrastive topic expression	92
2.4.3.4 The accented pronoun as focus expression	93
2.4.4 Third person pronouns and discourse units	93
2.4.5 Summary	94
2.5 Summary and conclusions	94
3 The distal demonstratives <i>aši+</i> and <i>anna/i-</i>	99
3.1 Status quaestionis	99
3.1.1 Introduction	99
3.1.2 Friedrich's different lexemes with similar function	100
3.1.3 Laroche's one paradigm, one function	102
3.1.4 HW ² 's criticism of Laroche, and my criticism of HW ²	104
3.1.5 A note on the classification of <i>aši+</i> as demonstrative	106
3.1.6 Paradigm cleansing and update	109
3.1.6.1 Paradigm cleansing	109
3.1.6.2 Updates for <i>aši+</i>	110
3.1.6.3 Old, Middle, and classical New Hittite paradigms	115
3.1.7 Research questions and method	117
3.2 The trilingual vocabularies	118
3.3 The situational or deictic use of <i>aši+</i>	121
3.3.1 Identifying deictic demonstratives	121
3.3.2 Self-reference	123
3.3.3 True situational use (and one case of temporal use)	123
3.3.3.1 The locative adverb of relative position <i>edi</i> / <i>edez</i>	123
3.3.3.2 The locative adverb <i>ea</i> 'yonder, over there' or 'there'? ...	128
3.3.3.3 The expression <i>edi</i> / <i>edez nai-</i>	131
3.3.3.4 Temporal deixis	136
3.3.3.5 Conclusion	136
3.3.4 Direct speech	137
3.3.4.1 The pronominal demonstrative <i>aši+</i>	138
3.3.4.2 The adnominal demonstrative <i>aši+</i>	141
3.3.4.3 Dissociative or distancing <i>aši+</i>	146
3.3.5 Conclusions	150
3.3.5.1 The deictic value of <i>aši+</i>	150
3.3.5.2 Chronological assessment	152

3.4 The recognitional use of <i>aši+</i>	153
3.4.1 Identifying recognitional demonstratives	153
3.4.2 Recognitional use and discourse genre	154
3.4.3 The semantics of recognitional <i>aši+</i> : dissociating or neutral?	155
3.4.4 New Hittite evidence	156
3.4.5 Middle Hittite evidence	160
3.4.6 Old Hittite evidence	161
3.4.7 The <i>eni kuit</i> syntagm	162
3.4.8 Conclusions	168
3.4.8.1 The recognitional value of <i>aši+</i>	168
3.4.8.2 Chronological assessment	169
3.5 The discourse deictic use of <i>aši+</i>	170
3.5.1 Introduction	170
3.5.2 The adverb of manner <i>eniššan</i>	171
3.5.3 Evaluation of <i>eniššan</i>	176
3.5.4 The syntagms <i>eni uttar</i> , <i>aši memiaš</i> and <i>eni</i>	177
3.5.5 The <i>eni kuit</i> syntagm	182
3.5.6 Conclusions	185
3.5.6.1 Evaluation of the discourse deictic expressions	185
3.5.6.2 Chronological assessment	186
3.6 The tracking or anaphoric use of adnominal <i>aši+</i>	186
3.6.1 Introduction	186
3.6.2 Identifying tracking <i>aši+</i>	187
3.6.3 Non-salient referents and discourse structure	188
3.6.3.1 Reference across a paragraph line	188
3.6.3.2 From direct speech to narration	197
3.6.3.3 Change of episode	199
3.6.3.4 Returning to the main story line	201
3.6.4 Salient referents and discourse structure	202
3.6.4.1 Digressing from the main story line	202
3.6.4.2 Marking a new discourse unit	204
3.6.4.3 Immediate anaphora after first mention	209
3.6.5 Conclusions	210
3.6.5.1 The function of tracking <i>aši+</i>	210
3.6.5.2 Chronological assessment	211
3.7 The demonstrative <i>anna/i-</i>	211
3.7.1 Introduction	211
3.7.2 Recognitional use	212
3.7.3 Tracking use	213
3.7.4 The temporal adverbs <i>annaz</i> and <i>annal(l)az</i>	214
3.7.5 Palaic <i>ānni-</i>	217

3.7.6 Conclusion	218
3.8 Final conclusions	219
3.8.1 Semantics and pragmatic function of <i>aši+</i> and diachronic development of the paradigms.....	220
3.8.1.1 The New Hittite material.....	220
3.8.1.2 The Middle Hittite material.....	224
3.8.1.3 The Old Hittite material	225
3.8.2 A New Hittite deprecativ demonstrative <i>uni-?</i>	225
3.8.3 Saliency, discourse structure and information structure.....	226
4 The medial or second person demonstrative <i>apā-</i>	231
4.1 Status quaestionis	231
4.1.1 Introduction	231
4.1.2 Previous literature on the deictic force of <i>apā-</i>	231
4.1.3 Research questions	234
4.2 The situational use of <i>apā-</i>	235
4.2.1 Introduction	235
4.2.2 True situational use.....	235
4.2.3 Direct speech	239
4.2.3.1 Introduction	239
4.2.3.2 The demonstrative pronoun <i>apā-</i> and the adverb <i>apija</i>	242
4.2.4 Self-reference	246
4.2.5 Summary and conclusions	246
4.3 The recognitional use of <i>apā-</i>	247
4.4 The discourse deictic use of <i>apā-</i>	249
4.4.1 Introduction	249
4.4.2 The adverb of manner <i>apeniššan/QATAMMA</i>	249
4.4.3 The syntagms <i>apāt uttar</i> , <i>apā- memia(n)-</i> and <i>apāt</i>	252
4.4.3.1 Introduction	252
4.4.3.2 Cataphoric discourse deictic <i>apā-</i>	254
4.4.3.3 Anaphoric discourse deictic <i>apā-</i>	257
4.4.4 Summary and conclusion	261
4.5 The anaphoric or tracking use of <i>apā-</i>	263
4.5.1 Introduction	263
4.5.2 Non-salient referents and discourse structure.....	268
4.5.2.1 Paragraph lines	268
4.5.2.2 From direct speech to narration.....	270
4.5.3 Salient referents and discourse structure	271
4.5.3.1 Returning to the main story line.....	271

4.5.3.2 Those captives you keep taking of your own accord	272
4.5.4 Summary and conclusion	274
4.6 Final conclusions	275
5 The proximal or first person demonstrative <i>kā-</i>	277
5.1 Status quaestionis	277
5.1.1 Previous views	277
5.1.2 Research questions	278
5.2 Situational or deictic <i>kā-</i>	279
5.2.1 True situational use	279
5.2.1.1 The locative adverb of relative position <i>kēt / kēz</i>	279
5.2.1.2 The locative adverb <i>kā</i>	284
5.2.1.3 Adnominal <i>kā-</i> referring to objects	286
5.2.1.4 Temporal deixis	288
5.2.2 Direct speech	289
5.2.2.1 The locative adverbs <i>kāni</i> and <i>kā</i>	290
5.2.2.2 Salient referents: pronominal <i>kā-</i>	292
5.2.2.3 Non-salient referents: adnominal <i>kā-</i>	294
5.2.3 Self-reference	295
5.2.4 Summary and conclusions	296
5.3 The recognitional use of <i>kā-</i>	298
5.4 The discourse deictic use of <i>kā-</i>	299
5.4.1 Introduction	299
5.4.2 The adverb of manner <i>kiššan</i>	299
5.4.3 The phrases <i>kī uttar</i> , <i>kā- memiṣa(n)-</i> and <i>kī</i>	303
5.4.3.1 Cataphoric <i>kā-</i>	303
5.4.3.2 Anaphoric discourse deictic <i>kā-</i>	307
5.4.3.2.1 Reference across a discourse node	307
5.4.3.2.2 <i>kī kuit</i> clauses	310
5.4.3.2.3 Remaining cases	311
5.4.4 Summary and conclusions	312
5.5 Cataphoric and anaphoric <i>kā-</i> , managing lists	313
5.5.1 Cataphoric “new this” <i>kā-</i> , introducing lists	313
5.5.2 Anaphoric <i>kā-</i> , resuming lists	316
5.6 The tracking use of <i>kā-</i>	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

5.6.2.3 Change of episode	322
5.6.2.4 Relative clauses	322
5.6.3 Salient referents and discourse structure: parenthetical remarks	323
5.6.4 Both tracking and situational <i>kā-</i>	325
5.6.5 Summary and conclusions	328
5.7 The distributive use of <i>kā-</i> ... <i>kā-</i> ‘this (one) ... that (one)’	329
5.7.1 Introduction	329
5.7.2 Situational distributive pairs	329
5.7.3 Anaphoric distributive pairs	331
5.7.4 Summary and conclusions	332
5.8 Final conclusions	333
6 Pilot study: the use of <i>apā-</i> in the laws	337
6.1 Introduction	337
6.2 Previous scholarship on <i>apā-</i> as accented pronoun	338
6.3 Accented <i>apā-</i> is not a topic marker	340
6.4 The tripartite structure of the Hittite laws	343
6.4.1 Introduction	343
6.4.2 class I laws: pay!	344
6.4.3 class II laws: pay and do something else!	345
6.4.4 class III laws: just do something else!	345
6.4.5 Conclusion and preview	346
6.5 The use of <i>apā-</i> in the apodoses of class II laws	347
6.5.1 Coordination in the laws	347
6.5.2 Evaluation	352
6.6 The use of <i>apā-</i> in class III laws	353
6.6.1 Introduction	353
6.6.2 The homicide and manslaughter laws	355
6.6.3 Abduction/harboring runaway slaves	357
6.6.4 Burglary laws	361
6.6.5 Theft, injury or damage to animals, plants or tools	362
6.6.6 Arson laws	363
6.6.7 Certain offences requiring sacred sanctions	364
6.6.8 Evaluation	364
6.7 Remaining cases of <i>apā-</i> in the laws	367
6.7.1 Contrast and restriction	367
6.7.2 Contrast and replacement	368
6.7.3 Contrast and selection	370

6.7.4 Contrast, conjunction and disjunction	371
6.7.5 Similarities and comparison	372
6.7.6 Difficult cases	373
6.8 Summary	376
7 Exclusive focus <i>apā-</i>	379
7.1 Introduction	379
7.2 Definition of focus and focus typology	380
7.3 Replacing focus, indicating ‘that one instead’	382
7.3.1 Introduction	382
7.3.2 Replacing <i>apā-</i> : “not X, but Y”	383
7.3.3 Replacing <i>apā-</i> : “X, but if Y is present, Y instead!”	394
7.3.4 Replacing <i>apā-</i> : “X, instead Y”	398
7.3.5 Replacing <i>apā-</i> : “instead Y”	399
7.3.6 Evaluation of word order patterns	402
7.4 Restricting focus, indicating ‘only that one’	408
7.4.1 Introduction	408
7.4.2 Restricting <i>apā-</i> : “not X and Y, only Y”	408
7.4.3 Evaluation of word order patterns	412
7.5 Selecting focus, indicating ‘that one and no one else’	413
7.5.1 Introduction	413
7.5.2 Selecting <i>apā-</i> with antecedent focus skeleton	420
7.5.3 Selecting <i>apā-</i> with “from {X or Y or ...}, (just) X”	421
7.5.4 Selecting <i>apā-</i> : implicit “from {X or Y or ...}, (just) X”	422
7.5.5 Combinations of selecting focus and expanding focus	425
7.5.6 Evaluation of word order patterns	427
7.6 Confirmation focus	428
7.7 Word order within the focused noun phrase	430
7.8 Conclusion	431
8 Inclusive focus <i>apā-</i>	435
8.1 Introduction	435
8.2 Expanding focus, indicating ‘and/also/even he / she / that’	435
8.2.1 Introduction	435
8.2.2 Status quaestionis	436
8.2.3 Method	439

8.2.4 Old Hittite attestations	442
8.2.4.1 Asymmetry of syntax	442
8.2.4.2 Asymmetry of semantics	443
8.2.5 Middle Hittite attestations	445
8.2.5.1 Asymmetry of syntax	445
8.2.5.2 Asymmetry of semantics	446
8.2.6 New Hittite attestations	450
8.2.6.1 Asymmetry of syntax	450
8.2.6.2 Asymmetry of semantics	456
8.2.7 Late New Hittite attestations	458
8.2.7.1 Asymmetry of syntax	458
8.2.7.2 Asymmetry of semantics	460
8.2.8 Evaluation	460
8.2.8.1 Correlation between word order and meaning of <i>-ja</i>	460
8.2.8.2 Final results	465
8.3 Summary	467
9 Topics, contrast and <i>apā-</i>	469
9.1 Introduction	469
9.2 The pronoun <i>apā-</i> in coordinated clauses	471
9.2.1 Introduction	471
9.2.2 Conjunction (“(both ...) and” coordination)	472
9.2.3 Adversative coordination (“(but ...) but” coordination)	476
9.2.4 Disjunction (“(either ...) or” coordination)	480
9.2.5 Evaluation	481
9.3 The particle <i>-a/-ma</i> as adversative connective and <i>apā-</i>	483
9.4 Coordination and <i>apā-</i> explained: parallel and contrastive topics	486
9.5 Contrastive topics and “long distance” contrast	490
9.5.1 Introduction	490
9.5.2 “Long distance” contrast and <i>-a/-ma</i> (and once <i>-ja</i>)	491
9.5.3 “Long distance” contrast and asyndeton	493
9.5.4 “Long distance” contrast and <i>nu</i>	496
9.5.5 Summary and conclusion	497
9.6 Topic shift and <i>apā-</i>	497
9.7 Counter-expectation and <i>apā-</i> + <i>-a/-ma</i>	503
9.7.1 Introduction	503
9.7.2 Counter-expectant action	506
9.7.3 The pronoun <i>apā-</i> with <i>-a/-ma</i> as unestablished topic	510

9.8 Summary.....	511
10 Connecting the data: deixis, discourse and reference in Hittite	513
10.1 Introduction	513
10.2 The situational use of demonstratives	513
10.2.1 Introduction	513
10.2.2 True situational use.....	514
10.2.3 Direct speech	517
10.2.4 Self-reference	520
10.2.5 Summary and conclusions.....	521
10.3 The recognitional use of demonstratives.....	521
10.3.1 Introduction	521
10.3.2 Recognitionally used <i>kā-</i> , <i>apā-</i> , <i>aši+</i>	523
10.3.3 Summary.....	525
10.4 The discourse deictic use of demonstratives and pronouns.....	526
10.4.1 Introduction: “placing under oath”	526
10.4.2 Discourse deixis and non-salient referents.....	529
10.4.2.1 Introduction	529
10.4.2.2 The demonstrative adverbs of manner	532
10.4.2.3 The forward referring discourse deictic demonstratives	535
10.4.2.4 The backward referring discourse deictic expressions... ..	538
10.4.3 Discourse deixis and salient referents	539
10.4.4 Summary and conclusions	542
10.5 The anaphoric or tracking use of demonstratives.....	543
10.5.1 Demonstratives with salient referents	543
10.5.1.1 Introduction	543
10.5.1.2 Enclitics versus free forms	545
10.5.1.3 Accented pronouns versus lexical noun phrases	546
10.5.1.4 ‘Definite’ noun phrases and the three demonstratives versus each other	550
10.5.1.5 Summary and conclusions.....	551
10.5.2 Demonstratives with non-salient referents	551
10.5.2.1 Introduction	551
10.5.2.2 Demonstratives and discourse boundaries	552
10.5.2.3 Demonstratives and text genres.....	557
10.5.2.4 Summary	559
10.6 The third person pronoun <i>apā-</i>	559
10.6.1 The enclitic pronoun <i>-a-</i> and zero as the established topic	560
10.6.2 The accented pronoun <i>apā-</i> as unestablished topic expression .	560

10.6.3 The accented pronoun <i>apā-</i> as argument focus expression	562
10.6.3.1 Replacing focus	562
10.6.3.2 Selecting focus	563
10.6.3.3 Restricting focus.....	564
10.6.3.4 Expanding focus.....	565
10.6.4 Summary.....	566
10.7 Final words	566
 Bibliography.....	 569
 Cited texts.....	 597

List of tables

Table 1.1:	Laroche’s view on the system of demonstratives and accented pronouns in proto-Hittite and attested Hittite	2
Table 1.2:	The system of demonstratives and accented pronouns in attested Hittite according to the author’s views.....	3
Table 1.3:	Relation between type of pragmatic function and position in the clause	3
Table 2.1:	Combined geographical-cognitive matrix	44
Table 2.2:	Adjusted combined geographical-cognitive matrix.....	45
Table 2.3:	The Givenness Hierarchy	46
Table 2.4:	Distribution of referential expressions	51
Table 2.5:	Comparison of cognitive states.....	53
Table 2.6:	Domain, cognition and information structure combined.....	61
Table 2.7:	Correspondence between geographical domain and pragmatic categories	63
Table 2.8:	Types of deictic center.....	65
Table 2.9:	The demonstratives in Kambara	66
Table 2.10:	The demonstrative suffixes in Iraqw	66
Table 2.11:	Primary and derived situational deixis	67
Table 2.12:	Comparison of the deictic and recognitional use of demonstratives	71
Table 2.13:	Distribution of English, Japanese, Russian and Spanish demonstratives according to highest cognitive status.....	75
Table 2.14:	The use of anaphoric demonstratives according to Himmelmann	83
Table 2.15:	The use of demonstratives	86
Table 2.16:	Pronouns, saliency and information structure	94
Table 2.17:	Domain, cognition and information structure combined.....	97
Table 3.1:	Paradigms according to HE, HW, HW ² and HEG	102
Table 3.2:	Paradigm of <i>aši+</i> according to Laroche	104
Table 3.3:	Updated “paradigm” of <i>aši+</i>	115
Table 3.4:	Paradigm of <i>aši+</i> , contemporaneous documents from Mušili II.....	116
Table 3.5:	Middle Hittite paradigm of <i>aši+</i> (based on originals).....	116
Table 3.6:	Old Hittite paradigm of <i>aši+</i> (partially restored)	117
Table 3.7:	Visibility and <i>edez / edi</i>	136
Table 3.8:	Spatial semantics of <i>aši+</i>	152
Table 3.9:	Presence of criteria for recognitional use	154
Table 3.10:	Distribution of recognitional <i>aši+</i> over genre	155
Table 3.11:	Structure of KUB 22.70 obv. 12-27	167

Table 3.12: Paradigm of <i>anna/i-</i>	219
Table 3.13: Paradigm of <i>aši+</i> during Tuthaliya IV and later	221
Table 3.14: Paradigm of <i>aši+</i> during Hattušili III	223
Table 3.15: Paradigm of <i>aši+</i> during Muwatalli II	223
Table 3.16: Paradigm of <i>aši+</i> during Muršili II	223
Table 3.17: Paradigm based on <i>unica</i> in IIIb script	224
Table 3.18: The Middle Hittite paradigm	224
Table 3.19: The Old Hittite paradigm	225
Table 3.20: Pragmatic function of <i>aši+</i> as distal demonstrative	229
Table 4.1: Distribution of situational <i>apā-</i> over genres	247
Table 4.2: Distribution of anaphoric discourse deictic <i>apā-</i> over genres ...	262
Table 4.3: Distribution of cataphoric discourse deictic <i>apā-</i> over genres ...	262
Table 4.4: Distribution of cataphoric discourse deictic <i>apā-</i> over persons .	262
Table 4.5: Distribution of tracking <i>apā-</i> over genres	274
Table 4.6: Distribution of medial <i>apā-</i> over genres and language stages ...	275
Table 4.7: Distribution of medial <i>apā-</i> over New Hittite kings	276
Table 4.8: Pragmatic functions of <i>apā-</i> as medial demonstrative	276
Table 5.1: Pragmatic functions of <i>kā-</i> as proximal demonstrative	335
Table 6.1: Quantitative analysis of the pronoun <i>apā-</i> in the laws	342
Table 6.2: Distribution of accented <i>apā-</i> in the punishments of the laws ...	347
Table 6.3: Attested coordinate structures in the laws	352
Table 6.4: Abstract patterns attested for the coordinate structure	353
Table 6.5: Class III laws without <i>-pat</i>	354
Table 6.6: Laws 19-21	357
Table 6.7: Laws 22-24	357
Table 6.8: Laws 93-97	361
Table 6.9: Comparison of laws 25 and 9	375
Table 6.10: Comparison of laws 25 (KBo 12.49) and 9	375
Table 7.1: Exclusive focus types	382
Table 7.2: Word order for replacing focus with both members expressed or paraphrased: “not X, but Y”	404
Table 7.3: Replacing focus with implicit negation: “X, if Y present, Y instead”	404
Table 7.4: Replacing focus with implicit negation: “X, Y instead”	405
Table 7.5: Replacing focus with “not X” implicit: “instead Y”	405
Table 7.6: wide scope <i>-pat</i> indicating replacing focus (constituents marked * are forms of <i>apā-</i>)	407
Table 7.7: Narrow scope <i>-pat</i> indicating restricting focus (the constituent marked * is a lexical noun phrase)	412
Table 7.8: wide scope <i>-pat</i> indicating restricting focus (the constituent marked * is a form of <i>apā-</i>)	413
Table 7.9: Word order and selecting focus	428
Table 7.10: Word order and argument focus	432

Table 8.1:	Combinations of coordinators and connectives	439
Table 8.2:	Word order and <i>-ja</i> ‘also, too’	461
Table 8.3:	Word order and <i>-ja</i> ‘even’	461
Table 8.4:	Word order and <i>-ja</i> ‘and’	461
Table 8.5:	Word order and <i>-ja</i> ... <i>-ja</i> ‘both ... and’	461
Table 8.6:	Word order and <i>-ja</i> in all meanings	465
Table 9.1:	Word order in conjunctive coordinations	482
Table 9.2:	Word order in adversative coordinations	483
Table 9.3:	Word order in disjunctive coordinations	483
Table 9.4:	Referent chains in 9.56	503
Table 9.5:	Counts on <i>apā-</i> + <i>-a/-ma</i>	504
Table 10.1:	Distribution of anaphoric discourse deictic expressions	531
Table 10.2:	Distribution of cataphoric discourse deictic expressions	531
Table 10.3:	Distribution of the anaphoric demonstratives over text genres, based on my ON-NH (IIIa and b) corpus.	558
Table 10.4:	Distribution of the anaphoric demonstratives over text genres, based on my LNH corpus.	558
Table 10.5:	Relation between type of pragmatic function and position in the clause	566
Table 10.6:	The system of demonstratives and accented pronouns in attested Hittite according to the author’s views	568

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 acceptance 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, <i>Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon</i> , (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5), Leiden / Boston 2008.
HKM	Alp, Sedat, <i>Hethitische Keilschrifttafeln aus Maşat</i> , (Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları VI / 34), Ankara 1991.
HW	Friedrich, Johannes, <i>Hethitisches Wörterbuch</i> , Heidelberg 1952-54.
HW ²	Friedrich, Johannes, Annelies Kammenhuber, and Inge Hoffmann, <i>Hethitisches Wörterbuch: Zweite, völlig überarbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte</i> , Heidelberg 1975—.
HZL	Rüster, Christel and Neu, Erich. <i>Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon: Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten</i> , (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 2), Wiesbaden 1989.
IBoT	<i>İstanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri(nden Secme Metinler)</i> , İstanbul 1944, 1947, 1954, Ankara 1988.
KBo	<i>Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi</i> , Leipzig 1916-1923, Berlin 1954—.
KUB	<i>Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi</i> , Berlin 1921—.
KuT	Kuşaklı Texte.
OBGT	Old Babylonian Grammatical Texts.
Or.	Ortaköy.
TUAT I/1	Kaiser, Otto. <i>Texte der Umwelt des Alten Testaments. Band I: Rechts- und wirtschaftsurkunden. Historisch-chronologische Texte. Lieferung 1: Rechtsbücher</i> , Gütersloh 1982.
VBoT	Goetze, Albrecht. <i>Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte</i> , Marburg 1930.
VSNF	<i>Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin</i> , (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.	<i>exempli gratia</i>
coll.	collated	et al.	<i>et alii</i>
c./comm.	common gender	ex.	example
contr.	contrast(ive)	fn.	footnote
cop.	copula	G	genitive
dat.	dative	gen.	genitive

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

1 Introduction

1.1 Short overview

Demonstratives are among the few word classes that occur in all languages (DIESEL 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 (DIESEL 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, HW² 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 HW² (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 anatolien”), 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 (backward referring) function of *aši* was taken over by *apā-* and the cataphoric (forward 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	<i>kā-</i>	<i>apā-</i>	<i>aši+</i> ¹	<i>aši+</i>
Hittite	<i>kā-</i>	<i>apā-</i>	<i>apā-</i> (<i>aši+</i>)	<i>kā-</i> (<i>aši+</i>)

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 contexts 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 system 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 Tuḫaliya 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
	1 st person	2 nd person	3 rd person	3 rd person
OH-NH	<i>kā-</i>	<i>apā-</i>	<i>aši+</i>	<i>apā-</i>
Late NH	<i>kā-</i>	—	<i>aši+</i>	<i>apā-</i>
	proximal		distal	3 rd 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 <i>-pat</i>)	Preverbal/pattern position
Expanding focus (marked by <i>-ja</i>)	Preverbal
Non-contrastive focus:	
Expanding focus (marked by <i>-ja</i>)	Initial/First
Contrastive topic:	
Shifted topic (marked by <i>-a/-ma</i>)	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’, *apija* ‘there’, *kēt* ‘on this side’, *edi* ‘on yonder side’, *kiššan* ‘in this way’, *apeniššan* ‘in that way’, and *eniššan* ‘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 *kiššuyant-* ‘this kind of a ...’, *apeniššuyant-* ‘that kind of a ...’ and *eniššuyant-* ‘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 *-ia* ‘and, also, even’, *-al-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 *-ia* 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 *-ia* ‘he/she/that too’ and first position in the clause, whereas *-ia* ‘and’ is always cliticized to a word in initial position. When *-ia* 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 *-ia* ‘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 topographical 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 Tuḫaliya 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 Muṣili II but not in contemporary *unica* from previous reigns, then the previous reign, that of Šuppiluliuma I (and Arnuwanda II), provides the *terminus post quem* for this particular sign. Texts with the modern sign form can only be dated during or after Muṣili 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 Tuthaliya 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 Siegels 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 Muwatalli II to Šuppiluliamas³, 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):

	Muwatalli II	Ḫattušili III	Tuthaliya IV	Šuppiluliamas 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 Muwatalli: 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 Tuthaliya), 583 (except KUB 31.77) and 590 (KUB 15.4, 6, 18, 19, 22, 24, 30). For Tuthaliya 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 Šuppiluliamas 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 Tuthaliya by van den Hout), KBo 42.60, KBo 49.121, KUB 19.28, KUB 40.38, KUB 51.81).

	Muḡatalli II	Ḥattušili III	Tuḥalija IV	Šuppiliuma II
	old/new	old/new	old/new	old/new
DA	67/33	58/42	59/41	27/73
ḤA	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 Muḡatalli 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 vereinzelt 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 Tuḥalija IV, although we should not forget that IIIb is also attested for this king.

Following Starke (1985: 25), phase IIIb, which runs from Muḡatalli into the reign of Tuḥalija, 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 Taḡalaja letter (KUB 14.3, Ḥattušili III)⁴, a text which was not considered by van den Hout. As van den Hout has shown, IIIb regularly shows late ḤA (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 Ḥattušili 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 Ḥattušili III. However, certainly KUB 5.1 could be dated to Tuḥalija 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 Muḫatalli up to Šuppiluliamā.

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 Šuppiluliamā (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 Muḫatalli II, whereas the double wedged ḪA occurs until Šuppiluliamā. 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 Šuppiluliamā 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 Šuppiluliamā 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	Muḫat II	Ḫatt III	Tuḫ 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 (Tuḫalija 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
<i>Historical narratives</i>	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
<i>Administration</i>	238.4	KBo 16.57
	239	KBo 13.254
<i>Instructions</i>	272	KBo 22.1
<i>Laws</i>	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
<i>Myths</i>	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	
<i>Rituals</i>	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	
<i>Distribution lists</i>	523	KBo 16.72 + 73	
	530	KBo 25.83	
<i>Divination</i>	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	
<i>Festivals</i>	KILAM	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
<i>Thunder</i>	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
<i>Zippalanda</i>	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
<i>Ziparua</i>	643	KBo 17.8
<i>Infernal deities</i>	645.6C	KBo 17.15
	645.6G	KBo 25.29
<i>the Prince</i>	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
<i>Hattian-Hittite</i>	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
<i>Palaic-Hittite</i>	752A	KBo 8.74 + KBo 19.156 + KBo 39.174 + KUB 32.16 + 117 + KUB 35.93
	752B	KBo 17.25
<i>Luwian-Hittite</i>	772.II.2	KBo 25.53
<i>Benedictions</i>	820.1	KUB 36.110
<i>Oracle letter</i>	827	KBo 18.151
<i>Unassigned</i>	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
<i>Treaty</i> <i>with Pillija of Kiz-</i> <i>zuuatna</i>	25	KUB 36.108
<i>Letter</i>	194	KBo 8.18

1.5.2.2 Tutḫaliija I/II and Nikalmati

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
<i>Treaty</i> <i>with Šunaššura of</i> <i>Kizzuātna</i>	41.IIA 41.IIB	KUB 8.81 + KBo 19.31 (= CTH 131) KUB 36.127

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

1.5.2.3 Arnuṣanda I and Ašmunikal

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
<i>Treaty</i>		
<i>with the Gašga</i>	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 Tuḫaliya I/II by Giorgieri (2005: 330, w. fn. 38 and 39).

8 Attributed to Tuḫaliya I/II by Giorgieri (2005: 334).

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
<i>Indictment</i>	147	KBo 19.38 + KUB 14.1
<i>Annals</i>	148	KBo 50.4
<i>Letters</i>	209	KBo 18.66
	210	KBo 8.22
<i>Treaty/oath fragment</i>	212	KBo 50.107 (+) KUB 31.45
<i>Historical fragment</i>	214.17	KBo 18.80 + Privat 5
<i>Landgrant</i>	222.91	KBo 5.7
<i>Instructions</i>		
<i>for the HAZANNU</i>	257.4A	KUB 31.100
<i>for the BEL</i>	261A	Bo 7192 + KBo 50.280a + b + KUB
<i>MADGALTI</i>		13.1 + KUB 31.87 + 88 + KUB 40.55 +
		56
<i>Loyalty oath of</i>		
<i>the ^{LÚ.MES}DUGUD</i>	260.7	KBo 50.62
<i>Prayers</i>		
<i>to the Sungoddess</i>	375.1A	KBo 51.16 + KBo 52.14 + KBo 55.32
<i>of Arinna</i>	375.1B	+ KUB 17.21
	375.1B	Bo 8617 + KBo 53.10 (+) KUB 31.124
	375.3	+ 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
<i>Rituals</i>	494	Bo 4186 + KUB 45.47
	778.I	KBo 9.137 + KBo 23.22
<i>Oracles</i>	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 Tutḥaliḫa III

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
<i>Treaty</i>		
<i>Mida of Paḥḫuḫa</i>	146	KUB 23.72 + KUB 40.10 + KUB 40.11 + KBo 50.66 + KBo 50.216 + KBo 50.218 + KBo 57.238 ¹⁰
<i>Letters</i>		
<i>Egypt to Arzaḫa</i>	151	VBoT 1
<i>Arzaḫa to Egypt</i>	152	VBoT 2
<i>king to subordinates</i>	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
<i>from subordinates</i>	195	KBo 15.28 ¹¹
	199	ABoT 1.65
	200	ABoT 1.60
	209	KBo 32.145
	581	HKM 85
<i>Historical fragment</i>	214.13	KBo 16.42
<i>Treaty/oath fragments</i>	212	KBo 16.31, 46; KBo 17.48; KBo 50.103; KUB 13.26
<i>Instructions</i>	271	KUB 36.118 + 119

9 Attributed to the co-regency of Tutḥaliḫa I/II and Arnuḫanda I by Klinger (1998: 110) and Marizza (2007: 40).

10 Attributed to Tutḥaliḫa III by Torri (2005).

11 Attributed to Tutḥaliḫa III by de Martino (2005: 295), with older literature.

1.5.2.5 Šuppiluliuma I

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

1.5.2.6 Middle Hittite unassigned

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
<i>Treaties</i>		
<i>with the Ḫabiru</i>	27	KBo 9.73 (+) KUB 36.106
	28	KBo 16.47 (Arnuḫanda I?)
<i>Kuruštama</i>	134C	KUB 40.28 (Tuthaliya I/II?)
<i>Letters</i>	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
<i>Treaty fragment</i>	213	KUB 26.30
<i>Historical fragments</i>	214	KUB 23.57
	215	KBo 32.122, 201, 202, 203a-c, 224; KUB 23.58; KUB 48.106
<i>Itinerary</i>	230	Bo 2004/1

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

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
<i>Instructions</i>	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 (Tuthaliya III?); KUB 34.58 (Arnuwanda I?); KUB 36.109
<i>Horsetraining</i> <i>Kikkuli</i>	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
<i>Oracle</i>	573	KBo 22.263 + KUB 50.1
<i>Oracle letter</i>	581	KUB 31.101

1.5.3 New Hittite

1.5.3.1 Muršili II

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
<i>Treaties</i> <i>with Duppi-</i> <i>Teššub of Amurru</i>	62.IIA	KBo 5.9 (+) KBo 22.39 (+) KBo 50.28
	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 Šuppiliuma I's reign.

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
		21.49 (+) KUB 23.6
<i>with Targašnalli of Ḫapalla</i>	67	KBo 5.4 ¹⁴
<i>with Kupanta-Ku- runta of Mira</i>	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
<i>with Manapa- Tarḫunta of Šeḫa</i>	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
<i>Annals of Šuppiluliuma</i>	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
<i>10-year Annals</i>	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
<i>Extensive Annals</i>	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
<i>Edict</i>	63A	KBo 3.3 + KBo 50.77 + KUB 19.31 + KUB 23.126 + KUB 31.21 + 36 + KUB 40.29
	63E	KUB 19.45
<i>Letters</i>	72	KUB 19.15 + KBo 50.24
	202	KBo 18.15
	209	KBo 18.35 ¹⁷ , KUB 57.1
<i>Prayers</i>	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.
<i>Oracles</i>	570	KBo 53.103 + KUB 5.6 + KUB 18.54 + KUB 50.123

1.5.3.2 Muqatalli II

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
<i>Treaty</i>		
<i>with Alakšandu of Wiluša</i>	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
<i>Letters</i>	171	KUB 23.102
	191	KUB 19.5 + KBo 19.79
<i>Prayers</i>	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
<i>Vows</i>		
<i>Ištar of Šamuša</i>	590	KBo 9.96 (+) KBo 41.60

1.5.3.3 Urḫi-Teššub (Muršili III)

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

1.5.3.4 Ḫattušili III and Puduḫeba

Text genre	CTH no.	Text	
<i>Apology</i>	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	
	<i>Annals</i>	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
<i>Conflict with Urhi-Teššub</i>	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 (?)
<i>Edict</i>		
<i>Armatarhunda</i>	86.1A	KUB 21.17
	86.1B	KUB 31.27
	86.2	KUB 31.26
<i>Mittannamuša</i>	87	KBo 4.12
<i>ḫekur of Pirua</i>	88	KBo 6.28 + KUB 26.48
<i>Tiliura</i>	89A	KBo 51.1 (+) KUB 21.29
	89B	KUB 23.123
	89C	KUB 31.15
<i>Nerik</i>	90.3	KBo 22.73 (+) KBo 60.3 (+) KUB 21.11
<i>fragm. Nerik</i>	90.1	KUB 21.8
<i>Kuruntija</i>	96	544/f
<i>Letters</i>		
	175	KUB 23.88
<i>Puduḫeba</i>	176	KUB 21.38
	<i>‘Tauagalaua’</i>	181
	187	KUB 57.125
<i>Puduḫeba</i>	190	KUB 48.88
	180	KUB 23.85
<i>from Ramses II</i>	209	KBo 18.23
	209.5	KUB 26.89
	209.4	KUB 21.36
	209.20	KUB 26.53
<i>Prayers</i>		
	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
<i>Dreams of the Queen</i>	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
<i>Oracles</i>	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
<i>Vow of Puduḥeba</i>	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 Tuḫaliya 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 Tuḫaliya IV

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
<i>Treaties</i>		
<i>Šaušgamuša of Amurru</i>	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
<i>Kuruntija of Tarḫuntašša</i>	106A	Bo 86/299
<i>Ulmi-Teššub of Tarḫuntašša with ?</i>	106B.1	ABoT 1.57
	106B.2	KBo 4.10 + KBo 50.60 + KUB 40.69
	123	KBo 4.14
<i>Letters</i>		
<i>to Assyria</i>	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-Ninurta)
	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
<i>Milaqata</i>	182	KUB 19.55 + KUB 48.90
<i>Queen Mother</i>	187	KBo 18.2, 6
	187	in GÜTERBOCK 1979: 144
	192	KUB 19.23
<i>Historical texts</i>		
<i>Fragments of annals</i>	211.4	KBo 6.27 + KUB 23.13
	214.2	KUB 31.14, KUB 23.61 + KUB 26.78
	214.9	KUB 31.32
	214.20	KBo 22.10
<i>Landgrant to Šaḥurunuuḫa</i>		
	225A	KBo 22.56 + KUB 26.43
	225B	KBo 22.55 (+) 57 (+) 58 + 59 + 60 (+) KBo 50.225 + KUB 26.50
<i>Loyalty oath of Kupanta-Kuruntija²² of Mira</i>		
	275	KUB 6.47 (formerly CTH 214.3)
	275	KUB 26.18
<i>Instructions</i>		
	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
<i>Legal texts</i>		
	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-Kuruntija shortly after Tuḥḫaliḫa IV's accession to the throne, see VAN DEN HOUT 1995: 146f.

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
	297	KUB 54.1 ²³
<i>Prayers</i>	385.9	KBo 12.58 + KBo 13.162
<i>Cult inventories</i>	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
<i>Dreams of the Queen</i>	584	KBo 47.239
<i>Oracles</i>		
<i>Campaigns in Gašga territory</i>	561	KUB 5.1 + KUB 52.65
<i>Cult of Piruā</i>	565	KBo 14.21 ²⁴
<i>‘Sammeltafel’</i>	577	KBo 16.98 (+) KUB 49.49
<i>Accession</i>	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
<i>Illness</i>	577	KBo 2.2
<i>Zaualli-gods</i>	570	KUB 16.16
	570	KBo 23.114
	573	KUB 16.46
	578	KUB 50.87
<i>Purity of King- ship</i>	569.I.1	KUB 50.5
	569.I.2	KUB 16.58

23 For possible attribution to Tuthaliya IV, see VAN DEN HOUT 1995: 184.

24 For attribution to Tuthaliya 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
<i>Vows</i>	590	KBo 33.216, VSNF 12.103
<i>About Nerik</i>	673	KBo 26.181 + KUB 27.68 + KUB 42.100

1.5.4.2 Šuppiluliuma II

Text genre	CTH no.	Text
<i>Treaties</i>		
<i>Talmi-Teššub of Kargamiš</i>	122.1A	KBo 12.41 (+) KBo 13.225 (+) KUB 26.33
	122.1B	KUB 40.37
	122.2	KBo 12.30 (+) KUB 26.25
	122.3	KBo 42.60
<i>Alašija</i>	141	KBo 12.39
<i>Historical texts</i>		
<i>Conquest of Alašija</i>	121	KBo 12.38
<i>Fragments</i>	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
<i>Letters</i>	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
<i>Loyalty Oaths</i>		
of [...]–Šar-ruma ²⁶	124A	KUB 23.44 + KUB 26.32 + KUB 31.106 + KUB 40.38
	124B	KBo 14.112 (+) 113
<i>Fragments</i>	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 GHŁ, 143 (§ 7.3), 145 (§ 7.11) and KŁOEKHORST 2012. For the most recent version of the paradigm of *aši+*, however, see chapter 3.8.

1.6.1 Old Hittite, old script

OS	<i>kā-</i>	<i>apā-</i>	<i>aši+</i>
Singular			
nom.comm.	<i>kāš</i>	<i>apaš, apāš</i>	[<i>aši</i>]
acc.comm.	<i>kūn</i>	<i>apun, apūn</i>	[<i>uni</i>]
nom.-acc.neut.	[<i>kīni</i>] ²⁷ , <i>kī, ki =</i>	<i>apat, apāt</i>	[<i>ini</i>]
gen.	<i>kēl, kel</i>	<i>apel, apēl</i>	<i>aši</i>
dat.-loc.	[<i>kēti</i>] ²⁸ , <i>kēdani</i>	[<i>apēti</i>] ²⁹ , <i>apedani</i>	<i>edi</i> ¹
Plural			
nomm.comm.	<i>kē</i>	<i>apē</i>	∅
acc.comm.	[<i>kūši</i>] ³⁰ , <i>kūš</i>	<i>apūš</i>	∅
nom.-acc.neut.	<i>kē, ke =</i>	<i>apē</i>	∅
gen.	<i>kinzan</i>	[<i>apenzan</i>]	∅
dat.-loc.		[<i>apēdaš</i>]	∅

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	<i>kā-</i>	<i>apā-</i>	<i>aši+</i>
Number indifferent			
abl.	<i>kēt, ket</i>	<i>apez</i> = (?) ³¹	<i>edi</i>
instr.	<i>kēdanta</i>	[<i>apēdanda</i>]	∅
Adverbs			
of place	<i>kāni, kā</i>	<i>apija</i>	<i>ea</i> (?)
of cause	∅	[<i>apēda</i>] ³²	∅
of manner	[<i>kīniššan</i>] ³³ , <i>kiššan</i>	<i>apiniššan</i> , <i>QATAMMA</i>	<i>ene[ššan]</i> (?)

1.6.2 Middle Hittite, middle script

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

31 Perhaps attested in KBo 20.23 rev. 1' (OS festival fragm., CTH 678), written *a-pé-⁷ez-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	<i>kā-</i>	<i>apā-</i>	<i>aši+</i>
of place	<i>kā</i>	<i>apīja, apēja</i> ³⁶	∅
of direction	<i>kā</i>	<i>apadda</i>	∅
of cause	∅	<i>apadda</i>	∅
of manner	<i>kiššan</i>	<i>apiniššan,</i> <i>QATAMMA</i>	<i>iniššan</i>

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

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, Muḫatalli II, CTH 76).

New Hittite	<i>kā-</i>	<i>apā-</i>	<i>aši+</i>
	<i>kez</i> =	<i>apēzza, apijaz</i> ⁴¹	<i>etez, eteza</i>
Adverbs			
of place/direction	<i>kā</i>	<i>apija</i>	∅
of time	(<i>kinun</i>)	<i>apija</i>	∅
of cause (often with <i>šer</i>)	∅	<i>apadda(n), apātta, apatta</i>	∅
of manner	<i>kiššan, kišan</i>	<i>QATAMMA</i>	<i>iniššan, eniššan, eneššan</i>

1.6.4 Late New Hittite

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

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

40 Only attested in the phrase *apitpandalaz* ‘from that moment on’.

41 Attested in KUB 57.1: 38: [*n=an?* *ap*]iiaz lahḫiatteni (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	<i>kā-</i>	<i>apā-</i>	<i>aši+</i>
Adverbs			
of place	<i>kā</i>	<i>apija</i>	∅
of direction	∅	<i>apadda(n)</i>	∅
of time	(<i>kinun</i>)	<i>apija</i>	∅
of cause (often with <i>šer</i>)	∅	<i>apadda(n)</i>	∅
of manner	<i>kiššan, kišan</i>	<i>QATAMMA</i>	<i>eneššan</i>

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, approaches⁴³: 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 *ašī+* 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).