

Sonderdruck

# DIE SPRACHE

Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft

Band 43 · Heft 1

2002/03

Wiener Sprachgesellschaft

Harrassowitz Verlag

Im Auftrag der Wiener Sprachgesellschaft herausgegeben von Heiner Eichner unter Mitwirkung von Hans Christian Luschützky, Robert Nedoma, Oskar E. Pfeiffer, Klaus T. Schmidt, Chlodwig H. Werba und redaktioneller Mitarbeit von Melanie Malzahn.

Anschrift: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Wien, Luegerring 1, A-1010 Wien, Österreich

### Inhalt

A. Aufsätze	
Petra Goedegebuure, The Hittite 3 <sup>rd</sup> person distal demonstrative <i>aši</i> ( <i>uni, eni</i> etc.) . . . . .	1
Michael Janda / Andreas Kamp, Die germanischen Götter Nerthus und Njorðr im Rahmen der indogermanischen Religionsgeschichte . . . . .	33
Bernard Mees, Runo-Gothica. The Runes and the Origin of Wulfila's Script . . . . .	55
B. Kurzaufsätze	
Harry A. Hoffner, Hittite <i>a-aš-ma</i> . . . . .	80
Robert Nedoma, Abbildungen und Nachbildungen des unbeschädigten Runenrings von Pietroassa: Addenda . . . . .	88
† Hubert Petersmann, Bedeutung und Gebrauch von lateinisch <i>fui</i> . Eine soziolinguistische Analyse . . . . .	94
Recai Tekoğlu, Three New Lycian Inscriptions from Tlos and Asartaş . . . . .	104
C. Rezensionen . . . . .	115

Alle redaktionelle Korrespondenz, Manuskripte und Bücher sind an den Herausgeber (Anschrift wie oben) zu richten. Für unverlangt eingesandte Bücher kann weder eine Besprechung noch Rücksendung garantiert werden. Die Aufnahme von Repliken und persönlichen Erklärungen wird prinzipiell abgelehnt; die Mitarbeiter sind ihrerseits zu einer streng sachlichen Formulierung angehalten.

Autoren erhalten für Aufsätze 25, für Rezensionen 10 Sonderdrucke.

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung des Bundesministeriums für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur, Wien.

© Wiener Sprachgesellschaft, Wien 2003

Die Zeitschrift und alle in ihr enthaltenen Beiträge und Abbildungen sind urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes bedarf der Zustimmung der Wiener Sprachgesellschaft. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen jeder Art, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und für die Einspeicherung in elektronische Systeme.

Satz: Melanie Malzahn.

Druck und Verarbeitung: AZ Druck und Datentechnik GmbH, Kempten.

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier

Printed in Germany

www.harrassowitz.de/verlag

ISSN 0376-401X

### A. AUFSÄTZE

#### The Hittite 3<sup>rd</sup> person/distal demonstrative *aši* (*uni, eni* etc.)<sup>\*</sup>

##### 1. Introduction

From the beginnings of Hittite studies in the early twenties it has been assumed that the Hittite demonstrative system consists of two productive deictic demonstratives, the proximal demonstrative *kā*- “this, dieser, *hic* (“Ich-Deixis”)” and the non-proximal demonstrative *apā*- “that, jener, der, *is* (“Jener-” and “Du-Deixis”)” (Friedrich 1960: 66-67). Neu 1997: 148-149 added a third term, *šia*-<sup>1</sup>, tentatively comparing it with Latin *iste*, whereas *apā*- would correspond with *ille* (l.c., n. 39). According to Neu, the competition between non-proximal *šia*- and *apā*- ended with the disappearance of *šia*- in Middle Hittite times. There is also a rarely used demonstrative *an(n)i*- with unclear deixis, but with textual evidence until the end of attested Hittite.<sup>2</sup> Besides these four basically deictic demonstratives Hittite also has two anaphoric pronouns: the enclitic 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun *-a*- “he, she, it”, and the demonstrative *apā*- used as the accented 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun.

Finally there exists a pronoun/adjective *aši*, the subject of this study. In broad outline there are two opposing views on both the nature of this pronoun and the age of its paradigm.

<sup>\*</sup> This article should be read in connection with Professor Harry A. Hoffner's contribution on *ašma*, this volume (p. 80-87). At the Vth International Congress of Hittitology in Çorum (Turkey), September 2002, it became clear that Prof. Hoffner's views on *ašma* and my views on *aši* support each other. I also want to thank Prof. Hoffner for his valuable remarks on a preliminary version of this article. In the final stage of my study of the Hittite demonstratives *kā*- “this”, *apā*- “that” and *aši* “yon” (Goedegebuure 2003) I was granted access to the lexical files of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary Project of the Oriental Institute, for which I am very grateful to Professor Theo van den Hout.

<sup>1</sup> For a list of attestations of *šia*-, see Neu 1997: 146-147 with fn. 28. Friedrich 1960: 64 classified this pronoun as an accented 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronoun.

<sup>2</sup> For a list of attestations of *an(n)i*-, see Rieken 1999: 104 with fn. 474. Melchert 1991: 139 fn. 17 distinguishes two stems, *anna*- “that” < Common Anatolian \**anno*- < PIE \**éno*- and \**ana*- “this” < PIE \**ono*-.

First, it has been generally accepted that Hittite *aši*, *uni*, *eni* and several other forms (which will be listed below) belong to one single paradigm (Tischler 1977, and especially Laroche 1979<sup>3</sup>), that is, at least in New Hittite. However, according to Laroche the paradigm of *aši*<sup>4</sup> already existed in the oldest language phase of Hittite, with its roots in prehistoric times<sup>5</sup> (o.c. 151). This was contested by Friedrich & Kammenhuber HW<sup>2</sup> A 400. Although they accepted united *aši* for the 13th century and later, they expressed their doubts on the existence of the paradigm in the earlier periods<sup>6</sup>. They distinguished four stems, three of which have been published in their dictionary: (1) *aši* “der betreffende” (HW<sup>2</sup> A 400), (2) a defective demonstrative *a-* with the forms *e(-)* (nom.pl.c.), *edani* (dat.-loc.sg.), *edaš* (dat.-loc.pl.), *edez* (abl.) and *edi* (old dat.-loc.sg. and adverb of relative position “is; jener, er” (HW<sup>2</sup> E 42), (3) *eni* “jenes (zuvor erwähnte)”, in oracles “jenes (anderweitig bekannte)” (HW<sup>2</sup> E 38-9) and (4) *uni-*, which is not yet published. Following this line of thought, Hittite originally made use of eight demonstratives: *kā-*, *apā-*, *šia-*, *an(n)i-*, *a-*, *aši*, *eni*, and *uni-*.

<sup>3</sup> But see already Pedersen 1938: 59-61, who understood *aši* and *uni* as respectively the nom.sg.c. and acc.sg.c. of a stem \**e-*.

<sup>4</sup> In the remainder of this article I will refer to the paradigm of *aši*, *uni*, *eni* etc. by means of the nom.sg.c. *aši*.

<sup>5</sup> Laroche did not explicitly state that a predecessor of *aši* already existed in Indo-European (“L'étymologie de ces radicaux *a-/u-/en-* est un problème sans objet. On peut, si l'on veut, rapprocher de chacun d'eux quelque élément isolé du discours (par ex. le lat. *en*); l'identité est indémontrable”, 1979: 151) although the suppletive pronominal paradigm points at a very high age: “L'anomalie d'une telle flexion, qui ne répond à aucune des normes de la langue vivante, ne peut évidemment s'expliquer que par une longue préhistoire” (l.c., see also o.c. 152). It is positively considered Indo-European by Bader 1981: 31, Puhvel 1984: 6, sub *a-* (= IE \**e-/o-*), Neu 1997: 139 (IE \**o-* (> Hitt. *a-*), \**u-*, and \**e-* are expressed in *aši*, *uni* and *eni* respectively).

<sup>6</sup> The main arguments against a unified paradigm in older Hittite are (1) that inflected *uni-* is attested in Old Hittite, (2) that *aši* occurs as a nom.sg.c., nom.-acc.sg.n. and acc.sg.c., (3) that *edani* and the other obliqui of the defective Old Hittite demonstrative pronoun *a-* “is; jener” were understood as obliqui to *eni* from the time of Mursili II (see also HW<sup>2</sup> E: 38-9 sub *eni*), and (4) that the Old Hittite material is too restricted to say anything on the paradigm in the older language phases. Points (3) and (4) are addressed in sections 3, 4 and 5, points (1), (2) and (3) when building the paradigms in section 7. For point (2), see also fn. 13 where it is discussed that *aši* is never a neuter.

Secondly, Laroche assumed that *aši* was a true anaphoric pronoun, the “seul vrai pronom/adjectif anaphorique du hittite” (1979: 148)<sup>7</sup>. The view until then was that *aši* and the other forms were demonstratives, albeit anaphoric ones (see for example Friedrich 1960: 68), partially<sup>8</sup> followed by HW<sup>2</sup>. Puhvel 1984 on the other hand follows the unitary proposal made by Laroche and accepts the anaphoric nature of *aši* (o.c., 5), although he translates it with “this (one), that (one), the aforementioned” (o.c., 3), i.e., with demonstratives.

In this article I will try to solve the question of both the nature of *aši* and the age of the paradigm. I hope to show that *aši* is *not* an anaphoric pronoun but the 3<sup>rd</sup> person demonstrative “yon” instead, accompanying the 1<sup>st</sup> person demonstrative *kā-* “this, near me” and the 2<sup>nd</sup> person demonstrative *apā-* “that, near you”<sup>9</sup>.<sup>10</sup> This three-term system did not only exist in later Hittite, we also have to assume that it already was fully functional in Old Hittite<sup>11</sup>.

Besides the arguments which will be provided here, the case for an Old Hittite 3<sup>rd</sup> person demonstrative *aši* is strongly supported by the use and etymology of Old Hittite *āšma* by Prof. Hoffner, this volume. In section 2 I will present the methods I will use, followed by the presentation of the material from a typological point of view (section 3).

In section 4 the Hittite demonstrative system will be shown to be person-based, not distance-based. An important function of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person

<sup>7</sup> See also Neu 1983: 30: ‘*aši* “der/das betreffende”, anaphorisches Pronomen’.

<sup>8</sup> The lexeme *aši* is only classified as a pronoun (HW<sup>2</sup> A 401).

<sup>9</sup> The demonstrative *apā-* is generally thought of as the opposite of *kā-* (see for example HW<sup>2</sup> A 130b). With the introduction of the deictic demonstrative *aši* this view cannot be maintained anymore. In those instances where *apā-* is not anaphoric it is clearly connected with the Addressee. See for example (15) for an Addressee oriented *apā-* in Recognitional use. Anaphoric *apā-* on the other hand often occurs as the accented counterpart of the unaccented enclitic pronoun *-a-*. As an emphatic pronoun *apā-* always refers to the third person. For further discussion of Addressee oriented *apā-* see Goedegebuure 2003, Chapter 5. For *apā-* as accented pronoun see Goedegebuure 2003, Chapters 7, 8 and 9.

<sup>10</sup> The alternative terms proximal, medial and distal/remote are used when the deictic contrasts are based on distance contrasts. In sections 3 and 4 I will show that the Hittite deictic system is based on the category of person.

<sup>11</sup> I will discuss the demonstrative system of the other Anatolian languages elsewhere. But let me note here that Hieroglyphic Luwian *asi-* (Tischler 1977: 80, sub Hittite *aši*) does not exist. Read now with Hawkins 2000: 524 *i-pá(?)*, an apparent epithet of the Stag-God.

demonstrative in Hittite is the so-called *disassociative* use<sup>12</sup>, discussed in section 5. In section 6 I will discuss a lexical list containing *aši* which turns out to be more valuable than formerly supposed.

The paradigm of *aši* in Old and Middle Hittite is finally presented in section 7. Here however I will present the New Hittite paradigm. The numbers in parentheses are counts based on the files of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary Project. I only include those attestations of which the grammatical case could be established based on the context. Duplicates were not counted.

*The New Hittite paradigm of aši*

nom.sg.c.	<i>a-ši</i> (39), <i>a-ši-iš</i> (1), <i>u-ni-iš</i> (2), <i>e-ni-iš</i> (2)
acc.sg.c.	<i>u-ni</i> (15), <i>u-ni-in</i> (8), <i>a-ši</i> (18) <sup>13</sup>
nom.-acc.sg.n.	<i>i-ni</i> (2) <sup>14</sup> , <i>e-ni</i> (47), <i>u-ni</i> (1) <sup>15</sup>
gen.sg.	<i>u-ni-ja-aš</i> (2)
dat.sg.	<i>e-da-ni</i> (21)
abl.sg.	<i>e-da-za</i> (1), <i>e-de-ez</i> (1), <i>e-di-za</i> (1), <i>e-te-ez</i> (1), <i>e-di-iz</i> (3), <i>e-ti-iz</i> (1)

<sup>12</sup> I owe this term to Prof. Hoffner who coined it when we were discussing our views on *aši* and *ašma*.

<sup>13</sup> The acc.sg.c. *aši* mainly occurs in documents from the last rulers, i.e. Tudhaliya IV and later. The documents datable to the earliest New Hittite ruler Mursili II mainly contain the forms *uni* and *unin*. Contra Puhvel's remark (1984: 3) the use of *aši* as acc.sg.c. is not rare. Furthermore, *aši* is never plural (contra Kronasser 1956: 145), and never neuter (contra HW<sup>2</sup> A 400). The alleged neuter *aši* in the lexical list KBo 26.20 ii 21 (l.c.: *a-š[i k]u!-it memijauṣar*) does not exist. Read with Güterbock & Civil 1985: 107 *a-i[š-š]i-it memijauṣar*. The adnominal use of *aši* with INIM cannot be adduced as evidence since INIM can either be read as common gender *memija(n)*- or as neuter gender *uttar*. Therefore, there is no conclusive evidence for a neuter *aši*.

<sup>14</sup> The neuter *ini* occurs only in KBo 5.4 obv. 13, 17 (Mursili II). All other attestations have the writing *e-ni*. Without a doubt *ini* is older: all Middle Hittite originals show the writings *ini* and *iniššan*.

<sup>15</sup> The nominative *uni* in KBo 18.56: 5' seems to be used as a neuter sg.: [kin]una ma-ṣa u-ni 2 É.MEŠ<sup>6</sup> [IN]A<sup>HUR.SAG</sup> Ašgašipa ešzi "Those two households [no]w live [o]n mount Ašgasipa." For the combination of a sg. demonstrative with a plural for example KBo 5.8 iii 24 *nu uni kuin* 9 LIM ÉRIN.MEŠ ... "As for those (acc.sg.c.) 9000 soldiers ...".

nom.pl.c.	<i>u-ni-uš</i> (10), <i>u-ni-i-uš</i> (1), <i>e-ni-uš</i> (1)
acc.pl.c.	<i>u-ni</i> (1) <sup>16</sup> , <i>u-ni-uš</i> (4)
nom.-acc.pl.n.	<i>e-ni</i> (10)
dat.pl.	<i>e-da-aš</i> (6)
adv. of rel. position	<i>e-di-iz</i> (9), <i>e-da-za</i> (4), <i>e-di-iz-za</i> (3), <i>e-te-za</i> (1), <i>e-te-ez</i> (1)
adv. of manner	<i>e-ni-iš-ša-an</i> (16), <i>e-né-eš-ša-an</i> (9), <i>e-ni-ša-an</i> (3)

The minority variants nom.sg.c. *uniš*, acc.sg.c. *unin* and nom.sg.n. *uni* on the one hand and nom.sg.c. *eniš* and nom.pl.c. *eniuš* on the other hand are the first steps towards a transformation of the irregular paradigm *aši*, *uni*, *eni* etc. into a regular paradigm based on respectively *uni-* and *eni-* (for the nom.sg.c. *ašiš* see section 6). The obliqui were probably considered regular in view of the corresponding obliqui of *kā-* and *apā-* (*kēdani/apēdani*, *kēz/apēz*, *kēdaš/apēdaš*) and did therefore not require modification. Hittite ceased to be written before either *eni-* or *uni-* (or both) reached firm ground in the (literate) speech community.

## 2. Method

In order to prove that *aši* is a true demonstrative pronoun/adjective, on equal footing with the demonstratives *kā-* and *apā-*, I will study this pronoun/adjective in view of typological studies dealing with demonstratives (Himmelmann 1996, 1997, Diessel 1999). As these studies have shown, there are four typical uses of demonstratives (described in section 3). If *aši* occurs in all four contexts, then *aši* has to be a true demonstrative, and not an anaphoric pronoun or an anaphoric demonstrative. While discussing these four uses of *aši* I will also present arguments for the 3<sup>rd</sup> person deictic nature of *aši*, both by considering the discourse context and by contrasting it with (one of) the other demonstratives in a similar setting.

Another question is the age of the paradigm. Ideally, if one wants to establish whether *aši*, *uni*, *eni* and *ed-* (*ed-* will be used as a short-hand for the obliqui) belong to the paradigm of a 3<sup>rd</sup> person deictic demonstrative in the older periods, each form should occur in all four uses with 3<sup>rd</sup> person semantics (although the most important functions are the Situational and Recognitional use (sections 3.1 and 3.2)).<sup>17</sup> If so, it would

<sup>16</sup> KBo 3.4 i 26 (Mursili II).

<sup>17</sup> Since a unified paradigm of *aši* is accepted for the New Hittite period, it is not necessary to discuss each member of the paradigm in each of the four demonstrative functions for that period.

be rather far-fetched to maintain that the four 3<sup>rd</sup> person demonstratives *aši*, *uni*, *eni* and the root *ed-* were separate demonstratives with the same semantics, only to be united in New Hittite.

However, the situation for Middle Hittite (MH) and especially Old Hittite (OH) *aši* is not ideal. In old script (OS) texts only two forms are attested, Tracking (or Deictic?)<sup>18</sup> *aši* functioning as an Object and *edi* as the adverb of relative position “on yonder side”. One has to rely therefore on copied Old Hittite, assuming that the system was not subjected to a major change which led the later scribes to replace a badly understood demonstrative – unknown to us – by means of a contemporaneous 3<sup>rd</sup> person demonstrative *aši*. The situation in Middle Hittite is slightly better and it is therefore possible to set up a paradigm for the singular forms based on middle script (MS) (see section 7), although not each form is attested in each function.

In case one would wish to follow HW<sup>2</sup> on the age of the paradigm (see fn. 6) it would be necessary to assume that several of the forms that would later build the paradigm (1) either changed their deictic value, for example from 1<sup>st</sup> person to 3<sup>rd</sup> person, or (2) switched from anaphoric to deictic function. On typological grounds the first option cannot be excluded, the second one however is highly unlikely, since several studies have shown that demonstratives only develop from other deictic elements (Diessel 1999: 150 with references).

### 3. Deixis, Anaphora and *aši*

Before presenting the Hittite material, a few concepts from the field of anaphora and deixis need to be introduced in order to provide a framework for the use of demonstratives in general.

When describing the use of linguistic expressions, two major types of reference are distinguished. First, linguistic expressions may refer to the speech situation. Pointing to the speech situation is generally called *Deixis*. To quote Levinson (1983: 64): “Deixis concerns the ways in which languages encode or grammaticalize features of the **context of utterance** or **speech event**”. In order to interpret the deictic expressions, knowledge of the context of the speech event is a necessary requirement:

- (1) I am now here.

The words “I”, “now” and “here” receive their full meaning only from the

<sup>18</sup> The context of the only example of old script *aši* in KBo 17.17 (+) KBo 30.30 obv. 6' is too broken to establish its demonstrative function (see section 7).

context. Without this context the referent of the Speaker “I”, the moment indicated by “now” and the location indicated by “here” cannot be established. Besides the words already mentioned, also demonstratives<sup>19</sup> are used to refer to the surroundings.

A concept which is necessary when dealing with reference to the speech situation is the *Deictic Center*. The deictic center is the point from which the world is viewed and to which everything is related. The three basic parameters are person, time and place (see ex. (1)): the Central Person is the Speaker, the Central Time is the time at which the Speaker produces the utterance and the Central Place is the Speaker’s location at utterance time (Levinson 1983: 64).

Secondly, besides the situation in which a speech event takes place, linguistic expressions may also refer to entities in the text or speech itself. This is called *Anaphora*: “anaphora concerns the use of (usually) a pronoun to refer to the same referent as some prior term” (Levinson 1983: 85)<sup>20</sup>. A typical example is (2):

- (2) After some initial delay, Madduwatta<sub>i</sub> launched an attack on Hapalla. He<sub>i</sub> conquered it<sub>i</sub> and (ø)<sub>i</sub> added it<sub>i</sub> to his<sub>i</sub> own kingdom,<sup>21</sup> ... (Bryce 1998: 146).

First, two entities are introduced by means of a name, i.e., Madduwatta and Hapalla. Afterwards they are referred to by unaccented anaphoric pronouns, “he”, “it” and “ø”, and an unaccented possessive determiner “his”. Accented and unaccented pronouns are often used to refer anaphorically. However, also demonstratives can refer to textual entities.

Thus, demonstratives can be used outside the field of deixis proper, that is, they do not only refer to the surroundings. Himmelmann 1996, 1997, and Diessel 1999 show that there are four basic uses of demonstratives, of which only one is Deictic or Situational. The other uses are Recognitional, Discourse Deictic and Tracking.

#### 3.1 Situational use

A demonstrative in *Situational Use* (also called *exophoric*) is:

- (3) **This** finger hurts (Diessel 1999: 94).

<sup>19</sup> For general overviews of demonstratives see Anderson and Keenan 1985, Lyons 1999: 17-21 & 107-116.

<sup>20</sup> Or to some following term, in which case we have *Cataphora*.

<sup>21</sup> Identical indexes indicate the same referent.

This expression can only be understood if the speech context is monitored. The Addressee has to be present and watching when the Speaker produces this sentence. Languages have typically two or more demonstratives in order to denote a more or less well defined area in which to search for an entity. The area pointed at by demonstratives can be perceived of in two ways. Either it is connected with distance from the Deictic Center, in which case one speaks about a distance-based demonstrative system, or the area is connected with one of the speech participants, in which case we have a person-based demonstrative system. Japanese, for instance, has a person-based system consisting of three terms (the *ko*-series (1<sup>st</sup> person), *so*-series (2<sup>nd</sup> person) and *a*-series (3<sup>rd</sup> person), Kuno 1973: 282). Lezgian on the other hand is a three-term distance-based system (*i* (proximal), *a* (medial) *at'a* (distal), Haspelmath 1993: 190). As will become clear below, Hittite has a three-term person-based system.

The decisive factor in establishing the correct type of demonstrative system is the role of the second term. If the second term refers to a location at some intermediate distance from the Speaker, the system is distance-based. But if the second term refers to the location of the Addressee, irrespective of distance, the system is person-based. Additionally, in the person-based system the 'distal' term often refers to objects or locations at some distance from the Speaker, besides being connected with the Other, whereas the 'proximal' term often refers to objects or locations near the Speaker.

What has been said so far, only applies to living languages where the speech situation can be monitored. There is however a specific context which provides some clues as to what type of demonstrative system and deictic distinctions a dead language might have: *Reported Speech*. In Reported Speech the Deictic Center of the original Speaker is retained, together with the original deictics. If we quote someone, we project ourselves onto the location and time of the Speaker when s/he uttered his/her words. The Reported Speech is often preceded by a description of events in the speech context, replacing the monitoring of the surroundings. One could imagine example (3) being included in a narration as follows:

- (4) So then she was looking at her finger and said to her friend: "This finger hurts".

Before turning to Reported Speech in Hittite, I shall first present the only type of context in which a truly Situational *aši* can be found.

There are several examples in Hittite where a demonstrative is used to indicate a position relative to some point of reference which is different

from the Deictic Center:

- (5)<sup>22</sup> <sup>9</sup>[<sup>10</sup>*Mālan kuit š*]<sub>A LUGAL KUR URU Hurri e-di-iz tapuša ēšta</sub> <sup>10</sup>[*n=at išru* NAMRA GU<sub>1</sub>.HI.A] UDU.HI.A *āššuitta šarā dahhun* <sup>11</sup>[*n=at=za* ANA KUR URU *Ha*]tti *udahhun ke-e-ez-zi-ja-kan kuit* <sup>12</sup>[*ša* LUGAL KUR URU *Hurri t*]apuša *ēšta nu=za apātta* ANA KUR URU *Hatti* <sup>13</sup>[*udahhun*] [What] was alongside [the Mala-river] on the other side (*ediz*) belonging to the king of Hurri, I picked [it] up[, including deportees, oxen], sheep, and possessions, and I brought [them to Ha]tti. And what was alongside on this side (*kēz*) [belonging to the king of Hurri], that *too* [I brought] to Hatti. (KUB 19.20 + KBo 12.13 obv. 9'-13' (late MH/MS letter, Suppiluliuma I, CTH 154), ed. Van den Hout 1994: 64, 72)

The local adverbs *ediz* and *kēz* are not co-referential with any prior term. The Deictic Center is Hattusa, the river *Mala* is the point of reference (see Melchert 1977: 151ff.) for both *ediz* and *kēz* and not an antecedent. This example already shows that *ediz* is the opposite of *kēz* and therefore non-proximal.

The couple *ediz* ... *kēz* replaced the Old Hittite couple *edi* ... *kēš*<sup>23</sup>, which we find for example in:

- (6) § <sup>48</sup>[*ta*]kku ARAD-aš *huṣāi n=an āppa kuiški uṣatezzi takku man-ninkuṣan ē[pz]i* <sup>49</sup>*nu=šše* KUS<sup>5</sup>.SIR-uš *pāi takku ke-e-et* ID-az 2 GIN KÜ.BABBAR *pāi* <sup>50</sup>*takku e-di* ID-az *nu=šše* 3 GIN KÜ.BABBAR *pāi* § [I]f a male slave runs away and someone brings him back: if he ca[pt]ures (him) nearby, he gives him shoes. If (he captures him) on this side (*ket*) of the river, he gives 2 sheqels of silver. If (he captures him) on yonder side (*edi*) of the river, he gives him 3 sheqels of silver. (KBo 6.2 i 48-50, § 22 (OS laws, CTH 291), ed. Hoffner 1997: 31-2).

<sup>22</sup> The following conventions are used: only the demonstratives are transliterated (one sign = one syllable). The rest of the Hittite text is presented in bound transcription. Clitics are separated from their host by means of <sup>˘</sup>. Text in square brackets [...] is restored, text in square and round brackets [...] is securely restored by means of duplicates.

<sup>23</sup> The couple *ke-e-et* ... *e-di* also occurs in OS KBo 17.15 rev. 15f. and KBo 25.112 ii 5f., with duplicate KBo 25.114. The locative adverb *edi* is attested without its proximal counterpart in OS KUB 43.30 ii 6': [<sup>10.M</sup>]<sup>18</sup>MUHALDIM *išpantuziaššaruš e-di taršanzipaz pēdanzi* "The cooks carry the libation vessels to the other side (*edi*) of the 'Bühne' ". Mostly however *edi* occurs in the expression *edi nai-* "to turn from its accustomed place, to set aside, to remove" (CHD L-N 361f.). The only

The river mentioned in this law must be the Marassantiya river (Halys) surrounding the heart land of Hatti. The Deictic Center can only be Hatti itself (Melchert 1977: 154). This example already shows that the demonstratives do not necessarily indicate distance: the adverb *kēt* points at any location between the Speaker and the river. The rivers in ex. (5) and (6) divide the world in two: *kēt/kēz* refers to the world belonging to the Hittites, i.e., of author and reader (or Speaker and Addressee), and *edi/ediz* refers to the world outside the domain of Speaker and Addressee, that is, the domain of the Other. As we will see, this division of the world, either real or cognitive, is important if we want to understand the use of demonstratives in non-situational contexts.

The occurrence of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person demonstrative *edi* in old script makes it highly probable that the other members built on the stem *ed-* (*edani*, *edaš*, *ediz*) are also 3<sup>rd</sup> person demonstratives, although we do not have any *edanī*<sup>24</sup>, *edaš* and *ediz* in OH originals or copies.

OS attestation of *edi nai-* is KUB 37.223 obv. 2, for the OH/NS attestations see CHD L-N l.c. Add to their list of OH/NS attestations KBo 31.108 (91/d) rev. iv 3' ] *e-di-eš-ta nu-u-ma na-a-ṣ i'*, or *na-a-ṣ i'[-iš-kat-ta-ri]*. The adverb *nūma* is either a not yet attested variant of *nūya* “yet, still”, compare *nūman* / *nūyan*, or it has to be emended to the particle of negative volition *nūman* “not want to”. The translation is something like “He/it is still removed (from its accustomed place)”, or “He does not want to remove them (?) (-e- in *e-di-eš-ta* = *edi-eš-ta*?) (from their accustomed place)”, or “He does not want to be removed (from his accustomed place)”.

<sup>24</sup> The only dative-locative in OH/(NS) is *edi* in KBo 16.49 i 9: *t-uš e-di lūliaš arḫi* LUGAL-i [...] <sup>10</sup> *iškaranzi* “(The cooks seize the sheep) and line them up on the far side of the pond [opposite/before] the king” (see CHD L-N: 81, but HW<sup>2</sup> E 139a differently). For a similar word order ‘adnominal demonstrative - genitive - noun’ see MH/MS KUB 29.7+KBo 21.41 rev. 25-26: *edani* <sup>26</sup> DINGIR-LIM-aš *parni andan* “in that house of the deity”. A dative-locative sg. *edi* is possibly attested in OS KBo 6.2 iii 21 (§ 56), if *e-ki* indeed may be emended to *e-di* (Von Schuler 1982: 107, Soysal 1987: 233). However, I follow Hoffner’s dismissal of Von Schuler’s and Soysal’s proposal for interpreting *edi* BĀD-ni as “jenseits gelegene Stadt” (Hoffner 1997: 68, 193). But if law § 56 is understood as a continuation of law § 55, then *edi* BĀD-ni could refer anaphorically to Ḫattuša (DUMU.MEŠ<sup>UM</sup> HATTI) in KBo 6.2 iii 16 (§ 55). The first part of § 56 would thus read “In that fortification (i.e. Ḫattuša) none of the coppersmiths is exempt from being assigned to a royal expedition or from harvesting vineyards.” The implication of my interpretation is that the origin of the laws § 55 and 56 belongs to the time that Ḫattuša, although within the sphere of influence of the (nascent?) Hittite state, was not yet the capital, and thus not the Deictic Center. By the time of the New Hittite copies B (KBo 6.3) and D (KBo 6.6) however, Ḫattuša was indeed the Deictic Center. There was no need to use the 3<sup>rd</sup> person demonstrative *edi*, younger *edani* anymore, which explains the simple dative locatives (ANA) BĀD-ni in B and D. Attractive as this solution may be

A clear example of Reported Speech in which the value of a demonstrative can be derived from the context are the following two deictically contrasting examples:

- (7) <sup>1</sup> MUNUS.LUGAL<sup>URU</sup> *Kaniš XXX* DUMU.MEŠ *I-EN MU-anti ḫāšta UMMA ŠI=MA*  
<sup>2</sup> [*ki-i-ya* *kuit ḫalkuan ḫāšḫun*]  
 The queen of Kanesh gave birth to 30 sons in one year. Thus she (said): ‘What is that (*ki*)? I have given birth to a gang<sup>25</sup>!’ (KBo 22.2 obv. 1-2 (OS narration, CTH 3.1A), ed. Otten 1973: 6-7).
- (8) <sup>9</sup> AMA DUMU.NITA *taškupait nu=ššan* GAM AN-za <sup>d</sup>U-aš *aušta e-ni=ma=ya* *kuit*  
 The mother of the baby boy cried out (after the birth of her child), and the Stormgod looked down from heaven: “What is that (*eni*)!?” (KUB 44.4+ rev. 9 (MH/NS birth ritual, CTH 767), ed. Beckman 1983: 176).

First of all, *eni* refers to something which was not talked about before. Therefore it cannot be anaphoric. Secondly, it refers to an event that occurred in the world surrounding the Stormgod, which makes *eni* conclusively deictic. The neuter *eni* is therefore a true demonstrative. Since the distance between Stormgod in heaven and mother on earth is maximally large, *eni* should be the distal member of the demonstrative system. From the cognitive point of view, it is very unlikely that the Stormgod somehow associates the crying with himself, so also in a person-based system *eni* refers to the Other.

A last example which shows that *asi* cannot be an anaphoric “the aforementioned”, but has to be a distal demonstrative is:

- (9) <sup>72</sup> *mānn=as=du=za* LUGAL-uš *kuedaniki ANA [ZAG-]i parā* <sup>73</sup> *ūijazi it ḫa=mu a-ši ZAG ija z[i]k=ma pā[iš]* ...  
 And if the king sends you forth to some [border (country)] (saying): ‘Go make me that (*asi*, acc.!) border (country)’, and y[o]u g[o], ....., (KBo 4.14 iii 72-73 (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 123), ed. Van den Hout 1989: 297).

for a functional description of OS *asi*, I will not include this possible attestation of *edi* in the OS paradigm for the obvious reason that my interpretation of §§ 55 and 56 is highly speculative.

<sup>25</sup> For *ḫalkuan* as ‘gang’, see Hoffner 1980: 290 + n. 27.

Again, the border country is clearly distal, at the fringes of the Hittite empire, and additionally, it is not yet in the sphere of influence of the Hittite king.

### 3.2 The recognitional use of *aši*

The second type of use of demonstratives is called *Recognitional*. Recognitionally used demonstratives introduce elements into the discourse which are familiar to both Speaker and Addressee but which are not present in the speech situation. Their referents are also sometimes called 'Hearer old, Discourse new'. An example is

- (10) I couldn't sleep last night. **That** dog kept me awake (Gundel et al. 1993: 278).

One can only use this construction if 'that dog' is already familiar to the Addressee. Summarizing Diessel (1999: 105f.), recognitional demonstratives are only used adnominally, they are the first mention of a referent (in this they are similar to situationally used demonstratives)<sup>26</sup>, the entities they refer to are never present or visible, and recognitional demonstratives refer to nouns that encode private information. An extra feature which is not necessary but still often occurs, is that the recognitional noun phrase is regularly accompanied by a modifier or relative clause that helps the Addressee to correctly identify the intended referent. Finally, recognitional demonstratives are usually 3<sup>rd</sup> person or distal.<sup>27</sup>

The features just described facilitate the identification of recognitionally used *aši*. Many examples occur in vows and oracle texts, which can be explained by the fact that the information contained in the noun has to be private knowledge, only known to the Addressee and Speaker. The vows and oracles always deal with information that is known to the Addressee, i.e., a deity, while not being part of the general or cultural knowledge of the Hittites:

<sup>26</sup> However, Himmelmann 1996: 230, 236 states that recognitional demonstratives are not always a first mention. In those cases the demonstrative serves to remind the Addressee of a preceding episode. This same use is also noted by Gundel et al. 1993: 301-302 who use the term 'reminder *that*'. The demonstrative adnominal prompts the Addressee to search his/her long-term memory for a mental representation of an entity that was mentioned some time ago.

<sup>27</sup> Also non-distal terms can be used as a recognitional demonstrative, as Himmelmann 1997: 71 observes. There is an example of recognitionally used *apa-* (ex. (15) below), associating the referent of the demonstrative noun phrase with the Addressee.

- (11) § 48 *u-ni-uš-za-kan kuēš ù.MEŠ HUL-luš uškizzi* ISKIM.HI.A-*ja-za arpuanta* <sup>49</sup> *kikištari* ...  
As for those (*unius*) evil dreams which he keeps seeing and the negative premonitions that keep occurring, ... (KUB 5.1 rev. iii 48-49 (lateNH oracle, Tudhaliya IV<sup>28</sup>, CTH 561), ed. Ünal 1974: 72-73).

The text is well preserved. The evil dreams have not been mentioned before, so the acc.pl.c. *unius* is a clear first mention.

There are two middle script oracles containing the recognitionally used *aši*. The first example (12) belongs to a well preserved document, so it is clear that the affair of the city Isgazzuwa is first mention. The second oracle (13) is only partly preserved, but still the other characteristics of recognitionally used demonstratives are present.

- (12) § 7 *i-ni šA URU Isgazzuwa uttar mahhan memir nu* <sup>d</sup>UTU-*ši ukila* <sup>8</sup> *paimi* ...  
When they have reported that (*ini*) affair of (the city) Isgazzuwa, shall I, My Majesty, go myself? (KBo 16.97 + KBo 8.55 rev. 7 (MH/MS oracle, CTH 571), ed. Schuol 1994: 104, 108).
- (13) § 15 *n-uš<sup>29</sup> u-ni KASKAL-an-ma kuin paizzi nu* DINGIR-LUM *apija[<sup>30</sup> ja?]* <sup>16</sup> *idālu uškiši*  
As for that (*uni*) road which he shall travel, do you, O god, see evil there [too?].<sup>30</sup> (KUB 50.1 ii 15-16 (MH/MS oracle, CTH 573)).

So, in original Middle Hittite the form *ini* and probably also *uni* function as Recognitional demonstratives, showing that at least these two forms are demonstratives in Middle Hittite. In both cases the referents of *ini* and *uni* are connected with a third person, different from both Speaker and Addressee.

Finally I shall present two more or less similar examples from the time of Hattusili III, one with *eni*, the other with *apūn*.

- (14) § 17 ù-TUM MUNUS.LUGAL *zašhija-<sup>31</sup> ya-mu kuiški memiškizzi* <sup>18</sup> ANA <sup>d</sup>NIN.GAL-*ya-za-kan kišan maldi mān-ya* ANA <sup>d</sup>UTU-*ši* <sup>19</sup> *e-ni izi šA GİR.MEŠ-ŠU nuntaraš* SIG<sub>5</sub>-*ri* ...

<sup>28</sup> For the dating on Tudhaliya IV see Orlamünde 2001: 511ff.

<sup>29</sup> Is *nu-uš* a mistake for *na-aš*?

<sup>30</sup> Contra CHD P 25 'Do you, O god, see them as an evil on the aforementioned road which he will travel?'



A dream of the Queen. “Someone tells me in a dream: “Make Ningal the following vow: “If that (*eni*) burning of My Majesty’s feet (lit: that fire of his feet for My Majesty) will subside soon, ...” (KUB 15.3 i 17-19 (NH vow, Hattusili III, CTH 584), ed. De Roos 1984: 198, 337).

It is not very likely that the physical troubles of the Hittite king in all its details, described in the second embedded Reported Speech, are part of the general and cultural knowledge of the Hittites. Instead, it is private knowledge, shared by the Speaker of “If that burning ...”, the queen, and the Addressee, the deity Ningal.

However, also the demonstrative *apā-* may be used recognitionally (see ex. (15) below).<sup>31</sup> The difference between Recognitional *aši* and Recognitional *apā-* lies in the fact that both demonstratives refer to different domains: *aši* refers to the domain of the Other, that is, everything that is outside the domain of both Speaker and Addressee (also in the exx. (11) to (14) *ini/eni, uni* and *uniuš* are connected with the Other), whereas *apā-* refers to the domain of the Addressee.

- (15) § 7 [Ü-TUM MUNUS.LUGA]L INIM <sup>d</sup>Gurwašu=kan kuḫapi [anda ..... ]<sup>8</sup>  
 [<sup>d</sup>Gu]rwašu=kan GIM-an ŠA Ü-TI <sup>9</sup> [AN]A MUNUS.LUGAL IQBI a-pu-u-  
 un=ua kuin<sup>10</sup> ŠA <sup>10</sup>MUDI=KA INIM-an ZI-za ḫarti<sup>11</sup> nu=uar=aš TI-anza  
 1 ME MU.KAM.HI.A=ja=ua=šši<sup>12</sup> piḫhi MUNUS.LUGAL=ma=za=kan ŠA  
 Ü-TI kišan IKRUB<sup>13</sup> mān=ua=mu apēniššuan ijaši<sup>14</sup> nu=ua LUGAL  
 MUDI=YA TI-anza ...

[Dream of the Queen]: When the affair of Gurwasu [...], after [Gu]rwasu had said [to] the Queen in a dream: “As for that (*apun*) situation of your husband which has your attention, he shall live and I shall give him a 100 years”, the Queen promised as follows in a dream: “If you do like *that*, and the King, my husband shall live, ... (KUB 15.1 iii 7'-13' (NH vow, Hattusili III, CTH 584), ed. De Roos 1984: 186, 328-329).

<sup>31</sup> The literature on recognitional demonstratives does not mention the possibility that a language might use two (or more) demonstratives to express the Discourse New, Hearer Old distinction. The reason is probably that the classification of demonstrative use described here is rather new. Both Himmelmann and Diessel had to deal with grammars which did not discuss the demonstratives from the Recognitional point of view.

Here the Addressee is not the deity but the queen herself. The Speaker is Gurwasu who uses *apā-* in the context of an affair which belongs to the domain of the Addressee, the queen. In ex. (14) on the other hand the Speaker instructs the queen to address the deity. In this address she should, and does, use the distancing *aši*, firstly because the feet of the king do not belong to the domain of the Addressee, the deity, and secondly because the queen certainly would not like to associate the pain of her husband with herself.

### 3.3 The Discourse deictic use of *aši*

With the *Discourse Deictic* use of demonstratives we enter the field of reference to *linguistic* entities. Demonstratives can be used to introduce the contents of a clause or stretch of discourse into the discourse as an independent entity. They share the requirement of first mention with recognitionally used demonstratives. See for example (Diessel 1999: 102):

- (16) A: ‘I’ve heard you will move to Hawaii?’  
 B: ‘Who told you that?’

B comments on the contents of the clause itself, and does not refer to one of the entities in the clause, i.e. the ‘I’, ‘you’ or ‘Hawaii’.

In Hittite reference to contents of a clause or stretch of discourse can only be done by means of the neuter *eni* or by *eni/aši* with *uttar, memiya(n)-* or INIM. Since discourse deixis is quite straightforward I will only exemplify this use by means of one example<sup>32</sup>.

- (17) § 34 *maḫḫan=ma* <sup>d</sup>UTU-ši *u-ni memian* AŠME nu <sup>d</sup>UTU-ši <sup>m</sup>piš.TUR-an <sup>35</sup>  
 ŪL *kuitki* HUL-uanni *šanḫun n=an piran parā* [ŪL *kuitki*]<sup>36</sup> HUL-ahḫun  
 nu *kiššan* AQBI *paimi=ua uni memian* [EGIR-pa *anda*]<sup>37</sup> *tittanumi nu*  
*šarā tijanun nu kēdani memi[jani* EGIR-pa]<sup>38</sup> *anda tittanumanzi pāun*  
 But when I, My Majesty, heard about that (*uni*) affair, I, My Majesty, did not seek evil against Mashuiluwa at all. I did [not] act evilly [at all] towards him. I spoke in this way: “I shall go set that affair [right again].” I arose and went to settle this affair. (KUB 6.41 i 34-38 (NH treaty, Mursili II, CTH 68), ed. Friedrich 1926: 110-111).

In the preceding paragraph of this treaty between Mursili and Kupanta-Kurunta it is described how Mashuiluwa started to alienate the people of

<sup>32</sup> Another reason is that there are not many examples of discourse deictic *aši* in complete contexts.

Pitassa and even some Hittite subjects from the Hittite empire, trying to engage into fight. This series of events is nominalized for the first time in i 34 by means of *uni memian*. The noun phrase *uni memian* is therefore truly Discourse Deictic, referring backwards (compare with Recognitionally used *ini uttar* in ex. (12)).

### 3.4 The Tracking (anaphoric) use of *aši*

And finally there is the Tracking or Anaphoric use. This time the demonstrative refers to an entity which is already part of the discourse. Fox 1987 found for English that lexical noun phrases referring to entities that had just been mentioned demarcate rhetorical units. Apothéloz 1995: 291ff. noticed the same for the French demonstrative description (i.e., demonstrative plus noun). Major discourse boundaries for example occur when the narration moves from a main discourse unit (foreground unit) to an embedded unit (background unit) and vice versa. This can be illustrated by means of Latin (Bolkestein & Van de Grift 1994: 292, ex. 8b):

- (18) *Eidem Alexandro et equi magna raritas contingit. Bucephalan eum vocaverunt sive ab ... sive ab ... XVI talentis ferunt ex Philonici Pharsalii grege emptum etiam tum puero capto eius decore. Neminem hic alium quam Alexandrum regio instructus ornatu recepit in sedem* (Plin. Nat. 8.154)

Alexander also had the good fortune to own a great rarity in horseflesh. — They called the animal Bucephalas, either because of ... or because of ... It is said that he was bought for 16 talents from the herd of Philonicus of Pharsalus, while Alexander was still a boy, as he was taken by his beauty. — This horse (*hic*), when adorned with the royal saddle would not allow itself to be mounted by anybody except Alexander.

As Bolkestein & Van de Grift explain, the ‘great rarity in horseflesh’ is not constituted by the horse’s name, but by its refusal to accept anyone else but Alexander in the saddle. The name giving is a subsidiary passage, after which the clause with *hic* returns to the initial sentence (o.c. 292). A similar example in Hittite with a shorter digression is:

- (19) <sup>m</sup>Hūtupianzan<sup>ma</sup> <sup>19</sup>DUMU.LUGAL DUMU <sup>m</sup>Zidā GAL <sup>10</sup>MEŠEDI — <sup>m</sup>Zidāš kuiš <sup>20</sup>ANA ABI<sup>YA</sup> ŠEŠ<sup>ŠU</sup> ēšta — nu ABU<sup>YA</sup> <sup>21</sup>u-ni <sup>m</sup>Hutupijanzan DUMU <sup>m</sup>Zidā GAL <sup>10</sup>MEŠEDI INA KUR <sup>URU</sup>Palā <sup>22</sup>uatarnahta  
Now, Hutupianza (acc.), Prince, son of Zida, the Head of the Bodyguard — Zida who was a brother of my father —, that (*uni*) Hutupianza, son of Zida, the Head of the Bodyguard, my father

summoned to Pala. (KBo 5.8 ii 18-21 (NH Annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 152-153).

The demarcating use is also found at the beginning of a digression:

- (20) <sup>39</sup>[nu <sup>4</sup>UTU-ŠI (IN)]<sub>A</sub> <sup>HUR.SAG</sup>Arinnanda pāun — a-ši<sup>ma</sup> [(<sup>HUR.SA</sup>)<sup>c</sup> Ari-(nnanda)š mekkī] <sup>40</sup>[(n)]akkiš aruni<sup>ja</sup> aš<sup>kan</sup> parranda pānza na[(mma<sup>aš</sup> mekki parkuš)] uarhuiš<sup>aš</sup> <sup>41</sup>namma<sup>aš</sup> <sup>NA</sup>pērunanza nu<sup>kan</sup> <sup>IŠTU</sup> ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ š[(arā pennuma)nzi UL DÜ-ri — <sup>42</sup>NAM.RA.MEŠ<sup>ma</sup> an pankuš harta ERIN.MEŠ<sup>ja</sup> kan pank[(uš šer ēšta)] I [My Majesty] went to mount Arinnanda. — Now, that (*aši*) mount Arinnanda is [very] steep and it goes down into the sea. Further, it is very high, it is bush-grown. Moreover, it is rocky, (so) it is not possible to drive up (to it) with horses. — Now, the refugees all held it and the soldiers all were on top (of it). (KUB 14.15 iii 39-42 (NH Annals, Mursili II, CTH 61 II), ed. Götze 1933: 54-55).

Discourse units are not necessarily embedded; they may also be arranged linearly. Belonging to this type is the only example of tracking *aši* in copied Old Hittite<sup>33</sup>, in the Puhanu-Chronicle:

- (21) <sup>UMMA</sup>ŠU<sup>MA</sup> <sup>17</sup>[o-o-] mān lahheškinun nu<sup>nnaš</sup> <sup>HUR.SAG</sup>aš nakkiēt kāš<sup>a</sup> GUD.M[AH] <sup>18</sup>[dašš]uš (?) ēšta mān<sup>aš</sup> uēt nu <sup>u-ni</sup> <sup>HUR.SAG</sup>an karapta š<sup>an</sup> ašta <sup>19</sup>[edi n]ā(?)eš arunan<sup>a</sup> tarhuen nu karauar<sup>šet</sup> apēda lipšan §  
Thus said he: When I roamed/fought the ... [...], the mountain was an obstacle for us. This bull however was [stron]g. When he came, he lifted that (*uni*) mountain, and he [tu]rned it [away], so that we conquered the sea. Because of *that* his horn is chipped off (?). (KBo 3.41 + KUB 31.4 obv. 16'-19' (OH/NS Puhanu Chronicle, CTH 16), ed. Soysal 1987: 175).

The mountain is mentioned for the first time in obv. 17'. It is followed by a new unit, indicated by the particle *-a*<sup>34</sup>, attached to *kāš* “this”, which

<sup>33</sup> There are no tracking demonstratives attested for Middle Hittite.

<sup>34</sup> See Rieken 2000 for a discussion of form and function of *-a* and its variant *-ma*, with literature.

introduces the bull as the main discourse topic<sup>35</sup>. The next reference to the mountain in this new unit is done by means of a demonstrative noun phrase.

#### 4. The demonstrative *aši* as the third term in a person-based system

In section 3.1 some of the examples of the deictic demonstrative *aši* were clearly associated with large distance and third person: in (8) and (9) *aši* does not simply refer to something at a remote distance from Speaker and Addressee, but it also carries the connotation of not belonging to the domain of the Speaker and Addressee. In each case the contents of the clause indicate that the referent of *aši* is not Speaker's responsibility or possession (although he wishes it to be his in (9)). That not distance but person orientation is basic becomes clear when *aši* refers to something in the vicinity of the Speaker. A copied Old Hittite text illustrating how *aši* may be used to indicate that some entity is near but not associated with the Speaker is found in the next ritual:

- (22) §<sup>35</sup> *ni-ya LUGAL-yaš araš-miš zik nu-ya-mu i-ni GIŠ-ru*<sup>36</sup> *manijaḥ n-at-kan kar(a)šmi* <sup>37</sup>*tezzi kar(a)šš-at-kan kar(a)š* <sup>38</sup>*utū-ušš-a-at-ta* <sup>38</sup>*im-tašš a manijaḥḥir* §  
 “Are you not my, the king's friend? Allocate those<sup>36</sup> (*ini*) trees<sup>37</sup> to me and I shall fell them.” The Throne answers the king: “Fell them, fell! Both the Sungod and the Stormgod have allocated them you!” (KUB 29.1 i 35-38 (OH/NS Foundation ritual, CTH 414), ed. Kellerman 1980: 12, 26).

HW<sup>2</sup> (E p. 39a) assumes that *ini* refers to the trees that were mentioned before: ‘jenes (zuvor erwähnte) Holz’. Although the trees indeed occur in the preceding lines, they are not mentioned before in the dialogue with the Throne. The situation is similar to ex. (4), where “this finger” in the Reported Speech cannot be interpreted as “this aforementioned finger”.

<sup>35</sup> The lines preceding our example describe how the narrator of this text asks someone why a certain bull has damaged horns. The bull therefore is the discourse topic of the answer, but before he is introduced, the person addressed by the narrator gives some background information on the reason why he needs the assistance of the bull.

<sup>36</sup> The demonstrative *ini* has been translated by ‘this’ or ‘that’. The proximal version occurs for example in CHD L-N p. 165; Goetze (1955: 357) translated ‘that tree’.

<sup>37</sup> Kellerman 1980: 26 ‘cet arbre’. With CHD L-N p. 165 I consider *ini taru* as plural since it refers to trees that are going to be felled for the roof of a building.

The third-person reference of *aši* is also apparent in the discourse deictic ex. (17). The king uses the acc.sg.c. *uni* in i 34 to indicate that he heard about some affair connected with the Other. Then he decides in the Reported Speech in i 36 to become actively involved in ‘that affair’. After this decision, the king uses *kēdani* in i 37 to express his association with the problems which he now will try to solve. The first person demonstrative *kā-* is used to associate the Speaker with something which was originally associated with the Other. This associating use of *kā-* is paralleled by the disassociating use of *aši* (see section 5).

In the tracking ex. (19) Hutupianza is accompanied by the 3<sup>rd</sup> person demonstrative *uni*. At this particular moment in the narration Hutupianza is still under the command of Mursili's father. Thus, Hutupianza belongs to the domain of the Other and not to Mursili. In exx. (20) and (21) *aši* and *uni* refer to the Other.

These results should be compared with the demonstratives *kā-* “this” and *apā-* “that” in tracking use:

- (23) *nu-za kē* KUR.KUR.MEŠ *dannatta* <sup>67</sup>*istu ni-te-ya* EGIR-*pa ašešanunun*  
<sup>68</sup>*n-at* EGIR-*pa* <sup>69</sup>*Ḥattušan ijanun*  
 § <sup>69</sup>*GIM-an-ma uit š[(eš-y)]A kuḫapi* INA KUR *Mizri pait* <sup>70</sup>*nu-za*  
 KUR.KUR.MEŠ *kue ke-e* EGIR-*pa ašešanu[(nu)]n nu* KARAŠ ANŠE.  
 KUR.R[(A.MEŠ)] <sup>71</sup>*kēl šA* KUR-TI ANA ŠEŠ-*ya laḫḫi* INA KUR *Mizri* <sup>72</sup>*GAM-*  
*an pēḫutenun*  
 I resettled these empty countries on my own and made them Hittite again.  
 § But when it happened that my brother went at a certain moment to Egypt, as for these countries (KUR.KUR.MEŠ *kue kē*) that I had resettled, I led the army and the horses of these countries (actually sg.!) down to my brother on campaign in Egypt. (KUB 1.1 ii 66-72 (NH Ego-document, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 16-17).

At first sight it is surprising to find that in this document each reference to ‘these countries’ is done with *kā-*: besides our lines one finds in ii 55-56 ‘He let me to these countries. These unpopulated countries he gave to me in control: ...’, ii 63 ‘These unpopulated countries which my brother had placed in my hand, ...’ and finally ii 70 ‘as for these countries that I had resettled’. Clearly Hattusili stresses every time his control over these countries by using the Speaker-demonstrative *kā-*. The only time that these countries are *not* in his control he uses a noun phrase without demonstrative adnominal:

- (24) [(KUR.KUR.MEŠ-ja ku dannatta amm)]uk EGIR-pa<sup>58</sup> [(ašešanunun nu=mu=kan apē=ja hūmanda)] arḫa dāš  
 Also the unpopulated countries that I had resettled, all of them *too* he took away from me! (KUB 1.1 iii 57-58 (NH Ego-document, Hattusili III, CTH 81), ed. Otten 1981: 20-21).

Hattusili's nephew Urhi-Tessub, Great-King by now, has decided to take all his uncle's lordships away from him, even the ones Hattusili had populated himself. Not being under his command anymore, the countries cannot be referred to by means of *kā-*.

The same can be observed with the Addressee oriented demonstrative *apā-*:

- (25) §<sup>3</sup> [š]<sub>A</sub> <sup>u</sup>KUR kuit uttar<sup>4</sup> ḫatrāeš <sup>u</sup>KUR-za=kan<sup>5</sup> mahḫan<sup>uru</sup> Kāšašan<sup>6</sup>  
<sup>uru</sup>Tahazzimunann=a<sup>7</sup> zikizzi n=at AŠME  
 §<sup>8</sup> n=ašta a-pa-a-aš <sup>u</sup>KUR kuḫapi<sup>9</sup> naiškittari<sup>10</sup> nu=mu ḫatreški §  
 About the affair of the enemy that you write about, how the enemy keeps laying (his hand on) Kasasa and Tahazzimuna, I have taken notice of it.  
 § Wherever that (apāš) enemy turns away to, write (it) to me. (HKM 27 obv. 3-10 (MH/MS letter, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 166-167).

“That enemy” refers back across a paragraph line to <sup>u</sup>KUR “the enemy” in obv. 4. The enemy is in the domain of Himuili, the governor of the district, the Addressee of the letter, and is not considered to be part of the domain of the king alone or of both the king and Himuili. It is Himuili's responsibility to track the movements of the enemy. In the next example we see again a reference across a paragraph line, but this time the writer did not feel the need to add a demonstrative:

- (26) §<sup>15</sup> man=kan <sup>u</sup>UTU=ŠI BELI=YA BELU<sup>16</sup> kuinki parā naitti<sup>17</sup> man=a  
 KUR-i <sup>u</sup>KUR ūl dammišḫaizzi §  
 § (If) you, My Majesty, my Lord, would send over some general, the enemy (<sup>u</sup>KUR) would not damage the country. (HKM 46 rev. 15-17 (MH/MS letter, CTH 199), ed. Alp 1991: 200-201).

In this example no demonstrative is used, although reference is made across a paragraph boundary. The letter is written by one Adadbeli to the king. In the preceding paragraph Adadbeli reports the movement of the enemy towards the area he is stationed in at the moment, while the king is presumably in Maṣat. The enemy is only in Adadbeli's own area. Therefore, the Addressee oriented *apā-* is excluded, and the only other

possibility is that the sender wants to stress that the enemy is in his own country by means of *kā-*. But this is not likely since the sender tries to share the responsibility with the king by asking him to send a general, excluding Speaker oriented *kā-*.

#### 5. Negative emotional or disassociative use.

To summarize: in all four demonstrative contexts one can set up the following person-based system for Hittite<sup>38</sup>:

- (27) *kā-* is associated with the Speaker.  
*apā-* is associated with the Addressee.  
*ašī* is associated with the Other.

But one can go one step further. The situational 3<sup>rd</sup> person demonstrative does not always refer to an entity either at some distance from the deictic center or to the domain of the Other. Instead, sometimes it clearly refers to an entity in association with the Speaker. For the explanation of this conflicting use of *ašī* we have to turn to *Empathetic Deixis*. Levinson 1983: 81 recalls that English *that* may shift to *this* to show empathy, and that *this* may shift to *that* to show emotional distance<sup>39</sup>.

<sup>38</sup> The projection of the person-based contrasts on non-situational contexts is, as far as I am aware of, not noted in other studies on demonstratives. Lyons 1999: 113-114 only mentions the transferal of *distal* contrasts to anaphoric contexts in person-based systems. This means that the first person demonstrative refers to a recently mentioned referent and a non-first person demonstrative to a referent mentioned longer ago. One can often translate these demonstratives as ‘the former ... the latter’. However, Hittite does not belong to the languages with a person-based system with such an anaphoric use of demonstratives.

Besides the transferal of *distal* contrasts to anaphoric contexts, it also often happens that the proximal / first person demonstrative may refer anaphorically to something mentioned by the Speaker, the medial / second person demonstrative to something mentioned by the Addressee, and the *distal* / third person demonstrative to something mentioned by the Other (Lyons 1999: 113-114). Since there are hardly any dialogues with demonstratives preserved in Hittite, this latter use cannot be investigated.

<sup>39</sup> See Rong Chen 1990: 148-151 for a discussion of distancing-*that*, sympathy-*that* and camaraderie-*that* and -*this*. The empathetic use of demonstratives has not received much attention. Rauh 1983: 40-41 considers the transferal of deictic contrasts to the emotional level even problematic given the fact that for example *that* may be used both negatively and positively. However, the Hittite material shows clearly that demonstratives that are used as referent tracking devices in spoken or written discourse have their own typical empathetic use.

The term ‘emotional distance’ however is too closely connected with negative emotions. The next example is preceded by a description of how Kumarbi happily plays with his child. Therefore *aši* does not carry a negative emotional connotation.

- (28) <sup>27</sup> *nu-za PANI ZI-šU memiškiuṣan [dāiš kued]ani-ṣar-an*<sup>28</sup> *peḥḥi a-ši DUMU-an*  
 He [started] to talk in himself: “To [wh]om shall I give him, that (*aši*, acc.) son?” (KUB 17.7+ iii 27-28’ (NH myth, CTH 345), ed. Güterbock 1951: 152).

Instead, Kumarbi is pondering on how to divorce and thus distance the child from himself. The use of *aši* indicates a kind of cognitive distance, for which a better term might be *disassociation*. The disassociative use includes both the negative emotional attitude and a general cognitive distancing effect. However, given the fact that the Hittite demonstrative system consists of at least three terms, the disassociative use more specifically indicates that the Speaker wants to express that the referent of the noun should neither belong to the Speaker nor to the Addressee.

The disassociative use of Situational *aši* is already attested in two original Middle Hittite texts:

- (29) § <sup>46</sup> [*našma*]<sup>7</sup>-ššan<sup>40</sup> *kuiš kūruri parā galankanza nu kiššan*<sup>47</sup> [*imma ḫezzi man-ṣa i-ni*]<sup>41</sup> *kūrur arḫa ḫar(a)kzi nu kiššan*<sup>48</sup> [(*imma ḫ*)]*ezzi man ṣa i-ni [kūrur] .p-[ar(ā)]*<sup>49</sup> [(*a*)]*lpuēšzi [nu] apūn kē* NIŠ DINGIR .MEŠ *appandu*  
 [Or] (if) someone is completely fed up with war and [s]peaks as follows: “Would but that (*ini*) war utterly disappear!”, and speaks as follows: “Would but that (*ini*) [war] become .....”, (then) let these oaths of the gods grab *that* one, ... (KBo 16.24+25 i 46’-49’ with duplicate KBo 16.102 1’-5’ (MH/MS Instruction, CTH 251), ed. Rizzi-Mellini 1979: 522-523).

The soldier is probably on the battlefield, so he is actually in the midst of the war and could therefore also have said: ‘Would but this war (*ki kurur*) utterly disappear!’. By using the distal deictic *aši* however, he emphasizes his disgust and emotional distance from the war he is partaking in.

<sup>40</sup> Rizzi-Mellini (1979: 522f.) restores *še-er*]-*aš-ša-an*.

<sup>41</sup> Rizzi-Mellini l.c. reads here and in i 48’ *e-ni* instead of *i-ni*, although she notes that the lecture *i-ni* is also possible (o.c. 546). The photo however shows a clear *i-ni* in both cases (collated in Chicago).

The same applies to the other original Middle Hittite text, where an ill-willed ritual practitioner utters a curse inside a temple. Instead of using the more neutral *kēdani* DINGIR-LIM-*aš parni* the Speaker prefers the disassociating *edani*:

- (30) <sup>25</sup> *mān-ṣa ANA PA[NI] DINGIR-LIM kuiški* EN.SISKUR *idā[ā]uanni memian ḫarzi paiddu-ṣa-kan e-da-ni*<sup>26</sup> DINGIR-LIM-*aš parni an[d]an*<sup>42</sup> *ḫurtaiš ling[ā]iṣ paprātarr-ṣa ḫāšūṣājaš iṣar kišaru*<sup>27</sup> *nu-ṣar-at-ṣa ḫāšū[ṣa]iṣ<sup>5AR</sup> iṣar .mṣ.ān ešdu nu-ṣar-at-ṣa namma iṣatnuṣan*<sup>28</sup> *ḫāšūṣāi<sup>5AR</sup> [pu]ššūṣanz[i]*<sup>43</sup> *lḫe kuiški tar(a)ḫzi*  
 “If some ritual practitioner has spoken with evil intent befo[re] the deity: “Let curse, perjury and uncleanness inside that (*edani*) house of the deity become like soap-wort. Let it be luxuriant like soap-wort. Let no one be able to [crus]h (?) the luxurious soap-wort! (...)” (...)” (KUB 29.7 + KBo 21.41 rev. 25-28 (MH/MS ritual, CTH 480), ed. Lebrun 1976: 123, 130).

An Old Hittite disassociative use of Recognitional<sup>44</sup> acc.sg.c. *uni*<sup>45</sup> is attested in the copied Puhanu Chronicle.

- (31) § <sup>10</sup> [(URU A)]*rinna*<sup>ki</sup> *kuin pēḫutetten u-ni ḫurtalim-ṣan n[atta-ṣa]*  
<sup>11</sup> [(ANŠE-ī)]*š-ṣmiš nu-šše-ššan eškahḫa nu amruk pēḫutette[n]* §  
 The one you conducted to Arinna, that (*uni*) contester of mine, (is) [he] n[ot] my donkey? I shall sit on him!<sup>46</sup> You shall lead me (there instead)! (KBo 3.41 + KUB 31.4 obv. 10’-11’ (OH/NS Narration, Hattusili I, CTH 16), ed. Steiner 2002: 812).

The enemy belongs to the domain of the Speaker: he is *his* contester. So why not use *kā*- “this”? As the next example shows, it is very well possible to use *kā*- in connection with an enemy:

<sup>42</sup> Lebrun 1976: 123 transliterates *an[-da]* DINGIR instead of *an-d[a]-an*.

<sup>43</sup> Lebrun 1976: 123 transliterates [ ]-*šū-ṣa-an-z[i]* instead of [ ]-*u]š-šū-ṣa-an-z[i]*.

<sup>44</sup> I classify this example as recognitional because 1) the demonstrative is adnominal, 2) it is a first mention to the referent, 3) the enemy is not present, and 4) it is connected with a relative clause. Whether or not the leading of an opponent to Arinna is shared, private knowledge cannot be deduced from the text.

<sup>45</sup> It is possible that there is a second Recognitional *uni* in CTH 16: KBo 3.40 6’ § <sup>6</sup> [(*u-ni*)] *ḫUR.SAG-an kuin karšikanzi nu natta* SIG<sub>5</sub>-[*in*? ...

<sup>46</sup> Cf. CHD Š, p. 133 (with references) who translate ‘Is he not my donkey on whom (lit. on him) I regularly sit down?’

- (32) <sup>22</sup>  $\mu$ KUR=ja=mu *kuiš ka-a-aš* LUGAL K[UR AŠŠUR GUB-a]nza  
 n=aš=mu=kan <sup>23</sup> mānŠA KUR.URU uizzi nu=tt[a ħink]an ZAG-aš ešdu  
 And concerning this (*kāš*) enemy, the king of [Assur who is rising]  
 up against me, if he comes into my country, let [dea]th be your  
 end. (KBo 4.14 ii 22-23 (lateNH treaty, Tudhaliya IV, CTH 123), ed.  
 Van den Hout 1989: 284-285).

The difference between the two is that in (31) the Speaker plans to dissociate himself from his contesteer forever. In (32) on the other hand, the king states that the Addressee of the treaty should stop the enemy from entering Hittite territory without the further implication of removing the king of Assur from the scene.

To summarize, even if an entity is in the presence of a Speaker and somehow associated with him, it is still possible to use *aši* in order to express the negative or disassociating emotional attitude of the Speaker towards the entity.

#### 6. A lexical list

The lexical list KBo 1.50 + KUB 3.99 containing the nom.sg.c. *ašiš* is generally not taken into account in the discussion of *aši*. Although the form itself might be “wertlos” (HW<sup>2</sup> 400a), we can now understand why the Hittites thought it fit as a translation of Akkadian *ullû*.

(33)	Sumerian <sup>47</sup>	Babylonian	Hittite	
18'	ne.re	<i>ul-lu[-u]</i>	<i>a-ši-iš</i>	“that one”
19'	ne.re.re	<i>an-nu[-u]</i>	<i>ka-a-aš</i>	“this one”

(KBo 1.50 + KUB 3.99 ii 18-19 (Erim-ĥuš, Lexical list, CTH 301), ed. Güterbock & Civil 1985: 121-122).

The Babylonian proximal demonstrative *annû* “dieser” (Von Soden 1969: 47, §45.2) is matched by *kā-*, which is not surprising since the demonstrative *kā-* “this” is the proximal/1<sup>st</sup> person member of the deictic system. However, if one assumes that the pronoun *aši* is an anaphoric pronoun “the aforementioned”, then the equation of *ašiš* with the distal demonstrative *ullû* “jener” (o.c., p. 46, § 45.1) cannot be explained. Güterbock 1985: 122 already translated *ašiš* as non-proximal “that one” (without commentary).

<sup>47</sup> The Sumerian forms *ne-re* and *ne-re-re* are mistakenly equated with *ullû* and *annû* respectively (Woods 2001: 215-216). The Hittites obviously followed the Babylonian sequence.

#### 7. The Paradigm of Old Hittite and Middle Hittite *aši*

One of the criticisms of HW<sup>2</sup> (see section 1) was that Laroche projected the paradigm of the 13<sup>th</sup> century onto the older language phases. In this section I will summarize the demonstrative function and semantics of each form, followed by the paradigms of Middle and Old Hittite *aši*. The method was described in section 2: if each of the forms occurs in the four demonstrative uses with 3<sup>rd</sup> person deixis, then one has to accept that these different forms belong to one paradigm. Of course, another important characteristic would be the complementary distribution of the forms in the paradigm. Given the low number of attestations in the older language phases however, that might be coincidental. I will therefore only rely on a functional analysis.

The footnotes below either list attestations that were not discussed in the main text of this article or refer to the examples in the footnotes.  $\emptyset$  means ‘not attested’.

#### The Middle Hittite paradigm

The first question to be answered is how the forms are distributed across the four demonstrative functions (Situational, Recognitional, Discourse Deictic and Tracking).

In original and copied Middle Hittite<sup>48</sup> two of the four demonstrative contexts are represented here as follows: *Situational* nom.sg.c. *aši* (fn. 49), nom.-acc.sg./pl.n. *ini* (29) and *eni* (8), dat.sg. *edani* (30), and the adverb of relative position *ediz* (= abl.) (5); *Recognitional* acc.sg.c. *uni* (13), and nom.-acc.sg.n. *ini* (12). Thus Middle Hittite *aši*, *uni*, *ini* and *ed-* (like the New Hittite forms) are all true demonstratives, and not anaphoric pronouns as Laroche (1979) assumed (see section 1).

Secondly, the semantic values of these forms are summarized as follows. The Situational *ediz* and *eni* refer to a location or an entity that is far removed from the Speaker (5 and 8). Situational *ini* (29) and *edani* (30) are connected with an entity in the presence of the Speaker, with a negative connotation. Recognitional *uni* (13) and *ini* (12) both refer to entities that are connected with the Other.

In short, Middle Hittite *uni*, *ini* and *ed-* are all non-Speaker oriented or remote demonstratives. Taken together, the paradigm can be set up as follows (for comparison the early New Hittite forms are listed in the second column).

<sup>48</sup> Texts from Suppiluliuma I are considered here (late) Middle Hittite.

	MH/MS	NH
nom.sg.c.	<i>a-ši</i> (1) <sup>49</sup>	<i>aši</i>
acc.sg.c.	<i>u-ni</i> (1)	<i>uni(n)</i>
nom.-acc.sg.n.	<i>i-ni</i> (7) <sup>50</sup>	<i>eni</i>
gen.sg.	∅	<i>uniyaš</i>
dat.sg.	<i>e-da-ni</i> (2) <sup>51</sup>	<i>edani</i>
abl.	<i>e-di-iz-za</i> (1) <sup>52</sup>	<i>ediz(za)</i>
Adverbs of		
Relative position	<i>e-di-iz</i> (1)	<i>ediz(za)</i>
Manner	<i>i-ni-iš-ša-an</i> (5) <sup>53</sup>	<i>eniššan</i>

To conclude, the New Hittite paradigm continues the Middle Hittite one, with a minor change: the forms *ini* / *iniššan* have been replaced by *eni* / *eniššan*. Plural Middle Hittite forms are not attested.

#### The Old Hittite paradigm

In original and copied Old Hittite three of the four demonstrative contexts are represented as follows: *Situational* nom.sg.c. *aši* in fn. 54, acc.sg.c. *uni* in fn. 56, nom.-acc.sg.n. *eni* in fn. 57, nom.-acc.pl.n. *ini* (22), and dat.sg. *edi* (6), with fn. 23 and 24; *Recognitional* acc.sg.c. *uni* (31); *Tracking* nom.-acc.sg.n. *eni* in fn. 57, acc.sg.c. *uni* (21), *Tracking* or *Situational* acc.sg.c. *aši* in fn. 55. Thus also Old Hittite *aši*, *uni*, *ini* and *ed-* are all true demonstratives.

The semantic values of these forms are summarized as follows. The *Situational aši-s* refer to an entity that is not present in the Speech situation or that is not (yet) part of the cognitive domain of the Speaker (fn. 54). *Recognitional* (ex. 31) and *Tracking uni* (ex. 21) both refer to entities that

<sup>49</sup> In KBo 19.44 rev. 4: *a-ši-ya antuqaḥḥaš ida[(luš)]* <sup>5</sup> [(*idalauu*)aḥzi “That (*aši*) evil man behaves badly”. ‘That man’ is a first mention in Reported Speech and therefore *Situational*.

<sup>50</sup> Besides the neuters mentioned in exx. (12) and (29), there are also KBo 19.44b: 8’ ] *i-ni-ya ijam[i]*; KBo 9.127 + KUB 36.41 i 32: *i-ni-ya ku.it*; KBo 12.89 iii 10’: *i-ni-ma-ya kuit*; KBo 29.183: 7’: *nu-za i-ni uzul*].

<sup>51</sup> Besides in ex. (30) also in KBo 22.129 obv. 6: *nu-za e-da-ni pe[di]*

<sup>52</sup> In KBo 24.85 i 9’, broken context.

<sup>53</sup> HKM 6 obv. 5, KBo 22.192 (+) 192a obv. 1 (2x), KBo 18.86 obv. 17’ and 29’.

are obstacles for the Speaker and are to be removed. *Situational ini* (ex. 22) is connected with entities in the presence of the Speaker but outside his control. For the distal and/or non-Speaker orientation of *ed-* see again ex. (6), with fn. 23 and 24.

One of the arguments of HW<sup>2</sup> against a unified paradigm in older Hittite was the existence of inflected *uni-* in copied Old Hittite (point (1) in fn. 6). Both Kammenhuber 1962: 377 and Laroche 1979: 150 read ‘*u-ni-iš-ša* [ in KUB 31.64 (+) 64a + KBo 3.55 ii 24’ (OH/NS). This is however far from certain. More likely given the, admittedly broken, context is a reading ‘*ki-iš-ša-a[n]*: the first sign (u) could be the lower ‘Winkelhaken’ of *ki*, and the lower part of *ni* could be the lower horizontal of *ki*. Collation should decide in favor of one or the other reading.

Another objection was that *edani* and the other obliqui of the defective Old Hittite pronoun *a-* “is; jener” were understood as obliqui to *eni* from the time of Mursili II (see HW<sup>2</sup> p. 38-9 sub *eni*). But as we have seen above, the 3<sup>rd</sup> person/distal forms *edani* and *ediz* are attested in Middle Hittite, and the dat.sg./locative adverb *edi* already in old script. In short, from a cognitive point of view Old Hittite *aši*, *uni*, *ini* and *ed-* are all non-Speaker oriented or remote demonstratives. The paradigm can now be set up as follows: in the first column I will present the OS attestations, in the second one the OH/NS attestations (OH/MS is not attested for the paradigm of *aši*), and in the last column I will present a reconstructed paradigm, based on a combination of the first two columns.

	attested OH		reconstructed OH
	OS	NS	
nom.sg.c.	∅	<i>a-ši</i> (5) <sup>54</sup>	<i>aši</i>

<sup>54</sup> Two situationally used *aši-s*, both in Reported Speech, are found in KUB 11.6 ii 11’: *a-ši-man-ya uru-aš [a]mmel ki[šari]* “I wish that city we[re] mine”, and in VBoT 58 obv. 16-17: <sup>16</sup> *apāš-a pait<sup>4</sup>m-ni tet ki kuit kiša[∅]* <sup>17</sup> *a-ši haḥhimaš atti šši anni šši tezzi* ... “Thereupon he however said to the Stormgod: “This (is) what happened. That Frost tells his father and mother ...”. In the latter example *aši* refers to an entity that is not present at the moment of speech. Furthermore, there are a few pragmatically unclear *aši-s* in KBo 3.28 obv. ii 21 *a-ši MUNUS.LUGAL URU Huruma* E.G.I.A. ēšta “That (*aši*) queen of Hurma was an eligible bride” and KBo 38.188 left col. 8’-9’ <sup>8</sup> [...-t]i? *ya GIG-an a-ši piddāizzi* <sup>9</sup> [...-t]ar *a-ši piddāizzi* “Let that one carry (away) the disease [from Hat]ti(?), let that one carry (away) the [...]...”.

	attested OH		reconstructed OH
	OS	NS	
acc.sg.c.	<i>a-ši</i> (1) <sup>55</sup>	<i>a-ši</i> (1), <i>u-ni</i> (5) <sup>56</sup>	<i>uni, aši</i>
nom.-acc.sg.n.	∅	<i>e-ni</i> (3) <sup>57</sup> , <i>i-e-ni</i> (1) <sup>58</sup>	<i>ini</i>
gen.sg.	∅	∅	∅
dat.-loc.sg.	∅	<i>e-di</i> (1)	<i>edi</i>
abl.	∅	∅	∅
nom.-acc.pl.n.	∅	<i>i-ni</i> (1)	<i>ini</i>
Adverbs of			
Relative position	<i>e-di</i> (5)	<i>e-di</i> (5), <i>i-di</i> (1) <sup>59</sup>	<i>edi, idi</i> (?)
Manner	<i>e-ne-iš-ša-an</i> (1) <sup>60</sup>		<i>eniššan</i>

The difference between the Middle Hittite and Old Hittite paradigms is that the old dative *edi* was replaced by *edani*, and that the same form functioning as the adverb of relative position was replaced by the ablative *ediz*.

I have not included the semi-independent form nom.pl.c. *e-* (HW<sup>2</sup> A 42) because in the few texts with enough context *e-* does not function like the rest of the paradigm of *aši*. Instead, it seems to behave more like the

<sup>55</sup> KBo 17.17 (+) KBo 30.30 obv. 6'-7': <sup>6</sup> [(DINGIR.MEŠ-nan <sup>4</sup>UTU-*i*)]<sup>r</sup> *kā*<sup>r</sup>šā DINGIR.MEŠ-aš *a-ši* p[(*eškim*i <sup>4</sup>UTU-šumman laba)]<sup>r</sup>[(nan)]<sup>r</sup> [(DINGIR.MEŠ-aš *a-ši* piškim*i*)]<sup>r</sup> *ānda(n)ššan* [(pi)škim*i* (ā(n)zaššišr)]<sup>r</sup> *1-anza*<sup>r</sup>ššī[(š *kā*šā)] "O Sun god amongst the gods, I hereby give that one to the gods, Our Sun Labarna. I shall give that one to the gods. [I shall] giv[e] his equal. Here (is) his [equal, his living (substitute)]!" (Goedegebuure 2002: 64, 70). The demonstrative is either Situational, pointing at the king in the presence of the ritual practitioner, or Tracking (the king is mentioned before).

<sup>56</sup> Besides the exx. (21), (31) and fn. 45 there are also KBo 3.20 rev. 6 ]*u* *u-ni* ERIN.MEŠ-an[ and KUB 43.75 obv. 21 *u-ni* *ūk* *harmi* "That one I shall hold", in reported speech and thus deictic, but with unclear reference.

<sup>57</sup> Thrice in KUB 43.75: obv. 14' (broken) and obv. 20 (bis): *e-ni* *annaššar* *kāriēt* *kuit* *šan* *e-ni* *dā*[*itta*(?)] "He concealed that (*eni*) pillar (?): That (*eni*) which [you have pl]aced on top (of it), (*that* must remain on top)".

<sup>58</sup> The isolated writing *i-e-ni* in KUB 1.16 ii 40 is a conflation of *eni* and *ini* (CHD P 346b). The New Hittite scribe wanted to replace the older form *ini* with the form *eni* of his own time.

<sup>59</sup> KBo 6.26 ii 5.

<sup>60</sup> IBoT 2.121 rev. 12': <sup>12</sup> *ta*škan *e-ne-iš-ša-an*.

independent anaphoric pronoun *apā-* (see further Goedegebuure 2003, section 4.6.4.2.).

The lack of plurals in Middle and Old Hittite does not mean that they did not exist. What they would have looked like remains a mystery.

## 8. Conclusion

In Hittite there exists a third deictic demonstrative, *aši*, based on a suppletive (?) paradigm. The forms of *aši* occurred in the four typical uses of demonstratives. Since these uses are also attested in Old and Middle Hittite, the deictic demonstrative *aši* is attested in the whole Hittite history. Contrary to Laroche 1979, *aši* has never been a true anaphoric pronoun in attested Hittite.

The deictic value of *aši* was established as 3<sup>rd</sup> person/distal, with a secondary use as a disassociative marker. Thus, it is connected with Old Hittite *āšma* (see Hoffner, this volume).

The question whether deictic *aši* is proto-Anatolian was not addressed here, but will be studied elsewhere. However, we have to assume that deictic *aši* existed at least in prehistoric Hittite, since the paradigm was already fully functional in Old Hittite.

Marie Baronlaan 15  
NL-1183 WX Amstelveen  
email: pgoedegebuure@hetnet.nl

Petra Goedegebuure

## Bibliography

- Alp, Sedat (1991). *Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Anderson, S.R. and Keenan, E.L. (1985). 'Deixis'. In T. Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 259-308.
- Apothéloz, D. (1995). *Rôle et fonctionnement de l'anaphore dans la dynamique textuelle*. Genève-Paris: Librairie Droz.
- Bader, F. (1981). 'Anaphoriques du type *nin* en hittite'. In: Yoël L. Arbeitman, Allan R. Bomhard (eds.), *Bono homini donum. Essays in historical linguistics in memory of J.A. Kerns* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 16,1), 31-45.
- Beckman, Gary (1983). *Hittite Birth Rituals*. (StBoT 29). Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- Bolkestein, A.M. & M. van de Grift (1994). 'Participant Tracking in Latin Discourse'. In József Herman (ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Latin*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 283-302.



- Bryce, Trevor (1998). *The Kingdom of the Hittites*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Diessel, Holger (1999). *Demonstratives. Form, Function, and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fox, Barbara A. (1987). *Discourse Structure and Anaphora. Written and Conversational English*. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 48). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Friedrich, J. (1926). *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, 1. Teil. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- (1930). *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*, 2. Teil. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- (1960). *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*, 1. Teil, Kurzgefaßte Grammatik. Dritte, unveränderte Auflage. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Friedrich, J., & A. Kammenhuber (1975ff.). *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (= HW<sup>2</sup>) Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Goedegebuure, Petra (2002). 'KBo 17.17+. Remarks on an Old Hittite Royal Substitution Ritual'. *JANER* 2, 61-75.
- (2003). *Reference, Deixis and Focus in Hittite. The Demonstratives ka- "this", apa- "that" and asi "yon"*. (Dissertation, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Amsterdam).
- Götze, A. (1933). *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft (1967<sup>2</sup>).
- Goetze, A. (1955). 'Ritual for the Erection of a New Palace'. In: James B. Pritchard (ed.). *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 357-358.
- Güterbock, Hans G. (1951). 'The Song of Ullikummi. Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth'. *JCS* 5, 136-161.
- Güterbock, Hans G. & Miguel Civil (1985). *The Series Erim-ḫuš in Boghazköy*. In: *MSL* 17.
- Güterbock, Hans G., Harry A. Hoffner & Theo P.J. van den Hout (1980ff.). *The Hittite Chicago Dictionary* (= CHD). Chicago: The Oriental Institute.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., Hedberg, Nancy & Zacharski, Ron (1993). 'Cognitive Status and the Form of Referring Expressions in Discourse'. *Language* 69, 274-307.
- Haspelmath, Martin (1993). *A Grammar of Lezgian*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hawkins, John David (2000). *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Berlin ; New York : De Gruyter.
- Himmelman, N. (1996). 'Demonstratives in Narrative Discourse: A

- Taxonomy of Universal Uses'. In: B.A. Fox (ed.) *Studies in Anaphora*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 205-254.
- (1997) *Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase. Zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Hoffmann, Inge (1984) *Der Erlaß Telipinus*. (THeth 11).
- Hoffner, Harry A. Jr. (1980). 'Histories and Historians of the Ancient Near East: the Hittites'. *Orientalia* 49, 283-332.
- (1997) *The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition*. (Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui, vol. 23). Leiden [etc.]: Brill
- Hout, Th.P.J. van den (1989). *Studien zum Spätjunghethitischen: Texte der Zeit Tudhaliyas IV. KBo IV 10+ (CTH 106)*. (Dissertation, Universiteit van Amsterdam), Amsterdam.
- (1994). 'Der Falke und das Kücken: der neue Pharao und der hethitische Prinz?' *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 84, 60-88.
- (1997). 'The Proclamation of Telipinu'. In: William W. Hallo & K. Lawson Younger, Jr. (eds.) *The Context of Scripture*. Brill: Leiden etc., 94-198.
- Kammenhuber, A. (1962). Review of Johannes Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. In: *Orientalia N.S.* 31, 371-380.
- Kellerman, Galina (1980). *Recherche sur les rituels de fondation hittites*. (Dissertation, Université de Paris-1), Paris.
- Kronasser, Heinz (1956). *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Kuno, S. (1973). *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Laroche, E. (1971). *Catalogue des textes hittites* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Klincksieck: Paris.
- (1979). 'Anaphore et deixis en anatolien'. In: E. Neu & W. Meid (eds.), *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch* (IBS 25), Innsbruck, 147-152.
- Lebrun, René (1976). *Samuha. Foyer religieux de l'empire hittite*. (Publications de l'institut orientaliste de Louvain 11). Louvain-la-Neuve: Institut orientaliste.
- Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, Christopher (1999). *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Melchert, H. Craig (1977). *Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite*. (Dissertation, Harvard University), Cambridge, Mass.
- (1991). 'The Lydian Emphasizing and Reflexive Particle *-š/-is'*. *Kadmos* 30, 131-142.
- Neu, E. (1983). *Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten*. (StBoT 26). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

- — (1997). 'Zu einigen Pronominalformen des Hethitischen'. In: *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel. Part One: Ancient Languages and Philology*. Edited by Dorothy Disterheft, Martin Huld and John Greppin. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man, 1997, 139-169.
- Orlamünde, Julia (2001). 'Zur Datierung und historischen Interpretation des hethitischen Orakelprotokolls KUB 5.1+'. In: *StBoT* 45, Wiesbaden, 511-523.
- Otten, H. (1973). *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa*. (StBoT 17). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- — (1981) *Die Apologie Ḫattušiliš III. Das Bild der Überlieferung*. (StBoT 24). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Pedersen, H. (1938). *Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen*. København: Levin & Munksgaard.
- Puhvel, J. (1984ff.). *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin [etc.]: Mouton.
- Rauh, Gisela (1983). 'Aspects of Deixis'. In: Gisela Rauh (ed.), *Essays on Deixis*. Tübingen: Narr, 9-60.
- Rieken, Elisabeth (1999). *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. (StBoT 44). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- — (2000) 'Die Partikeln -a, -ja, -ma im Althethitischen und das Akkadogram Ḫ'. In: M. Ofitsch & Ch. Zinko (eds.), *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz*, Graz: Leykam.
- Rizzi-Mellini, Anna Maria (1979). 'Un' istruzione etea di interesse storico: KBo XVI 24 + 25'. In: Onofrio Carruba (ed.), *Studia Mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata II*. Pavia, 509-554.
- Rong Chen (1990). 'English Demonstratives: A Case of Semantic Expansion'. *Language Sciences* 12 (2/3), 139-153.
- Roos, J. de (1984). *Een teksteditie van Hettitische geloften met inleiding, vertaling en critische noten*.
- Schuler, Einar von (1982). 'Hethitische Rechtsbücher'. In O. Kaiser (ed.), *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments I*. Gütersloh: Mohn.
- Schulz, Monika (1994). 'Die Terminologie des hethitischen SU-Orakels'. *AoF* 21 (1), 73-124.
- Soden, W. von (1952/1969). *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. Rome.
- Soysal, O. (1987). 'KUB XXXI 4 + KBo III 41 und 40 (Die Puḫanu-Chronik). Zum Thronstreit Ḫattušiliš I.' *Hethitica* 7, 173-253.
- Steiner, G. (2002). 'Ein missverstandener althethitischer Text: Die sog. Puḫanu-Chronik (CTH 16)'. In: *Anatolia Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*. (Eothen 11). Firenze: LoGisma editore, 807-818.
- Tischler, Johannes (1977). *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. (IBS 20). Innsbruck.
- Ünal, Ahmet (1974). *Hattušili III*. THeth 3, 4.
- Woods, Christopher (2001). *The Deictic Foundations of the Sumerian Language*. Harvard University: Cambridge (pdf.file).