

Mojca Cajnko

# ‘I Took You Up, *Hukkana*, the Lowly Dog...’

An Introduction to Social Deixis in Hittite

DOI 10.1515/aof-2016-0003

**Abstract:** Bisher ist nicht systematisch untersucht worden, wie sozialer Status und gesellschaftliche Beziehungen im Hethitischen ausgedrückt werden. Der vorliegende Artikel soll deshalb diese Lücke, zumindest zum Teil, ausfüllen. Der erste Teil beschäftigt sich mit den Begriffen *Deixis* sowie *soziale Deixis* und gibt einen zum Thema relevanten Überblick zum hethitischen Korpus und dem Forschungskorpus. Es schließen sich Erörterungen zu den Termini *soziale Macht* und *sozial mächtig* im Hethitischen an. Die Untersuchung der Begriffe für relativen sozialen Status zeigt, dass die Hethiter oftmals gesellschaftliche Beziehungen mit Metaphern beschreiben, die auf räumlichen und physischen Beziehungen im menschlichen Umfeld basieren. Ferner wird dieses Ergebnis unterstützt durch Beschreibungen von Gesten, die solche sozialen Beziehungen durchspielen. Abschließend befasst sich die Autorin mit dem Gebrauch der sozialen Deixis der hethitischen Lokaladverbien und akkadischen Präpositionen mit den Bedeutungen „oben“, „darauf“, „unten“, „bevor“, „davor“ und „dahinter“.

**Keywords:** Deixis, Social Deixis, Hittite, Social Power and Socially Powerful, Orientation and Physical Metaphors, Relative Social Status, Gestures, Up-down and Front-back Orientation Axis, Hittite Local Adverbs, Akkadian Prepositions, Sumerian Adpositions

## 1 Deixis and Social Deixis

The term *deixis* refers to words, grammatical forms and phrases with a fixed semantic, but variable denotational meaning. The denotational meaning can be fully understood only in the context or the speech-setting of the utterance. In other words, deictics are shifters, in the sense that the real world referents (the object, event, etc.) to which they refer are not fixed. According to Lyons (1977: 637) *deixis* implies “the location and identification of persons, objects, events, processes and activities being talked about, or referred to, in relation to the spatiotemporal context created and sustained by the act of utterance and the participation in it, typically, of a single speaker and at least one addressee.” The following types of *deixis* may be distinguished:

- a) *person(al) deixis* encodes the identity of communication participants
- b) *place* or *spatial deixis* encodes the place or places in which communication participants are situated
- c) *time deixis* refers to the *encoding time* of the message (the time when the message is being sent) and to the *decoding time* (the time at which the message is received)
- d) *discourse deixis* encodes references to portions of the unfolding discourse in which the utterance is located
- e) *social deixis* encodes social distinctions between communication participants and referents.<sup>1</sup>

These categories seem to be universal, but their linguistic encodings may differ from language to language.<sup>2</sup> Linguistic expressions that encode deictic information are called *deictic expressions*. Various types of deictic expressions can be shown using a translation of a Hittite letter:

<sup>1</sup> Fillmore (1997: 59, 61).

<sup>2</sup> Levinson (2006: 112).

*Thus speaks the Priest: Say to Kaššū: § Concerning what you wrote to me as follows: “Your twenty people are in the environs<sup>2</sup> of the town Zikkašta. And because (my district) is the primary watchpoint, I will not give them to you on my own authority. Report them to the palace!” § I am now in the process of reporting my (missing) servants to the palace. And because the land of Kizzuwatna is (also) a primary watchpoint, if your servants come down here (from Tapikka), neither will I give them back to you.<sup>3</sup>*

The person(al) deictic expressions *I* and *you* refer respectively to the writer, who presents himself as the Priest, and the addressee, Kaššū; the discourse deictic expression *as follows* refers to the part of the letter being cited by the Priest, the time deictic expression *now* refers to the time of writing, and the place deictic expression *down here* refers to Kizzuwatna. Needless to say, the referents of the same deictic expressions would be different in a letter written and sent under different communication circumstances.<sup>4</sup>

It should be noted that sometimes the same linguistic material can have both deictic and non-deictic uses. For example, the adjective *right* is used non-deictically in the example *Look at your right* and deictically in the example *Look to the right*. In the first example there is no implicit or explicit reference to any aspect of the communication situation, and the location of the speaker at the time of the utterance is not important; the addressee’s right side is always his right side. In the second example the situation is presented from the point of view of a speaker who hopes to change the perspective of the addressee. The expression *to the right* is thus used deictically, and can be more accurately described as a place deictic expression.

We saw that in this example, the situation is described from the speaker’s point of view. The speaker is the reference point or *deictic center* in relation to which a deictic expression is to be interpreted.<sup>5</sup> Typically, the deictic center is the present time, place, participant role, etc. of the speaker. But the deictic center may also change. Ordinarily one would say “**I am here** and people **come to me**. **You are there** and people **go to you**”, but the poles can also be reversed: “**You are here**, people **come to you**. **I am over there**, people **go to me**”.<sup>6</sup>

According to Levinson (2006: 119), “social deixis involves the marking of social relationships in linguistic expressions, with direct or oblique reference to the social status or role of participants in the speech event.” In line with this definition, social deictic expressions encode the absolute social status (such as king, scribe, priest), and, more frequently, the relative social status (superordinate, subordinate) of the communication participants or referents of the communication.<sup>7</sup> But the notion *social deixis* can also be understood more broadly, and can include the coding of identity (such as gender, nationality, level of education), social roles (such as friend, mother, teacher) or the nature of the social context (a private conversation as opposed to a legal proceeding).<sup>8</sup> According to Fillmore (1997: 110f.), social deixis “is the study of that aspect of sentences which reflect or establish or are determined by certain realities of the speech situation in which the speech act occurs.”<sup>9</sup>

The use of social deictic expressions is thus affected by relations of social power between interactants (that is, by their relative positions in the social hierarchy, their ages, their gender, and so forth) and by the degree of social distance or solidarity (that is by the degree of intimacy, shared experiences and opportunities, similar amounts of capital, etc.). Norms of politeness, respect, the formality of the discourse in question, the purpose of the interaction, the attitude of the speaker and various other factors can also play a part.<sup>10</sup>

Across typologically different languages, various means can be used to encode social deictic information: pronouns (*tu : vous*), verb forms (*siehst du : sehen Sie*), expressions of modality (*must : should*), speech act formulas (*Send me a stylus : Could you send me a stylus*), different types of address (*Ramzes : Herr der*

<sup>3</sup> CTH 190, HKM 74, transl. Hoffner (2009: 235).

<sup>4</sup> For the deictic use of demonstrative pronouns in Hittite, see Goedegebuure (2014).

<sup>5</sup> Fillmore (1997: 83–85).

<sup>6</sup> Fillmore (1997: 98, 122).

<sup>7</sup> Brown / Levinson (1979: 311).

<sup>8</sup> See Brown / Levinson (1979), Kasper (1997: 380–383), Fillmore (1997: 110).

<sup>9</sup> The phrase “certain realities” is perhaps vague and could be replaced with “social realities”.

<sup>10</sup> Held (1994), Levinson (1994), Kasper (1997), Wardhaugh (1998), Brown / Levinson (1987).

*Kronen*), phrases (*your servant : your son*), lexical variations (*try : attempt*), etc. Non-verbal signals, that is, gift exchange, prostration and hand gestures, can also be used with this meaning.<sup>11</sup>

The use of the linguistic expressions listed above can be affected by various communication circumstances and/or strategies, and consequently the same expression can be observed from different angles. The sentence *He will sit in front of me on the right* provides an example of the non-deictic (from the perspective of place deixis) use of the adjective *right*. But in Hittite thought, the right side was understood as the favorable and good side;<sup>12</sup> the speaker was therefore displaying affection for the man to whom he promised a place on his right, or attributing to him a certain (relatively high) social status. *Right* in this example can therefore also be understood as a social deictic expression. The same can be said of the sentences ***You are here, people come to you. I am over there, people go to me.*** These too can be studied from the perspective of person(al), place and social deixis: A depiction of an event, situation or set of spatial relations from the point of view of the addressee can also be a feature of *respectful* or *polite language*, which can be used in symmetric or roughly equal relations or, as is more frequently the case, in asymmetric relations where one of the interactants is socially more powerful.<sup>13</sup> It follows that the terms *here* and *there* can also be understood as social deictic expressions.

The expression and creation of social relations through the use of language thus appears to be a complex phenomenon that can be studied from a number of perspectives: the meaning of individual words (lexical semantics), the use of different grammatical constructions to achieve the same result (speech act theory), social variables that determine different kinds of linguistic expressions (sociolinguistics), preservation or dismantling of the positive self-image of the addressee (politeness theory), the influence of context on the meaning of a linguistic expression (pragmatics), etc.

## 2 Hittite Texts as a Source for the Study of Social Deixis

The Hittite texts reveal a precisely regulated state apparatus and provide evidence of hierarchic organization within the state. The state gods function as the highest authority; the king (appointed by the gods) appears as a high priest, the supreme judge, a chief military commander and a shepherd of the people. Beneath the king are the vassals, who have sworn an oath and are bound by treaties, as well as functionaries in the palace and temples, officers at the state borders, and others. A similarly strict hierarchy appears in the framework of individual social classes (free, non-free and semi-free, the latter consisting of captives), occupational groups (the army, priests, scribes) and social groups. Within the so-called great family (*šalli ḫaššātar*), relations between king's women (that is, between the queen and other free and even non-free women) and consequently between the king's children were also hierarchically defined, the status of children being determined by that of the mother. Because the same person could perform multiple functions within the Hittite state, because the tasks of different functionaries or officials could overlap, and because higher social status was determined both politically as well as in relation or connection to the king,<sup>14</sup> Hittite society can be described as a multi-level society where one's momentary, relative status was for the most part more important than one's absolute social status. In other words, it was a society where the same person was a master at one moment and, in different communication circumstances, a subordinate.<sup>15</sup>

It should be noted that all the Hittite texts that we possess were preserved in the context of state administration and were written by official scribes or officials with some scribal knowledge. These persons belonged to the dominant and upper classes of Hittite society and (presumably) were a minority within the Hittite population;<sup>16</sup> it is therefore only possible to study *their* social and linguistic norms. The Hittite corpus

<sup>11</sup> See Brown / Gilman (1960), Brown / Levinson (1979; 1987), Bourdieu (1994), Levinson (1994: 91–96), Kasper (1997), Fillmore (1997: 111–125), Wardhaugh (1998: 266–277).

<sup>12</sup> Puhvel (1997: 245).

<sup>13</sup> Brown / Levinson (1987: 9f.), Fillmore (1997: 122).

<sup>14</sup> For example, see Beckman (1995), von Schuler (1957–1971).

<sup>15</sup> Liverani (1990: 68) thus describes international relations in the Near East ca. 1600–1100 B.C.

<sup>16</sup> Bryce (2002: 57).

has a further limitation: Because texts of a purely private nature are not known, and the only preserved private correspondence outside of the royal family is found in postscripts of official letters,<sup>17</sup> the research is limited to a (relatively) formal discourse. Proof that the study of social deixis in Hittite is merited despite these limitations can however be found in the Hittites' profound awareness of the way language is used to construct social relations. A letter from a Hittite king to King Adad-nērārī I of Assyria (1) reveals this awareness rather clearly:

(1) CTH 171, KUB 23.102 4'–19', ed. Hoffner (2009: 323f.)

*nu=za LUGAL GAL kištat šeš-UTTA=ma ū šA<sup>HUR.SAG</sup> Ammana uwauwar kuit namma memeškeši kuit=at šeš-UTTA n=at kuit=ma šA<sup>HUR.SAG</sup> Ammana uwauwar šeš-tar=ta kuedani memini hatrāmi šeš-tar kuiš kuedani hatreškezzi nu=kan ul āššiyanteš kuiēš nu 1-aš 1-edani šeš-tar hatreškezzi [t]uk=ma šeš-tar kuwatta šer [ha]trāmi zik=za=kan amukk=a 1-edani AMA-ni haššanteš [AB]I ABA ABI=YA=ya GIM-an ANA LUGAL KUR<sup>URU</sup> Aššur [šeš-tar] ul hatreškez zikk=a=mu [uwauwar] LUGAL.GAL-UTTA=ya lē hatreškeši [ul=mu] zi-anza*

'So you've become a "Great King", have you? But why do you still continue to speak about "brotherhood" and about coming to Mt. Ammana? What is it, (this) "brotherhood"? And what is it, (this) "coming to Mt. Ammana"? **For what reason should I write to you about brotherhood? Who writes whom (about) brotherhood? Do people who are not on familiar terms with each other write to each other about brotherhood? Why should I write you (about) brotherhood?** Were you and I born of the same mother? As my grandfather and my father did not call the King of Assyria "brother", you should not keep writing to me (about) "coming" and "Great Kingship". It displeases me.'

Why is the term *brotherhood* so important here? It is well known that like other Ancient Near East civilizations, the Hittites used kinship terms to express relative rank. Adad-nērārī is thus claiming peer/equal status with Muršili. Hoffner (2009: 323) offers an interpretation of this "misunderstanding": "By conquering the last remaining king of what used to be the great kingdom of Mitanni, the Assyrian king could rightfully style himself a "Great King", the technical term for a ruler who controlled a network of smaller vassal states. But in Muršili III's eyes this still did not entitle him to a position of equivalence with the Great King of Ḫatti. In this draft he brusquely rejects the Assyrian's overtures and claim to be a true peer." If Hoffner is correct, the use of the term *brotherhood* did not bother the Hittite king because the two kings did not in fact share a close familial bond; he was actually upset because he was not prepared to accept a status equivalent to that of the addressee. This letter therefore reveals negotiations on the relative social status of the communication participants and the use of language as a means for manipulating and constructing or reconstructing social relations. It also proves that although the notion of social deixis is an invention of modern sociology and linguistics, the socially proper language use was already deeply ingrained in the mindset of the Hittites.

The corpus of the research was crafted according to the following criteria:<sup>18</sup> 1. the participants of the communication are known, 2. their absolute social status or relative social status is known, 3. the time and broader historical context of the text is roughly known, 4. the texts fall under different types of discourse, 5. the texts are relatively well preserved.

Everyday-economic discourse is represented by a selection of letters. The corpus included 56 letters, 21 of which were sent by superiors, and 16 by subordinates; in 19 letters, the social relation between the communication participants was roughly one of equality.

Juridical discourse is represented by seven treaties. Nearly all of the treaties in the Hittite language are non-parity treaties, and the Hittite king functions as the superior and socially more powerful communication participant. The treaty between Tudḫaliya IV and Kurunta of Tarḫuntašša is an exception, as it displays a certain degree of reciprocity. In it, the Hittite king allows the addressee to choose his own successor, utters a curse upon any of his successors who would threaten Kurunta's rule, mentions past reciprocal oaths between the author and the addressee, etc.<sup>19</sup> Some scholars even think that "Kurunta was considered an equal by the Hittite ruler."<sup>20</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Weeden (2014: 49).

<sup>18</sup> Individual texts are presented in detail in the Appendix.

<sup>19</sup> These are the characteristics of parity treaties. For more, see Beckman (1999: 2–5), Pallavidini (2012: 123–126).

<sup>20</sup> Mora (2003: 293).

Religious discourse is represented in the corpus by ten prayers from the Hittite king, queen or royal couple to different deities. In these texts, the speaker is always the socially weaker and subordinate communication participant. He honors the god in the hymns that often accompany the prayers, and in the body of the text he admits or denies guilt for past transgressions against the gods and asks for the gods’ aid and blessings.<sup>21</sup>

Most of the findings presented below are based on the research corpus; in some of the examples, information collected outside the main corpus will also be referenced.

### 3 The Concepts of *Social Power* and *Socially Powerful*

The Hittites did not have an expression for *society*,<sup>22</sup> but we do know of expressions for individual social classes, groups and statuses. The social structure of the Hittite state has to date been researched primarily in the framework of the various provisions of the Hittite law code,<sup>23</sup> and definitions of individual social statuses and the rights, obligations and social relations they entailed are scattered throughout the whole of hittitological literature. The question of how (relative) social status and social relations were expressed in the Hittite language or created by the Hittites through the use of language has also yet to receive a systematic treatment outside of discussions of address terms in Hittite letters.<sup>24</sup>

Those Hittite expressions which in modern languages translate to *power* (*nakki-*, 𒀭𒊕𒍪, *tarḫuilatar*) mostly signify physical force, and their use is characteristic of descriptions of military or manly actions.<sup>25</sup> The Hittites used metonymy to express the idea of *social power*. The hand (Hitt. *keššar*, Sum. *š*, Akk. *qātu*), as one of the most active parts of the human body, is that which rules, which fights, which protects and which leads.<sup>26</sup> The hand represents the more powerful or important individual in an interaction; it is the center of his power and the point of contact between a superior and a subordinate (see **Table 1**).

**Table 1:** *Hand* as metonymy for *social power*.<sup>27</sup>

<i>hand-metonymy</i>	literal meaning	figurative meaning
<i>kuedanikki keššari eš-</i>	‘to be in someone’s hand’	‘to be in power/sphere of influence/under the jurisdiction/in the care of someone’
<i>ANA šu kuēlka miḫuntahḫ-</i>	‘to grow old in the hand of someone’	‘to grow old under the protection of someone’
<i>āššū lūlu ANA qāt kuēlka auš-</i>	‘to see well-being and blessing in the hand of someone’	‘to be well and blessed under the power/protection of someone’
<i>kišri kuedanikki dai-</i>	‘to put in someone’s hand’	‘to put under someone’s power/protection’
<i>tamain šu-an ilaliya-</i>	‘to wish another hand’	‘to wish the power/rule of someone else’

21 On the structure and principles of Hittite prayers, which are reminiscent of legal proceedings before the gods, see Singer (2002: 5).

22 See Benveniste (1969), Weeks (1985).

23 Goetze (1957<sup>2</sup>), von Schuler (1957–1971), Diakonoff (1967), Cornelius (1972), Güterbock (1972), Korošec (1972), Souček (1979, 1988), Giorgadze (1987), Yamada (1995), Starke (1996), Klengel (2003), Imparati (2004).

24 A basic outline of the use of address terms in Hittite letters was given by Hagenbucher (1989: 10f., 42–46, 81), Hoffner (2009: 58f.) and, partially, by Alp (1991: 4f.), see also Cajnko (2016). Terms of the type (*my*) *lord*, *father* showed the superiority of the addressee; *my brother* marks the equality of the communication participants and *my son* the subordinate status of the addressee.

25 For *nakki-* n. ‘power(?), honor(?), importance(?), force(?)’ see CHD L–N (1989: 368), for the Sumerian noun 𒀭𒊕𒍪 ‘strength, power, restraint’ and the noun *tarḫuilatar* ‘potency’ see Weeks (1985: 223, 69).

26 See Friedrich (1926: 29), de Martino / Imparati (2004: 802).

27 For these and other uses of the noun *hand* see Starke (1996: 168), Börker-Klähn (1999: 51–54), Klengel (2002), de Martino / Imparati (2004).

Metonymy of this kind is mostly used to describe the power of the Hittite king or the gods (2), (3), but in some examples it only serves to describe the concern of communication participants regardless of power relations, as an excerpt from the letter of Taki-šarruma to the Hittite king shows (4).

(2) CTH 106.B, KBo 4.10 rev. 11, ed. van den Hout (1995: 44), transl. Beckman (1999: 112)

*nu=kan ANA ŠU <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI aššuli meḥuntaḥḥut*  
‘And you shall **live to a good old age in the hand** of My Majesty.’

(3) CTH 68, KBo 4.3 i 45–47

*anda=ya=za=kan idalaui lē kuedanikki [kišta]ti tamain=ma=za šu-an lē kuinki ilaliyaši [zilati]ya <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI AŠŠUM BELUTIM paḥši*  
‘Further, you shall not become implicated in any evil, you should not **wish any other hand** (over you), but in future protect, My Majesty as overlord.’

(4) CTH 205, KUB 57.123 10–11, ed., transl. Hoffner (2009: 346)

[x k]āš=a uttar šu-za **DIB-mi** nu=kan udd[ār... GAM<sup>2</sup>-a]n<sup>2</sup> ūḥḥi  
‘I will **take** the matter **in hand**, ... and will look the matters over.’

The *hand*-metonymy reveals the Hittites’ basic conceptions of powerful individuals, social relations and those “duties” of the superior which both legitimate and create his dominance. The semantic fields of adjectives meaning *powerful* show that the Hittites also attributed honorary tasks and physical power to important individuals with high social status, as the overview of the adjectives *nakki-*, *šarku-*, *daššu-/daššaw-*, *daššuwant-* in the **Table 2** shows. These adjectives also had socially related meanings ‘important’, ‘high-ranking’, ‘honored’ and ‘strong’.

**Table 2:** Adjectives with the meaning *powerful* and their socially related meanings.<sup>28</sup>

(socially) powerful	other meanings			
	important	high-ranking	honored	strong
<i>nakki-</i>	x	x	x	
<i>šarku-</i>	x	x		
<i>daššu-/daššaw-, daššuwant-</i>	x			x

The image of an ideal, honest, merciful and caring lord can be shown using an excerpt from Muršili’s plague prayer (5) and an excerpt from fragments mentioning Pimpira (6):<sup>29</sup>

(5) CTH 378, KUB 14.8 rev. ii 22’–28’, ed. García Trabazo (2002: 324), transl. Singer (2002: 60)

*našma mān ANA ARAD-TI kuedanikki kuitki nakkiyahḥan [ ?] nu=za ANA EN=ŠU arkuwar iyazzi n=an EN=ŠU ištamašzi nu=šši g[enzu dāi(?)] kuit nakkiyahḥan n=at=ši SIG<sub>5</sub>-aḥzi našma mān ANA ARAD-TI kuedanikki waštul waštul=ma=zza=kan ANA PĀNI EN=ŠU tamāi n=an EN=ŠU kuit apiya iyezzi n=an iezzi waštul=ma=za=k[an AN]A PĀNI EN=ŠU kuit tamāi nu ANA EN=ŠU ZI-anza waršiyazz[i nu EN=]ŠU apūn ARAD-DI EGIR-pa UL kappūzzi*  
‘Or if something bothers some servant and he makes a plea to his lord, his lord listens to him, [has pity] on him, and he sets right what was bothering him. Or if some servant has committed a sin, but he confesses the sin before his lord, his lord may

<sup>28</sup> For these and other meanings not linked to social relations, see CHD, EDHIL q.v. According to CHD P (1997: 364–368) ‘powerful’ is not the basic meaning of *nakki-* and its derivatives. The Sumerian adjective *DUGUD* can be used with the same meaning.

<sup>29</sup> See also CTH 186, HKM 30 and CTH 264, KUB 13.4 i 22–28.

do with him whatever he wishes; but since he has confessed his sin before his lord, his lord’s soul is appeased, and the lord will not call that servant to account.’

(6) CTH 24, KBo 3.23 i 5–8, iv 7f., ed. Cammarosano (2006: 20), transl. Goetze (1964: 25)

<sup>L0</sup>GIG-*an au nu=šši NINDA<sup>1</sup>-an wātar pāi mān[=an] ḥandaiš walaḥzi zig=an ekunimi dāi [ ] takku=wa=an ekunimaš walaḥzi n=an ḥandaš[i] ... nu kišduwanti NINDA-an pāi [ ] i-an pāi nekumanti=ma rōg-a[n pāi]*

‘Look after the sick one and provide him with bread (and) water! When warmth bothers him, place him in a cool (spot)! When cold bothers him, place him in a warm (spot)! .... ‘To the hungry one give bread! To the one who lacks ointment give oil! To the naked one give clothes!’

## 4 Terms Describing Relative Social Status

According to the commonly held view of linguists, philosophers and psychologists, human anatomy and physiology, as well as man’s interaction with his environment, inherently influence human perception, cognition and – at least by proxy – language use. The interaction between the human body and its physical environment is reflected in the conceptualization and presentation of abstract concepts in terms of concrete spatial or physical reality. Social structures and relations can also be described this way. From the standpoint of spatial organization, the up-down and front-back axes are particularly important for describing social statuses and relations, while the lateral or left-right axis has a lesser role.<sup>30</sup> From the standpoint of the physical characteristics of an entity, in descriptions of social statuses and relations qualifications of the type *strong : weak*, *big : small* are primarily used; oppositions like *heavy : light*, *dark : light* are rare. In metaphorical uses, the dimension up, front and qualifications such as high, big, first therefore mark high social status and positive concepts within a society, while their opposites mark low social status and negative concepts.<sup>31</sup> Metaphoric uses of this kind are also used to describe social relations in Hittite, as **Table 3** shows.

**Table 3:** Terms describing relative social status.<sup>32</sup>

relative social status		literal meaning
position in the social hierarchy	<i>peda-</i>	place
	<i>AŠAR</i>	place
of high(er) rank	<i>ḥantezzi(ya)</i> <sup>33</sup>	first
	<i>šarku-</i>	high
important	<i>šalli-</i>	big
	<i>šarku-</i>	high
	<i>daššu- / daššaw-, daššuwant-</i>	heavy
superior	<i>GAL</i>	big
	<i>MAḤRU</i>	big
of equal rank	<i>annauli- / annawalli-</i>	from the same mother
	<i>MEḤRU</i>	
colleague, peer	<sup>L0/MUNUS</sup> <i>ara-</i>	one that conforms, is appropriate

<sup>30</sup> Chilton (2009: 469).

<sup>31</sup> Lakoff / Johnson (1980, 2011), Chilton (2009).

<sup>32</sup> For these and other meanings not linked to social relations, see CHD, EDHIL, HW<sup>2</sup>, Tischler 2008 q.v., for *ḥantezzi-* and *appezzi-* see also Hoffner (2002: 169), for <sup>L0/MUNUS</sup>*ara-* see also Cohen (2002: 20–23), for *AŠRU* see CHD P (1997: 330), *GAL* and *MAḤRU* with the meaning ‘superior’ see CHD Š.1 (2002: 100), for *MEḤRU/MIḤRU* and <sup>L0</sup>*TAPPŪ(M)* see HW<sup>2</sup> (1975–1984: 221, 80).

<sup>33</sup> Also used with the meaning ‘of first rank’ and ‘older’.

Table 3: (continued)

	<sup>L0</sup> TAPPŪ(M)	
of low(er) rank	<i>appezzi(ya)</i> . <sup>34</sup>	last
insignificant <sup>35</sup>	<i>mališku</i> - <sup>2</sup>	light
subordinate	<i>ammiyant</i> -	small
	TUR <sup>2</sup>	

Expressions for low or lower social status are attested much less frequently than expressions for high or higher social status. Additional proof of the relatively limited social deictic dimension or use of the former can be seen in the fact that the meaning ‘insignificant’ for the adjective *mališku*- has not been established beyond doubt.<sup>36</sup> I have also not been able to pinpoint the term for a subordinate. The meaning ‘subordinate’ for *ammiyant*- is presupposed on the basis of KBo 3.34 ii 27–28, which speaks of chariot-drivers who are to be trained and who will thus become skilled/experienced;<sup>37</sup> the meaning is presumed for TUR on the basis of the comparison GAL <sup>L0</sup>DUB.SAR ‘chief scribe’ (literally ‘big scribe’) : <sup>L0</sup>DUB.SAR TUR ‘novice/apprentice scribe’ (literally ‘small scribe’).<sup>38</sup> This interpretation is somewhat supported by the observation that the sign translated as ‘small’ (TUR) also has the meaning ‘child’ or ‘son’ (DUMU). The expression DUMU can also be used to address subordinates, but this usage is very rare.<sup>39</sup>

The social deictic use of some of the expressions listed in the **Table 3** can be observed in the following examples (7), (8), (9), (10):

(7) CTH 105.A, KUB 23.1 + KUB 23.7 + KUB 31.43 + 670/v + 720/v rev. iii 8–17, ed., transl. Beckman (2011: 58f.)

*nu=ta=kkān mān L0 URU Ḫatt[i kuiški] anda tamekzi naššu šeš.LU[GAL] našma DUMU.LUGAL n<aš>ma BELU našma EGIR-izz[iš] ḫantezziš UN-aš nu=ta=kkān šA dUTU-ši kuitki :kuggurniyauwar EGIR-pa anda udai našma=ta=kkān dUTU-ši kuitki ḪUL<sup>1</sup>-anni katta maniyahzi nu=kan INIM-an ANA dUTU-ši lē ša[nm]atti*

‘If [some] Hittite attaches himself to you – either a brother of the King, a prince, a nobleman, or **a man of the lowest (or) highest rank** – and he brings up again some slander concerning My Majesty, or he subjects My Majesty to malice in some way before you, you shall not cover up the matter before My Majesty.’

(8) CTH 106.A, Bo 86/299 ii 79–83, ed. Otten (1988: 18), transl. Beckman (1999: 118)

*ANA G1SŠŪ.A=ma=šši RABUTTI šA LUGAL KUR URU Kargamiš išhiul ešdu ANA LUGAL KUR URUDU-tašša=kan 1-aš L0 tūḫukantiš šalliš ešdu namma=ma=šši=kan lē kuiški šalliš šA LUGAL=ya šaklaiš kuiš ANA LUGAL KUR URU Kargamiš āra ANA LUGAL KUR URUDU-tašša=ya apāš āra ešdu*

‘Concerning the Great Throne (of Ḫatti), his protocol shall be the same as that of the king of the land of Carchemiš. Only the crown prince shall be **greater** than the king of the land of Tarḫuntašša; no one else shall be **greater** than he. Whatever royal ceremonial is allowed to the king of the land of Carchemiš shall also be allowed to the king of the land of Tarḫuntašša.’

<sup>34</sup> Also used with the meaning ‘younger’.

<sup>35</sup> Tischler (2008: 196) also suggests a social deictic meaning for the adjective *tepu*- ‘wenig’, ‘gering’, ‘(politisch) schwach’. In the corpus of the research this adjective does not have a social deictic meaning, although the verb *tepu*-, which belongs to the same semantic group, does: *ammuk=ma=za=kan apēdani ANA INIM ABI=YA UL kuitki an[da] ešun nu=wa=za DUMU-aš ešun mān=ma=kan [š]Ā Ē.L[UGAL] DĪNU šA tawannanna GĒME=KUNU kiša[t] ABU=YA GIM-an tawannan[na]n MUNUS.LUGAL tepnut apāš=ma GĒME DINGIR-LIM kuit eš[t]a [n=at tuel ANA z]I DINGIR-LIM GAŠAN=YA and[a] ku[iš] šakta* ‘But I was in no way involved in that matter of my father. I was (only) a child. When it came to pass that the process of *tawannanna*, your maid, took place in the palace, how my father **degraded** *tawannana*, the queen, although she was a maid of the goddess, that which was inside the soul of the goddess, my lady, nobody knew’; CTH 383, KUB 21.19 obv. i 18–24, ed. Sürenhagen (1981: 88).

<sup>36</sup> CHD L–N (1989: 130).

<sup>37</sup> See HW<sup>2</sup> 1975–1984: 66, I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for pointing this out.

<sup>38</sup> See Hoffner (2009: 10).

<sup>39</sup> Hoffner (2009: 58).

(9) CTH 181, KUB 14.3 ii 13–15, ed., transl. Beckman (2011: 106f.)

*ki<sup>1</sup>nuna=wa=mu šeš=ya LUGAL.GAL annauliš išpur nu=wa amme[l annauliyaš] memian ul ištamašmi*  
‘But now, my brother, a Great King, (my) **peer**, has written to me – should I not listen to the word **of (my) [peer]?**’

(10) CTH 383, KUB 21.19 + KBo 52.17 rev. iii 28’–30’, ed. Sürenhagen (1981: 94), transl. Singer (2002: 100)

*ammell=a=mu=kan<sup>LUG.MEŠ</sup> aruš<sup>LUG.MEŠ</sup> TAPPI=YA [=ya] šarešker ANA<sup>URU</sup> Nerik=wa=kan [šer] anda ḫarakti*  
‘My **friends** and **associates** kept intimidating me saying: “For Nerik will you perish.”’

## 5 Gestures Indicating Social Relations

Metaphoric uses enabled the Hittites to present social statuses and relations in a rather picturesque and concrete manner. This is most evident in descriptions of the different processions and gestures that act out these relations. The use of the lateral axis (left-right) can be seen in the use of *hand* as a metonymy for social power. The *hand*-metonymy is also characteristic of gestures used by superiors to symbolize leadership, protection or mercy. The same can be said, for the most part, of gestures that signal symmetric social relations. The Hittites could display equality of social statuses, friendship or a truce by shaking or holding hands. In the opinion of de Martino (1988), we may assume that the Hittites also marked equal rank with greetings consisting of a kiss on the lips and on the right hand. In expressing lower social status and the gestures characteristic of it, vertical orientation or the up-down axis once again plays an important part. In pleading and subordination gestures, the weaker party raises his hand in the direction of the superior or the sky or demonstrates his lower status by bowing, getting on his knees, or falling to the feet of the superior; he may also cling to, embrace or kiss the addressee’s knees. An overview of these gestures is shown in **Table 4**, and examples are given for some of the social deictic uses noted in the research corpus (11), (12), (13).

**Table 4:** Gestures indicating social relations.<sup>40</sup>

higher status – leadership, protection, mercy	
<i>šu.ḫi.a-uš arahzanda ḫar(k)-</i>	‘to put hands around’
<i>šu-az ēp(p)-, šu.MEŠ ēp(p)-, dā-</i>	‘to take by the hand’, ‘to take hands’
<i>šu-an ḫar(k)-, ēp(p)-</i>	‘to hold a hand’
<i>genzu ḫar(k)-</i>	‘to take (into one’s) lap’
equal status – friendship	
<i>keššeran pai-</i>	‘to give a hand’
<i>šu-an ḫar(k)-</i>	‘to hold a hand’
<i>ku(w)aš-</i>	‘kiss’
lower status – pleading, subordination	
<i>šu.MEŠ šarā ep(p)-</i>	‘to raise hands up’
<i>ar(u)wai-, kanen(iya)-</i>	‘to bow’
<i>ḫaliya-, ḫaliḫliške/a-, ḫink-</i>	‘to kneel down’
<i>genuwaš kattan uwa-</i>	‘to come to (one’s) knees’
<i>ANA GİR.MEŠ PN MAQĀTU/ŠUKĒNU</i>	‘to fall/to bow at (someone’s) feet’ <sup>41</sup>

<sup>40</sup> See n. 28, for *keššeran pai-* see CHD P (1997: 49), for *ku(w)aš-* de Martino (1988), for pleading and subordination gestures see Alaura (2005), for *ar(u)wai-*, *ḫaliya-*, *ḫaliḫliške/a-*, *ḫink-*, *genzu ḫar(k)-* see HW<sup>2</sup> q.v., for *kanen(iya)-* see EDHIL q.v.

<sup>41</sup> This translation may be problematic and is not in accordance with the HW<sup>2</sup> (1991: 35–38). In my opinion, the use of this formula should be studied in greater detail.

Table 4: (continued)

<i>genu(wa)/genuš ep(p)-</i>	‘to take (someone’s) knees’
<i>genuwa anda ħulħuliya-</i>	‘to cling to the knees’
<i>genuwa kuwaš(š)- (?)</i>	‘to kiss knees’
<i>iškiš lagan ħar(k)-</i>	‘to bend one’s back’

(11) CTH 190, HKM 81, 4–8, ed., transl. Hoffner (2009: 241f.)

MAḪAR BĒLI ħūman si[G<sub>5</sub>]-in ēšdu nu=šmaš LIM DINGIR.MEŠ TI-an ħa[rka]ndu nu=ttā šu.ḪI.A-uš arahzan[d]a aššuli ħarkandu  
nu=tt[a] paḥ[š]andaru

‘May everything be well with (my) lord. May the Thousand Gods (the entire pantheon) keep both of you alive. **May they hold their hands lovingly around** you (sg.) and protect you (sg.)’

(12) CTH 181, KUB 14.3 ii 28–30, ed., transl. Beckman (2011: 107f.)

nūwa=pat mem[iškit w]aḥḥeškimi=wa nu=mu<sup>m</sup> Atpā[š kišša]n i[QBI<sup>d</sup>]UTU-ŠI=wa šu-an ANA IBILA pāi

‘But he still kept saying: “I continue to be afraid.” Then Atpa said to me: “O, Your Majesty, **give a hand** to the heir!”’

(13) CTH 374, KUB 36.75+ obv. i 9’–14’, ed., transl. Schwemer (in: Jaques 2015: 364, 370–371)

[ne]pišaš taknāšš=a DINGIR.MEŠ-eš tuk=[pat<sup>d</sup>U]TU-i kattan kanenanteš [ku]tta<sup>d</sup>UTU-uš memiškeši DINGIR.MEŠ-š=a āppa tuk<sup>d</sup>UTU-i arūiškanzi<sup>d</sup>UTU-uš kur[mmaš w]anumiašš=a attāš annaš zik

‘The gods of [he]aven and earth are **bowed down** before you alone, o Sun-god! [What]ever you, o Sun-god, are saying, the gods **keep prostrating** themselves to you, o Sun-god, again. O Sun-god, you are father (and) mother of the orphan and of the bereaved.’

## 6 The Up-down Orientation Axis and Analytic Case Markers<sup>42</sup>

The social deictic use of the up-down orientation axis is also revealed by the metaphoric meanings of analytic case markers in Hittite. One of the semantic connotations of the concept *up* (Hitt. *šer*, *šarā*, Sum. *UGU*) is control and supervision, as the phrases *šer eš-* ‘to be above’, *šer ar-* ‘to stand above’, *šer tittanu-* ‘to set up’, ‘to install’, and *šer ħar(k)-* ‘to hold up, keep up, support’ show (14). The concept may also indicate rebellion or an upward change of social status as the phrases *GU UGU ep(p)-/šABĀTU* ‘hold the neck up’ (15) and *šarā da-* ‘to take up’, ‘to take control over’, ‘to elevate (politically)’ indicate (16).<sup>43</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Case markers are generally defined as overt means for expressing case relations. They are ordered in terms of their formal properties: analytic case markers are free forms (adpositions, adverbs, etc.); synthetic case markers are bound forms (affixes, clitics). Both can function independently, or they can link to form *complex case markers* consisting of multiple synthetic or analytic case markers or of a combination of synthetic and analytic case markers. Avarian is an example of a language that uses combinations of synthetic case markers (*-de* ‘to the top of’ can be analysed as *-d* ‘on, over’ + *-e* ‘away from’); combinations of multiple analytic case markers can be found in English (**from out of two hundred candidates**); combinations of synthetic and analytic case markers can be found in Ancient Greek: *eis tē-n poli-n* (into the-ACC city-ACC) ‘into the city’. See Blake (1994: 107f.), Moravcsik (2009: 240). Akkadian and Sumerian/Akkadographically and Sumerographically written analytic case markers (for example *PĀNI* and *UGU*) are traditionally understood in Hittitology as mere written variants of their Hittite counterparts. At present this is an unproven hypothesis, and because there exists evidence that calls this interpretation into question (see Cajnko 2012: 137–175), I treat elements of originally different language material separately. Social deictic uses of Akkadian analytic case markers were already noted by Korošec (1931: 34). This author has pointed out that in Hittite treaties, the choice of Akkadian prepositions was conditioned by the participants: the phrase *RIKILTU ANA* ‘treaty for’ is used in vassal treaties, while *RIKILTU QADU* ‘treaty with’ is used in parity treaties; phrases containing the preposition *ITTI* ‘with’ or the phrase *INA BĒRIŠUNU* ‘mutual’ are used in treaties where the vassal status of the addressee is played down. The Hittite analytic case markers will not be further categorized according to their possible syntactic roles of adverb, preverb, and postposition, but will be described with the cover term *local adverb*.

<sup>43</sup> Brosch (2014: 164) already noted that *šer* may indicate control and supervision; on the metaphorical meaning of *šer tittanu-*, *šer ħar(k)-*, *šarā da-* see CHD Š.3 (2013: 401f.) and CHD Š.2 (2005: 218f.).

(14) CTH 295, KBo 16.63 11

<sup>m</sup>*Tapanunaš=kan kuwapi kunati nu=za ul šēr ešun*  
‘When Tapanuna was killed, I **was not above** (I had no control)’<sup>44</sup>

(15) CTH 123, KBo 4.14 iii 39f., ed. Stefanini (1969: 46), transl. CHD Š.2 (2005: 212)

**GÚ UGU lē ēpti karū kuwapi** <sup>m</sup>PU.LUGAL-aš BA.ŪŠ zik=ma **GÚ UGU IŠBAT**  
‘Do not **hold up** your **neck** (i.e., be wilful)! Formely, when PU.LUGAL died, **you held up** your **neck**.’

(16) CTH 42, KBo 5.3 i 2f., ed. Wilhelm (hethiter.net, 2013–02–24)

*kāša tuk* <sup>m</sup>*Ḫuqqanān appezzin UR.GE<sub>7</sub>-an šarā dāḫḫun nu=ta SIG<sub>5</sub> iyanun*  
‘I **took** you **up**, *Ḫukkana*, the lowly dog, and have treated you well.’

Some social deictic uses of the concept *down* (Hitt. *katta, kattān*, Akk. *šAPAL*, Sum. *GAM*) are also attested and indicate a subordinate social position, subordination and subjugation, as the phrases *katta ḫar(k)*- ‘keep down’ (16) and (*ANA*) *šAPAL GİR kuēlka dai-/tiya-* ‘to put under (someone’s) feet’ (17) show.<sup>45</sup>

(17) CTH 127, Bo 2810 ii 4–6, ed. Klengel (1974: 172)

DUMU=YA *ape* KUR.KUR.MEŠ **katta ḫarak** *nu=kan le kuitki neyari*  
‘My son, **keep** those lands **subjugated** (lit. ‘down’) and none shall turn (away).’

(18) CTH 377, KUB 24.1 obv. iii 13’–15’, ed., transl. Kassian / Yakubovich (2007: 431, 434).

*nu=šmaš LŪ-aš tarḫūlin parā neya[nt]a[n]* <sup>d.GIS</sup>TUKUL-in *peški nu=šmaš* KUR.KUR <sup>LŪ</sup>KŪR *šAPAL* (rasure) **GİR.MEŠ=šUNU zikkī** *n=at in[nara ḫarganu?]*  
‘Give them a man’s (?) valiant, battle-ready, divine (?) weapon! **Put beneath their feet** the enemy lands and [destroy (?) them ri[ght away]!’

## 7 The Front-back Orientation Axis and Analytic Case Markers

The social deictic use of the Hittite local adverb *peran* and the Akkadian preposition *PĀNI* with the basic meanings ‘before’, ‘in front of’ to express goal and location was already described by Hoffner (2002: 165). Among the Hittites, subordinates would step, sit or swear an oath before the gods or the king, and the same is true of the hierarchical structure of individual social groups within the Hittite state: pupils or scribes of a lower status would write before a superior, that is, under his supervision (19), (20).<sup>46</sup> In these examples the subordinate is *peran/PĀNI*, but in other cases it is the person with the higher rank who is *before*. Namely, the notion *before* could also be used in the terms for ‘leader’ (*peran ḫuyatalla-*) or ‘champion/the outstanding

<sup>44</sup> In my interpretation of this example I follow Brosch (2014: 164).

<sup>45</sup> In the corpus of the study the social deictic use of the Sumerian *GAM* can be only observed in the formula ‘to fall down at (someone’s) feet’: *AMQUT ANA GAM GİR.MEŠ EN=YA 2-ŠU 7-ŠU* ‘I fall at the feet of my lord twice seven times (i.e., fourteen times).’; CTH 197, KBo 9.82 obv. 3, ed., transl. Hoffner (2009: 350).

<sup>46</sup> The author *ibid.* mentions that superiors are never said to stand or sit *before* an inferior. Other metaphoric expressions also show that among the Hittites, the presence of a subordinate before a superior meant the affection, protection or at least the attention of the superior. Dardano (2012: 51) thus mentions that the formula *ḫaššuwaš šakuwa auš-* ‘to look into the eyes of the king’ described the presence of a subordinate and, indirectly, his inclusion in life at the court. This author *ibid.* also mentions the phrase *LUGAL-i natta tiya-* ‘not (allowed) to step before the king’. This phrase is attested four times in the Hittite law code alongside the most severe offenses (*ḫurkil*); the purpose of the prohibition was probably to prevent the defilement of the king.

one' (*peran tiyant-*) and 'to lead' (*peran huwai-*),<sup>47</sup> 'promote' or 'to be promoted (to a higher rank)' (*peran tiya-*), 'get preeminence' (*peran wahnu-*), 'to be responsible for' (*peran eš-*) (21), (22).<sup>48</sup>

(19) CTH 264, KUB 13.4 obv. i 22, ed., transl. Miller (2013: 244f.)

IR=šU kuwapi ANA EN=šU **peran** šarā artari  
'When a servant stands up **in front of his master**.'

(20) CTH 481, KUB 29.4 rev. iv 45f., ed., transl. Miller (2004: 297)

šU mLU DUMU mNU. G15 KIRI6 PĀNI m **Anuwanza** L0 SAG IŠTUR  
'The hand of Ziti, son of NU. G15 KIRI6, wrote (this tablet) **before Anuwanza the Eunuch**.'

(21) CTH 264, KUB 13.4 iii 12–13, cited from CHD P 1997: 300

GE6-ti GE6-ti=ma 1 L0 SANGA GAL L0.MEŠ wehešgattallaš **peran huyanza ešdu**  
'Night by night let one high-ranking priest take **charge** of the patrolmen'

(22) CTH 381, KUB 6.45 obv. i 33, ed., transl. Singer (1996: 9, 32)

dŠeriš=ma EN=YA GU4 ŠA dU ŠA KUR URU KÜ.BABBAR-ti **peran tianza**  
'Šeri, my lord, bull of the Storm-god, **champion** of Ḫatti.'

The meaning 'before', 'in front of' to express goal and location could also be encoded by the Akkadian preposition *MAḪAR*.<sup>49</sup> The lexical catalogue in Mainz contains 51 examples of this preposition in a non-fragmentary context. In almost 78 %, or 40 examples, this preposition is used by the Hittite king in reference to himself or his father or by subordinates who address the king or refer to him (23); even the queen addresses the king this way (24). In 5 examples the Hittite gods and royal family are marked this way (25) and in an additional 6 examples the exact social relations between participants are unclear (26). In some of these examples *MAḪAR* is perhaps better understood as a politeness marker (27), but this observation would require further research. *MAḪAR* is mostly used in letters and in legal and historiographic propagandistic texts. Its use is therefore characteristic of texts that stress the absolute social status of the king and in texts with participants of unequal social status. It can be said to emphasize social distance between communication participants, the highest social status in the Hittite state and the social power of the king and the royal family.<sup>50</sup>

(23) CTH 63, KBo 3.3 + KUB 23.126 + KUB 31.36 rev. iii 53'–59', ed., transl. Miller (2007: 128, 130)

mān DINU=ma kuitki šallešzi n=at arḫa ēppuwanzi ul. taraḫteni n=at=kan duwan **MAḪAR** dUTU-ŠI parā naišten n=at dUTU-ŠI arḫa ēpzi  
'But if some judicial matter becomes (too) grave, and you are not able to handle it, than you shall refer it here **to My Majesty** (or 'bring it in the presence of My Majesty', author's note) and My Majesty will handle it.'

<sup>47</sup> See also CHD P (1997: 300) for a literal meaning of *peran huwai-* 'to run before (the king)'.

<sup>48</sup> See CHD P (1997: 291–311), Hoffner (2002: 165), Brosch (2014: 179). For the same meaning of the complex Akkadian preposition *ANA PĀNI* see example (5).

<sup>49</sup> It was used with the verbs *pai-* 'to go', *arnu-* 'to transport, to deport', *uwa-* 'to come', *uwate-* 'to bring (here)', (*lē*) *peḫute-* 'to lead, to bring, to conduct (here)', *uda-* 'to bring (here), to bring (over)', *uppa/i-* 'to send (here)', *ūnna-/ūnni-* 'to send (here), to drive', *nai-* 'to send, to dispatch', *šipant-* 'to libate, to pour, to sacrifice', *pē ḫark-* 'to have' and in the formulaic expressions *MAḪAR* (noun) *human sig5-in ešdu* 'may all be well with (noun)', *MAḪAR* (noun) *aššul*, 'greetings to (noun)', lit. 'greeting in the presence of (noun)'.

<sup>50</sup> A Hittite equivalent for *MAḪAR* could not be found. In my view the Hittites' use of *MAḪAR* conveys a social distinction that could otherwise not be expressed in Hittite, but this is a supposition which merits further study.

(24) CTH 188, Or. 90/800: 1–5, ed., transl. Hoffner (2009: 257f.)

ANA <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI BĒLI=YA QIBI=MA UMMA MUNUS.LUGAL GĒME=[KA] MAḪAR <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI BĒLI=YA ḫūman SIG<sub>5</sub>-in ēštu  
 ‘Say to His Majesty, my lord: Thus the Queen, your maidservant: “May all be well **in the presence of Your Majesty, my lord.**”’

(25) CTH 190, KuT 50 obv. 1–4, ed., transl. Hoffner (2009: 263)

ANA BĒLI BĒLI=YA QIBI=MA UMMA <sup>m</sup>Ḫalpa-LŪ ARAD=KA=MA MAḪAR DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ (Rasur) SIG<sub>5</sub>-in ū ANA MAḪAR BĒLI=V[A]  
 SIG<sub>5</sub>-in ēštu anzašš=a katta ḫūman s[IG<sub>5</sub>-i]n  
 ‘Say to the lord, my lord: Thus speaks Ḫalpa-ziti, your servant: “May it be well **with the daughters** (princesses?) and **with my lord.** All is well with us too.”’

This excerpt is taken from Ḫalpaziti’s letter to the Hittite king. Here the Sumerogram DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ signifies princesses, or at least girls with a high status at the court. This is made evident by the fact that it is the queen who is demanding an oracular inquiry because of portentous dreams in which these DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ appeared; BĒLU is the Hittite king.

(26) CTH 292, KBo 6.26 rev. iii 49–50, ed., transl. Hoffner (1997: 154)

takku lŪ-aš MAḪAR DAM ŠEŠ=ŠU šeškezzi šEŠ=ŠU=ma ḫūišwanza ḫūrkil  
 ‘If a man sleeps **with his brother’s wife**, while his brother is alive, it is an unpermitted sexual pairing.’

(27) CTH 186, HKM 36, left edge 3, ed., transl. Hoffner (2009: 152)

kāša=za <sup>URU</sup>Ḫattuši MAḪAR <sup>LŪ.MEŠ</sup>TAPPI=NI  
 ‘I am presently in Ḫattuša **in the presence of our colleagues.**’

The social deictic use of the concept *behind* (Hitt. *appa(n)*, Sum. EGIR(-an)) is attested much less frequently. When it is used in this sense, it bears a semantic connotation of help, support or protection regardless of power relations. This meaning is shown in the phrases EGIR-an *kuedanikki ar-* ‘to stand behind someone’, EGIR-an *kuinki tiya-* ‘to step behind someone’, EGIR-an *kuedanikki pai-* ‘to go behind someone’, EGIR-an *kuedanikki ḫuwai-* ‘to run behind someone’ (28).<sup>51</sup> We can also observe that the meaning of these phrases differs between individual text types. Hagenbuchner (1989: 102f., 1993: 111–118) has found that when used in letters, EGIR-an *tiya-* usually means ‘to care for/tend to something’ (29), while in treaties the choice of different lexical items (the verbs *ar-* or *tiya-*) is conditioned by the referent. When the phrases *ištu ša EGIR-an ar-* (30) and EGIR-an *tiya-* appear in the same text, the former is used only to express support for the Hittite king, while the latter is used for support for a vassal or some other person.

(28) CTH 68, KUB 6.44 11–13

maḫḫan=ma=za ABU=YA DINGIR-LIM-iš kišat <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI=ma=za=kan [A]NA <sup>GIS</sup>GU.ZA ABI=YA ēšḫat nu=šši EGIR-an tiyanu[n n]u=šši  
 EGIR-an *pāun*  
 ‘But when my father became god, I, My Majesty sat upon my father’s throne, and I supported him and I **followed** (lit. ‘went behind’) him.’

<sup>51</sup> See HW<sup>2</sup> (1975–1984: 200f., 2012: 798, 802), Hagenbuchner (1993: 111–118). It should be noted that the social deictic meaning of the Hittite local adverbs *appa* and *appan* is neither attested in the corpus studied nor proved by the examples in HW<sup>2</sup> (1975–1984: 148–161, 200f., 2012: 798, 802) or Hagenbuchner (1993: 111–118).

(29) CTH 186, HKM 31, 25–29, ed., transl. Hoffner (2009: 158)

<sup>m</sup>Himmu-DINGIR-LIM-iš=mu 1 GU<sub>4</sub> tet nu=šši šEŠ.DÜG.GA=YA EGIR-an tiya n=an=kan parā arnut n=an mu uppi  
‘Himmuili promised me an ox. **See to it**, my brother. Expedite it and send it to me.’

(30) CTH 68, KBo 5.13 8–9, ed., transl. Kitchen / Lawrence 2012: 512f.

nu iŠTU ŠA <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI=pat EGIR-an arḫut nu=za ANA <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI warriš šU.BULUG-ašš=a šardiyāš ēš  
‘So **stand** hereafter equally **by the side of the Sun-king**, and (thus) be helpful and supportive to the Sun-king.’

## 8 Conclusion

As noted above, the expression and creation of social relations through the use of language is a complex and very broad phenomenon that, as such, demands study and the use of an exhaustive, diverse theoretical apparatus. This problem has yet to be systematically addressed within the framework of the study of the Hittite language, and the analysis presented here is meant to serve only as an introduction to the study of social deixis in Hittite. At the same time, it presents arguments for the further study of, and, by addressing some of the most basic questions, offers possibilities for further approaches to the subject matter. Some of these questions include: Which expressions did the Hittites use to express social relations? How were these relations reflected in the language? And how did language serve as a means for creating social relations?

My research focused specifically on the identification of lexical means used to express the notions (*social*) *power* and (*socially*) *powerful*, descriptions of social relations and relative social status (for example high/low social status) and gestures which act out these relations. The findings showed that the Hittites used metonymy and metaphors to present social statuses and relations in a rather picturesque and concrete manner.

Because these findings accord with the claim of cognitive linguistics that social statuses and relations can be shown using concrete spatial relations in the human environment, wherein the up-down and front-back orientation axes have an important role, the research proceeded to deal with the analytic case markers of Hittite, Akkadian and Sumerian origin used to encode these terms. Some social deictic uses of these elements had already been noted by other authors (*šer*, *šarā*, *peran*, *EGIR-an*, *PĀNI*, *ITTI* and *QADU*), but the research also pointed out the social deictic uses of the analytic case markers *katta*, *kattan*, *ŠAPAL* and *MAḪAR*. Of course, most of these elements also have concrete meanings and were most frequently used in their non-social deictic sense; *MAḪAR*, however, is an exception. *MAḪAR* should probably be understood as an exclusively social deictic marker used to signal absolute and exceptionally high social status within the state, great social power (it is usually used in reference to the Hittite king, the royal family or the Hittite gods) and distance between communication participants.

Although the research did not deal with strategies for creating and altering social relations, it is perhaps necessary, for the sake of future research, to call attention to one more general feature of social deictic expressions. When a desirable social relation needs to be established or the social distance between communication participants needs to be stressed, these expressions serve as a mechanism for manipulation; if an adequate relation is already established, they express the subordinate's acceptance of the social reality. The excerpt from a letter from a Hittite king to King Adad-nērārī I of Assyria shows that the Hittites were well aware of socially proper language use. Namely, the Hittite king rebuked the Assyrian king for his improper use of the term brotherhood and thus rejected an undesirable social relation.

## 9 Appendix – the Corpus of the Research<sup>52</sup>

Letters						
CTH	Tablet	Script	Dating	Sender	Addressee	Relation <sup>53</sup>
127	Bo 2810	NS	?	Hittite king	Hittite prince <sup>54</sup>	Sup
151	VBoT 1	MS <sup>55</sup>	Arnuwanda I/ Šuppiluliuma I <sup>56</sup>	Pharaoh Amunḫotep	Tarḫunta-radu, King of Arzawa	E
152	VBoT 2	MS	Arnuwanda I/ Šuppiluliuma I	Tarḫunta-radu, King of Arzawa	Pharaoh Amunḫotep III	E
				Arzawan scribe	Egyptian scribe	E
171	KUB 23.102	NS	Muwatalli II/ Muršili III <sup>57</sup>	Muwatalli II/ Muršili III <sup>2</sup>	Adad-nērārī I, King of Assyria <sup>2</sup>	Sup
176	KUB 21.38	NS	Ḫattušili III <sup>58</sup>	Puduḫepa	Ramses II	E
180	KUB 23.85	NS	Ḫattušili III <sup>59</sup>	Puduḫepa	Tattamaru	Sup
181	KUB 14.3	NS	Hattušili III <sup>60</sup>	Hattušili III <sup>2</sup>	King of Ahhiyawa	E
184	AT 125	NS	?	King (probably of Carchemish)	Pirwanna <sup>61</sup>	Sup
186	HKM 6	MS		Hittite king	Kaššū	Sup
	HKM 10	MS		Hittite king	Kaššū	Sup
				Ḫattušili	Ḫimmuili	E
	HKM 13	MS		Hittite king	Kaššū	Sup
	HKM 14	MS	Tudḫaliya III <sup>62</sup>	Hittite king	Kaššū	Sup
	HKM 16	MS		Hittite king	Kaššū, Zilapiya	Sup
	HKM 22	MS		Hittite king	Pulli	Sup
				Mār-ešrē	Uzzū	E
	HKM 27	MS		Hittite king	Ḫimmuili	Sup
				Ḫattušili	Ḫimmuili	E
				Tarḫunmiya	Ḫimmuili	Sub
	HKM 31	MS		Hittite king	Ḫimmuili	Sup
				Mār-ešrē	Uzzū	E

<sup>52</sup> Because the study of the different periods of the Hittite script is beyond the scope of this study, in dating texts I adhere to the dates listed in S. Košak's *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln*, [http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/hetkonk\\_abfrageF.php](http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/hetkonk_abfrageF.php) (v. 1.9, november 2014); the texts are dated according to the Hittite kings.

<sup>53</sup> The relation between interactants is described from the point-of-view of the sender, as roughly equal (E), subordinate (Sub) or superordinate (Sup).

<sup>54</sup> See Hoffner (2009: 363).

<sup>55</sup> For problems pertaining to the dating of Hittite letters and further literature, see Hoffner (2009: 39–41); for dates of the letters from Mašat see van den Hout (2007) and Hoffner (2009: 39f.). When not listed in the table, the dating of the composition of these letters is set in the time of Arnuwanda I or Tudḫaliya III.

<sup>56</sup> See Hoffner (2009: 270f.) and *ibid.* for further literature

<sup>57</sup> See Hoffner (2009: 322f.).

<sup>58</sup> See Hoffner (2009: 281).

<sup>59</sup> See Hoffner (2009: 364).

<sup>60</sup> Beckman / Bryce / Cline (2011: 101).

<sup>61</sup> See Hoffner (2009: 372f.) and *ibid.* for further literature.

<sup>62</sup> Hoffner (2009: 119).

Table 5: (continued)

187	KBo 18.2	NS		Hittite king (Tudḫaliya IV <sup>63</sup> )	Hittite queen (Puduḫepa <sup>63</sup> )	Sup
	KBo 18.24	LNS	Tudḫaliya IV <sup>64</sup>	Hittite king (Tudḫaliya IV <sup>63</sup> )	Salmanaššar, King of Assyria	E
188	KBo 18.54	MS	Šuppiluliuma I <sup>65</sup>	Kaššū	Hittite king	Sub
	KBo 18.4	NS	Ḫattušili III/ Tudḫaliya IV <sup>66</sup>	King of Išuwa (Eḫlišarruma <sup>66</sup> )	Chief of the Chariotreers (Ura-Tarḫunta <sup>66</sup> )	Sup
	HKM 46	MS		Adad-bēlī	Hittite king	Sub
	HKM 48	MS		Marīya, Ḫapiri	Hittite king	Sub
	HKM 51	MS	Arnuwanda I <sup>67</sup>	Kašturraḫšeli	Hittite king	Sub
	Or. 90/800	MH	?	Hittite Queen	Hittite king	Sub
				Zuwa	Hittite king	Sub
	Privat 79	MS <sup>2</sup>	?	Hittite Queen	Hittite king	Sub
190	KuT 49	MS	?	Mayor <sup>68</sup>	Chief of the palace attendants	Sub
	KuT 50	MS	?	Hittite king	Ḫalpa-ziti	Sup
	HKM 52	MS		Ḫattušili	Ḫimmuili	E
				Tarḫunmiya	Ḫimmuili	Sub
	HKM 55	MS		Kaššū	Ḫimmuili	Sup
	HKM 56	MS		Ḫimmuili	Ḫuilli	E
				Tarḫunmiya	Walwa-ziti	Sup
	HKM 58	MS		Kikarša	Taḫazzili	E
				Ili-tukultī	Adad-bēlī	E
	HKM 59	MS		Šarpa	Provincial governor, Tarḫuni	Sub
	HKM 60	MS		Šarpa	Zaldumanni, Ḫuilli	Sup
				Šarpa	Pallanna	Sub
	HKM 63	MS		Piyama-Tarḫunta	Ḫimmuili	E
	HKM 65	MS		Pulli	Adad-bēlī	Sup
				Tarḫunmiya	Adad-bēlī	E
	HKM 66	MS		Ḫ[ulla]	[Adad-bēlī]	E
	HKM 68	MS		Commander of the Military Heralds (=Kaššū) <sup>69</sup>	Pallanna, Zardumanni	Sup <sup>70</sup>

63 Hoffner (2009: 327).

64 See Giorgieri / Mora (2004: 88f.).

65 Hoffner (2009: 340).

66 Hoffner (2009: 331).

67 Hoffner (2009: 189).

68 On the office of <sup>14</sup>ḫazammu see Beckman (1995: 25).69 See Hoffner (2009: 225) and *ibid.* for further literature.

70 On the function of UGULA NIMGIR.ÉRIN.MEŠ see Marizza (2007: 93).

Table 5: (continued)

	HKM 74	MS		The Priest (Kantuzzili <sup>71</sup> )	Kaššū	Sup
	HKM 81	MS		Tarḫunmiya	Father <sup>72</sup> (Pallanna), Mother <sup>72</sup>	Sub
				Tarḫunmiya	Uzzū	E
	KBo 18.95	MS <sup>73</sup>	?	Chief of the palace servants	Chief of the bodyguard	Sub
197	KBo 9.82	LNS	Tudḫaliya IV <sup>73</sup>	Maša	my lord (Hittite king <sup>74</sup> )	Sub
199	ABoT 65	MS	?	Tarḫuntišša	Pallā	E
200	ABoT 60	MS		Kaššū <sup>75</sup>	Hittite King	Sub

## Treaties

CTH	Tablet	Script	Author	Addressee
42	A = KBo 19.43a + KBo 19.43 + KBo 5.3 + KBo 5.12 + KUB 26.38 + KUB 40.35 + Bo 8138		Šuppiluliuma I	Ḫuqqana of Ḫayaša
62	A = KBo 50.28 + KBo 5.9 + KBo 22.39	NS	Muršili II	Duppi-Tešub of Amurru
	B = KUB 3.119 (+) KUB 14.5 (+) KUB 19.48 (+) KUB 23.6 (+) KBo 22.39	NS		
	C = KUB 21.49 (+) KUB 19.48 (+) KUB 23.6	NS		
	D = KBo 22.39	NS		
68	A = KBo 4.3 + KUB 40.34 (+) KBo 19. 62+63+64	LNS	Muršili II	Kupanta-Kurunta from Mira-Kuwaliya
	B = KBo 4.7 + KBo 22.38 + KBo 50.42 + KBo 19.65	NS		
	C = KBo 5.13	NS		
	D = KBo 19.69 (+) KBo 19.66 (+) KUB 6.41 + KBo 19.67	NS		
	E = KUB 6.44 + KUB 6.43 + KUB 19.53 + (+) KUB 6.42	NS		
76	A = KBo 19.73a + KBo 50.124 + KBo 19.73 + KBo 50.41 + KBo 50.212 + FHL 57 + KUB 21.1 + KUB 21.1 + Gurney 2	NS	Muwattalli II	Alakšandu of Wiluša
	B = KBo 19.74 + KUB 21.5	NS		
	C = KBo 12.36 + KBo 45.272 + KUB 21.4	LNS		
105	A = KUB 23.1 + KUB 23.7 + KUB 31.43 + 670/ v + 720/v	NS	Tudḫaliya IV	Šauškamuwa of Amurru
	B = KUB 8.82 + 1198/u + 1436/u + Bo 69/ 821	LNS		

71 See Hoffner (2009: 234), de Martino (2005: 311) and *ibid.* for further literature.72 For this interpretation see Hoffner (2009: 240f.); see also Imparati (1997: 652) who claims that the terms *father* and *mother* denote senior colleagues.

73 Klengel (1999: 280).

74 See Hoffner (2009: 350) and *ibid.* for further literature.

75 See Hoffner (2009: 176).

Table 6: (continued)

106.A	Bo 86/299	LNS	Tudḫaliya IV	Kurunta of Tarḫuntašša
106.B	KBo 4.10 + KBo 50.60 + KUB 40.69	NS	Ḫattušili III	Ulmi-Tešub of Tarḫuntašša
<b>Prayers</b>				
CTH	Tablet	Script	Author	Addressee
374	2.A = KBo 52.13 + KBo 51.15 + KUB 36.75	MS <sup>76</sup>	Hittite king	Sun-god
375	1.A = KUB 17.21	MS	Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikkal	Sun-goddess of Arinna
	1.B = KUB 31.124	MS		
376	2.A = KBo 51.18b + KBo 51.18a + KUB 24.3 + KUB 31.144	NS	Muršili II.	Sun-goddess of Arinna
377	A = KBo 58.10 (+) KUB 24.1	NS	Muršili II	Telipinu
	B = KUB 24.2	NS		
378.II	A = KUB 14.8	NS	Muršilli II	Storm-god of Ḫatti
	B = KUB 14.11 + KBo 55.25	LNS		
	C = KUB 14.10 + ABoT 2.22 + KUB 26.86	NS		
380	A = KBo 4.6	NS	Muršilli II	Lelwani
381	A = KUB 6.45 + KUB 30.14 + KBo 57.18	NS	Muwatalli II	assembly of the gods
	B = KUB 6.46	NS		
	C = KUB 12.35	NS		
382	KBo 11.1	NS	Muwatalli II	Storm-god
383	KBo 52.17 + KBo 57.19 + KUB 14.7 + KUB 21.19 + KUB 40.49	LNS	Ḫattušili III and Puduḫepa	Sun-goddess of Arinna
384	KBo 51.26 + KUB 21.27	NS	Puduḫepa	Sun-goddess of Arinna

**Acknowledgements:** I would like to express my gratitude to the Fritz-Thyssen Stiftung for financially supporting this research from March to September 2013 and from May to December 2014. The research was conducted at the Institut für Assyriologie und Hethitologie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München. I would like to thank J. Miller and W. Sallaberger for their help in obtaining financial aid and J. Miller for his willingness to again serve as my *Betreuer*. Because I had already spent an extended study period at the institute during my doctoral studies, this visit to Munich and to the confines of the exceptionally well-stocked but also warm and welcoming library was actually a “return”. I would therefore like to thank the entire staff of the institute, and my fellow students and visitors, friends and colleagues in Munich for making me feel welcome and for our conversations, both lighthearted and earnest. A portion of this article was already presented in November 2014 at the Kolloquium zum Alten Orient at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München; I would like to thank the organizers for their invitation and the participants for their comments, advice and encouragement. I also thank the anonymous reviewer for very helpful suggestions and commentaries. Because I first encountered the subject discussed here while preparing my dissertation, I would also like to thank my mentor, M. Zorman.

<sup>76</sup> The mention of Arzawa as an enemy land fits the historical circumstances of Tudḫaliya I's campaigns to western Anatolia, see Singer (2002: 33).

## References

- Alaura, S. (2005): Fleh- und Unterwerfungsgesten in den hethitischen Texten, *AoF* 32, 375–385.
- Alp, S. (1991): Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük, Ankara.
- Beckman, G. (1995): Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria: The View from Maşat and Emar. In: O. Carruba et al. (ed.), *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, Pavia 28 giugno–2 luglio (StMed 9), Pavia, 19–37.
- Beckman, G. (1999<sup>2</sup>): *Hittite Diplomatic Texts* (SBL WAW 7), Atlanta.
- Beckman, G.M. / T.R. Bryce / E.H. Cline (2011): *The Ahhiyawa Texts* (SBL WAW 28), Atlanta. (ed., transl. of the texts by Beckman)
- Benveniste, E. (1969): *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. Vol. 1: *Economie, parenté, société*, Paris.
- Blake, B.J. (1994): *Case*, Cambridge.
- Börker-Klähn, J. (1999): *Schrift-Bilder*, *UF* 31, 51–73.
- Bourdieu, P. (1994): *Language and Symbolic Power*, Cambridge.
- Brosch, C. (2014): *Untersuchungen zur hethitischen Raumgrammatik* (Topoi Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 20), Berlin – Boston.
- Brown, R. / A. Gilman (1960): *The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity*. In: T.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, Cambridge, 253–276.
- Brown, P. / S.C. Levinson (1979): *Social Structure, Groups and Interaction*. In: K.R. Scherer / H. Giles (ed.), *Social Markers in Speech*, Cambridge, 291–341.
- Brown, P. / S.C. Levinson (1987): *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge.
- Bryce, T. (2002): *Life and Society in the Hittite World*, Oxford.
- Cajnko, M. (2012): *Case Marking in Hittite*, Ljubljana (PhD Dissertation).
- Cajnko, M. (2016): *Politeness in Hittite State Correspondence: Address and Self-presentation*, *Journal of Politeness Research* 12(2), 155–171.
- Cammarosano, M. (2006): *Il decreto antico-ittita di Pimpira* (Eothen 14).
- Carruba, O. (2003): *Anittae res gestae* (StMed 13), Pavia.
- Chilton, P. (2009): *Metaphor in Mental Representations of Space, Time, and Society: The Cognitive Linguistic Approach*. In: H. Pishwa (ed.), *Language and Social Cognition: Expression of the Social Mind* (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 206), Berlin, 455–471.
- Cohen, Y. (2002): *Taboos and Prohibitions in Hittite Society: A Study of the Hittite Expression natta āra* (‘not permitted’) (THeth 24), Heidelberg.
- Cornelius, F. (1972): *Das Hethiterreich als Feudalstaat*. In: D.O. Edzard (ed.), *Gesellschaftsklassen im Alten Zweistromland und in den angrenzenden Gebieten: XVIII. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, München, 29. Juni bis 3. Juli 1970, München, 31–34.
- Dardano, P. (2012): *“Guardare gli occhi del re”: Per l’analisi di una formula antico-ittita*. In: J. Klinger et al. (ed.), *Investigationes Anatolicae: Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu* (StBoT 52), Wiesbaden, 47–60.
- de Martino, S. (1988): *L’atto di “baciare” nel culto e nella vita quotidiana degli Ittiti*. In: F. Imparati (ed.), *Studi di storia e di filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli* (Eothen 1), Florence, 57–65.
- de Martino (2005): *Hittite Letters from the Time of Tutḫaliya I/II, Arnuwanda I and Tutḫaliya III*, *AoF* 32, 291–321.
- de Martino, S. / F. Imparati (2004): *La “mano” nelle più significative espressioni idiomatiche ittite*. In: F. Imparati (ed.), *Studi sulla società e sulla religione degli ittiti* (Eothen 12), Florence, 787–802.
- Diakonoff, I.M. (1967): *Die hethitische Gesellschaft*, *MIO* 13, 313–366.
- Fillmore, Ch. (1997<sup>2</sup>): *Lectures on Deixis*, Stanford.
- Friedrich, J. (1926): *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*. 1. Teil: *Die Verträge Muršiliš’ II. mit Duppi-Tešup von Amurru, Targašnalliš von Ḫapalla* (MVAeG 31), Leipzig.
- Friedrich, J. / A. Kammenhuber (1975–): *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, 2., völlig neubearbeitete Aufl. auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte, Heidelberg. (HW<sup>2</sup>)
- García Trabazo, J.V. (2002): *Textos religiosos hititas: Mitos, plegarias y rituales*, Madrid.
- Giorgadze, G.G. (1987): *Two Forms of Non-Slave Labour in Hittite Society*. In: M.A. Powell (ed.), *Labor in the Ancient Near East* (AOS 68), New Haven, 251–255.
- Giorgieri, M. / C. Mora (2004): *Le lettere tra i re ittiti e i re assiri ritrovate a Hattuša* (HANEM 7), Padova.
- Goedegebuure, P. (2014): *The Hittite Demonstratives: Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus* (StBoT 55), Wiesbaden.
- Goetze, A. (1957<sup>2</sup>): *Kleinasien*, München.
- Goetze, A. (1964): *State and Society of the Hittites*. In: G. Walsler (ed.), *Neuere Hethiterforschung*, Wiesbaden, 23–33.
- Güterbock, H.G. (1972): *Bemerkungen zu den Ausdrücken ellum, wardum und asürum in hethitischen Texten*. In: D.O. Edzard (ed.), *Gesellschaftsklassen im Alten Zweistromland und in den angrenzenden Gebieten: XVIII. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, München, 29. Juni bis 3. Juli 1970, München, 93–97.
- Güterbock, H.G. et al. (ed.) (1980–): *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Chicago. (CHD)
- Hagenbuchner, A. (1989): *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter*. 1. Teil (THeth 15), Heidelberg.
- Hagenbuchner, A. (1993): *Schutz- und Loyalitätsverpflichtungen in hethitischen Staatsverträgen*. In: T. Mikasa (ed.), *Essays on Anatolian Archeology* (BMECCJ 7), Wiesbaden, 99–118.

- Held, G. (1994): Höflichkeitsstrategien in der Alltagsinteraktion. In: G. Held (ed.), *Verbale Interaktion*, Hamburg, 101–124.
- Hoffner, H.A. (1997): *The Laws of the Hittites (DMOA 23)*, Leiden – New York – Köln.
- Hoffner, H.A. (2002): Before and After: Space, Time, Rank, and Causality. In: P. Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Warsaw, 163–169.
- Hoffner, H.A. (2009): *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom (SBL WAW 15)*, Atlanta.
- Imparati, F. (1997): Observations on a Letter from Maşat-Höyük, *Archivum Anatolicum* 3, 199–214.
- Imparati, F. (ed.) (2004): *Studi sulla società e sulla religione degli ittiti (Eothen 12)*, Florence.
- Jaques, M. (2015): Mon dieu, qu'ai-je fait? Les diğir-ša-dab<sub>(s)</sub>-ba et la piété privée en Mésopotamie. Avec un contribution de Daniel Schwemer (OBO 273), Fribourg.
- Kassian, A. / I. Yakubovich (2007): Muršili II's Prayer to Telipinu. In: D. Groddek / M. Zorman (ed.), *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitologische Beiträge, Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag (DBH 25)*, Wiesbaden, 423–455.
- Kasper, G. (1997): Linguistic Etiquette. In: F. Coulmas (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, Oxford, 374–385.
- Kitchen, K.A. / P.J.N. Lawrence (2012): *Treaty, Law and Covenant in the Ancient Near East. Part 1: The Texts*, Wiesbaden.
- Klengel, H. (1974): "Hungerjahre" in Ḫatti, *AoF* 1, 165–174.
- Klengel, H. (1999): Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches (HbOr I/34), Leiden – Boston – Köln.
- Klengel, H. (2002): "An der Hand der Gottheit": Bemerkungen zur "Umarmungsszene" in der hethitischen Tradition. In: P. Taracha (ed.), *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Warsaw, 205–210.
- Klengel, H. (2003): Einige Bemerkungen zur Struktur des hethitischen Staates, *AoF* 30, 281–289.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden. (EDHIL)
- Korošec, V. (1931): *Hethitische Staatsverträge: Ein Beitrag zu ihrer juristischen Wertung (Leipziger rechtswissenschaftliche Studien 60)*, Leipzig.
- Korošec, V. (1972): Einige Beiträge zur gesellschaftlichen Struktur nach hethitischen Rechtsquellen. In: D.O. Edzard (ed.) *Gesellschaftsklassen im Alten Zweistromland und in den angrenzenden Gebieten: XVIII. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, München, 29. Juni bis 3. Juli 1970, München, 105–111.
- Košak, S. [hethiter.net/](http://hethiter.net/): hetkonk (1.91).
- Lakoff, G. / M. Johnson (1980): *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago.
- Lakoff, G. / M. Johnson (2011): Conceptual Metaphor in Everyday Language. In: A.E. Goldberg (ed.), *Cognitive Linguistics: Critical Concepts in Linguistics. Vol. 2: Metaphor, Blending and Embodied Language*, London – New York, 1–32.
- Levinson, S.C. (1994): *Pragmatik*, Tübingen.
- Levinson, S.C. (2006): Deixis. In: L.R. Horn / G. Ward (ed.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, Malden, 97–121.
- Liverani, M. (1990): *Prestige and Interest: International Relations in the Near East ca. 1600–1100 B.C.*, Padova.
- Lyons, J. (1977): *Semantics*, Cambridge.
- Marizza, M. (2007): *Dignitari ittiti del tempo di Tuthaliya I/II, Arnuwanda I, Tuthaliya III (Eothen 15)*, Florence.
- Miller, J.L. (2004): *Studies in the Origins, Development, and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals (StBoT 46)*, Wiesbaden.
- Miller, J.L. (2007) *Mursili II's Dictate to Tuppi-Teššub's Syrian Antagonists*, *Kaskal* 4, 121–152.
- Miller, J.L. (2013): *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts (SBL WAW 31)*, Atlanta.
- Mora, C. (2003): On Some Clauses in the Kurunta Treaty and the Political Scenery at the End of the Hittite Empire. In: G.M. Beckman et al. (ed.), *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr.*, Winona Lake, 289–296.
- Moravcsik, E.A. (2009): The Distribution of Case. In: A. Malchukov / A. Spencer (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, Oxford, 231–245.
- Otten, H. (1988): *Die Bronzetafel aus Boğazköy: Ein Staatsvertrag Tuthaliya IV (StBoT Beih. 1)*, Wiesbaden.
- Pallavidini, M. (2012): *Diplomazia e propaganda in epoca imperiale ittita: Forma e prasi*. Pavia – Berlin (PhD Dissertation).
- Puhvel, J. (1984–): *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin – New York.
- Salvini, M. / M.C. Trémouille (2003): *Les textes hittites de Meskéné/Emar*, *SMEA* 45, 65–72.
- Singer, I. (1996): *Muwatalli's Prayer to the Assembly of Gods Through the Storm-God of Lightning (CTH 381)*, Atlanta.
- Singer, I. (2002): *Hittite Prayers (SBL WAW 11)*, Atlanta.
- Souček, V. (1979): Soziale Klassen und Schichten in der hethitischen Tempelwirtschaft, *ArOr* 47, 78–82.
- Souček, V. (1988): Zur Struktur der hethitischen Gesellschaft. In: P. Vavroušek (ed.), *Šulmu: Papers on the Ancient Near East Presented at International Conference of Socialist Countries (Prague, Sept. 30 – Oct. 3, 1986)*, Prague, 329–335.
- Starke, F. (1996): Zur "Regierung" des hethitischen Staates, *ZABR* 2, 140–182.
- Stefanini, R. (1965): *KBo IV 14 = VAT 13049, AANL* 20, 39–79.
- Strauß, R. (2006): *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte*, Berlin – New York.
- Sürenhagen, D. (1981): Zwei Gebete Ḫattušilis und der Puduḫepa, *AoF* 8, 83–168.
- Tischler, J. (2008): *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch: Mit dem Wortschatz der Nachbarsprachen. 2. vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage (IBS 128)*, Innsbruck.
- Yamada, M. (1995): The Hittite Social Concept of "Free" in the Light of the Emar Texts, *AoF* 22, 297–316.
- van den Hout, Th. (1995): *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag: Eine prosopographische Untersuchung (StBoT 38)*, Wiesbaden.
- van den Hout, Th. (2007): Some Observations on the Tablet Collection from Maşat Höyük. In: A. Archi / R. Francia (ed.), *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia Roma, 5–9 settembre 2005, Parte I (SMEA 49)*, Rome, 387–398.

- von Schuler, E. (1957–1971): Gesellschaft. B. Bei den Hethitern, RIA 3, 236–243.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1998): *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, Malden.
- Weeden, M. (2014): State Correspondence in the Ancient World. In: K. Radner / E. Robson (ed.), *State Correspondence in the Ancient World*, Oxford, 32–63.
- Weeks, D.M. (1985): *Hittite Vocabulary: An Anatolian Appendix to Buck’s Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Studies*, Los Angeles (PhD Dissertation).
- Wilhelm, G. (2013): Vertrag Šuppiliumas I. mit Ḫukkana von Ḫajaša. [hethiter.net/](http://hethiter.net/): CTH 42 (INTR 2013–02–24), v 1.91.