

Petra M. Goedegebuure

Petra M. Goedegebuure devoted the majority of her research time this year on finishing and submitting her monograph *The Hittite Demonstratives: Studies in Deixis, Topic and Focus* (accepted for publication in the series *Studien zu den Boghazköy-Texten*; Harrassowitz).

In order to explain the functions of the Hittite demonstratives and accented pronouns, Petra constructed a descriptive model based on a combination of cognitive-functional and

INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH

typological approaches to referential expressions. The application of this model not only led to an improved description of the demonstratives *ka-* “this” and *apa-* “that” and the accented pronoun *apa-* (which is the same as the demonstrative but with completely different meanings and use), but also to a reclassification of the pronoun *aši*. The pronoun *aši* does not mean “he, she, it” as previously assumed but is a demonstrative with the meaning “that, yonder.” This “new” distal demonstrative required a reappraisal of the hitherto accepted distal semantics of *apa-*, which does not mark remote objects at all but points at objects in the vicinity of the addressee. An analogy that illustrates the relevance of this change is to imagine that the demonstrative system of English was always incorrectly believed to consist of only *this*, with all cases of the non-proximal demonstrative *that* misunderstood as an anaphoric pronoun. *That* in statements like “*this* is my chair and *that* one is his” would be interpreted as only referring to a chair that was mentioned before; it would never be understood as directing the attention to a chair at some distance from the speaker.

As a third-person pronoun, *apa-* expresses emphasis. A detailed analysis showed among other things that *apa-* in preverbal position marks a referent as the Contrastive Focus of its clause (in “the dog (not the cat) chased the horse,” *dog* is in Contrastive Focus). Non-contrastive focal *apa-*, on the other hand, always occurs in initial position. This correlation between preverbal position and emphatic contrast had not been noted before, which meant that crucial parts of the ancient author’s intention were overlooked. For English this amounts to not being able to detect the difference between contrastive “the dog (not the cat) chased the horse” and non-contrastive “the dog chased the horse.”

Petra also published two articles (“Hittite Iconoclasm: Disconnecting the Icon, Disempowering the Referent,” in *Iconoclasm and Text Destruction in the Ancient Near East and Beyond*, edited by Natalie Naomi May, pp. 407–52 (Oriental Institute Seminars 8; Chicago, The Oriental Institute, 2012); “Split-ergativity in Hittite,” in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 102/2 (2013): 270–303; and several entries (“Hattic (Language),” “Labarna,” “Kashka”) for the *Encyclopedia of Ancient History* (www.encyclopediaancienthistory.com).

Petra furthermore participated in the Chicago Hittite Dictionary (CHD) Project, proof-reading the third volume of Š (see project report for the CHD). She also initiated the CHD Paleography Project, announced at the Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale in Leiden (2012). For the chronological organization of lexemes the CHD currently relies on a palaeography that was established in the 1970s. In the last years, however, views on the introduction and development of writing in Hittite society have changed, and as a result the field requires a reassessment of the palaeographic dating methods.
