

THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

.....
**ANCIENT
ANATOLIA**
.....

10,000–323 B.C.E.

Edited by

SHARON R. STEADMAN
AND GREGORY McMAHON

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CHAPTER 22

THE HITTITE LANGUAGE: RECOVERY AND GRAMMATICAL SKETCH

GARY BECKMAN

DESPITE the fact well illustrated by Beal (chapter 26 in this volume) that the Hittite state of the mid- to late second millennium B.C.E. was one of the most important political entities of its day in western Asia, interacting peacefully and holding its own in war with such powerful countries as Assyria, Babylonia, and pharaonic Egypt, all memory of Hatti (as the Hittites referred to their realm) and its language had apparently been lost by the time of the great Classical poets and historians. Although a few of Homer's Trojans and their allies bear personal names that may be distortions of those of Luwian rulers of the western fringes of Anatolia during the Hittite Empire period (see Bryce, chapter 15 in this volume), the Greek bard displays no knowledge of the kings of Hatti or of their capitals, Hattuša and Tarhuntašša. Herodotus, himself a native of Anatolian Halicarnassus, is largely ignorant of Asia Minor east of Lydia, populating the former Hittite homeland with Amazons (Book 4:110) and attributing a surviving Hittite monument in his own neighborhood to a mythical Egyptian ruler (Book 2:106, Strassler ed.:161-62; see Ehringhaus 2005:87-91).

Although the Hebrew Bible mentions "Hittites" interacting with the patriarchs and governing parts of Syria, the pertinent scriptural passages in fact refer to later inhabitants of a region once subject to Hittite dominion and therefore still called "(Great) Hatti" by its neighbors in the Iron Age. Their ruling groups preserved aspects of imperial Hittite culture (royal names, architectural traditions, the Anatolian hieroglyphs) well into the first millennium B.C.E. and may to a certain extent have been genetically descended from the northern invaders of the Late Bronze

Age, but they were hardly Anatolians (see Hoffner 2004; Singer 2006; and McMahon, chapter 2, and Yakubovich, chapter 23 in this volume).

REDISCOVERY OF THE HITTITES

The emergence of Ḫatti from three millennia of historical oblivion began in the late nineteenth century of our era, when Hittites appeared in the newly deciphered Egyptian historical records as dangerous adversaries of the New Kingdom pharaohs.¹ A connection was soon drawn between these northern rivals of the Egyptians and the Hieroglyphic Luwian monuments that European travelers had encountered in Syria and Turkey. Since the greatest concentration of these inscriptions was in Syria, and since the Hebrew Bible located its Hittites in Syro-Palestine, early researchers (e.g., Wright 1884) concluded that the Hittite state had been centered in Syria and had only secondarily expanded to the north. Although this is precisely the reverse of the actual historical development, a more accurate picture of the history of Ḫatti and her people could be drawn only after her own written records had been recovered, deciphered, and interpreted.

“Decipherment”

The first successful modern reading of a Hittite cuneiform document was not really a decipherment in the strict sense, given that the script employed by the Hittites did not differ significantly from that used in contemporary Babylonia (Hawkins 1986), and that this writing system had long since yielded most of its secrets to students of Akkadian texts. Accordingly, the first modern scholars undertaking to read Hittite were immediately able to assign more or less correct phonetic values to the syllabic signs and thus discern the approximate phonological repertoire of the language. Thus, from the start they could search for familiar vocabulary, as well as for patterns in word formation and grammatical usage.

The Norwegian scholar J. A. Knudtzon was the first to make a significant attempt to translate a Hittite text, in connection with his edition of all pieces of the cuneiform archive uncovered at Tell el-Amarna in Egypt in the late 1880s (see Moran 1992). Most of this corpus of some 400 tablets consisted of the diplomatic correspondence of pharaohs Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV-Akhenaten with their Palestinian and Syrian vassals, as well as with their equals (Great Kings) on the international political stage. Almost all of these letters were written in Akkadian, the diplomatic language of the day, and thus posed no insuperable problems for Knudtzon. However, three of them had been composed in other idioms, unintelligible to him as well as to other researchers of the late nineteenth century.

Nonetheless, it was possible to identify the senders and recipients of these three missives, since they had been provided with the usual stereotyped Akkadian-language

heading: "Say to so-and-so, ruler of such-and-such a place: Thus says so-and-so, ruler of (some other) place." Therefore it was immediately clear that the longest of these mystery letters had been sent by the king of the Syrian state of Mittanni to the pharaoh. The language of this record was later recognized as Hurrian and does not concern us further here. The longer of the remaining letters (EA 31) was addressed by Amenhotep III to Tarhuntaradu, king of Arzawa, a country situated in southwestern Anatolia (see Bryce, chapter 15 in this volume). The final piece (EA 32) was a reply by the Arzawan ruler to this letter. Although Knudtzon and his contemporaries naturally concluded that these documents had been composed in the "Arzawan" tongue, they were in fact written in what we call Hittite.

Knudtzon dutifully undertook the study of the "Arzawan" documents as part of his larger project, and early in the twentieth century he published his startling conclusions (Knudtzon 1902). In addition to his comprehension of the formulaic headings of the letters, he was able to discern the gist of the initial portion of the body of the larger piece, since many of the words in this section had been rendered not in Hittite but in Sumerographic or Akkadographic form.² He also benefited from a comparison of this letter with other pieces of royal correspondence in the Amarna corpus written entirely in Akkadian. Following the heading, these letters often continued with a report by the sender on the prosperous state of his land and of all of his goods and subjects, followed by the wish that the recipient's land and belongings should likewise flourish.

The larger Arzawa letter (EA 31) begins:

THUS SAYS NIMUTRIYA (Amenhotep III), GREAT KING, KING OF EGYPT:

SAY TO TARHUNTARADU, KING OF THE LAND OF ARZAWA:

*<hu-u-ma-an> kat-ti=**mi** WELL-in HOUSES=**mi** WIVES=**mi**
CHILDREN=**mi** NOBLEMEN-**aš** SOLDIERS=**mi** HORSES=**mi**
pi-ip-pi-it=**mi** LANDS=**mi**=kan an-da hu-u-ma-an WELL-in
du-uq-qa kat-ta hu-u-ma-an WELL-in **e-eš-tu** HOUSES=**ti** WIVES=**ti**
CHILDREN=**ti** NOBLEMEN-**aš** SOLDIERS=**ti** HORSES=**ti**
pi-ip-pi-it=**ti** LANDS=**ti** hu-u-ma-an WELL-in **e-eš-tu**.³*

Those elements which Knudtzon could read with certainty are rendered here in capitalized English. Hittite words are presented sign by sign in italics. According to the considerations just outlined, Knudtzon surmised that the first paragraph ought to contain pronouns referring to the writer, and the second section pronouns appropriate to his correspondent. That is, first "my" and then "your" possessions are called for. Such pronouns are indeed found here and have been rendered in boldface: we now know that *-mi* means "to me," and *-ti* "to you" in Hittite. The similarity of these small words to the personal pronouns of the Indo-European language family was obvious to Knudtzon. (To *-mi* compare English *me* and French *moi*; to *-ti* compare English *thou* and French *toi*.)

Second, Knudtzon expected to find a verb of wish or command—an imperative—in the second section. Indeed, the cuneiform *eštu* (also indicated in boldface) is extremely close to the Classical Greek form for "let it be!" (*ἔστω*). It was primarily

these features of the "Arzawan" language that convinced the Norwegian that it belonged to the Indo-European family. In this conclusion he was enthusiastically supported by the Indo-European linguists—and his Oslo colleagues—Sophus Bugge and Alf Torp, who each contributed lengthy remarks to Knudtzon's book.

Sadly, the arguments of Knudtzon and his associates were not well received, seemingly due to both historical preconceptions and to scholarly caution. A century ago no one expected to find an Indo-European language at home in ancient western Asia, and linguists consequently demanded overwhelming proof before accepting such a notion. Also, in reaction to the excesses of unsystematic speculation that had marred the early study of the languages of this region, most of Knudtzon's contemporaries were wary of drawing conclusions with far-reaching historical and linguistic consequences on the basis of what might very well prove to be no more than coincidental similarities in sound (*Kling-Klang-Philologie*). It certainly did not help that the textual basis for the first attempted decipherment of Hittite was flawed: the larger Arzawa letter had been composed in Egypt by a scribe whose knowledge of Hittite was defective (Starke 1982), and both missives—consisting in any case of a total of just sixty-three lines of text—were available to Knudtzon and his critics only in relatively poor copies.

More material was called for, and it was soon forthcoming. It had already been observed that fragmentary tablets recovered by a French mission of 1893–94 to Boğazköy in north-central Turkey were written in the same language as the Arzawa letters. The prospect that additional texts were to be found in the extensive ruins at the site led to the dispatch of a German expedition under Hugo Winckler, which excavated there from 1906 through 1912 (Haas 1998; Winckler 1914). The site was soon revealed as ancient Hattuşa, capital of the Hittite kings. Winckler's workmen brought to light around 10,000 tablets and fragments from the royal archives, many of which were taken to Berlin for study, while others were deposited in İstanbul.

Since the Hittites, like the contemporary Egyptians, had made use of Akkadian in composing diplomatic records such as treaties and international correspondence, many important texts could be read immediately upon their excavation. On the basis of these Akkadian-language documents, scholars (e.g., Meyer 1914) quickly reconstructed the broad outlines of Hittite history—several years before the native language of the bulk of the texts could be understood.

The interpretation of the Hittite-language texts and their language was initially undertaken by their excavator himself, and Winckler had reportedly made significant advances in this project before his untimely death in 1913. The task of studying the native-language texts from Boğazköy fell to others. Among them was a Czech professor at the University of Vienna, Friedrich (Bedřich) Hrozný, who even in the dark years of World War I traveled to İstanbul to study and copy tablets in the Royal Ottoman Museum (Hrozný 1931). He announced the successful results of his work in a lecture delivered in Berlin in October 1915 (Hrozný 1915).

The scholar from Vienna reported that his study of the newly recovered tablets vindicated the opinion of the derided pioneer Knudtzon: the language of the Hittite Empire indeed belonged to the Indo-European group. The centerpiece of Hrozný's

decipherment was a single sentence drawn, as we now know, from a collection of regulations for temple employees (Ehelolf 1925: no. 4, col. ii, line 70): *nu NINDA-an e-ez-za-at-te-ni wa-a-tar-ma e-ku-ut-te-ni*. The second word in this sentence is written with a Sumerian ideogram accompanied by a Hittite phonetic indicator. When he considered this word, as an Assyriologist Hrozný immediately recognized that it must mean "bread." Then, further along in the line, he found the sequence of signs *wa-a-tar*, which is strikingly similar to English *water* and German *Wasser*. Noting that each of these nouns was followed by a word ending in the same pair of signs (*-te-ni*), a suffix which other passages suggested must mark the second person plural in verbs, it occurred to the scholar that these words ought to indicate the consumption of a foodstuff and of a liquid, respectively. The first word (*ezzateni*) called to mind Latin *edo*, German *essen*, and English *eat*. The second (*ekutteni*), which Hrozný now fully expected to mean "drink," was reminiscent of Latin *aqua*, "water." Soon he was able to translate this sentence as "Then you will eat bread and drink water," and to point to Indo-European etymologies for most of its elements (some now to be corrected; see Kloekhorst 2008).

Although early in his studies Hrozný had discounted the Indo-European affiliation of Hittite, the vocabulary of this sentence dispelled his skepticism. Poring over the hundreds of tablets at his disposal, he collected material for the first thorough analysis of Hittite grammar and vocabulary, presenting them in a book published two years later (Hrozný 1917). Within less than a decade, most authorities had come to accept Hrozný's views concerning the linguistic affiliation of the language, and a few linguists even began to brave the "treacherous difficulties" of the cuneiform writing system (Sommer 1947:39) to participate directly in Hittitological research. Ever more evidence studied by a growing number of scholars soon resulted in a clearer picture of Hittite grammar and of the place of the language within the Indo-European family.

Today we have achieved a fairly sophisticated understanding of the Hittite language, as illustrated by an exhaustive recent grammar (Hoffner and Melchert 2008), a number of linguistic sketches (Rieken 2007; Watkins 2004), and several ongoing dictionary projects (Friedrich, Kammenhuber, and Hoffman 1975–; Güterbock, Hoffner, and van den Hout 1980–; Puhvel, 1984–). In what follows, I present a bare-bones outline of this most ancient Indo-European tongue, referring the reader to these resources for greater detail.

THE HITTITE LANGUAGE

The Hattuša Archive

Although in recent years significant numbers of Hittite cuneiform records have been found at several provincial sites in central Anatolia (Maşat Höyük/ Tapikka, Alp 1991; Kuşaklı/Şarişša, Wilhelm 1997; Ortaköy/Şapinuwa, Süel 2002; and see

Mielke, chapter 48 in this volume), by far the bulk of the relevant material comes from the central archives at the capital Boğazköy/Hattuša (see van den Hout, chapter 41 in this volume). These Hittite texts include exclusively documents and compositions inscribed to facilitate the duties of the king and his bureaucracy in fulfillment of the royal duties as chief priest, highest administrator and judge, and commander in chief of the armies of Hatti (Beckman 1995). That is, there are no Hittite private records on clay; such documents were apparently set down on tablets of wood, none of which have survived the ravages of time (Marazzi 1994).

Several languages are represented in the Boğazköy cuneiform collections (Forrer 1919): first of all, of course Hittite, the idiom of state administration, but also Palaic, Luwian, and the non-Indo-European Hattic and Hurrian, primarily in the form of incantations embedded within a Hittite-language matrix in religious texts. Semitic Akkadian (a peripheral form of Babylonian) was, as we have seen, employed in diplomatic letters and international treaties, as well as in some early internal compositions, whereas the ancient cultural tongue Sumerian, a linguistic isolate, played a limited role in advanced scribal education.

The Anatolian Family

The cohort of Indo-European languages at home in Anatolia may be divided into two groups: on one hand those written in cuneiform during the second millennium B.C.E. (Hittite, Palaic, and Luwian), plus the dialect of Luwian represented in the Anatolian Hieroglyphs (whose use extended into the Iron Age), and on the other those inscribed in epichoric Greek alphabets during the first millennium B.C.E. (Lycian, Lydian, Carian, Pisidian, and Sidetic). Although it is of course attested in inscriptions recovered in central Turkey, Phrygian is not a member of the Anatolian subfamily but is more closely related to Greek (see Roller, chapter 25 in this volume). Finally, despite ancient traditions that the Etruscans had migrated to Italy from Anatolia (Herodotus, Book 1:94, Strassler ed.: 55–56), it is still debated whether Etruscan is an Indo-European language; it certainly does not belong to the Anatolian family. (For more detail on Indo-European, see Melchert, chapter 31 in this volume.)

Hittite

The earliest researchers to concern themselves with the language of Hatti naturally called it "Hittite," but strictly speaking this designation is appropriate only in the sense that it served as the administrative language of the realm. In fact, further acquaintance with the sources revealed that the ancients themselves referred to their tongue as *nišili* or *nešumnili*, "[the language] of (the city of) Kaneš/Neša," an early center of the population that established the Hittite state. However, by the time this was recognized, the inexact term had become firmly entrenched and could not be displaced (Güterbock 1959).

The writing of Hittite texts spanned nearly half a millennium, from the mid-seventeenth century into the early twelfth century B.C.E., and naturally the language changed over the course of that period. Recognizing that certain characteristics of the local cuneiform script also developed over time (Neu and Rüster 1989), scholars are now able to assign individual tablets an approximate date of inscription and discriminate between records surviving from the era of their composition and those available only in later copies. In current dictionaries and linguistic studies, writers are careful to specify both the date of original composition of a text or grammatical form and that of the tablet on which it has been preserved. The major hiatus—between Old Hittite and New Hittite—occurred early in the empire period, around 1350 B.C.E., but many scholars also recognize a transitional Middle Hittite stage to be assigned to the first half of the fourteenth century B.C.E.

In considering the discussion that follows, keep in mind that the scribes of Hatti have left us no grammatical treatises on their language, and that all terminology employed in the description of Hittite has been assigned by modern scholars.

The Writing System

Although writing was practiced in Anatolia before the establishment of the Hittite state—namely, by the merchants working in the trading settlements of the twentieth and nineteenth centuries B.C.E. (see Kulakoğlu, chapter 47, and Michel, chapter 13 in this volume)—the variety of cuneiform they employed was not ancestral to the script later adopted by the Hittites. Rather, to judge from the sign values and shapes of the characters, the kings of Hatti imported their writing system, along with other booty, from northern Syria in the course of their early campaigns there. Indeed, it is likely that the reintroduction of literacy to Anatolia was effected by Syrian scribes carried off to the Hittite capital (Beckman 1983; see van den Hout, chapter 41 in this volume).

The Boğazköy script largely follows Old Babylonian usage in regard to the shape and values of signs, but it ignores the distinction made in Syro-Mesopotamia among the voiced, voiceless, and emphatic series of consonants. Thus, for example, Hittite scribes employed the signs KA, GA, and QA promiscuously. Instead, they represented consonants with a voiced (*lax?*) pronunciation with a single sign (e.g., *a-pa-a-aš* = /*abas*/, “that one”), while geminating voiceless (*tense?*) consonants (e.g., *at-ta-aš* = /*atas*/, “father”). Obviously, this orthographic distinction could not be made at the beginning or end of words.

Phonology

In general, as a syllabary, the cuneiform script is not an ideal vehicle for expressing Hittite or any other Indo-European language, since the members of this family are well provided with consonant clusters, which the system cannot render in word-initial or word-final position. In addition, it is unlikely that cuneiform's repertoire

of vowels (a, e, i, u) is sufficient for an accurate representation of Hittite. Our reconstruction of the phonology of the language therefore remains most uncertain.

Nominal Forms

The Hittite noun and adjective are characterized by gender (common gender and neuter), number (singular and plural), and case. Cases in general function like those of the other early Indo-European languages: nominative (nom.) for the subject of a transitive or intransitive verb; accusative (acc.) for the object of a transitive verb; vocative (voc.) for direct address; genitive (gen.) for possession or appurtenance; dative (dat.) for indirect object; locative (loc.) for position; allative (all.) for goal of movement; ablative (abl.) for point of departure; and instrumental (inst.) for means. The ergative (erg.), found only in Hittite, is used when it is necessary for a neuter noun to serve as the subject of a transitive verb.

The following chart presents an idealized schema of the nominal endings, ignoring some rare forms and the significant collapsing of distinctions found in later texts.

	Singular	Plural
com. nom.	-š, -ø	-eš
acc.	-n, -an	-uš
neut., nom.-acc.	-ø, -n	-ø, -a, -i
voc.	-e, -i, -ø	—
erg.	-anza (-/ants/)	-anteš
gen.	-aš	-an, -aš
dat.-loc.	-i, -ya, -ø	-aš
all.	-a	—
Numerically Indifferent		
	abl. -az, -za (-/ts/)	
	inst. -it, -da	

Pronouns

Personal Pronouns

Inherited independent pronouns are found only for the first and second persons, singular and plural.

	Singular		Plural	
	First	Second	First	Second
nom.	ūk	zik	wēš	šumeš
acc.	ammuk	tuk	anzaš	šumaš
gen.	ammel	tuēl	anzel	šumenzan
dat.-loc.	ammuk	tuk	anzāš	šumāš
abl.	ammēdaz	tuēdaz	anzēdaz	šumēdaz

For the third person, see the section on Demonstrative Pronouns.

Enclitic Personal Pronouns

For the first and second persons, personal pronouns occurring in the enclitic chain at the beginning of a sentence (see table) are restricted to a single form functioning as both accusative and dative.

	Singular		Plural	
	First	Second	First	Second
acc.-dat.	-mu	-ta, -du	-naš	-šmaš

The system for the third person is fuller (in each instance the second form is that found in later texts).

	Singular	Plural
com. nom.	-aš	-e, -at
acc.	-an	-uš, -aš
neut., nom.-acc.	-at	-e, -at
dat.	-še, -ši	-šmaš

Possessive Pronouns

In older texts, the possessive relationship is expressed through enclitic pronouns (e.g., *išhaš=miš*, "my lord"), which are replaced in later compositions by the genitive of the independent pronoun (e.g., *ammel išhaš*, "id."). The declensional paradigm for attachment to singular nouns as in the example just given is as follows.⁴

	Singular			Plural		
	First	Second	Third	First	Second	Third
com. nom.	-miš	-tiš	-šiš	-šummiš	-šmiš	-šmiš
acc.	-man, -min	-tan, -tin	-šan, -šin	-šumman, -šummin	-šman, -šmin	-šman, -šmin
neut., nom.-acc.	-met	-tet	-šet	-šummet	-šmet	-šmet
gen.	-maš	-taš	-šaš	-šummaš	*-šmaš	*-šmaš
dat.-loc.	-mi	-ti	-ši	-šummi	-šmi	-šmi
all.	-ma	-ta	-ša	*-šumma	*-šma	*-šma
abl.-inst.	-mit	-tit	-šit	*-šummit	-šmit	-šmit

The schema in use with plural nouns (e.g., *išheš=miš*, "my lords").

	Singular			Plural		
	First	Second	Third	First	Second	Third
com. nom.	-miš	-teš, -tiš	-šeš, -šiš	-šummeš, -šummiš	-šmeš, -šmiš	-šmeš, -šmiš
acc.	-muš	-tuš	-šuš	-šummuš	-šmuš	-šmuš
neut., nom.-acc.	-met, -mit	*-tet, *-tit	-šet, -šit	-šummet	*-šmet	-šmet, -šmit
gen.	-man, *-maš	*-tan, *-taš	*-šan, *-šaš	*-šumman, *-šummaš	*-šman, *-šmaš	*-šman, *-šmaš
dat.-loc.	*-maš	-taš	-šaš	*-šummaš	*-šmaš	*-šmaš

Demonstrative Pronouns

Hittite originally displayed triptotic deixis (Goedegebuure 2002/3): proximal ("this") *kā-*, medial ("that") *apā-*, and distal ("that yonder") *aši*, but the third term dropped out early and appears only sporadically as an archaism, often employed and/or declined incorrectly. The living system distinguished only between the demonstratives *kā-*, "this," and *apā-*, "that." The latter also substitutes for the missing personal pronoun of the third person. The basic pattern of these words combines inherited nominal and pronominal elements.

	Singular		Plural	
com. nom.	<i>kāš</i>	<i>apāš</i>	<i>kē</i>	<i>apē</i>
acc.	<i>kūn</i>	<i>apūn</i>	<i>kūš</i>	<i>apūš</i>
neut., nom.-acc.	<i>kī</i>	<i>apāt</i>	<i>kē</i>	<i>apē</i>
gen.	<i>kēl</i>	<i>apēl</i>	<i>kenzan</i>	<i>apenzan</i>
dat.-loc.	<i>kēdani</i>	<i>apēdani</i>	<i>kēdaš</i>	<i>apēdaš</i>
	Numerically Indifferent Abl. <i>kez</i> , <i>apēz</i> Inst. <i>kedanda</i> , <i>apedanda</i>			

Relative Pronouns

The relative pronouns, which also function as indefinites ("which[ever]"), are as follows.

	Singular	Plural
com. nom.	<i>kuiški</i>	<i>kuižška</i>
acc.	<i>kuinki</i>	<i>kušuška</i>
neut., nom.-acc.	<i>kuitki</i>	<i>kuēkka</i>
gen.	<i>kuēlka</i>	* <i>kuenzanka</i>
dat.-loc.	<i>kuedanikki</i>	<i>kuedaška</i>
	Numerically Indifferent Abl. <i>kuēzka</i>	

Numbers

Because of the almost exclusive use of numerals in the texts, the phonetic realization of most numbers is uncertain or even unknown, but it is clear that Hittite had cardinal, ordinal, multiple, and fractional numbers. Bases of which we can be relatively certain are: *šia-*, "one" (Goedegebuure 2006); **duya-*, "two"; *teri-*, "three"; *meyu-*, "four"; and **šiptam-*, "seven." Large numbers are invariably expressed through ideograms (Hoffner 2007).

The Verb

The Hittite verb is characterized by person (first, second, third), number (singular and plural), voice (active and medio-passive), tense/aspect (present and preterite = imperfective and perfective), and mood (indicative and imperative). There are two conjugational patterns, customarily called after the ending found in the first person singular of the active present, *-mi-* verbs and *-ḫi-* verbs. The patterns differ only in the singular in the active present, preterite, and imperative, and solely in the third person singular throughout the medio-passive.

The ideal schema of the verbal desinences follows. Considerable mutual contamination may be observed between the *-mi-* and *-ḫi-* conjugations in later texts.

Active Present			
	Singular		Plural
	<i>-mi-</i> verb	<i>-ḫi-</i> verb	
First	<i>-mi</i>	<i>-ḫi</i>	<i>-weni, -meni</i>
Second	<i>-ši</i>	<i>-ti</i>	<i>-teni</i>
Third	<i>-zi (-/tsi/)</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>-anzi</i>

Active Preterite			
	Singular		Plural
	<i>-mi-</i> verb	<i>-ḫi-</i> verb	
First	<i>-un, -nun</i>	<i>-ḫun</i>	<i>-wen, -men</i>
Second	<i>-š</i>	<i>-ta, -t</i>	<i>-ten</i>
Third	<i>-t</i>	<i>-š</i>	<i>-ir</i>

Medio-Passive Present		
	Singular	Plural
First	<i>-(ḫ)ḫa(ri)</i>	<i>-wašta(ti)</i>
Second	<i>-ta(ri)</i>	<i>-tuma(ri)</i>
Third	<i>-mi-</i> verb <i>-ta(ri)</i> <i>-ḫi-</i> verb <i>-a(ri)</i>	<i>-anta(ri)</i>

Medio-Passive Preterite		
	Singular	Plural
First	-(<i>ha</i>) <i>hat(i)</i>	- <i>waštati</i>
Second	- <i>tat(i)</i>	- <i>tumat(i)</i>
Third	- <i>mi</i> - verb - <i>tat(i)</i> - <i>hi</i> - verb - <i>a(t)</i>	- <i>antat(i)</i>

Active Imperative		
	Singular	Plural
First	- <i>mi</i> - verb -(<i>a</i>) <i>llu</i>	- <i>hi</i> - verb -(<i>a</i>) <i>llu</i>
Second	- <i>ø</i> , - <i>i</i> , - <i>t</i>	- <i>ø</i> , - <i>i</i>
Third	- <i>tu</i>	- <i>u</i> - <i>antu</i>

Medio-Passive Imperative		
	Singular	Plural
First	-(<i>ha</i>) <i>haru</i>	- <i>waštati</i>
Second	- <i>hut(i)</i>	- <i>tumat(i)</i>
Third	- <i>mi</i> - verb - <i>taru</i> - <i>hi</i> - verb - <i>aru</i>	- <i>antaru</i>

Notice that there are no specially marked optative or subjunctive forms. Potentiality, desires, and contrary-to-fact conditions are expressed through the use of particles (*man* for possibilities, wishes, or irrealis; *numān* for negative wishes). The adverb *kāša/kāšma* indicates imperfective aspect or immediacy, for example, *haššuš kāša uizzi*, "The king is just now coming." The suffixes *-ške-* and *-anna/i-* also render a verbal stem imperfective.

Deverbal Nouns

Although not necessarily attested for every lexeme, four types of nouns may in principle be formed for each verb. The participle in *-ant-* expresses a state, normally passive to a transitive verb (e.g., *appant-*, "captured; prisoner" < *ēp-*, "to seize") and resultative to an intransitive (e.g., *pant-*, "gone" < *pai-*, "to go"). The verbal substantive in *-war/-mar* (*-ātar* for a small group of *-mi-* verbs) indicates an action, as does the English gerund (e.g., *pauwar*, "going"; *appātar*, "seizing"); in general, it is inflected only in the nominative and genitive. The indeclinable infinitive in *-anzi/-manzi* (*-anna* for a small group of *-mi-* verbs; e.g., *walḥuwanzi*, "to strike; be struck" < *walḥ-*; *appanna*, "to seize; be seized") is unmarked for voice and is employed in a number of special constructions (e.g., *walḥuwanzi zinnai*, "he

finishes striking" < *zinne-*, "to bring to conclusion"). Finally, the supine in *-(u)wan*, also indeclinable, appears only in association with auxiliary *dai-*, "to put," or *tiya-*, "to step," indicating the commencement of an action (e.g., *memiškiuwan dāiš*, "began to speak" < *mema/i-*, "to speak").

Adverbs

The meaning of a verb, explicit or implied, may be modified through the use of an adverb. These may be temporal: for example, *kāru*, "previously"; *kinun*, "now"; *luk-katta*, "in the morning"; local: for example, *kā*, "here"; *šarā*, "upward"; *šer*, "above"; or indicate manner: for example, *kiššan*, "thus"; *kuwatka*, "however"; *hudak*, "suddenly, immediately." The negations *natta* and *lē* (used only with prohibitions) also belong here. Furthermore, many adverbs may be employed as postpositions (e.g., *parni anda*, "in the house") or preverbs (e.g., *šarā paizzi*, "[s]he goes up"). On occasion it may be impossible to distinguish between these usages, as in: *nu=kan haššuš happiri anda ešta*, "And the king was in the city."

Conjunctions

Coordination of sentences and clauses is effected with the independent conjunctions *šu*, *ta* (both in use only in early sources), and *nu*, "and," or by means of enclitic *-a/-ya*, "and," or *-a/-ma*, "but." There are also many subordinating conjunctions, such as *mān*, "like, as"; *mahhan*, "when, if"; *kuitman*, "while"; and so on.

Particles

Several small enclitic lexemes that appear in the sentence-initial chain (see following discussion) are extremely important for the expression of meaning. These include the reflexive particle *=az/=za (/ts/)*, the quotative *=wa(r)*, the emphatic marker *=pat* (which may also be affixed to words elsewhere in the sentence), and the sentence particles (*=an*, *=apa*, *=ašta*, *=šan*, *=kan*). These latter words, whose frequency of use increases over the attested life of Hittite at the same time as *=kan* comes to displace all the others, mainly function adverbially (Tjerkstra 1999), but with some verbs they serve to distinguish between imperfective and perfective aspect (e.g., *kuen-*, "to strike, attack," but *=kan . . . kuen-*, "to kill").

The Enclitic Chain

A distinctive characteristic of the languages of the Anatolian family of the second millennium B.C.E. is the presence of a chain of enclitic elements attached to the first word of most sentences. Of course, not all possible constituents of the chain need be present in any particular sentence, but the order in which the categories of these

small words appear is invariable: host word + quotative particle + dative and accusative enclitic pronouns + reflexive particle + sentence particles. Example:

ḥaššuš=ma=war=at=šmaš=kan arḥa dāš,

“(He said): ‘But the king took it away from them.’”

(SUBJECT + CONJUNCTION + QUOTATIVE PARTICLE + ACCUSATIVE PRONOUN [OBJECT] + DATIVE PRONOUN [INDIRECT OBJECT] + SENTENCE PARTICLE, ADVERB, VERB).

Syntax

The unmarked Hittite sentence follows the order SUBJECT OBJECT VERB, with adverbial elements immediately preceding the verb. Within a phrase, adjectives and genitives normally precede the noun they modify. For example:

<i>nu</i>	<i>šalliš ḥaššuš</i>	<i>utneyaš ḥappriyuš</i>	<i>duddumili</i>	<i>kuenta</i>
Then	the Great King	the cities of the land	secretly	attacked.
CONJUNCTION	SUBJECT	OBJECT	ADVERB	VERB
	{adjective nominative}	{genitive accusative}		

As in any language, word order may be varied for emphasis or to express various special meanings.

In sentences containing a dependent clause, the subordinate clause precedes the main clause. Example: *nu=kan antuḥšaš kuiš parni ēšta n=an ḥaššuš aušta*, “The king saw the person who was in the house,” literally “The person who was in the house, the king saw him.”

Questions not featuring an interrogative word may in general be distinguished from declarative sentences only from context, but negative rhetorical questions often front the negative (e.g., *natta=(a)n=kan kuenta*, “Didn’t he kill him?”; Hoffner 1986:89–91).

Lexicon

Many students of Hittite (e.g., Kammenhuber 1969:266) have remarked on the non-Indo-European origin of much of its vocabulary, but in fact a large proportion of its basic words can be traced back to the stock of the proto-language. The exotic impression made by its lexicon is due to the large number of technical terms for particular areas of life that the Hittites borrowed from initially more culturally advanced groups: from Hattic for architecture (e.g., *dahanga-*, “shrine”), kingship (e.g., *tabarna-*, “ruler”), and theology (e.g., *purulli-*, “earth”); from Akkadian for writing and bureaucracy (*tuppi-*, “[cuneiform] tablet”); and above all from Hurrian for cult (e.g., *puḥugari-*, “substitute,” *zurki-*, “blood [offering],” *ḥuprušhi-*, “crucible”). During the Empire period, however, Hittite’s Anatolian sister Luwian exercised ever greater influence on the official language, leading to the introduction of many Luwian words and even inflectional forms (Melchert 2005), sometimes helpfully identified in the texts as foreign by gloss wedges (*Glossenkeile*).

CONCLUSION

Further progress in the study of the Hittite (Nesite) language and the other members of the Anatolian family as well as continued research into Hurrian and the peripheral dialects of Akkadian will undoubtedly allow scholars to bring into ever clearer focus our picture of Hatti, the earliest literate culture at home in Anatolia.

NOTES

1. This section has been adapted from Beckman (1996).
2. That is, while written in Sumerian or Akkadian or a combination of the two, these words were intended to be read in Hittite. Compare our use of the Latin phrase *et cetera* (etc.) to stand for English "and so on."
3. EA 31 = Götze (1930:no. 1, obv. 1–10). In light of our current knowledge of Hittite, this passage may be translated: "Thus says Amenhotep III, Great King, King of Egypt: Say to Tarhuntaradu, King of the Land of Arzawa: All is well with me. In my lands all is well for me—for my houses, wives, children, noblemen, soldiers, chariotry and . . .
May all be well with you. May all be well in your lands for you—for your houses, children, noblemen, soldiers, chariotry and . . ."
4. Starred forms are those to be expected but not actually attested.

REFERENCES

- Alp, Sedat. 1991. *Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Beckman, Gary. 1983. Mesopotamians and Mesopotamian Learning at Hattuša. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 35: 97–114.
- . 1995. Royal Ideology and State Administration in Hittite Anatolia. In *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, ed. Jack Sasson, 529–43. New York: Scribner's.
- . 1996. The Hittite Language and its Decipherment. *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 31: 23–30.
- Ehelolf, Hans. 1925. *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, vol. 13. Berlin: Vorderasiatische Abteilung der Staatlichen Museen.
- Ehringhaus, Horst. 2005. *Götter, Herrscher, Inschriften: Die Felsreliefs der hethitischen Grossreichszeit in der Türkei*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Forrer, Emil. 1920. Die acht Sprachen der Boghazköi-Inschriften. *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 53: 1029–48.
- Friedrich, Johannes, Annelies Kammenhuber, and Inge Hoffman, 1975–. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, 2nd ed. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Goedegebuure, Petra M. 2002/3. The Hittite 3rd Person/Distal Demonstrative *aši* (*uni, eni, etc.*). *Die Sprache* 43: 1–32.

- . 2006. A New Proposal for the Reading of the Hittite Numeral '1': *šta-*. In *The Life and Times of Hattušili III and Tuthaliya IV*, ed. Theo van den Hout, 165–88. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.
- Götze, Albrecht. 1930. *Verstreute Boghazköi-Texte*. Marburg: Selbstverlag des Herausgebers.
- Güterbock, Hans Gustav. 1959. Toward a Definition of the Term "Hittite." *Oriens* 10: 233–39.
- Güterbock, Hans G., Harry A. Hoffner, and Theo van den Hout, 1980–. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: Oriental Institute.
- Haas, Volkert. 1998. 1906–1912: Hattuscha (Boğazköy): Die Hauptstadt der Hethiter. In *Zwischen Tigris und Nil: 100 Jahre Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft in Vorderasien und Ägypten*, ed. Gernot Willhelm, 92–99. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Hawkins, J. D. 1986. Writing in Anatolia: Imported and Indigenous Systems. *World Archaeology* 17: 363–76.
- Herodotus. 2007. *The Histories*, ed. Robert B. Strassler. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hoffner, Harry A. 1986. Studies in Hittite Grammar. In *Kaniššuar: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Harry A. Hoffner and Gary M. Beckman, 83–94. Chicago: Oriental Institute.
- . 2004. Ancient Israel's Literary Heritage Compared with Hittite Textual Data. In *The Future of Biblical Archaeology: Reassessing Methodologies and Assumptions*, ed. James K. Hoffmeier and Alan Millard, 176–92. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- . 2007. On Higher Numbers in Hittite. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 49: 377–85.
- Hoffner, Harry A. Jr., and H. Craig Melchert. 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- Hrozný, Bedřich. 1915. Die Lösung des hethitischen Problems. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 56: 17–50.
- . 1917. *Die Sprache der Hethiter. Ihr Bau und ihre Zugehörigkeit zum indogermanischen Sprachstamm. Ein Entzifferungsversuch*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.
- . 1931. Le Hittite: Histoire et progrès du déchiffrement des textes. *Archiv Orientalni* 3: 272–95.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies. 1969. Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch und Hieroglyphen-luwisch. In *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen*, 119–357. Leiden: Brill.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Knudtzon, J. A. 1902. *Die zwei Arzawa-Briefe: Die ältesten Urkunden in Indo-germanischer Sprache*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.
- Marazzi, Massimiliano. 1994. Ma gli Hittiti scrivevano veramente su "legno." In *Miscellanea di studi linguistici in onore di Walter Belardi*, ed. Palmira Cipriano, Paolo Di Giovine, and Marco Mancini, 131–60. Rome: Il Calamo.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2005. The Problem of Luvian Influence on Hittite. In *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel*, ed. Gerhard Meiser and Olav Hackstein, 445–60. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Meyer, Eduard. 1914. *Reich und Kultur der Hethiter*. Berlin: Karl Curtius.
- Moran, William. 1992. *The Amarna Letters*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Neu, Erich, and Christel Rüster. 1989. *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon*. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten Beiheft 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Puhvel, Jaan. 1984–. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. 2007. Hethitisch. In *Sprachen des Alten Orients*, ed. Michael Streck, 80–127. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

- Singer, Itamar. 2006. The Hittites and the Bible Revisited. In "I Will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Times": *Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar*, ed. Aren M. Maeir and Pierre de Miroschedji, 723–56. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- Sommer, Ferdinand. 1947. *Hethiter und Hethitisch*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Starke, Frank. 1982. Zur Deutung der Arzaua-Briefstelle VBoT 1, 25–27. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 71: 221–31.
- Süel, Aygül. 2002. Ortaköy-Şapinuwa. In *Recent Developments in Hittite Archaeology and History: Papers in Memory of Hans G. Güterbock*, ed. K. Aslihan Yener and Harry A. Hoffner Jr., 157–65. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- Tjerkstra, F. A. 1999. *Principles of the Relation between Local Adverb, Verb and Sentence Particle*. Groningen: Styx.
- Watkins, Calvert. 2004. Hittite. In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, ed. Roger D. Woodard, 551–75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilhelm, Gernot. 1997. *Keilschrifttexte aus Gebäude A, Kuşaklı-Sarissa I/1*. Rahden, Westfalen: Verlag Marie Leidorf.
- Winckler, Hugo. 1914. *Nach Boghazköll*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.
- Wright, William. 1884. *The Empire of the Hittites*. New York: Scribner and Welford.