

Variation, Contact, and Reconstruction in the Ancient Indo-European Languages

Between Linguistics and Philology

Edited by

Domenica Romagno
Francesco Rovai
Michele Bianconi
Marta Capano



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

For use by the Author only | © 2022
Domenica Romagno and Francesco Rovai

To the loving memory of
Romano Lazzeroni (1930–2020)



Contents

Foreword IX
List of Tables and Figures XI
Abbreviations XIII
Notes on Contributors XV

Understanding Language Organization and Change: The Key Role of
Indo-European Studies. An Introduction 1
Domenica Romagno and Francesco Rovai

- 1 Variation, Contact and Reconstruction in the Indo-European Studies:
Divergent Paths? 11
Maria Patrizia Bologna

PART 1

Language Facts and Historical Accidents

- 2 Textual Multilingualism in 2nd Millennium BC Anatolia as a Heuristic of
a Culture: The State-of-the-Art 23
Paola Cotticelli Kurras
- 3 Linguistic and Cultural Contacts in Roman Nijmegen: Insights From
Theonyms and Non-Standard Variation in Latin Inscriptions 46
Francesca Cotugno
- 4 Revising a Syntactic Isogloss: Nominal Modifiers Marking in
Indo-European Languages 71
Artemij Keidan
- 5 The Alphabetic Tradition of the *Conexiones* 109
Marco Mancini
- 6 Greek, Syriac and Iranian Loanwords in Ancient Armenian: Reflexes of
Voiceless Stops in Word-Initial Position 156
Andrea Scala

PART 2

Grammatical Categories and Conceptual Representations

- 7 Spatial Cognition and Frames of Reference in Indo-European 179
Annamaria Bartolotta
- 8 Aspectual Distinctions under Direct Perception Predicates: The Interaction between Aspect and the Morphological Form of the Dependent Predicates 210
Davide Bertocci, Sira Rodeghiero and Emanuela Sanfelici
- 9 Anticausativization in Latin and Early Italo-Romance: The Semantics of Predicates and the Syntax of Voice 243
Michela Cennamo
- 10 Variation with Synonymous Suffixes between Derivation and Compounding in Ancient Greek 274
Francesco Dedè and Maria Margherita Cardella
- 11 Aspects of the Verbal Domain in Greek and Latin: Changing Valency and Actionality 290
Domenica Romagno
- Index of languages and language families 333
Subject index 335

Textual Multilingualism in 2nd Millennium BC Anatolia as a Heuristic of a Culture: The State-of-the-Art

Paola Cotticelli Kurras

1 Introduction

The archives of the Hittite capital Ḫattuša have transmitted to us a considerable amount of texts written in different languages (Sumerian, Akkadian, Hurrian, Hittite, Luvian, Palaic and Hattic). Of some of these cultures, the Ḫattuša archives have preserved the only records written in the cuneiform writing system already existing in the Assyro-Babylonian tradition. Numerous bi- and multilingual texts also show how the phenomena of one language have been applied to others.

The question aims at understanding what kind of multilingualism in the written texts we are dealing with and on what level it has been applied:¹ to the translation of a foreign text, or to bilingual texts and code-switching phenomena in the Hittite texts. Further, I consider the interrelation between the foreign languages and the texts, discussing whether it is a case of actual multilingualism or whether it was due to the writing schools, text genres or political goals. A further question is what kind of linguistic contact could spread in such cultures and in which direction. Furthermore, we consider how to explain the choice of a language for a written text (Andrason & Vita, 2016) as a manifestation of cultural contact in terms of literacy, literary tradition and prestige (Sassmannshausen, 2008: 268). My aim here is to rethink the interaction and distribution of language(s) and text genre(s) and the status of mixed languages in situations of bilingualism (Matras, 2000; Meakins, 2013) and introduce the concept of language contact for written languages, as described by Johanson (2013).

In the following, I describe the characteristics of the documentation of the main archives in Ḫattuša and the minor ones in other places of Anatolia, the attested languages in those texts, the interaction and motivation of the lan-

¹ See Neu (1995), Dardano (2011).

guage choice for some text genres in order to sketch light on the bi- and multilingual texts (§ 2). Further, I illustrate the reciprocal influence of language contact and the interrelation between foreign language and texts within the Near-Eastern text tradition and preservation of text genres which governed the language choice (§ 3). From these premises I draw the frame of the conditions of bilingualism and some contact-induced phenomena (§ 4) concluding my survey (§ 5).

2 Background: The Documentation

2.1 *The Empire with Eight Languages and Hittitology*

Since the deciphering of Hittite, scholars have discovered a multiliterate culture combining several aspects from different languages. In the archives of Ḫattuša, there are tablets containing texts written in at least eight different languages. This fact was originally an obstacle in profiling the genealogical and linguistic status of Hittite and its position among the other languages. I give a very short overview through the literature dealing with these aspects.

Hrozný (1915) classified Hittite as an Indo-European language because of some shared isoglosses, improved by Forrer (1922), who adduced the first significant comparative material with Ancient Greek. Friedrich (1927) and Sommer (1932; 1937) began a discussion of the phylogenetic structure of the Anatolian languages, though the first classification resulted from the difficulty in defining most etymologies in Hittite, which was considered at that time to be a mixed language.² The strong cultural influence from the neighboring cultures and the etymological difficulties let the identification of the original Indo-European linguistic and cultural traits of Hittite, and in general of the Anatolian branch, proceed very slowly.

The later deciphering of Luwian texts both in cuneiform and hieroglyphic writing, the discovery of the Palaic texts and of the languages from the 1st millennium added another perspective in the study of the Anatolian languages but did not solve the complex relation to the Near-Eastern cultures. Some of them are attested only in texts deriving from the capital of the Hittite empire, such as Hattic, also deciphered between the twenties and the thirties of the last century, while Hurrian is attested also in other places. Kammenhuber (1969) gave a first systematic genealogical description of the Anatolian branch that could be better understood also from an etymological viewpoint. Significant contribu-

² See also Oberheid (2007).

tions came from Neumann (1961) and Morpurgo Davies (together with Hawkins & Neumann, 1973) in the 1970s, with special reference to the interpretation of the language of Luwian hieroglyphs. Starke (1985; 1990) contrived a first comprehensive edition of the cuneiform Luwian texts following the one by Otten (1953), providing a pioneering study in linguistic and contact-induced phenomena.³

The broader acceptance of the laryngeal theory, the consequent improvement in the phonological reconstruction and of the individual lexeme etymologies disclosed a large part of the Hittite lexicon in its Indo-European derivation. In this sense, Tischler (1979) was also able to give a statistical rate of the inherited Indo-European vocabulary of Hittite, which is no less than the Greek or Iranian one, confirmed in Cotticelli-Kurras (2014: 32, claiming that the rate of the Indo-European vocabulary vs the non-Indo-European part is 5:3 or even 2:1). The new perspective of the linguistic status of Hittite increased equally its cultural partial independency from the Near Eastern civilizations and set the frame for a discussion about the complicated relations among the populations of that area.

2.2 *Royal Archives in Ḫattuša and Other Places*

It could be useful to illustrate the different royal archives and the rate of languages attested. In the archives from Boğazköy / Ḫattuša,⁴ around 2/3 of the texts are Hittite, less than 1/3 are Akkadian or Hittite-Akkadian, or Hittite-Hattian, or Hittite-Hurrian, Palaic and Luwian (both cuneiform and hieroglyphic).⁵ The texts contain the well-known genres: letters, religious texts, divination texts (*omina* and oracle reports), lexical lists, laws, historical texts, and instructions.

Another archaeological place with very significant finds is Maşat Höyük / Tapikka (100 km from Ḫattuša), discovered in the 1980s as a military post with another archive from the Middle-Hittite period. Moreover, Ortaköy / Şapinuwa,⁶ an important city for the testimony of texts from the so-called Middle-

3 For current projects on special *corpora* and Anatolian languages (e.g. *Luwili* by Mouton & Yakubovich), as well as texts editions, online CTH and more documentation on the texts collections, see the website *Hethitologie Portal Mainz* under the link: <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/HPM/index.php>.

4 In Ḫattuša, the main archives are those in the citadel of Büyükkale, Building A, 'Westbau', further Temple 1, House on the Slope, in the lower City.

5 Only a few hieroglyphic texts from the Old Hittite period have been found in Ḫattuša, comprising only seals.

6 In Şapinuwa, for example, there are several Hurrian texts which mention the Weather god (Hurrian *Teššub* is *Şapinuwa=hi*), as in the Hittite Suppiluliuma-Šattiwaza Treaty (KBo 1.3).

Hittite tradition, delivered many texts that have not yet been entirely edited and translated. Finally, Šamuḫa as a cult place, and Tarḫuntašša as the capital in south East Anatolia in the latest phase of the empire are known from the texts but not certainly identified.

2.3 *Rates of Texts in Foreign Languages*

The particularity of the composition of the collected texts found in the Hittite archives⁷ and covering a time span of 350 years is their different languages (besides Hittite): Akkadian, Hattic, Hurrian, Sumerian, Luwian, Palaic. As Haas (2006: 12) claimed, the archives in Ḫattuša are invaluable for Assyriology insofar as they have preserved the most extensive corpus of Sumerian and Akkadian literature from the middle of the 2nd millennium BC with texts that are known from Babylonia and Assyria only in later writings from the 1st millennium.

The classificatory catalogue by Laroche (1971) gave a first systematization according to the textual genres of the texts,⁸ which might display different *subcorpora*. We find Hattic texts (CTH 725–745; with relevant literature by Kammenhuber, 1969; Schuster, 1974; 2002; Klinger, 1996); Palaic texts (CTH 750–754, see their edition by Carruba, 1970); Luwian texts (CTH 757–773, see the edition as StBoT 30 and 31 by Starke, 1985; 1990). Hurrian texts from the Hittite archives are collected under the numbers CTH 774–791; moreover, the Lists of gods CTH 704, 705 (most of them published in the series ChS by Salvini, Wegner, Haas, Wilhelm, Giorgieri). Finally, Sumerian-Akkadian texts are listed under the numbers CTH 792–796, 800–835 (Akkadian from Boğazköy, see Schwemer, 1998, among others); while for further historical texts in Akkadian and letters see the editions by Marazzi (1986), and Mora & Giorgieri (2004).

The interplay between the languages in the above-mentioned texts varies, such that some texts are entirely in a foreign language, while others present only some inserts in a foreign language. The synchronic description of this phenomenon does not allow for understanding the terms of multilingualism in the society nor the diachronic historical circumstances that led to the introduction or use of a (different) foreign language. The sociocultural dynamics of multilingualism are too complex to be exhaustively described in a short overview, but mentioning some parameters might shed some light on the situation.

⁷ On the archives in Ḫattuša see, among others, Košak (1995), Francia (1996), Haas (2006), Alaura (2011).

⁸ Abbreviated as CTH, *Catalogue des Textes Hittites*.

2.4 *Explaining Bi-/Trilingual Texts*

Beside the texts entirely in foreign languages, there are also a certain number of bilingual and a few trilingual texts in the archives. In defining the type and the goal of bilingual texts, it is not always clear, whether they were created as parallel versions, or if one of them is a literary translation and, finally, which text is the original one. Traditionally we define a bilingual text in the Hittite tradition as a composition that contains both versions on the same tablet. In some cases, the foreign text is on the left side, while the right side contains the Hittite version. This is the case of CTH 6, a bilingual text, which contains the so-called political testament of Ḫattušili in the style of a farewell speech that lets the king appear as the author instead of a scribe. The consequence is that the Hittite version might be the original one.

In other cases the layout is different, e.g. in the Hattian-Hittite ritual KUB 2.2.+ (CTH 725); the paragraphs with the Hattian text and the corresponding paragraphs with the Hittite translation follow one another in the same column. For various Akkadian-Hittite texts, different situations emerge; this is the case of the historical report by Ḫattušili I on his campaigns in Syria (CTH 4), as well as chronicle reports in the Hittite and Babylonian languages. There are two different texts, respectively, for the Akkadian and the Hittite version, so that we may infer that the scribe translated the text for the sake of (international) communication, or of social or cultural prestige.⁹ In doing so, the linguistic operations are complex, and each text requires special research, especially if the texts are later copies and not original Old Hittite ones.

The Old Hittite historical texts dealing with the king's political deeds could follow the Babylonian historiographical tradition aiming at underlining the function of the king's political action as a sign of the reception of the Babylonian culture. The literary genre was a clear trigger for the choice of the composition's language, indicating the cultural tradition of some cultic or religious practices. The very particular liver models (CTH 547) are transmitted in an Akkadian, and an Akkadian/Hittite version (on a liver-shaped tablet), while the liver *omina* (presages, CTH 549) or KIGUB exist in an Akkadian, a bilingual Akkadian-Hittite version, and in Hittite. Some other texts reached us only in the Akkadian version, such as CTH 7, the siege of Urša/u.¹⁰

9 Other texts are attested in two separate versions for Akkadian and Hittite, i.e. CTH 19, the famous Telpinu edict, or 21, Telpinu's treaty with Išputahšu. In fact, some other treaties are attested in separate texts for each language, like CTH 41 treaty with Šunaššura, 49 with Aziru, 51 with Šattiwaza, 52 Šattiwaza's Treaty with Šuppiliuma I, and finally 62 (with Duppi-Tešub).

10 The texts under the CTH-numbers 208 (letters), 216 (fragments of historical texts), 222

Since Tutḫaliya III, in the Middle Hittite period (ca. 1450–1300), there is an increase of texts in Hurrian language, such as the bilingual literary work “Song of Release” (CTH 789), a Hurrian Gilgameš poetic work (CTH 341.II). In addition to the mythic-poetic “Kumarbi’s poems”, to which CTH 345 (Ullikummi), with each a Hurrian and a Hittite version, as well for CTH 348 (Hedammu’s song) belong, there are extensive rituals, hymns, prayers, occasionally also historical and mantic documents. Though the scribes had a competence in Hurrian (and in Hittite), we are not able to fully understand and translate Hurrian texts, so that we cannot completely evaluate the extent of translation techniques in such texts.¹¹

The Hattic language as a survivor of a substrate culture is a very old layer in the bilingual Hittite production, though Hattic seemed to be no longer spoken and understood in Ḫattuša, only used as a sacred language in certain ritual texts.¹² A small Hattic-Hittite text group of bilinguals of similar character from the ritual literature contains calls to gods or incantations by a singer, in which he calls the deity by her name “to mankind” and her name “among the gods”. Scholars have underlined some language and cultural interference, in particular on the basis of translations or bilingual texts: among others, we may mention Klinger (1996), Rizza (2008, 2009), Schuster (1974), Schwemer (1998), Sassmannshausen (2008).

Some trilingual texts belong to the production of religious literature, in different language combinations, such as the trilingual Hymn to Iškur-Adad (CTH 314). Moreover, there are the Gilgameš epic in Akkadian, Hittite, and Hurrian (CTH 341), as well Kešši’s tale, CTH 361, attested in three versions, in Akkadian, in Hittite, and in Hurric, and finally some festivals with songs in Hattic, Hurrian, and in so-called ‘Kanesian’ (the language of Kaneš, CTH 656).

The influence of the Sumerian tradition, not in the sense of a spoken language but for its cultural role especially in the scribal schools, writing system and education of scribes and curriculum will be discussed under § 2.2. Here, I will end with a reference to special text genres, the Mesopotamian hymns and prayers, some rituals, medical and mantic texts, and the Sumerian lexical lists, understood as a taxonomic systematization of world knowledge in the Ancient

(royal *tabarnaš*, donations) are only in Akkadian, and finally there is an Akkadian / Ugaritic edict fixing the tribute of Ugarit, CTH 47. The so-called *pabilti* (Babylonian) ritual for Ištar-Pirinkir CTH 718 is bilingual but without corresponding parts: the ritual instructions are in Hittite, only the ‘formulas’ are in Akkadian.

11 For the Hurrian-Hittite bilingue see Neu (1996) with further references.

12 Goedegebuure (2008) regarded Anatolia as an area characterized by a Luwian substrate and a Hattic and Hittite superstrate.

Near East, and the so-called vocabularies deriving from those texts, bilingual lists of words in Sumerian and Akkadian, to which the Hittite correspondences were added.

Many questions arise from the analysis of the bi- and trilingual texts, depending on not only establishing the ‘original’ and the ‘translated’ text, i.e. the direction of the translation, but also on the bi- or multilingualism of the scribe. In many cases the syntax and the style of the texts allows for inferring the origin and linguistic competence of the scribe(s). Furthermore, one might ask if the texts come from parallel traditions, or what their target is, their use in daily life. All these aspects build a complex of constraints that could influence the possible contact-induced linguistic phenomena they exhibit.

3 Typology of Multilingualism

Multilingualism seems to be a commonly occurring situation in many ancient societies. Recent studies conducted from a sociolinguistic perspective have shown how multilingualism could be widespread in certain population groups or in societies with various ethnic origins, as was the case for Hittite society.¹³ However, we have to be careful to distinguish oral and written multilingualism. The compositional character of the presented texts shows a multifarious kind of written multilingualism, motivated by very different factors. In the Hittite written tradition, there are ‘original’ texts entirely in a foreign language, translations from a foreign text, bilingual texts and Hittite texts with code-switching phenomena. This situation is not common and requires comment as regards the reasons, goals and targets of such a production and collection of texts for the Hittite archives.

In a recent article, Hasselbach-Andee (2020: 457 ff.) tackles in general the topic of ‘Multilingualism and Diglossia in the Ancient Near East’ providing a very general but comprehensive overview on the complex interaction among the various ancient cultures in the Near East area (with short references to the Anatolian situation: “co-existence of various languages ... in Anatolian”, a cross reference to chapter 12, “and to the ‘multilingual situation in Ugarit’”, *ibid.*: 460).

In the following, I refer to the interrelation of the languages in a bilingual text or to the direction of the texts in translation, as well as to the choice of the language for some textual genres.

¹³ See Molinelli (2017, ed.) on the multicultural Mediterranean cultures, Yakubovich (2010) on the socio-linguistic dynamics of the Luwian layer within the Hittite Kingdom.

3.1 *Cultural Contact in Terms of Literacy and Literary Tradition*

The co-presence of more languages in the Hittite archives is due to the historical background of the Empire, which requires a synchronic systematization, even if in a very general overview. How can we explain the choice of a specific foreign language from among the various ones available? What were the sociolinguistic dynamics and the historical motivations that led to the use of one specific language? We can say little about oral multilingualism in those Ancient societies; we can only deduce from the written texts and their types information concerning the written tradition, not about the competence of the individuals. We know that Hattic and Sumerian were no longer spoken in the Hittite period, while Hurrian was a spoken language, as well the different Semitic languages in the neighborhood.

The lexical level shows many loanwords that circulated in those languages, some of them as *Kulturwörter*, whereas others were due to the Sumerian-Akkadian literacy tradition. The documented presence of scribes, summoners, doctors, and perhaps artists from Babylonia in Ḫattuša shows that there was an interest in and a heritage from the Babylonian culture, i.e. a situation of multilingualism and multi-culturalism.

A very strong medium for the transmission of the Mesopotamian culture was undoubtedly the writing system. Weeden (2011a, 2011b, and 2020: 505 ff.) gives an overview of scribal practices and learning practices of writing as a typical approach to the Sumerian culture, writing system (Viano, 2016 and Weeden, 2011a) and literature, as well as of specific elements for certain genres, like incantations, or medical prescriptions (according to Sassmannshausen, 2008: 267, and Schwemer, 2013: 164, and below).

In fact, the *omen* and incantation literature as well the medical texts probably suggest a practical use deriving from the Babylonian tradition. ÉN was the traditional and technical term for incantation and the genre for magical practices, SĪR for songs, which survives also in language use, in specific terminology, in some phrases and phrasal constructions, though the linguistic frame is that of Hittite.

Further, Weeden (2020: 511 f.) provides Viano's (2016: 133) list of eight Sumerian literary texts from Ḫattuša as well as the only bilingual Sumerian-Hittite text KUB 4.5, which is very important for a hermeneutic insight into this level of literacy contact (the other texts are trilingual). The question is if the Hittite scribes needed the Akkadian mediation of the Sumerian texts for their understanding or not; the answer possibly being different from case to case.

Another example given by Weeden of Hittite texts as translation of Sumerian ones, known in their Akkadian and Sumerian-Akkadian bilingual versions, is quoted by Weeden (2020: 514, referring to Metcalf's, 2011; 2015 edition of the

text), especially the famous prayer KUB 30.10. It belongs to the text group listed under the CTH number 372–374. Weeden (*ibid.*) shows the difficulties in understanding the translational process into Hittite, especially because we do not have the Akkadian version of the whole text, so that it is not possible to understand if the translation is based on the Akkadian or only on the Sumerian text.

Investigations on Sumerian and Hittite cultural and linguistic contact show why it is difficult to describe paths of translations, or interpreting written signs and their use in their polyphonic reality, the possible linguistic competence of scribal groups, and even the motivation for the choice of translation of some texts, as well as the use of particular motifs from the literature. In addition, I suggest considering other cultural components, i.e. the Indo-European tradition and cultural elements, as a trigger or frame in which the foreign elements could find their place. This research perspective complicates investigations and requires interdisciplinary competences. Especially incantations and curses show many traditional elements recurring also in other Indo-European compositions, like the catalogues mentioning the ‘12 body parts’ in the purification practices occurring in Hittite rituals, but also in other literary traditions, such as the Germanic, Vedic or Avestan incantation texts.

Even the so-called *historiolae* in the Hittite rituals, well-known from the Mesopotamian tradition, provide material for comparison both in the Indo-European common heritage direction and in the environment of the Babylonian culture. We actually lack studies which try to combine in their analysis the possible different sources of motifs and vestiges in the different genres or also in particular topoi. Francia (2013) analyzed the interpretation of many Sumerograms in the *historiolae*, in order to understand if their (original Sumerian) logographic value was understood and imported into the Hittite language. The co-presence of all these different motifs offers a starting point for reconsidering the cultural interplay of literacy, magic practices, traditional songs, and writing aspects, which possibly form a composite, but new culture of its own in the Hittite tradition. From this perspective, one may understand the concept of multiculturalism not as a mere unreflected strategy of making culture but as a conscious elaboration and choice of expressing one’s own culture.

As far as Ḫattuša is concerned, it is notable that, according to Sassmannshausen (2008: 268), non-literary texts are always written in the Akkadian language when dealing with southern neighbors, or with vassals in the northern Syrian region. Thus, treaties with the non-Anatolian neighbors, like correspondence with vassal states in the South, are written in Akkadian, while correspondence such as treaties with vassals of other regions are written in Hittite. Regarding this point, the contribution by Vita (2020: 357–372) on Akkadian as a *lingua franca* in the Ancient Near East is illuminating. As far as Akkadian

and Hittite Anatolian are concerned, we know that the Old Assyrian texts by the so-called Cappadocian merchants between the 20th and the 18th century BC included individual Indo-European Anatolian words (see Dercksen, 2007).

It seems, moreover, that the Indo-European Anatolian people (Hittites) used cuneiform writing in a form not already adapted to their own language; rather, they wrote in Assyrian. This is testified by texts such as literary Akkadian texts in the second millennium, or Akkadian translations of Hittite texts written in Hattuša, such as the “siege of Uršu”, the annals of Hattušili I and the Telipinu decree mentioning, among others, the destruction of Babylon by Muršili I, concerning the subjugation of the southern neighbors.

The linguistic presence of Akkadian structures, school material for a curricular writing education, even phrases and technical vocabulary in the late Bronze Age of the Hittite Empire, document the strong diplomatic interrelationship which led to the spread of the Akkadian language as a *lingua franca* in a modern sense. As any other culture, the Hittite Anatolian culture developed its own peculiar contact-induced structures: from the (re)introduction of cuneiform writing through the influence of North Syrian scriptoria to the linguistic loan of individual lexemes or the adaptation of calques and grammatical structures (see, among others, Schwemer, 2005; Thomason, 2001, 6, 89; Dardano, 2012; Johanson, 2013; Beaulieu, 2013; Pozza & Gasbarra, 2014; Dardano, 2014).

In order to underline the deeper relation between a linguistic tradition and a literary genre, I give in Table 2.1 a tabulated overview over the correspondences between language used and text genre within Hittite literature. The resulting distribution is very clear and displays the cultural interaction within the genres in terms of bilingualism according to certain cultural patterns and traditions.

TABLE 2.1 Correspondences between language used and text genre in Hittite literature

		Hittite	Luwian	Palaic	Hattic	Hurrian	Akkadian	Others
Historical texts	Treaties		+				+	
	Letters		+			+	+	
	Epic		+			+	+	
Religious texts	<i>Omina</i>		+			+	+	
	Hymns/Prayers		+				+	+
Cultural texts	Mythological texts	+	(+)	(+)	+	+		
	Rituals	+	+	+	+	+	+	
Scholarly texts	Word lists						+	+

3.2 *Writing Schools, Traditions and Scribes*

Our knowledge about writing schools in the Hittite Empire and the origin of the operating scribes is limited. As theoretical constraints, we regard the linguistic competence of the scribes in their native language and the other foreign languages, which might also have implications for different types of writing systems (Akkadian cuneiform, Hittite and Hurrian cuneiform; see Beckman, 1983).

Furthermore, there were different writing schools and traditions which possibly conditioned not only the choice of the kind of cuneiform, but also signaled adaptation from other systems, i.e. in the use of logograms, of certain phrases and formulaic structures, in the specialization of a specific terminology or in the degree of their competence in international relations. The detailed investigation by Weeden (2011a) is a very comprehensive presentation and discussion of most of the problems and issues concerning scribal education and writing schools (É.DUB.BA / É *tuppaš* in a Hittite calque with Semitic word order). More is known about scribal education in the Babylonian period than for the Hittite period, as far as the art of writing, the use of logograms by the Hittites and the polysemic value of Sumerograms in Hittite texts is concerned.

Here I only highlight some basic considerations: the introduction of writing into Hittite culture is related both to the elaboration of a proper cuneiform type and to the recording of their own language through the writing system. In the Old Hittite tradition (and Old Hittite ductus), the first diplomatic texts are in Akkadian (possibly translations of Hittite into Akkadian), the historical texts show Akkadian elements, while the rituals are in Hittite.

I do not wish to go into the details of the chronological fixation of Old Hittite dating,¹⁴ but according to the evidence of the Old Hittite Script, the ductus and the writing seem to display a coherent system. In addition, as Viano (2016) has already pointed out and Weeden (2020: 511) has also remarked, there is a difference in the writing types (Boğazköy and Babylonian script-type), e.g. in relation to the Sumerian texts found within or outside of Ḫattuša which could signal the origin of the composition, independently of the place of their excavation. The lexical lists from Ḫattuša (CTH 299–309 among them Vocabularies, Erim.ḫuš and Diri),¹⁵ as school material for the Hittite scribes, display in three columns words in Sumerian and Akkadian and their Hittite correspondences, as practical writing learning material, partially documenting some phonetic readings of the Sumerian words, even if some signs and logograms are to some extent obscure to us.

14 For the discussion, I refer to Neu (1980), Popko (2008), Archi (2010), and van den Hout (2012).

15 Especially on the lexical lists, see Scheucher (2012), in general Weeden (2011a: 91–131).

Finally, the knowledge of the Akkadian and partially of the Sumerian literature was implicit in the process of learning the writing system, and contact with some foreign words came through their continuous elaboration on the writing system level.

3.3 *Interrelation between Foreign Language and Texts*

Aiming at understanding the choice, relation and distribution of the languages in these texts, we will consider some variable parameters. These may be the chronological period, a specific cultural tradition in relation to a genre, or the connection between text genre and language, further writing schools, traditions and scribes.

The question arising in investigating a situation of real bi- or multilingualism is the level and the target of the bi- or multilingualism itself. It includes considerations on the scribal caste, the royal clan, and international communication; further, the mutual influence and meaning of the use of more than one language and to what purpose, the possible connection to the situation of the spoken languages, and the direction of connection between a main text and a translated text, and under which conditions they were produced.

Recently, Pozza & Gasbarra (2014: 10f., and *passim* with older references) have collected some loanwords in Hittite and in other Ancient Near East languages showing the different directions of the loans and the target language, from Akkadian to Mycenaean across the second millennium. However, such generalizations illustrate the need for specific studies illustrating systematically the various times and regions, the language contact and its directions, intercultural and genetic relations and, finally, the possibility of the formation of linguistic areas. Only on these premises is the wide theoretical frame of linguistic area(s) and language contact suitable, but it requires longer and deeper systematic investigations of a very large collection of material to compare and analyze the attested phenomena.¹⁶

From a linguistic point of view, the presence of structures deriving from Akkadian elements in Hittite texts points to a close relation and a deeper elaboration of linguistic material through neo-formations in the sense of the creation of calques and grammatical structures (see below §3). Also, the creation of compounds from possible source material from the Sumerian logographic models could shed some light on the complex linguistic interaction

16 Here I refer to some current researches on Language and culture contact, such as the ERC project PALaC, conducted by Federico Giusfredi in Verona (grant agreement no. 757299), and Luwili quoted in footnote 4.

and on the proficiency of the scribes not only in Akkadian, but also in Sumerian, or in that part of the Sumerian vocabulary that was still used in Akkadian.

4 Some Considerations on the Conditions of Bilingualism and Contact-Induced Phenomena

From the above considerations, it has become clear that the type of multilingualism in Anatolia of the second millennium is a complex phenomenon. Given that the texts in our possession are mostly written by scribes, we can only evaluate on these terms their degree and type of linguistic competence, not generically a situation or social dynamics, or the linguistic profile of the Hittite court. In fact, the intrinsic multilingualism in written production includes both multilingualism due to curricular training in writing schools, and certainly centers of culture and literary training, and may provide indications regarding a certain degree of spoken multilingualism, or better of multilingualism in linguistic production.

Andrason & Vita (2016: 295) identified such a situation as a case of ‘written-language contact of both related and non-related linguistic codes’, which they defined as mixed language. The authors highlighted that within the Hittite Kingdom conditions developed necessary for building a multilingual scenario in writing:

[a] framework of mixed languages (which is typical of languages that, in a deliberate manner and in situations of bilingualism, make use of two original codes), the theory of written language contact (which explains linguistic contact specific for written codes) and the genetically sensitive model of language contact (which specifies possible implications for language contact that derive from the genetic relation existing between the interacting codes).

ANDRASON & VITA, 2016: 295

The theory that Hittite was a mixed language goes back to the time of its decipherment; after the balancing work of the etymological analysis of most words of the Hittite vocabulary, though many are written only in logographic writing, thus hiding their Hittite phonetic shape, it is worth asking whether Hittite can still be considered a mixed language. A short definition of mixed languages may be useful, again quoting Andrason & Vita (2016):

The prototype of a mixed language can be characterized by grammatical and socio-linguistic traits: on the one hand, contrary to non-mixed systems, a mixed language descends from two or more parent codes, failing to be classifiable in historical terms of a phylogenetic tree and, on the other hand, in contrast with other contact languages, it emerges from situations of bilingualism, being a product of expressive needs and constituting a relatively deliberate process.¹⁷

ANDRASON & VITA 2016: 295

Though in general this definition is suitable due to its applicability to the Hittite environment, Andrason & Vita in their article focused on another real situation involving three Semitic languages, namely that of the interrelation of Ugaritic-Hurrian, Hurro-Akkadian and Canaano-Akkadian. Today, we do not have a comprehensive overview of the different results of possible contact-induced phenomena during the four hundred years of Hittite written production, but only partial results of some aspects of such phenomena, considering Hittite respectively as the source or the target language. We can investigate syntactic structures, we can evaluate the presence of foreign words in the lexicon, we recognize some calques in phrasal structures as results of contact-induced phenomena in Hittite.

However, this still does not demonstrate that Hittite was a mixed language, representing only one side of the language contact. In fact, it might also be possible that the contact was bidirectional. The presence of an influence of the Hittite structures within other languages would require us to have a deeper knowledge of them than we actually have, especially with respect to Hurrian and Hattic. In this context, we may refer to a well-known syntactic change in Akkadian. Michalowski (2006) proposed the interpretation of an Akkado-Sumerian area with language contact and interference at a syntactic level, highlighting that the Akkadian vsO-system moved to SOV under the influence by Sumerian. In contrast, in the third millennium many Semitic words entered the Sumerian vocabulary.¹⁸

Further reflections touch the extent of contact phenomena, as some of them are limited to the texts in which they are realized (e.g. in bilingual texts), while others may instantiate linguistic structures that substitute those existing in the replica language. For this reason, I present some examples from Hittite with a special focus on the technique of calques as a strategy of introducing foreign

17 The authors refer also to Matras (2000); Meakins (2013: 179 f., 210, 215).

18 See Zólyomi (2011); Crisostomo (2020: 403 ff.).

structures into the replica/target language. This may also involve some compounds (types), and word order in certain phrases.

The univerbation *anišiwat* (adv.) “today (this day)”, a hapax, has been interpreted by Gusmani (1968, see also a discussion on its formation in EDHIL: 767; Cotticelli-Kurras, 2014: 31f.), as a possible calque from Greek *sāmeron/tēmeron*, see also Goth. *himma daga* (a further calque from Greek in the Gothic Bible translation). The expression remains close to other phrases such as *appašiwat* and *para šiwatti*, the former a calque from the Akkadian phrase (*w*)*arkāt ūmī* “the back side of the day”, with Sumerian correspondence EGIR.U₄. Dardano (2011; 2014) also using previous studies, collected many Hittite neo-formations as calques from Akkadian prepositional or genitival phrases, which include many designations of professions, or institutional offices.

Giving only a few examples, I may mention the group of phrases containing the word *išḫa-* / EN (Sumerian) / *BĒLU* (Akkadian), sometimes in the Middle Hittite short hand *BE*. “lord, master”, preceded by a genitive and listed in HW² IV/23: 99–109 s.v. *išḫa-*. In this article (especially p. 100), some interesting variations are highlighted: the different forms of writing seem to be significant: the syllabic one (Hittite) is seldom used when the word means ‘owner’ and occurs both in Old texts and in later copies, while the Akkadian written form *bēlu* occurs in the Middle Hittite texts and in the Mašat archive. In the compounded titles, the Sumerian written form EN is very frequent (EME EN, EN SISKUR).¹⁹ The point is that some structures, like *auriyaš išḫaš*, are calques of the Akkadian form *BĒL MADGALTI* “watchpost commander”, where the phrase structure mirrors the respective word order, GEN + N for Hittite and N + GEN for Akkadian.

5 Conclusions

Different types of phenomena can be subsumed under the label ‘multilingualism’: we distinguish written from oral multilingualism, even if we have little evidence of the latter. Certain texts preserve traces of non-spoken languages as cultural relicts in some literary uses, especially Palaic as an example of a related language, but also Hattic as an example of a non-related one. Furthermore, there is a large number of individual terms as a sign of *termini technici* in rituals from the Hurrian language, as well as some from Hattic and Akkadian.

19 According to HW², IV/23: 100, EN occurs in Middle Hittite with SISKUR, not only with MADGALTI, against Weeden (2011a: 54).

Occasional linguistic phenomena recur in translation texts, and seem to be due to the model language. In fact, they are mostly hapaxes occurring only in those texts without becoming part of the Hittite language use. Some phrasal structures which were introduced into the Hittite language as translation strategies became productive. The introduction of calques is an evident sign of living linguistic elaboration.

Some logographic writings are still ambiguous: Akkadian complementations or determinatives for some Sumerian logograms show a possible Akkadian reading (or mediation); in other cases, if attested, the use of Sumerograms of compound words, for example, has no influence of their word order.²⁰ Looking at the Hittite correspondences of specific Sumerian expressions, e.g. $MUNUS_{AMA} DINGIR_{LIM}$ and $MUNUS_{DINGIR} AMA$ ²¹ and Hittite *šiu nazanna* ‘mother of gods’, or Sumerian $\acute{E}^{NA_4} KI\acute{S}IB$ and Hittite *šyannaš per* ‘sealing or store house’, finally Sumerian $\acute{E} LUGAL$ and Hittite *haššuwaš per* ‘king’s house’, they give perfect calques, including the change in the word order from Sumerian N + GEN into Hittite GEN + N.

The still open question of the Sumerographic determinatives both as grammatical and as semantic markers points to some interesting employments as far as word order is concerned. Especially in certain nominalized and or composed words, their position is atypical, as the following examples show: e.g. *katta* ^(DUG)*kurant* ‘a libation vessel’ (here between the two elements of the juxtaposition / compound), or *halki* ^{H.L.A-}*uš* ‘crops’ (here between the stem of the lexeme and its accusative ending), $L\acute{U}.ME\acute{S}$ *hazziwaš išheš* ‘lords of the ritual’²² (see Hoffner & Melchert, 2008: 24, 63). Finally, if we accept the sociolinguistic

20 I make here only brief reference to different metalinguistic uses of the terms ‘Sumerogram, Akkadogram, logogram, heterogram and alloglottography’ within the Hittite tradition: they have been critically analyzed by Kudrinski & Yakubovich (2016) who give an extensive discussion on Weeden’s (2011a) definitions and further literature. I agree with the consideration and questions claimed by the authors, who wrote (2016: 59): “Nevertheless, the distinction between what is defined as logogram and heterogram in Weeden (2011a) raises an interesting question at the conceptual level. What was the social factor that contributed to the retention of Sumero- and Akkadograms in Hittite texts, despite the sufficiency of the syllabic cuneiform inventory for rendering their intended messages? Was it the lingering prestige of Mesopotamian high culture, which would be consistent with the hypothesis of “stylistic connotations”? Or was it the acknowledgement that the heterograms could be deployed for rendering certain fine semantic distinctions, which brings us back to “the additional level of meaning”? Although these two options are treated as different facets of the same phenomenon in Weeden (2011a), they are, in fact, substantially different”.

21 For the plural forms, see the different writing: $MUNUS.ME\acute{S}_{AMA} DINGIR_{LIM}$; $MUNUS.ME\acute{S}_{AMA} DINGI_{ME\acute{S}}$; and $MUNUS.ME\acute{S}_{DINGIR_{LIM} AMA}$; see Weeden (2011b: 438).

22 Here the determinative is before the genitive of the phrase and not immediately before

interpretation by Yakubovich (2010) and Kudrinski & Yakubovich (2016: 60f.) regarding the intentional use of heterograms in Hittite writing as a fulfilling of ‘other meaning purposes’, one may wonder why the cuneiform Luwian texts contain relatively few heterograms.²³ Three last considerations shall be put forward as a conclusion to the heuristic argumentation regarding Hittite culture: the picture of multiculturalism is the sum of many diachronic historical situations having the writing system as a common denominator and frame. Only detailed research can explain the functions, the origins, the different goals and motivations of a possible variation in the synchronic use of the languages in the texts and in public situations. The linguistic observations of the consequences of the multiculturalism yield different results.

First, we are dealing with many specific, non-generalizable solutions in the translational process of rendering a foreign text, which have no impact on the language use and system. Second, we note the traditional use of foreign elements, both in the writing system and the language, due to a precise literacy tradition, including frequent loan words in technical languages. Finally, we observe some contact-induced structures that enter and stay in the language system of the target language (in our case Hittite), and latter both among related as well as not-related languages. The investigations require more results, and the different hypotheses on possible stronger contact-induced phenomena, such as language leagues or areal diffusion in Ancient Anatolia,²⁴ show the heterogeneity of their nature and the scientific conclusions.

References

- Alaura, Silvia (2001), *Archive und Bibliotheken in Hattuša*, in *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999* (StBoT 45), Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, pp. 12–26.
- Andrason, Alexander & Vita Juan-Pablo (2016), *Contact Languages of the Ancient Near East—Three More Case Studies (Ugaritic-Hurrian, Hurro-Akkadian and Canaanite-Akkadian)*, in “Journal of Language Contact” 9, 2, pp. 293–334.
- Archi, Alfonso (2010), *When Did the Hittites Begin to Write in Hittite?*, in Cohen Yoram,

išeš “lords” as a sign of a strong nominalization of the phrase. For these types of compounds see Cotticelli-Kurras (2020).

23 See Cotticelli-Kurras & Giusfredi (2017: 9–12) which pointed out that the vocabulary layer of the employed logographic words belongs to the body parts, cultic concepts, animals, gods, and personal names.

24 See e.g. Lazzeroni (2006), Romagno (2015), Cotticelli-Kurras (2021).

- Gilan Amir & Miller Jared Lowell (2010, eds.), *Pax Hethitica—Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer* (StBoT 45), Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, pp. 37–46.
- Beaulieu, Paul-Alain (2013), *Aspects of Aramaic and Babylonian Linguistic Interaction in First Millennium BC Iraq*, in “Journal of Language Contact” 6, 2, pp. 358–378.
- Beckman, Gary (1983), *Mesopotamians and Mesopotamian Learning at Hattuša*, in “Journal of Cuneiform Studies” 35, pp. 97–114.
- Bowern, Claire (2013), *Relatedness as a Factor in Language Contact*, in “Journal of Language Contact” 6, 2, pp. 411–432.
- Carruba, Onofrio (1970), *Das Palaische—Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon* (StBoT 10), Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Cotticelli-Kurras, Paola (2014), *Il lessico anatolico nell’ambito delle lingue indoeuropee*, in Bombi, Raffaella, Cotticelli-Kurras, Paola & Orioles, Vincenzo (2014, eds.), *L’eredità scientifica di Roberto Gusmani*, Edizioni dell’Orso, Alessandria, pp. 23–41.
- Cotticelli-Kurras, Paola (2020), “Compounding and underlying syntax in Hittite between Indo-European heritage and language contact”. Word formation, grammar and lexicology. Contrastive, multilingual and comparative-historical perspectives, in Benvenuto, Maria Carmela, Braarvig, Jens Erland, Pompeo, Flavia, Rossi, Adriano Valerio & Sadovski, Velizar (2020, eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference organized by the University of Rome “La Sapienza”, in cooperation with the Multilingualism Research Group (Vienna), the Austrian Academy of Sciences, ISMEO—The International Association for Mediterranean and Oriental Studies, and the Norwegian Institute of Philology, Rome, February 6–8, 2019*, (Indogermanische Textlinguistik, Poetik und Stilistik 4), BAAR Hamburg, pp. 61–86.
- Cotticelli-Kurras, Paola (2021), *On the concept of an Anatolian-Greek language area*, in “Old World: Journal of Ancient Africa and Eurasia” 1, pp. 1–19, DOI: 10.1163/26670755-01010006.
- Cotticelli-Kurras, Paola & Giusfredi, Federico (2017), *Das Bild, die Silbe und die Laute: Keilschrift und Hieroglyphen Anatoliens zwischen II. und I. Jahrtausend*, in Waxenberger, Gaby, Sauer, Hans & Kazzazi, Kerstin (2017, eds.), *Von den Hieroglyphen zur Internet-sprache / From Hieroglyphs to Internet Language. Das Verhältnis von Laut, Schrift und Sprache / The relation of Script, Sound and Language*. Vol. 2, Reichert Wiesbaden, pp. 3–33.
- Cotticelli-Kurras, Paola & Giusfredi, Federico (2018), *Ancient Anatolian languages and cultures in contact: some methodological observations*, in “Journal of Language Relationship / Вопросы языкового родства” 16, 3, pp. 172–193.
- Crisostomo, Jay (2020), *Sumerian and Akkadian Language Contact*, in Hasselbach-Andee, Rebecca (2020, ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Near Eastern Languages*, John Wiley & Sons Hoboken, pp. 403–420.
- Dardano, Paola (2011), *Mehrsprachigkeit im hethitischen Reich: Die Beziehungen zwi-*

- schen dem Hethitischen und dem Akkadischen*, in Boschung, Dietrich & Riehl, Claudia Maria (2011, eds.), *Historische Mehrsprachigkeit. Workshop des Zentrums für Antike Kulturen des Mittelmeerraumes (ZaKMiRa) und des Zentrums Sprachenvielfalt und Mehrsprachigkeit (zsm) an der Universität Köln, Juli 2008* (zsm 4), Shaker, Aachen, pp. 47–60.
- Dardano, Paola (2012), *Contatti tra lingue nell'Anatolia preclassica: i rapporti tra l'ittito e l'accadico*, in "Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata" 3, pp. 393–409.
- Dardano, Paola (2014), *Interferenzerscheinungen in den hethitischen Texten: Der Einfluss des Akkadischen*, in "Linguarum Varietas" 3, pp. 55–72.
- Dardano, Paola (2018), *Semitic influences in Anatolian languages*, in "PHILIPPIKA" 118, pp. 345–375.
- Dercksen, Jan Gerrit (2007), *On Anatolian Loanwords in Akkadian Texts from Kültepe*, in "Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie" 97, 1, pp. 26–46.
- Forrer, Emil (1922), *Die Inschriften und Sprachen de Hatti-Reiches*, in "Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft" 76, pp. 174–269.
- Francia, Rita (1996), *Archivi e biblioteche nell'Anatolia del II millennio a.C.*, in "Archivi e Cultura" 29 (n.s.), pp. 118–138.
- Francia, Rita (2013), *Gli scongiuri e le historiologiae nella letteratura magica ittita*. PhD Thesis, Università di Roma, La Sapienza.
- Friedrich, Johannes (1927), *Werden in den hethitischen Keilschrifttexten die Griechen erwähnt?*, in "Kleinasiatische Forschungen" 1, 1, pp. 87–107.
- Friedrich, Johannes & Kammenhuber, Annelies (1975–1998); et al. (1998), *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage. Auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte* [= HW²], Vols. 1–5, Winter, Heidelberg.
- Goedegebuure, Petra (2008), *Central Anatolian languages and language communities in the Colony period: The Luwian substrate of Hittian and the independent Hittites*, in Dercksen, Jan Gerrit (2008, ed.), *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian period*, PIHANS 111, Peeters Publishers, Leiden, pp. 37–180.
- Gusmani, Roberto (1968), *Il lessico ittito. Introduzione allo studio comparativo delle lingue anatoliche 1* (Collana di studi classici 5), Libreria scientifica editrice, Napoli.
- Haas, Volkert (2006), *Die hethitische Literatur. Texte, Stilistik, Motive*, de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Hasselbach-Andee, Rebecca (2020, ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Near Eastern Languages*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken.
- Hawkins, John David, Morpurgo Davies, Anna & Neumann, Günter (1973), *Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: New Evidence for the Connection*, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen.
- Hoffner, Harry Angier Jr. & Melchert, Harold Craig (2008), *A Grammar of the Hittite Language. Part 1: Reference Grammar. Languages of the Ancient Near East*, Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake.

- van den Hout, Th.P.J. (2012), *The Ductus of the Alalah VII Texts and the Origin of Hittite Cuneiform*, in Devecchi, Elena (2012, ed.), *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age*, Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, Leiden, pp. 147–170.
- Hrozný, Bedrich (1915), *Die Lösung des hethitischen Problems, ein vorläufiger Bericht*, in “Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin” 56, pp. 17–59.
- Hrozný, Bedrich (1917), *Die Sprache der Hethiter* (BoSt 1–2), Hinrichs, Leipzig.
- Johanson, Lars (2013), *On the role of Turkic in the Caucasus Area*, in Matras, Yaron, McMahon, April & Vicent, Nigel (2013, eds.), *Linguistic areas. Convergence in Historical and typological Perspective*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 160–181.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies (1969), *Handbuch der Orientalistik, Hethitisch, Palaisch, Luwisch, Hieroglyphenluwisch und Hattisch*, Kitzingen, München.
- Klinger, Jörg (1996), *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht* (StBoT 37), Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin (2008), *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* [= EDHIL] (Leiden Indo-European Dictionaries Series 5). Brill, Leiden / Boston.
- Košak, Silvin (1995), *The Palace Library “Building A” on Büyükkale*, in van den Hout, Theo & de Roos, Johan (1995, eds.), *Studio historiae ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (PIHANS 74), Istanbul, pp. 173–179.
- Kudrinski, Maksim & Yakubovich, Ilya (2016), *Sumerograms and Akkadograms in Hittite: Ideograms, Logograms, Allograms, or Heterograms*, in “Altorientalische Forschungen” 43, 1–2, pp. 53–66.
- Laroche, Emmanuel (1971), *Catalogue des textes hittites*, Klincksieck, Paris.
- Lazzeroni, Romano (2006), *La codifica dell'allativo in greco e in ittita. Contributo allo studio di un'area linguistica circumegea*, in “Archivio Glottologico Italiano” 91, pp. 106–111.
- Marazzi, Massimiliano (1986), *Beiträge zu den akkadischen Texten aus Boğazköy in althethitischer Zeit* (Biblioteca di ricerche linguistiche e filologiche 18), Università La Sapienza. Dipartimento di Studi Glottoantropologici, Roma.
- Matras, Yaron (2000), *Mixed languages: A functional-communicative approach*, in “Bilingualism: Language & Cognition” 3, 2, pp. 9–99.
- Matras, Yaron (2007), *The borrowability of structural categories*, in Matras, Yaron & Sakel, Jeanette (2007, eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, De Gruyter, Berlin / New York, pp. 31–73.
- Meakins, Felicity (2013), *Mixed languages*, in Bakker, Peter & Matras, Yaron (2013, eds.), *Contact languages*, De Gruyter Mouton, Boston, pp. 159–228.
- Melchert, Harold Craig (2013), *Luwian Language in “Luwian” Rituals in Hattusha*, in Collins, Billie Jean Michalowski, Piotr (2013, eds.), *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, Lockwood Press, Atlanta, pp. 159–172.

- Metcalf, Christopher (2011), *New parallels in Hittite and Sumerian praise of the sun*, in “Die Welt des Orients” 41, pp. 168–176.
- Metcalf, Christopher (2015), *Old Babylonian Religious Poetry in Anatolia: From Solar Hymn to Plague Prayer*, in “Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie” 105, 1, pp. 42–53.
- Michalowski, Piotr (2006), *The Lives of the Sumerian Language*, in Sanders, Seth, L. (2006, ed.) *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures* (Oriental Institute Seminars 2), The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Chicago, pp. 159–186.
- Molinelli, Piera (2017), *Language and Identity in Multilingual Mediterranean Settings: Challenges for Historical Sociolinguistics* (TiLSM 310), De Gruyter, Berlin.
- Mora, Clelia & Giorgieri Mauro (2004), *Le lettere tra i re ittiti e i re assiri ritrovate a Hattuša* (HANEM 7), S.A.R.G.O.N., Padova.
- Neu, Erich (1980), *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift* (StBoT 24), Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Neu, Erich (1995), *Mehrsprachigkeit im Alten Orient—Bilinguale Texte als besondere Form sprachlicher Kommunikation*, in Binder, Gerhard & Ehlich, Konrad (1995, eds.), *Kommunikation durch Zeichen und Wort. Statten und Formen der Kommunikation im Altertum IV*, Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, Trier, pp. 11–39.
- Neu, Erich (1996), *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung 1—Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch–hethitischen Textensemble aus Hattuša* (StBoT 32), Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Neumann, Günter (1961), *Untersuchungen zum Weiterleben hethitischen und luwischen Sprachgutes in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Oberheid, Robert (2007), *Emil O. Forrer und die Anfänge der Hethitologie: Eine wissenschaftshistorische Biografie*, De Gruyter, Berlin / New York.
- Otten, Heinrich (1953a), *Luwische Texte in Umschrift* (Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung 17), Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.
- Otten, Heinrich (1953b), *Zur grammatikalischen und lexikalischen Bestimmung des Luwischen. Untersuchung der luwili-Texte* (Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung 19), Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.
- Popko, Maciej (2008), *Völker und Sprachen Altanatoliens*, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Pozza, Marianna & Gasbarra Valentina (2014), *Multidirectional Lexical Borrowings in the Ancient Near East in the 2nd Millennium BC*, in “Athens Journal of Philology” 1, pp. 245–257.
- Rizza, Alfredo (2008), *Interferenza linguistica e culturale nelle traduzioni del Vicino Oriente: il caso dell’Anatolia preclassica*, in Busetto, Luca & Morani, Moreno (2008, eds.), *La traduzione come strumento di interazione culturale e linguistica. Atti del seminario svoltosi a Genova nei giorni 6–7 novembre 2008*, Qu.A.S.A.R., Milano, pp. 235–260.
- Rizza, Alfredo (2009), *Left and Right Periphery in Hittite. The case of the translations from Hattic*, in Rieken, Elisabeth & Widmer, Paul (2009, eds.), *Pragmatische Kat-*

- egorien. *Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 24. bis 26. September 2007 in Marburg*, Reichert, Wiesbaden, pp. 275–286.
- Romagno, Domenica (2015), *The Greek-Anatolian area in the 2nd millennium B.C.: between language contact, Indo-European inheritance and typologically natural tendencies*, in “Studi e Saggi Linguistici” 53, pp. 429–446.
- Sassmannshausen, Leonhard (2008), *Babylonische Schriftkultur des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr. in den Nachbarländern und im östlichen Mittelmeerraum*, in “Aula Orientalis” 26, pp. 263–293.
- Scheucher, Tobias Simon (2012), *The transmissional and functional context of the lexical lists from Hattuša and from the contemporaneous traditions in Late Bronze Age Syria*. PhD Dissertation. Leiden University. URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/19986>.
- Schuster, Hans Siegfried (1974–2002), *Die Hattisch-Hethitischen Bilinguen*. Vol. 1: *Einleitung, Texte und Kommentar*. Vol. 2: *Textbearbeitungen Teil 2 und 3*, Brill, Leiden.
- Schwemer, Daniel (1998), *Akkadische Rituale Aus Hattuša: Die Sammeltafel KBo xxxvi 29 und Verwandte Fragmente* (THeth 23), Universitätsverlag Winter, Heidelberg.
- Schwemer, Daniel (2005–2006), *Lehnbeziehungen zwischen dem Hethitischen und dem Akkadischen*, in “Archiv für Orientforschung” 51, pp. 220–234.
- Schwemer, Daniel (2013), *Gauging the influence of Babylonian magic: The reception of Meso-potamian traditions in Hittite ritual practice*, in Cancik-Kirschbaum, Eva, Klinger, Jörg & Müller, Gerfried (2013, eds.), *Diversity and Standardization. Perspectives on social and political norms in the ancient Near East*, Akademie Verlag, Berlin, pp. 145–172.
- Sommer, Ferdinand (1932), *Ahhijava-Urkunden, Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-hist. Abteilung, NF 6*, Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften / Beck, München.
- Sommer, Ferdinand (1937), *Ahhijava und kein Ende?*, in “Indogermanische Forschungen” 55, pp. 169–297.
- Starke, Frank (1985), *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift* (StBoT 30), Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Starke, Frank (1990), *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens* (StBoT 31), Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Thomason, Sarah (2001), *Language contact: an Introduction*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Tischler, Johann (1979), *Der indogermanische Anteil am Wortschatz des Hethitischen*, in Neu, Erich & Meid, Wolfgang (1979, eds.), *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch*, Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, Innsbruck.
- Viano, Maurizio (2016), *The reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery*, Edizioni Ca' Foscari, Venezia.
- Weeden, Mark (2011a), *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship* (StBoT 54), Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

- Weeden, Mark (2011b), *Hittite scribal schools outside of Hattuša?*, in “Altorientalische Forschungen” 38, 1, pp. 123–130.
- WEEDEN, Mark (2020), *The “Influence” of Sumerian on Hittite Literature*, in Hasselbach-Andee, Rebecca (2020, ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Near Eastern Languages*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, pp. 505–520.
- Yakubovich, Ilya (2010), *Sociolinguistics of the Luwian Language* (BSIEL 2), Brill, Leiden.
- Vita, Juan Pablo (2020), *Akkadian as a Lingua Franca*, in Hasselbach-Andee, Rebecca (2020, ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Near Eastern Languages*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, pp. 357–372.
- Zólyomi, Gabor (2011), *Akkadian and Sumerian Language Contact*, in Weninger, Stefan (2010, ed.), *The Semitic Languages: An International Handbook*, de Gruyter, Berlin / New York, pp. 396–404.