



The Linguistic Situation of the 2nd Millennium B.C. in Ancient Anatolia (Abstract)

Author(s): Annelies Kammenhuber

Source: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, No. 2 (1975), pp. 116-120

Published by: Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25203650>

Accessed: 13/11/2009 09:33

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=rasgbi>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE LINGUISTIC SITUATION OF THE 2ND MILLENNIUM B.C. IN ANCIENT ANATOLIA

(ABSTRACT)

By ANNELIES KAMMENHUBER

I

In detail, the following is the situation regarding the languages of ancient Asia Minor and Mesopotamia:

(i) *Non-Indo-European languages*

Apart from the Semitic languages and Egyptian, at least five isolated languages are ascribable to that period in which the Sumerians and Egyptians had already invented their script. All five languages are recorded in the so-called Akkadian cuneiform, a syllabic script which the Sumerians had developed from their picture-writing.

We are concerned with *Sumerian*, *Elamite* and *Hurrian*, which are all already attested in the 3rd millennium B.C. They belong to the so-called agglutinative languages and show no relationship with one another. Only Hurrian, characterized exclusively by suffixation which (just like Elamite) is recorded for about 2,000 years, shows a relationship with Urartean (Chaldic), spoken in the Lake Van area from the 9th to the 6th centuries B.C.

In the 2nd millennium B.C. the Hittites, who, under their second king, Ḫattušili I, after 1650 (or 1590) borrowed Akkadian cuneiform from a north Syrian scribal school, preserved for us the equally isolated language of the earliest population in northern central Anatolia, Hattian, or proto-Hattian.

After the middle of the 2nd millennium some Kassite-Akkadian lists of words, gods, and names were noted down in the middle Babylonian kingdom, then ruled by the Kassites. The Kassites had migrated from Iran to Babylonia, where they soon abandoned their language in favour of Babylonian. The scanty Kassite linguistic remains, assembled in 1952 by Kemal Balkan, do not suffice to make a rational study of this isolated language possible.

Besides these five isolated languages we have at our disposal an almost 5,000-year-old record of Semitic languages in Mesopotamia and Syria.

Moreover, further text-fragments in unknown languages have been found, both in Mesopotamia, and in Asia Minor in the former capital of the Hittites, Ḫattuša-Boğazköy, approximately 150 km. east of Ankara. Furthermore, at least one other non-Indo-European southern-Anatolian language emerges from loanwords in Hittite and Luwian, as well as from names of persons, gods, and places, presumably ascribable to the area of Cilicia. Finally, a further isolated language can now be recognized in Sumerian texts of the 3rd millennium B.C., the so-called proto-Euphratic. It is to this language that Sumerian owes, among others, its word for bronze, *zabar*. The name of the Euphrates originates from this same language, having also been borrowed in different transformations, both by Sumerian and by Hurrian and Akkadian.

The various above-mentioned non-Indo-European languages of the 3rd/4th and 2nd

millennia B.C. were spoken in the area between western Iran and central Anatolia. As remnants of apparently extinct language families they extended, by chance, into that area which is to-day fairly well illuminated by texts handed down in the Sumerian-Akkadian cuneiform script and some newly invented scripts, e.g. the Ugaritic consonant script. There hardly remains room for the formerly-supposed extended Mediterranean substratum in Greece and Asia Minor. Moreover, a similar widespread dissemination of an indigenous language before the invention of writing has become more than improbable.

On the other hand it must be stated quite clearly that no light falls on the languages on and near the west coast of Asia Minor during the 3rd–1st millennia B.C. from the Hittite texts. The Hittite kingdom, which flourished between the 17th century and 1200 B.C., was orientated almost exclusively towards the East and South-East.

From these historical data in the Hittite material it follows with certainty that we cannot expect to find in the Greek of Greece, attested since the middle of the 2nd millennium B.C. in the Linear B texts, any trace of Indo-European or non-Indo-European languages already known through Hittite texts.

Other isolated non-Indo-European languages of the 1st millennium are Carian and Etruscan.

(ii) *Indo-European languages*

Beside this abundance of very variously structured languages of the 3rd/4th to the 1st millennium B.C., which by chance extend into the era of writing, one finds, in the 2nd millennium B.C. the first evidence of Indo-European languages. This late appearance of the Indo-Europeans to some extent also confirms the period of the emergence of proto-Indo-European. This, the last stage of transition before the separation of the individual Indo-European languages, does not reach back into the deepest neolithic period, but was spoken in the first half of the 3rd millennium B.C.

The confusion which, in its time, the discovery of Hittite caused in Indo-Europeanist circles no longer has any foundation nowadays. It is true that Hittite is the earliest Indo-European language attested so far, because it can be traced in Asia Minor since the last phase of the old Assyrian trading colonies, that is, since at least 1800 B.C. Nevertheless, we know today that the Greeks too arrived in Greece at an early date. A *terminus ante quem* is provided by the Linear B texts, viz. the middle of the 2nd millennium B.C. And an analogous *terminus ante quem* also arises for the Indo-Iranians.

The following belong to *Hitto-Luwian*:

Hittite, attested since about 1800 B.C. by single words and from about 1650 B.C. (since Hattušili I) till 1200 B.C. in texts.

Palaic, which was spoken to the north-east or north-west of Hattuša-Boğazköy and plays no further role in the languages of the period of the empires (about 1380–1200 B.C.); it occurs in a few fragments amounting to around 200 words; among them is to be found an Old Hittite original text.

The Luwian languages include the following:

Cuneiform Luwian or Luwian, 1400–1200 B.C., attested by cuneiform texts, mainly magic rituals; spoken in the south, in western Cilicia, and the areas to the west.

Hieroglyphic Luwian, about 1300–8th century B.C., attested in the picture-writing

invented by the Hittites, the Hittite hieroglyphs; most of the inscriptions originate from the period after the fall of the Hittite kingdom and are found in southern Anatolia and north Syria.

Lycian, attested in the 5th–4th centuries B.C. in inscriptions in a Greek alphabet as the language of Lycia (in two dialects).

Lydian, likewise attested in inscriptions in a Greek alphabet since the 6th century B.C.

Not belonging here are Phrygian and Armenian.

II

The significance of Hittite-Luwian for the reconstructed Indo-European cannot be overstressed.¹ First, a few essential points.

(i) Hittite-Luwian is just as Indo-European as all other Indo-European languages (not pre-proto-Indo-European).

Nouns

Hittite still had eight cases, like proto-Indo-European. The proto-Hittite-Luwian nominal word-formation is purely Indo-European, the morphemes containing *-l-* proliferate first in individual languages, viz. Hittite and Luwian, but not in Palaic. They are missing altogether from Phrygian, which does not belong to this group of languages. Proto-Hittite-Luwian had acquired at the proto-Indo-European stage all the nominal stem-classes including the youngest, that in *-ō-* (masculine and neuter). Like the other individual Indo-European languages, Hittite-Luwian gives no evidence for a later formation of the feminine gender, but only for a later formation of the neuter gender, whose nominative-accusative sing. in IE **-ōm-* = HL *-an* is derived from the accusative sing. masc. of the *-ō-* stems, and whose nominative-accusative plural in IE **-ā* = HL *-a* is derived from the nominative sing. of the feminine *-ā-* stems, and is therefore still constructed in Hittite (as in Greek, Gāthic Avestan, and in very isolated cases in Old Indian) with the predicate-verb in the singular.

Pronouns

The pronominal inflexion was distinguished from the nominal in proto-Hittite-Luwian just as in proto-Indo-European, and by the same means of differentiation from the nominal declension.

The Verb

As the proto-Indo-European system of three “tense-stems” had already been abandoned in proto-Hittite-Luwian, present, aorist, and perfect stems live on in the Hittite-Luwian verbal stems, thereby attesting that Hittite-Luwian had also received, besides the athematic and thematic present stems, all present formations as well as the aorist, inclusive of the *-s-* aorist, and the perfect with its vowel gradation. The verbal inflexions are good Indo-European, despite the novel formation of the Hittite verb in the singular in its *-hi-* conjugation, of which its sister languages only possess the third person singular in *-i*.

¹ For the bibliography see *Handbuch der Orientalistik, Altkeleinasische Sprachen*, Leiden, 1969, 119 ff.; A. Kammenhuber, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, XXIV, 1968, 55–123; J. Friedrich, A. Kammenhuber, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, 2nd ed., Heidelberg, 1975.

Syntax

The syntax of Hittite-Luwian involves the fully-developed Indo-European syntax (including the genitive !).

(ii) A survey of the use of the Indo-European verbal endings in the Hittite-Luwian conjugation can be seen in *Handbuch der Orientalistik, Altkleinasiatische Sprachen*, (Leiden, 1969), 278–335.²

III

1. Definitions regarding (proto-)Indo-European

(i) The Indo-European language naturally did not originate from the earliest times of the history of mankind, but had developed over a period of thousands of years to what we now call proto-Indo-European.

(ii) Proto-Indo-European is an inferred language; it results from the evidence of several individual Indo-European languages, which had no further contact with one another after separation from proto-Indo-European. More important than the vocabulary, which changes more easily, is the inflexion, which can be reconstructed to a certain degree.

(iii) On the other hand, on the strength of the inferred old vocabulary we can infer the stage of culture (late neolithic) and the time of proto-Indo-European, necessarily presupposing a people which spoke this language, at first in a limited area. Up to now, the arguments which put this Indo-European-speaking nation of the 3rd millennium B.C. to the west of the "birch-line", viz. west of the line from Königsberg to Odessa, are more convincing than those in favour of a more easterly *Urheimat*.

(iv) As we are dealing with a linguistic category when reconstructing proto-Indo-European, we have to undertake the reconstruction fundamentally by linguistic means, which, moreover, yield more clear-cut results than a similar number of archaeological or prehistoric indications.

(v) Proto-Indo-European is a linguistic transitional stage: it denotes the last phase of the common language before the separation of the individual languages, since about the middle of the 3rd millennium B.C. (and has been used in this sense throughout this paper). This proto-Indo-European phase is at the same time the only one we can reconstruct grammatically with fair certainty, and also the only phase we need for Hittite-Luwian.

(vi) Even proto-Indo-European was not entirely uniform (which is not very surprising in a language neither written nor standardized thereby), but showed dialect differences and divisions, as, for example, the later origin of the *-r-* medio-passive in the (later) Phrygian (which, like Armenian, is not connected with Hittite-Luwian), Celtic, Latin, Osco-Umbrian, Hittite-Luwian, and Tocharian, as opposed to the older "classical" middle type, which was best preserved in Indo-Iranian and Greek.

While the younger *-r-* medio-passive proves to be an innovation in proto-Indo-European, the only Indo-European dialectal-geographical distinction recognized by Brugmann, viz. that of the *centum* and *satem* languages, is, on the contrary, inapplicable. From the beginning, it separated those two language groups, Greek (*centum*) and Indo-Iranian (*satem*), which, through the agreement between their archaic and complicated verbal systems, still provide the basis for the reconstruction of proto-Indo-European.

² cf. also K. Hoffmann, "Das Kategoriensystem des indogermanischen Verbums", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, XXVIII, 1970, 19–41.

2. *On the dialectology of proto-Indo-European*

Although a certain dialect division of proto-Indo-European is fairly generally recognized nowadays, the evaluation of the dialect isoglosses ascertained belongs to the most obscure area which philology can offer. Nevertheless a few definitions and limitations can easily be offered in this section.

(i) One must differentiate between Indo-European dialectal isoglosses of the 3rd millennium B.C., in which Greek, Armenian, Indo-Iranian, and Hittite-Luwian participate, and later isoglosses of the 2nd millennium (the time of the "Old European language community" according to Hans Krahe), to which, among others, the "Italo-celtic" isoglosses, so much overrated by Meillet, belong.

(ii) For the reconstruction of proto-Indo-European and for the question of its original home, the most important items of evidence, according to expositions made to date, prove to be Greek, Indo-Iranian, Armenian, and Hittite-Luwian, whose first stage even within Indo-European was far removed from the other three languages. As they had already separated from Indo-European in the second half of the 3rd millennium—as opposed to Latin!—a special investigation of these four linguistic groups would yield an absolutely reliable basis for the vocabulary and word formation of proto-Indo-European.

The fact that Latin, whose separation from Germanic has been placed by glottochronology about 1500 B.C., stayed longer in the "Old European language community" of the 2nd millennium B.C.—though possibly not as long as Tocharian—is demonstrated, moreover, by consideration of the "Indo-European" word for "sea". It was only at the time of the "Old European language community" that the Indo-Europeans reached the sea (Baltic and/or North Sea): only Latin, Celtic, Germanic, Baltic, and Slavic possess a common designation for "sea", IE **mori*, **mōri*, Latin *mare*, *-is*, etc. The Indo-European languages which separated first, have, on the contrary, borrowed their word for "sea" (thus, for example, Greek *thalāssa*; Hittite *aruna*) or formed new words with their own linguistic resources (as, e.g., O. Ind. *samūdra*-).