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A mere ten years after the close of the first dig among the ruins of the Hittite capital, Hattusa (modern Boğazkale, formerly Bogazköy), which had prospered between ca. 1600 and 1200 BC, the Swiss linguist Emil Forrer (1922) was able to identify no fewer than eight languages among the nearly 10,000 cuneiform tablets and fragments (Figs. 1-2) clumsily pulled from the site’s remains between 1906 and 1912. Some of these languages would have been actively spoken by the peoples of Anatolia at the time and had been employed to write hundreds of small tablets of nearly every conceivable type, while some reflected distant tongues entirely unknown to the Hittites except for the most obvious and prominent language of the time, Hittite. Though these languages have not become firmly anchored in our history yet, the first of these eight tongues to be identified, and still the most prominent language of the Hittite world, as well as of those that were to be uncovered in ensuing archaeological campaigns bringing the total to ca. 25,000 documents, is Hittite. Though the term has been employed to write hundreds of small tablets of nearly every conceivable type, while some reflected distant tongues entirely unknown to the Hittites except for the most obvious and prominent language of the time, Hittite. Though these languages have not become firmly anchored in our history yet, the first of these eight tongues to be identified, and still the most prominent language of the time, Hittite. Though the term has...
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After the close of the first dig of the Hittite capital, Hattusa (formerly Bogazköy), which spanned ca. 1600 and 1200 BC, Paul Boller (1922) was able to identify no fewer than eight languages among the cuneiform tablets and fragments pulled from the site’s 1906 and 1912. Some of these languages have been actively spoken in Anatolia at the time and had been employed to write hundreds or thousands of tablets of nearly every conceivable genre, while some reflected distant times and cultures entirely unknown to the Hittites and had left only the slightest traces (Wikel 2000).

The first of these eight tongues and by far the most prominent of these languages, as well as of those that were to be discovered during ensuing archaeological campaigns at Hattusa, bringing the total to ca. 25,000 tablets and fragments, is Hittite. Though the term Hittites has become firmly anchored in modern parlance, Çoğu köy en azından bir dereceye kadar okuyup yazabiliyor olsa bile, Hattuša arşivlerindeki ikinci en yaygın dil, Hırit başkentinde sadece bir avuç seçkin diplomat ve/veya kâbihin yetkin şekilde konuşabileceği Akkad idi. Akkadçanın Babil lehçesi (babili, Hitiler için "Babilce"), zamanın geçeri dili dişleri ve her şeyden önce uluslararası yazıla ve diplomasiye kullanılıyordu. Ancak, bunun kadar önemli olan başka bir unsur, Babili Hüküm ve kâbiplerin yüz yüzlü boynunca yaratıkları kültürel mirası. Bu miras, cviýazısı kullanılarak dünyanın en büyük Hattuşa'ya ilavesi; Ugarit, Emir ve Alalah gibi önemli ve büyük oranda Akadca cviýazi tablet arşivine sahip merkezlerde büyük saygı görmüştü. Dolaysıyla, Hattuşa'nın Akadca metinleri da Hattı Ulkesi'nin Suriye vasallarının, Màar, Babil, Assur ve Mitanni gibi zamanın diğer büyük güçlerine yazılmış mektupları ve bunlarla yapılması antlaşmaklak değil, aynı zamanda...
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Hazırlayan: Prof. Dr. Hakan T. Okcular

...it is actually a misnomer, as the Hitites referred to their language as "núwanniš" or "navâšsi", i.e. "Kilmelian", whereas "navâšsi" can be related to the name of the city Kanesh (see below). This language would have been among the first to have split from the Indo-European "family tree" (Fig. 3) and was the very first to be recorded in documents that have reached modern researchers. Hitite was the language of the ruling elite of the Hitite state and at least a major portion of the population of what might be referred to as core Hitite territory, i.e. the region within the bend of the Maraššanta River (modern Kızılırmak). Precisely how far beyond this central Anatolian area large numbers of speakers of Hitite would have settled and how great the percentage of speakers of other languages in and around the core Hitite lands would have been at any given point during the history of the Hitite Period are questions that are still debated.

The second most common language in which the texts of Hattusa's archives were written is Akkadian, a language which only a handful of elite diplomas and/or scribes in the Hitite capital would have been able to speak proficiently, even if many or even most scribes would probably have been able to at least read and write it to some degree. The Babylonian dialect of Akkadian (babiliš, 'Babylonian', to the Hitites) was the lingua franca of the age and was employed above all in international correspondence and diplomacy. Nearly as important, however, was the cultural legacy that Babylonian scholars and scribes had created throughout the centuries, a legacy that was highly esteemed in the western periphery of the cuneiform world, such as, in addition to Hattusa, the Syrian cities Ugarit, Emar and Alalah, to name only a few sites that have yielded significant, largely Akkadian, cuneiform archives. The Akkadian texts from Hattusa include therefore not only letters to and from the Hittite's Syrian vassals and the other great powers of the day, including Egypt, Babylon, Assyria and Mitanni, as well as treaties with many of these, but also more personally oriented lists, literature, myths, epics, wisdom literature, purification rituals, medical texts and much more.

The Akkadian texts from Hattusa are not the first from Anatolia, however. Already some 500 years before the adoption of writing by the Hitites, another major cuneiform archive...
or group of archives served the needs of an entirely different people, the Assyrians. In the 19th and 18th centuries BC the Assyrians succeeded in creating and maintaining a trade network that reached from central Anatolia all the way to Babylon in southern Mesopotamia and to north-eastern Iran and beyond. The kūrun of Kanes, modern Çültepe (see p. 23, Fig. 1), located only a few km. northeast of modern Kaperi, served as the most important trading hub for the Anatolian end of the trade network.

By far the most significant documentation of this supra-regional trade discovered to date are the ca. 21,000 tablets from dozens of private archives of the kūrun (Fig. 4), i.e. the 'trading colony' (literally 'quay') of the lower city. Its cuneiform tablets were written in what is today known as Old Assyrian, which is the northern dialect of Akkadian (as opposed to the southern

neşidelarından konusuılmaktaydı. Kuzey Mesoapotamya'daki bir dizi Hurri ve Sami şeyh devletinin birleşmesiyle MÖ 18., 17. ve 16. yy.'arda ortaya çıkmış, zammam en büyük güçlerinden Mittani Imparatorluğu, bu döneme de kabaça Kiliya Ovası'na ve Ceyhan ile Seyhan Nehirlerinin kuzeyine denk gelen Kızıluhatma olarak adlandırılan bölgede etkiliydi (Fig. 5). Hurri kültürü ve dili Mittani'nin testiriyile Surili ve Kızıluhatma'ya oldukça baskın bir rol oynaydı. Nişâyet Hattuza MÖ 14. yy'ın ilk on yılları içinde I. Tuthaliya ve I. Arnuwanda'nın idaresinde Kızıluhatma'ya baş dışlama- nından geri geldiğinde Hurri etkisi, Hatt'ı'ye de ulaştı. Bu tarihten itibaren Hattuza'dan önemli miktarda mitolojik, tarih, bayram, kehanet metin bilinmektedir ve hatta bir Hurriçe mektup (belki tarih yazılığıyla ilgili) yakını

Fig. 4: Yabancı ve milli birlik "çökme"nin cıkarılmasına öncelik (sagain) ve çığır açmanın sorumlu (solda) halkın yerindeki主办 kurusu ve çığır açma tertibatı (Çültepe Kütüphane)

Modern araştırmacıların genelkile Orta Anadolu'nun yerli diller olarak kabul edilen Hattice, Hatısu metinlerinde de karşımıza kattılı adıyla çıkmaktadır. Gerçekte, modern Hatti ve -İncil açılışında- Hûhit terimlerinin çığ noktasi bu ismidir. Ancak söz konusu dilin Hittite (nušamili) ile hiçbir dillerimizle bağı yoktur ve henüz bilinen başka bir dille ikna edici şekilde ilişkilendirilememiştir. Görünüşe göre Kızılçam kvasi içindeki meşrue topraklarda ve kuzeyinde Hittite ile Luwicenin yerleşmesinden önce köprüsü gevşeydi. Sânîde tek Hattite metinler, sadece Hatısu'dan dialect, Babylonian, spoken in the 20th to the 16th centuries BC in and around the city-state of Alar on the Tigris River in northern Mesopotamia. After the collapse of this trade system, however, cuneiform writing seems to have largely receded from Anatolia, and the Hittites adopted their cuneiform variant not from the Assyrians, but from northern Syria.

Another foreign language from the archives of Hatısu, which would have been even more exotic to its Hittite scribes than Akkadian, was Sumerian, which despite many attempts has not yet been convincingly linked with any other known language. Like Akkadian, Sumerian would have been considered a language of literature and scholarship, but it would not have been spoken by any Hittite scribe. In fact, Sumerian had died out as a spoken language even in southern Mesopotamia during the first centuries of the second millennium BC, nearly half a millennium before the beginnings of the archives of Hatısu, but was kept alive by cuneiform scribes and scholars who studied and copied various word lists, cult liturgies and through some 1500 years after its fall, a language of the Empire of Ugarit in Syria, which came to prominence as a Semitic lingua franca in the 15th century BC, but not with certainty to any other known language. Unlike Akkadian and Sumer, it would have been spoken by scribes and scholars, especially in south-
ous word lists, cult liturgies and literary pieces through some 1500 years after its demise. It is in this context that the handful of hymns, prayers and incantations in the Sumerian language known from Hattusa would have been fashioned.

After Hittite and Akkadian the best represented language of the archives of Hattusa is Hurrian, a tongue related to Urartian, the language of the Empire of Urartu in eastern Anatolia, which came to prominence as a major adversary of the Assyrians in the 9th-8th centuries, but not with certainty to any other language. Unlike Akkadian and Sumerian, Hurrian would have been spoken by significant population groups, especially in south-eastern Anatolia, beginning in about the 15th century. It was during this period that the Mittanian Empire, which had coalesced out of a series of Hurrian and Semitic city-states in northern Mesopotamia during the 18th, 17th and 16th centuries to form one of the great powers of the age, succeeded in bringing under its influence the land of Kizzuwatna, which would have corresponded roughly to the Cilician Plain and areas to the north thereof along the Ceyhan and Seyhan Rivers (Fig. 5). Hurrian cultural and linguistic influence became quite prominent in Syria and Kizzuwatna while under the sway of Mittani, and when Hattusa finally succeeded in wresting Kizzuwatna away from its archenemy in the first decades of the 14th century under its kings Tad-halîya I and Arnuwanda I, Hurrian influence spilled over into Hatti as well. From this point in time a significant number of mythological, ritual, festival and oracular texts are known from Hattusa, and even one Hurrian epistolary (or perhaps historiographical) text has been recovered very recently at Karkamış on the upper Kızılirmak (likely Hittite Šamiha), ca. 45 km west of Sivas. The Hurrian texts from Hattusa constitute, in fact, the largest group of extant Hurrian language material, though Hurrian texts and Hurrian language influence are known from as far afield as el-Amarna in Egypt and Nuzi to the southeast of Alâüdâr.

What is often referred to as the indigenous or autochthonous language of central Anatolia known to modern researchers is the Hattian language, referred to in the texts from Hattusa as hatılı. In fact, it is from this stem of this designation that the modern conventions Hatti and – through Biblical intermediaries – Hittite are ve Şapınova'dan (Ortaköy) bilinmektedir (Süel-Soyer 2007). Hatti dilinde Hittite-Hattic ciltli yazılılar da dahil sadece 20 ya da daha az fragman bulunmamaktadır, dilin çözümlenmesi konusunda ancak spors bir ilerlemeye kaydedilmştir. Hattic corpusu birkaç kült künyesi ve şarkı, bir tapınmanın inşasıyla ilgili çeşitli törenler, törensel ihlâl ve dualar, bir bayrama da sunu düzenlemesi, dualar ve miler içerir.

Hittite epey yakın bir Hint-Avrupa dili olan Luwicce (Fig. 5), Hittî tarıhinin büyük bölümünde Güney ve Güneybatı Anadolu'da başlaca konuşuldu. Hiyeroglîf yazılarıyla yazılmış Luwicce metinler, sadece Anadolu'da ve Suriye'de yalnız Luvi dili için kullanılmıştır. Luvi Hiyeroglîflerile yazılmış metinler, MO 15. ve 14. yy'lar boyunca neredeyse tamamen mühürlendi ve bu mühürlerde bunlara denk gelen civiyazı işaretleri vardır. Ancak 13. yy'da hikaye ya da annal tarzındaki hýeroglîf yazılar, anıtsal binaların taş yüzeylerine ve belirgin köya cephele- rine işlenmeye başladılar (Fig. 7). Hittî İmparatorluğu'nu
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Fig. 6: Rabhip ve tapınak idaresi Tarkumaniyâ'da ile kâtip ve pense Bensi-Sarıvari (sağda)'nın Hattusî'nin Eskiyeşir arşivinden çıkan Lövi Hiyeroglîf yazılı basıkları (Herbert 2005: No. 434 ve 325)

Hieroglyphic Luwian seal impressions of Tarkumani (left), a priest and temple overseer, and Bensi-Sariyî (right), a scribe and prince, both from the Nişantepê archive at Hattusa (Herbert 2005: Nos. 434 and 325)
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MÖ 1200’den hemen sonra çöküşüyle birlikte cüvânsız, Anadolu’dan kaybolduğunda Luvi hiyeroğraf yaztları Gīyey ve Gīneyدوğu Anadolu’da ve Süriye’de, imparatorluğun çöküşüyle arında bırakılan boşluğu doldurmak için ortaya çıkan Luvi ve Luvi-Arami şehir desletlerinde kullanılmaya devam etti (Fig. 8). Fırat Nehri üzerindeki Karkamış ve Ceyhan Nehri üzerinde, Kadirli yakınındaki Karatepe şimdide kadar en çok ve en önemli yaztları sunmuştur (Fıgs. 9-10). Luvi Hiyeroğraf korpusu, çoğunlukla anıtsal taş yaztları içerir (bkz. s. 96 vd.), ama aynı zamanda kurtşın dairelerine yazılmış mektuplar da bulunmaktadır (Fig. 11).

Luvice kendi hiyeroğraf yazısıyla yaztlanadan önce Hattușa arşivlerinden bilinen bir dizi ayın, büyük festival ve efans metni cüvânsızla kaydedilmiş ve bir Luvice mektup bile mevcut (Kbo 29,38). Bu hiyeroğraf ve cüvânsız kârupsularla birlikte genellikle bir Glosenheit (açıklarsı cümli işareti) ile işaretlenmiş Luvice kökenli kelimeler görülür. Bunlar MÖ 14. ve 13. yy Hittit cüvâncı metinlerinde giderek daha sık fark edilir. İlgincir ki bu derived. This tongue, however, has no linguistic connection to Hittite (tuvallılı) and has not yet been convincingly related to any other known language. It seems to have been spoken in the core lands within the Kızırkuyuk bend and to the north thereof before it was slowly displaced by Hittite and Luwian. Thus far Hattian texts are known only from Hattuša and one other site, ancient Sippar, modern Orskoy (Süel-Soysal 2007). As only slightly more than 29 more or less fragmentary compositions in Hattian are preserved, including several Luwian-Hittian bilinguals, the decipherment of the language has seen only limited progress. The Hattian corpus consists of a number of cult incantations or songs, several rituals for the building of a temple, ritual incantations and invocations, and fragments of festival or offering regime, prayers and myths.

The language broadly referred to as Luwian, an Indo-European language fairly closely related to Hittite (Fig. 3), would have been spoken primarily in southern and southwestern Anatolia during much of Hittite history. Luwian texts were written with a hieroglyphic script thus far known to have been used only in Anatolia and Syria and on seals (Fig. 6), in some cases with corresponding cuneiform. Longer narrative or annalistic texts known from the monumental rock faces as late as the 12th century BC (Fig. 7). Following the collapse of the Empire shortly after 1200 BC, Luwian was no longer used in Anatolia and Syria, though Luwian inscriptions continued to be used in southern and eastern Anatolia and the Old Hittite texts that sprang up to fill the vacuum after the disappearance of the empire on the Ephrates and Karahantepe regions near Kadiša have the greatest number and the most famous inscriptions (see pp. 96 ff.).

Before Luwian was written in cuneiform script, though some texts known from the area were recorded in cuneiform Luwian cuneiform Luwian letter is cuneiform script. Alongside these hieroglyphic corpus, Luwian was also written in Luwian inscriptions with a so-called Glasekultur, while the Luwian inscriptions appear with ever increasing frequency in Luwian and Luwian cuneiform inscriptions in 13th century BC. Curiously, they seem to belong to the same culture that was written with the hieroglyphic script while the cuneiform Luwian inscriptions appear to belong to a southern dialect of Luwian. Of the last inscriptions in this chapter, Luwian, or more correctly be the Luwian group, is the only one to have survived to the Bronze Age in Anatolia and on a few documents of the first millennium BC. Luwian reached modern researchers as part of a hieroglyphic dialects just mentioned, the Lycian, written in an alphabet.
in Anatolia and Syria and only for the Luwian language. During the 15th and 14th centuries BC Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions remained restricted almost exclusively to personal names and professional designations found on seals (Fig. 6), in some royal seals coupled with corresponding cuneiform legends. Longer narrative or allusional inscriptions in the hieroglyphic script were hewn onto the stone surfaces of monumental structures and prominent rock faces as late as the 13th century (Fig. 7). Following the collapse of the Hittite Empire shortly after 1200 BC, when cuneiform vanished from Anatolia, Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions continued to be produced in southern and eastern Anatolia and in Syria by the Luwian and Luwian-Aramaic city-states that sprang up to fill the vacuum left by the disappearance of the empire (Fig. 8). Karkamish on the Euphrates and Karatepe on the Ceyhan River near Kadiša have thus far yielded the greatest number and the most significant texts (Figs. 9-10). The corpus of Luwian hieroglyphic consists for the most part of monumental stone inscriptions (see pp. 96 ff.), but also includes letters written on lead strips (Fig. 11).

Before Luwian was written with its own hieroglyphic script, though, a number of rituals, incantations and festival and mythical texts known from the archives of Hattonu were recorded in cuneiform, and even one cuneiform Luwian letter is extant (KBo 29.36). Alongside these hieroglyphic and cuneiform corpora, Luwian loan words, usually marked with a so-called Glaussian (a gloss wedge), appear with ever increasing frequency in the Hittite language cuneiform texts of the 14th and 13th centuries. Curiously, these Glaussian words would seem to belong to the dialect of Luwian that was written with the hieroglyphic script, while the cuneiform Luwian text compositions appear to belong to a southern, 'Kizzuwatnaei', dialect of Luwian. Of the languages discussed in this chapter, Luwian, or what has often been dubbed the Luwian group of languages, is the only one to have survived the end of the Bronze Age in Anatolia and to be recorded in documents of the first millennium that have reached modern researchers. The Luwian language family consists of the cuneiform and hieroglyphic dialects just mentioned, as well as Carian, written in an alphabetic script derived


Fig. 8: Demir Çağ'ın sonu Luvi ve Arami şehr dederleri, yaklaşık MO-900 (Ankarada kimya)
The Luwian and Aramaic cities of the Iron Age ca. 900 BC (Ankarada Ceşme)

Fig. 9: Korkamış kralı Yarıtbis'in
Hiyeroglit Luwicin yazısı yazısı (Ankarada anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi)
Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription of Yaritib of Karkamis from ca. 900 BC (Ankarada anadolu Civilizations Museum)
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yazısi lehçeleri dışında şu lehçeleri de içermektedir: Bir Bati Yunan alfabetesinden alınmış bir alfabe yazıyla yazılan ve MÖ 8.-3. yy boyunca Güneybatı Anadolu'daki Karia'lı paralı askerlerin Msř'da bıraktığı yazıtlardan bilinen Kara (Karia dili); MÖ 7.-3. yy'lar arasında Doğu Yunan yazılarından alınan bir alfabeyle yazılar Lıd'[ Lydia dili); Güneybatı Anadolu'da MÖ 6.-4. yy'arda başlıca mezar yazıtları ve siki lejanlardan bilinen Doğu Yunan yazısından alınma bir alfabeyle yazılı num Lıke (Lycka dili). Bunlara ek olarak daha az temsil edilen Sidece, Pisdce ve Milyas (Lycke B) gibi dilleri ya da lehçeleri mevcuttur.

Yine Hint-Avrupa dil ailesine mensup bir başka dil olan Palaca, Hattu'a arşivlerinde sadece bir avuç civaçılı metin tarafından temsil edilir. Bunlar büyü içeren ayın metinleri, ilahi, mit ve bayram metinleri içerir (Carruba 1970). Korpusun küçükçülüğü ve fragmanlar halinde from a western Greek alphabet and attested from the 8th to the 3rd centuries BC in south-western Anatolia as well as in a number of inscriptions left behind by Carian mercenaries in Egypt; Lydia, attested in the 7th to 5th centuries BC in an alphabet derived from the eastern Greek script; Lycian, written in an alphabet derived from the western Greek and known from the 6th to the 4th centuries BC in south-western Anatolia, primarily from funerary inscriptions and coin legends as well as the lesser known and less well attested Sidetic, Pisdian and Milyasian (or Lycian B) languages or dialects.

Also belonging to the Indo-European language family is Paš, attested in only a handful of cuneiform texts from the archives of Hattu'a, consisting of rituals with incantations and fragments of hymns, myths and festivals (Carruba 1970). Due to the small and fragmentary state of this corpus, Paš, which was probably spoken in the region to the northwest of Haiti, is still very poorly understood.

The last of the eight languages that Forrer was able to identify among the cuneiform archives from Hatti is clearly related to the Indo-Aryan language, more clearly related to that of the Mitanni Empire (Wilhelm 1916, 1953). These remains are currently classified as an Indo-Aryan language, since the texts clearly related to that of the Mitanni Empire in India. These scattered traces of this high-lycian language are in fact by far the oldest known examples of this language group within Vedic literature, though survival periods of the language group in the eastern Mediterranean is ensured in the 2nd millennium BC and the period ranges from the first millennium BC to the 7th century BC. The beginning of the Christian era, the beginning of the Common Era, the beginning of the Common Era, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia, the Kingdom of Armenia.
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archives from Hattusa is attested only as a few technical terms relating especially to equestrian training and in the names of a number of deities and persons, above all the kings of the Mitannian Empire (Wilhelm 1994a, Starke 1995). These remnants are commonly referred to as an Indo-Aryan language, since they are clearly related to that of the Vedic literature of India. These scattered traces of this Indo-Aryan language are in fact by far the earliest preserved remnants of this language group, since the Vedic literature, though assumed to have coalesced in the 2nd millennium BC (suggested dates range widely) and to have been written down for the first time in the centuries before the beginning of the Christian era, the earliest manuscripts preserved today date from the 11th or 14th century AD. The clearest and, in fact, entirely indisputable traces of Indo-Aryan in the Hittite texts are the four divine names found in the treaty concluded between Suppiluliuma I of Hatti and Šattiwaza of Mitanni, i.e. Mitra, Varuna, Indra and Nasatya (written in the Hittite text as ḫunu, ḫunu, ḫunu, ḫunu). These names are found in KBo 1.1:12, 11, 1 and 22 (see Wilhelm 1946b).

Though Forrer did not include Western Semitic (Otten 1953, Singer 2007), Kaškašan (von Schuler 1965: 83-107, Klinger 2005) or Itanaššian among the languages of the archives of Hattusa, one could perhaps mention them with no less justification as one does Indo-Aryan, even if it can be difficult to impossible to differentiate
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seçil karışımları öteki alt gruppardan ve civar halkardan ayrıt etmek zor olabilmektedir, çünkü Batı Sami ve Kaška dilleri dağınık hâldeki bir türün kelinе ve isimlerden meydana gelir; Kaška dili bir Hint kâtiibi tarafından bir dil olarak, yanı -sorduzu son ekleme (KUB 41.15. Öy. 5) belirtir. Son olarak Mısır dili, tek bir yazı (Bittel 1938: 18) ve Mısır ic bu iliklere atıfta bulunur bu avuç kelimeler yemelsiz edilir.


Lüwi ektisi daha bu en erken belgelerde bile belirli bir imperatorluk-MÖ 1200'den hemen sonrasına kısına kadar geçen yüzylarında giderek ön çıktır (Goedegebuure 2008). Ne kadar başkan olduğu ya da bu dönemde Hittitenin büyük ölçüde yerini alıp almadığı tartışılması konuşulmuştur (Yakubovich 2009). Başka bir başkan nüfus grubu, Anadolu’nun kuzeydeki dağılık kesiminde yaşayan ve Hittite İmparatorluğu’nun I. Tuthaliya ve ardından Arnawanda’nın (MÖ 15. yy. sonu-14. yy. başı) saltanatlardan itibaren toprak ve kaynaklar için mücadeleye especially Kalkaiyan linguistic remains from those of other substra and neighbouring peoples, since West-Semitic and Kalkaiyan are preserved in a number of scattered words and names, while the latter while Buzianic is referred to by a Hittite scribe as a language, i.e. with the suffix -awwe (KUB 41.15 obv. 5). Finally, Egyptian is represented by a lone inscription (Bittel 1938: 18) and a handful of words in texts relating to contacts with Egypt.

Naturally, what constitutes a ‘people’ does not necessarily coincide precisely with language boundaries. Without entering into the discussion of how a ‘people’ or ‘culture’ should be defined – if they can be at all – the ‘people’ commonly referred to as the Hittites of the 16th through the 13th centuries B.C. was in fact an amalgam of several peoples and cultures, most conspicuously a Hittite speaking population group, at least some of which had wandered into central Anatolia from the north presumably toward the end of the 3rd millennium B.C., and a Hattic speaking group, which is assumed have inhabited the region when the speakers of the Indo-European languages arrived. The beliefs, pantheon, rituals, festivals, diet, material remains and other cultural characteristics of the two elements of this Hittite-Hattic conglomerate are by the time the first textual sources become available already quite thoroughly mixed, to the point where it is very often difficult or impossible to determine what might originally have been Hattian and what should be considered Hittite. That a conscious division between the two peoples remained at least to a certain extent is shown, for example, by a shibboleth-like test found in the ‘Protocol for the Palace Gatekeeper’, in which the gatekeeper is to ask a cleaner going up to the palace for identification, to which the cleaner is to respond with the Hittian word taḥaya, meaning ‘cleaner’. If he does not, i.e., presumably if he answers in Hittite, then the man is suspect of not being a cleaner but rather some servant’s slave and a possible security threat or a runaway and is therefore to be arrested. In the same text it is stipulated that certain palace servants are to be spoken to in Hittite, while the person that tends the fire is to be addressed in Luwian.

Luwian influence is present already in this earliest attested amalgam, and becomes increasingly prominent through the centuries up until the fall of the empire shortly after
in linguistic remains from those and neighbouring peoples, and Kalkaians are preserved in attested words and names, while the suffix 5th obt. 5). Finally, Egyptian is no longer a substantive (Bittel 1958: 91 of texts in relation to Anatolia). It constitutes a "people" does not coincide precisely with language but entering into the discussion of culture should be defined as it all the commonly Hititit of the 16th through the 14th centuries is an amalgam of several different cultures, most consciously a population group, at least some of whom lived in central Anatolia reasonably toward the end of the 12th century BC, and a Hattian speaking assumed to have inhabited the Indo-European languages. The beliefs, pantheon, rituals, material remains of the Hititoid elements of the Hititoid culture are by the time the first known text is available already quite a, to the point where it is very impossible to determine what have been Hattian and what Hititite. That a conscious that the two peoples remained at the same time that this is shown, for example, by the best found in the "Protocol for a meeting of ambassadors," in which the gatekeeper is going up to the palace for a灰尘 is the cleaner to respond the word "labāna," meaning "cleaner". Presumably, if he answers in the name is suspect of not being a servant of someone's servant and a threat or a run-away and is rested. In the same text it is stated that palace servants are to be taken, while the personnel that be addressed in Luwian.

Once is present already in the 16th century BC, and becomes dominant through the centuries of the empire shortly after

1290 BC (Goedegebuure 2008); just how prominent, and whether it might have even largely supplanted Hittite by this time, has been a matter of debate (Yakubovich 2009). A further prominent population group is the Kalkaians, who inhabited the northern mountain regions of Anatolia and with whom the Hittite Empire increasingly struggled for land and resources beginning in the reigns of Tudhalya I and his successor Arnuwanda I (late 15th, early 14th cent.). It is presumably the Kalkaians' status as enemy rather than primarily ethnic disdain that leads to the prohibition in KUB 21.29 ii 41 2da bir kişinin Kaškalı kalesinin şehre/ saraya girişmesine yakas getirilmesine yol açmıştır. Kaška dili sadece birkaç yerde, her şeyden önce Kalkalara yaşamı bir dizi anlaşılması kıldığı adımların bilinir, fakat Hattice ve Hititçe gibi döndür alt gruplar arasında ayırt edilmesi çok zordur.
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