

Ilse Wegner
Introduction to the Hurrian Language

Forward:

Among the numerous languages of ancient near east, Hurrian is an important one, but in contrast to Akkadian or Hittite there are few investigations of this language, and summary works documenting present knowledge are non-existent. The present "Introduction" shall then be interested in providing access to the grammar as reflected in present research. Many grammatical phenomena that are introduced here may however in the future be modified or even completely reevaluated by others, especially since the study of the Hurrian language is strongly contested. A scientific grammar in the strict sense is not included in this introduction. The previous aids to the learning of Hurrian are however all out-of-date (?) and derive from three grammars and one glossary as well as from numerous scattered published articles. Works that introduce grammar to the student by means of largely coherent text fragments do not exist. These details shall here be taken into account. As reading pieces artificially formed sample sentences are not used. The sample texts originate primarily from the Mittani letters and a few examples of the Boğazköy texts. Following after a strictly grammatical portion comes a series of transcriptions, with a translation and a commentary provided as lessons. Lessons 1-10 are text passages from the Mittani letters, Lessons 11-13 originate from the Hurrian-Hittite bilinguals of Boğazköy, and lesson 14 treats the Tišatal-Inscription. The text passages that are taken from the Mittani letters are not arranged by content criteria, but instead suitable text fragments are chosen so that the grammatical material progresses from introductory to difficult.

I give many heartfelt thank in this connection to Dr. Chr. Girbal for reviewing the manuscript, for valuable references and corrections. For the Hurrian, above all the Mittani letters in many cases we had conversations through which I received important advice, but also some errors were preserved.

Dr. J. Klinger has kindly presented clear explanations involved in the construction of the stress patterns. Heartfelt thanks to him for this not underestimated help.

To my husband Volkert Haas I thank for making various suggestions, advice and corrections, and above all for the constant encouragement that brought this teaching book to completion.

Berlin, im March 1999, Ilse Wegner

I. Introduction

1. Time and Space of the tradition. A survey of the Hurrian language tradition in time and space.

a) The time span: written that is demonstrably Hurrian comes from 2230 B.C (Akkadian Period 2230-2090, for the short chronology; otherwise add 60 years) up to 1200 B.C. after that still surviving in the hinterlands of East Anatolia.

Possibly the Hurrian also appears considerably earlier in North Iraq and East Anatolia, like in the old Sumerian, where some have suggested the craftsman term *ta/ibira* “Coppersmith” could be obtained from a plausible hurrian derivation: root *tab/v* “pour” + *I +ri*, that a agent oriented participle ending forms = “he, the one who pours”¹.

b) The spatial extent:² The first comprehensible appearances of the Hurrian occur in North Iraq and Northeast Syrian (Khabur region), in both regions from ca. 2230 B.C. Later there is an expansion to the Mediterranean and Anatolia, with Hittite using the Hurrian since 1400 B.C. mainly in texts of the cultic sphere.

In detail there is following determinations. The oldest reports of the Hurrian language, in first place personal names (PM) and possibly also geographic names of the transtigridian region³, as mentioned above, come from the Akkadian period.

Akkadian Period (ca. 2230-2090)

In broadly separated locations in the northern conquests of the Akkadian kings relevant inscriptions are found:

b_a) In Gasur – the future Nuzi, situated in the northern east Tigris area— some of the numerous personal names can be identified as Hurrian (Gelb, Hurrians and Subarians 52f).

b_b) Azuhinnu, situated on the Lower Zab, is mentioned in a year-date of Naram-Sin (ca. 2150) whose ruler was captured by Naram-Sin. The name of this ruler **Tahiš-atili** is Hurrian (Lambert RA 77, 1983, 95). An old Babylonian period historical text that describes a general rebellion against Naram-Sin also names a king of Simurru with the Hurrian Name Puttim-atal (perhaps, however this text described a later event; Wilhelm, Grundzüge 11).

b_c) Tell Brak, in the upper Khabur-region, is through the discovery of an old Akkadian seals to be identified with Nagar. These seals also mention the name of the city’s lord,

¹ G. Wilhelm, Gedanken zur Frühgeschichte der Hurrer und zum huttitisch-urartäischen Sprachvergleich, Xenia 21, 1988 50 f. see also lesson 12.

² On the earliest references to the earliest Hurrian language, see M. Salvani, the Earliest Evidences of the Hurrians before the Formation of the Reigns of Mittanni in Bibl.Mes. 26, 1998, 99ff.

³ P. Michalowski “The Earliest Hurrian Toponymy: A New Sargonic Inscription”, ZA 76, 1986, 4-11.

who carries the Hurrian name **Talpuš-atili**⁴; the name element *atili* later probably *atal*, means approximately “the strong” (Wilhelm, SCCNH 8 1996, 336). The use of the element *-atal* is widespread over centuries (see e.g. the Names Na-x-s.e-a-tal in the Ugarit-letter RS 23.031 quoted in Fl. Malbran-Labat, L’epigraphie akkadienne. Rétrospective et perspectives, in: Ras Shamra-Ougarit XI, 1995, 37).

b_d) Tell Mozan, also in the upper Habur region, can be identified through the continuing excavations since 1987 with the later texts as the well-known city of Urkeš, the old cult-center of the Hurrian godfather Kumarbi. From the over 600 sealings associated with a queen of Urkeš with the Akkadian name *Uqnitum* “The lapis-lazuli girl”, there is a king (*endan*) of the city named **Tupkiš** (abbreviation for *Tupki-š(enni)*) and a wet nurse named *Zamena*; both of the latter names are doubtless hurrian. Also the in another context we encounter the PN *Unab=še(nni)* which is hurrian,⁵ The name element *tupki* is encountered –still over a thousand years later—in Nuzi, Alalakh and Boğazköy. The meaning of this word is unclear.

b_e) Tall as-Sulaima in the Hamrim-region supplies an old Akkadian letter containing the name *Tulpib=še*, with the element *-še* shortened from *šenni* “brother” (Wilhelm, SCCNH 8, 1996, 337).

Thus far the discussed cases of the Hurrian language from this epoch consist merely of personal or place names, so it is the following texts are more interesting, since for the first time Hurrian grammatical elements can be found:

Gutian Period (2090-2048) up to Ur-III period:

b_f) These appear in the so-called clothes-list from Nippur, the religious center of Sumeria (Gelb, Hurrians at Nippur, in FsFriedrich, 1959, 183 ff.). Besides Hurrian personal names like *Šehrin-ewri* and *Tubi*, we encounter here grammatical elements like *-hi/e* and *-na* e.g. 12 TÚG ‘à-ku-*hi*-na (root *ag-*) 8 TÚG *hi-šè-lu-hi*-na (root *hešl-*), 5 TÚG *zi-im-zé-hi*-na (root *zimz-*). These mentioned tablets are (tell of) valuable inscriptions of white marble that were a “splendid-covering letter of a gift delivery”. The origin of the tablets is not known.

Atal-šen

⁴ D. Matthews/J. Eidem “Tell Brak and Nagar”, Iraq 55, 1993 201ff

⁵ M. Liverani/L/ Milano: Mozan 2, The epigraphic Finds of the Sixth Season, Philological presentation SNS 5,1 Malibu 1991, 19, 25, 32; M. Kelly-Buccellati, SCCNH 8, 1996, 247 ff.; G. Buccellati and M. Kelly-Buccellati, The Seals of the King of Urkesh: Evidence from the Western Wing of the Royal Storehouse AK in FsHans Hirsch, WZKM 86, 1996, 66 ff with an excursion from M. Salvini on the Name Tupkiš 84ff.: G. Wilhelm Zu den hurritischen Namen der Kultepe-Tafel kt.k.4 SCCNH 8, 1996, 335ff with Anm., 17: *Un=a=b=še(nni)* “The brother come”

b_g) Among the ruins made when the Guti destroyed the Akkadian dynasty (the Akkadian dynasty ended swiftly with Šar-kali-šarri [ca. 2114-2090]) brought about the first inscription bearing witness to a tangible Hurrian state. From this period we have a discovery from Samarra named the Bronze Tablet. The inscription is composed in the Akkadian language and is written in the old Akkadian form. Its contents include a “Foundation Inscription” for a temple of the God Nergal, which is first mentioned in Inscription of Naram-Sin. The god Nergal is referred to as the “King of Hawalum”, a state in the Diyala-region.

At the foundation of this temple one can recognize a king with the old Hurrian name **Atal-šen** (*šen* a reduction of *šenn* “brother”), who is described as the king of Urkeš and Nawar. His father is given as the still not well-known king *Šatar-mat*, this name also can be interpreted as Hurrian.⁶

The inscription says (quoted from Wilhelm, *Xenia* 21, 1998, 47):

“To Nergal, the King of Hawalum, Atal-šem, the capable herdsman?, the king of Urkeš and Nawar, the son of the King Šatar-mat, the builder of the Temple of Nergal, the destroyer of (his) rivals. Whoever destroys this tablet, Šamaš and Ištar will make his seed be ‘pulled up’. Šaum-šen (has) made/is the maker of the”

Atal-šen is identified in this inscription as the king (LUGAL) of Urkeš and Nawar. Urkeš was first assumed to be in the West Tigris area (Thureau-Dangin RA 9, 1912, 1 ff.), later in the Habur drainage (Goetze, JCS 7, 1953 62 f.), then equated with Tell Amuda, on the Syrian-Turkish Border and finally has been identified with Tell Mozan.⁷ Nawar was earlier identified with a land named Namri or Namar, which was located in the Zagros region between the Diyala and the Lower Zab. This led to the suggestion of a very extensive early Hurrian state. Recent finds prove however that Nawar was also in the Habur-region, so that the assumption of early Hurrian state-building is to be rejected (D.Oates, Iraq 49, 1987, 188). The name Nawar has recently been interpreted as Hurrian (*nav=ar* “Place of the pasture”) (Wilhelm, *Amurru* 1, 1996, 178 f.)

Ur III Period (2047-1940):

b_h) In the following Ur III period a Hurrian-speaking population settled in the mountainous zones west and north of Mesopotamia, as well as the region north of the Diyala. In the countless economic texts of the Ur III period Hurrian PNs are still frequent (e.g. in Drehem, a suburb of Nippur, Šagir-Bazar is attested). Probably the bearers of Hurrian personal names arrived as prisoners of war in Southern Mesopotamia under Šulgi (2029-1982), the second king of the Ur III dynasty. From the Ur III period comes the oldest reference known to date to the great Hurrian goddess Ša(v)uška from Niniveh, in

⁶ The first treatment of the tablet is from Thureau-Dangin, *Tablette de Samarra* RA 9, 1912, 1 ff.

⁷ G. Buccellati and M. Kelly-Buccellati “The Identification of Urkesh with Tell Mozan (Syrian)” *Orient Express* 1995/3, 67-70.

the test ^Dša-u_{i8}(ÙLU)-ša, ^Dša-ù-ša, ^Dša-u-ša (all without the element –*k*- [Wilke, *Drevnij vostok* 5, 1988, 21ff.]). The name of this goddess is “the most great (godhead)” (Wegner, *SCCNH* 7, 1995, 117 ff.)

Tiš-atal:

The reign of Šu-sin (1972-1964) marked a turning point in the story of the Ur-III dynasty. Under the pressure from Amorite tribes from the northwest the country was driven into a defensive posture, as can be seen by the construction of a wall against these nomadic groups (the wall was located north of Baghdad, extending from the Euphrates to the Tigris and on to the Diyala).

Two documents from Ešnunna (-Tell Asmar)⁸, composed in the third year of the reign of Šu-Sin (e.g. 1970), mention a Hurrian prince named **Tiš-atal**, called the “Man of Niniveh”, and thus must have ruled over the northern part of Assyria, including the temple-city of Niniveh. A ruler with a similar name, and most likely identical with Tiš-atal, the “man of Niniveh”, is attached to the tradition of Atal-šen or even Tupkiš. Like Atal-šen this (second) Tiš-atal (old reading: Tiš-ari) left a foundation inscription on the construction of a Nergal temple, except this document was written in the Hurrian language! This document, – known as the Tiš-atal- or Urkeš-inscription—is therefore the oldest known inscription in the Hurrian language.⁹

Tiš-atal is described in this inscription –just as the above-mentioned Tupkiš—as “*endan*” of Urkeš, a thus far not fully understood title. At first this title was interpreted as coming from the Sumerian *entu-* (priestess) (in early works of the text we find the reading “Tiš-atal priestess?” from Urkeš), but today one favors a Hurrian derivation. Probably it contains the element –*tan*, which would correspond in later texts to the suffix –*tann/tenn* that serves to indicate job designations. The remaining *en* is derived either from the Sumerian EN “lord” or the Hurrian *en(i)* “God” (Wilhelm, *The Hurrians* 1989, 11).

A king from Kar(a)ḫar in seal legends is also named Tiš-atal (^DTiš-atal LUGAL Kar(a)ḫar). (Earlier the name was read as Ankiš-atal, which is also in RIA). Kar(a)ḫar = Ḫarḫar is situated west of the Tigris in the Diyala Area. The possibility that this Tiš-atal, king of Kar(a)ḫar is to be identified with the Tiš-atal of Urkeš, is made very unlikely by the great distance between the towns.

Old Babylonian Period (ca 1800-1530)

b.) In the Old Babylonian period one finds increasingly widespread Hurrian Personal Names, but also texts in the Hurrian language itself. From southern Mesopotamia

⁸ Whiting, *JCS* 28, 1976, 173 ff.; Wilhelm, *The Hurrians*, 1989, 11/

⁹ This tablet was previously dated to the end of the Akkadian period. The language stage of the Tiš-atal inscription is denoted in the literature as “old Hurrian”. The first work on the Tablet appears in AParrot and J. Nougayrol, *Un document de fondation hurrite*, *RA* 42, 1948, 1-20.

possibly from the city of Larsa itself or from Enegi, which lies in the region influenced by Larsa, comes invocations in the “Hurrian”, that is “Subarian” language (to so-call non-canonical invocations VAS 17, 5,6 and YOS 11, 64); ten texts were recognized as Hurrian by van Dijk, one as Subarian.¹⁰ One of these invocations properly is against serpents(?), another names “Teššub of Kumme”. Altogether however, these invocations are largely incomprehensible.

Language relationships: The term su-bir₄^{ki} (= Akkadian geographical term *s/šubartu*) for Sumerian and Babylonian corresponds to the region of northwestern Mesopotamia. eme-su-bir₄^{ki} (=subarian language) was originally a collective term for the languages of the people from this region, and thus originally did not correspond to a linguistic unit.

A. Ungnad¹¹ says the name Subarian, that is Subarish only applies to the language of the Mittani letters and the Bogazköy-Hurrian.

I.J. Gelb (Hurrians and Subarians 108) however draws a sharp division between “Subarian” and “Hurrian” in that he uses Subarian for the linguistic and ethnic substratum of northern Mesopotamia from the earliest times, distinguishing the Hurrians as later arrivals.

These positions later had to be given up because the clearly Hurrian language is described by Sumerians and Babylonians as “subarian”¹², nevertheless in earlier times the term “Subarian” also concealed non-semitic and non-hurrian languages (possibly Lullubaian or also Gutian?). In later times however eme-su-bir₄^{ki} doubtless also meant Hurrian.

The term “Hurrian” appears in the texts from Boğazköy, which appears in the Akkadian language writing of the days as the “Hurri-Land”, that is “The people of Hurri”. However the word was first read as *harri* (the cuneiform sign HUR also has the values HAR and MUR) and as the united gods in the treaty between Šuppiluliuma I and Šattiwaza of Mitanni have Indo-Aryan parallels, it was interpreted the “Hurrians” as the oldest Indo-Aryans.¹³ This hypothesis was very soon found to be untenable when texts were discovered that had the Hittite adverb *hurli* “Hurrian”, that is *hurli-* “Hurrian” as an equivalent in the Mittani letter itself (namely the membership adjective *hurr=o=he/hurv=o=he* in the titulary(?) of the king Tušratta from Mittani) and succeeded finally in convincing all that “*hurri*” instead of “Subarian” was the proper

¹⁰ J. van Dijk, Fremdsprachige Beschwörungstexte in der Südmesopotamischen literarischen Überlieferung, in Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn. Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient, Bd I/1. Hrsg von H-J Nissen/J. Renger. Berlin 1982, 97 ff.

¹¹ See A. Ungnad, Kulturfragen 1, Breslau 1923; ders Subartu, Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte und Völkerkunde Vorderasiens, Berlin und Leipzig 1936, 24 ff.

¹² Chiera/Speiser AASOR 6, 1926, 75 ff. Speiser AASOR 13, 1933, 13 ff.; ders. IH 2 ff.

¹³ Winckler, MDOG 35, 1907, 1 ff.; ders. OLZ 13,1910, 289 ff.

entire name. It is thanks to Speiser's great engagement with this issue that the name "Hurrian" was finally universally established.¹⁴

Old Babylonian Mari

b_j) A further source of Hurrian texts from the old Babylonian period is Mari, an important metropolis on the middle Euphrates. The archive of Mari has so far produced six Hurrian texts, of which five are described as invocations and one text is probably a letter.¹⁵

One of the invocations (Nr 1.) is directed – as far as it is understandable—against the "tooth worm" and thereby forms a parallel to the familiar Akkadian invocation. Another (nr 4) was a recitation for trapping the *gergiššum*- (skin) illness. The Hurrian gods Teššub, Kumarbi and Ša(v)uška (here still in the old form ša-ú-úš-a-an) are named, otherwise these texts are still poorly understood. Numerous Hurrian personal names are found in ration lists, where it sounds like they lie at the lower levels of society.

b_k) The modern site Tell Bī'a, situated near Raqqa on the upper Euphrates, is traditionally identified with the cuneiform inscriptions as the city Tuttul. From this excavation comes a still incomprehensible text that is a duplicate to the Mari-Invocation Nr 4 (*gergiššum*- (skin) illness). Another as with the Mari-tablets has on its front an Akkadian text, showing the invocation from the tablets of Tell Bī'a on the front and back sides. Also this text is nearly incomprehensible, still the preserved Akkadian tablet inscription fixes the invocation in any case against the illness "red skin rash" (*gergiššum*).¹⁶

Hurrian Personal Names appear now pile up in various places, so outside Mari in Šağir-Bāzār (here the names are about 20% Hurrian), Tell ar-Rimah (=Karana, situated between Niniveh and the Singar regions), Dilbat, Tikunani (in the Northern Khabur region), etc. The names for the most part are contained in name lists covering natural tasks and craftworks. The prism of the King *Tunib-Teššub* of Tikunani contains a list of Habiru people, of which a great portion have Hurrian names. Also from Tikunani comes a text fragment in the Hurrian language.¹⁷

b_l) In Šušarrā, on the upper course of the Lower Zab, there exists a local kingdom, its ruler having the Hurrian personal name *Kuvari*. Numerous personal names (e.g. *Hašib-*

¹⁴ Speiser IH 1 ff.; Wilhelm, Grundzüge 1982, 2 ff. ders. The Hurriand 1989, 2 ff. In the old testament the form *hōri(m)* appears, without however corresponding to the Hurrian in the historical and linguistic sense.

¹⁵ Thureau-Dangin, RA 36, 1939 1-28; Salvini RA 82, 1988, 81

¹⁶ See Krebernik/Strommenger 1980-1995: Tuttul (Tal Bī'a). Ausgrabungen in der Stadt des Gottes Dagan, in Zwischen Tigris und Nil 100 Jahre Ausgrabungender Deuthscehn Orient-Gesellschaft in vorderasien up Ägypten, Hrsg G. Wilhelm, Sonderhefte der Antiken Welt, Mainz 1998.

¹⁷ M. Salvini, The Habiru Prism of King Tunip-Teššub of Tikunani, Rom. 1998.

Teššub, Talpu-šarri, Unab-šenni, etc.) and Hurrian words suggest that a Hurrian-speaking populace was dominant here.¹⁸

In the second half of the 18th century, after the death of Šamši-Adad of Assyria numerous local principalities formed in upper Mesopotamia whose rules had Hurrian names.¹⁹

Alalakh VII

b_m) For westernmost discovered old Babylonian period site with texts possessing not only Hurrian personal names, but also words with Hurrian grammatical elements, is Alalakh level VII (first half of the 17th century, ca 1560). The city of Alalakh situated on the lower reach of the Orontes. Approximately half the preserved personal names are now Hurrian.²⁰ The Hurrian influence reached in the state cult with one oath in a contract being an oath to Teššub and Ištar.

Middle Babylonian Period (15th/14th centuries)

The following layers, Alalakh VI-V, were inscriptionless. In the following level **Alalakh IV** are found a distinct number of Hurrian personal names; about three quarters of all the personal names are now Hurrian. Hurrian or Hurrian-Akkadian words are encountered as technical terms of the political and economic administration and cult practices, but also as typical daily subjects. It is Hurrian numerals that are used. Here Hurrian texts still have not been found. To the east of the Orontes in the state of Qatna there is an inventory text for the goddess *bēlet ekalli* with Hurrian technical terms. Hurrian personal names are attested as well. From Nuzi, the successor state to the old Assyrian Gasur, but also properly descended from the kingdom of Arrapha, come thousands of documents, whose language, while Akkadian, in the Lexicon and Syntax has a strong Hurrian stamp (so-called “Hurro-Akkadian”²¹).

Mittani Letter

b_n) The thus far important testimonial of the Hurrian Language is the well-known since 1888/9 letter from the Mittanian King Tušratta to the Pharaoh Amenhotep that was written in 1365 (Mittani letter)/ The letter belong to a dossier of 14 writings altogether (12 letters and 2 gift lists) that Tušratta had sent to the Egyptian court (Amenhotep III and Amenhotep IV). Unlike the other Tušratta writings, which all were done in the Akkadian language, in this one Tušratta produced an over 500 line long letter in Hurrian. Probably

¹⁸ J. Eidem, *The Shemshara Archives 2, The Administrative Texts*, Copenhagen 1992; Wilhelm, *The Hurrians* 1989, 13.

¹⁹ e.g. *Atal-šenni* from Burundum or *Šukrum-Teššub* from Elakhut. See Wilhelm *Grundzüge* 1982, 20 ff.

²⁰ A. Draffkorn(-Killmer) *Hurrians and Hurrian at Alalakh: An Ethno-Linguistic Analysis*, Diss. Univeristy of Pennsylvania 1959, 17.

²¹ See G. Wilhelm, *Untersuchunger zum Hurro-Akkadischen von Nuzi*, AOAT 9, 1970.

this document accompanied the bridal party of the Princess on her trip to the Egyptian court. The tablet was found in the Egyptian archive of El-Amarna.

The contents of the Mittani Letter are part of the marriage correspondence between Tušratta and Amenhotep III and discuss the project of the marriage between the Pharaoh and a daughter of Tušratta with the name Tadu-Heba. The negotiation over the adventure had stretched over several years and ended happily with the arrival of the Princess in Egypt. Amenhotep III, however, died soon after the marriage. Marriage alliances between Egypt and Mittani were an established tradition. There was a marriage between a daughter (name unknown) of Artatama (I) (the grandfather of Tušratta) and the Pharaoh Thutmose IV; also a daughter of Šuttarna II, the father of Tušratta, and thus sister of Tušratta, named Kelu-Heba became a secondary wife to Amenhotep III.

The “Mitanni-Letter” is close in thematic and stylistic terms to the letters Tušratta composed in Akkadian, so one can treat the document as a quasi-bilingual work and develop a good chunk of grammar and semantics. This letter is in linguistic sense the most reliable source. It forms the basis for the development of Hurrian grammar and is the foundation of all the grammars thus far ; it also serves as the prime example for this work. The Mittani Letter is particularly notable for having a strict orthography, the other Hurrian texts are not done in this manner.

History of the Mittani State: The origins of the Mittani State are still murky. Shortly before or after 1500 there emerged in northern Mesopotamia the kingdom of Mittani. The oldest record for the name Mittani does not come from Mesopotamian archives, but the grave inscription of an Egyptian official from the time of Thutmose I (ca 1497-1482) “... a land, one called it Mittani. The enemy....” (Brunner MIO 4, 1956, 323-327). As Mait(t)ani the land is mentioned in older Mesopotamian sources (Sauštattar Seal of Urkunden from Nuzi; Ma-i-ta-ni). In sources from Nuzi/Arrapha of the 15th and 14th centuries there appears for Mittani the still totally obscure name Hanigalbat or Haligalbat, in the oldest form also Habingalbat. With the Mittani king Parrattarna through the mention in the Idrimi inscription, we get a first approximate date, ca. 1470 (Rouault SMEA 30, 1992, 254.)

At the apex of the of the Mittani state stands one dynasty, whose kings' non-Hurrian throne names are deceptive and certainly or still with great probability are linked to Indo-Aryan to etymologically (artatama = vedic rtá-dhāman “this living place that Rta is”, Tušratta²² = vedic tveša-ratha- “this war-chariot(?) monster advances”, Šattiwaza = old Indo-Aryan *sati-vāja “contestant of good obtains”, Vedic vāja-sāti “the obtainer of goodness” [Mayrhofer, Arier, 1974, 23-25]). Among the gods worshipped by the Mittani kings of the later 14th century of the Mittani kings, there were included Mitrá, Váruna, Índra and the Nāsātya-dieties, gods of the Vedas, the oldest Indian literature. These gods were in two god summaries of contract texts, namely they are mentioned in the contracts between Šuppiluliuma I and Šattiwaza as divine oaths. The rest of the Indo-Aryan

²² Also Tuišeratta in documents from Tell Brak, see N.J.J. Illingworth, *Inscriptions from Tell Brak* 1985, Iraq 50, 1988 83ff.

language terms are found in the names of the military nobility titles like *marianni=na* “charioteer”, in the expression for the bride-price *úadu-ranni* (=Indo-Aryan vadhü-rä “bride-gift”²³), and in certain expressions on the training of chariot horses (Kikulli-Text). The name Mittani is a geographical term and not a language of ethnic term.

Tell Brak

b_o) Tell Brak (=Nagar in the upper Habur region) provides a Mittani-period letter fragment in the Hurrian Language (published in Wilhelm Iraq 53, 1991, 159ff.). In this legal document the names of the Mittani kings Artasumara and Tušratta are found.²⁴

Ugarit

b_p) The next place to mention that has provided Hurrian material is on the North Syrian coast located in the mercantile state of Ugarit (modern Ras Shamra). From the tombs come important texts for the understanding of Hurrian of various types, including:

1. A short Akkadian-Hurrian Bilingual 8 Akkadian, 11 Hurrian lines;
2. A Sumerian-Hurrian List of the series HAR-ra = *hubullu* 9. Tablets;
3. A Sumerian-Akkadian-Hurrian and a Sumerian-Akkadian-Hurrian-Ugaritic vocabulary
4. Various Hurrian fragments in Babylonian script, including a letter that mentions the city of Carchemish
5. A religious Hurrian Text in Ugaritic consonantal script, which is important for the consonantal values.²⁵

Emar

b_q) Dating among the later Hurrian language inscription are the texts from Emar (destroyed 1187; modern Meskene, situated on the middle Euphrates). These include a lexical list of the Series AN=*anum* and omens. All the texts are at present still unpublished, several words and forms have however appeared in the works published by Laroche 1976-77 and 1980 “Glossaire de la langue hurrite” (GLH).

Assyrian Merchant Colony

b_r) In Asia Minor there are references to the Hurrian language in the following situations:

While thousands of documents from the old Assyrian period have been preserved, Hurrian words or Hurrian Names in these texts are still only found occasionally. This

²³ See M. Mayrhofer, Eine indo-arischer Rechtsterminus im Mittani-Brief? in *Hist Sprachforschund* 109,1996, 161-162. For the widely discussed “Aryan” problem, see A. Kammenhuber, *Die Arier in the Vorderen Orient* 1968 and the response by M. Mayrhofer, *Die Arier im Vorderen Orient ein Mythos?* Wien 1974.

²⁴ I. Finkel, *Inscriptions from Tell Braq* 1984, Iraq 47, 1985 191ff. N.J.J. Illingworth, *Inscriptions from Tell Braq* 1985, Iraq 50, 1988, 99ff.

²⁵ Bearb Laroche in *Ugaritica V* (1968).

situation can however change through the progress with the publication of the remaining Kültepe texts.²⁶

One of the rulers of Kaniš (modern Kültepe) received a legal letter from a prince of the city Mama (located in the vicinity of Maraš) with the name *Anum-hirbe*.²⁷ This name is – by general consensus—agreed to be Hurrian. A linguistic analysis of the name has been done by Wilhelm in *Amurru* 1, 1996, 176 Anm. 15: *an=o=m hirve* (so it does not include the God-name *Anum*, but instead the verbal root *an-* “be happy”).

Another letter of North Syrian origin from Kaniš names the sender as a certain *Ehli-Addu* and the letter receiver as *Unapše*. Under the named witnesses appears the probably also Hurrian name *Tuḫuš=maḫi*. This witness came from *Haššu* in north Syria; another witness who comes from a place in the same region named *Zibuḫuliwe*.²⁸ Furthermore the *Unapše* addressed letter mentions a “scribe who understood and read Hurrian”²⁹

Boğazköy: Extensive Hurrian linguistic material has been uncovered in the archive of the Hittite Metropolis *Hattuša*. The following text classes have been found so far:

1. Omens: Astrological and Birth Omens, still on the Akkadian model.
2. Historical Texts: So far only a few broken fragments of these are known.
3. Mythological Texts: Large fragments of the Gilgameš Epic, the story of the hunter Kešši; texts from the Kumarbi-cycle; one song described as a literary work on the kingdom in heaven.
4. Conjunction or purification rituals (e.g. the series *itkalzi* and *itkahhe*; the ritual of the lady *Allaiturah(h)e*); feast rituals, offering lists)
5. From the new excavations in the upper city of Boğazköy in 1983 come multiple tablets that provide complete Hurrian-Hittite bilinguals. These bilinguals provide another thus far unknown literary genre in the ancient near east unknown literary genre, namely so-

²⁶ See the Hurrian personal name *Titin-atal* in Kt 90/k, 223 9 *Ti-ti-na-tal*, C Michel and P. Garellu, *Tabletter PaleoAssyrienes de Kültepe Volume 1*, 1997, 33.

²⁷ K. Balkan, *Letter of King Anum-hirbe of Mama to King Warshama of Kanish*, Ankara 1957, TTKY VII/31a.

²⁸ The place name contains the root *zib-*, the title-forming suffix *-uh(u)li* and the genitive suffix *-ve*: *zib=uh(u)li=ve*.

²⁹ See K. Hecker, *Zur Herkunft der hethitischen Keilschrift*, SCCNH 8, 1996, 291 ff. (Revised from a lecture from 1990, mentioned in Corum.) See also G. Wilhelm, *The Hurrians in the Western Parts of the Ancient Near East*, *Michmanim* 9, 1996, 17 f. ; Veenhoof, SCCNH (next to thesecond letter of *Unapše*). For the name *Tuḫušmaḫi* consider Wilhelm, SCCNH 8, 1996, 342 who considers that it may also be of Anatolian origin.

called “Parables”.³⁰ The series mentions in its colophon the title *kirenzi* “release”, corresponding to the Hittite *para tarnumar*. The word *kirenzi* corresponds with the Akkadian expression *andurāru* and biblical Hebrew *d^eror* “manumission of slaves” (Neu StBoT 32, 1996, 8 ff.). The text was written down in the Middle Hittite period (14th Century), but the essential meaning can be found in older occurrences (e.g. from the destruction of Ebla in old Babylonian times.)

History: The Hurrian Boğazköy texts date to the 14th or 13th centuries. Nevertheless the presence of the Hurrians at least in southeast Anatolia seems to have been familiar from the foundation of the Old Hittite Empire. *Hattušili* I (1560) reports in his annals that the enemy *Hanigalbat* (noted first during old Babylonian times, later in Akkadian sources often employed for Mittani)/*Hurri* entered in the land and the land altogether fell away, until *Hattuša* alone remained. This proves that the Hurrians in the old Hittite period represented a very important factor and a powerful opponent to the old Hittite Empire. Under *Muršili* I, the successor of *Hattušilis* I, the Hurrians once more pushed into Anatolia. It was probably this renewed advance that prompted *Muršili* I, during his successful Babylon venture (ca. 131), to leave behind the stolen god images in *Hana* on the middle Euphrates and face the Hurrians. From *Terqa*, also situated on the middle Euphrates, comes a text that could be related to this event (Rouault, SMEA 30, 192, 252 with Anm. 24). In the following weak period after the old Hittite Empire the local kingdom of *Kizzuwatna* forms, that in the following period acted as mediator to bring Hurrian cult to *Hattuša*. The Hurrian influence derived from the mediation of *Kizzuwatna* is clearly noticeable in the Middle Empire of *Hatti*. For example the Hittite Kings have Hurrian private names (*Tašmešarri* = *Tuthalia* III, *Šarri-Teššub* = *Muwattall* II. *Urhi-Teššub* = *Muršili* III., *Hišmi-Šarruma* = *Tuthalia* IV.) and also the queens of the dynasty of the Middle Empire and Great Imperial period have Hurrian names: *Nikkalmadi* (wife of *Tuthalias* I/II). *Ašmunikkal* (wife of *Arnuwandas* I), *Tadu-Heba* (wife of *Tuthalias* III), *Pudu-Heba* (wife of *Hattušili* III).

Near the Turkish villages of **Ortaköy** (=Hittite *Šapinuwa*) with Çorum, ca. 50km northeast of Boğazköy, since 1990 numerous new texts have been found. Among these, several bilinguals, multiple Hurrian Texts of the series *itkalzi* and other Hurrian Texts have been found. This material is unpublished (1999).

b_s) In the first millennium, Hurrian texts are no longer found, but several words and Akkadianized Hurrian words still persist (the name of the goddess *Ša(v)uška* appears with Sargon).

³⁰ Published in KBo 32, work from Neu, StBoT 32; see here lessons 11-13.

2. *Dialect Structure from M.L. Chačikjan* (Churritskij I urartskij jazki, Jerevan 1985)

Hurrian inscriptions are scattered and dispersed so widely in time and space that M.L. Chačikjan, a student of the Russian scholar I.M. Diakonoff³¹, divided them in six dialects, that to different degrees show the development of a structural transformation of Hurrian from a predominantly “active”³² structure to an Ergative one. (This dialect structure has however not been adopted by all researchers, see Girbal/Wegner ZA 77, 1987, 147 ff.) Thereby obtaining the following cases:

1. The dialect of the Tiš-atal inscriptions (also Urkeš dialect), called the “Old Hurrian”;
2. The “Babylonian” dialect (in the old Babylonian oaths/rituals from Larsa and Mari);
3. The dialect of the Sumerian-Hurrian HAR-ra list from Ugarit
4. The dialect of the remaining Ugarit texts
5. The Boğazköy dialect
6. The Mittani dialect

The “Babylonian” dialect (2) is according to Chačikjan the archaic one. It possesses the opposition condition/action and gradually acquires(?) the opposition transitive/intransitive. The Urkeš dialect (1) also appears to be relatively archaic. In these two dialects according to Chačikjan the verb in the 3rd Person singular is still conjugated according to the principles of the “active” structure, whereby the suffix *-b* indicates the subject for the verb of action, regardless of whether it is transitive or intransitive. (For the suffix *-b* see S. 109). The dialect of the Sumerian-Hurrian Liste (3) is likely not derived from two previous dialects, but marks an independent development.

The dialects 4-6 have the most in common: The ergative structure (See S. 33 ff.) is pronounced, transitive and intransitive verbs are conjugated differently. A common innovation is the perfect (that is preterite) suffix *-oš-*. These three dialects appear to have a common origin, perhaps the “Babylonian” dialect.

The Ugarit, Mittani and Boğazköy dialects therefore have proven to be regarded as a linguistic group, wherein the Boğazköy text apparently, in contrast to the Mittani Letter, dates earliest. The Hurrian-Hittite bilingual is to be considered to a certain extent a special case, in that here the form inventory in particular contains verbs predominantly in the so-

³¹ Also Diakonoff himself has, based on the work of Chačikjan, discussed the dialect structure of the Hurrian language rules, see I.M. Diakonoff, Evidence on the Ethnic Division of the Hurrians, SCCNH 1, 1981, 77-89.

³² The notion of the “active” structure was first coined by Klimov (G.A. Klimov, On the Character of languages of active typology, in Linguistics 131, 1974, 11-25). It is believed that in these languages the verbs support the opposition condition/action, while in the ergative structure the corresponding opposition is transitive/intransitive. While all transitive verbs are also verbs of action, this does not apply in the reserve case. Verbs like “laugh”, “cry”, “walk” and in principle not transitive, but are in the sense of the “active” structure verbs of action (see also Girbal/Wegner ZA 77, 1987, 145 ff.)

called "Old Hurrian". It thus contains in first line verbal endings like $-i=b$, $-a=b$ and $-o=m$.

II. Introduction to the Grammar

A. Relationships and Typological Characteristics

1. *The genetic relationships*

Hurrian and Urartian, a language closely related to Hurrian from the first millennium,³³ belong to the so-called “isolated” languages of the ancient near east. Just like for Sumerian and Hattian can also the Hurrian-Urartian so far no convincing genetic relationships to other languages have been established with sufficient certainty.

Genetically related languages are understood as a language family or group, that is they all derive from a common root language (Sternemann/Gutschmidt, Einführung 1989, 140). (Large genetically related language families are e.g. Indo-European, Semitic, Turkish languages, Finno-Ugric, Altaic, Bantu and so on. Also today there are still languages with no genetic connections, e.g. Basque or Japanese, also over origin and connections of Etruscan is still not clearly known).

However in recent times people have not failed to attempt to situate Hurrian (and Urartian) in a language family. Candidates include a possible(?) class of Caucasian languages finish the both authors the Hurrian-Urartian on. which have similarities with the Hurrian.

In his Grammar published in 1971 the Russian linguistic scholar I. M. Diakonoff had speculated that a relationship with the Caucasian languages Nachian and Lezgian could exist (HuU 161 f)

Diakonoff and the Causcasologist Starostin generated in 1986 a work in which they looked for proof of the relationship of Hurrian with Northeast or East Caucasian and also reconstructed from the numerous Caucasian individual languages the “Proto-East Caucasian” (PEC) Language.³⁴ From these reconstructions both authors concluded that it was Hurrian-Urartian. The nearness of the expected relationships derived here placed them on par with those involving the oldest inscriptions of the Indo-European Language

³³ The Urartian tradition begins at the end of the 9th century and ends in the middle of the 7th century. Its settlement-zone extended to in a large extent corresponds with a region that was the territory of Greater Armenia in Classical times. The center of the Urartian Empire and its capital Tušpa lay in eastern Anatolia on the shore of Lake Van. The Urartian texts are written in a variant cuneiform introduced from Assyria, which was used primarily for rock and stone inscriptions. In linguistic terms, newer examinations show that the two languages Hurrian and Urartian are actually two dialects or better treated as two stages in linguistic development(/), whereby Urartian stands nearer to the so-called “Old Hurrian” (see M. Salvini, *Geschichte und Kultur der Urartäer*, Darmstadt, Wiss. Buchges 1995 2 ff. 193 ff.)

³⁴ I.M. Diakonoff and S.A. Starostin, *Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian Language*, MSS Beihelf 12 N.F. München 1986.

family, probably an all too optimistic estimate. Several of the documented parallels were surely nothing but accidental, others were uncertain or too few in number to provide such tight relationship between them. Particularly important was naturally the structure of the nominal and verbal complexes, where one can demonstrate indeed a number of clear(?) correspondences. The hypothesis altogether has several things (going for it?), it however above all depends on the reliability or unreliability of the intra-Caucasian etymological relationships which are hardly verified. Despite the great difficulty of the examination of individual languages and despite the large temporal distance between the Hurrian-Urartian to the Northeast Caucasian language, it cannot be rejected entirely out of hand. One is convinced that some derivations have proven to be false: Diakonoff and Starostin S. 58: *havurni* means from the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual and the Ugarit Vocabulary “Heaven” and not as the authors suggest “earth” and so the reconstruction of the PEC term **qwy'rV* “field” is invalid. The same goes also for the Hurrian *eše* PEC-term **7amsV*, the identified in the bilingual as “Earth” and does not mean “Heaven”.

The hypothesis of a genetic relationship between the Proto-Hurrian-Urartian and the Northeast-Caucasian language, as Diakonoff and Starostin advocate, therefore still demands further confirmation.³⁵

2. *The Typological Characterization*

Typologically Hurrian belongs to the “agglutinating” languages, a discovery already made in the first work on the Mittani Letter shortly after it was uncovered (see Messerschmidt, *Mitanni-Studien*, MVAG 4/4, Berlin 1899, 2 ff.; Plank Xenia 21, 1988, 69 ff.; Sternemann/Gutschmidt, *Einführung*, 1989, 75).

The examination of Languages for their genetic connections is however not the only way that languages can be compared or classified. In numerous languages, entirely independent of their genetic linkages, one can recognize similar traits and processes in their structure, without there being a genetic relationship (However, in covering genetic relationships and typological similarities, one must not ignore the other. Sternemann/Gutschmidt, *Einführung* 1989, 75.)

The examination of structural traits is the area of Typology. The valid typologically relevant traits are morphology, phonology and semantic-syntactic traits. Valid traits for all languages provide realizations of the so-called “universal”, those valid for only certain languages are called “partial universal” (Sternemann/Gutschmidt *Einführung* 1989, 76 ff.)

The actual originator of the classification of Typology was Fr. v. Schlegel to beginning of the 19th Century. In course of the development of the field these classifications underwent various changes, but nevertheless much linguistic research today still uses 4 basic types (including several subtypes) in discussions, that ultimately comes from a classification

³⁵ See the Recension of W. Farber ZA 78, 1988, 314 ff. and R. Smeets, *On Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian Language* BiOr 46, 1989, 259-279.

proposal by W. v. Humboldt. Crudely, for the sake of the simplicity and clarity we can say that the languages of the world can be divided typologically into four basic types (see Sternemann/Gutschmidt, Einführung 1989, 179 ff.)

a) *The “isolating language type” (also monosyllabic type)*

This language type is identified by the fixed forms of its words. Particularly distinctive for this type are the so-called “root isolated” languages like old Chinese that express terms – with very few exceptions—through monosyllabic words. The monosyllabic words are conveniently identified with one-syllable morphemes, a formative, that in the linguistic literature is called the root. A morphology of the word changes or a morphology of the word construction does not exist. Morphologically marked word types are also not found. One and the same root word can, depending on its position in the sentence represent various word types and fill different functions. The characterization of the syntactic function of the words is based on their locations in the sentence; this language type possesses strong rules on word order (in case of old Chinese it is S(ubject)P(redicate)O(bject) (see Sternemann/Gutschmidt, Einführung, 1989, 80; this book is also where the following sentences were obtained):

A sentence: *wō* *bù* *hē* *chá*
“I” not drink Tea

Subject *wō*, Predicate *bù hē*, Object *chá*

By positioning it after the “Verb” *wō* functions as the “Object”

tā *ài* *wō*
he/she love(s) “I” = “she loves me”

Languages of the isolating type change in source of their development to agglutinating types; for Chinese this development occurred in Middle Chinese (around the 6th Century A.D.). Other languages of these types are Vietnamese, Khmer and Malayan.

b) *The “polysynthetic” (or incorporeal) language type:*

To this language type belong a large numbers of mainly exotic languages, like Ainu, Chukchi and a services of Indian languages. The main feature of these still poorly investigated languages is that a number of non-independent or independent morphemes (words) fuse to form so-called “complex words” (also sentence words), a structure in which they are only usable and understandable in their polysynthetic form, and not as individual morphemes (Sternemann/Gutschmidt, Einführung, 1989, 85).

c) *The inflectional language type:*

The Indo-European and Semitic languages belong here. The defining characteristic of this group is the form change through inflection in the construction of words: in other words these languages change the word-body.

Thus essentially whenever inflection exists the inflectional morphemes accumulate several meanings (For example Latin *amic-a* Nominative Singular Feminine “friend”) and a grammatical term can be expressed through several morphemes: E.g. German *die*

Gäste (signals the plural three times) or *die Messer* (signals the Plural once through the article).

d) *The Agglutinating language type:*

To this type belong the majority of all languages. In this group are the languages –very independent of their genetic connections— that can be summarized as having for their “smallest common denominator” an unchanging root, and that grammatical elements (morphemes) through affixation are attached (or agglutinated) onto this root. In this way strikingly long morphomatic chains can be produced, in which it is frequent to observe vowel harmony (i.e. the adjustment of the affixed vowels to the stem or root vowel).

As essential criteria one further finds that each affix or morpheme carries only one grammatical meaning (as with inflectional morphemes); and one speaks of a separable exponent of the inflection-morphology (unlike the cumulative exponents of the inflectional languages).

An example: The inflected language Latin forms *amic-i* Genitive singular masculine “of the friend”. By contrast, the agglutinative language Hurrian needs two terms here (genera are not distinguished): Root “Friend” + singular marker (=Ø or *ni*) + Genitive case marker (=ve).³⁶

The affixes can be purely suffixes, but there are also languages that use prefixes as well as suffixes, or only prefixes.

Within the Ancient Near East the following belong to the agglutinating language type: Sumerian (uses prefixes and suffixes), Hattian (prefixes and suffixes) and Hurrian and Urartian (both languages only use suffixes). Modern languages of this type include Turkish, the Finno-Ugric languages and the Bantu languages.

An example from Turkish:

| | | |
|-----------|---|----------------------------------|
| ev | = | House |
| ev=in | = | of the House (genitive) |
| ev=ler=in | = | of the Houses (genitive, plural) |

A large number of agglutinating languages share a further common characteristic, the so-called “ergative sentence structure”, whereby they show to very different degrees the ergative arrangement: some languages construct only certain tenses ergatively (so e.g. Georgian) or only certain persons. These phenomena are designated with the term “split ergativity (German “gespaltene Ergativität”). In the ancient near east for example Sumerian belongs to these type. The “split ergativity” appears in the linguistics to a certain extent as the normal case (Plank, Xenia 21, 1988, 88). Only Hurrian and several Australian languages (like Dyirbal) are marked linguistically as extreme cases of the ergative arrangement, where ergativity appears through all tenses, persons, pronouns etc. (Plank, Xenia 21, 1988 76 ff.) As for Hurrian, one has the unique condition of the

³⁶ The german and latin examples follow Sternemann/Gutschmidt, Einführung 1989, 85 f.

ergative arrangement provided by this language. Furthermore(?) –as will be shown below– also the Hurrians knew of the phenomenon of “split” ergativity.³⁷

In summary one can say that agglutinating languages possess the following characteristics:³⁸

1. The mono-functional status of the morphemes i.e. each suffix keeps its individuality and meaning.
2. No semantic fusion of the grammatical elements
3. No multiple meanings (polysemy) of single morphemes
4. The relatively loose construction of root+affix, i.e. easily recognizable morpheme boundaries.
5. The syllabic independence of affixes.
6. The chaining together of morphemes of the word followed through by vowel harmony.
7. Suffix-rich
8. The null-term for the root-category of the paradigm (indicative Mood, Present Tense, Absolutive Case, Singular number)
9. No genera.

The ergative sentence structure:

The typological classification of Hurrian and Urartian under the languages with ergative structure is an important contribution of Russian linguistics.

In 1967 Diakonoff wrote an article in Russian in which he investigated the sentence structure of not only Hurrian-Urartian but also the Elamite and Sumerian and recognized them as ergative.³⁹

This idea replaced the out of date idea of the “passive verbal interpretation”⁴⁰ of Hurrian.⁴¹

In 1964 F.W. Bush had published his book “A Grammar of the Hurrian Language, without however having recognized the ergative structure of Urartian.

³⁷ See S 87 f. and the Recension of Haas/Wagner in StBoT 32 in OLZ 92, 1997, 440 f., 454.

³⁸ From V. Skalička, Typologische Studien, Braunschweig 1979; F. Plank Xenia 21, 1988, 80 ff.

³⁹ I.M. Diakonoff, Jazyki drevnej Perednej Azii, Moskau 1967, 29 ff.113 ff.

⁴⁰ The essence of the “passive verbal interpretation” as used for the Caucasian languages, states that a verbal usage when the an actor (Urheber, Agent) and a target (Patient) participate was represented in a linguistic manner with a reversal of that which usually appears in the Indo-germanic languages: The subject is not the actor but the target, which follows correct the verbal predicate rules, while the actor stands in an oblique case.

⁴¹ So J. Friedrich, Kleini Beiträge zur hurritischen Grammatik MVA(e)G 42/2, 1939, 19 Speiser IH 10.

In 1971 there appeared from I.M. Diakonoff a grammar “Hurrisch und Urartäisch”, in which he provided the Hurrian-Urartian language comparison. This study also contained the results of the Russian article from 1967.

In 1985 M.L. Chačikjan published a revised version of “Hurrisch und Urartäisch” (in Russian).

Bush, Diakonoff and Chačikjan in their works noted the ergative sentence construction for the Hurrian, without however recognizing the anti-passive sentence construction. Chačikjan and similarly Speiser(?) defined an sentence type called the “Equative” construction” and subsumed under it both the nominal sentences and “antipassive” sentences (e.g. Hurrian *šen=iffə šuda=man fašš=oš=I*, where *fašš=oš=i* is understood as the normalized participle: “My brother (is) my sender(?)”). This sentence is actually an anti-passive construction: “My brother has sent me” (the object, that which was to be sent, is not expressed).

(H.J. Thiel, *Phonematik* 1975 193 ff. introduced the term “antipassive” for Hurrian. The idea of “antipassive” was originated by M. Silverstein for the Chinook, an Indian language of Northwest America [Thiel took the term from a manuscript by Silverstein from 1971]. See M. Silverstein “Hierarchy of features and ergativity” in ed. R.M. Dixon: *Linguistic Series* 22, Canberra 1976, 140-143).

Definition of the Ergative (derived from the Greek word for “work”⁴²):

The basic distinction in languages with ergative structure is that between transitive and intransitive verbs, whereby the ergative sentence structure can only be used with transitive verbs. This gives also for the Hurrian; the transitive and intransitive verbs each possess separate rules for conjugation suffixes.

With languages that use case endings with the noun like Hurrian, the subject of the intransitive verb has an endingless case, called the absolutive case.

(Many authors use in their descriptions of the ergative language the term “nominative” for this endingless case. This usage is inadvisable, for the Nominative of ergative languages does not match with the Nominative of nominative-accusative languages.)

The subject of transitive verbs, by contrast, appears in another case, the one called *Ergative* (also *Agentive* = “acting person”). This case is identified through a particular ending. (The ergative function can be provided with a separate case, it can however also share a case that has another function; this is for example the case in Awarian, where the ergative function is shared with the instrumental case.)

⁴² Girbal, Hattisch, 1986, 137; Plank, *Ergativity*, 1979, 4 ff.

Also characteristic of the Ergative structure is the fact that the target (direct object) of transitive verbs does not appear in the accusative (=object case) –which does not occur in such languages–, but in the endless Absolutive case.

The absolutive is thus the case that identifies both the subject of the intransitive verbs (“the man comes”) and also the direct object of the transitive verbs (“The man struck the dog”).

An example of an intransitive sentence:

“The man comes” **tahe*=∅ *un*=*a*=∅

(Subject *tahe* in the absolutive singular with the null-marker (∅);

Verbal root *un*- “come” –*a* “intransitive marker; null-marker for the third person singular intransitive)

and a transitive sentence:

“The man strikes the dog” **tahe*=š *erbi*=∅ *id*=*i*=*a*

The man (*tahe*=š Subject of the trans. verb in the ergative with –š)

the dog (*erbi*=∅ Absolutive with null-marker is the direct object of the transitive verb.)

hit (*id*- “hit” transitive verb + *i* transitive ending + *a* person marker 3. person, singular transitive)

A number of ergative languages also possess a further sentence construction, the so-called “antipassive”. The antipassive construction occurs when one uses a semantically transitive verb without naming the target (the direct object). In our case it would be such a sentence:

“The man hit” **tahe*=∅ *id*=*i*=∅

The semantically transitive verb *id*- “hit” is constructed without the direct object. The subject *tahe* “man” has lost the ergative marker –š, it therefore appears now in the endless absolutive case; the verb has the particular ending –*i*, the marker for a transitive verb; the person-marker follows the intransitive conjugation, in which for the third person singular a null-marker appears.

Description of the Antipassive:

In the antipassive sentence construction, as the above example shows, a semantically transitive verb is conjugated like an intransitive verb, i.e. a direct object in the absolutive is no longer expressed. The active subject loses the ergative marker, i.e. it now appears in the endless absolutive case. The participle stem of the transitive verb follows the intransitive conjugation with regard to particular person markers, whereby for the third person singular a null-marker appears.

The distinction between intransitive and antipassive usage transitive verb is then exclusively the marker of intransitivity: –*a*- with intransitive and the marker –*i*- of transitive verbs even when conjugated with the antipassive.

There are however also languages which allow a target (=direct object) to be expressed with the antipassive construction, however under no circumstances (like to Agent) can these appear in the absolutive, but must carry the mark of an oblique case. One example of this is from the previously mentioned Dyirbal-language, in which the dative is used for this purpose.⁴³

Comparable constructions of such an “extended” antipassive usage are obviously found in the so-called “old Hurrian” as well, where a transitive (non-ergative) verb shows an object with a form in the Essive(?) case: *kirenz(i)=a*(Essive)=*mma šar=i=b* “and(=*mma*) he demanded (*šar=i=b*) release (*kirenz(i)=a* Essive)” see Haas/Wigner, recension of StBoT 32 in OLZ 92, 1997, 445; [see additional examples also under lesson 10 “old Hurrian”; for the eventual appearance of these sentence types in the Mitanni letter see S 103-104, 177.])

Summary: Hurrian is an agglutinating, purely suffix-using language with extreme ergative arrangements (at least in the Mittani and partly in the Boğazköy dialect) and antipassive constructions. In the Boğazköy texts, particularly in the bilinguals, there are further sentence types of the “extended” antipassive sort (for possible examples of the “extended” antipassive in the Mittani letter, see S. 103-104, 177.). “Split ergativity” comes in modal forms (Jussive).

A particular peculiarity of Hurrian (and Urartian) is the so-called “Suffix reception”, a form of the congruence merger in attributive constructions (for “suffix reception” see S 59 ff and Table 1).

As typologically tight relationship occurs with Dyirbal, an Australian language which possesses numerous typological similarities to Hurrian (Plank, Double Case 1995, 30 ff.).

⁴³ See Girbal, SMEA 29. 1992 172 with reference to R.M.W Dixon, The Syntactic Development of the Australian Languages, in Mechanisms of Syntactic Change, ed by Charles N. Li Austin 1977, 365-415. See also Girbal/Wegner, ZA 77, 1987, 150 with Anm. 8. For an extensive discussion of the “antipassive” concept above see: I Kalmár “The Antipassive and Grammatical relations in Eskimo”, in F. Plak, Ergativity, London 1979, 117-143.

B. Writing and Sound studies

1. Writing, Orthography and Phonetics

a) Hurrian is written in the syllabic Babylonian cuneiform script and to a limited extent also in the Ugaritic alphabetic script.

Heterogramy is relatively rarely used, the script is therefore in practice a true syllabic script. What can make the interpretation of the Hurrian texts much more difficult is the Sumerograms or Akkadograms which serve to support the comprehension.

b) At different places and different times various “Cuneiform-proper writings” come to be used for Hurrian, particularly to account for the sounds peculiar to Hurrian that Akkadian lacked. The considerable number of the variant Hurrian orthographies are as follows:

c) In Mari, north Mesopotamia and in the early texts of Arrapha and Nuzi, the Hurrian phonematic doubling of the intervowel consonants is rarely, if ever reproduced graphically. Similarly the sounds [u] and [o], also [h] and [ğ] are not distinguished graphically. Differences are also found in the treatment of the sound [s]: In Mari, older Arrapha, Meskene etc. express [s] with the Š-signs, but the voiced allophone (i.e. the position-dependent variant of a phoneme) unlike [s] is in particular positions occasionally written with Z-signs, whereas in Mittani and Boğazköy [s] and the position-dependent voiced allophon of [s], [z] are always written with Š-signs.

d) In Mittani, Syria, Nuzi and Boğazköy syllabograms which were used in the Old and Neo-Babylonian for Akkadian voicelss and for voiced consonants are used fundamentally without any distinction; thereby “doubled” writings of consonants (as the sign combination VC-CV) were used for the Hurrian long consonant, and a single writing represented the voiced allophone of the short consonant in the given position. The positions in which a voiceless short consonant of a voiced counterpart occur are: between vowels, attached to with *l, m, n, r* and at word endings. So for example the signs DI and TI at the beginning of a word is read as a voiceless [ti], while the same signs between vowels or the genuine voiced consonants *l, r, m, n* is to be read [di]:

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------|----|--------|----------|----------|
| e.g. given the signs | ad-da- | or | at-ta- | are read | /atta/ |
| | ak-ku- | or | ag-gu- | | /akko/u/ |
| whereas the signs | a-ta- | or | a-da- | are read | /ada/ |
| | a-ku- | or | a-gu | | /ago/u/ |

In Mittani-syllables and commonly also in Nuzi and Boğazköy the cuneiform signs:

GI has the reading /ke/ or /ge/ with the e-vowel.
KI has the reading /ki/ or /gi/ with the i-vowel
KU has the reading /ko/ or /go/ with the o-vowel
GU has the reading /ku/ or /gu/ with the u-vowel

The cuneiform signs U and Ú were only consistently distinguished in Mittani. There appears in the Mittani-Letter a phonemic opposition:

U-sign =[o]
Ú-sign =[u]

The ansatz of a vowel system with 5 (a,e,i, o, u) vowel qualities is certified through a student tablet of (Emar)-Meskene (Msk 7462; D. Arnaud, Emar VI.4, 1987, Nr. 601), which notes:

| | |
|-------------------------|---------|
| WA-u:BU-u | vowel o |
| WA-a:PA-a | vowel a |
| WA-e:BE-e | vowel e |
| WA-i:BI-i | vowel i |
| WA-ú:BU-ú ⁴⁴ | vowel u |

The rules of the Hurrian orthography were consistently used only in the Mittani royal office. This orthography known as the “Normal orthography”, was in principle also used in Boğazköy and Nuzi, however here the handling was considerably more careless. So *i* is often not graphically distinguished from *e* and also [u] and [o] are not always clearly separated.

e) Similarly, the Old Babylonian and Hittite cuneiform as well as Hurrian use the sign PI for the syllable wa, but the Mittani-Letter also uses it for we, wi, wu. The Hurrian Boğazköy-texts avoid this uncertainty with the aid of particular signs WA+A for wa_a, WE+E for we_e etc.

The signs AB, IB UB before WA represent the syllables aw,ew, iw, uw (hence AB+WA=aw-wa, in Mittani also aw-we etc.), in transliteration they are written as áw, éw, íw, úw. The sign IB has the reading EB in the word-initial position. which is frequently written in Boğazköy as e-IB-.

In Mittani the reading of the vowel for WA is determined through the next syllable when this begins with a vowel WA+UT- = wu-ut-. If the next syllable begins with a consonant, without the vowel for WA orthographically indicated, or with the syllable AH, there can be multiple interpretations of the reading: WA-ri-e-ta = wu-ri-e-ta = *fur=ed=a* “he will see”, WA-AH can be read wa-ah, we-eh, wu-uh, etc.

For the sign combination WA+subscript ap/b,ip/b, p/bu, in transliteration they are represented as wa+ap/b [wa_{ap/b}], wa+ip/b, that is wi+ip/b, wa+p/bu, that is wu+p/bu as their interpretation still (an) outstanding (issue?).⁴⁵

⁴⁴ So also the autograph

⁴⁵ for wa+ap as af(f), that is av, see thiel/Wegner SMEA 24, 1984, 208 f. anm 31. and HZL 318.

f) For the sound combination labial spirant+vowel requires different script rules for the difference signs.

Labial Spirant + a: Cuneiform signs BA, PA, WA+A [wa_a] (only Boğazköy), ú+a (this only after u is probably [wa]).

Labial Spirant + i: Cuneiform signs BI (=bé), pí, WA (Mittani), WA+E [we_e], WA+I [wi_i] (only Boğazköy), ú+e, that is ú+i (only after u, then probably [we]).

Labial Spirant + u: Cuneiform signs B/PU, WA, WA+U [wu_u], WA+ú [wu_ú], ú+ú [wu] or [ü].

So for example, the genitive marker /fe/ [ve]⁴⁶ is expressed in the Mittani-Letter with the cuneiform sign WA (without a vowel sign) or through the sign combination ú-e (thus only after the vowel u, then probably [we])⁴⁷, in Boğazköy through the cuneiform sign – pí, WA+I> wi_i; WA+E> we_e and also ú+e (for u) in Meskene through the sign –be, in Ugaritic alphabetic script through –w (the Genitive of the god name Teššub is however represented in Mittani and Boğazköy with the signs –ub-bi = up-pí, in Ugarit however it appears as –p [Tšb+we > Tšp], hence it is voiceless, probably the sound *-obwe > [*-owwe] >[-offe], from Diankonoff HuU 27 [Tessoffe], see also Laroche, Ugaritica V, 1969, 529 ff.).

For the Dative marker /fa/ [va] in the Mittani-letter the syllabogram WA (without vowel sign) is used as well or after [u] the sign combination –ú-a (probably [wa]) is written.⁴⁸ In Boğazköy –pa, WA, WA+A>wa_a is written, In Meskene also –ba.

The enclitic possessive suffix of the first person singular appears graphically as –IP-WA = íw-wə /iffə/, _IP-WA-Ú- = íw-wu-ú- /iffu/.

In certain orthographies the sign WA can also be used for ew, that is iw, e.g.: WA-ri = <ew-ri> /evri/ “gentleman”.

In the Mittani-letter among the stops the signs PA, TA, KA, TE, TI and DU are still used but not the signs BA, DA, GA, DI and TU, it appears therefore to have a reduced sign inventory. In the Boğazköy-texts such a phenomenon cannot be ascertained.

For the Hurrian the presence of consonant pairing is characteristic:

⁴⁶ The Genitive and also the Dative marker are on the easy comprehensible will here each be described in the normal manner, which is always as –ve that is –va, also we will present WI, -WE, -BI after –u- as –ú-e that is –WA, -WA_a, -PA, -BA after –u- as ú-a appears.

⁴⁷ See Speiser IH26,43,109 Bush GLH 91 f. and 136 f.

⁴⁸ See Speiser IH 26, Bush GLH 133 f.

1. A consonant is voiceless at the beginning of a word (e.g. **da**-he i.e. *tahe* “man”) a short (single) constant adjacent with another constant is also voiceless (e.g. **aš-du-u-u-uh**-he i.e. *ašt=o=hhe* “female”).

In certain positions it develops into a voiced allophone:

1a) Adjacent with a genuine voiced consonant like *l m n r* develops the short consonant a voiced allophone (e.g. **ar-te** i.e. *arde* “town”, **an-ti** i.e. *andi* “That”, **ge-el-ti** i.e. *keldi* “hail”),

1b) intervocalic (e.g. a-ta-ni i.e. *adani* “stall”; i-ti-ia i.e. *id=i=a* “he struck”).

1c) at the end of a word.

2. A doubled consonant is lengthened, voiceless and probably has still further traits provided (e.g. **ad-da**-ni i.e. *attani* “Father”)

The allophonic rules for the voicing of consonants is certain, as it is derived on the one hand from the alphabetic texts of Ugarit, but also independently from the derived writing of Hurrian personal names by Babylonian scribes in Nippur, Nuzi, etc.

The distinction between single and double consonants in an intervocalic position, as occurs in the Mittani-letter, therefore provides a phonematic opposition, but the exact definition is still uncertain (besides voiceless:voiced, for other authors⁴⁹ it is aspirated:unaspirated (gespannt?), it can even be treated as ‘glottalized:non-glottalized’).⁵⁰

Summing up, is the following determination: The single consonant is unvoiced and short; next to another consonant it is also unvoiced; in certain positions it transforms into the voiced allophone. The positions are between vowels, next to *l, m, n, r* and at the end of a word.

From Diakonoff (HuU 52-53) and Chačikjan (Churr. i uraru 43) Hurrian has the following phonemes:

⁴⁹ H.J. Thiel, *Phonematik*: 1975, 116 ff.: “The following representation of the Hurrian Consonant system yields insofar from the usual representation, as the consonant segment primary gives a contrast between ‘gespannt’ and ‘ungespannt’ (compared with the previous treatments [who regarded it] as a contrast between ‘voiced’ and ‘voiceless’ or ‘geminated’ or ‘ungeminated’)... “The phonetic characteristic of the aspirated segment is –for Thiel– “length” ([‘]) with the obstructive (generic term for stop and fricative) and further voiceless, with the occlusive perhaps at the end of the word perhaps also glottalized. The unaspirated segment contrasts with this by being short, voiced in associated with voiced segment...” see Chačikjan, *Churr i urart.* 23 ff.

⁵⁰ See Wilhelm, *Orientalia* 54, 1985, 489.

| The Phoneme Pair | | | |
|------------------|----------------|--|-------------------------|
| Unvoiced long | Unvoiced short | Voiced Allophone (only allophone of the short consonant in certain positions) | Signs |
| /ff/ | /f/ | with allophone [v] | <ww>-<w> |
| /pp/ | /p/ | with allophone [b] | <pp>-<p/b> |
| /tt/ | /t/ | with allophone [d] | <tt/dd>-<t/d> |
| /ss/ | /s/ | with allophone [z] | <šš>-<š> <z> in Mari |
| /cc/ | /c/[ts] | with allophone [dz] | <zz>-<z> |
| | /c'/ | ? | <s> |
| /kk/ | /k/ | with allophone [g] | <kk/gg>-<k/g> |
| /hh/ | /h/ | with allophone [g'] | <hh>-<h> |
| /ll/ | /l/ | | |
| /mm/ | /m/ | | |
| /nn/ | /n/ | | |
| | /r/ | | |

With the liquids (lingual sounds) probably only the single consonant *l* and *r* are present. *ll* as a voiceless variant of *l* is probably not present; *mm*, *nn* and *rr* as special phonemes is also probably not possible. Doubled *ll* and *rr* are most likely assimilation products $l+n > ll$, $r+n > rr$.

The doubling of *ll* in the root *hill*- “inform” can be shown to be from the petrified (iterative) morpheme *l*. This *l* appears also in the root *hub*- “break” and *hub+l*- “completely break” also perhaps *pugl*- “meet”. Final *l* or *r* is found only in loan words.

A *r/l*- exchange is a dialect that can be observed in Boğazköy: e.g. with *avari* “field” besides *avalli*- “field” as well.

g) The vowels

Hurrian has the vowels *a*, *e*, *i*, *u* and *o*, this has now been confirmed by the previously mentioned student tablet from Emar/Meskene. Probably Hurrian also used $\text{—}\text{ə}$, but the writing is identical with *e* or also with *i* or *a*.

The vowel [u] is written in cuneiform with the sign \acute{U} ,
The vowel [o] is written in cuneiform with the sign U.

The distinction behind U(=o) and \acute{U} (=u) comes from Bork and Speiser (Speiser IH 22 f.; see also Bush GHL 42). It is made, because the sign \acute{U} appears in combination with *e* as $\text{—}\acute{u}\text{—}e$, or with *a*, as $\acute{u}\text{—}a$,= *we* or *wa* in certain dialects, whereas U=o is never used in such combinations for *we* or *wa*.

The graphical marking of *o* and *u* however is only carried out consistently in the Mittani Letter:

| | | | |
|------|-------------|---------|---|
| e.g. | u-u-mi-i-ni | /ômini/ | “Land” |
| | šu-u-we | /šove/ | “Mine” (Genitive of the independent personal pronoun 1. person singular) |
| but | šu-ú-ta | /šuda/ | “to me” (Directive of the independent personal pronoun 1. person singular) |
| | šu-ú-ú-ra | /šura/ | “together with me” (Comitative of the independent personal pronoun, 1. person singular) |

In the other dialects the distinction not only between *u* and *o*, but also between *i* and *e* is not sufficiently consistently carried out. Thus one finds in Boğazköy on the one hand for one and the same word multiple spellings:

| | | |
|------|---------------------|--|
| e.g. | šu-u-ni and šu-ú-ni | “Hand” |
| | e-di but also i-di | “Person, self” (in Mittani only e-di is written) |

on the other hand one must however take into consideration that the Boğazköy texts do not show a uniform orthography, so that certain texts show more careful writings than others (see also Giogieri/Wilhelm SCCNH 7, 1995, 37 ff.).

Diphthongs *ai*, *ia*, *ie* (written a-i or a-e, i-a, i-e),
e.g. a-i “when, if”, or u-i-a-(man) = *oja*(=*man*) “(but) not”.

Plene-Writing: For Hurrian orthography the additional plene writing (i.e. writing for one or even two vowel signs after a syllabogram of the type C(onsonant)V(owel) or before a syllabogram of the type VC) is characteristic. It is used:

- a) to distinguish the vowels *e* and *i*, or *u* and *o*
- | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--|
| ú-ni-e-IT-ta | = un=et=t=a | “they will bring” and “she will come” (Mit. III 12,21) |
| -ni-e | = ne | so-called “article” |
- but
- | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| tī-i-ha-ni-tén | = tīhan=i=(i)d=en | “they want to show” (Mit. III 24) |
| pa-li-i | = pal=i | “he knows” (Mit. II 56) |
| šu-ú-ta | = šu-da | “to me” (Mit. I 50) |
| ú-ú-ri-a-a-aš-še-na | = ūr=i=a=šše=na | “which he desires” (Mit. I 108) |
- but
- | | | |
|-------------|---------|----------------------|
| šu-u-we | = šo=ve | “mine” (Mit. III 40) |
| u-u-mi-i-ni | = ômini | “land” (Mit. I 90) |
- b) to produce the diphthongs
- | | | |
|---------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| u-i-a-ma-a-an | = oja=mân | “but no” (Mit. IV 46) |
| ši-i-e | = šije | “water” |
- c) One case of the use of plene writing is difficult to clarify, but seems not to indicate a long vowel (Diakonoff HuU 32). See however Wilhelm, *Orientalia* 61, 1992, 125, in

which the supposition is made that “as a rule a strong accent on the penultimate syllable leads to the lengthening of this syllable (e.g. the *plene* writing [Wegner]) and produces or can produce a simultaneous shortening of the preceding syllable(s).”

(The representation of the *plene*-written syllables through the symbols *â*, *ê*, *î* etc in the coherent inscriptions is used in this work principally with certain particles, that here an important alternative is apparent; occasionally one also has words where plene writing in the root syllable distinguishes meaning: e/g/ *ur-* [*ú-rV-] “exist” and *ûr-* [*ú-ú-rV] “desire”, *hâš-* [*hâ-a-aš-] “ointment” and *haš-* [*hâ-aš-/*hâ-šV-] “hear”, *tar-* [*ta-rV-] verb of unknown meaning and *târ-* [*ta-a-rV-] “fire”, *pal-* “know” [*pa-IV-] and *pâl-* “false?”⁵¹ [*pa-a-IV-] and probably also *pahi* “head” [*pa-a-hV-] and *pahe* meaning unknown [*pa-hV-], perhaps derived from the verb *pah-* “destroy”).

h) Broken writings occur in Alalakh IV, Nuzi and Boğazköy occasionally for doubled consonants: e.g. ^{URU}Igingal-iš > ^{URU}Igingalliš “the town of Igingalli”; *kulah-e-na* > *kulahhena* “the so-called” (Wilhelm, SCCNH 8, 1996, 339 Anm. 26; ders., FsKingel, 1997, 283 Anm 34. For the suggested meaning of *kulahhe-* see Wegner, SMEA 36, 1995, 97 ff.).

Still unclear are writings like *ta-a-e* (Ugaritic Vocabulary RS 94-2939.Col. V5')⁵² for the normal *ta-(a)-hi/e* and *ta-ah-e* “man” or *i-ti-i-ih-[in]* for *i-ti-i-e-in* both “he wants to strike (the enemy)” (ChS I/5 Nr. 47 Rs. IV14 and Nr.46 Rs.IV 39'; for additional examples see Wegner, ZA 85, 1995,122 and 125 with Anm. 23).

(i) Assimilation with the rare consonantal stem can occur with the genitive and dative, e.g. ^{URU}Igingal(l)išša < ^{URU}Igingal(l)iš +va (dative) “for the town of Igingalliš (KBo32; 19 I 5), ^DHebatte < ^DHebat+ve (genitive) “of the goddess Hebat” (GLH 101).

Metathesis is reported with then god name *Kušuh* (*Kušuphi* < *Kušuh*+ve) (GLH 158), as likewise with the verb *tašp-*, later *tapš-* “destroy” (see Section 210) and the number word *kig* + *še* > *kiški* “third” (see Section 70)

Principles for arranging Hurrian Lemmata in the dictionary and the word-catalogues (see also Wilhelm *Orientalia* 54, 1985, 489)

The principle for the ordering of Hurrian words follows the arrangement of the standard works on the Hurrian personal names from Nuzi (I.J. Gelb *Nuzi Personal Names* (NPN), [OIP 57], Chicago 1943); it matches with the Hittite dictionaries and name lists.

This principles used is not claimed to have any phonological or phonetic correctness, it however appears handy(?). It corresponds therein, that voiced consonants (such as b,d,g)

⁵¹ Suggested meaning for this root by Friedrich, BChG 40

⁵² B. André-Salvini/M. Salvini, *Un nouveau vocabulaire trilingue sumérien-akkadien-hourrite des Ras Shamra*, SCCNH 9, 1998, 7,17.

are filed under their unvoiced equivalent (such as p,t,k), with the conventional exception w for f or v.

Furthermore the graphical doubling of consonants is neglected in the arrangements, although the distinction between single and double consonants in inter-vowel positions is a phonematic opposition, the strict definition is still open. Consistency in the single and double writing is only found in Mittani. For a dictionary and word catalogue is however with the previous research findings that distinction hardly occurs, as innumerable exceptions exist. (Totally unclear is also the relationship between single and double consonants in other positions, such as at the beginning of a word.)

Thus when phonetic organizing principles are not useful, and phonemic ones are not possible, one follows a convention. This organization is also followed in this work, with the additional feature that c [ts] occurs under z. The rare s-containing words (such as su-bi-) are included under š.

(E.Laroche in his “Glossaire de la language hurrite” only used these principles in a piecewise manner; he follows them for the unvoiced consonants [this is because the Hurrian texts in Ugaritic alphabetic script produce the voiced consonants] expanding the alphabet to add b. d.g.z.)

Transcription: With the transcription (really transliterations) the procedures are as follows: When a cuneiform sign represents Media and Tenuis and in both cases it carries the same index, the unvoiced variant is chosen, thus *ap, at* not *ab, ad*. As is normally the rule⁵³ the sound with the lower index figure is inserted, thus *be, bi* not *pè, pí*. With doubled consonants this principle is adjusted, so *ab-bi* or *ib-be* not *ap-pí* or *ip-pè*. The [in-sound?] syllable signs AB, IB, UB are written as *áw, íw, úw*, when the following syllable starts with W, thus IB+WA = *íw-wa*

Bound Transcription: The bound transcription is the close writing; Haček's are retained throughout, also the h is consistently written. Phonetic [u] and [o] are distinguished. The short consonants are also reproduced phonetically. The possessive pronoun of the third person signal is marked with *-i-*. The genitive and dative markers are uniformly reproduced with *-ve* and *-va*.

A circumflex (â, ê, etc.) shows only the plene-writing of the corresponding vowels.

⁵³ An exception is the sign TIN, which is here reproduced as TÉN.

C. The Hurrian roots

1. Syllable structure and word-building elements

A. The Hurrian roots by a large majority consist of a single syllable that is fundamentally unchanging. One can distinguish the following commonly occurring types:

| | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------------------|
| a) Roots of the type C(onsonant)V(owel) | <i>pa-</i> | “build” |
| | <i>ha-</i> | “name” |
| or V(owel)C(onsonant) | <i>un-</i> | “come” |
| | <i>ar-</i> | “give” |
| | <i>id-</i> | “strike” |
| Nominal roots | <i>*el</i> | “sister” |
| | <i>*en</i> | “god” |
| roots with VCC | <i>itt-</i> | “go” |
| | <i>ašš-</i> | “?” |
| Nominal roots | <i>*att</i> | “father” |
| | <i>*all</i> | “Mistress” |
| VC ₁ C ₂ | <i>ašh-</i> | “sacrifice” |
| | <i>ašk-</i> | “ask?” |
| Nominal roots | <i>*ard</i> | “town” |
| | <i>*ašt</i> | “wife” |
| b) The commonest root type is CVC | <i>tad-</i> | “love” |
| | <i>tan-</i> | “make” |
| | <i>haš-</i> | “hear” |
| | <i>hil-</i> | “inform” |
| | <i>kad-</i> | “speak” |
| | <i>pal-</i> | “know” |
| | <i>zaz-</i> | “to make eat [verköstigen?]” |
| Nominal roots | <i>*šen</i> | “brother” |
| | <i>*šal</i> | “daughter” |
| | <i>*ner</i> | “mother” |
| c) Roots of the type CVCC | <i>pašš-</i> | “send” |
| | <i>nahh-</i> | “sit” |
| | <i>nakk-</i> | “dismiss” |
| CVC ₁ C ₂ | <i>kunz-</i> | “throw oneself down(?)” |
| | <i>hemz-</i> | “bind” |
| d) Reduplicated roots | <i>keligel-</i> | “put up” |
| | <i>wirwir-</i> | [<i>firvir-</i>] “loosen?” |
| and with reduction of the intercalated vowel | <i>kelgel-</i> | “put up” |

e) Two-syllable roots of the type CVCVC like e.g. *šehel “purify” or zulud- “loosen” are probably not real. In the case of *šehel, there appears the root šehl- with an Anaptyxic⁵⁴ vowel, with *zulud there is a root *zul with a formation(?) –ut- [ud].

f) Primary nominal roots like šen-a “brother”, ner-a “mother” att-ai “father” are rare.

Up to three optional root extensions can be attached to these roots; the root and root extensions (in the following abbreviated RE) then form the stem.

2. Noun morphology

To the root and RE of the nominal stem there is a final vowel, or a Theme vowel, which is frequently *i* or *e*, or more rarely *a*; actual Hurrian *u*-stems are not securely proven.⁵⁵

The decision on whether the –*i*- or the –*e*- stem is present, is only established through the Mittani orthography. Since naturally all words don’t appear in the Mittani letter and examination of the quality of the final vowel hardly happens, here –*i*- and –*e*- stems are treated together (see also Diakonoff HuU 60 f.).

Stems that end in a consonant do not occur –expect with a few god names like *Hebat*, *Kušuh*, *Nubadig* and with particles like *tiššan* or *pegan*.

i/e-stem: *ašti* “wife”, *eni* “god”, *eli* “feast”, *pâhi* “head”, *edi* “body”,
 hani “child”, (from *han-* “give birth”), *furi* “look” (from *fur-* “see”
(The latter theme-vowel /i/ is written for the nominalized consequence from Wilhelm,
Orientalia 61, 1992, 140.)

tahe “man”, *arde* “town”, *tive* “word”, *eše* “earth”
 taše “gift”

a-stem: The a-stem is basically restricted to relationship terms and god names:

šala “daughter”, *šena* “brother”, *ela* “sister”, *nera* “mother”
 mena “twin(?)”

 GN *Ša(v)uška*, rarely *Šimiga* (usually *Šimige*)

one of the few words that does not belong to either of these categories is

tiša “heart”

Diphthong stems:

allai “lady”, *attai* “father”, *šije* “water”

⁵⁴ Anaptyxe, that is the insertion of a secondary vowel, appears most often between liquids and nasals when these are attached to another consonant. See for example the nouns *torbi* and *torubi* “enemy” *purli* and *puruli* “temple” (GLH 274 and 206).

⁵⁵ *u* as the final vowel appear with adverbs (e.g. *ašhu-* “above”), but principally with particles (*inu-* “how”, *panu-* “(al)though”).

On the unchanging root the following word-constructions, that is, stem-building elements can be attached, however their meanings are often unclear. These so-called “derivational” nominal suffixes give the root an alternative meaning, the nuance often remaining obscure. It is important to note that the nominal suffixes (just like the verbal ones) follow a clear, invariable sequence in position, and that the derivational categories are placed near the root and the flexional category closer to the end of the word. One distinguishes two groups:

1. Group (Speiser IH 129 ff.; Bush GHL 109 ff.) is little studied and the meaning of many is unclear:

- ar-** in: *av=ar=i* “field” *ped=ar=i* “cow”, *nih=ar=i* “gift”
(With this group, in contrast to the following ones, a verbal origin is not recognized)
haš=ar=i “fine oil” from *haš-* “ointment”, *šid=ar=ni* “curse” from *šid-* “to curse”
- ade** *amm=ade* “grandfather” *fir=ade* “nobleman”, *hur=ade* “warrior”, *er=ade* “bird”
- ni** individualizer, not to be confused with the so-called “article” Sg. *-ni/ne/*;
examples of this suffix in:
šid=ar=ni “curse”, *havur=ni* “heaven”, *evri* “Lord” but *ever=ni* “Lord King”.

2. Group of world-building suffixes that form the adjective, nomina actoris etc. From Diakonoff HuU 65 f. they follow either the root or the suffixes of the first group.

Hurrian only possesses a few primary adjectives: specifically:

- e.g. *turi* “below, low”
timeri/timari “dark”
ove- “dumb”

Much more common are the adjectives generated by derivational suffixes (see Speiser IH 144 ff.; Bush GHL 163ff.):

-**(h)he** The suffix, whose final vowel is added at the outset(?) for the Mittani-form after *e*, comes in two variants, namely a single and a double consonant. We cannot yet discern with certainty the distribution of *-he* and *-hhe*. The suffix forms adjectives of membership:

- a) Ethnic and geographic adjectives, the majority with the suffix *-he*
- b) Adjectives expressing the material or interior quality, most with the suffix *-hhe*,
- c) Numbers.

| | | | |
|--------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| - <u>he</u> | a) <u>hurri</u> + <u>he</u> | > <u>hurr</u> = <u>o</u> = <u>he</u> [With the transition of <i>i</i> > <i>o</i> , i.e. with derivation vowel <i>o</i>] ⁵⁶ | “Hurrian” |
| | <u>hatti</u> + <u>he</u> | > <u>hatt</u> = <u>o</u> = <u>he</u> | “Hittite” |
| | <u>Halba</u> + <u>he</u> | > <u>Halba</u> = <u>he</u> [with the <i>a</i> -stem the vowel <i>a</i> remains] | “Belonging to <u>Halab</u> ” |
| | <u>Ebla</u> + <u>he</u> | > <u>Ebla</u> = <u>he</u> | “Belonging to <u>Ebla</u> ” |
| | <u>Tukriš</u> + <u>he</u> | > <u>Turiš</u> <u>he</u> [with consonantal stems it attaches directly to the stem] | “Belonging to <u>Tukriš</u> ” |
| | <u>Igingalliš</u> + <u>he</u> | > <u>Igingalliš</u> <u>he</u> | “Belonging to <u>Igingalliš</u> ” |
| - <u>hhe</u> | b) <u>hiari</u> + <u>hhe</u> | > <u>hiar</u> = <u>o</u> = <u>hhe</u> [with the transition <i>i</i> > <i>o</i> , with the derivation vowel <i>o</i>] | “golden” |
| | <u>šinniberi</u> + <u>hhe</u> | > <u>šinniber</u> = <u>o</u> = <u>hhe</u> | “ivory” |
| | <u>ašti</u> + <u>hhe</u> | > <u>ašt</u> = <u>o</u> = <u>hhe</u> | “feminine” |
| | <u>turi</u> + <u>hhe</u> | > <u>tur</u> = <u>o</u> = <u>hhe</u> | “masculine” |
| | * <u>huši</u> + <u>hhe</u> | > <u>huš</u> = <u>o</u> = <u>hhe</u> | “belt” |
| | c) <u>eman</u> = <u>am</u> = <u>h(e)</u> = <u>a</u> from <u>eman</u> - | “ten” | “tenfold” |

When -he attaches to a verbal stem, it gets the theme vowel -i-:

| | | | | |
|----|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| d) | <u>pašš</u> = <u>i</u> = <u>he</u> | “mission” | > <u>pašš-</u> | “send” |
| | <u>na</u> = <u>i</u> = <u>he</u> | “pasture” | > <u>nav-</u> | “graze” |
| | <u>pa</u> = <u>i</u> = <u>he</u> | “building site(?)” | > <u>pa-</u> | “build” |
| | <u>hemz</u> = <u>i</u> = <u>he</u> | “belt” | > <u>hemz-</u> | “surround(?)” |
| | <u>kul</u> = <u>i</u> = <u>he</u> | “speech” | > <u>kul-</u> | “speak” |
| | <u>šiš</u> = <u>i</u> = <u>he</u> | “shovel, spade” | > <u>šiš-</u> | ? (Ugarit Vocabulary) |

Like the pair -he and -hhe, two very similar suffixes in form and function, distinguished only through the length of the consonant element, can also be discerned with both the following adjective morphemes -še/-šše and -ni/-nni (see Wilhelm, Double Case 1995, 123 ff.: for -ni and -nni see Parrattarna, Sauštatar und die absolute Datierung der Nuzi=Tafeln. Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 24, 1976, 149 Anm. 1):

| | | |
|------------------|--|--|
| - <u>o=š(š)e</u> | <u>talav(i)</u> = <u>o</u> = <u>še</u> [with the transition <i>i</i> > <i>o</i> i.e. Derivation vowel <i>o</i>] | “great” (derived from the root <u>tal(mi)</u> - “great”) |
| | <u>šav</u> = <u>o</u> = <u>še</u> | “great, elevated” |
| | <u>fahr(i)</u> = <u>o</u> = <u>še</u> | “good” from <u>fahri</u> - “good” |
| | <u>ker</u> = <u>a</u> = <u>šše</u> | “long” from <u>keri</u> - “long” |

-(a)=šše The Suffix -(a)+šše forms also abstract notions like:

⁵⁶ On the term “Derivation vowel” for this phenomenon see Wilhelm, SMEA 29, 1992, 241 Anm 6.

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| <i>ašt</i> = <i>a</i> =šše | “female-ness” | from <i>ašti</i> “woman” |
| <i>all</i> = <i>a</i> =šše | “ladyship” | from <i>alli</i> “lady” |
| <i>šarr</i> = <i>a</i> =šše | “kingship” | from <i>šarri</i> “king” |

Here belongs also the suffix combination -**ambašhe*, which is made from the individual morphemes =*a*=*mb*=*aš(š)e*=*h(h)e*. This suffix combination serves to form membership adjectives from abstracts:

alambašhe < *al*=*a*(intr.)=*mb*(unbk.)=*aš(še)*=*h(h)e* “count for the base from the harvest work” (Nuzi)

tehambašhu < *teh*=*a*(intr.)=*mb*=*aš(še)*=*h(h)u* (Akkadian form) “wages for the rearing from infants”

(for the segmentation see Wilhelm, AdŠ 3, 1985,85, for the suggested readings, see Fincke, WO 24, 1993, 48 ff.)

-(i)=šše forms abstracts as well

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| <i>šar</i> = <i>i</i> =šše | “desire” | from <i>šar</i> - “desire” (Ugarit Vocabulary) ⁵⁷ |
| <i>nir</i> = <i>i</i> =šše | “goodness” | from <i>niri</i> - “good” |
| <i>kib</i> = <i>i</i> =šše | “seating (on the throne)” | from <i>keb</i> - “sit, place, put” |

-ni KUR *mašriâ*=*ni*- “the Egyptian (land)” (Mit.II 69)

-nni KUR *mašria*=*nni*- (Mit. II 71)

or KUR *mašria*=*n(i)*=*ne*, e.g. a form with the so-called “article” *-ne* (Wilhelm, Double Case 1995,124, Examples[48] and [49])
maria=*nni*- “charioteer”

-o=nni *mad*=*o*=*nni*- “wise” from *madi* “wisdom” (Boğazköy)
pic=*o*=*nni* “happy” from *pico* “joy” (Mit I 79 bi-su-un-ni-)

-i=nni This suffix forms relative adjectives, substantives for job titles:

| | | |
|---|---------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>urb</i> = <i>ar</i> = <i>i</i> = <i>nni</i> | “butcher” | from <i>u(r)b</i> - “slaughter” |
| <i>išh</i> = <i>ar</i> = <i>i</i> = <i>nni</i> | “baker” | |
| <i>far</i> = <i>i</i> = <i>nni</i> | “bread-baker” | |
| <i>fand</i> = <i>i</i> = <i>nni</i> | “cook” | |
| <i>tab</i> =(<i>i</i>)= <i>r(i)</i> = <i>i</i> = <i>nni</i> | “smith” | from <i>tab/v</i> - “pour” |

-u/onni *ašh*=*uš*=*i*=*kk*=*onni* “offering-client” (Boğazköy)
amumm=*i*=*kk*=*onni* “administrator” (Boğazköy)

⁵⁷ Ugarit-Vokabular RS 94-2939 Col II 5, see André-Salvini/Salvini SCCNH 9, 1998, 5, 18 f.; 393.

-kk- Nominal element, unclear meaning: in *amumm=i=kk=onni* etc. For forms with the formation +t+u+kki see under –t- (The formation –kk- is not to be confused with the verbal negation suffix –kkV-)

-li Job-designation-forming element, appears athematically on the stem:

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| keb + li “hunter” | from <i>keb-</i> “set, place put” |
| tab/v + li “smith” | from <i>tab/v-</i> “pour” |

-(u)zzi This ending forms adjectives, that expresses an external quality such as its suitability. When attached this formation causes the theme vowel to be lost, so the theme vowel goes from *i* > *u/o/* above:

| |
|---|
| <i>ašt(i)=uzzi</i> “a particular woman” (name for a robe) |
| <i>pah(i)=uzzi</i> “the suitable head” |
| <i>šen(a)=iff(u)=uzzi</i> “my suitable brother” |

(The suffix –*o/u+zzi* has the unusual property that it does not have to attach directly to the nominal stem [example 3], which strongly suggests that it should not be treated as a word-building morpheme. One segmentation =*o/u+zzi* is from Wilhelm SMEA 29, 1992, 241 Anm. 6, who proposes =*o/u=* can be interpreted as the derivation vowel of the *i*-stem).

-phe/i This ending is predominantly used to form ethnicities. The /*p/* according to Wilhelm AdŠ 2, 1980, 99, 131, is an allomorph of the genitive suffix –*ve* attached to –*h*e/i, for the adjective: –*phe* < **-ve-(h)h*e.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| <i>ninua=p=<u>h</u>e</i> < <i>ninua=v(e)=<u>h</u>e</i> | “the (man) of Ninua” |
| <i>pišaiša=p=<u>h</u>e</i> | “he of the mountain Pišaiša” (GN) |

-(a)=šhe/i This suffix forms nomina loci and instrumenti

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| <i>ašt=a=š<u>h</u>e</i> “feminine attribute” | from <i>ašti</i> “woman” |
|--|--------------------------|

-(u)=šhe/i

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| <i>ahr=u=š<u>h</u>e</i> “incense user(?) | from <i>ahri</i> “incense” |
| <i>tiv=u=š<u>h</u>e</i> “word, speech” | from <i>tive</i> “word” |

(The suffix –*ušhe* as a way to form tool descriptions is also known in particular from the texts from Nuzi and Alalakh, Bush GHL 112).

-šari Possibly another abstract or collective suffix. When attached as a suffix to a stem with *n, l, (m,r?)* + vowel the theme-vowel is lost and the *š* becomes the graphic *z*:

| |
|--|
| <i>enzari</i> (< <i>en(i) + šari</i>) “godhead”, derived from <i>eni-</i> “god” |
| <i>tipšari</i> (< <i>tiv(e) + šari</i>) “word, speech, story” from <i>tive-</i> “word” |
| <i>furulzari</i> (< <i>fur + (u)l(i) + šari</i>) “offering shower” from <i>fur-</i> “see” |

-ki This suffix forms Nomina instrumenti and also substantives with resultive meaning:

| | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>id + ki</i> | “mortar” | from <i>id-</i> “break” |
| <i>id + ar+ ki</i> | “trash(?)” | |
| <i>tudi + ki</i> | “trashpile, clay pit” | |

| | | |
|----------|---------------------|--|
| nan + ki | “a striking weapon” | from <i>nan-</i> “strike (down enemy)” |
| fud + ki | “son” | from <i>fud-</i> “procreate, beget” |
| kad+ ki | “saying, remark” | from <i>kad-</i> “say” |
| tub + ki | ? | |

Nomina actoris (occupation names) are formed with the very productive suffix combination =o/u=h(e)=li (graphically *-uhli* or *-uhuli*, the later is the usual form in Alalakh and the western Hurrian region), whereby *-li* is the actual job designation suffix. The occupation terms with *-uhlu/-uhuli* are based on a Nomina, which with the help of the suffix *-he* is transformed into a membership adjective. Onto this membership adjective is attached the job designation suffix *-li* and in Alalakh the derivation vowel-*o/u-*, otherwise this vowel is not used and there is syncope of the final vowel with *-he*. Substantive occupation terms with Hurrian and non-Hurrian stems are:

emand=o/uhlu (Akkadian form) “leader of the ten” < eman “ten” + ti > *emandi* “the ten” + he > *eman*=d(i)=o=he “belonging to the ten” + li >
eman=d(i)=o=he=li
halz=uhli (Nuzi, Alalakh, Boğazköy) “mayor” (literally “the one whose occupation is working those who belong to the (military)-district” (Wilhelm, SMEA 29, 1992, 239 ff).
zil=ikk=uhli “witness”
ambann=uhli from *ambane* “firewood (root *am-* “burn”)
mašk=uhli (Alalakh) “leather worker” (Akkadian *mašku* “skin”)
mardat=uhli “carpet weaver” (Akkadian *mardatu* “carpet”)

-hhuri occupation term in *amummi*=hhuri “administrator”, see Wilhelm, SMEA 29, 1992, 240 Anm 4., in the part “eine Suffickombination of *-(h)h(e) + o + ri*”

-tann/tenn also job description in Nuzi (see Wilhelm UF 2, 1970, 277 ff.)

-arde forms collectives. Attaching this suffix causes the theme vowel to be lost (Girbal, ZA78,1988 125 f.).

šal(a)=arde “daughtership”
atta(i)=arde “forefather, ancestor”
maria=nn(i)=arde “fighting charioteer”

-arbu appears with number words (Nuzi, Akkadianized form). The theme vowel is again lost.

šin=arbu “two years old”
kig=arbu “three years old”
tumn=arbu “four years old”

-ae serves as the instrumental case and also for forming adjectives and adverbs.

ker=ae “long”
niroš=ae “in a good manner”
teon=ae “many”

-pae The ending *-pae* is interpreted in Wilhelm SCCNH 9, 1998, 178 ff. as <*ve + ae. In this analysis /p/ is then again treated as an allomorph of the genitive suffix *-ve* (see also above under *-phe*) and *-ae* the instrumental ending, which in the framework of the suffix reception is submitted without the suffix addition *-NE-* (Sg.)/*-NA_* (PL.). This ending therefore does not to the root extensions.

The above list leaves out still a great number of word-building suffixes, whose segmentation and meaning are still mostly unclear. Some are still listed:

- me** *ul=me* “weapon”, *taš=me* “gift” from *taš-* “give”
hud=me “prayer” from *hud-* “pray, praise”

- nzi** and **-lzi** Both suffixes probably form abstracts. In the writing *-zi* could be *-še*, which after *n, l* can go to *z*.
punuh=u=nzi “?” from *pun=uh* “?”, *kire=nzi* “release” from *kir-* “release”
talahh=u=lzi “drawing up?” from *tal-ahh-* “draw out”
itk=a=lzi “purity” from *itk-* “be clean”
un=a=lzi “the coming” from *un-* “come”
maga=lzi “gift”, perhaps equivalent to *maga=nni* “gift”

- t-** unclear, appears in expressions like *puttukki-* from *fud-* “produce” (fud+t+u+kki) or *mandukki-* probably derived from *mann-* “exist”; perhaps identical with the root extension *-t-* of the verbal morphology (see S. 77) or to the following suffix *-ti-*: (fud + ti (i>u/o before kki) + kki, man +ti(i>u/o before kki) + kki.

- ti** *kel=di* “Hail” from *kel-* “be wallet.”
kum=di “tower” from *kum-* “?”
hap=ti “ring” from *hab/v-* “?” (Ugarit Vocabulary)⁵⁸
eman=di “tenship”

- idi** Nominalizing element, appears in
tar=idi “pot” from *tari-* “Fire”
nahh=idi “seat” from *nahh-* “sit, seat”

- (i)=thi/e**
pašš=i=the “messenger” from *pašš-* “send”

- (a)=thi/e**
hašul=a=thi meaning unknown, derived from the root *haš-* “hear” or *hâš-* “anoint”
zalm=a=thi epithet of the god Nubadig.

⁵⁸ Ugarit Vocabulary RS 94-2939 Col. I 7 André-Salvini/Salvini, SCCNH 9, 1998, 5, 11

| | | | | |
|----------|-----------|---------------|----------------|-----------|
| eni | “god” | en(i)+ni > | <i>enni</i> | “god” |
| šena | “brother” | šen(a)+ni > | <i>šenni</i> | “brother” |
| šav(a)li | “year” | šaval(i)+na > | <i>šavalla</i> | “years” |
| eni | “god” | en(i)+na > | <i>enna</i> | “gods” |

When the so-called “article” is attached to a consonantal stem, that already carries the root-extension *-ni* (“individualizer” see above, so type: *-Cni*), the following occurs: the theme vowel disappears (syncope), between the consonant now at the end of the stem and the suffix *-ne* there appears a secondary vowel insertion (Anaptyxe); the inserted vowel matching the vowel of the root word:

e.g. evri “lord” +ni (“individualizer”) > *everni* + “article” *ne* > *evrenne* “lord, king”
 *havur + ni > *havurni* + “article” *ne* > *havurunne* “heaven”
 *šuh + ni > *šuhni* + “article” *ne* > *šuhunne* “wall”

Secondary vowel insertions are also found with the occupation-forming suffix *-li*, when *-li* is attached to a consonant:

keb- “set, put” + li “hunter” + na “article” plural > *kebella* “hunters”
 tab/v- “pour” + li “pourer” + ne “article” singular > *taballe* “smith”

In the Boğazköy texts one occasionally finds also non-assimilated forms, e.g. with *tali* “tree, wood” where *tali+ne+š* > *tali=ne=š* is given as the ergative singular and not the expected **talleš* (KBo 32: 14 Rs. 60).

The actual function of the so-called “article” singular *-ni/ne/* is difficult to determine. In practice the word class article is used, but *-ni/ne* within the Hurrian texts it does not have an “article’s” normal function and definition. A relational as opposed to determinative function of an article probably appeared in later times. In the Mittani letter the so-called “article” never appears on a noun which appears in the absolute case; as a result it is commonly suggested that this *-ne* also possesses some sort of case function, which is clear in the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual. Here the *-ne* with Ergative possesses also a local notion. E. Neu FsAlp 1992, 391 ff.; ders., StBoT 32, 1996, 23 ff. interprets this form as “absolute in locative function”, counting how also absolute forms without *-ne* (“... the local notion probably is not unique to the ‘article’”), whereas Wilhelm (ZA 83, 1993, 105 ff. remarks “(...), that the “article” or better relational suffix *-ne* in the from old and new collected cases approaches having a general relational case-function, that partly through the development specific cases were recovered(?)”, and Haas/Wegner (OLZ 86, 1991, 390) ascribe this *-ne* an originally case function. Since the final clarification of this problem is lacking because detailed individual investigations of the various time periods is still not possible, we continue using the name article, but place the word in quotation marks “article”, or say to so-called “Article”. Other authors (Wilhelm, ZA 83, 1993, 109 and following him Giorgieri/Röseler, SCCNH 8, 1996, 283 Anm 4 and 9) refer to this *-ni/ne* as a “relator” and place with it together the relational function of *-ni/ne/* with the suffix location(?).

In the genitive and dative without this, e.g. in:

šena=p=pe [$< *v+ve$]

“of your brother”

attai=p=pe [$< *v+ve$]

“of your father”

attai=p=pa [$< *v+va$]

“to your father”⁶³)

3. Person -i-

(with loss of the theme-vowel, e.g. in

ard(e)=i=da “in his city”

tiš(a)=i=da “in his heart”

The plural is formed from these well-known singular suffixes and the pluralizer **-aš-**, that occupies the third position:

3rd Position

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---------|---|
| 1. Pers. Plural -iff + aš | > iffaš | (e.g. <i>atta(i)=ard(e)=iff=aš</i> “our forefathers) |
| 2. Pers. Plural | -šu? | (only found in the Boğazköy bilingual; e.g. <i>e-te-šu-ú-ta</i> ⁶⁴ “to your body to yourself”) |
| 3 Pers. Plural -i + aš | > iaš | (e.g. <i>tiš(a)=i=aš</i> “their hearts”) |

The suffix of the third position (**-aš-**) thus forms the plural of the possessive suffixes, and also forms the plural for the case-morpheme(?) (except in the absolutive); the morpheme **-aš-** is separated from the case ending (except for the Genetive, Dative, Directive and absolutive) with the bound vowel **-u-** or **-o-**:

Plural: **=aš=u**+Case ending e.g. *en=na=aš=u=š* “the gods” (ergative case)
=(a)š=o+Case ending e.g. *man=š=o=š* “they” (independent pronoun of the 3. Person Pl. ergative)

The following rule is to be paid attention to: With the attachment of the possessive suffix of the 1. Person Singular or Plural (*-iffə*, or *-iff=aš*), as well as the 3. Person singular or plural (*-i-* or *-i=aš*) the final or theme-vowel of the noun goes away:

1. Pers. Sing. *šen(a)=iffə* “my brother” (absolutive)
el(a)=iffə “my sister” (absolutive)
atta(i)=iffə “my father” (absolutive)
el(a)=ard(e)=iff=u=ve “my sisterhood” (genetive)

⁶³ Grapically *še-e-na-ap-pè* Mit I 89; *at-ta-i-ip-pè* Mit III 69; *at-ta-i-ip-pa* Mit III 52, 58.

⁶⁴ One would expect following the pattern of the 1. Person Plural either *edi=v=aš=u=da* or *edi=v=aš=ta*

- 1.Pers. Plural *tiš(a)=iff=aš=a* “in your hearts” (essive)
ed(i)=iff=aš=a “for us”
 3.Pers. Sing. *nihar(i)=i=ve* “her dowry” (genitive singular)
nihar(i)=i=aš=(v)e “their dowr(ies)” (genitive plural)

With the attachment of the 2 Person singular the end or theme-vowel remains:

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| <i>šena=v</i> | “your brother” | <i>tiša=v</i> | “your heart” |
| <i>edi=v</i> | “your body” | <i>attai=v</i> | “your father” |
| <i>ômini=v</i> | “your land” | | |

With the 2 Person Plural, so far only the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual is known, and the segmentation is not certain. Graphically it appears that the suffix with the directive is –*šu-ú-ta* in the term *e-te-šu-ú-ta* “to your body, to your self”. By analogy to the 1 person plural (**ed(i)=iff=aš=ta*) however **edi=v=aš=u=da* or **edi=v=aš=ta* (graphically *e-te-wa-šu-ú-taor e-te-wa-aš=ta*), e.g. noun + possessive suffix + pluralizer + (bound vowel) + case, was to be expected (Wilhelm, *Orientalia* 54, 1985, 488 [Recension from GLH]; Girbal, *AoF* 21, 1994, 378 Anm.8)

The combination of the so-called “article” –*ni/ne* and the possessive –*iffe* etc. is, as mentioned above, found extremely rarely. Possibly they are even incompatible. Possible cases that have been interpreted in this way are Mit.II 54 *ma-ka-a-an-ni-iw-wu-ú-un-na-na* ie. *magan=n(i)=iff=u=nna* (as adverb) “as my gift” and Mit. II 77 *en(i)=n(a)=iff=aš=(v)e=n* “of our gods”. The first form *maganniffunna* has in the meantime been read as *maga=nn(i)=iff=u=nn(i)=a*, that is, a form with the morpheme –*nni*, which does not contain the so-called “article” (Giorgieri, *SCCNH* 8, 1996, 283).

As the example *nihar(i)=i=aš=(v)e* shows, the plurality of the noun can not be clearly expressed with the attachment of the possessive suffix.

| The Case-Morpheme Sounds | Singular | Plural |
|--------------------------|-------------------|--|
| Absolutive | Ø | -(na) |
| Ergative | -š | -aš=u=š |
| Genitive | -ve ⁶⁵ | -aš=u=ve (thus only in Nuzi) otherwise > aše |
| Dative | -va ⁶⁶ | -*aš=va > aša |
| Directive | -t/da /-u-da | -aš=ta |
| Ablative | -t/dan /-u-dan | -aš=tan |
| Comitative | -ra | -aš=u=ra |
| Equative-Adverbial | -nna | -aš=u=nna (< or from – <i>nni</i> +a Essive?) |
| Equative | -uš | -- |

⁶⁵ See Anm. 46. Actually probably /fe/, after vowel [ve] and after u also [we].

⁶⁶ See Anm. 46. Actually probably /fa/. after vowel [va] and after u also [wa].

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------|
| Instrumental | | |
| also Adverbial | -ae | -- |
| Locative-Instrumental | -ni/e? | -- |
| (also Ablative-Instrumental) | | |
| Essive | -a | -aš=a |
| Adverbial | -nni | |
| also | -nnae < (from: -nn(i)+ae | |
| Case open | -e? | |

4th Position. In the fourth position is what is known as the “relational”, e.g. the “Case-suffix”

The suffix of the 4 position indicates the case relation, which can not only indicate the subject-object relationship, but also the relationship of the nouns to their regens (that is of the genitive) as well as their relationship in space. Following the plural suffix *-aš-* (3.Position), the case signs of the genetic or dative both suffer certain phonetic changes.

The various cases are:

- Absolutive:** The absolutive with the null-sign (\emptyset) is the case that marks the subject of an intransitive verb and the object of a transitive verb.
The absolutive also appears in transitive sentences without objects (the so-called “antipassive construction”).
From place and direction terms appear in the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual from Boğazköy (Neu, FsAlp, 1992, 391ff.; also Wilhelm, ZA83, 1993, 105 f. and Haas/Wegner OLZ 86, 1991, 390 [Rencession of KBo 32]. The latter authors write not the endless absolutive, but a form with the formation *-ni/e* as the directional term)
- Ergative:** The ergative case is the subject-case in transitive sentences with objects.
- Genitive:** In attributive nominal phrase marks the genitive possessive or membership.
- Dative:** Marks the term “to whom?” and probably also “where to?”
The dative and the directive can be used equally (Wegner, Double Case 1995, 145).
The *-W-* of the genitive and the dative suffixes *-ve* and *-va* assimilate on the preceding plural element *-aš-* (*-a-še* < + *aš* + (v)e), the same *-W-* also binds to preceding labials to form *-pp-* ^DTe-e-eš-šu-up-pè < *^DTeššub + ve.
- Directive:** Marks movement toward something. Question “where to?”
- Ablative:** The Ablative indicates the starting point of a movement. It answers the question “where from”.

For Diakonoff (HuU97) the Ablative is combination case marker formed from the directive *-ta* and the ablative-instrumental *-ni*

Comitative: Marks the term as “(together) with, mutually”

Equative: Marks a comparison or an equality: “like”
The equative with *-nna* can also function like an adverbial “as”, “with the quality of” (Girbal, ZA 78, 1988, 131 f). Controversy exists whether *-nna* is “real” case or a case created from *-nni + a* (summarized in giorgieri, SCCNH 9, 1998, 76 with Anm.13.)

Instrumental: The instrumental indicates the means or the tools. It answers the question “with what, whitest made of(?)?”

Essive: The essive covers the function “when...”, direction, goal of a claim, condition, transfer from one condition to another; an adverb of number adjectives (Haas/Wilhelm, AOAT3.1974, 13 f.: Neu Hethitica 9, 1988, 163 f.).
In the “extended antipassive construction” the object appears in the Essive (and not like the agent in the absolutive)

Ablative-instrumental, that is the Locative-Instrumental of *-ni/e* established by Wilhelm 73, 1983, 96-113. Ders., Double Case 1995, 114: *-ne/i* “ablative-instrumental-directional”.

Adverbial: “like” “with the quality of”

The name for the *-a* case “essive” (from the Latin *esse* “to be”) was introduced by Haas/Wilhelm AOATS 3, 1974, 13 f., to deal with the problematic phenomenon that this case not only have the observed meaning of a state, but also the transfer of state and the destination, in Nuzi occasionally also substitutes for the dative. For this case see also Neu, Hethitica 9, 1988, 157-170. The term essive is used in Caucasian grammar for a case that answers the question “where?” (see HdO I., VII 69 ff.)

The cases *-a, -ae* and *-uš* behave differently from the others, in that when they are attached on the stem there is elision of the theme vowel (e.g. *halzuh(i)=a* “as mayor”, *išuhn(i)=ae* “with silver”, *kaz(i)=uš* “like a cup”); also it appears that *-a, -ae* and *-uš* share another peculiarity: these case morphemes are in framework of the so-called “suffix reception” (see below) wither follow irregular rules or are connected with suffix attachments *-NE/-NA-* (for this special case of irregular “suffix reception” see S.62 f., 207).

The case with *-e* is developed from postpositional expressions like *šen(a)=iff=u=ve=n(e)=e* “for my brother” (mit. IV 49 f.) or *ômini(i)=iff=u=ve=n(e)=e ed(i)=i=e* “concerning my land” Mit IV 19) (see Wilhelm: “Postulating a certain case or adverbial ending *-e-*, which is distinctive when adjacent to the possessive suffix of the 3.

Person Singular *-i-* from the genitive *-ve*, which would not give *-i-ie*” see Wilhelm, Iraq 53, 1991, 163 f. Anm. 20; further *Orientalia* 61, 1992, 136; ders. *Double Case* 1995, 119 and Anm. 4.; Neu StBoT 32, 1996, 1041-5). In older grammars the ending *-e* was seen as an allomorph of the genitive suffix-suffix *-ve* after the 3. Person singular possessive suffix *-i-* (*=i/y(a)=ve > =ye*, Speiser IH 56 [S69]; Bush GH 91, 127 ff.; Diakonoff HuU 153 with Anm. 163 Chačikjan, Churr. i urart. 115 f.; Plank, *Xenia* 21, 1988, 75).

The function of this *e*-case however, besides another genitive, is thus far not really clear.

The parallels in the Mittani letter where the *e*-case derived are however so constructed that at least a genitive function must exist, so Bush GH 91, 127 ff.; Neu StBoT 32, 1996, 104 f. in this connection draw attention to an example of the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual: *nav=n(i)=i=(v)e* or *nav=n(i)=i=e papanne* (KBo 32: 14 Vs 5.) “the mountain (*papanne*) of his pasture”.

5th, 6th and 7th positions give the suffixes of the “suffixaufnahme”.

The suffixes of the 5th, 6th and 7th position put the syntactic context into an attributive construction, and through repetition of the case-suffixes on preceding words. It is here that the peculiarly Hurrian “Suffixaufnahme” or also “suffix-duplication” appear.

Under “Suffixaufnahme” one observes the peculiar Hurrian phenomenon where in Genitive or other attributive constructions (*-(h)he*, *-(š)še*, *-(n)ni*) the case-suffix (i.e. the suffixes of positions 3 and 4) of the attribute (rectum = dependent noun) is recorded of the preceding words (regens= ruling noun).

[The term “suffixaufnahme” was coined by F.N. Finck, *Die Haupttypen des Sprachbus*, Leipzig 1910, 141 and by J. Friedrich, *Zum Subaräian und Urartäischen*, AnOr 12, 1935, 124, for the Hurrian mentioned above. In a later work Friedrich used the neutral term “Suffix transfusion” (J. Friedrich, BChG, 1939, 3. Anm. 3), however in 1969 HdO II, 1, 2, 21 this faded more and more through time and today “suffix-gathering” is generally used. Besides the term “suffix-gathering” one finds in the literature still the term “suffix-duplication”, “suffix-transfusion”, English “suffix-duplication” and “suffix-copying” (see I. Wegner, “Suffixaufnahme” in Hurrian: Normal Cases and Special Cases, in: *Double Case, Agreement by Suffixaufnahme*, ed. by Frans Pank, 1995, 137-138]

The suffixaufnahme serves as a congruence marker (i.e. a formal correspondence joining together sentence structures) of the syntactic connection in attributive constructions. Aside from the genitive construction it is found with the “membership-adjective” building suffix *-(h)he*, with the adjectiving suffixes *-(š)še* and *-(n)ni* and with *-šše*, the Nominalizing suffix of the verbal form; furthermore with rare suffixes like the conglomerate suffix *-nnohha*.

With the suffixaufnahme, at least as represented in the Mittani-letter, the case and number of the reference word (Regens) are followed by an anaphoric suffix *-NE-* (singular) and *-NA-* (plural) which separates them from the attributive suffixes *-ve* Gen.

–*hhe* “membership adjective”, –*šše/-nni* “adjectivizer” and –*šše* (nominalizer of verbal forms). The choice of –NE- or –NA- depends on the number-marker of the reference word. These anaphoric suffixes –*ne* and –*na* is referred to in the literature as the carrier-suffix, suffix-duplication –*ne/-na* or suffix-relator. It should not be confused with the so-called “article” Singular –*ni/ne* and Plural –*na*. The carrier-suffix and “article” have not only distinctive functions, but also appear in different places in the suffix-chain: while the so-called “article” singular –*ni/ne/* appears immediately after the stem (i.e. the root and root-extensions), the carrier-suffix –*ne/-na* occurs after the attributive suffixes –*ve*, –(*h*)*he* and –*šše* the basis of Suffixaufnahme. In the following the “carrier-suffix” is marked with capitals (–NE-, –NA-). In this work we use the term “carrier-suffix” or “relator”.

(The proper distinction between the so-called “article” and “carrier suffix” has been made by Bush GHL 153 f, who also noted the anaphoric usage of the “carrier suffixes”)

On the details:

- a) Suffixaufnahme is not found with a referred word in the absolutive singular case, which is endingless and therefore has no congruence-enabling morphemes:
 $\check{s}en(a)=iff=u=ve\ a\check{s}ti$ “the wife (*ašti* Absolutive singular) of my brother” (Mit. III 21)
 a_a) Suffixaufnahme of the so-called “article” singular –*ni/-ne/* is not securely attested. There are examples from the Boğazköy material, where a particle –*ni* is apparently used as a Genitive attribute: e.g.
 $\check{s}ehurni=ve=ni\ tupp\check{i}=ni$ “on the tablet of the living” (ChS I/1 Nr 9 III 42). This –*ni/ne/* of the so-called “article” has in this example however a purely case-function, where it is resumptive for the suffix on the Genitive attribute ($\check{s}ehurni=ve=ni$) (see also under the nominal morphology S 53 f.)
- b) If the reference word is Absolutive with the plural ending –*na*, that –*na* on the attribute is transmitted without inclusion of the carrier suffix:
 $*\check{s}en(a)=iff=u=ve=na\ a\check{s}ti=na$ “the wives (Abs. Pl.) of my brother”
 ${}^D\text{erbi}=na\ {}^D\text{NIN.GAL}=ve=na$ “the hounds of the goddess Ningal” (KUB XLV 47+ Bo 4186 III 19’).
- c) When the reference word is not in the absolutive, then the case sign of the attribute is transmitted and isolated by the carrier suffix –NE- or –NA- from the case sign of the preceding word:

Singular: The referred word *ašti*- “wife” appears in the ergative with –*š*
 $\check{s}en(a)=iff=u=ve=NE=\check{s}\ a\check{s}ti=\check{s}$ (Mit. III 7)
 “The wife (erg. Sing.) of my brother ($\check{s}en(a)=iff=u=ve+NE+\check{s}$)”

This example makes clear that –NE- is not the so-called “article” in the singular, since the referred word $a\check{s}ti=\check{s}$ carries no such term. Furthermore the so-called “article” Sing./Plural occurs to the left of the possessive pronoun, whereas the form –NE-, like this example appears to the right of the possessive pronoun.

- d) The referred word *ašti* “wife” appears in the genitive singular with –*ve*:
 $\check{s}en(a)=iff=u=ve=NE=ve\ a\check{s}t(i)=i=ve$ (Mit IV 48)
 literally “of the wife (genitive singular) of my brother”
- e) The referred word *torubi*- “enemy” appearing in the Dative singular with –*va*:
 $\check{s}en(a)=iff=u=ve=NE=va\ torub(i)=i=va$ (Mit. III 114)

literally “to the enemy of my brother”

- f) Plural: The referred word *ašti-* “wife” appears in the ergative plural with =*aš=u=š*:

**šen(a)=iff=u=ve=NA=aš=u=š ašti=na=aš=u=š*

“*The wives of my brother”

The reference term *tive-* “word” appears in the ergative plural and also as a plural:

en(i)=na=aš=(v)e=NA=aš=u=š tive=na=aš=u=š (Chs I/1 Nr 20 II 10)

“the words (*tive=na-*) of the gods”

- g) The referred word *eni-* “god” appears in the directive plural with =*aš=ta*, the attribute is singular:

en(i)=na=aš=ta attan(i)=ne=va=NA=aš=ta (ChS I/2 Nr 43 Rss 19)

“to the gods of your fathers”

- h) Example with the Equative case with *-nna*: The referring world appears in the Equative plural (= *aš=o=nna*), the attribute is the independent pronoun of the 1. Person Singular genitive *šove-*:

puttukki=aš=u/o/=nna=(lla=ân) šove=NA=aš=u/o/=nna (Mit III 60)

Proper Analysis (see Girbal ZA 78, 1988 130):

puttukki- “the performance” + *aš* Pluralizer + *u/o/* Bound vowel for case ending (hence not with absolutive) + *nna* Equative case.

šove- genitive of the independent first person singular pronoun + *NA* carrier suffix for the plural suffix + *aš* + *u/o/* resumptive plural suffixes from *puttukki-* + *nna* resumptive case suffix from *puttukki-*, (*-lla* enclitic 3rd person plural pronoun as subject-marker of the intransitive verbs *irn=o=kk=o* “they are not the same”, + *-an* “and”):

“(… They are not the same) as the performances from me = as my performances”

- i) Suffixaufnahme appears on nominalized verbs with *-šše*; functionally this construction corresponds to a relative sentence; also here the case-markers of the previous clause is transferred to the verb of the attributive dependent clause:

tive=na tan=oš=av=šše=na (Mit I 73)

“the thing, which I have done (*tan=oš=av-*)”

šove=mân tuppī niḥar(i)=ne=ve ar=oš=av=šše=NE=ve (Mit III 40 f)

“my tablet of the dowry, which I have given…”

Commentary: *tuppī niḥar(i)=ne=ve* functions in this sentence as a quasi-solid compound unit; the genitive of the independent pronoun of the 1st person singular *šove-* functions as the possessive pronoun

- j) Special cases of the suffixaufnahme

- a) Suffixaufnahme is not found with the so-called “fixed genitive-compound” as in the sentence:

^{URU}*ninua=ve* ^D*ša(v)uška=va* “for the *Ša(v)uška* of Nineveh” (Mit III 98)

With Suffixaufnahme we would have:

*^{URU}*ninua=ve=NE=va* ^D*ša(v)uška=va*

- b) When the ruling word has multiple attributes named, the hierarchically lowest attribute shows the case (Genitive) of their direct referring word, but not the case of the ruling word:

e.g. *šen(a)=iff=u=ve=NE=v(e>)a=t(ta)=an ašt(i)=i=ve... niħar(i)=i=da*
(Mit IV 46) “For the dowry of the wife of my brother”

Commentary: The ruling word *niħar(i)=i=da* appears in the directive. The first attribute *ašt(i)=i=ve* “the wife” (literally “of the wife”) appears in the genitive, and does not however name the case –*ta* [*da*] from *niħar(i)=i=da*, the lowest appearing attribute “my brother” shows the case –*ve* of the first attribute (i.e. *ašt(i)=i=ve*), but not the case of the overall referring word (*niħar(i)=i=da*); the case of the reference word therefore does not appear multiple times with the Suffixaufnahme in multiple attributes.

In the Boğazköy texts, however, there are multiple attributes showing the case ending of the referred word on all attributes:

en(i)=na attan(i)=ne=va=na ^D*ša(v)uška=ve=na* (ChS I/3-1 Nr 1 I 71)
“the gods of the fathers of the goddess Ša(v)uška”

- c) A further deviation from the norm is the “Suffixaufnahme” in spite of obvious absence of a reference word; this leads to the elliptical (from Latin *ellipsis* “left out, mangle”) usage of the Suffixaufnahme:

fe=š=nna=ân atta(i)=iff=u=va úadurann(i)=a keban=oš=o=šše tea
attai=p=pe=NE=dan (mit. III 68-69)

“and that, which you had sent to my father as bride-price, was more than that of your fathers”

Commentary: The verb is *keban-* “to send” + *oš* preterit + *o* person-marker 2nd person singular transitive + *šše* morpheme which nominalizes the verb-form. The referred word is expression within this sentence through the enclitic –*nna* (3rd Singular Absolutive of *fe=š=nna-*) (see under relative sentence b: Relative sentences without the relative particle *ije-*): “that, which you had sent”

The following genitive attribute *attai=p=pe=NE=dan* in this sentence is however missing an obvious reference word in the ablative, it appears therefore as an elliptical term (literally): “from them your fathers”

Another elliptical expression occurs in the following sentence:

adi=nîn ^D*Šimige=ne=ve=NE=mmaman amm=oš=a* (Mit I 94 f)
“he/she/it reached that (the city) of the Sun god”

The carrier-suffix –*NE-* after the Genitive attribute –*ve* is followed by neither a number nor a case marker, which is not expressed for the reference word (in the function of the direct object) in the unmarked absolutive singular. Instead the carrier suffix –*NE-* is followed in this example only by the sentence particle –*mmaman*.

- d) Hypostasis-building: The possibility of using such absolute reference-wordless genitive attributes with carrier-suffix and Suffixaufnahme, leads in

rare cases (only for Boğazköy examples) to Hypostasis-building, as shown in the following example (Chs ½ Nr 43 II 17'-21')

h̄uešša ^D*Teššub=va eh̄li=ve=NE=da šubri=ve=NE=da*

en(i)=na=aš=(v)e=NE=da šarri=ne=da

“Cry(?) to Teššub, to the rescuer (literally: to the one who rescues), to the *šubri*, to the king of the gods”

Under the premise of equal compatibility with the dative and directive it is clear that both the genitive *eh̄li=ve* and *šubri=ve* are syntactically parallel to the dative *Teššub=va* and therefore this can only be handled as a hypostasis. The elliptical expression *eh̄li=ve* “of the rescue” then only yields the “proper” case *-ta* (directive) within the pattern of the “Suffixaufnahme” after the carrier-suffix *-NE-*. Such Hypostases have the same syntactic potential as common genitives and this enables them to function again as an attribute, where a second genitive plus the suffix of the reference word is required. This leads formally to a doubled Suffixaufnahme like shown in the following example:

en(i)=na=aš=(v)=l(la) eh̄li=ve=NE=ve=NA=aš=(v)a=l(la) (ChS I/1 Nr 43 II 18' f.)

“for the god of the rescue” (see Wener, Double Case 1995, 143 ff. [21]; also Wilhelm, SCCNH 8 1996 340 for the meaning of *eh̄li=ve* as “of the rescue” and not “of the rescuer”)

- e) Another special case where irregular Suffixaufnahme appears is with cases like ^D*é-a-bi-ia ti-bi-ia*, that from ChS I/9 S 340 Anm. 250 can be analyzed as ^D*Éa=ve=<NE>=a* (Essive) *tiv(e)=i=a* (Essive) (i.e. without the suffix additions *-NE-*, but with the reduplication of the Essive *-a*). Here is another example where the above named ending *-pae* (*<v(e) + ae* Genitive+Instrumental) appears, and also the instrumental of *-ae* without the suffix *-NE-/-NA-* with the Suffixaufnahme on the genitive. Another case of ending *-ae* yields under loss to the preceding final vowel (see also above): *Teššup=v(e)=ai* [not **Teššup=ve=N(E)=ai*] *tev(e)=ai* “through the word of Teššub” (see Wilhelm, SCCNH 9, 1998, 177 ff. with further examples).

- k) With adjective using *-he/-hhe* and *-šše/-še* in the attributive function, the case-suffix of the membership noun is repeated after *-NE-/-NA-*:

- a) *h̄urv(i)=o=h̄e=NE=ve ômin(i)=ne=ve* (Mit. II 72)

“of the Hurrian lands”

en(i)=na=aš=(v)a ... turi)=o=h̄he=NA=aš=(v)a (ChS I/1 Nr 2. Rs 25') “for the manly gods”

- b) *hašar(i)=ne=š fahr(i)=o=še=NE=š* (ChS I/1 Nr.3 Rs 37) “The good oil”

Teššub=va šarri=ne=va talav(i)=o=še=NE=va (ChS I/1 Nr 41 III 20

f) “for Teššub, the great king....”

(Wilhelm in Double Case 1995, 120 ff. discusses this complex in detail: he comes to the conclusion [S 128] that the construction of attributes in Hurrian appears to have a uniform pattern of the Suffixaufnahme, independent of whether it is genuine adjective, adjectival noun, nominalized verb or nomina in the genitive)

Table 1: Schematic representation of the “Suffixaufnahme”

| Position | 1 | 2 | 3 | (3a) | 4 | 5 | 6 | (6a) | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------|---------------|-------------------------|--|------------------|---|---|-----------------------|
| Root+R E | “Article” | Poss. Pron. | Pluralize r | (unused) | Case | Suffix- aufnahm e | Pluralize r of reference word | (Bound vowel) | Case of the reference word | Enclitic Pronoun | Syntactic Particle |
| - <u>h</u> he -šše -arde etc. | Sg. – ni/ne Pl. -na | 1.Sg. (-iff- u) | -aš- | | Gen. – ve- | Sg. –NE- Pl. –NA- | -aš- | -u- | Erg. -š Abs -ø Gen. -ve Dat. -va Dir. -ta etc. | 1.Sg. -tta/t 2.Sg. – mma/m 3.Sg. – ma/h 1.Pl. – tilla/til 2.Pl. –ffa/f | -an -man etc. |
| e.g. šen(a)- en(i)- | -na- | -iff-u | | | -ve | -NE- -NA- | | | -ve | “my brother” “the gods (Erg)” | |

8th Position: The eighth position in the suffix chain is for what is called the enclitic (“ajar(?)” personal pronoun. Enclitic words can be attached to a noun, which stand in direct relation to it: it is thus the personal pronoun of the absolutive (other relations are associative pronouns Bush GHl 253 ff.; enclitic pronouns, enclitic personal pronouns. It functions either as the subject-marker of intransitive (or antipassive) sentences or as the object of transitive sentence. The third person plural *-lla* can furthermore also be used as a general plural marker (e.g. *andi* “that”, *andi-lla* “those”. The pronoun *-lla* is here practically a way to weakly form the plural ending.). The enclitic personal pronouns each have a long and a short form, what distinguishes their use is not determined.

The enclitic personal pronoun sounds:

| | Long Form | Short form | |
|------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| 1.Pers.Sg. | -tta | -t[-d] | “I” or “me” |
| 2.Pers. | -mma | -m | “you” |
| 3.Pers. | -nna | -n | “he/she” or “him/her/it” |
| 1.Pers.Pl. | -tilla [-dilla] | -til [-dil] | “we” or “us” |
| 2.Pers. | -ppa [-ffa]* | -p[b/v] | “you” |
| 3.Pers | -lla | -l | “they” or “them” |

*only found in the Bog-Bil.

In using of the enclitic personal pronoun take note of the following rules:

- a) When the enclitic pronoun of the 1,2 Pers. Sg. and the 1,2,3 Person. Pl. follow the ergative ending *-š*, the *š* disappears as the preceding vowel lengthens (see Bush GHl 89 f. [S4.4]; Kammenhuber, MSS 23, 1968, 64; Hass/Wilhelm, *Orientalia*, 38, 1969, 553 ff.; Farber, *Orientalia* 40, 1971, 33):

e.g. *še-e-ni-íw-wu-ú-ut-ta-a-an* (Mit II 50)

šen(a)=iff=û=(š)=tta=ân “and my brother (Ergative) me”

^D*Ši-mi-i-ge-ni-e-ti-la-an* (Mit I 77)

Šimige=ne=(š)=dil=an “and the Sun-god (Ergative) us”

i-šal-la-a-an (Mit III 54, IV 63)

iša=(š)=lla=ân “and I (Ergative) them...”

(This finding of the lengthening of the vowels is valid at the moment only for the Mittani Letter, here is marked the frequent failure of plene-writing.

- b) When the enclitic pronoun of the 3.Pers.Sg. *-nna* follows the ergative ending *-š*, the *-nn* assimilates on the *š* to make *-šša* (Farver, *Orientalia* 40, 1971 32 f.):

e.g. *še-e-en-ni-íw-wu-uš-ša-a-an* (Mit III 1)

šen(a)=iff=u=šša=ân < šen(a)=iff-u=š=nna=an “and my brother him”

¹*Ge-li-i-aš-ša-an* (Mit I 83)

Kelia=šša=ân < Kelia=š=nna=an “and Kelia him”

a-ar-ti-bi-ni-eš-ša (Bog-Bil KBo 32: 14 I 22):

arde=ve=NE=šša < arde=va=NE=š=nna “(the deity) of the city him...”

- c) Attaching these *a*-containing enclitic pronouns on a stem with *-i* or *-e*, causes a morpho-phonematic change of the Theme-vowel from *-i* or *e* to *a*, i.e. phonetically it results in vowel assimilation (Bush GHL 87 [S4.24]). This changes appears also when only the short form of the enclitic is used:

e.g. with the verb *mann-* “to be”: *mann=i* “he is” but
 *manni+tta > *manna=tta* “I am”
 With nouns *oli+ffa > *ola=ffa* “another you”
 *šue+lla > *šua=lla* “all”
 With the case *-ve* *-ve+tta > *-va-tta*
 (In Mit IV 46: *šen(a)=iff=u=ve=NE=va(<ve)=tta*
ašti=i=ve “the wife of my brother, I...”)

- d) These changes in the theme-vowel *i* or *e* > *a* do not occur when the enclitic pronoun is:

- 1) attached to the “article” *-ni/ne/* ^D*šimige=ne=(š)=lla*
 “Šimige (Ergative) them ...”
- 2) used with demonstrative pronouns e.g. *andi=lla* “that them” or “those”
 and independent pronouns, e.g. *šatti=lla* “we them”
mane=lla “he them” or only “them”
- 3) used with number words, e.g. *tumni=lla* “four them”
- 4) used with adverbs, e.g. *anammi=lla* “then they..” (Mit II 56)
- 5) *-nna* e.g. ^I*Asali=nna-* “Asali he...: (Mit IV 36)
ašti=n(na) “the wife he” (Mit IV 33)
- 6) When *-lla* is a general pluralizer, the change often does not occur:
mariannarde=l(la)=am “Charioteers” (Mit III 32)
elgi=lla “shiny application” (Bog Bil KBo 32: 14 I 58)
 Possible *elgi=lla* is instead to be read *elg(i)=i=lla*, so that the presence of the possessive suffix *-i-* hinders the change *i* > *a*.
- 7) With particles that end in *u*, there is no change:
inu=tta- (Mit I 74)
inu=lle- (Mit II 32, III 101)
panu=lle- (Mit IV 16)

The position of the enclitic pronominal suffix is relatively free, so it can appear anywhere in the sentence, namely a privileged beginning position:

e.g. *inu=tta=nîn henni šen(a)=iff=u=š tad=i=a* (Mit I 74)
 “as my brother now loves me (=tta)”
ai=l(la)=an tive=na anni talame=na... (Mit II 75)
 “and when these (-l(la) +anni) great words...”

- e) For the sentence-introductory conjunctions like *inu-* “as”, *inna-* “when”, *unu-* variant of *inu-*, *panu-* “although” and the relative particle *ije-/ija-* the enclitic particles *-me-/ma* are used for the 3.Pers.Sg. and *-lle-* is used for the 3.Pers. Pl. These therefore correspond in their function to the pronouns *-nna* and *-lla*. They appear exclusively with these sentence-initial particles (see also Diankonoff HuU 108; Chačikjan, Churr. i. urart. 1985, 82; Girbal, SMEA 34, 1994, 85 f.).

- f) In transitive sentences the substitution of direct objects can occur multiple times through the Noun and through the enclitic pronoun. In intransitive sentence double substitution of subjects (as noun and as pronoun) can also appear (Girbal/Wegmer, ZA 77, 1987, 151 f.; Wegner, AoF 21, 1994, 162, 168 ff.)
- g) The enclitic of the 3. Pers. Sg. *-nna/-n* can replace other, proper personal pronoun in the absolutive, when the expressed grammatical person is clearly expressed in another place. It functions therefore as a neutral pronoun-marker: e.g. substituting *-n(na)* in Mit I 78 for the first person plural (properly *-tilla*) *tīš(a)=i=aš=a=n(na)* “us in his heart (like the god loves)” (Girbal, ZA 80, 1990, 93 f.: ders. SMEA 29. 1992, 163).

9th Position: In the ninth and following positions there can appear various syntactic particles, so-called associatives. These enclitic associations are characteristic of the Hurrian of the Mittani-Letter, for they appear here uncommonly frequently, in contrast to the Boğazköy-Hurrian, where they are completely absent. The true meanings of these particles are often unclear or only difficult to determine. The most frequent are:

-an “and”: *-an* connects single words, but also two verbs or two sentences. The vowel of the morpheme */an/* is not long alone. A phonetically long one occurs only when */an/* is attached to a morpheme with a final vowel:

/an/ can follow a consonant

/an/ can follow one of the *-a*-ending morpheme

/an/ cannot follow a morpheme that ends in a vowel other than *-a*. For any other vowel *-a* is used as the associative.

/man/ or */mân/* “but, even” in addition (for this whole complex see Girbal ZA 78, 1988, 135).

-nin “for while” appears always at the word’s end, often with sentence-initial words like:

adi=nin, inu=me=nin, ija=lla=nin

and with the verb *mann-* “to be”: *mann(i>)a=tta=nin* “thus I am”

-mma-man “and namely” or similar

| Position | 1` | 2 | 3 | (3a) | 4 | 5 | 6 | (6a) | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|------------|---------------|--|----------------------|---------------|-------------|--|--|---------------------|
| Root+RE | “Article” | Poss. Pron.* | Pluralizer | Bound Vowel | Case | Suffix-aufnahme | Pluralizer of | Bound vowel | Case of the reference | Enclitic Pronoun | Syntactic Particle |
| -lhe -šše -arde etc. | Sg. -ni/ne Pl. -na | 1.Sg. -iffə -iffē -iff- 2.Sg. -v- 3.Sg. -i- | -aš- | -u/-o- -u- | Erg. -š Abs. ø Gen. -ve- Dat. -va Dir. -ta Etc. | Sg. -NE- Pl. -NA- | -aš- | -u- | Erg. -š Abs. -ø Gen. -ve Dat. -va Dir. -ta etc. | 1.Sg. -tta 2.Sg. -mma 3.Sg. -nna 1.Pl. -tilla 2.Pl. -ffa 3.Pl. -lla | -an -man etc. |

Table 1: Schematic representation of the Nominal Suffix Chain

The possessive pronoun and the “article” appear together extremely rarely, if at all.

For number-words the following are known in Hurrian:

| Cardinal Numbers | Ordinal Numbers |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1 <i>šukki</i> , <i>šugV</i> -? | -- |
| 2 <i>šin(i)</i> | <i>šinzi</i> < <i>šin+še</i> “the second” |
| 3 <i>kig(e)</i> | <i>kiški</i> < <i>kig+še</i> “the third” |
| 4 <i>tumn(i)</i> | <i>tumušše</i> < <i>tumun+še</i> “the fourth” |
| 5 <i>nari(ja)</i> | <i>narišše</i> “the fifth” ⁶⁷ |
| 6 <i>šeše</i> | -- |
| 7 <i>šind(i)</i> | <i>šindišše</i> “the seventh” |
| 8 <i>kir(i/a)</i> ? | -- |
| 9 <i>tamr(i)</i> | -- |
| 10 <i>eman</i> | <i>emanze</i> < <i>eman+še</i> “the tenth” |
| 18 or 80 <i>kirmani</i> | <i>kirmanze</i> < <i>kirman+še</i> “the 18 th ” or “the 80 th ” ⁶⁸ |
| 10,000 <i>nubi</i> | |
| 30,000 <i>kige nubi</i> | |

For the cardinal numbers various different words and forms are derived:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| -arbu | <i>šin=arbu</i> “two years old” |
| | <i>kig=arbu</i> “three years old” |
| | <i>tumn=arbu</i> “four years old” |
| | <i>nari(j)=arbu</i> “five years old” |
| | <i>šind=arbu</i> “seven years old” |
| | <i>kir=arbu</i> “eight years old” |
| -ade | <i>kig=ade-</i> “per three” |
| | <i>tumn=ade-</i> “per four” also “four-wise(?)” |
| | <i>nari(j)=ade</i> “per five?” (Alalakh) ⁶⁹ |
| | <i>šind=ade-</i> “per seven” |
| -ti | <i>eman=di-</i> “tenship” |
| -o= <u>h</u> (e)=li | <i>eman=d(i>)=o=<u>h</u>e=li</i> “project over 10, tenship-lord” |

Number adverbs:

| | |
|---------|---|
| X-times | <i>šukki</i> “Once” |
| X-times | <i>šug=am=<u>h</u>=a</i> from <i>šukko</i> “one” (Meskene) |
| | <i>2-<u>h</u>a = šin=am=<u>h</u>=a</i> from <i>šin(i)</i> “two” (Meskene) |
| | <i>3-<u>h</u>a = kig=am=<u>h</u>=a</i> from <i>kig(e)</i> “three” |

⁶⁷ The meaning “five” is from Rowe AZ 87, 1997, 247-257, and is uncertain.

⁶⁸ See Gieorgieri/Pöseler SCCNH 9, 1998, 87 ff. with the derivation *kir=(e)man(i)-* < *kir+eman* “eighteen, eighty” and *kir=(e)man=zi* < *kir+eman+ši* “18th/80th”.

⁶⁹ See Note 67.

tamr=am=h=a from *tamr(i)* “nine”
eman=am=h=a from *eman* “ten”

With the number words there does not appear to be a morpho-phonematic change in the Theme-vowel *i/e>a* before the enclitic pronouns (see above):
 e.g. *šini=dilla* “two we..”, *tumni=lla* “four, they...”

3. The Independent Pronouns

Besides the enclitic personal pronouns for the absolutive (see above position 8), Hurrian also possesses independent personal pronouns (for recent work see Wegner SMEA 29, 1992, 227 ff.)

The paradigms of the independent pronouns are however still afflicted by major gaps, these being above all in the plural forms.

For the pronouns of the first person singular there are two stems at one’s disposal: the absolutive term *iš=te*, the ergative *iša=š*; as well as the oblique case term *šo-* or *šu-*. For the second and third person singular here is only one pronominal stem attested.

Singular

| | 1. Person | 2. Person | 3. Person |
|--------|-------------------------|---|--|
| Abs. | <i>ište</i> | <i>fe</i> (graphically ú-i/e-/we-/bi-e-) | <i>man=e</i> (other form <i>mann=i</i>) |
| Erg. | <i>iša=š</i> | <i>fe=š</i> | <i>man=u=š</i> |
| Gen. | <i>šo=ve</i> | <i>fe=ve</i> | -- |
| Dat. | <i>šo=va</i> | <i>fe=va</i> | -- |
| Dir. | <i>šu=da</i> | <i>*fe=(u)=da</i> | -- |
| Abl. | -- | -- | <i>man=u=dan</i> |
| Com. | <i>šu=ra</i> | -- | <i>man=u=ra</i> |
| Equat. | <i>šo=nna</i> “like me” | -- | <i>man=u=nna</i> |

The plural forms have attached to the known singular forms the term **-š-**, with the absolutive form there is the enclitic pronoun *-lla*.

Plural

| | 1. Person | 2. Person | 3. Person |
|--------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Abs. | <i>šatti(=)lla</i> | <i>fe=lla</i> | <i>mane=lla</i> |
| Erg. | <i>šie=š</i> | <i>fe=š=u=š</i> | <i>man=š/z=o=š</i> |
| Gen. | -- | <i>fe=š=(v)e</i> | -- |
| Dat. | -- | <i>fe=š=(v)a</i> | <i>man=š/z=(v)a</i> |
| Dir. | -- | -- | -- |
| Com. | -- | -- | <i>man=š=u/o=ra</i> |
| Equat. | -- | -- | -- |

Rules: With the independent pronouns the change *i/e > a* for the enclitic pronoun does not occur: e.g. *šatti=dilla* “we, that is us”

With the Ergative forms *iša=š* or *man=š=o=š*, the enclitic pronouns (*-tta, -mma* etc.) appear also appear to not have the ergative markings:

e.g. *i-šal-la-an* ... *E-e-ma-na-a-mu-ša-a-ú* (Mit. III 54)

i.e. *iša=(š)=lla=ân* ... *eman=am=oš=av*

“and (*-an*) I have them (plural, probably the gifts) made tenfold”

This example also demonstrates the usage of the ergative pronoun: It functions to emphasize the subject term. The position of the pronoun is not fixed, it appears most often immediately before the verbal form, but it can also still turn up here.

The Absolutive can be a subject with intransitive verbs (and antipassive constructions) and an object with transitive verbs.

The genitive of the independent personal pronoun can moreover be also used as a possessive pronoun. ¹*Megi feve tiša=v an=ašt=i=kki* “Megi, your heart is not happy” (Bog-Bil KBo 32: 15 I 20’)

The Demonstrative Pronouns

The “Demonstrative Pronouns” *anni, ani* “this” *andi* “that”, *akki: *agi* “the one ... the other” have the following paradigms: In the absolutive there is the theme-vowel /i/, with the oblique forms /u/, the change of the theme-vowel *i > a* before the enclitic pronouns is not found.

Singular

| | | | |
|------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Abs. | <i>anni</i> | <i>andi</i> | <i>ani</i> |
| Gen. | -- | <i>andu=ve</i> | -- |
| Dat. | -- | <i>andu=va</i> | <i>anu=va</i> |
| Abl. | -- | <i>andu=dan</i> | <i>anu=dan</i> |

Plural

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| <i>anni=lla</i> | <i>andi=lla</i> | <i>ane=na</i> |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|

The alternative pronouns “the one... the other” also behaves in this way

| | |
|-------------|-------------|
| <i>akki</i> | <i>*agi</i> |
| <i>akku</i> | <i>*agu</i> |

For example, in ChS I/1 Hr 52 Rs 15’ *ak-ki a-ku-ta* “the one to the other”.

(Wilhelm SMEA 24, 1984, 215 ff. For Wilhelm, these pronouns have no space-time deixis like actual “demonstrative pronouns”, but are instead contextual “anaphoric-cataphoric”. For sake of simplicity we will her denote these deictic pronouns as “demonstrative pronouns”)

The pronominal stem *oli-* means “the other, not this”

The generalized pronoun in the Mittani letter is formed from the stem **šue-*:

šu(e>)a?=nna “whole, all” (The change of *e>a* before the enclitic pronoun *-nna* is however not secure.

šu(e>)a=lla “all”

In the Boğazköy Texts one finds instead

šummi(=nna) “whole, all”

šummi=l(la) “all”

and *hejarunna* “all”

The two pronominal terms “on this side” and “on the other side” are provided through *aga=ve* and *eša=ve*. Both can be interpreted as the genitives of the root words **aga-* and **eša-*.

An interrogative pronoun appears as *abe-/ave-* in the forms *ave=(š)=dilla* (KBo 32:15 I 26’ a-bé-e-di-il-la) “Who us” and *avešša* < *ave=š=nna* (KBo 32: 11 IV 19’ a-bi-iš-ša-a) “who he/him”. Both are the Ergative forms of the pronoun (although E. Neu in StBoT 32,1996, 50-51 sees the latter example as a substantive **abišši* in the Essive with *-a*)

The term “both ... and...” is formed through:

Ija + enclitic pronoun (ø-term with the 3.Pers. Sg.) + *an ûrikki* // *ija + enclitic pronoun* (3.Pers Sg. ø-term) + *an ûrikki*, whereby *ûrikki* appears to be a negative antipassive form of the verb *ûr-* “want, desire”. This structure appears for example in Mitt. III 5 f.:

--- **ja-a-an ú-ú-rik-ki** ma-a-na šu-e-ni 6) Hur-ru-hé KUR u-u-mi-i-ni **ja-a-an ú-ú-rik-ki** ma-a-na šu-e-ni 7)^{KUR}Ma-a-áš-ri-a-an-ni KUR u-u-mi-ni

“Both the all the Hurrian lands and all the Egyptian lands...” (Girbal AoF 21, 1994, 376-379).

4. The Verbal Morphology

The primary distinguishing characteristic of Hurrian verbs is the distinctive conjugations of transitive and intransitive verbs. Each has its own rules for conjugation suffixes, whereby the intransitive is not conjugated in the strict sense. It is treated as a (nominal) participle form, with the pronominal person marker not actually attached to the verbal form, but a lexically independent character. The agent, that is the subject can thus be expressed through the enclitic pronoun (as in the nominal morphology). The person-marker of the intransitive as a lexically independent can consequently appear anywhere in the sentence.

2. The Hurrian of the Mittani Letter contains three forms, which are the so-called “tenses”, or Aspects⁷⁰ according to Diakonoff:
- a) The Present or the aspectless form with the null-marker (∅-sign)
 - b) The preterit – the perfective aspect— or also narrative-form with the marker - **oš-**
 - c) The future –or the imperfective aspect—with the marker –**et-**.

The decision as to whether the verbal morphology should be interpreted with the aid of tenses or aspects, is to be made in such a way that the verbs in the Mittani-letter have a clear tense-system with the three temporal periods distinguished: present (unmarked), preterit (-oš-) and future (-et-), while the language of some of the Boğazköy tablets and some of the older texts appear to have aspects and action-types⁷¹ (Wilhelm, Double Case 1995, 114).

3. Hurrian possesses peculiar negative conjugation forms of the verbs.
4. The non-indicative verbal forms utilize a complex and still not completely understood system. Many of these non-indicative forms have no actual personal suffixes. Complete paradigms cannot be drawn up for lack of proof.
5. A passive is not given.
6. Hurrian verbal roots are –like the nominal roots—in a great majority of cases one syllable:

| | | |
|-----------|---------------------------------|---|
| Root type | CVC | <i>han-</i> “give birth to”, <i>tad-</i> “love”, <i>tan-</i> “do, make”, <i>zaz-</i> “to give food” |
| | CVCC | <i>nahh-</i> “sit”, <i>nakk-</i> “release”, <i>pašš-</i> “send”, <i>mann-</i> “be” |
| | CV | <i>ha-</i> “name”, <i>pa-</i> “build” |
| | VC | <i>ar-</i> “give”, <i>un-</i> “come”, <i>id-</i> “hit” |
| | VC ₁ C ₁ | <i>ašš-</i> “?”, <i>itt-</i> “go”, <i>tupp-</i> “exist” |
| | VC ₁ C ₂ | <i>ašh-</i> “sacrifice”, <i>šehl-</i> “be pure”, <i>hubl-</i> “break” |
| | CVC ₁ C ₂ | <i>hemz-</i> “girdled(?)”, <i>kunz-</i> “throw oneself down” <i>zimz-</i> “?” |

⁷⁰ The Aspect is an event form of the verb, which marks the completive or the incompletive of the event.

⁷¹ The action-type marks the type within an action sequence (e.g.. the durative action-manner indicates the continuation of an action, the ingressive or inchoative action-manner indicates the initiation of an action, the effective or resultative marks the conclusion of an action).

Reduplicated Root *keligel-* “set high”, *wirwir-* [*firvir-*] “loosen”
With loss of the intermediate vowel *kelgel-*

7. Onto these single-syllable roots are attached the stem-modification suffixes, which in the first place serve to make precise the semantics of the verbal root. They can lend the root a causative, factitive, iterative or reflexive meaning. A large number of these elements however still present interpretive problems.

For the sake of simplicity the stem-modification suffixes are ascribed one position in the suffix-chain of the verbs (**1. Pos**), even though in reality they can take multiple positions.

Polysyllabic stem modification suffixes are occasionally unclear with regard to their segmentation, for example consider the mutualistic, that is Iterative-durative term */-ukar-/* < *uk+ar* or *-ukar-* [*-ugar-*].

Some authors see in the suffix *-ukar-* a nominal element, which would form abstracts or collectives. At least for the language of the Mittani letter however it makes both (see in the end Girbal, SMEA 29, 1992, 164). So the supposed absolutive (Laroche GLH 249) *tad=ugar=i* is to be interpreted as an antipassive form and the supposed ergative (Laroche GLH 249) *tad=ugar=i=š* is to be interpreted as a Jussive form of the first person plural, a nominal interpretation would however make *aš-du-ka-a-rí-íw-wa-ša* (Mit. II 76) “in our marriage relationship” (Wilhelm, *Orientalia* 54, 1985, 490). The term appears however to be a postpositional submission in *š[a]š=va ašt=ugar=iff=aš=(v)a* “our favor” (Wener SMEA 29 1992, 232 Anm. 10).⁷²

The stem modification suffixes are below describes as root extensions (RE[s]).

As with the nominal suffix chain the suffixes of the verbal suffix chain obey a firm, invariable order-position and also like with the nominals the verbal suffix chain also the derivational categories closer to the root and the inflectional categories located closer to the end. This produces the following scheme:

Verbal root -- Root Extension – Valence⁷³/Diathesis⁷⁴ -- Aspect/tense – Mood⁷⁵ --
Number/Person, that is Person/Number (see also Bush GH 99f., 178 ff. {S7.4}; Plank Xenia 21, 1988, 71 ff.).

1. Position The first position indicates the Root extensions; (those forms marked with * only are found in the so-called “old Hurrian”):

-an(n)- indicates the causative: *ar-* “give”, *ar=ann-* “make one give”

⁷² For *ašt=ugar=i=* Akk. *mihru=* sum. GAB “equivalent”, see the Ugarit Vocabulary RS 94-2939 V 20, by Andre-Salvini/Salvini SCCNH 9, 1998, 8, 10.

⁷³ I.e. the valence of the verb

⁷⁴ Genus verbi (active/medium/passive)

⁷⁵ Indicative/non-indicative

-am- indicates the factitive: *eman-* “10”, *eman=am-* “make tenfold” (Wilhelm Iraq 53, 1991, 12 Anm. 35).

-ar- marks the factitive and also the iterative: *tad=ar-* “love”, *šid=ar-* “curse”. The RE corresponds to the Hittite iterative *-ske-* form.

-aš- intensivizer, e.g. *haš-* “listen”, *haš=aš-* also “listen”

***-ahh-** unclear, *tal-* “pull out, steal”, *tal=ahh-* also “pull out, steal”, *mel=ahh-* “expel” (This form apparently is only found with the verbal forms of the so-called “Old Hurrian”, e.g. with verbal forms of *=o=m* and *=i=b*; perhaps it marks a spatial dimension [“out-“], see also below)

-uk+ar or *-ukar-*: *tad=ugar-* is the mutual expression “love one another”, but also the iterative-durative.

-u/ol- reflexive, but also intransitivizer

-ol- unclear, *ar-* “give”, *ar=ol-* also “give”; *šalh-* “hear”, *šalh=ol-* also “hear” (Perhaps the form marks below another spatial relationship, see Neu StBoT 32, 1996, 361: *-ol-* “there”. For the Urartian verbal form with the term *-ul-* see Salvini; ZA 81, 1991, 122 ff.)

-om- unclear, in *ur=om=* perhaps “employ?”; *tihan=ol=om=* from *tihan-* “show”

-on- unclear, in *tad=on=i=i(d)=en* “she prefers love” from *tad-* “love”

-Všt- The vowel of this RE is fixed to match that contained in the root, e.g. *tan=ašt-* “make”, *an-/an=ašt-* “be pleased”, *mad=ašt-* “be wise”, *teh-/teh=ešt-* “increase, become large”, *šurv=ušt-* “do evil”.

(This RE has a denominalization character in several cases. It is not to be confused with the intransitive tense indicator of the preterit *-oš-* + *-t-*. It however also provides references, that with the formation *-ol-* and also all *-Vst-* with the verbal form of *=o=m* may indicate another grammatical differentiation [aspect or action-type, Wilhelm, FsHeger 1992, 670. In the so-called “Old Hurrian” it appears the form *-Všt-* may mark the end of events, e.g. *pa=ašt=o=m* “he had built”.)

***-ill-** the inchoative or ingressive is a action-type of verbs that marks the start or beginning of an event. E.g. *šis=ar=ill=o=m* “he began to curse” or *am=ar=ill=o=m* “he began to do evil” (Boğazköy bilingual; Neu Orientalia, 59, 1990, 223-233; ders., StBoT 32, 1996, 104:”... we judge *-ill-* as a unit to provide the inchoative function”. In this function the form *-ill-* only is found in the Boğazköy bilingual).

-uš- This morpheme of unclear meaning should not be confused with the tense marker *-uš-* /*oš-*. It appears in forms like *urhupt=uš=il=eva* (mit III 64) “(I) would like a sincere

manner” (from *urhi-* “true”) *šilah*=*uš*=*ušt*=*i*=*wa*=*en* (mit IV 41) “(my brother) shall not trade (with me)” (Girbal SMEA 29, 1992, 178 and 181).

-upp- unclear (Bush GHL 187), in *kap*=*upp-* from *kad-* “say”, *tad*=*upp-* from *tad-* “love” *pid*=*upp-* from *pid-* “turn, dance”.

-ut- unclear, this form perhaps occurs in *zul(l)*=*ud-* “loosen”⁷⁶ and *keb*=*ud-* “set” (*keb*=*ud*=*o/u* “they set there” KBo 32,13 I2). This is probably not the same as the negative particle *-ut-*.

-t- unclear, in *tan*=*d-* “celebrate (a festival)” from *tan-* “make”, *kul*=*d-* from *kul-* “say”, *pal*=*d-* from *pal-* “know”. This form is possibly identical with the RET *-t-* of the nominal morphology (see also above). This formation is not to be confused with the plural morpheme *-t-* and the marker of the objectless-term *-t-* (taking account of the suffix position).

-uh/-oh unclear, in *hic*=*uh-* trans. “sicken”, *hic*=*uh*=*o/ul-* intrans. “sadden”, *anz*=*ann*=*oh-* “designate” *šed*=*oh-* “make fatty, rich”, *ôl-ôh-* “be near?”

***-o/ur-** unclear, in *kul*=*o/ur*=*o=m* “He spoke” from *kul-* “speak”, *ar*=*ur*=*o=m* from *ar-* “give” *par*=*ur*=*o=m* from *=par-* “feel pain”.

2. Position. Next to the root and the root-extensions (1. Pos) , in the second position there is the Tense (or following Diakonoff, Aspect) Suffix with the following forms:

| | | |
|-------------|------------------|---|
| Null-Marker | for the present | = Neutral aspect |
| -oš- | for the preterit | = Perfective aspect (completed action) |
| -et- | for the future | = Imperfective aspect (incomplete action) |

3. Position is not occupied with the positive transitive verbs; with the intransitive verbs appear in this position the mark of objectlessness *-t-*.

4. Position can take a suffix *-imbu-* with unclear meaning and function. This elements appears both with intransitive and transitive verbal roots and only with derivations of *-š(š)e* and *-(h)he* (Bush GHL 147, 193 ff. [SS7.425]).

5. Position is marked for intransitive verbs with the intransitive-marker *-a-*.

In the aspectless positive transitive (ergative) verbal forms –i.e. with forms where only from the root exists, which is in the present tense, and probably after the root extensions – *ol-* and *-ar-*,-- following after the null-marker of the present is the marker of transitivity – *i-*, however only in **the 2nd and 3rd person singular**. The transitive marker appears

⁷⁶ See however also Giorgieri SCCNH 9, 1998, 80, who prefers to see this *-ud-* as the negative morpheme *-ud-* , with the meaning “un-, -less...”, *zul*=*ud-* would then mean “unbind, unleash”.

otherwise before the negative suffix (and as several authors assumed, in non-indicative forms. See below):

- e.g. *tad=i* (transitive marker)=*a* (person marker transitive erg. 3 Pers. Sg.)
 “he loves”
pal=i (transitive marker)=*o* (person marker transitive erg. 2 Pers. Sg.)
 “you show”

In the **1st person singular and all plural forms** there is no transitive marker:

- e.g. *tad=av* (Person marker transitive 1. Pers. Sg.) “I love”
tad=av=š (Person marker transitive 1. Pers. Pl.) “we love”

With the forms of the preterit with *-oš-* and the future with *-et-* the transitive marker *-i-* is not found **with any person**:

- e.g. *tad=oš=a* “he loved” (3. Pers. Sg. Preterit)
tad=oš=o “you loved” (2. Pers. Sg. Preterit)
tad=ed=o “you will love” (2. Pers. Sg. Future)

6. Position with the transitive-ergative, positive verbs is unoccupied; with negative verbal forms there appears in this position the negation (*-u(w)/wa-* that is *-kkV*).

7. Position After the tense marker and also the transitive marker *-i-* (in the 5th position) there follows in the **7th position** (the 6th position when the negation is not occupied) the person marker (=subject marker) of the indicative of the transitive-ergative, positive verbs. These are:

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|----------------------------|--|
| | Singular | | |
| 1. Pers. | -av | (graphically (K)a-a-ú/-ap) | Long form –affu- (thus before the enclitic pronouns after the negative suffix) |
| and | | | |
| 2. Pers. | -o | (graphically: -u) | |
| 3. Pers. | -a | | |

With the plural forms (**as the 8th Position**), following after the person marker of the singular is a pluralizer *-š* with allomorph *-ša* before additional terms. This pluralizer *-š(a)* is encountered both in indicative and non-indicative forms (see below).

- | | | |
|----------|------------|--|
| | Plural | |
| 1. Pers. | -av + š(a) | (graphically (K)a-(a)-ú-uš or (K)a-(a)-ú-ša when elements like <i>-šše</i> follow) |
| 2. Pers. | -aššu | (only in the Boğazköy bilingual KBo 32) |
| 3. Pers. | -a + š(a) | |

or -t + a⁷⁷

In the 9th and 10th Positions the enclitic pronouns (*-tta*, *-mma*, *-nna* etc.) and the syntactic particles (*-an*, *-man* etc.) can appear.

Examples of the indicative, transitive-ergative, positive verbs (Table 3)

ar=av “I give” but *ar=i=a* “he gives”; **ar=av=š(a)* “we give”
ar=oš=av “I gave”; *ar=oš=a* “he gave”
ar=ed=av “I will give”; **ar=ed=av=š(a)* “we will give”
ar=ol=av=š (graphically *a-ru-la-a-uš* Bog-Bil) “we give”
na-ak-ki-da-a-u-uš i.e. *nakk=ed=av=š* “we will release ...”
na-ak-ki-da-aš-šu i.e. *nakk=ed=aššu* “you will release ...”
with the long form *-affu-* of the personal suffix
a-ru-la-ú-un-na i.e. *ar=ol=af(f)u=nna* “I give him”

Beside the Position 8 pluralizer *-š* there is another additional plural morpheme *-t-* (Girbal AoF 16 1989 78 ff) or *-it-*. This plural morpheme appears after the tense marker but before the person marker.

e.g. *un=et=t=a*. This form can either be “he will come” (intransitive), or, by recognizing the plural morpheme *-t-* “they will bring” (transitive).

Addition examples are:

| | | |
|---|---------|--------------------------------|
| <i>gu-li-e-ta</i> Mit IV 27 | against | <i>gu-li-e-et-ta</i> Mit IV 60 |
| <i>kul=ed=a</i> | | <i>kul=et=(i)t=a</i> |
| “he will say” | | “they will say” |
| <i>a-ki-tu</i> KBo 32: 20 I 16’ (“Old Hurrian”) | | |
| <i>ag=id=o</i> | | “they lead ...” |
| <i>hu-u-i-tu</i> KUB 47: 2 IV 8’ | | |
| <i>hu=id=o</i> | | “they call over” |

⁷⁷ The pluralizer *-t-* is not generally accepted (see Giorgieri/Röseler, SCCNH 8, 1996, 281 Anm 2): in this work it will however be recognized as an allophone of *-id-*.

Table 3: The suffix sequence for indicative, transitive-ergative, positive verbs

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|------------------|----------------------------|--|---|---|--|------------------------------|
| Position Root | 1 RE | 2. Tense marker | 3 Objectless ness Marker (not used) | 4. (not used) | 5. Transitive Marker | 6. Transitive Negation Marker (not used) | 7. Marker for the subject of the action | 8. Plural Marker of the subject** | 9. Enclitic Pronoun | 10. Syntactic Particle |
| | -an- -ar- -ol- -Všt- etc. | -Ø- -oš- -et- | | | -i-.* -i- | | 1.Sg. -av/- affu- 2.Sg. -o 3.Sg. -a | -š(a)- | 1.Sg. -fta 2.Sg. - mma 3.Sg. -nna etc. | -an -man etc. |
| <p>* The marker of the transitive appears only in the present of the 2nd and 3rd person singular **or t+a for the 3rd person plural</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

8. With the indicative, transitive-ergative negated verbs there appears the negation suffix *-u(w)-/-wa-* (6. Pos.) after the transitive marker *-i-* (5 Pos.). The negation suffix *-u(w)-/-wa-* (whose full form, namely *-wa-* is the suffix in the modal form) appears as *-u-* and the person marker (7. Pos.) of the 1. Person *-av* appears in the long form *-(a)ffu*.

Together the *-u-* + *-(a)ffu* produce for the

1. Pers. Sg.

> **-uffu**

The first person plural is created from the first person singular, as *u+(a)ffu* and the plural term *-š* (8. Pos.) to form (only in the Boğazköy Bilingual)

> **-uffu=š**

The 2. Person Singular is not attested; the second person plural (only found in the Boğazköy Bilingual) is built from the *-u-* and the personal marker of the 2nd Person Plural *-(a)ššu*.

➤ **-uššu**

The paradigm thus appears to be:

- | | |
|---|---------|
| 1. Sg. trans.-erg. negative | -uffu |
| 2. Sg. (not attested) | -- |
| 3. Sg. trans.-erg. negative (see later) | |
| 1. Pl. trans.-erg. negative | -uffu=š |
| 2. Pl. trans.-erg. negative | -uššu |
| 3. Pl. (not attested) | -- |

(for 3. Person Singular see under Point [c] page 83)

a) The Negation of the First Person Singular and Plural

e.g. ku-z-u-ši-úw-wu-la- (Mit IV 46)
koz + oš + i + uffu + l(la)
“I have not held back them (-lla)”

na-ak-ki-u-úw-wu_u-uš (Bog-Bil KBo 32: 15 I 24’)
nakk + ø + i + uffu + š
“we do not let (something) free”

b) The Negation of the Second Person Plural (only Bog-Bil), the 2nd Person Singular is not attested.

e.g. na-ak-ki-u-uš-šu (Bog Bil KBO 32: 19 I 20)
nakk + ø + i + u + (a)ššu >uššu
“you do not let (something) free”

c) The Negation of the Third Person Singular: The negation morpheme *-ma* which could well be genetically related with *-wa-* (Chačikjn, Churr. I urart. 1985, 95), is taken out from the suffix chain and shifts to the end of the verbal form; the transitive marker *-i-* appears before the person marker:

e.g. pašš + i + a + **ma**
“he does not send”
kul + i + a + **ma**
“he does not say”
irnoh + oš + i + a + **ma**
“he has not retaliated”

The morpheme *-ma* appears in these cases in which the application of *-wa-* would lead to a series **i + wa + a 3. Pers. Sg. transitive*. It thus appears to function as a position conditioned allomorph of *-wa-*, although *-ma* does not appear in the suffix-chain as *-wa-* appears: whereas *-wa-* appears at the position between the transitive marker *-i-* and the person marker of the agent, *-ma* appears after the personal marker *-a*.

On avoiding the confusion with the particle *-mân* (-ma-a-an, see below), it seems that the negation morpheme *-ma* does not follow the associative *-an* “and” (Girbal SMEA 34, 1994, 83 f.).

Negated transitive forms in the third person plural are not attested.

d) Another negation morpheme is *-ut-* (Neu StBoT 32, 1996, 164 regards this as only *-u-*, while *-t-* is interpreted as a preterit form).

Thus far, his negation suffix has been found with sufficient security only in the Boğazköy-Bilingual.⁷⁸ Here it is found with verbal forms that are associated with so-called “Old Hurrian” (see also below). It is here where the 3. Person Singular Ergative is built with the forms =*o=m*:

fur=ud=o=m “he does not see (a second district)” (Bog Bil KBo 32: 14 I 38)
am=ud=o=m “he does not reach (the opposite bank)” (Bog Bil KBo 32: 14 I 29)
 (For an identical root extension *-ut-* see above.)

9. The Suffix Sequence with the Indicative, Intransitive, positive Verb

With the intransitive, non-negated verbs there occurs the tense-marker (2. Position) (as only in the preterit and the future) the intransitive marker *-t-* (as 3. Position) [the 4 position is still undocumented] and a further intransitive marker *-a-* (in the 5 Position); the enclitic pronouns (e.g. *-tta*, *-mma* etc.) are used as subject-markers, except the 3rd person singular which has a null-marker (not *-nna*). The subject-marker appears frequently not with the corresponding verbal form.

Examples:

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|--|---|---|---|--|-----|
| un + | | | | | a | | | |
| “he comes” | | | | | | | | |
| un + | | | | | a | + | | tta |
| “I come” | | | | | | | | |
| un + | | | | | a | + | | lla |
| “they come” | | | | | | | | |
| itt + | oš | + | | t | + | | | a |
| “he has left” | | | | | | | | |
| un + | et | + | | t | + | | | a |
| “he will come (for the ambiguities of this form see above)” | | | | | | | | |

10. The Suffix Sequence with Indicative, Intransitive, negated and with antipassive verbs.

The negated form of the intransitive verb is made with *-kk-* (in the 6th position). Before this morpheme appears the Intransitive marker *o* (*o* is an allophone of the *a* of the 5th position) –or in antipassive constructions the transitive marker *-i-*; after the negating morpheme *-kk-* one finds the vowel *-a-*, which in certain forms (probably in the absolute final sound) appears as *o*, in the antipassive it appears in contrast as *-i*. As subject markers the enclitic pronouns of the absolutive are used, although for the 3rd person singular in the null-marker is given (and not *-nna*).

Examples:

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|---|---|--|----|---|-----------|-----|
| mann “to be” | + | | o | + | | kk | + | | o |
| “he is not” but | | | | | | | | | |
| un “come” | + | | o | + | | kk | + | a (o > a) | lla |
| “they do not come” | | | | | | | | | |

⁷⁸ In the Mittani Letter one can point to forms like *hu-up-pu-ta-aš-ša-a-al-la-a-an* (II 22) which may have the negation morpheme *-ut-* (see Haas/Wegner, FsKlengel AoF 24/2, 1997, 344 ff.)

In contrast to the intransitive, here are the negated forms of the antipassive:

tan “make” oš + i + kk + (i >) a + tta

(as not –oš-t-, i.e. without the intransitive marker –t-)

“I have not made”

an + ašt + i + kk + i “he is not happy”

Tables 5 and 6: The suffix-chain of the indicative intransitive-positive and intransitive-negative verb as well as the antipassive verb

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------|----------------------------|------------|----------------|------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|---|-------------------------------|--|
| Position: 1. Root RE | -ol- -Všt- etc | 2. Tense | -ø- -oš- -et- | 3. Objectless Marker | -t- | 4. (unused) | 5. Intransitive marker | -a- -o- (o is an allophone of a) | 6. Intransitive Negation Marker | -kko (actually a, subjected to vowel harmony o>a before -tta, -mma etc.) | 7. Subject- marker of the action (unused) | 8. Plural- marker of the Subject (unused) | 9. Enclitic Pronoun as Subject Marker | 10. Syntactic Particles | |
| Antipassive | | | | (unused) | Transitive | | -i- | -kki (i>a before -tta, - mma, etc.) | | | | | | | |

11. *The non-indicative verbal forms*

Hurrian has at its disposal a number of different modal constructions, whose actual definitions are still unclear. Therefore the terminology used here must remain provisional since there is yet no adequate examination of the inventory of Hurrian Modal forms. Also the rules for the segmentation and regulation of particular morphemes are not consistent. Hence in this description of the Hurrian mood system the thesis is put forwards that with the Jussive form the same construction forms clearly underlies the transitive and intransitive verbs (i.e. there is not a morphological distinction between transitive and intransitive forms, e.g. *tad=ašt=i=i(d)=en* “they would like to love (something)” and *itt-=i=(i)d=en* “they would like to go”; *ḥaš=i=en* “he would like to hear” and *šir=i?=en*⁷⁹ “it (the dowry) would like to be sufficient/pleasing”) and furthermore, as the few interpreted sentences can be said to show “split ergativity”, since the person markers in the enclitic pronouns are always absolutive even when the verb is transitive. (For the relevant sentences see below.) This apparently also goes for the Imperative, but here still another examination is necessary (see Girbal, SMEA 29, 1992, 172 f. with Notes 2; Haas/Weegner, Recension of StBoT 32 in OLZ 92, 1997, 454).

The Hurrian modal forms possess no individual person markers.

12. *The non-indicative positive form* (the Jussive, from Latin *iussum* “order, command”)

Under the term “Jussive” (following from Speiser IH 163 ff.; Bush GHL 216; Chačikjan Churr. I urart. 105 and 109) – e.g. the commanding possible form – is here a summary term for forms that are of this general type (voluntative, imperative, optative): Below the Jussive is formed as follows (see Girbal, AoF 16, 1989, 81 ff.; Wegner, *Orientalia* 59, 1990, 298 ff):

⁷⁹ Mit III 34 *ši-ri-en-na-a-an*. Here the evidence of an intransitive Jussive form requires that the marker *-i-* is really the graphical marker of the Jussive and not an emphazier through plene-writing —the sign RI can also be read RE--, an intransitive marker is however not present in any case.

Table 8: The Suffixes for the positive Jussive

| Root+R E | Jussive Marker | Negation Marker (unused) | Plurali zer | Person Marker of the Jussive | Bound Vowel | Enclitic Pronoun * | Synt. Part. |
|--|--|--------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|---|----------------|
| -an- -ar- -aš- -ugar- etc. | -i- 1.Sg. -i- 2.Sg. — 3.Sg. -i- 1.Pl. -i- 2.Pl. — 3.Pl. -i- | | -(i)t- -š(?) e+š(?) -(i)t- | — -l+e (voluntative) -i/e (Imperative) -en -en | — (-i-) -i- | — -tta -mma -nna -tilla -ffa -lla | — -an |

*The enclitic particles are most advanced(?)

Examples:

1st Person Singular (Voluntative)

haš + i + l+e

“I shall hear” (Graphically ha-š-i-i-li Mit. IV 43)

talm+ašt + i + l+e

“I shall raise” (Graphically ta-al-ma-aš-ti-i-li KBo 32: 11 I 2)

kul + (i) + l+e

“I shall say” (Graphically kul-li Mit IV 1)

Rules: With stems ending in /l/, /r/ and /t/, the *-i-* of the Jussive does not appear (hence

*hil+i+l+e > *hilli* “I shall say”, *tad+ukar+il+eva > *tadugarreva* “I shall love”:

*kut+i+(i)t+en > *kutte(n)* “they shall fall”; but see also *itt=i=(i)d=en* “they shall go”.

Whether the voluntative morpheme *-le* can be segmented still further into *l+e* is not clear, in which case the purpose of the *-l-* is not clear. Therefore it is here regarded that *l+e* combined act as the person marker of the voluntative. Some authors, like Speiser IH 153 ff. and Bush GHL 215-217 segment *-le* and assign the proper Jussive function to the *-l-*. Other authors are satisfied with the segmentation =*i=l=e* or =*i=li*, frequently without distinguishing the separate functional elements. The final vowel of the morpheme is however treated here as *-e*, based on the form Mit II 85 ta-a-du-ka-a-ar-ri-**e** > *tad=ugar=i=l+e* “I shall love (my brother)” (see also Bush GHL 216 f.).

2nd Person Singular The Imperative --as the generalized morphological category of verbs-- is formed as the stem + *i* (that is, *-e* or also *-ə* as position-dependent allophone of *-i*, see Haas/Wegner, FsKlengel, AoF 24/2, 1997, 348 f.: *-e* that is *-ə*)

ar + i/e

“give!” (Mit. I 51)

nakk + i/e

“release!” (KBo 32: 19 I 1,3)

3rd Person Singular

| | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|---|----|----------------|
| <u>h</u> aš | + | i | + | en | |
| “he should hear” (trans.)(Mit.II 13) | | | | | |
| šir | + | i ⁸⁰ | + | en | + (n)na + an |
| “and it should be sufficient” (intrans.)(Mit. III 34) | | | | | |
| <u>h</u> aš | + | i | + | en | + (n)na + an |
| “and he should hear” (Mit. III 42) | | | | | |
| <u>h</u> aš | + | i | + | en | + i + lla + ân |
| “and he should hear it” (Mit. III 40) | | | | | |

1st Person Plural

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| tad+ugar | + | i | + | š | |
| “we shall love one another?” (Mit. IV 121) | | | | | |

2nd Person Plural

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---|----|--|
| kol | + | eš | |
| “Let off!” (KBo 32: 14 I 23) | | | |

3rd Person Plural

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|------|---|------|
| itt | + | i | + | (i)t | + | en |
| “they shall go” (Mit. III 23) | | | | | | |
| <u>h</u> a | + | i | + | (i)t | + | e(n) |
| “they shall take” (<u>h</u> a-a-i-te, <u>h</u> a-a-i-te-in KBo 32: 14 I 12, 13) | | | | | | |

According to Wilhelm (ZA 73, 1983, 108 f.) the transitive imperative uses the transitive vowel *-i-* (Mit. I 51 *ar=i* “give”, Mit II 56 *pal=i* “know”, whereby in the latter case the plene-writing *pa-li-i* is cited as proof for the ansatz that the imperative as *-i*. However, *pal=i* has been determined to be a form of the antipassive, see Haas/Wegner, AoF 24/2, 1997, 348), the intransitive however is then formed with the intransitive marker *-a*: *un=a* “come”; the indicative *un=a* “he comes” and imperative *un=a* “come” are then formally identical (Wilhelm ZA 73, 1983, 108 f.; Neu StBoT 32, 156 zu *i-te-i-e*).

The cases above show there is not universal agreement on the elements with the Jussive. Thus the *-i-* that is here regarded as the jussive morpheme former certain researchers see as the transitive marker (Speiser IH 164 [SS196]; Bush GHL 89 [SS4.33]; Diakonoff HuU 128 f.; Wilhelm, OrNS 61, 1992, 138), regarding only the *-e-* that is, *-en* as the Jussive morpheme (Speiser IH 163 ff.; Bush GHL 216, 2118,224; *-e-* Jussive suffix, 233 f.: *-n* copula; Diakonoff HuU 128 f). Other authors segment *=i=e=n* (singular) or *=id=e=n* (Plural) (Giorgieri/Röseler, SCCNH 8, 1996 281 with Note 2), without

⁸⁰ Graphically Mit. III 34 is *ši-ri-en-na-a-an*, i.e. *šir=i?=en=n(n)a=ân*

determining the individual segments, including the *-i-* in the singular and the word-final *-n*. When *=en* should be further broken down into *-en*, the form *-n* cannot be identified with the marker *-n* (*-nna*) of the 3rd person singular in the grammatical function of the absolutive. This means the forms covered above, in which the Jussive form is *-ien* has a direct object of the 1st Person Singular or Plural (Girbal, AoF 16, 1989, 81 with note 8). For the plural Jussive forms (3. Person) there are some authors that do not identify the plural sign /t/, but a plural morpheme *-it-* [*-id-*] (so first Jensen ZA 14, 176; FriedrichBChG 36; Speiser IH 146 ff. [with doubts regarding its position]; Bush GHL 218 ff.; Wilhelm, Bibl. Mes. 26, 1999, 142). We take *t* for an allomorph of *-it-* (see similar Steiner RHA 36, 1978, 173-187, however with another interpretation of the form).

The argument against the idea that *i* corresponds to the transitive marker is based mainly on the Mittani-letter term *it-ti-tén* “they shall go” from the actual root *itt-* “go”, which hardly can be transitive. An analysis *itt=id=en* or also *itt=id=en* has, as noted above, a marker of the person son (*-id-*) that is not in the expected position, in particular it is located closer to the root than the supposed modal element (*-e-*) or (*-en*). Regarding this Speiser’s doubts (IH 146 ff) are still valid. The agent-indicating person-number morpheme is still closer to the end of the sequence (see Speiser IH 147; Plank, Xenia 21, 1988 71 and Wegner, Orientalia 59, 1990, 298 ff.: Scheme: + Tense/Mood + Number/Person). In addition a further problem arises from the analysis *itt=id=en*, while *-en* must be treated then as a cumulative morpheme, but the Optative as also a 3rd Person marking (see below S 32-33). Furthermore, unfortunately there is no clearly secure intransitive Jussive form found in the Mittani-Letter⁸¹. The Boğazköy Bilingual KBo 32:12 V I 7-8 provides besides the transitive voluntative form *ḥaš=ašt=i+l+e* “I shall hear” an intransitive voluntative form with the same form *itt=i+l+e* “I shall go”. From the intransitive root *nahh-* “sit, put oneself” a voluntative form is made in the mythological text KUB 8 60(+?) KUB 47: 9 I 16’: na-ah-hi-li *nahh=i+l+e* “I shall sit”.

In the above cited case Mit IV 42-43 f. *ḥaš=i+l+e* (see Girbal, SMEA 29, 1992, 172, Note 2) there is the enclitic pronoun of the 1st person singular absolutive *-tta* in combination with the transitive verb *ḥaš-* “hear”: *tive(>a)=tta=ân... šeniḥḥivemân keldi nîriše ḥaš=i+l+e* “I shall hear ... the word and the well-being (and) the good health of my brother”

In this sentence *-tta* is the agent in a transitive sense, so the verb *ḥašile* “I will hear” has a direct object, this being “the word” (*tive-*) and “The well-being and good health of my brother” (*šeniḥḥive- keldi nîriše*). The pronoun under this condition is expected to be not the absolutive *-tta* but the ergative *iša=š*. A further example occurs in Mit II 84-85 *še[n(a)=iḥḥe=t]ta=man tad=ugar=i+l+e* “I (*-tta*) shall love my brother”, where also the absolutive pronoun *-tta* occurs with the transitive Verb *tad=ugar-*.

A comparable situation presents itself in the Hurrian-Hittite Bilingual with the multiple occurrences of the sentence: *amum(i>)a=f(fa) šalḥ=ol=a* (KBo 32:14I 23,140,IV 7,

⁸¹ The wish-form of the so-called “Old-Hurrian” of the Tiš-atal inscription, which ends in *-in*, is still not entirely clear. See however Wilhelm, Bibl. Mes. 26, 1999, 117 ff.

Rs.21,33,53). The enclitic Absolutive-pronoun of the 2nd person plural *-ffa* is also the agent of the transitive verb *šalh-* “to hear” and has the direct object *amumi-* “message”: “You (pl.) shall hear the message!”

(This does not support Neu’s StBoT 32 for KBo 21:11 I 4 ka-ti-il-li i-š[a-aš] suggested reconstruction of *iša=š* “I” , the independent pronoun of the 1st person singular Ergative, since with all forms of the Jussive in which a person marker is expressed, appears in the Absolutive case. In the meantime it raises the question whether the independent personal pronoun can appear with this modal form at all.)

So, assuming this proposed model is correct, then Hurrian in the non-indicative moods, and particularly in the Jussive, shows the phenomenon of “split ergativity”, in which the same formation scheme underlies the transitive and intransitive verbs. Furthermore, as the above examples show, at least with an agent in the first or second person Jussive (i.e. in the Voluntative and the Imperative) the ergative construction is not found (see also Girbal, SMEA 29, 1992, 172 with Anm. 2; ders., AoF 16, 1989, 81 ff.; Haas/Wegner, Recension to StBoT 32 in OLZ 92, 1997, 440 f.; 444 with Anm. 22, 454.)

Rules: With the attachment of the enclitic pronoun (except for the 3rd Person Singular) to the Jussive form, note the following:

When the person marker of the Jussive *-en* is followed by the enclitic pronoun, a bound vowel *-i-* is inserted between *-en* and the pronominal suffix:

ha=i=en=i=l(la)=an “he should take them (-lla Pl.)
 (ha-i-e-ni-la-an Mit III 30)
ar=ann=i=en=i=l(la)=an “He should give them”
 (a-ra-an-ni-e-ni-la-an Mit III 39)

A bound vowel does not occur with the enclitic pronoun of the 3rd person singular *-nna*, instead the three nnn are reduced to two:

Ar=ann=i=en=(n)na=man “he should give it”
 (a-ra-an-ni-e-ni-na-ma-an Mit. III 41).

A special development appears in the form of the Hurrian Boğazköy texts, especially those in the bilingual: Here the person marker *-en* of the Jussive can be reduced to *-e* before words starting with a consonant:

KBo 32: 14 I 12-13: ha-a-i-te-**in** a-a-še but ha-a-i-**te** ka-ri-e-na-šu-uš
 “they shall take the oil” “the bird-catcher shall take...”

Such a reduction of the morpheme *-en* to *-e* argues against the further segmentation of the suffix into *-e+n*, or the cessation of *-n* as a distinct morpheme. (Still with Bush GHL 224, Chačikjan, Churr. I urart., 122-125, and Diakonoff HuU 126 dropped the “Cupola-thesis”, whereby the Hurrian possesses no *-n* copula, see Girbal/Wegner, ZA 77, 1987, 151.)

The Boğazköy-texts offers further a plural imperative form with *-eš (-e+š)?*: e.g. *kol=eš/kol=e=š* “let go!” (KBo 32: 14 I 23 u.o). For a further imperative form of *-o* and *-o=š* see S 116)

13. The non-indicative negative Form (negated Jussive)

Table 9: The suffix sequence with the negated Jussive

| Root+RE | Jussive Marker | Neg. Marker | Plural izer* | Person marker of the Jussive | Bound Vowel | Enclitic Pronoun | Syntactic Particle |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|------------------|---------------------|
| -an -ar- -aš- -ugar etc | -i- | -wa- | (-id-) | -l+e/-lli (voluntative) -en | (-i-) | -lla | -an -man etc. |

*A negated Jussive in the 3rd Person Plural is not attested.

The negated Jussive form is formed by means of the well-known indicative form *-u(w)/wa-* that here appears in their full form (i.e. *-wa*). The negation morpheme *-wa-* appears after the marker of the Jussive *-i-* which – in our opinion— is not to be confused with the *-i-* of the transitive (Girbal, AoF 16, 1989, 83; ders. SMEA 29, 1992, 177 ff.; Wegner *Orientalia* 59, 1990, 298 ff.: on the problematic interpretation of the *-i-* see also above); *-wa-* is the only known negation of the non-indicative mood.

Examples:

pašš+ ar + i + wa + en
(pa-aš-ša-ri-i-wa-a-en Mit. IV 54)
“he should not send”

ḥaš+ aš + i + wa + en
(ḥa-ša-a-ši-wa-a-en Mit IV 20)
“he should not hear”

ḥaš+ aš + i + wa + lli + lla + ân
(ḥa-ša-a-ši-wa-al-li-i-il-la-(a-an) Mit IV 26)
“and I should not hear it”
(for the 1st Person Singular of the Jussive [Voluntative] l+e appears as the allomorph *-lli*; Girbal, SMEA 29, 1992, 177).

Besides the form *-iwaen* there exists a form with the ending *-o/uw(a)en*, which certain researchers (Bush *GHL* 212; Wilhelm *SMEA* 24, 1984, 220 Anm. 14) interpret as another negated Jussive form (e.g. *ḥi-su-ú-ḥu-lu-ú-en* “he should not be sad” Mit I 110 and *ú-ru-u-we-en* (*ur=o=w(e)=en*) “he does not exist” Mit. III 111, see Wilhelm, *Orientalia* 54, 1985, 492: “negated intransitive Jussive form”; ders. *SMEA* 24, 1984, 220 Anm. 14). Both forms can also be read as word-final *-o/uwen* –the following *-wa+en* are written using the rule *-wa-a-en* where the negation *-wa-* is needed– and at least for the

second forms a positive meaning is probable (Mit III 110-112: “When an enemy of my brother shall exist (*ur=owen*) (and) when now an enemy (*šukko=mmaman torubi*) of my brother shall enter (*faš=eva*) in your land , my brother sends to me”). It can therefore also be giving a positive form with *-owen*.

14. *The Non-indicative form with -ewa /eva/* (so-called conditional Optative, from Diakonoff HuU 130 f.)

Table 10: The suffix sequence with the so-called conditional optative

| Root+RE | Term | Term | Term of the condit. Optative | Pluralizer | Encl. Pron. | Synt. Part. |
|---------|--------|--------|------------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|
| | (-ol-) | (-il-) | -eva | -š(a) | -tta etc. | -an etc. |

The morpheme *-ewa /eva/* are interpreted as a conditional Optative form, which expresses an ability or desire. The form of the suffix with the final *-a* has already been recognized by Spieser IH 156 f. [SS 192] and Bush GHL 229 f. [7.46322]. (The graphical *-(K)i-e-WA* in the Mittani-Letter there is the final vowel is ambiguous.) The form *-eva* appears frequently in combination with *-il-*⁸² perhaps another term indicating of the conditional optative. Occasionally before *-eva* there appears a form *-ol-*. Both *-il-* and *-ol-* have a very similar function and come together --as already mentioned.

The subject of the action is indicated through the enclitic pronominal suffix of the absolutive term that commonly appears at the start of the sentence.

The plural marker of the subject of the action with *-eva-* in the Boğazköy-bilingual and with the *-ai/ae* form use the known indicative pluralizer *-š* with allomorph *-ša* for the further forms.

Examples:

kad + il + eva
(ka-ti-li-e-wa Mit IV 18)
“he could say”

hill + ol + eva
(hi-il-lu-li-e-wa Mit III 102)
“he could inform”

*kad + il + eva + tta
(*ka-ti-li-e-wa)

⁸² Other authors segment this term as *-i-l-* as in the form *kapp=i=l=eva=š* see Wilhelm, FsKlengel AoF 24/2, 1997, 280 f. with Note 20; Speiser IF 157 attach *-il* and see therein a cohortative suffix; Bush GHL 232 ff. attached to the voluntative *-l-*.

“I could say”

un + eva + tta
(ú-ni-wa_a-at-ta KBo 32:19 I 23)
“I will come”

Plural forms with the pluralizer *-š(a)* are only attested in the Boğazköy-bilingual

kapp + il + eva + š
(ga-ab-bi-li-wa_a-aš KBo 32:15 I 9’)
“we will fill”

pend + il + eva + š
(bi-in-ti-li-wa_a-aš KBo 32: 15 I 16’)
“we will send back”

The term *-il-*, when it occurs after the liquids */l/* and */r/*, transforms to the allomorphs */l/* and */r/* (so *-l+il > ll* and *-r+il > rr*):

e.g. ge-pa-a-nu-il-li-e-wa-a-at-ta-a-an (Mit III 63)
i.e. *keban=ol=(i)l=eva=tta=ân* “and I must send”
a-ar-ri-wa_a-aš (KBo 32: 15 I 6’, 8’)
i.e. *ar=r(<il)=eva=š* “we will give”

In the Mittani letter there are *-eva-*forms without an agent in the Ergative, even though it is used with lexically transitive as well as intransitive verbs. These verbal forms are not complete. Whether the action-ruler is, as in the case above, the subject in the Absolutive agent or the patient of the action, appears not at first clear and is not morphologically fixed. Probably the context makes possible the correct understanding of the sentence (Girbal SMEA 29, 1992 178).

The subject in the Absolutive of a form like *hill=ol=eva* can then be both who could talk and what could be said.

The Bilingual from Boğazköy provides another form. Here appears *eva-*forms with an object in the Absolutive:

e.g. e-hi-il-li-wa_a-aš-ša^DTe-eš-šu-up (KBO 32: 15 I 18’)
i.e. *ehl=il=eva=š=nnā* (*š+nnā > š^sā*)^DTeššub “we will save him (*-nna*),
Teššub.

15. *The non-indicative form with ae/ai* (so-called Debitive-Final; from Diakonoff HuU 130)

Verbal forms with the term *-ae/-ai* are interpreted as the Debitive-Final (Bush GHL 228 f., Diakonoff HuH 130 f.: Chačikjan, Churr. i. urart. 109-110: Optative-Finalis): which

indicates a purpose or target. It is occasionally has moderated meaning very similar to the Jussive, such that a distinction is not always possible. In the Mittani-Letter the distinctive forms *-ae* and *-ai* still have distinctive endings (see also Bush GHJ 229 f.). It may be supposed that the morpheme *-ai/-ae* is (originally) a case ending, derived from the Instrumental.

Just as the *eva*-form, the *-ae-* and *-ai-* forms can also occur in combination with the Optative *-il-*, however *-ae/ai* and *-eva* exclude each other. As a plural marker of the action's subject the pluralizer appears as *-š(a)*.

For this still little understood form the suffix sequence is as follows:

Table 11: The suffix-sequence with the so-called Debitive-Final

| Root+RE | Term | Term | Pluralizer | Enclitic Pronoun | Syntactic Particle |
|---------|--------|---------|------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| | (-il-) | -ae/-ai | -š(a) | -tta -mma -nna etc. | -an etc. |

Examples:

pal + (i)l + ae + n(na)
 (pal-la-(a)-en Mit. IV 56, 59)
 “so that he knows it” or “so that (my brother) knows it”

pal + (i)l + ai + n(na)
 (pal-la-in Mit IV 64)
 “so that he should know it”

itt + ai + nna + ân
 (it-ta-in-na-a-an Mit IV 53)
 “and so that he can go”

pal + (i)l + ai + ša + lla
 pal-la-i-šal-la- (Mit IV 65)
 “so that they may know”

itt + ai + ša + lla
 (it-ta-i-šal-la-a-an Mit IV 52)
 “so that they can go”

In Mit IV 122 and the Boğazköy texts there are the form *-ai* with additional forms like *-i-m-* and *-i-l-* whereby the *-i-* provides the nominalization indicator (and not the transitive marker *-i-*), as expected for a (originally) case ending (instrumental) (Wilhelm, *Orientalia* 61, 1992, 140). The forms with *-i-l-ai* and *-i-m-ai* are grammatically related to

the infinite verbal forms of the verbal system. Functionally they act as a gerund-like term (see Neu, FsThoma 1988, 503 ff.; ders. StBoT 32, 1996, 108, 133, 197; Salvini, Xenia 21, 1988, 168 f.; ders. *Orientalia* 59, 1990, 246 with Anm. 2 for parallel formations in Urartian)

Examples with the so-called “gerund”: Mit IV 121-122 *inu=mê=nîn* ^D*Šimige taršuvani=š* *fur=i=m=ai=n(na) tad=i=a* “and like the Sun God seeing (*fur=i=m=ai*) love (of) humans”

KBo 32: 14 I 8 *papani* *ħaş=i=m=ai* “the mountain hearing (*ħaş=i=m=ai*) this”

KBo 32: 15 V 12-13 ^I*Megi=ne tive=na* ^D*IM=u=da junz=i=m=ai kad=i=a* “Megi spoke, bowing (*kunz=i=m=ai*), the word to the weather god” (The action’s subject ^I*Megi* is missing the expected ergative morpheme –š; for this Sentence type see Wegner AoF 21, 1994, 161 f.)

KBo 12: 80+KUB 45:62 Vs. I? 6; ^D*IŠTAR-g[a=]l(la) tive=na* ^D*U=da alu=m=ai=n kad=i=a* “the goddess Ishtar spoke, saying (*alu=m=ai=n(na)*) the word to the weather god.”

16. Further request forms from the Boğazköy material

Here we consider verbal forms with the final sequences *=i+l=e=š*, *=i+l=anni*, *=o+l=e=š* or *=o+l=ae=š*. The forms with the endings *–ae(š)* are distinct from the above-mentioned *–ai* “gerunds”.

These verbal forms securely express requests, but the details still need further clarification. In some contexts there are forms with *–ol-e-š* and *–ol-ae-š* without distinctive usages (e.g. KUB 29:8 IV 31 [=ChS I/1 Nr 9]): *še-e-ħa-lu-le-e-eš ka-aš-lu-le-e-eš ki-ra-aš-šu-la-eš* “they (the ritual specialists) should be clean, strong (and) durable”, (ssee Wegner, Xenia 21, 1988, 152 f.). Whether *=i+l=* and *=o+l=* correspond to the modal forms (*=il=* or *=ol=*), or whether here there are two forms (*=i=l=* or *=o=l=*) attached to each other, often remains unclear. I tend towards the first possibility and therefore see *i+l* or *o+l* as a single term; the transitive marker *–i-* is not included in this formation.

Here are some further examples of such request forms:

ChS I/1 Nr 9 Rs III 34-35 (see Wegner ZA 85, 1995, 117): *edi=v ana=o_l=e=š irde=v urh(i)=a tij=a kad=i+l=e=š* “your body must be pleasing (*ana=o+l=e=š*), your tongue must speak (*kad=i+l=e=š*) true words”

ChS I/1 Nr 9 Rs III 30 *ħazziz(z)i=v=a=lla šalħ=o+l=e=š nui=v=a=lla* *ħaş=aš=i+l=e=š* “your mind must learn (*šalħ=o+l=e=š*) it (i.e. the words), your must hear (*ħaş=aš=i+l=e=š*) it.”

ChS I/1 Nr 9 III 39 (see Wilhelm SMEA 29 1992, 246 Anm. 2; Wegner ZA 85, 1995, 120): *kuduni=v ... hašar(i)=ai haš=o+l=e=š* “your neck(?)... must be anointed (*haš=o+l=e=š*) with oil; ChS I/1 Nr 9 III 36 *hinzur=o+l=ae=š* also ChS I/1 Nr 11 Rs 18’ *hinzur=i+l=e=š* meaning unknown

Forms with *=i+l=anni* are transcribed as transitive intensive-desirative mood forms. *=anni* is thus the suffix of the desirative, reinforced through a further modal element *-l-*. The *-i-* is supposed to be the transitive marker (Wilhelm Orientalia 61 1992 139 ders Iraq 53, 1991, 164 Anm. 20; Neu StBoT 32, 1996, 105 ff): *am=i+l=anni* “it (the fire) may burn (it)” KBo 32: 14 I 6: *id=i+l=anni* “he may break (it, i.e. the cup)” KBo 32: 14 I 6.

17. The Infinitive

The form *-umme* produces the nominal of the action, that is, the infinitive: e.g. *itt=umme* “departure”, *taš=umme* “donation”; *fahr=umme* “goodness” These structures are especially productive in the Nuzi texts, which also use structures like Root + *-umma epēšu* (Wilhelm SCCNH 2 1987 336; ders.ZA 83, 1993, 102 ff.)

5. The postpositions and particles

In a strictly suffix-using ergative language there are not prepositions. Languages of this type only have postpositions (Plank, Xenia 21, 1988, 74 ff.). These appear also in Hurrian, although there are some (e.g. *abi* and *egi*) in certain dialect forms that appear to be transitional between postpositions and prepositions (Diakonoff HuU 148 speaks of Pre-and Postpositions).

Hurrian possesses a small number of positions, which are derived from originally independent nouns, mainly body part terms.

These postpositions are found after various stages in the transformation from a noun to a postposition and from a postposition to a case marker. Thus the Hurrian *edi-* “body, person” still exists as an autonomous noun (*edi=v* “your body”, *edi=š* ergative “body” > “self”), but it also begins to function as an adverb and postposition. This transformation of the word *edi-* provides a good demonstration of this process:

edi=v “your body” functions as noun: *edi=v ana=o+l=e=š* “your body must be pleasing” or
eda=l=an ... koz=oš=o “You have restrained yourself (*edi=(š)=l(la)=an*)” Mit IV 45;
edi=š- Ergative “body” > “self”)

ed(i)=i=da with certain case endings occasionally has a meaning like “to his body”, but can also function as a Postposition:

ed(i)=i=da as a postposition means “for, referring to, because of, concerning”: *Fe=va ed(i)=i=da* “... for you”.

Other words of this type are:

| | | |
|---------|--------------------|--|
| abi/avi | “face” | ab(i) + i + ta “in front of” |
| furi | “sight” | fur(i) + i + ta “in view of, in front of” |
| egi | “middle” | eg(i) + i + ta “in, among” |
| ištani | “interior, middle” | ištani + i + ta “to its inside, to itself” |

The originally independent words are combined with the possessive suffix of the 3rd Person Singular *-i-* and the directive or dative, and so work as postpositions.

The postpositions *avi* and *edi* can also be formed with the genitive (see Wilhelm Double Case 1995, 119 and Note 4, with the *e*-case) of the ruling words:
e.g. *šove=NE=(v)e ed(i)=iff=u=ve* “referring to me” (Mit IV 18)

Examples with the *e*-case from Wilhelm, Double Case 1995 119 are as follows:

šen(a)=iff=u=ve=N(E)=e a(vi)=i=e “before my brother” (Mit. IV 49f)

ômin(i)=iff=u=ve=N(E)=e ed(i)=i=e “for my land” (Mit IV 22)

when the same postpositions are combined with the directive or the dative, then the ruling word must also be in the dative:

e.g. *en(i)=na=aš=va ... âb(i)=i=da* (graphically a-a-bi-ta) “before the gods...”

taše=ne=va ed(i)=i=da (Mit I 99, 104 ta-še-e-ni-e-wa e-ti-[i]=ta) “for the gift”

fe=va ed(i)=i=va (Mit III 55 we-e-wa e-ti-i-wa) “for you”.

The transition from postposition to preposition is observed with *avi* (and also with *egi*). The following examples from the bilingual show *abi* as preposition with the dative of the ruling word:

e.g. a-a-bi e-eb-ri-wa_a (KBo 32:14 Rs. IV 18) i.e. *âbi evr(i)=i=va* “before its people”

but as postposition with “peculiar” dative in the following example:

^[1]me-e-ki-ni!-wa_a ... a-b[i-wa_a (KBo 32: 20 IV 21’)

¹*Mêgi=ne=va ... ab[i=va* “before Mêgi”.

The remaining Boğazköy texts use *abi-/avi-* without the directive—as a preposition—(e.g. ChS I/1 Nr 5 IV 25 a-a-bi DINGIR^{MEŠ} -na-a-ša “before the gods”) and as a postposition—with directive—(e.g. ChS I/1 Nr 9 IV 29-30 DINGIR^{MEŠ} -na-a-ša tar-šu-wa-an-na-a-ša a-a-bi-ta “before the gods and the people”).

The same formations occur with *egi* (e.g. ChS I/1 Nr 8 III 25’ i-ki DINGIR^{MEŠ} -na-a-ša “among the gods” but III 23’ HUR.SAG^{MEŠ} -na-a-ša i-k[i-ta “among the mountains”).

An interesting example of such a transition occurs with the Text KBo 32: 13 I 15-16 of the bilingual: ^DIM-úw-wa_a ša-wu_u-u-ši-ni a-wi_i “before the great weather god”:

avi is here a postposition formed without the directive or the dative, as is the characteristic form of the prepositions:

šav=o=še=ne also appears without the dative and directive morpheme, but only the morpheme *-ne*;

^DIM-up=*va* does have the expected dative-mark *-va*.

The remaining postpositions are created with the directive or the dative and the ruling word is also required to be in the dative or the directive:

e.g. *attai=p=pa* (< *v+va*) *ed(i)=i=da* (Mit III 52-53) “for your father”.

The same postpositions can also be formed with the dative and then the ruling noun or pronoun is also dative:

e.g. *atta(i)=iff=u=š fe=va ed(i)=i=va ... tan=oš=a-* (Mit III 55 f)

“my father has done for you (*fe-* independent 2nd Person Singular Pronoun + *va* dative)”

ištani- “interior, middle” and *furi-* “sight”

From *ištani-* “interior, middle” and *furi-* “sight” can express obvious postpositions like “among each other, for each other” *ištan(i)=iff=aš=(v)a* (literally, “in our midst”) and *ištan(i)=i=aš=(v)a* (literally, “in their midst, with each other”), similarly can make *fur(i)=i=aš=(v)a* “before” (literally “in its sight”).

Summary: When these words not grammatical –in other words, those without a specific case for the covering word–, they are prepositions, when they occur with the Dative or Directive case of the covering word, they function as postposition. The originally autonomous nouns, most body part terms, are thus revealing the development of grammatical device.

The ruling noun however appears in these situations in particular cases, the Directive, Dative or Genitive or –only identified in the Bilingual of Boğazköy—in the still not entirely case “*ni*” case.

The development of the (unoriginal) case markings, as for the known Urartian, is present in Hurrian at most in early stages. As examples we can provide the following sentences, for which however Wilhelm Double Case, 1995, 119 with Anm 4, gives another meaning (see above on the *e*-Case). It treated these as:

šen(a)=iff=u=ve=N(E)=e a(vi)=i=e “before my brother”

omin(i)=iff=u=ve=n(e)=e ed(i)=i=e “for my land”.

The Particles

The term “particle” indicates a class of Hurrian words, which are not clearly recognized as of nominal or verbal origin and that are not combined with the nominal or the verbal suffixes. Attached to the independent particles there can only be the enclitic particles (associative) and the enclitic pronominal suffixes a certain group with particular allomorphs. Their primary function is as conjunctions, interjections and adverbs, nevertheless their exact meanings often are obscure (Bush GHL 97 ff.: 238 ff.).

In this class Hurrian words are frequently have the *u*-stem and the consonantal (*n*-)stem.

For the sentence introductory particles there are the conjunctions *inu-* “like, as”, *unu-* variant of *inu-*, or in combination with *anammi-* “thus, in this way”, *inna-* “when”, *panu-* “although”.

These conjunctions and the relative particle *iije-i* appear with the Allomorph */lle/* from */lla/* (“they” plural absolutive) and */me/* from */nna/* (“he” singular absolutive). These allomorphs are not free variants for */lla/* and */nna/* in all contexts. It appears the optional allomorphs are excluded for these sentence introductory conjunctions and the relative particles (Laroche GLH 122; Diakonoff HuU 147; Chačikjan, Churr. i. urart. 1985 119; Girbal, SMEA 34, 1994, 86).

For these independent auxiliary words there are the following:

- adi-* “hence, now”, combined only with the enclitic particle *-nin*: *adi=nin*
- anammi-* “thus, just as, of this way”. This particle shows the transition of *i>a* before an enclitic pronoun: *anammi=tta* “in this way I ...”
- ai-* “when” in the temporal as well as the conditional sense. In combination with certain verbs (e.g. *pal-* “know”), when the particle introduces a secondary sentence it has the meaning “that”.
- alaše-* conjunction “if, whether”
- henni* “now”
- kuru* “again”, the form *kuru=ve* (mit IV 42 gu-ru-ú-we) however appears to be a noun in the genitive (see also Bush GHL 324).
- padi* “even?” possibly indefinite “someone” (Wilhelm Orientalia 54, 1985 493)
- pegan* “?”
- tiššan* “very”
- oja-* independent negation particle “no”
- undo-* “hence, now”
- zuga*n “yet, nevertheless?”

The enclitic particles or “Associative”

The enclitic particles *-an, -nin, -ma, -man, -mmaman* can be attached to a noun, verb or the above independent particles. The particles *-an* “and” and *-man* “but, even” are commonly used connectives. The particle *-an* joins two nouns or two verbs or even two sentences (in the latter case with the meaning “and then, afterwards, and thus”). The particle *-ma* has the same meaning as *-an* and is frequently used in Boğazköy. On the particles *-man* “but, even”, *-nin* “further” and *-mmaman* “and namely” see also S 68.

(The meanings of the particles is often only approximate, and is frequently omitted in the translations)

D. Syntax

1. *General Remarks*

a) On Congruence (see also under “Suffixaufnahme” S 59 f.): The attributes, which are primarily the derived --as well as a small number of underived-- adjectives and the genitive attribute, generally agree with their associated reference word. Whether real incongruence occurs is thus far hardly settled (see however the “firm genitive construction” S. 62). Occasional cases of incongruence between noun and adjective appear (e.g. Mit III 120-121 [Context Unclear]: KUR *ômini talimde=na*) at times, but still unclear and could, particularly in the Boğazköy-Texts, also be classified as “errors”.

In the Mittani-Letter and largely in the other dialects the verbal forms in the ergative construction have a pronominal suffix that refers to the noun in the ergative case. Verbs of the non-ergative construction (transitive and intransitive) however lack an obligatory reference to the person, and their subjects are expressed through the enclitic absolutive personal pronouns, which do not have to be attached to the verbal form; they can appear anywhere in the sentence, however mostly on the first word of the sentence.

b) On Word Order: On the root word order there has only been investigated a little (Speiser IH 205 f.; Bush GH 121, 253; Plank, Xenia 21, 1998, 75ff.). The predominant word sequence in the Mittani-letter is “(Ergative) – Absolutive – Verb”, whereas in the bilingual there are relatively commonly transitive sentences with the order “Absolutive – Ergative – Verb”. In rare cases the verb can appear at the start of the sentence, probably for emphasis. Nouns in the dative or the directive can follow the verb or appear between the ergative and the absolutive. The genitive-attribute and the attributive adjective normally precede their reference noun (Speiser IH 200; Plank Xenia 21, 1988, 77 ff.). Overall, however, it appears that Hurrian does not follow strong rules of word order.

c) Hurrian is a so-called Ergative language. The basic distinguishing feature of Ergative languages is the distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs. Each verb has its own distinct conjugation suffixes; for Hurrian these are:

- 1. Pers. Sg. trans.erg. -av/-affu etc.
- 1. Pers. Sg. intrans. -tta/-t etc.

In the Hurrian of the Mittani-letter there are 4 or 5 distinct sentence constructions. Like most of the so-called Ergative languages, Hurrian of the Mittani letter also has at least two transitive sentence types: the ergative and the antipassive.

2. *The Ergative Sentence Structure*

This construction occurs with transitive verbs; the target (= patient, direct object) in the absolutive must be named in this sentence type:

The subject of the action (=agent) appears in the Ergative case = š
The direct object (=patient) appears in the absolutive case =Ø
The transitive verb for this conjugation has characteristic person markers: =av/affu

=o
=a, etc.

3. *The Intransitive Sentence Structure*

The subject of the action appears in the absolutive case
The person markers of the intransitive verbs are the
Enclitic pronouns of the absolutive

=Ø
=tta/t
=mma/m
=Ø⁸³, etc.

The absolutive is therefore the case that marks the subject of intransitive verbs as well as the direct object of transitive-ergative verbs.

4. *The “Antipassive” Sentence Structure with Sub-types*

a) This sentence construction occurs when a semantically transitive verb appears without a direct object, i.e. when it is syntactically intransitive. The verb is marked as lexically transitive through the vowel *-i-*.

Verbs like *tad-* “love”, *tan-* “make”, *han-* “give birth”, *pašš-* “send”, *kad-* “say”, *hil(l)-* “inform”, *ar-* “give” etc. can appear in the antipassive.

Formation Method: The transformation from the transitive to the antipassive construction proceeds by the following steps:

The action’s subject (noun or pronoun) loses the ergative marker *-š*, i.e. its case goes from ergative to absolutive.

The direct object in the absolutive case is no longer written out; in typologically related languages like Dyrbal the object can be written out, but in an oblique case and not the absolutive. In the Hurrian of the Mittani letter, however it appears that such a possibility of expressing the object probably did not exist (see however c) below).

However, the dialect of the so-called “Old-Hurrian” does show obviously comparably constructions, in which the transitive verbal form with *-i=b* can occur either without an object (“reduced” antipassive) or with the object in the Essive case (“extended” antipassive). (For details see the Chapter “Old Hurrian”).

The verb in the antipassive construction uses the characteristic forms of the intransitive conjugation. (Hence they use the negation suffix *-kkV-* and the person marker *-tta*, *-mma*, etc., which for the 3rd person singular a null-marker; in “Old Hurrian” there appears the person marker of the intransitive verbs *-b*.)

⁸³ Null sign for the third person singular, not *-nna!*

The distinction between intransitive and antipassive usages of transitive verbs is therefore restricted to the theme vowel, which is *-a-* with the intransitive and *-i-* with the antipassive (and transitive) verbs. Also with the antipassive no *-t-* of intransitivity appears after *-oš-* and *-et-*. This is inferred from the following examples from the Mittani letter :

The Ergative Sentence

¹[M]a-ni-en-na-a-an š[e-e]-ni-[íw-wu-u]š pa-aš-šu-u-u-ša (Mit II 107-108)

i.e. *Mane=nna=ân šen(a)=iff=u=š pašš=oš=a*

“And my brother (subject) has sent Mane (object)”

The Antipassive Sentence

Un-du-ma-a-an še-e-ni-í[w-w]e-e-en pa-aš-š[u-ši (Mit II 107)

i.e. *undo=mân šen(a)=iffe=n(na) pašš=oš=i*

(null marker for the 3rd person singular)

“Now has my brother (absolutive) sent” (object not written).

b) Besides the transitive verbs that have examples of antipassive constructions, there are also verbs that appear to be used exclusively as antipassives, i.e. for which a transitive usage is unlikely; these verbs include e.g. *an-* “be pleasing” *šurv=ust-* “do evil”:

e.g. Mit II 103 ... šur-wu-uš-ti-ik-ki-i-in ...

i.e. ...*šurv=ušt=i=kki=n(na)* ... “... he does not do evil ...”

With this interpretation Hurrian can be said to have, besides the transitive and intransitive verbs, a third category of verbs, which overall appear intransitive.

c) A still further usage of the antipassive is that in which the terms shift closer to the passive: Not only does the agent appear in the absolutive, but also the patient:

e.g. Mit IV 16 f. ti-w[a]-a-al-la-a-an šur-we še-e-ni-íw-wu-ta ka-ti-ik-ki

i.e. *tivalla=an (tiv(e>)a=lla=ân) šurve šen(a)=iff=u=da kad=i=kki*

“evil words were not said to my brother”

In this example sentence, not only the agent is in the absolutive, but also the patient (“evil words”), whereas the agent is completely skipped, so that a passive translation is made possible (Girbal, SMEA 29, 1992, 171 ff.; Plank, Xenia 21 1998 91).

This sentence however could also belong to the following sentence type (d) . The word transliterated above as *šur-we* could instead be read as *šur-wa* (the sign WA in the Mittani Letter does not have an established reading for the vowel), which would give *šurv(e)=a* in the Essive case, and similarly with *tiv(e)=a=lla=ân* (thus in this case there is not the transition of the final vowel *e > a* before the enclitic pronoun *-lla*, but the *a* of the Essive). The antipassive verb form *kad=i=kki* would then possess a target in the Essive case “they do not say an evil word to my brother”. With this interpretation, the language of the Mittani-letter has the opportunity to construct an antipassive in which a patient is expressed in the form of the indirect object (see also Plank, Xenia 21, 1988, 91).

d) In the language of the so-called “Old Hurrian” the option of forming transitive non-ergative sentences in which a target is expressed using the Essive case (“expanded” antipassive) is attested to multiple times. This sentence type allows in a certain sense for an accusative translation (see above S102 and below S 111)

e.g. KBo 32: 13 I 12 *el(i)=a fahr=o=š(e)=a tan=d=i=b*
 “she (the goddess Allani) celebrates a lovely festival”

In this sentence the object *eli-* “festival” appears in the Essive case with *-a*: *el(i)=a* (Haas/Wegner, Recension of StBoT 32, in OLZ 92, 1997, 445).

5. *Nominal sentences* are mainly used in sentence-personal-names (see Speiser IH 209; Chačikjan Churr. I urart. 125. See here also S 145 and 170). For an example from the Mittani letter see Lesson 4 SS24 Line 53; from Nuzi there is the example case of the personal name *enna-madi* “The gods are wisdom”, from Boğazköy *Nikkal-madi* “(the goddess) Nikkal is wisdom”.

6. *The Relative Sentence*

Hurrian demonstrates two strategies for forming relative sentences. The relative sentence in the narrow sense is generated with the structure described under point a).

a) This relative sentence is introduced by the particle *ije-/ija-* + an enclitic pronoun in the absolutive (this from the series *-tta, --ma* etc.) + a particle *-nin*, whereby for the 3rd person singular *-me/-ma* can appear for the 3rd person plural *-lle/-lla*. *ije-* or *ija-* is used without a recognized distinction. Relative sentences begun with the particle *ije-/ija-* without enclitics are not known. The reference noun is generally incorporated into the relative sentence. With the relative sentences starting with *ije-/ija-* does not need the verb to be nominalized using *-šše*, this can be done, however (see c below).

Example without *-šše*:

Ije=mâ=nîn tive Mane=š šen(a)=iff=u=da kad=ill=ed=a=mmaman fahr=[o-
 (Mit II 101 f.)

Relative + enclitic Pronoun + Particle *-nin tive* (Abs.) *Mane=š* (Erg.)

šen=iff=u=da (brother-my-directive) *kad=ill=ed=a* (future 3rd person singular)

fahr=[o-

“the thing, which Mane will say to my brother, is g[ood”

b) The second option for forming a relative clause occurs when the verb –whose finite form remains unchanged— is nominalized with the morpheme *-šše*. The relative sentence is now a nominal and is made congruent with its reference word following the pattern of the genitive attribute, i.e. the “suffixaufnahme”. Thus the *-šše*-nominalized verbs correspond to the rules of the “Suffixaufnahme” and contain the case endings of the reference word, as well as the “carrier-suffixes” *-NE/-NA-* before the ending of the nominalized verbal form.

Examples with –šše:

tive=na tan=oš=a=šše=na (Mit III 53 56)

“the things, which he had done ...”

tuppe nihar(i)=ne=v ear=oš=av=šše=NE=ve (Mit III 40 f)

“the tablet of the dowry, which I have given, ...”

c) These two strategies are now most often combined with each other, i.e. the most commonly found form for a relative sentences has not only the relative particle *ije-/ija-* but also a verbal form nominalized by –šše.

Example sentence with the relative particle *ije-/ija-* and the –šše-nominalized verb.

ija=lla=nîn ômin(i)=na šu(e>)a=lla=man eše=ne tupp=a=šše=na

(Mit IV 124 f.)

=*lla* enclitic pronoun 3rd person plural Absolutive in attached to the start of the sentence, it pluralizes the verbal form *tupp=a*, hence: “they are present”; *tupp-* “be present” + *a* intransitive marker + *šše* nominalizer + *na*, this –*na* corresponds to the plural in the reference noun *ômin(i)=na*. “All the countries, which are present on the earth...”

d) Both strategies are also used with relative sentences without reference nouns; where this does not appear, these constructions have no referent.

Example without reference noun, but with the relative particle *ije-*:

ije=mâ=nîn Kelia=š Mane=š=nnâ=ân kul=ed=a ... urh(i>)a=lla=ân

(Mit IV 27 ff)

“What Kelia and Malia will say ... is true”

(The plural the verbal form --*kul=ed=a* is 3rd person singular—can be omitted when in the sentence the plural subject appears as such [Bush GHL 209].)

Example without reference noun, but with a verb nominalized by –šše:

šen(a)=iff=u=va=lla=ân keban=ošav=šše=na keban=oš=av=lla=man

(Mit III 17 f)

“That (meaning the thing) which I have sent to my brother, I have sent...”

Summary: The structure of Relative sentences is thus characterized, that the reference word of a relative sentence—entirely independent from the attested case form from the syntax of the main clause—appears as the direct object of the relative sentence or as the subject of an intransitive relative clause (for the latter see the previous example Mit III 17 f). When the reference word is not to appear in the absolutive singular, it is marked through the –šše-nominalized verb the relative sentence through suffixaufnahme as the attribute of the reference word.

Like all the examples show, the nucleus in the relative clause is therefore always to be thought of in the absolutive, even when the reference word possesses its own casing. Cases in which the reference word appears in the Ergative, and hence is treated as the agent of the nominalized transitive verb, are not proven. Thus in Hurrian a sentence

like the example “my brother (agent), who gave a gift...” cannot be made, only the expression “the gift, which my brother gave...” is possible.

(For the relative sentence see also C. Lehmann, *Der Relativsatz, Typologie seiner Strukturen, theorie seiner Funktionen, Kompendium seiner Grammatik*, Tübingen, 1984, 75 ff.; F. Plank, *Das Hurritsche und die Sprachwissenschaft*, *Xenia* 21, 1988, 85 ff.)

E. “Old Hurrian”

Under the label “Old Hurrian” in the literature there are texts that in their form-inventory, and after Chačikjan also in their structure, deviate from the Mittani letter.⁸⁴ Included among these “Old Hurrian” texts there are:

1. The foundation inscription of Tiš-atal of Urkesh (ca 1970).
2. The roughly 10 old Babylonian oaths from southern Mesopotamia (“Non-canonical oath texts”).
3. The six texts from Mari (oath-texts and a letter)
 - 3a. A Hurrian oath-text from Tell Bi’a that represents a duplicate of Mari Text Nr 4.
4. The Sumerian-Hurrian bilingual from Ugarit
5. Beyond that, there are certain phenomena of the texts from Boğazköy, particularly the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual, that exhibit this language form.
6. Personal Names.

What distinguished the so-called “Old Hurrian” from the remaining Hurrian?

For this determination one can once again follow Chačikjan (following Diakonoff HuU 111) who drew attention typological shift in Hurrian. Chačikjan identified a shift in Hurrian, in which the language over the course of time changed from a language with a predominantly “active”⁸⁵ structure to a language with an ergative structure.

Languages that have an “active” structure share the fundamental characteristic in the conjugation of the verbs, an opposition between verbs of being and verbs of action. The two groups are conjugated in different ways.

With the ergative structure there is instead the opposition between transitive and intransitive verbs.

Whereas all transitive verbs are also verbs of action, all intransitive verbs are not verbs of being. Verbs of movement “go”, “come” “enter” etc., or verbs of emotion “laugh”, “cry” etc. are in principle not transitive, but in the sense of an “active” language structure they are treated like verbs of action.

After this division of the Hurrian, Chačikjan conjugated the verb in the above-mentioned dialects of Hurrian (hence Tiš-atal, Babylonian dialect, etc.) for the 3rd person singular following the principle of the “active” structure.

The suffix *-b* is the mark of the subject with the verb of action, regardless of whether it is transitive or intransitive.

⁸⁴ The designation “Old Hurrian” was chosen because certain they share verbal forms with the oldest Hurrian text, the Tiš-atal inscription. The term is still misleading, as these verbal forms are also found in later texts.

⁸⁵ For the meaning of the “active” structure, see S 26 note 32.

The markers of the transitive /i/ and the intransitive /a/ however at the same time also are present; i.e. a transitive verb like *pašš-* “send” therefore gives:

pašš=i=b “he sent” (in Mit. **pašš=i=a*).

following Chačikjan, an intransitive verb gives:

šiw=a=b (unknown meaning).

An “action verb” like *un-* “come” is in the present

un=a=b “he comes” (Mit *un=a=Ø*)

The verbs of being have for the subject marker either \emptyset or *-n*.

The marker of being is the vocalic morpheme *-o-*.

In this model, those verbs that have the transitive marker *-i-* or the intransitive marker *-a-* of the action verbs, were constructed with the same subject marker *-b*.

The marker *-b* would then mostly disappear and only be retained in archaisms, such as in personal names.

Simultaneously there would appear in these dialects a further transitive marker, namely *-u-*.

In dialects where both the *-u-* and *-i-* exist (Tiš-atal), *-u-* has the function of a marker for the transitive perfect: *pa=ašt=u=m* “he built”, while *-i-* appears to be an aspectless form (however not for all persons) of the transitive verb.

The distribution of these transitive markers would then be the following:

-i- in the aspectless form

-u- in the transitive perfective form, whereas

-a appears in the intransitive form and

-o is the marker of being in personal names (like *Tad=o=Heba*)

Wilhelm, FsHeger, 1992, 667, has shown that the “theme vowel” of the transitive past or perfect tense can not only use *-u-* but also *-o-*, and that it is the same term with the supposed marker of being *-o-* (Wilhelm, FsHeger 1992 669). The differentiation between *-u-* and *-o-* is therefore weak. The name *Tad=o=Heba* does not mean “He~~ba~~ is loved”, but also “He~~ba~~ loves (specifically the name carrier)”.

The Suffix *-m* of the Urkesh dialect Chačikjan (“On the Typology of the Hurro-Urartian Verb” in Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East, Studies in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff, 1982, 165; dies Churr. I urart., 81 f) regards as a variant of the subject-marker *-b* of the transitive and action verbs. This was however before Wilhelm, FsHeger, 1992, 667 rightfully rejected this.

The past tense marker (=perfect marker) *-oš-* and the future marker (=imperfect marker) *-et-* are still not found in these dialects.

The system deduced by Diakonoff and Chačikjan began as:

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Trans. <i>-i-</i> action verbs without object <i>-a-</i> | Subject marker <i>-b</i> |
| <i>-u-</i> | <i>-m</i> |
| Verbs of state | |
| <i>-o-</i> | \emptyset / n |

With a later development of inscriptions the distinction between action verbs and verbs of state collapsed, resulting in the following scheme:

| | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Trans. | Action Verb and State Verb | |
| <i>-i-</i> | | <i>-a-</i> |
| <i>-u-</i> | <i>-o-</i> | |
| Subject Marker <i>-b</i> | \emptyset | |

What Diakonoff (HuU 111, 118, 139) and following him, Chačikjan (Churr. I urart. 20-21), regarded as the distinction between a) *-u-* transitive and b) *-o-* “Participle of state ... of the object of the action” is –as shown above --- no longer accepted (Wilhelm, FsHeger 1992, 669). Instead it appears that these are one and the same morpheme /o/.

For the thesis of a change in Hurrian from a language with a basically “active” language structure to a language with an Ergative structure, the material that Chačikjan at that time had at her disposal was not extensive and the meaning of the above-mentioned forms was not certain. Here the bilingual makes further insights possible.

The language form of the bilingual is distinct from that of the Mittani-letter and shows a greater similarity to the language of the Tiš-atal Inscription (on account of the verbal form =o=m) and to certain other Hurrian texts from Boğazköy.

The “Archaisms (altertümlichkeit)” of the Hurrian language of the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual now yield an abundance of examples of the so-called “predicative participle” (Diakonoff HuU 141) with =i=b and =a=b as well as the ergative verbal form with =o=m. The question for the function of the final term *-b* in the numerous examples of the verbal forms with =i=b and =a=b is however not yet conclusively answered, we find the *-b* as a verb ending of the third person as a subject marker of transitive non-ergative and intransitive verbs, whereas *-m* is a transitive ergative verb ending of the 3rd person singular. The personal suffix *-b* appears both as a singular and also with plural subjects of the third person, the verbal form in the latter case being without a distinct plural marker. The plural in these cases is therefore expressed through the nominal or the pronominal subject (see Wilhelm FsHeger 1992, 662; finally also Neu StBoT 32,1996, 25).

Besides the intransitive marker *-a-* and the transitive marker *-i-*, there is in this language form (and also in the above mentioned older texts) another transitive marker *-o-*. The *-o-* marker is used however only with transitive verbs in the ergative sentence construction, whereas the *-i-* marker appears with transitive verbs in non-ergative constructions (comparable to the “Antipassive” of the Mittani letters) (Wilhelm, FsHeger, 1992, 659

ff.) However the “antipassive” sentence type appears in the bilingual with two patterns (Haas, AoF 20, 1993, 263 Note 15; Haas/Wegner, Rezension zu StBoT 32 in OLZ 92, 1997, 444-446):

- a) The transitive verbal form with $=i=b$ formed without an object, the subject appearing in the absolutive. We refer to these as the “*reduced antipassive*”
- b) The transitive verbal form with $=i=b$ which has the object in an oblique case (Essive or also $-ne$), the subject being in the absolutive. This construction is referred to as the “*expanded antipassive*”.

The intransitive, like the transitive non-ergative verb of the 3rd Person, is also formed with the subject-marker $-b$, the transitive-ergative form of the 3rd person singular is made with the subject marker $-m$, with the corresponding, if rare plural forms lacking the $-m$. Against the equation of $-m$ with $-b$, as Chačkijan has suggested (“On the Typology of the Hurro-Urartian Verb” in: Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East in Honour of I.M. Diakonoff, 1982, 165; Churr i urart 81 f), the latter also replaces the third person plural. On the other hand in the bilingual both forms with $=o=m$ and with $=o=b$ are found side-by-side, e.g.: pu-ú-zi-hu-um ($puz=i\bar{h}=o=m$) and pu-ú-zi-hu-ub ($puz=i\bar{h}=o=b$) in KBo 32: 14 Rs 23-24 (see Neu StBoT 32, 1996, 169. Allowing for the possibility of actual graphical variants, there are also the side-by-side examples of na-ah-ha-am and na-ah-ha-ab, both “he sits”).

Deriving from the above statements comes the following organization of the sentence types (see also Wilhelm, FsHegerm 1992, 659 ff.; New StBoT 32, 1996, 304; Haas AoF 20, 1993, 263 Note 15; Haas/Wegner, rezension to StBoT 32 in OLZ 92, 1997, 444-446):

- 1) **The Ergative Sentence** with subject in the ergative, object in the absolutive and the verbal form with
 - $=o=m$ (transitive 3rd Person Singular, in ergative construction)
e.g. *kazi taballi=š ... tab=ašt=o=m* (KBo 32 : 14 I 42)
“a smith ... poured a cup”
 - $=id=o$ (transitive 3rd Person Plural in ergative construction, thus far only a few examples)
e.g. *tun=id=o pug=ang=ai âbi evr(i)=i=va* (KBo 32: 14 IV 17f)
“they could transfer it before its gentlemen”
evern(i)=a kešhi=ne ag=id=o (KBo 32: 20 I 16’)
“they conducted (the *Ešeb=abu*) as a gentleman to the throne”
 - $=o$ (no secure whether this belongs here or under Number 4)
- 2) **The Antipassive Sentence** with subject in the absolutive and the verbal form with:
 - $=i=b$ (transitive, non-ergative: “*reduced antipassive*”)
e.g. *far=i=n(n)i=ma muš=i=b* (KBo 32: 13 I 21)
“the bread-baker however positioned”
mallad(e)=ae=l(la) un=i=b (KBo 32: 13 I 23)
“with a bowl they brought” ($=l(la)$ is the pronominal substitute of the subject in the absolutive)
 - $=i$ (transitive non-ergative, occasional form without $-b$)
e.g. *idenni alu=i=b hill=i išan(i)=i=da* (KBo 32: 14 Rs. 38)

“the builder spoke, he said to his insides”

2a) **The Antipassive Sentence** with subject in the absolute, object in an oblique case and the verbal form with

=*i=b* (transitive, non-ergative with object in an oblique case like -*a* essive or -*ne* “extended antipassive”)

e.g. *fand=ar=i=n(n)i=na=ma ag=i=b nehern(i)=a* (Essive)
(KBo 32: 13 I 22)

“the cook however brought (literally guided) the breast meat”

el(i)=a fahr=o=š(e)=a tan=d=i=b ... Allani (KBo 32: 13 I 12)

“the goddess Allani celebrated a beautiful festival”

kirenz(i)=a=mma [š]ar=i=b (KBo 32: 15 I 4’-5’)

“and (-*mma*) it demands release”

olvi=ne=ma amm=i=b ommin(i)=ne (KBo 32: 14 I 19-20)

“(The deer) reached another land”

3) **The Intransitive Sentence** with the subject in the absolute and the verbal form with:

=*a=b* (intransitive)

e.g. *tapašahi=na zugm=ušt=a=b* (KBo 32: 13 I 21)

“The mouth-giving came in”

=*a* (intransitive, occasionally a form without -*b*)

e.g. *Allani=ma ... meh=a* (KBo 32: 13 I 28 f)

“(the goddess) Allani, however, went in...”

4) Sentences with unclear verbal forms with -*u* (these could partly also belong under [1]).

=*u* (unclear verbal morpheme. In Mittani it is also found in forms like *ur=om=u* Mit IV 47. Verbs with these elements attached do not have terms like an object in the absolute. They are thus in a sense intransitive):

e.g. *idenni haš=i==m=ai far=u išan(i)=i=da* (KBo 32: 14 Rs 28)

“as the builder heard (this), displeasure (*far=u*) pulled into his inside”

Verbal forms of the type =*i=b*, =*a=b* and =*o=m* cannot be combined with terms like the -*oš*- of the preterit and -*et*- future. They do occur before forms like -*Všt*-, -*ill*-, -*ahh*-, -*uš*- and -*u/ol*- (see Wilhelm FsHeger 1992, 670), for which perhaps the label “root-extensions” is not true, instead they probably represent either an action type or aspect marker. Neu StBoT 32, 1996, 6 tends in the same direction: “... the Hurrian language of the bilingual (has) an unmistakable aspectual structure of the verbal system –in connection with temporal cases. The aspect system allows Hurrian to be the forerunner of the tense system, whereby the root extension and action types also play an essential roll. For this complex however further clarification of the whole context of the verbal system is necessary.”

The sentence type of the so-called “Old Hurrian” is now attached to the Hurrian sentence names derived from the most ancient times. Since Akkadian times and later passed down throughout the whole region where Hurrian was circulated, sentence-names in most of

their verbal element follow the above-mentioned paradigm of the so-called “Old Hurrian” (i.e. forms with *-b* and *-m*). The first component of such sentence-names is most often a verbal form of the 3rd person with *-a=b*, *-i=b* or *-o=m*, followed by a nominal element, which in the oldest personal names can still appear without a theme vowel. Sentence-names of this type are for example *Un=a=b Teššub* “Teššub came”, *Ar=i=b enni* “the diety gave” or *Ar=o=m Teššub* “Teššub have given (the child)”

In later times we frequently find the tendency to lose elements of the verbal element, e.g. *Pud=o(=m) Heba* “Hebat has created (him)”. (Name giving in Hurrian is discussed in detail by Wilhelm in RIA Band 9 under Name, Namengebung, D.).

Besides the sentence types discussed above, the bilingual also presents sentences with sentence patterns identical to those of the Mittani letter. In particular there are examples of the 3rd person singular transitive with *=i=a* (e.g. *tal=i=a* beside *tal=ahh=o=m*).

The tense markers *-oš-* of the preterit and *-et-* of the future are very rare in the bilingual; however they do exist, as the following examples show:

Present (unmarked): *tal=i=a*, *pal=i=a*, *kad=i=a*

Preterit (*-oš-*): *zaz=ol=oš=a*, *nahh=oš=a*

Future (*-et-*): *pah=ed=a*

The future form with *-et-* occasionally produces modal inflections:

Table 12: The suffix sequence of the “Old Hurrian” Verb

| Root | Root Extension | Root extension? Probably aspect or action type | Plural Marker | Transitive/ Intransitive Marker | Subject Marker |
|------|----------------|--|---------------|---|---|
| | -ar- -Všt-? | -ill- -ahh- -uš- -Všt- ? | -id- | -o (trans. erg.) -i (trans. Non-erg.) -a (intrans.) -a (intrans. with verbs of motion) -u (unclear, likely with intrans. verbs of action) | -m (3 Pers. Sg. Agent) -Ø (Null-marker of the 3 Person Pl.) -b (3 Person) -b (3. Person) -Ø (with 3.Pers.Sg.) -Ø (with 3.Pers.Sg.) |

Examples:

uv=o=m “it slaughtered (cattle)”

am=ar=ill=o=m “he did evil to”

pa=ašt=o=m “he built”

tun=id=o “they could”

(KBo 32: 13 I 15) (trans. Erg. 3rd Person Singular)

(KBo 32: 14 I 21) (trans. Erg. 3rd Person Singular)

(KBo 32: 14 Rs 35) (trans. Erg. 3rd Person Singular)

(KBo 32: 14 IV 17) (trans. Erg. 3rd Person Plural)

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>muš=i=b</i> “they arranged” | (KBo 32: 13 I 21) (trans. Non-Erg. 3 rd Person Pl.) |
| <i>nahh=a=b</i> “he sits” | (KBo 32: 13 I 4) (intrans. 3 rd Person Singular) |
| <i>un=a</i> “he comes” | (Mit II 14) (Intrans. 3 rd Person singular) |
| <i>un=a=tta</i> “I come” | (Chs I/5 Nr/ 64 IV 3’) (intrans. 1 st Person Singular) |
| <i>par=u</i> “it drew into (its inside) displeasure” | (KBo 32: 14 I 50) (designation of a procedure, but without an object in the absolutive) |

Sentences with the transitive, non-ergative verbal form *=i=b* can –as discussed above– also have an object: this appears not in the absolutive, like the agent, but in an oblique case (Essive of *-a* or the so-called “article” singular *-ni/ne* is used). These extended forms of the antipassive construction allow in practice an “accusative” translation:

e.g. *el(i)=a* (Essive) *fahr=o=š(e)=a* (Essive) *tan=d=i=b* ^D*Allani*
(KBo 32: 13 I 12)

“She (the goddess) Allani celebrated a beautiful festival”

fan=ar=i=n(n)i=na=ma ag=i=b nehern(i)=a (Essive) (KBo 32: 13 I 22)

“The cooks brought the breast meat”

When the subject is not expressed through a noun, then the enclitic pronoun of the third person plural absolutive *-lla* is used as the plural marker of the action’s subject:

e.g. *mallad(e)=ae=l(la) un=i-b* (KBo 32: 13 I 23)

“With a bowl they (*-lla*: meaning the cooks) brought”

(The enclitic absolutive pronoun *-lla* replaces the subject “they” (meaning the cooks) and not the named object “the breast meat”, which appears in the singular; the Hittite translation: “and they brought them (-aš Acc. Plural.c.) ... herein” (see Neu StBoT 32, 261) is based on a subject-object confusion, like occur throughout the rest of the bilingual [For subject-object confusion in Akkadian transcriptions of Hurrian texts in Nuzi, see Wilhelm AoAT 9, 1970, 61-63 and Diakonoff HuU 154. For other cases in the bilingual see G. Wilhelm, Die Könige von Ebla, FsKlengel, AoF 24/2, 1997, 283 Not 36])

Sentences of these types with the action’s subject in person other than the 3rd Person singular or 3rd Person plural are not attested. The conditions that determine the choice of either the transitive ergative or the transitive non-ergative object-containing sentences has not been investigated.

Beside the above separately treated forms of the 3rd person, which obviously encode another pattern, the bilingual also contains verbal forms that correspond to those in the Mittani Letter.

“he did not give (something)” (KBo 32: 15 IV 16: a-ri-ja-am-ma,
i.e. *ar=i=a=(m)ma*)

This morpheme is written in the Mittani letter as a single *m*, in Boğazköy it occurs most often with the double *mm*. It is not to be confused with the enclitic particle *-(m)ma* “and, but” and the enclitic pronoun of the 2nd person singular *-mma* “you”.

Intransitive and antipassive negated verbs are formed with the suffix *-kkV-* (the formation perfectly matches that of the Mittani Letters):

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----|---|------------|----------|----|-------|---|
| Root | + | RE | + | intrans. + | Negation | + | Vowel | |
| | | | | o[<a] | + | kk | + | o |
| kud | | + | | o | + | kk | + | o |
| “he did not fall” (KBo 32: 31+208 Vs 11: ku-du-uk-ku) | | | | | | | | |
| pend | | + | | o | + | kk | + | o |
| “he did not turn his back” (KBo 32: 31+208 Vs.12: be-en-du-uk-ku) | | | | | | | | |
| Antipassive | | | | transitive | | | | |
| | | | | i | + | kk | + | i |
| an | + | ašt | + | i | + | kk | + | i |
| “he was not happy” (KBo 32: 15 21’ a-na-aš-ti-ik-ki) | | | | | | | | |

c) The negation *-bur* in *mann=o=bur* “he is not” (e.g. KBo 32: 14 I 17, ma-a-an-nu-u-bur) does not allow further interpretation. This negation morpheme is not found in the Mittani letter, but beyond the bilingual it is also in other Boğazköy texts: e.g. ChS I/1 Nr 41 III 75, 78 ku-ul-du-pur (*ku=d=o=bur* probably the root *kul-* “speak” with the root extension *-t-* attached).

d) The suffix combination *-ubad-* in cases like *nahh=ubad(e)=uš* “not populated”, *kul=ubad=e* “not named”, *fahr=ubad=e* “not good” or *nir=ubad=e* “not good, bad” (Ugarit Vocabulary RS 94-2939 Col V 11’, described in B. André-Salvini/M/ Salvini in SCCNH 9 1983, 3 ff. 14) can perhaps be segmented into *-uw(a)+ade-*; in *-uw(a)-* probably lies the above mentioned negation morpheme *-wa-*. In the Mittani Letter there are also forms with *-ubad-* (abstracts from adjectives), but an obviously negative meaning is often ruled out (Wegner SMEA 36, 1995, 97 ff.)

Verbal forms with the element *-uva* have in contrast to the forms with *=o=m* a durative or descriptive character (Neu FsOtten 1988 244 ff.); possibly there is here an opposition between “punctual” (*-o-*) versus “durative” (*-uva-*) (Wegner SMEA 36, 1995, 97 ff)
e.g. KBo 32: 14 I 28 *hapš=ar=uva* “he directed (the eyes toward something)”.

The Jussive and other Modal Forms in the Bilingual

Voluntative

| | | | | |
|------------|------|---------|----|---|
| 1.Sg. | =i= | l+e | | (<i>kad=il=(i)=l+e</i> “I should say” KBo 32: 11 I 4 <i>ka-ti-il-li</i>) |
| Imperative | | | | |
| 2.Sg. | =i/e | | | (<i>nakk=i/e</i> “release!” KBo 32: 19 I 1, 3 <i>n[a]-ak-ki</i>) |
| Pl. | =e+ | | š | (e.g. <i>kol=e=š</i> “discharge!” KBo 32: 14 I 23 <i>ku-u-le-eš</i>) |
| 3.Pers. | =i= | | en | (<i>haš=i=en</i> “he should hear”) |
| or | | =u[o] | | (<i>kud=o</i> “he should fall” “it is to be felled” KBo 32:14 I 57 <i>ku-ú-du</i> ; <i>kir=o</i> “he shall be freed” KBo 32: 15 IV 3 <i>ki-i-ru</i>) |
| but also | | =u[o]=š | | (<i>zamm+al+ašt=o=š</i> “shall be ragged” KBo 32: 14 I 57 <i>za-am-ma-la-aš-du-uš</i> <i>parn=ošt=o=š</i> “he shall be clean” ChS I/5 Nr 2 64’ <i>bar-nu-uš-du-uš</i>) |
| Pl. | =i= | (i)d | en | (<i>ha=i=(i)d=en</i> “they must take” KBo 32: 14 I 13 <i>ha-a-i-te-in</i>) |
| or | | =u[o]=š | | (<i>itk=o=š</i> “they shall clean/be cleaned” ChS I/1 Nr. 8 III 9’ <i>it-ku-uš</i>) |

An intensive-desiderative transitive modal form can be represented as follows, see also above S 93.

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|------|------|---|--|
| Sg. | =i+l= | | anni | (<i>id=i+l+anni</i> “it shall strike still” KBo 32: 14 I 6 <i>i-ti-la-a-an-ni</i>) | |
| Pl. | =i= | (i)d | = | anni | (<i>itk=i=(i)d=anni</i> “they shall clean” ChS I/1 Nr 9 II 29 <i>it-ki-ta-an-nim</i>) |

(These forms are comparable to the Urartian Finalis-forms with *-ilanni*. See Salvini, SMEA29, 1992, 217 ff.)

The forms with *-eva* are occasionally given a meaning similar to the future.

| | | | | |
|-----|--------|-------|---|---|
| Sg. | (=il=) | eva | | (<i>un=ev=ttā</i> “I (=ttā) want to come” KBo 32: 19 I 23 <i>ú-ni-wa_a-at-tā</i>) |
| Pl. | =il= | eva = | š | (<i>eh(e)l=il=eva=š</i> “we will save (him)” KBo 32: 15 I 18’ <i>e-<u>hi</u>-il-li-wa_a-aš-</i>) |

Forms with *=ai*

| | | |
|------|-----|--|
| =i+l | =ai | (=i=following Wilhelm is not the transitive vowel but a nominalizer, it is thought that the ending <i>-ai</i> is originally a case ending and thus a nominalization theme vowel is to be expected) |
| =i+m | =ai | |

Forms with $-u/ol+il > u/oll=i$

(*zikk=u/ol=(i)l=i* “should completely break”
KBo 32: 14 I 48. Following Ney, StBoT 32,1996,
151 f., who places in this form of the intransitive,
also the reflexive use of the suffix *-ul-*; the *-il-*
is interpreted by Neu, *Orientalia* 59,1990, 224, 228
as an action-type suffix with a distributive-iterative
character; the meaning of the remaining *-i* is not
clear)

Peculiarities of the writing in the Bilingual

Especially noteworthy in the Bilingual is the graphical representation of the morpheme of the 1st person singular of the transitive verbs. While in Mittani this form is written as $-(K)a-(a)-ú$, the same form in the bilingual can be written as $-(K)a-ú$ or $-(K)a-a-ú$ or with the cuneiform sign TAP in future forms (pa-hé-tap i.e. *pah=ed=av* “I will destroy”, hu-bu-uš-tap, i.e. *hub=ošt=av* “I break”).

Difficulties regarding the interpretation of /i/ and /e/ arise because, except in the Mittani Letter, these vowels are not properly distinguished. Thus the commonly used signs BI, HI, MI, NI, IN are used for both the *i*- and the *e*-vowel, whereas the corresponding, rarer, signs BE, HÉ, ME, NE, En are predominantly used with the *e*-vowel. (Wilhelm/Giorgieri, SCCNH 7, 1995, 37 ff.)

What in the Mittani letter is a strictly followed distinction of the sign KI for /ki and gi/ and GI for /ke and ge/, is also observed in the Bilingual, however it is carried out much more carelessly.

The signs U and Ú are rather consistently distinguished and, as in the Mittani Letter, probably designate the sounds *o* and *u* respectively, it however can be inconsistent. Defective writings with the possessive pronouns, especially the 1st and 2nd person singular, are known, e.g. KBo 32 14 Vs 47 ta-bi-ri-pu-ú i.e. *tab=i=r(i)=if(f)=u=(v)e*, literally “my caster”.