Contact Languages of the Ancient Near East

- Three more Case Studies

(Ugaritic-Hurrian, Hurro-Akkadian and Canaano-Akkadian)

Alexander Andrason and Juan-Pablo Vita
University of Stellenbosch
CSIC – ILC Madrid
andrason@sun.ac.za
jp.vita@csic.es

Abstract

This article describes and analyzes three situations of linguistic contact in the Ancient Near East, taking, as its staring point three theoretical studies on contact languages which have been developed recently: the framework of mixed languages (Bakker and Matras, 2013; Meakins 2013), the theory of written language contact (Johanson, 2013) and the approach to contact among genetically related languages (Epps, Huehnergard and Pat-El, 2013a). The authors argue that the contact systems selected for this article (Ugaritic-Hurrian, Hurro-Akkadian and Canaano-Akkadian), although distinct from the grammatical and sociolinguistic perspective, can all be viewed as expressions of the same dynamic phenomena, where each variety of mixing corresponds to a different stage of a universal continuum of languages in the situation of merger. Consequently, they can be located along the universal cline of mixing: Ugaritic-Hurrian matches the initial stage of intermingling, Hurro-Akkadian reflects gradually more intense blending, and Canaano-Akkadian corresponds to the phase of a profound fusion of the two source codes. By examining and comparing the three cases of mixing, the authors introduce new insights to the general discussion on mixed languages, written language contact and relevance of genetic relation in language intermingling, thus corroborating and/or refining certain hypotheses and propositions that have previously been formulated within the latest theoretical studies.

Keywords
mixed languages – written language contact – contact of related languages – Ancient Near East – Semitic – Hurrian

1. Introduction[1]

Recently, two books have made an important contribution to the field of language contact. The first one – *Contact Languages: A Comprehensive Guide,* edited by Bakker and Matras (2013) offered an in-depth analysis of various types of languages in contact, including their properties and typology. In this volume, in particular, Meakins (2013) proposed a sophisticated study of mixed languages, while Johanson (2013) formulated a framework specifically designed to deal with the interaction of written languages. The other publication – edited by Epps, Huehnergard and Pat-El (2013a) and presented as a thematic volume of *Journal of Language Contact* – raised the question of what the possible implications of genetic relation for contact between languages might be. This work mainly focused on the analysis of ancient languages and studied, among others, the interaction between languages belonging to the Semitic family: between Aramaic and Neo-Babylonian (Beaulieu, 2013), between Hebrew and Aramaic (Pat-El, 2013) and amongst old Arabic dialects of Arabia (Al-Jallad, 2013).

Our paper continues the debate raised by these two valuable works. It aims to interact with these publications by applying their findings and/or testing their hypotheses, directing the scope of the discussion to language contact in the Ancient Near East in the 2nd millennium BCE. By doing so, we will familiarize the linguistic community with ancient contact languages that are less known: Ugaritic-Hurrian, Hurro-Akkadian and Canaano-Akkadian. Additionally, we hope that the three case studies selected for this article will be able to shed some light on the language contact phenomenon, corroborating and/or refining certain propositions formulated in the two aforementioned books.

The article will be structured in the following manner. First, the theoretical frame of reference which underlies the present study and which is based on the two said publications will be introduced (section 2). Next, the three cases of language contact in the Ancient Near East of the 2nd millennium BCE will be described and discussed in light of the recently formulated theories (section 3). Lastly, main conclusions will be drawn and the implications for a general discussion on contact languages will be proposed (section 4).

2. Theoretical frame of reference

Certain Ancient Near-Eastern texts from the second millennium BCE, mix elements of related and/or non-related languages in a written form – arguably in a deliberate manner – constituting cases of a written-language contact of both related and non-related linguistic codes. Accordingly, they necessitate a joint use of three perspectives in order to be accurately described and analyzed: the framework of mixed languages (which is typical of languages that, in a deliberate manner and in situations of bilingualism, make use of two original codes), the theory of written language contact (which explains linguistic contact specific for written codes) and the genetically sensitive model of language contact (which specifies possible implications for language contact that derive from the genetic relation existing between the interacting codes). In the following sections, these three theoretical frames, necessary for our study, will be presented in detail.

2.1. Mixed languages

The prototype of a mixed language can be characterized by grammatical and socio-linguistic traits: on the one hand, contrary to non-mixed systems, a mixed language descends from two or more parent codes, failing to be classifiable in historical terms of a phylogenetic tree and, on the other hand, in contrast with other contact languages, it emerges from situations of bilingualism, being a product of expressive needs and constituting a relatively deliberate process (Meakins 2013:180). However, it is necessary to emphasize that mixed languages

reflect complex situations found in the real world and, thus, display a considerable degree of typological variation. They comprise a continuum of prototypicality rather than a class of invariant traits. They also vary with respect to the type of mixing (the split in the contribution of the source codes can involve 'lexicon versus grammar' or 'verbal system versus nominal system') and in their degree of the grammatical type of mixing (the grammar may be derived from only one source language, or both source languages contribute significantly, forming a continuum from less grammatical mixing to more grammatical mixing; Matras, 2000; Meakins, 2013: 179, 210, 215).

The typological variation of mixed languages covering cases that range from less to more prototypical can be explained by relating the various types, distinguished for such synchronic linguistic systems, to stages on a cline representing the evolution of mixed languages and their gradual increase and/or intensification of intermingling. In the discussion of the origins and the development of mixed languages, two positions are usually defended: unidirectional view and fusional view. Unidirectional approaches to the genesis of mixed languages—more common than the fusional ones, seemingly—posit a one-way shift from a source language to a target language by means of the processes of borrowing and/or code-switching. As far as the borrowing is concerned, with the increase of the intensity and length of the bilingual contact that exists between the source codes, loans pass from involving non-basic vocabulary or functions previously missing in the target language to being related to syntax (word order and deep word structure) and morphology (inflectional and derivational affixes), through the stage where functional words (adpositions, pronouns and numerals) are transferred. At the apogee of this path, the use of inflectional morphology and/or syntax from both source languages leads to the impossibility of the identification of the one "grammar language"—due to the grammar being an interwoven composite of both (Meakins, 2013: 187-190; Thomason and Kaufman, 1988: 74-75; Thomason 2001).

With respect to codeswitching, mixed languages show a gradual progression from pragmatically conditioned codeswitching—first alternational (a mere alternation of structures from two different languages) and, later, insertional (the grammar of one language is more dominant, constituting the frame of insertion for the other language)—to genuine mixed languages, which typically cease to provide cases of alternational codeswitching and develop structures that, albeit functionally equivalent in the two source languages, acquire specialized uses in their mix. The intermediate phase is referred to as 'language mixing'. At this stage, although the two source codes still exhibit patterns of codeswitching, the social and pragmatic associations of this linguistic strategy are lost as such language switches are gradually determined by more regular syntactic factors and structural constraints (Meakins, 2013: 190-191).[2] One should note that insertional codeswitching is the most influential in the genesis of mixed language, being able to be conventionalized and grammaticalized into a stable and autonomous complex (Meakins, 2013: 213-215). The other group of approaches to the origin of mixed languages includes fusional hypothesis, whereby two languages merge or combine their components—by means of the mechanisms of borrowing and codeswitching analogical to those discussed above—rather than replace the elements of one by the features of the other (Bakker, 1997: 210; Meakins, 2013: 195).

To elaborate on a point which has previously been mentioned, it can be said that the socio-historical settings in which mixed languages of any advancement originate are quite specific, differentiating these linguistic composites from other systems that may emerge due to language contact. Mixed languages are products of prolonged coexistence of two source systems and the bilingualism of the speakers. They are also outcomes of expressive needs

---

[2] However, a given mixed language can synchronically coexist with insertional codeswitching (Meakins, 2013: 199).

rather than communicative necessities, which typically motivate the creation of pidgins and, next (if nativized), creoles. In fact, there is no particular need for a new code, since a common language that enables communication already exists. This also means that speakers who develop mixed languages employ resources available in their language consciously and creatively—for example, to mark their social, ethnic or in-group identity, or even just their distinctiveness (Thomason, 2003: 25; Matras *et al.* 2007; Meakins, 2013: 181-183, 194-195, 216).

2.2. Written language contact

The framework of written language contact has recently been developed by Johanson (2013). Johanson argues that written mixed languages constitute a phenomenon that is, to a degree, distinct from mixed spoken languages, from mixed spoken languages that are also written, and from written texts that represent oral productions of two interchanged linguistic systems. Although mixed written languages—just like linguistic intermingled systems of other types— emerge in bilingual or multilingual environments with features derivable from two or more languages, written-language contact offers properties typical to it and also different from features found in types of language intermingling. This mainly stems from the fact that written languages are more artificial or conscious than their spoken homologues (Johanson, 2013: 273).

In the context of written language contact, two codes are distinguished: a higher-ranking code (which is more prestigious and dominant, being used as a cultured, ceremonial, scientific, administrative, *lingua franca* or hegemonial variety) and a lower-ranking code (which is less prestigious and dominated, exemplified by vernacular, non-standard or local varieties). This distinction resembles the superstrate and substrate divisions in spoken language contact and/or pidgin-creole studies. Depending on the relation between the higher-ranking code and the lower-ranking code, Johanson (2013: 274) proposes the following five classes of situations of written language contact (cf. the table 1, below). Arguably, all the languages that emerge from written language contact should be classifiable in one of these groups. The specified types form an active-passive scale linking the class A to the class E. The continuum is organized following the parameter of being active, ranging from the type characterized by the most active role of the lower-ranking code (A) to the most passive role (E) of such a code in its relationship with the higher-ranking code.

Table 1 Classes of situations of written-language contact according to Johanson (2013: 274)

Type A:	Users of a lower-ranking code take over copies of elements from a higher-ranking code (e.g. copies from Latin are taken over in a written vernacular).
Type B:	Users of a lower-ranking code carry over copies of elements from this code into their variety of a higher-ranking code (e.g. copies from a vernacular are carried over to a variety of Latin).
Type C:	Elements of a higher-ranking code alternate in texts with elements of a lower-ranking code (e.g. Latin and vernacular elements alternate in texts).
Type D:	A lower-ranking code is used to explicate texts in a higher-ranking code (e.g. vernacular elements are used to explicate texts in Latin).
Type E:	Elements of a higher-ranking code are used in texts to represent a lower-ranking code (e.g. Latin elements are used to represent vernacular elements).

Type A corresponds to "adoption" from a higher-ranking system to a lower-ranking system, where the lower-ranking code offers the frame, at least a morphosyntactic one, for borrowing. The transfusion may range from few to excessive, on the one hand, and from direct (verbatim) to adapted ("lower-ized") on the other. As a result, Johanson distinguishes two subclasses of type A: one includes borrowings, which are grammatically adjusted to the hosting code while the other consists of loans that are kept separated from the framing

system, i.e. they are not adapted, being consciously treated as foreign. Type A is the most active on the passive-active scale, since the lower-ranking code is the medium of incorporation of elements (either direct or adapted) of the higher-ranking code.

Type B equals an imposition of elements from a lower-ranking code in a variety of a higher-ranking hosting code, which also constitutes the frame for transfusion. In other words, a prestige-code is used to communicate among speakers of a lower-ranking variety, being, however, impregnated by these speakers' vernacular language. The outcome is a deviation from the standard higher-ranking code. These deviations and, hence, a new code, may stem from imperfect language acquisition, although they can also constitute a fully deliberate phenomenon dictated by cultural and/or sociolinguistic motivations. As far as the parameter of "activity" of the lower-ranking system is concerned, type B can be viewed as active, albeit probably less so than it was in the case of above-mentioned type A: Even though the lower-ranking code is not the medium of adaptation, it is copied to the higher-ranking code, evidently influencing it.

Type C mixes two codes in one situation of text in comparable extents. Thus, it approximates the phenomenon of codeswitching, where two languages succeed one another. In written text, this alternation is deliberate and stems from cultural, social and political factors, as each code has a distinct function in a given texts. This class reflects an intermediate stage on the passive-active scale, given that the two codes operate in their own right.

Type D appears where a lower-ranking code explicates texts or their fragments in a higher-ranking code. It is, hence, not a hybrid language *sensu sricto*, but a uniquely written, hybrid style. It includes additional explanatory and/or didactic information aiding the reader (or the writer) in his or her interpretation of the higher-ranking text. In this class, the lower-ranking code plays a less active role than in the types described previously: the lower-ranking variety is merely employed to metalinguistically explicate the higher-ranking code.

The last class, type E, is found if the text in a higher-ranking code is employed in order to represent the language of lower rank. The most extreme form of this type is alloglottography, i.e. a situation where the text in one linguistic system is read out in another system, for instance *e.g.* in English 'for example' and not *exempli gratia*.[3] This type is the most passive on the active-passive scale, since the lower-ranking code is not expressed at all, being entirely substituted by the higher-ranking code (Johanson, 2013: 276-281, 322-323).

It should be noted that if the framework of mixed languages (see the previous section) is narrowed to written language contact, the bilingualism (necessary for creation and development of mixed codes of various advancement) may be understood as—or may be limited to—a more restrictive phenomenon, i.e. biscriptalism.[4] In such a case, the author of a given mixed text is skilled in two codes, as expressed in their written forms. The access to the two written codes (just like the bilingualism) can be gradual, ranging from more to less proficient.

2.3. Genetic relatedness or non-relatedness of source languages

As will be evident from the discussion in section 3, below, besides providing examples of language mixing and written-language contact, linguistic contact in the Ancient Near East involves a situation where both languages that are related (i.e. belonging to the same family and/or branch) and languages that fail to be genetically connected may interact.

---

[3] Concerning alloglottography, see also von Dassow (2004).
[4] The use of the term "biscriptal" can in fact be slightly confusing. It should mean "able to write in two scripts", but the word is used throughout this paper in the sense of "bilingualism in writing", i.e. to refer to scribes who could write in two languages (as opposed to speak), but using the same script.

Having correctly noted that most of the works on language contact have paid little attention to the distinction between the contact involving related linguistic codes and non-related linguistic codes, Epps, Huehnergard and Pat-El (2013a; 2013b) provide a detailed study of the similarities and dissimilarities of the ancient language contact phenomena, where an ancient language interacts with another related language, on the one hand, or with a non-related language on the other. Within the proposed framework, the three scholars hypothesize several features that may operate differently in the interaction between related or non-related linguistic systems. These propositions—rather than constituting a consistent and complete theory—form a list of research questions that still need to be successfully answered:

- Are related languages more propitious for mixing, or do speakers try to keep them separated?
- What is the relationship between related-languages contact and the borrowability of different grammatical features? This problem can be paraphrased as follows: Which contact-induced changes are more likely in related languages and, in particular, is morphology more likely to be transferred in related languages or are the constraints on morphological transfer equal in related and non-related languages which are quite resistant to borrowing morphological features?
- How does the language contact of related codes respond to different environmental contexts such as long-term bilingualism, multilingualism and code-switch?

Possible responses to these three main questions can subsequently elucidate a more general dilemma: What problems are unique in close-relatives contact; and what may related-language contact add to the comprehension of language contact in general (Epps, Huehnergard and Pat-El, 2013: 214-215)?

In light of preliminary results of their studies, Epps, Huehnergard & Pat-El (2013b) and other contributors to the volume propose the following:

- Prolonged contact between related languages seems to trigger a substantial mutual influence, even convergence, of one language to another, where both lexical and grammatical transfer takes place (Beaulieu, 2013);
- There is correlation between structural or typological similarity and borrowability in the sense that lexical (etymological) and structural (grammatical) similarity seems to facilitate borrowings, as it can be more difficult for speakers to determine what element is their own and what component is foreign (Epps, Huehnergard and Pat-El, 2013b: 210-211);
- In particular, relatedness creates a favorable context for transferring bound forms and borrowing—even of complex morphology—due to the conflation of grammatical boundaries by the speakers (Law, 2013). As a result, even fusional polysynthetic morphology can be transferred in related languages (Mithun, 2013; Law, 2013).
- In addition, not only the shape, but also the function of an entity—including a morpheme—can be shaped by the contact with a similar form in a related language (Melchert, 2013).
- Lastly, since closely-related languages are usually confined to adjacent or shared geographic areas, their speakers are almost *per se* obliged to interact in situations of bi-and/or multilingualism and code-switching. As a result, being more likely to have contact—the contact being granted by interacting populations—such languages also seem to be more propitious for transfer (Bowern, 2013).

3. Three cases

In this section, three situations of linguistically mixed texts from the 2nd millennium BCE—i.e. texts where elements typical of two distinct grammatical codes can be found—will be studied. In these texts, the following languages coexist and/or interact: Ugaritic and Hurrian (section 3.1), Hurrian and Akkadian (section 3.2), and Canaanite and Akkadian (section 3.3). It is important to emphasize that these three situations of languages in contact are distinct as far as their socio-cultural, geopolitical and linguistic backgrounds and properties are concerned. This will be evident from the subsequent discussion. In general terms, one should note that the two first cases involve non-related codes, i.e. Semitic languages (Ugaritic and Akkadian) and a non-Semitic language (Hurrian),[5] while the third case represents a coexistence and intermingling of two genetically related languages, both belonging to the Semitic family (Canaanite and Akkadian). Moreover, although all these situations involve languages that were spoken in the Ancient Near East region in the second half of the second millennium BCE (more specifically in the 14th and 13th centuries BCE), their exact geographical location is distinct, ranging from more northern (Ugaritic-Hurrian in Ugarit and Hurro-Akkadian in northern Syria as attested in a Qaṭna archive, both in modern Syrian Arab Republic) to more southern (Canaano-Akkadian in Canaanite kingdoms in modern Syria, Lebanon, Palestine and Israel). It should also be observed that the three cases are quite distinct with respect to their grammatical characteristics, so that even though all of them constitute examples of languages in contact, not all of them can be viewed as mixed languages *sensu stricto* or genuine, narrowly understood, contact languages.

Following the arrangement of the theoretical discussion exposed in the previous section, each case will be analyzed from the three theoretical perspectives: i.e. within the framework of mixed languages, the theory of written language contact and the model of linguistic contact of genetically related languages.

3.1. Ugaritic-Hurrian (UH)[6]

The first case studied in this article is provided by five texts proceeding from the ancient Kingdom of Ugarit,[7] located in actual Syria, and written in the Ugaritic and Hurrian languages.[8] Ugaritic is classified as belonging to the North-West branch of the Semitic family and the texts composed in this language were written mostly using a cuneiform alphabet of 30 signs (Bordreuil and Pardee, 2009; Huehnergard, 2012; Tropper, 2012).[9] Conversely,

---

[5] We are fully aware of the fact that Hurrian is still not fully understood and that it is often quite difficult to be sure of contact induced features.

[6] The abbreviated form (i.e. UH) will be used when the term is used as an adjective qualifying a noun. In cases where the term stands independently and is employed as a noun, the full form (i.e. Ugaritic-Hurrian) will be used. The same rule governing the use of abbreviations applies to Hurro-Akkadian (HA) and Canaano-Akkadian (CA).

[7] The corpus includes the texts RS 24.254 (KTU 1.110), RS 24.255 (KTU 1.111), RS 24.261 (KTU 1.116), RS 24.291 (KTU 1.132) and RS 24.643 (KTU 1.148), edited by Pardee (2000: 615-617, 618-629, 652-658, 738-744, 779-806 respectively). Similarly to Hurro-Akkadian (cf. section 3.2 below), the Ugaritic-Hurrian case is admittedly based on a rather small corpus of ritual texts. Given the scarcity of the two corpora and the fact that the exact interpretation of the texts they contain is still debated, one may argue that Ugaritic-Hurrian and Hurro-Akkadian in the form they are available currently to us, are not sufficient for a reliable analysis. Nevertheless, we are convinced that despite these limitations, the insight Ugaritic-Hurrian and Hurro-Akkadian can offer for the issue of languages in contact justifies the effort—and, inevitably, the danger—of examining these languages in the manner in which we propose in this paper. In our view, the relevance of this group of texts for the study undertaken in this article is inversely proportional to their limited number.

[8] On the general topic of Ugarit, see Watson and Wyatt (1999).

[9] For the most recent edition of Ugaritic texts produced and fragments of various genres, see Dietrich, Loretz and Sanmartín (2013).

Hurrian belongs to the Hurro-Urartian family,[10] which is unrelated to the Semitic and Afro-Asiatic languages (Giorgieri, 2000; Hazenbos 2005; Wegner, 2007; Wilhelm, 2008a; 2008b). In Ugarit, Hurrian was noted in the Mesopotamian syllabic system, although it could also be written in the Ugaritic alphabet (Vita, 2013). It should be noted that Hurrians and their language formed an important ethnic, cultural and linguistic component of the Ugaritic Kingdom, beside the dominant genuine Ugaritic population, culture and tongue.[11]

The UH texts that are important for our analysis were created somewhere between the 14th century and the beginning of the 12th century. Such texts—written consistently in an alphabetic script—contain ritual documents in which Ugaritic and Hurrian appear side by side.[12] In quantitative terms, the Hurrian part sometimes predominates, as the Ugaritic section can only be used to provide a type of an introducing headline or finalizing verse. However, in other instances, the Ugaritic predominates (Lam, 2006) or the two codes occupy a more equalized extent of the document and/or alternate one with another in a more interwoven manner (cf. further in this section; Pardee, 1996). In general, the Ugaritic section exposes the type of sacrifice and circumstances of the rites. The Hurrian section, which was most probably intended to be recited during the ceremony, besides presenting—just like Ugaritic—the type of sacrifice (as a type of a headline), also includes the list of gods involved in this very ritual (cf. example 1, below). In fragments with a more interwoven alternation of the two languages (cf. example 2), Hurrian expressions (usually, a lexeme with an accompanying case suffix) constitute a list of gods that, during the very same ritual, receive offers specified by the words given in Ugaritic.

Ugaritic-Hurrian can be considered an almost exemplary case of codeswitching, where two linguistic systems are functionally and grammatically delimited. The two languages intervene for two entirely distinct purposes and in two completely unaltered forms. In other words, both Ugaritic and Hurrian appear separately and with their own and typical grammar rules, without traces of hybridization that could suggest more intense mixing of the two codes. To be exact, while the Ugaritic language introduces the instructions of how to perform a given ritual, specifying, for instance, its manner and place, Hurrian constitutes a group of quoted words which should literally and exactly be pronounced during a given ceremony, explained by the Ugaritic fragment. A good example of the above-mentioned phenomenon may be found in the beginning of the following ritual text:[13]

| (1) | dbḥ | ʿttrt | qrảt | b | grn | **ảṯhlm** |
| | Sacrifice | PN1 | gathering | at | threshing-floor | Sacrifice |

| **tǔṯkd** | **ảgndym** | **ṯdndy** | **ỉnmṯy** |
| Šawuška-for | *agandi*-for-his-and | *šadandi*-for-his | *enumašše*-for-his |

| **ỉnhzzy** | | **kzǵd** | **ỉn** | **ḫmnd** … | | **nntd** |

---

[10] See for instance Wilhelm (2008b: 105): "Urartian is closely related to Hurrian […] Presumably Urartian branched off from Hurrian not much later than approximately 2000 BC".

[11] On the topic of the Hurrian language in Ugarit, see Dietrich and Mayer (1995) and (1999). Concerning the Hurrians and their language in Ugarit, consult also Vita (2009; 2013) and Giorgieri (2013).

[12] Concerning the Hurrian religious traditions in Ugarit, see del Olmo (2014: 63).

[13] Although our translations of the HU examples are based on the interpretation given by Pardee (2002: 88-116), in some aspects, they do diverge from the reading proposed by this scholar. Of course, the ultimate responsibility of the correctness of the translations lies exclusively on the authors of the present article.

ḫazizi-for-his[14]	PN2-for	gods	household-for…	PN3-for

kltd	**nbdgd**	w	lb	btm	**aṯḫlm**	**ṯŭṯk**
PN4-for	PN5-for	and	inside	house	Sacrifice	PN6-for

tİzr	pnm[15]
veil.IPVF.3MS	face

'Sacrifice of (the goddess) 'Aṭtartu, gathering at the threshing-floor. Sacrifice for (the goddess) Šawuška: For his *agandi* and for his *šadandi*, for his *enumašše*, for his *ḫazizi*,[16] for (the god) Kušuḫ, for the gods of the household ----,[17] for (the goddess) Ninatta, for (the goddess) Kulitta, for (the god) Nubadig. And inside the house, sacrifice: (the goddess) Šawuška veils her face.' (RS 24.261.1-9 = KTU 1.116)

Within the codeswitching phenomenon itself, UH texts can be regarded as an example of an alternational rather than insertional type. Whereas insertional codeswitching is found in instances where the grammar of one language predominates, the alternational type consists of the interchange of structures typical of two different linguistic systems. In this interchange no code can be viewed as grammatically framing and/or being framed (see again section 2.1). This is a situation that is found in Ugaritic-Hurrian: Ugaritic provides metalinguistic explanations, whereas the Hurrian fragment constitutes a direct quotation. As a result, the two types of text and the codes in which they are composed do not interact grammatically. In fact they cannot, since they belong to two separate functional and textual spheres. This, in turn, successfully prevents the two systems from mixing. In general terms, since UH texts exclusively offer alternational codeswitching—and, thus, never function as an insertional variety, which gives rise to mixed languages and/or hybridized forms—it is not surprising that Ugaritic-Hurrian did not developed grammatical hybrids or a mixed language, to which the lexicon and/or grammar of the two source languages would have contributed. As the two codes do not exert any grammatical influence on one another, being confined to two well-delimited and mutually exclusive functions, the two grammars remain entirely independent—they never mix and, therefore, are never bestowed with the possibility of deriving morphological, lexical or syntactic hybrids and mixes from one another.[18] Although the

---

[14] Although there is no doubt concerning the presence of the Hurrian lexeme *ḫassissi* in the term *inḫzzy*, the analysis and understanding of this latter word remain problematic. According to Laroche (1968: 502), this form should be interpreted as *eni-ḫazzizzi* with the meaning of "sagesse divine". However, in our view, this interpretation seems to be rather unlikely in the context of adjacent terms, which are all related to cults. Therefore, we do not translate this lexeme (see also footnote 16, below).

[15] The sections in Ugaritic are given in normal type of font, whereas the fragments in Hurrian are marked in bold.

[16] Words *agandi*, *šadandi*, *enumašše* and *ḫazizi* are terms related to cult, impossible to be translated in English.

[17] The sign "----" indicates that "[f]our signs have been erased at the beginning of this line" (Pardee, 2002: 116).

[18] However, even though from the grammatical perspective, Ugaritic-Hurrian constitutes a case of alternational codeswitching, it may be argued that from a larger textual perspective, the Hurrian fragment is always comprised in the Ugaritic section. As explained, the ancient Ugaritic-Hurrian texts usually start and end with the section in Ugaritic that introduces and clarifies a given ritual. It is most commonly in the middle of the whole text where the Hurrian portion appears, quoting the exact words that should be uttered during the ceremony. Thus, from the perspective of a global organization of the text, the Hurrian fragment is almost invariably enclosed in and delimited by the Ugaritic sections which constitute the frame of insertion. In this manner, it is possible to view this arrangement as a type of an insertional codeswitching. However, this insertion takes place uniquely at the larger texts' level and not at the grammatical one—the Ugaritic text is the matrix text that frames the Hurrian embedded text, but the Ugaritic language is not the matrix language that provides the frame of the

Ugaritic-Hurrian corpus exhibits a situation of languages in contact it does not give rise to a contact language *sensu stricto* or a genuine mixed language.

In a few texts, the mixing of the two languages is more interwoven and disrupted (see example 2, below). In such instances, each Hurrian fragment (usually one word, possibly accompanied by a case suffix) refers to a god summoned during the ritual, while the accompanying fragment in Ugaritic (again, one word) specifies the type of an offer that should be given to that god at the ceremony in question. Accordingly, the alternating text forms a repeating sequence of the following kind: [for a god] [an offer], where the first slot is in Hurrian and the other in Ugaritic. Such examples—even though more compact and disrupted, and giving the impression of a single grammatical level—should be interpreted as alternational codeswitching, since neither language constitutes the frame of the other. By no means do the Hurrian words form a part of the Ugaritic sentence—or vice versa.[19] The fragments in Hurrian were most probably still intended to be pronounced as such during the rite, while those in Ugaritic were never so. In any case, the origin of these types of texts lies in two distinct textual (and, hence, grammatical) levels, just like in the more separated text analyzed in the previous paragraph. The following fragment illustrates this more interwoven and disrupted type of mixing of the Ugaritic and Hurrian languages:

(2) b   tšʿ   ʿšrh   trbd   ʿrš   pdry   b   št
     on   nine   ten   prepare-IPVF.2MS   bed   PN1   with   bed-covers

     mlk   **ảṯḥl[m**   **ỉ]n**   **tlnd**   gdl[t]   **ḫbtd**   š
     king   Sacrif[ice   go]ds   house-for   bread   PN2-for   ram

     šb[-]ʿdʾ   gdlt   **dqtd**   gdlt   **ḫdn**   **ḫdlr**   dqtt
     PN3-for   bread   PN4-for   bread   PN5   PN6   ewes

'On the nineteenth (day of the month), you are to prepare the bed of (the goddess) Pidray with the king's bed-covers. Sacrif[ice: for the go]ds of the house one bread,[20] for (the goddess) Ḫepat a ram, for (the god) Šbr one bread, for (the goddess) Daqitu one bread, (for the goddesses) Ḫudena (and) Ḫudellurra a/two/some ewe(s).' (RS 24.291.1-8 = KTU 1.132)

Ugaritic was the common language of the population and was therefore also extensively used in the administration and cult. In fact, the main portion of the ritual texts and a considerable part of the administrative material that were composed in the town of Ugarit were written in the Ugaritic language. However, in the contexts of the rites that were of Hurrian origin—a culture and religion that were important both in Ugarit and in the neighboring regions[21]—the Hurrian language may have functioned as a high-ranking code. In such a case, these ritual texts written in Ugaritic and Hurrian would constitute a case of UH codeswitching which can be classified as belonging to Johanson's type C—a class where elements of a higher-ranking code (Hurrian) alternate in texts with elements of a lower-ranking code (Ugaritic). Arguably,

---

embedded Hurrian language. Consequently, as explained above, from the grammatical perspective, the two grammars are alternational and not insertional: neither of them can be regarded as matrix or embedded.

[19] One should, however, note that the Hurrian fragments never contain verbs.

[20] In order to translate the Ugaritic word *gdlt*, we follow Tropper (2002) and his reading as *Dickbrot*. For a more detailed discussion concerning this lexeme, see del Olmo (2007); del Olmo and Sanmartín, 2015: 291: "head of cattle, cow for sacrifice".

[21] Concerning the Hurrian religious traditions in Ugarit, see above note 12.

and in accordance with the definition posited by Johanson, Ugaritic-Hurrian mixes two codes in one situation of text in a comparable degree. In addition—and again complying with the description of type C—the use of the two shifting codes reflects a deliberate mechanism dictated by cultural factors, i.e. distinct functions of the two languages in this type of rituals, which were of Hurrian origin. By doing so, Ugaritic-Hurrian can be located at an intermediate stage on the active-passive scale, where the two linguistic systems (Ugaritic and Hurrian) operate independently and the lower-ranking code (Ugaritic) may be given the same active role as the higher-ranking code (Hurrian). Nevertheless, it is important to recall that from the textual perspective, the Ugaritic sections constitute the frame of insertion for the Hurrian fragments. This may suggest that Ugaritic, in fact, played a more active role.

Lastly, it should be noted that when a given fragment in Hurrian is inserted in the Ugaritic textual frame, it follows the Ugaritic section without any overt graphic marker, such as a gloss[22] or language-shift sign, in contrast with the situation which will be observed in Hurro-Akkadian (section 3.2) and Canaano-Akkadian (section 3.3). This is evident in the following fragment of a ritual text, where the Hurrian section appears after the Ugaritic introduction, in the middle of a line, without being separated in any graphic manner:

| (3) | ảl | prz | l | md | t̲l̲t̲ | ymm | l | lġz | y'rb |
| | god | *prz* | for | space | three | days | to | *lġz* | enter-IPVF.3MS |

| mlk | ả<u>t</u>{ḫ}lm | ản | ảtnd | ảld | t̲t̲bd | kmrbnd |
| king | Sacrifice | gods | father-for | PN1-for | PN2-for | PN3-for |

| kd̲ġd | ản | prznd |
| PN4-for | god | *prz*-DEF.ART-for |

'The god *prz*.[23] For the space of three days, the king enters the *lġz*.[24] Sacrifice: for the gods of the father, for (the god) Ilu, for (the god) Teššup, for (the god) Kumarbi, for (the god) Kušuḫ, for the god *prz*.' (RS 24.255.1-5 = KTU 1.111)

This may stem from at least three reasons: Firstly, in the alphabetic Ugaritic script—in which the analyzed texts were written—there is no sign corresponding to a gloss marker; this sign appears only in the syllabic script (Huehnergard, 1989: 91-95). Nevertheless, Ugaritic scribes could have adapted the Akkadian gloss sign to their alphabet, as the Ugaritic writing system was heavily influenced by the Mesopotamian cuneiform script.[25] For some reasons, they never did this. Secondly, the two languages operate at different levels of the text (metalinguistic *versus* quotation), thus being easily differentiable on a functional level. To put it differently, as the two codes never function within the same textual scope or the same level of language—this fact would imply at least insertional codeswitching or mixing within one grammatical frame—their overt separation may have been considered redundant or unnecessary. Thirdly, Ugaritic and Hurrian belong to two genetically unrelated and

---

[22] A gloss marker ("gloss-wedge" or "Glossenkeil") is a cuneiform sign that indicates a gloss or a change of language of the text (Krecher, 1957-1971).
[23] The meaning of this term is unknown.
[24] The exact meaning of the term *lġz* is still disputed (see del Olmo and Sanmartín, 2015: 490; Rahmouni, 2005; Richter, 2012a: 516).
[25] Compare the following traits of the Ugaritic alphabet that were adapted from the Akkadian writing system: the cuneiform shapes; the direction of the writing from left to right; the physical medium for writing (i.e. clay tablets); the separation line that divides paragraphs and/or topics.

typologically distant linguistic families and, hence, are grammatically distinguishable in quite a straightforward way. However, this last motivation may be less relevant, since Hurro-Akkadian, another mix of unrelated and typologically distant languages, consistently uses overt markers to indicate a language shift (cf. section 3.2 below).

As mentioned above, Ugaritic and Hurrian are genetically unrelated and, moreover, typologically very distant. The Hurrian language is an agglutinative ergative language, typologically dissimilar from Ugaritic, which is a synthetic accusative system. This typological and genetic distance seems to be reflected in the UH texts, where the two codes are kept separately in an alternational codeswitching manner with no traces of grammatical mixing.

3.2. Hurro-Akkadian (HA)

The second case involves a contact between Hurrian (cf. section 3.1, above) and Akkadian, an East Semitic language which originated in Mesopotamia (for the most recent discussions of Hurro-Akkadian and Akkadian, see Giorgieri, 2005: 92-97; Kouwenberg, 2011, and Streck, 2011).[26] During the second millennium BCE, and due to its high cultural prestige, this latter language was used as a *lingua franca* in the ancient Near East by a large number of states, reaching its peak as the language of diplomacy in the Middle Babylonian period (ca. 1500-1000; van Soldt, 2011: 405; Streck, 2011: 376).

The examples which are analyzed in this section form a group of five letters found in 2002 in a palace in the ancient town of Qaṭna (actually in Syria) and written in the second half of the 14th century.[27] Apart from the letters, this archive includes other genres such as juridical and administrative texts.[28] It should be emphasized that the five letters were not written at Qaṭna itself, but in areas between Alalakh and Qaṭna known in ancient times as Ni'a and Nuhašše. These four polities formed a continuum of Hurrianized principalities in northern Syria.

This situation of linguistic contact between Akkadian and Hurrian constitutes a case of a relatively more intense—and definitely more complex—mixing of languages than that of Ugaritic-Hurrian (cf. section 3.1). The mixing of the two sources is important both quantitatively and qualitatively. From the quantitative perspective, almost every 'sentence' in the Akkadian frame code contains some Hurrian traits—found in a general proportion of 5 to 1 (Richter, 2005a: 114; Richter, 2012b: 30). In other words, the bulk of the components of a sentence make use of the Akkadian code, while the Hurrian elements constitute less than one fifth.[29] This evident predominance of Akkadian over Hurrian suggests that Akkadian is most likely the matrix code of framing, whereas Hurrian corresponds to the embedded code. When they appear overtly, such (still secondary) Hurrian elements are typically verbal, i.e. inflected

---

[26] It should be noted that the Mesopotamian script, in which Akkadian texts were written, also used terms (nouns, verbs, adpositions, etc.) of the Sumerian origin referred to as 'sumerograms'. Sumerian was an agglutinative language, unrelated to the Semitic family. There are, however, signs indicating that, at least in the period relevant for our research, such sumerograms were read in Akkadian. In the examples where sumerograms appear in this paper, they are given in uppercase.

[27] Concerning the nature of the texts that constitute the Hurro-Akkadian corpus associated with Qaṭna, see footnote 7.

[28] In order to differentiate this type of Hurro-Akkadian from other Hurro-Akkadian varieties, the name Hurro-Akkadian of Qaṭna could be used. However, in this paper, for the sake of simplicity, the denomination Hurro-Akkadian will be employed. Only when the distinction between various types of Hurrian-Akkadian is necessary, will the toponymical specification (e.g. of Qaṭna, of Nuzi or of Alalaḫ) be provided (for a discussion of Hurrian traits in Hurro-Akkadian of Nuzi and Alalaḫ, see Wilhelm, 1970 and Giorgieri, 2005).

[29] It should be noted that the proportion of Hurrian elements is high when compared to other HA texts known to date. This means that the HA letters from Qaṭna "are unique among the text sources so far known from the ancient Near East" (Richter, 2005a: 114).

verbs (4). From the qualitative perspective, the frame also seems to be provided by the Akkadian system (5). For example, the grammatical core of the sentence (e.g. the first verb, pronouns, conjunctions and word order) is Akkadian, which thus constitutes the matrix for the insertion of the Hurrian element (e.g. the second verb).[30]

(4) ù   šu-nu-ti   iš-tu qa-ti   KÚR^na-ak-ri-šu-nu   :[31]
     and   them   from   hands   enemies-their   GLOSS

eḫ-lu-ša₁₀-ap[32]
save-PF1MS

'And I have saved (two idols) from the hands of their enemies.' (TT 2:19-21; Richter, 2003: 175; Giorgieri, 2005: 96; Richter, 2012b: 48-49)

(5) ù   ki-a-am   a-na   pa-ni-šu-nu   aq-ti-bi   a-na-ku   la
     and   so   to   them   say-PF.1MS I   not

     i-na-ṣa-ar-an-ni   ù   a-ḫi-ia   ^Iid-a-an-da   :
     protect-IPFV.1MS   and   brother-my   PN1   GLOSS

ut-ra-áš-te-eš
protect-IMP.2MP

'I said to them as follows: I will not protect (Idanda). Protect my Brother Idanda!' (TT 2:13-16; Richter, 2012b: 48)

Additionally, Hurrian is found in glosses which translate Akkadian nominal phrases, prepositional phrases or verbal forms. In example (6) below, the Hurrian lexeme *ša₁₀-ri-ni-* glosses the sumerogram NAM.RA.MEŠ "booty" (pl.). The complex form *ša₁₀-ri-ni-ra* (*šarrinira*; where the suffix *-ra* is the morpheme of the comitative case)[33] translates the Akkadian expression *itti* NAM.RA.MEŠ 'with booty' to Hurrian (Richter 2003: 174-175, 2012b: 46). It should be noted that in the two cases discussed thus far, i.e. as direct insertions (i.e. a direct change from Akkadian to Hurrian) and in glosses (i.e. translation from Akkadian into Hurrian), the text invariably marks the Hurrian component by a language-change sign ":".

(6) ù   i-na-an-na   ^Iḫa-an-nu-ut-ti it-ti   NAM.RA.MEŠ   :
     and   just   PN1   with   booty   GLOSS

ša₁₀-ri-ni-ra   i-ti-iq
booty   pass along-PF.3MS

---

[30] Sometimes, however, the order can be inverted and it is the Hurrian verb that precedes the Akkadian verb (see example TT 3:30-31 in Richter, 2012: 38, 46, 57).
[31] The sign ":" stands for a gloss marker.
[32] The Akkadian sections are given in normal font, while the Hurrian components are marked in bold.
[33] See Giorgieri (2000: 217) and Wegner (2007: 65).

'And just then Ḫannutti passed by with the booty / prisoners.' (TT 2:36-38; Richter, 2012b: 49)

Apart from directly inserted Hurrian verbs and Hurrian translation glosses, the third type of Hurrian traits corresponds to mixed Hurro-Akkadian verbal forms, in which the subject is marked on the verb by means of a suffix. Although superficially all the components of these constructions are Akkadian (i.e. both the stem of the verb and the suffixed subject marker), such formations seem to be bilingual hybrids. It is the "deep" structure of these composites that mirrors the structure of the Hurrian verb. In Hurrian, suffixes were regularly used in order to indicate the person of the subject, whereas in Akkadian the main tendency was to express the person of the subject by means of prefixes. Thus, the grammatical organization of the Hurrian verb influences the structure of the Akkadian verb in the way that the latter is remodeled in conformity with the former, employing, however, not Hurrian but Akkadian overt elements. In these instances, the language shift marker is not present (Richter, 2005a: 112). In example (7), the construction *immarkunu* (verbal form *immar* + the Akkadian suffixed object marker *-kunu*) parallels the Hurrian verbal base *wur-* 'see' with the morpheme of the future tense *-et-* and the 2nd person plural subject suffix *-aššu* (Richter, 2003: 176; Richter, 2012b: 53).[34] In a similar way, in example (8), the subject + verb arrangement typical of Hurrian (*tapp-* "fortify' + the suffix *-eš* of the imperative 2nd person plural)[35] is reflected in the superficially Akkadian form *dunninkunu* (*dunnin* + *kunu*) instead of the expected genuine Akkadian form *dunnunu*. The form *dunninkunu* is incorrect in Akkadian, as the imperative is never marked by subject pronominal suffixes such as *-kunu*. The use of *-kunu* is conditioned by the analogy to the use of pronominal suffixes in various verbal constructions in Hurrian, such the morpheme *-eš* in *tappeš* (Richter, 2005b: 163, 175; Richter, 2012b: 40, 56).

(7)   at-tù-nu-ma   lu-ú i-mar₆-ku-nu   :   **wu-ri-ta-áš-šu₁₁**
you   see-IPFV.2MS   GLOSS   see-IPFV.2MS
'You will see.' (TT 2:54-55; Richter, 2003:17; Richter, 2012b: 53)

(8)   ^uruqàt-na   du₄-un-ni-in-ku-nu   :   **da-ab-be-eš**
PN1   fortify-IMP.2MP   GLOSS   fortify-IMP.2MP
'Fortify (the city of) Qaṭna!' (TT 3:9-11; Richter, 2003: 175; Giorgieri 2005: 95; Richter, 2012b: 56)

Lastly, there is one case of an overt hybridized form—found in an inventory, i.e. outside the corpus of the letters—where the Hurrian nominal lexeme (*mardat-*) is accompanied by an Akkadian case and/or *status constructus* marked (*-i*) and Akkadian pronominal suffix (*-šu*).[36] In this case, the entire complex is headed by the language change marker.

---

[34] The same construction as *immarkunu* appears in example (5) *inaṣṣaranni* = "I will (not) protect".

[35] Concerning the function of the Hurrian morpheme *-eš*, see Giorgieri (2000: 234-235) and Wegner (2007: 102-103).

[36] The linguistic analysis of the term *mardatu* is controversial. In principle, it seems that it displays a good Semitic pattern and, in fact, several Semitic etymological explanations have been proposed (for the *status quæstionis*, see Vita, 2010: 330-331). However, *The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. M/1, 1977: 277 defines this item as "foreign word". In our view, the important indication is the presence of the gloss sign. This seems suggests that the scribe himself considered this lexeme as Hurrian just like it is indicated by the editor of the text, who proposes the following: "Das Wort *mardade* 'Teppich, Läufer (o. dgl.)' folgt zwar jeweils einem Glossenkeil und galt daher in Qaṭna als hurritischer Terminus" (Richter, 2012b: 85; for a further discussion see Richter, 2012a: 246). We understand the expression *mar-da-ti-šu* as a hybridized form due to the fact that it displays the suffixation of two Akkadian bounded morphemes (the case ending and the possessive pronoun). Of

(9)   qa-du   :   **mar-da-ti**-šu
        together   GLOSS   *mardade*-fabric-its
        'Together with its *mardade*-fabric.'[37] (TT 12:20; Richter, 2012b: 33, 84)

The evidence strongly suggests that Hurro-Akkadian can be viewed as a semi-advanced mixed language. The mixing of the source codes fails to offer a situation of an ideal split between the lexicon and grammar or noun phrase and verbal phrase, as commonly occurs in mixed languages. The lexical and grammatical component is mainly from Akkadian, while quantitatively fewer Hurrian components are mostly lexical, although cases of some grammatical ones also exist (cf. the new structure of verb forms).

In accordance with the so-called unidirectional approaches to the genesis of mixed languages, Hurro-Akkadian—being a type of a mixed language—is likely to have emerged as a result of insertional codeswitching and/or (first lexical and only later grammatical) borrowing from one language to another.[38] In light of the evidence, which suggests an intermediate state of intermingling, Hurro-Akkadian may be vied as an example of insertional codeswitching, where Akkadian is the dominant matrix system and Hurrian the embedded system. However, the disproportion between the two languages is such that the insertional codeswitching can rather be regarded as borrowing from Hurrian into Akkadian, which, in other words, would equal the "Hurrianization" of the Akkadian standard by local traits (Richter, 2005a: 115; 2005b: 163). The process of Hurrianization of the Akkadian framing code can be seen if diachronic perspective is adopted. Namely, Hurro-Akkadian of Qaṭna, discussed in this paper, is only one of the varieties of Hurro-Akkadian known to date. Two other important varieties are Hurro-Akkadian of Alalaḫ in actual Syria (from the 15th century BCE; Márquez Rowe, 1998; von Dassow, 2012) and Hurro-Akkadian of Nuzi in contemporaneous Iraq (15th-14th BCE; Wilhelm, 1970), both emerging historically earlier than the variety from Qaṭna. In these two variants of Hurro-Akkadian, the mixing is less profound. Although the three types of Hurro-Akkadian reflect different geo-historical situations—one cannot claim that Hurro-Akkadian of Qaṭna is a direct diachronic successor of Hurro-Akkadian of Nuzi and Alalaḫ—the three varieties can be arranged in a temporal order from the 15th (Alalaḫ and, a part of the archive Nuzi) to the 14th century (Qaṭna). This chronological arrangement is reflected in the advancement of mixing, from less pronounced (Alalaḫ and Nuzi) to more intense (Qaṭna), showing a possible developmental pattern of the hypothesized Hurrianization.

The fact that the overt Hurrian insertions—appearing as glosses or non-glosses—are always preceded by the language shift marker may indicate that Hurrian elements could still have been perceived as short insertional codeswitching. In other words, the consistent use of a graphic sign in order to mark the shift of the language strongly suggests that the biscriptal writers were always aware of the distinctiveness of the two codes just like in insertional codeswitching and, thus, their less profound mixing.[39] However, the existence of hybrid

---

course, the origin of this phenomenon is the fact that once Hurrian words were borrowed into the Akkadian frame, they could behave as any other Akkadian nouns, for instance, taking pronominal suffixes.

[37] In this context, *mardade*-fabric is an element of a chair.

[38] For the first discussion of the phenomenon of codeswitching in the Hurro-Akkadian texts, see Giorgieri (2005: 95-97).

[39] As far as Hurro-Akkadian of Alalaḫ is concerned, von Dassow (2012: 212) proposes that "at Alalaḫ in the 15th century, the practice of remarking words has an essentially non-linguistic character [.]" "[I]n this period and region, the mark : had yet to acquire the specific function of gloss mark[.] At Alalaḫ during the 15th century, the mark : was not specialized for marking glosses or other words extrinsic to the language of writing, though as mark of emphasis it could be used this way. This particular usage subsequently became generalized in Syro-

verbal forms, whose superficial Akkadian structure is adapted according to the rules of the Hurrian organization, indicates that the insertional codeswitching and/or borrowing developed into a slightly more fused grammatical composite, where both Hurrian and Akkadian grammar contribute to the shape of grammatical constructions.[40]

Consequently, the new HA system, although with traces of hybridization, is still (in majority of cases) a mere mix that fails to be a qualitatively novel combination of the two source codes—it does not live its own life yet, even though signs of this change are already visible. As indicated by the writing (cf. the gloss marker), it is not fully homogenous or independent from the two original Hurrian and Akkadian codes. Approximating insertional codeswitching or borrowing with traces of hybridization, it is certainly more mixed than Ugaritic-Hurrian (which is uniquely alternational codeswitching with no hybridization; see section 3.1), but significantly less intertwined than Canaano-Akkadian (which is profoundly mixed and hybridized; cf. section 3.3).

Using the classification developed by Johanson (2013), Hurro-Akkadian may be defined as belonging to type B, where users of a lower-ranking language transfer copies of elements from this language into a higher-ranking code, which, in turn, develops a locally colored variety. Thus, a higher-ranking prestige code (Akkadian) constitutes the frame for the transfusion of a lower-ranking code (Hurrian), being gradually impregnated by certain properties of this local vernacular and leading to a deviation from the standard higher-ranking code. If this classification is correct, the Hurrian code would have played a less active role than the Akkadian system in the mixing of the languages.

From a socio-historical perspective, it should be noted that the Hurrianization can constitute a fully deliberate phenomenon—dictated by cultural and/or sociolinguistic reasons—or can be related to expressive needs. Inversely, the mixing does not stem from communicative necessity, as the writers already possessed a language that would assure the communication, i.e. Hurrian. The letters were directed from a Hurrian speaking person to another Hurrian speaking person so that their writers could well have opted for the Hurrian language (cf. Richter, 2005b: 163; 2005a: 115). Since the Hurrian language was also written, as documented by texts from other archives and periods, scribes might have used it in their letters (Giorgieri, 2000; Wegner, 2007). The scribes were also biscriptal. Their knowledge of Akkadian was sufficient to be able to use this language—in a more or less correct shape—for correspondence. However, although these scribes chose the Akkadian code as the frame of the communication (arguable because of its prestige as the language of diplomacy), they colored it by their local, native tongue. From a sociolinguistic perspective, such a situation—bilingualism in writing, or biscriptalism, and existence of already sufficient communicative code (and, thus, the lack of need to develop a new system to assure communication)—constitutes an exemplary setting for the formation and further development of mixed languages.

Since the HA letters use Hurrian glosses which translate Akkadian expressions, the language can also be classified as belonging to Johanson's type D, which groups situations where a lower-ranking system is employed to explicate portions of texts in a higher-ranking code. Accordingly, Hurrian glosses provide explanatory information, facilitating the interpretation of the higher-ranking text. In such instances, once more, the lower-ranking

---

Canaanite scribal practice, so that in the following century : is regularly used to mark Hurrian glosses in the Qatna texts, the Canaanite glosses in the Canaanite Amarna letters, and so on".

[40] On the contrary, the one case of Hurro-Akkadian nominal phrase where a Hurrian noun bears an Akkadian suffix may be less relevant (cf. example 9). Rather than a transfer of Akkadian suffix in the Hurrian grammar, we face a deliberate or necessary substitution of the Akkadian lexeme by a Hurrian word (since Akkadian may have lacked the word for that specific fabric) in a complex Akkadian nominal phrase and, thus, in the Akkadian grammatical frame.

code, Hurrian, seems to play a relatively passive role, being used to elucidate the Akkadian active code. This D-type property of Hurro-Akkadian applies uniquely to its usage in glosses. Consequently, the letters of Qaṭna offer a situation where a collection of texts can be classified (depending of a specific fragment) as more than one type, in this case as type B or D.

With respect to the issue of genetic relation, Hurrian and Akkadian are non-related and typologically remote. As mentioned previously, Hurrian is an agglutinative ergative language, related only to Urartian (cf. section 3.1, above). In the morphology, suffixes play the most important role. Akkadian is a synthetic accusative system and an East Semitic language, with both suffixes and prefixes, the latter being typical of verbal morphology. However, even though the two codes are genetically and typologically remote, they do mix to a relatively high degree (compare especially the reorganization of the structure of verbs in accordance to the Hurrian morphological pattern), although, as will be evident from the next section, less than in the case of Canaano-Akkadian, which is another example of mixing based on the Akkadian language.

3.3. Canaano-Akkadian (CA)

The third case discussed in this study corresponds to a contact between two related languages. To be exact, Canaano-Akkadian emerged from an interaction between Akkadian (an East Semitic language; cf. section 3.2 above) and a group of the North-West Semitic dialects spoken in Palestine, referred to as Canaanite (Rainey, 1996a: 17-32). This contact is most evident in the so-called 'El-Amarna Letters', found around 1887 in the eponymous Egyptian locality, the ancient capital of Egypt under pharaoh Amenophis IV. This correspondence, composed of approximately 350 letters and fragments, constitutes the main documentation on international relations in the Ancient Near East in the 14th century BCE. It also constitutes the main documentation on the history and language of Syria-Palestine in this period.[41]

Canaano-Akkadian offers the most intense and the most complex situation of mixing of languages among the cases analyzed in this study. CA texts contain three grammatical components: Akkadian elements, Canaanite Semitic (NWS) elements, and hybridized CA forms (Rainey 2010). The Akkadian component is very extensive and usually includes lexical items (nouns, participles, adjectives) as well as grammatical elements (adpositions, conjunctions, particles, pronouns, function words and verbs with their inflections). The genuine and direct Canaanite component is much less common and includes lexemes—such as noun (10), pronoun (11), preposition or prepositional phrase (12), inflected verb (13)—that may appear in the middle of a sentence, being introduced (10, 12 and 13), or not (11), by a language shift sing (i.e. a gloss marker). The Canaanite source frequently constitutes the backbone of the clause and sentence syntax.

(10)   ù   SAG.DU-nu   :   **ru-šu-nu**   i-na   qa-te-ka[42]

---

[41] It should be noted that Amarna is a composite corpus. Although letters from Canaan make up the largest single group, the corpus also includes letters from other areas written in various forms of Akkadian that are not Canaano-Akkadian. Moreover, it contains one letter from the king of Mitanni, which is entirely written in Hurrian. Regarding the Amarna letters, in general, and Canaano-Akkadian, in particular, see Izre'el (1995a; 2005; 2012), Moran (1992), Liverani (1998; 1999), Rainey (1996a-d; 2010), von Dassow (2004), von Dassow and Greenwood (2006), Tropper and Vita (2010) and Mynářová (2014). The corpus has been re-edited by Rainey (2015).
[42] The Akkadian constructions are given in normal type of font. The Canaanite (as well as hybridized) elements are marked in bold.

| | and | head-our | GLOSS | head-our | in | hand-your |

'And our head is in your hand.' (EA 264:18)

(11) ÌR-ka   **a-nu-ki**
      servant-your   I
      'I am your servant.' (EA 287:66)

(12) ù   iz-zi-iz-mì   EGIR-šu   :   **aḫ-ru-un-ú**
      and   stand-up-PF.1MS   behind-him   GLOSS   behind-him
      'And I took my place behind him.' (EA 245:10; Moran, 1992: 299; Rainey, 1996b: 122; Tropper and Vita, 2010: 114)

(13) ᶦA-ia-ab   :   **ḫe-eḫ-bé-e**
      PN1   GLOSS   hide-PF.3MS

      'He has hidden Ayyab.' (EA 256:7; Rainey, 1996b: 12, 122; Tropper and Vita, 2010: 101)

Although the Canaanite grammatical component is important, quantitatively, the Akkadian code seems to predominate, as is demonstrated by the following example:

(14) [ù]   li-iḫ-šu-uš-mi   :   **ia-az-ku-ur**-mi
      [So]   recall-MODAL.3MS   GLOSS   take-thought-MODAL.3MS

      ᶦlugal-ri   en-ia   mi-im-ma   ša   in₄-né-pu-uš-mi
      king   lord-my   everything   REL   do-PF.3MS

      UGU   ᵘʳᵘḪa-ṣú-raᵏⁱ
      against   PN1

      '[So] may the king, my lord, recall for everything that has been done against (the city of) Hazor.' (EA 228:18-23; Rainey, 1996b: 65, 245)

As far as the Canaanite glosses are concerned, these can be introduced by a language change marker (15; see also examples 10 and 12, above) or inserted directly in the text without any overt sign (16):[43]

(15) a-nu-um-ma   uṣ-ṣú-ru   URU   ša   LUGAL   …   ù
      indeed   guard-IPFV.1MS   city   REL   king   and

      BÀD-ši   :   **ḫu-mi-tu**

---

[43] On the Canaanite glosses existing in the letters, see Izre'el (1995b; 2003; 2012), Liverani (1998a: 24-27) and Andrason and Vita (2014). It must be noted that terms in a Canaanite local language can also be found in lexical texts that were used in the teaching of the cuneiform writing to scribes. These texts usually consist of columns, each of which contains terms in a different language. For instance, the first column included terms in Sumerian, the second in Akkadian and the third in a local Canaanite language.

wall-its	GLOSS	wall-its

'I will indeed guard the city of the king…and its wall.' (EA 141:41-44; Moran,1992: 227)

(16)	li-ip-qí-id	a-na	LÚ.MAŠKÍM-šu	ù	li-id-din
	entrust-MODAL.3MS	to	commissioner-his	and	give-MODAL.3MS

URU	ú-sú.KI	a-na	À.MEŠ	mé-e-ma	a-na	ÌR-šu
city	PN1	for	water	water	to	servant-his

(May the king) charge his commissioner to give the city of Usu to his servant for water (EA 148:28-32; Moran,1992: 235)

Lastly, the hybridized forms—in which both Canaanite and Akkadian elements appear—are especially frequent in the verbal system, where Canaanite temporal and aspectual affixes accompany Akkadian verbal bases. In such instances, the tense and aspect of the verb is determined by the Canaanite morphemes and structure, while the Akkadian morphological shape has little bearing on the temporal-aspectual interpretation of the hybridized verbal form (Rainey, 1996b; von Dassow, 2004: 644-647; Izre'el, 2005; Tropper and Vita, 2010). It should be noted that the language has been (at least partially) stabilized possessing its own— albeit sometimes varying and flexible—rules. In example (17) the two verbal forms *daglāti* 'I looked' are derived of the Akkadian category *parsāku* (a type of a resultative) and the Canaanite formation *qatalti* (a type of a present perfect and past tense). The Akkadian ending CaCC-*āku* was reshaped in accordance with the Canaanite standard CaCaC-*ti*, yielding a mixed composite in -*āti*, where the structure of the stem and the morpheme *ā* match the Akkadian usage, while the person ending -*ti* reflects the usage in Canaanite (cf. also Rainey, 1996b: 285; Tropper and Vita, 2010: 70-71, 138). Additionally, the meaning and valency of the CA construction corresponds to the sense and function of the Canaanite *qatalti* (an active, possibly transitive perfect/past) and not the sense and function of the Akkadian *parsāku* (an intransitive, possibly passive, resultative proper). In example (18), the CA formations *yišmu* and *yiltequ-* mix the Akkadian preterite and *t*-preterite stems (-*šmu* and -*ltequ-*, respectively) with the morpheme *yi-*, typical of the Canaanite prefix conjugations (Rainey, 1996a: 54, 60-61). Additionally, the ending *u* in the two CA forms does not reflect the Akkadian patterns (cf. *išme* and *ilteqe* in Akkadian) but rather the Canaanite and North-West Semitic -*u* of *ya/yi-qtul-u* (Rainey, 1996a: 54; 1996b: 60-61; Tropper and Vita, 2010: 63, 64).

(17)	da-ag-la-ti₇	ki-ia-am	ù	da-ag-la-ti₇	ki-ia-am
	look-PF.1MS	this way	and	look-PF.1MS	that way

ù	la-a	na-mi-ir
and	no	light

'I looked this way, and I looked that way, and there was no light.' (EA 292:8-10; Moran, 1992: 335)

(18)	a-na-ku	aq-bu	[šum-ma	UD.K]ÁM.MEŠ
	I	say-PF.1MS	[if	da]y-PL

yi-iš-mu	lugal-ru	[ù	UD].KÁM.MEŠ
hear-IPFV.3MS	king	[and	day]-PL

yi-ìl-te₉-qú-šu-nu
take-IPFV.3MS-them

'I have been saying: [If one da]y the king should hear, [then in one da]y he could seize them.'(EA 109:15-17; Rainey, 1996b: 54, 60-61, 100)

The evidence and the properties presented above indicate a great degree of mixing of Canaano-Akkadian: the lexicon and the grammar of the two sources contribute importantly— albeit not equally—to the mix and the hybrid composites are relatively common. With respect to the grammar-lexicon or noun-verb split, typical of mixed languages, Canaano-Akkadian can suggest a partial or non-ideal division. In this way, Canaano-Akkadian would, to a degree, comply with the largest class of mixed languages that display a relatively clear division between the source of their nominal phrase and lexicon, on the one hand, and grammar or verbal phrase, on the other. The lexicon and noun phrase are commonly extracted from Akkadian, although they can also include Canaanite items, either introduced directly or employed as translating glosses. The grammatical component seems to derive mostly from a Canaanite system, which, according to the unidirectional theory of the genesis of mixed languages, would thus be the dominant language in original codeswitching (see further below in this section). The most evident grammatical features that are influenced by a Canaanite source correspond to syntax and the structure of the verb phrase. Lastly, various verbal forms appear as hybrids, accompanying the Akkadian stem by the Canaanite morphological features. However, it should be recalled that genuine Akkadian verbal forms are also found just like the Canaanite ones.

As far as the CA hybridized verbal composites are concerned, it is important to emphasize that according to current studies in languages in contact, only highly advanced mixed languages transfer inflexional morphology, giving rise to mixed verbal constructions. The fact that Canaano-Akkadian developed its own mixed forms (to which both the Canaanite code and the Akkadian system contribute) could suggest a very advanced stage of mixing of Canaano-Akkadian. Additionally, since the grammar and even verbal phrase can include genuine Akkadian elements and direct Canaanite features, the intense intermingling of the grammars of the sources leads to the impossibility of the identification of the one "grammar language". The grammar rather seems to be a composite structure that includes two sources languages and a qualitative novelty, i.e. hybrid forms.

Socio-historical settings of Canaano-Akkadian also suggest its definition in terms of a highly developed mixed language. Canaano-Akkadian was most likely a jargon limited to a particular place (scribal centers) and characteristic of a unique community and profession (scribes). The scribes—native speakers of a Canaanite language—were trained in Akkadian.[44] Thus, the language emerged in a situation of biscriptalism of its users.[45] Such a coexistence

---

[44] Contrary to places such as Ugarit, a likely atomized training in Akkadian in Canaan, scattered about in smaller and more or less independents centers, may have contributed to the outcome of this language in the lack of a strong and centralized scribal center.

[45] It is important to note that the grammar of Canaano-Akkadian cannot be viewed as imperfect second-language learning typical of pidgins. As mentioned before, the scribes were biscriptal (if not, at least in some cases, bilingual). In addition—and contrary to pidgins but in conformity with mixed languages emerging in situation of bilingualism—the grammar of Canaano-Akkadian is complex. It is not a simplified Akkadian and North-West Semitic blending. However, just like in the case of pidgin, one may argue for a possible tertiary hybridization.

of local Canaanite languages and Akkadian must have been prolonged as Akkadian constituted a high-ranking international language of the large Near Eastern territory for many centuries. Moreover, just like prototypical mixed language, Canaano-Akkadian seems to have arisen not from communicative needs—the scribes already knew a language that could guarantee the communication, i.e. Akkadian or even a type of "pan-Canaanite"—but rather from expressive necessities: it was an "in-group-language" granting and emphasizing the identity of the group of scribes. In this manner, Canaano-Akkadian constituted an educational elite code which distinguished the community of Canaanite scribes from other social strata.[46] Just like any bilingual speakers and/or speakers of mixed languages, the users of Canaano-Akkadian seem to have employed resources available in their native language and the other language consciously and creatively, i.e. for expressive reasons.

However, the original diglossia from which Canaano-Akkadian emerged at the time of Canaano-Akkadian letters corresponded, rather, to triglossia: Akkadian, Canaanite and the mixed language—Canaano-Akkadian (Andrason and Vita, 2014) Akkadian was a high variety and superstrate. It was used by a very limited part of the society. It was typically written and possibly, but infrequently, spoken. Canaanite was a low variety and substrate. It was used by the vast part of the society. It was spoken and very rarely written in syllabic script (e.g. glosses). Canaano-Akkadian was a "mixture" of the superstrate and substrate. It was typically written and, probably, commonly spoken (Izre'el, 2012), although only at the scribal centers. This last fact indicates the profound advancement of Canaano-Akkadian on the scale of mixed languages—the language has acquired its own status, independent of (or at least distinguishable from) the two sources from which it developed and may have been spoken (at least in the scribal centers), gaining an even stronger rank and individuality.

Before relating Canaano-Akkadian with the classes proposed by Johanson, let us recall the theories on the genesis of mixed languages, which are crucial for the distinction between Johanson's classes A and B. In general terms, two main views on the emergence of mixed languages can be distinguished: unidirectional and fusional. Unidirectional approaches propose a unidirectional shift from a source language to a target language, due to borrowing or code-switching. Accordingly, lexical and/or morphological components are replicated from the source into the target language. The transfusion of structural and morphological components (e.g. functional words, pronouns, inflectional affixes and deep syntax) usually is posterior to the exchange of lexicon and appears in situations of an extensive, prolonged bilingualism (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988: 74-75; Thomason, 2001). Fusion approaches see the combination as the central process rather than one-way replacement. Thus, no language shifts to another, but the two codes simultaneously intertwine, creating a new structure. The grammar usually derives from the most familiar language or from the language that the speakers aim their mixed code to approximate to. In both cases, mixed languages tend to develop from early stages of insertional codeswitching.

Using the categories proposed by Johanson, Canaano-Akkadian viewed as a mixed language can be ascribed to more than one class. First, it can be classified as type A, where users of a lower-ranking code copy elements from a higher-ranking code to their language. In this case, the lower-ranking code (Canaanite) constitutes the (morphosyntactic) frame for incorporation of Akkadian features. Accordingly, the Canaanite lower-ranking system is the

---

Namely, scribes from distinct scribal centres who spoke different mother tongues may have travelled and met. Thus, in these multilingual circles where different Canaanite vernaculars were spoken, the original secondary hybrid could have developed into a tertiary hybrid or a pan-Canaanite scribal code based on Akkadian and various Canaanite dialects. However, such a tertiary hybridization was very peculiar because the involved languages are closely related. Lastly, it should be noted that Canaano-Akkadian was never nativized.

[46] It is possible to distinguish circa 100 different scribes in the Canaanite Amarna letters (for a detailed discussion, see Vita, 2015: 140).

active code, while higher-ranking Akkadian is the passive system. This classification would have roots in the fact that Canaanite components predominate in clause and sentence syntax and that it also underlies a part of verbal morphology, which are viewed as components of the core grammar (cf. Johanson, 2013: 281-282).

However, the classification as type B is also possible and, probably, even more plausible. In this case, users of a lower-ranking code (Canaanite) carry over copies of elements from this code into their variety of a higher-ranking code (Akkadian). The transfer would, thus, be inverse, passing from a Canaanite language into the Akkadian matrix: elements from a lower-ranking code appear in a higher-ranking variety, which constitutes the frame for incorporation. In other words, the prestige-code (Akkadian) is used to communicate among speakers of a lower-ranking variety, being, however, impregnated by their own vernacular, leading to a new code, and deviating from the norm. This deviation is, nevertheless, a deliberate phenomenon, dictated by sociolinguistic reasons. This alternative scenario can be substantiated by the following arguments:

- First, the Akkadian component is quantitatively impressive, also being able to affect all various levels of the grammar, including the verbal morphology.
- Second, although scarce, direct historical evidence suggests that, at earlier stages of Canaano-Akkadian, the penetration of Canaanite elements was more restricted and, thus, that this component has gradually increased with time. To be exact, the letters from Taanach dated from the 15th century BCE include a more limited number of Canaanite features than the correspondence from Amarna (Rainey, 1996b: 31; 1999; Horowitz, Oshima and Sanders, 2006: 130-134, 139-142, 144-148). In Taanach, Akkadian appears as a matrix code into which certain Canaanite imports were introduced. Gradually, this "Canaanite-zation" may have intensified, so that in the next century, in which the Amarna letters were composed, the penetration of the Canaanite languages was greater, reaching the core grammar.
- Third, as explained in section 3.2, the situation of Hurro-Akkadian indicates that in the Near-East regions of the second millennium, Akkadian—a high prestige code—constituted the matrix system hosting and/or accommodating traits coming from non-Akkadian (Hurrian or North-West Semitic) local languages spoken by the scribes or author of the texts.

Finally, an intermediate and conciliating solution can also be proposed using the fusional approach to the genesis of mixed languages. Namely, rather than one-way development and, thus, framing, the two codes might have intermingled bidirectionally. Consequently, Canaano-Akkadian would correspond to a mixed type A-B. Although, at the beginning, the prevailing type would have been B (Akkadian is the matrix code, whereas a Canaanite dialect (or dialects) is the embedded code), with time and intensification of the Canaanite component and its acceptance in texts, the matrix-embedded relation may have been inverted or, at least, equaled. This may explain why, from a synchronic perspective, Canaano-Akkadian gives the impression of belonging to type A.

In addition, the presence of glosses which include supplementary explanatory information aiding the writer and/or the reader in their interpretation of the higher-ranking text allows at least some fragments of Canaano-Akkadian texts to be classified as type D, where a lower-ranking code (North-West Semitic) is used to explicate texts in a higher-ranking code (Akkadian). In such cases, the Canaanite lower-ranking code would play a less active role, being employed to metalinguistically clarify the Akkadian higher-ranking code. It should, however, be noted that glosses are not marked consistently by the language shift marker (contrary to the situation found in Hurro-Akkadian, cf. section 3.2), which may

suggest a profound mixing of the source languages into Canaano-Akkadian, and argue against any possible interpretation in terms of an insertional codeswitching. In this new composite system, the distinctiveness of the two sources becomes less important—the Akkadian and Canaanite codes merged into a new system which, possessing rules that relatively determine the presence of such Akkadian, Canaanite and hybridized elements, becomes more stabilized and homogenous. Canaano-Akkadian is much more than a blending of two sources. It is a qualitative novelty—a new language. Canaano-Akkadian lives and breathes in its own right.

As has been mentioned previously, Canaanite and Akkadian are genetically related languages—both are members of the Semitic family. Although the two belonged to distinct branches of this linguistic family—Canaanite has its place in the North-West Semitic group, while Akkadian is one of the East Semitic languages—the lexicon and grammatical structure of Canaanite and Akkadian offer a relative or even considerable degree of etymological and typological proximity. This may, thus, be viewed as one of the factors which encouraged a more intense—both quantitatively and qualitatively—mixing of the two codes. In particular, since the two languages share the principles of their morphology, it may have been relatively easy to mix morphemes typical of one system with structures (lexical or grammatical) of the other, and as a result construct novel hybrid forms.

4. Conclusions

The three cases of language contact studied in this paper (Ugaritic-Hurrian, Hurro-Akkadian of Qaṭna and Canaano-Akkadian) are typologically distinct—they are all characterized by different degrees and dissimilar types of mixing. Nevertheless, all of them can be viewed as expressions of the same dynamic phenomenon, where each variety of mixing corresponds to a different stage of a universal continuum of languages in the situation of merger. Accordingly, they can be arranged to reflect gradually more intense intermingling or greater fusion of two source codes. This continuum, itself, involves two closely interconnected scales related to two processes that regularly operate during the creation and evolution of mixed languages—the change from a disrupted structure of codeswitching (where two systems act separately) to a more coherent and unified code of a genuine mixed language, on the one hand, and a gradual intensification of intertwining of the input languages (in a way that the mixing affects not only lexicon but also grammar and syntax) on the other.

As explained in section 2.1, codeswitching constitutes the first step in a gradual process of developing mixed languages, during which the level of the mix gradually changes from pragmatics (codeswitching) to grammar (mixed languages) by replacing the pragmatic function typical of the former by grammatical constraints characteristic of the latter. Ugaritic-Hurrian (section 3.1) exemplifies the first stage of this cline and, thus, the situation of simple codeswitching. In fact, given that Ugaritic-Hurrian corresponds to alternational codeswitching—which is a pre-stage of the linguistic intermingling (it is insertional codeswitching that is one of the necessary conditions of the development of mixed languages)—the Ugaritic-Hurrian system offers an example of the very beginning of the entire continuum where the contact between languages still fails to yield a genuine contact and/or mixed language.[47] Hurro-Akkadian of Qaṭna (3.2) possibly corresponds to an

---

[47] This fact however does not minimize the relevance of Ugaritic-Hurrian to the discussion. As explained, the situation of contact exhibited by Ugaritic-Hurrian constitutes an example of one of the most initial stages of mixing. It is important to note that the identification of Ugaritic-Hurrian as a typological equivalent or representation of such an original and non-advanced stage of contact does not imply any predictive statement concerning its possible diachrony. Particularly, it does not mean that Ugaritic-Hurrian would or ever could evolve into a genuine contact and/or mixed language. It merely illustrates a typological continuum of linguistic

intermediate stage of language mixing. Although, at this stage, a mix still exhibits patterns of codeswitching, the penetration of the hosting grammar by foreign elements intensifies. As a result, the combination based originally on codeswitching is gradually subjected to more syntactic and structural constraints. In such cases, alternational codeswitching is missing and the structure of the resulting combination approaches only the insertional type of codeswitching. Finally, Canaano-Akkadian (3.3) can be viewed as an example of the third stage, i.e. as a genuine mixed language. The codeswitching—either alternational or insertional—is generally absent and structures that were originally functionally equivalent in the two source languages tend to develop grammatically specialized uses.

A similar progression can be hypothesized for the scale which represents development from less grammatical mixing to more grammatical mixing. Generally, as previously mentioned, various mixed languages tend to derive their grammar from only one source code, while the lexicon is extracted from the other. An alternative split concerns the noun phrase *versus* the verbal phrase, as these two frequently have their roots in two different source codes. However, there are many cases where both source languages contribute significantly to the new grammar. Mixed languages are commonly regarded as a continuum (from less grammatical mixing to more grammatical mixing) which usually reflects the duration and intensity of the mixing. Thus, a more intense blending of two grammars is found in more advanced mixed languages. Ugaritic-Hurrian—being a case of alternational codeswitching and, thus, also one of a non-advanced mix of languages—fails to provide any traits of grammatical combination: the grammars of Ugaritic and Hurrian do not intermingle at all and hybrid forms do not exist. Hurro-Akkadian is more advanced and, as expected, mixes both lexicon and grammar of the two languages to a certain degree. The bulk of the grammar and lexicon is Akkadian, although various lexical entities (which are nominal, verbal or phrasal) can be Hurrian. Yet, they appear as lexical intruders—although preserving their Hurrian morphology—so that the grammar mainly remains Akkadian. However, the restructuration of the Akkadian prefix conjugation into a suffixed pattern, in accordance with the organization of the Hurrian grammar, indicates a relative intensification of grammatical mixing. Canaano-Akkadian—the most advanced case of language mixing analyzed in this study—shows the highest degree of intertwining in both lexicon and grammar. Although the main part of the lexicon comes from Akkadian, there are many instances where words (nouns, pronouns and verbs) are taken from Canaanite. Analogically, even though the core grammar is heavily influenced by Canaanite (cf. syntax, word order, and tense-aspect morphology in hybridized verbal forms), elements of the Akkadian grammatical organization also appear. Additionally, it is important to note that many verbal forms are neither Akkadian nor Canaanite, but rather hybridized composites with Akkadian bases and Canaanite morphology. Consequently, the fact whereby two languages contribute to the grammatical structure of the mixed code and that hybrid forms are found demonstrates that the mixing of the two source codes in the case of Canaano-Akkadian is profound.

The evidence also indicates that, although, in some cases, a given situation of mixing of languages can be classified as corresponding to one category, as distinguished by Johanson (2013), in others, the same mixed code may belong—depending on a concrete contextual use—to two (or even more) classes. To be exact, Ugaritic-Hurrian behaves as a prototypical member of type C (i.e. as codeswitching, where two codes intervene separately), while Hurro-Akkadian and Canaano-Akkadian offer instances where two classifications are possible, i.e. as type B (whereby a higher-ranking code is infected by elements of a lower-ranking code) or type D (whereby a lower-ranking code under the shape of glosses explicates

situations possible in the world. Probably, given the linguistic, cultural and sociological characteristics of the situation of contact of Ugaritic and Hurrian described in section 3.1, such a development in to a genuine (or at least more advanced) mixed language might have been quite unlikely.

a higher-ranking code). In addition, due to its high advancement of mixing, Canaano-Akkadian can be viewed from a joint diachronic-synchronic perspective as an example of fused type A-B (which signifies that a higher-ranking code has been infected by elements of a lower-ranking code to such a degree that, contemporarily, the influence seems to be inverse: a lower-ranking code is being impregnated by traits of a higher-ranking code).

With respect to the connections that may exist between the intensity of intertwining of the source codes and their genetic-typological correspondence, the following can be noted: Firstly, while Canaano-Akkadian involves languages from the same family with a relative typological similarity, Ugaritic-Hurrian and Hurro-Akkadian do not. Canaano-Akkadian emerged from sources that, although not mutually intelligible,[48] were relatively proximate and similar. It also developed into an advanced mixed language characterized by a profound combination of the two input systems. On the contrary, Ugaritic-Hurrian and Hurro-Akkadian evolved into less blended varieties: the former remained at the stage of the alternational codeswitching with no traces of mixing, while the latter reached the stage of language mixing but is probably not a mixed language (or, at least, less mixed than Canaano-Akkadian). Secondly, although both Ugaritic-Hurrian and Hurro-Akkadian combine non-related and typologically remote systems, their mixed status is not identical—the former corresponds to mere alternational codeswitching, whereas the latter has progressed on the mixed language continuum. This may be linked to the previously discussed fact, whereby it is posited that Ugaritic and Hurrian codes in Ugaritic-Hurrian texts are functionally distinct. On the contrary, in Hurro-Akkadian letters of Qaṭna, Akkadian and Hurrian operate at the same linguistic and textual level, being able to give rise to insertional codeswitching or borrowing and, thus, to genuine mixing of languages, visible either in their lexicon or grammar. Consequently, it is the specific function of the two source codes in Ugaritic-Hurrian and Hurro-Akkadian that would prevent or encourage the two linguistic inputs to interact and mix.

Additionally, the comparison between the gradual advancement of mixing in the case of Hurro-Akkadian and Canaano-Akkadian again suggests a relation between genetic and typological relatedness and the advancement of the mixing. To be exact, the presented evidence indicates that the progression along the mixed languages cline is more rapid if the genetic and typological relation between involved codes exists. As explained, both the varieties of Canaano-Akkadian (i.e. Canaano-Akkadian of Taanach in the 15th century BCE and Canaano-Akkadian of Amarna in the 14th century) and the varieties of Hurro-Akkadian (i.e. Hurro-Akkadian of Alalaḫ in the 15th century, Hurro-Akkadian of Nuzi in the 15th and 14th century, and Hurro-Akkadian of Qaṭna in the 14th century) show an analogical tendency: Diachronically, or with time, and with the possible prolonged duration of the contact between the sources codes, the intensity of the mixing increases. Canaano-Akkadian of Amarna and Hurro-Akkadian of Qaṭna are more intermingled than Canaano-Akkadian of Taanach and Hurro-Akkadian of Nuzi/Alalaḫ, respectively. However, the other parameter that plays an important role in the intensification of mixing is the relation between the involved languages. Namely, both Canaano-Akkadian of Taanach and Canaano-Akkadian of Amarna are more mixed than the contemporaneous Hurro-Akkadian of Nuzi/Alalaḫ and Hurro-Akkadian of Qaṭna, respectively. Although the two types of mixing involve Akkadian as the framing or matrix code, the embedded or borrowed code is distinct. If it corresponds to a related language (North-West Semitic languages), the mixing is faster and more intense. Conversely, if it corresponds to a non-related and typologically distinct language (such as Hurrian), it is slower and less intense. As a result, the degree of mixing depends both on the time of contact

---

[48] Consider, for instance, the following statement of Moran (1992: xxii): "The language can only be described as an entirely new code, only vaguely intelligible (if at all) to the West Semite because of the lexicon, and to the Babylonian because of the grammar".

(the more prolonged the contact is, the deeper the mixing is) and similarity of the codes (the more genetically related and, thus, typologically proximate the languages are, the faster and more intense their mixing is). However, the intensity of mixing—and, in particular, the penetration of the local language to the hosting or framing higher-ranking code—may likewise be linked to the increase in the geographic distance separating the place of composition of the text in a given mixed language from the area where the more prestigious language (i.e. the other, higher-ranking source code) was used. Namely, both Hurro-Akkadian of Qaṭna and Canaano-Akkadian of Amarna build on the Akkadian system that frames the respective local language, Hurrian or Canaanite. Nevertheless, the penetration of such local traits is more intense—and inversely the resistance of Akkadian to local influence is weaker—in places that are more remote from the region of Mesopotamia, where Akkadian was a dominant spoken language.

As a final point, the results of our study can be related to the three theoretical approaches underlying this paper (cf. section 2), introducing the following insights to the general discussion on mixed languages, written language contact and relevance of genetic relation in language intermingling:

- In accordance with the position defended by Matras *et al*. (2007) and Meakins (2013: 193), the written mixed languages of the Ancient Near-East, analyzed in this paper, should not be viewed as closed systems classifiable, uniquely, as one category. They rather constitute a fluid choice of possible situations available to writers, oscillating from less mixed to more mixed and/or from codeswitching to the stage of a genuine mixed code. From a dynamic perspective, such situations reflect a diachronic continuum of types of mixing, ranging from those that are typical of less advanced cases of mixing to those that are characteristic of more advanced ones. It is important to note that, as proposed by Matras *et al*. (2007) and Meakins (2013), a single language can offer situations that correspond to different stages on this cline. Thus, one language can make use of more than one of the types developed by Johanson (2013). Given the fluid and diffuse transition from one stage to another, such classes—still useful for determination of prototypical situations—should not be understood as mutually exclusive and discrete.
- Following the opinions of Bakker and Matras (2013), Meakins (2013), Beaulieu (2013) and Epps, Huehnergard and Pat-El (2013a; 2013b), the temporal extent of contact seems to constitute a crucial condition for the intensification of mixing. The more prolonged the contact is, the more profound mixing will be, affecting not only lexicon but also grammar.
- In accordance with preliminary views presented by Epps, Huehnergard and Pat-El (2013), the etymological and grammatical similarity between the interacting codes originating in their genetic relatedness seems to importantly facilitate the mixing of both lexicon and grammar, including the blending of grammatical functions, synthetic morphology and syntax.
- In agreement with Epps, Huehnergard and Pat-El (2013a; 2013b), the geographic proximity—common for genetically related languages, but also possible in the case of non-related languages—can, likewise, influence the intensity of contact. In our case, the resistance of the higher-ranking hosting code for impregnation by elements of the local lower-ranking code seems to decrease with the escalation of the physical distance separating the area of the higher-ranking language from the region of the local language.

References

Al-Jallad, Ahmad. 2013. Arabia and Areal Hybridity. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2): 220-242.

Andrason, Alexander and Juan-Pablo Vita. 2014. From Glosses to the Linguistic Nature of Canaano-Akkadian. *Folia Orientalia* 51: 155-175.

Bakker, Peter. 1997. *A language of Our Own: The Genesis of Michif, the Mixed Cree-French Language of the Canadian Métis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bakker, Peter and Yaron Matras (eds.). 2013. *Contact Languages*. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Beaulieu, Paul-Alain. 2013. Aspects of Aramaic and Babylonian Linguistic Interaction in First Millennium BC Iraq. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2): 358-378.

Bordreuil, Pierre and Dennis Pardee. 2009. *A Manual of Ugaritic*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Bowern, Claire. 2013. Relatedness as a Factor in Language Contact. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2): 411-432.

del Olmo, Gregorio. 2014. *Canaanite Religion According to the Liturgical Texts of Ugarit*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

del Olmo, Gregorio. 2007. *gdlt/dqt ¿ganado o pan como materia sacrificial? Aula Orientalis* 25: 169-173.

del Olmo, Gregorio and Joaquín Sanmartín. 2015. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Leiden: Brill.

Dietrich, Manfried and Walter Mayer. 1995. Sprache und Kultur der Hurriter in Ugarit. In Manfried Dietrich and Oswald Loretz (eds.), *Ugarit. Ein ostmediterranes Kulturzentrum im Alten Orient. Ergebnisse und Pespektiven der Forschung. I. Ugarit und seine altorientalische Umwelt*, 7-42. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Dietrich, Manfried and Walter Mayer. 1999. The Hurrians and the Hittite Texts. In Wilfred Watson and Nicolas Wyatt (eds.), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, 58-75. Leiden: Brill.

Dietrich, Manfried, Oswald Loretz, and Joaquín Sanmartín. 2013. *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani und anderen Orten*. AOAT 360/1. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Epps, Patience, John Huehnergard, and Na'ama Pat-El (eds.). 2013a. *Journal of Language Contact*. Volume 6(2). Special issue on contact among genetically related languages. Brill: Leiden.

Epps, Patience, John Huehnergard, and Na'ama Pat-El. 2013b. Introduction: Contact among genetically related languages. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2): 209-219.

Giorgieri, Mauro. 2000. Schizzo grammaticale della lingua hurrica. In *La civiltà dei hurriti*. Parola del Passato 55, 171-295. Napoli: Macchiaroli Editore.

Giorgieri, Mauro. 2005. Bedeutung und Stellung der 'mittanischen' Kultur im Rahmen der Kulturgeschichte Vorderasiens. In Doris Prechel (ed.), *Motivation und Mechanismen des Kulturkontaktes in der späten Bronzezeit*, 77-101. Firenze: LoGisma Editore.

Giorgieri, Mauro. 2013. Diffusion et caractéristiques de la culture écrite d'origine hourrite dans le Proche-Orient asiatique et à Ougarit. In Pierre Bordreuil, Françoise Ernst-Pradal, Maria Grazia Masetti-Rouault, Hedwige Rouillard-Bonraisin and Michel Zink (eds.), *Les écritures mises au jour sur le site antique d'Ougarit (Syrie) et leur déchiffrement*, 157-185. Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.

Hazenbos, Joost. 2005. Hurritisch und Urartäisch. In Michael P. Streck (ed.), *Sprachen des Alten Orients*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Horowitz, Wayne, Takayoshi Oshima and Seth Sanders. 2006. *Cuneiform in Canaan. Cuneiform Sources from the Land of Israel in Ancient Times*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society – The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Huehnergard, John. 1989. The Akkadian of Ugarit. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Huehnergard, John. 2012. An Introduction to Ugaritic. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.

Izre'el, Shlomo. 1995a. The Amarna Letters from Canaan. In Jack M. Sasson (ed.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*. Vol. 4, 2411-2419. New York: Scribner.

Izre'el, Shlomo. 1995b. The Amarna Glosses: Who Wrote What for Whom? Some Sociolinguistic Considerations. *Israel Oriental Studies* 15: 101-122.

Izre'el, Shlomo. 2003. Canaanite Varieties in the Second Millennium BC: Can We Dispense with Anacronism? *Orient* 38: 66-104.

Izre'el, Shlomo. 2005. *Canaano-Akkadian*. München: Lincom Europa.

Izre'el, Shlomo. 2012. Canaano-Akkadian: Linguistics and Sociolinguistics. In Rebecca Hasselbach and Na'ama Pat-El (eds.), *Language and Nature. Papers Presented to John Huehnergard on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, 171-218. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Johanson, Lars. 2013. Written language intertwining. In Peter Bakker and Yaron Matras (eds.), *Contact Languages*, 273-332. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Kouwenberg, Bert. 2011. Akkadian in General. In Stefan Weninger (ed.), *The Semitic Languages. An International Handbook*, 330-340. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Krecher, Joachim. 1957-1971. Glossen. In *Reallexikon der Assyriologie 3*, 431-440. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Lam, Joseph. 2006. The Hurrian Section of the Ugaritic Ritual Text RS 24.643 (KTU 1.148). *Ugarit-Forschungen* 38: 399-413.

Laroche, Emmanuel. 1968. Documents en langue hourrite provenant de Ras Shamra. In Jean Nougayrol, Emmanuel Laroche, Charles Virolleaud, Claude F. A. Schaeffer, *Ugaritica V*, 447-544. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.

Law, Danny. 2013. Inherited similarity and contact-induced change in Mayan Languages. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2): 271-299.

Liverani, Mario. 1998. *Le lettere di el-Amarna. Vol. 1. Le lettere dei "Piccoli Re"*. Brescia: Paideia.

Liverani, Mario. 1999. *Le lettere di el-Amarna. Vol. 2. Le lettere dei "Grandi Re"*. Brescia: Paideia.

Márquez Rowe, Ignacio. 1998. Notes on the Hurro-Akkadian of Alalaḫ in the Mid-Second Millennium B.C.E. *Israel Oriental Studies* 18: 63-78.

Matras, Yaron. 2000. Mixed languages: A functional-communicative approach. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 3(2): 79-99.

Matras, Yaron, Hazel Gardner, Charlotte Jones, and Veronica Schulmann. 2007. Angloromani: A different kind of language? *Anthropological Linguistics* 49(2): 142-184.

Meakins, Felicity. 2013. Mixed languages. In Peter Bakker and Yaron Matras (eds.), *Contact Languages*, 159-228. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Melchert, Craig. 2013. Hittite and Hieroglyphic Luvian arha 'away': Common Inheritance or Borrowing? *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2): 300-312.

Mithun, Marianne. 2013. Challenges and Benefits of Contact among Relatives: Morphological Copying. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2): 243-270.

Moran, William L. 1992. *The Amarna Letters*. Baltimore, London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mynářová, Jana. 2014. Egyptian State Correspondence of the New Kingdom: The Letters of the Levantine Client Kings in the Amarna Correspondence and Contemporary Evidence. In Karen Radner (ed.), *State Correspondence in the Ancient World. From New Kingdom Egypt to the Roman Empire*, 10-31. London, New York: Oxford University Press.

Pardee, Dennis. 1996. L'ougaritique et le hourrite dans les textes rituels de Ras Shamra-Ougarit. In F. Briquel-Chatonnet (ed.), *Mosaïque de langues, mosaïque culturelle. Le bilinguisme dans le Proche-Orient ancien. Antiquités Sémitiques I*, 63-90. Paris: Jean Maissoneuve.

Pardee, Dennis. 2000: *Les textes rituels. RSO XII*. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations.

Pardee, Dennis. 2002. *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Pat-El, Na'ama. 2013. Contact or Inheritance? Criteria for distinguishing internal and external change in genetically related languages. *Journal of Language Contact* 6(2): 313-328.

Rahmouni, Aicha. 2005. The Term *prz* in Ugaritic-Hurrian Texts: A Possible Ugaritic-Hurrian 'Epithet Component'. *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians* 15: 101-107.

Rainey, Anson F. 1996a. *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets*. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill.

Rainey, Anson F. 1996b. *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets*. Vol. 2. Leiden: Brill.

Rainey, Anson F. 1996c. *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets*. Vol. 3. Leiden: Brill.

Rainey, Anson F. 1996d: *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets*. Vol. 4. Leiden: Brill.

Rainey, Anson F. 1999. Taanach Letters. *Eretz-Israel* 26: 153-162.

Rainey, Anson F. 2010. The Hybrid Language Written by Canaanite Scribes in the 14th Century BCE. In Leonid Kogan, Natalia Koslova, Sergey Loesov, and Sergei Tishchenko (eds.), *Proceedings of the 53e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Vol. 2: Language in the Ancient Near East*, 851-861. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Rainey, Anson F. 2015. *The El-Amarna Correspondence*. Leiden: Brill.

Richter, Thomas. 2003. Das 'Archiv des Idanda'. Bericht über Inschriftenfunde der Grabungskampagne 2002 in Mišrife/Qaṭna. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin* 135: 167-188.

Richter, Thomas. 2005a. Qaṭna in the Late Bronze Age. Preliminary Remarks. *SCCNH* 15: 109-126.

Richter, Thomas. 2005b. Hurriter und Hurritisch im Bronzezeitlichen Syrien. In Dennis Prechel (ed.), *Motivation und Mechanismen des Kulturkontaktes in der späten Bronzezeit*, 145-178. Firenze: LoGisma.

Richter, Thomas. 2012a. *Bibliographisches Glossar des Hurritischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Richter, Thomas. 2012b. Die Texte des Idadda-Archivs. In Thomas Richter and Sarah Lange, *Das Archiv des Idadda. Die Keilschrifttexte aus den deutsch-syrischen Ausgrabungen 2001-2003 im Königspalast von Qatna*, 27-132. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Streck, Michael P. 2011. Babylonian and Assyrian. In Stefan Weninger (ed.), *The Semitic Languages. An International Handbook*, 359-396. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Thomason, Sarah Grey. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburg University Press.

Thomason, Sarah Grey. 2003. Social factors and linguistic processes in the emergence of stable mixed languages. In Yaron Matras and Peter Bakker (eds.), *The Mixed Language Debate: Theoretical and Empirical Advances*, 21-40. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tropper, Josef. 2002. Brot als Opfermaterie in Ugarit. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 33: 545-565.

Tropper, Josef. 2012. *Ugaritische Grammatik*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Tropper, Josef and Juan-Pablo Vita. 2010. *Das Kanaano-Akkadische der Amarnazeit*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

van Soldt, Wilfred H. 2011. Akkadian as a Diplomatic Language. In Stefan Weninger (ed.), *The Semitic Languages. An International Handbook*, 405-415. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Vita, Juan-Pablo. 2009. Hurrian as a living language in Ugaritic society. In Diego A. Barreyra Fracaroli and Gregorio del Olmo Lete (eds.), *Reconstructing a Distant Past. Ancient Near Eastern Essays in Tribute to Jorge R. Silva Castillo*. Aula Orientalis-Supplementa 25, 219-231. Sabadell, Barcelona: AUSA.

Vita, Juan-Pablo. 2010. Textile Terminology in the Ugaritic Texts. In Cécile Michel, Marie-Louise Nosch (eds.), *Textile Terminologies in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean from the Third to the First Millennia BC.*, 323-337. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Vita, Juan-Pablo. 2013. Alphabet ougaritique et langue hourrite : interactions et adaptations. In Pierre Bordreuil, Françoise Ernst-Pradal, Maria Grazia Masetti-Rouault, Hedwige Rouillard-Bonraisin, and Michel Zink (eds.), *Les écritures mises au jour sur le site antique d'Ougarit (Syrie) et leur déchiffrement*, 203-217. Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.

Vita, Juan-Pablo. 2015. *Canaanite Scribes in the Amarna Letters*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

von Dassow, Eva. 2004. Canaanite in Cuneiform. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 124: 641-674.

von Dassow, Eva. 2012. Gloss Marking and the Language of the Alalaḫ IV Texts. In Elena Devecchi (ed.), *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age*, 201-216. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten.

von Dassow, Eva and Kyle Greenwood. 2006. Correspondence from El-Amarna in Egypt. In Mark W. Chavalas (ed.), *The Ancient Near East. Historical Sources in Translation*, 182-214. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Watson, Wilfred G. E. and Nicolas Wyatt (eds.). 1999. *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Leiden: Brill.

Wegner, Ilse. 2007. *Einführung in die hurritische Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Wilhelm, Gernot. 1970. *Untersuchungen zum Ḫurro-Akkadischen von Nuzi*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon and Bercker Kevelaer.

Wilhelm, Gernot. 2008a. Hurrian. In Roger D. Woodard (ed.), *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*, 81-104. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilhelm, Gernot. 2008b. Urartian. In Roger D. Woodard (ed.), *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*, 105-123. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.