Traces of "Weaving" in Hittite: A Brief Overview

By Marianna Pozza

The aim of the present paper is to analyze a selection of Hittite outcomes of Indo-European roots that are semantically connected with the idea of "weaving" and to compare them with other words drawn from other ancient Indo-European languages. These roots form several archaic derivatives in the Indo-European daughter dialects, and they also help us deepen our knowledge of the material culture of the Proto-Indo-Europeans. It is worthwhile, therefore, to study this small group of Hittite words, from both structural and semantic perspectives, and to provide an overview of the main etymological interpretations presented in the past by authoritative scholars.
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Introduction

Hittite is the oldest Indo-European language attested to date, it was spoken in north-central Turkey in the 2nd millennium BC. The royal capital city of the Hittite empire was Ḫattuša (Turkish Boğazköy, now called Boğazkale), some 150km east of Ankara, where most of the cuneiform tablets and table fragments have been recovered. Among the genres constituting the corpus there are edicts, treaties, letters, cult inventories, oracle practises, hymns, prayers, laws and administrative texts.

The language was deciphered in 1915 by the Czech Assyriologist Bedřich Hrozný (1915), the scholar to whom we owe the epochal placement of Hittite within Indo-Europe. The cuneiform writing system (wedge-shaped) was a syllabic script – as was Myceaean, for example –, where each cuneiform sign represented a syllable (vowel, vowel + consonant, consonant + vowel, consonant + vowel + consonant). The Hittite cuneiform script – which is a complex one, mixing logographic and phonetic spellings – derives from the Akkadian one, which, in turn, with some changes and adaptations, adopts the cuneiform writing system of Sumerian. Hittite texts were written by experienced scribes on soft clay tablets impressed by a stylus, tablets which were subsequently hardened by drying in the sun or in an oven.

Since a large number of Hittite texts deal with magical-religious and technical subjects, it is often very hard to understand the exact meaning of the lexemes mentioned therein: the available material allows us only to grasp the global semantic field, and sometimes we can get only a general and approximate idea of the meaning of some words. The Hittite lexicon contains both Indo-European and
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1 See Laroche’s fundamental work (Laroche 1971) for a classification of all Hittite texts into genres (http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/CTH/) and Hoffner and Melchert (2008) and van den Hout (2011) for their exhaustive reference grammars.
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non-Indo-European elements (quantitatively significant), due to contact with the subdued or neighbouring populations.

Hittite official texts contain lists of words denoting precious textiles and garments, which are of fundamental importance for a study on textile terminology within the Anatolian area. We owe the first interpretations of Hittite lexemes connected with different types of garments or clothing to Albrecht Goetze (1947, 1955 and 1956).

In subsequent years other scholars have analyzed Hittite textile terminology thanks to the help and progress made by archaeological discoveries (see in particular Frangipane et al. 2009 and Laurito 2013 for the situation during the Late Bronze Age), even if the archaeological evidence remains extremely limited: a few spindle whorls, loom-weights and spools have been recovered from the Late Bronze Age levels at Arslantepe, in Anatolia.

Among the recent studies that have contributed to improving our knowledge of Hittite textile terminology are those by Klengel (2008) and Vigo (2010 and primarily Vigo, forthcoming). As Baccelli et al. (2014: 110 stresses, "we have no Hittite texts that allow a clear reconstruction of the whole textile manufacturing process. The Hittite documentation offers us sporadic evidences to textile tools and techniques".

One of the main difficulties in analyzing and interpreting Hittite textile terms, in fact, is represented by the fact that these lexemes "appear in lists and inventories without pertinent data about the nature of the textile. The aim of such lists is not to qualify the textile" (Michel and Nosch 2010: xiv).

Moreover, unfortunately, the written documents do not allow us to understand with certainty if we are dealing with textile or clothing, and for this reason, in the majority of cases, the translations for such forms are of a generic type such as "cloth", "garment", "textile", etc.

"Weaving" as "Linking Together": Continuous Semantic Spaces

Within Hittite textual documentation, the most common determiner indicating "garment, cloth" is TÚG, which is found near words denoting dresses, garments, etc. (e.g. TÚG palaḫša- "cloth", cf. Gr. πέπλος, or TÚG kureššar "cut of cloth", etc.). The Hittite word underlying this sumerographic classifier could be, according to Goetze (1955), (TÚG)wašpa- "clothing", deverbal formation from wešš-, waššiya- "to clothe, wear, to be dressed", from IE *wes- "to clothe" (IEW: 1172-3, LIV: 192). The IE outcomes of the root *wes- are mostly nominal formations (Lat. vestis, Goth. wasti, Hitt. wašpa-, Skr. vásana- "vest, dress, garment" etc.), whereas the verbal outcomes are rarer and – as outlined by Gusmani (1968: 48) – characterized by a non-uniform structure. Greek, Hittite and

---

2 See the excursus presented in Baccelli et al. (2014: 97).

3 For example, a semantic classifier which was not pronounced but which helped to disambiguate the interpretation of a noun.
Indo-Aryan concordances show a common isoglosse (cf. Skt. váste "to be
clothed", Gr. εἶται "to wear", Hitt. wešta, wašta, Goth. wasjan "to clothe", etc.)

As Watkins (1969) argued, the Hittite word can be compared with Lat.
vespillō "undertaker for the poorest classes, dresser (of dead bodies)", attested in
Latin from the empire only, hence with the notion of providing the dead with the
appropriate clothing for their burial. The scholar observes that the comparison
between these two lexemes helps us to reconstruct a fragment of non-material
culture for Common Indo-European Society. Metaphorical connections between
the notion of "to cover" and the consequent notion of "to clothe, dress" and the like
can be observed in many Hittite words, such as for example TG kaluppa- (c.)
"petticoat", if we trace it back (see Čop 1963) to IE * kel- "to hide, conceal" (IEW:
553, LIV: 322), cf. Gr. κέλςθος "sheathing, liner", καλύπηφ "to hide", Lat. celō,
OHG helan id., Goth. huljan "to wrap, cover", etc.

Furthermore, words such as karza, karzan- "spool, bobbin (or similar)", which
probably denote a weaver's tool, show the widespread relationship between the
semantics of "to spin, to move quickly" and that of "to weave": cf. Skr. kart-
"to spin" and perhaps kṛtsna- "whole, entire".

The use of the image of spinning, sewing or weaving to describe the process
of linking words together seems to represent – as observed, among others, by
Bachvarova (2016) – a common Indo-European metaphor. Consider, for example,
the Hittite verb ıšḫai-, ıšhiya- "to bind, to wrap; to obligate with, to impose upon",
from which the noun ıšhamat- "song, melody" (literally "bound speech") derives,
cf. Skr. sā- "to bind", sāman "song", Lith. sēti "to bind", Gr. οἴμη "song" (<
*soymā), οἴμος "melody", perhaps from an IE root like *seh2- (Oettinger 1979:
461) or *sh2ey- "to bind" (LIV: 544).

As shown by Lazzeroni (1967: 55), in fact, the linguistic isoglosse that
characterizes Greek and Hittite would shed light on the close cultural contact
between the two populations that would have developed a joint concept of poetry
as a link between the various parts that constitute a melody, song.

In a similar way, then, if we observe Hitt. (Sk)šūl- "thread" < *syewh1-
"to bind, to sew" (IEW: 915–6, LIV: 545) and we compare it with cognate forms such
as Lat. suō "to sew", Gr. ὑμῆν "thin skin, membrane" (< *syu-men), Goth. siujan
"to sew", Ved. śīvati "to sew", and the suffixed form sūtra- "thread, line, cord" –
on which the words are strung like beads" (Bachvarova 2016: 37) –, we notice,
exactly as in Gr. ὑμῖνος "hymn" from the base ὑ- "to weave" (but see also DELG:
1156 for the problems connected with this etymology), the metaphorical process
through which raw material can become fine poetry thanks to the act of "linking
together" (see also HEG A-K: 379–380).

---

4 See Dardano (2010) for the metaphorical use of the notion of dressing in reference to
atmospheric phenomena (particularly to nightfall), and for the demonstration that this can be
considered a fully Indo-European inheritance.
5 Skr. sā-, sīyāti- "to bind" derives instead, according to LIV: 518, from *seh1(y)- "to release,
loose" (cf. also Lat. sinō "to let, permit"), from which "to send" → "throw, hurl, shoot" as in
Hitt. šai-ši- "to (im)press, to seal".
6 IE *sewh1- and *syewh1- are considered variants of the same root, even if no satisfactory
explanations for the presence or loss of *y have been proposed. Anatolian preserved only
continuants of *sewh1-. See Rieken (1999: 479).
**Hittite Outcomes of some IE Roots Indicating the Act of Weaving**

The Hittite terms connected in different ways with the idea of "weaving" as well as the IE roots to which they can be traced back, are given below. The different formal outcomes and meanings in the various IE languages are also shown. Hittite lexemes that cannot be traced back to an IE root indicating, if not the act of "weaving", at least the idea of "connecting together" (even if their historical semantics can be considered associable with the act of weaving) will not be listed.

The roots which are involved in this reasoning and which will be analyzed – in the light of Hittite historical developments – are:

- **webh**- "to weave, to tie", but also "to move quickly" (IEW: 1114, LIV: 658).
- **tek(s)**- "to weave, connect, hew", but also "to fabricate, especially with an ax", "to make wicker or wattle fabric for (mud-covered) house walls" (IEW: 1058, LIV: 619).
- **seh1**- "to impress, insert, connect → to sew" (IEW: 889-890, LIV: 517).
- **s(y)ewh1**- "to sew" (IEW: 915-6, LIV: 545), even if it is not productive and is only attested in one nominal form.

In Hittite, among the verbs which convey a meaning connected with the idea of "weaving", are verbs such as **takš**- "to devise, to unify, to undertake, to mingle", **wep**- "to weave" (and derivatives such as, perhaps, **wepa**- "cloth/fabric"), **šai/-ši**- ; **šiya**- "to impress, to prick, to seal, press down" and perhaps also **šar**- , **šariya**- "to sew (on), embroider" (although its meaning is not fully clear).

Among the verbs that do not immediately convey a meaning connected with the idea of weaving but that express, semantically, the idea of "to assemble, gather, unite", only **talupp/-tarupp**- is mentioned (see also **taluppa**- "clod of land, of clay", which in Melchert’s opinion could be a deverbal noun from the above-mentioned verb). The semantics of the Hittite verb, according to Melchert (1998), must have originally expressed the idea of connecting together materials that easily self-adhere (also raw wool and spun yarn), and only later was it extended to apply to people or other objects. At the end of this semantic shift (from the more general to the more specific), it assumed the secondary usage of indicating the technique of twisting strands of pliable material together. With regard to the original IE root, Melchert suggests the possibility of tracing back **tarupp**- to IE **rewp**- (IEW: 870, LIV: 510; cf. Lat. **rumpō** "to break", Old English **rēfan** id., Old Icelandic **reyfi** "plucked wool" etc.), which probably must have meant either "to break" or "to pluck,” to break”.

---

7 "The word […] is attested chiefly in purification rituals where the cleansing material is pressed against the client’s body and absorbs the afflicting sickness or other evil" (Melchert 1998: 47). The scholar stresses that the fact that the word **taluppa**- is not yet attested referring to wool could be due to an accidental gap: our knowledge of this lexical area is in fact extremely limited.
snatch”. The author’s conclusion, then, is that "if one snatches with the hand material which naturally self-adheres, such as clay, dough, or raw wool, the immediate result is that one gathers a handful" (Melchert 1998: 50). This is an example of a Hittite word, probably connected with the idea of weaving, that can be traced back to an IE root whose basic meaning was not specifically "to weave, to sew" or similar.

As will be seen, however, a problem arises in the case of a verb which Puhvel (HED 3: 384) cites as ḫuppai-, and which, in his view, means "to interlace, entangle, ensnare, commingle, (make a) blend (of)"; (intr.) "mix, mingle" (see, perhaps, also ḫuppa- "blending, mixing", ḫup(p)ala- "fishnet", ḫup(p)ara-, ḫupra- "a type of cloth"), contrary to most other scholars, who, as will be illustrated later, have expressed different opinions.

Even if these verbal forms have been generally (even if differently) traced back to the above-mentioned Indo-European roots, they present some problems, in some cases due to their graphic-phonological shape and to the semantic interpretation of the documented forms, which is sometimes quite difficult. In the case of ḫuppai-, in particular, the notion of "weaving" – which could emerge only through the connected semantics of "interlace" (only according to Puhvel’s interpretation) – is still obscure, and that is the reason why other scholars (see below) have advanced different opinions about the meaning of the verb. Here follow some of the forms that are pertinent to this overview:

- *takš- "to devise, to unify, undertake, mingle" < *tekiš- "to weave, connect, hew", but also "to fabricate, especially with an ax", "to make wicker or wattle fabric for (mud-covered) house walls" (IEW: 1058, LIV: 619).

As LIV (620, note 1) outlines, the Hittite figurative meaning "to undertake, strive, endeavour" could have spread from the original desiderative meaning "to desire to weave/plait". Also in the Old Persian form ham-ataxšata "he strove, endeavoured" the same figurative meaning documented in Hittite emerges, if we consider it a development of the same root. The noticeable vowel a in the Hittite form takš is due to the development *e > a before a consonant cluster.

It is difficult to determine the exact meaning of the verb, given the wide semantic spectrum that characterizes it. All the roots that have been proposed as archetypes of the Hittite forms present a voiceless final stop, which seems to correspond to the attested forms, documented with the double spelling in an intervocalic position (tāg-ga-aš[-mi], tāk-ki-iz-zi etc.).

A possible Lydian cognate could be tašo- "to order" (LW: 211), even if the semantic connection does not seem completely evident. Because of the wide range of meanings documented in Hittite the basic sense of the verb is not clearly definable and various etymological connections with different IE roots are possible.

---

8 For alternative etymological proposals see LIV (620 note 3).
A first possibility is an origin from IE *tek-š (IEW: 1058) / *tek-s (LIV: 619) "to weave, to connect" (Sturtevant 1930: 214, Oettinger 1979: 219).

In this case, the cognate forms would be Skr. takš- "to hammer, form, fashion", Greek τεκνή "art, ability, skill", tēktovn "architect" (Myc. te-ko-to-nè!), Lat. texō "to weave, put together, construct", tēla "linen, web" < *teks-lā, Skr. taksan- "carpenter", OAv. tāšt "to fashion", MHG dehsen "to break/swing flax", OHG dehsala "axe", etc.

Another proposal (Pedersen 1938: 139-144) could be the reconstruction of the root *dhǝ-k- "to do, to build" (with a k-enlargement from *dēh- "to put, to position"), cf. Lat. faciō "to do", Gr. θήκη "deposit" etc. (IEW: 236, LIV: 139).

In this case, in particular, a strong formal comparison could be recognized between Hitt. takš- and Lat. (intensive) facessō "to do intensely".

Laroche (1963: 69, 71), instead, has traced back the form to IE *dek- "to take, to perceive, to consider" (IEW: 189-190, LIV: 109), so that Gr. δέκομαι "to accept, to receive, to consider", Skr. daśasy ti "respects", Lat. decet "befits" etc. can be compared.

- šar-, šariya- "to sew (on), embroider (?)" < *ser- "to string together, connect" (IEW: 911, LIV: 534).

As for šar-, šariya- "to sew (on), embroider (?)", the interpretation of the meaning of the verb is not fully clear. It should be connected with the noun šariya- "line, file". CHD (Ș: 259), followed by Kloehhorst (2008: 727), hypothesizes a derivation from the same root from which Lat. serō "to link, join", Gr. εἴρφ "to string/knit together", OLith. sēris "thread", OIC. sõrvi "collar" etc. derive, i.e. IE *ser-. Furthermore, the meaning of the verb seems to be nearer to the idea of "embroidering" rather than of "weaving", since it is often attested in contexts where gold or other precious objects or stones occur (CHD: Ș: 259). Only in passages referring to meat could it mean "to truss, to sew together", after the flesh has been butchered and salted.

- wep- "to weave" (?)<webh- "to weave, to tie", but also "to move quickly" (IEW: 1114, LIV: 658). Derivatives: wepa- "cloth/fabric" (?). Cf. Skr. ubhnāti "tightens, ties, forces", Myc. e-we-pe-se-so-me-na "which will be woven/are ready to be woven", Gr. όφη "net, weaving", όφαίνω "to weave" (DELG: 1163-4), OHG weban, TochA wāp, TochB wāp- id. etc.

The verb and its derivatives constitute a figura etymologica (ú-e-pu-uš [acc. plur.] ú-e-ep-ta) which Neu (1998: 59) translates as "(he) work fabrics" and traces it back to IE *webh- "to weave", supported by the mentioning -- in the following sentence -- of TÚG "clothing", even though this value is only deduced from the context. The single spelling of the internal labial stop points regularly -- according to Sturtevant's Law (i.e. single and double spelling of stops representing, respectively, inherited voiced/voiced aspirated and voiceless stops)² -- to an original voiced consonant.

² For this topic see two recent studies by Pozza (2011, 2012).
• (ṣīg)ṣūil- "thread" < *sēwh₁₁-th.₁₀ < *s(y)ewh₁₁- "to sew" (IEW: 915-6, LIV: 545). Cf. Lat. suō, Skr. sūtra- "thread, string", Gr. ύμην "thin skin, sinew", etc.

As outlined by Kloekhorst (2008: 777), the root *syewh₁₁- "to sew" is continued, in Hittite, only in this noun, so there is no productive verb which preserved traces of the original root.

• ḫu(wa)pp-, ḫuppai-, ḫuppiya- "interlace, entangle, ensnare, commingle, (make a) blend (of)", (intr.) "mix, mingle" – in the opinion of HED (3: 384) / "to cast, hurl down" (ẖuwapp- + accusative), "to do evil against" (ẖuwapp- + dative-locative), "to heap together, make a heap" (ẖuppai-), "to play the ḫuḫupal-instrument" (ẖuppiya-) – in Melchert’s opinion (2007).

The first problem connected with this verb is represented by the fact that only Puhvel (HED 3: 384) interprets it semantically as "interlace, entangle" and differentiates it from the lemma ḫuwapp-, which he translates as "ill-treat, harrow, harass, disfigure, spoil" (HED 3: 430).

Only within the semantic framework outlined by Puhvel, then, can ḫuppai- be considered a form associated with the semantic idea of "weaving", and this is the only reason why the main interpretations concerning the form in question will be summarized.

If we connect this verb with Skr. ubhnāti "tightens, ties, forces", Myc. e-ve-pe-se-so-me-na "which will be woven/are ready to be woven" (Hajnal 2002), Gr. ύφη "net, weaving", ύφαίνω "to weave", OHG weban, TochA wāp, TochB wāp- id. etc., we have to hypothesize an origin from *webh- "to weave" (IEW: 1114; LIV: 658; HED 3: 386; HEG A-K: 290).

Kloekhorst (2008: 431), alternatively, compares it with Goth. ubils "evil" (following Juret 1942), OHG ubil id., Skr. vap- "to strew (out), to scatter (seed)" etc., and reconstructs an IE root of the type *h₂weph₁₁- "to hurl, to throw" (IEW: 1149, LIV: 684). The root-final laryngeal *h₁ is postulated by the scholar in order not to contradict his hypothesis of lenition of an original voiceless stop after *ō₁₁: the laryngeal would prevent the lenital process, causing, as a consequence, the secondary gemination of the labial stop. In any case, determining the meaning of the Hittite verb is problematic.

In light of the first reconstruction (IE *webh-) the only assumption that can explain an initial ħ in Hittite is the one that reconstructs an IE root beginning with *H. According to Beekes (1969), in particular, the Mycenaean future
participle e-we-pe-se-so-me-na (= ἐφευρησόμενα) points to a present *ἐφέσσω from an IE root with an initial laryngeal, i.e. *h₁*webh:- the Mycenaean form would show, through a prothetic /e/, its regular outcome. More precisely, this would be a case of the so-called "false prosthesis" (Austin 1941), that is to say that we are dealing, instead, with an inherited part of the original root. Pure prosthesis – which implies that a vocalic element is added initially to the root for mere phonetic reasons – is in fact rarer.

The double spelling of the internal labial, in Hittite, however, is striking with regard to Sturtevant’s Law. In particular, according to LIV: 658, ḫuppai-, ḫuppipía- cannot be ascribed to the IE root *webh- precisely because of the geminate spelling of the labial stop and of the presence of an initial *h-.

Hajnal (2002: 206-207) suggests solving this problem by assuming that the consistent double writing of -pp- is the result of an assimilation of the type *mb(h) > -pp- (phonetic /°bb°/), exactly as in the case of Hitt. ʾištāp- / ʾistapp- "to block, to enclose, to shut", from a previous *ste(m)bh- (Benveniste 1932: 139; Melchert 1994: 270). So, forms like ḫu-u-up-pa-an-zi / ḫūbbant’ī come from an original nasal-infixed present /ḥumbantī/ < */Humbh-enti/.

Notwithstanding the double spelling of the medial stop, Puhvel (HED 3: 386) considers plausible, for ḫuppai-, the reconstruction of an IE root characterized either by an enlargement in a labial voiced aspirated stop (of the type *A₂ubh-) or ending in voiceless stop (of the type *A₂up-). He considers ḫupp- and ḫuwapp- two different lexemes, the first indicating "to interlace, entangle, ensnare, commingle, (make a) blend (of)", (intr.) "mix, mingle", and the second "to spoil, disfigure, harass". In his view (HED 3: 432), ḫupp- could represent a semantic offshoot of the same root, as in the Engl. warp in the figurative sense of "distort, disfigure".

The majority of other scholars, on the other hand (see in particular HEG A-K: 290 and Kloekhorst 2008: 369 ff.), consider ḫupp- a graphic variant of ḫuwapp-, the same representing phonologically /hwapp/-. In their opinion, ḫuwapp- and ḫupp- are originally identical (the meaning "to be hostile towards, to do evil against" can be derived from a previous meaning "to hurl, to throw down").

A brilliant explanation of this problematic issue has been recently offered by Melchert (2007), who, through careful philological investigations, has reached the conclusion that the verbs erroneously linked by Puhvel should actually be distinguished. In Hittite, therefore, four different verbs are documented: ḫuppipía- "to play the ḫuḫpal-instrument", ḫuwapp- "to do evil against", ḫuwapp- "to cast, hurl (down)", and ḫuppati- "to heap (together), make a hip".

In Melchert’s view, in particular, there is no compelling evidence for any of the assigned meanings listed by Puhvel.

---

12 With *A₂j Puhvel intends a voiceless a-coloring laryngeal, preserved in Hittite.
13 For a metaphorical use of the expression sākwa katta ḫu(wapp)- "to throw down as to the eyes, face down" (lit. "mit den Augen nach unten gewendet beschädigen") see Oettinger (1976: 44) and for a comparison with Skr. vāpati "to throw, strew", Ved. ni-vāpati "throw down, shatter", see Melchert (1988: 233).
Szemerényi (1974: 154) compares the deverbal neuter abstract *
ḫu(wa)ppar "maltreatment, outrage", which unfortunately is documented in a
fragmentary context (KUB 34.73, 7 apaš idalawanni ḫu-wa-af[...]), with Gr.
ὑβρις "insolence, outrage" (see also the adjective ḫuwappa- "bad"), considering
the Greek form a borrowing from Hittite. In particular, the scholar (Szemerényi
(1974: 154) observes that "since the Western part of Asia Minor was in all
likelihood populated by Luwian speakers, it is of interest to note the Luwian
tendency to generalise i-stems".

Conclusion

As illustrated in this brief contribution, not all the principal IE roots
indicating the act of weaving are fully documented in Hittite. In particular,
after the new semantic interpretations of ḫuwapp- and ḫuppai- advanced by
Melchert (2007), the semantic counterpart of IE *webh- seems to be preserved
in Hittite only in the verb wep-, provided that its meaning is really to be
interpreted as "to weave": in fact there is only indirect (i.e. contextual)
evidence that its meaning was really connected with the idea of "weaving".

In regards to *
ḫu(wa)pp-, on the other hand, neither the semantics nor the
formal structure (especially due to the presence of the initial ḫ in Hittite) allow
us to consider it a direct outcome of *webh-, especially since Hittite wep- is
formally more regular compared to the original root.
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