Notes

1 Excepting the instances where English translations have rendered הֶת (ḥēt), “Heth,” as Hittites (Gn 10:15 = 1 Chr 1:13), בְּנֵי הֶת (benê ḥēt), “sons of Heth,” as Hittites (Gn 23:3, 5, 7, 10 [2], 16, 18, 20; 25:10; 49:32), and בְּנוֹת הֶת (benôt ḥēt), “daughters of Heth,” as Hittite (Gn 27:46 [2]).

2 Translations in other languages based on the Vulgate had a form of Hethite(s) until relatively recent times; e.g., German at first had Hethiter, later changed to Hetiter, and French Hétheien(s), became Hittite(s).

3 The passages where these terms are found are listed in Table 1 at the end of the article. Heb. grammars only mention the masc. sg. gentilic. Gogel gives the fem. sg. and masc. pl. suffixes, both based on the masc. sg., as is the fem. pl. not listed by Gogel (Sandra Landis Gogel, A Grammar of Epigraphic Hebrew [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998], 181).

4 For convenience, I shall use Hittite(s) to represent both Hethite(s) and Hittite(s) in our English translations, until the end of the article when I shall separate the two.


10 For recent treatments of Hittite history, see Trevor Bryce, Life and Society in the Hittite World (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); id., The Kingdom of the Hittites, new ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005); Collins, The Hittites and
Their World. A useful compendium of the peoples and places of ancient Anatolia and northern Syria is Trevor Bryce, Routledge Handbook of the Peoples and Places of Ancient Western Asia: From the Early Bronze Age to the Fall of the Persian Empire (New York: Routledge, 2009).

Heinrich K. Brugsch, A History of Egypt Under the Pharaohs Derived Entirely from the Monuments 2 (London: Murray, 1879), 2. Technically, this is an invalid association since ḥittî (ḥitti) was an ethnonym for descendants of the (ḥēt), who lived in Canaan (see below), whereas Hattî was the ancient name of unknown origin for Anatolia.


The Empire of the Hittites (New York: Scribner & Welford, 1884).


Heth is the Anglicized transliteration of ḫēt, son of Canaan (Gn 10:15 = 1 Chr 1:13). The name occurs in isolation only in Gn 10:15 = 1 Chr 1:13, but some twelve times in combination with -ynEB (benê) and -tAnB (benôt). Editors note: Autochthonous means “indigenous, native”.


In the early days of Hittitology a number of scholars argued for a Hittite background to the negotiations described in Genesis 23. Today, this association largely has been abandoned. Hoffner writes, “it is quite unlikely that genuine Hittite land tenure laws underlie this story” (Harry A. Hoffner Jr., “Some Contributions of Hittitology to Old Testament Study,” TynBul 20 [1969], 37). Singer agrees, stating Genesis 23 does not “reflect an intimate knowledge of Hittite legal procedures, as had formerly been claimed” (“Hittites,” 728).

Hoffner, “Contributions,” 32.

Ibid.
24 The dates for Israelite kings in this paper are from Rodger C. Young, “Tables of Reign Lengths from the Hebrew Court Recorders,” *JETS* 48 (2005) 245–46.
26 2 Sm 11:3, 6, 17, 21, 24; 12:9, 10; 23:39 (= 1 Chr 11:41); 1 Kgs 15:5.
28 2 Kgs 16:10, 11, 15, 16; Is 8:2; and Ezr 8:33; Neh 3:4, 21.
31 Id. 730.
35 It is not yet possible to assign accurate dates to the Hittite kings. Synchronisms with Egyptian history, however, indicate Tudhaliya III ruled ca. 1370?–1350 BC (Bryce, *Handbook*, 299).
36 Nm 34:8; Jos 13:5; Jgs 3:3; 1 Kgs 8:65 (= 2 Chr 7:8); Ez 47:16; Amos 6:14.
38 This possibility is strengthened by the apparent changing of the prince’s name from Aramean Hadoram, “Hadad is exalted,” to Hebrew Joram, “Yahweh is exalted.” Thiel believes Joram to be a scribal error since the LXX at 2 Sam 8:10 has essentially the same form of the name as in 1Chr 18:10 (Winfried Thiel, “Joram,” *ABD* 3.953). However, this simply may be a case of harmonization by the LXX translators.
43 There is some question about the credibility of the numbers in the Kurkh Stela (Shigo Yamada, *The Construction of the Assyrian Empire: A Historical Study of the Inscriptions of Shalmaneser III (859–824 B.C.) Relating to His Campaigns in the West* [Boston: Brill, 2000], 161–62). Even so, the relative sizes of the armies provide useful information.
44 K. Lawson Younger, Jr., “Shalmaneser III (2.113): Kurkh Monolith (2.113A),” *COS* 2.263.
45 For these campaigns only the kings of Damascus and Hamath are named in the available sources. The formulaic phrase “Hadad-eraz (Adad-idri), the Damascene, (and) Irḫulēni, the Hamathite, together with twelve kings on the shore of the sea, trusted in their combined forces” is used to describe the coalition (Younger, “Shalmaneser III,” 264–70).
50 K. Lawson Younger, Jr., “Sargon II (2.118): The Annals (2.118A),” *COS* 2.293.
51 Conversely, these constructs were not used in association with the indigenous Ḥatti (ḥitti).
52 Where pl. gentilics would be expected when referring to the descendants of Ḥett (ḥēt), the constructs Ḥa-ṭe-ynEB (benê ḥēt) and Ḥa-ṭe-tAnB (benôt ḥēt) were used instead. While the similarity of Ḥatti and Ḫatti no doubt lies behind the usage of the pl. gentilics of Ḫatti (ḥitti) for the people of Ḥatti in the Hebrew Bible, the linguistic details of this association are beyond the scope of the present paper.
53 Ḫatti (ḥitti) occurs in Jos 3:10; 9:1; 11:3; 12:8; and 24:11; as opposed to Ḫaṭṭīm (ḥittîm) in 1:4. Ḫatti (ḥitti) is found in Jgs 3:5 contrasted with Ḫaṭṭīm (ḥittîm) in 1:26. In 1 Kgs, Ḫatti (ḥitti) appears in 9:20 (= 2 Chr 8:7) and 15:5, while Ḫaṭṭīm (ḥittîm) is in 10:29 (= 2 Chr 1:17), and Ḫaṭṭīyōt (ḥittiyōt) in 11:1.
54 I would argue the references in Jos 1:4 and Jgs 1:26 are to the Hittite empire as I would place these allusions in a historical context prior to 1177 BC.
56 The Anatolian Indo-Europeans properly should be called “Hattians,” but that name has been reserved for the pre-Indo-European population of Anatolia (Gurney, *Hittites*, 13; Guterbock and Sterling, “Hittites”; Hoffner, “Hittites,” 85).