



A Hurro-Hittite Hymn to Ishtar

Hans G. Guterbock

Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 103, No. 1, Studies in Literature from the Ancient Near East, by Members of the American Oriental Society, Dedicated to Samuel Noah Kramer. (Jan. - Mar., 1983), pp. 155-164.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-0279%28198301%2F03%29103%3A1%3C155%3AAHHTI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-B>

Journal of the American Oriental Society is currently published by American Oriental Society.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/aos.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A HURRO-HITTITE HYMN TO ISHTAR

HANS G. GÜTERBOCK

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE HITTITE TEXT I AM HERE PRESENTING TO MY FRIEND SAMUEL KRAMER has been known for a long time. It takes up the first and part of the second column of a tablet, *Bo* 2024, published in cuneiform copy by A. Walther as *KUB* 24.7 in 1930; the tablet is now kept in the Istanbul Museum. The second part of the tablet contains the well-known tale of "The Sungod, the Cow, and the Fisherman."¹

In contrast to that tale the hymnic first part of the tablet (*CTH* 717) was for a long time more or less left aside because of the difficulties of understanding it. A. Goetze, in 1933, gave the first translation of col. i 12–32 (*AM* pp. 262f.), in which he correctly brought out the essentials. C. G. von Brandenstein (in the places cited under *CTH* 717) only commented on individual lines. Only recently have editions of the whole text been published. In 1977 there appeared an article by A. Archi, "I poteri della dea Ištar hurrita-ittita," *Oriens Antiquus* 16, 297–311, that contains a full transliteration and translation of the hymn (pp. 305–11). Almost simultaneously Ilse Wegner included individual parts of the text in her dissertation, *Gestalt und Kult der Ištar-Šawuška in Kleinasien*.² These editions have become a basis for further study and have been helpful in the preparation of this article.

¹ Abbreviations as in the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary* (*CHD*) and *HW*, *HW*².

CTH, 363; part of it was made available by H. Ehelolf as early as 1926 (*OLZ* 29, 766–69); the standard edition is by J. Friedrich, *ZA* 49 (1950), 224–33. In my *Kumarbi* (1946), 119–22 I gave an outline of the story, connecting it with the tale of Appu (*CTH* 360, ed. by J. Siegelová, *StBoT* 14, 1971, 1–34) for reasons that in my mind are still valid. A new analysis of "The Hurrian Story of the Sungod, the Cow and the Fisherman" was published by H. A. Hoffner in M. A. Morrison and D. I. Owen, eds., *Studies on the Civilization*

For some time I wondered whether the hymn was an introduction to the tale of "The Sungod and the Cow." In the beginning of the story the Sungod falls in love with a beautiful cow, and (apparently as a result of their union) the cow gives birth to a human child. Was that the reason for prefacing the tale with a hymn to the goddess of love? I no longer think so. It is more likely that *KUB* 24.7 is simply a *Sammeltablet*, a tablet upon which two separate texts happen to be written. Whether the scribe who thus combined them was thinking of Ištar's role in the adventure of the cow is another question. The main reason for separating the two texts, however, is their form: the tale is told in prose, while the hymn has a clear strophic structure. Another reason may be the following: In *Kumarbi*, 119–22, I included both the Appu story and the tale of the Cow among Hittite texts of Hurrian origin, and both Friedrich (*ZA* 49, 213 ff.) and Hoffner (l.c. in note 1) followed me in this. But Siegelová (*StBoT* 14, 33f.) showed that there is no evidence for Hurrian origin in these two tales, and the repertory of preserved Hurrian mythological fragments published by M. Salvini (*SMEA* 18, 1977, 73–91) does not include a Hurrian text on Appu or the Cow story. The hymn, on the other hand, shows its Hurrian origin clearly in the names of the goddesses who are attendants of Ištar. If thus the two texts have different backgrounds, this is one more reason for keeping them apart.

I shall first present the text in transliteration and translation; this will be followed by a philological commentary and a literary analysis.

and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians in Honor of E. R. Lacheman (1981), 189–94.

² *Hurritologische Studien* III = *AOAT* 36, published 1981, but, according to the preface, completed in 1976.

TRANSLITERATION

Col. i: First six lines lost; line 7 damaged.

- §1 7 [.]-ma ^rla-aḥ-ḫi(?) i-ia^r[-at/
aḥ-t]a-ri(?)
8 [. . .] ku-e-e[z-za o o]MEŠ(?)³na-at ku-ra-
ak-ki
9 [ma-a-an?] a-ša-an-zi šar-ga-u-e-eš-ma ku-e-
ez-za
10 [UR.SAG?].MEŠ nu za-aḥ-ḫi-ia tar-aḥ-ḫi-iš-
kán-zi
11 [ku-e-ez?]-ma SAL.MEŠ_e-ši-in-zi SAL.MEŠ_{KAR}.
KID-ia SIG₅-an-te-eš
-
- §2 12 [wa-al-l]a-aḥ-ḫi-ia-aš SA ^dGAŠAN ḥa-an-te-ez-
zi-uš SAL_{SUHUR}.LÁL.ḪI.A
13 [^dNi-na]-at-ta-an ^dKu-li-it-ta-an ^dŠi-en-tal-ir-
te-in
14 [^dḪa]-am-ra-zu-un-na-an nu-kan ^dIŠTAR-li é-ir
ku-it
15 [a-aš-ši]-ia-at-ta-ri nu a-pu-u-uš a-pé-e-da-ni
é-ni
16 [š]u²-wa-u-wa-an-zi u-i-ia-az-zi nu KIN-an ku-
it an-ni-iš-kán-zi
17 ^rna-at^r ḥal-wa-am-na-az an-ni-iš-kán-zi é-ir-
ma ku-it
18 an-ni-iš-kán-zi na-at du-uš-ka-ra-at-ta-az-za
(erasure)
19 an-ni-iš-kán-zi ḥa-an-ta-ir-ma SAL.MEŠ_E.GE₄.
A-uš
20 nu TÚG-an ša-ri-iš-kán-zi ḥa-an-da-ir-ma
DUMU.MEŠ É-TI
21 nu A.ŠĀ-an IKU-li ḥar-ši-iš-kán-zi
-
- §3 22 wa-al-la-aḥ-ḫi-ia-aš SA ^dGAŠAN ap-pé-ez-zi-uš
SAL_{SUHUR}.LÁL.ḪI.A
23 ^dA-li-in ^dḪal-za-a-ri-in ^dTa-ru-wi₅-in
24 ^dŠi-na-an-da-du-kar-ni-in wa-al-la-aḥ-ḫi nu-
kán ^dGAŠAN-li
25 [k]u-it é-ir pu-uk-kán nu a-pu-u-uš a-pé-e-da-
ni é-ri
26 a-ni-ia-u-wa-an-zi (eras.) u-i-ia-zi nu é-ir
tuḥ[-ḫi-ma-az-z]a
27 pid-du-li-ia-az-za e-eš-ša-an-zi nu-kán SAL_EΓ_E¹
[GE₄.A-X]
28 kap-pi-la-a-ir nu-kán l-aš l-an SAG.DU^r-an¹
29 šal-la-an-ni-iš-ki-iz-zi nu nam-ma ḥa-an-t[a-
an-te-eš(?) TÚG-an]
30 Ú-UL ša-a-ri-ia-an-zi LÚ.MEŠ AT-ḪU-TIM[-ma]
31 ^rku^r-ru-ri-^ria^r-aḥ-ḫi-ir nu nam-ma A.ŠĀ-an
[IKU-li Ú-UL]

³ Or [o - o-t]e-eš?

TRANSLATION

§1 (about six lines missing)

(7) But [when she] go[es] (or: [they] go) to war,
[. . .] on one side (are) [the . . .]s,
they are [like] pillars;
on the other side (are) the mighty [heroes],
they always win in battle;
and [on another side] (are) the ešī-women and
'good' (shapely?) prostitutes.

§2 (12) I shall praise them, the 'first' lady atten-
dants of Ištar:

Ninatta, Kulitta, Šintal-irti (and) [H]amra-
zunna.

Whatever household is beloved by Ištar,
she sends these into that house in order to
look (after it)(?).

The work which they (the people of the house)
perform,

they perform with laughter;

(17) the house for which they care,
they care for it with joy.

The young brides have been in harmony,

and (so) they keep weaving cloth;

and the sons of the house have been in harmony,
and (so) they continue plowing the field by
the acre.

§3 (22) I shall praise them, the 'last' lady atten-
dants of Ištar:

Ali, Halzari, Taruwi (and) Šinanda-dukarni
I shall praise.

Whatever household is hated by Ištar,
she sends those into that house in order to
treat it.

They do the housework with gr[oaning] and
anguish.

(27) The you[ng brides] were at odds,
and (so) one always pulls the other by the
head,
and they no longer weave [cloth] in har-
[mony].

The brothers have become enemies,

and (so) they [no] longer plow the field [by
the acre];

32 ¹har¹-ši-ia-a[n-z]i ḫal-lu-wa-nu-e-er-m[a-at-za(?)]
 33 nu nam-ma [šE? m]a-al-lu-u-wa-ar ú-U[l ki-ša-ri(?)]
 34 nu UR.GI₇ GI[M-an šA]Ḫ(?) Ú-UL ḫa-an-ta[-iz-zi(?) . . . (?)]
 35 nu-kán NINDA.X[o o]x ¹NA₄ku-un-ku-nu-uz-zi-i[n]
 36 GIM-an ú-e-te-ni an-da tar-nir na[-at]
 37 ar-ḫa ḫar-ni-in-ki-i[r]

§4 38 LÚ-iš-ma-kán DAM-ZU-ia ku-i-e-eš a-aš-ši-ia-a[n-ta-ri]
 39 nu-uš-ma-aš-kán a-aš-ši-ia-tar ZAG[-aš]-ša-an ar[-nu-wa-an-zi]
 40 na-at tu-e<-da>-az-za ^dIŠTAR-li-az-za [t]a-ra-a-an SAL¹-n[a¹-an ku-iš(?)]
 41 pu-pu-wa-la-iz-zi nu-za-kán pu-pu¹-wa-la¹-tar ZAG-aš[-ša-an]
 42 ar-nu-uz-zi na-at tu-e-da-za ^dGAŠAN-li-z[a ta-ra-a-an . . .]
 43 Ì.DÙG.GA na-at wa-aš-ta-ri tu-uk-ma-kán [ku-iš . . . (?)]
 44 [a-aš]-ši-ia-at-ta-ri nu-uš-ši zi-ik URU-a[š an-tu-uḫ-ša-tar(?)]
 45 [ga]-la-ak-ta-ra-ši na-an an-da ka-a[-ri-ia-ši]
 46 [nu-ká]n(?) tu-e-da-az¹-pát ^dIŠTAR-li-az a-pé-e [. . . (?)]
 47 [o]-x ar-ḫa Ú-UL ku-it-ki iš-da[m-ma-aš-ša-an-zi]

§5 48 [ma-a-a]n SAL-TUM-ma A-NA LÚ MU-TI-ŠU pu-u[k-kán-za na-an zi-ik]
 49 [^dGAŠAN-iš(?)] pu-uq-qa-nu-wa-an ḫar-t[i] ma-a-an [LÚ-iš-ma A-NA DAM-ŠU(?)]
 50 [im-ma(?)] pu-uk-kán-za nu-uš[-ma-aš]-kán [.]
 51 [zi-ik(?)] ^dIŠTAR-iš iš-ḫu-u-wa<-an> ¹har-ti¹ [.]
 52 [.]x na-aš mar-la-tar pu-pu-wa[la-tar]
 53 [.]x ma-na-at-kán wa-at-ku-an[-zi]
 54 [. T]i-nu-zi ap-pa-an-zi-ma[-.]
 55 [.] e-šú-wa-ar mar-la[-.]

§6 56 [^dIŠTAR-in(?) iš-ḫa-m]i-iš-ki-mi na-an[.]
 57 [.]x-in nu-mu LÚ.X[.]
 58 (traces)

(gap of about 5 lines)

ii I [. wa-aš(?)]-ta-aš-ku-wa-ar zi-ik ^dIŠTAR[-iš]

they have quarreled,
 (33) and (so) grinding [of grain] no longer [takes place].
 Just as the dog do[es] not [get] along with the pig(?),
 they let [. . .] bread (and?) basalt into the water like [. . .]
 and (so) they have destroyed [. . .] completely(?).

§4 (38) A man and his wife who love each other and carry their love to fulfillment: that has been decreed by you, Ištar. [He who] seduces a w[oman] and carries the seduction to fulfillment: that [has been decreed] by you, Ištar. [. . .] (43) sweet-scented oil, and it is pleasing. For him [who] is beloved [by you] you make the town[’s people] drowsy and cover him, (so that) thanks to you, Ištar, those [people] do not hear anything.

§5 (48) But [if] a woman is ha[ted] by her husband, [then you, Ištar] have caused [her] to be hated. [But] if [a man] is [even(?) hated [by his wife], then [you], Ištar, have heaped up [. . .] for them. [They/he will . . .] (52) and he [will commit] a foolish act, (namely) adul[tery]. They might elope, [but . . .] will not save [them]. They will be seized [. . .]; to be [. . .] is fooli[sh](?).

§6 (56) [Of Ištar] I shall [si]ng and [. . .] her. (Two lines too fragmentary for translation, then gap of ca. 5 lines) (ii 1) [. . .] constant [tra]nsgression [did] you, Ištar, [commit]: you devoured your husbands:

- 2 [.]x nu-za LÚ¹ MU-TI-KA ar-ḥa ka-ri-i[p-ta]
 3 [ku-in-kán LÚ-a]n LÚ.ŠU.GI-aḥ-ta ku-in-ma-
 kán LÚ-an ZAG-na
 4 [ar-nu-u]t(?) ku-in-ma-za LÚ-an LÚ¹GURUŠ-an-
 pát ḥar-ni-ik-ta
 5 [nu-z]a LÚ.MEŠ ḥu-el-pi GA.RAŠ.SAR i-wa-ar ar-
 ḥa ka-ri[ip-ta]
 6 [z]i-ik ^oIŠTAR-iš e-ša-ra-ši-la-aš-ma-aš a-ri-ša-
 an-d[a]
 7 GIM-an du-wa-ar-ni-iš-ki-it na-aš-za-kán ŠE.
 LÚ.SAR ḡGIM-an¹(?)
 8 IT-T[] NUM]UN(?) ka-ri-ip-ta na-aš-kán ar-ḥa
 ḥar-ni-ik-ta
 9 TÚG.NÍG.LÁ[M-aš-ma(?)]-aš-za GIM-an pár-ku-
 wa-ia wa-aš-še-eš-ki-ši
 10 nu ku-in [pa]-ap-ra-aḥ-ti ku-in-ma-za pár-ku-
 un-pát ar-ḥa pí-d-da-la-ši
 11 ku-in ḡú-wa-te¹-ši na-an ^{GIŠ}AN.ZA.GÀR GIM-an
 pár-ga-nu-ši
 12 ku-in-ma[ká]n a-pé-el-pát ú-e-ta-an-da-aš pa-
 ra-a
 13 ú-wa-te-š[i] A-aš-ma (? a-aš-ma?) ku-wa-pí
 la-ḥu-uz-zi
 14 nu wa^f-at-ta-ru(?)¹ KÚ-iz-zi zi-iq-qa-za ^dGAŠAN-
 iš LÚ.MEŠ-uš
 15 QA-TAM-M[A zi]-in-ni-iš-ki-ši nu-uš-ši-kán
 MÁŠ.TUR.ḤI.A
 16 GIM-an [ta-r]u-up-pa-an-zi EGIR-an-da GUL-ki-
 š[i]x(?)
 17 ^{GIŠ}kat-ta^f-lu¹-uz-zi-ma-aš DÙ-at na-aš-kán
 GÌ[R-ít]

- §7 18 ANŠE-aš-ma-za GIM-an pu-un-tar-ri-ia-li-iš
 z[i-ik]
 19 SAL.LUGAL-aš ^dIŠTAR-iš x-ga-x (traces)
 20 nu-ut-ta ku-wa-pí [o] x [.]
 21 UR.MAḤ-ma-za GI[M-an]
 22 KALAG.GA-aš al-p[a-aš(?)]
 23 LÚ.MEŠ^ŠGURUŠ-aš-ma-za [.]
 24 SAL.MEŠ^{KI}.SIKIL-aš x[.]
 25 SAL.MEŠ^Šal-la-wa-an[-.]
 26 zi-ik-pát ^dIŠTAR-iš

[End of hymn lost. Walther estimated the gap between line 26 and the double rule marking the end of the hymn as ca. 17 lines.]

- [One man] you made old,
 another man you [let attain] fulfillment,
 another you destroyed even in his prime:
 you devour[ed] men like fresh leek.
 (6) You, Ištar, kept breaking them like the . . .
 of their . . .
 and devoured them like coriander with (its)
 [see]d(?),
 and completely destroyed them.
 When you put clean festive garments on them,
 you soil one,
 and another you neglect even though he is
 clean(!).
 (11) Another you bring and make him high like
 a tower,
 still another you lead out to his own
 but when he pours into the waters (? when he
 first pours?)
 he keeps eating (? drinking?)
 you, Ištar, thus always finish men off.
 Afterwards(?) you keep hitting at(?) him(?)
 just as one herds kids together.
 You have made them into a threshold
 and [trample] them [with your] feet.

- §7 (18) You are stubborn like an ass, O queen
 Ištar!
 [.]
 And when [. . .] you [. . .]
 You are(?) like a lion [.]
 a terrible clo[ud]
 To the young men [.]
 to the maidens [.]
 the a-women [.]
 Only you, Ištar [.]

(§§ 8ff. lost: about 17 lines to the end of the hymn.)

COMMENTARY

i.9: Instead of [GIM-an] (Archi) I restore [ma-a-an], the same word spelled out, because it fills the space better.

Although the text uses GIM-an more often, the same tablet (same scribe, although the other text) has UR.MAḤ-aš GIM-an and ḥuwanḥueššar ma-a-an side by side in col. iii 24, 26.

10: [UR.SAG].MEŠ is free restoration based on the context and the space available.

11: SAL.MEŠ^ēš^{inzi}, Luwian nom. pl., not known otherwise.—SAL.MEŠ^ēKAR.KID, Akk. (sg.) *ḫarimtu*, Hitt. reading unknown. In the Hittite Laws (§ 194) the word occurs with its basic meaning “prostitute.” The KAR.KID, often in the plural and occasionally with a chief or overseer (GAL. UGULA), plays a role in the cult festivals; for details see H. Otten, *ZA* 53 (1959), 181f. In none of these occurrences do they actually exercise their profession. The only hint is contained in a text which I called “An Initiation Rite for a Hittite Prince,” where after much eating and some drinking twelve SAL.MEŠ^ēKAR.KID are brought into the presence of the prince.⁴ For a prostitute functioning in the cult the term “hierodule,” which is commonly used, is adequate; in our context it may simply be “prostitute.”

12 and 22: In contrast, the SAL.SUḪUR.LÁL (also SUḪUR.LAL, i.e., LA_s and LÁ, respectively) in the Hittite texts is not a hierodule. The definition as a kind of prostitute given for *kezertu* by both the CAD and the AHw is based on late sources. For the Old Babylonian period, J. J. Finkelstein (*YOS* 13 [1972], 10f.) only considered the possibility that *kezrētu* might have engaged in such activities. B. F. Batto (in 1974)⁵ flatly denied it; but M. L. Gallery⁶ argues that a certain married woman, among whose activities *ḫarimūtu* “prostitution” is mentioned in one OB document, was a *kezertu*, although she is not explicitly so designated. For the SUḪUR.LÁL in Hittite texts, a perusal of the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary* files⁷ resulted in the following picture, supplementing and modifying the observations of J. Friedrich, *SV* 2, 155f., 170f.

(1) The S.L. plays no rôle in the cult.

(2) She belongs to the palace (Huqq. §§ 31, 32; *Dienstanw.* 16; *KUB* 14.4 iii 15). Since she is contrasted to “free” women in the first two occurrences, she must have been unfree. Nevertheless,

(3) a S.L. named Kuwattalla and designated as GEME of the king and queen received a very large estate from Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal (ca. 1400 B.C.).⁸

⁴ *IBoT* 1.29 rev. 46–56; see Güterbock in D. Sinor, ed., *American Oriental Society Middle West Branch Semi-centennial Volume* [*Oriental Studies* 3] 1969, 99–103.

⁵ B. F. Batto, *Studies on Women at Mari*. 1974, 114f. (I owe this reference to Jo Ann Scurlock, Chicago.) J. Renger, *ZA* 58 (1967), 188 does not even mention this condition.

⁶ M. L. Gallery, “Service Obligations of the *kezertu*-Women,” *Or.* 49 (1980), 333–38. (I owe this reference to S. Košak, Chicago.)

⁷ Begun by H. A. Hoffner, Jr., continued under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

⁸ *KBo* 5.7, ed. K. K. Riemschneider, *MIO* 6 (1958), 344–55 as LS 1; her name is in rev. 47f.

(4) A S.L. of the same name, presumably the same person, is the author or co-author of several Luwian purification rituals (references in Laroche, *NH* no. 662.2). In most of the cases she appears together with a certain Šilalluḫi (*NH* no. 1148), a SAL.ŠU.GI, lit. “old woman” but in effect an exorcist.

(5) In some magic rituals the “tongue,” i.e., harmful speech, slander *vel sim.*, of the S.L. is exorcised with that of the palace attendant (DUMU.É.GAL), guardsman (*MESEDI*), *paššū*-priest (LÚ.GUDÙ), priest (SANGA) and priestess (AMA. DINGIR); here too she belongs to the personnel of the palace (*KUB* 9.34 i 31–32 and similar texts, cf. *CHD lala-* 4, esp. 4 b 3’).

(6) Deities can have S.L.s. In addition to our text there are these examples: [SAL]SUḪUR.LÁL ^dHé-bat (*KUB* 10.92 vi 7); the same goddess is kept from falling by her SAL.MEŠ^ēSUḪUR.LÁL (*KUB* 33.106 = *Ull.* III A ii 9). Apart from our hymn Ištar also has them in *KUB* 39.93 obv. 5, a text with recitations in *babili*, one of which reads: *alikätu ša paniki ali[kātu ša arkiki]* SAL.MEŠ^ēSUḪUR.LÁL-ki SAL.MEŠ^ēKAR.KID-ki “Those who walk before you and those who wal[k behind you], your S.L.s and your hierodules.” There are 2 SAL.MEŠ^ēSUḪUR.LÁL DINGIR-LIM “of the deity” in *KUB* 31.67 iv 9, where the deity probably is [Ištar of] Lawazantiya of line 8. In *KUB* 7.54 ii 19, however, the deity meant in the phrase SA DINGIR-LIM SAL.MEŠ^ēSUḪUR.LÁL can only be the male god Yarri (16), most probably the counterpart to Erra.

(7) Rarely does a S.L. act in a magic ritual. In the *Ritual of Tunnawi* (*CTH* 409) ii 65–67 she uses nine combs to cleanse the EN.SISKUR over his whole body while he is bathing, but it is the SAL.ŠU.GI who brings the combs and pronounces the spell. And in *KUB* 27.29 iii 5–7 the S.L. throws water over the EN.SISKUR.

As a result we can state that the S.L. is definitely not a hierodule in Hittite texts. She is an attendant, in the palace (where she is unfree), among gods, and also an attendant of the exorcist. Specifically in this case she is a helper in bathing a person. This function brings to mind the reliefs no. 37 and 36 at Yazılıkaya, where Ninatta carries an ointment horn and Kulitta, a mirror.^{8a} There we may call them “lady’s maids” (German: *Zofen*), but in general we shall translate S.L. as “attendant woman” or “lady attendant.”

12: ^dGAŠAN is simply another logogram for Ištar, as shown by the identical phonetic complement *-li-* used with both ^dGAŠAN and ^dIŠTAR. Cf. ^dIŠTAR-li (14) with ^dGAŠAN-li (24), both dat. in parallel clauses. Both writings represent the still unknown Hittite name of the goddess; cf. also abl. ^dIŠTAR-li-az(-za) (i 40, 46) and ^dGAŠAN-li-z[a] (42), nom. ^dIŠTAR-iš (i 51,

^{8a} Gallery, l.c. (n. 6), 338 with n. 22, cites Finkelstein’s suggestion of 1973 that the *kezertu* was a hairdresser. This would fit the reliefs very well and encourages me to interpret the hieroglyph of no. 36, Kulitta (Laroche, *HH*, sign no. 158), as representing curls.

ii 19). The use of the Hittite name of the goddess rather than of her Hurrian name, Šauška, side by side with her Hurrian attendants Ninatta, Kulitta, Šentalirte etc. has a parallel in the Hittite version of the Hurrian Kumarbi cycle; cf. *Kumarbi*, 96. I therefore use the name Ištar rather than Šauška in the translation.

14: Of the two alternative restorations of the first sign of the name as *ha* or *na* offered by von Brandenstein, *Bildbeschr.*, 33, I prefer *ha*, *Hamrazunna*, because of the frequency of the element *hamra/i-* in Hurrian; cf. Laroche, *Gloss. hourr.*, 91f.

15: The restoration [*a-aš-ši*]-*ia-at-ta-ri* follows Götze, *AM* p. 262; for *a-aš-* . . . cf. i 38f. For the construction with the dative see Sommer, *HAB*, 185, and *HW*², 401.

15 end: The sign as copied is *-ni* rather than *-ir*. The text writes *é-ir* (*per*) for the nom/acc. (i 14, 25) and *é-ri* (*peri*) for the dat.-loc. (25), but here *é-ni* (*parni*), the more frequent form of the dat.-loc.; probably a modernization by the copyist.

16: The restoration of the first sign and with it of the verbal stem is uncertain. Goetze refrained from restoring and translating. Wegner's restoration is against the available space and results in a non-existing form. Archi's restoration [š]u- is preferable, but "to fill" does not yield a satisfactory sense. I think of the verb *šuwaya-* "to look" although its (unattested) infinitive should be **šuwawayanzi* rather than **šuwauwanz*. But given the known mixing of similar verbs by the scribes (cf. Oettinger, *Stamm*, 269ff.) our interpretation seems possible.

16: For *KIN-an* = *aniyan* see *HW*², 88 r.; for the spelling of the simple verb *aniya-* with single *n*, of its iter.-dur. with double *n* see *HW*², 87 r.; *anniški-* with "house" as object was translated "besorgen" by Goetze (*AM*, 262), a definition which does not appear in *HW*²; presumably it is subsumed there under "behandeln" (p. 87 sub II 2 our passage is not translated). I chose "to care for" as suiting the context best.

17: For *halwamnaz* see Otten apud *HW* 3.Erg., 13.

19f.: *hantair* has been taken in the sense of "vermählen," i.e., "to marry off, give into marriage" by the previous interpreters. But this translation does not really fit the context: why should the sons of the house have to be married in order to till the fields? Also the contrasting statements in lines 27–32 point into a different direction. Decisive for our passage are two catalog entries: *KUB* 30.56 iii 10–11 *mān UN-ši IR.MEŠ-SU GEME.M[EŠ-SU-ya UL] SI×SÁ-anzi* (i.e. *handanzi*) *našma LÚ-LUM SAL-TUM-ya UL handanzi*, which Laroche, *CTH*, 182, translates: "Quand pour une personne ses serviteurs et ses servantes [ne] s'entendent [pas], ou bien qu'un homme et sa femme ne s'accordent pas"; *KUB* 30.45 iii 6–9 with dupl. 44 iii(?) 2–5, *CTH*, 160f. as lines 14–17 of the composite text and the translation "ne sont pas d'accord." Cf. also (I took Puduḫpa for my wife) *nu handawen* Ḫatt.

iii 2, which Otten, *StBoT* 24, 17, translates "wir hielten zusammen." This is a good rendering: "we understood each other, were in harmony, had good relations" would also fit. In these passages *handāi-* is intransitive, whereas in line 19 of our text *SAL.MEŠ É.GE.A-A-uš* is the accus. pl. form. Since, however, *DUMU.MEŠ É-TI* (20) and *LÚ.MEŠ ATHUTIM* (30) can be both nom. and acc., while *SAL É¹[.GE.A.A.]* (27) is incomplete, and since in the plural improper use of the *-ēš* and *-uš* forms is frequent, I follow the examples cited in taking the verb as intransitive with "brides" as subject. This has the advantage of avoiding change of subject.

29: The restoration proposed by Archi, *ha-an-t[an-zi] ū-UL nu TUG-an*, which would give a good sense also with our interpretation of the verb, seems to be too long for the available space. I therefore propose a shorter restoration yielding the same sense. The participle *handant-*, attested with meanings like "corresponding to, aligned with" *et sim.*, may also serve as participle to the intrans. use assumed here.

32: For *halluwanuer* see Goetze, *JAOS* 74 (1954), 188 (*HW* 1.Erg., 3). Still, the causative form here is difficult. In the Gilgamesh Epic (Otten, *Ist. Mitt.* 8, 114, line 15, to be restored after *Madd.*, 82 n. 1) Gilgamesh and Enkidu "incite" Huwawa "to violence"; but in our text we expect the young men to be violent, unless, of course, we assume that here the goddesses are the subject. Since the end of the line is broken, one might think of restoring a *-za* for a reciprocal meaning.⁹

33: In [o]*x-al-lu-u-wa-ar* I can only think of restoring [*m*]*a-* which fits the preserved traces. That the neglect of plowing would lead to curtailment of grinding grain fits the context. There is space for one more sign, for which I propose ŠE.

34: The restoration [š]AH rather than [*n*]ir as in line 36 is based on the fact that the line seems to contain a simile: "Just as the dog . . ." (With Archi's restoration *GIM[-an tar-n]ir* I cannot construe the rest of the line). *ha-an-ta[...]* brings to mind the verb discussed above, although here it seems to be transitive, since there is no "and" after ŠAH. But since the next lines are so fragmentary and difficult to understand, it is not clear where such a simile would lead.

35: The traces after *NINDA* do not support Archi's reading *NINDA.ri¹-[E.DÉ]r.A¹?*; the first sign looks rather like *KASKAL*; cf. *NINDA.KASKAL-NI KBo* 2.17:2 (*ŠL* 597, 184). I cannot restore the next few signs. With the "basalt" the grindstone could be meant. After *kunkunuzzi[n]* there is space for another word. "Let into the water" is used in magical and medical rituals for immersing and thereby dissolving materials in water. This cannot apply to the stone, so the whole

⁹ But the form *halluwanut*, *KUB* 24.7 iii 26 (Cow story, same tablet!) must be "lowered" as given in *HW* after Sommer, *HAB* 76. There seem to be two unrelated homonyms.

remains rather enigmatic. Maybe the GIM-*an* of 36 should be taken as the temporal conjunction “when”: “When they let (pret.) [the . . . (35)] into the water . . .” After *na*[. . .] in 36 there is more space than for only the enclitic pronoun *-aš* or *-an* or *-at*. If the lost word was the object, then it would have to be *na*[-*at* . . .] “and they . . .” “And they destroyed [. . .] completely.”

39 and 41f.: One expects the phrase beginning with ZAG to be the same in both places. I therefore restore ZAG[-*aš*]-*ša-an* in 39 and ZAG-*aš*[-*ša-an*] in 41, as did Wegner; the last sign in 41, as copied by Walther, can only be *aš*, not *na*. Besides, ZAG-*aš-ša-an* occurs KUB 31.125:7, followed by a trace that may be the beginning of *ar*, corresponding to *arnu-* in our text. The form is *kunna* (allative) “to the right” plus *-šan*. For the occurrence of this particle in the interior of a sentence see Carruba, *Part.*¹⁰ p. 20. ZAG-*aš-ša-pát* KUB 21.27 ii 32 could be either mistake for ZAG-*aš-ša-an-pát* or contain the possessive pronoun *-ša*, “to his/its right.”

ZAG-*na* is used as adverb. The right side being the propitious one, ZAG-*na* designates what is agreeable to someone, suits him, etc. Cf. *nuttakkan kuit ZAG-na nu apāt uppi* “send whatever you please” KBo 2.11 rev. 14 (AU 242); *mān tukma ul. ZAG-na nu ANA dUTU-ši hatrāi* “if it does not suit you write to His Majesty” Kup. § 19 D iv 3f. (SV I p. 132); “Let them unload (the grain shipments) in Ura or in Laštiš[a] *kuedani URU-ri ANA DUMU-YA ZAG-na* (!, copy *-uš*) [*na*] *n apiya katta i[šhuwandu]* In whichever city it suits you, my son, [let them] un[load] it there” (Bo 2810:14–17, H. Klengel, AOF I [1974], 171–73). In our text, ZAG-*na arnu-* “to bring/carry to the right,” with *aššiyatar* “love” as object,¹¹ would be “carry it to a state where it is pleasing or satisfying”; for the translation of our passages I chose “carry to fulfillment.” In line 39 I restored the verb as 3d. pi. pres. in order to make the construction parallel to 41f., with *-šmaš* (39) corresponding to *-za* (41). One could also think of restoring *ar[nuši]* “you (Ištar) carry the love for them to fulfillment,” but that would weaken the parallelism and be redundant in view of the next clause “that has been decreed by you, Ištar.”

41: *pupuwalāi-*, *pupuwalatar*: Wegner, op. cit., p. 142, came close to the right understanding. The basic stem ^{LÚ}*pupu-* (or *bubu-*) occurs in the Laws, § 198. This is the man with whom a married woman committed adultery in her house. Goetze (ANET, 196) translated “adulterer,” Friedrich (HG, 87) “Buhle.” In KUB 43.35:12 ^{LÚ}*pupuš aššuš* occurs

¹⁰ O. Carruba, *Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens* [Incunabula Graeca 32], 1969.

¹¹ Both Archi and Wegner took it as subject, which would result in intransitive use of *arnu-*, not registered in HW². I could not find our passage in HW² at all.

in broken context which belongs in the forensic sphere but leaves us to guess what the adjective “good” is doing here. An abstract noun directly derived from this noun is ^{LÚ}*pupuwatar*, in HW I.Erg., 16, without reference, now KBo 9.73 obv. 6, the Old Hittite Habiru treaty (CTH 27): [. . . w]aštai nu ^{LÚ}*pupuwatar izzi* “sins and commits p.,” here perhaps “fornication” in general rather than “adultery.”

In our passage *pupuwalatar*, abstract noun derived from the verb *pupuwalāi-*, has a positive connotation. I think that the term refers to all kinds of love affairs other than marriage; for translation I chose “to seduce, seduction.”¹² In the oracle questions KUB 49.94 obv. 2–14, where someone, presumably the king (cf. line 4), “was determined by oracle with regard to the word/affair of *pupuwalatar*” (3) and where someone (again the king?) has to perform a *SISKUR pupuwalannaš* “a ritual of/against p.” (11), the connotation is obviously one of reproach, regardless of whether the king had actually had an affair or whether there had only been some gossip of that sort.¹³

40: For the restoration [*r*]a-ra-a-an cf. KUB 14.4 iii 24, KBo 10.7 ii 18, etc.

40 end: My restoration SAL-*n*[a-an ku-iš] is based on my understanding of *pupuwalāi-*. The traces given by Walther, while not exactly suggesting the reading SAL-*n*[a-...], at least are not excluding it (not collated).

43: Ì.DÜG.GA must have been preceded by a word at the end of 42, after restored [*tarān*]; *waštari* after E. Neu, StBoT 5, 192 (:)*waš(š)-* “angenehm sein” with n. 3 about our passage.

43 and 45: In restoring [*ku-iš*] and *ka-a*[-*ri-ia-ši*] I follow Archi. This latter restoration together with *ul kuitki iš-d[am-...]* (47) seems to mean that Ištar somehow prevents someone—perhaps the townspeople (44)—from noticing the lovers. This leads me to my restoration and understanding of the first word in line 45.

45: [*ga*]laktaraši, 2d sg. pres. For the first sign I can only think of *ga*, since I know of no other word continuing with

¹² Archi correctly distinguishes between this paragraph, where the verb has a positive connotation (but where his rendering “adorare, adorazione” is, to my mind, not specific enough) and the next paragraph, where it is negative and where his translation “infedeltà” is appropriate. But I am not sure that this necessitates to restore **pupuwa*[*tar*] instead of *pupuwa*[*atar*].

¹³ In the prayer of Hattušili and Puduhepa, KUB 21.27 ii 32 (cf. above under ZAG, i 39) cited by Wegner, 142, the restoration of [*pupu*]lawatar is uncertain because of the trace of a vertical at the end of the gap which is also too long for [*pu-pu-*] alone, while a spelling **[pu-pu-ú]-...* is not otherwise attested; nor do the traces in the next line fit a form of *arnu-*.

-laktar-.... A noun *galaktar* is known. It designates something that is usually deposited in incantation rituals together with other objects, most frequently with *parḫuena*-. Otten, *ZA* 46, 218, n. 1, defined both words as “angenehme, süsse Produkte pflanzlicher Art.” In some instances these substances are expected to have the effect that the deity be *galankanza* (partic. pass.) “pacified, reconciled” *vel sim*. It is assumed that the verb and the plant (product) are connected at least by the magic of the assonance, if not by etymology. There is one passage where *galaktar* is inserted or stuck into some vessel.¹⁴ Thus *g*. itself is a plant, apparently one with a stem. In our passage the verb denominated from *g*. has the result, outlined above, that the lovers are not noticed.

A plant with a stem and having this effect may be the poppy, which is at home in Anatolia. I leave it open whether the Hittites extracted the sap or only used the seeds. It is tempting to connect Hitt. *galaktar* with Greek *gála*, *gálaktos* etc., Latin *lac*, *lactis*, but I must leave it to the specialists to judge this connection. The milky sap of the poppy might be the link. However, there is another word for “milk” in Hittite, *pankur* (if this tentative definition of mine is correct; *HW* 3. *Erg.*, 25).¹⁵ And according to W. Farber¹⁶ there is no evidence for the use of the poppy or of opium in ancient Mesopotamia. Thus I refrain from positing *galaktar* “poppy,” but I think that the context allows for the interpretation expressed in the translation.

51: I can only make sense out of the signs following *iš-ḫu-u-wa-* by inserting an omitted *-an* and restoring *ḫar-ti*. The object of the verb is lost.

52: For *marlatar* see *HW* 3. *Erg.*, 23; for *pu-pu-wa[-. . .]* see above. In view of the bad state of preservation of these lines the translation can only be tentative.

56: Here begins a new paragraph. Given the small size of the gap at the end of col. i it is probable that the beginning of col. ii still belongs to the same. Since Ištar is addressed in col. ii it is assumed here that her name was the object to “I shall sing of” (*[iš-ḫa-m]i-iš-ki-mi* with Archi).

ii 1: The restoration *[wa-aš]-ta-aš-ku-wa-ar* is based on the fact that according to the *Glossaire inverse* of P. Reichert¹⁷

¹⁴ *KBo* 22.225 ii² 5–7 with dupl. *Bo* 2646 iii 2–4 (Otten, *HTR*, 121 with obsolete translation); cf. *KBo* 22 p.vi.

¹⁵ Not to speak of *GA-uš KUB* 28.70 rev. 12, which could be a mistake for *GUD-uš*.

¹⁶ Walter Farber, “Drogen im alten Mesopotamien—Sumerer und Akkader,” in G. Völger, ed., *Rausch und Realität: Drogen im Kulturvergleich* (Materialienband zu einer Ausstellung des . . . Museums für Völkerkunde der Stadt Köln. Cologne, 1981), 270ff., 271; courtesy of the author.

¹⁷ Pierre Reichert, *Glossaire inverse de la langue hittite* = *RHA* 21/73 (1963), 59–143; 108.

this is the only verb that fits the preserved syllables, also because the following lines indeed describe the misdeeds of the goddess.

2: The first sign, *aš*, could be the ending of a 2d sg. pret., but I am unable to restore the verb.

3: Beginning of line restored in parallelism to the following *kuinmakan LÚ-an*.

3 end: The last sign is *na* rather than anything else, and according to the copy nothing is missing after it. This recalls the phrase *ZAG-na arnu-* of i 39 ff., and *[ar-nu]-¹ut¹* fits the space and the trace at the beginning of line 4. It is true that this, in contrast to the list of her misdeeds, would be a positive act of the goddess, but this has a parallel in line 11.

6: The last two words are *hapax legomena*. I would analyze the first as *ešarašilaš+šmaš*, gen. pl. with poss. pron. of 3d. pl.¹⁸

8 beg.: The traces look like *IT-¹TI¹* (thus also Archi), followed by traces which could belong to *NUMUN*. At least, “coriander with (its) seed(s)” would make sense.

9: . . . [*-aš-ma*] is the only restoration I can think of that fits the space and the trace and yields some sense. *TÚG. NÍG. LÁM* must be neuter according to the adj. *parkuwaya*. The restored reading would be neuter plur. ending *-a+šmaš+za*; *-šmaš* would refer to the men, since the following *kuin—kuin* presupposes a plurality.

10: Although *parkun*, strictly speaking, is from *parku-* “high,” the context here calls for *parkui-* “clean, pure.” Mixing of the two adjectives is easy to assume; it would be the mistake of a scribe who thought of the verb *parganu-* “to make high” of the next line. Archi also has “pure.”¹⁹

12–14: These lines are very difficult. *wetandaš* looks like the participle of *weda-* “to build” or perhaps *wida-* “to bring,” but neither of them fits the context. Because of *lahḫu-* in I3 one thinks of water, but *wetandaš* is not a form of *watar*, *wetenaš*. However, there is a derived *-ant-* stem attested as *ú-i-te-na-an-za* (nom. sg.)²⁰ and *ú-i-te-na-an-te-eš*

¹⁸ For *arišand[a(-) . . .]* see *HW*², 299 with reference to *areša-*, 259. This cross-reference need not imply morphological or semantic connection.

¹⁹ It has been claimed that *parkui-* originally is the IE feminine in *-ī* from an adjective **parku-* “clean,” and that the *-i-* was retained in order to distinguish this adj. from its homonym *parku-* “high.” See O. Szemerényi in *Studi linguistici in onore di Vittore Pisani*, vol. 2, 1969, 991f. with references to Holger Pedersen, *Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen*, 1938, 35f., and H. Kronasser, *Etymologie der heth. Sprache*, 1962–66, 107. If this were correct, *parkun* could be an archaic masculine form here, as tentatively suggested by Eric P. Hamp orally.

²⁰ *KBo* 10.45 ii 24 (Otten, *ZA* 54, 122); cf. *ibid.* p. 156 ad *KUB* 41.8 iv 37 = p. 139 n. 242, where, however, the

very short two of them may have formed a single 'verse.'

As far as the inner structure of the stanzas or strophes (here numbered as §§) is concerned, a fair amount of parallel structure can be observed in the two pairs mentioned above, §§ 2 and 3, §§ 4 and 5.

Thus in §§ 2 and 3 the introduction "I shall praise" forms a distich with the list of four divine names. This is followed by another distich, "Whatever household is beloved/hated, she sends these/those into that house." Thereafter, however, the two distichs of §2 ending with the words "with laughter" and "with joy" are contrasted in §3 by a single line combining "groaning" and "anguish" in one sentence. Then again §2 has one distich each for the girls' weaving and the youths' plowing, whereas §3 devotes a tristich to the girls and two distichs to the youths. After this come the enigmatic lines 34–37 of the text, where both the division into clauses and the translation are problematic; but in any case these lines form an addition over and above the parallel parts—if the term be allowed, a coda.

In the second pair of stanzas (§§ 4 and 5) the comparison is made difficult by the bad state of preservation of §5. Both speak of married couples first, of other relations second. In §4 the structure is fairly regular: one tristich each for the married couple and the other lovers; then, after an incomplete and unclear line (43), another tristich on Ištar's help for the lovers. In §5 I wrote the translation in five distichs, but they include a short clause that is lost and other short clauses that may have to be combined with the next one. But while the exact wording and verse structure are problematic, the sequence: married couple—extramarital relations—consequences of the latter, is parallel to that of §4.

It is a pity that §§ 1, 6, and 7 are incomplete. In §1 it would seem that five preserved original lines (7–11) and six lost lines preceding them would have formed one, rather than two, stanzas.

Above we proposed to take the entire text from col. i 56 to ii 17 as one stanza (§6). But even if this were wrong, i.e., if the end of col. i (three preserved plus five lost lines) were a stanza by itself, the paragraph from ii 1 to 17 would still be longer than any of the others. And of §7 only the first sentence, or stich, is preserved; otherwise only unconnected words at the beginning of lines; only the length, nine lines on the tablet, is given.

About the inner structure of §6 I need not say much beyond what is expressed by the arrangement of the translation. The one feature that stands out are the

sequences of *kuin—kuinma* "the one—the other" clauses, from time to time interrupted by a general statement. These *kuin—kuinma* chains are comparable to those with *kuez—kuezza* "on one side—on the other side" of §1.

Concerning the contents, the structure of the text is clear—as far as preserved. §1 seems to deal with Ištar the Warrior. If understood correctly it describes those who follow her into battle. In this context the two kinds of women in the last line might be camp-followers (German: *Marketenderinnen*) and prostitutes.

In §§ 2–3 the consequences of Ištar's favor and disfavor is described as it affects whole households; in §§ 4–5, as it affects individuals. In §§ 4–5 one may say that it is the mutual love, or the lack of it, of a married couple that determines Ištar's attitude. In §§ 2–3, on the other hand, we do not learn why one household is loved and the other hated by the goddess.

§6 is the most surprising part of the whole composition. It is a long list of invectives, reminiscent of the sixth tablet of the Gilgamesh Epic, although different in detail. Not every single point is negative, though: we found that probably two statements give credit to the goddess (ii 3–4 *ZAG-na a[rnut]* and I1 *parganut*). They would underline the unpredictability of the goddess, also known from Mesopotamia,²⁵ but the overall tenure of the stanza is to show her cruelty. This cruelty or dangerousness of the Goddess of Love is, of course, an essential part of her nature; in singing about it the poet, in a sense, praises her might.

One would like to know what §7 really contained. The comparison of the goddess with a stubborn ass at its beginning lets one expect a lighter tone, but nothing is preserved that would hint at such a tone. And after §7 there must have been at least one more stanza, to judge by Walther's estimate of a minimum of 16 and a maximum of 20 lines missing.

Even in this incomplete form this text is a piece of poetry of high quality. In the form in which it has come down to us it is the work of a Hittite writer. How close he followed a Hurrian original we shall only learn if and when such a Hurrian text is discovered. Ultimately one of course looks for Mesopotamian models. I hope that Sam Kramer, the rediscoverer of Sumerian literature, will be able one time to tell us about that.

²⁵ This side of her character has been illustrated by selections from many sources in the chapter "Inanna = Infinite Variety," by Thorkild Jacobsen in his book *The Treasures of Darkness*, 1976, 135–43.