

# ORIENTALIA

VOL. 57 - FASC. 2 - 1988

# SUMMARIUM

## Commentationes

D. FRANKE, Zur Chronologie des Mittleren Reiches (12.-18. Dynastie), Teil 1: Die 12. Dynastie . . . . .	113-138
R. KASSER, Aleph initial ou final en copte . . . . .	139-144
W. R. MAYER, Ein neues Königsritual gegen feindliche Bedrohung . . . . .	145-164
R. H. BEAL, <i>Kule-</i> and Related Words . . . . .	165-180
F. RENFROE, Diagnosing Long-Dead Patients: The Equine Ailments in <i>KTU</i> 1.85 . . . . .	181-191
H.-P. MÜLLER, Pygmaion, Pygmalion und Pumaijaton: Aus der Geschichte einer mythischen Gestalt . . . . .	192-205

## Animadversiones

K. VOLK, Eine bemerkenswerte nach-Fära-zeitliche Urkunde . . . . .	206-209
G. M. BROWNE, Ad Chrysostomum Nubianum 18.5-7 . . . . .	210-211

## Nuntii

W. R. MAYER – H. QUECKE, In memoriam P. Raimund Köbert SJ . . . . .	212-217
---	---------

## Recensiones

M. SMITH, The Mortuary Texts of Papyrus BM 10507 (D. DEVAUCHELLE) . . . . .	218-219
J. H. JOHNSON, Thus Wrote 'Onchsheshonqy: An Introductory Grammar of Demotic (H. QUECKE) . . . . .	220-223

(Continuatur in pagina III involucris)

## *Kule-* and Related Words<sup>1</sup>

Richard H. BEAL

### I. *kule-*

Many commentators have understood the term *ku-le-(e)-i* as a writing of <sup>GI</sup>TUKUL-*le* without the <sup>GI</sup>S determinative<sup>2</sup>, although some authors have expressed their reservations<sup>3</sup>. TUKUL-*le* is then understood either as "TUKUL-land"<sup>4</sup> or as "the corporate body of <sup>GI</sup>TUKUL-men in the area"<sup>5</sup>. An understanding of *ku-le-(e)-i* is thus essential for an understanding of Hittite rural society.

The term occurs only in §§ 46 and 47b of the Laws. The context is as follows:

§ 47b: *takku LÚ <sup>GI</sup>TUKUL-aš A.ŠA.ḪI.A-ŠU ḫūmandan kuiški wāši luzzi [karp]ʿiezzī* (dupl. B: *karpīezzi*) *takku A.ŠA.ḪI.A-na mekkī wāši luzzi natta karpiezzi* (dupl. [U]L *karpzi*) *takku A.ŠA.ḪI.A ku-le-e-ima ārki našma LÚ.MEŠ URU-LIM pianzi ta luzzi karpīezzi*.

"If someone buys all the fields of a <sup>GI</sup>TUKUL-man, he bears *luzzi*. But if he buys the fields (only) in large part, he does not bear *luzzi*. If . . ., or the men of the village give (him a field), he bears *luzzi*."<sup>6</sup>

§ 46: *takku URU-ri A.ŠA.ḪI.A-an* (B adds: *[ša]ḫhana*, C has: *šaḫhanaš A.ŠA.ḪI.A*) *iwāru kuiški ḫarzi takkušše* (C omits *šše*)

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank H. G. Güterbock, H. A. Hoffner, G. Beckman, A. Ünal and J. Scurlock for reading and making suggestions on various drafts of this article. Of course, I must stress that any errors of omission or commission that remain are my responsibility alone.

<sup>2</sup> F. Hrozný, *CH* 40f.; H. Zimmern and J. Friedrich, *AO* 23/2 (1922) 13; F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, *HAB* 126 n. 5; J. Friedrich, *HG* 32f. (translit. *ku-li-e-i* but translated as TUKUL-*lēi*); F. Imparati, *Leggi* 65 (translit. *ku-li-e-i* but tr. as TUKUL-*lēi*); F. Imparati, *JESHO* 25 (1982) 233f.; and E. von Schuler, *TUAT* 1/1, 105.

<sup>3</sup> Sommer, *HAB* 126f. n. 5; J. Friedrich, *HG* 97; I. M. Diakonoff, *MIO* 13 (1967) 322 w. n. 30; and read simply *kule* by R. Haase, *THR* 28.

<sup>4</sup> F. Imparati, *Leggi* 65; E. von Schuler, *TUAT* 1/1, 105.

<sup>5</sup> F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, *HAB* 126f. n. 5; J. Friedrich, *HG* 32f., 97; I. M. Diakonoff, *MIO* 13, 321f. w. n. 30(?); F. Imparati, *JESHO* 25, 233f. For a study of the <sup>GI</sup>TUKUL-man see my article in *AoF* (forthcoming).

<sup>6</sup> KBo 6.2 ii 45-48 (OS), w. dupl. KBo 6.3 ii 65-68 (OH/NS). Some insignificant variants have been omitted.

†A.ŠA.†[(H).A] *hūmanza* piyanza (C: *dapiān pīyanz[i]*) *luzzi karpīezzi* (B: *karapzi*) *takkušše* (C omits *šše*) A.ŠA.†[(H).A-†ša†] *tē*[(†pauieš pi†)yanteš] *luzzi natta karpīezzi* (B: *karpīezzi*) *IŠTU É ABIŠU<sub>ma</sub>* *k[arpiyanzi] takku iwaruaš išhāš* A.ŠA *ku-le-e-i* (B: A.ŠA.†[(H).A *ku-le-i*] *ārki naš[ma]* LÚ.MEŠ URU-LIM A.ŠA.†[(H).A-†an] *pianzi ta luzzi karpīezzi*).

"If someone holds fields (B: and *šahhan*-obligations, C: fields subject to [lit. of] *šahhan*-obligations) in a village as an inheritance portion<sup>7</sup>, if the fields are given (C: they give) to him in their entirety, he bears *luzzi*. If only small portions of the fields are given, he does not bear *luzzi*; however, they bear (it) from the house of his father. If the owner of the inheritance portion... or the men of the village give (him) fields, he bears *luzzi*."<sup>8</sup>

There are two theories as to the grammatical case of *kulēi* in its sentence. According to some, *kulēi* is the neuter subject of its sentence<sup>9</sup>. In § 47b, *takku* A.ŠA.†[(H).A *kuleima* *ārki* is then translated: "if a *kulēi*/TUKUL-*le* (i.e., the corporate body of <sup>GIS</sup>TUKUL-men in the area) divides fields", while in § 46 *takku iwaruaš išhāš* A.ŠA *ku-le-e-i* (B: A.ŠA.†[(H).A *ku-le-i*] *ārki* is translated "If a *kulēi*/TUKUL-*le* divides the field of an owner of an inheritance portion". Alternatively, some understand *kulēi* as a dative-locative: § 47b would then be translated, "If he cuts off fields as <sup>GIS</sup>TUKUL-land", while § 46 would be translated, "If the owner of an inheritance portion cuts off fields as/in the <sup>GIS</sup>TUKUL-land"<sup>10</sup>.

However, neither of these alternatives is possible. In KBo 6.2 ii 47 and duplicates (Law § 47b) the position of the *-ma* on the *kulēi* shows that this must be the second, not the third, word of the sentence<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> *iwaru*: "The share of the family estate due to a child leaving the paternal household before the father has died". So G. Beckman, *FsGüterbock*<sup>2</sup> (AS 23; 1986) 16 n. 16, following H. Hoffner, Diss. (1964) 47, 301f.

<sup>8</sup> KBo 6.2 ii 38-42 (OS), w. dupls. B: KBo 6.3 ii 59-63 (OH/NS), C: KBo 6.5 iv 24-26 (OH/NS). Some insignificant variants have been omitted.

<sup>9</sup> F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, *HAB* 126 n. 5; J. Friedrich, *HG* 32f., 97; H. A. Hoffner, Diss. 46-48, 314f.; F. Imparati, *Leggi* 234-36; I. M. Diakonoff, *MIO* 13, 321f. w. n. 30, 327; M. Marazzi, *VO* 2 (1979) 83 n. 16 ("Institution für die Zuweisung von nicht mehr bebauten Parzellen"); F. Imparati, *JESHO* 25, 233; E. von Schuler, *TUAT* 1/1, 105 § 46 n. e; R. Haase, *THR* 28 w. n. 26 ("eine Körperschaft, welche Felder zuteilt(?)"). On the grammar see n. 25.

<sup>10</sup> Imparati, *Leggi* 65 ("come spettanza artigianale") and E. von Schuler, *TUAT* 1/1, 105 ("(als) Handwerk(sland)", translating alternatively as subj. in n. e), more or less following F. Hrozný, *CH* 40f., and H. Zimmern - J. Friedrich, *AO* 23/2, 13 ("als Waffe(namt)"); differently A. Walther, *HC* 255 ("by usurping (?)"), followed by A. Goetze, *ANET* 191; cf. H. Hoffner, Diss. 315.

<sup>11</sup> See discussion in *CHD* 3/2 (1983) 97 s.v. *-ma f2'1'*. *CHD* s.v. ; *-ma f2'a2'a'1'* cites Law § 47b with the A.ŠA not raised. Therefore *CHD* appears to consider A.ŠA *kulēi* to be a single compound word.

Therefore, one must read A.ŠA.†[(H).A *kulēi* as a single word, either A.ŠA.†[(H).A *ku-lēi*, or A.ŠA.†[(H).A *kulēi* and consider the whole to be a type of field<sup>12</sup>.

Grammatically one could still translate in § 47b: "if he cuts off"<sup>13</sup> TUKUL-fields"<sup>14</sup> or "if he cuts (them) off as TUKUL-fields"<sup>15</sup>. However, the earlier part of § 47b already gives the law concerning the performance of *luzzi* on a divided up <sup>GIS</sup>TUKUL field — the original holder continues doing the service unless someone else acquires the entire holding. Furthermore, Sommer's<sup>16</sup> attempted explanation that the <sup>GIS</sup> determinative is omissible because the term TUKUL-*lē* refers (in his opinion) to a corporate body, not a physical one, seems unlikely. <sup>GIS</sup>, after all, means "wood" and is just as inappropriate to a corporate body as to a living person. Therefore it seems preferable to read the signs as *kulēi*, a Hittite word, and to divorce it from <sup>GIS</sup>TUKUL<sup>17</sup>.

As was seen by most earlier commentators, the New Hittite parallel version of the Laws, which uses entirely different words, but which is followed by the same two clauses as the Old Hittite version, may provide a clue as to the meaning of *kulēi*. In place of *takku* A.ŠA.†[(H).A *kuleima* *ārki*

<sup>12</sup> H. A. Hoffner, who formulated the *CHD* treatment mentioned in the preceding footnote, personal communication. See further below with n. 25.

<sup>13</sup> The verb *ark-* has been translated "divide up" ("aufteilen, zerteilen"), since F. Sommer, *HAB* (1938) 126f. n. 5. Sommer chose this translation for this passage in the laws from two alternative translations suggested for *ark-* by A. Götze, *NBr* (1930) 58, which were based on the usage of *ark-* as a term for butchering animals: "zerteilen (Opfertier)" or "auslösen (dessen Körperteile)". However, according to *CHD* 3/2, 188, as a butchering term *ark-* describes the part of the butchering process in which "the carcass is skinned and gutted and some of the extremities removed", leaving a bare (*pittalwant-*) torso. [See in particular KBo 11.17 ii 12-20, ed. *CHD* 3/2, 188 s.v. *mark-* a 5']. "Thus we cannot agree... that *ark-* means 'tranchieren' ('carve up')". Nor does the translation "divide up" make sense in two of its three usages in the laws. In Law § 109 Friedrich's (*HG* [1959] 62f.) translation, "Wenn jemand durch einen Kanal eine Obst(pflanzung) zerteilt", has been corrected by Güterbock, *JCS* 15 (1961) 70, to "if someone cuts off fruit (trees) from a canal (thus cutting off their water supply)", which is better grammatically and in sense. This translation was subsequently accepted by H. Hoffner, Diss. (1964) 80; E. von Schuler, *TUAT* 1/1 (1982) 113; J. Puhvel, *HED* 1-2 (1984) 141, and R. Haase, *THR* (1984) 38 (although not by A. Kammenhuber, *HW*<sup>2</sup> [1979] 300b). A translation: "if he divides *k-*fields" is not a parallel alternative to the following clause "or the men of the village give them (to him)". Moreover, all the rest of the clauses in our two laws (§§ 46, 47b) concern the *luzzi*-taxes on land acquired by varying means. If *ark-* were to be translated as "to divide up", it would have to refer to the division, not the acquisition, of property and would thus not fit with the rest of its law. Law § 73: *takku* *GU<sub>D</sub>-aš huišwanda<sub>n</sub> kuiški* *ārki* is less clear. *Arki-* could mean "butchers". It would then be a single term with a specific meaning in the butchering process, that is used here to refer to the entire process. Alternatively one could follow J. Puhvel, *HED* 1-2, 140, and translate "sequesters". In all cases a basic meaning "carve/cut out/off and remove (a portion)" makes better sense.

<sup>14</sup> See below n. 25.

<sup>15</sup> Dative of purpose, cf. J. Friedrich, *HE*<sup>2</sup> 1 § 207a.

<sup>16</sup> *HAB* 126f. n. 5.

<sup>17</sup> Read as *kulē* by A. Walther, *HC* 255; A. Goetze, *ANET* 191; H. A. Hoffner, Diss. 46-48, 314f.; M. Marazzi, *VO* 2, 83 n. 16; R. Haase, *THR* 28 w. n. 26.

*našma* LÚ.MEŠ URU-LIM *pianzi luzzi karpiezzi* in Law § 47b, the New Hittite parallel (§ XXXIXb) has *takku* A.ŠA A.GÀR *ḫarkanza našmašši* LÚ.MEŠ URU-LIM *pianzi luzzi iyazi*: "If field and pasture is *ḫarkanza*, or the men of the village give (it) to him, he does *luzzi*"<sup>18</sup>. Similarly while Old Hittite Law § 46 has *takku iwaruaš išḫāš* A.ŠA *kulēi arki našma* LÚ.MEŠ URU-LIM A.ŠA.HIA-*an pianzi ta luzzi karpiezzi*, the New Hittite parallel (§ XXXVIII) has *takku iwaruwaš* EN-aš A.ŠA A.GÀR! *ḫarkanza* A.ŠAšši<sup>19</sup> LÚ.MEŠ URU-LIM A.ŠA A.GÀR!-*an pianzi ta luzzi karpiezzi*: "If the field and pasture of the owner of an inheritance portion is *ḫarkanza*, (or) the men of the village give (it) to him, he bears *luzzi*"<sup>20</sup>. Thus, the phrase A.ŠA A.GÀR *ḫarkanza* in the New Hittite version would appear to be equivalent to the phrase A.ŠA(HIA) *kulēi* in the Old Hittite version.

The verb *ḫark-*, of which *ḫarkanza* is the participle, means "umkommen, zugrunde gehen, verkommen, verfallen"<sup>21</sup> and "verloren gehen"<sup>22</sup>. Therefore A.ŠA A.GÀR *ḫarkanza* would appear to mean "spoiled, defunct fields". There seem to be three possibilities as to what a *ḫarkanza* field could be: 1) an unproductive field, i.e. a field which has stopped producing<sup>23</sup>, 2) a field that is temporarily defunct or non-producing, i.e. a fallow field, 3) a field which is defunct or non-productive because there is no one to farm it.

If A.ŠA A.GÀR *ḫarkanza* is to be translated in the first manner, then the parallel A.ŠA.HIA *kulēi ma arki* would mean something like "he cuts off unproductive fields". This cannot mean "cuts off (eliminates from his holdings) unproductive fields" since the context surrounding this passage in both the Old and New Hittite laws refers to the tax status of fields *acquired* by the referent. Therefore the expression should mean that he cuts these fields off in order to acquire them for himself. Why, however, would anyone in his right mind try to take possession of unproductive fields, especially if he had to pay *luzzi* on them? Therefore *kulēi* is unlikely to mean "unproductive".

<sup>18</sup> KBo 6.4 iv 34-35.

<sup>19</sup> The scribe seems to have inadvertently omitted a *našma* "or" (*našmašši* A.ŠA), an assumption recommended by the Old Hittite version of this law and by the New Hittite § XXXIX that is parallel to § 47b cited above. One should translate: "<Or> the men of the village give him fields as (his) field". F. Hrozný, *CH* 96f. w. n. 2 emended A.ŠA to *na-aš-ma*, a suggestion accepted by H. Hoffner, *Diss.* 47; E. von Schuler, *TUAT* 1/1, 105 (with uncertainty); R. Haase, *THR* 37, and passed on by J. Friedrich, *HG* 58 n. 3, 59, and F. Imparati, *Leggi* 112f., in a footnote and employed in the translation.

<sup>20</sup> KBo 6.4 iv 25-27.

<sup>21</sup> J. Friedrich, *HW* (1952) 57.

<sup>22</sup> F. Sommer, *AU* 24.

<sup>23</sup> Note KUB 13.4 iv 15-16, where an *anda ḫarkanza* field is the opposite of a *miyanza* field, that is a "productive field". Cf. F. Sommer, *AU* 25 (*anda ḫarkant-* = "verkommen"), *CHD* 3/3, 235b (*anda ḫarkant-* = "ruined").

If, alternatively *ḫarkanza* is understood to have meant "fallow", then A.ŠA.HIA *kulēi* would mean something like "fallow fields". However, fields which are fallow are owned by someone. How could someone legally simply cut them off without being given them or buying them? Therefore *kulēi* is unlikely to mean "fallow, temporarily non-producing".

The third possibility for the meaning of *ḫarkanza* is that it refers to fields which are defunct or non-productive because there is no one to farm them. A.ŠA.HIA *kulēi* would then mean something like "uncultivated land". Perhaps the "cutting off" refers to the acquisition of a field by reclamation, i.e. taking a piece of empty land and turning it into productive land. In any case, this third possibility makes the most sense. Reinserting this translation of *ḫarkanza* into the New Hittite version yields: "if the fields are vacant<sup>24</sup> (at the time of acquisition), or the men of the village give him fields, he does *luzzi*".

Assuming, then, that A.ŠA.HIA *kulēi* means "uncultivated land", what is the exact nuance of the word? Does A.ŠA.HIA *kulēi* refer to the state of the fields before they were taken over and thus have exactly the same meaning as *ḫarkanza*? The Old Hittite version would then be understood as: "if he cuts off (for himself) vacant-fields (A.ŠA.HIA *kulēi*)"<sup>25</sup> or "if he cuts off (for himself) (land) in the vacant-fields". Alternatively, A.ŠA.HIA *kulēi* could be understood as a legal category: "reclaimed fields" i.e. "producing fields which had previously been *ḫarkanza* ('vacant')". In this case, the passage would be translated "if he cuts off (land) as reclaimed fields" (A.ŠA.HIA *kulēi*).

There are a number of other words in Hittite texts that begin *kuli-*. Many of these have been considered to be related to one another<sup>26</sup>. On formal grounds, it can be seen that A.ŠA.HIA *kulē-* may be related to these. An examination of these may help determine whether there is a common

<sup>24</sup> "Vacant" ("erledigt") has been given as the translation of *ḫarkanza* in this passage from the very beginning, cf. H. Zimmern - J. Friedrich, *AO* 23/2, 13 n. 8 and F. Sommer, *AU* 25 n. 3, but, to the best of my knowledge, no commentator has ever justified this translation by the elimination of other possibilities.

Note that according to Law § 41 (KBo 6.2 + KBo 19.1 ii 26 [OS], w. dupl. KBo 6.3 ii 47 [OH/NS], translit. H. Otten and V. Souček, *AfO* 21 [1966] 3, ed. without join J. Friedrich, *HG* 28f.), when a field falls vacant (lit. "they take it for the palace"), the *ṣahḫan*-obligations are said to *ḫark-*. Thus perhaps it is because vacant fields are fields on which *ṣahḫan* has "disappeared" (*ḫark-*) that these fields are said to be *ḫarkant-*.

<sup>25</sup> The *-i* of *kulēi* could then presumably be explained as the neut. pl. case ending *-i* found in Old Hittite according to C. Watkins (*GsKronasser* 259-260, reference courtesy of G. Beckman, personal communication). Beckman points out that *kulēi* is unlikely to be an adjective modifying A.ŠA.HIA, since A.ŠA.HIA's usual Hittite equivalent is com. sg. (cf. in the same passage Law § 46, KBo 6.2 ii 38, 42). It is more likely to be a nominalized adjective, either in apposition to A.ŠA.HIA or having A.ŠA.HIA as a determinative.

<sup>26</sup> E. Neu, *StBoT* 5 (1968) 100f.; E. Laroche, *OLZ* 64 (1969) 148; H. Otten and W. von Soden, *StBoT* 7 (1968) 23f.

meaning that will fit both the *kuli-* family as well as our new understanding of *AŠA.HLAkulē-*. This may in turn help decide between the two suggested nuances of *AŠA.HLAkulē-*.

## II. *kuleššar/KULA' ŪTU*

In the siege of Uršu text we read<sup>27</sup>:

"Šanda brought a report. Thus said the king: Why have you not given battle? Do you stand on chariots of water, or have you perhaps (yourself) turned to water? Will you take revenge? If you had fallen on your knees before him, you would certainly have killed him, or at least have frightened him! (But) now you have engaged (only) in *kula' ūtum*. The sons of Lariya and Lariya (himself), while inactive, sang the song (of the Wargod) Zababa. ... Last year Tuthaliya engaged in *kuliēššar* — now you have practiced *kula' ūtum*."

The words *kula' ūtu* and *kuliēššar* are assumed to be abstracts, Akkadian in *-ūtu* and Hittite in *-eššar*, based on the same word *kula/i*, as was already noted by H. G. Güterbock<sup>28</sup>. While Güterbock was aware that the word really should be a Hittite word loaned for the occasion into Akkadian, he could not see any link between this word and the two similar words in Hittite that were known to him at that time, *kula-* "an object made of precious metal", and *kule-*, which he described as "ein noch nicht genau fassbarer Terminus der Lebenswesens". He therefore opted to take the words as abstracts from the known Akkadian word *kulu'u* "gigolo/performer", which yielded a tolerable translation: "weibisch". Later, H. Otten and W. von Soden<sup>29</sup> dismissed Güterbock's translation since the words should be Hittite rather than Akkadian. Based on context and on an assumed relationship with the words *kuliēšš-* and *kulkuliya-* (see below), they suggested a translation "Zaudern, Abwarten". This was followed by Beckman<sup>30</sup>. An understanding of this *kuliēššar* as "idleness, inactivity" or the like, is remarkably close to one of the meanings sug-

<sup>27</sup> KBo 1.11 rev. 10-14, 17-18, translation taken over from G. Beckman, "The Siege of Uršu text" (forthcoming).

<sup>28</sup> ZA 44 (1938) 128.

<sup>29</sup> StBoT 7, 24.

<sup>30</sup> "The Siege of Uršu text" (forthcoming): "hesitation, procrastination". Beckman suggests that the semantic field of the *kulē-* words, i.e. *kuleššar* and *kuliyahh-*, was "inertia, idleness, peace".

gested above on entirely independent grounds for *AŠA.HLAkulē-*, "vacant/inactive-fields"<sup>31</sup>.

## III. *kuliēšš-/kuwalēšš-/kuliyawēšš-*

Otten and von Soden<sup>32</sup> also mentioned another passage that, in their opinion, contains a word that is related to *kuliēššar*. It reads:

A [...] *kiš<ta>nunun* <sup>4</sup>IM-nata ZI-KA *QĀTAMMA ku-li-ya-u-e-eš-du*  
B [...] *kištanun*]un <sup>4</sup>IM-naša ZI-KA [*QĀTAMMA ku*]-wa-le-e-eš-du  
"I have extinguished [...]. In the same way let your will, O Stormgod, be *kuliyau-/kuwali-* (A: for you)."<sup>33</sup>

Later in the same text, the Stormgod is addressed:

*nu ZI-KA anda ku-ū-li-i-e-eš-du nu āššu šanizzi uddār memiški*  
"Let your will be *kulī-* within. Speak good, sweet words."<sup>34</sup>

There are three different roots, *kulī-*, *kuwali-*, *kuliyau-*. Yet, as they interchange in duplicates and in similar passages within the same text, all appear to be the same word<sup>35</sup>. In the context of the deity's will and appearing in a construction after "I extinguished", a translation such as "to be/become inactive" > "to be/become pacific" seems to make good sense<sup>36</sup>. Thus the verb *kuliēšš-/kuwalēšš-/kuliyawēšš-* appears to be fit in with the translation proposed for *AŠA.HLAkulē-* and *kuleššar*.

<sup>31</sup> The idea of linking *AŠA.HLAkulē-* with *kuliēššar* was suggested to me by H. G. Güterbock, after reading an earlier draft of this paper containing only the discussion of *AŠA.HLAkulē-*.

<sup>32</sup> StBoT 7, 23f.

<sup>33</sup> KBo 15.30 ii 1-2 (A), w. dupl. KBo 27.24 iii 2-3 (B).

<sup>34</sup> KBo 15.30 iii 6-7. O. Carruba, *Die Sprache* 14 (1968) 18f. n. 10a sought to emend the *-e-* to *-ū-*. This emendation is rejected by J. Weitenberg, *U-Stämme* 420 n. 210.

<sup>35</sup> For the *w* syncope see H. C. Melchert, *Phon.* 53. For the forms *kulī-* and *kuliyau-* E. Laroche, *OLZ* 64, 148 points to a similar set of roots in the word *nakki-*, *nakku-*, *nakkiu-*. Cf. *CHD* 3/4 (forthcoming) s.v. *nakkiu-*, *nakki(ya)-* "(a class of deities or demons associated with the netherworld)". Note for example *šarkiwalīyaš nakkiyaš* in KUB 35.145 obv. 4 and *šarkiwalīeš nakkiueš* in KUB 9.4 iii 41-42. For the stem *nakkiu-* see also KUB 35.40 i 1 and KUB 29.7 obv. 19, 22. *CHD* treats *nakku-* separately "(a carrier-away of evils, similar to a *nakkušši-*?)".

<sup>36</sup> Already J. Friedrich, *HW* 3. Erg. (1966) 20 ("sich beruhigen(?)"), and cf. H. Otten – W. von Soden, StBoT 7, 23f. E. Laroche, *OLZ* 64, 148 modifies Friedrich's translation by pointing out that this is a verb "d'état" derived from the adjective *kuliyaw(a)-*. Neu, StBoT 5, 100 does not accept that *kuwalēšš-* is in parallel construction with *kištanu-* but with some other verb in an earlier sentence, now lost in the break. He also rejects Friedrich's translation (p. 101 n. 4).

IV. *kuliyahh-*

A word probably belonging to this family also occurs in the Old Hittite text dealing with Hattušili I and Muršili I's wars in Syria that is known as the Zukraši text. The context is unfortunately badly broken<sup>37</sup>:

A: 22 [... n]ušmaš ku-le-e-i(-)a-<sup>r</sup>wa-ah<sup>1</sup>-ha-ti

B: 11 [... nušm]aš ku-le-e-i a-wa-ah<sup>1</sup>-ha-ti

If the spacing seen in the two copies belongs there<sup>38</sup>, then one probably has an example of the noun *kulē-*. Unfortunately, the verb of the sentence yields no easy meaning. It could be mid. pret. sg. 3 from an unattested *awahh-*, or it could be an imper. sg. 2 from an unattested verb *awahhati-*<sup>39</sup>. It could also be mid. pret. sg. 1 from a verb *awa-* (unattested unless it is an aberrant form of *auš-*). The resulting translation, "I appeared inactive to them", makes good sense<sup>40</sup>. These difficulties can be ignored if one ignores the word space and reads it all as a single word *kulēyawahhati*, which can then be considered a mid. pret. sg. 3 factitive from *kulē-*'s alternate stem *kuliyau-*<sup>41</sup>: "He made himself inactive for/toward them".

What is perhaps a word *kuleya(w)ahh-* occurs in a ritual recitation containing much Luwian: Á.MUŠEN.ḪI.A-zi arutati[...] / wetar ku-li-ya-ah[...]/ "Eagles (nom.) [...] from/by means of an a. (a body part) [...] / [...] pacif[y(?)]/stil[l(?)] the water(s)"<sup>42</sup>. "Mankind" is the subject of a later sentence in this text and "mountains" are mentioned in a previous paragraph. It is impossible to know the merits of this translation due to the unknown Luwian words and the fragmentary nature of the tablet.

<sup>37</sup> A = KUB 36.100:22 (OS), B = KUB 36.101 iii 11 (OH/NS). S. Rosi, *SMEA* 24 (1984) 119f., translit. *Ku-li-i-ya x-x-ha-ti* [...] and gives no translation for this line.

<sup>38</sup> Contrary to the copy, a photograph shows no space between the *a* and the *wa* in copy A.

<sup>39</sup> This possibility is preferred by H. A. Hoffner (personal communication), who suggests that the subject is the ERIN.MEŠ-att-, a singular term.

<sup>40</sup> This is the preferred interpretation of this passage by H. G. Güterbock, personal communication. He translates, "I appeared lazy to them" (??).

<sup>41</sup> So E. Neu, *StBoT* 5, 100f. w. n. 1 (w. different tr.) and E. Laroche, *OLZ* 64, 148. Although -ahh- factitives usually take -mi rather than -hi conjugation endings, thus -ta(i) rather than -ati, there is an example, also in OH, of the use of a -hi conjugation ending: *šuniyahhati*, KUB 11.1 iv 15.

<sup>42</sup> KBo 12.100 rev. 5-6; cf. E. Neu, *StBoT* 5, 100. The suggestion that an *aruta-* is an avian body-part I owe to H. A. Hoffner, personal communication. He bases this on the statement: "Let the birds come *mannai*-d on their *aruta-* and oiled on their breast" KBo 20.107 + KBo 23.50 ii 23-24, cf. *CHD* 3/2, 162.

V. *kulkuleške-*

Another term that has been linked to words in this family is the verb *kulkuleške-*. This occurs only in two duplicating lexical lists. In one *gulk[uleškizzi]* is equated by the Hittite scribe with an Akkadian word written *šu-up-pu-u*, and a Hittite word *šupp[iyauwar]* "ritual purity" is equated with Akkadian *šu-uk-ku-u*<sup>43</sup>. In the duplicating list the Akkadian words are reversed<sup>44</sup>. Between these two lines both texts show an equation Hitt. *parākan pāuwar* = Akk. *uṣṣūtu* "going forth". Neu<sup>45</sup>, taking KBo 13.1 as the correct text, argued that *šuppu* was understood by the Hittite scribe as *šupū*, which Neu translates "glänzend, leuchtend". This, he argued, was not a bad reading for *šuppiyauwar*. Since *parākan pāuwar* can refer to "sunrise", Neu argued that all three Hittite words had to do with brightness. Thus, by extension, the remainder of the family of *ku(wa)le-* words, in his opinion, had to do with brightness. However, in the first place, it is unwise to assume that all the Hittite (or even Sumerian or Akkadian) words within a paragraph in a lexical text have similar meanings. Secondly, *AHW*<sup>46</sup> now translates *šupū* as "deutlich gemacht, herrlich". Finally, lexical text KBo 26.23, as we have seen, reverses the equivalences and gives a far better equivalent for *šuppiyauwar* "ritual purity" namely *šukku* = *zukku* "purification"<sup>47</sup>. This leaves *kulkuleške-* equivalent to *šuppu*. One possible *šupū* (D stem of *AHW*'s *šapū* III, *CAD*'s *šapū* C) means "to quiet, silence, subdue"<sup>48</sup>. This, as Otten and

<sup>43</sup> KBo 26.23:6, 4.

<sup>44</sup> KBo 13.1 rev. 17, 15, ed. H. Otten - W. von Soden, *StBoT* 7, 19, and H. G. Güterbock in *MSL* 17 (1985) 113f. In full the text has:

15: KA.ZU.KAL.LA = qa-zu-gal-la = *šu-up-pu-u* = *šuppiyauwar*

16: PĀ.Ē.A = pa-e = *uṣ-šū-tū* = *parākan pāuwar*

17: GÜ.GIL.AN.NA = da-<sup>r</sup>ri<sup>1</sup> = *šu-uk-ku-u* = *gulk-ku-le-eš-ki-iz-zi*.

<sup>45</sup> *StBoT* 5, 101.

<sup>46</sup> W. von Soden, *AHW* 1281.

<sup>47</sup> Suggested by H. Otten - W. von Soden, *StBoT* 7, 23.

<sup>48</sup> *AHW* 1177, D stem = "zum Schweigen bringen". J. Weitenberg, *U-Stämme* 420 n. 209 rejects this translation for the Hittite in part because O. R. Gurney, *OLZ* 65 (1970) 554 points out that the very existence of the Akkadian verb is controversial. Gurney refers to W. Lambert, *BWL* (1960) 285 who questions the verb's existence and M. Held, *JCS* 15 (1961) 14 who rejects "to make silent" all together. Both of these authors argue that certain specific cases of *šubb/ppū* do not make sense as "to make silent". Lambert wonders about the remaining examples where the object of the verb is "a revolt" or the like. Held translates these examples as "to quell" but insists that all are from *šubbū* "to make sated". However, if the expression does mean "to quell a revolt", it is unlikely that the verb means "to satiate". To "satiate" a revolt would be to allow it to take its course until the revolt had "had their fill of" revolting and simply stopped by themselves. One need hardly contemplate Hammurapi bragging about taking such a course of action. It is much easier to derive "to quell" from "to make quiet" as W. von Soden

von Soden already noted<sup>49</sup>, fits in well with the other meanings of words of the *kule-* family<sup>50</sup>.

# VI. *ku(wa)li(u)-*

A further word that has sometimes been linked to some of the above words is the adjective *kuwaliu-/kuwali-/kuliu-*. Since the verb *kuliešš-* has byforms *kuwaliešš-* and *kuliyawešš-*, it can be seen on formal grounds that *kulē-* and *kuliešš-* may be related to *ku(wa)li(u)-*. The latter adjective occurs in the following contexts:

"The Sungod sent the speedy eagle (to search for Telipinu), (saying) 'Go. Search the high mountains. Search the deep valleys.'"

continues to do in *AHW* 1177. *CAD* S 65, left bottom, transliterates the verb with *b* but translates "*mušebbi*" as "he who silences". Finally, *CAD* Š (consulted in galley proofs, courtesy of E. Reiner) lists a *šapū* C whose D stem, attested in OAkk, OA, OB and SB means "to silence, subdue". If one insists that there is only one verb covering the meaning "to silence, quell" and "to satiate", it seems that the common ground is "to pacify (one's appetite, one's creditors, one's enemies)". However, *šubbū* "to satiate" takes as object that with which one is being satiated, while *šubb/ppū* "to quiet" takes as object that which is being quieted. In either case there seems to be no reason to doubt that when the Hittite scribe saw the Akkadian *šubb/ppū* in the lexical text that he was translating, he could have thought of the Akkadian verb meaning "to quiet, to pacify".

<sup>49</sup> StBoT 7, 22-24.

<sup>50</sup> Admittedly, Otten and von Soden's theory does not explain how the Hittite scribe managed to reverse the two Akkadian entries as well as Neu's assumption that the two Akkadian and two Hittite words were synonyms (J. Weitenberg, *U-Stämme* 420 n. 209). However *AHW*'s translation of *šuppū*, "made manifest, evident; splendid" is even further from Hittite *šuppi-* "pure" than Neu's obsolete translation. Furthermore as Otten and von Soden note (StBoT 7, 23), a scribal error cannot be ruled out. Perhaps the similarity of sound between Akk. *šuppū* and Hitt. *šuppi-* caused the copiest of KBo 13.1 to assume a relationship and then to hypercorrect his text (StBoT 7, 23). Finally, more *kule-* words can be made sense of by using Otten and von Soden's translation than by using Neu's.

K. K. Riemschneider, *Or* 40 (1971) 477 argues that the original lexical list had instead of KA.ZU.KAL.LA rather KA.ŠU.GÁL "to put the hand on the mouth/nose" i.e. "to pray" with Akkadian translation *šuppū* "to pray". While Riemschneider may be correct in his interpretation of the Sumerian and Akkadian, this in no way helps us know what Akkadian word the Hittite scribe thought he was translating. Riemschneider then considers *kulkuleške-* (equated here in KBo 13.1 with Sum. GÜ.GIL.AN.NA) to be a mistake for *hulhuliya-* which is equated with Sum. GÜ.GIL in KBo 1.42 ii 29. He admits that none of the Hittite words is a translation of *šuppū* "to pray" and he does not mention that in KBo 1.42 ii 29, *hulhuliyauwar* more or less correctly translates the Akkadian *mundahšu*, not *šukkū*. In any case, the question of what the Akkadian scribe thought the Sumerian meant is a different question from the question relevant to my inquiry, the question of what the Hittite scribe thought the Akkadian meant.

The name of a deity, if properly restored [*k*u-ul-ku-li-im-ma-aš-ša, KUB 33.120 i 7 (invocation introducing 'Kingship in Heaven'), ed. H. G. Güterbock, *Kum.* 6, \*1 (not restored), tr. *MAW* 156, translit. E. Laroche, *Myth.* 153, may be based on this verb. E. Laroche, *BSL* 52 (1956) 77 w. n. 3, had previously suggested linking it to *kuliya-* (see below), and *kuleššar* (see above).

*huwanhueššarkan ku-wa-a-li-ū šāh*<sup>51</sup> "Search the *kuwaliu-* *huwanhueššar*." A parallel passage in a similar myth gives a variant *ku-wa-li-e*<sup>52</sup>. Another similar passage gives a plural accusative form with the *-wa-* dropped: *ku-li-ya-mu-uš*<sup>53</sup>. At the end of the paragraph preceding the above cited "let your will, O Stormgod, become pacific (*kuliešdu*)" one finds after a long break [*kuwa*]*i-i-ūma wā[tar]* *akkuškit* 'nuza '10<sup>1</sup> *šuppiyahhut*<sup>54</sup>. If the restoration is correct<sup>55</sup>, it reads "You drank much [*kuwa*]*liu* water. O Stormgod, make yourself ritually pure"<sup>56</sup>.

Since the translation of *kuwaliu-* depends to some extent on our understanding of *huwanhueššar*, an excursus into the meaning of the latter word is necessary. In the Ullikummi myth, Ištar attempts to seduce with her songs the monster Ullikummi who lives in the sea. However, "a great *hunhuešna-* <comes> from the sea. The great *hunhuešna-* speaks to Ištar" (informing her that the monster is both deaf and blind)<sup>57</sup>. Since a *hu(wa)nhuweššar* is searched in parallel with mountains and rivers it is apparently a geographical feature, and since it comes from the sea, it is likely to be watery. Furthermore, an *h.* could be said to be "deep" according to a text reading "from the four corners", *ha[ll]ūwaz h[ū]nhuešnaz* UGU *ehu*, "from the deep *h.* come up. (Turn back to Ner-ik.)"<sup>58</sup>. A bilingual text has in Hittite [(KU<sub>6</sub>-uš)]*šakan hunhuešni* [(and)]*a ueriteš* <*k*>*izzi*<sup>59</sup> while the Akkadian has [*nūnu ina gi-i*]*p<sup>2</sup>-ši-š[u ig]al-lut*<sup>60</sup>. The Hittite can be translated "The fish is constantly afraid in the *h.*" while the Akkadian reads "[The fish] quakes/becomes frightened in its *gipšu*". *Gipšu*, according to the Akkadian dictionaries<sup>61</sup>, means "mass, expanse, might" and is used in association with words for water or mili-

<sup>51</sup> KUB 17.10 i 24-26 (OH/OS or MS), translit. E. Laroche, *Myth.* 31, tr. A. Goetze, in *ANET* 127.

<sup>52</sup> KUB 33.24 i 26-29 (OH/NS), w. dupl. KUB 33.26 obv. 3-7 (OH/MS) (spelled *ku-wa-li-ū*), cf. KUB 33.24 i 23-25 (spelled *ku-wa-li-ū*), all translit. E. Laroche, *Myth.* 53f.

<sup>53</sup> KBo 13.86 obv. 18. Also lacking the *-wa-* are forms in KUB 33.33:4, 6 (OH/NS), translit. E. Laroche, *Myth.* 65. For references in parallel or similar passages see J. Weitenberg, *U-Stämme* 118 § 257.

<sup>54</sup> KBo 15.30 iii 4-5.

<sup>55</sup> See E. Neu, StBoT 5, 100, J. Weitenberg, *U-Stämme* 118 § 257.

<sup>56</sup> The translation of *akkuškit* as 2 sg. follows the suggestion of G. Beckman, personal communication. It is taken as 3 sg. by J. Puhvel, *HED* 1-2, 265. A translation results such as "He drank much [*kuwa*]*liu* water, (and said:) 'O Stormgod make yourself ritually pure.'"

<sup>57</sup> KUB 36.12 ii 7-8 (Ullik. IIB), ed. H. G. Güterbock, *JCS* 6 (1952) 14f. ("wave"(?)).

<sup>58</sup> KUB 36.89 obv. 27-28 (NH), ed. V. Haas, *KN* 146f. ("auf der tiefen Quelle").

<sup>59</sup> KUB 4.8 rev. 3-4, w. dupl. KUB 4.5 rt. col. 1-2 (NH), ed. E. Laroche, *RA* 58 (1964) 72, 74 ("tourbillon"), discussion p. 76 ("vague, tourbillon (du fleuve)").

<sup>60</sup> KBo 12.72:1-2, ed. E. Laroche, *RA* 58, 72, 74, 76.

<sup>61</sup> *CAD* G 84f., *AHW* 290.

tary power. One also finds <sup>62</sup>E.A-*aškan* *huwanhuišni kuit hatrēšša anda kidda* "A mission(?) that was established in the *h.* of Ea"<sup>62</sup>. According to Mesopotamian mythology, Ea, in addition to being god of wisdom, was god of the fresh underground water, and lived in a watery realm called the Abzu. In the tale of the Sungod and the Cow, the Sungod seduces the cow, who is angered when she gives birth to a two-legged offspring. It continues: GUD-uš UR.MAḥ-aš GIM-an KAXU-iš *arḥa kinut naš DUMU-li adanna paškitta* GUD-uš<sup>63</sup> *za šarhu[wantan] hūwanhuešar mān halluwanut naš DUMU-li* [...] *īyanniš* "The cow opened her mouth like a lion. She went to the child to eat (the afterbirth?). The cow dropped (her) [udd]er(?) (lit. [bel]ly) like a *huwanhuešar*. She went [to suckle??] the child"<sup>63</sup>. Again a *huwanhuešar* may be something watery. A number of other words that look similar seem to have the same meaning or meanings in the same semantic sphere<sup>64</sup>. However, as it is unclear whether or not

<sup>62</sup> KBo 3.21 ii 8-9 (OH/NS), ed. A. Goetze, *JCS* 2 (1948) 149f. The text is presumed to be a Hittite translation of an Akkadian original, now lost.

<sup>63</sup> KUB 24.7 iii 24-27. The translation follows H. Hoffner, *FsLacheman* 192f. w. n. 12 in assuming that the events described here are normal actions of the cow on giving birth. He suggests that the phrases "the cow opens her mouth like a lion" and "goes to eat" refer to a cow's usual eating of the fetal membrane. All previous commentators have assumed that the cow is here trying to kill and eat what is in her eyes a monster. J. Friedrich, *ZA* 49 (1949-50) 228f. translated "Die Kuh riss das Maul auf wie ein Löwe und ging immer wieder gegen das Kind (los), um (es) zu fressen. Die Kuh neigte [ihren Kopf(?), um] anzugreifen(?), wie eine Woge und ging gegen [das Kind], [um es zu töten(?)]". Concerning the sentence containing *huwanhuešar*, the word *šarhu* [...] is already written out into the margin and so restoring not only the end of this word but an object [SAG.DU-ŠU] (originally F. Sommer, *HAB* 76) seems rather unlikely. Furthermore, N. Oettinger, *Stammbildung* 288f. w. n. 57, argues that the root of what Friedrich in *HW* 185 considered to be the verb *šarḥ*- "to pounce on" is actually *šarḥye*- (i.e. *šarḥiye*-), and so would have an infinitive *šarḥiyanzi*. Goetze's argument, *JAOs* 74 (1954) 188, picked up in Friedrich, *HW* 1. Erg. 3, that *halluwanu*- is from the verb *halluwai*- "to quarrel" rather than from the adjective *hallu(i)*- "deep" is refuted by J. Puhvel, *BiOr* 36 (1979) 57 and J. Weitenberg, *U-Stämme* §§ 728-730 w. n. 729. Weitenberg's translation of our passage (p. 471 n. 729), "Sie (eine Kuh) machte [(Objekt)] tief wie eine Woge" glosses over how to read *šarhu* [...] and hardly fits anyone's understanding of the context.

<sup>64</sup> A catalogue entry reads "If an eagle sits on the roof of houses" [*našma*] *hunhešni ešari* "or sits on a *hunhešsar*" (KBo 10.6 i 12-13, ed. E. Laroche, *CTH* p. 185). A *hunhešsar* is mentioned in the context of Istar hearing the words of the Sea (KUB 33.89 + KUB 36.21 iii 15-20, translit. E. Laroche, *Myth.* 183-84). This appears to be very similar to the Ullikummi passage involving a *hunhešsar* cited above. A ritual fragment says that it is to be performed "If a bee seizes a [...] or a *hunhešsar* [seize]s (it), [or] an eagle on the wall of the fortifications of a city, or in? a rain-gutter? [...] -s], or a snake dies on an altar, or it dies in a pithos, or it dies on a *huimpa*-beam, or it dies in a bed, ..., or what-so-ever (bad) omen happens, this is the ritual for it" (KUB 53.50 i 1-6, 12-13, rit. to make right a bad omen). According to a myth "the great river (and) its *hunhumazzi*- were bound. Therein it bound the fish in... It bound the high mountains, it bound the deep valleys. It bound the meadow of the stormgod". (Later) "The great river (and) its *hunhumaz<zi>*- were released. Therein the fish were released" etc. (KBo 3.8 iii 1-5, 20-21 [NS]). "Inara [came] to Kiškilišša. When she put her house and the [river?] of the *hunhuwatar/hunhuwana*- [into] the hands of the king - because of this we celebrate the first *purulli*-festival, and the hands of [the king hold the house] of Inara

these are synonymous or merely related concepts, they add little relevance to this discussion. The word *h.* has been translated "wave" since H. Ehelolf, *KlF* 1 (1930) 395f. as it is natural to think of a wave as a thing that comes from the sea to speak to Istar. However, this is certainly not the only possibility. In another myth, a river comes from the sea as a messenger<sup>65</sup>. Therefore a *h.* could be some other watery geographical feature. Beckman<sup>66</sup> points out that *hunhuešna*- is probably best understood as a free-standing genitive: "The great (spirit) of the *h.* (or: the one of the *h.*) [emerges?] from the sea. The great (spirit) of the *h.* (or: the one of the *h.*) speaks to Istar". While no text definitively rules out a translation "wave" (although one hardly thinks of "'wave' of Ea" being a good description of the Abzu)<sup>67</sup>, no text in any way argues for this translation either. Beckman states, "In fact, *h.* seems to indicate water itself in large quantities". In the Illuyanka text he suggests a translation "watery abyss".

As long as *hu(wa)nhuešsar* is translated "wave" no connection can be made between the word *kuwaliu*- and some of the other similar words dealt with above. Ehelolf<sup>68</sup> had suggested translating the *kuwaliu*- with Greek *kuáneos*, an adjective meaning "dark blue" that sometimes refers to the sea, on grounds of partial similarity of sound. E. Neu<sup>69</sup> suggested a translation "pure, bright, clean"<sup>70</sup>. While Neu's translation can connect most of the *ku(wa)li*- words together, he must disassociate *kule*- and probably *kulešsar* as well. However, as *hu(wa)nhuešsar* need not mean wave, but could rather mean some large watery feature, there is no reason that it could not be described as "pacific, still": "Go search the high mountains. Search the deep valleys. Search the still waters."<sup>71</sup> In the other passage, of course, "you drank still waters" makes adequate sense<sup>72</sup>. Thus *kuwaliu*-, too, seems likely to belong to the above discussed family of terms, whose meaning seems to involve idleness.

and the *ri[ver?]* of the *hunhuwatar/hunhuwana*- (KBo 3.7 ii 15-20 [Illuy., OH/NS], ed. G. Beckman, *JANES* 14 [1982, arr. 1985] 14, 19 ["watery abyss?"]). See discussion of all of these forms by H. Kronasser, *EHS* 104, 290; G. Beckman, *JANES* 14, 21-23.

<sup>65</sup> KUB 12.60 i 20-21, translit. E. Laroche, *Myth.* 20.

<sup>66</sup> *JANES* 14, 22 n. 71. Ehelolf, *KlF* 1 (1930) 396, had already suggested that the unusual form of the word was due to personification.

<sup>67</sup> A. Goetze, *JCS* 2, 149f. translated *h.* in this text as "watery realm".

<sup>68</sup> *KlF* 1, 395f.

<sup>69</sup> *StBoT* 5, 100f.

<sup>70</sup> "Rein, hell, sauber". A. Goetze, *ANET* 127 suggested yet another translation, "watery".

<sup>71</sup> Cf. already cautiously put forward by H. Otten - W. von Soden, *StBoT* 7, 24 n. 1.

<sup>72</sup> This perhaps means "water taken from a well or pond" as opposed to water taken from a flowing river, stream, or spring.



## VII. Other words

The noun *kuwaluti-* was cautiously linked to *kuwaliu-* by Ehelolf<sup>73</sup>. It appears to be a piece of jewelry. Different texts describe it as being blue, or being made of blue stone, or gold, or gold and stones, or carnelian<sup>74</sup>. If it is related to the *ku(wa)le-* family, it could be a device for pacifying or a "pacific" symbol. It may, however, be unrelated.

One of the several possibilities that were put forward by Hoffner<sup>75</sup> for the derivation of the *kulēi* which appears in the Laws was to see *kulēi* as the dative-locative of a word *kula-*, supposedly meaning "army". However, there is no evidence for the existence of a word *kula-* with such a meaning. It was first posited by Bossert<sup>76</sup> as the nom.-acc. form of a word whose oblique cases are based on the root *kuwalan(a)-*. Bossert is certainly correct in arguing that *kuwalan(a)-* is a/the Luwian word underlying the Sumerogram *KARAS*<sup>77</sup>. However, the form without the *-n-* is based on Bossert's reading of a hieroglyphic form *KARAS-la-i* which, as Hawkins, Morpurgo-Davies, and Neumann have shown, is actually to be read *KARAS-la-za*<sup>78</sup>. Since *n* is typically not written in the consonant cluster *nz* in Luwian hieroglyphics, being either assimilated to the *z* or simply omitted in the script, there is no difficulty in deriving *KARAS-la-za* from *kuwalan(a)-*. Bossert's<sup>79</sup> other evidence for the form *kula-* meaning "army" is the name of a Hittite messenger to Egypt called Kula-ziti in Ramses II's letters<sup>80</sup>. This name Bossert claims is equivalent to the name Kuwalana-ziti<sup>81</sup>. The assumption is not demonstrable. Bossert<sup>82</sup> claims that a word *kula-* found in inventories is also his word "army". This is primarily based on an inventory that lists "6 gold and jeweled 'moun-

<sup>73</sup> KIF 1, 396.

<sup>74</sup> See S. Košak, THeth 10 (1982) 59 (for discussion), 224 (for references); and J. Siegelová, Inv. 442f., 603.

<sup>75</sup> Diss. 314f.

<sup>76</sup> Die Sprache 4 (1958) 115-126; cited in J. Friedrich, HW 2. Erg. (1961) 15, and H. Hoffner, EHGI (1967) 19.

<sup>77</sup> For the alternation see KBo 5.6 i 32 and dupl. KBo 14.11 i 4 (DŠ Frag. 28), ed. H. G. Güterbock, JCS 10 (1956) 91, w. discussion in n. 8. Güterbock read *kuwatna-*, but collation made for the CHD confirms the readings *kuwalana-* of E. Forrer, BoTU 41 i 32 and H. Bossert, Die Sprache 4, 115-117, and the hieroglyphic-Luwian evidence that lead M. Poetto, Kadmos 21 (1982) 101-103 and J. D. Hawkins, RLA 6 (1983) 398 s.v. Kuwatnamuwa, to the same reading. Note also the noun *kuwalanalli-* "soldier" (?), see R. Beal, Diss. (1986) 56-57 and n. 1380.

<sup>78</sup> J. D. Hawkins - A. Morpurgo-Davies - G. Neumann, Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian: New evidence for the connection (NAWG 1973 no. 6; Göttingen 1974).

<sup>79</sup> Die Sprache 4, 117.

<sup>80</sup> E. Laroche, NH no. 611.

<sup>81</sup> NH no. 666 (read Kuwatna-ziti).

<sup>82</sup> Die Sprache 4, 121.

tains', 12 gold *DUR-RU*, 12 gold and jeweled *kulaš*'<sup>83</sup>. Bossert argues that *DURRU* is Akkadian *dūru* "wall". He then compares *BAD.KARAS* (*BAD* = *dūru*) to show that "walls" and "armies" occur together. However, *BAD.KARAS* is a single term meaning "fort", whereas the items in the inventory are separate things. Furthermore, considering the double *r*, it is better to read the first word as *ṬURRU*, "band"<sup>84</sup>. Finally, one can imagine a gold mountain, and even a gold wall, but what is a "gold and jewelled" army? Thus, there is no reason to translate *kula-* as "army". A translation such as "pendant" is more likely<sup>85</sup>. The word *kula-*, and its relatives *kulaimi-* and *kulant-*<sup>86</sup>, may be related to the word *kuwaluti-*, but if so, none of these, nor words with a stem *kuwalan-*, are likely to be related to words of the *ku(wa)le-* family.

Also difficult to fit into this family of words is the Luwian verb *ku(wa)le-*. It is attested in a healing ritual: "He goes forth to the gate". [o] 2 NINDA.KUR<sub>4</sub>.RA i *ku-wa-li-i-ti* "Two oily thin-breads he k.-s. Therein he says as follows: if the aforementioned person will live, let the flatbreads turn themselves [fac]e up(?)"<sup>87</sup>. If *kuwali-* is related to the above words, it could mean "to hold (something) still". Alternatively it could mean "to flip (something)" or "to deep fat fry" or something entirely different. What may well be the same verb in first singular present form :*kuliwi* is found in a curious late Hittite instruction text in entirely broken context<sup>88</sup>. This Luwian verb may be unrelated to the remainder of the *ku(wa)le-* family of Hittite words<sup>89</sup>.

<sup>83</sup> KUB 12.1 iv 18.

<sup>84</sup> AHW 1397 "Band, Knoten". Already, S. Košak, Linguistica 18 (1978) 105 iv 18 ("string"), 107 ("rope, string, wire, chain"); THeth 10, 295 ("wire, string, chain"); J. Siegelová, Inv. 705 ("Binde, Riemen, Kette").

<sup>85</sup> S. Košak, Linguistica 18, 110; THeth 10, 46, 223; differently J. Siegelová, Inv. 55 w. n. 4, 602 ("Anhänger, Kettenglied").

<sup>86</sup> S. Košak, THeth 10, 223, J. Siegelová, Inv. 602.

<sup>87</sup> KUB 17.12 ii 24-27. This appears to be a means of taking an oracle. One presumes that the breads are either flipped in the air (as today we flip a coin and request it to land "heads" or "tails"), or is floating in something such as boiling oil in which it can turn on its own.

<sup>88</sup> KBo 4.14 iv 34. E. Laroche, BSL 52 (1956) 77 n. 3, attempted to see *kuliat* in KBo 1.11 obv. 26 and *kuliēt* in rev. 7 as pret. sg. 3 of this verb. However, both are proper names, although they are unmarked by a determinative. See already H. G. Güterbock, ZA 44, 118f., 120f., 127f., later accepted by Laroche, NH no. 613. For *kulkulima-*, Laroche, BSL 52, 77, see above s.v. *kulkuleške-*.

<sup>89</sup> Previous commentators did not mention this word, or failed to fit it into their schemes, cf. E. Neu, StBoT 5, 101 n. 6. Having a double *-l-* and unrelated is *gulli-* "hole, ravine" and *gullant(i)-* "hollow, having a hole in it", for which see H. C. Melchert, JCS 35 (1983) 138f. To his references add [...]*x-ir našza :ku-ul-li-ya*[-] [...]. KUB 50.46 iii 7 (oracle question, NH).

## VIII. Summary

In summary, we have seen that two different suggestions had previously been put forward to explain many of the words beginning *ku(wa)le-*, namely "bright, clean" and "pacific, inactive". Our own study of the term <sup>A.SA.HLA</sup>*kulēi* found in the laws, showed that two possible meanings fit this term, "reclaimed fields" or "vacant, non-producing fields". One thus sees common ground; one of the meanings suggested for the group of *ku(wa)li-* words supports one of the meanings suggested for the <sup>A.SA.HLA</sup>*kulē-* and vice-versa. Thus, the whole *ku(wa)le-* family of words can be united with meanings such as "inactive, non-productive, pacific".

The Oriental Institute  
1155 East 58th Street  
Chicago, IL 60637

---