

A NEW FRAGMENT OF KUB 15.5+

Johan de Roos*

It is with great pleasure that I dedicate this article to that unique husband and wife team of Hittitologists, Ali and Belkis Dinçol, with whom I have enjoyed a longstanding friendship; a friendship that I hope may continue for many years to come.

In 2002, in KBo Volume 43 no. 66 (=85/f), H. Otten and Chr. Rüster published a fragment of a vow text, which can be immediately identified as such purely from the reference to ʾHepa-SUM, who is already known from KUB 15.5+.

In 2004 D. Groddek gave this fragment a place in KUB 15.5+III and added a transliteration with several notes, in one of his extremely useful articles. The fragment further expands the already substantial quasi-vow text KUB 15.5, which had previously been increased through the addition of KUB 48.122. Since KBo 43.66 was found on Büyükkale and is not a duplicate, it confirms the location where the entire vow text was originally deposited, in Building E. Of particular interest in this 14-line fragment are the names of the gods and the personal names: GN: DINGIR GAL, ʾIŠTAR LÍL, ʾU HÍ.HÍ-aš-ši. PN: ʾHé-pa-SUM and ʾLišša-ʾU. For the ease of the reader I have reproduced the transliteration below, followed by the translation and a selective commentary.

Transliteration

(x+1) 32' 1 10 U[D.KAM.HÍ.A (?)
(2') 33' ʾÚR² [-ʾU
(3') 34' e-da-n[i
(4') 35' UM-MA ʾH[é-pa-SUM

(5') 36' nu-wa-ra-an A-NA D[INGIR-LIM
GAL SUM-an-zi³ 4
(6') 37' Û-TUM ʾUTU-ŠI za-aš-ḫi-ja-wa-mu [
(7') 38' me-mi-iš-ki-iz-zi 1 BÍ-IB-RU [
(8') 39' AN.BAR SAG.DU-SÚ GUŠKIN GAR.
RA ḫar-
(9') 40' A-NA ʾIŠTAR-LÍL-wa-ra-an Ú-U[L
(10') 41' UM-MA ʾLišša-ʾU-MA am-m[u-uk-
wa
(11') 42' ŠA⁵ ʾU HÍ.HÍ-aš-ši 1 GAL
KÛ.BABBAR x [
(12') 43' nu-wa-ra-an A-NA ʾU HÍ.HÍ[I-aš-ši
(13') 44' UM-MA ʾHé-pa-S[UM 1 BÍ-IB-RU
(14') 45' AN.BAR SAG.DU-S[Ú GUŠKIN
GAR.RA
(15') 46' A-NA DINGIR-LIM G[AL SUM-an-
zi³

Translation

32' 10 d[ays (?)
33' UR-[Tarḫunta
34' for that [...
35' Thus (said) H[epapija: "...
36' and he/she [shall be given] to [the great
god."]

* Prof. Dr. Johan de Roos, Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, Leiden / NETHERLANDS.
1 Groddek's proposal to designate the first line of the new fragment as line 32' may be approximately correct. By any reckoning the paragraph would then total six lines, which is not impossible in column three. The other paragraphs number three, eleven, seven and eight lines respectively, up to line 30.
2 Here Groddek reads 1 ÚR = 1 penis. The KBo edition lists ʾÚr in the index of personal names. See commentary.
3 Lines 36' and 46' are possibly followed by karu, as in line 29, for example, or nawi, as in I 9.
4 The remains of sign zi, from column 4 line 35, can be seen at the level of the paragraph dash, as already presumed in the text edition.
5 In the text edition of KUB 15.5+ the beginning of lines 42' to 46' can be seen in lines 40' to 44'.

37' Dream of My Majesty: "In a dream [...
 38' said to me: 'A rhyton [...
 39' of iron, its head inlaid with gold [...
 40' to Ištar of the field ... it no[t...]"
 41' Thus Liššatarḫunta: "To m[e ...
 42' of the stormgod of lightning one silver
 goblet [...
 43' and it ... to the stormgod of lightn[ing...]"
 44' Thus Ḫepapija: "One rhyton
 45' of iron, its head inlaid with gold
 46' to the great god [shall be given.]"

Commentary

As I already stated in 1984, in my edition of the vow texts (volume I, p. 55), KUB 15.5+ must date from the time of Muwatalli II or Urḫi-Teššub, when Ḫattušili was king of Ḫakpiš. It is not a vow text in the more restricted sense, with a preliminary condition; neither does it incorporate the verb 'to make a vow' or 'to pledge' as such. It is a text in which a female functionary Ḫepapija repeatedly assigns objects to one specific god, DINGIR GAL. Regrettably Ḫepapija appears in too few texts⁶ for us to know her actual role and the authority by which she is allowed to do what she does⁷. The fact that she does not occur in later texts might be connected with the supplanting of her patron Urḫi-Teššub. The name Ḫepapija does, however, appear on two seals from Tarsus, in which the woman in question is designated as the daughter of a king (Gelb 1956: 248 f.).

32' The supplementation is uncertain. Days do not appear as time indicators in vow texts. If we read UD.ḪI.A there would be a parallel with a silver day and a gold day which are pledged in KUB 15.18 II 2' and a silver day in IBoT 3.123 7.

33' If we accept Groddek's proposed transliteration, we would have here a unique mention of one penis. Would this be the king's or the functionary's penis, cited here as the object of a vow? It seems highly unlikely to me, although other body parts, such as eyes, ears and a soul, are pledged in vows. At any rate pledged days and a pledged penis necessarily preclude each other. It is more probable that a personal name should be read here, with the aforementioned ^mUR-^DU being the sole candidate⁸. The index of the text edition gives ^mUr-[, although there is no personal name that begins thus.

36' In KUB 15.5+ an object is always assigned by Ḫepapija to DINGIR GAL. For an identification with Nergal see: Houwink ten Cate 1994: 258. If a penis does feature in line 33', then -an is associated with this.

37' In this line we see that someone (eg. *kuiški* or a personal name to be supplemented at the end of the line) addresses the king directly (=mu) in his dream. As in I 18: Û-TUM ^DUTU-ŠI Û-it-wa-mu ku-iš-ki me-mi-iš-ta, in which the instrumental Û-it is equivalent to *zašḫija*. This phraseology does not occur in 15.5+.

38' The present *memiskizzi* only occurs in this context here. It also occurs in I 11 in a slightly different context. Elsewhere in our text we find *memir* (I 7, II 32', 42', 46'), *memišta* (I 18) and *memiškit* (II 53' and III 5).

39' For a gold horse rhyton in the same text see II 36'. The type of iron rhyton was stated at the end of line 38'. An iron rhyton was an extremely valuable gift, and was probably more expensive than a gold rhyton. As the metal from which a object is made always follows the noun we may safely assume here that the rhyton in question is of iron.

40' Other vow texts do not reveal the purpose for which Ištar of the field is cited either, although we do know this for many other manifestations of Ištar, such as Ištar of Alalaḫ, Ištar of Lawazantija (cited nine times with certainty), Ištar of Nineveh, Ištar of Šaḫpina and Ištar of Šamuḫa (cited four times with certainty). In column III 15 ff. the king has already given silver, oxen and sheep to Ištar of the field from his own estate; however, at Ḫepapija's behest she is deprived of these gifts which are then given to the great god. In the following paragraph Ištar of the field has asked the king in a dream for a quiver of arrows, a wall hanging and a chariot with a quiver of arrows; although the king has given the goddess all these items, Ḫepapija has again deprived Ištar of these gifts which are then presented to the great god (III 22-29).

It appears in our fragment as if someone is advising the king not to give the iron rhyton to Ištar of the field (40'). Naturally, the rhyton then goes to the great god, at Ḫepapija's command.

The fourth time Ištar of the field occurs in KUB 15.5+ (I 18-21), someone also speaks to the king in a dream and advises him to give two yellow sheep to the goddess. However, this gift goes to the great god as well, and has already been presented according to the text.

41' After the personal name ^mLišša-^DU it is better to read MA than -ma. In two other places in KUB 15.5+, UM-MA is also followed later in the sentence by -MA, as in the letters, in III 7: UM-MA ^DUTU-ŠI-MA, and in III 10: UM-MA LUGAL ^{URU}Ḫa-ak-piš-ša-MA. -MA never follows UM-MA ^Ḫé-pa-SUM.

The functionary Lišša-^DU (= Liššatarḫunta) only occurs in two other places, in the letter KUB 23.45 (Ünal 1974a, 118ff. and 1974b, 132), where the personal name Lupakki also appears and, in all probability, ^mEḫli-^DSIN (= Eḫlikuṣuḫ), which should be supplemented thus in this letter, and in KUB 15.5+. Ünal calls him treasurer. Unfortunately the context of KUB 23.45 is extremely unclear: in line 11' Lišša-^DU has given something, in 20' he is mentioned in connection with Tarḫuntašša and the matter of the insurrection, after which the letter writer reports that he has told Urḫi-Teššub this. In our text it is not clear whether Liššatarḫunta is proposing that one silver goblet be given (back) to the god Piḫaššašši. In any case, at the end of the text Ḫepapija refers to another object, the iron rhyton. The god Piḫaššašši does not appear in any other vow texts⁹. For more about this god see: Singer 1996, pp.185 ff.

⁶ We find the name of Ḫepapija completely or fragmentarily 27 times in KUB 15.5+. She also occurs once in the Merzifon 3 text, in the line 3', as published in AoF 25 1998, 160f., where she assigns something to "the god" and not to "the great god". Ḫepapija further appears in KBo 41.208 14' (CTH 580), a fragment with bird oracle reports. There is also a dream of Ḫepapija, about which little more can be said.

⁷ Houwink ten Cate (1994: 252 n. 63) sees in her "a woman of considerable importance during the reign of Urḫi-Teššub". He partially bases his opinion on her hypothesised presence in KUB 52.15 III 1', where, however, it would be better to read ^Ḫepati.

⁸ In the Zeichenlexikon Rüster and Neu have listed the name under no. 124, without specifying the text, however.

⁹ This is understandable as he was the tutelary deity of Muwatalli II and the vow texts date from the time of Ḫattušili III and Tutḫaliya IV (Singer 1996: 185 ff.).

Bibliography

Gelb, I. 1956	in <i>Tarsus II</i> , (ed. H. Goldman), New Jersey.	Roos, J. de 1984	<i>Hettitische Geloften. Een teksteditie van Hettitische Geloften met inleiding, vertaling en kritische noten. Deel I Inleiding</i> , Amsterdam.
Groddek, D. 2004	“Fragmenta Hethitica Dispersa”, <i>Altorientalische Forschungen</i> 31: 78-79.	Rüster, Chr. – E. Neu 1989	<i>Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon</i> , Wiesbaden.
Houwink ten Cate, Ph.H.J. 1994	“Urhi-Tessub revisited”, <i>Bibliotheca Orientalis</i> 51: 233-259.	Singer, I. 1996	<i>Muwatalli's Prayer</i> , ASOR, Atlanta.
Otten, H. – Chr. Rüster 2002	<i>Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi</i> 43, Berlin.	Ünal, A. 1974a	<i>Ḫattusili III</i> , Texte der Hethiter 3, Heidelberg.
		1974b	<i>Ḫattusili III</i> , Texte der Hethiter 4, Heidelberg.