

**“Let only Neša become populous!”, and more.
Philological Notes on Old Hittite.***

Petra M. Goedegebuure (Chicago)

1. “Let only Neša become populous!”

Recently O. Carruba¹ considerably improved our understanding of the Anitta text² by proposing several new readings. One of the altered passages, § 6 (OS KBo 3.22 obv. 22-26), now deals with the benedictions for the future kings of Neša, instead of with a curse on any king that dares to resettle some destroyed cities. Carruba’s most important changes are the replacement of twice restored *ku-ru-ur* with LUGAL-*uš* at the beginnings of obv. 25 and 26³. As an alternative for obv. 25 Carruba elsewhere offers the sequence [... LUGAL-*uš*]²⁵ *ša[r-ku-u]š e-eš-tu*⁴. All references to curses against Neša are therefore removed from this section and replaced by the *topos* of the hero-king:

URU~~Ne-e~~[-*ša-aš* URU-*aš šar-ku-uš*]²⁵ LU[GAL-*u*]š *e-eš-tu nu a-pa-aš ut-ni-an-da-an hu-u-m[a-an-da-an]²⁶ L[UGAL-*uš*] *e-eš-tu nu UR.MAH-iš ma-a-an ut-n[e-e ša-ak-ku-ri-(iš-ki)-id-du/pa-aḫ-ša-ru’]**

Er soll starker König von Neša sein, jener soll aller Länder König sein und wie ein Löwe soll er das Land schützen/in der Gewalt haben.⁵ (KBo 3.22 obv. 24-26, CTH 1A).

* This paper is but a small token of my gratitude to the honorand for his important Konkordanz, and more personally, for his ever generous help in discussing problems of reading, either by email or on visits to Mainz. I hope he will enjoy that some of the problems we discussed now return to him.

1 O. Carruba, *Anitta res gestae: paralipomena I*, in: StBoT 45, 2001, p. 51-72; id., *Anittae res gestae* (StMed 13), Pavia 2003, p. 102-104.

2 Edited by E. Neu, *Der Anitta-Text* (StBoT 18), Wiesbaden 1974.

3 StBoT 45, p. 62.

4 StMed 13, p. 104.

5 Compare Carruba’s translation with other recent translations that more or less follow the original edition with curses, such as Hoffner’s “Whoever after me becomes king, whoever resettles [the cities of Ullamma, Tenend]a, and Harkiuana, [the enemies of] Neša, let him be enemy to [the Stormgod] of Neša. And he – let him be [...] of all the lands. Like a lion the land [...]” (H.A. Hoffner, *Proclamation of Anitta of Kuššar*, in: *Context of Scripture 1*, 1997, p. 183). For the restoration of Tenenda, see B.J. Collins, *Ḫattušili I, The Lion King*, JCS 50 (1998), p. 17;

Even though Carruba has convincingly shown that it is necessary to replace *k[u]-r[u-u]r(-)e-eš-tu* in obv. 25 with a more positive phrase, I do not believe that the traces on the handcopy justify the readings of either LUGAL or ŠAR: the traces still seem to favor the reading KU.

There is however a close alternative to KU. If we read the sign as MA, the first word of obv. 25 would become *ma[...]-x-[┐]e[┐]-eš-tu*. The only sensible restoration would be *ma[-ak-]k[e-][┐]e[┐]-eš-tu*, the imp. 3.sg. of *makkešš-* “to be or become numerous, populous”⁶, cf. KBo 40.338 rev. 8’ *ma-ak-ke-eš-tu*. This verb is already attested with ‘countries’ (*ku-ṽa-pí-ma KUR-e ma-ak-ke-e-eš-zi*, “But when the land becomes populous” KUB 23.68 rev. 4⁷), and might therefore also be appropriate for cities.

The proposed restoration highlights a contrast between the ban on settling a couple of destroyed and depopulated hostile cities and the population growth of Neša. This population growth is exploited in the next clause, which predicts the superior position of Neša and its king (“*That* one shall be king of all countries”, obv. 25-26). The presence of a large population is after all one of the prerequisites for power. In my view, the relevant lines now read as follows:

²² *ku-i[(š a)]m-me-el a-ap-pa-an LUGAL-uš ki-i-ša-r[i nu^{URU}...]* ²³ *UR^Uo-(x-n)]a-an^{URU}Har-ki-ú-na-an-na^{URU}Ne-e[-ša-aš]* ²⁴ *a-a[p-pa le-][┐]e[┐]ku-iš-ki a-ša-a-ši^{URU}Ne-e[-ša-aš-pát[?]]* ²⁵ *m[a-ak-]k[e-][┐]e[┐]-eš-tu nu a-pa-aš ut-ni-an-da-an ḫu-u-m[a-an-da-an]* ²⁶ *L[UGAL-uš][┐]e[┐]-eš-tu nu UR.MAH-iš ma-a-an ut-n[e-e ma-ni-ia-aḫ-tu[?]]*

Whoever shoul[d] become king after me: let [n]o one [out of] Ne[ša] r[e]-settle the cities of [...], [...]-x-na and Ḫarkiu-na: [Only[?]] Ne[ša] shall be(come) p[op]ulous. And *he* shall be k[ing] of a[l]l countries. Like a lion [he shall rule[?]] the lan[d(s)].

further see Beckman’s “Whoever should become king after me – out of Neša no one shall re-settle [Wašḫaniya(?), ...] na, or Ḫarkiu-na. (Whoever should do such a thing) shall become the enemy of Neša; he shall become the [enemy] of the entire populace! And like a lion [I fell upon(?)] the land(s)” (Gary Beckman, *The Anitta Text*, in: Mark W. Chavalas, *Historical Sources in Translation: The Ancient Near East*, 2006, p. 217).

⁶ CHD L-N p. 120b.

⁷ A. Kempinski and S. Košak, *Der Išmeriga-Vertrag*, WO 5 (1970), p. 196-197, p. 211; CHD L-N, p. 121.

2. Heaping heaps of wood

The fourth purification ritual for the Royal Couple (CTH 416) contains a reference to two heaps of wood, placed at the feet of the king and the queen (OS KBo 17.3 +, IV 25-26, StBoT 25.4):

²⁵ GIŠ *har-pa-ma* I-an-ta LUGAL-aš GÌR-ši *ki-it-ta* MUNUS.LUGAL-ša I-an-ta
²⁶ *ki-it-ta*

(As for) the heaps of wood, one stack lies at the feet (lit. foot) of the king, and one stack lies (at those) of the queen.

This is the first instance that these heaps of wood are mentioned. From a structural point of view this observation constitutes a problem. With the exception of the relative pronoun *kui-* “who” and *tamai-* “(an)other”, indefinite noun phrases are not allowed in initial position. The heaps of wood must therefore be considered as definite. Therefore, they should have been mentioned before, like the other *materia magica* mentioned in this part of the ritual. Another problem is that the duplicate KBo 17.1 + (StBoT 25.3) contains an unclear expression in rev. IV 18, which is never referred to again (III[?] x[...]x TUR.TUR).

In order to show the context of StBoT 25.3 IV 18 and StBoT 25.4 IV 25-26 I will provide a full translation⁸ from the first two paragraphs of the ritual (in the paragraph count of StBoT 25.4). For ease of comparison the ritual materials are indexed:

Preparation of ritual materials:

When I am taking woe, pain, and worries from the king and the queen, the queen gives me **5 small threads** (# 1): a white one, a black one, a red one, a green-yellow one, and a blue one, and there is one **piece of wood** (# 2) below (them?), five are its branches. And from each one I hang one thread. I *arap-/ara(u)-* **3[?] small [...]** (# 3) (and) **one figurine of clay** (# 4) with mud-plaster and with [...]. **Heads of barley** are tied together, and **heads of spelt** (# 5) are tied together. All these objects I put on a sieve, and I place them at the heads of the king and the queen. But on top (of them) I throw a cloth, so that no man will see them. (StBoT 25.4 IV 10-18)

Ritual performance:

Three thick-breads and a libation vessel with *marnu-* stand ready. But when it dawns, a deaf man and I enter (the royal sleeping quarters), to pick them (the ritual materials) up. The king and queen sit ready. I wrap their digits with the

⁸ For a sometimes different translation see V. Haas, *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica*. Ein Beitrag zur Heilkunde im Alten Orient, Berlin/New York 2003, p. 664-665.

threads (# 1), (that is, the digits) of their hands, while *I* keep the **shrub** (# 2), and I also keep the **figurine** (# 4). (As for) the **heaps of wood** (# ?), one stack lies at the feet (lit. foot) of the king, and one stack lies (at those) of the queen. I say to the **figurine** (# 4): Take the woe, pain, and worries of the king and the queen. Then I take the **yarn** (# 1) from the **twig** (# 2)⁹, wrapped around their fingers. But as for (*kuit=a*) the **heads of barley and spelt** that (are lying) together (*anda*), that too lies at their feet (# 5). (StBoT 25.4 IV 20-29)

The only ritual materials that do not match with a corresponding element in the other paragraph, are the three⁷ small objects (# 3) and the two heaps of wood (# ?).

In order to resolve the observed irregularities we need to investigate whether # 3, III² x[...]x TUR.TUR can be linked to the ^{GIŠ}*harpa* of StBoT 25.4 rev. IV 25. Although Otten – Souček¹⁰ and Neu¹¹ did not attempt to read the signs, the sign following the numeral is an almost fully preserved ^{GIŠ}, and the sign after the break is clearly PA. Only the wedges of the two horizontals of PA have disappeared in the break. Finally, the first sign could also be 2. Thus, we read II² ^{GIŠ}[*har-p*]a TUR.TUR “two small heaps of wood”, the two heaps that are later placed at the feet of the king and the queen.

Another difficulty is the sequence *a-ra-um-mi* or *a-ra-ap-mi* in StBoT 25.3 rev. IV 19 and StBoT 25.4 rev. IV 15. If we read *a-ra-um-mi*, we might connect this verb with a base *āra* “right” (without the more ethical connotations of *āra*¹²), “I set right” > “I arrange”, although *handai-* is the more common expression for arranging ritual materials.

9 This is another example of the Instrumental of separation, like *kalulupit+šmit* in StBoT 25.4 rev. IV 30 (CHD L-N p. 187). I prefer this analysis above one which takes the twig (*ḥaḥḥal*) as the instrumental of means with which the yarn is removed from the fingers, described in the next paragraph, in rev. IV 30. I now understand the ritual acts preceding the removal of the threads from the fingers as follows. The five threads, still attached to the five branches of the twig, are wrapped around five pairs of each two digits of the king and queen: they need to press their hands together to achieve this. The ritual practitioner holds the branch while the hands of the king and the queen are connected. After the verbal act of removal, the practitioner detaches the threads from the twig (IV 27-28, containing our Instrumental of separation), while the threads still tie the couple's hands together. I believe that the threads need to be detached from the twig (IV 27-28) *before* the twig can be used to remove the threads from the fingers (IV 30); any other sequence of events would be difficult to envisage.

10 H. Otten and V. Souček, *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar* (StBoT 8), Wiesbaden 1969, p. 36-37.

11 E. Neu, *Althethitische Ritualtexte im Umschrift* (StBoT 25), Wiesbaden 1980, p. 11.

12 See Y. Cohen, *Taboos and Prohibitions in Hittite Society. A Study of the Hittite Expression *nata āra* ('not permitted')* (THeth 24), Heidelberg 2002.

We might also consider *arapmi* instead of *araummi* and compare it with Old Hittite *harp-*, which in its medial intransitive form means “associate oneself with, join with”¹³. Active transitive *harp-* is attested at the beginning of Middle Hittite, but according to Melchert there should also exist an older transitive verb *harp-* “to associate, bring together” to account for the animate action/result noun *harpa-* “pile, heap”, attested in our Old Hittite ritual.

Although it is now very tempting to emend *a-ra-ap-mi* to *ha-ra-ap-mi*, I refrain from this because we would have to assume the same mistake in the two duplicates, unless of course one of these versions was copied from the other version, including the mistake.

Even though the exact nature of *a-ra-ap-mi/a-ra-um-mi* remains unclear, KBo 17.1 +, IV 18-19 is now better understood:

¹⁸ II[?] GIŠ[*har-p*]a TUR.TUR I^{EN} *ši-i-na-an ú-i-il-n[a]-aš ša-lu-i-ni-it* [o-o-(o)]¹⁹ x
x x [-t]*a-it-ta a-ra-ap-mi*

I arrange/bring together (?) 2 small [pil]es of wood, one figurine of clay with mud-plaster [...]and with [...].

3. “You may no longer hold this cup!”

Neu¹⁴ observed that the form *ki-i-ni* is firmly established as a neuter of the 1st person/proximal demonstrative *ki-* “this” given its occurrence in the expression *ki-i-ni kuit* in the Middle Hittite oracle inquiry KBo 34.142 + KBo 8.55 I 16’ (MH/MS). Besides that, the more regular expression *ki-i kuit* “as for this fact that” occurs in the same text, in I 20’. The setting of *kini kuit* is quite clear¹⁵:

§ 16’ *ki-i-ni ku-it I-NA KUR* URU *I-šu-ua NI-IŠ-ME*

As for this fact that we heard (about it) in the country of Išuua, (...)

13 H. Craig Melchert, Hittite *har(ap)p-* and Derivatives (to appear in the Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu, ed. J. Catsanicos), <http://www.unc.edu/~melchert/harp3.pdf> (October 2006).

14 E. Neu, Zu einigen Pronominalformen des Hethitischen, in: FS Puhvel, 1997, p. 156.

15 I will not discuss the internal structure of *kini*. For suggestions regarding the function of *-ni*, see N. Oettinger, BiOr 39 (1982), col. 366 ((dative-)locative particle); Neu, FS Puhvel, p. 156 (emphatic deictic particle?); J. Puhvel, Hittite Etymological Dictionary – Vol. 4: Words beginning with K, Berlin/New York 1997, p. 47 (related to *-ni* in *kani* and *kedani*); H.S. Schuster, Die Hattisch-hethitischen Bilinguen. II. Textbearbeitungen Teil 2 und 3 (DMOA 17/2), Leiden/Boston/Köln 2002, p. 495 (deictic particle).

Another clear example, which until very recently has gone unnoticed¹⁶, is provided by the Old Hittite myth VBoT 58 obv. 35-36 (OH/NS):

*nu-ya ki-i-ni GAL-ri*³⁶ [*le-e*¹⁷ *na*]*m-ma har-ši*
 “You [may no lo]nger hold this cup”.

Laroche (l.c.) transliterated *ki-i-pit'*, emending the sign NI to PÁT. This has been followed by other scholars, most recently by Neu¹⁸.

An inconclusive but nevertheless interesting instance of *ki-i-ni* in KBo 50.103, 12' (MH²/MS) might be a neuter as well:

[*t*]ák-ku *ki-i-ni-ma i-da-a-I*[*a-ya-tar*² ...]
 „But [i]f this evi[l ...]“

More evidence for *ki-i-ni* as an old alternative to the regular neuter *ki-i* is provided by two tokens of the demonstrative adverb of manner *kiniššan*, besides regular *kiššan*. Both neuters *kī* and *kīni* served as the basis for these two variants of the manner adverb of the 1st person demonstrative *kā*¹⁹. One of the attestations of *kiniššan*, KUB 28.4 obv. 16b (OH/NS), will be cited below. The other attestation also occurs in an early Hittite composition, KUB 31.74 II 8' (CTH 23.3): ^{8'} *pé-e-ra-aš-mi ki-i-ni-iš-ša[-an]*. Either *ki-i-ni* or *ki-i-ni-iš-ša-an* might be present in Old Hittite (NS) KBo 17.56 rev. 8' § *ki-i-ni*[-] and in the Old Hittite myth (MS) KUB 33.22 + KUB 33.23 obv. I 8']*ki-i-ni*[-].

16 I would like to thank the honorand for our discussions of several readings in VBoT 58, but especially for agreeing with me that we should read *ki-i-ni* instead of *ki-i-pát* (visit to Mainz in january 2005). Now also see Jared Miller, Inhaltsübersicht KBo 50, p. VIII (Nr. 103).

17 E. Laroche, Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription 1. Mythologie anatolienne, in: RHA 23[77] (1965), p. 84 restored differently: [*Ú-UL na*]*m-ma*. I restore *le-e* instead of *Ú-UL/na-at-ta*, because I believe that obv. 35-36 deals with a prohibition instead of with a description of some current state-of-affairs (i.e., “You do not any longer hold this cup”). Thus, Frost orders the Stormgod to let go of his cup. This turns out to be impossible, for the Stormgod replies (obv. 39-40): *ki-iš-ši-ra-aš-mi-iš-ya GAL-ri-ja an-da da-me-in[-kán-za]* ⁴⁰ [*an-da GİR^{MES}-IA*]-*ja da-me-in-kir* “My hand [is] stu[ck] to the cup, and they have tied [my feet (to it)] as well.” As noted by F. Pecchioli Daddi & A.M. Polvani, La mitologia ittita (Testi del Vicino Oriente Antico 4), Brescia 1990, p. 66 n. 20., the cup, representing heaven, is probably the symbol of power for the Stormgod.

18 E. Neu, Zur Morphologie und Syntax einer mythologischen Erzählung aus althethitischer Zeit, in: FS Neumann², 2002, p. 322, 327.

19 Since we can parse *kiniššan* and *iniššan* as the neuters *kini* and *ini* followed by the derivational morpheme of the manner adverbs *-šan*, pre-OH might have contained a neuter **apēni* (in view of *apēniššan*) besides or instead of *apat*. All attested tokens of *apēni* however, function as dat.-loc.s, and are possibly scribal errors for *apēdani* (Neu, Studien zum endungslosen “Lokativ” des Hethitischen (IBS Vorträge und kleinere Schriften 23), Innsbruck 1980, p. 50-51 n. 116).

As noted above, Neu²⁰ recognized *ki-i-ni* as a variant of *kī* but hesitated to ascribe *ki-e-ni* to the neuter, since this might be a scribal mistake for the dat.-loc. *ki-e-da-ni*²¹. Oettinger²² on the other hand argues that a dat.-loc. *ki-e-ni* “(in) die-sem” is the regular outcome of an assimilation process **kēd-ni > kēni*²³. The creation of this extended form caused an irregularity in the paradigm of *ka-*, so, according to Oettinger, the locative *kēd* was again used to create a new dat.-loc., but this time with *-ani*, leading to *kēdani*. From a functional point of view Oettinger’s analysis is unlikely. Assuming that the alleged dat.-loc. *ke-e-ni* is only expected to occur in older compositions (as it indeed is), the OH dat.-loc. was covered by *four* forms: *kēd*, *kēdi*, *kēni* and *kēdani*²⁴.

Soysal²⁵ likewise accepts the reality of *ki-e-ni* but simply takes it as neuter, which is also the view of Schuster²⁶. Three instances of *ki-e-ni* occur in broken passages²⁷, thus excluding any analysis of form and function. However, if Schuster (l.c.) is right²⁸ in restoring *ki-e-ni* at the end of obv. 15b in KUB 28.4 (NS, CTH 727A), the use of *ki-e-ni* as a neuter seems to be firmly established as well:

Kamrušepa looked down from Heaven:

ku-it k[u-it² k]e-[⌈] e-ni[⌋] 16b ki-i-ni-iš-ša-an

“What? W[hat[?]] (is) *this*?” Thus (she continued): (“...”) ²⁹

Two MS attestations are written *ki-i-ni*, whereas most cases of *ki-e-ni* occur in NS copies of Old Hittite texts³⁰. This distribution matches the distribution of the neuter forms of the 3rd person/distal demonstrative pronoun *ašī* etc. The original

20 FS Puhvel, p. 156-157. Puhvel himself (HEG K: 4ff.) does not list the nom.-acc.sg. neuters *ki-i-ni* and *ki-e-ni*.

21 FS Puhvel, p. 157 n. 80; Lokativ, p. 51 n. 116.

22 BiOr 39 (1982), col. 366.

23 The original locatives *kēd* (and *apēd*) received a locative particle *-ni > *kēdni*. This highly unstable form became **kēnni*, and with lenition of *-nn-* after an accented long vowel became attested *kēni* (Oettinger, BiOr 39 (1982), col. 366).

24 Assuming that *kēd* is indeed a locative and not an instrumental.

25 O. Soysal, Beiträge zur althethitischen Geschichte (II), AoF 25 (1998), p. 26.

26 DMOA 17/2, 2002, p. 495.

27 KUB 33.22 + KUB 33.23 obv. I 22'; KUB 7.57 I 9; KUB 23.53, 5'.

28 But compare the alternative readings *ku-it m[a[?]-uš-š]a-an(-) [⌈] me[?]⌋ [-ma-i[?]] ki-i-ni-iš-ša-an* „What [has] f[alle]n? [(And) she] s[ays]“ as follows.“ (J.V. García Trabazo, Textos religiosos hititas. Mitos, plegarias y rituales, Madrid 2002, p. 262).

29 Schuster (o.c., p. 387) has a slightly different translation: “Was (alles) (ist) in dieser Weise da (geschehen)?” Folgendermaßen (fuhr sie fort):

30 Although I do not find much evidence for an early date of translation for the Hattic-Hittite myth KUB 28.4 (CTH 727), the duplicate KU 28.5 (NS) shows the slightly adversative conjunction *-a*, variant of *-ma* in (*ḫé-e-ú-ša-aš-ši = ḫeuš=a=šši*). This at could point at a Middle Hittite date of translation.

form *ini* lasts until MH, and is replaced in NH by *eni*³¹, being remodelled after *edani*, *edaš* and *edez*³². Although *kini* fell out of use in MH, the NH scribes copied the vocalism of the productive neuter *eni* to ‘improve’ their OH and MH documents³³.

To the list of instances of *ki-e-ni* and *ki-i-ni* should be added *ki[-e/i-ni]* in KBo 40.350, 5'. This small fragment is a duplicate of KUB 7.57 I 4-15 (CTH 412, Zuḫi ritual):

x+1	]x[
2'	]na-an-k[án ...
3'	ma-ṽa-an-n]a-aš an-ni[-ti ...
4'	nu-ṽa-aš-š]a-an pa-i[-mi
5'	UM-MA] ^d LAMMA ki[-e/i-ni
6'	ḫa-a]n-da-a-ši[
7'	]x ^{URU} L[i-iḫ-zi-na-an
8'	]x LÚ ^{ME} [š
9'	]x[

31 P.M. Goedegebuure, The Hittite 3rd person/distal demonstrative *aši* (*uni*, *eni* etc.), *Die Sprache* 43 (2002-2003), p. 1-32.

32 H. Craig Melchert, Problems in Hittite Pronominal Inflection (to appear in a forthcoming *Festschrift*), <http://www.unc.edu/~melchert/hittitepronouns.pdf> (October 2006).

33 Schuster (o.c. p. 495-496) suggests to analyze *kēni* as plural, although he also mentions that the *e*-vocalism could be the result of the later tendency to write *-e-* instead of *-i-*. In view of the development from *ini* to *eni* I prefer the latter solution.