

ANTIQUUS ORIENS. MÉLANGES OFFERTS AU PROFESSEUR RENÉ LUBRUN (VOLUME I).

EDITEURS M. MAZOYER, O. CASABONNE. LOUVAIN, 2004. PAGES 337-358.

**PLACENTA, COLOSTRUM AND MECONIUM IN HITTITE**

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.

1. It has been known since 1939 that Hittite scribes used an Akkadogram, <sup>UZU</sup>ŠALITU, to denote the afterbirth of domestic animals.<sup>1</sup> This term is invariably accompanied by a second Akkadogram, <sup>UZU</sup>ḪAK/GURRATU, whose meaning has not yet been determined by Assyriologists.

<sup>UZU</sup>ŠALITU and <sup>UZU</sup>ḪAK/GURRATU

2. [1] KUB 13.4 iv 35-39 (instructions for priests, pre-NH/NS),<sup>2</sup> *nu mān ḫaššannaš mēḫūni DINGIR-LIM-ni kuedanikki / šaklāiš nu=šši naššu AMAR SILA<sub>4</sub> MÁŠ.TUR našma* <sup>UZU</sup>ŠA-LI-TE<sup>MEŠ</sup> / ḪA-AG-[GUR-]RA-TE<sup>MEŠ</sup> *pē ḫarteni n=at lē ištantanuškatteni / mēḫūnaš=at mēḫūni pē ḫarten n=at=kan DINGIR.MEŠ / menahḫanda lē ūš!kanzi* “And when at the time of (domestic animals’) giving birth, some deity has a prerogative (i.e., is owed an offering),<sup>3</sup> and you present to him/her either a calf, lamb or goat kid, or<sup>4</sup> afterbirth (and) *H.*,<sup>5</sup> do not delay them (neut. pl.): present them (neut. pl.) on time, and do not make the gods wait for them.”

3. [2] KBo 22.222 iii 1’-7’ (cult inventory or festival, CTH 530).<sup>6</sup> *nu EN K[UR?]-TI? U[Z<sub>6</sub>?..ḪI.]A?[-aš] 1(?) MÁŠ.TUR* <sup>UZU</sup>ŠA-LI-T[<sup>UZU</sup>ḪA-AG-GUR-RA-T<sup>UZU</sup> udai(?)] (2) *nu ANA<sup>dU</sup> URU Atalḫaziya EZEN<sub>4</sub> nu[-..... iyazi(?)]* (3) *SILA<sub>4</sub> [338] MÁŠ.TUR=kan ANA<sup>dU</sup> URU Atalḫaz[iya ... šipanti]* (4) *n=aš palzaḫanzi n=aš PANI DINGIR-LIM ŠALM[UTIM .....]* (5) *tianzi GAM-an=ma* <sup>UZU</sup>ŠA-LI-T<sup>UZU</sup>ḪA-A[G-GUR-RA-T<sup>UZU</sup>] (6) *1/2 BÁN ZÍD.DA 1<sup>DUG</sup> ḫūpparaš KAŠ ZAG.GAR.RA-ni<sup>7</sup> [pianzi(?)]* (7) *BIBRI=kan šunnanzi* “And the ‘Lord of Country’ [brings(?)] one(?) goat kid [of] the nan[ny-goats(?)], afterbirth[h, *H.* ...], [performs] the festival of *nu*-[...] for the Stormgod of Atalḫaziya,<sup>8</sup> and dedicates(?) a lamb (and) goat kid to the Stormgod of Atalḫaz[iya ...], they stretch them (i.e., the young animals) out (on a flat surface) and place them in front of the deity [...]

whol[e]. Along with (them) [they give(?)] afterbirth and *H.*, 1/2 BÁN of flour, (and) one *huppar*-vessel of beer on the offering table. They fill rhyta.”

4. [3] KUB 18.16 ii 1-6 (oracle inquiry, NH)<sup>9</sup> <sup>LÚ</sup>A.ÍL=*wa* NU.GÁL *nu=w[a*  
G]IDIM.MEŠ *INA É DU*<sub>10</sub>.Ú[S.S]A (2) *UL pē harkanzi* <sup>UZU</sup>*H*A-AG-GUR-RA-TÙ=*wa*  
<sup>UZU</sup>*ŠA-LI-TÙ* (3) GA NINDA GIBIL.MEŠ=*ya kās* MU.3.KAM *kuit=at karšanteš* (4)  
EZEN<sub>4</sub> GA RA-*nas*<sup>10</sup> EZEN<sub>4</sub> *šeliašš=a kās* MU.3.KAM (5) *kuit=at karšanteš*  
GIDIM.MEŠ=*za kēdaš waškuwaš* (6) *šer TUKU-wanteš nu MUŠEN HURRI* NU.SIG<sub>5</sub>-  
*du* NU.SIG<sub>5</sub> // “There is no water-carrier. They make no presentation (to) the deceased  
ones in the bath-house. (As for) the *H.*, the afterbirth, milk and fresh/new breads— this  
(is) year three, since they have been omitted. (As for) the festival of churning milk and  
the festival of the piles of threshed and winnowed grain<sup>11</sup> — this is year three, since they  
have been omitted. Are you deceased ones angry on account of these sins/omissions? (If  
so,) let the shelduck oracle be unfavorable. (Result:) unfavorable.”

5. It is possible that in several passages from oracular inquiries which parallel those  
mentioning the failure to offer the <sup>UZU</sup>*ŠALITU* and <sup>UZU</sup>*HAK/GURRATU* the word  
<sup>UZU</sup>*šarnanta* may represent the Hittite term underlying <sup>UZU</sup>*ŠALITU*. [339]

<sup>UZU</sup>*šarnanta*

6. [4] KUB 5.5 i 21'-23' (CTH 578) SILA<sub>4</sub>.HI.A *kuit* <sup>UZU</sup>*šar-na-an-ta* <sup>GA</sup>*tar-aš-gán-na*  
*karšir* (22) *n=at šakuwaššar SUM-anzi GAM-ann=a zankilatar* (23) NINDA KAŠ  
SUM-anzi ... SU.MEŠ SIG<sub>5</sub>-*ru* “Because they have omitted the (giving of) lambs,  
afterbirth(?) and ..., shall they give them in full, and along with them shall they give  
bread and beer as a fine? ... (If so,) let the oracle entrails be favorable. ... (Result:)  
favorable.”

7. [5] (NH) 578 KUB 5.5 iv13'-21' // [SIL]A<sub>4</sub>(?) <sup>UZU</sup>*šar-na-an-ta* <sup>GA</sup>*ta-ra-aš-ga-an-na*  
*kuit* (14) [MU?.I]M.MA(!) *karšer n=aš šakuwaššarit SUM-anzi* (15) [GAM-a]nn=*a* 1  
SILA<sub>4</sub> *zankilanni SUM-anzi* (16) [DINGIR-LUM]=*za* KI.MIN *nu MUŠEN HURRI* SIG<sub>5</sub>-  
*ru* (17) [x-x] *IŠTU MUNUS ŠU.GI* SIG<sub>5</sub> // “Because [the prece]ding(?) [year] they  
omitted the (giving of) [lam]b(s)(?), afterbirth(?) and ..., shall they give them in full, and

[alo]ng with them give one lamb for a fine? [...] DITTO. (If so,) let the shelduck oracle be favorable.”

### Annotations to the Translations

8. [3] The role of the water-carrier (<sup>LÚ</sup>A.ÍL) in connection with the cult of the dead may have been to provide drinking water to the deceased, but the subsequent mention of the “bath-house” (É DU<sub>10</sub>.Ú[S.S]A) may also suggest another purpose for the water. *kāš* MU.3.KAM *kuit=at karšanteš*. Whether the *kāš* is the near demonstrative pronoun, common gender, agreeing with MU/*wett-*, (“This is year three”) or is an alternate shape of *kāša*, (“Just now [*kāša*]<sup>12</sup> it is year two”), I take this expression to be equivalent to *kinun=a=wa kāša* MU.2.KAM *kuit=war=a[t!]* *karšanteš* KUB 18.21 ii 6. The GA mentioned immediately after the afterbirth prompted van den Hout in a personal communication to wonder if the GIBIL modifying NINDA could not also modify the GA, making it a candidate for colostrum (“new milk” = colostrum).<sup>13</sup> Unfortunately, I can [340] find no solid grammatical or orthographic evidence to make the governing of both nouns certain. Furthermore, the mention immediately following of the neglected festivals of churning milk<sup>14</sup> and of sheaves (EZEN<sub>4</sub> GA RA-*naš* EZEN<sub>4</sub> *šeliašš=a*) makes it likely that the GA is offered in connection with the former and the fresh bread with the latter. They have therefore no direct connection with the preceding afterbirth.

9. [5] Line 14 [MU?.I]M.MA(!). A time expression is needed here on analogy with ŠA ITU.6.KAM *karšan* KBo 14.21 i 8, *nu mašiya[nteš ITU.ÍI.A-eš]* / *karšanteš* KBo 14.21 ii 68-69, INA UD.11.KAM *karš[an .....]* KUB 50.95: 2’, ŠA MU.7.KAM *karšan* IBoT 2.129 obv 4, *kēl* MU-*aš karšanza* KUB 5.5 i 26, and *kāš* MU.3.KAM / *kuit=at karšanteš* in [3] above. For another example of MU.IM.MA in an oracle text see KBo 23.106 rev 14.

### The terms for afterbirth and related items.

10. Ever since the publication and first treatments of KUB 13.4 (my example [1]), it has been recognized that the Akkadograms <sup>UZU</sup>ŠA-LI-TE<sup>MEŠ</sup> / HA-AG[-GUR]-RA-TE<sup>MEŠ</sup> have to do with by-products of the birth of domestic animals. von Brandenstein 1939 72<sup>2</sup> correctly identified the first term with Akk. *šilītu/šilītu* “Nachgeburt”. This identification

was accepted by the two latest full dictionaries of Akkadian (CAD H 33 sub *hakurratu*, CAD S s.v., AHW 1043 s.v.). The second term is less clear. The Akkadian dictionaries read it as *hakurratu* and merely identify it as “a cut of meat used in offerings” (CAD H 33) and “ein Fleischstück” (AHw 309).

11. Since at least *silītu* (and possibly also *hakurratu*<sup>15</sup>) in Akkadian is singular (perhaps the fem. sg. ending itself expressed a kind of collective idea), the employment of the plural marker *-MEŠ* on both terms in example [1] suggests that the Hittite scribe was aware that the underlying terms in Hittite (or Luwian loanword?) were plural or collective.<sup>16</sup> [341]

12. In the other occurrences of these Akkadograms ([2] and [3]), both in oracle texts, the plural marker is not employed, and the terms have the overtly nominative-accusative ending *-U* for post-OB Akkadian.

13. In [2] and [3] also the terms are associated with immature animals: calves, lambs and goat-kids. It may have been that an adult female animal’s first birth had to be sacrificed together with the afterbirth. Subsequent births would then be exempt.<sup>17</sup> Or the newborn of one animal from each flock of bearing animals would be sacrificed together with the afterbirth. It would make no sense for all the newborn to be sacrificed. From [3] it would appear also that such an offering was particularly appropriate to the spirits of the deceased.

14. The appearance in [4] and [5] in a very similar oracle passage of a pair of Hittite (or perhaps Luwian loan-)words offers the possibility of identifying at least one of them with one of the Akkadian terms.

15. As regards the singular-plural-collective issue, *šarnanta* has the characteristic form of a collective (“neut. pl.”), while <sup>GA</sup>*tarašgan*, being contextually a direct object in all occurrences, could be either common gender sg. or neuter sg., although evidence to be developed below indicates that it is a neuter *n*-stem. As mentioned above, the fem. sg. form of Akk. *silītu* can itself be indication of an underlying collective idea in that language. But even if this is not the case in Akk., it is possible that independently in Hitt.-Luw. such a notion would be evoked by the obvious phenomenon of the composite nature of the fetal membranes. Note that in [1] the two Akkadograms are resumed by the neuter

plural accusative pronoun *-at*, indicating either that both underlying nouns were neuters, or that one of them was a neuter plural “collective”. This would fit the idea that

<sup>UZU</sup>ŠALITU<sup>(MEŠ)</sup> was read with <sup>UZU</sup>šarnanta. [342]

16. There is a similar use of a collective in *-anta* for the product of a human or animal miscarriage: *šarḫuwanta* (Laws 17 and 77 in the NH copies B, C and K).<sup>18</sup> In Laws 17 and 18 NH copy B has substituted the common gender “count” plural *šarḫuwanduš*, and the latest manuscript, KBo 6.4, has made it a common gender singular (§§XVI and XVII). Although no OS manuscript is preserved for any of these laws, I suspect that the collective in *-anta* was the OH writing, the others being secondary. The collective form also occurs in the NS ritual text KUB 7.53 i 4-5 *našma=kan MUNUS-ni*

DUMU.MEŠ=ŠU *akkiškanzi našma=ši=kan* / <sup>UZU</sup>šarḫuwanda=*ma mauškizzi* “or if a woman’s babies keep dying or she keeps having miscarriages”.

17. *šarnanta* (which is a collective in form) does refer to the afterbirth (fetal membranes), and is the equivalent to Akkadian ŠALITU, but <sup>GA</sup>tarašgan is clearly not the equivalent to <sup>UZU</sup>ḤAKKURRATU.

<sup>GA</sup>tar-aš-gán / <sup>GA</sup>ta-ra-aš-ga-an

In both KUB 5.5 i 21’ and iv 13’ the GA sign is written in direct contact with the following sign, so that reading GA *tar-aš-gán-na* and GA *ta-ra-aš-ga-an-na* as containing two separate words is unlikely. GA is therefore a determinative for a kind of milk or milky substance. *tarašgan* could be the term for the colostrum, the first supply of protein-rich milk from the udder of the ewe or nanny goat. My colleague, Theo van den Hout, has indicated that he favors such an interpretation, and would link the word to the adjective *tar-aš-ga-ni-ia-u-wa-an-za* in KBo 10.37 i 61, ii 24, iii 48, where the newborn human (DUMU)<sup>19</sup> is said to be *tar-aš-ga-ni-ia-u-wa-an-za* with respect to his mouth, and *šēḫuganiyawanza* with respect to his anus. The oft-repeated passage reads: KBo 10.37 iii 46-51 (restorations from dupl. 514/u, and the parallel KBo13.156) // *UL iyat kuitki* *UL=ma waštaš kuitk[i]* (47) *UL=ma=kan dāš kuedanikki kuitki* (48) [343] *kaliliyanza* *DUMU-aš a-iš-mi-it tar-aš-ga-ni-ya[-u-wa-an-z]a* (49) *[a]r-ri-iš-ša šēḫuganiyauwanza nu=šši=ka[n]* (50) [DINGIR.]MEŠ *piran artē nu=šši=kan ḤUL-lu anda lē* (51)

*ta[(r)]nattēni*.<sup>20</sup> Previous interpreters of this passage have encountered difficult forms which required emendation. In each of the two clauses the true grammatical subject of the common gender singular adjectives *tar(a)šganiyawanza* and *šēhuganiyawanza* is not the body part mentioned, which are accusatives of respect, but rather the common gender singular DUMU-*aš*. There should be agreement in number between the singular DUMU-*aš* and the nouns describing his body part and the possessive suffixes where they occur (ideally *aiš=še/it* and *arra(n)=ša/in*). Yet we find plural forms *a-iš-mi-it* “their mouths” (neut. pl.) and *[a]r-ri-iš-ša* (*arrišš=a*, NH com.! acc.! pl.!<sup>21</sup> without a poss. suffix) “and anuses”, which are clearly inappropriate. The solution is found in the parallel text KBo 13.156, which is a similar ritual designed for multiple sufferers:<sup>22</sup> KBo 13.156 rev 1-3 [*UL iēr kuitki UL=ma wašter kui*]t?ki *UL=ma=kan* (2) [*dāer kuedanikki kuitki kaliliyant*]eš DUMU.MEŠ *aiš=šmit* (3) [*tarašganiyawanteš arrišš=a šēhuganiyawa*]nteš “[They have done nothing. They have not sinned] in any way. [They have] not [taken anything from anyone. Boun]d (are) the children. Their mouths [are smeared with colostrum. And (their) anuses] smeared [with meconium]”. Here we see the source of the problem in KBo 10.37. It was adapted imperfectly from a ritual like that in KBo 13.156, where there were multiple clients. Some plural forms like *aiš=šmet* and *arriš* (NH plural accus. in *-i/eš* of respect<sup>23</sup>) were accidentally retained, when the other forms (DUMU.MEŠ, *kaliliyanteš*, etc.) were changed to singulars.<sup>24</sup> In one case, *ar-ri-iš-me-e[t]* (KBo 10.37 ii 24) the NH scribe ignored the gender difference and remodelled his hyparchetype’s *ar-ru-uš-mu-uš* (if OS or MS; *ar-ri-iš-me-eš* if NH<sup>20</sup>) to fit the adjacent form of *aiš=šmet*. And although *aiš* itself in the compound *zašgaraiš* “feces orifice” denotes the anus,<sup>25</sup> there is no reason to suspect a double statement of the same body part here. Rather the infant’s mouth [344] is smeared with the colostrum (the mother’s first milk) and his anus with meconium (the newborn’s first bowel emission, more on this below). This evidence resolves the ambiguity of our accusative form *tarašgan* as to its stem: it would be a neuter n-stem *tar(a)šgan-*. Formally this can either be derived by deverbative *-an* from a stem *tarške/a-* (compare *maškan* derived from the base of *maškiške/a-* CHD L-N 209f.) or with by *-gan* from a stem *\*tarš-*. The former is certainly much easier, since no noun-forming suffix *-gan* is yet known. As for the putative

\**tarške/a-*, this could be a lexicalized *-ške-* like *duške-*, *iške-*, and (as *duške-* produced *dušgaratt-*) could form a derivative in deverbative *-an*. Whether the base of the lexicalized *tarške/a-* was the verb *tarš-* “to dry (grains)”, which I identified in *Alimenta*,<sup>26</sup> depends on how the Hittites conceived of colostrum. It is thicker than the regular milk of the mother and darker in color. Whether they thought of this as due to a drying process similar to that of the *taršan mallan* I could not say.

18. Identifying the n-stem neuter noun *tarašgan* as the base of the adjective *tarašganiyawant-*, however, raises new questions about the analysis of the accompanying term *šeḥuganiyawant-*. The simplest solution would be to consider *šeḥuganiyawant-* an ad hoc creation on the pattern of *tar(a)šganiyawant-*, using the noun *šeḥur/šeḥun-* as a base. This account also draws support from the attested sequence of verbs *taršitta ... šeḥuriyat* in the queen’s dream, KUB 31.71 ii! 9 and 11.<sup>27</sup> In this case the well known noun *šeḥur* denoting a liquid feces<sup>28</sup> would be the base of the second adjective and would presumably have been the Hittites’ choice if they wanted a noun for meconium.

#### Returning to *šarnanta*

19. If my reading <sup>GA</sup>*tarašgan* and van den Hout’s interpretation of *tar-aš-ga-ni-ia-u-wa-an-za* in the KBo 10.37 passages as “covered with colostrum” are accepted, this would appear to strengthen the case for <sup>UZU</sup>*šarnanta* being “fetal membranes, [345] afterbirth”. At least it would point to some fleshy item associated with the emergence of the newborn animal. And the collective form indicates something having the character of multiplicity, as the membranes do. The only other word in Hittite which might share the same root with <sup>UZU</sup>*šarnanta* is <sup>UZU</sup>*šarnu(m)mar*. It is possible that the noun <sup>UZU</sup>*šarnanta* is based on the participle and <sup>UZU</sup>*šarnummaš* the verbal substantive of the same verb, \**šarn(a)-*.<sup>29</sup> There is, however, no trace in published texts of that verb.<sup>30</sup> As for <sup>UZU</sup>*šarnummar*, all of its occurrences are in broken and obscure passages.<sup>31</sup> All that is clear is that is a body part of animals. The only additional information obtainable from these references depends on the restoration from an unpublished duplicate: KUB 44.15 i 7-10 (dupl. Bo 3727, Otten/Rüster, ZA 64; Archi 1977 304) [(*nu* SI)]G<sub>4</sub> *dāi nu=ššan paḥḥur šuhḥai nu ANA* <sup>d</sup>U=*m[a ...]* (8) [...] BAL-*anti* 1 NINDA.GUR<sub>4</sub>.RA *dai nu=ššan* Ì.GIŠ <sup>GIŠ</sup>ERIN (9) [...]ya



*dāi ANA GEŠTU UDU tepu kuerzi* <sup>UZU</sup>*šar-nu-um<-ma-aš>-š=a* (10) [(SÍG.BABBAR *t*)]*epu kuerzi nu=kan IŠTU NINDA.GUR<sub>4</sub>.RA hašši šuhhai*, which might indicate that the <sup>URU</sup>*šarnummar* of a sheep was a source of white wool, that is, it was not an internal organ. In addition KBo 23.21: 20'-22' might suggest that it was cooked (*zanuwanzi*). So although <sup>UZU</sup>*šarnummar* appears to be derived from the same root, and it is a body part, there is no reason to believe that it can shed additional light on the meaning of the collective noun <sup>UZU</sup>*šarnanta*.

### <sup>UZU</sup>*HAKURRATU*

20. If <sup>GA</sup>*tarašgan* denotes the colostrum, and <sup>UZU</sup>*šarnanta* the fetal membranes or afterbirth, it would follow that, while <sup>UZU</sup>*šarnanta* is the Hittite term underlying <sup>UZU</sup>*šALITU*, <sup>GA</sup>*tarašgan* is not that underlying <sup>UZU</sup>*HAKURRATU*. Assyriologists will have to give the final verdict on of the referent of this word.<sup>32</sup> But given that in Hittite contexts it is part of a complex of terms all of which relate to post-partuitional tissues, [346] it is unlikely that the provisional translation in the two leading Akkadian dictionaries, “a cut of meat used in offerings” [CAD H 33], “ein Fleischstück” [AHw], is sufficiently precise.<sup>33</sup> This Akkadian term could be a rare synonym of Akkadian *abunnatu* “navel, navel cord, umbilical”, since this would fit the use of the determinative UZU. The formation of *hakurratu*, to the extent that we can determine it from the inexact writings in Hittite, may shed some light. Both CAD and AHw reconstruct its proper stem form as *hakurrat-*. In terms of the Akkadian convention the stem is of the *parussat* type, which denotes either a deverbal juristic concept of verbs with root-initial “aleph”, or substantivized intensive adjectives of the type *da'ummatu* “terrifying darkness”, *šalummatu* “terrifying splendor” (so von Soden 1952 [= GAG] §55 p). But even more interesting is the coinciding stem form of the anatomical term *abunnatu* “navel” (CAD A 89f., AHw 9). If the latter suggests anything, it might be that *HAK/GURRATU* was a term for the umbilical cord, or something closely related to the navel. AHw translates *abunnatu* as “Nabelschnur, Nabel”, giving priority to the first translation, while the CAD gives priority to “navel” and lists “umbilical cord” with a question mark as a third possibility. The CAD also notes that “the meaning umbilical cord is not attested for



*abunnatu* except for the Gilgamesh reference, where only the use of *bitqu* ‘cutting’ suggests it; note that Ez. 16:4 speaks of the cutting of the navel, not of the umbilical cord” (CAD A/1 p. 90).<sup>34</sup> If *abunnatu* does not refer to the cord (per CAD A), then *hakurratu* might be the specific term. If *abunnatu* does refer to the cord (per AHw), there is no reason why *hakurratu* (built to the same stem-type) might not be a synonym, perhaps a western peripheral dialect. The Hittite term for the umbilical cord has not yet been determined.<sup>35</sup>

### Conclusion

21. Several of the conclusions drawn above are only tentative. But it is to our advantage to advance and test theories which can [347] make sense out of the somewhat scattered evidence for the tissues and substances associated with the newborn. Basing some of my ideas on the oral suggestions of van den Hout, I would tentatively propose the following distribution of meanings for the vocabulary of this semantic area:

<sup>UZU</sup>*šarnanta* (neut. pl. or collective) “fetal membranes, afterbirth” (grammatically a collective noun), logogram <sup>UZU</sup>*ŠALITU*.

<sup>(GA)</sup>*tarašgan* (neut. sg. *n*-stem) “colostrum, first milk produced by the mother”, with derived adjective *tarašganiyawant*- “covered/smeared with colostrum”.

*šeḫur* (neut. *r/n*-stem) “urine, liquid feces, meconium”, with derived adjective *šeḫuganiyawant*- “covered/smeared with meconium”.

Akkadogram <sup>UZU</sup>*ḪAKURRATU* “(umbilical) cord(?)”. The Hittite word for “umbilical cord” is still unknown.

<sup>(UZU)</sup>*LI.DUR-i-* (common gender *i*-stem noun) “navel”.<sup>36</sup>

Excursus: Is the DUMU in KBo 10.37 an infant or an older child?<sup>37</sup>

22. In order to be able to show that the terms *tarašganiyawant*- and *šeḫuganiyawant*- from KBo 10.37 describe an infant whose mouth is smeared with colostrum (first milk) and whose anus is smeared with meconium (first bowel movement) one has to show that the subject human described is in fact an infant.

23. Although there is nothing in the colophon to indicate that the subject being cured of the effects of a curse is other than a “human being” (*antuḥša-*), he/she is repeatedly referred to in the body of the text as a DUMU. And since (other than the use [347] of DUMU for DUMU.LUGAL in highly restricted contexts) the logogram DUMU simply means “child”, either in a genealogical sense (in which case he/she could be an adult son or daughter of someone mentioned) or in a chronological sense (not yet an adult), that term by itself does not narrow the range of age possibilities beyond pre-adulthood.

24. If the DUMU envisaged in this ritual is beyond the stage of infancy, the two terms in question may describe the effects of the curse: mouth covered with vomit (*tarašganiyawant-*) and anus covered with diarrhea (*šeḥuganiyawant-*). It will not be easy to find clear evidence within the ritual to decide on the age of the DUMU and consequently the meaning of *t.* and *š.*

25. All of the requests to the gods in the ritual would fit either a newborn or an older child. They are asked to place their arms around him (iv 24-25), not to allow evil to get to him, and to send the words of the evil curse back upon the one who uttered them (iv 24-28, iii 50-51, iv 35-38). Aside from the description of the child with the two words under consideration, the only description of him given is the sequence of short clauses:

*kāš=ma DUMU-RU* (59) [*UL iyat kuitki*] *UL=ma waštaš kuitki* (60) [*UL=ma=kan dāš <kuedanikki?> ku*]itki i 58-60 (*kuedanikki* is expected, but the space available in the break is insufficient).

*UL DÛ-at kui*[itki] (22) *UL=ma waštaš kuitki UL=ma[=kan]* (23) *dāš kuedanikki kuitki* ii 21-23

*UL iyat kuitki UL=ma waštaš kuitk[i]* (47) *UL=ma=kan dāš kuedanikki kuitki* iii 46-47

“This child, however. He hasn’t done anything. He hasn’t sinned in any way. He hasn’t taken anything from anyone.” [349]

26. Now obviously these statements could constitute a defense of the victim’s (an older child’s) innocence: he had done nothing to the person who has uttered the curse against him. But located immediately before the description as *t.* and *š.* these words could also be a way of describing the victim as an infant, who has had no opportunity to do anything.

27. In ii 25-26, immediately following the *t.* and *š.* description, the child is further described: *šakki*<sup>38</sup> [*UL kuitki*] (26) *wemiyaz<zi>=ya=kan UL kuit[ki]* “He does[n’t] know [anything], and he doesn’t find/notice(?) anythi[ng]”.

28. This passage could refer to an older child’s not being aware of any evil that he might have done to the cursing person. But it could also describe an infant who has little awareness or knowledge of the world about it.

29. *wemiyaz<zi>=ya=kan UL kuit[ki]* said of the DUMU here would be similar to the description of the newborn puppy: HT 6 + KBo 9.125 obv 21-23 *kāš=ma UR.TUR! maḥḥan IGI.ḪI[(.A-wa anda)] dameinkanza nāwi nepiš au[(šzi)]* (22) *nāwi=ma taganzipa[n] aušzi nāwi=ma=za annaš* (23) *fitan hūdā[(k)] aušzi* “But as (this newborn) puppy is stuck with respect to its eyes (i.e., its eyelids are stuck together), so that it is not yet able to see the sky or earth or even its mother’s teat” (cited CHD S 69 sub 1 b 2’ with Akkadian parallel).

30. Both views can find plausible interpretations for the clauses in §§25-27. But it seems to me that since they flank the description of the child as *tarašganiyawant-* and *šēḥuganiyawant-*, that intervening section too should be one of the reasons for innocence rather than an interposed description [350] of the child’s illness caused by the curse. And if so, since it cannot describe an older child’s innocence, it must describes a newborn in graphic terms recalling its first moments of life outside the womb.

8421 Creekside Ln.,  
Darien, IL 60561, USA  
July, 2003

## References

- Archi, Alfonso. 1977. I poteri della dea Ištar hurrita-ittita. *Oriens Antiquus* 16:298-311.  
Beckman, Gary M. 1998. Ištar of Nineveh Reconsidered. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 50:1-10.  
— — —. 1999. The Goddess Pirinkir and Her Ritual from Ḫattuša (CTH 644). *Ktema* 24:25-39.  
Berman, Howard. 1972. The Stem Formation of Hittite Nouns and Adjectives. Ph.D., The University of Chicago.

- Black, Jeremy A., Andrew George, and J. Nicholas Postgate. 1999. *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian, Santag ; Bd. 10*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- von Brandenstein, Carl-Georg. 1939. Zu den hethitischen Jahreszeiten. *Orientalia Nova Series* 8:68-86.
- Dalley, Stephanie. 1989. *Myths from Mesopotamia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- del Monte, Giuseppe F. 1995. I testi amministrativi da Maşat Höyük/Tapika. *Orientalis Antiqui Miscellanea* 2:89-138.
- Eichner, Heiner. Review of A. Ünal, *Ein Orakeltext über die Intrigen am hethitischen Hof* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1978), *Die Sprache* 25, 202?
- — —. 1980. Indogermanische Chronik 26b. II. Anatolisch. *Die Sprache* 26/2:207-214.
- — —. 1985. Das Problem des Ansatzes eines urindogermanischen Numerus 'Kollektiv' ('Komprehensiv'). In *Grammatische Kategorien. Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der [351] VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, 20.-25. Februar 1983*, 134ff., edited by B. Schlerath and V. Rittner. Berlin-Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- George, Andrew. 1999. *The Epic of Gilgamesh*. New York: Barnes & Noble.
- van Gessel, Ben H. L. 1998-2001. *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon. Parts 1-3, Handbuch der Orientalistik, I. Abt., v. 33:1-3*. Leiden: Brill.
- Goetze, Albrecht. 1962. Review of A. Kammenhuber, *Hippologia Hethitica* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1961), *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 16, 30-35
- — —. 1968. Review of J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. 3. Ergänzungsheft* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1966), *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 22, 16-24
- Güterbock, Hans Gustav. 1967. Lexicographical Notes III. *Revue hittite et asianique* XXV/81:141-150.
- Hallo, William W., and K. Lawson Younger, eds. 1997. *The Context of Scripture. Volume One: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*. Leiden: Brill.
- Haroutunian, Hripsime. 2003. The Hittite Ritual Against Curse (CTH 429). In *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, 149-168, edited by R. H. Beal, G. M. Beckman and J. G. McMahon. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. 1968. Review of O. Carruba, *Studien zu den Boghazköy-Texten 2* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966), *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 88, 531-534
- — —. 1974. *Alimenta Hethaeorum: Food Production in Hittite Asia Minor*. Vol. 55, *American Oriental Series*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- — —. 1993. Milch(produkte). B. Bei den Hethitern. In *RIA 8*, 702-706, edited by E. Ebeling, B. Meissner, E. Weidner, W. von Soden and D. O. Edzard. Berlin-Leipzig-New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- — —. 1997. *The Laws of the Hittites. A Critical Edition*. Vol. 23, *Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui*. Leiden: Brill. [352]

- — —. 2001. *Alimenta Revisited*. In *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie*. Würzburg, 4.-8. Oktober, 1999, edited by G. Wilhelm. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- — —. 2002. Some Thoughts on Merchants and Trade in the Hittite Kingdom. In *Kulturgeschichte. Altorientalistische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, 179-189, edited by T. Richter, D. Prechel and J. Klinger. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag.
- Ivanov, V. V. 1997. Luwian Collective and Non-Collective Neutral Nouns in *-ar*. In *Indo-European, Nostratic, and Beyond: Festschrift for Vitalij V. Shevoroshkin*, 155-167, edited by I. Hegedus, P. A. Michalove and A. M. Ramer. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Kammenhuber, Annelies, and Ahmet Ünal. 1974. Das althethitische Losorakel KBo XVIII 151. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* 88:157-180.
- Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm. 1994-2000. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill.
- Kühne, Cord. 1975. Hethitische Texte. In *Religionsgeschichtliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament*, 169-204, edited by W. Beyerlin. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- — —. 1978. Hittite Texts. In *Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 146-184, edited by W. Beyerlin. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1987. Reflexes of *\*h<sub>3</sub>* in Anatolian. *Die Sprache* 33:19-28.
- — —. 1995. Neo-Hittite Nominal Inflection. In *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, 269-274, edited by O. Carruba, M. Giorgieri and C. Mora. Pavia: Iuculano.
- — —. 2000. Tocharian Plurals in *-nt-* and Related Phenomena. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 9:53-75.
- Milgrom, Jacob. 1976. Hittite *huelpi*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 96:575-576. **[353]**
- Neu, Erich. 1980. *Studien zum endungslosen Lokativ des hethitischen*, IBS 23. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- — —. 1992. Zum Kollektivum im Hethitischen. In *Per una grammatica ittita: Towards a Hittite Grammar*, 197-212, edited by O. Carruba. Pavia: Gianni Iuculano Editore.
- Oettinger, Norbert. 1993. Der Akzent des indogermanischen Kollektivums im Lichte des Hethitischen. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 54:207-214.
- — —. 1995. Griech. ὁστῆον, heth. *kulēi* und ein neues Kollektivsuffix. In *Verba et Structurae. Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag*, 211-228, edited by H. Hettrich, W. Hock, P.-A. Mumm and N. Oettinger. Innsbruck: Universität Innsbruck.
- Otten, Heinrich. 1958. *Hethitische Totenrituale*. Vol. 37, *Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

- Puhvel, Jaan. 1975. Lexical and etymological observations on Hittite *ark-*. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 95:262-264.
- — —. 1979. Some Hittite Etymologies. In *Florilegium Anatolicum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, 297-304, edited by E. Masson. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.
- Shafer, Byron E., ed. 1991. *Religion in Ancient Egypt*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- von Soden, Wolfram. 1952. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*. Vol. 33, *Analecta Orientalia*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.
- Stol, Marten. 1993. Milk, Butter, and Cheese. *Bulletin on Sumerian Agriculture* 7:99-113.
- Stol, Marten, and F. A. M. Wiggermann. 2000. *Birth in Babylonia and the Bible : its Mediterranean setting, Cuneiform Monographs, 14*. Groningen: Styx.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H. 1934. A Hittite Text on the Duties of Priests and Temple Servants. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 54:363-406. [354]
- Sturtevant, Edgar H., and George Bechtel. 1935. *A Hittite Chrestomathy*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.
- Süel, Aygül. 1985. *Hitit kaynaklarında tapınak görevlileri ile ilgili bir direktif metni*. Vol. 350, *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Basımı.

---

<sup>1</sup> von Brandenstein 1939, HW<sup>1</sup> 312; CAD S sub *silitu*. On the subject of placentas and umbilical cords in Babylonia and the Bible see Stol and Wiggermann 2000 141-145. Dr. Stol has also provided me with the following additional bibliography on Akkadian *abunnatu*: “Sjöberg, ZA 86 225 to obv. 17 (the cord?); JCS 29 (1977) 23 to 11 (navel). BAM 3 252:1, cf. Biggs, šaziga 68b to iii 47 (of a gazelle); Böck, *Morphoskopie* 163:188 (of a woman); *Ugaritica* V 74 RS 20.33 rev. 31, with RA 68 95 (Lettre du General); Adamson, RA 84 28 with note 13; BAM 1 92 I 26; BAM 3 237 I 3; BAM 6 574 IV 43, 44, 49; KBo 36 34 II 15, dupl. 29 II 13; Reynolds, *Festschrift Walker* 220:18; STT 2 241:6 (amulet stones tied to it); STT 2 403:48, comm. to Labat, *TDP*: HÁSH-su = KI.TA LI.DÚR; Durand, *AEM* 1/1 497 no. 241:20 (*izbu*). A new, derived, meaning: Ziegler, *Flor. Mar.* III 150 (of an army) (and more lit.).” He also kindly informed me of an old article by Immanuel Löw on colostrum in Semitic, for which see Stol 1993 100, 105, 111.

<sup>2</sup> ed. Süel 1985 80f. (with commentary 148-150), CHD S p. 45, earlier ed. Sturtevant 1934 and Sturtevant and Bechtel 1935 164f.; translations by Kühne 1975 (English

version Kühne 1978 179-184) and by McMahon in Hallo and Younger 1997 220f. (the latter author unaware of the established meaning of <sup>UZU</sup>ŠALITU).

<sup>3</sup> I prefer to assign this occurrence to CHD's *šaklai*- mng. 3 (cf. Hoffner 2002), instead of mng. 2 ("rite"). For this sacrifice owed to the god at the time of birth see footnote 15.

[355]

<sup>4</sup> The specific location of *našma* suggests a deliberate distinction between the offering of entire young or newborn domestic animals and these products associated with their birth.

<sup>5</sup> Süel 1985 150 tentatively supposed that *ḪAKURRATU* was colostrum (Turkish *ağız*): "After the birth of animals a highly prized, very delicious substance of the consistency of yoghurt is produced which is called *ağız*, the first milk" (my translation of her Turkish).

<sup>6</sup> Süel 1985 149 treats line 5-7 only. Anticipating the objection posed by its UZU determinative, she cited UZU.I<sub>3</sub> "yağ".

<sup>7</sup> Collation from photo.

<sup>8</sup> For this deity see van Gessel 1998-2001 798 sub <sup>d</sup>U <sup>URU</sup>Atalḫaziya. The reading <sup>URU</sup>A-ri-ḫa-zi-ya is excluded by <sup>URU</sup>A-ta-al-ḫa-a-zi-ya KBo 13.175 obv 4 (OH/MS).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Süel 1985 149.

<sup>10</sup> Süel 1985 149 reads "EZEN ga-ra-na-aš". My reading is favored by the last two named offerings, GA NINDA GIBIL.MEŠ=ya (see §8 and footnote 14), but it is not without its problems. For RA "to beat, strike" in Hittite see HZL entry 233. In oracle texts the writing RA-IŠ = Akk. *maḫiṣ*. See Kammenhuber and Ünal 1974 94 and CHD L-N 9 for brief discussions of RA "to attack" in oracle inquiries about battle strategy. In KUB 41.11 rev 6-7 the forms *walḫanzi* and RA-*anzi* seem to be used in parallel. RA-*naš* would be a gen. of a verbal noun. A form *walḫatar*, gen. *walḫannaš*, however, is presently unknown. Perhaps some synonymous verb lies behind RA-*naš*. For more on terms related to churning see Güterbock 1967 141, CHD *makkuya(n)*- and *šapp*- 2.

<sup>11</sup> Otten 1958 140f., Hoffner 1974 33f., del Monte 1995 129 ("i mucchi di grani lasciati nell'aia dopo la trebbiatura e la spulatura"), Hoffner 2001 207.



---

<sup>12</sup> Hoffner 1968 532.

<sup>13</sup> On colostrum in ancient Near Eastern sources see Stol 1993 100, 105, 111 (citing Löw).

<sup>14</sup> On the EZEN<sub>4</sub> GA see KUB 13.4 iv 41-42 and Güterbock 1967 242, Hoffner 1974 121, Hoffner 1993, and CHD S 202. Cf. footnote 10. [\[356\]](#)

<sup>15</sup> The problem here is that, since our only occurrences of Akkadian *hakurratu* to date come from these Akkadograms in Hittite texts, where long vowels are rarely marked, we cannot be sure that the word was not the feminine plural *hakurrātu*. See below in §20.

<sup>16</sup> For a discussion of the grammatical category “collective” in Hittite see Eichner 1985; Melchert 1987; Neu 1992; Oettinger 1993, 1995; Ivanov 1997. Melchert 2000 59f. has argued that the Hittite equivalent of 1-*NŪTUM* or any number plus *TAPAL* is a number with suffix *-ant-*, inflected to agree with the collective head noun.

<sup>17</sup> This would correspond to the *huelpi* of the Hittite Instructions for Priests (KUB 13.4 iv 3-10) and the ancient Israelite concept of sacrificing the “firstborn, firstling” (Hebr. פֶּטֶר *peter*) of domestic animals to God (Exodus 13:2-13; 34:19-20); see Milgrom 1976.

<sup>18</sup> See edition in Hoffner 1997 28f., 83, and glossary entry on p. 296.

<sup>19</sup> For the question of whether the DUMU in this ritual is an infant or an older child see the excursus at the end of this article.

<sup>20</sup> For the edition see Haroutunian 2003 156 (transliteration) and 161 (translation).

<sup>21</sup> See Melchert 1995 for the com. acc. pl. endings *-e/iš* of a-stems in later NH.

<sup>22</sup> Haroutunian 2003 mentions this text on p. 150 and understands its plural form DUMU.MEŠ as “members of the royal family”. If she is right in understanding that this ritual only applied to the royals, the use of DUMU, would still exclude adult members. But she does not use the existence of this variant version to explain the intrusive plural forms in KBo 10.37.

---

<sup>23</sup> On *arruš* as accus. of respect in KUB 31.71 iii 31-32, where however the scribe carries over a plural idea from the preceding relative clause to the clause in which the subject is “one horse”, see Neu 1980 31 note 68.

<sup>24</sup> It is therefore unwarranted on the basis of KBo 10.37 to posit a Luwian stem *arri-* for “anus” (so Goetze 1962 30, Goetze 1968 18, Puhvel 1975 264 and HED 122). For another earlier claim for a stem other than the *a*-stem, although not appealing to Luwian, see Eichner 1980 212. **[357]**

<sup>25</sup> See Berman 1972 86, followed by HED A sub *a(y)is(s)-* (17), *arra-* (122), and Puhvel 1979 302f. See *za-aš-ga-ra-iš-kan za-aš-ga-ri-iš-ši* KI.9! KBo 17.61 rev 14 and StBoT 29:44f.

<sup>26</sup> Hoffner 1974 139ff.

<sup>27</sup> See Eichner 202, who tentatively suggests a translation of *tarašganiyawant-* as “vom üblem Wind erfüllt(?)” and compares Akkad. *edēpu*.

<sup>28</sup> Puhvel 1979 298 has shown that in some of the uses of *šeḫur* instead of urine a liquid form of feces is denoted.

<sup>29</sup> Suggested to me by Craig Melchert.

<sup>30</sup> A form *šar-nu-ut* (KUB 57.66 iii 17) in broken context *might* be a preterete of a verb *šarnu-*, but this is still difficult to relate to the nouns under discussion.

<sup>31</sup> KBo 8.91 obv. 4, KBo 13.13 obv. 12, KUB 33.52 iii 5, KUB 43.54, most of these cited by Riemschneider, KBo 23.21: 20'-22', and probably KUB 44.15 i 9, if we are permitted to emend to *šar-nu-um-<ma-aš>-ša*.

<sup>32</sup> As noted above (footnote 4), Süel sought to identify the word with colostrum. But colostrum would not bear the UZU determinative for fleshy parts. One wonders if there is a connection with *agurratu* “ewe”, attested to date only in the Assyrian dialect of Akkadian (CAD A/1 160, AHW 299a [sub *gurratu*, *agurratu*]).

<sup>33</sup> See also CDA (=Black, George, and Postgate 1999) 101 “a cut of meat”.

<sup>34</sup> But note that HALOT (=Koehler, Baumgartner, and Stamm 1994-2000) gives טַבְּוּר *tabbūr* as “navel” and שֹׁר *šor* (< *šurr*) Ezek. 16:4 as “navel cord”, citing also Ugaritic *šr* (Dietrich-Loretz-Sanmartín, UF 7 [1975] p. 110, 113) with purportedly the same meaning. *abunnatu* is interpreted as the umbilical cord in the OB Gilgamesh passage by Dalley 1989 140 (“umbilical cord”), George 1999 106 (“navel-cord”).

<sup>35</sup> Van den Hout (in a personal communication) suggested *šummanza* on the basis of a restoration<sup>35</sup> in the triad of festivals for Ishtar of the Amanus Mountains: EZEN<sub>4</sub> *šum-ma-[an-za-na-aš?]* (4) [EZEN<sub>4</sub> (*ú-i-ú-*)]*e-eš-ki-wa-aš* (var. [EZEN<sub>4</sub>] *ú-i-ú-eš-ki-ya-u-wa-aš*) EZEN<sub>4</sub> *ḥa-aš-ša-an-na-[aš]* KBo 14.68 + KUB 30.58 + ii 3-4 restored from HSM 3644 (JCS 19:33):1-2 + KBo31.12:7-8. Note that the second and third festivals are clearly birth-related, [358] leading to the conclusion that the first is as well. But see below in §21. But Craig Melchert (in personal communication) proposed a different restoration which van den Hout and I agree is more likely: either EZEN<sub>4</sub> *šum-ma-[ri-ya-u-wa-aš?]* or EZEN<sub>4</sub> *šum-ma-[ra-an-na-aš?]* “festival of pregnancy” (from the verbal *šumrai-* “to be pregnant”),<sup>35</sup> which has the advantage of a chronological sequence: pregnancy > labor pains > birth.

<sup>36</sup> The word occurs in a Hittite translation of an Akkadian *šumma izbu* omen: KUB 34.19 i 11’ (*ŠUMMA IZBU* omens) *takku IZBU* <sup>UZU</sup>LI.DUR-*in x[-.....]*. The other occurrence in a Hittite text lacks the UZU determinative, because it refers to a representation in gold of the navel of the goddess Pirinkir as the night sky (KUB 29.4 i 13, translation by Collins in Hallo and Younger 1997 173 “one gold navel”). An explanation of this gold image of Pirinkir as the night sky is given by Beckman 1999 26 with footnotes. See also Beckman 1998 7 note 80. One is reminded of the Egyptian graphic representations of the (daytime and nighttime) sky as the frontal view of an adult female goddess, Nut, arched over the earth (see Shafer 1991 24, plate 13).

<sup>37</sup> A third option, which I do not consider plausible, is that DUMU here is the shorthand for DUMU LUGAL “prince” which one finds in some of the festival texts. This interpretation has been followed by Haroutunian 2003.

---

<sup>38</sup> For this reading see CHD S 25 sub 1 b 3' a'.