

A BRIEF COMMENTARY ON THE HITTITE ILLUYANKA MYTH (CTH 321)

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., The University of Chicago

Although Bob Biggs is not a Hittitologist, he has contributed significantly to the understanding of Akkadian literary texts, including myths. Since the Illuyanka Myth is one of the most important myths in the Hittite repertoire,¹ and is widely known in translation far beyond the field of Hittitology, it seems appropriate to me to dedicate to him this brief commentary on the myth. In the notations of the lines that follow I have used the sigla of the editions of the text, but I have engaged as many of the various published translations and commentaries as possible.

In the form we have it today the Illuyanka Myth consists of two stories recounted on a single tablet. Each story is followed by a ritual. The main cuneiform text is KBo 3.7 with seven duplicates.² The text has been often translated³ and studied.⁴

¹ E. Laroche, *Catalogue des textes hittites* (Paris, 1971), no. 321 (hereafter *CTH*).

² For a listing, see either of the two editions: G. M. Beckman, "The Anatolian Myth of Illuyanka," *ANES* 14 (1982) and J. V. García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas: mitos, plegares y rituales*, Biblioteca de Ciencias Bíblicas y Orientales 6 (Madrid, 2002), pp. 75–103.

³ A. Goetze in J. B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 2d ed. (Princeton, 1955), pp. 125–26 (hereafter *ANET*²); T. H. Gaster, *Thespis: Ritual, Myth, and Drama in the Ancient Near East*, 2d ed. (Garden City, New York, 1961), pp. 245–67; H. G. Güterbock, "Hittite Mythology," in S. N. Kramer, ed., *Mythologies of the Ancient World* (Garden City, New York, 1961), pp. 139–79; H. G. Güterbock, "Hethitische Literatur," in W. Röllig et al., *Altorientalische Literaturen*, Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft, Band 1 (Wiesbaden, 1978), pp. 246–48; C. Kühne, "Hittite Texts," in W. Beyerlin, ed., *Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia, 1978), pp. 155–59; B. DeVries, "The Style of Hittite

Epic and Mythology" (Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1967), pp. 16–19, 64–66; A. Bernabé, *Textos literarios hititas* (Madrid, 1987), pp. 29–37; H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *Hittite Myths*, Writings from the Ancient World 2 (Atlanta, 1990), pp. 10–14 (hereafter *HM*¹); F. Pecchioli Daddi and A. M. Polvani, *La mitologia ittita*, Testi del Vicino Oriente antico 4/1 (Brescia, 1990), pp. 39–55 (hereafter *LMI*); V. Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1. Abteilung, Band 15 (Leiden, 1994), pp. 703–7 (hereafter *GhR*); A. Ünal, "Hethitische Mythen und Epen," in O. Kaiser, ed., *Mythen und Epen*, Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments III/4 (Gütersloh, 1994), pp. 802–65; G. M. Beckman, "The Storm-god and the Serpent (Illuyanka)," in W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger, eds., *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 1, *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World* (Leiden, 1997) (hereafter *CoS* 1); and H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *Hittite Myths*, 2d ed., rev., Writings from the Ancient World 2 (Atlanta, 1998), pp. 9–14 (hereafter *HM*²).

⁴ A. H. Sayce, "Hittite Legend of the War with the Great Serpent," *JRAS*, 1922, pp. 177–90; A. Goetze, *Kleinasien*, 2d ed., rev., Handbuch der

I. THE DATING OF THE COMPOSITION

Although all extant manuscripts of the Illuyanka text are copies made after the Old Hittite period,⁵ the original form of the composition derives from Old Hittite. One can see this from sporadic linguistic archaisms.⁶ Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani note the following linguistic archaisms:⁷ the enclitic pronoun *-e* in § 10 B i 12', 13', *-apa* in *an-da-ma-pa* § 4 A i 13 and *am-mu-ug-ga-za-pa* § 26 A iii 29, and the use of the allative in *gi-im-ra* § 13 C i 18. It may be that Stefanini's *mān* with final force (§ 1 A i 3), if he is right in his analysis, is also an archaism.⁸ To these examples we may also add: Old Hittite *ma-a-wa* (§ 8 A i 25, § 13 C i 18, 21) for later *ma-a-an-wa*, *kat-ti-ti* (§ 8 A i 25) for later *-ta katta(n)*, the writing *-z* for the reflexive particle in ^d*Inarašš=a=z* (§ 9 B i 4), and *andan Ê-[(ri)]* (§ 13 C i 16) instead of later *Ê-ri anda*. The Old Hittite nongeminating *-a* for change of topic (often rendered "but") is also attested in *a-pa-a-ša* § 14 C i 23 (beginning apodosis after a *mān* clause), *mān=aš pa-a-i-ta* "but when he went" § 24 A iii 13, ^d*Za-li-nu-i-ša* in § 29 D iv 6, *ku-i-ta* § 33 A iv 18, and erroneously for the geminating *-a* in *ša-ku-wa-aš-še-<et->ta* "and his eyes" § 24 A iii 18. Archaic elements having to do with the *contents* of the stories are amply discussed in *LMI*, p. 39, n. 4.

It would be interesting to determine if the archaic elements are equally distributed between the *narrative* and *ritual* portions of the two accounts. If they are, this would indicate that the rituals as well as the narratives stem from the Old Hittite period. If not, we may be permitted to look to religious-political influences from the thirteenth century on the rituals. As for archaic linguistic elements in the ritual portion of Account 1 (§§ 18–19: A ii 21–30), there is nothing linguistically distinctive of Old Hittite versus

Altertumswissenschaft, Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orients (Munich, 1957), pp. 139–40; V. Haas, "Jasens Raub des goldenen Vlieses im Lichte hethitischer Quellen," *UF* 7 (1975): 227–33; C. Mora, "Sulla mitologia ittita di origine anatolica," in O. Carruba, ed., *Studia Mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata*, *Studia Mediterranea* 2 (Pavia, 1979), pp. 380–83; H. Gonnet, "Institution d'un culte chez les hittites," *Anatolica* 14 (1987): 89–100; F. Pecchioli Daddi, "Aspects du culte de la divinité hattie Teteshapi," *Hethitica* 8 (1987): 361–80; C. Watkins, "How to Kill a Dragon in Indo-European," in C. Watkins, ed., *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985)* (Berlin, 1987); V. Haas, "Betrachtungen zur Rekonstruktion des hethitischen Frühjahrsfestes (EZEN *purulliyas*)," *ZA* 78 (1988): 284–98; E. Neu, "Der alte Orient: Mythen der Hethiter," in G. Binder and B. Effe, eds., *Erzählende Weltdeutung im Spannungsfeld von Ritual, Geschichte und Rationalität*, Bochumer Altertumswissenschaft-

liches Colloquium 2 (Trier, 1990), pp. 101–3; C. Watkins, "Le dragon hittite Illuyankas et le géant grec Typhôeus," *CRAI*, avril–juin (1992): 319–30; and M. Popko, *Religions of Asia Minor* (Warsaw, 1995), pp. 121–23.

⁵ So, for example, García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hittitas*, p. 78, and compare the on-line concordance of S. Košak at http://www.orient.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/hetkonk_abfrage.php. García Trabazo dates them all to the fourteenth century B.C., while Košak dates KBo 12.83 ("F") to the thirteenth ("sjh").

⁶ A. Kammenhuber, "Die Sprachstufen des Hethitischen," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 83 (1969): 259.

⁷ *LMI*, p. 39, n. 3.

⁸ R. Stefanini, "Alcuni problemi ittiti, lessicali e sintattici," in F. Imparati, ed., *Studi di storia e di filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli*, *Eothen* 1 (Florence, 1988), p. 255.

later periods.⁹ But in the ritual of Account 2 (§§ 27–35) there are a few possible linguistic archaisms: *pa-i-u-wa-ni* § 30 D iv 9 (and *pa-a-i-wa-ni* in A and C) with its Old Hittite/Middle Hittite *-wani* ending, the older *e-šu-wa-aš-ta* of § 30 D iv 10 (contrasted with its duplicate A iv 7, which modernized as *e-šu-wa-aš-ta-ti*), the construction of middle *eš-* “sit down” with *-šan* but no *-za*, the Old Hittite spelling *ša-al-li-iš* (A iv 17) versus post-Old Hittite *šal-li-iš*.

This is scant evidence, but it is enough to suggest an Old Hittite archetype for the ritual in Account 2. On the other hand, New Hittite spellings (which arguably could be due to the scribe rather than the original) abound in the ritual portions. If these New Hittite spellings belong to the original form of the rituals, one could suppose that the old narratives were joined to newly created rituals.

Kellerman mentions several elements of the contents of the two rituals to argue that the second is more recent and more appropriate to the late empire period (Tudḫaliya IV) than the first.¹⁰ In the first ritual the name of the god Zaliyanu is written with the mountain determinative, ^{HUR.SAG}Zali(ya)nu, while in the second it is written with the DINGIR determinative ^dZali(ya)nu. In the second ritual he has both a wife and a concubine and is therefore portrayed as fully anthropomorphic. But is this evidence compelling? If the transfer from mountain to anthropomorphic deity could be conclusively shown to be a widespread and virtually exceptionless trend in Hittite cult, this would be a significant indication of a later date for the second ritual. Kellerman quotes Laroche¹¹ for the elements of Tudḫaliya IV’s religious reforms, which include the replacement of ancient theriomorphic images, stelae, and different objects thought to be divine incarnations by anthropomorphic statues. But a mountain deity is not theriomorphic, and there is no way to show a mountain-god in art other than in the traditional style with human heads but sloping rocky flanks, i.e., half and half.

With respect to the content of the text, one can see its original Old Hittite setting in the following five features, already noted by *LMI*: (1) the role played by the city of Nerik, which was lost to the Hittites from the late Old Kingdom until the reign of Ḫattušili III, (2) the use of the matrimonial institution of the ^{LÚ}*antiyanza*, known to us only in the Old Hittite laws, (3) the fact that the myth furnishes an etiology for the Old Hittite festival of *purulli*, (4) the mention (in the second account) of the ^{LÚ}GUDU₁₂ Taḫpurili (see below in § 29), who is mentioned in an Old Hittite Script text, and (5) the names of the deities, all of which belong to the pre-Hittite Hattian sphere.

⁹ Unless one wishes to exaggerate the importance of the mildly temporal use of *mān* in line 22. But since it is likely that in *hi-ni-ik-ta* we have a “dynamic” (i.e., deponent) middle form, present tense (correctly in *LMI*, p. 52, “avrà distribuito”), there is nothing unusual in New Hittite about a temporal use *mān* with a pres.-future (“whenever”). Its clause establishes a contingency for the action of *pīdāi* in line 24.

¹⁰ G. Kellerman, “Towards the Further Interpretation of the *purulli*-Festival,” *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 5/6 (1981): 36.

¹¹ E. Laroche, “La réforme religieuse du roi Tudḫaliya IV et sa signification politique,” in *Les syncrétismes dans les religions de l’antiquité* (Leiden, 1975), pp. 92–93.

II. TRANSMISSION

LMI, p. 40, argues against oral transmission from the Old Hittite period to the first written form in New Hittite for the following reasons. (1) The linguistic archaisms in the text are grammatical, not just lexical, and would not have survived oral transmission for centuries in a nonmetrical form. (2) The name of the text's author, Kella, is only attested in the pre-imperial period.¹² A copy attested in one small fragment appears to show Middle Hittite script. But the vast majority of the extant copies are New Hittite and were probably made during a period of reinterest in the north, such as in Ḫattušili III's reign, and were copied from Kella's Old Hittite exemplar, which has never been recovered. But if the extant copies are only one copying away from an Old Hittite archetype, I am surprised at how few archaisms remain. *LMI*'s assessment of the age of the Kella name militates against the view of Kellerman,¹³ who assumes that Kella is not the ancient author of the stories, but a New Hittite GUDU₁₂-priest contemporary with the copy, that is, during the reigns of Ḫattušili III and the cult reformer Tudḫaliya IV.

III. INTERPRETATION

Purulli was an Old Hittite festival, which continued to be celebrated in the early empire before the revival of contact with Nerik in the north under Ḫattušili III. We know this because in his annals Muršili II wrote: "I celebrated the *purulli* festival, the great festival, for the Storm-god of Ḫatti and the Storm-god of Zippalanda."¹⁴ Some scholars claim that the *purulli* festival was the Hattic festival of the New Year,¹⁵ although this can only be an inference, since it is never called such in the texts.

While each has a subplot, both stories focus on a conflict between the chief Storm-god of the Hittites, the Storm-god of Heaven, and a huge and powerful reptile, Sum. MUŠ, Hitt. *illuyanka-* or *elliyanka-*. In English translations this reptile is sometimes called a "dragon" (*LMI*, "il drago"). But one should not prejudice the conception of this huge being by a word associated with a particular mythological creature that figures in Western fairy tales.

The word *illuyanka-*, also written *elliyanka-*, is thought by Puhvel to be an "autochthonous term," that is, non-Indo-European.¹⁶ But in a recent article Katz has proposed

¹² The name occurs in Old Assyrian Kültepe texts, in the Telepinu Proclamation, and in an Old Hittite land-grant text (according to *LMI*).

¹³ Kellerman, "Towards the Further Interpretation of the *purulli*-Festival," pp. 36–37.

¹⁴ *nu* EZEN₄ *pu-ru-ul-li-ya-aš ku-it GAL-in* [EZEN₄-an] A-NA dU URU *Ha-at-ti U A-NA dU URU Zi-ip-pa-[la-an-da] i-ya-nu-un*, KBo 2.5+ iii 44–46,

edited by A. Goetze, *Die Annalen des Muršiliš*, MVAG 38 (Leipzig, 1933), p. 188.

¹⁵ For example, García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hittitas*, pp. 77–78, 83 with n. 16.

¹⁶ J. Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, vols. 1–2, A, E, I, Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 1 (Berlin, New York, and Amsterdam, 1984), vol. 2 (E/I), pp. 358–59 (hereafter *HED*); cf. also *LMI*, p. 40, n. 11.

an Indo-European etymology for the word.¹⁷ What is certain is that it is a noun, not a proper name, and should be translated—failing any more specific evidence—with as general a term as possible, “serpent” or “reptile.”

Most interpreters would agree today that there is more to these stories than literature. One can read the Kumarbi Epic without reference to Hittite concepts of ritual and kingship, for whatever theological and ritual concepts are embedded in those stories are most probably Hurrian or Mesopotamian but not necessarily Hittite. This is not the case with Old Hittite myths such as this one and the so-called Telepinu Myth.

Where interpreters are *not* in agreement is in the details of the interpretation of the symbolism. It is inevitable in literary works employing symbolism that only some details of the story are intended to be understood symbolically. Many elements are merely details essential to the plot of the narrative and to lend verisimilitude. It is difficult for interpreters to know which details are intended to be taken symbolically. Which of the following elements of the first Illuyanka story, for example, should one consider as having a symbolic meaning?

1. The Storm-god and serpent fight, and the Storm-god is defeated.
2. The fight takes place in Kiškilišša.
3. The Storm-god appeals to the other gods for help (§ 4 A I 13).
4. Inara prepares a feast with the emphasis on beverage types.
5. Inara finds Ḫupašiya in Zikkaratta and proposes that he assist her.
6. Ḫupašiya agrees on condition that he may sleep with her, and she concurs.
7. Inara hides Ḫupašiya.
8. Inara ornaments herself and calls the serpent up (*šarā kallišta*) out of his hole/cave.
9. The serpent and his children come up, eat and drink to excess.
10. They are unable to go back down into their hole.
11. Ḫupašiya ties (*kalēliet*) the serpent up with a cord (or with cords).
12. The Storm-god kills the serpent, and the other gods side with him once again.
13. Inara builds a house/temple for herself on a rock/cliff in Tarukka.
14. She installs Ḫupašiya in the house.
15. She warns him against looking out the window at other mortals while she is away.
16. After 20 days of obedience, he looks outside and sees his wife and children.
17. When she returns, he begs to be able to return to his family.

¹⁷ J. T. Katz, “How to Be a Dragon in Indo-European: Hittite *illuyankaš* and Its Linguistic and Cultural Congeners in Latin, Greek, and Germanic,” in J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, and L. Olivier,

eds., *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Band 92 (Innsbruck, 1998), pp. 317–34.

Most interpreters would consider numbers 1, 12, and 13 as theologically and ritually significant, but the rest of the details are folkloristic and are present only in order to fill out a plausible story. Yet one wonders if there is a theological or ritual significance to some of the other details, such as the locus of the original fight in Kiškilušša (no. 2), the choice of Zikkaratta as Ḫupašiya's hometown (no. 5), and the entire set of events involving Ḫupašiya, who seems to have been the unsuccessful prototype of the Hittite king in his relationship to Inara, the daughter of the Storm-god. Certainly the specification of 20 days as the duration of Inara's absence from Ḫupašiya (§ 14 C I 23) serves no obvious part of the narrative plot itself and raises the suspicion that there is some obscure allusion here to the duration of a festival of Inara celebrated in the open country (Hittite *gimra*-). An official at Tapikka bore the Akkadian name *l*mār-ešrē, also written in Sumerian as DUMU.UD.20.KAM "son (born on) the 20th day." Which 20th day does this name refer to, if indeed there was not a particular 20th day of a festival that was particularly auspicious for the birth of children? Admittedly, this Babylonian personal name already existed in Mesopotamia, and the day referred to was the 20th day of the month on which a joyful festival was celebrated in honor of the Sun-god Šamaš.¹⁸ But an official in Mašat-Tapikka would hardly have taken a name referring to his own date of birth, if that was to refer to a festival for Šamaš that did not exist in Hatti. Most likely, therefore, the name was reinterpreted in terms of a known Anatolian festival.

It is widely believed, perhaps correctly, that the conflict between the serpent and the Storm-god is over the control of the waters, so necessary for agriculture and life.¹⁹ The Storm-god would presumably be lord of the rainfall, while the serpent controlled the subterranean water sources. By defeating the Storm-god, the serpent thwarts the rainfall and continues by himself to control the subterranean springs, which he can cut off at will. But there are unanswered questions regarding the theory that it was only the Storm-god who controlled the rains. Strange as it seems, where the Illuyanka Myth itself mentions a divine being who is asked to give rain (§ 19), it is not a storm-god, but Mt. Zaliyanu, a deified mountain near the city of Nerik. Why is the Storm-god not asked? Furthermore, the triad of deities who in their priests or emblems remain to preside over the cult location at Tanipiya, include in the persons of the Mountain-god Zaliyanu and the goddesses Za(š)ḫapuna and Tazzuwašši (perhaps deified springs²⁰) precisely these two sources of water. Indeed, Haas claims that both of these goddesses were "Tochtergöttinnen" and "Quellnymphen."²¹ But his further claim that Tazzuwašši²² has the variant name Tašimi or Tešimi is unsupported by his evidence.²³

¹⁸ See CAD E s.v. *ešrā* usage b-2' and *ešrūa* for the name *Mār-ešrē* in Akkadian texts.

¹⁹ For example, García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 78 ("por el control de las aguas").

²⁰ As mountain deities are always male in Hittite, so springs are female. And the spring name

^{20L}Tautawazi (KUB 38.6 obv. 31) is tantalizingly close to Tazzuwašši.

²¹ *GhR*, p. 446.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 446, n. 39.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 598–99.

All that is known is that Tešimi is the beloved of the Storm-god of Nerik, and in some texts ^dZaḥapuna is also associated with him as a consort. Tazzuwašši, on the other hand, is called the concubine (*šašanza*) of the Mountain-god Zaliyanu, whose wife (DAM) is Za(š)ḥapuna. The picture offered by the two narratives and their two ritual sections is not uniform theologically.

The two accounts exhibit other important differences: (1) The first contains several geographical references that permit localization in the north near Nerik, while the second has no such references and involves only an anonymous “sea,” which could be the Black Sea, the Mediterranean, the Tuz Gölü (Salt Lake), or (according to *LMI*) it refers simply to the mythical “sea,” the locus of the marine enemies of ancient Near Eastern storm-gods. (2) The serpent of Account 1 lives in a cave or hole in the ground and is terrestrial, while that of Account 2 is marine. The serpentine opponent of the Storm-god in both Illuyanka and the Kumarbi cycle of stories is stereotypical: powerful and gluttonous. *LMI* maintains that he is also portrayed as stupid. But it can be argued that he is merely outwitted by the more crafty and clever Inara and her father. Certainly the point of the stories is the superior wisdom of the Storm-god. If his opponent were portrayed as a dunce, it would reduce his triumph to mere “child’s play.” In both the Illuyanka and Ḫedammu (*CTH*, no. 348)²⁴ stories the protagonist, or one of his allies, defeats the serpent by trickery. The trick in the second Illuyanka story is so complex (involving an understanding of the *antiyanza* marriage customs²⁵) and works only over such a lengthy period of time (during which the child born to the Daughter of a Poor Man grows to adulthood), that one would be hard-pressed to say that the serpent was stupid not to have detected it. Since nothing in the account suggests that the true parentage of the son of the Daughter of a Poor Man was known in advance by the serpent, he could not have suspected the trap. *LMI* is right in pointing out that we have no clue as to what the serpent thought he would derive from the marriage other than a son-in-law. No dowry (Hittite *iwaru*) paid by the boy’s mother is mentioned.

²⁴ The Ḫedammu Myth was edited by J. Siegelová, *Appu-Märchen und Ḫedammu-Mythus*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 14 (Wiesbaden, 1971), translated in *LMI*, pp. 131–41 and *HM*², pp. 48–52.

²⁵ On the *antiyanza* marriage, see K. Balkan, “Eti hukukunda içgveylik,” *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 6 (1948): 147–52; J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch: Kurzgefaßte kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*, 1st ed. (Heidelberg, 1952), p. 23 (hereafter *HW*); H. A. Hoffner, Jr., review of J. Friedrich and A. Kammenhuber, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, 2d ed., rev., Lieferungen

2–3 (*annaz - arahza*) (Heidelberg, 1979–80) in *BiOr* 37 (1980): 198–202; F. Imparati, “Il trasferimento di beni nell’ambito del matrimonio privato ittita,” *Geo-archeologia*, no. 2 (1984): 109–21; and T. R. Bryce, *Life and Society in the Hittite World* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 123–24; 279, n. 9. The first scholar to interpret the actions of the second version of the Illuyanka Myth in terms of the *antiyanza* marriage was Güterbock, in “Hittite Mythology,” p. 152. García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 79 with n. 8, adopts this view without, however, citing Güterbock, or any of the translations of the laws that have followed this view previously.

Both *LMI*, p. 42, and Haas consider the goddess Inara to be the real protagonist of Account 1. She shows similarities to ^d*IŠTAR* in the Hurrian myths, who in those stories aids her brother, the Storm-god (^dU), uses her feminine charms to seduce opponents, and remains faithful to the powerless Storm-god when the other deities have deserted him. But unlike *IŠTAR*, Inara is also a protectress of kingship.²⁶ Whether she was the *only* divine protectress of Hittite kingship depends on whether one considers Ḫalmaššuit in the originally Old Hittite ritual for building a new palace (KUB 29.1 and duplicates) to be the embodiment of Hittite kingship. And as *LMI* correctly notes, since we lack the original Old Hittite version and detailed knowledge of Hittite theology, we do not know if Inara's *IŠTAR* traits are Old Hittite or added by the New Hittite scribes. Judging from Inara's role of providing abundant wine, ordinary beer, and *walhi* beer (§ 5), she may have also been associated with the growth of vines and cereal crops necessary to produce these fermented beverages. The coda to Account 1 (§§ 13–16) suggests that she was a deity of the wild, open spaces (*gimra-*), where she lived alone, isolated from human life in the cities and villages. In another myth about Inara there is mention of a horn, perhaps a hunting horn, by which cult officials could produce a sound called ^d*Inaraš ḫaluga-* “the message of Inara.” See *CHD* P s.v. *palwatalla-*.

LMI, p. 43, offers two reasons why Ḫupašiya was chosen to assist Inara in rescuing the Storm-god: courage (binding the serpent) and initiative (asks to sleep with Inara). It is true that these are only displayed after she has made him the initial offer, but they are intended to reveal innate qualities that he possessed before she selected him.

As for why he was prohibited from looking out the window at fellow mortals, Gaster suggested it was to prevent him from having sex with his wife and thereby weakening himself and transmitting to her some of the special powers now transmitted to him by his sexual union with Inara.²⁷ Mora prefers to think that it was a matter of preserving Ḫupašiya's purity, which would be violated by even looking at his wife.²⁸ Beckman attributes Ḫupašiya's death to *hybris* in first connecting with a goddess and then renouncing her.²⁹ Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani (in *LMI*) compare Ḫupašiya's role with that of the Old Hittite kings in their relationship to the gods and propose that in respect to his sacred royal duties—heroic (i.e., military) and sacral—he failed in the sacral and having become impure was no longer worthy of the preeminence accorded him. The explanation offered by Gaster, Gurney, and Beckman need not have any reference to Hittite kingship. But those of Mora, Pecchioli Daddi, Polvani, and García Trabazo do. Once again, we must decide if even such a prominent part of the story needs to be taken symbolically. If so, we must follow those four scholars. I am inclined to do so. My published remark (cited in *LMI*, p. 43, n. 22) that the mention of the lo-

²⁶ García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 79, agrees with this conception.

²⁷ Gaster, *Thespis*, p. 246.

²⁸ Mora, “Sulla mitologia ittita di origine anatolica,” pp. 373–85.

²⁹ Beckman, “The Anatolian Myth of Illuyanka,” p. 25.

cality (Tarukka) of Inara's house might have had an etiological motive, to explain a prominent ruin in the area, was predicated on the common view that the house on the rock was destroyed by Inara and sown with cress so as never again to be inhabited. Even if that house was not destroyed, its survival in that area could still have motivated the mention of Tarukka. My remark never intended to deny that the entire episode concerning the house on the rock might have a function other than etiology as well.

The "house" (or temple) built on the rock does indeed—as *LMI* correctly notes³⁰—remind one of the palace of the Labarna, which in a famous Old Hittite liturgical song (KUB 36.110:13–16) is said to be built on a rock, where it endures, in contrast to the house of the traitor (*appaliyalla-*)³¹ whose house built in the path of the flood is washed away. But, contrary to *LMI*, p. 43, Inara builds the house "for herself" (§ 13 C I 14 *nu=z=(š)an^dInaraš É-er wetet* "Inara built a house for herself (-za))—note the reflexive particle -za. The house "for herself" must be a temple, not a palace for Ḫupašiya as king. It is true that Ḫupašiya would also live in this house/temple but as her lover and consort, which symbolically might correspond to her priest.

There seems to be some misunderstanding of the nature of Ḫupašiya's offence. It is true, as others have pointed out, that he disobeys the goddess. But his action is more than merely becoming impure and unworthy. When he pleads to return to his home (§ 15 C i 27), he is not simply asking for a short leave to enjoy family life and return to Inara. Rather, he is renouncing the special relationship that had been established between the two of them involving the permanent renunciation of his former earthly ties. This has to be taken into consideration before symbolic allusions to Hittite kingship are drawn from the story. We know from the Instructions for Priests³² that ordinary priests could go home to eat their main meal at dusk and even have sexual intercourse with their wives, but they had to return to the temple in the evening to spend the night there.³³ And before returning to duty they had to bathe and report in the temple that they had slept with a woman. But the purity demands on the king were more stringent and of a different order from those imposed on priests. The king was the "holy priest" (*šuppiš šankunniš*) above all others. Yet even Hittite kings occasionally became temporarily impure. If there is a symbolic allusion to the duties of kingship here, I would think that

³⁰ Followed by García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 79.

³¹ Various attempts have been made to interpret the word *appaliyalla-* ("trapper," etc.). I myself once suggested that it meant "deceived one, fool." But since it is in a *political* aspect that Labarna's house is contrasted with that of the *appaliyalla-*, and since in Hittite treaties it is traitors who perform the action *appāli da-* "to betray (the king)," I think it best to translate *appaliyalla-* as "traitor."

³² Edited by A. Süel, *Hitit kaynaklarında tapınak görevlileri ile ilgili bir direktif metni*, Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları 350 (Ankara, 1985), translations by A. Goetze, "Hittite Instructions," in J. B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3d ed. (Princeton, 1969), pp. 207–10 (hereafter *ANET*³); Kühne, "Hittite Texts," pp. 180–84; and by J. G. McMahon in *CoS* 1, pp. 217–21.

³³ KUB 13.4 ii 75–iii 1. See also iii 15, 68, and 74.

instead of sexual impurity it might lie in putting the interests of his human subjects above those of the gods who have chosen and installed him: a species of “spiritual unfaithfulness” rather than a physical one. There was always the danger that pressure from his subjects would dissuade a king from actions for which divine guidance had been given by oracular means. It is for this reason that in the Political Testament of Ḫattušili I³⁴ the king instructs his council (*pankuš*) regarding his successor: “Let not the elders continually speak to him ... Let not the elders of Ḫatti continually speak to you, (my son)” (KUB 1.16 ii 58–60).

It appears that recent interpreters who have expressed themselves on the issue assume that Inara killed Ḫupašiya.³⁵ If his sin was *hybris*, as Beckman proposed,³⁶ there is ample reason to expect such a harsh punishment. But we should be clear that nothing in the preserved parts of the relevant lines remotely suggests that he was killed.³⁷ *LMI* even says that Inara destroyed “the house.” And since only one “house” is mentioned in the story, this would mean that she destroyed the temple/house that she had built on the rock. Yet only a few lines later we read that she placed in the hands of the Hittite king “her *house* and the subterranean waters.” The reader must be expected to understand by “her house” precisely that house in which she had kept Ḫupašiya. The Hittite king was expected to be Ḫupašiya’s successor in this house, even if not in the literal sense of Inara’s consort. It seems more likely to me that Ḫupašiya was rejected as Inara’s consort and sent home, although it is likely that once he was rejected by Inara, the narrator Kella would not bother to dwell upon details of his later life in this text.

If, despite the doubts I have just raised, the missing part of the tablet did tell of the death of Ḫupašiya, since it would have been Inara who killed him as punishment, it is difficult to follow Gaster, Haas, and García Trabazo in seeing his death as symbolizing the death of plant life with the arrival of another winter.³⁸ Why would Inara, the daughter of the Storm-god and protectress of kingship, be the appropriate one to put an end to the fertile season, symbolically initiating another cycle of infertility and the renewed

³⁴ Edited by F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein in *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattusili I. (Labarna II.)*, Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Abt. n.F. 16 (Munich, 1938) (hereafter *HAB*); I. Klock-Fontanille, “Le testament politique de Ḫattušili I^{er} ou les conditions d’exercice de la royauté dans l’ancien royaume hittite,” *Anatolia Antiqua* 4 (1996): 33–66. Translation by G. M. Beckman, “Bilingual Edict of Ḫattušili I,” in W. W. Hallo and K. L. Younger, eds., *The Context of Scripture*, vol. 2, *Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 79–81 (hereafter *CoS* 2).

³⁵ Güterbock, “Hittite Mythology,” p. 151 (“we may assume that he was killed”); A. Goetze, “Hit-

tite Myths, Epics, and Legends,” in *ANET*³, p. 126 (“she [killed him] in the quarrel”); Mora, “Sulla mitologia ittita di origine anatolica,” pp. 373–85; Beckman, “The Anatolian Myth of Illuyanka,” p. 19 (“[... killed?] him”); *LMI*, p. 51 (“l’uccisione di Hupasiya”); *GhR*, p. 104; Beckman, “The Storm-god and the Serpent (Illuyanka),” p. 150 (“[... killed?] him”); and García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 91 (“le [ilegó] un pen[oso final]”).

³⁶ Beckman, “The Anatolian Myth of Illuyanka,” p. 25.

³⁷ See the remark in *HM*¹, p. 38, n. 1.

³⁸ See García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 79 and n. 7.

reign of the serpent? If it turns out that Inara killed Ḫupašiya, I would be more inclined to see this as a punishment for his *hybris*, as Beckman claimed.

LMI, pp. 47 f., propounds a theory to explain why, although the chief male deity of the two accounts is just called ^dU or ^dIŠKUR, the ritual at the end exalts ^dZaliyanu (a mountain-god, not a storm-god) as the rain-giver. *LMI* thinks that the ritual pertains to the situation at the beginning of both myths, when the Storm-god was disabled, and *purulli* is performed to replace his functionality with Zaliyanu. The account of the Storm-god's recovery is merely an appendix. This theory is at first glance plausible, but I find it ultimately improbable, since the Storm-god's recovery is the main point of both stories and is not placed at the end as an appendix. No mention is made of ill effects on the land from his defeat or disablement. Unlike in the so-called Disappearing Deity Myths, the text does not elaborate the natural catastrophes that must have followed from the Storm-god's disablement. Furthermore, the text says that the occasion for celebrating the *purulli* festival was Inara's gift of her house and the subterranean waters to the king (§ 17 A ii 18–19), and this was impossible until *after* the killing of the serpent and his kin, which also resulted in the gods' aligning themselves with the Storm-god again. In terms of the narrative, then, *purulli* could be celebrated only after the Storm-god recovered his old position. *Purulli* then ensured a fruitful spring and harvest but not by surrogates of the Storm-god.

The existence of the two versions is explained as depending on when (first or second *purulli*) and where (Nerik, Kaštama, Tanipiya) it was performed in connection with the *purulli* (*LMI*, p. 48).

Gonnet proposes the theory that in the second account the son of the Storm-god represents ^dU ^{URU}Nerik, and the serpent represents the Kaškaeans who had overrun Nerik.³⁹ Certainly the epithet “snake” was hurled at enemies, as is clearly seen in the Political Testament of Ḫattušili I: *nu annaš=šaš MUŠ[-aš kuit uttar nu apāt daškit]* “he always took the word of his mother, (that) snake” (KUB 1.16 ii 10).⁴⁰ If Gonnet is right in this assumption, it shows that the characteristics associated in Hittite myths with serpents—malevolence and greed and possibly stupidity⁴¹—were also attributed by them to the Kaška people. Other examples of such unfavorable epithets used for the Kaška are “swineherds.”⁴²

³⁹ Gonnet, “Institution d'un culte chez les hittites,” pp. 93–95, and cf. *LMI*, p. 45, n. 33.

⁴⁰ Edited in *HAB*; Klock-Fontanille, “Le testament politique de Ḫattušili I^{er} ou les conditions d'exercice de la royauté dans l'ancien royaume hittite,” with translations by Beckman in *CoS* 2, pp. 79–81, and A. Bernabé and J. A. Álvarez-Pedrosa, *Historia y leyes de los hititas: textos del imperio antiguo, el código* (Madrid, 2000), pp. 114–15.

⁴¹ But see my doubts expressed above on the supposed stupidity of the serpent.

⁴² On this point, see H. A. Hoffner, Jr., review of E. von Schuler, *Die Kaškäer* (Berlin, 1965), in *JAOS* 87 (1967): 179–85. For a general discussion of Hittite attitudes toward foreign and outsider groups, see J. Klinger, “Fremde und Außenseiter in Hatti,” in V. Haas, ed., *Außenseiter und Randgruppen: Beiträge zu einer Sozialgeschichte des Alten Orients*, Xenia: Konstanzer althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen, Heft 32 (Konstanz, 1992), pp. 187–212.

Finally, I would agree with *LMI*, pp. 41–42, that the presence of what appear to be folkloristic motifs in the stories—especially the alleged “stupidity” of the serpent—are not evidence of the naiveté (*LMI*’s word is “ingenuità”) of these tales. Many of the same motifs can be found not only in the Hittite myths of Hurrian origin (Hedammu, Ullikummi), but also in other myths and epics from the ancient Near East, such as the Egyptian tales of Horus and Seth, the Doomed Prince, and the Babylonian Gilgamesh. As *LMI* correctly notes, since the serpent tales were part of a cult legend, they had to be mere outlines, very schematic, in order to fit within the parameters of the *purulli* festival.

LINE-BY-LINE COMMENTS (§ NUMBERS FROM BECKMAN’S EDITION)

The Serpent Story: Account I

- §1 A i 1 The restoration [^{LÚ}GUDU₁₂] depends on A iv 30. In the northern Anatolian cult centers, as depicted in the cult inventories,⁴³ each temple had three major cult officials: a ^{LÚ}GUDU₁₂, a ^{LÚ}SANGA (*šankunni-*), and an ^fAMA-DINGIR-LIM (i.e., *šiwanzanni-*). The syllabic reading of ^{LÚ}GUDU₁₂ was not *tazzeli-*, as is still anachronistically maintained by Haas and García Trabazo.⁴⁴ The correct reading, which we know from phonetic complements was an a-stem, was probably *kumra-*, borrowed from *kumru*, which was the Old Assyrian reading of ^{LÚ}GUDU₁₂.⁴⁵
- A i 2 Güterbock wished to read: [U]M-MA ^mKi-il-l[a ŠA] ^{dU} URU^{URU}Ne-ri-ik (2) *ne-pí-ša-aš* ^{dI}[M-aš DUMU-]aš! (3) *pu-ru-ul-li-ia-aš ut-tar* and render: “Thus says Killa: the words of the *purulli* festival of the Storm-god of Nerik, [the son of] the Storm-god of heaven (are as follows).”⁴⁶ If this reading were accepted, Killa would not be given here, as he is in the colophon of copy A, the title ^{LÚ}GUDU₁₂. Otten’s collation of the line yielded different traces,⁴⁷ which were followed by *LMI*, namely, *ne-pí-ša-aš* ^{dI}[M-*h*]u-[*n*]a (i.e., Tarḫuna).
- A i 3 Despite a certain similarity of sound, there is no etymological connection between *purulli* and the word for the lots, *pul*, cast in the ritual at the end of one of the versions. Rather, *purulli* is a Hattic word, probably derived from *w/pur*

⁴³ Edited by C. W. Carter, “Hittite Cult Inventories” (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1962).

⁴⁴ García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 83 with n. 14.

⁴⁵ See H. A. Hoffner, Jr., “Hittite Equivalents of Old Assyrian *kumrum* and *epattum*,” *WZKM* 86 (1996): 151–56, where I proposed *kumra-* as the Hittite reading of ^{LÚ}GUDU₁₂. H. Otten, “Erwägungen zur Kontinuität altanatolischer Kulte,” in *Uluslararası 1: Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri*

(19–21 Temmuz 1990) (Çorum, Turkey, 1990), pp. 34–42, had already correctly derived this Hittite *kumra-* from Old Assyrian *kumru(m)* but did not suggest that it was the syllabic equivalent of the logogram ^{LÚ}GUDU₁₂. For a brief discussion of Anatolian deities served by *kumru*-priests in Old Assyrian texts, see Popko, *Religions of Asia Minor*, pp. 24–25.

⁴⁶ Güterbock, “Hethitische Literatur,” p. 246.

⁴⁷ H. Otten, *Or.*, n.s., 20 (1951): 331, n. 1.

“land.”⁴⁸ It may have been a spring festival designed to ensure abundant crops in the coming harvests (in *LMI* “probabilmente in primavera”). The festival was originally performed in Nerik but after the loss of Nerik transferred to Hakmiš and Utruna.

LMI, p. 50, n. 7, and García Trabazo⁴⁹ quite correctly exclude Goetze and Kellermann’s reading *nu-ma-a-an* “no longer,” but neither notes that *nūman* does not even mean “no longer” but “does not want to” (see § 11 B i 14 below).⁵⁰

§ 2 A i 6 Stefanini argues for a “final” force for *mān* “so that,” comparing Latin *ut* and Greek *hōs*.⁵¹ This suggestion was followed by *LMI*, p. 50, n. 8 (“[proprio] perché”), and García Trabazo⁵² but not by others.⁵³ No “final” sense of *mān* was indicated in the *CHD* article on the word, which appeared a year after Stefanini’s article.

§ 3 A i 10 Contrary to the claim in *LMI*, p. 50, n. 10, Kiškilišša is not “unattested elsewhere”: it is found as Ga[š]kilišša in KUB 19.33 + 34 i 34 (DŠ frag. 34⁵⁴), where—as in this myth—it is also associated with ^{URU}Tarukka. This fact was noted already by Gonnet⁵⁵ and was registered by del Monte.⁵⁶ One of the features that distinguishes the first Serpent Story (Account 1) from the second (Account 2) is the presence in the first of toponyms, several of which are known from other texts, and all of which establish the locale of the action in north-central Asia Minor (on this see *LMI*, p. 41).

⁴⁸ See V. Haas, *Der Kult von Nerik*, Studia Pohl, Dissertationes Scientificalae de Rebus Orientis Antiqui, 4 (Rome, 1970), p. 252 (hereafter *KN*); O. R. Gurney, *Some Aspects of Hittite Religion* (London, 1977), pp. 38–39; G. F. del Monte, “Utruna e la festa *purulli*,” *Oriens Antiquus* 17 (1978): 179–92; Kellerman, “Towards the Further Interpretation of the *purulli*-Festival,” pp. 35–46; *GhR*, pp. 699–747; and S. de Martino, review of V. Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion* (Leiden, 1994), in *BiOr* 54 (1997): 411–16.

⁴⁹ García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 85, n. 25.

⁵⁰ See H. A. Hoffner, Jr., “Hittite *mān* and *nūman*,” in E. Neu, ed., *Investigationes Philologicae et Comparativae: Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser* (Wiesbaden, 1982), pp. 38–45, and the concurrence of A. Morpurgo Davies, review of E. Neu, ed., *Investigationes Philologicae et Comparativae*, in *Kratylos* 28 (1983): 95–102.

⁵¹ Stefanini, “Alcuni problemi ittiti, lessicali e sintattici,” p. 255.

⁵² García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 85, n. 26.

⁵³ Compare *HM*¹, pp. 10–14; *GhR*, p. 704; or Beckman, “The Storm-god and the Serpent (Illuyanka),” pp. 150–51, who follow the pre-Stefanini understanding reflected in Goetze, in *ANET*², p. 125; Beckman, “The Anatolian Myth of Illuyanka,” pp. 11–25; and Gonnet, “Institution d’un culte chez les hittites,” p. 89.

⁵⁴ Translated in *CoS* 1, p. 191, rt. col.

⁵⁵ Gonnet, “Institution d’un culte chez les hittites,” p. 100 with nn. 51 and 54.

⁵⁶ G. F. del Monte, *Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes*, Band 6/2, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte, Supplement*, Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, Reihe B, no. 7/6 (Wiesbaden, 1992), p. 80.

§4 A i 13 As pointed out in *CHD* s.v. *-mu*, *an-da-ma-pa* is to be analyzed as *anda=m(u)=apa*; so that Beckman's translation "Come in!" (in *CoS* 1) is excluded, and the word "mio" in Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani's translation "Accorrete (in mio aiuto)" (*LMI*) and the "mí" in García Trabazo's "¡Venid a (mí)!" should be removed from inside the parentheses, since the pronoun *-mu* is actually present in the form *-ma-pa* from **-mu* + *-apa*.

A i 14 Beckman (*CoS* 1) includes line 14 in the Storm-god's quoted invitation, probably because of the paragraph line after it. But that leaves the immediately following sentence in line 15 without an explicit subject. I prefer *LMI*'s interpretation as a statement. That *anda=m(u)=apa tiyatten* means to come to someone's aid or join his side rather than assemble for a party or festival seems clear from the evil invitation to treachery quoted in KUB 21.42 + 26.12+ iii 10 *nu=wa=kan eḫu tamedani anda tiyaweni* "Come, let's join someone else's side"; compare also KUB 26.32+ iii 10–15. Furthermore, Beckman's interpretation ignores the *nu* in line 15, which continues the statement of line 14.

§5 A i 15–18 *mekki ḫandait* and *iyāda iet* make the same statement: a lot of drink was prepared. Accordingly, Beckman (*CoS* 1) is right to translate *palḫi* as plural "vessels" (contra *LMI* "*un* vaso di vino, *uno* di ..." and García Trabazo "*una marmita* de vino, *una* ...").⁵⁷ In fact, the form is probably a collective in *-i*, not a neuter pl. Stefanini seems to think the three beverages are drawn from a single large vessel.⁵⁸ But that would not fit with the three mentions of *palḫi*. The beverages *marnuwan* and *walḫi* are varieties of beer.⁵⁹ The New Hittite Script copy's *i-ia-a-šu* is explained by the "stepped" form of *DA* in Old Hittite Script, which makes confusion with *ŠU* possible for a New Hittite copyist. For the loss of final *r* in Hittite, see Neu and Melchert.⁶⁰ For another (Middle Hittite in New Script) example of *iyata tameta*, see KBo 12.42:4–5 *uwaweni nu=wa iyata tameta / pe harweni*. See also Puhvel, *HED* s.v. *iyata(r)*.

A i 20 I prefer "found" (*HM*² 12) rather than "encountered" (*LMI*, *CoS* 1, García Trabazo) for *wemi(e)t*, since it seems unlikely that Inara's meeting with him was by chance: I think she intentionally went in search of a particular man and made her offer to him, just as the bee in the Telepinu Myth searches for and eventually finds the god who will restore fertility and plenty.

⁵⁷ García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 87.

⁵⁸ Stefanini, "Alcuni problemi ittiti, lessicali e sintattici," pp. 255–56.

⁵⁹ Correctly García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 87.

⁶⁰ E. Neu, "Hethitisch /r/ im Wortauslaut," in J. Tischler, ed., *Serta Indogermanica: Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*,

Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 40 (Innsbruck, 1982), pp. 205–26; H. C. Melchert, "Word-final *r* in Hittite," in Y. L. Arbeitman, ed., *A Linguistic Happening in Memory of Ben Schwarz: Studies in Anatolian, Italic, and Other Indo-European Languages* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1988), pp. 215–34; and H. C. Melchert, "A New Anatolian 'Law of Finals'," *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 8 (1993): 105–13.

§ 7 A i 21 Instead of a dative-locative form ^mḪupašiya might be a vocative here: “Thus spoke Inar: ‘O Ḫupašiya, I am about to...’.”

A i 23 For the use of *ḥarp-* (mid.) for divorce (and remarriage?), see Laws § 31 (with *-kan*) and for livestock wandering from one corral or fold to another in Laws § 66 (without local particle). This double emphasis of separation from association and joining another is particularly appropriate here, where in order to become Inara’s partner, Ḫupašiya must first leave his wife and family. Inara needs the assistance of a mortal to accomplish her task, much as there was a necessary collaboration between divine and human participants in the rituals to recover the “Disappearing Deity” in the Old Hittite Telepinu-type myths (cf. Beckman’s observation quoted in *LMI*, p. 43, n. 22). To his observation may be added that even in the building rituals it is always stressed in the ritual dedicatory prayers that the mortal king who authorized its building was not acting alone as a human but in concert with all the gods: “This temple which we have just built for you, O god—and here he calls by name the deity for whom they were building it—it was not we who built it: all the gods built it.”⁶¹

§ 8 A i 24–26 Ḫupašiya consents on the condition that he be permitted to sleep with the goddess. His motive here is clearly not mere lust, but precisely what is it? Is he expressing a belief (shared also by the narrator of this story) that sexual intercourse with the goddess will confer upon him the necessary courage and skill to succeed in her commission? If the latter is the case, then his precondition both ensures his success in the near future and obligates him in the long run to abandon his family permanently. This is an important question in view of *LMI*’s theory about the reasons why Inara chose Ḫupašiya (*LMI*, p. 43, top). In Hittite belief, as expressed in the Paškuwatti ritual, sleeping with a goddess in her temple (Lat. *incubatio*⁶²) conferred sexual potency on a previously impotent man.⁶³

§ 9 B i 4’–5’ There is a certain (perhaps deliberate) ambiguity in *munnaīt* “hid”: Inara hid Ḫupašiya from his own family (wife and children), and she hid him from the invited serpent. Although the text does not state it explicitly, the Storm-god himself is in hiding until the serpent has been tied up. There is a sexual motive in the words *-z unuttat* “adorned herself” (line 5’). The serpent is attracted to the feast not just by the lavish food but by the sexual charms of Inara. Compare the actions of *IŠTAR* in the Kumarbi Cycle, where she seeks to disable

⁶¹ *kāša kē kue É.DINGIR-LIM tuk ANA DINGIR-LIM wetummen DINGIR-LIM=ya=kan / ŠUM=ŠU ḥalzai wedanzi=ya=at kuedani nu=war=at UL / anzaš wetummen DINGIR.MEŠ=war=at ḥūmanteš weter*, KBo 4.1 i 28–30 (CTH, no. 413).

⁶² Goetze, *Kleinasien*, p. 148.

⁶³ See the edition of the Paškuwatti ritual by H. A. Hoffner, Jr., “Paškuwatti’s Ritual against Sexual Impotence (CTH 406),” *Aula Orientalis* 5 (1987): 271–87 and the discussion there of the Hittite concept of *incubatio*.

or distract the Storm-god's reptilian foes twice, successfully in Hedammu⁶⁴ and unsuccessfully in Ullikummi (*HM*², p. 61 § 36), by displaying her naked charms and singing.⁶⁵

§ 10 B i 9–10 (cf. B i 17–18) Although the serpent's offspring are not mentioned in B i 17–18, it is clear that they are present at the banquet because it is necessary to kill the entire family to ensure that no other member of the brood can later rise against the Storm-god and regain control of the subterranean waters. Compare Kumarbi's emasculation of Anu to prevent any descendant from taking revenge (*HM*², pp. 41–43).

B i 11 *LMI*, *HM*², and Beckman (*CoS* 1) translate ^{DUG}*palḥan ḥūmandan* as “every vessel” and García Trabazo as plural accusative “todas las marmitas.”⁶⁶ But Melchert has correctly observed that there is no evidence other than this passage for an a-stem variant of ^(DUG)*palḥi*-.⁶⁷ He interprets the two-word phrase as the Old Hittite genitive plural in *-an*: “they drank (some) of all the vessels,” a partitive genitive, which makes better sense.

§ 11 B i 14 *nūman* can mean either “not want to” or “be unable to.”⁶⁸ Contrary to earlier claims, it never means “no longer.”⁶⁹ In *HM*² I rendered this line as “not want to,” while *LMI* and García Trabazo chose “be unable to” (“non furono ... in grado di,” “no pueden bajar”). It could be either.

B i 16 The verb *kalel(i)ye-* is archaic (not noticed in *HED* K 22): all datable texts or fragments in which it appears have an Old Hittite archetype. It tends to be replaced by other words for “bind, tie” in later Hittite.⁷⁰ There is a noun *kaliliulli-* derived from this verb root in KUB 7.1 + KBo 3.8 ii 40 (Old Hittite in New Hittite Script).

§ 12 B i 17–18 Although the Storm-god needs a mortal's help to trap and disarm the serpent, the execution must be carried out by the Storm-god himself. For line 18, see *LMI*, p. 51, n. 14, where the views of Gonnet and *LMI* are contrasted. The gods fall in behind whichever party wins. Although they were all invited to the EZEN₄, they waited until after the serpent's death to take the side of the Storm-god.⁷¹

⁶⁴ Edited in Siegelová, *Appu-Märchen*, pp. 54–55, translated in *HM*², p. 54.

⁶⁵ For the importance of these two seduction attempts in determining the sequence of the myths in the Kumarbi Cycle, see *HM*², p. 42 (introduction).

⁶⁶ García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 89.

⁶⁷ H. C. Melchert, review of D. Yoshida, *Die Syntax des althethitischen substantivischen Genitivs* (Heidelberg, 1987), in *Kratylos* 34 (1989): 182.

⁶⁸ As demonstrated in Hoffner, “Hittite *mān* and *nūman*,” pp. 38–45.

⁶⁹ García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 89: “ya no pueden” should have been rendered “(ya) no pueden,” since there is no Hittite term for “(no) longer” in the text.

⁷⁰ Suggested already in H. A. Hoffner, Jr., review of Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate, *Records of the Early Hittite Empire (C. 1450–1380 B.C.)* (Istanbul, 1970), in *JNES* 31 (1972): 29–35.

⁷¹ A point recognized also by García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 89, n. 53.

§ 13 C i 14–15 *-za-an* stands for *-z(a) + -šan*. The duplicates equate ^dInaraš here with ^dLAMMA-aš. But since the copies are late, how early does this equation go back?⁷² The “house” on a rock is obviously a temple. On the significance of *-za* here, see the discussion above.

C i 17 *ašaš-/ašeš-* “to settle (someone)” implies that she established his *permanent* residence with her.⁷³ Quite likely Ḫupašiya has been made Inara’s priest not just her lover. And since, if as a special kind of celibate, live-in priest, he sleeps every night in the cella, he thus sleeps *with* Inara. It is not possible to assume that the Hittite ^{LÚ}GUDU₁₂ was celibate, since the “wife of the G.,” DAM ^{LÚ}GUDU₁₂, is mentioned in IBoT 3.1 23, 26, but perhaps an earlier Hattian equivalent was celibate and was conceived as the bedfellow of the goddess. Hittite priests did not sleep in the cella.

C i 17–22 The text suggests that Inara’s house was so close to Ḫupašiya’s home that looking out the window would cause him to see his family. What is the significance of keeping Ḫupašiya from seeing his family? Possibly it is that he has agreed to become a celibate priest and voluntarily cuts himself off from wife and family. In a similar way the “son of the Storm-god” in Account 2 severs his familial ties in order to join the family of the serpent, as an *antiyanza*.⁷⁴ Looking through windows, especially temple or cella windows, was potentially dangerous. In one oracle inquiry it was determined that the deity was angry because someone outside the cella had looked through a window and seen the divine statue.⁷⁵ In this case, however, we have the opposite: a lover-priest of the goddess looking *out* a temple window and seeing a woman whom he was supposed to have renounced. Temple windows marked the boundary between sacred and profane. For this reason offerings made to holy places in the temple always include the windows.⁷⁶

§ 14 C i 25 Ḫupašiya’s plea here is to be released from his vows (as a priest?) to Inara.

⁷² For a discussion, see J. G. McMahon, *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities*, AS 25 (Chicago, 1991), pp. 24–25.

⁷³ Cf. García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 89, “estableció a Ḫupašiya.”

⁷⁴ For the significance of *-z(a)* in 22 (“your own wife and children”), see H. A. Hoffner, Jr., “Studies of the Hittite Particles, I,” review of O. Carruba, *Die satzeinleitenden Partikeln in den indogermanischen Sprachen Anatoliens* (Rome, 1969), in *JAOS* 93 (1973): 524, on its use with the synonymous *šakuwai-*.

⁷⁵ The relevant passage reads: “Because it was determined by oracle that the god’s anger was because of sacrilege (*maršaštarri-*), we questioned the temple servants. (One of them,) Tila, said: ‘People aren’t supposed to look at (the statue of) the Stormgod. Yet a woman looked in through a window’” (D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Texts*, Occasional Papers of the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara, no. 2 [London, 1953], p. 454 ii 7–10).

⁷⁶ See Goetze, *Kleinasien*, p. 162.

§ 16 A ii 9–12 *LMI* assumes the broken section contains three important events: “la descrizione dell’ira di Inara, la distruzione della casa - sulle cui rovine sembra che il dio della tempesta semini erba - e l’uccisione di Hupašiya.” None of these assumed events, however, is supported by the traces that remain. It is true that the mortal who collaborates with the Storm-god in the second account dies at the end. But this is the only reason to assume that Inara kills Hupašiya. His disobedience in looking out the window and his plea to return home very likely resulted in his dismissal from Inara’s house (temple) and from the priesthood.

A ii 13 Goetze (*ANET*²) arrived at his translation “sowed cress/weeds over the ruins” by reading ^ú[ZÀ.A]H.LI = Akk. *sahlû*, Hitt. *zahheli*. He was followed by *LMI*, p. 51 (“sembra che ... semini erba”) but not by Beckman (edition and *CoS* 1) or by me (*HM*²).⁷⁷ The gesture is, of course, perfectly appropriate to condemning a site never to be inhabited again. But the reading of the traces raises objections. In the copy there is insufficient space to restore ZAG. Furthermore, in attested examples of ZÀ.AH.LI in Hittite texts it either has no determinative or it has the postposed determinative SAR. It never has the preposed determinative Ú. In addition, a new text from Ortaköy (Or 95/3)⁷⁸ gives the correct “Hittite” reading of ZÀ.AH.LI(.SAR), namely, *marasḫanḫaš*. I used quotation marks on “Hittite” because this could be either a real Hittite word or a Hattic loanword. The previously known reading *zahheli*, if it is not a misreading, appears on its face to be a Sumero-Akkadian loanword into Hittite. With regard to the possibility of reading ZÀ.AH.LI here in Illuyanka, we learn from the immediately following context that Inara went to Kiškilišša and placed her house/temple and the subterranean waters in the lands of the (Hittite) king (see discussion above). She could hardly do this if she had sown its ruins with cress/weeds.

§ 17 A ii 15–20 Stefanini prefers to translate: “And since (*kuit*) we are (re-)performing the first *purulli*—(that is) how (*mān*) Inara ... in Kiskilussa set her house and the river of the watery abyss into the hands of the king—the hand of the king [will hold] the house of Inara and the watery abyss.”⁷⁹ But one could render this: “And (this is) why (*kuit*) we celebrate the first *purulli*.” The *purulli* celebration was motivated by Inara’s gift to the king of the subterranean waters, which she obtained by killing the serpent. This would agree with what *LMI*, p. 41, writes: “Inara affida al re ...; in ricordo di tale avvenimento viene istituita la prima festa del *purulli*.” And since Inara makes this grant only *after* the defeat of the serpent, causing the gods to realign with the Storm-god, it

⁷⁷ García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, pp. 90–91, line 13’, printed Beckman’s transliteration but translated using Goetze’s older reading instead: “El dios de la Tempestad [sembró] ma[lez]a [sobre las ruinas de la casa].”

⁷⁸ Published by A. Süel and O. Soysal, “A Practical Vocabulary from Ortaköy,” in G. M.

Beckman, R. H. Beal, and J. G. McMahon, eds., *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Winona Lake, Indiana, 2003), pp. 349–65.

⁷⁹ Stefanini, “Alcuni problemi ittiti, lessicali e sintattici,” p. 256.

would be an objection to the later assertion in *LMI*, p. 48 (“Nel momento di debolezza del dio della tempesta l’ordine di importanza degli dei viene modificato e la festa del *purulli* viene celebrata proprio per assicurare che il paese di Hatti prosperi anche senza la momentanea protezione della sua divinità principale”). The granting of her house/temple to the Hittite king further shows that the king has inherited what Ḫupašiya had forfeited, namely, the priesthood of Inara and the control of the subterranean water sources.

§ 18 A ii 21 Although ^{HUR.SAG}Zali(ya)nu (also written ^dZali(ya)nu) is worshiped in various festival texts, ironically he does not appear in the Tetešḫawi festival, the very one Pecchioli Daddi thinks might be *purulli*.

A ii 22–23 *LMI* takes *ḫeuš* as nom. sg., *ḫinikta* as pres. middle(!), and the thought is a pres.-future passive. It renders *ḫeuš* ... *ḫinikta* as “dopo che avrà distribuito la pioggia” “after the rain will have been distributed.” My earlier translation in *HM*² is wrong on this point and should be corrected accordingly.

A ii 24 Although this in itself does not prove Pecchioli Daddi’s theory that the Tetešḫawi festival is the *purulli*, it is interesting that the LÚ ^{GIS}GIDRU participates in the Festival of ^dTetešḫawi (*CTH*, no. 738), as (judging from this line) he also does in EZEN₄ *purulli*, and other festival texts mention the “staffs of Zaliyanu” (^{GIS}GIDRU.ḪI.A ^dZaliyanu, KUB 20.80 iii 17).

The Serpent Story: Account 2

§ 21 D iii 1–5 In the broken context we are not told the circumstances of the original defeat of the Storm-god. But here he is not only defeated. Although, contrary to nature, the injured Storm-god can continue to live even without a heart, he is clearly disabled. What is the significance of the choice of “heart and eyes” among all other body parts (ears, nose, head, brain, etc.) that could be taken from him? There are rituals that refer to parts of the Storm-god’s body. In KUB 17.29 ii 6–19 the violating of a neighbor’s boundary line is said to be tantamount to violating or injuring the Storm-god’s knees, and violating a roadway (which also served as an even more conspicuous boundary) was violating the Storm-god’s chest (^{UZU}GABA). Do the eyes and heart refer to his “intelligence and courage”? Perhaps, but without a commentary like the one just cited from KUB 17.29 we really cannot be certain. In the Late Egyptian story of the Contendings of Horus and Seth, the evil god Seth removes from the sleeping Horus his two eyes and buries them. Later, Hathor, the Mistress of the Southern Sycamore, miraculously restores Horus’s eyes. Here there is much native Egyptian symbolism involving the “Eye of Horus.”⁸⁰

⁸⁰ Translated in *ANET*², pp. 14–17, and W. K. Simpson, ed., *The Literature of Ancient Egypt* (New Haven and London, 1973), p. 119.

§ 22 A iii 4 *LMI* has pointed out that a DUMU.MUNUS ^{LÚ}MAŠ.EN.KAK “daughter of a poor man” appears in a festival text for ^dTetešḫabi (*CTH*, no. 738: KBo 25.48 iii 6’), which may be another name for ^dInara. The context mentions a NIN.DINGIR, a ^{LÚ}^{GIŠ}GIDRU, and DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL. She may also appear without the ^{LÚ}MAŠ.EN.KAK in another EZEN₄ ^dTetešḫabi fragment in the sequence NIN.DINGIR [DU]MU.MUNUS AMA.DINGIR-LIM=ya (KUB 11.32 + 20.17+ ii 8, 25). In all of these contexts there are many Hattic words and phrases (*illuwaya illuwaya*, and *awazza awazzanga* and *hakanteš kantišma mayamauma*) called out by the participants. Since this DUMU.MUNUS ^{LÚ}MAŠ.EN.KAK in the Tetešḫabi festival always occurs as a kind of priestess, it is possible that she represented a class of girls given to the cult of Tetešḫabi by poorer parents who could not afford a dowry to obtain husbands for them. If so, then perhaps in the second version of the Illuyanka Myth the Storm-god actually takes an unmarried temple-girl as his wife. Against this interpretation is the grouping of the DUMU.MUNUS between NIN.DINGIR and AMA.DINGIR-LIM in KUB 11.32 + ii 8, since she is flanked by relatively high-ranking women in the cult, a position not to be expected of a poor girl donated to a temple. Her prominence in the festival suggests an important position. Perhaps she is the priestess who plays the role of the wife of the Storm-god in the Serpent Story as a cult drama.

A iii 10ff. The É DAM-KA constitutes more than just her father. Note the -šmaš dative forms in 11, 13, 15 and the plural verbs *pier* in 14, 16. The decision on the nature of the “dowry” to this *antiyanza* was apparently made by her father and at least one other person, perhaps his wife. Compare Laws §§ 28–28. Of course the marriage customs and laws reflected in the original Serpent Story were not Hittite but Hattian. Nevertheless, in the present Hittite adaptation they probably reflect Hittite family law as well.

A iii 22 *LMI*, p. 53 does not seem to translate the *namma*, which I take as “again” (he fought the serpent there before). If the sea is a historical one, *LMI* prefers the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, since the *antiyanza* marriage custom reflected in Account 2 is thought to be Hattian and therefore “northern.”

A iii 23 The -ši is anticipatory for the serpent mentioned in line 24. The apparent acc. sg. ^{MUŠ}*illuyanka[n]* shows that *namma* cannot mean “again” here but “at last” (*HM*², p. 13). See the discussion in *CHD* s.v. *namma*. Here, too, *LMI*, p. 53, chose not to render the *namma* explicitly.

A iii 25 I would personally include among the linguistic archaisms of this text the use of a supinum on a perfective stem: *tarḫ(u)wan*, instead of imperfective *tarḫiškiwan*, and the genitive + postposition (*illuyankaš katta*).

§ 26 A iii 29 First clause: not “seize me” (*LMI*) but “include me” (*HM*², p. 13). This is the meaning of -za + *apa* ... *anda ep-*. For a different view, see E. Rieken, in *Die Indogermanistik und ihre Anrainer* (Innsbruck, 2004), p. 255.

A iii 30 This clause is asyndetic, indicating that it is essentially describing the action of iii 29 more fully. “Including” the son means having no pity upon him.

A iii 31 The referent in -šU is (perhaps intentionally?) vague: is the young man here styled as the natural son of the Storm-god (*LMI*, p. 53, “il suo proprio figlio”; *GhR*, p. 705, “seinen [eigenen] Sohn”) or the legal son (*antiyant-*) of the serpent? Perhaps the lack of a -za to identify the -šU with the subject of the sentence points to the second alternative: he is now the legal son of the serpent, and it is as such that he is killed (*kuenta*).

§ 28 D iv 1'–4' Beckman and *LMI* agree on the translation. But what does this mean? Notice that the verbs are preterites: the action is not prescriptive but a record of something once done. *LMI*, pp. 47–48, gives a plausible explanation: with the disablement of the Storm-god at the beginning of the story, it is necessary to find a new deity to provide the water to sustain the land. This means that the Storm-god, who was once the “foremost” god (*ḫantezziyaš*) has been made “last” (*appezziyaš*), and a subordinate deity (*appezziyaš*), in this case the Mountain-god Zaliyanu, has been elevated or promoted to assume the role of the “foremost” deity (*ḫantezziyaš*). The specific method of choosing a subordinate to fill this role as “foremost” is the casting of the lot (§ 31 C iv 13). The reason for the use of the plural *ḫantezziuš* and *appezziuš* is that this is a general statement, one that does not refer specifically to the incident of the replacement of the Storm-god by Zaliyanu but to the reversal of roles in times of emergency.

§ 29 D iv 5'–7' ^dZalinuiša appears to be a Hattic stem form.⁸¹ Haas renders this sentence: “(Deshalb) ist Zali(ya)nu, nämlich seine Gemahlin Za(š)ḫapuna, größer als der Wettergott von Nerik.”⁸² My translation in *HM*² should be amended to “Zalinuwa’s wife, Zašḫapuna, is greater than the Storm-god of Nerik.” ^dZalinu(iša), being a mountain-god, is certainly a male, which means ^dZa(š)ḫapuna is female.

Exemplar D reads ^{LÜ}*taḫpurili*, while the other manuscripts, A and C, have ^m*Taḫpurili*.⁸³ This Hattic personal name may be built upon a variant spelling of the DN ^dTaḫ(a)puna. This name was mistakenly read as ^m*Taḫ-pu-tal-li* by Laroche.⁸⁴

§ 30 D iv 10 *eš-* (mid.) with -š*an* but without -za could be an archaic feature surviving from the original Old Hittite version. And if so, it would be a rare piece of evidence for an Old Hittite origin of the *ritual* portion of the text. But then again it might just be an affectation, that is, an archaizing feature. *paiwani ešuwāšta*

⁸¹ According to B. H. L. van Gessel, in *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon*, Parts 1–3, Handbuch der Orientalistik, I. Abteilung, Band 33:1–3 (Leiden, 1998–2001), pp. 572–73.

⁸² *GhR*, p. 706.

⁸³ Cf. *LMI*, p. 53, n. 23.

⁸⁴ E. Laroche, *Les noms des Hittites* (Paris, 1966), p. 169, no. 1204.

occurs in an Old Hittite Script passage (KUB 31.143 ii 36), which might suggest that D's *kuwapi ešuwašta* is closer to the Old Hittite version than A's *kuwapit ešuwaštati*.

§ 31 D iv 12 Manuscript D has the post-Old Hittite nonassimilated form *ma-a-an-wa*, versus A and C with the Old Hittite form *ma-a-wa*.

D iv 15 Beckman, *LMI*, and Haas all render ^{NA₄}ŠU.U as “diorite,” although there is reason to translate it as “basalt.”⁸⁵ The precise identification of this stone type in Hittite must for the time being remain open. As for the translation of lines D iv 14–16 and duplicates, see the long note in *LMI*, p. 54, n. 26. *LMI* and Polvani⁸⁶ understand that the GUDU₁₂-priest who holds Zaliyanu sits on the throne above the spring, while Haas paraphrases (“setzt ... (ihn) auf den Dioritstuhl nieder”) in order to make the text say that the GUDU₁₂ seats Zaliyanu on the throne above the spring.⁸⁷ The ^{LÚ}GUDU₁₂'s holding Zaliyanu is probably the same thing as his holding the staff (^{GIŠ}GIDRU) of Zaliyanu, mentioned in Bo 3649 iii 4'.⁸⁸ The ^{GIŠ}GIDRU “staff” is a visible symbol of the Mountain-god Zaliyanu. And if this is the case, then it rules out Haas's idea that the god's statue is “seated,” since one cannot “seat” (*ašeš-*) a staff.

§ 32 A iv 14 ff. A iv 17 preserves an archaic writing of *ša-al-li-iš*, for which D iv 19 has *šal-li-iš*.

§ 33 The text reads “these three LÚ.MEŠ remain in Tanipiya,” *perhaps* using the logogram LÚ.MEŠ (literally “men”) to refer to the god Zaliyanu and two goddesses Zašḫapuna and Tazzuwašši. Kellerman is wrong when she writes that the expression LÚ.MEŠ (§ 33 A iv 19) is “usually found in cult inventories as designating statues.”⁸⁹ The collocation DINGIR.MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ in all Hittite text genres denotes male deities and in the cult inventories ALAM LÚ designates the statue of a male (deity). But LÚ.MEŠ alone does not designate statues of deities, either in the cult inventories or anywhere else in Hittite texts. So unless it refers to three male priests of these three deities, the use of LÚ.MEŠ in § 33 remains an unsolved problem.

⁸⁵ Cf. A. M. Polvani, *La terminologia dei minerali nei testi ittiti, Parte prima*, Eothen 3 (Florence, 1988), pp. 38–46, and add now CAD Š/3 161f. s.v. *šû* s.

⁸⁶ Ibid., pp. 160–61.

⁸⁷ *GhR*, p. 706.

⁸⁸ Haas, *KN*, p. 80, n. 4.

⁸⁹ Kellerman, “Towards the Further Interpretation of the *purulli*-Festival,” p. 36.