



Hittite Notes

Jared L. Miller

Journal of Cuneiform Studies, Vol. 54. (2002), pp. 87-92.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-0256%282002%2954%3C87%3AHN%3E2.0.CO%3B2-W>

Journal of Cuneiform Studies is currently published by The American Schools of Oriental Research.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/asor.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Hittite Notes

Jared L. Miller

Institut für Orientalische Philologie, Würzburg

The “Ghost-town” *Harnuwasila

The hapax booked in *RGTC* 6:89 as ^{URU}HAR-nu-wa-ši-la-aš is a case of a “ghost-town.” The passage in which the crux is found is preserved at the beginning of the third paragraph of Zarpīya’s ritual,¹ which should be read: “And the *ali*-fabrics are of black wool, blood-red wool (and) yel[low-green] wool . . .”² The misreading apparently goes back to B. Schwartz, *JAOS* 58 (1938) 334, who read ^{URU}hur-nu-wa-ši-la-aš, commenting that *iš-har*, preserved in the duplicate, is “perhaps better read ^{URU}hur.” This interpretation has been followed in all subsequent treatments of the passage of which I am aware.

The main manuscript that preserves the passage (*KUB* 9.31 i 10) clearly shows a corrupted representation of *išharnuwandas* (or *išharuwil*), “blood(y)-red.”³ An emended reading *iš-har-nu-wa-an-da-aš* is strongly supported by the duplicate text *HT* 1 i 3’, which shows *iš-har-nu²-[wa-an-da-aš^(p)]* (or *iš-har-nu²-[i-il^(p)]*), clinching at least the emendation of *URU*⁴ to *iš*¹.

A miswriting of *URU* for similar *IŠ* is not difficult to imagine, but I can offer no convincing mechanism by which *-an-da-* became *-ši-la-* (or by which *-ú/u-i-il* might have become *-nu-wa-ši-la-aš*). Perhaps nothing more than a damaged *Vorlage* was responsible.

harziyalla-, “Gecko,” “Salamander” (or the Like)

Since J. Friedrich, *ArOr* 17 (1949) 247, *harziyalla* had been translated “lizard” or, with the additional observation that it seems to be aquatic, “salamander” (e.g., J. Siegelová, *StBoT* 14, 58–59, 72–73; cf. J. Tischler, *HEG* 1, 314). C. Watkins, *Kerns Mem.* (1981) 345–48, placed this interpretation in question, suggesting instead “snail.” J. Puhvel (*HED* 3, 209) subsequently suggested the etymology “*hars/zi*-carrier,” i.e., a creature that carries a *harsi*-jar on its back, while more or less simultaneously B. J. Collins, *Diss.*, 265–68, defended the interpretation “salamander.”

Watkins summarizes his own arguments as follows: “The *harziyalla-* is thus a ‘nasty’ creature, classified with frogs,⁵ considered unfit to eat, and

Abbreviations follow the conventions of the *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (1989–).

1. For translation and references, see most recently, B. J. Collins, *CoSI*, 162–63.

2. *‘a-li¹-e-eš-ša ŠA SÍG GE₆ SÍG SA₅ iš-har-nu-wa-an-da-aš* (copy: *URU-har-nu-wa-ŠI-LA-aš*) *SÍG SI[G₇SIG₇]* (*KUB* 9.31 i 10).

3. For *išharnuwandas*, *išharuwil* and related forms, see most recently *HW²* 2, 122a–23b; *HED* 2, 308–12.

4. Collation of the photograph at the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz confirms the rendering in the copy. I wish to express my appreciation to Professors

H. Otten and G. Wilhelm for their kind permission to check the photos in Mainz.

5. Watkins also mentions (*ibid.*), apparently as an aside, that “frogs and snails” should be seen as a *merism* collectively designating “‘nasty’ little animals viewed as unfit to eat.” While an interesting point, especially when taken with the fact, as he mentions, that frogs and snails are taboo in modern Turkey, this collective term could just as well apply in the Hittite view to frogs and salamanders as to frogs and snails, and thus, lends no credence to his argument.

having spiky horns” (*Kerns Mem.*, 346). He argues that Siegelová’s claim that the creature must be aquatic is invalid,⁶ since the watery environment of the *harziyalla-* found in the text is conditioned not by the fact that it is an aquatic creature, but rather by the fact that the waters are Hedammu’s abode. Further, based on his interpretation of *sappu-* in *KUB* 43.60 i 18–20 as the “spiky horns” of a billy-goat, he suggests that the *sappu-* attributed to a *harziyalla-* in *KUB* 30.34 + *KUB* 60.75 must refer to the “horns” of a snail, i.e., its antennae. Next, he would read the *BAD-da-al-li-iš* in *KBo* 9.106++ ii 24 (*CTH* 404.2B) as *pád-da-al-li-iš*, and derive the form from *padda-*, “to dig,”⁷ arguing that it is “not intelligible as a variant” of the *pít-ti-ia-li-iš*, “fleet, swift,” found in *KUB* 12.34++ ii 25 (*CTH* 404.1B). This in turn allows him to argue that *paddalli-* would constitute a derivative meaning “shovel” or the like, and that *paddallis padas* would mean “shovel-” or “spade-foot,” which indeed would not be an inappropriate designation for a snail. Finally, Watkins would understand the passage in which Mastigga apparently invokes the *harziyalla-* to carry away the evil “with its tongues”⁸ as referring to two small olfactory projections located below the “horns” of a snail.

Much speaks against Watkins’ suggestion and for an interpretation as “gecko,” “salamander” (or the like). First, it is surely correct, as one may judge from the Hedammu passage, that the *harziyalla-* was considered an “unclean” creature, probably unfit to eat, and that it was grouped

with such undesirables as frogs. However, these features could apply equally as well to a salamander or a gecko as to a snail, and hence provide no evidence in favor of one as against the other.

Second, as Collins, Diss., 268, pointed out, it is by no means assured that *sappu-* refers to the spiked horns of a billy-goat as opposed to the curved horns of a ram, though the suggestion is not otherwise unattractive. In the text in question, the three animals, a billy-goat, a ram, and an ewe, “strike” (*walḫ-*) an object with the *sappuit*, with the horns (SI^{HIA}), and with the nose (*tittit-tet*), respectively, which leaves open the possibility that the first is some other body part: a hoof, the forehead, the chin, each of which is quite possible upon reflection of the ornery behavior of a billy-goat. Further, again seconding Collins (*ibid.*), a goat’s horn may indeed be referred to with SI/*karawar*, and hence, the neat distinction suggested by Watkins either did not exist or was not fully adhered to.

Third, while the form *pád-da-al-li-iš* is attested only once,⁹ otherwise written *pát-ti-ia-li-iš*, it hardly represents the insurmountable barrier that Watkins sees. The variation likely derives from the two different forms of the verb, namely *piddai-* and *pittiya-* (N. van Brock, *RHA* 20/71 [1962] 167; H. Kronasser, *EHS*, 212; *CHD* P, 352b–55b; J. Tischler, *HEG* 2, 631). If Watkins’ interpretation of the variant *BAD-da-al-li-iš* in *KBo* 9.106++ ii 24 were correct, one would be forced to accept that the copying scribe who misunderstood *BAD-da-al-li-iš*, supposedly “scoop(ed)-foot,” emending it to *pát-ti-ia-li-iš*, “fleet-(foot),” must also have misunderstood the meaning of the word *harziyalla-*. The scribe would surely not have emended an unintelligible *p*-foot, as epithet for a snail, to “swift-foot.”

Fourth, C. Rüster’s recently published copy of a nearly fully restored Mastigga tablet (*KBo* 39.8, *CTH* 404.2.A) reveals that the *harziyalla-* has teeth, a fact which served as the impetus for the

6. Again, this is apparently as an aside, since snails are also largely aquatic creatures, loosely speaking, and hence the invalidation of Siegelová’s point does not lend any support to the meaning “snail” as against “salamander.”

7. Puhvel, *HED* 3, 209, either misunderstood Watkins’ intent or fell victim to a couple of typographical errors, as he transliterates “*pè-da-al-li-iš* (sic)” and writes that the form may be derived from “*pèda-* ‘dig’ (sic).” *CHD* P, 361b–62a then rejects the suggestion as presented by Puhvel, apparently not realizing that he had simply misrepresented Watkins’ proposal: “Puhvel . . . implausibly transliterates the dupl. as *pè-da-al-li-iš* GİR-aš with the meaning ‘scoopfoot,’ derived from a supposed *pèda-* ‘dig.’” Nonetheless, I must agree with the editors of *CHD* that Watkins’ derivation seems rather implausible.

8. *KUB* 12.34++ ii 25–28.

9. I.e., counting the attestation in *KBo* 39.8 iii 11 and those in the two duplicates (*KBo* 44.19 ii 7’ and *KBo* 9.106++ ii 24) as one attestation.

present note and which presents a seemingly insurmountable obstacle to Watkins' thesis, if the indices against it were thus far insufficient. While one might, with a stretch of the imagination, see "spiky horns" and "tongues" in the small protrusions on a snail's head, one would indeed be hard pressed to find teeth, which geckos and salamanders, of course, have. The copy includes fragment 1994/c—joined to the tablet since L. Rost's treatment of the text in *MIO* 1 (1953) 345–79—in which *ZU₉-ia-wa-ra-at* is clearly to be read (*KBo* 39.8 iii 12),¹⁰ as opposed to the *EME^{HLA}-ŠU-ia-wa-ra-an* found in *KUB* 12.34++ ii 27. Thus, the passage should be read as follows (*KBo* 39.8 iii 8–13):¹¹

8. *nu*^{MUNUS} *ŠUGI* *ha-ar-zi-ia-al-la-an da-a-i*
nu-uš-ši-kán
9. *SÍG ZA.GÌN SÍG SA₅ an-da hu-u-la-a-li-ia-*
az-zi na-an-kán
10. [(A-N)]A 2 [BE]-EL *SÍSKUR še-er ar-ḥa*
wa-aḥ-nu-zi nu ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i

-
11. [(*kar-ap-du-wa pād-da*)]-*al-li-iš GÍR-aš i-*
da-a-lu-un EME-an
 12. [(*nu-wa-ra*)-*at (iš-ki-ša-a)*]*z kar-ap-du*
ZU₉-ia-wa-ra-at
 13. [(*kar-ap-du i-da-a-lu*)] *KA×U-iš*^(copy IT)¹²
*i-da-a-lu-⟨(un)⟩*¹³ *EME-an*

(8–10) Then the old woman takes a *salamander*, she wraps blue (and) red wool around it, she waves it over the two ritual patrons, and she speaks thus:

(11–13) “May the swift foot carry away the evil tongue! And let it carry it away from behind! In (its) teeth let it carry them away, the evil mouth (and) the evil tongue!”

10. Unpublished duplicate 1992/u+ ii 9' shows *ZU₉-*az*-zi-ia-wa-r[a]*, hence “with its teeth.”

11. Restored after *KUB* 12.34++ ii 21–28, 896/z+ ii 18–24, *KBo* 44.19 ii 3'–10' and *KBo* 9.106++ ii 21–27. I am preparing a full treatment of the text and duplicates in my Ph.D. dissertation, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*, Universität Würzburg.

12. The emendation is assured by *KBo* 9.106++ ii 27 and *KUB* 12.34++ ii 28, both of which show *-iš*, in the latter correcting what seems to have been an *-it*.

13. The expected *-un* is found in *KBo* 44.19 ii 10' and *KUB* 12.34++ ii 28.

Finally, and perhaps (methodologically) most importantly, Watkins' suggestion ignores the functional intent of this and practically all other passages of the ritual: to rid the ritual patrons from the *miasma* that had accrued to them as a result of domestic conflict. A snail, as Collins, Diss., 268, briefly noted, would not only be inefficient at expediting the impurity away from the ritual patrons, the ritual practitioner could not possibly select a snail for the purpose. A snail is so slow that the evil would in effect stay right where it was, i.e., in the immediate vicinity of the ritual patrons; on the other hand, anyone who has observed a gecko when it sees a person might very well hit upon the idea of tying evil to it and letting it scamper away. That the use of a snail might be intended ironically, as suggested in *CHD* P, 235b, seems highly unlikely.

ḥaskallatum (=Akk. *ḥalḥallatum*), “(a Type of) Drum”

In the list of paraphernalia in the ritual for the expansion of the cult of the Goddess of the Night (*CTH* 481) are listed three items, two of which have long been understood as musical instruments (*KUB* 29.4 i 24–25 and dupl. *KUB* 29.5 i 8–9): ⁽²⁴⁾1-*NU-TIM ḪA-AS-KAL-LA-TUM*¹⁴ *ZABAR* 1-*NU-TIM* ^{GIŠ}*hu-u-hu-pa-al* ⁽²⁵⁾*ma-a-an ŠA* ^{GIŠ}*TÚG ma-a-an ŠA ZU₉ AMSI 1-EN* ^{GIŠ}*ar-kam-mi-iš*. J. Friedrich, *HW*, 3. Erg., 470, books *ḥaskallatu* as “ein Gefäß” and equates it with Akk. *ḥaṣḥaltu*, referring to *ḥaš/šḥaltu*, *AHw* 330b, where the occurrence in *KUB* 29.4 is included. In a suggestion that was all but ignored, H. M. Kümmel, *OrNS* 36 (1967) 368, disassociated *ḥaskallatum* from *ḥaṣḥaltu*, the meaning of which, “Blatt²⁰” (*AHw* 330b; cf. *CAD* H, 125–26), would make little sense in the lines under discussion, and equated it instead with Akk. *ḥalḥallatu(m)*, “(a type of) drum” (*CAD* H, 41). This note reiterates Kümmel's suggestion and attempts to solidify the evidence for the equation.

The word is most commonly written *ḥal-ḥal-la-tu/ti* in Mesopotamia (see *CAD* and *AHw*, s.v.;

14. *KUB* 29.5 i 8: *ḪA-AS-KÀ-A*[L-.

Dumbrill, *The Musicology and Organology of the Ancient Near East* [London: Tadmor, 1998], 478–81). Of interest in light of the Hittite spelling, however, is the *has-hal-la-ta*, attested in KAR 91 rev. 23. This form is emended to *hal*’- in AHw and attributed to a scribal error in CAD. The number of variants showing an *s* rather than an *l*-consonant, then, would be three, i.e., those in KUB 29.4, KUB 29.5¹⁵ and KAR 91. For a word that occurs only slightly more than a dozen times, three occurrences of the *s* consonant (i.e., not only *has*- but also *ha-as*-) would seem sufficient to indicate a phonetic variant.

The *h > k* shift does not detract from the suggestion, as such a shift is well attested in Akkadian (GAG §25d). For the attestations of *s* instead of *l*, I can offer no satisfactory inner-Akkadian explanation, and other possibilities¹⁶ would be pure speculation.

The two musical instruments with which the *haskallatum* appears in the Hittite ritual text, the *hūhupal* and the *arkammi*-, are generally considered to be percussion instruments (RIA 8, 485b–86b), though the attestations are not unequivocal and dissenters may be found (e.g., HED 1, 146–47). When it comes time for the paraphernalia to be employed in the ritual, the actors “carry the *ulīhi*-wool into the house of the ritual patron accompanied by an *arkammi*- and a *galgalturi*-drum” (KUB 29.4 ii 63). It was presumably the correlation of this passage with the inventory list at the beginning of the ritual that led H. Otten (apud HW, 3. Erg., 470) to suggest the equation of (Boğ.) Akk. *haskallatu* and Hitt. *galgalturi*-.

Two Level VII texts from Alalah (*ALT 413:16; *ALT 432:26, the latter *hal-hal-l(a)*-) are of particular relevance, as they consist of lists of cult objects, some Akkadian, others Hurrian, similar in many respects to the objects listed in the Goddess of the Night ritual. *ALT 413 is apparently an inventory of items for the cult of Nergal, whose

name appears just as the text breaks off. A further similarity between the Boğazköy and the Syrian occurrences is the determinative that they often bear, i.e., primarily URUDU in Mesopotamia vs. ZABAR at Boğazköy and Alalah. That the instrument appears in similar cult inventories and bears the determinative ZABAR particularly at Alalah is noteworthy in light of the well-known cultural influence that northern Syria exerted upon Hatti, as reflected in the archives at Boğazköy, and especially upon the Kizzuwatnaean ritual texts found therein. One might suggest that this term for a musical instrument was transmitted to Hattusa via northern Syria and Kizzuwatna as part of the same cultural aggregate.

That *haskallatu* (Boğ.) and *halhallatu* (Mesopotamia) are nearly homonymous, that they can independently be shown to be percussion instruments, that the Mesopotamian writing occurs in north Syrian archives which are otherwise known to have played a significant role in the transmission of the cuneiform tradition to Anatolia, and that one Mesopotamian occurrence can also be read *haskallata* seem in sum to point unequivocally to an identification of the two terms.

*dIšū > dDUMU-ŠU

Insufficient notice seems to have been taken of one particular paragraph of E. Laroche’s article about the deity Šarruma, *Syria* 40 (1963) 292:

Sarruma est le «divin fils» de Tešub et de Hebat. Outre KBo IV 10 II 27 et KUB XV 1 II 23 déjà cités, l’équation dLUGAL-*ma* = dDUMU-ŠU résulte du rituel IBoT III 148, où le dieu est nommé alternativement sous les deux formes, soit à la suite de dU (Tešub) et des dieux, soit à la suite de Hebat et des déesses.

Indeed four occurrences of dDUMU-ŠU (Šarruma) in IBoT 3.148 (ii 56, iii 41, iv 20, 31) show a clear DUMU, while the others (i 48, ii 53, 58) are damaged and unclear.¹⁷ Nevertheless, the signs have been read dI-šū in all treatments of or references to the texts of which I am aware,¹⁸ the

15. Of course the Boğazköy occurrences might be counted essentially as a single variation, as the tablets are not independent of one another.

16. E.g., a scribal error, which was integrated into the Hittite scribal tradition, an intermediate scribal or linguistic tradition (Hurrian?) in which the mutation occurred, confusion with or a connection to the nearly homophonic *hashallatum*.

17. This alongside dLUGAL-*ma*(-) in i 26’, 33’, 35’, 42’, ii 44, 47, 52, iii 59, iv 18.

18. Haas-Wilhelm, AOATS 3, 91, 212–31; Otten, RIA 5, 212b; Wegner-Salvini, ChS I/4, 6; Haas, ChS I/9, 128.

only exception being van Gessel, *HdO* I/33/1, 378 (see under DINGIR DUMU-ŠU).¹⁹ Hence, one must conclude that the deity Išu does not occur in this evocation text, but rather that it is Šarruma, son of Teššub and Ḫebat.

The present note intends to show that Laroché's observation may be taken one step further, i.e., that all occurrences of *Išu can and should be read ^dDUMU-ŠU, and hence, that there was no deity *Išu in the Hittite pantheon. It is not a terribly difficult task, since the only other attestations are to be found in *KBo* 14.143 i 7 and its duplicate *KBo* 33.157 i 3,²⁰ which preserve offering lists to Teššub, Ḫebat and their entourage,²¹ as do the sections in *IBoT* 3.148 in which Šarruma appears. Both copies show the sign I, and collation of the somewhat poorly focused and wide-angled photographs at the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz was inconclusive. Nonetheless, ^dDUMU-ŠU is certainly to be read.

Although Šarruma does not immediately follow Teššub or Ḫebat in *KBo* 14.143 i 7, the same is often the case in *IBoT* 3.148 (e.g., ii 53, 56, 58, iv 31²). Moreover, Teššub or Ḫebat may indeed have stood in the breaks preceding ^dDUMU-ŠU in *KBo* 14.143 i 7 and *KBo* 33.157 i 3.

Finally, it should be noted that the debunking of *Išu leaves the deity Ḫ/I/Ešuwa²² of the festival of the same name (*CTH* 628) with one less variant, simplifying the picture somewhat (see Wegner-Salvini, *ChS* I/4, 6).

parā siwattan,

“During the Following Day”²³

Following the listing of the temple paraphernalia in the ritual for the expansion of the cult of

the Goddess of the Night (*CTH* 481), the first day is concluded and the actions of the second day are introduced as follows (*KUB* 29.4+ i 50–54):

50. ... *nu ma-aḫ-ḫa-an*
51. DINGIR-LAM *a-ni-ia-u-wa-an-zi zi-in-na-an-zi ki-ia-aš-ša-an*
52. *ḫu-u-ma-an pé-di ḫa-an-da-a-an-zi nu-za*
DINGIR-LAM *ku-iš ḫa-an-ti-i*
53. *a-ša-ši nu-za a-pa-a-aš* EN SÍSKUR
LÚSANGA MUNUS.MEŠ *kat-re-eš-ša*
54. *pa-ra-a UD-an wa-ar-ap-pa-an-zi nu a-pa-a-aš UD^{KAM}-az pa-iz-zi*

55. *lu-uk-(kat)-ta-ma*²⁴ I-NA UD 2^{KAM} *ku-it-ma-an* ^dUTU-uš *nu-u-a ar-ta-ri*

56. *nu a-pé-e-el IŠ-TU É EN SÍSKUR ki-i da-an-zi ...*

And as soon as they finish producing the deity, they also arrange all these (things) in (their) place. The ritual patron who sets up the deity separately, the priest, and the *katra/i*-women wash themselves during the following day, and that day passes.

Then on the morrow, on the second day, while the sun still stands, they take these (things) from the house of the ritual patron: ...

In other words, at the end of the first day, once the ritual paraphernalia is arranged, the participants are not required to wash, as they wash during the following day,²⁵ before the next stage of the ritual that takes place in the evening on

greatly benefited from his commentary (letters of 3/12/02 and 3/22/02). Indeed, the interpretation of the crux as an accusative of temporal duration (*Akkusativ der temporalen Ausdehnung*) is his, while I had previously considered an accusative of relation/specification (*accusativus relationis/limitationis*).

24. Emending to *lu-uk-<kat>-ta-ma* would eliminate the only occurrence of adverbial *lukta*, i.e. with no interconsonantal vowel, booked in *CHD* L-N, 76b–77a. This might then simplify the derivation of all the adverbial forms from a neuter noun **luk(k)at*, as R. Stefanini, *JNES* 42 (1983) 148–49, would prefer in any case.

25. This can be contrasted with a number of occurrences in other Kizzuwatna rituals in which the ritual participants carry out a full day of ritual activity, then wash themselves, and finally, the day comes to an end, e.g., in the Ritual of Kizzuwatna (*CTH* 479.A = *KUB* 30.31+): (i 6) ... *ma-aḫ-ḫa-an-ma-kán A-NA UD-MI 2½ ki-pé-eš-šar* (7)5 *wa-ak-šur pa-iz-zi nu-za* LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL *wa-ar-pa-an-zi* (8) *nam-ma*

19. See also B. H. L. van Gessel, *HdO* I/33/3, 326 (under [DINGIR DUMU-ŠU]).

20. Cf. Haas-Wilhelm, *AOATS* 3, 91; Otten, *RLA* 5, 212b; Wegner-Salvini, *ChS* I/4, 6; Haas, *ChS* I/9, 66–67; van Gessel, *HdO* I/33/1, 207–8.

21. E.g., the bulls Šeri and Hurri (i 9'); Argaba (i 11'; see Haas, *HdO* I/15, 333–34); Tenu (i 12'; see Haas, *HdO* I/15, 332–33); Ḫebat herself (i 15').

22. See van Gessel, *HdO* I/33/1, with refs., under Ešue, Ešüwa, Ḫešui, Ḫišu, Ḫišuwa, and Išuwa.

23. I wish to heartily thank Professor F. Starke for his kind reading of my note on *parā siwattan*, which has

the second day before the sun has gone down. Thus that day (*a-pa-a-aš*), i.e., the first day, passes with no further ado.

H. Kronasser, *Schw.Goth.*, 13–14, transliterated *pa-ra-a pir-an*, employing a phonetic value of UD rare in Hittite texts, and translated “dann waschen sich . . . jener Opferherr, der Priester und die katra-Frauen vorher (noch),” implying that the ritual participants actually washed themselves previous to the listing of the paraphernalia. He was probably influenced in his reading by the writing UD-*an*, rather than the more common UD^{KAM}. However, a number of cases of *parā* UD- and *parā* MU- without the purely graphic element ^{KAM} are attested (see a selection of citations in *CHD* P, 123b–24a),²⁶ and further, as noted by Kronasser himself (*ibid.*: 44–45), “vorher,” “previously” is otherwise written *peran parā*, not *parā peran* (see also *CHD* P, 303a, sub. 3.b).

CHD P, 123b–24a groups the occurrence together with *parā* UD-*ti* and similar expressions in the dative (and allative), such as *parā* UD-*ti*, *parā hameshi* and *parā* MU-*anni*, correctly recognizing that *parā* may denote temporal posterity with substantives of time. Hoffner, *FsPopko*, 164, comments that “this type of locution presupposes the image of a person traveling in time and encountering milestones as he progresses.” Indeed, nearly all other occurrences of *parā* with temporal substantives govern the dative, thus to be interpreted as a *dativus temporis*, while a few govern the allative.

However, it seems that the difference in case marking should not be ignored, and that the

dative occurrences should be separated grammatically from that under discussion, which should most likely be interpreted as an accusative of temporal duration. Thus, “they wash during (-*an*) the following (*parā*) day.” Exactly how great a semantic distinction is indicated by the case ending is another question. The *dativus temporis* may express either a further limiting nuance in a time expression, or (like the accusative of temporal duration) temporal duration.²⁷

The *CHD* cites only one other example of *parā* UD-*an*, in the fragment *KBo* 13.155, 6', in what seems to be a MH ductus:] *ha-aš-ša-an pa-ra-a UD^{KAM}-an ha-an-ta-an-zi*. A translation, “they arrange the hearth during the following day” is plausible, but can be neither substantiated nor refuted, as the context, that of a ritual centered around a hearth, is too fragmentary.²⁸ In any case, while the attestations governing the dative form a coherent group that presents no particular grammatical or semantic difficulties, *parā* UD-*an* clearly belongs in a different category, as shown by its variant case marking and seemingly different context.

27. At least in the Turkish languages; see J. Knobloch *Sprachwissenschaftliches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1986), sub. *dativus temporis*.

28. The likely related, but not entirely clear, usage, *peran parā* UD-*an*, is found in *KUB* 32.123 + *KBo* 29.206 ii 25'–29' and *KUB* 41.30 iii 8' with dupl. *KUB* 51.37 iii 8'–13'. A translation “beforehand, during the following day” is tentatively suggested here, pending further investigation. The first reads: (25') 1 + 5⁷¹ UDU^{HIA} *na-aš-ta* 2 UDU^{HIA} *ku-na-an-zi* ŠÀ.BA 3 UDU^{HIA} (26') *na-an-kán a-pa-a-ši-la pé-ra-an pa-ra-a UD-an ku-na-an-zi* (27') 2 UDU-*ma-kán* LUGAL-uš *ši-pa-an-ti ha-an-te-ez-zi UD-ti* (28') 1 UDU *lu-uk-kat-ta-ia I-NA UD* 2^{KAM} 1 UDU 2 UDU^{HIA}-*ma-z[a]* (29') LÚ^{MES} URU *La-al-lu-pt-ia ar-ha ne-in-ni-ia-an-zi*, “five sheep; and they kill two sheep. Among the two sheep, they kill (one) themselves *beforehand, during the following day*, but the king consecrates two sheep—on the first day one sheep, and on the morrow on the second day, one sheep. But the people of Lallupiya drive off the two sheep to (their) home(s).” See Starke, *StBoT* 30, 307–8; *CHD* P, 303b; L–N, 437b. The second reads: (1') x x *pé-ra-an pa-ra-a UD-an* (2') LÚ SANGA *ku-ru-ta-u-wa-an-za* (3') LÚ *ta-az-zi-el-li-š* (4') LÚ *Ha-me-na-aš* LÚ GUDU₁₂ (5') LÚ^{MES} É.DINGIR-LIM *hu-u-ma-an-te-eš* (6') *wa-ar-ap-pa-an-zi* DINGIR^{MES}-*ia* (7') *wa-ar-ap-pa-an-zi* (8') É^{MES}.DINGIR^{MES}-*kán pa-ra-a ša-an-ha-an-zi* (9') *hur-ni-ia-an-zi*, “*beforehand, during the following day*, the *k*-priest, the *t*-man, the *h*-man, the anointed, the temple personnel all wash themselves, and they also wash the deity. They sweep out the temples and sprinkle them.” See Popko, *THeth* 21, 271.

a-pé-e-da-ni UD-ti Ú-UL ku-it-ki i-en-zi (9') UD 16^{KAM} QA-TI, “But when 2½ units and 5 sub-units of the day have gone by, the King (and) the Queen bathe themselves. They do nothing further on that day. The 16th day is complete” (see also i 41–44); and in the Ritual of Samuha (*CTH* 480.1 = *KUB* 29.7+) (obv. 36) *nu-za wa-ar-pa-an-zi* [É.DINGIR-LIM-*i*] *a-kán hur-nu-an-zi* / (37) [UD 11^{KAM}] QA-TI, “Then they wash themselves, and they sprinkle the [temple]. / The 11th day is complete” (cf. obv. 46–47, 56–57, 74–75).

26. After this short note had been completed, Professor Doctor G. Wilhelm was kind enough to provide me from the Mainz archive with a copy of H. Ehelolf's transcription of *Bo* 6110, an unpublished duplicate to *KUB* 29.4, which indeed preserves the variant *pa-ra-a UD^{KAM}-an* (line 7'), fully excluding the reading *pir-an* in this case too.