

ON HITTITE (LÚ) *ānt-* “(THE) EQUAL (ONE) > RIVAL” AGAIN*

ÖĞÜZ SOYSAL

Abstract

This article brings further textual material for the Hittite lemma (LÚ) *ānt-* “(the) equal (one)” which has recently been clarified and established by P. M. Goedegebuure. This meaning may be semantically shifted also to “rival”. The additional occurrences for (LÚ) *ānt-* are obtained by an alternative analysis of the ghost word *ānzāšš-* “a kind of animal”.

In a previous volume of this journal, P. M. Goedegebuure has convincingly clarified the Hittite lemma (LÚ) *ānt-* (nom. written as (*a-*)*a-an-za*) “(the) equal (one)”, primarily focusing on the Old Hittite magical ritual KBo 17.17(+³)KBo 30.30.¹ The equation of Hitt. *a-a-an-za* and Akk. *ŠĀNINU* “rival, equal” was already known from two lexical entries of the proto-LÚ vocabulary KBo 1.30 obv. 2’ and 3’, but the different interpretations about the reading *a-a-an-za* in the secondary literature have caused this word to remain a riddle for long time.² Since P. M. Goedegebuure has collected and re-interpreted relevant occurrences for (LÚ) *ānt-*, we now have an established lemma with the meaning “equal” which appears in royal

* The manuscript was completed in May 2004. Very fortunately, I was able to use the files of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary Project, which is supported by a grant from the *National Endowment for the Humanities*. To M. Schröder I am indebted for correcting my English. The bibliographic and Hittitological abbreviations follow those used in CHD (Chicago, 1980 ff.) and HW² (Heidelberg, 1975 ff.). Additional abbreviations are:

HHw: J. Tischler, *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch. Mit dem Wortschatz der Nachbarsprachen*. Innsbruck (2001).

Materia Magica: V. Haas, *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica. Ein Beitrag zur Heilkunde im Alten Orient*. Volumen I & II. Berlin–New York (2003).

Omentexte: K. K. Riemschneider, *Die akkadischen und hethitischen Omentexte aus Boğazköy*. Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 12. Dresden (2004).

¹ “KBo 17.17+: Remarks on an Old Hittite Royal Substitution Ritual”, *JANER* 2 (2002) 61–73.

² See discussions of P. M. Goedegebuure, *ibid.*, 66–67.

substitution and purification rituals. This meaning may semantically be shifted also to “rival” (see below) and even be interpreted sometimes as “substitute”³ as the context requires.

I want to dedicate this short article to further textual material for (LÚ) *ānt-* all of which, I am glad to see, is in favor of P.M. Goedegebuure’s position. These “additional” occurrences rise actually from the ashes of a ghost word *ānzašši-* that, to date, has been controversially interpreted and is listed in some lexical works as “an animal”.⁴ Contra to A. Kammenhuber’s assumption to take *ānzašši-* as a word stem, CHD (L-N) Fasc. 4 (1989) 377, in the treatment of the lemmas *nakkuššiya/e-* “to be a scapegoat, carrier of evils” and *nakkuššēš-* “to be(come) a scapegoat / carrier of evils”,⁵ analyzed it as a substantive with a following possessive pronoun *ānza(š)=šiš* “his a.”⁶ The usage *ānza(š)=šiš* appears in various omen compositions, always accompanied with the verb *nakkuššiya/e-*. The following attestations of *ānza(š)=šiš* are now to be added to the textual material supporting the idea of P. M. Goedegebuure.⁷

KUB 8.13 obv. (lunar omens, OH²/NS)*:

- § 4 5 [tāk-k]u DXXX SI-ŠÚ *al-ki-iš-ta-ni-eš k[i-iʷ-ša-niʷ ...ʷ]*
 6 ‘[a]-*an-za-aš-še-eš* *na-ak-ku-uš-še-e-eš-kān¹-* [ziʷ b]
 § 5 7 [tā]k-ku DXXX A-NA SI.GÙB-ŠÚ *al-ki-iš-ta-aš* [ar-ta(?)]
 8 LÚKÚR-*an-ni a-a-an-za-aš-še-eš* *na-ak-ku-uš-še-eš-kān¹-* [ziʷ b]

³ See n. 12 below.

⁴ Suggested by A. Kammenhuber, HW² Lfg. 2 (Heidelberg, 1977) 124: *anzašši/e-* c. “ein lebendes Wesen (Tier ?)”, and followed by J. Tischler, HdW (Innsbruck, 1982) 4; *idem*, HHw (Innsbruck, 2001) 18: *anzašši-* c. “(ein Tier ?)”, and M. Hutter, Behexung (Göttingen, 1988) 27, 69, 135: *anzašši-* c. “(Tier)”. A. Kammenhuber’s tendency to assume this word as an “animal” designation might have been influenced by its close connection with *nakkušši-* “scapegoat,” which, however, cannot be justified factually anymore; see n. 10 below.

⁵ The lexical entry *nakkuššēš-* in CHD is perhaps to be omitted; see the textual remarks on KUB 8.13 “c” below.

⁶ Cf. also J. Tischler, HEG II / 7 (N) (Innsbruck, 1991) 266: *ānza=sis*, although he tends somewhere else (see n. 4 above) to accept rather the A. Kammenhuber’s interpretation *ānzašši-*; most recently V. Haas, OLZ 97 (2002) 504 and *idem*, *Materia Magica I* (Berlin–New York, 2003) 503–504: “sein *ānza*-(grasfressendes Tier)”.

⁷ The usage *ānza(š)=šiš* “his a.” (now understood as “his equal”) has also been detected by Th. van den Hout, *apud* P. M. Goedegebuure, J_{ANER} 2, 64, in the substitution ritual KUB 43.53 i 18’ (NH duplicate of OH KBo 17.17(+³)KBo 30.30) [a-]ʷa-*za-aš-ši-iš*, however, with a nasal reduction. The hypothetical form **a-a-an-za-aš-ši-iš* mentioned by P. M. Goedegebuure, *ibid.*, has now appeared in the occurrences presented in this article.

- § 4 5 “[I]f the horn of the moon t[urns] to branches,
6 his *ānt*-s wi[ll] be °scapegoats”
- § 5 7 “[I]f towards the left horn of the moon [stands?] a branch,
8 in hostility his *ānt*-s wi[ll] be scapegoats”

Brief textual remarks: **a)** A provisional text edition by K. K. Riemschneider, *Omentexte* (Dresden, 2004) 80-81. On some points, my transliteration differs from his. For the dating of KUB 8.13 (of following KBo 13.13 and KUB 43.7 as well) I prefer to use my personal views, due to extremely controversial proposals in the secondary literature. **b)** The highly speculative reading of this predicate in different Hittite dictionaries (e.g., HW² Lfg. 2, 124-125; CHD (L-N) Fasc. 4, 377; and E. Neu, *apud* HEG II / 7 (N) 266) can be now refined in this way following K. K. Riemschneider, *Omentexte*, 80, 186 f. The computer generated enlarged photo of BoFN 685 has shown that the identical sign after “*es*” in both lines 6 and 8 should be most likely “*kán*” which is slightly damaged, or written somehow small and insecure (over erasure³). Thus, the -*šk*- predicates for pres. pl. 3. are in full conformity with the plural possessive -*šeš* “his ...s”; contra to this cf. the use *ānza(š)=šiš nak(k)ušš(i)ez(z)i* for singular 3. person in KBo 13.13 obv. 6’, 13’ and KUB 43.7 iii 8 (see the texts below). Why we find an *ānza(š)=šeš*, and not **ānte(š)=šeš* in KUB 8.13 for the plural use, can be explained either by the fact that in New Hittite in the formation “noun + enclitic possessive” the first element can remain undeclined, or by a lexical misunderstanding of the New Hittite copist of KUB 8.13 who was not able to recognize the word anymore. **c)** Since *nakkuššešk-* may present a regular iterative form of *nakkuššiya/e-*, the supposition of an inchoative verb **nakkuššeš-* for KUB 8.13 obv. 6 and 8 seems now to be superfluous.

KBo 13.13 obv. (*šumma izbu omens*, OH²/NS)^a:

- § 3’ 5’ [*ták-ku IZ-BU-aš?* ...] 1-EN *ki-i-ša-ri*
6’ [*a-an-za-aš-ši-iš n*] *a-ak-ku-uš-ši-e-zi*
- § 4’ 7’ [*ták-ku IZ-BU-aš?* ... NU.GÁ]L(?) LUGAL-uš KUR
LÚKÚR-ŠU
8’ [*-z*]i
§ 5’ 9’ [*ták-ku IZ-BU-aš?* ...]-x NU.GÁL LUGAL-uš ŠA
LÚKÚR-ŠU
10’ [*na-aš-ma É* LÚKÚR-ŠU *har-ak-zi*
11’ [*d*]a²-an-na-at-te-ez-zi

- § 6' 12' [*ták-ku IZ-BU-aš?* ... ^{UZ}] ^U*šar-nu-um-ni-iš-ši*
 13' []-*x-e-ez-zi a-an-za-aš-ši-iš na-ak-ku-uš-ši-e-zi*
 § 7' 14' [*ták-ku IZ-BU-aš?* ...] *aš-ši LUGAL-uš na-ak-ke-e-zi*
- § 3' 5' “[If a malformed newborn’s ^b ...] becomes one / single ^c,
 6' [... his *ānt-* will be a s]capegoat”
- § 4' 7' “[If a malformed newborn’s ... does not exist]^t, the king
 8' [will conquer / destroy]y the land of his enemy”
- § 5' 9' “[If a malformed newborn’s ...] does not exist, the king
 10' [will conquer / destroy the house²] of his enemy, or the house of his enemy will perish (by itself),
 11' [and its ...] will be [e]mpty”
- § 6' 12' “[If a malformed newborn’s ... is²] in its *šamummar*-body part,
 13' [...] will [...] ^d (and) his *ānt-* will be a scapegoat”
- § 7' 14' “[If a malformed newborn’s ...], that² king will be important ^e”

Brief textual remarks: a) Text edition by K. K. Riemschneider, StBoT 9 (Wiesbaden, 1970) 60 ff.; my transliteration slightly differs from his. **b)** The protasis is always referring to an animal birth. **c)** It is not clear if this sentence belongs to the protasis or apodosis. If it is the apodosis, we may reconstruct it as “[the king] will become the only one (= ² unrivalled)”. K. K. Riemschneider, StBoT 9, 60 and 65, however, prefers for here a protasis. **d)** It is not clear if the broken verb belongs to the protasis or apodosis; the restorations [*hull*]*ēzzi* “he will [defeat]^t” or [*šull*]*ēzzi* “he will [quarrel]^l” would suggest rather the apodosis referring to the combat acts of the (native) king. **e)** i. e. the king at whose time that malformed newborn takes place.

Another fragment, not very helpful in content, KUB 43.7 iii (*šumma izbu* omens, OH²/MS)^a obviously contains a similar phrase:

- § 2 7 [*ták-ku IZ-BU-aš?* K] ^A*xU-it* ^b UR.MA[*H*(-)...²]
 8 [*a-an-za-aš-ši-iš na-ku-uš-[šē²]-e-ez-zi*]
 § 2 7 “[If] with² [a malformed newborn’s m]outh [...] a lion
 ...²]
 8 [... h]is [*ānt-*] wi[ll] be a scape[go]at”

Brief textual remarks: **a)** K. K. Riemschneider, StBoT 9, 53, and *Textbeilage I*; the text is cited there as Bo 1488. **b)** Or, to be emended as [K]A× U<-še>-et ?; the protasis then would read “[If a malformed newborn’s m]outh (is like one) [of] a lio[n]”.

Furthermore, in two broken contexts, we find the occurrences *a-an-za-aš-ši-i[š]* in the lunar eclipses⁷ KBo 34.119 ii 2’,⁸ and *a-an-za-aš-š[ī]-i[š]’* in the purification and healing ritual of Tunnawiya for the royal pair IBoT 3.99:13⁹ which do not yield any decisive evidence on the subject.

After combining the contents of both omen texts some useful information about *ānt-* “equal” can be revealed, even from the very laconic formulated apodosis sentences in KUB 8.13 obv. 5-8 and from the always incomplete omen clauses of KBo 13.13 obv. 5’-14’. The complete apodosis sentences of KUB 8.13 do not specify *whose* equals will be scapegoats, but it is obvious that here with the possessive pronoun “his” the (native) king is meant, who may possibly have been mentioned in the previous and lost paragraphs of KUB 8.13. We indeed come across similar phrases in the consecutive paragraphs §§ 3’-7’ of KBo 13.13 speaking of the status of a scapegoat again (obv. 6’, 13’) and also dealing in that context with the fate of the (native) king (obv. 7’, 9’, 14’), and his relations to the enemy as well (obv. 7’, 9’, 10’). This fact does also help to determine the *ānt-* “equal” of the king more precisely as his “rival”. Especially, the expression ^{LÚ}KÚR-*anni* “in hostility” in KUB 8.13 obv. 8 strongly supports this conclusion. Although the verb *nakkuššiya/e-* which is a derivation from the noun *nakkušši-* “scapegoat”¹⁰ would first suggest a “ritual substitute”¹¹ to the native king rather than a “(hostile)

⁷ A provisional text edition by K. K. Riemschneider, *Omentexte*, 161-162.

⁸ M. Hutter, *Behexung*, 26 f., 49, 69.

¹⁰ *nakkušši-* “scapegoat” can be an animal (cow, ewe, nanny goat, sheep, goat, goat kid, ox, bull, bird), or a human being (man, boy, girl) as well; see examples in CHD L-N, Fasc. 4 (1989) 375 (sub *nakkuššaḫit-*, *nakkušatar*), 376 f. (sub *nakkušši/a-*). The Ammiḫatna ritual KBo 5.2 iii 32-35 even makes the options clear, that a great lord offering the sacrifice can release a human in the status of a scapegoat, or alternatively an ox, if he wishes.

¹¹ Despite the necessity of the distinction between the concepts *tarpalli-* “substitute” and *nakkušši-* “scapegoat” in Hittite ritual practice (cf. CHD L-N, Fasc. 4, 375 and 377, referring to O. R. Gurney’s suggestions) *tarpalli-* may act, or can be manipulated as, *nakkušši-*. In the ritual KUB 17.18 ii 17, 24-25, for example, one releases living human substitutes of both male and female sexes (*hūišwanduš*

equal” to him,¹² I believe, nevertheless, that the omen texts use these stereotyped apodosis sentences to express a **d r a s t i c** downgrading of the equal hostile king(s) against the native ruler in favor of the latter one’s fate and success.

On P. M. Goedegebuure’s claim that the Hittite (LÚ) *ānt-* “the equal (one)” might find a Luwian cognate in the word *ayawala-* in KUB 14.3 i 12, one of the most debated hapaxes in Hittite lexicon, I abstain from any judgment and confine myself here to a reference to her argumentation in *JANER* 2, 67-68. I would like, however, to call attention to a similar-sounding lemma *aywant-* (nom. written as *a-i-ua-an-za*) attested in the lunar (KUB 8.8:3’; KUB 8.9 obv. (4’), 6’, (11’)) and liver omens (KBo 10.7 + iv 1) which refers to an attribute or shape of the moon, and to a feature observed in the KI.GUB / *šintahi*-part of a liver.¹³ According to its word structure, and phoneti-

*tarpalli*š LÚ MUNUS_{ya}) in the status of carriers / scapegoats (*nakkuššahiti*) for the clients before the Sun goddess of the Netherworld.

¹² However, according to P. M. Goedegebuure, *JANER* 2, 70-72, (LÚ) *ānt-* “equal” too may ritually act as the “living substitute” for the king. Furthermore, a semantic approach between the notions “rival” and “substitute” might supposedly find support from a lexical relationship between the nouns ^(LÚ)/(*𐎶*)*tarpalli-* and ^(LÚ)/(*𐎶*)*tarpanalli-* in the Hittite texts. Since H.G. Güterbock, *OrNS* 25 (1956) 124, ^(LÚ)/(*𐎶*)*tarpanalli-* “opponent, rival” is semantically taken very close to ^(LÚ)/(*𐎶*)*tarpalli-* “substitute” (cf. J. Tischler, *HEG* III / 9 (T/D 2) [1993] 207 ff., 209 f., with anterior literature). This is because the Luwian pl. acc. form *𐎶tar-pa-na-al-li-ḫn-za* in KUB 24.5 rev. 16 alternates with the Hittite pl. acc. (*𐎶*)*tar-pa-al-li-uš*² (or: *-na*²) in the duplicate KUB 36.94 rev. 11’. The recent CHD works on both lemmas, however, may let arise some doubts about this lexical phenomenon, due to the following arguments: 1) All useful occurrences for ^(LÚ)/(*𐎶*)*tarpalli-* (from MH/MS) plead for the meaning “ritual substitute” only, whose Akkadian equivalent is *DINĀNU* “substitute; wraith” as given in the Izi-Bogh. vocabulary KBo 1.42 iv 28’ (CAD *D* [Chicago, 1959] 148 f.). The other Akkadian equivalent of ^(LÚ)*tarpalli-* is ^(LÚ)*PŪḪU* “(human) substitute”. 2) The relatively poor occurrences for ^(LÚ)/(*𐎶*)*tarpanalli-* (only NH) are attested exclusively in the Hittite fragments of the Hurrian compositions of “Song of Ullikummi” and “Myth of Hedammu”, and always appear in the sense of “opponent, rival”. 3) Although the New Hittite text KUB 24.5 rev. 16 uses the Luwian pl. acc. form *𐎶tar-pa-na-al-li-ḫn-za* against *𐎶tar-pa-al-li-uš*² in its duplicate KUB 36.94 rev. 11’, the same text itself frequently uses elsewhere the “regular” Hittite pl. acc. form *𐎶tar-pa-al-li-uš* (KUB 24.5 obv. (10’), 34’, rev. 6). The sudden —and for once— insertion of a Luwian form instead of a Hittite one in KUB 24.5 rev. 16 shows first of all a scribal instability. Therefore I find more accurate to make a simple emendation *𐎶tar-pa-<<na>>-al-li-ḫn-za* for this isolated form in KUB 24.5 rev. 16 in the meaning “substitutes (acc.)” instead of “rivals” which is not necessitated by the context in KUB 24.5 anyway.

¹³ K. K. Riemschneider, *Omentexte*, 181: (Adjektiv u. B. in Gestirn- und Leberomina, zur Bezeichnung einer Farbschattierung oder Oberflächenstruktur); A.

cally too, *aywant-* may very well be a cognate of *ayawala-*; but the mutilated omen contexts do not give any factual clue about its eventual relationship to the notion “equal.”

Kammenhuber, HW² Lfg. 1 (1975) 50: (Nomen u. B. in Mond- und KI.GUB-Omina); J. Tischler, HDW, 1: (t. t. in Gestirnomina); idem, HHw, 12: (follows K. K. Riemschneider).