

**Audias fabulas veteres.  
Anatolian Studies in Honor of  
Jana Součková-Siegelová**

*Edited by*

Šárka Velhartická



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

# Contents

- Editor's Foreword IX  
Tabula gratulatoria X  
Jana Součková-Siegelová XVII  
*Gernot Wilhelm*  
Jana Součková-Siegelová and the Náprstek Museum Prague XIX  
*Milena Secká*  
Bibliography of Jana Součková-Siegelová XXII  
*Milena Secká / Šárka Velhartická*  
List of Abbreviations XXVIII  
List of Authors XXXVI
- 1 Proverbs and Rhetorical Strategies in § 7' of the Hittite *Instructions for Priests and Temple Personnel* (CTH 264) 1  
*Silvia Alaura*
- 2 Luwian Monumental Inscriptions and Luwians in Northern Syria 16  
*Alfonso Archi*
- 3 The Old Woman: Female Wisdom as a Resource and a Threat in Hittite Anatolia 48  
*Gary Beckman*
- 4 A Study in Doors 58  
*Petr Charvát*
- 5 Das semantische Feld der hethitischen Verwaltungssprache 71  
*Paola Cotticelli-Kurras*
- 6 Išuwa and Ḫatti during the Early Hittite Empire (Tutḫaliya I—Šuppiluliuma I) 98  
*Stefano de Martino*
- 7 Ivory Pyxis in the National Museum, Prague 111  
*Marie Dufková*
- 8 Zur Syntax des vedischen und hethitischen Vokativs im Vergleich 119  
*Heiner Eichner*

- 9 **Überlegungen zur Textherstellung des Hedammu-Mythos** 141  
*Detlev Groddek*
- 10 **The Story of Wāšitta and Kumarbi** 165  
*Alwin Kloekhorst*
- 11 **SIURI—SINURI, deux divinités à redécouvrir** 178  
*René Lebrun*
- 12 **MEŠ<sub>4</sub>—ein Pluraldeterminativ im Hethitischen** 184  
*Jürgen Lorenz / Elisabeth Rieken*
- 13 **Die sogenannten „eingepunzten“ Hieroglypheninschriften von Boğazköy: *Status quaestionis*** 194  
*Massimiliano Marazzi*
- 14 **Marginalia to the Myth of Telipinu** 210  
*H. Craig Melchert*
- 15 **Activities and Roles of Court Dignitaries towards the End of the Hittite Empire** 221  
*Clelia Mora*
- 16 **La fête dite de l'intronisation CTH 659** 233  
*Alice Mouton*
- 17 **Auf der Suche nach dem Schreiberprofil** 257  
*Gerfrid G.W. Müller*
- 18 **Etymologisches und Morphologisches zu einigen anatolischen Wörtern** 276  
*Norbert Oettinger*
- 19 **The Hieroglyphic Sign EGO<sub>(2)</sub>** 282  
*Annick Payne*
- 20 **Zippalanda and the Cities of Central Anatolia: Economic and Religious Connections** 296  
*Franca Pecchioli Daddi*

- 21 **Nuovi sigilli in luvio geroglifico VIII** 309  
*Massimo Poetto*
- 22 **One More Hapax Crux in Hittite** 318  
*Jaan Puhvel*
- 23 **The Hattian-Hittite Foundation Rituals from Ortaköy (II). Fragments to CTH 726 “Rituel bilingue de fondation d’un temple ou d’un palais”** 320  
*Oğuz Soysal / Aygül Süel*
- 24 **On Anatolian Traditions of the Old Hittite Kingship** 365  
*Piotr Taracha*
- 25 **A Hittite View of Lullubum and its World** 374  
*İlknur Taş / Selim F. Adalı*
- 26 **Eine alternative Deutung des „Wildtierparks“ im Anitta-Text** 389  
*Ahmet Ünal*
- 27 **Cuneiform Texts in the Náprstek Museum Prague** 401  
*Luděk Vacín*
- 28 **A Brief Note on the Syntax of Writing in Hittite** 426  
*Theo van den Hout*
- 29 **Dokumentation zu Bedřich Hrozný in den Archiven des tschechischen Nationalmuseums** 438  
*Šárka Velhartická*
- 30 **Schreiber und Beschwörung im Hurritischen** 454  
*Gernot Wilhelm*
- 31 **A Luwian Welcome** 463  
*Ilya Yakubovich*

**Indices**

- Index of Texts 485
- Index of Personal Names 506
- Index of Modern Historiography and Research 510
- Index of Divine / Mythological / Literary Names 511
- Index of Geographical Names 514

## Marginalia to the Myth of Telipinu

*H. Craig Melchert*

*Among our honorand's many contributions to Hittitology is her edition of the Myth of Hedammu (Siegelová 1971). As a modest token of esteem for her many accomplishments, I offer the following remarks on certain problematic passages from the Myth of Telipinu.<sup>1</sup>*

### 1 The Denigration of the Bee

After Telipinu, son of the Storm-god, has retired in anger, sending the world into chaos, the gods large and small search for him in vain. The Sun-god then sends the mighty eagle to find him, but the eagle fails. The Storm-god himself searches and also fails. The wise Ḫannaḫanna goddess then sends the bee. This meets with the sneering skepticism of the Storm-god, who says the following:

- (1) (KUB 17.10 i 37–39; restorations after KUB 33.5 ii 12–14)  
*nu=war=an paizzi kāš [(NIM.LÀL-aš wemiya)zi par]tauwa=ššet=wa  
 amiyanza apasš=a=uwa amiyanza namma=war=aš ḫanti tuḫšanzi*

“Will this bee proceed to find him? His wings are puny, and he too is puny (*lit.* not grown up), and furthermore. . .”

None of the previous interpretations offered for the last clause is remotely satisfactory: A. Goetze: “Shall they admit that it is greater than they?”;<sup>2</sup> C. Kühne: “Werden sie (die Götter) das verstehen?”;<sup>3</sup> F. Pecchioli Daddi and A.M. Polvani:

1 Unless otherwise noted, I take as the basis for the text the transliteration by Laroche (Laroche 1965: 89–110), primarily that of KUB 17.10, which is a Middle Script copy of the Old Hittite text. For translations of the Myth of Telipinu see among others Pecchioli Daddi/Polvani 1990: 71–87, Hoffner 1998: 14–20, and Mazoyer 2003: 73–91.

2 Goetze 1955: 127.

3 Kühne 1975: 183.

“Sono essi forse diversi?”;<sup>4</sup> J. Puhvel: “they also cut them in two”;<sup>5</sup> A. Ünal: “Außerdem sind sie (die Flügel?) auseinander geschnitten?”;<sup>6</sup> G. Beckman: “And furthermore they (the gods). . .”;<sup>7</sup> M. Mazoyer: “et en outre on les choisit (eux) de préférence”.<sup>8</sup> H.A. Hoffner prudently leaves the entire clause untranslated.<sup>9</sup>

The problem for any analysis is twofold: first, the enclitic pronoun *-aš* can only be animate nominative singular, referring to the bee as a subject, or animate accusative plural. It cannot refer to the bee as a direct object (Goetze), which would have to be animate accusative singular *-an*. It likewise cannot refer to the wings as either object (Puhvel) or subject (Ünal), since *partauwa* ‘wings’ is neuter nominative accusative plural, as shown by the predicate adjective *amiyanta*, and the enclitic pronoun could only be *-e* (or perhaps *-at*). Nor can *-aš* refer to the gods as a subject (Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani), since animate nominative plural would also only appear as *-e* or *-at*. The second problem is the apparent transitive present third plural *tuḥšanzi* ‘they cut’, for which the only likely subject is the gods, but as we have seen there is then no suitable animate plural antecedent to serve as the object. Mazoyer avoids these difficulties by assuming that the third plural *tuḥšanzi* is being used impersonally with an unspecified subject, but his interpretation of the verb as ‘choose’ is entirely ad hoc and not supported by any evidence.<sup>10</sup>

The solution to this impasse is to suppose that *tuḥ-ša-an-zi* is a rare spelling of a word-final sequence of two consonants with *-i* as the “empty vowel”, rather than the standard *-a*. The form is thus animate nominative singular /tuhsants/, a predicative participle agreeing with the subject *-aš*, referring to the bee. Such use of final *-Vn-zi* for /-(n)ts/ is attested in Palaic, in texts written by Hittite scribes (e.g. KUB 32.18 i 10 *ḥarāš=kuwar=zi panāganzi* “The eagle (is) *p*-ed”). However, I know of no other examples for such an orthography in a Hittite context. I therefore find it more likely that, instead of being a true alternative spelling for final /-Vnts/, the Telipinu example is rather a hypercorrection by the Middle Hittite copyist. Based on Old Hittite/Old Script spellings like *iš-ḫi-an-za* for *iš-ḫi-an-zi* ‘they bind’, he “improved” *tuḥ-ša-an-za* into *tuḥ-ša-an-zi*.

4 Pecchioli Daddi/Polvani 1990: 80.

5 Puhvel 1991: 93.

6 Ünal 1994: 817.

7 Beckman 2003: 152.

8 Mazoyer 2003: 75 (see his commentary *ibid.* 97).

9 Hoffner 1998: 15.

10 Despite the highly misleading implication of Mazoyer (2003: 97), Güterbock (1964: 106–7 and 1986: 211 n. 10) correctly interprets the verb as ‘to cut’ in all instances. Kühne’s ‘verstehen’ likewise lacks any foundation, and his translation leaves the enclitic *-aš* unaccounted for.

Once we read *tuh-ša-an-zi* as a participle /tuhsants/, the syntax of the clause is perfectly normal, and the sense is equally clear: “Furthermore, he (the bee) is cut off in front”. The Storm-god is ridiculing the bee for being snub-nosed or flat-faced—it is not only puny, but also ugly, particularly in contrast with the mighty eagle and his impressive beak. Beyond the invidious comparison with the eagle, we are probably dealing with a broader cultural prejudice. Depictions of the Hittites and their gods suggest that a prominent nose was a desirable feature. I cite as further support for this notion the exorbitantly high fine (30 minas!) for biting off the nose of a free person in the Hittite Laws (versus just 3 shekels for slaves).<sup>11</sup>

## 2 The Alleged “grains of Telipinu”

After the goddess Kamrušepa has seen the angry Telipinu (driven from his hiding place by the bee’s sting) and stopped his wrath, she prepares to ritually remove all of his anger:

- (2) (KUB 17.10 iii 3–10; restorations mine, HCM)  
<sup>d</sup>Kamrušepaš DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-naš EGIR-pa tēzzi it[ten] DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-eš  
 kāšma <sup>d</sup>Ḫapantali <sup>d</sup>UTU-aš UDU<sup>H1.A</sup>=šU w[ešyatta?] n=ašta 12 UDU.  
 NÍTA<sup>H1.A</sup> kar(a)šten nu <sup>d</sup>Telipinuwaš t[uekk]uš aniyami dāḫḫun=za  
 pattar 1 LIM IGI<sup>H1.A</sup>-wa nu=ššan kar(a)ššus šA <sup>d</sup>Kamrušepa UDU.NÍTA<sup>H1.A</sup>  
 =šU išḫūḫun § nu <sup>d</sup>Telipinui šēr arḫa duwān warnunun tuwann=a  
 warnunun n=ašta <sup>d</sup>Telipinui tuggaz=šēt<sup>t</sup> idālu=ššit dāḫḫun . . .

“Kamrušepa reports back to the gods: ‘Go, oh gods! Ḫapantali is h[erding?] the sheep of the Sun-god. **Shear** twelve rams, so that I can treat the **limbs** of Telipinu. I have taken a basket (with) a thousand ‘eyes’ (= holes; i.e. a sieve). I have poured on it the **shearings** of the rams of Kamrušepa. I have burned from over Telipinu (down) away in this direction, and I have burned (down away) in that direction. I have taken from Telipinu’s limbs his evil; (I have taken his sin, I have taken his wrath, I have taken his anger, I have taken his \_\_, I have taken his sullenness).”

11 See Hoffner 1997: 26–27 and his commentary 178.



My restoration *w[ešiyatta]* follows A. Goetze, F. Pecchioli Daddi/A.M. Polvani and G. Beckman, contra H.A. Hoffner,<sup>12</sup> but this does not affect the rest of the interpretation. For the correct interpretation of ‘basket with a thousand eyes’ see M. Popko.<sup>13</sup>

Aside from A. Goetze: “I want to fix long days for Telipinu”(??)<sup>14</sup> and M. Mazoyer,<sup>15</sup> all scholars known to me but one accept the restoration by E. Laroche of *k[ar-aš-š]u-uš* after <sup>d</sup>*Telipinuwaš*,<sup>16</sup> most assuming an alleged ‘grains of Telipinu’, which are again mentioned two sentences later, where they are equated with the rams of Kamrušepa! Thus A. Ünal, H.A. Hoffner, and G. Beckman.<sup>17</sup> F. Pecchioli Daddi and A.M. Polvani also translate ‘his grains’, but impossibly construe ‘the rams of Kamrušepa’ with the verb ‘burned’ of the next clause.<sup>18</sup> V. Haas/G. Wilhelm and E. Masson take *karaššuš* rather as ‘the chosen’ (rams).<sup>19</sup> Only C. Kühne<sup>20</sup> sees that the restored word must refer to a body part of Telipinu and that the attested *karaššuš* refers to something cut off, but he does not fully pursue these implications.<sup>21</sup>

The standard interpretation of this passage faces both linguistic and contextual problems. First of all, the noun *kar(a)š* (clearly to be read /kars/) is a *neuter s-stem*, which cannot possibly have an animate plural *kar(a)ššuš*. Furthermore, /kars/ refers to a *kind* of grain. It cannot possibly be used to mean ‘grain’ in the sense of individual grains, for which the Hittite word was surely *warwalan-* (NUMUN) ‘seed’. That /kars/ means ‘castrated parts of an animal’ (Mazoyer)<sup>22</sup> is wildly implausible. Even if *kar(a)ššuš* could mean individual grains, it is nonsensical to scatter grains onto a sieve. They will fall through the holes, and there will be nothing to burn. Furthermore, individual grains burn only with great difficulty and then merely produce charred bits—virtually no smoke, as needed for what is clearly a fumigation of Telipinu. Finally, no one has ever explained how or why the ‘grains’ of Telipinu would be equated with the rams of Kamrušepa! The entire passage makes no coherent sense by this interpretation.

12 Goetze 1955: 127; Pecchioli Daddi/Polvani 1990: 81; Beckman 2003: 152 and Hoffner 1998: 16.

13 Popko 1974.

14 Goetze 1955: 127.

15 Mazoyer 2003: 48, with an impossible interpretation 77 and commentary 102–103.

16 Laroche 1965: 94.

17 Ünal 1994: 818; Hoffner 1998: 16; Beckman 2003: 152.

18 Pecchioli Daddi/Polvani 1990: 81.

19 Haas/Wilhelm 1974: 25; Masson 1991: 133.

20 Kühne 1975: 185.

21 See also Masson 1991: 133 with note 23.

22 Mazoyer 2003: 102.

The description of the fumigation of Telipinu makes it absolutely clear that it is his *limbs* that are being treated and cleansed of anger and sin (*tuggaz=šēt*). We must therefore restore *t[u-ek-k]u-uš* ‘limbs’ in the clause with *aniyami*: “so that I can treat the limbs of Telipinu”. The traces in the published copy are fully compatible with this reading (note the reading of Otten *apud* Mazoyer of *w[ar-k]u-uš*, which is contextually far less likely). The text KBo 8.73 ii 1–10 cited by Haas and Wilhelm confirms the application to body parts.

The verb *karš-* ‘to cut’ certainly is used to mean ‘cut out (animals) from a herd’, hence ‘select’, but the Hittites must have also had a verb for ‘to shear’ (sheep), and by all criteria *karš-* is surely that verb. Kamrušepa is instructing the gods to shear twelve rams. The product of the shearing will of course be wool shearings. One productive way to form result nouns in Hittite is with *animate* deverbative nouns in *-a-*: e.g. *parša-* ‘crumb’ from *parš-* ‘to break’ (bread), *šarra-* ‘portion’ < *šarra-* ‘to divide’, *wāga-* ‘bite’ < *wag-* ‘to bite’. We may therefore likewise trivially assume a noun *kar(a)šša-* ‘shearing’, with accusative plural *kar(a)ššuš* < *karš-* ‘cut, shear’.

Freshly shorn wool is also not easy to set on fire if it is left in large clumps. It will burn much better if *scattered* over a large basket with *air holes*. Once set afire, due to its lanolin content, it will produce a greasy, black smoke, ideally suited for fumigation. Previous translations have wrongly ignored the force of *arḫa* in *šēr arḫa duwān warnunun*. The basket with the burning wool shearings is not waved over Telipinu or merely beside him. It is moved in a sweeping motion, starting from his head, proceeding down his body, and then swung *away* from his body, first on one side and then the other. The away motion is crucial, since the evils picked up by the smoke are thus removed from Telipinu’s limbs. The basic technique is the same as with *šēr arḫa waḫnu-* ‘whirl over (and away from)’, in which various scape animals and purificatory substances are swung once over a person’s head, picking up evils with the inward arc and removing them with the outward arc. The only difference is that here the basket with the smoke is swung from head to toe on both sides of the body and then away.

### 3 The Alleged “stifling” of the Gods

The opening preserved lines of the myth describe the disruption of the natural order caused by Telipinu’s withdrawal in anger:

## (3) (KUB 17.10 i 5–9; restorations mine, HCM)

<sup>GIŠ</sup>*luttāuš kammaras̄ IŠBAT É-er tuḥḥuiš [IŠBAT] INA GUNNI=ma kalmišeniš wišūriyantat[i ištaniš šA] DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup> wišūriyantati INA TÙR anda UDU<sup>HI.A</sup> KIMIN INA É.GUD andan GUD<sup>HI.A</sup> wišūriyantati UDU-uš=za SÍLA=SÚ mimmaš GUD=ma=<z> AMAR=ŠU mimmaš*

“A mist seized the windows; smoke [seized] the house. On the hearth the burning logs were \_\_. [The altars of] the gods were \_\_. In the fold the sheep were \_\_. In the corral the cattle were \_\_. The ewe refused her lamb. The cow refused her calf.”

All scholars to my knowledge have accepted the restoration in the fourth clause by Laroche<sup>23</sup> of [*iš-ta-na-na-aš an-da*] (or similar), taking DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup> as the subject of the verb *wišūriyantati*. The verb is consistently rendered as ‘were suffocated, stifled’.<sup>24</sup>

The problem with this interpretation is that at the end of the myth, when all the disruptions just described are made right upon the return of Telipinu, the clause describing the altars of the gods reads (KUB 17.10 iv 22): *ištaniš DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-naš ḥandantati* “The altars of the gods were put in order/alignment” or “The altars were put in order for the gods”. See correctly A. Goetze: “The altars were set right for the gods”;<sup>25</sup> E. Masson: “les autels sont dressés pour les dieux”;<sup>26</sup> M. Mazoyer: “les autels des dieux furent en ordre”;<sup>27</sup> F. Pecchioli Daddi and A.M. Polvani: “furono allestiti gli altari degli dei”;<sup>28</sup> J. Puhvel: “the altars were set aright for the gods”;<sup>29</sup> The renderings of C. Kühne: “Die Altäre ordneten sich den Göttern unter”;<sup>30</sup> A. Ünal: “Da fügten sich die Altäre den Göttern”;<sup>31</sup> H.A. Hoffner: “the altars were in harmony again with the gods”<sup>32</sup> and G. Beckman: “the altars were reconciled with the gods”<sup>33</sup> imply a conflict *between* the altars and the gods for which there is no evidence. The crucial

23 Laroche 1965: 90.

24 Kühne 1975: 182; Pecchioli Daddi/Polvani 1990: 79; Masson 1991: 124; Ünal 1994: 816; Hoffner 1998: 15; Mazoyer 2003: 73; Beckman 2003: 151.

25 Goetze 1995: 128.

26 Masson 1991: 138.

27 Mazoyer 2003: 79.

28 Pecchioli Daddi/Polvani 1990: 83.

29 Puhvel 1991: 100.

30 Kühne 1975: 186.

31 Ünal 1994: 818.

32 Hoffner 1998: 17.

33 Beckman 2003: 153.

point, however, is that it is the *altars* that are the subject of the verb *ḥandantati*, not the gods, so we must restore the opening passage accordingly. It should be clear that altars cannot be ‘stifled’ or ‘suffocated’.

This interpretation is confirmed by the fuller description of the same events in KUB 33.19 iii 2–7, apropos of the disappearance of another deity,<sup>34</sup> which is superior to the compressed and corrupt passage in KUB 17.10 iv 22–24, where the verb *tarnaš* ‘left’ is wrongly used of the hearth, sheep, and cattle:

- (4) (KUB 33.19 iii 2–7)  
 [G<sup>1</sup>Š<sup>AB</sup>]-ya kammaras̄ tarn[aš É-er tuḥḥuwaiš t]arnaš ZAG.GAR.  
 RA-aš ḥandattat [šerr=a=ššan DINGIR<sup>ME</sup>]<sup>š</sup> ḥantandati [GUNNI=ma  
 ḥanda]tta<t> šerr=a=ššan G<sup>1</sup>Š<sup>AB</sup>kalmiyēš [ḥantan]tat Éḥili=kan anda UDU<sup>H1.A</sup>  
 ḥantantati [INA É.GU]D=ma GUD<sup>H1.A</sup> ḥantantati

“The mist left the windows. The smoke left the house. The altar was put in order, and [also on it the go]ds were put in order. [The hearth was put in o]rder, and also on it the burning logs were put in order. In the fold the sheep were put in order, and in the corral the cattle were put in order.”

All available evidence argues that *wišūriya-* means ‘twist’ or ‘press’ (with *anda* = ‘twist, press together’). The only alleged evidence for ‘stifle, suffocate’ is the passage being discussed, where ‘altars’ as the subject excludes that interpretation. The evidence assembled by Carruba<sup>35</sup> falsifies his own conclusions:

- (5) KUB 9.6 + 35.39 iii 20–23 (Ritual of Kuwatalla; see Carruba’s own translation 1966: 50!)  
 nu 2 G<sup>1</sup>Š<sup>AB</sup>PISAN<sup>H1.A</sup> ŠA GI appezz[īya]z MUNUSŠU.GI ḥarzi EN  
 SISKUR=ma=šši=(y)aš mena[ḥḥ]anda IŠTU QATI=ŠU ēpzi nu=uš anda  
 wešuriyanzi nu=uš arḥa duwarnanzi

“The ‘old woman’ holds two tubes of reed from behind. The ritual client facing her takes hold of them with his hands. They twist them together and break them.”

34 See Laroche 1965: 123.

35 Carruba 1966: 50–52.

- (6) KUB 32.49a iii 8–9 (Libation to the Throne of Ḫebat)  
 MUŠEN<sup>HLA</sup>=*ma partāuwar*=šet [an]da QATAMMA *wišūriškezzi*

“While they likewise press together the wings of the birds.”

- (7) KUB 39.57 i 4 and 8 (Funeral Rite)  
 ZI<sup>HLA</sup> A.BĀR *anda wišurianteš*. . . ZI-TUM *wišuriantan arḫa lānzi*

“Souls of lead (are) pressed in(to a figurine). . . They release the (op-) pressed soul.”<sup>36</sup>

- (8) KUB 5.1 iii 51 (Oracular Inquiry about Campaign Routes)  
*kī kuit* KASKAL<sup>URU</sup> *Tanizila wišureškezzi*

“Seeing that he (the god) is (op)pressing the road to Tanizila. . .”

- (9) KUB 33.51, 4–6 (Disappearance of Ḫannaḫanna)  
<sup>d</sup>MAḪ-aš ZI=ŠU<sup>GIŠ</sup> *waršamaš wišūriyattati nu* <sup>GIŠ</sup> *waršaman maḫḫan lukkanzi*

“The soul of Ḫannaḫanna has been pressed together (like) kindling. As they set fire to kindling. . .”

- (10) KBo 31.76 lk. Kol. 8–10 (Disappearance of Ḫannaḫanna)  
*nu ḫatugaš miyēš* [ -a ] *nza=ma memi wišuriyanza=ma* EGIR-pa  
 [ḫan] *daḫḫut nu=tta takšuliandu*

“(Being) frightful, become mild! (Being) [silent?], speak! (Being) oppressed/out of sorts, be made right again! Let them reconcile/pacify you!”

The lexical entries in KBo 1.42 ii 26 and 40 also point to ‘twist’ and ‘constrict’: *wišuriyauwar* = Akkadian *zāru* ‘to twist’;<sup>37</sup> *wešuriyawar* = Akkadian *ḫanāqu* ‘to compress, constrict; strangle’, also ‘to become annoyed’.<sup>38</sup>

36 Compare with Carruba (1966: 51) also KUB 38.13, 9: ZI-TUM GUŠKIN *anda dam-me-i[n-kV]* “impr[ess] a soul of gold. . .”. See also Kapehuš 2010: 262, 267–268.

37 Thus with Goetze 1927: 129, contra Carruba 1966: 50; see CAD 21.72–3.

38 See CAD 6.77.

The correct meaning has now been confirmed by a new occurrence in the Hurro-Hittite Bilingual:

- (11) KBo 32.14 ii 47–49 (Hurro-Hittite Bilingual, Parables)  
*man=wa=šši=kan kiššaraš arḫa duwarnattari kunnaš=man=wa=šši=kan*  
*išḫunaūš arḫa wišūriattari*

“Would that his (the smith’s) hand be broken off! Would that his right upper arm be wrenched off!”

Contra E. Neu<sup>39</sup> *išḫunau-* means ‘upper arm’, not ‘sinew’, and the force of *arḫa* could be ‘completely’, but ‘off’ is more likely. In any case, the upper arm is at least twisted until it has been wrenched out of the socket. It is obvious that an upper arm cannot be ‘stifled’ or ‘choked’.

Outside our passage the Hittite verb is used exclusively of inanimate objects that are twisted or pressed together and of the soul, where it likewise most plausibly means either ‘oppressed’ (< ‘pressed’) or ‘out of sorts’ (< ‘twisted’). This sense also fits all the subjects in our passage. When neatly stacked logs burn, they inevitably collapse on each other and become twisted and pressed together, so that they burn poorly (hence the need for a poker to separate and reorder them). When herds of domestic animals are disturbed (especially by a threatening natural event such as an earthquake or an impending storm), they typically crowd together and even attempt to climb onto each other. Finally, the altars of the gods were certainly neatly ordered and (the images of) the gods on them (see KUB 20.1 iii 8 *maḫḫan=ma* DINGIR.MEŠ *taninuwanzi* “But when they arrange/put in order the gods. .”), and their being crowded together and made crooked with the disappearance of Telipinu would have been regarded as another serious sign of a world gone awry.

The verb that expresses the restoration of order and harmony, both physical and spiritual, is *ḫandā(i)-* ‘arrange, set right’. The concrete notion of *order* and proper alignment is made clear by the simile used to express Telipinu’s own return to his normal state, but it has generally been misinterpreted:

- (12) KUB 17.10 ii 31–32  
*GI-az lazzaiš māḫḫan ḫandānza zik<sup>d</sup>Telipinuš QATAMMA ḫandaḫḫut*

“As a/the *l* reed is well-aligned (i.e. straight), so may you, Telipinu, become well-aligned!”

39 Neu 1996: 153.

Compare also:

(13) KUB 33.8 iii 19–22

GI.DÜG.GA *maḥhan ḥandanza z[ig=a I]TTI* LUGAL MUNUS.LU[GAL]  
ANA KUR<sup>URU</sup> *Ḥatti QATAMMA ḥandanza ē[š]*

“As the ‘sweet reed’ is well-aligned, so may you, Telipinu, be thus well-aligned toward the king and queen and the land of Ḥatti.”

See correctly E. Neu: ‘(wohl) gefügt’<sup>40</sup> and E. Masson: ‘dressé droit’<sup>41</sup> against all others (C. Kühne: ‘sich flechten läßt/sich fügen’;<sup>42</sup> F. Pecchioli Daddi and A.M. Polvani: ‘disponibile’;<sup>43</sup> A. Ünal: ‘biegsam/fügsam’;<sup>44</sup> H.A. Hoffner: ‘pleasant’;<sup>45</sup> M. Mazoyer: ‘prêt’;<sup>46</sup> G. Beckman: ‘intertwined’).<sup>47</sup> Whatever the sense of *lazzaiš*, the outstanding characteristic of a reed is that it is *straight*. Moreover, it is straight because its individual sections are all *aligned* in a straight line. For the Hittites, like other Indo-European speakers, straight was good, and crooked or twisted was bad. All things that became misaligned through Telipinu’s disappearance were to be made straight again, and likewise Telipinu’s out-of-joint soul was again to become properly aligned.

### Bibliography

- Beckman, G., 2003: “The Wrath of Telipinu”, in W.W. Hallo, K.L. Younger Jr. (eds.), *The Context of Scripture*, 1., *Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, Leiden, 151–153.
- Carruba, O., 1966: *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišurijanza*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 2, Wiesbaden.
- Goetze, A., 1927: “Randnoten zu Forrers ‘Forschungen’”, *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* 1, 125–136.

40 Neu 1968: 41.

41 Masson 1991: 132.

42 Kühne 1975: 185.

43 Pecchioli Daddi/Polvani 1990: 81.

44 Ünal 1994: 818.

45 Hoffner 1998: 16.

46 Mazoyer 2003: 76.

47 Beckman 2003: 152.

- , 1955: "Hittite Myths, Epics, and Legends", in J.B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*, 2nd edition, Princeton, 120–128.
- Güterbock, H.G., 1964: "Lexicographical Notes 11", *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* 22/74, 95–113.
- , 1986: "A Religious Text from Maşat", *Anadolu Araştırmaları* 10, 205–214.
- Haas, V., Wilhelm, G., 1974: *Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Sonderreihe 3, Kevelaer—Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Hoffner, H.A. Jr., 1997: *The Laws of the Hittites. A Critical Edition*, Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui 23, Leiden—New York—Köln.
- , 1998: *Hittite Myths*, Second Edition, Writings from the Ancient World 2, Atlanta.
- Kapelus, M., 2010: "À propos du culte des ancêtres. Un aspect de la notion de l'âme chez les Hittites", *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 67, 259–269.
- Kühne, C., 1975: "Hethitische Texten", in W. Beyerlin (ed.), *Religionsgeschichtliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament*, Göttingen, 169–204.
- Laroche, E., 1965: "Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription. I. Mythologie anatolienne", *Revue Hittite et Asiatique* XXII/77, 61–178.
- Masson, E., 1991: *Le combat pour l'immortalité. Héritage indo-européen dans la mythologie anatolienne*, Presses Universitaires de France, Ethnologies, Paris.
- Mazoyer, M., 2003: *Télipinu, le dieu au marécage. Essai sur les mythes fondateurs du Royaume hittite*, Kubaba, Série Antiquité 11, Paris.
- Neu, E., 1968: *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 5, Wiesbaden.
- , 1996: *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I. Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Ḫattuša*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 32, Wiesbaden.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F., Polvani, A.M., 1990: *La mitologia ittita*, Testi del Vicino Oriente antico 4.1, Brescia.
- Popko, M., 1974: "Notes on Hittite Vocabulary", *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 26, 181–182.
- Puhvel, J., 1991: *Hittite Etymological Dictionary. Volume 3. Words beginning with H*, Trends in Linguistics, Documentation 5, Berlin—New York.
- Siegelová, J., 1971: *Appu-Märchen und Ḫedammu-Mythus*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 14, Wiesbaden.
- Únal, A., 1994: "Hethitische Mythen und Epen", in K. Hecker et al. (eds.), *Weisheitstexte, Mythen und Epen*, Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments 3, Gütersloh, 802–865.