

The New Akkadian Solar Hymn and Prayer from Ortaköy/Šapinuwa (DAAM 2.6): An Interpretation and Trilingual Commentary

Christopher Metcalf (The Queen's College, University of Oxford)

Summary

This article offers a detailed interpretation of the fragmentary Akkadian solar hymn and prayer from modern Ortaköy/ancient Šapinuwa recently published by D. Schwemer and A. Süel (DAAM 2.6). As recognised by its editors, DAAM 2.6 is an intermediary version that links the Sumerian solar hymn 'Utu N' from southern Mesopotamia to the Hittite corpus of solar hymns and prayers CTH 372–374 from central Anatolia. On the basis of DAAM 2.6 and other recent Sumerological and Hittitological research, the present article seeks to reconstruct the contexts and transmission of the Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite sources: it is here argued, in particular, that the poem is likely always to have been associated with royal cults of the Sun, in both Mesopotamia and Anatolia. DAAM 2.6 and related texts therefore deserve attention not only as a uniquely detailed example of multi-lingual literary transmission in the ancient Near East, but also as a paradigm for cultural and religious contact in the ancient world in general. The present article seeks to facilitate the interpretation of the sources by offering a commentary on those passages of the hymn and prayer that are currently extant in Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite, with a focus on philological aspects and on the choices made by the Hittite translators of the Sumero-Akkadian model.

It has long been recognised that the well-known Hittite corpus of hymns and prayers to the Sun-god CTH 372–374 was in many respects composed on the basis of Sumero-Akkadian

models from Mesopotamia.¹ An important new impetus arrived in 2009 with A. Cavigneaux's first edition of an Old Babylonian Sumerian solar hymn and prayer, which turned out to provide the ultimate model for two central and coherent sections of the Hittite texts, namely the opening hymn to the Sun-god and the diseased supplicant's prayer for information on the nature of the offence for which (he believes) he is being punished by his personal god.² In 2021 D. Schwemer and A. Süel published an Akkadian version of the solar hymn and prayer, written by a Hittite scribe and discovered in Ortaköy/Šapinuwa (DAAM 2.6), which agrees with previous conjectures that there must have existed an Akkadian intermediary between the Sumerian and Hittite texts.³ As a result, this Sumerian-Akkadian-Hittite solar hymn and prayer now presents an unprecedented combination of textual coherence, linguistic diversity and cultural impact. The fact that Sumero-Akkadian literature was copied and sometimes translated in the wider ancient Near East is well-known and well-documented.⁴ In this instance, we are in a unique

¹ See Güterbock (1958), with references to earlier scholarship.—I am grateful to Prof. A. Willi for his invitation to contribute to the Comparative Philology Graduate Seminar in Oxford, in March 2022, which gave me an opportunity to read DAAM 2.6 in detail, and to the participants in that Seminar for their responses. I also thank Prof. P. Attinger, Prof. H.C. Melchert, Prof. D. Schwemer and Dr C. Steitler for their improvements on earlier versions of this article; it should not be assumed that these colleagues necessarily agree with my argument in every respect. Please note the following supplements to the standard abbreviations: aBZL = Mittermayer (2006); DAAM 2 = Schwemer/Süel (2021); DGS = Jagersma (2010); EDHIL = Kloekhorst (2008); GHL = Hoffner/Melchert (2008); GSF = Attinger (2021).

² Cavigneaux (2009: 7–13), Metcalf (2011).

³ Schwemer/Süel (2021).

⁴ See e.g. Viano (2016).

position to reconstruct a very close translation and adaptation, across three languages, of large parts of a specific literary text, the influence of which demonstrably extended beyond scribal circles and shaped certain religious practices in the Hittite royal cult of local Anatolian deities. The remarkably full Sumero-Akkadian-Hittite evidence that is now available naturally offers a wealth of literary, historical, religious and linguistic information, but its wider interest lies in the fact that it also presents a particularly richly documented example of the transmission, not only of texts, but also of attendant concepts and practices, across ancient cultures. On the basis of certain underlying commonalities—such as, most fundamentally, the shared worship of solar deities—specific ways of speaking about the Sun-god were selectively translated and adapted from a Mesopotamian to an Anatolian environment. The case of this solar hymn and prayer therefore deserves attention not only as a multi-disciplinary philological challenge, but also as a paradigm for cross-cultural influence in the ancient world.⁵

The present article seeks to address both aspects. The first two sections attempt a reconstruction of the textual and literary history, combining the new evidence of DAAM 2.6 with several other significant contributions of recent Sumerological and Hittitological research. The third and fourth sections offer a text and interpretation of the better-preserved trilingual sections that are now extant, in the opening hymn to the Sun and the supplicant's prayer to the personal god. My interpretation, which is presented as a commentary on the texts, is intended to complement Schwemer's excellent edition of, and notes on, DAAM 2.6, in the sense that it exploits the new Akkadian source to illuminate the still partly obscure Sumerian text, and devotes special attention to the choices made by the Hittite translators in interpreting the Sumero-Akkadian source.

⁵ The latter point has been recognised, and applied to a different context (early Greece and the ancient Near East), by Clarke (2019: 25–26 with n.95).

The Literary-Historical Development

To begin with the Sumerian evidence, the recent dissertation of Glenn (2019) has made several contributions to the interpretation of the hymn and prayer known as ‘Utu the Hero’ or, as it will here be called, ‘Utu N’.⁶ The main extant manuscript of ‘Utu N’, H 150 from Meturan (= ms. A), identifies the poem as a *ser₃-gid₂-da* (perhaps ‘Highly-Pitched Song’) of Utu. Glenn offers both a commentary on ‘Utu N’ that clarifies certain philological problems (see esp. on Utu N, 46–48, below) and a contextualisation of ‘Utu N’ within the well-documented corpus of Old Babylonian Sumerian *ser₃-gid₂-da*-poems. Two main insights result from this. The first is that *ser₃-gid₂-da*-poems are ‘hymnic’ in the sense that they are concerned primarily with the praise of deities, and that this praise is closely intertwined with references to human kingship: as Glenn shows, *ser₃-gid₂-da*-poems can in that sense be called ‘royal hymns’, and their performance context is to be sought in royal rituals.⁷ No king is mentioned, implicitly or explicitly, in the extant parts of ‘Utu N’: the central transitional section, which moves from the

⁶ ‘Utu the hero’, which is the translation of the incipit (^dutu ur-saĝ), is the title used in several recent publications. RIA s.v. Sonnengott A I §7.3.4 and the list of Sumerian literary compositions in GSF 21–56 have however labelled the text as ‘Utu N’, and so I adopt this title for the sake of consistency with Sumerological conventions. In the catalogue of sources for ‘Utu N’ that is given in RIA, read ‘H 150’ instead of ‘H 180++’: the latter is a manuscript of a separate solar hymn, known as ‘Incantation to Utu F’, also edited by Cavigneaux (2009: 3–7). This error results from Polonsky (2002: 50–1 nn.127, 131), and appears to have misled Baragli (2022: xvii and *passim*), who erroneously treats ‘Utu the hero’ (^dutu ur-saĝ) and ‘Utu N’ as distinct compositions.

⁷ Glenn (2019: 88–97, 155–190).

praises of the Sun-god to the supplicant's situation, is currently lost. But Glenn's study makes it seem overwhelmingly likely that this hymn too was composed for use in royal cult: the unnamed supplicant who prays to Utu for intercession with his angry personal god, at the end of 'Utu N', can probably be described as a royal person.⁸ This agrees very well with the Hittite evidence, since the Hittite versions CTH 372–374 are clearly linked to Hittite kingship: this is true of the older extant versions, i.e. CTH 374, where the supplicant is an unnamed king, and CTH 373, where the supplicant is Kantuzili, who was a member of the royal family (see below, on the Hittite sources). In other words, the results of Glenn's study suggest that the translation and adaptation of the Sumero-Akkadian model in CTH 372–374 reflects, not only an interest in certain aspects of the Mesopotamian Sun-god, but also an interest in appropriating the literary language of praise and prayer from a Mesopotamian royal context to an Anatolian royal context.⁹

The second insight contributed by Glenn is that 'Utu N' possesses, in its final section, clear affinities with personal prayers for appeasing an angry deity, and that these affinities were already perceived by Old Babylonian scribes in Nippur, as shown by the contexts in which 'Utu N' is cited in two Old Babylonian literary catalogues (STVC 41 obv. 12' and Schollmeyer Šamaš 34 II 10).¹⁰ Yet there exists no contradiction between our poem's likely setting in a royal cult of Utu and the supplicant's language of lament and penitential prayer for divine appeasement. The latter element has recently been studied by Jaques (2015), in a study of Mesopotamian *piété privée* as reflected primarily in prayers known as er₂-ša₃-ḫuḡ-ḡa₂ and,

⁸ Glenn (2019: 178–179).

⁹ Compare further the links between the Sun-god Utu and kingship in Sumerian literary hymns like ŠQ 11 and CUSAS 38.9 (Sin-iddinam).

¹⁰ Glenn (2019: 68–75, 276–282).

relatedly, *diġir-ša₃-dab₍₅₎-ba*, both of which aimed to appease divine anger. Jaques adopts a traditional evolutionary view, according to which such prayers were originally composed for the use of non-royal individuals in the Old Babylonian period, and therefore testify to the *piété populaire* at that stage, before being integrated into Assyrian royal rituals in the first millennium BC.¹¹ Yet the existence of an early bilingual manuscript in the palace archive at Mari points to a plausible royal context of penitential prayers for divine appeasement in the early second millennium BC (ca. 1800 BC).¹² It may seem surprising to see an Old Babylonian royal subject depicted as a penitent suppliant suffering from divine anger, and even contemplating imminent death, as is probably the case in ‘Utu N’, but Old Babylonian Sumerian (and later) sources offer clear parallels for this topos (which typically leads to, or implicitly presupposes, the restitution of divine favour and the king’s salvation).¹³ All of this encourages the view that personal prayers for the appeasing of divine anger could take place in royal contexts as early as in the Old Babylonian period, and it is in such a setting that I would situate ‘Utu N’, following Glenn. The implication for CTH 372–374 is that the combination of hymnic praise of the Sun-god with the language of lament and prayers for divine appeasement, in a royal setting, is an adaptation of the Sumero-Akkadian model rather than an innovation. The new Akkadian version DAAM 2.6 from Ortaköy/Šapinuwa now strengthens the usual conjecture that the Hittite translation and adaptation was made on the basis of an Akkadian

¹¹ Jaques (2015: 329–330).

¹² As observed by Guichard (2015: 351–353) in his edition of the text.

¹³ See esp. the poem ‘Išme-Dagan AB’, with Ludwig/Metcalf (2017: 2–3), and Gabbay (2014: 12–14, 289) on further OB evidence; cf. Schwemer (2019: esp. 26–43) on the ‘kontraintuitiver König’ in the later *Bīt rimki*-ritual.

intermediary.¹⁴ While the precise nature of the transmission from Sumerian to Akkadian remains hypothetical, the most economical combination of the available evidence seems to be the following. It would be unexpected to encounter an independent unilingual Akkadian version of ‘Utu N’ in an Old Babylonian Mesopotamian setting, since the extant corpus of Old Babylonian Akkadian hymnic poetry consists of original Akkadian compositions that were generally inspired by Sumerian conventions in form and content but that were not translations of any particular Sumerian text.¹⁵ In an Old Babylonian setting, direct Akkadian translations of Sumerian hymnic compositions are found in bilingual (rather than unilingual) manuscripts, and that is exactly what is attested for ‘Utu N’ by ms. E (BM 78614), a (partial) Sumerian version with an interlinear Akkadian translation maybe from Sippar (see the following section, below). I would assume that it was a bilingual Sumero-Akkadian version of this kind that was used to produce a unilingual Akkadian version like DAAM 2.6, which is written with Hittite sign-forms (and in partly faulty Akkadian orthography) and was therefore clearly produced in a Hittite context. No Sumero-Akkadian bilingual version of ‘Utu N’ is so far attested in a Hittite context, but it is perhaps legitimate to compare the Sumero-Akkadian bilingual manuscripts of two incantations to Utu that have been found at Hattusa.¹⁶

It was then no doubt on the basis of Akkadian versions like DAAM 2.6 that the translation and adaptation into Hittite took place.¹⁷ While it is not clear which extant Hittite version is the

¹⁴ e.g. Metcalf (2011: 175–176), Weeden (2020: 516).

¹⁵ Metcalf (2015a: 50–78).

¹⁶ CTH 793, CTH 794. The comparison has also been made in part by Klinger (2010: 329, 332) and Weeden (2020: 516).

¹⁷ Schwemer/Süel (2021: 2) envisage a possible bilingual Akkadian-Hittite version, like DAAM 2.9 (a bilingual invocation in which the supplicant is probably Tuthaliya II.).

oldest, it is agreed that the two earliest versions are CTH 374 (in which the supplicant is an unnamed king) and CTH 373 (the prayer of Kantuzili, probably the brother of king Tuṭḫaliya II.), both of which date to the Early Empire period (late 15th/early 14th century BC), whereas CTH 372 (the prayer of an unnamed mortal, who may also be a royal individual) represents a later adaptation.¹⁸ This corresponds well to the probable royal setting of the ultimate Sumerian model: the translation of the Sumero-Akkadian solar hymn and prayer was no doubt likewise commissioned and carried out in a royal setting, for use in royal worship of the Sun-god. As D. Schwemer comments on another recent find from Ortaköy/Şapinuwa, a bilingual (Akkadian-Hittite) invocation of the gods of the Underworld in which the supplicant may be Tuṭḫaliya II. (DAAM 2.9): ‘the provision of suitable devotional texts to the king should not be underestimated as one of the driving factors in the reception and adaptation of Mesopotamian hymns and prayers in Hittite Anatolia’.¹⁹

Second, within the Hittite tradition, CTH 372–374 exerted a strong influence on the wider corpus of Hittite prayers. As is well-known, the opening solar hymn was selectively adapted in a hymn to the Anatolian Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.1).²⁰ More recent research has shown that the supplicant’s central prayer for information on the nature of his offence also had

¹⁸ On the dating see Schwemer (2015), Daues/Rieken (2018: 4–5 with n.5). On Kantuzili see now de Martino (2016: 49–50), and add the new information provided by the letters DAAM 2.12 and 15. On the identity of the supplicant in CTH 372, note that royal supplicants were commonly referred to simply as a ‘person’ (lu₂) in Old Babylonian Sumerian religious poetry, e.g. CUSAS 38.1 rev. 44 and 2 obv. 6, and the OB er₂-ša₃-ḫuḡ-ḡa₂ BM 29632 rev. 39 with Gabbay (2014: 289).

¹⁹ Schwemer/Süel (2021: 39).

²⁰ Güterbock (1958: 245), Metcalf (2015a: 97–100).

an afterlife, in Mursili II.'s attempts to discover the religious causes of a plague afflicting the Hittites.²¹ According to the monographic study of Hittite prayers by Daues/Rieken (2018), CTH 372–374 as a whole can even be said to have provided certain structural and formal templates that were adapted and varied in later Hittite compositions.²² All of this tends to confirm the view, expressed long ago e.g. by E. Laroche, that the Hittite genre of literary hymns and prayers is likely to have developed primarily under the influence of Mesopotamian models.²³ In terms of religious history, according to M. Hutter, CTH 372–374 contributed decisively to the rise of the male Sun-god (as distinct from the female Sun-goddess of Arinna) in the Hittite pantheon, from the Early Empire period onwards.²⁴ The Hittite translators appear to have selected Sumero-Akkadian texts that suited their own religious priorities: as C. Steitler argues in an extensive discussion, certain pre-existing religious commonalities facilitated the translation and adaptation of specific texts that developed themes that were of interest from a Hittite perspective.²⁵ On the basis of Steitler's study of Anatolian solar deities, these underlying commonalities included the very belief in a male Sun-god, and his perceived affinity to justice and human kingship.²⁶ The notion of human transgression and divine punishment, and the use

²¹ Metcalf (2015b).

²² Daues/Rieken (2018: e.g. 123–126, 173–174, 179–180, 296–302).

²³ Laroche (1955: 336) and (2016: 447), cf. Wilhelm (1994: 68, 74).

²⁴ Hutter (2021: 124–127). See now also Soysal (2019) on recent archaeological discoveries relating to a possible solar temple (E₂ ^dUTU) in Hattusa.

²⁵ Steitler (2017: 371–376).

²⁶ According to this view, which is seemingly questioned by Taracha (2020: 125) but accepted by Hutter (2021: 125–126), the concept of a Hittite male Sun-god was derived from Luwian

of oracular inquiry to establish the divine will (as proposed by the supplicant in ‘Utu N’ and DAAM 2.6), were presumably similarly intelligible and relatable to the Hittite translators. What the Sumero-Akkadian texts offered was a form of words to combine and articulate these concepts. As M. Weeden has put it: ‘It is certainly not the case that there was no oracular activity in Anatolia before the translation of *Utu the Hero* or its probable Akkadian counterpart, nor is it likely that the gods were not asked in prayers to reveal the cause of their displeasure before Utu arrived in Anatolia. However, the efficacy of a prayer depends greatly on the words that are chosen, and the choice of the appropriate words is no doubt the work of scholars.’²⁷ In this connection, another Hittite contribution lies in the fact that the translations found in CTH 372–374 are of high quality: as the following commentary hopes to document, departures from the Akkadian model in CTH 372–374 can usually be argued, at least, to reflect deliberate adaptations, whereas clear errors or misunderstandings are rare. Another recent study by A. Daues and E. Rieken suggests that the prayers were also composed in a three-unit verse-pattern that was characteristic of the Hittite genre.²⁸ Some phraseological details may, finally, remind

and Palaic traditions, and then strengthened and elaborated by the Sumero-Akkadian influence reflected in CTH 372–374.

²⁷ Weeden (2020: 516). Compare perhaps KUB 4.53 as interpreted by Rutz (2012): the obverse is likely to be an Akkadian incantation to the Sun-god, the reverse contains Akkadian medical diagnostic-prognostic omnia relating to illness.

²⁸ Daues/Rieken (2019).

us of the fact that Hittite is an Indo-European language, and that certain ways of calling on the gods may have closer comparanda in that realm than in the literary Sumero-Akkadian models.²⁹

The Constitution of the Texts

Rich and stimulating as the Sumerian-Akkadian-Hittite textual evidence may now be, it is important to remember that the extant sources are mere fragments of what must have been a much larger network of texts. The Sumerian source ‘Utu N’ provides the ultimate model for most, but not all, of the opening solar hymn as preserved in CTH 374 and 372. While the central transitional section of ‘Utu N’ is unfortunately not extant at present, the supplicant’s prayer for information on the nature of his offence in ‘Utu N’ and DAAM 2.6 offers the model for the central prayer-section attested in CTH 372 and 373. But this prayer-section seems not to have been contained in CTH 374, which, according to the recent analysis of A. Daues and E. Rieken, had a simpler structure than CTH 373 and 372.³⁰ If this is correct, then CTH 374 diverged in at least one significant respect from the Sumero-Akkadian models. It seems unwise to speculate further, given the fragmentary state of the sources: a possible reconstruction is perhaps that CTH 374 and 373 are both adaptations of an older *Vorlage*, and that CTH 374 represents a simplified version whereas CTH 373 followed the Sumero-Akkadian model more closely. What is clear is that the Hittite versions also enrich and extend the supplicant’s prayer with

²⁹ See below on CTH 372 §4 30–31 // CTH 374 §9’ 19–20. Compare the ‘Relativstil’ in the Hittite version of the Ištar-prayer CTH 312, with Metcalf (2015a: 93–94); and Watkins (1995: 167).

³⁰ Daues/Rieken (2018: 40–41, 118–119, 183–205).

lamentational topoi that are separately derived from Mesopotamian sources.³¹ In this respect the new Akkadian source from Ortaköy/Šapinuwa is closer to ‘Utu N’ than to CTH 372–374, since ‘Utu N’ and DAAM 2.6 appear to have been of roughly similar length. The opening of DAAM 2.6 is fragmentary, but the verbs at the end of lines 7 and 8 clearly correspond to lines 7 and 8 of ‘Utu N’. There appears to be no space here for an Akkadian counterpart to the elaborate introduction of the suppliant in CTH 372 §1 (partly preserved in CTH 374 §1). After another fragmentary passage and a break that D. Schwemer estimates at approximately five lines, the text resumes at obv. 2’ with another direct parallel to the Sumerian version (= Utu N, 13, see below). The end of the Akkadian prayer-section is again fragmentary, but its final lines announce the suppliant’s intention to sing the praises of the Sun-god (DAAM 2.6 rev. 8’–9’), which corresponds to the final line of ‘Utu N’, and the colophon to DAAM 2.6 adds that the composition is completed (al-ti1) at that point.³² By contrast, the corresponding Hittite passage occurs much earlier in the fullest preserved version (CTH 372 §20’ 180), and seems to promise praises of the personal god rather than of the Sun-god.³³ At the same time, other parallel passages offer different perspectives: the suppliant’s prayer for information in DAAM 2.6 rev. 23–25 probably had the same structure as the Hittite versions, as opposed to ‘Utu N’ (see below on Utu N, 53–57), which makes the Akkadian and Hittite versions seem closer to

³¹ See Güterbock (1974), Jaques (2015: 19–20). Further, the ritual descriptions contained within the Hittite prayers have clear parallels in Sumero-Akkadian *Gebetsbeschwörungen*: see now Baragli (2022: 153–157).

³² [DUB] 1¹.KAM.MU AL.TIL, ‘First [tablet]. Completed.’ The inclusion of a sequence number (‘First tablet’) is conventional, and does not here imply the existence of further tablets: Waal (2015: 140).

³³ The crucial word, DINGIR-YA, is written above the line (KUB 31.127 col. iii 37’).

each other than to the Sumerian. Yet, in a related passage, the Akkadian version appears to omit the supplicant's famous reflections on life and death, which are contained in both the Sumerian and the Hittite texts (see below on CTH 373 §5' 34–37 // CTH 372 §11 100–104). In sum: not only are the extant texts fragmentary (only CTH 372 contains the beginning and most of the middle and end), but even if they were fully preserved, there would remain many gaps in our understanding of the transmission.

The praise of the Sun-god: Trilingual Text and Commentary

While the opening ca. 17 lines of DAAM 2.6 are lost (see above), the obverse of the tablet still preserves substantial parts of the introductory hymn to the Sun-god. Here, the supplicant praises the Sun-god's important position in the pantheon, before describing his benevolent attitude to humans and his interest in justice, which extends even to animals.³⁴

Sum. (Utu the Hero = Utu N, 13)

A: ^dutu ka ba-zu giri₁₇ šu ḥa-pa-ĝar

B : ^dutu ka pa-zu giri₁₇ šu ḥa-pa-ĝa₂-al

‘Utu, your utterance truly commands a gesture of respect.’³⁵

³⁴ Some of these hymnic commonplaces of course occur also in other Sumero-Akkadian religious poetry devoted to the Sun-god, see e.g. Metcalf (2011: 169–70), Baragli (2022: 272–275), but ‘Utu the hero’ / ‘Utu N’ remains the most coherent parallel text known to me, especially as it also contains the ensuing prayer of the diseased supplicant.

³⁵ This translation, which resembles that of Cavigneaux, assumes that ḥa-pa-ĝar/ĝa₂-al represents *ḥa-ba-ĝal₂, where -ba- is the 3rd person non-human indirect object-prefix (DGS

Akk. (DAAM 2.6 obv. 2')

[] ʽxʽ *ap-pa-šu-nu i-l[a-ab-bi-nu]*

‘[...] they (the gods) make a gesture of respect.’

Hitt. (CTH 372 §4 30–31 // CTH 374 §9' 19–20)³⁶

30. *kwitt=a* ^dUTU-uš *memiškeši*

31. DINGIR.MEŠ-(š)š=*a āppa tuk=pat aruwēškanzi*

‘Also whatever you say, Sun-god,

it is you to whom the gods also incline in return.’³⁷

§17.2.1), the literal sense being ‘your utterance truly lets the hand be placed on the nose’. Alternatively, P. Attinger suggests (*per litteras*) that we should distinguish between *giri*₁₇ *šu* *ġar* and *giri*₁₇ *šu* *ġal*₂, where the latter denotes the usual gesture of respect and the former means, in this instance, ‘to be placed (i.e. the hand) on the nose (as a gesture of obedience)’, or ‘to impose obedience’ in a causative sense.

³⁶ For CTH 372–374, I have followed the editions of Rieken et al. (2017).

³⁷ The sense of the additive enclitic particle (*kwitt=a*), if the geminate spelling is to be taken seriously, is that the act of inclining before the Sun-god is an elaboration of the gods’ general submissive posture, which is described in the preceding clause (CTH 372 §4 28–29 // CTH 374 §8' 18; I owe this interpretation to H.C. Melchert). Rieken et al. (2017) translate ‘Was auch immer du, Sonnengott, sagst, die Götter aber verneigen sich wiederum vor DIR’, presumably

Commentary: The Akkadian translation offers *appa labānu*, which is the expected equivalent to Sumerian giri₁₇ šu ĝal₂, literally (Sum.) ‘to place the hand on the nose’ / (Akk.) ‘to stroke the nose’ (as a gesture of respect). As previously noted, the Hittite translator chose, not a literal rendering, which would not have been idiomatic in a Hittite context, but a culturally sensitive interpretation: *aruwai-*, ‘to incline’, captures the sense of the Sumero-Akkadian original and translates it into an equivalent gesture (Metcalf (2011): 172).

In stylistic terms, as E. Rieken comments, the frequent use of the 2nd sg. personal pronoun in the Hittite version casts a spotlight on the deity’s special position in the pantheon, and is a characteristic feature of Hittite hymnic praise (Rieken/Daues 2018: 162). Here, as throughout the introductory hymn (CTH 372 §§1–4 // CTH 374 §§2’–14’), the Hittite translator intensified this emphasis by appending the focus particle *-pat* to 2nd sg. personal pronouns referring to the Sun-god, though occasional variation shows that this was not felt to be absolutely compulsory.³⁸ Parallels can be found in the suppliant’s appeals to the personal god CTH 373 §2’ 11–13 (// CTH 372 §9 77–79) and in the subsequent adaptation

on the understanding that DINGIR.MEŠ-ša contains the non-geminating, contrastive enclitic *-a*. According to HGL §29.38, such logographic spellings can however conceal the geminating, conjunctive *-a* in older Hittite texts (e.g. LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL-ša can represent **ḥaššuš ḥaššušarašš=a*, ‘the king and queen’).

³⁸ In this hymnic context I translate *-pat* as ‘it is (you) who...’, following a suggestion by H.C. Melchert. For a recent linguistic study of the particle, see Sideltsev (2020).

of the solar hymn in the praises of the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.1 §4' 34–57).³⁹ The new Akkadian version (DAAM 2.6) offers a partial model for this usage, in its occasional repetition of the 2nd sg. pronoun *attā*, ‘you’ (see the following sections), yet the general tone of the Hittite hymn is much more insistent than what is found in the Sumero-Akkadian models, and the almost mechanical anaphora of the pronoun with *-pat* perhaps seems rather more reminiscent of the ‘Du-Stil’ of hymnic praise and prayer in Greco-Roman (and other Indo-European) religious poetry.⁴⁰

Sum. (Utu the Hero = Utu N, 14–16):

14. A: ^dutu ad-da nu-sig₁₁-me-en

B: ^dutu ad-da nu-uš-ki-mi-en

C: ^dutu at-ta(?) nu-siki-me-en

15. A: ^dutu ama BA nu-mu-un-kuš₈-me-en

B: ^dutu ama u₂-mu-un-ku-šu-ḫe₂(?)

C: ^dutu ma nu-um-^ʾuku₂-me-en

³⁹ See also the Middle Hittite hymn to the Storm-god CTH 313 II 1–5 (...*tuk paiš...tuk zinnit...tuel=pat gulašša tarranut*).

⁴⁰ See Norden (1913: 149–160), West (2007: 310–311). Compare the style of the prayers to the Sun-goddess of the Earth (CTH 371.1), which are thought to reflect Old Hittite traditions that predate Sumero-Akkadian influence (Steitler (2018): 238–242).

16. A: ^dutu ki-gul-la šu-ĝar-gi-ne-me-en

B: ^dutu ki-^ʾgul^ʾ-la₂ šu-ĝar-gi-ne-mi-en

C: ^dutu ki-gul-la šu-g[i₄(?)]-i-ne-me-en

‘Utu, you are the father of the orphan,

Utu, you are the mother of the widow,

Utu, you are the avenger of the destitute.’

Akk. (DAAM 2.6 obv. 3’–4’):

3’. [ša e-ku]-^ʾti(!)^ʾ u[m-m]u ^ʾat^ʾ-ta ^dUTU ^ʾa-bi^ʾ a[t-ta ^dUTU]

4’. ^d[UTU^ʾ ša ki-gu[l-l]a-ti mu-te-^ʾer^ʾ gi₅-mi-i[l-li-ša at-ta]

‘You are the mother of the orphan(?), Utu, you are the father, Utu,

Utu, you are the avenger of the destitute.’

Hitt. (CTH 372 §4 32–33):

32. ^dUTU-uš dammeišḫandaš kurimmašš[=a a]ntuḫḫaš attaš annaš zik

33. kurim[m]aš da[m]m[i]šḫandaš antuḫḫaš kattawātar zik[=pa]t ^dUTU-uš šarninkiškeši

‘Sun-god, you are the father and mother of the oppressed and orphaned person,

It is you, Sun-god, who makes compensation for the grievance of the orphaned and oppressed person.’

Variant (CTH 374 §10'–11' 21–22):

21. ^dUTU-*uš* *kurimmaš wannumiyašš=a attuš annaš zik*

22. [...] ^dUTU *kurimmaš dammešhantašš=a antuḥšaš k[attawa]tar zik(=pat) ^dUTU-*uš*
šarninkiškeši*

‘Sun-god, you are the father and mother of the orphaned and widowed person,

Sun-god, it is you who makes compensation for the grievance of the orphaned and
oppressed person.’

Commentary: The triad nu-siki, nu-mu(-un)-kuš and ki-gul-la, ‘orphan’, ‘widow’, ‘destitute’, is conventional in Sumerian, as noted by Cavigneaux, and more widely in ancient Near Eastern literature: compare, e.g., in reverse order, ‘Woe to those who make unjust laws, to those who issue oppressive decrees, / to deprive the poor of their rights and withhold justice from the oppressed of my people, / making widows their prey and robbing the fatherless’ (Isaiah 10:1–2).⁴¹ Equally conventional is the topos of addressing a deity, or some other strongly protective figure, as a mother and/or father: see Gudea Cyl. A III 6–7 for a well-known Sumerian example; Yakubovich (2015: 43) for Hittite, Luwian, Palaic and Phoenician attestations; and Homer, Iliad VI 429–30 (in words spoken by one Trojan character to another—Andromache to Hector—and so perhaps still in an imagined Anatolian context) and Propertius, Elegies I 11.23.

⁴¹ Compare Utu F, 52–55; Incantation to Utu, 37–38, 71–72; and further e.g. Kutter (2008: 395–396), Baragli (2022: 112–113).

Within this frame, the present passage exhibits considerable variation of detail: no version is an exact translation of another, and this illustrates that the extant manuscripts really are mere fragments of a much larger network of texts. The Akkadian rendering subsumes the ‘mother/father’-metaphors into a single clause (‘You are the mother and the father’), and is in this sense closer to the Hittite than to the Sumerian, and neither the Akkadian (as reconstructed) nor the Hittite version according to CTH 372 mention the ‘widow’ (the expected Akk. term being *almattum*). But the Sumerian text and the Hittite version CTH 374 are closer to each other than to the Akkadian (as reconstructed) in that both have two separate terms to refer to the individual who lacks a male relative (Sum. *nu-mu(-un)-kuš*, ‘widow’, and *nu-siki*, ‘orphan’; Hitt. *kurimma-*, *wannumiya-*, both of which in essence mean a person that is ‘bereft’ or ‘single’).⁴² The Sumerian, Akkadian and Hittite versions according to CTH 374 reserve the ‘destitute’ or ‘oppressed’ person (*ki-gul-la* / *kigullatum* / *dammeišhanda-*) to the notion of ‘avenging the destitute/oppressed’ in the final element, whereas CTH 372 mentions the ‘oppressed’ (*dammeišhanda-*) already in the preceding ‘mother/father’-clause. Finally, both of the Hittite versions show a tendency to variation in repetition, by resuming the reference to the ‘orphan’ (*kurimma-*) in the final element, unlike both the Sumerian and Akkadian texts.

Of greater interest than these relatively inconsequential variations are two semantic aspects. First, while the lexical equations that underlie the Akkadian version are not surprising in themselves, they raise questions about the correct translation of the Akkadian terms *ekūtu(m)* (= *nu-siki*), ‘orphan’ (if correctly restored), and *kigullatu(m)* (= *ki-gul-la*), ‘destitute person’. Both words are morphologically feminine in Akkadian, and in the former case scholars have traditionally followed the CAD s.v. *ekūtu* in interpreting the term as

⁴² See HED s.v. *kurimma-*, EDHIL s.v. *uannum(m)iya*, and Oettinger (2021).

referring specifically to persons of female gender (hence Schwemer’s ‘you are the father [of the *orphaned gi]rl’*). The Sumerian version however gives no reason to think that the ‘orphan’ should be thought of as feminine, and the Hittite translator saw no implication of femininity either: both of the extant Hittite versions speak of ‘persons’ (*antuḫša-*) in general. This clearly encourages the view, independently expressed by K. Volk and M. Stol, that *ekūtu(m)* is not inherently feminine in meaning, and should rather be translated as ‘orphan’ *vel sim.* (common gender).⁴³ Likewise in the case of *kigullatu(m)*, the Sumero-Akkadian-Hittite lexical correspondence that is now available gives no reason to suppose that the ancients saw anything specifically feminine in the term, and so traditional translations such as ‘destitute woman’ should again be abandoned in favour of the common-gender ‘destitute’ (*vel sim.*), just as the Hittite translator took it (*dammišḫandaš antuḫšaš*, ‘of the oppressed person’).⁴⁴ It is well-established that the feminine suffix in Akkadian has a wide range of uses: while I am not equipped to offer a formal linguistic classification, I suggest only that *ekūtu(m)* and *kigullatu(m)* belong to those Akkadian concrete nouns that are morphologically feminine but do not denote female gender.⁴⁵

⁴³ Volk (2006: 59–60): ‘Waise; mittelloses Kind’; Stol (2016: 275 n.1) and (slightly differently) in RIA s.v. ‘Waise’ §1.

⁴⁴ Recent discussions of *kigullatu(m)* are Klein (2017: 31 n.31) and Kogan/Krebernik (2020: 479), but note that it is not clear that the form **kigullu* is attested in context, since *ki-gul-lim* in the diagnostic text and commentary cited by CAD s.v. *kigullu* B does not belong here, according to Scurlock/Andersen (2005: 432 with nn.). The usual form seems to be *kigullatu(m)*, as in DAAM 2.6.

⁴⁵ GAG³ §60a, and cf. the study of feminine gender in OB Akkadian nouns by Streck (2010).

The second point of interest are the Hittite translator's choices in translating the Sumerian-Akkadian notion of 'vengeance'. Sumerian *šu-ĝar gi*₍₄₎, 'to avenge', unsurprisingly yields Akkadian *gimillam turru(m)*: see now U. 32332 II 5'-7' (ed. Ludwig 2021) for that equation in an OB lexical text, and CAD s.v. *gimillu* 2.b). As previously noted, *gimillum* is the expected Akkadian counterpart to Hittite *kattawatar* (Metcalf (2011): 172): the correspondence between *gimillam turru(m)* and *kattawatar šanḫ-* (HAB I 21 // II 22) suggests that *kattawatar* was seen to be a Hittite approximation of *gimillum*, at least. Yet, as Melchert (1979: 268-71) has shown, *kattawatar* means, not 'vengeance', but the object for which vengeance or retribution might be sought ('grounds for a quarrel', 'grievance'), and *kattawatar šanḫ-* at HAB I 21 // II 22 should thus be translated as 'to seek grounds for a quarrel' (the subject being the vindictive former Hittite crown prince). If *gimillam turru(m)* could be rendered as *kattawatar šanḫ-* at HAB I 21 // II 22, why did the Hittite translator choose a different rendering of the same Akkadian phrase (as DAAM 2.6 now shows) in the solar hymn? While *kattawatar šanḫ-* in the sense 'to seek grounds for a quarrel' would evidently not have been appropriate to the present context, the verb *šanḫ-* is regularly used in religious poetry in the sense 'to seek punishment', including with divine subjects (CHD s.v. *šanḫ-* 5.), and it would therefore have been possible, I think, for the translator to use a form of *šanḫ-*, with or without *kattawatar*, to describe the Sun-god's intervention on behalf of the destitute. Instead, the translator appears to have preferred to amplify the legalistic aspect of *kattawatar* by complementing it with the verb *šarnink-*, to convey the notion of 'compensation', which is common in legal contexts. Yet the attestations in CHD s.v. *šarni(n)k-* (and *šarnikzil-*) suggest that *šarnink-* much more commonly describes the action of the guilty party (or a person held responsible on behalf of the guilty party) in making

compensation, rather than the action of a benevolent third party such as the Sun-god.⁴⁶ In sum, the phrase *kattawatar šarnink-*, which seems to be unique, may have an experimental quality: in attempting to convey the Mesopotamian notion that the Sun-god can intervene directly in human affairs, the Hittite translator resorted to legal terminology that is focused on the ‘grievance’ (*kattawatar*) of the wronged and on the expectation that someone ‘compensate’ (*šarnink-*) for what was done, even though the latter notion is not wholly appropriate to the Sun-god as a third party.

Sum. (Utu the Hero = Utu N, 17):

17. maš₂-anše niĝ₂-ur₂-limmu zi-zi laḥ₄-laḥ₄-ṛe(?)¹ u₂ duru₅-še₃ ki-nu₂

‘Raising the cattle, all the quadrupeds, in order to(?) deliver them to the well-watered pasture, a place of rest.’

Akk. (DAAM 2.6 obv. 5'–6'):

5'. bu-ul ḏŠAKKAN₂ š[a] ṛ4 GIR₃¹.MEŠ-šu te-ṛde₄¹-ek-ki-[ma]

6'. a-na ma-aš-qi₂-i[m t]u-ub-ṛbaṭ¹-[šu]

⁴⁶ The closest parallel seems to be Bronzetafel II 74–77, cited by CHD s.v. *šarni(n)k-* e. 1', where the king mentions that he always ‘compensates’ (*anda šarninkiškimi*) his protégé Kuruntiya for anything that he has lost, and prescribes that his son and grandson shall keep ‘compensating’ the descendants of Kuruntiya in the same way. On the legalistic tone of Hittite prayer-language, see e.g. Laroche (1955: 336).

‘You raise the four-footed cattle of Šakkan,
you deliver them to the watering-place.’

Hitt. (CTH 372 // CTH 374):

—

Commentary: The Akkadian translation *tedekki* ‘you raise’, confirms the reading *zi-zi*, ‘raising’, in the Sumerian source, doubted by Cavigneaux. For the second part of the verse, Cavigneaux suggested *laḥ₄-laḥ₄ pu₂(?) u₂-a-še₃ ki-nu₂*; since the Akkadian version makes no reference to a ‘well’ (*pu₂*), I would tentatively consider the reading *ṛe⁷*, i.e. *laḥ₄-laḥ₄-ṛe(?)⁷*, ‘to deliver’, which seems a possible interpretation of the sign as copied. *u₂-a* could be read literally as ‘food-and-drink’; in light of the Akkadian version, I would however suggest the reading *u₂ duru₅*, ‘well-watered pasture’ (cf. CAD s.v. *rītu* bil., with the reading *u₂-a*), which may be similar in meaning to (or perhaps an abbreviation of) *u₂ ki-duru₅*, as at DumEnk. 76: *udu-zu u₂ ki-duru₅ ḥe₂-em-mi-gu₇*, ‘Certes, tu as fait manger l’herbe du sol humide à tes moutons’ (transl. Attinger 2019).

Further, the Akkadian version DAAD 2.6 now shows this passage to resemble the following lines in a trilingual (Sumerian, Akkadian, Hittite) hymn to the Storm-god Adad (CTH 314) from Hattusa:

CTH 314: KUB 4.5+KBo 12.72+ iii 7–8:⁴⁷

⁴⁷ The most recent edition is that of Klinger (2010: 312–324). Note however that, according to Torri (2022: 219), the Sumerian and Hittite versions represented on KUB 4.5+ and the

Sum.: ma-aš-am-ši niĝ₂-ur₂-lim₃-ma / ti-la-a-bi-iš(-)ši ki-ki

Akk.: [bu]-ṛu₂-ul ^dŠAKKAN₂ ša₂ 4 GIR₃.MEŠ-šu₂ / [x]-ṛx₁-a ru-up-ši-šu il₅-la-ak

Hitt.: ^dŠAKKAN₂-ša-at N[UMUN-an...] / da-pi₂-an ku-it-ta [...]

Sum.: ‘The cattle, the quadrupeds, as many as they are, seek their pasture.’⁴⁸

Akk.: ‘The four-footed cattle of Šakkan, [...] its plenitude, walk (about).’

Hitt.: ‘The offspring of Šakkan, it [...] all, whatsoever [...].’

Both passages associate the respective deities (i.e. the Sun-god and the Storm-god) with the sustenance of herds, and thus with the topos of fertility and natural abundance in general, which the Akkadian versions elaborate by including a reference to Šakkan, the god of cattle and son of the Sun-god.⁴⁹ The same association was made in a fragmentary Akkadian hymn

Akkadian version on KBo 12.72 join to form a single tablet, contrary to the published copy of KUB 4.5+.

⁴⁸ Partly modifying Laroche (2016: 404), I gratefully adopt a suggestion by P. Attinger: given that -bi-še₃ was pronounced /biš/, ti-la-a-bi-iš(-)ši ki-ki could reflect til-la-bi-š(e₃) u₂ kiĝ₂-kiĝ₂ (vowel harmony u₂ > /i/), which supplies the expected reference to the ‘pasture’ (see GSF s.v. kiĝ₂ for u₂ kiĝ₂, ‘chercher des pâturages’).

⁴⁹ An = Anum III 191. The Sum.-Akk. equation maš₂-anše (or niĝ₂-ur₂-limmu) // b^ul ^dŠakkan is conventional, see CAD s.v. b^ulu lex. and bil. On Šakkan, see now Wiggerman (2021). A more idiomatic Hittite rendering of the phrase might be something like *gimraš

to Šamaš found at Hattusa, whose Hittite translation is almost completely lost (KBo 1.12 obv.¹ 1–8, rev.¹ 3–6, CTH 792.1). Intriguingly, the extant Hittite versions of the solar hymn (CTH 372 and 374) offer no translation of this passage, neither in the present context nor elsewhere. While this could be explained as a mere accident of transmission, the Hittite versions of the solar hymn otherwise track the Sumero-Akkadian models quite closely, and the Akkadian version from Ortaköy (DAAM 2.6) now shows that the passage was present in at least one version from the Hittite area. An alternative, non-trivial explanation for the absence of this element from CTH 372 and 374 would be that the topos of natural abundance seemed, to a Hittite translator, more natural in connection with the Storm-god (as in CTH 314) than with the Sun-god. In a Mesopotamian context the Sun-god was conventionally associated with notions of fertility and prosperity, as his paternity of Šakkan illustrates, but this aspect of the Sun-god appears not to have been of interest to the Hittite translator: a reference to natural abundance, along the lines of the Sumerian and Akkadian versions, would indeed have been unique in the corpus of Hittite solar hymns and prayers (CTH 372–374, 375, 376, 384). This is not to claim that solar deities were not associated with the fertility of the natural world in Hittite sources.⁵⁰ I mean only to suggest that the focus of the

huitar, ‘wild animals of the field’, as in the later version of the solar hymn at CTH 381 §X60 99 (*gimrašš=a hwitnaš*).

⁵⁰ See e.g. Steitler (2017: 227) on the Sun-god and fertility in myths attested in Old Hittite texts, and compare the Sun-god’s sexual interest in the Cow in the tale of the Sun-god, Cow and Fisherman (CTH 363), which Haas (2006: 204–205) links to a Mesopotamian motif. ^dŠAKKAN co-occurs with ^dUTU in the fragmentary Hittite solar omen KBo 34.120 3’–4’, but (according to J. Klinger in RIA s.v. ‘Sumuqan’ B) this should be seen as a purely textual import from Mesopotamia, cf. Steitler (2017: 414).

Hittite translator in this particular instance lay elsewhere, on the Sun-god's role as provider of justice and as a benevolent intermediary. In this sense the absence of a Hittite version of this passage in CTH 372 and 374 is unsurprising, and may reflect a deliberate choice. Other, clearer instances in the corpus of Hittite solar hymns show that omission, rather than elaborate reinterpretation, was the preferred method to deal with inconvenient elements in a model text.⁵¹

Sum. (Utu the Hero = Utu N, 18)

18. $\text{r}^{\text{d}}\text{utu}^{\text{1}} \text{ni}^{\text{g}_2} \text{gi-na ki a}^{\text{g}_2}$

‘Utu, who loves justice...’

Akk. (DAAM 2.6 obv. 12’):

12’. $\text{r}^{\text{at}}(?)^{\text{1}} - [\text{ta}(?)^{\text{1}}] \text{r}^{\text{DINGIR-lum}}(?) \text{ša}^{\text{1}} [\text{ki}(?)^{\text{1}}] - \text{r}^{\text{it-ti}}^{\text{1}} \text{i-ra-}^{\text{r}^{\text{am}}^{\text{1}} - \text{m}[u(x)] \text{x x [x x x]}$

‘You(?) are a god who loves justice...’

Hitt. (CTH 372 // CTH 374)

—

⁵¹ Metcalf (2015a: 97).

Commentary: Here again there is no corresponding text in the Hittite versions, but in this case the opening hymn preserved in CTH 372 offers a good parallel: *ḫandanz(a)=kan antuḫšaš tuk=pat āššuš*, ‘It is you (Sun-god) to whom the just person is dear’ (§1 8).

Sum. (Utu the Hero = Utu N, 19–24(?))

19. [x] ʾxʾ zi-da UD SAḪAR DIB(?) šum₂-mu

20. [x x] ʾru(?) -gu₂(?)ʾ -ta-zu-ne

21. [x x x] ʾx xʾ si-du₃-zu mul-mul

22. [x x x] -ʾx-xʾ ku₄-ku₄-da-zu-ne

23. [...] ʾxʾ am₃-ši-ʾxʾ [(...)]

24. [...] an-na IGI [...]

‘[...] right, to give...(?)

[...] as you approach(?),

[...] your rays⁵² are/make brilliant,

[...] as you enter [...],

[...] ...(?) [...],

[...] in the sky...(?) [...].’

⁵² On si-du₃, not registered in GSF, see Pettinato (1992: 187–88). According to Waetzoldt (2001: 221) the literal sense is ‘aufgerichtetes Horn’, and from this the secondary sense ‘ray’ may be derived (I owe the reference and the suggestion to P. Attinger).

Akk. (DAAM 2.6 obv. 7'–8'):

^dUTU iš-tu qe₂-r[e-e]b ša-me-ṛe i-na aš-še-ṛe-k[a]

ṛiš-tu KUR UGU-ṛti a-na KUR ṛšap-li-ti i^l(A)-n[a-mir]

‘Utu, as you emerge from the middle of the heavens,

it gets light(?) from the upper to the lower lands.’

Hitt. (CTH 372 §5 34–35 // CTH 374 §11' 23–24):

mān=ašta karūwarwar ^dUTU-uš nepišaz šarā ūpzi

nu=ššan šarāzziyaš KUR-eaš katterašš=a utneyaš hūmandaš tuel=pat ^dUTU-waš

<lālučkimaš>⁵³ tiyari

‘When at dawn the Sun-god comes up from (the middle of) the heavens,

it is your—the Sun-god’s—light that steps into all of the upper and lower lands.’

Commentary: While the Sumerian passage is too fragmentary for detailed interpretation, to the extent that it is unclear whether l. 19–20 even belong into this context, both of the coherent phrases that are discernible correspond in general to the Akkadian and Hittite versions, in inverse order: l. 21 describes the Sun-god’s luminous radiance, and l. 22 his morning ascent. The Sun-god’s presence in the upper and lower lands, which is prominent in both the Akkadian and Hittite sources, may have been mentioned in the lost parts of the

⁵³ Restored in CTH 372 from CTH 374.

Sumerian version.⁵⁴ Conceivably, then, the damaged sign at the start of the second half of l. 23 could be read [...] ʾsigʿ (rather than ʾkiʿ, following Cavigneaux), ‘[...] the lower land’, and in l. 24 it is tempting to restore igi [nim...], ‘upper land [...]’, although this is obviously just one possibility among many. In any case this passage is a good example of the flexibility of a literary topos: the ‘upper lands’ and the ‘lower lands’ are meaningful geographical terms in both Mesopotamia and Anatolia, and could thus be translated without difficulty, even though the underlying local referents were of course different.⁵⁵

A second point of interest is the variation in the description of the Sun-god’s movement through the heavens: the Akkadian term *qereb šamê*, literally the ‘inner part of the heavens’, is the region in which the Sun-god is regularly said either to emerge or to set. This idiomatic

⁵⁴ Compare, in connection with Utu: H 180+ 34' (igi nim-ma-kam sig-še₃), ed. Cavigneaux (2009: 3–7); Utu B, 1 (sig-še₃...nim-še₃); Utu G (ASJ 12, 1990, 7–11), obv. 2 (igi niĝen₂ a-ab-ba-ke₄ sig igi nim-ma); Incantation to Utu 33–34 (a-ab-ba igi nim-ma...a-ab-ba sig...); InŠuk 101–102, where the sunrise is to be seen in the lower land and the sunset in the upper land. See in general Klein and Sefati (2019: 113) *ad* iii 26–27.

⁵⁵ From a Sumerian perspective, the ‘lower lands’ (sig) refer to the south-eastern Mesopotamian plain and the ‘upper lands’ (igi nim) to the mountains in the north-west, as suggested esp. by the parallelism at EnmEns. 145–146: sig-ta igi nim-še₃ ab-ta kur ĝeš₃eren-še₃, ‘From the lower land to the upper land, from the sea to the cedar mountain’. In a Hittite perspective, the ‘upper lands’ are the mountainous regions of north-east Anatolia that border the Hittite heartland, whereas the ‘lower lands’ are the provinces in south-central Anatolia: Alparslan (2017), Forlanini (2017), Matessi (2018). According to Yakubovich (2014: 348–349), the Hittite terminology was itself borrowed and adapted from Mesopotamian models.

phrase, while widely attested, has posed difficulties for modern scholarship: the CAD s.v. *qerbu* 1f chooses to leave *qerbu(m)* untranslated in several instances of *qereb šamê*, and the Hittite translator similarly appears not to have attempted to render the phrase literally.⁵⁶ The Akkadian version has the preposition *ištu*, ‘from (heaven)’, which is expected in connection with the Sun-god’s rise from the *qereb šamê*, and the Hittite mirrors this in offering the ablative *nepišaz*. Yet, in the absence of a direct Hittite counterpart to *qereb šamê*, the ablative seems surprising: Rieken et al. (2017) interpret the latter as an ablative with a function resembling a locative (‘auf der Seite des Himmels’, cf. GHL §16.92). The intuitive meaning of *nepišaz* is however surely ‘from heaven’ (GHL §16.89), as subsequently at CTH 372 §7 58–59 *nepišaz...nepiši=ššan*, ‘Vom Himmel ... im Himmel...’, where *nepišaz* may in fact correspond to *ištu qereb šamê* in the Akkadian version (DAAM 2.6. obv. 21') in fragmentary context, as noted by Schwemer.⁵⁷ It seems possible, then, that the slightly enigmatic Hittite translation was here influenced by the Akkadian wording: that is to say, the translator chose the ablative *nepišaz* on the model of Akk. *ištu*, even though this separative sense is meaningful only in combination with the common Akkadian idiom *qereb šamê*, as an expression of sunrise, which the Hittite translator did not attempt to render.

⁵⁶ See recently Alaura/Bonechi (2012: 50–51) on *qereb šamê*, which corresponds to Sum. an-ša₃. Cavigneaux (2009: 9) restores [an]-ṛša₃-ba⁷ ku₄-ku₄-da-zu-ne, ‘Quand tu pénètres au fond du ciel ...’, in l. 22, but this seems uncertain: the notion of ‘entering’ (ku₄) in connection with an-ša₃ refers to the setting of the sun, according to Alaura/Bonechi (2012: 50).

⁵⁷ For our passage, CHD s.v. *nepiš-* a offers ‘through the sky’, and Singer (2002: 37) ‘from the sky’.

Sum. (Utu the Hero = Utu N):

(*lacuna*)

Akk. (DAAM 2.6. obv. 9'–11'):

9'. $\lceil di-in \rceil$ UR.GI₇ $t[a_2-d]i_3-in$ $di-in$ $\lceil \check{S}AH \rceil$ $ta_2-di_3-[in]$

10'. $\lceil di-in \rceil$ $u_2-ma-\lceil a-am-mi \rceil$ $\check{s}a$ KA×U $\lceil x\ x \rceil$ $[la(?)\ i(?)-\check{s}]u(?)-\lceil u_2(?) \rceil$ $t[a_2(?) -di_3-in]$

11'. $di-\lceil in \rceil$ $\check{h}a-ab-\lceil l\bar{i} \rceil-im$ $di-in$ $\check{s}a-\lceil ag-\check{s}i\ ta_2 \rceil-[di_3-in]$

‘You judge the case of the dog, you judge the case of the pig,

You judge the case of the animals that have(?) no mouth [...],

You judge the case of the wronged and oppressed person.’

Hitt. (CTH 372 §5 36–39 // CTH 374 §12'–13' 25–28):

36. *nu* UR.GI₇-*aš* $\check{S}AH$ -*ašš=a* *ḫannešša[r]* *ḫannattari*

37. *šuppalann=a* *ḫanneššar išš[i]t kwiēš UL memiškanzi*

38. *apātt=a* *ḫan[n]attari*

39. *idalauwašš=a* *ḫūwappašš=a* *antuḫšaš ḫanneššar zik=pat ḫannattari*

‘You judge the case of the dog and pig.

Also the case of the animals that do not speak with a mouth

—that is also what you judge,

and it is you who also judges the case of the evil and wicked person.’

Commentary: The new Akkadian version (DAAM 2.6) confirms the suggestion of Wilhelm (1994: 67–68) that the Sun-god’s judging of the animals should be seen as yet another Mesopotamian element in the Hittite solar hymn: compare Šamaš’s judging of the gods, wild animals (*umāmim*) and humans in an Old Babylonian Akkadian *Opferschaugebet* (ed. Starr (1983) 30–106 l. 11). The dog and the pig are also mentioned together, and in the same order, in the prologue of the Sumerian poem ‘Enki and Ninḫursaġa’ (17–18). As Wilhelm remarks, the more specific background of this passage is to be found in Sumero-Akkadian animal proverbs and fables: compare in particular the wolf’s appeals to the Sun-god in the Sumerian Proverb Collection 5 (SP 5 Vers. B 72, A 73, B 73), the speaking pig in another Sumerian proverb (SP 14.45), the Old Babylonian Akkadian wolf-proverbs on the obverse of BM 13928 (ed. Streck/Wasserman 2016) and more generally the ‘grievance formula’ in Akkadian epics and fables, in which an aggrieved character (i.e. an animal, in the case of fables) complains to Šamaš as god of justice.⁵⁸ Further support comes from a famous comparandum in a fragment of the archaic Greek poet Archilochus (mid-seventh century BC), in which a fox prays to Zeus as the god who oversees justice among both humans and animals, also in the context of a fable.⁵⁹ As Wilhelm (1994: 67) comments, in CTH 372 and 374 (and now also DAAM 2.6) the image is designed to illustrate the Sun-god’s universal interest in justice, which here extends not only to familiar animals like dogs and pigs, but even to unspecified animals that are not typically imagined to speak. Yet, as

⁵⁸ See Jiménez (2017: 94–97) on the ‘grievance formula’, and add perhaps the small Akkadian fragment from Meturan edited by Cavigneaux/al-Rawi (1993: 105). Even more broadly, see Ballesteros (2021: 12–18) on complaints to the gods in cuneiform literature.

⁵⁹ Archilochus fr. 177, ed. Swift (2019), see West (1997: 504–5).

Schwemer notes on DAAM 2.6, the Hittite translator has slightly misunderstood the Akkadian model in l. 11': *ḥablum* and *šagšum* both mean 'wronged person' (the pairing is common), whereas the Hittite version speaks of the Sun-god's judging the case of an 'evil and wicked person' (*idalu-*, *ḥūwappa-*). This error destroys the crucial analogy between the aggrieved animal and the wronged person, both of whom can appeal to the Sun-god: the Sumero-Akkadian fabular background was perhaps not fully grasped by the translator.

The remainder of the praise-section is fragmentary in the Akkadian version DAAM 2.6 obv. 13'–26': see Schwemer's detailed textual notes, with suggested restorations based on CTH 372 and 374, to which I would add only the following observations. According to Bonechi (2010), the lacuna that here intervenes in the Sumerian version ('Utu N') is to be restored in part by the obverse (col. ii) of the late Old Babylonian bilingual fragment BM 78614 (= Cavigneaux's ms. E), which enumerates the Sun-god's divine attendants.⁶⁰ CTH 372 §7 57–59 at this point contains an interesting but fragmentary reference to the Storm-god, who seems to be involved in harnessing the Sun-god's team. The new Akkadian version DAAM 2.6 mentions someone who comes 'from the heavens' (obv. 21'), which as Schwemer notes corresponds to *nepišaz*, 'from heaven', where someone (the Storm-god?) is dispatched in the context of harnessing in CTH 372 §7 58. On the other hand, there seems to be no reference to the harnessing of the Sun-god's team in the corresponding section of CTH 374 (§21"–22"). What seems clear in all of this is that some versions of the hymn could include an enumeration of the Sun-god's

⁶⁰ The remains of a vertical ruling separating cols. i and ii are clearly visible (collated, October 2022), confirming the suggestion of Bonechi (2010) that BM 78614 must have had four columns in origin. This also agrees with the thickness and the shape of the fragment. See now Baragli (2022: 272–275) on col. ii.

attendants: this list could be quite long, as in BM 78614 (if col. ii contains some version of ‘Utu N’), or much briefer, as in DAAM 2.6 and CTH 372.⁶¹ While both Hittite versions (CTH 372 and 374) mention the attendants Bunene and Mišaru, who belong to the circle of the Mesopotamian Sun-god, CTH 372 also adapts the Mesopotamian harnessing-motif by involving the Storm-god (^d10).⁶² This adaptation, which seems likely to reflect Hittite religious interests, was perhaps encouraged by the fact that many Sumerian (and Akkadian) names of the Sun-god’s attendants, including those listed in BM 78614 col. ii, were based on the word *u₄* (e.g. *u₄-ḫuš-gal-an-na*, etc.), which means both ‘daylight’ and ‘storm’, and thus invites an association between the Sun-god and the Storm-god.⁶³

⁶¹ The discrepancy with DAAM 2.6 and CTH 372 reinforces the view of Glenn (2019: 520–521) that BM 78614 col. ii cannot be straightforwardly assigned to ‘Utu N’, and may represent a variant version. I would add that the likely restoration of col. i. 5 is: [...^dnun-gal-e]-ne // [...^di-g]i-gi (collated), which does not match the ending of Utu N, 5 (as preserved in both extant mss., A and C).

⁶² While the exact sense is unclear, the most economical interpretation of the fragmentary passage CTH 372 §7 57–59 seems to me to be that the gods in heaven appoint the Storm-god as the Sun-god’s divine groom (^d*Turešgala-/Durešgala-*, from *tūriya-*, ‘to harness’). The text at §7 59 can hardly be reconciled with the view that *turešgala-* is here an epithet of the Sun-god himself (thus HEG III/10 461).

⁶³ See Steinkeller (2005: 45) and Alaura/Bonechi (2012: 82) on this point. As is well known, the Sun-god and Storm-god were also commonly juxtaposed, in various guises, in Syro-Anatolian sources, on which see Steitler (2018: 366–371).

The Prayer to the Sun-god for Intercession with the Personal God: Trilingual Text and Commentary

The first fifteen lines on the reverse of DAAM 2.6 closely parallel the Hittite versions (see Schwemer's notes): the suppliant here requests the Sun-god to transmit his prayer to his personal god, in which he describes his close links to his personal god and claims to be innocent of wrongdoing. This section coincides with a long lacuna (20 lines) in the Sumerian version 'Utu N', at least in ms. A, which seems too short to accommodate all of the Akkadian text (about 34 lines) that intervened since the last parallel passage. The Sumerian text resumes with the suppliant's meditations on sickness, life and death:

Sum. (Utu the Hero = Utu N, 44–45):

44. [...] ʾza-eʾ-da nu-me-a zil₂(?)-la₂ bi₂-in-d[u₁₁]

45. [x x n]a-an-du₃-du₃ nu-mu-un-da-sa₆-s[a₆-ge(?)]

'Without you [...], did he say "Get well!(?)"?

[...] were not vigorous(?), would I(?) not get well thanks to him?'

Akk. (DAAM 2.6. rev. 16–17):

16. *lu ad-mi-[iq...]*

17. *ba₂-lu-uk-k[a...]*

'Would I have got well [...]

Without you [...]'

Hitt. (CTH 373 §4' 30–33 // CTH 372 §11 96–99):

30. *kinun=a=man mān lazziahhat*

31. *nu tuel šiunaš uddanta natta SIG₅-ahhat*

32. *mā(n)=man innarahhat=ma*

33. *nu tuēl šiunaš uddanta UL innarahhat*

‘If I got well now,

would I not get well thanks to your—the god’s—word?

If I became vigorous,

would I not become vigorous thanks to your—the god’s—word?’

Commentary: As Cavigneaux notes, the Sumerian text that resumes in l. 44, after a lacuna of twenty lines, is based on the phrase *N-da nu-me-a*, ‘Without *N*...’, where *N* is usually the name of a deity: this is a common idiom of Sumerian religious language that is attested as early as in personal names of the mid-3rd millennium BC, and that was widely used in religious poetry. The expected Akkadian counterpart is *(ina) balum N*, as it is found in the Akkadian version DAAM 2.6 rev. 17 (*balukka*). The general sense of the phrase is that ‘without’ the deity in question, various regular phenomena of the divine, human and natural worlds would not occur.⁶⁴ In this instance, the Akkadian and Hittite versions clarify that it is the suppliant’s health that is said to depend on the personal god.

⁶⁴ See Metcalf (2015a: 154–170) and Baragli (2022: 85–88) for attestations and discussion.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty presented by the fragmentary Sumerian text is the interpretation of the persons involved: the Akkadian and Hittite versions suggest that the supplicant, speaking in the first person, addresses his personal god in the second person. This suits *za-e-da*, ‘Without you...’, but not the clear references to a third person in *bi₂-in-d[u₁₁]*, ‘He said...’, and *nu-mu-un-da-sa₆-s[a₆-ge(?)]*, ‘Would I(?) not be well thanks to *him*?’. Further, the expected 1st person subject is not preserved in the extant text, and my translation ‘Would *I*(?) not be well?’ depends on the restoration of [-ge]. Though confusion of person-prefixes and -suffixes is very common in Old Babylonian literary mss., it is not permissible to posit scribal errors in such a difficult and fragmentary passage. It is possible that the Sun-god is here addressed in the second person and the personal god in the third (‘Without you [= Sun-god], did he [= the personal god] say “Get well!”?’), but this would differ from the Hittite version, at least, where only the personal god is involved.

The reading of the crucial sign preceding -*la₂* in l. 44 of the Sumerian version also poses problems. Cavigneaux tentatively suggested *lu₁(?)-la₂*, translating ‘[Preux Utu sans] toi il dit(?) un mensonge(?)’, which is epigraphically attractive but difficult to reconcile with the corresponding Akkadian and Hittite texts. Further, as P. Attinger notes (*per litteras*), the combination **lu₁-la₂* is otherwise unattested, and LUL has no other known reading ending in /-l/. With all due hesitation I instead propose the reading *zi₁₂-la₂*, from *zi₁₂* ‘rendre qqc. plaisant, reconforter, guérir’ (GSF s.v.), if the former sign can be read as a cursive (or misunderstood?) form of TAG (aBZL no. 121), which yields the expected sense: *zi₁₂* would then correspond to *damāqum*, ‘to be well’, in the Akkadian version DAAM 2.6 rev. 16 (*lū admiq*), as it does in lexical sources (e.g. Ea V 59 [MSL 14, 398]). At the end of the line, -*d[u₁₁]* seems the most plausible restoration, with Cavigneaux, which would provide the ultimate model for the formulation ‘by your word’ in the Hittite version.

In l. 45, the Hittite version leads us to expect a conditional construction with a rhetorical question in the apodosis. Unfortunately, the beginning of the line is broken in the Sumerian version: the form [...](-)na-an-du₃-du₃ could be variously restored and interpreted, but seems most likely to contain the negative modal prefix na(n)-, which is typically found in imperfective verbal forms (as here) and is the negative counterpart to the modal prefix ḥa-, which can be used to express conditionality (DGS §§ 25.4.2, 25.5, see also Utu the Hero = Utu N 48, below). If this is correct, perhaps [u₄-da], ‘If...’, can be restored at the beginning of the line. Yet the resulting translation ‘If(?) he (i.e. the personal god?) did not block/plant/make/build’ yields little sense. I therefore venture the highly tentative suggestion that the meaning of du₃ here resembles Akk. *banûm* (AHw s.v. *banû(m)* II, ‘gut, schön sein, werden’; Hitt. *in(n)arahḫ-* (medio-passive), ‘to become vigorous’), and that a first-person subject is intended, even though the expected first-person suffix *-e(n) is absent. All of these assumptions would result in the following, admittedly problematic reconstruction: [u₄-da n]a-an-du₃-du₃ nu-mu-un-da-sa₆-s[a₆-ge], ‘If I(?) were not vigorous(?), would I not get well thanks to him (= the personal god)?’, i.e. ‘If I lost my vigour, would it not be thanks to him that I would get well?’⁶⁵

Sum. (Utu the Hero = Utu N, 46–48):

46. A: [nam-til₃ l]u₂-lu₇ igi niĝen₂-na-a-kam

⁶⁵ On this interpretation, the syntax of the clause is comparable to the *irrealis* construction at GiAk. 71–81, as analysed by Black (1995: 26–28), with ḥa- in the protasis and la- (i.e. nu- assimilated to the ensuing -ba-prefix) in the apodosis (‘If that man were my king...would not multitudes (of soldiers) rush on?’, etc.).

47. A: [tu]kum-bi lu₂ ulu₃-ta ulu₃-še₃ al-til

D: [...] lu₂ da-[ri₂-še₃...]

48. A: [a₂] ge₁₇-ga niĝ₂ GIG-ra ħe₂-en-du lu₂-lu₇ ba-ra-an-ge₁₇-ga

D: [...] -ga niĝ₂ la-ra-[aḥ]-ta ħe₂-du lu₂-ra ba-r[a-...]

‘The life (of) a human is a blur(?)⁶⁶:

If a human lived for all eternity,

Bitter cries of woe, an unpleasant thing could occur—it would not harm the human.’

Akk. (DAAM 2.6 rev.):

—

Hitt. (CTH 373 §5' 38–40 // CTH 372 §11 105–107):

mā(n)=mman dandukišnaš=a DUMU-aš uktūri ħuw[i]šwanz(a) ēšta

man=ašta mān [a]ntuwahḫaš idāluwa inan arta

man=at=ši natta kattawatar

‘If a son of mortality lived forever,

even if something harmful to the human—an illness—remained,

it would not be a cause of grievance for him.’

⁶⁶ See Glenn (2019: 541–542) on this phrase.

Commentary: There is here a discrepancy in the order of the verses: in the Hittite versions, the present passage occurs after the suppliant's reflection on the links between life and death (see below), not before it (as in both Sumerian sources). The Sumerian version remains difficult: in particular, the apparent postpositions $ni\hat{g}_2$ GIG-*ra* // la-ra-[aḥ]-*ta* seem inexplicable. But the text is well-preserved, and the general sense seems clear; see Metcalf (2011: 173–176) for a general commentary, especially on the underlying word-play between lu_2 - lu_7 , 'human', and ul , 'eternal', and til_3 , 'to live', and til , 'to end'. Importantly, Glenn (2019: 543) has now shown that $\lceil a_2 \rceil$ ge_{17} -ga means, not 'evil force', as it was previously understood, but 'bitter cries of woe', a_2 being a variant spelling of $a_{(1)}$. Note here again the Hittite preference for legalistic terminology (*kattawatar*, 'grievance', see above on CTH 372 §4 32–33), which reinterprets the Sumerian version: whereas the Sumerian text seems to say that a hypothetical immortal human would not be truly harmed by an illness, the Hittite translates this lack of harm into a lack of cause for subsequent complaint. The real surprise, however, is that the Akkadian version DAAM 2.6 rev. nowhere seems to contain the famous conditional clause 'If a mortal lived forever...': while the passage (rev. 16–25) is fragmentary, the incipit of each line is preserved, and no match for the expected conditional construction is apparent. Since the clause is present in the Hittite version, it must have featured in elsewhere in the text or in other, lost Akkadian intermediaries.

Sum. (Utu the Hero = Utu N, 49–52):

49. A: nam- til_3 ug_5 -gid₂-da zu₂ ba-an-keše₂

D: [...] ug_5 -ge-de₃ zu₂ ba-da-an-keše₂

50. A: u₃ nam-til₃-la ug₅-ga ba-ra-an-da-si-a

D: [...] ug₅-ge-de₃ ba-da-an-sa₂-a

51. A: u₄ til₃-la diĝir an-da-šid u₄ ug₅ nu-mu-un-da-šid

D: [...] diĝir-ra am₃-da-šid ug₅-ga nu-mu-da-an-šid

52. A: u₄ zi al-til al-kur₄-ra-a-ni

D: [... z]i ti-la al-ṛkur₄(?)ṛ-ra-ṛni(?)ṛ

‘Life is linked to dying for him,’⁶⁷

and the things of life can certainly not(?) equal the things of death.

The days of life—a god(?) can count them, the days of death he cannot count:

The day (on which) life ends is stronger than him(?).’

Akk. (DAAM 2.6 rev. 18–22):

18. TI-ṛtu₃ṛ i[t-ti...]

19. b[a-l]a-aṭ [...]]

20. U₄-um ba₂-l[a-ṭi₃...]

21. a-ṛnaṛ t[a-...]

22. li-it-[tu-tu...]

⁶⁷ ug₅-gid₂-da in ms. A is probably an unorthographic spelling of *ug₅-ge-da (‘(linked) to dying’), as Glenn (2019: 528 n. 1068) notes.

‘Life [...] with [...],

The life [...]

The days of life [...]

To/for [...]

Old age [...].’

Hitt. (CTH 373 §5' 34–37 // CTH 372 §11 100–104):

ḫwišwatar=m(u)=apa anda ḫingani ḫaminkan

ḫingan=a=m(u)=apa anda ḫwišwanni=ya ḫaminkan

dandukišnaš=a DUMU-aš uktūri natta ḫwišwanz(a)

ḫwišwannaš UD.ḪI.A-ŠU kappuwanteš

‘Life is bound up with death for me,

while death is bound up with life for me.

A son of mortality does not live forever,⁶⁸

The days of his life are counted.’

Commentary: The interpretation of the Sumerian version is marred by several inconsistencies between mss. A and D, especially in l. 50. Like Cavigneaux (‘...la vie n’équivaut pas à la

⁶⁸ CTH 372 here offers a variant, fragmentary text: *tepu pēdan ka[tta...]*, ‘The small place [...] below [...],’ see CHD P, 339f.

mort'), I previously assumed that the verb is negative (Metcalf (2011): 173), since ms. A displays the modal negative *bara*-prefix (DGS §25.7). On the other hand, ms. D does not contain this prefix, and the Hittite version suggests that both elements of the life/death-comparison are positive. It is not entirely clear what the modal force of *bara*- would be in this context, and in l. 53 ms. A offers another verbal form with the same *bara*-prefix that is clearly erroneous; both instances, in l. 50 and 53, could be inspired by a mistaken analogy to the correct use of that prefix in l. 48. The new Akkadian version DAAM 2.6 rev. 19 unfortunately does not help, since it contains nothing more than the first word of the line. In brief, the available alternatives offered by the Sumerian version seem to be as follows. On the reading of ms. A, the approximate sense would be 'Life is linked with dying for him, and the things of life can certainly not equal the things of death'.⁶⁹ The train of thought would presumably be that life and death are inextricably linked, but that death is greater than life in the sense that the days of our lives are numbered, whereas the days of death are infinite (cf. l. 51). This could be harmonised with ms. D if *ba-da-an-sa₂-a* in that source were taken as a rhetorical question: '[Life] is linked with dying for him—[and is life] equal to dying?' (I owe this suggestion to P. Attinger). The other main possibility, on a more straightforward reading of ms. D, is: '[Life] is linked with dying for him, [and life] is equal to dying'. On this interpretation, which is encouraged by the Hittite version, l. 49–50 form a crescendo: life is inextricably linked (*zu₂ keše₂*) to death, and life can even be said to be equal (*sa₂*) to death, perhaps in the sense that

⁶⁹ I assume that *ba-an-keše₂* is an intransitive form with an oblique object (/n/, DGS §18.2.3) referring to the 'human' of the previous line (cf. the suppliant's 'for me' in the Hittite version), and that *-si-a* in ms. A stands for **-sa₂-a* (rather than *-diri*), as found in ms. D, cf. Glenn (2019: 544).

the suppliant, faced with the immediate prospect of death, struggles to perceive a meaningful distinction between the two: in his current state of desperation, he may as well be dead.

The remaining lines (l. 51–52) present further variants between mss. A and D, and are similarly fragmentary in the Akkadian version DAAM 2.6. The Hittite version is much clearer, but seems to conserve only the gist of the Sumerian original (the counting of the days of life, the inevitability of death). My understanding of the Sumerian text follows that of Cavigneaux; in the Akkadian text, I provisionally assume that l. 21 somehow expresses the idea that the days of death are beyond counting, and that the reference to very old age (*littūtum*) in l. 22 corresponds to the end of life that is apparently described in l. 52 of the Sumerian version, the sense of which is however not entirely clear.⁷⁰

Sum. (Utu the Hero = Utu N, 53–57):

53. A: diĝir-ĝa₂ niĝ₂-ge₁₇-ga-a-ni ħa-ma-be₂ ša₃-bi ĝal₂ ba-ra-ab-taka₄-a
niĝ₂-nam-ma-a ga-zu
D: [...] ʾge₁₇-ga-niʾ ħa-ma-ab-ʾxʾ ša₃-bi ĝal₂ ħa-ma-ab-ʾtaka₄ʾ / niĝ₂-
ʾnam-ma x zuʾ [x]-x

‘Let my god tell me what offended him, let him reveal its meaning to me, may I know everything!’

⁷⁰ As Cavigneaux comments, the verb can hardly be read other than gur₄/kur₄, ‘to be strong’, see now GSF s.v. kur₄.

Akk. (DAAM 2.6 rev. 23–25):

23. ʾDINGIR-*li*₃ ʾ*l*[*i-ibba*...]

24. ʾ*i-na* x₁-[...]

25. *mi*-ʾ*im*₁-[*ma šumšu*...]

‘My god [...] heart [...]

With [...]

‘Everything [...]’.

Hitt. (CTH 373 §6' 41–43 // CTH 372 §12 108–109):

[*kinun*]=*a*=*mu*=*z*(*a*) *ammel* DINGIR-YA ŠA₃-ŠU ZI-ŠU *ḫūmantet kardit kīnuddu*

nu=*mu* *wašdul*=*mit* [*tēdd*]*u*

n=*e*=*z*=(š)*an ganešmi*

‘Now let my god reveal his innermost soul to me with all his heart,

and let him tell me my offences

so that I may know them.⁷¹

Commentary: This is the refrain of the supplicant’s central prayer to the personal god: see Metcalf (2015b) for a detailed study of the Sumerian text and the Hittite versions, including adaptations in later Hittite prayers beyond CTH 372–374. The refrain is composed of three

⁷¹ Others translate: ‘...so that I may confess them’: see Metcalf (2015b: 47) on the semantics.

elements: ‘Let my god (a) tell me what offended him, (b) let him reveal its meaning to me, (c) may I know everything!’. While the Sumerian version presents the order (a)-(b)-(c), the Hittite version has the sequence (b)-(a)-(c), which entails a reinterpretation of $\check{s}a_3/\check{S}A_3$, ‘heart’: in Sumerian this refers to the ‘heart’, i.e. the true nature, of the offence, whereas in Hittite the suppliant asks that the personal god reveal his own ‘heart’, i.e. his thoughts and feelings on the suppliant’s offence. The new Akkadian version DAAM 2.6 is regrettably fragmentary: in l.25, *mim[ma]* can no doubt be restored as *mimma šumšu*, ‘everything’, corresponding to Sum. $ni\hat{g}_2$ -nam-ma(-a) in element (c). As for the order of elements (a)-(b), the likely restoration *l[i-ib-ba...]* in l. 23 suggests that the Akkadian text resembled the Hittite version in placing the ‘heart’ of the god first (sequence (b)-(a)-(c)). In l. 24, the most obvious interpretation of *i-na* x[...] would be to understand this as the opening of the phrase *ina libbīšu gamrim*, a common idiom of Akkadian prayer-language that is absent from the Sumerian version but that clearly underlies Hitt. *hūmantet kardit*, ‘with all his heart’. Yet the traces of the heavily damaged sign after *i-na* do not seem to yield the expected $\lceil li \rceil$. The reading $\lceil ga \rceil$ seems at least conceivable (possibly reflecting *ina gamrim*, ‘altogether’, see CAD s.v. *gamru* s. 1b). Alternatively *ina* could somehow introduce element (a) of the Akkadian refrain, or even represent *inanna*, ‘now’, as a counterpart to Hitt. *kinun*, although these options seem intuitively less likely to me.

Conclusion

The present article has sought to exploit the wealth of new insights offered by DAAM 2.6 and other recent Sumerological and Hittitological research. As a result, it seems very likely that this solar hymn and prayer was always situated in royal cults of the Sun, in both Mesopotamia and Anatolia, and that it was translated into Hittite on the basis of an Akkadian intermediary.

The Hittite translation reflects an interest in the worship of the male Sun-god, and in the relevance of that Sun-god to royal cults and the conception of ancient kingship: we are not here dealing with a phenomenon of purely scribal or academic interest. A detailed comparison of the extant Sumero-Akkadian-Hittite passages has yielded insights into the constitution of the text (in particular the Sumerian version, which remains difficult), questions of lexicography (such as the meanings of the Akkadian words *ekūtum* and *kigullatum*) and the choices made by the Hittite translators: the apparent omission of the fertility-aspect from the characterisation of the Hittite Sun-god is of special interest here. In some respects the Sumerian and Akkadian versions seem more similar to each other than to the Hittite (especially in length), while in other respects the Akkadian and Hittite versions are aligned in contrast to the available Sumerian sources (in the order of the verses, and certain phraseological details, of the supplicant's prayer): rich and rewarding as the evidence may be, it is therefore clear that the extant sources are mere fragments a much larger network of texts.

List of References

- Alaura, A./M. Bonechi (2012): Il carro del dio del sole nei testi cuneiformi dell'età del bronzo, *SMEA* 54, 5–115.
- Alparslan, M. (2017): The East. In M. Weeden/L.Z. Ullmann (ed.), *Hittite Landscape and Geography*, Leiden, 209–218.
- Attinger, P. (2019): Dumuzi et Enkimdu, online manuscript <https://zenodo.org/record/2599554> (accessed 31.3.2022).
- Attinger, P. (2021): *Glossaire sumérien-français*, Wiesbaden.
- Ballesteros, B. (2021): On *Gilgamesh* and Homer: Ishtar, Aphrodite and the Meaning of a Parallel, *Classical Quarterly* 71, 1–21.
- Baragli, B. (2022): *Sonnengrüße: Die sumerischen Kiutu-Gebetsbeschwörungen*, Leiden and Boston.
- Black, J. (1995): Real and Unreal Conditional Sentences in Sumerian, *ASJ* 17, 15–39.
- Bonechi, M. (2010): On BM 78614, *NABU* 2010/70, 79–80.
- Cavigneaux, A. (2009): Deux hymnes sumériens à Utu. In: X. Faivre et al. (ed.), *Et il y eut un esprit dans l'homme. Jean Bottéro et la Mésopotamie*, Paris, 3–18.
- Cavigneaux, A./F. Al-Rawi (1993): New Sumerian Literary Texts From Tell Haddad, *Iraq* 55, 91–105.
- Clarke, M. (2019): *Achilles beside Gilgamesh*, Cambridge.
- Daues, A./E. Rieken (2018): *Das persönliche Gebet bei den Hethitern (StBoT 63)*, Wiesbaden.

- Daues, A./E. Rieken (2019): Rhythmische Sprache in den hethitischen Gebeten, WO 49, 29–47.
- Forlanini, M. (2017): South Central. In M. Weeden/L.Z. Ullmann (ed.), *Hittite Landscape and Geography*, Leiden, 239–252.
- Gabbay, U. (2014): *Pacifying the Hearts of the Gods (HES 1)*, Wiesbaden.
- Glenn, A. (2019): *Praise of Kingship: širgida-hymns in the Old Babylonian Liturgical Tradition* (PhD diss. Johns Hopkins), Baltimore.
- Guichard, M. (2015): ‘Une prière bilingue inédite de Mari’, J.-M. Durand/L. Marti/Th. Römer (ed.), *Colères et repentirs divins (OBO 278)*, Fribourg and Göttingen, 343–376.
- Güterbock, H.G. (1958): The Composition of Hittite Prayers to the Sun, JAOS 78, 237–245.
- Güterbock, H.G. (1974): ‘Appendix: Hittite Parallels’, JNES 33, 323–327.
- Haas, V. (2006): *Die hethitische Literatur*, Berlin.
- Hoffner, H.A. Jr./H.C. Melchert (2008): *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*, Winona Lake.
- Hutter, M. (2021): *Religionsgeschichte Anatoliens*, Stuttgart.
- Jagersma, B. (2010): *A Descriptive Grammar of Sumerian* (PhD diss. Leiden), Leiden.
- Jaques, M. (2015): *Mon dieu qu’ai-je fait? Les diġir-ša-dab₍₅₎-ba et la piété privée en Mésopotamie (OBO 273)*, Fribourg/Göttingen.
- Jiménez, E. (2017): *The Babylonian Disputation Poems*, Leiden.
- Klein, J. (2017): The Concept of ‘Misfortune’ in Sumerian Wisdom Literature. In O. Drewnowska/M. Sadowicz (ed.), *Fortune and Misfortune in the Ancient Near East (RAI 60)*, Winona Lake, 25–38.

- Klein, J./Y. Sefati (2019): *From the Workshop of the Mesopotamian Scribe: Literary and Scholarly Texts from the Old Babylonian Period*, University Park.
- Klinger, J. (2010): Literarische sumerische Texte aus den hethitischen Archiven aus paläographischer Sicht – Teil II, *AoF* 37, 306–40.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden.
- Kogan, L./M. Krebernik (2020): *Etymological Dictionary of Akkadian. Volume 1/1*, Berlin–Boston.
- Kutter, J. (2008): *nūr ilī*. Die Sonnengottheiten in den nordwestsemitischen Religionen von der Spätbronzezeit bis zur vorrömischen Zeit (AOAT 346), Münster.
- Laroche, E. (1955): Littérature hittite, in R. Queneau (ed.), *Histoire des littératures*, Paris, 332–342.
- Laroche, E. (2016): *Études anatoliennes*, Brussels.
- Ludwig, M.-C. (2021): Ein neues zweisprachiges altbabylonisches Vokabular aus Ur, *AoF* 48, 250–267.
- Ludwig, M.-C./C. Metcalf (2017): The Song of Innana and Išme-Dagan, *ZA* 107, 1–21.
- de Martino, S. (2016): *Da Kussara a Karkemish: Storia del regno ittita*, Turin.
- Matessi, A. (2016): The Making of Hittite Imperial Landscapes, *JANEH* 3, 117–162.
- Melchert, H.C. (1979): Three Hittite Etymologies, *ZVS* 93, 262–273.
- Metcalf, C. (2011): New Parallels in Hittite and Sumerian Praise of the Sun, *WO* 41, 168–176.
- Metcalf, C. (2015a): *The Gods Rich in Praise. Early Greek and Mesopotamian Religious Poetry*, Oxford.

- Metcalf, C. (2015b): Old Babylonian Religious Poetry in Anatolia: From Solar Hymn to Plague Prayer, *ZA* 105, 42–53.
- Mittermayer, C. (2006): Altbabylonische Zeichenliste der sumerisch-literarischen Texte. Unter Mitarbeit von Pascal Attinger (OBO Sonderband), Fribourg and Göttingen.
- Norden, E. (1913): *Agnostos Theos*, Berlin.
- Oettinger, N. (2021): Heth. *wannummiya-* ‚ohne Familienvorstand‘, ^{MUL}*wannup(p)astal(l)a-* und idg. **uēn-*, in M. Tarsi (ed.), *Studies in General and Historical Linguistics Offered to Jón Axel Hardarson* (IBS 166), Innsbruck, 215–221.
- Pettinato, G. (1992): *Il rituale per la successione al trono ad Ebla* (Rome).
- Polonsky, J. (2002): *The Rise of the Sun God and the Determination of Destiny in Ancient Mesopotamia* (PhD diss. University of Pennsylvania), Philadelphia.
- Rieken, E. et al. (2017): *hethiter.net/*: CTH 372 (TX 2017-11-19, TRde 2017-12-11); E. Rieken et al. (ed.), *hethiter.net/*: CTH 373 (INTR 2017-01-31); E. Rieken et al. (ed.), *hethiter.net/*: CTH 374 (INTR 2017-01-31).
- Rutz, M.T. (2012): Mesopotamian Scholarship in Hattuša and the Sammeltafel KUB 4.53, *JAOS* 132, 171–188.
- Schwemer, D. (2015): Hittite Prayers to the Sun-God for Appeasing an Angry Personal God, in M. Jaques, *Mon dieu qu’ai-je fait? Les diğir-ša-dab₍₅₎-ba et la piété privée en Mésopotamie* (OBO 273), Fribourg/Göttingen, 349–393.
- Schwemer, D. (2019): *Der kontraintuitive König. Zum babylonisch-assyrischen Badehaus-Ritual*. Stuttgart.

- Schwemer, D./A. Süel (2021): The Akkadian and Sumerian Texts from Ortaköy-Šapinuwa (DAAM 2), Wiesbaden.
- Scurlock, J./B.R. Andersen (2005): *Diagnosis in Assyrian and Babylonian Medicine*, Urbana and Chicago.
- Sideltsev, A.V. (2020): Syntax of the Hittite focus particle *-pat*, WO 50, 111–145.
- Singer, I. (2002): *Hittite Prayers* (Leiden).
- Soysal, O. (2019): Philologische Kommentare und sachliche Bemerkungen zu É (LÚ.MEŠ)ZABAR.DAB, ArchAnz. 2019/1, 52–57.
- Starr, I. (1983): *The Rituals of the Diviner* (BiMes. 12), Malibu.
- Steitler, C. (2017): *The Solar Deities of Bronze Age Anatolia* (StBoT 62), Wiesbaden.
- Steinkeller, P. (2005): Of Stars and Men. In: A. Giamto (ed.), *Biblical and Oriental Essays in Memory of William L. Moran* (Rome 2005), 11–47.
- Stol, M. (2016): *Women in the Ancient Near East*, Berlin–Boston.
- Streck, M.P. (2010): Feminine Gender of Old Babylonian Nouns. In: D. Shehata et al. (ed.), *Von Göttern und Menschen. Beiträge zu Literatur und Geschichte des Alten Orients. Festschrift für Brigitte Groneberg*, Leiden–Boston, 287–305.
- Streck, M.P./N. Wasserman (2016): Of Wolves and Kings, Iraq 78, 241–252.
- Swift, L. (2019): *Archilochus: The Poems*, Oxford.
- Taracha, P. (2020): Review of Steitler (2017), OLZ 115, 123–126.
- Torri, G. (2022): *The Haus am Hang at Ḫattuša* (StBoT 67), Wiesbaden.
- Viano, M. (2016): *The Reception of Sumerian Literature in the Western Periphery*, Venice.

- Volk, K. (2006): Von Findel-, Waisen-, verkauften und deportierten Kindern. Notizen aus Babylonien und Assyrien, in A. Kunz-Lübcke/R. Lux (ed.), «Schaffe mir Kinder...». Beiträge zur Kindheit im alten Israel und in seinen Nachbarkulturen, Leipzig, 47–87.
- Waal, W.J.I. (2015): Hittite Diplomatics (StBoT 57), Wiesbaden.
- Waetzoldt, H. (2001): Wirtschafts- und Verwaltungstexte aus Ebla: Archiv L. 2769 (MEE 12), Rome.
- Watkins, C. (1995): How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics (Oxford).
- Weeden, M. (2020): The ‘Influence’ of Sumerian on Hittite Literature. In: R. Hasselbach-Andee (ed.), A Companion to Ancient Near Eastern Languages, Hoboken, 505–520.
- West, M.L. (1997): The East Face of Helicon, Oxford.
- West, M.L. (2007): Indo-European Poetry and Myth, Oxford.
- Wiggerman, F.A.M. (2021): Sumuqan, BiOr. 78, 597–607.
- Wilhelm, G. (1994): Hymnen der Hethiter, in W. Burkert/F. Stolz (ed.), Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich (OBO 131), Freiburg/Göttingen, 59–77.
- Yakubovich, I. (2014): ‘From Lower Land to Cappadocia’, in M. Kozuh et al. (ed.), Extraction & Control: Studies in Honor of Matthew W. Stolper, Chicago, 347–351.
- Yakubovich, I. (2015): ‘Phoenician and Luwian in Early Iron Age Cilicia’, AnSt. 65, 35–53.