

## Abhandlung

Christopher Metcalf

# Old Babylonian Religious Poetry in Anatolia: From Solar Hymn to Plague Prayer

**Abstract:** In a recently published Old Babylonian Sumerian solar hymn, a diseased suppliant inquires into the nature of a past but unknown religious offence with which he has angered his personal god. The present article contains an interpretation of this passage and a discussion of its various Hittite versions, which range from an almost literal translation (in the Prayer of Kantuzili) to renderings that were strongly adapted to Hittite customs (in the prayers of Mursili II.). This unusually well-documented case offers new insights into the translation and adaptation of literary texts in the ancient Near East.

DOI 10.1515/za-2015-0005

The Sumerian solar hymn ‘Utu the hero’, first edited by Cavigneaux (2009), was a well-known text in the Old Babylonian period: its incipit is cited in a literary catalogue from Nippur, and the extant manuscripts, as far as their provenance is known, were found in Meturan, Susa and (probably) Sippar. Indeed the popularity of ‘Utu the hero’ extended as far as Anatolia, since two central passages in a group of Hittite solar hymns (CTH 372–374) can be shown to depend ultimately on the Sumerian text (Metcalf 2011). This fact is not surprising in itself, because the Hittite hymns CTH 372–374 manifest various other signs of Babylonian influence that have long been recognised; but the correspondences with ‘Utu the hero’ are remarkably literal and detailed. They consist of an opening section in which the Sun-god enters the divine assembly through the gates of heaven, where the other gods of the pantheon pay him homage. In both versions (Sumerian and Hittite), these introductory praises of the Sun-god prepare the ground for a later passage in which a human suppliant complains of a debilitating affliction that has left him contemplating the prospect of death. The suppliant assumes that he must have angered his personal god with some religious offence, and suggests various types of divination by means of which the personal god might inform him of his crime, under the benign watch of the Sun-god.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviations are those of the Reallexikon der Assyriologie. This article was written with the support of a postdoctoral research fellowship awarded by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, thanks to

**Christopher Metcalf:** Wolfson College, University of Oxford;  
Email: christopher.metcalf@wolfson.ox.ac.uk

The present article revisits a particular section of the suppliant’s prayer. The sense of the passage in ‘Utu the hero’ can be clarified with the help of parallels in other Babylonian literary compositions that address similar topics, and some improved readings of the difficult Sumerian source (text 1) are proposed here. An almost literal Hittite translation of the Sumerian passage is extant in CTH 372–374, where the best-preserved version in the Prayer of Kantuzili (CTH 373, text 2) presents some intriguing variants that require detailed examination. Further Hittite versions, which were clearly adapted to suit an Anatolian context, emerge in the corpus of Plague Prayers of king Mursili II. (texts 3–4), and this process of adaptation can be reconstructed with the help of other Hittite and Luwian sources. While a full comparative analysis of Babylonian and Hittite religious poetry remains to be written, the texts from Hattusa do suggest that certain Sumerian and Akkadian compositions were deliberately selected, probably according to Hittite religious priorities, and then sometimes translated into Hittite and adapted in hymns and prayers devoted to Anatolian deities.<sup>2</sup> The present study aims to illuminate this process of translation.

which I enjoyed the ideal working conditions of the Lehrstuhl für Alt-orientalistik, Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg. I am grateful to my sponsor, Prof. Daniel Schwemer, for his advice and support. I also thank Prof. Antoine Cavigneaux for some discussion of the Sumerian text, Samuel Atkins (British Museum) and Prof. Markus Hilgert (Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin) for enabling me to collate relevant tablets, and audiences in Chicago and Munich for their comments on earlier versions of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> See Wilhelm (1994); a new comparative analysis of some of the major sources can be found in Metcalf (2015, 79–103).

tion and adaptation by examining in detail a specific and unusually well-documented case.

In the Sumerian version (1), the supplicant is afflicted by a disease that he believes to have been sent by his angry personal god to punish him for some religious offence. In order to recover, the supplicant first needs to establish the nature of his crime, and he therefore invites his personal god to communicate with him by means of divination. As noted in the comments to line 53 (below), the underlying concepts of religious offence and divine retribution are familiar from Babylonian wisdom literature and mythology.<sup>3</sup> The disease from which the supplicant claims to suffer is

a conventional and perhaps metaphorical image that is supposed to illustrate his alienation from the personal god.<sup>4</sup> It will be seen below that in some of the Hittite adaptations (3)–(4) the disease is no longer a literary topos but a real affliction that has struck the Hittite country. The Sumerian passage starts with a refrain (line 53), which the main manuscript (ms. A) subsequently repeats in abbreviated form. The sequence of the lines follows ms. A, although ms. D and the near-literal Hittite version (2) suggest that lines 54 and 57 should swap places (see the comments to line 54, below). I propose the following score transliteration followed by a translation and comments:<sup>5</sup>

#### Transliteration:

- (1) 53 A rev. 10': diġir-ġa<sub>2</sub> niġ<sub>2</sub>-ge<sub>17</sub>-ga-a-ni ħa-ma-be<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>3</sub>-bi ġal<sub>2</sub> ba-ra-ab-taka<sub>4</sub>-a niġ<sub>2</sub>-nam-ma-a ga-zu  
D obv. 8'–9': [...]'ge<sub>17</sub>-ga-ni' ħa-ma-ab-<sup>1</sup>x' ša<sub>3</sub>-bi ġal<sub>2</sub> ħa-ma-ab-<sup>1</sup>taka<sub>4</sub> / niġ<sub>2</sub>-[nam-ma x zu<sup>1</sup> [x]-x
- 54 A rev. 11': maš<sub>2</sub>-šu-gid<sub>2</sub>-gid<sub>2</sub> <sup>4</sup>utu-kam usu<sub>3</sub>-kam ħa-ma(BA)-be<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>3</sub>-bi  
D obv. 14'–15': 'maš<sub>2</sub>-šu-gid<sub>2</sub>-gid<sub>2</sub> <sup>4</sup>utu-kam u[su<sub>3</sub>...] / ša<sub>3</sub>-bi ġal<sub>2</sub> ħa-ma-ab-t[aka<sub>4</sub>...]
- 55 A rev. 12': ensi(EN.(ME.)LI) x x x-a-bi ħa-ma-be<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>3</sub>-bi  
D obv. 12'–13': ensi NE [(x)] še 'šum<sub>2</sub><sup>1</sup>-ma i[n(?)-...] / 'ša<sub>3</sub>-bi ġal<sub>2</sub> ħa-ma<sup>1</sup>-ab-taka<sub>4</sub> niġ<sub>2</sub>-n[am...]  
E rev. 1': [...] ša<sub>3</sub>-bi ġal<sub>2</sub> ħa-ma-ab-taka<sub>4</sub> niġ<sub>2</sub>-nam [...] // [...mi-im]-ma šu-um-šu lu-lum<sup>1</sup>-mi-[id]
- 56 A rev. 13': pu<sub>2</sub>-ta AMA-dul-la igi nu-du ħa-ma-be<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>3</sub>-bi  
D obv. 16': 'u<sub>2</sub>-ħub<sub>2</sub><sup>1</sup> ma-an-dul i[gi...]  
E rev. 2': [...u<sub>2</sub>]-ħub<sub>2</sub>-me-en igi ħu-mu-ni-in-du<sub>8</sub> // [...s]uk-ku-ka-a-ku u<sub>2</sub>-ul a-na-a<sup>1</sup>-[ta<sub>2</sub>-a]<sup>1</sup>
- 57 A rev. 14': ma-mu<sub>2</sub>-da igi nu-du ħa-ma-be<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>3</sub>-bi  
D obv. 10'–11': 'ma-mu<sup>1</sup>-da igi 'nu(?) -mu-un-du<sub>8</sub> ħa-ma-ab<sup>1</sup>-du<sub>11</sub> / ša<sub>3</sub>-bi 'ġal<sub>2</sub><sup>1</sup> [ħa-ma-ab]-taka<sub>4</sub> niġ<sub>2</sub>-n[am-...]x

#### Translation:

- 53 Let my god tell me what offended him, let him reveal its meaning to me, may I know everything!
- 54 The diviner is the one of Utu, the one of the liver-omen – let him tell it to me, let him reveal its meaning to me, (may I know everything)!
- 55 The dream-interpreter ...(?) – let him tell it to me, let him reveal its meaning to me, may I know everything!<sup>6</sup>
- 56 I am deaf, he (i.e. my god) has shrouded it for me, I cannot see<sup>7</sup> – let him tell it to me, let him reveal its meaning to me, (may I know everything)!
- 57 I see no dream – let him tell it to me, let him reveal its meaning to me, may I know everything!

<sup>3</sup> See recently also Uehlinger (2007, 124–159), Mittermayer (2013), RIA s.v. Sünde A. §§ 3.2., 4. (A. Löhnert).

<sup>4</sup> See Sitzler (1995, 207–213) on the diseased supplicant in Egyptian and Babylonian wisdom literature.

<sup>5</sup> The sigla and line numbers follow Cavigneaux (2009, 8); ms. A = H 150 (Meturan); ms. D = VS 10, 212 (provenance unknown), collated in December 2014; ms. E = BM 78614 (probably Sippar), Sumero-Akkadian version, ed. Wasserman (1997), see also Bonechi (2010), collated in October 2014.

<sup>6</sup> Here the Akkadian translation of ms. E presents a variant of the final element of the refrain: '... inform (me) of everything!'. See the comments on line 53, below.

<sup>7</sup> In ms. E, the verb of 'seeing' is (correctly) negated in the Akkadian version but (erroneously) phrased as a positive modal form in the Sumerian version.

Comments on the text:

**53** This verse, which presents the refrain in its fullest form, can be divided into three elements: ‘Let my god (a) tell me what offended him, (b) let him reveal its meaning to me, (c) may I know everything!’. To begin with the final element: in ms. A, Cavigneaux (2009, 9) hesitantly suggested the reading  $ni\hat{g}_2\text{-}nam\text{-}diri\text{-}ga\text{-}ke_4$ , ‘ce sont choses qui (me) dépassent(?)’. But the corresponding part of the refrain in the Hittite Prayer of Kantuzili (2), which is presented below, states: ‘may I know them (i.e. my offences)’. The supplicant wishes to learn the true nature of his offence, and this suggests a different reading of the Sumerian version:  $ni\hat{g}_2\text{-}nam\text{-}ma\text{-}a\text{-}ga\text{-}zu$ , ‘may I know everything’, matching the fragmentary Akkadian translation of the refrain in ms. E at line 55: [... *mim*] *ma šumšu* (=  $ni\hat{g}_2\text{-}nam\text{-}ma$ ) *lumm[id]*, ‘... inform (me) of everything!’ (collated). Ms. D seems to present another version of the phrase: while  $ni\hat{g}_2\text{-}nam\text{-}ma$  looks certain (collated; kindly checked by D. Schwemer), I have failed to decipher both the broken sign (not  $ga\text{-}$ , possibly  $i_3\text{-}$ ) that precedes  $zu$  and the very faint traces of wedges that follow it. But the phrase  $ni\hat{g}_2\text{-}nam\text{-}(ma)\text{-}zu$  is in any case well-attested, particularly as a divine attribute: e.g. *munus zi dub-sar nin ni\hat{g}\_2\text{-}nam zu*, ‘(Nisaba,) the true woman, the scribe, the lady who knows everything’ (Lipit-Eštar B:19, ed. Vanstiphout 1978); *gal-zu ni\hat{g}\_2\text{-}nam\text{-}ma* // *mu-de-e mim-ma šum-šu\_2*, ‘(Asalluḫi,) who knows everything’ (SBH 34 obv. 11f. = CLAM 413–417, 30). It is the supplicant’s hope that the gods will communicate their superior divine knowledge to him and deliver him from his human ignorance. The situation resembles a passage in the Old Babylonian Sumerian composition known as ‘A Man and his God’, in which the supplicant seems to be ignorant of his crimes and appeals to his god to let him know what he has done wrong.<sup>8</sup> As a bilingual prayer puts it: when it comes to distinguishing between offensive and inoffensive behaviour, ‘mankind is deaf, it knows nothing’ ( $nam\text{-}lu_2\text{-}u_{18}\text{-}lu\text{-}u_2\text{-}ḫub\text{-}am_3\text{-}a\hat{g}_2\text{-}nu\text{-}un\text{-}zu$  // *a-me-lu-tu su-ku-ka-at-ma mim-ma ul i-de*, IV R<sup>2</sup> 10 rev. 29–34, ed. Maul 1988, 237–246), and the supplicant in the present text expresses his incomprehension in similar terms: ‘I am deaf, I do not see’ (line 56).<sup>9</sup> His request for information is the topic of the first part of

<sup>8</sup> Following Klein (2006, 129), see also Uehlinger (2007, 130f). The text of line 113, based on CBS 15205+ (P343746 and Kramer 1969, pl. iv) is:  $di\hat{g}ir\text{-}\hat{g}u_{10}\text{-}[x]\text{-}nam\text{-}da_6\text{-}\hat{g}u_{10}\text{-}igi\text{-}\hat{g}u_{10}\text{-}u_3\text{-}mi\text{-}zu$ , ‘My god [...], when you have made my eyes know my error (then I will declare it)’, i.e. ‘when you have let me know my error (then I will declare it)’.

<sup>9</sup> See further van der Toorn (1985, 94–97) on this topos.

the refrain (a), beginning with an anticipatory genitive:  $di\hat{g}ir\text{-}\hat{g}a_2\text{-}ni\hat{g}_2\text{-}ge_{17}\text{-}ga\text{-}a\text{-}ni$ , literally: ‘of my god, his forbidden thing’, i.e. ‘the thing that my god forbids’, which refers to the religious offence that the supplicant committed and corresponds to *wašdul=mit*, ‘my offence’, in the Hittite version (2). The subject of the verb  $ḫa\text{-}ma\text{-}be_2$  is probably also the personal god, as Cavigneaux (2009, 11) understood it, rather than the Sun-god (who is not mentioned in the preceding lines), and so ‘let my god tell me what offended him’ is an appropriate English rendering of (a). Element (b) of the refrain continues this request: ‘let him reveal its meaning to me’, referring to the offence. The verbal form  $\hat{g}al_2\text{-}ba\text{-}ra\text{-}ab\text{-}taka_4\text{-}a$  in ms. A could in practice be interpreted in various ways (negative modal prefix *bara-*; ablative *ba-ta-* > *ba-ra-*),<sup>10</sup> which however make no sense in the context, and the translation must therefore follow the precativ form in ms. D ( $\hat{g}al_2\text{-}ḫa\text{-}ma\text{-}ab\text{-}taka_4\text{-}l$ ), corresponding to the 3<sup>rd</sup> sg. imperative *kinuddu*, ‘let him reveal’, in the literal Hittite version (2).

**54** Comparison with the more explicit Hittite version (2) of the refrain suggests that  $ni\hat{g}_2\text{-}ge_{17}\text{-}ga\text{-}a\text{-}ni$  remains the implied object of  $ḫa\text{-}ma\text{-}be_2$  and that the first part of the line is syntactically independent. There is variation in the arrangement of the text between ms. A on the one hand and ms. D and the Hittite version (2) on the other. In ms. A, extispicy by the diviner is the first option mentioned (line 54), followed by the dream-interpreter (55) and an implicit request for a dream (57); but in ms. D, and in the Hittite version (2), the request for a dream comes first, followed by the dream-interpreter and the diviner. The numbering of the lines of the Sumerian text that Cavigneaux (2009) established is based on ms. A, which may however present an eccentric variant.

**55** In analogy to the description of the diviner (‘the one of Utu, the one of the liver-omen’), the first part of the present line is likely to specify the particular technique that is to be used by the dream-interpreter. In ms. D, the sign *NE* is probably to be read *izi*, ‘fire’, and *še* refers to grain that is elsewhere said to be used in connection with dream-interpretation, compare: *ensi-e še-e-ta i-bi\_2-a nu-mu-un-na-an-bad-de\_3* // *ša\_2-i-lu ina mu-uš-ša\_2-ak-ka ul i-pe-te-šu\_2*, ‘(Sum.) The dream-interpreter cannot reveal (his fate) to him by means of grain in the smoke’ // ‘(Akk.) The dream-interpreter cannot reveal (his fate) to him by means of a dream-oblation’ (IV R<sup>2</sup> 22

<sup>10</sup> See Attinger (1993, 796) s.v. *ba-ra-*.

n2: 10'–11' = Maul 1988, 331–333), with the detailed comments of George/al-Rawi (1996, 173f.). A possible reading of ms. D is: *ensi izi-<sup>1</sup>e še šum<sub>2</sub>-ma i[n-...]*, 'The dream interpreter, having given grain to the fire,...'; but this is not certain, and I am unable to reconcile it with the undeciphered signs in the corresponding text of ms. A – In the final element of the refrain at the end of the line, collation of ms. E confirms the copy of Wasserman (1997, 266) and the reading *lu-<sup>1</sup>um<sup>1</sup>-mi-[id]*, 'inform (me)!' (Cavigneaux 2009, 9). A 1<sup>st</sup> sg. form (*\*lulmad*), which would correspond literally to *ga-zu* (1) and *ganešmi* (2), is excluded. The sense is not fundamentally different ('may I know everything!' vs. 'inform me of everything!'), and the variant indeed helps to clarify the general meaning of the refrain, since it confirms that the supplicant is genuinely ignorant and therefore seeks to learn the nature of his offence. This will prove to be relevant in the comparison with the Hittite version (2), below.

56 Wasserman (1999) has drawn attention to a parallel that clarifies the sense of this line: *u<sub>2</sub>-ḫub-me-en du<sub>6</sub>-la-ab i-bi<sub>2</sub> nu-un-du<sub>8</sub> // su-uk-ku-ka-ku ka-at-ma-ku ul a-na-aṭ-ṭa-al*, 'I am deaf, I am shrouded,<sup>11</sup> I do not see' (Ešh n38–42: 15', composite text, ed. Maul 1988, 216–228). The first two signs in ms. D are certainly to be read *u<sub>2</sub>-ḫub<sub>2</sub>* even though the latter sign is TUK (no final vertical wedge), as correctly copied by Zimmern. Cavigneaux (2009, 13) has noted the lexical equation *pu<sub>2</sub>-ta* (ms. A) = *sukkuku*.

(2) [*ki-nu-n*]a-mu-za am-me-el DINGIR-IA ŠA<sub>3</sub>-ŠU ZI-ŠU ḫu-u-ma-an-te-<sup>1</sup>et<sup>1</sup> kar-di-it ki-i-nu-ud-du nu-mu wa-aš-du-ul-mi-it [*te-e-ed*]-du ne-za-an ga-ne<sub>2</sub>-eš-mi na-aš-šu-mu DINGIR-IA za-aš-ḫe<sub>2</sub>-ia me-e-ma-u<sub>2</sub> nu-mu-za DINGIR-IA ŠA<sub>3</sub>-ŠU ki-nu-ud-du [*nu-mu wa-aš-d*]u-ul-mi-it te-e-ed-du ne-za-an ga-ne<sub>2</sub>-eš-mi na-aš-ma-mu <sup>munus</sup>ENSI me-e-ma-u<sub>2</sub> [*na-aš-ma-mu* Š]A <sup>d</sup>UTU <sup>lu<sub>2</sub></sup>AZU IŠ-TU <sup>uzu</sup>NIG<sub>2</sub>.GIG me-e-ma-u<sub>2</sub> nu-mu-za DINGIR-IA ḫu-u-ma-an-te-et kar-di-it [ŠA<sub>3</sub>-ŠU ZI-ŠU] <sup>1</sup>ki-i-nu-ud-du<sup>1</sup> nu-mu wa-aš-du-ul-mi-it te-ed-du ne-za-an ga-ne<sub>2</sub>-eš-mi

57 In ms. D, the sign after *igi* probably has no vertical wedge (against Zimmern's copy), and *nu-* therefore seems possible but not certain.<sup>12</sup>

The Sumerian passage was among those elements of 'Utu the hero' that emerge in a nearly literal but at the same time highly sensitive Hittite rendering in the corpus of solar hymns CTH 372–374 (ed. Schwemer, in press). It is not currently possible to determine when or where the translation was made, and the practical function of these solar hymns, which open with extensive praises of the Sun-god and conclude with a prayer for the calming of an angry personal god, is likewise unclear. While the vision of the Sun-god (and the personal god) that they present is heavily indebted to Babylonian concepts,<sup>13</sup> this does not preclude their use in practical Hittite religion – given that various Babylonian elements are known to have been embedded in the rich corpus of ritual texts from Hattusa.<sup>14</sup> But the prayers of Mursili II. show that CTH 372–374 also served as a literary template that was subsequently used in the composition of other Hittite religious poetry. Whatever its primary purpose may have been, CTH 372–374 (text 2) is a vital intermediary that stands between the ultimate Sumerian model (1) and the strongly adapted Hittite versions (3)–(4). In this prayer, which is best preserved in a version uttered by an otherwise little-known figure known as Kantuzili (CTH 373), the supplicant complains bitterly of his alienation from his personal god, which causes him great suffering. He seems not to know what he has done to offend his god, and therefore asks the Sun-god to transmit a request for information:

11 Following the Akkadian version and ignoring the imperative in the Sumerian text.

12 Additional remarks on the lines that follow this passage: in line 58, ms. E rev. 3' has [...]-mi-du<sub>11</sub>-ga-ge<sub>n</sub>7 ma-ab-diri // [... ki]-ma iq-bu-u<sub>2</sub> u<sub>2</sub>-ša-te-er (collated). In line 59, ms. A rev. 16' should probably be read *diri nam-ku<sub>5</sub>-da*, rather than *diri nam-tar-da*, compare the similar passage in *utu-gen<sub>7</sub> e<sub>3</sub>-ta n+2: 30'–31'* with parallel texts (ed. Löhnert 2009, 355, 370).

13 See most recently Metcalf (2011, 168–170), Alaura/Bonechi (2012, 24 f. and 53–55).

14 See Schwemer (2013b) for a convenient overview, which includes the Babylonian ritual for the calming of a personal god (CTH 432) in which the Sun-god is invoked as a judge. In the late river-ritual KUB 36, 83(+) i 12–15 (CTH 456.2.1.A, ed. F. Fuscagni, URL <hethiter.net>: CTH 456.2.1, Expl. A, 10. 03. 2014), the invocation of the Sun (as lord of heaven and just shepherd who saves mankind) broadly resembles the opening of the solar hymn CTH 372 and may thus be another instance of Babylonian influence on Hittite ritual sources.

‘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. Let my god either speak to me in a dream – let my god reveal his soul to me and let him tell me my offences so that I may know them – or let a female dream-interpreter speak to me, or let a diviner of the Sun-god speak to me (upon reading) from a liver! 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!’ (CTH 373, 24’–28’ = KUB 30, 10 obv. 24’–28’).<sup>15</sup>

The Hittite version clearly follows the Sumerian refrain, except that the order of the elements that form the sufferer’s plea has changed. In the fullest version of the Sumerian source (1), line 53, they appear as follows: ‘Let my god (a) tell me what offended him, (b) let him reveal its meaning to me, (c) may I know everything!’, whereas in CTH 373 (2) the order is (b)–(a)–(c): ‘Now let my god (b) reveal his innermost soul to me with all his heart, and let him (a) tell me my offences (c) so that I may know them’. Element (b) calls for particular comment. The supplicant in the Sumerian version (1) asks the personal god to reveal the ‘meaning’ of the offence that was committed against him (niĝ<sub>2</sub>-ge<sub>17</sub>-ga-a-ni ... ša<sub>3</sub>-bi). According to the fullest form of the Hittite refrain in (2), however, the god is asked to reveal his own self, rather than the meaning of offence: this is expressed in the curious and at first sight redundant phrase ša<sub>3</sub>-šū ZI-ŠU *hūmantet kardit*: ‘(let him reveal) his innermost soul, with all his heart’. Since element (b) of the refrain precedes element (a) in the Hittite version (2), the supplicant’s mention of the ‘offence’ (*wašdul* // niĝ<sub>2</sub>-ge<sub>17</sub>-g) is postponed, and so ša<sub>3</sub>-šū must naturally refer to the personal god himself rather than to the offence. It is also clear that nothing in the available Sumerian text corresponds to ZI-ŠU or to *hūmantet kardit*.

An attempt to explain these discrepancies could start from the phrase ša<sub>3</sub>-šū ZI-ŠU. Before the publication of the Sumerian model, ša<sub>3</sub>-šū ZI-ŠU was taken to correspond to the pair *karāt- ištanzan-* that is attested in Hittite mythological and ritual texts and seems to mean something like ‘inner body (and) soul’ as an expression of totality.<sup>16</sup> There is nothing in the Sumerian source that requires this interpretation to change. It can even be strengthened by an entry in a section on words beginning with ša<sub>3</sub> in the Hittite recension of the Old Babylonian Lu<sub>2</sub>-series: in KBo

1, 39 ii 8’, the Sumerian phrase lu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>3</sub>-ge<sub>4</sub> // *tu<sub>3</sub>-ub lib<sub>3</sub>-bi* is glossed in Hittite as ZI-ni x- [...], ‘in the soul [...]’ (MSL 12, 216 f.). This suggests that a Hittite scribe who saw ša<sub>3</sub>/šA<sub>3</sub>, ‘insides’, in a Sumerian text might naturally associate this term with ZI (*ištanzan-*), ‘soul’, guided perhaps by the common pairing *karāt- ištanzan-*, ‘inner body (and) soul’.<sup>17</sup> Comparison with the lexical source is further encouraged by the fact that the same text lists the equation lu<sub>2</sub> ša<sub>3</sub> til-la // [ga]m-ra-at lib<sub>3</sub>-ba<sub>2</sub> (ii 6’); even though no Hittite gloss is recorded, this is evidently a Sumero-Akkadian form of the phrase *hūmantet kardit*, ‘with all his heart’, which follows ša<sub>3</sub>-šū ZI-ŠU in CTH 373 (2). In fact *libbum gamrum* is a common Akkadian idiom of sincerity, attested already in CH xlvi 45 f.: ‘let (the wronged man) bless me with all his heart (*ina libbišu gamrim*)’.<sup>18</sup> I am on the other hand unable to adduce clear contextual examples of ša<sub>3</sub> til-la, the equivalent Sumerian phrase quoted by the lexical text KBo 1, 39, which was perhaps formed artificially to create a matching pair with the following, homophonous entry ša<sub>3</sub> til-la // ba<sub>2</sub>-la-a<sub>7</sub> ša<sub>3</sub> (ii 7’).<sup>19</sup> But the independent Akkadian evidence and the lexical text indicate, at least, that *hūmantet kardit* could have a Babylonian (specifically Akkadian?) background,

<sup>15</sup> Parallel version: CTH 372: 119–127 (= KUB 36, 79+ ii 51–59), without significant variants.

<sup>16</sup> For instance, the Telipinu-myth CTH 324.2 speaks of the ‘inner body (and) soul’ of Telipinu that are to be purified (*ga-ra-az-ši-iš ištā-an-za-ši-iš*, KUB 33, 5 iii 6, Rieken [et al.] (ed.), URL <hethiter.net>: CTH 324.2 INTR 2009.08.12). The attestations have been collected by Kammenhuber (1964, 164–167) and HED s.v. *karat-*, see further discussions by Rieken (1999, 139 f.), Archi (2007, 183 f. n.12), Melchert (2010, 149).

<sup>17</sup> In the lexical lists from Hattusa, it is not unusual that Hittite translations of Sumerian terms were written with Sumerograms that were not the same as the signs in the orthographic Sumerian column: see Weeden (2011, 95–97. 102). Connections between lexical texts and other imported Babylonian literature have recently been established by Cohen (2012, 12).

<sup>18</sup> See esp. Stol (1993, 247–249), Durand (2001, 125). To my knowledge, J.-M. Durand *apud* Mouton (2007, 119 n.83) was the first to note the correspondence between *hūmantet kardit* and the Akkadian idiom *libbum gamrum*.

<sup>19</sup> The difficult passage: x[...u]r<sub>5</sub>-ĝu<sub>10</sub> ħul til-la-ĝu<sub>10</sub> // [x] ka-bat-ti ul [i]b-šū<sub>2</sub>-u (Ešh 106: 11’–12’), left untranslated by Maul (1988, 359–361), may at first glance seem to offer some kind of parallel to ša<sub>3</sub> til but is actually founded on the usual confusion of til and til<sub>3</sub> (= *bašūm*), the latter being the expected term here (see Krecher 1987, 86 n.21 on ħul til<sub>3</sub>). If the correspondence between ħul and ul is based on homophony without reflecting the sense of the Sumerian words, the translation is ‘... my mood that is doing badly’. Elsewhere, the lexical equation za l = *gamārum* (Secondary Proto-Ea/Aa no. 14 ii’ 11’ = MSL 14, 136) could point to the rare phrase ša<sub>3</sub> za l as another possible parallel, but its meaning seems quite different: see attestations and discussion by Marchesi (2006, 39 f. n.172) and Peterson (2011, 193 f. n.62).

even though it is not found in the currently available Sumero-Akkadian models of CTH 373 (2).<sup>20</sup>

Hence the phrase  $\check{s}a_3\text{-}\check{s}u\text{-}zi\text{-}\check{s}u\text{-}\check{h}umantet\text{-}kardit$  departs considerably from the simple  $\check{s}a_3\text{-}bi$  of the Sumerian model. The switching of elements (a) and (b) of the refrain means that  $\check{s}a_3\text{-}\check{s}u\text{-}zi\text{-}\check{s}u$  refers back to DINGIR-IA ('my god') rather than to *wašdul* //  $ni\check{g}_2\text{-}ge_{17}\text{-}g$  (the 'offence'). Unless this reflects a variant model,<sup>21</sup> the switching could be seen as a deliberate adaptation to the familiar Hittite pairing *karāt*-( $\check{s}a_3$ ) *ištanzan*-(*zi*), 'inner body (and) soul', which must naturally refer to an animate being. The passage could therefore represent another example of intelligent translation in CTH 372–374, since the Hittite version manages to conserve the basic sense of the original while adapting it to a new idiom.<sup>22</sup> Finally, the expansion *hūmantet kardit* is probably a further Babylonian element in the Hittite text, but its precise origin cannot be established at present.

Segment (c) of the refrain in the Hittite version (2) also seems to differ slightly from the newly available Sumerian model (1). This is the segment in which the supplicant, having asked the god to identify his offences, adds, according to the Hittite version: *n=e=z=(š)an ganešmi*, 'so that I may know them'.<sup>23</sup> In the comments to line 53 of the Sumerian version, above, I argued that the corresponding Sumerian phrase 'may I know everything' reflects the supplicant's genuine ignorance: humans become culpable unwittingly because they struggle to distinguish right from wrong, and so divine help is needed to establish what exactly they have done to anger the gods. This interpretation is confirmed by the Akkadian variant in line 55, ms. E: '... inform (me) of everything!', which is clearly a request to be told the nature of the offence. The Hittite version, however, is generally rendered 'so that I may

acknowledge them', which implies that the supplicant's concern is to accept the offences as his own, or even to confess them.<sup>24</sup> It may be true that this interpretation is founded on the general usage of the Hittite verb *ganešš-/kanešš-*, but the Sumerian and Akkadian evidence better agrees with older translations such as 'damit ich sie (i.e. meine Sünde) herausfinde' (Friedrich 1940, 154).<sup>25</sup> On the other hand, Hittite oracular reports suggest that such demands for basic information used the verb *šakk-*.<sup>26</sup> A sharp distinction is probably unnecessary, since, in the present context, knowledge of the offence implies its acknowledgement before the god.<sup>27</sup> This was explicitly the case in the Old Babylonian Sumerian composition 'A Man and his God', where the supplicant states that, once the god has informed him of his offence, he will then recognise it in public.<sup>28</sup> 'Knowing' is the preliminary step to 'acknowledging' in this context, and the difference is therefore gradual rather than categorical.

The Sumerian and Hittite versions essentially agree in the remaining elements that make up the passage until line 57 of the former source, as far as it can be understood. Both versions refer to the same two basic methods of divination: extispicy or dream-interpretation. These two techniques are commonly associated in Sumerian and Akkadian literature, and they are the usual provinces of the Sun-god Utu.<sup>29</sup> As a further possibility, the supplicant in CTH 373 (2) asks the personal god to speak to him directly in a dream, which probably corresponds to line 57 of the Sumerian text (1), if that is an implicit request for

<sup>20</sup> No other attestation of the phrase *hūmantet kardit* is listed by HW<sup>2</sup> s.v. *humant-* 1.2. According to Rieken (2014, 165 f), constructions in which *hūmant-* precedes its head noun are characteristic of Hittite religious language.

<sup>21</sup> Passages describing divination in Gudea Cyl. alternate between  $\check{s}a_3\text{-}(bi)$ , referring to the 'meaning' of a dream, and  $\check{s}a_3\text{-}(ga\text{-}ni)$ , referring to the 'heart' or 'intention' of the god who sent the dream: see Zgoll (2006, 452–454). By analogy, a hypothetical variant Sumerian model containing a sequence (b)–(a)–(c), as in the Hittite version (2), is not inconceivable:  $*\check{s}a_3\text{-}ga\text{-}ni\ \check{g}a_2\ \check{h}a\text{-}ma\text{-}ab\text{-}ta\check{k}a_4\text{-}(a)\ ni\check{g}_2\text{-}ge_{17}\text{-}ga\text{-}a\text{-}ni\ \check{h}a\text{-}ma\text{-}be_2\ ni\check{g}_2\text{-}nam\text{-}ma\text{-}(a)\ ga\text{-}zu$ .

<sup>22</sup> Compare the move from  $gir_{17}\ \check{s}u\ \check{g}a_2$  to *aruwai* in the opening hymn to the Sun-god, which illustrates the sensitivity of the translation (Metcalf 2011, 172).

<sup>23</sup> Here as elsewhere, a Sumerian voluntative verbal form (*ga-zu*) corresponds to a Hittite present-future, which can therefore be interpreted as modal, see Metcalf (2011, 175 n.28) with literature.

<sup>24</sup> This was argued by Laroche (1961, 27 f), whose interpretation has been followed in HED s.v. *ganes(s)*, *kaneš(s)-* as well as in the lexicographical studies of Catsanicos (1991, 9–11) and García Trabazo (2007, 293) and in the recent translations of Singer (2002, 32), Mouton (2007, 119) and Schwemer (2013a, 107). But when Mursili II. speaks of admitting past offences in the Plague Prayer CTH 378.II, the verb usually translated as 'to confess' is *tarna-*, e.g. KUB 14, 8 rev. 15', 16', 26', 27', 29' (ms. A).

<sup>25</sup> Compare also: 'so that I might learn about it' (ANET<sup>3</sup>, 400), 'damit ich sie erkenne' (Haas 2003, 64).

<sup>26</sup> For instance: 'If you, O god, are angry about only those offences (*waškuwaš*) that we already know about (*šekkueni*) ...' (KUB 5, 7+ obv. 26), cit. CHD s.v. *šak(k)-*, *šekk-* 1 b 2', see further under 1 f 1'.

<sup>27</sup> As observed by Archi (1991, 86). Note also, elsewhere in the prayer of Kantuzili, the sequence 'Do I not know (*šakhi*) my god's mercy that is (with me) since childhood, do I not acknowledge it (*ganešmi*)?' (KUB 30, 10 obv. 10'), which could imply a semantic distinction between the two verbs and, possibly, a move from 'knowing' to 'acknowledging'.

<sup>28</sup> 'A Man and his God' 113–115, see Klein (2006, 129) and n.8, above.

<sup>29</sup> See esp. Steinkeller (2005, 34–37), Zgoll (2006, 401–411).

a dream-message to be sent.<sup>30</sup> As for extispicy, the Hittite version features the Sumerogram <sup>uzu</sup>NIG<sub>2</sub>.GIG, ‘liver’, a usage only attested in Anatolian cuneiform, according to the recent study of Weeden (2011, 591). Uncannily, the same sign-combination niĝ<sub>2</sub>-ge<sub>17</sub>-g (ge<sub>17</sub> = GIG) is also prominent in the Sumerian version, but there it has the usual meaning ‘forbidden thing’. It is difficult to see how the Anatolian Sumerogram <sup>uzu</sup>NIG<sub>2</sub>.GIG in CTH 373 (2), and in Hittite texts generally, could in any way be linked to the presence of niĝ<sub>2</sub>-ge<sub>17</sub>-g in the Sumerian model, especially since the standard meaning of niĝ<sub>2</sub>-ge<sub>17</sub>-g was known at Hattusa, and so the coincidence is probably meaningless.<sup>31</sup>

Fear of divine punishment for human offences was an established theme in Hittite religious thought, as is documented for instance by oracle reports,<sup>32</sup> and the fundamental concerns of the supplicant in the Sumerian hymn ‘Utu the hero’ are therefore likely to have been naturally intelligible to a Hittite audience. The translation in the Prayer of Kantuzili (2) is certainly a very sensitive rendering, even though it is in my view not yet possible to determine whether it was made directly from a Sumerian source or via an Akkadian intermediary.<sup>33</sup> The redundant syntax follows the Sumerian refrain, and the substance of the supplicant’s request remains intact. There are differ-

ences in the syntactical arrangement, however, and this has led to at least one change in sense (the ‘meaning’ of the offence vs. the ‘innermost soul’ of the god), which may reflect a variant model or an editorial intervention. The basic means of divination proposed by the supplicant are entirely conventional in a Babylonian context, and in the following pages I will attempt to show how the appeal to extispicy and dream-interpretation was not only translated into Hittite (version 2) but also (in versions 3–4) adapted to the specific practice of divination in Hattusa.

Within the corpus of Hittite religious poetry, it has long been recognised that the request formulated by Kantuzili (2) is also attested in further versions (3)–(4) that likewise ask for information on a past offence and that propose the same methods of divination.<sup>34</sup> The earliest of these (CTH 376.I) is now considered to be a Middle Hittite prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (3a) that served as a model to a prayer of Mursili II. (CTH 376.II) to the same deity (3b). In both versions the Hittite land is said to be suffering from plague, hostility and famine that the gods have sent for unknown reasons.<sup>35</sup> The supplicant therefore asks the gods to identify the offence. The relevant passage is nearly identical in (3a) and (3b), the former being partly reconstructed:

30 This request is the first of the three options in version (2), which corresponds to the order in ms. D (but not ms. A) of version (1). See the comments on line 54 of the Sumerian text, above. A close parallel to the Hittite wording is found in a later Akkadian prayer: *ina maš<sub>2</sub>.ge<sub>6</sub> li-šab-ru-nin-ni-ma liq-bu-ni*, ‘Let (the angry gods) make me see (my offence) in a dream, and let them speak to me!’ (Šamaš 64’, line 26, ed. van der Toorn 1985, 147–54). This brief prayer also contains further elements that broadly resemble the Hittite corpus CTH 372–374 (opening praises of Šamaš passing through the door of heaven; supplicant’s prayer transmitted by Šamaš to the personal gods; promise of future praise).

31 niĝ<sub>2</sub>-ge<sub>17</sub>(-g) // [ik-ki-b]u // u<sub>2</sub>-ul a-a-ra, ‘not right’ (Izi Bogh. A 234 = MSL 13, 140). Weeden (2011, 312–14) has derived the Sumerogram <sup>uzu</sup>NIG<sub>2</sub>.GIG from a dictation error and subsequent reinterpretation of a lexical entry (in origin niĝ<sub>2</sub>-kiĝ<sub>2</sub>-ge<sub>4</sub>-a).

32 A succinct statement is contained in an oracle report on cultic practices relating to Aštata: *ma-a-an-wa DINGIR-LUM UN-ši me-na-aḥ-ḥa-an-da TUKU.TUKU-an-za iš-tar-ak-zi-wa-ra-an*, “‘When a deity is angry with a person, disease afflicts him’” (KUB 5, 6 + i 45’–46’ = CTH 570, § 11’, 45’–46’, ed. Beckman/Bryce/Cline 2011, 183–209). See also n.26, above.

33 Analysing the usage of logographic writings in Hittite texts, Weeden (2011, 383) concludes that ‘Sumerian does appear to have

been partly understood by some scribes at least. The frequency of phonetic Sumerian spellings, while not enormous, is enough to realise that school texts were probably recited.’ As far as the translation of an actual literary composition is concerned, the bilingual fragment KUB 4, 5 + KBo 12, 73 (CTH 314), in which a Hittite rendering was attempted directly from the Sumerian text, shows that the translator’s understanding of the Sumerian language was only superficial (note in particular the translation of lu na-me, ‘anyone’, as lu<sub>2</sub>-tar, ‘manliness’, where na-me is rendered as if it were an abstract-noun suffix \*lu<sub>2</sub>-nam, in analogy to -atar in Hittite), see Klinger (2010, 318–321).

34 See esp. Kammenhuber (1976, 16. 19f.), Archi (1991, 88), de Roos (2007, 20f.), Haas (2008, 126).

35 Klinger (2013, 114 n.32) has observed in this connection that the pestilences mentioned in the prayers seem to some extent to be conventional topoi. But this does not necessarily undermine their status as actual historical events, especially since ritual texts like those edited by Bawanypeck (2005, 126–148) prove that the elimination of pestilence from the Hittite land was a genuine concern and not simply a literary conceit. What the Hittite corpus of prayers does show is that such disasters were regularly interpreted as a divine punishment; compare the remarks of Singer (2011, 758 with n.131) on topoi and historical fact in Hittite historiography.

(3a) *nu* DINGIR.MEŠ *ku-it wa-aš-du-ul uš-ka-at-te-ni nu na-aš-šu* [DINGIR.MEŠ-*ni-ia-an-za u<sub>2</sub>-ed-du*] *na-at me-e-ma-a-u<sub>2</sub> na-aš-ma-at* munus.mešŠU.GI lu<sub>2</sub>.mešAZU lu<sub>2</sub>.mešMUŠEN.DU<sub>3</sub> *me-mi-ia-an-du na-aš-ma-at* *za-aš-ḫe<sub>2</sub>-az* DUMU.LU<sub>2</sub>.U<sub>19</sub>.LU *u<sub>2</sub>-wa-an-du*

‘Gods, whatever offence you perceive, let either a man of god come and declare it, or let the old women, the diviners, the augurs declare it, or let people see it in a dream’ (CTH 376.I.A = KUB 24, 4+ obv. 10’–12’).<sup>36</sup>

(3b) *nu* DINGIR.MEŠ *ku-it wa-aš-tu<sub>2</sub> uš-kat-te-ni nu na-aš-šu* DINGIR.MEŠ-*ni-ia-an-za u<sub>2</sub>-ed-du na-at me-<sup>1</sup>ma<sup>1</sup>-u<sub>2</sub> na-aš-ma-at* munus.mešŠU.GI lu<sub>2</sub>.mešAZU lu<sub>2</sub>.mešMUŠEN.DU<sub>3</sub> *me-mi-ia-an-<sup>1</sup>du<sup>1</sup> na-aš-ma-at za-aš-ḫe<sub>2</sub>-ia-az* DUMU.LU<sub>2</sub>.U<sub>19</sub>.LU *a-uš-du*

‘Gods, whatever offence you perceive, let either a man of god come and declare it, or let the old women, the diviners, the augurs declare it, or let a man see it in a dream’ (CTH 376.II.A = KUB 24, 3 ii 19’–22’ + KBo 51, 18b obv. 26’–29’).

Just as in the more literal version in the prayer of Kantuzili (2), the aim of the suppliant in passages (3a) and (3b) is to identify a past offence (*wašdul*) that provoked the anger of the gods, except that the sufferer is not just an individual as in (2) but the general Hittite population. The two basic methods of communication – extispicy by the diviner (lu<sub>2</sub>AZU), and dream-interpretation – are still present, and new means of divination have been added: the ‘man of god’, the ‘old women’ and the ‘augurs’. The laborious refrain in text (2) (‘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’), which was borrowed from the Sumerian original (1), is absent. This is also the case in a further version of the passage, in a prayer of Mursili II. to the Storm-god of Hatti (CTH 378.II). In this text, which is concerned specifically with the plague that is afflicting his country, Mursili reports past attempts to learn the cause of the gods’ wrath by means of divination. Having reviewed the possibilities that were thus established, he adds:

(4) [*nam-m*]a *ma-a-an ta-me-e-ta-az-zi-ia ku-e-ez-qa ud-da-a-na-az ak-ki-iš-ki-i-it-ta-[(r)]i [(na-at-za-ka)]n<sub>2</sub> na-aš-šu te-eš-ḫi-it u<sub>2</sub>-wa-al-lu na-aš-ma-at a-ri-ia-še-eš-na-az [ḫa-an-da-i(a-a)]t-ta-ru na-aš-ma-at* <sup>1</sup>lu<sub>2</sub>DINGIR-LIM-*ni-an-za-ma me-ma-a-u<sub>2</sub> na-aš-ma* <sup>1</sup>(A-NA)<sup>1</sup> [(lu<sub>2</sub>.mešSANGA *ku-it*) ḫu-(u-ma-an-d)]a-a-aš *wa-tar-na-aḫ-ḫu-un na-at-ša-ma-aš šu-up-pa-ia še-e[(š-ki-iš-kan<sub>2</sub>-zi)]*

‘Further, if people are dying for some other reason, let me see it in a dream or let it be determined by an oracle, or let a man of god declare it; or the priests, since I have instructed all of them, shall sleep in a sacred way’ (CTH 378.II.A = KUB 14, 8 rev. 41’–44’).<sup>37</sup>

Earlier in the same composition, Mursili cited fruitless pleas that he had made to the gods in the past and that may already have contained a similar request for information, but the text is so fragmentary that most of the key words cannot be restored with certainty.<sup>38</sup> In any case, the request has clearly become a stock element even before the prayers of Mursili. Versions (3)–(4) are so heavily adapted that the connection to the ultimate Sumerian model (1)

would be difficult to perceive if the more literal rendering in the prayer of Kantuzili (2) were not available. Starting from a Sumerian prayer to Utu by an individual suppliant (1), the extant Hittite versions begin with a (strongly Babylonian-influenced) individual prayer to the Sun-god (2). Further stages are attested in the prayers to the Anatolian Sun-goddess on behalf of a suffering country (3a)–(3b), and a prayer to the Storm-god of Hatti also on behalf of the country (4).<sup>39</sup> In the remainder of the present article, I propose to investigate the changes that were made in versions (3)–(4) in order to adapt the prayer to an Anatolian context.

<sup>36</sup> Reasons for the Middle Hittite dating of (3a) are summarised by Singer (2002, 44 f.), with further references.

<sup>37</sup> The restorations in round brackets within square brackets follow the parallel manuscripts CTH 378.II.B = KUB 14, 11+ iv 11’–17’ and CTH 378.II.C = KUB 14, 10+ iv 8’–14’. For minor variants see Mouton (2007, 121 f.).

<sup>38</sup> KUB 14, 8 obv. 2’–3’ // KUB 14, 11 i 23’–24’, reconstructed by Singer (2002, 58) as: ‘[Let the matter on account of which] it (i.e. Hatti) has been decimated [either be established through an oracle], or [let me see] it [in a dream, or let a man of god] declare [it].’ Only the last of these means of divination is certainly present in the text: [<sup>1</sup>lu<sub>2</sub>DINGIR-LIM-*ni*]-*an-za-ma me-ma-a-u<sub>2</sub>* (KUB 14, 8 obv. 3’). The ‘man of god’ also appears in a very similar context in the small fragment KBo 22, 78 obv. 3’–4’, which may belong to a manuscript of a Plague Prayer.

<sup>39</sup> According to Singer (2002, 48), the Middle Hittite version (3a) ‘may have been composed before or during the reign of Suppiluliuma I.’. It could therefore be later than the prayer of Kantuzili (2), but the precise dating of the latter cannot be established either, see Schwemer (in press). Since there may have been other (and perhaps even earlier) Hittite versions besides the sources that are currently available, and since versions (3)–(4) show that the passage under discussion was a stock phrase, it would be vain to attempt an exact chronological reconstruction.

To begin, it can be noted that the two basic means of divination mentioned in the Sumerian text (1) and in the prayer of Kantuzili (2) remain in place in the adapted versions (3)–(4): extispicy<sup>40</sup> and the interpretation of dreams (seen either by the supplicant or by someone else). The most remarkable new element in versions (3)–(4) is the ‘man of god’ (DINGIR.MEŠ-*niyant-*, *šuniyant-*) who is to declare the nature of the offence and, as the syntax in (3)–(4) makes clear, was quite distinct from the other kinds of diviners. This ‘man of god’ seems to be able to speak directly on behalf of the god, without resorting to any technical divinatory method. Source (4) suggests that he was also distinct from the ordinary priests (<sup>lu2</sup>.MEŠSANGA) who served the deity. While the other, fragmentary Hittite attestations listed by CHD under *šuniyant-* (and the verb \**šuniya-*) lack context, a recently published hieroglyphic Luwian inscription mentions another ‘man of god’ (*maššanāma/i-*) who similarly conveys the wishes of the Storm-god to a local ruler.<sup>41</sup> It has been claimed that the *šuniyant-* was identical to the individuals described as *šunan antuḥšeš*, ‘men of the gods’, who, in the Edict of Telipinu, denounce widespread bloodshed in the royal family at Hattusa,<sup>42</sup> and also to individuals referred to as <sup>lu2</sup>.MEŠ DINGIR-LIM, who carry out duties e.g. in a ritual for the Deity of the Night.<sup>43</sup> In the latter case, however, the translation ‘personnel of the deity’ (Miller 2004, 279) is entirely appropriate to the simple actions performed (handling of ritual items), and the attestation in the Edict of Telipinu is so elliptical (no divine message is mentioned) that its relevance to the present context is uncertain. Haas (2008, 50) has claimed that the *šuniyant-* of the Plague Prayers is present in the guise of an ‘old man’ (<sup>lu2</sup>ŠU.GI) in the ritual of the augur Maddunani from Arzawa, which seems to be thematically related since it is to be performed when a plague occurs in the army camp and causes men, horses and cattle to perish.<sup>44</sup> According to Bawanypeck (2005, 252f.), this ritual has a unique position among

the other plague-rituals in the Arzawa-corpus because it is designated by the Luwian term *mūranza* (meaning unknown) and because it is concerned with oracular inquiries rather than with the sending away of scapegoats. She concludes that, in this particular case, the cause of the plague was yet to be established, and that this was done by means of augury in combination with purification rites and sacrifices in which the ‘old man’ was involved. But his exact role in the (fragmentary) ritual of Maddunani is not clear, and since there is no evidence that links him to the *šuniyant-* of the Plague Prayers this (superficially attractive) comparison is not cogent.<sup>45</sup> Yet another comparison was proposed by Kammenhuber (1976, 19), who stated without argument that the *šuniyant-* simply replaces the dream-interpreter (ENSI) in (2), but the reason for this supposed substitution is not obvious, since the ‘man of god’ is clearly not an ordinary diviner.<sup>46</sup> While the Luwian parallel supports the idea that the *šuniyant-* was able to convey divine messages directly, other attestations are not easily found in the Hittite corpus, and there is no obvious counterpart to this ‘man of god’ in the Sumerian source (1) or in the prayer of Kantuzili (2): why then was he introduced to the prayers (3)–(4)? In my view, the answer could be that the *šuniyant-* who ‘comes and declares the offence’ is in fact the concrete translation of the plea contained in the refrain of the Sumerian version (‘Let my god tell me what offended him’, 1) and of the Kantuzili-prayer (‘Let him tell me my offences so that I may know them’, 2). If this plea was taken as an actual request for direct communication that was different from oracular techniques like extispicy and dream-interpretation, it required an individual who could speak to the king on behalf of the deity – and this is precisely what the function of the ‘man of god’ seems

<sup>40</sup> Represented by the <sup>lu2</sup>AZU in versions (2)–(3) and probably subsumed under the term *ariyašešsar* in (4). This term refers primarily to extispicy, according to Haas (2008, 19), but in the present context it can be understood to subsume the techniques of the ‘old women’ and the augurs as well.

<sup>41</sup> TELL AHMAR 6, later 10<sup>th</sup>–early 9<sup>th</sup> century BC, ed. Hawkins (2006): DEUS-na-mi-i-sa (§ 22); also TELL AHMAR 5, §§ 11–15. The comparison between the Hittite *šuniyant-* and the Luwian *maššanāma/i-* was made by Laroche (1967, 176) and more recently by Durand (2014, 2).

<sup>42</sup> KBo 3, 1+ ii 32, see Ehelolf (1936, 177), de Roos (2007, 20 n.90), Haas (2008, 8 n.23), CHD s.v. *šiu-* 1 n 24’ d’.

<sup>43</sup> KUB 29, 4 i 69; ii 41 (<sup>lu2</sup>.MEŠ DINGIR-LIM-ma), adduced by Pecchioli Daddi (1982, 300).

<sup>44</sup> KUB 7, 54 i 1–ii 6 (CTH 425.A), ed. Bawanypeck (2005, 126–36).

<sup>45</sup> Haas (2008, 50) supports the comparison by referring to a ‘great old man’ (*šalliš* <sup>lu2</sup>ŠU.GI) who, in a prayer of Muwatalli II. (CTH 382), supposedly performs duties similar to those of the *šuniyant-* by identifying past wrongdoings (KBo 11, 1 obv. 42). A similar claim was made by Kammenhuber (1976, 24), but the text does not say that these ‘great old men’ could speak on behalf of the gods; rather, the king consulted them simply because they remembered the old rites, as an earlier passage makes clear (KBo 11, 1 obv. 23, see CHD s.v. *mema-* 4d).

<sup>46</sup> It is true that there exists a Mesopotamian logogram <sup>lu2</sup>.DINGIR(.RA) that is a synonym of ENSI (*šā’ilu*) and occurs in Akkadian sources in relevant contexts, e.g.: [k]i <sup>lu2</sup>HAL u <sup>lu2</sup>.DINGIR.RA *di-in-šu*, EN 7-*šu*<sub>2</sub> NU SI.SA<sub>2</sub>, ‘The case of (someone suffering under divine wrath) seven times fails to be determined by the diviner and the dream-interpreter’ (BAM 316 ii 12’, ritual, see Abusch 1999, 87 f and 95 n.36), compare the analogous phrase at Ludlul II 6–7 with <sup>lu2</sup>HAL and <sup>lu2</sup>ENSI. But the logogram <sup>lu2</sup>.DINGIR(.RA) is unlikely to be connected to the Hittite ‘man of god’, since it is no more than a rebus-writing of *šā’ilu*, i.e. it implies that the etymology of *šā’ilu* is ‘(he) of god’ rather than ‘he who asks’ (root *š’l*), much like the similar rebus-writing *ša*-DINGIR (see CAD s.v. *šā’ilu*).

to have been. I suggest that his presence may result from an interpretation of the literary model: while the laborious refrain of versions (1)–(2) has disappeared, the *šuniyant*-in (3)–(4) perhaps contains its essence.

Version (3) explicitly introduces further methods of divination: ‘old women’ (*munus.meššU.GI*) and an ‘augur’ (*lu<sub>2</sub>MUŠEN.DU<sub>3</sub>*). Both are well-attested in Hittite sources and may therefore be interpreted as evidence of the adaptation of the ultimate Sumerian source to a new context. Since the systematic observation of bird-flight is not attested in Sumerian sources, no one would have expected augury to feature in text (1) or in the near-literal Hittite rendering (2), while its occurrence in (3) is clearly motivated by the popularity of this technique in Hittite divination.<sup>47</sup> The ‘old women’ are likewise well-documented in Hittite practice, where they were in charge of a lot-oracle.<sup>48</sup>

The expansion of the catalogue of diviners in (3)–(4) is presumably to be explained by the fact that these experts often collaborated, since similar sequences occur in technical sources. In an oracle report concerning an illness of Mursili II., for instance, an ‘old woman’, a diviner and an augur question the deity in turn (KUB 5, 6+ ii 7’–8’, CTH 570, ed. Beckman/Bryce/Cline 2011, 183–209).<sup>49</sup> Another report (KUB 5, 11, CTH 577.1, ed. Mouton 2007, 193–197) deals with a dream seen by a king, the significance of which is established with the help of lot-oracles, extispicy and augury. Outside the corpus of oracular reports, a group made up of diviners (*lu<sub>2</sub>.mešAZU*), augurs, ‘old women’, and a female seer or dream-interpreter (*munusENSI*) are present in a ritual concerning a river, KUB 36, 83(+) i 8’–9’ (CTH 456.2.1.A), during which they were presumably consulted. Bawany-peck (2005, 267 n.813) remarks that, in the ritual, this grouping implies the common practice of cross-checking results by means of different oracular techniques. Reviewing the few older, pre-13<sup>th</sup> century Hittite sources on divination, van den Hout (2001, 439 f.) has noted that Middle Hittite texts occasionally attest ‘second opinions’ but that

the systematic practice of cross-checking is only attested later. While the literary evidence is not explicit on the precise relationships between the divination experts, the Middle Hittite precursor (3a) does mention ‘old women’, diviners and (if correctly restored from 3b) augurs, which suggests a collaborative approach already at this earlier stage. It is important to observe the syntactic disjunctions (*naššu ... našma ... našma*): source (2) presents the various methods as distinct alternatives (‘let him speak to me in a dream’ – ‘or let a female dream-interpreter speak to me’ – ‘or a diviner’);<sup>50</sup> whereas (3) distinguishes between direct communication (‘man of god’), the technical specialists as a group (‘the old women, the diviners, the augurs’), and dream-interpretation (‘let people see it in a dream’); version (4) similarly distinguishes between a dream seen by the supplicant himself (as in version 2), an ‘oracle’ (which probably subsumes the technical specialists), the ‘man of god’, and incubation by priests. Source (3) in particular suggests that the specialists were treated as a collective, since they are not sharply distinguished from each other but are rather seen as an alternative to more direct forms of divine communication (via a dream, or via the ‘man of god’).

To conclude, a detailed comparison of versions (1)–(4) confirms the view that Hittite translations and adaptations of Babylonian religious poetry were not mere scribal exercises: this case-study demonstrates the influence of the ultimate Sumerian model on Hittite religious practice.<sup>51</sup> While the prayer of Kantuzili (2) remained heavily indebted to the model, despite some variation, other versions (3)–(4) adapted the material to a new setting. This was achieved by the insertion of new types of diviners (the ‘old women’ and augurs), in accordance with Hittite custom, and perhaps also by an interpretation of the ultimate literary source (the ‘man of god’ as a direct means of communication that puts the plea ‘Let my god tell me my offences’ into practice). The scope of the prayer was broadened: whereas the earlier versions were uttered by a diseased individual (1)–(2), the later adaptations (3)–(4) claim to speak on behalf of an entire country that was suf-

<sup>47</sup> See Haas (2008, 27–45) and Sakuma (2014) on augury in Hittite sources. It may be necessary in this connection to distinguish between augury (the systematic interpretation of bird-flight according to specialised procedures) and the observation of birds as a phenomenon of generally ominous animal behaviour, which occurs in many circumstances and is concerned with various activities besides flight. The latter kind of observation is attested as early as in the Old Babylonian and Kassite sources published by Weisberg (1969–70) and De Zorzi (2009).

<sup>48</sup> See Haas (2008, 19–22 and 105–108).

<sup>49</sup> Note that the three specialists are here enumerated in the same order as in (3), as is also the case in the oracle report CTH 569, see van den Hout (1998, 11 n.27).

<sup>50</sup> But the fragmentary parallel version of (2) in CTH 372, 119–127 (= KUB 36, 79+ ii 51–59) omits the disjunctions (*nu-mu DINGIR-IA za-aš-h[i-ia]... na-at-mu munusEN[SI]...*).

<sup>51</sup> Compare the recent remarks of Beckman (2012, 134) and Lorenz/Rieken (2010, 226 n.24), who likewise note the impact of imported literature on Hittite religion. In certain cases, such as the trilingual hymn to Iškur (CTH 314), it has been argued that the foreign text served purely didactic purposes (Klinger 2010, 324), but genuine theological interest on the part of the Hittite translators may be suspected there too: see the discussion in Metcalf (2015, 86–89).

fering under divine punishment. In the latter two versions, the disease is therefore no longer a literary topos of alienation but reflects a genuine affliction. Some reduction has also taken place, at least on a stylistic level, since the more strongly adapted versions have omitted the laborious and redundant refrain of the Sumerian model that the prayer of Kantuzili imitated. Further discoveries of new versions should help to clarify the connections between the sources, and the conclusions offered here may eventually require serious revision. But the extant versions do show that the central religious concerns of the Sumerian poem seemed intelligible and significant to an audience outside Babylonia, and that its Hittite adaptation became independent of the ultimate source to such a degree that version (4) is no longer connected to a solar deity.

Finally, this case-study illustrates the extent to which a literary text can be modified when it is transmitted across languages and cultures: no one would suspect a connection between versions (1) and (4) if the intermediate, more literal stage in the Prayer of Kantuzili (2) were not available. This is a major complicating factor in cross-cultural comparisons of ancient literature: the source text has necessarily been transformed to suit a new context, which can disguise similarities. Indeed, many scholars have compared the Hittite passages (2)–(4) to an episode in the first book of the *Iliad*, in which the Greek army is suffering under a plague sent by an angry Apollo, and Achilles proposes to consult a ‘diviner, a priest, or a dream-interpreter’ who might tell the Greeks what they have done to offend the god. This comparison, which has recently been made e.g. by Mouton (2007, 31 n.5) and West (2011, 84), is sufficiently complex to require a separate investigation.<sup>52</sup> For now, the case of the Sumerian solar hymn shows in unusual clarity that religious poetry can be helpful in reconstructing processes of literary translation and adaptation in the ancient Near East.

## List of references

- Abusch, T. (1999): Witchcraft and the anger of the personal god, in: T. Abusch/K. van der Toorn (eds.), *Mesopotamian magic. Textual, historical, and interpretative perspectives*. AMD 1. Groningen, 83–121
- Alaura, S./M. Bonechi (2012): Il carro del dio del sole nei testi cuneiformi dell'età del bronzo, *SMEA* 54, 5–115
- Archi, A. (1991): Die hethitischen Orakeltexte, in H. Klengel/W. Sundermann (eds.), *Ägypten, Vorderasien, Turfan. Probleme der Edition und Bearbeitung altorientalischer Handschriften*. Berlin, 85–90
- Archi, A. (2007): The soul has to leave the land of the living, *JANER* 7, 169–195
- Attinger, P. (1993): *Éléments de linguistique sumérienne. La construction de du<sub>11</sub>/e/di ‘dire’*. OBO Sonderband. Fribourg/Göttingen
- Bawanypeck, D. (2005): *Die Rituale der Auguren*. THeth 25. Heidelberg
- Beckman, G. M./T. R. Bryce/E. H. Cline (2011): *The Ahhiyawa texts*. Atlanta
- Beckman, G. (2012): Šamaš among the Hittites, in: W. S. van Egmond/W. H. van Soldt (eds.), *Theory and practice of knowledge transfer. Studies in school education in the ancient Near East and beyond*. Leiden, 129–135
- Bonechi, M. (2010): On BM 78614 (Bilingual hymn to Utu), *NABU* 2010/70, 79–80
- Catsanicos, J. (1991): *Recherches sur le vocabulaire de la faute. Apports du hittite à l'étude de la phraséologie indo-européenne*. Paris
- Cavigneaux, A. (2009): Deux hymnes sumériens à Utu, in: X. Faivre [e.a.] (ed.), *Et il y eut un esprit dans l'homme*. Jean Bottéro et la Mésopotamie. Paris, 3–18
- Cohen, Y. (2012): The Ugu-mu fragment from Ḫattuša/Boğazköy KBo 13.2, *JNES* 71, 1–12
- De Zorzi, N. (2009): Bird divination in Mesopotamia. New evidence from BM 108874, *Kaskal* 6, 85–135
- Durand, J.-M. (2001): Une alliance matrimoniale entre un marchand assyrien de Kanesh et un marchand mariote, in W. H. van Soldt [e.a.] (ed.), *Veenhof Anniversary volume. Studies presented to Klaas R. Veenhof on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Leiden, 119–132
- Durand, J.-M. (2014): Réflexions sur deux cas d'oniromancie, in J. M. Durand [e.a.] (ed.), *Comment devient-on prophète? Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 4–5 avril 2011*. OBO 265. Fribourg/Göttingen, 1–22
- Ehelolf, H. (1936): Hethitisch-akkadische Wortgleichungen, *ZA* 43, 170–915
- Friedrich, J. (1940): Review of KUB 30, *Afo* 13, 153–156
- García Trabazo, J. V. (2007): Die hethitischen Verben für ‘wissen, erkennen’ im indogermanischen Kontext, *SMEA* 49, 293–303
- George, A. R./F. N. H. al-Rawi (1996): Tablets from the Sippar library VI. Atra-ḫasīs, *Iraq* 58, 147–190
- Haas, V. (2003): *Materia magica et medica hethitica. Ein Beitrag zur Heilkunde im Alten Orient*. Berlin
- Haas, V. (2008): *Hethitische Orakel, Vorzeichen und Abwehrstrategien*. Berlin
- Hawkins, J. D. (2006): The inscription, in: G. Bunnens, *A new Luwian stele and the cult of the storm-god at Til Barsib – Masuwari*. Leuven
- van den Hout, T. (1998): The purity of kingship. An edition of CTH 569 and related Hittite oracle inquiries of Tuḫaliya IV. DMOA 25. Leiden
- van den Hout, T. (2001): Bemerkungen zu älteren hethitischen Orakeltexten, in: T. Richter [e.a.] (ed.), *Kulturgeschichten. Altorientalistische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*. Saarbrücken, 423–440
- Kammenhuber, A. (1964): Die hethitischen Vorstellungen von Seele und Leib, *ZA* 56, 150–212

<sup>52</sup> Attempted by Metcalf (2015, 191–220), with a particular focus on the Homeric context (and including a brief outline of some of the arguments elaborated in detail here).

- Kammenhuber, A. (1976): Orakelpraxis, Träume und Vorzeichenschau bei den Hethitern. THeth 7. Heidelberg
- Klein, J. (2006): Man and his god: A wisdom poem or a cultic lament?, in: P. Michalowski/N. Veldhuis (eds.), Approaches to Sumerian literature. Studies in honour of Stip (H. L.J. Vanstiphout). CM 35. Leiden, 123–143
- Klinger, J. (2010): Literarische sumerische Texte aus den hethitischen Archiven aus paläographischer Sicht – Teil II, Aof 37, 306–340
- Klinger, J. (2013): Die Pestgebete Muršiliš II. (CTH 378), in: B. Janowski/D. Schwemer (eds.), Hymnen, Klagelieder und Gebete. TUAT NF 7. Gütersloh, 114–120
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008): Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon. Leiden
- Kramer, S. N. (1969): 'Man and his god': A Sumerian variation on the 'Job' motif, in: M. Noth/D. W. Thomas (eds.), Wisdom in Israel and in the ancient Near East presented to Professor Harold Henry Rowley. VTS 3. Leiden, 170–182
- Krecher, J. (1987): Morphemless syntax in Sumerian as seen on the background of word-composition in Chukchee, ASJ 9, 67–88
- Laroche, E. (1961): Notes de linguistique anatolienne, RHA 19, 25–37
- Laroche, E. (1967): Les noms anatoliens du 'dieu' et leurs dérivés, JCS 21, 174–177
- Löhnert, A. (2009): 'Wie die Sonne tritt heraus!' Eine Klage zum Auszug Enlils mit einer Untersuchung zu Komposition und Tradition sumerischer Klagelieder in altbabylonischer Zeit. AOAT 365. Münster
- Lorenz, J./E. Rieken (2010): Überlegungen zur Verwendung mythologischer Texte bei den Hethitern, in J. C. Fincke (ed.), Festschrift für Gernot Wilhelm anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 28. Januar 2010. Dresden, 217–234
- Marchesi, G. (2006): LUMMA in the onomasticon and literature of ancient Mesopotamia. HANES 10. Padova
- Maul, S. M. (1988): 'Herzberuhigungsklagen'. Die sumerisch-akkadischen Eršarunga-Gebete. Wiesbaden
- Melchert, H. C. (2010): Hittite *talliye* (šš) 'Be(come) quiet, quiescent', in: T. M. Nikolaev (ed.), Issledovanija po lingvistike i semiotike. Sbornik statej k jubileju Vyach. Vs. Ivanov. Moscow, 148–152
- Metcalf, C. (2011): New parallels in Hittite and Sumerian praise of the sun, WO 41, 168–176
- Metcalf, C. (2015): The gods rich in praise. Early Greek and Mesopotamian religious poetry. Oxford
- Miller, J. L. (2004): Studies in the origins, development and interpretation of the Kizzuwatna rituals. StBoT 46. Wiesbaden
- Mittermayer, C. (2013): Gut und Böse. Anforderungen an menschliches Handeln im Beziehungsgefüge zwischen Göttern und Menschen in den mesopotamischen Mythen, in: H.-G. Nesselrath/F. Wilk (eds.), Gut und Böse in Mensch und Welt. Tübingen, 31–50
- Mouton, A. (2007): Rêves hittites. Contribution à une histoire et une anthropologie du rêve en Anatolie ancienne. CHANE 29. Leiden
- Pecchioli Daddi, F. (1982): Mestieri, professioni e dignità nell'Anatolia ittita. Rome
- Peterson, J. (2011): Sumerian literary fragments in the University Museum, Philadelphia. BPOA 9. Madrid
- Rieken, E. (1999): Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen. StBoT 44. Wiesbaden
- Rieken, E. (2014): Sprachliche Merkmale religiöser Textsorten im Hethitischen, WO 44, 162–173
- de Roos, J. (2007): Hittite votive texts. Leiden
- Sakuma, Y. (2014): Analyse hethitischer Vogelflugorakel, in: J. C. Fincke (ed.), Divination in the ancient Near East. A workshop on divination conducted during the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Würzburg 20–25 July 2008. Winona Lake, 37–51
- Schwemer, D. (2013a): Gebete an den Sonnengott und den persönlichen Schutzgott (CTH 372–74), in: B. Janowski/D. Schwemer (eds.), Hymnen, Klagelieder und Gebete. TUAT NF 7. Gütersloh, 105–114
- Schwemer, D. (2013b): Gauging the influence of Babylonian magic. The reception of Mesopotamian traditions in Hittite ritual practice, in: E. Cancik-Kirschbaum [e.a.] (ed.), Diversity and standardization. Perspectives on social and political norms in the ancient Near East. Berlin, 145–171
- Schwemer, D. (in press): Hittite prayers to the Sun-god for appeasing an angry personal god. A critical edition of CTH 372–74 (with a glossary by Ch. Steitler), in: M. Jaques, 'Mon dieu, qu'ai-je donc fait?' Les prières pénitentielles (dingir-ša<sub>3</sub>-dab-ba) et l'expression de la piété privée en Mésopotamie. OBO. Fribourg/Göttingen
- Singer, I. (2002): Hittite prayers. Leiden
- Singer, I. (2011): The calm before the storm. Selected writings. Atlanta
- Sitzler, D. (1995): Vorwurf gegen Gott. Ein religiöses Motiv im Alten Orient (Ägypten und Mesopotamien). Wiesbaden
- Steinkeller, P. (2005): Of stars and men. The conceptual and mythological setup of Babylonian extispicy, in: A. Gianto (ed.), Biblical and Oriental essays in memory of William L. Moran. Rome, 11–47
- Stol, M. (1993): Biblical idiom in Akkadian, in: M. E. Cohen [e.a.] (ed.), The tablet and the scroll. Near Eastern studies in honor of William W. Hallo. Bethesda, 246–249
- van der Toorn, K. (1985): Sin and sanction in Israel and Mesopotamia. A comparative study. Assen
- Uehlinger, C. (2007): Das Hiob-Buch im Kontext der altorientalischen Literatur- und Religionsgeschichte, in: T. Krüger [e.a.] (ed.), Das Buch Hiob und seine Interpretationen. Zürich, 97–163
- Vanstiphout, H. L.J. (1978): Lipit-Eštar's praise in the Edubba, JCS 30, 33–61
- Wasserman, N. (1997): Another fragment of a bilingual hymn to Utu, ASJ 19, 261–266
- Wasserman, N. (1999): Improvements to BM 78614 (= ASJ 19 [1997], 262), NABU 1999/48, 51
- Weeden, M. (2011): Hittite logograms and Hittite scholarship. StBoT 54. Wiesbaden
- Weisberg, D. B. (1969–70): An Old Babylonian forerunner to Šumma ālu, HUCA 40/41, 87–104
- West, M. L. (2011): The making of the Iliad. Oxford
- Wilhelm, G. (1994): Hymnen der Hethiter, in: W. Burkert/F. Stol (eds.), Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich. OBO 131. Freiburg/Göttingen, 59–77
- Zgoll, A. (2006): Traum und Welterleben im antiken Mesopotamien. AOAT 333. Münster