

Cancik-Kirschbaum, Klinger, Müller (Eds.)

Diversity and Standardization

Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum, Jörg Klinger,
Gerfrid G. W. Müller (Eds.)

Diversity and Standardization

Perspectives on social and political
norms in the ancient Near East



Akademie Verlag

Einbandkonzept: hauser lacour
Druck & Bindung:????

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen
Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Dieses Werk ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Die dadurch begründeten Rechte, insbesondere die der Übersetzung, des Nachdrucks, des Vortrags, der Entnahme von Abbildungen und Tabellen, der Funksendung, der Mikroverfilmung oder der Vervielfältigung auf anderen Wegen und der Speicherung in Datenverarbeitungsanlagen, bleiben, auch bei nur auszugsweiser Verwertung, vorbehalten. Eine Vervielfältigung dieses Werkes oder von Teilen dieses Werkes ist auch im Einzelfall nur in den Grenzen der gesetzlichen Bestimmungen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes in der jeweils geltenden Fassung zulässig. Sie ist grundsätzlich vergütungspflichtig. Zuwiderhandlungen unterliegen den Strafbestimmungen des Urheberrechts.

© 2013 Akademie Verlag GmbH
www.degruyter.com/akademie
Ein Unternehmen von De Gruyter

Gedruckt in Deutschland

Dieses Papier ist alterungsbeständig nach DIN/ISO 9706.

ISBN 978-3-05-005756-9
eISBN 978-3-05-005757-6

Gernot Wilhelm
Dem Kollegen, Lehrer und Freund

Contents

Preface	IX
Vorwort	XIII
<i>Alfonso Archi</i>	
The Anatolian Fate-Goddesses and their Different Traditions	1
<i>Dominique Charpin</i>	
Harrâdum, entre Babylone et le « pays de Mari »	27
<i>Jean-Marie Durand</i>	
Nommer à l'époque amorrite	49
<i>J. David Hawkins</i>	
Gods of Commagene: The Cult of the Stag-God in the inscriptions of Ancoz	65
<i>Jan-Waalke Meyer</i>	
Urbanisierung, Stadtplanung und Wirtschaftsweise in „marginalen Gebieten“ Nordostsyriens. Das Beispiel von Tell Chuera sowie erste Überlegungen zum Transfer dieser Siedlungsweise nach Westsyrien	81
<i>David I. Owen</i>	
A Tale of Two Cities. New Ur III Archives and their Implication for Early Old Babylonian History and Culture	99
<i>Mirjo Salvini</i>	
Neuassyrische Schrift und Sprache in den urartäischen Königsinschriften (9.-7. Jahrhundert v. Chr.)	113
<i>Daniel Schwemer</i>	
Gauging the influence of Babylonian magic: The reception of Mesopotamian traditions in Hittite ritual practice	145

Itamar Singer

Between scepticism and credulity: In defence of Hittite historiography 173

Appendix

Index of texts cited 215

Program of the Symposium *Normierung und Emanzipation: Bausteine für eine*

Kulturgeschichte des 2. Jts. v.Chr. im Alten Orient 221

Preface

The ancient Near East is a historical construct defined by present-day scientific investigations, a construct whose temporal and spatial boundaries are fuzzy, constantly shifting under the weight of new empirical data and increasingly sophisticated analytical methods. Its objects of investigation, even those that have resided in museum collections for generations, are in flux, as the profound cultural, geographical, ethnic and social diversity of the ancient Near East threatens to drown out any points of commonality. Each historical phase within its long history can only be seen as a center of gravity, identifiable on the basis of urban social practices and the use of writing. Though essentially an epiphenomenon, the type of writing known as cuneiform functions not only as a point of demarcation between the historic and the prehistoric, but also as a jumping off point for a number of different Near Eastern disciplines. Thus even as the ancient Near East designates a region of southwest Asia, it does so from the culture-historical point of view of a European tradition rooted in early modernity.

Still in its vagueness lies an enormous potential as a designation: the ancient Near East represents, in the strict sense of the term, a powerful example of regional or area studies, drawing together a diverse range of methods (philological, historical, archaeological and iconographic) in synthetic work on a family of related societies. The temporal span of the archaeologists is the most dramatic, extending from the earliest settled communities in the late Neolithic far into the Islamic period. In their concern with contacts between widely scattered regions as well as phenomena such as cultural interaction and the transfer of knowledge, Near Eastern archaeologists are largely concerned with what in later periods we might speak of as globalization. Philological and historical analyses of the cuneiform sources in Sumerian, Akkadian, Hittite, Hurrian, Ugaritic, Urartian, Elamite and Old Persian happily shed light on non-cuneiform materials in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Persian and Arabic, and *vica versa*. The conceptual uniqueness, worldview and history of ideas that comes into view, in all its variety and detail, through these sources can then be combined with the knowledge generated through archaeological methods to describe the ancient Near East as both a heterogeneous yet cross-culturally coherent cultural sphere.

Even as the region comes into increasing clear relief in its cultural, geographical, ethnic and social diversity, its points of commonality also come increasingly into view. It is these points of commonality amid the profound diversity of the ancient Near East that draws us to Diversity and Standardization as categories of cross-cultural and trans-historical analysis, that asks whether these categories have a life of their own in the

length and breadth of human history. As we look across the variegated horizons of antiquity, do these categories have any real analytical power?

The introduction of a new system of measurement or bookkeeping technique or even the imposition of a standardized repertoire of pottery forms are just some examples of the real power of processes of standardization to stabilize territorial political entities. Seemingly, the problem must be posed for the ancient Near East at an even more fundamental level, however: what role do concepts, methods of standardization and, more generally, sign systems play in the reconfiguration and reconstitution of cultural, political, religious, scientific and social spaces?

In the context of a symposium entitled *Normierung und Emanzipation: Bausteine für eine Kulturgeschichte des 2. Jts. v. Chr. im Alten Orient* these questions were addressed in a number of philological, historical, linguistic, and archaeological case studies.¹

The relationship between language and text in multilingual societies was dealt with in David Owen's (Ithaca) presentation on two extensive corpora from the Ur III period, while Mirjo Salvini (Rome) looked at bilingualism in the Akkadian-Urartian royal inscriptions. Jan-Waalke Meyer (Frankfurt) described processes of urbanization in north-west Syria on the basis of excavations from Tell Chuera and the so-called Kranzhugel sites. On the basis of the text from Harradum, Dominique Charpin (Paris) presented on the end of the Old Babylonian period. Daniel Schwemer (London, now Würzburg) investigated the role of (Mittani)-Assyrian as well as Babylonian influences on the transmission of magical texts in Hittite, while Mauro Giorgieri (Pavia) looked at the influence that Hurrian materials had on the Hittite tradition. The presentation of Theo van den Hout (Chicago) took the origin of cuneiform variants in the Hittite texts as his theme and this led to an interesting discussion of orthographic standardization. In contrast, Jean-Marie Durand's (Paris) contribution looked at strategies of name giving in Old Babylonian Mari, in particular in terms of the individual and social identities that personal names bring into being. Alfonso Archi (Rome) described the relative flexibility (or stability) of the interdependencies between goddesses of fate in a number of different traditions. The contribution from Stefan Maul (Heidelberg) dealt with a similar topic, focusing on latent monotheisms in Assyria and Babylon. John D. Hawkins (London) stalked the lines of tradition emanating from an ancient Anatolian hunting cult and its divinities, tracing them down into the Iron Age on the basis of a hieroglyphic Luwian inscription from Ancoz in Commagene. Itamar Singer (Tel Aviv) offered a reanalysis of the research history devoted to the influence of various historiographic and cultural paradigms on Hittite history.

The thematic spectrum of these case studies cannot claim any methodological completeness or systematicity. It reflects, however imperfectly, the profile of the analytical methods that are currently being used to investigate the ancient Near East: both, multilin-

¹ The program of the meeting is reproduced on p. 221.

gualism and a profound interest in the textual minutia of individual languages; an awareness of the multifarious variety of cultural interdependencies alongside glimpses of the social specificity and its local micro-history; a respect for methodological differences as well as a renewed advocacy for the interdependence of ancient Near Eastern traditions.

The acknowledgement of diversity and standardization has always been a major interest in the scholarly work of Gernot Wilhelm. On the welcome occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the conferral of his PhD as well as his sixty-fifth birthday, the speakers presented their ideas with regard to his special areas of interest. Following the conference some of these casestudies have been scripted and assembled in this volume as a token of esteem to a great scholar, colleague, and friend.

We would like to thank the research center EC 264 TOPOI (*The Formation and Transformation of Space and Knowledge in Ancient Civilizations*)², which not only made the conference possible under the auspices of research group B-III-3³, but also made available the spacial and inspiring accommodations of the TOPOI House at Freie Universität in Berlin-Dahlem. Special thanks to the Coordinator for Area B, Sandra Feix, M.A., who with the help of the staff at TOPOI as well as the students from ancient Near Eastern studies was responsible for the day-to-day organization of the meeting. We would also like to thank Judith Esders, M.A., Dr. des. Andreas Graff and, above all, Dr. des. Sebastian Fischer, Dr. Cale Johnson for their work in preparing this volume for publication and Akademie-Verlag for overseeing its production.

As the volume was nearing completion, we received word that our colleague Itamar Singer has passed away. In the course of the symposium, he continually demonstrated the sense of humor, acumen and tenacity that we might have expected from a historian of his stature, as he interrogated the normative power of scientific paradigms. He will be sorely missed.

Berlin, September 2012

Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum, Jörg Klinger, Gerfrid G.W. Müller

² The growing use of English as a lingua communis represents a telling example of the "reshaping process" that we find in scientific systems.

³ Diversity and Standardization was the title of a small research project which was developed by E. Cancik-Kirschbaum and J. Klinger and drew on case studies involving hieroglyphic Luwian and metrological systems in order to investigate the role of cultural techniques in processes of standardization; see E. Cancik-Kirschbaum and J. Klinger, Diversity and Standardization. Gemeinsamer Bericht der Forschergruppe B III-3, in: Friederike Fless, Gerd Graßhoff, Michael Meyer (eds.), Berichte der Forschergruppen auf der Topoi-Plenartagung 2010. eTopoi, Journal for Ancient Studies 1, 2011, <http://journal.topoi.org>; E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, Metrische Normierung: zu einer administrativen Dimension des politischen Raumes im Alten Orient, in: O. Dally, F. Fless, R. Haensch, F. Pirson, S. Sievers (Hrsg.) "Politische Räume. Gestaltung - Wahrnehmung - Funktion" (in print).

Vorwort

Der *Alte Orient* ist ein konstruierter Raum. Seine Grenzen in Raum und Zeit sind unscharf, seine Forschungsgegenstände unterliegen kontinuierlich der Veränderung. Eine Art Gravitationszentrum bildet darin sicher jene historische Phase, die durch die Entstehung frühstaatlicher Gesellschaften und den Gebrauch der Schrift gekennzeichnet ist. Dabei fungiert das kulturelle Epiphänomen einer Schriftart „Keilschrift“ nicht nur als Trennlinie zwischen schriftführenden (historischen) und schriftlosen (*prähistorischen*) Perioden, sondern auch als Moment der Abgrenzung zu zahlreichen anderen, altertumswissenschaftlichen Disziplinen. Damit wird deutlich, dass der Begriff *Alter Orient* vor allem wissenschaftshistorische und wissenschaftssystematische Dimension hat: er bestimmt die Region Südwestasiens kulturhistorisch aus der europäischen Tradition der Frühen Neuzeit.

Doch in ihrer Vagheit liegt zugleich die enorme Leistungsfähigkeit der Bezeichnung: der *Alte Orient* steht für einen im strengen Sinne regionalwissenschaftlichen Ansatz, wie er in jüngster Zeit durch die *Area studies* (wieder)entdeckt wurde. Dieser Begriff steht für eine Forschungsperspektive, die unterschiedliche Methoden der Forschung – namentlich philologische, historische, archäologische und kunsthistorische sowie das breite Spektrum der systematischen Bindestrich-Methoden – einbezieht. Die archäologische Forschung erstreckt sich vom Beginn der Sesshaftigkeit im späten Neolithikum bis weit in die islamische Zeit: In den Kontakten, die zwischen weit entfernten Regionen nachgewiesen werden können, in der Intensität von Austausch- und Transferbeziehungen spiegeln sich Phänomene, die in anderen Epochen mit dem Begriff Globalisierung belegt worden sind. Philologische und historische Analyse beziehen neben den keilschriftlichen Quellen in sumerischer, akkadischer, hethitischer, hurritischer, ugaritischer, urartäischer, elamischer und altpersischer Sprache auch die hebräische, griechische, lateinische, persische und arabische Überlieferung ein: Eigenbegrifflichkeit, Anschauungen und Ideengeschichte in großer Mannigfaltigkeit und Detailliertheit erschließen in Verbindung mit den durch archäologische Methoden gewonnenen Erkenntnissen den *Alten Orient* als einen heterogenen und doch in gewissen Belangen kohärenten Kulturraum.

Denn in demselben Maße, in dem die kulturelle, geographische, ethnische und gesellschaftliche Diversität im *Alten Orient* an Kontur gewinnen, treten auch die Gemeinsamkeiten deutlicher hervor. Dies lenkt den Blick auf *Vielfalt* und *Normierung* als Kategorien kulturgeschichtlicher Betrachtung, und es stellt sich die Frage, inwieweit diese als Elemente des historischen Prozesses selbst wirksam sind, genauer: welche Rolle spielten Standardisierungs- und Normierungsprozesse für die Erzeugung von Kohärenz und Iden-

tität besonders in großräumigen territorialen Strukturen? Inwieweit nutzte beispielsweise der frühe Staat im *Alten Orient* das homogenisierende und identitätsstiftende Potential von Normierung? Annahmen oder Einsichten über diese Zusammenhänge werden allerdings in den keilschriftlichen Quellen kaum je direkt thematisiert. Andererseits: Die Einführung eines neuen Maßsystems, eine Schrifthereform, die Durchsetzung eines neuen keramischen Formenrepertoires sind Beispiele für die aktive Nutzung des Wissens um die Wirkmächtigkeit von Normierungsprozessen zur Stabilisierung territorialer Herrschaft. Die genannten Beispiele stehen freilich für eine bestimmte Konfiguration, nämlich die systematische Einführung von normierten Strukturen bzw. Instrumentarien als Herrschaftsstrategie. Doch die Frage stellt sich natürlich sehr viel grundsätzlicher: Welchen Anteil haben Konzepte, Regelungsmechanismen und Zeichensysteme an der Erzeugung von kulturell, politisch, religiös, wirtschaftlich und sozial überformten Räumen?

Im Rahmen eines Symposiums mit dem Titel *Normierung und Emanzipation: Bausteine für eine Kulturgeschichte des 2. Jts. v. Chr. im Alten Orient* wurde diese Frage im Januar 2010 in philologischen, historischen, linguistischen, textwissenschaftlichen, religionsgeschichtlichen und archäologischen Fallstudien diskutiert.¹ Das Verhältnis von Sprache und Text in multilingualen Gesellschaften behandelte der Beitrag von David Owen (Itaca) am Beispiel zweier umfangreicher Textkorpora aus der Ur III-Zeit, während Mirjo Salvini (Rom) das Phänomen der zweisprachigen assyrisch-urartäischen Königsinschriften näher beleuchtete. Am Beispiel der Ausgrabungen in Tell Chuera und den sogenannten „Kranz-Hügel“ Siedlungen zeichnete Jan-Waalke Meyer (Frankfurt) bereits für den Beginn des 3. Jt. einen eigenständigen Urbanisierungsprozeß für Nordost-Syrien nach.

Anhand von Texten aus Harradum beschäftigte sich Dominique Charpin (Paris) mit dem Ende der altbabylonischen Epoche. Fragen der Tradierung von Wissen bzw. der Rezeption wissenschaftlich-literarischer Texte standen im Zentrum der Beiträge von Daniel Schwemer (London) zur Rolle (mittano-)assyrischer und babylonischer Einflüsse in der hethitischen magischen Überlieferung, bzw. von Mauro Giorgieri (Pavia) zum hurritischen Einfluß auf die hethitische Tradition. Der Beitrag von Theo van den Hout (Chicago) thematisierte das Problem der Herkunft der hethitischen Keilschriftvariante und kam damit auf Fragen von orthographischer Normierung zu sprechen. Demgegenüber führte der Beitrag von Jean-Marie Durand (Paris) mit den Strategien der Namengebung in Mari in altbabylonischer Zeit in den Bereich des Individuums und der sozialen Identität. Am Beispiel der Schicksalsgöttinnen in unterschiedlichen Traditionszusammenhängen zeigte Alfonso Archi (Rom) das Zusammenspiel von stabilen und flexiblen Anteilen in einem religiösen Konzept. Diesem Phänomen widmete sich auch der Beitrag von Stefan Maul (Heidelberg) zum latenten Monotheismus in Assyrien und Babylonien. John D. Hawkins (London) verfolgte die Traditionslinien eines altanatolischen Jagdkultes und

¹ Das Programm der Tagung siehe im vorliegenden Band, S. 221.

der damit verbundenen Gottheiten von der mittleren und späten Bronzezeit bis in die Eisenzeit anhand der hieroglyphenluwischen Inschriften von Ancoz in der Kommagene. Itamar Singer (Tel Aviv) verdeutlichte in einer forschungsgeschichtlichen Analyse zur hethitischen Historiographie den Einfluss wechselnder wissenschaftlicher und kultureller Paradigmen.

Das thematische Spektrum dieser Fallstudien erhebt keinerlei Anspruch auf systematische oder methodische Vollständigkeit. Es spiegelt sich darin vielmehr ein Profil des wissenschaftlichen Zugriffs, das die Forschung zum *Alten Orient* auszeichnet: Vielsprachigkeit *und* Interesse für das einzelsprachliche, individuelle textliche Detail; Wissen um die vielen Verbindungen zwischen den Kulturen *und* zugleich Blick auf das je Spezifische jeder einzelnen Gesellschaft und ihrer kulturellen Äußerungen; Respekt für die Vielfalt der wissenschaftlichen Methoden *und* Eintreten für ihr Zusammenwirken bei der Interpretation der altorientalischen Überlieferung. Gernot Wilhelm steht als Freund, Lehrer und Mentor für dieses Profil, und so waren 40-jähriges Promotionsjubiläum und 65. Geburtstag willkommene Anlässe, die eingangs umrissene Problematik in historischen Kontexten zu untersuchen, denen sein besonderes Forschungsinteresse galt. Eine Reihe dieser Fallstudien wurde durch die Referenten für die Publikation ausgearbeitet und in diesem Band zusammengestellt.

Wir danken dem Forschungsverbund *EC 264 TOPOI: The formation and transformation of space and knowledge in Ancient Civilizations*², der nicht nur die Tagung im Kontext der Forschergruppe B-III-3 *Diversity and Standardization*³ ermöglicht hat, sondern mit dem TOPOI-Haus an der Freien Universität in Dahlem einen gleichermaßen großzügigen wie inspirierenden Ort für den wissenschaftlichen Austausch zur Verfügung stellte. Unser besonderer Dank gilt der Koordinatorin der Area B, Sandra Feix M.A., die – unterstützt vom Team der TOPOI-Verwaltung und den Studenten des Seminars für Altorientalistik – mit unermüdlichem Einsatz die Tagung organisatorisch betreut hat. Judith Esders M.A., Dr. des. Andreas Gräff, vor allem aber Dr. des. Sebastian Fischer haben die in diesem

² Zu den latenten Überformungsprozessen im System Wissenschaft gehört auch die Durchsetzung des Englischen als *lingua communis*.

³ *Diversity and Standardization* war der Titel eines kleinen Forschungsprojektes, in dem anhand von Fallstudien zur luwischen Hieroglyphenschrift und zu metrologischen Systemen eine Methodologie zur Untersuchung von kulturtechnischen Normierungsprozessen entwickelt wurde, vgl. E. Cancik-Kirschbaum & J. Klinger, *Diversity and Standardization*. Gemeinsamer Bericht der Forschergruppe B III-3, in: Friederike Fless, Gerd Graßhoff, Michael Meyer (Hgg.), *Berichte der Forschergruppen auf der Topoi-Plenartagung 2010*. eTopoi, Journal for Ancient Studies 1, 2011, <http://journal.topoi.org>; E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, Metrische Normierung: zu einer administrativen Dimension des politischen Raumes im Alten Orient, in: O. Dally, F. Fless, R. Haensch, F. Pirson, S. Sievers (Hrsg.), *Politische Räume. Gestaltung – Wahrnehmung – Funktion* (in Druck).

Band versammelten Beiträge für den Druck vorbereitet. Dem Akademie-Verlag sei für die gute Betreuung gedankt.

Mit Fertigstellung des Bandes erreicht uns die Nachricht vom Tod unseres Kollegen Itamar Singer. Er hat in den Diskussionen immer wieder mit Humor, Scharfsinn und Beharrlichkeit auf die Verantwortung des Historikers hingewiesen, die normative Kraft wissenschaftlicher Paradigmen zu hinterfragen.

Berlin, im September 2012

Eva Cancik-Kirschbaum, Jörg Klinger, Gerfrid G.W. Müller

The Anatolian Fate-Goddesses and their Different Traditions

1. *Išduštaya and Papaya*

In an often quoted passage of an Old-Hittite ritual for the erection of a new palace, KUB 29.1(+) (CTH 414),¹ the king says:

“To me, the king, have the gods (that is) – the Sun-god(dess) and the Storm-god – entrusted the land and my house. I, the king, shall rule over my land and my house. ... To me, the king, has Ḫalamašuit (the Hattic Throne-goddess) brought from the Sea the (insignia of) authority (and) the coach; thereupon have they opened to me the land of my mother (i.e. the Sun-goddess) and called me Labarna, the king. From then on I have been directing my request to the Storm-god, my father. ... The Throne-goddess hails the Eagle: Go! I am sending thee to the Sea ... The Eagle says: I have searched. Only Išduštaya (and) Papaya, the primeval goddesses of the netherworld, the daughters-in-law, (*kat-te-ir-ri-eš ka-ru-ú-e-li-e-eš* DINGIR^{MEŠ} *ku-ú-še-eš*) are kneeling ... One holds a distaff, they hold full spindles.² They are spinning the years of the king. The shortness of the years, their calculation cannot be seen.” (I 23-II 10)

This ritual has a general Hattic background.³ In particular, Išduštaya and Papaya are Hattic goddesses,⁴ who appear in Hattic texts, KUB 28.15 I 5a: *Eš-du-uš-ta-ya* [; KBo 37.11 II 14, 15: *Pa-a-pa-a-i-ya-a* (without divine determinative).

For the Hattians, life was compared to a thread, a metaphor well diffused also in the Indo-European milieu (it is attested in Greek, Latin, Germanic and perhaps also in Indo-

* Università La Sapienza, Roma.

¹ Carini 1982. An English translation was provided by Albrecht Goetze in ANET 357–358.

² A bronze “middle-whorl-spindle” (14 cm long, diameter of the disc: 4.5 cm), and a silver one with a golden tip (16 cm long, 7 cm in diameter) were found at Horoztepe, Özguç – Akok 1958, 15 f. (with figs. 25-26), 45, 51 and Pl. VIII 1-3. For another bronze spindle, see Koşay 1951, Pl. 197, 1. For ^(GIŠ)*ḫueša-* “spindle”, and ^(GIŠ)*ḫulali-* “distaff”, see Oettinger 1976, 64–66. The textual documentation has been represented by Ofitsch 2001. An etymological derivation of ^(GIŠ)*ḫueša-* from *ḫueš-* “to live” is unlikely, *HED H*, 343.

³ At least, for most of the interpreters, see Klinger 1996, 125 f. and 140 f.

⁴ For Išduštaya, see Otten 1976–1980a; for Papaya, see Frantz-Szabó 2003–2005.

Iranian and Slavic literatures),⁵ which the Hittites received instead from the Hattic substrate. Išduštaya and Papaya coexisted (as will be shown here below) with the Hittite Fate-goddesses, the Gulšeš, who never were assimilated to them. They used a different technique: that “to engrave, inscribe”, *gulš-*, the destiny of mankind.

1.1 Celebrations in the *hešta*-house⁶

In the texts in Hittite, Išduštaya and Papaya⁷ appear mostly in the cult for the chthonic gods of the *hešta*-house in Ḫattuša (CTH 645), where the *purulli*-festival was celebrated, that is the Hattic festival of the Earth (*wur*), in spring, “when the land prospers (and) thrives.” These rites had the aim of guaranteeing that life continued.

According to the OH manuscript KBo 17.15 Vs. 9-17 (StBoT 25 no. 27), the worshipped gods were:

Lelwani - Šiwat - Tašammat - Tašimmet - UTU - Ištuštaya - Papaya - Ḫašammila - Zilipuri.⁸

NH duplicates of this list are KBo 17.40 + 25.177 I 1-5 (+ KBo 24.111 I¹ 2-17);⁹ the fragmentary KBo 23.69 Rs. 1-8. Further lists of the same festival are:

KBo 13.216 VI 1-6: Išduštaya] - Pappaya - Ḫašammili - Zilipuri - [.
 KBo 25.71(a) + KBo 31.208(b) 1-13; [Išdušt]ya Papaya (in *a* 14 + *b* 10).
 KUB 58.28 III 2-IV 8:] Išduštaya Lelw[ani] [U.GUR] - Šitarz[una -
 GIŠ¹⁰AB-ya] - GIŠ¹¹hattalwaš GIŠ - Zappa - MU^{HLA}.
 KUB 58.50 V 3-11:] Išduštaya - Pappaya - [Ḫašammil]i - [. ¹⁰

The redaction of this festival which was celebrated in the *hešta*-house on the eleventh day of the Spring festival (AN.TAḪ.ŠUM^{SAR}) lists the following gods, IBoT 3.1 (CTH 609) 44-49:

Lelwani - UD.SIG₅¹ - (taknaš) UTU - Papaya - Išduštaya - Ḫašamili - U.GUR -
 Šitaršuna - GIŠ¹⁰AB-ya - ḫatalwaš GIŠ - Zappa(š) - MU^{HLA}. ¹¹

⁵ Giannakis 1998.

⁶ Another festival of Hattic origin with Išduštaya (and) Papaya is documented by the fragment KBo 37.161, in ll. 2-5: Zalinu [] Wurunkatte [] NIN.É.GAL Išt[uštaya Papaya] Eštanu.

⁷ For the writings of the two names in the documents in Hittite, see van Gessel 1998, 206 f. and 349 f.

⁸ Cfr. Yoshida 1996, 94.

⁹ Haas – Wäfler 1976, 86 f.

¹⁰ KBo 25.30 (Išduštaya in l. 15) belongs either to CTH 645 or CTH 609.

Lelwani and his circle were deities of Hattic origin.¹² Lelwani received the Hattic epithet of *katte* “king,” in the bilingual mythological section of a ritual for the building of a palace for the king, KBo 37.1 lk. Sp. 5-6 - r. Sp. 5: (the Storm-god) ^DŠāru (= ^DTāru) *kātte* ^DLēlwani *kātte* - ^DIM-aš LUGAL-uš *Lēlwaniš-a* LUGAL-uš.¹³ The two gods give their approval for the Sun-goddess to build for herself a palace in Liḫzina. Ḥašammili (who appears also in the *ḥešta*-celebrations) takes part in this building as the blacksmith of the gods (ll. 9-21).

Hittite Šiwat, “Day,” Hattic Izzištanu,¹⁴ logogram UD.SIG₅ “Propitious Day,” was the day on which one dies. Taknaš UTU was Wurunšemu/Urūnzimu “Mother of the Earth,” an epithet of the Sun-goddess Eštan qualifying her as a chthonic deity.¹⁵ Zilipuri was a god connected with the hearth; his logogram, U.GUR,¹⁶ is the same as Šulinkatte. In the list KUB 44.23 Zilipuri is replaced by Šulinkatte (also a Hattic god).¹⁷ In the Hattic-Hittite Bilingual KUB 2.2 + 48.1 II 37 ff., where the gods build a palace for the king, Zilipuri “the king,” *katte* / LUGAL-uš, builds the throne (*ḥānwašuiitt-* / *ḥalamašuiitt-*) (ll. 14-18).¹⁸ Tašimmet was a “concubine” of the Storm-god.¹⁹ The deities Šittarzuna and Zappa are not sufficiently characterized. The Window (*luttai*^{GIŠ}AB-ya) and the Wood of the bolt (*ḥatalwaš taru*/GIŠ) were important elements connecting the inside with the outside of the temple and often received offerings in the regular cults.²⁰ The Years (MU^{HLA}) were symbolic representations of the years of the dynasty, kept in the *ḥešta*-house, under the protection of the gods of that temple.²¹

If the Fate-goddesses had the task of establishing the length of mortals’ lives and, therefore, were deities of life, also the other Hattic deities of the *ḥešta*-house acted in that fearful borderland that separates life from death. This border was represented by the Propitious Day (the day of one’s death). Zilipuri provided the hearth and the throne, the former representing the unity and continuity of the family and the latter, of royal

¹¹ The same list, ending with U.GUR, is also in ll. 60-62; see Haas – Wäfler 1976, 92 f. A parallel passage is KUB 41.27 V 1-4, with Zuppa(š) and MU.KAM^{HLA}. See further, KUB 58.69 I 12-17: Išduš[taya] ... P[apaya], see García Trabazo – Grodek 2005, 180.

¹² On Lelwani, see the monograph by Torri, 1999. Previous studies are: Otten, 1950; von Schuler, 1980–1983. See, further, Haas, 1994, 245; Klinger 1996, 167–169; Taracha 2009, 49 f. (on Lelwani’s circle).

¹³ Schuster 2002, 156 f.

¹⁴ Otten 1976–1980b.

¹⁵ In the Funerary ritual for the royal family, Izzištanu / UD.SIG₅ and taknaš UTU are the gods who receive more offerings, together with the Soul, ZI (Ištanžana).

¹⁶ Yoshida 1991, 58–61.

¹⁷ Torri 1999, 11 f. 16.

¹⁸ Schuster 1974, 70 f.

¹⁹ Klinger 1996, 173.

²⁰ Archi 1966, 89–92; Popko 1978, 42–48.

²¹ Torri 1999, 22–27. Similarly, the hieroglyphic sign L.336 depicts the pithos (kept in several temples), where barley was kept at the harvest. In spring it was ground and used for making bread, symbolizing the continuity of the harvest from year to year, see Archi 1973.

power. The Sun-goddess of the Earth ensured a favourable journey to the afterlife. It was Lelwani, the deity to whom the *hešta*-house was dedicated, who established when an individual's life would end (which explains why she was linked to Išduštaya and Papaya).²² The queen Puduḥepa asks Lelwani to intercede with the other gods to grant long lives to her husband Ḫattusili and herself.²³ This same queen makes various vows to Lelwani for the life of his Majesty.²⁴ It is to Lelwani that one turns in order that the princess Gaššuliyawia may be cured.²⁵ According to the *Annals* of Tuḫaliya I, Lelwani (together with the principal gods) accompanied the king into battle. In the case of a trial, the palace officials had to swear to Lelwani that they had faithfully performed the tasks they had been assigned (KUB 13.35 I 6-7). Political treaties were also deposited in the temple of Lelwani, evidently because it was her task to put an end to those unfaithful to the pacts undertaken.²⁶

Although Išduštaya and Papaya are defined as *kattereš karuileš* “primeval goddesses of the netherworld” in the ritual KUB 29.1, they, together with Lelwani, must be distinguished from the *karuileš šiuneš*, *kattereš šiuneš*, Hurr. *enna durenna* “primeval gods,” and *enna ammattena* “ancestor gods,” terms which qualify the primeval, inferior gods of Hurrian origin.²⁷ Of the gods of the *hešta*-house, only the Sun-goddess of the Earth (the Netherworld), taknaš UTU, found a correspondence with Ereškigal, the Sumerian “Queen of the Great Below,” and Hurr. Allani, that is the queen of the Netherworld.²⁸ The Fate-goddesses may be considered underworld gods, only because they determined precisely when an individual was to reach pass to the Netherworld.

1.2 Other contexts

- a) The two Hattic Fate-goddesses appear (so to say, for attraction) behind the Hittite Parcae, the Gulšeš, in the Telepinu Myth. “All the gods” are sitting in assembly under a hawthorn tree. Only the Fate-goddesses are mentioned by name, together with the Hittite goddesses of prosperity and the tutelary-deities involved in the ritual to which the myth is associated, KUB 17.10 III 30-32:

²² Torri 1999, 49–51.

²³ KUB 21.27(+) III 31-38: “You, Lelwani [my Lady], let the life of Ḫattušili, your servant, and of Puduḥepa, your servant, [come forth] from your mouth before the gods! ... If you, Lelwani, my lady, will speak favorably [to the gods] and will keep your servant, Ḫattusili, alive and grant him long years, months, days, I shall come ...”. See Lebrun 1980, 333 f.; Singer 2002, 104.

²⁴ Otten – Souček 1965, 16 f., I 2-4: “Der Göttin Lelwani, meiner Herrin, habe ich für das Leben der Person der Majestät (dieses) Gelübde abgelegt: ‘Wenn du, o Göttin, meine Herrin, die Majestät für lange Jahre bei Leben und Gesundheit erhältst...’”.

²⁵ KBo 4.6 (CTH 480); see Torri 1999, 41 f.

²⁶ See the passages quoted by Torri 1999, 59–61.

²⁷ Laroche 1974; Archi 1990.

²⁸ Torri 1999, 89–97.

“[Papapya], Ištušaya, the Fate-goddesses (Gulšeš), Miyatanzipa, Telepinu, the Tutelary-god (Innar/KAL), Ḫapantali [and ...].”

- b) KBo 4.13 + KUB 10.82 (CTH 625) is a great celebration at Ḫattuša, in the palace (É^{TIM} GAL), on one of the days of the spring-festival AN.TAḪ.ŠUM, listing a large number of gods on the occasion of several offerings.²⁹ Although this manuscript is late (probably from the period of Tuthaliya IV),³⁰ the scribe used several older documents.³¹ The first offering list (I 1-48), starts anomalously (at least according to the Hattic-Hittite tradition), with Heaven and Earth (the Netherworld), the Hattic Fate-goddesses, two other deities of Lelwani's circle, and quite probably with Lelwani herself (*ALLATUM*):

I 1 [I UDU AN] 'T' 'UDU' ER-ŠE-TU[M I UDU
^DAL-LA-TUM(?)]
 I UDU ^DIš-du-uš-ta-ya [I UDU ^DPa-pa-ya]
 3 I UDU ^DTa-ša-ma-za I UDU rD[Ta-ši-mi-iz].

The presence of Heaven and Earth is according to an Akkadian-Hurrian model.³² There are then some tutelary spirits (of the Front, Tongue, A[...], Fault); some qualities of the Storm-god. The great gods appear first at line 17. The Hittite Parcae, Gulšeš, appear in this festival much more frequently than the Hattic ones, together with their own circle, that of the gods assuring prosperity:

II 19-22, IV 1-3, IV 21-24: Telepinu - Ḫalki - SUMUQAN; Gulšuš - DINGIR.MAḪ^{MES}-uš Ḫarištašši - U.GUR U.GUR^{URU}Ḫayaša³³
 VI 32-38 (dupl. KBo 19.128 VI 17-24):³⁴ XV DINGIR^{MES}: Gulšuš - DINGIR.MAḪ^{MES}-uš - Kuzanašu (/ GUNNI) - U.GUR Ḫayaša - SĪN (/ EN.ZU) - MUL - Išpanza (/ GE₆-anza) - Ḫašmaiu (/ Ḫašammili) - Kattaḫḫi (/ SAL.LUGAL) - Ḫarištašši - Ḫilašši - tepu pedan - EME-aš ḫandanza - zipu Šarrumar (/ lammar tartan) - UD.[SIG₅].

²⁹ Haas 1994, 775–781, who suggests that this celebration was performed the day before the “first day” of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM-festival. For alternative suggestions, see Schwemer 2004.

³⁰ Otten 1971, 51, who pointed out the many parallelisms between KBo 14.13 + KUB 10.82 and KBo 19.128.

³¹ As Forlanini 2007, has shown, with insight.

³² See the ritual KUB 9.28 I 3-9 (dupl. KBo 27.49, 3-7): Sun-god, Storm-god of heaven, Storm-god of the country, thousand gods, Heaven (and) Earth, [...], Moon-god, Grain (Dagan), NIN.É.GAL, Ištar Ninatta Kulitta, Taraweš Gulšeš Ḫilaššiš, Mountains (and) Rivers of Ḫattuša, thousand gods.

³³ The first and third lists start, and the second ends with: ^DU É^{TIM} GAL, “of the Palace”, Otten 1971, 22 f.

³⁴ Otten 1971, 45–47.

This last list includes gods directly related to the inhabitants of the palace and their fate: Hearth, Hatt. Kuz(z)ana/išu, Hitt. Ḫašša; the celestial bodies: Moon, Star, and Night, which influence human beings; Ḫarištašši: connected with *ḫarištani*- “storeroom”,³⁵ Ḫilašši: the Genius of the courtyard; tepu pedan “Little Place” (perhaps a euphemism for the netherworld and/or the grave);³⁶ Tongue Fit; ... Separation (/ / ... Moment); Propitius Day (the day on which one dies).

- c) It is difficult to understand why Išduštaya and Papaya appear in a ritual concerning an oath for an army employed in the Hurrian lands, KUB 9.1 II 30. The king has to say secretly that he (a former Macbeth) had encountered the Fate-goddesses, II 1-9: “The king [recites] as follows: ‘[] took (3rd pl.) the king (acc.) and the lords (acc.) 1 *pālza*. I, the king, met the two goddesses: Papaya (and) [Išdu]štaya, and I camped’. The two (II^{TAM})³⁷ met he! [The king] whispe[rs] these words by night in the land of the town of Ḫimmuwa.”
- d) Papaya appears together with Kataḫzipuri (Hittite Kamrušepa), the Hattic goddess of magic, in KUB 56.17, an obscure text concerning the elimination of omens announced in an “unfavourable dream,” Û ḪUL.³⁸

2. The *Gulšeš*

2.1 The Hittite contexts

The verb *gulš-* means “to carve, engrave, mark, inscribe, write.” The thematic noun ^D*Gulša-* appears as personified theonym (in general plural): “Fate-goddesses.” The Luwian forms are ^D*Gulza-*, ^D*Gulzanzipa-*; Palaic ^D*Gulzan(n)ika-*.³⁹ The idea that the “lot, fate” (cfr. Gk. *moîra*) was “marked, engraved” for every individual from his very birth was, therefore, common amongst Anatolian peoples of Indo-European language

³⁵ Haas 1994, 261, note 74.

³⁶ *CHD P*, 339 f.

³⁷ Here, better than “twice”.

³⁸ Klengel 1988.

³⁹ Carruba 1966, 34–37, has demonstrated that this verb and divine name are written phonetically (not ideographically). For the verb *gulš-*, see Oettinger 1979, 203 f.; in general, *HED K*, 239–244. For the Luwian data, Melchert 1993, 107 f.; Starke 1990, 462–464 and Melchert 2003, 284. For Palaic ^D*Gulzan(n)ikas*, ^D*Gulzan(n)ikeš*, see Carruba 1972, 27, and the list in van Gessel 1998, 255. For *Gulšaš* in the festival of Zaparwa (in Hittite), see KBo 13.217 V 16, 20.

The list of gods in the Palaic ritual KUB 35.165 Rs. 13–18 has, beside the *Gulzannikeš*, a list of Hattic and Palaic-Hittite gods: Kataḫzipuri, Ilaliyantikeš, Ḫašamili, Kamama, Ḫilanzipa, *Gulzannikeš*, Uliliantikeš, see Carruba 1970, 19.

and this undoubtedly predates the introduction of writing. The earliest attestations of this root are given by the personal names Kulšata, Kulziya(r) of the Old Assyrian period.⁴⁰ The act of counting, incising a sign for every unit of measurement, is described in a myth, KUB 33.118, 5-6: UD.KAM^{HIA}-uš kap[puwaizzi IT]U.KAM^{HIA}gulaškiz[zi] “(Mount Wašitta) counts the days, keeps incised the months.” It is possible that, with the spread of writing in certain spheres, the custom of *writing* the fate was attributed to the Gulšeš: GIŠ(HUR)gulzattar, derived from gulš-, means “inscribed wooden tablet.”⁴¹

The vocabulary KBo 13.2 rev. 2 has: [nam-tar = šīmta šāmu] = gulšaš gulšuwa[r] “determine the fate” (CHD L-N, 44 s.v. lappiya-).^(D)Gulšaš was the translation for Akk. šīmtu “fate”. The Akkadian *Wisdom of Uruk* is known from the archives of Ugarit, Emar and Hattuša, where it received a Hittite translation; Il. 145-147: a-[na u₄]-mi [ši-ma]-ti-ka (dupl.: a-na u)m-me ša-a šim-ma-ti-ka) 9 KURUM₆^{MEŠ} ŠID-nu-m[a mu-t]a-a-nu [re-š]u-uk-ka “(Le grenier de ta maison, sur toute [l’étendue] de sa [p]ièce, est rempli de grain;) au jour de ta mo[rt] on comptera (seulement) neuf rations: c’est l’épidémie que tu auras pour capital!”⁴² The Hittite version, misunderstanding this passage, translates *rēšu* literally with “head,” KBo 12.70 Vs. 39-42: GIM-an-ma-ta^DGul-ša-aš UD.KAM-uš ti-an-zi nu 9-an a-ra-li-i-en kap-pu-u-wa-a-an-zi na-an-ta ki-it-kar-za zi-ik-kán-zi “lorsque les Parques fixent l’avenir (/ les jours), elles comptent neuf arali, et le portent à ta tête.”⁴³

In the KIN oracles (belonging to the Hittite tradition), the tokens called^DGulšaš minumar /^DNAM minumar “favour of Fate” may alternate in the same text.⁴⁴ There are “unfavourable / well-being Gulšaš,” KUB 58.108 I 5, 8, IV 8: idaluš^DGulšaš, IV 10, 13: :ušantariš^DGulšaš. KUB 23.85, 5-6: “You, Tattamaru, had married the daughter of my sister, (but) then the Gulšeš treated you badly, and she died on you.”⁴⁵ KUB 43.72 II 11: ^DGulšaš idālu gulaššuwar “bad decree of the Fate-goddesses.”

Although the following ritual for Tuthaliya III presents certain elements from Kizzuwatna (and perhaps some others taken from a Babylonian ritual), the passage with the Gulšeš and the Mother-goddesses (DINGIR.MAH^{MEŠ}) presents the usual Hittite formulae, KUB 43.55 II 11-21 (dupl. KUB 58.101 Vs. 1-19):⁴⁶

“In regard to this matter we have just now summoned as witnesses the [... Mo]ther-goddesses and the Fate-goddesses. [And i]f a man is at any time born, [then] as the

⁴⁰ Laroche 1966, 97.

⁴¹ The attributes of the Roman Parcae are not only the implements for weaving, as for the Moirai, but also the *volumen*, where they fixed the fate in writing.

⁴² Translation by Arnaud 2007, 148–179, who has provided a recent edition of the text.

⁴³ Laroche 1968, 782.

⁴⁴ This fact has been noted by Laroche 1948, 125. For *minumar* in connection with other terms as a token of the KIN oracles, see Archi 1974, 135.

⁴⁵ Hagenbuchner 1989, 2. 15.

⁴⁶ Haas 1988, 87–91; Taracha 2000, 58–61. The translation is that of Beckman 1983, 245. A similar invocation to the Fate-goddesses is KUB 55.42 4-8.

Fate-goddesses and the Mother-goddesses on that day designate well-being (*aššul*) for him – this is the day! May you Fate-goddesses and Mother-goddesses designate (*gulašten*) life, [...] strength, long years, [future li]fe, success, love of gods and human beings ... for the king (and) queen.”

The Fate-goddesses, active at the moment of birth, follow man throughout his entire life. The middle Hittite ritual of *Ḫantitaššu* (“the woman of *Ḫurma*,” CTH 395), was performed “if the years are disturbed (*nininkanteš*) for a man or a woman,” and addressed not only to the Sun-god, but also to the *Gulšeš*, KBo 11.14 I 16, II 36 (the “words of the goddess *Kamrušepa*” are also mentioned in II 25).

The *Gulšeš*, generally associated with *DINGIR.MAḪ*, that is *Ḫannaḫanna*, or the *DINGIR.MAḪ^{MES}* (as well as the *Darawa*, *Darawaeš*, Luw. *Darawanzi*),⁴⁷ are deities in charge of well-being. They appear together with *Telepinu* and *Ḫašamili*, of Hattic origin, and play an important role as tutelary deities in the (Hattic-)Hittite cults. The *Gulšeš* and *DINGIR.MAḪ^{MES}* appear in the birth ritual KBo 24.6 Vs. 3.⁴⁸ The *Telepinu Myth*, KUB 17.10 III 30-32, mentions: “[*Papapy*], *Ištuštaya*, the Fate-goddesses (*Gulšeš*), *Miyatanzipa*, *Telepinu*, the Tutelary-god (*Innar/KAL*), *Ḫapantali* [and ...].” The pantheon of the city of *Karaḫna*, KUB 25.32(+) (a late manuscript) I 4-19, lists: several tutelary gods of nature (*KAL*), the Storm-god of the army, *U.GUR*, *ZA.BA₄.BA₄*, *Pirwa*, *Aškašipa*, [*MUNUS.LUGAL*], *Ḫalki*, *Telepinu*, Moon-god, *Antaliya* (a local deity), *Immarniza*, *MAḪ*, *Gulšeš*, *Ḫašamili*.⁴⁹

DINGIR.MAḪ^{MES} and *Gulšeš* are also associated with each other in other myths of Hittite tradition. VBoT 58 (*Disappearance of the Sun-god*) I 32-34: “[Go,] call the Fate-goddess (^D*Gulaššan*) and *Ḫannaḫanna* (*DINGIR.MAḪ*). If those (other gods) have died, [then] these too (who assure the future of the land) may have died. [Did] *Frost* (*Ḫaḫḫi-ma*) [come] to their gate too?” KUB 33.24 (*Disappearance of the Storm-god*) I 37-38: “The Storm-god's father went to the Fate-goddess and *Ḫannaḫanna* ...”⁵⁰

They appear together in some rituals, such as that dictated by *Pupuwanni*, KUB 7.2 (CTH 408) I 15-16 and KUB 41.3(+) I 20: Storm-god, Sun-god, Tutelary-god of nature (*Innar*), *Gulšeš*, *Darawaeš*.⁵¹ KUB 15.31 is an evocation of “the *DINGIR.MAḪ^{MES}* and the *Gulšeš*, (i.e.) the *DINGIR.MAḪ^{MES}* and the *Gulšeš* of the gods and of the persons of the human beings, (and) *Zukki* (with) *Anzili*” (I 1-2, 36-37, II 4-5).⁵²

⁴⁷ Carruba 1966, 30 note 48, suggested identifying the *DINGIR.MAḪ^{MES}* with the *Darawaeš* (for the sequence *Gulšeš* - *Darawa*, see, e. g., KBo 30.124 Rs. 1, 12). This is not possible because of passages such as KUB 35.84 II 9: *Gulšeš DINGIR.MAḪ^{MES} Darawaeš*; KBo 24.101 Rs. 6: *DINGIR.MAḪ Gulšeš Tarawa*.

⁴⁸ Beckman 1983, 224 f. See also KBo 30.4 III 7-8.

⁴⁹ Dinçol – Darga 1969–1970, 100 f. See, further, the passages from KBo 4.13(+) quoted above, 1.2.

⁵⁰ See Hoffner 1990, 21. 27.

⁵¹ Bawanypeck 2005, 277 f. 286.

⁵² Haas – Wilhelm 1974, 148–155 (with the duplicate KUB 15.32). Another evocation of the *Gulšeš*, *DINGIR.MAḪ^{MES}* and *Darawaeš*, KUB 35.84, belongs to the Luwian milieu. See also the catalogue