

^{GIŞ}*kalmuṣ* "LITUUS,, AND HUB.BI "EARRING,,
IN THE HITTITE TEXTS.

Dr. SEDAT ALP

At the end of 1946 I sent an article entitled "La désignation du Lituus en Hittite,, to A. Goetze, the Editor of the Journal of Cuneiform Studies. The object of this article was to prove that the instrument called "lituus,, by the archeologists, which plays a prominent part in archeological representations, as a royal emblem, occurs also in the texts under the Hittite word ^{GIŞ}*kalmuṣ*. After receiving my paper Prof. Goetze kindly informed me that he himself had prepared an article on "The priestly Dress of the Hittite King,, and that his results were incompatible with mine. However he generously proposed to publish both papers, which deal largely with the same subject, in the same issue of the journal and to let the reader decide for himself.

Though my correspondence with Prof. Goetze helped to clarify certain points, we nevertheless came to different conclusions. In the meantime our papers were in the press¹. In my article I considered HUB.BI² as a part of the royal dress and accepted the suggestion of von Brandenstein that it stood for "earring,,

¹ JCS I 164 ff. and 176 ff. In my paper, in addition to some printing errors which can easily be recognised as such, the following passages had been unfortunately omitted, and I publish them here with the kind permission of Prof. Goetze.

P. 167: To the translation of the second paragraph add after le ^{GIŞ}*kalmuṣ*: et la lance. (37) Et l'officier du palais donne au Roi le ^{GIŞ}*kalmuṣ*.

To the transliteration of the third paragraph of the same page add the following as lines 8 and 9: (8) *da-a-i na-at pa-ra-a piṣ-e-da-i* (9) *ṣal-li a-ṣe-eṣ-sar a-ap-pa-a-i*.

P. 172, footnote 24: Add the following as the last line of the transliteration: LUGAL-uṣ-kan₂ E₂ tar-nu-ua-az u₂-iz-zi.

Furthermore p. 164, footnote 5: Correct the quotation after LU₂ SANGU as follows: KUB II 3 II 22.

² For the transliteration of the ideogram see Alp, l. c. 173 note 27 and Goetze l. c. 180.

(Hethitische Götter nach Bildbeschreibungen in den Keilschrifttexten 56, MVAG 46/2)³. Goetze tried to prove from Akkadian lexical literature that the Akkadian word *hubbu*, as he reads it, means "lituus," in the Hittite texts. According to him, *hubbu* originally denoted the "fly-brush,". However the identity of *hub₂-bu* in K 5474, 12 with HUB or HUB.BI(2) in the Hittite texts still needs to be proved, since the last mentioned ideogram always occurs, as far as I know, with the sign *hub*⁴. Even if their identity is proven, which I doubt very much, and if *hubbu* means "fly-brush," then the development from "fly-brush," to "lituus," must be demonstrated on the archeological monuments. In my opinion there is some evidence against Goetze's views:

A) HUB.BI never occurs with the determinative GIŠ, as would be expected from an instrument like "lituus,".

B) HUB.BI occurs very often in pairs (cf. von Brandenstein, l. c.). It is not easy to understand this in case of the lituus. I am doubtful if one can evaluate this as the examples given by Goetze in ZA NF 6, 79 ff.

C) Twice the king takes for himself HUB.BI₂.HĪ.A (KUB II 6 III 26; IBoT I 3 I 6; cf. Goetze JCS 180). The plural form is not easy to explain, since the King is shown on the monuments bearing only one lituus. The explanation given by Goetze, in his letter, to the effect that this is plurale tantum, does not convince me.

D) In KUB XI 22 I 17 the King puts on his adornments (*unuṣašhuš*). According to the parallel texts, these include the long gown, the shoes and HUB.BI (see Alp, l. c. 173; Goetze, l. c. 177). It is difficult to consider "lituus," as an ornament.

E) HUB.BI is an object that differs according to the sex of its bearers (see von Brandenstein, l. c.). However cf. Goetze, l. c. 181 note 40 a.

F) I cannot accept Goetze's interpretation (l. c. 184 note 52) of the passage quoted by von Brandenstein. If one studies his

³ JCS I 173 note 27. So did Güterbock in *Orientalia* 15 NS, 486.

⁴ Cf. also Goetze l. c. 179. The transliteration of von Brandenstein as HUP₂ seems to be an error. As long as we do not know writings in the form of HUB.BU or HUB.BA, we cannot say that this word is Akkadian.

Book as a whole, one is inclined to agree with von Brandenstein's translation (MVAG 46/2 was inaccessible to Goetze).

G) But the most decisive evidence is found in KUB XVII 14 IV 5. There we read the following: II *TA.PAL* HUB.ḪI.A KUBAB-BAR ṢA I GIN₂. GIN₂ "two pairs of HUB⁵ of silver of one *šiqu*⁶.". I cannot decide whether the weight of one *šiqu* stands here for one piece of this article or for one or two pairs. If I accept the most unfavorable possibility from my point of view, that the text quoted by me means one *šiqu* of weight for one piece of HUB, it's weight will approximately be 8 gramms, provided that the Hittite MANA was 60 *šiqu*'s. If we suppose that it stands for one or two pairs, then its weight will be respectively 4 or 2 gramms^{6a}. According to the ciphers used with GIN₂ in the Laws, it is very probable that the Hittite MANA was 60 *šiqu*'s.

It is obvious that a "lituus," as shown in the royal representations, cannot be such a small weight and, therefore, HUB.BI cannot mean "lituus," I should like to draw the reader's attention to the "lituus," found in the grave K at Alaca-Hüyük⁷. Those finds belonging to the copper age show that "lituus," had, as an emblem, an old tradition in Anatolia. Only the metal parts of them, with their curved ends are in our possession. As the handles^{7a} were made of wood, they have not been recovered. Though

⁵ Goetze also accepts the identity of HUB with HUB.BI, cf. l. c. 180 note 34.

⁶ The paper of Friedrich (WZKM 49 (1943) 172-179), which argues that the sign written like *zu* in the texts is to be transliterated as GIN₂ = *šiqu* (cf. Lacheman, JAOS 57, 181 - 184), was not accessible to me. The ciphers given for this sign in the laws are so small that I am inclined to agree with his suggestion. However this question has no bearing on our problem.

^{6a} Here I cannot fail to mention that sometimes much smaller imitations of some things were used as models in the rituals. See KBo IV 1 Obv. 47 ff. (=KUB II 2 I 57 ff.). But in the text I cited above there is no indication to the effect that HUB had been used as a model.

⁷ These finds from Alaca-Hüyük will be published soon by Dr. Koşay, Director General of Antiquities.

^{7a} The Hittite equivalent of «handle» or «hilt» is probably *ipulli*. Cf. *ep-«hold»*. KUB XVI 83 obv. 51 ṢA GIŠTUKUL GUŠKIN-ia-ua-kan₂ i-pu-ul-li IŠ.TU N[A⁴ ZA.GIN₃] ar-ḫa pi₂-ip-pa [an] «The hilt with the [lapis lazuli] of the golden weapon is broken away». von Brandenstein, who gives also the transliteration and translation of this passage in op. cit. 65, makes no suggestion for the

Dr. Hamit Koşay's report on the field seasons of 1937-38-39 at Alaca is still in the press, he has kindly permitted me to use his unpublished measurements. The measurements given by Dr. Koşay are as follows: The length of the specimen K 25 is 22.5 cm. and its diameter in the middle is 4.8 cm. The length of K 26 is 18.2 cm. and its diameter 4.6 cm. As for K 27, its length is 15 cm. and its diameter 3.9 centimeters⁸. However Dr. Koşay probably measured the length on a straight line between the ends, as my measurements taken along the curvature of the instrument are much larger. Along the curvature I obtained the following length measurements: For K 25, 50 cm., for K 26, 46 cm. and K 27, 38 centimeters. I am grateful to Prof. Arık, Director of the Ethnographical Museum in Ankara, for permitting me to measure the length of these pieces and for supplying me with their weights. Their weights are as follows: K 25, 1580 grams, K 26, 1340 grams and K 27, 680 grams.

These finds are very important as they indicate that the graves at Alaca are royal graves, since among the Hittites, probably following an old Anatolian tradition, only the Kings used this important insign.

As far as I can judge from our correspondence and his article, Goetze's sole reason for not accepting the identity of *kalmuş* with "lituus," is that he believed that HUB.BI was the equivalent of "lituus,"⁹. As this possibility is now excluded, there

meaning of *ipulli*. Genitive: *i-pu-ul-li-ia-aš* (KUB IX 22 II 24, not clear). For the formation of the word cf. *ištappul(l)i* «lid» (H. Otten, MVAG 46/1, 71, from *ištap*- «shut, cover»), TUG² *kariulli* «hooded gown» (Forrer, Forschungen I 179; Goetze, OLZ 33, 291 fn. 5 and MVAG 34/2,77 and fn. 3, from *kariia*- «cover») and DUG*kuşkuşulli* (Witzel, HKU 100, 25; 114, 22, from *kuşkuş*-).

⁸ I measured this as 3.4 centimeters.

⁹ H. Otten has placed at my disposal a new passage for *kalmuş* from KUB XXXV, which he is preparing for publication:

Bo 415 III 8]x kar-ši-eš-ki-iz-zi DU-ša-aš-kan ₂ GIŞPA [
	ti?-]ia GIŞkal-mu-ša ti-ia
10	-a]t-kan ₂ GIŞša-ḫu-ta-az kar-ši-eš-kan ₂ -zi [
	-z]i-el-li-uš-ma-at-kan ₂ GIŞTUKUL-az GIŞPA-az KI. MIN

Regarding *kalmuş*, this text does not teach us anything more than the fact that *kalmuş* belongs to the same sphere as the sceptre.

Furthermore I am grateful to Otten for supplying me with the translite-

is no reason to doubt my own identification. The small weight of HUB seems to verify the interpretation of von Brandenstein, that it means "earring".

To me it appears likely that the word *ištamaḫuruš* represents the Hittite reading of this ideogram¹⁰. In the inventory of KUB XII 1 we read the following:

-
- IV 37 IV TA.PAL HUB.BI GUŞKIN LU₂ ŞA₃ BA [III TA.PAL
HUB.BI GUŞKIN] NA₄
- 38 II *iš-ta-ma-ḫu-ru-uš* GUŞKIN [×?]
-
- 39 I-NU-TUM HUB.BI SAL^{TI} GUŞKIN NA₄ *an-da*
ap-pa-a-a [n]
-
- 37 "Four pairs HUB.BI of gold belonging to men ;
among these [three pairs HUB.BI of gold], (studded
with ?) stone(s),
- 38 two *ištamaḫuruš* of gold [×?].
-
- 39 One set of HUB.BI of gold belonging to women,
studded with stone(s). „
-

Although the restoration of the line 37, given by me, is not certain, it is very unlikely that between the same article in lines 37 and 39 should be included something entirely different. That *ištamaḫuruš* is to be connected with *ištamaš*- "hear," and *ištamana*- "ear," seems probable to me.

ration of an unpublished passage, redemonstrating the close connection of *kalmuḫ* with the throne and consequently with the kingdom, as was shown by me at the beginning of my previous article. This passage, in addition to the form *kalmuḫa* given above, supplies us with a sure dative-locative form, i. e. *kalmuḫi*. 832/c I (18) [GAL DUMU E₂. G]AL-*ma ku-it* GIŞ ŞUKUR (19) [*ḫar-zi na-at* GI]Ş DAG-*ti IT.TI* GIŞkal-*mu-ḫi da-a-i* *But[the chief of] the pa[lace officials] places the lance, which [he holds], on the throne beside *kalmuḫ*."

¹⁰ Last year during a conversation Prof. Güterbock had first expressed this opinion.