

A RELIGIOUS TEXT FROM MAŞAT

Hans G. GÜTERBOCK

Among Hittite tablets found outside the capital the most numerous are letters. Those from Tell el Amarna, Tell Açıana, Alacahöyük and one from Maşat have been known for a long time¹. Recent excavations have added a great number of administrative letters from Maşat² and, so far, one from Meskene³. Of other genres, Ras Shamra-Ugarit added one legal document and some trilingual literary compositions⁴, while at both Açıana-Alalakh and Meskene-Emar the texts that are not letters are oracle texts⁵.

It was therefore a surprise when Tahsin Özgüç published a fragment of a text of a different nature. In his book *Maşat Höyük II*⁶ an excellent photograph of the tablet is on the cover, with a short explanation on the back of the first title page (p. II) and a brief note on p. 146 (Turkish) and 152 (English). As already stated there, the text forms part of an incantation aimed at bringing back the god who disappeared. It is a pleasure for me to dedicate the following comments on this text to the memory of my late friend Bahadır Alkım.

1 L. Rost, MIO 4 (1956) 328-350.

2 S. Alp, Belleten 41 (1977) 638f., VIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi Bildiriler Kitabı I, 165-196 (Turkish) = Belleten 44 (1980) 25-59 (German), Studia Mediterranea I Piero Meriggi dicata (1979) 21, Festschrift Bittel (1983) 46.

3 E. Laroche, in Meskene-Emar, Dix ans de travaux (1982) 54.

4 E. Laroche, in Ugaritica V (1968) 769-779.

5 O.R. Gurney, in D.J. Wiseman, The Alalakh Tablets (1953) No. 126; E. Laroche, l. c. (Note 3) 54f.

6 T. Özgüç, Maşat Höyük II: Boğazköy'ün Kuzeydoğusunda bir Hitit merkezi = A Hittite Center Northeast of Boğazköy, T.T.K. Yayınları, V. Dizi-Sayı 38* (1982).

The best known god who disappeared is, of course, Telibinu, but he is not the only one. The Maşat fragment speaks only of «the god» without—in the preserved part—giving his name. As already stated by Özgüç, the tablet can be dated to the thirteenth century on the ground of both its script and its findspot, Level I. It was found in 1981 and is now kept in the museum of Tokat; I have not seen the original.

The piece is part of the right column of the obverse, most probably of column ii; the upper and right-hand edges are preserved. On the left, the beginnings of all lines are lost. In the first few lines no more than one or two signs are missing, but further down the loss is greater. The story of the god's disappearance and of the search must have been contained in the first column, and even the beginning of the incantation must have been there. For most parts of col. ii similar passages from other texts of the same type can be found, but there is no single version running parallel with the Maşat tablet⁷, and not all the comparable passages are similar enough to allow for full restorations of the lacunae in the Maşat tablet; some of our restorations therefore remain tentative or problematic.

Transliteration

- 1 [ŠA DING]IR-LUM TUKU.TUKU-*u-an-za* ZI-ŠU
 - 2 [ka]-*ra-az-še-iš wa-ra-an pa-aḥ-ḥur la-ap-ta*
 - 3 [nu-x?] *ki-i pa-aḥ-ḥur GIM-an ú-i-te-ni-it*
 - 4 [ki-iš]-*ta-nu-nu-un*
-
- 5 [ŠA DINGIR]-LUM *kar-pí-iš* TUKU.TUKU-*za*
 - 6 [wa-aš-túl š]*a-a-u-wa-ar QA-TAM-MA ki-iš-ta-ru*
-
- 7 [BÜLUG GIM]-*an te-ep-šu-uš Ū-UL-an A.ŠĀ-ni*
 - 8 [pé-e-da]-*an-zi na-an NUMUN-an i-ia-an-zi*

⁷ The distinction of different versions of the Vanishing God myth was first made by H. Otten, *Die Überlieferungen des Telipinu-Mythus* (MVAEG 46.1, 1942). E. Laroche made them easily available in *Textes mythologiques hittites en transcription, Première partie: Mythologie anatolienne*, RHA 77 (1965), quoted here as *Myth.* with the pagination of the book edition of 1969.

- 9 [Ú-UL-a]n NINDA-an i-ia-an-zi na-an I-NA É[.NA₁.KIŠIB]
 10 [ti-an-zi Š]A DINGIR-LIM kar-pi-iš TUKU.TUKU-az
 11 [wa-aš-túl ša-a-u]-wa-ar QA-TAM-MA te-ep-ša-u-e-eš[-du]
-
- 12 [o o na-a]k-ki-iš DINGIR-LUM dĤa-pa-an-ta-l[i-ia-aš]
 13 [ĤUR.SAG-az(?) o]-x-ga-an GIŠkar-ša-ni-ia-an
 14 [ú-da-aš GAL(?)]-iš dĤa-pa-an-ta-li-i[a-aš]
 15 [dam-me-la-az(?) p]é-e-da-az
 16 [NA₄pa-aš-ši-lu-uš] da-a-aš nu-uš-ša-an ĥa-aš[-ši-i]
 17 [an - da šu-uh]-ĥa-iš
-
- 18 [Ú.ĤI.A(?) z]i-e-an-ta-ri
 19 [d o o (o)] wa-aš-ši-aš SAL.LUGAL-aš
 20 [o o o o] GIŠa-la-an-za-na-an
 21 [GIŠĥa-tal-kiš]-na-aš GIŠša-ma-li-ia-aš
 22 [la-ah-ĥu-wa-a]r-nu-uz-zi
 23 [kal-ú-iš-na-a]n tuh-ĥu-eš-šar šu-ma-an-za-n[a]
 24 [o o o o] NA₄pa-aš-šu-e-la-aš še-er šu-u[ĥ-ĥa-i(?)]
-
- 25 [nu-uš-ša-an šu]-up-pi wa-a-tar pa-ap-pa-ar-iš-š[a-an(?)]
 26 [o o o o o] na-aš-ta wa-ar-šu-la-aš
 27 [ša-ra-a ú-it n]a-aš-kán [A-NA] DINGIR-LIM
 28 [tu-e-ek-ke-e]š-ši an-da pa-it
-
- 29 [na-aš-ta ŠA DINGIR-LI]M(?) NÍ.TE-az ŠĀ-az
 30 [o o o o o (o)]-ta nu-uš-ši-iš-ta
 31 [kar-pi-in TUKU.TUKU-a]n wa-aš-túl ša-a-u-wa-ar
 32 [ar-ĥa pár-ah-ta(?) n]u-uš-ša-an ar-ša-na-an-ta
 33 [ša-a-ku-wa(?) LŪ.U₁₉]. LU-aš ĤUL-lu-un
 34 [EME-an(?) ...]
-
- 35 [.] x ZI-ni
 36 [.] tar-ra-nu-ud-du
 37 [.]x-aš-kán DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ZI-ni
 38 [. . . . la-lu]-uk-ki-iš-nu-ud-du
-

39 [.]x DINGIR.MEŠ-aš *ḥa-am-mi-in-kán-du*

40 [. a-a]p-pa *la-a-ú*

41- [*zi-ga-az* GĪŠ*ḥa-a*]t-tal-kiš-na-aš

42 [*ḥa-me-eš-ḥi-ia-az* BABBAR-TIM w]a-aš-ši-ia-ši

43 [BURU₁₄ -ma-az iš-ḥar-nu-wa-am-da wa-]aš-ši-ia-ši

44 [GUD-uš-ták-kán kat-ti-ti ar-ḥa pa-iz]-zi

broken

Translation

(1) [The go]d's angry soul and his figure glowed as a burning fire. Just as I have extinguished this fire with water, so let [the go]d's wrath, anger, [exasperation] and fury likewise be extinguished.

(7) Just as [malt] is reduced (so that) it is not [tak]en to a field and used as seed, [nor] made into bread and put into a [store] house, so let the god's wrath, anger, [exasperation and fu]ry likewise be reduced.

(12) [... the mi]ghty god Ḥapantaliya [brought from the moun-tain(?) ...]... (and?) *karšaniya* (a tree, its wood or fruit). [The gre]at(?) Ḥapantaliya took(?) [pebbles] from [a virgin] place and [hea]ped them up [on] the hearth.

(18) [Herbs(?)] are cooking. [(The goddess) ...], the queen of remedies, he[aped. ...] *alanzana* (wood) (and?) the foliage of hawtho]rn (and) *šamaliya*, *kalwišna*, resin and a string on top of the pebbles.

(25) [... h]oly water is sprinkled [...]. Then the smell [went up] and it went into [the bod]y of the god.

(29) [Then] from [the god]'s body and heart it [remov]ed [the ...], and [drove away] his [wrath, ange]r, exasperation (and) fury, and [removed the envious(?) [eyes (and) man]kind's evil [tongue].

(35) [...] in the soul let it exhaust [... , an]d in the soul of the gods let it enlighten [...].

(39) Let them tie [...] for the gods, [but] let [...] untie [...] again.

(41) [You are the haw]thorn. [In the spring you] put on [white (clothes), but in the fall] you put on [red ones. The ox pass]es [beneath you, and you pull its hair; the sheep passes beneath you, and you pull its wool. In the same way pull the wrath, anger, exasperation and fury of the god!]

Commentary

For lines 1-6 cf. KUB 17.10 iii 21-23, Telibinu myth, first version (Myth. 35). While that text has a nominal predicate, «is a burning fire», ours adds the verb *lapta*. Note also the change in the sequence: what follows here (7-11) precedes there (16-20).

The position of the column divider is determined by line 2, where the sign [*ka-*] alone must be restored. Then [DINGIR] alone does not fill the space available in line one. The *LUM* in 5 sits exactly below the *LUM* of 1. The parallel texts have ^d*Telibinuš* in KUB 17.10 iii 13 and 21 (Myth. 34f.) corresponding to our line 1, ^d*Telibinuwaš* in 15, corresponding to our 5. The first form is probably nominative, forming a *schema* construction with *ZI-ŠU karaz-šiš*, although some have assumed a contracted genitive in *-uš < -uwaš*; the second, before *karpiš* etc., must be genitive. In the Stormgod version, KUB 33. (24+)28 iii 7 and 9 (Myth. 57), both clauses have ^d*IM-na-aš*, which can be both nominative and genitive, as shown by KUB 33.24 i 37 and 39 (Myth. 54). In the second clause genitive is required, so we restore [*ŠA DINGIR*]-*LUM* despite the wrong Akkadian complement. The space then requires the same restoration also in line one, since a sentence connective is not expected according to the parallels.

Line 2: The Zalpa story (KBo 22.2 obv. 16, StBoT 17, 6) has shown that *karaz* cannot be «inner parts (of the body)». Our trans-

lation «figure» is only an attempt, just as the earlier renderings «Gestalt» and «features»⁸.

For lines 7-11 cf., besides KUB 17.10 iii 16-20 (Myth. 35) also KUB 33.11 iii 1-7 (Myth. 49). In all three texts the subject of the first sentence is lost. A. Goetze, Madd. 72 n. 1, restored BÜLUG on the analogy of KBo 6.34 ii 31ff. (now StBoT 22, 1976, 10). In this we follow him because we cannot think of any other kind of grain which is not used for sowing or baking. For *tepsu-* we follow Gurney (AAA 27, 107f.) and Sommer (HAB 141 n. 4).

Line 9. The last two signs of the expected É.NA₄.KIŠIB must be written on the right edge.

Lines 12-17. A parallel is in KUB 33.45 + 53 + FHG 2, 17-22, a text about DINGIR.MAḤ (Myth. 81 can in part be restored according to the Maṣat text).

Line 17. The first partly preserved sign looks like *ha*. I can only think of the verb *šuhai-*. Its 3rd. sing. pret. form has been attested only as *šuhāš* but in view of the alternation *išhuwaš* KUB 33.45 + iii 20 with *išhuwaiš* KUB 33.11 iii 21 (Myth. 50) I do not hesitate positing a form *šuhaiš*.

Another parallel to lines 17-18 (and following, see presently) was brought to my attention by H. A. Hoffner: KUB 7.23., which in lines 5'-6' offers NA₄ *paššiluš* [...] *anda šuhāš* with the known pret. form in a sentence similar to ours.

Lines 18-24. As noticed by Hoffner, KUB 7.23 is very close to this part of the Maṣat text. It is part of an invocation similar to those for the vanished god. The first person singular pronouns in lines 14-15 must be part of the individual's wish that the reconciliation of the gods apply to his own person. The agent in the past tense story is a «shepherd»; he might be the god Ḥapantaliya, cf. KUB 17.10 iii 3-5 (Telibinu version, Myth. 34), just as in the DINGIR.MAḤ version (Myth. 81, 17 and 19) restored by the Maṣat text

8 H. G. Güterbock, in *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft* (1978) 219, und in *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literatures*. The Hebrew University, (1983) 28.

it is Hapantaliya who brings the wood and the pebbles. But while in KUB 7.23 the «shepherd» seems to be the only agent, both other texts introduce a lady —doubtless a goddess— called «queen of the fountain» and «queen of the remedies», respectively ([*w*]aššiyaš may well be the whole word). For line 18 I can only think of [*z*]ēantari; the tentative restoration Ū.ĦI.A is based on the combination with this word and the [*w*]aššiyaš of line 19.

The gist of lines 20-28 apparently is that by putting the foliage (cf. CHD, also for the form *lahhuwawarmuzzi*) of various trees together with other plants and with *tuhhueššar* on (hot) pebbles and pouring water over them one sends a soothing smell to the gods. (The pebbles were put on the hearth according to lines 16-17 restored from KUB 7.23).

The restorations of lines 21-23 are also based on KUB 7.23. The foliage is modified by two tree names in the genitive. The first tree name, *alanzanan*, seems to be in the accusative (a genitive plural seems not to be likely here). If so, it may be the wood of the *alanzana*- tree as a separate item (shavings?). *kalwišna*-, sometimes written with the determinative SAR, is a plant (cf. I. Singer, StBoT 27 (1983) 61f. n.29); thus its place after the foliage is easily understood.

Line 23. For *tuhhueššar* I still use the tentative translation «resin», cf. RHA 74 (1964) 106f. In contrast to S. Alp⁹ I feel that *t.* is not a liquid but a solid object that can be put into water and poured out with it. It does not dissolve in it, but rather is lying in it (*kitta*, KUB 20.85 i 12-14), it can be tied (KUB 9.28 iii 15f.), it can be tied and lying in water (KBo 17.15 obv. 16); it is put on a cloth and carried out with it (KUB 20.59 i 18-21, KUB 10.4 i 5-6). The string mentioned with it in our line 23 recalls the passages where it is tied¹⁰.

9 S. Alp, *Belleten* 46 (1982) 252-259 (Turkish) and *Orientalia* 52.1 (1983) 14-19 (German).

10 I also maintain that there is only one verb *tuhš-*, «to cut.» One reason is that the spellings with and without the additional *uh* occur in both of the previously assumed verbs; the other, that there is no morphological bridge from *tuhš-* to *tuhhueššar*. For the transitive, intransitive, and passive uses of the

Line 24. NA_4 *paššuelaš* is a new formation; cf. *paššu-*, *piššu-*, and *paššila-*. KUB 7.23, 5' actually has *paššiluš*, and accordingly I have restored this word in our line 16 (where there is no space for the long form).

Lines 25-28. Cf. KUB 33.45+ (Myth. 81) and KUB 7.23, 10-13 also KUB 33.9 iii 1-4 (Myth. 46). For *waršula-* I have long since thought of the meaning «smell.» Friedrich, HW 3rd Erg. 36, while quoting Laroche, BSL 58, 59-61, lists not only the translations proposed there as «Tropfen; Saft» but adds «Duft», apparently on his own¹¹. I can only agree. I think that the frequent phrase *waršuli ekuzi* should be translated «he drinks in the smell» and refers to «drinking the god» only by sniffing the aroma of the wine. The traditional rendering «zur Beruhigung» is unsatisfactory, not to say incomprehensible¹².

Lines 29-34. The tentative restorations are based on KUB 33.45+ iii 27-29 (Myth. 81) and KUB 33.9 iii 4-8 (Myth. 46). In 30 one would expect [*arḫa parḫ*] *ta*, which however leaves very little space for the expected object. The usual string of four expressions for «anger» in line 31 is in a new clause introduced by *nuššišta*. On the other hand, [*arḫa parḫta*] would fit the space in 32. Perhaps 30 had a different verb, or [... *pár-ah*]-*ta* without preverb; in 34 another synonym is needed.

Line 32. *aršananta* is another attestation of the form listed in HW² p. 344a bottom, from KUB 33.9 iii 7, the passage parallel to ours. Friedrich's presentation in HW¹ p. 33 is preferable: he posited the verb as only *aršaniya-* (all finite forms in HW² are from this

middle verb *tubš-* see E. Neu., StBoT 5 (1968) 175-177. Important is KUB 10.11 ii 4-5: *nu-za-kán LUGAL[-uš] tub-ḫu-i-šar tub-uḫ[-ša]* «Then the king cuts *tubḫueššar* for himself (-za)».

11 Incidentally, the form listed as *waršuliš* is written with the LIŠ sign which should be read *li_x*; the context requires the normal *waršuli*. In Mat. heth. Thes., Lfg. 7-8, *eku-/aku-* p. 370, under «Kultinventare» read KUB 17.35 i 33 (not 36) and add iv 32.

12 Ibid. pp. 365-370 *waršuli* is translated «zur Befriedigung, zur Besänftigung» (after HW¹), even only «zur Befriedigung» (367, 369). This almost looks as if the «satisfaction» of the drinker were meant, but the added «Besänftigung» of the other instances shows that this was not intended.

-*iya*- stem) and a separate *aršanant-*, which he defined as adjective and translated «envious», obviously because of the connection with the verb and the combination with «eyes» in KUB 33.9. If *šakuwa aršananda* there really belongs together the adjective follows the noun; but in our text *aršananta* comes right after the sentence connecting *nuššan* so that, if it is an adjective modifying a noun here too, it would precede it. However, the notion that «envious eyes» are one of the evils is appealing, and therefore I restored [*šakuwa*] after *aršananta* despite the different word order.

Line 33. For LU-*aš* preceded by a vertical wedge I can only think of LÚ.U₁₉.LU-*aš*, and «the evil [...] of mankind» gives a good sense. For the noun expected in line 34 one thinks at first of [*patalhan*], cf. KUB 33.9 iii 6 (Myth. 46), KBo 24.17, 4, KBo 26.132, 5 and, in the nominative, KUB 33.8 iii 12 (Myth. 44) and KBo 13.260 iii 32f.; cf. also *idalun GİR-an* KBo 10.45 iv 3 (ZA 54, 134). However, in line 34 a verb must be restored, which leaves too little room for *patalhan*; we therefore restore EME-*an*, cf. CHD *lala-* 4.

Lines 35-38 and 39-40. I did not find parallels which would allow to restore these lines.

Lines 41-44. In these lines enough is preserved to show that this is an exact parallel to the spell invoking the hawthorn which H. Otten discussed in AfO 16 (1952/53) 69f. It is best preserved in KUB 33.54 + 47 ii 13-17, (Myth. 79, DINGIR.MAḪ); in slightly different wording in KUB 34.76 i 1-8. Parts of it are recognizable in KUB 17.10 iv 1-3 (Myth. 36, Telibinu) and KUB 33.19 ii 14-16 (Myth. 63, Stormgod). In the translation we have added the part of the spell which is lost on the Maşat tablet.

* * *

The Maşat fragment shows again how freely the Hittite scribes used the various motifs in composing this kind of incantation. The reference to the god who disappeared as simply «the deity» (DINGIR-LUM) occurs also in other texts of this kind. KUB 33.72 (+) 73+74 (Myth. 104f.), like ours, is so small that the name of the deity may well have been mentioned in the lost part of the tablet.

In KUB 33.38 (Myth. 84f.) it is simply «the deity» in iv 3 and 6, but i 7 reveals the name of DINGIR.MAḪ, the Mother goddess Hannahanna. An account of her disappearance is not preserved in any of the DINGIR.MAḪ texts (Myth. 78-86), but this may be due to the fragmentary state of the tablets. In KUB 33.38 iv (Myth. 84f.) the results of her reconciliation are described in the same terms as in the Telibinu version (KUB 17.10 iv 24ff., cf. ANET 128), but an account of her actual return is lacking - perhaps only broken off. Thus we are left in the dark as to whether the great Mother goddess actually went into hiding or manifested her anger in other ways. Let us hope that the first column of the Maṣat tablet, which should contain the name of the deity, may turn up in future excavation.