APPENDIX

HATTIAN ORIGINS OF HITTITE RELIGIOUS CONCEPTS: THE SYNTAX OF ‘TO DRINK (TO) A DEITY’ (AGAIN) AND OTHER PHRASES

PETRA M. GOEDEGEBUURE

In the preceding pages Oğuz Soysal has provided new, convincing evidence for a Hattian background of the well-known Hittite cultic expression ḏ(DN) eku- “to drink a deity”. Although this phrase is not yet attested in Hattian itself (see his fn. 17), Soysal has shown that the original Hattian expression must have contained the deity in the Hattian dative case -n, thereby giving further, unexpected proof for the interpretation of ḏ(DN) eku- as “to drink (to the honor of) a deity”.1

Melchert2 has shown how the alternation of ḏ(DN) eku- “to drink to (the honor of) a deity (dat.)” and ḏ(DN) eku- “to drink (to the honor of) a deity (acc.)” is part of a larger syntactic phenomenon in Hittite3 in which a construction of the type of ‘do something (acc.) to/for someone (dat.)’ competes with ‘do (to/for) someone (acc.) by means of something (instr.)’. Although the semantic roles patient and recipient or beneficiary of the entities involved do not change, they receive a different morpho-syntactic treatment in these two constructions. To the modern reader the more common construction for


3 See HW2: E 30 for a rather unjustified criticism of Melchert and most of the other scholars mentioned in fn. 2 (they are accused of naively applying modern “Trink(spruch)gepflogenheiten” to the religion of the Hittites).
eku- “to drink” would be the one in which the liquid or its container is in the accusative, and the recipient or beneficiary in the dative (“I am drinking (a glass of) wine to your health”). But as Soysal has shown, in Hittite the construction with the dative is extremely rare, and moreover, in each case the verb eku- is used absolutely (i.e., without accusative-object), see for example (1a, Soysal IX 4) and (1b, Soysal IX 1):

1a nu ANA dUTU ekuzzi[ “He drinks to the Sundeity (dat.)”]
   KBo 21.36: 4' (MS, ritual fragment, CTH 470).
1b EGIR-ma ANA dIŠKUR ekuzzi nu tem[i] “Afterwards he drinks to the Weathergod (dat.), and I sa[y]” KUB 34.77 obv.’ 8’ (NS, ritual fragment, CTH 470).

Otherwise, only the vessel is mentioned, but in that case the vessel is always accompanied by the deity in the genitive case, thus identifying the beneficiary of the action:

2 § 34 LUGAL-uš MUNUS.[LU]GAL-š=a ešanda GAL dUTU
dMezz[ul]la ašandaš 35 akuanzi “The king and queen sit down. They drink the cup (acc.) of the Sungoddess (and) Mezzulla while seated.” KBo 17.74 ii 34-35 (OH/OS or MS, thunder-storm ritual, CTH 631).

However, the overwhelming majority of drinking to a deity is expressed with the deity in the accusative. In most cases the container is omitted (see for example 3 = Soysal I 3)), but there are also numerous cases in which we find a complete construction with the container in the instrumental (4a = Soysal VI 3)) or instrumental ablative (4b):

3 [LUGAL-uš MUNUS.LU]GAL-ašš=a TUŠ-aš dZuliyan akuanzi “The king and queen drink (to) Zuliya (acc.) while seated.” KBo 20.5 rev. 9’ (OS, KI.LAM festival, CTH 627).
4a [L]UGAL-uš MUNUS.LUGAL-ašš=a GUB-aš aššuzeriu 19 dIšanu
dPalatappinu akuanzi “The king and the queen drink (to) the Sun-goddess ‘and her child’ (acc.) with a fine cup (instr.)

---

4 For more examples see A. Archi in A. Kammenhuber, Materialien zu einem hethitischen Thesaurus, Lieferung 5, Nr. 5 eku-/aku- (Heidelberg: Carl Winter 1976): 121ff.
6 See for example the lists in A. Archi, Materialien 5, Nr. 5: 136ff., 139, 142.
while standing.” KBo 20.67 i 18'-19' (OH/MS, festival of the month, CTH 591).8

4b LUGAL-uš GUB-äš DINGIR.MEŠ hūmanteš GAL-az 20 1=ŠU ekuzi “The king, while standing, drinks once (to) all the gods (acc.) with a cup (abl.).” KUB 2.13 vi 19-20 (OH/NS, festival of the month, CTH 591).9

The alternation of a dative with an accusative to indicate the recipient or beneficiary of the action is not only attested with eku-, but also with wahnu- “to whirl” and šipant- “to libate, offer”:10, 11

5a [u]g=a-šnaš=šan ÉRIN.MEŠ-an še[(r)] 3=ŠU wahnümi “But I whirl the soldier over them (dat.) three times.” KBo 17.1 ii 17'-18', w. dupl. KBo 17.6 ii 11' (both OS, ritual for king and queen, CTH 416).12

5b nu marn[(uan KAŠ.LĂL)] GEŠTIN-an ANA dUTU šipanti “He libates marruan-drink, honey-beer (and) wine to the Sungod (dat.),” VBoT 58 rev. iv 42-43 (OH/NS, ritual part of the myth of the disappearance of the Sungod, CTH 323), w. dupl. KUB 53.20 iv 16' (OH/MS).13

6a “He falls down on the bedroll,” [(n=an LÚ d-U-äš MĂŠ.GAL-za 3)]=ŠU wahnužzi “and the man of the Stormgod whirls (over) him (acc.) three times with a billy-goat.” KUB 28.82 i 7' (both OH/NS, Hutusi’s ritual, CTH 732), w. dupl. KBo 13.106 i 7 (OH/NS).

---


9 Ed. Klinger, StBoT 37: 568f.

10 This construction with šipant- was already recognized by C.W. Carter, o.c., 449, and Heiner Eichner, o.c., 66.

11 There may very well be other verbs with optional dative or accusative marking of the recipient or beneficiary, but a study of this phenomenon lies outside the scope of this note. For more examples of wahnu- and šipant- and a thorough discussion of the syntactic transformations involved, see Melchert JIES 9 (1981): 247ff.


Even though all three verbs show both constructions, the distribution of these constructions is not the same. Whereas the use of the dative and the accusative with wahnu- and šipant- is of the same order, eku- “to drink” with a god in the dative is extremely rare, as mentioned above (Soysal’s category IX, with only four attestations). As Soysal already observed, the overwhelming majority of phrases with a god in the accusative is the likely result of interference from Hattian. In that language the recipient of the drinking, the god, either carried the dative marker -n or showed lengthening of the final vowel. It therefore seems likely, in view of the strong influence of Hattian religion in the Old Hittite kingdom, that the formal similarity between the Hattian dative marker and the Hittite accusative marker caused the near-extinction of the Hittite phrase with the dative.

Even though her interpretation of the phrase was different, Kammenhuber already observed that the concept of ‘god-drinking’ probably originated with the Hattian population. This has not been claimed about the acts of whirling some object over a person or entity or libating to some deity or deified object: libation to deities is a cross-cultural phenomenon, and I assume that whirling something over someone is not restricted to Hattian culture either. Hattian linguistic interference is therefore not expected, at least not to the extent as with the Hattian concept of ‘drinking (to) a deity’. This might explain why the recipient or beneficiary of the verbs wahnu- and šipant- remained to be expressed in the dative case besides the accusative.

The Hittite phrase “to drink (to) a deity” always occurs in the descriptive parts of ritual texts. Up to this date there are no such descriptions in Hattian, even though all Old Hittite recitations such...
as invocations, incantations, myths and prayers were mainly conducted in Hattian. But perhaps we may conclude from the influence of this Hattian morphological feature on a Hittite syntactic construction that there was a stage in which also the ritual descriptions were expressed in Hattian. Klinger already proposed something similar with respect to the scribal error $^{d}$Pala(-)tappinu in KBo 20.67 i 19’ (4a repeated here):

$^{7}$ [L]UGAL-uş MUNUS.LUGAL-äšš=a GUB-äš äššazerit $^{d}$Ištanu $^{d}$Palatappinu akuanzi “The king and queen drink Ištanu “and her child” / “and” Tappinu) with a fine cup while standing.”

KBo 20.67 i 18’-19’ (OH/MS, festival of the month, CTH 591).

The ‘name’ Palatappinu does not represent a real deity, but is an error of translation and has to be analyzed as the Hattian coordinator pala “and”, and either the possessive prefix ta- “her” and the substantive pinu “child”, both Hattian as well, or the deity Tappinu. Either way, the sequence $^{d}$Ištanu $^{d}$Palatappinu stands for $^{d}$UTU and $^{d}$Mezzulla, i.e., the Sungoddess and her daughter Mezzulla.

As Oğuz Soysal kindly pointed out to me, the same kind of error can be observed for two other pseudo-divine names that are attested only once: $^{d}$Hattušantewašhap (KBo 21.85 i 24’, MS ritual, see Soysal, this volume, p. 57) and $^{d}$Hattušin $^{d}$Tešhap (KBo 25.62: 5’, OŠ ritual). The names of these phantom deities should be analyzed as Hattuš=an te=wa=šhap “Hattuš-of her-collective-god = the gods of Hattuš” and Hattuš=in te=šhap “Hattuš-of her-god = the deity of Hattuš”, respectively.

16 Klinger, StBoT 37: 28 fn. 70, p. 330.
17 See Klinger, StBoT 37: 683 and Oğuz Soysal, Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischen Textüberlieferung, Handbuch der Orientalistik I/74 (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2004): 244 sub ta- for the suggestion of ta- as a variant of the 3rd pers.f. (and inanimate?) possessive prefix te-.
19 Klinger, StBoT 37: 330.
22 Van Gessel, Onomasticon, 113, 481.
23 Translit. Neu, StBoT 25: 137.
24 Soysal, HWHT: 459, with lit.
25 Soysal, HWHT: 460, with lit.
In addition to the scribal mis- or reinterpretations of the three Hattian phrases just discussed, Soysal’s analysis of the Hattian origins of the expression 4(DN) _eku- “to drink a deity” now provides further proof that Hittite prescriptive religious texts are based on Hattian compositions. Whether these compositions were transmitted orally or in writing before being translated into Hittite, we are not yet in a position to decide.
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JIES = Journal of Indo-European Studies.
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