

This PDF file of your paper in *Anatolian Interfaces* belongs to the publishers Oxbow Books and it is their copyright.

As author you are licenced to make up to 50 offprints from it, but beyond that you may not publish it on the World Wide Web or in any other form.

An offprint from

ANATOLIAN INTERFACES
HITTITES, GREEKS AND THEIR NEIGHBOURS

*Proceedings of an International Conference on Cross-Cultural Interaction,
September 17-19, 2004, Emory University, Atlanta, GA*

edited by

*Billie Jean Collins, Mary R. Bachvarova
and Ian C. Rutherford*

© Oxbow Books 2008

ISBN 978-1-84217-270-4

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	v
<i>Abbreviations</i>	vi
<i>Maps</i>	viii
Introduction	1
PART 1	
HISTORY, ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE MYCENAEAN-ANATOLIAN INTERFACE	
1. Troy as a “Contested Periphery”: Archaeological Perspectives on Cross-Cultural and Cross-Disciplinary Interactions Concerning Bronze Age Anatolia (<i>Eric H. Cline</i>)	11
2. Purple-Dyers in Lazpa (<i>Itamar Singer</i>)	21
3. Multiculturalism in the Mycenaean World (<i>Stavroula Nikoloudis</i>)	45
4. Hittite Lesbos? (<i>Hugh J. Mason</i>)	57
PART 2	
SACRED INTERACTIONS	
5. The Seer Mopsos as a Historical Figure (<i>Norbert Oettinger</i>)	63
6. Setting up the Goddess of the Night Separately (<i>Jared L. Miller</i>)	67
7. The Songs of the <i>Zintuḫis</i> : Chorus and Ritual in Anatolia and Greece (<i>Ian C. Rutherford</i>)	73
PART 3	
IDENTITY AND LITERARY TRADITIONS	
8. Homer at the Interface (<i>Trevor Bryce</i>)	85
9. The Poet’s Point of View and the Prehistory of the <i>Iliad</i> (<i>Mary R. Bachvarova</i>)	93
10. Hittite Ethnicity? Constructions of Identity in Hittite Literature (<i>Amir Gilan</i>)	107

PART 4	
IDENTITY AND LANGUAGE CHANGE	
11. Writing Systems and Identity (<i>Annick Payne</i>)	117
12. Luwian Migration in Light of Linguistic Contacts (<i>Ilya Yakubovitch</i>)	123
13. “Hermit Crabs,” or New Wine in Old Bottles: Anatolian-Hellenic Connections from Homer and Before to Antiochus I of Commagene and After (<i>Calvert Watkins</i>)	135
14. Possessive Constructions in Anatolian, Hurrian and Urartian as Evidence for Language Contact (<i>Silvia Luraghi</i>)	143
15. Greek <i>mólybdos</i> as a Loanword from Lydian (<i>H. Craig Melchert</i>)	153
PART 5	
ANATOLIA AS INTERMEDIARY: THE FIRST MILLENNIUM	
16. Kybele as Kubaba in a Lydo-Phrygian Context (<i>Mark Munn</i>)	159
17. King Midas in Southeastern Anatolia (<i>Maya Vassileva</i>)	165
18. The GALA and the Gallos (<i>Patrick Taylor</i>)	173
19. Patterns of Elite Interaction: Animal-Headed Vessels in Anatolia in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries BC (<i>Susanne Ebbinghaus</i>)	181
20. “A Feast of Music”: The Greco-Lydian Musical Movement on the Assyrian Periphery (<i>John Curtis Franklin</i>)	191
General Index	203

PREFACE

When Ian Rutherford and Mary Bachvarova first conceived the idea for a conference on cross-cultural interaction in Anatolia, they found a willing collaborator in Billie Jean Collins, who volunteered Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia as the location for the conference. Its purpose would be to bring together scholars who might not normally travel in the same academic circles to engage in a discussion about Anatolia's many cultural "interfaces." Cross-cultural interaction in ancient Anatolia between indigenous groups, such as the Hattians, Indo-Europeans, including Hittites and Greeks, and Near Eastern cultures, particularly the Hurrians, resulted in a unique environment in which Anatolian peoples interacted with, and reacted to, one another in different ways. These cultural interfaces occurred on many levels, including political, economic, religious, literary, architectural and iconographic. The rich and varied archives, inscriptions and archaeological remains of ancient Anatolia and the Aegean promised much material for study and discussion. After a year of planning, on September 17–19, 2004, an international body of scholars, more or less equally divided between Classicists and Anatolianists, met at Emory University. These Proceedings present the rich fruits of the discussion that took place over those three days in Atlanta.


Hosted and co-sponsored by the Department of Middle Eastern and South Asian Studies of Emory University, the conference, "Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbors in Ancient Anatolia: An International Conference on Cross-Cultural Interaction" was made possible by the generous support of many sponsors. From within Emory, the sponsors include the Center for Humanistic Inquiry, the Department of Anthropology, the Department of Art History, the Department of Classics, the Department of Religion, the Graduate Division of Religion, the Graduate Program in Culture, History and Theory, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the Institute for Comparative and International Studies, the Michael C. Carlos Museum, the Office of International Affairs, the Program in Classical Studies, the Program in Mediterranean Archaeology and the Program in Linguistics. Support from outside the University came from the American Schools of Oriental Research, the Georgia Middle East Studies Consortium, the Georgia Humanities Council, the Foundation for Biblical Archaeology and the Hightower Fund. The publication of these proceedings was made possible by a subvention from Emory College and the Emory Graduate School of Arts & Sciences. Thanks also go to Susanne Wilhelm of Archaeoplan for preparing the maps for the volume.

The conference "Hittites, Greeks and Their Neighbors" underscored how all our fields of study can benefit from a cross-cultural, cross-disciplinary approach. If, in publishing these proceedings, we draw attention to the importance of Anatolia in recovering the cultural heritage of the western world, then our efforts have been worthwhile. Many at the conference expressed the hope that it might be the beginning of a regular series of formal conversations on the topic, and one participant predicted that the conference would usher in a new era of cross-disciplinary cooperation. We certainly hope so.


ABBREVIATIONS

ABAW	Abhandlungen der Bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
AHw	W. von Soden, <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> . Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1958–1981.
Alc.	Alcaeus
Anac.	Anacreon
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AP	<i>Anthologia Palatina</i>
Euphorion, <i>ap Ath.</i>	Euphorion, <i>ap Athenaeus</i> “ <i>Deipnosophistae</i> ”
Ar., <i>Thesm.</i>	Aristophanes, <i>Thesmophoriazusa</i> e
Archil.	Archilochus
Arnobius, <i>Adv. nat.</i>	Arnobius, <i>Adversus nationes</i>
Ath.	Athenaeus
ca.	circa
CAD	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . Chicago, The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1956–
CAH	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i>
CANE	<i>Civilizations of the Ancient Near East</i> . New York, Scribner’s Sons, 1995
CDA	J. Black, A. George, and N. Postgate, <i>A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian</i> . 2nd corrected printing. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2000.
CHD	<i>The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . Chicago, The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1980–
Clement of Alexandria, <i>Protrep.</i>	Clement of Alexandria, <i>Protrepticus</i>
CLL	H. C. Melchert, <i>Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon</i> . Chapel Hill, N.C., self-published, 1993.
CLuw.	Cuneiform Luwian
CNR	Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche
CTH	E. Laroche, <i>Catalogue des textes hittites</i> . Paris, Klincksieck, 1971.
CTH suppl.	E. Laroche, Premier supplement, <i>RHA</i> 30 (1972), 94–133.
Diog. Laert.	Diogenes Laertius
DLL	E. Laroche, <i>Dictionnaire de la langue louvite</i> . Paris, Maisonneuve, 1959.
DLU	G. del Olmo Lete and J. Sanmartín, <i>Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica</i> . Aula Orientalis Suppl. 7–8. Barcelona, AUSA, 1996.
FGrH	F. Jacoby, ed. <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , Berlin, Weidmann, and Leiden, Brill, 1923–.
Firmicus Maternus, <i>De. err. prof. rel.</i>	Firmicus Maternus, <i>De errore profanarum religionum</i>
fl.	floruit
fr.	fragment
Gr.	Greek
HED	J. Puhvel, <i>Hittite Etymological Dictionary</i> . Berlin, Mouton, 1984–
HEG	J. Tischler, <i>Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar</i> . Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1977–
Hitt.	Hittite
HLuw.	Hieroglyphic Luwian
Homer, <i>Il.</i>	Homer, <i>Iliad</i>
Homer, <i>Od.</i>	Homer, <i>Odyssey</i>
[Hom.], <i>Marg. P.Oxy.</i>	Pseudo-Homer, <i>Margites</i> , <i>Oxyrhynchus Papyrus</i>

HW	J. Friedrich, <i>Hethitisches Wörterbuch</i> . Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1952.
HW ²	J. Friedrich and A. Kammenhuber, <i>Hethitisches Wörterbuch</i> . 2. Auflage. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1975–
Iamblichus, <i>De Myst.</i>	Iamblichus, <i>De mysteriis</i>
IBoT	<i>Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde bulunan Bogazköy Tabletleri</i> . Istanbul 1944, 1947, 1954, Ankara 1988.
IBS	Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft
IEG	M. L. West, <i>Iambi et elegi graeci</i> . 2 vols. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991–1992.
<i>Il. Comm. ad. Π</i>	R. Janko, <i>The Iliad: A Commentary</i> , vol. IV: Books 13–16. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
KBo	<i>Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi</i> . Berlin, Gebr. Mann, 1916–.
KUB	<i>Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi</i> . 60 volumes. Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1921–1990
KN	Knossos tablet
Lith.	Lithuanian
Luw.	Luwian
Lyc.	Lycian
Lyd.	Lydian
MesZL	R. Borger, <i>Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon</i> . Münster, Ugarit-Verlag, 2003.
MHG	Middle High German
MSL XIII	B. Landsberger et al., <i>Materialien zum sumerischen Lexikon</i> , vol. 13. Rome, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1971.
MY	Mycenae tablet
Myc.	Mycenaean
Myl.	Mylesian
Nic. Dam.	Nicolaus Damascenus
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
Or.	<i>Oratio</i>
Pal.	Palaic
PIHANS	Publication de l'Institut Historique et Archéologique Néerlandais de Stamboul
[Plutarch], <i>De mus.</i>	Pseudo-Plutarch, <i>De musica</i>
Plutarch, <i>Mor.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Moralia</i>
PMG	D. Page, <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> , Oxford, Clarendon, 1962.
PN	personal name
PRU 4	C. F.-A. Schaeffer, <i>Le palais royal d'Ugarit IV</i> . Paris, Imprimerie Nationale & Klincksieck, 1956.
PY	Pylos tablet
r.	ruled
RHA	<i>Revue hittite et asianique</i>
StBoT	Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten
Strabo, <i>Geog.</i>	Strabo, <i>Geography</i>
s.v.	sub voce
Theoc.	Theocritus
trans.	translated by
TrGF	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> . Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971–.
Ugar.	Ugaritic
<i>Ugaritica V</i>	J. Nougayrol et al., <i>Ugaritica V</i> . Paris, Geuthner, 1968.
UT-PASP	University of Texas at Austin Program in Aegean Scripts and Prehistory
vel sim.	<i>vel similia</i> “similar word”
Verg.	Virgil
WAW	Writings from the Ancient World



Anatolia and the Aegean in the Late Bronze Age.



Anatolia and the Aegean in the Iron Age

SETTING UP THE GODDESS OF THE NIGHT SEPARATELY

Jared L. Miller

Local hypostases of supra-regional deities are well known to any student of the ancient Near East; so well known, in fact, that this rather remarkable phenomenon is seldom the topic of further inquiry. It is not often asked, for example, perhaps because the answers seem self-evident, how there could be an Ishtar of Nineveh and an Ishtar of Hattusa? Were these two hypostases essentially the same deity, worshipped at two different places, or two distinct personalities? How did the two forms come into being? If a single entity, how did the deity reside in two distinct temples? And perhaps most importantly: How did the worshippers perceive their deities and the processes by which they became differentiated?

Fortunately for the researcher interested in the answers to such questions, there exists a passage that is, to the best of my knowledge, unique in ancient Near Eastern literature, an incantation that provides much insight into a process of differentiation that presumably would have happened repeatedly in polytheistic cultures such as those of the ancient Near East, Anatolia and Greece. The passage occurs in a composition commonly known, after Heinz Kronasser's 1963 edition, as *Die Umsiedelung der schwarzen Gottheit*, but more appropriately described as the Expansion or "Adlocation" of the Goddess of the Night.¹ This remarkable composition is, to paraphrase its incipit, intended for when a man takes it upon himself to build a second temple for the Goddess of the Night (DINGIR GE₆) and for setting up the Goddess of the Night herself separately.

The rites consist mainly of preparing all the paraphernalia needed for the new temple, which are exhaustively listed, then evoking the "old" deity, as she is called, into the "old" temple so that she can be worshipped and sacrificed to in a manner to which she is accustomed. Once the deity is comfortable and content, then comes the crucial incantation (§22):

Honored deity! Preserve your being, but divide your divinity! Come to that new temple, too, and take yourself the honored place! And when you make your way, then take yourself only that place!

This "new deity" is then afforded in her new temple all the customary rites that the old deity received in her original temple.

This splitting of the deity and her relocation seems not to have been without some risk in the mind of the person(s) composing the incantation. The deity is explicitly asked to preserve her being while dividing her divinity, and she is admonished to come specifically to the place intended, that is, to the new temple built for her, perhaps to ward off the possibility that she might wander off to some other location, in the worst case, to some enemy land, a constant fear among the Hittites. This incantation seems to imply that the deity was conceived of as a single entity, a distinct personality, which, however, could divide herself into two parts that would each retain the qualities of the original singularity.²

Since Beal has recently devoted an article to splitting deities (2002), I will concentrate rather on the development and wanderings of the Goddess of the Night, as an attempt to trace her steps may help us

better understand the processes of syncretization and differentiation seen in the polytheistic religions of the ancient Near East and beyond.

In the modern secondary literature, the Goddess of the Night is normally associated, even identified, with Ishtar,³ who of course is at least typologically related to Aphrodite.⁴ More specifically, it is generally accepted that the Goddess of the Night is Ishtar's Venus aspect, even if, as we shall see, the evidence for this equation is less than robust and not without its difficulties. As Beckman wrote in his study of Ishtar of Nineveh, "any special features of the (Ishtar) varieties will become apparent only if each is initially studied in isolation" (1998, 4–5), an approach that clearly bore fruit for Beckman. In keeping with this principle, this paper will attempt to arrive at a more differentiated picture of the Goddess of the Night.

In the Expansion of the Goddess of the Night composition just mentioned (henceforth Expansion), it cannot be ascertained where the original temple and deity was located or where the new home of the new deity was established, and the event can only be dated roughly to perhaps the late-Middle or early-New Hittite period at the latest, that is, some time in the first part of the fourteenth century.

In another text, however, the Great King Mursili II (last third of the fourteenth century) makes reference to a time when his forefather, Tudhaliya I (I/II),⁵ split the Goddess of the Night from her temple in Kizzuwatna, that is, approximately classical Cilicia, and worshipped her separately in Samuha,⁶ to be sought on the upper Kızılırmak, perhaps near Sivas. Tudhaliya I (I/II) thereby established a temple for this Kizzuwatnean deity in Hittite territory, and the rites that must have been carried out on this occasion presumably would have had much in common with those detailed in the Expansion. This event during the reign of Tudhaliya I (I/II) – which must be kept distinct from the events of the strictly local Expansion⁷ – is thus dated to that period of time that sees the start of a deluge of Hurrian and Syrian influence in practically all aspects of religion and culture in Hattusa, and the "adlocation" of the cult from Kizzuwatna to Samuha can be seen as part of this process, which in turn was presumably due to the subjugation and subsequent annexation of Kizzuwatna to Hatti under Tudhaliya I (I/II) and Arnuwanda I toward the end of the Middle Hittite period. It is this Goddess of the Night brought from Kizzuwatna to Samuha who is generally assumed to be identical with Ishtar of Samuha, a deity who plays an important role in later Hittite history, and to whom we shall return in a moment.

This Kizzuwatnean deity, as far as can be judged by the available documentation, which, it should be noted, originates exclusively from Hattusa, seems to have been an autochthonous Kizzuwatnean entity, with no Mesopotamian precursors. No "Deity of the Night" (DINGIR GE₆) is known from Mesopotamia or Syria. There one finds only a general description "gods of the night" (*ilū/ilānī mušīti*) used as a poetic epithet for the stars and/or planets and the various gods associated with them.⁸ This is practically all that one can say about the Goddess of the Night as she existed in Kizzuwatna before her importation into Hatti. Much of what will be said in the remainder of this chapter *may* also have applied to the deity in Kizzuwatna, but is known only concerning the deity as witnessed in Hatti.

As mentioned, the Goddess of the Night is generally identified with Ishtar or considered to be her Venus aspect. The earliest, and among the best, evidence for the association of the Goddess of the Night with Ishtar is a passage from a Middle Hittite oracle investigation, in which two local hypostases of the Goddess of the Night are the subject of inquiry immediately following an inquiry concerning one Ishtar hypostasis and immediately preceding an inquiry concerning four more Ishtars, and finally, an inquiry aimed at ascertaining if any Ishtar at all is angry.⁹

A further support for the association is the fact that the Goddess of the Night and a deity named Pirinkir are worshipped as a dyad of sorts in the Expansion, while the names Ishtar and Pirinkir are used seemingly interchangeably in a set of rituals in which the incantations are set down in *babili*, that is, in the language of Babylon, Akkadian.¹⁰ This fits nicely with an incantation found in the Expansion in which the Goddess of the Night, apparently along with Pirinkir, is evoked (§25) "from Akkade, from Babylon, from Susa, from Elam (and) from the Ḫur.sağ.kalam.ma in the city that you^(fem. sg.) love." Akkade, Babylon and the temple

precinct Hur.sağ.kalam.ma in Kish are of course well-known cult centers of Ishtar, while Susa in Elam was the original place of worship during the second half of the third millennium of Pinenkir, the progenitor of the Anatolian Pirinkir.¹¹

Also supporting the association between the Goddess of the Night and Ishtar is the hermaphroditic character of both. This trait for the Goddess of the Night is best seen, again, in the Expansion, in which she is provided with sets of clothing and utensils of both genders (§8), and in which she is addressed as essentially female.¹² The hermaphroditic character of Ishtar need not be further detailed.¹³

Hence, if one considers only the evidence mentioned thus far, one could confidently assert that the Goddess of the Night in Kizzuwatna and Hatti is to be identified with Ishtar, and to what aspect of Ishtar could the epithet “Deity of the Night” refer if not the Venus star? However, this ignores some evidence that might cause one to temper, though not necessarily reject, these conclusions.

First, it is actually quite uncertain that the epithet “Deity of the Night” refers to the Venus star, an assumption based solely on the association of the Goddess of the Night with Ishtar,¹⁴ who indeed is known in Mesopotamia to be seen in the Venus star.¹⁵ The Venus aspect is actually nowhere attested for Ishtar, the Goddess of the Night or Pirinkir in Anatolia, except in the list of oath deities in the Suppiluliuma-Shattiwaza Treaty. Here, however, a closer look suggests that the usage ^dIštar MUL Dil-bat, “Ishtar, the Venus star,” may be rather Mittannian than Hittite.¹⁶ Further, the Sumerogram DINGIR GE₆, when found in Anatolian personal names, represents not a star, but the moon, and alternates with ^d30, generally indicating in Anatolian context the Luwian name of the moon-god, Arma.¹⁷ This evidence should not be neglected when considering the nature of the Goddess of the Night, as odd as it may seem for a deity apparently associated with Ishtar.

Second, the Goddess of the Night shows one feature that Ishtar, at least as she is known in Mesopotamia, never elicits, namely an infernal aspect.¹⁸ This is seen from the fact that she is evoked up out of the netherworld through an offering pit dug in the earth, a rite typical of, though not restricted to, the heterogeneous religious culture of Kizzuwatna. Interestingly, Ishtar is also attested in one text passage of Kizzuwatnean ilk as being evoked up from the underworld in similar fashion,¹⁹ and hence, while this feature does not exclude an association or identity of the Goddess of the Night and Ishtar, she would certainly be a deity who possesses some unique characteristics in comparison with Ishtar known from Mesopotamia.

Further insight into the nature and development of the Goddess of the Night and her relationship to Ishtar is gained by a diachronic analysis of the texts concerning her and Ishtar of Samuha.²⁰ It will be remembered that the Goddess of the Night divided in Kizzuwatna and “adplanted” in Samuha by Tudhaliya I (I/II) is often taken by modern researchers as the progenitor of, or identical with, Ishtar of Samuha.

The first result yielded by a diachronic analysis is that the Goddess of the Night is well attested in the mid to late Middle Hittite period, with an active cult relating to her, while Ishtar of Samuha is absent from the textual sources.²¹ At the same time there is evidence, in the form of the Middle Hittite oracle investigation mentioned above, that the Goddess of the Night of Samuha was grouped with the Ishtar deities even during this early period. Still, she seems to have maintained a separate identity, never being confused with, or subsumed by, Ishtar, and in the oracular investigation she is referred to by her epithet “Deity of the Night” even while listed among the other Ishtars. The scribe could, after all, simply have written “Ishtar of Samuha” if there were no difference between the two deities.

Moreover, there is already at this point in the latter part of the Middle Hittite period an Ishtar to be found in Samuha, but this is Ishtar of Taminga,²² who was worshipped in Samuha, perhaps because there was no hypostasis there who was considered a real Ishtar deity. Was it this deity, rather than the Goddess of the Night, who eventually became Ishtar of Samuha? When exactly in the latter part of the Middle Hittite period Ishtar of Taminga was brought to Samuha is impossible to ascertain, but if she were already there during the reign of Tudhaliya I (I/II), why would he have brought the Goddess of the Night to Samuha from Kizzuwatna if she were simply another Ishtar or some aspect thereof? Conversely, if the Goddess of the

Night was the first to have been imported to Samuha, why would Ishtar of Taminga have then been brought to Samuha if there were already an Ishtar resident there? This seems to suggest that there was sufficient distinction during this period between Ishtar and the Goddess of the Night to warrant both being worshipped separately in the same town.

The Middle Hittite period thus provides ample data, as well as unanswered questions, concerning the Goddess of the Night. In the New Hittite period, in contrast, there is little evidence for further worship of the Goddess of the Night. Most of the activity concerned with her consists of copying and cataloguing the Middle Hittite texts already extant. Ishtar of the Field and Ishtar of Samuha, in contrast, experience a flurry of cult activity during the reigns of Mursili II and his son Hattusili III, respectively, who venerated these Ishtar hypostases as their patron deities. Hattusili III even further “split” Ishtar of Samuha in order to found an additional cult for her in the town of Urikina.²³ The copying and cataloguing activity relating to the Goddess of the Night during the reigns of Mursili II and Hattusili III seems to be connected to the rise in prominence of Ishtar of the Field and Ishtar of Samuha and may have been part of some kind of “background research” into the nature and history of these Ishtar hypostases.

This activity even included a reform of the cult of the Goddess of the Night in Samuha by Mursili II, who felt that the worship of the deity had become corrupted since the days of his forefather, Tudhaliya I (I/II). In the incipit of Mursili’s Reform we read:²⁴

When my forefather, Tudhaliya, Great King, split the Goddess of the Night from the temple of the Goddess of the Night in Kizzuwatna and worshipped her separately in a temple in Samuha, those rituals and obligations which he determined in the temple of the Goddess of the Night – it came about, however, that the wooden tablet scribes and the temple personnel began incessantly to alter them – I, Mursili, Great King, have re-edited them from the tablets.

This text thus gives the impression that the cult of the Goddess of the Night received new impetus at this point during the reign of Mursili II, if, that is, she is not simply to be equated by this time with his Ishtar of the Field. If indeed Mursili’s Reform indicates a reinvigorated cult, it may have been a last gasp of sorts for the active and separate cult of the Goddess of the Night, for in the great offering lists for Ishtar of Samuha dating to the time of Hattusili III,²⁵ the Goddess of the Night is not even mentioned, though the entire entourage of Ishtar is listed, including Pirinkir, along with many deities who can hardly be said to have belonged to Ishtar’s inner circle. It is difficult to imagine that the Goddess of the Night, who had formerly enjoyed such prominence, would not even have been mentioned if indeed she maintained a separate identity and cult. Hence, the “revival” of interest in the Goddess of the Night during this period might be largely a scribal phenomenon related to the interest in the Ishtar deities of Mursili and Hattusili rather than a genuine revival of an active cult.

It is also during this period, and up to the end of the Empire – and only during this late period – that the signs DINGIR GE₆ are used in personal names to represent the Luwian Moon-god, Arma.²⁶ How this is to be explained remains a mystery. No known Ishtar hypostasis, to the best of my knowledge, has a real lunar aspect. Neither would it otherwise be conceivable for a sign/signs representing Ishtar to be used in personal names to signify the Moon-god, especially since Ishtar is essentially female, the Moon-god male. Yet the epithet “Deity of the Night” would clearly be a more apt description of the moon than any other nocturnal body, and this should be remembered when considering whether or not the Goddess of the Night might be the Venus aspect of Ishtar. Are we to assume that the Goddess of the Night really was a lunar deity, despite her obvious affiliation with Ishtar, but that this aspect remained undetectable throughout the Middle Hittite and early New Hittite periods, only to surface in personal names so late in Hittite history? This seems somehow unlikely. Did the Goddess of the Night at this late stage of her evolution begin to develop a lunar aspect? This seems no more probable than the first suggestion. Does, then, the alternation signify no more than a playful graphic innovation, by which the scribes sought to represent in a descriptive manner the moon-god, the dominant deity of the night sky, without intending to transfer with the graphic representation the person

and nature of the Goddess of the Night? Were the New Hittite scribes who employed the grapheme DINGIR GE₆ to represent the moon-god Arma completely unaware of the existence of a Goddess of the Night associated with Ishtar? If so, perhaps no further theological implications need be derived from the phenomenon. Unfortunately, this explanation is no more convincing than the others, especially since at least one scribe responsible for the writing of the personal names was a scribe of Puduhepa, queen of Hattusili, and hence, presumably would have been aware of the nature and history of the Goddess of the Night.

In conclusion, the dividing and “adplanting” of the Goddess of the Night from one cultural sphere to another represent just one stage in the development and evolution of this deity, much of which should perhaps be left open for debate rather than glossed over by a hasty identification with Ishtar or an aspect thereof.

NOTES

- 1 See the most recent edition in Miller (2004, 272–312) as well as the translation by Collins (1997).
- 2 This may be contrasted with the oft-quoted passage in which Puduhepa, in her prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna, seems to imply that the “Sun-goddess of Arinna” and “Hebat” are simply two names for the same deity (*KUB* 21.27 i 4–6; see Singer 2002, 102): “In Hatti you have given yourself the name Sun-goddess of Arinna; but the land which you made, that of the cedar, there you gave yourself the name Hebat.”
- 3 E.g., Lebrun (1976, 16); Wegner (1981, 163–65); Haas (1994, 352–53); similarly, Beckman (1999, 30).
- 4 The most thorough study to of Ishtar as known from Anatolia is that of Wegner (1981).
- 5 For argumentation in favor of Tudhaliya I (I/II) being the one referred to in Mursili’s Reform, see Miller (2004, 350–56).
- 6 For this text, which could be dubbed “Mursili’s Reform of the Cult of the Goddess of the Night” (henceforth “Mursili’s Reform”), see Miller (2004, 312–19).
- 7 For the argumentation concerning this point, see Miller (2004, 357–62).
- 8 For an alternative opinion, see Mouton (2004, 88).
- 9 *KBo* 16.97+*KBo* 40.48 rev. 12–32. The deities in the order of their appearance are: *IŠTAR* of Nineveh; the Goddess of the Night of Samuha; the Goddess of the Night of Lahhurama; *IŠTAR* of Nineveh; *IŠTAR* of Hattarina; *IŠTAR* of his mother; *IŠTAR* of his father; any other *IŠTAR*. (The pronoun of “his mother/father” in the second and third to last inquiries presumably refers to the king who instigated the oracle inquiry.) See edition and involved discussion of terminology in Schul (1994, 73–124, 247–304) and evaluation of its historical contents and setting by de Martino (1992) and Klinger (1998, 108–111); see also Miller (2004, 355, 365, 379–80).
- 10 No edition of the *babili* texts has yet been published, a desideratum that Beckman (2002, 35), in his discussion of the texts, has announced he plans to fulfill.
- 11 See Beckman (1999); Kühne (1993, 245–46).
- 12 See discussion in Wegner (1981, 163–64).
- 13 See, e.g., the various contributions in *NIN: Journal of Gender Studies in Antiquity* 1 (2000); Groneberg (1986); Wegner (1981, 46–55).
- 14 It should be noted here that the inclusion of a *wannupattalla/i*-“star” symbol among the accoutrements of the Deity of the Night in the Expansion text (§§2, 17) cannot necessarily be used as support for the equation since the exact meaning of the word *wannupattalla/i* is yet to be determined. See discussion in Riemschneider (2004, 279); cf. Kronasser (1969, 313), Kümmel (1967, 370). It should in any case be noted that *mul.á.gú.zi.ga* in RS 25.421, 13’ (*Ug. V*, No. 169) is fully restored, and therefore cannot lend any credence to the equation, as implied in *HW* 3. Erg., s.v., and followed elsewhere.
- 15 Pirinkir is also associated with the Venus star at Emar; see Beckman (1999, 27–28).
- 16 See *KBo* 1.1 rev. 45’, 57’, *KBo* 1.2 rev. 22’–23’, 33’, *KBo* 1.3(+)*KUB* 3.17 rev. 42’; for the distribution of the attestations and further discussion, see Miller (2004, 391 n. 622).
- 17 See Miller (2004, 370–73).
- 18 The possibility exists that this feature might have accrued to Ishtar already in northern Syria, judging from the entry “*a-na* ^dINANNA *ša a-bi* ...” in the *zuku*-festival text from Emar (see Emar VI/3, No. 373, 92’; Fleming 2000, 186–87 and n. 200, with references), but the meaning of *abi* in this context is disputed. I wish to thank Yori Cohen, Tel Aviv, for directing my attention to this attestation and to his discussion of it (2003, 271).

- 19 KUB 15.35+KBo 2.9 i 21–55; see Miller (2004, 374–76).
 20 See Miller (2004, 378–90).
 21 For a discussion of the one possible exception, KUB 32.130, see Miller (2004, 385–87), where it is maintained that this text should likely be dated to the early New Hittite period.
 22 See ChS I/3-1, No. 12 and discussion in Miller (2004, 384, n. 600).
 23 KUB 21.17 ii 5–8; see Miller (2004, 360, n. 514).
 24 KUB 32.133 i 1-7; see Miller (2004, 312).
 25 E.g., KUB 27.1 (ChS I/3-1, Nr. 1); see also KUB 6.45++ i 43–45 (see Singer 1996, 10, 33, 54).
 26 See Miller (2004, 370–73).

REFERENCES

- Beal, R. H. (2002) Dividing a God. In P. Mirecki and M. Meyer (eds.) *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World* 141. Leiden, Brill.
- Beckman, G. M. (1998) Ishtar of Nineveh Reconsidered. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 50, 1–10.
 — (1999) The Goddess Pirinkir and Her Ritual from Ḫattuša (CTH 644). *Ktêma* 24, 25–39.
 — (2002) *Babyloniaca Hethitica: The “babilili-Ritual” from Boğazköy (CTH 718)*. In K. A. Yener and H. A. Hoffner, Jr. (eds.) *Recent Developments in Hittite Archaeology and History. Papers in Memory of Hans G. Güterbock*, 35–41. Winona Lake, IN, Eisenbrauns.
- Cohen, Y. (2003) Review of D. E. Fleming, *Time at Emar. Orientalia NS* 72, 267–74.
- Collins, B. J. (1997) Rituals. In W. W. Hallo (ed.) *The Context of Scripture. Vol. I. Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, 160–77. Leiden, Brill.
- de Martino, S. (1992) Personaggi e riferimenti storici nel testo oracolare ittito KBo XVI 97. *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 29, 33–46.
- Fleming, D. E. (2000) *Time at Emar: The Cultic Calendar and the Rituals from the Diviner’s Archive*. Mesopotamian Civilizations 11. Winona Lake, IN, Eisenbrauns.
- Groneberg, B. (1986) Die sumerisch-akkadische Inanna/Ishtar: Hermaphroditos? *Die Welt des Orients* 17, 25–46.
- Haas, V. (1994) *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. Handbuch der Orientalistik I/15. Leiden, Brill.
- Klinger, J. (1998) Zur Historizität einiger hethitischer Omina. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 25, 104–11.
- Kronasser, H. (1963) *Die Umsiedelung der schwarzen Gottheit. Das hethitische Ritual KUB XXIX 4 (des Ulippi)*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophische-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 241. Band, 3. Abhandlung. Wien, Hermann Böhlau.
- (1969) Review of J. Friedrich, HW, 3. Erg. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlands* 62, 311–14.
- Kühne, C. (1993) Zum Vor-Opfer im alten Anatolien. In B. Janowski, K. Koch and G. Wilhelm (eds.) *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament. Internationales Symposium Hamburg 17.-21. März 1990*, 225–85. *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 129. Freiburg/Göttingen, Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kümmel, H. M. (1967) Review of J. Friedrich, HW, 3. Erg. *Orientalia NS* 36, 365–72.
- Lebrun, R. (1976) *Samuha. Foyer religieux de l’empire Hittite*. Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain 11. Louvain-la-Neuve, Institut Orientaliste de l’Université Catholique de Louvain.
- Miller, J. L. (2004) *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*, StBoT 46. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Mouton, A. (2004) Le rituel hittite de Walkui (KBo 32.176): quelques réflexions sur la déesse de la nuit et l’image du porc dans le monde hittite. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 94, 85–105.
- Riemschneider, K. K. (2004) *Die akkadischen und hethitischen Omentexte aus Boğazköy*, Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 12. Dresden, Verlag der Technischen Universität Dresden.
- Schuol, M. (1994) Die Terminologie des hethitischen ŠU-Orakels. Eine Untersuchung auf der Grundlage des mittelhethitischen Textes KBo XVI 97 unter vergleichender Berücksichtigung akkadischer Orakeltexte und Lebermodelle. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 21, 73–124, 247–304.
- Singer, I. (1996) *Muwatalli’s Prayer to the Assembly of Gods through the Storm-God of Lightning (CTH 381)*. Atlanta, Scholars Press.
 — (2002) *Hittite Prayers*, WAW 11. Atlanta, GA, Society of Biblical Literature.
- Wegner, I. (1981) *Gestalt und Kult der Ishtar-Šawuška in Kleinasien*, AOAT 36. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener/Butzon and Bercker.