Asia Anteriore Antica
Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Cultures

Firenze University Press
www.fupress.com/asiana

Citation: Napoletano, I. (2024). A new edition of the Hittite hymn to Adad (KBo 3.21 – *CTH* 313). *Asia Anteriore Antica. Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Cultures* 6: 21-41. doi: 10.36253/asiana-2827

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Competing Interests: The Author(s) declare(s) no conflict of interest.

A new edition of the Hittite hymn to Adad (KBo 3.21 – *CTH* 313)[1]

Immacolata Napoletano

Università degli Studi di Napoli L'Orientale, Italy
imma.napoletano12@gmail.com

Abstract. In the ancient Near East, hymns have preserved their stylistic and formal integrity across epochs, serving as exemplary models for translation and literary adaptation in different languages and cultures. They provide critical insights into linguistic and religious ideologies, and shed light on the phenomenon of religious syncretism in the ancient Near East. Originating in Mesopotamia during the 3rd millennium BCE, hymns were transmitted to Hittite Anatolia around 1450 BCE, likely through Hurrian mediation. Their subsequent prominence within the Hittite court can be attributed to the convergence of religious concepts, which highlights the intercultural exchanges that shaped the region's religious landscape. The Hittite hymns dedicated to the Storm god, *CTH* 314 and *CTH* 313, exemplify the adaptation of Mesopotamian religious texts to Hittite ideological and ritual needs. *CTH* 313, dedicated to the god Adad, presents more interpretative challenges than *CTH* 314 but offers intriguing points for reflection, which are investigated here. The paper presents a new critical edition of *CTH 313,* exactly 41 years after Alfonso Archi's edition. The aim is to further enhance our understanding of the reception and development of the hymnic genre in Late Bronze Age Anatolia, by integrating the new data with the most recent historical, linguistic and palaeographic discoveries.

Keywords: storm god, religious poetry, hymn, Adad, Hittite, KBo 3.21, *CTH* 313.

[1] The present article benefited from the comments and suggestions of Dr Michele Cammarosano, to whom goes my sincere gratitude. I am also indebted to Prof. Gian Pietro Basello and to Dr Ilya Yakubovich, for their significant insights into the historical-religious and linguistic aspects debated in this paper. Moreover, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to the anonymous reviewer whose recommendations have played a crucial role in improving the quality of this manuscript.

1. INTRODUCTION[2]

KBo 3.21 (*CTH* 313) is a Hittite hymn dedicated to the god Adad, preserved on a cuneiform tablet found in Ḫattuša (modern Boğazkale) and currently kept in the Istanbul Archaeological Museums.

The composition has the characteristics of an *eršaḫunga* prayer (Maul 1988: 1-72; Lenzi 2011: 43-46), whose purpose is to 'appease the heart' of the wrathful god. This type of hymn was recited by the cult cantor, and often, in Hittite literature, it served as an introduction to longer, more articulate prayers (Singer 2002; Daues, Rieken 2018; Schwemer 2022: 394). The mixture of hymn and prayer is typical for the Hittite religious literature and prompted the elaboration of emic types: the *mugawar* prayer, which was meant to act directly upon the god, to appease his wrath; the *malteššar* prayer, with which the king asked for prosperity for himself, his family and his country; and the *arkuwar* prayer, a kind of supplication that sought to defend a man afflicted by the wrath of a god, the most representative example of which is contained in the set of prayers of Muršili II (Singer 2002: 47-49; Daues, Rieken 2018: 63-74, 218-246, 369-398; Rieken 2019: 150, 154, 157-161). Such supplications were recited in specific circumstances, and the petitioner believed they had illocutionary effects. This is a clear indication of how hymns and prayers had impact on practical religion among the Hittites.

From a formal point of view, the Sumero-Akkadian hymn is composed according to a canonical order, established in Mesopotamia by experts in religious poetry. The earliest accessible phase of Mesopotamian hymnic religious poetry is the Old Babylonian one, whose works were based on earlier Sumerian models, but at the same time presented original innovations. Later, in the second half of the 2nd millennium BC, the hymn became one of the most translated and re-adapted genres by the Hittites, proving that it enjoyed a certain popularity even outside Mesopotamia itself.

Praising the deity appropriately was a fundamental requirement when appealing to it, as the correct execution of all the ritual steps avoided arousing its wrath and incurring disastrous consequences. For this reason, the very content of the textual material had to be flawless.

According to Metcalf's (2015b: 9) reconstruction, the hymnic canonical compositional scheme is as follows:

1. *Invocatio*: this is the opening part of the hymn, in which the deity (to whom the text is dedicated) is introduced.
2. *Laudes*: in the central section, the praises of the god are amplified using stereotyped and repetitive formulas.
3. *Preces*: the chant ends with a short supplication (e.g., for the health of the one for whom the hymn was composed) and/or a brief greeting.
4. *Elatio*: this is a variable component; when it is present, the praised deity (a minor god, such as Nergal, or even prominent gods, such as Marduk) is 'elevated' in rank by a superior deity (An and/or Enlil). In other cases, it may merely list further epithets of the god (as in KBo 3.21).

The 'Hittite hymns' were Hittite translations and (re-)compositions of Sumero-Akkadian texts, which followed the canonical scheme and were mostly used as prologues to prayers (Archi 1983: 21-22; Wilhelm 1994: 74; Haas 2006: 245; Rieken 2019). There is a consensus among scholars that the earliest Hittite 'versions' of Mesopotamian hymns were composed during the Middle Hittite period (15th century BC), in connection with a major influx of Mesopotamian literature and through Hurrian mediation.[3]

The translated hymns are mostly dedicated to Babylonian gods who also held counterparts in the Hittite cult, such as the Sun god (and goddess) and the Storm god. This implies that the reception of Sumero-Akkadian models was 'not merely an exercise in philology, but also reflected the Hittites' particular interest in certain aspects of

---

[2] Abbreviations follow the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* (<https://rla.badw.de/reallexikon/abkuerzungslisten.html>, accessed on 31 May 2024). All dates are BC. The customary subdivision into Old Kingdom (Ḫattušili I to Telipinu, ca. 17th-16th century BC), Early New Kingdom (post-Telipinu up to Tudḫaliya III, ca. 15th century BC) and Empire Period (Šuppiluliuma I to Šuppiluliuma II, ca. 14th-13th century BC) is used when referring to Hittite historical phases.

[3] See West 1997: 101-106; Schwemer 1998: 50-52; Metcalf 2015b: 81, 90. For general reviews of the spread of Hurrian traditions in Anatolia, see Wilhelm 1991; Klinger 2001; Giorgieri 2013; de Martino 2017.

Mesopotamian religion' (Metcalf 2015b: 83), which they believed were akin to their own religious ideology (Steitler 2017: 371-376). These aspects include the selection of specific deities for their translations and (re-)compositions, the poetic theme of elevating a beloved deity (known as *elatio*) and the rhetorical strategy employed to pacify an offended deity's heart during prayers. The very choice of the minor god Adad as the main deity in *CTH* 313 reflects this concept.

The opening section of KBo 3.21 is fragmentary, but the second column is well-preserved and opens with the *elatio* of the storm god Adad by the supreme god Enlil. The following section describes Adad in the role of an interpreter of *omina* (obv. ii 6-11) and a warrior fighting in the name of An and Enlil (obv. ii 12-19): both attributes are attested in the Mesopotamian tradition, especially in the northern Syrian area (Aleppo and Mari; Schwemer 2001: 221-226). The column ends with the beginning of the storm, which resumes in the third column. The prayer to 'calm the heart' of Adad is followed by the praise of the cities of Sippar, Babylon, and Pada (seats of the god's cult; rev. iii 14′-28′). After a fragmentary section, the text concludes with the colophon and the mention of a scribe 'competent in the Babylonian language' (rev. iv 12′).

This article presents a new edition of this remarkable composition, consisting of transliteration, bound transcription, translation, and a line-by-line commentary. In the last section, the genesis and cultural significance of the hymn are discussed.

2. CRITICAL EDITION

2.1. The manuscript

The hymn to Adad *CTH* 313 is known from a single two-columned cuneiform tablet, KBo 3.21, which is missing the lower part (maximum preserved thickness: 2.7 cm; length: 11.3 cm; width: 11.7 cm; measurements based on the photograph). Most of the preserved text is on columns obv. ii and rev. iii, where paragraphs are separated by remarkably slanted rulings that suggest little attention to layout accuracy; obv. i and rev. iv are extremely fragmentary.

The manuscript appears to be a scribal draft. The oblique course of the paragraph lines would confirm this hypothesis; moreover, there are an arguably erased and rewritten paragraph in rev. iii 10′-11′, and four lines written smaller in rev. iii 10′-13′. Emil Forrer, implicitly followed by Archi (1983: 29), thought that these lines had been left blank and then written later, but the erasure (Fig. 1) shows that the scribe had first inserted only one 'couplet' instead of two and had realized too late that he had to insert another couplet, whilst the space below was already

Fig. 1. Erasure traces, KBo 3.21 rev. col. III 11′ (© Vorderasiatisches Museum, Inv. Nr.: Bo 447 - *No* hethiter.net/: photoarch BoFN02029; BoFN02025a).

occupied by the following paragraphs. Whereupon he must have necessarily deleted and rewritten it in smaller characters.

The paleographic analysis of the diagnostic signs in KBo 3.21 suggests a MS (Middle Script) dating of the manuscript – this interpretation is supported by the *Konkordanz* of the *Hethitologie Portal Mainz* – which corresponds to the Middle Hittite (or pre-imperial) historical phase. The diagnostic sign forms for the Middle Script phase attested on the tablet are TAR (HZL #7/B, 6) and EN (HZL #40/A, 6); all others are attributable to the pre-imperial phase and range from OS (Old Script) to MS dating: IK (HZL #67/A,1), AK (HZL #81/A, 2), AZ (HZL #92/B, 13), UK (HZL #93/B), AL (HZL #183/A, 4), E (HZL #187/C, 4), UN (HZL #197/A, 2), KU (HZL #206/A, 3), DA (HZL #214/A, 8), ID (HZL #215/A, 5–6), URU (HZL #229/A, 2), DI (HZL #312/B, 4), KI (HZL #313/A, 4), AḪ (HZL #332/A, 1–3), LI (HZL #343/A).

MS dating is further supported by linguistic analysis, which reveals the presence of elements typical of Middle Hittite: *tuliya anda* (postposition *anda* with dative/locative; obv. ii 3-4), *naḫšaratti peran* (postposition *peran* with dative and not the genitive; obv. ii 21) and *kerti=tta* (the dative *=tta* in a possessive function is one of the innovations that characterize Middle Hittite, as in Old Hittite possessive pronouns would be used; rev. iii 9′-13′).

2.2. Transliteration

Obv. i

§ 1

3′ [...] ˹RI˺ [...]

4 [... *ne-pí-ši d*]*a-ga-*˹*an-zi*˺*-pí-ia*

5 [...]

§ 2

6 [...]x *iš-kal-li-iš-ke-ez-zi*

7 [... *-e*]*z*′*-zi*

§ 3

8 [...]*-an ku-iš ar-ta-ri*

9 [... x]*-ez-zi*

§ 4

10 [...]*-it-ḫa-u-wa-an-ni-it*

11 [... *-p*]*a*′*-an-ma*

12 [...]

§ 5

13 [... *-ut*′*-t*]*e*′*-na-aš*

14 [...]*-ša*

15 [...]

§ 6

16 [...]

17 [...]

§ 7

18 [...]

19 [...]*-ma*

(breaks off)

Obv. ii

§ 8

1 *nu* ^{D}EN.LIL-*tar-še-et tu-uk pa-iš* DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*na-ša wa-li-iš-ḫi-u-wa-ar*
2 ⌜*ma*²⌝-*ni-ia-aḫ-in-na tu-uk zi-in-ni-it*

§ 9

3 *na-aš-ta A-NA* DINGIR^{MEŠ} GAL^{TIM} *tu-li-ia an-*⌜*da*⌝ *tu-el-pát*
4 *gul-aš-*⌜*ša*⌝ *tar-ra-nu-ut na-aš-ta ut-ne-ia-aš iš-ta-an-za-na-aš*
5 *ap-pa-an-na ki-iš-ri-it-ti da-iš*

§ 10

6 *li-iš-ši-ia-la-at-ta-ma ne-pí-ša-aš da-ga-an-zi-*⌜*pa-aš*⌝*-ša*
7 *ut-ta-a-ar kat-ta-an ar-ḫa pé-e-tum-ma-an-zi*
8 ^{D}É.A-*aš-kán ḫu-wa-an-ḫu-iš-ni ku-it ḫa-at-ri-i-e-eš-ša*
9 *an-da ki-it-ta a-aš-šu* ^{UZU}IÀ *ḫu-wa-ap-pa-an-na* ^{UZU}IÀ
10 *ú-wa-an-na nu* KUR-*e-aš a-ru-u-wa-u-ar* DINGIR^{MEŠ} *tu-uk*
11 *i-wa-a-ar-wa-a-ir*

§ 11

12 ^{D}*A-nu-uš-ma-*⌜*at*⌝*-ta* ^{D}EN.LIL-*aš-ša šar-ga-wa-an-ni ḫa-an-da*
13 *A-NA* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$KÚR-*ŠU-NU ú-e-mi-ia-u-wa-an-zi tu-uk wa-a-tar-na-aḫ-ḫe-er*

§ 12

14 *na-aš-ta tar-ḫu-i-la-a-tar-te-et ḫa-tu-ga-a-tar-te-et*
15 DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*aš pa-ra-a kal-la-ra-an-ni ne-ia-an li-li-wa-an-za-ma-aš-ša-an*
16 *ik-za-te-eš* KUR-*e kat-ta ḫu-u-up-pa-an ḫar-zi*

§ 13

17 *ik-ta-aš-ma-ad-du-uš-ša-an er-ḫa-az Ú-*⌜*UL*⌝ *na-aḫ-ša-ri-ia-wa-an-za*
18 *ar-ḫa Ú-UL u-ez-zi Ú-UL pít-tu-li-an-ta-an-ma*
19 *an-da wa-ar-pí-iš-ke-ši*

§ 14

20 [x x -*u*]*m*²-*mi-it-ma-kán al-pa-ra-mi-it-ti-ta* KUR-*e ka-ri-ia-an*
21 [*na-aḫ-ša-ra*²]-*at-ti-ma pé-ra-an da-an-du-ki-iš ḫu-u-ma-an-za*
22 [⋯ -*n*]*a*²-*aš*? *ú-i-te-na-aš ta-ga-wa-aš*
23 [⋯ -*d*]*a*²-*an-za-mi-iš ar-pí-ia-at-ta-ri*

§ 15

24 [⋯ -*t*]*e*²-*et ḫa-tu-ga A-NA* DUMU.NAM.LÚ.U$_{19}$$^{LÙ.MEŠ}$
25 [⋯ -*i*]*t*²-*ta ḫe-e-u-un-ma ḫi-in-ga-na-aš*
26 [⋯ -*n*]*a*²-*aš*? *na-aš-ta da-an-du-ki-iš* DUMU-*aš*
27 [⋯ *la-aḫ-l*]*a*²-*aḫ-ḫi-iš-ke-et-ta-ri*

§ 16

28 [⋯ -*z*]*i*²-*nu-za* SAG.DU-*in*
29 [⋯] x x x -*zi*²-*da*²
30 [⋯]x

(breaks off)

Rev. iii

§ 17

1′ [⋯]x-⌜*ir*⌝
2′ [...]x

§ 18
3′ [⋯ -*t*]*ar*-*te-et-kán aš-nu-an šal-la-an-ni-ma-ad-du-uš-ša-*⌜*an*⌝
4′ [⋯] *nu-ut-ták-kán an-da* Ú-UL *ku-iš-ki*
5′ [⋯]-*zi*

§ 19
6′ [*ka-ru-i-l*]*i*-*e-eš* DINGIR^{MEŠ} *pít-tu-li-ia-u-wa-ar*
7′ [⋯]-*ia-an-du*

§ 20
8′ [DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*na-ša*] $^{⌜D⌝}$IŠKUR-*aš šar-ku-uš nu-ut-ta* ^{D}IŠKUR AN-*pát*
9′ [*mi-nu-mar da*]-*ra-an-du*

§ 21
10′ [*nu ke-er-ti-it-t*]*a mi-nu-wa-an-du li-iš-ši-ma-ad-du wa-ar-aš-nu-an-du*
11′ [*nu iš-ḫi-i*] *mi-nu-mar da-ra-an-du*

§ 22
12′ $^{⌜D⌝}$IŠKUR-*aš ke-er-ti-it-ta mi-nu-an-du li-iš-ši-ma-at-ta*
13′ *wa-ar-aš-nu-an-du nu iš-ḫi-i mi-nu-mar da-ra-an-du*

§ 23
14′ ^{URU}*Zi-ip-pí-ri-ma-az* ^{D}UTU-*wa-aš uk-tu-u-ri* URU-*ri*
15′ *du-un-na-ak-ke-eš-na-aš* É-*ri an-da-an e-eš-ḫu-ut*
16′ *nu-ut-ta ke-er-ti mi-nu-wa-an-du li-iš-ši-ma-at-ta*
17′ *wa-ar-aš-nu-wa-an-du nu iš-ḫi-i mi-nu-mar da-ra-an-du*

§ 24
18′ ^{URU}KÁ.DINGIR.RA-*ma-aš-ša-an ku-e-da-ni* URU-*ri* ^{D}*A-nu-uš*
19′ *la-a-ma-an da-iš* ^{D}EN.LÍL-*aš-ma-aš-ši-kán gul-aš-ta*
20′ *du-uš-ga-ra-u-an-da gul-aš-ša* ^{D}AMAR.UTU-*aš a-aš-ši-ia-an-ti*
21′ *nu-za-kán* É.NAM.ḪÉ *a-aš-ši-ia-an-ti* É-*ri an-da e-eš-ḫu-ut*
22′ *nu ke-er-ti mi-nu-wa-an-du li-iš-ši-ma-at-ta*
23′ *wa-ar-ša-nu-wa-an-du nu iš-ḫi-i mi-nu-mar da-ra-an-du*

§ 25
24′ *A-NA* ^{URU}*Pà-da-ma-az-kán a-aš-ši-ia-an-ti* URU-*ri*
25′ *an-da du-uš-ga-ra-an-na a-ša-a-tar e-eš-ḫu-ut*
26′ *nu ke-er-ti mi-nu-wa-an-du li-iš-ši-ma-*⌜*at*⌝-*ta*
27′ *wa-ar-aš-nu-wa-an-du nu iš-ḫi-i mi-nu-mar*
28′ ↖ *da-ra-an-du*

(*Randleiste*)

Rev. iv
§ 26
1′ [...]x
2′ [...]-*ta*
3′ [... -*u*]*t*-*mi*
4′ [...]

§ 27
5′ [...]-⌜*a*⌝-*an-ra*
6′ [...]-*a-u-ar*

7′ [… *-m*]*a*²
8′ […] *uk-tu-u-ri*
9′ […]

§ 28
10′ [… *-m*]*i*²*-ia-at-ta ú-ez-zi*
11′ [… *-i*]*š*² *dam-mi-li šu-up-pa-i pé-di*
12′ […] DUB.SAR *pa-pí-li-li*

(*Randleiste*)

2.3. Bound transcription

Obv. i
§ 1
3² […] RI […]
4 [… *nepiši da*]*ganzipi=ya*
5 […]

§ 2
6 […] *iškalliškezzi*
7 [… *-e*]*zzi*

§ 3
8 […]*-an kwiš artari*
9 […]*-ezzi*

§ 4
10 […]*-itḫawannit*
11 [… *-p*]*an=ma*
12 […]

§ 5
13 [… *-utt*]*enaš*
14 […]*-ša*
15 […]

§ 6
16 […]
17 […]

§ 7
18 […]
19 […]*-ma*

(breaks off)

Obv. ii
§ 8
1 *nu* ^{D}EN.LIL*-tar=šet tūk paiš* DINGIR^{MEŠ}*-naš=a wališḫiwar*
2 *maniyaḫḫinn=a tūk zinnit*

§ 9
3 *n=ašta ANA* DINGIR^{MEŠ} GAL^{TIM} *tuliya anda tuel=pat*

4 *gul(a)šša tarranut n=ašta utneyaš ištanzanaš*
5 *appanna kišri=tti dāiš*

§ 10
6 *liššiyala=tta=ma nepišaš daganzipašš=a*
7 *uttar kattan arḫa petummanzi*
8 ^{D}*ÉA-aš=kán ḫuwanḫwišni kwit ḫatriyešša*
9 *anda kitta āššu* ^{UZU}IÀ *ḫuwappann=a* ^{UZU}IÀ
10 *uwanna nu* KUR-*eaš aruwawar* DINGIR^{MEŠ} *tūk*
11 *iwarwaer*

§ 11
12 ^{D}*Anuš=ma=tta* ^{D}EN.LIL-*ašš=a šargawanni ḫanda*
13 *ANA* $^{LÚ.MEŠ}$KÚR-*ŠUNU wemiyawanzi tūk watarnaḫḫer*

§ 12
14 *n=ašta tarḫuilatar=tet ḫatugatar=tet*
15 DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*aš parā kallaranni neyan liliwanz(a)=ma=ššan*
16 *ikz(a)=teš* KUR-*e katta ḫuppan ḫarzi*

§ 13
17 *iktaš=ma=ddu=ššan erḫaz* UL *naḫšariyawanz(a)*
18 *arḫa* UL *uezzi* UL *pittuliyantan=ma*
19 *anda warpiškeši*

§ 14
20 [... *-u]mmit=ma=kan alparamittit=a* KUR-*e kariyan*
21 [*naḫšar]atti=ma peran dandukiš ḫūmanz(a)*
22 [... *-n]aš witenaš tagawaš*
23 [... *-d]anzamiš arpiyattari*

§ 15
24 [... *-t]et ḫatuga ANA* DUMU.NAM.LÚ.U$_{19}$$^{LU.MEŠ}$
25 [... *-i]tta ḫeun=ma ḫinganaš*
26 [... *-n]aš našta dandukiš* DUMU-*aš*
27 [... *laḫḫ]aḫḫiškettari*

§ 16
28 [... *-z]inu=z(a)* SAG.DU-*in*
29 [...]*-zida*
30 [...]

(breaks off)

Rev. iii
§ 17
1′ [...]*-er*
2′ [...]

§ 18
3′ [... *-t]artet=kan ašnuan šallanni=ma=ddu=ššan*
4′ [...] *nu=tta=kkan anda* UL *kwiški*
5′ [...]*-zi*

§ 19
6′ [*karuil*]*eš* DINGIR^{MEŠ} *pittuliyawar*
7′ [⋯]*-iandu*

§ 20
8′ [DINGIR^{MEŠ}*-naš=a*] ^{D}IŠKUR*-aš šarkuš nu=tta* ^{D}IŠKUR AN*=pat*
9′ [*minumar da*]*randu*

§ 21
10′ [*nu kerti*]*=tta minuwandu lišši=ma=ddu waršnuandu*
11′ [*nu išḫi*] *minumar darandu*

§ 22
12′ ^{D}IŠKUR*-aš kerti=tta minuandu lišši=ma=tta*
13′ *waršnuandu nu išḫi minumar darandu*

§ 23
14′ ^{URU}*Zippiri=ma=*(*a*)*z* ^{D}UTU*-wa-aš uktūri* URU*-ri*
15′ *dunnakkešnaš* É*-ri andan ešḫut*
16′ *nu=tta kerti minuwandu lišši=ma=tta*
17′ *waršnuandu nu išḫi minumar darandu*

§ 24
18′ ^{URU}KÁ.DINGIR.RA*=ma=šša*n *kwedani* URU*-ri* ^{D}*Anuš*
19′ *lāman dāiš* ^{D}EN.LÍL*-aš=ma=šši=kan gul*(*a*)*šta*
20′ *dušgarawanda gul*(*a*)*šša* ^{D}AMAR.UTU*-aš āššiyanti*
21′ *nu=z*(*a*)*=kan* É.NAM.ḪÉ *āššiyanti* É*-ri anda ēšḫut*
22′ *nu kerti minuwandu lišši=ma=tta*
23′ *waršnuandu nu išḫi minumar darandu*

§ 25
24′ *ANA* ^{URU}*Pada=ma=*(*a*)*z=kan āššiyanti* URU*-ri*
25′ *anda dušgaranna ašātar ēšḫut*
26′ *nu kerti minuwandu lišši=ma=tta*
27′ *waršnuandu nu išḫi minumar*
28′ ↖ *darandu*

Rev. iv
§ 26
1^{i}′ [...]
2′ [...]*-ta*
3′ [... *-u*]*tmi*
4′ [...]

§ 27
5′ [...]*-anra*
6′ [...]*-awar*
7′ [... *-m*]*a*
8′ [...] *uktūri*
9′ [...]

§ 28
10′ [... *-m*]*iatta wezzi*
11′ [... *-i*]*š dammili šuppai pedi*
12′ [...] DUB.SAR *papilili*

2.4. Translation

Obv. i

§ 1

[… in heaven] and earth

§ 2

[…] tears

§ 3

[…] who stands

§ 4

(*fragmentary*)

§ 5

(*fragmentary*)

§ 6

(*fragmentary*)

§ 7

(*fragmentary*)

(breaks off)

Obv. ii

§ 8

(Enlil) has given to thee, (Adad), his 'Enlilship', and has made perfect for thee (thy) elevation and (thy) rule over the gods.

§ 9

In the assembly, in the presence of the great deities, he has made your destiny mighty, and has placed in your hand the power to take the souls of the earth.

§ 10

You (Adad) have the power to interpret the *omina celestia et terrestria* contained in liver: the decree, which lies in the abyss of Ea (Apsû); to examine the favourable entrails and the unfavourable entrails! The gods have bestowed upon thee the submission of the lands.

§ 11

Anu and Enlil, in consideration of your eminence, have charged you with finding their enemies.

§ 12

Your formidable power is directed against evil entities, in the presence of the gods. Your quick net keeps the earth trapped.

§ 13

Not even the fearless escape the confinement of your net; (with your net) you keep imprisoned (even) those who do not fear (you)!

§ 14

[…] with […] and with thy mantle of clouds the land is covered. Every mortal from fear […] of the great mass of water […] mine […] turns out badly.

§ 15

[… th]y terrible towards mankind […] but the rain of pestilence […] and the mortal son […] is troubled.

§ 16

[…] the head […]

(breaks off)

Rev. iii

§ 17

(*fragmentary*)

§ 18

[…] thy […] is accomplished; and to thy greatness […] and thou in none […]

§ 19

[May the prim]eval deities […] anguish.

§ 20

[Among the deities,] the Storm god is eminent; to thee, the Storm god of heaven, may they (the deities) speak (words) of pacification!

§ 21

May they comfort thy [hear]t, may they appease (thy) liver, may they (the deities) speak (words) of pacification [to (thee), Lord]!

§ 22

Storm god, may they comfort thy heart, may they appease (thy) liver, may they (the deities) speak (words) of pacification to (thee), Lord!

§ 23

In Sippar, eternal city of the Sun god, establish (thy) residence in the sacred chamber! May they comfort thy heart, may they appease (thy) liver, may (the deities) speak (words) of pacification to (thee), Lord!

§ 24

Enlil engraved a happy fate for Babylon, the city to which Anu gave his name, beloved of Marduk! Establish (thy) residence in the 'Temple of Abundance', in the beloved home! May they comfort thy heart, may they appease (thy) liver, may (the deities) speak (words) of pacification to (thee), Lord!

§ 25

To Pada, beloved city, establish (thy) residence there, in gladness! May they comfort thy heart, may they appease (thy) liver, may (the deities) speak (words) of pacification to (thee), Lord!

Rev. iv

§ 26

(*fragmentary*)

§ 27

(*fragmentary*)

§ 28

[…] comes […] in a pure, pristine place […] scribe (expert) in the Babylonian language.

2.5. Line-by-line commentary

i 4: The expression *nepiši daganzipi=ya* is also attested elsewhere (cf. KUB 59.56 vs. 12′).
ii 1: On the 'sovereignty of Enlil': see *Ellilūtu*; *CAD* I/J: 85-86, see *illilūtu*.

wališḫiwar: from *walli-* 'glory, pride'; a noun derived from the idiomatic Hittite verb *walla-/walliya-* 'to rise, to glorify, praise' (semantically cf. *wallaḫḫiya-* 'song of praise' and *walliyatar-* 'glory, praise, song of praise'; *HEG* 4: 264; Sasseville 2020: 33-34, 129-132). It is used together with the verb *išḫamai-* 'to sing' (Akkadian *zamārum*) in the composition of hymns inspired by Mesopotamian and Hurrian traditions (Laroche 1964-1965: 28; Kloekhorst 2008: 944-945; Metcalf 2015b: 100).
ii 3-4: Archi (1983: 27) draws a parallel between this passage and *The Prayer to Ištar* (*CTH* 312), in which 'the great primordial deities' (corresponding to the Babylonian *Annunaku*; Hittite *karuileš* DINGIR^{MEŠ}) are mentioned.

gul(*a*)*šša*: Melchert (2016: 356) refutes the analysis of Archi (1983: 21) and Puhvel (1997: 242) – according to which *gul*(*a*)*šša* is the plural of a verbal noun †*gul*(*a*)*ššar* – and asserts that this term is a regular collective plural of the animate noun (*gul*(*a*)*šša*), resulting from the verb *gul*(*aš*)*š*, 'to engrave, trace, write', with verbal noun *gul*(*aš*)*š*(*u*)*war* (cf. KUB 3.110: 17; 43.72 ii 11). For Melchert, *tuel=pat gul*(*a*)*šša tarranut* corresponds to the Akkadian ^{D}EN.LIL *šīmātikka ušarbi* ('Enlil has exalted your destiny'; Šamšu-Iluna C, 73). See Melchert (2016: 355-359) for further insights; for the derivation of *gul*(*a*)*š-* from the theonym ^{D}*Gulšeš* (the Hittite goddesses of fate, partly analogous to the Greek Fates) and the discussion about the hypothetical identification of the Hittite ^{D}*Gulšeš* with the Luwian ^{D}*Kuwanšeš* (see Archi 2013a: 1-26; Waal 2014: 1016-1033, 2019: 121-132; Yakubovich 2014: 282-297, 2020: 281-282).
ii 4-5: The expression *n=ašta utneyaš ištanzanaš appanna kišri=tti dāiš* ('He (Enlil) has placed in your hand the power to take the souls of the earth') has a parallel in an Old Babylonian Akkadian hymn to Adad, *CT* 15.3-4
ii 7-8: *uštātlimkum bēli parakki epiātim ana qātika apqid* ('I had bestowed upon you the lords of the daises, I had entrusted the people to your hand' (Metcalf 2015b: 70; cf. Schwemer 2001: 419-421; Pohl 2022: 96-101).
ii 6-7: The adjective *liššiyala-*, 'pertaining to the liver, oracular' (*CHD* L/N: 72b; only one attestation), has been attributed by both Götze (1948: 149-150) and Archi (1983: 27) to the *omina celestia et terrestria* that would be shown to the god in his 'mind' (on the oracular powers of the deities, see Ebeling 1953: 20-21). In his reconstruction of the Akkadian original, Götze uses the term *kabattu* as the equivalent of *liššiyalatta*, which means both 'liver' and 'mind'; according to him, therefore, the Hittite scribe was misled by obv. ii 9 (*āššu* ^{UZU}IÀ *ḫuwappann=a* ^{UZU}IÀ) and chose for his 'translation' an adjective that specifically referred to the liver as a divinatory organ, i.e. *liššiyala-*. According to Van Brock, Mac Gregor (1962: 88), however, there would be no mistake: this adjective is a specific reference to the practice of extispicy (Mouton 2015, 2017: 7) and should be translated literally.
ii 8: The noun *ḫuwanḫueššar* can be translated as 'abyss', 'water in great quantities', and is associated with the realm of underground waters in which Enki/Ea, the god of wisdom, dwells. According to Beckman (1982: 22-23), a similar concept is also rooted in Anatolian beliefs, cf. KUB 36.89 obv. 27f. (*CTH* 671; Haas 1970: 146):

... DUMU ^{D}*Šulikatti nanakuššiya*[*ntaz*]*a*$^{?}$ 4 *ḫalḫaltumaraza ḫa*[*ll*]*uwaza ḫ*[*u*]*nḫuešnaza* UGU *eḫu* EGIR-*pa=wa=*[*za* ^{URU}*Neri*]*kki andan neya*

O son of Šulikatti ... from the four corners (of the Earth), from the deep abyss, come up! Come back (to the city of) Nerik!
ii 14-15: The endiad *tarḫuilatar=tet ḫatugatar=tet* ('thy formidable power') has a semantically ambiguous meaning: it can have a negative connotation and, in this case, a positive one, which can also be translated as 'the splendour of terror' (Groddek 2002: 85).
ii 15-16: On the more recent discussion of the etymology of the participle *ḫuppan*, see Melchert (2007: 513-518).
ii 17: The *ikz*(*a*) (cf. obv. ii 16) is a weapon used by the Storm god to trap his adversary, through the creation of an enclosure (*erḫa-*) from which the victim cannot get out. According to Hoffner (1977: 105), this passage reflects ancient Mesopotamian concepts of divine combat. Metcalf (2015b: 91) also argues this attribute of Adad is to be found in a very ancient Sumerian *topos*: the myth of the warrior god Ninĝirsu/Ninurta, equipped with a battle net with which he punishes his father Enlil's enemies. In support of this thesis, in a Babylonian myth (Schwemer 2001: 166-167) Adad is also described as the son of Enlil who takes on the warlike role of scourging his enemies, in his father's name.

arḫa uwa- and abl. "to come out from under what is upon"; see *CHD* Š: 137, 154.

ii 20: In his edition of the text, Archi (1983: 28) cites several passages in which Adad is described in the act of covering the sky with his clouds, obscuring 'the bright day'.

ii 24-27: The act of obscuring 'the bright day' (cf. obv. ii 20), as well as the 'rain of pestilence' (translation proposed by Archi 1983: 25), could both refer to the god's wrath, which makes mortal man anxious (*laḫlaḫḫiškettari*, 'is troubled').

dandukiš DUMU-*aš*: literally, 'the mortal son'. In Hittite, the standard expression is *dandukišnaš* DUMU-*šaš*, 'the son of mortality', which is commonly translated as 'mankind'. The nonstandard formulation used here may be a mistake or a calque from the original Sumerian expression.

iii 6′: The restoration proposed by Archi (1983: 28), *karuileš*, is plausible, both in terms of material space on the tablet and context; (see obv. ii 3-4; Laroche 1974: 175-185). The whole line could be a calque of the Akkadian expression: DINGIR^{MEŠ} *irubu inarruṭū* ^{D}*Anunnaki*, 'the gods shudder, the *Anunnaku* tremble' (cf. *CTH* 312; Reiner, Güterbock 1967: 260).

iii 8′: *šarku-* corresponds to Sumerian GÚ.TUKU and Akkadian *ašarēdum*, 'preeminent'; it is an epithet attributed to storm deities (see *CHD* Š: A 268-270).

iii 9′-13′: In his reconstruction of the original Akkadian text, Götze (1938: 71-72) has proposed a well-known Babylonian formula for this passage: *libbaka linūḫ kabattaka lipšaḫ*, 'may your heart calm down, may your mood calm down' (see *CAD* P: 228 for further attestations; Metcalf 2015b: 91 fn. 42). The following couplet, which repeats the content of the previous verses, also follows the Sumerian and Babylonian stylistic custom of invoking the deity before the supplication.

liššu-: 'liver', Akkadian *kabattu*. The liver – together with the heart and, more generally, the abdomen – is the seat of various emotions in Akkadian hymns, including anger, desire, and anguish. Specifically, the emotional tension accumulated in the upper part of the body is often associated with heat, as testified in numerous Old Babylonian texts (*kabattī ušaṣriḫ*, 'it made my liver warm', *The Annals of Sargon II of 711 BC* ii b/c' 7; cf. Fuchs 1998: 23; Sonik, Steinert 2023: 60, 337). One of the most common translations of the term *kabattu* is 'mind' (cf. rev. iii 10′-13′), but also 'soul', 'feeling' (especially in association with ŠÀ 'heart'; Sonik, Steinert 2023: 398). However, I think that the image of the liver needing to be quenched, associated with another organ that is the seat of the most impetuous and passionate human emotions, is more evocative: that's why I have chosen this translation.

iii 14′-15′: The sanctuary dedicated to the Sun god Šamaš, the É.BABBAR, is the main cultic complex in the city of Sippar, where the temple of Adad would have been located (Schwemer 2001: 321f.). The connection between the two deities is not unusual: Šamaš is mainly associated with the practice of extispicy, and Adad is also a master of this art (cf. rev. ii 6′-11′). According to Archi (1983: 29), the reason why the Hittite scribe did not quote the É.BABBAR directly is that he confused the signs that compose the name of the temple: ŠÀ (É.ŠÀ), instead of BABBAR. This circumstance determined his attempt to translate *dunnakešnaš* É-*ri*, 'inner chamber' – which would reflect the custom of naming the part of the temple where the deity is ritually invited to settle (cf. rev. iii 21′; KUB 15.34 ii 13-14).

iii 18′-21′: The É.NAM.ḪÉ ('Temple of Abundance') in Babylon is another famous place of Adad worship, consecrated by Ḫammurabi and restored by Ammi-Ṣaduqa (George 1993: 129-130; Schwemer 2001: 305-306; Polvani 2010: 279). The epithet LUGAL.É.NAM.ḪÉ(-A)/*bel enamḫe*, 'Lord of the É.NAM.ḪÉ (RIMB 2 B.2.4.1. i 11 in Schwemer 2001: 305 fn. 2245) is attributed to the Storm god in various texts. Archi (1983: 29) proposes a comparison with the Akkadian verse: KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{KI} *šum-šu ṣīram ibbiū*, '(When Anu and Enlil) called Babylon by her exalted name' (*CH* i 16-17).

gul(*a*)*šša*: Melchert (2016: 356) refutes Archi's (1983: 21) amendment of the correct *gul*(*a*)*šša* into *gul*(*a*)*šta* and argues that this etymological figure is a calque of Akkadian *šīmta*/*šīmāti šâmu* 'to decree a fate'.

For the derivation of *dušgarawant-*, see Maier (2013: 175).

iii 24′-25′: The city of Pada, placed under the rule of Babylon since the time of Sûmû-la-el, is known from an inscription of Šamšu-Iluna for having a temple dedicated to Adad, erected by Ammi-Ṣaduqa (Archi 1983: 30; Schwemer 2001: 308).

dušgaranna: allative, restricted to the earliest linguistic phase of Hittite.
iv 11′: Puhvel (2012: 84) disputes Hans Güterbock's translation of this verse, which is modelled on Sumerian-Akkadian expressions ('in a virgin and pure place') and speculates that the phrase *dammili šuppai pedi* refers to an open-air shrine (a *ḫuwaši*?).

3. DISCUSSION

3.1. The Storm God in the Ancient Near East

The proximity and coexistence of different polytheistic systems were two determining factors in the syncretic process of harmonizing typologically similar deities in the ancient Near East. These *polisthea* (or *corothea*) were composed of both local and 'foreign' gods, which were articulated in a common semantic universe and mutually equated through the attribution of names, forms and functions. This syncretism was intended to turn everything 'different' into something more comprehensible, through the creation of 'divine assemblies'. The way these assemblies were conceived and structured suggested that ancient people may have believed in a multi-faceted divine unity. According to Schwemer (2007a: 123):

> Deities with different names are frequently gathered under a single typological label, whether in Ancient Near Eastern Studies, or in the study of religions in general, when they display a broad agreement with regard to their central functions and profile. Typological classification can bring several deities together within just one cultural context or assemble divinities from different cultural traditions under one type.

In a recent contribution (Schwemer 2022: 364), he expanded the discussion:

> The multitude of gods and goddesses that populated the land was tempered by hierarchy on the one hand, and typology on the other: Hierarchy kept the number of (regionally or trans regionally) important deities manageable and gave structure to the divine sphere by establishing groups and relationships. Typology allowed to form groups of deities with a shared profile and to identify them as local hypostases of the same major deity (e.g., the solar deity of a certain city), as hypostases with a certain remit or character (e.g., the Storm-god of the army), or as yet one more manifestation of a type of deity that was as common as the natural phenomenon with which they were associated (e.g., a spring goddess or a mountain god).

A fitting example of this concept is the divine figure that falls under the (modern) typological classification of the 'Storm god': as the dispenser of the rains necessary for harvests, this god is a central figure in the cults of many ancient Near Eastern civilizations that based their economy and survival on agricultural practices, such as the Anatolian one. However, although his nature remains the same, his importance and his names undergo substantial variations and evolutions depending on the regions in which he was worshipped (or, sometimes, within the same cultural context).

In order to understand the figure of the Storm god in Hittite Anatolia, it is necessary to consider that the Hittite culture is the result of the intermingling of different traditions, which include both those of the indigenous Anatolian-Hattian substratum and those of neighbouring countries. The Hattian religious ideology is the foundation on which all Hittite religious thought was firstly modelled, then enriched and expanded through the ages. In addition to the Hattian heritage, Hittite religious practices and beliefs also incorporated elements from Palaic and Luwian traditions, and most of the Mesopotamian and Hurrian religious concepts reached Anatolia through Kizzuwatnean mediation (Schwemer 2022: 368). This mixture gave birth to the cult 'of the thousand gods' of which the 'the Storm god of Heaven' was the undisputed leader, together with the Sun goddess Arinna, his spouse (Houwink ten Cate 1992: 83-148; Klinger 1996: 147-152; Schwemer 2022: 372, 2016, 2007a, 2001).

The name of Taru, the Hattian Storm god, could be written either in syllabic spelling or with the Sumerian ^{D}IŠKUR and ^{D}10 logograms, and his characteristics are the same as those of his Mesopotamian counterparts: associ-

ation with natural storm phenomena, the beneficial action of rain and the destructive force of thunder (Schwemer 2007b: 18).

Other peculiar characteristics of the Storm god are described in the divine lists of the Old Babylonian period and are also found in KBo 3.21 (*CTH* 313). The celestial couple consisting of Iškur/Adad and Šamaš (the Sun god) – who are sometimes joined by the Moon god Sîn – are divine 'witnesses' in connection with legal cases, such as trials and temple loans and oaths (recited before the symbol of the deities, within institutions named *ḫamrum*).[4] The connection between the Sun god and the Storm god as guardians of justice seems to be archaic (from the 3rd millennium BC onwards) and would have spread to Anatolia when cuneiform writing was introduced into the administration of the Hittite kingdom with Ḫattušili I (Steitler 2017: 369).

Storm god and Sun god have also a fundamental role in divinatory rituals, especially those involving the reading of the viscera (extispicy; cf. Lenzi 2011: 48-53 and related texts). Schwemer (2007a: 150) provides two explanations according to which the Storm god is connected to divination. His nature as a celestial deity, responsible for numerous nefarious natural phenomena, associated him with the omens for which oracular questions were required. Moreover, the winds he governed were the divine messages the gods used to communicate with men (Steinkeller 2005: 11-47; Schwemer 2007a: 150). Next to him, the Sun god Šamaš, the most 'omniscient'[5] of the gods – because he sees everything during his daily journey through the firmament – observes, controls and is not so much concerned with predicting events as judging those that have already taken place (Schwemer 2001: 221-226, 284, 683-686; cf. Schwemer 2022: 370-371).

As argued by Steitler (2017: 368), the joint prominence of the Storm god alongside the Sun god may have originated in northern Syria, of Hurrian culture. From the Middle Hittite period onwards, Hurrian influences had an increasing importance on the cult practised by the Hittite royal family.[6] Tarḫun(t), the Hittite Storm god, was assimilated to the Hurrian Storm god and king of gods, Teššub (particularly the one worshipped in Ḫalab, modern Aleppo), through the syncretic process of systematisation. Similarly, his divine circle, composed of his consort Ḫebat, the minor gods Ḫazzi and Nanni (the mountain gods) and Šeri and Ḫurri (the divine bull-men), was definitively integrated into the Hittite imperial cult, as shown in the rock reliefs in Chamber A of the Yazılıkaya sanctuary (Seeher 2011). *The Chronicle of Puḫānu* (Singer 1994: 86-87; Schwemer 2001: 494; Gilan 2004: 275) suggests the veneration of the Storm god of Aleppo had already been introduced in the time of Ḫattušili I's campaigns in northern Syria (Houwink ten Cate 1986: 109 fn. 37); later, from Tudhaliya I/II onwards, the god was integrated into the ranks of Hittite deities, initiating the golden age of his cult (Schwemer 2007a: 166).[7]

3.2. KBo 3.21: discussion

A first point of discussion on KBo 3.21 concerns the chronology of the composition. Scholars disagree on the dating of the text on both linguistic and paleographical basis: Güterbock (1978: 128) referred to KBo 3.21 as a hymn written in the Old Hittite language but attributed the manuscript to a later period; Kammenhuber (1990: 193), on the other hand, asserted that it belongs to the later phase of the language (NH). More recently, Klinger (2013: 102) places the writing of the hymn between the middle and the end of the 15th century BC, while

---

[4] A shrine outside the city; its attestation in the Hurrian-Hittite texts may depend on the hypothetical presence of this institution in the *karum* of Kaneš, see Schwemer 2007a: 140 fn. 44.

[5] The gods of the ancient Near East did not possess the characteristics that today, under the influence of monotheistic theology, we associate with gods, e.g., omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence. The term 'omniscience' is not used here according to its modern meaning, but according to the ancient assumption that, to know, it was necessary to 'see'. See Basello 2012: 149; for a comprehensive treatment of the topic in Hittite Anatolia, see Wilhelm 2002: 54-70.

[6] For more recent studies on Kizzuwatna and the role of Hurrian mediation in the dissemination of Mesopotamian religious literature in Anatolia, see Trameri 2020. For a discussion of the development of the Hurrian pantheon, see Archi 2013b.

[7] About 150 places where he was worshipped and placed at the head of the local cult (also in the form of hypostases) are attested in written sources; see Schwemer 2007a: 166-167, 2007b: 21.

Hoffner, Melchert (2008: 116 fn. 182) consider it to be in the middle part of the linguistic spectrum (MH), but at the more recent end of the paleographic spectrum (NS; Hoffner, Melchert 2008: 116 fn. 182). The *Konkordanz* of the HPM suggests a paleographic dating 'mh.' (in German *mittelhethitisch*, corresponding to the MS phase). In the present discussion, the paleographic dating of the tablet to the MS phase and the linguistic and orthographic dating of the composition to the MH phase are argued. These conclusions are compatible with the hypothesis that the tablet represents a scribal draft, and that the composition of the text, as written on the tablet, is coeval with the writing of the tablet.

Concerning the *Sitz im Leben* of KBo 3.21, the secondary literature considers this hymn to be clearly Mesopotamian in origin. In addition to the explicit reference to cities such as Sippar, Babylon, and Pada (rev. iii 14′, 18′, 24′), the description of a belligerent Adad armed with a net (obv. ii 16) recalls the ancient Sumerian *topos* of the god Ninĝirsu/Ninurta, who wields a battle net and punishes the enemies of his father Enlil (Metcalf 2015b: 91 fn. 40). As Archi (1983: 29) notes, the *a-a'* form of this hymn and the rhetoric of 'soothing the heart' are also typical of the Mesopotamian style. Moreover, the hymn was written by a scribe competent in the Babylonian language (it is specified in the colophon of the text, rev. iv 12′), so it is possible that he translated an original Akkadian manuscript into Hittite (Haas 2007: 346). Götze (1948: 150) has proposed a partial reconstruction of the alleged original Akkadian text, and Klinger (2013: 102 fn. 11) also argues that KBo 3.21 is nothing more than the first draft of a translation: in support of his thesis, he cites the text and the paragraph lines, which are oblique, imprecise, and often written past the margin or above the column divider. Additionally, in rev. iii 10′-13′, the signs are smaller in size than the others, and Klinger affirms they could have been written by someone else later. Melchert seems to agree with this interpretation, because he assumes that 'the very unusual Hittite word order in the second passage (cf. iii 18′-20′) betrays that we are dealing with a translation' (Melchert 2016: 356). However, the unusual word order may also be due to a marked construction in Hittite, so it does not allow to assert with certainty that the text is a translation from an Akkadian original.

The 'Enlilship' (Akkadian *enlilūtum*) granted by Enlil to other deities is an attribute conventionally bestowed on the god Marduk, patron of Babylon, since Old Babylonian times.[8] The fact that, in KBo 3.21, the minor deity Adad obtains such a position prompted Güterbock (1946: 109) to suggest that the text is not a translation of an Akkadian original, but a Hittite 'reconstruction', adapting Mesopotamian models to a Hittite context. In contrast to this interpretation, Metcalf recently adds that, although there are no Sumero-Akkadian sources in which Iškur/Adad is bestowed with the privilege of *elatio*, 'this specific type of elevation by Enlil (and An) of a god of the second rank is an established topos' (Metcalf 2015b: 90). He also argues that a lost *elatio* dedicated to the Storm god might have been contained in the Old Babylonian hymn to Adad *CT* 15.3-4 (Schwemer 2001: 419-421; Metcalf 2015b: 69-71; Pohl 2022: 96-101). In this text, Enlil reproaches Adad for bringing destruction to the land, despite being the guardian of its survival; moreover, he reminds him that it is due to the life-giving power of the Storm god that he entrusted him with the lives of human beings: 'I had bestowed upon you the lords of the daises, I had entrusted the people to your hand' (*CT* 15.3-4 ii 7-8; Metcalf 2015b: 70). This expression has a parallel in KBo 3.21 (cf. obv. ii 4-5), which led Metcalf (2015b: 71) to suggest that Enlil's reproach might refer to a lost *elatio* similar to the one contained in the Hittite hymn.

Before Metcalf, Archi (1983: 21) also rejected Güterbock's hypothesis and proposed that the original Akkadian text was written not in Babylon (where Marduk was worshipped), but in a city where the Storm god Iškur/Adad had a prominent role, probably located in northern Syria or upper Mesopotamia (of Hurrian culture). The role of Hurrian mediation in the reception of Babylonian religious literature in Anatolia, first argued by Wilhelm (1991), is to be stressed here. In KBo 3.21, this hypothesis could be supported by Adad's ability to interpret *omina celestia et terrestria* (obv. ii 6-11), which is attested particularly in Aleppo and Mari, but never in Sumerian sources (Schwemer 2001: 221-226). Moreover, the use of the '*Ich will preisen'-Formel* (the Mesopotamian 'I want to sing'

[8] Cf. the opening of the prologue to the *Codex of Ḫammurabi* i 1-13.

formula)[9] in the composition, which is also present in Hittite version of Hurrian texts (e.g., the *Ulikummi Song*), could suggest that it may have reached Anatolia through Hurrian mediation and, linguistically, through Akkadian 'intermediaries' (as explained below). In conclusion, the strong theological bias in favour of the Storm god and his 'elevation' could be the result of the complex and rich interactions that took place between Hittite Anatolia, the kingdom of Kizzuwatna, and northern Syria (cf. Klinger 2005).

4. CONCLUSION

The hymns to the gods are one of the most pregnant and pervasive forms of cultural and textual transmission among the Late Bronze Age civilizations of the ancient Near East, so it is easy to guess that such symbolic and performative texts must have piqued the interest of the cultures that met Sumerian and Sumero-Akkadian literature. This is true for the Hittite world, where there was no local hymnic tradition (except for the hymnic sections contained in prayers), but where the ritual aspect of cult was particularly important. From this perspective, the hymn for the Hittites was not just a poetic composition: the recitation of a hymn was accompanied by rituals, and the 'borrowed' material could be used in religious practices by those who first translated and then readapted it, with the aim of meeting local cultic and ritual needs. This is evident in a series of hymns inspired by the Old Babylonian Sumerian model *Utu the hero* (also known as *Utu N*; Cavigneaux 2009: 7-13; Metcalf 2011, 2015a, 2015b: 95-98, 2023), which reached Anatolia through Hurrian mediation and in the form of Akkadian texts, called 'intermediaries' (Beckman 2012: 132-134; Daues, Rieken 2018: 7-8; Metcalf 2011: 176, 2015a, 2015b: 81-103, 2023). The discovery of an Akkadian version of a solar hymn and prayer, authored by a Hittite scribe and unearthed in Ortaköy/Šapinuwa (Schwemer, Süel 2021), substantiates this assumption. Moreover, it enabled philologists to reconstruct a trilingual translation (Sumerian-Akkadian-Hittite; Metcalf 2023: 53-72) of a text that significantly impacted specific religious practices within the Hittite royal cult dedicated to local Anatolian deities (Metcalf 2023: 47).

The first examples of this process of textual adaptation can be found in the hymnic sections of the *Prayer of Kantuzili to the Sun god* (*CTH* 373) and the *Prayer of a King* (*CTH* 374);[10] these texts were later refined during the Empire Period, resulting in works like the *Prayer of a Mortal* (*CTH* 372; Schwemer 2015: 29-48; Rieken, Lorenz, Daues 2017 –; Metcalf 2023), and the prayers of Muršili II (Singer 2002: 47-49; Daues, Rieken 2018: 63-74; 218-246; 369-398; Rieken 2019: 150, 154, 157-161). As summarized by Metcalf (2023: 48):

The translation and adaptation of the Sumero-Akkadian model in *CTH* 372–374 reflects, not only an interest in certain aspects of the Mesopotamian Sun-god, but also an interest in appropriating the literary language of praise and prayer from a Mesopotamian royal context to an Anatolian royal context.

This is even more evident during the Empire period, when prayers – the highest representation of Hittite religious literature, of which the hymnic sections are a part – changed and adapted to Hittite religious thought, both in terms of content and technique. This circumstance is indicative of the 'Hittites' struggle for a place among the great political and cultural powers of the 2nd millennium BC' (Rieken 2019: 160-161). The composition of KBo 3.21, on the other hand, belongs to that early phase (Middle Hittite) in which Hittite scribes were still heavily dependent on the structure and content of Mesopotamian religious texts, without yet venturing the (re-)compositions typical of the later period. Thus, the hypothesis of KBo 3.21 as a translation from an Akkadian original remains the most plausible, at least until further discoveries prove otherwise. Regardless, it is evident that the Hittite hymn to Adad *CTH* 313, along with those devoted to the Sun god, serve as additional proof that the dissemination of religious literature in the ancient Near East was a rich, living and dynamic process.

---

[9] In Hittite translations, the Akkadian verb *zamārum* is translated with the Hittite verb *išḫamiḫḫi-*, 'to sing' (from *išḫamiḫḫi*, 'I want to sing'), but also with the idiomatic *walla-*, 'to praise', which is derived from the root of 'elevate', perhaps in analogy with the Sumerian KA-TAR-SI.L (see Laroche 1964-1965: 28; Metcalf 2011: 175 fn. 28).

[10] Both are dated to the Early Empire period; see Schwemer 2015: 3-14; Rieken Lorenz, Daues 2017 –; Metcalf 2023.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archi A. 1983, Die Adad–Hymne ins Hethitische übersetzt, *Orientalia* Nova Series 52: 20-30.

Archi A. 2013a, The Anatolian Fate-Goddesses and their Different Traditions, in E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, Jörg Klinger, Gerfrid G.W. Müller (eds), *Diversity and Standardization. Perspectives on social and political norms in the ancient Near East*, Berlin, Akademie Verlag: 1-26.

Archi A. 2013b, The West Hurrian Pantheon and Its Background, in B.J. Collins, P. Michalowski (eds), *Beyond Hatti. A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, Atlanta, Lockwood Press: 1-21.

Basello G.P. 2012, L'uomo e il divino nell'antico Elam, in G.P. Basello, P. Ognibene, A. Panaino (a cura di), *Il mistero che rivelato ci divide e sofferto ci unisce. Studi Pettazzoniani in onore di Mario Gandini*, Supplemento speciale a Strada Maestra 1959-2009, San Giovanni in Persiceto, Biblioteca Comunale "Giulio Cesare Croce": 143-220.

Beckman G.M. 1982, The Anatolian Myth of Illuyanka, *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 14: 11-25.

Beckman G.M. 2012, Šamaš among the Hittites, in W.S. Egmond, W.H. van Soldt (eds), *Theory and Practice of Knowledge Transfer. Studies in School Education in the Ancient Near East and Beyond. Papers read at a Symposium in Leiden, 17-19 December 2008*, Publications de l'Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul = Uitgaven vanhet Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten te Leiden 121, Leiden, Nederlands Instituut voor Hetnabije Oosten: 129-135.

Cavigneaux A. 2009, Deux hymnes sumériens à Utu, in X. Faivre, B. Lion, C. Michel (éds), *Et il y eut un esprit dans l'homme. Jean Bottéro et la Mésopotamie*, Paris, De Boccard: 3-18.

Daues A., Rieken E. 2018, *Das persönliche Gebet bei den Hethitern: Eine textlinguistische Untersuchung*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 63, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag.de Martino S. 2017, The Hurrian Language in Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age, in A. Mouton (ed.), *Hittitology Today: Studies on Hittite and Neo-Hittite Anatolia in Honor of Emmanuel Laroche's 100th Birthday: 5e Rencontres d'archéologie de l'IFEA, Istanbul 21-22 Novembre 2014*, Istanbul, Institut français d'études anatoliennes: 151-162.

Ebeling E. 1953, *Die akkadische Gebetsserie „Handerhebung"*, Veröffentlichung / Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Institut für Orientforschung 20, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag.

Fuchs A. 1998, *Die Annalen des Jahres 711 v. Chr.*, Helsinki, Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.

George A.R. 1993, *House Most High. The Temples of Ancient Mesopotamia*, Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns.

Giorgieri M. 2013, Diffusion et caractéristiques de la culture écrite d'origine hourrite dans la Proche-Orient asiatique et à Ougarit, in P. Bordreuil, F. Ernst.Pradal, M.G. Masetti-Rouault, H. Rouillard-Bonraisin, M. Zink (éds), *Les écritures mises au jour sur le site antique d'Ougarit (Syrie) et leur déchiffrement– 1930–2010. Commémoration du quatre-vingtième anniversaire du déchiffrement de l'alphabet cunéiforme de Ras Shamra-Ougarit, Colloque international tenu au Collège de France le jeudi 2 décembre 2010, et à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres le vendredi 3 décembre 2010*, Paris, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres: 157-185.

Gilan A. 2004, Der Puḫānu-Text – Theologischer Streit und politische Opposition in der althethitischen Literatur, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 31: 263-296.

Götze A. 1938, *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi*, in cooperation with E.H. Sturtevant, American Oriental Series 14, New Heaven, American Oriental Society.

Götze A. 1948, Review of F. Ose, Supinum und Infinitiv im Hethitischen, *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft (e.V.)* 47/1, Leipzig, J.C. Hinrichs verlag, 1944, in *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 2: 145-155.

Groddek D. 2002, Ein Reinigungsritual für Muršili II. anläßlich seiner Thronbesteigung, *Hethitica* 15: 81-92.

Güterbock H.G. 1946, *Kumarbi. Mythen vom churritischen Kronos aus den hethitischen Fragmenten zusammengestellt, übersetzt und erklärt*, Istanbuler Schriften / Istanbul Yazıları 16, Zürich – New York, Europa-Verlag.

Güterbock H.G. 1978, Some Aspects of Hittite Prayers, in T.T. Segerstedt (ed.), *The Frontiers of Human Knowledge: Lectures Held at the Quincentenary Celebrations of Uppsala University 1977*, Uppsala, Uppsala University Press: 125-139.

Haas V. 1970, *Der Kult von Nerik. Ein Beitrag zur hethitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Studia Pohl 4, Roma, Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Haas V. 2006, *Die hethitische Literatur. Texte, Stilistik, Motiv*, Berlin, De Gruyter.

Haas V. 2007, Beispiele für Intertextualität im hethitischen Schrifttum, in D. Groddek, M. Zorman (Hrsg.), *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 25, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz-Verlag: 341-351.

Hoffner H.A.Jr 1977, Hittite Lexicographic Studies, I, in M. de Jong Ellis (ed.), *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein*, Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts & Sciences 19, Hamden, Archon Books: 105-111.

Hoffner H.A.Jr, H.G. Melchert 2008, *A Grammar of the Hittite Language.* Part 1: *Reference Grammar*, Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns.

Houwink ten Cate Ph. H.J. 1986, Brief Comments on the Hittite Cult Calendar: The Outline of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival, in G. Beckman, R. Beal, G. McMahon (eds.), *Kaniššuwar. A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on his Seventy-fifth Birthday*, Assyriological Studies 23, Chicago, The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago: 95-110.

Houwink ten Cate P.H.J. 1992, The Hittite Storm God: His Role and His Rule according to Hittite Cuneiform Sources, in D.J.W. Meijer (ed.), *Natural Phenomena. Their Meaning, Depiction and Description in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the Colloquim, Amsterdam, 6-8 July 1989*, Amsterdam – Oxford – New York – Tokyo, Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences: 83-148.

Kammenhuber A. 1990, Marduk und Santa in der hethitischen Überlieferung des 2. Jt.s v. Chr., *Orientalia* Nova Series 59: 188-195.

Klinger J. 1996, *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 37, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz-Verlag.

Klinger J. 2001, Die hurritische Tradition in Ḫattuša und das Corpus hurritischer Texte, in Th. Richter, D. Prechel, J. Klinger (Hrsg.), *Kulturgeschichten. Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz-Verlag: 197-208.

Klinger J. 2005, Die hethitische Rezeption mesopotamischer Literatur und die Überlieferung des Gilgameš-Epos in Ḫattuša, in D. Prechel (Hrsg.), *Motivation und Mechanismen des Kulturkontaktes in der späten Bronzezeit*, Eothen 13, Firenze, LoGisma editore: 103-127.

Klinger J. 2013, Hethitische Gebete, in B. Janowski, D. Schwemer (Hrsg.), *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments: Neue Folge* 7, Gütersloh, Gütersloher Verlagshaus: 99-128.

Kloekhorst A. 2008, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, Volume 5, Leiden – Boston, Brill.

Laroche E. 1964-1965, La Prière hittite: vocabulaire et typologie, in *École pratique des hautes études (Ve Section): Sciences Religieuses* 72: 3–29.

Laroche E. 1974, Les dénominations des dieux 'antiques' dans les textes hittites, in K. Bittel, Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate, E. Reiner (Hrsg.), *Anatolian Studies Presented to Hans Gustav Güterbock on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Publications de l'Institut historique et archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul = Uitgaven vanhet Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten te Leiden 35, Leiden, Nederlands Instituut voor Hetnabije Oosten: 175-185.

Lenzi A. 2011, *Reading Akkadian Prayers and Hymns: An Introduction*, Society of Biblical Literature, Ancient Near East Monographs 3, Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature.

Maier M.G. 2013, *Hethitisch °u̯ant- und Verwan(d)tes. Untersuchungen zur Vertretung des indogermanischen Possessivsuffixes *-u̯ent- in den anatolischen Sprachen*, Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 42, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz-Verlag.

Maul S.M. 1988, *'Herzberuhigungsklagen': Die sumerisch-akkadischen Eršaḫunga-Gebete*, Göttinger philosophische Dissertation D7, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz-Verlag.

Melchert H.C. 2007, Hittite *ḫuu̯app-*, *ḫu̯ppā(i)-* and *ḫuppiia-*, in D. Groddek, M. Zorman (Hrsg.), *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 25, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz-Verlag: 513-519.

Melchert H.C. 2016, Formal and Semantic Aspects of Hittite *gul(aš)ša-* 'Fate', in S. Erkut, O. Sir Gavaz (eds), *Ahmet Ünal'a Armağan. Studies in Honour of Ahmet Ünal*, Istanbul, Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları: 355-359.

Metcalf C. 2011, New Parallels in Hittite and Sumerian praise of the Sun, *Welt des Orients* 41/2: 168-176.

Metcalf C. 2015a, Old Babylonian Religious Poetry in Anatolia: From Solar Hymn to Plague Prayer, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 105: 42-53.

Metcalf C. 2015b, *The Gods Rich in Praise: Early Greek and Mesopotamian Religious Poetry*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Metcalf C. 2023, The New Akkadian Solar Hymn and Prayer from Ortaköy/Šapinuwa (DAAM 2.6): An Interpretation and Trilingual Commentary, *Die Welt des Orients* 53/1: 4675.

Mouton A. 2015, Hépatoscopie à Ḫattuša, in C. Roche-Hawley, R. Hawley (éds), *Devins et lettrés dans l'orbite de Babylone. Travaux réalisés dans le cadre du projet ANR Mespériph 2007-2011*, Orient & Méditerranée; Archéologie 16, Paris, De Boccard: 207-237.

Mouton A. 2017, Animal Sacrifice in Hittite Anatolia, in S. Hitch, I. Rutherford (eds), *Animal Sacrifice in the Ancient Greek World*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 239-252.

Pohl A. 2022, *Die akkadischen Hymnen der altbabylonischen Zeit: Grammatik, Stilistik, Editionen*, Leipziger Altorientalistische Studien 13, Leipzig, Harrassowitz Verlag.

Polvani A.M. 2010, The God Bunene, in Y. Cohen, A. Gilan, J.L. Miller (eds), *Pax Hethitica – Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 51, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag,: 278-283.

Puhvel J. 1997, *Volume 4: Words beginning with K*, Hittite Etymological Dictionary, Berlin – New York, De Gruyter Mouton.

Puhvel J. 2012, Hittite *dammeli-*: Jurare in Verba Magistri?, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 64: 83-86.

Reiner E., Güterbock H.G. 1967, The Great Prayer to Ishtar and its Two Versions from Boğazköy, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21: 255-266.

Rieken E. 2019, Hittite Prayers and their Mesopotamian Models, in S. Blakely, B.J. Collins (eds), *Religious Convergence in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Studies in Ancient Mediterranean Religions 2, Atlanta, Lookwood Press: 149–162.

Rieken E., Lorenz J., Daues A.2017 –, Gebete der Hethiter,http://www.hethiter.net/txhet_gebet (last accessed 14.06.2024).

Sasseville D. 2020, *Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation. Luwian, Lycian and Lydian*, Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics, Volume 21, Leiden – Boston, Brill.

Schwemer D. 1998, *Akkadische Rituale aus Ḫattuša. Die Sammeltafel KBo XXXVI 29 und verwandte Fragmente*, Texte der Hethiter vol. 23, Heidelberg, Universitaetsverlag C. Winter.

Schwemer D. 2001, *Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen*, *Materialien und Studien nach den schriftlichen Quellen*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz-Verlag.

Schwemer D. 2007a, The Storm–Gods of the Ancient Near East: Summary, Synthesis, Recent Studies. Part 1, *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 7: 121-168.

Schwemer D. 2007b, The Storm–Gods of the Ancient Near East: Summary, Synthesis, Recent Studies. Part 2, *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 8.1: 1-44.

Schwemer D. 2015, Hittite Prayers to the Sun-god for Appeasing an Angry Personal God: A Critical Edition of *CTH* 372–74, with a glossary by Ch. Steitler, in M. Jaques (éd.), *Mon dieu qu'ai-je fait? Les diĝir-šà-dab(5)-ba et la piété privée en Mésopotamie*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 273, Fribourg – Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: 349-393, 421-457.

Schwemer D. 2016, Wettergott(heiten). A. Philologisch, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 15: 69-91.

Schwemer D. 2022, Religion and Power, in S. de Martino (ed.), *Handbook Hittite Empire. Power Structures*, Empires through the Ages in Global Perspective 1, Berlin – Boston, De Gruyter: 355-420.

Schwemer D., Süel, A. 2021, *The Akkadian and Sumerian Texts from Ortaköy-Šapinuwa*, Documenta antiqua Asiae minoris 2, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz-Verlag.

Seeher J. 2011, *Gods Carved in Stone. The Hittite Rock Sanctuary of Yazılıkaya*, Istanbul, Ege Yayınları.

Singer I. 1994, 'The Thousand Gods of Hatti'. The Limits of an Expanding Pantheon, in I. Gruenwald, I. Alon, I. Singer (eds) *Concepts of the Other in Near Eastern Religions*, Israel Oriental Studies 14, Leiden – New York – Köln, Brill: 86-102.

Singer I. 2002, *Hittite Prayers*, Writings from the Ancient World 11, Leiden – Boston – Köln, Brill.

Sonik K., Steinert U. 2023, *The Routledge Handbook of Emotions in the Ancient Near East*, London – New York, Taylor & Francis.

Steinkeller P. 2005, Of Stars and Men: The Conceptual and Mythological Setup of Babylonian Extispicy, in A. Gianto (ed.), *Biblical and Oriental Essays in Memory of William L. Moran*, Biblica et Orientalia 48, Roma, Pontificio Istituto Biblico: 11-47.

Steitler C.W. 2017, *The Solar Deities of Bronze Age Anatolia. Studies in Texts of the Early Hittite Kingdom*, Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 62, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz-Verlag.

Trameri A. 2020, *The Land of Kizzuwatna. History of Cilicia in the Second Millennium BCE until the Hittite Conquest (ca. 2000-1350)*, Ph.D. dissertation, Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, New York University.

Van Brock N., Mac Gregor N. 1962, Thèmes verbaux à nasale infixée en Hittite, *Revue Hittite et Asianique* 20/70: 31-36.

Waal W. 2014, Changing Fate: Hittite *gulš-*/GUL-*š-*, ^{D}*Gulše*/^{D}GUL-*šeš,* Cuneiform Luwian *gulzā*(*i*)-/ GUL-*zā*(*i*)-, Hieroglyphiv Luwian REL-*za-* and the *Kuwanšeš* deities, in P. Taracha (ed.), *Proceedings of the Eight International Conference of Hittitology. Warsaw, 5-9 September 2011*, Warsaw, Agade 1016-1034.

Waal W. 2019, Fate Strikes Back: New Evidence for the Identification of the Hittite Fate Deities and its Implications for Hieroglyphic Writing in Anatolia, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 71: 121-132.

West M.L. 1997, *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*, Oxford [England] – New York, Clarendon Press.

Wilhelm G. 1991, Zur hurritischen Gebetsliteratur, in D.R. Daniels, U. Glessmer, M. Rösel (Hrsg.), *Ernten, was man sät. Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener-Verlag: 37-47.

Wilhelm G. 1994, Hymnen der Hethiter, in W. Burkert, F. Stolz (Hrsg.), *Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 131, Freiburg [Schweiz] – Göttingen, Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Göttingen: 59-78.

Wilhelm G. 2002, 'Gleichsetzungstheologie', 'Synkretismus' und 'Gottesspaltungen' im Polytheismus Altanatoliens, in M. Krebernik, J. van Oorschot (Hrsg.), *Polytheismus und Monotheismus in den Religionen des Vorderen Orients*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 298, Münster, Ugarit-Verlag: 54-70.

Yakubovich I. 2014, The Luwian Deity Kwanza, in A. Kosyan, Y. Grekyan, A. Bobokhyan (eds), *The Black & the White: Studies on History, Archaeology, Mythology and Philology in Honor of Armen Petrosyan in Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ARAMAZD, Armenian Journal of Near Eastern Studies Volume VIII/1-2 (2013-2014), Yerevan, Association for Near Eastern and Caucasian Studies: 282-297.

Yakubovich I. 2020, Review of A. Kloekhorst, *Kanišite Hittite. The Earliest Attested Record of Indo-European*, Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section One, The Near and Middle East, Volume 132 132, Leiden, Brill, in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 110: 278-288.