

THE STRUCTURE OF HOSPITALITY TYPE-SCENES IN HOMER AND HITTITE
MYTHOLOGY: EVIDENCE FOR AN EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN TRADITION

by

SILVIO CURTIS

(Under the Direction of Jared Klein)

ABSTRACT

This thesis compares the structure of hospitality scenes in the Homeric poems and Hittite mythological texts. In both traditions, hospitality scenes are type-scenes. That is, they have a conventional, recurring narrative structure and conventional, recurring phraseology. Hittite and Homeric type-scenes share several elements of narrative structure, most notably the prominence of feasts in which visitors and hosts participate together. Other elements are characteristic of Homeric or Hittite hospitality scenes, most notably the conventional Homeric description of the host's activities, and the two traditions appear independent on the phraseological level. However, the same set of common elements also appears in hospitality scenes from Ugaritic epic, confirming its origin in a shared regional pool of conventions.

INDEX WORDS: Homer, Hittite, Near East, hospitality, *xenia*, type-scenes, epic, comparative poetics, oral poetry, *Odyssey*, *Iliad*, succession myth, food, drink

THE STRUCTURE OF HOSPITALITY TYPE-SCENES IN HOMER AND HITTITE
MYTHOLOGY: EVIDENCE FOR AN EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN TRADITION

by

SILVIO CURTIS

BA, Grinnell College, 2012

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2015

© 2015

Silvio Curtis

All Rights Reserved

THE STRUCTURE OF HOSPITALITY TYPE-SCENES IN HOMER AND HITTITE
MYTHOLOGY: EVIDENCE FOR AN EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN TRADITION

by

SILVIO CURTIS

Major Professor: Jared Klein
Committee: Thomas Biggs
Charles Platter

Electronic Version Approved:

Suzanne Barbour
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank my committee for their encouragement on an unusually cross-disciplinary project. I also thank Alwin Kloekhorst, who taught me Hittite at the Leiden Summer School of Linguistics, Jennifer Singletary, who taught me Hittite at the University of Georgia, and my classmates. They all made it as fun as it should be to learn a language three millennia old and forgotten for most of that time. This project would have been extremely unlikely without the financial support of the Graduate School Dean's Award and a substantial travel grant from the UGA Classics Department, which helped me travel to Leiden and pay for the Summer School.

My fellow MA students have been wonderful colleagues in Classics and in life. Community is by definition not an individual achievement, but Emily Sharp, Jill Simmons, and Nick Mantia have my special gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER	
1 CONTEXT AND STRUCTURE OF HITTITE HOSPITALITY SCENES.....	9
The Context of Hittite Hospitality Scenes	9
The Structure of Hittite Hospitality Scenes	17
2 NARRATIVE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STRUCTURE OF HITTITE HOSPITALITY SCENES.....	26
3 ETYMOLOGIES OF KEY TERMS IN GREEK AND HITTITE HOSPITALITY SCENES.....	36
4 THE HOMERIC HOSPITALITY SCENE REVISITED	46
5 HOSPITALITY SCENES IN OTHER NEAR EASTERN AND INDO-EUROPEAN TRADITIONS.....	59
CONCLUSION.....	72
REFERENCES	76
APPENDICES	
1 HOSPITALITY TYPE-SCENES FROM HITTITE LITERATURE: TEXTS, TRANSLATIONS, AND SYNOPSES	80
2 LIST OF HOSPITALITY SCENES EXAMINED FOR CHAPTER 5.....	99

INTRODUCTION

This thesis compares the structure of hospitality scenes in two traditions of ancient literature, the Homeric tradition attested by the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and the Anatolian tradition attested by a variety of more or less fragmentary texts in Hittite. Its analysis of the structure of these scenes is founded on the concept of the type-scene, which is already well-known in the branch of Homeric scholarship that developed from the work of Milman Parry. I develop a framework for the comparison by taking methods already fruitfully used in the study of Homeric hospitality scenes as type-scenes, especially by Steve Reece,¹ and reapplying them to Hittite mythological texts. I consider both the content and the historical development of Homeric and Hittite hospitality scenes, with some attention to other Indo-European and Near Eastern literature. The historical component of the results has particular significance, providing evidence that hospitality scenes in Greek, Hittite, and Ugaritic narratives all belonged to a wider regional tradition.

The introduction defines the basic concepts used in my thesis and reviews some elementary information on Hittite language and literature. The first chapter explains the narrative contexts of hospitality in Hittite myths, describes their structure in terms of a list of recurrent elements, and assesses the degree to which that structure varies from example to example. The second chapter characterizes the narrative function of particular elements of Hittite hospitality scenes in the passages where they occur. The third chapter discusses the etymology of words and phrases that occur repeatedly in Homeric and Hittite hospitality scenes, demonstrating that the

¹ Steve Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1993).

wording of hospitality scenes developed independently in the two traditions. The fourth chapter compares Homeric and Hittite hospitality scenes in terms of their content, extending Reece's analysis of the Homeric material in the process. The fifth chapter makes a preliminary investigation of the structure of hospitality scenes in languages other than Greek or Hittite and argues for historical diffusion to explain the parallels between Hittite, Ugaritic, and Homeric texts. The conclusion recapitulates the most notable results of the thesis and contextualizes them with regard to existing scholarship on parallels between ancient Greek and Near Eastern literature.

Definitions and Methods

The concept of the type-scene in Homeric scholarship originated with Walter Arend, who formulated it in answer to the question: "Wie kommt es, daß derselbe Dichter, der die Fähigkeit hat, Neues mit neuen Worten zu sagen, daneben alte Verse beibehält . . . ?"² Milman Parry integrated type-scenes with his own insights into the oral composition of the Homeric poems in his review of Arend's book.³ Many researchers since then have used the term, but not always with equivalent definitions.⁴ For the purposes of this thesis, I define a type-scene as a unit with the two characteristics attributed by Foley to type-scenes from the *Odyssey*: "a definite grouping of actions or elements" and "a recurrent phraseological content,"⁵ that is, repeated narrative structure and repeated wording.

² Walter Arend, *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1933), 3.

³ Milman Parry, review of *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*, by Walter Arend. *Classical Philology* 31, no. 4 (1936): 357-360.

⁴ For a historical summary see John Miles Foley, *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 240-245.

⁵ Foley, *Oral Epic*, 247. However, I follow Reece, *Stranger's Welcome*, in referring to larger units as type-scenes than Foley has in mind. The three kinds of type-scene from *The Odyssey* that Foley discusses in *Traditional Oral Epic*, the Greeting, the Bath, and the Feast, are all considered elements of the hospitality type-scene in Reece and here.

I define a hospitality scene as any interaction between characters in a narrative that takes place in the home of one or more characters, but not the others, except for interactions that are overtly hostile on all levels and those where the participants constitute a formal decision-making body. That is, I exclude fights, thefts, and so on as well as formal councils or assemblies. My criteria agree in practice with the hospitality scenes that Reece identifies in Homer⁶ and with Mark Edwards' classification of type-scenes in Homer.⁷

The method used to analyze repeated narrative structure in this thesis maximizes comparability with Reece's work. I present the narrative structure of Hittite hospitality scenes as a numbered list of narrative elements in the order in which they normally occur in the narrative, to be understood as "a highly artificial abstraction, a mechanical device by which the modern reader may by conscious effort shed some light on the backdrop of inherited conventions."⁸ Obviously, including all the elements on one list does not indicate that every hospitality scene has all of them. Some of these elements occur frequently while others occur only two or three times. Thus, the full list represents a composite of different subtypes of hospitality scene, as chapter 2 explains at length. I use the same method to analyze hospitality scenes in other traditions in chapter 5, again with some discussion of identifiable subtypes.

The analysis of the narrative structure of type-scenes has a certain similarity in spirit with the study of plot structure along the lines proposed by Vladimir Propp. In his study of Russian folktales,⁹ Propp breaks down their plot structure into fundamental components or functions. The plot of any given tale consists of a sequence of functions, drawn from a limited set of

⁶ Reece, *Stranger's Welcome*, 5.

⁷ Mark W. Edwards, "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type-Scene," *Oral Tradition* 7, no. 2 (1992): 284-330. For hospitality scenes, see p. 303-308.

⁸ Reece, *Stranger's Welcome*, 7. In chapter 1 I give Reece's list for hospitality scenes in Homer.

⁹ Vladimir Propp, *The Morphology of the Folktale*, trans. Laurence Scott, 2nd ed. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968).

possibilities and combined subject to certain restrictions. The analysis of type-scenes, like Propp's structural analysis of plot, reveals the limited set of conventional elements that characterize a certain type of narrative sequence. However, whereas the sequences dealt with by Propp are complete, independent narratives, a type-scene is a small part of a much longer narrative. In terms of its relation to the plot as a whole, an entire hospitality type-scene is comparable to just one of the functions identified by Propp. Edwards similarly distinguishes type-scenes from larger structures, which he terms "story patterns."¹⁰

Hittite Language and Literature

I anticipate that most people who read this thesis will know more about Homer than about Hittite mythology. Such readers, especially those who do not read Hittite, may find the following introductory remarks on Hittite texts helpful. Hittite was the chief written language of a multilingual empire, the kingdom of Ḫatti, that ruled much of Anatolia in the mid to late second millennium BCE.¹¹ Although the language belongs to the Indo-European family, Hittite culture borrowed heavily from the non-Indo-European speakers of the Near East. The contact between Hittites and Hurrians has most relevance for my purposes. The Hurrians used a non-Indo-European language still only partially understood by modern scholars.¹² Signs of Hurrian influence in Ḫatti began around the fifteenth century and soon became abundant, including widespread use of Hurrian names by the royal family and others. The later Hittites derived much of their literature and mythology from Hurrian speakers, including elements that Hurrians had

¹⁰ Edwards, "Type-Scene," 286.

¹¹ Helpful introductions to Hittite history and culture include Billie Jean Collins, *The Hittites and Their World* (Leiden: Brill, 2007) and Trevor Bryce, *Life and Society in the Hittite World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

¹² For further information on Hurrian language and culture and Hurro-Hittite contact, see Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., "Hurrian Civilization from a Hittite Perspective," in *Urkes and the Hurrians: Studies in Honor of Lloyd Cotsen*, ed. Giorgio Buccellati and Marilyn Kelly-Buccellati (Malibu: Undena Publications, 1998), 167-200.

borrowed from the Akkadian-speaking cultures of Mesopotamia. In fact, the Hittites sometimes wrote down mythological texts in Hurrian. One of the texts discussed in this thesis, the *Song of Release*, is even preserved in a bilingual format with Hurrian and Hittite versions on the same tablet.¹³ Besides material derived from Hurrian and Mesopotamian cultures, Hittite literature includes myths adopted from Hattic speakers, who were indigenous to the area before the Hittite immigration, and from speakers of Northwest Semitic languages like Ugaritic.

Some aspects of the cuneiform writing system used by the Hittites seem peculiar from the perspective of someone used to alphabets, and awareness of them may make it easier to follow my discussion of Hittite texts. The following treatment explains the basic principles, but glosses over many complications and exceptions.¹⁴ Cuneiform was mostly a syllabary, in which a sign represented a consonant followed by a vowel (CV), a vowel followed by a consonant (VC), a vowel alone (V), or a sequence of consonant-vowel-consonant (CVC). Even though they had CVC signs, Hittite scribes more usually spelled CVC syllables by writing a CV sign and then a VC sign, so that the signs *na-aš* spelled *naš*. Adding a seemingly redundant V sign to a syllable marked a phonological distinction of disputed nature, which is transcribed with a macron, so that the signs *e-eš* spell *ēš*. Hittite scribes had no unambiguous way of dealing with consonant clusters at the beginning or end of a word, or word-internal clusters of three or more consonants in a row. These consonant clusters forced the scribes to use CV or VC signs for a consonant alone, so that a word-final *-anz*, for example, was usually spelled *-an-za*. The unpronounced vowel in these signs is called a “dead vowel.”

¹³ Erich Neu, *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I: Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Hattuša* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996).

¹⁴ For more information on the Hittite language, a standard reference is Harry A. Hoffner and H. Craig Melchert, *Reference Grammar*, vol. 1 of *A Grammar of the Hittite Language* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2008).

Along with the syllabic signs, the Hittites used Sumerograms and Akkadograms, that is, they wrote some words or affixes in Sumerian or Akkadian but still pronounced them in Hittite. Modern Hittitologists transcribe Sumerograms by writing the Sumerian pronunciation in capital non-italic letters and transcribe Akkadograms by writing the Akkadian pronunciation in capital italics. By a convention that I follow although it is not universal, Sumerographic suffixes are written superscript as well as capitalized and non-italicized. Often Hittite scribes would write a phonetic complement giving the last few sounds of the Hittite pronunciation in syllabic signs after a Sumerogram or Akkadogram, especially when it was necessary to indicate grammatical inflections. Sumerograms and Akkadograms are a nuisance in the linguistic analysis of Hittite texts because they make it hard to know the Hittite pronunciation, except for what information can be gleaned from phonetic complements. Some Sumerograms could also be used as determiners, signs that indicated the semantic category of a following word but were not pronounced at all. Hittitologists transcribe a determiner with non-italic superscript letters, usually representing the pronunciation that it would have if it were in a Sumerian text and were not a determiner. One last typographic convention in the modern transcription of languages from ancient Anatolia has nothing to do with cuneiform spelling, the use of an equals sign as punctuation before enclitics.

As an example of Hittite spelling conventions, I give the following passage from the *Song of Hedammu*:

Narrow transcription (sign by sign): *nu-wa-at-ta* ^dSÎN-*aš* ^dUTU-*uš* *ták-na-aš-ša* DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*mu-uš* *le-e* *ú-wa-an-zi* *ma-a-an* *šal-li-iš* *a-ru-na-aš* *ud-da-a-ar* IŠ-ME

Broad transcription: . . . *nu=wa=tta* ^dSÎN-*aš* ^dUTU-*uš* *taknašš=a* DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*muš* *lē* *uwanzi!*” *mān šalliš arunaš* *uddār* IŠME . . .

Translation: . . . Do not let the Moon God and the Sun God and the gods of the earth see you!”

When the great Sea heard the speech . . . (CTH 348.I.1.88-89)

Here the superscript d transcribes the determiner marking divine names. The same sign is used independently as the Sumerogram DINGIR. The sign for “Moon God” is here transcribed $\hat{S}\hat{I}N$ according to its Akkadian pronunciation and UTU “Sun God” is a Sumerogram. $^d\hat{S}\hat{I}N-a\check{s}$ and $^dUTU-u\check{s}$ each have a phonetic complement, showing that the underlying Hittite names are nouns of the common gender in the nominative singular, and that the name of the Moon God is an a-stem noun while the name of the Sun God is a u-stem. The superscript MEŠ in DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*mu-uš* is a Sumerian plural suffix, which is redundant here because the Hittite nominative plural common u-stem ending is included in the phonetic complement. (From other texts where the word for “god” is spelled out syllabically we can infer that DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*mu-uš* was pronounced *šīmuš*). *IŠME* “he heard” is an Akkadogram without a phonetic complement.

All translations from Greek and Hittite are my own. Translations from other languages are cited in appendix 2. I cite the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* by book and line number. For Hittite texts I use the CTH number and colon from the online editions available on the Hethitologie-Portal Mainz website, except for *The Song of Release*, which I cite by tablet, side, column, and line from Neu’s edition in KBo XXXII.¹⁵ I use the conventional transcriptions *ku* and *hu* for the Hittite labialized consonants where the Hethitologie-Portal editions have *kw* and *hw*, but I omit dead vowels from the ends of words and in word-final consonant clusters more consistently than is usual in Hittitology. Because the vowels *e* and *i* are imperfectly distinguished in cuneiform, and editors’ practices are confusing, I standardize their spelling so far as I can in the main text of my thesis, but follow the editions strictly in appendix 1. In another departure from Hittitological

¹⁵ Neu, *Epos der Freilassung*.

convention, all quotations in the main text are punctuated to make my interpretation easier to follow.

CHAPTER 1

CONTEXT AND STRUCTURE OF HITTITE HOSPITALITY SCENES

The discussion of Hittite hospitality scenes in this thesis relies on a corpus of thirteen scenes from Hittite mythological literature. The first part of chapter 1 will briefly discuss the context and content of each and assign it a number for future reference.¹⁶ The second part of the chapter will show that Hittite hospitality scenes are type-scenes by introducing the conventional elements of narrative structure that recur from scene to scene and the commonalities of wording associated with them.

The Context of Hittite Hospitality Scenes

The Kumarbi Cycle: Introduction

The Kumarbi Cycle, as modern Hittitologists call it, is a set of loosely connected narrative texts in Hittite about struggles over the kingship of heaven among the Hurro-Hittite gods.¹⁷ A few fragments of Hurrian versions also exist, from which it seems that the Hittite texts are loose adaptations or expansions rather than translations.¹⁸ At least one composition, the *Song of Ullikummi*, is metrical, with four stress accents in each line of verse. Possibly the entire cycle

¹⁶ Appendix 1 includes transcriptions, translations, and synopses of all the scenes along with their reference numbers, as well as transcriptions and translations of some additional unnumbered hospitality scenes from the Kumarbi Cycle. The unnumbered scenes are more fragmentary than the Kumarbi Cycle scenes that I number and discuss.

¹⁷ For more extensive introduction to the Kumarbi Cycle, see Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., *Hittite Myths*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1998), 40-42, and Volkert Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006), 130-133.

¹⁸ Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur*, 130.

uses the same meter.¹⁹ Those texts whose title is preserved identify themselves as belonging to the genre of ŠĪR “song.”

Hesiod’s *Theogony* contains several elements whose ultimate source seems to be this Hurro-Hittite myth. M.L. West is among the best known scholars to defend the Anatolian origin of Hesiod’s version.²⁰ However, Mary Bachvarova cautions against assuming a connection,²¹ and Johannes Haubold accepts “that the texts adhere to internationally accepted narrative models, and consciously so” while refraining from suggesting a route of transmission.²² The proposal of a Northwest Semitic route by Carolina López-Ruiz²³ will be revisited in the conclusion of this thesis.

In the first story, Kumarbi rebels against the reigning king, Anu, defeats him, and bites off and swallows his genitals. Anu’s genitals impregnate him with five offspring, among them the Storm God.²⁴ The Storm God then displaces Kumarbi from the kingship. The other stories, whose chronological order is uncertain, tell how Kumarbi produces a series of further offspring in the hope that they will overthrow the Storm God, and how the Storm God defeats each one in turn. Of the various compositions, the *Song of Hedammu* and the *Song of Ullikummi* contain hospitality scenes in their extant portions.

¹⁹ I. McNeill, “The Metre of the Hittite Epic,” *Anatolian Studies* 13 (1963): 237-242.

²⁰ M.L. West, *The East Face of Helicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 277-280.

²¹ Mary Bachvarova, “From Hittite to Homer: The Role of Anatolians in the Transmission of Epic and Prayer Motifs from the Near East to the Greeks” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2002), 10-11.

²² Johannes Haubold, *Greece and Mesopotamia: Dialogues in Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 52-53.

²³ Carolina López-Ruiz, *When the Gods Were Born: Greek Cosmogonies and the Near East* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2010), 84-129.

²⁴ Written Sumerographically as ^dIM. The Hurrian name is Tessub and the Hittite one is probably Tarhunna. See Erich Neu, *Epos der Freilassung*, 228, and Alwin Kloekhorst, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), under *tarḫu-*.

The Kumarbi Cycle: *The Song of Hedammu*²⁵

Kumarbi marries Sertapsuruhi, daughter of the Sea,²⁶ and they produce the sea monster Hedammu as their son. Ultimately, Ištar²⁷ seduces Hedammu, which presumably leads to his destruction. The *Song of Hedammu* has three hospitality scenes. In (1), the Sea visits Kumarbi as part of the negotiations concerning the marriage of Kumarbi and Sertapsuruhi. The conversation is apparently underway already when the fragment begins. In (2), Ištar has discovered that Hedammu exists and goes to the Storm God with the bad news. The fragment breaks off as the Storm God weeps. (3) is quite long – 43 cola – but has an unclear context. At the beginning of the fragment, Kumarbi is giving instructions to his vizier Mukisanu to go to the Sea and summon him: *uddani=ma=wa=tta kuedani ḫalziššai, nu=wa uttar liliwan* “The matter for which he is calling you is urgent” (CTH 348.I.1.84-85). The Sea comes as commanded and eats with Kumarbi. Then Kumarbi tells Mukisanu to bolt the door, presumably as a secrecy precaution against the Storm God and his allies. Frustratingly, we do not know what is so urgent and secret because the fragment breaks off at this point.

The Kumarbi Cycle: *The Song of Ullikummi*²⁸

This time, Kumarbi tries to engender someone who can defeat the Storm God by having sex with a giant rock. The rock gives birth to a son made of basalt whom Kumarbi names Ullikummi. To protect him, Kumarbi has him set on the shoulder of Upelluri, the god who holds up the world from underneath. When Ullikummi has grown huge enough to reach from the sea to the sky, the Sun God²⁹ sees him and warns the Storm God. Ištar tries to seduce Ullikummi, but

²⁵ CTH 348. See Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 50-55 and Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur*, 153-156.

²⁶ Aruna in Hittite.

²⁷ Written thus Akkadographically, Hittite name unknown, Sauska in Hurrian.

²⁸ CTH 345. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 55-65 and Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur*, 156-175.

²⁹ Written Sumerographically as ^dUTU.

he is blind and deaf and therefore immune to her charms. The Storm God fights him, but Ullikummi is already too big and strong for him. In desperation, the Storm God goes to Aya,³⁰ the wise god of the underworld waters, for help. Aya gives him the cutting tool that was used to cut heaven and earth apart so he can cut Ullikummi off Upelluri's shoulder. The Storm God fights Ullikummi again. The tablet is broken here, but presumably the Storm God uses the cutting tool and wins this time.

Hospitality scene (4) comes between Ullikummi's conception and birth. The Sea's vizier sees Kumarbi in circumstances obscured by broken sections of the tablets. The Sea sends a message to convey his worry that Kumarbi has become hostile to him and to invite him to a feast. Kumarbi comes and eats, then begins instructing his own vizier Mukisanu to take a message, but the text trails off into more broken sections without making the nature or recipient of the message clear. In (5) the Sun God brings the news of Ullikummi's existence to the Storm God, much like Ištar bringing the news of Hedammu in (2). In (6) the Storm God and Tasmisu supplicate Aya and obtain the cutting tool from him.

The Song of Release³¹

This is the best-preserved Hurro-Hittite bilingual text. Even so, it consists of several long fragments whose interrelationship is unclear. The beginning of a proem, of which only the Hurrian text survives, states that the composition is about the Storm God, Istanu of the Earth,³² Išhara (the goddess of healing), and a man named Pizikarra. There are a number of short moral parables. Hospitality scene (7), which Bachvarova has discussed at length and compared to

³⁰ Written Sumerographically as ^dÉ.A.

³¹ Not in CTH. Published in Neu, *Epos der Freilassung*. Discussed by Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 65-77, and Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur*, 177-192.

³² An underground sun-goddess whose name is normally written *taknas* ^dUTU, with the same Sumerogram as the sun god of the sky. Her Hurrian name is Allāni.

Homeric hospitality scenes,³³ forms the whole of another fragment. The Storm God visits Istanu for a feast in the underworld together with his vizier (here called Suwalyat rather than Tasmisu as in the Kumarbi Cycle). There is extensive description of Istanu's preparations for the feast, but no dialogue. It is unclear how much of the original hospitality scene the fragment represents. Finally, there are three episodes involving demands made by the Storm God to Mēki, leader of the city of Ebla, with which he wants to comply but which the citizens refuse. At one point a speaker brings up a hypothetical prospect of the Storm God being in debt and needing rescue.

Neu interprets scene (7) as a reconciliation between the celestial and chthonic deities,³⁴ Haas understands the feast as a trap with which the chthonic deities will take the Storm God captive,³⁵ Hoffner withholds judgment,³⁶ and Bachvarova suggests that in the missing portion of the scene the gods discuss the problem of Ebla and decide to destroy the city.³⁷ Considering the evident complexity of the plot and the lack of cross-references between the surviving fragments, it is probably wisest not to rely on any theory about the role of the hospitality scene.

Gurpāranzaḫu³⁸

Only a few short fragments of this composition survive. It is set in Akkad, but the story is presumed to be a Hurrian myth because the characters mostly have Hurrian-derived names.³⁹ Gurpāranzaḫu is king of Ailanuwa. In one fragment, hospitality scene (8), he participates in a

³³ Bachvarova, "Hittite to Homer," 107-116.

³⁴ *Epos der Freilassung*, 265-266.

³⁵ *Die hethitische Literatur*, 181.

³⁶ *Hittite Myths*, 73.

³⁷ Bachvarova, "Hittite to Homer," 113.

³⁸ CTH 362. Not included in Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*. Discussed by Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur*, 217-220, and Franca Pecchioli Daddi, "From Akkad to Hattuša: The Story of Gurparanzah and the River That Gave Him Its Name," in *Semitic and Assyriological Studies: Presented to Pelio Fronzaroli by Pupils and Colleagues*, ed. Paolo Marrassini (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003), 476-494.

³⁹ Pecchioli Daddi, "Akkad to Hattuša," 477.

hunt organized by Impākru, king of Akkad. Then he returns to Akkad with the hunters, where Impākru marries his daughter Tatizuli to him and he beats the other men in an archery competition. Some kind of dispute is arising between Gulpāranzaḫu and Tatizuli when the fragment trails off. In the other main fragment, the god of the river Aranzaḫu comes to Gulpāranzaḫu in Akkad and discusses the problem with him. There follows hospitality scene (9), in which the Aranzaḫu visits the fate goddesses. Just enough is left at the end of the fragment to show that they give him food and drink.

Appu⁴⁰

The ethnic origins of this story remain uncertain.⁴¹ Appu is a wealthy man with no sons. Finally the Sun God promises him a son. After a long break in the surviving text, Appu has *two* sons in succession, and he names the older one Wrong⁴² and the younger one Right.⁴³ When the boys grow up and divide the estate, Wrong cheats Right out of all the good property. Then the Sun God intervenes, the brothers argue, and the Sun God judges in favor of Right. Wrong intimidates the Sun God into handing the case over to Ištar, and then the text breaks off. Hospitality scene (10) comes immediately after the Sun God tells Appu that he will have a son. The Sun God goes to the Storm God's residence in the sky. The Storm God expresses surprise and starts to question the Sun God, but the rest of the scene is lost in the break in the text.

Elkunirsa and Ašertu⁴⁴

This text appears to represent a Hittite translation of an unknown West Semitic original.⁴⁵ It has as its principal characters the Storm God, here representing the Semitic Baal; Elkunirsa, a

⁴⁰CTH 360. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 82-85, and Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur*, 194-199.

⁴¹Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 82, and Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur*, 193.

⁴²Sumerogram HUL.

⁴³Sumerogram NÍG.SI.SÁ.

⁴⁴Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 90-92, and Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur*, 213-216.

Hittiticization of the Semitic phrase for “El, Creator of Earth;” and Elkunirsa’s wife Ašertu, whose name is also Semitic. Ašertu wants to sleep with the Storm God and threatens him when he refuses. The Storm God goes to Elkunirsa’s tent and informs him of the situation, which constitutes hospitality scene (11). On Elkunirsa’s advice the Storm God goes back and tells Ašertu that he has killed her children. A break in the text follows. When the surviving copies resume, Elkunirsa and Ašertu are scheming against the Storm God. After another break, the last fragments describe the Storm God being healed and exorcized, presumably after being attacked by Ašertu and Elkunirsa.

The Text of the Purulli⁴⁶

Hittitologists believe that the myth of the battle of the Storm God with a serpent comes from the Hattic culture indigenous to central Anatolia before the Hittites arrived there and not from Hurrian sources. The version that concerns us identifies itself as *purulliyaš uttar*, “the text of the Purulli (festival)” (CTH 321.2). The Storm God and serpent fight for unclear reasons, and the serpent wins. The defeated Storm God then invites the gods to a feast, which I number (12), prepared by his daughter Inara, the goddess of wild animals. Inara gets the alliance of a mortal man by having sex with him, then invites the serpent to the feast. The serpent gets drunk, and while he is helpless the man ties him up and the Storm God kills him. The broken remainder narrates some kind of conflict between Inara and the man. The serpent myth seems to preserve some Indo-European themes. Calvert Watkins analyzes it as a reflex of the Indo-European dragon-slaying myth, and in particular as one representing a variant that intersects with inherited Indo-European notions of hospitality. This subtype, which modifies the basic pattern HERO

⁴⁵ Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 90.

⁴⁶ CTH 321. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 10-12, and Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur*, 97-103.

SLAY MONSTER to GUEST SLAY ANTI-GUEST, also underlies the episodes of Odysseus and Polyphemus and Odysseus and the suitors in the *Odyssey*.⁴⁷

Divine Disappearance Myths

Several narratives about the temporary disappearance of a god survive. In one, the disappearing god is the Storm God himself⁴⁸ and in others it is his son Telipinu⁴⁹. In the Telipinu versions, Telipinu becomes angry for reasons lost in the broken beginning of the text and hides himself. His withdrawal interrupts the reproduction and growth of all plants, nonhuman animals, and humans. The other gods send an eagle, which fails to find Telipinu, then a bee, which succeeds. The gods then carry out a ritual to propitiate Telipinu, which the text describes in great detail. The disappearance of the Storm God has the same plot except for the change of protagonist. The myth of the disappearance of the Storm God and two versions of the myth of Telipinu preserve hospitality scene (13), which I treat as one scene because it is nearly identical in all versions, like most of the rest of the narrative. It is only a few lines long. The Sun God invites the other gods to a feast, but the food and drink fail to satisfy them because of the withdrawal of Telipinu/the Storm God.⁵⁰ It is this occasion which provokes their search.

Conclusions

The Hittite hospitality scenes treated here almost all concern hospitality between deities. Wherever the hospitality has a preserved context, it functions as an opportunity for the gods to

⁴⁷ Calvert Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 401-407.

⁴⁸ CTH 325. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 21-22.

⁴⁹ CTH 324. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 14-20, and Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur*, 97-103.

⁵⁰ A version of this myth has also been found in Palaic, a poorly known language closely related to Hittite. The Palaic text may explicitly call the gods guests, according to the interpretation of the word *mārhas* in Ilya Yakubovich, "Were Hittite Kings Divinely Anointed? A Palaic Invocation to the Sun-God and Its Significance for Hittite Religion," *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 5, no. 1 (2005): 118-119. I thank Craig Melchert for the reference.

discuss their problems and conflicts and form alliances – divine networking, we could call it. This function characterizes not only the Hurro-Hittite Kumarbi myths, where hospitality scenes are best attested, but other types of narrative as well, lending strength to Bachvarova’s argument that the lost portions of (7) contained a discussion among the gods of how to resolve problems facing them. Hospitality is attested mostly between deities even in myths where the doings of humans determine a good deal of the plot, as in *The Song of Release* and *Appu*. The only example of hospitality between humans is (8) in *Gurpāranzahu*. It has the same function of allowing characters to form alliances as the divine hospitality scenes; the marriage of Gurpāranzahu and Tatizuli seems particularly analogous to the marriage of Kumarbi and Sertapsuruhi arranged in (1).

The Structure of Hittite Hospitality Scenes

Introduction

Steve Reece isolates from Homeric hospitality type-scenes a basic structure of twenty-four elements, which he subdivides further to make a total of thirty-eight. The rest of his book relies on this basic list as its framework for discussion. As I will refer to Reece’s list frequently, especially in chapter 4, it is worth reproducing here in full:⁵¹

- I. Maiden at the well/Youth on the road
- II. Arrival at the destination
- III. Description of the surroundings
 - a. Of the residence
 - b. Of (the activities of) the person sought
 - c. Of (the activities of) the others
- IV. Dog at the door
- V. Waiting at the threshold
- VI. Supplication
- VII. Reception

⁵¹ Reece, *Stranger’s Welcome*, 6-7. Carolyn Higbie applies similar methodology to some of the same material with similar results in *Heroes’ Names, Heroic Identities* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1995), p. 73-74.

- a. Host catches sight of the visitor
- b. Host hesitates to offer hospitality
- c. Host rises from his seat
- d. Host approaches the visitor
- e. Host attends to the visitor's horses
- f. Host takes the visitor by the hand
- g. Host bids the visitor welcome
- h. Host takes the visitor's spear
- i. Host leads the visitor in
- VIII. Seat
- IX. Feast
 - a. Preparation
 - b. Consumption
 - c. Conclusion
- X. After-dinner drink
- XI. Identification
 - a. Host questions the visitor
 - b. Visitor reveals his identity
- XII. Exchange of information
- XIII. Entertainment
- XIV. Visitor pronounces a blessing on the host
- XV. Visitor shares in a libation or sacrifice
- XVI. Visitor asks to be allowed to sleep
- XVII. Bed
- XVIII. Bath
- XIX. Host detains the visitor
- XX. Guest-gifts
- XXI. Departure meal
- XXII. Departure libation
- XXIII. Farewell blessing
- XXIV. Departure omen and interpretation
- XXV. Escort to visitor's next destination

Similarly, from my analysis of the Hittite hospitality scenes that I have just discussed, I have abstracted a descriptive list of narrative elements or motifs that occur repeatedly in them.

Throughout this thesis I will use the list as a framework both for the discussion of Hittite hospitality scenes on their own terms and for comparison with other traditions:

- 1. Invitation
- 2. Journey
 - III. Questions about the visitor
 - IV. Arrival
 - a. Arrival at a location

- b. Arrival at a person
- c. Arrival at a building
- V. Preparations
 - a. Chair, tables, and/or stool
 - b. Food and/or drink served
- VI. Visitor is upset
 - a. Visitor refuses chair, table, and cup
 - b. Host takes offense
- VII. Host questions visitor
- VIII. Visitor tells news
- IX. Host assigns seats
- X. Eating and drinking
- XI. Host responds
- XII. Departure

All the elements in the list appear in at least two hospitality scenes, and they always appear in this order, except that III cannot be ordered relative to I and II; VIII relative to VII; VI relative to VII, VII, and IX; or XI relative to X because they never occur in the same scene.⁵²

I. Invitation

A host can initiate a hospitality sequence by inviting the guest or guests to a feast using the command *eḥu* “come!” (CTH 348.I.1.75, 86; CTH 345.I.1.58; CTH 321.30) or *tīya(tten)* “come (sg./pl.)” (CTH 345.I.1.57; CTH 321.11). The invitation can be delivered by the host’s vizier as in (3) and (4), or in person as in (12). (13) does not specify the method. (4) reports the invitation message twice, first as given to the vizier and then as delivered by him, with the two passages identical word for word most of the way through, whereas (3) omits the delivery. (12) in fact contains two invitations, one for all the gods and one for the serpent.

II. Journey

The journey is attested only from the Kumarbi Cycle. The visitor gets up: *šarā ḥ[ūdak arāiš]*, “[he] q[uickly rose] up” (CTH 348.I.1.77, CTH 345.I.3.1.104), or *šarā tīyat*, “he got up”

⁵² I include in the appendix synopses of each hospitality scene in terms of the narrative elements from the list present in it.

(CTH 345.I.1.59). Then the visitor goes to the destination: *iyat*, “he went” (CTH 348.I.1.78), *iyanniyat*, “he started to go” (CTH 345.I.1.62). Although journeys take only a few lines to narrate, their phraseology is relatively stable from example to example.

III. Questions About the Visitor

This motif has a peculiar association with the Storm God and the Sun God, since it is found only in the two hospitality scenes where the Storm God is the host and the Sun God is the visitor, in the *Song of Ullikummi* (5) and in *Appu* (10). The Storm God and his vizier Tasmisu question each other in alarm when they see the Sun God approaching. Evidently, he does not often visit the Storm God’s dwelling. In (5) Tasmisu remarks to the Storm God on the Sun God’s visit and in (10) the Storm God does the same to Tasmisu. The wording of the two passages is almost entirely different, but they have similar content and structure. The narrator presents the scene from the commenter’s point of view, introducing it with ^dUTU-*un IGI-anda aušta*, “he saw the Sun God in front of him” (this wording is from 345.I.1.221, but it recurs with only a few additions in 360.1.63). First comes a surprised exclamation that the Sun God is coming. A series of speculations about what kind of disaster could have occasioned the visit follows, immediately in (10) and soon in (5). As it happens, in (5) the Sun God is actually coming to report a disaster, namely the existence of Ullikummi, but in (10) nothing particularly upsetting has occurred. The loss of most of the rest of (10) and the following context makes it hard to assess the significance of this motif, but the similarity between the two scenes, which Haas notes,⁵³ speaks in favor of assigning *Appu* to the Hurrian tradition.

⁵³ Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur*, 196-197.

IVa-c. Arrival.

The texts often narrate a visitor's arrival at the destination in two or three steps, narrowing down from more general terms of spatial reference to more specific ones. (8) includes all three of the steps that I list. (6), (8), and (11) all mention a relatively extended location (Aya's city of Abzūwa, the sources of the river Māla, and the city of Akkad, respectively). Next in the sequence comes reference to the person sought, namely the Sea in (3) and Elkunirsa in (8). The most specific reference is the building in which the visitor finds the host: the Sea's house in (4), Ea's house in (6) and Elkunirsa's tent in (8). For entering the building, all three examples use the verb *pait* "he went," (CTH 342.I.1.10, CTH 345.I.1.63, CTH 345.I.3.1.108)

Va. Chair, table, stool

In almost all the hospitality scenes from the Hurro-Hittite myths, when a visitor arrives, the host has servants provide the guest with furniture to use. This phase of the hospitality sequence can appear as part of the narration or as the host's instructions in direct discourse. The examples tend to use similar phraseology. The longest recurring formula, and typical in its vocabulary, is *ašanna=šši* ^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A-*an tiyandu*, *adanna=ma=šši* ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-*un unuwandu*, "let them bring a chair for him/her to sit on, and let them set a table for him/her to eat from," attested in full form at CTH 345.I.1.232-233 and almost certainly CTH 348.I.5.10-11 and with partial parallels at CTH 345.I.1.65-66 and CTH 348.I.1.94-96. (7) also has the visitor seated on a ^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A. Instead of a chair, the host may seat the visitor on a ^{GIŠ}*haššalli* "stool" (CTH 345.I.1.65). Scenes (1) and (7) include mention of a footstool; unfortunately, the word for it is missing from the text in (1), but (7) uses ^{GIŠ}GÌR.GUB (KBo XXXII 13 Vs. II 7).

Vb. Food and/or Drink

Along with the furniture, a host can provide food and drink, as already suggested by the phrase *adanna* ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-*un* “a table to eat from.” (7) lists the immense quantities of meat that Istanu serves (KBo XXXII 13 Vs. II 15-20), but the other examples give more emphasis to the drink, which can be GEŠTIN “wine” (CTH 345.I.1.70, CTH 321.14). Servants provide (*uder*, “they brought in,” CTH 345.I.1.69-70 and KBo XXXII 13 Vs. II 24) the food and drink, among them ^{LÚ.MEŠ}SAGI “cupbearers” and ^{LÚ.MEŠ}MUḪALDIM “cooks” (CTH 345.I.1.69-70, KBo XXXII 13 Vs. II 21-22).

Via. Visitor Refuses Chair, Table, and Cup

This motif occurs in (2) and (5), the two surviving scenes from the Kumarbi cycle where a deity brings the Storm God news of a monstrous son of Kumarbi. The visitor is so disturbed by the news that he or she is bringing as to refuse the chair and the meal. The wording echoes the instructions to provide the chair and table. (5) narrates it as follows: *ašanna=šši* ^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A-*an tiyēr, n=aš=z ŪL [eš]at. adanna=[m]a=šši* ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-*un unuēr, nu=kan parā ŪL šal[ikt]a. GAL-in=ši pier, nu=ššan pūrin ŪL dāi[š],* “They brought him a chair to sit on, but he did not [sit]. They set a table for him to eat from, but he did not to[uc]h it. They gave him a cup, but [he did] not put his lip to it” (CTH 345.I.1.236-241). (3) has almost the same formulaic passage, with only a few minor words varying (CTH 348.I.5.15-20).

Vib. Host Takes Offense

When the visitor refuses hospitality, the Storm God as host responds with shocked questions about the reason. Here (2) and (5) diverge. In (5), he asks the Sun God if he should blame the incompetence of his servants. In (2), the questions are different, but the passage is too damaged to understand them well.

VII. Host Questions the Visitor

In (10), the Storm God questions the Sun God after offering food and drink, and in (11) Elkunirsa questions the Storm God as soon as he arrives. Both cases use related vocabulary for questioning: *n=an pūnušta*, “he questioned him” (CTH 342.1.1.12), and *n=an pu[nuškiwan dāiš]* “[he began to questi]on him” (CTH 360.1.74). Elkunirsa’s question in (11) is simply [*kuit=wa*] *uwaš* “[Why] have you come?” (CTH 342.1.1.13). The Storm God’s question in (10) seems to be two cola long but is mostly lost (CTH 360.1.75-76).

VIII. Visitor Tells News

In a number of scenes the visitor’s explanation of what brought him or her survives, though sometimes only very fragmentarily. As far as the condition of the text allows us to tell, he or she normally brings news of a threat concerning both himself or herself and the host. Some such passage must have occurred in the lost sections of (6), another hospitality scene with uninvited visitors. Because the plot of the story heavily involves the content of the visitor’s speech, the absence of repeated wording from example to example is unsurprising.

IX. Host Assigns Seats

When the host has multiple visitors, he or she decides where they should sit. Two scenes attest the motif, (7) and (8). Both of them note it in order to point out significant choices about who will sit next to whom. In (7), Istanu assigns the Storm God a seat next to the Elder Gods, deities whom he banished to the underworld: *karūliuš=ma=z DINGIR^{MEŠ}-uš^dIM-aš ZAG-az ašašta*, “And she seated the Elder Gods on the Storm God’s right” (KBo XXXII 13 Vs. II 26-27). In (8), Impākru seats Gurpāranzahu next to him as a sign of his betrothal to Tatizuli: [*ZA*]G-*naz=an=z=an awan katta ašešanut^mgurpāranzahun apel^{LÚ}HATANI-ŠU*, “he sat Gurrpāranzahu, his son-in-law, down on his ri[ght]” (CTH 362.1.16).

X. Eating and Drinking

Feasting constitutes one of the most frequently attested elements of Hittite hospitality scenes, perhaps not surprisingly, but still remarkably, considering that food and drink matter less than exchanges of information and loyalty in terms of both character motivation and significance for the plot. The texts normally narrate feasts by collocating the roots *et-* “eat” and *eku-* “drink” – again, not at all a surprising phrase, but still one repeated with such frequency and such resistance to variation that it deserves to be considered a characteristic quasi-formula⁵⁴: for example, *nu=z eter ekue[r]* “they ate and dr[a]nk (CTH 321.32), *nu=z azzikkanzi akkuškanzi* “they are eating and drinking” (CTH 348.I.1.99), *eter=šmaš ekuer*, “they ate and drank with each other” (CTH 362.1.17). One further peculiarity of narrative technique involves counting how many times the characters drink or eat: *1-ŠU ekuer*, *2-ŠU ekuer*, *3-ŠU ekuer*, *4-ŠU ekuer*, *5-ŠU ekuer*, *6-ŠU ekuer*, *7-ŠU ekuer* “they drank once, they drank twice, they drank three times, they drank four times, they drank six times, they drank seven times” (CTH 345.I.1.71-77), or the same phrase without the verb at CTH 362.4.40.

XI. Host Responds

In (6) and (11), where the visitor has come to ask the host for help, the host’s advice concludes the scene. Ea promises the cutting tool to the Storm God and Tasmisu, and Elkunirsa tells the Storm God to threaten Ašertu. In both cases, as far as the condition of the text allows us to tell, the visitor follows the advice to good effect. Although some of the words are lost, a standard speech formula, also common in other contexts throughout these works, seems to introduce the advice: [A-nominative] [B-dative] EGIR-*pa memiskewan dāiš*, “A began to answer B” (CTH 342.1.1.32, CTH 345.I.3.1.137).

⁵⁴ A formula in the strict sense belongs to a metrical composition, and not all the Hittite compositions are known to be metrical.

XII. Departure

Only two scenes narrate the departure of a visitor as we have them, (1) and (5) from the Kumarbi Cycle, though other passages where we might expect one break off before the end of the hospitality scene. In (5), the Sun God leaves the Storm God immediately after eating and without ceremony. In (1), nightfall prompts the Sea to leave Kumarbi and he goes with a procession of music-playing attendants. Both go to their own homes.

Conclusions

The hospitality scenes of Hittite mythological texts are type-scenes, units “dependent (a) on a definite grouping of actions or elements and (b) on a recurrent phraseological content.”⁵⁵ They draw much of their content from a limited pool of narrative elements, and those elements even recur in the same sequence. No doubt the total absence of contradiction found in this study is an artifact of the small sample size and the fragmentary condition of so many scenes, and if we had more hospitality scenes some variation would appear, but for even this much material to allow a non-contradictory ordering is a notable degree of consistency. A larger sample would also probably allow us to find more repeating elements. The preparations for a feast and its consumption recur with particular frequency, with the first possibly limited to Hurro-Hittite stories and the second clearly found in other myths too. Besides the parallels in structure, we have numerous repetitions and near-repetitions of phrases or sentences between scenes, sometimes associated with a particular narrative element of the hospitality scene and sometimes not. Even so, the scenes display a good deal of variety, in part by using different subsets of the elements on my list.

⁵⁵ Foley, *Oral Epic*, 247.

CHAPTER 2

NARRATIVE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STRUCTURE OF HITTITE HOSPITALITY SCENES

Now that chapter 1 has established the basic content and typical phrasing of the elements of Hittite hospitality scenes, this chapter will go on to characterize their narrative function within the scenes and texts where they occur, so far as the fragmentary condition of the tablets allows. I group together elements that are dependent on each other or alternative ways of accomplishing the same purpose. The discussion shows that hospitality scenes include preparations and feasting most consistently, while some of the other elements belong to particular subtypes of hospitality scene.

I. Invitation

A broad distinction exists between what I will call visitor-initiated scenes, where the visitor takes the initiative in moving the plot forward, and host-initiated scenes, where the host plays the more active role. In theory, host-initiated scenes should always contain the action of invitation, though the poor condition of our texts means that it is often not preserved. We have two invitations from the Kumarbi Cycle and two from Anatolian myths.

In the Kumarbi Cycle we find them in (3) addressed from Kumarbi to the Sea and in (4) addressed from the Sea to Kumarbi. The host makes the invitation into a speech of considerable length and tailors it to indicate the hierarchical relationship between himself and the guest. Kumarbi's invitation is a forceful command, taking the Sea's compliance for granted:

*eḫu! ḫalzeššai=wa=tta DINGIR^{MES}-aš attāš^d kumarbiš.
 uddanī=ma=wa=tta kuedani ḫalziššai, nu=wa uttar liliwan.
 nu=wa ḫūdak eḫu!*

“Come! The father of gods, Kumarbi, is calling you. The matter for which he is calling you is urgent. Come quickly!” (CTH 348.I.1.82-86)

On the other hand, when the Sea invites Kumarbi to his house, he takes care to express it submissively:

*kuwat=wa É-ri menaḫḫanda ka[rtimmiy]auwanz wet? nu=wa É-er
 katkattimaš ēpta, SAG.GÉME.ARAD^{MES}=ya naḫšaraz ēpta,
 [amm]ukk=a=wa=kan [...] tuk=wa IGI-anda^{GIŠ}ERIN-pi karū
 duwarnan, TU₇^{HL.A}=ya=tta menaḫḫanda karū zanuwan,
 tuk=ma=wa IGI-anda^{KAM}UD^{KAM}-ti GE₆^{KAM}-ti=ya
 LÚ.MES^{NAR}=ma=wa[!] GIŠ^dINANNA^{HL.A} menaḫḫanda tiššan
 ḫarkanzi.*

“Why has he come a[ng]ry against the house? Trembling has seized the house and awe has seized the servants and I [. . .] Cedar has already been broken for you and soups have already been cooked for you, and musicians hold lyres readied for you by day and night.” (CTH 345.I.1.50-56)

The native Anatolian myths of the *Text of the Purulli* and the *Disappearance of Telipinu* provide much more cursory invitations, in the *Text of the Purulli* a simple *anda=ma=pa tīyatten!* (“Come in!”) (CTH 321.11) and *kāša=wa EZEN₄-an iyami. nu=wa adanna akuwanna eḫu.* (“Now I will make a feast. Come eat and drink.”) (CTH 321.29-30), while the *Disappearance of Telipinu* does not report the invitation in direct speech at all. These invitations do not express the relative hierarchical status of the host and the guests. Furthermore, they are given in different contexts from those in the Kumarbi Cycle. The hospitality scenes from Anatolian myths involve multiple guests, and the host has no overt motive for organizing them except entertainment, whereas the Kumarbi Cycle scenes have only one guest, and the guest and host know beforehand that they have a problem to discuss.

Of other scenes, (8) from *Gurpāranzaḥu* and probably (7) from the *Song of Release* are host-initiated and presumably contained an invitation somewhere in the missing portions. (2), (5), (6), (9), (10), and (11) are clearly visitor-initiated, while (1) is an unclear case. The treatment of the other narrative actions of the Hittite hospitality scene in the rest of this section will pay attention to whether they occur in host-initiated or visitor-initiated passages.

II, IV. Journey and Arrival

Though many hospitality scenes have fragmentary beginnings, only (12) and (13) clearly do not contain a journey or an arrival. These two scenes are the ones from extremely compressed indigenous Anatolian narratives. It is possible that Hurro-Hittite and Semito-Hittite hospitality scenes always included a journey, an arrival, or both. The narrative focus immediately preceding the hospitality scene always seems to be on the visitor, and so following the visitor's journey provides a natural way of transitioning into the visit. In visitor-initiated scenes, the focus is on the visitor because of whatever events motivate the visit, and in host-initiated scenes, narrating the invitation transfers the focus to the visitor even if the host's activities were being narrated before, as seems to be the case for the Sea's invitation to Kumarbi in (4).

III. Questions about the Visitor

As already mentioned, this element belongs to visitor-initiated scenes where the Sun God is the visitor and the Storm God is the host. The principal interpretative question that its two attestations raise is what makes the Storm God and Tasmisu so worried. In hospitality scene (5), from the *Song of Ullikummi*, the events end up justifying their concern. The Sun God has in fact seen a worrisome development and is coming to report it. But in (10), from *Appu*, he has come after granting a son to Appu, which seems not to entail any such catastrophe as his hosts speculate about. Haas, in commenting on the two passages, suggests that the author of *Appu*

modeled the entire hospitality scene on (5) or a scene like it (he does not specify), leaving the host's questions as a stranded element without the narrative relevance it had in its original context: "Da ein Besuch des Sonnengottes eine nahende Katastrophe anzeigt, paßt das Motiv nicht sonderlich in diese Erzählung; es gibt aber einen Einblick in die Art der Textkompilation."⁵⁶

However, the Storm God's alarm in *Appu* could have more relevance than is obvious from the text as we have it. The Storm God applies an epithet to the Sun God that resonates thematically with his worry, calling him ^d[UT]U-uš KUR-*eantaš* ^{LÚ}SIPA.UDU-*aš* ("[the Su]n God, shepherd of the country") (CTH 360.1.65). In (5), Tasmisu likewise applies an epithet to him including KUR-*e*- "country," though the rest of it is lost (CTH 345.I.1.223). These descriptors allude to a well-known aspect of the Sun God derived from the Mesopotamian tradition, his "central function as 'shepherd of mankind' who sees everything and exerts his judgment over all living creatures."⁵⁷ Thus, it seems that the Storm God's worry at seeing the Sun God stems from the Sun God's particular responsibility as governor of the earth, a responsibility which means that only some disastrous violation of justice could make him call on the Storm God.

The Sun God's role as guarantor of justice on earth plays a particularly important role in *Appu*. The text opens with a proem hymning a deity of justice whose name is missing, but who very likely is the Sun God, as Haas believes:⁵⁸

[... *h*]an[dand]uš ^{LÚ}MES-uš *kuiš šar[l]iškezzi. hūwappaš[=a=k]an*
^{LÚ}MES-uš *GIŠ-ru mān lilakki; hūwapp[uš]=a=kan* ^{LÚ}MES-naš
tarnaš=šmaš šakšakiluš walḥannai; [t]=uš ḥarnikzi.

⁵⁶ Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur*, 197.

⁵⁷ Itamar Singer, *Muwatalli's Prayer to the Assembly of Gods through the Storm-God of Lightning (CTH 381)* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1996), 149.

⁵⁸ Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur*, 195.

. . . who up[r]aises [r]ig[hteo]us people. Evil people he chops down like wood; evi[l] people he beats on the head as ?s; he destroys them. (CTH 360.1.2-5)

Furthermore, the Sun God's role as judge of the earth comes into play later in the text, as he attempts to enforce justice against Wrong's attempts to cheat his brother Right. It is reasonable to speculate that the Sun God anticipates that granting a son to Appu will somehow give rise to a conflict and that he goes to the Storm God to discuss it. At any rate, the break in the text must have contained some further explanation to clarify why, despite the Sun God's specification that Appu will have one son, he ends up with two sons. The element of questions about the visitor is clearly proper to hospitality scenes involving the Sun God, which perhaps formed a distinctive subtype of hospitality scene, and it responds to his characteristic role within the Hittite pantheon as judge of the earth.

V. Preparations

Preparations for the visitor's comfort occur in all the hospitality scenes except (6), (8), (11), and (13), regardless of whether they are host-initiated or visitor-initiated. They always follow immediately on the visitor's arrival. As (10) attests, a host who gives orders to prepare for a visitor does so even before questioning him, even though in this scene the Storm God as host is so worried by the Sun God's arrival that he has shared his alarmed speculations with his vizier. In scenes where the visitor is upset and refuses the chair, table, and cup, the host's instructions to provide them prepare for that narrative element. But much the same instructions can occur in scenes that clearly do not contain the upset visitor element, like (4), where the Sea commands:

ANA ^d*kumarbi*=*wa* ^{GIŠ}*haššalli ašanna tiyandu* ^{GIŠ}*BANŠUR-un*
 =*ma*=*w[a]*=*šši peran tiyandu. adanna*=*wa*=*šš[i a]kuwanna*
udandu, KAŠ-eššar=*ma*=*wa*=*šši akuwanna udandu.*

“Let them place a stool for Kumarbi to sit on and let them place a table before him. Let them bring (things) for hi[m] to eat and [d]rink, and let them bring beer for him to drink.” (CTH 345.I.1.65-68)

In this case, as in others, the preparations lead smoothly into the feast itself. The preparations in (7) are narrated in anomalously great detail, taking up the majority of the substantial preserved text. The most likely explanation lies in the identity of the visitor. The unusual situation of a visit from the king of the gods requires unusually elaborate preparations for his comfort.

VI-VII. Visitor is Upset and Host Questions Visitor

The Hittite myths use these two actions as alternative ways to introduce the visitor’s telling of news. The host may either ask the visitor’s business as soon as he arrives, or first offer a chair, table, and cup and infer that there is a problem when the visitor rejects them. It is not entirely clear what factors decide the choice between the two alternatives, but it is not simply a function of whether the visit involves a meal, since (10) includes preparations for a feast but has the host question the visitor. The upset visitor seems to be the more marked choice, as it is narrated much more elaborately, and both examples of it occur in the Kumarbi Cycle with deities reporting offspring of Kumarbi to the Storm God. It could be that this action is specific to the Hurrian tradition or to the Kumarbi myths in particular. Alternatively, the writers may have chosen to reserve this element for when they wanted to convey the fear generated in the visitor by the sight of a monster and had the host question the visitors whose consternation was less extreme. (1), which is a generally anomalous example of the element of the visitor telling news, is the only one that has neither a questioning host nor an upset visitor.

VIII. Visitor Tells News

The action of the visitor telling news to the host occurs in (1), (2), and (5) from the Kumarbi Cycle, (10) from *Appu*, and (11) from *Elkunirsa and Asertu*. It is thus heavily

associated with visitor-initiated hospitality scenes. Of the remaining visitor-initiated scenes, 6) and 9), 6) certainly had the visiting Storm God and Tasmisu tell Aya the news about the appearance of the Basalt, since after a gap in the text we find Aya giving them advice about how to meet the threat. 9), where the god of the Aranzaḫu River visits the Mother Goddess and the fate goddesses or Gulsas after conferring with Gurpāranzaḫu in Akkad, could easily have had this action too, although not enough is left of the text to provide clear evidence.

In visitor-initiated scenes, the visitor always comes as a suppliant or subordinate to the host, which is not necessarily the case in host-initiated scenes. Since most or all visitor-initiated scenes include news from the visitor, it seems that Hittite myths normally assumed that subordinate deities would only visit their superiors uninvited if they had important information to provide or important requests to make. The transfer of information can provide an opportunity for the narrator to switch from tracking the visitor before the hospitality scene to tracking the host afterward. It is used that way in both the hospitality scenes from the *Song of Ullikummi*, though in *Elkunirsa and Asertu* the narrative focus remains on the Storm God both before and after. (1), where the Sea uses his visit to Kumarbi to give him permission to marry his daughter, may not be visitor-initiated and does not seem to have similarities with the other examples of news from the visitor, but it is too poorly preserved to allow much analysis.

IX. Host Assigns Seats

This element occurs in (7), from the *Song of Release*, and (8), from *Gurpāranzaḫu*, both of which seem to be host-initiated hospitality scenes. Because the host has invited multiple guests, he or she has the option of marking distinctions among them through seating. Both examples remark specifically on which visitor sits on whose right. (8) explains the decision to

have Gurpāranzaḥu sit on Impākru's right through his status as Impākru's son-in-law, suggesting that it is honorable to sit on the right of the host, or of someone with high status, or both.

(7) shows that when a visitor had higher status than the host, the seat on that visitor's right is the one that matters. Here, the Storm God, king of the pantheon, plays the role of guest. Istanu of the Earth recognizes his social superiority by personally serving as his cupbearer. The position of cupbearer has connotations of subservience, as seen in the *Song of Kumarbi*, where Anu serves as Alalu's cupbearer before rebelling against him (CTH 344.11-13), and Kumarbi in turn serves as Anu's cupbearer during his reign as king of heaven (CTH 344.22-24). By seating the Elder Gods on the Storm God's right, Istanu of the Earth evidently means to give some special honor to them. Because of the lack of surrounding context for this scene, we unfortunately cannot tell what her motives are, whether she has the Storm God's cooperation, or what the outcome is.

X. Eating and Drinking

The wide representation of the motif of eating and drinking lets us see how much its function can vary. In the Kumarbi cycle, it normally marks a section break in the small-scale narrative structure of the scene. Either the resolution of a narrative sequence immediately before the meal or the opening of a new one immediately afterward, or both, can always be identified.

The eating and drinking action occurs in host-initiated scenes (3) and (4) in the Kumarbi cycle. In both, a short sequence of causes and effects carries the narrative from the action of invitation through journey, arrival, and preparations, culminating in the feast. Kumarbi then initiates a new narrative sequence by giving instructions to his vizier Mukisanu, though he is the Sea's host in (3) and his guest in (4). From this it seems that the dialogue following eating and drinking introduced the part of the hospitality scene that advanced the plot, and that its structure

was motivated by global considerations of plot and characterization external to the type-scene.

(5) is a visitor-initiated scene where the Sun God is willing to eat and drink only after delivering the news of his discovery of Hedammu. The meal and his subsequent departure constitute a rest in the narrative, after which the story resumes with the conference of the Storm God and Ištar discussing what to do about the threat.

In (8), eating and drinking occurs alongside a shooting contest and sleep, entertainments that collectively fulfill the same purpose as the meal in the Kumarbi Cycle hospitality scenes. Although the context for the scene is missing, it appears to be host-initiated. Whatever narrative sequence led up to the meal, contest, and sleep must end at that point, since there follows a dialogue between characters which appears to introduce a new conflict, in this case between the guest, Gurpāranzaḥu, and his wife, Tatizuli.

In the Anatolian myths of the snake-killing and the disappearing god, the meal itself forms part of a narrative sequence rather than marking a rest. In the *Text of the Purulli*, Inara makes the meal a weapon by getting the snake drunk to render him helpless. In the disappearing god myths, the meal becomes the conflict that initiates a new sequence. The gods' inability to satisfy their hunger and thirst makes their need for the disappeared god evident and provokes them to search for him.

XI. Host Responds

The response from the host is another optional element belonging with the cluster of elements related to the news from the visitor in visitor-initiated scenes. Our two examples suggest that it is only included when the visitor has reported something that threatens him personally – Ullikummi in (6) and Asertu's sexual harassment in (10). In (5), where the Sun God has at first refused a chair, table, and cup, the host's response is replaced by a passage in which

he soothes the visitor and induces him to eat and drink. Probably this variant of the eating and drinking element provided a conventional alternative to the host's response, designed to appear specifically in those scenes that had an upset visitor.

XII. Departure

In (1) and (5), the only scenes that preserve the element of departure, it serves to show the visitor's contentment. In (1), the Sea has just offered his daughter in marriage to Kumarbi and Kumarbi has accepted. In (5), the Sun God has just been persuaded to eat after being agitated by the sight of Ullikummi. *Elkunirsa and Asertu* (11) narrates the Storm God's progress to his next destination rather than from Elkunirsa's tent, which reduces the implication of closure. Unlike arrival, the narration of departure is certainly not a simple consequence of narrative focus on the visitor, since *The Song of Ullikummi* tells of the Sun God's departure at the end of (5) and then returns to the Storm God, who was his host.

Conclusions

Hittite hospitality scenes usually contain two well-attested core elements, namely preparations and feasting, filled out with various less frequent elements. Any hospitality scene can be classified as visitor-initiated or host-initiated, and an identifiable subtype of visitor-initiated scenes contain a sequence of either the visitor being upset or the host questioning the visitor, followed by the visitor telling news, optionally followed by the host responding. Other elements also show signs of narrative significance, but the fragmentary condition of the texts obscures their interrelationships.

CHAPTER 3

ETYMOLOGIES OF KEY TERMS IN GREEK AND HITTITE HOSPITALITY SCENES

This chapter discusses the etymologies of words typical of hospitality scenes from the Homeric poems and Hittite mythological texts. The analysis focuses on words that belong to the two elements found most consistently in the Hittite scenes and also common in Homer, the preparation of furniture for the visitor and the consumption of the feast. I also include the element of catching sight of a visitor, which belongs to a well-developed complex of elements in Homer (the reception, divided by Reece into a total of nine sub-elements) and is marginally distinguishable in Hittite. Despite the commonalities in structure and content, Hittite and Greek seem to have developed their vocabulary for hospitality scenes independently.

Seeing the Guest: Greek ὁράω/ἴδον, Hittite *au-*

The narrative element of a host catching sight of a visitor frequently occurs in Homeric hospitality scenes, usually narrated with forms of the ordinary Greek word for seeing, which suppletively alternates ὁράω in the present with ἴδον in the aorist.⁵⁹ Hittite hospitality scenes also make mention of hosts seeing visitors on three occasions: ^dUTU-*un* IGI-*anda aušta* (“he saw the Sun God in front of him”) (CTH 345.I.1.221), ^dUTU-*un=kan* ^dU-*aš* IGI-*anda* 3 DANNA *au[š]ta* (“The Storm God saw the Sun God in front of him at three DANNAs”) (CTH 360.1.63), [^d*elkun*]*iršaš* ^dU-*an aušta* (“[Elkun]irsa saw the Storm God”) (CTH 342.1.1.11). However, I have not included catching sight of the visitor with the narrative elements on my list because its position in the narrative sequence is not as consistent as theirs.

⁵⁹ Reece, *Stranger's Welcome*, 17.

The etymology of ὀράω is somewhat unclear. The initial *h* points to a preform with **s-*. A **w-* or **sw-* would explain the synchronically irregular augment found in the imperfect ἐώρων, but the Mycenaean participle *o-ro-me-no* contains no *w*.⁶⁰ The Greek word thus seems best explained by positing a Proto-Indo-European **ser-*, though acceptable semantic matches in other Indo-European languages can be found for both **wer-* and **serw-*.⁶¹ The aorist ἴδον transparently reflects Proto-Indo-European **wid-* “see.”⁶² The Hittite verb for “see,” *au-* or *u-* depending on ablaut, has a controversial etymology, but at any rate is not cognate with ὀράω or ἴδον⁶³ and the word provides no evidence on the origin of this feature of hospitality scenes.

Furniture

Both Homeric and Hittite hospitality scenes incorporate description of the furniture provided to a guest in preparation for the meal as part of their standard narrative structure. In Homer, depending on a visitor’s social status, he or she sits on a θρόνος (chair with an upright back), κλισμός (seat with a reclined back), or δίφορος (stool). A θρῆνυς (footstool) supports the visitor’s feet.⁶⁴ The table does not have the same prominence in Homer that it has in Hittite or that seats have in both Homeric and Hittite passages, but when it is mentioned Homer calls it τράπεζα. Though the etymologies of these Greek furniture terms are not completely clear, the words for seats seem to be derived using various deverbative formations, while τράπεζα is a denominative compound describing a table’s shape.

⁶⁰ Robert Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 2:1096; Pierre Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots* (Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1968-1980), 2:815.

⁶¹ Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, 2:814-815.

⁶² Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, 1:455.

⁶³ Kloekhorst, *Hittite Lexicon*, 228-229.

⁶⁴ Reece, *Stranger’s Welcome*, 21-22.

Indo-Europeanists most often assign θρόνος, the word for the upright chair found in the most developed formulae, to the root **dher-* “support.”⁶⁵ It is attested in Mycenaean as *to-no* and apparently in the compound *to-ro-no-wo-ko*.⁶⁶ The spelling *to-no* should not represent *thronos*, but could represent *thornos*; however, *to-ro-no-wo-ko* would more naturally be read as *thronoworgos* with *-ro-*.⁶⁷ Some researchers have even attempted to explain the varying Mycenaean spellings as attempts to represent a syllabic /r/ inherited from Proto-Greek and ultimately from Proto-Indo-European.⁶⁸ However, most think that Mycenaean did not have syllabic resonants, and so we should read the Mycenaean spellings as genuine representations of *thornos/thronoworgos*.

Explaining the origin of the *-ono-* has posed difficulties for accounts deriving θρόνος from *dher-*. Some have considered it a suffix, but no other clear examples of such a suffix occur.⁶⁹ On the other hand, a Proto-Greek **th̥ynos* or **thornos* would exhibit normal morphology with the Proto-Indo-European agentive suffix **-no-*. Thus, it makes most sense to see Mycenaean *thornos* as continuing the oldest form of the word. The metathesis in *thronoworgos* and alphabetic Greek θρόνος would have arisen by analogy with θρήνυς, which often occurs together with θρόνος both in Homer and in Mycenaean.⁷⁰

It may not be possible to decide whether **th̥ynos* or **thornos* is the more likely reconstruction for Proto-Greek. Most Homeric vocabulary comes from the Ionic dialect, in which

⁶⁵ Chantraine, *Langue grecque*, 1:443; Beekes, *Dictionary of Greek*, 1:558.

⁶⁶ Beekes, *Dictionary of Greek*, 1:558.

⁶⁷ Rémy Viredaz, “La graphie des groupes de consonnes en mycénien et en cypriote,” *Minos* 18 (1983): 140-141.

⁶⁸ See especially Alfred Heubeck, “Syllabic r in Mycenaean Greek?,” *Minos* 12 (1972): 55-79.

⁶⁹ Beekes, *Dictionary of Greek*, 1:558.

⁷⁰ Charles de Lamberterie, “*Sella, subsellium, meretrix*: sonantes-voyelles et ‘effet Saussure’ en grec ancien,” in *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, ed. J.H.W. Penney (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 241-242. My etymology mostly agrees with Viredaz, “Groupes de consonnes,” 172.

**r* became *ar* or *ra*. Although **thornos* could have developed into *θρόνος* in Ionic, assuming that the same metathesis occurred as in Mycenaean *thronoworgos*, **thynos* would have yielded **θράνος*. However, *or* could represent a normal phonetic development of **r* attributable to an “Achaean phase” in the pre-Homeric epic tradition.⁷¹ Metrical evidence at least gives no support to **thynos*, since as de Lamberterie shows, the Homeric poems normally treat *θρόνος* as CCVC-, and could sometimes even reflect a CVCC- structure as in **thornos*.⁷²

That brings up the question of *θρήνυς* “footstool” and its etymology. There is a long history of connecting it to *θρόνος* because of the formal and semantic similarity, a theory which Chantraine and de Lamberterie both support.⁷³ Again, however, the etymology raises formal problems. To Homeric *θρήνυς* “footstool” correspond Mycenaean *ta-ra-nu* “footstool” and Attic *θράνος* “bench.” These forms indicate a proto-Greek root **thrā-*, which if inherited would reflect Proto-Indo-European **dhreh₂-* or **dhrh₂-*. But we cannot reconstruct any such root for Proto-Indo-European. The **h₂* is compatible with Proto-Greek **thornos* from a supposed Proto-Indo-European **dhorh₂-no-*, but the Indo-Iranian comparanda reflect **dher-*, without a laryngeal.⁷⁴

Further, the semantic relationship between *θρόνος* and *θρήνυς/θράνος* really creates more problems than it solves for an etymological connection between the two words. Allegedly, they reflect nearly parallel formations (**dhorh₂-no-* and **dhrh₂-no-* or **dhrh₂-nu-*), both

⁷¹ I thank Jared Klein for pointing out this possibility to me. The Achaean phase is often invoked to explain archaisms, such as lines that scan with *r*. However, the Homeric *Kunstsprache* also sometimes seems to share innovations with Arcado-Cypriot. For an example, namely the development **es-went-* > *-ηεντ-*, see C.J. Ruigh, “Les origines proto-mycéniennes de la tradition épique,” in *Hommage à Milman Parry: Le style formulaire de l’épopée homérique et la théorie de l’oralité poétique*, ed. Françoise Létoublon (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1997), 36.

⁷² de Lamberterie, “Sonantes-voyelles,” 243-246.

⁷³ Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, 1:443; de Lamberterie, “Sonantes-voyelles,” 246-249.

⁷⁴ Beekes, *Dictionary of Greek*, 1:552.

etymologically meaning “holder” or “support.”⁷⁵ Taken singly, the attested meanings “chair” and “footstool” both make sense in this light. However, the chair and footstool form a complementary pair which speakers would naturally have mentioned together, and which we in fact find mentioned together in both Mycenaean and later dialects. It would have been confusing for speakers of pre-Greek to call both the chair and the footstool by nearly identical words that both meant “holder.” We should expect speakers to have avoided such a situation and reconstruct it only on unambiguous evidence. Since the actual formal evidence is already difficult to reconcile with an etymological connection, it makes more sense to connect only θρόνος with **dher-*. θρῆνυς must represent a separate root whose only connection with θρόνος is its analogical influence on the cluster θρ-.

κλισμός has a comparatively transparent etymology. It literally means “a tilt,” derived from the verbal root κλι- found in κλίνω “I tilt,” and ultimately from Proto-Indo-European **kl(e)i-*.⁷⁶ The remaining Homeric word for “chair,” δίφορος, has a less obvious derivation than κλισμός, but without as much controversy as θρόνος. Researchers agree on an etymological meaning “double-carried,” δί- from Proto-Indo-European **dwi-* “twice” compounded with φορ- from Proto-Indo-European **bhr-o-* with the zero grade of **bher-* “carry.” The seat would have had two handles by which two people could carry it. τράπεζα “table” shows a reasonably obvious compounding of some form of **k^wetwor-* “four” with **ped-* “foot.”⁷⁷ Proto-Greek would have had it as **typeya*, as shown by Mycenaean *to-pe-za*, to be read *torpeza*.⁷⁸

Logographic spelling, the lexicographer’s curse, obscures most of the Hittite vocabulary for furniture. Words for “chair” are ordinarily spelled ^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A. The Sumerogram can represent

⁷⁵ de Lamberterie, “Sonants-voyelles,” 247.

⁷⁶ Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, 1:544; Beekes, *Dictionary of Greek*, 1:717.

⁷⁷ Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, 2:1129; Beekes, *Dictionary of Greek*, 2:1499.

⁷⁸ Beekes, *Dictionary of Greek*, 2:1499.

keshi-, a loanword from Hurrian (likely from Sumerian *gu.za* “throne” to begin with).⁷⁹

However, the seat provided for Ištar in (2), the one for the Sun God in (5), and the one for the Sea in (3) all appear in the accusative singular with the phonetic complement *-an*, implying an a-stem common noun underlying the Sumerogram. Possibly, then, all the uses of ^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A in hospitality scenes conceal some unknown Hittite word.

^{GIŠ}BANŠUR “table” presents us with a similar enigma. Tischler suggests that it could represent Hittite *papu-*, which agrees with the u-stem phonetic complements found in the texts.⁸⁰ However, *papu-* is only certainly attested in one passage, and its meaning and etymology are both uncertain.⁸¹

In (4), Kumarbi sits on a stool, written ^{GIŠ}*hassalli*, rather than a chair. Puhvel explains this word as “bearer,” from *has-* “give birth,” since one of the uses of the stool is for women to sit on while giving birth.⁸² Tischler does not venture an etymology,⁸³ but approves of Howard Berman’s suggestion that the connection with *has-* is one of folk etymology.⁸⁴ *hassalli* seems to underlie some but not all occurrences of ^{GIŠ}GÌR.GUB “footstool.”⁸⁵ ^{GIŠ}GÌR.GUB occurs as the spelling for “footstool” in (7) from the *Song of Release* (KBo XXXII 13 Vs. II 8), but without anything to indicate the underlying Hittite word. In line with his proposed etymology, Puhvel regards the ^{GIŠ}*hassalli* as a specifically feminine seat, even outside its obstetric use, observing,

⁷⁹ Johann Tischler, *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 1983-), 1:590.

⁸⁰ Tischler, *Hethitisches Glossar*, 2:431.

⁸¹ Kloekhorst, *Hittite Lexicon*, 629; see also *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, ed. Hans G. Güterbock and Harry A. Hoffner (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1980-), P:108.

⁸² Jaan Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary* (Berlin: Mouton, 1984-), 3:128-129.

⁸³ Tischler, *Hethitisches Glossar*, 1:167.

⁸⁴ Tischler, *Hethitisches Glossar*, 1:197; Howard Berman, “The Stem Formation of Hittite Nouns and Adjectives” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1972), 128.

⁸⁵ Puhvel, *Hittite Dictionary*, 3:128-129.

“Kumarbi is the only attested male to be offered one [in hospitality scene (4) from the *Song of Ullikummi*], and he was capable of pregnancy.”⁸⁶ However, the passage in question makes no other reference to the ambiguous gendering of Kumarbi, and in the absence of certainty regarding where ^{GIS}*hassalli* underlies Sumerograms, it is risky to speculate about its gender connotations.

Feasting: Greek δαίνυμι, πίνω, ἔσθω, and ἄσαι; Hittite *ēt-*, *eku-*, and *hassik-*

According to Reece,⁸⁷ the most usual formula for consumption of a feast in Homer is οἷ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνειάθ’ ἐτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἵαλλον (“and they stretched their hands toward the ready provisions laid out”), which avoids any explicit mention of eating and drinking.⁸⁸ The Hittite myths have no analogous phrase. When Homer does use a verb for feasting, it is most commonly δαίνυμι. This verb is not originally a word for eating or drinking, but a variant of δαίομαι “divide,” which appears to derive from a Proto-Indo-European **dh₂-eye-* “divide.”⁸⁹ The root in question does not survive in Hittite unless Kloekhorst is right in assigning to it *tahs-* “predict.”⁹⁰

Besides these expressions, the ordinary Greek roots for eating and drinking occasionally turn up in hospitality scenes in the verbs ἔσθω and πίνω. πίνω has a cognate in Hittite, the ablauting verb *pās-/pas-* “swallow,”⁹¹ but it does not occur in hospitality scenes. The verb that

⁸⁶ Puhvel, *Hittite Dictionary*, 129.

⁸⁷ Reece, *Stranger’s Welcome*, 24.

⁸⁸ However, as Thomas Biggs points out to me, the conclusion of the feast (a sub-element not found in the Hittite material) normally does mention eating and drinking. The predominant formula is ἀντάρ ἐπει πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο (“but when they had banished their desire of drinking and eating”); see Reece, *Stranger’s Welcome*, 24 for attestations and other variants. I discuss the etymologies of these roots in the next paragraph.

⁸⁹ Beekes, *Dictionary of Greek*, 1:298-299; Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, 1:248.

⁹⁰ Kloekhorst, *Hittite Lexicon*, 805-806.

⁹¹ Kloekhorst, *Hittite Lexicon*, 649. The Proto-Indo-European form of this root is uncertain, partly because of the difficulty of accounting for the variation in Greek between forms with *pī-*

does occur for drinking in Hittite hospitality scenes, *eku-/aku-*, also has an Indo-European origin, deriving from **h₁eg^wh-*.⁹² ἔσθω and *ēt-/at-*, the Hittite word for eating that typically occurs in hospitality scenes, are cognates from Proto-Indo-European **h₁ed-*.⁹³ However, the lack of correspondence between the Indo-European root for “drink” reflected in hospitality scenes does not support an inherited connection between the expressions for “eat and drink.” The consideration that Homer uses the word order “drink and eat” πῖνε καὶ ἤσθε⁹⁴ (rather than *ἤσθέ τε πῖνέ τε or the like) versus the fixed order “eat and drink” in Hittite gives additional evidence against a linguistically detectable common origin for the consumption of feasts in Homeric and Hittite hospitality scenes.

A number of Greek words semantically related to satiety begin with *ā-* or *hā̃-*, including the Homeric aorist infinitive ἄσαι “to sate” and the Homeric adverb ἄδην “to satisfaction,” and the Mycenaean third person plural future indicative *a-se-so-si* (presumably pronounced *asēsonsi*). Despite their semantic appropriateness, these words do not occur in Homeric hospitality scenes. However, certain researchers have attempted to connect them with the Hittite *ḫassikk-* “satisfy oneself,” a word used for feasting in Hittite hospitality scenes in the *Song of Ullikummi* (CTH 345.I.2.20) and the *Disappearance of Telipinu* (324.1.47). Jaan Puhvel gives the proposal a favorable treatment in his *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*,⁹⁵ deriving *ḫassik-* from

and forms with *pō̃-*. It may have occurred both as **peh₃-* and **peh₃y-*; see Beekes, *Dictionary of Greek*, 2:1195, and Helmut Rix and Martin Kümmel, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*, 2nd ed. (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001), 462-463.

⁹² Kloekhorst, *Hittite Lexicon*, 236-237; Ronald Kim, “‘To drink’ in Anatolian, Tocharian, and Proto-Indo-European,” *Historische Sprachforschung* 113, no. 1/2 (2000): 151-170.

⁹³ Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, 313; Kloekhorst, *Hittite Lexicon*, 261-263.

⁹⁴ Reece, *Stranger’s Welcome*, 24.

⁹⁵ Jaan Puhvel, *Hittite Dictionary*, 3:231-232.

a Proto-Indo-European pre-form **H₁es-A₂-*, *ἄσαι* from **H₁-seA₂-*, and *ἄδην* from **H₁sA₂-*.⁹⁶ The inconsistency of the Homeric texts in reflecting PIE **sV-* would explain the smooth breathing in *ἄσαι*. However, the word-initial laryngeal should have vocalized in Greek. Pierre Ragot⁹⁷ attempts to derive the *ā-* of *ἄσαι* from an earlier Greek **hā-*, which in turn would have come from **aha-* < **h₂(e)sh₂-* or **ahā-* < *h₂seh₂-*, and explain the *ha-* of *ἄδην* as a remodeled zero-grade (“degré zéro renouvelé”).⁹⁸ To do so, he has to reinterpret the Mycenaean *a-se-so-si* as a simplified writing of *a-a-se-so-si* or *a-a₂-se-so-si*.⁹⁹ All this seems more speculative than the loose semantic match warrants, and it makes more sense to follow Kloekhorst and refrain from giving *ḥassikk-* an Indo-European etymology.¹⁰⁰

Conclusions

The core vocabulary of Hittite and Homeric hospitality type-scenes gives no significant indication of common Indo-European ancestry or later borrowing. The only cognate pair among the most relevant words is Greek *ἔσθω* and Hittite *ēṭ-*, which however are the most ordinary words for eating in both languages, and are not found in similar phrasing across the two traditions. In the semantic field of furniture, the element of hospitality scenes whose presence in both traditions is most remarkable, the Greek words all appear to be Greek-specific formations from known Indo-European roots. Hittite furniture words are hidden by the writing system,

⁹⁶ Puhvel uses a nonstandard laryngeal theory in his PIE reconstructions. His **H₁* is not equivalent to the standard **h₁*. It refers to any laryngeal reflected by Hittite *ḥ*, which in his view can have any vowel-coloring effect.

⁹⁷ Pierre Ragot, “Hittite *ḥaššikzi/ḥaššikkanzi* « se rassasier », grec homérique *ἄσαι/ἄμεναι* « id. » et *ἄδην* « à satiété » : réflexions nouvelles à l’appui d’un rapprochement étymologique discuté,” *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d’histoire anciennes* 83, no. 2 (2009): 223-251.

⁹⁸ Ragot, “Se rassasier,” 236.

⁹⁹ Ragot, “Se rassasier,” 236-240;

¹⁰⁰ Kloekhorst, *Hittite Lexicon*, 324-325.

except for ^{GIŠ}*hassalli* “stool,” which has a doubtful etymology and evidently no connection to Greek.

CHAPTER 4

THE HOMERIC HOSPITALITY SCENE REVISITED

The differences in context between Homeric and Hittite hospitality scenes might seem to detract from the significance of the differences in structure. The social circumstances represented for hosts and guests by Homer vary considerably from scene to scene and are never those typical of Hittite hospitality scenes. In fact, the title of Reece's study of Homeric hospitality scenes, *The Stranger's Welcome*, would make no sense if the object of study were Hittite, because in Hittite scenes the guest is never a stranger. As previous chapters of this thesis have discussed, the Hittite scenes normally involve gods who are of course known to each other, who can travel to each other's homes quickly and painlessly, and who often arrive by invitation. The best-known hospitality episodes in Homer, however, are those that showcase the norms of ξενίη. These scenes typically involve humans only, with the guest arriving after a long journey, unidentified and unannounced, and sometimes unintentionally. Nevertheless, the wider social circumstances of Homeric hospitality scenes do not matter as much for their narrative structure as we might expect them to. Across the wide variations in social circumstances between Homeric hospitality scenes, including those that approach closest to the Hittite material, the narrative structure discovered by Reece holds remarkably constant.

The clearest differences among hospitality scenes in Homer concern the status of the guest and host: nobles, slaves, gods, or exotic monsters. Another obvious distinction is that between peaceful hospitality that satisfies the moral norms and examples of hospitality gone wrong. Despite the existence of these distinctions in Homer, the same conventional elements are

typical of all varieties of hospitality scene and require only superficial adaptations to accommodate them to the varying contexts. This chapter will give closer examination to a few of the elements of the Homeric hospitality scene in the light of the Hittite material analyzed in previous chapters. I discuss seats and feasting because their analogues occur relatively often in Hittite hospitality scenes and I discuss the visitor's arrival and the description of the host because they occur most often in Homer.

The Visitor's Arrival

Reece's element II, "Arrival at the Destination,"¹⁰¹ is short and conventional in each scene, never taking more than one or two clauses per occurrence. Although Reece does not subdivide this element in his schematic grid, Homer frequently uses a "zoom-in" technique of narrating the arrival in two stages: first the visitor arrives at an area (a city or island), then at the specific building where the host is. These two-stage arrivals occur for Telemachus in Pylos (*Odyssey* 3.4-5, 31), Telemachus in Sparta (*Odyssey* 4.1-2), Hermes and Calypso (*Odyssey* 5.55-58), Odysseus and Polyphemus (*Odyssey* 9.181, 216), Odysseus and the Laestrygonians (*Odyssey* 10.81-82, 112), Odysseus and Circe (*Odyssey* 10.135, 210, 308-309), and Priam and Achilles (*Iliad* 24.443, 448, 471).

Usually, description or dialogue intervenes between the stages of arrival. However, in the cases of Telemachus in Sparta and Hermes and Calypso, arrival at the building follows immediately after arrival at the area, demonstrating that they are separate components of the type-scene and not merely a resumptive device. When Hermes comes to Calypso's dwelling, there is a clear semantic separation between his arrival on the island and his arrival at the cave

¹⁰¹ Reece, *Stranger's Welcome*, 13.

where she lives, and both are marked with the characteristic arrival word *ικνέομαι*, though the syntactic structure is different:

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τὴν νῆσον ἀφίκετο τηλότ' ἐοῦσαν,
ἔνθ' ἐκ πόντου βάς ἰοειδέος ἤπειρόνδε
ἦεν, ὄφρα μέγα σπέος ἴκετο, τῷ ἐνὶ Νύμφῃ
ναῖεν ἐνπλόκαμος·

But when he arrived at the island, which was far away, then he stepped off of the violet-colored ocean and went on land, until he arrived at the great cave, in which the Nymph with pretty tresses dwelt. (*Odyssey* 5.55-58)

In the Hittite material, multiple-stage arrivals, with a distinction between the area and the building, occur in scenes (6) and (11). With the Homeric passage quoted above we can compare (6), narrating the Storm God's visit to Aya: [n]=at INA ^{URU} *abzūwa* [erer. nu ^dU? ANA] É ^dA.A *pait* ("They [arrived] in Abzūwa. [The Storm God] went [to] the house of Aya") (345.I.3.1.107-108). This subdivision of the arrival at the destination is of course a matter more of form than of content. It is not conditioned by the surrounding context of the arrival element or any other obvious factors, making it a fairly arbitrary and therefore nontrivial parallel. As we will see in chapter 5, its correlation with other similarities of narrative structure across Homeric, Hittite, and Ugaritic texts suggests that it came about through contact between poetic traditions.

The Description of the Host

In Homer, the arrival at the destination is always closely associated with Reece's element III, the "Description of the Surroundings," which follows soon after the arrival and often immediately. The most predictable component of Homeric hospitality scenes, IIIb-c, "Description of (the Activities of) the Person Sought and Others," occurs in each one of the hospitality scenes that Reece identifies. (He distinguishes IIIb from IIIc in many scenes, but not all). This section of a hospitality scene begins when the visitor finds the host, signalled by forms of *εὐρίσκω* or various synonyms and near-synonyms, and it normally goes on to tell what the

host is doing at the moment that the visitor walks in.¹⁰² As Reece observes, “the host is usually involved in the activities of the banquet: sacrifice, libation, feast preparation, eating and drinking, lyre and song.”¹⁰³ This generalization applies very broadly to all aristocratic male hosts, and the deviations that do occur cut across the boundary between human and god.

Telemachus in Pylos in *Odyssey* 3 provides the best example to take as a prototype for this narrative element, with a human guest and human host interacting peacefully and normally:

ἴξον δ' ἐς Πυλίων ἀνδρῶν ἄγυρῖν τε καὶ ἔδρας,
ἔνθ' ἄρα Νέστωρ ἦστο σὺν υἰάσιν, ἀμφὶ δ' ἑταῖροι
δαῖτ' ἐντυνόμενοι κρέα τ' ὄπτων ἄλλα τ' ἔπειρον.

And they arrived at the Pylian men's gathering and seats, where Nestor was sitting with his sons, and around them their companions, preparing the feast, were roasting meat and spitting the rest. (*Odyssey* 3.31-33)

The same convention occurs in the *Iliad* in Nestor's retrospective account of visiting Peleus to recruit warriors, as he likewise finds the host involved in animal sacrifice:

ἔνθα δ' ἔπειθ' ἦρωα Μενοίτιον εὔρομεν ἔνδον
ἠδὲ σέ, πάρ δ' Ἀχιλλῆα· γέρων δ' ἰππηλάτα Πηλεὺς
πίονα μηρία καῖε βοῶς Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ
αὐλῆς ἐν χόρτῳ· ἔχε δὲ χρύσειον ἄλεισον
σπένδων αἴθοπα οἶνον ἐπ' αἰθομένοις ἱεροῖσι.

And then we found warrior Menoetius there inside, and you [Patroclus], and Achilles next to you; and old horse-driver Peleus was burning the fat thighs of an ox for thunder-joyful Zeus in the feeding place of the courtyard; and he was holding a golden cup, libating gleaming wine over the blazing sacrifice. (*Iliad* 11.771-775)

And the poet does not restrict the convention to mundane encounters. The passages cited above are practically interchangeable with Odysseus's arrival among the lords of the exotic, divinely favored Phaeacians, who are pouring a libation as he arrives (*Odyssey* 7.136-138). Furthermore,

¹⁰² Reece, *Stranger's Welcome*, p. 14

¹⁰³ Reece, *Stranger's Welcome*, p. 14

Odysseus puts a comparable description of feasting into his description of the demigod Aeolus and his children:

οἱ δ' αἰεὶ παρὰ πατρὶ φίλῳ καὶ μητέρι κεδνῇ
δαίνυνται, παρὰ δέ σφιν ὄνειάτα μυρία κεῖται,
κνισῆεν δέ τε δῶμα περιστεναχίζεται αὐλῇ
ἦματα· νύκτας δ' αὔτε παρ' αἰδοίης ἀλόχοισιν
εὐδουσ' ἔν τε τάπησι καὶ ἐν τρητοῖσι λέχεσσι.
καὶ μὲν τῶν ἰκόμεσθα πόλιν καὶ δώματα καλά.

And the men are always feasting with their dear father and cherished mother, and countless dishes lie next to them, and the smoking house resounds around the courtyard in the day; but then at night they sleep next to their respected bedmates both on carpets and on perforated beds. Well now, at their city and beautiful palace we arrived. (*Odyssey* 10.8-13)

The choice to generalize about the hosts' activities in the present tense rather than say what they were doing at a particular moment subtly characterizes them as supernatural or immortal beings.¹⁰⁴ However, the activities themselves are the same as those of any aristocratic male human. Furthermore, when Odysseus returns after his men let the winds out of Aeolus's bag, a second and thoroughly conventional description of Aeolus's activities occurs: τὸν δὲ κίχανον / δαινύμενον παρὰ ἧ τ' ἀλόχῳ καὶ οἴσι τέκεσσιν ("and I found him feasting with his bedmate and his children") (*Odyssey* 10.60-61).

Three pairs of examples occur in which the content of the description of the host deviates from the conventional topic of feasting and sacrifice, each of them conveying significant information about the host's identity. One pair of outliers comprises the cannibalistic monsters of the *Odyssey*, the Cyclopes and the Laestrygonians. For these, Odysseus uses the description as an opportunity to remark on his anti-host's frightening physical appearance. In the episode of failed hospitality in Polyphemus's cave, the description of the host gives us what Reece calls "a

¹⁰⁴ Irene J.F. de Jong, *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 225-226.

particularly striking example of Homer’s tendency to adhere to the conventional schema.”¹⁰⁵

Odysseus narrates his arrival at Polyphemus’s dwelling in two stages, and inserts a description of Polyphemus after each stage, even though Polyphemus was not home at the time. The first description is the more detailed one, and I quote it in full:

ἔνθα δ’ ἀνὴρ ἐνίαυε πελώριος, ὅς ῥα τὰ μῆλα
οἶος ποιμαίνεσκεν ἀπόπροθεν· οὐδὲ μετ’ ἄλλους
πωλεῖτ’, ἀλλ’ ἀπάνευθεν ἐὼν ἀθεμίστια ἤδη.
καὶ γὰρ θαῦμ’ ἐτέτυκτο πελώριον, οὐδὲ ἐώκει
ἀνδρὶ γε σιτοφάγῳ, ἀλλὰ ῥίῳ ὑλήεντι
ὑψηλῶν ὄρέων, ὃ τε φαίνεται οἶον ἀπ’ ἄλλων.

And there a monstrous man spent the nights, one who pastured his flocks off alone; and he did not go among other people, but thought lawlessly while apart. For he had really been made a monstrous marvel, and he did not look like a food-eating man, certainly, but like a forested peak of the high mountains that shows itself alone from the others. (9.187-192)

The Laestrygonian episode is more conventional in that the visitors find someone at home, but also more abbreviated. Odysseus omits the queen’s activities entirely, describing only her appearance instead: οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ εἰσῆλθον κλυτὰ δώματα, τὴν δὲ γυναῖκα / εὔρον, ὄσσην τ’ ὄρεος κορυφὴν, κατὰ δ’ ἔστυγον αὐτήν (“and when they went into the famous palace, they found his wife, as big as a mountaintop, and they shuddered at her”) (*Odyssey* 10.112-113). Clearly, it’s a bad sign in the *Odyssey* when your host looks like a mountain.

The goddesses Circe and Calypso form a second pair of outliers. In their case, the descriptions of the host’s activities come very close indeed, to the point of drawing on the same formula systems. When Hermes arrives at Calypso’s cave, he finds her inside (τὴν δ’ ἔνδοθι τέτμεν ἐοῦσαν) (*Odyssey* 5.58), a description of her fragrant fire follows, and then the nymph’s activities: ἡ δ’ ἔνδον ἀοιδιάουσ’ ὀπι καλῆ / ἰστὸν ἐποιομένη χρυσεῖη κερκίδ’ ὕφαινεν (“but she,

¹⁰⁵ Reece, *Stranger’s Welcome*, 14.

inside, was singing with a beautiful voice, working her loom, and weaving with a golden shuttle”) (*Odyssey* 5.57-58). Similarly, Odysseus’s companions arrive at Circe’s doors,

Κίρκης δ’ ἔνδον ἄκουον ἀειδούσης ὀπι καλῆ,
ἰστὸν ἐποιχομένης μέγαν ἄμβροτον, οἷα θεάων
λεπτά τε καὶ χαρίεντα καὶ ἀγλαὰ ἔργα πέλονται.

And they heard Circe inside, singing with a beautiful voice,
working a great immortal loom like the light and pleasant and
splendid works of the goddesses are. (*Odyssey* 10.221-223)

It is important to distinguish the singing of Circe and Calypso from aristocratic male singing. Aristocrats typically sing at a banquet. Even in *Iliad* 9.186-191, where Agamemnon’s messengers find Achilles singing without food or drink, he still has a companion and sings to the accompaniment of a lyre, as banquet singers normally do. The sorceresses sing alone, without musical accompaniment or food.¹⁰⁶ It is uncertain whether their unusual activities have more to do with their gender or their divine status, since no mortal woman in Homer takes sole responsibility for guests and it would run against the norms of Homeric society.¹⁰⁷ The formula αειδ-/αοιδ- ὀπι καλῆ may have specifically divine resonances, recalling ἀμειβόμεναι ὀπι καλῆ (used of the Muses at *Odyssey* 24.60, *Iliad* 1.604), while the loom in ἰστὸν ἐποιχομεν- belongs to mortal women’s work also (for example, *Iliad* 1.31). Considering the similarity of mortal and immortal men’s feasts, it seems likely that gender plays the more important role here.

Two male Homeric hosts are working but not singing when their visitors find them, the slave Eumaeus in the *Odyssey* and the distinctly unaristocratic god Hephaestus in the *Iliad*.

¹⁰⁶ Circe and Calypso’s singing could conceivably mark a sinister inversion of normative male singing, reinforced by the conventional metaphor of weaving for poetry. Ann L.T. Bergren, “Language and the Female in Early Greek Thought,” *Arethusa* 16 (1983): 70 and 89n13, sees a connection between their weaving, their singing, and their prophecies. Be that as it may, what matters here is that Homer makes a distinction between their singing and that of male aristocrats.

¹⁰⁷ When human women participate in hospitality in the *Odyssey*, their role is complementary and subordinate to that of the men in the household. For a full analysis, see Victoria Pedrick, “The Hospitality of Noble Women in the *Odyssey*,” *Helios* 15 (1988): 85-101.

Odysseus arrives at the swineherd's house τὸν δ' ἄρ' ἐνι προδόμῳ εὖρ' ἤμενον ("and then he found him sitting in front of the house") (*Odyssey* 14.5). After a long description of the court and the animals, the narrator elaborates, αὐτὸς δ' ἀμφὶ πόδεσσιν ἐοῖς ἀράρισκε πέδιλα, / τάμνων δέρμα βόειον ἐϋχροές ("But he himself was fitting sandals around his own feet, cutting a nicely colored oxhide") (*Odyssey* 14.23-24). The divine craftsman, Hephaestus, has the more impressive task of making self-moving tripods, and gets a correspondingly more impressive description (*Iliad* 372-379). Just as characters within the warrior elite, whether mortal or immortal, are normally eating, drinking, and singing when a visitor interrupts them, non-warrior males are involved in manual crafts. All the same, Homer stops short of applying this pattern to the disguised Odysseus when he and Eumaeus receive Telemachus into the swineherd's hut, instead adapting the feasting host pattern to the humbler circumstances: τὼ δ' αὖτ' ἐν κλισίῃ Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ δῖος ὑφορβὸς / ἐντύνοντο ἄριστον ἅμ' ἠοῖ, κηαμένῳ πῦρ ("But in the hut, Odysseus and the noble swineherd were preparing breakfast at dawn after kindling a fire") (*Odyssey* 16.1-2).

Reece's "Description of (the Activities of) the Person Sought and Others" appears consistently in Homeric hospitality scenes with few major variations in form or content. The few variations that appear mark distinctions of warrior versus non-warrior class, masculine versus feminine gender, or norm-respecting being versus antisocial monster, but not human versus god. Thus, the presence of this element in Homer and its absence from Hittite hospitality scenes constitutes a genuine difference with historical and interpretative relevance.

The Visitor's Seat

Reece's elements VIII, "Seat,"¹⁰⁸ and IXa, "Feast – Preparation,"¹⁰⁹ correspond in content to what I have numbered V for Hittite hospitality scenes, the preparation of furniture and food. As reflected by Reece's classification, the Homeric narrator, unlike the Hittite material, describes the guest's seat separately from the table and food. In Homer the preparation of food typically precedes its consumption with no intervening material, whereas Hittite hospitality scene (5), the Sun God and the Storm God in *Ullikummi*, inserts an extensive conversation between these two elements. However, Homer and the Hittite tradition have suggestive similarities in the shared element of seating the guest.

The seat is more significant than most of the parallels between Homeric and Hittite hospitality because of its relative arbitrariness. While it is no doubt true in most cultures that a host is expected to offer visitors a place to sit, that has no great importance to the literary context of hospitality scenes – in both Homer and Hittite mythology, nobody ever visits someone else just because he or she needs a place to sit and does not have one. It would be possible for the narrator to pass over seating arrangements in silence without disrupting the continuity of the story. However, the seat is well attested in both the traditions studied here, occurring in thirteen of Reece's sixteen hospitality scenes from Homer and six of my thirteen hospitality scenes from Hittite literature.

Reece has already spelled out the social distinctions conveyed by the type of seat that a guest receives: deities and unusually high-ranking men sit on a *θρόνος*, other men and women on a *κλισμός*, and subordinates on a *δίφορος*.¹¹⁰ Besides the significance in the seat itself, there is

¹⁰⁸ Reece, *Stranger's Welcome*, 21-22.

¹⁰⁹ Reece, *Stranger's Welcome*, 23.

¹¹⁰ Reece, *Stranger's Welcome*, 22. Chapter 3 discussed the etymologies of these terms.

significance in where the guest sits. Respected guests receive a place beside the most honored of the hosts.¹¹¹ However, when Odysseus arrives home in disguise as a beggar, he has to sit on the threshold inside the doors, apart from the feasting suitors (*Odyssey* 17.339-341).

Such distinctions recall the element of the host assigning seats in some Hittite hospitality scenes.¹¹² At the same time, it differs from the Hittite counterpart in form and function. In terms of narrative form, the assigning of seats in the Hittite texts seems independent of any mention of the furniture on which the guest sits, and I have accordingly classified it as a separate element (IX on my list, while the furniture is Va), but Homer describes the location of the seat in the same sentence as the seat itself. In terms of social function, the hosts in the Hittite texts seem to be making a personalized statement about a connection between the guest and someone else: Istanu of the Earth in the *Song of Release* seems to be intervening in the conflict between the Storm God and the Elder Gods by seating them next to each other (KBo XXXII 13 Vs. II 26-27) and Impākrū seats Gurpāranzaḫu next to himself because they are father-in-law and son-in-law (CTH 362.1.16). In Homer, however, the relative location of seats can communicate respect or disrespect for the guest, but no further dimensions of meaning are evident. Nevertheless, the prominence of seating arrangements in marking social distinctions constitutes a nontrivial parallel between Homeric and Hittite hospitality scenes, most plausibly interpreted as reflecting a parallel in real social customs rather than purely poetic factors.

¹¹¹ Reece, *Stranger's Welcome*, 21.

¹¹² Bachvarova, "Hittite to Homer," 107, mentions "the order of the guests sitting at the feast table" as a similarity between Hittite and non-Hittite hospitality scenes, but she does not elaborate.

The Feast

Another nearly universal component of hospitality scenes in Homer is Reece's element IXa, the preparation of the feast.¹¹³ It is both more consistently present and more elaborately developed than the consumption of the feast. Though it displays considerable variety, most of the variation does not cluster into identifiable subcategories or affect the hospitality scenes' comparability with Hittite texts. Most typically, a variety of people, generally servants, carry out the various tasks of preparation, analogously to the cooks, cupbearers, and other servants in Hittite hospitality scenes. However, free subordinates of the host can help too, such as Patroclus in the embassy to Achilles (*Iliad* 9.201-220). Both the goddess Calypso (*Odyssey* 5.92-93) and the slave Eumaeus (*Odyssey* 14.72-81) prepare meals for their guests entirely by themselves. Nevertheless, Eumaeus later on enlists the help of his own slaves for a second meal (*Odyssey* 14.426-452). The division of labor in preparing a meal seems not to have any meaningful correlation with the circumstances of the hospitality scene.

The host generally provides both meat and bread (σῆτον) to eat. Some scenes describe the slaughter and cooking of the animals at considerable length, but the bread gets less emphasis. The drink is consistently wine among mortals, or nectar in the case of Hermes and Calypso, in contrast to the variety of drinks mentioned in the Hittite material. The importance of meat in Homeric hospitality scenes distinguishes them from the Hittite myths, where drink appears to have more importance. The one clear subgroup of Homeric hospitality scenes in terms of feast preparation is again the inverted hospitality scenes of Odysseus and Polyphemus and Odysseus and the Laestrygonians, where the host eats his guests instead of feeding them: σὸν δ' ὃ γε δὴ αὖτε δύο μάρψας ὀπλίσσατο δεῖπνον ("And then he snatched up two of them and prepared his

¹¹³ Reece, *Stranger's Welcome*, 23.

dinner”) (*Odyssey* 9.311, with 9.344 nearly identical) and ἀντίχ’ ἕνα μάρψας ἐτάρων ὀπλίσματο δειπνον (“at once he snatched up one of my comrades and prepared his dinner”) (*Odyssey* 10.116).

During the preparations a host can recognize a guest’s high status by assigning him the best piece of meat,¹¹⁴ a custom not found in the Hittite material. This performs much the same social function as offering an honored seat, and can co-occur with it as in the case of Telemachus in Sparta (*Odyssey* 4.51, 66). It occurs less often, however, and seems to provide a more valuable mark of status. Its performance is not limited to hosts, since Odysseus, as guest of the Phaeacians, honors the singer Demodocus by offering him his own portion (*Odyssey* 474-483).

The preparation of feasts in Homer and Hittite texts shows no parallels likely to provide evidence for contact between the two traditions. However, it shows that both traditions modelled their hospitality scenes on large and hierarchically organized households. They suggest differences in the social mystique attached to food, with meat more significant in the conventions of Greek epic and drink more significant in Anatolia, and with the allotment of portions of meat optionally available in Greece as a way to show favor toward a guest.

Conclusions

The structure of hospitality scenes in Homer shows consistent differences from the hospitality scenes in Hittite texts, even across the considerable variety of contexts in which Homeric hospitality scenes appear. This stability justifies attributing the differences to poetic and social differences between the Greek and Anatolian cultural traditions. The differences include both matters of narrative convention, especially the invariable presence of a description of the host and his or her activities in Homer and its absence in the Hittite texts, and matters of social

¹¹⁴ Reece, *Stranger’s Welcome*, 23.

structure, such as the greater significance of meat and lesser significance of drink in Homer. At the same time, attention to the structure of the Homeric hospitality scene allows us to identify the arrival of the visitor and the seating of the visitor as elements sharing significant parallels with their Hittite analogues. Assessing the probability that these parallels descend from a common origin requires considering their distribution in other ancient literary traditions, which will be the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5
HOSPITALITY SCENES IN OTHER NEAR EASTERN AND
INDO-EUROPEAN TRADITIONS

This chapter makes a very brief and exploratory investigation of hospitality scenes in other literary traditions that we might expect to show a connection with Homer and Hittite mythological texts. While a more thorough description of hospitality in these and other traditions would be desirable, even the information analyzed here gives considerable help in interpreting the similarities between Homeric and Hittite hospitality type-scenes. I present observations on the structure of hospitality scenes in texts from Sanskrit, Welsh, Akkadian, and Ugaritic literature. Ugaritic shows by far the most striking similarities to the Hittite and Homeric material, including all the features that the Hittite and Homeric traditions share with each other. The correspondences imply that at some point in time poets and storytellers in these traditions developed a regional pool of conventions by communicating across linguistic boundaries and geographical distance.

For each language I examine the hospitality scenes from a limited sample of its literary corpus.¹¹⁵ I present a list of the narrative elements typically found in each sample in the order in which they most typically occur, followed by explanation and further discussion. Because it is not possible here to analyze the phraseology of all these hospitality scenes, I make no claim that they are type-scenes in all the traditions. However, each tradition does repeat the same narrative elements in multiple scenes.

¹¹⁵ Appendix B gives full citations for the hospitality scenes examined for this chapter.

Sanskrit: The “Nalopākhyāna”

- I. Invitation or instructions
- II. Journey
- III. Arrival
- IV. Description of host(s) or visitor(s)
- V. Host reacts to visitor’s arrival
- VI. Exchange of information
 - c. Host questions visitor
 - d. Exchange of riddles
 - e. Visitor reveals identity
 - f. Host makes announcement
- VII. Guests exchange gifts
- VIII. Departure

The foregoing list gives typical elements in hospitality scenes from the “Nalopākhyāna,” a well-known episode of the encyclopedic epic *Mahābhārata*. This episode tells the story of Nala, king of Niṣadha, and his wife Damayantī. In a fit of insanity, the king gambles away his kingdom in a dice game and abandons his wife. After they each spend some time at foreign courts under fake identities, they are reunited through Damayantī’s clever planning and win the kingdom back in a rematch.

Two of the hospitality scenes in the “Nalopākhyāna” are Damayantī’s two ostensible *svayamvara* or “personal choice” ceremonies, the real one in which she chooses Nala as husband in preference to four gods, and the fake one through which she is reunited with him. In both of these scenes, Nala receives gifts from the other participant(s) before they depart. This element seems not to be connected with Homeric guest-gifts,¹¹⁶ despite the superficial similarity. They function in the story to explain Nala’s display of superhuman abilities later on and to establish that he is parting from his *svayamvara* rivals on good terms, rather than to create a bond between guest and host as in Homer. The *svayamvara* scenes also include an invitation, while in several

¹¹⁶ For which see Reece, *Stranger’s Welcome*, 35-36.

other scenes the visitor instead serves as a messenger for a third party whose instructions prompt the visit.

The “Nalopākhyāna” shares with the *Odyssey* a thematic concern with disguise and recognition, which may be sufficient to explain why both typically have visitors identify themselves in hospitality scenes, unlike Hittite texts, but a common origin seems plausible. To the extent that the small number of hospitality scenes in the “Nalopākhyāna” permits analysis of repeating phraseology in the visitor’s self-identification, it shows no formulaic parallels to the *Odyssey*, but the similarity in content is extremely close. The “Nalopākhyāna” version has as its most consistent detail the visitor’s command for the host to know (“viddhi” [*Mahābhārata* 3.52.21], “avagacchadhvam” [*Mahābhārata* 3.61.79], “vijānīhi” [*Mahābhārata* 3.62.25]) who he or she is.

The description of the host found in a few scenes of the “Nalopākhyāna” gives this text’s next closest parallel to anything in the Homeric conventions. However, other scenes describe the guest’s appearance instead, and some describe neither the host nor the visitor. The visitor’s arrival is normally quite short, although the text as a whole is more like Homer’s leisurely descriptions than the synoptic Hittite narratives. The “Nalopākhyāna” narrates the visitor’s arrival in the city or less frequently the arrival at the building, but the two-stage structure found in Homer and the Hittite texts appears nowhere.

The other Homer-Hittite parallel identified in chapter 4 as significant, the provision of a seat for a guest, does not normally appear as a distinct element in the hospitality scenes of the “Nalopākhyāna.” However, seating does appear in other parts of the *Mahābhārata* in something like the form it takes in Homeric and Hittite hospitality scenes. According to Stephanie Jamison, more elaborate descriptions of seating, as well as other ritually prescribed acts of hospitality,

indicate that a hospitality scene will have greater narrative significance.¹¹⁷ She gives the example of Kṛṣṇa’s embassy to the Kurus on behalf of the Pāṇḍavas (*Mahābhārata* 5.70-145), where at each meeting he receives a seat whose splendor is described with as much enthusiasm as some of the θρόνοι in the *Odyssey*. Seats can also indicate status: a quarrel over seating between two guests almost turns deadly in the story of Sudhanvan and Virocana.¹¹⁸ It is not clear whether seating plays a role as a repeating narrative element anywhere in the *Mahābhārata*, and we should not read too much into its unimportance in the Nalopākhyāna, but it still seems less prominent than in the Homeric and Hittite traditions. The descriptions of feasting so widespread in Homeric and Hittite hospitality scenes do not appear in the “Nalopākhyāna” either, and Jamison only mentions extended descriptions of food in her discussion of cases where a visitor’s demands cause hardship or humiliation for the host.¹¹⁹ The “Nalopākhyāna” does not share in the principal commonalities between Homeric and Hittite hospitality scenes.

Welsh: the Four Branches of the Mabinogi

- | | | |
|----|-------|----------------------------------|
| | I. | Host welcomes visitor |
| | II. | Feast prepared |
| | III. | Seating |
| | IV. | Storytelling |
| | V. | Visitor makes request |
| | VI. | Visitor tricks host |
| | VII. | Host curses visitor |
| | VIII. | Departure |
| or | I. | Host welcomes visitor |
| | II. | Feast prepared |
| | III. | Seating |
| | IV. | Visitor attracted to host |
| | V. | Visitor and host have sex |
| | VI. | Visitor asks permission to leave |

¹¹⁷ Stephanie Jamison, *Sacrificed Wife/Sacrificer’s Wife: Women, Ritual, and Hospitality in Ancient India* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 159.

¹¹⁸ Jamison, *Sacrificed Wife*, 159-161.

¹¹⁹ Jamison, *Sacrificed Wife*, 161-169.

VII. Departure

The Four Branches of the Mabinogi are a group of four folktales within the *Mabinogion*, a medieval Welsh collection: “Pwyll Lord of Dyved,” “Branwen Daughter of Llŷr,” “Manawydan Son of Llŷr,” and “Math Son of Mathonwy.” According to Sioned Davies, the stories show verbal repetitions reminiscent of oral-poetic formulae, although they are not in verse.¹²⁰ All except “Branwen” contain hospitality scenes. They fall into two types so distinct that I have judged it clearer to present two separate lists. The first type includes the four scenes in “Math” where the trickster figure Gwydyon is the visitor. The second type includes the two weddings of Rhiannon, with Pwyll in “Pwyll” and with Manawydan in “Manawydan,” and the adultery of Goronwy and Blodeuedd in “Math.” Two other scenes have some of the introductory elements found in both types without clearly belonging to either one.

The shared introductory elements show similarities to Homer, but not to the elements that Homer shares with Hittite hospitality scenes, except for the concern with the position of the visitor’s seat. Both Homer and the *Mabinogion* typically mention an expression of welcome from the host,¹²¹ but where Homer gives the welcome in direct speech, the *Mabinogion* only mentions that the hosts are joyful. Next, hospitality scenes from the *Mabinogion* usually mention the preparation of a feast, but without specifying any of the foods or drinks, unlike both Homer and the Hittite texts. In fact, the *Mabinogion* often represents feasts as already underway when the visitors arrive, so that it is more like the Homeric description of the activities of the host than the Homeric preparation of the meal. The three hospitality scenes from “Pwyll” and “Branwen” show a concern with seating arrangements much like that of the Homeric and Hittite material

¹²⁰ Sioned Davies, “Storytelling in Medieval Wales,” *Oral Tradition* 7, no. 2 (1992): 242-252. See p. 248 for the structure of the beginning of a feast.

¹²¹ See Reece, *Stranger’s Welcome*, 20 for this element in Homer.

(though without describing the seats themselves), coming especially close to the Hittite convention of using neighboring seats to mark particular interpersonal connections. Just as in the wedding of Gurpāranzaḥu and Tatizuli from *Gurpāranzaḥu*, the narrator of “Pwyll” makes a point of mentioning that the father-in-law sits next to his new son-in-law at the wedding feast of Pwyll and Rhiannon: “The hall was made ready and they entered and sat down: Heveydd sat on one side of Pwyll and Rhiannon on the other, and everyone else according to rank.”¹²² This similarity between Hittite, Welsh, and Greek literature appears to reflect a widespread social custom.

The element of storytelling that occurs in two of Gwydyon’s hospitality scenes resembles the after-dinner entertainment in Homeric hospitality.¹²³ It may not be coincidence that Gwydyon and Odysseus are both simultaneously tricksters and excellent storytellers. However, since this is not a feature shared with the Hittite myths, I will not explore the question further here. It is also not possible to establish in this thesis that the similarities between Homer and the *Mabinogion* go back to an early Indo-European origin, since Homeric influence through medieval European literature cannot be ruled out. Gwydyon’s tricks do not cause physical harm to his hosts, however, and seem distinct from the guest-slaying myths found in the *Odyssey* and the *Text of the Purulli*.

Akkadian

- I. Instructions for the visitor
- II. Invitation
- III. Journey
- IV. Visitor arrives (in heaven or the underworld)
- V. Description of hosts
- VI. Gates

¹²² *The Mabinogion*, trans. Jeffrey Gantz (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1976), 55.

¹²³ For which see Reece, *Stranger’s Welcome*, 28-29.

- a. Visitor arrives at gates
- b. Gatekeeper sees visitor
- c. Gatekeeper questions visitor
- d. Visitor asks to be let in
- e. Servant announces visitor
- f. Host instructs servant
- g. Visitor enters gates
- VII. Visitor enters courtyard
- VIII. Visitor approaches host
- IX. Visitor kisses the ground
- X. Visitor delivers information
- XI. Host responds
- XII. Host tricks guest
- XIII. Host offers refreshment
 - a. food
 - b. drink
 - c. bath
 - d. oil
- XIV. Visitor reports on the visit

For this section I analyzed the structure of the hospitality scenes in a one-volume anthology of Akkadian literature¹²⁴ and the *Epic of Gilgameš*. Even this quick look reveals considerable heterogeneity. The list of elements given here reflects the structure of the stylized exchange of visitors between the underworld and heaven in the composition *How Nergal Became King of the Netherworld*. Not surprisingly, given its thematic similarity, Ištar's descent to the underworld in *When Ištar Went to the Netherworld* follows the same structural template. More surprisingly, so does the mortal man Adapa's visit to heaven in *How Adapa Lost Immortality*. The rest of the hospitality scenes analyzed, except for the coronation feast of Marduk in the *Epic of Creation* and Gilgameš and Ūta-napišti in *Gilgameš*, are quite short; none of them follows the template represented by my list here and they do not share any alternative structure either.

¹²⁴ *From Distant Days: Myths, Tales, and Poetry of Ancient Mesopotamia*, trans. Benjamin R. Foster (Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 1995).

Despite their abundance of repeating elements, the hospitality scenes in the underworld and heaven have little similarity to Hittite or Homeric hospitality scenes. A description of the activities of the host appears only in the visits of Ištar and Nergal to the underworld, where it takes the form of timeless generalizations about the gloomy existence of the dead, quite different in structure and function from the corresponding element in Homer, though not so much as to make a common origin impossible. Offers of food, drink, and seating do not occur in the same form as in the Hittite and Homeric texts either. When hosts offer refreshment, they offer it at the very end of the visit in order to test the visitor. Nergal follows the advice of Ea by refusing what the deities of the underworld offer him until he fails by allowing Ereškigal, queen of the underworld, to seduce him. Adapa also takes advice from Ea, refusing food and drink but accepting water and oil when he visits heaven, but the gods of heaven have a laugh at his and Ea's expense by offering him food and drink that would have made him immortal.¹²⁵ The visitor's arrival never shows the two-part structure found in Homer and Hittite hospitality scenes, since no building is mentioned.

Ugaritic

- I. Preparation of Feast
 - a. Meat
 - b. Wine
- II. Invitation
- III. Arrival
 - a. Arrival at a location
 - b. Arrival at a building
- IV. Visitor bows

¹²⁵ The gods offer Adapa food, drink, clothing, and oil, which Mario Liverani, "Adapa, Guest of the Gods," in *Myth and Politics in Ancient Near Eastern Historiography* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2004), 9, considers the four "basic requirements of life" in Near Eastern cultures, "obtained through the intersection of the two oppositions, 'solid/liquid' and 'internal/external.'" I suspect that these would emerge as the standard sub-elements of the offer of refreshment in a larger sample of Akkadian hospitality scenes, but the list of food, water, a bath, and oil is more true to the sample that I used.

- V. Description of activities of host
- VI. Host sees visitor
- VII. Host questions visitor
- VIII. Feast served
 - a. Meat
 - b. Seat
 - c. Wine
- IX. Visitor brings news
 - a. Visitor delivers information
 - b. Visitor threatens host
 - c. Host submits
 - d. Visitor blesses host
- X. Feast consumed
 - a. Meat
 - b. Drink
- XI. Host makes announcement
- XII. Visitor responds
- XIII. Departure

Ugaritic poems include many hospitality scenes. The majority of those studied for this section come from the Baal Cycle, an epic or group of epics about struggles over the kingship of the gods, and so the Baal Cycle is best represented in my list of elements. However, the other hospitality scenes analyzed, which come from the poems known as *Kirta*, *Aqhat*, *El's Divine Feast*, and *The Rapiuma*, seem to follow the same structure. Most of the hospitality scenes narrate hospitality between gods in contexts of divine networking very similar to those in Hittite. *Kirta* and *Aqhat* also provide examples of hospitality between humans and humans hosting gods.

All the structural parallels between Homeric and Hittite hospitality scenes appear in Ugaritic too. Furthermore, Ugaritic hospitality scenes have additional similarities with the Homeric and Hittite traditions taken separately, especially the Hittite one. This distribution provides evidence for mutual influence through an area including the Greek, Hittite, and Ugaritic traditions and excluding the Akkadian, Sanskrit, and Welsh ones.

Ugaritic literature, like Homeric and Hittite traditions, makes the preparation and consumption of feasts a prominent and frequent element of hospitality scenes. Feasting plays a

more similar role in the narrative structure to the one it has in Hittite texts than in Homer, since serving the meal and consuming it can appear as two separate sections with dialogue between them, rather than following one after the other as they normally do in Homer. The Ugaritic poems sometimes separate the slaughtering of food animals and the opening of the wine vats as yet another element distinct from serving the meal, placing it at the very beginning of the scene, even before the invitation to the guests. Although the feasting element in Ugaritic hospitality scenes has more structural similarity to the Hittite ones, it comes closer to Homer in content, since it typically gives just as much attention to the eating as to drinking, and more attention to the preparation of meat than the preparation of drink. For example, when Baal summons Kothar to build a house for him in the Baal Cycle, “He sets an ox before him, / A fatling right before him,”¹²⁶ but the text makes no mention of serving drink.

The same scene attests seating the guest: “A throne is set up and he is seated, / At the right hand of Mightiest Baal.”¹²⁷ Notably, this example shows the same concern with the position of the guest’s seat as Homer, Hittite myths, and the *Mabinogion*. The seat for the guest recurs in the feast that Baal holds to inaugurate the palace: “He provides the gods with thrones, / Provides the goddesses with chairs.”¹²⁸ These are the only two examples in the scenes analyzed here, so the seat seems not to have formed as widespread an element in Ugaritic hospitality scenes as in Hittite and Homeric narrative. As in Hittite, the “Baal Cycle” places the seating of the guest together with the preparation of the feast in the narrative sequence.

The two-stage format for the guest’s arrival is another optional feature shared by the Homeric, Hittite, and Ugaritic traditions. In Ugaritic, it appears in the Baal Cycle’s standard

¹²⁶ “The Baal Cycle,” trans. Mark S. Smith, in *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, ed. Simon B. Parker (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 131.

¹²⁷ “Baal Cycle,” 131.

¹²⁸ “Baal Cycle,” 134-135.

formula for reaching the dwelling of El: “She/he comes to the mountain of El and enters / The tent of the King, the Father of Years.”¹²⁹ Though this feature is too simple to completely rule out coincidence as an explanation for its occurrence in a few Homeric, Hittite, and Ugaritic scenes and its absence from my samples of other traditions, it adds something to the evidence for mutual influence among those three. In the Hittite scene that I number (11), which is from a translation or adaptation of a Semitic myth about El, a Semitic origin for the two-stage format was almost a foregone conclusion anyway, but not in the other Hittite example, (6) from the *Song of Ullikummi*.

Like the Homeric poems, the Akkadian works and to some extent the Hittite ones, the Ugaritic texts sometimes mention the moment when the host catches sight of the guest. The Ugaritic tradition also has the element of the host questioning the visitor in common with Homeric and Hittite hospitality scenes, as well as the Akkadian works and the “Nalopākhyāna.” Baal and Anat’s visit to Athirat¹³⁰ agrees with the Hittite conventions but not with Homer in placing the questions, the visitors’s answer, and the ensuing dialogue before the meal. Like the Hittite texts, the Ugaritic ones have both host-initiated hospitality scenes with an invitation delivered by messenger and visitor-initiated hospitality scenes without an invitation.

Besides the parallels shared with both Homeric and Hittite hospitality scenes or with Hittite ones alone, the Ugaritic Baal Cycle parallels Homer in allowing a description of the activities of the host, which precedes the host catching sight of the visitor. The Baal Cycle does not contain this element as consistently as Homer; while it occurs in all of the Homeric hospitality type-scenes, only two scenes from the Baal Cycle have it, the visit of the hostile god Yamm’s messengers to El to take El prisoner and the visit of Baal and his sister Anat to Athirat

¹²⁹ For example, “Baal Cycle,” 127.

¹³⁰ “Baal Cycle,” 124-125.

(the same Semitic goddess whose name is rendered as Asertu in Hittite). However, the content appears to follow the same conventions as the Homeric description of the host, which I discussed in chapter 4. The messengers find El and his companions feasting, just like aristocratic men and gods in Homer:

Meanwhile the gods sit down to fea[st,]
The holy ones to dine,
Baal waits on El.¹³¹

When Baal and Anat approach Athirat, she is engaged in making clothes, like the Homeric goddesses Circe and Calypso. The Homeric goddesses are weaving, while Athirat seems to be spinning: “She takes her spindle [in her hand,] / A mighty spindle in her right hand.”¹³² These similarities in content, which the descriptions of the host in the “Nalopākhyāna” and Akkadian texts do not share – aristocratic feasting in the *Mabinogion* may be comparable, however, as I already mentioned – suggest that the Baal Cycle and Homer owe their descriptions of the host’s activities to the same source tradition.

Conclusions

All the parallels in narrative structure between Homeric and Hittite hospitality type-scenes occur in the Ugaritic tradition as well, especially the Baal cycle. These three traditions share detailed descriptions of the preparation and consumption of feasts; the provision of a seat for the visitor; an optional two-stage format for narrating the visitor’s arrival; the mention of the host’s catching sight of the visitor, and the host’s questioning of unexpected visitors. Though coincidence could have plausibly explained the sharing of these elements between Homer and Hittite texts alone, their co-occurrence across three traditions gives much stronger evidence for cross-cultural transfer of poetic motifs. Besides the group of elements shared by all three

¹³¹ “Baal Cycle,” 99.

¹³² “Baal Cycle,” 122.

traditions, Ugaritic shares host-initiated hospitality scenes with Hittite alone and conventional descriptions of the host's activities with Homer alone. Determining the significance of these similarities would require closer examination of the Ugaritic texts, but it could conceivably indicate that Anatolia and Greece had more direct contact with Ugarit than with each other during the period of transfer. Hospitality scenes from the Sanskrit "Nalopākhyāna," the Welsh *Mabinogion*, and various Akkadian works share only a few isolated parallels with Homer and Hittite texts, most of them superficial or trivial.

CONCLUSION

The Homeric poems and Hittite mythological texts both structure their portrayals of hospitality as type-scenes, with a recognizable common framework of narrative structure and conventional phraseology underlying the different instantiations of the theme. Though clearly distinct from its Hittite counterpart, the Homeric hospitality scene shares certain narrative elements with it: the feast, the visitor's seat, the questioning of visitors, and the visitor's arrival conceptualized in two stages. An additional element of the Homeric hospitality type-scene, the host's catching sight of the visitor, occurs in Hittite as well although it has only a marginal role in the type-scene structure there. The same five features also occur in the narrative structure of hospitality scenes in Ugaritic mythology. This co-occurrence of the same set of elements across three languages indicates the existence of a shared regional poetic tradition. The shared fund of content and structure seems not to have facilitated the borrowing of hospitality-related phrases or words, at least between Hittite and Homeric Greek. Nevertheless, it shows that at some point in time, poets in the ancient eastern Mediterranean had enough familiarity with compositions in other languages to adopt from each other not only isolated stories, like the much-discussed succession myth, but stylistic conventions as well, and integrate them with elements derived from their local traditions or elsewhere.

Some of the similarities could conceivably result from partial standardization in real-life hospitality rituals across the cultural region, with the poetic traditions separately incorporating the shared ritual conventions into fictional narratives. Margo Kitts makes a

notable suggestion along these lines about hospitable feasting in Homer and Anatolia.¹³³

On the other hand, similarities in narrative structure, such as the two-stage structure of the visitor's arrival, indicate more strictly poetic transfer. Bachvarova has recently argued that the Hurro-Hittite texts from Ḫatti represent a genre of oral poetry produced by bilingual bards,¹³⁴ which would provide a striking example of how poetic conventions could have crossed linguistic boundaries in the eastern Mediterranean region. Of course, ritual and poetic transfer are not mutually exclusive modes of cultural contact, since hospitality rituals would have had a verbal component.

Of the elements shared by Homeric and Hittite type-scenes, the feast and the seat stand out for their frequent occurrence in both traditions. In Hittite the feast and seat occur most frequently of all the narrative elements and thus seem to have the most fundamental role in the structure, and in Homer they are also among the most consistently present, while Akkadian literature, the Sanskrit *Nalopākhyāna*, and the Welsh *Mabinogion* have no analogues or partial ones at best. Both Homer and the Hittite texts usually represent hosts as having a crew of servants to prepare the meal. Homer tends to give less attention to the drink and more to the food, especially the meat. The allotment of meat even marks gradations of honor among guests, a function to which seating arrangements also contribute in Homer as they do in Hittite texts. The Homeric poets further develop the significance of feasting through conventional descriptions of the host at the beginning of a hospitality scene. Aristocratic male hosts are already feasting when visitors encounter them, while other hosts are not. The description of the host is characteristic of

¹³³ Margo Kitts, "Ritual Scenes in the *Iliad*: Rote, Hallowed. or Encrypted as Ancient Art?" *Oral Tradition* 26, no. 1 (2011): 238-239.

¹³⁴ Mary Bachvarova, "Hurro-Hittite Song as a Bilingual Oral-Derived Genre," in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology*, edited by Piotr Taracha (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Agade, 2014), 77-108.

Homeric hospitality scenes and apparently absent from Hittite ones, though it seems to have occurred sometimes in Ugaritic texts.

In its focus on the narrative structure of type-scenes, this thesis has used a somewhat different methodology from other researchers who have offered evidence for contact between the ancient poetic and mythological traditions of Greece and the Near East, but for the most part it confirms their results. M.L. West briefly discusses commonalities between feasting in Homer and in the Ugaritic and Hurro-Hittite traditions, characterizing the Ugaritic examples as “stock scenes” and recognizing the association between feasts and hospitality in all three traditions.¹³⁵ My program of research perhaps comes closest to that of Bachvarova, who includes detailed discussion of hospitality scenes in her treatment of similarities between Homeric epic and Hurro-Hittite *SÌR*, though like West she deals with particular motifs in isolation from the structure of the type-scene.¹³⁶

Bachvarova’s discussion privileges the hospitality scene from the *Song of Release* that I number as (7), though she also comments on (1), (2), and (3) from the *Song of Hedammu*, while her primary Homeric example is the embassy to Achilles (*Iliad* 185-219). Of the parallels treated here, she recognizes the chair and footstool for the guest and the importance of the order of seating.¹³⁷ Bachvarova recognizes the similarity of Ugaritic hospitality scenes to Homeric and Hittite ones, too.¹³⁸ In her interpretation, Anatolia was the channel for the transmission of Near Eastern epic to Greece.¹³⁹ She finds evidence for the theory in an assembly scene from the *Song*

¹³⁵ West, *East Face*, 201-203.

¹³⁶ Bachvarova, “Hittite to Homer,” 107-116.

¹³⁷ Bachvarova, “Hittite to Homer,” 107. Her other parallels, “the magnificence and extravagance of the trappings, the host personally serving the guest wine, [and] the wine goblet filled only with the finest,” are more difficult to investigate in the framework of type-scene structure.

¹³⁸ Bachvarova, “Hittite to Homer,” 109-110.

¹³⁹ Bachvarova, “Hittite to Homer,” 3-5, 25-26, 126-128.

of Release which is apparently intermediate between the conventions of Near Eastern and Greek assembly scenes.¹⁴⁰ However, chapter 5 of this thesis demonstrated that hospitality scenes from Ugaritic stand in the intermediate position between Homeric and Hittite ones, if anything. Conceivably the Hittite tradition shared in the Homeric-Ugaritic parallels and no examples happen to have been preserved, but it is also possible that the conventions for assembly scenes and hospitality scenes spread through the eastern Mediterranean from different origins.

However, my results offer most support for the model put forward by López-Ruiz. Based on her reinterpretation of the relationship between Hesiod's *Theogony*, the Kumarbi Cycle, the Baal Cycle, and other Near Eastern succession myths, she proposes "a Graeco-Levantine tradition with a strong Northwest Semitic component."¹⁴¹ I cannot assess her argument here, but such a "Graeco-Levantine tradition" would explain the commonalities between Homeric, Ugaritic, and Hittite hospitality scenes perfectly. The possible role of poorly known, undeciphered, or undiscovered languages as centers of origin or routes of transmission for poetic motifs should not be forgotten, of course; Hurrian is a case in point. Perhaps the most intriguing question raised by the commonalities between Greek and Hittite hospitality scenes is why the *Theogony* lacks them when the Near Eastern succession myths that so clearly influenced it and the Homeric poems from another part of the Greek hexameter tradition are both so hospitality-rich. In any case, paying attention to the structure of type-scenes allows a systematic and unified treatment of elements that early Greek poetry shares with Near Eastern texts and those that it does not, a treatment that adds to the evidence for cross-linguistic influence between the Greek and Near Eastern traditions.

¹⁴⁰ Bachvarova, "Hittite to Homer," 84-107.

¹⁴¹ López-Ruiz, *Gods*, 128.

REFERENCES

- Arend, Walter. *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1933.
- Bachvarova, Mary. "From Hittite to Homer: The Role of Anatolians in the Transmission of Epic and Prayer Motifs from the Near East to the Greeks." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2002.
- . "Hurro-Hittite Song as a Bilingual Oral-Derived Genre." In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology*, edited by Piotr Taracha, 77-108. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Agade, 2014.
- Beekes, Robert. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Bergren, Ann L.T. "Language and the Female in Early Greek Thought." *Arethusa* 16 (1983): 69-95.
- Berman, Howard. "The Stem Formation of Hittite Nouns and Adjectives." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1972.
- Bryce, Trevor. *Life and Society in the Hittite World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Chantraine, Pierre. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1968-1980.
- Collins, Billie Jean. *The Hittites and Their World*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Davies, Sioned. "Storytelling in Medieval Wales." *Oral Tradition* 7, no. 2 (1992): 231-257.
- Edwards, Mark W. "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type-Scene." *Oral Tradition* 7, no. 2 (1992): 284-330.
- Foley, John Miles. *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Foster, Benjamin R., trans. *From Distant Days: Myths, Tales, and Poetry of Ancient Mesopotamia*. Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 1995.
- Gantz, Jeffrey, trans. *The Mabinogion*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1976.

- Güterbock, Hans G., and Harry A. Hoffner, ed. *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1980-.
- Haas, Volkert. *Die hethitische Literatur: Texte, Stilistik, Motive*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006.
- Haubold, Johannes. *Greece and Mesopotamia: Dialogues in Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Heubeck, Alfred. "Syllabic *r* in Mycenaean Greek?" *Minos* 12 (1972): 55-79.
- Higbie, Carolyn. *Heroes' Names, Homeric Identities*. New York: Garland Pub., 1995.
- Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. *Hittite Myths*. 2nd ed. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1998.
- . "Hurrian Civilization from a Hittite Perspective." In *Urkish and the Hurrians: Studies in Honor of Lloyd Cotsen*, edited by Giorgio Buccellati and Marilyn Kelly-Buccellati, 167-200. Malibu: Undena Publications, 1998.
- Hoffner, Harry A., and H. Craig Melchert. *Reference Grammar*. Vol. 1 of *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- Jamison, Stephanie. *Sacrificed Wife/Sacrificer's Wife: Women, Ritual, and Hospitality in Ancient India*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- de Jong, Irene J.F. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Kim, Ronald. "'To drink' in Anatolian, Tocharian, and Proto-Indo-European." *Historische Sprachforschung* 113, no. 1/2 (2000): 151-170.
- Kitts, Margo. "Ritual Scenes in the *Iliad*: Rote, Hallowed. or Encrypted as Ancient Art?" *Oral Tradition* 26, no. 1 (2011): 221-246.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Lamberterie, Charles de. "*Sella, subsellium, meretrix*: sonantes-voyelles et 'effet Saussure' en grec ancien." In *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, edited by J.H.W. Penney, 236-253. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Liverani, Mario. "Adapa, Guest of the Gods." In *Myth and Politics in Ancient Near Eastern Historiography*, 3-23. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- López-Ruiz, Carolina. *When the Gods Were Born: Greek Cosmogonies and the Near East*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2010.

- McNeill, I. "The Metre of the Hittite Epic." *Anatolian Studies* 13 (1963): 237-242.
- Neu, Erich. *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung I: Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Hattuša*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996.
- Parker, Simon B., ed. *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Parry, Milman. Review of *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*, by Walter Arend. *Classical Philology* 31, no. 4 (1936): 357-360.
- Pecchioli Daddi, Franca. "From Akkad to Hattuša: The History of Gurparanzaḫ and the River that Gave Him Its Name." In *Semitic and Assyriological Studies Presented to Pelio Fronzaroli by Pupils and Colleagues*, edited by Paolo Marrassini, 476-494. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003.
- Pedrick, Victoria. "The Hospitality of Noble Women in the *Odyssey*." *Helios* 15 (1988): 85-101.
- Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Translated by Laurence Scott. 2nd ed. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968.
- Puhvel, Jaan. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin: Mouton, 1984-.
- Ragot, Pierre. "Hittite *ḫaššikzi/ḫaššikkanzi* « se rassasier », grec homérique ἄσαι/ἄμεναι « id. » et ἄδην « à satiété » : réflexions nouvelles à l'appui d'un rapprochement étymologique discuté." *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 83, no. 2 (2009): 223-251.
- Reece, Steve. *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993.
- Rix, Helmut, and Martin Kümmel. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.
- Ruigh, C.J. "Les origines proto-mycéniennes de la tradition épique." In *Hommage à Milman Parry: Le style formulaire de l'épopée homérique et la théorie de l'oralité poétique*, edited by Françoise Létoublon, 33-45. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1997.
- Singer, Itamar. *Muwatalli's Prayer to the Assembly of Gods through the Storm-God of Lightning (CTH 381)*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Smith, Mark S., trans. "The Baal Cycle." In *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, edited by Simon B. Parker. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Tischler, Johann. *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 1983-.

Viredaz, Rémy. “La graphie des groupes de consonnes en mycénien et en cypriote.” *Minos* 18 (1983): 125-207.

Watkins, Calvert. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

West, M.L. *The East Face of Helicon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Yakubovich, Ilya. “Were Hittite Kings Divinely Anointed? A Palaic Invocation to the Sun-God and Its Significance for Hittite Religion.” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions* 5, no. 1 (2005): 107-137.

APPENDIX 1¹⁴²

HOSPITALITY TYPE-SCENES FROM HITTITE LITERATURE:
TEXTS, TRANSLATIONS, AND SYNOPSES

The Song of Hedammu

CTH 348.I.21

[...] *pai*[*t*]
[...]^d*kumarbiy*[*a* ...]
[...]^{GIŠ}*DÌM-az* [...]
n=aš ANA ^d*kumarbi* [...]
[*n*] *u arunaš uddā*[*r* ...]
[...] *EG*] *IR-pa QĀTAMMA kappuw*[*a*- ...]
[*m*] *ān* ^d*kumarbiš ar*[*unaš uddā*] *r*[?] *IŠME*
[...]^{LÚ} *halukattallan 7-Š*[*U* ...]
[*n*]=*aš=ši=kan KILĪLU* [...] *GUŠKIN* [...]
[...] ^d*kumarbiš* ^{LÚ} *hal*[*ukattalla-* ...]
[...] *GAM-anta duddumil*[*i* ...]
[^d*kumar*] *biš=kan aruni GAM-a*[*n*] *ārš*
adanna=šši akuwanna p[*iyēr*[?]]
[...]-*za DUMU.NITA-an karpta*
n=an[?] [*AN*] *A* ^d*kumarbi g*[*inuwaš* ...]
[^d*kumarbi*] *š=z=kan*[?] *DUMU-a*[*n* ...]
[...]-*an*[?](-)[...]

[. . .] *wen*[*t* . . .] *Kumarbi* [. . .] *The Sea* [. . .] *spec*[*h* . . . *noti*[*c*- . . . *ag*] *ain* the same way
[. . .] *W*] *hen Kumarbi heard the S*[*ea*'s *spec*] *h* [. . .] *messenger seven tim*[*es* . . .] *He* [. . .] *crown*
to him [. . .] *gold* [. . .] *Kumarbi* [. . .] *me*[*ssenger* . . .] *down quietl*[*y* . . . *Kumar*] *bi reac*[*h*] *ed the*
Sea. [*They gav*] *e for him to eat and drink*[. . .] *he lifted up the son* [. . .] *o*[*pen him fo*] *r Kumarbi*
[. . .] *Kumarb*] *i* [. . .] *the son* [. . .]

¹⁴² See Reece, *Stranger's Welcome*, 207-231 for synopses of the hospitality scenes from Homer.

1) CTH 348.I.6.1-24

[...] arḥ[a ...]
[...]
[... =w]ar=an eter?²
[...]
5 [...] dagān ŪL mau[š- ...]
[...]
arḥa=ma=an eter
[... tak]nī kattanta pai[t]
[...] IŠME
10 n[u]=šši=kan ZI-anz anda [...]-yattat
nu=kan ĠİR-an ANA ^{GIŠ}. ...]-at
nu=kan aruni BIBRŪ ŠU-ši dāer
šall[iš arunaš uddā]r ANA ^dku[m]arbi EGIR-pa memi[škiuwan dāiš]
[...]-aš ašanza memiaš ^dku[m]arbi DINGIR^{MES}-[aš at]taš
15 nu=mu INA UD 7^{KAM} INA É-YA eḥu
n=a[n ... ^dše]rtapšuruḥin DUMU.MUNUS-YA
dalugašti=ya[...]
[palḥ]ašti=ma=aš 1 DANNA
n=an GA.KU₇ GIM-an [... ^dš]ert[ap]šuruḥin
20 mān ^dku[m]arbiš IŠME
nu-[... an]da duš[k]attat
nekuzz=a meḥur tīyat
[nu=k]an GAL-in arunan ^dku[m]arbiyaz É-erz IŠTU [... a]rkammiyaz [galgaltū]riyaz
ZABAR U IŠTU BIBRĪ^{HLA}ZABAR [pa]rā uwat[er]
[... IN]A É-ŠU arḥa pēḥuter

[. . .] awa[y . . .] “They ate it[.]” . . .] not fal[l] on the earth [. . .] and they ate it up[. . . .
w]ent down to the earth [. . .] heard. His spirit within him [. . .]ed. [. . .]ed his foot on [. . .] They
put a rhyton in the Sea’s hand.

The gre[at Sea began to sp]eak in answer to Kumarbi: [“. . .]matter is settled, Kumarbi,
father of gods. Come [to me] in my house in seven days. [. . . he]r, my daughter [Se]rtapsuruḥi.
And in length [. . .] but in [wid]th she is one DANNA. [. . .] her, [S]ert[ap]suruḥi, like sweet
milk.”

When Kumarbi heard, [. . .] rej[o]iced wit[hin . . .] The time came to night. [They]
broug[ht] the great Sea away from Ku[m]arbi in his house with [. . . h]arps and [tambou]rines of
bronze and with rhytons of bronze[. . .] they led him away [t]o his house.

Synopsis:

V. Preparations

a. Footstool (11)

b. Drink served (12)

VIII. Visitor tells news (13-19)

XII. Departure (22-24)

2) CTH 348.I.5.8-37

- [...]-ti [...]
 [...]-zi ^dIŠTAR-iš ^{URU}n[enuwaš MUNUS.LUGAL-aš]
 10 [ašanna=šši ^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A-an tiyandu]
 [ad]anna=ma=šši ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-un [u]nuwandu
 [kuitman eniššan memišker]
 [^dI]ŠTAR-iš=ma=šmaš kattan ārš
 n=a[š ...]
 15 [ašanna=šši]i ^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A-an tiyer
 ŪL=aš=z=kan eša[t]
 [adanna=ma=šši ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-un] unuēr
 nu=ššan parā UL šali[kta]
 [GAL-in=ši parā piē]r
 20 nu=kan pūrīn UL dāi[š]
 [^{UR}U]nē[nuwaš MUNUS.LUGAL-aš ... memi]škiuwan dāiš
 kuwat=z ŪL ez[ti ...]
 [kuwat] ŪL ekutti ammel išhā=mi
 [...]adātar
 25 nu kuit akuwatar ŪL ša-[...]
 [...]-na arunan DINGIR ^{MES}-naš menaḥḥand[a ...]-ēr
 n=aš=kan nepiši daganzi[pi ...]-aš
 nu=kan aruni anda kuin tarpan[allin ...]
 [... š]akiyaz memaḥḥi
 30 nu ^{MUS}ḥedam[mu- ...]-na [...] memišket
 n=an ^dIŠTAR-iš [...]-ma kappūwaet
 [... ^d]IŠTAR-in išdammašta
 [...]
 [... -z]i arḥa ḥallanniešk[ezzi]
 35 [...]
 [išḥaḥru=ma=šši]i=kan parā PA₅^{HLA}-[uš mān aršanzi]
 [...]

[. . .] Ištar, [queen of] N[ineveh. Let them place a chair for her to sit in] and [s]et a table for her to [eat from.” While they were speaking in this way, I]štar reached them. S[he . . .] they placed a chair for [her to sit in;] she d[id] not sit. They set[a table for her to eat from,] but she did not tou[ch] it. They [gave her a cup,] but she [did] not put her lip to it. [The queen of] Ni[neveh . . .] began to spe[ak:]: “Why [do you] not eat [. . . Why] do you not drink, my lady? [. . .] eating, and because [. . .] not [. . .] drinking[.” . . . “. . .] the sea agains[t] the gods. He [. . .] in heaven and eart[h. . .] The deputy that [. . .] in the sea [. . .] I tell from the [s]ign. Ḥedam[mu . . .” . . .] s/he spoke. Ištar noticed him [. . .] he heard Ištar [. . .] is wreck[ing . . . and tears flow] from h[im like] canals[. . .]

Synopsis:

Va. Chair and table (10-11)

IVb. Arrival at a person (13)

VI. Visitor is upset

a. Visitor refuses chair, table, and cup (15-20)

b. Host takes offense (21-25)

VIII. Visitor tells news (26-30)

3) CTH 348.I.1.72-115

[...]

[... ÍD-z] taknaz GAM-an [arḥa KASKAL-an iya]

[nu=wa=tta^dSÎN-aš]^dUTU-uš taknašš[=a DINGIR^{MEŠ}-uš lē uwanzi]

75 [n]u=wa=kan ANA^dkum[arbi ... ÍD-z takn]az GAM-an šarā eḥ[u]

[^dmukišanuš udd]ār IŠME

n=aš šarā ḥ[ūdak arāiš]

[n=aš=ka]n ÍD-z taknaz GAM-an arḥa KASKAL-an iyat

n=an^dSÎN-aš^dUTU-uš taknašš=a DINGIR^{MEŠ}-uš [ŪL a]wēr

80 [n=aš=kan] aruni kattanda pait

^dmukišanuš^dkumarbiyaš uddār aruni EGIR-pa memiškiuwan dāiš

eḥu

ḥalzeššai=wa=tta DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš attaš^dkumarbiš

uddanī=ma=wa=tta kuedani ḥalziššai

85 nu=wa uttar liliwan

nu=wa ḥūdak eḥu

eḥu=ma=wa=kan ÍD-z taknaz kattan arḥa

nu=wa=tta^dSÎN-aš^dUTU-uš taknašš=a DINGIR^{MEŠ}-muš lē uwanzi

mān šalliš arunaš uddār IŠME

90 n=aš=kan šarā ḥūdak arāiš

n=aš=kan taknaš ÍD-ašš=a KASKAL-an GAM-an arḥa i[yat]

1-anki=aš šarrattat

n=aš=kan ANA^dkumarbi šarḥulaz taknaz^{GIŠŠÚ.A-i[=šši]} kattan šarā wet

ašanna=šši^{GIŠŠÚ.A-an aruṇi tiyēr}

95 nu=z=kan šalli[š arunaš]^{GIŠŠÚ.A=ši ešat}

^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-un=ši unuwandan adann[a z]ikkezzi

^{LÚ}SAGI.A-aš=ma=šši^{GEŠTIN KU₇ akuanna peške[zzī]}

^dkumarbiš=kan DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš attaš šallišš=a aruna[š aš]anz[i]

nu=z azzikkanzi akkuškanzi

100 ^dkumarbiš uddār ANA^{LÚ}SU[KKAL-ŠU mem]iškiwan dāiš

^dmukišanu^{LÚ}SUKKAL-YA

uddār=t[a] kue tem[i]

[nu=mu u]ttanaš^{GIŠ}GEŠTU-an parā lagān ḥark

^{GIŠ}IG ḥatt[alwai]

105 [...]-i

^{GIŠ}zakkiuš=ma peššiya

[...]

[... w]aršulaš GIM-an lē [...]

[...]-aš pušpušin mān [...]^{LÚ.MEŠ}MÁŠD[A ...]

110 ^dmukiš[a]muš uddā[r IŠME]

[n]=aš hūtā[k arāiš]
 [...]-an dāiš
 URUDU za[kk]iš GIŠ tar-[...]
 [... Z]ABAR and[a ...]
 na-[...]

[“ . . . take a path back] under [the rivers and] earth. [Do not let the Moon God and] the Sun God [and] the gods of the earth [see you! C]ome up to Kum[arbi . . .] under [river and earth!”

Mukisanu] heard the [spee]ch. He qu[ickly stood] up. [He] took a path back under river and earth. The Moon God and the Sun God and the gods of the earth did [not s]ee him. [He] went down to the Sea.

Mukisanu began to repeat Kumarbi’s speech to the Sea: “Come! The father of gods, Kumarbi, is calling you. The matter for which he is calling you is urgent. Come quickly! And come back under river and earth. Do not let the Moon God and the Sun God and the gods of the earth see you!”

When the great Sea heard the speech, he quickly stood up. He t[ook] a path back under earth and river. He traveled in one stage. He came up to Kumarbi from the post and the earth under [his] chair.

They placed a chair for the Sea to sit in, and the grea[t Sea] sat in his chair. He starts to [p]lace a prepared table for him t[o] eat from and the cupbearer [starts] to give him sweet wine to drink. Kumarbi the father of gods and the great Se[a si]t. They are eating and drinking.

Kumarbi began to [say] something to [his vizi]er: “Mukisanu, my vizier, hold your ear tilted toward the thing that [I] speak to yo[u. Bo]lt the door. [. . .] and throw the latches. [. . .] Do not let [. . .] like an arom[a . . .] like a ? [. . . p]oor people [. . .] Mukis[a]nu [heard the s]peech. He quickl[y stood . . .] he began [. . .] la[tc]h [. . .] bronze in [. . .]

Synopsis:

- I. Invitation (73-88)
- II. Journey (90-92)
- IVb. Arrival at a person (93)
- V. Preparations
 - a. Chair and table (94-96)
 - b. Drink served (97)
- X. Eating and drinking (99)

CTH 346.4

[...]
 [ad]anna=wa=[šši[?] akuwanna[?] ...] handandu
 nu=[šši[?] ...] :lahpaš unuwandu
 [...]
 nu=z ēzdu eku[ddu]
 [... -n]aš[?] [...]
 n=an apiya [p]unuššuwēni
 kuitman eniššan memišker

^dUTU-uš=m[a ...]
 n=aš=kan GIM-an anda wet
 n=aš=z=kan ^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A-k[i ...]
 adanna=šši akuwanna piyēr
 arunaš[...] memiškiuwan dāiš
 UL-a=tta ^{LÚ}ḥ[aminaš? ...]
 UL=ma=tta ^{LÚ}kallištarwanaš wet
 [...]
^dUTU-uš=kan aruni GAM-anda GIM-an apenišša[n ...]
^dUTU-uš aruni EGIR-pa memiškiuwan dāiš
 [...] wakkari ŪL kuedani kuitki
 nu kū-[...] ŪL zāi
 mān=ma=kan waggari=ma kued[ani ...]
 nu GIM-an arunaš ^dimbaluriyaš ^{LÚ}SUKKAL-ŠU uddā[r IŠME]
 nu=šši=kan ZI-z anda idalawēšta
 n=uš[...] tameummaḥtat
 n=uš=z=kan arunaš SA[G.DU? ...]
 nu wēškezzi
 išḥaḥru=ma=šši=kan p[arā PA₅^{HL.A}] mān aršanzi
 nu=z arunāš wēškiuwanza ZI-ni=ši[... memiškiuwan? d]āiš
 NÍ.TE^{HL.A}-uš=mu=z ḥalmešnaš ki-[... U]R.GI₇^{HL.A}-uš ŠAḤ^{HL.A}-uš
 nu=mu=kan anda BAD-ḥiškan-[...]
 [...] kišḥaḥat
 nu=mu=kan kuiš wāki
 [...] :puššaezzi
 :ḥūwahaḥwanalaš[...]
 :maluštayaš=ma=mu wāket
 nu GIM¹[...]
 DINGIR^{MEŠ}-uš=mu šalli[n U]R.MAḤ-an [...]
 [...] anda kalleštarw[a? ...]
 [...] KA₅.A^{HL.A}-uš katta[...]
 n=uš [...]

“[. . .] Let them arrange [. . . for him] to [eat and drink . . .] Let them prepare [. . .]of ivory [for him. . . .] Let him eat and drink[. . . .] At that time we will [q]uestion him.”

While they were speaking in this way, the Sun God [. . .] He arrived. He [. . .] in a chair. They gave for him to eat and drink.

The Sea [. . .] began to speak. “Did a ch[amberlain] not [. . .] you, and did a herald not come to you? [. . .]”

As soon as the Sun God [. . .] down in that wa[y] to the Sea, the Sun God began to answer the Sea: “[. . .] no-one lacks anything. [. . .] is not excessive. But if any[one] lacks [. . .]”

As soon as the Sea [heard the s]peech of Imbaluri, his vizier, he became evil within his soul. He changed them [. . . he]ad of the Sea [. . .] them. He is shouting and tears flow f[rom] him like [canals.] The Sea, shouting, bega[n to speak . . .] to his soul: “A ?’s [. . .] my limbs [. . .d]ogs and pigs[. . . .] remov[- . . .] inside me [. . .] I have become [. . .] Who bites me? [. . .] grinds [. . .]”

a ? [. . .] and a ? bites me. When [. . .] The gods [. . .] a grea[t l]ion at me [. . . he]rald inside [. . .]
foxes down [. . .] them [. . .]”

The Song of Ullikummi

4) CTH 345.I.1.43-87

- [mān arunaš^dimpal]uriyaš INIM^{MES}-ar IŠME
nu arunaš ANA^dim[pa]luri EGIR-pa memiškiuwan dāiš
45 [dimpaluri ... INIM^{MES}-a]r=ta kuie [memiškemi]
[...] GEŠTU-an parā [...]
^dimpaluri kē=mu uddār ištamaš
n=at īt ANA^dkumarbi peran daššanut
nu īt ANA^dkumarbi memi
50 kuwat=wa É-ri menahḥanda ka[rtimmiy]auwanz wet
nu=wa É-er katkattimaš ēpta
SAG.GÉME.ARAD^{MES}=ya nahšaraz ēpta
[amm]ukk=a=wa=kan [...]
tuk=wa IGI-anda^{GIŠ}ERIN-pi karū duwarnan
55 TU₇^{HIA}=ya=tta menahḥanda karū zanuwan
tuk=ma=wa IGI-anda UD^{KAM}-ti GE₆^{KAM}-ti=ya^{LÚ.MES}NAR=ma=wa[!] GIŠ^dINANNA^{HIA}
menahḥanda tiššan ḥarkanzi
šarā tīya
nu INA É-YA arḥa eḥu
n=aš šarā tīyat^dkumarbiš
60 nu=šši^dimpaluriš peran iyattari
^dkumarbiš=ma [IŠTU] É-ŠU iyattari
n=aš iyanniya[t]^dkumarbiš
n=aš=kan arunaš É-ri anda pait
nu arunaš IQBI
65 ANA^dkumarbi=wa^{GIŠ}ḥaššalli ašanna tiyandu
^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-un=ma=w[a]=šši peran tiyandu
adanna=wa=šš[i a]kuwanna udandu
KAŠ-eššar=ma=wa=šši akuwanna udandu
^{LÚ.MES}MUḤALDIM TU₇^{HIA} uter
70 ^{LÚ.MES}SAGI.A=ma=šši GEŠTIN KU₇ akuwanna uter
1-ŠU ekuer
2-ŠU ekuer
3-ŠU ekuer
4-ŠU ekuer
75 5-ŠU ekuer
6-ŠU ekuer
7-ŠU ekuer
nu^dkumarbiš ANA^dmukišanu^{LÚ}SUKKAL-ŠU memiškiuwan d[āiš]
^dm[ukišanu^{LÚ}SUKK]AL-YA memiyan=da kuin memaḥḥi
80 nu=mu GEŠTU-[an parā] ēp

ŠU-z^{GIŠ}GIDRU-an dā
 [INA GÌR^{MESŠ}-KA=ma=z^{KUŠ}]E.SIR^{HL.A}-uš šarkui
 nu ī[t]

[...]
 85 [n]u=kan A^{HL.A}-naš and[a ...]
 [nu=kan[?] kē udd]ār A^{HL.A}-aš pera[n memi]
 [... ^dku]marbi[...]

[When the Sea] heard [Impal]uri’s speech, the Sea began to answer Im[pal]uri:
 [“Impaluri, . . .] your ear [. . .] toward [the thing]s that [I am telling] you. Impaluri, hear these things from me. Go speak them firmly before Kumarbi. Go tell them to Kumarbi. Why has he come a[ng]ry against the house? Trembling has seized the house and awe has seized the servants and I [. . .] Cedar has already been broken for you and soups have already been cooked for you, and musicians hold lyres readied for you by day and night. Get up! Come away to my house!”

Kumarbi got up. Impaluri goes before him and Kumarbi goes out of his house. Kumarbi started to go. He went into the Sea’s house.

The Sea spoke: “Let them place a stool for Kumarbi to sit on and let them place a table before him. Let them bring for hi[m] to eat and [d]rink, and let them bring beer for him to drink.” The cooks brought soups and the cupbearers brought sweet wine for him to drink. They drank once. They drank twice. They drank three times. They drank four times. They drank five times. They drank six times. They drank seven times.

Kumarbi b[egan] to speak to Mukisanu, his vizier: “M[ukisanu,] my [vizi]er, hold [out] your ear to the speech that I speak to you. Take a staff in your hand and put shoes [on your feet.] G[o! . . . i]n the waters [. . . Speak these thin]gs befor[e] the waters [. . . ” . . . Ku]marbi [. . .]

Synopsis:

- I. Invitation (1.45-58)
- II. Journey (1.59-62)
- IVc. Arrival at a building (1.63)
- V. Preparations
 - a. Stool and table (1.65-66)
 - b. Food and drink served (1.67-70)
- X. Drinking (1.71-77)

5) CTH 345.I.1.217-253, 345.I.2.1-30

[mā]n nepiš[aš] ^dUTU-uš DINGIR-LU[M arun]i[?] aušta
 nu ^dUTU-uš kalmaruš dān EGIR-p[a wa]hnut
 n=aš=kan [...] p[ar]ā iyanneš
 220 n=aš ^dU-ni GAM-an iyanneš ^d[UTU-uš[?]]
 [nu mān[?]] ^dUTU-un IGI-anda aušta
 nu ^dtašmišuš ^dU-[ni] mem[iškiuwa]n dāiš
 kuit=war=aš wezzi AN-aš ^dUTU-uš KUR-e[aš LUGAL-uš]
 wezzi=ma=war=aš kuedani memiyani
 225 nu=wa memiya[š nakkiš]
 [Ū]L=war=aš arḥa peššiyauwaš

- daššuš=war=aš ḥalluwaiš*
daššuš[=ma=war=aš] zahḥāiš
nepišaš=ma=war=aš ḥarnamniyašḥaš
 230 *ŠA KUR-TI=ma=war=aš kāšz akkatarr=a*
^dU-aš ANA ^dtašmišuš memiškiuwan dāiš
ašanna=šši ^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A-an tiyandu
adanna=ma=šši ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-un unuw[and]u
[k]uitman eneššan memišker
 235 *^dUTU-uš=ma=šmaš [parn]i tiyat*
ašanna=šši ^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A-an tiyēr¹
n=aš=z ŪL [eš]at
adanna=[m]a=šši ^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-un unuēr
nu=kan parā ŪL šal[ikt]a
 240 *GAL-in=šši piēr*
nu=ššan pūrin ŪL dāi[š]
[n]=aš ^dU-aš ^dUTU-i EGIR-pa memiškiuwan dāiš
^{LÚ}Š.Ā.TA[M ... ḤUL]-luš
[^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A-an[?] kui]š dāiš
 245 *nu=z UL ešat*
^{LÚ}<^{GIŠ}>BAN[ŠUR]-aš ḤUL-lu[š]
[^{GIŠ}BANŠUR-un[?] kuiš d]āiš
nu=z ŪL ezta
^{LÚ}SAGI.A-aš ḤUL-l[uš]
 250 *[GAL-in[?]] kuiš pāiš*
nu ŪL ekutt[a]
DUB 1^{KAM} ŠĪR ^dullikum[m]i ...]
[...]-mau

[...] ēšzi
[...]
^dU-aš EGIR-pa AN[A ...]
[...] ŪL ēzza[t- ...]
 5 *[... š]anezz[i ...]*
[...] [E]GIR-pa memi[ške- ...]
[...] [arḥ]a mar-[...]
[... r]a-[...]
[...]x[...]
 10 *[...]x[... ku]edani memini[?] x[...]*
[...] ^dU-aš IŠME
nu=wa=šši kartimmiatt[i peran ... tameu]mmaḥtat
nu=wa ^dU-aš [ANA ^dUTU ŠAMĒ EGIR-p]a memiškiuwan dāiš
[... š]anezzišdu
 15 *nu=wa=z ēz*
[...]x anda šanezzišdu
nu=wa [...]
[... i]špiya

- 20 *eku=ma=wa*
nu=wa=z haššik
 [...]-a
nu=wa=kan nepiši šarā ī[t]
 [...] *ištamašta*
^dUTU ŠAMĒ [... -z]a[?] *anda duškettat*
- 25 [*nu=kán NINDA INA* ^{GIŠ}BANŠU]R *šanezzišta*
 [*nu*]=z *ēzta*
 [GAL-i=ma=kan *anda* GEŠTIN K]U₇ *šanezzēšta*
nu e[ku]tta
 [*nu=kan* ^dUTU-us[?] *šar*]ā *tiyat*
- 30 *n=aš=kan nep[iš]i šarā pait*

[Whe]n the Sun God [of] the sky saw the go[d] in [the sea,] the Sun God [tu]rned his rays bac[k] again. He started going [t]o [. . . The Sun God] started going down to the Storm God.

[When] he saw the Sun God in front of him, Tasmisu began to s[pea]k [to] the Storm God: “Why is the Sun God of the sky coming, the [king of] lands? The thing for which he is coming is [an important one.] It is [n]ot one to dismiss. The quarrel is strong, the fight is strong, there is a tumult of the sky, and a hunger and death of the land!”

The Storm God began to speak to Tasmisu: “Let them place a chair for him to sit in and let them se[t] a table for him to eat from.”

[W]hile they were speaking in that way, the Sun God came to the [hous]e. They placed a chair for him to sit in, but he did not [si]t. They set a table for him to eat from, but he did not to[uc]h it. They gave him a cup, but he did not pu[t] his lip to it. The Storm God began to answer the Sun God, [“Is the] chamberla[in bad wh]o placed [the chair?] You have not sat. Is the ta[bl]e man bad [who p]laced [the table?] You have not eaten. Is the cupbearer bad who gave [the cup?] You have not dr[u]nk.” *Tablet 1 of the Song of Ullikummi* [. . .]

[. . .] eats [. . .] the Storm God back t[o . . .] not ea[t- . . . t]asty [. . .] answ[er . . . awa]y [. . .] the speech tha[t . . .] the Storm God heard. He cha[n]ged in anger [. . .] The Storm God began to answe[r the Sun God of the sky:] “Let [. . . b]ecome tasty. Eat. Let [. . .] become tasty inside [. . . e]at your fill and drink. Satisfy yourself[. . . G]o up to the sky[. . .]” [. . .]

[. . .] heard. The Sun God of the sky rejoiced inside [. . . The bread on the tabl]e became tasty [and] he ate. [In the cup the swe]t [wine] became tasty. He d[ra]nk. [The Sun God] got [u]p. He went up to the sk[y.]

Synopsis:

- II. Journey (1.220-221)
- III. Questions about the visitor (1.223-231)
- Va. Chair and table (1.232-234)
- IVc. Arrival at a building (1.236)
- VI. Visitor is upset
 - a. Visitor refuses chair, table, and cup (1.237-242)
 - b. Host takes offense (1.243-252)
- VIII. Visitor tells news (2.6-10)
- X. Eating and drinking (2.25-28)

XII. Departure (2.29-30)

6) 345.I.3.1.102-149

- [GIM-an^dU-aš ŠA^dtašmiš]u uddār ištamašta
 nu nuntarnutta [liliwahta]
 [GISŠ]Ú.A-az šarā hūdak arāiš
 105 [dU-aš^dtašmišuš]š=a ŠU-z appantat
 n=at 1-anki ša[rrer]
 [n]=at INA^{URU}abzūwa [erer]
 [nu^dU[?]ANA]É^dA.A pait
 n=aš hantezz[iyaš[?]GISIG-aš 5-ŠU hinkta]
 110 [GISar]ašaš=ma=aš 5-ŠU hinkta
 [mahhan=ma=kan MA]HAR^dA.A[?]erer
 [n=aš PĀNI[?]É.A[?] 1]5-ŠU hin[kta]
 [... š]arā ti[yat]
 [... memiškiwa]n dāi[š]
 115 [... ^dÉ.A-aš [...]
 [...]-ši Ū[L ...]
 [...]-ši ša[k ... ?]
 [...](-)zi(-)[...]
 [..](-)aru (-)[...]
 [gap]
 120 [...]
 [...] ŪL [...]
 [...]memiškiwan [dāiš]
 [...]
 [...]x=mu memiyaš šan-[...]
 125 [... _ _ _ d]āi
 nu=mu zik^dU-aš pi-[...]
 [...]peran šarā artaru
 nu mem[i-...]
 nu mahhan^dtašmišuš uddā[r ŠA[?]É.A[?] ištamašta[?]]
 130 [...]parā piddāet
 n=an ginuwa 3-Š[U kuwašta[?]]
 n=an patalhuš 4-ŠU kuwašta
 [...]hulhuliyat
 nu=šši=kan w[a-...]
 135 nu=šši=kan kuitman anda :k[u- ...]
 [...]^{NA4}kunkunuzi aggtar ZAG-ni^{U[ZU]}ZAG.UDU-ni[?] ...]
^dA.A-aš ANA^dtašmišu EGIR-pa me[miškiwan[?] dāiš[?]]
 nu=kan INA^{HUR.SAG}gandur[na šer[?] ...]
 [...]INA^{HUR.SAG}lalapaduwa š[er[?] ...]
 140 [...]dankui daganzipi [...]
 [...]dadalla huḥadall[a É.^{NA4}KIŠIB^{HI.A?} ...]

145 [n]u=kan^{URUDU} ardāla par[ā tiyandu]
 [...]
 [L]Ú^{MEŠ} kattan arḥa [...]
 [mā]n[?] dÉ.A-aš uddā[r memiyawanzi[?] zinnet[?]]
 [...]-ša INA^{HUR.S[AG]} kandurna[?] šer[?] ...]
 [INA^{HUR.S[AG]} lalapaduw[a šer[?] ...]
 [... P]ANI ZI-ŠU[...]
 [...]

[When the Storm God] heard the speech from [Tasmis]u, he made haste [and hurried.] He quickly got up from his chair. [The Storm God] and [Tasmisu] took each other by the hands. They traveled in one stage. They [arrived] in Abzūwa. [The Storm God] went [to] the house of Aya. He [bowed five times at] the main doors and he bowed five times at the [inn]er doors, [and when] they arrived [be]fore Aya, he bowed [fif]teen times [in the presence of Aya. . . .] g[ot u]p [. . .] began [n] t[o speak . . .]

[. . .] Aya [. . .] no[t . . .] not [. . . began] to speak: [. . .] “My words [. . . t]ake [. . .] You, Storm God, [. . .] me [. . .] Let him stand up before [. . .] spe[- . . .] When Tasmisu [heard the] speec[h of Aya,] he ran out [. . . He kissed] his knees three tim[es.] He kissed the soles of his feet four times. He struck dead [. . .] him [. . .] While inside him [. . .] death to the Basalt on its right [shoulder . . .]

Aya [began to ans]wer Tasmisu: “On Gandur[na . . .] on Lalapaduwa [. . .] on the dark earth [. . .] fatherly and grandfatherl[y seal houses . . . Let them brin]g the stone-saws[. . . . Peo]ple [. . .] down away [. . . ” Whe]n Aya [stopped saying] somethi[ng, . . .] on [Kandurna . . . on] Lalapaduw[a . . . in the] presence of his spirit [. . .]

Synopsis:

II. Journey (3.1.104-106)

IV. Arrival

a. Arrival at a location (3.1.107)

c. Arrival at a building (3.1.108-110)

b. Arrival at a person (3.1.111-112)

XI. Host responds (122-144)

The Song of Release

7) KBo XXXII 13 Vs. II

^DIM-aš mahḥan iyattat

n=aš=kan taknaš^DUTU-waš ḥalentūwaš andan iyanniš

nu=šši^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A-ŠU [...]

^DIM-aš=kan LUGAL-uš mahḥan āškaz andan uit

nu=ššan ŠA A.ŠÀ IKU (5) ANA^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A^DIM-aš pargawan ešat

A.ŠÀ 7 tawallaš=ma=ššan ANA^{GIŠ}GÌR.GUB GÌR^{HI.A}-ŠU parknut

^DIM-aš=kan^DŠuwaliyazš=a kattanta tankuwai taknī iyannir (10)

nu=z=an anda išḥuziyait taknaš^DUTU-uš

n=aš ANA^DIM piran weḥatta

*nu šanizzin EZEN₄-an iēt taknāš ḥattalwaš taknāš^DUTU-uš
 nu SIG₇-an GU₄.^{HLA}-un ḥatteš
^DIM –unni (15) šallai piran SIG₇-an GU₄.^{HLA} -un ḥatteš
 3 SIG₇ ^{UDU}GUKKAL[?] KUN^{HLA}-na ḥatteš
 kappuwauwar=*ma* kuedani NU.GÁL MÁŠ.TUR-i SILA₄-i MÁŠ.GAL-ya
 nu apiniššuwān ḥattat (20)
 LÚ.MEŠ NINDA.DŪ.DŪ ḥandāir
 LÚ.MEŠ SAGI-ya anda arir
 LÚ.MEŠ MUHALDIM=*ma*=kan ^{UZU}GABA^{HLA} šarā dāir
 n=aš=kan ^{DUG}DÍLIM.GAL kuškuššullaz[]anda uter
 nu adānnaš meḥur tiyet
 nu=z ^DIM-aš LUGAL-uš adānna (25) ešat
 karūliuš=*ma*=z DINGIR.MEŠ-uš ^DIM-aš ZAG-az ašašta
 taknaš=*ma* ^DUTU-uš ^DIM-an piran ^{LU}SAGI-aš iwar tiyēt
 kišraš=*ma*=šši galulupēš=šeš talugaē[š] (30)
 n=at=kan miyawēš=*pat* galulupēš [ANA B]IBRI kattanta kiantari
 [IŠTU ḥalwan]it=*ma* kuēz akuwanna [piškizzi
 apēd]aš=*a* anda aššuwātar kitt[a(-)]
 [. . .]-atta[r . . .] (35)*

When the Storm God went, he was going into the palaces of Istanu of the earth. [. . .] his chair [. . .] for him. When King Storm God came inside the gates, the Storm God sat high on an IKU-field chair, and he raised his feet on a seven-tawalla-field footstool. The Storm God and Suwaliyat were going down to the dark earth.

Istanu of the earth girded herself up. She turns around before the Storm God. Istanu of the earth made a tasty feast at the bolts of the earth. She slaughtered ten thousand cattle. She slaughtered ten thousand cattle before the great Storm God. She slaughtered thirty thousand fat-tailed sheep, and so many kids and lambs and billy-goats were slaughtered that there was no counting them. The bakers arranged and the cupbearers arrived inside, and the cooks took up briskets. They brought them in with bowls and mortars.

The time came to eat. King Storm God sat to eat, and she seated the Elder Gods on the Storm God's right, and Istanu of the earth went to go before the Storm God as a cupbearer, and the fingers of her hand were long. All four fingers lie under [the r]hyton, and goodness l[ies] in [the rhytons] with which [she is giving] to drink[. . .]

Synopsis:

V. Preparations

- a. Chair and footstool (3-8)
- b. Food and drink served (13-24)

IX. Host assigns seats (26-27)

Gurpāranzahu

8) CTH 362.1.4-41

[...]-malla[?] [...]

- 5 *nu=kan hūya-[...]*
 [...]-*pu hūdak*^m*gurpa*[ranza- ...]
 [...] *udaš*
nu=z šarga[we- ...]
 [... ^m]*impākruš taruht*[a]
- 10 [...]-*maš gimri iya*[?]-[...]
 [...]-*ya=kan huwedat* [...]
 [... PIRIG.TU]R *hartaggan*^m*gurpāranzaḥuš* [... *hū*]*dak kuenta*
gimran šarā [...]
 [namm]a[?]URU[?] *aggata anda pāer*
- 15 [... URU[?]a]ggata URU-ri^m*impākruš* [... Š]UŠI LÚ^{MEŠ} 70 *šargawēš andan pā[er]*
 [ZA]G-naz=*an=z=an awan katta ašešanut*^m*gurpāranzaḥun apel*^{LÚ}*HATANI-ŠU*
eter=šmaš ekuer
nu=šmaš=at [...]
nu^{GIŠ}PAN^{H.L.A} *weker*
- 20 ^{KUŠ}IŠPATU AN.ZA.GÀR [...]-ir[?] *mahḥan unuwāer*
n=at ANA^m*gurpār[a]nzaḥu peran katta tiyēr*
šiyaiškezzi^m*gurpāranzaḥa*[š[?]]
 [n]u=šši=*kan GI-aš IŠTU*^{GIŠ}PAN *pariyan MUŠEN-iš mān iyattari*
 ŠUŠI [L]Ú^{MEŠ} 70 ^{LÚ}GURUŠ *šišiyauwanzi taruhta*
- 25 ^m*impākru*[š] *šašti pait*
n=aš=z ka[tta[?] š]ešta
^m*gurpāranzaḥašš=a šašti pait*
 Ì.DÛG.GA=*ma=šš[i p]eran papparšeškanz*[i]
 [...] KASKAL^{MEŠ} *IŠT[U ...] išparrer*
- 30 *n=at=kan É*.[ŠÀ[?] ...]
n=aš=kan šašti šer IŠTU^{GIŠ}KUN₅ *pai*[t]
 [... [?]] DAM-SU=*z^ftatizuli tamai UD-a*[tti ...] *šešḥaš*
nu ANA^m*gurpāranziḥu* [... š]a[l]ikaš
lē=wa=z kuitman [...]-ti
- 35 *nu=wa=nnaš=kán ŠÀ É.ŠÀ-ni in*-[...]
 [...]^f*tatizuliš* [...]
 [...] É^{NA4}KIŠIB *parā* [...]
 ... -š]uš 1-NUTIM AN.B[AR[?] ... -y]anza
n=an=k[an ...]
- 40 [...]=*z šu*-[...]
 [... -u]š=*z* [...]

[. . .] run off [. . .] Gurpa[ranzaḥu] quickly [. . .] he brought. Her[o- . . .] Impākru defeat[e]d . . . go in the meadow [. . .] game [. . .] Gurpāranzaḥu [qui]ckly killed a [leopard]d and a wolf [. . .] the meadow [. . .] up [. . .]

[The]n they went into Akkad. Impākru to [A]kkad City [. . . s]ixty people and seventy heroes we[nt] in. He sat Gurpāranzaḥu, his son-in-law, down on his ri[ght.] They ate and drank with them. They [. . .] them. They asked for the bows. When they prepared the quiver and pillar [. . . ,] they set them down before Gurp[ā]ranzaḥu. Gurpāranzaḥa is shooting. His arrow flies from the bow like a bird. He defeated sixty [pe]ople and seventy youths at shooting.

Impākru went to bed. He fe[ll a]sleep. And Gulpāranzaḥa went to bed, and they are sprinklin[g] fine oil before hi[m.] They spread paths wit[h . . .] They [. . . inner] chamber [. . .] In bed he wen[t] off the step.

His wife, Tatizuli, arranged [. . .] on another day [. . .] She [a]pp[r]oached Gulpāranziḥu. “Do not [. . .] while [. . .] for us in the inner chamber [. . .]” Tatizuli [. . .] to [. . .] seal house [. . .] -]ed [. . .] set of ir[on . . .] him [. . .]

Synopsis:

- IVa. Arrival at a location (14-15)
- IX. Host assigns seats (16)
- X. Eating and drinking (17)

9) CTH 362.4.36-43

n=aš IN[A ...] ITTI DINGIR.MAḤ pait

^d*gulšuš[...]* ^{id}*aranzaḥan awēr*

[...] *akuwanna piyēr*

ēz[ta]

40 1-ŠU 2-ŠU 3-ŠU 4-ŠU 5-ŠU 6-ŠU 7-ŠU [...]

^{id}*aranza[ḥu- ...]*

^d*gul-[...]*

[...]

He went t[o . . .] to the Mother Goddess. The Gulsas saw the Aranzaḥa [. . .] They gave [. . .] to drink. He at[e. . . .] once, twice, three times, four times, five times, six times, seven times [. . .] The Aranza[ḥu . . .] The Gul[- . . .]

Synopsis:

- Va. Drink served (38)
- X. Eating and drinking (39-40)

Appu

10) CTH 360.1.62-81

^dUTU-*uš=ma=ššan šarā nepiši iyanniš*

^dUTU-*un=kan* ^dU-*aš IGI-anda 3 DANNA au[š]ta*

nu=z ANA ^{LÚ}SUKKAL-ŠU *memiškiuwan dāiš*

65 *āšma=war=a[š] wezzi* ^d[UT]U-*uš KUR-eantaš* ^{LÚ}SIPA.UDU-*aš*

KUR-e=wa ni[kk]u kuwapikki ḥarkan

man=wa URU ^{DIDL.HI.A} *nikku kūwa[p]ikki dannatieššanteš*

mān=wa ^{LÚ}ÉRIN ^{MES} *nikku kuwapiki ḥullanteš*

^{LÚ}MUḤALDIM-*an* ^{LÚ}S[AG]I.A-*an watarnaḥten*

70 *nu=šši adan[na ak]uwanna pišket[en]*

n=aš wit[...]

n=an apiy[a ...]

^dU-aš ^dUTU-[...]
n=an pu[nuškiwan dāiš]
75 *kuit=wa [...]*
nu=war=a[t ...]
[...] EGIR-pa [*memiškiwan dāiš*]
nu=wa [...]
ammu[k(-) ...]
80 ŠU^{MES}[...]
[*n*]u[=ššī? ...]

And the Sun God started going up to the sky. The Storm God saw the Sun God in front of him at three DANNAs. He began to speak to his vizier: “Now [the Su]n God is coming, the shepherd of the country! The land is not destroyed somewhere, i[s i]t? Cities are not devastated some[w]here, are they? Armies are not embattled somewhere, are they? Command the cooks and c[up]bearers! Giv[e] for him to ea[t and d]rink!”

He came [. . .] him ther[e . . .] The Storm God [. . .] the Sun God [. . . He began to questi]on him: “Why [. . .] i[t . . . began to ans]wer [. . . “ . . .] me [. . . ” . . .] hands [. . .] to [him . . .]

Synopsis:

- I. Journey (62)
- III. Questions about the guest (64-68)
- Va. Food and drink served (69-70)
- VII. Host questions visitor (74-76)
- VIII. Visitor tells news (77-79)

Elkunirsa and Ašertu

11) CTH 342.1.1.7-36

[*n=aš šarā*] *tiyat*
n=aš ŠA^{ID} māla ḥaršumnaš ār[š]
10 [*n=aš ANA*] ^d*elkunirša ŠA^d ašertum^{LÚ} MUTI-ŠU ā[rš]*
[*n=aš=kan ŠA*] ^d*elkunirša^{GIŠ} ZA.LAM.GAR-aš anda pait*
[^d*elkun*] *iršaš^d U-an aušta*
n=an pūnušta
[*kuit=wa*] *uwaš*
UMMA ^dU-MA
15 *mān=wa=ta=kkan ŠÀ É-KA=ya uwanu[n]*
[... =w] *a=mu^d ašerduš DUMU.MUNUS^{MES} wiyat*
eḥu=wa=mu=z katta šē[š]
[*ūk=ma Ū*] *L memmahḥun*
apāš=ma=mu=z=kan ḥalanzatta
20 [*nu kišš*] *an IQBI*
appan=wa=mu=z=kan ēš
[*namma=wa*] *=ddu=z tuk EGIR-pa ēšmi*

- nu=wa=ta=kkan ammitaz [memiyanaz k]atta tamašmi
 ammēdaz=ma=wa=ta [^{GIS}BAL.TUR-az[?] ḥatt]arāmi
 25 nu apadda uwanun ammel attaš=meš
 [IŠTU^{LU}T]EMU=ya=ta ŪL u[w]anun
 ūk=wa=tta ukila [uwanun]
^dašerduš=wa=z tuk^{LU}MUT-KA markiya[zi]
 [... DA]M-KA
 30 nu=wa ammuk wiškezzi
 [katta=wa=mu=z šē]š
^delkuniršaš ANA^dU EGIR-pa [memiškiuwan dāi]š[?]
 īt=war=an :šaššūmāi :[... ^dašerdun DA]M-YA
 [n]u=war=an lūriyah
 35 [^dU-aš IN]IM^delkunirša IŠME
 n=aš ITTI^dašertum [pait]

[He] got [up.] He reach[ed] the sources of the Māla. [He reac]hed Elkunirsa, the husband of Asertu. [He] went into Elkunirsa[’s] tents.

[Elkun]irsa saw the Storm God. He questioned him: [“Why] have you come?”

And the Storm God thus: “When I cam[e] to you and your house, Aserdu sent her daughters to me: ‘Come sle[ep] with me!’ [But I] said [n]o. And she ?ed me. She spoke [as fol]lows: ‘Be behind me. [Then] I will be behind you. I will press you dow[n with my speech] and [pr]ick you [with my spindle.’] That is why I have come, my father, and I have not c[o]me to you [through a me]ssenger. I myself [have come] to you. Aserdu object[s] to you in your husbandhood. [. . .] your w[ife . . .] She keeps coming to me: ‘S[leep with me!’”]

Elkunirsa b[egan to ans]wer the Storm God: “Go demean [Aserdu,] my w[ife.] Humiliate her.”

[The Storm God] heard [the wo]rds of Elkunirsa. He went to Asertu.

Synopsis:

IV. Arrival

- a. Arrival at a location (8)
- b. Arrival at a person (9)
- c. Arrival at a building (10)

VII. Host questions visitor (12-13)

VIII. Visitor tells news (14-31)

XI. Host responds (32-34)

12) CTH 321.10-40

- 10 ^dIM-tašš=a DINGIR^{MES}-naš ḥūma[nd]uš mūgaet
 anda=ma=pa tīyatten[?]
 nu=z ^dinaraš EZEN₄-an yēt
 nu ḥūman mekki ḥandaet
 GEŠTIN-aš^{DUG}palḥi marnuwandaš^{DUG}palḥi [wa]lḥiyaš^{DUG}palḥi
 15 [nu^{DU}]Gpalḥaš a[nd]an iyāda y[ēt]
 nu^dinara[š INA^{URU}]z]iggaratta pait

- nu ^mhūpašīyan LÚ.U₁₉.LU wemiet
 UMMA ^dinar ^mhūpašīya
 kāša=wa kī=ya kī=ya uttar iyami
 20 nu=wa=mu=ššan zikk=a ḥarphut
 UMMA ^mhūpašīya ANA ^dinar
 mā(n)=wa katti=ti šešm[i]
 [n]u=wa uwami kardiaš=taš iyami
 [n]=a[š] katti=ši šešta
 25 nu ^dinaraš ^mhūpaš[iyan p]ēhutet
 n=an mūnnāet
^dinarašš=a=z unuttat
 n=ašta ^{MUS}illuyank[an] ḥantešnaz šarā kallišta
 kāša=wa EZEN₄-an iyami
 30 nu=wa adanna akuwanna eḥu
 n=ašta ^{MUS}illuyankaš QADU [DUMU^{MEŠ}-ŠU] šarā wēr
 nu=z eter ekue[r]
 n=ašta ^{DUG}palḥan ḥūmandan ek[uer]
 n=e=z ninkēr
 35 n=e namma ḥattešnaš kattand[a?] nūmān pānzi
^mhūpašīyašš=a wet
 nu ^{MUS}illuyankan išḥimant kalēliet
^dIM-aš wet
 nu=kan ^{MUS}illuya[nk]an kuenta
 40 DINGIR^{MEŠ}-š=a katti=šši ešer

And the Storm God invited a[l] the gods: “Come in!” Inara made a feast. She arranged everything grandly, pots of wine, pots of barley-beer, and pots of [wa]lḥi. She m[ade] an abundance i[ns]ide the pots.

Inara went [to Z]iggaratta. She found Ḥūpašīya, a human. Inara thus to Ḥūpašīya: “Now I will do such-and-such a thing. You join with me too.”

Ḥūpašīya thus to Inara: “If [I] sleep with you, I will come do your wish.”

He slept with her. Inara led Ḥūpaš[iya u]p. She hid him. And Inara prepared herself. She called the snake up from his hole: “Now I will make a feast. Come eat and drink.”

The snake together with [his sons] came up. They ate and dran[k.] They dr[ank] a whole pot. They got drunk. Then they do not want to go down their holes. And Ḥūpašīya came. He tied the snake with a rope. The Storm God came. He killed the sna[k]e. And the gods were with him.

Synopsis:

I. Invitation (10-11)

Vb. Drink served (12-15)

I. Invitation (28-30)

X. Eating and drinking (32-34)

Disappearance of Telipinu

13) CTH 324.1.42-47

GAL-iš=z ^dUTU-uš EZEN₄-an yēt
nu=z 1 LIM DINGIR^{MEŠ} ḫalzaīš
eter

45 n=e ŪL išpiyēr
ekuiēr=ma
n=e=z ŪL ḫašš[i]kker

The great Sun God made a feast. He invited the thousand gods. They ate; they did not get full. And they drank; they did not satisfy themselves.

Synopsis:

I. Invitation (43)

X. Eating and drinking (44-47)

APPENDIX 2

LIST OF HOSPITALITY SCENES EXAMINED FOR CHAPTER 5

Sanskrit

Citations refer to book, section and *śloka* in the Critical Edition of the *Mahābhārata*, published by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

2. Nala and Damayantī's first meeting (3.51.25-3.53.21)
3. Damayantī's *svayamvara* (3.54.1-33)
4. Damayantī and the ascetics (3.61.67-91)
5. Damayantī and the Cedis (3.62.19-43)
6. Nala in Ayodhyā (3.64.1-8)
7. Sudeva and the Cedis (3.65.1-3.66.21)
8. Parṇāda in Ayodhyā (3.68.2-12)
9. Nala and Damayantī's Reunion (3.68.20-3.77.2)

Welsh

Citations refer to *The Mabinogion*, trans. Jeffrey Gantz (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1976).

1. Pwyll and Rhiannon's attempted wedding (p. 55-57)
2. Pwyll and Rhiannon's wedding (p. 57-59)
3. Teirnon, Pryderi, and Pwyll (p. 63-65)
4. Manawydan and Rhiannon's wedding (p. 85)
5. Gwydyon, Gilvaethwy, and Pryderi (p. 100-101)

6. Aranrhod and Math (p. 106)
7. Gwydyon, Lleu, and Aranrhod's meeting (p. 107)
8. Lleu's arms (p. 109-110)
9. Goronwy and Blodeuedd (p. 111-112)
10. Gwydyon and the peasant (p. 114-115)

Akkadian

Citations for 1-12 refer to *From Distant Days: Myths, Tales, and Poetry of Ancient Mesopotamia*, trans. Benjamin R. Foster (Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press, 1995).

1. Marduk's coronation (p. 22-28)
2. Ištar in the netherworld (p.78-83)
3. Gaga in the netherworld (p. 85-86)
4. Nergal offends Namtar (p. 86-87)
5. Nergal hides from Namtar – i (p. 86-87)
6. Nergal in the netherworld (p. 88-92)
7. Nergal hides from Namtar – ii (p. 94)
8. Nergal hides from Namtar – iii (p. 94-95)
9. Adapa in heaven (p. 99-101)
10. The eagle's dream (p. 112)
11. Marduk and the Anunna-gods (p. 142)
12. The merchants and Sargon (p. 168)

Citations for 13-15 refer to tablet and line in A.R. George, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

13. The hunter and Gilgameš (1.148-168)
14. Enkidu and the shepherds (2.36-51)
15. Gilgameš and Ūta-napišti (10.184-11.285)

Ugaritic

Citations refer to *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry*, ed. Simon B. Parker (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997).

Kirta

1. The gods and Kirta (p. 24-25)
2. Kirta and Huraya's first feast (p. 27-28)
3. Kirta and Huraya's second feast (p. 28-29)
4. Kirta and Huraya's third feast (p. 30)

Aqhat

5. The gods and Daniel (p. 58-59)
6. Anat and El (p. 62-64)
7. Paghit and YTPN (p. 77-78)

The Baal Cycle

8. El's feast (p. 88-90)
9. Kothar and El – i (p. 90-92)
10. El summons Anat (p. 92-94)
11. Kothar and El – ii (p. 95-96)
12. Yamm's messengers to El (p. 98-102)
13. Baal summons Anat (p. 109-115)
14. Anat's audience with El (p. 116-118)

15. Baal's messengers to Kothar (p. 118-121)
16. Baal, Anat, and Athirat (p. 122-125)
17. Athirat and El (p. 127-130)
18. Anat announces Baal's palace to him (p. 130-131)
19. Kothar and Baal (p. 131-133)
20. Inauguration banquet for Baal's palace (p. 134-135)
21. Mot and Baal (p. 141-146)
22. Baal and El (p. 146-147)
23. Messenger's announce Baal's death to El (p. 149)
24. Anat announces Baal's death to El (p. 153)
25. Anat and Shapsh (p. 158-160)

El's Divine Feast

26. El's feast (p. 194-195)

The Rapiuma

27. The Rapiuma and El (p. 199-204)