

## Bestiality in Hittite Thought\*

Ilan Peled

VU University, Amsterdam

### *Introduction*

Almost three decades ago, Archi commented that the relationship between men and animals in an agricultural society, such as the Hittite, was immediate.<sup>1</sup> Archi concluded that in the Hittite mind, the worlds of humans and animals should have been kept separated, and any mixture between them was viewed negatively.<sup>2</sup> The current paper explores an aspect of this relationship that reaches the extreme borders of human behavior: the attitude of Hittite society towards the act of bestiality.

Though most of the data we examine derives from written sources, we begin with silent evidence, which may bear relevance to our topic. AO 9664, a curious metal artifact from Yozgat which is currently hosted at the Louvre, was probably a votive rein, dated to the late third-early second millennium BCE. The object is decorated with the image of an equine, probably a horse, rearing up on its hind legs. The animal is leaning forward, with its front legs

---

\* Author's note: The topic of bestiality is understandably delicate and morally complex. As noted by anthropologist Wendy Doniger ("Calf and Other Loves," *London Review of Books* 16/15 [2009]: 3) in her review of M. Dekkers, *Dearest Pet: On Bestiality* (London: 1994), "The subject itself would tend to make the book one long dirty joke; but the issues it raises are deadly serious, touching the tender spots of racism, sexism, sexual abuse and, indeed, the nature of sexual otherness." The current article expresses no moral or judgmental views, and maintains a descriptive nature in studying the textual evidence of Hittite attitudes towards bestiality. In this regard, any discussion is avoided of the moral, legal or psychological aspects of the phenomenon. Interesting and important as these may be, they remain beyond the scope of this historically-based study.

I thank Jared Miller for kindly reading a draft of this article, and making many important comments on it. The responsibility for the content of this article, and any error it may contain, are entirely my own.

Abbreviations follow *CHD*, Volume P, vii–xxix.

<sup>1</sup> Alfonso Archi, "Société des hommes et société des animaux," in Fiorella Imparati, ed., *Studi di storia e di filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli* (Firenze: ELITE, 1988), 25. For a survey of animal imagery in Hittite texts, see *ibid.* For selected papers discussing the topic of animals in the Hittite world and the ancient Near East, see Billie Jean Collins, ed., *A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

<sup>2</sup> Archi, "Société," 37.

placed on the shoulders of a man standing in front of it. The two figures appear as if they are embraced.<sup>3</sup> The true meaning of this scene will probably ever evade us, and speculations are unwarranted. Whether this scene was meant to signify human control over beasts, the domestication of equines or fond relations between them, one thing remains clear: it attests to close contact between man and animal, whatever the exact nature of this contact was.

A clarifying comment on methodology is in order. In the type of textual analysis presented in this article, the matter of contextualization is imperative. Though the central objective of this article is to discuss the attitude towards bestiality in Hittite culture, the pertinent evidence must be evaluated against the background of a clear theoretical and historical framework, and within the wider context of social conduct. The discussion of the Hittite material, therefore, must not be disconnected from other historical and cultural parallels. For that end, our survey begins with a presentation of the theoretical framework for the study of bestiality, and continues with a brief account of historical examples of the phenomenon. Once the context has been clarified, we turn to discuss the Hittite evidence.

### *Theoretical Considerations and Historical Parallels*

Before discussing the Hittite attitude to sexual relations between humans and animals, we should first consider the wider significance of this phenomenon, and the general scholarly view of it.<sup>4</sup> Various different terms

---

<sup>3</sup> Images of this object can be found on the Musée du Louvre website: [http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/cartelfr/visite?srv=car\\_not\\_frame&idNotice=19271](http://cartelfr.louvre.fr/cartelfr/visite?srv=car_not_frame&idNotice=19271) (last access 20 August 2020).

<sup>4</sup> The scholarly literature surveying this topic from various angles, including historical, anthropological, legal and psychological, is vast. The following is a mere basic list: Adolph Fredrick Niemoeller, *Bestiality in Ancient and Modern Times: A Study of the Sexual Relations of Man and Animals in All Times and Countries* (Girard, KS: Haldeman-Julius Publications, 1946); Robert E. L. Masters, *Forbidden Sexual Behaviour and Morality: An Objective Re-Examination of Perverse Sex Practices in Different Cultures* (New York: Matrix, 1962); Joseph R. Rosenberger, *Bestiality* (Los Angeles: Medco Books, 1968), Edwin Harris, *Animals as Sex Partners* (Los Angeles: Ultima House, 1969); Alfred Ellison, *Sex between Humans & Animals: The Psycho-Mythic Meaning of Bestiality* (San Diego: Academy Press, 1970); Peter O. Peretti

are employed for defining the act of sexual intercourse between humans and non-human animals. The most common of these are “bestiality” and “zoophilia”, while less frequent are “bestiosexuality”, “zooerasty”, “zoosexuality” and “sodomy”. Each one of these terms, however, has its own meaning nuances, and they are by no means identical. Most significantly, “zoophilia” implies an emotional affinity for the animal, and not necessarily sexual or erotic tendency, while “bestiality” refers more explicitly to sexual congress.<sup>5</sup> It appears that bestiality existed from the dawn of human civilization, as we know of scenes found in European cave paintings from fifteen to twenty thousand years ago that depict sexual encounters between humans and animals.<sup>6</sup> Salisbury has suggested that in early Christian thought the very existence of human sexuality was perceived as “bestial,” its origins rooted in the seduction of Eve by the snake in the Garden of Eden. To demonstrate this view, Salisbury quotes the words of Thomas Aquinas, “In sexual intercourse man becomes like a brute animal.” Later on, according to Salisbury, an opposite approach developed, according to which Adam and Eve were the ones who introduced sexual intercourse to animals, and thus the act portrayed animals as assuming human behavior.<sup>7</sup> Salisbury has pointed to a gradual change that can be observed in society’s attitude towards bestiality along human history. The writings of the second century Roman writer Claudius Aelianus contain numerous allusions to bestiality, which Salisbury interprets as evidence for relative toleration of such acts by

---

and Maurice Rowan, “Variables Associated with Male and Female Chronic Zoophilia,” *Social Behavior and Personality* 10/1 (1982): 83–87; Joyce E. Salisbury, “Bestiality in the Middle Ages,” in eadem, ed., *Sex in the Middle Ages. A Book of Essays* (New York: Garland 1991), 173–86; Joyce E. Salisbury, *The Beast Within: Animals in the Middle Ages* (New York: Routledge, 1994); Dekkers, *Dearest Pet*; Hani Miletski, *Understanding Bestiality and Zoophilia* (Bethesda, MD: East-West, 2002); Colin J. Williams and Martin S. Weinberg, “Zoophilia in Men: A Study of Sexual Interest in Animals,” *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 32/6 (2003): 523–35; and Richard Kahn, “Zoophilia and Bestiality: Cross-cultural Perspectives,” in *Encyclopedia of Human-Animal Relationships*, ed. Marc Bekoff (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2007), 107–10. See also the collection of essays in Andrea M. Beetz and Anthony L. Podberscek, eds., *Bestiality and Zoophilia: Sexual Relations with Animals* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2005).

<sup>5</sup> Kahn, “Zoophilia,” 109.

<sup>6</sup> Peretti and Rowan, “Variables,” 83 and Kahn, “Zoophilia,” 107.

<sup>7</sup> Salisbury, *The Beast Within*, 78–79, 86.

contemporary Roman society. This attitude changed, according to Salisbury, with the rise of Christianity and the attempts made by the church to fight the phenomenon, which it associated with pagan traditions. Thus, the Christian attitude towards bestiality grew hostile across time: while in the sixth and seventh centuries the act was considered to be less severe than adultery or homosexuality,<sup>8</sup> in the beginning of the second millennium church laws grew harsher towards it. The animal was no longer perceived as a passive object, but rather as a partner in crime. In the thirteenth century, bestiality was labeled by Thomas Aquinas as the severest of all sexual sins, because, according to Aquinas, by having sexual intercourse with an animal, man has delivered himself away from his very humanity.<sup>9</sup>

According to this view, then, the negative social attitude towards the act of bestiality is rooted in Christian moral ethics, while in previous pagan environment it was less objectionable. Quite similarly, Kahn writes that “societies rooted in Abrahamic religious traditions...maintain important prohibitions against the practice”, and “as secular culture became instantiated throughout much of Europe and North America during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, legislative concern with and the penalties for bestiality largely lessened.”<sup>10</sup> In a sense, therefore, we notice here a circular model of thought. According to it, bestiality was tolerated to a certain degree among pre-monotheistic cultures; later it was legally prohibited, as a result of Judeo-Christian ethics; and ultimately, in modern times, legal prohibitions of bestiality were lessened, because of the rise of secularization in the Western world. In referring to bestiality in the United States, Kahn claims that “the pressure of socio-religious mores against bestiality remains the primary force preventing its wider adoption as an acceptable American practice”, rather than the enforcement of formal laws.<sup>11</sup> Some of these assumptions,

---

<sup>8</sup> In the Columbanus penitentials (591 CE) and Cummean penitentials (660 CE) bestiality was regarded as equal to masturbation; see Salisbury, "Bestiality," 177.

<sup>9</sup> Salisbury, "Bestiality," 174, 177-79, 182.

<sup>10</sup> Kahn, "Zoophilia," 107.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 108.

and the model itself, however, are perhaps over-simplistic. As we will see, the negative attitude towards bestiality was by no means introduced to the world by monotheistic religions, and prevailed among human cultures predating the rise of any of them.<sup>12</sup> It is also questionable whether only religious circles may object to bestiality, and whether it is more likely to occur in secular communities than in religious ones.

Allusions to bestiality are embedded in myths and cultic rituals of various human cultures, the most notable of which – at least in the Western world – is ancient Greece. In Greek mythology, however, the act usually involves a deity in a zoomorphic form, rather than an actual animal, who initiates the relations. We thus know of Zeus who seduced Europa, Leda and Persephone while disguised as a white bull, a swan and a serpent, respectively. Zeus further abducted Ganymede while disguised as an eagle, in a scene strongly alluding to both bestiality and pederasty. Another well-known tale is that of Pasiphaë, who mated with a white bull sent to Crete by Poseidon, which led to the birth of the Minotaur, the infamous half-human half-bovine creature.<sup>13</sup> In his discussion of these tales, Robson concludes that they were meant to entertain and to educate Greek society, and delineate the boundaries between deities, humans and animals. He also asserts that these myths conveyed the morals of the appropriate social conduct of Greek women, who were expected to suppress sexual passion, lest they are punished for it.<sup>14</sup>

Another example is found in the Indic world. Hindu mythology shows numerous mentions of bestiality,<sup>15</sup> while during the *Aśvamedha* ritual the queen performed symbolic sexual intercourse with a sacrificed stallion, thus

---

<sup>12</sup> The Hittite evidence, as demonstrated in this article, exemplifies this. Another example in this regard appears in the Hindu Laws of Manu, for which see below.

<sup>13</sup> For an account and sources of these and other similar myths, see James E. Robson, "Bestiality and Bestial Rape in Greek Myth," in Susan Deacy and Karen F. Pierce, eds., *Rape in Antiquity: Sexual Violence in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (London: Duckworth, 1997), 83–89.

<sup>14</sup> Robson, "Bestiality," 65, 82–83.

<sup>15</sup> For a study of this topic, see Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty, *Sexual Metaphors and Animal Symbols in Indian Mythology* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1981).

metaphorically transferring the vigor of the animal to the king.<sup>16</sup> In contrast, a reference to bestiality in the Hindu Laws of Manu<sup>17</sup> expresses objection to the act. We therefore notice here a contrast between hyper-realistic occurrences, such as mythical episodes and the symbolic performance of rituals, and the prohibitions expressed by formal laws. It is not always clear which of these aspects reflects society's actual conduct more accurately, or whether any consistency exists in this regard.

Closer to the Hittite material, bestiality is rarely attested in the Mesopotamian corpus. The few references to the act belong to the realm of hyper-realistic texts, such as literary compositions, omens and dream reports. For example, it has been suggested that before being introduced to sexual intercourse by the prostitute, Enkidu was engaged in bestiality.<sup>18</sup> We encounter numerous occasions of women giving birth to various animals in the omen series *šumma izbu*, "If an anomaly...",<sup>19</sup> while several mentions of bestiality exist in dream reports, such as the following:<sup>20</sup>

diš lú *ana ú-ma-mi du-ik* x[...]

*ana igi-šu du-ak*

If a man goes to a wild animal: [his house?] will become prosperous.

The phrase "to go to..." (*ana...alāku*) sometimes alluded to sexual intercourse in Mesopotamian literature,<sup>21</sup> and hence relates the above quote to bestial relations. Perhaps the most intriguing allusion to bestiality in Mesopotamian sources derives from magical rituals. Some of the most notable examples are found in *šà.zi.ga* ("rising of the heart," an allusion to erection) potency

---

<sup>16</sup> For descriptions and discussions of this ritual, see Roman Zaroff, "Aśvamedha – A Vedic Horse Sacrifice," *Studia Mythologica Slavica* 8 (2005): 75–86 and Morris L. West, *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 417–18.

<sup>17</sup> Chapter 11, §174, see Wendy Doniger, *The Laws of Manu: With an Introduction and Notes* (London: Penguin, 1991), 267–68.

<sup>18</sup> See Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. "Incest, Sodomy and Bestiality in the Ancient Near East," in idem, ed., *Orient and Occident. Essays Presented to Cyrus H. Gordon on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Kevelaer: Butzon und Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973), 82, following Otto J. Baab, "Bestiality," *IDB* 1 (1962), 387.

<sup>19</sup> See Erle V. Leichty, *The Omen Series šumma izbu* (Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin, 1968).

<sup>20</sup> *MDP* 14, pp. 50–59 rev. iii 8'–9'.

<sup>21</sup> See *CAD* A/1, 321, s.v. "alāku 4c".

incantations and rituals.<sup>22</sup> In one occurrence, the impotent patient lies on a bed to which the female practitioner ties certain animals. She then addresses the animals as follows:<sup>23</sup>

*lim-gu-ug anše-ma munus.anše li-ir-kab*

*lit-bi da-áš-šú li-ir-tak-ka-bu ú-ni-qí x*

*ina sag ḡišnú-ia lu ra-ki-is da-áš-<sup>r</sup>šú<sup>1</sup>*

*ina še-pit ḡišnú-ia lu ra-ki-is pu-ha-lu<sup>4</sup>*

*šá sag ḡišnú-ia ti-bá-a ra-man-ni*

*šá še-pit ḡišnú-ia ti-bá-a hu-ub-<bi>-ba-an-ni*

*ú-ru-ú-a ú-ru munus.ur ú-šar-šú ú-šar ur.ku*

*gim ú-ru munus.ur iṣ-ba-tú ú-šar ur.ku*

May the donkey swell up! May he mount the jenny! May the buck get an erection! May he repeatedly mount the female-kid! At the head of my bed, indeed, a buck is tied! At the foot of my bed, indeed, a stag is tied! The one at the head of my bed: get an erection! Make love to me! The one at the foot of my bed: get an erection! Caress me! My vagina is the vagina of a bitch! His penis is the penis of a dog! Like the vagina of a bitch seizes the penis of a dog (may my vagina seize his penis)!

Even if bestiality was not actually performed here, and the sole purpose of the magical procedure was to stir the patient using spoken metaphors, it is beyond doubt that in this episode bestial imagery was taken to be sexually exciting for humans.

Last but not least, Ugaritic literary texts also supply allusions to the act. One of the most explicit of these is a famous scene from the fifth tablet of the Baal Cycle, in which Baal copulates with a cow multiple (“seventy-seven, eighty-eight”) times.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup> See Robert D. Biggs, *ŠA.ZI.GA: Ancient Mesopotamian Potency Incantations* (Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin, 1967).

<sup>23</sup> *KAR 236:3-10.*

<sup>24</sup> *KTU/CAT 1.5 = CTA 5 col. v 17-21*; see transcription and translation in Mark S. Smith, “The Baal Cycle,” in Simon B. Parker, ed., *Ugaritic Narrative Poetry* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 148; see comments on the meaning of this episode in Hoffner, “Incest,” 82; Adrian H. W. Curtis, “Some Observations on “Bull” Terminology in the Ugaritic Texts and the Old

### *The Hittite Evidence*

We continue now to discuss the Hittite evidence. Hittite texts provide us a glimpse into the social attitude towards human-animal sexual congress, and in the broader sense, to society's reaction to occurrences in which individuals infringed the boundaries of law and custom. The Hittite attitude towards human-bestial sexual encounters is alluded to in texts that stem from various genres: legal, mythological, cultic and ritual. Further relevant information derives from other textual genres, as well as from archaeological finds. In what follows, we examine the pertinent evidence, and discuss its implications.

### *Legislation*

The Hittite Law Code (henceforth, HL) consists of some two hundred clauses.<sup>25</sup> Most of these laws are organized in thematic groups, the last of which is dedicated to topics of sexual conduct. This group includes some fifteen laws that were meant to regulate human sexual behavior.<sup>26</sup> Four of these relate to bestiality: HL §§187, 188, 199 and the first part of 200a:

*HL §187 (KBo 6.26 iii 20–22 // KUB 29.33 ii 2 // KUB 29.34 iv 2–4)*

*ták-ku LÚ-iš GU<sub>4</sub>-aš kat-ta [wa-aš-t]a-i hu-u-ur-ki-il a-ki-aš*

---

Testament," in Adam S. van der Woude, ed., *In Quest of the Past: Studies on Israelite Religion, Literature, and Prophetism* (Leiden: Brill 1990), 18–19; and Oded Borowski, "Animals in the Religions of Syria-Palestine," in Billie Jean Collins, ed., *A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 407.

<sup>25</sup> For editions of the Hittite Law Code, see Frédéric Hrozný, *Code Hittite provenant de l'Asie Mineure (vers 1350 av. J.-C.). 1<sup>er</sup> partie. Transcription, traduction française* (Paris: Geuthner, 1922); Ephraim Neufeld, *The Hittite Laws* (London: Luzac, 1951); Johannes Friedrich, *Die hethitischen Gesetze: Transkription, Übersetzung sprachliche Erläuterungen und vollständiges Wörterverzeichnis* (Leiden: Brill, 1959); Fiorella Imparati, *Le leggi ittite* (Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1964); Richard Haase, *Die Fragmente der hethitischen Gesetze* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1968); and most recently Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., *The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

<sup>26</sup> For a discussion of the terminology and semantics of these laws, see Ilan Peled, "'Amore, more, ore, re...': Sexual Terminology and the Hittite Law," in Yoram Cohen, Amir Gilan and Jared L. Miller, eds., *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010).

LUGAL-an<sup>127</sup> a-aš-ki ú-wa-da-an-zi ku-en-zi-ma-an LUGAL-uš  
 ḫu-iš-n[u]-zi-i[a-an LUGAL-u]š LUGAL-i-ma-aš Ú-UL ti-ia-iz-zi

If a man [si]ns with a cow: abomination. He shall be killed. They shall conduct (him) to the king's gate. The king may kill him, [the kin]g may spare [him], but he shall not approach the king.

HL §188 (KBo 6.26 iii 23–25 // KUB 29.33 ii 3–8 // KUB 29.34 iv 5–7)

tá[k-k]u LÚ-aš UDU-aš kat-ta w[a-aš-t]a-i ḫu-u-ur-ke-el a-ki-aš  
 [LUGAL-aš a-aš-ki] ú-wa-da-an-zi ku-en-zi-ma-an LUGAL-uš  
 ḫu-u-i[š-nu-zi-i]a-a[n LUGAL-u]š LUGAL-i-ma-aš Ú-UL ti-i-ez-zi

If a man s[in]s with a sheep: abomination. He shall be killed. They shall conduct (him) [to the king's gate]. The king may kill him, [the kin]g may sp[are] h[im], but he shall not approach the king.

HL §199 (KBo 6.26 iv 16–22 // KBo 22.66 iv 1'–7')

ták-ku ŠAḫ<-aš> UR.GI7-aš kat-ta ku-iš-ki wa-aš-ta-i a-ki-aš  
 A-NA KÁ É.GAL-LIM ú-wa-te-ez-zi ku-en-zi-uš  
 LUGAL-uš ḫu-iš-nu-zi-ia-aš L[UG]AL-uš LUGAL-i-ma-aš Ú-UL  
 ti-i-ez-zi ták-ku GU4-uš L[Ú-ni] wa-at-ku-zi  
 GU4-uš a-ki LÚ-aš-ša Ú-UL 'a'[-ki] 1 UDU LÚ-na-aš  
 ka-a-aš-ša-aš ḫu-u-it-ti-ia-a[n-ta]<sup>28</sup> na-an-kán ku-na-an-zi  
 ták-ku ŠAḫ-aš LÚ-ni wa-at-ku-z[i] Ú-UL ḫa-ra-a-tar

If someone sins with a pig (or) a dog: he shall be killed. He shall be conducted to the palace gate. The king may kill them,<sup>29</sup> the k[in]g may spare them, but he (=the human culprit) shall not approach the king. If a bull leaps [on] a m[an]: the bull shall be killed, and the man shall not be k[illed]. They addu[ce]<sup>30</sup> one sheep instead of the man, and they shall kill it. If a pig leap[s] on a man: there is no offense.

<sup>27</sup> This is according to Hrozný (*Code Hittite*, 142 n. 3) and Hoffner (*The Laws*, 148), unlike the *KBo* copy, that has “LUGAL-uš?”; see Hoffner, *The Laws*, 148 n. 517.

<sup>28</sup> Though there seems to be no obvious reason for the inflection of this verb in the medio-passive, instead of the usual present-future, in all of its attestations in the HL its inflection is identical (Pres.-Fut. pl. 3 med.-pass., see Hoffner, *The Laws*, 277).

<sup>29</sup> As noted by Hoffner (*The Laws*, 157), “them” refers here to the human and the animal.

<sup>30</sup> For this translation of “ḫuittiyanta”, see *HED* 3: 347, s.v. “huet-, huit-, hut(t)-, hu(i)ttiya-”.

HL §200a (KBo 6.26 iv 23–25 // KBo 22.66 iv 8'–10')

ták-ku LÚ-aš ANŠE.KUR.RA-i na-aš-ma ANŠE.GÌR.NUN.NA kat-ta  
 wa-aš-ta-i Ú-UL ḥa-ra-tar LUGAL-i-ma-aš<sup>31</sup> Ú-UL ti-ez-zi  
 LÚSANGA-ša Ú-UL ki-i-ša

If a man sins with a horse or a mule: there is no offense. But he shall not approach the king, and shall not become a priest.

It may be suggested that the sequence of these laws expresses a sense of gradation, from harsh to light. We first encounter the laws in which bestiality is defined as “abomination” (*ḥurkel*), for which the culprit is to be executed;<sup>32</sup> in the following laws, the act is not defined as “abomination”, but the culprit is nonetheless to be executed;<sup>33</sup> and eventually we come across laws in which the act is defined “not an offense” (*UL ḥaratar*), and thus the culprit is exempt from liability.<sup>34</sup> In all these cases, however, the sexual act is regarded to be a behavior which deviates from the social norm, since the verb denoting it is “to sin” (*waštai-*). Furthermore, in all cases the culprit is forbidden to approach the king (*ḥaššawi=ma=aš UL tiezzi / tiyazzi*), because of the fear that his impurity might contaminate the ruler. The obvious question that comes to mind is, if we are to accept the possibility that the four laws of bestiality were edited deliberately in order to display a tendency of reduction in the gravity of the act,<sup>35</sup> why were these laws not grouped together consecutively? We can only speculate that in the earlier versions of the law code, which were not preserved, the four laws in question appeared one after the other, but in later versions the sequence was disrupted. This kind of

---

<sup>31</sup> Correction to the text following Friedrich, *Die hethitischen Gesetze*, 86 n. 5 and Hoffner, *The Laws*, 158 n. 565. The original text shows “LUGAL-iš-aš”.

<sup>32</sup> §§187, 188: sexual intercourse with a cow or a sheep (though the king has the right to spare his life).

<sup>33</sup> §199: intercourse with a pig or a dog (though here, too, the king may spare him); bull leaping on a man, in which case the animal is perceived as the sinner to be executed, while the human partner is not held responsible for the act.

<sup>34</sup> The last clause of §199: pig leaping on a man; §200a: intercourse with a horse or a mule. For a discussion of the terms “*ḥurkel*” and “*UL ḥaratar*” in the HL dealing with sexual matters, and the legal and semantic implications of these terms, see Peled, *Amore*, 254–55.

<sup>35</sup> Indeed, Hoffner (*The Laws*, 215) pointed to the existence of such tendency of reduction in certain groups of laws which stipulated various fines in a variety of cases.

speculation, of course, cannot be proven. An alternative suggestion is that the laws which conclude the corpus (§199 onwards) were a later addition to it,<sup>36</sup> and this is the reason for the possible gradation they show. This, however, is yet another unproven conjecture.

The most intriguing aspect of the taboo on bestiality reflected in the HL is the fact that the prohibition was not total. In HL §200a the pairing of a man with either a horse or a mule is defined as “*UL ḫaratar*”, “not an offense”. Considering the relative universality of the prohibition on bestiality throughout human history,<sup>37</sup> this legislation seems astounding. It certainly contradicts the taboo expressed by the three preceding laws of bestiality (§§187, 188, 199). In considering this peculiarity, Hoffner offers an analogy to the biblical attitude towards bestiality, as well as to the categorization of certain animals as pure or profane.<sup>38</sup> Thus, according to Hoffner’s view, the distinction in the HL between animals that were permitted or prohibited for sexual union with humans was analogous to the distinction in the biblical law between animals that were permitted (“clean”) or prohibited (“unclean”) for eating. Hoffner suggests that in both cultures the animals to be domesticated last (the pig, horse and camel among the Israelites; the horse and mule among the Hittites) were not included in the group of “clean” animals (permitted for eating by the Israelites, or for sexual union by the Hittites).<sup>39</sup> However, this approach implies that among the Hittites horses and mules were of low status, like the “unclean” animals in the Bible. This stands in contrast with the apparent high status of horses, and possibly equines generally, among the Hittites (see below).

---

<sup>36</sup> Hans Gustav Güterbock (review of *Die hethitischen Gesetze: Transkription, Übersetzung sprachliche Erläuterungen und vollständiges Wörterverzeichnis*, by Johannes Friedrich, *JCS* 15 [1961]: 64, 66) noted that §200 was a later addition to the corpus.

<sup>37</sup> See in this regard Peretti and Rowan, “Variables,” 83 and Salisbury, “Bestiality”.

<sup>38</sup> Hoffner, *The Laws*, 224. Ilona N. Rashkow (*Taboo or not Taboo: Sexuality and Family in the Hebrew Bible* [Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2000], 38–42) also pointed to the ideological connection between sexual and dietary prohibitions.

<sup>39</sup> Hoffner, *The Laws*, 224: “*Perhaps* the late comers were not introduced into the field of domesticated animals proscribed to humans for sexual pairing. But this is only a guess.”

One of the most influential analyses of the issues of purity and pollution, and of biblical dietary rules, was published by anthropologist Mary Douglas. Douglas attempted to clarify the reasons for defining the breaking of these rules in the Bible as an act of abomination.<sup>40</sup> The equation between the biblical term *tō'ēbā(h)* (תועבה) and the Hittite term *hurkel*, both denoting “abomination”, reinforces the linkage between bestiality in the HL and the biblical dietary prohibitions.<sup>41</sup> According to Douglas, the ancient Israelites related success and material prosperity with godly blessing, which reflected God as the embodiment of wholeness. As a result, any religious practice must reflect this aspect of wholeness, so that the lack of wholeness contrasts godly blessing. Hence, claimed Douglas, the absence of wholeness – in the form of wearing mixed attire, growing mixed crops and sexual intercourse between humans and animals – was perceived as contradicting godly blessing and completeness, and eventually, holiness itself.<sup>42</sup> Douglas, therefore, viewed the motif of holiness as a means for separation between categories, in order to maintain order and keep all things in their proper place. However, the equation “holiness=wholeness” and the dichotomy of order versus confusion as the sole ideological foundation upon which each biblical law or prohibition is to be analyzed are insufficient.<sup>43</sup> The Bible (Lev 18:23–24) explicitly states the reason behind the prohibition on bestiality (as well as incest):

Do not have sexual relations with an animal and defile yourself with it.  
A woman must not present herself to an animal to have sexual  
relations with it; that is a perversion. Do not defile yourselves in any

---

<sup>40</sup> Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge, 1966).

<sup>41</sup> For *hurkel* and תועבה, see, among others, Hoffner, "Incest," 83–84 and *The Laws*, 224.

<sup>42</sup> Douglas, *Purity*, 51–56.

<sup>43</sup> The prohibition on bestiality in Lev 18:23 and 20:15 has attracted much scholarly attention; see discussions in Jan Joosten, *People and Land in the Holiness Code: An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17–26* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 31; Calum Carmichael, *Illuminating Leviticus: A Study of Its Laws and Institutions in the Light of Biblical Narratives* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 184; Johnson M. Kimuhu, *Leviticus: The Priestly Laws and Prohibitions from the Perspective of Ancient Near East and Africa* (New York: Peter Lang, 2008), 98, 234–36; and Saul M. Olyan, *Social Inequality in the World of the Text: The Significance of Ritual and Social Distinctions in the Hebrew Bible* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 77–83.

of these ways, because this is how the nations that I am going to drive out before you became defiled.

This explicit rationale recurs several times in the following verses. The biblical prohibition was a means of self-definition, consolidation and shaping of oppositional cultural identity. Thus, the boundaries of the cultural group were defined by determining its unique norms of behavior, which distinguished it from other groups.<sup>44</sup> The question of why this particular mechanism was chosen for this purpose is immaterial for the present discussion; it was merely one among many other means for attaining cultural separation and self-definition, together with the ban on wearing linsey-woolsey attire and on the planting of mixed crops. The attempt to identify concrete reasons for explaining the essence of any such prohibition may be futile, since the reasons behind the formation of such bans are not inherent to the bans themselves, but to their very existence as mechanisms of separation and self-definition. And though we are ignorant of the norms and rules concerning bestiality by which the Canaanite inhabitants of the land lived, the fact remains that these defiling norms were ascribed to the Canaanites by the Bible, whether this reflected a true reality or mere propaganda.<sup>45</sup>

Hittite records, on the other hand, supply no explanation for the prohibitions and permissions of the laws, and we are therefore left to speculate regarding their ideological background. Hoffner has even expressed pessimism about the very ability of modern scholars to comprehend the Hittite state of mind in this regard.<sup>46</sup> Gordon suggests that these laws reflected the notion of how close various animals were to humans,

---

<sup>44</sup> See similarly Rashkow, *Taboo*, 16–17.

<sup>45</sup> See comprehensive discussion of these issues in Edward L. Greenstein, "The God of Israel and the Gods of Canaan: How Different Were They?," *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Division A: The Bible and Its World, 1997), 47\*–58\*, and especially in one of his concluding remarks: "The God of Biblical Israel may not actually be very different from the gods of the neighboring nations, but claiming that he is, is an important part of the rhetoric promoting devotion to that God alone" (58\*).

<sup>46</sup> Hoffner, *The Laws*, 224.

in the mind of ancient people. As an analogy he points to the readiness of people in modern society to eat cows, sheep and pigs, but not horses or dogs.<sup>47</sup> These preferences are clearly dependent on variables of culture, time and place. Even in our own era, no universal convention exists in this regard: horse or dog meat is certainly regarded as an acceptable food in many cultures, while in others it is rejected with disgust.<sup>48</sup>

Neufeld understands HL §200a against the background of cult. In his opinion the cow, sheep and pig (he did not mention the dog) were sacred animals, while the horse and the mule were not included in this category, because of their late arrival to the region.<sup>49</sup> As was already noted, Hoffner suggests a similar explanation. This view, however, stands in contrast with the approach assumed by many scholars, according to which horses – and equines generally – had a unique status among Indo-European cultures.<sup>50</sup> Perhaps this is the direction in which clues are to be sought for interpreting HL §200a. The “Kurgan hypothesis” formulated by Marija Gimbutas formed a significant stage in the consolidation of this branch of research. This theory integrates archaeological and linguistic evidence in reconstructing the

---

<sup>47</sup> Cyrus H. Gordon, *The Ancient Near East* (New York: Norton, 1965), 242.

<sup>48</sup> For detailed discussions of social and cultural norms of dietary and eating habits, see Marvin Harris, *Cannibals and Kings: The Origins of Cultures* (New York: Random House, 1977) and idem, *The Sacred Cow and the Abominable Pig: Riddles of Food and Culture* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987).

<sup>49</sup> Neufeld, *The Hittite Laws*, 188.

<sup>50</sup> See among others Wilhelm Koppers, "Pferdeopfer und Pferdekult der Indogermanen: Eine ethnologisch-religionswissenschaftliche Studie," in idem, ed., *Die Indogermanen- und Germanenfrage* (Salzburg: Pustet, 1936), 279–411; Jaan Puhvel, "Vedic aśvamedha- and Gaulish IIPOMIIDVOS," *Language* 31 (1955): 353–54 (previous literature in 353, n. 1); James P. Mallory, "The Ritual Treatment of the Horse in the Early Kurgan Tradition," *JIES* 9 (1981): 205–25; Johannes Maringer, "The Horse in Art and Ideology of Indo-European Peoples," *JIES* 9 (1981): 177–204; David W. Anthony, "The Earliest Horseback Riders and Indo-European Origins: New Evidence from the Steppes," in *Die Indogermanen und das Pferd: Akten des Internationalen interdisziplinären Kolloquiums, Freie Universität Berlin, 1.–3. Juli 1992. Bernfried Schlerath zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. Bernhard Hänsel and Stefan Zimmer (Budapest: Archaeolingua Alapítvány, 1994), 185–95; Robert Drews, *Early Riders: The Beginnings of Mounted Warfare in Asia and Europe* (New York: Routledge, 2004); and West, *Indo-European*, 465–68. For a discussion of the status and function of the horse in Indo-European fertility rites, see Doniger O'Flaherty, *Sexual Metaphors*, 165–66.

origins of Indo-European cultures.<sup>51</sup> According to the theory, in the mid- fifth millennium BCE, a nomadic culture emerged in the steppe regions of nowadays southern Russia. This culture was characterized by the use of burial mounds (kurgans), the breeding of horses and the use of chariots. In the course of time, numerous sub-groups were split from this ancient culture. In many of these sub-groups we find evidence for the practice of communal burials of men and horses, a testimony for the unique status the horse enjoyed among these cultures.<sup>52</sup> It is commonly accepted that the Hittites were one of these Indo-European groups who were split from the “mother-group”, eventually to have set themselves in the Anatolian plateau.<sup>53</sup> It has to be noted that many of Gimbutas’s theories were criticized by scholars,<sup>54</sup> and may be considered today somewhat obsolete. However, their scholarly contribution cannot be ignored, even if they must be viewed with reservation and caution.

What are, then, the hints we have regarding the status of the horse in the Hittite world of thought? In the Hittite-period cemetery of Osmankayasi,

---

<sup>51</sup> Marija A. Gimbutas, *The Prehistory of Eastern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum, 1956).

<sup>52</sup> For a selection of Gimbutas’s researches on this topic, see Marija A. Gimbutas, *The Kurgan Culture and the Indo-Europeanization of Europe: Selected Articles from 1952 to 1993* (Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 1997). For further investigations that followed her, see among others Shan M. M. Winn, "Burial Evidence and the Kurgan Culture in Eastern Anatolia c.3000 B.C.: An Interpretation," *JIES* 9 (1981): 113–18; Jak Yakar, "The Indo-Europeans and Their Impact on Anatolian Cultural Development," *JIES* 9 (1981): 94–112; and Maria N. Pogrebova, "The Emergence of Chariots and Riding in the South Caucasus," *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 22 (2003): 397–409.

<sup>53</sup> Certain scholars disagree with the common view and propose alternatively that the origin of the Indo-European peoples (including the Hittites) was in the autochthonic population of prehistoric Anatolia. The expansion of the Indo-European peoples, according to this view, lies in the development of agriculture, beginning in the Neolithic period. This theory was first suggested by Colin Renfrew (*Archaeology and Language: The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins* [London: Jonathan Cape, 1987]). Later on, an intermediate approach was developed by James P. Mallory (*In Search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, Archaeology and Myth* [London: Thames and Hudson, 1989]), which bridged the views of Gimbutas and Renfrew.

<sup>54</sup> See among others Margaret W. Conkey and Ruth E. Tringham, "Archaeology and the Goddess: Exploring the Contours of Feminist Archaeology," in Domma C. Stanton and Abigail J. Stewart, eds., *Feminism in the Academy: Rethinking the Disciplines* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1995), 199–247; Lynn Meskell, "Goddesses, Gimbutas and ‘New Age’ Archaeology," *Antiquity* 69 (1995): 74–86; and Cynthia Eller, *The Myth of Matriarchal Prehistory: Why an Invented Past Won’t Give Women a Future* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2000).

near Hattuša, archaeologists found mixed burials of humans and animals, among them donkeys and horses. The total amount of equine bones that were found belonged to at least thirteen specimens, two of them “large” (horses), and eleven of them “small” (either small horses, domesticated donkeys, or mules).<sup>55</sup> According to Mellink, these bones were deposited along with the human buried, and belonged to horses (two skulls, an unknown number of additional bones) and donkeys (eleven skulls, an unknown number of additional bones).<sup>56</sup> Van den Hout noted that occasionally equines, especially mules, were buried complete, though in most cases only their heads were found. All the equines were males, slaughtered in the prime of their lives.<sup>57</sup>

Puhvel claimed that among certain Indo-European cultures (such as the Hindu and Roman), the horse was regarded as the most prestigious sacrificial animal of all.<sup>58</sup> The excavators of the cemetery at Osmankayasi suggested that because of the economic and military importance of the horse in Hatti, this animal was only rarely sacrificed,<sup>59</sup> a suggestion that coincides with Puhvel’s assertion concerning the cultic uniqueness of the horse as an

---

<sup>55</sup> See Wolf Herre and Manfred Röhrs, “Die Tierreste aus den Hethitergräbern von Osmankayasi (Nach den Grabungen des Jahres 1952),” in Kurt Bittel et al., eds. *Die Hethitischen Grabfunde von Osmankayasi* (Berlin: Mann, 1958), 63–64.

<sup>56</sup> Machteld J. Mellink, review of *Die Hethitischen Grabfunde von Osmankayasi*, ed. Kurt Bittel et al., *AJA* 63 (1959): 291–92.

<sup>57</sup> Theo P. J. van den Hout, “Death as a Privilege: The Hittite Royal Funerary Ritual,” in Jan M. Bremmer, Theo P. J. van den Hout and Rudolph Peters, eds., *Hidden Futures: Death and Immortality in Ancient Egypt, Anatolia, the Classical, Biblical and Arabic-Islamic World* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1994), 55.

<sup>58</sup> Jaan Puhvel, “Victimal Hierarchies in Indo-European Animal Sacrifice,” *American Journal of Philology* 99 (1978): 355, 359. Sanskrit even has a special term for this sacrifice: *áśva-medha-*; see Puhvel, “Vedic,” 353. We may note in this regard the mentions from various areas of the ancient Near East of the sacrifice of donkeys during the performance of the *ḥiyara*-festival; see Manfred Hutter, “Das *ḥiyara*-Fest in Hattuša: Transformation und Funktion eines syrischen Festes,” in Piotr Taracha, ed., *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Warsaw: Agade, 2002), 189–93.

<sup>59</sup> See Herre and Röhrs, “Die Tierreste,” 73. Volkert Haas (*Geschichte der hethitischen Religion* [Leiden: Brill, 1994], 417) also claimed that horse sacrifice was extremely rare and known only from a burial rite.

Indo-European cultural attribute.<sup>60</sup> Mellink even equated the horse bone findings from Osmankayasi with horse burials known from other Indo-European cultures, such as the Mycenaean, Phrygian and Scythian.<sup>61</sup> Finally, Collins proposed that the animals found in the cemetery were slaughtered in order to be used by their owners in the afterworld.<sup>62</sup>

Turning to written sources, the importance of the horse in Hatti is reflected in a text commonly known by the name of its author, the Mittanian Kikkuli, chief of the horse trainers, a text that details instructions for training and treating horses.<sup>63</sup> Further, no textual evidence shows that the Hittites ever consumed equine meat.<sup>64</sup> Archaeological research supports the probability that the Hittites indeed avoided eating these animals: the analysis of animal bones from the excavations at Boğazköy-Hattuša shows that though in the Bronze Age various equines (horses, donkeys and mules) were widespread in the Hittite capital, it can safely be determined that they were not eaten. During this period, the animals that were eaten were pigs, sheep and goats. In a stark contrast, in the Iron Age – that is, after the collapse of the Hittite kingdom, and most likely because of the socio-cultural changes that followed it – equines were indeed eaten, together with other animals.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Puhvel's paradigmatic cultural reconstruction based on myths has been criticized: see Haijo J. Westra, review of *Comparative Mythology*, by Jaan Puhvel, *Phoenix* 45 (1991): 76–81 [but see more favorable views of Puhvel's analysis of Indo-European comparative mythology in Edgar C. Polomé, "Survey of Comparative Mythology," *History of Religions* 29 (1989): 184–89 and Ken Dowden, review of *Comparative Mythology*, by Jaan Puhvel, *The Classical Review (New Series)* 41 (1991): 111–13]. This, however, does not rule out the basic claim that the horse formed a significant Indo-European cultural symbol.

<sup>61</sup> Mellink, review of *Die Hethitischen Grabfunde*, 292.

<sup>62</sup> Billie Jean Collins, "Animals in the Religions of Ancient Anatolia," in eadem, ed., *A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 327.

<sup>63</sup> For editions and discussions of this text, see Annelies Kammenhuber, *Hippologia hethitica* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1961) and Frank Starke, *Ausbildung und Training von Streitwagenpferden, eine hippologisch orientierte Interpretation des Kikkuli-Textes* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995).

<sup>64</sup> See Theo P. J. van den Hout, "Pferd (und weitere Equiden). A. II. In Anatolien," *RIA* 10 (2004), 487.

<sup>65</sup> See Angela von den Driesch and Nadja Pöllath, "Changes from Late Bronze Age to Early Iron Age Animal Husbandry as Reflected in the Faunal Remains from Büyükkaya/Boğazköy-Hattuša," in Bettina Fischer et al., eds., *Identifying Changes: The Transition from Bronze to Iron Ages in Anatolia and its Neighbouring Regions. Proceedings of the International*

Another aspect of this topic is the use of animals as *materia magica* in Hittite rituals. In most cases, the use of animals in magical or cultic rites involved their butchering. According to the ritual texts, however, horses were only seldom used as carriers of perceived evil in scapegoat rites, and their role in the magical sphere was otherwise limited to purification rites, in which these animals were purified.<sup>66</sup> Haas pointed to the relation of the horse with several deities of the Hittite pantheon, usually in ritual contexts: Kamrušepa, Maliya, Pirinkir and especially Pirwa, the “horse-deity”.<sup>67</sup> Haas further noted that in “Zarpiya’s Ritual” a pair of horses was harnessed to the chariot of the Storm-god, rather than the customary pair of bulls.<sup>68</sup>

The special status of the horse in Hatti may have also resulted from its use for military purposes. The textual evidence shows that the Hittite battle chariots were pulled by horses. Further, the iconographic evidence from the wall paintings of Pharaoh Seti I show that donkeys and horses were among the animals that carried the supply wagons of the Hittite army.<sup>69</sup>

As for the mule, evidence for its importance is found in the royal funerary ritual *šalliš waštaiš*, in which a mule was harnessed to a chariot, and pulled it together with a horse.<sup>70</sup> According to HL §180 the price of a mule was forty shekels of silver, while the price of a horse did not exceed twenty shekels.

In discussing the mule and its importance in Hittite mind, we should perhaps consider yet another equine, the donkey, since in most of their

*Workshop: Istanbul, November 8–9, 2002* (Istanbul: Türk Eskiçağ Bilimleri Enstitüsü, 2003), 297.

<sup>66</sup> See Collins, “Animals,” 323, with references to previous literature.

<sup>67</sup> Volkert Haas, “Das Pferd in der hethitischen religiösen Überlieferung,” in *Die Indogermanen und das Pferd. Akten des Internationalen interdisziplinären Kolloquiums, Freie Universität Berlin, 1.–3. Juli 1992. Bernfried Schlerath zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. Bernhard Hänsel and Stefan Zimmer (Budapest: Archaeolingua Alapítvány, 1994), 77–82. For discussions of Pirwa, see Haas, *Geschichte*, 412–15, and Franca Pecchioli Daddi, “Pirwa,” *RIA* 10 (2005), 573–75.

<sup>68</sup> Haas, “Das Pferd,” 83.

<sup>69</sup> See Richard H. Beal, *The Organisation of the Hittite Military* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1992), 133–34.

<sup>70</sup> See Heinrich Otten, *Hethitische Totenrituale* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958), 138–39, and most recently Aleksej Kassian, Andrej Korolëv and Andrej Sidel’tsev, *Hittite Funerary Ritual šalliš waštaiš* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002), 376–77, 384–85, 418–19.

mentions in the HL, both these animals appear together, and always accompanied by the horse.<sup>71</sup> In two cases where the two do not appear together,<sup>72</sup> as in the case of HL §200a presently discussed, the donkey is missing. Watkins notes that the donkey formed a highly important cultural motif among the Hindu and Greek cultures, both in ritual and mythology, and suggested that the Hittites shared this concept as well.<sup>73</sup> Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies have demonstrated that the term for “donkey” figured as an element that was part of the personal names of certain people in the Hittite-Luwian world, occasionally even in royal names, such as Targašnawa king of Mira. They noted that the prices for animals in the HL demonstrate that the worth of the horse, donkey and mule was higher than that of other animals.<sup>74</sup>

Puhvel interprets HL §200a as referring to the copulation of a man with a mare or she-mule. Since the offender was prohibited of becoming a priest, Puhvel viewed this behavior as reserved for the class of warriors, which were potential candidates for royalty.<sup>75</sup> At the basis of Puhvel’s view lies the assumption that the special status of the horse among certain Indo-European societies derived from ancient fertility rites, in which the king (among the Celts) or queen (among the Hindus) took part, as they committed symbolic copulation with a stallion or a mare.<sup>76</sup> This view, however, is not supported by any Hittite text. More importantly, in the same clause of the law where the privilege of becoming a priest is denied of the culprit, he is also

---

<sup>71</sup> See HL §§70, 71, 75, 76, 148 and 152.

<sup>72</sup> See HL §§129 and 180.

<sup>73</sup> Calvert Watkins, "The Third Donkey: Origin Legends and Some Hidden Indo-European Themes," in John H. W. Penney, ed., *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 65–80.

<sup>74</sup> David Hawkins and Anna Morpurgo Davies, "Of Donkeys, Mules and Tarkondemos," in Jay H. Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert and Lisi Oliver, eds., *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins* (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1998), 256–57. For tables exhibiting the fares in question, see Hoffner, *The Laws*, 221–22.

<sup>75</sup> Jaan Puhvel, *Comparative Mythology* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 276.

<sup>76</sup> Puhvel, "Vedic," 354. As mentioned before, in the ancient Indic ritual Aśvamedha the queen lay down with a dead stallion in order to transfer his virility to the king. Somewhat similarly, in a twelfth-century ritual from Donegal the new king would copulate with a white mare in front of an assembly of spectators. For a discussion of both rituals, see West, *Indo-European*, 417–18.

forbidden of approaching the king. The Hittite monarch acted as the chief commander of the army, as well as the highest priest of the kingdom. Therefore, the view of clear-cut separation between the circles of military and priesthood in this case is problematic. Most important of all, the very use of the term *waštai*, “sins,” for describing the felony, clearly demonstrates that even in case the animal involved was an equine, human copulation with it was regarded sinful. This last remark highlights the complexity of this issue, since the law does not permit sexual union of a man with a horse or a mule. The act is explicitly defined as “to commit a sin,” even if it is not regarded as an “offense.” Hence, this behavior was by no means considered to be normative, but the culprit would have not been sentenced to death.<sup>77</sup> This observation is highly significant, and we must therefore reject the view according to which the HL allowed humans to conduct sexual union with a horse or a mule.<sup>78</sup> Oettinger has suggested to me in a personal communication that the classes that came in the most frequent contact with horses were aristocrats, especially as military men, and merchants. Both were frequently required to be away from their homes for prolonged periods, with no female companion. Since, at the same time, they were surrounded by animals, these circumstances might have led to cases of bestiality. Oettinger has suggested further that the legislators who formulated the law came from the circles of social aristocracy. For this reason, the law corresponded to the norms that characterized these members of society, rather than the norms typical of other parts of the population. In another personal communication, Melchert suggested to me that the military sphere was a possible background for occurrences of bestiality with a horse. It was necessary to overlook these events in order to avoid execution that would cause the loss of soldiers, officers and horses,

---

<sup>77</sup> Richard Haase (“Kapitaldelikte im hethitischen Recht,” *Hethitica* 7 [1987]: 97) even viewed the prohibition of the offender to approach the king as a social humiliation.

<sup>78</sup> As expressed, for example, by Edwin M. Good (“Capital Punishment and Its Alternatives in Ancient Near Eastern Law,” *Stanford Law Review* 19 [1967]: 961) and Hoffner (*The Laws*, 224).

which were valuable military animals. As can be seen, these two views associate bestiality with the proximity formed between man and animal, when the animal was the only alternative for the man to conduct sexual intercourse. This interpretation coincides with historical examples where bestiality indeed occurred among people who were frequently in proximity to animals: young boys who acted as cattle shepherds in Sweden in the seventeenth century and boys who grew up in farmhouses in the twentieth-century United States.<sup>79</sup>

It seems that the Hittite preferential attitude towards equines is not unique, as we have seen that this phenomenon has historical and ethnographic parallels. The Hittite example is exceptional, however, because it was embedded and recorded in formal law, and, according to some scholars, perhaps even led to certain alleviation in one of the most fundamental cultural prohibitions in human mind: the taboo on bestiality. This alleviation we find in HL §200a is one of the most enigmatic issues of the Hittite code of laws, at least with regard to the laws dealing with sexual issues. Copulation with an equine is not defined in this law as an “abomination” or even an “offense,” though the act is still termed as “committing a sin.” It is impossible to offer any persuasive explanation for this, and the scholarly literature which addressed this issue and attempted to solve its peculiarity is scarce and inconclusive. This law may be evaluated as a remnant of Indo-European perceptions of a special intimacy between the warrior and his horse. Alternatively, it may be possible that socio-economic factors stood behind the formulation of this law. And, perhaps, all these suggestions are erroneous, and Hoffner was right in his pessimistic view, according to which all our efforts to decode the Hittite mind, in this specific case, are futile.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> See Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy and Clyde E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders, 1948), 671, and Salisbury, *The Beast Within*, 84.

<sup>80</sup> Hoffner, *The Laws*, 224.

### Myths

Hittite myths occasionally mention types of sexual misbehavior that were perceived as contradicting the customary conduct in society, the most notable of which were incest and bestiality. The latter is alluded to in the tale known as “The Sun-god, the Cow and the Fisherman,” CTH 363.<sup>81</sup> The plot begins with an episode in which the Sun-god wears a human form, and copulates with a cow:

“The Sun-god, the Cow and the Fisherman”, CTH 363 (KUB 24.7 ii 53–59)<sup>82</sup>

...<sup>D</sup>UTU-uš-kán AN-za GA[M] a-u[š-ta]

[o o o o A-]NA GUD ZI-aš pa-ra-a wa-at-k[u-u]t LÚ-x

[o o o o na-]aš-kán AN-za GAM ú-it na-aš IT-TI GUD

[o o o o o me-]mi-iš-ki-u-wa-an da-a-iš nu-za ku-iš x-x

[o o o o o an-z]i-el Ú.SAL ar-ḫa ú-e-ši-eš-ki-ši

[o o o o o ma]-a-an ḫu-el-pí ḫa-ap-pu-ri-ia-an e-[eš]

[o o o o o n]u-kán Ú.SAL ar-ḫa ḫar-ni-in-ki-eš-ki-š[i]

...The Sun-god loo[ked] dow[n] from heaven [...] His desire lea[pe]d<sup>83</sup>

[to]wards the cow. [He turned to a young?] man, [and] he came down

from heaven. To the cow he [...] began [ta]lking: “Who [are you, that?]”

you are grazing in [ou]r meadow?! [...wh]ile the grass i[s] tender [...]

You are destroying the meadow!”

<sup>81</sup> See edition in Johannes Friedrich “Churritische Märchen und Sagen in hethitischer Sprache,” ZA 49 (1950): 224–33; translation in Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., *Hittite Myths* (Atlanta GA: Scholars Press, 1998), 85–87. See further electronic edition in the Hethitologie Portal Mainz: [http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet\\_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20363.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al](http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_myth/intro.php?xst=CTH%20363.1&prgr=&lg=DE&ed=E.%20Rieken%20et%20al) (last access 20 August 2020).

<sup>82</sup> My estimation of the number of missing signs at the left side of the tablet is based on the comment in the KUB copy, according to which the left part of the drawing should be added some three centimeters. This part was omitted in the facsimile in order to save drawing space; see comment in KUB 24, p. 23. Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. (“The Hurrian Story of the Sungod, the Cow and the Fisherman,” in M. Morrison and D. I. Owen, eds., *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians in Honor of E. R. Lacheman* [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981], 192) estimated that this gap included about four signs.

<sup>83</sup> The phrase *ištanza parā watkut*, “his desire leaped forward”, denotes an expression of sexual arousal; see Hans Gustav Güterbock, “The Song of Ullikummi: Revised Text of the Hittite Version of a Hurrian Myth,” JCS 5 (1951): 149 n. m; HED 1/2: 468, s.v. “*istanza(n)-*” and CHD P: 117, s.v. “*parā 1 ccc*”.

The response of the cow and the rest of the conversation are highly fragmentary. In the following episode, however, the cow is impregnated, probably as the result of copulation with the Sun-god. She gives birth to a two-legged human, to which sight the cow is startled, and wishes to devour him. In her distress, the cow cries out to the Sun-god:

*“The Sun-god, the Cow and the Fisherman”, CTH 363 (KUB 24.7 iii 23–25)*

4 GÌR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-ŠU ku-u-un-ma-wa-za ŠA 2 GÌ[R<sup>M</sup>]<sup>EŠ</sup>[-Š]U k[u-w]a-a[t]

ḫa-a-šu-un GUD-uš UR.MAḪ-aš GIM-an KAḫU-iš ar-ḫa

ki-nu-ut na-aš DUMU-li a-da-an-na pa-iš-ki-it-ta

“(A calf,) his legs (are) four. But h[o]w did I beget this one, whose le[g]s (are) two?!” The cow opened her mouth like a lion, and was walking towards the child to eat (him).

Though the remaining part of the text is damaged, it is clear that the Sun-god prevents the cow of harming the newborn:

*“The Sun-god, the Cow and the Fisherman”, CTH 363 (KUB 24.7 iii 28–31)*

nu-kán <sup>D</sup>UTU-uš AN-za GAM a-u[š-ta...]

na-aš GUD-i GAM-an ti[-ia-at...]

da-a-iš nu-za ku-u[š-...]

GAM pa-aš-šu-u-na [...]

The Sun-god loo[ked] down from heaven [...] He appr[oached] down to the cow [...] And he began [talking to her:] “Wh[o are you, that you try?] to swallow [the child??!”]

And thus the Sun-god saves the child, and subsequently takes him to heaven. Hoffner claimed that there is actually no evidence that the cow attempts to harm the child, and that she actually approached him in order to lick and take care of him, as a cow would with a newly born calf.<sup>84</sup> This suggestion, however, does not coincide with the description of the cow opening her mouth “like a lion” (UR.MAḪ-aš GIM-an), clearly a metaphor of a predator preparing to devour its prey. Nor does this suggestion match the accusation

---

<sup>84</sup> Hoffner, “The Hurrian Story,” 193.

of the Sun-god, which albeit being fragmentary and vague, clearly refers to the cow using the verb “to swallow” (*paš(š)-*). It seems more feasible that this part of the tale conveys the moral of a negative attitude towards the unnatural pairing of humans and animals, and displays the negative consequence of the act, in the form of fantastic birth of a human child by an animal. Admittedly, the Sun-god’s reaction to the outcome of this pairing does not seem to be negative, as he saves the newborn from being devoured by the cow. However, the child is later on reared by humans (the fisherman and his wife), rather than by the Sun-god, which puts in question the alleged positive attitude of the deity towards his peculiar son. Since the continuation and ending of the tale are unknown to us, it should not be excluded that the destiny of the child was eventually ill-fated, similarly as we see in the second version of the Illuyanka myth. There, the son born of the Storm-god and a mortal woman is destined to be killed by his own celestial father.<sup>85</sup>

### *Cultic Ceremonies*

In an Old Hittite<sup>86</sup> festival text, *CTH 669.9*, we encounter a passage that details ceremonial procedures in which the royal couple participates. Melchert viewed the following passage as describing a royal fertility rite:<sup>87</sup>

*Festival Text, CTH 669.9 (KUB 11.25 iii 19’-22’)*<sup>88</sup>

*ku-it-ma-an-ma* LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL

*a-ra-ar-ki-iš-kán-zi*

GIŠ<sup>D</sup>INANNA<sup>H1.A</sup>.GAL-*ma* ŠÌR-*RU*

LÚ.MEŠ<sup>D</sup>*pal-wa-tal-le-e-eš pal-wiš-iš-kán-z[i]*

While the king (and) queen perform *arark-*, (the players) play the big lyres<sup>?</sup>,<sup>89</sup> (and) the criers cry out.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>85</sup> *CTH 321, KBo 3.7 iii 29–33*; see translation in Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 13.

<sup>86</sup> Though the copy we have is late, the original composition is of an Old Hittite date.

<sup>87</sup> H. Craig Melchert, "A Hittite Fertility Rite?," in Gernot Wilhelm, ed., *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie. Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001), 404–9.

<sup>88</sup> See partial duplicate in KUB 11.20.

The key-term in this passage is the verb *ararkiškanzi*, which is a hapax legomenon. This act is performed by the royal couple to the accompaniment of music and singing, in front of various palace personnel. The attempt to interpret the enigmatic term as a scribal error for the iterative form *ār(a)škanzi* of the verb “to arrive”,<sup>91</sup> was rejected by Melchert. He suggested alternatively that *ararkiškanzi* stood for the iterative form of the reduplicated root *arark-* for the base verb *ark-*, a verb that means either “to cut” or “to copulate”, the latter meaning always ascribed to animals. Melchert rejected the former option, mostly on the grounds of the lack of an object for the verb (what do the king and queen “cut”?), and therefore only one possibility remains for interpreting the obscure verb. We have an episode, therefore, in which the royal couple performs sexual intercourse in public, to the sound of music and shouting.<sup>92</sup>

The essence of the whole episode, therefore, lies in the meaning of the verb *ark-*. As noted above, in referring to sexual intercourse, this verb is found exclusively as denoting animal mating.<sup>93</sup> Melchert mentioned in this context the famous Inandik vase, on which an artist depicted scenes portraying the preparations and procedures of a public festival or ritual.<sup>94</sup> One of these scenes displays a couple sitting on a bed, while the man (most of his figure is destroyed) unveils the woman. Directly above this scene we find

---

<sup>89</sup> For the musical instrument  $\text{GIŠ}^{\text{D}}\text{INANNA}$  (probably a lyre) in Hittite texts, see Stefano de Martino, “Il lessico musicale ittita II:  $\text{GIŠ}^{\text{D}}\text{INANNA}$  = *cetra*,” *OA* 26 (1987): 172–85; and Monika Schuol, *Hethitische Kultmusik: Eine Untersuchung der Instrumental- und Vokalmusik anhand hethitischer Ritualtexte und von archäologischen Zeugnissen* (Rahden: Marie Leidorf, 2004), 102.

<sup>90</sup> For the possible interpretations of these performers ( $\text{LÚ.MEŠ}^{\text{palwatallēš}}$ ), and the nature of the act they perform, see *CHD* P: 83–85, s.v. “ $\text{LÚ}^{\text{LÚ/MUNUS}}\text{palwat(t)alla-}$ ,  $\text{LÚ}^{\text{LÚ}}\text{pal(t)uwatalla-}$ .” Melchert (“A Hittite Fertility Rite?,” 404) translated it differently: “the clappers clap”.

<sup>91</sup> See *HW*<sup>2</sup> 1: 250, s.v. “*ararkiški/a-*”.

<sup>92</sup> Melchert, “A Hittite Fertility Rite?,” 404–5. For further considerations in favor of this interpretation of the ritual episode, see Melchert, “A Hittite Fertility Rite?,” 404–9; Volkert Haas, *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica* (Berlin, 2003), 687 and Watkins, “The Third Donkey,” 72–73. In contrast, Schuol (*Hethitische Kultmusik*, 39) translated the problematic term as “praying”, thus eliminating any sexual sense from the passage currently discussed.

<sup>93</sup> See *HED* 1/2: 142, s.v. “*ark-*”. For the etymology of this verb, see Alwin Kloekhorst, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 203–4, s.v. “*ark-<sup>a(rī)</sup>*, *ār<sup>k-</sup>* / *ark-*”.

<sup>94</sup> Melchert, “A Hittite Fertility Rite?,” 406.



building a new palace (CTH 414),<sup>97</sup> we find the verb *ark-* in a context where sexuality, virility and fertility were connected with the Hittite king. In the episode under discussion, the king approaches the trees that are to be cut down for building the roof of his new palace. The king speaks to the trees as follows:

*A Ritual for Building a New Palace, CTH 414 (KUB 29.1 i 28–30)*

...UR.MAḪ-aš<-ma-aš>

*kat-ta-an še-eš-ki-it PÌRIG.TUR-aš-ma-aš kat-ta-an še-eš-ki-it*

*ḫar-tág-ga-aš-ma-aš-ma-aš*

*ša-ra-a ar-ki-iš-ki-it-ta*

The lion would sleep underneath (you), the leopard would sleep underneath you, but the bear would copulate above you.

Marazzi translated this passage differently: "...the lion used to come to crouch under (you), the panther used to come to fall asleep under you, the hartagga used to climb up on you..."<sup>98</sup> Carini translated the passage as follows: "The lion slept under you, the panther slept under you, but the bear mounted<sup>99</sup> upon you."<sup>100</sup> We can see that Marazzi's understanding of the passage excluded the sexual sense,<sup>101</sup> while Carini considered it possible.<sup>102</sup>

<sup>97</sup> For editions and discussions of this text, see Maria Francesca Carini, "Il rituale di fondazione KUB XXIX 1: ipotesi intorno alla nozione etea arcaica della regalità," *Athenaeum (Nuova Serie)* 60 (1982): 483–520; and Massimiliano Marazzi, "'Costruiamo la reggia, 'fondiamo' la regalità': Note intorno ad un rituale antico-ittita (CTH 414)," *Vicino Oriente* 5 (1982): 117–69. Galina Kellerman ("The King and the Sun-God in the Old Hittite Period," *Tel Aviv* 5 [1978]: 203) related this text to a group of ritual texts originating in the Old Hittite period, that were meant to secure by use of magical means the life, health and fertility of the royal couple.

<sup>98</sup> "...il leone sotto (di voi) veniva ad accovacciarsi, la pantera sotto di voi veniva ad addormentarsi, lo hartagga su di voi usava arrampicarsi..." (Marazzi, "Costruiamo," 151).

<sup>99</sup> The Italian verb *montare* has multiple meanings (similarly as English "to mount"). This may have been the reason for Carini's use of it in this case, as it reflects both possible meanings of the current passage, exactly as the Hittite verb *ark-* does.

<sup>100</sup> "Il leone dormì sotto di voi, la pantera dormì sotto di voi, ma l'orso montó su di voi." (Carini, "Il rituale," 489).

<sup>101</sup> In *CHD* (Š/2: 211, s.v. "šarā B 1 a 4") the passage is translated similarly, as the combination *šarā ark-* is understood there to denote "to climb up".

<sup>102</sup> Carini ("Il rituale," 504) relied on a previous translation of this passage by Jaan Puhvel ("Lexical and Etymological Observations on Hittite *ark-*," *JAOS* 95 [1975]: 263). Years later Puhvel (*HED* 1/2: 142, s.v. "*ark-*") repeated the same wording: "the lion would pair, the panther would pair by you, but the bear would couple up against you."

I believe that this episode includes sexual attributes, as it describes the relation between the trees and three wild animals: the lion and leopard safely sleep underneath them, while the bear copulates under their cover. The trees addressed by the king are meant to be used for building the roof of his palace. Therefore, I associate the description of the animals resting or copulating under their shelter with security, strength and virility, qualities to be part of the palace later on, and that project on its owners – the royal couple – as signs of protection, virility and fertility. Carini ascribed the possible sexual sense of the passage to the positive affect of the sexual virility of the animals on the trees.<sup>103</sup> However, I suggest that the practical significance of the sexual connotation lies in the function of the trees as mediating between the sexual virility ascribed to the animals, and the king himself.

The attestations of the verb *ark-* in both texts under discussion (once in the reduplicated form *arark-*) may hint to the role of fertility and sexuality in cultic procedures involving the royal couple. We should bear in mind that both texts originate from the Old Hittite period, as well as the İnandik vase, on which an iconographic scene described a couple performing sexual intercourse in a “backward” position. Naturally, it can be a matter of mere coincidence, but it is also possible that these three pieces of evidence reflect a remnant of an ancient Hittite tradition of sexual intercourse engaged by the royal couple, in which the virility and fertility requested for the king were connected with animal sexuality.

### *Magical Rituals*

The Hittites applied a vast variety of magical rituals, both communal and private, as means for manipulating what was in their mind the natural world order, and for counteracting a diverse range of possible predicaments affecting the individual or the community. Some of these rituals were

---

<sup>103</sup> Carini, "Il rituale," 504.

performed in order to purify the community when a sin was committed, because of the belief that the evil consequences of sin committed by one person raised the rage of the gods, and contaminated his entire community. Sexual vice, such as bestiality, was regarded as such a sin that required the performance of purification rites. The best example in this regard is CTH 456.5,<sup>104</sup> a ritual whose aim is stated in its introductory paragraph:<sup>105</sup>

*Purification-Rite following Bestiality, CTH 456.5 (KUB 41.11 2')*

[*ma-a-an LÚ-a*]š UDU-*i na-aš-ma UZ<sub>6</sub>-i GAM w[a]-aš-t[a-i]*

[If a ma]n s[i]n[s] with a sheep or a goat...

Throughout the ceremony, several ritual procedures are conducted as compensation for the offense that was committed, and for achieving the hoped purification. The second paragraph of the text (KUB 41.11 6'–12') describes sheep and bird offerings, while in the third paragraph (KUB 41.11 13'–18') certain items are specified (silver, gold, tin and bronze shekels, various clothing items, jewelry and a variety of foodstuff), which according to Hoffner were given as a dowry. Hoffner proposed that the animal with which the sin was committed was treated as if it was a bride. The animal was veiled, and when banished from town "its dowry" was returned to it, just as a divorced husband would give his wife back her dowry when she returned to her parents' house.<sup>106</sup> The fourth paragraph (KUB 41.11 20'–28') describes the dispatching of the animal, in a similar manner of a scapegoat:

*Purification-Rite following Bestiality, CTH 456.5 (KUB 41.11 20'–28')*

*...nu UDU ar-ḫa tar-na-[a]n-z[i]*

[o o o o o] *kiš-an me-ma-an-zi ka-a-ša-wa-ra-aš a-pa-a-aš*

[o o o o o w] *a-aš-ta-aš-wa ku-iš ḫa-ra-tar-wa ku-iš DÙ-at*

<sup>104</sup> For a partial edition of the text, see Hoffner, "Incest," 86–88. For discussions of it, see Rita Strauss, *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006), 86–88; and Ilan Peled, "The Use of Pleasure, Constraints of Desire: Anniwiyani's Ritual and Sexuality in Hittite Magical Ceremonies," in Aygül Süel, ed., *Proceedings of the VII International Conference of Hittitology, 25–31 August 2008, Çorum, Turkey* (Ankara: Anit Matbaa, 2010), 632.

<sup>105</sup> This is repeated in the colophon (KUB 41.11 32'), though with minor insignificant writing variations: [*ma-a-an LÚ-aš UDU-*]i<sup>2</sup> *na-aš-ma UZ<sub>6</sub> GAM-an wa-aš-ta-i*.

<sup>106</sup> Hoffner, "Incest," 88.

[o o o o o a]n-kán ka-a-ša i-wa-ru-wa-za IŠ-TU KÛ.BABBAR GUŠKIN

[o o o o o o]x-za aš-ša-nu-nu-un NUMUN<sup>H1.A</sup>-wa-aš-ši a-ni-ia-nu-un

[o o o o o o]x-x-uš pa-iz-zi DINGIR-LU<sub>4</sub> pa-ra-an-da-aš-ša-an-ká[n]

[o o o o o o]x nu-za ku-iš ka-a-aš UDU-un KAR-zi

[o o o o o o h]a-ra-tar wa-aš-túl a-pa-a-aš da-a-ú EN SISKUR-m[a]

[ke-e-da-az wa-aš-tú]l-az<sup>107</sup> pár-ku-iš e-eš-du

T[h]e[y] send away the sheep [...] Thus they say: "He, that one, has hereby<sup>108</sup> [...] He who sinned, he who committed the offense [...] A dowry of silver, gold, [...] I have hereby<sup>109</sup> made good. Seeds I sowed for him. [...] he goes/will go. Beyond the god<sup>110</sup> [...] Who ever encounters this<sup>111</sup> sheep [...] offense, sin may that one take! Bu[t] the patient, may he be pure from [this si]n!"

Once the ceremony was concluded, the sinner washed himself, and performed further unspecified rites. Hoffner noted that apparently in the first part of the ritual appeared the elderly of the community, who performed purification acts that were aimed at the offender, but purified the whole community.<sup>112</sup>

We may consider another example in this regard, which is more complicated, and less straightforward. The text commonly known as "Zuwi's Ritual" (CTH 412)<sup>113</sup> was sometimes understood as aimed at dealing with the

<sup>107</sup> This restoration follows Hoffner, "Incest," 87.

<sup>108</sup> For the grammatical use and semantic implications of *kāša*, see Harry A. Hoffner Jr. and H. Craig Melchert, *A Grammar of the Hittite Language* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 323–24 (§§24.27–24.30); and most recently Elisabeth Rieken, "Hethitisch *kaša*, *kašma*, *kašat(t)a*: Drei verkannte deiktische Partikeln," in Elisabeth Rieken and Paul Widmer, eds., *Pragmatische Kategorien. Form, Funktion und Diachronie. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Marburg, 24.–26. September 2007* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009), 265–73.

<sup>109</sup> See previous note.

<sup>110</sup> The meaning of the phrase DINGIR-LUM *parandaššan* is unclear; see CHD P: 137–138, s.v. "*parandaššan*". I view it as the postpositional adverb *parranda*, "beyond" (see CHD P: 135–137, s.v. "*parranda*"), affixed by the local particles *-šan* and *-kan*, namely: DINGIR-LUM *parranda=šan=kan*.

<sup>111</sup> As Hoffner ("Incest," 88) commented, *kāš* (nom.) here has to be a mistake for *kūn* (acc.).

<sup>112</sup> Hoffner, "Incest," 88.

<sup>113</sup> For the edition of the text, see Mauro Giorgieri, *Il rituale di Zuwi (CTH 412)* (MA thesis, University of Pavia, 1990). For a discussion of it, see Manfred Hutter, "Tiere als *Materia Magica* im Ritual der Zuwi (CTH 412)," in Yoël L. Arbeitman, ed., *The Asia Minor Connexion:*

occurrence of bestiality, though opinions differ on the matter. The introductory paragraph of the ritual is not explicit with regard to its aim:

*Zuwi's Ritual, CTH 412 (KBo 12.106+13.146 i 1-2)*

[U]M-MA <sup>f</sup>Zu-ú-i MUNUS <sup>URU</sup>Dur-mi-it-[ta ma-a]-an an-tu-u[h-š]a-an  
<sup>d</sup>U-aš ú-e-ri-da-nu-zi nu <LÚ><sup>114</sup> <sup>d</sup>U-ni-li ki-[iš-š]a-an<sup>?</sup> i-ia-mi da-a-aḫ-ḫi  
 [T]hus Zuwi, woman of Durmit[ta: I]f the Storm-god horrifies a  
 pe[r]son, I do the following, in the manner of (the man of) the Storm-  
 god: I take: ...

It appears that the key-term in this passage is *weridanu-*, “to horrify.”<sup>115</sup> The ritual was meant to treat a person that was “horrified” by the Storm-god, and therefore the treatment was conducted “in the manner of the man of the Storm-god,” that is, the priest of the deity. The vague wording of the text led to various different opinions in interpreting the significance of this “horror.” Giorgieri assumed that it represented a disease that resulted from impurity, which required cleansing.<sup>116</sup>

A different view was expressed by Hutter, who regarded “Zuwi's Ritual” to be a purification rite that was performed following the occurrence of bestiality.<sup>117</sup> Already in the beginning of the first tablet of the text several animals are enumerated, which will be used throughout the ceremony:

*Zuwi's Ritual, CTH 412 (KBo 12.106+13.146 i 4-5)*

[...1 G]U<sub>4</sub>.MAḫ 1 UDU.A.LUM 1 MÁŠ.GAL  
 1 MÁŠ.GAL.ŠIR-aš 1 UZ<sub>6</sub> 1 UDU.ÁŠ.[MUNUS.GÀR 1 UR.G]I<sub>7</sub>? 1 UR.TUR  
 1 ŠAḫ

---

*Studies on the Pre-Greek Languages in Memory of Charles Carter* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 95–106.

<sup>114</sup> This restoration is based on the appearance of an identical phrase in the colophon of the third tablet (*KUB 7.57+35.148 iv 25–27*). See Giorgieri, *Il rituale*, 66, 76; and Hutter, “Tiere,” 95 n. 3.

<sup>115</sup> This term consists of the verbal base *werite-*, “to fear, be afraid,” affixed by the causative suffix *-nu-*. For a discussion of the semantic significance of *werite-*, see Erich Neu, *Ein althethitisches Gewitterritual* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970), 46 n. 12.

<sup>116</sup> Giorgieri, *Il rituale*, 49–59.

<sup>117</sup> Hutter, “Tiere”.

[...One b]ull, one ram, one Billy-goat, one Billy-goat (of a different breed?)<sup>118</sup>, one goat, one [young e]we, [one do]g?, one puppy, one pig.

In the second tablet we find a passage which according to Hutter bore the characteristics of a legal dispute. The priest of the Storm-god<sup>119</sup> gives certain instructions to a group of people termed “abomination-men”:<sup>120</sup> they are to overcome a wolf, a lion and a snake (*KUB* 12.63 obv. 22–28); however, they are unable to execute these instructions (*KUB* 12.63 obv. 29–33). The three said animals are not among the ones mentioned at the beginning of the text, and Hutter assumed that they represented the opponent of the ritual patient in the legal procedure. The failure of the “abomination-men” to withstand the legal procedure raised the need for applying other means, which included the invocation of three deities: Šišummi, Hapataliya and Andaliya. These deities, together with certain animals (a bull, a ram, a goat and a dog), will be involved later on in the healing process of the patient. An argument breaks between the “abomination-men” and the priest of the Storm-god, and therefore they all head to the king’s gate, in order to resolve it.<sup>121</sup> Hutter suggested that the “abomination-men” served as stand-in for the patient, who was still defiled, while the magical purification procedures about to be performed by the priest of the Storm-god were meant to take place in the temple of the Storm-god.<sup>122</sup> As noted by Hutter, sexual abominations were

---

<sup>118</sup> Adding the logogram ŠIR, “testicles,” makes no significant difference, since even in case it does not follow the compound MÁŠ.GAL, the term still designates a male goat. See similarly UDU-iš as an abbreviated writing for UDU.ŠIR-iš in Harry A. Hoffner Jr., “Akkadian *šumma immeru* Texts and their Hurro-Hittite Counterparts,” in Mark E. Cohen, Daniel C. Snell and David B. Weisberg, eds., *The Tablet and the Scroll. Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo* (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1993), 117. It is possible, therefore, that the writing variation points to two different breeds of goats.

<sup>119</sup> Written in the abbreviated form É ʿIM, “(priest of the) temple of the Storm-god.”

<sup>120</sup> *hurkelaš* LÚ.MEŠ. The term *hurkel*, “abomination,” denoted severe sexual offenses such as incest and bestiality, and the scholarly literature of it is vast; see among others Herbert P. H. Petschow, “Incest,” *RIA* 5 (1976), 146–47; Neufeld, *The Hittite Laws*, 189; Hoffner, “Incest,” 83–84; Jaan Puhvel, “Who Were the Hittite *hurkilas pesnes?*,” in Annemarie Etter, ed., *o-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986), 153–54; *HED* 3: 401–2, s.v. “*hurkil-*”; Richard Haase, *Beobachtungen zur hethitischen Rechtssatzung: nebst einem bibliographischen Anhang* (Leonberg: Selbstverlag, 1995), 34–38; Hoffner, *The Laws*, 224; Kloekhorst, *Etymological Dictionary*, 364, s.v. “*hurkil-*”; and Peled, *Amore*, 254–55.

<sup>121</sup> Hutter, “Tiere,” 98.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, 102.

decided according to the HL at the king's gate.<sup>123</sup> And indeed, in the current ritual the priest and the "abomination-men" go to that location for deciding their dispute. We can also add that the laws proscribe a sexual offender of approaching the king, which coincides with Hutter's view that the "abomination-men" took the patient's place in the dispute, as long as he was still contaminated with the evil of his sin.

A different interpretation for this episode, and for the term "abomination-men," was offered by Puhvel. On account of Indo-European etymologies, he translated the term "*hurkelaš LÚ.MEŠ*" as "men of strangulation."<sup>124</sup> Puhvel assumed that these men were accused for the misconduct of passive homosexuality, and were therefore supposed to be executed by strangulation. However, they were offered an alternative: if they are able to prove their manliness and virility, their lives will be saved. To this end, they should strangle three animals: a wolf, a lion and a snake. It should be noted that this interpretation did not gain scholarly acceptance.<sup>125</sup> However, in light of the growing awareness and recent discussions of male passivity and the attitude towards homosexuality in Hatti,<sup>126</sup> we should perhaps reconsider these objections, as well.

The third tablet of the text details three procedures of analogic magic. These procedures form the three parts of the patient's healing process: removing the corporeal representation of evil from the patient's body; mending the physical harms caused to the patient by that evil; and locking away the removed evil, thus preventing any possible harm it may cause in the future.

In the first of these procedures, the perceived evil, in the form of spittle, was extracted from the patient and transferred to an external carrier

---

<sup>123</sup> See in this regard previous discussion in the current article, in the section dealing with the evidence of bestiality in the HL.

<sup>124</sup> Puhvel, "Who," 153–54; *HED* 3: 401, s.v. "*hurkil-*".

<sup>125</sup> See Hutter, "Tiere," 103 n. 30.

<sup>126</sup> See comprehensive discussion in Ilan Peled, "Expelling the Demon of Effeminacy: Anniwiyani's Ritual and the Question of Homosexuality in Hittite Thought," *JANER* 10 (2010): 69–81.

by means of sympathetic magic. A Billy-goat was chosen as the carrier, and the spittle was spat into its mouth:

*Zuwi's Ritual, CTH 412 (KUB 7.57+35.148 iii 1–8)*

[...k]u-wa-pí ḫe-e-[...]  
 [...] x MÁŠ.GAL ḫa-a-ši-ir KAxU-<sup>r</sup>za-aš-ši-kán<sup>1</sup>  
 [...wa]-ar-aš-ta a-ar-ra-az-ma-aš-ši-kán  
 [...]-kán DUMU.LÚ.U<sub>19</sub>.LU-kán iš-ša-a-az  
 [...w]a-ar-aš-ta ar-ra-az-ma-aš-ši-kán  
 [...-ḫ]u-ni-zi SI<sup>ḫ</sup>.A-ŠU KUN-ia kal-la-ar  
 [...-w]a KAxU-iš-ši al-la-ap-pa-aḫ-ḫi  
 [...] pa-ra-a pé-en-ni-an-zi

[...W]hile [...] they opened [the mouth of?] the goat. In/to its mouth [...c]leaned. By the anus for him (=in his stead?) [...] The human by the mouth [...c]leaned. By the anus for him [...] His horns and tail (are now?) evil [...] He spits into its mouth [...] They lead forth [the goat].

Once the evil, in the form of the “contaminated” spittle,<sup>127</sup> has been removed, the second part of the treatment – the healing of the body – was applied:

*Zuwi's Ritual, CTH 412 (KUB 7.57+35.148 iii 14–19)*

na-an-ši-pát an-da ZAG-az e-ep-mi UR.TUR-aš-za ma-aḫ-ḫa-an  
 9 <sup>UZU</sup>ḫa-ap-pé-eš-šar-še-et li-ip-zi  
 nu-kán an-tu-uḫ-ša-an ŠUM-ŠU ḫal-zi-iḫ-ḫi  
 ki-i-el-la ḫa-ap-pé-eš-na-aš i-na-an QA-TAM-MA  
 li-ip-du <sup>UZU</sup>ZAG.UDU-aš i-na-an li-ip-du  
 ga-ak-kar-ta-an-<ni>-ia-aš-ša-aš i-na-an li-ip-du

I hold it (=the puppy) in his (=the patient's) right side (and say:) “As the puppy licks his nine body organs” – I call the human by his name – “May he lick in the same way the illness of this one's body! May he lick the illness of his shoulder! May he lick the illness of his shoulder-blade!”

<sup>127</sup> Hutter (“Tiere,” 100) even proposed that the evil was “tied” to the horns and tail of the goat.

Once the treatment was done, the removed evil must have been kept confined, in order to prevent any future damage it might cause:

*Zuwi's Ritual, CTH 412 (KUB 7.57+35.148 iii 38–44)*

*i-ia-an-za i-ia-an-za da-ak-ku-da-ku-wa-a[n-te-eš]*

*i-ia-an-zi ša-ra-ku-wa-an-te-eš i-ia-an-z[i]*

GU<sub>4</sub>-uš É *ki-iz-zu-mi-ia da-ak-ku-da-ku-wa-a-i[r]*

UDU-un *ḫi-i-la-aš da-ak-da-ku-wa-a-ir* UR.GI<sub>7</sub> *ḫar-pí* K[I.MIN]

[ŠA]Ḫ *ḫu-u-um-mi* KI.MIN *nu an-ni-iš-ki-mi ku-in* [LÚ-an]

[*na-an-kán*] ŠUM-ŠU *ḫal-zi-iḫ-ḫi za-aḫ-ḫi-ia-wa-ra-aš pa-i[t]*

[...*d*] *a-ak-ku-da-ku-wa-at-ta-a[t]*

(It) is done! (It) is done!<sup>128</sup> The lock[ed-ones]<sup>129</sup> walk. The shoe-wearers<sup>130</sup> wal[k]. They have locked the cattle<sup>131</sup> in a *kizumi*-pen; they have locked the sheep in the courtyards; the dog in the kennel – d[itto]; [the pi]g in the sty – ditto. [The man] which I am treating, I call [him] by his name: “He wen[t] to battle! He wa[s l]ocked!”

This passage is highly complicated, and can be interpreted in more than one way. The translation offered here matches Hutter's view, that the confinement of the animals was analogous to the confinement of the evil with which the patient was contaminated.<sup>132</sup> Giorgieri understood this passage quite similarly.<sup>133</sup> Other scholars, however, differ. This, for example, is how the two opening lines of the passage under discussion were translated in

<sup>128</sup> Or, as translated by Giorgieri (*Il rituale*, 79): “(he who has) gone, (has) gone!”

<sup>129</sup> This term may refer to the animals about to be locked. For the meaning of *dakkudakkuwanteš*, see below.

<sup>130</sup> This term may refer to the humans leading the animals. For the meaning of *šarakuwanteš*, see below.

<sup>131</sup> The ending *-uš* makes the translation difficult (unless we face here a scribal error for *-un*, as appears in the beginning of the next line), since it cannot be understood as acc. sg., but as nom. sg., nom. pl., or acc. pl. Since the animal must be the object of the sentence, I chose the third of these options. The first option is impossible because the verb is declined in the pl.; the second option, which requires us to view the verb as passive (“the bulls were locked”) is grammatically possible, but semantically improbable, because the following sentence is built with the acc. case and an active verb (“they locked the sheep”), and there is no reason to analyze the current sentence differently.

<sup>132</sup> Hutter, “Tiere,” 101.

<sup>133</sup> Giorgieri, *Il rituale*, 79.

CHD: “‘It is treated, it is treated’ (or: ‘The livestock, the livestock’<sup>134</sup> (cf. UDU *iyant-*))...‘They make (them) sheltered, they make (them) watered(?)...’<sup>135</sup> From this translation, it may be inferred that the confinement of the animals is positive, and reflects protection and shelter. In the same entry, the word *šarakuwanteš* is analyzed as derived from the verb *šarak(k)u(i)-*, translated as “to water(?), give water to(?)” I, however, view *šarakuwanteš* as a derivative of the participle *šarkuwant*, “shoe-wearer.”<sup>136</sup> The substantive *dakkudakkuwa-* was translated as well in various ways: “covered,”<sup>137</sup> “ready”<sup>138</sup> and “sheltered.”<sup>139</sup> According to HEG, this term was a reduplicated form expressing the iterative of *takkuwa-*, “to enclose (animals in their pens).”<sup>140</sup>

As is explained above, the introduction of the text and the colophon of the third tablet probably indicated that the ritual was conducted following a harmful punishment inflicted by the Storm-god on the patient. According to Hutter, this punishment harmed the person’s health, which was to be cured “in the manner of the priest of the Storm-god.”<sup>141</sup> It should be noted, however, that the infliction of the Storm-god upon the patient is not mentioned explicitly in the ritual, and only vaguely alluded to once in the beginning of the text. Hutter suggested that the phrase “*nū-tummantiya-*”<sup>142</sup>

---

<sup>134</sup> For this translation, see Calvert Watkins, “A Palaic Carmen,” in Mohammad Ali Jazayery, Edgar C. Polome and Werner Winter, eds. *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Archibald. A. Hill, Vol. 3: Descriptive Linguistics* (Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press, 1978), 308.

<sup>135</sup> CHD Š/2: 239, s.v. “*šarak(k)u(i)-*”.

<sup>136</sup> See similarly Giorgieri, *Il rituale*, 79; Hutter, “Tiere,” 201; and Norbert Oettinger, *Die Stammbildung des Hethitischen Verbums. Nachdruck mit einer kurzen Revision der hethitischen Verbalklassen* (Dresden: Verlag der TU Dresden, 2002), 336.

<sup>137</sup> See H. Craig Melchert, “Three Hittite Etymologies,” *ZVS* 93 (1979): 266.

<sup>138</sup> See Giorgieri, *Il rituale*, 79.

<sup>139</sup> See CHD Š/2: 239, s.v. “*šarak(k)u(i)-*”.

<sup>140</sup> HEG T, D/1: 52, s.v. “*takkuwa-*”, with references to previous literature suggesting similar interpretations.

<sup>141</sup> Hutter, “Tiere,” 101.

<sup>142</sup> *nū-* was translated as “a desirable condition, perhaps “contentment(?), satisfaction(?)” (CHD L-N: 476, s.v. “*nūt-*, (:)*nū-*”) and “contentment, enjoyment, profit” (HED 7: 131, s.v. “*nū(t)-*”). *tummantiya-* was translated as “obedience” (H. Craig Melchert, *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon* [Chapel Hill, NC, 1993], 233, s.v. “(:)*tūmmantiya-*”) and “Ruhm(?)” (HEG T, D/3: 431, s.v. “(:)*tummantiya-*”). On both these terms, see further Kloekhorst, *Etymological Dictionary*, 610, s.v. “*nū(t)-*”.

in this text alluded to the return of the patient's sexual behavior to standard norms, because of the contexts in which this phrase was attested in other texts.<sup>143</sup> Hutter's basic claim was that considering the attestations of the animals in the text, and their use throughout the ritual, the sexual sin committed by the patient can be understood to be bestiality. The sin enraged the Storm-god, who inflicted upon the offender an unspecified harm. The ritual was therefore meant to appease the raging god, cleanse the offender from his impurity and ease his anguish.

However, the exact nature of the ailment suffered by the patient still remains to be clarified. When trying to identify the physical symptoms of the patient, which required the performance of the ritual, we should concentrate on the term *weridanu-*, "to horrify," discussed above. In our text, this horrifying was caused to the patient by the Storm-god. Terms for fright (*werite-*, *naḫ-*) appear in other texts in contexts indicating a state of disease, a negative physiological symptom that should be removed by magical means.<sup>144</sup> For example, in the birth-ritual *KUB* 17.15 fear of the Storm-god ("dU-aš na-aḫ-ša-ra-<ad->da-[(an)]", *KUB* 17.15 ii 15') is regarded as a negative mishap that strikes a woman in labor. Further, in the bilingual Hurro-Hittite ritual *KBo* 12.85+ the fear of a lion and a snake ("ŠA UR.MAḪ na-aḫ-š[a-ra-at-ta-an] / ŠA MUŠ-ia ú-e-ri-te-ma-an", *KBo* 12.85+ iii 47–48) appears to be related to demons who represent the personification of various diseases.<sup>145</sup> The sole place in which fear was regarded explicitly as a physical hurt is the birth-ritual *KUB* 44.4+, where fear was listed as one of the maladies that strike the nine body organs of a delivering woman ("na-aš ḪUŠ-ri-ia-ad-da-at ú-e-ri-te-eš-ta", "And she became afraid, she feared," *KUB* 44.4+ rev. 7).<sup>146</sup> Some of the symptoms described in this birth-ritual are parallel to

---

<sup>143</sup> Hutter, "Tiere," 103–104.

<sup>144</sup> See Volkert Haas and Ilse Wegner, *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen* <sup>SAL</sup>ŠU.GI (Rome: Multigrafica, 1988), 241. For a discussion of this topic, including various textual examples, see Giorgieri, *Il rituale*, 49–59.

<sup>145</sup> For these two examples, see Giorgieri, *Il rituale*, 55–56.

<sup>146</sup> On this passage, see Giorgieri, *Il rituale*, 57 and Anna Maria Polvani, "Relations between Rituals and Mythology in Official and Popular Hittite Religion," in Manfred Hutter and Sylvia

those that appear in the description of king Muršili's aphasia (CTH 486), where it is said that the king became afraid because of the thunders of the Storm-god.<sup>147</sup> Thus, equating Mušili's "fear" with the "fright" currently discussed, allow us to hypothesize and identify the fright suffered by the patient in Zuwi's Ritual with the pathological state of aphasia. This aphasia was believed to be caused by the Storm-god, who became furious by the sin of bestiality.

### *Dream Reports*

Several dream reports ascribed to queen Puduhepa<sup>148</sup> reveal various concerns of the queen, which modern scholars interpret as reflecting her fear of loss of power.<sup>149</sup> Horses figure as a prominent motif in one of these dream reports (CTH 584, KUB 60.97+31.71):<sup>150</sup>

*Dream of a Hittite Queen, CTH 584 (KUB 31.71 obv. ii 1'-11')*

[ANŠE.KUR.RAM]<sup>EŠ?</sup>-ia-wa(-)ᵀ mu ku-wa-at-qa<sup>151</sup>

[o]-x :tar-ši-en-ti nu<sup>!</sup>(TAR)-za MUNUS.LUGAL

kat-ta iš-ḫa-ḫa-at

nu-wa taš-ku-pí-iš-ki-u-wa-an ᵀ ti<sup>!</sup>-ia-ᵀ nu<sup>!</sup>-un

nu-mu-kán<sup>LÚ.MEŠ</sup>KAR-TAP-PU pa-ra-a

---

Hutter-Braunsar, ed., *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kult und individuelle Religiosität: Akten des religionsgeschichtlichen Symposiums "Kleinasien und angrenzende Gebiete vom Beginn des 2. bis zur Mitte des 1. Jahrhunderts v. Chr."* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2004), 370–71.

<sup>147</sup> See in this regard Giorgieri, *Il rituale*, 50–51.

<sup>148</sup> Her name is not actually attested in all these texts. However, on various accounts it is assumed that she is the queen to whom the dreams are to be ascribed, including the one presently discussed; see Alice Mouton, *Rêves hittites: Contribution à une histoire et une anthropologie du rêve en Anatolie ancienne* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 272.

<sup>149</sup> For a discussion of these dreams, see Volkert Haas, *Hethitische Orakel, Vorzeichen und Abwehrstrategien: Ein Beitrag zur hethitischen Kulturgeschichte* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), 160–64 (for the current dream, see pp. 161–62). Mouton (*Rêves*, 48) assumed that they bore political significance.

<sup>150</sup> For editions and discussions of this text, see Rudolf Werner, "Ein Traum einer hethitischen Königin," in Heinrich Otten, Erich Neu and Christel Rüster, eds., *Festschrift Heinrich Otten: 27. Dez. 1973*, (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1973), 327–30; Theo P. J. van den Hout, "Traume einer hethitischen Königin: KUB LX 97 + XXXI 71," *AoF* 21 (1994): 305–27 and most recently Mouton, *Rêves*, 272–78.

<sup>151</sup> This restoration follows van den Hout, "Traume," 309. Based on the photograph of the tablet, as appears in the Mainz Photoarchiv (<http://www.hethport.adwmainz.de/fotarch/index.php>; last access 20 August 2020), this restoration seems highly probable.

*:ḥa-aḥ-re-eš-kán-zi*  
*nu-mu-kán im-ma u-ni-uš ANŠE.KUR.RA<sup>MEŠ</sup>*  
*a-wa-an ar-ḥa pé-e-ḥu-te-<sup>r</sup>er<sup>1</sup>*  
*:tar-ši-it-ta-ia-wa-mu <sup>r</sup>Ú-UL*  
*ku-iš-ki ša-ra-a-ia-mu-kán Ú-[U]L*  
*ku-iš-ki še-e-ḥu-ri-<sup>r</sup>ia<sup>1</sup>-[a]t*

“And [the horse]s? [...] would trample [on me?...] (I), the queen, sat down and started wailing. The charioteers were laughing at me. They indeed led the horses away from me. No one trampled on me, no one urinated on me.”

In this dream, the queen expresses her fear that horses trample and urinate on her. Van den Hout suggested that though the implication of this passage cannot be clearly explained, it reminds us of magical rituals in which urine and bodily waste were used.<sup>152</sup> He further mentioned in this context two other dreams<sup>153</sup> in which the queen (presumably Puduhepa) was portrayed as being “harassed” (*ḥatkiš(a)nu-*)<sup>154</sup> by young men behind the “bathhouse” (*Étarnu-*).<sup>155</sup> Though van den Hout did not mention it explicitly, the latter dreams may certainly imply a sexual sense,<sup>156</sup> and their relation to the passage quoted above strengthens the impression that this passage, too, bore some sexual sense. The contact between the horses and the queen, whether symbolically sexual or not, is eventually avoided. However, the scene clearly depicts the queen as afraid of the possible contact. The symbolism of a stallion trampling and urinating on a female human being may certainly hint to bestiality. Therefore, the queen’s anxiety in this episode may also be

<sup>152</sup> Van den Hout, “Traüme,” 320.

<sup>153</sup> *KUB* 15.1 ii 5–10 and 37–41; for transliteration and translation of these two dreams, see most recently Mouton, *Rêves*, 261–62; 264–65.

<sup>154</sup> See *HED* 3: 268, s.v. “*ḥatk-*”.

<sup>155</sup> See *HEG* T, D/2: 199–201, s.v. “*Étarnu-*”.

<sup>156</sup> As noted, among others, by Haas (*Hethitische Orakel*, 163). We may further consider in this context the dream report in *KuT* 50:5–9 (see Gernot Wilhelm, “Zwei mittelhethitische Briefe aus dem Gebäude C in Kuşaklı,” *MDOG* 130 [1998]: 181, 184), in which the princess was “repeatedly beaten” (*A-NA* [erasure] *DUMU.MUNUS-wa za-aš-ḥé-it an-da wa-al-ḥa-an-ni-iš-<kat>-ta-at*, *KuT* 50:7).

understood as the fear of unwillingly engaging in bestial relations with the horses.

This brings us back to the discussion with which the present paper began. We initiated our survey of human-bestial relations in Hittite texts with the prohibition of copulation between humans and equines. We now conclude this survey with an example of the fear of the breaking of this prohibition, though from a different point of view than the one expressed by the formal law.

### *Conclusions*

In this survey of textual references to bestiality in Hittite thought, we have seen that the circumstances in which the phenomenon occurred are in most cases unknown. More often than not, the act itself is not recorded, but rather the social reaction to it. Therefore, we cannot speak so much of the psychological or social factors that led people to conduct sexual congress with animals, but rather, of the customs and norms that prevailed among the Hittites with regard to this act. Not surprisingly, it becomes immediately apparent that the social reaction to bestiality in Hatti was highly negative, and the act was condemned and sanctioned. Bestiality was considered to render impurity, and its performance defiled not only the offender, but also any person who came in contact with him, and, more broadly, the entire community. For this reason, various social mechanisms were applied in order to demonstrate and emphasize the disapproval of bestiality, its detrimental affect on society, and the sanctions destined for anyone who infringes the prohibition and performs the forbidden act.

The means by which Hittite society expressed its disapproval of bestiality, and labeled it as inappropriate and prohibited, were numerous. Formal laws proscribed sexual coition between humans and various animals, while, less explicitly, certain myths may have viewed such acts as improper. Furthermore, various magical rituals were meant to purify the offender and his community in case the act indeed took place, and perhaps also meant to

pacify the gods who became enraged as a result of the act. It seems reasonable to assume that the very knowledge of the existence of such rites functioned as an intimidating means for deterring people from performing bestiality. However, when condemnation was insufficient, and bestiality did take place, the social sanctions to be applied were harsh. The laws prescribed death penalty for the culprit in almost all cases (though the king was entitled to spare the offender's life), and even in case the offender's life was spared, the purification rites he was required to undergo surely involved a considerable degree of public humiliation.

Occasionally, however, the course of events was more complicated, and the strict objection to bestiality seems to have been less straightforward. A case in point is the lack of complete prohibition of bestiality by formal law: as we have seen, HL §200a condemned human copulation with a horse or a mule, tagged it as the performance of sin, and prevented the human culprit of approaching the king or becoming a priest. However, at the same time this act was labeled "not an offense," in contrast with human coition with all other animals mentioned in the HL.

Another case of discrepancy between the general taboo on bestiality, and what may have been a custom contradicting it, is the possible tradition of the royal couple as connected with animal sexuality. This appeared in a festival in which sexual relations between two human partners – the royal couple – were termed as "mating"/"copulating", a term otherwise reserved exclusively for denoting the mating of animals. This may have symbolized the royal couple as performing intercourse in a "backward" position, characterizing animal mating. This suggestion is reinforced by other textual and iconographic evidence. In this example, however, no bestiality per se was performed, but the copulation occurred between two human partners, perhaps mimicking animals. The discrepancy in this case between taboo and its contradicting custom, therefore, is less apparent.

As for the gender perspective, the Hittite texts we have examined usually reflect the masculine point of view, since they depict the bestial

relations between a male human and an animal partner. It seems, therefore, that the Hittite perspective considered the human partner to be the active/penetrative party of the relations, and their initiator. Puduhepa's dream, therefore, presents us with a rare exception, in which the human partner is female and the animal is male. Here, as well as in other examples, the masculine partner appears to represent the dominant side, regardless of being human or not, because the queen is portrayed as afraid of the animals. Her fear is interpreted here to result from the potential sexual relations. We may therefore assume that the gender factor was crucial when referring to questions of dominance and control: the masculine penetrator was always dominant, even in the rare case where he was the bestial partner of the relations.

At the beginning of this article we have briefly referred to the attitude towards bestiality among several ancient cultures, as a comparison with the Hittite case. We may now conclude that the reference to bestiality in myths, in order to delineate the borders between humans and gods, was shared by both Greek and Hittite cultures, while the rape motif, predominant in Greek myths, can only be traced in Puduhepa's dream report, and even there, only allegorically, if at all. As for the comparison between the Hittite and Hindu cultures, both proscribed bestiality by law. However, the ritual sphere of each of these cultures shows markedly different attitude. Hittite rituals formed expiating means in case the sinful act occurred, while Hindu royal rites included bestiality, perhaps symbolically, as part of their performance.

We may conclude that even when severe social taboos were involved, they were not automatically applied and enforced in everyday life. Social rules of conduct are not universal, and occasionally they are manifested in the actual way of life in surprising ways.