

tionen haben: (5) Kennzeichnung der Pluralität des Verbums (?), (7) Verneinung, (8—9) Modi, (10) Subjekt der Handlung, (11) Plural des Subjekts der Handlung. Zu den enklitischen „Objekt“-Suffixen s. schon unter § 4. 6.

Häufig sind Partizipialformen; grundsätzlich werden sie beim intrans. Verbum gebraucht.

I. M. Diakonoff, HuU 113—138; 139—147 sowie die am Ende von § 4 zitierten Werke zur hurr. Grammatik.

8. Entlehnungen, Interferenz. Über die mögliche Einwirkung des Hurr. insgesamt auf benachbarte Sprachen oder den Einfluß fremder Sprachen auf das Hurr. läßt sich noch nichts Sichereres sagen. Man könnte vermuten, ohne es schon zu beweisen, daß der Kontakt der verschiedenen Sprachen in Nordmesopotamien, Nordsyrien, Südost- und Zentralanatolien sowie den Gebirgsgegenden im Bereich von Van-, Urmia- und Sevan-See zu Erscheinungen geführt hat, die unter den Begriff „Sprachbund“ fallen, so wie es sich in moderner Zeit am Persischen, Kurdischen, Neuaramäischen und Türkischen nachweisen läßt.

Ein mannigfacher Lehnwörtertausch ist von vornherein wahrscheinlich. Zu sum. und akk. (sowie indirekt vorsum. und vorakk.) Lehnwörtern im Hurr. s. A. Kammenhuber, Die Arier 125—132; I. M. Diakonoff, Or. 41 (1972) 100f. Hurr. Lehnwörter im Akk. sind ziemlich selten, sieht man ab von dem hurr. Wortschatz in akk. Texten aus hurrophonem Milieu.

Vgl. zu den im CAD aufgenommenen Lemmata einstweilen Edzard, ZA 53 (1959) 298; 54 (1961) 253, 255; 56 (1964) 281f.; 60 (1970) 158; 64 (1975) 123f.

Zu hurr. Lehnwörtern im Heth. vgl. kurz J. Friedrich, HdOr. I 2/1—2 (1960) 22f.; I. M. Diakonoff, o. c. 101f. Zu einigen als indogerm. verkannten wohl hurr. Nomina s. A. Kammenhuber, Die Arier 220ff. und passim.

Die Interferenz des Hurr. in der akk. Amtssprache von Nuzi hat viel zum Verständnis des Hurr. selbst beigetragen. Charakteristische Erscheinungen sind die Verwechslung der akk. Genera masc. und

fem. oder die Verwechslung von Subjekt und Objekt beim Verbum (z. B. *ipallatš-šunati*, „er wird sie (= eos) verehren“ für gemeinses *ipallatš-ši*, „sie werden sie (= eam) verehren“; vgl. Diakonoff, HuU 154). S. dazu G. Wilhelm (Lit. s. § 3 C 1, und vgl. G. Szabó, WO 7 (1973/74) 169—173).

Allgemeine Literatur zur Grammatik des Hurritischen (s. a. die einzelnen Abschnitte von § 4): E. A. Speiser, IH (s. Vorbericht oben S. 507) als bahnbrechendes Werk (1941). — F. W. Bush, A Grammar of the Hurrian Language (Diss. Brandeis Univ. 1968, Univ. Microfilms Ann Arbor, Nr. 64—12, 852; dort S. 400—424 Bibliographie). — E. Laroche, Ugaritica V (1968) 527—540, wozu A. Kammenhuber, UF 2 (1970) 297—302. — J. Friedrich, Churritisch, HdOr. I 2/1—2 (1969) 1—30. — I. M. Diakonoff, HuU (1971), nicht nur glänzende Zusammenfassung des Forschungsstandes, sondern weiterführende Arbeit.

Allgemeine Literatur zu den Hurritern überhaupt: A. Ungnad, Subartu (1936). — I. J. Gelb, HaS (1944). — A. Kammenhuber, Die Arier im Vorderen Orient (1968), wozu I. M. Diakonoff, Or. 41 (1972) 91—120. — E. von Schuler, WEMyth. I (1965) 176f.; zuletzt V. Haas / H.-J. Thiel, et al., Das hurritologische Archiv (Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler, Berlin, 1975) mit Lit.

D. O. Edzard — A. Kammenhuber

Hurriter, Kunst.

§ 1. Third Millennium. — § 2. Old Assyrian Period. — § 3. Old Hittite Period. — § 4. Mitannian Period. — § 5. The Hittite Empire Period. — § 6. Tell Halaf — Guzana. — § 7. Urartu, North Iran. — § 8. Conclusion.

The existence of a Hurrian artistic tradition has been advocated by some and rejected by others. Because the most important political and religious centers of Hurrian and partly Hurrian states have not yet been excavated (e. g., Urkiš*, Wašukanni*), Hurrian art and architecture are a matter of hypothetical reconstruction and combination of evidence. The identification of Hurrian traits is complicated by the amalgamation of Hurrian elements in the following populations and possibly therefore in the following artistic traditions: Akkadian, Assyrian,

North Syrian, Hittite, neo-Hittite, Urartian.

The following works of art, references to works of art, and trends in art and architecture may be considered in the tentative reconstruction of Hurrian art:

§ 1. Third Millennium. *Urkiš*. The two bronze lion protomes from the temple built by Tišari king of Urkiš are unusual in being truncated as blunt nails; their protomes are lively with a free turn of their snarling heads; for this they may be indebted to Akkadian art.

A. Parrot and J. Nougayrol, RA 42 (1948) 1—20; Syria 31 (1954) 11—13; A. Parrot, Sumer. The Dawn of Art (1961) fig. 220; R. S. Ellis, Foundation Deposits in Ancient Mesopotamia (1968) 57—58. New York lion: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Ancient Near Eastern Art (1966) p. 11, fig. 15; inv. 48. 180.

The text of the foundation tablet attests the building of temples by Hurrian kings in the late Akkadian period. Urkiš, the town of Kumarbi, must contain early religious architecture of the Hurrians, cf. the Samarra tablet recording the dedication in Hawilum (Hawalum*) of a temple to Nergal by Atalšen, king of Urkiš and Nawar (F. Thureau-Dangin, RA 9 [1911] 1—4; A. Finet RA 60 [1966] 17). A lapislazuli cylinder seal of the daughter of Tišadimmuzi, reportedly also from Urkiš, confirms the indebtedness of early Hurrian art to Akkadian artists (J. Nougayrol, Syria 37 [1960] 210, fig. 2).

*Tell Huēra**. The Early Dynastic II temples and other buildings at T. H. cannot yet be interpreted as belonging to a Hurrian architectural tradition (A. Moortgat, Tell Chuēra in Nordost-Syrien, Vorfällige Berichte I-V, 1960—1967; cf. R. M. Boehmer, ZA 58 [1967] 335—339 and M. E. L. Mallowan, CAH³ I, 2 (1971) 308—314.). The most original elements are the anta temples and the large orthostats set up along a roadway. Among the minor arts from T. H. the terracotta incense burners with architectural detail (windows) and reliefs are the earliest in a series of such stands occurring in Hurrian territory of the third and second millennia

(A. Moortgat, Tell Chuēra III [1962] 29—35).

Gebel el-Bēdā. The sculptures found by M. von Oppenheim were interpreted by U. Moortgat-Correns as victory monuments of the Early Dynastic II—III period (Die Bildwerke vom Djebel el-Bēdā). The statue and the restored stela (with its unusual design of a single figure filling the upper part of each side of the block) are colossal sculptures; as such they are not congenial to Mesopotamian art proper. Occasional instances of colossal stone sculptures in the second and first millennia B. C. are potentially related to Hurrian interaction (the Fasillar* stela in Anatolia, the statuary of Karkemīš*, Zincirli*, and Tell Halaf*).

Iconography, Bildgedanken. A. Moortgat's theory that certain iconographic concepts (*Bildgedanken*) in Hittite and neo-Hittite art are of Hurrian origin (Bergvölker, 1932) may have to be tested for the Akkadian period. The representations on Akkadian cylinder seals may partly render Hurrian myths and deities; weather gods (Tešub?), mountain gods, battles against monsters deserve analysis in this respect (cf. H. Frankfort, CS [1939] pl. 22a. e. f; pl. 23j; R. M. Boehmer, Die Entw. d. Glypt. während der Akkad-Zeit [1965] 62—64, pl. 25, 292).

§ 2. Old Assyrian Period. The inscriptions of Shalmanesser III refer to a *šalmu* of Anum-ḥirbi on the mountain of Atalur* (the Amanos*), (CAD vol. S, p. 83; cf. J. Læssøe, Iraq 21 [1959] 38—39; P. Hulin, Iraq 25 [1963] 49, 60). This must have been a rock relief carved for the Hurrian king Anum-Ḥirbi of Mama known from his letter to king Waršama* of Kaniš* (K. Balkan, Letter of King Anum-Ḥirbi of Mama to King Warshama of Kanish [1957] 34—38; H. Otten in FW II [1966] p. 108). The same king is referred to in a text from the *Haus am Hang* in Boğazköy (KBo. 12, 3 in Otten, WVDOG 77; cf. A. Goetze, JCS 18 [1964] 89). The relief may have shown Anum-Ḥirbi as a victor in an Akkadian or an

unknown Hurrian tradition; it must have been inscribed.

A large *votive sword* with an Old Assyrian inscription comes from the region of Diyarbakır. H. G. Güterbock interprets the text as referring to Hubšal, a sanctuary or cult city of Nergal as a Hurrian underworld deity (AS 16 [1965] 197–198). The geographical provenance confirms this. The bronze sword with its decoration of two cast lion figures (with heads reversed) can be seen as a votive of Hurrian manufacture.

Tell al-Rimah. The architectural sculptures found re-used in later levels were probably made for the Old Assyrian temple at Tell al Rimah, a site with a strong admixture of Hurrians. To be considered of Hurrian affinity are the orthostat with a winged scorpion man (D. Oates, Iraq 28 [1966] 131, pl. 34b) and the impost blocks for lintels with the relief of a frontal goddess(?) between palmtrees (Oates, Iraq 29 [1967] pl. 31a) and especially the Humbaba mask (Iraq 29, pl. 31b). This sculpture is unlike that of Mari or Babylon; in motifs, frontality, and boldness (of the large projecting Humbaba mask) it suggests Hurrian rather than Old Assyrian art.

Iconography. Continuing analysis of Hurrian *Bildgedanken* will have to take into account the extensive Anatolian glyptic repertoire of the Old Assyrian period as attested in the seal impressions from the Kārum at Kültepe (N. Özgür, Seals and Seal Impressions of Level Ib from Karum Kanish [1958]; id. The Anatolian Group of Cylinder Seal Impressions from Kültepe [1965]).

§ 3. Old Hittite Period. The bilingual annals of Hattušili I* report that this king brought rich booty from the city of Haššuwa* to his capital Hattuša*: silver and gold statues, statues of several weather gods (of Armaruk, Halap/b*, Atalluri and Leluri), silver bulls, precious furniture. The gods in question are Hurrian and the temple inventory brought back to Hattuša evidently included metal statues of Teššub and other gods. The natu-

re of the statuary remains hypothetical; it probably was of small format and richly covered with gold and silver, if not of solid precious metal. The early presence of Hurrian artistic booty in the Hittite capital has been noted in connection with the potential Hurrian influence on Hittite art.

H. Otten, MDOG 91 (1958) 75–84; H. Otten/H. G. Güterbock, KBo. 10; A. Goetze, JCS 16 (1962) 28; Güterbock JCS 18 (1964) 3–4; Otten in FW II (1966) 115; J.-R. Kupper, CAH³ II 1 (1973) 36–41.

§ 4. Mitannian Period. Hurrian elements have principally been looked for in the art of sites with a strong concentration of Hurrians c. 1500–1350 B. C.; the site of Wašukanni is the conspicuous gap in our evidence. Sites to be considered are Tell Faharija (Fecherije*), Tell Brak, Şağır Bázär, Tell al-Rimah, Nuzi*, Tell Şemşāra, Basmusiān, Alalah, Tell Mardih, Ugarit.

Architecture. The so-called *bilāni* plan, better represented in the first millennium B. C., perhaps has a precursor in the palace of Alalah IV (L. Woolley, Alalakh [1955] 110–131; but cf. R. Naumann, Architektur Kleinasiens² [1971] 408; Hrouda, HArch. I [1971] 180f.). The use of structural orthostats starts earlier in North Syria and is not likely to have been a Hurrian innovation (Alalah VII, Tilmen Hüyük*, Tell Mardih).

Sculpture. Architectural sculpture is rare. The angular lions from the temple at Alalah (Woolley, Alalakh pl. 49–51) are perhaps Hurrian in style. The statue of Idrimi* (Woolley, Alalakh pl. 46; S. Smith, The statue of Idrimi [1949]) certainly proves that the gentler sculptural traditions of Alalah VII had been discontinued. Hurrian traits may be seen in a rigidity of forms and a simplification of features; the large staring eyes of Idrimi are deliberately archaic. One may also consider the limestone statuettes from Tell Faharija which escape classification according to the Mesopotamian norm (C. W. McEwan a. o., Soundings at Tell Fakhariyah = OIP 79 [1958] pl. 55–57). A. Moortgat includes the cult relief from Assur in the

Hurrian group (Die Kunst des alten Mesopotamien [1967] 115). Better modelling, combined with stylization, is evident in the faience lion guardians from Nuzi (R. F. S. Starr, Nuzi pl. 110–111, pp. 430–432) which may have had counterparts at Boğazköy (R. M. Boehmer, Die Kleinfunde von Boğazköy = WVDOG 97 [1972] No. 1858–9).

Terracottas. Nuzi and other sites continue to make tower-shaped terracotta incense-burners with incised or relief decoration; the architectural affinities of the shapes are reminiscent of the Early Dynastic incense stands from Tell Huēra (R. F. S. Starr, Nuzi [1937] pl. 61, 113–114). At Şemşāra and Basmusian in the Ramia plain clay models of such towers are set on the backs of animals (B. Abu Soof, Sumer 26 [1970] pl. 12–13). Variants of such towers may be seen as cult objects on Anatolian seals of the Old Assyrian period (N. Özgür, Anadolu 10 [1966] pl. XV, 2, from Acem Hüyük); Boğazköy has painted terracotta towers in level IVd of Büyükkale (P. Neve, MDOG 95 [1965] 34–35).

Glyptic. The seal of Sauššatar (Starr, Nuzi II, pl. 118, I; Frankfort, CS pl. 42a; Th. Beran, ZA 52 [1957] 202–203) is a composite of iconographic motifs in free field style, not a document of a strong dynastic art. The seal impressions from Nuzi in the 'elaborate style' (E. Porada, AASOR 24 [1944/45]) are a mine of iconographic information; Mitannian motifs reveal Mesopotamian, Syrian, and Anatolian ties. It is not always possible to separate Hurrian and Indo-Aryan inspiration, the latter contributed by the new dynasty. The most characteristic motifs are the stylized tree flanked by human or hybrid worshippers or animals; the tree crowned by the winged sun-disc; antithetical animal groups; compartmented guilloche or chevron borders with winged griffins; various roles for winged deities and hybrids; libations by griffin demons; mythological fights ('Humbaba'); rows of marching men in closely overlapping order. Mitannian seals travelled widely and were influential as far

away as the Aegean, e. g., at Thebes in Boeotia (E. Porada, AJA 69 [1965] 173) and at Perati in Attica (Sp. Iakovidis, Perati [1969] pl. 47a, 322–325).

Wall Painting. The compartmented designs on some of the Nuzi sealings are related to fragmentary wall paintings from houses at the same site (Starr, Nuzi pl. 128–129). These are ornamental guilloche borders with individual filling motifs (masks, volute trees); there as yet no representations of action as one might expect from some sealings which have hunts and battles, even chariot scenes.

Pottery. The so-called Nuzi ware is a Mitannian variant of the goblet tradition; it is decorated in white paint on a dark slip which shades from reddish to black (B. Hrouda, IstForsch. 19 [1957]; S. M. Cecchini, StudSem. 15 [1965]). The decorative motifs vary with the area of manufacture. Friezes are made up of miscellaneous spiral and guilloche borders, floral trees and palmettes, rosettes, and stylized birds. The use of glazed ware and frit is beginning to be popular. Glass appears as a luxury item (Nuzi pl. 128–129).

Arts and crafts. The wealth of jewelry and precious personal belongings listed in the Amarna letters of Tušratta to Amenophis III (Nos. 17–25) give us an indirect reflection of Mitannian craftsmanship and fine arts in the 14th century B. C. Among the most extensively decorated objects must have been the royal chariots and their paraphernalia. Cf. M. S. Drower in CAH³ II 1 (1973) 522–524.

§ 5. The Hittite Empire Period. The Hurrian ritual order and the Hurrian names of the deities represented in the rock reliefs of Yazılıkaya near the Hittite capital pose the question of artistic Hurrian counterparts (and wall paintings in Mitannian-Hurrian temples) to which the answer cannot yet be given.

K. Bittel/R. Naumann/H. Otto, Yazılıkaya = WVDOG 61 (1941); E. Laroche, JCS 6 (1952) 115–123; E. Laroche, RHA 27/84–85 (1969) 61–109.

The iconography is part of a complex which becomes first noticeable in the seal

impressions of Kārum Kaniš of the Old Assyrian period. The Hurrian affinities of Yazılıkaya and other Hittite monuments such as the rock relief at Imamkulu* are discussed under *Hethiter, Kunst**.

Tell Faharija. Some late Mitannian 'depleted style' seals are known from 13th century F. (H. J. Kantor in Tell Fakhariyah = OIP 79 [1958] p. 84). Ivories from 13th century F. repeat Mitannian motifs: volute trees, robed figures flanking tree, masks, winged discs with solar motif, kneeling griffin demons (OIP 79, pl. 58—63).

§ 6. *Tell Halaf*-Guzana* as a neo-Hurrian site. The architecture and sculpture of the temple palace of Kapara presents elements of potentially Hurrian derivation: the *hilāni** plan (R. Naumann, Architektur Kleinasiens² [1971] 411—415; M. Fr. von Oppenheim, Tell Halaf II, 1950), the use of colossal statuary as supporting figures in the entranceway; the embodiment in these figures of the Hurrian triad: Teššub*, Hepat*, and Šarruma* standing on their attributive animals; the use of alternating dark-and-light stone orthostats with individual motifs (instead of a neo-Hittite frieze) as wall decoration (M. J. Mellink, Anatolian Studies presented to H. G. Güterbock [1974] 209—212). The stylistic characteristics of the statuary of Halaf (the 'Caryatids' as well as the funerary statues) are outside of the Hittite and Assyrian traditions but link better with traits apparent, although much less forcefully, in the Alalah and Faharija sculptures. The colossal size of the Halaf figures (note also the colossal bird on its pedestal) and their architectural role suggest that Kapara's sculptors and builders were able to draw on a Hurrian tradition the prototypes of which remain to be discovered in the area of the Hābūr* triangle. Discoveries of such precursors would give the hitherto lacking proof of monumental Hurrian art.

§ 7. Urartu, North Iran. Hurrian components survive in the iconography of the gold bowl from Hasanlu* with its scenes of a divine procession headed by

Teššub and its mythological detail (E. Porada, Ancient Iran [1965] 95—101; Mel-link, IrAnt. 6 [1966] 72—87). Urartian art and architecture, disciplined in a dynastic tradition, yet should reveal Hurrian links, as the language does (I. M. Diakonoff, Hurritisch und Urartäisch, 1971). The leading Urartian temple form is a square tower-like structure with windows.

B. Hrouda, HArch. I (1971) 258; R. Naumann, IstM 18 (1968) 45—57; D. Stronach, JNES 26 (1967) 281—288; E. Akurgal, Urartäische und Altiranische Kunstszenen (1968) 12—17.

In proportions they are perhaps to be compared with Hurrian tower-like structures represented in miniatures as terracotta incense burners. The reliefs from Adilcevaz (B. Öğün, AA 1967, 497—501), carved on monolithic architectural piers, have images of Urartian towers with crenellations, windows, and extensive ritual decoration.

§ 8. Conclusion. The negation of Hurrian art is unfounded, but the existence of an original, independent tradition of Hurrian art and architecture is improbable for lack of a strong, lasting dynastic center which could have sponsored continuity. As soon as the Hurrians adopted writing and other cultural traits from the Akkadians, artistic compromises must have started. Hurrian cults and iconography are to be reckoned with from the Akkadian period on; in the second millennium Hurrian diffusion is strongest and a blending of artistic elements affects Anatolia, North Syria, and North Mesopotamia. With the Mitannian dynasty a foreign element is added to the complex character of Hurrian culture, but a brief period of material and artistic splendor ensued, the art and architecture of which are known to us only peripherally in sites like Nuzi and Alalah. The characteristics of Hurrian art as very tentatively sketched in the above suggest that temples and palaces, some of *hilāni** type, would have been decorated with architectural sculptures, that colossal statues and votives existed, that cult statues were made of precious metal in human and animal form, that wall

paintings decorated the shrines and palaces, and that the lively world of imagery seen in the elaborate style of Mitannian glyptic had its counterpart in the designs of such paintings. Stylistically formalization prevails; if the Halaf statues of the Kapara age still belong in the Hurrian tradition, they confirm the resistance to naturalism and realism also suspected for the Mitannian counterparts of Idrimi.

A. Moortgat, Die Kunst des Orients und die Bergvölker (1932); A. Goetze, Hethiter, Hurriter, Assyrier (1936); H. G. Güterbock, Siegel aus Boğazköy II (1942); A. Moortgat, Nur hethitische oder auch churrische Kunst? (ZA 48 [1944] 152—160); K. Bit-tel, Nur hethitische oder auch hurritische Kunst? (ZA 49 [1949] 256—290); A. Goetze, Kleinasiens² (1957) 173—178; A. Moortgat, Die Kunst des alten Mesopotamien (1967) 109—116; B. Hrouda, Handbuch der Archäologie, Vorderasien I (1971) 180 bis 184; J.-R. Kupper, Hurrian elements in art and religion (CAH³ II 1 [1973] 39—41); M. S. Drower, Syria c. 1500—1400 B. C., Religion, art and literature (CAH³ II 1 [1973] 519—525); H. Frankfort, The Art and Architecture of the ancient Orient (1954) 140—147, 162—188.

M. J. Mellink

Hursagkalama. A. Philologisch.

hur-sag-kalam-ma „Gebirge des Landes Sumer“ „Heiligtum der Inanna*/Ištar in Kiš*; zugleich Name des östlichen — verselbständigen — Teils der Stadt. Ruinenname Umm Garra/ Ingārra. Der sumerische Name weist auf imposante Größe des Heiligtums hin, doch ist unklar, ob ursprünglich ein bestimmtes Gebäude (Zikkurrat) oder der Gesamtkomplex gemeint war. Inanna als Herrin von H. heißt auch ^anin-H. (An: Anum IV 30), ^agašan-H. (Emesal-Voc., MSL 4, 8 Z. 83) oder akk. *hur-sag-kalam-ma^{ki}-i-tum* (Rm. IV 97 Z. 5: PSBA 23 [1901] 197 = St. Langdon, SBP S. 264, seleuk.).

Die bisher nur ziemlich seltenen Belege für H. gestatten nicht, eine Geschichte des Heiligtums und der angeschlossenen Siedlung zu schreiben, und sei es in größten Zügen. Auch ist oft unklar, ob ein Beleg das Heiligtum oder die Siedlung meint. Näheres über H. im Verhältnis zu Kiš als ganzem s. dort.

Es gibt noch keine sicheren schriftlichen Belege für die Ur III- und ältere Zeit (zum archäologischen Befunde s. unten S. 520f.). *hur-sag-GA-lam-ma* ist im Rép. géogr. 2 (1974) 80 zu Unrecht für H. beansprucht worden; es handelt sich gewiß um *hur-sag-galam-ma* in Nippur (dazu Å. Sjöberg, TCS 3 [1969] 50 mit Lit.).

Die Ortsnamenlisten der albab. Vorläufer von HAR-ra = hubullu trennen bezeichnenderweise Kiš und H^{ki}. (Determinativ!): MSL 11, 103 Z. 224 (K.) — 105 Z. 318 (H^{ki}, attrahiert durch *hur-sag^{ki}*, es folgt *hur-sag-galam-ma^{ki}*); ähnlich S. 132 IV 29 (K.) — V 29 (H^{ki}); S. 140 I 6 (K.) — S. 142 VII 18 (é-H.). — H^h. XXII selbst nennt einen i-, H. „H.-Kanal“: MSL 11, 27 A III 5. — Der Kommentar HAR-gud zu H^h. XXIII—XXIV verbindet bestimmte Sorten von Breien oder Rührkuchen (*me/irsu*) mit Nippur, Kiš, H. und den Göttern (s. MSL 11, 88 Z. 67—70).

H. in Tempellisten: PSBA 22 (1900) 365 Z. 11 ([é-H.]); KAV 84 B 2 (é-H.^{ki} zwischen Kiš und é-^anin-ll1); 2 R 61 Nr. 2, 15; 33e; 50, 13b.

Im sum. Tempelhymnenzyklus (TCS 3) fehlt H.; Kiš ist dort durch Zababa vertreten. Laut „Inannas Gang zur Unterwelt“ „verließ (I.) das H. in Kiš“ (S. N. Kramer, JCS 5 [1951] 2; s. a. E. Bergmann, ZA 56 [1964] 3). Der Prolog des CH hat nebeneinander die Abschnitte Zababa/Kiš (II 56—62) und Inanna/H. (II 63—67). Daß die Litaneien mit Inanna-Heiligtümern auch das H. einschlossen, liegt auf der Hand; s. F. Thureau-Dangin, RA 33 [1936] 109; W. Römer, Or. 38 [1969] 109ff. mit Beispielen.

Die Himmelsgeographie* des mittleren I. Jts. v. Chr. kannte die Gleichung ^{[m]^u}ul gír-tab „Skorpion“ = H. (s. LKU Nr. 44, 12, wozu E. Weidner, AfO 20 [1963] 119f.).

H. in nichtliterarischem Kontext ist selten (s. a. das Rép. géogr.): AbB VI Nr. 166 (Schiffstransport von Kiš nach H.); PRAK II 8: C 37, 1—2 (*a-na* ^aINANNA H., *[i]-na Kiš^{ki}*); Tiglatpilesar III. brachte dem Aššur und neun weiteren Göttern (darunter Bēlet Bābili, aber nicht ausdrücklich Ištar) im H. Opfer dar (Tigl.