



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

In defence of psychoanalysis: the unconscious and the place of phenomenology in Lacan

Uljée, R.

Citation

Uljée, R. (2026). In defence of psychoanalysis: the unconscious and the place of phenomenology in Lacan. *Studia Phaenomenologica*, 26, 79-97.
doi:10.5840/studphaen2026265

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licensed under Article 25fa Copyright Act/Law \(Amendment Taverne\)](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4308787>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

This pdf is a digital offprint of your contribution in R. de Boer & E. Zomer (eds), *Memorial Volume Wilfred H. van Soldt*, ISBN 978-90-429-5464-9.

The copyright on this publication belongs to Peeters Publishers.

As author you are licensed to make printed copies of the pdf or to send the unaltered pdf file to up to 50 relations. You may not publish this pdf on the World Wide Web – including websites such as academia.edu and open-access repositories – until three years after publication. Please ensure that anyone receiving an offprint from you observes these rules as well.

If you wish to publish your article immediately on open-access sites, please contact the publisher with regard to the payment of the article processing fee.

For queries about offprints, copyright and republication of your article, please contact the publisher via peeters@peeters-leuven.be

MEMORIAL VOLUME WILFRED H. VAN SOLDT

Edited by

R. de Boer *and* E. Zomer



NEDERLANDS INSTITUUT VOOR HET NABIJE OOSTEN
LEIDEN

PEETERS
LEUVEN

2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	IX
List of publications W.H. van Soldt	XI
Patterns of Immigration and Expansion in Mesopotamia, a Comparative Examination of the Amorite and Later Arab Migrations	1
Kozad M. AHMED	
An Old Assyrian Letter and its Copies: A Possible Case of Home Schooling in Kanesh	15
Wiebke BEYER & Jan Gerrit DERCKSEN	
International Relations between Larsa and Ešnunna under Rim-Sin and Dadusha: The Shamash-magir Archive	27
Rients DE BOER	
Wilfred van Soldt and the Western Regions of the Cuneiform World. An Appreciation	51
Yoram COHEN	
Remarks on the “Archive of the Granary” from Nippur	59
Elena DEVECCHI	
More Solar Omens: EAE 25 (26) and 26 (27) Revisited	87
Jeanette C. FINCKE	
Arachnophilia in Mesopotamia	109
Nils P. HEEßEL	
When the Sun went down in Ugarit	113
Teije DE JONG	
The Development of the Oblique Independent Personal Pronouns, in Particular in Middle Assyrian	125
N.J.C. (Bert) KOUWENBERG	
The Identification of the <i>zami/sammû(m)</i> -Instrument	143
Theo J.H. KRISPIJN	

In Search of the Holy and Commercial City of Paranzi in Zamua	155
DLshad Aziz MARF	
Schreiberübungen aus mittellassyrischer Zeit	169
Stefan M. MAUL	
On Sealings on Pottery	183
Diederik J.W. MEIJER	
First-Humans	189
Piotr MICHALOWSKI	
Anu-aba-utēr, Son of Anu-bēlšunu, Astronomer from Uruk	211
Mathieu OSSENDRIJVER	
Loans and Debt in Kassite Rural Babylonia	231
Susanne PAULUS	
The Runaway Slave of Enlil-kidinnī	285
Jacob Jan DE RIDDER	
Das Cruciform Monument des Maništušu – ein Werk der Kassitenzeit	293
Walter SOMMERFELD	
The Asa foetida in Cuneiform Texts	313
Marten STOL	
Ten Old Babylonian Texts from Sippar in the British Museum	331
Klaas R. VEENHOF	
Middle Babylonian Exercises from Susa	353
Niek VELDHUIS	
It is not a deer. It is.... a sheep! Revisiting the Meaning of Hittite <i>aliya(n)</i> -	363
Willemijn J.I. WAAL	
Silence as Message: Cyrus and the End of the Babylonian Tradition of Royal Inscriptions	381
Caroline WAERZEGGERS	
The Typology and Distribution of <i>Glossenkeile</i> in the Late Bronze Age	407
Elyze ZOMER	

IT IS NOT A DEER. IT IS.... A SHEEP! REVISITING THE MEANING OF HITTITE *ALIYA(N)*-

Willemijn WAAL
Leiden University

Abstract

*The Hittite word *aliya(n)*- is usually translated as ‘deer’ or ‘roe deer’. This interpretation is, however, not without problems. A careful examination of the attestations of this word reveals that another animal is a more likely candidate, namely a sheep.¹*

1. INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1983, archaeologists uncovered an exceptional group of clay tablets in the Upper City of the Hittite capital Ḫattuša, which included several Hurrian-Hittite bilingual texts. The importance of these tablets, dating to the Middle Hittite period, is hard to overestimate. They are of great value not only for the advancement of our knowledge of the Hurrian language, but also because of their content, which includes a unique collection of fables and parables. The protagonist of two of these stories is an animal called *aliya(n)*- in Hittite. The word is usually translated as ‘deer’, or ‘roe’, but there are good reasons to assume that we are in fact dealing with a different animal here. I am honoured to dedicate this article to Wilfred van Soldt, who taught me Akkadian as a student in Leiden, and later acted as one of my promotors. Like all his students, I have fond memories of his classes, which were characterized by his great intellect and dry sense of humor. I am grateful that I was able to share in his unrivalled knowledge, which extended far beyond the field of cuneiform studies. Since his expertise also included Hittite and Hurrian, I hope he would have appreciated this small contribution.

2. HURRIAN *NĀLI* AND HITTITE *ALIYA(N)*- IN THE HURRIAN-HITTITE BILINGUAL

Before the discovery of the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual text KBo 32.14, it was assumed that the forms that are nowadays regarded as belonging to *aliya(n)*- belonged to the word

¹ I would like to thank Alwin Kloekhorst and Theo van den Hout for their helpful comments and suggestions. Needless to say, I alone am responsible for the views expressed here and any errors that may remain. Abbreviations follow CAD U/W, to which we may add: HED: J. Puhvel, 1984: *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

al(l)iya- that refers to some kind of ornithomantic bird.² The attestations of *aliya(n)-* in KBo 32.14, however, clearly do not refer to an oracle bird, and since the publication of this text two different stems are distinguished: *alliya-* (with variant spellings) referring to a bird,³ and *aliya(n)-* referring to a mammal. The *aliya(n)-* animal features in the first parable of KBo 32.14, of which the Hittite version runs as follows:

1. KBo 32.14 obv. ii 1-21

1. *a-li-ia-n[a-an-]za a-pé-el tu-e-eg-ga-a[z-še-et]*
2. *ḫur.sag-aš a-ua-an ar-ḫa šu-ú-e-et nu-uš-š[a-an]*
3. *a-li-ia-aš pa-ra-a ta-me-e-da-ni ḫur.sag-i pa[-it]*
4. *na-aš ua-ar-ke-eš-ta na-aš šu-u-ul-le-e-et*
5. *nu a-ap-pa ḫur.sag-an ḫu-ur-za-ke-u-an da-iš*
6. *ú-e-ši-ia-ah-ḫa-ri ku-e-da-ni ḫur.sag-i ma-a-na-an*
7. *pa-ah-ḫu-e-na-an-za ar-ḫa ua-ar-nu-zi¹ m-aš-ma-na-an*
8. *ua-la-ah-zi pa-ah-ḫu-e-na-an-za-ma-na-an ar-ḫa ua-ar-nu-zi*
9. *ḫur.sag-aš-ša ma-ah-ḫa-an iš-ta-ma-aš-ta*
10. *nu-uš-ši-kán šà-ŠU an-da iš-tar-ak-ki-at*
11. *nu ḫur.sag-aš a-li-ia-na-an a-ap-pa ḫu-ua-ar-za-aš-ta*
12. *a-li-ia-na-an ku-in ua-ar-ga-nu-nu-un*
13. *ki-nu-na-mu a-ap-pa ḫu-ur-za-ke-zi pé-eš-ši-an-du-ia-an*
14. *a-li-ia-na-an^{1ú.meš} ŠA-A-I-DU-TIM da-a-an-du-ma-an*
15. *^{1ú.meš} mušen.dù^{TIM} uzu¹ ^{1ú.meš} ŠA-A-I-DU-TIM da-an-du*
16. *kuš-ma^{1ú.meš} mušen.dù^{TIM} da-an-du*

A mountain expelled an *a.* from its body. The *a.* went over to another mountain. It grew fat, became *swollen-headed* and began to curse the mountain: “If only fire would burn down the mountain on which I am grazing! If only Teššup would strike it (with his lightning), and fire burn down the mountain!” Now when the mountain heard (this), his heart became sick within him, and he cursed the *a.* in return: “(Why) does the *a.* which I have fattened now curse me in return? Let the hunters bring down the *a.*! Let the *bird experts* capture him! Let hunters take its meat, and let the *bird experts* take its hide!”

In the next paragraph, the moral message of the fable is revealed; it is in fact not an *a.*, but a human being. The *a.* represents a man who runs away from his city and arrives in another country. He then becomes arrogant and starts to plot evil against his new city, for which the gods accurse him.

In the second parable, the *aliya(n)-* is also the main protagonist:

2. KBo 32.14 obv. ii 26-38

26. *a-li-ia-na-aš na-aš-ta íd-an ta-pu-ša ku-i-e-eš*
27. *ú-e-še-eš nu a-pu-u-‘uš’ ú-e-ši-ia-at-ta-ri*

² Note that HW² A: 58–59 further distinguish a separate lemma *alili-* (*alila-*, *aliliya-*), which also refers to an oracle bird, whereas Puhvel (HED A: 34) includes the stem(s) *alili-*, *alila-*, *ali(li)li-* and *aliliya-* under the lemma *al(l)iya-*.

³ The stem of the *alliya*-bird is mostly spelt with double *-ll-*, and usually also with *plene*-spelling of the initial *a*. The word is never preceded by the determinative *mušen* (‘bird’), but this is not uncommon for augural bird names (HED A: 35). For the occurrences of this word in oracle texts, see Sakuma 2009: 390–394.

28. *ke-e-zi-ia-ká[n] ku-i-e-eš ú-e-še-eš nu-us-ša-an a-pé-e-da-aš-ša [*
 29. *š[a-a-ku-ua] 'zi'-ik-ke-zi na-aš-ša-an ta-pu-ša-aš ú-e-ši-ia-aš*
 30. *'a-ar-aš' Ū-UL ki-ma u-e-mi-et Ū-UL*

There is an *a*. It grazes on pastures which are alongside a river. And it constantly sets its eyes also on those pastures on the other side. It did not *reach* the pastures of (that) side, but it did not *appreciate* (the one on) this (side).⁴

In this story, the *a*. symbolizes a man who has been made a border commander in one district, but constantly set his eyes on a second district. In the Hurrian version, the Hittite word *aliya(n)-* is translated with the word *nāli*. Erich Neu (1996: 99) connected this word to Akkadian *nālu(m)*, *na(i)jalu*, which means ‘roe deer’ (cf. CAD N/1, 152 s.v. *najalu* (*nālu*); aHw II, 725a s.v. *nālu(m)*, *najjalu*: ‘wohl ‘Reh’). He suggested that *nāli* is a borrowing from Akkadian *nālu* with a Hurrian stem ending in *-i*, comparable to the Hurrian word *šarri*, derived from Akkadian *šarru*. He therefore proposed the translation ‘roebuck’ (‘Rehbock’),⁵ though leaving room for other interpretations.⁶ Neu’s suggestion has been generally accepted, and most translations of this text render Hittite *aliya(n)-* with ‘roe deer’, or, more freely, ‘deer’ (cf., e.g., Hoffner 1998: 68; Haas 2006: 187; Collins 2003).

It is, however, not at all certain that the Hurrian word *nāli* is indeed a loanword from Akkadian. Other attestations of *nāli* in Hurrian texts are not particularly helpful to establish its meaning, as the word mostly occurs in broken and fragmentary contexts. The most informative is a passage in a prayer or invocation of Taduḫepa to Teššup (KUB 32.19+, CT77.8).⁷ As observed by Dennis Campbell, the *nāli*, along with the *šaderi*, are pivotal elements in this composition. The *nāli* plays an active role, acting as an intermediary between the human supplicant and the divine powers (Campbell 2015: 123).⁸ Campbell plausibly concludes that it is highly doubtful that the *nāli* in this text is the same *nāli* ‘deer, roebuck’ known from the parables of the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual texts, and it is more likely to be a homonym instead.⁹ Based on the Hurrian evidence, the meaning ‘roe deer’ for Hurrian *nāli* is thus merely a possibility, and, as we shall see below, there are persuasive reasons to reconsider this interpretation. Before we will do so, however, a brief discussion of Hittite terminology for deer-like animals seems in order.

⁴ Hoffner (1998: 70) translates: ‘It did not care for (literally, “attain”) the pastures on the (near) side (which it already had), and it did not achieve (literally “find”) the one (on the far side).’

⁵ In light of the context of the bilingual, Neu (1996: 99) considered a powerful male animal more fitting, and therefore proposed the translation ‘roebuck’ (‘Rehbock’),

⁶ In footnote 7 (p. 99), he mentions that *nāli*- could also refer to another kind of ‘reh- oder hirschähnliches Tier’, such as a ‘Bergziege’ or ‘Bergschaf’ (rendered in Hittite with the Sumerogram *uz₆.kur.ra* or *udu.kur.ra* respectively).

⁷ For an edition of this text, see Haas 1984: 215–232.

⁸ Campbell (2015: 123 n. 70) further remarks that *nāli* also occurs in a ritual text (KBo 27.108+obv. ii 9, see Haas 1984: 269) as part of a list together with a ‘city’ (*ardi*) and a ‘house’ (*šelli*).

⁹ As kindly suggested to me by the late Meindert Dijkstra (pers. comm.), *nāli* may function as an adjective here, qualifying the nouns *šaderi* and *ep/wri*.

3. ROE AND DEER IN HITTITE ANATOLIA

No less than three deer species are native to Anatolia; the Caspian red deer (*cervus elaphus maral*, see Fig. 1), the fallow deer (*cervus dama dama*, see Fig. 2) and the roe deer (*cervus capreolus capreolus* see Fig. 3). As Billie Jean Collins (2003: 76) observes, three designations for deer have long been known in Hittite texts: the Sumerogram d à r a . m a š , the Akkadogram *AYALU* and the Sumerogram lu . li m . She rightly points out that the fact that all three terms have been borrowed from Mesopotamian orthography, seriously complicates the picture, since – except for the roe deer – no deer species lived both in Mesopotamia and in Anatolia. The ranges of the Caspian red deer and European fallow deer do not include the Mesopotamian lowlands, and Mesopotamian fallow deer are not to be found in Anatolia. It is therefore uncertain to what animal(s) the Hittite scribes referred to with the terms they borrowed from Mesopotamia. The contexts in which these terms appear are also not particularly helpful.¹⁰ All three terms may refer to kept animals, all three appear in ritual contexts, all three are represented in faunal assemblages from Anatolia and all three are mentioned as objects of art (Collins 2003: 76–77).

Collins (2003: 77) suggests that the most attested term, the Sumerogram d à r a . m a š , and Akkadian *AYALU* refer to the red deer, which dominate the archaeological remains of wild fauna in Hattuša.¹¹ With respect to the Sumerogram lu . li m , she cautiously raises the possibility that it refers to the fallow deer. She further identifies another Hittite word for deer; *kūrala-* which as she suggests, may refer to the male red deer (hart) and may etymologically be derived from the Indo-European stem **ker-*, referring to *cervidae* (Collins 2003: 80). However, it should not be excluded that this rarely attested word instead refers to another kind of animal.¹²

Turning to the Hittite word *aliya(n)-*, it is generally assumed that this is the Hittite reading behind d à r a . m a š and Akkadian *AYALU*, thus referring to a red deer. The word is generally taken to be derived from PIE **(h₁)ol-ēn*,¹³ which, like the stem **ker-* mentioned above, refers to deer species (see also below §10). The problem with this suggestion is that in the Hurrian version, *nāli* supposedly refers to a *roe deer*, and not a deer – which are two clearly distinct animals.¹⁴ We would thus have to assume that the translator changed the Hurrian ‘roe’ into a ‘deer’ in Hittite. This is quite an adjustment, with severe complications

¹⁰ The iconographic evidence is often also ambiguous, and it is not always clear which animal is being represented. As Collins (2003: 75–76) observes, many representations that have been interpreted as fallow deer may in fact be red deer.

¹¹ In Akkadian, the Sumerogram d à r a . m a š is used to refer to a deer (*aj/yalu*), and d à r a . m a š . d à for roe deer (*najalu*).

¹² With respect to the attestation of *kūrala-* in HKM 48, in his lecture at the *Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* (Leiden, July 2023) Andrea Trameri has made a convincing proposal that all the animals mentioned in this letter must be birds. For the other possible attestation of *kūrala-*, see Hoffner 1997: 20–21.

¹³ See Oettinger 2003: 145.

¹⁴ As also remarked by Mallory 1982: 216–217 the differences between a roe and red deer are quite substantial, if only for their size (red deer weigh around 100–250 kg and roe ca. 15–30 kg). Note that Hoffner 1998: 78 (note 28), however, seems to think that modern readers are not aware of these differences. He remarks that, although Neu has shown that we are probably dealing with a roe deer who is shy of water, he has chosen for

for the second fable. In this story, it is implied that the animal cannot cross the river, which, as already observed by Erich Neu (1996: 131–132 n. 70), would be in line with the behavior of roe deer, who do not like water, but not of that of red (or fallow) deer, who are excellent swimmers. This would mean that the Hittite translator did not necessarily understand or render this nuance of the Hurrian word, and instead chose to use the word for ‘deer’ (Collins 2003: 78). This is not an attractive solution, as one would expect the translator (and the audience!) to be aware of the difference between a deer and a roe, especially since both these species existed in Anatolia. Moreover, it remains unclear what advantage there is to be gained by changing a ‘roe’ into a ‘deer’.

To complicate matters more, there is yet another term attested in Hittite texts; *aliyanzina-*. The *aliyanzina-* and *aliya(n)-* occur together in the same text (see below examples 8a-c), which makes clear that they are unlikely to be the same animal. Melchert (2002: 298) takes the form *aliyanzina-* as a possessive compound with the noun *šīna-* ‘figure, figurine’ as the second element, proposing a meaning ‘having the form/shape of a deer/deer-like’ (see also below §8). In a procession during the *ki.lam* festival of cultic objects in the shape of animals, the *aliyanzina-* is mentioned together with silver images of *dàra.maš* (red deer).¹⁵ Since both terms are listed with contrasting ‘horned’ and ‘unhorned’ varieties, Collins (2003: 81) has raised the possibility that *aliyanzina-*, rather than *aliya(n)-* could be the Hittite reading behind *dàra.maš*, but she also leaves open other options, e.g., that *aliyanzina-* refers to a roe deer or fallow deer.

It may be clear from the above that there are many uncertainties surrounding the Hittite terminology for deer species, and that the inference that Hittite *aliya(n)-* refers to a deer is not at all straightforward. This meaning is based on the assumption that (a) Hurrian *nāli* is an Akkadian loan meaning ‘roe deer’, which is not supported by external evidence, and (b) that this term was subsequently falsely rendered as ‘deer’ by the Hittite translator(s). This scenario is not compelling if only for its complexity, and – what is more – the meaning ‘deer’ is not supported by other attestations of Hittite *aliya(n)-*.

4. AS MEEK AS AN *ALIYA(N)-*

Perhaps the most informative passage about the meaning of *aliya(n)-* occurs in the so-called ‘Indictment of Madduwatta’. This text deals with the behavior of the rebellious and treacherous vassal king Madduwatta, who was a constant source of trouble for the Hittite kings Tudḫaliya I/II and Arnuwanda I. Towards the end of the tablet, Madduwatta sends a message to the Hittite king:¹⁶

3. KUB 14.3 rev iv. 91-94

91. *nam-ma* ^{urru} *A?* [-] x [-] *aš* [-] x [-] *’ḥa-ri’* [-] *’ki’* [-iš] *’ša’-an ú-da-aš*
a-li-ia-aš-ua *Ú-UL* *ua-a-i* *Ú-UL-ma-ua* *wa-ak-ki* *Ú-UL-ma-ua* *iš-pár-ri-ez-zí*

the generic term ‘deer’ instead of ‘roe deer’, ‘for general readers unfamiliar with the habits of the various species of deer’.

¹⁵ Singer 1983: 94; 1984: 16.

¹⁶ For this text, see most recently Beckman et al. 2011 (text no. 3).

92. x [] 'a'-li-ia-an p̄ar-ha-at-ta-ri 'ša h'-ma-ua ú-i-ua-i ku-it nu-ua ku-iš
A-NA ša h'¹
93. še'[-] x x x x x [] '-ia' ku-en-zi nu-ua ú[-ug]-'ga ša h'-aš i-ua-ar'
ú-i-ia-mi
94. [nam-ma-ua]a ak-kal-lu x []

Furthermore, (the town).. [] .. [] brought [a message] as follows: "The *a*. does not cry out. It does not bite. It does not escape. [...] chases the *a*. But because the boar does cry out, the one who [...] to the boar [...] he kills. I will cry out like the boar, [and then] let me die [...]"

Unfortunately, the context is quite broken, but the gist of the passage is clear. Madduwatta is sending out a clear warning; he will not cowardly surrender without a fight, but he will make himself heard. To illustrate his point, he uses a comparison featuring two animals: the first is the *aliya(n)*-animal that is portrayed as meek; it does not cry, it does not bite, it does not escape, and it is chased like a prey animal. This behaviour is contrasted with that of the swine or boar, who does cry out, and who does resist, and may even kill. Indeed, boars are quite fierce animals and the wounds they inflict can be fatal to humans.

The deer or stag, however, is hardly the stereotype of a meek animal. They are in general not easy to capture, as they tend to make a run for it. When attacked or threatened (or protecting their young), they can be quite vicious; they may bite, charge or kick as a defense mechanism. All in all, they are not the most likely example of a proverbial push-over. A more obvious candidate that comes to mind is a sheep (or lamb), which is famously meek and obedient (see Fig. 5). The possibility that *aliya(n)*- refers to a sheep is supported by a passage in the Hurrian ritual of Allaiturah(h)i (CTH 780), which will be discussed in the following paragraph.

5. THE SPELLING ^{UDU}ALIYA(N)-

4a. VSNF 12.57 rev 15'

(Then she settles the Sungoddess of the Earth and Išhara in the middle of the (his) garden, to the right of the twigs.)

15'. pa₅-ma-kán gùb-la-az ^{UDU}a-li-ia-na-an šA im da-a-i

4b. KUB 58.107+ rev. iv

8'. pa₅-ma-kán gùb-la-az a-li-ia-na-an šA im da-a-i

But to the left of the canal, she places an *a*. made of clay. (And the thread, which is bound around its mouth, the Sungoddess of the earth holds with the hand.)

In text no. 4a, the word *aliya(n)*- is preceded by ^{UDU}. Since ^{UDU} is omitted in the duplicate text KUB 58.107 (4b), it is usually interpreted as a determinative or a scribal error.¹⁷

¹⁷ Cf., e.g., Haas and Wegner (1988: 81) who take ^{UDU} as a determinative and the remark of Otten (1976: 98): 'das Dupl. Bo 2860 I 8.. läßt also UDU als übergeordneten Begriff aus oder vertauscht die beiden Wörter in ihrer Reihenfolge'.

The fact that *a.* is either preceded by the determinative for sheep, or is confused with this animal, is of utmost significance; such a spelling or mistake can only be explained if we are dealing with a sheep or a sheep-like animal.¹⁸

Returning to the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual (examples 1 and 2), a translation ‘sheep’ would also be very fitting; in the two fables the *aliya(n)-* is an animal that grazes, can become fat, has a skin (*kuš*), and cannot swim or cross a river.¹⁹ Moreover, this new interpretation might elucidate the otherwise unexplained reference to the ^{lú.mēš}*m u š e n . d ù* ^{TIM} (bird experts, augurs) to whom the animal’s skin (*kuš*) is to be given in the first fable. The ^{lú}*m u š e n . d ù* ^{TIM} is known to perform rituals involving wool (see, *e.g.*, Bawanypeck 2005: esp. 163–165; 190–192, 255–256), so pulled wool (*i.e.* wool removed from the skin of a dead sheep) would be of use to them.²⁰

Interestingly, Otten (1976: 98) and the CHD (L-N: 223 s.v. *meya-*, *miya-*) seem to have reached a similar conclusion before the publication of KBo 32.14, as they translate *aliya(n)-* as ‘*a.*-sheep’. We may further recall that Erich Neu raised the possibility that *nāli* might refer to ‘Bergziege’ or ‘Bergschaf’ (see above n. 6). The idea that *aliya(n)-* refers to a sheep has thus already been floating around for some time, but it was overshadowed by other interpretations.

6. THE FIELD OF THE *ALIYA(N)-*

The meaning ‘sheep’ also seems appropriate in the expression ‘the field of (the) *a.*’ This expression occurs in a complex passage which has been extensively discussed by Gary Beckman (1988: 37).

5. KUB 48.106 rev. 11'–13' (CTH 215)

(In respect to such matter of the field as [they (?)] ... mistreated me, I spoke [to him (?)] thus. From the presence of His Majesty he(?) return[ed], and he spoke to me as follows: “His Majesty has *turn[ed]* over the fields.” I (then) spoke as follows: “Whatever field he has *turned over*, I have *freed* ... For the sake of the cattle (and) sheep of the poor man he has *turned* it *over-* so that the cattle (and) sheep of the poor man will survive).²¹

11'. *A-NA* ^d*u t u* ^{šl}*-ua-kán*

12'. *a-li-i*[*a-n*]*a-aš gi-im-ra-aš Ū-UL ku-it a-aš-ša-a-u-e-eš an-tu-uh-ša-aš-ua-a*[š-ši-kán?]

13'. *gi-im-ra-aš a-aš-šu-uš a-pu-u-un-na-ua ú-ez-zi ap-pé-ez-zi-an-na a-ra-iz-zi*

¹⁸ Though we do not have other attestations of clay sheep, their existence is not unlikely, as we do have references to oxen, horses, donkeys, mules, pigs, and birds made of clay (Haas 2003: 610–613), and a mention of a ram made of wood for the Stormgod of the Field (KUB 38.10 rev. iii 17, see Van den Hout 2009: 123). Furthermore, in the wider Near East, many clay sheep figurines have survived (Postgate 2009: 115).

¹⁹ Considering the text genre, some of the information of course needs to be taken *cum grano salis*. On the other hand, fables generally tend to be ‘realistic’ with respect to the appearance of animals, or their habitats.

²⁰ A sheepskin (*kuš u d u*) is also mentioned in Hittite Law §80, which stipulates that the meat of a dead sheep should go to the owner, but its skin to the person who has saved the animal from a wolf.

²¹ Translation largely following Beckman 1988: 36–37 with some adjustments.

Because the fields of the *a.* are not beneficial for his Majesty, (but) the field of the man is beneficial to him and he will finally come to also *restrain(?)*²² that one. (Now he has *turn[ed]* it *over* (for) the cattle (and) sheep of the poor man).

Beckman (1988: 37) plausibly proposes that this passage “seems to relate the freeing of grazing acreage by the Hittite king and the confirmation of this act by a local administrator, the probable author of the letter in question.”

If *aliya(n)*- is here understood as ‘sheep’, the field of (the) *a.* would refer to pasture where the sheep would graze. This land would not yield direct profit for the king, at least not in the form of agricultural products. By contrast, the field of the man, presumably referring to cultivated land, would yield crops, and thus income for the king through taxes. The translation ‘sheep’ makes good sense here, especially considering the mention of sheep and cattle in the preceding and following lines, and as demonstrated by Beckman (1988: 41) there is textual evidence for the grazing of sheep (and other animals) adjacent to agricultural plots. A reference to a field of (roe) deer’, however, would be quite unexpected and puzzling here.

The expression ‘the field of the *aliya(n)*’ is further found twice in KUB 36.83 and once in its duplicate KBo 54.36:

6a. KUB 36.83 obv. i 21-23

21. *ma-a-an* ^{lú}*ku š*₇-*ma nu ki-x*[
 22. [*a-l*]*i-ia-na-aš* *líl-aš an-tu-ub-ša-aš* *líl-aš ha-t[u-ga-a-tar]*
 23. [*t*]*a-ra-iš na-at-za nam-ma kar-pu-u-ya-an-zi d[a-a-iš]*

But if it is a charioteer ... [].
 The ter[rer] of the field of *a.* (and) the field of man
 he-(e)d. And then he b[egan] to *levy*² it.²³

6b. KUB 36.83 obv. i 32-33

32. [*-m*]*i-ta a-li-ia-na-aš gi-[im-ra-aš*
 33. [*an-tu-ub-ša-aš gi-im-r*]*a-aš ha-t[u-ga-a-tar]*

[]... [of] the f[ield] of *a.*
 the te[rer] of [the fiel]d of man

6c. KBo 54.36 obv. ii 8'-9'

- 8'. [*-i*]^{š?} *ha-tu-ga-tar an-da ma-a-na-aš* (-) *x*[...
 9' [*a*]⁻ *li-ia-na-aš*²⁴ *líl-aš u n -aš líl-aš* [

[].. terror within.. When.. [] of the field of [*a.*] (and) the field of man

²² Is this perhaps a reference to the taxes that the king will restrict now that the field will be used for cattle grazing?

²³ Somewhat differently Fuscagni 2014: ‘[... das Feld] des/eines [R]ehs? (und) das Feld des/eines Mannes Schrecken/Bedrängnis (Akk.?) ...31 (und) er wird bereit sein, um es/sie nochmals aufzuheben’ and Bawanypeck 2005: 268–269: ‘Wenn der Wagenlenker aber .. [das R]eh des Feldes, der Mench des Felder Schr[ecken] ..t er. Und dann m[achte] er sich auf, es wegzutragen.’

²⁴ Groddek 2010: 25 instead restores]*x* ^r*še-e-na-aš*.

Regrettably, the context is too unclear and broken for a proper understanding of this passage. Could the ‘terror of the field’ perhaps be related to tax collection?²⁵ Though the precise meaning of examples 6a-c eludes us, they do not seem to plead against a translation ‘sheep’ for *aliya(n)-*.

7. DON’T SCARE THE *ALIYA(N)-*!

The *aliya(n)-* also makes an appearance in the ritual text KBo 12.96:

7. KBo 12.96 i 11' (CTH 433.1)²⁶

(and I will speak exactly as follows: “Mouth, may you be filled with fat! Throat, may you be filled with laughter!”)

11'. *nu a-li-ia-ni egi r-an-da le-e ku-iš-ki pal-ua-iz-zi*

Let no-one *cry out/speak in a loud voice*²⁷ behind the *a*.”

The meaning of the verb *palwai-* is not entirely clear. As Daliah Bawanypeck (2005: 79–80) suggests, the essence of this passage is that the *aliya(n)-* is not to be startled by noise. Sheep are notoriously timid and sensitive to high-pitched sounds; they can be easily frightened by sudden loud noises, though this of course applies to many animals. What might plead in favour of a translation ‘sheep’, is that its presence, unlike that of a deer, would not be entirely out of place; on the next day (which is day four of the ritual), eight sheep are sacrificed, prepared, and eaten (KBo 12.96 rev. iv 5-19), and on day five, one sheep is sacrificed to the Sungod. By contrast, no deer appear to be mentioned in the ritual.

8. UNCLEAR ATTESTATIONS OF *ALIYA(N)-*

Lastly, there are some attestations of *aliya(n)-* that are too opaque to be of any help in establishing its meaning, and I only mention them for the sake of completeness. First, there is the ritual text KUB 30.36 with the parallel texts KUB 30.33 and KBo 13. 131 (CTH 401).

8a. KUB 30.36 obv. ii 9-13

(Thus speak the mountains: Do not fear! We will stand by your side)

9. *gi š-ru a-pé-el* ^{§13} *KA-PA-RU ar-ʿhaʿ*

10. *iš-kal-la-ú ua-ar-ši-i-ma-ša-at a-pé-e-ʿel-pát*

11. *mi-ia-aš iš-ha-a-I a-li-ia-na-an-kán*

12. *a-li-ia-an-zi-na-aš a-pé-e-el-pát mi-ia-aš ku-en-zi*

²⁵ Intriguingly, a charioteer might also be acting as a tax collector in KBo 22.1 obv. 7' (CTH 272). However, other interpretations should not be excluded.

²⁶ For this text passage, see Bawanypeck 2005: 73–75.

²⁷ See CHD P: 82 s.v. *palwai-*.

8b. KUB 30.33 obv. i 16-17

16. [g^{iš}_K]A-PA-RU ar-ḥa du-^ua^u-ar-na-i g^{iš}_ua-ar-ša-ma-ša^u [
 17. a-li]-ia-<na>-an-kán a-l[i-ia-a]n-zi-na-aš²⁸ a-pé-e-el me-ia-aš ku[-en-zī]

8c. KBo 13. 131 obv. 4'-6'

- 4'. g i š -ru a-pé-[el]
 5'. [g i š] u a -ar-ša-ma-aš-ša a-pé-el <me-ia-aš> iš-ḥa[-a-i]
 6'. [-z]i-na-aš a-pé-e-el mi-ia-aš ku-en-z[i]

May the tree tip split off its own top.²⁹ The *waršīma*-, (that is) its own *miya*-, will bind it; the *aliyanzina*- (that is) its own *miya*- will strike the *a*.³⁰

The above translation largely follows that of the CHD (L-N 223 s.v. *meya*-, *miya*-), but it may be clear that the passage is fraught with problems and other interpretations should therefore not be excluded.³¹ Of interest is the mention of an *aliyanzina*-animal, which we already briefly encountered above (§3). If the analysis of Melchert (2002: 298) is correct, and *aliyanzina*- refers to an animal having the form/shape of an *aliya(n)*-, a potential candidate would be the Angora goat. This animal, which inhabits Anatolia since at least Palaeolithic times, has a sheep-like appearance because of its woolly coat (see Fig. 4). It is famous for producing mohair, which is a much-desired kind of wool today because of its soft and silk-like texture, and this was probably no different in ancient times. However, the fact that in Hittite texts mention is made of *aliyanzina*-animals without horns (see above §3), pleads against this identification, since both male and female angora goats are horned (unless we assume that they were sometimes dehorned). The identity of this *aliyanzina*- thus remains unresolved.

Lastly, in the festival text KUB 55.38, the *a*. occurs together with a panther:

9. KUB 55.38 rev. iii 8'-16' (CTH 772)

- 8'. [] kiš-an sīr^{RU}
 9'. -i]a-an a-li-ia-an pīrig. tur'-in-pa
 10'. pa-an-k]u-^uš-ša gam-an QA-TAM-MA sīr^{RU}
 11'. []x-aš lugal-i-kán igi-an-da ar-ta-ri

[] the song as follows: [].. the panther [] the *a*. (acc.) [] and [al]f
 down/below the song as follows: [] .. stands before the king

²⁸ The text reads *-an*.

²⁹ Text 8b reads 'will break off' instead.

³⁰ According to the CHD L-N (223 s.v. *meya*-, *miya*-), KUB 30.36 can be regarded as the version which best reflects the MH original. Note that in KUB 30.33 i 16-17 and KBo 13.131 obv. 5-6, the hapax *waršīma*- is replaced with g^{iš}_u*waršāma*-, and that in KBo 13.131 obv. 5 *meyaš* is omitted, and that both texts contain various other omissions and mistakes.

³¹ See, e.g., the translation of Melzer and Görke 2016 of KBo 13.131 and KUB 30.33: Sei[ne Bau]mspitze wird das Holz/den Baum entzweibrechen, sein *miya*- wird die [Fe]uerhölzer bind[en], sein *miya*- wird das *aliyana*- und die zum *aliyana*-Vogel Gehörigen <*schlagen*>. Note that with respect to KUB 30.36, Melzer and Görke 2017 follow the translation of the CHD.

From this broken passage we may derive that there was a song about a panther and an *a*-animal – could this have been a fable featuring these two animals?³² The intriguing fragment unfortunately raises more questions than it answers, and it does not shed any light on the meaning of *aliya(n)*-.

9. HITTITE TERMINOLOGY FOR SHEEP

In the above, I have argued that *a*. must mean ‘sheep’, which is of course a rather generic term. In Hittite, like in most languages,³³ more than one word referring to *ovidae* existed. Different terms were used not only to differentiate between different species, but also to indicate animals of different sex or age. In Hittite texts, sheep are usually rendered with the Sumerogram *udu*. This Sumerogram has at least two different Hittite readings, one ending in *-u-*, and one in *-i-*. The word ending in a *u*-stem might be the unattested Hittite word **pekku* ‘cattle’, and the word ending in *-i* might be the word **hāwi*-.³⁴ The latter is possibly attested once in the adjective form *hawiyašši*, qualifying a type of bread (3 *ninda.gur₄.ra* *ha-ui-ia-aš-ši*, KBo 21.42 obv. i 11). Since in another text, we find the expression *ninda.gur₄.ra*^{hi.a} *ŠA gu₄ udu-ia* (KUB 10.2 rev. iv 13-14) it has been proposed that *hawiyašši* must correspond to *ŠA udu-ia* –despite the absence of *gu₄*.³⁵ This suggestion is attractive from an etymological perspective, as *hāwi*- may be linked to Cuneiform Luwian *hāwi* and Hieroglyphic Luwian *hawī*-, meaning ‘(female) sheep’ (Hoffner 1974: 159; Oftisch 1998: 661–662; Van den Hout 2009: 121; Kloekhorst 2008: 337–338).

Further, the texts mention the term (^{udu})*iyant*-, which originally is probably the participle of either the verb *i-* ‘to go’ or the verb *iyela-* ‘to go, to march’. This expression may be compared to ancient Greek *πρόβατα* (*probata*), which literally means ‘that which moves ahead’ and is still used in modern Greek to refer to sheep (Kloekhorst 2008: 379 with references).

In addition, the following Sumerograms are found in Hittite texts:³⁶

ram, male sheep	<i>udu.a.lum</i> <i>udu.nita</i> / <i>udu.níta</i> <i>udu.šir</i> ³⁷
female sheep, ewe	<i>udu. síg+munus</i>
mother sheep	<i>udu.u₈</i>
not yet sexually mature (female) sheep	<i>udu.tur</i> <i>udu.munus.áš.gàr</i> /

³² Note that the panther is probably mentioned again in the next paragraph, this time together with an *awi*- (15' x[x *x-an-tar a-ui*, p̄rig<.tur(?)>-in *a-at-ti* {Rasur}).

³³ Compare, e.g., the extensive English terminology for sheep: hogget, shearling, gimmer, theave, teg, pet lamb, wether, tup, flock, store, etc.

³⁴ See, e.g., Van den Hout 2009: 121 with references to previous literature.

³⁵ Presumably, the expression refers either to breads in the shape of a sheep or oxen, or made of fat from these animals (Hoffner 1974: 159; Oftisch 1998: 661).

³⁶ See Van den Hout 2009: 121.

³⁷ As observed by Theo van den Hout (2009: 121), the *udu.šir* and *udu.nita/níta* often refer to castrated male sheep, whereas the *udu.a.lum* is used for reproduction.

	udu.áš.munus.gàr
lamb	sila ₄
	sila ₄ .níta (male)
	sila ₄ . síg.munus (female)
fat sheep	udu.niga
mountain sheep	udu.kur.ra
fat-tailed sheep	udu.gukkal+kun

If we turn to the Old Assyrian texts for comparison, we see that they also mention various kinds of sheep, but it is difficult to determine whether these terms specify breed, age, or something else altogether (Lassen 2014: 257; Michel 1997: 108–109; Dercksen 2008: 152–153). In a similar vein, it is impossible to determine to what kind of sheep the term *aliya(n)*- refers to. In some cases, a translation ‘lamb’ seems fitting, but in other cases, a (female) sheep may be more plausible.

10. ETYMOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

As mentioned above (§3), it has been proposed that the word *aliya(n)*- is derived from PIE **h₁ol-en-* which is in turn derived from a root **h₁el-* ‘red, brown’ (e.g. Adams 1985: 278).³⁸ With the new meaning ‘sheep’ suggested here, this etymology is no longer valid. Instead, one might consider connecting *aliya(n)*- with the noun *ali-*, one of the terms used for ‘wool’ in Hittite. The word only occurs in Hurrian-Hittite rituals, and it is always preceded by the determinative *síg* (HED A: 34). As sheep produce wool, it is an intriguing thought that these two words are related, and that *aliyan-* is derived from the noun *ali-* with a suffix *-an-*. This *-an-* is also found in other Hittite words denoting animals, like *hāran-* ‘eagle’ and *lahhanzan-* ‘duck’. However, whether we are dealing with a synchronic derivation in *-an-* of the noun *ali-* is unclear. The examples listed by Hoffner and Melchert (2008: 55) of Hittite words containing a synchronic suffix *-an-* are all derived from verbal stems, and not from nouns. Moreover, the etymology of *ali-* is uncertain, and it may not be Indo-European (cf. HED A: 34: ‘presumably Hurrian; possibly a “Mediterranean term”’). It is further possible that *ali-* does not refer to ‘wool’ in general, but rather to a certain type or preparation of wool. It can therefore not be excluded that *aliya(n)*- and *ali-* are in fact unrelated words.³⁹

11. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The following characteristics can be attributed to the *aliya(n)*-animal based on Hittite textual material:

³⁸ For a discussion of the Indo-European terminology for *cervidae*, see Mallory 1982: 211–213, 216–217 and Adams 1985.

³⁹ In light of the new meaning of *aliya(n)*-, the Hittite word *kurala-*, of which Billie Jean Collins suggested that it might refer to a male red deer, could now also be the generic term for ‘red deer’. It is, however, also very well possible that we are dealing with a different animal altogether here, see note 12 above.

- it is meek
- it does not run
- it does not bite
- it does not scream
- it is a prey animal
- it grazes
- it cannot swim
- it is indicated by the determinative for sheep u d u (or confused with a sheep)
- its hide is given to the ^{lú.meš} m u š e n . d ù , who make use of wool in ritual contexts
- it is associated with fields or meadows

The above makes it highly plausible that *aliya(n)*- refers to a sheep or a lamb. This means that the two earlier discussed Hittite-Hurrian fables do not feature a deer, but a sheep. If we look at ancient fables from other regions for comparison, this is nothing out of the ordinary. A female sheep, for instance, occurs as the protagonist in the Sumerian disputation between Sheep and Grain (or Ewe and Wheat, see Vanstiphout 1997), and sheep and lambs make a frequent appearance in the later fables of Aesop and Phaedrus. Of particular interest is a small, damaged fragment in alphabetic Ugaritic from Ugarit (RS 19.54).⁴⁰ It contains a fable about a cow and a mountain, in which the cow seems to be bragging in an insulting manner towards the mountain (Dijkstra 1986; 2020: 49–50). It has been observed that this fable bears some thematic resemblance to the first *aliya(n)*-fable (Dijkstra 2020: 49). Interestingly, this short Ugaritic story about the cow seems to be followed by a fable about a ewe (*t'at*, Dijkstra 1986: 126). Unfortunately, not much is preserved of the fragment and the only other possibly discernible word is 'wine' (*yn*). If this reading is correct, it was obviously a different story than the two fables attested in the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual. However, the possibility that a female sheep may be the protagonist of a fable from Wilfred's beloved Ugarit is nonetheless intriguing.⁴¹

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, D.Q. (1985) "Designations of the Cervidae in Proto-IndoEuropean", *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 13, 269–282.
- Bawanypeck, D. (2005) *Die Rituale der Auguren*, Texte der Hethiter 25, Heidelberg: Winter Verlag.
- Beckman, G.M. (1988) "Herding and Herdsmen in Hittite Culture", in E. Neu and C. Rüster (eds.), *Documentum Asiae minoris antiquae. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 33–44.
- Beckman, G.M., T.R. Bryce, and E.H. Cline (2012) *The Alḫiyawa Texts*, Writings from the Ancient World, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

⁴⁰ For the identification of this text as a fable, see Dijkstra 1986.

⁴¹ In Hittite texts, I do not know of any other examples of stories about sheep. Once, a sheep is mentioned in a metaphor, in a mythological text about a vanished deity (cf. Van den Hout 2009: 125): *nu-za u d u -uš ma-aḫ-ḫa-an si la₄-an ka-ni-eš-zi* 'like a sheep accepts a lamb (as its own), (like [an ox]) accepts his calf as its own, like a father and mother accept their children, may you likewise, Sungod, accept the king, the queen and the princes' (KUB 33.70 (obv. ii 14, CTH 335): 14').

- Campbell, D. (2015) *Mood & Modality in Hurrian*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Collins, B.J. (2003) “On the Trail of the Deer: Hittite *kūrala*”, in G.M. Beckman, R. Beal, and G. McMahon (eds.), *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 73–82.
- Dercksen, J.G. (2008) “Observations on Land Use and Agriculture in Kaneš”, in C. Michel (ed.), *Old Assyrian Studies in Memory of Paul Garelli*, Old Assyrian Archives 4, PIHANS 112, Leiden: NINO, 139–157.
- Dijkstra, M. (1986) “An Ugaritic Fable (KTU 1.93)”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 18, 125–128.
- (2020) *De Reiger en de Schildpad. Sprookjes en fabels uit de oude Oriënt*, Utrecht: Uitgeverij Kok Boekencentrum.
- Fuscagni, F. (ed.) (2014) hethiter.net/: CTH 456.2.1 (TRde 28.02.2014).
- Groddek, D. (2010) *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 54*, Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 31, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Haas, V. (1984) *Die Serien itkahi und itkalzi des AZU-Priesters. Rituale für Tašmišarri und Tatuhepa sowie weitere Texte mit Bezug auf Tašmišarri*, Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler 1/1, Roma.
- (2003) *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica Vol. II*, Berlin & New York: De Gruyter.
- (2006) *Die hethitische Literatur. Texte, Stilistik, Motive*, Berlin & New York: De Gruyter.
- Haas, V., and Wegner, I. (1988) *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen* ^{SAL}ŠU.GI, Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler 1/5, Roma: Multigrafica Editrice.
- Hoffner, H. (1974) *Alimenta Hethaeorum*, New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- (1997) “On Safari in Hittite Anatolia”, in D. Disterheft, M. Huld, and J. Greppin (eds.), *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel. Part One. Ancient Language and Philology*, Washington D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man Inc., 5–21.
- (1998) *Hittite Myths. Second Edition*, SBL Writings from the Ancient World 2, Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008) *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5, Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Mallory, J.P. (1982) “Indo-European and Kurgan Fauna I: Wild Mammals”, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 10, 193–222.
- Melchert, C. (2002) “Covert Possessive Compounds in Hittite”, in F. Cavoto (ed.), *The Linguist’s Linguist. A Collection of Papers in Honor of Alexis Manaster Ramer*, Munich: LINCOM, 297–302.
- Melzer, S., and S. Görke (eds.) (2016) hethiter.net/: CTH 401.2 (INTR 2016-06-08).
- (2017) hethiter.net/: CTH 401.1 (INTR 2017-04-20).
- Michel, C. (1997) “À table avec les marchands paleo-assyriens”, in H. Waetzoldt and H. Hauptmann (eds.), *Assyrien im Wandel der Zeiten: XXXIX^e Rencontre assyriologique internationale, Heidelberg, 6.-10. Juli 1992*, Heidelberg: Heidelberger Orientverlag, 95–113.
- Neu, E. (1996) *Das hurritische Epos der Freilassung Bd. 1: Untersuchungen zu einem hurritisch-hethitischen Textensemble aus Hattuša*, StBoT 32, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Oettinger, N. (2003) “Zum Ablaut von n-Stämmen im Anatolischen und der Brechung ē > ya”, in B. Irslinger, E. Tichy, and D.S. Wodtko (eds.), *Indogermanisches Nomen. Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Freiburg, 19. bis 22. September 2001*, Bremen: Hempen, 141–152.
- Oftisch, M. (1998) “Das Wort für ‘Schaf’ in den anatolischen Sprachen Kleinasien”, in L. Anreiter, E. Bartosiewicz, E. Jerem, and W. Meid (eds.), *Man and the Animal World: Studies in*

Archaeozoology, Archaeology, Anthropology and Palaeolinguistics, in Memoriam Sándor Bökönyi, Budapest: Archaeolingua, 655–666.

- Otten, H. (1976) “Bemerkungen zum Hethitischen Wörterbuch”, *ZA* 66, 89–104.
- Postgate, J.N. (2009) “Schaf (sheep). A. In Mesopotamien”, *RLA* 12, 115–120.
- Sakuma, Y. (2009) *Hethitische Vogelorkelttexte*, PhD Dissertation, Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg.
- Singer, I. (1983) *The Hittite KI.LAM Festival*, StBoT 27, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- (1984) *The Hittite KI.LAM Festival*, StBoT 28, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Van den Hout, Th. (2009) “Schaf. B. Bei den Hethitern”, *RLA* 12, 121–126.
- Vanstiphout, H.J.L. (1997) “The Disputation Between Ewe and Wheat”, in W.W. Hallo (ed.), *The Context of Scripture I*, Leiden & Boston: Brill, 575–758.
- Wisti Lassen, A. (2014) “Wool in Anatolia in the Old Assyrian Period”, in C. Breniquet and C. Michel (eds.), *Wool Economy in the Ancient Near East and the Aegean. From the Beginnings of Sheep Husbandry to Institutional Textile Industry*, Oxford & Philadelphia: Oxbow Books, 255–263.
- Witczak, K.T. (2007) “A New Look at the Etymology of Germanic **lambaz*”, *North-Western European Language Evolution* 52, 75–80.



Fig.1. Caspian red deer (male). Source: https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/c/cb/Caspian_Red_Deer_%28Maral%29_in_Arasbaran_forest.jpg



Fig. 2. Fallow deer (male). Source: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:D%C3%BClmen,_Wildpark_--_2018_--_3762.jpg Photograph: Dietmar Rabich



Fig. 3. Roe deer (male and female). Source: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Capreolus_capreolus_2_Jojo.jpg



Fig. 4. Angora goat (female). Source: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Angora_002.jpg. Photograph: Ltshears - Trisha M Shears



Fig. 5. Sheep (female) with lamb. Source: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Sheep_and_lamb_at_Thornley_Gate_-_geograph.org.uk_-_2936020.jpg Photograph: Oliver Dickson