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İlimizde Boğazkale-Hattuşa, Ortaköy-Şapinuva ve Alacahöyük’te sürdürülen uzun soluklu ve geleneksel arkeolojik kazı çalışmalar ile ortaya çıkarılan kültürel miras, toplumun bütün fertlerine ortak geçmişi anlatan, aralarındaki bağı güçlendiren önemli bir değerdir. Bu değerleri oluşturan çok kültür zengin geçiş ve tarihsel kimliğin kurgulanmasında, kamusal ihtiyaçlar doğrultusunda işlevlendirilmesinde ve tanıtılmasında ilimizin bütün dinamiklerinin birlikte hareket etmesi gerekmektedir.


Yukarıda vurguladığımız gibi bilgilendirme, bilincçendirme ve sahiplenme çalışmaları kapsamında değerlendirildiğimiz VII. Hititoloji Kongresi kitabıın basılmasında Valiliğimiz tarafından verdiği gibi elinizde bulunan IX. Hititoloji Kongresine ait bu kitabin da Valiliğimizin destekleri, Orta Karadeniz Kalkınma Ajansının maddi katkıları ile yayınlanmasından mutluluk duyumuyoruz.
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İçerisindeki bilgilerin gelecek nesillere aktarılması adına kalıcı ve önemli bir belge niteliği taşıdığına inanıyorum bu kaynak eserin oluşmasında bilgi, belge ve emekleriyle katkıda bulunan herkese en kalbi duygularla şükranlarını sunuyor, kitabın yayına hazırlamasını sağlayan Kongre Başkanı Prof. Dr. Aygül Süel’e içtenlikle teşekkür ediyorum.

Selam ve saygılarımla.

Prof. Dr. Reha Metin ALKAN
Hitit Üniversitesi Rektörü
ÖNSÖZ

Hitit uygarlığı Anadolu’ya özgün, çağının en önemli devletlerinden biridir. Onlardan bize ulaştıran bilgiler ve yarattıkları uygarlık her zaman ilgi çekmektede tüm dünyada son derece merak uyandırılmaktadır.

Anadolu’nun hemen hemen altı asırlık bir dönemde damgasını vuran ve çağının en büyük güçlerinden biri olan Hitit Devletinin yarattığı uygarlık; özellikle idari yapısı, hukuku, din anlayışı, doğaya yaklaşımı, mimarisi, kadın hakları gibi hususlara son derece ileriyi ve nedeniyle hayranlık duyulması gereken bir medeniyettir. Hitit Devletinin yaptığı uluslararası antlaşmalar tüm dünyaya örnek olmuştur. Birçok medeniyete temel olan Hitit uygarlığının dünya konjonktöründeki yeri tartışılmalıdır.

Çorum İlimiz Anadolu tarihinde çok önemli yeri olan Hitit Uygarlığının başkentlerini ve önemli merkezlerini bulundurma gibi bir şansa sahiptir. Hitit Uygarlığının değerlendirilerek yeni nesillere aktarılması için düzenlenen kongreler yararlı neticeler doğurmuştur. Bu kongreler alanda çalışan her bilim insanının merakla beklediği değerli toplantılar haline gelmiştir.


Ülkemiz topraklarında yapılan arkeolojik kazılar, bu toprakların kültürel açıdan ne kadar zengin olduğunu, çeşitli ulusları, dilleri ve dinleri bağında nasıl da besleyip çoğalttığını ortaya koymaktadır. Anadolu topraklarında yaşamış uygarlıkların izlerini ortaya çıkarmak ve gelecek nesillere aktarmak kadar bu uygarlıklarla ilgili değerli bilim adamları tarafından yapılan bilimsel çalışmalar ve araştırmalar sahip çıkılması ve bu çalışmaların geniş kitlelere ulaştırılması hepimizin görevidir.

Hitit bilimi için yeni yeni projeler hazırlanmakta, Hitit Uygarlığı hakkındaki araştırmalar yeni teknolojilerle de desteklenmeye çalışılmaktadır. Bugün sahip olduğumuz yüksek teknolojik güç bile, Hititlerin yaratıkları şaheser sanat eserleri ile, harika mimari ve mühendislik örneklerinin 4 bin yıl sonra bile bizleri hala etkilemesine ve bizde hayranlık uyandırmasına engel olamamaktadır.

VIII. Kongre’den sonra aradan geçen 3 yıl içinde Hitit Bilimine emek vermiş, katkılarda bulunmuş çok değerli bilim adamlarını kaybettik. Burada Prof. Dr. Heinrich OTTEN, Prof. Dr. Hayri ERTEM, Prof. Dr. Ali DİNÇOL, Prof. Dr. Itamar SINGER, Prof. Dr. Halet ÇAMBEL, Dr. Peter NEVE, Prof. Dr. Klaus SCHMIDT’i minnet ile anmaktayız.

Her Hititoloji Kongresi gibi IX. Uluslararası Kongresi de yeni bilgiler ve buluşlarla, zengin Hitit Uygarlığını daha yakından tanımamızı yardımcı oluyor, bizleri bu engin, güçlü ve muhteşem uygarlık hakkında daha da aydınlatıyor.

Çorum İlinin Kıymetli Halkına, Değerli Yöneticilerine ve Hitit Üniversitesi temsilcilerine bu toplantıyı yapmamız için gereken imkanları sağladıkları için teşekkür ederim.

Kongrenin hazırlanmasında büyük katkıları olan ve Kongre Kitabının basılmasına öncülük ederek destek veren, Hitit Üniversitesi Rektörü Prof. Dr. Reha Metin ALKAN’a ve emeği geçen herbise teşekkür ederim.

2015 yılının Ekim ayında Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongrelerinin fikir babası, kurucusu Dr. Mustafa SÜEL’i kaybettik. Hitit Bilimine, Arkeolojiye ve Hititoloji Kongrelerine olan yadsınmaz katkılarını hiçbir zaman unutmayacağız. Kongre Kitabının basımı için geçen süre içinde yaşanan


Prof. Dr. Aygül SÜEL
Kongre Başkanı

Hititler Devri Anadolu’nun önemli şehirlerinden Lawazantiya, Asur Ticaret Kolonileri döneminden itibaren Geç Hitit’e kadar yerleşim görmüştür. Eski Asur metinlerinde şu yazım şekilleriyle görülmektedir²:


Eski Asur Çağına ait belgelerde Luhuzattiya ile Hurama şehirlerinin aynı metinde 10 kez birlikte yer almaları, aralarında çok yakın bir ilişki olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu arada, Hahhum (ayrı metinde 3 kez), Hattum (3 kez),

¹ Bildiriyi hazırlamadım her türlü desteği sağlayan Çukurova Üniversitesi Rektörlüğüne, Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi Müdürlüğüne ve değerli katkılarından dolayı Prof.Dr. Ahmet Ünal’a çok teşekkür ederim.
³ Barjamovic 2011: 133 d.not 426’da, Luhuzattiya’nın belgelendiği diğer şehirleri şöyle sıralamaktadır: Birtu’um, Burallum, Durhumit, Hamizanum, Haqa, Hatikaitra, ől Kaneš’i’e, Karahna, Kuburnat, Kuššara, Kutiya, libbi mātim, Qattara, Salahšuwa, Salatuwar, Šamua, Tegarama, Wahšušana, Zalpa.

Rukiye AKDOĞAN*
Şalahşuwa (3 kez), Şamuha (3 kez), Tegarama (2 kez), Timelkiya (5 kez) şehirlerinin de, aynı metinde yer aldıkları sayılar göz önüne alındığında, Luhuzattiya şehri ile ilgili yerleşimler kategorisinde yer alabileceği söylemek mümkündür. Timelkiya, Hurama ve Şalahşuwa şehirlerinin, Firat’ı Kaneş’e bağlayan ana güzergâh üzerinde olduğu bilinmektedir. Dolayısıyla bu üç kentin Hattum, Şamuha ve Tegarama ile birlikte aynı kontekstte telaffuz edilmiş olması Luhuzattiya’nın ana güzergah üzerindeki genel doğrultusu hakkında da fikir vermektedir.⁴ Locus classicus niteliğindeki bir grup Asurlu tüccarın kaçakçılık yaparken yakalandığına dair bir mektupta (ATHE 62), kraliçenin kaçakçıları desteklemeleri için sınır komşusu olan bütün krallıklara mektup yolladığı anlatılmaktadır. Kraliçenin temasa geçtiği Luhuzattiya, Hurama ve Şalahşuwa kentlerinin Timelkiya ve Kaneş arasındaki bir yerde bulunduğu anlaşılmaktadır.⁵

Kt. 93/k 84 nolu vesika, Luhuzattiya’nın, Hurama’dan Kaneş-Fırat güzergâhına bağlı bir yol üzerinde olduğunu göstermektedir.⁶ Forlanini, Luhuzattiya yerleşimini Hahhum ve Kaneş arasındaki ana güzergah dışındaki bir yere lokalize eden ilk bilim adamıdır; araştırmacı KTK 64 nolu mektuba dayanarak söz konusu kenti Timelkiya’dan uzanan “dar patika” üzerine yerleştirmiştir.⁷

Lewy, kentin bir yün ve tekstil endüstrisi merkezi olduğunu işaret etmiştir. Luhuzattiya’da yapılan yün ve deri ticareti ile ilişkili çok sayıdaki referans bu izlenimi güçlendirmektedir.⁸ Luhuzattiya, Eski Asur metinlerine göre, aynı zamanda demir cevher ve ham demir kaynağı (aši’u ve amūtu).⁹

Luhuzattiya kentinde herhangi bir Asur müessesesi — bir koloni veya bir istasyon — ait tek bir referansa rastlanmaması önemli bir tespittir.¹⁰ Daha sonraki dönemde ait Hitit ve Geç Asur kaynaklarında Kilikya sınırları içindeki bir noktaya lokalize edilmesi gereken es sesli Lawazantiya yer ismiyle ilişkili referanslar, Luhuzattiya’nın lokalizasyonu ile ilgili tartışmaları

---

4 Barjamovic 2011: 133, 134.
7 Barjamovic 2011: 140, 141.
8 Barjamovic 2011: 142.
10 Barjamovic 2011: 143.
sekteye uğratmıştır. Eski Asur Çağına ait kaynaklar, Luhuzattiya’nın, Orta Anadolu’daki bir güzergâh üzerinde, Kaneş’in doğusunda bir yerde aranması gerektiğini işaret etmektedir; söz konusu lokalizasyon önerisini Kilikya’da bir başka konumla uyuşturmak güçtir. Bu durum daha geç dönemde ve başka bir yerde eş sesli bir yerleşimin olduğu ihtimalini de aklı getirmektedir.11


Lawazantiya’nın, Hitit dönemine ait belgelendiği metin yerleri ve yazılış şekilleri ise şöyledir:

1) KBo 45.101 Öy. Sağ. Sütun 8’ URLa-h[u-wa-za-an-ti-ya
2) KUB 46.48+KBo 17.103+ KUB 54.36(+)KUB 46.49 Öy. 38 URLa-hu-wa-az-za-an-ti-ya, Ay. 32’ URLa-hu-wa-za-an-ti-ya[3) KBo 3.46+KUB 26.75 Öy. II 24 URLa-hu-uz-za-an-ti-ya
4) KBo 46.23 5’ URLa-w[a-
5) KUB 6.15 II 10 URLa-wa-za[-an-ti-ya
6) KUB 16.53 Öy. 3’ ]x URLa-wa-za-an-ti
7) KBo 60.97 Ay. 5 URLa-wa-za-an-ti-ya, 8 URLa-wa-za-an-ti-y[a
8) KBo 41.233 Öy. 6’ URLa-wa-za-]an-ti-ya, 8’ URLa-wa-za-an-ti-ya
9) KUB 5.20+KBo 58.88+KUB 18.56 Ay. III 43’ URLa-wa-za-an-ti-ya

11 Barjamovic 2011: 140.
10) KUB 52.72 Öy. 10 U]RU La-wa-za-an-ti-ya-ya

11 URU La-[a-w]a-za-an-ti-ya-ya

13 URU La-[a-w]a-za-an-ti-ya

11) KUB 6.29+KUB 18.63+KBo 57.123 Ay. 25’ U]RU La-wa-za-an-ti-ya

12) KBo 19.129 (+) KBo 53.84 Öy. 2 URU La-[a-u-wa-za-an-ti-ya]

4 URU La-[a-u-wa-za-an-ti-az

18 URU La-[a-u-wa-z]a-an-ti-ya-x[

13) KBo 17.102+KBo 23.84 Öy. 3’ URU La-a-u-wa-za-â[n-ti-ya

Ay. 19’ URU La-a-u-wa-za-an-ti-ya

kolophon 2’ URU La-a-u-wa]a-za-an-ti-ya

14) Bo 86/299 III 91 URU La-wa-za-an-ti-ya

15) KUB 6.45+30.14+KBo 57.18 Öy. I 76 [(ŠA URU La-a-u-wa-an-a-t[(i-y)]a

77 URU La-a-u-wa-an-ti-ya

16) KBo 21.34+IBoT 1.7 Öy. I 2 URU La-a-wa-za-an-ti-ya

II 11 URU La-a-hu-wa-az-za-an-ti-az

Ay. IV 40 URU La-a-u-wa-az[-za-an-t]i-ya

17) KUB 31.69 Öy.? 4 URU La-wa-za-an-ti-ya

13 U]RU La-wa-za-an-ti[-

Ay.? 12’ ]x URU La-a-wa-za-an-ti-ya[

18) KBo 8.63 I 10’ DIŠTAR URU La-a[-

11’ DIŠTAR URU La-a-u-wa-z[a-
19) KUB 48.123 Öy. I 4’ DiŠTAR URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya
6’ DiŠTAR URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya
9’ DiŠTAR URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya
23’ DiŠTAR URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya
Ay. III 15 DiŠTAR URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya
Ay. IV 16 DiŠTAR URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya

20) KUB 60.118+KUB 56.25 Ay. IV? 10’ URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya
12’ URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya

21) KBo 46.131 Öy. 5’ ]x URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya

22) KBo 16.83+23.26 III 1 DiŠTAR URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya

23) KBo 9.119 A I 5’ URUL[a-wa-za-a]n-ti-ya

24) KUB 7.20 I 5 ŠA URULa-wa-az-za-an-ti-ya

25) KBo 14.125+126+40.26 Öy. I 4 [ŠA URULa-wa-az-za-an-ti-ya

26) KBo 6.29+50.56+ KUB 23.127+21.12 I 17 ŠA DiŠTAR URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya

27) KBo 3.1 II 20 URULa-wa-az-za-an-ti-ya
21 URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya-an

28) KUB 11.1+KBo 19.96 Öy.II 28* [ URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya ú-wa-nu-un]
30* URUL[a-wa-za-an-ti-ya-an

29) KBo 50.158 3’ [ DiŠTAR URULa-u-wa-za-a[n-ti-ya

30) KBo 3.6 Öy. II 58 URULa-wa-za]-an-ti-ya

31) KUB 42.41 Öy. 6’ URULa-wa]-a-za-an-ti-ya

32) KUB 1.1+19.60+61+62+63+66+26.44+46+1304/u+1683/u Öy. II 80 URULa-wa-za-an-ti-ya
33) KBo 1.11 Öy. 21’ \text{Rukiye AKDOĞAN} Lu-hu-uz-za-an-di-ya
34) KBo 55.186 Sağ Sütun 11’ \text{Rukiye AKDOĞAN} La-wa-za-an-ti-ya
35) LSU 6 = LhK 10 Öy. 4 \text{Rukiye AKDOĞAN} Lu-hu-u]z-za-an-di-ya[
36) KUB 16.8(+)]KUB 52.79 Ay. 2 \text{PIŞTAR} La-wa-za-a-ti-ya
5 \text{PIŞTAR} La-wa-za-an-ti-y[a
37) KBo 4.10+50.60+KUB 40.69 Öy. 48’ \text{DIŞTAR} La-wa-za-an-ti-ya
38) HKM 96 (Mşt. 75/79) Ay. 20’ \text{KUR} La-h[u-u-wa-a-an-ti-ya

Sonuçta Hitit metinlerinde yazılış şekilleri şöyledir:

\text{URU}Lu-hu-u]z-za-an-di-ya[ = LSU 6, \text{URU}Lu-hu-uz-za-an-di-ya, \text{URU}La-h[u-wa-a-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-h[u-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-hu-wa-za-an-ti-ya[ , [\text{URU}La-hu-wa-az-za-an-ti-ya.

Yukarıda görüldüğü üzere, \text{Lu}huzzand/tiya veya \text{La}huwa(z)antiya yazılışi toplam 7 metinde görülmektedir.

\text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti[-, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za[an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya, \text{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-ya. \]
Yukarıdaki yazılışlara göre, Hitit Metinlerinde en çok belgelendiği yazım şekli olan, URU La-wa-za-an-ti-ya toplam 40 kez belgelenecektir.

Belgelendiği diğer yazım şekilleri


Yine yukarıdaki yazılışlara göre, La’dan sonra “a”nın veya sonra “u”nun eklenmesiyle oluşmuş yazım şekli de 14 kez belgelenecektir.

Belgelendiği metin yerleriyle lokalizasyona ışık tutabilecek Hitit tabletleri şöyledir:

1) KUB 46.48+KBo 17.103+ (+)KUB 46.49 (CTH 706.1.9, Teşub ve Hebat için bayram ritüeli)

Öy.13

37 [ [ a-pé-e-da-ni UD-ti I-NA URU Ki-iž-wa-at-n[i L][I-IB-RA]14[ ]

38 [ [ URU La-hu-wa-az-za-an-ti-ya ú-i-da-a-ar x-x[- -]

39 [ [ LÚ pu-ra-ši-iš V NINDA.SIG I DUG KU-KU-U[B ]

---


15 Trémouille 1996: 83’ d.not 27’de, Öy. 42’ pura|pši|š kelimesinden yola çıkarak, bu kısmın böyle tamamlanabileceği ihtimaline deşinmektedir.
40 [ ]ma-ah-ha-an PÜ-i pa-ra-a a-ri nu NINDA.SIG PÜ-i[ ]
41 [na-at ú-e-te-ni-it] šu-un-na-i nam-ma-kân PÜ-aš VII
    pa-aš-šš-l [a-uš an-da pé-eš-šš-yazi nu İ.ĐÜG.GA te-pu an-da
    za-ap-nu-zī] 16
42 [še-er-ra-aš-sha-an GIS pa-i-]ni ša-a-hi nu ú-i-da-a-ar I-NA
    URU Ki-iz-zu-w[a-at-ni ]
43 [ ]x É DÜ-g-pāt x[ ]x-x-x-x-x[ ]
Ay. 18
29’ nu I SUR.14.DÜ.A MUŠEN I ha-pu-pi-in MUŠEN I[ ]x-x[ ]-]na
    ar-ha-ya-a[n ]
30’ I GIS ha-tal-ke-š-ni-ya SỊG-a-li-t[i  ]-l-i-it[ ]-zi ki-ip-ri-ti x[ ]
31’ da-an-zi PA-NI D Ti-yā-pi-t[i  ]-e ŠA rTÜL Kal-μu-x LI -IB3-RA
    TÜL Zu-um-ma-ri x[ ]
32’ ŠA URU La-hu-wa-za-an-ti-ya[ ]-]x ú-i-da-a-ar ki-it-ta-ri na-at-kān
    an-da
33’ rA-NA GIS pa-a-i-in-ni an-da ti-an-zi

KUB 46.48+KBo 17.103+KUB 54.36(+) KUB 46.49 nolu metinde, Tešup
ve Hepat için kutlanılan ay festivali Kummanni’de icra edilmesine karşı,
ritüelde kullanılan temiz suyun Lawazantiya (Öy. 38), Alta nehri (Ay. 19’
ile Kalmu-x ve Zummari (Ay. 31’) su kaynaklarından (Ay. 31’) getirildiği
görülmemektedir. Böylece Winuwanda da söz konusu ritüel etkinliklerle
ilişkilendirilmiştir. Bu metinden hareketle Trémouille, Kummanni’den
Lawazandiyaya’ya aynı gün içinde gidip dönemin mümkün olabileceğini
belirtmiştir. 19

KBo 17.102+KBo 23.84 ve KBo 21.34+IBoT 1.7’de, aynı kolonunun ve
aynı kompozisyonun konu edildiği görülmektedir.

16 Trémouille 1996: 83’ d.not 28’a göre olguğunu belirtmektedir.
17 Trémouille 1996: 83’ d.not 29: Tamamlama Öy. 31’e göre.
18 Transkripisyon ve tercüme için bkz. Trémouille 1996: 85, 89.
2) KBo 21.34+IBoT 1.720 (CTH 699, Teşub ve Lawazantiyalı Hebat için Bayram)

Öy. I

1 ma-ah-ha-an-ma I-NA UD.1521.KAM ma-a-an lu-uk-kat-ta
2 na-aš-ta I-NA URULa-a-za-wa-an-ty-i A-NA DIŠKUR I MÂŞ.GAL
3 ke-e-el-di-ya ši-pa-an-ty am-ba-aš-ši-ma-kán I SILA4
4 ke-e-el-di-ya ši-pa-an-ty nu-uš-ša-an ma-ah-ha-an
5 zé-ya-an-da-az a-ri nu V NINDA.SIGMEŠ I NINDA-du-ri-in ha-zi-la-aš
6 par-ši-ya še-er-ra-aš-ša-an ŞA MÂŞ.GAL UZUŠÂ da-a-i
7 na-at PA-NI5DU da-a-i nam-ma I NAM-MA-AN-TUM GEŠTIN da-a-i
8 na-aš-ta GAL DIŠKUR šu-un-na-i la-ha-an-ni-uš-ša ši-pa-an-ti
9 nam-ma URU Aš-tu-ya-ra-az 5 NINDA.SIGMEŠ I NINDA-mu-la-a-ti-iš
     BA.BA.ZA


Bütün seremonilerin odak noktasında tanrıça bulunuyordu. Tören alayıyla yapılan yolculuk — tören alayına alalu giydirilmiş bir Hebat da eşlik ederdi

---

21 Wegner 2002: 310: U₄,5?.KAM.
— sırasında bir tür sahne oyununun da icra edildiği anlaşılaktadır: Tanrıça güya ortadan kaybolmuş gibi bir tapınağa kapattılmış; daha sonra tapınağın dışında olan kral ile tanrıça arasında bir rahibin yardımyyla bir diyalog yaşanmıştır. Kral tanrıyi geri gelmesi için cesaretlendirmiş ve kendisini kutsamasını talep etmiştir: “Bana gelecekte (uzun) ömür, sağlık, kız ve oğlan çocuklar ver; ... düşmanlarını ayaklarına koy”. Daha sonra tanrıça dışarı çıkarılır ve kral “Güneş Tanrısi hari (ve) Tanrı Mušuni”ye libasyon yaparken, tanrıça tapınağın avlusunun içinden geçerdi”.22

3) KBo 21.34+IBoT 1.723 (CTH 699, Teşub ve Lawazantiyalı Hebat için bayram)

Öy. II

9 nu DINGIRMEŠ I-NA URU Aš-tu-u-ya-ra an-da-an İŠ-TU D GIŠ INANNAHI.A LÚMEŠ BALAG.DI-ya

10 gal-gal-tu-u-ri pé-e-da-an-zi MUNUSMEŠ kat-ri-i-e-eš-ša SİR

11 na-aš-ta ma-ah-ha-an DINGIRMES URU La-a-hu-wa-az-za-an-ti-az

12 ar-ha ar-nu-an-zi nu pHé-pát İŠ-TU GAD a-la-a-lu an-da wa-aš-ša-an-zi

13 LÚMEŠ NAR-ya SİR uš-ši-ya-an-zi

4. Tablet, KBo 21.34+’ün duplikatı olan Bo 6871’de sol kenar şöyledir: 1 -N]4 URU Ki-iz-z[u.

II 9-13. satırlarda tanrılar, şarkıcı ve müzisyenlerin içinde bulunduğu Lawazantiya’da (tertip edilen) bir tören alayı eşliğinde Astuyara’ya nakledilir; Hebat’a “alalu” giyisini giydirilmiştir.24

Lebrun 1977: 141-142’de bu metinde ilgili şu açıklamalarda bulunmaktadır: “Beşinci günde gerçekleştirilen seremonilerin anlaşılmamasında hangi bir güçlük söz konusu değildir; ritüelin ilgili kısmında Lawazantiyalı Teşub ve Hebat onuruna düzenlenen büyük bir şölen konu edilmektedir; şölene ilgili tantrların yanı sıra bu tantrlar ile ilişkisi bulunan başka tantrların da

24 Lebrun 1977 : 139.

- Lawazantiya’da, sırasıyla Teşub, Hebat ve diğer tanrı konuklara operatif hamur işleri ve birçok içki sunulurdu; bunun sonucunda ayfine ayıran kimse yiyecek sunulan tanrıların sağlığına kadeh kaldırırdı.

- Giysilerle donatılmış Hebat gibi tanrı heykelciklerinin başını çektiği bir tören alayı organize edilerek, koronun söylediği ilahiler eşliğinde Lawazatiya’dan Astuyara’ya gidilirdi.

- Tanrılar Aštuyara tapınağında şahsi atribütleriyle birlikte bir defa daha tanıtıldıktan sonra, burada yeni bir şölen start verildi; kap kacaklar tıka basa yiyecekle doldurularak, bol miktarla içki sunuldu; şarkıcı ve harpistler herkesin duyacağı şekilde müzik yaparlardı. ... Lawazantiyalı Hebat ve Teşub onuruna düzenlenen bu bayram ritüelinin gerçekleştirildiği zaman dilimi, beliriz bir sözcük olan MU-ti ifadesi (“yıl boyunca”) yüzünden aydınlatılmadan kalmıştır.

Sonuç olarak bu festivalin bu kadar geç kaleme alınmasını Hebat-Šarrumma ikilisinin bayram ritüelinin önemli bir yer işgal etmesinden kaynaklandığı sonucuna varabiliriz; Hurri-Hatti kontekstine özgü bu tanrısal gerçeklik Hattušili III ve Tudhaliya IV’ün hüküm sürdüğü Büyük İmparatorluk döneminin sonuna ait dini metinlerden aşına olduğumuz bir durumdur.”

KBo 21.34+ nolu metinde söz konusu ritüel etkinliğinin, Kizzuwatna sınırları içindeki Lawazantiya kenti ile bu yerleşime komşu olan Aštuyara
Ašturiya kentinde icra edildiğinden bahsedilmiştir. Forlanini,25 Ašturiya kentinin Elbistan ovasının doğu kısmında, Yukarı Ülke sınırları içinde bulunan La(hu)wazzandiya’nın kuzeyinde, bu kentten çok uzak olan bir mesafedeki Osdana isimli Klasik çağ yerleşimiyile ilişkilendirmenin mümkün olabileceğini düşünmektedir.

-KBo 21.34+IBoT 1.7 (CTH 699, Tešub ve Lawazantiyalı Hebat için bayram)
Ay. IV26

40 I-NA URU-La-a-u-wa-az[-za-an-f]i-ya
42 pa-ra-a-ya I-NA URU Aš-tu-u-y[a]-ra
43 A-NA ŠA-PAL GIŠ{TÜG} HLA MU-t[mi] e-e-a-ni hal-zA-a-i

Tercüme:

39-43 Üçüncü tablet [bitmemiş]tir: (Bu tablet şunun hakkındadır) “Kral, Tešub (ve) Hebat’ı pithos açılışı için Lawazantiyalı kentine ve ayrıca Astuyara kentine, bütün yıl [boyunca], şimşir ağacının altında (toplamanmak üzere) çağırduğu vakit”.

Tabletin kolophon kısmında bu seremoninin Hebat ve Fırtına Tanrısına yapılan bir “dua” (halzai- fiili kullanılmıştır) seremonisi ile ilişkili olduğu ifade edilmiştir.27

4) KBo 17.102+KBo 23.84 (CTH 706.I Tešub ve Hebat için (bayram) ritüeli)28

---

27 Trémouille 1997: 111.
28 KBo 17.102+KBo 23.84 ve KBo 21.34+IBoT 1.7’de, aynı kolofo ve aynı kompozisyon konu edilmektedir.
Ay.29

17’ [ EGIR-ŠU]-ma MUNUS iš-ta-ha-ta-al-li-iš ma-ah-ha-an I[-NA
18’ [ x UD.VIII KAM I-NA İÐ A-al-da ú-i-da-a-ar da[-a-i
19’ [ ]I-NA URU La-a-u-wa-za-an-ti-ya I-NA İD Tur-ma-a[n-na
20’ [ -]x-ah-ha-an na-at A-NA PA-NI DINGIR LM EGIR-pa x[-
21’ [ ]I-N]A URU Ki-iz-zu-wa-at-ni ma-ah-ha-an iš-ša-x[-

18’ [ Sekizinci günde Alda ırmğında su alıyor.
19’ [ ]Lawazantiya şehrinde Tarmana ırmğında[

KBo 17.102+23.84 nolu metinde, Tešup ve Hepat için ritüellerin Lauwazantiya ve Aštuyara dışında, Kizzuwatna (Öy. 20’, Ay. 21’) ve Lawazantiya yakınılarından akan Alda, Tarmana nehirlerinde gerçekleştirildiği belirtilmektedir.30 O halde Alda ve Tarmana ırmğ, Lawazantiya şehri yakınında bulunmamalıyordu.


5) KBo 17.102+KBo 23.84 kolophon (CTH 706.I, Tešub ve Hebat için (bayram) ritüeli)

x+1 DUB 3.KAM Ú-UL QA-TP ma-a-an-za LUGAL-uš
DIŠ[KUR ÏHé-pát]

29 KBo 17.102 Ay. 17”-21” satırlar arasının transkripsiyon ve tercümesi için bkz. Lebrun 1979: 205-206.
30 Forlanini 2013: 7.
2’  "I-NA URU La-a-u-w]a-za-an-ti-ya DUG har-ši-ya-al[-li-uš]
3’  ki-nu-ma-a]n-zi hal-za-a-i pa-ra-a-ma-aš-za[]
4’  "I-NA URU Aš-]tu-u-ra-ya A-NA ŠA-PAL GIS TÜG[ MU-ti me-e-a-ni]

6) KUB 7.20\(^{31}\) (CTH 475.Tf01.A, Kizzuwatna kralı Pilliya ritüeli)

I

1  "mPal-li-ya-aš LUGAL URU Ki-iz-zu-wa-at-na\(^{32}\) ku-wa-pí [  ]
2  DU URU Ki-iz-zu-wa-at-na\(^{33}\) ša-ra-a ti-it-ta-nu-ut [  ]
3  na-an ki-iš-ša-an ma-al-ta  [-i ]\(^{34}\)

4  IŠ-TU VII PÚ\(^{35}\) HI.A še-he-el-li-ya\(^{35}\) ú-i-da-a \([-ar]\)\(^{36}\)
5  ŠA URU La-wa-az-za-an-ti-ya d[(a-a-aš)]
6  nu še-he-el-li-ya-aš ú-i-te-na-aš\(^{37}\) ki-i x\(\)\]

Bu metnin duplikat metni olan KBo 9.115(+)KBo 9.119’da Kizzuwatna’nın, Kummanni olarak yer aldığı görülmektedir.

Tercüme:

1  Kizzuwatna/Kummanni kralı Palliya
2  Kizzuwatna/Kummanni şehri Fırtına Tanrısına tapınıdığı sıra da
3  şu ayini yaptı:

4-5  Lawazantiya kentinin yedi pınarından temiz suyu aldı.

6  Ve temiz suya şunları [koydu]:

Yukarıdaki tercümeden hareketle Lebrun, Teşup kültününün Lawazantiya’ya ilk

---

\(\)\(^{32}\) Dupl. KBo 9.115(+)KBo 9.119 I 1 URU Kum-ma-an-ni.
\(\)\(^{33}\) Dupl. KBo 9.115(+)KBo 9.119 I 1 PU Kum-ma-an-n[i.
\(\)\(^ {34}\) Dupl. KBo 9.115(+)KBo 9.119 I 2 ma-al-[i].
\(\)\(^ {35}\) Dupl. KBo 9.115(+)KBo 9.119 I 3 še-hi-il-li ya.
\(\)\(^ {36}\) Dupl. KBo 9.115(+)KBo 9.119 I 13 ü-e-da-a-ar.
girişinin Kizzuwatna kralı Palliya zamanında olabileceği belirtmektedir. Puduhepa’nın doğduğu ve genç kızlık yıllarını geçirdiği Lawazantiya kentinin bugün nerede olduğu maalesef bilinmiyor. Ancak Kizzuwatna toprakları içinde ve Kummanni’den uzaklarda olmadığı kesindir. Çünkü Kizzuwatna kralı Palliya burada birtakım dini ayinler icra edebilmekteydi.\[39\]

Lawazantiya kentinin su kaynaklarının bol olduğu bir yerde olması gerektiğini bu metin bize göstermektedir. Lawazantiya’nın 7 pınarından veya kaynağından Fırtına Tanrısı için kutsal suların alınması gerektiğini görürmektedir. Metnin devamı şöyledir: “1 šekel gümüşü, bir göz örtüsü bezi, yünden kišri, mavi yünden 1 tarpali- dokuması, kırmızı yünden 1 tarpali- dokuması, içinde ince yağ dolu 1 hakkumna- kabı, undan 3 yufka ekmeği ve 1 KUKUB kabı şarabını 7 kaynağına sunar. (Ellerinde) temiz sularla geri geldiklerinde, bir kaz (?), yarım ölçek buğday unundan yapılmış bir mulati-ekmeği, beş yufka ekmeği, biraz zeytinyağı ve bir ölçek şarap alırlar ve bunları temiz sulara sunarlar.” İlk gün yapılan bu ayından sonra ertesi gün sabahleyin Fırtına Tanrısı bu arı sularla yıkanır ve temizlenir.\[40\]

Hurrice-Hititçe bir Boğazköy ritüelinde (KBo 23.27 Ay. III 5-14) sunuda kullanılacak kutsal su için Šapinuwa’daki kaynaklara işaret edilmektedir. Šapinuwa’dan temin edilecek 7 kap suyun 3 tanesi Šapinuwa şehri ana kaynağından, 1 tanesi Šulupašši şehri ana kaynağından, 1 tanesi Šapinuwa şehrinin başında kaynaktan, 1 tanesi x nehrinden ve 1 tanesi de Šapantalliya şehri nehrinden getirilmektedir.

Or. 90/1711 Ortaköy’den bir ritüel tablette ise ilgili satırlar şöyledir:

4 ] … söyle temiz[
5 get]irirler. Sonra nehrinden tekrar[
6 ]… içinde ve o 9 nehir. Ve sonra
7 ] Šapinuwa’nın 2 fırtına tanrısı …[
8 ] yakarlar. Nehirden[

38 Lebrun 1979: 201.
Sonra Şapinuwa’nın 2 Fırtına Tanrısı [baba tanrılar içinde/ortasında] içerir/ortasında götürürler.[kutsal] suyu yukarı serper[ler."
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7) KUB 1.1+19.60+61+62+63+66+26.44+46+KBo 52.17+1683/u (CTH 81.A, III. Hattušili’nin apolojisi veya otobiyografisi)
Öy. II
79 še-er šu-un-ni-īš-ta GI-M-an-ma IŠ-TU KUR Mi-iz-ri-i
80 EGI-R-pa i-ya-ah-ha-ha-at nu I-NA URU-La-wa-za-an-ti-ya
81 A-NA DINGIRLIM BAL-u-wa-an-zī i-ya-ah-ha-ha-at
82 nu-za DINGIRLIM i-ya-nu-un

Tercüme:
79 ...... Mısır ülkesinden
80-81 geri döndüğümüzde, tanrıya kurban sunmak için Lawazantiya şehrine gittim,
82 ve tanrınnın (kültünü) yerine getirdim.

III. Hattušili’nin apolojisini anlatan bu tablette kral olmadan önce Hattušili, kardeşi kral Muwattalli’nin Mısır’a yaptığı bir sefere katıldığından bahseder. Yukarıda tercümesi sunulan metnin bu kısmından sonra, “Rahip Pentipsarri’nin kızı Puduhepa’yı tanrının emriyle karılığa aldım” ifadesi yer almaktadır.

8) KBo 1.11 Öy. (CTH 7, Uršu kuşatması)

20’ ù an-nu-ut-tum li-iš-ta-as-sū-ku LUGAL ud-da-mi-iq
21’ LUGAL mŠa-an-da i-na URU Lu-hu-uz-za-an-di-yā iṣ-sī ù ARAD LÚ URU Kar-ka-mi-is
22’ LUGAL iš-ta-na-a-al-šu KUR-tum ki i-[d]āb-bu-ub um-ma šu-ū <-ma> šum-ma URU UršuK1 i-hal-li-iq
23’ ARAD i-na qa-ti-ni-i-ma-qū-ut ...

46 B II 58 KUR URU Mi-iz-ri.
47 KUB 19.71 3 -a]-z-an-ti-ya.
48 B II 59 ši-pa-an-tu-u-wa-an-zi.
50 Metin: ur-.

51 Uršu kenti, Urfa’ya lokalize edilmiştir.

9) KBo 55.186 $^{53}$ (CTH 530, Kültenvanter fragmanı)

Sağ Sütun

10’ [ -]x-za $^{URU}DU_{6}^{HLA} I-NA^{URU}Kum-ma-[a]n-ni$ x[11’ [ -]$^{URU}ŠÀ URU.DU_{6}^{HLA} ŠA^{URU}La-wa-za-an-ti-tya$[12’ $^{NA}4^{ZI.KIN^{HLA}te-iš-ki-iz-z} $

Burada Kummanni ve Lawazantiya’da karanlık bir şehirden bahsedilmektedir, fakat metin kırık olduğu için yeterince açıklık yoktur.$^{54}$

10) KBo 4.10+50.60+KUB 40.69 (CTH 106.B.2, Tarhuntašša kralı ile antlaşma)

Lawazantiya şehir adı, Tarhuntašša ülkesi kralı Ulmi-Tešup antlaşmasında şahit tanrılar arasında yer almaktadır.$^{55}$

Öy.

48’ $^{DU}$ $^{HI.HI-aš-ši-iš}$ $^{DUTU}$ $^{URU}$ $^{PÚ-na}$ $^{DU}$ $^{URU}$ $^{Ha-at-ti}$ $^{DU}$ $^{URU}$ $^{Ne-ri-ik}$ $^{DIŠTAR}$ $^{URU}$ $^{Ša-mu-ha}$ $^{DIŠTAR}$ $^{URU}$ $^{La-wa-za-an-ti-ya}$ $^{LI-IM}$ $^{DINGIR^{MES}}$

$^{52}$ del Monte-Tischler 1978: 476.
$^{53}$ KBo 55.186, KUB 60.117 ve Bo 5056 fragmanları ile paraleldir.
49’ ŞA KUR Ha-at-ti ku-ut-ru-e-eš a-ša-an-du
Tercüme

48’ Bu mesele için, şimşekin Fırtına Tanrısi, Arinna’nın Güneş Tanrıçası, Hatti’nin Fırtına Tanrısi, Nerik’in Fırtına Tanrısi, Šamuha’nın Ištar’, Lawazantiya’nın Ištar’ı (ve)

49’ Hatti ülkesinin bin Tanrısi şahit olsunlar!


11) HKM 96 (Mšt. 75/79)56 (CTH 188 Krallar ya da kraliçeye mektup)

Ay.

17’ [ÉRIN MEŠ KUR.KU]R MEŠ KUR.UGU TIM KUR Iš-hu-pi-it-ta
18’ [ … KUR HUR.S]AGŠa-ka[d]-du-nu-wa KUR Ša-na-hu-it-t[a]
19’ […] x KUR [U]RU Tu-u-pa-az-zi-ya
20’ [KUR URU La-h]u-u-wa-a-an-ti-ya KUR Iš-u-wa
21’ […]x-ya [k]u-[i]t ku-it ŠA KUR.UGU TIM
22’ [ÉRI]N MEŠ.HLA na-aš hu-u-ma-an-du-uš ni-ni-i[k]

Söz konusu mektupta coğrafik sıra şu şekildedir: Išhupitta (muhtemelen Zile’nin kuzeyinde)57, Šakaddunüwa dağı (Zuliya/Çekerek irmağının batı kıyısı)58, Šanahuitta (Yeşilirmak-Çekerek veya Kızılırmak arasında bir yerde)59, Tupazziya (Bor civarı, Ammuna dağı yakınında)60, Lawazantiya ve Išuwa (Elazığ civarı)61. Buradaki coğrafik sıralama, Lawazantiya’nın daha kuzeye yerleştirilmesi gerektiğini ortaya çıkarmaktadır.62

60 Alp 1991: 45.
61 del Monte Tischler 1978: 155.
62 Barjamovic 2011: 141.
Yeni Asurca tek yazım olan ve Lawazantiya ismi son olarak Salmanassar III (M.Ö. 858-831) tarafından bu kralın yirminci seferi ile ilişkili telaffuz edilmiştir. Söz konusu metin, Lawazantiya kentinin lokalizasyonu ile ilişkili en önemli belge niteliğindedir; Salmanassar, Amanos dağlarını aştıktan sonra sırasıyla Lusanda, Abarnani ve Kisuatni kentlerini fethederek Que ülkesine (Kizzuwatna) indiğinden bahsetmiştir.63 Amanos geçidinden (kesin olarak Adalur geçidi) Que’nin merkezine kadar uzanan söz konusu rota boyunca devam eden seferin kronolojisi, burada doğru batı doğrultusunda coğrafik bir ardışığın söz konusu olduğunu göstermektedir.64 Bu bilgi Lawazantiya kentinin Amanos dağlarının en kuzeyindeki geçitten çok uzak bir mesafede olamayacağı anlamına gelmektedir.65

Forlanini 2013: 8’dede, Lawazandiya’nın geçmişte pek çok Bronz Çağ yerleştirmine ev sahipliği yapan Ceyhan nehrinin hemen doğusundaki verimli alana localize edilmesini düşündüğünü ve bunun için de Tatarlı Höyük’ün bir aday olabileceğini belirtmektedir.


İmparatorluk çağının son safhasına tarihlenmiş, Šipti-Ba’al tarafından o sıradaki Lawazantiya’daki (lwsnd) bulunduğu ifade edilen Ugarit kralına yazılmış içeriği

64 Forlanini 2013: 9.

Lawazantiya’nın konumu hakkında, Kummanni ve Fırat arası, Ovalık Kilikya, Doğu Kilikya, Malatya civarında, Elbistan-Karahöyük gibi teklifler şimdiye kadar yapılmıştır (Bossert’in Karahöyük yazıtında Lawazantiya okunununun yanlış olduğu anlaşılmıştır).67 III. Hattušili’nin kardeşimini yaptığı Mısır seferinden dönüş yolunda Lawazantiya’ya uğraması, bu şehrin, Suriye ile Hattuša arasında ya da Goetze’nin buna ilaveten belirttiği gibi; o sıradada Hattušili’nin yöneticisi

Sonuç olarak;


3) Yeni Asur döneminde ise Salmanassar III zamanında “Lusanda” adı ile karşılaşılmış.

Ve şehrin sadece URU “şehir” determinatifi ile birlikte yer aldığını görmekteyiz.

Maşathöyük mektubunda Zile’nin kuzeyi, Çekerek ırmağının batı kıyısı ve Bor civarına lokalize edilen şehirlerle birlikte yer alması, daha güneye yerleştirilen Lawazantiya ile ters düşmektedir. Yalnız bu mektupta koloni döneminde belgelenen isimle benzer Lahuwantiya yazımının yer alması düşündürücüdür.

Eğer Yeni Asur Döneminde belgelenen Lusanda da bu şehirle aynıysa, belgelendiği metinde Salmanassar doğu batı istikametinde devam eden şehirleri fethederek, Que’ye (Kizzuwatna) indiğinden bahsetmektedir.70

Lawazantiya’nın belgelendiği metin yerleri ne yazık ki, şehrin nerede

68 Yiğit 1997: 11.
69 Yiğit 1997: 11, d.not 71 ve 72 ile.
70 Krş. dip not 64.

Şehrin belgelendiği diğer metinler, lokalizasyona pek açıklık getirmemesi nedeniyle transkripsiyonları ve bazı açıklamalarıyla aşağıda sunulmaktadır:

1) KBo 45.101 (CTH 670.834, Bayram ritüeli fragmanı)

Öy. Sağ Sütun

5’ pár-aš-na-a-u-aš-k[án  LÚSAGI.A]
6’ ú-iz-zi [ ]
7’ LUGAL-uš TUŠ-aš  ^DIŠ[TAR
8’ ^DIŠTAR  ^URULa-h[u-wa.za-an-ti-ya e-ku-zí]
9’ LÚNAR  ^URUHu[r-ri SİR
10’ ^GİŞar-kam-mi[ gal-gal-tu-u-ri
11’ wa-al-ha-an-z[i

2) KBo 3.46+KUB 26.75 (CTH 133.1.A, I. Murşili’nin(?) Hurrilere karşı savaşları)

Öy. II

14  [ ^URUH]a-at-ti ú-it ta-a-ma ú-it-ti
15  [KUR ^URU… KUR  ^URUHa-at-r]a-a-aš ták-ša-an-na ú-it KUR
    ^URUHa-at-ra-a-aš
16  [ ^URU… ^URUŞ]u-uk-zi-aš-ša hur-li ne-ya-an-ta-ti

17 [ -]x-eš e-šir šu-uš e-ep-pí-ir
18 [ -]i\^{r} a-pé-e-ma hur-la-an
19 [ -i]š-na zi-nu-e-er
20 [ ]ú-it
21 [ -i\^{r}t URU Hu-ru-ma-az
22 [ -]i-iz-zi
23 [ -d]a-az hur-li
24 [ URU L]a-hu-uz-za-an-ti-ya
25 [ (-)š]a-an hu-ul-li-it

3) KBo 46.23 (470.1173, Ritüel fragmanı)

4’ ]\^{r}e\^{1}-eš-na-az ’X IV\^{r}73
5’ D\^{I}ŠTA]R URU La-w[a-
6’ ]x DÙ-mi x[

4) KUB 6.1574 (CTH 582, Orakel fragmanı)

KUB 6.15 II
1 ma-a-an-ma-kán DINGIRMEŠ GIG-ši DUTUŠ1
2 a-ra-at-te-ni IŠ-TU LÜHAL MUNUSŠU.G[I
3 ÜJTUM MUNUS.LUGAL I-NA URU Ut-ru-na I-MU[R
4 [ ]ar-pu-na-an-ti-iš nu-wa-ra-an [ 
5 nu-wa DUTUŠ1 ma-a-an MUNUS.LUGAL-ya[- 
6 nu-wa-kán e-da-ni KASKAL-ši an-d[a 
7 nu-wa-kán « ha-ah-ha-lu-wa-an-ti[]

73 Veya M\^{i}S, krş. Kempinski-Košak 1982: 89 d.not 1.
URU LA(HU) WAZANTİYA “LA(HU) WAZANTİYA ŞEHİRİ”

8 « tar-ra-wa-u-un-ta nu a-ri [-
9 DIŞSTAR URU Şa-mu-ha [-
10 DIŞSTAR URU La-wa-za [-an-ti-ya
11 an-na-al-la-aš x [-
12 še-er SI x SÁ-at [-

5) KUB 16.53 (CTH 577.1, Birleştirilmiş Orakel, I. SU, KIN ve MUŠEN) Öy.

x+1 ]x wa-ra-ah-ša a [n-
2’ N]U.SIG-du ŠÀ-ir DIB’-an [-
3’ - ]x URU La-wa-za-an-ti I-NA KASKAL [M
4’ wa-]aš-ku-wa-aš še-er TUKU.TUKU-an-zu A-NA DINGIR [L][M
5’ NINDA]a-a-an NINDA.GÚG I DUG hu-up-pár KAŠ [-
6’ ] an-da-an ú-wa-u-wa-aš-ša-wa x [-
7’ ] e-eš-zi ku-wa-pí nu II-an šar [- ra

6) KBo 60.97 (1283/z) (CTH 582 ?, Orakel fragmanı) Ay.

2 ]x TUKU.TUKU x [-
3 ]x LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL [-
4 ]x-zi

5 URU La-] wa-za-an-ti-ya Û ŠÀ x [-
6 U]RU Tal-ma-li-ya x [-
7 ]x GU₄ VIII UDU [-
8 URU ] a-wa-za-an-ti-ya [-
7) KBo 41.233 (CTH 582, Orakel fragmanı)
Öy.

x+1 \[x-ša-aš pár-kán[- ]-x
2' \\
3' \] a-ri-ya-zi
4' \] ZABAR SUM-an-zi
5' \] nam-ma DINGIR\textsuperscript{LUM}
6' \textsuperscript{URU} La-wa-za-[an-ti-ya pé-e-da-[
7' -]x nam-ma-an-kán
8' \textsuperscript{URU} L'[a-wa]-za-an-ti-ya
9' -]x-x-wa[ ]

8) KUB 5.20+KBo 58.88+KUB 18.56 (CTH 577.1, Birleştirilmiş Orakel, I. SU, KIN ve MUŞEN)
Ay. III

41’ nu-za-kán ŠÀ URU\textsuperscript{LUM}-ma ku-e-da-ni-ik-[i
42’ \textsuperscript{EMEŞ} EGIR-an še-eš-ha-ah-hi nu-kán ALAM [
43’ \textsuperscript{IŠTAR} URU La-wa-za-an-ti-ya EGIR-an[
44’ ma-a-an-ma-mu-kán DINGIR\textsuperscript{LUM} a-[p] i-i[z
45’ an-da-an aš-šu-li ne[-

9) KUB 52.72\textsuperscript{75} (CTH 570, Karaciğer orakeli (SU))
Öy.

8 a-ši ]Ü\textsuperscript{TUM} A-NA MUNUS.LUGAL D-Za-wa-al-li-iš-pát pa-ra-a IS-BAT nam-ma-ma KI.MIN
9 [nu \textsuperscript{MES} SIG\textsubscript{5}-ru ŽÉ hi-li-ip-ši-ma-an NU.SIG\textsubscript{5}
10 [ma-a-an \textsuperscript{IŠTAR} \textsuperscript{RU} La-wa-za-an-ti-ya-ya nu \textsuperscript{MES} nu NU.SIG\textsubscript{5}-du ZAG-za RA\textsuperscript{5} NU.SIG\textsubscript{5}

\textsuperscript{75} Transkripsiyon ve tercüme için bkz. Mouton 2007: 187, 189, 190.
12 [nu TEMES] SIG_5-ru ni ši ta ki zi GAR-ri XII ŠÀ DIR SA_5
13 ^D^ISTAR ^URUL[a-w]a-za-an-ti-ya ku-it 'SIXSÅ^1-a[t] ^RD^UTUSÍ I x-x
    SISKUR pu-pu-wa-la-an-na-aš EGIR-an x nu x x TI

10) KUB 6.29+KUB 18.63+KBo 57.123 (CTH 574.22, MUŠEN ḪURRI)

Ay.
20' [da-ma-i]n wa-aš-ku-un UL nam-ma ku-in-ki uš[-ki-ši]
21' [LÚMEŠ ME.S]AG-ma-aš-kán ZI-za GAM UL ku-it-ki [da-ma-aš-ša-an]
22' [har-kán-z]i nu IGI-zi MUŠEN HURRI SIG_5-ru EGIR-ma N[U.SI
23' IGI-zi nu SIG_5 EGIR SIG_5
24' [LÚMEŠ]ME.SAG pu-nu-uš-šu-u-en nu me-mi-ir A[-NA DINGIR^LIM-wa
25' ^URULa-wa-za-an-ši-ya GİŞ KIRI_6 GİŞ nu-x[)
26' [DINGIR^LIM-za] a-pád-da še-er TUKU.TUKU-u-an-za nu MUŠEN HURRI S[IG_5-du

11) KBo 19.129 (+) KBo 53.84⁷⁶ (CTH 500.249.A, Kizzuwatna (bayram) ritüeli)

Öy.
1 [ ] hal-za-a-i nu ki-iš-ša-an m[e-ma-i]
2 [ L^]U[PU-ra-ap-ši-iš I-NA ^URULa-[a-u-wa-za-an-ti-ya]
3 [ ] ha-an-da-a-iz- [zi]
4 [ ^URULa-]t^a^1-u-wa-za-an-ti-az X NINDA.SIG^MEŠ
5 [ ] ^f^ANA^1^DU^D^HÉ-pát-ya šu-up-pí-ya[ah-ha-an-zi]'
6 [ ] tap-ri-[i] ti pár-ši-ya na-at pí-ra-an-š[i-it ]

Rukiye AKDOĞAN

7 [ z]i-iz-zu-hi te-pu la-a-hu-i [ 1 GAL šu-un-na-a-i [  
8 [  
9 [ ] p]ár-ši-ya na-at pi-ra-an-ši-it [  
10 [ -]x zi-iz-zu-hi te-pu la-a-hu-[i[ ]  
11 [ ]]-ši-kán 1 GAL šu-un-na-i [ ]  
12 [ tap-rí-y]a] az kat-ta ú-da-i na-an-ša-an [ ]x-x-x-aš  
13 [ ]x da-a-i I-NA É D hé-pát-ma-kán D x-x[ ]  
14 [ tap-r]i-ya-a]z kat-ta da-a-i nu PA-NI tap-rí-t[i] D Šar-ru-m[a  
15 [ ] a-ša-a-ši ŚUKUR D Šar-ru-ma-ma PA-NI tap-r[i]-i-ti D ]Hé-pát hal-zi-ya[-wa-aš]  
16 [ ] hal-z[i-ya-u-wa-aš GİŠ] tap-rí-az kat-ta ú-da-i nu-u[š] D Da-ki-du-un [ ]  
18 [ ]x ku-iš LŰ pu-ra-ap-ši-iš pa-ra-a pa-a-an-za nu I-NA URU [a-u-wa-z][a-an-ti-ya-x[ ]  
19 [ ]x GİŠRA ki-iš-ša-an šu-ni-ya-zi iš-ta-na-ni x[ ] [p]i-ra-an[ ]  
20 [ ]x da-a-i nam-ma-kán A-NA DUG iš-nu-u-ri še-er 1 NINDA x[ ]x[ ]  

12) KBo 17.102+KBo 23.84 (CTH 706.I, Teşub ve Hebat için (bayram) ritüeli)  

Öy.  

3’ [  

4’ [  

5’ [  

6’ [  

7’ [  

13) Bo 86/299 [CTH 106.A.1, Tarḫuntašša kralı ile anlaşması]

III

90 DḪ-ḫát URU Ki-iz-zu-wa-at-ni DIŠTAR URU Ša-mu-u-ha

91 DIŠTAR LÍL DIŠTAR URU La-wa-za-an-ti-ya DIŠTAR URU Ni-nu-wa


14) KUB 6.45+30.14+KBo 57.18 (CTH 381.A, II. Muwattalli’nin tanrı topluluğuna duası)

Öy. I

74 [(DU URU)] ḪUr-ma ŠA URU[ ] x DḪ-a-an-ti-da-79-aš-šu-uš DU DḪ-ḫát

75 [(URU H)] a-la-ap ŠA URU[ ] x DINGIR.LÚMEŠ DINGIR.MUNUS MEŠ HUR.SAG MEŠ ID MEŠ KI.MIN

76 [(ŠA URU) La-a-u-wa-an-a-t[(i-y)] a DḪ-a-ši-ga-aš-na-wa-an-za DMu-ul-li-ya-ra-aš

77 [(DINGIR.LÚMEŠ)]Š DINGIR.MUNUS MEŠ [(HUR.)] SAG MEŠ ID MEŠ ŠA URU La-a-u-wa-an-ti-ya

78 [(DINGIR. MUNUS MEŠ)] k DU URU U-da DḪ-ḫát LUGAL-ma-aš DINGIR. LÚMEŠ

79 [DINGIR. MUNUS MEŠ (HUR. SAG MEŠ İD)] MEŠ ŠA URU U-da

15) KUB 31.69 (CTH 590 Rüya- ve adak metinleri fragmanları)

Öy.?

x+1 -]Ša-pḫ-ḫa-am-m[a

2’ -]x-x-x- nu-un I x pa[-

3’] K]ARAŠ HL.A ŠA KUR URU Ar-za-u-wa GAM-an []

4’ DIŠTA]R URU La-wa-za-an-ti-ya GAŠAN-YA A-NA DU TUTU ISP I-NA K|UR

---

79 39 om. –da-aš.
80 4-6. satırlar arasının transkripsiyon ve tercümesi için bkz. Lebrun 1979: 202 d.not 23.
Rukiye AKDOĞAN

5’ )i-ya-ši tu-el-za wa-aš-pa-an LÚ-aš i-wa-ar wa-aš-ši-[a-ši
6’ MUNUS-š]a-za i-wa-ar wa-aš-ši-ya-ši tu-el-za wa-aš-pa-an NÍ.TE-[x
7’ ]mu A-NA DUTUŠ KUR URU Ar-za-u-wa pi-ra-an GUL-ah-ti[-KUB 31.69 (CTH 590 Rüya- ve adak metinleri fragmanları )

Öy.?

12’ -]x-ru-ši-ši-ta x[-
13’ U]RU La-wa-za-an-ti[-
14’ -]x-ya-az TI-eš-x[-

Ay.?

6’ -]x URU U-da A-NA DIŠTAR URU[
7’ D]UTU ke-e-el MUKAM-aš x-x-x[
8’ -]x-x I MUKAM-aš KÙ.BABBAR I ALAM KÙ.BABBAR LUGAL[
9’ ]k]a-ru-ú MU ALAM LUG[AL] na[-
10’ ]x-x KA DINGIRMES lu-la-h[i-
11’ ]x-ul-li-kán GIM-an x[-
12’ ]x URU La-a-wa-za-an-ti-ya[
13’ ]x.LUGAL A-NA DIŠTAR
14’ ]]K-RU-UB ma-a-an[

16) KBo 8.63 (CTH 590 Rüya- ve adak metinleri fragmanları)

I

x+1 ma-a-an-za LUGAL KUR URU
2’ ]I-NA MU VIIKAM ŠA [
3’ DUTUSI ku-in me-mi-an hé-t[e?-
4’ nu A-NA ĐÉ.A Ü A-NA ĐAl-li-x[-
5’ AŠ-RU-MA a-ri-ya-an-zi nu ku-e-da-ni x[

30
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6' ú-e-da-ah-hi nam-ma-at IŠ-TU NAM.RA[MEŞ]
7' I BI-IB-RU KÜ.BABBAR MA.NA I BI-IB-RU UR.x[
8' XL NAM.RA[MEŞ] pi-ih-hi GAL tap-ri pu-nu-uš-mi[
9' DUTUŠI ku-in me-mi-an ŠA URUŠap-la I-DI nu ma[-
10' a-pu-u-un me-mi-an << ta-pár-ri-ya-i DIŠTAR URULa-'a[-
11' tSIG₂-in¹ aš-ša-nu-ši-nu A-NA DİŠTAR URU La-a-u-wa-z[a-
17) KUB 48.123 (CTH 590 Rüya- ve adak metinleri fragmanları)

Öy. I

3' [ ]x[
4' [ ]'an-da¹-ma-wa-ra-aš-za DIŠTAR[URU La-wa-za-an-ti-ya]
5' [ ]-x AK-RU-UB ma-a-an-wa DUTUŠI
x[- ]
6' [ ]u-k[án A-NA DIŠTAR URU La-wa-za-an-ti-y[a ]
7' [ ]-g][a-nu-um-mi

8' [ ] ku-wa-[]\pi I-NA URU Zi-it-ha-ra a-ú-le-en GUL-ah-ta
9' [ ] A-NA DIŠTAR URU La-wa-za-an-ti-ya IK-RU-UB
10' [ma-a-an-wa DINGIR¹⁰ LUM GAŠA]N-YA ŠU ñPi-ha-DU LÚ U A.ZU¹
mi-nu-ši nu A-NA tDINGIR¹⁰ LUM[GAŠ]AN-YA
11' [ ] KJILÁ.BI.NU.GÁL DÜ-mi
12' [MUNUS.LUGAL-za-ká]n A-NA DIŠTAR¹⁰ URU Af¹⁸₂-wa-za-a[n-ti-ya
kiš-an IK-RU-UB ]
13' [ ]-k[án ku-i-e-eš HUL-t¹la-mu-uš³ [UH,L,A-š] x[
14' [ ]x ki-iš-ša-aš A-NA üH,L,A EGIR-an A-NA DUTUŠI
15' [ ]x-x SIG₂-in DINGIR¹⁰ LUM-mu ŠA DUTUȘI ū ŠA DUMU[MEŞ

81 Transkripsiyon ve tercüme için bkz. Lebrun 1981: 96-97, 100-101; 12'-22'. satırlar arasının trankripsiyon ve
82 Kâtip herhalde yanlışlıkla “La” yerine “Al” işaretini yazmış olmalı.
Rukiye AKDOĞAN

16’ [ Ú-UL ]ku-it-ki i-ši-ya-ah-hi-iš-ki-ši DINGIR LUM A-NA DUTU ŚI
17’ [ ]'HUL'-lu ma-ni-en-ku-wa-an Ú-UL tar-na-at-ti
18’ [nu A-NA DINGIR LUM] I DIŞTAR KÙ.BABBAR I MA.NA I DIŞTAR GUŞKIN XX [G]İN DÛ-mi
19’ [ ]ŠA UR.MAH <m>Hi-iš-ni-iš mTâš-mi-LUGAL-[m]a-ya?
20’ [ ]]-e-er nu A-NA mTâš-mi-LUGAL-ma
21’ [ A-NA DINGIR LUM GAŠA]N-YA SISKUR GIS TUKUL DINGIR[ ][M] SISKUR NIM.LÀL
22’ [ ]pé-d]i-š-ši BAL-u-wa-an-zi SÌxSÁ-at
23’ [MUNUS.LUGAL A-NA DIŞTAR URU]La-w[a-za-an-ti-ya IK-RU-UB
24’ [ma-a-an ]'a1-aš-šu-li PAP-aš-ti
-KUB 48.123

Ay. III83

9 MUNUS.LUGAL-za-kán I-NA [URU] x IK-RU-UB
10 ma-a-an-kán mTal-m[i-LUGAL-ma
11 nu ALAM mÚr-hi-mU-ub[
12 DÛ-an-te-ëš ki-nu-na-y[a
13 ŠA KÙ.BABBAR DÛ-mi nu-kán[

14 MUNUS.LUGAL-za-kán I-NA [URU]Ha-ša-x[ ]
15 A-NA DİŞTAR [URU]La-wa-za-an[-ti-ya IK-RU-UB ma-a-an DUTU ŚI
16 ha-at-tu-liš-zi nu-wa A[-NA
17 IR-an har-ta ki-nu-na-a[t(-
18 ha-an-ti-i TÚG ku-ši-ši še-p[i-ik-ku-uš-ta? 

Ay. IV84

12 [ ]].GI KI.LÁ.BI NU.GÁL pí-ih-hi

URULA(HU)WAZANTİYA “LA(HU)WAZANTİYA ŞEHİRİ”

13 [ URUMa-na-y]a-ra-za ar-ha I-NA KURURU Ku-du-up-ša-aš-ši
HUL-un Ú-an

14 [ ]x MUNUS.LUGAL INA URUMa-na-ya-ra

15 [a-uš-ta I-NA? URUPi-iš-h]a-pu-wa-iš-ša a-ar-aš {silinti}

16 [nu-za-kán MUNUS.LUGAL A-NA D IŞTAR URULa-wa-z]a-an-ти-ya
kiš-an IK-RU-UB ma-a-an-kán

17 [DINGIRLUM GAŠAN-YA HUL-lu ÚŠ-an A-NA DUTUS]I Ú A-NA
KARASHILA an-da UL

18 [tar-na-at-ти ke-e-d]a-ni LIL-ri A-NA DUTUSI pí-ra-an

19 [LÜKUR? pí-r]a-an ku-en-na-at-ти DUTUSI KARASHILA

20 [ I]GI’te-ez-zi-ya SIGs-in

21 [ -]x-x e-eš-ša-ah-hi

22 [ DÛ-]mi

18) KUB 60.118+KUB 56.25 (Bo 1966) (CTH 590, Rûya- ve adak
metinleri fragmanları)

Ay. IV

4’ [HI-IT-TI ANŠE.K[UR.RA] A-NA DUTUSI a-wa-an ar-ha

...

7’ [GAM-an I GU4 VIII UDU-y[a ]x

8’ [DINGIR.GAL ha-la-ap-la-x[ ŠA UP-NI ki-e-da-ni-pát
INIM-NI še-er

9’ -]e SUM-hi [ ]

10’ [x-ušURULa-wa-za-an-ти-ya [ki-e-d]a-ni-pát INIM-NI še-er

11’ GUŠKIN I MA.NA I GİŞGIGIR x[ -y]a-an KÜ.BABBAR

12’ [x NU.GÁL I GU4 VIII UDU- ya i[- ]URULa-wa-za-an-ти-ya

13’ ] pí-di-ši [ -]x

14’ [x-mu-za DINGIRLUM GAŠAN-YA x LÚ-ni-li[- ]x pu-x[ -]ya

15’ -]x me-e-hu-ni du-wa-ar-ni-eš-ki-mi [ 
Rukiye AKDOĞAN

16’  -wa-ra-at ma-a-an Ú-UL-ya x-x-x[
17’  ]x-x-ma-wa-za LÚ-ni-li wa-aš-šī-ya-mî[
18’  ]x-du du-wa-ar-na-ah-hi-pát [  

boşluk

19) KBo 46.13185 (CTH 584, Kraliçenin rüyaları)

Öy.

2’  -k]án A-NA EZENš-ma [  
3’  ]x ŠÁ ÚT[^] GIM-an [  
4’  ]x ŠÁ Š tar-nu-i-ma-wa[  
5’  ]x URU La-wa-za-an-ti-y[a  
6’  MU]NUS.LUGAL x x DINGIR.GAL ši-pa-a[n-  

Ay.

2  nu-za MUNUS.LUGAL PA-NI ZI-ZU ki-iš-du[-  
3  ĐIŠTAR ku-wa-at-qa a-pa-a-aš-ma-wa[  
4  nu-wa-ra-an ni-in-ga-nu-uš-ki-m[i  
5  UM-MA DUMU.MUNUS-ma A-NA ĐUTUšIš-wa[  
6  tu-uq-qa-wa SIGš NUN ĐUTUšIš-ma-w[a

20) KBo 16.83+23.26 (CTH 242.8, Metaller, aletler ve silahların envanteri)

II86

10’  mAMAR.MUŠEN-na LÚNAGAR mŠag-ga-na-aš I-DI II GAL  
     KÚ.BABBAR mHa-i-i[t-ti-li]87  
11’  LÚJ URUŠa-aq-qa-ma-ha mŠag-ga-na I-DI  
12’  VI URUDU du-pí-ya-liš A-NA Gitš TUKULHLA IK-RI-BIHLA ŠA ĐI[ŠTAR]

Kizzuwatna kral Palliya’ın ritüel etkinliğinin çerçevesinde, Kalzadaba dağı gibi dağ grupları ile Lawazandiya’daki temiz su kaynaklarından (şelleliyaş widar) söz edilmiştir.90

89 KBo 9.119 A I 9'-16'. satırlar, ABoT 2.93 1'-9'. satırlar ve KBo 61.75 (Bo 69/630) Öy.7 sağ sütun 4'-10' satırlar arasına duplikattır; krş. Akdoğan 2010: 93 vd. ve kopya için bkz. ABoT 2.93.
90 Krş. Forlanini 2013: 8 d. not 28 ile.
22) KBo 14.125+126+40.26 (CTH 475.Tf01.D, Pillija ritüeli)
Öy. I
1 \[^[m]\text{Pal-li-ya-aš LUGAL} {}^U \text{RU} \text{Ki-iz-zu-wa-a[t-na ku-wa-pí DU} {}^U \text{RU} \text{Ki-iz-zu-wa-at-na}\]
2 \[\text{[ša-ra-a ti-it-ta]-nu-ut na-an ki-i[š-ša-an ma-al-ta]}\]
3 \[\text{[IŠ-TU VI]I PÜ} {}^\text{MÊŠ} \text{še-he-el-li-ya [ú-i-da-a-ar]}\]
4 \[\text{[ŠA} {}^U \text{RU]} \text{La-za-za-an-ti-ya [da-a-aš]}\]
5 \[\text{[nu še-he-e]l-ya-aš ú-šša-an ma-al-ta [\text{da-a-i}]}\]

23) KBo 6.29+50.56+ KUB 23.127+21.12\(^{91}\) (CTH 85.1.A, III. Muršili (Urhi-Tešub) ve III. Hattušili arasındaki ihtilaf)

10 \[\ldots\ldots \text{IŠ-TU DINGIR} {}^\text{LIM} \text{-mu}\]
11 \[\text{pa-ra-a- pa-ra-a SIG} {}^5 \text{-iš-kat-ta-ri nu-mu} {}^\text{D} \text{IŠSTAR} {}^U \text{RU} \text{Ša-mu-ha}\]
13 \[\text{Ü ŠA ŠEŠ-YA ka-ne-ěš-šu-u-wa-ar pé-eš-ta}\]
14 \[\text{am-mu-uk-ma-kán DINGIR} {}^\text{LIM} \text{GAM-an pit-ta-iš-ki-u-wa-an te-eh-hu-un}\]
15 \[\text{nu-mu Ê -ir ku-it e-eš-ta nu-kán IŠ-TU Œ-YA}\]
16 \[\text{D} \text{IŠSTAR} {}^U \text{RU} \text{Ša-mu-ha ha-an-ti-ya-nu-un} \text{I Pu-du-hé-pa-aš-ma}\]
17 \[\text{ŠA} {}^\text{D} \text{IŠSTAR} {}^U \text{RU} \text{La-wa-za-an-ti-ya GEME-aš DUMU.MUNUS} \text{mPé-en-ti-ip-LUGAL}\]
18 \[\text{ĽU SANGA} {}^\text{D} \text{IŠSTAR} \text{e-eš-ta nu-za a-pu-u-un-na}\]
19 \[\text{AŠ-ŠUM DAM} {}^\text{UT-TIM} \text{mar-ri Ū-UL da-ah-hu-un}\]
20 \[\text{IŠ-TU KA DINGIR} {}^\text{LIM} \text{-za-an da-ah-hu-un DINGIR} {}^\text{LIM} \text{-an-mu Ū-it}\]
21 \[\text{hi-en-ik-ta}\]

\(^{91}\) Transkripsiyon ve tercüme için kz. Götze 1925: 46, 47.
III. Hattušili ile Puduhepa’nın evlenmesinin yer aldığı yukarıdaki metinde, Hattušili’nin yeğeni Urhi-Tešupla olan mücadeledeki konu alır. Kral, Lawazantiya İstar’ın hizmetkâri ve İstar rahibi Pentipšarri’nin kızı Puduhepayla tanrının emriyle evlendiğini anlatmaktadır.  

24) KBo 3.1 (CTH 19.II.A, Telipinu fermanı)

II

20  ma-a-na-pa LUGAL-uš URU La-wa-az-za-an-ti-ya ú-wa-nu-un
  mLa-ah-ha-a[š-mu? ku-u-ru-ur?]
21  e-eš-ta nu URU La-wa-za-an-ti-ya-an wa-ag-ga-ri-ya-at na-an[ DINGIRMEŠ]
22  ki-iš-ša-ri-mi da-a-ir ha-an-te-ez-zi-ya-aš-ša UGULA LÚMEŠ LI-IM
  mD[U-]
23  mKar-ru-wa-aš UGULA LÚMEŠŠÀ.TAM mI-na-ra-aš UGULA
  LÚMEŠSAGILÀaKi-il-[(a-aš UGULA LÚMEŠx]
24  mD[U-mi-im-ma-aš UGULA LÚMEŠGISPA mZi-in-wa-še-li-iš Ū mLe-el-li[-iš]
25  me-eg-ga-e-eš nu mTa-nu-u-i LÚ GISPA du-ud-du-mi-li pi-i-e-e[r]

25) KUB 11.1+KBo 19.96 (CTH 19.II.B, Telipinu fermanı)

Öy. II

27*  nu URU Zi-iz-zi-li-ip-pí hu-ul-la-an-za-iš ki-ša-at
28*  ma-a-m[a-pa LUGAL-uš URU La-wa-za-an-ti-ya ú-wa-nu-un]
29*  mLa-ah-[ha-aš-mu ku-u-ru-ur e-eš-ta?]
30*  nu URU L[a-wa-za-an-ti-ya-an wa-ag-ga-ri-ya-at
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26) KBo 50.158

27) KBo 3.6

Öy. II

58 GIM-an-ma IŠ-TU KUR URUMi-iz-ri EGIR-pa i-yᵃ[-ah-ha-ha-at nu
I-NA URULa-wa-za]- an-ti-ya

59 A-NA DINGIR⁹⁵ ši-pa-an-tu-u-wa-an-zi i-yᵃ-ah-h[a-ha-at nu-za
DINGIR⁹⁵ i-yᵃ-nu-un]

60 [mu]-za DUMU.MUNUS mPu-en-ti-ip-šar-ri L⁰[SANGA Pu-du-hé-pa-an
IŠ-TU INIM DINGIR⁹⁵]

DINGIR⁹⁵ ŠA MU-TI₄ DAM]

95 Groddek bu kısmını, ]x(-)ka-r[U⁹⁵ şeklinde transkripsiyon yapmıştır. Ankara’da müzede orijinal tablet üzere-

Her paragraf, Kizzuwatna’daki binalar ve şehirlere ait nesnelerin listesine ayrılmış görünüyor. 2’-3’. satırlar, tanrıça’nın (Ištar?) bir heykelini betimliyor: “Onun göğsü gümüştendir, onun dizi gümüştendir.” 4’. satırda da büyük tapınaktan bahsedilmektedir.98

29) Üzerinde bir Tabarna-mührü bulunan LSU 6 = LhK 10 no’lu bir Hitit arazi bağışı listesi, Zaruna ile Lawazandiya kentleri arasında çok yakın bir mesafe bulunduğunu destekler mahiyette bilgilerle karşılaştırılmıştır.99 (CTH 222, Bilinmeyen kralın (tabarna) arazi bağış belgesi)

ü.k.

2 [ ] x^{HI.A} \text{ša-am}^{1-x}[^{101}]

3 [ ] r^{ù1} E \text{URU} Za-ru-{t}un^{1} -{t}[^{i}]^{102}

100 Forlanini 2013: 10’da, bu kısmı PA^{th.a} şeklinde okumustur.
101 Forlanini 2013: 10’da burayı ŠA(-)AM-{f/[N]}E… olarak kaydetmiştir.
102 Ankara’da müzede Ağustos 2014’de tablet üzerinde yapılan karşılaştırmaında, şehir ismini “\text{URU} Za-ru-{t}un^{1} -{t}[^{i}]” şeklinde olduğu tespit edildi. Forlanini 2013: 10’da burayı \text{URU} Za-ru-{t}un^{1} -{t}[^{i}] olarak okumustur.

30) KUB 16.8(+)KUB 52.79 (CTH 577, Birleştirilmiş Orakel, I. SU, KIN ve MUŞEN)

Ay.

1 'TÜ1TUM MUNUS.LUGAL a-pa-a-at-wa-za-kán ku-it DAM-KA tu-x [ 
2 ] x-ta 'İSTAR1URU La-wa-za-r'an1-ti-ya TUKU.TUKU-an-z[a
3 x x 'TE/SU'MEŞ1 NU.SIG5-du ir-li12 ZAG-za NU.SIG5[
4 'IŞ-1TU1 MUNUS ŠU.GI IR TÜM QA-TAM-MA-pát nu KIN NU.SIG5-du SIG5 'ME1-a[š nu SIG5]]

Forlanini 2013: 10’dan buraya [I-NA URU Lu-hu-uz]-za-an-di-ya olarak tamamlanmıştır.


URA(UH)WAZANTİYA “LA(HU)WAZANTİYA ŞEHİRİ”

5 ma-a-an a-ši ÛTUM A-NA MUNUS.LUGAL ÛN URA La-wa-za-an-
ti-y [a pa-ra-a IS-BAT’]

6 nu IGI-zî SU SIG₅-ru EGIR-ma NU.SIG₅-du IGI-zî SU ni ši ta KASKAL
[…SIG₅]

7 EGIR TEMEŠ ZÈ hi-li-ip-ši-ma-an […]SIG₅
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HOW A GOD OF NATURE BECAME A TUTELARY GOD OF THE KING

Alfonso ARCHI

1. The lists of the gods invoked in the political treaties as guarantors of the sworn agreements has, in third place after the Sun-goddess of Arinna and several epiclesis of the Storm-god, a group of male deities denoted by the Sumerogram KAL: dKAL of UNHatti, dKAL of Karahna, Zithariya, Karzi, Hapantali(ya), KAL of the hunting bag (KUSH kuršaš), dKAL LÍL “of the countryside”. Since the sign KAL, if preceded by the divine determinative, has to be read dLAMMA/ Lamassu according to the Sumerian and Akkadian tradition, many scholars transliterated the name dLAMMA. This became general use for Hittitologists after that Erich Neu normalized and updated (1989) the transcriptions of the Sumerian logograms according to the Assyrisch-babylonische Zeichenliste (1981) by Rykle Borger.

This reading raises, however, a problem of identity, because LAMMA was a female tutelary deity: not a male god! The most usual picture in the seals of the Ur III and Old Babylonian periods is that of the owner of the seal portrayed as being introduced to a major god by the goddess Lamassu, dressed in a kaunakes which covers her from her shoulders to her feet. The Hittite dKAL had several clear attributes of a tutelary deity, but he was undoubtedly a male deity. Now, it is true that sexual identity might have been questioned in Anatolia in later periods: in Phrygia the priests of Cybele, the famous Galli, renounced their masculinity in total obedience to their goddess Cybele. For earlier periods, Ištar/Šauška could provoke men to behave as women, and women as men; her cult did not foresee, however, a factual change of sex.

* Universita di Roma - La Sapienza
When the Egyptian scribes had to transfer the Hittite god-list of the treaty between Hattusili III and Ramses II into hieroglyphics (a list which they had received from the Hittites written in Akkadian), they consequently translated $d$LAMMA with “goddess” $ntr$, while Zithariya and Karzi (who belonged to the group of the KAL-gods) were denoted as $ntr$ “god”, because their name was not preceded by the logogram $d$LAMMA/KAL: $d$LAMMA KUR $Ḫatti = ntr n p3-t3 n Ḫt$; $d$Zithariya = $ntr n Ḫṃṯr$rṛy; $d$Karzi($š$) = $ntr n Karzis$; $Ḫapantaliya($š$) = $ntr n Ḫṃptlys$; $d$LAMMA $ḪU$R $Ḫaraṅna = ntr n Ḫm Ḫr$ (Edel 1997: 70-71, 99-100). The Egyptian scribes (or their consultants) had received, in fact, their proficiency in Asian cultures by studying the Akkadian lexical lists.

The Hittite scribes also had to study the Akkadian lexical lists. Those who worked on the Erimhuš list, which collects Sumerian-Akkadian entries by semantic associations, provided it with Hittite equivalents. Because $d$KAL had two Akkadian equivalents, that is the genii Lamassu (female) and Šēdu (male), the obscure Hittite couple $\text{annariš tarpis}$ was chosen for them (with the variant in a manuscript: $d$LAMA/KAL-$aš$; $MSL$ 17: 116; cfr. Veldhuis 2014: 274-275):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Sumerian)</th>
<th>(gloss)</th>
<th>(Akkadian)</th>
<th>(Hittite)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[dála]d</td>
<td>a-la</td>
<td>$ši-e-du / še-du$</td>
<td>$tar-pi-iš$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d.lamm]a</td>
<td>la-am-ma</td>
<td>$la-ma-sú$</td>
<td>$a-an-na-ri-iš / d$LAMMA/KAL-$aš$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The protective spirits Šēdu (masculine) and lamassu (feminine), representing a person’s good luck and vital force, played a major role in Mesopotamian religion. The Hittite translators could find for them only a flat, rarely attested rendering, which has nothing to do with the gods of the lists in the treaties; moreover, tarpis, if alone, has a negative meaning. $2$ Annari-$ “is the Luwoid equivalent of Hittite *innar(a)*- ‘strength, force, vigor’, with typical $a : i$ alternation” (Puhvel 1984: 62). The result is a paradoxical gender inversion:

---


In(n)ara-, a male deity, was the Hittite reading of $^d$KAL, while Ala was his female counterpart!

The fathers of Hittitology were perfectly aware that the nature of Mesopotamian LAMMA was very different from the Hittite KAL-gods, and Albrecht Goetze warned against considering all of them simply as tutelary gods. Annelies Kammenhuber and Hans Martin Kümmel have pronounced on the subject in the same vein. Only David Hawkins (and the present writer), however, refuse to transcribe this name as $^d$LAMMA.

It was Emmanuel Laroche, who, many years ago, with his usual insight, firmly established some clear points on this subject. On the one hand, the transcription $^d$KAL is consistent with the adjective KAL, Akk. $danānu$, $dannu$ “strong”. It is on the basis of the meaning “strong” that the equivalences $^d$KAL = $^d$In(n)ara-, $^d$KAL innarawuantes = Luw. Annarumenzi (cf. annari-), have been established. There is a play of words between Hattic inar(a-) and Hittite innarawant- (Volksetymologie; see below). On the other hand, the Hittite gods defined as $^d$KAL (+ a geographical name or simply a name) have a meaning, a function, which goes far beyond that of the Mesopotamian LAMMA/Lamassu. If we transfer the idea of Akk. Lamassu to the Hittite KAL-gods, we are eliminating any chance of understanding the nature of this group of deities.

2. Cun. $^d$KAL = hier. (DEUS)CERVUS (represented by a stag or its antler) has the Luwian reading Kurunta/Kuruntiya; later: Runtiya. Some seals of the late 13th century may have the PN CERVUS-ra/i, whose reading is therefore Hittite Innara (CERVUS-ra/i-wâ/i = Innarawa) as in cuneiform $^d$KAL-ri. D. Hawkins (2006: 51) has remarked: “The evidence suggests that at least by the time of Tuthaliya IV, the readings Innara and Kuruntiya for $^d$KAL // (DEUS)CERVUS were interchangeable and no longer regarded as separate deities”.

---

3 Goetze (1964: 91) writes: “In my opinion the equation $^d$KAL = $^d$Inar(a) has been by now talked about enough. ... What I dislike in these discussions is the persisting notion that $^d$KAL is a ‘protective’ or ‘tutelary’ deity. Is this not rather the consequence of the habit of translitering $^d$LAMA, clearly due to an interpretation which may be true in some cases, but certainly is invalid in others.”

The male partner of the great goddess of Karkamish: Kubaba, was Karḫuḫa, whose name is written in cuneiform 𒈨KAL (e.g. in the Deeds of Suppiluliuma). This logogram therefore classifies the main male deity of Karkamish as a Stag-god, suggesting that Karḫuḫa was a god of wild animals and hunting. According to Heiner Eichner (personal communication), Karḫuḫa could mean “horn; antler”, IE *krh₂-uh₂- (cfr. Hitt. karāwar “horn”; javest. srû-, sruuâ-). The attested writings are:

a) Ankara silver bowl: a personal name, Maza-Karhuha, whose second element is written (DEUS)CERVUS₂ (=ANTLER)-hu-ha
b) Karkamish A11b: (DEUS)CERVUS₂+ra/i-hu-ha-ia
c) Malatya 13: (DEUS.CERVUS)kar-hu-ha-sa

Eichner’s interesting interpretation presents, however, a problem: one has to explain how such a name (which looks, as a matter of fact, Anatolian) reached Karkamish, a city Semiticized from the 3rd millennium B.C., and under Hurrian influence at least from the 17th century B.C.

3. The iconography of the Stag-god is one of the most frequently represented. The most complex representation is that of the Schimmel silver rhyton: the god is depicted standing on a stag, receiving a libation; in his right hand he holds a crook, in his left hand an eagle, that is a bird of prey, as is explained by the idol of 𒈨KAL of Wiyanawanda. KUB 38.1 II 1-6: “Town of Wiyanawanda. KAL of the open country: [the image is] a gold statue(tte) of a man, standing, helmeted; in his right hand he holds a gold bow and in his left [hand] a gold eagle and a gold hare; a dagger of gold (decorated) with fruit; he stays on a gold stag on its four (legs as) socle; silver [...]” (von Brandenstein 1943: 14-15). The god is denoted here by his bird of prey and the animal hunted by it: a hare, as well as in the Yeniköy stele (probably from Alaca Höyük). The stag and bow belong to the iconography of this god, e.g. in the Altînyayla stele, where the god holds in his left hand an antler (Müller-Karpe 2003). The hare belongs to this god in the Late Hittite relief

5 KBo 5.6 III 33-35 (//= KBo 14.12(+) III 5-7: [nu] šarâżzi gurti ŠA Ƌ[Ku-ba-ba Ū ŠA ƋKAL ma[nninkâan] ᖇL kuinki tarnaš. “since my father feared the gods, on the upper citadel he let no one approach the deities Ku-baba and KAL”); Güterbock 1956: 95; Del Monte 2008: 89, 93.
of Hacı Bebekli.

In the Shimmel rhyton, the necessity of representing In(n)ara / Kurunti(ya) on his animal had the result (unusual for our idea on perspective) that the female figure sitting behind him is represented in far larger proportion. The legenda of this goddess is: á-x (that is: Ala) DEUS₺ₓ-FILIA (Hawkins 2006: 52). Ala was, therefore, not the spouse of In(n)ara / Kurunti(ya) (as was previously thought), but his daughter. Behind the two deities there are two spears and a quiver with arrows: the weapons used for hunting, and the hunting bag. The victim, a stag, lies below a tree. Between the stag representing the god and the slain stag there is no contradiction. Hunting is allowed, if some particular procedures are followed. The story of the hunter Appu is just one example of what hunting may demand in a traditional society: the violence which provoked a death always had to be restored through a ritual action ensuring substitution (Burkert 1983).

4. Because KAL was considered just a Tutelary god, former Hittitologists explained his most usual cult attribute, the KUŠkurša-, as a “shield”. The gods Zithariya and KAL (that is In(n)ara) of Hatenuwa (a town not far from Nerik), were worshiped in the form of a KUŠkurša in their particular “Temple of the KUŠkurša”. A well known text published by Otten (1959) concerning the renewal rite of those images prescribed that the old KUŠkursa were brought to a temple outside the capital: “[When] they renew the [two] KUŠkursa [of] Zithariya and KAL of Hatenuwa, whether in the ninth year, or whenever they renew them, the time is not prescribed. When they bring the two new KUŠkursa of Zithariya and KAL of Hatenuwa (to Ḫattuša), they take them into the ‘Temple of the KUŠkursa’. The place is prescribed: just below the place of the god(-image) the pegs are driven in: they hang them (the KUŠkursa) there” (KUB 55.43 I 1-10).

An oracle inquiry concerning the return of the king from a military campaign and putting Zithariya back into his temple (this inquiry undoubtedly refers to the second day of the nuntarriyashas Festival, therefore in Autumn), shows that ḪKAL/In(n)ara (certainly in form of a KUŠkurša) accompanied the king
on his military campaigns: “When His Majesty (re)turns from the (military)
campaign and when they release Zithariya to his temple, with respect to the
festival which (on that occasion) will be performed for him, 10 bucks (etc.)
are immolated”. (ABoT 14+ V 12’-16’; Howink ten Cate 1988: 180-181).

A shield could indeed have been a suitable representation of a tutelary god
accompanying the king in war. Hans G. Güterbock, however, has shown
that the KUŠkurša was a hunting bag. This fact compels us to correct our
interpretation of the sphere of influence of this god.

The KUŠkurša bag used in hunting, made by fleece, symbolized prosperity
in the Telepinu Myth (of Hattian origin): it was full of “sheep fat, animal
fecundity, wine, cattle and sheep, longevity and progeny”.

This symbolism, together with the idea of some kind of protection in war,
goes back to the Hattian culture: Hattian gods, such as Kappariyamu and
Kantipuitti, were also represented by a KUŠkurša (Popko 1978: 112; Haas

How may the two aspects - hunting and war - be reconciled? The noble
art of hunting was an activity characterizing kingship. Hawkins (2006) has
devoted an article to this, and some of the Alaca reliefs concern the hunting
of a lion, a boar and a stag.6 Hunting needed strength and courage; moreover,
it brought the hunter into direct contact with the mystery of uncontaminated
Nature. For this reason kings (e.g., Tutḫaliya IV(?) in Kammer 2 of the
Südburg) and princes may have been portrayed with bow and spear.

It is hardly necessary to stress the role of hunting in a Neolithic society:
Çatal Hüyük provides impressive images. The bull played a fundamental
role in the ideology of the Neolithic period: its brute force, and the dangers
involved in hunting it, made of the bull the symbol of the violent force
of Nature. This animal, the largest of the period, was represented in the
collective imagination by its horns; bucrania were collected in depositories
or hung on the walls of houses. Domestication provoked a transformation

6 The Kınık - Kastamonu bowl represents hunting scenes with deer, ibexes, and boars (Emre-Çınaroğlu 1993:
684-703).
in its cognitive image, accomplishing the anthropomorization of the god symbolising violence, and the bull was associated with a god in human shape, in a more domestic role. The bull as the primordial image of the Storm-god, embodied the essence of this deity.

Female deities are also often placed in relation with the world of the wilderness. The famous so-called “mother-goddess” of Çatal Hüyük, a steatopygous woman in the process of giving birth, is seated on a throne flanked by two leopards. This is undoubtedly a Mother-goddess, but not the image of the archetypal Mediterranean Great Mother as she was expounded by Johann J. Bachofen (1861). The relationship Nature-mother-fecundity, so widespread in ancient cultures, is a “primordial image” of the psyche, which in Anatolia never found its realization in a single Great Mother, but in different forms according to different religious experiences.

At an archaic period, that of the Hattian culture (about 22nd century B.C.), among the extraordinary finds from the royal tombs of Alaca Höyük, there are disks or standards in round form which symbolize the Sun: in this particular case the Sun-goddess of Arinna (Alaca Höyük was Arinna); bulls representing the Storm-god and stags representing the wilderness. The religious experience of this society was therefore, realised in the light of the sun: the prerequisite of life; in natural phenomena: the Storm-god, and in Nature, where human beings lived.

There are also other aspects which completed such experiences. The nude female figurine in silver and gold from Hasanoğlu, and the ivory one from Kültepe (first centuries of the 2nd millennium), present distinctive features related to fecundity, very different from the Çatal Höyük figurines.

The life of uncontaminated Nature means its wild animals. They are called “the animals of the gods” in the K.LAM festival, of Hattian origin, whose manuscripts are in part in Old Script (Singer 1983, 1984). A central event of this festival was a procession of images of wild animals: a silver panther, a golden lion, a silver boar, a lapis lazuli boar, a silver bear. Stags followed in a separate group, and their description gave prominence to the antlers.
This fragmentary passage lists: a golden stag, a silver stag with antlers, a silver stag with antlers in gold, a silver deer without antlers. These must have been large images, because they were “pulled, dragged” by several men. The king and queen sit first outside the gate of the palace to view the procession of these “animals of the gods”: “At the gate-house of the gods, the priest of dKAL (Inar) keeps the head (of the procession), (i.e.) ‘the holy priest’ of dKAL (Inar)”. This procession was followed by a group of hunters, what means that animals, although sacred, could be hunted under particular conditions. The royal couple then rides in chariots to the gate of the temple of the Grain-goddess Ḫalki. The following station of the royal procession was the gate of the goddess of Growth: Miyatanzipa.

The KI.LAM festival introduces, therefore, first the animals representing uncontaminated Nature; then the procession moves towards two deities who, embodying agricultural production, represent Nature tamed by man.

The late manuscripts of this festival have the logogram dKAL; the older manuscripts of this festival use instead the phonetic writing: DI-na-ar, which most probably refers to the goddess Inar, whose cult in Hattusa is well attested by manuscripts in Old Ductus. According to the Illuyanka myth, of Hattian origin, Inar was the goddess of the countryside, of the wilderness (gimra-, LÍL), the realm opposed to the areas which hosted the human beings. A female deity of the wild animals is quite widespread: in the Greek religion it was Artemis who ruled over hunting. Agamennon, having killed a deer of her herd and boasted that he was a better hunter than her, was not allowed to sail with the Mycenaen fleet from Aulis against Ilios (the land of Wilusa) until he assented to sacrifice his daughter Iphigenia, who was, however, transformed into a deer at the very last moment by the compassionate Artemis.

The different manuscripts of the KI.LAM festival clearly attest to the transmission of some functions and attributes of the Hattian goddess I-na-ar (Inara- with the Hittite thematic vowel) to the Hittite In(n)ara, Luwian Kurunta, or, more probably, a correspondence of functions between

---

7 See the ritual for the royal couple, KBo 17.3+4(+), CTH 416.B, in the passages listed by Neu 1983: 342.
8 On the possible assimilation of the goddess Inar(a) with Tetešṣapi, see Pecchioli Daddi 2011/2013: 614, with bibliography.
the two deities. The diffusion of the Hunting god holding an eagle or hare in the seals of the karum Kanesh (Özgüç 1965: 66-67 and pl. XXI, 64; XXII, 65; XXIII 69) reveals the presence of the cult of this male god outside the Hattian milieu, in the kingdom of Kaneš were Hittite culture had already spread.

The Hittite pantheon included Hattian deities according the following typologies:

a) the coexistence of deities with the same functions: the Hattian Fate-goddesses Papaya and Išduštaya coexisted with the Hittite Gulšeš, having two different domains. The first two were relegated to the cult of kingship, at Ḫattuša; the sphere of the second ones concerned all the people, and they appear frequently in rituals (Archi 213);

b) the total assimilation of a Hittite deity into a Hattian one: the god of Light was assimilated into the Hattian Sun-goddess: Eštan/Istanu-;

c) the correspondence of functions: the Hattian Storm-god Taru and the Hittite Tarhunt- held the same place in the Hattian-Hittite cultic celebrations. The same is the case of the Hattian goddess Kataḫzipuri and the Hittite Kamrušepa (Haas 1994: 438-441; Klinger 1996: 155-159).

d) the attribution of similar functions to deities of different sex: the domains of the Hattian goddess Inar and that of the Hittite god denominated with the epithet Innara(want)- “the strong / powerful one”, were, in both cases, uncontaminated Nature. The assonance of the two names facilitated this process.

That In(n)ara, a male god, was a Hittite deity, not received by the Hattian tradition, is proven by the fact that he had his equivalent in the Luwian Kurunta: a god with the same functions and symbols.

5. The AN.TAḪ.ŠUM or Spring-festival (and its parallel: the nuntarriyašhaš or Autumn-festival) received its complex structure at least at the time of Suppiluliuma I (the outline of the festival was commented by Güterbock,
1960). It included many rites and single festivals which had their origin in the Hattian period (e.g., the rite of the *harsiyalli*, the pithos, filled in Autumn and opened in Spring). The KI.LAM festival, which is the festival documented by the largest number of manuscripts, had to be celebrated probably in the 25th and 27th days of the *munṭarrīyašāṣa*s-, according to a suggestion by Howink ten Cate (1988: 193-194), supported by Nakamura (2002: 80-81, 125-130). The procession of the “animals of the gods”, introduced by the “holy priest of Inara”, and closed by hunters, therefore fell in Autumn having, as did all the festival rites, a cyclical nature.

The AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festival prescribed that the king and queen had to enter Ḫattuša so as to take possession of the capital of the kingdom in inaugurating a new yearly cycle. Therefore, “if the king spends the winter up in Ḫattuša, then ... the king and queen go from Ḫattuša to Taḫurpa”, where the “great assembly”, šalli ašešsar, takes place (1st day). Moving from Taḫurpa, the next day the king reaches Tippuwa, which was in sight of Ḫattuša, towards which the king bows. In Ḫattuša, he reaches the stele of the Sun-goddess of Arinna. Parallel to the king and queen, the hunting bag (*KUŠ kurša*) of Zitḫariya (the image which accompanies the king in war) comes from Arinna in three days, and having reached Ḫattuša, is placed in the temple of the Sun-goddess. Also in the *munṭarrīyašaš* festival, the royal couple and Zitḫariya (one of the KAL gods) had to enter Ḫattuša coming from outside.

During the year, Zitḫariya’s hunting bag was kept apparently in the temple of this god in Ḫattuša. Both the royal couple and the god Zithariya, who represented therefore an important aspect of kingship, had to inaugurate the new cycle of the year.

How can we explain this peculiar parallelism between king and tutelary god of Nature, whose function finds its expression in the image of a stag (an animal which inspires fascination), and also in a hunting bag, which symbolize the violation of Nature by killing its inhabitants (as is depicted on the Schimmel rython)?

For the Hittites, the opposition human society - untouched Nature did not mean culture versus wilderness since Nature was inhabited by the Divine, represented by wild animals. The direct relation between animals and gods is exemplified by
the theriomorphic vessels *BIBRU* (like the Schimmel rhyton), each of which was devoted to a particular god and which were used in the festival of the Hattian-Hittite tradition (Carruba 1967; Tuchelt 1962).

The stag, a majestic animal which does not attack human beings, might stand for Nature in general. A slight parallel may be offered by the relevance of the stag in European folklore. Antlers were the most widespread decorative elements in the country residences of the upper class in central and northern Europe.

The well known text KUB 2.1 lists first 112 names of In(n)ara / "d\textsuperscript{KAL}, which are the expressions of royal power: “In(n)ara of the heroism, of the army, of the battle, (and so on)”; then, a similar number of attributions for "d\textsuperscript{Ala} follows. The text ends in this way: “To all the mountains (and) lands of the land of Ḫatti in which His Majesty Tutḫaliya regularly campaigns *(lahhiyaiskizzi)*, to all the mountains of the land Ḫatti which His Majesty Tuthaliya, the great king, regularly hunts *(siyatalliskizzi)*” (McMahon 1991: 96-115).

Ala, the daughter of In(n)ara (as the inscription of the Schimmel rhyton has revealed), was created in a later period, providing the god with a counterpart (as was the custom), in adopting the second reading of "d\textsuperscript{KAL}: "d\textsuperscript{álad given to the logogram in the Erimḫuš lexical list (above), whose pronunciation is explained as: a-la! A literary influence on the litany KUB 2.1 is evident: In(n)ara and Ala assume the meaning of “tutelary, beneficient protective genii”, like Akk. *šēdu* and *lamassu*.

The Hittite and Luwian Stag-god was the tutelary-god of Nature, which was also under royal authority, because the king defined his territory by campaigning and shooting. It was for this reason that the king had a particular relation with In(n)ara: from the foundation of the kingdom, this god accompanied the king in his military expeditions.

In a later time the aspect of In(n)ara / Kurunta as tutelary god of the king was accomplished drawing up a list (KUB 2.1) which describes all the activities and manifestations of the king, each of them being under the protection of Innara / Kurunta.
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HİTİTLERDE FAL ANLAYIŞININ METİNLERE YANSIMALARI

Sedef AYYILDIZ

ÖZET

M.Ö. 2. Binyılda Anadolu’da büyük bir devlet kurmuş olan Hititler hakkında bilgilerimiz Boğazköy (Hattuşa) ve son yüzyılda keşfedilen Ortaköy (Şapinuva), Maşat Höyük (Tapığga), Kuşaklı (Şarişša), Kayalıpinar (Şamuha) ve Oymaağaç (Nerik) gibi merkezlerde yapılan arkeolojik kazılar sonucunda ele geçen çivi yazılı belgeler sayesinde her geçen gün artmaktadır. Bu merkezlerde ele geçen çivi yazılı metinler devletin arşivine ait olan belgelerdir. Bu belgeler içerisinde yer alan fal metinleri sayesinde Hititlerin yaşamında falın çok önemli bir yer tuttuğunu ve çok geniş bir kullanım alanına sahip olduğunu da öğrenmektediriz. Ele geçen bu belgeler devlet devlet arşivi olduğu için daha çok kral, kraliyet ailesi ve yüksek dereceli memurların fal ile ilgili münasebetlerini görmektediz ancak bu durum halkın fala karşı ilgisiz olduğu şeklinde yorumlanmamalıdır. Boğazköy’de¹, Ortaköy’de², Maşat Höyük’tə³, Kuşaklı’d’a⁴ ele geçen mek-tupalarda dahi fal ile ilgili mevzuların olması, Hititlerin yaşamında fal kullanımının yaygınlığını göstermesi bakımından da önemlidir.

Bin tanrılı halk olarak bilinen Hititlerin, yaşamında din son derece önemli bir role sahiptir. Hititlerin düşüncede yapısına göre başlarına gelen veya gelmesi muhtemel pek çok sorun kaynağıında tanırın ihmal edilmişsi ya da geç-mişte işlenmiş herhangi bir suç, bir günah nedeniyle tanırların kızdırılması

* Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, Bitlis Eren Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü
1 KBo XV 28, KUB XXXI 101.
2 Or. 90/1775, Or. 90/1000.
3 HKM 47, HKM 48, HKM 49.
4 KuT 49, KuT 50.


Hititler de falı kullanan diğer toplumlar gibi faaliyetlerini yaparak, faaliyetin amacı ise çeşitli araçlar ve teknikler kullanmışlardır. Zaman içerisinde olayların arkasındaki gerçek nedenleri öğrenme arzusunun etkisiyle fala olan ilgi artmış ve bunun sonucunda ihtiyaçlar doğrultusunda da fal türleri giderek çeşitlenmiştir.

Fal metinleri konu bakımından zengindir ve bazı olaylar sadece fal metinleri vasıtasıyla bilinebilmektedir. Bunlar: Arma-datta meselesi6, Haittili ve Pi(-

ya)şšili’nin öldürülmeleri⁷, Halpa-ziti’nin öldürülmesi⁸, Azzi-Hayaşa kralı Hukkana’nın vasallığından ayrılmış⁹, Büyük kralın da katılmasıyla “atalar mezarı” (⁴NA hánuššá) malzemelerinin yağmalanması¹⁰, Mašhuiluwa meselesi¹¹, bir şahsin tarlada ölü olarak bulunması¹², Pala adında bir şahın iki adet koyunu çalıp onları öldürmesi¹³, Arma-datta’nın karısı Šaušgatti’nin öldürümesi¹⁴, Danuhepa’nın mal ve mülkünün elinden alınması¹⁵, Tawananna meselesi¹⁶, Pešušpu meselesi¹⁷, Urhi-Tešup’un öğrencilerinin mallarının hıçkırıldığı⁸, m⁵DU.SUM’un kral tarafından makamından atılması¹⁹.


Kral ve kraliyet ailesini ilgilendiren meselelerle ilgili olan günümüzde kadar gelebilen fal metinlerinde daha çok tanrılardaki ihmal edilmesi, adakların yerine getirilmemesi, işlenen bir suçun unutulması gibi konulara yer verildiği görülmektedir. Tanrının gazabından korkan insanlığının çaresizliğini dua

---

⁷ KUB XVI 77 (II) 55 vd.
⁸ KUB XVI 58 ay. 6; KUB XXII 35 III 9.
⁹ KUB XVIII 2 III 10 vd.
¹⁰ KUB V ay. 31 vd.
¹² KUB XVIII 9 II 17 vd.
¹³ KUB XVI 21 I 28 vd.
¹⁴ KBo II 6 + II 37 vd.; Ünal 1974: 102 vd.
¹⁵ KUB XVI 32 II 1 vd.
¹⁶ Ünal 1974: 37 vd., a.n. 6 vd.
¹⁷ KUB XVI 41 + 7/7 ay. III vd.; KUB XLIX 97.2; Ünal 1974: 165 vd.
¹⁸ KUB XVI 32 II 14 vd.
metinlerinde açıkça görmek mümkündür. Zira aşağıdaki metinde de görülüğü gibi tanrılara kızdırılmasını sadece bir kişi etkileyebilecek bir durum değildir.


Faf metinlerinde gerçeklerin ortaya çıkarması, büyük oranda tanrıyla insan arasındaki karşılıklı menfaatin rolü gerektiğini, söz konusudur. Bir Hitit direktif metninde geçen aşağıdaki sözler tanrıya doğruyu söylemenin gerektiğini ve ondan kaçılamayacağını gösteren en güzel örneklerden biridir.


22 KUB XXIV 3 öy. I 21-28 (CTH 376).
24 Schuler 1957: 46, metin yerli A II 42 vd.
Fal metinlerinden alınan bütün önlemlere rağmen ancak yine de eşyaların ve kült aletlerinin zaman zaman tahrip olduğu, kaybolduğu, bazı yolsuzlukların meydana geldiği anlaşılmaktadır. Kaybolan eşyalar için tanrının kızgınlığının tespit edildiği aşağıdaki fal metni durumu kısaca özetlemektedir:


Tapınak görevlilerinin altın, gümüş gibi kıymetli mal varlıklarını olamazdı. Ne kendilerinin ne de ailelerinin bu eşyaları kullanımları yasaktı. Ancak

26 XXII 65 II 30 vd.; XLIX 30 öy. 16 vd.; IBoT II 129 öy. 5 vd.; Süel 1990: 522.
tapınak görevlilerine saraydan armağan olarak altın, gümüş verildiğinde\textsuperscript{28}, bu hediyenin niteliği, ağırlığı ve ne zaman verildiğinin şahitleri huzurunda belgelenmesi gerekliydi. Bu armağanı tapınak görevlisi evinde tutamazdı. Satması gerekliydi. Satış Hattı beylerin huzurunda yapılır ve bir belge düzenlenirdi. Sonra bu belge saraya sunulup mührürlendiren\textsuperscript{29}. Böylece tanrıların mallarını üzerine yapılabilecek suistimal önlenmeye ve güvenli altına alınmaya çalışılmıştır. Tapınak hizmetlilerine ilgili metinde “Siz sadece tanrıların mallarının bekçisineriniz.” Şeklinde vurgulanmaktadır\textsuperscript{30}. Tapınak eşyalarının, kült aletlerinin kaybolması veya kırılması durumunda, rahip, merhemli rahip, tanrı analarının bunların yerine yenilseri temin etmeleri gerektğini BĒL MADGALTI enstrüksiyonundan öğrenmektedir\textsuperscript{31}

Hitit inanışına göre tanırlarında insanlar gibi bir ruhu ve bir bedeni vardır. Onlarda doğal olarak insanlar gibi öfkelenebilirler, ihtimam görmek isterler ve hoş tutulmak isterleri. Ancak insanoğlu tarafından tanrılar unutulursa ve onlar ihmal edilirse bunun sonucunda da çok kötü şeyler olabilir. Bu nedenle tanrıların memnuniyeti Hitit insanı için son derece önemlidi. Onları memnuniyeti için düzenli olarak kurbanları sunulmalı, bayramları kutlanmalı ve hediyeleri tam olarak verilmeliydi. Tanrının kızdırılması insana her defasında ceza olarak geri dönemeğinden son derece önemli olan bu hususla ilgili olan ifadelere metinlerde de yer verilmiştir:

İnsan(lar)ın ve tanrıların ruhen herhangi bir farklı (var mıdır)? Asla bir (fark) yok(tur). (Onlar) ruhen bir(dir). Bir köle beyinin huzuruna çıktığı zaman o yıkanmış ve temiz (elbiseler) giyinmiştir. Ve ona yiyecek verir ya da ona içecek verir. Beyi yiyip içtiğinden ruhen rahatlanış(tır) ve ona (karşı) hoşnutluk duyar. Ayrıca o devamlı ihtimam görmüse (kölesini) suçlamaz. Tanrının ruhu da herhangi bir (sekilde) farklı (midir)? Eğer, ne zaman kölesi beyini kızdırırsa onu ya öldürler ya da onun burnunu, gözlerini, kulaklarını yaralarlar ya da onu, karısını, çocuklarını, erkek

\textsuperscript{28} Archi 1978: 26 vd. da Kral ve kraliçenin bayram törenlerinde LÚ. MES SUKUR ya da LÚ. MES UR.GI, sere hediye olarak altın ve gümüş verdikleri ABoT 9, KBo XVII 74, KBo XXI 25 I 46-50, KUB II 5, 20-24'den bilinmektedir.

\textsuperscript{29} Süel 1985: 40 vd. 164 vd.

\textsuperscript{30} KUB XIII 4 öy. II 25 vd.; Süel 1985: 40 vd.

\textsuperscript{31} Schuler 1957: 46 vd.
kardeşini, kız kardeşi, hissımı, soyunu ister köle ister cariye (olsun) [yakalar]lar. O adı geçeni öte yana çağırırlar (da) ona hiçbir şey yapmazlar mı? Ne zaman o ölüm cezasına çarptırılırsa, tek başına ölmez, soyu da ona katılır32.

Aşağıdaki enstrüksiyon metninde de görüldüğü gibi temiz olarak tanırların hizmetlerini yerine getirmek ve onları ihmal etmemek gerekirdi. Tanırlaraerekli özen gösterilmeden yapılan hizmetlerin cezası öldü. Eğer ki herhangi bir şekilde insanın gözünden kaçan ihmalлер varsa onu da tanrı bulur ve cezalandırırıldı.


Tanırların evleri olan tapınakların devamlı suretle temiz tutulmaları doğal olarak yapının da korunması anlamına gelmektedir. Yazılı belgelerde de görüldüğü gibi hizmetliler her gün tapınakları siler, süpürür, su ve güzel kokular serper ve kokulu bitkilerle tütsülerdir. Hizmetlilerin yapıları temiz tutmaları gerektiğini gibi, kendilerini de her türlü pislikten arındırmaları ve tanrılara bedensel ve ruhsal olarak temiz hizmet vermeleri söz konusuydu. Tanırlara ait kült aletlerinden kirilenlerin rahipler tarafından temizlenmesi hususunu da yine fal metinlerinden öğrenmektedir.

Fal, büyü ve dua metinleri sayesinde diğer metinlerden farklı olarak o dönemde insannın hangi sıkıntı ve sorunlarla mücadele ettikleri ve bunlarla baş edebilmek için nasıl yöntemler geliştirildiklerini anlamak mümkündür. Çaresiz kaldığı durumlarla insanoğlunun tanırlara iletişim kurmak, tanırların istekleri ve arzuları hakkında bilgi sahibi olmak, için dua metinlerinde de rüyalara ve fala başvurulduğunu yine Hitit metinlerinde görmektedir. İnsanlar tanrılardan niyetlerini bir şekilde belli etmesini isterecekler. Bunun için onların gönderdikleri işaretleri bir şekilde yorumlamak veya niyetlerini öğrenmek amacıyla bazı fal sorgulamaları yürütülürdü. Fal metinlerine bakıldığında daha çok ilahi öfkenin sebebini tespit edebilmek için fal sorularının kullanılıldığı görülmektedir.

Kantuzili’nin duası olarak bilinen metin Hititlerin tanrırlarla olan ilişkilerini, insanın tanrı karşısındaki acızını ve başlarına musallat olan kötü durumlardan kurtulmak için hangi yollara başvurduğunun en yalin şekilde özetlemektedir. Metin şöyledir:

Kantuzili’nin Duası (CTH 373)³⁶

Öfkenin tanrıların huzurunda Yalvarma

[Hangi] tanrı öfkelendiysese, o tanrı gözlerini başka tarafı çevirdi, ve Kantuzili’nin hareket etmesine izin vermiyor. Bu tanrı ister cennette, isterse yeryüzünde olsun, sen, Ey İstanu, ona gitmelisin. Git, benim tanrımla konuş [ve şöyle de (?)].

³⁴ KUB IX 15 ay. III 5-17 (CTH: 456).

Hitit metinlerine bakıldığında dua, fal ve rüyaya başvurulma sebebi olarak tanrıının isteğini öğrenme ve buna göre telafi yollarına gitme söz konusu olsa da rüya bu ikisine göre daha çok manipüle edilebilir. Fal ile dua arasındaki temel benzerlik her ikisinde de başlarak gelen sorunun nedeniyle daha çok sorunun ortaya çıktığı yerin temeline inme ve çözüm için çareler arama amacı söz konusudur. Ancak fal metinlerinde dua metinlerinden farklı olarak alınan ifadeler ve edinilen bilgiler, doğruluk açısından karşı bir denetime tabii tutulmuştur. Metinde geçen şu ifadeler bu fikri destekler niteliktedir: “Ammatalla ne söylediysen, (onun bu) ifadesinin geçik olup olmadığı henüz araştırdık. (bundan başka bu ifadeyi) fal sorusu kapsam içine almamız.”

Fal uygulamalarında cevabı aranan sorular fal uzmanları tarafından uygunlanan falın çeşidine göre değişiklik gösterse de, tanrılarla yönetilmektediydi. Cevabinin nasıl verildiği hakkında teknik olarak herhangi bir bilgiye şu an için sahip olamasak dahi falların sonuçları fal uzmanları tarafından yorumlanmaktadır.

38 KUB XXII 70 öy. 30,31; Terc. için bkz. Ünal 1983: 59.
Fal metinlerinde bahsedilen bazı olaylar tarihi ve coğrafi açıdan büyük değer taşıyan çeşitli ülke ve kentlere yapılan askeri seferler, kralın tahta çıkması, kralın kışı geçireceği yerler, orduğahta salgın hastalık, tanrı heykeli ve diğer nesnelerin tahribi, kralın göz hastalığına karşı bazı şifalı otların kullanılması, tanrı heykellerinin nakli, kurban ve adakların ihmalı ve tanrılarnın aldıltılması gibi genel krallığı ilgilendiren meseleler söz konusu olabileceği gibi bir rahibin bira içtiği aleti tapınağa getirmesi ve onu tanrıya sunum yaparak kullanmak gibi ender de olsa özel hayatla ilgili fallarda söz konusudur.


Fal metinlerinde tanrıyla insanın doğrudan sorunun çözümü için karşıya karşıya geldikleri durumlar söz konusu olduğu için bu metinlerde başka metinlerde daha önce bahsi geçmemeyen, tarihsel gerçekliği sorgulanan, başka hiçbir yerde itiraf edilmiş, hükümlanmış, gerçeklerin ortaya çıkarıldığı ve dolayısıyla diğer tarihi belgelerde olmayan bilgiler mevcuttur.

Fal metinleri gerçeklikleri ve güvenilirlikleri açısından diğer metin türlerine göre, fal bakırtan kişinin sorunun çözümü için tanrından yardım alabilmek ve tanrılın vereceği cezalandan kaçınmak için, dalar, mahkeme tutanakları, fermanlar, antlaşma metinleri, daha farklı metinlerdir.

Kent dışında bulunan tapınakların geniş arazilerinde tanrılara sunulan sebze ve meyve yetiştirilir ayrıca kurban edilecek hayvanlarda bu arazilerde beslenirdi. Tanrının mali sayılan bu ürünün değiştirilmesi, satılması, yenilmesi, rüşvet olarak amirlere verilmesi gibi yolsuzlukların önlenmesi vazifesine tapınak görevlilerine verilmiştir. Ancak tapınak görevlilerinin de bu gibi yolsuzluklar yapmaları halinde direktif metinlerine ağır

40 Ünal 1983: 8, 9, 12.
41 Süel 1985: 173 vd.
cezalar konularak tanrılın kurban maddelerinin korunmasına çalışılmıştır. Bütün bu sert önlemlere rağmen bu konuda da suistimallerin yapıldığı, yine elimize geçen fal metinlerinden anlaşılmatmaktadır. Tanrının gazabından bu kadar korkan insanoğlunun yine de tanrının gözlerini tutması ve tanrıyla ilgilenmemesi bir ironidir.
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TOWARDS AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE GENDERED HITTITE LANDSCAPE: WHAT DOES IT MEAN WHEN MOUNTAINS GIVE BIRTH?

Mary R. BACHVAROVA*

There has been a rich vein of scholarship exploring the Hittite fascination with mountains as cult places and as recipients of cult. Gonnet (1968) listed more than 150 mountains mentioned in Hittite texts.¹ Haas (1982; 1983) has provided important analyses of the meaning of mountains that remain the basis for scholarly work, while Lombardi (1996; 1997) has deepened our understanding of how mountain imagery was used to support the hegemony of the Hittite king.² It is, however, important to re-visit certain assumptions that lie behind many scholars' work, in particular the notion of the "Mountain Mother" as a divine archetype. In this contribution I clarify some points with regard to the symbolism of mountains in Hittite myth, moving away from a history of ancient religion subtended by an old-fashioned anthropological viewpoint that looks for human universals evolving in a certain direction, to one that one that looks at human activities and cultural products as contingent and particular. I avoid sweeping generalizations about a supposed

* Willamette University, Salem, OR, USA.

¹ Del Monte and Tischler (1978), with the update in del Monte (1992), remains a key reference source on the mountains mentioned in Hittite texts. I thank Aygül Süel for allowing me to submit my contribution to this volume well after the deadline, which meant that I was able to make use of important additions to the conversation about the Hittite view of mountains published very recently.

² Other recent important studies include Beckman (2013: 153-6), examining mountains and living rock as sacred spaces, which includes recent bibliography; Freu (2003), discussing geographical information that can be gleaned; Lebrun (2006), focusing on oronymy; and Popko (1992) on mountains as sanctified spaces for ritual activities.
"Anatolian" mythical mindset that promiscuously combines data from the Neolithic, Bronze and Early Iron Ages, a point of view that has played a role in the creation of the "Mountain Mother," a conception that has in turn prevented us from achieving an emic understanding of the meaning of mountains for the Hittites. I will argue the following: Among the Hittites, mountains and living rocks, when assigned gender, are always gendered male. Therefore, when mountains or living rock are impregnated or give birth, they are considered to be male entities able to carry out a feminine activity. Thus, mythological texts can use volcanic imagery to explore the binaries of human gender, sexuality, and procreation.

First of all, the gender of mountains. All known personified depictions of mountains are male, and it was kings (Ammuna, Arnuwanda, Tudḫaliya), not queens, who were named after mountains (also cf. the man's name Kaššu). We must take care not to confuse the deity for whom the mountain serves as a throne – a concept well attested among the Hittites, who in fact named at least one mountain "throne" (šarpa) – and the mountain itself. The same applies for a Mesopotamian comparandum, the goddess Ninḫursag 'lady mountain', who is not the mountain itself, but associated with mountains in memory of her son Ninurta's exploits conquering the rebellious stone monster Asag (Ninurta's Exploits 390-410).

There is, however, one apparent exception to the general rule that among the Hittites mountains were conceptualized as male that must be addressed,

---

3 For the iconography of mountain gods, see Calmeyer (1999) and Danrey (2006). Danrey (2006: 215) suggests an image on a Middle Bronze Age Syrian seal depicting a woman on top of a mountain might represent a female mountain divinity (Doumet 1992: No. 273). Note she stands on the mountain, rather than is the mountain itself.

4 DEUS.MONS.THRONUS = Mt. Šarpa (Forlanini 1987; Güterbock, Hoffner and van den Hout 1989 ff. Š: 288). According to Forlanini (1987) one Mt. Šarpa is at Emirgazi, close to Ikona in Lycaonia, another is at Karakuyu (see Ehringhaus 2005: 49-50 for a description of the monument and the Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription on the latter mountain). Hawkins (2006: 57-8, 61) now prefers to place the Mt. Šarpa mentioned at Emirgazi at nearby Arisama Dağ and, like Lombardi (1998: 76), disagrees on the need to postulate two separate mountains. Wyatt (1995: 108-11) suggests that the Greek name Kassios of Ugaritic Mt. Ṣapon, the home of Baal/Teššub, is similarly from Ugaritic kṣu 'throne'.

5 So, for example Haas (1982: 94-104) in his section on "Bergmütter." As for the depiction of the deity carved into living rock at Mt. Sipylus, which Haas (1982: 69-72) sees as female, as do many scholars, I discuss this in Bachvarova (forthcoming), but see already the judicious discussion of Ehringhaus (2005: 84-7), who ends up interpreting the figure as male. Certainly, in the post-Classical period the mountain is depicted as a man on coinage (Foss 1982: 184).
the mountain Išḫara in Cilicia. This mountain is mentioned in a New Hittite tablet concerning emoluments that were set aside for a shrine on its flanks, CTH 641.1 = KUB 40.2. This passage is regularly cited in discussions of the Syrian goddess Išḫara's cult among the Hittites to support the thesis that she arrived in Anatolia via Cilicia before the fifteenth century. The tablet records the renewed commitment of a Hittite king (Šuppiluliuma I?) to a sanctuary on Mt. Išḫara, near Tarša in Kizzuwatna (obv. 30'), which had been established first by a certain Talzu and then Šunaššura, a king who had entered into a treaty with Tudḫaliya I/II. The first establishment of the perquisites of the shrine is therefore from the period before Hittite hegemony over Cilicia. The text was first translated by Goetze (1940: 60-71) and has been recently edited and translated by A. Chrzanowska (2011) on the electronic database Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln (KhT). It begins by referring to an oracular answer, then quotes in detail words apparently from a previous tablet. I provide the relevant part of Chrzanowska's transliteration below, followed by my own translation:

§1 4' dIM-aš-wa ku-wa-pi’ a'-a[š-]
5' nu-wa ku-u-uš DINGIR.MEŠ dMu[-wa-nu-u dMu-wa-at-ta-al-li Û
dGIBIL6]

dIM-ni šar-ti-i[a pa-a-ir
dIM-aš KUR URU Kum-ma-an-ni [__ __ __ __ __]
dPu-u-ru-na-ia uš-ki’[-
ke-e-da-aš-ma-wa DINGIR.MEŠ-aš
10' UḪ.ŠE x MUŠ GÍR.TAB PĔŠ [
tar-ḫu-u-i-la-a-tar []

§2 12' ma-aḫ-ḫa-an-ma-wa mTal-zu-ú-uš [
ti-it-ta-nu-ut nu-wa-kán ŠÂ Ḥ[UR.SAG Iš-ḫa-ra
[__ __ ] I-NA ḤUR.SAG Iš-ḫa-ra-pát še-er [

---

7 CTH 41; see Prechel (1996: 120-1).
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15' ú-e-te-it 3 ḫu-u-wa-ši i[š-ga-ra-a-it] [___] dMu-u-wa-nu
dMu-wa-at-ta-al-li Û dG[IBIL]
É.ŠÁ-ni IT-TI dIš-ḫa-ra-ru U[Ru]Ne-e-ri-ša
dam-pu-pi-iš Ú-UL ku-iš-ki pa-iz-z[i]
ŠA DINGIR.MEŠ-ia-wa ALAM.HI.A-ŠU-NU i-ia-at

20' ALAM GUŠKIN GUŠKIN i-ia-at [___] ŠA
DUMU.MU[NUS an-da ap-an-da-aš ...]

§1 "When Tarḫun [...] These gods, Mu[wanu, Muwattalli, and the Fire-
god came] i[n] aid to Tarḫun [...] Tarḫun [...] the land of Kummanni
[...] and the river Puruna [...]. But, to these deities [...] the crop pest,
..., snake, scorpion, mouse [...] power [...].

§2 "And when Talzu [...] set up [...] in the heart of the mo[untain Išḫara
...] on that very Mt. Išḫara [...] he built. Three ḫuwaši-stones [he] s[et
up.... Muwanu,] Muwattalli, and the F[ire-god...] in the sanctum with
Išḫara of the to[wn Neriša ...], no profane person will go [...] and he
made statues of the gods [...] He made a silver and gold statue. Of a
gir[l] [...] fully supplied...."

The text goes on to define the original borders of an extensive territory
that served the shrine, naming a spring of Išḫara of Neriša (a town only
mentioned here) as one of the landmarks (obv. 33'), and then promises
supplies guaranteed into perpetuity, as once had been declared. Among the
items are three fine bed sheets and a bed for Iš[ḫara] (rev. 24).

Chrzanowska states the animals mentioned in §1' are associated with the
goddess, following Haas (1994: 100, 404).\(^8\) In fact, the mention of these
pestilential animals may be referring to some kind of evil condition of the land
that the gods remedied. Compare perhaps the Hittite version of *Atrahasis*, in
which a plague of ants appears to be mentioned.\(^9\) Here I am building on the

\(^8\) On the association of snakes and scorpions with Išḫara see Rahmoudi (2007: xxiii-iv).

\(^9\) *CTH* 347.1 A = *KBo* 53.3 + *KUB* 8.63 iv 12'-13', see ed. and trans. by Rieken *et al.* (2009 ff.) on KhT.
most recent discussion of the passage by Gilan (2014: 2001), who avoids making the bald claim that the cult installed is for Išḫara, highlighting instead the fact that the description of emoluments and the territory dedicated to the sanctuary is preceded by what looks to be a brief mythologeme justifying the creation of a new place of worship by referring to the help given to Tarḫun by the gods Muwanu and Muwattalli, possibly local storm-gods, and what he interprets as a "new god," (obv. 1'-11').

He sees the three gods as the primary beneficiaries in return for their service, which I am here suggesting included ridding the territory of a pestilence.

I do not wish to dispute that in fact this text is evidence for relatively early worship of Išḫara in Cilicia. The question is whether the mountain should be considered to be named after her. Mt. Išḫara seems not to have been important as an object or place of worship for the Hittite court after the early temple foundation. Mentioned only in this one tablet, strikingly it does not appear among the many Cilician mountains named in the Ḫišuwa festival, which suggests that the mountain was not considered to be important in the wider cult of Syro-Cilician gods. I suggest that in fact the mountain's name was a Luwian word meaning išḫara 'lordly', cf. Hittite išḫa- 'lord'. The etymology of išḫa- 'lord' has been disputed, with attempts to link it to the goddess Išḫara and even to compare it to Hattic ašḫap 'god'.

Most recently Kloekhorst (2008: 390) offers the PIE reconstruction of *h₁esh₂h₁-ó-, with Latin erus 'master' as a cognate. Using this etymology for the Hittite word and adding the accent-bearing adjectival suffix *-ro results in Luwian išḫara- /išhra/, with pretonic short *e > i. In fact, this is the same etymology that Kronasser (1966, §106) suggested for the goddess's name. However, I separate the Semitic goddess's name from the Luwian mountain name. If this etymology is accepted the mountain bore a typical name: compare ḪUR.SAG.GAL...
or Mt. Parku ('Great Mountain') and Mt. Šarlaimmi ('exalted'). But, even if we cannot provide a satisfactory etymology for the oronym, it still makes sense to assume that a *Gleichklang* between the mountain's name and the name of the goddess newly rising to prominence in Cilicia – and perhaps recently ensconced in Neriša – encouraged a connection between the two, one that served the shrine well in later times when the goddess had achieved importance among the Hittite elite. The mountain was not named after the goddess, nor was it a representation of the goddess.

Moving on to the gender of living rock, unlike the mountains which it formed it was not always treated as an animate thing eligible to be assigned sexual gender; grammatically, the noun could appear in the neuter as an inanimate noun *peru*, as well as in a derived common gender form *perunaš*. I argue that when living rock was conceptualized as bearing gender, it was also male. Thus, Pirwa, also built off the base *peru*, served as a man's name, and the deity Pirwa, the head of the pantheon at Kaneš, was male. Like mountains, living rock could be used in metaphors legitimizing kingship and expressing the Hittite construction of masculinity. I have already discussed some aspects of the masculinity of living rock in a recent article exploring the themes of kingship and excessive masculinity in the Kumarbi cycle (Bachvarova 2016). As an everlasting, stable feature of the landscape, it symbolized the maintenance of the household across generations that was the task of the paterfamilias. Hard and protruding from the earth, living rock also had a phallic aspect, as shown by the myth of the stone monster Ullikummi's birth and development.

The animals associated with mountains iconographically were ones that dominate wild spaces, such as lions and the eagles that soared above untrammeled by the constraints of gravity, both of which were frequent in depictions of divine mountains. Vessels used to toast mountains could be in the shape of lions (Freu 2003: 237). Because mountaintops, cliffs, and boulders belong to wild, untamed spaces, they could also be used to express

15 His consort was Haššušara 'queen'. He was associated with horses and high cliffs (Bachvarova 2016: 98; Lebrun 1983: 145; Pecchioli Daddi in *Reallexikon der Assyriology* sub Pirwa).
TOWARDS AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE GENDERED HITTITE

the concept that masculinity needed to be controlled and regulated,\(^\text{16}\) as in the Hittite fragment of a Hurro-Hittite narrative song about Anzili (IŠTAR) and Mt. Pišaiša (CTH 350.3 = KUB 33.108, ed. Rieken et al. 2009 ff. on KhT):

\([\S1', ii'^2'\text{-20'}']\) The mount[ain] he [saw?] Anzili, her [naked] limbs. His desire to sleep [with her sprang] f[orth]. Mt. Pišaiša slept with [Anzili ] Anzili [ ] leapt up. [Her] limb[s ] "Who at this time [ ] did dishonor to me? To Tarḫun not [ ] furthermore another enemy. [ ] an enemy to him." Anzili in her anger said this. Mt. Pišaiša heard angry Anzili, her words, and he was afraid, and he groveled down at Anzili's knees like a (bent) apple tree. [He said,] "Don't kill me. I will speak to you [ ] life. With what [ ] Tarḫun of Heaven contests the Sea, [and with] what the angry mountains contest in battle Tarḫun of Heaven. Long ago Na[mni] and Hazzi, the mountains, …"\(^\text{17}\)

This text reworks narrative building blocks found in two different Sumerian stories, replacing the transgressive human gardener who rapes the sleeping Inanna in Inanna and Šukaletuda with a mountain and re-orienting the meaning of events in Inanna and Ebiḫ, in which Inanna's attack on Mt. Ebiḫ is almost entirely unprovoked. (Yes, she claims that Mt. Ebiḫ did not show respect to her when she came near, but the underlying motive is her jealousy of his stature.)

Such opportunities for comparison show us that mythology can be treated as a pool of available motifs or building blocks that can be bundled in different combinations and orders, including what I call the "toggle switch": flipping roles or outcomes. Whereas Inanna and Šukaletuda warns of the hybris of humans daring to cross the boundary between human and divine and is one of the many examples of the danger of sleeping with Inanna/Išhtar, famously alluded to by Gilgameš (SB V 22-79), and the goddess is the one who is

\(^{16}\) See Collins (2004: 83-8) on the association between eagles and lions, and kingship; Bachvarova (2016: 92) on the Hittite conception of masculinity as something that must be controlled.

\(^{17}\) Translation from Bachvarova in Chavalas (2013: 284); filled in from the New Hittite parallel text CTH 350.2.A = KUB 36.33.
depicted as uncontrollable and wanting to control all the natural world, even beyond the bounds of her purview in *Inanna and Ebiḫ*, in the story about Mt. Pišaiša, the female is presented as a guide and admonisher punishing the mountain. In the Hittite story it is masculine urges that must be tamed and controlled.

Clearly, myth has a certain flexibility to allow for new meanings depending on the audience. This leads me to an important principle when doing comparative mythology: we should focus not only on what is shared, or unchanged when comparing myths separated by time, space, language, culture, but on how shared motifs were reworked or combined in different ways to present a message relevant or appealing to the storyteller's particular audience. This information can be used to get a quite fine-grained picture of the audience's interests and concerns, and therefore allow us to get a sense of who that audience might be and why the stories were written down, a question still not fully answered with regard to Hurro-Hittite narrative song. For the Hurro-Hittite narrative songs available to us, the unifying theme is the didactic discussion of what it means to be a good man and/or successful king (Bachvarova 2016), suggesting that their ultimate patron is conceived of as the Hittite king, and that their content, not just their copying, had an educative role for the young scribes.

The versions of the Hurro-Hittite myths available to us in the Kumarbi cycle focus on normative masculinity and the breaches thereof that the failed enemies of the Storm-god commit. It is not surprising therefore to see mountains and living rock showing up repeatedly with more complex meanings than in the fragment about Mt. Pišaiša, and once we accept that their meaningfulness within the stories starts with the presumption that they are gendered male, we can achieve a better understanding of the overall messages of the stories themselves. In the article alluded to earlier, I suggested that we could achieve a better understanding of why Kumarbi thought he could create a rival for the Storm-god who could overcome his impetuous strength by ejaculating on the Great Rock at the Cool Lake. I argued that the rock was

---

18 Among the explanations for writing down Hurro-Hittite narrative song is that of Lorenz and Rieken (2010), who suggest the goal was to create a written mythology comparable to that of Mesopotamian scribes.
gendered male, and that Kumarbi was in fact creating a doubly masculine child in the hope that he could take on his doubly masculine son, created when Kumarbi swallowed Anu's sperm (Bachvarova 2016: 98). In fact, there is such a thing as being "too masculine" as well as "not masculine enough." Ullikummi fails because he is excessively hard, brutishly unintelligent and lacking mercy, whereas the Storm-god is able to build an alliance with the older generation of gods, combining his martial power with their wisdom to defeat the stone monster using the primeval copper saw that had been kept safe in the "grandfatherly" storehouse (Bachvarova 2016: 101-3).

There is, however, much left to be explored with regard to the connotations of the volcanic processes that produced Ullikummi, once we understand that we are not supposed to view volcanoes simply as females giving birth to new rock. In particular the fragment of a myth about Mt. Wašitta giving birth is amenable to new interpretations. This fragment, \textit{CTH} 346.4.A = \textit{KUB} 33.118, has been edited and translated by Rieken et al. (2009 ff.) on KhT, and has recently been the subject of an interesting discussion by Kloekhorst (2016). As he suggests, this fragment may be providing an alternate version of the birth of a volcanic rival to Tarḫun, with Kumarbi again impregnating a rocky entity, but here we have access to the point of view of that entity, and the mountain seems to complain about being raped by a stranger, who must be Kumarbi, thus inverting the storyline attached to Mt. Pišaiša. I provide my own translation here:\textsuperscript{19}

\begin{quote}
(§1', 5'-11') … He [keeps] co[unting] the days. He keeps marking off the months. […\ldots\textsuperscript{]} with that table [    ]. The days [    ] The first [mo]nth went by, the second month arrived, [the third month, the fourth month], the fifth [month,] the sixth month, the seventh month, the eighth month arrive[d, the ninth month, the tenth month arrived]. He was ready to emit smoke and rumble (\textit{tuḫḫeškiuwan ti[yat]}).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{19} This translation modifies my translation in Chavalas (2013: 283-4) with regard to the terms involving the root \textit{tuḫḫ}- and a correction in the final fragmentary sentence, following Kloekhorst (2016: 167).
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§2', 12'-22') [M]t. Wašitta smoked and rumbled (tuḫḫait). Kumarbi heard the rumbling and smoking ([tuḫḫiman] [ ] in [his house (or: city)]. Mt. Wašitta [r]umbled and [s]moked ([tuḫḫāit]). All the mountains went to him/her to see. "Mt. Wašitta," all the mountains began to say, "Mt. Wašitta, why are you rumbling and smoking ([tuḫḫāit]? You have not known rumbling and smoking (tuḫḫiman) since childhood. The Fates have not inscribed it for you, nor did your mother give birth to you for it." Mt. Wašitta began to answer all the mountains, "I have not known rumbling and smoking (tuḫḫiman) since childhood. The fates have not inscribed it for me, nor did my mother give birth to me for it.

§3', 23'-28') "[ ] when among the mountains a visitor [came], he made me sleep with him. From that moment on [ ] I began to rumble and smoke (tuḫḫeškiuwan teḫḫun) [ ] … wise ones. The next [month ….] The ninth [month we]nt by. The tenth month arrived. […..] [I beg]-a[n] to rumble and smoke…"

We can see that volcanic action has a paradoxical bi-gendered aspect to it that the story must be exploring; eruption is like both ejaculation and birth. The terrifying sound and destructive power of the volcano can be seen as emerging from a masculine being with the strength to take on the power of the Storm-god's thunder and lightning. Volcanic soil is well known to be rich, luring farming to volcanoes' flanks the world over, and thus can be connected to "feminine" fertility, while volcanic rock is a source of ore, amenable to the masculine craft of metal-working, which is frequently made parallel to volcanic processes. Yet, the act of transformation of a raw material through heat into a well-formed artifact has obvious parallels with the process of gestation and birth.

The complexities of the transgression of gendered binaries are encapsulated in the semantic field of the root tuḫḫ-, which both Kloekhorst (2008: 886-9; 20 Cf. Vulcan's workshop under Mt. Etna (Johnston 2005). 21 See the discussion of Blakely (2006: 99-122) about the ritual behaviors and beliefs of traditional iron smelters in sub-Saharan Africa.
2016) and Roider (1981: 105-7) have examined. Whereas Kloekhorst arrives at the conclusion that the root means solely 'smoke', with no connotations of gasping or suffocation, as the previous analyses he discusses have assumed, Roider, who considers the root to mean here 'to spew fire', stresses how easily the notion of smoking can be applied as a metaphor for violent emotion, in particular anger, as seen in the Old Indic and Greek cognates *dhūmāḥ* 'smoke' and *thumos* 'spirit, courage, anger, sense'.\(^{22}\) I have translated the root in the above passage as 'rumble and smoke', and I will contend that it has an audible, emotional, and gendered valence to it by comparing it to its Greek cognate and drawing on its appearance in other Hittite texts.

*Thumos* has received many detailed treatments because of its interesting semantic range. It encompasses both an abstract and a physiological meaning in the notion that the human urge to leap into action lies within the chest. As Cairns (2003: 18) describes, it speaks to a metaphor of anger as a "hot fluid" contained in the body, making use of the cross-linguistically common metaphor of the body as a container for emotions (Kövecses 2000: 37). More specifically, *thumos* when used in the sense of anger in Homeric poetry seems to be imagined as a steamy substance breathed out of the lungs (Clarke 1999: 75). Moreover, the emotion of anger is constructed as typically masculine, as Roider's examples from a variety of Indo-European languages show.\(^{23}\) As Kloekhorst (2008: 188-9, 895) notes, in Hittite as well the notion of breath contained within the body applies to this root, lying behind the term *antuwaḫḫa*-'having breath inside, human'.

With regard to the metaphoric use of terms containing the root *tuḫḫ*- in Hittite discussed by Kloekhorst, they too can be read as speaking to the notion that smoking is evidence of an extreme emotion. For example, in *CTH* 446: *Purification Ritual for the Former Gods*, the practitioner begins the day's activities by digging holes in the four corners and at the hearth of the house needing to be cleansed of the evil words that had been uttered by and against its inhabitants, then speaks to the Sun-goddess of the Earth, asking *kī Ė-er kuwat tuḫḫaett[ari ...]* šarā nepištı kuwat šakueškezz[zi]

---

\(^{22}\) I quote the dictionary entry of Beekes (2010: 564).

\(^{23}\) Also see Faraone (2003) on *thumos* 'anger' as a feature of men, both appropriate and destructive.
(KUB 7.41 obv. 10-11), in Kloekhorst's translation, "Why is this house smoking, and why does it have its eye cast upon heaven?" (2016: 174). Kloekhorst (2016: 174-5) argues that the house is meant to be seen as communicating upward, as normal, with the heavenly gods via smoke from its hearth and its regard, whereas it now needs to turn its line of communication down towards the earth. I agree that smoke is considered to be a means of drawing the attention of the heavenly gods, but I think that the description also refers to the fact that the house is suffering from the effects of the evil words now being removed by the practitioner. It stares upward hoping to see some evidence for heavenly attention, and its smoke is meant to signal its distress.

As in CTH 446, smoke appears in mugawar incantations to refer to an unwanted state that both triggers and represents divine anger. Thus, in a mugawar to invoke Telipinu, the story starts by describing smoke adversely affecting a house: Gištuttāuš kammarāš Išbatēr-tūḫḫuišš[uš]ušriyantat tī Tīna GUNNI-ma kalmišeniš uššūriyantat[i ...] DINGIR.MEŠ uššūriyantati (1, §4', A₁ + A₂ = KUB 17.10 i 5'-7' + KBo 55.8 i 16'). "Smolder seized the windows, smoke smothered the house and on the hearth the logs were smothered.... The gods were smothered." Then, the description of the god's return after being soothed again makes use of the burning and smoking metaphor, the practitioner taking on the persona of Kamrušepa:

(1, §27", A = KUB 17.10 iii 8-12) "I burnt away on one side above Telipinu, and on the other I burnt. I took from Telipinu, from his body his evil, I took his sin, I took his fury, I took his anger, [I] too[k] his wrath, I took his sullenness."

(1, §28", A iii 13-16) "Telipinu is angered. His mind, [his] inside was smothered in the logs. As they burned these lo[gs], burn likewise the fury, anger, sin, sullenness of Telipinu also...."

(1, §29", A iii 21-23) "Telipinu is angered. His mind, [his] in[side] is burning fire, and a[s] this fire [is extinguished], likewis[e le]t rage, sullenness also [be extinguished]." 24

24 I use here my translation from López-Ruiz (2013: 453, 456). The transliteration is by Rieken et al. (2009 ff.) from KhT.
The smoke and fire image is usefully multivalent, applicable to the actions of practitioner driving away the god's powerful negative emotions with smoke and burning up the negative emotions, and the burning sensation of the negative emotions themselves.

Besides the fact that Mt. Wašitta's smoking should be considered to allude to his emotional reaction to the pain of childbirth and possibly to his anger at being raped in the first place, I would argue – against Kloekhorst – that we should accept that the mountain's emissions are also audible; if the smoke is like the volcano's breath, a living metaphor that Hittite antuwahlja- is a witness to, the volcanic rumbling is like the sounds coming from an agonized person's lungs, metaphorized as groans and panting.\(^{25}\) That is, I argue that there is no reason to exclude the meaning 'breath' from the verbs and nouns derived from tuḫḫ- in this passage, and that the breathing brought forth is loud, loud enough for Kumarbi to hear at a distance. Kloekhorst (2016: 175) is able to put forward a passage using ištamašš- in the sense of 'hear about' rather than directly hear (CTH 40.IV.1.A: Manly Deeds of Šuppiluliuma = KBo 5.6 iii 5-6) to support his contention that we should be envisioning that Kumarbi, waiting eagerly for the birth of his child as he counts off the months, does not hear the sound of the mountain rumbling but receives a report. The question, though, should first be how the act of hearing is used in formulaic narrative sequences in Hurro-Hittite narrative song. In fact, hearing direct speech frequently occurs as a way of motivating a step forward in the action. When a new event occurs, it is always first directly perceived (the Sun sees Ullikummi growing in the sea, for example), then reported using direct speech. In the Song of Ullikummi Ḫebat loses her line of communications with the other gods, and it is clear that we are supposed to be thinking of her ability to both see and hear them directly:

\[(CTH 345.I.3.1, §2', A = KUB 33.106 i 22'-24')\] The basalt approached Ḫebat in her temple, so Ḫebat could no longer hear the message of the gods, and she could not see Tarḫun and Šuwaliya[t] with her own eyes.
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(3, §3', A i 25'-28') Ḫebat bega[n] to speak wo[lds] to Takiti, "[I] cannot he[ar] the [w]ord of Tarḫun, the important matter, and I cannot [hea]r the message of Šuw[aliya]t and of all the gods. This one, whom [they] speak of as Ullikummi the basalt, has he perhaps de[f]eated my husband, the augus [Tarḫun]?m

Hebat then sends Takiti to find out and to "[bring back] w[ord] to me" (A i 33'). Column i breaks off just as Takiti returns to relate in direct speech what she has learned. In other words, Hurro-Hittite narrative song consistently conveys knowledge of events to characters through direct perception or direct speech, not through unquoted reports.

Kloekhorst appositely compares a passage from the Song of Birth in which Earth is described as giving birth after the formulaic counting off of months. "In the tenth month Earth [began to] cry out (wiweški[wan dāiš])" (CTH 344.A = KUB 33.119 iv 16'). The term wiwai - 'cry out' is in fact a metonym for childbirth (Beckman 1983: 37). In the story about Mt. Wašitta, instead of crying out with a sound constructed as feminine, the volcano emits the smoke and rumbling signaling an immanent eruption, possibly also referring to emotions and behavior thought of as masculine. If Ullikummi's failing was an excessive hardness that made him brutish and dumb as a rock, the monster about to emerge from Wašitta may have suffered from a volcanic, uncontainable rage that gave the Storm-god a means to defeat him.
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Introduction

The group of Hittite tablets currently classified under CTH 630 and 631 represents a unique corpus of documents which casts light on a hitherto little investigated aspect of Hittite religious belief. The preserved texts, whose oldest exemplars date to the Old Hittite period, describe the celebration of particular festivals and rites aimed at exorcising the religious fear caused by the thunder and to protect the king from the potential danger perceived in the phenomenon, interpreted as a direct expression of the wrath of the Storm God. With the exception of Neu’s publication of KBo 17.74+ in 1970, no text belonging to this corpus has ever been the object of a comprehensive edition. In this article I intend to address the problem concerning the nature of the ceremonies described in the texts, arguing that they are not to be considered as casuistic rites performed occasionally, but as regular ceremonies which were celebrated at a specific time of the year, like many other seasonal festivals attested in Hittite documentation.

* Università degli Studi di Firenze, Dipartimento di Storia, Archeologia, Geografia, Arte e Spettacolo. Via San Gallo 10, 50129 Firenze.

1 This paper presents some general results of my dissertation, discussed at the University of Florence in April 2014. The work has been published in 2017 with the title “Le feste ittite del tuono. Edizione critica di CTH 631” (Studia Asiana 12). I am very grateful to prof. Giulia Torri for reading a previous draft of this paper and for her invaluable remarks and observations. Any errors or mistakes are mine and mine alone. The abbreviations used follow those of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary.

2 On this aspect see the interesting considerations by Oettinger, 2001: 453-454.

3 Neu, 1970.
The text corpus

Besides many fragments which are assigned to the same text group but cannot be placed with certainty due to their fragmentary conditions, five main compositions can be detected in CTH 631.\(^4\)

The oldest text of the corpus, KBo 17.11+\(^5\), and its duplicate, KBo 17.74+, have a typical Old Hittite script\(^6\). The document, as already observed by Wilhelm\(^7\), shows the distinct features of a Sammeltafel, a compilation tablet where the descriptions of two different festivals related to thunder are collected\(^8\). Between them, a short redactional insert of only five lines seems to describe the actions the king has to perform if a sudden clap of thunder at the end of the day makes a prosecution of the rite necessary.

Two other compositions, KBo 17.75 and KBo 20.61+\(^9\), can be dated to a later phase. A close examination of the ductus\(^10\) shows paleographic features which have generally been considered as typical of the Middle Hittite script\(^11\). Both texts are divided by single or double paragraph lines into different sections and have hitherto been considered, as KBo 17.74+ // KBo 17.11+, compilation tablets, collecting several thunder festivals. However, some features, which I have described elsewhere\(^12\), could represent the attempt to adapt a standard ritual practice to an unpredictable event such as thunder. The different sections in which the tablets are divided seem to record, rather than entirely different festival descriptions, the modifications that the thunder festival has to undergo in relation to the atmospheric condition. If so, they would not represent ordinary Sammeltafeln but a very unusual typology of scribal products, which has no parallel in Hittite documentation.

\(^4\) All texts are now published in Barsacchi, 2017.
\(^5\) Published in transcription by Neu, 1980: 5-11.
\(^8\) On Hittite Sammeltafeln, see Hutter, 2011: 115-128, with previous literature.
\(^9\) On which see also Goedegebuure, 2017: 105-107.
\(^11\) On the difficulties in the definition of the Middle Hittite script see the considerations by Popko, 2007: 575-581; van den Hout, 2009: 21-35; Weeden, 2011: 46-49, all with further literature.
\(^12\) See Barsacchi, 2015: 38-40.
KBo 20.61+, in particular, is the only text of this group that explicitly refers, at the end of the description of the first day, to the celebration of a “thunder festival”, EZEN₄ tetḫešnaš, in ll. obv. II 8-9: [...] lukiattama EZEN₄ tetḫešnaš / [iyanzi (?)] (…)¹³, “the following day [they perform (?)] the festival of thunder (…)”. I believe that this reference alludes to the standard articulation of the thunder festival, whose complete description, however, is not present on the tablet, where only the incipit of the ceremony and the eventual modifications to the original sequence of rites prescribed for each day of the festival are recorded.

VSNF 12.10, another Middle Hittite tablet, clearly belongs to the same typology of texts but the broken conditions of the document prevent us from understanding whether it shares this particular structure or not.

All the texts, designated in the preserved colophons¹⁴ simply as “tablets of the thunder”, DUB tetḫešnaš, begin with the description of the location and the particular action carried out by the king at the moment of the thunderclap, and describe the rites that have to be performed in order to deal with the new situation determined by the occurrence of the thunder, a situation perceived as potentially dangerous for the holiness of the king.

This character of unpredictability of the rites is particularly evident in the composition whose fragments are currently listed under CTH 630. The preserved colophons generally refer to the composition as follows: DUB x EZEN₄ D̄EN.ZU EZEN₄ tetḫuwaša kuwapi anda imiyattari, “tablet x of the festival of the moon and of the festival of thunder, when they are performed jointly”¹⁵. It is a specific, three-days long, thunder festival, which originates from the superimposition of the structure of the thunder festival onto an ongoing ceremony, designated in the incipit of the text as “festival of the moon-god”, EZEN₄ D̄EN.ZU, necessitated by the sudden emergence of thunder during its celebration.

¹³ See also KBo 20.61+, rev. III 4.
¹⁴ Cf. KBo 17.74+, rev. IV 43’; KBo 17.75, rev. IV 57’; KBo 17.77 (which I believe is the colophon of KBo 20.61+), rev. IV x+1’.
¹⁵ KUB 32.135, rev. IV 59’-60’; KBo 25.178, rev. IV 20’-22’; KBo 23.64 rev. III 39’-41’.
The fragments of the composition show either a Middle or a Late Hittite script, but the close affinity with the documents of CTH 631, already attested in the Old Hittite period, and the Hattian background of the divine lists mentioned in two texts of the corpus¹⁶ seem to point to an Old Hittite tradition. As can be observed from the few preserved colophons, the festival seems to be collected on two different tablet series: one organized according to the number of the tablets and one organized according to the festival days¹⁷.

**The external sources**

While styled as substitute CASUISTIC with OCCASIONAL rituals, thunder festivals were assigned a specific calendrical setting. Several external sources record the importance of these ceremonies in Hittite cult and their celebration both at a local level and in what is generally defined as “state cult”. In particular, two types of documents, the so-called “cult inventories”¹⁸ and the oracular reports relating to the cultic duties of the king currently filed as CTH 563 and 564, prove to be particularly meaningful. From these sources, thunder festivals appear as seasonal ceremonies, performed every year at a specific time, which I believe can be identified with the beginning of the spring season, the moment of transition between the old and the new year in the Hittite calendar.

The cult inventory KUB 42.105+ (CTH 525)¹⁹ reports information about the development of the two major yearly celebrations in the Hittite calendar, the spring and the autumn festivals²⁰, in a series of cities, mentioning for each of them the amount of offerings prescribed and the main deities involved. In the fourth column of the reverse, the celebration of a “thunder festival” is mentioned as well. The broken condition of this part of the tablet prevents us from identifying the name of the city where the festival is performed.

---

¹⁶ On this divine list see Laroche, 1973: 83-89.
¹⁷ The same thing was observed by Singer, 1983: 38-48, with regard to the Old Hittite KILLAM festival.
¹⁸ On this text group see Carter, 1962; Hazenbos, 2003; Cammarosano, 2012a, all with previous literature.
²⁰ On which see Archi, 1973: 7-27.
“WHEN THE STORM GOD THUNDERS”

4’ [A-NA EZEN₄ ṭe-et-ḫe-ešnia-ȧš 2 UDU 2 DUG KA.GAG ZÌ.[A
5’ [x UP-NU A]R-ŠÀ-AN-NU 1 wa-`ak-šür GA 1 tar-na-ȧš [Ī.NUN]

6’ [ŠU.NIGIN] 4’ UDU 5 P₄ ZÌ.[DA 4 ‘DUG ’KA.GAG.A ’A-NA’[°
7’ [x na-aḫ]-ḫa-ši-ıš Ī.NUN MU-ti me-ţe-ń ni

(4’-7’) “[For the festival] of [th]un[der]: 2 sheeps, 2 vessels of
KA.GAG beer, fl[our...x UPNU] of barley porridge, 1 wakšur of milk,
1 tarna- of [butter...].

[Total]: 4 sheeps, 5 PARĪSU of flour, 4 vessels of KA.GAG.A beer for
[...], [x naḥ]ţaši of butter over the cou[rse] of the year [...].”

In KUB 38.12 (CTH 517), a text relating to the cult of the city of Karahna,
a festival of thunder is mentioned two times among the celebrations to be
performed in the course of the year for the Storm God of Liḫzina and the
divine couple: Storm God - Sun Goddess of Arinna. In the first occurrence,
the thunder festival is associated with another yearly event with a clear
seasonal character, the summer festival.

obv. II

6 DU URULi-il-zî-na DINGIR₄⁴-tar ki-nu-un EGIR-pa DÙ-ir
7 Ė.DINGIR₄⁴-šî u-e-te-ir EZEN₄ MEŠ GİŞḪUR gaš-tar-ḥa-i-da
8 tar-ra-u-wa-an 2 EZEN₄ MEŠ-šî MU-aš me-ia-na-aš
9 ŠÀ 1 EZEN₄ te-et-ḫe-eš-na-aš 1 EZEN₄ GİŞBURU₁₄ (…)
(…)

12 DU AN₄²⁴ PUTU URUPÚ-na KÛ.BABBAR GUŠKIN kap-pu-u-wa-an
(…)
22 EZEN₄ MEŠ GİŞḪUR gaš-tar-ţa-`a’ tar-ra-u-wa-an
23 NINDA.GUR₄ RA UDₓ₄ KAML-šî EZEN₄ ITUₓ₄ e-eš-zî 1 EZEN₄ te-ë[ţ-ě-eš-na-aš]
24 [MIU-‘aš me-‘ia-na-aš (…)
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(6-9) “Storm God of Liḫzina: now they have remade the divine image (and) for him they have built a temple. The festivals are established according to the wooden tablet gaštarḫaita\(^{21}\): 2 festivals for him over the course of the year, whereof a festival of thunder (and) a festival of the summer (…).

(12) Storm God of Heaven, Sun-goddess of Arinna: silver (and) gold have been registered (…).

(22-24) The festivals are established according to the wooden tablet gaštarḫaita: for him there is a daily bread, a monthly festival and a festival of thun[der] over the course of the year (…).”

In KUB 56.56, listed under CTH 670 among the fragments of festivals but certainly to be identified with a cult inventory connected to the city of Ḫurma\(^{22}\), the festival of thunder is mentioned in the group of ceremonies performed for the deities of Zippalanda, together with the festival EN.NU. WA.ŠU, an obscure logographic construction not yet interpreted.

rev. IV

5  (...) 27 PA ZÌ.DA 14 DUG KA.GAG 21 DUG [ ...]
6  1 PA AR-SÁ-AN-NU 1 GA.KIN.AG LÚ\(^{MEŠ}\) É.GAL \(^{URU}\) Ḫur-ma p[é-eš-kám-zí]
7  4 [DU]G ta-wa-al ki-nu-na-aš NU.GÁL nu GEŠTIN kar-ša-an-[ží]
8  A-NA NINDA.GUR,RA UD\(^{KAM-mi}\) EZEN\(^{4}\) ITU\(^{KAM}\) A-NA 2 EZEN\(^{4}\) MEŠ-ia [ ...]
9  ŠÀ 1 EZEN\(^{4}\) te-et-he-eš-na-aš 1 EZEN\(^{4}\) EN.NU.WA.ŠU \(^{DU}\) \(^{URU}\) Š*i-ip-pa-la-an-da]
10 \(^{DU-zi-li}\)\(^{23}\) Ḫa/ur-ša-aš-wa \(^{HUR.SAG}\) Da-a-ḫa \(^{DU.GUR-ia}\) [ ...]

(5-10) “The employees of the palace of Ḫurma provi[de]: 27 \(^{PARĪSU}\) of flour, 14 vessels of KA.GAG beer, 21 vessels of […] 1 PARĪSU of barley porridge (and) a cheese […] 4 vessels of tawal beer: now (this is) not (there) and they neglect the wine. For the daily bread and the monthly festival, and for two festivals, whereof a festival of thunder

\(^{21}\) On this term, whose meaning remains unknown, see the considerations by Cammarosano, 2012a: 419, with n. 852.


\(^{23}\) \(^{\text{An-zi-li-iš}}\) in the autography.
and a festival EN.NU.WA.ŠU, for the Storm God of Z[ippalanda], Anzili, Ḫa/uršašwa, the mountain Daḥa and U.GUR [...]"

A thunder festival for the Storm God of Zippalanda is also mentioned, although in broken context, in the first column of the obverse of the tablet KUB 55.1 (CTH 581/CTH 574) a document collecting negligences towards a series of cultic duties24.

(21-26) “[Negligence] concerning the Storm God of Zippalanda: the monthly festival of the third month […] of the wine, of […]]. Now instead […] for the festival [of] thun[der…]. Now instead to thi[s’…].”

In the fourth column of the same tablet, a festival of thunder is mentioned in the group of ceremonies for the mountain Daḥa, the holy mountain of Zippalanda, immediately before the festival of the year. The indication that the performance of these ceremonies has been neglected for two years seems to confirm the yearly character of the thunder festival. In the following paragraph, the same ceremony seems to be performed for the holy mountain Puškurunuwa. Immediately before, a “great festival” is mentioned as well.

15 Kat-ta-an ḫa-ma-an-kán ki-nu-na ka-[a-a]š MU 2[KAM] ku-it-ta-at UL e-[eš-ša-an-zí]
16 [x x x (x) Pù]š-ku-ru-nu-wa EZE[N₄] ʾGAL ’[t]
17 [x x EZE[N₄ te-e]t-he-eš-na-aš 2 UDU x]

(13-15) “For the mountain Daḫa to the city of Šantiwara, at the wish of my Majesty, are imposed: the [monthly] festi[val] of the twelfth month, the festival of the fruit, the festival of thunder, the festival of the year, the festival of the ste[le]. Now this is (already) the second year. Why don’t they [do] it?

(16-17) […] Puškurunuwa the great festival […]festival] of thunder 2 sheeps […]”

The festival of the thunder is mentioned twice also in the text KUB 53.21 (CTH 678)²⁵, although it is not certain whether it belongs to the corpus of cult inventories or not. On the reverse of the tablet, a sequence of festivals performed in Nerik for several deities is recorded. The celebration of a thunder festival is prescribed, together with a “festival in the autumn”, EZE[N₄] zeni, for the Sun God of the Heaven in this case, the usual writing EZE[N₄] tethesnas has been replaced by the equivalent logographic writing EZE[N₄] BÜN. More logically, the celebration of a festival of the thunder for the Storm God of Nerik is prescribed in line rev. 10’.

WHEN THE STORM GOD THUNDERS

8’ Ḫarpiyaš, festival [...]. [...] Sun Goddess of Arinna: festival of the summer, festival [of the autumn]. [...] Sun God of Heaven (?): festival of thunder, festival in autumn. In Nerik (for) ḫarpiyaš, festival of the summer, festival of the autumn. In Nerik (for) Telipinu and Ḫašamili: festival of the summer, festival of the autumn.

(8’-10’) When they celebrate the conciliation in Nerik for DINGIR. MAḪ and (by) the stele of conciliation for DINGIR.M[AH…]. Storm God of Nerik: festival of thunder. For [...].”

This brief list is completed by a small fragment from Kušakli/Sarissa, KuSA I. 1/4 (CTH 530)26, where in the same paragraph the “daily bread”, the monthly festival and some yearly festivals are mentioned together with a thunder festival, expressed also in this case by the logographic writing EZEN₄ BŪN.

The summary character of the inventory tablets, imposed by the very nature of this textual typology, prevents us from identifying elements which could clarify the nature of the festivals related to thunder, and how they were performed. Still, some data can be inferred. These festivals appear as regular ceremonies, which are performed in several local religious centres on an annual basis, generally as a part of the cult due to a particular deity. Like other local festivals, they are directly related to local habits and beliefs, and inserted in cult calendars largely modelled on natural and agricultural cycles.

At the same time, however, unlike many other festivals mentioned in the cult inventories, thunder festivals survive also in detailed descriptions, represented by the particular typology of compositions collected in CTH 631, whose character I have tried to delineate above.

26 Edited by Hazenbos, 2003: 155-156.
These documents, copied and preserved from the Old Hittite period in the archives of Ḫattuša, clearly indicate that the thunder festivals were also part of what is generally called the Hittite “state cult”. Maybe originally local festivals, performed at a certain period of the year in order to appease the angry Storm God, thunder ceremonies became official festivals, performed by the king and his entourage in order to prevent the potential negative effects perceived in thunder and to exorcize the religious fear caused by the phenomenon. It is certainly to this official sphere of Hittite worship that the festival of the thunder mentioned in the fourth paragraph of the Instructions for the temple personnel CTH 264 must be assigned:

(KUB 13.4, obv. I)

40  EZEN₄ ḫa-me-eš-ḫa-an-da-aš EZEN₄ te-et-he-eš-na-aš `EZEN₄ ḫi-ia-r[a]-aš
41  EZEN₄ pu-u-da-ḫa-aš EZEN₄ i-šu-wa-aš EZEN₄ ša-at'-la-aš-ša-aš
42  EZEN₄ BI-IB-RI EZEN₄ MEŠˢšu-up-pa-ia-aš `LÚ SANGA-aš
43  EZEN₄ MEŠ LÚ MEŠ猬SU.GI EZN₄ MEŠ MUNUS MEŠ AMA.DINGIR'LME EZEN₄ da-ḫi-ia-aš
44  EZEN₄ MEŠ ḫU-pa-ti-ia-aš EZN₄ MEŠ pu-u-[a]-aš EZN₄ MEŠ ḫa-ḫa-ḫa-an-na -aš
45  na-aš-ma-aš ku-iš im-ma ku-iš EZN₄ MEŠ aš-ša-aš URU[h[a-a]t-tu-ši-kán še-er
46  na-aš ma-a-an IŠ-TU GU₄ HLA UD˚ U MEŠ NINDA KAŠ Ü IŠ-TU GEŠTIN
47  ḫu-u-ma-an-da-aš ša-ra-a ti-ia-an-ta UL e-eš-ša-aš-at-te-ni
48  na-at pé-eš-kán-zi ku-i-e-eš nu-uš-ma-aš šu-me-eš LÚMEŠ É.DINGIR'LME
49  ḫa-ap-pár da-aš-kat-te-nî DINGIRMEŠ-aš-ma-at-kán ZI-nî wa-ak'-ši-ia-nu-ut-te-ni

(39-49) “Fur[ther]more: the festival of the month, the festival of the year, the fall festival, the [fe]stival of the spring, the thunder festival, the [fe]stival of ḫiyara, the festival of pudahā, the festival of ḫišuwa, the festival of [ša]talšša, the festival of the rhyton, the festivals of the sacred SANGA-[priest], the festivals of the old men, the festivals of the AMA.DINGIR priestesses, the festival of dahiya-, the festivals of the upati- men, the festivals of the lot, the festivals of ḫahratar, or whatever festival (there is) up in Ḫattuša, if you do not celebrate them along with all cattle, sheep, bread, beer and wine set up
(for the gods), but (from) those (people) giving it (the offerings), you - Temple-men -from them you’ll keep taking payment, you will cause them (the offerings) to fall short off the will of the gods.”

The thunder festival is mentioned as part of a group of eighteen festivals that the religious functionaries of the central administration in Ḫattuša have to perform in the course of the year. As correctly observed by A. Taggar-Cohen, the list is conceived with a rational method: it mentions first the seasonal festivals of old Anatolian tradition, such as the festivals of the month and of the year, and then ceremonies such as the ḫiyara, the pudaḫa and the hišuwu festivals, whose presence must be considered a direct reflex of the religious politics of the royal court at the time of the redaction of the text, largely influenced by Hurrian religious notions. The festival of thunder, mentioned immediately after the spring festival, can confidently be assigned to the first group.

It is very likely that the local thunder festivals mentioned in the cult inventories differed in many aspects from the official ceremony performed in Ḫattuša. The shift from a traditional rite, related to local habits and cults, to an official one, performed in the capital at the presence of the royal court, certainly implied a certain degree of modification in the ceremony and its structure. The main purpose itself of the official rite, aimed at the ritual protection of the king, was clearly different from the one attributed to the ceremony at a local level.

The festivals of thunder and the Hittite cult calendar

As recently suggested by Cammarosano, the order and position of the festivals mentioned in the cult inventories seem to reflect a chronological succession, even though exceptions from the normal sequence are attested.

---

29 Pace Taracha, 2009: 137, according to whom: “Some of these festivals belonged to the old tradition, while the festivals of thunder, ḫiyara, pudaḫa and šatlašša were celebrated for Teššub of Ḫalab and deities from his circle”.
The festivals, in other words, seem to have been listed rationally and grouped according to their calendrical setting. A regular structure can thus be identified, with the autumn festivals generally preceding those of the spring and these followed by the ceremonies connected with the agricultural activities of the summer. In KUB 38.12 the festival of thunder precedes the summer festival, EZEN₄ BURU₁₂, lit. “festival of the summer/harvest”, a logographic expression which could also refer to the spring festival. In KUB 53.21 it is followed by the autumn festival, like the several festivals of the summer performed for the different deities of Nerik and mentioned in the same passage. The reversed order, with the summer (or spring) festivals preceding that of the autumn, could reflect here the order of their performance starting from the beginning of the year rather than the traditional seasonal sequence by which the festivals are listed in the inventory tablets.

In the Instruction text KUB 13.4, a thunder festival is mentioned immediately after the autumn and the spring festivals and it is grouped together with other ceremonies, such as the hiyara- festival, whose celebration was almost certainly carried out in the spring.

A close correlation between thunder festivals and the spring season is further suggested by the fact that the Hittites explicitly connected the celebration of the festivals of the spring with the acoustic perception of thunder.

The description of the spring festival in the inventory texts is generally introduced by the standard formula: GIM-an DIŠI / ḫameššanza DŪ-ri tētḫai ḫaṛši gēnuanzi (e.g. KBo 2.7, obv. 9’, rev. 16 passim), “When the spring comes (and) it thunders, they open the ḫaṛši vessel”.

---

32 The fact that the autumn festival always precedes the spring festival seems to contradict the chronological order of their performance, considering that the Hittite year began in spring. This has been explained by Hazenbos, 2003: 169, as the reflex of an ancient agricultural calendar where the beginning of the year was placed in autumn. Cf. Haas, 1994: 693. Cammarosano, 2012a: 181, suggests also that the sequence could reflect the logical priority of the action of filling the ḫaṛši- vessel with the harvest, typical of the autumn festival, on the ritual opening of the vessel which characterized the spring festival. On these ritual actions see Archi, 1973: 14-18.


34 See Haas, 1994: 556. Cf. also n. 113. The hiyara- festival, in particular, was probably performed in the months of April or May, if the derivation from the Akkadian term ayyūrû, which designated a spring month in many west-Semitic calendars, is correct. Cf. HED 3: 304. On this festival see Hutter, 2002: 187-196, with further literature. Cf. also Taggar-Cohen, 2006: 96. See also the critical considerations by Trémouille, 1997: 101-102, based on the fact that, in KBo 14.142, obv. II, 34 (CTH 698), the festival seems to take place in the 10th month, i.e. in winter period.
“WHEN THE STORM GOD THUNDERS”

This clause can be found in slightly different forms, such as: GIM-an=ma DÌ₂-SI DÛ-ri tethiman ištamaššanzi, “when the spring comes (and) they hear the thunder”, attested in KUB 17.35, II 12’, or, more simply: GIM-an=ma ḥamišhi DÛ-ri tethai, “when in spring it thunders” (KUB 25.23+ obv. I 8’)

Even today on the Anatolian plateau the spring season, whose beginning can be placed between the end of the month of March and the beginning of April, is characterized by heavy rainfalls.

Given the impossibility of confining a meteorological phenomenon such as thunder to an exact chronological timeframe, it is very likely that the starting moment of the spring festivals was marked by a certain degree of flexibility, and a geographical variation dependent on the climatic situation must certainly be assumed as well.

The association between the thunderstorm and the beginning of the spring season which emerges from the cult inventories makes it likely that the meteorological ceremonies connected to thunder and defined in the sources as EZEN₄ tethenaš/BŪN were celebrated in the same period of the year.

The transition between winter and spring coincides with the beginning of the Hittite year. This seems to be confirmed by the often-quoted passage KUB 38.32, obv. 3 (CTH 508): GIM-an zénaš kišari ANA MU^KAM₄-ti ITU 8^KAM, “(…) when it becomes autumn, in the eight month of the year”. If we calculate, with Hoffner, the approximate length of the Hittite autumn in two months, the current months of November and December, the text would place the beginning of the Hittite year between the end of March and the beginning of April, which coincides perfectly with the beginning of the spring period.

35 On the grammatical form ḥamišhi DÛ-ri tethai see the considerations by Cammarosano, 2012a: 234, with previous literature.
36 Hoffner Jr., 1974: 18, 22, with further references.
37 See also Taggar-Cohen, 2006: 119.
38 Hoffner Jr., 1974: 42.
39 The same date can be inferred from KUB 20.25, a text dealing with the cult of Zippalanda, where the twelfth (and last) month of the year is explicitly located in winter. Cf. Popko, 1994: 309.
In the ten year Annals of the king Muršili the second (KBo 3.4 + KUB 23.125, obv. II 48)\(^{40}\) the celebration of a festival of the year is mentioned at the end of the campaign of the third year, and thus in winter period, when all military activities are suspended. In the next paragraph, the description of the events of the following year is introduced by the phrase: “when the spring comes”. Later on, Muršili claims to have waged battle against the city of Puranta: “when I finished celebrating the festival of the year” (KBo 3.4 + KUB 23.125, obv. II 57).

The exact meaning of the expression EZEN\(_4\) MU\(^{KAM}\), is not clear but, in such contexts\(^{41}\), it probably refers to the particular ceremony, or ensemble of ceremonies, which marked the passage from the old to the new year, and was an important part both of the official cult calendar and of the local religious traditions reflected in the inventory texts. It must not be confused with ceremonies like the purulli festival, whose calendrical setting is still far from ascertained\(^{42}\), or the cult of the Year performed in the ḫešta- house on the eleventh day of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festival\(^{43}\), whose celebration took place at a later time of the spring, as confirmed by the oracular report KUB 18.12+\(^{44}\).

Whether the time of celebration of the EZEN\(_4\) MU was clearly established on an astronomical basis (e.g. the solar equinox\(^{45}\)), or depended on a rather fluctuant seasonal event, such as the thunderstorms which marked the beginning of the spring season, is hard to establish. The spring thunders certainly represented an important marker of time, as confirmed by the introductive formula which opens the description of the spring festivals in

---

\(^{40}\) See Del Monte, 1993: 65.

\(^{41}\) In other contexts the expression EZEN\(_4\) MU certainly must not be understood as referring to a particular ceremony, but rather as “yearly festival”, i.e. as a general indication for a festival performed once in a year. Cf. the prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal CTH 375: UD-\(\text{aš} \text{ITU-\(\text{aš} \text{MU-ti meyaniyaš SISKUR}^{\text{H}}{\text{A}} \text{EZEN}^{\text{H}}{\text{A}}\), “daily, monthly and annual rites and festivals” (KUB 17.21, obv. I 21’-22’; rev. III 14’-15’with duplicates). See the translation by Singer, 2002: 42-43.

\(^{42}\) Pace Haas, 1994: 696ff., who identifies it with the Hittite New Year festival and believes it was initially celebrated in autumn, before being integrated, at least in part, in the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festival from the time of Muršili II. Thus also Hutter, 1997: 81-82. Cf. now, on the purulli festival and its relationship with the cult of Lelwani performed in the ḫešta- house, Torri, 2015: 296-298.

\(^{43}\) On which see Torri, 1999: 21-29 ; id., 2015: 295-296.

\(^{44}\) See below.

\(^{45}\) See Haas, 1994: 693 with n. 142.
the cult inventories, as well as by the fact that some sources correlate the thunder festivals and the festival of the year.

This is the case of two oracular texts, KUB 5.4+KUB 18.53 (CTH 563) and KUB 18.12+KUB 22.15 (CTH 564), where omens concerning the place where the Hittite king will spend the winter period and the cultic duties which he, together with the queen, will have to perform, are collected. The documents, very similar in their structure, follow the pattern of Hittite oracular praxis, proceeding through consecutive questions, to which a positive or negative answer is given\(^\text{46}\). The two passages read as follows:

KUB 5.4 + KUB 18.53, obv. I

16 [\(\text{PU}_\text{ši}\) \text{ke-e-da-ni} \text{MU-ti} I-NA \text{URU} \text{Ḫati-ti} \text{SÈD} i-ia-zi]

17 [\(\text{nu-z}a\) \text{EZEN}_4 \text{MEŠ} \text{SAG.USH} \text{EZEN}_4 \text{MU-ti} \text{EZEN}_4 \text{BÛN-na-aš} I-NA \text{URU} \text{Ḫati-ti} \text{DÛ-zìi}]

(16-17) “My Majesty in this year will spend the winter in Ḫattuša and he will celebrate in Ḫattuša the regular festivals, (i.e.) the festival of the year, the festival of thunder”.

KUB 18.12 + KUB 22.15, obv. I

1 [\(\text{ma-a]-an-kán}\) \text{PU}_\text{ši} \text{la-ah-ha-az} \text{UGU ú-iz-zi} \text{nu-za} \text{DINGIR}_\text{MEŠ} \text{DÛ-zìi} \text{ŠÈ}_{12}\text{-an-zi-ma} \text{PU}_\text{ši} \text{MUNUS.LUGAL} \text{URU} \text{KÛ.BABBAR-šì}]

2 \(\text{ŠA DÛ URU} \text{Ḫa-la-ab} \text{EZEN}_4 \text{te-et-ḫe-eš-na-aš-za} \text{a-pí-ia} \text{DÛ-an-zi} \text{EZEN} \text{MU-tì-za} \text{a-pí-ia} \text{DÛ-an-zi}]

3 \text{MUŠEN}^\text{HLA} \text{mi-ia-na-aš-šì} \text{a-pí-ia} \text{ta-ru-up-pa-an-ta-ri} \text{GIM-an-ma} \text{ŠA AN.TAH.ŠUM} \text{me-ḫur} \text{ti-ia-zi} \text{nu-kán} A-NA \text{DINGIR}^\text{MEŠ}

4 \text{AN.TAH.ŠUM} \text{ti-ia-an-zi} (…) \(\text{…)}\)

(1-2) “[Wh]en my Majesty comes up from the military campaign, he will celebrate the gods, and my Majesty and the queen will spend the

\(^{46}\) On these texts, see Archi, 1975: 122-123, 141.
winter in Ḫattuša. There they will celebrate the festival of thunder of the Storm God of Ḫalap, there they will celebrate the festival of the year, there the birds of the season will congregate for him, and when the time of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM comes, then they will place the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM for the gods (…).”

In KUB 5.4 + KUB 18.53 the thunder festival and the festival of the year are defined as “regular festivals”. The exact definition of the expression EZEN₄. SAG.UŠ is still a much debated issue, whose solution is not without relevance for our comprehension of the Hittite cult calendar. Singer approached the problem focusing on the relationship between the expression EZEN₄.SAG. UŠ and the locution EZEN₄.GAL, the “great festival”, suggesting that with the term “regular”, SAG.UŠ, akk. KAYYANAMU, hitt. ukṭuri-, the Hittite scribes defined the standard version of a festival, performed on an annual basis at a fixed time.

According to this interpretation, the expression “great festival”, when referring to the same ceremony, would have been used to indicate a distinct version of it, perhaps more extended, to be celebrated only in certain years for particular occasions. Singer based this theory on the presence of both the “regular” and the “great” version of the KI.LAM festival and of the festival of the hešta- house in the shelf list KUB 30.68. His solution, although intriguing, does not take into account the presence of “great festivals” in Hittite cult inventories, such as in KUB 38.12 (CTH 517), where a great festival is mentioned among the ceremonies performed annually for the god Dкал in Karahunja. We find mentions of an EZEN₄.GAL also in the fragments of cult inventories KBo 13.252 and KuSa I. 1/5 (both listed under CTH 530), where the term is even attested in the plural form (KuSa I. 1/5, obv. 4’: […] x EZEN₄.MES GAL […] ). This seems to me to contradict

48 Referring to the mentions, in the Annals of Muršili II, of “the festivals of the sixth year” at the end of the campaign of the 10th and 16th year (cf. Del Monte, 1993: 100-113), Singer, 1983: 94 (with n. 30) suggests that the “great festivals” were celebrated in a six-years cycle. However, Taracha, 2009: 70, n. 386 (with further literature), correctly points out that the great festival of Telipinu in Ḫanḫana was celebrated every nine years, and that festivals “of the third year” are attested as well (e.g. KBo 13.231, rev. 7’: 1 EZEN₄.ŠA MU 3.KAM. Cf. Hazenbos, 2003: 86-87).
50 Edited by Hazenbos, 2003: 156-159.
Singer’s distinction between “regular festivals” performed annually and “great festivals” performed only in certain years. According to Del Monte\(^5\), the adjective šalli-, when applied to a festival, would indicate the local ceremonies which have become part of the larger AN.TAḪ.ŠUM\(^5\)A and nuntarriyaššaš festivals, but this assumption remains extremely uncertain.

In the reports CTH 563 and CTH 564 the thunder festival and the festival of the year are mentioned as the most important cult activity that the king has to perform in the particular period of the year taken into account by the oracular investigation. In this sense their definition as “regular” festivals is no surprise, since their performance is not presented as an exceptional event but as a standard religious duty the king has to perform at a specific time of the year, a time characterized by recurrent thunderclaps and perceived as the moment of transition between winter and spring.

The expression SAG.UŠ probably refers to the festivals that had a fixed place in a cult calendar, connected with seasonal events or religious activities unvaryingly performed at particular times of the year\(^6\). As regards local cults, it is likely that every religious centre of the Hittite empire had its own regular festivals, which did not necessarily coincide with those performed elsewhere. Similarly, in the official cult, some religious ceremonies which did not have correspondence in the local cults, such as the KI.LAM festival and the festival performed in the ḫešta- house, assumed the character of EZEN\(_4\) SAG.UŠ. The relationship between the regular and the great versions of the same festivals currently remains an open question.

Houwink ten Cate has seen a contradiction between the aforementioned oracular reports, which connect the celebration of the festival of the year and the festival of the thunder with the winter period, and the picture that emerges from the inventory tablets, where the thunder as a meteorological

\(^{6}\) With regard to the “regular festival” in the ḫešta- house mentioned in the Middle Hittite shelf list KBo 31.1+, obv. 8', I tentatively suggest that this expression could refer to the rites connected with the new year performed in the ḫešta- house during the 11\(^{th}\) day of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festival (whose main core was already formed by the time of Šuppiluliuma I), which has a seasonal character and a precise calendrical setting. This part of the great spring festival was created on the basis of an old tradition of rites devoted to the goddess Lelwani and her circle and performed in the ḫešta house, a tradition represented by KBo 17. 15 and its later manuscripts. Cf. Torri, 2013: 289-296.
phenomenon is clearly associated with the spring. According to the scholar, this is no surprise, since “a festival of Thundering in a cult calendar is a contradictio in terminis. It inevitably was an ad hoc religious festival”. A certain character of uncertainty in the definition of the exact moment of celebration of the thunder festivals is certainly undeniable, given the fact that they are closely related to an unpredictable meteorological event. Nonetheless, I find it hard to see a contradiction between the situation presented in the cult inventories and the one described in CTH 563 and 564. Far from proving the ad hoc character of the festivals related to thunder, they seem to me to confirm the fact that they took place at a precise time of the year, a time characterized by a strong religious meaning: the beginning of the spring season, which coincides with the transition from the old to the new year in Hittite calendar, as confirmed by the close association between the festival of thunder and the festival of the year, particularly evident in the oracular reports concerning the winter stay of the king, but observable also in some cult inventories (cf. KUB 55.1 rev. IV 14’).

The recurrent thunderclaps of this time of the year marked the beginning of the spring season. The festivals of thunder mentioned in the cult inventories could have been performed in occasion of the first thunders of the new season, immediately before the several ceremonies of the spring mentioned in the cult inventories as an important part of local cult calendars. As confirmed by the oracular report KUB 18.12+, the festival of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM plant, which incorporated several originally independent local cults, was celebrated at a later time with respect to the thunder festival and the festival of the year, whose celebration took place in the liminal period between the old and the new year.

Conclusion

Although thunder signaled the beginning of the spring season and the renewal of the agricultural cycle, and was therefore an essential and most welcome

53 Houwink ten Cate, 1992: 92.
54 Ibidem.
55 Thus also Taggar-Cohen, 2006: 119, according to whom: “(…) the thunder festival is the first among the festivals of the spring”.
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marker of time in Hittite calendar, it remained, from a strictly religious point of view, a frightening manifestation of the Storm God’s anger, which demanded to be soothed by appropriate rites. This duplicity explains in my opinion the ambiguity of the festivals of thunder and lies at the basis of their celebration in the official Hittite cult. Their integration in the state cult already in the Old Hittite period is reflected by the existence of detailed festival descriptions represented by the tablets collected in CTH 630 and 631, while very few descriptions of local seasonal festivals mentioned in the cult inventories were preserved and copied in the archives of Ḫattuša.

The performance of thunder ceremonies at a specific time of the year does not conflict, in my opinion, with the character of unpredictability particularly evident in the incipit of the texts collected in CTH 630 and 631. As festival descriptions preserved in the Hittite archives, they represent the official part of this cult, performed by the king and the queen as part of their religious duties. Even if the celebrations were expected to take place at a specific time of the year, the exact moment of their beginning depended on the perception of the thunder, probably the first thunder of the new season (and thus of the year). Given the ominous value of such phenomenon, the development of the ceremony, aimed at the ritual protection of the king, could not but be influenced by the location and the action carried out by the king at the moment of the thunderclap. The double characterization of the thunder festivals, as ceremonies performed at a specific time of the year, and therefore inserted in a cult calendar, and as official rites constantly modified in relation to the atmospheric condition, makes the corpus of the thunder festivals collected in CTH 630 and 631 a unique body in Hittite religious documentation.
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THE TRIALS OF TUDHALIYA IV

Gary BECKMAN*

The resources now available to scholars through the Hethitologie Portal Mainz website, particularly the photographs accessible there, have greatly facilitated progress in the recovery of the history and culture of Hatti. I have previously made good use of these images in preparing re-editions of several compositions first studied long ago, and have most recently perused the relevant photos while working on CTH 123 (KBo 4.14), an enigmatic document whose only full treatment was published by Ruggiero Stefanini a half-century ago.¹

The unique manuscript is definitely inscribed in late script, and grammatical features indicate clearly that the text itself was composed during the final decades of the Hittite Empire. Previous writers have attributed the text to each of the final known monarchs of Hatti: Tudhaliya IV,² Arnuwanda III,³ and Suppiluliyama II,⁴ but I agree with the late Itamar Singer⁵ that the impassioned reference to the battle of Nihriya featured in CTH 123 demonstrates that Tudhaliya was its author.

The reign of Tudhaliya IV was replete with trials: Internally, this ruler was confronted by rivalry with his cousin Kurunta, representative of the

---

¹ Stefanini 1965; cf. the earlier remarks of Meriggi 1962: 84-90. For transliterations of quoted passages and philological commentary the reader is referred to my re-edition, which will appear elsewhere (forthcoming).
² Klengel 1999: 276-77.
³ Stefanini 1966.
descendants of Muwattalli II, who stood in dynastic conflict with his own line stemming from the usurper Hattusili III, whether or not this contention resulted in an actual rebellion or coup d'état.\(^6\) He also experienced an unsuccessful plot seemingly organized by his own brother Hesni, according to the investigation recorded in a court document.\(^7\)

Abroad, Tudhaliya engaged in military campaigns against the minor states of southwestern Anatolia and Cyprus, as recorded in the hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions of Yalburt\(^8\), Emirgazi,\(^9\) and Nişantaş.\(^10\) But the weightiest problem faced by the Great King was the challenge posed to the Hittite empire in Syria by the growing power and influence of Assyria.\(^11\) In the course of the face-off between Hatti and Assur, which seems to have begun early in his reign, the Hittites suffered a decisive defeat near the town of Nihiry/Nihriya\(^12\) in Upper Mesopotamia. It was following this calamity that the king composed the most curious administrative document here under discussion, which is directed to a subordinate who had failed him at a crucial moment.

KBo 4.14 is a four-columned tablet, of which columns ii and iii are generally well preserved, while large portions of columns i and iv have been broken away. Of an estimated 320 original lines, around 150 are more or less complete, while an additional 100 or so lines are partially present. The language of the text is Hittite, larded with thirty-three Luwian Glosenkeilwörter. A large erasure at the top of col. i suggests that we are dealing with a draft.

The document may have opened with a salutation and greetings, that is, as a letter, to judge from the first legible section:

> May whichever deities [to whom you turn(?)] protect [you!] May [you] be [well(?)!] But on your neck [ … ] May those (gods) protect you! [ … ]

---

\(^7\) CTH 297.8 (KUB 31.68).
\(^8\) Poetto 1993.
\(^10\) Güterbock 1967.
\(^12\) On this place name, well known from Assyrian sources, see Miller 2012.
in regard to which matters [you(?)] are sworn, [ ... ] let it be! ... May [those (gods) ... ] you away! (i 17-24)

But just who is the addressee whose name has been lost at the head of the first column? Laroche\(^{13}\) simply labels him “un partenaire inconnu,” but others have suggested that he was the vassal king of the land of Išuwa.\(^{14}\) This is doubtful, however, since we now know that the ruling family of Išuwa was an appanage line of the Hittite royal house,\(^{15}\) and given this fact, it would not have not been appropriate for Tudhaliya even to contemplate bossing about its current head in the manner in which he deals with the recipient of this missive. Even if the name written \textit{Eh-li-LUGAL} (iv 71) is to be understood as that of Ehli-Šarruma, the final attested king of Išuwa, the context in which this man appears is third-person, not second-person as would be expected for the document’s addressee. The brusque tenor of the discourse also rules out the possibility that the document was intended for a king of Ugarit or Carchemish. No, the object of the Great King’s scorn in CTH 123 was most probably a member of the native Hittite nobility who could not claim even a semi-independent power base of his own.

In any event, this individual had well deserved the contempt of his master:

\begin{quote}
But when it became difficult for me, you were off somewhere. You were not with me. Did I not drive away from (the city of) Nihirya alone? When it came about that the enemy once more took the Hurrian lands away from me, was I not alone back in (the city of) Alatarma? And if such a critical occasion should recur – or if the enemy should enter my land or city, as he has already done previously – or if some subject of mine should defect and turn to you out of fear of me, then die for the sake of the king! Let (this) be under oath! (ii 7-16)
\end{quote}

Indeed, the purpose of the present administrative instrument is to assure that just such an act is not repeated. Accordingly, the subordinate is presented with various scenarios in which he might be tempted to behave in a disloyal manner.

\begin{itemize}
\item \(CTH\) 123: “Traité avec un partenaire inconnu.”
\item Meriggi 1962: 84-85; Singer 1985: 118 (tentatively).
\item Glocker 2011.
\end{itemize}
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through action or inaction – and then sworn not to embrace such conduct.

Many are the social and political conditions that might give rise to rebellion, as Tudhaliya explains:

The occasion of revolt is as follows: Even the wealthy become impoverished. Or the royal military forces or the provinces defect from the king. Or the enemy takes from the king by force his confidential advisors. Or they are killed. Or the noblemen defect from the king. Or the king falls ill. Or the king goes off on a distant campaign. Or it is any sort of treacherous time. You shall not seek to revolt, nor to abscond, nor to misbehave at your post. Let death be your limit! (ii 52-61)

Beyond these hypothetical occurrences, there is the very real danger posed to Hatti by Assyria:

And this Assyrian enemy who has arisen against me has held off for many years. And if he bravely challenges me with arms or enters my land or city, at such a moment you shall not seek to revolt, nor to abscond, nor to misbehave [at your post]. Die along with the king! Let (this) be under oath! (ii 66-72)

Note that the enmity with Assyria is said to be of long standing, although things seem to be quiet at the moment. This state of affairs accords well with what we otherwise know of the episodic character of the Assyro-Hittite struggle under Tudhaliya on the one side and Shalmaneser I and Tukulti-Ninurta I on the other. It is apparently the same Mesopotamian foe who is referred to throughout CTH 123 by the generic term “the enemy,” and in the following section by the phrase “the hostile king”:

And as for this hostile king who has [arisen] against me – if he should enter my land or city, let death be your [limit] (in protecting me)! Or (if) he should inflict misfortune on me by force of arms, or come into my land or city, [die] for the person of the king! (ii 22-25)

See references in note 11.
But in our text even greater attention is devoted to the danger of disloyalty among the Great King’s own underlings:

Or (if) the lands defect, or bloodshed occurs among my domestic or foreign subjects, as it continues to be difficult for the king, on that occasion you must bite firmly the Dark Earth. Let death be your limit!

And if some man of Hatti on that [occasion] joins your party, or [some people] have been your sworn associates and [someone (among them)] says to you: “This is the time! You should revolt against the king!”—then as a loyal man you will speak as follows: “[If] I do such a thing(?), then let me die, [and] let the Sun-goddess of Arinna not give [me] a (further) life of (even) a single day!”

In the future you shall not seek revolt. You shall not revolt at a critical time. You shall not think up anything foolish against me. You shall not [stifle(?)] the manliness in your soul. You shall not think as follows: “Someone [somewhere] has let the enemy escape.” And you shall not revolt at a critical [time]. The gods shall pursue (any) matter of revolt in relation to you. And if things become difficult at some point, you shall not flee, thinking: “(I am) sworn in regard to defection, but not in regard to this.” And (if) you then throw in your lot with those who rebel, claiming: “They carried me off by force” – this matter shall be under oath for you. (ii 26-51)

Indeed, Tudhaliya enjoins the addressee to value the life of his master – himself – as highly as his own: “Let me be [as] important [to you] as [your own person(?)] is important [to you]!” (i 42-43). The subordinate must also be proactive as well as vigilant:

[And] let this matter [be] inscribed … for you (pl. sic!). You shall be a bodyguard for My Majesty. You, [your wife], your child<ren>, and your subjects shall be lookouts and watchmen for the life of the king. You shall [not] overlook (any) evil.
And [if] something causes difficulty for the king, or the king falls ill, [or] provinces defect, or an enemy enters the provinces, [then] … likewise, and likewise let it cause anxiety for you. Your wife, your children, and your subjects shall be trustworthy watchmen [for] the person of the king. They shall not be untrustworthy watchmen and scouts.

And if you (fore)see some terrible day for the king, then as it would be of concern to the personal servants of the king regarding the person of the king, let it likewise cause concern for your own person, your wife, your children, and your subjects. (iii 8-22)

Much of the language here is familiar from the stipulations and curses found in the treaties of the empire period.\(^{17}\) Most unusual, however, is a paragraph detailing what we might label “thought crimes”:

Concerning the fact that I had already confronted you about these words, and you yourself spoke them repeatedly: “Would that even a small matter becomes constrained for him!”—because venereal disease(?)\(^{18}\) afflicted me without cease, in anger it found you. And if something becomes difficult for the person of the king, or some province defects, or an enemy enters the land or city, or an incident of illness or defeat occurs, you shall not celebrate secretly, nor shall you secretly rejoice(?). As it is personally critical for (me), the king, (thinking:) “If only I could get away”—so let it be critical for you, (thinking:) “May my lord get away from here!” I experienced this matter in regard to you on the Nihirya campaign. (iii 23-35)

Clearly the relationship between Tudhaliya and this junior partner was a close one. The Great King was privy to details of the latter’s reflections and confidential conversations, while the latter in turn had knowledge of embarrassing aspects of the monarch’s health. And if the ruler had indeed been abandoned at Nihriya in the heat of battle by all of his followers, as recounted earlier, he had taken special notice of the absence of this particular courtier.

\(^{17}\) Compare the various stipulations and sanctions in the treaties translated in Beckman 1999.

\(^{18}\) iii 25-26: Š4 MUNUS … GIG, literally “illness of a woman.”
Nonetheless, Tudhaliya had forgiven his faithless subject, but remained uncertain whether his magnanimity would be reciprocated with the appropriate devotion:

[And] given that I have promised as follows: “I [will] take [you] back; I will not cast you out. Things will be [good] for you once more” – would I for some reason go back on my word? Time will pass and you might think as follows: “The king has not paid any attention to me, so let me be free from these oaths.” You shall not do it. Let (this) be [under] oath for you! (iii 1-7)

I believe that I have now established that CTH 123 is verily an unusual text. Here a Hittite Great King unburdens himself to another mortal, exhibiting before a fellow human being a vulnerability otherwise displayed by kings in our Hittite records only in prayers to the gods. As has already been observed by others,\(^\text{19}\) it is also difficult to assign a generic label to this composition. It combines elements of a letter, of an *Anklageschrift* – compare the Madduwatta text, of instructions for bureaucrats – particularly of the latest of these with their emphasis on loyalty rather than upon duties,\(^\text{20}\) and of an inter-state treaty. However we categorize it, KBo 4.14 conveys a vivid picture of the disorder besetting Hatti during its years of ultimate decline.
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HATTIAN-CAUCASSIAN ISOGLOSSES

Merab CHUKHUA*

Many special works [Ivanov 1985; Braun 2002; Girbal 1986...] have been dedicated to the issue of interrelation of the Hattian and Caucasian languages. As it is obvious Hattian is one of the Paleo-Caucassian (Ibero-Caucasian) languages which is considered to be a kindred language of the Circassian languages by one part of scholars [Meszares 1934; Ivanov 1985; Braun 2002], others – of the Kartvelian ones [Girbal 1986; Giorgadze 1999; Gordeziani 2007; Gabeskiria 2007; 2010].

The isoglosses represented by me reveal the Circassian nature of Hattian, though in some cases the number of Kartvelizms exceeds [Chukhua 2015]. At this stage I represent only lexical material in which the Hattian data is initial. Afterwards the Kartvelian, Circassian, Dagestanian and Nakh correspondences are given.

Hatt. al ‘word; language’: Old Geo. al-a ‘speech of many people’: Ts.-Tush. al’-, Chech. āl-, Ing. al- ‘saying, telling, speaking’: Dag., Akhv. e*, Cham. i* ‘saying’


Hat. -bh- ‘seeing, eye-sight’: Svan ab/hab ‘color; outward, appearance, looks,

* Assoc. Prof. Institute of Caucasiology Faculty of Humanities Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University


Hat. il ‘god’: Geo. el-ia ‘Elijah’, Colkh (meogr.) al-, in the word al-erṭ-i ‘Helios, chariot’…

Hatt. ka ‘which/who’, ki ‘that one’: Geo. i-g-i, e-g, Svan e-ǧ-i (← *e-g-’i) ‘which/who’: Adyg. (Shaps.) a ‘that’ – Dag., Botl. go-w /go-j/go-b ‘that’, Lak ga’/ge ‘that’

Hatt. kait ‘species of grain’: Geo. krt-il-i ‘autumn barley’: Chech. köta ‘linen’ (cf. Hurr. kade ‘barley’): Ingush. geta ‘linen’

Hatt. kut ‘liver’: Geo. kūrtum-o ‘rump’, Colkh kūrtum-el-i “id.”: Dag., Avar kūtub, Darg. (Chirg.) kūtum, Agul kūrtum, Budukh kuṭun, Krits kuṭin ‘liver’…

Hatt. kupal in the word kur-kupal ‘nail’: Geo. kopal-i, Colkh (Megr.) kupul-i ‘arrow’

Hatt. kurt ‘leaf’: Geo. kwirt-i ‘bud’

Hat. mar ‘digging over (with spade)’: Geo. bar-i ‘spade’, bar-v-a ‘digging’: Dag., Lezg. pper, Khinal ber, Budukh bar ‘spade’

Hatt. ma ‘no(t)’: Colkh (Laz) mo/mo-t, Svan mā-de ‘don’t/not’: Apkh., Abaz. –ma ‘no’: Nakh mo ‘no’

Hatt. muna ‘botton; foundation, basis’: Geo. bun-i ‘foundation, hole’:
Adyg. băn-ǝ ‘grave’, Ubykh băn-ǝ ‘grave hole’ : Chech. ben, Tsova-Tush be “nest”

Hat. mu ‘mother’, teti-mu ‘grandmother’ : Svan mu ‘father’ : Lak ppu (←*bu) ‘father’, Arch. bu-va ‘mother’...

Hatt. mut ‘part of a body’ : Geo. muṭ-el-i ‘vulva’ : Dag., Awar. (Chad.) muṭu ‘mouth’, Bezhit moṭo ‘face’


Hatt. pašun ‘soul’, pušan ‘breathing’ : Geo. pšwin-v-a ‘heavy breathing”, cf. sa-mšwin-v-el-i ‘soul, spirit’ : Dag., Did. muš-a, Bezhit muš-o, Hunzib. muš-e ‘breath, smell’

Hatt. pin (=bin) ‘son, one’s own child, child’ : Geo. bun-i ‘descendant of one grandfather’ : Adyg bǝn-ǝ, Qab. bǝn ‘child; descendant’, cf. Adyg. bǝνa ‘family’ : Colkh. (Megr.) pan-ia ‘family’ : Dag., Bezhit bina ‘house’

Hatt. pip ‘stone’ : Colch (Megr.) papa-ala ‘sheer (rock/cliff), boulder, rocky shore’ ; cf. Urart. papa (?) ‘stone, rock’


Hatt. şam ‘hearing’ : Geo. sem/-sm-, sm-en-a ‘hearing; watching/looking’ : Adyg. (Basl.) psǝ-, qá-úψ-psǝ-n ‘awaking/waking up’ : Chech. sam-a-dal-a, Ingush som-a-dal-a ‘awaking/waking up’, for semantics cf. Apkhaz a-pš-ra ‘looking all around/in both direction’; awaking/waking up’
Hatt. šuwa ‘over there’ : Geo. sve ‘plot of land’, Colkh (Laz) sva ‘place’ : Ubykh šwa ‘place’ : Dag., Lak šawa ‘house’

Hatt. tal ‘tree, beam’ : Geo. tal-i //tal-a ‘hoop’, Svan tal ‘wedge/spoke’ : Chech. tal ‘poplar’, Ingush tāl-g ‘wedge/spoke’ : Lak · ala ‘thick block of wood/tree stump’, Darg. (Sirg.) · ali ‘pole/pillar’

Hatt. taš ‘no’ : Svan dēsa //desa ‘no, not’ : Dag., Tsakh. dēš ‘no’

Hatt. tawa_a //tawa-tup ‘giant/gigantic, awful/terrible’ : Geo. dev-i, Svan na-daw-ra ‘horned/many-headed devil, giant’ : Apkh. a-dvǝ, Abaz dwǝ ‘great/gigant’ : Dag., Rut daw ‘lion’


Hatt. witanu ‘cheese’ : Geo. motal-i ‘moldy cheese’ : Dag., Archib murtila ‘cheese’

Hatt. zar ‘calling over, calling’ : Geo. zar-i, Colkh (Megr.) zor-i ‘ sound of bugle/trumpet’, Svan zär //zar ‘mourning hymn’ : Nakh *azan ‘voice’

Hatt. ziber ‘construction wood; tree’ : Svan zek ‘firewood; tree’, zek-ra ‘made from logs/tree-trunk : Ingush zagal ‘stick’

Hatt. zilat ‘sofa’, ma-zilat ‘sofa (stands)’ : Geo. zinad-i ‘bed for resting’ (“Knight in the panther’s skin”) : Etrusc. zilath ‘high position’

Hat. zinar ‘lyre, harp’, hun-zinar ‘big lyre’ : Geo. zonar-i ‘lace’, cf. Arm. (← Geo.) ǯnari ‘string; lyre’

HATTIAN-CAUCASSIAN ISOGLOSSES

(Urakh) ʒe ‘salt’

I abstain from presenting the formulas of sound-correspondences between the mentioned languages on the basis of the given material since due to the lack of the material I think it is too early to draw conclusions in this respect. I only would like to note that phonological difference is revealed between the z and zz recordings (Viach. Ivanov), i.e. z=z and zz=dz whistling (hissing) sibilants. It doesn’t seem inappropriate to note that Hattian pʃ complex which corresponds with Apkhaz-Abaza pʃ and Kartvelian ps groups, excludes the existence of laterals in Hattian since the Circassian languages reveal the plŕ lateral complex, i.e. l’ → ʃ is confirmed in Hattian and in this regard it coincides with the Apkhaz-Kartvelian data.

In point of fact it is required to carry out the Hattian-Caucassian comparative study on all language hierarchical level which will enable us to learn to what extant demonstrates the Hattian language the Caucasian (Paleo-Caucasian) nature.
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ON THE VALUES OF THE CV-SIGNS FOR WORD-MEDIAL STOPS IN HITTITE. A NEW APPRAISAL

David Pascual COELLO*

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to report briefly the results, methodology and conclusions of my PhD dissertation on the use and values of the CV-signs for stops in word-medial position in Hittite, which was defended in July 2014 in Madrid at the Universidad Complutense.¹

The purpose of this research was to carry out a systematic study of the CV-signs for stops² in word-medial position throughout the three palaeographical periods of the Hittite documentation. A great deal has been said over the years about the use and value of these signs, but so far no attempt has been made to take up this task in a comprehensive systematic way.

With this aim I built up a corpus of texts of more than 3,000 tablets and 25,000 words coming from all three periods of writing, excavation sites³ and covering all kinds of literary genres (historical, administrative, religious, technical and legal texts, letters, bilinguals, etc). I have always worked on the basis of transcriptions provided by the text editions. Because my study has a statistical method and purpose, I have refrained from making any personal interpretation of those transcriptions.

---

¹ This research began in 2009 thanks to a scholarship granted by the Spanish government and was carried out at the CCHS of CSIC, Madrid.
² These signs are as follows: TA, DA, TI, DI, TU, DU, KA, GA, QA, KI, GI, KU and GU.
³ Texts coming from Maşat-Höyük, Ortaköy and Kayalıpmar are also included.
2. Methodology

In my dissertation I tried to establish a method for the study of these signs that could take into account all the different aspects implied in the use of the CV-signs for stops by the Hittite scribes. I have therefore classified the information according to three different criteria. First of all, I have taken into account all the possible graphic sequences in which each sign could be involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible sign sequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V-CV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, I have also taken into account the paleographic classification of the tablet in which each sign appears, following the information provided by the Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln of Silvin Košak available in the Hethitologie Portal Mainz. However, due to the recent discussion about the limits of the three main periods of the Hittite script, I have decided to establish a clear distinction between the old and the new periods of the script, classifying every doubtful tablet as middle and making this category into a general transition period in order to establish a clear difference between the old and new periods of the script.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OS</th>
<th>“MS”</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ah</td>
<td>ah?</td>
<td>mh?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ah?/mh?</td>
<td>mh?</td>
<td>sjh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And thirdly, I have also introduced a morphological criterion, classifying the signs according to the morphological element they belong to. According to this criterion, the signs are classified in four groups, namely whether they belong to a **lexeme**, a **nominal morpheme**, a **verbal ending** or a **clitic**.

Due to the limits of space in the present paper, I cannot make here a comprehensive exposition of my dissertation, and will confine myself to present what I believe is the more significant data provided by the research.

3. Use of the signs DI, GI and GU

These signs are rare and use to appear in words like *e-di* (D.sg. *asi, uni, ini*),
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galdi-, wagessar/n- or p]a-an-gu-uš (KBo 16.71+ anv. II 9’ (OS)), the only attestation of GU in a Hittite word in the whole corpus of texts. Let us take a general look at their frequency of use in the graphic sequences.

a) Frequency of the signs in “voiced” sequences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V-CV</th>
<th>Vn-CV</th>
<th>Vr-CV</th>
<th>VI-CV</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Frequency of the signs in “non-voiced” sequences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VC₁-C₁V</th>
<th>Vs-CV</th>
<th>Vk-CV</th>
<th>Vp-CV</th>
<th>Vt-CV</th>
<th>Vḫ-CV</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, according to these data the distribution of the Old Babylonian voiced signs DI, GI and GU in the sequences does not seem to be arbitrary at all: in the first table there are 417 voiced signs used in the voiced sequences, while in the second one only three of these signs appear in a non-voiced sequence. So, from these point of view, the use of these signs does not seem arbitrary at first sight. As can be seen in the following chart, the use of the voiced signs in non-voiced sequences is less than 1%.
4. Use of the signs KA & QA vs. GA

As regards the use of the velar signs KA, GA and QA there is a very interesting distribution of the signs in the representation of the suffix -\textit{kki/a} and in final position of the word. In this morphological and grammatical context the use of these signs seems to be determined by a certain phonetic interpretation of the morphemes or phonemes implied, so let us take a look at the use of the signs in these grammatical circumstances:

\textbf{Use of the signs KA, GA and QA in the representation of the indefinite suffix -\textit{kki/a}}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KA</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>1 (6.25%)</td>
<td>10 (11.6%)</td>
<td>13 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
<td>2 (2.4%)</td>
<td>4 (3.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>13 (81.25%)</td>
<td>74 (86%)</td>
<td>87 (83.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table, in spite of the general use of the sign GA for the representation of the phonetic sequence /velar + a/, this sign is hardly used to write this indefinite suffix. On the other hand, the signs KA and QA, which are barely used in general, show here a rate of more than 95 per cent. Thus, in this morphological context we find a use of signs which is contrary to the general tendency in the Hittite writing.
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In the writing of the words *uga/ukka, ammuga/amukka* and *ziga/zikka* we find similar rates, although in this case it is possible to observe a complementary distribution of the signs according to the graphic sequence use in the representation:

**Use of KA, GA and QA in the words *uga/ukka, ammuga/amukka and ziga/zikka***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-kka</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VC₁-C₁V</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 (13.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 (76.2%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26 (22.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (23.8%)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-CV</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38 (100%)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>85 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table, in the double sequence the rates are very similar to that observed in the suffix *-kki/a*, while in the simple sequence the only sign used is GA, which is very significant if we take into account the phonetic values of these sequences established by Sturtevant.

**5. Use of the signs TA vs. DA**

In the same line, if we look at the use of the signs TA and DA in the representation of the etymological voiceless dental phoneme in verbal endings, we find also that the sign TA is used both in the double and simple
sequences (although its use is much more common in the double one) and that the sign DA appears only in a double sequence in a very low number of cases (always in NS tablets).

**Intervocalic *t representation in verbal endings with TA and DA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VC₁-C₁V</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>38 (100%)</td>
<td>166 (98.8%)</td>
<td>551 (97%)</td>
<td>755 (97.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.2%)</td>
<td>17 (3%)</td>
<td>19 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-CV</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
<td>42 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the most interesting fact is that we do not find any case of simple writing with DA in a sample of more than 800 cases, which, if we assume that these signs had a voiced value, would be a rather confusing writing.

**Proportions**

[Diagram showing proportions of Vt-ta, Vd-da, and V-ta]

Quite the opposite happens in the representation of the pronominal infix -d- (as in *apedani*, *kuedani*, etc.), which is always represented by a simple sequence and where the use of the sign DA reaches almost 97%.
Use of the signs TA and DA in the representation of the pronominal infix -d-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VC-CV</th>
<th>V-CV</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30 (3.3%)</td>
<td>30 (3.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>878 (96.7%)</td>
<td>878 (96.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportions

So, at least in this morphological context it is possible to establish a clear opposition between the use of the signs TA and DA in the use of both verbal endings and pron. infix -d-, as we can see in the following chart:

Opposite use of TA and DA
If we look now at the use of these two signs in verbal endings when the dental phoneme is preceded by a consonant, we can also notice that the use of the sign DA is even less frequent than in intervocalic position, which was a 2%.

**Use of TA and DA in verbal endings in *t after a consonant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal endings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>1709 (99,5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>8 (0,5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, in the light of these data we must conclude that the Hittite scribes use to write these verbal endings according to the following pattern:
6. Conclusions

Therefore, in the light of these new data I think it is possible to draw the following conclusions:

- In some phonetic and morphological contexts the use of the CV-signs for stops in Hittite is NOT ARBITRARY:
  - DI, GI and GU are almost always (99.3%) used in voiced sequences.
  - The use of KA and QA in the Indef. Suffix -kki/a amounts to 96% of all cases.\(^4\)
  - \textit{Ukka, amukka} and \textit{zikka} are represented with KA and QA (79%) and \textit{uga, ammuga} and \textit{ziga} with GA (100%).
  - In verbal endings we find a very high use of the sign TA in all the sequences, contrasting with the use of DA in the representation of the infix -d-.

- In intervocalic position there is a full agreement between the OLD BABYLONIAN VALUES of the signs and STURTEVANT’S LAW:
  - VC\(_1\)-C\(_1\)V: TA, KA and QA (\textit{ka\(_4\)})
  - V-CV: DA, DI, GA and GI

- From an etymological and phonetical point of view, their use also agrees with the voiced or voiceless character of the phonemes represented:
  - Verbal endings: TA = VC\(_1\)-C\(_1\)V = \(*t\)
  - DA, DI, GI and GU = V-CV, Vn-CV, Vr-CV, VI-CV = */voiced stop/ or voiced context.
  - KA and QA (\textit{ka\(_4\)}) = VC\(_1\)-C\(_1\)V vs. GA = V-CV

\(^4\) In this morphological context we find a use of the signs KA, GA and QA contrary to the usual custom of the scribes, who use to choose GA for the representation of the sequence /velar stop + a/. 
• There is a close correspondence among the Old Babylonian values of the signs, their use in the graphic sequences, and their etymology or phonetic context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signs</th>
<th>OB Value</th>
<th>Hittite Sequence</th>
<th>Etymology, Phonetics</th>
<th>Hittite Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA, DI, GI (and GU)</td>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td>V-CV</td>
<td>*/d/, */dʰ, */g/, */gʰ/</td>
<td>Voiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vn-CV, Vr-CV, Vl-CV</td>
<td>Voiced phoneme + stop</td>
<td>Glottalic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA, KA, QA</td>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td>VC-CV</td>
<td>*/t/, */k/</td>
<td>Voiceless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glottalic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All in all we can conclude, according to the former information, that:

• The Hittite scribes knew the Old Babylonian values of the CV-signs for stops TA, DA, KA, GA, QA, TI, DI, KI, GI, KU and GU, although they did not usually employ them systematically.\(^5\)

• The use of these signs according to their OB values seems to imply the existence of a voiced vs. voiceless opposition between the stops series in Hittite, that can be represented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonetic character</th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voiced</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>/k/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>/g/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This seems at least to be the best hypothesis in order to explain simply and thoroughly the particular use made by the Hittite scribes of the CV-signs for stops that has been exposed in the present paper.

---

\(^5\) However, in some specific contexts their use becomes more systematic, always according to their OB values.
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VORFAHREN, AHNENKOLLEKTIV UND KÖNIGLICHE VORGÄNGER: UNTERSCHIEDLICHE BEZEICHNUNGEN

Chiara COGNETTI*

Im vorliegenden Beitrag werden die vorläufigen¹ Ergebnisse meiner Untersuchung über jene Ausdrücke bzw. Redewendungen vorgestellt, mit denen sich hethitische Texte aus Boğazköy auf die Ahnen, Vorfahren, Vorfäter bzw. königlichen Vorgänger beziehen. Dem ist aber vorauszuschicken, dass die folgende lexikalische Untersuchung nur auf Verwendung und Vorkommen bestimmter Ausdrücke in den Texten hethitischer Sprache abzielt, die aber nicht unbedingt anatolischen Ursprungs sind. Es gibt nämlich Texte (s. unten den Mythos vom Königtum des Gottes LAMMA und die hethitische Version des Lieds von Ullikummi), die ihren Ursprung in einem anderen kulturellen bzw. ethnischen, d. h. hurritischen, Bereich haben. Die Aneignung bzw. Übersetzung solcher Texte durch hethitische Schreiber eröffnet aber die Möglichkeit, die lexikalischen Entscheidungen der Schreiber nachzu vollziehen: Daraus lässt sich erkennen, wie die Schreiber die Texte verstanden und welche Begriffe sie dafür als adäquat erachtet haben, woraus sich implizit sehr wohl Spuren ihrer Weltvorstellung enthüllen lassen. Deswegen ist es nicht nur gestattet, sondern geboten, auch Texte nicht-anatolischen Ursprungs in die Diskussion einzubeziehen.

Im Laufe der Untersuchung stellten sich folgende Fragen: Muss man betreffs der Ahnen von einem kollektiven Begriff für unbestimmte Vorfahren ausgehen oder ist es vorstellbar, dass jeder König nach seinem Tode ein Ahne wurde,

* Institut für Assyriologie und Hethitologie, Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität, München.
¹ Der Ahnenkult und seine Erscheinungsformen bei den Hethitern stellen einen Teil des Themas meiner Dissertation dar, aus welcher das Kapitel über die Bezeichnungen der Ahnen im Rahmen des 9. IKH in Čorum auszugsweise vorgetragen worden ist.
mit seinem eigenen Namen in Erinnerung blieb und zu verehren war? Das heißt, kannten die Hethiter sowohl die kultische Verehrung der kollektiven Vorfahren als auch die der früheren Könige? Gab es somit unterschiedliche Bezeichnungen für zwei verschiedene Arten von Ahnen?

**Der „Großvater“ und die „Großväter“**


Die Untersuchung der Pluralform von ḫuḫḫa- darf als besonders vielversprechend gelten, weil damit schwerlich auf eine Pluralität von Großvätern Bezug genommen wird, eher dagegen auf eine Vielzahl an Ahnen oder Vorfahren. Einige der einschlägigen Textstellen sind nur fragmentarisch erhalten; es gibt aber Fälle, die eine solche Untersuchung


erlauben. Im Mythos vom Königstum des Gottes LAMMA KBo XXII 86+ (CTH 343.1.A)⁶ Rs. III liest man Folgendes:

4´) me-mi-iš-ke-u-wa-an [d]a-a-iš a-aš-ma-wa-[za ‚…]"  
5´) DINGIRMEDŠ GAL{T}I LÚMEDŠ ŠU¹ GI tu-u-e-e[l ‚…]"  
6´) ḫu- uğ-ḫi-iš nu-uš-m[a-aš] me-na-ah-ḫa-an-da i-i[f]  
7´) nu-uš-ma-aš ḫi-in-i[k DLA]MMA-aš A-NA ḫu-[ba]-[ba]  
8´) EGIR-pa me-mi-iš-[ke-u-wa-a]n da-a-iš  
9´) ka-ru-i-li-u[§ DINGI]RMEDŠ-uš šal-le-e-eš [‚…]"


⁷ Hier lässt sich annehmen, dass kein weiteres Zeichen am Ende von Z. 5´ geschrieben wurde. Es gibt sehr wohl Fälle von Personalpronomen, deren Bezugswort nicht in derselben Zeile steht; s. z. B. KUB XXVI 1 Rs. IV 20ff.: [(ma-a-an-na-a)]d-[du-za] "uru" ku-e-da-ni-ik-<ki> me-mi-ya-ni (21) [(pa-ra-a u-)][ya-mi na-aš-me-at-a-tu-e-el (22) [(ku-e-da-ni-i)]k-ki *me-mi-ni* pu-nu-uš-mi .(23f.) I, My Majesty, [(es)]nd you[w] [(out)] for some matter, or I question you[w] about [(som)e affair of yours[w], [(Then)] you[w] must [(no)] t conceal [(it)]“ (Übersetzung von Miller 2013, 305).  
vom Königstum des Gottes LAMMA finden sich im Text jedoch keine Gleichsetzungen Annunaku = frühere Götter und Igigi = große Götter, da eine Übereinstimmung von DINGIR¹MEŠ GAL¹TIL […] und karuliš DINGIR¹MEŠ vorliegt.

Bezüglich der Einordnung der großen Gottheiten als „Großväter“ in die Gruppe der früheren Gottheiten lässt sich eine Verbindung zwischen dem Mythos vom Königstum des Gottes LAMMA und der folgenden Textstelle aus der hethitischen Version des Liedes von Ullikummi KUB XXXIII 106++ (CTH 345.I.3.1.A)¹⁰ Rs. III 48′–55′ herstellen:


Hier ist die Verbindung der früheren Gottheiten mit den „alten, väterlichen und großväterlichen Siegelhäusern“ belegt. Darüber hinaus findet sich der Ausdruck „frühere Väter“, der sich mit jenem für die „früheren Gottheiten“ gleichsetzen lässt: Da von der Zeit der Welterschaffung die Rede ist, muss es sich bei den „früheren Vätern“ nicht um bloße Menschen, sondern eher um Gottheiten handeln. Der Unterschied zwischen den karūiliyaš DINGIR¹MEš

---
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Der folgenden Textstelle aus dem historischen Bericht Arnuwanandas I. KBo L 4 (CTH 148)11 Vs. 4–7 ist eine genauere Begriffsbestimmung der ḫuḫḫeš zu entnehmen:


Die „Großväter (und) Großmütter“


14 Die Ergänzungen stammen aus den folgenden Paralleltexten: IBoT III 147 (+) Bo 4371 4–19; Bo 3367 Vs.! 4–8; KUB VII 10 Vs. I 5–11; KUB LIII 58 1–7; KBo XXII 112 (+) KUB XL 74 16–21.

162

Die „Großmütter (und) Großväter“ stellen hier die Vertreter des Königspaares dar, indem sie eine Vermittlerrolle gegenüber der Sonnengöttin der Erde ausüben. Ihre Funktion besteht darin, die Ersatzfiguren als Substitute des Königspaares anzuerkennen. So erweisen sich die kollektiven Ahnen nicht nur als Fürsprecher des Königspaares, sondern auch als dessen symbolische Verkörperung: Sie bürden sich nämlich die Verantwortung für die Verfehlungen des Königspaares auf und tragen die Konsequenzen dieser Verfehlungen gegenüber der Sonnengöttin der Erde, so wie auch die Substitute.

Darüber hinaus lässt sich eine weitere Überlegung hinsichtlich der kollektiven Dimension des Ausdrucks ḫuḫḫiš ḫanniš bzw. ḫuḫḫaḫanniš anführen: Bei diesem Ersatzritual sowie beim Totenritual šalliš waštaiš waren wahrscheinlich nicht die Bilder aller Vorfahren anwesend – dies wäre in der praktischen Ausführung zu umständlich gewesen. Demzufolge ist anzunehmen, dass lediglich zwei Statuen, eine für die Großväter und eine für die Großmütter, repräsentativ für alle Vorfahren zur Verwendung kamen. Dies würde zur Vorstellung der Ahnen als Kollektiv passen.

**Der „Vater“, die „Väter“ und die „früheren König“**

Das Sumerogramm AB.BA im Singular unterscheidet sich vom heth. Wort atta- und dem Akkadogramm ABU im Singular, da es dann nicht wie letztere die Bedeutung „Vater“ hat: Im Text der Reform des Kultes der Göttin der Nacht von Šamuḫa KUB XXXII 133 (CTH 482)\textsuperscript{15} Vs. 2 bezieht sich Muršili

\textsuperscript{15} Miller 2004, 312–319.
II. mit AB.BA auf seinen Ururgroßvater Tudḫaliya: Folglich bezeichnet dieses Sumerogramm im Hethitischen ein entfernteres Verwandtschaftsverhältnis.


Die „Väter“ sind demzufolge mit den „früheren Königen“ vergleichbar. Mit dem Ausdruck karūilieš LUGAL¹⁷ MEŠ werden in zwei Gebeten¹⁷ und in einem Kultinventartext¹⁸ die unmittelbaren Vorgänger des Königs bezeichnet. Dies geschieht aber nicht in der folgenden Textstelle aus dem Maštigga-Ritual KBo XXXIX 8 (CTH 404.1.I.A)¹⁹ Rs. IV 27–31:

„Die beiden Opfermandanten versiegeln es (das Stierhorn) oben, und die Ritualistin / spricht folgendermaßen: „Wenn die früheren / Könige wiederkehren und die Riten des Landes / nachrechnen werden, erst dann soll auch dieses Siegel / erbrochen werden‘.“

Die hier genannten „früheren Könige“ konnten in der damaligen Vorstellung über die Sitten der hethitischen Gemeinschaft richten und verkörperten selbst das Wesen dieser Bräuche. Daher stellten sie dem Anschein nach eine Gruppe dar, die über das Reich wachte, genauso wie die kollektiven Ahnen (ḫuḫḫahanniš).

¹⁸ Siehe das Heiligtumsinventar Tudḫaliyas IV. KUB XXXVIII 35 (CTH 525.4; s. Hazenbos 2003, 48–51) Vs. I 1ff.


---


Die „Väter (und) Großväter“

Etwa Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. könnten diese zwei kulturellen Komponenten, die anatolische und die hurritische, in dem Ausdruck addeš ḫuḫḫeš „Väter (und) Großväter“ eine Verbindung eingegangen sein. Ein Beleg dieses Ausdrucks findet sich in der folgenden Textstelle aus dem išḫuul-Teil von ABoT I 56 (CTH 256)²³ Rs. III:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{x+2)} & \quad \text{ŠA KUR.KUR } \text{URU } \text{ḪAT-TI-ma} \ldots \\
\text{3’) } & \quad \text{nu-uš-ma-aš an-na-li-uš } \text{x}[\ldots] \\
\text{4’) } & \quad \text{šME₃ } \text{šA GIDIM}^{\text{HL₃}} \ldots \\
\text{5’) } & \quad \text{lu-uz-zi-ya-za-at } \text{x}[\ldots \text{a-ra-u-e-eš a-ša-an-du}]^{\text{24}} \\
\text{6’) } & \quad \text{nu } \text{GIDIM}^{\text{HL₃}}-aš ku-iš ku-it \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

VORFAHREN, AHNENKOLLEKTIV UND KÖNIGLICHE VORGÄNGER:

7’) *A-NA* ÊMES ŠIDIMḪI.A ku-e[(-?) …]  
8’) *ad-da-aš ḫu-ḫu-ḫaḫaš ku-e[(-?) …]  
9’) ŠA ŠIDIMḪI.A iš-ḫi-ú-ul […]

„Von den Ländern Ḫattis aber […] / und euch/ihnen die früheren […] / Die Häuser der Toten […] / und von Fronarbeit [sollen] sie [frei sein.] / Wer den Toten was […] / Welche (Dinge)’ den Häusern der Toten […] / Welche (Dinge)’ den Vätern (und) Großvättern […] / die Pflichten/Vorschrift betreffs der Toten […]“. 


Der Beleg von *addaš ḫuḫhaš* im Zusammenhang mit Toten eröffnet die Möglichkeit eines Vergleichs der dadurch bezeichneten Gruppe mit den *ḫuḫheš ḫanniš bzw. ḫuḫḫaḫanniš*. Bei den kollektiven Ahnen handelt es sich nämlich um Statuen bzw. Bilder, die u. a. beim Totenritual šalliš waštaš Opfer erhalten und verehrt werden (s. oben). In ABoT I 56 ist von Häusern der Toten die Rede; demzufolge dürften sich dort ebenfalls die Bilder der „Väter“ und der „Großväter“ befunden haben. Hinsichtlich der generellen Verwendung und Bedeutung der Termini kann hier jedoch insofern ein

Diesbezüglich erweist sich die folgende Textstelle aus der Übersichtstafel des 2. Tages des Totenrituals šalliš waštaiš KBo XXXIX 289 (CTH 450)²⁵ Vs. als besonders aussagekräftig:

1) [I-N]A UD II KM ma-aḫ-ḫa-an ḫa-aš-[t]a₁-[i le-eš-ša-an-zî]
2) [n]a-at I-NA É.NA₄ pé-e-da-a[n-zî]
3) [n]a-at-kán GišNÁ-aš ti-an-zi ñu I GU₄¹
4) [V]I’ UDU ḫI.A-ya ki-iš-ša-an ši-pa-an-ta-an[-zî]
5) [I UDU t]ák-na-aš DUTU-i I UDU ne-pí-ša-aš [DUTU-i]
6) [II’ UDU ḫ]u-ulḫ-ḫa-aš ḫa-an-na-aš I UDU <I GU₄-ya> at-ta-[š]
7) [I UDU A-N]A DUD.SIG₅,…


roßväter (und) Großmütter, ein Schaf <und ein Rind> für die atta[š], / [ein Schaf für] den Gott des guten Tages …“


**Fazit**

In den Boğazköy-Texten sind mehrere unterschiedliche Ausdrücke belegt, die als Bezeichnungen für die Vorfahren gedeutet werden können. Die Pluralform des Terminus *ḫuḫha-* „Großvater“ kann in einer übertragenen Bedeutung auch für die Ahnen verwendet werden; damit werden jedoch wahrscheinlich nicht die königlichen Vorgänger bezeichnet, sondern etwas wie Stammväter (Gottheiten und Könige). Die *ḫuḫheš ḫanniš* bzw. *ḫuḫḥahanniš* „Großväter (und) Großmütter“ bezeichnen die kollektiven

26 Vergleiche Kassian (2000, 80), der das Wort *addeš* anhand des Vergleichs mit dem Ritual von Ziplantawiya KBo XV 10+ (CTH 443.A) Vs. I 16–18 als Bezeichnung der „Seele“ deutet; s. auch HED 1-2, 227 unter *adda-/addi-*.

Aufgrund der Analyse aller einschlägigen Termini lässt sich schließlich annehmen, dass bei den Hethitern deutlich zwischen dem Kult der kollektiven Ahnen und dem Kult der verstorbenen Könige unterschieden wurde.
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THE HITTITE KING AND THE VINE

Carlo CORTI

It is well known that wine played an important role in many ancient cultures. The complex processes of wine-making were known and practiced in several regions of the ancient world; often wine was considered as a prestigious luxury product, to be consumed by the royal family and the elites at court. The prestige of the beverage wine and the economic importance of viticulture transcended the sphere of production and consumption, entering the realm of religious and ideological concepts.

The extensive use of wine is well established for Hittite Anatolia. Sources suggest that wine there was not only consumed by the royal family and the elites, but was a more common commodity for which there was a considerable demand throughout the kingdom. The economic significance of wine in Hittite society is closely linked to its ubiquitous use in the temple cult, which required a reliable supply of wine for the consumption of the gods. The association of wine with the cult certainly stimulated the attribution of symbolic values to the vine and its product, traditions that can be shown to go back to the pre-Hittite Hattian civilization in North Central Anatolia as clearly inferred from CTH 733, “Invocation to the Hattian deities”:

---

* University of Würzburg.
1 This work was carried out within the project „Wine and Viticulture in Hittite Anatolia“, financed by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) – Project number CO 1147/1-1. Some of the concepts expressed in the last part of this paper have already been presented in Corti 2017c. I would like to thank Daniel Schwemer for his help with comments on several parts of this paper.
4 On CTH 733 now Corti 2010a.
Long life to the king⁵! The queen ditto, his children ditto, his grandchildren ditto, and the same for the people.⁶ Let his country leave the borders of the sea over here and over there ditto. Let flourish the field of tāḫata for (their offerings of) bread to the gods. Let flourish the vineyard⁷ of the town of Kakumaḫa for (their offerings of) wine to the gods.

As already affirmed, the importance of the wine it is well known for Hittite Anatolia, especially within the sphere of the cult. But the role that vineyards and the vine themselves played from an economic point of view, for religious practices as well as for the use of viticulture images and actions was, at the same time, no less significant for the Hittites.

The economic prominence of viticulture and the vine in the Hittite society is evident from reading some texts of administrative and economic content. In fact, several paragraphs of the Hittite Laws (CTH 292) pertain to vine and vineyard management, dealing with the regulation of controversies and providing information concerning the value of terrain used to cultivate vines (§ 101, 105, 107–8, 113) as well as the price of wine itself (mainly § 183 and 185). It is also meaningful that of the two series which make up the Laws, the second is titled “If a vine”.⁸ Various administrative documents and letters, especially those from the Mašat Höyük archive, provide data on the cultivation of the vine and the production of wine in the region of Tapikka and highlighting the sovereign’s interest in successful harvests and care for the vineyards (HKM 4, 35); others in which the city of Kašaša, in the Tapikka district, appears as a center of wine production (HKM 31, 37, 105).⁹ The (late) middle-Hittite tablet KBo 16.65 (+), which refers to the province administration belonging to the region of Zalpuwa along the southern coast of the Black Sea, lists the vineyards and vine-dressers assigned to the temple of the Stormgod of the town of Hašhatatta by private citizens.¹⁰ As far as the land donation tablets are concerned, in addition to KBo...

---

⁵ Or: May the king live (in eternity)!
⁶ For the translation ERINMEŠ as “people” - instead of “army” - in this group of documents see del Monte 1984, 169-170.
⁷ The restoration GISKIRI₄,GEŠTIN “vineyard” in the documentation of CTH 733 is according to Corti 2010a, 143-144.
¹⁰ See Corti 2017c, 50-53. To the tablet KBo 16.65 (+) Privat 15 now we can add KBo 23.58; this last fragment cites the town of Zilnuwa at l. 4’. For a general overview of the Land of Zalpuwa see now Corti 2017a, 226-228 and 2017b, 198-200.
5.7 which talks about various plots of land – including vines – donated by the king Arnuwanda I and the queen Ašmunikkal to the priestess Kuwatalla,\textsuperscript{11} and Bo 90/750 where the sovereign gives to a vassal a large plot of land cultivated with vines in the region of Tapikka, VAT 7436 \textsuperscript{12} appears significant since it cites vines from the city of Tuhuppiya, known for its production of olive oil and, probably, of wine already during the Old Assyrian period.\textsuperscript{13}

The grapevine and its main product, wine, acquired special significance as symbol of abundance, well-being, regeneration and immortality, reaching the height of its symbolic value in relationship with the Hittite king and the royal family. Before talking about the symbolic value of the grapevine itself in the Hittite sources, I think it is important to emphasize the role that the vineyard played for the Hittites. In addition to the economical aspect, already touched upon, the vineyard presents particularly significant elements at the religious level as a place with cathartic power where the deities are located (\textit{locus numinosus}). Although there are a limited number of texts in which the vineyard is the setting of ritual action and celebrations, those mentioned are significant for our reasoning and I will give a brief overview of several of them.

In addition to a group of fragments that is part of the documentation of Luwian \textit{milieu}, labeled as “Fragments of rituals with Luwian words” (CTH 670/763) and dealing with a celebration for the Storm god of the sky during which gardeners and vine-dressers move a statue of the deity from a vineyard,\textsuperscript{14} the very first document I would like to examine is KUB 43.23+, called “Blessing for the Labarna”. It is a middle-Hittite ritual that was performed to assure the prosperity of the royal vineyard.\textsuperscript{15} A large section of the text consists of an invocation to the Storm God Tarhunta and of a plea addressed to the dark genius of the Earth and to the Sun goddess of the Earth to bring prosperity to the vineyards and—in a broad

\textsuperscript{11} Edition Rüster and Wilhelm 2012, 231-244 with literature. I maintain that in obv. 40 of this text it is possible to restore \textit{IUL\textsf{\textit{ku}}-wa-an-na-ni-ya}; this spring could be connected with (the irrigation of) a vineyard, because \textit{GIŠ\textsf{\textit{KIRI}, GEŠTIN} is cited in the next line.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{12} Rüster and Wilhelm 2012, 186-189 (Nr. 41).

\textsuperscript{13} Barjamovic 2011: 309–311.

\textsuperscript{14} KUB 35.1; KUB 35.2 (+) 4. See Starke 1985, 354-357.

\textsuperscript{15} For a new edition see Corti, in progress; Fuscagni, \textit{apud} Košak, Konk, added to this tablet the fragment Bo 9252. I would like to add also Bo 4243, up until now catalogued under CTH 470; it duplicates KUB 43.23+ obv. 12-20.
Carlo CORTI

sense—to grant prosperity to the sovereign’s household; the tablet ends with a list of offerings for the deities including, Kamrušepa, Telipinu and Maliya; the latter bearing the meaningful title of “Mother of Vine and of Grain” (rev. 23-61). From the very beginning the tablet shows that we dealing with a plea and not only to a magical ritual; it also shows several elements that recall the missing deities mythologem (obv. 1-9): 16

1 \[[\text{DIM}]\text{-}na-aš \text{DINGIR.ŁÚ}^{\text{MEŠ}} \text{u-wa-te-et-te-en} \text{DIM-an}\]
2 \[[\text{ḫu-e}]l-pi-na-aš \text{KiRÍ}_6-aš \text{GEŠTIN LUGAL-uš ku-in} \text{r[a]}-\text{l}[i\text{-zi(?)]]\]
3 \[\text{nu} \text{[e]}-\text{ez-du e-ku-ud-du ma-a-na-aš kar-di-mi-ya-an-}[\text{r}a]\]
4 \[\text{nu} \text{kar-di-mi-ya-at-ta-an ke-e-ti UD-ti ar-ḫa pe-eš-še-ad-du}\]
5 \[\text{ma-a-na-aš ta-ma-at-ta-ma KUR-ya na-an ta-me-e-}ta-az\]
6 \[\text{KUR-az u-wa-te-et-te-en na-aš-ta LUGAL-}[\text{r}a]-\text{DU MU}^{\text{MEŠ.-ŠU}}\]
7 \[\text{ḫa-a-aš-ša ḥa-an-za-aš-ša} \text{DIM-ni [pár-ra-(a-)an-t]a}^{17} \text{a-aš-šu}\]
8 \[\text{me-mi-š-ki-it-te-en šu-me-eš-}y[a \text{DIM-na-aš DI}][\text{NGIR. ŁÚ}^{\text{MEŠ}}-eš}\]
9 \[\text{e-ez-te-en e-ku-[ut-te-en]}\]

1 O male gods of the [Stormgod bring (here) the Stormgod
2 of the [you]ng vineyard who the king evo[kes(?).]
3 Let him drink (and) eat! If he is angry,
4 let him throw away his anger on this day.
5 But, if he is in another country, bring him from (that) other country.
6 Speak the king, his wife, children
7 and descendants favorably [acros]s to the Stormgod.
8 And you, male gods [of the Stormgod]
9 eat (and) dri[nk!]

---

17 For this restoration see Boley 2000, 183-184; for the use of parranda in similar contexts see CHD P, 136-137. Haas 1988, 132 proposes \[\text{me-na-ah-ḫa-an-t]a}\, but the length of the lacuna is not sufficient to house this restoration.
The last lines of the composition (rev. 19’-22’) – followed by the offerings to the deities – are devoted to a famous simile; the excerpt compares the vine to a sow in the following way:18

19  nu-za 1 ȘAH ma-a-ah-ha-an
20  ŠAH.TUR[H] me-ek-ku-uš ha-aš-ki-iz-zi ke-e-el-la-az ȘA[G] ŠAḪ.KIRI[G][EŠTIN]
21  l-aš-ša GISA ma-a-ah-la-an ŠAH-aš i-wa-ar mu-u-ri-uš
22  me-ek-ku-uš  ĥa-aš-ki-id-  du

19  …  Just as one sow
20  gives birth to many piglets, may also from this [vine]yard
21  even a single (vine) branch, like a sow,
22  begin to bear many grape clusters.

The relationship between the sow and the grapevine as symbols of regeneration and renewal is also confirmed by KUB 12.44+ “Ritual of Anna of Kaplawiya for an unfruitful vineyard” (CTH 392) in which magical procedures are carried out at the entry and within the field of the vines to ensure the fertility of the vineyard. The incipit – and partly the colophon - clearly shows the scope of the performed magical ritual (obv. II 36-37):19

36  ma-a-an  GISA.KIRI[G][EŠTIN] ku-iš Ú-UL mi-i-e-eš-ki-iz-zi
37  [ ]  ʾki-iš-šaʾ an a-ni-ya-mi na-aš mi-iš-ki-u-an da-a-i

36  If a vineyard never bears fruit
37  I will perform [the ritual] as follows and it (the vineyard) will begin to bear fruit (again).

One of the magic actions carried out in order to make the vineyard fruitful again was based on the burying the “female genitalia” of a sow.

18  CHD L/N, 333.
19  See Haas 1988, 138-142.
The tablet KUB 55.54(+) also presents interesting elements. At first glance this document seems difficult to attribute typologically, but at closer look, it must be considered a ritual in honor of deceased members of the same family; in addition to a list of offerings to the gods, peculiar ritual actions are carried out involving the statues of the deities and those of the ancestors; one of these actions actually takes place in a vineyard. It is interesting to point out that, as far as we know, the text does not appear to be dealing with members of the Hittite royal family nor with dignitaries of particularly high ranking since their names - mDUTU-liya / Tiwataliya e ʾKuzi – are apax; but we have also to remember that, being a document preserved in Tempel 1 archives, this family must have held some importance or role within the Hittite capital. The transliteration presented here follows the one provided by Groddek with additional restorations (rev. IV 1-3):

1 [ANA₂DINGIR₂]LM-ma-kán(?) KASKALHLA-uš ka-ru-u ta ”-ni-nu-a ni”-te-eš(?)
2 [GIŠZA.LA]MGARMES-ša GIŠKIR₁₆.GEŠTIN ka-ru-u”-an”-[d]a”-an DINGIR₂LM-kán”
3 [ŠA GIŠKIR]₁₆.GEŠTIN pé-e-da-an-zi šA GIŠZA.LAM.GARMES-ša GIŠKIR₁₆.GEŠTIN ta-ni-nu-wa-an zi”

1 The paths are already prepared(?) [for the deity; (?)
2 [the tents are already inside the vineyard.
3 They carry the (statue of the) deity [in the vine]yard and arrange it inside the tents.

The next paragraph, devoted to the offerings for the statues, cites the ancestor mDUTU-liya and not once but twice, the goddess Maliya, the only

---

20 Actually this tablet is composed by KUB 55.54, KBo 52, IX nr. 128, KBo 52, IX nr. 128. Groddek, apud Košak, Konk added DBH 43/2.13 (=Bo 8281) and Bo 10096. Some passages are treated by Miller 2004, 112 and Kapeluš 2010, 260-261. I maintain that also VSNF 12.55 is a fragment that join indirectly with the same manuscript.

21 See Groddek 2002, 96-99. Note at lines 1-2 the very concise information expressed by nominal sentences.

22 For the use, in this document, of one vertical wedge to express the Akkadian preposition compare DBH 43/2.13 l.col. 6’ (better 7’): ]2 ’GAL KAŠ ANA DUMUMESS. The fragment is now published in hand-copy by Taş 2017, 4; it could be tentatively placed in rev. IV 21-28.

23 The restoration is not sure but we have, at least, one clear reference at hand in KUB 58.32 obv. I 14; other options, mainly with the initial syllable ša-, are possible.
deity named soon after. This goddess, as we know from CTH 820 and the previously cited magical ritual for the prosperity of royal vineyard, is the tutelary deity of the vine and of wine.

Also in CTH 667, “Celebrations in the Zalpuwa Land”, a document connected with a funerary ritual or a celebration for a deceased sovereign, the vineyard is the location where several rituals related to the gods and/or human beings are carried out (KUB 58.32+ rev. III 1’-6’ and duplicates):

x+1’ ‘nu-wa-ra-an-kán’ [IŠ-T(U’ GAD ka-ri-ya-an-zí)]
2’ nu-wa-ra-an-kán x[...
3’ nu-wa-aš-ši GIŠKIRI₆.GE[(šTIN e-eš-ta nu-wa-ra-an-kán ŠÀ GIŠK)IRI₆.GEŠTIN(?)]
4’ pé-e-da-an-zi n[ú'-wa-ra-a(n’ ka-ri-y)a’-]
5’ ḪUL-za UL [(ku-iš-ki e-ep-zi da-pí-an-za-wa-za)]
6’ du-uš-ki-iš-ki[-iš-ki-wa-an da-a-i (?)

x+1’ “They cover him/her [wit]h a cloth[
2’ [they ….] him/her
3’ He/She had a vineyard and they carry him/her inside the vi[neyard (?)].]
4’ The[n(?)] they] cov[er(?)] him/her[?] [and he/she(?)]
5’ [shall] not [take any] evil. [All (the people)]
6’ [begin to] rejoic[e(?)”

Even if the passage is damaged and we don’t know exactly who is being taken to the vineyard and whether the act of covering the human or divine entity with a cloth is to avoid visual contact, however it is clear that, the vineyard being a locus nominosus par excellence, the negative elements do not dwell there. On the contrary, it seems that whoever is afflicted by the spell is somehow purified by just entering the vineyard; the use of the verb

---

24 For this group of texts see Corti 2010b, 91-102, in particular 99.
25 For dusk- see recently Cammarosano 2014, 138-144.
26 I maintain that the protagonist of the excerpt is a deceased person also because of the past tense sentence at line 3’.
dušk- at the end of the excerpt and the subsequent party that takes place at the palace (omitted in the text-passage), confirm that the ritual action, whatever it was, had a positive outcome.

We can conclude by saying that the vineyard was not only the setting for ritual actions and celebrations which involved the (statues of) the deities, but also the ancestors effigies; noteworthy to remark is the function of the vineyard in connection with death or funerary rituals. In the last two texts, some events take place inside a tent that has been specifically placed in the vineyard and, most likely, involve deceased individuals. I’m quite sure that also in the 12th day of the funerary ritual a similar scenario occurred (see *infra*).

In so much as the grapevine is concerned, in key texts of Hittite royal ideology the association of the king with the vine, its growth and capacity for renewal, all play a central role. This aspect may be illustrated by the following passage from the building ritual KUB 29.1 rev. IV 13-16:27

13  *nu*  $\text{GIŠGEŠTIN-aš}$  $\text{GIŠma-ah-la-an ti-an-zi KI.MIN GIŠGEŠTIN-wa}$
14  $\text{ma-ah-ha-an kat-ta šu-u-ur-kə-uš ša-ra-a-ma-wa}$
15  $\text{GIŠma-ah-lu-uš ši-i-ya-iz-zi LUGAL-ša MUNUS.LUGAL-ša kat-ta}$
16  $\text{šur-kə-uš kat-tə-ma}  $\text{GIŠma-ah-lu-uš ši-i-ya-an-du}$

They place (into the ground) a branch of a grapevine, and speak as follow: ‘Just as the grapevine sends down roots and sends up branches, let the king and queen also send down roots and send up branches’.

A passage from KBo 21.22 rev. 46-53, another document belonging to the so-called “Blessing for the Labarna”, reveals the importance and strong symbolic value of this plant as related to the king and the royalty.

46  [ $\text{š[a-li-ki}  \text{GIŠma-a-ah-li na-pa iš-hi-ši-it-ti a-ap-pa la-a-ak}$
47  [ $\text{š[a-li-ki a-ku-ki nu-za par-ku-nu-mar da-a}$
48  [ $\text{ša-]}_1 \text{li}_1 \text{-ki A-NA GEŠTIN.KU}_7  \text{nu-za mi-li-it-du-uš-ši-it}$

27 CHD L/N, 112.
THE HITTITE KING AND THE VINE

49 [da-a(?)] Ḫal-ma-aš-šu-iz nu[-z]a² ki-`nu-pi-iš-ši-it gi-nu-ut
50 [x-aš-sa da-a-li-iš-te-] en
51 [x-aš-sa da-a-li-iš-te-en ki-nu-na-aš
52 [t]a²-ba-ar-na-aš UTU-uš ma-a-an
53 [A-WA-A]T a-ku-ka[-aš(?] QA-TI

(O Halmasuit?) touch the (vine-)branch and train (lit. bend) (it) on your back! Touch the akuka and take for yourself purification! Touch the sweet grape and [take] its sweetness for yourself? O Halmasuit! Tread his skin (of the grape) [ … release! [ … ]…… release! Now he [ ]the tabarna as the Sun deity [ let become!(?) “Word(s) of the akuka”. Finished.

The magic word akuka at the end of the paragraph, for which we know neither the meaning nor the origin, could refer to the vine tendrils since it is preceded by (vine-)branch – and the verb “to train” - and followed by grape. It proves difficult, instead, to identify it with the leaf for which there is more than one word in Hittite (for example paraštu- or lahlurnuzi-).

This strong connection between the king and the vine reaches, in my opinion, its maximum intensity during the funerary ritual for the Hittite sovereign. Due to the relevance of the twelfth day of this ritual, defined by Hittite scribes as the day of the ‘Cutting of the Grapevine’, here is presented a transliteration and translation of the most interesting passages, starting from obv. I 9 of the tablet KUB 30.19+ (and duplicates):


28 See CHD Š1, 101 and CHD L-N, 18.
30 The importance of this line is highlighted by the fact that it is the only one which makes up paragraph 3.
31 This restoration proposal fits in well with the context.
9 The ‘mother-vine’ (was) already washed (starting) from the edge and (then) it (was) brought.

10 Then they bind up a **vine shoot** with a cloth belt.

11 They adorn it with grapes, with clusters of fruit[s] (and) with clusters of iyatna-wool

12 and pick it up.

13 Taptara-women bring it inside the tent

14 and they lay it on the table of the deceased.

55 Then a man, who (belongs) to his family, takes a silver axe (weighing) twenty shekels

56 and cuts[s] the **vine (shoot)**. The cupbearer hits isqaruh-vessel against the ground
and (afterwards) he laments(?).\textsuperscript{32} Taptara-women begin to wail.

They put (the piece of) the vine (shoot) with the cloth belt into the hearth.

Taptara-women walk around the fire. (That one) who has cut off the vine (shoot),

takes the silver axe for himself.

After few other ceremonies are carried out, the twelve day goes to the end with the sentence: “The twelve day is finished: Of the cutting of the grapevine” (\textit{G\i\textsuperscript{S}GEŠTIN-aš karšuw\textsuperscript{a}š}). We know that the eighth through the eleventh days of the funerary ritual for the Hittite king were dedicated to fundamental elements of the life and, specifically, the sovereign’s life; among these animal husbandry and agriculture; so then we ask ourselves why an entire day of the celebration was dedicated to the vine when, as we just said, the tenth day was already reserved for agriculture. The title of the twelfth day must have then clearly stressed a strong symbolic action; difficult to say what this was. The most obvious explanation would be to see the action of the cutting of the shoot from the vine as the end of its productivity and, consequently, for the deceased sovereign, the end of his fertility and the interruption of the lineage.\textsuperscript{33}

I believe, however, that there is evidence for a different interpretation. The “mother-vine” – cited at the beginning of the day - as rightly recognized by Puhvel, is a clear botanical expression;\textsuperscript{34} I maintain we are dealing with the “mother of grape-vines”, “that is to say, the ‘mother-plant’ that, from an horticultural point of view, is defined as a plant grown for the purpose of taking cuttings or offsets in order to grow more quantity of the same plant”.\textsuperscript{35} The interpretation of \textit{annaš} \textit{G\i\textsuperscript{S}GEŠTIN-aš} as a metaphor of ‘grape-vine’ given by Kassian, Korolev and Sidell’tsev is not self-evident, and, in my opinion, the parallels from the Sumero-Akkadian epoch and from classical

\textsuperscript{32} About lines 56-57 see now HW\textsuperscript{2} K, 32 with literature.

\textsuperscript{33} For this interpretation see, for example, Trémouille, 2004, 173 and fn. 99.

\textsuperscript{34} Puhvel 2004, 128.

\textsuperscript{35} Corti 2017c, 56.
sources that they mention do not fit to our context. As I already said this is a technical term in botany; it is not by chance that both the ‘queen bee’ and the ‘mother vine’ are – for their respective species – the mothers par excellence.

After a series of ritual actions, the cutting of the so called “grape-vine” is carried out. In keeping with the interpretation made up until now, I believe that on a purely symbolic level, we are dealing with the action of “striking” a vine shoot from the mother-vine in order to create the “cutting”, which will give life to an identical plant in the afterlife. As a matter of fact, the daughter plants that arise from the mother plant are adventitious plants. Adventitious plants will either be released by the mother plant itself or can be cut when the plantlets reach a suitable size. The washing ritual “(starting) from the edge (on)” of the mother-plant, at the beginning of the twelfth day, fits well with my interpretation: just as in nature the mother-plant must be healthy and vigourous in order to avoid passing on defects to the “twin” grape-vine, so, it is at the beginning of the ritual, that the mother-vine is washed to free it from impurities. The reason for which the “cutting” was not planted in the earth as one would expect, is connected to the type of ritual action taking place; the “cutting” is one of the things that will go to the afterlife with the king and therefore is destined to be burned. This concept was clearly explained by Rutherford (“The premise of the Hittite ritual is that the king’s soul ends up in a sort of paradise, and the purpose of the destruction rituals that take place– by fire - is to make sure he enjoys a comfortable existence there”) and, most recently, reaffirmed by van den Hout (“Burning was probably seen as the ultimate way to ‘send’ things to the hereafter”). Therefore, my conclusion is that with the expression “cutting of the grapevine” the Hittites make reference to the “striking”, the practice of reproducing vines by cutting.

The connection of the royal family with the plants-world is confirmed by another famous simile cited in KUB 29.1 rev. IV, 22-25:

38 See CHD L/N, 200.
They put (out) artari- and maršiqqa- plants, and in this way they say: “As they cultivate/bed out these (plants), so may their descendants take care for the king and the queen”.

As I already pointed out “Just as it is the progeny who take care and assure the continuation of life in the afterworld for the deceased, so, during the funerary ritual, it is ‘the relative’ who takes the silver axe and cuts the vine shoot from the ‘mother-vine’, in order to give new life in the afterlife to the deceased sovereign”.39

We can conclude saying that the cutting of the vine did not symbolize the death of the sovereign and the interruption of his fertility as often thought but, on the contrary, it represented his regeneration as a deity. The fundamental element for the afterlife of the king underlying the twelfth day of the funerary ritual was the renewal and thus eternity.
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HİTİT UYGARLIĞI ANTİK YAPILARININ 3D MODELLEMESİ; A BİNASI
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Özet

Her geçen gün, hızla gelişen bilişim teknolojileri, diğer bilim dalları ile de iç içe geçmekte ve kullanım alanları da genişlemektedir. Özellikle; eğitimden, tarih ve sanata, mühendislikten üretim alanlarına ve bunların yanında pek çok alanda 3-boyutlu (3D) bilgisayarlı modelleme sistemlerinden olabildiğince yararlanılmaktadır. Canlandırılması ve gerçekleştirmesi oldukça zor olan cisimlerin ve ortamların ve hatta hayallerin somutlaştırılmasına imkan sağlayan 3D yazılımlar gerçeği yansıtmasının yanı sıra sınırları da ortadan kaldırmaktadır.


Bu çalışmada Hitit medeniyetinin günümüz kadar sadece belirli bir kısmı ulaşan A binasının temel ölçüleri ve yıkılan duvar izdüşümlerinden yararlanılarak 3D-Max ve SolidWorks yazılımı kullanılarak bilgisayar...

---
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Abstract

Fast-growing information technologies integrates with other scientific fields and its expands and its area of use expands each passing day. In fact, 3 dimensional computerized modelling systems are utilized as far as possible in the fields of education, history, art, engineering, production and many others. 3D softwares which enables the instantiation of the images, places and objects that are extremely difficult to animate and realize not only reflect the reality but also remove the borders.

One of the most important cities of Hittite Civilization, Şapinuva is located 3km far from the Ortaköy county of Çorum. It is also situated on the mountain pass between Göynücek and Alaca Plains around Çekerek River. Şapinuva is second to Hattusa in providing information about Hittite Empire. A significant structure of the city has come out with the excavations started in 1990. As an engineering and architectural wonder built around 3500 years ago, this construction is called as Building ‘A’.

With this study, the modeling of the building A- only a small part of which has reached up to now- was tried to be done on computer by using the fundamental measures and fallen wall projections as well as 3D-Max software. During modeling, interdisciplinary data (Archeology, Engineering fields and History) was collected. Thanks to 3D modeling of these ancient architectures, useful information regarding those periods was tried to be given with traveling in time. Moreover, this study aims at giving introductory information to individuals who are interested in this field due to the reconstruction of ancient cities which date back to Anatolian Civilizations and were excavated, are being excavated and are planned to be excavated. The study also include applications, problems and general information about the topic.

Keywords: Hittite, Ancient building, Computer modeling, Reconstruction, 3D.
GİRİŞ

Arkeolojik kazılar sonucunda elde edilen bulgular oldukça heyecan verici sonuçlar vermektedir. Ortaya çıkarılan yeni bulgular eskiye göre daha çok ilgiyi artırmakta ve çalışmalar disiplinler arası bir boyuta dönüştü ve paylaşılan bilgiler artmaya başlamıştır [1].

Ülkemiz tarihi ve kültürel birçok zenginliğe sahip olmasına rağmen, bu zenginliklerin birçoğu doğal ve insan kaynaklı nedenlerden dolayı hasar görmüş ve ancak kalıntıları günümüze ulaşabilmiştir. Bu kalıntılarından yola çıkararak gelişen teknolojinin sunmuş olduğu olanaklardan yararlanarak bilgisayar destekli 3 boyutlu modelleme programları yardımıyla gerçekini aratmayacak bir şekilde rekonstrüksiyonunu oluşturmaktadır [2].

Tarihi mirasın üç boyutlu modellenmesi ve görüntülenmesi çok yönlü ve karmaşık bir işlemdir. Bu mirasların belgelenmesinde Sayısal Yersel Fotogrametri çok etkili ve faydalı bir yöntemdir [3].

Gelişen modelleme teknikleri, tarihi ve arkeolojik yapıların kazı ve restorasyonu aşamasında, belgelemeyi sağlamakta ve mevcut durumun sanal ama gerçekçi bir rekonstrüksiyonu olanak vermektedir. Bu çalışmalar, arkeoloji disiplini ile bilgisayar teknolojileri, gelişmiş yöntem ve teknikler kullanılarak hazırlanan modelleme ve görselleştirme çalışmaları ile arkeolojik eserlere uygulanmaktadır [2].

Bu çalışmada antik yerleşim alanlarının ve binalarının 3D modelleme sayesinde görsel bir canlandırma yapılmak istenmektedir. Bu sayede geçmişe bir yolculuk olanağını sunulacak, bu bölgelere yapılan ziyaretlerde daha kalıcı bir etki bırakmak ve ilgiyi artırmak amaçlanmaktadır. Bu amaçla Hitit medeniyetinin önemli şehirlerinden olan Şapinuva’nın önemli yapılarından biri olan A binasının temel kalıntıları dikkate alınarak ölçümler sonucunda elde edilen verilerle bilgisayar ortamında 3D modellemesi yapılmaya çalışılmıştır.
2. KAVRAMSAL ÇERÇEVE

2.1. Modelleme

Modelleme, gerçeğe benzer bir şekilde görüntüler elde etme sürecidir. Günümüzde sanal ortamda en yaygın olarak kullanılan modelleme şekli nurbs (doğal) ve polygon (çokgen) modellemedir. Modeller orijinal halini ve çalışma sistemini tam olarak bilemedeniz yaplarının ve sistemlerin anlaşılmasına yardımcı olmaktadır.

Modelleme sürecinde aslına bağlı olarak ölçek ve çalışma sistemine uyumlu olmasıına dikkat edilmelidir. Elde edilen verilerin çok büyük bir titizlikle değerlendirilmesi gerekir. Model seçiminde, bulguların genelleştirilebilme ve insana uyarlanabilme özelliği de mutlaka göz önüne alınmalıdır.

2.2. 3D Modelleme Yazılımları

2.3. A Binasının Özellikleri

Hitit yerleşkesinde bulunan ve kazılar sonucunda temel kalıntıları günümüze kazandırılan A Binasının hava fotoğrafları aşağıdaki şekillerde verilmiştir.
Şekil 2’de görüldüğü gibi A binasının yaklaşık 100 metrelık bir mesafeden üstten çekilmiş bir fotoğrafı görülmektedir. Aşağıdaki şekilde ise daha yakın bir mesafeden yandan görünüş verilmiştir.

Şekil 3. A Binası kazı alanının yerleşim düzeni

A Binasının temel kalıntıları ve yerleşim alanının kazı ekibi tarafından ortaya çıkarılması sonucunda yaklaşık 1500 m² bir alana oturduğu belirlenmiştir. Bu alan şekil 3’de görülmektedir. Yapılan ölçümler ve hesaplamalar sonucunda bu binanın genel bazı özellikleri aşağıda verilmeye çalışılmıştır.

Bina boyutu yaklaşık 21 m x 68 m olarak 1428 m²’lik bir alanı kaplamaktadır.

Simetrik planlı yapıya ait dış temel duvar kalınlıkları 1.83 m ile 2.03 m arasında

Temel iç duvar kalınlıkları ise 1.70 m ile 1.80 m olarak değiştiği belirlenmiştir.

Kazı esnasında bulunan, binaya ait duvar kerpiçlerin bazılarının temelden 8-10 metre uzaklıkta olması binanın en az iki katlı olduğunu düşündürmektedir.

Şapinuva yapılarının inşaatlarında dolgu yaygın bir şekilde kullanılmıştır. Bina temelini arazinin topografiyasına düzgün bir şekilde yerleştirmek için belirli alanlarda dolgu yapıldığı, bu leylekde büyük taş bloklarının eşit boylara getirildiği görülmüştür.
YÖNTEM

Kazı ekibinden alınan bilgiler ve A binasının genel özellikleri dikkate alınarak, öncelikle binanın temel kalıntıları üzerinde metraj ölçümleri yapılmıştır. Şekil 4’de binanın temel kesintinden bir örnek görülmektedir. Ölçümler sonrasında krokisi elde edilmiştir. Bu kroki yardımıyla bilgisayar ortamında SolidWorks programı kullanılarak 2 boyut ve 3 boyut görüntüler elde edilmiştir.


SONUÇLAR

Bilgisayar ortamında Solid yazılımı ile gerçek boyutlarına ve temel kalıntılarına bağlı olarak gerçekleştirilen 3D modelleme sonucunda öncelikle 1. kat modellenmiştir. Ardından ahşap ve taş malzemeleri çağrıştıran kat tavanları örülecek 2. kat inşa edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Son olarak
çatı kaplaması ile bina kapatılmıştır. Bu aşamalar şekil 5’de özetlenmeye çalışılmıştır.

Şekil 5. A Binasının modelleme aşamaları

Bu aşamaların ardından modelleme işlemine canlandırma işlemini de dahil ederek web ortamında ziyaret edilebilir ve bina içerisinde sanal tur yapılabilir hale gelebilir. Tarihi alanların, binaların ve eşyaların asılina uygun bir şekilde modellemesi ve ziyaret edilebilir hale gelmesi sayesinde daha çok kitlenin bu tarihe ilgisini ve bilgisini artıracağı düşünülmektedir.

Ayrıca kazı alanlarının haritalanması ve 3D modellenmesi sayesinde kazık ekipi bütün alanı ele alarak henüz ortaya çıkmayan kısımlarında modellenceği göz önünde bulundurulursa hız ve gelecek kestirimine yardımcı olacaktır.
KAYNAKÇA


In the ancient Middle East, freedom was only relative, the situation in Kaneš (modern Kültepe) being no exception.\(^1\) A significant proportion of society was dependent on a superior, in relations that could vary between different social classes. In some cases, this dependency was similar to the social relations that we have traditionally regarded as slavery. Studies of Old Assyrian slavery are marred by an ambiguous terminology on the subject, applied in Kaneš by the Assyrian traders and natives alike. In a manner reminiscent of the English word ‘servant’, the Akkadian noun *wardum* (later *urdum*) was used to indicate the subordination of a person, rather than the more explicit description of his social position as that of an unfree slave. One could be in servitude to a goddess; thus, the term could be applied to more or less all people, and could be included in some personal names such as Warad-Aššur ‘servant of Aššur’ (*ÎR*-ad-*A*-šùr AKT 5 38:22). Even local rulers were in servitude to their overlords, as is demonstrated by the famous Anum-ḫirbi letter, where Waršama, the ruler (*rubāʾum*) of Kaneš, refers to the Taišmaean ruler as *ur-di-i* ‘my servant’ (kt g/t 35:5).\(^2\) Within the lower strata of society, people were in such a state of subjection to their superiors that they could be sold to others (e.g., CCT 5 20a). Yet, despite the apparent differences between the aforementioned examples, the indication *wardum* was used for both the Taišmaean vassal king as well as the person sold in

\(^1\) In this short study, I will focus on traditional slavery in the Old Assyrian period, by discussing a few selected texts that deal with slavery. I thank Prof. M. T. Larsen (Copenhagen) for providing me with an early draft of his forthcoming article on the same subject.

\(^2\) The reader should be aware that the word *wardum* changed over the Assyrian history to *urdum*. It can also be indicated logographically with ÎR, but also IR.
CCT 5 20a. Problems arise when we look at texts where the social context of participants is less clear, an issue that is further complicated by the relative amount of freedom that some slaves exercised, which allowed them to deal with money. This is best illustrated by the following text:

**no. 1: AKT 1 33**

(broken)

1'. \( um-ma \ Is_8-tár-pi-lá-aḥ \)
\( ÍR \ ša \ Amur-Is_8-tár-ma \)
\( KI \ E-nam-A-šûr \)
\( DUMU \ Puzur_4-Is_8-tár \)

5'. \( 1/3 \ MA.NA \ KÜ.BABBAR \)
\( [š]a \ Sú-sâ-a \ a-na \)
\( [i]g-ri-a : al-qé \)
\( [a]-na \ a-wa-tim \)
\( a-ni-a-tim \)

10'. \( kà-ru-um \ [di-nam i-dí-in] \)

(broken)

11-2') Thus Ištar-pilaḫ, the slave of Āmur-Ištar: 21-7') With Enam-Aššur son of Puzur-Ištar, I took 20 shekels of silver of Susâ as my wage. 8-10') For these words, the colony rendered a verdict.

As can be seen here, the Assyrian person Ištar-pilaḫ, who is indicated as a slave from somebody else, is said to take his wages together with another man. It indicates that slaves, to a certain degree, could be paid and therefore could own property. People indicated as slaves certainly exercised a certain independence in their work. As an example, in the Kuliya archive (AKT 5) we find the memorandum of the purchase of a slave, Alī-abum.4 In a later text (AKT 5 76) this slave received money from a fellow merchant,

---

3 See also Sever 1998, 485-486.
4 AKT 5 45: (21') \( IR \ A-bí-i-li : ū rí-ki-sâ a-na 3½ \[GÍN\] \( 22' \) KÜ.BABBAR SAḪAR.BA : Ku-a-li' DUMU \( A-lá-/bi-im \ iš-[š] \( 23' \) UTU-du-gul : DUMU Ib-ni-li'M : iš-am 'Kulīya son of Alī-abu bought the slave Abî-ill, with his fetter, from Šamaš-dugul son of Ibní-Adad for 3½ shekels’ of ‘dust silver.’

Note that the price of sale is extremely low, yet if we were to replace the restoration of GÍN with MA.NA, the amount would instead become extremely high for a single slave. Despite this extremely low price, the slave Alī-bani was regarded highly enough to be trusted to conduct trade for his master (see AKT 5, 23).
thus representing his master by doing business in another city. It is clear that slaves did possess money, or at least administered funds. In TC 3 129, a slave is said to have borrowed money. As his master was aware of this event, he was regarded as responsible for the debt and was therefore obliged to pay the money back. Slaves sometimes appear as witnesses or with their seal in a number of legal documents. They are indicated with their own name and the name of their master, though in some cases one of the two is omitted, as can be observed in the following selected examples.

AKT 4 10:3-4  Imlik-ilim slave of Iddin-Kubim  seal
CCT 3 12a:13  slave of Kura  witness
KTS 1 50a:10-11 (EL 117)  amtum (probably Anatolian wife)  seal
kt n/k 32:5 (Donbaz 1989 no. 1)  Kuwatar GAL urdē ša elānim  seal
TC 1 75:22 (EL 94)  slave of Lā-qēp  witness
TCL 1 239:18-19 (EL 144)  Lā-qēp son of Wardum (probably a PN)

5 A similar matter was the large dossier concerning Abu-šalim wardum of Šalim-Aššur (AKT 6a 89-111). The slave was working in a trading enterprise in Buršāḫaddum on his master’s behalf; however, things did not go well and Ilī-bāni was sent in order to take the expected revenues. Fraud at the hands of the slave was suspected and thus the first text (AKT 6a 104) is an interrogation of Abu-šalim by Ilī-bāni, a representative of Šalim-Aššur. A few selected passages: AKT 6a 104: (1) Il-ba-ni DUMU I-a-a (2) ú A-bu-ša-lim ĪR (3) i-na Bu-ru-uṣ-ḫa-dim (4) a-na ni-kā-si ša-sā-im (5) iš-bu-tu-ni-a-ti-ma ‘Ilī-bāni son of Yaya and the Abu-šalim the slave seized us in Buršāḫaddum in order to settle account.’ (42) um-ma A-bu-ša-lim-ma (43) a-lā-ak-ma iš-ti be-li-a-ma a-za-ku ‘thus said Abu-šalim, I shall go and clear myself with my master.’ The conflict deals with a large amount of silver (5 talent), which are supposedly revenues that were expected from Abu-šalim. However, he could only present 40 minas and some additional funds, which can be regarded as a large amount of money, but which is considerably less than the five expected talents. As Šalim-Aššur was only one person in this enterprise, other parties could demand their cut of the expected revenue. As a result, in AKT 6a 106-7 Šalim-Aššur is taken to Buršāḫaddum as a prisoner in order to account for the debt accrued by his slave Abu-šalim. AKT 6a 106: (4) i-a-ti : a-na Bu-ru-uṣ-ḫa-dim (5) i-na ma-akšú-e-im (6) a-na ḫa-bu-ul ĪR A-bu-ša-lim (7) ša-[q]a-lim : ‘they are going to lead me personally to Buršāḫaddum to pay the debt of the slave Abu-šalim.’ It seems that that Šalim-Aššur was trying to guarantee some funds for himself in order to pay the debts of Abu-šalim. Moreover, in the two letters AKT 6a 109-110, Šalim-Aššur describes writing from Buršāḫaddum on how the local colony had ordered him to come and answer for the debts of his slave Abu-šalim. They said: ‘Abu-šalim must come. If Abu-šalim is absent, his master must come over.’ The entire debt of the slave was as high as 16.040 minas of copper owed to Ušinalam, who seems to have been the middleman in the wool enterprise (AKT 6a 109:13). AKT 6a 109: (13) um-ma šu-nu-ma A-bu-ša-lim (19) li-li-kam šu-ma A-bu-ša-lim là-šu (20) bè-el-šu le-ti-qām ‘they said: ‘Abu-šalim must come. If Abu-šalim is absent, his master must come over.’ The entire debt of the slave was as high as 16.040 minas of copper owed to Ušinalam, who seems to have been the middleman in the wool enterprise (AKT 6a 109:13). AKT 6a 109: (13) um-ma šu-nu-ma A-bu-ša-lim (19) li-li-kam šu-ma A-bu-ša-lim là-šu (20) bè-el-šu le-ti-qām ‘they said: ‘Abu-šalim must come. If Abu-šalim is absent, his master must come over.’ The entire debt of the slave was as high as 16.040 minas of copper owed to Ušinalam, who seems to have been the middleman in the wool enterprise (AKT 6a 109:13).
The slaves discussed above were involved in the trade and were mostly Assyrian. Slaves bearing an Assyrian name are dominant in letters and various legal documents that belong to the Assyrian archives, where they appear as witnesses or with their seals. However, when we look at the contracts of sale that deal with slaves, the picture changes. From the ca. 60 pieces I gathered, over 75% concern slaves with non-Assyrian names, of which the vast majority are Anatolian. In general, the contracts seem to belong to Anatolian archives, as in addition to the slaves, the buying and selling parties were usually native, as well. This does not mean that Anatolian slaves were not common in Assyrian firms; many servants are simply never mentioned by their name. Moreover, the statistical evidence suggests that the ‘Anatolian slave market’ was a source of slaves for the Assyrian firms, as Assyrians occur more frequent as the buying party rather than as the selling party or object of sale. The slaves sold were generally defaulting debtors, as demonstrated by Veenhof (1978), who discussed the dossier of texts concerning the Anatolian moneylender Enišarum, who specialized in small loans of silver or cereals. One text (LB 1218) shows us the consequences of defaulting on debts; it concerns the sale of two debtors into slavery. If this example is taken as a representative situation for Anatolian slaves, it suggests the low social stratum occupied by this type of local debt slave, perhaps lowlier than Assyrian slaves, who could be entrusted with business enterprises. Two examples of slave sale can be given here:

**no. 2: kt a/k 898b (Sever 1998, 486-487)**

1. \(2/3\) MA.NA 5 GÍN
   KÙ.BABBAR ši-im Ši-ku-wa
   a-na Sú-bé-li
   DUMU Ḥu-nu-wa-an

5. \(Iš₇\)-tár-ba-āš-ti
   ta-āš-qüt šu-ma
   ma-ma-an lu
   be-el ūt-bu-li-šu
   lu ma-ma-an
10. Ši-ku-wa i-ša-bat
rev. 2/3 MA.NA 5 GÍN
Sú-bé-li DUMU Ḫu-nu-/wa-an
a-na Iš₈-tár-ba-aš-tí
i-ša-qal-ma ÊR-sú

15. i-ta-ru-ú-šu
šu-ma ra-ma-šu
i-pá-tá-ar
1½ MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR
i-ša-qal-ma ú-ši

20. IGI A-šur-lá-ma-sí
IGI Ši-im-nu-ma-an
IGI Wa-al-ḫa-aš-na
IGI Ḫa-ma-ar

1-5) Ištar-bāšti paid 45 shekels of silver, the price of Šikuwa, to Subeli the son of Hunwan. 6-15) If somebody, be it his creditor or anyone, seizes Šikuwa, than Subeli the son of Ḫunwan will pay 45 shekels of silver to Ištar-bāšti and he will lead away his slave. 16-19) If he will redeem himself, than he will pay 1 mina and 30 shekels of silver and leave. 20-24) list of witnesses.

no. 3: kt 92/k 1033 (Gül 1998, 105-106 no. 3)

1. ½ MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR ši-mi-šu
ša Ti-ká-nu-ú
En-na-Sú-en₆ a-na
Ša-ra-bu-nu-a a-bi-šu

5. Be-ru-a û A-áš-a-al-kà
um-mi-šu iš-qú-ul
šu-ma ma-ma-an
a-na Ti-ká-nu-ú
i-tù-a-ar
10. 3 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR
rev. Ša-ra-ba-nu-a a-bu-ršu
Be-ru-a a-ḫu-šu
Ù A-âš-a-al-kà u[m-mì-šu]
a-na En-na-Sù-en

15. i-ša-qú-lu IGI Ha-nu-nu
IGI Kà-bu-nu-ú
[IGI x]-le-le-e
[IGI A]-šùr-i-mì-tì

1-6) Enna-Suen paid 30 shekels of silver, the price of Tikanū, to Šarabunua his father, Berua, and Ašālka his mother. 7-15) If somebody comes back on Tikanū, Šarabunua his father, Berua, and Ašālka his mother will pay 3 minas of silver to Enna-Suen. 15-18) list of witnesses.

The debtors themselves were not the only victims of their inability to satisfy their creditors, they could also sell their children and other members of their family. This is attested to in text no. 3, where the sellers are the father and mother of the slave, together with a third person who was probably the brother. The price of 30 shekels is about the average for a slave in the Old Assyrian period and, despite what one might expect, prices for children are rarely demonstrably lower than those for adults. In both texts, the sellers are financially responsible for any future contestation of the sale. In text no. 3, the family even has to pay a hefty three minas of silver (1:6) to the buyer as compensation. These contracts of sale are usually examples of debt slavery, which rendered only limited rights to the buying party. This is well-illustrated by text no. 2, in which the slave in question was able to redeem himself with 90 shekels of silver, which is twice the original price of sale (45 shekels). The proportion of 1:2 was common in these contracts of sale, however an equal rate (1:1) is also frequently found in other texts. Losing the right of redemption was possible; for example, the passing of a pre-set time limit, being born to a debt slave and even bad behaviour on the slave’s part were mentioned as reasons for this event occurring. 6 Sale of debt slaves was

---

6 One example of bad behaviour is found in ICK 1 27B (FAOSB 1, 117-119 no. 10): šu-ma ar-na-am 10) ū ši-là-tám té-pù-ša 11) PN a-šar li-bi-ša 12) a-na ši-me-em ta-da-ša ‘if she (the slave girl) commits a sin or villainy,
permitted and did not interfere with the right of redemption (cf. Westbrook 1995, 1660-1662). The lower-class Anatolian was probably not expected to raise the money necessary to redeem family members, something that could be made more difficult when a person entered slavery for a relatively small amount of money, but the full value of a slave was attached to him for redemption. There were more ways to avoid the possibility of redemption; traders were known to sell slaves in Syria, specifically the town of Talḥat, where they entered a different jurisdiction and slaves were out of their kin’s reach (Veenhof 2008, 18-21). For slaves imported from abroad to Anatolia there is less evidence: there are a few references to Kilarite slaves (e.g., CCT 3 14:22), which may refer to a toponym, Šubārum slaves (e.g., CCT 3 25:35) and the odd reference to the asīrum ‘captive’, which may indicate that this type of slave was taken from elsewhere (Dercken 2014, 105-106). These rare ethnic designations stand in sharp contrast to the various origins of slaves in the Old Babylonian corpus (van Koppen 2004, 15-17). It seems likely that the vast majority of unfree people who appear in the Old Assyrian documentation were local debt slaves, whereas there was not sufficient demand to import or export slaves from abroad on a large scale.
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HITTITE SYMBOLIC LANDSCAPES: AN ANALYSIS FROM THE STANDING POINT OF MYTHS

Romina DELLA CASA*

Introduction

As K. Basso observed, one may venture that “when places are actively sensed, the physical landscape becomes wedded to the landscape of the mind, to the roving imagination, and where the mind may lead is anybody’s guess” (Basso 1996: 55). Thus conceived, as a dynamic and reciprocal involvement where material reality and imagination merge, Hittite landscape is also present in myths. Therefore, with the goal of analyzing how these texts reflect the intertwining of society and environment—as well as with the intention of going beyond “apparent meaning,” and grasp core ideas on “intended meaning” (Vansina 1985: 83)—the present article focuses on both the semantic and the symbolic levels of the texts. As a result, the attention will be centered on the study of a group of terms and expressions associated with Hittite symbolic landscape, as well as with the king’s role to guarantee the land’s cosmic order.

As observed by L. Ullmann, aspects of landscape representation are already attested in the adaptations of Gilgamesh’s epic made by Hittite scribes and stored at Hattusa (Ullmann 2010: 49, Beckman 2003: 43ff.). As indicated by Ullmann, the first difference between the Hittite and Akkadian editions is that the Hittite author shows a great interest in the adventure to the Cedar forest, the location where the fight between the protagonists, Gilgamesh and Enkidu,
against the monster Huwawa takes place. (...) This is in sharp contrast to the
great attention paid to the walls of Uruk in the Akkadian version; *the Hittite
text does not even mention Uruk’s fortification*. Moreover, there are several
instances in the Hittite version that speak about *bodies of water* that are not
addressed at all in the other editions. (Ullmann 2010: 49, emphasis added).

Following this train of thought, the underlying aim during the initial stages
of the current analysis was to identify and compare a series of terms and
expressions used in different mythological texts so as to advance core ideas
on Anatolian symbolic landscape. Nevertheless, after pausing to consider
the first paragraph from Illuyanka’s myth (CTH 321), it was clear that the
meaning of one of the most frequent words in Hittite, which broadly refers
to space, left room for debate, interfering when approaching the myth’s
meaning itself. As a result, it seemed necessary to establish a different set
of goals.

This new arrangement led me to shift the focus towards Illuyanka’s myth, so
as to: a) approach the use the Hittites gave to the term *utne-* (or its logogram
KUR) in connection with the verbs *mai-* “to grow, increase, mature, ripen”
and *šešd/-šišd-* “to prosper, to proliferate,\(^1\) to thrive,” which corresponds to
the semantic dimension of these words; b) to assess the importance these
first lines carry on the myth’s interpretation, which refers to the symbolic
dimension of the myth; and c), to approach other aspects of the text’s
symbolism and its relationship to Hittite *utne-*.

If we observe the opening lines of the first version of Illuyanka’s myth, after
Kella (the GUDU-priest of the Storm-god of Nerik) and the *purulli-* are
mentioned, in lines 4 to 7, we find a description of the Hittite land in relation
to the *purulli-* festival and its performance.

---

\(^1\) A. Kloekhorst observed that the verb *šešd/-šišd-* “…practically always occurs together with *mai-*/ *mi-* ‘to
grow’ and therefore probably denotes ‘to prosper, to proliferate’ (2008: 757).
Several translations of these lines have been advanced in different modern languages, some of which I have gathered here to illustrate the importance given to the text translation as well as to determine the difficulties still noticeable when interpreting its meaning.

In 1982 G. M. Beckman translated this passage as, “Let the land grow (and) thrive, and let the land be secure (lit. ‘protected’)!”—and when it (indeed) grows (and) thrives, then they perform the festival of purulli. (1982: 18). In keeping with this line of thought, F. Pecchioli Daddi and A. M. Polvani, in 1990 translated “Il paese cresca nella prosperità e nella sicurezza”, (propio) perché cresca nella prosperità, si celebra la festa del purulli. (1990: 49-50). In 1998, H. A. Hoffner Jr., translated “Let the land prosper (and) thrive, and let the land be protected”—and when it prospers and thrives, they perform the Purulli Festival (1998: 11). A couple of years later G. del Monte reads “Il paese prosperi e fiorisca, il paese sia sicuro”, quando prospera e fiorisce si celebra la festa del purulli- (2003: 105). Similarly, V. Haas translates „Das Land möge wachsen, gedeihen, und beschützt möge das Land sein!“ und
wenn (es) wächst (und) gedeiht, feiert man das purulliya-Festritual. (2006: 97).

A slightly different translation can be found, though, in Hoffner and H. Craig Melchert (GHL: 391, also 281), which reads: “May the land prosper and have rest” (...) And when prosperity and abundance come, they celebrate the festival of purulli KBo 3.7 i 6–8 (OH/NS). Recently E. Rieken has translated „Das Land soll wachsen (und) gedeihen. Das Land soll geschützt sein“, und wenn es wächst (und) gedeiht, feiert man das purulli-Fest (2009); and A. Gilan (incorporating a possible different translation of ma-a-an) reads „Das Land soll gedeihen und sich vermehren! – Das Land soll geschützt sein!“ Und sobald/damit es dann gedeiht und sich vermehrt, feiert man das purulli-Fest. (2010: 106; emphasis added).

In contrast to traditional translations of the mentioned term, it has been suggested that ma-a-an (mān, in line 6) carries a final force, expressing desire and implying that the purulli- was celebrated “so that” or “in order that” the land grow and prosper (see Hoffer 2007: 131). The underlying problem is, once more, how to deal with the text’s general meaning as well as the festival’s; whether the purulli- was celebrated to make the land prosper and thrive, or when it prospered and thrived, or both, as Beckman proposed back in the early 80’s “…the purulli-festival is performed both when, and in order that the land should thrive, and the myths are the texts of this festival.” (Beckman 1982: 24).

This issue also advances the following question: what does it mean that the land prosper and thrive? Is the Hittite term utne- referring to the “country,” the “land,” the “territory,” a “region”2 or the “countryside”?3 In other words, does its meaning correspond to a biological sphere or to a political component within its semantic field? To some degree, interpretations of the myth have oscillated between these two alternatives. Accordingly, a number

---


3 As indicated by Beckman, the term utne- includes “…the notion of rural landscape as a minor component within its semantic field,” being its most frequent meaning ‘polity’ (1999a: 161). In Tapikka letters, however, as noted by del Monte and Hoffner, utne- is associated to the countryside (del Monte 2005: 21; Hoffner 2009: 188).
of scholars have highlighted the seasonal character of the narrative. For instance, Beckman concludes:

…most importantly that of the royal cultic establishment in the town of Kiskilussa (cf. IV. IO), more significant is the provision of a mythological paradigm for a human situation. Each year Hittite society had to cope with and understand the alteration of periods of growth and stagnation. (...) I feel that the resolution of the crisis of the seasons through the combined efforts of humans and deities is the most significant element here. (Beckman 1982: 24; emphasis added).

Sometimes, scholars associate Illuyanka with the personification of the earth, with winter, or drought.⁴

Am Ende des landwirtschaftlichen Jahres im Herbst nach der Ernte besiegt der hethitische Python Illuyanka, die Personifikation des Winters, den die Kräfte des Frühlings verkörpernden Wettergott Tarhun(ta), der nun außer Funktion getreten ist und sich während der Wintermonate in der Gewalt des Illuyanka befindet. (Haas 2006: 97; emphasis added).

Meanwhile, other studies point to the political tone of the story, which seems to be tied to the origins of Hittite kingship. Sometimes both components (seasonal and political) have been alluded. In this line of thought, J. Klinger suggested that “the mythic story about the dragon Illuyanka could be interpreted as an aetiological legitimation of the invention of kingship and the festival itself is read as a spring-festival but that’s not sure” (2009: 99, emphasis added).⁵ Keeping these approaches to Illuyanka’s myth in mind, I would like to return to the initial lines and consider other texts where the term utne- is used in connection with Hittite mai- and šešd-/šišd-.

In fact, even if these verbs are used together several times, it is interesting to observe that they do not appear so often in relationship to Hitt. utne-, or its Sum. KUR. Certainly, the majority of the cases where these verbs are

---

⁴ Collins 1989: 211; see also Gilan 2010: 99. H. Gonnet suggested a different interpretation where Illuyanka would be identified with the Kaska (Gonnet 1987: 93-95; see Beckman 1994).

⁵ Regarding the identification of Hupasiya with an archaic mythological king, see: Gilan 2010: 105.
directly linked to the Hittite land come from prayers. In a number of them, the logogram KUR appears directly attached to the name of the Hittite socio-political organization (URU Hatti) and, as a consequence, to its corresponding semantic field. However, since this expression is included in the context of the growing of grain, vines, cattle, sheep, goats, etc. (as in the following examples), one may agree that it most likely refers to “land” as an entire community of growing and reproducing beings (CHD L-N: 114ff.).

Mursili’s Hymn and Prayer to the Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.A)

§14. Grant forever growth of grain, [vines, fruit-trees(?), cattle], sheep, horses [. . .].

O Sun-goddess of Arinna, [have] pity on Hatti. [. . .]. [. . .] winds [. . .]. May the winds of prosperity come, [and may the land of Hatti grow and] prosper. And to you, O gods, your offering bread and your libations will be presented. And the congregation cries out: “[So be it]!” (Singer 2002: 53; emphasis added).

Mursili’s Hymn and Prayer to Telipinu (CTH 377)

§14 (iv 9–18) Grant to the king, the queen, the princes and the land of Hatti life, health, vigor, longevity, and brightness of spirit forever! Grant forever growth of grain, vines, fruit-trees(?), cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, mules, asses (var.: horses), together with the beasts of the field, and mankind. May they grow! The rains [. . .]. May the winds of prosperity come, and in the land of Hatti may everything grow and prosper! And the congregation cries out: “So be it!” (Singer 2002: 56).

Another text where such combination of terms is found is the Treaty of Arnuwanda I with the Kaska. In it, we find a brief “blessing” sentence, where we read “in the hand of the king thrive and prosper”/ našta QATI LUGAL ma-iš-te-en ši-is-te-en (cf. CHD L-N: 115; HED M: 7). In the lines that follow, it is indicated that the land, the cities, the women and sons, the

---

6 A similar combination of these words is used in CTH 371, and CTH 385.10.
7 CTH 139 MS, KBo 8.35 ii 15; cf. von Schuler 1965: 111.
vineyards and the cattle are the recipients of the punishment of breaking the oath. Concurrent with this, all of the aforementioned elements of the Kaska world (cities, humans, animals, etc.) would also be the receivers of the blessing expressed just a line ahead, which would indicate that the verbs mai- and šešd-/-šişd- were used in this context to refer to the community of living beings (as in the preceding examples), but also in a broader sense, to the whole region’s well-being. In the same way, when considering Illuyanka myth’s opening lines, we find no references to the growing of nature or direct indications to a political use of the term utne-. But I will return to this topic later.

From the viewpoint of the myth’s performance, it has been assumed that the text was somehow enacted or recited in spring, during the festival of the purulli- (see, for instance: Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani 1990: 40; Hoffner 1998: 11); a practice probably dated to old Hittite times.

There is no reason to believe that the whole Illuyanka-story too was not an integral part of the puruliyas-festival since the old Hittite times. Even the small fragments we can attribute to the puruliyas-festival description show at least one or other linguistic evidence of an early composition. (Klinger 2009: 100).

To the extent of my reasoning, there are no difficulties in considering that this text was somehow enacted during the purulli-. The document itself indicates that it is the text of the purulli- (which, as a festival, involves per se some enactment). Also, when in line 3 we read: “when they speak as follows” (with the Hitt. verb taranzi, in 3rd person plural), and then in line 4 we discover a “direct speech” as indicated by the enclitic particle “-wa,” we can expect that the text signals the people participating in the festival.

Thus, one should expect there be a meaningful relationship between the festival and the narrative itself. Unfortunately, we know little about the characteristics of the rites involved in the festival, and we cannot, as of yet,

8 It is not certain if the Akkadian expression lišrī lirpiš (KBo 1.1 rev. 73, drafted in Akk. by the Hittites in a treaty with Sattiwaza) is parallel to the Hittite māu šešdu; CHD L-N: 114.
9 For a discussion about the link between the purulli- and the myth, see Gilan 2010.
understand it completely (CHD P: 392). Of no less importance is the fact that the *purulli*- was celebrated “for the sake of the life of the king (KUB 22. 31 obv. 7, 12) and for that of the lands (obv. 15)” (CHD P: 392) which, once again, brings us back to the main discussion about Illuyanka text’s alternative meaning.

In proceeding with the myth itself, some aspects on Hittite space will be analyzed later on, which shed light on its inaugural lines and symbolism. In other words: the myth’s crisis, Illuyanka’s battles with the Storm-god and the Hittite king. Therefore, I will not invest any time in pointing out the differences and similarities between the versions, which have already been analyzed by other scholars, and will begin straight away with addressing the issue of the crisis in the myth.

**FIRST BATTLE AND CRISIS**

With regards to the turning point generated by the Storm-god’s defeat, one would expect that the text develop the characteristics of the crisis. Such an elaboration may be observed, for instance, in the myths of the vanishing gods after the deity departs or is hidden from view.

**Telipinu Myth**

§4 (A i 16-20) … *Humans and gods are dying of hunger.* The Great Sun God made a feast and invited the Thousand Gods. They ate but couldn’t get enough. They drank but couldn’t quench their thirst. (Hoffner 1998: 15; emphasis added).

**Telipinu and the Daughter of the Sea-god**

§1 (A i 1-4) Long ago … The Sea God quarreled and brought [the Sun God] down [from heaven] and [hid] him.

§2 (A i 5-8) *In the land (conditions) were bad, and it was dark.* But no one could withstand the Sea. [The Storm God called Telipinu, his favorite and firstborn [son]. (Hoffner 1998: 26; emphasis added).

---

10 A row of dots … in the following quotations indicates that words from the original translation have been omitted.
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The Disappearance of the Sun God

§4 (B i 2-11) “… Frost has paralyzed the entire land. He has dried up the waters. Frost is great.” (Then the Storm God) says to his brother, the Wind: “The waters of the mountains, the gardens, the meadow(s)-let your refreshing go (through) the lands-but let him (i.e., Frost) not paralyze them.”

§5 (B i 12-20) “[He] paralyzed the herbs, the lands, the cattle, the sheep, the dogs, (and) the pigs. But he won’t paralyze the crops (which are) ‘sons of the heart.’” (Hoffner 1998: 27-28; emphasis added).

However, in Illuyanka’s myth, not only is the crisis not described, but we are also deprived of a detailed account of the battles involved in the narrative. One can presume, though, that the Storm-god’s defeat does not unleash “hunger” as Telipinu’s departure did.

In contrast to the characteristics of the feast prepared in Telipinu’s text, Illuyanka’s myth portrays Inara’s feast by describing it on a grand scale: vessels full of wine, vessels of beer; and everything prepared in abundance.

§ 4, 15 [nu du]G palḫaš an iyāda y[ēt] (KBo 3.7, cf. Rieken 2009). Even if it is not narrated, there can be no doubt that a crisis (the characteristics of which we can only imply) affects the cosmos from the moment a powerful serpent was capable of defeating the Storm-god. Following this line of thought, I believe that Illuyanka’s seizing of the god’s heart and eyes is an indicator of the characteristics of the crisis (even if not clear to us), since the anatomy of the gods embodied for the Hittites a meaningful symbology, also in respect to space imagery, as recently highlighted by M. Hutter (2014; see also Corti 2011: 58ff.).

In fact, we can trace several analogies between the body of the god and the Hittite land; between micro and macrocosm. In the myths of the vanishing gods, for instance, the anger inside the god’s body is parallel to that of the chaos seizing the inhabited world, described as agents that can disperse easily and provoke dismay quickly. When looking at those myths, and their magical procedures, we find, for instance, that Hannahanna’s myth provides
us with a good example of a redundant sequence of figs and other fruits as holding something precious inside, in analogy to the goddess holding [indicated by the Hitt. verb ḫar-/ḫark] “to have, to hold, to keep” the King, the Queen, their sons, and the land of Hatti. The fact that this analogy is primarily attested in Hannahanna’s myth doesn’t seem to be random when we consider that she was a Mother-goddess present at birth; a goddess who embraced humanity, and who, as we’ve just seen, holds the entire land of Hatti inside of her. Thus, the symbolism of the heart and the eyes in CTH 321 may also reflect features of the general situation of the cosmos.

SECOND BATTLE: ILLUYANKA’S FEATURES AND THE ROLE OF THE KING

Moving on with the story, after the serpent is tricked in both myths, a second battle begins, allowing the Storm-god to kill the creature. How did the Storm-god succeed? This is a question that the narrative explains by itself. What is not clear, though, is how to grasp the nature of the creature as well as that of its living space. In the first version, it is said that Illuyanka came from below the earthly world, through a hole (lit. Hitt. gen. ḫattešnaš), a behavior the Hittites linked to snakes in other texts as well –as for instance, in ritual incantations: “just as the snake does not [return to] (its) hole, let [the evil w]ord go back to the mouth of that one” (Collins 1989: 217; 2002a: 240). In the second version, we know the second fight took place in the sea (lit. Hitt. d-l. aruni). In accordance to the aforementioned spaces to which Illuyanka is associated in this story, I would like to suggest that both the pit and the sea are linked through an interrelated environment, that where a MUŠilluyanka- could be found. This would indicate, consequently, that the two versions of the myth are not describing different kinds of creatures –respectively a terrestrial and a sea serpent (Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani 1990: 41)– but a single one which inhabited an interconnected ambient.

I would like to highlight that several species of snakes are equally at home in water or land. As highly adaptable animals, we find them all around the world, inhabiting meadows, tropical or rain forests, savannahs, deserts, high mountains or deep valleys, but also in watery environments, including oceans.
and coral reefs (Schine and Shetty 2006). Some live in trees, other on the ground or even underground (cf. Menez 2004: 44). In the same way, we find serpents within different cultures around the world—sometimes featured as dragons. They are identified with positive, negative or ambiguous powers: “strength, power, beauty, cleverness, nimbleness, a highly developed instinct, nobility and an ability to cause death (…)[are some of them]. Being sometimes poisonous, hidden in the shadows, slowly and mutely gliding, “snakes have often been deemed powerful and shifty, evil creatures whose major aim was to frustrate the natural and proper development of life” (Menez 2004: 9). Negative aspects of snakes, associated with death and evil forces, for instance, can be observed in Christian imagery, as in Saint Michael’s representations. In other occasions, this versatile creature expresses an ambiguous symbolism, embodying opposite forces, as in Eastern art, where we find two dragons facing each other.

As indicated by M. Lucker, it seems that their peculiar way of locomotion, along with the sloughing of their skin, and their ambivalent nature, led societies to contradictory assessments of serpents (Lurker 1987: 8460). The Mesoamerican case is very illustrative of the hybrid features societies link to snakes. As signaled by its name, the mythological Quetzacoatl—which comes from the Nahua quetzalli, meaning “precious green feather,” and coatl, “serpent”—alludes both to a bird and a serpent, to an ambiguous symbol that refers both to heaven and earth. Thus, Quetzacoatl became a symbol of fertility and, even if it does not seem directly connected to water, it “almost always appears within an aquatic medium, surrounded by lilies, sea conches, Mexican emeralds, and seeds, all symbols of fertility” (Florescano 1999: 4). Within Chinese mythology the dragon has been both associated to China’s Emperor as well as to “…the earliest gods, and like them is vague, changeable, and contradictory in its attributes; but it maintains from first to last a definable characteristic –association with and control of water” (Zhao 1989: 235). As in the preceding case, and among their different features, M. Eliade observed that snakes, dragons, fish, and shell-fish, tend to be emblems of water, “hidden in the

11 It is important to highlight that, in contrast, in the Greco-Roman tradition, the watery-dragon just described was associated with fire, the one spread in Europe as a “spitter of fire” more than a “rain bringer,” a destroyer, and some times a treasure guardian (Zhao 1989: 244, 245).
depths of the ocean, they are infused with the sacred power of the abyss; lying quietly in lakes or swimming across rivers, they bring rain, moisture, and floods, thus governing the fertility of the world” (Eliade 1958: 205). To their connection to water and fertility, one may add the fact that some of these creatures tend to fight against a major deity, usually a Storm-god.

For instance, in the *Ṛgveda* it is narrated how Indra –originally meaning “strong,” “mighty”–, a supreme god in the Vedic pantheon, both a rain bringer and a “great dragon-slayer,” defeated *Vṛitra*, the first born of the serpents, releasing the waters he controlled (Lurker 2004: 88). A fight also occurs in the Ugaritic story of Baal against Yam –Yam(m)(u), the Sea-god or ‘Prince Sea’ (Mettinger 2001: 55ff.; Wyatt 2003; Schwemer 2008: 8ff.), and in the Hurrian-Hittite tradition comprehended by the Kumarbi cycle, CTH 346. In the latter, we find the antagonism between Tessub (a celestial Storm-god) and Kumarbi (a netherworld god), which in the Hedammu cycle (CTH 348) is embodied by a snake (*MUŠḥedammu*), a sea serpent that Kumarbi created by taking Sertapsuruhi (the daughter of the Sea-god) as a wife. Even though it is not possible to tell if Hedammu is killed (since no extant fragment states it so, as indicated by Hoffner) the overall plot line of the Kumarbi cycle implies that each opponent of Tessub is eventually defeated (Hoffner 1998: 51).

Although the text is very fragmentary, in paragraph 4, line 26’ of version B (KUB 8.65, CTH 348.I.1; cf. Rieken 2009) we read “I fear them, the snakes…” (cf. CHD L-N: 339).

§ 4’

B Vs. I 23’ ṛṛIŠTAR-iš-ma-kán a-ru-ni p[a-ra-a ... ] [ ... ]
B Vs. I 24’ ṛṛIŠTAR-in a-uš-ta nu *MUŠḥé-dam-mu(-) ... ]
B Vs. I 25’ nu ne-pí-iš ša-ra-a x[ ... ]
B Vs. I 26’ *na-aḥ-mi-uš* *MUŠ'il-[i-ya-an-ku-uš ... ]

(Rieken 2009)12

Even if the Hedammu cycle is a myth of foreign origin, the use of the

---

12 This passage is very fragmentary, but it seems Istar went to the sea, that somebody saw her, and that probably Heddamu did something, but then we miss the context, as well as in the following line (25’), where we read “the sky, above…”
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Hittite word MUŠ-il[liyankaš] “snakes” to refer to creatures to be afraid of, fit Hittite symbolic imagery on serpents, which in this context, also seems to include MUŠ-hedammu-. As observed by Collins, “in Anatolia there is no evidence to suggest that the snake was a symbol of abundance, sexuality or fertility. Rather, the consistent representation of this creature as a fearsome, dangerous thing suggests that the Hittites harbored a dislike for snakes that many societies have shared.” (1989: 214). Along these lines, Collins also indicated that snakes in Hittite literature appear as dangerous evil creatures, as representative of external hazard and disorder, as in the case of Hattusili I’s Edict: “You will kindle fire on the hearth. But indeed you will not violate my words. If you do not kindle fire on the hearth, then it will happen (that) a snake will encircle [Hatšuša” (KBo 3.27 obv., 23'-27’; Collins 2002a: 240).

We also find MUŠ-illuyanka- in another Mesopotamian tradition which mentions the god Ea (CTH 351). There, we read [...] x-x-aš ŠIDMesš1-aš a-ru-na-aš MUŠ-il-lu-i-ya-an-ga-aš / “snake of the rivers (and) the sea” (KUB 36.55 obv. § 6’, 28; Rieken 2009). This passage, together with the incorporation of snakes’ names (MUŠ) with fish and frogs as “animals of the sea” in a list of offerings to the gods of Zalpa (IBoT 2.9 I + KUB 52.102 I 8’-10’; see also Corti 2010: 94ff.) would suggest, as Collins proposes, that MUŠ may be a generic designation for reptiles, while illuyanka- would be the Hittite word for snake –and then, a sub-category of the various species of reptiles included under the aforementioned logogram (Collins 1989: 208; see also HED I: 358-359; Kloekhorst 2008: 384).

As real snakes, the mythical Illuyanka is described as inhabiting the underground, what the Hittites denominate the “Dark Earth” –a name probably coming from the idea that “the interior of the earth was conceived as a space without illumination” (Haas 1995). In Hittite imagery, the Dark Earth was a realm of chthonic deities, usually associated to magic and birth, and ruled by the Sun-goddess of the Earth; an area of the world tied to death, and polluted elements which were ritually locked down, inside of it –as expressed in Telipinu’s and Hannahanna’s myths. In accordance, its deities
seem to have an affinity with blood as a liquid which not merely constituted food for them but also carried the symbolic value of lost life (Beckman 2011).

The Hittites used pits dug into the ground, artificial but also natural ones (where they also performed their rituals) to communicate with spirits inhabiting beneath the terrestrial surface (Collins 2002b: 225). As identified by Collins, such pits served a number of different functions, one of which was as a channel for chthonic deities and creatures, as is the case of Illuyanka. More meaningful to Illuyanka’s myth interpretation is the fact the Dark Earth was actually not only accessible through pits, but also through springs and rivers (Mouton and Erbil 2012: 61), and, more importantly, it was broadly associated to water –cf. Dardano 2012: 622– 627; Hutter 2014. Since the Dark Earth was intimately connected to water passages, it seems likely that Illuyanka was able to move easily through them, and cross what can be defined as liminal areas of the Hittite world, to threaten the cosmic order.

Until now, the sea where the battle took place (in the second version), has been identified with the Black Sea, the Mediterranean, the Salt Lake and a mythical sea (Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani 1991: 46-47, Hoffner 2007: 125). From the point of view of the narrative’s symbolism, M. Vigo considered that: “la scelta di inserire nella seconda versione del mito il mare riflette forse la necessità di collocare l’antagonista del dio della Tempesta in una “cornice mitica” che possa rendere al meglio l’idea del caos che si contrappone all’ordine costituito, rappresentato appunto dal dio” (Vigo 2012: 270). In addition to these interpretations, I would like to posit an alternative in which a battle at sea expresses the natural habitat where this snake-like creature, able to navigate both the underworld and aquatic mediums, could be found.

A spring, a river and the sea are, of course, variant aquatic mediums. In Anatolian myths though, they seem to appear interconnected and linked to the Dark Earth, as in the “Sacrifice and Prayer to the Storm god of Nerik”

---

13 Haas indicated that “Schauplatz des Mythos ist die Küste des Schwarzen Meeres nahe der einstigen Mündung des Flusses Kızılırmak bei Bafra sowie das Land (der Stadt) Tarukka, wahrscheinlich am Kızılırmak in der Gegend um Durağan und Havza” (2006: 97).
(CTH 671), where we read, according to Hoffner’s translation, that the god is first called forth from a pit, “…come up from the dark four corners, from the deep wave. Turn back to Nerik,” and later on lured to come back “… from down the sea, from under the [waves]” (respectively: §5, obv. 24-32; §10, rev. 18-24, Hoffner 1998: 23, 24).

In this scenario, it is important to observe that CTH 321 is referring to the GUDU-priest of the Storm-god of Nerik as a main priest; a person who was associated to cults in different towns of central Anatolia; and, as in the following example, was a specialist in connecting the terrestrial world and the one under it.

§2 (obv. 5-11) …The GUDU-priest calls (in the Hattic language) three times down into the pit: wi wi purusael purusael. Concurrently he again speaks the word:

§3 (obv. 12-17) “The Storm God of Nerik became angry and went down into the pit. …” (Hoffner 1998: 23).

The GUDU-priest’s presence in the text does not seem accidental if we consider Iluyanka’s connection to the Dark Earth and its watery resources. As it was pointed out already by some scholars, the fact that the Anatolian plateau is a karstic area where underground water goes in and out, probably influenced its inhabitants to consider water as a passageway into the netherworld (Mouton and Erbil 2012: 73).

Moving on to the king’s relevance in the texts, in the first version it is said that Inara went to the town of Kiskilussa (concluding a series of actions which began at the same location), placed her home (or “a house for herself,” indicated by the reflexive particle -za), and gave the king power over the water?

With respect to the king’s symbolism here, and his connection to Hupasiya as a priest of Inara, I follow Hoffner’s interpretation; to further stress the idea that the origins of kingship

14 It is worth mentioning that a debate surrounding the word ḫunḫuwa(na)šš here was recently sparked at the international congress ‘Hrozný and Hittite: The First Hundred Years’ held in Prague (2015). In contradistinction to traditional interpretations that link the term to wave(s), seas and flow, W. Waal proposed that the basic meaning of the term ḫunḫu(n)eššar, ḫuwa(n)ḫueššar, ḫuḫeššar (ḫu.) meant “depth hollow, (underground) cave, cavity.” In accordance, if Waal is correct, and ḫu. refers indeed to a cavity, it would be reasonable to think that it would refer to some kind of hollow that most probably was related to a watery environment. See Della Casa Diss. forthcoming.
are defined here as intimately related to the ruler’s duties as a “holy priest” (in Hitt. šuppiš šankunniš), as well as a guarantor of natural water resources through the god’s will. Further down, the text returns, once more, to its initial topics, indicating why the first purulli-festival is celebrated, although the explanation is not clear. In spite of the text’s fragmentation, the purpose of the purulli- appears connected to Inara’s house, to the flow of the river’, and the hand [of the king] (CTH 321, KBo 3.7, §15, 62; cf. Rieken 2009). Taking all of this into account, I would like to suggest, in agreement with the conclusions reached by Hoffner (2007) – even though both points of departure differed –, that the myth narrates the story of how the Storm-god fought to regain his competence over the water that flowed under the Hittite cosmic space, but also emerged and provided Hittite society with a highly beneficial source of living.

At this point, it is important to draw attention to the fact that while in foreign myths the Storm-gods show clear celestial features, in Hittite religion, however, their role is not as clear. As indicated by D. Schwemer, “there is no adequate comprehensive study of the Anatolian storm-gods, one of the more urgent desiderata of Hittitology” (2008: 17). The Hittite Storm-god seems to be more of a celestial deity, since it is usually referred as the “Storm-god of Heaven” (as in CTH 321, §1, 1 nepišaš 4[M-aš?] from the Old Hittite period onwards, who benefited the Hittite land with rain. However, it has been suggested too that it was a deity of the underworld waters (Deighton 1982), and even if this approach is presently considered to be somewhat extreme (Beckman 1994), it seems that, if the Illuyanka Myth actually narrates how the Storm-god overpowers the forces of the Dark Earth, then we might need to consider that the Hittites believed the Storm-god shared some kind of competence with regards to such area too.

Thus, one can reasonably ask why the myth is incorporated into the purulli-festival. My contention is that the Hittite governing elite felt it necessary to reenact (during the purulli-) the original moment when the Storm-god overcame the forces coming from the Dark Earth, gaining dominion over the waters. In turn, the new dominion could only be passed over to the Hittite king through such reenactment. In effect, the text gives us an indication of this when it narrates “because we celebrate the first purulli- …” (CTH 321,
KBo 3.7, §15, 62, Rieken 2009). In version II, the lines explaining why the purulli- was celebrated are missing; but after a gap of undetermined length, the hierarchy of the gods is established – a process which includes the “place of lots” (nu=za pūl tianzi), after which, “the result of the process is that the god Zaliyanu and his family assume a higher position than the Storm-god of Nerik” (Taggar-Cohen 2002: 97). It seems coherent to me that after the forces of water were put in order, the cosmos (and more specifically the gods that provided water to the Hittites) continued to be reorganized by this practice, as well as by their respective cults.

Conclusions

To conclude, I would like to return to the myth’s initial lines, which motivated this presentation, and in which the purulli- is associated to the growing and thriving of the land. Considering that there is no contextualization for the words utne-, mai-, šešd-/šišd- that would give us a clearer and more precise idea of their meaning, that is to say, if they are referring to a broader or a narrower semantic field, to the prosperity of the state in general, or to the fertility of the land and agriculture. Taking all this into consideration, my intention has been to look for the missing context on the text’s symbolic level. As we have observed, previous interpretations oscillate, broadly speaking, between the “political” and the “natural” perspective, with some works taking a middle ground. This appears to be so because – among other aspects taken into account by other scholars – in the myth utne- implies a strong association between the king, the underground waters, and the realm of living beings.

As observed, the only reference that limits utne- to its political aspect in CTH 321 is the mention of the king. However, we’ve also read that the gods have given the king power over the waters, and that through it he exerts his influence over the realm of nature itself. Thus, as the myth tells by itself, nature and politics are spliced together “in one hand.” As we read in CTH 321, §15, 62-63 ha[μ]ezziyan purull[iyan’] kwit iyaweni / U QĀT [LUGALʔ É-erʔ] 4inaraš ūnuhwnašš=a [ÍDʔ [ ... ] / – because we celebrate the fiirst purull[i]-Festival–, the hand [of the King holds’ the house] of Inara and the water abyss³ (KBo 3.7, cf. Rieken 2009; for a discussion, see Hoffner 2007: 136).
Accordingly, *utne*-’s semantic field, as expressed in the myth, seems to show a direct association between the natural and the political; which are one and the same under the rule of a king. Respectively referring to the “growing” and “thriving” of the community of beings –through the god and the king’s dominion over the water–, and that of the socio-political organization in general –through the special relationship the king keeps with the gods, being systematically actualized during the *purulli*-festival.
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Oluz Höyük 2014 dönemi çalışmalarında Karanlık Çağ’a ait olduğunu saptadığımız yeni bir mimari tabaka, Hatti Ülkesi ile Sarazzi Uinte (Yukarı Ülke) sınırlarını oluşturan Yeşilirmak (Kummešmaha) Havzası’ndaki Hakmiš Krallığı topraklarında Hitit çöküşünün şiddetli bir savaş ya da yıkımla gerçekleşmemiş olabileceğini göstermeye başlamıştır. 7B Mimari Tabakası’nda (MÖ 13. yüzyılın sonu – 12. yüzyılın başı) bastırlılmış topraktan oluşturulmuş basit bir avlu tabanı üzerinden (Fig.1) Büyük Krallık Dönemi çanak-çömlek parçaları (Fig.2) ile birlikte, kızılımsız devetüyü hamuru, iri taşçık ve bitki katkıları, orta pişmiş, hamurunun renginde astarlı ve kalın bantlarla oluşturulmuş geometrik motiflerle karakterize olan boyalı bezemeli kap parçaları (Fig.3-6) ele geçmiştir. Hitit Krallığı’nın son yıllarına ait 7B Mimari Tabakası’nda farklı türdeki iki çanak-çömlek grubunun birlikte bulunmuş olması, kültürel bir değişimın keramik üzerindeki yansımısı

7B Mimari Tabakası üzerinde yer alan 7A Mimari Tabakası’nda (M.Ö. 11-10. yüzyıllar) gerçekleştirilen 2015 dönemi çalışmaları sırasında açığa çıkarılan mimari kalıntılar, Oluz Höyük ve Amasya Bölgesi için bir ilk olma özelliğindedir. Söz konusu kalıntılar yamaca inşa edildiği gözlenen kerpiç bir yapıya ait duvar ile basit bir ocaktan (Fig.7-8) oluşmaktadır. Kuzey tarafından dik bir yamaç bulunan duvarın, hemen güney dibindeki kil ocağı nedeniyle güneye doğru inşa edilmiş olduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Büyük olasılıkla yapının kapalı mekânında yer alan ocağı sonuca basit görünmülmüştür. Höyükün kuzey yamacında yer alan söz konusu duvar ve ocağı ile ilgili diğer kalıntıların yamaç erozyonu sonucu yok olduğu gözlenmektedir. Karanlık Çağ’a tarihlenen Gordion 7B ve 7A (MÖ 1100-950) tabakalarındaki pise ve dal-çamur teknikinde inşa edilmiş tek odalı basit ve kaba konutların oda içlerinde ocaklar açığa çıkarılmıştır.13 Mekan içi ocak kullanımı temelinde Kızılırmak Havzası ile Kızılırmak’ın batısı arasında Karanlık Çağ’da yapı tasarrımıcısı açısından benzerlikler olduğu Oluz Höyük bulguları ışığında farklı edilmeye başlanmıştır.

12 Bouthillier/Colantoni/Debruyne/Glatz/Hald/Heslop/Kozal/Miller/Popkin/Postgate/Steele/Stone 2014: Fig.11.
13 Sevin 2003: 239.

15 Ross 2010: Fig.5b.
19 Genz 2004: Tab.1
20 Genz 2001: 2.


---

çömlek gelişiminin bir sonucu olarak ortaya çıkmış gibi görünmektedir. Büyükkaya boyalıları içinde görülen bu tipteki gaga ağızlı testi parçaları, Karanlık Çağ boyalarının MÖ 11. yüzyılın başlarına değil, en erken MÖ 11. yüzyıl sonlarına ya da MÖ 10. yüzyıl başlarına tarihlenebileceğini göstermektedir. Hermann Parzinger tarafından Hitit olarak yayınlanan VII numaralı Tapınak'ta (Fig.11) bulunan boya bezekli çanak-çömleklerin yeni bulgular ışığında Karanlık Çağ'a tarihlenmesi gerekmektedir. Söz konusu boya bezekli çanak-çömlekle, VII numaralı Tapınak'ta da Büyükkaya gibi bir Karanlık Çağ iskâni yaşanmış olduğunu kanıt lamaktadır.

Bütün bu gelişmeler Hititlerin siyasi otoritesinin MÖ 1190/1180’lerde sonlanması ile Karanlık Çağ boyalarının ortaya çıkması arasında boya bezekli çanak-çömlekle temelinde bir boşluk olduğuna işaret etmektedir. Boğazköy hafırları tarafından eleştirilen bu kayıtların doğruluğu hususuna Oluz Höyük kazıları Demir Çağı mimari tabakalarında açığa çıkan bazı boya bezekli çanak-çömlek grupları tanıklık etmeye başladı. Oluz Höyük 7B Mimari Tabakası’nda Hitit Büyük Krallık Dönemi çanak-çömleği ile birlikte ele geçen yeni tür boyaların (Fig.3-6) Boğazköy ya da başka bir Hitit yerleşiminde bugüne de gölmemeyen özel bir durum oluşturmuşlardır. Oluz Höyük’te kültürel bir değişime işaret eden Çöküş Dönemi boya bezeme uygulamasının MÖ 12. yüzyıl içlerine uzanmış olabileceği düşünülebilir. 7B Mimari Tabakası’nın hemen üzerinde yer alan 7A Mimari Tabakası’nın zayıf mimari izleri (Fig.7-8) birlikte Büyükkaya tipi boya bezekli çanak-çömlekle (Fig.12-17) içermesi, Karanlık Çağ kaplarının köken ve gelişimi konularını yeniden değerlendirilmesi gerektiğini işaret etmeye başladı. 7A Mimari Tabakası’nın 7B ile organik bir bağın bulunmaması ve 6. Mimari Tabaka (MÖ 9. yüzyıl) ile olan boya bezekli çanak-çömlekle temelindeki ilişkileri, Kızılırmak Havzası Karanlık Çag boyalarının büyük olasılıkla MÖ 11. yüzyıl sonlarına ya da MÖ 10. yüzyıl başlarına tarihlenebileceğini işaret etmiştir. 2003 yılındaki yayımımızda Büyükkaya ve Eşkiyapar Karanlık Çag boya bezekli kap parçalarının Karanlık Çağ sonu yani Erken Demir Çağ ortalarına (MÖ 11. yüzyıl sonu ile 10. yüzyıl) tarihlenmesi gerektğini zaten belirtmiştik. Bugün gelinen noktada özellikle içleri noktalı basit örüntülerle


Oluz Höyük 2014 dönemi çalışmalarında 7B ile 7A mimari tabakaları arasındaki kültürel dolgu içinde bulunan iki buluntu oldukça ilgi çekicidir. Kurşundan dökülmüş olduğu gözlenen ilk buluntu ilk silaha benzemektedir (Fig.18-19). Basit bir mızrakcu görünümündeki nesne ergimesi oldukça kolay olan kurşun madeninin oldukça ilkel şartlarda şekillendirildiğine işaret etmektedir. Diğer bulgu ise kilden üretilmiş bir boncuktur (Fig.20). Küre biçimli boncuk, koyu gri yüzeyi ile yine ilkel şartlarda pişirilmiş görünümü vermektedir. Hitit coğrafyası içindeki Oluz Höyük'te bölgeye yabancı özellikler gösteren bu iki bulgu, 7B Mimari Tabakası'ndan itibaren izleyebildiğimiz çanak-çömlek geleneklerindeki değişimle paralel olarak değerlendirilmelidir. Mimarisi, çanak-çömleği, mühürleri ve metal eserleri ile önemli bir Hitit yerleşmesi olduğu anlaşılan Oluz Höyük'te, MÖ 12-11. yüzyıllara tarihlenebilecek kültür dolgusunda ele geçen kurşun mızrakcu ile kil boncuk daha geri bir kültürün ürünlerini olarak değerlendirilebilir. Bu bağlamda Hitit siyasi otoritesinin yıkıldığı süreçte Kaška halkının işgaline uğrayan Kuzey-Orta Anadolu'daki Hitit kültürune yabancı öğelerin Kaška kültürü ile ilişkilendirilmesi bu aşamada yanlış olmayacaktır. Oluz Höyük 2015 dönemi çalışmalarında 7A Mimari Tabakası’nda açığa çıkarılan büyük kısmı yamaç erozyonu nedeniyle yok olmuş basit bir kerpiç duvar ile hemen güney bitişğindeki basit ocak kalıntısi (Fig.6), Hitit sonrası Kaška yerleşime ait olmalıdır. Söz konusu duvar ve ocak kalıntısi Hitit sonrası ilk yerleşime yani Karanlık Çağ’a ait mimari öğeler olması bakımından oldukça önemlidir. Söz konusu duvar ve ocak kalıntısi Hitit sonrası ilk yerleşime yani Karanlık Çağ’a ait mimari öğeler olması bakımından oldukça önemlidir. Karanlık Çağ’ın sonlarına doğru boya bezekli çanak-çömlek üretimini gerçekleştirmiş olan Kaška halkın, MÖ 8. yüzyıl Assur belgelerinden izleyebildiğimiz, kralı (Dadi-İlu) olan küçük bir krallık/beyliktir (Kaški/Kašku) üzere neğere yaşadiği düşünülür.
Harita: MÖ 2. binyılda Oluz Höyük ve yakın çevresi
Şevket DÖNMEZ - Fidane ABAZOĞLU

Fig. 1: 7B Mimari Tabakası’nda açığa çıkarılan bastırılmış topraktan oluşturulan basit avlu tabanı

Fig. 2: 7B Mimari Tabakası’nda açığa çıkarılan bezemesiz Hitit çanak çömlek parçaları
Fig.3-7B Mimari Tabakası’nda açığa çıkarılan boyalı bezemeli çanak çömlek parçaları

Fig.4: 7B Mimari Tabakası’nda açığa çıkarılan boyalı bezemeli çanak çömlek parçaları

Fig.5: 7B Mimari Tabakası’nda açığa çıkarılan boyalı bezemeli çanak çömlek parçaları
Fig.6: 7B Mimari Tabakası’nda açığa çıkarılan boya bezemeli çanak çömlek parçaları

Fig.7: 7A Mimari Tabakası’nda açığa çıkarılan kerpiç duvar ve ocak kalıntıları
Fig. 8: 7A Mimari Tabakası'nda açığa çıkarılan kerpiç duvar ve ocak kalıntıları.
Fig. 9: Doğantepe’de bulunmuş Karanlık Çağ boya bezekli çömlek parçası

Fig. 10: Doğantepe’de bulunmuş Karanlık Çağ boya bezekli çömlek parçası
Fig.11: Boğazköy 7 numaralı tapınak
Fig. 12: 7A Mimari Tabakası’nda (Karanlık Çağ) bulunan boya bezekli çanak çömlek parçaları.

Fig. 13: 7A Mimari Tabakası’nda (Karanlık Çağ) bulunan boya bezekli çanak çömlek parçaları.
Fig.14: 7A Mimari Tabakası’nda (Karanlık Çağ) bulunan boya bezekli çanak çömlek parçaları
Fig. 15: 7A Mimari Tabakası’nda (Karanlık Çağ) bulunan boya bezekli çanak çömlek parçaları

Fig. 16: 7A Mimari Tabakası’nda (Karanlık Çağ) bulunan boya bezekli çanak çömlek parçaları
Fig. 17: 7A Mimari Tabakası’nda (Karanlık Çağ) bulunan boya bezekli çanak çömlek parçaları

Fig. 18: 7A Mimari Tabakası’nda (Karanlık Çağ) bulunan mızrakcu, kurşun
Fig. 19: 7A Mimari Tabakası’nda (Karanlık Çağ) bulunan mizrakcu, kurşun

Fig. 20: 7A Mimari Tabakası’nda (Karanlık Çağ) boncuk, pt
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DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROSE AND POETIC STYLE IN THE HITTITE LANGUAGE

Rita FRANCIA*

What characterizes prose text, and how is it different from poetry? And, most importantly, is there a clear distinction between prose and poetry?

In a literary text (in the proper sense of the term) the dominant function of language is always poetic; although the referential, the conative and the emotive functions are also usually present.

The writer is mainly interested in the message itself. It would be inaccurate to mark a sharp divide between a work in prose and one in poetry.

A good example of this is the opening line of perhaps the most famous Italian novel, I Promessi Sposi (The Bethrothed) by Alessandro Manzoni:

Quel ramo del lago di Como, che volge a mezzogiorno, tra due catene non interrotte di monti, tutto a seni e a golfi, a seconda dello sporgere e del rientrare di quelli, vien, quasi ad un tratto, a strinigersi....

G. Leech identifies the distinction between poetic language from prose in three main elements:

1. repetition and parallelism which includes words and repeated sounds (anaphora, alliteration, assonance, rhyme etc.), semantic fields;

2. deviation from the common language and uses archaic or invented words, infringement the rules of grammar, spelling unusual;

3. creativity through imagery, polysemy, ambiguity.¹

* ‘Sapienza’ - Rome

Nursery rhymes belong to a literary genre that share characteristics typical of folk poetry: they are written in poetic language (the connotative level overrides the denotative and they contain many rhetorical-rhythmic artifices) so as to be easily memorized, repeated and passed down orally:

*Ninna nanna, ninna oh,*
*questo bimbo a chi lo do?*
*Lo darò alla Befana*
*Che lo tiene una settimana*
*Lo darò al lupo Nero*
*Che lo tiene un anno intero*
*Lo darò al lupo Bianco*
*Che le tiene finché è stanco*

/Ladybug ladybug fly away home,*
*Your house in on fire and your children are gone,*
*All except one and that’s little Ann,*
*For she crept under the frying pan.*

The most useful rhetorical devices for memorizing and transmitting a text orally - alliteration and rhyme - are employed in these examples, both in English and Italian.

In Hittite documents, the same differences between texts with a predominantly denotative level of meaning (non-literary texts) and those with a principally connotative level of language (high literature in prose and poetry) can likewise be found.

In Hittite Rituals there are parts of text with a descriptive function (prose) and parts that provide recitative passages (spells, incantations, *historiolae*) that must be remembered to be passed down orally. To this end, rhetorical-rhythmic devices and “poetic” techniques common to all oral folk literature are employed; for example, the formulaic poetry of the Homeric epics and the *Carmen* in archaic Latin.²

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROSE AND POETIC STYLE

In the following analysis, we examine several passages from different genres - a treaty, an edict and a ritual (one from a descriptive section and one from a *historiola*). Individual sentences will be analyzed so that any rhetorical figures are highlighted. Accadograms and Sumerograms will be omitted, where possible, and replaced with the corresponding Hittite word.

From the treaty between Muwatalli and Alakšandu of Wiluša (CTH 76):³


“Furthermore, the lands which I, My Majesty, have given to you, and which constitute the border districts of Hatti – if some enemy mobilizes and goes to attack those border districts, and you hear about it and do not write in advance to the one who is commander in the land, and do not lend assistance, but ignore the evil”

(A) A III (44) namma-ta *ištu-nuš-miš kue utnē peḫḫun
(B) (45) par[(ā)]-ma-kan kue irḫuš ŠA KUR Ḥatti ašanzi
(C) (46) nu mān kuiški kururaš niniktari
(D) nu-aš apēdaš irhaš (47) walāḫḫuwanzi paizzi
(E) zik-ma ištamašti
(F) (48) nu-kan utni andan kuiš išḫi
(G) nu-ši [p]eran parā natta ḫatrāši
(H) (49) ziqqa natta warreššatti
(I) nu-kan idalaui (50) ʾpaʾrā uškiši

In this passage, no rhythmic patterns can be found. All of the figures of speech that would serve this purpose, for example, alliteration or homeoteleuton, are

lacking. There are some repeated endings: -ZI in (B) with ‘and (D), -TI in (E) and (H), -ŠI in (G) and (I)’, but they cannot be considered homeoteleuton in the proper sense of the term because of a rhetorically developed text is missing.

Now let’s examine a passage from “The Edict of Queen Ašmunikal on Royal Mausoleum” (CTH 252): 4

Vs. (1) UM-MA MUNUS Aš-mu- D NIN.GAL MUNUS.LUGAL.GAL É.NA₄-aš ku-it i-ia-u-e-en (2) nu A-NA É.NA₄ ku-i-e-eš URUHLA pí-ia-an-te-eš LÚ.MEŠ BE-EL QA-TI ku-i-e-eš pí-ia-an-te-eš (3) APIN.LA LÚ.MEŠ SIPAD GU₄ LÚ.MEŠ SIPAD UDU ku-i-e-eš pí-ia-an-te-eš (4) LÚ.MEŠ ša-ri-(ku)-wa-za-kán ku-i-e-eš da-an-te-eš na-at QA-DU É -ŠU-NU URUHLA -ŠU-NU A-NA É.NA₄ pí-ia-an-te-eš LÚ.MEŠ ẖi-lam-mi-e-eš ša ku-i-e-eš ka-ru-ú (6) A-NA É.NA₄ pí-ia-an-te-eš na-at-kán ša-ah-ḫa-na-za lu-zi-ia-za a-ra-u-e-eš a-ša-an-du (7) UR.GI₄-aš wa-ap-pi-ia-zi a-pi-ia-ma-aš a-ri na-aš ka-ru-uš-ši-ia-zi (8) ḫ-an-ma-kán la-ḫu-uṭ'-ta-ri a-pu-uš-ma-kán pa-ra-a li-e ú-wa-an-zi (9) nu-uš-ma-aš-kán pí-an ḫ-e-ia-an ar-ta-ru pa-ra-a-ma-aš-kán lé-e ku-iš-ki tar-na-i (10) GU₄HLA ia-aš-ma-aš UDUHLA lé-e ku-iš-ki ap-pát-ri-ia-zi (11) ḫa-u-ma-an-ta-za a-ra-u-e-eš a-ša-an-du "As follows the queen Ašmunikal: Regarding the House of Stone that we did, the villages which (have been) given to the House of Stone, the workmen who have (been given), the ploughmen, ox-herders and shepherds who (have been) given, those who have been taken from the soldiers-šarikuwa that (have been) given to the House of Stone along with their homes and their villages, as well as the doormen that (have) long (been) given to the House of Stone, should be free of duties and taxes”.

(A) (1) UMMA MUNUS Ašmunikal šallaš ḥaššuššaraš
(B) É.NA₄-aš ku-it iyauēn

The text opens with a queen’s speech listing what has been donated in favor of the “house of stone,” naming villages and men responsible for various jobs, and specifying that all are free from taxation. The list is expressed with relative clauses and the related verb is expressed by the participle. From a rhetorical standpoint, one notices the epistrophe in the repetition of the verb \( \text{piyanteš} \) in (C), (D), (E), (G) and (H), but given the content and the intent of the text, it could not have been expressed in a different way. No other figure of speech can be identified, neither in the signifier nor the signified, that would indicate the use of poetic device. Alliteration, repetition, homeoteleuton, anaphora or other figures of speech that occur abundantly in other kinds of text that we define as “poetic,” are missing here; rhythm is totally absent.

Instead, lines 7-8 of the tablet are completely different, rhetorically speaking, from the rest of the text. Here, a proverb or something similar, is quoted that serves to emphasize the special status of the personnel of the mausoleum. For this purpose an \( \text{eja} \)-tree must be planted in front of their homes as a visible sign of their rank and the exemptions that they are offered. Even at first glance, these lines appear stylistically different from what precedes them and from what follows:
Although there are only five clauses, some features are evident that distinguish this part or these words from the rest of the text. This small “composition” of five clauses, or more precisely verses (where one clause corresponds to one verse), perhaps a proverb or the beginning of a poem or a saying, was certainly known by the audience to which it is directed. The first four verses consist of two units; the fifth verse contains three (if parā is considered part of the verb) or four units (if not). The poetic device of homeoteleuton is clearly visible, or rather, alternating rhyme between the first and third verses and the second and fourth (ZI – RI – ZI - RI). In addition, the choice and arrangement of words is not accidental; instead, the number of syllables is also taken into account. The first three verses follow this scheme:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kuwaš</td>
<td>wappiyazi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apiya-ma-aš</td>
<td>ari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-aš</td>
<td>karuššiyazi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šagan-ma-kan</td>
<td>laḫuttari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apuš-ma-kan</td>
<td>p(a)rā lē uwanzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The opening words of the first and third verses (kuwaš and na-aš) each consist of one and two syllables, at least they are shorter than the words that follow them in the same verses (wappiyazi and karuššiyazi), which contain respectively four and five syllables. On the other hand, the opening word of the second verse (apiya-ma-aš) contains four syllables, while the second term (ari) is made up of two. The pattern that emerges is a double chiasmus in the number of the syllables: short – long (2-4)/long – short (5-
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2)/short – long (1-5). The homeoteleuton found in the first and third verses, *(wappiyazi and karuššiyazi)*, and in the second and fourth verses *(ari and laḫuttari)* borders on alternate rhyme. These rhetorical devices combine to give the lines a rhythmic pattern. The fourth and fifth verses are longer than the previous ones with eight and nine syllables and have the enclitic *-ma-kan* in common at the beginning of the phrase.

In some recitative passages in the rituals, namely in the *historiolae*, these same characteristics (rhythm, figures of speech) are found. For example from “Lord of Tongue” *(CTH 338 KUB 12.62+, Vs. 10’-15’)*:  

A *lalaš išhaš kuwapi pāši*

B *palši karipuwan[zi pāimi]*
C *walkwi tarwauwanzi pāimi*
D *alili waršuwanzi pāimi*
E *antušši lalauwanzi pāimi*

F *palšaš=za karipuwanzi natta memmai*
G *walkuwaš=za tarwauwanzi natta memmai*
H *alila-aš=za waršuwanzi natta memmai*
I *Ištanuš=za idalamuš lalaš natta memmai /*

“Lord of the tongue, where are you going?” ‘I’m going to the road for (her ability) to devour (the space), I’m going to the lion for (his ability) to pounce; I’m going to the *alili* -bird for (his ability) to pluck; I’m going to the man for (his ability) to speak’. The road will not refuse devouring; the lion will not refuse plouncing; the *alili* -bird will not refuse plucking. The Sun God will not refuse the evil tongues””

The passage opens with a question that introduces a dialogue. Two stanzas of four lines each follow. The first stanza (B-E) contains the first part of the dialogue and in the second stanza (F-I) the concepts are repeated and

reinforced. The pattern is repetitive due to the use of isocolon; the verses have the same number of words and the same structure. In B-E the construction is:

B dat.loc. – purpose (infinitive) – verb
KASKAL-ši karipuwan[zi pāimi]

C dat.loc. – purpose (infinitive) – verb
*walkwi tarwauwanzi pāimi

D dat.loc. – purpose (infinitive) – verb
alili waršuwanzi rāimi

E dat.loc. – purpose (infinitive) – verb
antuḫši lalauwanzi pāimi.

Instead, F-I uses the following construction:

F subject +za – acc. (infinitive) – negation – verb
KASKAL-aš=za karipuwanzi natta memmai

G subject +za – acc. (infinitive) – negation – verb
*walkuwaš=za tarwauwanzi natta memmai

H subject +za – acc. (infinitive) – negation – verb
alila-aš=za waršuwanzi natta memmai

I subject +za – acc. – negation – verb
štamuš=za idalamuš lalaš natta memmai /

Epiphora can also be found in the two stanzas. In the first, the verb pāimi and in the second stanza the verb memmai appear four times. Isocolon is present because the lines have the same number of words and the same construction.6

These features are not found in all the recitative passages of rituals. In the following passage, from a Mastigga’s ritual against family discord, we can see a narrative and recitative sections without literary artifices (CTH 404 KUB 34.84+, II 15-20):7


7 J. L. Miller, Studies in Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals. StBoT 46. Wies-
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Then afterwards she takes the clay(?), whence she makes up seven tongues, and she secures them to the ground. Then she waves them (= the tongues) over the two ritual patrons, and she speaks thus: ‘On that day on which you condemned each other – the tongues of that day (are) right here – now the father, the sun-god, has hereby secured them’ And she places them in the hearth’.

(A) nu appanda ḫašawaš wilanan dāi
(B) nu-šan šer arḫa *šiptameš? laleš iyazzi
(C) n-aš-kan katta tarmāizzī
(D) na-aš-kan *duyaš aniuraš/mukešraš išhaš šer arḫa waḫnuzi
(E) nu kiššan memai
(F) ḫaššikketten kuëdani šiwatti
(G) nu-wa kāša apēl šiwattaš laleš
(H) kinuna-war-aš kāša addaš šišuš tarmāit
(I) na-aš-kan ḫaššī dāi

In these passages there are no stylistic elements that would indicate rhythm or “rhythmic prose.” Some rhetorical figures can be noted; for example, homeoteleuton in the repetition of the third-person singular ending -ZI in (B), (C), and (D); alliteration in the repeated S in (B) (nu-šan šer arḫa *šiptameš? laleš iyazzi); and anastrophe in the anticipation of the verb ḫaššikketten in (F). They are not enough, however, to give the text a “different” style from the norm and they have nothing of the rhythm of speech seen in the historiola or in the “saying” of the Edict of Ašmunikal neither in the narrative part (A-E), nor in the recited one (F-I).
As a final example, a few lines from the Myth of the Disappearance of Telipinu (CTH 324.I) will be analyzed: 8


“Mist seized the windows. Smoke [seized] the house. In the fireplace the logs were stifled. [At the altars] the gods were stifled. In the sheep pen the sheep were stifled. In the cattle barn the cattle were stifled. The mother sheep rejected her lamb. The cow rejected her calf.”

Many stories that we call myths are nothing more than *historiolae*, having been originally inserted in ritual texts. 9 In the Myth of the Disappearance of Telipinu, there are many stylistic features worthy of mention. The first nine lines of text are organized according to the scheme: two (A,B) – four (C,F) – two (G,H), which is followed by a paragraph line. Given the symmetry of the construction, which is not random, these lines could be more accurately referred to as three stanzas of two, four and two verses each. Each verse consists of three units, considering the phrase, Noun – dat.loc + Postposition equal to one unit and genitive – dative locative + Postposition, (F), equal to


---
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one unit. The stanzas are marked by the verb at the end of the clauses and by isocolon and epiphora: in A and B the verb is *epta*; in C, D, E, F it is *wišuriyantati*; and in G, H *mimmaš*. In A and B the syntactic construction is: Object – Subject – Verb, with anastrophe for the anticipation of the object; in D, E, F it is dative locative. – Postposition – Subject – Verb, anastrophe is likewise found in the anticipation of the locative noun; in G, H, it is Subject – Object + Possessive Adjective – Verb.

In conclusion, various stylistic devices were used in the drafting of Hittite texts depending on their type. At least, it is possible to observe a clear difference in a linear, “prose style” without any noteworthy stylistic elements; and a “poetic” one, or rather, “rhythmic prose” characterized by symmetrical and repetitive constructions, and figures of speech such as alliteration, homeoteleuton, epiphora and chiasmus that facilitate mnemonic learning.\(^\text{10}\)

---

\(^{10}\) R. Francia, Lo stile poetico delle *historiolae* ititite, VO XVII (2013), pp. 165-173.
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ON THE ORIGIN OF THE HYDRONYM HALYS

Shalva GABESKIRIA*

The old name of the longest river of Turkey Kizilirmak (1355 km) is attested in some ancient languages. In scientific literature more often the data of classic languages are given where in Old Greek it is Ἀλυς and in Latin it is written as Halys. The same name is found in Assyrian texts Hulaijash (Bilabel : 269). The most important river of the Hittite kingdom occurs in Hittite texts as Marassanda.

There is a diversity of opinions as to the structure and origin of the hydronym Halys: there are Greek, Turkish, Kartvelian versions.

A number of scientists associate it with the Greek word, meaning “salt”. The root occurs in some Indo-European languages (Latin, Armenian, Slav languages). This opinion, shown in J.Tischler’s Kleinasiat. Hydronimie, (1977, 1120) is also reflected in Britannica (v.19, 44).

There is a version according to which the potamonym we are discussing, goes back to the Turkish word, meaning “flash” (Umar 1993: 52).

The above opinions, in my view, are not convincing due to the following circumstances: as is well known, the names of big rivers are of ancient origin. Thus the hydronym Halys had been long originated in the times when in Northern-East Anatolia there was no Greek population. As is well known, for giving names to rivers, the language of people, living at the beginning of the river, plays an important part.

* Prof. Dr. Free University of Tbilisi, Georgia
As to the Greek version of the Anatolian river’s name, basing on the identity of the words “salt” and “sea” (Gamkrelidze – Ivanov 1984:674), the following questions arise: ἄλυς in old Greek dictionaries has two meanings: 1. salt, 2. sea. The “salt” is the poetic name for the “sea” and consequently, this meaning is compared to the initial meaning of the stem (salt) that belongs to a later period. The word with the meaning first “salt” and second “sea” and the name of the river Halys in old Greek texts are not homonyms (Beekes 2010: 44-45). Hence the pre-greek name of this river has taken its origin much earlier.

I think that the Turkish version is not convincing from the chronological aspect either and for naming the river, taking into account the semantics of the initial word “flash”.

The present paper expresses the viewpoint that the hydronym Halys is of Kartvelian origin.

The river Halys in ancient times was the border between Paphlagonia and Pontos.

Many Georgian scholars have long expressed their opinion about the Kartvelian origin of the potamonym (David Chubinashvili, N.Marr, I.Javakhishvili, A.Svanidze, G.Gozalishvili and others). The same opinion is shared by the Armenian scholar N. Adonts, though there has not been any special investigation, devoted to this issue. In Kartvelian languages we have Georgian ghele, Colchian ghali, Svan ghele, ghela denoting “small river, rivulet”. G. Rogava supposes that ghele is connected with the verb ghel -to ripple, rise in waves. According to the Georgian scientist, the archetype of ghali is ghalu where in the author’s opinion, u is the morphological equivalent which we have in the initial Kartvelian name of the river ghele. (Rogava 1962:75). Ghali occurs in many Kartvelian hydronyms. In Western Georgia there is the river Ghalidzga (53 km length), etymologically meaning the bank of the river, which has the same meaning in Hopa district, the river Petroghali (Hopa) which means a little river of the rocks. In Cyprus there is a hydronym ghalia (ghali-a). Initially ghali was a common word for
the mountain river. Then it became the proper name because Kizilirmak
rises in the south slope of the Kizildagh mountain. Ghali is a part of
many composites, among them is Ghali Chkhomi (trout). There are same
examples in other language groups when a common name (water, river) for
the hydronym becomes a proper name in Indo-European languages (e.g.the
Don). The name Don takes its origin from Iranian danu*danu, avesta danu
“river”, the inflow of the river Volga (Idil) is Kama which goes back to the
Udmurtian word “Kam”, meaning “water”, “river”.

In Ἀλυς the Greek nominative morphem was added to the Colchian word.
The Kartvelian velar consonant gh is not characteristic of the phonological
system of the Greek language and therefore, it was replaced by aspiration,
finally it was spread in the Latin way - Halys. The similar example is in
the old name of the biggest river of Western Georgia Rion-i which has the
morpheme of the nominative case of Greek Pasis-(Pas-is).

Some scholars think that the ethnonym khalib, attested in the texts of old
Greek authors, is related to the above mentioned Ghali, where “-ib” may
be the reflection of the Laz morphem of plurality “-ep” (the land, rich in
water sources). In the Laz dialect of the Colchian language we have the word
Ghalibar-i which means an inhabitant of the ravine.

In conclusion, on the basis of all these data and suggestions, I think that the
Kartvelian word ghali is the pregreek name for the hydronym Halys.
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TIERISCHE GOTTHEITEN IN DER ANATOLISCHEN RELIGION

José Virgilio GARCÍA TRABAZO*

ABSTRACT

Animal Deities in Anatolian Religion. It has been widely acknowledged that animal, and especially horned deities, are among the most striking phenomena of ancient mythological religions. Egyptian, West Semitic, Celtic, Greek, Indian and other religions over the world include this iconic archetypal. Therefore, it is not surprising that those horned deities are present as well in the Anatolian tradition. Our contribution tries to highlight two hitherto neglected – as far as we know – aspects of the cult of the Anatolian horned deities:

1) Their prehistorical background as developed from the palaeolithic primary “animal-religions”: bulls, stags, rams, goats and similar horned animals survived later on associated to the (relative) new secondary numina or holy figures. A prominent example is to be found in the Luvian Stag-God K(u)runtya (CERVUS₂).

2) Their connections with surrounding religions, either as receptacles of wandering motives, or becoming sources of later important religious or mythological figures. The study of the Anatolian horned deities and their background have not yet revealed their promising possibilities showing, for instance, the relation with “animal” deities like Kubaba and Cybele. We think that research in this direction could as well cast light on such an important deity like Artemis Ephesia, related both iconographically and mythologically to the horned deities of Anatolia.

* Universität Santiago de Compostela
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1. Einleitung: die ‘primäre’ (paläolithische und mesolithische) *Numina*

Einer philosophischen Interpretation der Religiösen Entwicklung der Menschheit (G. Bueno 1996, usw.) zufolge, verteilt sich die Religionsgeschichte in drei Phasen:

1. Primäre Religionen (Kern → die Tiere / körperliche *Numina*)
2. Sekundäre Religionen (Kern → hybride / mythologische *Numina*)
3. Terziäre Religionen (philosophische / monotheistische)

Der Interpretation z.B. von Clottes & Lewis-Williams (1996 usw.) zufolge, fanden in den paläolithischen und mesolithischen Höhlen *schamanistische* Riten statt. Obwohl manchmal umstritten, gilt die Existenz eines vorgeschichtlichen Schamanismus in der Forschung heutzutage als
zumindest sehr wahrscheinlich.¹


1.1. Tiere „die aus der Steine springen“ → belebte Steine / Berggötter

Die weltweit in Höhlen zahlreich nachweisbaren seltenen positiven und sehr zahlreichen negativen Handabdrücke sind wohl nach Lewis-Williams als engstmögliche Kontaktaufnahme mit der Geisterwelt hinter den Höhlenwänden zu werten. Dabei ist auffällig, daß die Tiere als „aus dem Wand herausspringende“ vorgestellt werden, das ist (emic) aus der

Geisterwelt hinter der Höhlenwand.²


Die kultische Stelen, in der hethitischen Schrifttum als ḫuwaši oder sik(k)-ānu(m) (=" ZI.KIN) genannt, erfüllen die gleiche Funktion wie Götterstatuetten. Die zumeist im Freien errichteten Stelen sollen die Anwesenheit der Götter in heiligen Hainen – in Wäldern, Baumplantagen, Bergen oder Flüssen und Quellen – anzeigen. Ihre Ursprung könnte die sehr alte Auffassung der „(von den tierischen numina) belebten Steine“ sein.

1.2. Stiere und Pferde in Verbindung mit dem Berg(gott)


Die obengenannte „Stiermänner“ von Tell Halaf, die eine Flügelsonne (als Firmament) stützen, entsprechen, ihrer Funktion nach, die den Himmel stützende Berge, wie z.B. diese die in der hethitischen Quellheiligtum von Eflâtun Pinar dargestellt sind.


### 1.3. Hybride Wesen (therianthropoi)


---


\(^4\) Erwähnenswert ist die seltsame Geschichte des indischen Mischwesens R̥ṣyaśṛṅga, der „Hirschgehörnte“ (vgl. hauptsächlich Mahābhārata 3.110-113), eigentlich ein menschlicher „Einhorn“: „A fearsome ascetic, Vibhāndaka, is bathing in a lake when the sight of a celestial nymph causes hi to spontaneously ejaculate. The semen is consumed by a doe that subsequently gives birth to a human son. The boy, R̥ṣyaśṛṅga, is born with an antelope horn in the middle of his forehead and is raised in the hermitage.” (vgl. Abusch & West 2014: 73).

1.4. Die ‘numinose Umstellung’ → die Sternbilder als ‘himmlische Projektion’ der alten paläolithischen Numina


Somit gewinnt an Wahrscheinlichkeit eine Deutung der „gehörnten Tiere“ als „Träger spezieller Numinosität“.


In der Inschrift aus dem *Timpone Grande* von Thurioi wird der Verstorbene zuerst zum Gott erklärt und dann „Böcklein“ genannt: χαίρε παϑὼν τὸ πάϑημα τὸ δ᾿ οὖπω πρόσθε ἑπεπόνθεις (4a) θεὸς ἐγένου ἐξ ἀνϑρώπου (4b) ἔριφος ἐς γάλα ἔπετες „Freue dich, erlitten zu haben, was du noch nie zuvor erlittest: Gott bist du geworden aus einem Menschen, Böcklein fielst

du in die Milch” (Janda 2005, 327). Unter der „Milch“ wäre eigentlich die „Milchstraße“ als Wohnstätte der Seligen zu verstehen.\textsuperscript{6}

2. Die zoomorphe Religion des Neolithikums Anatoliens


göttliche Gestalt in der Religion von Çatal Hüyük der Wildstier ist, wird 
“auf Grund jüngerer religionsgeschichtlicher Quellen” von Haas (1994: 57, 
315) als Verkörperung des männlichen Fruchtbarkeitsprinzips” gedeutet. Die 
Bedeutung des Wildstieres in den religiösen Vorstellungen des neolithischen 
Anatoliens ist also kaum zu überschätzen.

3. Luwische Onomastik Westanatoliens

Es ist daher kein Wunder, daß sich auch unter den uns bekannten 
onomastischen Elementen anatolischer, insbesondere westanatolischer 
Herkunft solche finden, die als Reflex der obengenannten religiösen 
Vorstellungen betrachtet werden können. Einige dieser Elemente verbergen 
sich möglicherweise in den vor kurzem von R. Oreshko (2013 : 409-413) 
behandelten Namen, wie kubanta, ein Bestandteil von Kubanta-K(u)runtiya, 
des Namens zweier Könige der westanatolischen Länder Arzawa und Mira.8 
Ein neuer Beleg für dieses Element findet sich im Namen Kubanta-zalma9, 
der unter den erst kürzlich veröffentlichten Texten von Ortaköy erscheint10. 
Der Verwendungszusammenhang des Elements kubanta11 erlaubt eine 
Deutung als Göttername oder Personennamen. Auf diese Weise könnte man 
z.B. Sauska-K(u)runtiya (Sà-us-ka-CERVUS$_2$ oder DLIŠ-DKAL), Santa- 
K(u)runtiya (Santa-DKAL) und wahrscheinlich auch Tiwada-K(u)runtiya 
(SOL-CERVUS$_2$ oder SOL-taCERVUS$_2$) als strukturelle Pendants zu 
Kubanta-K(u)runtiya verstehen. Anscheinend sind also solche Komposita 
as ‘GN [Göttername] ist mein Schutzgott’ zu deuten, obwohl theoretisch

8 Laroche (1966), s.v. KupantaDKAL.
9 Das Hinterglied ist mit dem luwischen Element zalma, zarma ‘Schutz’ zu identifizieren, wie in ṃu-za-al-ma 
(= *Tarḫunta-zalma, Laroche 1966, NH 1270) usw.; so auch in altindischen Namen vom Typ Viṣṇuśarman 
usw., altdeutsch Ans-helm ‘Gott als Helm (habend)’ etc. Als Ursprung wäre idg. *k̑el-mo(n) anzusetzen, 
vertreten z.B. in ai. šarman ‘Schutz’, heth. ĝalamma (ein Behälter).
10 Süel 2001: 671 ff. For Kupantazalma.
11 Oreshko (2013: 409f.): “This name [Kubanta-zalma] is somewhat more suggestive for a possible meaning 
of kubanta than KubantaK(u)runtiya is. […] [T]he element zalma, corresponding to the Sumerogram PAP, 
can be interpreted as ‘protection, shield’. Besides Kubanta-zalma, the following names containing this ele-
ment are are attested […]: Tarhu(na)-zalma […], Nani-zalma […], Iyarra-zalma […], Huha-zalma, É.GAL. 
PAP-ma-, Huliya-zalma-nu-, […] It is noteworthy that in all cases, besides the unclear Huliya-zalma-nu- and 
É.GAL.PAP-ma- ‘palace-protection’, the first part of all the names contains an animate noun: either the name of 
a deity (Tarhunta and Yarri) or the nouns ‘lord’ and ‘ancestor’.”
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---
\(^{12}\) Oreshko (2013: 410).
\(^{13}\) Nach H.C. Melchert (bei Dexter 2009: 64 Fn. 43) bietet jedoch die dorische Form Κυβαλα ein Problem für die von Munn postulierte Vokalentwicklung a > e.

Folgt man wiederum der Argumentationslinie des Aufsatzes von Oreshko (2013: 411), steht nicht nur die Etymologie zur Verfügung, um die Natur der (Göttin) *Kubanta* zu erschließen. Es scheint nämlich kaum ein Zufall, dass nur ungefähr 40 km südlich des Fundortes der KARAKUYU-TORBALI-Inschrift (§ 2) der in der Antike weltberühmte Tempel der Artemis stand, der Herrin von Ephesus: “The possibility thus arises of seeing in Kubanta, the Great Queen, a direct predecessor of this deity. Unfortunately […] we have little precise information on the nature of this goddess. However, one thing is clear: in origin the goddess is a local Anatolian deity, whose cult goes back to the Bronze Age”.17

Oreshko stützt sich mit seiner Identifizierung zwischen der Artemis Ephesia und Kubanta auch auf die Verknüpfung beider göttlichen Gestalten mit dem sogenannten ‘Reich der wilden Natur’ (*realm of wild nature*), was auch Gottheiten wie der hurritischen Šauška oder der mesopotamischen Ištar als typisches Merkmal zukommt. So teilen Šauška und Ištar das Epithet *immar(ra)šši* oder (*ŠA*) LÍL ‘des Feldes’ oder ‘des Wilden’ mit dem Gott

15 Vgl. zuletzt Maier (2013: 158-161).

¹⁸ Zu den Kορύβαντες als *kοrου-γεντ- ‘die Gehörnten’, vgl. → § 4.2.
²¹ Auch bei den Sakralgefäßen, die in der anatolischen Religion als Kultobjekte verwendet werden, besteht in der Regel “ein sinnvoller Bezug zwischen der Gottheit und der Form ihres Gefäßes: So hat das Tiergefäss des tauromorphen Wettergottes die Gestalt eines Rindes oder Rinderhorns und das Tiergefäss des Schutz- und Hirschgottes die Gestalt eines Hirsches. […] Die ältesten Kultgefäße stammen aus der neolithischen Siedlung Haklar VI, die in etwa 5600 v. Chr. datiert wird. Es sind ein Becher in Gestalt eines Menschenkopfes sowie zwei Tiergefäße – das eine ist als Hirsch und das andere als Eber gestaltet” (Haas 1994: 520 f.).
4. Artemis Ephesia ~ Kubanta als πότνια theidôv / ‘sekundäre’ numina


Gerade in diesem Kontext einer langen Tradition der πότνια theidôv und der “gehörnten Gottheiten” Anatoliens wäre vielleicht eine Erklärung des Namens Artemis möglich. Bekanntlich ist diese Göttbezeichnung trotz zahlreicher Etymologisierungsversuche\textsuperscript{25} immer noch ohne allgemein

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Ich folge G. Buenos Interpretation der Entwicklung von Religionen, die er im Rahmen seiner Religionsphilosophie darlegt; vgl. insbesondere Bueno (1996: 266 f.).
  \item \textsuperscript{23} Vgl. Yakubovich (2010: 80 mit Anm. 5).
  \item \textsuperscript{24} Vgl. Haas (1994: 315 mit Abbildung 50).
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4.1. Epitheta der Artemis. Ikonographie der Artemis Ephesia

In Zusammenhang mit der vorgeschlagenen Etymologie lassen sich wohl


30 Für eine ausführlichere Diskussion der sprachwissenschaftlichen Details sei auf García Trabazo (2017) hingewiesen.

Die Etymologie stützt sich ebenfalls auf der bekannten Ikonographie der Artemis Ephesia, mit ihren viel diskutierten ‘Brüste’ (oder ‘Stierhoden’?), sowohl die gehörnte Fauna die ihre Toga und ihren Kopfputz schmückt.

4.2. Κορύβαντες < *kōr-u-ų-gent- ‘die Gehörnten’ (?)


Es handelt sich um Vegetationsdämonen und orgiastische Ritualtänzer, die die Göttin Kybele (im römischen Reich auch Magna Mater) begleiten. Nach dem Mythus sind sie die erste Gründer der kretischen Zivilisation, und sie lehrten den Menschen die Tiere zu bändigen.

5. Schlußfolgerungen - Zusammenfassung

1. Als ‘primäre’ (paläo- und mesolithische) Numina könnten die Tiere “die aus der Steine springen” (→ belebte Steine / Berggötter) mögliche Vorfahren für
   → den Stier als ‘Repräsentant des Berges’, oder
   → die Verknüpfung zwischen Pirwa ~ Pferd darstellen.

3. Die πότνιαι ἠηρῶν / ‘sekundäre’ Numina sind auch wahrscheinlich mit mythologischen Figuren wie die Artemis (Ephesia) / Kubanta (?) usw. zu identifizieren.
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THE HIEROGLYPHIC LUWIAN SIGNS *128 (AVIS ‘BIRD’) = wa\textsubscript{x} 
AND *30 = HAPA\textsuperscript{1}

* Petra GOEDEGEBUURE*

1. Introduction\textsuperscript{2}

Even though Luwian studies have since long moved beyond mere decipherment, it is still possible to discover phonetic values for hieroglyphs with unknown syllabic or symbolic value. Two such cases will be presented here: I propose that the signs AVIS (*128) and *31 be read as wa\textsubscript{x} and HAPA, respectively. This leads to full readings of six words, including four new lexemes, and in a few cases to a better understanding of the passages in which these words occur.

Following Simon’s overview and discussion of the different uses of the bird-shaped sign AVIS (= *128) (this volume), when used as a logogram *128 covers several concepts. First, it overwhelmingly appears in the divine name Kubaba, written (DEUS)Ku+AVIS-pa-pa, (DEUS)Ku+AVIS-pa, (DEUS) Ku+AVIS, AVIS (DEUS)ku (GULBENKIAN seal), (DEUS.AVIS)ku-pa-pa (once, in KÂHTA 1 § 1 (Simon 2014:248)), or merely (DEUS)AVIS.

\textsuperscript{1} The Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, USA.

\textsuperscript{2} I am most grateful to Zsolt Simon and Craig Melchert for making their conference papers available to me, to Annick Payne for allowing me the use of her Hieroglyphic Luwian signs, and finally the audience of the 9\textsuperscript{th} ICH and in particular Ilya Yakubovich for their helpful remarks, suggestions and improvements. All remaining errors are my own.

\textsuperscript{1} The corpus on which this study is based consists of all texts from Hawkins 2000 and the following texts that were not included in Hawkins 2000, either because they were edited after 2000 or belong to the Empire period: AFYON, ALEPPO 1, 6, 7, ANCOZ 5, 11, 12, ANKARA 1, ARSUZ 1, 2, BEYKÖY, ÇİNEKÖY, DEMİRKÖPRÜ, DÜLÜK BABA TEPESİ 1, EMİRGAZI, EREĞLİ, FRAKTIN, GÜRÇAY, İSTANBUL 2, KÂHTA 1, KARAHÖYÜK, KARKAMİŞ X (stele of Suhi I), KIRŞEHİR (+) YASSIHÖYÜK, KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ group, KÖYLÜTOLU, KUŞÇU-BOYACI, MALKAYA, POTOROO, ŞARAGA, SİRKEŞI, SÜDBURG, TALL ŠTĪB, TELL AHMAR 6, YALBURT, YUNUS.
Especially the latter three writings make it clear that without complements AVIS logographically represents the deity Kubaba, while the other writings of Kubaba show that AVIS cannot have a syllabic value but is simply a logogram surrounded by phonetic complements. As D’Alfonso in his edition of the Sprenger seal suggests, another concept that might be hiding behind AVIS is *kukula- ‘cuckoo’* (2009:321 with n. 5). The reading *kukula-* seems to be the only feasible explanation for the alternation of the personal name *ku+AVIS-la-(i)a* and AVIS-[l]a-i(a) on the Sprenger seal and for the spelling of the personal name *ku-ku-AVIS-la* (Herbordt 2005:143, Kat. 169). And finally, as Simon argues in this volume, the logogram AVIS may stand for *kutta- ‘wall’ or kuttawanni- ‘precinct’*, attested in SULTANHAN § 12 as abl. “AVIS”-ta-wa/i-na-ri+i.

The logogram AVIS was thus liberally used as a logogram representing different concepts based on the principle of *connectio homophonica* or phonetic assonance (Simon, this volume), but it does not end there. AVIS also has at least two, perhaps even three different syllabic readings. The least certain reading is without much support, but needs to be mentioned in view of the alternation *ku+AVIS-la-(i)a* and AVIS-[l]a-i(a) on the Sprenger seal. A syllabic reading of AVIS as *kú* and thus of *ku-kú-la-(i)a* and *kú-[l]a-i(a)* reminds one of the possible but not assured equation of the name *ku-la-na* (Herbordt 2005, Kat. 171) with *ku-ku-la-na* (Herbordt 2005, Kat. 172), as suggested by Hawkins (*apud* Herbordt 2005:259). Another syllabic reading, *zi*, has long been recognized and only occurs in KARATEPE 1 in REL-zi (Ho. § XXVII; the duplicate Hu. has REL-zi) and *mi-ia-ti-zi* (Ho. § LI; the duplicate Hu. has *mi-ia-ti-zi*). This value must have been derived through acrophony from a bird-name starting with *zi*.

---

3 Given the equation AVIS = Kubaba, Simon (this volume) now suggests to read the name TONITRUS. GENUFLECTERE-AVIS, attested on a seal, as Halpa-Kubaba (Herbordt 2005:132, Kat. 111 suggests Halpasulupi). Another personal name where the equation AVIS = Kubaba might apply is *ku-AVIS-pi-da-na* (Herbordt 2005:142f., Kat. 165). Hawkins *apud* Herbordt 2005:259 suggests reading it as *kupapitana* and compares it with the Alalāḫ names Kupapaduni and Kupapatanni.

4 I herewith withdraw my tentative suggestion for *tawani-* as another word for stele in Goedegebuure 2007:324. Perhaps we should also read AVIS-ni-na = kuttawannin in POTOROO facet 8a: [NEG]3-s-[a-p]a-wa/i|AVIS-ni-na| (PES,PES) tara/i-pi-ti “or (if) he attacks the precinct, (may this deity [… to that one]”) (ed. Hawkins 2010:186f.). AVIS in SAMSAT 3 is utterly unclear (za-wa/i AVIS-na x-na […] “[……] this AVIS (acc. sg.),” ed. Hawkins 2000:353f.). Alternatively, as suggested by Ilya Yakubovich (pers.comm.) we could read AVIS-ni-na as wa_x-ta-ni-na /wattanin/ ’holding’ (see further below).
The final value is \( wa_x \), proposed here. This syllabic value should be acrophonically derived from another designation for a bird species. The best option is the generic word\(^5\) for bird, \( wattai- \) (Sum. MUŠEN), only attested as nom.pl.comm. \( wattaēš \) in the phrase \( ḫatugaēš wattaēš \) ‘terrible birds’ (KBo 4.2 ii 32, also see \( [wa-at]- τtαŋ -i-e-eš \) in KBo 4.2 i 2\(^c\); for the latest discussion see Kloekhorst 2008:987). Still, this in itself is not enough to establish \( wa_x \) as the reading behind AVIS.

2. AVIS (*128) = \( wa_x \)

2.1 ARHA (MALLEUS) \( wa_x -la- ‘to remove’\)

The proof for the reading of *128 (AVIS) and its cursive form *71 as \( wa_x \) depends upon the rare spelling of the common expression \( ARHA \) MALLEUS-la- ‘to remove, erase’ as \( ARHA \) (MALLEUS) AVIS/*71-la- and the singular reading of the sign *280 = MALLEUS as \( wa/i_y \) in TOPADA § 26. In the latter case MALLEUS occurs in the middle of a word (see Laroche 1960:147, sub *280 II., “valeur phon. \( wa_s \) ”):

(1) \( pa+rα/i-zu/za_s^-ta_x -MALLEUS=wa/i_x-ni-sa-pa-wa/i-ta_x \) (URBS) (ANIMAL) EQUUS-sa_s \(*219\) \( ha+rα/i-pa-zi/α-ha \) OMNIS.MI-z/α \( á-zu/za_s^-sa_s^-na \) FINES+HI HIC (?) CRUS+RA/I

The Parzu/atean horse and all the rebels stood here (?) on our border. (TOPADA § 26, ed. Weeden 2010:54f., diff. Hawkins 2000:453; for reading \( za_s \) instead of \( zu^3 \) see Yakubovich 2010:66ff.)

---

\(^{5}\) Whether \( wattai- \) is genuine Hittite, a borrowing from Luwian, or both Hittite and Luwian cannot currently be decided. For the acrophonic derivation of the syllable value /wa/ this is not important. As Yakubovich (2008) has convincingly shown, both Hittite and Luwian served as source languages for the development of the Anatolian hieroglyphic script.

\(^{6}\) Watson (2008:95) suggests that Emar Akkadian \( wattu ‘pigeon’\), written PI-at-tu\(_i\) and glossed \( summatu ‘(female) dove, pigeon’ \) (Emar 555: 71’, discussed in Pentiuc 2001:139), was borrowed from Hittite. Besides the fact that this word might be Semitic after all (see Pentiuc 2001:139, Cohen 2010:831), I would reject such a borrowing on the grounds that \( wattai-/MUŠEN \) does not mean ‘pigeon’ but ‘bird’, and that in the lexical lists in Ḫattuša \( summatu \) glosses TU/MUŠEN ‘(female) dove, pigeon’, not MUŠEN (KBo 26.3 + KUB 4.96 ii’ 24’, ed. Schuecher 2012:498). To my knowledge TU/MUŠEN is elsewhere only attested in KUB 42.29 rev.? v? 14’.
MALLEUS occurs here as the first syllable of the suffix of appurtenance -\textit{wa-ni-}/-\textit{wanni-} in \textit{pa+ra/i-zu}/z\textsubscript{a}/-MALLEUS-\textit{ni-} ‘of Parzu/ata, Parzu/atean’, and therefore was established already in the late thirties to represent /\textit{wa}/ (Hrozný 1935:507 n. 8 ‘\textit{va}’; Meriggi 1937:90 with n. 2 ‘\textit{wa}’). The scribe of Topada added quite a few signs to the Luwian syllabary, using the acrophonic principle. If he could use MALLEUS to represent /\textit{wa}/, then clearly the first syllable of the lexeme hiding behind the ‘hammer’ logogram started with /\textit{wa}/.

Almost every other instance of MALLEUS occurs in the expression \textit{ARHA} MALLEUS ‘to erase/remove (a name or object)’, with MALLEUS used as a logogram. In that use MALLEUS is often followed by a phonetic complement /\textit{la}/. Typical examples are (2) and (3):

(2) he who …
\textit{\underline{\text{NEG}_{2}}-pa-\textit{wa/i-tâ} za-a-\textit{ti-ia-za} (“SCALPRUM”) ku-ta-sa\textsubscript{5}+ra/i-za |\textit{á-ma-za} |\textit{á-lâ/ i-ma-\textit{za}} |\textit{ARHA “MALLEUS”-la/i/u-i}}

or \textbf{erases} my name \textbf{from} these orthostats,

(may against him celestial Tarhunt, Karhuha and Kupapa, and the Stormgod of Mount Arputa and the gods of the riverland of the river Šakura litigate.)

(KARKAMIŠ A11c § 24, ed. Hawkins 2000:104)

(3) \textit{\underline{\text{wa/i-tâ} za-a-z}\textit{i} (“SCALPRUM)} [\textit{k}u-ta-sa\textsubscript{5}+ra/i-zi |\textit{zi-ri+i} pa-sa-na \textit{LO[CUS]-la/i-\textit{ti}} |\textit{ARHA} | REL-sa “\textit{MALLEUS}”-i}

He who \textbf{removes} the\textbf{se orthostats here} \textbf{from} their location, … (KARKAMIŠ A27e § 4, ed. Hawkins 2000:166)

The syllabic reading of MALLEUS as \textit{wa/i}_{9} and the use of the logogram MALLEUS in contexts like (2) and (3) probably led Laroche to suggest that MALLEUS could be read as \textit{wala-} (“lect. ou compl. phon. -\textit{wala?”}, 1960:147). The reading of MALLEUS-\textit{la-} as \textit{wala-} is supported by a very similar though not exactly cognate expression in Hittite, \textit{laman wallanu-} ‘to erase/remove a name’\textsuperscript{8} (HW 242 (“\textit{tilgen (?), ausstreichen (?)}; ändern (?”), Tischler 2001:193, Kloekhorst 2008:945):

\textsuperscript{7} Also see KARKAMIŠ A14a § 8; A16b.

\textsuperscript{8} The only other attestation of \textit{wallanu-} occurs in a broken context: \textit{wallanuanza KUR[-\textit{anza?…}]} (OH/NS, KUB 34.19 rev. 9’, CTH 538).
(4) This tablet must be placed before the Stormgod of Hatti, and [no one may take] it away from before (him). But anyone who take[s] this tablet away from before the Stormgod of Hatti, or melts it down

našma ŠUM-an wallanu[zzi]

or removes the name,

([or] carries it (the tablet) forth, [may] the Stormgod of Hatti, the Sungoddess of Arinna and all the gods completely destroy him together with his offspring!) (NH, KUB 26.43 rev. 37, CTH 225)

In three⁹ cases MALLEUS is followed by an extra syllable preceding the usual /la/, namely AVIS or *71 (Hawkins 2006:29):

(5) “MALLEUS”(-)*71-la- (*71 (early 8th c., BOYBEYPINARI 1, § 9)
“MALLEUS”(-)*71-la-i (late 10th – early 9th c., TELL AHMAR 2, § 12)
“MALLEUS”(-)AVIS-la-i (late 10th – early 9th c., TELL AHMAR 6, § 29)

See for the context for example:

(6) mha-mi-i-ia-ta-sa-pa-wa/i-ta |á-lá/i-ma-za |REL-i-sa |ARHA |“MALLEUS”  AVIS-la-i ||

He who removes the name of Hamiyata, (…) (late 10th – early 9th c., TELL AHMAR 6, § 29)

The full rendering of our word could therefore be *71-la / AVIS-la-. Based on the alternation of *71 and AVIS (= *128) in the TELL AHMAR texts, Hawkins plausibly considers *71 as a cursive form of AVIS (2006:29). Following Laroche’s very tentative reading of *71 in TELL AHMAR 2, § 12 as wa (1960:44; “arha MASSUE-wa??-la-a”), and the reading of MALLEUS as /walla-/, we should now equate AVIS with wa as well. This gives us the full reading (“MALLEUS”) waₓ-la-i.¹⁰

---

⁹ There might be a fourth case: MALLEUS-x+ra/i-i (MARA§ 8, § 12), where x is perhaps *71 (Hawkins 2000:255).

¹⁰ The expression ARHA (MALLEUS) wala- ‘to erase, remove’ should be kept separate from ARHA (MORI) wala- ‘to die’.
2.2. (DEUS)waₜ-ᵗⁱ- ‘(divine) mountain’

Another instance in which AVIS = waₜ leads to an acceptable full reading is TELL AHMAR 6 § 2, where we find a list of deities including the (DEUS) AVIS-ti-zi (Hawkins 2006:12f., 18f.; Rieken & Yakubovich 2010:212):

(7) *a-wa/i-mu |á-ia-lá/i-na |INFANS(-)*282-ní’-wa/i-ra+a CAELUM (DEUS) TONITRUS-sa (DEUS)ia-[...] (DEUS)BONUS (DEUS)LUNA-sa |á-ta-na |(PES₂) tara/i-za-mi-i-sa (DEUS)SOL-sa (DEUS)CERVUS-sa || (DEUS)kar-hu-ha-sa (DEUS)kur+AVIS (DEUS)hi-pu-da-sa |EXERCITUS-la/i/u-na-si-ha (DEUS)sà-us-ka-sa [(DEUS)FORTIS-sa (DEUS)SARMA-sa |“CAELUM”-ti-sa |“TERRA”-REL+ra/i-ti-sa-ha (DEUS)AVIS-ti-zi (DEUS)⁎30-da-ti-zi a-tā |ta-sa?-mi-zi DEUS-ní-si |(LITUUS)ā-za-ta

Celestial Tarhunt, Ea, the Graingod, the Moongod, the benevolently inclined¹¹ Sun-God, Runtiya, Karhuha, Kubaba, Hipuda (= Hebat) and Šauska of the Army, Teššub, Šarruma, Heaven and Earth, the divine AVIS-ti-zi, the divine *30-da-ti-zi, the … gods loved me, the first-born child. (late 10th – early 9th c., TELL AHMAR 6 § 2, ed. Hawkins 2006:12f.)

Together with two other unidentified divine groups, the (DEUS)AVIS-ti-zi deities follow Heaven and Earth. A comparison with the divine witness lists of the Hittite Empire treaties (for which see Beckman 1999) shows that once the natural phenomena have been introduced all following deities are natural phenomena as well. The Bronze Tablet, for example, concludes its divine witness list with “heaven, earth, the great sea, the mountains, rivers, and springs of Hatti and of the land of Tarhuntassa” (Bo 86/299 iv 3-4, tr. Beckman 1999:121). The order of deities in the witness lists is not fixed, but we can establish a few groups whose members always appear in a certain order. These groups of natural phenomena, with their internally fixed order, are: (a) mountains, rivers, springs¹²/ Euphrates¹³, (b) the (great) sea, (c) heaven and earth, and (d) winds, clouds.

Reading (DEUS)AVIS-ti-zi as (DEUS)waₜ-ti-zi /wattinzi/ immediately identifies them as the mountains: both in Hieroglyphic Luwian and Cuneiform Luwian the word for mountain is watta/i- (for Hieroglyphic Luwian wa/i-.

---

¹¹ For antan tarzami- as the equivalent of Hittite anda nei ant- ‘benevolently inclined’, see Rieken 2004:459.
¹² The springs are only absent in the treaty with Sattiwaza of Mitanni.
¹³ The Euphrates is only present in the treaty with Sattiwaza of Mitanni.
ti- ‘mountain’ see Hawkins 2000:350 with further references; for Cuneiform Luwian watta/i-
see Gérard 2006:248f.).

2.3. (DEUS) wa₄-ta-ni(-ya)- ‘(sacred) holding’

Another case where AVIS = wa₄ makes sense is for DEUS.AVIS-ta-ni- and its alternative spelling LITUUS+AVIS-ta-ni-, attested four times. By assigning the value wa₄ to AVIS, we now may read (DEUS) wa₄-ta-ni-ia-za and LITUUS+wa₄-ta-ni-ia-za. Since intervocalic -ta- represents /ta/, /nta/ or /nda/, the underlying lexeme is either /wa(t)tani(ya)-/ or /wanTani(ya)-/.

Hawkins established the meaning of this word as ‘day’ (Hawkins 2000:97f., 1986:95), and the related verb DEUS.AVIS-ta-ni-sà- as ‘to endow with days’ (KARKAMIŠ A6 § 1, ex. 14). Although I will reject this translation further below following Ilya Yakubovich (pers.comm.) in favor of ‘(sacred) holding’ (see ex. 8*), ‘day’ fits the contexts of KARKAMIŠ A2+3 § 7-8 (ex. 8) and the very similar KARKAMIŠ A11a § 10 (late 10th – early 9th c.,)

(DEUS)wa₄-ta-ni-ia-za):

(8) (§ 7) *a-wa/i-ta *a-mi-ia-za LITUUS+wa₄-ta-ni-ia-za |REGIO-ni-i a-tá (DEUS)BONUS-na (DEUS)VITIS(-)ti-PRAE-ia-ha || ARHA (CAPERE₂)u-pa-ta
(§ 8) a-wa/i *a-mi-ia-za |LITUUS+wa₄-ta-ni-ia-za |OVIS.ANIMAL-ı 10 ASINUS CRUS+RA/I

(§ 7) In my days he (Tarhunzas) brought away¹⁵ grain and wine into the country. (§ 8) In my days 10 donkey loads (of barley) stood for a sheep (late 10th – early 9th c., KARKAMIŠ A2+3 § 7-8, ed. Hawkins 2000:109).

Under this interpretation the phrase amiya"za LITUUS+AVIS-taniya"za finds its parallel in the expression apata"za (“ANNUS”)usa"za ‘in those years’ (Hawkins 1986:95):

(9) |a-wa/i |||ú[-pa-]|tá||-za, (“ANNUS")u-sá-za |(OVIS.ANIMAL)ha-wa/i-i 30 ti-wá/i-ta-li-sa “HORDEUM”-za |CRUS+RA/I

---


¹⁵ For the sense of this sentence see Melchert 2004:373.
In those years 30 tiwattalli-measures of barley stood for a sheep. (AKSARAY § 4, ed. Hawkins 2000:476)

Reading DEUS.AVIS-ta-ni-/LITUUS+AVIS-ta-ni- as wa’tani(ya)- allows for comparison with Cuneiform Luwian wandaniya-. Both words could then be related to the Hittite verb want- ‘to glow, to light’ and the noun wantemma- ‘glowing of the sun, lightning’. This suggests translating wandaniya- as ‘bright, radiant’ (Tischler 2001:194; Torri 2010). The adjective wandaniya- only occurs in the phrase “bright, radiant sky,” the day sky therefore, and thus belongs to the same semantic field as “day”:

(10) (18’) [mā]n 4UTU-uš wan’dAN-I’YA nepiši (19’) [anda ištam]ašta

When the Sungod in the radiant sky heard about (it) ((KBo 43.223 +) KBo 9.127 + KUB 36.41 i 18’-19’ (MS, CTH 764, ed. Torri 2010:384f.))

There is another option that seems equally possible in the context of (8). ACLT translates AVIS-ta-ni-ya- as ‘holding’, and Ilya Yakubovich (pers. comm.) has now proposed reading it as /wattaniya-/17. As ex. 13 shows, this lexeme is common gender, and in my view a (lexicalized) adjectival -iya- derivation of neuter REGIO-ni(ya)- ‘country’. The same formation, wattaniya-18, is also attested in Cuneiform Luwian:

(11) ā-ṭṭa ādduwanza 14’ pariyan ADDUWALIYAN 15’ wattaniya uppannandu §

Let them carry the evil across that of the evil land (or the holding of/pertaining to evil) (NS, CTH 765, KBo 13.260 iii 13’-15’, ed. Yakubovich (2010: 237) “let them carry the evils over to an evil land”).

Under this alternative interpretation the phrase amiya"za LITUUS+wataniya"za finds its parallel in the expression (TERRA)taskwari ‘in the land’:

(12) |REL-i-pa-wa/i |("TERRA")ta-sà-REL+ra/i|2 “OVIS”-sa 80 “HORDEUM” CRUS+RA/I ||

16 Also see on the same tablet ta-ap-pa-āš-ša wa-an-da-ni-ya-aa-n-za (nom.-acc.sg.neut.) ‘bright sky’ (MS, CTH 764, KUB 35.107 iiii 6), and [ta-ap-pa-āš-ša wa-an-]-du-ni-ya[”]-an-za] (MS, CTH 764, KUB 35.107 iiii 26). Fragmentary: wa-an-da-ni-[y(a-r)] (MS, CTH 766, KUB 35.102 iv’).

17 REGIO = */wattani-/ is derived from Luwian *wadni ‘land’ through fortition of the etymological *d and anaptyxis (Yakubovich 2010:237).

18 Yakubovich (2010:237) treats wataniya- as a thematized form of *watani-‘land’ (attested in the dat.-loc. sg. in KUB 35.133 ii 24’). I prefer to understand the ending -iya- as the adjectival derivational morpheme in view of the preceding adjectival formation adduwaliya- ‘of evil’ < adduwal- ‘evil’ (now also see ACLT).
Indeed, in the land two sheep stood for 80 (measures of) barley. (SULTANHAN § 11, ed. Hawkins 2000:466)

The passage that helps decide between the two proposals\(^{19}\), (13) below, was originally used to support the temporal reading. By showing that temporal expressions can occur as accusatives, Hawkins assumes that the accusative (DEUS)\(wa_x-ta-rn\dot{n}\dot{h}-zi\) in (13) means ‘during (my) days’ (2000:229). But temporal expressions occur only in the accusative in three contexts: (a) as the object of a verb, (b) to mark habituality when reduplicated (\(usin\ usin\ ‘yearly, every year’, \(arin\ arin\ ‘time after time, always’), or (c) to denote ‘for x amount of time’. Expressions locating the state of affairs in time, as would be the case in (8), only occur in the dative-locative. Translating according to option (c), ‘during my days’ (= ‘for the duration of my days’), is no longer a contextually viable option, because that would mean that it took the ruler’s whole life to settle the Anaitean districts. This seems hardly worthy of boasting. Letting the achievement take place ‘in my days’ would have been more appropriate, but this requires the dative-locative (DEUS) \(wa_x-ta-rn\dot{n}\dot{h}\-(ia)-za\) (see ex. 8) instead of the accusative (DEUS)\(wa_x-ta-rn\dot{n}\dot{h}-zi\). The syntax of (13) therefore tips the scale in favor of ‘holdings’. The consistent use of DEUS or LITUUS might point at a religious nature of the holdings, hence ‘(sacred) holdings’:

(13) \(^*\)\(a-wa/i-mu\ (DEUS)wa_x-ta-rn\dot{n}\dot{h}-zi\) || \(á-na-i-tá(REGIO)-wa/i-na-\)\(^{20}\) || (SOLIUM)\(i-sà-nù-wa/i-h[a]\)

I settled/established the Anaitean (districts) as my (sacred) holdings/*during my days (late 10\(^{th}\) – early 9\(^{th}\) c., TELL AHMAR 2 § 10, ed. Hawkins 2000:228, translating “during my days”)

I therefore translate ex. 8 as follows:

(8*) (§ 7) \(^*\)\(a-wa/i-ta\ *a-mi-ia-za\ LITUUS+wa_x-ta-ni-ia-za\) |REGIO-ni-i a-tá (DEUS)BONUS-na (DEUS)VITIS(-)ti-PRAE-ia-ha || ARHA (CAPERE\(_2\))u-pa-ta

(§ 8) \(a-wa/i\ *a-mi-ia-za\ LITUUS+wa_x-ta-ni-ia-za\) |OVIS.ANIMAL-i 10 ASINUS CRUS+RA/I

19 The spelling \(wa_x-ta-ni\) allows for a third option, \(wattanni-\ ‘small mountain > hill’ (see fn. 13), but this is contextually very improbable.

20 For the use of another headless neuter plural adjective as the object of \(isnuwa-\ ‘to settle, establish’, see \(a-wa/i\ |\(\text{"VACUUS"}ta-na-ta-\) ("SOLIUM")\(i-sà-\)|\(nu-wa/i-ha\ ‘I settled the devastated (places)’ (MARAŞ 1 § 4, ed. Hawkins 2000:263).
In my (sacred) holdings he (Tarhunzas) brought away grain and wine into the country. (§ 8) In my (sacred) holdings 10 donkey loads stood for a sheep (late 10th – early 9th c., KARKAMIŠ A2+3 § 7-8).

KARKAMIŠ A6 § 1 probably contains a verbal derivation of *watani-/*wattani-/. Originally translated as ‘endowed with days(?)’ (Hawkins 2000:125), the participle DEUS.AVIS-\textit{\textit{ta-ni-sà-mi-i-sa}} = (DEUS)\textit{\textit{wa-x-ta-ni-sà-mi-i-sa}}\textsuperscript{21} should now mean something like ‘endowed with holdings’:

\begin{align*}
\text{(DEUS)}\textit{\textit{wa-x-ta-ni-sà-mi-i-sa}} & | \text{LITUUS+}\textit{\textit{ta-sa-pa-CERVUS-wa/i-ti-i-sa}} & \text{CAPUT}\textit{\textit{ti-i-sà}} \\
\text{I am Yarri, ruler, Prince, endowed with (sacred) holdings, …, (Prince, heard of by the west (and) the east, beloved by the gods)} & (end 9th – beginning 8th c., KARKAMIŠ A6 § 1, ed. Hawkins 2000:124)
\end{align*}

2.4. \textit{wa-x-sà-} ‘to lead here’

The last word with AVIS that needs to be discussed, “CAPUT”(-)AVIS-\textit{\textit{sà-}} in MARAŞ 4 § 5 (mid 9th century), is also the most problematic one. The violent context in which this lexeme occurs and the presence of CAPUT supports ACLT’s attribution of “CAPUT”(-)AVIS-\textit{\textit{sà-}} to the verb \textit{kusa-} ‘to smash’\textsuperscript{23}, attested in TÜNP 1 (§ 2, (“CAPUT+SCALPRUM”) \textit{ku-sà-mi-na}), KULULU 3 (§ 4, (“LONGUS”)REL-\textit{\textit{sà-i}}) and EMİRGAZİ (§ 8, 20, CAPUT+SCALPRUM). There is however very little evidence that AVIS should be read as /ku/, unless we accept that the name on the Sprenger seal discussed in the introduction should be read as \textit{ku-kú-la-(i)a} and \textit{kú-\textit{\textit{[l]a-i(a)}}. The alternative is to read “CAPUT”(-)AVIS-\textit{\textit{sà-}} as (“CAPUT”)\textit{\textit{wa-x-sà-ha}} and to relate it to (PES)\textit{\textit{u-sa-}} ‘to lead here’ (see further below). I take the

\textsuperscript{21} This word is perhaps also attested in SUVASA inscription C as adj. LITUUS+AVIS ‘having/of holdings’.
\textsuperscript{22} For a discussion of LITUUS+\textit{\textit{ta-sa-pa-CERVUS-wa/i-ti-i-sa}} see Hawkins 2000:125.
\textsuperscript{23} ACLT translates the verb as ‘to erase’, but it is usually translated as ‘to remove’ (Hawkins 1995:94, 2000:155). I have suggested elsewhere (2012:435 w. fn. 100) that \textit{ku-sà-} means ‘to smash, pound, crush’. The base \textit{ku-sà-} is also present in the noun (CURRUS) \textit{ku-sà-ti} \textit{INFRA-\textit{\textit{t}}a “PUGNUS”-sà-ha} (KARKAMIŞ A12 § 7, ed. Hawkins 2000:113) with suggested new translation ‘I brought down the fortifications of the city of Awayana with 100 \textit{battering rams}’. ACLT translates \textit{ku-sà-} as ‘attack’. A hundred attacks makes as much or as little sense as a hundred battering rams. In both cases the number can be attributed to poetic license.
logogram CAPUT as a determiner that is restricting the semantic field of ARHA (PES)u-sa- to leading away humans, thus ‘I deported’:

(15) In what year I smote the town of Hirika (= Hilikka), in that year I seated Tarhunt of the desmene.

(§ 4) a-wa/i-tá |i-la/i/u-wa/i-si-na(URBS) |INFRA-ta |(CAPERE)la-ha

(§ 5) (MONS.SCALPRUM)á-tu+ra/i-sa-li-ia-za-pa-wa/i |ARHA |(“CAPUT”) wa₂-sà-ha

(§ 6) hi-ri+i-ka-pa-wa/i-ta(REGIO) (“PES₂.PES”)tara/i-[pa]-ha

§ 4 I took down the town of Iluwassi;

§ 5 I deported (here) Mount Atursaliyanza;

§ 6 I attacked the country of Hirika. (mid-9th c., MARAŞ § 4 § 4-6, ed. Hawkins 2000:256f.)

Support for the equation of wa-sà- with u-sa- consists of several steps: (1) to show that the alternation wa-/u- is not always relevant; (2) to show that in this case the alternation sà/sa is not relevant. The alternation of wa-/u- is elsewhere attested, see for example u-sa-la-li- ‘to treat well (?)’ (TELL AHMAR 6 § 33) and wa/i-sa-la-li- (KARKAMIŠ A2+3 § 12)²⁴ or (BONUS)u-li-ia- ‘to favor, exalt’ (MARAŞ 1 § 1i) and (BONUS)wa/i-li-ia-id.’ (MALPINAR § 11) in exactly the same context. How to interpret the alternation of sà/sa is a more complicated endeavor because this part of the argument depends on whether wa or u is original with our verb.

Rieken (2010) has recently shown that in the heydays of Luwian administration (ca. 1000-850 BCE) sà and sa/sά consistently represented different sounds. Following the closed vowels /u/ and /i/ and preceding /k/ and */w/, the alveolar sibilant /s/ palatalized as [ʃ], represented by sà. In all other contexts /s/ remained [s], and was represented by sa or sá. In word final position this allophony was neutralized in favor of [s]. After 850 BCE the signs sà and sa/ sá were no longer strictly confined to their original environments and started to alternate, although in certain words free variation was extremely limited.

²⁴ Per Rieken’s “wuki” rule, discussed immediately below, the date of the documents in the late 10th – early 9th c. shows that wa/i-sa-la-li- must have been the original writing (usa- would have been written u-sà-).
The verb *isnuwa-* ‘to set, settle’, for example, shows *sà* in all 24 instances where the word is spelled out.\(^{25}\)

The date of MARAŞ 4, around the mid 9\(^{th}\) century, is on the cusp of the loss of the distinction between *sà* and *sa/sá*. In this text we indeed encounter *sà* in word final position (*mu-wa/i-ta-la/i/u-i-si-sà*, § 1) besides correct (“SOLIUM”) *i-sà-mù-wa/i-ha* (§ 3) and (“THRONUS”) *i-sà-tara/i-ti* (§ 17). The orthography of (“CAPUT”) *wa-sà-ha* is therefore either still according to the rules of 1000-850 BCE and should then represent *wi-sà-ha ‘?’*, *u-sà-ha ‘?’*, *wa-sà-ha ‘I did good’*\(^{26}\) or it no longer correctly distinguishes between *sà* and *sa* and now also allows the readings *wa-sà-ha ‘I bought’* and *u-sà-ha ‘I led here’*.

The verb that comes closest to *wi-sà-* is *wis(a)i-* ‘to emerge’\(^{27}\) (compare Cun. Luwian *wiš(a)i-*). Because this verb is intransitive, it needs to be rejected. The verbs *was-* ‘to buy’ and *wassa-* ‘to be dear (to)’ do not make much sense in the context, and a verb *u-sà-* does not (yet) exist (unless this is the correct spelling for *usa-* ‘to carry’. I will reject this option immediately below). This leaves us with *wa-sà-ha = u-sa-ha ‘I led here’*.

According to Rieken’s “wuki” rule the verb *usa-* should have been spelled *u-sà-. To my knowledge, this verb and the verb *us(a)nu-* ‘to bless, treat’\(^{28}\) are the only exceptions to the rule. Despite the /u/ both words are consistently written with *sa* or *sá*, starting with (PES)*u-sa-tá* in the 11th century BCE (ALEPPO 7 § 7, ed. Hawkins 2011:48f.). Yakubovich (2016:85-6) recently provided the solution that perfectly accounts for the spelling with <sa> instead of <sà> in (PES)*u-sa-*. He argues that *u-sa-* is the outcome of

\(^{25}\) The counts are based on ACLT (last accessed June 24, 2015). The one instance of *sa* in (“SOLIUM”) *i-sa*(sic)-*mu-wa/i-ha* in MARAŞ 1 § 4, so Hawkins (2000:263) and still Payne (2012:53), is a typo. The photo and handcopy clearly show *sà*.

\(^{26}\) *wa-sà-* represents /waʃa-/ < */waswa-/, see Rieken 2010:659.

\(^{27}\) For the meaning ‘to emerge’ see Rieken 2010:654.

\(^{28}\) The verb *u-sa-mu-* ‘to bless, treat’ is a causative formation of the stem *was-*, also attested in *wasu* ‘well’, *wass-* ‘to be dear’, and *wassammi-* ‘beloved’ (for these four lexemes see Yakubovich 2002: 199). The verb *u-sa-mu-* = *usnu-* and its iterative *usnussa-* is attested eight times (BULGARMADEN § 8; ÇİNEKÖY § 11; KARATEPE 1 § 14, 49 (Hu. and Ho.), 51 (Hu. and Ho.); KULULU 4 § 10 (with <sa4> instead of <sa>); ŞIRZI § 2), and never spelled *u-sa-mu-*(sa-). Such a consistent flouting of the “wuki” rule is highly unlikely, and I therefore read this verb as [o:snu-]. How this then relates to its Hittite cognate *aš(ša)nu-* on the one hand and Luwian *wass-* on the other hand, requires further study.
*ūdh-so-*, which reflects the merger of the centripetal prefix *u*- ‘here, towards the speaker’ with the PIE iterative stem *uedh-‘to lead’). (PES)*u-sa-* thus means ‘to lead here’ instead of ‘to carry’. Because of the reconstruction of the dental we no longer have the environment for the application of Rieken’s Rule.

3. *30 = HAPA*

3.1. (DEUS)HAPA-da-ti- ‘(divine) riverland, valley’

If the Neo-Hittite scribes of TELL AHMAR 6, in the shadow of Carchemish, continued the Hittite Empire tradition, we should expect the mountains to be followed by the rivers, *hapa/i*- (see section 2.2). Because the Luwian nominative plural of *hapa/i-* is *hapi(n)zi*, this cannot be the form behind (DEUS)*30-da-ti-zi*. In view of the preceding -ant- derivations “CAELUM”-ti-sa = tipasa*tis (< tipas n. ‘heaven’) and “TERRA”-REL+ra/i-ti-sa (taskwara*tis < taskwara/i-c. ‘earth’), we should read instead hapada*ti”zi, individuating -ant- derivation of (FLUMEN.REGIO)*hapada/i-c. ‘riverland, valley’29. I therefore suggest reading *30 as HAPA:

(16) § 2 *a-wa/i-mu |á-ia-lá/i-na |INFANS(-)*282-ní’-wa/i-ra+a CAELUM (DEUS) TONITRUS-sa … (DEUS)wa₅-ti-zi (DEUS)HAPA-da-ti-zi a-tá |ta-sa’-mi-zí DEUS-ní-zí |(LITUUS)á-za-ta

Celestial Tarhunt, …, the divine mountains, the divine river valleys, the … gods loved me, the first-born child. (late 10th – early 9th c., TELL AHMAR 6 § 2, ed. Hawkins 2006:12f.)

3.2. “HAPA”-ri+i-nu-wa/i - ‘to trade, deliver’

With HAPA as a possible value for *30, the verb “*30”(-)ri+i-nu-wa/i- in KARKAMIŠ A12 § 13 (ed. Hawkins 2000:114) reads as “HAPA”-ri+i-nu-wa/i-. Given the context this could very well represent *haparini(wa)-*, causative of *haparī-*, and cognate of Hitt. *hap(pa)riya-* ‘to sell, trade, deliver, dispense, hand over’ (HED Ḫ, 126; HW² Ḫ, 216f.). With this reading of the verb, Melchert’s discussion of § 11-12 (2004:375), and Yakubovich’s translation of the verb (PES₂) *paza-* as punctual 'to carry' (2016:73ff.), the passage is finally fully understandable:

29 For a discussion of (FLUMEN.REGIO)*hapada/i-, see Lebrun and De Vos 2006:54ff.
(17) (§ 11) *a-[w]a/i-[t]ú-[ta] (“*350”)á-sa-ha+ra/i-mi-sà |(PES₂)pa-za-ha
(§ 12) |(*273)wa/i+ra/i-pi-ha-wa/i-tú (“SCUTUM”)hara/i-li-ha |(ARGENTUM)
pi-ta-tara/i-[…] |(PES₂)pa-za-ha
(§ 13) *a-wa/i-tú-wa/i-na |PRAE-na |“HAPA”-ri+i-nu-wa/i-ha

(§ 11) I carried blood offerings to him [i.e., the deity].
(§ 12) And I also carried to him (my) craft and (my) shield as gifts.
(§ 13) And I delivered them (lit. it) in front of him³⁰. (KARKAMIŠ A12 § 11-13).

4. Conclusion

The strongest piece of evidence for a syllabic reading waₙ for AVIS (*128) was provided by the word (“MALLEUS”)AVIS-la-i ‘he erases/removes’ (TELL AHMAR 6, § 27). Combining Hawkins’s suggestion that *71 is the cursive form of AVIS (Hawkins 2006:29) with Laroche’s suggestion that *71 should be read as wa (Laroche 1960:44), I proposed to read syllabographic AVIS as wa as well. Although this does not apply to all words containing the sign AVIS (see the discussion in the introduction), we can now provide the full readings of four lexemes:

\[ \begin{align*}
ARHA \quad \text{“MALLEUS” AVIS-la-} & = \quad ARHA \quad \text{“MALLEUS” waₙ-la- /arha walla-/} \\
& \quad \text{‘to remove, lift off’} \\
(\text{DEUS})\text{AVIS-ti-} & = \quad (\text{DEUS}) \quad \text{waₙ-ti- c. /watti-/ ‘divine mountain’} \\
(\text{DEUS})\text{AVIS-ta-ni-} & = \quad (\text{DEUS}) \quad \text{waₙ-ta-ni(-ia)- c. /wattani(ya)-/} \\
& \quad \text{‘(sacred) holding’} \\
\text{AVIS-sà-} & = \quad \text{waₙ-sà- /wasa-/ = u-sa- ‘to lead here’} \\
\end{align*} \]

As a corollary of reading (DEUS)AVIS-ti-zi as /wattinzi/ ‘divine mountains’ in TELL AHMAR 6, the lexeme (DEUS)*30(-)da-ti-zi in the same text might represent /habadantinzi/ ‘divine riverlands’, suggesting that *30 should be read as HAPA. This in turn led to a contextually acceptable reading of “*30”(-)ri+i-nu-wa/i- in KARKAMIŠ A12 § 13 as “HAPA”-ri+i-nu-wa/i- / haparinuwa-/ ‘to deliver’. We may thus add two more lexemes with full phonetic readings to the Luwian lexicon:

³⁰ Differently Hawkins (2000:114): “I went to him (as) a living sacrifice. I went to him for skill and protection (“shield”) [and] profit (“selling”). And it before him I caused to …”
(DEUS)*30-da-ti- = (DEUS) HAPA-da-ti- c. /habadanti-/ ‘divine river valley’

“*30”-ri+i-nu-wa/i- = “HAPA”-rì+i-nu-wa/i- /haparinuwa-/ ‘to deliver’.

With the establishment of AVIS = waᵝ there are now ten signs representing /wa/. This highly unusual situation is less aberrant than it seems. Six of the ten signs only occur in the archaizing TOPADA and SUVASA inscriptions: wa/i₄ (*207 = MONS /watti-/), wa/i₅ (*204), wa/i₆ (*201 = TERRA /walilid-/), wa/i₇ (*286), wa/i₈ (*160 = VITIS /wiyani-/), and wa/i₉ (*280 = MALLEUS /walla-/). The sign wa/i ( *165 = BONUS /wasu-/) is only attested as a syllabogram in KARATEPE and on the Empire Period Tarkandemos seal in the name TARKASNA-wa/i (*320). Of the remaining three signs, wa/i (*439) is the most common one and attested in documents from every region and time period. The other two signs are found in complementary geographical distribution: wà/i ( *166, probably a cursive form of wa/i = *165 and *320) is attested in documents from Tabal (HİSARCIK, KAYSERİ, NİĞDE 2) and Cilicia (KARATEPE), whereas waᵝ is attested in documents from the regions of Carchemish (KARKAMIŞ, TELL AHMAR), Gurgum (MARAŞ), and neighboring Kummuh (BOYBEYPINARI). In other words, wà/i is attested to the north and waᵝ to the south of the mountain ranges separating Cappadocia and the Cilician plain from Syria.

The complementary geographical distribution of wà/i and waᵝ provides yet another piece of evidence for the existence of two distinct areas with slightly diverging scribal traditions. D’Alfonso (2012) already observed some differences in the development and distribution of the sign wa/i (*439) depending on geographic area. Undoubtedly future research will bring more evidence for separate scribal traditions in first millennium B.C.E. Anatolia and Syria.

The syllabic value wa/i₄ is also attested in names on Empire period seals (see Archi 2010:46 with references, and Dinçol & Dinçol 2008:52 Kat. 237).
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Yakubovich, Ilya, 2002


The Urartian text CTU A 5-3 is a rock inscription of Yazılıtaş in the region of Erzurum. It was found and published in the 19th century and discussed many times in special literature since then. The inscription describes the military campaign of King Minua (ca. 810-785/780 BC) against Uṭupuršini of Diauehi. Diau(e)ḫi is to be located from modern Erzurum and the upper reaches of the Euphrates and far to the north, including the valley of the Çoruh. It is identified with Greek Τάοχοι, Georgian Tao, Armenian Tayk, also with Daiaeni of the Assyrian texts. An assumption has also been made about the identity of Assyrian Daiaeni with Hittite Azzi-Hayasa. As recently proposed by Shota Asatiani, Uṭupuršini might have been the prototype of the Colchian king Aietes from Argonautica.

CTU A 5-3 (УКН 36, КУКН 53)
1 ḫal-di-ni uš-ta-bi ma-si-ni GISšú-ri-e

4 Transliteration of Salvini (M. Salvini, Corpus dei testi urartei (CTU), CNR, Istituto di studi sulle civiltà dell'Egeo e del Vicino Oriente, Roma 2008: 190).
Went forth (to battle) (the god) Ḫaldi with his weapon against (the tribe of) Diaueḫi, against (the land) Taraiu. Ḫaldi is powerful, Ḫaldi’s weapon is powerful. Went forth (to battle) with power of Ḫaldi Minua, the son of Išpuini, Ḫaldi led him. Minua says: I conquered the land of (the tribe) Diaueḫi. I took the royal city Šašiluni with battle, I burned the land, (destroyed) the castles, I reached (the land) Šešetina, (the city) Zuaina and in the region of (the city) Utuḫa.

5 Melikishvili and Harouthiounyan translate KUR tar-a-i-ú-e-di as “против ... могущественной страны” (Меликишвили 1960: 158; Арутюнян 2001: 78). Both interpretations are possible, but the qualification “a great power” for the enemy would be a unique case in Urartian texts. In the text CTU A 8-7 KUR tar-i-ú-ni is attested in the context of a campaign of Arghišti I against Diauehi. KUR tar-i-ú-ni is mentioned in CTU A 8-3, I 8 in the same context. We may assume that the land Taraiu/ Tariu of all the three texts was the same land, a neighbour or even a part of Diauehi (L. Gordeziani, Urartian Inscription from Hanak (Georgian translation and comments), Oriental Studies 3, Tbilisi 2014: 332f.).

6 Kavtaradze (2006: 36ff.) identifies it with Georgian Sasiro.
Minua says: Uṭupuršini, the king of Diaueḫi came to me, embraced my feet, fell down (before me). I treated him mercifully, pardoned him under the condition of paying tribute. He gave me gold and silver, he gave me tribute. All prisoners/ captives/ refugees who returned (to him), he gave me back. Minua says:

19 ka-am-na-a-ḫi a-li m di-a-ú-e-ḫi-ni-i
20 ANŠE.KUR.RA MEŠ -ú-ú LÚ A.SI MEŠ ’a-a-ḫa-a-ú
21 LÚ A.SI MEŠ -āš-te ú-i ú-ni a-šá-a-zi-e
22 ħi-i-ni-e ši-ú-bi LÚ ḫu-ú-ra-d[i-n]a-a
23 ma-a-si-ni-e-i-a-ni a-šá-a-zi-e [ú-ú]-še

Salvini translates only partially: kamnaḫi il quale di Diaueḫi cavalli e truppe ’ahau alle truppe neppure (?) ašazie ora (?) portai via (fra i) soldati dal suo ašazie; Melikishvili and Harouthiounyan do not translate the passage at all and only mention in comments that it deals with the obligation of the king of Diaueḫi to give horses and troops to Urartians. Diakonoff translates as: раньше вот что (говорили) диавейскому (правителю): “твоих лошадей войнам ты соберешь!” для войнов было это назначено в долю, теперь я приказал, (чтобы) у войнов из своей собственной доли (было) ú-ú-še.

24 2 MAN MEŠ -li-li e-di-ni su-ṭu-[ú]-bi
25 m ba-al-tū-ú-ul-ḫi-e KUR e-ba-a-ni-i-e
26 URU ḫa-al-di-ul-ḫi KUR e-ba-a-ni-i-e
27 É.GAL MEŠ -a-ši-li a-gu-ú-nu-ni-e-li
28 KUR e-ba-ni-a-ṣi e-di-ni su-ṭu-qu-bi

8 Меликишвили 1960: 158. Salvini does not translate this sentence (Salvini 2008: 191).
10 Меликишвили 1960: 159; Арутюнян 2001: 79.
11 И.М. Дьяконов, Урартские письма и документы (УПД), М.-Л. 1963: 70.
2 kings¹² I removed from there: the (king) of the land of the tribe Baltu and the (king) of the land of the city Ḫaldiri. The fortifications (/fortified castles) that were in the region I removed from there.

29 $m$ini-nu-a-šē a-li-e a-lu-šē i-ni DUB-te
30 tú-li-i-e a-lu-šē pi-tú-li-i-e
31 a-lu-šē a-i-ni-[i] i-ni-li du-li-e
32 a-lu-šē ú-šē ti-ú-li-e i-e-šē za-du-bi
33 tú-ri-ni-ni $D$h-al-di-šē $D$IM-šē $D$UTU-ni-[šē]
34 DINGIR$^M$EŠ-šē ma-a-ni $D$UTU-ni pi-i-ni mî-i ar-ḫi
35 ú-ru-li-a-ni mî-i i-na-i-ni
36 mi-i na-ra-a a-ú-li-e ú-lu-li-e

Minua says: (he) who will destroy this inscription, who will break it, who will make someone else do (this), who will say: “I have done (this)”, may he be annihilated by Ḫaldi, the Weather Deity, the Sun Deity, all gods under the Sun, ...

The final part of the formula is rather obscure. None of the corpora offers its translation although the meaning of its words, taken separately, has recently been specified. The passage approximately translates as follows: “Neither shall (he have) a way out, nor shall the god or people lead (him) anywhere”.¹³

As already mentioned, the text describes the Urartian military campaign against Diaueḫi. Apart from the traditional description of victory expressed by the terms “conquered”, “destroyed”, “burned”, we can see the real results

---

¹² MAN is usually translated as “king”, but in case of “others”, i.e. enemies/ opponents of Urartians, it may designate rulers of very different entities – from the Assyrian king to the local chiefs of valleys or settlements.

¹³ Although none of the numerous curse formulas found in the Ancient East shows any apparent parallels with the cited passage, the latter, anyway, clearly reflects the primitive ideas about the universe order. The space “under the sun” is regarded as the territory under the authority of the Urartian deities and the deities of the peoples conquered by the Urartians. Beyond this area there was chaos, and other territories subject to the power of other deities and peoples. Presumably, the curse formula must refer to the restriction in offering a shelter to a sinner by other, foreign peoples and gods (L. Gordeziani, To the Interpretation of an Urartian Formula, Caucasian and Near Eastern Studies 13, Tbilisi 2009: 59-62).
of the war, which are quite different from the standard outcome of a victorious campaign of Urartians. Urartian kings mostly report about the trophy – thousands of men and women, cattle, etc.\textsuperscript{14} They are counted in the texts; even if the numbers may not always seem realistic. The defeated lands were either destroyed or became part of the Urartian kingdom.\textsuperscript{15} Sometimes the losers had to pay annual tribute,\textsuperscript{16} which may be regarded as a sign of subordination.

In this case we see:
- one-time undefined contribution,
- exchange of refugees or captives (?),
- delivery of horses and troops (?),
- delimitation of borders,
- destruction of border fortifications.

This could be the result of a war between two more or less equal rivals, one of them, Minua, won and Uṭupuršini was forced to pay contribution, return refugees or and captives, agree with the obligation to give horses and troops (or horses for troops). The formula of this obligation appears again only once – in the annals of Argišti I, the son and successor of Minua, in the context of the new campaign against the same Uṭupuršini of Diaueḫi.\textsuperscript{17}

The outcome of the fight is quite similar to the conditions of Hittite treaties.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{14} E.g.: CTU A 3-4, 5-2, 8-2 Vo, 8-3, 8-7, etc.
\textsuperscript{15} E.g.: CTU A 8-2 Vo, 9-3, 9-4, 10-1, etc.
\textsuperscript{16} E.g.: CTU A 8-2 Vo, 9-1, 9-3, 9-4, 10-2, etc. The formula ’aaldubi mešini pii – “put him under tribute” or “pardon him under the condition of paying tribute” appeared first in texts of Minua. In CTU A 5-1, 5-2 we can’t be sure if it denotes one-time contribution or stable periodical obligation. In the texts of Sarduri II (CTU A 9-1 Vo 31, 9-3 I 17-18, II 39, IV 54, VI 20-21, 9-4 26) the word “annual” is not present, but the context lets us think that the conquered lands were obliged to pay tribute for years. The “annual tribute” is attested only in CTU A 8-2 Vo 23 (terubi MU.MU-ni ardilani) and CTU 10-2 14 (mešini šáali), only in A 8-2 Vo both one-time contribution (l. 18-21) and annual tribute (l. 23-25) are listed in detail.
\textsuperscript{17} CTU A 8-2 Vo 26. LÚ A.SI MEŠ-na-a ú-úše ma-a-si-ni-i-a-ni áš-zí-e.
\textsuperscript{18} See G. Beckman, \textit{Hittite Diplomatic Texts}. Atlanta 1996. For different types of ancient Near Eastern treaties see e.g., A. Altman, \textit{How Many Treaty Traditions Existed in the Ancient Near East? Pax Hethitica. Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer.} Ed. by Yoram Cohen, Amir Gilan and Jared L. Miller, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2010: 16-36. One might expect that the Urartian practice was influenced mostly by the Assyrian diplomatic tradition; however, it seems that we can find more similarities with Hittite texts. This fact could be explained by the supposition that the Urartian concept of empire (cf. P. Zimansky, \textit{Urartu as Empire. Cultural Integration in the Kingdom of Van. Biainili-Urartu. Proceedings of the Symposium held in Munich 12-14 October 2007}. Edited by S. Kroll, C. Gruber, U. Hellwag, M. Roa& P. Zimansky, Peeters, Louvain 2012: 101-110) was closer to the Hittite rather than to the Assyrian model.
Most of them mention one-time contribution or annual tribute, return of refugees and captives, obligation to give troops, etc. But the discussed text is “historiographical” and I prefer to compare it with Hittite “historiographical” texts, to check how they reflect the conditions of treaties.

It was a great surprise for me that Hittite annals mention treaties only in very few cases:

Deeds of Suppiluliuma (Tablet Seven, Fragment 28, KBo 5.6 and duplicates): Then my father asked for the tablet of the treaty again, (in which there was told) how formerly the Storm God took the people of Kurustama, sons of Hatti, carried them to Egyptian territory, and made them Egyptian subjects, how the Storm God (30) concluded a treaty between the lands of Egypt and Hatti, and how they remained on friendly terms with each other. And when they had read aloud the tablet before them, my father addressed them: (35) “Hatti and Egypt have been friends a long time. Now this too on our behalf has taken place between t[hem]. Thus Hatti and Egypt will keep on being friends”.19

“Friendship” is mentioned as the only condition of the treaty between two superpowers.

DS (fragment 51) ... and made it again (part) of Hattiland. Consequently ... took (his place) with my father. ... made a treaty, and began to give him troops...20

Here is attested the obligation to give troops.

No treaty is mentioned in The Ten Year Annals of Mursili II.21 But in some places there are traces of conditions of treaties – again the obligation of giving troops and returning refugees or/and captives. Sometimes the local lord became a vassal of Mursili and kept his position:

(year I) I defeated the levies of the Kaska and killed them. The Kaska

---

20 H.G. Gütterbock, The Deeds of Suppiluliuma as Told by his Son, Mursili II. JCS 10 (1956): 118.
21 Translation of R. Beal, COS II: 82ff.
of the land of Durmitta resubmitted and they began to give [me troops]. [Then] I, [My Majesty,] returned. Because the Kaska of the land of Ishupitta had become hostile and ceased giving me troops, I, My Majesty, went to the land of Ishupitta. I attacked the town of [...]humissena. I looted it including its transplantees, cattle and sheep and brought them away to Hattusa, while the town I burned down. I resubjugated the Kaska of the land of Ishupitta. They began to give me troops. All this I did in one year.

(year IV) [When] I came back [to the Se]ha-[River Land,] I would have fought [Manapa- Tarhunta who was] [lord] in Seha-River Land. However, when [Manapa-Tarhunta] heard about me: “The Hittite king is coming,” [he became] afraid and so [he did not] then [come] against me. He sent [to] me his mother and old men and old women. They came and [fell down] at my feet. Because the women fell down at my feet, I had mercy on the women and so I did [not] enter the Seha-River Land. They handed over to me the Hittite transplantees who were in Seha-River Land. There were 4,000 transplantees whom they handed over. I sent them back to Hattusa and they led them away. Manapa-Tarhunta and Seha-River Land I made into my subjects. Then I went to Mira. I gave Mira to Mashuiluwa; I gave Seha-River Land to Manapa-Tarhunta; and I gave Hapalla to Targasnalli. I made these lands into my subjects where they were. I imposed military obligations on them and they began to give me troops … Some (of Arzawa) I brought away to Hattusa and some I made into my subjects where they were. I imposed military obligations on them and they began to give me troops. The transplantees whom I, My Majesty, brought back for the royal estates, because I overcame all of Arzawa, numbered all together 66,000. Those whom the Hittite lords, infantry and horse-troops brought back were innumerable.

(year VII) When I had overcome Tipiya, I sent a messenger to Anniya, king of Azzi. I wrote to him: “[Return to me] my subjects who came to you while my father was in Mitanni.”

It is obvious that the description of the outcome of a single campaign, especially the list of conditions of the truce in the abovementioned Hittite annals is no
more detailed than that of the Urartian text CTU A 5-3. On the contrary – the Urartian text records in lines 15-28 almost all points of the hypothetical treaty between Minua and Uṭupuršini.
REFLEXION ON THE SURVIVAL OF ANATOLIAN HIEROGLYPHIC SCRIPT IN ARMENIAN

Aline HOUSEPIAN*

The subject of this speech is one of the enigmas in the history of the Armenian script: the medieval nšanagirk′ (ideogrammic signs)1 and their possible connection with the ancient Anatolian hieroglyphic writing.

Nšanagir is the ancient name of these lists, consists of nšan (Iranian origin: sign2) and gir (writing). There are also other designations such as nšanagir imastoc′ (nšanagir of scholars), nšanagir of Armenian people, etc.

These nšanagir are grouped in separated lists of abbreviations which are merged in to the medieval literature as appendixes. The lists are composed of abbreviations and their definitions. It was the imitation of Armenian authors from Greeks3.

The lists of nšanagir have been published since the 19th century by the researchers and historians of Armenian diaspora4. The first western scholar who has published a list and an article about these nšanagir was Abbé P. Martin (by the end of the 19th century)5.

* PhD. researcher, University of Limoges.
1 nšanagir is the single form of nšanagirk′ (k′ is the plural sign in Classical Armenian).
3 ABRAHAMIAN A. G. Naxamaştoc′yan Hay Gir ev Grčut′yun, Erevan, Hayastan, 1982, p. 51
There are two different groups of lists: Erzinjan (made by Rotakes Erznkac’i) and Cilician group, created probably in Cilicia by a historian named Vardan Arevelk’c’i (the 12th century). We should note that many scholars became specially encouraged after the discovery of Hittites and the wrong hypothesis of Peter Jensen regarding Armenian -Hittite relations: They deduced that Anatolian hieroglyphic writing was probably the ancient Armenian script.

Even it was not a valid hypothesis, a lot of effort was put into distinguishing the hieroglyphic signs in the lists of nšhanagir. Especially in Erzinjan group of nšanagir, there are many signs very similar to ideograms and hieroglyphs.

The majority of these signs, certainly are late creations based on the Armenian alphabet or on the forms derived thereof. In addition, the meaning of the sign in most cases is very different.

To date, the origin of these medieval signs is unknown. The dating of the lists is also a problematic issue. We have the examples from 13-15th centuries, but there are many manuscripts which are preserved in private collections or in the collections of the Institute of Manuscripts of Yerevan (Matenadaran), which are not analyzed yet.

With regard to comparison of these signs with Anatolian hieroglyphic writing, the major problem is the huge distance between the time of use of hieroglyphic writing (Anatolian or Urartian) and that of composition of nšhanagirk. Obviously, the geographic origin of these hieroglyphs must have been in the great Eastern Anatolia which includes a part of the Armenian Highland. In this vast area, two types of hieroglyphic writing are known for us: the Luwian hieroglyphs and the Urartian hieroglyphs.

6 Op. cit. ABRAHAMIAN A. G. Hayoc’ ...p. 204
9 Idem. p. 429.
To answer the question whether there are hieroglyphs (in narrow sense) in the nšanagir, we should research the history of Armenian writing before the creation of alphabet by Maštoc’ in the 5th century in order to find the sources of this transmission.

In this context, we have another important problem: the question of the existence or absence of Armenian pre-Christian writing.

Contrary to the enigma of nšanagirk which has been exclusively investigated by Armenian scholarship, the question of Armenian writing before the creation of alphabet by Maštoc’ has been treated by many western scholars.

Actually, those who work on this issue are divided into two groups: scholars who think that before the creation of the Armenian alphabet by Maštoc’ in the 5th century, there was no writing in Armenia10. However, these scientists are not yet able to answer the obvious question: how could survive the Armenian Kingdom so many centuries after its creation in the 5th century without any writing system? These researchers relay on historical accounts of the destruction of the pagan culture after the arrival of Christianity.

A second group of scholars believe rather the contrary: there was indeed writing even though we have no written literature and any other evidence11. They refer to the testimony of historians and foreigners who had seen or heard about one (or more) Armenian script called nšanagir.

There is no physical evidence of any writing before the creation of Maštoc’, however, the oldest witness (fourth century AD) Agatangelos reports that the king Tirdad’s scribes were recording the testimonies of holy Christian preachers (Gayane and Gregory The Illuminator) by “nšanagir” (ideograms).


When the Armenian alphabet was created, we have the testimony of historians about Daniel’s script. Three historians (Koryun, Moses of Khoren, Lazarus Pharpensis) testify the existence of signs / ideograms (Daniel was a Syriac bishop).

We have no other information about this writing (Was it pictographic? hieroglyphic?). According to these historians it was an Armenian native writing. Lazarus Pharpensis emphasizes that these signs are at the root of the Armenian alphabet.

These historians inform us that Bishop Daniel had “found” letters which made researchers think that Daniel’s letters (or signs) were the old pagan Armenian alphabet that had been hidden to be protected from being destroyed by preachers of Christianity. Unfortunately, we don’t have any example of letters of Daniel’s script.

Hmayagir writing

Hmayagir means magical script. This was the writing that was used to create the magical texts of the Middle Ages\(^\text{12}\). It is part of a larger corpus called the astronomical writing (axtargrer). It is an intermediate phase between pre- Maštoc’ phase and that of creation of alphabet.

We cannot say that it was a writing for the use of scribes and ordinary people, as that seems to be a defective script. Most of the signs are similar to later Armenian alphabet.

It is interesting that we can see some signs quite similar to hieroglyphs. The date of this scripture is uncertain.

We have a gap of more than six centuries between this scripture and that which precedes it: the Urartian hieroglyphic script.

This writing has been in use since the reign of Ishpuini, Urartian king. It has been suggested that maybe it was in use already in second millennium B. C.

but this opinion is not accepted by the majority of urartologues.

The hieroglyphs have been found from the western border of Urartu (Altintepe) until conquered Eastern countries (Armavir, Armenia). The language must be either that of the cuneiform inscriptions, or another common language in the kingdom\textsuperscript{13}. We do not agree with the opinion that the Proto-Armenian could be the language of Urartian hieroglyphs. There are few examples which showed Armenian words of Indo-European origin in recent researches and they are not sufficient to make such suggestions.

It was not the official script of the kingdom. Obviously, it was a script in use by the population. As E. Laroche had suggested, at the time of this writing there is evidence of a strong neo-Hittite influence at the western border of the kingdom. The language was a dialect of Urartian\textsuperscript{14} (however to date, the existence of dialects for Urartian is not attested by linguists). The specificity of this writing is that it was mostly used on objects.

However, some important facts such as the limited number of signs, limited geographic extent and disappearance of writing with the fall of Urartu exclude the possibility of a deep root of this writing in the population as a real everyday writing system, but the possible transmission of at least some signs to the peoples of the following centuries arrived to the region could not be excluded.

Luwian Hieroglyphs

As we already know, Luwian writing was the writing used in the Neo-Hittite country of the Iron Age. Objects with this writing have been found not only in Eastern Anatolia but also the eastern border of the Armenian Highland (Karakend: Azerbayjan).

The scholars have found many signs in \textit{nšnagirk} which are similar to Anatolian (Luwian) hieroglyphs\textsuperscript{15}. Contrary to the Urartian hieroglyphic signs which

\textsuperscript{13} Op. cit., MOVSIYAN A. \textit{Naxamaštoc'yan}...p.27.
\textsuperscript{14} LAROCHE E. "Les hiéroglyphes d'Altintepe", \textit{Anadolu}, 1971, 15, p. 61.
Aline HOUSEPIAN

was a local writing system of Urartian population who was substituted by other peoples of which Armenians, it is difficult to imagine how the Luwian hieroglyphs could be transmitted to Armenians. The only possible contact between two cultures (neo-Hittite-proto-Armenian) could take place by the end of the second millennium B. C. A. in the region of upper Euphrates, if we accept the theory of early arrival of Armenians (proto-Armenians) in this region.

Rock carvings

The earliest source for the comparison of the signs are the rock carvings that were found on the territory of Armenia.

The age of these rock carvings is the late Bronze Age and the Iron Age, which corresponds to the period post-Urartian and Urartian in the Armenian Highland. A detailed study of these rock carvings in the territory of Armenia has shown that there are several signs that are similar to Urartian hieroglyphics but also to nšhanagirk’.¹⁶

Conclusion

To conclude, we can say that there are two possibilities for transmission of Anatolian hieroglyphic signs in Armenian medieval lists:

An indirect transmission: The signs are the inventions before the creation of the alphabet on the basis of ancient pictographic and hieroglyphic writings (Anatolian and Urartian). It is possible that a holy scripture (or scriptures) has been preserved by pagans for the aim of religious use in pagan temples in ancient Armenia: (the old places of religious and secular education). The indirect transmission could be also possible by considering some common signs as “traveler” and common in general for the vast region of Anatolia.

A direct transmission: the signs included in *nšanagirk* come from Urartian hieroglyphs, inspired from Luwian hieroglyphs. We know that two writings should be in contact near the western border of Urartu (Altintepe).

Although the material culture of Urartu shows a sudden and brutal end in the 6th century, it is possible that some signs have been survived and preserved as holy symbols by population during centuries.

Let’s not forget that the establishment of Christianity in Armenia has been carried out with difficulty. Despite the massive destruction of temples and other pagan places of worship, there are several historians who testified that paganism was being practiced still longtime after the establishment of the Christianity. It is interesting to see that a writer of the 13th century (*Vardan Aygekc’i*) in his book *Vasn kṙapaštut’ean* (for idolatry) dedicated to paganism in Armenia testifies that although 900 years had passed from the arrival of Christianity in Armenia, the people (in his time) still preserved the habits related to pagan times and practiced the ancient cults.

However, it is important to note that the work of assembling the lists of *nšanagirk* is not finished yet. And maybe if we have a more complete collection, we will have more acceptable results as evidence of the transmission of hieroglyphic signs.

There was also an attempt to compare *nšanagir* with the proto-Indian signs found at Mohenjo-Daro but the hypothesis of resemblance and a possible historical connection has been rejected.\(^{17}\)

Thanks to new archaeological discoveries and newly found lists of *nšanagirk*, future studies will probably allow us to try to trace the contacts between these ancient cultures of the Near East which will highlight the dark ages of the history of Armenian non-material culture and its possible kinship with the neighboring countries.
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THE LUWIAN RITUALS OF KUWATTALLA: THOUGHTS ON THEIR RE-ARRANGEMENT

Manfred HUTTER*

1. The state of research

Since long Frank Starke’s arrangement and transliteration of all known Cuneiform Luwian texts has made available this textual corpus in an easy way to researchers, which also has been the basis for substantial progress both to our understanding of grammar and vocabulary.\(^1\) In the catalogue of Hittite texts, rituals attributed to a certain Kuwattalla had been organized as numbers CTH 759-763, and Starke could re-arrange the textual fragments by establishing three different rituals,\(^2\) attributed to the attendant woman Kuwattalla as author, who has received a land grant (KBo 5.7)\(^3\) during the reign of Arnuwanda and Asmunikal at the end of the 15\(^{th}\) century. In abbreviated form we have to deal with the following rituals:

(a) First ritual:\(^4\) the šalli aniur, the “Great Ritual” is transmitted in three different redactions, one by Kuwattalla only, the other by Kuwattalla and the Old Woman Šilaluḫḫi, and a third redaction by Šilaluḫḫi only. This ritual was set down at least on four tablets, most probably even more.

---

\(^*\) Manfred HUTTER, University of Bonn

1 Starke 1985; cf. also the very useful online edition by Melchert 2001 with some corrections and alternatives to Starke’s textual arrangement. His study on the formation of Luwian nouns (Starke 1990) is covering many other aspects of Luwian grammar and vocabulary, too. Side by side with Starke’s studies one has to mention – just as the main contributions of research – the word-list by Melchert 1993 and his descriptive Grammar (Melchert 2003) as well as the profound study by Yakubovich 2010 and his now online vocabulary (Yakubovich 2014sqq.).

2 Starke 1985: 72-201, including those fragments which are very badly preserved which makes it impossible to add them to one of the three rituals for certain.

3 Cf. also Yakubovich 2010: 102 and the recent new edition of the document by Rüster / Wilhelm 2012: 231-239. – See further the library inventory text KUB 30.55 rev. 8’, mentioning tablets by Kuwattalla concerning omina (Dardano 2006: 156f.).

4 Starke 1985: 74 gives a table of all textual details of this ritual according to his reconstruction.
(b) Second ritual:\(^5\) the SISKUR \textit{dūpaduperša}, the “Ritual of Striking”, which – according to the colophons – is also preserved in a redaction by Kuwattalla and Šilaluhhi and it comprised at least nine tablets.

(c) Third ritual:\(^6\) For this ritual, a colophon (KBo 10.42 iv 6) also mentions Kuwattalla as “author”, but the “title” of the third ritual is not available due to the fragmentary colophon; the ritual also covered at least eight or nine tablets (cf. KBo 29.12 iv 6).

Even though all three rituals are extending over several days and a relatively high number of tablets, the fragmentary situation of the tablets found all around in Hattusa – at Büyükkale, in the area of Temple I and in the House on the Slope\(^7\) – makes it difficult to understand the exact purposes of the three rituals.\(^8\) In my contribution I want to draw the attention to some minor observed aspects in reconstructing the sequence of the texts and some details of the rituals which can shed some light on aspects of the special background of Kuwattalla’s ritual(s), differentiating them from other Cuneiform Luwian rituals from Kizzuwatna.

2. The relationship between SISKUR \textit{dūpaduperša} and \textit{šalli aniur}

The first tablet\(^9\) of \textit{šalli aniur} begins as follows (KUB 35.18 i 1-7):\(^10\)

\begin{verbatim}
1 [UM-MA 'Ku-wa-at-tal-la] MUNUS SUḪUR.LÁ
2 Ūṭ 'Š[i-la-al-lu-u-ḫi MUNUS Š]U.GI ma-a-an an-tu-uḫ-š[i]
\end{verbatim}

\(^5\) Starke 1985: 105 with all textual details.
\(^6\) Starke 1985: 137 with all textual details. The third ritual (mainly the text KUB 35.43) has some similarities to Tunnawiya’s ritual KUB 9.34 (cf. Hutter 1988: 79, 128; Hutter 2014), but it cannot be attributed to that “author” as Starke 1985: 136 has convincingly shown.
\(^7\) Cf. Bawanypeck 2013: 167.
\(^8\) Cf. the rather general observations e.g. by Bawanypeck 2013: 167 who only mentions that the third ritual counteracts impurity or by Goedegebuure 2010: 304 who refers to the \textit{dūpaduperša} ritual as “a ritual against afflicting (through an evil act) in general”.
\(^9\) The colophon in KUB 35.18 iv 2-6 mentions this being the “first tablet”. According to Starke 1985: 91f. this is the second redaction of the ritual, done by Kuwattalla and Šilaluhhi. Starke’s reconstruction of the different redactions of the ritual(s) are important, but – due to the fragmentary state of the texts – for this contribution the various redactions have to be treated separately. A parallel version (found in Temple I) to the beginning of the first ritual is KBo 29.3 (Starke 1985: 98-100), the end of the first tablet is well preserved in KUB 35.24+ (Starke 1985: 83-86).
\(^10\) Transliterated Hittite texts are given in italics, while transliterated Luwian texts are written with normal types. Both Hittite and Luwian words in (bound) transcription are given in italics.
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3 kat-ta wa-al-[u-u-wa-aš SÍSKU]R ši-pa-an-du-wa-ni
4 na-aš-ta ma-aḫ-ḫa-an [I-NA] UD 3.KAM
5 kat-ta wa-al-[ḫu-u-wa-aš SÍ[SKU]R aš-nu-me-ni
6 [n]a-an I-NA UD 3.KAM pa-ra-a GAL-li-pát a-ni-u-u[r]
7 [a]p-pu-ú-e-ni nu ki-i tum-me-ni

Thus (speak) Kuwattalla, the attendant woman, and Šilaluḫḫi, the Old Woman: “When we perform the ‘ritual against being afflicted with something’ for a person, then when on the third day we finish the ‘ritual against being afflicted with something’, we continue the ‘great ritual’ on the third day; and we take this:”

As important information from this opening paragraph of šalli aniur we learn that the “great ritual” did not start with this tablet, but that the “ritual of being afflicted with something” had already been carried out during the days before. The Hittite wording katta walḫuwaš SISKUR corresponds to Luwian SISKUR dūpaduparša, the “title” of a (sub-)ritual which has been preserved on (at least) nine separate tablets. The sequence of the tablets is hard to establish, the best preserved text of the ritual is KUB 9.6 + 35.39 (third tablet) which is possibly continued by KUB 35.78 as the “fourth” tablet. That these two texts are closely connected to each other can be proved by the fact that on both tablets a special deity is mentioned, namely the “Sun-god of the oath” (or the “Sun-god by which one swears”). At the end of the third tablet, the “Sun-god of the oath” (ḫirutalliš Tiwaz) is the recipient of the sacrifice; KUB 9.6 + 35.29 iv 20-26 reads as follows:

20 EGIR-an-da-ma-kán EN SISKUR UDU IŠ-TU DUG KU-KU-UB GEŠ[TIN]
21 ḫi-i-ru-ta-al-li ḫUTU-i ši-pa-an-ti

12 See the colophon of KUB 35.40 + KBo 29.8 iv 6’, found in Temple I.
13 Thus the suggestion by Starke 1985: 106.
14 Cf. also the translation by Starke 1990: 538.
§§§
ma-a-an me-eq-qa-a-uš-ša an-ni-iš-kán-zi
ma-a-an me-eq-qa-a-uš-ša an-ni-iš-kán-zi
i-ik-ku-ú-na-ú-na-aš-ši-iš-ša i-ik-ku-ú-na-ú-na-aš-ši-iš-ša
§§§
25 DUB.3.KAM ŠA SISKUR du-ú-pa-du-pa-ar-ša
26 Ú-UL QA-TI

Then the ritual client offers one sheep with a jug of wine to the Sun-god of the oath. §§§ But it is (only) one sheep for the _ikkunauna_-.. When they perform the ritual for many (ritual clients), they also take only one sheep for the _ikkunauna_-.. §§§ Third tablet. The ritual of striking. Not finished.

This sacrificial act seems to be continued on the next tablet, part of which is KUB 35.78 obv. 5-11).

5 [   ] ... nu-uš-ša-an MUNUS Š[U.GI
6 [   ] kat-ta tar-ma-a-iz-zi nu me-m[a-i]
7 [ ma-al-]ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ša-an-za-an-z[a] EN-an-z[a]
8 [i-ik-ku-n]a-at-ta-aš 1 UDU ši-pa-an-ti nu me-ma[-i]
10 [UZU NÍG.GIG ḫu-u-i-šu UZ]UŠ ḫu-u-i-šu ḫU-TU-i me-na-ḫa-[an-da]

Then the Old Woman nails .... down.\(^\text{15}\) Then she says: “[...] for the ritual client.” – He sacrifices one sheep of/for _ikunatt_- and says: “Sun-god of the oath.” – The Old Woman holds [a raw liver and] a raw heart into the direction of the Sun-god and says: “Sun-god of the oath.”

\(^\text{15}\) Cf. Goedegebuure 2010: 306: The “nailing down” of something occurs several times in this ritual (e.g. KUB 32.8+5 iv 24; KBo 9.143 iii 2; KBo 9.145.4.11), a ritual action which also fits with the title SISKUR _dāpadāparša_ “ritual of striking“.
The Sun-god of the oath is only mentioned in the dūpaduparša ritual\textsuperscript{16} – neither in other rituals of Kuwattalla nor in other Cuneiform or hieroglyphic Luwian texts.\textsuperscript{17} But we can deduce that the function of the god – safeguarding the oaths and punishing those who swear falsely – should be held in high esteem in the dūpaduparša ritual; the one who breaks the oath will be judged by this Sun-god who is the supervisor of justice. Maybe also actions like the “nailing down” (of evils), which frequently occur in this ritual, fit together with the purpose to fix evil (like curses or perjury) so that they cannot harm the ritual client anymore – thanks to the help of the Sun-god. But whoever transgresses the oath will be cursed by the Sun-god of the oath.

The just quoted passages KUB 9.6+ iv 22,24 and KUB 35.78 obv. 8 mention a special kind of offering of a sheep. In KUB 35.78 we find the Hittite word ikkunatta- which has been borrowed from the Luwian language; this nomen actionis in -tta- is also attested in other passages (KUB 35.18 i 10; KBo 29.3 i 5; Bo 4388,3).\textsuperscript{18} In KUB 9.6+ we find the adjective as a derivation in -ašša/i- from the verbal (extended) substantive ikkunawar/ikkunaun-, while the “plain” verbal substantive ikkuwar/ikkun- is attested in KUB 35.72 iii 8. All these references have been discussed by Starke, who comes to the result that the basis of the various derivations might be an unattested verbal form *ikkuni̯i/*ikkunai̯i-.\textsuperscript{19} The exact meaning of the verbal basis and the derivated words is left open by Starke; he only suggests a general semantics of the word referring to some kind of sacrifice which is often combined with the offering of liquids.\textsuperscript{20} Also Ilya Yakubovich recently has suggested a general meaning “immolare” (Latin for “to sacrifice”) as semantic basis for this group of words.\textsuperscript{21} My guess of the semantics of the

\textsuperscript{16} Cf. the following action by the MŪNUŠŠU.GI who evokes the Sun-god of the oath (KUB 35.78 obv. 12f.) and takes thick bread and gangati- (probably some vegetable). – As far as I know there is only one more occurrence of this special Sun-god in KBo 29.18,3 (Starke 1985: 197); because of the epithet it is probable that this fragment belongs to the dūpaduparša ritual, but its exact position cannot be determined.

\textsuperscript{17} In this way my overview of Luwian religion was not absolutely precise when the impression appears that the Sun-god of the oath was a widely spread manifestation of the Luwian Sun-god (Hutter 2003: 226).

\textsuperscript{18} Maybe there is also an -ašša/i-extension of this word attested in KUB 35.16 i 14 ([i-ik-k]u-na-at-ta-aš-ši-in).

\textsuperscript{19} Cf. Starke 1990: 537-540. Another verbal basis is ikkunāu̯a-, which is attested in KUB 35.16 i 6 (3rd person, plural, past).

\textsuperscript{20} Starke 1990: 539.

\textsuperscript{21} Yakubovich 2014sqq. Earlier Yakubovich (2010: 48) has translated KUB 35.78 obv. 8 as “one anointed” sheep” (probably based on Melchert 1993: 86f.).
group of these words is based on Hurrian *egunni-* “pure”,\(^{22}\) which might be taken into Kizzuwatnaean Luwian as a loanword to qualify a “sacrifice of / for purification”.

Even if the exact semantics of these words remain uncertain to this moment, it is important that this kind of sacrifice is attested both in the SISKUR *dūpaduparša* and in *šalli aniur*. Already at the beginning of the first tablet of *šalli aniur* we find a reference to this sacrificial action, which therefore immediately follows the SISKUR *dūpaduparša* which was just finished on the third day (cf. above for KUB 35.18 i 4f. and the parallel text KBo 29.3 i 2f.); in KUB 35.18 i 8-12 the necessary victims for the sacrificial ceremony are mentioned:

8  [8] UDU\(^{HLA}\) Û 1 MÁ[Š.GA]L na-aš-ta A-NA 8 UDU\(^{HLA}\)
9  [i]š-tar-na 1 UDU GE\(_{6}\) ŠĂ.BA 2 UDU\(^{HLA}\) a-ni-u-ra-aš
10  [1] UDU BABBAR 1 UDU GE\(_{6}\) 2 UDU\(^{HLA}\)-ma i-ik-ku-na-at-ta-aš
11  [1 UDU] šar-la-a-at-ta-aš [1 UDU].GANAM na-an-za

Eight sheep and one billy goat; and among the eight sheep there is one black sheep, two sheep for the ritual, one white sheep, one black sheep, but two sheep of the *ikkunatt-*“purification”, one sheep of the praise offering, one ewe. Then they call out ... all [

Therefore it is evident that the first tablet of *šalli aniur* also includes the same ritual action as we can deduce that it was performed during the SISKUR *dūpaduparša*. This similarity also allows us to add the unpublished text Bo 4388 (CTH 470.264) most probably to the first tablet of *šalli aniur*; the lines read as follows:\(^{23}\)

3’  nu 4 UDU\(^{HLA}\)-pát Û 1 MĀŠ.GAL [
4’  1 UDU ik-ku-na-at-ta-aš 1 UDU [
5`  iš-ḫar-nu-ma-an-zi 1 MĀŠ.GAL-ma A-NA

\(^{22}\) Cf. Richter 2012: 77 for further discussions of this Hurrian word and related forms derived from the base *eg*.-

§§§
6’ na-ak-ku-uš-ši-i-x

§§§
7’ 1 ŠAḪ.TUR 1 UR.[TUR
8’ MUŠENʰLA iš-[ḥar-nu-ma-an-zi

And four sheep and one billy goat [...] one sheep of the ikkunatt—“purification”, one sheep [of the praise-offering] they smear with blood, but one billy goat for [...] §§§ For a substitute [...] §§§ one piglet, one pup[py.... ] and birds they smear with blood

There is one more correspondence between the SISKUR ḏūpaduparša and KUB 35.16, a tablet of šalli aniur according to the colophon (KUB 35.16 iv 2.5; the number of the tablet is not preserved); KUB 35.16 i 6 has the past verb (3rd person plural) n]a-a-nu-ú-un-pa i-ik-ku-na-a-ú-un-ta “but now they have ikkunaṣa-ed”, or “but now they have ‘purified’ by the means of the ikkunatt-offering/purification”. The preceding fragmentary line mentions Luwian ḥaratar “offense” and waškuwallimma/i- “sinful”.24 Though the text is very fragmentary, it is important because we find quite the same wording in KBo 9.143 iii 8f., where we can restore the verb in iii 9 as [i-ik-ku-na]-a-un-ta; KBo 9.143 can be attributed to the SISKUR ḏūpaduparša.

These observations lead us to the first result in interpreting Kuwattalla’s šalli aniur: The “first” tablet – starting with the ceremonies performed on the third day – makes it obvious that the “ritual of striking down” is performed on the day(s) before and finished during the third day. Both during the ḏūpaduparša ritual and the opening ceremonies of šalli aniur a special kind of sacrifice is mentioned; building on Starke’s observations on ikkuwar and the related words we may presume that this is a special word, maybe expressing the idea of some special act of purification. But what is even more important is the fact that this terminology is not attested in any other Luwian (or Hittite) rituals; so the occurrence of this terminology only in the SISKUR ḏūpaduparša and in the beginning of šalli aniur can be taken as a weighty argument for the re-arrangement of the texts.

24 Cf. on these words Starke 1990: 181, 445f.
3. KUB 35.43 as part of šalli aniur (Starke’s “first ritual”)

In arranging and attributing the Luwian text to Kuwattalla’s ritual, Starke has rightly observed that the Luwian incantations of KUB 35.24++ i and KUB 35.43 iii correspond to each other, but also the practice of using a lump of dough we find several times in both texts. Therefore Starke attributed KUB 35.43 to a “third” ritual by Kuwattalla, but also in this case, a re-arrangement of the text is suggested, taking KUB 35.43 as part of šalli aniur, and not as a third ritual. Some observations are in favour of this:

3.1. war(a)palla/i- Tarhunt-

This epithet of the weather-god is – as far as I know – restricted to the rituals of Kuwattalla, at least in the Cuneiform Luwian texts. In the first tablet of šalli aniur we find the following Luwian spell (KUB 35.24 + 35.20 + 32.12 + 35.22, obv. 33-38):

§§§
34 ma-al-ḥa-aš-ša-a[š-ši-iš-pa-tar EN-aš a-pa-a-aš-ša-an-z]a a-a-an-nu-un-n[a-an-za]
37 ḫu-i-tum-na[-a-ḫi-ta-ti ]
§§§
38 nu-za MUNUSŠU.G[I pár-kú-in iš-na-]a-aš ta-lu-up-pí-in da-a-i n[a-an-ša-an A-NA BE-E[L SÎSKUR]
39 A-NA RA-M[A-NI-ŠU an-da ta-m]a-aš-zî nu MUNUSŠU.GI te-ez-zî\(^{26}\)

\(^{25}\) The same spell occurs also in KUB 35.16 i 9-13 (unknown number of tablet of šalli aniur) and on the third tablet, KUB 32.9 + KUB 35.21 (+) 32.11, rev. 11-14. The surrounding paragraphs on the third tablet differ from the first tablet.

\(^{26}\) Restoring obv. 38-39 according to the third tablet, KUB 32.9++, rev. 15-16. – Cf. also Kammenhuber 1965: 213 = 1993: 331.
Powerful Tarhunt, look at the miserable (and) the defiled with favour. But the ritual client shall look upon his body – with life, with virility, with long years, with future time, with health, with the favour of the gods, with vitality. §§ Then the Old Woman takes a pure clod of dough and presses it upon the ritual client, upon his body. Then the Old Woman says:

In a slightly different form, we find the same Luwian evocation of Tarhunt in the so-called third ritual (KUB 35.43 ii 36-40; cf. also the duplicate text KUB 35.44, ii 1-11), varying only the sequence of the well-wishing component which should be bestowed on the ritual client. Although in all occurrences the adjective accompanying Tarhunt as an epithet is fragmentary, it is restricted to these texts, therefore it is an indication that KUB 35.43 (and the duplicate KUB 35.44, too) is closely related to those texts which belong – according to the colophons – to šalli aniur and not to a different ritual.

The beginning of the epithet is fragmentary, but we certainly can restore it as warpalla/i-, based on Hieroglyphic Luwian evidence and the Hittite vocabulary KUB 4.4. obv. 13, where warpalla/i- is rendering the Akkadian word gašru; the -alli-suffix favours a Luwian interpretation of the word in Hittite context. In the Hieroglyphic Luwian corpus we find the following references. In MARAŞ 1 (line 2d) we read – as part of the genealogy – the sequence mu-wa/i-ta-li-si-sà ¦ (“SCALPRUM+RA/I.LA/I/U”)wa/i+ra/i-pa-li-sa ¦ (INFANS.NEPOS)ha-ma-su-ka-la-sá “Muwatalli’s powerful grandson”, using the word as an adjective accompanying “grandson”. Hidden behind the logographic writing, we most probably encounter the adjective as a divine epithet in another Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription:

27 Cf. Hittite ᦍꦮanswered “to grieve” and Hittite šaknuwant- “defiled”: As there are Luwian words like “šaḫḫa- “de-filement” and šaḫḫaniya- “defile” (Rieken 1999: 340f., KUB 35.45 ii 21) one has to explain the different velars /k/ and /ḫ/, which seemingly also occur in the two Luwian divine names Sarku- (KARKAMIS A 11b+c, § 18; KARKAMISA 29 f, Fragment 2,2) and Sarḫunta- (ÇİFTLİK § 6) for which see Hawkins 2000: 450 with further arguments. – Yakubovich 2014sqq. offers a totally different interpretation, s.v. šaknuwant(i)- “fatty” and s.v. wayant(i)- “animal” (?).


29 “Powerful Tarhunt, look at the miserable (and) the defiled with favour. But the ritual client shall look upon his body – with life, with virility, with future time (a-ap-pa-ra-an-ta-ti a-ra-ta), with health, with the favour of the gods, with long years” (a-ar-ya-ti uš-ša-ti).

30 Kloekhorst 2008: 967.

SUVASA B has the wording (DEUS)SARMA-ma-sa₆ *273.REX, “the powerful Sarruma”. According to Hawkins the hieroglyphic sign *273 renders either warpa/i- or muwa- and is sometimes also used as a determinative for other derivations from warpa/i-.

So it is a well founded guess to interpret *273.REX as rendering warpalla/i- in connection with the divine name. The third context where we encounter this word regularly in Hieroglyphic Luwian is the proper name Warpalla(wa)-, a Tabalean ruler, who is famous for the veneration of a local form of the Tarhunt of the vineyard according to his inscriptions and reliefs.

Thus, there can be no doubt about the existence of this word in Cuneiform Luwian, used as adjective in the general sense “strong, powerful, great”. Its use in the context with gods can both be seen in SUVASA B, but also Warpalla(wa)’s reverence of Tarhunt might at least show a relation of the epithet with the divine sphere. Though it is only a proper name, the young form – transmitted in Greek script from Cilicia – Orbala-sētas undoubtedly renders Luwian *warpalla-zita/i- “the man of the powerful ([Storm-]god)”, corresponding in name giving to (Hittite-)Luwian names like Santa-zita/i- “the man of Santa” or Arma-zita/i- “the man of the Moon-god”.

Therefore the name can be taken as a proof for the use (and existence) of the divine epithet, which is employed in Kuwattalla’s rituals.

The threefold sequence – use as adjective, as divine epithet, as proper name – can be compared with the Luwian word muwatalla/i- (also written with the Logogram NIR.GÁL) which occurs in Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian texts and which was also taken into Hittite: the adjective “awe-inspiring” or “mighty” is also used as a “simple” adjective specifying weapons or cultic implements, but it is also often used as an epithet of the Storm-god and of course as a proper name of Hittite and (local) Luwian rulers in the second and first millennium, as a few examples show: A Cuneiform Luwian mugawar for the Storm-god mentions the “mighty / awe-inspiring weapon”

---

33 Hawkins 2000: 463. Cf. also Yakubovich 2014qq., who suggests “champion” (s.v. warpall/i-).
35 For references see Houwink ten Cate 1961: 120, 165; Zgusta 1964: § 1102-1; cf. also Ourpalos from Phrygia (Zgusta 1964: § 1174).
36 For zita/i- in (Luwian) onomastics see Laroche 1966: 324f.
37 CHD L-N 316; Starke 1990: 173.
(KBo 29.31 iv 9), KARKEMIS A1a, line 4 (§ 26) refers to the awe-inspiring Tarhunt (FORTIS)mu-wa/i-ta-lin-na (DEUS)TONITRUS-za-na\(^{39}\) and the proper name Muwatalli is well documented from the Hittite Empire up to the Hellenistic era. – Thus there should be no doubt that Kuwattalla’s rituals have preserved a divine epithet related to (the Storm-god) Tarhunt which has not been attested otherwise in the second millennium, but only in the first millennium, where it – probably – could also refer to Šarruma who then had some aspects of the Storm-god.

3.2. The way of the gods

Another interesting formula in KUB 35.43 which also occurs in the šalli aniur is the symbolic phrase the “way of the gods” metaphorically mentioned side by side with parts of the body of the ritual client. Unfortunately, some of the references are rather fragmentarily preserved, as we see from KUB 35.43 iii 1-4:

1  [ x x x x[  
2  [ x la-a-la-ad-da da-a-ru-u[š-ša mi-i-ša-an-za]  
4  [ku-wa-an-na-ni-i in ma-aš-š]a-na-al-li-in KASKAL-a[n]  
[ ... ] he/she has taken\(^{40}\) – (his) image, (his) flesh, bones, ḫalḫalzana/i-, the ability to walk, “greatness”\(^{41}\), the eyelash, the eyebrow, the divine path.”

As the preceding section of the tablet is broken, the interpretation of the context is not certain, it cannot be decided if the action affects the body parts in a negative or positive way; so we can only assume that either an enemy or the Old Woman has taken (la-a-la-ad-da) the image, the flesh, the other body parts, ending with the “divine path”.\(^{42}\) This metaphor “the divine path”

\(^{39}\) Hawkins 2000: 89; Starke 1990: 173.

\(^{40}\) Cf. also Carruba 1982: 2; Kammenhuber 1986: 90 = 1993: 737.

\(^{41}\) For (u)warannāhit- the translation “greatness” (maybe “tallness”) is a guess, based on the derivation of the noun from urayann(i)- / urann(i)- “great; tall” (cf. Starke 1990: 167); thinking of physical “tallness”, the word might well match both with the body parts and the ability to walk; cf. also Carruba 1990: 250, who suggested “potency, power”.

\(^{42}\) KUB 35.43 iii 5ff. shows striking similarities to KUB 35.24 i 5ff., as has been correctly observed by Starke 1985: 136; these similarities he took as proof that KUB 35.43 can be attributed to Kuwattalla (as “third”
seems to be something which characterizes a human in the spiritual way (contrary to the material or physical side of the body) and which can also be harmed by negative impurity or spells. – There are further occurrences of these elements in KUB 35.73,1-12 (and the parallel text KUB 35.74,1-9) as well as in KUB 35.20 rev. 8-12 (belonging to KUB 35.24++, the first tablet of šalli aniur). From KUB 35.74,1-4 we can deduce that the Old Woman holds (or maybe waves) sheep fat to the ritual client and recites into the direction of the Sun-god.

The best preserved passage mentioning the “divine path” is KUB 35.45 ii 15-30; after the description of the ritual action, the incantation is quoted in Luwian.

15 \textit{nu-za} MUNUSŠU.GI EGIR-an-da iš-na-aš 2 ši-e[-(nu-)]uš da-a-i
16 na-aš-kán dUTU-i me-na-ah-ḥa-an-da' e-ep[(-z)]i
17 nam-ma ši-pa-an-ti ḫu-uk-ki-iš-ke-ez-zi-ma [(k)]i-iš-ša-an

\textendcsname

18 x[x x]x EN-ya ti-wa²-a-li-ya pí-ya-aš LÚKÚR.MEŠ-in-z[(i)²]
21 EN.MEŠ-an-za ku-i-ša-an ša-aḥ-ḥa-ni-iš-ša-at-ta ku-i-ša-an
22 ip-pa-tar-ri-<iš>-ša-at-ta EN SÍSKUR-aš-ši-in ALAM-ša mi-i-ša-an-za
23 ḫa-aš-ša ḫal-ḫal-za-ni-in ú-wa-ra-an-na-ḫi-ša i-ú-na-ḫi-ša

\textendcsname

26 ma-a-na-aš ú-la-an-ti-iš a-an ti-ya-am-ma-aš-ši-iš dUTU-za da-ra-ú-id-du?

\textendcsname

(ritual).
Then the Old Woman takes two figures made of dough. She holds them in the direction of the Sun-god. She makes an offering and pronounces the following spell:

§§§ Oh [...], tiwali-lord, deliver them, the enemies, the opponents of law, the lords of spells, of (magic bonds), of imprecation, of curses and of oaths. (Deliver him) who has defiled him, who has got hold magically of him, the ritual client, (his) image, (his) flesh, bones, halhalzana/i-, greatness, the ability to walk, eyelash, eyebrow, the divine path. §§§ If he (the enemy) is living, Tiwad shall deliver him above; if he is dead, the Sun-goddess of the Earth shall deliver him, the man of curse and oath. Then the Old woman puts two figures made of dough under the feet of the ritual client. And she puts a jug of beer on a table of reeds.

According to Starke, KUB 35.45 is tablet “y” of Kuwattallas “third ritual”; this may be possible as at the moment it can only be seen that there is no solid evidence that KUB 34.45 shares precise expressions or formula which appear neither in the SISKUR dūpadparša nor in šalli aniur.

45 Cf. Melchert 2000: 181 for the interpretation of piya=aš as an imperative + -aš “them”. Starke 1990: 122 contrarily interprets piyaš as preterit because of the following verbs (ii 21f.), but the invocation of the Sun-god for help makes an imperative more plausible. See also the translation of Yakubovich 2010: 29.
46 For this interpretation of the two verbs cf. Carruba 1982: 2 (and Carruba 1990: 250); Kammenhuber 1986: 89 = 1993: 736; Rieken 1999: 340f. has confirmed this interpretation; see further Puhvel 1979: 303 for Luwian šaḫḫa- “dirt, filth” and the denominative verb šaḫḫaniya- “befoul” besides Hittite šakniya-.
48 Cf. also the two parallel texts: KUB 35.48 ii 8-24; KBo 29.10,1-10. – The same body parts and the “divine path” are also mentioned in KUB 35.11 ii 8-11 (par. KUB 35.12 iii 1-4), but in a different context. The participle a-ab-ḫa-ša-am-mi-ḫš, ruling the nouns in the accusative cannot be interpreted, thus the phrase is not clear.
But this does not contradict our considerations about the re-arrangement of KUB 35.43 as belonging to šalli aniur as the “divine path” (all passages with the accusative singular ma-aš-ša-na-al-li-in KASKAL-an) is not restricted to Kuwattalla’s texts. To my knowledge, there are two further passages in rituals from Ḫattuša which mention the “divine path” in a way comparable to the occurrence in Kuwattalla’s rituals. The one passage is KUB 32.121 iii 8-25, which belongs to the (Hurrian) ritual series of the Old Woman Šalašu (CTH 788). The path of several gods is mentioned here:

8 [ -k]an an-da ŠA ĐTÜRKİYE A-NA ǦIŞKIRI₆
9 [ ] 3-ŠU te-ez-zi l-NA 3 KASKAL₇-ma EN.SÍSKUR
10 [te-ez]-zi ú-uk-wa-za EN.SÍSKUR nu-wa ku-it da-aš-ki-ši
11 [da-aš-k]i-mi ALAM-YA mi-iš-ri-wa-a-tar
12 [ ] me-mi-an iš-ša-aš ḫa-lu-kán tar-ḫu-u-i-la-a-tar
13 [TI-tar] MU.KAM.HI.A GÍD.DA UD.KAM.HI.A GÍD.DA ŠA ĐU KASKAL-an
14 [ŠA ĐZA.]BA₄,BA₄ KASKAL-an da-aš-ki-mi ŠA Đ30 KASKAL-an
15 [ŠA] Đ[ KASKAL]-an da’-aš’-ki’-mi ŠA ĐLAMMA KASKAL-an
16 [ŠA Đ... KASKAL-an da-aš-ki]-mi ŠA ĐİŞTÜRKİYE KASKAL-an
17 [ ] DINGIR.MEŠ [ ]xx DINGIR.MEŠ
18 na-an da-aš-[i-mi ]x DINGIR.MEŠ-na-aš
19 KASKAL-an da-aš-k[i-mi ] DINGIR.MEŠ-na-aš
20 KASKAL-an da-aš-ki-[mi ]

§§§
21 TI-tar da-aš-ki-mi xx xx xx DINGIR.MEŠ-eš
22 ḫu-u-ma-an-te-eš e-šir ĐİŞTÜRKİYE-uš-ma Ú-UL e-eš-ta
23 ku-it-kán an-da-an KUR-ak-ku-un
24 A-NA ǦIŞKIRI₆ ĐİŞTÜRKİYE
25 [ ]x-i pé-ra-an da-aš-ki-mi

49 Already Carruba 1990: 250 has referred to this passage in interpreting KUB 35.45; cf. also de Martino 1986: 215 (for iii 8-12); CHD L-N 299b; CHD P 73b.
inside to the garden of Šaušga, ... three times she/he speaks, on the three roads/ways the ritual client speaks: I am the ritual client. What are you taking? – I am taking the beauty of my form/image, the word of [...], the message of the mouth, the vigor, [life], long years, long days, the road of the weather-god, the road of Zababa. I am taking the road of the Moon-god, the road of ...; I am taking the road of the Tutelary deity, the road of the ...; I am taking the road of Šaušga, ... the “divine path”. §§§ Life I am taking, ... all gods did, Šaušga did not. What in ... to the garden of Šaušga ... before I am taking.

Although the fragmentary context is difficult to understand, we see a dialogue – taking place in the garden of Šaušga – between the ritual client and another person: if this is the opponent (cf. KUB 35.45 ii 18) of the ritual client, he is taking things and symbols which are necessary for the ritual client; if the ritual text refers to the Old Woman (cf. KUB 35.43 ii 2) as partner in the dialogue, she is taking (away) those “infected” or impure things and symbols which harm the ritual client. Irrespectively of the partner in the dialogue, the symbolic use of the “way of different gods” can clearly be compared to the situation in Kuwattalla’s ritual: taking away or defiling the “divine path” weakens the ritual client, because the client’s integrity is connected with this metaphor.

Also the second reference to this metaphor outside its use by Kuwattalla points to the same direction of interpretation: This is an oracle question concerning the pacification of the anger of Šaušga of Šamuḫa: to propitiate the goddess, either an evocation ritual (mukiššar), the (ritual of the) divine path (KASKAL DINGIR-LIM), or an ambašši-offering should be carried out (KUB 49.80,1-4)50. The “divine path” in the oracle question is parallel to the evocation ritual and the ambašši-offering, therefore one has to think that this wording refers to some ritual treatment by which the spiritual condition of the person which is described metaphorically as “divine path” must be put in order to appease the wrath of the goddess again.

50 Cf. Lebrun 1976: 201 (no. 33); CHD P 73b.
Judging from this evidence, we can draw the following conclusion regarding the semantics of the “divine path”: with the phrase *maššanalla/i-palša/i-* our texts express some mental or spiritual capacity of a person which leads him to the gods. This capacity can be compared to other expressions of well-wishing like valour, long life, vitality or the favour of the gods which frequently are mentioned in rituals. Looking at the – limited – occurrences of this wording, both the ritual of Šalašu and the oracle question are situated in the Hurrian milieu. Therefore I suggest that here we find an element of Hurrian tradition taken up by Kuwattalla in her Kizzuwatnaean surroundings.

3.3. *Further observations and some speculative thoughts about the relationship between KUB 35.43 and SÍSKUR ḫalliyattanza*

There are some faint echoes of KUB 35.43 to texts attributed to šalli aniur (or vice versa), but they are of a general character, not unfamiliar also in various rituals from the Kizzuwatnaean area. But these echoes at least do not contradict the possibility to take KUB 34.43 as a tablet of šalli aniur and not as a tablet of a separate ritual.

Even if the use of piglets is not uncommon in rituals from Southern Anatolia one can observe that the piglet is only used in KUB 35.43 iii 28ff. The piglet shall remove all evils from the ritual client, and then the piglet is waved above the ritual client, who spits on the piglet. And the Old Woman recites in Luwian. Maybe we can combine the ritual use of this piglet with the piglet mentioned in Bo 4388,7 which is the only other passage in Kuwattalla’s texts referring to this animal. If my attribution of Bo 4388 to šalli aniur is correct as argued above then we have another indirect indication also for taking KUB 35.43 as a šalli aniur text.

Also the treatment of the twelve parts of the body (ḫappiš-) is restricted to KUB 35.43 iii 9 and its duplicate or parallel text KUB 32.14 iii 8, but it is also found in texts attributed to šalli aniur, namely KUB 35.24+ obv. 7,

10, 21 (first tablet) and KUB 32.9+ rev. 5 (third tablet). Of course, also the
naming of the twelve parts of the body is well known from other rituals of
the Luwian sphere, but its occurrence in the mentioned passages can be
seen as a slight indication which helps to re-arrange the textual corpus of
šalli aniur.

Even if these observations are less weighty than the ones mentioned before
they can also be taken as further evidence to come to a new solution.
Contrary to Starke’s suggestion that KUB 35.43 (with duplicates) belongs to
a/the third ritual, we have shown that the correspondences between this text
and those assigned to šalli aniur allow to transfer this tablet from Starke’s
“third ritual” to his “first ritual”, the šalli aniur. Taking up the observation
from above, the SISKUR dūpaduparša precedes (on the first and second
day) immediately the šalli aniur’s first tablet (cf. KUB 35.15 i 2-7; KBo 29.3
i 1-4). But there are no correspondences between the texts of the SISKUR
dūpaduparša and KUB 35.43 (contrary to the correspondences between the
beginning for šalli aniur and SISKUR dūpaduparša). Thus we can conclude
that KUB 35.43 has to be placed to a later position during šalli aniur; but at
the moment no number in the sequence of tablets can be assigned to KUB
35.43.

One last observation and idea shall be presented here for further discussion
and on-going research. The colophon of KUB 35.33 iv 4 refers to another
ritual, being part of šalli aniur, which is called SÍSKUR ʰalli yatanza. The
interpretation of this word is not absolutely clear. Starke has suggested that
the Luwian term might correspond with Hittite katta walḫuwaš, but this
connection has been rejected. For the meaning of ʰalliya- Melchert has
suggested to connect this Luwian adjective either with ʰallīya- “day” or
derive the word from ʰallīna- “be sick, hurt” or ʰallīš- “sickness, pain”.
The verb ʰallīna- is attested several times in Kuwattalla’s texts, most striking
are the widely parallel structures of KUB 35.43 iii 14-18 and KUB 35.34+

ii 11-16 corresponding to the other similarities between these two texts. But also all other references of ḫallina- can be compared with these two texts: KBo 29.20,1-5; KBo 29.22,3; KUB 35.29 ii 2; KUB 35.112,8.10.13. Starke rightly mentions that all these fragments must be assigned either to his “first” or “third” ritual\(^{57}\), or precisely to the two texts mentioned above. The fragmentary condition is not very helpful for a clear interpretation, but it is noteworthy that the verb ḫallina- is only attested in these texts. Therefore my guess is to connect the verb ḫallina- “be sick, hurt” semantically with SÍSKUR ḫalliyatta- taking this as a ritual against sickness.\(^{58}\) But I dare to go one step further presuming that KUB 35.43 could be a possible candidate giving at least parts of the wording (and prescription) of the SÍSKUR ḫalliyatta- mentioned in the colophon of KUB 35.33. Maybe also the very fragmentary contexts attesting the verb ḫallina- mentioned above are fragments of the “(sub-)ritual against sickness”.

4. Conclusion

More than a decade ago I wrote: “The ritual ‘ṣalli aniur’ is the most extensive composition of Kuwattalla, one that also comprises some different sub-rituals, like the SÍSKUR ḫalliyattanza and the katta walḫuwaš SÍSKUR. SÍSKUR.”\(^{59}\) This position was mainly based on the colophon of KUB 35.33 and the beginning of the first tablet (KUB 35.18; KBo 29.3), but now this statement can be based also on the assignment of preserved texts, which have earlier been taken as a separate “second” ritual (SÍSKUR dūpaduparša-) and a “third” ritual (with no title) by Starke; according to my interpretation only KUB 35.43 can be attributed to ṣalli aniur, therefore Starke’s assumption that Kuwattalla has also “authored” other rituals cannot be ruled out, which can be made up by remaining texts of Starke’s “third” ritual\(^{60}\) after taking KUB 35.43 as part of ṣalli aniur, maybe representing parts of the SÍSKUR ḫalliyattanza. But the SÍSKUR dūpaduparša is no ritual of its own, but the sub-ritual performed at the “beginning” of ṣalli aniur.

\(^{57}\) Starke 1985: 190, 198.

\(^{58}\) Cf. also Yakubovich 2014sqq., who suggests “affliction” as translation of ḫalliyatta-.

\(^{59}\) Hutter 2003: 253.

\(^{60}\) Cf. also the colophons in KBo 10.42 and KBo 29.12, but they do not necessarily refer to KUB 35.43 as Starke 1985: 135 has argued. On Kuwattalla as “author” see also above (footnote 2).
Despite the observations presented here, we still have to say that at this moment it is not possible to give a well-founded idea of the concrete purpose of Kuwattalla’s ritual because of the fragmentary condition of the texts. But I think some of the observations have also shed light on some details about the place of the rituals in Luwian tradition. The occurrence of the analyzed elements (hirutalliš Tiwaz; ikkuwar-, ikkunatt-; warpalla/i- Tarhunt-; maššanalla/i- palša/i-) does not leave doubt that these rituals have a mainly local character and highlight some individual ritual practice of Kuwattalla and Šilaluḫḫi. As the epithet of the “Sun-god by which one swears” does not occur in any other text it is difficult to say how important this special “manifestation” of the Sun-god has been in general religious tradition. The situation concerning the “great/powerful Storm-god” is a little bit different, as there are some references to this epithet in later time – from the Tabalean, Cilician and Phrygian geographical areas. So we can at least deduce that this epithet of the Storm-god had some continuity in Kizzuwatna / Cilicia and also spread Tabal (the Lower Land in the second millennium). This is interesting for reconstructing cross-regional “Luwian” traditions, as this connection between Kizzuwatna and the Lower Land fits well with Laroche’s observation that there are some thematic similarities to Tunnawiya’s rituals (KUB 9.4 and KUB 9.34), which show the possibility of “ritual exchange” between a tradition we know from the Lower Land (by Tunnawiya’s rituals) and from Kizzuwatna (by Kuwattalla’s ritual). The epithet war(a)palla/i- now can be added to such corresponding elements in the ritual sphere of Kizzuwatna and the Lower Lands. Other aspects also show the interference of Luwian and Hurrian milieu of Kizzuwatna, as becomes evident by the motif of the “divine path” and maybe also by the word ikkuwar / ikkunatt- if it can be derived from the Hurrian language. This is not really surprising as the cultural “mixture” of Hurrian and Luwian elements in Kizzuwatna is known since long. And Yakubovich has also mentioned – in passing by – that there are some Hurrian elements in Kuwattalla’s rituals:61 the Hurrian gods Hebat (KUB 9.6 ii 6), Šaušga (KUB 35.82,7) and Ninatta (KUB 35.71 iii 3). In the first ritual also the Hurrian term keldi (KBo 29.3+29.4 i 8; KUB 35.18 i 14) is mentioned.62 All these elements fit into the well-known setting of rituals from Kizzuwatna, but they also give Kuwattalla’s šalli aniur its own flavour – compared to other Luwian rituals from Kizzuwatna.

62 For a further Hurrian element one can refer to the name Šilalluḫḫi; a ritual practitioner with the same name (cf. Zehnder 2010: 271 with short discussion) is mentioned in some texts which clearly show a Hurrian background.
Manfred HUTTER
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RECHTSDOKUMENTE UNTER DEN HIEROGLYPHENLUWISCHEN INSCHRIFTEN DER EISENZEIT

Sylvia HUTTER-BRAUNSAR*

1. Einleitung


Es ist wohl damit zu rechnen, dass der Großteil der Gebrauchsliteratur aus

* Universität zu Köln

1 Sprachlich gesehen ist das Luwische in zwei Formen zu unterteilen: das Kizzuwatna-Luwisch, das so gut wie ausschließlich in Keilschrift aus dem hethitischen Bereich des Zweiten Jahrtausends überliefert ist, und das Großreichluwisch ("Empire Luwian"), das bis auf wenige isolierte Formen in der Keilschriftüberlieferung in hieroglyphischen Texten des ersten und zweiten Jahrtausends überliefert ist (Yakubovich 2010: 15-73).


dieser Zeit verloren gegangen ist; neben Bleistreifen kommen für solche Texte sicherlich mit Wachs überzogene Holztafeln und vielleicht sogar bereits Pergament in Frage.


6 Gemeint sind damit das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22-23,19 [33]), das Heiligkeitsgesetz (Lev 17-26) und Teile des Deuteronomiums (Dtn 4,4-30,20).
A. Bauer erkannt hat – als juristische Dokumente deuten; diese sollen im Folgenden diskutiert werden.

2. Rechtsdokumente

2.1. CEKKE (Hawkins 2000: 145; pl. 42f.)


Übersetzung der relevanten Textpassagen:

(Der Anfang der Inschrift (§§ 1-5) bezeichnet den Kaufvertrag mit LIGNUM[x]-pal-ma-za und nennt den Stifter der Stele (STELE),9 deren Vorderseite einen stehenden Wettergott auf einem Stier zeigt, und nennt Opferbestimmungen dafür.)


§ 7 Sie gaben ihnen 600 Esel.

§ 8 Für za-Crus+RA/I- aber sind den Söhnen des Warpat 3 Minen Silber einer ARGENTUM-Einheit11 zu geben.12

§ 9 ... dem Labarna und dem Zaza sind 4 Minen einer ARGENTUM-Einheit von der Ortschaft Nuhaza zu geben,

§ 10 ... ist in jeder Ortschaft vor dem Fluss herrn Ahaliya ein Fest(mahl) zu geben

§ 11 und ein Rind und 15 Schafe sind für die Ortschaft / in der Ortschaft Kanapu (im Wert von ?) 2 Minen einer ARGENTUM-Einheit als Fest(mahl)13 zu veranstalten.

§ 12 Dem14 DOMINUS-Tiwadi aber, dem Sohn des Ahaliya sind XXX, 1 Mine (und) mirasra/i(-?) zu geben.

§ 13 In der Stadt ist für 10 tam15 und 20 Kinder eine Schenkung zu „binden“.

9 Weil der Inschriftenträger als STELE bezeichnet wird, muss sich der erste Terminus auf den Inhalt beziehen.
10 Im ACLT ist diese endungslose Form als Adjektiv karkamisizz-im Nominativ Singular analysiert.
13 Gegen die Analyse im ACLT fasse ich die Form als Nominativ Singular auf; die Form in § 10 fasse ich mit dem ACLT als Akkusativ Singular Neutrum (azzaliyya=z) auf.
15 Im ACLT ist für tammi- die Bedeutung „adult“ angegeben, was durch § 16 naheliegend ist. Das Wort ist hapax.
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§ 14 hazani aber war Za, Sohn des Hapuzi, BRACCHIUM-la\textsuperscript{16} und MAGNUS-ra-ya [ ... 

§ 15 Grenzsteine sind zu beschriften.

§ 16 Sie sind als Schenkung für Väter und Söhne zu „binden“.

(§ 17: es sind 15 Personen mit jeweils einem Sohn aus neun Ortschaften genannt, wahrscheinlich als Zeugen)

(§ 18 nicht verständlich)

§ 19 Grenzsteine sind zu setzen.

Darauf folgt eine ausführliche Fluchformel, die die Grenzen, die Stele (STELE) und die Worte darauf schützen sollen.

2.2 KARKAMIŠ A 4a (Hawkins 2000, 152; pl. 44)


\textsuperscript{16} S. dazu jetzt Peker 2016: 17 mit der Deutung als „rechte Hand“.

\textsuperscript{17} Der Terminus washa- wird im ACLT mit „fee“ übersetzt; Melchert 2015: 412 übersetzt „lord of the washa“, nach ihm bezeichnet der Terminus den Handelsabschluss.
„jemandem (etwas) verkaufen“.\textsuperscript{18} Leider ist in dem Text keine Bezeichnung für den Inschriftenträger erhalten.

\textbf{Übersetzung:}

§ 1 Diese Häuser verkaufte PN\textsubscript{x} dem König Kamani.

§ 2 Kamani aber verkaufte sie dem (/seinem) Neffen Parisarma, dem Enkel des Papitati.

§ 3 Ihm sind 22 (+ x ?) Minen der ARGENTUM-Einheit zu geben.

§ 4 Ihm ist ein Fest(mahl) zu veranstalten.

§ 5 BRACCHIUM-la [

(§§ 6-10 nennt Orts- und Personennamen, wahrscheinlich handelt es sich um die Aufzählung von Zeugen)

§ 11 Ein Fest(mahl) ist zu geben für den „Herrn des washa“.

(Die §§ 12-14 beinhalten die Fluchformel gegen jemanden, der die erwähnten Häuser dem Sohn, Enkel oder Urenkel wegnimmt)

\textbf{2.3 TÜNP 1} (Hawkins 2000: 155; pl. 45)

Mit CEKKE und KARKAMIŚ A 4a vergleichbar ist die Inschrift TÜNP, die ebenfalls zum Gebiet von Karkamiš gehört. Auf einem kleinen unbehaarten Basaltblock ist ein Landkauf dokumentiert. Die Inschrift ist ebenfalls in die Zeit Kamanis zu datieren, aber sein Name ist im Text nicht erhalten.\textsuperscript{19} An spezifischem Vokabular aus diesem Text kommt wiederum CUM-ni („CONTRACTUS“)\textsubscript{i}(ya)sa- „kaufen von“ vor. Was an dieser Inschrift anders ist als in den beiden eben besprochenen, ist das Fehlen einer Fluchformel; stattdessen ist davon die Rede, dass derjenige, der diesen Verkauf anficht (PES\textsubscript{2}, PES tarpi-), einen gewissen Betrag als Strafe ((„*419“)washa-) bezahlen muss. Eine Bezeichnung für den Inschriftenträger ist auch hier nicht enthalten. § 2 ist möglicherweise dahingehend zu verstehen, dass ein

\textsuperscript{18} Dass die Götter hier in der Fluchformel aufgefordert werden, gegen den Übeltäter zu prozessieren, kommt nicht nur in diesem rechtlichen Dokument vor, sondern ist ein gängiger Topos in Fluchformeln.

\textsuperscript{19} Giusfredi 2010: 179 sieht darin ebenfalls eine Aktivität des Kamani festgehalten.
„Stein“ ((SCALPRUM)asu-) auszulöschen sei, wobei es sich um eine durch neuerlichen Besitzerwechsel unwirksam gewordene Besitzurkunde bzw. alte Verkaufsurnkunde handeln könnte.

Übersetzung:

§ 1 ... von ?]ara-FRATER-la, dem Sohn des Statiwara/i kaufte PN\(_x\) Land

§ 2 Der Stein ist zu entfernen / (die Schrift darauf) auszumeißeln ...

(§§ 3-4 nicht vollständig verständlich)

§ 5 wer (dies) anficht / agressiv dagegen vorgeht:

§ 7 die Strafe ist 1 Mine Silber (und) 1 manasahana-

§ 8 Der Mensch aber, der nicht mitmacht, [...]

3. Indirekt bezeugte Rechtsdokumente bzw. Lexeme der Rechtssprache

3.1 LIGNUM[x]-\(\text{pa}'\)-\(\text{ma}'\)-\(\text{za}\) (CEKKE § 2)


Dieses Wort ist ein hapax, und in der Fluchformel wird das zu schützende Objekt als STELE bezeichnet, sodass unklar bleibt, ob sich die Bezeichnung auf den Inschriftenstein, d.h. eine bestimmte Art von „STELE“, oder den Inhalt, d.h. den Vertragstext bzw. das Formular, bezieht. STELE determiniert \text{wanit-}, was nach allgemeiner Auffassung „Stele“ bedeutet; in MEHARDE und SHEIZAR – zwei Parallelinschriften aus Hama – ist damit \text{tanisa}-determiniert. Da die Form der Stele als Relief- und Inschriftenträger sehr häufig ist, die Bezeichnung aber ein Hapax, ist wohl davon auszugehen, dass sich die Bezeichnung auf den Inhalt beziehungsweise den Zweck der Inschrift bezieht.

---

20 Dazu zählt auch \text{tarut-}, „(Holz-)Statue“, das meist mit STATUA, zweimal aber mit LIGNUM determiniert ist.
21 Nach dem ACLT ist in der Inschrift ŞARAGA aus Karkamiş in § 1 kuttassar(i)- „Orthostat“ mit STELE (*267) determiniert, das in allen anderen erhaltenen Fällen mit SCALPRUM (*268) determiniert ist.
3.2 **CAPERE-ma=za und saman=za**


KULULU 2 ist eine Grabinschrift des Panamuwa, in der es heißt:

§ 1: Ich bin Panuni, der zur Sonne gehörige / zum Sonnengott gehörige Prinz.

§ 2 Mir machten meine Kinder hier einen gesiegelten’ (sama”=za) Vertrag’ (CAPERE-ma=za).

Um diese Stelle mit dem BULGARMADEN-Beleg in Zusammenhang zu bringen, muss man annehmen, dass es sich dabei um eine Art Kaufvertrag für das Grundstück für das Grab oder für den Grabstein handelt.

Das Lemma saman=za kommt noch einmal vor, und zwar in der Inschrift KARABURUN § 5 (Tabal; Hawkins 2000: 481 und pl. 266f.). Dabei handelt es sich um eine Felsinschrift, in der mitgeteilt wird, dass ein König namens Sipi mit Sipi, Sohn des Ni, gemeinsam eine Festung erbaut hatten und dies durch eine Vereinbarung (sama”=za) besiegelten. Die Fluchformel will verhindern, dass einer der beiden bzw. dessen Söhne gegen den anderen beziehungsweise dessen Söhne irgendetwas Böses planen.

\(^{22}\) Diese Inschrift ist zwar eine Grabinschrift, aber am Anfang erwähnt der Autor, dass seine Kinder „hier ein gesiegeltes Dokument“ für ihn gemacht hätten.
3.3 LIS


4. Resümee


Wie dieser kurze Überblick gezeigt hat, sind uns zwar aus dem Bereich der sog. hethitischen Nachfolgestaaten keine Gesetzes texte erhalten, die genannten Termini lassen aber auf das Vorhandensein einer betreffenden Fachsprache schließen.
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SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE FUNCTIONS OF HITTITE AN.TAH.ŠUM FESTIVAL: THE CASE OF CTH 604 AND CTH 612

Jiayu JIANG*

ABSTRACT

AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival is one of the two Hittite spring festivals. With the long duration for almost 38 days, it includes so many factors which make the festival more complicated. Thus it is very difficult to make clear the functions of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival. However, it is possible to divide and classify the factors appeared in the festival, which could show the relationship between these factors. Based on these relationships between human and gods, human and human, human and nature, even human and themselves, it maybe show some functions of Hittite AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival. The relationship between human and gods substantially is the relationship between human and nature, while the relationship between human and human or human and themselves shows the identification of authority. To some extent, Hittite people may have a bad relationship with gods, nature or other people in ordinary days. However, during the period of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, these relationships between them become more harmonious.

KEY WORDS: Hittite; AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival; Functions

Hittite AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival is one of the two spring festivals (the other one is purulli Festival) in the Hittite festival calendar. According to the outline

* Dr. Jiayu JIANG, School of History, Capital Normal University, Beijing, China, 100048. E-mail: jiangjiayu1234@163.com
It is easy to know that AN.TAH.ŠUM may last 38 days or even more than 38 days. As for the purposes of Hittite AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, Mursili II gave a statement: “it happened that my father arranged the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival for the gods of Hatti and for the sun-goddess of Arinna”. Having been held in the spring, AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival is thought to be “celebrated the regeneration of the powers of nature. It was a time of renewals, of reconfirmation of the gods’ endorsement of the king’s authority, of the regeneration of the life and health and vigor of the king and his consort.”

However, anyone who wants to talk about the functions of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, it is necessary for him to analyze the factors which make up of the whole festival. By the analysis to the factors and the relationship between these factors, we could find the inner mechanism of this festival which probably indicates the functions of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival. CTH 604 belongs to the outline of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival which had been transliterated and translated by Hans G. Güterbock, while CTH 612 covers the detailed actions in the 16th day of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival which had been researched by Enrico Badalì und Christian Zinko. Thus CTH 604 and CTH 612 could be taken as both the macro- and micro- point of view to talk about the functions of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival. Therefore firstly the factors in CTH 604 and CTH 612 should be reviewed.

1. The Three-main Factors of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival
1.1. Humanity

From the outline tablets and some other tablets related to AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, it is easy for us to find that the humanity is the most important participant in the whole process of this festival. Based on these tablets, the humanity in the festival could be divided into three classes according to their different political status. The first group could be called the leaders or the

---

rulers. The second group is the officials and the last one is the servitors and common people.

1.1.1. Leaders

In CTH 604 (Outline of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival), LUGAL, MUNUS. LUGAL and DUMU.LUGAL are attested to be three main types of royal members (king, queen and prince).

Firstly LUGAL and MUNUS.LUGAL should be the most important persons. The king and queen often appear together in the whole process of the festival. Both in CTH 604 and CTH 612, the king and queen play the important role in the festival. Either the king or the queen will take the procession in kinds of cities, temples or houses. Meanwhile either of them will attend in the rituals held in the festival. Therefore the king and queen are absolutely the core-persons dominating the whole festival, as well as the main participants.

As for DUMU.LUGAL, it is found in CTH 604 once, from which it is obvious to know what the prince plays in the festival:

Col. II (40) lu-uk-kat-ti-ma LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL I-NA É DHa-an-nu pa-a-an-zi (41) nu šal-li a-še-eš-ša[r I]-NA É DU-ma DUMU.LUGAL (42) IŠ-TU É.GAL-LIM u-i-ia-an-zi nu EZEN ha-ta-ú-ri (43) i-ia-zi…(47)...a-da-tar a-ku-wa-tar (48) [IŠ]-TU É.<.GAL-LIM> A-NA DUMU.LUGAL u-i-ia-an-zi (Güterbock 1960:82-83).

Next day the king and queen go into the temple of Hannu. Great assembly. But they send the prince from the palace to the temple of storm-god. He celebrates the hatauri-Festival……They send the food and drink from the palace to the prince.

However in CTH 612 (Concrete 16\textsuperscript{th} of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival), DUMU. LUGAL appears as its plural form, which may indicate that there are at least several princes attending the festival:

(20) LÚ ĠIŞ GIDRU pi-ra-an hu-u-wa-i nu DUMUMEŠ.LUGAL a-ša-a-ši (Enrico Badali 1994:50).
The herald runs in front, he leads the princes to sit down.

nu DUMULMEŠ.LUGAL a-ša-ši (KBo 34.152 Rs. III 1)

He (Someone) leads the princes to sit down.

Therefore the prince not only celebrates the festival when the king and queen are absent, but also takes part in the rituals in the festival as one of the participants.

1.1.2 Officials

In AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, the officials are those whose political status is lower than the leaders’ status but higher than the servitor and the common people’s status. Those officials include GAL MEŠEDI (Chief of Bodyguard), GAL DUMULMEŠ.É. GAL (Chief of palace-attendants), UGULA LÚMEŠGISBANŠUR (Overseer of Table-men) and UGULA LÚMEŠ MUHALDIM (Overseer of cooks) and so on.

GAL MEŠEDI is attested in CTH 604 only on 19th day, before which the king celebrates the Storm-god pihašašši the in Pure Temple and the queen celebrates the Sun-goddess of Arinna in halentu-House:


The chief of bodyguards or the chief of palace-attendants sets up the cups before the Storm-god pihašašši and the Sun-goddess of Arinna.

However in CTH 612, GAL MEŠEDI appears almost for 30 times. His actions could be generalized as follows: ① informing something or somebody to the king, then conveying the command from the king to the herald; ② holding the mantle of the priest of protective god and the cupbearer when they respectively perform the rituals for the king; ③ holding the gold spear and the scepter of šuruhha-wood for the king and queen; ④ performing with the spear and calling the shout (in ritual); ⑤ acting together with other officials,
such as the chief of palace-attendants, the overseer of table-men and so on.

GAL DUMU$^{MEŠ}$.É.GAL appears on 11th, 19th and 35th day in CTH 604 for three times:

Col. II (11) l[u-u]k-kat-ti-ma GAL DUMU$^{MEŠ}$.É.GAL $I\text{-}NA$ Ėhe-eš-ti[-i] (12) MU.KAM-a)n pé-e-da-i LUGAL-uš-ša EGIR-ŠU i-ia-a[t-ta-ri] (Güterbock 1960:82)

Next day the chief of palace-attendants carries [the year] to the hešti-House, and the queen follows him.

Col. IV (12) [lu]-uk-kat-ti-ma-az LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL $^\text{PUTU}^\text{URU}$ A-ri-in-n[a...]-ia (13) $[\text{I}]\text{-}NA$ $^\text{URU}$ Hur-ra-na-aš-ši i-ia-an-zi GAL DUMU.É.[GAL-ma …..](14) $I\text{-}NA$ $^\text{URU}$ Zi-ip-la-an-da pé-en-an-i (Güterbock 1960:84)

Next day the king and queen celebrate the Sun-goddess of Arinna […] in Hurranassa, while the chief of palace-attendants drives […] to Zippalanda.

In CTH 612 the actions of GAL DUMU$^{MEŠ}$.É.GAL could be generalized as follows: ① holding out the cloth for drying the hands of king and queen; ② as the key-man breaking the bread for spear of protective god; ③ acting together with other officials, such as the chief of bodyguards, the overseer of table-men and so on.

The overseer of table-men and the overseer of cooks and some other officials in the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, whose actions and functions will not be detailed, however still should play the important roles in the whole festival.
1.1.3. Servitors/Common People

Except for the leaders and officials, the servitors and common people would be the main participants and the true executants in the festival. CTH 604 mainly includes LÚ.MEŠ.MEŠEDI (bodyguards), DUMU.MEŠ.É.GAL (palace attendants), LÚ.MEŠ.SANGA (SANGA-priests), LÚ.NAR (singer), LÚ.MEŠ.HAL (prophets), LÚ.MEŠ.GUDU (GUDU-priests) and so on. However CTH 612 demonstrates that the servitors and common people are more than those who are attested in CTH 604. In CTH 612 those additional people are LÚ.MEŠ.GIŠ.GIDRU (heralds), LÚ.MEŠ.MUHALDIM (cooks), LÚ.SU.I (barber), LÚ.MEŠ.GIŠ.BANŠUR (table-men), LÚ.palwatallaš (reciter), MUNUS.AMA.DINGIR.LIM (AMA.DINGIR-priestess), LÚ.kitaš (recital-priest?), LÚ.HUB.BI (dancer), LÚ.MEŠ.UR.GI (hunters), LÚ.MEŠ.halliyariš (priest-singer?), LÚ.MEŠ.SIMUG (blacksmiths), LÚ.MEŠ.UBARUM (foreigners?), LÚ.MEŠ.ZABAR.DIB (wine-cup-bearers), LÚ.SAGI.A (cupbearer), LÚ.MEŠ.GI.GÍD (flute-player) and so on.

All the people mentioned above could be divided into three types: ① administrative staffs, such as the bodyguards, the palace-attendants, the heralds; ② religious staffs, such as the SANGA-priests, the GUDU-priests and the AMA.DINGIR-priestess; ③ servicing staffs, such as the singers, the dancer, the prophets, the cooks, the barbers, the table-men, the cupbearer, the flute-player and so on.

1.2. Nature

Nature plays an important role in ancient people’s ordinary life. The Hittites try to understand the entire world through what they could see in their life. Both the artificial world and the primary nature which are reflected in the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival compose the entire nature.

1.2.1. Place

The artificial world includes the cities, the temples and the houses which are built and constructed by human. In the process of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, people hold the rituals in different cities, temples and
houses. CTH 604 mentions the cities as follows: URU Hattuša, URU Tahurpa, URU Katapa, URU Arinna, URU Tawiniya, URU Hiyasna, URU Zippalanda, URU Kašaya, URU Haitta, URU Huršannašša, URU Ankuwa. The temples and houses contain the Ėhalentuwa, Ėtarnu, Ė.GAL, Ė DNisaba, Ėhešti, Ė DUTU, Ė.MUNUS. LUGAL, Ė DZiparwa, Ė.DINGIR, Ė DU, Ė DZababa, Ė D Hannu, Ė DU, Ė parkuwaiš, Ė DKAL, Ė D Aškašipa, Ė D Aa, Ė DINGIR.MAH, Ėarkiuia, Ė ŠÀ. TAM, and Ė LÚ.MESMU Furthermore, the mountains are attested in the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival as the place where the festival are held, for example the HUR.SAG Tipuwa, HUR.SAG Tapala, and the HUR.SAG Piskurunuwa.

Some of the cities are the religious centers of the Hittites, such as URU Arinna, URU Zippalanda and so on. Some of them are administrative centers such as URU Hattuša, URU Ankuwa (the site of royal palace favored by the Hittite king⁴) and so on. With the purpose of combining the religious and administrative power, people may choose these cities as the places in which the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival was held.

1.2.2. Animate and inanimate stuffs

In the rituals of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, many animals and plants appear, such as the GUD (bull), UDU (sheep), SILÁ (lamb), ANŠU.KUR.RA MEŠ (horses) and AN.TAH.ŠUM SAR (plant) and so on. Some other objects and goods are every kinds of bread, the grain storage vessel, the cups, the (gold-) spear, the scepter, the throne, the oven, the window and even the wooden-bolt and so on. All these animate and inanimate stuffs are the important medium for human to communicate with the god and nature.

1.3. Gods

The god is one of the three-main roles in the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival. It is indeed difficult to enumerate all of the gods in the whole AN.TAH.ŠUM festival. However, it could take CTH 604 and CTH 612 as the examples for the general understanding. In CTH 604 are there the DNisaba, DU

---

Meanwhile the gods in CTH 612 are DAG, Halki, Hulla, HALMAŠUTTUM, Ištanu, LAMMA, Tappinu, Tauri, Telipinu, U, UTU, Zababa, Mezzulla, and Wašezza.

All these gods could be divided into three groups: ① Gods related to nature, such as UTU (storm-god), U (sun-god), Halki (grain-god), Hulla (mountain-god?) and Telipinu; ② Gods related to the common life, such as DAG (throne-god), IŠTAR and Zababa; ③ Some other gods, such as LAMMA, Tauri and so on.

Though either these gods or other factors (humanity and nature) talked above are not the total factors included in the whole process of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, they are still able to be the most representative factors. Based on the three-main factors, it makes the discussion on the relationships between humanity, nature and gods possible.

2. The Relationships based on the Three-main Factors

2.1. Relationship between humanity and humanity

It has been talked about the humanity as one of the main factor in AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival. The humanity includes leaders, officials and the servitors/common people. Thus the relationships between humanity could be summed up as three relationships: ① The relationship between leaders and officials; ② The relationship between the officials and the common people; ③ The relationship between the leaders and the common people.

Firstly, both the king and the queen, and even the prince are the core-persons in the festival. Especially as for the king and the queen, either in CTH 604 or CTH612, they are the dominant people who go around different cities, temples and houses. When the king and queen are absent, they will
delegate the prince to celebrate the festival. Meanwhile the couples and the prince are all the participants. As talked above, GAL MEŠEDI and GAL DUMU\textsuperscript{MEŠ}.É.GAL are the most important officials. Their work for leaders are mainly ① informing something or someone to the king and the queen then conveying the command from the king to the herald; ② holding the gold spear and the scepter of šuruḫḫa-wood for the king and queen; ③ holding out the cloth for drying the hands of king and queen. Therefore the officials work as the first intermediary who services for the leaders, and conveys the command from the leaders to others.

Secondly, the officials maybe chose from the common people. They are titled with the GAL or UGULA which differentiate them from the common people. Between the officials and the common people there is an obvious rule for the delivery of good. The process of bread-delivery in CTH 612 could be taken as an example:

(11) $\text{LÚŠU.I} \ 1 \ \text{NINDA.KU}_{7} \ \text{ú-da-i} \ (12) \ \text{ta-an} \ \text{A-NA} \ \text{DUMU.É.GAL} \ \text{pa-a-i} \ \text{DUMU.É.GAL-ma-an} \ (13) \ \text{A-NA} \ \text{GAL} \ \text{DUMU\textsuperscript{MEŠ}.É.GAL} \ \text{pa-a-i} \ (14) \ \text{GAL DUMU\textsuperscript{MEŠ}.É.GAL-ma-an} \ \text{A-NA} \ \text{GIŠŠUKUR} \ \text{D.LAMMA} \ \text{pár-ši-ya} \ (15) \ [n]\text{a-an} \ \text{GAL DUMU\textsuperscript{MEŠ}.É.GAL EGIŔ-pa} \ \text{A-NA} \ \text{DUMU.É.GAL-ma-an} \ \text{EGIŔ-pa} \ (17) \ \text{A-NA} \ \text{LÚŠU.I} \ \text{pa-a-i}$ (Enrico Badalì 1994:46-48)

The barber gives 1 sweet-bread to the palace-official, the palace-official gives it to the chief of palace-officials, the chief of palace-officials breaks it for the spear of protective god, and then gives it back to the palace-official, and the palace-official gives it back to the barber.

The route of bread delivery can be seen clearly from this picture:

Barber \hspace{1cm} palace-official \hspace{1cm} chief of palace-officials

Breaking the bread

Barber \hspace{1cm} palace-official \hspace{1cm} chief of palace-officials
Therefore there may be a potential rule between the officials and the common people. The officials are the head of common people which reflects in the rituals with some fixed procedures.

Lastly, the relationship between the leaders and the common people is obvious that the common people will carry out the officials’ instructions conveyed from the leaders. Furthermore they will prepare everything for the festival and do the performances in the festival. For the sake of their ranks, they must service for both the leaders and the officials.

Therefore the relationships between humanity and humanity are based on their different political ranks. All the rituals in AN.TAH.ŠUM festival may be held in certain rules according to the participants’ ranks. Therefore in the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival, the leaders, officials and the common people reinforced their respective political ranks by the rituals. In ordinary life, there may be some frictions between leaders, officials and common people, which make the relationship of humanity unsteady. For example, the leaders may punish lower ranked people, while the officials conspire to be leaders and the common people try to become officials. However, in the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival the relationship can be found as an orderly state.

2.2. Relationship between humanity and gods

It is no doubt that the gods play the important part in the Hittites life. That the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival is held in kinds of different gods’ temples is a convincing demonstration. As it has been discussed in §1.3 that all the gods could be divided into three groups: gods related to nature, gods related to the common life and some other gods. As indicated in Tudhaliya’s prayer to Sun-goddess of Arinna (CTH 385.9): I have sinned against the Sun-goddess of Arinna…I neglected your festivals…never again shall I omit the Festivals. I will not again interchange the spring and autumn festivals. The festivals of spring I shall perform only in the spring, and the festival of autumn I shall perform only in the autumn… (Itamar Singer 2002:108), it is obvious that the festivals are held for the gods, however which may be neglected or held
in a wrong way for some reasons. Neglecting the gods’ festivals will be a kind of sin or offence for the king. Furthermore there may be other sins or offences to the gods, which humanity does intended or unintended. Therefore the humanity takes the festivals as one of the methods to communicate with the gods and show the reverence for the gods. The relationships between humanity and gods in the festivals are strictly ruled.

The utopian relationship between humanity and gods should be that the humanity respect for the gods and the gods help and protect the humanity. However in true-life, it is a frequent antinomy that either the humanity maybe displeases the gods (just as Tudhaliya omitting the festivals for Sun-goddess of Arinna) or the gods do not exert their effectiveness to help the humanity. Therefore the humanity pin their hope on the festivals in which the humanity and the gods get along well with each other. In the festivals, the humanity sacrifices to the gods while the gods have no any punishment on the humanity which makes the relationship between the humanity and the gods more harmonious.

2.3. Relationship between humanity and nature

Nature in AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival is both the world reconstructed by humanity and the primary nature. The former includes the cities, temples and houses, and even the inanimate stuffs created by human such as the bread, the vessel, the cups, the (gold-) spear, the scepter, the throne, the oven, the window and so on. The latter mainly refers to the mountains, the rivers, the springs, the animals and the plants such as the bull, the sheep, the horses and AN.TAH.ŠUMŞAR and so on. Furthermore, the gods related to nature are substantially equal to nature. Therefore the relationship between humanity and nature are much more complex.

Firstly it is no doubt that the inanimate stuffs created by human such as the oven, the throne, the window and the wooden-bolt are necessaries of life. Therefore people apotheosize all these goods and give the sacrifices:
The overseer of cooks libates once for the oven, once for the throne-god, once for the window, once for the wooden-bolt; furthermore he libates once near the oven.

People use these stuffs in ordinary life; however they need to pay the reverence to these stuffs in AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival. Thus it seems that people abuse the oven in ordinary days, but in festival they sacrifice and satisfy the oven, which makes the oven available in future. That is to say, AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival makes people and the oven more harmonious.

Secondly, some goods are used as the medium for communication between humanity and gods. Animals are sacrificed to the gods by people, as well as the bread and the wine in vessel or cups. However, it should be known that all these animals and inanimate goods are originated from nature. Therefore people offer the things originated from nature to satisfy the gods, which may show that nature acts as the intermediary between humanity and gods.

Furthermore, some gods are related to nature, such as the storm-god, the sun-god, the grain-god and so on. Thus in substantially speaking, people are offering the things originated from nature to nature.

Then as for the relationships between humanity and nature, it could come into a conclusion that, in festivals humanity apotheosize nature and give offerings to it, though the offerings are still originated from nature. Then it makes a circle that nature is used by humanity offering to nature, which may keep a balance between humanity and nature.

3. Conclusion

Based on the three-main factors and their relationships in AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival which are talked above, it may be possible to conclude that the
AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival’s function is to deal with these relationships between humanity, gods and nature.

Firstly, the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival makes the relationships between humanity and humanity more fixed. By the rituals in festival, the borderlines between the leaders, the officials and the common people become clear. Their fixed political ranks are strengthened again by the festival.

Secondly, the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival mediates between humanity and gods. The conflicts between humanity and gods take place in common life, however, in festival humanity and gods will get along with each other. It comes to the perfect state that humanity shows the reverence and gives offerings to the gods while the gods accept the sacrifice “agreeably”. Therefore, the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival makes the relationships between humanity and gods more harmonious.

Last but not least, the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival makes a balance between humanity and nature. In festival the humanity tries to use the stuffs originated from nature to offer to nature, by which they wish to remedy the overusing of nature and makes the nature for further-using in future.

All in all, the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival makes all the relationships between humanity, gods and nature become fixed and harmonious, which could keep all the world in a good balance.
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HİTİTLER ve TEVRAT: TARİHSEL ÇÖZÜMLEMELER

Güngör KARAÜGÜZ*

I. Giriş


Dikkatleri çekmek ve toplamak istediğim asıl nokta, İ.Ö. 1650 ila 1200 yılları arasında bir dünya medeniyeti kurmuş olan Hititleri o zaman ki antik dünyanın artık hatırlamıyor olmasıdır. Hatta İ.Ö. XII. yüzyıldan sonra da Anadolu’nun Orta, Doğu ve Güneydoğu’unda birkaç yüz yıl daha yaşayacak olan Geç Hitit Beylikleri de İ.Ö. V. yüzyılın başlarında antik dünya toplumlarının hafızasından tamamen silinmişti. Dolayısıyla Ön Asya coğrafyasının büyük bir bölümlünde bin yıldan daha fazla hüküm sürmüş bu güçlü medeniyet belki de Arkaik

---

* Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi - Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi - Sosyal Bilgiler Eğitimi ABD - karauguz@msn.com.
1 Herodotos: II:106.
2 Bu antın Hitit’e ait olduğu ilk kez 1908 yılında Batıya duyurulmuştu (Sayce 1908).
Dönemin (İ.Ö. 750-480) ortalarından itibaren bilinmiyordu. Muhtemeldir ki sebebini şu an bilemedigimiz gerekçelerle ‘unutuluş’ bu dönemde başladı.

II. Hititler Hâlâ Bilinmiyor


---

3 Kâtip Çelebi 617.
5 Texier 1839, 1862.
Bu yıllarda Paul Émile Botta, 1843-1854’te Khorsabad’ta Yeni Asur kralı II. Sargon’un (İ.Ö. 721-705) inşa ettiği Dur-Şarrukin’de; 1845-1855’te Austen Henry Layard, II. Asurnasirpal’in sarayında ve Ninive’de yaptıkları kazılarda⁶ -diğer meslektaşları gibi- çıkardıkları devasa eserleri Avrupa müzelerine taşımaktan da üşenmiyordu.

Ama Mezopotamya’da gerçekleştirilen tüm bu kazılara rağmen Anadolu ve Suriye’nin⁷ çeşitli bölgelerinde keşfedilmiş olan kabartmalar hangi ulusa ait olmalıydı? Kafaları kurcalayan tek soru buydu o yıllarda.

---

⁶ Nissen 2004, XI.
⁷ Wright 1884; Sayce 1888.

\(^{8}\) Hamilton 1842, II, 350-351, no. 25.

III. Hitit Kalıntıları Gün Işıği Görüyor ve Hititçe Déşifre Oluyor

Ancak hem Musevi ve hem de Hristiyan dünyanın kutsal kitabı olan Tevrat, İnciller ve diğer Kanonik kitaplarda Asur11 (156 kez), Babil12 (310 kez), Ninive (31 kez), Asurbanipal (1 kez), Nebukadnezar (93 kez), Salmanasser (2 kez) ve Koreş/II. Dareios13 (23 kez geçer) gibi daha birçok eskiçağ ulusal yarımların ve kralların söz ediliyordu.


---

9 Seehler 2011.
10 Hamilton 1842, I, 390 vd.
12 Salvini 2006.
13 Kuhrt 2010, 389 vd.
14 Sayce 1914.
15 Delaporte 1938.
16 Sayce 1891/1925, 1906, 1928, 1929; Forrer 1936; Kempinski 1979; Chiera 1996, 44.

XX. yüzyılın ilk çeyreğinde Norveçli Jørgen Alexander Knudtzon ve arkadaşları bu tabletlerin okunamayanlarının dilinin Hint-Avrupa kökenli bir kavme ait olduğunu 1902’de haykıracağı. Ama hiç taraftar bulamayacaktı. Bu arada 1906-7 sezonunda Boğazköy’de on binin üzerinde çiviyazılı tablet keşfediyordu Hugo Winckler ama hâlâ tabletler okunamıyor ve anlamlandırılamıyordu. Ta ki 1915 yılında Çek Bedřich Hrozný, bu çiviyazılı tabletlerin dilini çözmeye koyulana kadar. Yaptığı çözümlemelerden Hrozný,

---

17 Chantre 1898.
18 Knudtzon 1915.
19 Thompson 1892, IX.
20 Chiera 1996, 146 vd.
21 Knudtzon vd.1902.
dilin Hint-Avrupa özelliği gösterdiğini ifade edecekti. Çözümlemeler ilerledikçe tarihin derinliklerinde unutulup kaybolmuş bu halkın -Amarna mektuplarında ifadesini bulduğu şekilde- kendini ‘Neš(a)umnili’ olarak adlandırduğu da anlaşılacaktı.


23 Hrozný 1920.
24 VBoT 2 25.
25 Sayce 1888, 11-19; Messerschmidt 1903, 9 vd.; Garstang 1910; Bryce 2003, 19 vd.; Collins 2007, 3.
26 Conder 1898, V-VI, 111 vd.
27 Campbell 1890.
IV. Tevrat’taki Anlatımlar ile Hititler

Het oğulları’ ya da şimdiki moda tabirle Hititler, Tevrat’ta 60 kez ve genel olarak28 şu konu başlıklılarıyla birlikte anılmaktadır.


İbrahim ve Çocukları İsmail ile İshak Döneminde Hititler

- Rab, Hitit topraklarını da kapsayan Mısır İrmagından Fırat’a kadar uzanan geniş bir coğrafyayı Avram/İbrahim’e verir (Yaratılış 15:18-21; Nehemya 9:8).
- Esav, Hititli Beeri’nin kızı Yuhit ve yine Hititli Elon’un kızı Basemat ile evlenir (Yaratılış 26:34; 27:46; 36:2).

28 Arbeitman 1981.
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- Hititli kadınlar ve kızlar (Yaratılış 27:46).

**Musa ve Yeşu Döneminde Hititler**

- Musa’nın kavmini Mısır ülkesinden çıkarıp Hitit topraklarının da içinde yer aldığı geniş, verimli araziler ve süt, bal akan ülkeye götüreceği vaadi yapılır (Çıkış 3:7-8, 17; 13:5; 23:23; 33:2; 34:11).
- Rab, Hititleri kovmak için eşkarasını gönderir (Çıkış 23:28).
- Hititler Kenan’ın dağlık bir bölgesinde Amorluların bitişığinde yaşar (Çölde Sayım 13.29).
- Hititler yedi büyük ve güçlü halk içinde sayılır (Yasanın Tekrarı 7:1).
- Hititlerle birlikte Amor, Kenan, Periz, Hiv ve Yevus halklarının yok edileceği (Yasanın Tekrarı 20:17).
- Rab, çölden Lübnan’a, Fırat’tan –bütün Hitit ülkesi dâhil- Akdeniz’e kadar olan bölgeyi Yeşu’ya verir (Yeşu 1:4)
- Kenan, Hitit, Hiv, Periz, Gırgaş, Amor ve Yevus halklarının sürülmesi konu edilir (Yeşu 3:10).
- Şeria Irmağının ötesinde dağlık bölgesinde, Şefela’da ve Lübnan’a kadar uzanan Akdeniz kıyısında hüküm süren bir kavim de Hititlere (Yeşu 9:1; 11:3; 12:7-8; 24:11).
- Hitit topraklarında Luz adlı bir kent kurulur (Hâkimler 1:26).
- İsraililer Kenan, Amor, Periz, Hiv, Yevus ve Hititlerin arasında yaşamaya başlar (Hâkimler 3:5).

**Davut, Süleyman ve Hezekiel Döneminde Hititler**

- Davut, Hititli Ahimelek ile Avişa’ya ‘ordugaha onunla birlikte kimin gelmek istediyini sorar (1. Samuel 26:6).
- Kral Süleyman için Mısır ve Kilikya’dan getirilen atlar Hitit ve Aram

- Kral Süleyman firavunun kızı başta olmak üzere Hititli ve bir çok yabancı kadın sever (1. Krallar 11:1).
- Aramlılar, İsrail kralının Hitit ve Mısır krallarını kiraladığı hakkında aralarında söylesirler (2. Krallar 7:6).
- İsraililer kızlarını Hititler başta olmak üzere diğer ulusların oğullarına, onların kızlarını da kendi oğullarına alırlar (Ezra 9:1-2).
- Yeruşalim/Kudüs için babası Amorlu ve annesi ise Hititli benzetmesi yapılır (Hezekiel 16:3,45).

Yukarıda verilen bu genel bilgilerden de anlaşılacağı üzere Tevrat ile Hititler arasında sıkı bir işbirliği ya da bir ilişki olduğu çok rahat anlaşılabilirdir. Hatta Hititlerin Filistin’in kuzey bölgelerinde ikamet ettiği görülebilmektedir. Sosyal ve kültürel ilişkilerin izleri, çiviyazılı kil tabletler üzerinden de takip edilebilmektedir.

V. Avram29/İbrahim ve Hititler: Tarihsel Çözümleme


29 Wolley 1936.
Tevrat’ta söz edilen İbrahim, putperest Terah’ın oğlundur ve Barnabas İncil’inde sözü edildiğine göre de toplum, ‘Ba’al ile birlikte bin adet tanrıya’ tapmaktadır. İbrahim, Kildanilerin Ur kentinde dünyaya gelmiştir. Ur’da uzun bir süre yaşayan İbrahim, babasının isteği üzerine diğer kardeşi Haran, yeğeni Lut, karısı Saray –sonradan ismi Sara olacaktır ve babası ile birlikte buradan Harran’a göç etmişlerdir.

Tevrat’ın aktardığı bu bilgiler çerçevesinde daha önce uzun uzun ifade ettiği gibi İbrahim’in yaşadığı devir hakkında bazı ipuçları yakalayabileceğimiz kanaatini taşıyorum.

C. Texier’in Kaleminden Yazılıkaya’daki Tešup, Hepat ve Šarruma


31 Yeşu 24:2.
32 Barnabas İncili 38.
33 Yaratılış 17:15
34 Yaratılış 11:27 vd..
36 Oates 2004, 118 vd..
Birinci Babil Hanedanın altıncı kralı olan Babilli Hammurabi’nin (İ.Ö. 1795’te tahta geçer) krallığının yaklaşık otuzüncü yılında (İ.Ö. 1763) İsin, Uruk ve Nippur kentleriyle birlikte Ur kentini, birinci Babil hanedanlığının sınırları içine dâhil ettiği bilinir37. Böylece bir Sumer38 kenti olan Ur, Sami ırkından bir sülalenin elindedir artık.


Bu durumda, hem Babilli Hammurabi ve hem de Hititlerle çağdaş olduğu anlaşılabilen İbrahim, Hitit devletinin hangi döneminde kadar yaşamını devam ettirmiş olmalıdır?


37 Kuhrt 2010, I, 141.
38 Crawford 2010.
39 Yaratılış 14:1, 8.
40 Yaratılış 10:8-11.

C. Texier’ in Bakış Açısıyla Boğazköy Harabeleri

V.1. Çiviyazılı Bir Belgede Avram/İbrahim Hikâyesi: Appu ile İki Oğlu

43 Haas 2004, 32 vd.
44 Sayce 1915.
45 Böhl 1924, 1929; Bruce 1948, 20 vd..
46 Siegelová 1971.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KUB XXIV 8 I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. **URU-aš ŠUM-an-še-et**<br>**UR[^"Š]u-du-ul**
8. **URU**Lu-ul-lu-wa-ia-aš-ša-[a]n<br>**KUR-e a-ru-ni**
9. **ZAG-ši e-eš-zi nu-kán še-er**<br>**LÚ-aš**
10. **M’Ap-pu ŠUM-an-še-et**<br>**KUR-e-kán iš-tar-na a-pa-a-aš**
11. **ha-ap-pi-na-an-za**
    **G[UD^[HL]^]{uš-ši-iš**
12. **UDU-uš me-ek-[ki]-iš**
13. **KÚ.BABBAR-ma-aš-ši**
    **GUŠKIN-aš N[^"ZA.GI]^N-aš**
    **ud-da-ni**
14. **[p]a-an-ku hu-u-i-ga-tar**
    **ma-a-[an] ha-ah-ha-ri-ia-an**

7. **Šudul** isimli (bir) kent var(miş).
8. **Lulluwa** ülkesinde deniz ona
13.-14. (Hububatın) işlenip yığılması (gibi) o altın, gümüş (ve) lapis lazuli taşı (yiğmiş).

“Ve Abram sürülerde, gümüşte ve altında çok zengindi.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KUB XXIV 8 1</th>
<th>Transkripsiyon: Siegelová 1971, 4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. <strong>NU.GÁL</strong> *LÜ.MEŠ ŠU.GI** U**RU Šu-du-ul-um-ni-iš</td>
<td>17. (olmuyormuş). Sudul kentinin (önde gelen) yaşlıları</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. <em>pi-ra-an-ši-it a-da-an-na</em> *a-ša-an-zi**</td>
<td>18. onun huzurunda yemek için oturdu(k)lar(nda)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Ben çocukusuz gidiyorum. … İşte bana zürriyet vermedin. ….”
“Ve Abram’ın karısı Saray ona çocuk doğurmadi”
Yaratılış 15:2-5; 16:1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>[<strong>GIS</strong>]<strong>BAN</strong>]**ŠUR-ká[n GA]<strong>D-it</strong> ka-ri-ia-an</td>
<td>22. Sofraya örtü seril(miş)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td><strong>na-</strong>]<strong>at</strong>[<strong>GIŞ</strong>]<strong>ZAG.GA.RA</strong> pi-ra-an ar-ta-ri</td>
<td>23. ve sunağın önüne kon(muş).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>[a-r]<strong>a-i-ša-pa</strong> MAp-p[u-u]<strong>š</strong> na-aš-za par-na-aš-śa</td>
<td>24. Appu (da) evine doğru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>[i-i]<strong>a-an-ni-iš</strong> š[a-aš-†]<strong>a-aš-ša-an</strong></td>
<td>25. yönel(miş). Hazır</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>[<strong>GIŞ</strong>]**NÁ-aş šar-ku-w[(a-a)]n-za še-eš-k[†]<strong>it</strong></td>
<td>26. karyolasına ayakkabiliyıyla (birlkte) uzan(miş.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>[<strong>DAM</strong>]<strong>MAp-pu</strong> LÜ.MEŞ**AMA.TU-an pu-nu-uš-ki-w[a-]**an da-a-iš</td>
<td>27. Appu’nun karısı uşaklarına soru sorarak (onlarla dertleşmeye, onlara kinayeli bir şekilde güllerek içini dökmeye) başla(miş.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>[<strong>Ú-</strong>]<strong>UL-wa ku-uš-ša-an-qa kat-ta e-ep-ta</strong></td>
<td>28.‘Daha önce o, (çocuk yapmayı) asla başaramamış</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>[<strong>nu-</strong>]<strong>wa ki-nu-un kat-ta e-ep-ta pa-a-i-ta-aš</strong></td>
<td>29. (ve) şimdi başaracağını mı düşünüyorsunuz?’ (diye söylene söylene) giden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>[<strong>na-</strong>]<strong>an</strong> DAM-ZU pu-nu-uš-ku-wa-an da-a-iš</td>
<td>32. karısı onu soru (yağmuruna) boğ(arak):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>[<strong>Ú-</strong>]<strong>UL-wa ku-uš-ša-an-qa kat-ta e-ep-ta</strong></td>
<td>33. ‘Daha önce (çocuk yapmayı) bir türlü başarama(miş)tin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
401.

“Ve Allah, İbrahim’e dedi: ‘Senin karın Saray’a gelince, …. onu mubah- 
kılaçağım ve ondan da sana bir oğul vereceğim.’ Ve İbrahim yüz üstü 
düştu ve güldü ve yüreğinden dedi: ‘Yüz yaşında olana bir oğul doğar mi ve 
doksan yaşında olan Sara doğurur mu?’”

“Sara kocamış ve yaşta ilerlemiştir. Sara âdetten kesilmişti. Ve Sara: 
‘İhtiyar olduktan sonra bana sevinç olur mu? Efendim de kocamıştır 
dierek içinden güldü.”

Yaratılış 17:15-17; 18:11-12.

V.2. Avram/İbrahim Sonrası Hititler

C. Texier’in Kaleminden Yazılkaya’daki IV. Tuthaliia Kabartması
VI. Musa’nın İkinci-Beşinci Kitabı ve Hititler


VI.1. Hitit ve Tevrat Yasaları

Tevrat’taki yasalar Çıkış’ın 20. bölümünden itibaren başlar. Musa’nın Çıkış kitabında yer alan Tevrat yasaları, kısasa kısas uygulaması ve diğer bazı maddeler açısından Sami yasalarına benzemekle birlikte şekil ve suçun tasarlanıp maddeleştirilmiş noktalarında Hitit yasalarıyla birbiri örtüşmektedir. Hitit ve Tevrat yasalarının benzerliklerinin ele alınıp değerlendirilmesi gerektiğini daha önce ‘Hitit Yasaları’ adıyla Türkçe’ye çevrilmüş kitabın girişinde Batı Hititolog da söylenecekti47. Dolayısıyla Tevrat ve Hitit yasalarında görülen benzer kanun maddelerinden bir kısmını kısaca söyle sıralamak mümkündür:

## Çocuk Düşürme

| 40. ((ták-ku MUNUS-aš EL-LI šar-hu-wa-an-du-uš-šu-šu ku-iš-ki p[(é-e)] š-[(ši-ia)]-zi | “Eğer adamlar kavgada edip bir gebe kadına çarparlar ve onun çocuğunu düşürtürse ve bir zarar olmazsa kocasının kendi üzerine tayin edeceği gibi tazmin edecek ve hâkimler vasıtasıyla verecektir. Fakat zarar olursa, o zaman can yerine can, göz yerine göz, diş yerine diş el yerine el, ayak yerine ayak, yanık yerine yanık, yara yerine yara, bere yerine bere vereceksin Çıkış 21:22-25.”

Eğer herhangi biri hür bir kadının meyvesini (çocuğunu) attırsa (düşürtürse) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|

## Adam Yaralama


Eğer bir adam erkek kölesini ya da cariyesini kör ederse ya da [(dişini)] kırarsa |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| 20. [(10)] GÍN KÙ.BABBAR pa-a-i pár-na-aš-še-e-a šu-wa-a-iz-zi | |

on şeqel gümüş verir. (Böylece yaptığı kötülüğü) evinden kaldıır.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hırsızlık</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 26. **ták-ku** **GUD.MAH** *ku-iš-ki ta-ia-az-zi*  
> “Eğer bir adam öküz çalarsa”  
| 35. **ták-ku** **UDU.A.LUM** *ku-iš-ki ta-ia-az-zi*  
> “Eğer bir adam koyun çalarsa” |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hayvanların Başkasının Tarlasına Girmesi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6. **[(ták-ku)]** **GUDHL̃A.A.ŠÀ- ni pa-a-an-zi BE-EL A.ŠÀ [(ü)]-e-mi-ia-zi**  
> “Eğer sığırlar tarlaya girer (ve) tarla sahibi (onları tarlasında otlar) bulursa” |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kundaklama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 22. **[(ták-ku pa-ah-hur A-NA A.SÀ-SU k)]**u-ıš-ki pé-e-da-i nu mi-ia-an-da-an  
> “Eğer ateş (yakıp) biri, (başkasının) tarlasına (onu) sıçratırsa ve (ates, başak dolu ekin alamına)” |
| 23. **[(tar-na-a-i A.SÀ lu-uk-ki-ız-zi)]**i ku-ıš-sa-at lu-uk-k-ız-zi  
> “Eğer ateş çıkıp dikenlere varırsa ve demet yiğinleri yahut ekin yahut tarla yanarsa atesi tutuşturan mutlaka ödeyecektir” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hayvanlarla Cinsel İlişkiler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 20. ták-ku **LÚ-îš GUD-as kat-ta** [wa-aš-t]a-i hu-ur-ki- i[ l a-ki-aš]  
Eğer bir adam sığırla gü[nah iş]lerse rezalettir, o ölsün. |
| 23. tá[(k-k)]u [(LÚ)-îš (UDU-as kat-ta) wa-aš-t]a-i hu-ur-ki-ı[ l a-ki-aš]  
| 16. ták-ku **ŠAH UR.ZÍR-aš kat-ta** ku-iš-ki wa-aš-ta-i a-ki-aš  
Eğer domuz (ve) köpekle biri suç işlerse o ölsün. |
| 23. ták-ku **LÚ-aš ANŠE.KUR.RA-i na-aš-ma ANŠE.GİR.NUN.NA kat-ta**  
Eğer bir adam at ya da katırla |
| 24. wa-aš-ta-i **Ú-UL ha-ra-tar**  
suç işlerse ceza gerektiren bir durum değildir. |

“Hayvanla her yatan mutlaka öldürülecektir  
Çıkış: 22:19.”

“Hiçbir hayvanla kendini murdar etmek için yatmayacaksın ve bir kadın hayvanla yatmak için onun önünde durmayacaktır, rezalettir  
Leviler: 18:23.”

“Bir hayvanla yatan adam mutlaka öldürülecektir; hayvanı da öldüreceksiniz  
Leviler 20:15.”

“Bir kadın bir hayvana yaklaşmak üzere onun yanına giderse kadın ve hayvanı öldüreceksin, mutlaka öldürülecekler ve kanları kendi üzerinde olacaktır  
Leviler 20:16.”

“Herhangi bir hayvanla yatan **lanetli olsun**  
Tensiye 27:21.”
Yakın Akrabalarla Cinsel İlişkiler

26. 
[(ták-ku LÚ-iš a-pé-e-e-l(l-pát)] an-na-ša-aš kat-ta wa-aš-ta-i
[(Eğer bir adam öz annesi ile günah işlerse,

27. hu-u-u[r-k]-i-il ták-ku
L[(Ú)-iš] DUMU.MUNUS-aš kat-ta wa-aš-ta-i
27. rezalettir. Eğer bir adam kızı ile günah işlerse,

hu-u-ur-ki-il
28. rezalettir. Eğer bir adam oğluya günah işlerse, rezalettir.

49. ták-ku LÚ-aš MA-HAR
DAM ŠEŠ-SU še-eš-ki-iz-zi
ŠEŠ-ŠU-ma
49. Eğer bir adam erkek kardeşinin karısı ile yatar ve erkek kardeşi

50. hu-u-iš-wa-an-za hu-ur-ki-il
50. hayatta ise rezalettir.

“Babasının karısı ile yatan babasının çıplaklığını açmıştır, ikisi de mutlaka öldürülecektir Leviler 21:11.”

“Babasının karısı ile yatan lanetli olsun Tensiye 27:20.”

“Babasının kızı ya da anasının kızı olan kızkardeşi ile yatan lanetli olsun Tensiye 27:22.”

“Kadınla yatar gibi erkekle yatmayacaksın Leviler 18:22.”

“Bir adam kardeşinin karısını alırsa, murdardır. kardeşinin çıplaklığını açmıştır, çocukusuz olacaktır Leviler 20:21”

Bu kanun maddelerini genel manada şöyle değerlendirmek mümkündür.


- Tasarlanmış kanun paragrafları hem Hitit ve hem de Tevrat’ta çok özlü bir şekilde ifadelendirilmiştir.

- İki yüze yakın Hitit kanun paragrafi içinde ve Tevrat’ta Çıkış, Levililer ve Tesniye bölümlerine serpiştirilmiş olarak rastlanan ‘çocuk düşürme, adam yaralama, hırsızlık, hayvanların başkalarının tarlasına girmesi, kundaklama, hayvanlarla ve yakın akrabalarla cinsel ilişkiler’ ile ilgili suçlar çok yakın benzerlikler içerir.

W. J. Hamilton’un Çizimiyle Alacahöyük

48 Whitley 1963, 43 vd.
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- Sami yasalardan olan Hammurabi kanunlarında akrabalar arası uygunsuz ilişkilere sürgün, suya atılma ve para cezası verilirken\(^{49}\) bu eylemlerin Tevrat’taki cezai müeyyidesi Hitit yasallarıyla aynıdır, yani ölümdür.

- Hitit yasalarında yakın akrabalar ve hatta hayvanlarla böyle uygunsuz eylem için *hurkil* - ‘rezalet/lanet\(^{50}\)* ifadesi kullanılmıştır. Aynı eylem Tevrat’ta\(^{51}\) da γυναικός/ ‘rezalet/iğrenç/lanet/kendini kirletmek’ kelimesiyle karşılanmıştır.


\(^{49}\) Tosun-Yalvaç 1975, 200.

\(^{50}\) Imparati 1992, 172 vd.


\(^{52}\) Friedrich 1952, 162.; Güterbock-Hoffner 1997, 290.

\(^{53}\) Imparati 1992, 36 vd.

VII. Sonuç

Görüldüğü üzere yeri geldiğinde, tarih kitabının mahiyetinde eskiçağ dünyasının sosyo-kültürel yapısını çözümelemek -kısımsız da olsa- Tevrat’a ve Tevrat’ı anlamak ve anlamlandırabilmek de çoğu kez çiviyazılı belgelere müracaat edilmekle mümkün olabilmektedir. Nitekim İbrahim’in torunu olan Yakup’un, kayınpederinin evinden iki karısı ve elde ettiği tüm mal varlığı ile ayrılanak kayınpederine ait aile ilahlarının çalınması olayını da çiviyazılı belgelerin nasıl aydınlattığı gösterilmişti. Dolayısıyla bu ilahların damad tarafından ele geçirilmesinin, damadın öz evlat olarak telakki edileceği ve mirastan pay alabileceği anlamına geldiğini E. Chiera daha önce ifadelendirmişti.

Yine Tevrat’ta, İbrahim’in karısı Saray/Sara’nın çocuğu olmadığını dönemde Mısırlı cariye Hacer için İbrahim’e ‘rica ederim cariyemin yanına gir, belki ondan çocuklarını olur’ şeklinde bir ifadeyi bulunması ve bu cümlede ‘çocuklarım’ sözcüğünü kullanması ancak çiviyazılı belgelerle açığa kavuşturulabilir kanaatindeyim. Nitekim İbrahim’in yaşadığı dönemde yaklaşık yüz elli yıl önceden bilinen İsin kralı Lipit-İştir tarafından konulmuş bir yasa bu olayı çözümlüyor: ‘Eğer (birinin) ilk karısı ölürse, karısından sonra cariyesini karılığa alırsa ilk karısının çocukları onun varisleridir. Cariyesinin efendisine doğurduğu çocuklar (onun kendi) çocuğu gibidir, evde yetişeceklerdir.’ Dolayısıyla Tevrat’taki İbrahim ile karısının da bu hukuka göre hareket ettiği anlaşılmaktadır.

Örnekleri çoğaltmamız mümkündür ama bu kadarının meramımızı anlatmada kâfi geldiği düşündesindeyim.

55 Yaratılış 31.
56 Chiera 1996, 79.
57 Yaratılış 16:1-3.
58 Tosun-Yalvaç 1975, 67.
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TYPOLOGIES OF SETTING PARAGRAPH DIVIDERS IN THE HITTITE TEXTS

Tomoki KITAZUMI*

Introduction

A paragraph divider is a physical feature on a clay tablet. In contrary to column dividers, it runs parallel to the texts. In most cases, the length of the ruling corresponds to the width of the column or the tablet. Its perception can be only optical; that means, it cannot be converted into acoustic language.

The paragraph divider is however not a simple tool to divide a composition into distinct units. It enables us to enhance the legibility and readability of a given text for much clearer structural information. Our cognitive process becomes faster, smoother, and more convenient. In this sense it plays a special role as a part of typography, the process of text arrangement. As formulated by Bringhurst (2008: 17), “[t]ypography exists to honor content”. The paragraph dividers belong to such graphical cues and serve to achieve the understandability at the highest. Its usage seems to be quite consequent

1 This article is a part of results from my master’s theses “Untersuchungen zu den Paragraphenstrichen in den hethitischen Texten”, which I submitted in July 2013. I would like to thank my supervisors, Prof. J. Klinger and Prof. em. M. Meier-Brügger. I am grateful to the audiences at the congress for further impetus as well. I would like to express my sincere thanks to Prof. M. Geller for correcting my English with care. Of course, the responsibility for any mistakes remains solely on mine.
2 For the extensive study of physical features of Hittite tablets, I refer to the dissertation of Waal (2015).
3 For exceptions, see Hagenbuchner-Dresel 1999: 60-61 fn. 40.
5 According to Tinker (1963: 122), indentation at the beginning of a paragraph increases the legibility up to 7%. The experiment is of 1940, and today we would carry out better experiment for such eye-tracking. But the fact “increasing of the legibility” would remain still valid today.
regardless of text genres.\textsuperscript{6} It is a well-established scribal convention\textsuperscript{7} among the scribes in the Hittite Empire.

Despite their abundance in the Hittite texts (or because of this very reason?), the issue was never investigated in a satisfactory manner. Philologists, who work(ed) on text editions, have surely seen occasional deviations and irregularities in the usage of paragraph dividers. But such anomalies are simply noted in footnotes and rarely further commented. Here are some examples:

- Beckman (1983: 44 with fn. b): CTH 430: Birth ritual
  “The paragraph stroke is double for the last third of its original length.”
- Singer (1984: fn. 12.): CTH 628: KI.LAM-festival
  “Division line in D.”
  „Danach Paragraphenstrich!“
- Taracha (2000: 54-55 with fn. 182): CTH 448.4: Ritual for the Sun-goddess of the earth
  „Der Abschnittstrich ist fehlerhaft mitten im Satz gesetzt.“
- Weidner (1923: 60-63 with fn. k): CTH 53: Treaty between Šuppiluliuma I of Ḫatti and Tette of Nuḫašše
  „Zwischen Z. 20 und 21 im Original irrtümlich eine Zwischenzeile.“
  “dividing line here!”

It is obvious that some editors are stumbled by the unexpected occurrence of some paragraph dividers. Nevertheless, it does not disturb the understanding of the respective text as a whole. Hence, there was no necessity to thematize the problem. No one has made any compilation of such materials to check if there are comparable text passages or not. Indeed, the fact “they [= paragraphs

\textsuperscript{6} On tablets without any paragraph dividers, see Waal 2015: 109-111.

\textsuperscript{7} I follow Gelb (1980: 8) for the definition of “convention”: “the signs used by some individuals can be understood and reacted to by others.”
marked by rules on the tablets] differ from tablet to tablet”⁸ became a too
self-evident axiom to be questioned. It may appear to be superfluous to
undertake a study of paragraph dividers. However, there are three reasons
which make their investigation worthwhile.

(1) There is a serious deficiency of studies concerning paragraph dividers.
To my knowledge, Cancik (1979) and Justus (1981) are the only
attempts to examine this issue.⁹ However, they do not treat a sufficient
amount of sources to make convincing generalizations. An extensive
study is necessary in view of the ample Hittite text corpus.

(2) The above mentioned articles give at least a starting point for further
thoughts. The method is discourse grammar, i.e. how the paragraph
dividers are used to regulate the discourse direction of a certain text.
Cancik has suggested making use of Textwissenschaft oriented by
syntactic analysis. There is growing interest in syntactic analysis among
linguists working on Anatolian languages for a better understanding of
the discourse of texts.¹⁰ The paragraph dividers organize a text in distinct
meaningful units, so that one can easily recognize the discourse of
each paragraph.¹¹ For this reason, the study is justified from a linguistic
perspective as well.

(3) Last but not least, I would like to mention the voluminous study of
Waal, which focuses on the physical features (and colophons) of the
tables from the Hittite Empire. In accordance with her term “physical
feature”, I would like to coin the term “mental feature” to analyze what
may happen in the brain by the use of the paragraph dividers. The
following contribution does not contradict her work, but rather aims to
be mutually complementary.

⁸ As laconically stated by Güterbock (1980: 42 fn. 9).
⁹ One may also consult Hoffner 2009: 47-48. (1.2.8.4. Paragraph Dividers)
¹⁰ A very eclectic list from last 5 years: Becker 2014, Brosch 2014 and 2015, Goedegebure 2014, Melchert
¹¹ Cf. Cancik 1979: 84 „Diese textkonstituierenden optischen Zeichen und ihr Ort in der Evolution der mensch-
lichen Informationsverarbeitung sind der Gegenstand dieses Versuches“.
The following contribution has its aim to shed some light on the usage of paragraph dividers based on Hittite texts. I will discuss their general typologies by means of some selected texts to clarify the use and function of the paragraph dividers as a discourse organizer.

Method and Result

Taking the summary of results beforehand, the following typologies can be determined.

(1) Positive vs. Negative
(2) Expected, but negative
(3) Unexpected, but positive

With “positive”, I mean that the paragraph divider is present in a text, and with “negative”, it is absent. In view of the amount of text materials, these are established inductively.

(1) Positive vs. Negative

The texts should clearly show that the scribes needed to think when to make a paragraph divider or not. We can observe such decisions through texts with multiple copies and duplicates. This variability of one text with diverging copies is the key. If one copy has a paragraph divider on a certain place, but not the other(s), then we look for its reason. In sum, there are three patterns: (a) categorical variability (b) structural parallelism (c) *verba dicendi*.

(a) Categorical variability

A certain paragraph has one theme, which is however perceived as two or more themes by a different scribe. It depends on how the scribe categorize a certain phenomenon as one unit or more.
Hittite Laws § 151 (Text aa obv. II 24-25) - § 152 (obv. II 26-27)12


25 [ták-ku ... k]u-iš-ki ku-uš-ša-ni-ez-zi A-NA ITU.I⁰ KAM 1/2 GÍN K[Ú. BABBAR pa-a-i]

_______________________________ (not in Ms. x, but in Mss. aa, c, q)


27 [A-NA ITU.]I⁰ KAM I GÍN KÚ.BABBAR pa-a-i

“If anyone rents a plow ox, [he shall pay] one shekel [of silver] for one month. [If] anyone rents a [cow, he shall pay] a half shekel of silver for one month.” (§)

“If anyone rents a horse, a mule or an ass, he shall pay one shekel of silver for one month.”

In Ms. x, the paragraph divider in the middle is absent. It is obvious that all the animals are simply categorized as labor force by the scribe of Ms. x. The older version takes the plow ox and cow separately, treating it as a special case, while other manuscripts treat the other animals under the same category.

CTH 375.1.A: Prayer of Arnuḫanda I. and Ašmunikkal to the Sun-goddess of Arinna

KUB 17.21++ rev. III13

3 … na-at-za ar-ḫa šar-ri-i[(r)]

4 ^LÚ.MEŠ^ SANGA šu-up-pa-e-ša-za ^LÚ.MEŠ^ SANGA ^MUNUS.MEŠ^ AMA.

5 ^DINGIR⁶[^MÚ.⁴[^MEŠGUDU]⁴]`

6 ^LÚ.MEŠ^ NAR ^LÚ.MEŠ^ iš-ḫa-ma-ta-[[(l)u]-]lu-uš ^LÚ.MEŠ^ MUḪALDIM

6 ^L[Ú.M]⁶[NINDA.DÙ.DÙ] ^LÚ.MEŠ^ APIN.LÁ ^LÚ.MEŠ^ NU.⁶ GIŠ KIRI⁶ ar-ḫa

“And they divided them up among themselves. (§) They divided up the priests, the priestesses, the anointed ones, the musicians, the singers, the cooks, the bakers, the plowmen, and the gardeners, and they made them their servants. (§) They divided up your cattle and your sheep; they shared out your fallow lands, the source of the offering bread, and the vineyards, the source of the libations, and the Kaška-men took them for themselves.”

The scribe of Ms. A divided the booty-list into two paragraphs: the first one containing human booty, whereas the second one other objects (animals and fields) respectively, while the scribe of the Ms. B lumped everything together.

The same applies to the lists of divinities and geography.

CTH 381.A: Muṣattalli’s prayer to the Assembly of gods
KUB 6.45++ obv. I 40-42

CTH 375.1.A: Prayer of Arnuṣanda I. and Ašmunikkal to the Sun-goddess of Arinna

---

In the list of divinities, line 40 contains the deities of the city Šamuḫa, whereas the lines 41-42 contain the ones of another category, which may reflect the geographical understanding of scribe. The first half seems to be located within the river Marassantija, and the second half after the paragraph divider in B outside of it. But our research on Hittite geography is on-going. For this reason, I leave the question open.

These examples show deviations among the copies and duplicates, caused by different interpretations of the scribes of respective texts. The reason for choosing the terminology “categorical” is based on the fact that each scribe may “categorize” a discursive unit into another unit(s), or vice versa.

b) Structural parallelism

The situation is of more linguistic nature, recognizable through more or less similar grammatical structure.

CTH 360: Appu and his two sons

Text 1 rev. IV 4-12

---


16 Siegelová 1971: 12 fn. 46. In spite of the very fragmentary state of the tablet, the position of the paragraph divider is clear. Translation adopted from Hoffner 1998: 84.
Brother ‘Wrong’ said to Brother ‘Right’: “Let us part and settle down in different places.” Brother ‘Right’ said [to Brother ‘Wrong’]: “Then who [ . . . ]?” (§) Brother ‘Wrong’ said to Brother ‘Right’: “Since the mountains dwell separately, since the rivers flow in separate courses, as the very gods dwell separately – I say these things to you:’”

The paragraph divider in Ms. 9 makes the syntactic parallelism clear, even though some words need to be restored. Both paragraphs in Ms. 9 begin with an identical sentence. “Brother ‘Wrong’ said to Brother ‘Right’.”

And below, one example from Hurrian corpus.

CTH 777.6.A: Mouth washing ritual
ABoT 37++ (= ChS 1/1 No. 19) rev. IV 7-14

7 šum-mi tar-šu-ya-an-ni-bi a[((š-ḫu-ši-ik-ku-un-ni-ni-bi MUNUS ta-du-ḫé-pa-a-bi)]

8 [(še-ḫ)]a-lu-la-a-eš ka-aš-lu-l[(a-a-eš it-ku-la-a-eš e-ku-uš-šu-la-a-eš)]
9 [(aš-ḫ)]u-si-ik-ku-un-ni MU[(NUS ta-du-ḫé-pa-an) DINGIR MEŠ-na-a-ša a-a-bi-da]
Our knowledge of the Hurrian language is limited, but structural similarity is evident. The paragraphs begin in the same manner, and end as well.

Interestingly, there must have been a scribe who had some idea of layout. Consider the following case:

Hittite Laws § 181

Text p obv. II 42-47

42 ŠA ANŠE.KUR.RA.NÍTA Ū ŠA I ANŠE.KUR.RA.MUNUS.AL.LÁ ša-ú-i-ti-iš-ta-aš
43 IV GÍN KÙ.BABBAR ŠI-IM-ŠU <ŠA> IV MA.NA URUDU I GÍN KÙ.BABBAR ŠI-IM-ŠU
44 ŠA I zi-pát-ta-ni İ.DUGH.GA II GÍN KÙ.BABBAR ŠA I zi-pát-ta-ni
45 İ.ŠAH I GÍN KÙ.BABBAR ŠA I zi-pát-ta-ni İ.NUN I GÍN KÙ.BABBAR
46 ŠA I zi-pád-da-ni LÀL I GÍN KÙ.BABBAR ŠA II GA.KIN.AG [I GÍN KÙ.BABBAR]
47 ŠA III EM-ṢÚ I GÍN KÙ.BABBAR ŠI-IM-ŠU

Text x₁+₃ obv. I 8-15

8 [Š]A ANŠE.KUR.RA.NÍTA ANŠE.KUR.RA.MUNUS.AL.LÁ IV GÍN KÙ.BABBAR
9 [ŠI-IM-ŠU ŠA IV MA.NA URUDU I GÍN[.GÍ]N KÙ.BABBAR ŠI-IM-ŠU

₁₈ Hoffner 1997: 144-145.
“The price of a weaned colt (or) a weaned filly is 4 shekels of silver. The price of 4 minas of copper is one shekel of silver, (§) of one bottle of fine oil is 2 shekels of silver, of one bottle of land is one shekel of silver, of one bottle of butter/ghee is one shekel of silver, of one bottle of honey is one shekel of silver, of 2 cheeses is one shekel [of silver], of 3 sourdough is one shekel of silver.”

If we compare the lower text to the upper one, the legibility is evident. Ms. p is written in a prosaic way, whereas Ms. x lists up the prices like a memorandum. And I assume that the scribe of Ms. x had a Vorlage in front of him for copying. This kind of listing during a dictation would be difficult.

HKM 30 4-10

4 ŠA LÚ KÚR-mu ku-it ut-tar
5 ḫa-at-ra-a-eš nu.za PA-NI LÚ KÚR
6 me-ek-ki pa-ah-ḫa-aš-nu-an-za e-eš
7 ŠA ANŠE.KUR.RA-ma-mu ku-it ut-[ar]
8 ḫa-at-ra-a-eš nu-mu ka-a
9 ANŠE.KUR.RA MEŠ ku-iš-ki kat-ta-an
10 na-an-da up-pa-ah-ḫi

19 For the interpretation of this Akkadogram as “sourdough”, see Fritzsche 2011, and esp. 36-38 for this passage.
20 And the idea of this “listing” must have come to the mind of the scribe a bit later, since the foregoing paragraphs 179-180 are written prosaically. And in this text, §§ 179-180 are even in one paragraph.
“Concerning what you wrote to me about the enemy: Be very much on your guard against the enemy! Concerning what you wrote to me about chariotry: Some chariotry is here with me. I will send them to you.”

Hoffner (2009: 56) notes that the scribe Ḫašammili fails to draw a paragraph divider before line 7. But in view of his other letters (i.e. HKM 17, 19, 36), he tends to draw a paragraph divider after at least 4 lines, except for some formulaic greetings and two exceptions. The structural parallelism could operate in line 4 and 7, but it seems his personal preference finally won out here.

c) verba dicendi (+ oracle)

The verbs of saying like mema- or te-/tar- belong here. The scribes had to decide whether to write the act of speech together with the speech itself or not.

Between paragraph dividers

CTH 701.b₁: Libation for the throne of Ḫebat

KUB 32.44 (= ChS 2 No. 27) obv. II 1-3

1 [nam-ma]-az I NINDA.SIG da-a-i ḫur-li-li-ma me-m[(a-i)]

2 [ú-la-ap g]i-lum-ma dḤé-pát dŠar-ru-um-ma še-ni-e[š-še-i]-e-[ni]

3 [ge-el-te]-i-e-ni ku-la-a-am-mu-ur-ši-i-e-ni

“[Further,] he (i.e. the AZU-Priest) takes a thin bread and says in Hurrian: (§) (Hurrian incantation)”

Not between paragraph dividers

CTH 701.b₂.A: Libation for the throne of Ḫebat

---

22 Greetings with max. 3 lines: HKM 17 1-3, HKM 19 1-3 and 26-28, HKM 30 1-3, HKM 36 1-2. Paragraph with 3 lines: HKM 19 23-25 and HKM 30 15-17, i.e., 7 out of 32 paragraphs in these four letters written by Ḫašammili. But the greeting formulas are an already fixed form and cannot be longer, so that they are statistically not significant.

KBo 19.136 (+) VBoT 4 (= ChS 1/2 No. 31) obv. I 15’-17’24
15’ … na-aš-ta ḫ.GIŠ DUG GAL A an-da za-ap-nu-zi
16’ ḫur-li-li-ma me-ma-i a-aš-še-es ḫ.X-up šu-ú-ni-ip ši-ja-i
17’ a-ḫar-ra-i ú-na-am-ma ge-el-te-ni am-ba-aš-ši-ni gi-lum

“Then he drips the sesame oil into the cup and says in Hurrian: (Hurrian incantation)”

The speech-part has honor to have its own paragraph, but sometimes not. And the same phenomenon can be observed in Akkadian25, Luwian26, Palaic27, and Hattic28 texts. Therefore, the usage of paragraph dividers as “marking off direct speech” as suggested by Mabie29 seems to be limitedly valid, at least for Hittite texts. One might entertain with the possibility that the short(er) dictum is written following the verb of speech act, and the longer one get its own. But the very above mentioned examples contradict with this. Again, it confirms that a discourse separation by a paragraph divider relies on the pragmatic decision of each scribe.

Hoffner (2009: 48) wrote that the paragraph lines are like the ones which we have today. I note however two cases, which stand against our norm. (The speech part is underlined by me.)

CTH 344.A: The Song of Kumarbi30
KBo 52.10 + KUB 33.120 + KUB 33.119 + KUB 48.97 + KUB 36.31 obv.
I 27-36
27 … ḫ.A-nu-uš
29 ḫ.du-uš-ki-iš-ke-et-ta LÚ-na-tar-mi-it-ya ku-it pa-aš-ta

25 Ex. KUB 4.47 rev. 33ff. and in the same text rev. 20-27.
27 Ex. KBo 19.153 rev. 4’-8’ and KUB 33.165 rev 21’-24’.
28 Ex. KUB 27.75 obv. II 3-6.
29 Mabie 2004: 293 with fn. 7.
30 Rieken et al. (ed.): hethiter.net/: CTH 344 (TX 2012-06-08, TRd 2009-08-31), translation adopted from Hoffner 1998: 42-43.
Anu turned around and spoke to Kumarbi: “Are you rejoicing within yourself because you have swallowed my ‘manhood’? (§) Stop rejoicing within yourself! I have placed inside you a burden. First, I have impregnated you with the noble Storm God. Second, I have impregnated you with the irresistible Aranzaḫ River. Third, I have impregnated you with the noble Tašmišu. (And) two (additional) terrible god I have placed inside you as burdens. In the future you will end up striking the boulders of Mount Tašša with your head!””

CTH 324.1.A: The disappearance of Telipinu (mugaṣar)31
KBo 55.8 + KUB 17.10 obv. I 23’-27’

31 Rieken et al. (ed.): hethiter.net/: CTH 324.1 (TX 2012-06-08, TRde 2012-06-08), translation adopted from Hoffner 1998: 15.
Search the deep valleys. Search the Blue Deep.” The eagle went.”

In the first example, Anu is threatening Kumarbi. By the quotative particle -\textit{ua}, we can recognize that the direct speech by Anu continues from the line 28 to 36. But a paragraph divider stands after the first two sentences, and his speech continues even after the paragraph divider. One would expect that the entire speech stands alone as a new paragraph, or it remains together with the preceding sentence(s). But the direct speech goes beyond the paragraph divider. In the second example, only the first sentence is marked with a quotative particle; however, its use is not obligatory.\textsuperscript{32} I do not have any reason to doubt that the imperative order of the Sun-god to the eagle continues from the line 24’ to 26’. The divider only indicates the transition of focus from the sun-god to the eagle. The duplicate has the paragraph divider in the same place. It seems that such cutting off a speech in its middle did not bother the scribes.

As these examples show, the use of paragraph dividers is consistent but not the usage. If it is really a marker of logical – i.e. objectively ascertainable reasoning – units, as it is often claimed\textsuperscript{33}, there would have been no deviation(s) among the copies and duplicates. The excerpts presented here are of course selective, and it is not possible to go through all the cases which I compiled in appendix 1. The use of the paragraph dividers in the Hittite texts is pragmatic and relies on the intuition of individual scribes. For this reason, it is not possible to find out a strict rule for its setting, but the general tendency can be determined. Recognizing such a regularity is sufficient enough in view of the following statement of Givón (1979: 28): “What is the communicative difference between a rule of 90% fidelity and one of 100% fidelity? In psychological terms, next to nothing. In communication, a system with 90% categorical fidelity is highly efficient system.”

The solution to this “positive vs. negative” lies in the dichotomy “writer’s intention vs. readers’ recognition”. Becker suggested this principle,

\textsuperscript{32} Fortson 1998.

\textsuperscript{33} Cf. Mabie (2004: 293) “as a marker of distinct logical units” and Waal (2015: 107) “to divide the text in distinct logical units”.
reflecting a hot debate on the nature of paragraphs in 1965 and 1966 in the journal *College Composition and Communication*. With this I assume the following scenario: The scribe who composes a text draws paragraph dividers according to his taste. But another scribe (if not collectively a scribal group) who makes a copy of it does not necessarily follow the intention of the scribe of the Vorlage, and is free to make any changes. The readers’ recognition becomes the new writer’s intention, and this causes deviations.

Ad 2) Expected, but negative

One expects a paragraph divider, but it is missing, but to prove something is missing, is *a priori* difficult. For this reason, the text corpus selected here is lists: Inventories (CTH 241-250), Catalogues (CTH 276-282), Vocabularies (CTH 299-309), Cult inventories (CTH 501-530), Omens (CTH 531-560), and Vows (CTH 583-590). Because of the structural closeness of each entry, there is a good chance to detect such “missing” lines.

CTH 534.1.2: Solar omen

KUB 37.161 obv. 2'-rev. 1\(^{40}\) = KUB 4.63 rev. III 6-10\(^{41}\)

\begin{verbatim}
2' [(UD ŠÈ ITUŠ.U.NUMUN A)]N.T[(A.LÙ dUTU i)]t-UŠ u[(b-bu-tû)]
3' [(iš-tak-nu)] LUGAL.GAL BA.UŠ-ma [(KUR in-ne-e)]š-ši
4' [(UD ŠÈ l)]TU.NE.NE.GAR [(AN.TA.LÙ dUT)]U
5' it-UŠ mi-lum sa-ad[(-ru a-na)]
6' [(KUR GIN-m)]a BURU
\end{verbatim}

____________________________________________ (end of the column)

\(^{34}\) Becker in Irmscher 1966: 69.
\(^{35}\) Košak 1982.
\(^{36}\) Dardano 2006. Cf. the following comment as well: „Paragraphenstriche haben dabei die Funktion, jeden Eintrag der Liste klar abzugrenzen.“ (Dardano 2007-08: 171)
\(^{39}\) Otten-Souček 1965 and de Roos 2007.
\(^{40}\) Riemschneider 2004: 131.
\(^{41}\) Riemschneider 2004: 50 (text), 53 (translation), and 54 fn. 23.
“If a solar eclipse takes place in Tammuz: a famine is set, a great king will
die, the land will be eliminated. If a solar eclipse takes place in Abu: an
expected flood (comes) to the land, harvest will be prosper, a king will send
a peace-offering to the king.”

We expect a paragraph divider between the lines 3’ and 4’, because the
apodosis of the omen beginning in the line 2’ ends with [(in-ne-e)]š-ši. The
other duplicates have indeed the paragraph divider here.43

CTH 532.II.1.A: Lunar eclipse omen
KBo 13.15 (+) KUB 8.1 1’-6”44

1’ [ma-a-an] I-NA ITU XI (Text: XII)KAM UD X[IVKAM dX]XX-aš[ a-ki
2’ [ME-a]n-daLUGAL-uš LUGAL-i [t]u-ù-ši-
3’ [(ma-a-a)]n I-NA UD XVKAM dXXX-aš a-ki KUR-a[n-za]
4’ [ ]-ja ú-ša-an ḫar-zi nu-za a-pa-a-aš[
5’ [ ]x-zi nu LUGAL-uš a-ki I-NA GISP][ZA]-ŠU-ma-za-kán]
6’ [t]a-ma-iš ku-iš-ki e-ša-ri

“[If] the [m]oon dies on the 1[4th] day of 11th month: [ . . . ] will [ . . . fighti-
ng]. King will [ . . . ] a king in assem[bl]y’ . . . ] If the moon dies on the 15th
day: the land has seen’ [ . . . ] And that one[ . . . ] The king dies. Another one
will sit on [his] throne.”

Here we miss a paragraph divider between 2’ and 3’. These two attestations
are already noted by Riemschneider, in his posthumously published “Die
akkadischen und hethitischen Omentexte aus Boğazköy.”

42 As far as I can see from the picture in the Hethitologie Portal, the verb cannot stand in the obverse, but as the
first word in the reverse. A sentence stretching over columns is not trivial, but there are some attestations:
KBo 4.2 rev. III, KBo 5.1 rev. IV, KBo 5.9(+ )rev. III, KBo 6.34+ rev. IV, KBo 10.2 obv. II, KBo 15.37 rev.
24.5+ rev., KUB 53.11 rev. III., and probably KBo 3.4+ rev. IV and KBo 22.189 rev. VI.
43 KUB 4.63 rev. III 8, KUB 37.157 line 3’, and the Hittite translation KUB 8.11 line 4’.
44 Riemschneider 2004: 33-34.
45 Suggested by Neu 1968: 203-204 fn. 4.
CTH 585: Vow of Puduḫepa

Text S rev. III 8-11

8 É dXXX-wi₃-ia II MUNUS II DUMU.NITA ŠU.NIGIN IV SAG.D[(UMES)]

9 LÚ-aš-kán an-da NU.GÁL

(not in Ms. M)

10 É mGAL-li III LÚ V MUNUS ŠU.NIGIN VIII SAG.DU

11 ŠA₄ II LÚ I MUNUS ak-kán-za

“The house of Armawiya: 2 women (and) 2 boys; in total, 4 persons. There is no man.”

“The house of GAL-li: 3 men (and) 5 women; in total, 8 persons. Thereof, 2 men and 1 woman are dead.”

As the reason for these missing paragraph dividers, I suggest simply the scribe’s loss of concentration. Almost identical wording with syntactically similar sentences of these text genres and the routine nature of the job would have robbed the scribes of concentration. It sounds quite unprofessional for trained scribes but seems quite plausible as a practical reason. But this same reason would not apply to the following case.

Hittite Laws § 200a (text p rev. IV 23-27) - § 200b (rev. IV 27-31)

23 ták-ku LÚ-aš ANŠE.KUR.RA-i na-aš-ma ANŠE.GÌR.NUN.NA kat-ta

24 ya-aš-ta-i Ú-UL ḫa-ra-tar LUGAL-uš-aš Ú-UL ti-ez-zi

25 LÚSANGA-ša Ú-UL ki-i-ša ták-ku ar-nu-₃a-la-an [ku-iš-ki]

26 kat-ta še-eš-ki-iz-zi an-na-aš-ša-an n[e-]k[a-aš-ša-an-na ú-en-zi]

27 Ú-UL ḫa-ra-tar (§-divider in text x) ták-ku DUMU-an an-[na-nu-ma-] an-zi

28 ku-iš-ki pa-a-i na-aš-šu LÚNAGAR n[a-aš-ma LÚSIMUG.A L][UŠ.BAR

29 na-aš-ma LÚAŠGAB na-aš-ma LÚAZLAG n[u an-na-nu-um-m]a-aš

If a man sins (sexually) with either a horse or a mule, it is not an offence, but he shall not approach the king, nor shall become a priest. If anyone is regularly cohabiting with an arnuḫalaš-woman, and has intercourse with her mother and her sister, it is not an offence. (§) If anyone gives (his) son for training either (as) a carpenter or a smith, a weaver or a leather worker or a fuller, he shall pay 6 shekels of silver as (the fee) for training. If the teacher makes him an expert, (the student’s parent) shall give to him one person.”

Hoffner commented (1997: 158 fn. 567) “§ 200b begins immediately on the same line”, probably implying that a division is expected here, but missing. The sentences of the Law are not as similar to each other as are the lists or omens; therefore, it cannot be explained in the same manner as above. The text is close to the end, and indeed, the last paragraphs, so that it seems to be difficult to imagine that the scribe could not concentrate on his text, which could be more plausible in the middle part of the text. Since both § 199 and § 200a treat the case of sexual offences, they can be in a same paragraph, but not § 200a and § 200b, the latter dealing with a case concerning apprenticeship. Neither the content nor structural parallelism can be the reason for dividing them. The other exemplar Ms. x has a paragraph divider between § 200a and § 200b. After the § 200b in Ms. p, there is a double line, and then a blank space for ca. 22 lines. That means running out of a space is excluded as a possibility as well. Even if § 200b were added later, then the scribe could do better than continuous writing.

Ad 3) Unexpected, but positive

In contrast to the preceding one, we look for paragraph dividers which we do not expect, but they are present. Because what we understand as a meaningful unit does not agree with the understanding of the scribes, the criteria in regard to the contents seem difficult. Here we can work only on a grammatical level. The solution to this problem turns out to be astonishingly simple, they are subordinate clauses.
The cities in the territory which were promised to be relocated, (§) they have already relocated those cities.”

And as soon as I dispatched those tablets to Your Majesty, my lord, (§) early the following morning Nerikkaili, the man from Tapḫa[llu] awoke me …

When the livers are cooked, (§) the priest of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti breaks three moist breads of 30.”
21-23  \( \text{n} \text{u-}\text{un-na-ša-an} \text{\textsuperscript{d}UTU} \text{\textsuperscript{st}} \text{BE-}\text{LÍ-NI} \text{EGIR}\text{-pa ḫu-u-da-a-ak ḫa-at-ra-a-i} \)

“And because you, Your Majesty, our lord, initiated (the matter) with us separately, from the towns Tišaliya (and) Palḫišna, write us back immediately (and tell us) on which road we should seek these birds.”

CTH 262: Protocol for the royal body guard (\( \text{LÚ MEŠ MEŠEDI} \))\(^{52} \)

IBoT 1.36 rev. III 16-22

16  ... a-ra-aḥ-zi-ja-az ku-i\( \text{X} \text{LÚ ME-ŠE-DI ḫar-zi} \)

17  ma-a-ah-ha-an-\text{ma šar-kán-ti-in ta-ma-in ú-ya-te-ez-zi} \)


19  an-dur-za ta-pu-ša i-ja-an-ta

“But as soon as the bodyguard who holds the outside brings another petitioner, (§) then the two lords who stand behind the chief of the body guard march inside alongside the petitioner.”

The preceding clauses always have relative pronouns (6 cases), subordinating conjunctions (16 cases) or both (1 case, the last example).\(^{53} \) I wonder if it has to do with the prosodic/intonation system, making a kind of speech break before introducing the main clause.\(^{54} \) Such a break may well be the result of dictation, where the speaking person took a breathing pause which was perceived as the end of a sentence by the dictating scribe. The high occurrence of the letters, which we \textit{a priori} expect the verbal communication between the speaking person and the dictating scribe, seem to confirm this hypothesis. But it is notoriously difficult question in the linguistics dealing with dead languages. One should not venture a hasty conclusion.

There are four exceptions in this category. Since they lack comparable cases, each solutions remain only speculative.

\( ^{52} \) Güterbock–van den Hout 1991: 24; Miller 2013: 112-115.

\( ^{53} \) See Appendix 2 for all the attestations.

\( ^{54} \) For example in German, there is a speech break if a subordinate clause precedes its depending main clause.
TYPOLOGIES OF SETTING PARAGRAPH DIVIDERS

(a) CTH 433.2: Ritual for the Protective Deity of the Hunting-bag
KBo 17.105 + KBo 34.47 obv. II 31’-33’

31’ nu ki-iš-ša-an me-Ša-i dLAMMA KUŠkur-ša-aš dIMIN.IMIN.BI-aš-ša
32’ i-da-a-lu-un kar-di-mi-ja-at-ta-an ša-a-u-ya-ar ar-ḫa nam-ma
33’ pé-eš-ši-ja-tén …

“And she (=MUNUSŠU.GI) says the following: Protective Deity, KUŠkurša and the heptade, § Cast out the evil anger (and) fury again.

The deities before the paragraph dividers are in vocative, so that we would expect a break after the calling out of the names. The second person plural imperative form in the line 33’ supports that it is a form of addressing.

(b) CTH 488.4.1.b.D: Ritual for the Sun-goddess of the earth
KUB 7.10 obv. II 1-10

1 tar-pa-al-li-uš ANA GUNNI
2 ūa-ar-nu-an-zì
3 A-NA GUNNI-ma GU₄.MAḪ
4 ūa-ar-nu-ya-an-zì A-NA GUNNI-ma
5 UDU.ŠIR MĀŠ.GAL.SIR-ja
6 ūa-ar-nu-ya-an-zì A-NA I GUNNI-ma
7 ŠA MUNUS.LUGAL tar-pa-al-li-uš
9 ūa-ar-nu-[a-an-zì A-NA GUNNI-ma ]
10 ’UDU’.[„SIG+]M[UNUS“.NI[GA subdivisions with favor] UZ₆-ja² …

“They burn the substitutes in a fireplace. In a(nother?) fireplace, they burn a bull. In a(nother?) fireplace, § they burn a ram and a he-goat. In a(nother?) fireplace, they burn the substitutes of the queen. A fat cow? [ . . . they] bu[rn . . . In a(nother?) fireplace, they burn a fat?] sheep [and a goat?]”

57 Kümmel 1967: 130 reads tar-pa-al-li-uš <ANA> I GUNNI, maintaining the parallel construction.
Kümmel and Taracha, the editors of this text, noted that the paragraph divider is wrongly set in the middle of the sentence. The duplicates do not help either, since the corresponding places are broken. My suggestion is to move the paragraph divider between the lines 4 and 5 to between lines 2 and 3. In this way, we get parallel constructions (ANA GUNNI-ma – sacrificial animal – ṣarrnu₃u₃anzt) in the following lines. The direction of the discourse is grammatically marked by the particle -ma\(^{58}\), which is absent in the first line. It shows exceptional position of the GUNNI in this line and not to be treated on the same syntactical level as the other GUNNI-s. The restoration [ŠA LUGAL] at the end of column I by both editors seems to be motivated by the presence of the ŠA MUNUS.LUGAL in line 7. But it does not clarify the different word order, which is questionable.\(^{59}\) My suggestion for interpretation of the emendation of the paragraph divider would look like this:

1-2 They burn the substitutes in (each) fireplace:

3f. They burn a bull in a fireplace, they burn … (and so on.)

(c) CTH 284.2.T: Kikkuli-Text

KBo 3.5 + IBoT 2.136 obv. II 36-41\(^{60}\)

36 . . . EGIR-an-da 1/2 DANNA VII IKU-ja pār-ah-zi
37 ti-e-ra-u-ur-ta-an a-a-u-za-mi-e-ya₃₆₃₇₅₈
38 tar-kum-ma-an-zi-ma ki-iš-ša-an 1/2 DANNA VII IKU-ja
39 ḫal-zi-iš-ša-an-zi (erasure)
40 ma-ah-ḥa-an-ma-aš ar-ḥa la-a-an-zi na-aš u-e-te-ni-it
41 V-ŠU kat-kat-ti-nu-an-zi …

“He lets (the horses) gallop 1/2 mile and 7 field: ‘triu₃(a)rtan ăuzameya’. One translates (it) as follows: 1/2 mile and 7 field. They call ____ . § As soon as one unhitches them, one lets them massage five times with water.”

\(^{58}\) On its usage, see Melchert 2009.


\(^{60}\) Kammenhuber 1961: 90 fn. 69.
Kammenhuber thought that the paragraph divider stands on a wrong place. In reality, this paragraph divider is not set wrongly; nevertheless, one needs many additions, as was done by Starke.\footnote{Starke 1995: 73-74, but <šinišella> after tieraqūrtan in his emendation seems to be superfluous, therefore, omitted.}


“He lets (the horses) gallop 1/2 mile and 7 Field: They call (it) ‘triu(a)rtan<na> āuzameu̇a’. One translates (it) as follows: 1/2 mile and 7 field. They call it <3-times turn>.” §

These amendments are supported by the parallel sentences in the obv. I 44-48 in the same text, and the problem is solved.

(d) CTH 76.A: Treaty between Muqqattali II of Ḫatti and Alakšandu of Ŭiluša KBo 19.73a++ rev. III 18-23\footnote{Friedrich 1930: 70-71 with the join piece KBo 19.73a, translation adopted from Beckman 21999: 90. The syntax of the original Hittite sentence cannot be imitated in English. Therefore, I underline the verbs right after the paragraph dividers.}

18 ularyu\([(a-ká)]n \)HUL-la-u-ya-an-ni [kiš(-a)]n kiš-an-n[(a)]
19 zi-ik-ki-iz-[(z)]i KUR-e-ya-ták-kán ar-ḫa da-a-i
20 na-aš-ma-ya-at-[(ta)] HUL-la-u-ya-ah-zi-ma ku-it-ki [(zi-ik-ma a-pu-u-un)]
21 me-mi-an A-NA [(dyUTU)ši ku-it-ma-an ŠU-PUR nū ma-a-an me[(mi-ja-aš a-ša-a-an-zā)]
22 mu-ut-ta [(GIM-an) dyUTUši EGIS-pa ḥa-at-ra-a-m[(i z)i-i[(k-ma le-e)]
23 mu-un-ta[r-ši nū] ḫar-[pu] ša-ru-pa le-e i-ja-ši

“‘His Majesty is undertaking [su]ch and such to your disadvantage, and will ta[k] e the land away from you, or will mistreat you in some way,” write about the matter to My Majesty. And if the matter is true, when I, my [Maje]styt, write back to you, you shall not act rashly, nor do . . .”
Both paragraph dividers cut off verbs from the sentences, to which these verbs should belong. Friedrich (1930: 70 fn. 1 and 4) noted that these paragraph dividers are added later, and it consequently seems to be then a kind of emendations which the scribe made during the proofreading of the text. The intention of this ruling of paragraph dividers was probably like this:

18  dUTUŠI-ya-du-za[(a-ká)]n HUL-la-u-ua-an-ni [kiš(-a)]n kiš-an-n[(a)]
19  zi-ik-ki-iz-[(z)]i | KUR-e-ya-ták-kán ar-ḥa da-a-i
20  na-aš-ma-ya-at-[(ta)] HUL-la-u-ya-aḥ-zi-ma ku-it-ki [(zi-ik-ma a-pu-u-n)]
21  me-mi-an A-NA [(dUTU)]ŠI ku-it-ma-an ŠU-PUR nu ma-a-an me[(-mi-ia-aš a-ša-a-an-za)]
22  nu-ut-ta [(GIM-an) dUTUŠI EGIR-pa ha-at-ra-a-m[(i| z)]i-i[(k-ma le-e)]
23  nu-un-ta[r-ši nu] ḫar-[pu] ša-ru-pa le-e i-ja-ši

The scribe did not correct the text as we insert a paragraph correction today < ___|¯¯¯ >. This interpretation above is speculative due to the lack of other comparable textual attestations.

Further Thoughts

If we look at the relatively consistent use of these paragraph dividers, it seems quite plausible that this rulings on tablets seem to be well conventionalized. Together with learning a writing system, we learn the writing conventions as well, which require certain amount of practice. It is hardly possible that individual scribes used these paragraph dividers as a para-linguistic instrument on their own. However, I propose that the paragraph dividers were institutionally learned as a part of the curriculum in scribal schools. Whether it had a special designation as a punctuation mark, is another question.

63  It should be noted as well that such writing conventions and scribal habits of the Ancient Near East are not fully investigated. The obvious reason for this is due to the vast chronological and geographical frame of the cuneiform writing. For the format in its relation to the content, see Green 1981 (a sketchy account), Radner 1995 and 2011 (Neo-Assyrian), and Waal 2012 (Hittite).
64  Whether it had a special designation as a punctuation mark, is another question.
on the scribal curricula in the Ancient Near East, it is fruitful to investigate them on an individual level, i.e. among scribal schools. The quote of Gordon (1965: 24 fn. 1) seems to be timely: “A comprehensive study of the use of lines, with reference to scribal peculiarities, might reveal some significant results”.

A further question arises concerning the scribal schools: where then did the scribes in the Hittite scriptoria learn this convention? Interestingly, this system of paragraph dividers is intensively applied (and even more consistently than in other cuneiform culture areas) from the beginning of writing in the Hittite empire. As noted above, it had to be learned. It seems plausible that the origin of the Hittite cuneiform writing had comparable conventions. In view of the recent debate, Alalah VII is the first candidate for this. However, texts from there are mostly of economic and legal nature, which are in turn entirely missing in the Hittite empire. As long as we do not find corresponding texts from Alalah VII (or its vicinity in the North Syria), the origin of the Hittite cuneiform writing is still a mystery.

Justus (1981: 383) commented in her article “Visible sentences in Cuneiform Hittite”: “The ruling, however vague a clue, is our link with second millennium BC speaker intuition, and should not be disdained.” I have nothing to add this comment. The setting of the paragraph dividers show the diverse interpretations of scribes in the scriptoria of the Hittite Empire. Accordingly, their various and valuable ways of textual thinking are evident. The copies and duplicates deviating as such are not simply there to reconstruct an Urtext. They have their own history in the process of redaction. Just as orthographic variations are important for the phonological interpretation, and just as variations in grammatical forms and ductus are used for the dating of a text, we should regard these textual variations as clues to a better understanding of redaction history.

---

65 Waal 2010: 102 with fn. 330, also with the reference to Scheucher’s dissertation on lexical lists.
### Appendix 1: List of footnotes concerning the deviations of paragraph dividers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Footnotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBH 12</td>
<td>33 (2), 50 (23), 51 (34), 66 (7, 8, 11), 168 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBoT 1</td>
<td>17 (19a), 21 (41), 23 (9), 24 (13), 28 (8), 30 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBoT 3</td>
<td>59 (35), 61 (48, 53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBoT 8</td>
<td>32 (6), 38 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBoT 14</td>
<td>4 (4), 9 (33), 12 (46), 16 (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBoT 17</td>
<td>10 (A rev. 7’ = B rev. 22’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBoT 18</td>
<td>14 (19, 28), 15 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBoT 28</td>
<td>18 (12), 19 (19), 20 (24), 21 (27), 22 (2), 23 (8), 25 (14), 26 (4), 47 (4, 14), 48 (27, 28), 50 (37), 62 (6), 67 (44), 93 (7), 105 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBoT 29</td>
<td>88 (c, k), 90 (o), 96 (d), 126 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBoT 37</td>
<td>391 (4), 394 (3), 400 (3), 403 (3), 429 (8), 461 (5), 462 (3), 463 (6, 7), 507 (5), 510 (1), 521 (6), 522 (1), 524 (1), 539 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBoT 48</td>
<td>46 (199, 202), 184 (737), 186 (760, 764, 770), 190 (803), 192 (809), 202 (867, 872), 206 (882, 890)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THeth 2</td>
<td>20 (9), 22 (20), 42 (2), 43 (10), 46 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THeth 11</td>
<td>24 (b), 64 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THeth 25</td>
<td>138 (469, 475), 144 (501, 509), 279 (839, 841)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChS 1/1</td>
<td>57 (55, 58, 60), 58 (64), 69 (8, 15), 70 (19, 22, 26), 105 (49, 51’), 106 (10’), 107 (31’), 108 (34’), 109 (44’, 45’), 135 (21’’), 140 (11, 14), 156 (22’, 24’, 27’), 157 (36’, 37’), 158 (41’, 43’), 159 (7’, 10’), 161 (16), 162 (32, 35), 168 (14), 169 (29, 30), 175 (1’), 178 (9’, 11’), 179 (16’), 180 (17’, 4’), 184 (3), 188 (11, 12, 14, 17), 190 (1’, 4’, 5’, 6’), 193 (7’, 8’), 244 (27’), 245 (38’), 255 (7’), 259 (6’), 332 (5’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChS 1/2</td>
<td>39 (16), 49 (24), 73 (16), 76 (15’), 157 (26, 30), 174 (13’), 183 (3’), 200 (1’), 204 (3), 225 (15’, 17’), 227 (3’), 228 (17’), 233 (4’), 235 (10’), 242 (9’), 246 (5’), 251 (3’), 255 (9’), 256 (14’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

67 Numbers without bracket = page numbers; either numbers or alphabets in brackets = number or alphabets of the footnotes. But for ChS 1/1, ChS 1/2, ChS 1/4, ChS 1/5 and ChS 1/9: numbers in brackets = line numbers.
### TYPOLOGIES OF SETTING PARAGRAPH DIVIDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ChS 1/3</td>
<td>64 (206), 120 (325), 132 (348), 133 (350), 134 (352), 135 (353), 154 (395, 398), 157 (406, 409), 158 (413)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChS 1/4</td>
<td>167 (19), 182 (15')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChS 1/5</td>
<td>80 (9'), 94 (2'), 128 (44), 138 (28), 141 (6, 10), 145 (11'), 151 (10'), 154 (12), 155 (17), 271 (9), 276 (3, 9), 277 (10, 13, 16), 181 (6), 284 (5'), 285 (14'), 294 (9', 12'), 334 (2'), 406 (6'), 414 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChS 1/9</td>
<td>43 (45, 49, 50-51), 45 (21'-22'), 46 (49'), 47 (51'-52'), 48 (8), 49 (5', 11'), 82 (10-11), 83 (31), 187 (12'), 188 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich 1926</td>
<td>6 (2, 4), 116 (7), 117 (23), 136 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich 1930</td>
<td>50 (3), 68 (1, 3, 9), 70 (1, 4), 82 (5), 128 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glocker 1997</td>
<td>20 (84), 54 (128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffner 1997</td>
<td>114 (363, 364), 115 (367, 368), 120 (383), 124 (398), 126 (404, 405), 129 (419), 130 (424 = 425), 133 (441), 134 (452), 143 (495), 144 (505), 151 (535), 158 (567)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebrun 1980</td>
<td>95 (1, 8, 11), 101 (4, 5), 122 (1, 2), 123 (2), 124 (1, 2, 6), 134 (2), 136 (6), 137 (7, 8), 259 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMahon 1991</td>
<td>86 (12), 88 (21, 25, 28), 92 (37, 40), 94 (45, 47), 102 (83), 202 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Schuler 1957</td>
<td>41 (6), 44 (15, 18), 45 (2, 24), 46 (21), 47 (7, 12), 48 (13), 50 (3, 5), 51 (6, 11) [Cf. Pecchioli Daddi 2003]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer 1996</td>
<td>(only page numbers) 17, 18, 19, 22, 28, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strauß 2006</td>
<td>224 (21), 231 (52), 260 (109), 263 (135), 331 (298), 332 (303, 305), 338 (359)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taracha 2000</td>
<td>36 (73), 50 (124), 51 (140), 52 (160), 53 (172), 92 (294)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix 2: Sentences with an unexpected paragraph divider**

(1) Relative clause

(1-1) CTH 330: The Weather God of Kuliqũšna: *mugayar* and ritual

KBo 15.33 + KBo 15.35 rev. III 33-35

33-34 … *nu IŠ-TU HURT.ŠAGŠi-id-du-ya ku-it GİŞ-e-ja-ra-n [([ū-)]da-a)n-zi*

---


443
35  na-at IŠ-TU [(TUG.ÍB TA-)]ḪA-AP-ŠI iš-ki-ša-raz kar-apn-zi

(1-2) CTH 381.A: Prayer of Muṣatalli’s to the Assembly of gods
KBo 57.18 + KUB 30.14 + KUB 6.45 + Fragment obv. I 17-21
17  ... dUTU URUPŪ-na GAŠAN-[I]A Ū DINGIRMEŠ ḫu-u-ma-an-du-uš ŠA KUR URUKÜ.BABBAR-ti
18  ENME.ES LÚ SANGA-az ku-e-da-aš ŠA KUR URU Ḥa-at-ti-mu-kán
19  EN-UT-TA ḫu-u-ma-an-da-az ku-i-e-eš me-mi-iš-tén
20  ki-nu-na-mu DINGIRMEŠ am-me-el ŠA LÚ SANGA-KU-NU ĪR-KU-NU me-mi-an
21  ar-ku-ya-ar iš-ta-ma-aš-tén ...

(1-3) CTH 406: Ritual of Paškuṭatti from Arzāna against effeminacy
KUB 7.5 + KUB 7.8 + KUB 9.27 obv. II 55*-57
55 ... NINDA.GUR₄.RA-ja
56-57 ku-i-uš ka-ru-ú-ya-ri-ya-ar pár-ši-ja-an-na-ah-hi

(1-4) CTH 780.II.Tf05.B: Ritual of Allaiturahlī
KUB 24.13 (= ChS 1/5 No. 15) obv. II 9-10
9  al-ya-an-zi-na-aš ku-it ḪUL-lu ut-tar e-eš-še-še-ta
10  ar-ḥa-ták-kán an-ša-an e-eš-du al-ya-an-Za-tar an-da-an

(1-5) CTH 790: Fragment of Hittite-Hurrian ritual and incantation
KUB 58.88 + KUB 38.22 (= ChS 1/9 No. 84) obv. II 28-29
26-27 ... nam-ma-kán ENMEŠ SÍSKUR a-pé-e-da-aš A-NA ḪI.LA an-da pa- a-an-zi
28  ar-ḥa-ja-an ku-e ú-i-da-an
29-30 EN DINGIRLI₃₃-ma-kán a-pé-e-da-aš A-NA ḪI.LA [...] an′-da pa-iz-zi ...
(1-6) HKM 43\(^73\)

4’-5’ KUR-ja-kán \textit{ku-i-e-eš} an-da URU\textsuperscript{DIDLI.H.L.A} ar-nu-ma-an-zi\(^4\) ta-ra-a-an-te-eš

6’-7’ nu a-pu-u-uš URU\textsuperscript{DIDLI.H.L.A} ka-ru-ú ar-nu-er...

(2) Sentences with subordinate conjunctions \textit{māhhan}, \textit{mān} (and its Akkadian equivalent \textit{šumma} in the last example), \textit{kuit} (in the meaning of “because”):

(2-1) CTH 49.II: Treaty between Šuppiluliuma I of Ḫatti and Aziru of Amurru

KBo 10.12 + KBo 10.13 + KBo 42.73 obv. II 21’ff.\(^74\)

21’ … nu [\textit{m}a-a-an zi-ik \textit{m}A-zi-ra-aš

22’ [\textit{IŠ-TU} \textit{ÉRIN}\textsuperscript{MEŠ} \textit{ANŠE.KUR.RA}\textsuperscript{MEŠ} ša-ku-ṭa-ša-ri-it \textit{ZI}-ni-it

23’ [\textit{Ú-UL} n]e-ni-ik-ta-ti [\textit{n}a-an ša-ku-ṭa-ša-ri-it

24’ [\textit{ZI}-ni-it] \textit{Ú-UL} za-ah-ḥi-[\textit{i}]a-ši

25’ [\textit{n}u \textit{m}a]-a-an \textit{dUTUŠ} na-a[š-š]\(\text{u}) \text{DUMU.LUGAL [na-aš]-ma BE-LU GAL

26’ [\textit{IŠ-TU} \textit{ÉRIN}\textsuperscript{MEŠ} \textit{GIŠ.GIGIR}\textsuperscript{MEŠ}.ŠÚ tu-uk A-NA [\textit{m}A-z]\textit{i-ra

27’ [\textit{u}-a-ar-\(\text{r}i\] u-i-ja-mi

(2-2) CTH 76.A: Treaty between Muṣattalli II of Ḫatti and Alakšandu of Ūluša

KBo 19.73a++ obv. I 78’-81\(^75\)

78’ … \textit{m}[\textit{(a-)}\textit{a}][\textit{(-an tu-uk-ma \textit{m}A-)]l-a-ak-ša-an-d[(u-u)n ŠEŠ-KA

79’ [(\textit{n}a-a)š-(\textit{m}a ŠA MĂŠ-KA ku-iš-ki ūa-ak-k)]\textit{a}_4\textit{-ri-f[(a-zi)]}

80’ [(\textit{n}a-(aš-ma kat-ta DUMU-KA DUMU.DUMU\textsuperscript{MEŠ}-KA ku-iš-ki)] ūa-ak-

\textit{ka}_4\textit{-[(a-ri-ja-zi)] nu Š(A KU)]R \textit{URU Ūi}((-lu-ša)]

81’ [(LUGAL-iz-na-tar ša-an-ḥa-an-zi ...
(2-3) CTH 86: Decree of Ḫattušili III. concerning the property of Arma-Tarḫunta

KUB 21.17 rev. III 9’-12’

9 nu ma-ah-ḫa-an MU^KAM-za me-ḥur ti-ja-zi

10-11 še-li-aš šu-un-nu-ma-an-zi nu-kán BI-IB-RU ŠA dLIŠ URU Ša-mu-ḫi

12 URU Ha-at-tu-ša-za kat-ta ú-da-an-zi

(2-4) CTH 276: Tablet catalogue: DUB.x.KAM

KBo 31.8+ rev. IV 27-30

27-28 … ma<a>-an-kán I-NA É.DINGIR\LIM šu-up-pa pé-di ku-in im-ma

29 ku-in mar-ša-aš-tar-ri-in ú<-e>-mi-ja-an-zi

30 [n]u ki-i SÍSKUR-ŠU QA-TI

(2-5) CTH 330: The Weather God of Kuliqišna: mugḫar and ritual

KBo 15.33 + KBo 15.35 rev. III 14-18

14 … ma-ah-ḫa-an-ma

15 ŠA DINGIR\LIM uk-tu-u-ri ŠA ḤA.LA ḫu-ki-eš-šar túḫ-ḫu-uš-zi

16 nu-za-an ma-a-an LÚ EN É TIM ku-it-ki A-NA DINGIR\LIM ma-al-ta-an

17 ḫar-zi ma-a-an Ū-NU-TUM ku-it-ki ma-a-an GU₄ UDU

18 nu-uš-ša-an Ū-NU-UT I-NA NINDA.ÉRIN\MESÉ ti-an-zi ...

(2-6) CTH 377.A: Muršili II’s Hymn and of Prayer to Telipinu

KUB 24.1 + KBo 58.10 obv. I 8-12

8 nu-za-kán ma’a-an’ [(na-ak-ki-iš)] Te-li-pi-nu-uš še-er ne-pi-ši

9 DINGIR\MESÉ aš iš-tar-na’ ma-a-an’ a-r[(u-n)]i na-aš-ma A-NA

ḪUR.SAG\MESÉ

10 ṣa-ḫa-an-na [(p)]a-a-an-za na-aš’ma’-za I-NA KUR LÚKÚR za’-ah-ḫi-ja pa-a-an-za

---

79 Lebrun 1980: 181; Kassian and Yakubovich 2007: 428. Likewise, text B (KUB 24.2) has a paragraph divider between pa-a-an-za and ki-nu-na-at-ta.
11-12 ki-nu-na-at'-ta' ša-ne-iz-zi-iš' ünchen-su-la-aš ĞESERIN-an-za 'Î-an-za kal-li-iš'-du …

(2-7) CTH 433.2: Ritual for the Protective Deity of the Hunting-bag
KBo 17.105 + KBo 34.47 obv. II 34’-38 80
34’ … ma-a-an LÚMUŠEN.DÙ
35’ ku-iš-ki PA-NI DINGIR LIM i-da-a-lu ut-tar me-mi-an ħar-zi na-aš-ma-du-kân
36’ kar-di-mi'-nu-ya-an ku-iš-ki ħar-zi
37’ na-aš-ta LÚMEŠMUŠEN.DÙ-ja UZUKAxU-ŠU-NU IŠ-TU NINDAI.È.E.DÈAR-Ha
38’ a-an-ša-an-te-eš a-ša-an-du …

(2-8) CTH 685.1: Fragment of the festival for the Protective Deity
KUB 53.11 obv. II 6’-8 81
6’ ma-a-an UZNÍG.GIG HALA zê-e-a-ri
7’-8’ nu LÚSANGADUMÁMA URUḪA-AT-TI III NINDAL-A-B-KU XXX-l[i] pár-ši-ja

(2-9) CTH 757.F: Ritual of Zarpija from Kizzuṣatna against pest
KUB 54.65 + IBoT 4.16 + KUB 56.59 rev. III 8-9 82
8 nu ma-aḫḫa-an ki-i ḫu-u-ma-an ḫa-an-da-iz-zi
9 nu EN SISKUR gi-im-ri pa-iz-zi …

(2-10) CTH 780.II.Tf01.G: Ritual of Allaituraḫi
KUB 17.27 + KUB 12.50 + KUB 40.67 (+) VSNF 12.57 (= ChS 1/5 No. 7 + No. 36) obv. II 20’-24 83
20’ e-ez-zu-at-tēn ญา-pu-ญา-aš ḫu-Gul-šu-uš nu ma-a-an ke-e-el UN-aš
21’ LA-AN-ŠU UĦ-na-aš LŬḪUL-aš UN-aš na-aš-ṣu ญา-ap-pu-i

82 Bawanypeck 2005: 140-141. (as CTH 425.2.B: The Ritual of the Augur Dandanku)
Tomoki KITAZUMI

22’ na-aš-ma ÍD-aš a-ar-šar-šu-ri pa-iš ki-nu-na-at-ši EGIR-pa pé-eš-tén
23’ nu ku-it ku-it LÍL-ri da-a-i na-at an-da-an URU-ja ú-da-i
24’ na-at-kán URU-ri ŠÁ É.ŠÁ ḫar-ya-ši pé-di da-a-i nu MUNUSŠU.GI ú-iz-zi

(2-11) ABoT 684

5’-6’ nu-kán ma-a-ah-ha-an a-pé-e ṬUP-PA² MA-ḤAR dUTUŠI BE-LÍ-IA
pa-ra-a ne-eḫ-ḫu-un

7’-8’ ša-li-ka-aš-ma-mu ka-ru-uṭa-ri-uṭa-ar mNi-īk-ka₄-i-li-iš LÚ URUTa-ap-
ḫa[-al-lu … ]

(2-12) HKM 2685

4-5 … LÚKÚR ma-ah-ha-a[n] XXX ṢI-IM-DĪ ANŠE.KUR.RA²
6 URU Pa-na-a-ta ši-na-a[h]-ḫ[a da-a-iš]

7-8 nu LÚKUSH, KÙ.GI ku-it ku-ra-an-na-aš ṭa-ḥa-ana-na š[a-a-an-ah-ta]
9-10 EGIR-an-ma-an-kán LÚKÚR ku-e[n-ta] na-at AŠ-ME

(2-13) HKM 3486

5-7 [ma]-ah-ha-an-ša-ma-aš ka-a-aš [ṭ]up-pi-an-za an-da ú-e-mi-ja-zi
8-9 nu ŠA É dUTUŠI GIŠGEŠTIN x² túḫ-ṣa-at-t[én]

(2-14) HKM 4387

12’-13’ … [ÉRINME]Š x x-[ … ] x [ … ] š[a-r[a]-a ma-ah-ha-an ú-ya-te<-[te]-ni
14’ [nu] k[i-i]š-ṣa-an-ma tar-te-ni

(2-15) HKM 4888

14-15 nu-un-na-aš-za-kán dUTUŠI ku-it BE-LÍ-NI URUTi-ya-li-ja-za
16-17 URU Pal-ḥi-iš-na-za ar-[h][a-ja-a]n z[i-i]k-ke’e-ešš
18-20 nu-kán ke-e MUŠEN² ku-e-da-ni KASKAL-si an-da ša-an-ḥu-e-ni
21-23 nu-un-na-ṣa-an dUTUŠI BE-LÍ-NI EGIR-pa ḫu-u-da-a-ak ḫa-at-ra-a-i

(2-16) CTH 53: Treaty between Šuppiluliuma I of Ḫatti and Tette of Nuḫašše\textsuperscript{89}

KBo 1.4 + KUB 3.10 obv. II 20-22

(Zz. 17-19: similar conditional clauses like the following one, beginning with šumma)

\begin{verbatim}
20 ù šum-ma DUMU NUN be-la₁₂ GAL qa-du ÉRIN\textsuperscript{MES-šu} GIŠGIGI[R\textsuperscript{ME-š-u}]

21 a-na "Te-et-te a-na KASKAL.KUR-ti-šu u-la-ma-a

22 a-na KUR ša-ni-i-ti a-na ḫáb-ba-a-ti a-š[ap-pár] ...
\end{verbatim}

(3) Complex case: Combination of (1) and (2)

(3-1) CTH 262: Protocol for the royal body guard (\textsuperscript{LÚ}\textsuperscript{MES-MEŠEDI})\textsuperscript{90}

IBoT 1.36 rev. III 16-22

\begin{verbatim}
16 ... a-ra-ah-zi-ja-az \textsuperscript{kU-\textsuperscript{S}} \textsuperscript{LÚ}ME-ŠE-DI ḫar-zi

17 ma-a-ah-ha-an- \textsuperscript{ma} šar-kán-ti-in ta-ma-in ú-ya-te-ez-zi


19 an-dur-za ta-pu-ša i-ja-an-ta
\end{verbatim}
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Hititler’in Hurrî Tanrîlarını Benîmsemesînîn Kronolojîsî′


Hitit panteonunun da sürekli bir değişim içinde olduğu, ülkenin genişlemesiyle birlikte, fethedilen yerlerden yeni tanrîların dâhil edilmesiyle büyüdüğü ve karmaşıklığı görülmektedir. Hititler’in ilk panteonunu yerel Anadolu halkı olan Hattiler’in tanrîlarını oluştururken, Mezopotamya ve Suriye’nin tanrîları zaman içerisinde ve Hurrîler sayesinde Hatti ülkesinin tanrîlar topluluğuna eklenmeye başlamış ve bu etki artarak devam etmiştir.

Hurrîler’in dini Hititler üzerinde son derece belirleyici olmuştur. Hattuša ve Šapinuva arşivinde ele geçirilmiş başta büyük ritûelleri olmak üzere çok sayıda dini metin bunu bizlere göstergemektedir. Hurrîler’e ait olduğunu

* Bu makale Hitit Kültüründe Hurri Etkisi adlı doktora tezimizin bir bölümünden genişletilerek hazırlanmıştır.

** Öğr. Gör. Dr. Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Tarih Bölümü.

459
düşündüğümüz tanrılar Hitit çivi yazılı metinlerinde özellikle de tanrı/kurban listelerinde görülmekte ve hatta bütün bu metinler, Batı Hurri panteonunun da anlaşılmasında başlıca belgeler olarak kabul edilmektedirler.


Hititler’in yabancı tanrılarını benimsemedeki hevesleri, Eski Hitit Çağ’ından

---

4 Taracha 2009: 36.
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итибaren кантыланабилмектедир. Бu süreç öncé танрî heykellerinin taşınmasî ile başlamakta, sonra ona bir тапынк ınşасы ve бu тапынкларда базï seremonilerin gerçekleшirilmesi ile devam etmektedir. Yeni танрïlerin ve культlerin benimsenmesi süreci, культlerde yapılan деğişiklikler Hitit тарîhi boyunca görülebilmekte, ancak бu деğişikliklerin hangi kralın döneminde gerçekleшtiği, zaman zaman тespit edilebilmekte.<br>

Tabletlerin çõgu кирк olduã için ve метинlerin tarihlemelerinin там anlamıyla yapõlamamасından5 долоã Hurri культlerinin и танрïlerinin Hitit Anadolu’su’na aktarilışı kronolojisini kesin olarak тespit etmek mümkün olmamaktadır.


6 Hoffner 1992: 104.
8 De Martino 2003: 54-57.
(CTH 4.II.B.c): VBoT 13 3’-6’ + KUB 57.48 5’-7’; (Dupl. KBo 10.2 II 25-28)

“ Ayrıca onun tanrılarnını (heykellerini) y[ukarı kaldım] (aldım): Fırtına Tanrısi, aruzu beyi, [Halep’iın Fırtına] Tanrısi, Allatum, Adalur, (ve) [Liluri], 2 gümüş boğa ve 13 (duplikat 3) gümüş ve altın heykel.”

(CTH 4.II.A): KBo 10.2 II 36-40:

36 [H]aššuwa’nın tanrılarını
38 A[Ilatu’nun] kızını, Hepat’ı, 3 gümüş heykeli,
39 2 altın heykeli, (tanrıça) Mezulla’nın tapınağına
40 taşıdım.

(CTH 4.II.A): KBo 10.2 III 3-5:

3 ve Zippaşna şehrini mahvettim.
4 Onun tanrılarını (heykellerini) yukarı kaldırdım
5 ve Arinna şehrinin Güneş Tanrıçası’na götürdüm.

Hava Tanrısi’nin en önemli kült merkezi Halep’tir ve yukarıdaki metinlerden anlaşılacağına göre I. Hattušili Halepli Tešup’un bir heykelini yağmalamıştır. Puhanu kroniğine göre tanrı, Hattušili’ye yardımcı olmuştur:


7’-8’ Halep’in Fırtına Tanrısı bizden oraya koşarken, eğer onu [……], bizim için buraya gelecek.

13 Schwemer 2001: 494.
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9’O, onde koşmaya başlayacağı için. Bana, Fırtına Tanrısi’nin eril tanrılarnını
10’ krala, gönderdiler: “Git, soyluları bul ve soylular krala
11’ söylesinler”: “(Yardıma) geldiğim için, bana saygı göstersin!”


II. Muršili, Arinna’nın Güneş Tanrıçası’na yaptığı duasında Halep ve Babil’in imha edildiğini ve tanrıların (heykelleri) getirildiğini anlatır. Bu olay da I. Muršili döneminde gerçekleşmiştir:

(CTH 376.II.A): KUB 24.3 + II 44-4816:

“Eskiden Hatti ülkesi, Arinna’nın Güneş Tanrıçası’nın yardımıyla, bütün ülkeleri, bir aslan gibi pençesiyle ezdi. Dahası, Halep ve Babil imha edildi. Onlar, bütün ülkelerin ganimetlerini, altın ve gümüşten eşyalarını ve tanrılarını aldılar. Onları Arinna’nın Güneş Tanrıçası’n’a sundular.”


15 Schwemer 2001: 495.
19 Taracha 2009: 42.


22 De Martino 2006: 45.
23 Beal 2002: 59 vd.

M.Ö. 15. yüzyılın başında Hurri kültürel akımın başladığı düşünülmekte30 ve I./II. Tuthaliya, I. Arnuwanda ve II./III. Tuthaliya döneminde Batı Suriye’de yerleşik olan Hurriler’in dininin, Hattuša için son derece ilgi çekici olduğu görülmektedir31. Orta Hitit çağına ait bazı bayram metni parçalarında (CTH 647.II.2.a ve II.2b) Anadoluyl Fırtına Tanrısı, Hurrili Tešup kılığında, kardeşi Tašmišu/Šuwaliyat ile birlikte görünmeye başlamıştır32. Yine Fırtına Tanrısı ilk defa olmak üzere bu dönemde Kuzey Suriye’den öncül alınan DU ideogramı ile yazılmaya başlamıştır33. I./II. Tuthaliya’nın ve Arnuwanda’nın eşleri olan Nikalmati ve Ašmunikal’in isimleri Hurrice olup, Babil Ay Tanrısı...

29 Taracha 2009: 82-83.
31 Archi 2006: 160.
32 Taracha 2009: 45, dn. 225 ve 84.
33 Taracha 2009: 84.
Sin’in eşi Ningal’in adını taşıy첫 adılır. Nikalmati, Hurrice bir isim taşıyan ilk kraliyet ailesi üyesidir.

I./II. Tuthaliya döneminde Kizzuwatnalı Şunaşšura ile yapılan antlaşmanın Akadca nüşhasına ait bir parçada (CTH 41.I.1: KBo 28.110+ Öy. 80-84) panteonun başında yer alan üç tanrıdan sonra Halep’in Tešup’u, Hepat, Ay Tanrıçası (PEN.ZU), İstar/Ša(w)uška, Savaş Tanrıçası (PZA.BA₄.BA₄), Lelwani(?), Hatti ülkesinin tanrıları, Kizzuwatna ülkesinin tanrıları ve doğayla ilgili kavramlar sıralanır. Başkan Hattuša’da ya da herhangi bir şehirde bir tanrıının kültünün kurulması demek ona ait bir tapınağın yapılması ve bu tapınağa o tanrı için gerekli olan ayinlerin düzenlenmesi demektir. Gecenin Tanrıçası (DINGIR. GE₆) kültünün Kizzuwatna’dan Šamuha’ya taşınmasında (CTH 482) buna ait güzel bir örnek görülmektedir. II. Muršili, atası Tuthaliya’nın (I./II.) bu tanrıçayı Šamuha’ya getirip onun için tapınakta yeni ayinler gerçekleştirdiğini, ancak tahta tablet yazıcılarının bunları değiştirdiğini anlatmaktadır. Bu ayinleri Muršili, tekrar yerine getirdiğini söylemekte ve tapınağa giren her kim olursa olsun bunları uygulaması gerektiğini ifade etmektedir:

(CTH 482): KUB 32.133 Öy 1-10:

1 Kahraman, büyük kral Šuppiluliuma’nın oğlu, büyük kral, majesteleri Muršili şöyle (söyler):

2-3 Atam büyük kral Tuthaliya Kizzuwatna’daki Gecenin Tanrıçası’nın tapınağından Gecenin Tanrıçası’nı ayırdığında ona Šamuha’daki 4 tapınakta öncelik tanıdı (önde gelen tanrılardan biri yaptığı) ve o ritüel ve ayinlere

5 Gecenin Tanrıçası’nın tapınağında ilaveler yaptı. Ancak tahta tablet yazıcıları

6 ve tapınak personeli geldiler ve onları değiştirmeye başladılar. Muršili

---

34 De Martino 2006: 45.
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7 büyük kral, tabletlerden onları tekrar yerine getirdi. Gelekte
8 Šamuha’nın Gecenin Tanrıçası’nın tapınağında ister kral ister kraliçe, prens
9 veya prenses, Šamuha’nın Gecenin Tanrıçası’nın tapınağına girerse bu
10 ritüelleri uygulamasın.

Her ne kadar III. Hattušili dönemde önem kazandıysa da Šamuhali Ištar/Ša(w)uška kültünün Orta Hitit Çağ’ı’na kadar uzandığı ve bu tanrıçanın, I./II. Tuthaliya dönemde ait belgelerde ortaya çıktığı düşünülmektedir. KUB 32.130 (CTH 710) numaralı belgeye göre Šamuha şehrinin savaş alanının Ša(w)uškası’nın (DİŠAR SERI URU) Şamuha) öfkeli olduğu fal aracı ile tespit edilmiş ve bu nedenle adı verilmeyen kral bir fal soruşturması yürütülmüş. Šamuha’ya bir temsilci göndermiş, tanrıça için ritüeller yerine getirilmiş ve bir bayram kutlanmıştır. Fakat Išhupitta ve Tašmanha kentlerine bir sefer söz konusu olduğunda majesteleri bir kişiyi tekrar göndererek, Šamuha şehrinin savaş alanının Ša(w)uškası’nın (heykelini) getirmiş (belki Hattuša’ya?), tanrıça için törenleri yerine getirdikten sonra onu Šamuha’ya geri göndermiş ve ayinlerin orada devam etmesini istemiştir. Belge, yazı ve dil özelliklerinden açısdan Orta Hitit Çağ’ına tarihlenir. Gecenin Tanrıçası Kizzuwatna’dan Šamuha’ya I./II. Tuthaliya tarafından getirildiği ve bu tanrıca, Ša(w)uška ile özdeş olarak düşünüldüğü için KUB 32.130 numaralı belge de I./II. Tuthaliya döneminde tarihlenmektedir. Orta Hitit döneminde ait bir fal metni de (CTH 570: KBo 16.97 + KBo 40.48) görüşi destekler niteliktedir. Bu fal metni de muhtemelen I./II. Tuthaliya’ya aittir, çünkü KUB 32.130’de de söz konusu olan Išhupitta kentine düzenlenecek askeri sefer CTH 570’de bu sefer bir fal soruşturmasına konu olmuştur. Bu fal raporunda, tanrıçaların öfkesinin konu edildiği satırlarda Gecenin Tanrıçası’nın biçimleri ile Ištar/Ša(w)uška’nın biçimleri peş peşe sıralanır ve hangisinin öfkeli olduğu sorgulanır. CTH 571: KBo 16.97 + Ay. 12-32 arasında Niniwe’nin Ša(w)uškası, Šamuha’nın Gecenin Tanrıçası, Lahharuma’nın Gecenin Tanrıçası,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sayfa numarası</th>
<th>Metin için bkz.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Klinger 2010: 156-1558; Beckman 2012: 3-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Beckman 2012: 2-3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Niniwe’nin Ša(w)uškası, Hattarina’nın Ša(w)uškası, annesinin Ša(w)uškası, babasının Ša(w)uškası sıralandıktan sonra “başka hangi Ša(w)uška öfkeliyse? (sonuç) uygun olsun” denmektedir. Böylece Orta Hitit Çağ’ında bir Şamuhalı Ištar/Ša(w)uška kültünden söz etmek mümkündür. 44

Arnuwanda-Ašmunikal çiftinin dönemine ait Kaška antlaşmasında (CTH 139) da Ištar/Ša(w)uška, Išhara, Gökyüzünün ve Yeryüzünün tanrırlarını çıkarlar. “İkisi/esi tanrırlar” ya da “aşağıdaki tanrırlar” olarak adlandırılan tanırlar, Hititler Mezopotamyalı Annunakkiler ile özdeşleştirmişler ve onları yer altı tanırlar olarak kabul etmişlerdir. Devlet anlaşmalarının yanı sıra Hitit/Hurri ritüel ve mitlerinde ortaya çıkan bu tanrılar, Mezopotamya kökenli olmakla birlikte Hurri kültür çevresinde de sıklıkla görülür. 45

Yine I. Arnuwanda dönemine tarihlenen İšmeriga antlaşmasının (CTH 133), yemin tanrısı listesinde, tıpkı Šunaššura antlaşmasında olduğu gibi Halep’in Hava Tanrısı, eşi Hepat’la birlikte görülmektedir. 46

M.Ö. 15. ve 14. yüzyıllar boyunca, ilk Hurrice metinler yazılmış olmalıdır. Çoğu tek dilli olan bu metinlerin Hititçe çevirileri günümüze ulaşmıştır. Bu metinlerde Hatti ülkesinde en üst seviyede olan Tešup, Hepat, Šarruma, Ša(w)uška gibi tanırlar görünmektedir. 47

Hurri kökenli mitolojik metinler, Serbest Bırakma Şarkısı, itkalzi ve itkahi ritüelleri, Tašmišarri (II./III. Tuthaliya) ve eşi Taduhepa için yapılan diğer ritüeller, Orta Hitit Çağ’ının ürünleridir. 48

Šapinuwa arşivi, Hurrice belgeleri, itkalzi ve diğer büyü ritüelleri ile III. Tuthaliya döneminde Hurri etkisini gösteren bir başka önemli kanıttır. III. Tuthaliya ve eşi, Tešup ve Hepat onuruna yapılan “krallık” (Hurrice: šarrašši) ve “kraliçilik” (Hurrice: allašši) ritüellerini yerine getirmiştir. 49


47 Schwemer 2001: 495.


49 Archi 2006: 160.
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Mevcut tabletlerinin ağırlıklı bölümünün Orta Hitit’e tarihlendiği İtikalzi ve itkahi ritüeller ile Ortaköy’de açığa çıkarılan Kizzuwatna kökenli, tanırları çağırma ritüellerinde belli başlı Hurri tanırlarını görmek mümkündür.


50 Haas 1984: 14.
51 Reyhan 2010: 637 vd.
55 Giorgieri-Murat-Süel 2013:172

(CTH 40.IV.1.A): KBo 5.6 (ve duplikatlar) Ay. III 31-38:
31-32 Kenti (Kargamış’ı) ele geçirdiğinde [babam] tanrılarından

56 Gurney 1977: 15-17.
59 Singer 2002: 76.
60 Singer 2002: 87, 90.
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33 kork[tuğ için], yukarı kente (sitadelde)
34 [Kubaba]’nın [(ve)] Koruyucu tanr[(ın)]
35 [yanına?] hiç kimseyi bırakmadı.
36 [tapınakların] yakınına
37 [bir tanesine bile] her kim olursa olsun
38 y[aklaştırmadı] [(ve onlara)] kendisi saygı gösterdi.

Yukarıda ifade ettiğiımız üzere II. Murşili, atası Tuthaliya’nın Gecenin Tanrıçası’na ait kültü Šamuha’ya getirip onun için tapınakta yeni ayniler gerçekleştirdiğini anlatmaktadır. Bu anlamda Ištar/Ša(w)uška, Halepli Tešup ve Ea’nın özel bir önemi vardır; çünkü bu tanrılar kendi tapınaklarına sahiptirler ve en az II. Murşili döneminde itibaren kendi özel kültleri mevcuttur62. II. Murşili’nin hem yıllıklarına hem de dualarına bakıldığında Fırtına Tanrısı ile Arinna’nın Güneş Tanrıçası’na olan bağlılığı açıkça ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bu tanrı çiftinin yanı sıra Ištar/Ša(w)uška da Büyük Kral için önemsenen tanrıları arasındadır. Adı geçen tanrıçanın savaşçı özelliğinin (Savaş alanının Ištar’ı = ḪIŠTAR.LÍL63) daha ön sırada tutulması, II. Murşili’nin tahta çıktığı anda ülkenin düşmanlar tarafından kuşatılması ile ilgili olmalıdır64. Bu dönemde Hattuša’dan “güçlü savaş alanının Ša(w)uškası”’nin (ḪIŠTAR.LÍL walliwalli) kültü kanıtlanmıştır65.


(CTH 70): KUB 14.4 Ay III 23-2967:

64 Alparslan 2006: 132-137.
66 Alparslan 2006: 84, Strauß 2006: 10
23 Kumanni ülkesine gittiğimde – babam, Kumannili Hepat’a
called the bayramı yapmaya söz vermişti. Fakat O, Hepat için bayramı
kutlamadı.

25 Bu vicdani dokundu – ve Kizzuwatna’ya gittim,
26 ve hep şunu söyledim: “Babamin sözünü yerine getirmeme izin ver!”
27 Ben Kumannili Hepat’a kendim için,
28 oğlum için, evim için ve düşmanlarım için
29 sürekli olarak yakardım ve dua ettim. [...]

Kizzuwatna kültleri ve Hurri tanrılarının II. Muršili için önemi, onun konuşma
bozukluğunu ve bu sorunu çözmek için yerine getirdiği ritüeli anlatan metinde
(CTH 486) de ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bir rüyadan sonra Muršili, rahatsızlığı
hakkında ne yapması gerektiğini dair bir fal soruşturması yürütür. İlk fal
sorgusunda konuşma bozukluğundan Manuzziya’nın Fırtına Tanrısı’nın
sorunlu olduğunu öğrenir. Metnin içeriği çok sayıda Hurrice terim, kurban
alan tanrı ile ilişki olabilir. II. Muršili, hastalığının kaynağı olarak bir Hurri
tanrısını göstermektedir68.

“II. Muwatalli, Hitit panteonuna resmen Hurri tanrılarını sokmuş, Halpa
(Haleb’daki Fırtına Tanrısı ve tanrıça Hepat kültünü, büyük bir dinsel
merkez olan Kizzuwatna’da Lawazantiya şehrine taşımıştır.69”

II. Muwatalli’den günümüze iki büyük dua metni ulaşmıştır (CTH 381-382)70.
Şimşeğin Fırtına Tanrısı aracılığıyla, tanrılar meclisine yaptığı duada (CTH 381)
adı geçen Tešup, eşi Hepat, Šinapši’nin Fırtına Tanrısı, Šinapši’nin Hepat’ı,
Manuzziya’nın Fırtına Tanrısı, Nikkal, Pišahuni, Kalištapa Dağı, erkek ve
dişi tanrılar, Kumanni kenti ve ülkesinin ırmakları ile dağları gibi tanrı ve
kutsal coğrafi unsurlar Hurri-Kizzuwatna kökenlidir71. Kumanni kentinin
kültleri ile ilgili olarak (Kumanni’nin Hava Tanrısı için) bizzet kral tarafından
dikte ettirilmiş olan dua metni ise (CTH 382) Kizzuwatna’nın güneyinde

2010.
kutsanan Hepat, Şarumma, Hazzi ve Hutanni gibi tanrılardan söz eder72.

Tanrılara meclisine yapılan duada (CTH 381), Suriye-Hurri tanrılarnının Hitit panteonuna dâhil edilmesinin izlerini görebiliriz. Duanın başında kısa listede öncelikle şu çift ortaya çıkar:

“Gökyüzünün Güneş Tanrısı - Hatti ülkesinin kraliçesi, sahibem, Arinna’nın Güneş Tanrıçası.”

Peşinden gelen çift ise şu şekildedir:

“Efendim, Gökyüzünün kralı, Fırtına Tanrısı - sahibem, kraliçe Hepat.”


74 Archi 2006: 149-150.
dolaylı yer değiştirilebileceğine dair güçlü bir eğilim görülür. Kralın Hurrice isminin ikinci kısmını Tešup (Šarri-Tešup) oluştururken, Muwatalli’nin başkentinin adı Tarhuntašša, Anadolu Fırtına Tanrısı’nın adını taşır. Muwatalli’nin koruyucu tanrısı Şimşeğin (pihaššašši) Fırtına Tanrısı, Tešup’un bazı özelliklerini almıştır. Tarihlemesi yapılamayan bir orakel metninde Hatti’nin Fırtına Tanrısı ile Halep’in Fırtına Tanrısı’nın birleştiği görülmektedir. Bu metinde Hattuşa, “Halep’in Fırtına tanrısının kenti” olarak adlandırılmakta, aynı zamanda Hatti’nin Fırtına Tanrısı’nın Gök gürültüsü bayramı, Halep’in Fırtına Tanrısı’nı köşebilir, kışı geçirmeleri için...

(CTH 564): KUB 18.12 + KUB 22.15 Öy 1-4:

1-4 Eğer majeste seferden (Hattuşa’ya) dönene, tanrılari (onların bayramlarını) kutlar; Majeste (ve) kraliçe kişi Hattuşa’da geçirirler, Halep’in Fırtına Tanrısı’nın Gök gürültüsü bayramını orada kutlarlar, Yıl bayramını orada kutlarlar…; eğer siz tanrılar, majesteleri ve kraliçeye Halep’in Fırtına Tanrısı’nın kenti Hattuşa’yi, kişi geçirmeleri için…


---

78 Archi 2006: 159.
80 Wegner 2002: 272-277 (Nr. 147).
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standart kalutî listesi olarak adlandırılan (CTH 705: KBo 14.138 (+) KUB 43.10281) metinler arasında kuvvetli sapmalar olduğu ifade edilmektedir82. Her iki liste karşılaştırıldığında83 Muwatalli dönemine tarihlenen metinde Halepli Tešup’un daha üst mevkide tutulduğu fark edilmektedir.

II. Muwatalli’nin, başkenti Tarhuntašša’ya taşımasyyla Güney Anadolu ve Kizzuwatna kültlerinin ve tanriların ağırlığı artmış olmalıdır. Hem krala ait dualar, hem Halepli Tešup ve Hepat kültü ile ilgili düzenlemeleri ve hem de Hurri kökenli Hišuwa bayramına bu dönemde yapılan eklemeler84 bunu kanıtlamaktadır.

M.Ö. 13. yüzyılda III. Hattušili’nin Hurrîli rahip Bentipšarri’nin kızı Puduhepa ile evlenmesi Hurri dini akımının devamını sağlamıştır. Hurri-Kizzuwatna tanrîların Hitit panteonundaki ağırlığı artarken, panteonun başına Tešup, eşi Hepat, oğulları Šarrumma ve kızları Alanzu yer almıştır. III. Hattušili’nin kendisi de koruyucu tanrısi olarak Šamuhali Ša(w)uška’yı seçer85. III. Hattušili bu tanrıçayı benimserken, yukarıda bahsettiğimiz üzere babası II. Muršili’nin tanrıçası, Savaş alanının Ištar/Ša(w)uškası’nı daha geride tutar. Šamuhali Ša(w)uška için kurbanlar düzenlenirken, Muršili’nin tanrıçası (P)IŠTAR.LÍL walliwalli) bu düzenlemelerde tamamen kurban dışı bırakılmaz86:

(CTH 712.A): KUB 27.1 Öy. I 1-687:

1-2 Yıllar geçtiği sürece, “eski” Savaş alanının Ištar’ı (P)IŠTAR.LÍL için önceki kurbanları yerine getirecekler.

3 Muršili’nin güçlü Savaş alanının Ištar’ı (P)IŠTAR.LÍL walliwalli) içinse eski 4 kurbanı bir kez daha yapmazaklar. Šamuha’nın Ištar’ı için

81 Wegner 2002: 66-73 (Nr. 1).
84 Doğan-Alparslan 2012: 139-142.
85 Gurney 1977: 17.
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5 bir bayramı iyilikle davet ederler (ilan ederler). Murşili,

6 majestenin babası, şöyle yapardı:


Ay bayramı (CTH 591) çok sayıda fragmandan oluşur. Bunların çok az bir kısmı Orta Hitit’e, geri kalaları İmparatorluk dönemine tarihlenir. İki

90 Gurney 1977: 19-23.


AN.TAH.ŠUM SAR bayramının yine son dönemine tarihlenen kopyalarında Hurri tanrılarını görmek mümkündür. Bu, özellikle bayramın otuz yedinci gününü içeren KUB 11.27’de ortaya çıkar. Bu kısımda, içerdiği tanrılarla bakılacak olursa Hatti-Hitit geleneğinden çok, Hurri anlayışına daha yakındır94.

Hitit Devleti’nin panteonu dediğimizde başlıca kaynaklarımızdan biri de Yazılıkaya açık hava tapınağıdır. A odasında yer alan ve isimleri hiyeroglifle yazılımış tanrıların Hurri-Kizzuwatna panteonunun adeta çekirdeği gibidir. Çünkü burada gördüğümüz, eril-dişi karşılığı şeklinde ve önem sırasına göre tasvir edilmiş tanrılar Kizzuwatna kökenli metinlerde de aşağı yukarı benzer bir biçimde ortaya çıkmaktadırlar. Yazılıkaya’nın tanrılarını çeşitli ritüellerde, (H)išuwa bayramında ve kaluti adını verdiği metinlerde

94 Archi 2006: 155-158.
benzer bir sırlama ile görürüz.

Hurri tanrılarının, böylesine önemli bir kutsal mekânda tasvir edilmiş olmasından dolayı Hitit Devleti’nin sonuna geldiğiımızde panteonunun tamamen Hurrileştiği şeklinde yorumlar yapılmıştır\(^{95}\).

Bununla birlikte yukarıda söz ettikimiz üzere IV. Tuthaliya döneminde tarihlenen, kült reformu ile ilgili belgeler ve bayram metinleri incelendiğinde, bu kültlere son dönemde çok az sayıda Hurri tanrısının eklendiği ve aslında Hatti-Hitit tabakasının bayramlarının, devletin sonuna kadar varlığını koruduğu anlaşılmaktadır\(^{96}\). Her ne kadar bu dönemde kültlerin yeniden düzenlenmesi amacıyla girişimde bulunulduysa da yerel bayramların Hurrileştiğine dair herhangi bir ize rastlanmadığı söylenmelidir\(^{97}\).


\(^{96}\) Archi 2006: 150 vd.

\(^{97}\) Schewemer 2006: 257 vd.
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dahta fazla önem kazandıklarına ilişkin kesin veriler yoktur. Ancak kimi
kralların dönemine ilişkin bazı atıflardan ve belli dönemlerde bazı Hurri
tanrılarnın daha fazla önemsendiğinden söz etmek mümkündür. Buna,
I. Hattušili döneminde ilk Hurri tanrılarnın adının geçmesi ya da I./II.
Tuthaliya döneminde Gecenin Tanrıçası kültünün Šamuha’ya nakli örnek
olarak gösterilebilir. Ayrıca Hitit tarihi boyunca Hurri kültlerine ilişkin iki
parlama döneminde söz etmek mümkündür. Bunlardan ilk I./II. Tuthaliya
dönemidir ki bunun sebebi Kizzuwatna’nın Hatti topraklarına katılmasıdır.
İkincisi ise III. Hattušili dönemidir; bunun sebebini ise eşi Puduhepa’da
aramak gerekir.
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Unter Grundproblemen der Morphologie der hattischen Sprache ist seine Verbkonjugation eine der wichtigsten Fragen. Verbsflexion der hattischen Sprache unterscheidet sich von allen kleinasiatischen Sprachen, die an der Wende des III-II Jahrtausends v.Chr. in Vorderasien vorhanden waren, nicht nur genetisch, sondern auch strukturell und typologisch.

Es wurde mehrmals betont, dass man die Forschung der hattischen Sprache zusammen mit kaukasischen Sprachen durchführen soll. Ich bin auch damit einverstanden und die hier dargestellte Hypothese ist mit Berücksichtigung der Struktur und Typologie der kaukasischen Sprachen entstanden.

Schon E. Laroche und A. Kammenhuber haben gezeigt, dass das Verb im Hattischen sehr reich an Präfixen ist und vor einem Stammmorphem eine Vielzahl von Präfixen steht.


---

* Tbilisi State University, History.


Bekanntlich wird in den hattisch-hethitischen Bilinguen hattischer Text nicht Wort für Wort ins Hethitische übersetzt, was meiner Ansicht nach gerade durch Spezifik des Verbs verursacht war. Verb in der hattischen Sprache kann Subjekte und Objekte in sich markieren und infolgedessen ist es nicht mehr nötig, sie (S und O) auch im Satz separat wiederzugeben. Zahlreiche Präfixe im Verb bezeichnen die Hauptglieder des Satzes und deswegen wird ein hattischer einfacher Satz im Hethitischen immer länger ausgedrückt.


S₁: \(wa_a\)-tu-ḫaš-tur-u: tur schlagen; \(wa_a\)-tu-k-sul-pa šul –”lassen”
S₂: u-še-ḫaš-tur-ma: tur schlagen; u-š-te-piš-e: piš –”nehmen”
S₃: a-š-du-kas-tur: tur schlagen; a-š-wa_a: wa_a –”legen”.

Außerdem unterscheidet O. Soysal Präfixe für Subjekte und Objekte, sowohl für rein-transitive als auch für transitiv-intransitive Verben³, was in der folgenden Tabelle zusammengefasst wird:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive Verben</th>
<th>O.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing.</td>
<td>Pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: wa_a-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II: u-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III: a- (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive-intransitive Verben</td>
<td>O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing.</td>
<td>Pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: wa_a-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II: u-; un-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III: 0-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Soysal 2004, 188ff.
Meiner Meinung nach, hat das hattische Verb ein klassen-personelles Konjugationssystem und dieser Mechanismus wurde infolge diachronischer Transformation entstanden⁴.

Ich denke, dass grammatische Klasse als Kategorie anfangs in der hattischen Morphologie bekannt war und im Laufe der Zeit verschwand. Der sinchronische Abschnitt, der in hattischen Texten überliefert ist, zeigt die endlichen Entwicklungsstufen der Transformation des Konjugationsmechanismus. Das beendete fast die funktionelle Beschränkung der Klassenkategorie.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S _ subjektive Person</th>
<th>O _ objektive Klasse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₁: wa⁻</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₂: u⁻</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₃: a⁻</td>
<td>_</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Wir behandeln einige Verbformen:

Levan KOTCHLAMAZASHVILI

waₜu-ḥaš-tur-u: *tur* - “schlagen”, S₁ /waₜu-/ , OⅡ /tu-/⁵
u-tu-ḥaš-tur-ma: *tur* - “schlagen”, S₂ /u-/ , OⅡ /tu-/⁶
a-š-du-kaš-tur: *tur* - “schlagen”, S₃ /a-/ , OⅡ /š-/⁷
a-p-ta-ka-waḥ: *waḥ* - “befehlen”, S₃ /a-/ , O₁ /p-/⁸
u-n-ḥu-pi: *ḥu* - “rufen”, S₂ /u-/ , O₁ /n-/⁹
a-š-a-ḥu: *ḥu* - “rufen”, S₃ /a-/ , OⅡ /š-/¹⁰
a-n-a-ḥu: *ḥu* - “rufen”, S₃ /a-/ , OⅡ /š-/¹¹
a-m-ḥuru-pa: *ḥuru* - u. B., S₃ /a-/ , O₁ /m-/¹²
u-t-ḥuru: *ḥuru* - u. B., S₂ /u-/ , OⅡ /t-/¹³
a-š-iya: *iya* - “geben”, S₃ /a-/ , OⅡ /š-/¹⁴
waₜ(u)-kam: kam u. B., S₁ /waₜu-/ , OⅡ /t-/¹⁵

Im heutzutage existierenden hattischen sprachlichen Material kann man wenige Fälle, wo Änderung des gleichen Verbes nach Person und Klasse dargestellt wird, bestätigen, aber für die Analyse angeführte Beispiele erlauben mir solche Schlußfolgerung.

In indo-germanischen und semitischen Sprachen, die im Königreich von Hethittern verbreitet waren, gab es keine Klasse als morphologische Kategorie, was nach meiner Auffassung, einen deutlichen Unterschied zwischen einerseits dem Hattischen und andererseits der hethitischen, luwischen und akkadischen Sprachen zeigt. Sie ist ein die kaukasischen Sprachen charakterisierendes grammatisches Merkmal, auf das sich die morphosemantische Klassifizierung der Namen gründet⁷.

Nach meiner Beobachtung gab es in der hattischen Sprache zwei Klassen.

---

⁶ Diese Beispiele wurden aus Soysal 2004 angeführt.
⁷ Die nachischen Sprachen haben vollständiges Klassensystem, das sich aus 4 Klassen besteht, z. B., tsowa-tushische Sprache hat vier Klassen sowohl im Singular als auch im Plural. Georges Dumézil schreibt über die Frage von Klassensystem in den Nordkaukasischen Sprachen: „Le fait morphologique qui, au premier abord, différencie le plus nettement les trois familles de langues caucasiennes du Nord est le fait des classes, c’est-à-dire la distribution de tous les êtes en 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, ou 8 groupes dont les oppositions indo-européennes «anime-inanimé», «masculin-féminin» donnent une idée. Dans les trois familles système des classes se présente avec des formes, des fonctions et surtout des ampleurs fort diverses“ (Dumézil 1933, 1).
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Namensklassifikation folgte nach binarischem Prinzip **männlich ~ allgemein.** I. Klasse umfasste nur Gottheit und Mann als grammatische Begriffe. Ihr Marker war /wa_a/- Präfix. Sie fasste sowohl primäre Nominale als auch verbale Stämme zusammen und in den bestätigten Formen schriftlicher Denkmäler kann man ihren Marker teilweise ausscheiden, unter Annahme, dass historischer Aufbau des nominalen Stammes berücksichtigt wird, aber von einem synchronischen Standpunkt wurde es mit dem Stamm verbunden und in s.g. versteinert Form dargestellt. Damals hatte er keine Funktion, z.B. wa_a-zaril „Mensch“, wa_a-ḫurla „Hurriter“, wa_a-šḫap „Gott“ u.s.w. Zur II. Klasse gehörten Frauen und andere belebte und unbelebte Namen. Der Marker dieser Klasse ist /š(e)-/ Präfix: eš-wu_r „Land“, še-munamuna „Steine“, ša-kil „Herz“ u.s.w. Man kann so sein, dass keine Klasse in einem Namen formal dargestellt wird, aber semantisch waren alle Namen einer Klasse zugeordnet.

Zweiklassiges System haben wir z.B. in tabasaranischer Sprache⁸, wo die Namen nach binarem Prinzip unterschiedet sind: **Mensch – Gegenstand.** Davon I. Klasse umfasst nur den Mensch und Gott, aber II. – alle belebten und unbelebten Namen. Das Verb hat klassen-personelle Konjugation, wo den Marker des Subjektes ein Suffix, des Objektes dagegen – ein Präfix darstellt:

I. Klasse: izu b-isnu-za ḟaqa „Ich habe den Vogel gefangen“ (S₁: /-Za/; O₁: /b-/)

In der abchasischen Sprache unterscheidet man auch zwei Klassen¹⁰, aber im Unterschied von Tabasaranischem sind hier die Marker der Klasse und der Person Präfixe:

I. Klasse: sara larā dә-z-bojt „Ich sehe dich (Mensch.)“ (S₁: /z-/; O₁: /d-/)
II. Klasse: sara ampǝl z-bojt „Ich sehe den Ball“ (S₁: /z-/; O₁: /0-/)¹¹.

---

⁸ Dumézil 1933, 8f.
⁹ Tschikobawa 1979, 170.
¹⁰ Vgl. Dumézil 1933: 32f.
¹¹ Gwanzeladse 2011, 76.
Klassen-personell ist auch die Verbkonjugation in lakischer und tsova-tuschischer Sprachen.

Heute ist für manche kaukasischen Sprachen Klassenkategorie des Verbes und selbst grammatische Klasse als eine morphologische Kategorie ganz fremd.

Solche sind z.B. alle kartwelischen Sprachen, Tscherkesisch, Ubichisch, Udisch u.s.w. Man findet, dass ursprünglich diese Sprachen auch eine grammatische Klassenkategorie hatten\textsuperscript{12}.

Wie schon gesagt, wurde in der hattischen Sprache, meiner Meinung nach, eine diachronische Transformation morphologischen Systems durchgeführt. Es handelt sich hier um funktionelle Änderungen morphologischer Kategorien, die einerseits zum Verlust einiger grammatischer Kategorien und andererseits zur Entwicklung einiger neuen beitrugen. Diese Prozesse verbreiteten sich weiter, wobei die Formante, die aufbewahrt worden waren, bei den Änderungen morphologischen Typs eine neue Funktion erwarben und morphemischer Bestand des Wortes blieb unverändert, nur flexive Bestandmorphe änderten grammatische Bedeutung. Ich finde, dass die Klasse als eine der wichtigen morphologischen Kategorien am Anfang auch in der hattischen Sprache vorhanden war.

Änderungen morphologischen Typs verursachten Entstehung der Personskategorie des Verbes als grammatischer Kategorie, was auch auf das Konjugationssystem auswirkte.

Nach der Herausbildung der Klassen- und Personenkonjugation, wenn das Verb beide morphologischen Komponente darstellte, vollzog sich innere Differenziation dieser Kategorien in funktioneller Hinsicht und Subjektsperson wurde mit Personsmarker ausgedrückt, während das Objekt mit einem Formant der Klasse markiert wurde:

\textsuperscript{12} Tschikobawa 1979, 118ff.
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wa šḥapma ešwu r aškāḥir\(^{13}\), „O, Gottheiten, das Land wurde bestimmt“\(^{14}\).

anteš\(^{15}\) Dšulinkati katte lewa el „Er schenkte dem König Šulinkatte sein Haus“\(^{16}\).

Vermutlich wurden die Formante bei der Änderung morphologischen Typs aufbewahrt und sie übernahmen eine neue Funktion, aber in Ausnahmefällen blieben sie mit dem Namens- und Verbstamm verbunden. Genauso konnte auch im Falle der Klassen und Personenmarker geschehen. Unter dem Einfluss phonetischer Vorgänge, die tendentionell in der hattischen Sprache wirkten, konnten die Zeichen I. Klasse in die Subjektiven Personenpräfixe umgewandelt werden:

\(\text{S}_1: \text{wa}_a > \text{wa}_a\)
\(\text{S}_2: \text{wa}_a > u\)
\(\text{S}_3: \text{wa}_a > a\)

Was die Objektmorpheme, die in der Tabelle von O. Soysal angeführt wurden, betrifft, stellen sie meistens ein diachronisches Resultat der globalen phonetischen Veränderung – Lautverschiebung dar. Primäres Exponent II. Klasse sollte nach meiner Vermutung /*j*/ sein, dessen historische Artikulationsverschiebung sich sowohl in der anterionalen als auch in der posterioralen Reihe vollzog. Als Halbvokal wurde es in den Konsonanten umgewandelt und zuerst blieb Spirant, aber endgültig untergang Okclusivisation:

\(t \parallel \ddot{s} < *j > h \parallel k\)

Diese Zeichen werden mit neuer Funktion in der verbalen Konstruktion dargestellt. Was die Reihe objektiver Zeichen, die von O. Soysal angegeben werden, betrifft, behandle ich sie als Zeichen I. Klasse (/w(a)-/, /p-/, /m-/, /n-/). Sie sind, meiner Meinung nach, gleicher Herkunft und sollen von Präfix

---

\(^{13}\) a-š-ka-ḥir: a-S\(^{a}\), š-O\(^{III}\), ḥir – Stamm „bestimmen“.  


\(^{15}\) a-n-tuh: a-S\(^{a}\), n-O\(^{III}\), tuh - Stamm „bauen“. 

\(^{16}\) Vgl. Schuster 1974, 74: „es nahm sich der Gott Šulinkatte des Königs sein Haus(?)Gerät“. 
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/*wa_a*/ historischer I. Klasse abgeleitet werden:

*wa_a > w(a)  
*wa_a > p  
*wa_a > m  
*wa_a > *m > n.

Daher, unterstützten phonetische Prozesse diachronische Transformation morphologisches System in der hattischen Sprache. Ihrer hochfrequenten Wirkung machte einen wichtigen Beitrag zur Formierung innovativer grammatischer Kategorien als Systems.
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TO AND FROM A CITY. A NOTE ON HITTITE TOPOGRAPHY

Adam Kryszeń*

The topic of this paper represents a part of a greater problem of the Hittite perception of space, a subject still underexplored in Hittite studies. Recent works by Cyril Brosch on the Hittite “grammar of space” (2013, 2014) and Lee Ullman (2011) address the issue from linguistic and archaeological standpoints respectively, yet a thorough philological treatment is yet to appear. What I would like to discuss here is the use of the local particles šarā and katta with respect to the movement in and out of a Hittite city. Interpretations of such expressions may not be highly frequent in secondary literature, yet they all share a strong conviction that passages mentioning katta and šarā can be read as clearly reflecting the topographical relations of a given Hittite city and its surroundings. Consequently, they were used by scholars as arguments in their discussion on the problems of historical geography.

In his review article of Maciej Popko’s book on Zippalanda, Ronald Gorny leans toward the southern position of the famous Hittite religious centre, using the passage from the scenario of the nuntarriyašhaš-festival, KUB 55.5 i 10’-12’ (CTH 626) as one of his arguments:

---

* University of Warsaw
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2 See now also the work of Ilgi Gerçek (e.g. Gerçek 2017).
CTH 626: KUB 55.5 i 10’-12’:

(10’) lu-uk-kat-ti-ma-kán LUGAL-uš kat-t[a URUHa-at-tu-ša-az]
(11’) [IŠ]-TU KÁ.GAL URUZI-IP-PA-LA-[N-DA]

“The next day the king goes down from [Ḫattuša to Ḫarr]anašši [th]rough the Zippalanda-Gate.”

Gorny (1997: 551) interprets this passage as follows: “Festival texts indicate that the Hittite king, after performing his cultic duties in the capital, travels “down” (katta) to Ḫarranašši and Zippalanda by way of the “Zippalanda Gate” (...) I think that the use of “down” (katta) in KUB 55.5 obv. (?) i 10’ is a topographic indicator hinting at the direction of Zippalanda. Since Alaca Höyük and Eskiyapar are at the same altitude as the Hittite capital, the usage of “down” is significant and makes a trip to the lower altitudes of the south a more likely alternative than one in the opposite direction.”

Similarly, on the basis of the oracle fragment KBo 23.106 obv. 4-6 (CTH 582) Popko’s view of Arinna was that “der Weg von Arinna nach Ḫattuša herunter (heth. katta) führte.”

The most significant (and likely the best known) discussion on the matter, however, concerns the location of Tawiniya. Already in 1959, Garstang and Gurney argued that the city had to be situated south of Ḫattuša, on the basis of the passage KUB 10.91 ii 11-12:

CTH 669: KUB 10.91 ii 11-12:

(11) DINGIRLU₄-kán KÁ.GALTIM
(12) URUṬA-WI₅-NI-YA kat-ta GIS̄TIR-ni an-da pé-e-da-an-zi

---

4 CTH 582: KBo 23.106 obv. 4-6: (4) ma-ah-ḫa-an-ma-wa-kán (5) URU-A-ri-in-na-az kat-ta URUKÚ.BABAR-ši
(6) an-da pa-iz-zí “When he goes down from Arinna to Ḫattuša.” Cf. Popko 2009: 15
“They carry the deity down the Tawiniyan Gate into the wood.”

Garstang and Gurney (1959: 11) wrote on that passage: “the Tawinian Gate cannot have been the gate at the north of the city because of the lie of the land, (...) we must therefore conclude that the temple from which the procession went «down» to this gate was one of those in the upper city, and it is only the Lion Gate to which a procession would be said to go «down».”

Güterbock soon contradicted this view in his review of Garstang and Gurney’s book. He noted two additional passages where the Tawiniyan Gate appears, KUB 15.31 i 13-15 and KUB 15.34 i 18 (the Evocation Rituals CTH 484 and CTH 483 respectively):

CTH 484 (NH): KUB 15.31 i 13-14:
(13) nu GIŠBANŠURH_LA ša-ra-a kar-pa-an-zi na-at-kán KÁ.GAL
(14) ŠA URU TA-Ú-I-NI-YA kat-ta pé-e-da-an-zi

“They pick up the tables and carry them down the Tawiniyan Gate.”

CTH 483 (MH): KUB 15.34 i 18-19:
(19) nu-uš-ša-an KASKAL-ši GIŠBANŠUR AD.KID A-NA [D]INGIRMEŠ LÚMEŠ GIŠERINMEŠ-aš ti-an-zi

“They go down through the Tawiniyan Gate and put the wicker table on the road for the male cedar gods.”

5 De Martino (2006: 541) translates the expression KÁ.GALH_TM URU Tawiniya katta “under the Tawinya Gate” both here, as well as in the passages from CTH 483 and CTH 484 cited below (cf. nn. 7, 8).
7 Both texts were edited by Hass and Wilhelm (1974).
8 Cf. n. 6.
9 Cf. n. 6.
Güterbock (1961: 87) then commented: “Although both rituals are of the *evocatio* type, aiming at bringing gods back home, they are styled in so general terms that the conclusion is inevitable that the way to the Tawiniya Gate led «down» from anywhere in the city, in other words, that it was indeed a north gate.”

The passages were brought up once again quite recently by Stefano de Martino, who opted for the southern location of Tawiniya, thus aiming to rehabilitate Garstang and Gurney’s view: “They [i.e. the passages] do not, actually, indicate that the wayfarer, upon leaving from within the city, had to go downwards in order to get to the Tawiniyan Gate and that, therefore, this gate was to be found in the Lower City [i.e. what Güterbock proposed]. These texts inform us, on the contrary, that the wayfarer, once outside the gate, had to follow a down-sloping route till he reached the countryside and woodland (...). Therefore, the Tawiniya Gate was in a part of the city that was higher compared to the roads that linked it to the surrounding territory and it was here, at the base/beneath (*katta*) the gate itself, that rites and ceremonies of cult were celebrated.”

It is thus manifest that regardless of how exactly the above fragments were interpreted, all the cited scholars are or were of the opinion that *katta*, in these examples, literally denotes the movement downwards and that it can be related to the topographical reality of Zippalanda, Arinna and Ḫattuša. Meanwhile, when one examines other passages with the use of *šarā* and *katta* with reference to the moving in and out of a city, the matter becomes decisively less clear.

**KÁ.GAL – ‘the (city) gate’**

Let us first examine the use of *katta* with the word for “(city) gate” (Sum. KÁ.GAL). The above cited fragments refer to the Tawiniya Gate in Ḫattuša and deal with the moment of exiting the capital, as clearly shown by the context. Additional examples may also be found for other gates in the Hittite capital.

---

11 Passages on *šarā* were commented less often. However, with regard to Katapa, both Cornelius (1961: 216 and 1963: 236), and Karasu (1988: 378) came to the conclusion that the city must have been situated on a hill, since moving to Katapa is often described with the use of *šarā* (for examples, see below).
12 Interestingly enough, *šarā* is decisively less attested in this context.
The ašuša-gate in Ḫattuša plays a role in the KI.LAM festival (CTH 627) when the procession moves to the ḫuwaši-complex of the Storm God outside the city:

CTH 627: KUB 10.1 i 9f.:
(9’) LUGAL-ḵán MUNUS.LUGAL KÁ.GAL a-šu-ša-aš
(10’) kat-ta ú-wa-an-zi

“The king and the queen come down by the ašuša-gate.”

In another ritual fragment someone, perhaps the king, leaves the city through the same gate to arrive at a river:

CTH 669: KUB 20.2 iv 24’:
(24’) [LUGAL-uš-ká]n kat-ta KÁ.GAL a-šu-ša-aš pa-iz-zi

“[The king?] goes down through the ašuša-gate.”

The last fragment referring to the capital, KUB 55.43 (CTH 683) mentions two gates, one of which unfortunately has its name broken off.

CTH 683: KUB 55.43 i 20f.¹⁴
(20) n[u] ŠA звуч-ḥa-[ri-ya K][UŠ kur-ša-an TIL I-NA URU TU-ḪU-U[P-PÍ-YA]
(21) p[ē]-e-da-an-zi na-a[n-kā]n [m]a-ah-ḥa-an URU Ḥa-at-tu-ša-az KÁ.GA[L ]
(22) kat-[l]a ar-nu-an-zi na-an-za-kān KUR-ya an-da ḍLAMMA KUṢ kur-š[a-aš]
(23) ḫal-[z]i-iš-ša-an-zi ŠA ḍLAMMA URU ḤA-TE-EN-ZU-WA-ma KUṢ kur-ša-[n TIL]
(24) INA URU DUR-MI-IT-TA pé-e-da-an-zi na-an-kān ma-ah-ḥa-[n]
(25) KÁ.GAL a-šu-ša-{an} kat-ta ar-nu-an-zi nu-uš-ši-kān ŠUM-ŠU
(26) ar-ḥ[a d]a-an-zi na-an-za-an ḍLAMMA URU ZA-P[4-TI-IŠ-KU-WA]
(27) ḫal-[z][i-iš-š]a-an-zi

¹⁴ The MH Festival of the Renewal of the kurša, cf. McMahon, 1991: 25, 146f. Note that the sign GA[L] in l. 21’ is at the very end of the column, so it is not even clear that the gate name was given here.
“They take away the old *kurša* of Zitḥariya to Tuḫuppiya. When they bring it down the [x?]­gate from Ḫattuša in the land they call it “the Tutelary Deity of the *kurša*”. The [old] *kurša* of the Tutelary deity of Ḫatenzuwa, however, they take to Durmitta. When they bring it down the *ašuša*-Gate they take its name away and c[al]l it the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiškuwa.”

There are at least two additional passages that concern gates in other cities. KUB 20.87 (CTH 739) describes a fragment of a festival in the city of Tuḫumiyara (a city attested only in fragments belonging to this CTH number). During the celebrations the king leaves the ḫalentuwa and preparations for a procession commence. A priest (*LÚ SANGA*) then hits a bull with an iron rod and the procession begins:

**CTH 739: KUB 20.87 i 16-19:**

(16) *ma-a-na-aš-ta GU₄ MAḪ-aš KÁ.GAL-az*

(17) *kat-ta pa-iz-zi ta KÁ.GAL ḫat-[a-an-zi]*

(18) *[LUGAL]-uš EGIR-pa ḫa-le-en-tu-[w[a-aš]]*

(19) *[pa-iz-z]i*

“As soon as the bull goes down through the gate¹⁵ they close the gate and the king goes back to the palace.”

The name of the gate is not specified, which could either mean that it was the only gate in Tuḫumiyara or that it was irrelevant, which gate was used during the festival.

Perhaps the most illuminating is the last example, a fragment of Iriya’s ritual of Cleansing a City (CTH 400). The incipit of the tablet reads:

**CTH 400: KUB 30.35 i 1ff.¹⁶**

(1) *UM-MA mI-RI-[A ḫAL] ma-a-an URU-an iš-[a-na-aš]*

---

¹⁵ Alternatively, the passage may be understood as (or: as he goes down the Bull’s Gate), yet, concerning previous sentences referring to the driving of the bull, this seems unlikely.

¹⁶ Cf. Melchert, 1977: 306, example 168
(2) li-in-ki-ya-aš pa-an-ga-u-wa-aš la-la-aš a-ni-ya-mi

“These are the words of Iriya, a seer: when I cure a city of blood, (evil) oath (and) the tongue of everyone.”

The city here is clearly unspecified so one can assume that the ritual could be performed for any settlement. The relevant fragment then reads:

CTH 400: KUB 30.34+ iv 19-24:

(19) [nu]-kán MÁŠ.GAL-an šu-u-ra-šu-u-ra-an-na URU-ri
(20) iš-tar-na ar-ḥa pé-e-da-a-i na-aš-ta an-tu-ḥ-šu-uš
(21) ku-e-ez-za KÁ.GALḪI.A-za kat-ta ku-na-an-na
(22) pé-e-ḥu-da-an-zi a-pu-u-ša-kán a-pé-e-ez kat-ta
(23) pé-da-at-ti nu an-tu-ḥ-še-eš a-pí-ya ku-e-da-ni pi-di
(24) a-ki-ir nu-uš a-pé-e-<da->ni pi-di pé-e-da-at-ti

“He carries a he-goat and a šurašura-bird through the city. Through the (same) gates, through which they bring down people to kill, you will bring them (= the animals) down. And there, where the people have died, to that place you will bring them.”

Since the city is unspecified, so must be the gates, and yet katta is still used. This, along with all the previous examples, leaves little room to doubt that katta denotes not so much the movement downwards (although it certainly does not exclude it), but rather simply “out of” the city.

If katta denotes exiting, it is logical to assume that šarā should denote entering the city. The examples with šarā, however, are unfortunately scarce. The

---

17 See Kümmel 1977: 158 for a German translation.
18 Miller (2012: 677) understands this fragment differently. According to him the people are brought for the execution “to the city-gate”, not through it. Yet, as enticing as this may be within the context of the city-gate as the place of the projection of the king’s power, it hardly fits the fact that the gates (not gate!) stand in ablative and not in locative (or genitive). This requires the translation “through the gates” and not “to the gates”.
19 At least when referring to city gates; the situation is different with respect to gates of buildings.
only relatively clear fragment I have managed to find is KBo 25.84 (CTH 670):

CTH 670: KBo 25.84 i 3’-7’:\textsuperscript{20}

(3’) LUGAL-uš a-šu-ú-ša-an KÁ.GAL-m[a-az kat-ta’ pa-iz-zi’]
(4’) MUNUS.LUGAL-aš ZA.LAM.GAR-az ú-iz-zi
(5’) ir-ḫa-i-iš-ki-iz-zi MUNUS.LUGAL-aš-ša[
(6’) ma-a-an LUGAL-uš MUNUS.LUGAL-aš-ša a-a[p-
(7’) KÁ.GAL-ma-az ša-ra-a ti’-en-z[i

“The king [goes down?] through the ašuša gate. The queen comes out of the tent […] makes a libation round. The queen […] When the king and queen […] they step up through the gate.”

The second example, KUB 20.96 iv 2f. (CTH 635), is somewhat less clear. After the offerings at Mt. Daḫa, the king embarks a chariot and travels to Ankuwa:

CTH 635: KUB 20.96 iv 2f: (2) DINGIR\textsuperscript{LUM}-kán KÁ.GAL-na (3) ša-ra-a a-ri

“The deity enters the city gate.” Afterwards the procession enters the city. Here, however, the allative denotes perhaps arriving at the gate rather than going through it.\textsuperscript{21}

**URU – ‘city’**

Similar conclusions can be reached when one examines the passages with *katta* and *šarā* in connection with URU. Here, the instances of *šarā* are decisively easier to find and the distribution of *šarā* / *katta* is more or less equal. The passages are also clearer since not only the context, but also the case endings indicate that *katta* denotes “exiting” while *šarā “entering” the city. The most illustrative example is the Instruction of Arnuwanda I for the Frontier Post Governors (CTH 261).

\textsuperscript{20} Cf. Neu 1980: 164.

\textsuperscript{21} Thus Popko 1994: 192-194.
CTH 261: KUB 13.1++ i 6-8 (§3 in Miller’s edition): 22
(6) na-āš-ta ku-it-ma-an ḫ[a-li-y]a-az LÚMEŠ ḫa-α-λι-y[a-tal-le-e-eš]
(7) kat-ta na-a-ū-i ú-wa-an-[zi n]a-āš-ta URU-az kat-ta L[(ÜMEŠNI.ZU)]
(8) ku-it-ma-an [ú-wa-a]n-du […]

“As long as the wa[tchm]en have not yet come down from the w[at]ch, let the [(scouts) come] down from the town in the meantime.”

CTH 261: KUB 13.1++ i 12-13 (§5 in Miller’s edition):
(12) nu LÚMEŠ NÍ.ZU Š4 KASKAL GÍD.DA a-ū [(ri-i-e-e)]š e-ep-du na-āš-ta LÚMEŠ[
(13) URU-az kat-ta ku-ra-an-na ša-a-[n-ḫu-wa-an-ž]i [(u-u)]n-ni-ya-an-du

“The scouts shall occupy the p[[ost]]s of the main road, and the […]-men shall [(dr)]ive down from the town t[o inspe]ct the sectors.

CTH 261: KUB 13.1++ i 17 (§7 in Miller’s edition):
(17) na-āš-ta GU₄ UDU LÚMEŠ KIN URU-az kat-ta [tar-na-an-du]

“And [they shall let] the cattle, the sheep (and) the workmen down from the town.”

CTH 261: KUB 13.1++ i 19-22 (§8 in Miller’s edition):
(19) [(IGI-zi pal-ši-ma)]
(20) ku-i-e-es LÚMEŠ NÍ.ZU UD-az a-ū-i-[e-er (nu-za LÚMEŠ KIN GU₄ U)]DU]
(21) ANŠE.KUR.RA ANŠE.HLA pé-ra-an ḫu-u-i[(nu-wa-an-du na-a)t-kán URU-ri]
(22) ša-ra-a ni-ni-in-kán-[du]

“The scouts who observ[ed (the first stretch)] of the day, however, [(shall)] drive forth [(the workmen, the cattle, the sh)eep], the horses (and) the donkeys, [(and th)ey] shall move them up [into the town].”

22 All passages from this text are cited after the latest edition by Miller (2013: 212-237).
CTH 261: KUB 13.1++ i 22-24 (§9 in Miller’s edition):23

(22) *na-aš-ta GIM-an LÚ\(^{\text{MES}}\) KIN GU₄ UDU [ANŠE.KUR.RA\(^{\text{HLA}}\) ANŠE\(^{\text{HLA}}\)]
    [UR]U-ri ša-ra-a ta-ru-up-ta nu [ ]

(23) *nam-ma LÚ\(^{\text{MES}}\) NÍ.ZU\(^{\text{TJ}}\) ku-i-e-eš a-ú-w[a-ri-e-eš e-ep-per (na-at-kán
    URU-ri)]

(24) *ša-ra-a pa-a-an-du

“And as soon as the workmen, the cattle, the sheep, [the horses and the
donkeys] have gathered up in the [to]wn, then [...]. Further, the scouts who
[took up] the pos[ts] shall go up [(into the town)].”

CTH 261: KUB 13.1++ i 29-30 (§10 in Miller’s edition):

(29) *ma-a-aḫ-ḫa-an-ma lu-uk-kat-ta na-aš-ta URU-az LÚ[\(^{\text{MES}}\) NÍ.ZU kat-ta]
    ú-wa-an-du]

(30) *na-aš-ta ku-ra-an-nu-uš SIG₅-in ša-an-ḥa-<an>-du

“But as soon as it dawns, the [(scouts) shall come (down)] from the town,
and they shall inspect the sectors well.”

As said, the distinction between the use of *šarā* and *katta* is demonstrated
here both by the fact that *katta* is used only with URU in the ablative, while
*šarā* with URU-in the dative-locative. Furthermore, events that follow
the expression URU-az *katta* take place outside of the city, whereas those
following URU-ri *šarā* occur within the city walls. Just like Iriya’s Ritual
(CTH 400) cited above, the instruction for the Frontier Post Governors does
not concern any specific city, and one is tempted to question the relation of
these expressions to the city’s topography. Certainly, one could expect that
the frontier towns were built on elevation and that those expressions could
actually reflect their topography, but it seems more probable that they were
used to simply denote exiting and entering the city. Some further examples
confirm this view. In Anitta’s Res Gestae (CTH 1), we read that:

23 This paragraph is restored with KUB 31.108++ 22’ff.
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CTH 1: KBo 3.22 obv. 5-6:24

(5) [LUG]AL URU KU-UŠ-ŠA-RA URU-az kat-ta [p]a-an-ga-ri-it ú[-iť]
(6) [U]RU Ne-e-ša-an iš-pa-an-di na-ak-ki-it da[-a-aš]

“The king of Kuššar came down out of the city (of Kuššar) with large numbers and took Neša during the night by storm.”

An interesting example is provided by the Tale of Zalpa, where URU-az katta is connected with the verb uek- (here: “demand”)

CTH 3: KBo 3.38 rev. 27'-28':25

(27’) [I-N]A MU.3 KAM LUGAL-uš I-NA URU ZA-AL-PA pa-it L[UGAL-uš URU ZA-AL-PA MU.2 KAM kat-ta
(28’) [e-eš]-ta ta-ba-ar-na-aš mḪa-ap-pi-in URU-a[z k]at-ta ú-e-ek-ta

“In the third year the king went and besieged Zalpa. He was there for two years. He demanded Tabarna and Happi down from the city.”

CTH 3: KBo 22.2 rev. 14’:26

(14’) ša-aš ša-ra-a URU-ya pa-it

“(The king) went up to the city.”

To add one more example, in the Deeds of Suppiluliuma we read:

CTH 40: KUB 34.27+ iv 26’-27’:27

(26’) [lu-uk]-kat-ti-ma-kán A-BU-YA URU Ti[(=-wa-an-za-na-za kat-ta)]
(27’) [(KUR-e)]-kán an-da pé-en-na-a-i

“In the morning my father drove down from Tiwanzana into the country (while in the rear his charioteers and six teams of horses were supporting him.)”

27 Güterbock, 1956: 76
Again, it seems that the use of *katta* and *šarā* does not depend so much on a city’s topography, but rather on the fact, whether one was entering or exiting it. When one was going into the city, to a Hittite it was always “up”, and the road out of the city led always “down”. If one still wanted to assume that such passages really reflect the topographical relations of cities, one would have also to assume that all settlements were built on elevation, which hardly seems the case given the fact that the Hittite scribes did not distinguish between a city, a town, and a village – they were all URUs.

Certainly, nothing stands in the way of assuming that originally these expressions actually reflected the lie of the land, but, with time, they acquired more of a symbolic nature, as a city always marks the center of a landscape and, to quote anthropologist Yi Fu Tuan, “centre implies elevation”. The phenomenon of perceiving parts of the landscape as symbolically higher or lower, with disregard to their physical position is also known from other cultures, e.g., the use of the term downtown in American English has nothing to do with the topography, but denotes simply the city’s centre. Also, as noted by Nelson Wu in his “Chinese and Indian Architecture”, “No matter how the natural terrain of China is formed, one always goes up to Peking.”

I managed to find only one fragment in which *katta* appears in connection to loc., thus seemingly standing in contrast to the above considerations. However, the otherwise famous passage from the Apology of Ḫattušili III (CTH 81) concerns the city of Tarhuntassa and, I think, can be explained by the fact that Tarḫuntassa was not thought of as part of Ḫatti proper. If one considers other passages dealing with going abroad from Hatti, like those concerning travelling to Egypt, one sees that in such cases the road led also down.

I would like to conclude with a short comment on the expression *šarā pai-* and its relation with *anda pai-*. The well-known outline tablet of the AN.TAH.ŠUM...
festival (KBo 10.20, CTH 604) provides us with a very interesting distinction between anda pai- and šarā pai-. 32

CTH 604: KBo 10.20 obv. 4-6:
(4) [(nu LUGAL) MUNUS.LUGAL UR(U Ha)]-at-tu-ša-az URU Ta-ḥur-pi
(5) [(an-da pa-a-an-zi na-aš-ta LUGAL)]-uš URU Ta-ḥur-pi
(6) [š(a-ra-a IŠ-TU GIS GIGIR)] pa-iz-zi

„The king and the queen go from Ḫattuša to Taḫurpa. The king goes up to Taḫurpa in a chariot.”

CTH 604: KBo 10.20 obv. 10-11:
(10) [(nu a)]n-da-an URU Ta-ḥur-pi pa-iz-zi
(11) [(URU Ka)]-a-ta-pi-ma-kán ša-ra-a-ű-UL ku-it-ki pa-iz-zi

“He goes to Taḫurpa, but does not go up to Katapa.”

CTH 604: KBo 10.20 obv.13f.:
(13) ma-a-an LUGAL-i-ma a-aš-šu ta-aš-ta URU Ka-a-ta-pi ša-ra-a
(14) a-pé-e-ni-iš-ša-an pa-iz-zi

“(But) if the king wishes, he (still) goes up to Katapa accordingly.”

CTH 604: KBo 10.20 obv. 15-16:
(15) lu-uk-kat-ti-ma LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL
(16) URU Ta-ḥur-pi an-da-an pa-a-an-zi na-aš-ta LUGAL-uš URU Ta-ḥur-pi
(17) ša-ra-a GIS GIGIR-az pa-iz-zi

„The next day the king and the queen go to Taḫurpa. The king goes up to Taḫurpa on a chariot.”

CTH 604: KBo 10.20 obv. 19:
(19) lu[-uk]-kat-ti-ma LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL URU Ḫa-at-tu-ši an-da-an pa-a-an-zi

„The next day the king and the queen go to Ḫattuša.”

32 For the edition of the text see Güterboc 1960.
CTH 604: KBo 10.20 obv. 22-23:

(22) na-aš-ta URU Ḫa-at-tu-ši ša-ra-a GIŠ ḫu-u-lu-ga-an-ni-it
(23) pa-iz-zi

“(The king) goes up to Ḫattuša on ḫuluganni.”

The above extracts allow to grasp the exact meaning of šarā pai-. Whereas anda pai- (or anda with the verb denoting movement) means a more general “go to”, šarā pai- (or šarā with the verb denoting movement) seems to indicate the very moment of entering the city. Note that in the above examples the sentence with šarā pai- is frequently in a sentence that follows the expression anda pai- and contains details as to the means of transportation, differently than the sentence with anda pai-.
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THE DEFINITION OF THE TERMS //LALAMIŠ AND //DUŠDUMIŠ IN HITTITE TEXTS

Zheng Li*

Abstract: The words //lalamiš and //dušdumiš were certainly attested in few Hittite texts, but it seems that their definition was rather definite and even they have a common meaning, supposed by scholars. The present understanding were not completely explained as a real physical object, and in fact, they were analyzed mainly from the point of view of their value and functions. In this article, we will reconsider the meaning of these two words. Although they were thought to be have a common value and function, quite possibly, they might be understood two different things and might be translated differently according to the context of the texts.

Key Words: //Lalamiš //Dušdumiš Definition Objects Context

The words //lalamiš and //dušdumiš, prefixed by the so-called ‘Glossenkeil’, could be so far attested only in few Hittite texts which might be not proved in Old and Middle Hittite kingdom period until now. They were mentioned in

* Research center of Eastern Literature, Peking University, Beijing, China
different kinds of texts of the Hittites, and it is so curious that the definition of these two words was rather similar and both even have a common sense according to the present study.

The word //lalamiš was translated mostly as ‘list’, ‘accounting receipt’ and ‘receipt’. Another word //dušdumiš was understood almost same as the former, but it was also supposed as the word ‘Bescheinigung’ or ‘Ausweis’. It seems that, to a certain extent, such understanding could more emphasize their role, but not the basic meaning.

In fact, it is very difficult to make a clear about what they actually meant or what they were or looked like. The words lalamiš and dušdumiš, in my opinion, could be referred to two different things. In other words, each represents its own object basically. As it could be seen that they were simultaneously mentioned in a compound sentence in a same paragraphy of one text. If both are the same and common thing and they have no any differences, then, it is impossible that they were used at the same time and

---

1 Until now, the word //lalamiš might be attested in the following seven texts or fragments, and they are:
   - Inventory of Chests (KBo IX 91, CTH 241)
   - Inventories of Metals, Tools, Weapons (KBo XVIII 153, CTH 242.2)
   - Bo 4514(CTH 242)
   - Ukurra Text, (KUB XIII 35, CTH 293)
   - Vow of Puduhepa (KUB XXXI 53, CTH 585)
   - Sacrifice and Prayer to the Stormgod of Nerik (KUB XXXVI 89, CTH 671)
   - KBo LXIV 298, Bo 69/163.
   The word // dušdumiš was mentioned even in less texts, and probably in following four texts or fragments:
   - Ukurra Text, (KUB XIII 35, CTH 293)
   - Ritual of the Goddess Ishara against Perjury(KUB VII 56 III 10, CTH 782)
   - Bo 8029
   - KBo XLVIII 247 (Bo68/226)

   All these cuneiform documents, no matter whichever word concerned, were thought to be the New Hittite texts based on the contents and their palaeographical and linguistic analysis. They are all dated to New Hittite period according to Hethitologie Portal Mainz, www.hethport.uni-würzburg.de.
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appeared in two coordinate clauses because it was not necessary. Therefore, it is possible that their meaning has not yet been very well understood and differentiated properly until now.

The only one evidence which both appeared in a same text was Ukurra Text (KUB XIII 35, CTH 293), and they were mentioned in line 5 and 15-19:

Obv. Col.I 1-8

1 [MUNUS LUGAL k]u-it Ū-NU-TUM A-NA mGAL-D-aš U DUMU mUk-[ku-ra] LÜUGULA X

2 [GIŠGIGI]R Ū-NU-UT ZABAR URUDU TÚG GAD GIŠBAN GIŠGAG. TAG.GA KUŠ A-RI-TUM

3 [GIŠTU]KU]L NAM.RA GU₄ UDU ANŠE.KUR.RA ANŠE.GİR.NUN. NA EGIR-pa pí-eš-ki-it


6 Ū-UL e-eš-ta UM-MA MUNUS.LUGAL-MA pa-a-an-du-wa LÚMEŠ KUŠ ₇ GUŠKIN

7 LÚMEŠ ša-la-aš-hu-uš MUNUS.LUGAL mGAL-DU-aš mUk-ku-ra-aš LÜUGULA X

8 ša-ku-wa-aš-ša-ra-uš I-NA É ₇ Pli-el-wa-ni li-in-kán-du

The instrument which Queen had given to GAL-U, son of Ukkura, Chief of the Ten is a chariot, bronze and copper instrument, clothe, textiles, bow, arrow, shield, staff, prisoner, cattle and sheep, horse and donkey. To whom the items which she gave, she did not seal them. He did not have a dušdumiš and he did not have a lalamiš.

7 The Queen speaks thus:”Let they, golden-spear, salasha people of

6 This word lalamiš was also attested in the 36th line, Col.IV, at the same text, but without dušdumiš in former or latter sentences.

7 J. Tischler 1994, p470. Tischler translated dušdumiš and lalamiš into Quittung and Verbuchung respectively. As for the word dušdumiš in line 16, at the same text, he combined it with mLE-₄ and took these two words as Quittungstafeln. Hans G. Güterbock and H. A. Hoffner, The Hittite Dictionary., Vol. L., Chicago, 1980, p20. They just kept the word dušdumiš and translated lalamiš into an itemized list.
the Queen, GAL-DU and Ukkura, Chief of the Ten, go”. Let them take
an oath in the temple of the goddess, Lelwani.

Obv. Col.I. 9-16
9   nu-wa mUk-ku-ra-aš LÚ UGULA X MUNUS.LUGAL li-in-kán-ta
10  nu-za-kán li-in-ki-ya an-da kiš-an pí-e-da-aš
11  Ú-NUT LUGAL-wa ku-it ku-it har-ku-un nu-wa A-NA Ú-NUT LUGAL
12  :har-pa-na-al-la Ú-UL ku-wa-pí-ik-ki i-ya-an-ni-ya-nu-un
13  nu-wa-za Ú-UL ku-it-ki da-ah-hu-un MUNUS.LUGAL-wa-mu ku-it
14  EGIR-pa pí-eš-ki-it nu-wa-kán ar-ha Ú-UL ku-it-ki pí-ni-nu-nu-un
15  ANŠE.KUR.RA  ANŠE.GİR.NUN.NA ku-[n har-ku-un nu-wa-mu
     GIS LE-U₅
16  :du-uš-du-ma-aš-ša ši-ya-a-an [e-eš-ta

Ukkura, Chief of the Ten of the Queen swore, and he swore as
follows:”Whichever instrument of the king which I managed, I by
no means cast greedy eyes on the instrument of the king, and
I myself took nothing. Whatever the queen had given to me,
I did not throw away anything, The horse and donkey which
I had, I had a sealed lalamiš and sealed dušdumiš ”.

Comparing with the paragraphs between 1-8 and 9-16, these two words were
used in a similar structure and both were used to intend to testify Ukkura’s
reality and his innocence. It seems that both could play very important and
crucial part in the work and life of Ukkura, and of course in his lawsuit.
Here, these two words were mentioned one by one and such a phenomenon
possibly indicated that they both could not be replaced each other although
their function was possibly similar or even the same.
This Ukkura text was regarded as a ‘Gerichtsprotokolle’, and to a certain extent, it might belong to the group of the Law texts of the Hittites on the basis of its content. Although these two words were not translated in Werner’s monography, they both had a common value and function, and could prove the validity which Ukkura has certain kinds of property. Such a understanding has been accepted among the Hittitologists. But the common function does not necessarily mean that present translation could be only based on this point or these two words must be referred to a same thing. On the contrary, it is just their similar or common value and function that indicated they were two different things or objects.

It was quite possible that both words were treated as different things by the Hittites themselves. This is possibly mainly because both were expressed in two different words, and, after all, these two words had their own roots. The former probably came from cuneiform Luwian verb lala-, and probably means ‘to take’. Meanwhile, according to Tischler, in cuneiform Luwian there was a verbal abstract noun form, namely lalaman-, means ‘contract’, ‘treaty’ which is possibly neuter gender and it might be related with the word // lalamiš. This word probably was really a Luwian in origin. Also, we might take the word // lalamiš in Hittite texts as a neuter gender.

The word //dušdumiš, probably Luwian in origin, too, might be from the verb //dušdu-, about which we do not know its meaning, and its form in noun was possibly the //dusdumi-, which is common gender. Although until now, it is attested in rather few texts and most of the texts were just in fragment, but this is another word after all and it had a different root from // lalamiš. It is more important that both had a same origin, and after all, both were ‘Glossenkeilwörter’, therefore, it is enough to show that the basic
meaning of this word differed from the word //lalamiš, and both referred to two different things. If one word could be translated as the word ‘list’, then, another one must not be the same meaning. The former //lalamiš was somehow a kind of thing which related with wood since it might be equal to the word $\text{GIŠ}LE-U_5$.\(^{14}\) whereas, we know nothing on this point about the latter.

The present translation of the word //lalamiš, as above mentioned, was rather various, and even in Friedrich’s Wörterbuch, they are translated into three words with uncertainty, namely, Beleg, Nachweis and Liste. Besides the Ukkura text, it was used in some other Hittite texts, then, how it could be understood there? Here, it is much better to have an overview about how this word was in the following texts.

In the text which is called Inventory of Chests, this word can be found many times and it is worthy that it appeared at the very beginning of the paragraph concerned. Then, What single function does this word have? How can we explain such a phenomenon? Moreover, We do not know how the Hittites called this text, and this name ‘Inventory of Chests’ was no more than a proposal today on the basis of the content of the text itself.

On the basis of the content, the expression ‘pa-ra-a SUM-u-aš’ for ‘delivery’ might indicate that these things which here were listed will be sent, and this text was somehow prepared by the sender. According to the mood revealed from the whole of this text, we think, it reflected the mood of the sender, quite possibly, it was not written by the receiver, and it was not the receipt which the receiver recorded. Therefore, it shows that the word lalamis could not be a receipt. Here is the text and translation:\(^{15}\)

---

\(^{14}\) As concerning the word $\text{GIŠ}LE-U_5$, certainly, this form was mentioned in a little text, but it might be proved to be an akkadian form of the word lalamis according to the content and structure of this Ukkura text, where the word $\text{GIŠ}LE-U_5$ and //dušdumiš were once mentioned together. Just we have seen, in this very text, the word //dušdumiš was mentioned together with the word //lalamiš once, especially, the meaning of the word //lalamiš and $\text{GIŠ}LE-U_5$ could be understood in the same way because the function was the same. Thus, this word was possibly written just in two different forms, one is Luwian form, //lalamiš; another was an akkadian word with a sumerian determinative form,$\text{GIŠ}LE-U_5$ which possibly means ‘Holztafel’, namely, wooden-tablet. H. G. Güterbock and H. A. Hoffner1980, p26. They took it as a single word and translated into (waxed)writing boards. J.Friedrich, Kurzgefasstes Hethitisches Wörterbuch, Heidelberg 1991, p309. Holztafel.

\(^{15}\) The transliteration and translation(KBo IX 91, CTH 241) here are from Košak. S. Košak, Hittite Inventory Texts (CTH 241-250), THeth 10, Heidelberg, 1982, p24-29.
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Obv. 1 la-la-me-eš TÚG hlu-ni-pa GAB
2 3 TÚG maš-[š]i-aš KÙ.BABBAR
3 A-NA LÚMEŠ a-ra-un-na
4 URU Ne-ri-ik a-ša-an-du-la-aš
5 la-la-me-eš ŠA GIS PISAN pa-ra-a SUM-u-aš
6 2 TÚG GÚ uz-za-i-mi-ya
7 1 TÚG GÚ SA₃ 1 TÚG SA GA.DÙ KUR kar-DU-ni-aš
8 A-NA LÚMEŠ a-ra-un-na a-ša-an-du-la-aš URU Ne-ri-ik
9 1 GÍR GAB KÙ KUN SAG.DU NA₄ DU₈ ŠÚ.A
10 mŠu-na-DINGIR GÍR Kán-nu-wa-ri-ša-an
11 la-la-me-eš tup-pa-aš GÍR
12 3 GÍR ŠÀ.BA 2 LÍL 1 LÚMU
13 A-NA LÚMEŠ a-ra-un-na a-ša-an-du-la-aš
14 URU Ne-ri-ik
15 la-la-me-eš GIS PISAN KUR Mi-iz-ri BI-IB-RI KÙ.BABBAR
16 (erased)
17 1 GÚ UR.MAH 2 GAL KÙ.BABBAR LÚMEŠ a-ra-un-na
18 a-ša-an-du-la-aš URU Ne-ri-ik
19 [la-la-m]e-eš ŠA GIS PISAN 9₀ TÚG E.ÍB ku-wa-pi an-da
20 [x TÚGE.ÍB ZAG.KUD LÚMEŠ [a-ra-u]n-na x[
21 [a-]ša-an-du[-la-aš URU Ne-ri-ik]

1 Receipt (for) the hunipa-cloth (of) the breast
2 3 white sash belts
3 for the yeomen
4 of the garrison of Nerik
5 Receipt of the chest for delivery:

---

16 Here is my translation:’ List (for) the hunipa-cloth (of) the breast’, and the word Receipt in following paragraphs should be replaced by the word List.
6 2 Hurrian? Shirts, …
7 1 red shirt, 1 sash belt from Babylon,
8 for the yeomen of the garrison of Nerik,
9 1 dagger, (its)front (is)shimmering, its tail and pommel (are of) rock-crystal:
10 Sunaili and Kannuwari(made/gave)it.
11 receipt of the chest (of) daggers:
12 3 daggers: thereof two field knives, 1 kitchen knife
13 for the yeomen of the garrison
14 of Nerik
15 Receipt of the chest (from) Egypt, with silver rhyta
16 (erased)
17 1 (shaped like the) neck of a lion, 2 silver beakers (for) the yeomen
18 of the garrison of Nerik
19 [Receipt of the chest where 90 tunics are in,]
20 [ x tunics ] cut along the edge?, for the yeomen
21 of the [garri[son of Nerik]

Rev.
3 [la-la-me-eš ŠA] GIŠ PISAN TÚG NÍG LAM MEŠ
4 [ a]n-da ap-pa-an[-da]
5 [ i]r-hi-iš A-NA Dx

6 HAR. ŠU KÙ.BABBAR A-NA DU URU TÚL-na
7 DUTUŠI URU TÚL-na LÚMEŠ KÙ. DÍM
8 KASKAL-ah-ha-an-zi
9 1 ME GÍN KÙ.BABBAR DUTUŠI
10 EZEN AN.TAH. ŠUM URU TÚL-na pi-da-i
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Rev. 3 [Receipt of the chest of costly clothes 4 [for preparing 5 [lord to god x
6 silver bracelet for the weather-god of Arinna 7 and for the Sun-goddess of Arinna: the goldsmiths 8 will send by road.
9 His Majesty will send 100 shekels of silver 10 for the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival in Arinna.

Following one is another so-called inventory text which mentioned metals, tools and weapons, and here are the transliteration and translation from Košak: 18

Obv. 1 (-)da-a[š(-)
2 MA.N]A GUŠKIN man[-ta-ad-du
3 [ x MA.N]A GUŠKIN man-ta-ad-du [
4 [ x MA.NA] GUŠKIN Gištup-pa-za la-la-me-eš N[U.GÁL
5 [ lP]al-la-a mZu-zu-li za-nu-m[a-an-zi
6 [ x GÍN] GUŠKIN QA-DU URUDU 1 KI.LAL NA 4 IŠ-TU
7 [ ]iš-ša-ra-at-ta-na-aš x[ 8 1 MA.NA GUŠKIN QA-DU URUDU 1 KI.LAL NA 4 IŠ-TU
9 TÚG ku-ši-ši EHIR-an[(-)
10 20 GÍN GUŠKIN QA-DU URUDU 1 KI.LAL NA 4 IŠ-TU x[ 11 1 MA.NA 5 GÍN GUŠKIN QA-DU URUDU 1 KI.LAL NA 4 IŠ-TU ŠA m Lu[-

17 This text(KBo XVIII 153, CTH 242.2) was named ‘Inventories of Metals, Tools, Weapons’ according to CTH. 18 S. Košak, Hittite Inventory Texts (CTH 241-250), THeth 10, Heidelberg, 1982, p71-72.
Obv.

2 [ min]as of gold for tri[bute

3 [ x m]inas of gold for tribute [  

4 [ x minas] of gold: receipt from the chest is miss[ing]

5 [ mP]alla and Zuzuli will refi[ne it]

6 [ x shek]els of gold with copper, 1 stone-weight, f[rom

7 [ jiššarattanaš x]

8 1 mine of gold with copper, 1 stone-weight fro[m

9 festive garb after[

19 Here is my translation: ‘A list on a wooden-tablet is missing’.
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10 20 shekels of gold with copper, 1 stone-weight, from x[

11 1 mina 5 shekels of gold with copper, 1 stone-weight, from the [ ] of

mLu[-

12 afterwards he [took]3 hessamala.

13 12 shekels of gold they take outside [ ]

Snaffle (is ) therein.

14 [x mi]nas of gold with copper, 1 st[one-weight]:

Receipt for the chest from the country[20

15 [x mi]nas of gold with coppe[r, 1 stone-weight: ]

Receipt from the chest :ar-k[u-?21

16 [x mina]s of gold, no copper (added), 1 [stone-weight

From the che]st receipt for the troops x[22

17 [x minas of s]ilver and 4 shekels of gold, [ ]

(temporary record)on the wooden tablets, 1 [stone-

w]eight

18 [x minas of go]ld, 1 stone-weight [        

19 [x minas of go]ld from Bab[yon they]…

20 [x minas of go]ld are ke[pt outside [for the …]of the regular festival.

21 [x minas of g]old with copper[ ], 1 stone-

weight: neck-rings

22                       ] Zuzuli

23 [x minas of gold] with copper

As we have seen above that the word lalameš which was translated as ‘receipt’
was mentioned four times on this extant version. This inventory mentioned

20 My translation is ‘There was a list on a wooden-tablet from the country’.
21 ‘There was a list on a wooden-tablet’.
22 ‘There was a list on a wooden-tablet from the troops’.
some very precious metals, such as gold and silver and etc. However, these metals here were possibly prepared for tribute and for regular festival and so on according to the content of the text itself, and probably nothing related with the activity of receiving because possibly there could not exist such a case, which this text was written down as a receipt for the provider or which was the record of scribe for the storehouse. Therefore, here, the document probably intended to show there existed a list of the items, which will be sent for some activity or place.

In the text which is called **vow of Puduhepa**, this word was translated as a list by Otten and other scholars, and it can be possibly accepted. But, it will be difficult to favour if we understood it as a receipt. Here is the transcription and translation of the text:

7 II ME 87 UDU.SÍG+MUNUS I ME UDU.NITÁ XI MÁŠ.GAL IŠ-TU É.GALLM ku-in pi-i-e-er
8 la-la-mi-iš III MÁŠ.GAL I UDU.NITÁ A-NA DINGIRLM ši-pa-ante-er IV UDU.NITÁ tu-uk- kán-zi-ya-aš
9 ŠA EZENl li-la-aš EGIR-pa AD-DIN III MÁŠ.GAL II UDU.NITÁ A-NA an-na-nu-ma-aš
10 SANGA-eš-na-za na-a-ú-i EGIR-pa

7 The 287 female sheep, 100 male sheep and 11 he-goats which they gave from the palace,
8 there was a list, they offered 3 he-goats and one male sheep to the gods, and I had given
9 4 male sheep for the lila-festival. 3 he-goats, 2 ram was not yet back from temple service
10 because of the training.

24 KUB XXXI 53, line 7-10(47-50).
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It is very clear that the subject of this text was the first person, singular, namely the queen, Puduhepa and she was the actor because she made a vow to the god although she also mentioned some other people. Puduhepa here numbered the items which she and others would like to offer to the god, and the word lalamis could not be understood receipt because what they had done is not to receive, but to send.

Similarly, the text which was the sacrifice and prayer to the Stormgod of Nerik could be only made by either Hittite king or Queen generally,26 and the lalama was mentioned in this text, and it must be an object on which certain items were mentioned possibly for the god and it could be brought.

Obv.

18 hal-zi-ya-an-du-wa-ra[-an] -wa-za-kán GE₆-i KI-pí na-a-ú
19 ú-it-du-wa-ra-aš [ ] KI-aš₆-GIS-KÁ.GAL₆-H₆ a-pa-ši-el hi-eš-du
20 pí-ra-an-wa-aš-ši-y[a] nu-wa-r[a]-an- kán UGU GE₆-ya-za KI-za
21 PU₆-[URU]Ne-ri-ik [ ] u-i)d-du
22 PZA₆-BA₆-BA₄ [ ]-za ma-ni-ya-ah
23 ú-it-du-wa-ra-aš [ ]₆ /la-la-a-ma pí-ra-an

18 Let they call [him] to the dark earth, may he turn himself
19 let he come [ ] himself let he open the door of the [dark]earth!
20 to him [ ] him from dark earth
21 The stormgod of Nerik [ ] let he come
22 The war-god of the city [ ] may you give to
23 let he come [ ] let he bring the lalama forwards.27

---

26 This text (KUB XXXVI 89, CTH 671) was dated in New Hittite period, the transliteration and translation were published by Haas. V. Haas, Der Kult von Nerik, Ein Beitrag zur hethitischen Religionsgeschichte., Rom, 1970, p144-145.

27 Haas1970. This word was not translated here.
Another fragment which mentioned the word lalameš was so poor and almost there was no more information. But the style of this text was rather similar to the text which is above discussed, namely inventories of metals, tools, weapons (CTH 242.2.), perhaps it belonged to this group of texts.

X+2                         -z]i 
3'                           -]EN-NU-Ú KI.LAL.BI
4'                           KÜ.BABBAR 4 KI.LAL.BI [
5'                           KÜ.BABBAR 35 GÍN GÍN [
6'                           MA.N]A KÜ.BABBAR 8 KI.LAL.BI
7'                           ]x KI.LAL.BI ŠA x[
8'                           ]x x x-ši la-la-me-eš[ 
9'                           ]x uš-ki-zi [  
10'                          ]pUTU URUTÚL-na  
11'                          ]x-UT Û[
12'                          ] [  
13'                          A-]NA LÚMES[  
X+2                          not clear
3'                           ]x weight 
4'                           silver 4 weight [
5'                           silver 35 shekel [
6'                           min]a silver 8 weight
7'                           ]x weight of [
8'                           ]x list [  

---

28 Bo 4514 (CTH 242).
29 The transliteration was published by Siegelova, but she did not give us its translation. J. Siegelova, Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis im Licht der Wirtschafts- und Inventardokumente I, Narodni Muzeum V Praze, 1986, p122.
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Therefore, possibly, the word lalameš might be a list which covered different items and it will be sent either to a king or to a certain god or for some other purposes.

The last one was a tiny fragment Bo 69/163 (KBo LXIV 298), and the word la-la-me-eš was mentioned in line 5,\textsuperscript{30} but it was very difficult to understand it because there were no more other words which could help us to understand the text.

Then, what kind of a list is for the word lalamiš? We have already made a conclusion that the word lalamiš might be equal to the word \textit{GIŠLE-U\textsubscript{5}}, that is to say, such a list was connected with the wood. One good evidence is the text which is Inventories of Metals, Tools, Weapons, and it clearly shows that this list was written down on a wooden-tablet. Therefore, this word might be translated as a list on a wooden-tablet.

The understanding of another word //dušdumiš might be very difficult, too. Its definition, such as Bescheinigung or Quittung, possibly was based just on its value or function in the context of the text. But, we also think that this word, at first, should be understood as a kind of object because it should be sealed.

Unfortunately, the word //dušdumiš could only be attested in one more texts. The Ukkura text was a only evidence which could prove it referred to an object and here are the descriptions:

\textsuperscript{30} This transliteration is just according to the file of Mainz archive, and I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Silvin Košak and Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz for allowing me checking and presenting it here.
The horse and donkey which I had, I had a sealed lalamiš and dušdumiš.

But such an important aspect was not attested in other broken texts. How was the dušdumiš and how it looked like? We can not answer this question now, but it is true that it must also be a specified and physical object which could be sealed, just like lalamiš.

In the ritual of the Goddess Ishara against Perjury, which is also a New Hittite text, a word du-uš-du-ma was possibly mentioned according to the restoration of Melchert, but it is nothing besides the form. However, it was important that the content of this text could help us understand the meaning of this word. A sealed specified object as a good witness was likewise necessary at this kind of ritual activity, and it could not be just understood as a abstract conception.

This word might be also attested in a unpublished fragment, Bo8029, although its complete form and understanding for this word could not be easily given.

X+2 ]an-zi du-uš-du- [
3' ]ya-an-ma lu-kat-ti[
4' ] GIS̄a-ya-an i-ya[-
5' ]at A-NA DINGIRLIM iš-ki-ša[-
6' ]GUD MEŠ UDULÁ a-pi-ya x[
7' ]EGIR-pa HUR.SAG-i pi-ten-r[

32 KUB VII 56 III 10', (CTH 782).
34 I am very grateful to Prof. Dr. Silvin Košak and Mainz Akademie for allowing me to publish this fragment and present its transliteration here.
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8' x AN.BAR GAL LÚMES UKUŠ [ ]
9' x x x kat-ta-an ti-y[a-
]
] du-uš-d[u ]
] but x next day[
] made Giša-ya-an
] it back to the god [ ]
] cattles and sheep there [ ]
] sent back to the mountain [ ]
] chief of the soldiers iron [ ]
[... ]place down

The fragment somehow possibly related with some kind of social activities before the god, and here the appearance of this du-uš-d[u- might be not strange, probably it was also mentioned as a sealed or unsealed specified object and also functioned as a witness.

Moreover, this word was quite possibly attested in another tiny fragment, KBo XLVIII 247 (Bo68/226) according to the transliteration of Mainz Archive, 35 but no more information could be given from it.

x +1 ]da-a-i

35 This transliteration is just according to the file of Mainz archive, and I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Silvin Košak and Mainz Akademie for allowing me checking and presenting it here.
Conclusion

In a word, although the words //lalamiš and //dušdumiš // had a same function or value, however, they both should be understood as different things, and represent two different specified objects. As we discussed, they could not be mentioned simultaneously if they were a same thing. The former one was a list on a sealed wooden-tablet, the latter was not yet clear, but, possibly, was also a sealed physical object, and also possibly it could not be a list any more. Moreover, such understanding for this two words should be at the first place in our dictionaries, and they could not be understood only as abstract concept.

As for the translation, ‘receipt’, in my opinion, such definition might be not consistent with the contents of these texts which the word //lalamiš was mentioned, and after all, it could be not accepted when such a translation was used to understand other texts.
BÜKLÜKALE IN THE HITTITE PERIOD

Kimiyoshi MATSUMURA* - Mark WEEDEN**

I. Introduction

The site of Büklükale (coordinates 39° 35’ 0” N by 33° 25’ 42” E) is situated in Kırıkkale province, central Turkey near the town of Karakeçili. The site lies on the western bank of the Kızıl Irmak (Red river), opposite the village of Köprüköy, on the river’s western bend, at the modern crossing for the Bâla-Kirşehir road (D260). It is located c. 100km south-east of Ankara and about 50km west of Kaman-Kalehöyük (Fig. 1).

The city is about 500 m wide on the west-east axis and 650 m from north to south. At the eastern part of the city, there is a mound on a rocky hill, which is about 30 m high and 300 by 200 m in area (Fig. 2).

The location of Büklükale seems to have been important from a strategic perspective, because it is situated at the narrowest point of Kızıl Irmak and one of the most important crossing-points through the ages has been here. There is a Seljuk bridge (Çeşniğir Köprüsü) of the 13th century A.D. and beside it the remains of a Roman bridge.


* Japanese Institute of Anatolian Archaeology, Kaman, Turkey.
II. Background and Purpose of the Excavations at Büklükale

Since 1986 the JIAA has been continuously excavating at Kaman-Kalehöyük in Kırşehir prefecture in Turkey under the directorship of Dr. Omura. Object of the excavations up to now was the clarification of the settlement history of Central Anatolia from the 3rd Millennium B.C. to the Ottoman period. While Kaman provided a great opportunity to better understand the stratigraphy and occupation levels in Central Anatolia, sparse data about the second half of 2nd Millennium BC, the Hittite Empire period, have been brought to light. As such, understanding the cultural transformation that took place from the Hittite Empire period to the Early Iron Age (which is referred to as the “dark age”) has been very difficult.

In an effort to shed more light on the Central Anatolian occupation levels, the Japanese Institute of Anatolian Archaeology has conducted surveys since 1986, and over 1,300 sites have been investigated and registered. Büklükale was specifically investigated in 1991 and 2006 (Omura 1993: 368, Büyükkaletepe; 2007: 50). According to the results of the surveys and of the excavations at Kaman-Kalehöyük, in connection with analysis of the pottery sherds collected from the surface at Büklükale, we believed that Büklükale was one of the important Hittite cities of the late 2nd Millennium BC. These facts clearly indicated that Büklükale was a suitable site to help us better understand the time period gap present at Kaman-Kalehöyük. For this reason, and to better understand Büklükale’s strategic role in the Hittite Empire period, a preliminary survey was conducted under the directorship of Dr. Omura in 2008.

III. Research History

The site was visited in 1926 by E. Forrer (1927: 37, Pl. 29) and in the same year by H.H. von der Osten (1929: 144-5). Particularly Forrer pointed out the existence of the lower town. On the rocky hill, he observed the wall with towers. Von der Osten described a lion statue that probably belongs to the Seljuk period. It is now in the Ethnography Museum of Ankara.¹ After

¹ Information courtesy Mehmet Arlı in Ankara Ethnology Museum.
that, S. Omura surveyed the site for the JIAA (see above). Furthermore, G. Barjamovic visited this site and discusses it in detail (2010: 18-22, Kapalikaya). He also reported an ancient paved road to the west of the rocky hill, supposed by him to be dated to the Seljuk period.

**IV. Results of Recent Research Thus Far**

**IV-1. Preliminary Survey at Büklükale 2008**

The purpose of the preliminary survey was to prepare the future excavations and the following work was done:

1. Making the topographical map;
2. Geophysical research;
3. Collecting surface finds;
4. Taking an aerial photograph. The results are summarized as follows:

1. Hittite Empire period and Late Iron Age were the predominant levels on the natural rocky hill at Büklükale, where pottery sherds of these two periods were found in the highest numbers. There are some Early Bronze Age pottery sherds.

2. The scatter of pottery sherds showed that there is a lower city around the rocky hill at a scale of 600m from north to south by 500m from east to west. It was occupied only during the 2nd Millennium BC, especially Hittite Empire period. There is no indication of an earlier and later occupation there.

3. On the surface at the north, east and south of the rocky hill, stone foundations consisting of large-faced stones were observed. In some places the height of the walls was over 2m. The result of the magnetic survey showed that these foundations extend further.

**IV-2. Results of the Excavations in 2009 - 2014**

After the results of the survey in 2008, the first excavation at Büklükale was undertaken. The first purpose of the excavations was to understand the stratigraphy at the highest point of the rocky hill (Fig. 3) and the results

---

2 Courtesy Sabri Aydal.
showed four cultural layers of Ottoman period, Iron Age, Middle to Late Bronze Age, and Early Bronze Age.

Besides this, a Byzantine coin was found which was dated to Constantine X (1059-1067 AD). There were also some Middle Iron Age pottery sherds, so-called Alişar IV painted pottery and some Early Iron Age pottery sherds, so-called “Dark Age” bichrome pottery that is typical for Kaman-Kalehöyük Stratum IIId. These pottery sherds indicate that Büklükale was also settled in the Early and Middle Iron Age (Matsumura 2011, Resim 9, 10). Also there are some sherds that can be dated to the late Middle Bronze Age, that is the Old Hittite period. According to these finds, the Chronology of Büklükale can be structured as follows:

1st Stratum: Ottoman and Byzantine period
2nd Stratum: Hellenistic and Iron Age (late, middle and early), and
3rd Stratum: 2nd Mill. BC. (Late and Middle Bronze Age)
4th Stratum: 3rd Mill. BC. (Early Bronze Age)

IV-3: Researches Relevant to the 2nd Mill. BC.

From 2009 to 2014 settlements of the 2nd Mill. BC were found on the rocky hill and in the city area, which was investigated by geomagnetic research. In this article, the research on the Hittite period is presented.

IV-3.1. City Area:

At Büklükale, there is a city area to the west of the mound. Focused northwest of the city area, a geophysical survey was carried out in 2010 and revised in 2012 (Fig. 4). Results showed that there were at least three phases of the city walls. The last phase belongs to the Hittite period and there is a typical Hittite fortification wall that contained a “kastenmauer,” towers and city gate. The fortification wall suggests that the Hittite-period occupation at the city area can be dated to the 17th century BC or after (cf. Seeher 2010: 30). Two other city walls seem to be older, likely dating to the Assyrian Colony

---

3 Courtesy of Sena Mutlu at the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara.
4 The geomagnetic research is conducted by Dr. Kazuhiro Kumagai.
Period. Since, almost all surface pottery collections at the city area belong to the 2nd Millennium BC, any settlement later than the 2nd Millennium BC is not likely there.

IV-3.2. Citadel:

As for the excavations on the mound at Büklükale, one of the most impressive architectural features is a cyclopean architecture. The wall is over 7m high on the hillside and up to now it has been traced over 50m in length (Fig. 5). The problem for the architectures of this period is the difficulty in dating, because later occupation levels mostly destroyed the upper structures including the floor above the foundation. Therefore in-situ materials above the floor are uncommon and they are not enough to date the architecture.

To understand the entire history of the Cyclopean Architecture, C14 samples were collected from the 3 meters of ash debris outside of it. The C14 samples were measured and analyzed with Bayesian statistics by Dr. Omori at the University of Tokyo, Japan. The results suggest that the cyclopean wall was first constructed in about 2000 BC, and was abandoned around 1850 BC, possibly because of a conflagration. After the break in occupation, the architecture was rebuilt in about 1800 BC, but at the end it was destroyed again by fire in the first half of the 16th century BC (Fig. 6: for dating of the burnt layer see Matsumura 2018: fig. 24).

As maintained by the C14 dating, there are two occupation phases for the Cyclopean Architecture in the Assyrian Colony Period at Büklükale and each phase is almost comparable with Karum-Kanîş II and Ib. Furthermore, the dating results indicate that at Büklükale occupation continued during the gap from the end of the Assyrian Colony period to the beginning of the Hittite period. Future research will contribute to helping us better understand this unknown transitional period in the history of Central Anatolia.

Hittite Period

As for the Hittite Period, up to 2012 no occupation layer was found, that could be dated to the Hittite Empire Period. However, a fragment of a Hittite
cuneiform clay tablet (Fig. 7: BK100147) was found in 2010 from the fill outside of the cyclopean wall. From the paleographic evidence, Dr. Mark Weeden proposed that it was written in the early 14th or late 15th centuries (Weeden 2013). This is the most westerly known discovery of any Hittite tablet. On the tablet, he found two interesting phrases: “these lands” and “your country”. So, it may be suggested that a diplomatic letter that might have been written between the great king of the Hittites and a king of the land, possibly in Western Anatolia.

Additionally, during the excavation at the northern edge of the rocky mound in 2012, three bullae with hieroglyphic signs were found in secondary contexts (Fig: 8: from left BK120173, BK120195, BK120150). The impressions seem to come from two different seals, but share the same hieroglyphic signs, which show the woman’s name “Tarhundawiya.” Dr. Weeden has tentatively dated these three bullae to the 15th century BC (Weeden in 2016).

According to the results in 2012, we extended the excavation area to the northwest in 2013 and we expected Hittite layers in this area (N4W2). Then we found a new burnt layer (Fig. 9) and it is likely dated to 15th century or later, because above the wall W228 in the burnt layer a second fragment of a Hittite tablet (Fig. 10: BK130111) was found. According to Dr. Weeden, a dating to the 15th or early 14th century is not excluded (Weeden 2016). Although very few words are understandable, Dr. Weeden points out that there is probably a broken word “(My) sun”, meaning “my majesty”. According to this word, it is plausible that this tablet is a letter that was addressed to the Hittite king. Moreover, it suggests that the Hittite king was perhaps in residence at Büklükale on at least one occasion. Up to this point only discontinuous occupation was attested in the Hittite period of Büklükale.

In 2014 we searched for the continuation of the Hittite burnt layer to the north. Unfortunately, a half-basement styled house of the late Iron Age (R97) destroyed the most part of the burnt layer (Fig. 11). However, after removing it, we could identify two more architectural layers under the Hittite burnt layer, from which the above-mentioned fragment of a Hittite tablet was
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found (Fig. 12). These were provisionally numbered I to III. 1st one is the Hittite burnt layer, 2nd one is the unburnt architectural layer under it, and 3rd one is possibly the same with the 1st one. They two might belong to the Hittite period or earlier.

In addition to that, at Büklükale there are quite important philological finds, mostly from the secondary contexts. In 2014, during the removal of the Iron age fortification wall in N3E0, a seal impression of so-called anonymous Tabarna-style Seal (Fig. 13: BK140138) was found. According to the study by Dr. Mark Weeden, there is no king’s name on it, but the following inscription: “Seal of xxx Great [King/Queen]. He who changes (it) will die.” In the center there is a cuneiform sign that means “goodness.” Its dating is a matter of argument. There were many changes in Hittite royal seals. The first type of the Hittite royal seal is the so-called anonymous Tabarna seal and according to the Land Donation tablets from Boğazköy, Tarsus and İnandık (Carruba 1993: Abb. 2; Goldman 1956: 253-4, Pl. 404.64, 408.64; Balkan 1973: Res. 1, 8), it was used under the reign of Zidanda to Telipinu, that is the later part of the Old Hittite period, in 16th century BC, but possibly used until the beginning of 14th century BC. It was also found at Ortaköy, Maşat Höyük and Kuşaklı (Süel 2009: Pl. XXI, Fig. 7, 8; Alp 1980: Abb. 2, Taf. 3; Müller-Karpe 1997: Abb. 18).

In 2014, one more important seal impression was found that attests the occupation of the 13th century BC at Büklükale. This is a sealing with a hieroglyphic inscription, on it a winged female figure in profile, right-facing with a horned helmet (Fig. 14: BK140045). Her left leg is walking forward naked, while the right leg is covered by a skirt. Winged figures are rare in Bronze Age Hittite iconography, but at Yazılıkaya you can find a similar figure as Šauška=Ištar (Bittel et al. 1975: Taf. 23, 2. Relief 38). There are some examples from Nişantepe at Boğazköy (Herbordt 2005: Abb. 42 g, h, i). If you look carefully at the edge of the impression, then you notice that its edge is not straight, but slightly curved. Such a curved edge is very similar to the edge of the signet ring. Examples are found at Ras Shamra, Ugarit (Boehmer 1975: Abb. 143g; Schaeffer 1956: Fig. 54), and also there
is one gold example in the Ashmolean museum (Boehmer 1975: Abb. 337e). According to the hieroglyphic inscription, “Saluwanda, Great Shepherd” that is translated by Dr. Mark Weeden, this sealing is probably to be dated to the 13th century BC (Weeden 2016), and it may prove the occupation at Büklükale in that time period.

**Conclusion:**

After 6 years of excavations, taking in combination, several types of finds, with help of philological finds, we have now obtained evidence for the occupation of almost the entire Hittite period at Büklükale. There is still a small quantity of evidence for Hittite occupation. In future seasons, we plan to excavate towards the northern part of the rocky hill to understand the Hittite history at Büklükale better.

**Historical Büklükale: An Overview of the Epigraphic Finds.**

Even before excavations at the site began the site of Büklükale on the Kızılırmak had been the subject of controversial debates regarding its place in the Old Assyrian and Hittite worlds, particularly with regard to its name during those periods. The two proposals for its identification are based on differing assessments of the spatial extent of Old Assyrian trade, and give different weight to the Hittite versus Old Assyrian evidence. Absolutely key here are the locations of Purušhattum and Durhumit in the Old Assyrian period. Traditionally Purušhattum has been located at Acemhöyük, while G. Barjamovic has it much further west in the region of Bolvadin. For Barjamovic Büklükale is to be equated with Wahšušana, a key staging post between Purušhattum and Durhumit on the Assyrian copper-route, where there was supposed to have been a ferry.

---

5 For publication of the epigraphic finds from Büklükale from 2010 to 2014 with further discussion and documentation, see Weeden 2013 and 2016
7 Barjamovic 2010: 18-22; 2011: 401-402. The cautious notes sounded ibid. fn. 1635 regarding the first results of the excavation are to be updated on the basis of the more recent findings of the excavations regarding the large building on the top of the mound which appears to have been founded around 2000 BC. There is no chronological obstacle to Büklükale being Wahšušana in the Middle Bronze Age. However, as we will see below, Büklükale would appear to have thrived during the Hittite period, whereas Wahsusana is only once mentioned in Hittite texts.
Forlanini on the other hand locates the city of Durhumit itself at Büklükale, and gives especial weight to the Hittite period evidence of a geographically organised list of offerings taken by the king for various religious institutions which lists cities belonging to the land of Durmitta (= Durhumit).\(^8\) Included here (KUB 48.105+KBo 12.53) is the city of Nenassa, which is usually thought to be in the region of the south-western bend of the Kızılırmak.\(^9\) Barjamovic, however, has Durhumit up in the north-east, in the region of Merzifon.\(^10\) The issue of Nenassa he solves by positing that there are simply two or even more of these.\(^11\) If homonymy can be invoked in the case of Nenassa, it might be possible to invoke it also in the case of Durmitta, although Barjamovic contends that homonymy decreases the more important the settlement is.\(^12\) However, this “rule” does not seem to apply to the town of Hattusa known from the Sahurunuwa land-donation, which is reasonably clearly not the capital city Hattusa.\(^13\) A western Durmitta would explain the other western associations of Durmitta in KUB 48.105+KBo 12.53 of which the most convincing are [Malli]daskuriya and Piddaniyassa, even though one of these is an albeit probable restoration and the other is located through equation with Lycaonian Pitnissos in Strabo, which is itself unclear in its location.\(^14\) The adduced Luwian connections of Hittite Durmitta, such as the ritualists Mallidunna (CTH 403) and Zuwi (CTH 412) who are supposed to come from Durmitta, would also be unexpected, although not impossible, with a north-eastern location for the city.\(^15\)

\(^12\) Barjamovic loc. cit.
\(^13\) KUB 26.43 obv. 15 (Imparati 1977: 24). Imparati (ibid. 52) argues that Hattusa is here mentioned as a point of reference for the other place-names, but this does not seem evident from the text itself, where the mention of Hattusa is precisely in the same style as the other names listed. Similarly against this being the capital Hattusa are Forlanini 2012a: 137 and Gander 2014: 380 fn. 58.
\(^14\) Strabo’s account covers a wide area, so it is not necessary that Pitnissos would have been too far away to be included in the land of Durmitta if it were in this area (Strabo Geography 12.6.1). There is serious doubt attached to the identification of Uwalma from KUB 48.105+ obv. 31’ with the Ulama that was destroyed by Hattusili I, given that there are numerous places called Walma, but only one Ulama.
\(^15\) Hutter 2003: 249-250. According to Hutter the ritual of Mallidunna belongs to a Hattian cultural level, while Zuwi belongs rather to the Luwian sphere due to using Luwian phrases. The name Mallidunna at least appears to be Luwian, although Del Monte notes that this is an unexpected context for a Luwian name. (Del Monte 2002: 63).
A detailed review of the Hittite evidence for the location of Durmitta is beyond the scope of this contribution, although a couple of further points can be made in support of a north-eastern Hittite Durmitta as well, both illustrating the dubious nature of the Hittite evidence. Barjamovic’s proposal fits a location of Durmitta that is suggested by the Treaty between Suppiluliuma I and Šattiwazza of Mittani. In this the “people/troops” (ÉRIN MEŠ) of Durmitta move into the land of Isuwa, i.e. into the region of Elazığ, something that they would only be able to do with great difficulty if they were coming from the western Kızılırmak. However, this passage is still poorly understood and it is difficult to work out who is going into Isuwa from where, particularly as other areas with western associations are mentioned alongside those with eastern ones. Furthermore, the unassigned historical fragment KBo 50.209, 6’ mentions Durmitta after Mount Sakduna in l. 5’. This may be identical with the Mount Sak(ka)dunuwa known from the Maşat letters, but it is unclear if the listing has any geographical relevance as the next paragraph mentions Attarimma and Hupisna in consecutive lines. These are unlikely to have been neighbours, either to each other or to Durmitta.

There is no definitive resolution to either the location of Durmitta or the name of Büklükale in sight. One should never exclude that there are further possibilities than the two main candidates that have been proposed for the latter. The excavations at Büklükale have revealed extensive palatial remains for the period from around 2000 BC to the beginning of the sixteenth century, thus providing adequate evidence for occupation for the Middle Bronze Age. Although it is large by Anatolian standards Büklükale does not seem big enough to accommodate somewhere as important as Durhumit must have been in the Old Assyrian period, especially when compared with the vast mound

16 KBo 1.1 obv. 10-13 (Beckman 1999:43; Barjamovic 2011: 128; de Martino 2012: 379).
17 West: Arawanna, Kalasma, possibly Timna (KUR URU im-im-na KBo 1.1 obv. 12, rather than Timana, thus unlikely to be Tummana). East: Alha, Hurma, Mt Harana, half of the land of Tegarama, Teburziya, Hazga, Armatana.
of Yassıhöyük some 60km to the south-east towards Kırşehir, or indeed the huge mound at Kırşehir itself. Until recently Hittite architectural layers at Büklükale have been elusive, mostly having been destroyed by Iron Age structures. This might support the Barjamovic identification, given that Wahšušana seems to have dwindled in importance during the Hittite period, only being mentioned briefly once in a fragmentary context. Nevertheless, as explained above, the evidence for Hittite occupation levels is growing year by year. It is thus quite possible that neither identification is correct. The epigraphic finds thus far hint at a continued importance for Büklükale in the Hittite period, whatever its name was.

The two or three Hittite architectural layers that have been identified at the time of this conference are badly damaged, and the artefacts mostly found in secondary contexts. Thus it is good to start with the only possibly epigraphic artefact that does have a clear context and is also the earliest, belonging to the early 16th century BC, the last phase of the palatial building on the top of the mound that seems to have been built around 2000 BC. This phase belongs to the period before the two or three architectural layers that must belong to the Hittite period, and the dating of the find has interesting ramifications for our comprehension of the beginning of the Hittite period at Büklükale. This seal-impression, found on two objects, presents a glyptic style that accords closely with a group of seals and seal-impressions referred to as the Tyskiewicz group. The most similar objects to this thus far are the Tyskiewicz seal itself, a seal-impression from Eskiyapar excavated in 1974, and one from Boğazköy (Fig. 15). It remains debatable whether this sealing actually represents hieroglyphic writing, although the symbols bear some resemblance to signs known later from the hieroglyphic sign-repertoire. More importantly, both this and the Tyskiewicz stamp-seal appear

---

19 To give an idea of this: the mound at Yassıhöyük (625 x 500m) is roughly as large as the whole site of Büklükale (650 x 500m). It is also likely that Yassıhöyük had a lower city beyond the mound. For a summary of mounds in the area see Barjamovic 2011: 398. This is not to suggest that Durhumit was located at any of these, but merely to give an idea of the settlement hierarchy in the area.

20 KUB 23.116 obv. 7’ (Del Monte and Tischler 1978: 471), in connection a journey from Mount Zippasla, see Barjamovic 2011: 350.


22 Esy 74-82 (Dinçol and Dinçol 1988: 88); SBo 2.187. The Boğazköy example shows much similarity in the inner decorative rim, but it is unclear whether it has one or two symbols in its centre.
to contain symbols arranged in twos, one over the other, an arrangement which reminds us of the bipartite structure of so many Hittite names (e.g. Tarhunda-ziti). Later the model of writing a name in the centre of a seal on the vertical axis became the normal organisational principle for writing Hittite names. It would be interesting if we could see the earliest dated example of this procedure here.

The Tyskiewicz group, specifically the Büklükale sealing and the stamp-seal on Tyskiewicz, are comparable to seal-styles that are found at Konya-Karahöyük, although the arrangement with the two symbols in the centre is not found there.\(^{23}\) For this reason the Tyskiewicz group has been dated to the time after Konya-Karahöyük on the underlying assumption that stylistic developments in iconography proceed on a sequential basis.\(^{24}\) Similarly, Konya-Karahöyük itself had been dated by some to the period after Kültepe Ib on similar grounds.\(^{25}\) Whether this assumption concerning stylistic change through time corresponds to reality or not, it is interesting that we now have a carbon-date for this example of the Tyskiewicz group at least. A dating to the early 16th century BC would definitively place this seal-type, which can be argued to be an early form of typically Hittite seal-design, within the early Hittite period. Its close relationship with other seals and sealings from the central Hittite area demonstrates a tight iconographic unity over this space. This kind of similarity in iconographic practices over widely different topographical regions was not something new in Anatolia, but if one accepts that elements of hieroglyphic writing are beginning to be used, it would make it difficult to imagine that these similarities are not at this stage to be associated with the emergence of the nascent Hittite state.

It is unclear under what circumstances a building that used such sealings during its last phases would have been burned to the ground and not used again in the early days of Hittite statehood. One might speculate that this was to do with the unification efforts of Labarna or Hattusili I, but these seem a little early to correspond to the current interpretation of the carbon-

\(^{23}\) E.g. Alp 1968: Taf. 103, no. 294
data. Or one might think that this happened in the course of one of the many internal conflicts of the Old Hittite period. What is interesting, however, is not so much that this probable destruction might have been associated with one or the other historical event, but that the large building at Büklükale continued in use right through the end of the so-called Old Assyrian period well into what can fairly confidently be identified as the Hittite era, with no destruction or otherwise remarkable change marking any transition between the two.

All other epigraphic finds from Büklükale come from secondary contexts. In some way they must be attached to the Hittite levels excavated thus far, although this is purely speculative at this stage. All but one of the finds probably belong on stylistic grounds to the period before the early 14th century BC and probably also later than the early 16th century, when the large building on the top of the mound seems to have gone out of use, but there are significant problems associated with obtaining a more precise dating within this period.

Three clay lumps with impressions of two seals are probably to be counted among the older finds (Fig. 8) bearing a hieroglyphic name in the centre, which were all found in Iron Age fill in the north-west of the mound (N7 W5). The name is written with the sign for the storm-god (L. 199), followed by the sign for the vine (L. 160) and must represent the name Tarhundawiya. This woman’s name itself was not attested until recently in cuneiform sources from Anatolia but is now found on a Land Grant from the “Westbau”-archive at Boğazköy, which dates to the late years of Telipinu or the earlier years of Alluwamna. However, there is no reason to think that there is any identity in the person, nor that the name would have been particularly rare or restricted to one period, as it is a completely normal formation. Its non-appearance in Anatolian cuneiform documents up until now must be an accident of discovery. As far as the dating of these sealings is concerned, the decorative rim appears to indicate an earlier dating, while the hieroglyphic centre appears to favour a later dating, depending on one’s interpretation of

26 StBoT Bh 4: 22, 51, see Rüster and Wilhelm 2012: 144.
the development of hieroglyphic sign-forms and orthography. Provisionally one might entertain a 15th century dating for this group.

Quite possibly from a similar or slightly later period is a cuneiform sealing of the type commonly referred to as “Tabarna(-style)”. The appellation “Tabarna” for the Hittite Great King, or “Tawananna” for the Great Queen, is either broken off or it was never there in the first place. In the last case this would mean that strictly speaking this is not a Tabarna or Tawananna-seal, but instead something much more rare. The central field contains the sign SIG₅ “goodness”, which sometimes occurs in combination with the cuneiform sign TI “life”, and appears to alternate with the hieroglyphic symbols triangle “goodness” and Ankh “life”. The Tabarna-sealings which are used on the Land Grants from Boğazköy never use SIG₅ in this way, it only appears on clay lumps, bullae and mushroom-shaped objects, which are thus more difficult to date. Examples have been found at Ortaköy-Sapinuwa, Kayalı Pınar-Samuha and Boğazköy-Hattusa.²⁷ Unusually for this kind of seal, however, the example from Büklükale also contains a curse formula: ša uš-pa-ah-ḫu BA.ŪŠ “whoever changes (it) will die”.

There is, however, a problem with interpreting this cuneiform sealing as a regular example of the impression of a Tabarna-seal. One would expect that all of the five fragmentary impressions on the clay object found at Büklükale came from the same seal. However, the impression on face B does not fit the regular sign-forms required for the expected writing NAVKIŠIB ta-bar-našt/MUNUS.)LUGAL GAL, “seal of the Tabarna/Tawananna, Great King/Queen”. The signs after the probable KIŠIB on the very fragmentary face B, especially when combined with the traces on face C, remind us only of a sealing found on a mushroom-shaped clay object that was excavated in at Kuşaklı-Sarissa 1998, which was published in 2014 (see Fig. 16).²⁸ Unfortunately here too the reading is disputed, partially due to damage, but also due to the fact that all proposals for its reading are completely unparalleled. In the publication A. Müller-Karpe presents two alternatives for reading the seal, the second of which originates with

²⁷ Süel 2011: 404, 409-10; Müller-Karpe 2009 Plate XI fig. 17; SBo 1.76-83.
²⁸ Müller-Karpe 2014.
Müller-Karpe interprets the first reading, which is his own, as including a word which is a designation of the status of the Great Queen before she became Tawananna, the *iskanta. This unattested word would be derived according to this theory from the Hittite verb “to smear, to anoint”, and would thus mean the “anointed one”. This interesting theory has the advantage that it allows us to read the text as indicating the seal of a person, but the disadvantage of constructing a good deal of albeit plausible social, political and linguistic content in order to be able to read the signs. However, it is certainly the case that all identifiable cases of texts on seals indicate the person who owns the seal rather than the object sealed by it. This is the disadvantage of the second reading, which fits the traces better when compared with face B of the sealed clay lump from Büklükale. In fact, we could go as far as to say that the traces on face B exclude reading (1). One way out of this impasse might be to assume that the “box-seal” is a specific type of seal belonging to the queen, but this is an ad hoc solution, and writings such as “seal of the box/basket” to denote a particular type of seal are not found either in Hittite texts or in Mesopotamia to our knowledge, although seals and sealed documents are often attested in connection with boxes or baskets.\(^{31}\)

For the moment we can do no more than note the similarity to the sealing from Kuşaklı-Sarissa. In the case of the Büklükale sealing it is also impossible to say for sure whether this was actually a seal that belonged to the king or to the queen, although the only comparative evidence available points to it being the queen. It is possible that a better solution for the reading of both sealings is yet to be found. Whatever the reading, it is extraordinary

\(^{31}\) CAD P 422.
that only these two examples of this text have thus far been found on a
cuneiform seal. This, of course, makes it all the more difficult to date them.
The Kuşaklı example comes from a level that has been dated to the end of the
Middle Kingdom, thus presumably the late 15th or early 14th century. It is of
course possible that it could have been made a good deal earlier, but kept for
many years. The fact that both sealings contain the curse formula and the lack
of dividing lines between the outer and inner cuneiform rings may or may not
indicate that they are slightly earlier than other cuneiform seals with central SIG₅
that have been found at Kayalı Pınar and Ortaköy, but the evidence is very slim.
Again it is difficult to imagine a dating earlier than the 15th century and later than
the early 14th century, with the late 15th century being possibly the best guess at
the moment. The fact that it was found at the site in the first place makes us think
that Büklükale played host to representatives of the royal family during the time
of its use.

Clay Tablets

Thus far two clay tablets with fragments of Hittite letters have been found at
Büklükale. Neither of them was found in situ, one being excavated from Ottoman
fill on the east side of the mound in 2010, the other being found in 2013 on top
of the base of a burnt wall dated to the Hittite period by the find of the self-same
Hittite tablet when considered along with the stratigraphy of the area between it
and burned level of the early 16th century BC (Fig. 10). The tablet in this case
itself is so fragmentary that a secure dating is hardly possible. Only the whole
of the left edge of the obverse and some of the right edge of the reverse are
preserved. However, it includes two features that may indicate that it should be
earlier rather than later: the writing starts on an upper edge and the sign EN has a
typically “Middle Hittite” form. However, tablets with writing beginning on the
upper edge are attested, although rarely, in the later periods. The use of the older
sign-form could just as easily be the effect of the scribe having recently copied an
older text or have some other ground that makes it irrelevant for dating purposes.
A dating to the early 14th or 15th century is thus not excluded, however, with the
only relevant dating criteria pointing in that direction, albeit not categorically.

32 Waal 2010: 59.
Further interest is aroused by the very clear appearance of the signs ḏUTU just after the first line-divider after the greeting (see Fig. 4). It is tempting to restore this as ḏUTU-[ŠI] “my majesty”, which would thus appear in the nominative or vocative. If this restoration is correct we would here have a letter that was addressed to his majesty either while he was at Büklükale, or was stored there for some reason. Either way, the appearance of this very fragmentary letter reinforces the impression that Büklükale was a strategically important site with royal connections.

The tablet fragment found in 2010 also appears to agree with the impression made by this even more fragmentary piece (BKT 1, see Fig. 7).33 Again the evidence is slim, as the larger part of the tablet is not preserved, including the introductory address. However, there is sufficient text preserved to be able to make a provisional palaeographic assessment, which would concur with a dating to the early 14th or late 15th centuries (Weeden 2013). The language of the tablet also contains older features, among which one may mention the form issumeni “we will perform”, which was not previously attested but had been predicted by Hoffner and Melchert in their grammar.34 The bulk of the text is very difficult to understand and open to interpretation, even as far as regards the tenor of the whole piece: whether a hostile exchange regarding detention of messengers or a relatively friendly piece of correspondence in the run-up to a diplomatic marriage or other international festivity. The international character of the letter is guaranteed by the isolated occurrences of KUR-KA “your country” and kī KUR[H] “these countries” on the otherwise entirely broken reverse. We submit that in Hittite texts only a king or a god would say KUR-IA “my country”, therefore KUR-KA must be addressed to a similarly high person, either a foreign king (of the West?) or to the Hittite king himself.

A final sealing

In 2014 a sealing was uncovered on a small clay lump (BK 1400045) in a secondary context at Büklükale (Fig. 14). The seal-face is rectangular

---

33 Weeden 2013.
34 GHL §13.15.
although with slightly curved horizontal edges. It may derive from a signet ring, although it is a little large for this by contrast to other examples. Another reason for thinking it might not come from a ring is that the original seal seems to have been re-cut, as part of the surface is noticeably higher than the rest. Most signet rings are made of metal, in which case the original would in this case have to be made of a very soft metal such as gold, or not be a signet ring at all. The seal contains an extraordinary figure of a mostly naked winged goddess, right-facing with prominent vulva in the typical striding posture known from Syrian manifestations, but with an upper body arranged according to Hittite rather than Syrian iconographic norms. The seal-face is divided into boxes, the outer of which contain rosettes and similar decorative elements. In the middle there is another box to the right of the striding winged goddess, which consists of the raised portion which may have been re-cut. In this box we find hieroglyphs of a typically 13th century shape and form which we read:

L. 417- tà MAGNUS.PASTOR

Saluwanta, Great Shepherd

The sign L. 417 can be read as SAL(U), following a suggestion by M. Forlanini which can now be augmented with further evidence.\textsuperscript{35} Comparative evidence suggests the name might be Saluwanta, which is not attested as such as a personal name in Hittite cuneiform sources but belongs with Old Assyrian Saluwanta (Laroche Noms 1089), the eponymous mountain name attested in Hittite texts, as well as with names such as Salu(wa) now attested on a Land Grant.

However we date the iconography of the winged goddess, the hieroglyphs, especially the form of the sign tà, appear fairly clearly to be late, i.e. late 14th or 13th centuries BC. This is considerably later than any of the other epigraphic material from Büklükale appears to be. The mainly civilian official MAGNUS PASTOR has been thought to be identical with the

\textsuperscript{35} Forlanini 1987: 74-76. See Weeden (2016) for collection of evidence, particularly the name Salu(wa) at KBo 32.136 obv. 6’, and the name written L.417-u(wa) on seals from Kaman-Kalehöyük.
mainly military title “Great Shepherd” (GAL NA.GAD).\textsuperscript{36} While this overlap of civilian and military functions should not necessarily surprise us, it is clear that whoever held either title was an extremely high official. This remains a lonely indicator for the moment, presumably removed from its original context by Iron Age excavations, but nonetheless a possible hint that Büklükale continued to have some strategic and/or civil administrative importance during the later part of the Empire period, the later 14th and 13th centuries BC. It remains to be seen whether this continuity of iconographic and glyptic material through the Hittite period is matched by the dating of the individual architectural layers that are emerging at Büklükale.

It is currently impossible to align the epigraphic finds to attested architectural layers securely. However, a very preliminary schematic phasing might be suggested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Büklükale Provisional Artfact</th>
<th>Approximate date of artefact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hittite period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early-Old Hittite:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyskiewicz-style sealing</td>
<td>Early 16th century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarhundawiya sealings</td>
<td>Early 15th century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hittite phase III or II:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuneiform sealing</td>
<td>Later 15th century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuneiform tablets</td>
<td>Later 15th/early 14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saluwanta sealing</td>
<td>Later 14th/13th centuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Naturally this extremely tentative sketch will have to change with the discovery of new layers, and hopefully of further artefacts with more secure contexts.

Abbreviations:
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**Fig. 14: Bulla with a Winged Goddess**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Büklükale</th>
<th>Tyskiewicz</th>
<th>Eskiyapar</th>
<th>Boğazköy</th>
<th>Konya-Karahöyük</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Büklükale Bulla" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Tyskiewicz Bulla" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Eskiyapar Bulla" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Boğazköy Bulla" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.jpg" alt="Konya-Karahöyük Bulla" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BK 10-57A</th>
<th>Tyskiewicz</th>
<th>Esy 74-82</th>
<th>SBo 2.187</th>
<th>Alp 1968 Tk 81/217</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Fig. 15: Comparison of the seal-designs in the Tyskiewicz-style**
Fig. 16: Face B of the cuneiform seal from Büklükale and the sealing from Kuşaklı
HITTITE AND LUVIAN UPPI- AND HITTITE UIYA-

H. Craig MELCHERT

I. Hittite uppi/a- ‘send; bring’

1. Since Hrozný (1917: 122, n. 2), Hitt. uppi/a- has been almost universally assumed to contain the prefix u- ‘her-’ marking motion towards the speaker: see Götze 1933: 22, n. 3 and 1938: 124; Friedrich 1952: 234 ‘(her)schicken’ (sic!); Oettinger 1979: 489 ‘her-schicken’ (sic!); Melchert 1994: 104 and 149; Yakubovich 2005: 245 (implicit in the gloss ‘to bring’); Kloekhorst 2008: 921-2 ‘send (here)’ (sic!). However, there are no attested spellings †u/ú-up-pí/a-. Kloekhorst (2008: 36) assumes that the unattested OS spelling would be *ú-up-pí/a- (citing the restriction of the plene spelling ú-uš-ši-ya- ‘to throw’ to OS).¹ This is possible, but ad hoc and unlikely, given the very restricted attestation of ‘throw’ (a total of 3x OS ú-uš-ši-° vs. 12x post-OS uš-ši-°) versus the very well attested up-pí/a-° (at least 100x, 22x in MS). The complete absence of any spellings †u/ú-up-pí/a- can hardly be due to chance.

2. Much more important is that the objection of Pedersen (1938: 116-7) has been wrongly ignored: the actual usage of uppi/a- shows no fixed directionality whatsoever (towards or away from the speaker)! The parentheses in the glosses of Friedrich and Kloekhorst tacitly admit this fact, and a review of the attestations fully confirms Pedersen’s assertion:

¹ Carrboro NC USA. melchert@humnet.ucla.edu.

I use the standard sigla OH, MH, and NH to refer to the date of a composition as Old, Middle, or New Hittite and OS, MS, and NS to refer to the date of a manuscript as Old, Middle, or New Script.
“There are some troops of the Upper Land and Ishupitta here with me. I will send them to you.”

“And you write me: ‘Send me troops and horses!’ I will send you infantry and horses.”

“I seized him and sent him alongside the sea.”

In (1) and (3) the direction clearly is away from the speaker, while in (2) the verb is used for motion both towards and away from the speaker. See also HKM 25:22-23 and HKM 30:8-10 for further examples of uppi/a- clearly indicating motion away from the speaker.

Naturally, since there is no inherent directionality in the verb, there are also instances where the context shows that the motion is towards the speaker (or more accurately towards the “deictic center”):

(“When it dawns on the eighth day, the large loaf of cheese and the leavened bread of three parīsu-measures of flour which (are) broken for the gods of the fathers and which are placed back on the sacrificial tables,”)
“They crumble them and then bring one morsel of cheese and one morsel of bread before each of all the gods (lit. before all the gods in each place) and place them before the gods.”

Contra Carruba (1966: 20), Oettinger (1979: 489) and Nakamura (2002: 159), there is no basis for a separate verb ‘lift, raise’, but ‘send’ (Güterbock and Hoffner 1995: 193) is also unlikely. The cheese and loaves of bread that had been broken and presented to the gods of the fathers previously, but then put back on the sacrificial tables, are now crumbled, and a morsel of each is brought before the gods, whose images are surely the center of the action.

At least two instances of uppi/a- do not mean merely ‘send’ or ‘carry’, but rather ‘fetch’ (that is, to go somewhere and bring something from there to the starting point):

(5) KBo 17.65+ Ro 38-39 (MH/MS; Birth Ritual)

(“But how the festival of birth (is)—how they perform the festival when she gives birth,”) [(n)=aš GIŠ kurtaš iy]anza n=aš URU Kizzuwatna nu=mu=kan EZEN KAxU-it [ÜL karta n]=an apēz uppaḫḫi

“[It is made (as) a kurta-tablet], and it is in Kizzuwatna. I [do not know] the festival orally [by heart]. I will fetch it from there.”

The restorations are based on the parallel passage ibid. Vo 45-46, which has rather udanzi ‘they will bring’. See Beckman 1983: 136-7 and 161-4 with differing details, but it is clear that the speaker is in Hattusha and needs to retrieve the tablet in question from Kizzuwatna.

(6) KUB 12.58 ii 36-42 (MH/NS; Ritual of Tunnawi)

(“The ritual client goes to bathe,”) n=ašta MUNUS ŠU.GI 9 GIŠ GA.ZUM ŠA GIŠ TŪG anda upp[āi] GIŠ šēn’an IM-aš anda uppāi

“The “old woman” fetches in nine combs of boxwood. She fetches in a figurine of clay.”
Goetze (1938: 14-15) renders ‘brings in’, but the practitioner has been in the ritual space in the entire preceding context, so she must first go out in order to fetch the objects in.

We must therefore conclude with Pedersen that Hittite uppi/a- means ‘send, bring/take (somewhere)’ without specification of direction to or away from the speaker, occasionally also ‘fetch’ (go somewhere and bring back something). The lack of evidence for directionality combined with the total absence of spellings †u/ú-up-pi/a- means that we must abandon all attempts to force a meaning ‘her-, hither’ that does not exist and likewise the unfounded presumption that the verb contains the directional prefix ū-.

The question of the verb’s correct etymology is as always an entirely secondary matter. Given the total lack of evidence for the presence of the prefix ‘her-’ but a strong goal orientation (all 80+ examples of ‘send’ in sufficient context have an explicit or implied goal), perhaps the verb represents a deadverbal stem from the adverb *úpo as in Skt. úpa ‘up to’ (anticipated by Oettinger 1979: 489-90, but with false semantics for a non-existent homonym ‘raise, lift’). For Skt. úpa as expressing ‘(hin)zu’ with mostly horizontal orientation (no trace of ‘from below’!) see Casaretto apud Hettrich, Casaretto and Schneider 2004: 36-42. For the derivational process see Melchert 2009 and compare the rare transitive use of English ‘near’ to mean ‘bring near (to)’ (Ruskin and Wilde). For the unexpected stem uppi- (which clearly is older than uppa-) from *úpo compare the opposite discrepancy in Hitt. šanna- ‘conceal’ as if from *ṣn(h₁)o vs. Latin sine and OIr. sain- < *ṣn(h₁)i.

II. Cuneiform Luvian (u-)up-pa- ‘carry’ and Hieroglyphic Luvian (CAPERE) u-pa- ‘carry (off)’

Pace Kloekhorst (2008: 922) the basic sense ‘carry’ of the CLuvian verb is not in doubt, but his rejection of the equation with Hittite uppi/a- is surely correct:

(7) KBo 13.260 iii 13-15 (Birth Ritual)
ā=tta āduwan=za pariyan adduwaliyan wattaniyan uppanddu
“Let them carry the evil over to an evil land.”

For this interpretation see Yakubovich (2010: 237). The stem uppanna- shows the Luvian cognate of the Hittite “iterative-durative” suffix -anni/a-. One could suppose here a meaning ‘carry away’ for the verb, but such directionality cannot be proven, since pariyan ‘over to’ already conveys this nuance.

(8) KBo 13.260 iii 16-20 (Birth Ritual)
\[zīla=pa=tta \text{ za-x-x-ti } \text{ DUMU.LÚ.ÚLU}^{-ni} \text{ ŠUM-ŠU ūḷalzāi ūhdatumar=ša \ ūppannandu wayahi=ša ūhdušahi=ša ūnanurumāši=ša\]

“This henceforth let them bring to this(?) human—one calls out his name—life, w., health (and) vigor.”

Here the directionality clearly is towards the deictic center, the place where the ritual is taking place, but once again this is furnished by the context, and cannot be shown to be inherent in the verb.

(9) KUB 35.88 iii 11-12 (Birth Ritual)
\[upatta=pa=wa=du šarriyanin 2-šu 9-u[n]-za \text{ anta}=wa=š=ta walluna<š>šan wāni uppanta\]

“She furnished to her twice nine s., and they carried them in to the midwife (lit. woman of lifting).”

Likewise in this example there is no clear evidence for any inherent directionality in the verb, which simply means ‘carry’. See also KUB 35.107 iii 21 (anda uppanta) and KUB 25.39 iv 16 (ūppadda) with limited context. As will become clear presently, it is important that in the two instances of plene spelling the spelling is specifically u-up-pa° with <u>, not <ú>.

For arguments that the HLuvian cognate of CLuvian ūppa- ‘carry’ is (“CAPERE”) u-pa- and not (PES) u-pa- ‘dedicate, furnish’ see Melchert 2004 contra Yakubovich 2005, but it is doubtful that the verb (“CAPERE”) u-pa- inherently implies speaker-oriented directionality:
In all three examples cited (and the similar ones at KARKAMIŞ A 1α, §§7 and 10) the action involves removal of things from one place and their transportation to another. Since the new location is either explicitly or implicitly associated with the speaker (‘into the country’ in (11) clearly refers to Carchemish), ‘bring’ is the natural rendering, but the directionality is contextual, not inherent in the verb. As attested, HLuvian ("CAPERE/CAPERE_2")u-pa- is neutrally ‘carry’ like its CLuvian cognate.

However, the phrase (SCALPRUM.CAPERE_2)u-pa-ni- (CAPERE_2)u-pa- is clearly a figura etymologica, and contra Melchert (2004: 372) ‘spoils’ are inherently something that is carried off, not something that is brought in. This figure and the use of CAPERE/CAPERE_2 ‘take’ as determinative
suggest that this verb *u-pa-* originally meant ‘carry off, remove’, although like its CLuvian counterpart it has undergone semantic bleaching to merely ‘carry’. The spelling of the CLuvian cognate as *u-up-* points to /o-/, so the combined evidence argues that *this* verb contains the reflex of *au-* ‘off, away’, matching Latin *au-ferō* ‘carry away/off’. For the contrast of <u> = /o/ vs. <ú> = /u/ in Hittite see Rieken 2005: 538-9 after Eichner and on sources of Hittite /o(:)/ see Kloekhorst 2008: 35-60.\(^3\) The main point, however, is that Hittite *uppi/a-* ‘send’ (with no directionality) and Luvian *ūppa-/(CAPERE)u-pa-* ‘carry’ < *‘carry off, remove’ are not cognate, as per Kloekhorst (2008: 922).\(^4\)

III. Hittite *uiye/a-* ‘send, drive’

This verb (overwhelmingly spelled *u-i-e-/ya-* with <u>!) is universally assumed to be *u-(i)ye/a-* ‘her-schicken’ vs. *pe/i-ye/a-* ‘hin-schicken’: see Pedersen 1938: 198; Friedrich 1952: 232 ‘schicken’ (eigentlich ‘herschicken’); jagen’; Kloekhorst 2008: 910 ‘send (here)’. Once again, however, there is actually *no* textual evidence for speaker-oriented directionality of *u(i)ye/a-* (note here too the respectively explicit and tacit admissions of this fact by Friedrich and Kloekhorst). Since this actually well-known fact is consistently ignored in discussions of the verb’s morphology and history, it seems necessary to reiterate some of the evidence:

(13) *KBo* 3.40b:9-10 (OH/NS; narrative)
\[\text{am}[(\text{mug}=\text{a}^d\text{U-aš})] \text{DINGIR} \text{pišeneš} [\text{LUG}] \text{AL-i uyēt} \text{īt}=\text{wa} \text{LÚ.MEŠ GAL.GAL wemi(y)\{a\}]\]

“But me the male gods of the Storm-god sent to the king (saying): ‘Go and find the great men!’”

(14) *KUB* 33.5 ii 4 (OH/NS; Telipinu, 2nd version)
\[d\text{MAĦ-aš NIM.LÀL-an uyēt ūt=za x\{\ldots}\}x \text{dTelipinun zik šanṭa}\]

---

\(^3\) This means that the Hittite prefix *u-* (regularly spelled <ū>) that *does* mark directionality towards the speaker cannot reflect *au-* (contra Melchert 1994: 104 et al.). Its true etymology remains to be determined.

\(^4\) The root *pa-* of Luvian /o:pa-/ (sic!) is probably *(s)peh,-* ‘set in (violent) motion, draw’ seen also in Greek σταύο ‘tear/pull’ and Armenian *hanem* ‘pull; take away; lead’: see García Ramón 2009. Thus /o:pa/- *(s)take away, remove* whence ‘carry’ reflects a virtual *au-(s)ph(e)nti* *‘take away, remove’ whence ‘carry’ reflects a virtual *au-(s)ph(e)nti* would give /o:panti/ in either a mi-or ḫi-verb.
“Hannahanna sent the bee (saying): ‘Go [ ] and you search for Telipinu!’”

It is quite certain that the direction in these two passages is not oriented towards the speaker or the “deictic center”. It is noteworthy that the duplicate to (14) KUB 33.4 ii 17 (also NS) has piyēt, while KUB 33.8 ii 22 (NS) in a similar context also has uyēt.⁵

(15) KUB 14.3 i 6-9 (NH; Tawagalawa letter)

\[ \text{nu} = m[u \text{ U]}N-an \text{ IGI-} \text{anda} \text{ uiyat ARAD-anni=} \text{wa}= \text{mu} \text{ dā} \text{ nu}= \text{wa}= \text{mu} \text{ LÜ-} \text{tuḫkantin} \text{ uiya} \text{ nu}= \text{wa}= \text{mu} \text{ ITTI} \text{ dUTU}^{51} \text{ uwatezzi} \text{ nu}= \overset{šši}{\text{šši}} \text{ LÜ} \text{TARTENU} \text{ uiyanun} \]

“He sent a person to meet me (saying): ‘Take me into servitude! Send the crown-prince to me, and he shall bring me to Your Majesty.’ So I sent the crown-prince to him.”

This example confirms that uiya- has no inherent directionality, since it is used indifferently for both motion towards the speaker in the first instance and motion away from the speaker in the second.

(16) KBo 4.8 ii 13-14 (NH; Tawananna Affair)

\[ \text{kī}= \text{ya}= \text{an} \text{ 1-an} \text{ dammešhanunun} \text{ IŠTU} \text{ É.GAL-LIM}= \text{pat}= \text{kan} \text{ kuit} \text{ katta} \text{ uiyanun} \]

“And I also did her this one harm, that I sent her down from the palace.”

The banishment of the tawananna undeniably refers to motion away from the speaker.

(17) KUB 1.1+ iii 10-11 (NH; Apology of Hattušili)

\[ \text{URU} \text{Hakpiššaš}= \text{ma} \text{ kururiyah}^{54} \text{ta} \text{ [nu]} \text{ LÚ.MEŠ} \text{ Gašga}^{54} \text{H}^{54} \text{A} \text{ uiyanun} \text{ n}= \text{an} \text{ IŠTU} \text{ NÍ.TE}= \overset{Ya}{Y} \text{ SIG}_{5}= \overset{aḥḫun}{aḥḫun} \]

---
⁵ It is mildly unfortunate that KUB 17.10 i 35, a MS copy of the Telipinu myth, has [IŠ-P]UR, so that we cannot determine which Hittite verb was used. Both uiye/a- and pe/iye/a- are securely attested in OH/OS: x-x-[ ] iššāz LUGAL-i atti=mi u-i-[ ] (KUB 26.35:3) and [°-a]n arḫa imma piyēzzi (KUB 36.106 Ro 5).
“But Hakpis became hostile, [so] I drove out the Kaskeans and on my own put it (the city) in order.”

The context argues for the given interpretation with Otten (1981: 17) contra van den Hout (2003: 199). The sense is confirmed by the parallel KUB 1.7 ii 6, which adds arḫa, but it is crucial to note that there is no space in KUB 1.1 iii 11 for any restoration beyond [nu]. Thus uiya- by itself could mean ‘banish, drive away’. This passage is surely also the source for the second meaning ‘jagen’ given by Friedrich (1952: 232). For the sense ‘banish, drive away’ for the combination arḫa uiya- see also KUB 14.8 Vo 17-18 and the Plague Prayers passim, but here of course the directionality is overtly signaled by the preverb.

The sense ‘banish, drive (away)’ of enemies shows that uiya- did not originally necessarily imply control of the object by the subject. Thus the meaning ‘send’ is secondary. Example (17) also shows that the preverb arḫa also was not originally required for the meaning ‘drive away, banish’. These facts argue for an original *au-(Hi)Hyeh₁- *‘cast away’. However, as in the case of Luvian u-up-pa- ‘carry’ from original *‘carry off, remove’, the sense of Hittite uiya- was mostly bleached to a more general ‘drive, send’, without implication of direction. This led already in Old Hittite to creation of a new univerbation with the productive pē- for ‘send off, hin-schicken’.⁶

IV. Conclusions

Hittite uppi/a- means ‘send’ without specification of directionality and contains no prefix. CLuvian (u-)up-pa- ‘carry’ and HLuv. (CAPERE)u-pa- ‘carry’ contain a prefix /o:-/ originally indicating motion away, but the meaning was bleached to simply ‘carry’. Likewise, Hittite u-i-e/ya- contains a prefix /o:-/ and originally meant ‘send/drive away’, but was bleached to simply ‘send/drive’. None of these verbs has anything to do with the Hittite prefix /u:-/ spelled <ú> indicating motion toward the speaker (contra Melchert 1994: 104 and all others).

⁶ It seems likely, though not strictly provable, that the “bleaching” of the sense of *au- ‘away’ was tied to its relative lack of productivity in both Hittite and Luvian.
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WHAT DOES A ḪUWAŠI LOOK LIKE?

Patrick Maxime MICHEL*

Since the end of my PhD,¹ new information has come to light regarding the shape of hittite Ḫuwaši.

The recently published Band III/2 of the Hethitisches Wörterbuch gives a very complete catalogue of data concerning the word Ḫuwaši.

The very word is translated as “Stele, Kultstein; Stelen (-Areal)” and several categories are created to distinguish different kinds of Ḫuwaši. The object is sometimes describe as “good” (aššu-) or “polish” (ḫašḫaš-) (KUB 25, 23 (+) i 34),² “covered with metal” (KUB 15, 1 ii 3 sq.) or “cut up” (Bo. 2004/1). It is normally made of stone, as indicated by the determinative NA₄, but can also be attested in wood or metal. Two different metals are known for Ḫuwaši: silver (KÙ.BABBAR in KBo 26, 228 i 9. and KBo. 26, 197: 4) and iron (AN.BAR in KUB 17, 35 ii 35). Finally the Ḫuwaši can be plated (ḫališšiant-), mostly with silver (Bo. 4071 = CTH 790, KBo 2, 1 ii 12 sq. and KUB 17, 35 ii 6 sq.), or decorated (CTH 525, KUB 17, 35 ii 6 and CTH 584, KUB 15, 1 ii 3-4). In the difficult Cult Inventory KBo 2, 1 i 33,³ it is attested once with relief on it. Size is also variable as portable Ḫuwaši are as well attested (KUB 35, 133 (+) I 15 sq.).

* University of Geneva
1 P. M. Michel, Le culte des pierres à Emar à l’époque Hittite, OBO 266, (Fribourg, Göttingen 2014).
2 Ibid. 162, note 190.
3 Ibid. 146–147.
A definition had been earlier given by Puhvel: “stone or wood pillar, occasionally with metal (silver, iron), serving as outdoors or sheltered cult object, or as boundary marker”.

As mentioned in the *HW* (2013, 830), the word ḫuwaši is attested, during the middle-hittite period, written na₄ZI.KIN explained by J.-M. Durand as a pseudo-Akkadogram based on sikkānu. This was already anticipated by Bossert, who could not know at that time the occurrences of the word sikkānu in the texts from Mari, Emar or Tell Munbaqa. The equation ḫuwaši = ZI.KIN is confirmed by CTH 594, where A (KUB 10, 18) gives na₄ZI.KIN, text B (KUB 10, 17) writes syllabically (na₄ḥu-wa-ši-ia).

Following the definitions, a ḫuwaši is normally used in a ritual context and is made of stone (with determinative NA₄), but can also be attested in wood or metal. From most of the ritual texts and Cult Inventories, one understands that it could be considered a *standing stone*.

**Erratic bloc or cut up stone?**

If the ḫuwaši is made of stone, one could raise the question whether the stone is an erratic bloc, a sculpted stone or a cut up rock. The site of Šarišša, with a sanctuary not far from the ancient city (fig. 1), answers perhaps a part of the question.

---

5 M. Darga, “Über das Wesen des Huwaši-Steines nach Hethitischen Kultinventaren”, *Revue hittite et asiatique* 27, (1969) 5–24, was right in identifying the word with the Hittite word for standing stone.
9 For a discussion about ḫuwaši as “sanctuary”, see P. M. Michel, OBO 266, 35 sq.
11 For another point of view, see M. Cammarosano (forthcoming.) I thank my colleague for the very challenging discussions.
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Two rock blocks (one bigger than the other one) have been found in an important building of 48 m by 45 m together with ceramics dating back to the Imperial Period, giving a context that dates back to the same period as the texts found in building A of the acropolis. The sanctuary also contained an adjacent sacred pond. If the identification of this pond (Šupitaššu) is correct, it is then possible to postulate that those two stones are the Ḫuwaši of the Storm-god and his consort Anzili.\(^\text{12}\)

The two stone blocks being part of the sanctuary, they would be the first identifiable Ḫuwaši known. The stones are raw and unpolished blocks coming from the surrounding cliffs. From Kuşaklı, we could admit a specific category of standing stone: un-worked blocks. Two others stones could perhaps be added in the identifiable Ḫuwaši, but as cut up stones: the stones on Kızlarkaya (Maidens’ Rock) in Boğazköy and the Karahöyük limestone stela.

Outside texts and archaeology, iconography is the better way to try to discover a form and a typology of Hittite standing stones.

Hieroglyphic monuments

It seems pertinent to include in this study two stone bases dating back to the Empire Period and housed in the Istanbul Museum (inv. N°7775 et 7776 = BOĞAZKÖY 1 & 2) (fig. 2).

Those two bases contained standing objects, likely stones. The Anatolian hieroglyphic sign to designate the object, Ḫuwaši is the sign STELE (N°267 of Laroche), which is a combination of the signs « LAPIS » et « SCALPRUM ». The sign represents exactly the very object it is written on.\(^\text{13}\)

---

12 Contrary to what I wrote earlier. The stone of Anzili and the one of LAMA are two different stones, P. M. Michel, OBO 266, 183. See G. Wilhelm, Kuşaklı – Şarişşa, Band 1,1, Keilschrifttexte aus Gebäude A (Rahden, 1997) 14–15.

This same sign is also attested elsewhere, especially on the so-called Emirgazi “altars” (fig. 3). On those monuments, the sign STELE designating them appears on lines 3, 6, 7, 24 and 27. STELE is however different from offering table (and maybe from altar), that normally appears with the sign MENSA (Klappstuhl).

In cuneiform writing, “altar” is attested under the logogram GIŠZAG.GAR.RA (Hitt. ištana-). The offering table, normally made of wood, is attested under GIŠBANŠUR (no Hittite reading). A. Ünal, in a very interesting article,\(^\text{14}\) has demonstrated that the Hittites called the “altars/offering tables” with GIŠ even though they are mostly made of stone.

A distinction should perhaps be made: BANŠUR, normally of wood, is the offering table while “altar”, a sacred object, is made of stone. In Ünal’s article, the iconographic data studied concern mainly the stone monument which is unfortunately equated with the wooden table BANŠUR of texts.\(^\text{15}\) The latter should not be confused with “altar”.\(^\text{16}\) The comparison of cuneiform sources and iconographic data used in the study of Ünal is the right methodology. The hypothesis of interpretation of the cultic objects and monuments may however be different.

To sum up, a first confusion has been made between iconographical occurrences of stone monuments and their naming in texts,\(^\text{17}\) and a second one seems indeed to exist between the two objects “stele” and “altar”.

Tracing the iconographic evolution and history of the object, Ünal observed rightly that “Den Prototypen der altarähnlichen Opfertische kann man auf den kārum-zeitlichen Siegelabdrücken aus Acemhöyük und Kültepe

---


\(^{15}\) The difference between table and altar is however clearly visible in the glyptic. Tables are attested for example on a seal from Büyükkale, see Ünal, Fs. Hrouda, 286 and Ünal, Fs. Hrouda, fig. 1.4; and from Boğazköy Ünal, Fs. Hrouda, fig. 1.6.


\(^{17}\) In the literature you will find “Tischaltar” as well as “table-shaped altar”, which underline the difficulty of categorizing the very object.
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begegnen. It seems in fact that the first representation of “altar” in Anatolia dates back to the Assyrian Trade Colony Period and that the same shape was conserved until the Empire period.

If the sign L.267, attested on the stone bases from the Istanbul Museum, designates the installation with standing stones put inside the bases, we should admit that L.267 could not be used for “altar”, but rather for the “STELE” = standing stone (Hitt. Ḫuwaši). Furthermore, we know that the altars I et IV from Emirgazi could be inserted into a rectangular base, which was covered with hieroglyphic writings as well (drawings in Masson 1979:9). The way the Emirgazi stones were placed in it would have been similar to the stones inserted into the Istanbul bases and perhaps also similar to the Karahöyük stele.

The Emirgazi inscriptions say that nobody is supposed to change the divine patrons of the stele in question. And this goes well together with the preceeding line, which contains the injunction against altering the text of the inscription. In addition, §25 says that those stones must be made TANA “sanctified”. The Luwian term tana as known from the Empire-period Emirgazi inscription, indicates a state that a stele is supposed to be in, and is translated by H. C. Melchert as “sanctified”. The consecration of these stones was made by Tudḫaliya IV. This interpretation suggests that the Emirgazi stones are a kind of Ḫuwaši rather than altars.

The text of the monument itself supports such an hypothesis as a word hwa-sa-ti-(sic !) appears beside the STELE sign. For this reason, I suggested to read the Emirgazi monument as follow:

§11 DEUS-ní-zi/a STELE kwi/a-i(a)-sa hwi/a-sa-ti-sa

---

18 Ünal, Fs. Hrouda, 290.
20 Several examples of hieroglyphic monuments are, in fact, bases, see also Bossert, Belleten 16, 498, 506: “Man darf jedoch ohne weiteres annehmen, dass alle Stelen mit ihrem untersten Teil in Basen oder in Erdboden eingelassen waren (...)”
23 Warm thanks to Ilya Yakubovitch for his very friendly help.
Whose ḫuwaši is the stele for the gods,

§12 i(a)-zi/a-tá-sa wa/i-tá STELE pa-sa-ı́ hwi/a-sa-ti-sa i(a)-zi/a-i(a)-ru.

let the stele to be made become the ḫuwaši of that one.

This interpretation\(^\text{24}\) would clearly indicate that the demonstrative refers to the stone on which the inscription appears. In the translation, one could only recognize the equivalent made between STELE and ḫuwaši: the STELE is the ḫuwaši of the god. One could also think that the Emirgazi monuments are indeed altars, and that the STELE to which the text refers was a standing stone placed in the rectangular base, within the altars. However, the text indicates a plural form which identifies all the standing stone monuments as being STELE (§24 with demonstrative plural zaya). All of them have to be made tana, and all of them, as being holy, should be protected.

If the precise reading of the logogram STELE is unknown, it seems to be a generic sign for numbers of different standing stones. In several cases, it could well refer to the known cultic standing stones worshipped in the rituals.

With respect to the Emirgazi monuments and their inscriptions, we could consider that they belong to a specific category of standing stones, which is the Hittite ḫuwaši of the gods. The rituals with ḫuwašis dating back to Tudḫaliya IV are well documented. From this, one could postulate that the Emirgazi monuments are, under Tudḫaliya IV, considered as part of the sacred standing stones, known in Hittite under the word ḫuwaši.

Hawkins wanted to identify the Emirgazi “altars” with the mushroom shaped (fungiform) objects depicted on the Hittite vase of Inandık.\(^\text{25}\) Let’s have a look at the vase’s iconography.
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Hittite vases

The so-called “altars” are depicted in ritual scenes on several Old Hittite vases: Inandık and Hüseyindede for example.

On the Inandık vase (fig. 4):26 the standing stone monument, covered with some motifs, appears in the 2nd register between a structure with small human beings on it, a Hittite vase and a bed with two people: the king and the queen. It is worth noting that the vase depicted on the Inandık vase is identical to the Inandık vase itself. Thus, the very vase is represented on its own decoration, in a ritual context. On the 3rd register, a libation is offered to the stone, in front of a figure.

On the Hüseyindede vase (fig. 5):27 the scene showing the stone monument is similar to the one on the Inandık vase, but in this scene, the vase is missing.

In this iconography, the stone monument is attested in ritual contexts, with music, offerings and sacrifice of animals.

Music during rituals is well attested by texts that mention the INANNA-instruments and galgaturi-castanet28.

For T. Yıldırım,29 the vases of Hüseyindede30 are vases with “narrative representations of spring festivals organized in honour of the local Storm-god in the countryside of Hatti where agriculture depends of fertility and reproduction”. Furthermore, rituals texts dealing with spring festivals for the Storm-god underline the role and the importance of the standing stone of the god, like in KUB XI 22 obv. I 1-5 (CTH 611):

---

29 T. Yıldırım, SMEA 50, 845.
30 Different vases have been found on this site.
“[W]hen the king celebrates the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival in [s]pring, the Storm-God of Ḫatti’s ḫuwaši-stone stands in the étarnu- in the box[wood grove].”

Our interpretation of this iconographic corpus is close to the one proposed by Yıldırım. These vases are certainly ritual objects, containing perhaps the wheat used to make bread during the spring festival (so-called storage vessel of the Storm-god), and their decoration is directly linked to their practical use in a ritual context. The vase shows the ritual context in its own decoration.

It is thereby worth considering the ritual texts, especially spring festivals (CTH 604-625 of the AN.TAH.ŠUM), rather than interpreting the iconographical programme of the vases as a hierogamy. The presence of the bull in a sacrifice scene of the Inandık vase strongly identifies the vases with the cult of the Storm-god. The hierogamy is indeed excluded from the interpretation of the silver drinking vessels (Boston fist cup, Schimmel’s rhyton) whose iconographic programme are the same.

The hieroglyphic text of the Emirgazi monument, newly interpreted, sheds some light on this stone monument and clearly identifies the very object as being a ḫuwaši (with the Luwian hapax).

As claimed before, these standing stones, attested on several vases, are very similar to the Emirgazi monuments. Does it mean that the new interpretation of the Emirgazi monuments proposed in this paper could change the interpretation of the iconographic programme of the Old Hittite vases? If the interpretation of the Emirgazi monument as ḫuwaši is correct, is it then possible to identify the stones on the Old Hittite vases as another instance of the same object?

The motifs visible on the lower part of the stone monuments (Inandık, 31 The Alaca Höyük orthostats represent as well the cult of the Storm-god (bull), in the same way.
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Hüseyindede, Alaca, Fraktin) should still be explained. It is usually interpreted as AD.KID\textsuperscript{32}: altars made of wicker-work. But if the monument is made of stone and is not an altar, could it be pieces of fabric around the base\textsuperscript{33} or a way to probably schematize hieroglyphs, as it is still visible on the Emirgazi monuments? The first proposition implies a wooden table, which seems excluded for the round-topped cylindrical objects we are dealing with. The second is probable. The latter hypothesis, interesting for its correlation with archeological findings, is problematic in a way, because it would make admissible the existence of the Anatolian hieroglyphs already during the Old Hittite Period - a hotly debated question.\textsuperscript{34}

In conclusion, what does a Ḫuwaši look like?

This contribution was intended to show that the Hittite Ḫuwaši is above all a stone object used in rituals to materialize the divinity. One might legitimately ask if these stone monuments were crude, natural blocks or cut up stones. In the first category we might classify the two rocks from the extra-muros sanctuary of Šarišša; in the second we might categorize the stones on “Maidens’ Rock” (Kızlarkaya) in Boğazköy and the Karahöyük limestone stele.

Additionally, the new proposed reading for the monuments of Emirgazi, commonly referred to as “altars,” allows us to augment the corpus of Hittite sacred standing stones. King Tudḫaliya IV did in fact name these monuments by the Luwian hapax Ḫwa-sa-ti-. This reference permits us to suggest that the mushroom-shaped objects, typically interpreted as Hittite altars, were in reality considered to be Ḫuwaši (and likewise that offerings could be placed upon them). We should thus avoid using the term “altar” to designate these monuments. Hawkins already years ago underscored the analogy between the objects reproduced on vases and the monuments at Emirgazi. If the new interpretation of the Emirgazi inscriptions is correct,

\textsuperscript{33} The practice is attested in the Hittite texts with the garments TŪG or GAD.
we are correct in asking if the figural scenes decorating the vases of Inandık and Hüseyindede might not represent a springtime festival in honor of the local Storm-god. Furthermore, during these festivals, libation and offering rituals took place for the sacred stone of the god, to the sound of Inanna’s musical instruments. This is precisely what is manifest in text CTH 611: the ḫuwaši of the god who appears in the tarnu is the one who receives the offerings. In conclusion, we propose the hypothesis that the mushroom-shaped objects appearing on the Hittite relief vases are materializations of the Storm-god and not altars, and that this particular standing stone’s shape endured until the imperial age.

FIGURES

Fig.1 Pierres Sarissa (Photographer: Stephan Balmer (UNIBE))
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Fig. 2 STELE Istanbul

Fig. 3 Emirgazi
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CORPUS STUDY OF INFORMATION STRUCTURE IN HITTITE: NEGATION AND WORD ORDER

Maria MOLINA*

Abstract:

Position of negation in the Hittite clause has long been discussed in the literature, especially concerning negation fronting and the placement of preverbs as well as negation markers in relation to each other in the preverbal position. However, none of the previous research has so far used corpus approach. This paper presents quantitative data on the position of negation markers in the Hittite clause, based on a syntactically annotated corpus of clauses from Hittite letters and instructions. Thus it offers a new understanding for word order in preverb-negation sequences and for negation fronting in Hittite.

Key words: Hittite, syntax, negation, word order, corpus approach, preverbs, information structure

1. Introduction

Word order in negated clauses in Hittite has already been widely discussed, see most recently Sideltsev 2015a, 2015b, 2016 and Hackstein 2014, 2015, among others. Still, as those works are not based on a syntactically annotated corpus, I hope to add some new, mostly quantitative, contribution

* Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences.

1 In 2017–2019 the Hittite corpus is being developed under the project “Typology of verse genesis” (Hittite meter research), supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, project #17-06-00392.
to the discussion. My research is based on an online corpus of syntactically annotated Hittite clauses, representing the results of an on-going corpus project at the Institute of Linguistics (Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow) supervised by Dr. Andrej Sideltsev. The corpus covers all Hittite letters and instructions published by Hoffner (2009); Beckman et al. (2011) and Miller (2013) and is now being published online at http://hittitecorpus.ru (Molina & Sideltsev 2015–). The basic element of the corpus is the clause, annotated for a number of parameters, including word order (SOV–OSV), clause type (positive, negative, interrogative: rhetorical and non-rhetorical), information structure (focus-comment-topic). The global aim of the project is to get quantitative data on syntax and information structure of the Hittite clause. One particular goal of the work is to analyse the position of the Hittite negation in the clause, particularly in questions, the scope of negation and the placement of preverbs in relation to negation, in order to find out more about their nature and the conditions of their placement. The current research on the corpus comprises the following questions:

1) How frequent are non-canonical positions of the negation marker in Hittite?

2) How are these positions conditioned?

2. Quantitative data

The online corpus currently contains 3807 clauses, 145 clauses from the Old Hittite material, 1826 clauses from the Middle Hittite and 1836 clauses from the New Hittite texts, with 12, 141 and 259 negated clauses respectively, 412 negated clauses in total. The preliminary statistical data cover most Hittite letters published by Hoffner (2009), with an exception of several letters from the Mašat archive. Some instructions have not yet been included into the corpus for technical reasons (see the supplements for a list of all texts included into the current research).

The material was also analysed for different types of negation markers and negative pronouns, which in Hittite should be considered as negation marker plus negative polarity items (NPI, for the detailed account of the nature of
NPI in Hittite see now Sideltsev 2016). The types of Hittite negation markers are represented in Tab. 1; Tab. 2 summarizes the types of Hittite negative pronouns; the quantitative information is shown in Tab. 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>natta/ŪL/UL/NU.GÁL</th>
<th>negative of assertion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lē</td>
<td>negative of prohibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāwi</td>
<td>negative with the meaning ‘not yet’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nūman/nūwan</td>
<td>negative of wish or potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nekku</td>
<td>negative with the meaning ‘not... somehow’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab 1. Negation markers in Hittite (following Hoffner & Melchert 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>natta/ ŪL kuiski</th>
<th>‘no one’</th>
<th>NOM.COM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>natta/ ŪL kuinki</td>
<td>‘no one’</td>
<td>ACC.COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natta/ ŪL kuitki</td>
<td>‘nothing’</td>
<td>NOM/ACC. N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natta/ ŪL kuis</td>
<td>‘no one’</td>
<td>NOM.COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natta/ ŪL kuit</td>
<td>‘no one’</td>
<td>NOM/ACC.N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natta/ ŪL kuedaniki</td>
<td>‘no one’</td>
<td>DAT-LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natta/ ŪL kuwapikki</td>
<td>‘no where’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natta/ ŪL kuwatka</td>
<td>‘no reason’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nawi kuiski</td>
<td>‘no one’</td>
<td>NOM.COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lē kuiski</td>
<td>‘no one’</td>
<td>NOM.COM: before the verb in imperative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab 2. Negative pronouns in Hittite (they always consist of a negation marker plus–commonly–indefinite or–rarely–relative pronouns)

2 The Hittite material is given in narrow transliteration. Plene writing is reflected as vowel length mark, which follows the traditional way to transcribe plene in narrow transliteration. On the problem of plene in Hittite and its reference to vowel length and accent see most recently Kloekhorst 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negation marker</th>
<th>Number of clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>natta/ŪL/UL/NU/NU.GAL</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĖL</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU.GÁL</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĖL</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU.GÁL</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natta</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĖL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU.GÁL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lē</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāwi</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāwi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nawi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nūman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total NH</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total MH</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total OH</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total negated</strong></td>
<td><strong>412</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tab. 3. Quantitative data for different types of negation in the Hittite letters and instructions*
If we look at the distribution of negation markers in Hittite, the following Diagrams 1 and 2 best visualize our corpus data. The most frequent negation markers are, naturally, *natta* (negation of assertion) and *lē* (negation of prohibition). One should notice that in our New Hittite material only three markers of negation have been found, namely *natta* (ŪL/UL/NU/NU.GÁL in writing), *nawi* and prohibitive *lē*; while in the Middle Hittite material *nūman* is also attested. There are no instances attested for *nekku* yet.

The material shows (rather roughly) that in New Hittite *natta* gives 77% of all negation markers, 21% — *lē*, and *nawi* is only 2%. In Middle Hittite *natta* represents 81% of all cases of negation, 18% — *lē*, 1% is *nūman*. For the Old Hittite period the material is too scarce to be statistically relevant. In general, 79% of all negated clauses in our material are sentences with *natta*, 20% — with *lē*.

**Diagram 1. Negation markers in the New Hittite letters and instructions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negation markers in Middle Hittite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>nūman</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lē</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>natta</em> (UL/UL/NU/NU.GÁL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram 2. Negation markers in the Middle Hittite letters and instructions**
3. Position of negation in the clause

It was long established by Hoffner (1986:86) that the normal position of a negation marker in Hittite is preverbal. My corpus data confirm this yet again. The majority of negated clauses (see Tab. 4, Diagram 3 below) unambiguously show immediately preverbal position, just as described in Hoffner & Melchert 2008 and in Hoffner 1986. “Unclear position” in Tab. 4 means that either the clause is too damaged or the position of negation marker is ambiguous between preverbal and internal, preverbal and fronted, internal and fronted. If there is a preverb in the clause, the basic position for natta and lē is between preverb and verb, but there are exceptions. These conditions are very well known, and present undoubtedly the most neutral, canonical word order of negation markers in Hittite.

More interesting are non-canonical cases: fronted (clause first/initial), clause internal (other than immediately preverbal) and postverbal positions. They are quite rare, but regular: for 306 cases of immediately preverbal position in my corpus (OH, MH and NH, 74.26% of all cases) there are 38 cases (9.22%) of fronted negation markers, 15 clause internal negation markers, 14 postverbal ones, and 39 other cases, mostly unclear, but also negations with narrow scope on noun phrases. It should be mentioned that at least in our corpus natta is fronted distinctly more often (in relation to the overall amount of negated clauses) than the other negation markers, and for lē postverbal position seems to be a consistently regular strategy.

It should be mentioned here that frequency of postverbal position in Hittite in general was roughly estimated in Luraghi 2012 as 1% (with no statistical data, to my knowledge), and postverbal position of negations – as less than 1%. The preliminary results of our quantitative research of postverbal position in Middle Hittite (on the material of letters) was published recently in Molina 2014: 1.68% of postverbal clauses (no data for postverbal negation). Sideltsev (2015a) accounted for the postverbal position as a rare, but regular strategy.

The data of the current research represented in Tab. 4 show that postverbal
position makes even more: 3.4% for all the letters and instructions, which reflects its regular character, but needs more research on a wider corpus. It is twice as many as the data in Molina 2014 and Sideltsev 2015a. Scarcity of good examples limits the reliability of the statistical data, as just one lost or misunderstood case might significantly change the situation, but, nonetheless, postverbal negations certainly make more than 1% in MH and NH letters and instructions. We suggest preliminarily that the negation marker takes preverbal position, most probably a focus one, which reflects the structure of immediately preverbal position (for analysis of postverbal position, copying the structure of immediately preverbal position, see Sideltsev 2015a).

![Diagram 3. Position of natta and lē in general](image)

All figures concerning the position of negation in the Hittite clause given above include cases with NPI, though their position was annotated as well as an additional option. The results of this additional annotation go as follows: for the New Hittite material there are 36 clauses with NPI, and for the Middle Hittite material there are 17 clauses with NPI. In most cases, even more consistently than for negation markers in general, NPIs show exclusive preverbal position, and even in cases when negation marker is fronted, NPIs stay preverbally, — the split demonstrates their nature as NPI (and not just negative pronouns).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of clauses</th>
<th>Per cent of all negated clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>natta</strong></td>
<td>201</td>
<td>77.31% of all negated in NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preverbal</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>71.14% of all <strong>natta</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fronted</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postverbal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>lē</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21.15% of all negated in NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preverbal</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81.82% of all <strong>lē</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fronted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postverbal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>nāwi</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.92% of all negated in NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preverbal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100% of all <strong>nāwi</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>natta</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>79.02% of all negated in MH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preverbal</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>76.99% of all <strong>natta</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fronted</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postverbal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>lē</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.48% of all negated in MH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preverbal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76% of all <strong>lē</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fronted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postverbal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>nūman</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7% of all negated in MH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preverbal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100% of all <strong>nūman</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tab. 4. Position of negation markers in the clause (NU.GÁL included into natta)**
There are 3 fronted negation markers split from NPIs in the NH part of the corpus (KUB 14.3 i 54, KUB 14.3 i 54–55, BLMJ 1143 obv. 10–11), and 3 fronted negation markers split from NPIs in the Middle Hittite material (ABoT 65 rev. 11–13). There are also 2 postverbal negation markers with NPIs (1 MH, 1 NH), and 2 internal ones (1 MH, 1 NH), all of them are lē kuiški.

This is the weak spot where our annotation needs further research to provide annotators with the stricter rules for fronted/internal positions. One example of an ambiguous case is BLMJ obv. 10–11: here lē is placed in the initial position in order to provide a host for second position Wackernagel’s clitics (ex. 1). It was preliminarily annotated as fronted, and no corrections have been made to the annotation so far, but the sentence is too short to consider the position as indeed fronted.

(1) NH/NS (CTH 204) BLMJ 1143 obv. 10–11  (Hoffner 2009:372)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lē=war=an</th>
<th>kuiški</th>
<th>dammešḫai-zzi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEG=QUOT=PRON.3SG.ACC</td>
<td>someone.3SG.NOM</td>
<td>damage.3SG.PRS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘No one should oppress him’

However, most negation markers with NPIs unambiguously show immediately preverbal position.

As far as the sequence preverb-negation is concerned, when they are both present in the clause in preverbal position, the standard placement of the negation marker is after the preverb and before the verb. It is well known, though, see for attestations Hoffner & Melchert 2008, CHD L-N 1990, that in some cases the negation marker goes before the preverb. In our material the usual frequency of the word order negation-preverb is 10.71% for MH period, 47.82% for NH period, and, consequently, it is 27.45% in average. A positive trend can be noticed from Middle to New Hittite to use negation-preverb word order more frequently (figures, however, still need more consideration and a larger corpus).
Hoffner & Melchert (2008:341–2) explicitly write that “with preverbal constructions natta (and other negatives…) breaks the nexus between preverb and verb… There are occasional exceptions to this rule with anda…, but no exceptional examples with arha, katta(n), parā, or šarā.” Our corpus data do not agree with this assertion: in NH data there are 3 examples of negation marker before anda (2 natta, 1 lē), 2 examples before parā (1 natta, 1 lē), 2 examples before arha (both times ŪL kuitki); in MH data 2 examples before anda (natta and NU.GÁL kuiški), 1 example before appa (natta), 2 examples before šarā.

4. Negation fronting: interrogative contexts and contrastive focusing

Now the most regular non-canonical position of negation in Hittite–fronted, i.e. clause initial/first, should be discussed. In the most recent Hittite grammar Hoffner & Melchert (2008:342–3) suggest that negation fronting is limited to rhetorical questions and in general to emphatic assertion. It is quite paradoxical that, even though Hoffner in his classical paper on negation in Hittite (Hoffner 1986) explicitly stated that negation fronting is in no way limited to rhetorical questions, subsequent research tended to ignore his observation. No less paradoxical is the fact that a quantitative approach to the Hittite material of letters and instructions shows very clearly that indeed such a limitation exists. However it should be formulated rather as follows:

negation fronting correlates with rhetorical questions (if it is a question indeed), but non-fronted negation in a question does not correlate with non-rhetorical contexts, and there is negation fronting in non-interrogative sentences, mostly with emphatic function—in terms of information structure it should comprise contrastive focusing on the negation marker.

The latter assertion can be supported by the following examples from our corpus. Case (2) is obviously an emphatic assertion, representing one of the conditions for negation fronting mentioned by Hoffner & Melchert (2008). For cases (3) and (4) we consider contrastive focusing as well:³

³ In these and in the following examples, focus is marked up with bold letters, negation is underlined.
(2) NH/NS (CTH 181) KUB 14.3 i 74  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UL=aš</th>
<th>šarku-š</th>
<th>LUGAL-ur-š</th>
<th>ēš-ta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>neg=PRON.3SG.COM</td>
<td>powerful-NOM.SG.COM</td>
<td>king-NOM.SG.COM</td>
<td>be-3SG.PST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Yet he (i.e., Kurunt(i)y)a”) was not a mighty king!’

(3) NH/NS (CTH 181) KUB 14.3 ii 18  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mān ŠEŠ-YA namma IQBI ammel=wa memian UL ISMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UL=war=aš=mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg=QUOT=PRON.3SG.NOM=PRON.1SG.GEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(‘My brother would have said again: “He didn’t hear what I said,)  
nor has he complied with my request” ’

(4) NH/NS (CTH 176) KUB 21.38 obv. 39‘  

| ŠEŠ-YA=ma=mu=za NIN-tar nakkiyatar ZI-ni=pat EGIR-pa [UL dāš...] |
|------------------------|------------|------------|
| UL=ya=wa | kui-t | iyauwa-š |
| neg=and=QUOT | what-NOM.SG.N | doing-NOM.SG |

(‘But my brother has not accepted in his own mind my status as a sister  
and my dignity, saying: “[…do not], and do)  
what should not be done” ’

All questions were annotated in our corpus as rhetorical/non-rhetorical. The  
overall number of interrogative sentences in the current material is 105, of  
them 50 have negation markers and 55 go without negation. The distribution  
of rhetorical and non-rhetorical questions is as shown in Tab. 5:
Tab. 5. Distribution of rhetorical and non-rhetorical questions

The problem here is indeed how to detect whether a question is rhetorical or a question at all, as the Hittite scribes did not use any question marks. The only possible approach is contextual. The following example is supposed to demonstrate the principle. Without further context the question might well be non-rhetorical or not a question at all, but with the preceding ‘was that enemy enchanted (that you did not recognize him)’ the rhetorical nature is obvious.

(5) MH/MS (CTH 186) HKM 6 obv. 13–14 (Hoffner 2009:105)

\begin{verbatim}
kāša=wa LÚ.KUR uit nu=wa=za=kan URU Haparan iniššan
(tamašta URU Kašipuran=ma=wa=kan kēz tamašta
apāš=ma=wa=kan īštarna arha uit nomma=ma=wa<+r>=aš
kuwapi pait nu=war=at ÕL IDI nu apāš LÚ.KUR alwanzahanza
imma ēšṭa)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
| n=an | ŬL | šākt«a-š» |
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
CONN=PRON.3SG.ACC.COM | NEG | know-2SG.PST |
\end{verbatim}

(‘(you wrote to me, saying) ...“The enemy has come. He pressed the city Ḫapara on that side (of me) and the city Gašepura on this side. But he himself passed through, and I don’t know where he went”, so–was that enemy enchanted)

(that) you did not recognize him?’

See also below four other examples of rhetorical questions from MH material where the context helps to understand if the question is rhetorical or not:
### (6) MH/MS (CTH 200) ABoT 60 obv. 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KASKAL.HI.A</th>
<th>UL</th>
<th>EGIR-pa</th>
<th>hišwa-ndari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nu=wa=šmaš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONN=QUOT=PRON.3PL</td>
<td>road.PL</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>PRV</td>
<td>be.open-3PL. PRS.MID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(‘If they build this fortress)
Will not the roads lie open to them?’

### (7) MH/MS (CTH 190) HKM 55 obv. 31–32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TE₄MI-YA=mu kuwat UL uieškettani tuēl ARAD.MEŠ t[a]riyanzi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LÚ.MEŠ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man.NOM.PL</td>
<td>messenger.NOM.PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(‘Why are you (pl.) not sending my messengers (back) to me? Are your servants too tired (to do so)?
Do the(se) messengers not belong to our lord?’

### (8) MH/MS (CTH 190) HKM 71 obv. 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UL</th>
<th>BELU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zik=za</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON.2SG.NOM=REFL</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>lord</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(‘ “If only the Commander of the Chariot-warriors would drive here, we would make peace!” You keep writing to me like that!) (But) are you not a lord, (too)?’
Compare them to non-rhetorical contexts with negation. It is noteworthy that non-rhetorical questions often include a *wh*-word, and there are almost no *wh*-words in rhetorical contexts, which is another argument in determining the nature of questions (rhetorical vs. non-rhetorical):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MH/MS (CTH 190) HKM 56 obv. 8–10</th>
<th>(Hoffner 2009:203)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ŠEŠ</td>
<td>DÛG.GA-YA=ma=mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brother.NOM.SG</td>
<td>aššul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŪL</td>
<td>kuwat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hatrāe-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg</td>
<td>write-2SG.PST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Why, my dear brother, did you not send your greeting to me?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NH/NS (CTH) KBo 18.54 rev. 21’</th>
<th>(Hoffner 2009:343)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kuē-zza=wa=kan</td>
<td>ŪL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what.abl=QUOT=LOC.PART</td>
<td>ḥap-dari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg</td>
<td>succeed.3SG.PST.MID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Why will it be impossible?’

Statistical information on positions of negation in interrogative sentences is presented in the Tab. 6 below:
First of all, the data show that rhetorical questions use negation markers three times as frequently as non-rhetorical ones. The figures support the idea that negation in a question was normally used in rhetorical contexts for expressing the contrast, while in non-rhetorical contexts the function of negation is slightly different, as negation regularly stands in predicative focus.

Secondly, the data show that negation normally stands in preverbal position in interrogative contexts in Hittite, 57% in rhetorical and 17% in non-rhetorical questions (the significant difference is explained by the fact that we included clauses with no negation into proportion, thus there are less negated clauses among non-rhetorical questions). This means that non-fronted negation does not correlate with non-rhetorical contexts. Thirdly, negation fronting is attested in 14% of all rhetorical contexts, while in non-rhetorical questions it is attested only in 3% of all cases. These 3% is only 2 examples, actually. If we look at these examples, we can see that both of them might well be considered rhetorical (exx. (3), (4)). Example (4), moreover, looks rather ambiguous regarding the position of the negation marker—there are too few words in the sentence, the negation marker stands before the focus, the understanding of its position as internal is not completely excluded. If one considers these questions as rhetoric, then every fronted negation question is rhetorical; and even if there is such a thing as non-rhetorical fronted negation, the number of such contexts is very low. This supports the idea that negation fronting correlates with rhetorical questions.

Tab. 6. Negation markers in interrogative sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Rhetorical</th>
<th>Non-rhetorical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preverbal</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fronted</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postverbal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hackstein suggested (pers. comm., Hackstein 2015) that the particle *imma* might serve as a marker for a specific word order (position of fronted negation marker) in Hittite, and therefore, we checked all the material on that particle. Among interrogative clauses there are 1 rhetorical and 1 non-rhetorical context with *imma* in MH (both without negation), 2 contexts with negation and *imma* in preverbal position and 1 in ambiguous (most probably again preverbal) position in the NH material. This means that for now we cannot find any support for a specific role of *imma* in negation fronting.

5. Negation and focus

As was shown above, negation fronting in non-interrogative contexts might be associated with contrastive (rejecting) focusing. If a negation marker stands in its own contrastive focus, it can be raised to the projection dedicated for contrastive focusing, i.e. either clause first or immediately preverbal; see Goedegebuure 2014 on the classification of contrastive foci in Hittite and their position in the clause.

Therefore, discussing the reason of non-canonical placement of the negation marker, we should turn to negation scope. As is obvious, a negation marker can have a wide (sentential) scope and a narrow one, over a single constituent. How can we tell one from the other? No formal criteria, to the best of my
understanding, have been offered in the literature. But certain ideas have already been started before. One of them concerns the link between negation scope and focus, see Krifka (2007:15) who introduces the idea of focus/negation scope connection, saying: “Negation has been analyzed as a focus-sensitive particle…”. It is a well-known fact that focus helps in determining the restrictor of quantifiers, in particular adverbial quantifiers, and then has truth-conditional impact as well. One important fact about focus-sensitive operators is that they have to be in a position in which they can scope over their focus:

“For example, only in (D) could associate with Mary, with Sue, with introduced or with the whole VP, but not with John as it does not c-command John on any level of representation.

(D) John only introduced Mary to Sue.” (Krifka 2007)

Thus, we keep to the hypothesis previously discussed in literature that negation scope is closely linked to the focus.

As our corpus is annotated with regard to focus, it is easy to check if there are any negation markers not in focus. There are no cases in the material of the Hittite letters and instructions annotated so far, where we would have thought that negation is not focused. Yet it should be stressed that the notion of focus does not coincide with the notion of negation scope. It is, rather, that illocutionary operators make use of the alternatives introduced by focus. Still, we can technically use this understanding in further argumentation.

Lambrecht (1994) introduced 3 types of basic information structures:

1) topic-comment, or structures with predicative focus (for a definition of predicative focus see Lambrecht 1994:221);
2) identification, or structures with the focus on one argument;
3) focus on the whole sentence (thetie, sentence focus, event-reporting).
Predicative and argument focus are relevant for us when we discuss negation. Predicative focus is, following Lambrecht, a neutral (unmarked) one. Argument focus identifies a focused constituent as an answer to the question “what exactly happened” (while predicative focus answers a more general question “what happened”). If a negation marker stands in its Hittite canonical preverbal position, and the focus in the sentence is predicative, the wide (sentential) scope of the negation should coincide with the scope of focus, i.e. negation scopes over the whole VP. If it is argument focus, the scope of negation is narrow, and it is over the negation marker only, and it is the negation marker that is in focus. In fact, for the Hittite material Salisbury (2005:217–8), followed by Sideltsev (2015b:827) has already introduced the idea that if a negation stands before a preverb, the word order flags focus, i.e., as stated above, the negation scope is on the focused negation (see now the same idea in).

In terms of information structure, negation marker and preverb in preverbal position can easily follow each other—though negation usually stands immediately before the verb, the preverb can stand between negation and the verb without any big change in the information structure of the clause: negation marker scopes over preverbs even when the former stands after the latter, because the preverb is in the same predicative focus.

This does not actually give us any explanation as to why a preverb and a negation in canonical preverbal position can have both the order negation-preverb and preverb-negation, (NEG-PRV word order appears—regularly!—in about 27% of all cases). The working hypothesis might be:

If a negation marker is preverbal, it scopes over the VP, and it stands in the canonical immediately preverbal position. Standing in predicative information focus, it does not allow the preverb to appear between the negation and the verb. But if the negation is in a contrastive focus, it might allow the preverb to stand lower (but this does not necessarily happen, see exx. (15) and (16) below!).

One additional marker for a contrastive focus on negation is the focusing
particle =*pat*, which sometimes marks the negation, but further research is needed for any assertions on this score. For the placement of negation markers and preverbs in relation to each other see Sideltsev 2015a, 2016.

Corpus approach helps to find rare negated cases where verbs are topical, thus giving new material for the analysis. There are 24 clauses with topical verbs and negation in the Middle Hittite material (the New Hittite corpus is not yet annotated for topical verbs). As stated above, negation is always in focus in my material, and if the verb is topical, the focus is only on negation, and it is a contrastive (rejecting) focus. This way, comparing clauses with the same wording, but different information structure, we can spot cases of contrastive focusing on negation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(14) MH/MS (CTH 262) IBoT 1.36 iii 75</th>
<th>(Miller 2013:116)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LÜ kītaš=ma</td>
<td>ŬL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chanter=but</td>
<td>neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>call.out-3SG.PRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘But the chanter [does] not [cry out]’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(15) MH/MS (CTH 262) IBoT 1.36 iv 4–5</th>
<th>(Miller 2013:118)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LÜ kītaš=ma</td>
<td>[nam]ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chanter=but</td>
<td>then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>call.out-3SG.PRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘The chanter, though, does not cry out [again]’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In example (14) *natta* stands preverbally, but is not in the predicative focus, it is in the contrastive focus whereas the verb is information focus. This is proved by the example (15) that follows in the nearest context with the same meaning, but with the topical verb.

It should be mentioned that there can be several foci in a sentence. Here I follow Krifka 2007, ex. (29): “it is a case of multiple focus in which in one and the same sentence, one expression introduces alternatives that are exploited in one way, and another expression introduces alternatives that are exploited in a different way”.
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Compare also examples (16) and (17):

(16) MH/MS (CTH 262) IBoT 1.36 iv 14–15 (Miller 2013:118)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Š[A]</th>
<th>É.G</th>
<th>AL-Lî=<em>{ma=at=kan}</em></th>
<th>KÁ.GAL [...]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of</td>
<td>palace.gen.sg=but=pron.3sg.pl=loc.part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

šarā ŪL uwa-nzi
PRV NEG come-3pl.prs

‘Though, they do not (just) come up to the gate [of the pa]lace’

KÁ.GAL is in contrastive replacing focus, and preverb-negation-verb order is in predicative focus. In (16), following several lines below, we see šarāzzi in contrastive replacing focus, clause initially, and ŪL in contrastive rejecting focus preverbally, while the sequence preverb-verb stays topical. Another revealing example is (18).

(17) MH/MS (CTH 262) IBoT 1.36 iv 16–17 (Miller 2013:118)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>šarāzzi=ma=at=kan</th>
<th>KÁ.GAL</th>
<th>šarā ŪL</th>
<th>uwa-nzi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>upper=but=pron.3pl.com=loc.part</td>
<td>gate PRV NEG</td>
<td>come-3pl.prs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘But they do not come up to the upper gate’

(18) MH/MS (CTH 261.II) KUB 26.17 ii 6’–7’ (Miller 2013:130)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nu=za=kan</th>
<th>Lû[huyandan]</th>
<th>KUR-e</th>
<th>anda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conn=refl=loc.part</td>
<td>prisoner.acc.sg</td>
<td>land.loc.sg</td>
<td>PRV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lē=pat</th>
<th>dâla-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEG=emph</td>
<td>release-3sg.prs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘He must in no case rel[ea]se him [wi]th[in] the l[and]’

Here one can spot three foci: predicative focus (the verb, dâlai), contrastive focus on negation, marked by the focusing particle =pat (lē=pat), and contrastive focus on KUR-e ‘in the land’ (to release the prisoner not in the land, but to bring him before the king). This can also explain the use of the
focusing particle. The notion of multiple foci can help to explain the position of negation in clauses with non-canonical word orders, such as fronted.

There is one, unfortunately broken, context in the “Milawata letter” (KUB 19.55 + KUB 48.90), that shows NEG-PRV/PRV-NEG interchange at a distance of literally one line in the same tablet. The translation allows for understanding that the negation marker in (19) is contrastively focused, and in (20) stands in predicative focus (with additional identificational focus on SIG₅-an[n]i).

| (19) NH/LNS (CTH 182) KUB 19.55 + KUB 48.90 l.e. 1–2  (Hoffner 2009:320) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| [...] kan       | dUTU-ŠI         | [...] teš        | UL anda         | ū-hhu[n]        |
| XXX=LOC.PART   | My.Majesty      | XXX             | NEG PRV         | see.1SG.PST     |
| ‘I, My Majesty, [...] did not see [...]’ |

| (20) NH/LNS (CTH 182) KUB 19.55 + KUB 48.90 l.e. 3  (Hoffner 2009:320) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| [...] SIG₅-an[n]i | šer             | anda UL         | ū-hhu[n]        |
| XXX             | well-being      | PSTP            | PRV NEG         | look.1SG.PST    |
| ‘Out of consideration for your well-being I did not look [...]’ |

6. Conclusions

So I presented corpus research of the positioning of negation markers in Hittite, conducted on the material of New and Middle Hittite letters and instructions. Thus, the conclusions are as follows. Quantitative data were obtained concerning types and placement of negation markers and pronouns. The statistical approach confirmed the idea of a basic preverbal position for negation in Hittite and became the basis for some conclusions about negation fronting, such as that negation fronting correlates with rhetorical questions, but non-fronted negation in a question does not correlate with non-rhetorical contexts, and negation fronting in sentences other than questions should be connected to contrastive focusing. Negation scope is closely linked to the focus, and it has been shown that there can be several foci in a clause, among
them a contrastive rejecting focus on *natta*. Negation with sentential scope should correlate with the predicative focus, while negation with narrow scope should correlate with a contrastive focus, over negation only. A contrastively focused negation behaves differently from a negation in predicative focus, hence can come a solution for the word order negation-preverb. Negation-preverb word order is a rare, but regular strategy, according to our corpus material where this order is attested in roughly the same proportions for all Hittite preverbs, except *katta(n)* (contra Hoffner & Melchert 2008:341–2).
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8. Supplements–sources for the corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Hittite letters</th>
<th>From Queen Puduḫepa to Ramses II of Egypt(?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KUB 21.38</td>
<td>From the King of Aḫḫiyawa to the Hittite King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 26.91</td>
<td>To King Muwattalli II from Manapa-Tarḫunta of the Šeḫa River Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 19.5 + KBo 19.79</td>
<td>From King Ḫattušili III to the King of Aḫḫiyawa (“Tawagalawa Letter”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 14.3</td>
<td>From King Tudḫaliya IV to Tarkašnawa of Mira (“Milawata Letter”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 19.55 + KUB 48.90</td>
<td>To King Muršili II of Ḫatti from Mašḫuiluwa of Mira-Kuwaliya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 18.15</td>
<td>From King Muwattalli II or Muršili III (Urḫi-Teššub) to King Adad-nirәri I of Assyria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 23.102</td>
<td>From King Tudḫaliya IV of Ḫatti to an Assyrian Nobleman Bāba-ah-iddina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 23.103 (Dupl. A)</td>
<td>From the King to the Queen Mother; Piggyback Letter from the King to Several Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Güterbock 1979, 142–44</td>
<td>To the King from the Queen; Piggyback Letter from mNÍG.BA-du (= Ari-Teššub or Piyama-Tarḫunta) to [PN]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 18.4</td>
<td>From the King of Išuwa to his Father, the Chief of the Charioteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 18.48</td>
<td>From the King to Prince Ḫešni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 13.62</td>
<td>School Tablet Based Upon a Real Letter from […] to [the Queen?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 18.54</td>
<td>To the King from Kaššu; Piggyback Letter to the King from Zarna-ziti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 18.29</td>
<td>To the King from UR.MAḪ-[…]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 57.123</td>
<td>To the King from Taki-Šarruma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 19.23</td>
<td>To the Queen (Puduḫepa?) from Tudḫaliya (IV?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 9.82</td>
<td>To the King from Maša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 2.11</td>
<td>From the King of Arzawa(?) to Ḫattušili III(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 18.79</td>
<td>From […] to […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 57.1</td>
<td>To the Field Marshall (Nuwanza?) from Ḫutupianza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 40.1</td>
<td>To the King from […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 2810</td>
<td>From the King to […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 23.85</td>
<td>From Queen Puduḫepa to Tattamaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 28.129</td>
<td>From […] to the GAL LÚ.MEŠUKU.UŠ, Nananza, and Ḫattušili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEA 45-T 1</td>
<td>From the Hittite Emperor to Alziya-muwa in Emar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLMJ 1143</td>
<td>From the King of Carchemish to Alziya-muwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT 125</td>
<td>From the King of Carchemish to a Hittite Official at Alalakh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT 35</td>
<td>From the King to Tudḫaliya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Hittite letters</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 31.79</td>
<td>River Traffic on the Euphrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 15.28</td>
<td>Three-Plus Augurs to the Queen + piggyback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 12.62</td>
<td>[…] to […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 18.14</td>
<td>To the King from Pazzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 18.95</td>
<td>To the Chief of the Guard from the Chief of the Palace Servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HKM 1–10, 12–39, 43–68, 70–75, 79–82, 84, 88–89</td>
<td>Letters from Masat archives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CORPUS STUDY OF INFORMATION STRUCTURE IN HITTITE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABoT 60</td>
<td>To the King from Kassu (Masat archives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABoT 65</td>
<td>From Tarhuntissa to Palla (Masat archives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or 90/1400</td>
<td>From the King to Kuikuisanduwa (Ortakoy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or 90/800</td>
<td>To the King from the Queen + piggyback (Ortakoy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHCTO 1</td>
<td>From [...] to [...] + piggyback (Ortakoy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHCTO 3</td>
<td>From the King to [...] (Ortakoy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHCTO 4</td>
<td>From the King to [...] Musu, and [...] (Ortakoy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBoT 45: 671-72</td>
<td>From the King to Uhha-muwa (Ortakoy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KuT 50</td>
<td>To the King from Halpa-ziti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KuT 49</td>
<td>To the GAL DUMU. MEŠ É.GAL from the HAZANNU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Middle Hittite instructions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KBo 22.1</td>
<td>A Royal Reprimand of the Dignitaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 13.3</td>
<td>Instructions and Oath Imposition for Royal Servants concerning the Purity of the King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 50.282</td>
<td>Instructions and Oath Imposition for Royal Servants concerning the Purity of the King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 5.11</td>
<td>Protocol for the Palace Gatekeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBoT 1.36</td>
<td>Protocol for the Royal Body Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 50.284(+)</td>
<td>Royal Decree on Social and Economic Matters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Hittite instructions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KUB 26.17</td>
<td>Instructions for Military Officers and Frontier Post Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 13.9 (+KUB 40.62)</td>
<td>Tudhaliya I’s Decree on Penal and Administrative Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 27.16+</td>
<td>Tudhaliya I’s Decree on Penal and Administrative Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 13.7</td>
<td>Tudhaliya I’s Decree on Judicial Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 26.11</td>
<td>Tudhaliya I’s Instructions and Oath Imposition for All the Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 50.268+ KUB 13.21</td>
<td>Tudhaliya I’s Instructions and Oath Imposition for All the Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 36.112+</td>
<td>Instructions and Oath Impositions for the Successors of Tudhaliya I and Tudhaliya III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 16.54</td>
<td>Instructions for Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 21.41</td>
<td>Instructions of Suppiluliuma I for the Military and a Corresponding Oath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 26.57</td>
<td>Instructions of Suppiluliuma I for the Military and a Corresponding Oath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 21.46</td>
<td>Oath of the Men of Ḫattusa to Ḫattusili III and Pudu-Ḫepa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 31.113</td>
<td>Instructions for Priests and Diviners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 13.28</td>
<td>Instructions for the UKU.UŠ-troops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 26.13+ (B), KUB 26.12+ (A), KUB 40.24 (C)</td>
<td>Tudḫaliya IV’s Instructions and Loyalty Oath Imposition for Lords, Princes and Courtiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 26.1 (A), KBo 50.258 (E), KUB 26.8 (B), KUB 23.67 (D), KUB 31.97 (C)</td>
<td>Tudḫaliya IV’s Instructions and Oath Imposition for Courtiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABoT 1.56</td>
<td>Suppiluliuma II’s Instructions and Oath Imposition for the Men of Ḫattusa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tab. 6. Sources for the corpus*
“CTH 416 AS A SAMMELTAFEL: NEW PERSPECTIVES ON AN OLD-HITTITE RITUAL”¹

Claudia MONTUORI*

Abstract

In the following paper, I will argue that the old-Hittite ritual for the royal couple CTH 416, considered so far as one single composition, collects as a matter of fact four different rituals.

These four rituals appear to have the same purpose – the purification of the royal couple – and they show the use of very similar magic techniques, but each one of them forms a separate unit that could work by itself. Moreover, the tablet’s structure is characterized by double paragraph lines separating the four rituals, and thus it points to a strong division between the different sections of the text, in a way similar to the scribal compositions known as Sammeltafeln.

The German noun Sammeltafel defines a tablet containing two or more separate texts, written in sequence and divided one from another by a double paragraph line. Compositions of this kind date back mostly to the Empire Period (13th century B.C.) and so far there are no evidence of an old-Hittite Sammeltafel. However, a middle-Hittite composition (CTH 443) has recently been redefined as a Sammeltafel by Christiansen (2007).

---

* Università degli studi di Pavia, Italy.
1 In this paper I would like to present the main results coming from my doctoral dissertation, entitled “Quattro rituali antico-ittiti per la coppia reale: una nuova edizione di CTH 416” (“Four old-Hittite rituals for the royal couple: a new edition of CTH 416”), defended at the University of Pavia in January 2014, under the supervision of Prof. M. Giorgieri, whom I thank.
In this paper I will show that CTH 416 can be considered a Sammeltafel too and, as a consequence, that the dating and composition’s criteria of this scribal genre should now be reconsidered.

**Paper:**

**Introduction**

The old-Hittite composition classified as CTH 416 is preserved in three different copies, all of them written on double-columned single tablets in old-Hittite ductus: copy A comes from building A of the royal palace on Büyükkale – the so-called “Palace library”\(^2\) – while copies B and C were found in the storerooms surrounding Temple 1 in the lower city of Ḫattuša. The three copies are composed by many different fragments, as presented in the following list\(^3\):

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>KBo 17.1</td>
<td>717/b+744/b+802/b+820/b+1142/c+1301/c+1549+c+2088/c+2386/c+2801/c+56/q+315/w+AlacaFr.1+AnAr6974+AnAr8351+AnAr8912+Bo10410+MAH16866+MAH16867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>KBo 17.26</td>
<td>158/q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>KBo 25.3</td>
<td>1444/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>KBo 25.148</td>
<td>1839/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>KBo 30.33</td>
<td>1562/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>KBo 17.2</td>
<td>Bo2743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>KBo 17.3</td>
<td>Bo2416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>KBo 17.4</td>
<td>Bo3046+Bo4194+Bo4431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>KBo 17.7</td>
<td>417/u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>KBo 20.15</td>
<td>Bo69/331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>KBo 25.7</td>
<td>Bo69/157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>KUB 43.32</td>
<td>Bo8060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>KUB 43.39</td>
<td>Bo8931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>IBoT 3.135</td>
<td>Bo3596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^2\) For this expression see Košak, 1995; Alaura, 2001.

\(^3\) S. Košak, hethiter.net/hethkonk (v. 1.91)
The vast majority of the fragments belonging to CTH 416 was first edited by H. Otten and V. Souček in 1969: their work was focused on the detailed paleographic analysis of the old-Hittite *ductus*, and it truly marked a fundamental step in the text-dating process. However, the contents and the structure of the composition were only sketched out. After that, CTH 416 has never been fully investigated again, even if many of its parts have been repeatedly discussed by scholars over the years and a partial transliteration has been published by E. Neu in 1980.

The importance of CTH 416 within the *corpus* of Hittite rituals, together with the need to update the textual reconstruction, require now a deeper investigation of this composition, in order to fully unravel its particular contents and its meaning.

The main purpose of CTH 416, basically a series of purification rituals, is to preserve the royal family from impurity and disease by using different magical techniques and ingredients. One particular feature of this composition is that the entire text is written in the first person singular, as if it was directly described by the person who officiated it, most probably – even if not certainly – an Old Woman. Moreover, the ancient dating of all of the copies of the text seems to support the idea that CTH 416 represents an original transcription of some old-Hittite rituals. Unfortunately, since the very first lines and the *colophon* are missing in each copy of the text, it is impossible

4 Join F. Fuscagni. Since the fragment is unpublished, it hasn’t been possible for me to see the fragment itself, but I was only able to read an old transliteration of it made by H.G. Güterbock.
5 Otten-Souček, 1969.
6 Neu, 1980.
7 Another one of the very few existing ritual texts showing this peculiar feature is CTH 396.1.1, the middle-Hittite ritual of Hatiya, woman of Kanzapida (see Carruba, 1966; A. Chrzanowska (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 396.1.1 (2012sqq.): this ritual, however, doesn’t seem to have nothing in common with CTH 416, except for being written in the first person singular and performed by a woman.
8 See Taracha, 2009, pp. 76-79; Popko, 1995, pp. 82-84. About the Old Woman see also Gurney, 1977, pp. 44 ff.
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for us to know both the Hittite definition of this composition, if present, and the name and qualification of the ritual performer.

**The structure of CTH 416**

CTH 416 constitutes an interesting case of study not only for its antiquity, but also for its peculiar structure, which will be the topic of the following analysis.

Ever since it was first edited by Otten and Souček, this text has always been classified as a single ritual, lasting several days and mentioning different Hittite holy cities, which could be seen as a description of some ancient festival. Taking a closer look to the structure of the text and the layout of the three copies, however, we can notice some features that seem to contradict the interpretation of CTH 416 as one single ritual.

First of all, the layout of the tablets itself shows, with significant regularity in the three copies, four different sections of the text separated by double paragraph lines. This kind of partition usually indicates, in Hittite tablets, the end of the text and it is never used as an alternative to the single paragraph line. Moreover, at the end of each section a small recurring paragraph is embedded in another couple of double lines.

As to the content, the four sections identified by this graphic partition in the three copies show a very similar internal structure, even if there are some minor differences that can be attributed to gaps in the tablets. This structure reproduces the typical sequence of steps that forms a Hittite ritual in four different and separate units, composed as follows:

a. Presentation of the problem
b. List of materials and execution of the main magic actions

---

9 Otten-Souček, 1969, p. 101: “(...) der vorliegende Text mit der Nennung verschiedener Orte, der Verteilung der einzelnen Kulthandlungen auf mehrere Tage, mit Nennung genauer Tageszeiten, eher an die Gruppe der Festbeschreibungen erinnert.”.

10 Regarding the typical structure of Hittite rituals see Tremouille, 2004, pp. 180-182; Haas, 1987-1990, p. 243a. For a comparison with the structure of the purification ritual CTH 443, which is very similar to the one shown in the first and second rituals of CTH 416, see Szabó, 1971, p. 108.
c. Removal of the impure materials  
d. Invocation to the gods  
e. Ritual feast  
f. Closing paragraph

Each one of the four sections, then, begins with a presentation of the problem that has to be solved, expressed by the adverb mān “when” plus a brief description of the occasion in which the subsequent ritual takes place.

- Rit. 1: […]
- Rit. 2 (Obv. II 18): mān MUŠEN₃ḥaranan ḫuṣuwandan appanzi “When they catch a living eagle”
- Rit. 3 (Rev. III 19-20): anda=ma [mān LUGAL-aš] MUNUS.LU[-GAL-aš=a] hatūgan ēšhar/ papra[ta]r d]ahh[i] “Furthermore, when I take the King and Queen’s fear, blood and impurity”
- Rit. 4 (Rev. IV 14-15): [m]ān [a]ṭin ṣīn pittuliuš=a LUGAL-i MU-NUS.LUGAL-(i)=ya / daškiemi “When I take pain, sorrow and constrictions from the King and Queen”

The beginning of the first ritual, as mentioned above, is hidden in the gap that deprives us of the first lines of the text: nevertheless, its purpose could be deduced from the magic formula that closes the ritual (Obv. II 9-11): “I took from the King, the Queen and from the children of Ḫattuša their evil, their impurity, the fearful iron tongues (and) the blooded [garments(2) of] the Ḫantašepa deities”. It is evident, in fact, that in CTH 416 a relationship exists between the initial presentation of every ritual and its closing formula, that repeats quite literally the opening words, but in the past tense, since the action is at that point already completed.

11 The third ritual, for example, ends with the magic formula “I took fear, blood and impurity: may this not turn back! May the enemies take this away!” (Rev. IV 2-4), while the last says “I took from you pain, sorrow and your constrictions” (Rev. IV 38-40). The second ritual’s closing formula, instead, doesn’t match with the initial presentation of the problem, which focuses on the catching of a living eagle: the closing formula, on the other hand, is similar to the first ritual’s one and recites “For the King, the Queen and the Children in Ḫattuša I buried their illness, their blood, their evil (and) their fear. May this do not resurface again! May the enemy take this away!”.
The second and most substantial part of the four rituals naturally consists of the presentation of the necessary objects and materials and of the execution of the various magical actions. Unlike the vast majority of later rituals, which shows first a detailed list of materials and then the active part of the process, CTH 416 introduces the different materials little by little, in parallel to the related actions.

As already said, a great similarity exists among the contents of the four rituals, including the magic materials, the actions performed and the personnel involved, even if each section preserves its particular features. The main magical operations performed in CTH 416 to transfer the impurity from the royal couple to the inanimate carriers or to the living substitutes are roughly the same in each one of the four rituals: the most important among these actions is clearly the one indicated by the verb waḥnu-, which means “to make turn, to swing” an object above the King’s and Queen’s bodies, in order to load the carrier up with the royal couple’s impurity. Another procedure commonly used in CTH 416 to free the patients from their impurity is spitting (Hitt. allappahh-) on the carriers, while only the last ritual involves specific manipulations of colored woolen threads. All these operations, as well as the related magic materials, were classified by Otten as “typically Anatolian”\(^{12}\), thus belonging to the ancient core of the Hittite culture.

The similarity existing among the different sections of the composition, then, is probably due to the fact that one single person, coming from one specific cultural milieu, performed all the rituals collected in CTH 416, rather than to the fact that all the magical actions belong to one single ritual lasting several days.

After the end of the sections that describe the magical actions, the removal of the impure materials represents the next step of the four rituals. According to the typical Anatolian custom, the objects used during each ritual are buried and fixed in the ground, along with the recitation of a magic formula, in which the ritual performer explains his/her actions.

\(^{12}\) Otten-Souček, 1969, p. 106.
Rit. 1 (Obv. II 1-2): […] Ḫant[ašepuš teššummiuš=a ERÍNMEŠ-an/ [dāḥḥi(?)] daganzipa]n paddaḥhi t(a)=uš ḫariemi “[I take(?)] the Ḫantašepa deities, the cups and the (clay) troop. I dig [the ear]th and I bury them”

Rit. 2 (Rev. III 8-9): uīlnaš ERÍNMEŠ-an teššummiuš=a taknā/ ḫariemi t(a)=uš tarmaemi “I bury the clay troop and the cups into the ground and I nail them”

Rit. 3: […]

Rit. 4 (Rev. IV 48): […] kē aраhza pē[t]ahhe t(a)=uš tarmaemi “I take these things outside and I nail them”

The first ritual is a bit broken at this point, but it is possible to understand that cups of tarlipa- and a clay troop are important magic materials here, just as in the second ritual of CTH 416, at the end of which they are not only buried, but also nailed to the ground. The removal of the third ritual’s impure materials is lost in a gap, but, because of the affinity existing within the four rituals, it is only logical to postulate a similar situation. The end of ritual four is badly preserved too, but in this case, at least, the verb tarmaemi “I nail” survives (Rev. IV 48), so that we can easily imagine that the impure materials of this ritual were buried and fixed in the ground as well.

In rituals one, two and four, the removal of impure materials is followed by an invocation to the gods for the blessing of the royal family: the absence of this section in ritual three can be easily attributed to the large gap that covers the final part of the third column of the text.

Rit. 1 (Obv. II 8-11): tuwattu DINGIRMEŠ-eš/ kāša LUGAL-aš MUNUS.LUGAL-ša DUMUMEŠ URUḥattušaš=a idalu=šmit/ pa-prātar=šmit ḥatugauš lāluš AN.BAR Ḫantašep[aš TÚG][IL-A-uš(?)]/ išhaškantuš dāḥḥun šumeš=uš DINGIRMES-eš [pahhašt]e[n] “Mercy, Gods! Here, I took from the King, the Queen and from the Children of Hattuša their evil, their impurity, the fearful iron tongues (and) the blooded [garments(?)] of the Ḫantašepa deities. You, Gods, protect them!”
Rit. 2 (Obv. II 54-57): *tuwattu* DUTU DM ℳ FileMode/ [te]riyala(š)=šmiš LUGAL-ūš kullupi ḫarzi MUNUS.LUGAL-āš=a NA4 ARĀ-an/ [ḡarzi (nu) š]umāš uktūri NINDA ḫarsīn ḫipantušzi=ya/ [handan]zi “Mercy, Gods! The eagle is their [sub]stitute”. The king holds the sickle and the queen holds the grindstone; they eternally dedicate to you bread and libations”

Rit. 3: […]

Rit. 4 (Rev. IV 52-55): nēpišāš DUTU-uš/ [x x] taknaš DUTU-uš šumeš[=a LUGAL-ūš MUNU]Š.LUGAL-āš=a/ [x x] aín uvāin [pitiuišš=a] datten/ […] pīšten “Solar deity of Heaven, […] Sun-Goddess of Earth! You take [the King’s] and Queen’s pain, sorrow and constrictions! … g][ive!”

In the first ritual, for example, the already mentioned closing formula is embedded in a very basic invocation to the gods (Obv. II 8-11), while the second ritual shows a more complex invocation to the Sun-Goddess and to the Storm God, featuring a symbolic representation of the royal couple holding a sickle and a grindstone (Obv. II 54-57). The closing invocation of the fourth ritual is once again badly preserved, but the names of the Sun deities of Heaven and Earth are readable, such as the verb *pišten* “Give!”, the object of which, lost in the gap, should have been some kind of blessing for the royal couple.

A peculiar feature of ritual one, on the other hand, is the presence, just after the final formula and invocation, of a list of offerings to the deities mentioned in the ritual: as far as we can see, because of the poor conditions of

13 The reconstructed word *teriya-la*- literally means “the third”, as already suggested in the first edition of CTH 416 (Otten-Souček, 1969, p. 29 n. 9): in this case, however, the eagle has simultaneously the role of a substitute for the royal couple as well as its traditional function of divine messenger (see also Mouton, 2014, p. 568). The enclitic personal pronoun -šmiš, as a matter of fact, can represent both the second and the third person plural, thus it can be related to the royal couple – meaning “their substitute” – as well as to the gods (“your messenger”).

14 The deities mentioned in these lines (Obv. II 4-6) are the solar deity of Heaven – here probably to be intended, for many reasons, as the feminine Sun-Goddess of Arinna –, Ḫantitaššu, Inara of Ḫattuša and the Queen of Katapa, a name who can hide the great goddesses Ishtar or Hepat. Another mention of a Solar deity is present in these lines (Obv. II 6: […] DUTU-i), but, since the first part of the name is lost in a gap, it is difficult to understand which kind of solar deity we are dealing with, even if the Sun-Goddess of Earth, who appears in the fourth ritual together with the Sun of Heaven, could be the most probable solution.
the tablets at this point, every deity receives a sheep, honey and fat. No one of the other rituals collected in CTH 416 shows a similar section, but every one of them contains, just after the invocations to the gods, a brief reference to a ritual feast.

Since Hittite rituals don’t usually show a feast scene, the presence of such a moment in the rituals belonging to CTH 416 represents a distinctive feature of this text. However uncommon, the presence of feast scenes doesn’t necessary means that the text describes a several days lasting festival, and not four simple rituals. A similar scene, as a matter of fact, is preserved also in the ritual of Ašḫella (CTH 394), which dates back to the middle-Hittite period: the final section of this ritual contains the brief description of a meal (KUB 9.31 Rev. IV 26 *nu=za adanzi akuwanzi* “and they eat and drink”).

The description of the feast is very short also in CTH 416, where it is always limited to the two verbs *adueni akueni* (in Obv. II 12, Rev. III 15 and IV 6):

- Rit. 1 (Obv. II 12-13): *adueni akueni nu URUḫattuša iyannah[ḥi] “We eat (and) drink and I go to Ḫattuša”*
- Rit. 2 (Rev. III 15-16): *[a]tueni akueni ta šarā/ uwaueni “We eat (and) drink and we come up (to the city?)”*
- Rit. 3 (Rev. IV 6-7): *[a]tueṇi akueni (...) ta/ uwaueni “We eat (and) drink (...) and we come (back)”
- Rit. 4 (Rev. IV 56): […] URU-*i=ya uwami “[We eat and drink (?) … and] I come to the city”

Once more, a textual gap prevents us from proving the presence of a feast scene also in the fourth ritual. In this last section of CTH 416, the paragraph following the invocation is constituted by one single line (Rev. IV 56: B, IV 11’), the first half of which is missing: the gap in the tablet, however, is large

---

15 The Hittite expression šara *uwa*- literally means “to come up”, but it is used sometimes to indicate the act of returning to the city of Ḫattuša, or to every town in general: at this point of the text, this second interpretation might be of better use, since the previous ritual scene is set outside the town, in the mountains. After the ritual feast, the participants have to come back to the city, which in this case could be both Ḫattuša or Katapa, where the first ritual takes place and which is known to be located on a higher ground too (Polit, 1999, p. 86): the expression “come up to Katapa” appears, for example, in a couple of festive rituals, such as CTH 631.1A (KBo 9.124 ‘7-8: *URU Katapi šara nejanzi*) and CTH 604 (KUB 30.39 Obv. 8,10: *URU Katapi šara […]*).
enough to easily contain the expression *adueni akueni*, while the second half of the line skips quickly to the description of the following moves of the ritual performer, just as in the first ritual, where the King leaves for the city of Arinna right after the feast.

The use of the first person plural of the verbs “eat” and “drink” suggests that the ritual performer and the patients – the royal couple – take part to the feast together, possibly along with the palace servants who also participated to the ritual’s execution.

As already pointed out, every ritual in CTH 416 is followed by a small, recurring paragraph, separated from the previous section of the text by one (rituals 1 and 2) or two (rituals 3 and 4) partition lines and always followed by a double paragraph line. In this last paragraph the performer considers whether or not to go to the “House of the Children” (“DUMU\(^{MEŠ-} an\ pir”\(^{16}\)), an otherwise unknown building that probably accommodated the princes and princesses, depending on the wishes of the royal couple: the performer, then, could probably repeat the same ritual also for their children.

- **Rit. 1 (Obv. II 15-17):** *ta LUGAL-i kiššan tēmi pai=mu DUMU.É.G-AL-in t[a] DUMU\(^{MEŠ-} an/parna paimi LUGAL-uš=mu DUMU.É.G-AL päi nu kuit/ LUGAL-uš tezzi nu apēt iyami* “And I speak to the King as follows: ‘Give me a palace servant and I will go to the House of the Children’. The king gives me a palace servant and I do as the king says”

- **Rit. 2 (Rev. III 17-18):** *mān LUGAL-uš MUNUS.LU[GAL-(a)š=a t] ezzi ta DUMU\(^{MEŠ-} an\ parna pa[i]mi/ mān natta=ma [tara]nzi nu natta paimi* “When the King and the Queen say (so) I go to the House of the Children, when they don’t say (so) I don’t go”

\(^{16}\) Since this fascinating expression is attested only here, in CTH 416, it is really difficult to say if the space designated by it was an independent building or simply a part of the royal palace, and, moreover, if such a building was present only in Ḫattuša or also in other cities where royal palaces are attested, like Katapa. According to Hoffmann (1992, p. 292), the “House of the Children” mentioned in CTH 416 could be the same building identified by the Hittite noun \(^{6}pulla\)-, but contra see CHD (P, p. 374b), Neu (1983, p. 152), and Melchert (1981, pp. 90-95), who suggests that the mysterious Hittite word for “son” should be aiawala-, and not *pulla*- as proposed by Hoffmann.
Rit. 3 (Rev. IV 11-13): [m]ān LUGAL-uš MUNUS.LUGAL-aš=a taranzi ta DUMU\textsuperscript{MEŠ}-an parna paimi/ [takk]u natta=ma taranzi nu natta paimi karū=ma/ [x] É DUMU\textsuperscript{MEŠ}-an paišgaḥat kinun=a natta kuwāpikki pāun “When the King and the Queen say (so) I go to the House of the Children, if they don’t say (so) I don’t go. Once, I used to go [to?] the House of the Children, but now I didn’t go anywhere”

Rit. 4 (Rev. IV 57-58): [... mā]n natta=ma/ [... pa]imi

This closing paragraph is almost completely lost in a gap at the end of the fourth ritual, but its presence can easily be detected on the base of the few remaining words: “[…] if not […] I [don’t] go”.

The closing paragraph of ritual three, actually, shows a meaningful variation of the formula (Rev. IV 13), introducing the idea of a temporal gap between an undetermined past (karu\textsuperscript{17}), when the ritual performer used to visit the children of the royal couple, and the present (kinun), when apparently the Old Woman didn’t performed this specific ritual for the younger members of the family.

In my opinion, these closing lines, recurring almost unaltered at the end of each section of the text, strongly suggest the separation between the four rituals, since they openly state the possibility that the performer leaves from where the ritual has taken place to the “House of the Children”, therefore interrupting the alleged unity of this old-Hittite composition.

Furthermore, none of the indications of time given in the text marks a separation between the four groups of magical actions, as we would expect in a several days lasting ritual. Instead, the different indicators are used inside the four sections to mark the timing and duration of each ritual, as shown in the following scheme:

- Rit. 1: no indications
- Rit. 2: Obv. II 24: mištiliya mēḥur; II 43: lukkatta
- Rit. 3: Rev. III 29, 46: išpanti; Rev. IV 7: lukkatta
- Rit. 4: Rev. IV 24: lukkatta

\textsuperscript{17} On the use of karu see Masson, 2004, in particular pp. 458-459.
Ritual one seems to be an exception, since no indication about time is present, but once again the gap at its beginning could cover some similar expressions. The second ritual, instead, clearly begins just before the evening meal\(^{18}\), it continues during the night and it ends the morning after. The third ritual is mostly performed during the night, but one last magical action is completed in the morning. The fourth ritual seems to begin at night, but the vast majority of it is performed the day after.

Every ritual, then, features both diurnal and nocturnal actions, but the time sequence of the four rituals doesn’t seem to be continuous, suggesting once more that the sections of the tablets are separated.

**An old-Hittite Sammeltafel?**

All of the above-mentioned features of CTH 416’s structure, in my opinion, indicate that this composition sums up four separate rituals, in the same way of those scribal compositions known as *Sammeltafeln*.

The German noun *Sammeltafel*\(^{19}\) defines a tablet containing two or more texts, written in sequence and divided by a double paragraph line\(^{20}\). The great majority of texts collected on this kind of tablets belongs to the cultic sphere - namely rituals, festivals and oracular inquiries – but historical and political compositions are attested too.

Surprisingly, neither the nature of the materials collected on *Sammeltafeln*, nor the peculiar shape of the tablets seem to have been perceived as distinctive by the ancient scribes: no Hittite definition for this kind of composition, in fact, can be identified in the few existing *colophon* of *Sammeltafeln*, which structure doesn’t differ from the Hittite standard, except that these particular cases describe not only one text, but more. The lack of a specific definition for *Sammeltafeln* emerges also from shelf lists and labels referring to this kind of tablets. Given that *Sammeltafeln* have been found – mixed

\(^{18}\) For the expression *miššiliya meḫur* “the time of *miššiliya*” see Otten-Souček (1969, pp. 98-99) and Neu (1970, pp. 34 ff.).

\(^{19}\) For a selection of Hittite *Sammeltafeln* and their composition criteria see Mascheroni, 1988.

\(^{20}\) See Güterbock (1983, p. 155): “a tablet upon which two separate texts happen to be written”.
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with other texts – in every tablet collection of Ḫattuša, even the distribution of these compositions doesn’t show any relevant criterion.

Therefore, the main reason for collecting various texts on a Sammeltafel seems to be the similarity of their contents, since they usually deal with the same topic or problem: KUB 2.2, for example, contains two rituals regarding the building and consecration of a temple (CTH 413-CTH 725); KUB 9.31 collects three different rituals against a pestilence in the army (CTH 757-CTH 410-CTH 394); KUB 26.71, on the other hand, puts together various historic compositions, such as the Anitta’s text (CTH 1), a chronicle of Ammuna’s reign (CTH 18) and fragments of Telipinu’s annals (CTH 39.6).

It frequently happens that a ritual collected once in a Sammeltafel appears elsewhere on its own or in combination with other texts. For example, the above-mentioned CTH 394, the ritual of Ašḫella, is preserved in four main copies: two of them appear in two identical Sammeltafeln with CTH 410 and CTH 757, a third copy is written on a tablet that collects again also CTH 410, but together with CTH 424 – another ritual against a pestilence in the army – while the last copy is preserved on a single tablet.

Some composed tablets, however, don’t seem to have an unifying element binding the different texts together: in this case, the definition Schülertafeln “scholastic tablets” – proposed lastly by M. Hutter21 – might be of better use. In fact, tablets such as KUB 28.88+, which contains a fragment of an incantation ritual (CTH 734) and a legal case (CTH 295.13), could be better described as scholastic exercises for training scribes. Another example of a tablet collecting texts apparently unrelated to each other is KUB 24.7, the first half of which contains a hymn to Išhtar (CTH 717), while the second shows the tale of the Fisherman and the Cow (CTH 363).

Sometimes, it happens that the similarity existing among the texts collected on a tablet is very strong, to the extent that, even if some compositions show the distinctive structure of a Sammeltafel – that is the double paragraph line and a recurring textual pattern - , scholars have never recognized so far their composed nature.

This is, in my opinion, the case of CTH 416, which structure and contents, as seen above, clearly indicate that this old-Hittite compositions collects four different rituals: the three existing copies of this text, thus, are composed tablets. The case of CTH 416, after all, is not the only example of a magic ritual recently reconsidered: as convincingly suggested by B. Christiansen\textsuperscript{22}, the middle-Hittite composition CTH 443 (KBo 15.10+) should be now also considered as a \textit{Sammeltafel}, collecting two independent rituals against the evil incantations of Tuthaliyaš I’s sister Zipliantawiya.

Another possible case of a long-neglected \textit{Sammeltafel} could be, in my opinion, KUB 29.1 (CTH 414.1)\textsuperscript{23}, which has a double paragraph line in the middle of its third column, separating the first part of the text, regarding the foundation of a new palace\textsuperscript{24}, in which only the king is involved, from a second section dedicated to the installation of the fireplace, involving the entire royal family. The partition in discussion is not only a feature of this copy of the text: also the fragment HT 38, belonging to CTH 414.2\textsuperscript{25}, even if it is badly broken, preserves the double line in the same exact point.

The two sections of CTH 414, then, are obviously connected, but if a new palace always needs a new fireplace, there might be occasions in which only the fireplace has to be built or replaced: therefore, such as it happens in CTH 416, here the double paragraph line apparently means that the various rituals could be also used separately.

According to their paleographic and linguistics features, however, the classic \textit{Sammeltafeln} date back mostly to the Empire Period (13\textsuperscript{th} century B.C.). Generally, compositions of this kind are considered a product of the late scribal system, a mere archival practice developed for convenience of use after a reorganization of the tablet collections in Ḫattuša. The lack of ancient \textit{Sammeltafeln}, moreover, has been interpreted as one of the evidences of the lack of archival practices in the old-Hittite Period\textsuperscript{26}.

\textsuperscript{22} Christiansen, 2007, p. 102; S. Görke (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 443.1 (2006sqq.).
\textsuperscript{23} S. Görke (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 414.1 (2011sqq.).
\textsuperscript{24} This group of texts was classified in Laroche’s catalogue as a ritual for the foundation of a new temple, but it has been reinterpreted since Kellerman’s edition (Kellerman, 1980) as the foundation ritual for a royal palace.
\textsuperscript{25} S. Görke (ed.), hethiter.net/: CTH 414.2 (2011sqq.).
\textsuperscript{26} Van den Hout, 2009, p. 80: “No Sammeltafeln are known that show either OS or MS”.
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The strongest objection that could be made against the interpretation of CTH 416 as a *Sammeltable*, then, is a chronological one, since the tablets’ old-Hittite dating places the drafting of this composition approximately three centuries before the supposed development of that scribal practice. However, the presence of a middle-Hittite *Sammeltable* such as CTH 443, the above-mentioned rituals against Ziplantawiya, suggests that the matter is much more complicated.

Moreover, the third composition mentioned in the previous lines, CTH 414.1, is of old-Hittite origin too: the fragment KUB 29.3 (CTH 414.1.B), in fact, is written in the old-Script. Even if this fragment is very small and we cannot be sure about the presence of the double paragraph line at the end of the first section of the text, there is no reason to believe that its structure was different from the one attested in the later, better preserved copies of this composition.

CTH 416, along with CTH 443 and possibly – even if not certainly – also CTH 414.1, then, show many distinctive features of a *Sammeltable*, but they all predate by far the broad development of this archival practice. These three texts, thus, could be seen as forerunners of the late scribal habit of grouping various rituals regarding the same issues on one single tablet.

Initially, old- and middle-Hittite *Sammeltable* like CTH 416 might have been the description of two or more separate rituals performed for the same specific occasion: the high level of affinity between the different sections – higher than the one generally shown by classic *Sammeltable* – supports the idea of a single origin of the rituals collected on these tablets.

Later, however, the graphic aspect of these compositions, which have in the meanwhile lost their overall specificity in favor of a more general use of their single rituals, could have been perceived by Hittite scribes as the standard model for a tablet containing various rituals. CTH 416 and the other compositions mentioned, therefore, could have actually contributed to the development of Empire period *Sammeltable*, being the first examples of collections of related – or just simply similar – rituals.
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