

6688

Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie

Herausgegeben von
Walther Sallaberger
in Verbindung mit
A. Cavigneaux · U. Seidl · G. Wilhelm

Band 95 · 2005



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

HAZENBOS, JOOST: *The Organization of the Anatolian Local Cults During the Thirteenth Century B.C. An Appraisal of the Hittite Cult Inventories.* (Cuneiform Monographs 21). Leiden/Boston: Brill/Styx, 2003. x, 358 S. 17 × 24 cm. ISBN 90 04 12383 0. Price: EUR 78.00

This book presents a revised version of the author's 1998 Amsterdam dissertation, in which he treats, with minor adjustments (p. 1, n. 1), the Hittite cult inventories (CTH 501–530). It is divided into seven chapters: (1) Introduction; (2) Cult inventories of Tudḫališaš IV; (3) Additional inventories of the cult reorganization; (4) Other cult inventories; (5) Festival descriptions and divine representations; (6) Geography and the central government; (7) The procedure and the settlements. These are followed by a welcome and exhaustive glossary,¹ a text concordance and a list of bibliographical abbreviations.

In outlining his palaeographical dating criteria, the author notes (p. 5) that he uses the signs AG, AZ, IG, KUG, LI, UG and URU to distinguish between New Script (NS) and pre-NS texts. He then uses SILA to distinguish between NS texts from before Ḫattusili III (without wedge) and those from his reign onwards, and UN to differentiate between those from before Tudḫališa IV and those from his reign. This schema he bases primarily on van den Hout's dissertation (p. 5, ns. 30–32). Not each of the signs AG, AZ, IG, KUG, LI, UG and URU, however, can be used to distinguish between NS and pre-NS texts in the same way. Newer AZ and UG, for instance, are found beginning around the middle of the MH period, while newer LI is found beginning around the time of Muwattalli II/Ḫattusili III. Further, the use of sign forms within the 13th century could be refined and supplemented with reference, e.g., to Klüger, *StBoT* 37 (1996) 32–39. DA and IT with an unbroken middle horizontal, e.g., are found primarily beginning with Mursili II; ŠA with the third horizontal from Tudḫališa IV, EN with no subscripted vertical mainly from Muwattalli II; later LI essentially from Muwattalli II/Ḫattusili III; KI and DI with the inset vertical and HA² with only one wedge from ca. Ḫattusili III/Tudḫališa IV.

H. notes (p. 6) that 'about half' of the cult inventories were found in the Haus am Hang, and 'about one third' in Temple I, but this is imprecise and may be somewhat misleading. According to van den Hout's study of the documents from the main archives from the second half of the 13th century,³ of 236 provenienced cult inventory texts and fragments, 94 were found in the Haus am Hang, i.e. 64 % of all texts that can be attributed to the Haus am Hang, compared to 128 cult inventory texts found in Temple I, constituting 32.6 % of all texts found there. Only 12 inventories were found in Building A on the Büyükkale, constituting only some 10.3 % of the texts from that archive. Thus, slightly more inventory texts can be attributed to Temple I than to the Haus am Hang and Bk. A combined. Further, it is clear that the primary purpose of the archive in the Haus am Hang – at least quantitatively, during the latter half of the 13th century – was related to the

¹ It is, however, unfortunate that the texts are cited in the glossary by KBo, KUB, etc., even though the texts as treated in the volume are assigned sequential numbers. Hence, the reader must first look up a word in the glossary, then go to the text concordance to find the Text Number before one finally gets to the wanted passage. Using the Text Numbers in the glossary would also have saved many pages.

² H. does say that the HA in KBo 12.57 'could be interesting' (p. 44), and does refer to the sign occasionally in his dating of the texts.

³ Administration in the Reign of Tudḫališa IV and the Later Years of the Hittite Empire, forthcoming.

cult inventories and the phenomena reflected in them. Still, Temple I was an even more important depot for these texts, even if this element in the temple archive played a proportionately smaller role there than it did in the Haus am Hang.

It would perhaps have been of interest to learn of the reasoning behind or a fuller exposition of the statement, attributed to van den Hout (p. 8 and n. 64), according to which, 'It may be concluded safely that the circulation of goods for cultic purposes took place along the same route as that for secular reasons; palace inventories reflect an earlier stage of the redistribution procedure (income of revenues) than cult inventories (redistribution to temples).'

H. comments (p. 13) that perhaps Tudḫaliya IV's 'religious fervor is also demonstrated by the great number of temples dating from his reign, that is, of course, if the ascription of these temples to his reign is correct.' It should be noted that the dating of the *Oberstadt* to Tudḫaliya IV, never a properly founded hypothesis, must now be discarded.⁴

The transliterations are generally accurate, the translations largely reliable. It is unfortunate, though, that the transliterations and translations are not placed on recto and verso. A few relatively minor comments and corrections (the occasional H/h for Ḫ/ḫ and S/s for Š/š are not listed) may be noted (cited according to H.'s text numbers):

No. 1a: 1': Read EZEN₄.IT]I¹.KAM, as the trailing vertical is unbroken in the copy.⁵

No. 1b: ii 7': Read INA instead of I-NA; iii 25': Read: wa-ak-^ska₄-ri^o (c. Ú), cf. No. 54 rev. 14'; iii 26': Read [an-na-l]a-za-ma; iii 34'-35': Better: 'Because they made me priest, however, the utensils which they handed over to me have been set up,' for which, see already del Monte, OA 17 (1978) 187; CHD L-N, 167a.

No. 3: i 4: Better: 'They place him on a *ḫuwasi*-stone, (i. e.) on a *passu*-(platform), in Taḫniwara.' Otherwise one must imagine that the text suddenly switches from discussing the iron statue to a second representation of the deity, the *ḫuwasi*-stone, for which there seems to be no hint in the text. For an alternative possibility, see CHD P, 211b.

No. 4: i 23': Read at end of line, DINGIR-LUM; i 12'-16': *ma-a-an* probably to be understood here as conditional, not temporal; hence: 'If (the region) is being oppressed by the enemy, ...; if (the region) is not being oppressed by the enemy, ...'; i 26'-28': I am not so sure the incongruence between the SANGA-priest, unmarked for plurality, and É-ŠU (twice) on the one hand, and *iyanzi* on the other can simply be translated consistently in the plural. Perhaps a kind of partitive apposition is the case, yielding, 'Then on the morrow, they, i. e. the SANGA-priest, celebrate the spring festival for Ḫalwanna in his house from (the resources of) his house.' Similarly in i 28'; i 37' (also iv 7): Better simply: '1/2 BÀN flour, 1 *ḫanissa*-vessel of beer for pouring into the *ḫarsi*-vessel.' Thus one can avoid creating a

⁴ See, e. g., A. Müller-Karpe, Remarks on Central Anatolian Chronology of the Middle Hittite Period. In: M. Bietak (ed.) *The Synchronisation of Civilisations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Second Millennium B. C. II* (2003) 383-394, as well as the internet site of the Boğazköy excavations at www.hattuscha.de.

⁵ There are several instances in which an exclamation mark should have been added when H. has read against the traces, e. g.: No. 1b i 1', ZI.D]A¹, iii 26', UL¹ and 27', KÜ.G]i¹, iii 34', am¹(c. GAR)-mu¹ (c. ḪAL.ŠE)-uk. Also to be noted are minor inconsistencies in the representation of erasures: No. 3 i 5 ^{DUG}ḫar-^sšī* is unmarked, while in iv 9', 30 NINDA^{HU}.** is; and in No. 4 i 15'-16', the first words are inscribed over erasures in the hand copies, and some 3-4 signs toward the end of 15' are erased, but this is not marked in H.'s transliterations.

'festival of pouring into the *harsi*-vessel', which was presumably not the Hittite designation of this celebration; i 40': Though not marked for the genitive, I see no reason not to translate '... the statue of the Storm-god of the Meadow of Hjakmis ...' as in, e.g. iv 2; i 41': At points such as this one misses a philological commentary and has the feeling that the footnotes at times are not entirely sufficient. H. apparently parses *utne=za*, interpreting the *-za* as the reflexive particle.⁶ This, however, would of course be quite unexpected with *pai-*, and the placement on the penultimate element of the sentence would also be surprising. Further, one might anticipate the animate *utniyants*, for which *KUR-an-za* would be expected.⁷ Hence, one might want to opt for the ablative, despite the singular verb form which clashes with the plural forms in the rest of the paragraph,⁸ translating, 'He gives/delivers 1 ox (and) 7 sheep from the land.' The same might be said of No. 30 ii 25'; i 45': One should probably translate the infinitive *assanummanzi* differently than the verbal substantive *assanummas* in, e.g. i 29', or at least note the variant usage; ii 12': H.'s 'at the *huyāši*' might be justified, as the d.l. is found as either *huwasi* or *huwasiya*, but his 'for her' cannot, for which one would expect ^{NA}ZI.KIN-*ši-(ia)-aš-ši*. See also Left Edge a) 4; ii 13': Here one finds a translation 'spelt', a specific type of wheat, for *ziz*, while in i 35', e.g., it is translated 'wheat'. Concerning what type of wheat *ziz* may have been in Anatolia, Hoffner, *Alimenta Hethaeorum* (1974) 60–61, 68–69, has suggested 'bread wheat' or simply 'wheat', while HZL opts for emmer wheat, i.e. the type of wheat designated by *ziz* in Mesopotamia; ii 25': The *-aš* in *DINGIR-LUM-ma-aš-kán* is presumably a case of the late usage of *-as-* for the nom. pl. c. rather than an abbreviated form of the 3rd pl. oblique personal pronoun, *-smas*, left untranslated in H.'s translations but booked as such in the indices (p. 256). Indeed the personal pronoun would be quite impossible to interpret in the context, though one could perhaps assume that *-smas* functions as the reflexive particle, which indeed often occurs with *-kan ... dusk-*.⁹ Likewise in KUB 59.34 üi 4 (p. 43); KBo 26.182 i 16 (p. 69); KUB 42.91 ii 14 (p. 112). It should be noted that *DINGIR-LUM-ma-aš-kán* occurs only in this and similar phrases with *duskanzi/duskiskanzi*. See already Carter, *Hittite Cult-Inventories* (1962) 199; iv 46': Rather than *KIN-it = hatrait = Akk. šapāru* (see Carter, *Hittite Cult-Inventories*, 176, followed by H.), one should perhaps read *sixSÄ'-it*, i.e. *handail*, and translate, 'he determined/instituted (it)'. *KIN*, as far as I can see, is never complemented with *-it*, which might suggest *hatrait*; iv 52': Translate '... s/he mills and grinds it'; iv 56': Read *ta-ga-a-an*.

No. 9: rev. 8': Read 3 *GÍN*?

No. 10: i 5': With no parallel in the corpus, one might doubt whether *É.DIN[GIR-LIM GIBIL-ši DÜ-er]* should be restored at the end of the line.

No. 12: In general and especially here, one might note that H. often reads against the traces in the copy, frequently without indicating such in his transliteration; obv. 4', 17', 19', 21', rev. 5: Read *BÁN* instead of *PA*; obv. 6', 10': The restored text could by no means fit in

⁶ That the odd locution also caused H. to wonder is indicated not only by the question marks attached to the entries in his indices, but also by the fact that *-za ... pai-* is booked in the glossary under both *pai-* 'to go' and *pai-* 'to give', as well as under *-za*.

⁷ Cf. already Sommer/Falkenstein, *HAB*, 106, where *KUR-i/ez-za* is emended to *KUR-e'(?)*.

⁸ Such switches are not, however, uncommon in Hittite texts in general or in this genre in particular. Cf., e.g. this text, iv 52', where one finds *mallai* and *harrai* for the more common *mallanzi* and *harranzi*.

⁹ See discussion in Boley, *IBS* 97, 273 ff.; and examples in *HEG T/D*, s.v.

the available space, assuming the space seen in the copy represents anything near the actual space in the break; obv. 14': Since the writing ZAG.GAR-*ni* occurs no fewer than four times in this text (also obv. 19', 21', rev. 23'), one might consider whether the scribe was employing an abbreviation, rather than emending to ZAG.GAR<.RA>*ni* each time; obv. 19': Read ^{MUR.SAG} *Hu-uh-uš-na*; rev. 1: The remainder of the line following the break is omitted. The line should read: [... ^{UG} *har-ši aš-š[a-nu-ma-aš...*]x x x 1 UDU ¹⁰ x ^{MUR.SAG} *Hu-uh-uš-<na>*; rev. 2: Better 1 ^{UG} [*hu-pár κ*]Aš, due to the space available; cf. obv. 12'; rev. 4: For the translation 'to clean out' for *sara sanḫ-*, see now CHD Š, sub *sanḫ-*, 8f, k.

No. 16: i 5: Read *te-et-ḫa-i*.

No. 17: Contra H.'s comment, the LI in obv. 11' dates the fragment to the latter half of the 13th century.

No. 20: i 18'-20': Space is insufficient at the beginning of the lines even for the restorations given, and, as H. recognizes, the traces at the end of the break in 20' do not suggest -zj; iv 11': Insufficient space for restoration.

Finally, indirect joins have been suggested for (see the online *Konkordanz* at www.hethiter.net): Nr. 4 with 677/v and KUB 59.34; Nr. 6 with 677/v and KUB 25.23; Nr. 29 with KBo 24.117+KBo 40.42; and Nr. 41 with KUB 54.61.

Often one is not immediately sure what parallel or analogous passages the author is restoring from, e.g. in No. 4 ii 2'-9', 15'-16', 21'-27', and though this can generally be discovered in a round about way through the indices, it would have been helpful if this had been explicitly indicated.

It is also not clear why some personal and geographical names are placed in the Hittite nominative in the translations, while others are left in the stem form, e.g. Wanzapanda in No. 19 iii 5' vs. Puparaš in No. 19 iv 9'.

An important point discussed in detail by H. (pp. 168 ff.) is the fact that the autumn and spring festivals in the cults of the many different towns always display basically the same characteristics. Further, the descriptions of these festivals in the cult inventories differ from the descriptions of the same festivals in the *Festbeschreibungen* (p. 168, n. 18), a distinction which can be of great use in the attribution of other fragments and the search for joins.

H.'s treatment includes (pp. 176 ff.) a convenient table presenting the cult objects – primarily *ḫuwasi*-stones and statues – representing deities found in the various Hittite towns, including any descriptions of those objects given and which deity they were supposed to represent. Importantly, the table includes the data treated in H.'s volume as well as those in all cult inventories edited in KUB 38 and KBo 26.

In Chapter 6B is discussed the role of the central government in the cult. Whether seven pages is sufficient to discuss this theme is questionable. H. notes, for example, that all occurrences of the verb *dai-* in the phrase ^{UTU-SI} *dais*, 'the king has instituted (it)', are in the past tense. He does not, however, discuss any possible implications of the fact that ^{UTU-SI} *pai/pesta* (sometimes with a named king or local ruler), 'the king donates/has donated', is found in the past and the present-future, while the donations of some other personnel are sometimes related with the – presumably in these cases habitual – *-ske-* form. Does this imply that some donations were perpetual in nature, some a one-off gift? Is there any evidence which speaks for or against one or the other hypothesis?

A brief discussion (pp. 212–214) of verb tense in relation to changes that had been or were to be made in the cult as a result of the investigations is provided. Further consideration of the texts' *Sitz im Leben* might have been in order in this context. The issue springs to mind, for example, when one reads, '... They bring the god to the agitated(?) well. They

put the god down before the *huwasi*-stone. The inhabitants of the town used to deliver 3 (loaves of) thick bread (and) 1 *huppar*-vessel of beer. The *palwatalla*-woman cries out 3 times' (No. 45, iii 13'-16'). Why is this 'historical' reference, which reminds one rather of those passages that detail the way the cult used to be vs. the way it is now, mentioned in the middle of what is otherwise a festival prescription?

Perhaps the most significant shortcoming of the volume, however, is its failure to clearly define its corpus. On p. 1, n. 1, H. states that CTH 504 and 523 are to be excluded from the corpus, as they belong to other genres, which presumably leaves the remainder of CTH 501-530 as the object of the study. H. also states (p. 4) that those texts treated already by von Brandenstein, Carter and Jakob-Rost, the three other major studies to take up the subject of the cult inventories, are generally not treated again in his work.

However, when one then marks through all texts in Laroche's CTH 501-530 (including his 1972 supplement) treated by von Brandenstein, Carter, Jakob-Rost and H., one is still left with some 75 texts and fragments which have never been treated and are not mentioned by H. And of course, this reflects only those texts known to Laroche by 1972, and ignores the many dozens of published and unpublished texts and fragments listed in B. J. Collin's internet catalogue (www.asor.org/hittite/cthhp) and now in S. Kořak's on-line *Konkordanz*.

Why did H. select those texts which are treated in his study and exclude the others? Why, for example, does H. treat KBo 2.16 of CTH 509, but leave IBoT 2.105, KBo 13.235 and KBo 21.81 (now with (+)KBo 34.106) untouched? It may well be that the number of texts and fragments is presently too great to be treated in a single monograph, and one might indeed think of acceptable reasons for including some and excluding others, but this must be done according to explicitly stated criteria, criteria which are chosen with specific objectives in mind. This is not done in H.'s study, and one suspects that the process of selection was less than deliberate, and further, that this has impacted the value of the study. On the bright side, it certainly means that the genre is far from exhausted, and that further text treatments and analyses are needed before the corpus will have been fully exploited.

A further caveat concerns H.'s English grammar and usage, which could have profited considerably from an editing pass by a native speaker; the reader whose mother tongue is English will find the going a bit agitating. Some more attention paid to formatting matters might have prevented minor irritants such as the orphans at the tops of pp. 36 and 44.

Despite the reservations expressed, H. deserves the Hittitologist's appreciation for working through another chunk of this fragmentary corpus.

JARED L. MILLER – Mainz

SINGER, ITAMAR: *Hittite Prayers*. Ed. by H. A. Hoffner, Jr. (SBL Writings from the Ancient World 11). Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 2002. xv, 141 S. 16 x 24,5 cm. ISBN 9004126953. Preis: \$ 24.95.

Die hethitischen Gebete gehören zu einem Textcorpus, das seit den Anfängen der Hethitologie größtes Interesse in der Wissenschaft fand. Davon zeugen die in der ausführlichen Bibliographie (S. 119-132) des anzuzeigenden Bandes aufgeführten zahlreichen Einzeldarstellungen, die im Jahre 1980 von R. Lebrun vorgelegte Gesamtbearbeitung

Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie Bd. 95, S. 312-313

© Walter de Gruyter 2005

ISSN 0084-5299