

Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie

Herausgegeben von
Walther Sallaberger
in Verbindung mit
A. Cavigneaux · Th. van den Hout

Band 99 · 2009

7458



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

dizin anzuführen, auch wenn dies zum Verständnis der damaligen Medizin wenig beigetragen hat.

MARTHA HAUSSPERGER – München

STRAUSS, RITA: *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2006. xix, 470 S. 15,5 × 23 cm. ISBN 978-3-11-017975-0. Preis: € 128,00.

This volume¹ constitutes the revised version of the author's PhD thesis, supervised by V. Haas and submitted in 2003 at the Freien Universität Berlin. It may be counted among a number of recent publications² that attest to a welcome renaissance in the study of such ritual texts.

The book is divided into seven parts: I. An introduction;³ II. A discussion of the many cathartic ritual techniques and offering rites found in the Kizzuwatnean ritual texts, the chapter which relates the essential results of the study; III. A comparison of Ammiḫatna's ritual (CTH 471) with the *itkalzi*-texts (CTH 777) and the Mesopotamian *mis pi*-rituals, a particularly productive section; IV. A discussion of what one might call the 'Samuḫa ritual complex' and the relations among them, including the Expansion of the Cult of the Deity of the Night (CTH 481), Mursili's Reform (CTH 482) and the *babili* text group (CTH 718); V. Editions and commentary to Ammiḫatna's ritual (CTH 471), Ammiḫatna, Tulbi and Mati's ritual (CTH 472), fragmentary texts (e.g. CTH 473) and catalogues mentioning these ritualists, Pabanigri's birth ritual (CTH 476), the purification ritual KBo 24.45+ (CTH 479.2), and the purification ritual CTH 491;⁴ VI. Summary and conclusions; and VII. Glossaries, Bibliography, Texts Cited, etc.

Part II is largely descriptive and comparative, detailing the various rites that occur in the texts edited and comparing these with related passages from throughout the Hittite corpus and in some cases beyond to Mesopotamia and elsewhere. It thus forms a handy summary of a significant portion of the repertoire of rites and actors common to the Kizzuwatnean religious sphere, and in this she largely fulfills her central aim of isolating practices specific to this cultural sphere. Undoubtedly the most salient portion of this chapter is the elucidation (Ch. II.9) of a typical chain of rites, for the most part designated with Hurrian *termini technici*, found in several Kizzuwatnean rituals, generally in the same, or nearly the same, sequence. Strauss's work as typified in this chapter is highly readable, the presentation of her ideas clear and fluid. At the same time, apart from the 'Ritenkette', one will find little in the way of novelty, and her summary is heavily dependent on pre-

¹ A review by G. Torri will be appearing shortly in *Or*.

² E.g. D. Bawanypeck, *TdH* 25 (2005); B. Christiansen, *StBoT* 48 (2006); J.L. Miller, *StBoT* 46 (2004); V. Haas, *Materia Magica* (2003); G. Torri, *Studia Asiana* 2 (2003); to name just the monographic treatments of the last five years.

³ To p. 3, n. 9, reference to the numerous contributions in E. Jean et al (eds), *La Cilicie: espaces et pouvoirs locaux*. *Varia Anatolica* 13 (2001), could be added.

⁴ Of the texts treated only CTH 491 had not been previously edited, and it is therefore especially welcome.

vicious work, especially that of V. Haas, to whom, to be fair, any work in this sphere will be indebted.

I should like to comment on just two items from this section: On p. 212 Strauß states that 'Ištar des Feldes' is an actor in the house purification ritual CTH 446,⁵ but this is not the case. Nowhere in the text does this particular avatar of Ištar, most closely associated with Ḫattusili III, appear. On p. 213 Strauß assumes that in CTH 481 Pirinkir is worshipped in the temple of the Goddess of the Night in Samuḫa, but this is predicated on the assumption that the expansion mentioned by Mursili in CTH 482 and carried out by his forefather Tudḫaliya is the same as that prescribed in CTH 481, though it is clear from CTH 481 that both the original temple and the new temple for which this expansion (481) is intended are in the same city, and that this expansion text (481) therefore cannot represent the expansion of the cult from Kizzuwatna to Samuḫa referred to by Mursili II in CTH 482. In which city the Expansion (481) took place cannot at present be determined.⁶

Strauß's transliterations and translations are generally reliable, especially when texts that have already been published by earlier scholars are at issue. In the hitherto unpublished purification ritual CTH 491, admittedly a fragmentary and thus rather challenging text, one encounters more deficiencies. A few notes may be in order.

In CTH 471 (V.1) C ii 2 should be read *iš-ḫu-w]a-an me-ma-al-la 'pū-tal'-w[a-an da-a-i]*, requiring a correction to p. 224, n. 20, which should simply note that C ii 2 omits the plene writing in *išḫuwan*. For ii 15, 16 one finds the translation 'lockere' *mulati*-bread and meal, when surely 'plain' is intended with *pittalwant*. Strauß (pp. 225, 238, 248) has misunderstood Hoffner's comments in *Alimenta Hethaeorum* (1974, 140). He does not emend each occurrence of DUG *simmallu* to GA.⁷ He reports that his collation of KBo 5.2 ii 42, i.e. the text in question, reveals GA;⁸ that his collation of ABoT 55 obv. 7 reveals DUG; and that he was unable to collate KBo 19.126, 13'.⁹ When one considers Hoffner's point that *simmallu* is also sometimes associated with cheese, along with the fact that vessels are countable and generally preceded by a numeral, while GA/DUG *simmallu* is not, one may perhaps conclude that Hoffner's suggestion is the more convincing. In iv 6 read A-NA *ḫu-ub-ru-uš-ḫi*.

Strauß's table (p. 253) presenting the mss. of CTH 472 is in need of correction and updating. First, KBo 41.113 has been joined to KBo 23.1++ i 46'-52' (A). Second, KBo 38.194 ('F') and KBo 40.307 ('G') in Strauß's table also directly join A, the former at the right column of KBo 41.113, the latter at the break in KBo 23.1 ii 36, so that only a few millimetres separate KBo 40.307 and KBo 38.194.¹⁰ Third, Bo 3964 has been recognized as a duplicate to A ii 13-21 and iv 33 ff. The mss. are thus: A. KBo 23.1++ i [1]-ii 22;

⁵ See most recently, J.L. Miller, TUAT, NF 4 (2008) 206-217.

⁶ See Miller, StBoT 46 (2004) 350-362.

⁷ His list in RLA 8, 202a is admittedly less precise.

⁸ I am not at all certain that Hoffner is correct here. As far as I can see from photos of KBo 5.2, DUG appears quite likely.

⁹ My collation of photos of KBo 19.126 was not conclusive, but GA is certainly a possibility, while the DUG signs of the preceding line are clearly DUG.

¹⁰ Unfortunately, the photo BF00055, which can be seen by clicking on 1991/c or 249/n in the online Konkordanz (www.hethiter.net, Version 1.3), shows 1991/c+2059/c together with 249/n+231/f as if they joined.

B. KBo 23.1++ ii 23-iv 42; C. KBo 24.50;¹¹ D. KBo 23.2;¹² E. KUB 30.38a; F. Bo 3964. Since Bo 3964 offers a number of interesting variants, it seems fitting to provide a transliteration here.

Bo 3964 iv¹³

1' [(1 UDU)]¹ A-NA ke-e-el¹-I[(i-ia ši-pa-an-da-an-zi)]

2' [(IŠ-T)]U É^d HÉ-bat-ia-kán I[(a-pu-ú-ša MUŠEN^{HI.A} SILÁ)]

3' [(QA-TAM-M)]A wa-ar-nu-wa-an-[(zi)]

4' [ke]-I e¹-el-ti-ia-ia QA-TAM-MA [(ši-pa-an-da-an-zi)]

5' [(1 I)]M.GÍD.DA QA-TI A-WA-AT^m[(Am-mi-ḥa-at-ná)]

6' [(^m)Tu-u]l-bi-ia¹⁴ Ú^mMa-a-ti-i [(^{L.Ü.MEŠ}pu-ra-ap-ši-i-e-eš)]

7' [(š)]A KUR^{URU}Ku-wa-an-ni¹⁵ ma-a-[(an-kán I-NA É.DINGIR-LI)]

8' [(š-u-u)]p-pa-i pé-e-ti an-d[(a ku-in im-ma ku-in)]

9' [(mar-š)]a-aš-tar-ri-in [(ú-e-mi-ia-an-zi)]

10' [(nu ki-i síSKUR-šU)]

¹¹ Pace Strauß (p. 253, n. 79, 255, n. 87, 281, n. 194), it can be considered very unlikely that KBo 24.50 represents a single-columned IM.GÍD.DA tablet. Its obv. i is not significantly wider, its text lines not significantly longer, than those of KBo 23.1. If it were a single-columned tablet containing some 80 lines, as suggested by Strauß, it would be some 3 times long as wide, a highly unexpected format for a tablet from Hattusa, where single-columned tablets are always rather wide and only slightly longer, if at all, than they are wide, and this applies also to that pointed to by Güterbock, AfO 38/39 (1991/92) 135b, i.e. KUB 9.32, as an example of a single-columned IM.GÍD.DA tablet for which a corresponding double-columned *Sammeltafel* is known. If, then, KBo 24.50 is indeed a double-columned tablet, then it seems likely that it, too, contained the text of CTH 472 twice on the same tablet, as its obv. i duplicates A i 26–40, while its rev. iv duplicates B iii 30-iv 12.

¹² As appears to be the case with KBo 24.50, it seems that D also would have contained the text of the ritual twice, as D ii duplicates A i 54-ii 3 while D iii duplicates B ii [end]-iii 2.

¹³ Restored after A ii 13–21 and iv 33–42. For further variants, see Strauß. My thanks go to Dr. R. Akdoğan for examining and photographing Bo 3964 for me in the museum in Ankara.

¹⁴ Otherwise always written ^mTúl-; but cf. [^mT]u-ul-bi-LUGAL-ma in KBo 13.42(++), 6', likewise a singular writing for Tulbi-Šarrumma. (Of course, both cases could conceivably have been written Tūr-.)

¹⁵ Of the dozens of attestations of Kummanni, the only others I was able to find with initial Ku- instead of Kum- are KBo 2.3++ iv 14 (Ku-ma-ni) and KUB 48.81, 6' (Ku-um-ma-an-ni₁). The writing with -wa- is unique, and while a phonetic explanation is certainly a possibility, one cannot help but wondering if it was not somehow influenced by the identically written PN ^mKu-wa-an-ni, likewise a priestess¹ of Hēbat of Kummanni (MUNUS É.DINGIR-LI ŠA^d HÉ-bal^{URU} Kum-[ma-an-ni]; KUB 32.129 i 1). Was the scribe of Bo 3964 also referencing or copying one of Kuwanni's tablets while finishing up the colophon here?

For Section V.3.2, the tablet catalogues, cf. now Dardano, StBoT 47 (2006), in which a number of improvements and corrections can be found, as well as the review of Dardano by B. Christiansen, to appear shortly in ZA, which offers some interesting thoughts on the contents and purpose of the catalogues, a topic also touched on by Strauß.

One seemingly inexplicable lapse in the treatment of CTH 476 (V.4) is the consistent reading of ^upat-ti-li for ^upa-ti-li, though PA has no such value in HZL or MesZL. One would also like to see the transliteration 2-TA.ĀM (i 37, 46), though the 2 *da-a-an* in i 30 gives one pause. It may be that the scribe himself became confused, and one might want to emend to 2-TA¹(DA).ĀM. It does not, though, seem necessary to emend 𒊕AR<ŠU> ŠU^{H1.A}-ŠU-ia-aš-ši-kán in iv 19. Reading 𒊕AR.ŠU^{H1.A}-ŠU-ia-aš-ši-kán ⁽²⁰⁾𒊕AR.GIR-ia A-NA GIR^{H1.A} ti-an-zi and translating, ‘then they place arm rings on him, and an ankle ring on the feet,’ renders a sensible translation without emendation.

In KBo 24.45+ obv. 18’ (Ch. V.5) can likely be restored, with reference to KBo 11.1 obv. 20–24 (cf. CHD Š, 44b–45a) and KUB 5.6 i 44’–45’ (cf. CHD Š, 45b), MUNUS-a[z-ši-k]án ku-iš¹ IŠ-TU ša¹-a[k-la-i] ⁽¹⁹⁾pu-nu-uš-ke-zi, ‘The woman who inquires [of him/her (i.e. the deity)] concerning the custom, ...’. Though it does not appear to be the case in the edition of KBo 24.45+ rev. 2, from photos it is clear that the signs and space are perfectly amenable to ¹še¹-h[é-e]I-[l]i¹ ia¹-aš, and there is therefore no need for emendation. In rev. 6 there is clearly no space for ú-[i²-d]a-a-ar, leaving ú-[d]a-a-ar as the only alternative. The same spelling is found in KUB 58.68: 21’, but two attestations do not seem enough to count as a proper variant writing, and scribal errors are probably to be assumed.

Since the appearance of Strauß’s work on CTH 491 (V.6), KBo 22.126 has been joined to KUB 59.50, and the suggestion has been made that these belong to the same tablet as KUB 15.42 (DBH 14 [2004], 87). Also, I was able to identify in KBo 53.88 a further duplicate to A i 16–32 and B(+)+ i 14–30, and since it aids in restoring A, it seems fitting to provide a transliteration here:

KBo 53.88

- 1’ [(a)]r-ḫa-[(ma-at da-a-an pa-ri-ia-an na-at pár-ku-nu-wa-an¹⁶)]
 2’ [(p)]a-ap-ḫ[(a-tar-kán an-da NU.GÁL A-NA 2 DUG.GAL-ma-aš-ša-an)]
 3’ [(n)]a-aš-ma [(2^{DUG}ka-az-zi-ti wa-a-tar la-a-ḫu-wa-an)]
-
- 4’ [(A-N)]A 2¹⁷ NINDA.SI[(G-ma-aš-ša-an ga-an-ga-ti ki-it-ta 1^{NINDA}mu-la-ti-iš tar-na-aš-ša)]
 5’ [(1 NIND)]A.GUR₄.RA G[(A.KIN.AG TUR 7¹⁸ NINDA.SIGMEŠ 1^{DUG}ši-pa-an-du-wa-aš¹⁹ GEŠTIN)]
 6’ ¹a¹-ku-wa-₁an-na₁-aš^D[^U(GKU-KU-UB GEŠTIN da-a-an pé-e-da-aš 1^{G1S}BANŠUR AD.KID)]
 7’ 1 DUG A ¹1^{DUG}1ág-g[(a-pi-iš-ša-aš²⁰ A 3 DUG.GAL PUR-SÍ-TI RI-IQ-QÚ-TIM...²¹)]

¹⁶ B i 14: pár-ku-nu(U)-an.

¹⁷ A i 19: 1.

¹⁸ Partly visible in A i 21; cf. also i 34.

¹⁹ B i 19:] ŠA GEŠTIN, whereby there would seem to be enough space between the break and ŠA to exclude the reading -aš]-ša.

²⁰ B i 21: -i]š-ta-aš.

²¹ As is the case with B, the whole of the line in A i 24 (^{G1S}IN-B^{H1.A}-ia ^{G1S}PÈŠ ^{G1S}GEŠTIN 𒊕ĀD.DU.A ^{G1S}ŠE₂₀-ER-DUM ku-it-ta te-pu) was here either omitted or written far into the column divider.

- 8' *nu ma-aḥ-ḥa-an* ₁ki₃-[(*i ḥu-u-ma-an ḥa-an-da-a-iz-zi*) *nu* (^{G18}BANŠUR AD.KID)]
 9' ₁Ē₁-ri-kán a[(*n-da*) *da-(a-i nu-uš-ša-an* 2²² DUG.GAL A *na-aš-ma* 2 ^{DUG}ka-az-zi A]
 10' ₁da₁-a-i 1 DUG.GAL [(^{GEŠTIN}-ia-aš-ša-an *da-a-i an-da-ma*)-kán ... (*da-a-i*)]²³
 11' ₁1_J DUG.GAL ĩ.DÜG.GA-ia-[(*aš-ša-an da-a-i an-da-ma-kán* SIG SA₃) *ki-it-t(a)*]
 12' ₁1_J DUG.GAL BA.₁BA.ZA₁-i[(*a-aš-ša-an da-a-i* ^{SIG}a-li-ša-kán *a-wa-an kat-ta*)]
 13' ₁ki₁-it-ta ₁1_J[... (*pít-tal-wa-an-da-aš-ša*) *da-(a-i?)*]
 14' [1] ₁DUG.GAL_J²⁴ x-[(*ia-aš-ša-an* Û 1 DUG.GAL L)Ā]²⁵ (*da-a-i*)

As mentioned, Strauß's treatment of CTH 491 requires somewhat more attention than the others, and I offer here a few suggestions.²⁵ In my view *i-lā-ša-l-kán* in A i 8 can be regarded as certain. Other attestations that may represent the same word are found in IBoT 3.13 rev. 5'; KUB 29.1 i 46; KBo 22.156+660/z i 11'; and KBo 21.20 i 15. Comparison with A i 13–14 and B iii 4'–6' allows one to safely restore [1 ^{DUG}BUR.ZI T]U₇ and [1 ^{NINDA}mu-la-ti-i]n in A i 33 and 34, respectively. The restoration of MUNUS-za at the end of A i 36 is probably unnecessary, as a translation 'Then the AZU-priest takes either a pure vessel with water or a *kazzi*-vessel with water' is quite sufficient and avoids introducing an otherwise non-existent participant. At the end of A i 58 one may read ₁me-ma₁-i. The traces at the beginning of A ii 3' demand rather QA-T[AM-MA, after which there is still room in the break for *pár-ku-wa-e-eš*. Traces and available space dictate that one restore, in contrast to B, [Ē.DINGIR^{ME}Š-KU-NU-l ia¹-aš-ma-aš in A ii 23'. On photos one can read [a]₁pa-a-ša ú-iz₁-zi in A ii 28', and one can translate the phraseological construction, with reference to Th. van den Hout, Fs. Hoffner (2003) 177–203, which is to be preferred to Neu, Fs. Strunk (1995) 195–202, 'Daraufhin nimmt jener eine andere, ungebrauchte *ali*-Wolle.' In A ii 29' the traces dictate EN.SÍSK]UR-i[a. At the end of A ii 49' one can restore l[*i-in-ga-iš*]. At the end of A iii 6' one can restore EN.SÍSKUR-m[a-kán] after KUB 59.50 iii 5', at the end of iii 10', EN.SI[SKUR QA-TAM-MA] after KUB 59.50 iii 8'.

In 491.2 (V.6.6) one can likely read ^{ci}š^{ci}HŠHUR in i 7'. In i 8', *nu ki-i ḥu-[u-ma-an*. In ii 11', 40 ^{G18}KIRI₆ *ip-p*[*i-ia-a*]n-za^{SAR}, '40 *ippijant*-Pflanze des Gartens.' In ii 15', *ḥu-u-ma-an* SAR^{H1.A} *da-a-i*. in ii 22', [*ḥu-u-ub-ru-uš*]-*ḥi-ma-aš-ša-an ša* DINGIR-Li.

JARED L. MILLER – Mainz/München

²² B i 24 omit.

²³ A omits §-divider.

²⁴ The only other DUG.GAL item in this text that would seem to fit the traces of KBo 53.88, 14' and of A i 32 would be the DUG.GAL.GIR₄ of B ii 2.

²⁵ I should note that CTH 491 was the subject of a seminar I attended led by D. Schwemer in 2000. Some of the suggestions mentioned here may therefore be his, but I am no longer certain what originated with him and what is of my own invention.