



A Forgotten Hittite Fragment of the "KILLAM" Festival

O#uz Soysal

Journal of Cuneiform Studies, Vol. 50. (1998), pp. 59-65.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-0256%281998%2950%3C59%3AAAFHFOT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-I>

Journal of Cuneiform Studies is currently published by The American Schools of Oriental Research.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/asor.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A FORGOTTEN HITTITE FRAGMENT OF THE *KILAM* FESTIVAL

Oğuz Soysal

The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago

In 1996, H. G. Güterbock put his personal scholarly materials at the disposal of the staff of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary. Among them are transliterations made by him mostly in the early 1930s of several dispersed Hittite tablets from private collections or those deposited in local museums in Turkey. The fragment in question belongs to this group, and primarily merits attention because it contains a recitation in the Hattian language. A closer examination of the contents of the text, however, shows that it can furthermore be compared profitably with other Boğazköy documents and even classified under a specific text genre. This is enough to justify publication.

Despite the small size of the three-column fragment, seven well-preserved lines in the middle column reveal sufficient information about the text's genre. The preserved contents of this fragment describe a festival in which the touring Hittite king worships various gods in sequence. Meanwhile, a Hattian recitation is spoken. No information is available as to whether the partly preserved side is the tablet's obverse or reverse.

This manuscript was completed in March 1997. I am indebted to Prof. H. G. Güterbock for his kind permission to publish this fragment. He also provided useful information about the history of some stray tablets, and made many other remarks in general. I also would like to thank Prof. H. A. Hoffner for his comments and his permission to use the files of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary Project, which is supported by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. To F. Güterbock, Dr. R. H. Beal and J. Smolin I am indebted for correcting the English of this paper. Abbreviations follow those used in *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*.

The left column contains only traces of a sign, which ends with two *Winkelhakens* like “pi” or “ul” (approximately on the level of line 7' in the middle column). The right column is entirely broken away. The portions of the transliteration below in boldface type were drawn in Güterbock's papers as cuneiform signs, for whose readings presented here I am responsible, as well as for the restorations of lines 9'–11' (see commentary). According to the transliteration of Güterbock, the text reads as follows:

Middle column (obv. ii or rev. v).

§ 1'	1'	[]	x ₁ x ₂ 'x ₃ ' x ₄ x ₅ x ₆ [
	2'		<i>ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i</i>
	3'		<i>ta-ni-u_u-ul-la u_u-ul-la</i>
	4'		<i>ta-ni-zi-la zi-la</i>
	5'		<i>ta-ši-ma-az</i>
<hr/>			
§ 2'	6'		LUGAL- <i>uš ir-ha-a-u-ua-an-zi</i>
	7'		<i>ti-ja-zi I-an ir-ha-a-iz-zi</i>
	8'		<i>^dTa-hi-iš-ta-nu</i>
<hr/>			
§ 3'	9'	[]	'x' par-ga-aš a-aš-ki a-ri
	10'	[]	-<i>h</i> <i>a-a-iz-zi</i>
	11'	[]	-š <i>i</i>

After this paragraph line the tablet breaks off; the other side is not preserved.

Commentary

1': The cuneiform signs drawn in the transliteration of Güterbock can be read as follows: x₁

(ends with a vertical), x_2 (= *me*), x_3 (= 'za' or 'ha'), x_4 (= [a]t or [l]a), x_5 (= *te*), x_6 (unidentified). Thereby, a reading and restoration of the whole line as [nu^{LÚG}]UDU₁₂¹ 'ha'-[a]t-te-[i²] "[and the anoin]ted-priest in Ha[t]tia[n]" appears most probable. This would also fit well with the expression *kiššan memai* "says thus" in line 2', which precedes three lines written entirely in Hattian.

3'–5': These lines contain a recitation in Hattian. On account of the example *ta-ni-yu_u-ul-la* in line 3', the first sign of the following word *ya-ul-la* is either a scribal error or a phonetic variation for "yu_u"² since both words refer to the same root *wu_ul*. This is, according to Schuster (1974, 96), a (verbal) stem (there cited as *vul*) of unknown meaning. Consequently, the following morpheme *-a* is the verbal suffix for the imperative. The identical form is present also in the preceding word complex, but there it has the additional prefix(es) *ta-ni-*. Although *tani-* frequently³ occurs in the Hattian texts alone or as the anterior part of the morpheme chain, its function has yet to be determined. The same scheme works for the next line as well: the prefix(es) *tani-*, (verbal) stem *zil*⁴ with imperative suffix *-a*, and then a repetition without *tani-*. A structural analysis of these three lines as *tani-wu_ul=a* *wu_ul=a* / *tani-zil=a* *zil=a* / *tašimaz* reveals a phonetic harmony, even a rhythm, which is called forth especially by the repetition of the final *a*-phoneme. This

harmony is certainly what one might expect from a liturgy.⁵

It is even possible that *tanizila* in line 4' is fully reflected in the geographical name ^{URU}Tanizila which hitherto occurs only in oracle texts. It was, according to *KUB* 5.1 i 5 and passim, a town in northern Anatolia under the sway of the Kaškaeans.⁶

Despite the absence of the divine determinative,⁷ *tašimaz* in line 5' can hardly be anything but a deity who is often mentioned in other religious texts of Hattian provenance. Indeed, *KBo* 21.84 iv 3, which contains a slightly variant version of the above recitation, cites this deity in its complete form with determinative as ^dTašimaz (see below). Because of its foreign origin this divine name is not written uniformly in the Boğazköy texts but shows diverse vocalizations in writing, e.g., Taša(m)maz, Tašamez, Tašimmaz, Tašimiš, Tašimez, Dašimiz, Taš(š)imiz (cf. Otten 1950, 122–25).

The recitation in 3'–5' above also appears to be split in two parts in *KUB* 10.100 (+? *KUB* 46.11)⁸ ii 7'–9' and *KUB* 44.25 ii 10'–12'. By combining these recitations, we realize a direct join between *KUB* 10.100+ ii 6'–9' and *KUB* 44.25 ii 9–12 (the numbering of the lines here is taken from *KUB* 44.25 ii; the line numbers of *KUB* 10.100 are indicated in parenthesis):⁹

1. The signs are [LÚ]M.ME.

2. For the phonetic alternation *ya_a(-)-yu_u* within Hattian cf. *KBo* 19.161 iv 16: *a-ya_a-ar-ru-pa ya_a-ru-ya* versus the parallel text *KBo* 21.90 lower edge 32': [a] *ya_a-ar-ru-ya(-)u-yu_u-ru-ú-ya*; *KUB* 1.17 iii 58: *ya_a-ru-ú-še-mu* versus ii 3: *yu_u-ú-ru-še-mu-ú*. Furthermore, *ya-ul-la* in our fragment corresponds with *pu-ul-la* in the two other variations of the same recitation; see below.

3. Cf. *tāni(-)*, *taninenti*, *taninti*, *tanita*, *tanitanin* etc., and the Hattian professional titles ^{LÚ}*tānišawa* (= ^{LÚ} ^{GIŠ}GIDRU) and ^{LÚ}*tušhawa_adun tānišau* (= ^{LÚ}GAD.TAR) in *KBo* 5.11 i 16, 17.

4. For the frequent element *zil* (with its phonetic variant *zel*) cf. *hinašizil* (*hinmašizel*), *iškijazzil*, *ištarrazil* (*ištarraiz-zel*), *kamzil*, *šipzil* (*šipzel*), *tuphazil*, *uizil*, *ya_aya_azil*, *yi_ipizil* (*ya_apizel*, *yi_ipizel*), *aštazel*, *hinalizel*, *kaḫalyu_uzzel*, *kišazzel* etc. Most of these words are of nominal character, whereas *aš-ta-ze-el* in the Hattian-Hittite bilingual *KUB* 28.6 obv. It.col. 16a' (with Hitt. equivalent *u-a-i* "it cries, screams" rt.col. 16b') is obviously a verbal form.

5. We do not need to discuss here whether one can detect meter in this passage. An attempt to recognize meter in Hattian texts is made by Eichner (1993, 153–54, 157).

6. For this town see del Monte and Tischler (1978, 394–95 with further bibliography); del Monte (1992, 158). On the analysis of the toponym Tanizila cf. also von Schuler (1965, 103).

7. For the omission of the divine determinative in Hattian contexts see e.g., the list of deities in *KUB* 28.15 obv. It.col. 1a–9a; cf. also İzmir 1270 + 1271 + 1272 (= Singer 1984, 72–75) obv. iii 18: *ku-tar-ma-a ku-tar-ma-a* (in Hattian recitation) versus obv. iii 20: ^d*Ku-tar-ma-a* (in Hittite context).

8. This join is suggested by Laroche (1975, 66).

9. As a result of this direct join, the preceding lines of the recitation now read as follows (numbering from *KUB* 44.25 ii, the lines of *KUB* 10.100 ii are cited in the parenthesis):

1	[^{GIŠ}]ú-i-du-li pí-ra-an 3-ŠU
2	[šī-pa]-an-ti

3	[UGULA ^{LÚ} ME]ŠMUḪALDIM iš-pa-an-tu-zi-aš-šar GEŠTIN
---	--

4 (= 1')	LUGAL-i p[a-r]a-a e-ep-zi
----------	---------------------------

- 9 (= 6') LÚ^Éhe-eš-tq-a ma-al-di
 10 (= 7') ta-a-ni(-)ul-la(-)pu-ul-la
 11 (= 8') ta-a-ni(-)[ze-e]l-la(-)ze-el-la
 12 (= 9') ta-ši-i[m-ma-a]z

Except for small differences in spelling and uncertain word divisions, the structure of this recitation is the same as in our fragment. The alternations (p)ul=a and zel=a versus yuul=a and zil=a are easily explained as insignificant phonetic variations within the Hattian language in the Hittite tradition. A very similar recitation appears also in *KBo* 21.84 iv, but with a conspicuous distinction:

- 1 LÚGUDU₁₂ ma-al-di ha-at-ti-i-li [ka-an-ni(-)pu²-ul-la]
 2 pu-ul-la ka-an-ni(-)zi-¹il-la z¹[i-il-la]
 3 ^dTa-ši-mi-iz

Philologically noteworthy may be the alternation between *tani-* (in *KUB* 10.100 + *KUB* 44.25 and our fragment) and *kani-* (in *KBo* 21.84), although it is not possible to determine their exact function(s) with our present knowledge of the Hattian language. With the exception of this variation, the structures of both recitations are identical. The occurrence of LÚGUDU₁₂ in *KBo* 21.84 iv 1 strongly supports the supposition above that the reciter in line 1' of the middle column of our fragment is also the “anointed priest.” By comparing these three occurrences, we conclude that the “recitation of Tašim(m)a/iz” was performed in cultic ceremonies by different functionaries, namely LÚ^Éheštā¹⁰ and LÚGUDU₁₂. The latter, who shares the “recitation of Tašim(m)a/iz” with LÚ^Éheštā-, could be the “anointed priest” specific to the *heštā*-house found in other religious documents.

-
- 5 (= 2) LUGAL-uš-kán QA-TAM da-a-i
 6 (= 3') UGULA LÚMEŠMUḪALDIM GIŠ-ú-i-tu-li
 7 (= 4) pi-ra-an 1-ŠU ši-pa-an-ti
 8 (= 5) LUGAL-uš UŠ-KÉ-EN
-

10. On the Hattian recitations of the men of the *heštā*-house see also Otten (1955, 391 n. 2); Kammenhuber (1972, 301); Haas and Wäfler (1977, 93 with n. 42). This profession should now be added to the list of those reciters in the Hattian language given by Schuster (1974, 44–45).

On the “man” and “anointed priest” of the *heštā*-house and their appearance together see Haas and Wäfler (1977, 92–93), and Singer (1983, 113 and 114 n. 76). Through an examination of these closely related recitations, one of which calls the “*heštā*-house” to our attention, the possibility arises that lines 1'–8' (and possibly the missing preceding lines as well) of our fragments also describe rites in the course of the festival located in or around the *heštā*-house.

6'–8': For this cultic rite and its formulary see Kammenhuber (1971, 145–46); additional occurrences: *KUB* 11.30 obv. iii 22'–25' + *IBOT* 4.197 obv. 3''–6'', *KUB* 44.30:8'–10', *Bo* 5045 (= Popko 1994, 202–5) ii 8'–11', v 4'–6' and İzmir 1270 + 1271 + 1272 (= Singer 1984, 72–75) obv. iii 24–26 (see below).

8': An important matter for the history of second millennium Anatolian religion is the appearance here of a deity named Taḫištanu, because it is a hapax. The name appears to be undeclined and consequently is not congruent with the case of its determining number 1-an (acc.) in line 7'. The origin of the name is clearly non-Hittite, but belongs rather to a Hattian milieu, and is thereby to be analyzed as follows: The first element *taḫ(a)* is widespread within the Hattian language and appears in many divine names (Laroche 1947, 31 with n. 5), e.g., Taḫa, Taḫaitanu, Taḫakšail, Taḫakšaziyati, Taḫam/npip/wu, Daḫangaili, Daḫa(n)gawili, Taḫankula, Taḫantiu, Taḫarul, Daḫarunuwa², Taḫata/enuit(i), Taḫawašezu, Taḫišu, Taḫitanu (< Taḫaitanu), Taḫi[...]^u,¹¹ Taḫpill/tanu.

11. This divine name is cited as ^dTa-ḫi-[...]-ú by Singer (1983, 80 and 1984, 68) under the exemplar 1.kE of the KILAM-Festival (i.e., *Bo* 2505, now published as *KUB* 56.33)—where the king arrives at the gate of the [*heštā*]-house and honors the deity by drinking (iv 7'–10'). However, one could restore this name as ^dTa-ḫi-[šu]-u, or, because of the length of the broken space, more likely as ^dTa-ḫi-[(it)ta-nu]-ú, or even as our form ^dTa-ḫi-[iṣ-ta-nu]-ú. Indeed, a close connection of one of these deities, Taḫit(t)anu, to the gate of the *heštā*-house is revealed by some fragments of the AN.TAḪŠUM^{SAR} Festival (*CTH* suppl. Nr. 621 “Première tablette” [*RHA* 30, 115]) *KBo* 24.87 + *KBo* 23.99 + *KBo* 20.76 rev. 7', (// *KBo* 21.80 iv 8' + *FHG* 7 lt.col. 12'): [LUGAL]-uš^Éh¹i-iš-tq-a-aš a-aš-ka a-ri 1 e-ku-zi ^dT[(a-ḫi-ta-nu-u)] “[The king] arrives at the gate of the *ḫištā*-house (and) honors one (deity) by drinking (namely): Taḫitanu.”

The following element is the well-known Ištanu (< Hattian Eštan) “Sun deity (rather goddess).”

Due to a possible contraction of *ai* > *i*, ^dTa-*ḫi*štanu should go back to a form *^dTaḫaištanu (cf. ^dTaḫaitanu > ^dTaḫitanu), and an alternative interpretation of this name as “Sun deity of (Mount) Taḫa” is also conceivable; cf. the compound divine name ^dTaḫurpištanu “Sun deity of (city) Taḫurpa” (Laroche 1947, 32). On the other hand, one should not exclude an explanation of Taḫištanu as a variation of Taḫit(t)anu (i.e., spelled as ^dTa-*ḫi*-*iš*-*ta*-*nu* instead of *^dTa-*ḫi*-*it*-*ta*-*nu*)¹² or even simply as an error in writing. Such an interpretation further strengthens the above argument that the scene of the rites described in lines 1’–8’ was in or around the *ḫeštā*-house, since a close connection of the deity Taḫit(t)anu with the gate of the *ḫeštā*-house is known from the other texts (see note 11).

9’: In the broken beginning of the line there is space for two signs. Because the agent in the preceding paragraph is the king, a restoration [LUGAL-*uš*] here appears to be most likely.

According to an old annotation of H. A. Hoffner, ^d*Pár-ga-aš a-aš-ki* in *IBoT* 3.1 rev. 91’ can be compared with this line which makes feasible the reading ^d*Pár-ga-aš* here as well. In fact, the visible traces of the first sign in the transliteration of Güterbock conform perfectly to a “DINGIR.” The king’s arrival (at the entrance of) the house of Parga in the course of festivals is briefly related also in *KBo* 10.27 v (9’), *KUB* 57.95 v 1 and *VBoT* 56 obv. 7’. On the deity Parga of Hattian origin see Otten (1959, 178, 182); Otten and von Soden (1968, 15 with n. 3), and most recently Otten (1990, 25–33 [Turkish], 34–42 [German]).

10’: Due to the length of the broken part and textual parallelism to line 7’ the restoration [l-*an ir-h*]a-a-iz-zi is certain.

11’: In accordance with line 8’, which names ^dTaḫištanu, one expects in the broken part of this line the name of another deity which ends in [...]š*i*. By analogy to the phrase ^d*Pár-ga-aš a-aš*

ki ^d*Wa_a-ḫi-ši-in* etc. [...]“at the gate of Parga (the king) [honors?] the deity Waḫiši (and the other gods)” in the above mentioned *IBoT* 3.1 rev. 91’, we are inclined to identify the deity in our passage, likewise connected with the gate of Parga, as [^d*Wa_a-ḫi*]-š*i*. Like Taḫištanu in line 8’, this divine name appears to be undeclined. For *Wa_aḫiši* another deity of Hattian provenance, see von Schuler (1970, 45–49), and most recently Otten (1990, 26, 31 n. 8 [Turkish], 35, 40–41 n. 8 [German] with bibliography). A Hattian word that represents or contains the original form of the deity *pé-el-ua_a-a-ḫi-ši* is known from the lists of deities in *KUB* 28.31 obv.?[?] It.col. 2’, and its variant *ui_i-il-ua_a-ḫi-ši* from *KUB* 28.72 obv. It.col. 5’.

Following the above remarks, the translation of our fragment now reads thus:

- | | | |
|------|-----|---------------------------------------|
| § 1’ | 1’ | [And the anoin]ted-priest |
| | 2’ | speaks in Ha[t]tia[n] as follows: |
| | 3’ | <i>taniyu_alla yauulla</i> |
| | 4’ | <i>tanizila zila</i> |
| | 5’ | <i>tašimaz</i> |
| § 2’ | 6’ | The king starts to make the |
| | | worshiping-rounds. |
| | 7’ | He worships one (deity, namely): |
| | 8’ | Taḫištanu. |
| § 3’ | 9’ | [The king] arrives at the gate of |
| | | Parga. |
| | 10’ | [He wor]ships [one (deity, namely):] |
| | 11’ | [<i>Wa_aḫi</i>]š <i>i</i> |

Both the recitation and the two deities above reflect a Hattian cultic origin for our fragment. For the matter of classifying the text as to specific genre, one has to take the following points into consideration: 1) The statement ^d*Pár-ga-aš a-aš-ki* ^d*Wa_a-ḫi-ši-in* in *IBoT* 3.1 rev. 91’ is strongly reminiscent of lines 9’–11’ in our fragment. Beyond that, there are further similarities between the scenes of the rites in both texts as we will point out below. *IBoT* 3.1 had been classified by Laroche in *CTH* under Nr. 609 as a part of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM^{SAR} Festival and entitled “11^e jour: les ‘années’ vont au *hesti*”; cf. also Otten (1990, 26 and 35).¹³

13. *IBoT* 3.1 is edited by Haas and Wäfler (1976, 88–95); for the relevant text passages see also the same authors (1977, 91 and 105).

12. On the alternation *š* ~ *t* within Hattian see Girbal (1986, 165–66). Alternatively, one might suggest a contraction of *št* > *t(t)*. In this case, the deity would originally have gone by the name ^dTaḫištanu (more precisely *^dTaḫaištanu, see above commentary for line 8’).

2) The Hattian recitation in lines 3'–5' is identical with that in *KUB* 10.100 + *KUB* 44.25 ii 10–12. Laroche lists *KUB* 10.100 under *CTH* Nr. 675 “Fragments de fête au *hesta*” (but with reference to *CTH* Nr. 609 once more).¹⁴ One finds the same recitation with slight variations also in *KBo* 21.84 iv 1–3 where it is spoken by the ^LUGUDU₁₂ “anointed priest,” just as in our fragment. *KBo* 21.84 is categorized in *CTH* suppl. (Laroche 1972, 119) under Nr. 670 under the rubric “Fragments divers [de fêtes].”

3) The document most similar to our fragment in its contents and textual structure, however, is a group of fragments known as “İzmir 1270 + 1271 + 1272” etc. This has already been treated by Singer (1984, 72–75), and was included with good reason among the exemplars of the KILAM Festival (*CTH* 627). The similarity between these two documents may be observed in the ceremonial procedure in which the king arrives at the entrances of several temples or sacred buildings and worships in turn their particular deities. Here are the relevant passages of “İzmir 1270 ++.”¹⁵

obv. ii	1	[... K]Á.GAL- <i>aš a-ri</i>
obv. ii y+	7''	[LUGAL- <i>u</i>]š ^d GİR- <i>aš a-aš-ki a-ri</i>
	8''	[2]- <i>e ir-ḥa-a-iz-zi</i>
	9''	[^d Tē]- <i>li-pí-nu-un</i> ^d H'al- <i>ki-in</i> (?)
obv. iii	24	[LUGAL]- <i>uš ir-ḥa-a-u-ya-an-zi</i> <i>ti-ia-z</i> [i ^p]
	25	<i>2-e ir-ḥa-a-iz-zi</i>
	26	^d LAMMA ^d H <i>a-pa-an-ta-li</i>
<hr/>		
	27	LUGAL- <i>uš KÁ É</i> ^d UTU <i>a-ri</i>
	28	<i>2-e ir-ḥa-a-iz-zi</i>
	29	^d [U]TU ^d Mi- <i>iz-zu-ul-la</i>

The remarkable similarity between our fragment and “İzmir 1270 ++” in contents is corrob-

orated by their history, even making a direct connection between these tablets conceivable. According to a personal communication from Güterbock, all of these fragments and some others¹⁶ originated from one and the same place (i.e., Boğazköy) and were acquired by the General Directorate of Antiquities and Museums of Turkey. In 1934, with the permission of H. Z. Koşay, the Director General of the Department, Güterbock was able to transliterate them in Ankara. Later, these tablets (or some of them) were delivered to the Museum of İzmir for exhibition, and then became the permanent property of that museum. It is unknown whether our fragment was among them. In 1980, Hoffner was shown Güterbock's transliterations of the İzmir fragments and identified “İzmir 1277” as a join to *KBo* 4.8 (prayer of Muršili II about his stepmother) which he published later (1983, 187–92). Besides “İzmir 1270 ++,” two more fragments, “İzmir 1274” and “İzmir 1275,” have been utilized by Singer (1984, 71–72, 76) as exemplars of the KILAM Festival. However, when on a visit to Turkey in 1978, Güterbock attempted to examine these fragments at the İzmir Museum, he was not successful, since they could not be found under the inventory numbers “İzmir 1270 ++” etc. So the fate of the “İzmir tablets” remains a mystery. Because of both the unreliability of the İzmir inventory numbers and of the uncertainty as to whether our fragment had actually been sent to the Museum of İzmir, we would prefer to label it instead as “Ankara 1934” based upon the location and date in which the transliteration was made. If one combines the common circumstances of “İzmir 1270 ++” and “Ankara 1934” with the similarity of content, the possibility arises that they originally belonged to the same tablet. This is further strengthened because both are three-column fragments, and Güterbock in his transliteration made an annotation for “Ankara 1934” that “clay and script are like that large one (i.e., İzmir 1270 + 1271 + 1272, joined by him.)”¹⁷ Thus, “Ankara

14. Since this fragment has been recognized as a direct join to *KUB* 44.25, the placement by Laroche (1975, 68) of *KUB* 44.25 “Fragments de fêtes contenant des chants et récitations en hattî” under *CTH* Nr. 744.19 (cf. also Laroche 1977, 33, 34), should be revised.

15. For the citation of the following text passages I refer again to the original transliterations of Güterbock. As there are small differences in textual details and in the transliteration system, compared to the study of Singer, they are, of course, my own responsibility. The numbering of the lines is based on Singer (1984, 72–73).

16. The story of the İzmir fragments is given in brief by Hoffner (1977, 155–56 n. 22) and Singer (1983, ix).

17. In his transliterations Güterbock makes the same note for “İzmir 1274” and “1275.” Furthermore, he indicates “İzmir 1274” more specifically as “part of 1270 + 1271 + 1272(?)”

1934,” whose middle column is best-preserved, would fit the obverse ii or reverse v of “İzmir 1270 ++.” Maybe we can go one step further and place “Ankara 1934” in the gap between obv. ii 5 and y+ 1 of “İzmir 1270 ++” which, according to Singer (1983, 71 and 1984, 72), is to be estimated at about twenty lines. This is so because the king’s arrival at the gate of Parga in line 9’ of “Ankara

1934” chiefly corresponds with the king’s worship tours in obv. ii 1 and y+ 7’’–9’’ of “İzmir 1270 ++.” Because a physical examination of both fragments is no longer possible, this suggestion is made only with reserve. Such a combination of “Ankara 1934” and “İzmir 1270 ++” also suggests a certain parallelism to the cultic rites described in *IBoT* 3.1 as we can observe in the following synopsis:

“Ankara 1934”	IBoT 3.1
ii 1’–8’: Hattian recitation of the anointed priest (of <i>heštā</i> -house ¹⁸), king’s worship of Taḫištānu / Taḫittānu (at the gate of <i>heštā</i> -house ¹⁹)	rev. 89’: <i>heštā</i> -men sing
(not mentioned)	rev. 90’: King’s departure from <i>heštā</i> -house
ii 9’–11’: King’s arrival at the gate of Parga, worship of [Wa _a ḫi]ši there.	rev. 90’–91’: [Arrival] inside the ^E <i>ḫilammar</i> “gate-house,” worship of Wa _a ḫiši at the gate of Parga.
[breaks off, and immediately? followed by] “İzmir 1270 + 1271 + 1272” (= Singer 1984, 72)	
ii y+ 1’’–6’’	(no counterpart)
ii y+ 7’’–9’’: Arrival at the gate of ^d GİR, worship of Telipinu and Ḫalki ²	rev. 91’: Worship of Telipinu and Ulipaš[u] at the gate of ^d G[İ]R
[broken]	rev. 92’: Worship of Telipinu and Šepuru at the gate of Ḫalki etc.

Besides some similarity, there is also a certain divergence between the details of the two descriptions. Thus one would not attempt to ascribe all the cultic rites above to one and the same festival. On the other hand, the possibility of a partial relationship in content between the two documents cannot be excluded either, even though they might represent different festivals. In *IBoT* 3.1, the text passages describing ceremonial acts that occur around and inside the *heštā*-house occupy most of the text’s narration. They consist of about eighty lines total beginning with the king’s departure from his residential palace (^E*ḫalentuwa*-), his entrance into the *heštā*-house, and finally, his depar-

ture from that building. Regardless of the exact determination of textual genre of *IBoT* 3.1—which probably belongs to the AN.TAḤŠUM^{SAR} Festival as stated in *CTH* Nr. 609—its central subject seems to be the area of the *heštā*-house. In contrast to this extended narration, “Ankara 1934,” as a part of the KILAM Festival, deals with the scene (of the *heštā*-house)²⁰ in broad outline. We

20. On the position of the *heštā*-house within the KILAM Festival see Singer (1983, 112–15). In the texts of this festival, however, none of the passages dealing with the *heštā*-house is well-preserved. Singer (1983, 114) states: “The fragmentary contexts in which the *heštā*-house appears in the KILAM text do not bring us any closer to the solution. Perhaps the descriptions relating to the *heštā*- are contained within the large missing parts of the text.” Thus those missing descriptions, as has been proposed in the commentary for lines 3’–5’ and 8’ above, may have been contained in “Ankara 1934.”

18. See above commentary for lines 3’–5’.

19. See above commentary for line 8’.

also should consider that such diversity may have resulted from the reorganization of the festivals, which would certainly have caused changes in

cultic procedure, or, from the modernization of their textual tradition over the centuries, as Kammenhuber (1972, 298) suggests for *IBoT* 3.1.

References

- del Monte, G. F.
1992 *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. Supplement.* RGTC 6/2. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- del Monte, G. F., and J. Tischler
1978 *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte.* RGTC 6. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Eichner, H.
1993 Probleme von Vers und Metrum in epischer Dichtung Altkleinasiens. *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften (Phil.-Hist. Klasse) Denkschriften* 236: 97–169.
- Girbal, C.
1986 *Beiträge zur Grammatik des Hattischen.* Europäische Hochschulschriften XXI/50. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Haas, V., and M. Wäfler
1976 Bemerkungen zu $\acute{e}he\acute{s}t\bar{u}/\bar{a}$ - (1. Teil). *UF* 8: 65–99.
1977 Bemerkungen zu $\acute{e}he\acute{s}t\bar{u}/\bar{a}$ - (2. Teil). *UF* 9: 87–122.
- Hoffner, H. A., Jr.
1977 Studies in Hittite Vocabulary, Syntax, and Style. *JCS* 29: 151–56.
1983 A Prayer of Muršili II About His Stepmother. *JAOS* 103: 187–92.
- Kammenhuber, A.
1971 Heth. *ḫaššuš 2-e ekuzi* «Der König trinkt zwei». *SMEA* 14: 143–59.
1972 Review of H. Otten, *Keilschrifttexte aus Boğazköy*, Heft XVII. *OrNS* 41: 292–302.
- Laroche, E.
1947 *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites.* Paris: Maisonneuve.
1971 *Catalogue des textes hittites.* Paris: Klincksieck.
1972 *Catalogue des textes hittites.* Premier supplément. *RHA* 30: 94–133.
1975 Reviews of H. Klengel, *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, Heft XLIV and following. *RHA* 33: 63–71.
- 1977 Review of H. Klengel, *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*, Heft XLIV. *OLZ* 72: 32–34.
- Otten, H.
1950 Die Gottheit Lelvani der Boğazköy-Texte. *JCS* 4: 119–36.
1955 Review of M. Çiğ and H. (Bozkurt) Kızılyay, *Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzelerinde bulunan Boğazköy tabletleri III.* *OLZ* 50: 389–94.
1959 Zur Kontinuität eines altanatolischen Kultes. *ZA* 53: 174–84.
1990 Eski Anadolu kültlerinin devamlılığı ile ilgili bazı düşünceler. / Erwägungen zur Kontinuität altanatolischer Kulte. *Uluslararası 1. Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri (19–21 Temmuz 1990)*: 25–33 and 34–42.
- Otten H., and W. von Soden
1968 *Das akkadisch-hethitische Vokabular KBo I 44 + KBo XIII 1.* StBoT 7. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Popko, M.
1994 *Zippalanda. Ein Kultzentrum im hethitischen Kleinasien.* THeth 21. Heidelberg: Winter.
- von Schuler, E.
1965 *Die Kaşkärer. Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des Alten Kleinasien,* UAVA 3. Berlin: de Gruyter.
1970 Eine hethitische Festbeschreibung aus dem Iraq Museum. *BagM* 5: 45–50.
- Schuster, H.-S.
1974 *Die ḫattisch-hethitischen Bilinguen I/1,* DMOA 17. Leiden: Brill.
- Singer, I.
1983 *The Hittite KILAM Festival. Part One.* StBoT 27. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
1984 *The Hittite KILAM Festival. Part Two.* StBoT 28. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.