

Altorientalische Forschungen	25	1998	1	158–162
------------------------------	----	------	---	---------

J. DE ROOS

A Few Missing Hittite Tablets*

Although the fragments of tablets presented here are in no way comparable to those in the magnificent collection that in Berlin for many years was entrusted to the care of the man we honour in this publication, it is with pleasure that I offer them to my friend Horst Klengel. I would also like avail myself of this opportunity to reiterate my thanks for his kindness in making available to me the texts of many vows before their official publication. My wish for him is that his activities in the field of the languages and the cultures of the Ancient Near East may continue for many years after his 65th birthday.

In 1987 H. G. Güterbock received a letter from Robert S. Hardy, formerly of Robert College, Istanbul,¹ enclosing drawn copies of four Hittite text fragments, a provisional transliteration and the note “Tablets formerly in Amerikan Kolej Merzivôn, now probably at Tarsus”. The last mentioned may give rise to some surprise, since tablets from Boğazköy have swarmed out to diverse places in the world but not, as far as was known prior to this announcement, to Tarsus.

In the in note 1 said article, H. G. Güterbock described how a tablet from Boğazköy ended up in Grinnell College in Iowa. For the history of the tablets published here, it is important that the events mentioned in the article in question be recalled to mind.

First it must be noted that it has long been known that tablets from Boğazköy found their way elsewhere, even before H. Winckler’s excavations in 1906. The best known ones were displayed by E. Chantre in 1898.² H. Winckler was him-

* It would have been impossible to write this article had not Prof. H. G. Güterbock very generously given me copies of the fragments drawn some years ago by R. S. Hardy along with his permission to publish them. Abbreviations are according to CHD fasc. 4, 1989.

¹ Cf. H. G. Güterbock in “Hittites” at Grinnell, 76, n. 23. This article appeared in “Ancient Anatolia”. Aspects of Change and Cultural Development. Essays in Honor of Machteld J. Melink. Ed. by Jeanny Vorys Canby, Edith Porada, Brunilde Sismondo Ridgway and Tamara Steh. University of Wisconsin Press 1986.

² E. Chantre, *Mission en Cappadoce, 1893–1894*, Paris 1898, 15–16.

self aware of this as attested in his report on his work in Boğazköy, published in 1907³: “Wir haben auch von anderen gelegentlichen Besuchern – so von einem der amerikanischen Missionare von Merzuwan⁴ – gehört, daß Stücke gefunden worden waren, und kurz vorher muß ein Stück einer größeren Tafel nach der benachbarten Stadt Jozgad gekommen sein, von wo es seinen Weg in das Museum in Liverpool gefunden hat. Es ist von Pinches und Sayce veröffentlicht worden.”⁵

From the correspondence published by H. G. Güterbock in the article mentioned in note 1 it can be inferred that this American missionary must have been Rev. Prof. G. E. White. In 1899 White wrote to Prof. L. F. Parker D. D. of Grinnell College that the Hittite objects, including one tablet, which he gave to him for the Alumni alcove of the College were obtained in Boğazköy. It is likely that White often took objects from Boğazköy before 1899⁶ in view of the fact that, stationed in Merzifon, he founded there an Archaeological Society. “He spent much of his time in studying the ancient ruins of the vicinity, especially at Boghazkeui and Eyuk”.⁷ Of the two tablets which are designated Merzifon 1 und 2 in the “Catalogue des Textes Hittites” and were published by A. H. Sayce in 1907,⁸ number 1 (= Sayce II) is now in Grinnell College and number 2 (= Sayce I)⁹ has disappeared without leaving a trace, as did the other tablets which were formerly kept in the American College in Merzifon.

As Güterbock himself writes,¹⁰ he heard from lecturers from said college around about 1935 that “a few Hittite tablets” were indeed kept there. In the summer of 1939, however, when the closure of that institution was impendent, they were no longer there, as Güterbock discovered, and were probably already gone in the summer of 1938.¹¹ It is remarkable that in Merzifon it was said that the tablets had been taken to the American College in Izmir, whereas in the above cited statement of R. S. Hardy of 1987 it is said that they are now probably in Tarsus.

³ MDOG 35 [1907] 6. I thank Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate for this reference.

⁴ All possible spellings are used to designate the modern town Merzifon in the literature and private correspondence. I use this last spelling, except in literal quotations in which a different spelling occurs.

⁵ The Tablet from Yuzgat in the Liverpool Institute of Archaeology, by the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D. D., M.R.A.S. and Theophilus G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S. (Asiatic Society Monographs, vol. XI). London 1907.

⁶ The letter from White to Parker dates from June 2, 1899 and was written in Salem, Mass. At that time the objects were already in Grinnell. It is therefore possible that they were obtained at least a year earlier in Boğazköy.

⁷ From a letter sent by Edgar J. Banks to Professor Spencer, dated December 11, 1939, as quoted by H. G. Güterbock in “Hittites” at Grinnell, 73.

⁸ JRAS [1907] 913–921.

⁹ Ed. A. Dinçol, JCS 24 [1971] 29–30.

¹⁰ “Hittites” at Grinnell, 74.

¹¹ Communicated by R. S. Hardy to H. G. Güterbock, as recorded on the same p. 74.

Translation Merzifon 3

x + 1

- 2' [As regards] the fact that [GN to His Majesty] by means of a dream [
 3' [as]ked, thus Hepapiia [
 4' [one shall] set up an investigation and [one shall] it [
 5' [to the god]head give [

Comments

The occurrence of the female office-bearer Hepapiia makes it possible to date this fragment to Urhi-Teššup/Hattušiliš III. The text is important in the sense that, because of the omission of GAL after DINGIR-LIM (see above), Hepapiia no longer allocates objects exclusively to one particular godhead, DINGIR GAL, as is the case in KUB 15.5+, but here to the (not regarded) godhead who requests the gifts (2' and 3'). In what is otherwise a brilliant article on Urhi-Teššup¹⁴, Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate recently cautiously promoted Hepapiia from “a female interpreter of dreams or a priestess or a female intendant (of an economic institution?)”,¹⁵ a relatively minor figure, to “a woman of considerable importance during the reign of Urhi-Teššup”.¹⁶ This he does on the grounds of her presumed occurrence in KUB 52.15 III 1'. Gladly would I like to see the occurrence of the intriguing woman who allocates objects to certain gods in more text passages, but I fear that in the fragmentary oracle text it is more a question of ^{MUNUS}Hepati than of ^{MUNUS}Hepa-SUM in III 1', because clearly in II 7' *He-pa-ti* must be read, as does G. Beckman in his review of KUB 52¹⁷. I hasten to add that this divergent reading has no influence on the tenor of the article of Houwink ten Cate.

On the ground of the Merzifon text we can, in any case conclude that Hepapiia did not specifically belong to the temple of DINGIR GAL, convincingly identified by Houwink ten Cate with Nergal, at least in texts with “sufficient Netherworld associations”,¹⁸ such as KUB 15.5+. The Merzifon tablet offered here yield little new information, but it makes a contribution, albeit small, to our knowledge of the Hittite religion.

Although the remains of the other three fragments are even smaller and the copies are moreover unclear, a transliteration is given below of the best preserved piece Merzifon 4, but without commentary.

Merzifon 5 and 6 have only 2 signs per line, making any transliteration useless, especially since there remain only 5 or 6 lines.

¹⁴ “Urhi-Teššup revisited”, *BiOr* 51 [1994] 233–259.

¹⁵ O.c. 252.

¹⁶ O.c. 252, n. 63.

¹⁷ *BiOr* 42 [1985] 139.

¹⁸ *BiOr* 51 [1994] 258.

Merzifon 4

1'	[]- <i>an-te</i> [

2'	[-] <i>uš-te-ni</i> x[

3'	[] ^['a'] <i>-ra-aḫ-za-ia</i> x[
4'	[] <i>ḫu-u-m</i> [<i>a</i>
5'	[] x TÚG?[