

NOV 14 1989

RESEARCH ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

/ HITTITE CULT-INVENTORIES /

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
DEPARTMENT OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES
AND CIVILIZATIONS

BY
CHARLES WILLIAM CARTER
"

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
JUNE, 1962

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer would like to take this occasion to acknowledge his indebtedness to those whose assistance has made the preparation of this study the stimulating and rewarding experience it has been. Prof. H. G. Güterbock, who suggested the Hittite cult-inventories as a topic for research, made many valuable suggestions and criticisms while this monograph was being written. Many hours were spent in his office discussing problems relating to readings of texts and the interpretation of various matters of a philological, historical, and religious nature with respect to which the cult-inventories are pertinent. The wealth of information in his files was extended freely. Profs. I. J. Gelb and Eric Hamp brought the author's attention to some relevant linguistic considerations. Profs. A. Leo Oppenheim and Erica Reiner gave invaluable assistance in matters pertaining to Assyriology. Miss Johanna Vindenas extended library privileges without which this work could not have been completed.

NOTES ON REFERENCE ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations of references cited in this study are those commonly employed in Hittitological literature. They are found, in the main, in the Abkürzungsverzeichnisse of Johannes Friedrich's Hethitisches Wörterbuch and its supplements. I have deviated from his lists only in the case of C.-G. von Brandenstein's Hethitische Götter nach Bildbeschreibungen in Keilschrifttexten, which Friedrich lists as von Brandenstein, Bildbeschr. In this one instance, I have followed the list of abbreviations of E. Laroche, Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites, where the symbol used is HG.

Ti asawac ken naganac caniac

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
NOTES ON REFERENCE ABBREVIATIONS	iii
Chapter	
I. CHARACTER AND PURPOSE OF THE HITTITE CULT-INVENTORIES	1
II. THE <u>HUWAŠI</u> , HITTITE SEASONAL FESTIVALS, AND THE PROBLEM OF CULTURAL SIMILARITIES IN ANTIQUITY	26
III. CULT-INVENTORY TEXTS IN TRANSLITERATION AND TRANSLATION, WITH NOTES	51
KBo II 1	51
KUB XII 2	74
KBo II 7	90
KBo II 13	105
KUB VII 24	116
KUB XVII 35	123
KUB XXV 23	154
IV. COMMENTS ON SOME WORDS AND NAMES OCCURRING IN THE HITTITE CULT-INVENTORIES	177
APPENDIX. SYNOPSIS OF HITTITE CULT-INVENTORY TEXTS	203

CHAPTER I

CHARACTER AND PURPOSE OF THE
HITTITE CULT-INVENTORIES

Among the myriads of clay tablets found in the ruins near the present-day Turkish village of Bogazköy, there are many that are known by the name "cult-inventories." This term is quite inclusive: the texts it labels are almost as heterogeneous a mixture as one could want. This fact alone makes the task of understanding the character of the texts difficult. When, in addition, the question of purpose is asked, the undertaking becomes an even more laborious one.

A superficial perusal of the cult-inventory texts will quickly point up the fact that they mention and sometimes describe the cultic figures of many gods at temples in various localities, list and occasionally describe the festivals pertaining to them, and indicate the offerings and other pertinent data related to their cults. But, the cult-inventories are, typologically, heterogeneous. Thus, the arrangement or order according to which one text presents data is frequently different from that of another. In addition, the formal layout of these texts is not always the same. Furthermore, there are differences in what, if anything, is described in the various texts.

Many of the cult-inventory texts are composed in keeping

with an outline according to which a cult center and the deity or deities (this sequence can be reversed) worshiped there are mentioned first. Following this, there are statements concerning images and symbolic objects, and offering materials. Next, the festivals performed are noted. This pattern is repeated for every cult treated in the cult-inventory text. KBo II 7 and 13 are clear-cut examples of cult-inventories that are composed in keeping with this outline. KBo II 8, KUB XII 36 and its duplicate XXX 37, XVII 37,¹ XX 14,² XXV 23, and VBoT 26 are other, albeit less well preserved, instances of cult-inventories where the data are presented in the same sequence.

To be sure, there are deviations from this pattern. Thus, in KBo II 1 ii 32; iii 13, 26, and 34, the stela is listed first, before the divine name. Moreover, in all of the sections of KBo II 1, mention of offering materials, the number of religious edifices pertaining to the cult, and cultic functionaries is made following the lists of festivals, not before. (Sometimes, as in cols. i 23-25, ii 4-6, reference to a group of functionaries also precedes the note on the number of temples.) The sequence in which data are presented in von Brandenstein's HG, texts 2, 3, and 4, is, in general, similar to that of KBo II 1. There are, however, some differences in this regard between the von Brandenstein texts, on the one hand, and KBo II 1, on the other. Thus, KBo II 1 mentions festivals and offering materials pertinent to the cults of the

¹See particularly obv. 16 ff.

²Note line 2 and cf. KBo II 13 obv. 24.

deities inventoried in it; the HG texts do not list them. (There is one exception here: in HG, text 2, festivals at Wiyanuwanda for LAMA and Ala are listed, among other things, on the left edge of the tablet.) VII 24 obv. mentions the name of the deity, includes statements about his statue and stela, notes the places at which he is worshiped, and then describes his festivals. The reverse of this text is arranged differently, in that the name of the cult center (here Hawalkina) must have preceded the list of deities and their inventoried cults: the statements in the colophon necessitate this conclusion. XII 2 is organized differently from the preceding in that the cult center, where mention of it is preserved, is noted at the end of the list of the inventories of the deities worshiped in it. In this connection, note col. iii 24 f. Apparently col. ii 4, which is possibly to be restored [ha-ti-wi-iš ŠA DINGIR.MEŠ ^{URU} x x x]x-en-ta QA-TI, is also relevant here. The sequence in which the data in HG, text 1, are presented is similar to that of the preceding, but no direct mention of offering materials is made. Moreover, the references to cult centers are oblique: it is stated that the (men of a specified) town perform(s) the religious rites pertaining to the deity or deities worshiped in that town. Both IBoT II 104 and XII 3 list cult data in a slightly different sequence. Thus, a stela (or other cult object) is at the head of each deity's inventory. Then comes the name of the deity. Next, various offering materials are enumerated. This is followed by a list of the festivals performed for the deity. Mention is made of the cult center at the end of the section containing the inventories of the

deities worshiped there, and in the same oblique manner as that found in HG, text 1. IBoT II 106 lists offering materials first, and then the deity's name. This is followed by a note on the festivals that form a part of the deity's cult. The name(s) of the cult center(s) is (are) not unambiguously preserved anywhere in the text.¹ It may have been noted at the end of each lined-off section of the text; or, possibly at the end or beginning of a series of such lined-off sections. IBoT II 108 is patterned somewhat similarly. Sometimes, to be sure, the lists of offering materials are preceded by the mention of a can (lines 3 and 12). After the listing comes the deity's name. However, the text is so broken that it is difficult to say what, if anything, may have been mentioned between the list of offering materials and the deity's name. The cult center may have been mentioned at the end of each deity's inventory, or at the end of a section containing the cult-inventories of a number of deities. But, perhaps it preceded these inventories, as in VII 24 rev. In XVII 35, each deity's cult inventory is introduced by a section in which the symbolic object or objects is listed first, followed by the deity's name, and then the cult center.² After this preliminary paragraph, the pertinent festivals are described. IBoT II 103 (particularly lines 3 ff) resembles XVII 35 i 4 ff in that a short, two line list of totals precedes one or more festival descriptions. It is possible, then, that the data in both texts were presented in the same sequence. Probably

¹The mountain mentioned in obv. 5 is probably a deity.

²Cols. ii 6 f, 35 ff; iii 23, 39 ff.

the same is true with respect to XVII 36, because the style of this text is similar in a general way to that of XVII 35. It is not possible to comment here on the order or arrangement of the cultic data in IBoT II 105, KUB XII 45, XIII 32 obv., XXV 24, and 25, VBoT 38, 49, and 122. They are too fragmentary.

The formal layout of the cult-inventory texts is, like the sequence in which data are presented in them, not uniform in all cases. Thus, some of the texts use a horizontal line (or a pair of such lines) to separate one part of a cult-inventory from another. That is, a preliminary paragraph is separated from subsequent sections of the text by a line drawn across the column. The various festivals, or portions of festivals, in turn, are similarly set apart from one another in the text. Any summaristic material is placed in a final paragraph which, like the others, is separated from those adjacent to it by a line. Major divisions of the text, which indicate a transition from the inventory of one cult center, or one deity, to that of another, are separated from each other by a double line.¹ On the other hand, there are texts that include a deity's complete, or, rather, all but complete inventory between two lines. One deity's inventory follows that of another, until the cults of all the deities celebrated in a given town are recorded. These texts do not once unequivocally preserve the name of any cult center, but they may have included mention of it either at the end of each lined-off section of the text or at

¹Examples: IBoT I 9, II 103, KBo II 7, 8 (the double line is used erratically in this text), 13, KUB VII 24 obv., XII 36 and its duplicate XXX 37, XIII 32 obv., XVII 35, 36, 37, XX 14, XXV 23, 24, 25, VBoT 26, 49, 122.

the end or beginning of a series of such lined-off sections.¹ In other texts whose formal layout is somewhat related to this type, the cult center is noted in a separate, lined-off paragraph that may either precede or follow the series of deities and their cult-inventories.² Still other texts include the inventories of all the deities worshiped in a given town, as well as mention of that town, in one lined-off section of the text.³ In the case of a few of the texts, the arrangement or formal layout is either unique, or the text is too fragmentary to permit a reliable comparison with some other, better preserved document. Thus, in HT 14, the line sometimes does, and at other times does not divide the inventory of one deity's cult from that of another. On the other hand, AboT 55 and XII 45 are not well enough preserved to show either a parallel to any of the other cult-inventories, or to exhibit a standard in keeping with which the scribes divided those texts into sections.

A classification of the cult-inventories drawn up according to the presence or absence of one or the other type of description contained in them exhibits a range in kind from mere listings of paraphernalia and festivals to attempts to describe minutely the material elements and activities pertinent to a given cult. An example of the former class is probably⁴ to be found in HT 14,

¹Examples: IBoT II 106, 108.

²VII 24 rev., XII 2.

³Examples: IBoT II 104, KBo II 1, 16, KUB XII 3.

⁴HT 14 is badly preserved, and therefore it is necessary to exercise caution in making statements about descriptions it may

where no indication whatever is to be found that the scribe intended to write a description of anything. The badly broken state of IBoT II 106 does not permit a categorical statement in this matter, but if any description was originally contained in the tablet, it was scanty. On the other hand, descriptive statements with respect to cultic objects and activities are found in many of the texts. Some, such as KBo II 1, include descriptions of material objects only. These statements may be either brief or extensive. Of the briefer sort, one is found in col. ii 12, where the new image for the Storm-god of Suruwa is said to be "1 iron bull, 1 sekan (in size)." By contrast, the new figure for the Storm-god of Sanantiya is described more elaborately as "1 iron bull, standing on all fours, two sekan (in size), (whose) eyes are plated with gold" (col. iv 3). Still longer descriptions are to be found.¹ A scrap of a text, IBoT II 105, though very fragmentary, bears all the marks of being of a kind with KBo II 1.² Similarly, KBo II 16 belongs in this class,³ as do HG, texts 1, 2, 3, and 4, which describe only cult images and objects. Although IBoT II 108 is in such a state as to preclude an unequivocal statement, there is no indication that the tablet originally contained descriptions of anything other than cult objects and offering materials. Different from the foregoing are texts that omit de-

or may not have contained. On the one hand, the text bears all the marks of what was originally merely a list. On the other, one sign (such as MI) can constitute a description, and it would not take up too much space.

¹Note, for example, KBo II 1 i 35 f; iv 4 f.

²See Laroche, Catalogue, # 294. ³Idem.

scriptions of images and other material elements of the cult, but make statements concerning the festivities performed at various shrines. Among the better preserved examples of this type are KBo II 7 and IBoT II 103. Other cult-inventories contain descriptions of materials (images, symbolic objects, and offering materials) as well as festivals. To be sure, descriptions of images are infrequent and scanty in XII 2.¹ More elaborate statements concerning materials and festivals are found in KBo II 8; KBo II 13; KUB VII 24; XII 36 and its duplicate XXX 37;² XVII 35; and XXV 23.

The descriptions of festivals contained in the cult-inventory texts follow the same pattern. Thus, after some preliminary remarks that serve to identify the particular festival to be treated, it is stated that the deity or deities is/are taken to the postament or the huwaši after a series of ablutions are performed. There follow sacrificing ("a specified animal to a/the deity/ies they offer; at a given place they slaughter it," both these statements are found regularly, and in this order); putting meat down at the appropriate place; listing of materials put at, on, or near the postament; thick bread breaking; filling rhytons; listings of materials to be used for display (particularly noteworthy is the order in which materials placed at the postament, or used for display, are listed; thus, grains and solid grain products, then liquids or containers for liquids, are listed, and in that

¹Note col. i 1 ("seated"), and col. ii 5 ("an ox of wood, standing on all fours").

²Laroche, Cat. 297.

order); eating and drinking; the arrangement of cups for display (this statement is sometimes followed immediately by GAL^{HI.A}-kan IGI-ziaš GAL^{HI.A} SIXSÁ-anteš in XVII 35; this fact has been kept in mind in making the restorations to col. iv 13, 23 of that text); entertainment for the deity or deities; and a procession back to the temple. To be sure, there are some minor variations of or deviations from this outline.

It should be noted here that the fact that a text contains a description of a festival, or festivals, does not make it a festival text. The festival text and the cult-inventory text are different in some respects. The festival text elaborates the ritual activities pertaining to some festival or festivals. Where preserved, the colophon to a festival text gives a brief indication of what is treated in it. Many of the festival texts treat but one festival (or part of a festival) each. Thus, X 89 vi 1 f (colophon) indicates that the text of which it is a part describes the activities of the second day of the festival of the month. II 13 vi 32 ff (colophon) shows that the text as a whole treats the festivities of the third day of the festival of the month. IX 16 iv 11-13 (colophon) indicates that this text concerns itself with the nuntariyašhaš-festival. XX 28 describes the spring festival at Zippalanda (see vi 3 ff [colophon]). Other festivals, too numerous to mention, are the subjects of other festival texts. Some of the festival texts, however, are not limited to the description of one (or part of one) festival. The colophon to XXV 32 + XXVII 70 (Laroche, Cat., 501, 1) indicates that the festivals of the town Garahna are described in that text. XXVII 68

iv 1-6 (colophon) notes that six deities of Nerik are "arranged (SIXSÁ-anteš) on the tablet; that is, the festivals of these deities are written down on it. (This conclusion as to the implication of the relevant sentence in the colophon is necessitated by the following considerations: in col. i 1-2, it is noted that the priest celebrates [restored] several festivals for the Storm-god of Zahaluka. This is followed in lines 3 ff by a description of a festival. Moreover, col. iii 5 mentions ^DLAMA. Since both these deities are mentioned in the colophon as deities of Nerik, and since there is one relatively well-preserved festival description and a small fragment of another in the remains of col. iii, it is necessary to conclude that the text concerned itself with the festivals of the deities mentioned in the colophon.) The festival text is, then, one the purpose of which is to provide a record of festivities that take place at a specified time and place.

In so far as the festival text provides a record of cult activities, it is a cult-inventory text. That is, it inventories a festival (or festivals), and such is (are) a part of the cult. It is not correct, therefore, to state that the festival text and the cult-inventory text are completely distinct entities. Nevertheless, there are differences between those texts that have traditionally been called cult-inventories,¹ on the one hand, and the festival texts, on the other. These differences are, essentially, concerned with the range of the features of the cult that

¹This traditionally limited use of the term will be employed throughout this paper.

are inventoried, the manner in which some of these components of the cult are introduced into the texts, and the personnel mentioned in the texts as participating in the festivals described therein. Furthermore, there is a marked preoccupation, in the cult-inventory texts, with the spring and fall festivals. This cannot be said of the festival texts. Even those festival texts which are concerned with the spring and fall festivals treat only one or the other of these festivals, not both.

The cult-inventory text is different from the festival text, with respect to what is inventoried, in that the cult-inventory text essays to record all the components of the cult (whether or not in complete detail), not just the activities associated with one or the other festival or festivals. Thus, the cult-inventory text lists (and frequently describes) images, symbols, tables, stands, and offering materials, among other cult paraphernalia, separately and apart from any mention of these items in a festival description contained in that text; the festival text, on the other hand, alludes to such particulars, not in a separate statement (note the qualification presently), but in the description of the festival and at such places in that description where said items are instrumental to and necessary for the execution of some phase of the festival being described.

The principal difference between the cult-inventory texts and the festival texts, in terms of the personnel said to participate in the ceremonies recorded in the festival texts, is the presence of the king (and frequently other members of the royal family) in the ceremonies recorded in the festival texts, on the one hand,

and his (their) absence as (a) participant(s) in the festivals outlined in the cult-inventory texts. Other functionaries mentioned in the festival texts, but not in the cult-inventories, are the ^{LÚ}ALAM.KAXUD ("statue worshiper"), the ^{LÚ}haliyari(ya)- ("priest singer"), the ^{LÚ}kīta- (a reciting priest), the ^{LÚ}MEŠEDI ("body guard"), the ^{LÚ}SILA.ŠU.DU₈.A ("cupbearer"), and the DUMU É.GAL ("courtier").

Some of the Hittite religious texts which, readily at first sight, might appear to be either festival texts, on the one hand, or cult-inventory texts, on the other, on closer examination do not admit of such facile classification. The joined text listed by Laroche in his Catalogue as # 501, 1 (XXV 32 + XXVII 70), is one of this sort. The colophon to this text (XXV 32 iv 17 ff) indicates that it concerns itself with the festivals of the town Garahna. A natural inference, then, is that the text is a festival text. But, the fact that the colophon reads as it does (viz., DUB I.KAM QATI ŠA EZEN.M[EŠ] ^{URU}Garahna, "one tablet, (text) complete, of the festivals of Garahna"), shows that the text is an inventory of festivals, and thus could be considered a cult-inventory. The festival described in XXVII 70 ii 19 ff + XXV 32 ii 1-32 reads like the festival descriptions contained in the cult-inventories, especially XXV 23 and, to a lesser extent, XVII 35. Furthermore, there is a separate, summary statement about offering materials in XXVII 70 ii 17 f. Also, the text contains the seal (XXV 32 iii) of Tabrammi, an official of the time of Tudhaliya IV. Since Tudhaliya IV is associated prominently with the cult-inventories, it might be argued that the presence of

Tabrammi's seal on this text indicates that the text is a report, and tends to support the thesis that the text is a cult-inventory. However, since, as pointed out previously, any festival text is a cult-inventory, no special significance in this connection attaches to the fact that a festival text describes more than one, or only a portion of one, festival. Moreover, the fact that two festivals are similar in some details has no bearing, in itself, on the type of text that contains the description of either of those festivals. Furthermore, it is only too obvious that texts coming from the same period of time are not necessarily all of the same genre. The fact that there is a separate summary statement of offering materials for one of the festivals recorded in the text does not, in this instance, make the text a cult-inventory text. For one thing, there is no allusion in this, or any other, separate statement in the text to images, symbolic objects, and festivals, nor to any of the paraphernalia of the cult except offering materials. Nor is there anywhere in the text any indication that such a separate and distinct allusion was made. Furthermore, the king participates in the festivals outlined in this text (XXV 32 i 1; ii 24, 33, 34; iii 1, 15, 16, 32, 33; XXVII 70 ii 19). The text is not, therefore, a cult-inventory text in the narrower sense of the term that is applicable to KBo II 7 and 13, KUB XVII 35, and XXV 23, among others. It is, rather, a festival text, albeit of a somewhat unique type. Similarly, XXVII 68, which records the festivals of six deities of Nerik, is not a cult-inventory text, but a festival text. This is so, in spite of the absence of any reference to the participation of the king in the festivals outlined in

the text, because the text, in its present state, at least, concerns itself with descriptions of festivals, and does not contain any separate statement about, or list of, cultic paraphernalia: it makes no attempt to give a general picture of the total cult situation as it is related to the deities mentioned in the colophon. The unpublished text, 230/p,¹ and its parallels, KBo VII 27, and KUB XXVII 13 and 15 (see Laroche, Cat., 392), bear a superficial resemblance to cult-inventories like KBo II 1. Nevertheless, while it is true that these texts are inventories treating the cult of Teshub and Hebat of Aleppo, it is not correct to liken them to that type of cult-inventory. For, these texts are essentially inventories of rituals performed for Teshub, Hebat, and their divine entourage. They do not make specific mention of some of the particulars pertaining to the cult, such as images, tables (the mention of the tables of the Sun-god of heaven in 230/p ii 17 is no valid exception, since the clause, mahhanma ^DUTU AN-E ^{GIŠ}lahhur-nuzziuš appanzi, is an expression for the time of day,² and not a reference to the presence of tables in the sanctuary), stands, and the like. Thus, these texts treat a relatively limited part of the cult, and do not give a general, over-all picture of the situation, whereas KBo II 1 and the other cult-inventory texts do. KBo X 20 is, as pointed out by Güterbock in JNES, 19, p. 87, "an outline as well as a cult-inventory" of the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival. It concerns itself with a relatively concise treatment of

¹For my knowledge of the contents of this text, I am indebted to Prof. H. G. Güterbock, who showed me his transliteration of it.

²See p. 29, note 1.

a long festival. It does not present a general inventory of the cult(s) of some deity or deities located at some specified town or towns. It is not, then, in the narrower sense of the term, a cult-inventory text.

Some of the texts included by Laroche in his list of inventories (Cat., 292-307) are manifestly not cult-inventories. KUB XII 1 (Cat., 292, 1) is, according to its colophon (col. iv 45 f), a personal property inventory. VBoT 87 (Cat., 293) is an inventory of the "house of the seal" (É^{NA}₄ KIŠIB, line 5). KBo VII 26 (Cat., 307, 4) and VBoT 9 (Cat., 307, 10) are lists of tribute¹ received, as are IBoT 1 31 (Cat., 306, 1)² and NBC 3842 (Cat., 306, 3).³

Many of the other texts Laroche includes in his catalogue of inventories have not been included in the preceding discussion of cult-inventories for a variety of reasons. In all probability, however, some⁴ of them are fragments of cult-inventory texts. On the other hand, some of the others⁵ are most likely not cult-

¹See KBo VII 26 2, VBoT 9 obv. 8, rev. 4.

²Cf. obv. 12. See Goetze, JCS, 10, p. 32.

³Obv. 4, 5, rev. 21. See Finkelstein, JCS, 10, p. 101.

⁴Bo 563, Bo 595 (Cat., 294, 4); Bo 5695 (Cat., 295, 4); Bo 2863 (Cat., 301, 10); KUB XX 89 (Cat., 302, 4); XI 12 (Cat., 303, 2), HT 57 (Cat., 303, 4); IBoT III 92 (Cat., 304, 4); 2151/g (Cat., 305, 10); VAT 7700 (Cat., 305, 11); AboT 54 + 105/c (Cat., 306, 2); IBoT II 102 (Cat., 307, 6); VBoT 42 (Cat., 307, 12).

⁵XII 4 (Cat., 305, 6; no reference to images or stelae); IBoT III 110 (Cat., 307, 1; a list of garments); KBo VII 23, 25 (Cat., 307, 2, 3; lists of garments); IBoT II 58 (Cat., 307, 5; this text is problematical, but reference to a specific year [rt. col., line 6] is not paralleled in the other cult-inventory texts); HT 53 and 69 (Cat., 307, 8 and 9); there is nothing to indicate that these are cult-inventory texts).

inventory texts. In either case, the fragmentary nature of these texts necessitates a cautious attitude. I have not, therefore, referred to any of these documents in attempting to define what a cult-inventory text is. The remainder of those texts Laroche lists as inventories have been excluded from the present treatment of cult-inventories either because, in my opinion, they are not cult-inventories, or because it is not possible to determine exactly what they are. Thus, IBoT III 120 (Cat., 301, 3) is not a cult-inventory text. It is more likely a report on what the king did for some cult(s) at a specific time, and may be a part of an historical text such as XXI 17. Note the use of the first person preterite in both texts. Similarly, XXXIV 87 (Cat., 304, 1) may be a part of an historical text which, also like XXI 17, includes some data concerning a cult. The use of the first singular preterite in rev. 11, 12 points in this direction. VBoT 83 (Cat., 301, 6), listed by Laroche as an inventory of a sanctuary, is actually a series of questions, addressed possibly to the king, and related to the taking of a cult-inventory. The text itself is not a cult-inventory text. IBoT II 131 (Cat., 304, 3), rather than being a cult-inventory, is a list of what is not found at cult centers. It may be a part of a survey made in order to ascertain what was to be done at various local shrines. XXV 22 (Cat., 302, 1), HT 71 (+ ?) IBoT III 100 (Cat., 305, 4), and XVII 19 (Cat., 305, 7) are not clearly distinguishable from festival texts. True, there are points of similarity between these texts, on the one hand, and XVII 35 and XXV 23, on the other. The resemblances are, however, restricted to descriptions of festivals.

It would be better, perhaps, to compare these texts with XXV 32 + XXVII 70 (Cat., 501, 1), on which see pp. 12-13 above. XXX 32 + 1042/c (Cat., 304, 6) is not a cult-inventory, but apparently a catalogue of preparations and donations for a festival.¹ VBoT 110 (Cat., 307, 14) may be something of the same sort, but its present state of preservation warrants caution.

There can be no doubt that the cult-inventory texts are reports that indicate the condition of the cults of various deities in specified cities. That is, they are the type of document requested by the king in the instructions to the chief of the border guard (BĒL MADGALTI). XIII 2 ii 42 f (part of the instructions for the BĒL MADGALTI) reads:

42). nam-ma ŠA DINGIR-LIM Ú-NU-TUM a-ú-wa-ri-ya-aš EN-aš
GUL-aš-du

43). na-at MA-ḪAR ^DUTU <-ŠI> up-pa-ú. . . .

42). "Furthermore, let the chief of the border guard make
a note of the utensils of the deity

43). and send it (the list) to my Sun. . . ."

In other words, the king² is asking his agent to send him a cult-inventory. Support for the thesis that these texts are reports compiled in response to a request such as the preceding is found at the beginning of XII 36, and its duplicate XXX 37: UMMA

¹See Sommer-Ehelolf, Vorwort to KUB XXX, p. iii.

²On the problem of establishing the identity of this king, see E. von Schuler, Hethitische Dienstanweisungen, p. 2. For the passage here quoted, see ibid., p. 46, with note 14, which refers to the duplicate, XXXI 90 iii 13 f, where the sign -ŠI- of DUTU-ŠI is written.

¹Tarhini LÚ ^{URU}Tamarmara, . . . "Thus (says) Tarhini, the Tamarmarite. . . ." Here the text begins in the way one would expect a report should. Moreover, the broken remains of col. iv and the left edge of HG, text 1, indicate that this text too is a report.¹ Unfortunately, it is impossible to know whether or not all the cult-inventories began or ended as do these two, because not all of them are preserved at the beginning or end. Nevertheless, their contents make it clear that their purpose is to give information or to report on the conditions obtaining at local religious centers. The lists of images, symbols, offering materials, and festivals in the cult-inventories necessitate such a conclusion: the only purpose such lists could have is to serve as reports. The frequent use of the first person plural past tense in HG, texts 2 (i 3, 9, 23, 24) and 3 (iii 4, 7, 16, 18), points in the same direction, as does the all but ubiquitous use (in the cult-inventories) of the expression ^DUTU-ŠI.²

Not only do the cult-inventory texts record the condition of the local religious cults, but they witness to the intensification of those cults.³ This is to be seen in the oft-repeated

¹The fragmentary lines preserved in these portions of the text constitute a part of an official letter, so that the text as a whole must be a report. See HG, pp. 10 f.

²If more of the texts, such as IBoT II 105, were better preserved, it would doubtless be possible to state that the expression was found in all of them.

³C.-G. von Brandenstein (MVAeG, 46, 2, p. 1) asserts that the inventories were made for the purpose of intensifying and restoring the state cult. In a way this is true. Statements to the effect that a local shrine has no priest (cf. KBo II 1 iii 6, 12, 19, 42), or that he has fled (see KBo II 1 ii 39; iii 33) could, and probably did, elicit positive action on the

antithesis annallan . . . kinun ("formerly . . . now") in KBo II 1. Here the former and present state of the cults are contrasted. There is a noticeable enrichment of these cults as the result of the donations made to them by the king. For example, the cult of the Storm-god of Suruwa had, in former days (annalan), one stela (col. ii 9). Now (kinun), it has, in addition, one iron figure of a bull (col. ii 12). That the bull did not replace the stela, but was an addition to the cult, is to be inferred in keeping with the comments in footnote 2, p. 34. It might, however, be argued that statements to the effect that there was not yet a priest (col. iii 6, 12, 19, 42), or that the priest had fled (cols. ii 31, 39; iii 33), or that the temple was not yet built (col. iv 15 f) indicate deterioration or degeneration, not intensification. To be sure, data of this sort, considered out of context, do support such a theory. It is impossible, however, to consider these items of information in isolation. Moreover, the

part of the king. It is another matter, however, to show that the inventories had this as their purpose. More probably, they were made in order that the king might have information concerning what the status of the cults was, and that he might have a record of what he had done on their behalf. Reports to the effect that the king had already enhanced the cults of various deities would not normally be made to the same king if the purpose of those reports were to intensify and restore the cult (see especially in this connection VII 24 obv.). Such a purpose would be served by an order, not an inventory.

If it should be objected that the expression ^DUTU-ŠI dāiš, or the like, is used in some of these texts, and that the use of this expression indicates that the king was the author of said texts, it must be pointed out that this statement does not necessarily mean that the speaker is using the first person singular. Sommer, HAB, p. 72, with note 3, has dealt with this construction and demonstrated that basically the ^DUTU-ŠI formula was an appellation used by subordinates in addressing the king. That a subordinate, in making a report to his ruler, should refer to him as "my Sun" is nothing other than one might expect.

fact that data of this sort, together with other and undeniable indications that the cults had been enhanced, are registered in the inventory, shows that the deficiencies of the cults had been given attention, with the intention of improving or correcting the situation. While, indeed, intention is not accomplishment, there is ample evidence in the case of all of the cults inventoried in KBo II 1 that, even though these cults were not yet in every instance satisfactorily cared for, their condition had been improved by the king. Since IBoT II 105 resembles KBo II 1 closely, and since the word annallan appears to be used in the IBoT II text (line 4) in a context similar to those in which it is found in KBo II 1, it is to be concluded that the Istanbul text points to the reformation of some cult. Note also in this connection XVII 35 ii 6, 35; iii 39; and VBoT 26 5. Enhancement of the cult is definitely and explicitly indicated in VII 24 obv. 1 ff, where it is stated that there were no divine images in former days (line 1), but that recently the king had contributed a statue in human form to the cult (lines 2 f). Obviously this indicates that the cult was enriched. A somewhat similar situation is implicit in IBoT II 103, where the former matters are listed together with those things which the king instituted. The reference to the former festivals in KBo II 8 i 14-16 points in the same direction. Furthermore, the fact that the festivals described in the cult-inventory texts are all based on one model (see pp. 8 f) tends to indicate imposition into the cult (and thus enrichment or intensification) from a single, outside source. KBo II 7 obv. 18 ff indicates, albeit in a somewhat indirect

manner, that the cult of the Storm-god of Hursa had been expanded as a result of the efforts of the king. In obv. 18 f, it is stated that the king instituted and established a statue, a temple, and a quantity of spelt for the cult of this deity. In obv. 27 (partially restored) mention is made of the sacrifice of eight sheep according to the former manner for this god. The reference in this section (that which treats the cult of the Storm-god of Hursa) of the text to the king's contributions to the cult alongside the reference to past or former custom demonstrates beyond a doubt that the king had acted to improve or enhance the condition of the cult. Furthermore, since each preserved section of KBo II 7 begins with a statement of what the king had instituted or established for the cult inventoried in that section, and since obv. 3 and 7 refer to sacrifices performed according to the former manner, it is necessary to conclude that obv. 1-17 of the text also show that the cult inventoried therein had been revamped by the king. Most of the other cult-inventory texts contain references to the king's activity on behalf of the cults treated in those texts. Nothing could be clearer testimony to the king's interest in religion and the benefit to the local cults of that interest than such statements.

That at least some of these texts, and consequently the renewal of the cult to which they bear witness, were composed during the reign of Tudhaliya IV has been demonstrated.¹ The reason for this king's attention to such religious matters is, in some if

¹See H. G. Güterbock, Vorwort to KUB XXV; A. Goetze, Kleinasien (2d ed.), p. 169.

not all instances, probably related to the fortunes of war. Tudhaliya's father, Hattusili III, succeeded in taking certain lands from the Gasgaeans and others. Among the cities thus taken by him were Hakkamis¹ and Nerik.² Hakkamis plays a central role in the religious activities recorded in XXV 23. Festivities for several gods, whose images had been transported thither, were performed there, and Tudhaliya's name appears in the text (iv 63). After Nerik was taken, Tudhaliya was made priest of the Storm-god of Nerik--and probably in Nerik--by his father.³ If, then, Tudhaliya was priest of this god in Nerik, it is more likely than not that the god and his cult made a greater impression on him than on any of his predecessors. Furthermore, if Hattusili's relationship to the goddess Istar of Samuha can be taken as indicative of his son's attitude, then this early association with the cult of the Storm-god of Nerik was probably the beginning of an interest that ran through the length of Tudhaliya's reign. The mention of this deity in some of the cult-inventory texts,⁴

¹Hatt. iii 11; cf. Goetze, BASOR, 122, p. 22, note 17. This in spite of the fact that, according to XXVII 80 iv, the festival of Nerik was performed in Hakkamis during the "years of hostility." The Hattusili text clearly states that Hakkamis revolted, and that Hattusili drove out the Gasgaeans.

²Hatt. iii 46 ff.

³XXV 21 iii 16; Goetze, BASOR, 122, pp. 24 f.

⁴For the Storm-god of Nerik, see VII 24 rev. 4; XII 2 iii 18, iv 8; XXV 25 4; XXX 37 iv 1. See von Brandenstein, op. cit., p. 74, note 2. His statement that the particular attention paid to the cult of the Storm-god of Nerik by Tudhaliya speaks for the thesis that this king was one of the builders (if not the principal one) of Yazilikaya holds true if the equation of Sarruma with the Storm-god of Nerik is valid. (On this, see Güterbock, Orientalia, n.s., 15, pp. 488 f.)

taken together with the fact that Tudhaliya was manifestly responsible for some of the inventories--including VII 24, which mentions Tudhaliya by name as having been responsible for the reform of the cult of Mt. Malimaliya, and presents an inventory of the cult of the Storm-god of Nerik at Hawalkina--tends to support the thesis that his decree was the occasion for the compilation of yet more of them. Sometime during Tudhaliya's reign, he became involved in a war with Kupanta-^DKAL.¹ On this occasion, Tudhaliya took several towns, which then came under Hittite control. Among the towns captured at the time was Assaratta.² This town is mentioned as a cult center in KBo II 1 ii 40. Since it is likely that the other localities mentioned in this text as cult centers are in the neighborhood of Assaratta--it being unthinkable that an agent of the king would skip about erratically from one end of the empire to the other while inspecting the conditions obtaining at several minor cult centers--it may be assumed that they too were visited at the time by the king.³ This would include the mountain Suwara, mentioned in both KBo II 1⁴ and KBo II 16.⁵ Furthermore, the mention of Masa and Arduka together in XXIII 21 ii 23--the text treating Tudhaliya's war with Kupanta-^DKAL--coupled with the association of Masa and Gursamassa in XVII 35 iii 9 ff

¹XXIII 21 ii 16 f. See A. Götze, Madd., pp. 156 f.

²XXIII 21 iii 4 f.

³See Forrer, Klio, 30, pp. 173-176.

⁴Cols. i 32, 37; iii 34; iv 17.

⁵Lines 7, 14.

(and, incidentally, the mention of the latter town in KBo II 1 iii 43), might be taken as an indication that the latter, too, was on the king's itinerary.¹ In view of the foregoing, it is likely, then, that KBo II 1, KBo II 16, and KUB XVII 35 were composed during the reign of Tudhaliya IV shortly after the time of his war with Kupanta-D^{KAL} and Arzawa. Internal evidence lends support to the thesis that at least some of the cult-inventories pertain to the crown's attempts to renew the cult after a period of war. Thus, KBo II 1 refers to the priests of various cult centers as having fled.² XXV 23 is more definitely to the point in that it indicates that the enemy has not been thoroughly conquered.³

In spite of the manifest typological heterogeneity of the cult-inventory texts, there are reasons for seeing in them a collection of reports on the work of one man that were composed at one relatively limited period of time. Some of these arguments for a variety of the texts have been discussed. It remains to be established or rejected whether or not the other texts can be associated with the same man and period. The fact that a Tudhaliya is mentioned by name in VII 24 obv. 2, XIII 32 obv. 8, XXV 23 iv 63, 24 ii 7, and XXXI 24 7 supports this view. The stylistic similarity between XXV 23, on the one hand, and IBoT II 103, XVII 35, 36, 37, XXV 24, and 25, on the other, is another case in point. The relatively close stylistic relationship between the aforementioned

¹Cf. O. R. Gurney, The Geography of the Hittite Empire, p. 109.

²Cols. ii 31, 39; iii 33.

³Col. i 12-14.

texts, on the one hand, and IBoT I 9, KBo II 7, 8, and 13, XX 14, VBoT 26, 49, and 122, on the other hand, is another argument supporting this thesis. The similarities of style between VII 24 and XII 36 (with its duplicate XXX 37) point in the same direction. So too do the characteristic expressions of KBo II 1, 16, and IBoT II 105.

To be sure, none of the above statements, taken by itself, establishes conclusively that all the cult-inventory texts witness to Tudhaliya IV's postwar contributions to local cults. On the other hand, when considered together, they weigh heavily in that direction.

CHAPTER II

THE HUWAŠI, HITTITE SEASONAL FESTIVALS, AND THE PROBLEM OF CULTURAL SIMILARITIES IN ANTIQUITY

A relatively large body of literature has been written on the question of cultural similarities in antiquity. Some of it is concerned with Hittite institutions. Thus, Otten, in OLZ, 1956, cols. 101 ff, has published in transliteration and translation a text¹ which describes an assembly of all the deities of heaven and earth at the beginning of the year in the house of the Storm-god, where they are to determine the fates for the year just begun. The existence of this text, mentioned by Ehelolf to Landsberger, contributed to the latter's suggestion that the Mesopotamian akītu-festival had its analogue in Hattusa, with its focal point at Yazilikaya.² Prior to this, W. Andrae had concluded, on the basis of comparative studies, that Yazilikaya was the Hittite akītu-house to which, at the appropriate time, a procession worked its way from the main temple which lay within the city walls.³ In another Hittite text which has been adduced as a possible indication of the existence of an akītu-festival in Hattusa, there is a

¹XXXVI 97.

²Sam'al, p. 113.

³Alte Feststrassen im nahen Osten, pp. 14-19.

description of a procession in which a god, seated in a chariot decorated with red, white, and blue streamers, is led from the city through the Tawiniya Gate to the tarnu-house in the wood, where he is worshiped according to the prescribed ritual.¹ Gurney, in commenting on this text, is reminded of the Babylonian akītu-procession, but thinks, nevertheless, that the similarity is "probably fortuitous."² The fourth column of those texts that preserve the Illuyanka myth (KBo III 7, and its duplicates XII 66 and XVII 6; Cat., 257, A, C, and D) relates that all the deities were convened with the Storm-god of Nerik for the casting of the lots(?).³ Such a setting resembles that of XXXVI 97, to a certain extent, and, likewise, may constitute an instance of the akītu-festival motif in Hatti. In MDOG, 86, p. 76, note 2, Prof. Güterbock notes that, according to a portion of a description of an AN.TAH.ŠUM festival, the king, on a trip from Tahirpa to Hattusa, stops first at an upper huwaši, and then at a second huwaši, after which he goes to Hattusa along the "great road."⁴ Güterbock then raises the question whether or not these huwaši-s may be either Büyükkaya or Yazilikaya.

The cult-inventories, as well as other Hittite religious

¹KUB X 91 ii contains the description, and a small portion of the ritual. Col. iii is separated from col. ii by a gap of unknown proportions. It is, however, probably a continuation of the ritual begun in col. ii. A comparison with the texts listed by Laroche, Cat., 495, shows that X 91 and the texts listed in 495 do not describe the same festival.

²G. Gurney, The Hittites (2d ed.), p. 130.

³KBo III 7 iv 10 ff; XII 66 iv 13 ff; XVII 6 iv 7 ff.

⁴See X 18 i 13 ff; X 17 i 1 ff.

texts, make frequent mention of huwaši-s and seasonal festivals. Now, if, as Güterbock has suggested, Yazilikaya is a huwaši, and if, as Andrae et al., have proposed, it is the center or focal point of the Hittite counterpart to the Mesopotamian akītu-festival, it is reasonable to expect that the Hittite seasonal festivals, in the descriptions of which the huwaši is mentioned prominently, will have affinities to the Mesopotamian akītu-festival. An investigation of the texts that contain such festival descriptions should point up details relevant to the huwaši and the seasonal festivals of such a nature as to permit a comparison between the huwaši and the seasonal festivals mentioned in those texts, on the one hand, and the akītu-house and the akītu-festival, on the other. Of course, the suggestions of Güterbock, Andrae, et al., will be either strengthened or weakened by the results of such a comparison, as well as by other pertinent considerations. It should prove to be instructive, then, if the cult-inventory and other religious texts that contain references to huwaši-s in descriptions of seasonal festivals are examined while the preceding remarks are kept in mind.

In KBo II 7 obv. 11-17, it is stated that the day after the spring festival begins, the image of Mt. Sidduwa is brought to the huwaši, where he, ^DU, ^DUTU, ^DLAMA, and ^DIMIN.IMIN.BI are worshiped. On the next day, he is picked up and taken into his temple, where the ceremonies continue. A similar situation is treated in KBo II 7 rev. 19-22, where the Storm-god of Ziyaziya and Mt. Kenkalisa are taken to the huwaši-s, and each is arranged

before his own huwaši and worshiped. Then, when evening comes,¹ the deities are returned to the temple, after which festivities are continued.² The parallel passage, found in KBo II 13, differs

¹The line reads: UD.KAM .kulanittar DINGIR.MEŠ INA É.DINGIR-LIM-ŠÚ arḫa pitinzi. . . . The parallel text has: GIM-anma nekuza mehuni kišari DINGIR.MEŠ SAL.MEŠ ḫazkaraiyaza arḫa pēdanzi. . . . (KBo II 13 obv. 19). Obviously, then, UD.KAM .kulanittar refers to the evening. But how is it to be understood? An examination of the passages listed by Laroche, *Dictionnaire*, p. 56, under kulani- would seem to indicate a meaning such as "to consummate," "to perfect," "to bring to an end," "to complete"; or, in the case of kulanaš (KBo II 38 4), "consummation," or the like. As to form, kulanittar is probably not an abstract noun, since -ittar does not normally serve to form abstracts in Hittite, and -hi is the abstract noun suffix in Luwian. It is probably better here to think of the Luwian 3 pres. sing. mid.-pass. suffix -tari; our form would, then, be an abbreviation from a longer *kulanittari, "it is completed." The line in question, then, would be translated, "The day is completed. The deities into their temples they carry."

Another time expression occurs in other cult-inventory texts in positions corresponding to those occupied by the two phrases mentioned above; that is, after the description of those ceremonies that are performed near the huwaši, and before the mention of the removal of the deity to his temple. It is GIM-anma ^{DUTU} AN-E ^{GIS} laḫhurnuzziuš appanzi (XVII 36 11 [context broken badly]; XXV 23 i 23, 48; ii 27 [text badly broken here]). From the relationship this clause bears to the statements preceding and following it, taken together with the fact that the two time-phrases mentioned above bear the same relationship to their contexts, it is to be inferred that it too refers to the advent of evening. This conclusion is supported by XXV 23 ii 26 ff, which runs:

- 26). SAL.MEŠ ḫazza[garaza duškiškanzi GIM-anma ^{DUTU} AN-E]
 27). laḫhurnu[zziuš appanzi. . . .]
 28). šešzi. . . .]

If the expression in question refers to evening, the occurrence here of šešzi, "he (the deity) spends the night," makes sense. (Cf. KBo II 7 obv. 14.) The phrase itself, to be sure, deserves comment. Behind ^{DUTU} AN-E ^{GIS} laḫhurnuzziuš may lie one or the other of two Hittite expressions: viz., nepišaš Ištuwaš laḫhurnuzziuš, or nepišaš Ištuun laḫhurnuzziuš, in which latter case we have a $\sigma\eta\mu\alpha \kappa\alpha\theta' \ \delta\lambda\omicron\nu \ \kappa\alpha\iota \ \rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ construction. In either case, the meaning is the same: "When they seize the tables of the Sun-god of heaven. . . ."

²KBo II 7 rev. 22 f.

in some relatively minor details from the report as preserved in KBo II 7. KBo II 13 obv. 11 ff begins almost exactly as does KBo II 7 rev. 19 ff. It differs in that, among other things, at a specified time--which itself is differently expressed in both places, although the reference is to the same time of day--the hazgara-women take the deities away and set them at or on their postaments, after which festivities continue; whereas, in KBo II 7 rev. 22, only the removal of the deities to their temples is noted. In KBo II 13 rev. 2 ff, the deities are brought to their huwaši-s, which are located by the spring Warwataliyanza,¹ and set before them. They are then worshiped, after which (no time reference²) they are taken away, arranged on or near their postaments, and the festivities continue. In XXV 23 i 10-25, it is stated that, when spring comes, the cultic representation of Mt. Halwanna is brought to a mountain, in case a not clearly specified area is under the control of the enemy. In case the area is not under the control of the enemy, the people participating in the ceremonies carry the image to the side of the river. The rites are then performed at the huwaši. When the sun sets,³ the god is taken back to the city and put in his temple, where the festivities continue. Two days later, the god is taken to Hakmis,⁴ but what, if any, rite

¹On this, see Laroche, Onomastique, p. 132. It is interesting to compare the spring and huwaši mentioned here with a place like Eflatun Pinar. See zarim(m)i/am(m)a, p. 201.

²But note line 9, . . . šaššanuš tiyanzi, ". . . They put up the lamps," which most probably points to a time after sunset.

³See p. 29, note 1.

⁴XXV 23 i 32 f.

is performed there subsequently is unfortunately not mentioned in the text, which states merely, . . . naš apiya, ". . . And he (stays) there." In lines 40-50 of the same column, the god ^DU UŠALLI of Urista is celebrated at the beginning of spring in a similar manner after he has been carried to Hakmis and placed before his huwaši. When the sun sets,¹ he too is taken to his temple. At this point the column ends. The text is badly broken from the beginning of col. ii to a place near the end of col. iv. Even so, it is clear that the spring festival of the Storm-god of the Thunder-Storm is celebrated in Hakmis.² Beginning with line 51, the text is once more in excellent condition. Here the spring festival of the Storm-god of Rain is described. But no mention is made of his being taken to a huwaši. He is, however, petitioned to provide a bountiful crop during the ensuing year³ in terms reminiscent of those found in XXXVI 97. The festival delineated on the left edge of this text is a spring festival, and is performed near a huwaši for the same god. A sheep is said to be slaughtered for him at the huwaši,⁴ and the text ends with the statement that there is entertainment.⁵ The time of day is not mentioned, nor is there any reference to the god being taken either to the huwaši or back to his temple. In XVII 35 ii 6 ff, two

¹See p. 29, note 1.

²Col. iv 38 ff.

³Col. iv 57-59.

⁴Left edge, left half, 4.

⁵Ibid., right half, 4.

deities--^DU of Gursamassa and ^DUTU MĒ--are mentioned in connection with the filling of the harši-vessels; that is, the fall festival for each is performed at the same time. After this, there is a description of a spring festival; but, mention is made of the Sun-goddess only. Furthermore, the festival of the Sun-goddess is said to take place only when that of the Storm-god has been completed.¹ The occurrence of these two names in line 6 cannot, therefore, be construed as depicting an assembly of deities. Be that as it may, the goddess is taken to the huwaši and worshiped. When evening comes (ii 27), she is taken back to the temple, and the ceremonies continue. In column iii of the same text, line 20, it is said that the "spring festival is patterned according to the fall festival." Only the fall festival is described at length in lines 1-19. During this festival, Iyari of Gursamassa² is taken to the huwaši by the priest, and there worshiped. In addition,

¹Col. ii 12-14.

²The text from col. ii 35-iii 22 treats the cult of Iyari of Gursamassa. After the preliminary listing in ii 35-37, it resumes in iii 1 with the phrase, mān ANA ^DU EZEN zeni. . . . The seeming alternation of Iyari in ii 37 and ^DU in iii 1 is tempting. At first glance, it might be said to show that Iyari is the name of the Storm-god of Gursamassa. But, is Iyari the name of this deity? I think not. In col. iii 1 the phrase reads, "When for the Storm-god there is the fall festival, . . ." which is merely a statement identifying a particular period of time, just as col. ii 9 refers to the same time. That is, both ii 9 and iii 1 identify the time at which the fall festivals for the Sun-goddess of the Water and Iyari, respectively, take place; viz., at the time of the fall festival of the Storm-god, a description of which festival is not preserved in col. i of the text. Furthermore, col. ii 1-5 shows clearly that the festivals for the Storm-god were delineated in col. i. (Note particularly in this connection the occurrence of [EZEN FEŠI ^{DUG} harši h ēšuwa[š] and [EZEN pul aš in i 16, 17, and ii 3, 4.)

^DIMIN.IMIN.BI is a recipient of a sacrifice made at the huwaši.¹ The festivities continue, and afterwards (no reference is made to the time of day), Iyari is taken back to the temple and the ceremonies continue. Since the spring festival was to be patterned on this model, we know that the ceremonies of the spring festival were of the same sort.

Other pertinent texts in this connection are XII 2 and 3, and KBo II 1. These texts are listings of the cults of many deities.² In XII 2 there is manifest a patent connection between the huwaši and the spring festival; that is, in the lists of cultic appurtenances which are noted as being at hand for the spring festival for a given deity, the huwaši is all but universally mentioned.³ Moreover, it may be that there is a reference in this text that indicates an assembly of deities during a spring festival. Thus, col. iii 18, which inventories the cult of the Storm-god of Nerik at a town the name of which is not clearly legible (iii 24), refers to a sacrifice made also for the "male gods" at the time of his spring festival. The names of the several deities whose festivals are listed in XII 3 are not, to be sure, all preserved. But the text bears some resemblance to XII 2 in form: it too lists various deities whose spring festivals are

¹iii 4. There may be a question as to whether or not there is here a real divine assembly, since ^DIMIN.IMIN.BI is sometimes a subordinate or satellite of other deities (cf. KBo IV 13 i 13, 14). Nevertheless, the fact remains that sheep are sacrificed for two deities.

²Cf. Bossert's notes on XII 2 in Belleten, 16, p. 502. See Forrer, MDOG, 61, p. 38, for a resume of an hitherto unpublished Hittite text of a kind with XII 2.

³Exceptions: cols. iii 9 f, 15 ff, 18 f; iv 1 ff.

celebrated at or near a given town and in connection with huwaši-s. But it cannot be demonstrated that XII 3 depicts a divine assembly. KBo II 1 lists the deities of one city or another, their huwaši-s and other cult objects, and their festivals. The manner in which the festivals are listed indicates that each of them was intended for all the deities mentioned in any given section of the text.¹

In the preceding paragraph, a deliberate limitation has been imposed on the materials to be treated. Accordingly, the spring festival (save for XVII 35 iii 1-19) alone was examined. If such a restriction were to be lifted, it would be possible to adduce more instances of seasonal festivals involving processions to huwaši-s. Thus, in some of the above cited texts, there are references to the huwaši and its use during the autumn festival. To be sure, KBo II 1 is not explicit in terms of the role of the huwaši during either the spring or the fall festival. Here the inventory of a given deity's cult merely mentions a huwaši (or huwaši-s) and spring and fall festivals. In view of the data furnished by other texts, however, it is probable that the huwaši-s mentioned in KBo II 1 were ritual focal points during both the spring and (at least some of) the fall festivals.² In a somewhat

¹While groupings of divine families, or of a god and his retinue, are not exactly assemblies of deities in the sense that each has come from his own (and different) abode to a single cultic center where a grand festival is to be performed, the fact remains, nevertheless, that in such groups more than one deity is present.

²It must be argued that the huwaši here is the deity, in much the same way that a bull image or human statue is (or at least represents) the deity. If so, how are we to understand those passages, such as XXV 23 i 40 f and KBo II 7 obv. 11, where the statue or image of the deity is carried to the huwaši? In my

similar manner, XII 2 ii 8 ff and XII 3, passim, list the huwaši-s of various deities in connection with both festivals. In XII 2 ii 8 ff, the reference to the role of the huwaši during the spring festival is indirect. That is, the spring festival is said to be patterned on the model of the fall festival. In XII 3, on the other hand, the references to the autumn festivals are made in terms of the spring festivals; that is, a list which mentions the deity's huwaši and the offering materials for the spring festival, is followed by the statement that the fall festival is of the same sort. In XVII 35 iii 20, again, it is stated that the spring festival is patterned after that of the fall. The autumn festival (1-19) is characterized, in part, by the fact that Iyari of

opinion, there is an essential difference between the two. Thus, a god had his huwaši, and this huwaši was the focal point of the ceremonies celebrated for him. The figures or statues which, frequently as a part of a religious reform, were given by the king to the cults of many deities, could be used in the processions that formed so characteristic a part of the festivals recorded in the cult-inventories. Such images were so used, as many of these texts demonstrate. VII 24 obv. 4 cannot be entered as an objection to

this interpretation. The expression, ^{NA}4ZI.KIN-yankan can, to be sure, be translated, "And him (as) a huwaši. . . ." But, it can also be read, "And his huwaši. . . ." The reading of the text is determined by one's understanding of what a huwaši is; this text alone does not determine the meaning of huwaši. To be noted in this connection is XX 99 iii 9 f and 16 f, where in each case the

text reads: . . . nankan EGIR-pa^DIM-aš ^{NA}4huwašiya dāi. If the huwaši were a fetish, it would hardly be found in a construction of this sort. Therefore, it seems to me that the former state of the cults of many deities was poorer than the reformed condition because in the latter case there were images of the deities that could be used in connection with the festival processions to the huwaši-s, whereas in the earlier state no such images were available for said processions. Furthermore, in view of the preceding, the huwaši-s of XII 2 and 3, and VII 24 rev. 6 are seen to be appurtenances of the respective cults, and as such are designated, as are the other items enumerated in each of these texts, as being at hand for some specified festival.

gursamassa is taken to the huwaši by the priest, receives homage there, and finally is taken back to the temple. huwaši-s¹ are associated with the fall festival recorded in VII 24 rev. 6 f. Some of the references in XXV 23 to the huwaši in those paragraphs treating fall festivals are preserved. In no case, however, can it be said that a procession to a huwaši standing in an open space outside the city is clearly described or mentioned in this text in connection with a fall festival. In col. iv 47-50, which alludes briefly to a fall festival, the Storm-god of Rain is depicted as being removed from the vicinity of his huwaši into the temple of another deity. It is likely that cols. ii 10 ff, iv 4 f, 11 ff, 33 ff depict the same sort of activity. No removal, as such, is explicitly mentioned in col. i 34-37. Such a removal is, though, mentioned in XVII 35 ii 6 f.

Another text, KBo II 8, mentions a procession to a huwaši in connection with one of the festivals it outlines. In col. iii 4 ff, the "festival of wielding the sickle on the mountain,"² is

¹The reading of this line (VII 24 rev. 6) is difficult, because it is in part a palimpsest. The crucial part of the line might conceivably be read either as ^{NA}4ZI.KIN.MEŠ GIŠ TIR ar-ta-ri,

or as ^{NA}4ZI.KIN.MEŠ GIŠ SAR ar-ta-ri. The present traces of the sign TIR/SAR seem to favor the latter alternative, because the final vertical is not broken, and there are no traces of the small Winkelhaken that characterize the bottom portion of the TIR sign. But, the first part of the sign is good for TIR. Furthermore, TIR in this sort of context is known; SAR is not. In any event, the huwaši-s stand outside the city proper. If the plural ^{NA}4ZI.KIN.MEŠ is to be read, it would seem that the cult of Iarri at Hawaikina was prepared for a festival at which more than one deity might be worshiped. Cf. KBo II 7 rev. 19 ff, and the parallel KBo II 13 obv. 11 ff.

²This is the EZEN URUDU ŠU.KIN tar-nu-um-ma-ni HU[R.SAG-i]

described. After the various offering materials are brought together, the deity is taken to the "raging" spring and placed in front of his huwaši.¹ There he is worshiped. It is not stated that he is returned to the temple.

In KBo II 1 i 43, three festivals are listed as part of the royal establishment for the cult of the Storm-god of Maras. The last one listed is EZEN HUR.SAG-i pēdummaš, "festival of carrying to the mountain." Here we have what may be a very brief reference to the type of ceremony recorded in XXV 23 i 11, which reads: nu HUR.SAG Halwannan HUR.SAG-i UGU pitinzi, "And they carry (the image of) Mt. Halwanna up to the mountain." When the god arrives at the mountain, he is set on or near his huwaši, and there worshiped.²

Other Hittite texts describe festivals in which the king, among others, participated in a procession to a cultic place, outside the city proper, where ceremonies for a number of deities were performed.

of col. i 15. It is very likely that the final sign (-ni) in tarnummani is a mistake for -aš. On the meaning of ŠU.KIN, see Eisser and Lewy, MVAeG, 33, p. 71, note. On tarna-, cf. Götze's notes in Neue Bruchstücke, pp. 71 f.

¹Cf. p. 30, note 1.

²Line 12, partially restored. Perhaps also pertinent here are the activities that take place during the 32d through 34th days of the AN.TAH.SUM-festival as recorded in the calendar recently published by Güterbock in JNES, 19, pp. 80-89. In this text it is said that the king and queen spend part of three days in the neighborhood of the mountain Piskurunuwa (col. iv 3-10). On the second day (the text is broken, obliterating the word in question; but, in the light of the situation discussed above [see p. 34, note 2], and the fact that there is room for about two signs, it is probably DINGIR-LAM--that is, the cultic representation of the deity) is carried up to the mountain (iv 7 f). On the third day, the king and queen go up to the mountain and participate in the festival ceremonies (iv 9-10).

One such text is XX 85 (+) XX 48,¹ a text that presents a description of a festival performed in the spring. According to this text, the king goes up to a mountain and enters a tent, in which a huwaši is located. There he washes his hands.² After this, the huwaši is purified,³ and then the king and his assistants complete the performance of the ritual for the deities listed.⁴

Laroche lists in his Cat. (501, 1) a joined text, XXVII 70 + XXV 32. Beginning in XXVII 70 ii 19 + XXV 32 ii 1, there is a description of festival activities the features of which are similar to those found in cult-inventories like XXV 23.⁵ According to this text, the Sun-god is carried to the forest and set down at or near his huwaši.⁶ Offerings are made, and "all the deities" are celebrated.⁷ After the performance of the rites associated with the huwaši, the Sun-god is taken back to his temple.⁸ It is to be noted, however, that the participation of the king in this festival is mentioned only in connection with the first part of the celebration, before the procession to the wooded area takes place.⁹

The texts listed by Laroche in his Cat. under 495¹⁰

¹Laroche, Cat., 475. Riedel, Bemerkungen, p. 9.

²XX 85 i 7 ff. ³Ibid., line 15.

⁴XX 85 v 6, 12, 16; XX 48 i 9; v 2; vi 4, 7, 11 ff.

⁵For a discussion of the relationship of XXVII 70 + XXV 32 to the cult inventories, see above, pp. 12-13.

⁶XXV 32 ii 3 f + XXVII 70 ii 25 f.

⁷XXV 32 ii 18 f, 27. ⁸XXV 32 ii 28.

⁹XXVII 70 ii 19 ff.

¹⁰The differences between XX 63 + XI 18 and XX 42 are slight and not significant for the present purposes. These texts

depict an AN.TAH.ŠUM festival performed in the spring at the tarnu-house near the grove of boxwood trees.¹ Inside the tarnu-house there was a huwaši of the Storm-god of Hatti,² where ceremonies were performed--with the participation of the king throughout--for an indeterminable number of deities.³ That a procession from some point in the city to the tarnu-house formed an integral part of this festival is indicated by the statement of the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival calendar.⁴

The data reviewed above demonstrate that the huwaši-s were cult objects which figured prominently during certain seasonal festivals in connection with processions (occasionally clearly said to be upwards) to locations sometimes specifically stated to be outside the confines of the town or towns where the deity or deities

are duplicates. The same relationship does not, however, exist between these texts, on the one hand, and XI 22, on the other. That both groups describe an AN.TAH.ŠUM festival for the Storm-god of Hatti at the tarnu-house near the forest of boxwood trees during the spring is clear. But the rites described in the one deviate somewhat from those mentioned in the others. Note also that XI 22 does not mention Tudhaliya, whereas the introductions to the other texts do. It is conceivable, then, that the latter (XX 63 + XI 18 and XX 42) constitute a revision of the former (XI 22), which revision was drawn up in keeping with the instructions of the king.

¹Cf. Güterbock, JNES, 19, pp. 82, 86, where the calendar for the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival merely alludes to the activities more fully documented in these texts. The question of the location of the tarnu-house is important here. If the evidence of X 91 can serve as a norm, then the tarnu-house is always outside the city gate. XIII 2 ii 19 points the same way when it refers to the tarnu-houses of the forests, vegetable gardens, and wine gardens. (On this see Ehelolf, KLF, I, p. 154, note 2.)

²XX 63 11 f; XX 42 i 10 ff; XI 22 i 2 f.

³XI 18 ii 7, 24; iii 19; XX 42 ii 3; XI 22 ii 6, 12, 19,
24, 26.

⁴Col. ii 27-31.

were worshiped. Sacrifices¹ and other offerings² were frequently made at the huwaši. Moreover, in at least one instance,³ the huwaši could be entered.

Since most of the huwaši-s were made of stone (but note, for example, the exception mentioned in KBo II 1 ii 12, which is said to have been made of silver), it is to be expected that some of them are still reasonably well-preserved. The summary statements

¹See under huek-, p. 189.

²KBo II 13 obv.13. Thick bread is placed in front of the deities, each of whom is in front of his huwaši.

³II 3 ii 32 ff. The text runs:

32). LUGAL-uššan ^{DU-aš} ^{NA}₄ huwašiya

33). anda paizzi ^{NA}₄ huwašiya

34). UŠKĒN ^{LÚ} ALAM.KA×UD memai

35). ^{LÚ} kītaš halzāi

36). taš ^É arkiui tiyazi

32). The king goes into the huwaši

of the Storm-god. In the huwaši

34). he prostrates himself. The statue worshiper speaks. The kīta-man calls.

36). And he steps to the arkiui-house.

To be sure, questions can be raised concerning the interpretation of the preverb, anda, in line 33, and the function of the dat.-loc., huwašiya, in that line. Thus, one might argue that anda paizzi denotes the king's going into a place where the huwaši was located. But why is this not expressly stated? That is, why is there no explicit mention of the place wherein the huwaši was located? Or, why is there no more explicit reference to the king's activity, so that the distinction between what the king enters, and to what he goes, is made clear? (In this connection, see XX 99 ii 4, LUGAL-

^{NA}₄ uš-kán hu-wa-ši-ya pí-ra-an an-da pa-iz-zi, "The king goes into [some place, the mention of which is not preserved in the text], in front of the huwaši." It would seem to be necessary, then, to think of the huwaši mentioned in II 3 ii 32 f as something which can be entered. If this interpretation is correct, then huwašiya in line 33 must be read, "in the huwaši," and not, "at the huwaši."

p. 39 would seem, at first sight, to characterize some of the Hittite hieroglyphic monuments. Thus, some of these monuments are not infrequently found outside the confines of a town.¹ In some instances, it is necessary to go to higher ground to reach them.² In at least three cases, there is clear evidence of the performance of some kind of offering at the monument.³ One of them can be entered.⁴ There are, then, a number of hieroglyphic monuments that archaeological considerations demonstrate to have played a role in the cult quite like that of the huwaši-s mentioned in the cuneiform texts. Moreover, Bossert⁵ has argued that the hieroglyphic word wanai- (found on and designating some of these monuments) and cuneiform huwaši are etymologically identical. Thus, according to Bossert, the chisel-sign, written with or without the oval, and found as a determinative before words designating objects made of stone and sometimes inside the hieroglyphic, logographic sign for wanai-, has the phonetic value hu. But, it was always limited to this value, as is to be seen in the word

¹For example, Eflatun Pinar, Fraktin, Imankulu, Ivriz, Kötükale, Gezbel, Yazilikaya.

²E.g., Ivriz, Gezbel, Yazilikaya.

³Yazilikaya: see Bittel, Naumann, and Otto, Yazilikaya, pp. 10, 28, 72 f and plates 3 (# 4), 7 (# 3), and 17. The references describe and picture an offering trough in a rock in front of the main chamber, and a conduit and a basin (in front of figs. 35-39) intended for liquid offerings. Karahüyük: the offering trough, and possibly also the animal bones found in the earth near the monument. (See T. and N. Özgüz, Karahüyük, pp. 70 f.) Çekke: the inscription notes that offerings were to be made at this monument. (See Belleten, 16, p. 541.)

⁴Yazilikaya.

⁵Belleten, 16, pp. 495-545; see particularly pp. 511-513.

(A 11 a 4; Bossert's figure 4), where the sign must have the value huha (so Laroche, HH, I, # 331, against Bossert, op. cit., p. 511, who inserts <ha>). Furthermore, the chisel-sign (without oval) represents the relative pronoun, which by the time of Karatepe had become wa-, but which cannot have begun with huha-; therefore, at one time it must have been *huwa-. With the passing of time, the phonetic value of the sign was simplified to hu. Now, in the second millennium, the chisel-sign was written inside the hieroglyphic sign for wanai-. Accordingly, either both signs had the same reading, or both began in the same way; viz., huwa-. Since the later form of our word is wanai, and since the later form of the relative pronoun is wa-, it must be concluded that at some earlier period these words were *huwanai- and *huwa-, respectively. In a late thirteenth century inscription from Emirgazi (II M XLIX 2; Bossert's figure 12), the word used in reference to the monument is awana- or awanai- (but, see Laroche, HH, I, # 267). In accordance with this writing, Bossert theorizes that *huwani- became *hawanai-, which already in the thirteenth century was awanai, which in turn and in still later times lost the initial a-. In view of the foregoing, then, huwaši- and *huwanai- can be analyzed as huwa + ši and huwa + na + i. Both words are similar in formation, and most likely mean, "pertaining to the chisel," or "chisel-work." Bossert's arguments, however, are not free from criticism. For one thing, his reading of the relative pronoun has not enjoyed universal acceptance. In addition, it is necessary to show that the ending -ši- in cuneiform Hittite functions in the same manner as does -na + i- in hieroglyphic.

The reading of the relative pronoun depends on the phonetic value of the chisel-sign. According to Bossert, this sign occurs in the Kötükale inscription (HMM, 40) in the name of the man the inscription says to be the father of Sulumeli, and the grandfather of Hilaruada. According to Urartaeen sources, the man in question must be Sahuwa.¹ The Kötükale inscription is not, however, too well-preserved at this point.² On the other hand, the reading of the name tends to be corroborated by the presence of the name of a ruler of Malatya (𐎠 𐎢𐎠𐎶 , Sa-hu(wa?)-sa) in an inscription near Şirzi.³ While such considerations tend to support the value hu or huwa for the chisel-sign, they do not serve to establish certain proof of such a value.⁴

The ending -ši- in cuneiform Hittite nouns is not too well attested. I know of only one example besides the word in question; viz., ^{LÜ} pahhurši-. This term refers to a man not capable of becoming king. If, as has been thought, illegitimacy was the cause of his disqualification, then the term itself may just possibly be related to the word pahhur ("fire") in the same way Bossert suggests huwaši- is related to *huwa-. To my knowledge, there are no other hieroglyphic words ending in -nai-. It is, at present, therefore, impossible to determine from hieroglyphic sources whether or not

¹See H. Th. Bossert, "Zur Chronologie der Skulpturen von Malatya," Felsefe Arkivi, 2, 1947, Abb. 17.

²See the photograph and copy in Gelb, HMM, 40. Cf. Laroche, HH, I, # 329, II (p. 173).

³Bossert, AfO, 17, pp. 56-70, especially Abb. 9 and p. 68.

⁴See Laroche, HH, I, p. 173.

Bossert's suggestion as to the meaning of the ending is correct. At the same time, the language of the Hittite hieroglyphs is a dialectical variant of Luwian, and the Luwian word wani- is most likely the same as hieroglyphic wanai- (cf. Laroche, Dict., p. 106). The ending -ni- is not an isolated occurrence in Luwian, limited only to the word wanai-. It is found also in the words t/dawani (cf. t/dawi-, "eye"), and titani, "breast" (cf. titai-, "to suckle"). The meaning of t/dawani- is not clear; so, this word supplies no relevant, usable information concerning the significance of the ending -ni-. But that titani- ("breast") is something related ("of or pertaining to") to titai- ("to suckle") cannot be denied.

In view of the foregoing considerations, it is necessary to conclude that there is linguistic evidence--albeit not completely satisfactory--to support Bossert's etymological identification of cuneiform huwaši- and hieroglyphic wanai-. The archaeological data mentioned above in connection with statements from cuneiform sources point in the same direction. Thus, there can be no very serious doubt that cuneiform huwaši- and hieroglyphic wanai- designate the same thing; viz., the type of Hittite hieroglyphic monument on which the word wanai- frequently appears.

Now, it is known that Yazilikaya was used for funerary purposes. It might be argued, then, that Yazilikaya is not a huwaši, on the assumption that a funerary sanctuary cannot be used for other purposes. On this point, however, it should be noted that there are texts according to which a part of the material devoted to the deity in the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festival for ^DZA.BA₄.BA₄ is brought IŠTU É.NA₄DINGIR-LIM, "from the royal burial cham-

ber."¹ The materials treated by Otten also demonstrate that the NA₄ DINGIR-LIM was not restricted in use to burial rituals.² Further indication of this is found in IBoT III 1,³ where the bešti-house is a place for ceremonies both for the underworld deity and for the principal deities of the kingdom. It is impossible, then, to argue, on this count, that Yazilikaya was not a huwaši.

As has been noted above, various scholars have been prompted by one or the other consideration to suggest a connection or relationship between a given Hittite festival and the Mesopotamian akītu-festival. In order to examine such a proposal, it is first necessary to have as clear an idea as possible of the nature of the akītu-festival. In a relatively recent article entitled "akīti-Fest und akīti-Festhaus," Falkenstein has pointed out that the Mesopotamian akītu-festival was not in all places and at all times exactly the same,⁴ but that there were, nevertheless, six aspects of the festival which at least in all probability characterized it from its earliest beginnings. These he lists as: (1) the akītu-house was in the precincts of the city, but outside its walls;⁵ (2) it lay near or on a canal, though this seems not to have had any special cultic significance;⁶ (3) there was a procession to the akītu-house in connection with the festival;⁷

¹See, for example, II 5 i 38 ff = XXV 1 iii 11 ff.

²Otten, ZA, NF, 12, pp. 233 f.

³See Güterbock, MDOG, 86, pp. 75 f.

⁴Festschrift Johannes Friedrich, p. 164.

⁵Pp. 164 f. ⁶Pp. 165, 166. ⁷P. 165.

(4) the king's participation was apparently a duty;¹ (5) the festival was a joyous affair, and included the people;² (6) the festival was not celebrated in all cities, not even all the major cities.³

If the spring and fall festivals delineated in the cult-inventory texts, as well as the other festivals to which allusion has been made in this survey, are examined against Falkenstein's outline, the similarities between them and the akitu-festivals of Mesopotamia become apparent at once. Accordingly, (1) as has been shown (see above, p. 39), the focal point of the Hittite seasonal festivals lay in the vicinity but outside the confines of the town with whose cult it was associated. To be sure, the huwaši (the focal point of the Hittite festivals), cannot always be said to be an akitu-house. It was, however, and on occasion, situated in a tent or in the tarnu-house. In at least one textually attested instance (II 3 ii 32 f), it could be entered.⁴ In all cases, religious rites (frequently for more than one deity) were performed at or in the huwaši. (2) In some of the festival descriptions, the huwaši is said to be situated near a body of water.⁵ Many of the Hittite monuments are located in the immediate vicinity of a stream or spring.⁶ (3) There was invariably

¹Idem. But, it was possible for him to deputize these functions; cf. p. 162.

²p. 165. ³Idem.

⁴See above, p. 40, note 3.

⁵KBo II 13 rev. 4; KBo II 8 iii 13 f; XXV 23 i 15.

⁶E.g., Ivriz, Sirkeli, Gavur Kalesi, Eflatun Pinar, Fraktin, Imamkulu, Taşci, Karabel, Yazilikaya (stream now diverted from

a procession to the huwaši in the festivals described in the cult-inventories, as well as those delineated in some of the other Hittite religious texts.¹ (4) As has been pointed out above,² some of the Hittite festival texts mention the king as participating in festivals of which a characteristic feature is a procession to a place where one or more huwaši-s are located. Therefore, the lack of reference to royal participation in similar festivals outlined in the cult-inventories is not to be taken as an argument against the thesis that something like the Mesopotamian akītu-festival existed in Hatti. Furthermore, deputation of the king's responsibility in matters of this sort is known even for Babylon and Harran.³ In addition, the fact that the king instituted at least some of the elements of various local cults mentioned in the inventories is indicated by the oft-repeated phrase, ^DUTU-ŠI ME-iš ("My Sun instituted"), or its equivalent. While this is not the same as deputation of specific cultic tasks, it does demonstrate that the king assumed the responsibility for the maintenance and enhancement of local religious practices. (5) Merry-making and popular participation characterize at least some of these ceremonies. KBo II 7 rev. 9, which concludes the description of the spring festival for the Sun-goddess of Wiyananta, states that this festival has been instituted with entertainment or amusement

former course), and Gezbel. See R. D. Barnett, "The Phrygian Rock Facades and the Hittite Monuments," Bi. Or., 10, 3 and 4, p. 81; cf. Güterbock, Anat. Stud., 6, p. 54, note 5.

¹See above, pp. 28-40. ²Pp. 38 f.

³A. Falkenstein, "akīti-Fest und akīti-Festhaus," Festschrift Johannes Friedrich, p. 162.

(duškaratta). Almost the same expression is used in connection with the spring festival of the Storm-god of Panissa and Mt. Kenkalisa in KBo II 7 rev. 23.¹ In the more elaborate parallel text, KBo II 13 obv. 18, these two gods are the objects of the verb duškiškanzi, "they entertain."² The hazgara-women entertain the deity and some unidentified people engage in a mock fight³ in XVII 35 ii 26 (a spring festival). A more elaborate description of fighting as festival entertainment is contained in XVII 35 iii 8-15.⁴ The hazgara-women entertain (duškanzi) the deity, and the young men are divided into two groups who wage a mock battle (MÈ-iškanzi) for the pleasure of the deity. This occurs during the spring as well as the fall festival (cf. line 20). In a description of a spring festival for the Great Spring (deified body

¹ba-az-zi-wi-ya-za du-uš-ka-ra-at-ta-a. This last word presents a problem. Is the final -a a mistake for -za, and is the form then ablative? Or, is it a neuter plural + -a, "and," in which case the sentence takes on a different meaning; viz., "their festival--with (its) rites--and entertainment are instituted." If a sign is missing at the end of duškaratta in KBo II 7 rev. 9, these questions apply equally well there.

²The latter reference to entertainment precedes the statement of time and removal of the deities to the temple. In KBo II 7 rev. 23, the order of events seems at first sight to be reversed. Such, however, is not the case. A careful reading of the latter passage will bear out the fact that no temporal relationship between entertainment and the removal of the deity to his temple is stated or implied. All that is said is that the festival has, at an unspecified time, some entertainment.

³bu-ul-bu-liš-ya tiyanzi. bulbulišya is obviously intended for bulbuliya. Note wa-ar-su-li (XV 32 iii 28) and wa-ar-šu-liš (XVII 35 i 33) in similar contexts. Cf. also, ANA ^{DUG}har-ši-ya-liš, XVII 70 ii 20. Under the circumstances, it is necessary to conclude that the sign -liš- (rarely) has the value -li_x- in Hittite. The form, bulbuliya, consists of a noun in the dat.-loc. case, plus the enclitic -ya, "and."

⁴On this, see Ehelolf, SPAW, 21, pp. 267-272.

of water), there is again entertainment for the goddess.¹ Another instance of entertainment and fighting (wrestling) occurs in the spring festival for Mt. Halwanna.² A badly damaged reference to entertainment in the spring festival for the Uristaen Storm-god of the meadow is found in XXV 23 i 47. In the spring festival for the Storm-god of Rain, entertainment was also to be found.³ Explicit indications of popular participation in the festivals outlined in the cult-inventories are to be found in KBo II 13 obv. 18 (the people bedeck themselves with wreaths); XII 3 9 (referring to spring and fall festivals, the text reads: . . . LÚ.MEŠ^{URU} Zihila ešš[anzi], ". . . the men of Zihila celebrate"); XVII 35 iii 9 (the young, able-bodied men engage in a mock battle), 20 (a repetition in the spring of what is mentioned for the fall in line 9), 33 (the people bedeck themselves with wreaths), 34 (the cheese that has been pressed [flat] is given to the people); XXV 23 ii 7 (the same as the preceding). In XXV 23 i 35 f, it is said that the men of Urista pour spelt, and in line 39 of the same column it is said that they open the haršiyalli-vessel and grind and crush its contents.⁴ (6) It is impossible to make a reliable general statement based on explicit textual evidence concerning the geographic distribution of the Hittite seasonal festivals. The cult-inventories demonstrate that Tudhaliya IV was keenly

¹XVII 35 iii 35. ²XXV 23 i 22.

³XXV 23 left edge, right half, 4.

⁴There are also passages in which popular participation in the rites is not explicitly mentioned, but where it might be inferred. Thus, for example, XXV 23 i 40 ff; left edge, right half, 1 ff.

interested in the intensification of the cult in those towns mentioned in the inventories, without regard to their importance or distance from the capital. Whether or not, however, festivals of a kind with those discussed above were found in every Hittite town cannot be proved. The accidents of the survival and loss of texts and an inadequate understanding of Hittite geography preclude certainty in any statement on this point.

In view of the preceding considerations, it is clear that the Hittite seasonal festivals are markedly similar in nature to the Mesopotamian akītu-festivals. Furthermore, since there are at least two instances where seasonal festival processions are said to have started from inside the capital city and to have made their way to places outside the city walls,¹ and since Yazilikaya probably was a huwaši (or wanai), it is not unlikely that an akītu-type festival, featuring a procession to Yazilikaya, was performed at Hattusa.

¹X 91 and the texts listed in Laroche, Cat. 495. In X 91, the goal of the procession is the tarnu-house in the forest. In the texts listed in Laroche, Cat., 495, it is the tarnu-house at the grove of boxwood trees. If cols. ii and iii of X 91 are parts of a description of the same festival, then the fact that a spring (TUL) is mentioned in iii 5-7 as a place where offerings were made possibly indicates that the procession noted in col. ii made its way to (the tarnu-house in the neighborhood of) Yazilikaya, since there was a spring (now dried up) in the vicinity of Yazilikaya. The other texts (Laroche, Cat., 495) mention that a huwaši was inside the tarnu-house (see, e.g., XI 22 i 2 f). If, as I have argued (see above, pp. 39 ff), Yazilikaya was a huwaši, then these texts (Cat., 495) do not describe a festival any part of which was performed there.