

- Георгиев, Владимир
1977 Траките и техният език. София.
- Kieckers, Ernst
1928 Handbuch der vergleichenden gotischen Grammatik. München.
- Kluge, Friedrich
1926 Nominale Stammbildungslehre der altgermanischen Dialekte. 3. Aufl. Halle.
- Melchert, H. Craig
1988 Luvian Lexical Notes. HS 101, 211-243.
1993 Historical Phonology of Anatolian. JIES 21 (3-4), 237-257.
1993a Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon. Chapel Hill, N.C. (version pdf).
- Rikov, Georgi T.
1994 Hittite *šuwa*- 'to fill', *šuta(i)* 'to fill up' and Slavic **syť* 'satisfied, replete'. Orpheus 4, 67-74.
1997 Hittite (*i*)*yanna*-, Tocharian B *yanem* and Indo-European nasal infix presents of the type *CRen_h*. Orpheus 7, 9-36.
- Schwyzler, Eduard
1939 Griechische Grammatik. Erster Band. Allgemeiner Teil. Lautlehre. Wortbildung. Flexion. München.
- Seebold, Elmar
1967 Die Vertretung idg. *g^h* im Germanischen. KZ 81, 105-133.
- Szemerényi, Oswald
1971 Pierre Chantraine: Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Tome I: A-Δ, 1968; Tome II: E-K, 1970. Gnomon 43, 641-675.

Two New Votive Texts

Johan de Roos (Leiden)

It is a great joy for me to contribute to a celebratory volume for someone who has spent the greater part of his academic life fulfilling the primary necessity of any Hittitologist: to supply information on new texts. Both he and I have been united in the special experience of teaching at the N.E. Normal University at Changchun, China, where some twenty years ago I succeeded Silvin Košak as Professor of Hittite. There is ample reason to contribute "new" texts to this volume, even if they are not so much "new" but already noted by Silvin himself.

1. Some years ago Silvin sent me the transliteration of the text 976/z, a small but clear votive fragment found in Temple I. It is very similar to KUB 15.3 I 10-16 in vocabulary and in the occurrence of the divine name ^d*SÎN*, yet it is not a duplicate. As no duplicates of votive texts have been found so far, this was not to be expected. According to Silvin it is impossible to say from the photograph whether both pieces belong to the same tablet. In any case it is very likely that it is, like KUB 15.3, a vow by the queen for the benefit of a long life for the king. This assumption is mainly based on the occurrence of [IT]U.XII^{KAM} in line x+1, ZI-za *da[h_{hi}* in line 3' and a possible *ya* in line 5', when the queen is speaking.

First I present KUB 15.3 I 10-16 with translation, and then 976/z with restorations based on the previous text.

KUB 15.3 I 10-16 – transliteration

- 10 ... A-NA MU^{KAM}-*ja* ku-*it* ITU.XII^{KAM}
11 MU^{KAM}-*li* MU.I^{KAM} ITU.XII^{KAM}-*ja* ŠA KÙ.BABBAR GUŠKIN
12 e-eš-šu-u-*ya-an* te-e_h-*hi* KI.LÁ.BI ZI-za *da-a_h-hi*
13 na-aš A-NA DINGIR^{LIM} *pí-eš-ki-u-ya-an* te-e_h-*hi* ^d*SÎN*-*ma*
14 ku-iš ZI-an-za nu ITU^{KAM.H1A} ŠA KÙ.BABBAR GUŠKIN a-*pí-e-da-ni*
15 *pí-eš-ki-mi* ma-a-an¹ URU¹ *Ú-ri-ki-na*
16 ma-a-an im-ma ku-*ya-pí*

1 Originally the scribe wrote *I-NA* before URU¹Urikina. Perhaps the idea of ^d*SÎN* URU¹Urikina induced him to remove it later. The erasure is clearly visible on the tablet.

KUB 15.3 I 10-16 – translation

- 10 ... and, since a year (has) twelve months,
 11 each year one year and twelve months of silver (and) gold
 12 I will make. I will determine the weight thereof according to my own judgment
 13 and I will give them to the god. And whatever wish
 14 Sin entertains, according to that (wish) the months of silver and gold
 15 I will give, either (in) Urikina
 16 or anywhere else.”

976/z – transliteration

- x+1 [IT]U.XII^{KAM} [MU^{KAM}-li MU.I^{KAM} ITU.XII^{KAM}-ja]
 2' ŠA KÙ.BABBAR GU[ŠKIN e-eš-šu-u-ya-an te-eḫ-ḫi KI.LÁ.BI]
 3' ZI-za da-[aḫ-ḫi na-aš A-NA DINGIR^{LIM} pí-eš-ki-u-ya-an te-eḫ-ḫi]
 4' ^dSÎN-ma ku-[iš ZI-an-za nu ITU^{KAM.HI.A} ŠA KÙ.BABBAR GUŠKIN]
 5' ma-a-an^U[^{RU2} xxx ma-a-an im-ma ku-ya-pí]
 6' a-pí-d[a-ni]-----pí-eš-ki-mi]

Commentary

Compared to KUB 15.3 there is one obvious difference: in 976/z the location is mentioned first (line 5') with *mān* followed by *apidani*, while in KUB 15.3 *apedani* is mentioned first followed by the location. Furthermore the spelling *apidani* differs from *apedani*. According to Kammenhuber (HW² 139) *apidani* occurs nine times, whereas *apedani* is found 214 times. The spelling in 976/z can be said to be unusual.

It is unknown where KUB 15.3 was found – perhaps in Temple I. It has become clear that more votive texts have been found on Büyükkale than were known in 1984. I was able to mention a few at that time (KBo 8.63 and KBo 9.96) as well as two texts from the Haus am Hang (KBo 13.72 and KBo 13.80), but the find spot of most texts was unknown. At present more texts are known to have originated from Temple I and the cautiously phrased question whether the palace mostly controlled the realisation of the vows must now be answered negatively, as Th. van den Hout recently argued³.

What is the correlation between 976/z and KUB 15.3? The vow is identical in both texts, albeit with a minor variant in the last sentence. As Košak has men-

2 Although S. Košak wrote about “oblique Winkelhakens e.g. HI, GAŠAN vel sim.” before the break, something like URU seems to be required.

3 FS de Roos, 2006, 91.

tioned, it is difficult to determine from the photograph whether the fragments are from one and the same tablet. Supposing a different location is to be restored in line 5' the vows are identical but for the city names. Based on this assumption there is a large probability that the fragments belong to one tablet. A good example of identical vows in different cities is the famous case of Puduḫepa behind the bath house in Ijamma and in Lajuna (KUB 15.1 II 5-10 and 37-41).

2. A second unpublished votive text is particularly interesting as regards its provenance. Some fourteen years ago Prof. Dr. H. Otten very kindly sent to me his hand copy of this special tablet. It is labeled “Touristik”, because it was only shown to him “vor Jahrzehnten” by an unknown private owner and the provenance is “wahrscheinlich aus Boğazkale”.

Touristik – transliteration

- 1 [] ma-a-an-na DINGIR^{LU}[^M
 2 [] -ta-an-na-aš UD-x[⁴
 3 [] a⁷ -pí-e-ni-eš-š[u-u-ya-an
 4 [] -mu ku-iš-ki me-m[i-iš-ta
 5 [] x-ja-ya-za-kán kiš-a[n
 6 [] x GEME^{5MES}-ŠÚ«I»⁶ nu-un-tar-r[i-ja-an-zi⁷
 7 [nu A-NA^d IŠTAR^{URU} La-ya] -za-an-ti-ja I tal-la-[an GUŠKIN⁸
 8 [] KUR MI-IŠ-RIGIM-an a-x[-
 9 [] x-kán ša-aš-ti a-še-šu-u-ya-aš-š[a(-)⁹
 10 [nu-za-kán MUNUS.LUGAL ŠÀ Û^{TI} kiš-an IK-RU-UB ma-a-an-ya[a
 11 [] ^dIŠ^{URU} TAR^{URU} La-ya-za-an-ti-ja [ku-e⁷ []
 12 [] ¹⁰ nu-ya-ra-at IŠ-TU^{NA4} mu-u[š-nu-ya-an-ti-í?]

4 Although many readings are possible (including ZABAR), I prefer a form of UD with the preceding genit. dependent on it. UD could be preceded by *maltannaš* (= of the promised), but then one would be inclined to expect *maltešnaš* (= of the vow).

5 Written, admittedly, as GU.

6 In erasure.

7 Most probable restoration: 3rd present plural dependent on a possible *mān* earlier in the line. I have restored the form *nu-un-tar-r[i-ja-an-zi*, although according to CHD L/N 473 this has so far not occurred in any text.

8 GUŠKIN is the most likely restoration.

9 I cannot explain this form of the verbal noun *ašešuyar*. Instead of š[a a reading SISKUR is impossible.

10 From line 12 the text runs remarkably parallel with KUB 48.126, 7'-9'. Because of the same matter of an eagle, an identical vow is evidently made and the same gift is promised to another goddess. For another eagle in a vow see KUB 15.10 I² 6'.

13 [*t] e-eh-hi TI₈^{MUŠEN.HLA} -ja-ya ku-^U i^U [-e-eš*
 14 [*ŠA-PAL KA] P-PI^{HLA} TI₈^{MUŠEN} ALAM L[UGAL-ja i-ja-*
mi
 15 [*-m] u^d IŠTAR IQ-BI^{URU} [*
 16 [*URU La-ya-z] a-an-ti-ja e-eš-n[a[?]-*
 17 [*] x x x x [*

Touristik – translation

1 [] and if you, O god, [
 2 [] the day of the ...
 3 [] thus m[uch].
 4 [] someone tol[d] me [
 5 [] ... as follows: [
 6 [] his/her maid servants [shall] hast[en?
 7 [then shall I to Ištar of La^a]zanti^a one *talla* [(of) gold
 8 [] just as the land of Egypt ... [
 9 [] in bed ... of sitting [
 10 [then the queen] made in the [drea]m the following vow: “If [
 11 [Iš]tar of La^azanti^a which [
 12 [] then with the *mu[šnuqant* stone] it
 13 [] I shall put and which eagles [
 14 [under the wi]ngs (of) an eagle [and] a statue [of the king I shall
make
 15 [] Ištar spoke to me:¹¹ (the city) [
 16 [La^az]anti^a []
 17 [] []

Commentary

The text undoubtedly contains vows, in at least four paragraphs, by queen Pudu^hepa to Ištar of La^azanti^a perhaps for the health of her husband Hattušili III. Some of the vows are based on a dream. It is the upper part of a tablet described by Prof. Otten as “(hellbraun) hellgrau. Kleiner Schrift Vs. Rs. soweit erhalten unbeschrieben.” Seventeen lines of text are preserved and one of the vows (line 12-14) is identical to KUB 48.126, 7'-9'. The fragments might belong to the same text, as the upper part of KUB 48.126 is missing and both fragments have a blank reverse side.

11 The translation is based on a presumed preceding “when in a dream...”.

The total number of lines would be (32' + x) + (17 + x), which is unusually high, even though 52 and 54 lines occur in KUB 15.1 and twice 55 in KUB 15.5 +. Cities where the dreams take place are mentioned neither in “Touristik” nor in KUB 48.126.

Ištar of Šamu^ha is pre-eminent in four out of the five vows in KUB 48.126, and Ištar of La^azanti^a in three out of the four vows in “Touristik”, as far as the text is preserved. “The matter of the eagle” is mentioned as the subject of the queen’s dream in KUB 48.126, causing her to make a vow for the benefit of the king. She promises to place an object under the wings of the (or an) eagle, and she promises to make(?) a statue of the king.

The vow is probably made to the protective goddess Pirinkir. In the present text an identical vow is made to Ištar of La^azanti^a, but without mention of “the matter of the eagle” that appears in her dream in the first instance.

There is mention of a *mušnuqant* stone in both instances. A *mušnuqant* stone occurs no more than four times in texts, twice in identical passages where there is a connection with an eagle. In these two cases ^{NA4}*mušnuqantit* can be supplemented (cf. CHD L/N 334), but it is very unfortunate that in the present text again the end of the word is missing. The two other occurrences are both in inventory texts: Bo 87/5a and KUB 42.14 I 6-7, published in THeth 10 by Silvin Košak, but the context tells us nothing about the nature of the stone¹².

It is remarkable that the unknown object *talla* in line 7 is written without any gloss sign, as opposed to KUB 15.3 I 20. The supplementation GUŠKIN is based on this text. Whether the golden *talla* is inlaid with lapis lazuli as well in the present text is of course unsure.

In line 8 Pudu^hepa apparently follows a good custom from Egypt, or the *talla* is made as it is done in Egypt.

So, in this presentation of these two new votive texts, I hope to have made a contribution not only to the honouring of Silvin Košak but to CTH no. 584 as well.

12 Cf. H. Otten in FS T. Özgüç 1989, 366ff.