

CRITICAL REVIEWS

Liane Jakob-Rost, Hethitische Rituale und Festbeschreibungen, Keilschrift-urkunden aus Boghazköy, 46. Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1976.

This volume of hand copies by Liane Jakob-Rost contains fragments of tablets with Bo-numbers between 599 and 800. It continues the systematic publication of the remaining Hittite tablets in Berlin. Previous volumes in this group include KUB 41 by Jakob-Rost (Bo 1 to Bo 211) and KUB 44 by Horst Klengel (Bo 219 to Bo 597). Most of the 73 texts in this volume are festivals or rituals. Numbers 16, 17, 21, 22, and 27-33 are cult inventories, and numbers 37, 53, and 58 are oracle texts.¹

Number 37 is a large oracle text with a number of unusual features. The surface of the tablet is worn and many readings are difficult. I am grateful to Mrs. Jakob-Rost for permitting me to collate this tablet. The collations showed the following: Obv. 7: The last signs are NU.ŠE. The small horizontal after ŠE looks like a continuation of the paragraph divider rather than a horizontal wedge. Obv. 11: The last signs before the break are [S]I×SÁ-at. Obv. 21: The first signs are p[a-r]a-¹pát. The next to last word is *ki-nu-un-pát* written over an erasure; cf. ¹ki¹-nu-¹un¹-pát DÜ-zi at the end of obv. 18. Obv. 24: After ¹ku-e-da-ni¹ the signs are pí-di. More is visible on the tablet than in the hand copy. The next to last word is ¹a¹-pí-¹ya¹. The winkelhaken after ¹a-¹ is actually a crack. Obv. 28: The beginning of the line reads [2-N]U ¹SU.MEŠ¹. Obv. 30: After 2 ŠE the signs are ni ši t[a]. The first vertical of ta in the hand copy is a crack. Obv. 32: Read ha-me-eš-¹hi-ma ¹ku-wa-pí¹ near the beginning of the line. Obv. 33: The last signs are ¹ZÉ¹ ¹hi-BÍL.² Obv. 34: After wa-ar-pa the sign is du, not ma as in the hand copy. After a-pí-iz- the beginning of a-za is visible. Obv. 36: After ZAG-za the next sign begins with two horizontals and a winkelhaken following the lower horizontal. Perhaps this is to be read D[U₈]-¹a¹-an-za. Obv. 39: After IGI-zi read 1[2 ŠÀ.D]IR. Obv. 40: The last word is ne-ya-ad!-da-at. Obv. 41: The first word is A-NA with NA written partially over the A. The head of a vertical from A- is visible that is not shown in the hand copy. The last two words are še-er ir-liš. Obv. 45: The last two words are ⁴hé-pát SIG₅-u-wa-aš. The other signs are chips or an erasure. Obv. 47: Before ir-liš restore [še-e]r as in obv. 41. Obv. 49: The line begins ¹A¹-[N]A SA[L.GI]C-li [2] Š[E] 1 S[U.ME]Š [ni ši]i ta ki. Obv. 50: The first visible signs are 2-NU S[U.MEŠ] ni ši t[a]. Only the two horizontals of t[a] are on the tablet. There is no winkelhaken. Obv. 52: After BE-LU.ĪI.A the next sign is probably da(!). Obv. 54: After the first visible sign read a-pu-u-u[š]. The winkelhaken of the uš-sign is visible. Obv. 55: The last signs are ir-liš ŠÀ-ir <<liš>> [DI]B-an. The scribe inadvertently wrote the liš-sign twice,

1. In preparing this review I had access to the reviews of KUB 46 by Laroche, RHA 33 (1975) 66-67, 69, and Hoffner, BiOr 34 (1977) 74-75.

2. See below for an explanation of these signs.

then partially erased the second *liš*-sign. Obv. 56: After *ú-da-aš* there are several incompletely erased signs. The erasure is longer than in the hand copy. Rev. 2: The last sign is ZA[G]. Six horizontals are visible on the tablet. Rev. 4: The *DI* of *I-DI* has only the two horizontals expected. Rev. 5: After the first sign the next word is *a-na-ḫi-da-u-wa-zi*. There is no space between the *ḫi* and the *da* as in the hand copy. Rev. 8: The last word is *ir-liš*. Rev. 11: The first word is EGIR-*an*. The small verticals in the hand copy are scratches. After ZÉ *ḫi-BÍL* read *še-er ir-liš*. Rev. 12: After *ni-kán* ZAG-*aš* the tablet has KA×U-*i* rather than KA×UD-*i* as in the hand copy. Rev. 15: After the first two signs read [n]iNU.GÁL. Rev. 16: After *pa-ra-a* read ME¹-*an-zi* as in rev. 18. Rev. 17: The last signs are 2-NU S[U.M]EŠ *ni* [x] *ir*¹-*liš*. Rev. 18: After [IT]U.KAM-*ma* read UL. The lower winkelhaken of UL in the hand copy is a chip. Rev. 20: The spacing favors GÜB-*za* GAM [IGI]-*zi*. Rev. 23: After the long break the first signs are probably [i]r-*liš*. The heads of the horizontals are not visible on the tablet. Rev. 29: Read '2' [ŠE] 1 SU.MEŠ. There is less space in the break than is shown in the hand copy. The two fragments of the tablet were glued together at a bit of an angle. Rev. 31: The first visible word is [Š]Ā-*ir*(!). The expected verticals of the *ir*-sign are missing, as in the hand copy. Rev. 32: At the end read EGIR[-ŠÚ] *šu*¹-*re*¹-*eš* as in rev. 35. Rev. 33: The first visible sign has the end of a horizontal at the bottom. Read perhaps [K]A×[U]-*i*. Rev. 46: Read *a-na-ḫi-d*[*a-a*]n-*zi*. Left edge 1: The first word is *pé*¹-*en*¹-*nu-ma-aš* as in left edge 2.

In text number 37 each paragraph contains the oracle question followed by a description of two extispicies. The two extispicies are introduced by the phrase 2 ŠE, which is peculiar to this text. ŠE in oracle texts means "favorable," but 2 ŠE cannot mean "let both (extispicies) be favorable" because it is preceded in obv. 19 by 2 SIG₅-*ru*, which means "let both be favorable," and in obv. 46 by SIG₅-*ru* "let it be favorable." 2 ŠE therefore appears to mean simply "two extispicies." I cannot explain this use of the ŠE sign.

Another unusual feature of this text is the writing ZÉ *ḫi-BÍL* in obv. 12, 27, 28, 30, 33, 36, 40, 41, 43, 47, 50, rev. 11, 15, 19, 25, 35, 40, and 50. In obv. 12 and rev. 11 and 19, there is space between ZÉ and *ḫi*. Elsewhere on this tablet they are written together. I believe this is to be read ZÉ *ḫi-li*, and is an abbreviation for ZÉ *ḫilipšiman* "the gall bladder is *ḫilipšiman*."³ In the oracle texts by far the most common adjective that modifies ZÉ "gall bladder" is *ḫilipšiman*, a word of unknown meaning.⁴ This adjective has a number of orthographic peculiarities. It is often abbreviated *ḫi-li*₈. When this abbreviation is used there is no space between the ZÉ and *ḫi* signs, as

3. Laroche, RA 64 (1970) 129, 133, and 138 reads *zehili(pšiman)* as one word and suggests that it is the phonetic reading of the Sumerogram ZÉ "gall bladder."

4. The unabbreviated oracle text KBo 16.97 has two other adjectives which describe the gall bladder, both participles: UZU.ZÉ ZAG-*az ni-ni-in-kán* "the gall bladder is raised on the right" (rev. 5, 16); and 'UZU.ZÉ' ZAG-*az la-a-an*¹-*z*[*a* . . .] "the gall bladder is detached on the right" (rev. 20). Note that UZU.ZÉ "gall bladder" takes neuter gender agreement in rev. 5 and 16, but common gender agreement in rev. 20.

there is when the word *ḫilipšiman* is written out. The ÁB sign with the phonetic value *li*₈ occurs at Boghazköy only in this word. Examples of the spelled-out word include *ḫi-li-ip-ši-ma-an* (KUB 5.1 iv 43, 50, 58; KUB 5.3+ i 31; KUB 6.26 obv. 8; KUB 16.8 rev. 7; KUB 16.56 obv. 9, KBo 2.2 iv 25; (KUB 16.77 ii 15), *ḫi-li*_x (LIŠ)-*ip-ši-ma-an* (KUB 5.20+18.56 ii 20 and 32), *ḫi-li*₈-*ši-man* (KBo 13.68 obv. 5 and 26). The MAN sign used phonetically in a Hittite word is very rare.⁵ The only other examples I know of are *ku-it-man* (KUB 5.1 iii 79, 85; and KUB 6.26 rev. 3), all from oracle texts. In KBo 13.68 obv. 5 and 26 the -*p*- of *ḫilipšiman* is lost. Usually the -*pš*- cluster is stable in Hittite: compare for example *kurupšini*-, *lipšai*-, *šapšama*-, *šinapši*-, *tepšu*-, and *dupšaḫi*-. Another word in which -*pš*- and -*š*- alternate is *ḫapšalli*-/ḫaššalli-.⁶ If more evidence is needed that *ḫilipšiman* is a separate word, in KBo 13.68 obv. 5 the preceding word is not ZÉ. It is broken, but the last signs are [-*n*]e²-er. In KUB 46.37 we appear to have *ḫi-BIL* used as an abbreviation in the same way as *ḫi-li*₈. No other spelling of *ḫilipšiman* besides *ḫi-BIL* occurs in this text. The reading *li*_x for the sign usually used at Boghazköy as the ideogram for "new," Sumerian GIBIL, is a new value for that sign. However, all the phonetic values of BIL are shared with the sign BIL, and BIL has a rare phonetic value *li*₉.⁷ The standard method of indicating a new phonetic value by writing a subscript _x presents a problem in this instance. The sign LIŠ has the phonetic value *li* in a number of Hittite texts at Boghazköy. Neither LIŠ nor BIL is given the value *li* in Labat, Manuel. When they are given this value, the subscript number assigned to LIŠ should be lower than that assigned to BIL, since LIŠ is more frequent, although still rare.

The appearance of cult inventories (CTH 501-30) in this volume indicates that many more such texts remain to be published in the KUB series. A large number of cult inventories were copied by Jakob-Rost in KUB 38 (1965). Many more will appear in KBo 26 (forthcoming) in hand copies by Charles Carter. An excellent introduction to these texts is provided by Carter's dissertation "Hittite Cult-Inventories" (University of Chicago, 1962).

In reading through the cult inventories I have noticed a number of unusual sign values, though not nearly as many as are found in the oracle texts. Foremost among these is TEN with the value *tan*_x. The spelling *pí-tan*_x-*zi* "they take away" occurs in KBo 2.7 i 11; KUB 17.35 i 6, 31, ii 28, iii 16, iv 25; KUB 25.23 i 50; KUB 25.25:6; KUB 38.26 i 17; KUB 38.32 ii 15; KUB 46.21 obv. 6; KUB 46.22 obv. 8, 12, rev. 6, and elsewhere. The spelling *pí-tan*_x for the participle "taken away" occurs in KBo 2.7 i 17; KUB 38.26 i 20, 21, 22, 30; KUB 38.34:7; and KUB 46.21 obv. 4. The spelling *ú-tan*_x-*zi* "they

5. It is more common in geographical names and Akkadograms, for example URU.*kum-man-ni* (KUB 46.37 obv. 15, 16, rev. 7, 12, 36, etc.), and MAN-TA-DU (KBo 18.156:4; KUB 42.23 i 7, etc.).

6. Van Brock, RHA 20 (1962) 117.

7. Labat, Manuel d'Épigraphie Akkadienne (1976) 111.

bring" occurs in KBo 2.7 i 26; KUB 17.35 i 5, iv 24; KUB 17.36:2; and KUB 46.27 obv. 16. It is remarkable that the reading *tan*_x is so common in the cult inventories, since it is quite rare outside them.⁸

Other unusual sign values found in the cult inventories include *pí-iš-kir*_x (KAR) (KUB 38.3 i 17⁹); LÚ.MEŠ *hi-lam-ma-DIŠ-ši-kán* (KUB 38.12 ii 19), *paš*_x (PIŠ)-*šu-u-i* (KUB 25.23 left edge 1¹⁰), *wa-ar-šu-li*_x (LIŠ) (KUB 17.35 i 33, iv 32), and *hu-ul-hu-li*_x (LIŠ)-*ya* (KUB 17.35 ii 26, iv 34).¹¹ Most of these unusual sign values were discussed by Laroche, RA 56 161-63, who however did not mention that they were taken from the cult inventories.

The following comments apply to the individual texts:

10. I cannot find the É.*halentuwa* referred to by Jakob-Rost in the Inhaltsübersicht.

17. Laroche classifies this as CTH 510 "Idoles et fêtes de villes." The only other text in this CTH number is KUB 38.6 and its duplicate KUB 38.10+10a. Each paragraph in KUB 38.6 begins with the name of a town followed by a list of idols and festivals. KUB 46.17 is a list of gods, festivals, and items for the festivals, but it is arranged by gods rather than by towns. Compare KBo 13.238, which is a list of offerings for various gods and is also arranged by gods. Laroche classifies it as CTH 670 "fragments divers (de fêtes)," but it is actually a cult inventory. Compare also KUB 34.87 (CTH 530), which is another list of offerings for various gods.

22. This cult inventory is similar to KUB 41.34 rev. 5-13. HUR.SAG *Puparan* (rev. 2) also appears in KUB 41.34 i 10.

37. See above for collations of this text.

38 and 42. The accusative plural *šar-ni-ik-zi-lu-uš* in 38 i 7, 10, and 42 iv 6 suggests that *šarnikzel* "compensation" is common gender. This is confirmed by KUB 14.8 rev. 30: [*ma-a*]-*an šar-ni-ik-ze-el ku-iš* "If there is any compensation," where *šarnikzel* is modified by the common gender pronoun *ku-iš*.¹²

47. This is not a duplicate of IBoT 3.109 as Jakob-Rost says in the Inhaltsübersicht. IBoT 3.109 is a fragment of a cult inventory (CTH 530) and is a duplicate of 125/r.

58. This is a fragment of a lot oracle. In line 3 read 'A'-TAM-MA-*ya* ME-*aš*.

Howard Berman
University of Chicago

8. See Goetze, Madduwattaš (1928) 56, for examples of *tan*_x outside the cult inventories.

9. Friedrich, Hethitisches Elementarbuch 1 (1960) 26, with references, interprets *kar* here as the phonetic reading.

10. Friedrich, Hethitisches Wörterbuch (1952) 165 and 170 interprets *píš* as the phonetic reading.

11. *ha-mi-iš-kán-za* (KUB 38.26 rev. 1, 19), for the usual *ha-mi-iš ha-an-za*, may also belong here, or it may be an isolated phonetic variant.

12. Goetze, KIF 1 (1930) 216.