



Zippalanda and Ankuwa Once More

Author(s): Maciej Popko

Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 120, No. 3 (Jul. - Sep., 2000), pp. 445-448

Published by: [American Oriental Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/606014>

Accessed: 08/12/2010 07:42

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

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=aos>.

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

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

BRIEF COMMUNICATION

Zippalanda and Ankuwa Once More

Despite recent critical remarks to the contrary by R. L. Gorny in this journal, the Hittite town of Zippalanda is indeed to be identified with the modern site of Alaca Höyük, and ancient Ankuwa is probably to be equated with Eskiyyapar. Some general observations are made concerning the methodology employed in reconstructing Hittite geography.

R. L. Gorny has published a review article (*JAOS* 117 [1997]: 549–57) of my book *Zippalanda: Ein Kultzentrum im hethitischen Kleinasien* (1994), in which he rejects my identification of Zippalanda with Alaca Höyük and of nearby Kalehisar/Karahisar with Mt. Taḥaya/Daḥa (not Daḥḥa, as throughout Gorny's article). Gorny also defends his idea that Ankuwa is to be equated to Alişar, and Zippalanda with Kuşaklı Höyük in Yozgat province.¹

Although in many points I disagree with Gorny in the interpretation of the available data I do not think it is necessary to examine, step by step, each statement made in his article. Of course, I intend here to defend my views and, inter alia, present general observations on the methodology of research into Hittite geography.²

First, some remarks on earlier attempts to estimate distances between towns. In the past, descriptions of ceremonial trips of the Hittite king from town to town during the spring and autumn festivals often served as a basis for such estimations. Today it is obvious that their value for this purpose is very limited. The texts inform us only about the towns as places of ceremonies and of overnight rests. Since at each town elaborate rituals were performed, each journey of the king and his retinue must have been much shorter than a full day.

Generally, it is difficult to find reasonable estimates for a daily travel distance in Hittite times. Gorny assumes

a pace of thirty to thirty-five kilometers a day, and I consider that to be a good estimate for a day in a carriage or a wagon, even over rough ground. We know, however, that the ceremonial tour of the king was not an ordinary trip but a sort of procession (a term also used by Gorny) in which the king, members of his family, and dignitaries used chariots or wagons, whereas the guards and other accompanying persons walked. For an observer the procession must have been like the well-known departure of the king from his residence at Ḫattuša, as described in IBoT 1.36 i 64ff.³ Of course, progress between towns will not have been at this stately, ceremonial, pace, but it seems impossible that the heavily armed guards could have routinely covered on foot a minimum distance of thirty kilometers daily.

Consequently, during a ceremonial trip the king and his retinue moved slowly, which may indicate that the whole area visited was smaller than was admitted in earlier literature. Other reasons for the reexamination of the reconstructed geography of the area include, first of all, the discovery of Šapinuwa at the site of Ortaköy. Formerly scholars supposed that Šapinuwa with its Hurrian cults lay somewhere far to the east. Its position on the Çekerek River forces one to shift the whole reconstructed system to the northwest.

However, such a reexamination is not the goal of this communication. I reject the equation of Ankuwa with Amkuwa (modern Alişar), and my reasons have been presented on another occasion.⁴ Now I would like to comment on KUB 25.28 i 1–10, which is occasionally cited as evidence that Ankuwa lay at a distance of about one hundred kilometers from Ḫattuša. Gorny's interpretation (p. 551) is no different. However, as H. G. Güterbock has

¹ For the latter equation, see also O. R. Gurney, "The Hittite Names of Kerkenes Dağ and Kuşaklı Höyük," *Anatolian Studies* 45 (1995): 69–71. The site of Kuşaklı Höyük in Yozgat province is not to be confused with Kuşaklı near Başören-Yayla in Sivas province, where Hittite tablets have been recovered recently.

² "Zur Geographie des nördlichen Zentralanatoliens in der Hethiterzeit," in *Studio Historiae Ardens: Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H. J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Th. P. J. van den Hout and J. de Roos (Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut, 1995), 253–59.

³ For this text see H. G. Güterbock and Th. P. J. van den Hout, *The Hittite Instruction for the Royal Bodyguard* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1991).

⁴ See the article cited in note 2.

pointed out,⁵ the text concerns not an ordinary trip but the shipment of the equipment (*aniyaz*) of “the house of the *ŠATAMMU*,” accompanied by the potter (*ḥuprala*-). We know nothing about the nature of this dispatch, but the reference to the potter seems to suggest that it included objects made of clay, perhaps cult vessels. If so, they needed to be transported very carefully, and obviously the vehicle with such a load would have moved extremely slowly. The transportation itself was a serious problem that required a particular command. One must emphasize in this context that Hittite literature offers no analogous document. Consequently, it is better to avoid estimating the distance between *Ḫattuša* and *Ankuwa* on the basis of this text.

It is true, as Gorny writes (p. 549), that the main body of my manuscript contains a collection of transliterated and translated Hittite texts, but the criteria of their attribution to the cult at Zippalanda (see *Zippalanda*, 6–7) are other than he supposes and more complex. A mention of the town of Zippalanda in a text is not enough to classify it among the documents concerning the gods’ city. Inversely, many texts in which the name Zippalanda is not mentioned belong to the corpus. I have managed to find features which are characteristic only of the cult at that town, and their presence in a particular text is a good reason to classify that text within the Zippalanda corpus.

According to such criteria, KBo 16.78 with its list of seven towns (*Zippalanda*, 142–46) surely belongs to this corpus, its data referring to the Old Hittite period. On its obverse one can find the names of some rare objects also attested in KBo 16.71+ obv. i, a fragment of the “Great Old Hittite Ritual” (see *Zippalanda*, 100). The analogies to that ritual are easy to discover on the reverse, which is partly duplicated by KBo 16.49 (*Zippalanda*, 146–48). Both texts concern a religious ceremony with the participation of some functionaries typical of the cult at Zippalanda (cf. especially the presence of the *tazzili* priest, KBo 16.49 obv. i 13’; on this priest, see *Zippalanda*, 73–75). A mention of the gate of the god *Tāḫa* (a Middle Hittite form of the god’s name) allows one to assume that the ceremony has taken place in a temple, or rather in a sacred precinct of that Mountain God at the foot of the mountain. According to the sources, Zippalanda and Mt. *Daḫa* constituted a single sacral complex.

The above evidence cannot be separated from the data on the obverse of the discussed text. In conclusion, we

must agree with the view that the seven towns listed there (*Šanaḫḫuitta*, *Tapikka*, *Taptiga*, *Takašta*, *Katapa*, *Karaḫna*, and *Ḫattuša*) were responsible for the provisions for a festival at Zippalanda; therefore they formed a kind of amphictyony (the term used by O. R. Gurney in his letter of 29th September 1996 to the present author).⁶ One can suppose that they lay, more or less, around Zippalanda. Their situation on the map of Anatolia is thus of great importance for the location of Zippalanda.

Of these seven towns, *Ḫattuša* (modern *Boğazkale*) and *Tapikka* (today, *Maşat Höyük*) are securely located.⁷ As the texts from *Maşat Höyük* show, at the end of the fifteenth century B.C. *Tapikka* was the capital of a border province which faced the *Kaška* tribes and suffered under their attacks. Later, *Tapikka* fell under the control of the *Kaška*. From the Middle Hittite period onwards, the same enemy occupied the former districts of *Takašta* and *Taptiga*. There are no indications concerning the position of *Šanaḫḫuitta* and *Karaḫna*, but it is certain that these towns lay outside the *Kaška* zone.

As regards the position of *Katapa*, the town must have been situated on the road from *Ḫattuša* to the town of *Nerik*. H. G. Güterbock has placed *Nerik* on the lower *Kızılırmak* near the modern *Kargi*,⁸ a hypothesis accepted by most scholars. It is well known that for a long time *Nerik* had been under the occupation of the *Kaška* people, while *Katapa* served as a base for military operations against them. According to KBo 13.234+ rev. 20’, *Katapa* had its *BĒL MADGALTI*, i.e., a governor of the border province. All this evidence shows that the town lay close to the *Kaškean* border. On the other hand, since the town was a winter residence of *Muršili II*, it must have been situated at a safe distance from the enemy. As *Ḫattušili III* states in his Apology, the *Kaška* troops crossed the upper *Kızılırmak* once and even reached *Kaneš*, but there is a consensus among scholars that the *Kaška* people lived in the Pontic mountains. Thus, *Katapa* must have been situated north of *Ḫattuša* and near the *Kaška* zone, i.e., the Pontus. I think a location south of the modern town of *Çorum* is very probable.

⁶ It might seem unlikely that the capital would have been part of Zippalanda’s amphictyony. Both Zippalanda and *Arinna* were, however, very old Hattian cult centers, while *Ḫattuša* became such an important center relatively late, and this is why in the Old Hittite period the town still bore some of the costs of the great cultic ceremonies in Zippalanda.

⁷ At present, objections to the equation of *Tapikka* with *Maşat Höyük* raised by some scholars should be considered groundless.

⁸ *JNES* 20 (1961): 92ff.

⁵ “The North-Central Area of Hittite Anatolia,” *JNES* 20 (1961): 88.

The position of Katapa is of decisive importance for the location of Zippalanda and Ankuwa. The festival texts bear witness to the fact that Zippalanda was situated close to Katapa. One of the proofs is even trivial: together with those of Kartapaḥa and Šalampa, the inhabitants of Katapa supplied the priests of Zippalanda with hogs (see *Zippalanda*, 100–103, 106–11); thus, on practical grounds, we must assume that all these towns lay close to Zippalanda. The text KBo 13.214, which describes a festival at Zippalanda and offerings at Katapa taking place on the same day (see *Zippalanda*, 182–85), is also of considerable value.

As regards Ankuwa, Gorny agrees with me that the town was situated south of Zippalanda. It must be emphasized that both KBo 30.155 and KUB 20.25 + 10.78 (see *Zippalanda*, 304–12) describe not an ordinary trip but a solemn procession from Zippalanda to Ankuwa and back. Moreover, these texts do not mention a night's rest, which means that the distance between these towns was considerably shorter than the thirty to thirty-five kilometers suggested by Gorny (p. 551).

All these facts may serve as an indication that Katapa, Zippalanda, and Ankuwa lay within the area between Ḫattuša and the Pontic mountains. Together with other towns whose names occur in the festival outlines, that area formed the heartland of the Hittite state and the cradle of the old Hattian tradition. As stated above, this area was smaller than was admitted in earlier literature. I think the capital was the southernmost outpost of the Hattian cultic region.⁹ The evidence for Hattian cults south of Ḫattuša is very scanty.

In accordance with the arguments presented here, I searched for Zippalanda in the area north of the capital and selected the site of Alaca Höyük, twenty-five kilometers from Ḫattuša, as a most likely location. Of course, I am not able to prove that the mound at Alaca represents the remnants of Zippalanda, but I think my hypothesis is tenable. I cannot see any reason for the equation of Alaca Höyük with Arinna, as proposed by S. Erkut.¹⁰ For a scholar familiar with the texts, Arinna cannot be placed so far from Ḫattuša, and I estimate that the distance between these two cities only required a

few hours to walk. Moreover, the gods represented on the well-known orthostats of Alaca Höyük (see below) have nothing in common with the local pantheon of Arinna. A monograph on that religious center is still a desideratum, and we can expect that studies of the Arinna texts will bring more evidence enabling the location of that town.

Gorny questions the view that the representations on the Sphinx Gate at Alaca Höyük might have reflected local religious beliefs that were different from the official religion (p. 554). It is obvious that in a gods' city, just such a local creed might be promoted and expressed both in texts and in local art. The documents concerning the gods' cities of Arinna, Nerik, and Kummanni show strong evidence of this fact. As regards local art, the documentation is still very poor, and the orthostats of Alaca Höyük are here an exception.

The case of Zippalanda illustrates the view discussed. On the basis of the available texts, I have managed to reconstruct a local pantheon with its three major gods: the younger Stormgod of Zippalanda, the older Stormgod of the Sky, and the Sungoddess of the Earth. (The latter goddess is not to be confused with the Sungoddess of Arinna.) Then I tried to link this picture with the carvings of Alaca and, to my surprise, I found that the three great gods of Zippalanda are represented on the orthostats. Indeed, there is no corroborative epigraphic evidence, but so much can hardly be expected. Nevertheless, there are grounds to assume that the younger Stormgod of Zippalanda is represented as a bull on the left side of the main entrance, and his parents as seated gods. The seated goddess on the right side of the gate resembles neither the Sungoddess of Arinna, as known from her golden statuettes, nor Ḫebat, as depicted at Yazılıkaya and Fraktın, so that she cannot be identified with either of them. In my opinion, the carving represents the Sungoddess of the Earth.

The texts reveal the existence of only two temples at Zippalanda, one belonging to the Stormgod of Zippalanda and the other devoted to the Sungoddess of the Earth, his mother. I wonder whether the images of the gods on both sides of the main entrance to the town reflect this situation. If so, this would be another indication that Zippalanda may be equated with Alaca Höyük.

If Alaca Höyük is identified as Zippalanda, we must look for Mt. Daḥa (see above) in its vicinity. The best choice is the rock of Kalehisar/Karahisar, four kilometers north of Alaca Höyük, and the relevant arguments are offered in my book.¹¹ The reader can also find more

⁹ Against I. Singer, "Hittites and Hattians in Anatolia at the Beginning of the Second Millennium B.C.," *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 9 (1981): 122, who believes that "in the south the Hattian cult realm is broadly congruent with the Halys Basin."

¹⁰ S. Erkut, "Hitit Çağının önemli kült kenti Arinna'nın yeri," in *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp*, ed. H. Otten et al. (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1992), 159–65.

¹¹ See also V. Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 592f.

about Mt. Daḫa in my recent article, “Berg als Ritualschauplatz: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der hethitischen Religion,”¹² where I have modified my earlier views concerning the details of the cult on this “mountain.” I consider that article a response to Gorny’s objections to the proposed identification. More generally, I attempt to show there that the Hittites venerated not only high mountains but also unusually shaped rocks and hills, and that for practical reasons cult places in the mountains were situated rather low, for easy access. Analogous locations are characteristic of such shrines in the whole of the ancient Near East and, later, in Christian Europe.

Consequently, Ankuwa can be equated with the site of Eskiypar, situated only ten kilometers south (more precisely south-southeast) of Alaca Höyük, this being at a suitable distance for a cult procession as described in KBo 30.155 and KUB 20.25 + 10.78 (see above). Unlike Alişar, remains of the Hittite period are well attested there,¹³ and Eskiypar thus seems to fit much better the evidence for Ankuwa.

MACIEJ POPKO

UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW

¹² *Hethitica* 14 (1999): 97–108.

¹³ See R. Temizer, “Introduction,” to T. Özgüç, *İnandıktepe: An Important Cult Center in the Old Hittite Period* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1988), xxviii–xxix.