

The Prayers in the Haus am Hang

Theo van den Hout (Chicago)

1. *Introduction*

On the basis of all kinds of records securely dated to the latest phases of the Hittite capital Ḫattuša one can gain a first impression of the respective functions of the most important places of tablet storage there¹. These are Building A on Büyükkale, and the *Haus am Hang* (HaH) and the storerooms surrounding Temple 1 (StT1) in the Lower City. Conveniently located in between two streets that lead up to two city gates to its north-west both the StT1 and the HaH seem to have been the main center of daily administration. It is here that we find lists and rosters including the cadaster texts (*Feldertexte*), the economic texts attesting to incoming taxes and the redistribution of raw materials, cult inventories, vows and oracle reports. Texts of some record groups were either exclusively (cadaster and economic records) or almost exclusively (lists and rosters, vows) produced and kept in the StT1. A few lists and rosters were also found in the HaH. What the StT1 and the HaH share, are especially the cult inventories of which the HaH has the by far largest percentage. Many of these genres are notoriously absent or attested in very low numbers in Bldg. A. The latter location is richer in letters, oracle reports and festival texts but no genre is exclusive to Bldg. A. It had, moreover, already been noticed that tablets and fragments in the latest ductus and sign forms were not very well represented there² and that in some cases tablets were deliberately moved there for longer-term keeping³. On the whole, Bldg. A seems to have had the character of what is nowadays often called a record center, that is, a storage facility where records are stored that are no longer active in an administrative sense but that are still considered to be of enough value to be kept for future reference.

Although there are some differences between the StT1 and the HaH they show a large overlap in genres. Striking, however, is the number of records dated to the

1 See my contribution to: *The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tuthaliya IV* (ed. Th. van den Hout, Leiden 2006), 77-106. I would like to thank Giulia Torri and Oğuz Soysal for their comments on an earlier version of this paper.

2 S. Košak, FS Houwink ten Cate 179.

3 S. Alaura, *StBoT* 45, 26.

latest phases of the Hittite capital in the HaH that must be ascribed to the last known Hittite king Šuppiluliuma II or Šuppilulijama whereas records explicitly mentioning Tuthaliya IV almost all come from the StT1. The documents in question are treaties and loyalty oaths, correspondence and cult inventories. This suggests that at least in some cases the most recent administration was carried out in the HaH while the StT1 served as a first stage in removing less current records to another location. Bldg. A may have been the last stage in this process. There is one text, however, that seems to contradict this dichotomy: the Prayer of Tuthaliya IV to the Sungoddess of Arinna, KBo 12.58 + KBo 13.162 (CTH 385) found in the HaH. If the observed distribution of texts is valid, why was this text kept there and not in the StT1?

It is a great privilege and an even greater pleasure to dedicate these remarks to Silvin Košak who has made a systematic study of Hittite record management and administrative practices at all possible. With his unbelievable patience and perseverance Prof. Košak has created one of the most powerful research tools in Hittitology: the *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln*. All Hittitologists present and future owe him an immense debt of gratitude.

2. The prayers in the Haus am Hang

The prayer of Tuthaliya IV, KBo 12.58 +, is not the only prayer found in the HaH. Silvin Košak's *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln* (I-LXI)⁴ lists the following six prayer fragments for that location:

<i>Edition</i>	<i>Bo-number</i>	<i>CTH</i>	<i>findspot</i>
KBo 12.58 + KBo 13.162	436/s + 392/t	CTH 385	L/18, b-c/6 (436/s), L/18, b/5
KBo 12.132	286/t	CTH 375.3	L/18, b/5
KBo 13.166	317/t	CTH 389	L/18, b/5
KUB 30.13	2156/g	CTH 376	Raum 14
KBo 49.53	529/s	CTH 389	L/18 ... b-c/6
unpubl.	625/u	CTH 389	L/18, c/5

4 www.orient.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/index.html, version 1.0.

A few brief remarks on each of these are in order. Apart from KUB 30.13 all pieces were found among the wash going downhill and originating from the building⁵. Since, given their dispersal, the tablets are likely not to have been stored originally at the “basement” level of Room 14, the latter cannot automatically be taken to have been the original place of storage of that piece. Since five of the six pieces have not been edited before I will present them below in transliteration.

2.1 KBo 12.132 (286/t, CTH 375)

Obv.

(vacat)

x+1 [-z]i É ^{MEŠ} DINGIR ^{MEŠ} -ma
2 [^{URU} Ka(?) -l]a [?] -aš-ma
3 [^{GIŠ} ZAG.GA]R [?] .RA ^{HI.A} pí-ip-pé-er ⁶ É.DINGIR ^{MEŠ} -ja ša- ar- ^u a [!] -er URU ^{HI.A} - m[a [?]]
4 [hu-u-m]a-an-da KUR.KUR ^{MEŠ-TIM} (Rev. 1') ⁷ ŠA [?] d Te- ^u a-ša-i[l [?]]
5 [-]ja-an-ta-ma (2') ša-an- ^{he} -eš-kán- zi []
6 []x ^{LÚ.MEŠ} SIPA.UDU {erasure} ^{LÚ} ŠAH-ja (rest of rev. uninscribed)
7 [ar-]kam-ma-an pí-d-da-a-er
8 [a]r-kam-ma-an ar- ^{ha}
9 [pí-d-da-a-er(?) ka-r]u-ú KUR ^{URU} HA-AT[-TI
10 [-e]n [?] ma-a-an [
11 [] x [

5 For the archaeological interpretation of the findspots see W. Schirmer in the introduction to KBo 13, IV, and in more detail id., Die Bebauung am unteren Büyükkale-Nordwesthang in Boğazköy (Berlin 1969 = BoHa 6), 20-22.

6 Added slightly higher than the preceding words and reaching across the edge onto the reverse.

7 The two lines on the rev. are written upside down vis-à-vis the usual orientation, that is, they are written perhaps as a continuation of the text coming from the obv. right above it; for a similar case cf. KUB 44.4.

(partial translation:)

“[Th]ey [...] but temples ... [and] they toppled [the alta]rs(?) and plundered the temples w[hile(?) they ...] the towns [...] of (the deity) Teḡašai[l ...] they kept (lit. keep) seeking. §
[... al[l the countries [...] ... [...] shepherds and swineherds [... , the gods’ tr]ibute they carried (off). §
[... the gods’ t]ribute [they carried] off [... form]erly the land of Ḫat[ti ...]”

Emmanuel Laroche listed this fragment in his CTH under no. 375 as “analogue à” KUB 17.21 ++, the main manuscript (A) of the Prayer of Arnuḡanda and Ašmunikal to the Sungoddess of Arinna concerning the cult city of Nerik⁸. Indeed, the fragment shows several words and phrases reminiscent of that prayer: the carrying off of the gods’ tribute (7’, 8’[-9’]? *arkamman piddai-* cf. KUB 17.21 ++, II 12-13), the use of the verbs *pippa-* and *šaruḡai-*. However, as Erich Neu⁹ rightfully remarked, the relation between the two is very loose and the fragment does not belong to the younger manuscript C. Also, the blank space at the beginning of the obv. and the following double paragraph line might point to a *Sammeltafel*. In that case the prayer, if that is what it is, would start very much *in medias res*. If so, the tablet may be a very rough draft containing a trial passage or might even be a student’s work. Note in this context that the new sentence starting in line 3 after *pipper*, begins a little bit higher, strongly suggesting that it is a later addition or insertion that continued on the reverse for perhaps two more lines¹⁰. However that may be, although the preserved wording might have been inspired by the Prayer of Arnuḡanda and Ašmunikal, KBo 12.132 theoretically may never have formed part of that composition. The appearance of the deity Teḡašail (sic¹¹, rev. x+1) on the other hand pleads against a late composition: although a hapax¹², the element *-šail* reminds of Hattian DNs like Tuḡašail, Taḡakšail, containing Hattian *šail* “lord”¹³. That a Hattian deity and – given its very poor attestation – a fairly obscure one at that, would have been included in a new composition in the late 13th century, seems un-

8 For an edition see R. Lebrun, Prières, 132-154.

9 FS Bittel, 396.

10 Whether this later hand is the same as the one that wrote the obverse is difficult to say judging from the photo.

11 The photo shows TE and not NE. As Dr. Oğuz Soysal informs me, the meaning of the DN in Hattian would be “its lords” (= *te=ua=šail*): for the prefixes see Soysal, HWHT 261 (for *u¹- „eigentlicher Pluralanzeiger“), 248f. (te¹- „Possessiv für 3.Pers.Sg.“), and 203 (for the order of the elements). Typologically the name would resemble ^d*Šiušummi-* (lit.) “our god”, a combination that also evolved into a DN.

12 Cf. van Gessel, OHP 1: 332.

13 Cf. Soysal, HWHT 306, for the two DNs see van Gessel, OHP s.vv.

likely. The script is NS, for which one can compare the pronounced URU-signs (obv. 3', 9').

2.2 KBo 13.166 (317/t, CTH 389)

Obv.

x+1 [^d UTU ^{URU} A-ri-] [┐] in-na me [┐] -mi- [┐] iš-ki-šī [┐]
2' [^d UTU ^{URU}] [┐] A-ri [┐] -in-na
3' []x-za
4' []x zi- [┐] ik [┐]
5' []x-a- <u>u</u> a
6'' []
<hr/>	
7'' [-a]n [?] -te-eš
8'' []x na-an [E]GIR-pa
9'' []x [o]x- [┐] šī [┐] ?

Rev.

x+1 []x
2' []x-aš
3'' []
4'' []
5'' [] [┐] É [┐] -er
6'' []x <u>har-ni-in-ke</u> [?] - [┐] er [┐] ? ¹⁴
7'' []x

Laroche had this fragment originally listed under CTH 832 but I follow Košak in identifying it as a prayer because of the combination of [the Sungoddess of] Arinna with a 2nd sing. verb (obv. x+1). Apart from a possibly older IK (obv. 4') the fragment is too small for a reliable dating.

14 For a very similar sign shape of HAR/HUR/MUR see HZL 333/10; since the only difference is an extra horizontal in the present fragment, I have not marked it with an exclamation mark. The field transliteration by Prof. Güterbock transliterated as given here, a reading that seems possible according to the photo and does not require any emendations. Since the signs were written on the edge, however, there is room for doubt. The handcopy in KBo 13 suggests *har-ni-in-te-ni* which requires at least an emendation to *har-ni-ik¹-te-ni* (the theoretically possible *har-ni-in-<ik>-te-ni* implies a spelling parallel to, for instance, *li-in-ik-ta*, from *link-* “to swear” that to my knowledge is not attested, however, for *-nink-*verbs). The handcopy gives no indication of inscribed verticals in the last sign (NI) but although not completely in focus at this point the photo does seem to show traces of such inscribed wedges which would make it into an ER/IR sign.

2.3 KUB 30.13 (2156/g, CTH 376)

KUB 30.13 is duplicate to KUB 24.3 II 3-18 and KUB 24.4 obv. 1-8, the Prayer of Muršili II to the Sungoddess of Arinna. Since Laroche¹⁵ an indirect join has been considered for KUB 30.13 with KBo 7.63 (2039/k) but the latter piece was found in the StT1 Room 10 which makes a join implausible. A dating of the manuscript to the time of Muršili is consistent with the ductus and sign forms: compare older LI (6', 7'), AZ (6'), AK (10') besides younger TAR (x+1) while there are no typical IIIc signs; note also the use of the CVC signs TÉN (x+1 *tarnatten*), KIR (3' *annieš-ker*).

2.4 KBo 49.53 (529/s)¹⁶

Left col. (at same level as r.col. line 4' in intercolumnium)

[...]x-š*i*

Right col.

x+1 x x[

2' ^dUTU [

3' *ne-p*[*i-š*^o

4' *ma-a-ú* [*šišdu*(?)

5' *tu-ga-x*[

6' *ut-tar* t[*a-/ga*[-

7' [┐]KASKAL-*an*[┐] x?[

The ^dUTU and the 2nd sing. of r. col. 5 are consistent with a prayer to the Sundeity. In the *Konkordanz* the ductus of the fragment is characterized as MS ("mh."), probably because of the older TAR (6).

2.5 Unp. 625/u

x+1 [¹⁷*ne-pí-ša-aš*(?) *da-ga-z*] *i-pa-aš-š*[*a*

¹⁵ Cf. CTH 376B.

¹⁶ I want to thank Prof. Gernot Wilhelm of the Boğazköy Archiv of the Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz for his very kind permission to quote here both unp. fragments 529/s and (below) 625/u.

¹⁷ How much room there was on the left cannot be estimated.

2' [<i>ḥa-an-ni(?)</i> -]	[⌈] <i>eš</i> [⌋] [?] <i>-na-aš</i> x[
3' [] <i>tu-e-e</i> [<i>l</i>
4' [] <i>tu-el</i> [
5' [<i>-u</i>] <i>a</i> [?] <i>-ar</i>	[
6' [] <i>x-a-a-aš-ša</i> [
7' [] <i>SUM-i</i> [<i>r</i>]
8' [] <i>x-zi nu ne-</i> [⌈] <i>pí</i> [⌋] <i>-i</i> [<i>š</i>
9' [] <i>x</i> [?] <i>-eš-kán-ta-ri</i> [
10' [] <i>x</i> [<i>x?</i>]- <i>iz-zi nu</i> x[
11' [] <i>x x x GE</i> ₆ ^{HL.A} x[
12' [<i>t</i>] <i>u-el-pát</i> [
13' [] x [

Although no name of a specific deity is preserved in this fragmentary piece there is the 2nd sing. *tuel* in ll. 3, 4, and 12. The collocation *nepiš dagazipašš=a* recalls the Prayer to the Sungod CTH 372, I 2 *nepišaš dagazipašš=a* LUGAL-ue “o king of heaven and earth” or *ibid.* I 14 *nepišaš taknašš=a ḥūlalešni zik=pat*^dUTU *laluk-kimaš* “In the circumference of heaven and earth you, o Sungod, are the source of light.” Ductus and sign forms do not show any particularly older features. The *Konkordanz* lists 625/u as NS (“jh.”).

3. Conclusions

It follows from the above that of the 1632 entries listed for the HaH only six belong to the prayer genre. Four out of these six (KBo 12.58 +, KBo 13.166, KUB 30.13, KBo 49.53) mention the Sungoddess (of Arinna) explicitly while for the remaining two, either a link to prayers to the Sungoddess has been suggested (KBo 12.132) or a case for such a link can be made (625/u).

Given the assumption that the administration of the Hittite kingdom and empire was subject to a certain system, this can hardly be due to coincidence. Rather, we are dealing with a small collection of prayer fragments that were once brought together by the scribes of the HaH as part of their work. This work may have been the composition of a new prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna for which they fell back on earlier compositions.

For the above fragments there are two basic possibilities: they either served as examples after which the new composition was to be modeled or they are part of that composition. The fragments showing early NS or MS (KUB 30.13, KBo 49.53) or KBo 12.58 + which is firmly dated to Tuṭḫaliya IV can only have served as examples. The same is probably true of KBo 12.132 because of the likely Hattian deity Teḫašail mentioned. KBo 13.166 is too small for a reliable dating but the possibly older IK sign does not immediately favor a very late date. Unp. 625/u is the only one without explicitly older signs. It may well be that none of the six is part of the “new” composition. Apart from complete loss through destruction or a piece not having been recognized by us, the new composition might have been part of the texts that were taken by the ruling class upon leaving the capital shortly after 1200. Such speculations are unnecessary, however. What is important, is that it seems possible to make sense out of what at first sight may look like an unsystematic collection of records. What results, is the emerging picture of a chancery at work, producing new documents, sometimes on the basis of older ones (*retroacta*¹⁸) that were retrieved from other collections and ultimately would have to be returned to their former location. It also speaks to the Sungoddess of Arinna’s undiminished popularity at the end of the empire period.

A look at the findspots of other prayers reveals that older, that is, OH or MH prayer compositions to the Sundeity were kept in Bldg. A¹⁹ the only exception being KUB 36.75 (CTH 374.2, MS) that was found in the storerooms surrounding Temple I. As far as the prayer is concerned that is usually entitled “Prayer to the Sungoddess of Arinna” of King Arnuṣanda I and his wife Queen Ašmunikal (CTH 375), it should be pointed out that in spite of her being mentioned explicitly in the fragmentary incipit, the composition as a whole addresses the totality of gods, in a consistent 2nd person plural. The only mention of the Sungoddess in the text is a reference to her (“... they [i.e., the Gašgaeans] carried off the sun-discs ... the offering bread and the libations of the Sun-goddess of Arinna”)²⁰. Note also the colophon of the composition (p. 43): “Second tablet. When they speak concurrently [the plea(?)] before the gods, pertaining to the Sungoddess of Arinna.”²¹ It looks as if the prayer is directed to all other gods on behalf of the Sungoddess rather than to her.

In general it can be observed that pre-NS prayers seem to have been kept in Bldg. A or on Büyükkale with the already mentioned exception of KUB 36.75, and

18 For this term cf. van den Hout, SMEA 47 (2005), 283.

19 See the *Konkordanz* for CTH 371, 372, 373, 374.

20 KUB 17.21 II 14-17, ed. Lebrun, Prières, 136, 144, tr. I. Singer, Prayers, 41.

21 KUB 48.107 IV 3-5, ed. Lebrun, Prières, 142, 148, transl. Singer, Prayers, 43. Note that in the colophon the name of the Sungoddess of Arinna has been written over erasure.

further KUB 17.21 + (CTH 375.1A), KUB 31.124 + (CTH 375.1B), and unpubl. 590/u, 1255/u²², and the above discussed KBo 49.53. Later prayers, whose findspots are known and that can attributed to specific kings, among which those to the Sun-goddess of Arinna of Muršili II (CTH 376) and of Ḫattušili III and his wife Puduḫepa (CTH 383, 384), were all found in the StT1. The only exception here is the Prayer of Muḫatalli II to Teššub of Kummanni that comes from Bldg. K. Further research is necessary to see patterns in the distribution of tablets all over Ḫattuša: with the invaluable *Konkordanz* of Silvin Košak we have the ultimate tool to do so!

22 See the *Konkordanz* for these two.