

CONTENTS

List of Plates	ix
Preface	xi
Abbreviations	xv
Introduction	1
1 The Sources	5
1.1 Text Constitution	5
1.1.1 The Middle Hittite Festival <i>CTH</i> 647.II–III	5
1.1.2 The New Hittite Local AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival <i>CTH</i> 647.I.....	6
1.2 Text History: Editions and Later Copies of the Festival Description	6
1.3 Stemmatological Analysis	13
2 The Texts: Transliteration with Facing Translation	20
2.1 The Middle Hittite Festival <i>CTH</i> 647.II–III	20
2.2 The New Hittite Local AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival <i>CTH</i> 647.I	80
3 Characteristics of the Local Cult	90
3.1 Festival Proceedings: a Synopsis	90
3.1.1 The Middle Hittite Festival <i>CTH</i> 647.II–III	91
3.1.2 The New Hittite Local AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival <i>CTH</i> 647.I	94
3.2 Identification of the Center	95
3.3 The Deities and Their Temples	99
3.4 The Participants	120
3.4.1 The Prince: Relations Between Local Cults and the State Cult	120
3.4.2 Priests	125
3.4.3 Other Participants	128
4 Cult Traditions of North-Central Anatolia	131
4.1 Traditional Beliefs in North-Central Anatolia	131
4.2 Festivals	142
Glossary	149
A Hittite	149
B Sumerograms	160
C Akkadograms	165
D Divine Names	167

E Place Names	168
F Numbers	168
Bibliography	171
Indexes	201
Plates	213

PREFACE

The present volume is the outcome of my intermittent studies over the course of more than twenty years on a group of texts describing two local festivals celebrated by a Hittite Prince (DUMU.LUGAL) in one of the cities of the Ḫatti land. The local pantheon of this city as well as its cult traditions were connected with the Hattian substrate. Most of the fragments published before 1971 were booked by Emmanuel Laroche in his *Catalogue des textes hittites* (CTH) by formal criteria under No. 647 (“Fêtes célébrées par le prince (DUMU.LUGAL)”).¹ Other texts were dispersed, among others, under Nos 663,² 705,³ 738⁴ and 670. Lacking well preserved colophons, the texts could not be ascribed either to a specific festival or to a place where the celebrations took place. Progress in my work and suggestions by Carlo Corti, Detlev Groddek, Jared L. Miller, Gabriella Stivala and others concerning the classification of fragments published in successive KBo fascicles, as well as the identification of new joins between texts of the said group, have resulted in a regular updating of the text arrangement in successive editions of the online *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln*. Nevertheless, the final arrangement of the texts presented in this book, verified by examination of the originals in the Ankara museum, differs from that in the newest version 1.95 of the *Konkordanz*.⁵

My interest in this group of texts goes back to my review of the first volume of Silvin Košak’s *Konkordanz* that was published in the *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* series.⁶ I noted some Middle Hittite fragments that evidently had to belong together, since they are the only sources in the Boğazköy archives to feature the writing ^{GIS}E.URUDU for the logogram ^{GIS}BANŠUR.⁷ This was the beginning of my research. In October 1993 I had an opportunity to study in Berlin at the invitation of Professor Volkert Haas. I have

1 Laroche 1971. CTH 647 is a ‘dustbin’ for texts describing different festivals celebrated by a prince. In the recent version of the online *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln* (Košak 2002-2016), CTH 647 has been rearranged, including also texts booked originally under CTH 648 (“Fêtes célébrées par le fils (DUMU)”), for both writings, DUMU.LUGAL and DUMU, refer to the prince. Apart from the texts belonging to the two festivals under discussion, it includes also a large group of texts related, among others, to the cults in Ḫattuša, Kaštama and Ḫanḫana; cf. Taracha 2005a: 709 n. 12; forthcoming.

2 Cf. Košak 1992: 11 (sub 7/a); 1995a: 58 (sub 642/b).

3 Cf. Košak 1995a: 60 (sub 668/b).

4 Cf. Košak 1999: 99 (sub 2602/c).

5 Košak 2002–2016 (sub CTH 647).

6 Košak 1992. Cf. Taracha 1995.

7 Košak 1992: 11 (sub 7/a). See already Haas – Klinger 1988: 291.

also nothing but gratitude for Dr. Joachim Marzahn for access to photographs of the Hittite texts and transliterations by Hans Ehelolf in the Vorderasiatisches Museum. Based on the photos and transliterations, I was able to identify a few joins and more unpublished fragments among the Bo-texts. I am deeply grateful to Professor Cem Karasu for checking my joins against the original tablets in the Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi in Ankara in August 2004. Initially, I had hoped to publish the results of my work in an article provisionally entitled “Bemerkungen zu den hethitischen Ritualen des Prinzen (DUMU.LUGAL),”⁸ but I continued to procrastinate, not satisfied with the recognition of particular editions and copies belonging to the festival description, and also because of many gaps that made a reconstruction of the course of the festival still patchy to say the least.

The outcome of my research and a provisional arrangement of 37 fragments were presented at the fifth International Congress of Hittitology in Çorum in September 2002,⁹ together with an announcement of a monograph,¹⁰ the preparations for which have taken all these years. I continued to be unsatisfied as to whether the text arrangement was entirely correct and whether I had actually understood the nature of the festival and re-created its course. Needless to say, the past ten years have seen some fairly fundamental changes to my original assumptions.

I have benefitted substantially from several visits to Mainz. Professor Doris Prechel five times (2004, 2008, 2010, 2014 and 2016) graciously invited me to lecture as a visiting professor at the Institut für Ägyptologie und Altorientalistik of the Mainz University. Professor Gernot Wilhelm and Professor Daniel Schwemer kindly and generously allowed me the use of the files of the Hethitologie-Archiv in Mainz. On these occasions, I benefited from the kind assistance of Dr. Silvin Košak. A new arrangement of the texts, including 41 fragments, which was presented in an article published in 2011,¹¹ resulted from their collation in June 2010, based on photographs in the Hethitologie-Archiv in Mainz. Yet even this arrangement did not prove to be final.

The present volume in its current shape has been made possible by a grant (no. N N103 096438) from the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education. It gave me the opportunity to complete my research at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago in June 2011. I would like to thank Professor Theo van den Hout for his hospitality and versatile assistance during my stay in the USA. The grant also went to covering my stay at the Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi in Ankara in September 2013, where by permission from the Ministry of Tourism and Culture of the Republic of Turkey I was able to study the original tablets, photograph the texts (some of the photos are published in this volume), find two new joins and complete the final text arrangement. I owe Dr. Şerife Yılmaz, the head of the Tablet Seksyonu of the Ankara museum, a debt of gratitude for her kind assistance. Also the Dean of the Faculty of

8 Announced already in Taracha 1995: 738 (sub 7/a).

9 Taracha 2005a.

10 Taracha 2005a: 709 n. 11.

11 Taracha 2011: 276 n. 2.

Oriental Studies and the Rector of the University of Warsaw, my academic base, have provided generous assistance for the publication of this book.

The long time spent on this group of texts illustrates the difficulties encountered in putting the fragments in order and attributing relevant fragments (the number of which had grown to 46) to particular editions and copies. The examination of the original tablets in Ankara was of great importance, allowing me to avoid some errors in the text arrangement. In the meantime, all of the texts from the German excavations at Hattuša after 1931 were published in successive KBo fascicles. Transliterations and photographs of the unpublished Bo-texts are included with permission from the Turkish Ministry of Tourism and Culture. Dr. Carlo Corti kindly shared a photograph of fragment E 553 that, meanwhile, has been published as KBo 66.223. The join piece KBo 52.121 + KBo 66.223 + Bo 6896 I photographed later at the museum in Ankara (Plate 10).

Finally, I owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Elisabeth Rieken and Professor Daniel Schwemer, who kindly agreed to publish the book in the *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* series.

Warsaw, October 2016

Piotr Taracha

INTRODUCTION

Texts relating to festivals and cult administration in general are among the most numerous categories of surviving Hittite clay tablets in the archives at Hattuşa. The festival texts are admittedly prescriptive in nature, giving the general course of the functions rather than descriptions of specific cult ceremonies. Most of them have been preserved in a number of parallel editions and/or copies, thus being literary compositions of a long tradition. They were copied or newly edited, also as abridgements or outline tablets, for different reasons which are mostly unknown to us, often for more than a hundred years, demonstrating, on the one hand, a cultural continuity throughout the existence of the Hittite state and, on the other hand, tracing changes in the cult at the capital Hattuşa, as well as in other centers, from the OH period (mid-seventeenth to mid-fifteenth century BC) through the fall of the Empire in the first decades of the twelfth century BC.¹

The great number of tiny fragments of festival descriptions and tablets without surviving colophons is a real challenge for a Hittitologist. This category of Hittite texts is the least studied and it will be one of the chief tasks of Hittitology tomorrow to put such texts in order and to classify them by theme (and not just formally as has often been the case until now), taking advantage also of the new opportunities created by comparative analyses of tablets with the aid of computer technologies.² One should also note with satisfaction that a new research scheme, “Das Corpus der hethitischen Festrituale: staatliche Verwaltung des Kultwesens im spätbronzezeitlichen Anatolien,” coordinated by the Universities of Würzburg and Marburg and the Hethitologie-Archiv of the Academy of Sciences in Mainz, will focus for the next twenty years after 2016 on the study of Hittite festivals. The present volume leads to some extent the way for this research perspective, showcasing some of the difficulties presented by a reconstruction and interpretation of these severely damaged documents without colophons.

Working methods of Hittite scribes add to the difficulty of putting in order fragmentary texts and ascribing them to specific festivals. Texts relating to different festivals describe typical events, like the beginning of the cult ceremony or the sequence of offerings, in much the same if not identical manner; this sometimes concerns passages taking up more than a whole column on the tablets. When editing a new text,

1 Generally on cult practices and the most important festivals in the Old Hittite and the Empire periods, see Taracha 2009: 59–74, 128–41, with refs. For the management and administration of Hittite state cults, see, e.g., Gilan 2007; Schwemer 2012a; 2016.

2 See, e.g., Müller 2014; Cammarosano 2015a; Müller – Fisseler – Weichert 2015; Müller 2016a and 2016b.

a scribe availed himself of other ritual texts as a model, copying extensive passages from these. In consequence, “in very fragmentary ... tablets it is difficult to distinguish with any amount of precision between duplicates of the same document and cases in which we find repetitions of the same ritual words and sentences in different texts.”³

On the other hand, the stereotyped and repeated actions, ‘liturgized’, if you like, and appearing somewhat monotonous – which was one of the most characteristic features of cult practices in Hittite Anatolia (and generally in the ancient Near East) – can prove to be useful for reconstructing the course of a festival based on fragmentarily preserved texts. Despite the fragmentary state of a given description, the cult performed in one temple can be reconstructed from a text referring to another temple, assuming that the cults were the same or quite similar in all likelihood. The method was applied to obtain the results presented in Chapter 2 that offers a transliteration of the texts with facing translation. It was also used in a synoptic presentation of the festival events in Chapter 3.1. In the former, the wording of some fragmentary passages has been restored based on parallels from other parts of the text, while in the latter the possible contents of the lost parts of the document have been suggested.

The festivals presented here are well worth study by scholars of religion and local cults in Hittite Anatolia. They were performed in one of the Hittite towns cultivating Hattian cult traditions, which may indicate its location to the north of Ḫattuša. An effort has been made to identify the center in Chapter 3.2. The structure of the local pantheon is described in Chapter 3.3, including deities of which little has been known until now. The inner hierarchy of the priestly college is reconstructed, providing information on the local cult tradition (Chapter 3.4.2). It is noteworthy that the celebrations were presided over by the prince, who represented the king in local festivals in different cities in the north of the land. These cult journeys of the prince are attested already for the OH period (see Chapter 3.4.1). It seems that in this early period most, if not all, festivals were celebrated annually on a set date in the cult calendar that was based primarily on the vegetation and agrarian cycles. During the Empire period, ‘great’ festivals were usually organized at longer intervals, usually in three-, six- or nine-year cycles. Festivals in the spring and fall were of special importance in the local cult tradition, marking the beginning of the vegetation cycle or the beginning and end of work in the fields.⁴

The present volume is about one such local festival (*CTH* 647.II–III)⁵ that is likely to have been performed in the spring. The participation of the prince indicates that the festival was part of the state cult, indirectly attesting to the importance of the center in the structure of the Hittite state and its relations with the capital Ḫattuša.

3 De Martino 2010a: 94. See also, e.g., Popko 2009: 2; Lorenz 2014. Note also another spectacular example of the same passage in texts belonging to different festivals: KBo 27.42 ii 43–51 (KILAM, Singer 1984: 57–8), KUB 25.1 i 18–26 (16th day of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM, Badali – Zinko 1989: 10), KBo 30.56 iv 34–44 (*CTH* 669.33 “Large fragments of festivals,” Groddek 2002a: 74).

4 On Hittite spring and fall festivals, see, e.g., Carter 1962: 8–9; Güterbock 1964: 70 ff.; Archi 1973; Hazenbos 2003: 168 ff.; 2004. Cf. also Taracha 2009: 70–1.

5 See Chapter 1.1 Text constitution.

Concerning the festival description, fragments of two one-column tablets and five exemplars in two-column format written in Middle Script are preserved, not to mention a number of (L)NH copies / editions, including one-column and two-column tablets (see Chapter 1). Several MH manuscripts can be dated to the very beginning of the Empire period.⁶ Thus, the surviving documents permit the festival to be traced for a period of about two hundred years, showing continuity as well as changes taking place in this local cult. This issue will be taken up in the summary in Chapter 4.2.

A well preserved NH text KUB 20.45++ (*CTH* 647.I) describes cult celebrations presided over by the prince, who visited temples of diverse deities, where the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM plant⁷ would be left in offering at the ‘holy places’ in the cella. On these grounds Hans Gustav Güterbock ascribed this tablet to the text corpus of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festival,⁸ suggesting that it could have been one of the *hadauri* festivals performed parallel with the great AN.TAḪ.ŠUM and *nuntarriyašḥaš* festivals, respectively in the spring and fall, in the sanctuaries of different divinities.⁹ Referring to KUB 20.45, Güterbock called upon the information in an outline tablet KBo 10.20 ii 40–49 that on the seventeenth day of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festival, when the royal couple visited the temple of the deity Ḫannu, the prince officiated at the celebrations of the *hadauri* feast in the temple of the Storm-god.

In her 1977 article, A. Margherita Jasink Ticchioni proposed an interpretation of texts published at the time and classified as *CTH* 647.¹⁰ Fragments belonging to the description of the festival *CTH* 647.II–III dealt with in this book, parallel to KUB 20.45++, she ascribed to the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM text corpus, following Güterbock’s suggestion, despite the fact that none of them mentions the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM plant. According to Volkert Haas, KUB 20.45++ might be associated with cult ceremonies in Ankuwa on the 37th and 38th day of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festival.¹¹ In turn, Alfonso Archi recently stated that this text refers to “a later festival celebrated by a prince, DUMULUGAL, concerning the restoration of cults in the region of Nerik (*CTH* 647).”¹²

Examination of relevant texts leaves no doubt that the festival *CTH* 647.II–III was performed outside of Ḫattuša. KUB 20.45++, and even more so the MH editions of the former festival, could not have been one of the *hadauri* festivals mentioned in the outline of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festival that were celebrated in the capital.¹³ The issue of the

6 Phase two according to Popko 2005: 12, that is, the reigns of Muwattalli I and Tudḫaliya I.

7 CAD A: 112–3 (“a bulbous spring vegetable,” written SUM.TUR ‘little onion’); Beal 2002: 74 with n. 114 (‘garlic?’). Differently, Farber 1991 (‘fennel’), and Cornelius 1965 (‘crocus/saffron’), followed by Hoffner 1974: 109–10; Haas 2003: 346–7, and others.

8 Güterbock 1960: 82–3, 86, 88. On the festival of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM plant, see, e.g., Güterbock 1964: 62 ff.; Houwink ten Cate 1986; Zinko 1987; Popko – Taracha 1988; Badali – Zinko 1989; Haas – Wegner 1992; Yoshida 1992; Haas 1994: 772 ff.; Houwink ten Cate 2003; Taracha 2009: 138–40; Galmarini 2013; 2014; 2015. A comprehensive study of this great Hittite festival remains one of the main tasks of Hittitology in the future.

9 On the *hadauri* festivals, see Houwink ten Cate 1986: 100–4; Balçioğlu 1990; Nakamura 2002: 96–7. For the role of the DUMULUGAL in these festivals, see Torri 2004: 461–3.

10 Jasink Ticchioni 1977: 152–3.

11 Haas 1994: 821–2.

12 Archi 2010: 23–4. Archi mistakenly assigns fragment KBo 20.86+ (*CTH* 662.1B) to this festival.

13 Cf. Taracha 2005a: 710–1.

relationship between the MH festival *CTH* 647.II–III and the beginnings of the cult practice of bringing the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM plant to the temples of a given city, which took place in the spring with the awakening of all vegetation after the winter, is much more complex. The cult ritual presented here sheds new light on this issue.

The rite of offering the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM plant by the prince in the temples, described in KUB 20.45++ (*CTH* 647.I), irrevocably calls to mind the celebrations on the ninth day of the great festival of AN.TAḪ.ŠUM, when the king did the same in Arinna and the queen in her palace in Ḫattuša.¹⁴ This thirteenth century BC cult ritual should certainly be considered a local AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festival.¹⁵ The MH editions of *CTH* 647.II–III, the earliest of which go back to the mid-fifteenth century BC, attest to a two-hundred-year-old cult tradition in one center. Significantly, they do not mention the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM plant. It can be assumed that the celebrations took place in the spring, but the surviving parts of the description reveal no sign of rites typical of spring festivals connected with the agrarian cycle, such as the ceremonial opening of a large storage vessel filled with harvest grain, used in spring to bake bread offered to the god in order that he shall recover his vital forces in the new season.¹⁶ In some of the centers of north-central Anatolia, spring festivals were celebrated in keeping with a cult calendar based on the vegetation cycle, the purpose being, similarly as in the case of the ‘agrarian’ spring festivals, to imbue the gods with new life and ascertain prosperity of the town and its inhabitants. These festivals were similar to but not identical with the ‘agrarian’ spring festivals marking the beginning of work in the fields. With time they were transformed into local festivals of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM plant, which became a new symbol of the beginning of spring vegetation. These issues will be taken up in detail in successive chapters of this book.

¹⁴ Güterbock 1960: 81, 85.

¹⁵ Taggar-Cohen (2006a: 378) still connects it with Ḫattuša. It remains also unclear why she considers one of the texts belonging to *CTH* 647.II–III (KUB 20.88) comparable “with the rituals engaging the prince: the *ḫaššumaš*-festival (IBoT 1.29) and the Telipinu festival (KUB 53.4),” Taggar-Cohen 2006a: 145 n. 331.

¹⁶ See n. 4.