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PREFACE

This volume represents a thorough revision of my doctoral dissertation completed at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago in May of 1988. It therefore necessarily reflects an immense amount of encouragement, correction, and guidance from my dissertation committee of Professors Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., Hans G. Güterbock, Ahmet Unal, and Thomas McClellan, at that time all on the faculty or staff of the Oriental Institute. I have retained some of the personal element inherent in a closely supervised dissertation by referring to personal communications throughout the monograph. It would be impossible to credit my committee with every correction and idea which they shared; I have tried to do so for certain important concepts.

This work represents an attempt to study all the religious textual material available on the Hittite tutelary deities and to analyze the role they played in the official state cult as celebrated in the capital and at provincial cult centers. I have not attempted to evaluate the many tutelary deities in all of their occurrences in every genre of Hittite text beyond the survey presented in Chapter 1. The use of titles and names of tutelary deities in personal names is beyond the scope of this work. The basis of the work is extensive philological research in the cuneiform archives left by the Hittites over 3,000 years ago. The work on texts which are completely edited in the chapters devoted to different festivals is based on a year of research in the Hittite tablet archives in the museums of Istanbul, Ankara, and Berlin. That work with the tablets was supplemented with research in the lexical files of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary, which provided convenient access to the entire published corpus of Hittite tablets for research on individual deities or Hittite words that required in-depth analysis.

A word of caution is in order concerning the conclusions reached in this volume. The nature of the Hittite archives is such that the amount and type of textual material which is available to us is dependent on accidents of preservation and discovery. Unlike historical archives of more recent cultures that have been continuously maintained up to the present day, the Hittite tablet archives were buried underground for more than three millennia. The Hittite capital, Ḫattuša, has not been completely excavated, and we simply cannot know what portion of the preserved corpus of Hittite material has been discovered. Shelf lists from the archives list many festivals and rituals the actual texts of which have not yet been discovered or identified. Of what has been discovered a portion has yet to be published. Therefore a work such as this, which relies to some extent on the frequency of occurrences of particular deities in the texts and assumes that we have representative samples of at least most of the major Hittite cultic texts, must carry with it the caveat that new discoveries of tablets or temples or cult objects may alter our reconstruction. Part of the attraction of Hittitology as a discipline is the intellectual flexibility which it requires, the certain knowledge that only a portion of the evidence is available, that more is constantly being discovered, and that theories will have to be revised. Our understanding of cultic activity at the local level especially may change as additional sites outside the capital continue to be investigated.
The work has two main focuses. The first is a broad review of the evidence for the role of all tutelary deities in the cult. The discussion draws on evidence from the corpus of festivals, rituals, prayers, cult inventories, and mythology, as well as various genres of "secular" texts. I have created a provisional outline of the types of tutelary deities, the kinds of cultic activities performed for them, and their position vis-à-vis the other gods in the Hittite pantheon.

The second focus of this monograph is a contribution to the continuing process of establishing our sources for the study of Hittite religion by editing a number of the festival texts. A study of the cults for tutelary deities must utilize as sources all types of religious texts, but the texts in which the Hittites described specific cult ceremonies will be our most important source. The festivals which I have chosen for extensive work are ones which were or at least may have been celebrated primarily for one or more tutelary deities. A number of fragmentary cult texts having to do with tutelary deities which cannot be fitted into the scheme of one of the larger festivals are included in Appendix A. The editing of texts from any ancient Near Eastern culture requires intensive philological investigation into certain words or phrases central to the meaning or difficult of translation. Selected words which required special attention are treated individually in Appendix B.

Because part of this work involves making English translations of Hittite religious texts available to the non-Hittitologist interested in ancient Near Eastern religious, social, or intellectual history, I have tried to be sensitive to the varied audience to which this monograph will appeal. Much of the work must remain fairly technical and address itself to other Hittite scholars. I hope, however, that the discussions in Chapter 1 and the English translations of Chapters 2–5 will be of use to non-Hittitologists. Citations of reference works abound, and a word is in order concerning these. Laroche's Catalogue des Textes Hittites is a systematic cataloguing of all published Hittite tablets, in which texts are assigned a modern title and a number. This standardizes the names by which we identify festivals, rituals, treaties, etc. Laroche's work in identifying festival texts for tutelary deities was the starting point for my research. In the Introduction I provide a revised schema of the texts for CTH 681–685, Laroche's "Cultes de de KAL." Hittite lexicography is still in a rather fluid state as attested by the three major dictionary projects being carried on simultaneously to supplement the admirable Hethitisches Wörterbuch of Friedrich published in 1952. The newer dictionaries benefit greatly from the hundreds of tablets published since Friedrich's work, but for many words Friedrich remains the only dictionary available.

Any exercise in scholarship is a cooperative effort that benefits from a multiplicity of perspectives, and it is with gratitude that I acknowledge those who helped guide this work. I offer here my sincerest thanks to my advisor Professor Harry Hoffner, who not only taught me Hittite and supervised my dissertation but also graciously extended to me the use of the lexical files of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary for my research. Professors Hoffner and Güterbock also allowed me to utilize early drafts of individual CHD articles. The dictionary project has been funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities. I wish to express my deep appreciation also to Professor Hans G. Güterbock, who gave generously of his time and unparalleled experience in guiding and correcting my work and also provided me with examples from his field transcriptions of unpublished material. I also extend my thanks to the other members of my committee, Professors Ahmet Ünal and Thomas McClellan, each of whom carefully helped guide me through the various stages of preparing this work. Dr. Richard Beal read the entire manuscript more than once and checked all my references. I thank him for his meticulous care and the excellent ideas he offered along the way. Any errors which remain in the work are naturally my sole responsibility. I am grateful also to Professor Robert Dankoff, who introduced me to the joys of Turkish and thus facilitated my research in Turkey. I would in addition like to thank the other members of the faculty and my classmates at the Oriental Institute, who shared with me the wonder and fascination of the ancient Near East. I acknowledge a special debt of

1. In Chicago the Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago (CHD), in Munich the second edition of the Hethitisches Wörterbuch (HW2), and in Los Angeles (UCLA) the Hittite Etymological Dictionary (HED).
gratitude to Ron Gorny, who accompanied me in explorations of the Hittite homeland, provided much-needed guidance in the archaeology of ancient Anatolia, and shared my passionate enthusiasm for things Hittite.

My work here and abroad has been aided by numerous fellowships. I wish to thank the American and Turkish Fulbright Commissions and the American Research Institute in Turkey, all of whom helped make possible my research in Turkey. The Mrs. Giles Whiting Foundation provided generous support of my research and study in the crucial last year of my doctoral program. I am grateful also to the Turkish Department of Antiquities for allowing me to work in their museums, and I extend my appreciation to the staffs of the Istanbul Arkeoloji Müzeleri and the Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi in Ankara for their kindness and help in my work in Turkey. I particularly would like to thank Veyssel Donbaz and Fatma Yildiz of the Istanbul museum tablet archives, who extended their friendship as well as professional assistance throughout my year in Turkey.

I also wish to acknowledge my gratitude to Professor Heinrich Otten, who gave me access to important unpublished sources. While I worked at the Vorderasiatisches Museum in Berlin I was aided by the director, Professor Liane Jakob-Rost, and Dr. Evelyn Klengel, both of whom very willingly facilitated my work with the tablets there. Professor Horst Klengel of what was then the Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR has very kindly allowed me to utilize an unpublished tablet fragment which has greatly aided my understanding of the relevant text.

The revision of the dissertation has been generously funded by my present academic home, the University of New Hampshire. The UNH Center for Humanities provided a summer grant which gave me the necessary time to revise the manuscript. The Central University Research Fund awarded me a travel grant to return to Chicago to confer during the revising process with Professors Hoffner and Güterbock and with the editors of the Oriental Institute Press. I would also like to thank Tom Holland and Tom Urban of the Oriental Institute for their diligence and expertise in the preparation of the manuscript.

Finally I would like to thank my parents for their unceasing encouragement and support of every kind over years of bringing this project to fruition and to express my deep appreciation to my wife Melinda, without whose constant support, encouragement, and sacrifice this work would never have been possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AANL</td>
<td>Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze moralì, storiche e filologiche, Serie 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABoT</td>
<td>Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri. Istanbul 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFO</td>
<td>Archiv für Orientforschung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHw</td>
<td>W. von Soden, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AION</td>
<td>Annali dell’Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AION</td>
<td>Annali del Seminario di Studi del Mondo Classico Sezione Linguistica. (Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJA</td>
<td>American Journal of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alakš.</td>
<td>Treaty of Muwatalli with Alakšandu, edited in SV 2: 42–102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AlHeth</td>
<td>H. A. Hoffner, Jr., Alimenta Hethaeorum. (AOS 55) New Haven 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alp, Beamt.</td>
<td>S. Alp, Untersuchungen zu den Beamtenamen im hethitischen Festzereonial. Leipzig 1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>A. Götze, Die Annalen des Mursiliš. (MVAeG 38) Leipzig 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr</td>
<td>Analecta Orientalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnSt</td>
<td>Anatolian Studies (Journal of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnYayın</td>
<td>Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Çoğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Der Alte Orient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOAT</td>
<td>Alter Orient und Altes Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOATS</td>
<td>AOAT, Sonderreihe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOF</td>
<td>Altorientalische Forschungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOS</td>
<td>American Oriental Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArOr</td>
<td>Archiv Orientální</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Assyriological Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>F. Sommer, Die Ahhiyavā-Urkunden. Munich 1932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The abbreviations used are in general those of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary. I also have striven for consistency by following Chicago Hittite Dictionary style in my citations of primary sources and secondary works.*
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BagM  Baghdader Mitteilungen
Balkan, İnandık  K. Balkan, İnandık'ta 1966 yılında bulunan eski Hitit çağına ait bir bağış belgesi. Ankara 1973
Bel Madg.  BĚL MADGALTI instr., ed. Dienstanw.
Belleten  Türk Tarih Kurumu Belleten
Bildbeschr.  C.-G. von Brandenstein, Hethitische Götter nach Bildbeschreibungen in Keilschrifttexten. (MVAeG 46.2) Leipzig 1943
BiOr  Bibliotheca Orientalis
Bittel, Hethiter  K. Bittel, Die Hethiter. Munich 1976
Bo  Inventory numbers of Boğazköy tablets excavated 1906–12
Bo year/...  Inventory numbers of Boğazköy tablets excavated 1968–
BoHa  Boğazköy-Hattuša, Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen
Borger, AOAT 33  R. Borger, Assyrisch-babylonische Zeichenliste. (AOAT 33) Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978
BoSt  Bogazköy-Studien
BoTU  E. Forrer, Die Bogazköy-Texte in Umschrift. (WVDOG 41/42) Leipzig 1922, 1926
CAD  The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Chicago 1956–
CHD  The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. Chicago 1980–
CRRAI  Compte rendu de la ... Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (cited by date of congress, not date of publication)
CTH  E. Laroche, Catalogue des textes hittites, 2nd ed. Paris 1971
DLL  E. Laroche, Dictionnaire de la langue louvite. Paris 1959
DMOA  Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui
Erimḫuṣ  Lexical series erimḫuṣ = anantu
Erimḫuṣ Bogh.  Boğazköy version of Erimḫuṣ
Ertem, Fauna  H. Ertem, Boğazköy metinlerine göre Hititler devri Anadolu’yunun Faunası. Ankara 1965
Ertem, Flora  H. Ertem, Boğazköy metinlerine göre Hititler devri Anadolu’yunun Florası. Ankara 1974
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FsAkurgal</td>
<td><em>Akurgal’a Armağan</em> (Festschrift Akurgal). Ankara 1987–89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FsBittel</td>
<td><em>Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasiens. Festschrift für Kurt Bittel</em>. Mainz 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FsFriedrich</td>
<td><em>Festschrift J. Friedrich zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet</em>. Heidelberg 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FsKantor</td>
<td><em>Essays in Ancient Civilization Presented to Helene J. Kantor</em>. Chicago 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FsLacheman</td>
<td><em>Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians in Honor of Ernest R. Lacheman</em>. Winona Lake, Indiana 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FsLaroche</td>
<td><em>Florilegium Anatolicum: Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche</em>. Paris 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FsNeumann</td>
<td><em>Serta Indogermanica: Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag</em>. (IBS 40) Innsbruck 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FsOtten</td>
<td><em>Festschrift Heinrich Otten</em>. Wiesbaden 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FsOtten²</td>
<td><em>Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag</em>. Wiesbaden 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilg.</td>
<td>Gilgamesh epic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goetze, KI</td>
<td>A. Goetze, <em>Kleinasiens</em>, 2nd ed. Munich 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>F. Sommer und A. Falkenstein, <em>Die Hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Ḥattušili I</em>. Munich 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HbOr</td>
<td><em>Handbuch der Orientalistik</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

HHB

Hipp.heth.

HT
*Hittite Texts in the Cuneiform Character in the British Museum.* London 1920

HTR

İjuqq.
The Treaty of Šuppiluliuma with İjuqqana, edited in *SV* 2:103–63

HW
J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch.* Heidelberg 1952(–54)

HW 1., 2., 3. Erg.

HW²

IBoT

IBS
*Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft*

IF
*Indogermanische Forschungen*

Illu.
Illuyanka Myth

IM
*Istanbuler Mitteilungen*

Izi
Lexical series *izi = išatu* (MSL 13:154–226)

Izi Bogh.
Boğazköy version of *Izi* (MSL 13:132–47)

JANES
*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society*

JAOS
*Journal of the American Oriental Society*

JBL
*Journal of Biblical Literature*

JCS
*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*

JESHO
*Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*

JIES
*Journal of Indo-European Studies*

JKF
*Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische Forschungen (= Anadolu Araştırmaları)*

Josephson, Par.
F. Josephson, *The Function of Sentence Particles in Old and Middle Hittite.* Uppsala 1972

JNES
*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*

Kammenhuber, Materialien

Kaškäer
E. von Schuler, *Die Kaškäer.* Berlin 1965

KBo
*Koilschrifttexte aus Boghazkoi*

KIF
*Kleinasiatische Forschungen,* ed. F. Sommer and H. Eheloff

KUB
*Koilschrifturkunden aus Boghazkoi*

Kum.

Kup.
The Treaty of Muršili II with Kupanta-šKAL, edited in *SV* 1:95–181

KZ
*Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* ("Kühns Zeitschrift")

Laroche, HH
E. Laroche, *Les hiéroglyphes hittites 1.* (Unmarked number following "HH" refers to a sign number) Paris 1960

Laroche, Myth.

Laroche, Onom.
E. Laroche, *Recueil d'Onomatique Hittite.* Paris 1951

Laroche, Rech.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man.</td>
<td>Treaty of Muršili II with Manapa-šu, edited in <em>SV</em> 2:1–41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAOG</td>
<td><em>Mitteilungen der Altertumskundlichen Gesellschaft</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mašt.</td>
<td>Ritual of Mašigga against family quarrels (CTH 404); 2Mašt. cited according to the edition of L. Rost, <em>MIO</em> 1 (1953) 348–67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDOG</td>
<td><em>Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIO</td>
<td><em>Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS</td>
<td><em>Mission de Ras Shamra</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSL</td>
<td>B. Landsberger et al., <em>Materialien zum sumerischen Lexikon</em>. Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td><em>Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVAeG</td>
<td><em>Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVAG</td>
<td><em>Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>Neue Folge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHF</td>
<td><em>Neuere Hethiterforschung</em>, ed. G. Walser. Wiesbaden 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td><em>Oriens Antiquus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLP</td>
<td><em>Oriental Institute Publications</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLP</td>
<td><em>Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLZ</td>
<td><em>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pap.</td>
<td>F. Sommer and H. Ehelolf, <em>Das hethitische Ritual des Pανανικρι von Komana</em>. (BoSt 10) Leipzig 1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRU</td>
<td><em>Le palais royal d’Ugarit</em> (subseries of <em>MRS</em>). Paris 1955–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td><em>Revue d’Assyriologie et d’Archéologie orientale</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHA</td>
<td><em>Revue hittite et asiatique</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLA</td>
<td><em>Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie</em>. Berlin 1928-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Ras Shamra Text, inventory number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSO</td>
<td><em>Rivista degli Studi Orientali</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAOC</td>
<td><em>Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCO</td>
<td><em>Studi Classici e Orientali</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHAW</td>
<td><em>Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEA</td>
<td><em>Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StBoT</td>
<td><em>Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StMed</td>
<td><em>Studia Mediterranea</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>J. Friedrich, <em>Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache 1, 2. (MVAeG 31.1, 34.1)</em> Leipzig 1926, 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taw.</td>
<td>Tawagalawa letter, edited in AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel.pr.</td>
<td>Telipinu proclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel.myth</td>
<td>Telipinu myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THeth</td>
<td><em>Texte der Hethiter</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF</td>
<td><em>Ugarit-Forschungen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugar.</td>
<td><em>Ugaritica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT</td>
<td>Inventory numbers of tablets in the Staatliche Museen in Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBoT</td>
<td>Verstreute BoghazkÖ-Texte, ed. A. Götte. Marburg 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIO</td>
<td><em>Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Orientforschung der Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WO</td>
<td><em>Die Welt des Orient</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WVDOG</td>
<td><em>Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZKM</td>
<td><em>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaz²</td>
<td><em>Das hethitische Felsheiligtum Yazılıkaya</em>. (BoHa 9) Berlin 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZA</td>
<td><em>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LIST OF GENERAL ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>col.</td>
<td>column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diss.</td>
<td>dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.-l.</td>
<td>dative-locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>divine name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dupl(s).</td>
<td>duplicate(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed.</td>
<td>edition, edited by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eras.</td>
<td>erasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erg.</td>
<td>Ergänzungsheft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f(f).</td>
<td>following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fasc.</td>
<td>fascicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fest.</td>
<td>festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frag.</td>
<td>fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN</td>
<td>geographical name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>instruction(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e.</td>
<td>left edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lief.</td>
<td>Lieferung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Middle Hittite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Middle Hittite Script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>New Hittite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>New Hittite Script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Old Hittite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Old Hittite Script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>par.</td>
<td>parallel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>plate(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>personal name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOS**
- Typical Old Script
- translation, translated (by)
- transliteration, transliterated (by)
- indicates an inscribed sign
- space within a lacuna for a sign
- illegible sign
- equivalences in duplicates, lexical texts and bilinguals
- paragraph in cuneiform text
- denotes an unattested form
- encloses material lost in a break in the tablet
- encloses material restored from a duplicate text
- partly broken
- omitted by scribal error
- omitted by scribal error and restored from a duplicate
- to be omitted
- end of line in cuneiform text
- marks morpheme boundaries
- single- or double-wedge marker (Glossenkeil). Used to indicate foreign words in a Hittite text.
- indicates that the first line of a transliteration is not the original first line because the top of the tablet is broken away
- after a line number indicates that the line numbering reflects only the preserved lines of a broken tablet
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INTRODUCTION

GENERAL

Much of Hittite official life revolved around the cult, the system of state-sponsored festivals designed to ensure regular and appropriate offerings to the gods.\(^1\) Festivals in this sense are cult ceremonies often lasting several days, which are the primary shared religious expression of the Hittites.\(^2\) Although the state had a well-developed system of priests and other functionaries, the king and queen played the most prominent role in most festivals. The festival descriptions as they have come down to us written in cuneiform on clay tablets specify in great detail the materials and mode of offerings, the kinds of cult liturgy to be performed, and the places of celebration. Investigation into the nature of the Hittite state reveals that among a Hittite monarch’s responsibilities the one that was perhaps most essential was that of maintaining the state’s relationship with its deities by providing for and performing the requisite cult ceremonies. A rather full religious calendar prescribed a yearly cycle of these festivals. Further evidence bearing on the centrality of the cult comes from the oracle texts in the state archives, in which very often the Hittites question a god as to whether his anger stems from the forgetting of cult offerings.

The activities of the cult took place at a variety of sacred loci. The Hittite capital, Ḫattuša, is a city of temples large and small, with attached storerooms and tablet archives. Within the temple cella was a series of “holy places” that received libations and offerings. Many major festivals involved cult journeys or processions of king and queen, priests, and gods within the capital or to sacred spots outside the city. Sacred groves or springs might be the locus of a deity. Many deities had a cult stela (ḫuwaši) out in the countryside at which offerings would be made. Those offerings might be beer or wine or other unidentified beverages, meat, bread, or cheese. The great variety of offering breads alone testifies to the diversity within the cult.


2. Hittitologists follow the Hittites themselves in distinguishing between festivals (EZEN), group religious ceremonies designed to worship and provide offerings to the gods, and rituals (SISKUR), magical procedures often performed by and for individuals to address specific maladies.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

Tablets of festival descriptions make up a large portion of the extant Hittite corpus. The nature of a cultic description is such that these tablets can be difficult to place chronologically within the four centuries of the Hittite kingdom. Unlike historical texts, which often can be dated by events or allusions to known individuals, the festivals usually exist in many copies written over a period of centuries, changing little if at all during that time. The primary means for establishing the date of a festival tablet are the types of gods mentioned, the characteristics of the language, and the paleography of the script. None of the festivals edited in this volume is on the grand scale of a festival like the thirty-eight days of the Festival of the AN.TAH.ŠUM plant, but they are in most cases state festivals celebrated by the kingdom's religious institution. Some Hittite festivals are intended to be universal, dedicated to the entire pantheon; others are performed for a particular deity. The cult descriptions edited herein contain festivals of both types. The texts describing the cult, while often repetitious in their descriptions of offerings, provide a penetrating insight into the Hittite perception of the world, a world ruled by gods who must be fed and propitiated, who must at any cost be provided with their ordained offerings and ceremony.

TUTELARY DEITIES

Among the gods of the Hittite pantheon were a number of deities who were thought of as "tutelary" or "protective" deities. This is not a uniquely Hittite concept, as many cultures revere and attempt to propitiate gods who are supposed to be guardian spirits over personal well-being, nature, the home, a sacred locus, a particular activity, etc.3 The Mesopotamians revered protective spirits who watched over one's person and served as patron deities.4 Two of the Sumerian words for these deities were LAMMA and ALAD, whose Akkadian equivalents were lamassu and šedu.5 It is in fact the Sumerian logogram LAMMA6 which the Hittites used in writing the titles of many of their protective deities. They used this logogram not as a name but as a title, "the Tutelary Deity," or to represent an Anatolian name such as Inara, whose name is sometimes written with this sign, usually with a phonetic complement, for example ḫLAMMA-āṣ or ḫLAMMA-ṛ.7

The notion of protective deities is of great antiquity in Anatolia. Kutlu Emre identifies the lead statuettes found in houses from the Old Assyrian colony period as protective

5. See the Erimhus vocabulary KBo 26.25(+)KBo 1.35 iii 3’–4’, discussed in Chapter 1.
6. The KAL sign, Borger, AOAT 33A #322. The reading LAMMA is derived from lexical texts such as the one cited above.
7. Steiner, RLA 3 (1957–71) 548, and Laroche, RLA 6 (1980–83) 456, note the complexity of the Hittite use of ḫLAMMA, which denotes not one specific god but a type of god.
deities for the houses, probably the "your god, our god" referred to in the documents. The evidence of seals from the pre-Hittite period also indicates the antiquity of the association of certain gods with the stag, the sacred animal of the tutelary deity in the Hittite period. There are seals from the Old Assyrian period which show a deity on a stag, armed with weapons, with a hare and/or bird in its hand. This is the same iconography attested for certain Hittite tutelary deities (see below) and demonstrates the continuity of cult representation from the kârum period into the Hittite kingdom, a continuity based on the Hittites’ extensive borrowing of gods, cults, and iconography from the Hattians, their Anatolian predecessors.

The appropriate English translation for the title DLMMA has proved somewhat elusive. In German DLMMA is usually translated "Schutzgott," which is convenient and conveys the meaning as well as any other translation. There is, however, no one-word English equivalent for "Schutzgott"; I have chosen in general to utilize the term "tutelary deity." The translation intentionally conveys the rather general connotations of the Hittite term.

The iconography of tutelary deities is fairly well known, thanks to the well-attested use of a kursa- (hunting bag) as a cult image and several descriptions of images from cult inventories. The description of DLMMA LÍL matches so well with a number of extant representations that we can identify a number of images of tutelary deities in the preserved art of the Hittites, for example the Yeniköy relief, Karasu, the Haci Bebekli relief, and a relief from Arslantepe. Güterbock notes that the god on the stag and the

9. Old Assyrian seals noted by Güterbock, Belleten VII/1 (1943) 316.
11. DLMMA is also sometimes translated “patron deity” in English, “dieu protecteur” in French, “divinità tutelare” in Italian, and “koruyucu tânrı” in Turkish. Laroche, RLA 6 (1980–83) 455, points out that even “Schutzgott” is a makeshift term which does not completely describe the nature of these deities.
12. See Chapter 4 and Appendix B sub kursa-.
13. Discussed under DLMMA, DLMMA URU Hatenuwa, DLMMA GISUKUR, and DLMMA LÍL in Chapter 1.
14. See the discussion in Bildbeschr. 78–82 and the list of late Hittite material in Orthmann, Untersuchungen 258–63, with accompanying plates. Orthmann provides a recent overview of the iconography in the late period, with examples, and discusses the problems of identifying all the pertinent reliefs as tutelary deities. In addition to Orthmann’s list Yazılıkaya #32, Karasu, the Schimmel rhyton, and seal #386 in von der Osten, Ancient Oriental Seals in the Collection of Mr. Edward T. Newell (p. 58, pl. XXVI), represent tutelary deities. The identification of these images as tutelary deities is discussed by Przeworski, Syria 21 (1940) 69–71, and Güterbock, SBo 11 (1947) 15–17, Belleten VII/1 (1943) 313–16, Or 15 (1946) 494–95, and FsBittel 207–08.
15. Bittel, Hethiter pl. 247.
hieroglyphic stag-god must be the cuneiform DLMMA.19 The iconography may include the god represented (1) standing on its sacred animal the stag, (2) armed with bow and sword, (3) holding a bird, often an eagle, on his outstretched hand,20 and (4) holding an animal, often a hare, upside down.

The iconography is not consistent and shows many variations in the representations within a fairly clear group of similar images. Orthmann21 provides a table of the variations and similarities of this group. Headgear is not always the expected high horned helmet of divinity. The bow may be replaced by a spear or axe or staff. Güterbock22 indicates from the evidence of gods such as the moon god that at Yazilikaya the sacred animal may be omitted, as is the case with the Tutelary Deity (#32) in that sanctuary's divine procession. The significance of the animal held upside down by the god is open to some question. In Orthmann's table these animals are referred to as "Beutetier," the results of the hunt. This contributes to our association of the tutelary deities with the hunt. Güterbock23 notes that the hare and the eagle could either be the fruit of the hunt or a representation of the beasts of the field as an indication of what the Tutelary Deity of the Countryside protects. As there are some reliefs in which a god holds a hare or other animal upside down while raising a weapon to strike it, I would interpret the animal suspended from the Tutelary Deity's hand as the prey, Orthmann's "Beutetier."

The variations in iconography suggest that in the images we have to do with a variety of deities of the same general type, which fits well with the textual evidence of many different manifestations under the general rubric of tutelary deity. Przeworski24 infers from these differing representations a group of related gods reflecting local manifestations. Güterbock25 also derives from the lack of uniformity the idea that different gods are represented in this group.

Although there are a great variety of tutelary deities in the Hittite pantheon, they may be reduced to the following types:

I. Deities whose actual name is written out in the text.
II. A deity whose title is written simply DLMMA without any further specification.

This is the most problematic to the modern scholar because the Hittites did not use this title to denote the same deity throughout the history of its usage. It is sometimes

19. SBo II 16, where Güterbock points out that like many hieroglyphs, this sign evolved, and may take the form of the whole stag, the head, or the antler. In Belleten VII/1 (1943) 213–14, he adduces other evidence such as the unpublished tablet 544/f for the connection of the stag with the tutelary deity. In FsBittel 207 he reiterates the use of the antler as a name-hieroglyph for the Tutelary Deity. This sign is used for human and divine names on seals and monuments. See also Laroche, HH 102.

20. Güterbock, Belleten VII/1: 315, cites two seals which show a seated deity with a bird on its hand and the antler, the hieroglyphic sign for tutelary deity, as inscription.


used for Inar(a), an originally Hattic goddess, and at other times for a god who is clearly male. I have translated this unspecified title $^{\text{DLAMMA}}$ as “the Tutelary Deity.”

III. Deities who are identified by title in the form $^{\text{DLAMMA}}$ plus (geographical name), for example $^{\text{DLAMMA URU}}$Karahan.

IV. Deities whose title is of the form $^{\text{DLAMMA}}$ plus (non-GN) epithet. The epithet is usually formed with a genitive construction and may therefore precede the $^{\text{DLAMMA}}$ element (normal Hittite syntax) or follow it (Sumerian or Akkadian syntax), for example $^{\text{DLAMMA}}$LIL = $^{\text{DLAMMA SERI}}$ = gimras $^{\text{DLAMMA}}$, “the Tutelary Deity of the Countryside.”

The Hittites’ own awareness of the unusual nature of this large group of gods who had the same title and were distinguished only by individual epithets is most clearly seen in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities, whose ostensible purpose was to name and provide offerings for all of the tutelary deities. Probably all of the tutelary deities whose names we know are Hattic in origin. That tutelary deities were important in the religion of the pre-Hittite Anatolian peoples may be inferred from the evidence cited above and the survival of these Hattic gods in Hittite rituals, festivals, and prayers. In many ceremonies they continue to enjoy their offerings to the accompaniment of singing in the pre-Hittite Hattic language. The origins of the deities who are known to us in the texts only by title cannot so easily be discerned. Given the eclectic nature of the Hittite religious mind, it is likely that this plethora of tutelary deities exists precisely because the Hittites borrowed such gods (along with other deities) from many of the peoples with whom they came in contact.

The tutelary deities are normally grouped together when they occur in lists, especially in the lists of oath-deities in the treaties. Some of them indeed are minor deities who are only rarely if ever attested by themselves, occurring almost invariably in a group with other tutelary gods. Some of the offering or oath deity lists are of course more complete than others and include a larger range of the tutelary deities. Partly because Hittite uses a common gender for both masculine and feminine it is often impossible to determine the sex of a particular tutelary deity. A deity such as Inara, whose name is often written with the LAMMA sign, is female, but there are other tutelary deities represented by the same logogram who are male. The question of the gender of various gods is taken up in Chapter 1 in the discussions of individual tutelary deities. I have purely as a convention generally used the pronoun “he” and the noun “god” to denote a tutelary deity without necessarily implying anything about the gender of the divinity. Where the gender is known it is indicated.

26. CTH 682; see Chapter 3.
27. As Laroche, JCS 1 (1947) 196, notes the pre-Hittite Hattians also did not indicate the sex of their deities.
28. Laroche, Rech. 82, Onom. 79.
29. Laroche, Onom. 81.
The tutelary deities occur in all types of cultic texts as well as texts of other genres. In the present work I have edited or discussed texts which I consider the most important sources for our understanding of this group of deities. Chapters 2-5 treat the major festivals dedicated primarily to tutelary deities. In Appendix A fragments of festival texts having to do with tutelary deities are discussed. Evidence for the cult of the tutelary deities from other texts is assembled in Chapter 1, and some conclusions are offered in Chapter 6.

TEXT SCHEME OF THE FESTIVALS FOR THE TUTELARY DEITIES

The following text scheme represents a revision of Laroche's initial work of identifying and cataloguing all of the Hittite tablets (CTH 681–685) that contain festivals for tutelary deities, a collection of tablets that Laroche titles "Cultes de KAL." The revisions and additions to Laroche's text scheme are the result of the publication of many new tablets since Catalogue des Textes Hittites appeared, and of my identifying some of his fragments (CTH 685) with known festivals.

CTH 681. Festivals of Karrha (Chapter 2)

1. Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+KUB 27.70+1628/u

2. IBoT.1.5

CTH 682. The Festivals for All the Tutelary Deities (Chapter 3)

The Festival of Group Offerings

1. A. KUB 2.1.


C. KUB 44.16+IBoT 3.69. Columns i–iii describe offerings, column v duplicates 1.A (KUB 2.1) ii 22–41, vi duplicates 1.A (KUB 2.1) iii 46–iv 23.


E. KBo 22.189. Column i lost, column ii duplicates 1.C (KUB 44.16+IBoT 3.69) ii 8–25', but the reverse does not duplicate the main text KUB 2.1.

F. KUB 11.21. Obverse ii and iii too broken to place, reverse v 15'–25' duplicates 1.E (KBo 22.189) iii 3–13,

G. IBoT 4.73. Duplicates 1.E (KBo 22.189) v 6–11'.


The Festival of Individual Offerings

2. A. KBo 11.40. Column i is parallel to 1.A (KUB 2.1) i 47–51.

Column ii is parallel to 1.A (KUB 2.1) ii 15–24.

Column v probably parallels lost portions of 1.A (KUB 2.1) v.

Column vi 1–8 are parallel to 1.A (KUB 2.1) vi.
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B. KUB 40.108. Column ii duplicates 2.A (KBo 11.40) i 18'-26'; column v is parallel to 1.A (KUB 2.1) iv 7-10 and fills in some of the missing portions of 2.A (KBo 11.40).

C. KUB 40.101. Duplicates 2.A (KBo 11.40) v 1-23'.

D. KUB 40.107+IBoT 2.18. Column i may be from the early part of the festival. Reverse iv 17'-30' duplicate 2.A (KBo 11.40) vi 2'-18'.

E. KBo 12.60. Parallel to 1.A (KUB 2.1) iii 8-15, probably duplicate to missing portions of 2.A (KBo 11.40) obverse iii. It is not an indirect join to KBo 11.40.

F. KUB 55.25. Parallel to 1.A (KUB 2.1) iii 29-35 and probably duplicates some of the missing 2.A (KBo 11.40) obverse iii.

Texts of Uncertain Attribution

3. KBo 12.59. Similar to 1 (Festival of Group Offerings) and 2 (Festival of Individual Offerings).

4. KUB 51.36.

5. KUB 52.100.

CTH 683. The Festivals for Renewing the Kus kurša-s (Chapter 4)

1. KUB 55.43.

2. A. KBo 13.179.
   B. KBo 22.168. Duplicates 2.A (KBo 13.179) ii 2'-13'.

3. KUB 7.36.31

4. KUB 20.13.31

5. A. KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97.31
   B. IBoT 2.69.31 Obverse i duplicates 5.A (KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97) i 10'-18'. Reverse too small to interpret.

CTH 684. The Festivals for the Tutelary Deities of the River (Chapter 5)


2. IBoT 1.2

3. A. KUB 51.79.
   B. IBoT 2.19. Duplicates 3.A (KUB 51.79) rev! 10'-15'.
   C. 412/6(+?)457/s. Obverse duplicates 3.A (KUB 51.79) obv! 4'-15'. Reverse 1'-7' duplicate 3.A (KUB 51.79) rev! 14'-18'.

4. A. KUB 44.2. Parallel to 3.A (KUB 51.79) rev! 7'-13'.
   B. KUB 44.3. Adds one line to the beginning of 4.A (KUB 44.2) and duplicates 1'-7' of that tablet.

31. Catalogued by Laroche as CTH 685, "Fragments de fêtes pour les dieux KAL."
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CTH 685. Fragments of Festivals for Tutelary Deities (*Appendix A*)

* KUB 7.40
* KUB 9.17
* KUB 10.29
* KUB 10.93
* KUB 12.52
* IBoT 2.22
* IBoT 3.18
* KBo 8.59
* KUB 44.24
* KUB 51.40
* KUB 53.11
CHAPTER 1
TUTELARY DEITIES AND THEIR CULTS

GENERAL COMMENTS

As mentioned in the Introduction, tutelary deities may be referred to either by name, such as Zitṭariya, or by the title LAMMA, with or without an epithet. We have the evidence of lexical texts such as the Erimḫuš text A. KBo 26.25(+)KBo 1.35 iii 3'-4' with the duplicate B. KBo 13.1+KBo 1.44 iv 35-36 for the reading of the KAL sign: Sumerian [\(^{p}\)LAMM(A)] = Syllabic la-am-ma = Akkadian LA-MA-SŪ = Hittite \(^{p}\)LAMMA-aš \(^{2}\) / [\(^{p}\)ALA(D)]\(^{3}\) = a-la = \(SE-DU\)\(^{4}\) = tar-pi-iš. Both LAMMA and ÁLAD (ALA in this text) are readings of the same sign (KAL), indicated by the syllabic column in text A. For further comment on \(^{p}\)ALA(D) see sub Ala on page 11.

The Hittite column of B reads a-an-na-ri-iš instead of \(^{p}\)LAMMA-aš. The word annari-is not completely understood. Otten, MDOG 94 (1963) 19, suggests as a meaning “männliche Potenz.” Puhvel, HED 1–2: 62, translates it “strength, force, vigor.” Kammenhuber, HW\(^{2}\) 79, does not give a translation. In the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities\(^{5}\) annari- and tarpi- are associated together, both in rare or unique a-stem forms. They occur in a genitival relationship with \(^{p}\)LAMMA that is not consistent with text B’s

1. Edition MSL 17 (1985) 115, in which KBo 13.1+KBo 1.44 is the main text. KBo 26.25(+)KBo 1.35 is text A, in MSL 17. KBo 13.1+ lacks the column of syllabic Sumerian. KBo 13.1+KBo 1.44 is also edited by Otten and von Soden, SiBoT7.

2. MSL 17: 115 n. 36 (3) gives the equation \(^{p}\)KAL-aš = \(^{p}\)Inaraš for the Hittite column of A. I read \(^{p}\)LAMMA-aš based on the syllabic Sumerian column. The correct Hittite reading may very well be \(^{p}\)Inaraš, but Inara is not always the Hittite deity behind the logogram LAMMA. On \(^{p}\)LAMMA-aš = \(^{p}\)Inaraš see pp. 24–27 below.

3. Borger, AOAT 33A p. 226, gives a value ÁLAD for the KAL sign. In Mesopotamia the KAL×BAD sign, ALAD in Borger AOAT 33A #323, is the regular Sumerogram for Akkadian šedu. Deimel, Pantheon Babylonicum (Rome, 1914) 154, had at an early date recognized a reading A-la-ad = še-cedu for the KAL sign. In this Boğazköy lexical text the syllabic Sumerian column gives the Hittite pronunciation ALA.

4. Text B iv 35: \(SE-DU\).

5. KUB 2.1 obv. iii 1–2 (Chapter 3).
equation of $\text{DLAMMA}$ with $\text{annariš}$. Von Soden\(^6\) notes that in Mesopotamia the paired tutelary deities $\text{LAMASSU}$ and $\text{SEDU}$ together were benevolent but $\text{SEDU}$ by itself usually evil.\(^7\) Hoffner\(^8\) suggests a similar pattern for $\text{annari-}$ and $\text{tarpi-}$, noting especially that the two together form one protective spirit. Hittite $\text{tarpi-}$ by itself seems to be evil. Otten and von Soden\(^9\) adduce additional evidence, partly from unpublished sources, to demonstrate that $\text{annari-}$ and $\text{tarpi-}$ often occur together and that $\text{tarpi-}$ alone is evil. Despite the evidence of copy B of the lexical text, we cannot assume that $\text{annari-}$ is the Hittite or Luwian word invariably underlying $\text{DLAMMA}$. The evidence of the $\text{a}$-stem complementation for many $\text{DLAMMA}$ occurrences (including text A of the vocabulary) argues against it. The parallelism of $\text{LAMASSU}$ and $\text{SEDU} = \text{annariš}$ and $\text{tarpiš}$ conditioned the pairing of the latter in text B, but if the equivalence $\text{DLAMMA} = \text{LAMASSU} = \text{annariš}$ were universal we would expect $\text{DLAMMA}$ to occur regularly with $\text{DALAD}$ or $\text{tarpiš}$, which it does not. Perhaps the $\text{annariš}$ comes simply from confusion with $\text{Inaraš} (\text{DLAMMA-aš})$ of text A.

Such a confusion of the two is attested by the $\text{In-na-ri}$ for expected $\text{annari}$ in the unpublished tablet 453/d.

Most tutelary deities are associated with a location or a particular object or being. Some of them show close connections with the hunting bag ($\text{kurša-}$) and the dog-men, who are hunters or dog-handlers, and are to be associated with the hunt. Güterbock\(^11\) interprets the EZEN $\text{hurnayayaššar}$ attested in the cult inventory for $\text{DLAMMA}$ of Karahna\(^12\) as possibly meaning “Festival of the Hunt.” One of the most obvious characteristics of the tutelary deities is the great diversity of their manifestations. The nature of a tutelary deity easily lends itself to the diversification of this god type as new deities, in the form $\text{DLAMMA}$ plus epithet, are created. This tendency to expand the number of tutelary deities is most obvious in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities, treated in Chapter 3. This text is apparently an attempt by the Hittites to codify in written form their concept of the tutelary deity in the late period.\(^13\)

---

7. In Mesopotamia $\text{DLAMMA} = \text{LAMASSU}$ is female and $\text{DALAD} = \text{SEDU}$ is male. Exceptions to this are noted by Foxvog, Heimpel, and Kilmer, RLA 6 (1980-83) 447, who cite Assyrian evidence to indicate that LAMMA may sometimes be male.
8. JNES27 (1968) 64–66.
10. In 453/d obv. 4 (StBoT7: 29) replaced by $\text{In-na-ri}$.
11. FsKantor 118.
12. KUB 31.35 i 21.
13. The unique or rare titles of tutelary deities in this festival are not treated individually in this chapter; their discussion is reserved for the treatment of the text itself in Chapter 3.
TUTELARY DEITIES WITH KNOWN NAMES

DALA

There is a Mesopotamian deity DALAD whose name is written with the ÁLAD (KAL) sign or with the ALAD (KALxBAD) sign. In the Boğazköy lexical text cited at the beginning of this chapter the syllabic column for ÁLAD gives the pronunciation a-la. This raises the question as to whether the deity whose name is usually written DA-a-la-15 in the Hittite texts is to be identified with DÁLAD of the lexical text. Laroche16 implies his understanding of DALAD as separate from the DÁLAD of the lexical text by placing Ala (as Aala) under his very general rubric “Divinités Asianiques” instead of under “Idéogrammes.” This also indicates his caution in not identifying Ala as either a Hattic or Hittite deity. Kammenhuber17 does not consider the possibility that Ala is the Mesopotamian deity DALAD and suggests that Ala is a newly created consort for the male tutelary deity DLAMMA in the late period. The writing of doubled a at the beginning of the name would be unnecessary in representing a Sumerian divine name, and we would expect the Hittites to use the logogram anyway if they were referring to the Mesopotamian deity. The a-stem complementation for this name is not consistent with the Hittite reading tarpiš given in the lexical text above as the equivalent for DÁLAD. In Anatolia DALA is female, while the Mesopotamian DALAD = SEDU is male. As noted above, tarpi- by itself, without annari-, is an evil, not a protective demon. This is good evidence for understanding DALAD as distinct from Ala, as Ala never has a malevolent persona. The Anatolian deity DALA must have been confused with the Sumerian DALAD in the lexical text, conditioning the syllabic Sumerian spelling a-la without final d for the KAL sign in that vocabulary. Evidence for the antiquity of Ala in the cult in Anatolia may be seen in her inclusion in a ritual featuring Hattic cult singing18 and in an Old Script cult text.19 As detailed below, DALA in her few attestations in the Hittite corpus occurs both with and without DLAMMA.

Ala was not one of the “standard” group of tutelary deities listed among the oath-deities in the treaties.20 She does however occur once in a late treaty (Tudh. IV), in the middle of the standard group of tutelary deities, between DLAMMA ḪATTI and DKarzi.21 There is one example of a masculine personal name mA-a-la-a, whose daughter occurs in

14. This deity receives a short treatment in Laroche, Rech. 78. There is no “Ala” article in RLA because the first volume antedated the discovery of DALA in Hittite texts.
15. Case endings D A-a-la-aš and D A-a-la-an are attested.
16. Rech. 78.
18. KBo 29.211 i 7'-12', discussed below.
19. KUB 43.23 rev. 38-42, discussed below.
20. For example KBo 5.3+KBo 19.43++ i 48-49 (Ḫuqq.), KUB 19.49+KUB 26.36+ iv 2-4 (Man.), and KUB 21.1+KBo 19.73a++ iv 10-11 (Alakš.).
21. KBo 4.10 obv. 54 (Ulmi-Tešub treaty).
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broken context in a list of women,22 but as Laroche indicates23 this is not an argument that
Ala is masculine, as other names such as mInara indicate that a man might have a name
which was identical with a feminine divine name.

Besides these two examples in non-cultic type texts, Ala occurs exclusively in texts of
primarily religious nature. Ala is paired with DLAMMA in KUB 43.23, a text which
Laroche catalogues in his supplement to CTH under number 820, “Bénédictions pour le
labarna-roi.” Reverse 38–42 reads: 2 NINDA.KUR,RA GÍD.DA 1 NINDA.KUR,RA
LIBIR 1 GAL GEŠTIN 1 MÁŠ.GAL ANA LÚ.MEŠ SA DLAMMA DLAMMA ɒA-a-la “Two
‘long’ thick breads, one ‘old’ thick bread, one cup of wine; (and) one billy-goat to the men
of the Tutelary Deity, the Tutelary Deity, (and) Ala.” The tablet KUB 43.23 is written in
Old Script and is thus firm evidence for the antiquity of Ala in the Hittite pantheon and the
antiquity of the pairing of the Tutelary Deity and Ala. The “men of the Tutelary Deity” are
not otherwise attested but are presumably cult personnel of this deity, although it is unusual
for personnel to be receiving offerings.

In Muwatalli’s prayer to the Stormgod pihasšašši,24 this goddess occurs as ḏAlaš25 in a
paragraph naming the gods of Karahna, including the Tutelary Deity of Karahna. This text
is instructive, because the unusual writing of her name with both DINGIR and feminine
determinatives confirms that Ala is indeed a goddess, while causing us to wonder why it
was felt necessary to specify that she was female. Was there some confusion among the
Hittites, or perhaps rather some variation from place to place, as to the nature or gender of
this deity? We also observe in this text a paired LAMMA tutelary deity and Ala tutelary
deity at the same town, and we learn that Ala was important enough at Karahna to be
mentioned individually and not simply grouped together with the main body of male and
female gods of Karahna.

In addition to this list of deities in a prayer, Ala occurs several other times in texts
which are primarily lists, such as cult inventories. The cult inventory text KUB 38.126
describes cult items belonging to Ala. In i.e. 1–2 we read: x UKU Wiyanauwanta ANA
DLAMMA EZ[EN o o AN]A ɒA-la EZEN TEš[?]27 o o o o D]Ū-at DINGIR-LIM-tar-ма
nal[wi? “At(?) Wiyanauwanta a festival of x] for the Tutelary Deity, a spr[ing] festival for
Ala […] is done. The divine images, however, not y[et…”28 Again we see a LAMMA
tutelary deity and an Ala tutelary deity together in a provincial city. The parallel
prescription of a festival for each god testifies to the prominence of Ala in the local cult.

22. KBo 10.10 obv. iv 29.
25. The writing ɒA-la-aš is unusual and is sufficiently faint on the tablet that the copyist suggested it
may have been meant to be erased. The duplicate has ɒA-la-aš and is also partially erased.
180.
27. Implied by Rost in her translation and based on her collation.
28. Güterbock, FsBitteL 208, interprets this section as a statement that although Ala had a festival at
Wiyanauwanta, she still had no cult image there.
cult image (DINGIR-LIM-tar) was not, apparently, part of the equipment when the inventory was taken. This same pair is attested as the gods for the city Kalashmita in a text detailing royal gifts. In this text the king establishes temples and deportees to be dedicated to the service of these gods in this provincial city. Ala is paired with a different tutelary deity in a ritual fragment: DINGIR-tar GUB-AS D LA-a-la-an-na GUB-AS ekuzi nu? L]0.MES[NAR URukiš ŠIR-RU “[He drinks] the Tutelary Deity of the [co]untryside and Ala, standing. The singer[s] of Kaneš sing.” Ala occurs once in a list of Hurrian gods, as [D]A-a-la-aš in broken context in KBo 14.141 ii 2'.

In actual festival texts Ala is quite rare. The festival fragment KUB 55.12 ii? 13′-14′ [...] ANA DINGIR D ALAMMA x [...] [ ] D A-a-la-ya [...] provides little information beyond a further example of the pair DINGIR D Ala. Another example of this pairing, again emphasized by the conjunction -ya “and,” occurs in the following passage: DUMIHALDIM tuhušnit našuwašiya EGIR-pa šuppišḫi LUGAL-us 1 NINDA.KUR, RA SA3 ANA DINGIR D A-a-la-ya paršišu nu ZAG-az kuit 1 AM ḫarzi n- at ZAG-az-pat ū₂ 1 na- at ZAG-az-pat dai GUB-laz-ma kuit 1 AM ḫarzi n- at GUB-laz-pat katta dai “The cook re-purifies(?) the stela with tuhuššar.” The king breaks one red thick bread to the Tutelary Deity and Ala. The half which he holds on the right, he holds on that same right side. He places it on that same right side. The half which he holds on the left, however, he puts down on that same left side.” KUB 20.99 ii 6–10 (Festival at Šarešša). The divine pair DINGIR and Ala received offerings at Šarešša, and we learn from this text that this pair probably did not have a temple at this cult center, but only a stela.

The text in which Ala plays a major role is the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities, CTH 682, for which see Chapter 3. This text uses Ala as a generic title instead of a name and claims to provide offerings for all the “Ala deities.” Most copies of the text are late, and it may be a late composition, done under Tuhaliya IV. It seems to be an attempt to extend to their logical limits all the functions and attributes of both the DINGIR tutelary deity and of Ala. I have understood this festival as a unique experiment in theology and not necessarily a reflection of the general Hittite conception of Ala in earlier periods. The many copies datable to the reign of Tuhaliya IV attest to that king’s great interest in religion and the importance of the state cult.

The attestations of Ala are few in number and indicate the small role which she played in the Hittite cult. The premise that the Anatolian Ala is female is based on one occurrence of her name as D'Alaš and on the pairing with DINGIR, who in Anatolia is often male. Her appearance only once in an oath-deity list points up her absence from the “standardized” pantheon. In many of her occurrences she is paired with the Tutelary Deity, both in the state cult and at provincial cult centers. The occurrence of this pair in the Old

30. KBo 29.211 ii? 7′-8′. The same pair receives offerings later in the same ritual, column iv? 6′-10′.
31. The -ya on ūwašiya is difficult to interpret. Gütberbock suggests to me that EGIR-pa = appa could conceivably stand for appan here and mean “behind,” if ūwašiya is to be taken as a d.-l. form. The -ya could also be a conjunction, “the stela also,” after the king used the tuhunit šar in ii 3, in which case appa should probably be understood as “again.”
Script text KUB 43.23 rev. 38-42 indicates the early date from which the Hittites put them together. Because Ala is female and the Tutelary Deity seems to be male, it is clear from these occurrences that these two were often viewed as a divine couple.

Hapantali(ya)

An important tutelary deity of Hattic origin is Hapantali(ya). As Laroche and Otten point out, this god appears primarily in lists of oath deities, in myths and in festivals. In the treaties he occurs in a group of tutelary deities which is fairly standardized, for example: D LAMMA D LAMMA URU HATTI D Zithariya[s] D Karziš D Ḥapandalīyaš D LAMMA URU Garahnan D LAMM[A.LI]L D LAMMA KUS kuršaš. He is attested from the earliest period; there is at least one Old Assyrian text in which a personal name Ḥa-ba-ta-li occurs.

In the mythology, Ḥapantali(ya) occurs in the myth of the Moon That Fell From Heaven, next to the Tutelary Deity as one of the assembly of gods in the Telipinu myth, and in the myth of the Missing Stormgod. The god is an active participant in the disappearing deity myth preserved on the Maṣat tablet edited by Güterbock and is part of an unidentified mythological fragment. As befits Ḥapantali(ya)'s Hattic origins, he occurs only in the older Anatolian myths and not in the later Hurrian myths.

Hapantali(ya) occurs once in a prayer—in a list of gods, next to Karzi—but not in a context that provides any information about his nature. He also occurs one time in a dream of Puduḫepa, again next to Karzi in a list of gods. The context is broken and again provides no information about Ḥapantali(ya)'s nature. However, Ḥapantali(ya)'s occurrence in these later texts does demonstrate that he remained a part of the pantheon into the Empire period.

By far the majority of references to Ḥapantali(ya) are in the cultic texts. He occurs in a variety of festival texts, usually as one of a group of gods receiving offerings, a group that...
normally includes the familiar companions DLAMMA and Karzi. As might be expected, he is included among the gods who receive offerings in the Hattic-based Festivals of Tetešabi.\(^{44}\) In each case where the text is preserved, Ḫapantali(ya) is paired with DLAMMA, and this pair receives its own drink offerings and bread offerings. This pairing of the Tutelary Deity and Ḫapantaliya in the offerings ceremonies is a theme in other festivals, for example the KILAM Festival.\(^{45}\) The same pair is also attested in the Festival celebrated by a DUMU-aš.\(^{46}\) The pair receives drink offerings in an unassigned festival fragment in a ceremony in which the “singer of Ḫatti” sings.\(^{47}\)

Similar to this pairing of Ḫapantali(ya) with DLAMMA in the festivals is the pairing of Inar with Ḫapantali(ya). A parallel situation in which these two alone receive offerings can be seen in the KILAM Festival\(^{48}\) and in an unidentified festival fragment.\(^{49}\) In the KILAM Festival Ḫapantali(ya) can be paired either with Inar or DLAMMA and always occurs with one or the other of these two deities.\(^{50}\) DLAMMA and Inar do not both occur in any text of the KILAM; the texts with Ḫapantali(ya) and DLAMMA are OH/NS, while those with Ḫapantali(ya) and Inar are OH/MS or OS. Apparently in the later copies of this festival the scribes have replaced Inar with DLAMMA; Ḫapantali(ya) is consistently paired with this tutelary deity. This substitution is implied in Singer’s remark that Ḫapantali(ya) always occurs with “İNAR/KAL.”\(^{51}\)

One of the reasons why we cannot make a good case for a divine couple Inar and Ḫapantali(ya) is that the latter god in other texts is frequently paired with Karzi\(^{52}\) and the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti.\(^{53}\) Of course such “pairings” may be nothing more than a group of two, just as other deities can occur in groups of two without necessarily being a couple. Ḫapantali(ya) also receives offerings once in conjunction with the name of the king.\(^{54}\) He is listed in groups of three or more in a number of festival texts, including again KBo 4.13, the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival fragment in which he occurs in a number of different arrangements of deities. These gods are usually the gods with whom he is listed in the

\(^{44}\) KBo 19.161 i 6', ii 1', KBo 19.163 iii 14 (OH/NS), and KBo 20.46 iv 3' (OS?).

\(^{45}\) KBo 10.26 i 6–7 (OH/NS), translit. Singer, StBoT 28 (1984) 42; KBo 25.176 obv. 18 (OH/NS), translit. Singer StBoT 28: 93.

\(^{46}\) KBo 25.43 rev. 4' and KUB 53.26 ii? 7'.

\(^{47}\) KUB 20.100 obv. iii? 5–7.

\(^{48}\) KBo 20.33+ obv. 13–14 (OH/MS), translit. Singer, StBoT 28 (1984) 89; KBo 22.195 ii! 10' (OH/MS) with duplicate KBo 20.5+ ii 13' (OS), translit. Singer, StBoT 28: 34.

\(^{49}\) KBo 30.32 obv. 3.

\(^{50}\) Noted by Singer, StBoT 28: 235.

\(^{51}\) StBoT 28: 235.

\(^{52}\) For example, KBo 4.13 ii 12' (AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival?).

\(^{53}\) KBo 4.13 iv 40. The pairing of Ḫapantali(ya) with two different deities in the same festival suggests that he was not strongly associated with any one god.

\(^{54}\) KUB 55.18 ii 13–16' (festival fragment): EGER-anda -ma Ḫapantaliyan ŠA LUGAL-ya ŠUM-an IŠTU GAL.GIR, ekúzi GIS pINANNA.GAL ŠIR-RU “Then he drinks Ḫapantaliya and the name of the king with a bitumen cup. (They play) the large Inanna instrument and sing.”
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

oath-deity lists: the Tutelary Deity, the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti, Karzi, and Zitḫariya. In the festival fragment KUB 55.12 iii? 3–7 he is associated (in broken context) with the Tutelary Deity of Karahna. It is in fact the normal pattern for Ḫapantali(ya) to receive offerings in a festival only as part of a group of gods, and that group is almost always composed of other tutelary deities. One of the few examples in which he occurs among a group of deities which are of a diverse nature is IBoT 1.29 obv. 63–67 (EZEN ḫaššumaš), in which he occurs with a group of Hattic deities.

It is clear from his presence in the oath-deity lists from the Empire period that Ḫapantali(ya) continued to be a part of the pantheon to the end of the Hittite Empire. This supposition is strengthened by his presence in various newer festival texts cited above as well as in the New Hittite text KUB 27.1, the Festival for Istar of Šumuḫa. In lines i 64–67 Ḫapantaliya occurs in a group of ten different tutelary deities, once again following Karzi in the list. Another instructive text for the place of Ḫapantali(ya) in the later Hittite pantheon is KUB 2.1 i 42–44, the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities. In these lines near the end of the first column, Ḫapantaliya and Karzi (as Karši) are listed (along with a great many tutelary deities identified by various epithets) among all the names of the tutelary deities.

Ḫašgala

This god appears to be a Hattic deity; Otten so identifies him, and Laroche puts him in his “Proto-Hittite” classification. Neither cites any evidence, but we may point out the KUB 28.103 vi 4' occurrence, which is in a fragment of festival containing Hattic, and KUB 53.3 i 13'–15', in which offerings to Hašgala are accompanied by the Hattic exclamation “aḫa” and by breaking takarmu- bread, which Hoffner suggests is probably Hattic. None of this evidence conclusively proves that Hašgala is a deity of the pre-Indo-European Hattian population, but there is nothing to suggest otherwise. He occurs exclusively receiving offerings in festivals. He occurs both by himself and with other gods not known to be tutelary deities. In the KUB 28.103 passage the next paragraph has to do with the priest of the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag, so here Hašgala is in close proximity to another Tutelary Deity, although not apparently in a list of tutelary deities as in the kurša- Festival texts discussed below.

55. For example KUB 2.13 v 4–9 (OH?/NS), Festival of the Month.
56. Spelled Ḫa-pa-la-li-ya in the main text, Ḫ[a]-ba-an-ta-li-ya in the duplicate KUB 27.64 ii 37 (NH).
57. See Laroche, Rech. 24, and Otten, RLA 4 (1972–75) 134. Laroche cites only the passage KUB 28.103 vi 4' (festival fragment containing Hattic, CTH 744); Ḫa-āš-qa-, as all of the other occurrences of this god occur in texts published after Rech. was completed. Now that we know of a god by this name, however, we may understand this passage as another occurrence of his name.
58. AlHethm. 185.
59. KUB 53.3 i 13' (Festival for Telipinu) and possibly HFAC 60:3' (fest. frag.).
60. KUB 53.14 ii 2 (Festival for Telipinu); KUB 55.18 ii 7' (fest. frag.); and KBo 20.101:9' (fest. frag.).
Hasgala is included here because he receives offerings in two different texts of the Kurša-Festival among a number of tutelary deities. In KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97 i 18', in the form .bufašt-ga-la-a-i, he occurs in a list of gods receiving offerings, between the Tutelary Deity of Hatenzuwa and the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa. He occurs as .bufašt-ga-la-a-an in KUB 55.43 iv 23', between the same two gods in a similar list. I also restore his name in KUB 55.43 ii 24, in the analogous slot in the offerings list of that column. One other probable occurrence is KUB 55.43 ii 31, where the broken beginning of the line is almost certainly to be read .bufašt-ga-la-a-an, which in turn suggests restoring his name in the analogous place in the column iv-left edge list, which I do in the broken away portion at the beginning of l.e. 1. From these several occurrences of Hasgala in lists of tutelary deities, we may infer that he as well is a tutelary deity, but the paucity and nature of attestations do not allow us to define his nature further.

Inara

See the discussion of Ąlamma without epithet below.

Kantipuitti

This god is attested only a few times, several of which are in texts presently unpublished. Two festivals in which he appears represented by a Kurša-indicate that he is a tutelary deity: Nin.Dingir 'ma šarrā Ina É Kuse Kurša paizzi piran ÐKantipuittiya Kuse Kurša iyatta Lū.Mes Epeš u-nu-wa-an-t(e-eš?) iyanta Lū.Mes UrU Anunuwač[a Sīr]-UR L[ wäre]-Si[ntuḥiyaš Egiš a[n Sīr]-UR Sal.Mes arkanmiyaš G1š arkanmi galgalturi Gula-[aḫḫanniškanzi “The Nin.Dingir goes up to the house of the hunting bags. The hunting bag of Kantipuitti goes before. The *[hapiya-] functionaries, adorned(?), proceed. The men of Anunuwač[ sing. The female singers sing afterwa[rds]. The female arkanmi- players play the arkanmi- and galgalturi- instruments” Kbo 10.27 iii 10'-17' (Festival naming the Nin.Dingir); Lū.Mes ḫešta Kuse Kuršan kuš karpar ħarzi nu -šši 1 Tugbar pianzi § SA ÐKantipuitti Kuse Kuršan kuš karpar (eras.) ḫarzi nu -šši 2 Tugbar pianzi “They give one ‘rough garment’ to the men of the ḫešta- building who have carried the hunting bag. § They give two ‘rough garments’ to the one who has carried the Kurša- of Kantipuitti” KUB 10.13 iii 16'-21' (Kllam outline tablet). In each case the Kurša- of Kantipuitti must be the cult image of the god in the form of a hunting bag. Since the hunting bag is an

61. See Chapter 4.
62. See note to the transliteration of Kbo 21.89+Kbo 8.97 i 18’ in Chapter 4 on this restoration.
63. See the comprehensive article by Otten, Rla 5 (1976-80) 390, for the unpublished material. Bo 2622 is now KUB 56.51. Laroche, Rech. 83, comments on Kantipuitti briefly.
64. The duplicate Kbo 25.176 rev. 16’ has L1[kān-te-pu-šši.
65. See Singer, StBoT27 (1983) 91.
66. The duplicate Kbo 25.176 rev. 14’ has singular Lū ḫešta, which agrees with the singular relative pronoun kuš, and with the -šš of nu -šši.
image normally used for tutelary deities, we may posit that Kantipuitti is a tutelary deity. *KUB* 56.51 i 7–14 describe ceremonies for Kantipuitti in association with the temple of the Tutelary Deity.

**Kappariyamu**

This deity is only attested in a few examples, all of them in festivals. Laroche's proposed identification of this deity with Ḥatepinu is the only evidence we have that she is female, but we may accept that as a working hypothesis. Her very scant attestation would be understandable if she did indeed also go by the name Ḥatepinu as Laroche suggests. In a fragment of a festival for tutelary deities she is associated with the *kurša*- symbol. She appears also in a festival fragment in a context which provides little to supplement our knowledge about her. She occurs after Inar and Ḥapantaliya, both tutelary deities. She is followed, however, by Telipinu, which is one of the reasons why Laroche, *Rech. 27*, tentatively identifies her with Ḥatepinu, Telipinu’s consort. She is attested in the K.I.LAM Festival in broken context together with *Ḍaḥantiu*. Her appearances in the *kurša*-Festival indicate that she is a minor tutelary deity who occurs in a triad with the Tutelary Deity of Tatašuna and the Tutelary Deity of Tašhapuna.

**Karzi**

Karzi precedes Ḥapantali(ya) in lists of tutelary deities, occurring with that god in all of his attestations where the text is preserved. The converse, however, is not true; Ḥapantali(ya) sometimes occurs without Karzi. Karzi is included in the oath-deity lists of a number of Empire period treaties, in the prayer of Muwatalli to the Stormgod *piḥaššašši*, and in queen Puduḫepa’s dream.

---

68. See Laroche, *Rech. 27*, on the morphology of the name, her origins in the town Kappa/cri, and her probable identification with Ḥatepinu. See also Frantz-Szabó, *RLA* 5 (1976–80) 400.

69. *KUB* 53.11 ii 9', 18', 25', and 31'. See discussion of this sub *KUB* 53.11 in Appendix A.


71. *DLAMMA* in text B.


73. *KUB* 55.43 ii 17 and iv 16'; *KUB* 7.36 rev. rt. 4' and 16'; and *KBo* 21.89+KBo 8.97 iv 17'. See Chapter 4.

74. See the further discussion of Kappariyamu and this triad in Appendix B sub *kipikkisdu*.


76. Including the Egyptian language version of the Ḥattušili III-Ramesses II treaty, translated by Wilson, *ANET* 201, as “the god of Karzis.”

77. *KUB* 6.45 i 55.

78. *KUB* 31.77 iii 3'.
Of the festivals in which he occurs, several are significant for our understanding of this god. His presence in the AN.TAH.ŠUM fragment KBo 4.13 ii 12', if I am correct in dating it as Old Hittite, would indicate his role in the state cult from an early period. His presence in the New Hittite Festival of Istar of Šamuḫa is good evidence that he continued to receive offerings in the cult down into the Empire period and that he, along with other tutelary deities, was included in the Hurrian-influenced cult at Šamuḫa. Another significant passage for Karzi is KUB 40.107+ i 26'-28', one of the texts of the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities. Here he and Ḫapantali(ya) each receive a billy-goat as an offering. In the very late text KUB 2.1 i 44 (Tudḫaliya IV) Karzi (as Karši) is cited as one of the names of the tutelary deities. A suggestion of Franz Steinheř's to Güterbock (cited in Yaz2 175) involves reading the hieroglyphic name of Yazılıkaya god #32 as ṚKar-ti for Karzi. While this is not impossible, Güterbock notes the difficulty of such a reading and interpretation.

Zitḫariya

This is the best attested of the tutelary deities whose names are known. Laroche points out his place in the oath-deity lists with the other tutelary gods, after Karzi and Ḫapantali(ya). He notes the existence of a city Zitḫara, from which this god took his name, and the theophoric mountain names Ḫur.SAG Zitḫariya and Ḫur.SAG Zitḫarunuwa. He cites a Hattic word zithar which reinforces the idea that this is an originally Hattic deity. Otten concurs that Zitḫariya is Hattic.

There is some confusion about Zitḫariya's home city. In the Detailed Annals of Muršili II the king describes Ḫatenzuwa as Zitḫariya's city. The kurša- Festival text makes it clear that Zitḫariya and the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenzuwa are distinct deities, so Zitḫariya, if he originates in Ḫatenzuwa, is not the only tutelary deity of the city. Two text fragments mention Zitḫariya and the city Ḫalenzuwa (a common variant of Ḫatenzuwa) together, but both of them are very broken and do not allow us to determine what they originally said about the relationship between the two. In a cult inventory text Tudḫaliya IV describes how Ḫalenzuwa had deteriorated, and how he rebuilt the city. This included making a new cult image, an image of Zitḫariya as a hunting bag (kurša-), with a sundisk of gold on it.

79. The sentence particle ta, although not used exclusively, occurs throughout the text. The text also consistently uses natta instead of ŪL.
80. KUB 27.1 i 65, ed. Lebrun, Samuha 77 and 88.
81. Rech. 40.
82. He also appears before these gods, as in KUB 19.50++ iv 7-8 (Man.), KBo 22.34 iii 18'-19' (Dupp.), and KBo 5.3+KBo 14.43++ i 48-49 (Ḫuqq.).
83. FsFriedrich 355, 357.
84. KUB 19.39 ii 7-8, ed. AM 167-64.
85. KUB 55.43 i 1-27, see Chapter 4.
86. KUB 38.35 i 1-5, ed. Jakob-Rost, MIO9 (1963) 195-96.
87. This sounds a bit like the renaming of the kurša-s in the festival treated in Chapter 4, with the difference that the kurša- Festival was a regularly instituted procedure while Tudḫaliya's
The king also had a temple built. In the third paragraph, i 9–10, a statue of gold or silver (the text breaks after KU) of the Tutelary Deity of Ḥalenzuwa is described. Thus down to the very late period of the Hittite Empire Zitḫariya and the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatenzuwa remained distinct, but each had a cult at that city. Muwatalli’s prayer to the Stormgod piḫaššašši, however, confuses the issue slightly. Among the deities who are addressed are: [(P)Z]iṯḫariyaš DU KARAŠ DUMU DU PLAMMA KUR kuršaš (eras.) [ ]x ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ ÍD.MEŠ SA URU Zitḫara “[Z]iṯḫariya, the Stormgod of the Army the son of the Stormgod, the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag, [ ]x, (and) the mountains (and) rivers of the city Zitḫara.” Here in a post-Mursili text Zitḫariya is associated with the town Zitḫara and addressed as one of its gods. Zitḫara very well may be the original home of Zitḫariya, but at some point he added a cult center at Ḥatenzuwa in addition to the one at Zitḫara.

Popko takes a different view, citing the prominence of Zitḫariya in the Ritual at an Enemy Border, discussed below, as evidence that he received a special reverence in the north. As he locates Zitḫara in the far south, in Kizzuwatna, Popko suggests that only later, when Zitḫariya’s homeland had been lost to the Kaškeans, did the Hittites suggest (in Muwatalli’s prayer) that Zitḫariya came from Zitḫara. This does not fit with del Monte’s assertion with good evidence that Zitḫara is to be located in the Halys basin not far from Ḥattuša. Nor does Popko’s assertion that Zitḫariya is not attested in the Old Hittite corpus take into account the possible OH/NS dating for KUB 2.13, a tablet of the Festival of the Month, in which Zitḫariya receives offerings to the accompaniment of chanting in Hattic.

This god shows an extremely close connection with the kurša-. In the kurša- Festival and the cult inventory mentioned above, Zitḫariya’s cult image is the hunting bag (kurša-). In a ceremony of the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, Zitḫariya’s offering is placed on the hunting bag. The cult inventory KUB 38.35 i 1–5 cited above makes it clear that when Tudḫaliya IV made a new cult image for this god it took the form of a kurša-. This association conditions an unusual use of his name; among the holy places that receive libations in many Hittite festivals the kurša- is often included. There are occasions, however, when in this standard list the name Zitḫariya occurs in place of the kurša-. This occurs mostly in the reconditioning of the cultic equipment at Ḥatenzuwa was prompted by the state of disrepair into which it had fallen.

88. KUB 6.45 i 59–60.
89. Kultobjekte 111–12.
91. KUB 2.13 v 4–9.
92. Giiterbock, NHF 67–68, notes this close association, especially the fact that the offering materials for Zitḫariya were normally provided by the Temple of the kurša-s. Popko, Kultobjekte 111, also discusses this and suggests that the only cult image Zitḫariya ever had was a kurša-. Houwink ten Cate, FsOtten 190, notes that the nuntarriyaššaš Festival for Zitḫariya takes place in the Temple of the kurša-s. See Güterbock, FsKantor 113–19, for the kurša- as hunting bag and Appendix B for discussion of this cult item.
AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival. The kursa- as the cult image of Zitṭariya represented that god, and the god could therefore be referred to simply as the kursa-. Here the name Zitṭariya is used in place of kursa- because of this close association of the two. In the only other example of a specific kursa- cult image being used this way the Hittites used the kursa- of Kapparīyamu as one of the holy places in a series of offerings.

Zitṭariya occurs somewhat rarely in rituals but is involved in at least two. In the Great Substitution Ritual he occurs immediately after the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag (D.LAMMA KUS kuršaš). This is interesting because in the renaming ceremony of the kurša- Festival the old hunting bag of Zitṭariya is given the new name of “the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag” and sent off to a provincial cult center. One might therefore have thought that these two deities would not occur together, but the renamed Zitṭariya symbol was sent to Tuḫuppiya, and there is no reason to think that there would not be another Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag located in the capital.

The other ritual in which Zitṭariya plays a role is the Ritual at an Enemy Border. In this text Zitṭariya is perceived as the god most offended by the Kaškean incursions, presumably because the lost territory is his homeland, and he is therefore singled out for the chief role in the early portion of the ritual. While one sheep is sacrificed to all the gods, a second sheep is sacrificed for Zitṭariya alone. When the practitioner prepares to address the gods, he bows to “Zitṭariya (and) all the gods.” That Zitṭariya was considered the primary god threatened by the Kaškeans is indicated by the fact that the practitioner feels compelled to remind the other deities that it was not Zitṭariya alone from whom the lands were taken, but all the gods.

Zitṭariya is well attested in the Hittite cult, receiving offerings in many different festivals both in the capital and in the countryside. He is associated in one festival with cult functionaries who bark, reminiscent of the barking dog-men who play such an important role in the kurša- Festival devoted partially to him. Unlike tutelary deities like Ḫapantali(ya) and Karzi, he was considered important enough to receive offerings on an individual basis. When he does appear as part of a group of deities in the cult, it is

94. KBo 4.13+ iii 21', KUB 11.22 obv. iii 3'+81A obv. iii 17', and KUB 20.42 ii 9. An additional example, KUB 51.75-4', is a fragment of a festival and could belong to the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM.

95. See the discussion of the evidence for this in Appendix A sub KUB 53.11, §§9'-12'.


97. KUB 55.43 i 20-27; see Chapter 4.

98. CTH 422: A = KUB 4.1, B = KUB 31.146. Von Schuler, Kaškāer 168, calls this text “Ritual vor Beginn eines Feldzuges gegen die Kaškāer.”

99. Noted by Popko, Kultobjekte 111.

100. KUB 4.1 i 8-9.

101. KUB 4.1 i 19-20.

102. KUB 4.1 i 24-29. In i 24 Zitṭariya’s name is spelled Ḫi-ḫa-ri-ya, possibly just a scribal slip, but explained by Laroche, Rech. 40, as a means of avoiding the -ḫṭ- combination foreign to Hittite.

103. KUB 20.90 iv 2-5 (festival fragment naming the NIN.DINGIR).

104. See for example KBo 4.13+ iv 19 and vi 5; and KBo 19.128 ii 11, ed. Otten, StBoT 13 (1971) 4-5.
usually with other tutelary deities, although he does also occur with theStormgod\textsuperscript{105} and in
groups of diverse deities.\textsuperscript{106}

Hittite deities often moved around the various cult sites as part of certain ceremonies,
and for Zithariya we have several good references to his movements among the sacred
loci. In the Festival of Haste he was [taken(?)] into the house of the hunting bags.\textsuperscript{107} This is
not unexpected, since the kurša- Festival tells us that this was his official locus. It is
noteworthy rather in that it implies that he had been moved from the house of the hunting
bags to some other cultic place for a ceremony, possibly the temple of Ziparwa. He also
goes into the Š[ubhaš] in the Festival of Haste.\textsuperscript{108} In a fragment of festival celebrated by
the queen\textsuperscript{109} the (kurša- of) Zithariya is hung up in the ūalentu- building. As is discussed in
\textit{Appendix B} sub kurša- the hunting bag as a cult image moved among temples and cult
centers as a regular part of the KILAM, AN.TAH.ŠUM, and nantariyašhaš festivals.\textsuperscript{110}

The god is associated with cultic singing in Hattic\textsuperscript{111} and has a “great festival”
performed just for him in his temple.\textsuperscript{112} This text in which a “great festival” for Zithariya is
prescribed demonstrates another point of contrast between Zithariya and some of the more
minor Hattic tutelary deities, namely that he has a temple. The Festival of Haste provides
additional evidence for this, as the king goes into the temple of Zithariya.\textsuperscript{113} In the text
describing the Spring Festival at Tippuwa Zithariya goes into his temple for the
AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival.\textsuperscript{114} Zithariya was an important deity in the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival,
as evidenced by the passage at the end of that festival’s outline tablet, which refers to “the
AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival of Zithariya.” The text also mentions a temple of Zithariya and a
karimmi- building for him.\textsuperscript{115} An oracle about festivals\textsuperscript{116} mentions a festival specifically for
Zithariya after the king returns from campaign and returns Zithariya to his temple. In this
case offering materials are to be supplied from the palace. Thus Zithariya has his own
temple, a festival, and is sufficiently important to the king’s safety that he is taken on
campaign.\textsuperscript{117}

\begin{thebibliography}{117}
\bibitem{105} KBo 13.135:13’ (Thunder Festival?).
\bibitem{106} KBo 12.135 vii 1’–17’ (divine list fragment).
\bibitem{107} KBo 14.76 i 13’.
\bibitem{108} IBoT 4.81(+)34/t+KBo 3.25 i 4–5, with duplicate KUB 9.16 i 4–5. 34/t is from ZA 64 (1975) 246.
\bibitem{109} 315/t i 12’–14’, ed. Alp, Tempel 228–31, and discussed in \textit{Appendix B} sub kurša-.
\bibitem{110} Noted by Güterbock, \textit{NHF} 68.
\bibitem{111} KUB 44.12 v 4’–5’ (Festival of the Month?).
\bibitem{112} KUB 25.27 ii 18–70 (CTH 629, “Regular Festival”).
\bibitem{113} KBo 22.228:13’–14’, ed. Alp, Tempel 180–81.
\bibitem{114} KUB 10.18 ii 10–13 with duplicate KUB 10.17 ii 5–8.
\bibitem{115} KBo 10.20 iv 24–27, ed. Güterbock, \textit{JNES} 19 (1960) 84–87. Lines 25–26: [(i)]N\,A-E-S\,ap\,l\,6\,karimmi paiš\,(aita)]. Güterbock translates “one goes to his temple, (that is) to his own temple (in Hattusa).”
\bibitem{116} ABoT 14 v 11’–20’.
\bibitem{117} Zithariya’s importance in accompanying the king on campaign is pointed out by Popko, \textit{Kultobjekte} 112, and Houwink ten Cate, \textit{FsOtten}² 180.
\end{thebibliography}
Zithariya's tutelary, or protective, nature is also manifest from references to a Zithariya of a person. A Zithariya of the king receives offerings once in the Spring Festival at Mt. Tapala. The Zithariya of the king also occurs in a list of deities in a fragment of a treaty or protocol and receives offerings during the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival. Most interesting of the few examples of such a deity is the occurrence of both a Zithariya of the king and a Zithariya of the queen in the festival of Ištar of Ṣamuhā: 1 NINDA.SIG LUGAL pZittiḫariyašt KI.MIN (i.e., paršiya) 1 NINDA.SIG ŠA SAL.LUGAL pZittiḫariyašt KI.MIN. The ending -aš on this name is odd, as one would expect a dative-locative case here. This is probably another example of the scribe forgetting what he was writing and not consistently putting the elements of the list in the proper case. It is somewhat problematic that there is no indication that LUGAL is to be taken as genitive, but the parallel example with SAL.LUGAL is good evidence that LUGAL was intended to be genitive as well. Laroche takes the deities in line 64 not as tutelary deities of the king and queen but as a god and goddess of (the town) Zithara. Other examples of tutelary deities of the king and the queen suggest to me, however, that these also are intended to be personal tutelary deities. Line 66 of this text refers to a pLAMMA LUGAL, so the king has both a personal Zithariya and a personal LAMMA tutelary deity. See below for discussion of pLAMMA LUGAL. There is at least one other occurrence of a Zithariya of the queen, in the Festival celebrated by the queen mentioned above. It is not only royalty who have a Zithariya; as part of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival a Zithariya of the NIN.DINGIR priestess receives an offering loaf.

**TUTELARY DEITIES WITH THE TITLE pLAMMA**

Many tutelary deities are known to us not by name but by the designation pLAMMA. The following discussion of these deities is organized according to the three basic types noted in the *Introduction*: simple pLAMMA, pLAMMA GN, and pLAMMA plus non-GN epithet.

**pLAMMA WITHOUT EPITHET**

I translate this title as “the Tutelary Deity.” A possible reading Kurunta is proposed by Houwink ten Cate on the basis of texts in which the name pLAMMA-a- seems to refer to

118. This is not unique; there are a few examples of other deities not specifically tutelary being associated with a person. There is attested, for example, a “Stormgod of Ašmunikal.”
119. 755/t ii 17’–21’.
120. *KBo* 12.69:9’.
121. *KUB* 41.55 obv. 8’–9’.
122. *KUB* 27.1 i 64 (NH), ed. Lebrun, Ṣamuhā 77 and 88.
124. 315/t i 7’–14’, ed. Alp, *Tempel* 228–30, and discussed in *Appendix B* sub kurša-.
Kurunta, king of Ṭarḫuntašša. This is certainly a possible Luwian reading, but it would not fit the complementation ḨLAMMA-ri that is attested throughout the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities and in other texts such as KUB 44.2:6'. This complementation as evidence for a confusion of the Tutelary Deity with Inara is discussed below. This suggested equivalence of ḨLAMMA with Kurunta was not picked up or commented on by Otten in his RLA article on Kurunta.127 Laroche accepts Kurunta as a possible late form in his RLA article on LAMMA.128

One cult inventory describing an anthropomorphic cult image of this god is extant: ḨLAMMA ALAM LÛ GUB-an IGI-ŠU KÛ.GI GAR.RA ZAG-za ŠU-za marin KÛ.BABBAR Ḩarzi GÛB-za ŠU-za ARITUM Ḩarzi "The Tutelary Deity, a man, standing, his eyes inlaid with gold, in (his) right hand he holds a silver mari-spear, in (his) left hand he holds a shield."129 It is probably unspecified ḨLAMMA who is the god represented in the great outdoor sanctuary at Yazilikaya.130 The accompanying hieroglyphic name cannot yet be read but the antler sign indicates that this is a tutelary deity.

ḤLAMMA occurs in basically the same types of texts as the other tutelary deities. We should note, however, that it is not certain that all the occurrences of "AN KAL" are to be read ḨLAMMA. The most obvious possible exception is in the myth of the "Kingship of KAL" (CTH 343). In this myth, which belongs to the Kumarbi cycle, the title or name of the god who seizes control of heaven is written ḨKAL. He is a Hurrian god not necessarily related to the earlier Hittite pantheon. For this reason and because he does not seem to behave like a tutelary or protective deity in the myth, scholars hesitate to equate him with the Tutelary Deity and render his name ḨKAL.131 However, Hoffner points out to me that the fact of the gods themselves being offended by his behavior after his accession to kingship may indicate that they had expected something different from him, something more in keeping with the character of a patron deity. We therefore cannot say definitely that this is not also the Tutelary Deity.

There has been some confusion as to the name(s) underlying the logogram ḨLAMMA. The reading Inara132 for this logogram was proposed as early as 1926 by Forrer.133 Otten notes the alternation of ḨLAMMA and Inara in duplicates of the Illuyanka myth.134 This alternation can be seen in that myth for example in KUB 17.6 i 14 (OH/NS) ḨI-na-ra-aš =

129. KUB 38.2 ii 24–26, ed. von Brandenstein, Bildsbeschr. 8–9, Rost, MIO 8 (1963) 176.
130. God #32; see Bittel, Yaz 2 137–38, pl. 21.2, 57, Güterbock, Yaz 2 174–75. This could also be the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatti.
133. Forsch. 1: 10 n. 2.
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KBo 12.84 i 1 (OH/NS) DLAMMA-as, as well as the myth of Inara, KUB 33.63 rev. 5 (OH/NS) DLAMMA-as = KUB 36.51 rev. 7' (OH/NS) DLAMMA. In these texts Inara is the original god, and it is DLAMMA who has been inserted in her place in some late copies. It therefore has been thought that Inara was the Tutelary Deity in the Old Hittite period. This would mean that the oldest form of the Tutelary Deity among the Hittites was female, which is interesting in light of the fact, mentioned in this chapter’s introduction, that in Mesopotamia DLAMMA = Akkadian LAMASSU is female. The later Hittite concept of DLAMMA as male would then be due to a development within Hittite cultural history rather than a fundamental difference between Anatolian and Mesopotamian perceptions. Kammenhuber rejects this identification of DLAMMA and Inara in the early period, pointing out that this would require some “altheth. ‘Originale’” (that is Old Script) evidence to verify the existence of DLAMMA in the Old Hittite period, evidence which she does not find.

KUB 43.23 is an Old Script text which provides evidence for an Old Hittite DLAMMA. Reverse 38–42 reads: 2 NINDA.KUR4.RA GÍD.DA 1 NINDA.KUR4.RA LIBIR 1 GAL GESTIN 1 MÁŠ.GAL ANA LÚ.MES ŠA DLAMMA DLAMMA D-A-a-la “Two ‘long’ thick breads, one ‘old’ thick bread, one cup of wine, (and) one billy-goat to the men of the Tutelary Deity, the Tutelary Deity, (and) Ala.” Instead of strengthening the equation Inara = Old Hittite DLAMMA, however, this passage indicates an Old Hittite pairing of DLAMMA and DAla. In the Empire period DLAMMA and DAla are attested as a divine couple, DLAMMA as the male and DAla as the female deity. The KUB 43.23 passage indicates that this divine pair goes back to the Old Hittite period and therefore implies that the DLAMMA was male already in this period. Although there is no question that DLAMMA is often used, at least in New Script tablets, for DInara, more than one “Hittite” name could underlie this logogram, and we must accept the evidence for an Old Hittite male tutelary deity written DLAMMA. The very existence of the female DAla as an Old Hittite tutelary deity suggests that tutelary deities in the early period could be female, and Inara may therefore also have been a tutelary deity. Hoffner points out to me that in the Old Hittite Illuyanka myth Inar(a)’s activities in providing abundance at a feast and in making (hunting?) trips to the steppe (gimraš) would be consistent with what we know of the activities of a tutelary deity. If she were a tutelary deity the confusion in the New Hittite period between her and DLAMMA would be understandable.

138. CTH 820: “Bénédictions pour le labarna-roi,” cited also in the discussion on Ala.
139. See comments on this above sub DAla and in Güterbock, FsBittel 208, and Kammenhuber, ZA 66 (1976) 72f. The Festival for All the Tutelary Deities, edited in Chapter 3, is good evidence for this pairing. Güterbock earlier in Ferm, ed. Forgotten Religions (New York, n.d. [ca. 1950]) 92 had suggested without specifying time period that the tutelary deities written with the LAMMA ideogram were male gods.
In the late period ḫLAMMA is definitely masculine, as is most obvious in the cult inventory entry describing his cult image as that of a man. Other evidence includes the occurrence of the divine pair ḫLAMMA and Ala in a cult inventory for Wiyanawanta and more extensively in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities. Kammenhuber comments on the male tutelary deity portrayed in this festival. In addition the Tutelary Deity at Yazılıkaya and elsewhere in the extant cult images is clearly male.

The evidence that ḫLAMMA is male must be reconciled with the fact that this logogram in the New Hittite period is often complemented for a reading Inara. One possible pre-New Hittite example is KUB 41.10, the reverse of which contains a list of gods in the Ritual for the Stormgod of Kuliwša. All of the LAMMA tutelary deities are complemented ḫLAMMA-ri. If I am correct in dating this tablet Middle Script, this would be an early example of ḫLAMMA as Inara. Alternation between ḫLAMMA and Inara occurs in New Script copies of older texts as well as New Hittite texts. ḫLAMMA-ri for example occurs throughout KUB 2.1, a Tüdḫaliya IV text. KUB 51.79 rev! 12′ (OH/NS?) has ID-aš ḫInaran where the parallel KUB 44.2:5′–6′ (/?NS) has ID-aš-[a] ḫLAMMA-ri. KUB 44.3, the Middle Script? duplicate to KUB 44.2, has uncomplemented ḫLAMMA ID. It therefore is possible that here the tutelary deity of the river was originally written ḫLAMMA, which later copyists interpreted as Inara in the New Script copies KUB 44.2 and KUB 51.79. KUB 44.16 ii 16′, ḫ[NA ḫLAMMA]A shows the variant ḫInaras parna in KBo 22.189 ii 8. The substitution of ḫLAMMA for Inara in the later copies of the KI.LAM Festival is noted above under ḫapantali(ya). The same alternation can be seen in two unidentified festival fragments which duplicate each other: KBo 11.35 rev. 2–3: ḫLAMMA ḫHa-pa-an-[a-li-ya] ḫKap-pa-ri-ya-mu, KUB 20.39 v? 13′–14′; ḫJ-na-ar ḫI[(a-pa-an-t)a-li-ya] ḫKap-pa-ri-ya-m[u]. Laroche, RLA 6 (1980–83) 455, points out that the logogram KAL (LAMMA) has the meaning “strong” and explains the confusion of ḫLAMMA and Inara as a folk etymology connecting Inara with innarawanza “strong.” Kammenhuber explains the use of Inara as the reading for ḫLAMMA in the late period as a product of the confusion between ḫLAMMA and Inara that occurred in the Empire period, the same confusion which led to writing ḫLAMMA for Inara in New Script copies of Illuyanka. She notes without comment that ḫLAMMA = Inara occurs in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities as a male tutelary deity. This is true if we read ḫInari for the many occurrences of ḫLAMMA-ri in that festival. It is at least possible that some other name

140. KUB 38.2 i1 24′–26′, ed. von Brandenstein, Bildbeschr. 8–9, Rost, MIO 8 (1963) 176.
141. KUB 38.1 i.e. 1–2, ed. von Brandenstein, Bildbeschr. text 2, trans. Rost, MIO 8 (1963) 182.
143. Laroche, Onom. 79–81, sums up the situation by noting that although Inara definitely is one possible reading for ḫLAMMA, this logogram also stands for male gods and obviously covers a diverse group of gods. He quite rightly cautions against mechanically reading Inara for all occurrences of ḫLAMMA.
144. See Chapter 5 for these festival texts.
145. Both Festival for All the Tutelary Deities, edited in Chapter 3 with commentary on the possibly early date of their composition.
ending in -r+ stem vowel underlies this writing. The use of DLAMMA to denote a tutelary deity goes back to the Old Hittite period as seen in the Old Script Benediction for Labarna KUB 43.23. Inar(a) is a pre-Hittite Hattic goddess who plays a prominent role in the Hattian-based mythology of the Old Hittite period. In the Empire period the Hittites confused these two, putting DLAMMA in Inara’s place in mythological texts, and perhaps switching each for the other in the festival offering prescriptions.

One explanation for DLAMMA as Inara in the late period and for expressions such as the “Inara of the River” in the KUB 51.79 passage is that Inara by the Empire period was a common noun. Perhaps Inara was always a noun with a semantic range of “protection, guarding,” used as a name, or it may have been an originally Hattic divine name borrowed by the Hittites which in later usage became a common noun. This development is already discernible in an OH/OS or MS lot oracle in which one of the “lots” is URUĦATTUŞAŠ DLAMMA, “the inaras of Ḥattuša,” where plural “inaras” is not a proper name but rather a noun.

The LAMMA logogram was also used as a common noun designating a type of deity, as in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities, KUB 2.1 i 42, ANA ŠUMDLAMMA ħumandaš “to the names of all the tutelary deities.” Such a usage is also seen in an oracle on the king’s campaigns, in which one of the lots is DLAMMA.ḪI.A “the tutelary deities.” In the prayer of Mursili II to all the gods, among similar expressions like DLAMMA.ḪI.A ħumanteš “all the Stormgods” (line 6’) is the phrase DLAMMA.ḪI.Á MEŠ ħumanteš, “all the tutelary deities.” DLAMMA’s protective nature can be seen in an OH/MS text of uncertain category: uk-war-an-ši DLAMMA maniyahhun “I assigned him to him (as) a protective deity.” Here DLAMMA is not a title, but a common noun denoting the generic concept “protective deity.”

DLAMMA as a common noun occurs with possessive suffixes. This occurs for example in the Festival for the Underworld Deities, in which in consecutive paragraphs, each describing short ceremonies, the palace attendant (DUMU.É.GAL) calls out the title “the Stormgod” and then DLAMMA-aš-miš “my tutelary deity.” In an Old Hittite historical fragment in broken context DLAMMA-KNU “your (pl.) tutelary deity” is preserved. The tutelary deity as a kind of guardian angel occurs twice in similar formulas in the Instructions for Temple Personnel: takku parkwešteni šumel DLAMMA-KNU takku paprišteni-ma nu-šmaš-at SAG.DU-aš wašṭul “If you (pl.) are innocent, (it is) your (pl.) protective deity, but if you are guilty, it (is) a capital sin for you” (iv 32, cf. also line 54).

148. CTH 561: KUB 5.1 i 94–95.
149. CTH 379: KUB 31.121 ii 11’.
150. CTH 645: KUB 20.24 iv 8’–11’.
151. KBo 3.23 rev. 3’.
Although the LAMMA logogram can be a common noun, in the great majority of cases the use of ḌLAMMA without any accompanying epithet or modifier is a title used to refer to one particular deity, whom I call "the Tutelary Deity." He occurs primarily in lists of deities, usually other tutelary deities, both among the oath deities in treaties and among groups of gods who receive offerings in the festivals. He is included in the major state cults, but his role is restricted to witnessing the oaths of treaties and receiving offerings. He is attested from the earliest period, as evidenced by his appearance in the Old Script text KUB 43.23 rev. 41 (Benediction for the Labarna).

Like many of the other tutelary deities, ḌLAMMA is one of the standard oath deities in the treaties, occurring in the New Hittite treaties as the first of the group of tutelary deities, but in two Middle Hittite treaties with the Kaškeans he occurs without the other tutelary deities. In KUB 23.77a+KUB 13.27+ obv. 3 he occurs as the third of the "gods of Ḫatti" after the Sungod and Stormgod. The only other tutelary deity witness in this treaty is the Tutelary Deity of Karahna (line 4). In KUB 40.36+KUB 23.78+ ii 5' he occurs fourth in the list, after the Sungod, the Stormgod, and ZA.BA₂². BA₄. In the Middle Hittite period, when the list of oath-deities was not fully developed or nearly as extensive as it was in the Empire period, ḌLAMMA was one of the primary gods of Ḫatti, along with the Sungod and Stormgod. By the Empire period he merely has first place among the tutelary deities in the lists.

In the prayers as in the treaties we see ḌLAMMA not only in the texts in which many tutelary deities occur but also in texts where he or he and the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti are the only tutelary deities mentioned. Again this preference can be seen in the Middle Hittite period, as the Tutelary Deity occurs in the prayer of Kantuzili and the prayer of Arnuwanda and Asmunikal. In the latter ḌLAMMA again occurs third in the list after the Sungod and Stormgod. ḌLAMMA is also prayed to individually in Muršili II's prayer to all the gods, in which all the tutelary deities, except for the Tutelary Deity and the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti, are covered with the phrase ḌLAMMA MEŠ ḫumanteš "all the tutelary deities."

The Tutelary Deity frequently played a role in Hittite magic, occurring in many different rituals. He was included in rituals for other gods; for example, the Ritual for the Stormgod of Kuliwišna, in which the gods are regularly grouped under the rubric DINGIR.MEŠ ḫumandaš, except for the Stormgod of Kuliwišna (the main god of the ritual), Ištar, and the Tutelary Deity. He occurs in major state rituals such as the

---

154. This is done with the understanding that some of these occurrences may refer to Inara. Those that can be shown to be Inara are not considered here.
155. CTH 373: KUB 30.10 obv. 4, rev. 20.
156. CTH 375: FHL 3+KUB 31.123 obv. 9.
157. CTH 379: KUB 31.121+KUB 48.111 i 11'.
158. KBo 15.35+KBo 15.33 i 5'; KBo 15.36+KBo 21.61 ii 15.
"Totenrituale,\textsuperscript{159} the Ritual at an Enemy Border,\textsuperscript{160} and the Old Hittite Ritual Against Curse.\textsuperscript{161} DLAMMA's range of influence can be inferred not only from his inclusion in rituals for provincial gods such as the Stormgod of Kulwišna but also from the occurrences of his name in "foreign" rituals, magic performed by practitioners not native to Ḫatti and containing conjurations in foreign languages.\textsuperscript{162} There is also a tablet catalogue\textsuperscript{163} which lists a ritual perhaps dedicated to the Tutelary Deity: 1 TUP[(PU INIM ʻAnna)]nna ȘU.GI URU Zigažhura [(mān DLAMMA-an) mug]anzi "One tablet, the words of Annanna, the old woman of Zigažhura, 'when they invoke the Tutelary Deity.'" This could also be interpreted as a generic use of the title DLAMMA: "... when they invoke a tutelary deity."

The evidence of the festival texts demonstrates that the Tutelary Deity was a major god of the pantheon involved throughout the entire range of the Hittite state cult, receiving offerings in all the major festivals such as the KI.LAM, AN.TAH.SUM, nuntarriyashas, etc. His fairly prominent position in the procession of state gods at the cult center of Yazilikaya also attests to his importance in the pantheon. The use of his spear as a cult symbol in the KI.LAM Festival is commented on below in the discussion of the Tutelary Deity of the Spear. DLAMMA like Zitḫariya was at times taken out during cultic ceremonies and transported to cult loci outside his temple. An example of an unusual cult ceremony involving such a journey occurs in a large unidentified cult fragment: [LUGAL-ūš-ka]n? katta KĀ.GAL aššaš paizzi [nuʔ-Š]an maḫḫān ANA ĪD DLAMMA šer [par]a armuwanzi n-\~an-kān GIS GIGIR-az [kafi]a uwatanzi nu-kan İSTU GAL KU BABBAR [kuc]z\textsuperscript{164} akkuškit šaštattān-\~a [nu-ūš-š]i? para pianzi maḫḫān-`ma-\~aš-kan [ANA? ĪD kattanta ari (bottom of column) "[The king(?)] goes down to(?) the aššaš- gate. When they bring the Tutelary Deity forth to the river on top,\textsuperscript{165} they carry him down on a chariot. The silver cup from [which] he used to drink, and the bed, they give [them] forth to him(?).\textsuperscript{166} When, however, he arrives down at the river\textsuperscript{167} ...\textsuperscript{168} Another example of this is KUB 9.17 (edited in Appendix A), depending on the interpretation of the text. One interpretation is that a god travels by chariot to Tauriša, Ḫahiša, and other local cult centers, a god that context indicates was the Tutelary Deity. See the comments to KUB 9.17 in Appendix A.

\textsuperscript{159} CTH 450, e.g., KUB 30.25+KUB 34.68+KUB 39.4 obv. 34, ed. Otten, HTR 26–27; KUB 39.33 ii 7, ed. Otten, HTR 114–15.

\textsuperscript{160} CTH 422: KUB 4.1 i 3.

\textsuperscript{161} KBo 10.37 ii 7', 13', 18', iii 39, 41, 42.

\textsuperscript{162} For example KUB 7.1+KBo 3.8 iii 13 (Ritual of Wattiti), translit. Laroche, Myth. 1: 169; and KUB 17.15 ii 19' (Conjuration containing Luwisms).

\textsuperscript{163} KUB 5.1+KUB 31.45+ i 22–23, with duplicate KUB 30.58 obv! 7'–8'(+) KBo 14.68 i 21', ed. Laroche, CTH pp. 158–59.

\textsuperscript{164} This restoration as well as the ideas on šer and kattanta with ĪD expressed in the translation were suggested by Güterbock.

\textsuperscript{165} That is, perhaps at the top of a high riverbank?

\textsuperscript{166} That is, the god?

\textsuperscript{167} Perhaps at the water's edge as opposed to up on top of the riverbank as in the second sentence.

\textsuperscript{168} KUB 20.2 iv 24'–30'.
Although the Tutelary Deity is ubiquitous in the state cult, there are very few references to his cultic equipment or personnel. The cult inventory discussed above describes an anthropomorphic cult image of this god. A fragment of cult inventory mentions an "Temple of the Tutelary Deity" several times in descriptions of festivals. However it is not discernible from this broken fragment where this temple is located, whether in the capital or in a provincial city. A temple of the Tutelary Deity, probably in the capital, is clearly attested in KUB 9.17:5'; see Appendix A. An ē Našhekur PLAMMA at the capital is attested in Muršili’s Prayer about the Tawannana.

A throne or chair of the Tutelary Deity is mentioned in the Ritual of Wattiti. It is first described as being bound: ŠA PLAMMA GIS ŠU.A hamikta “He (the Great River) bound the Tutelary Deity’s throne/chair,” and then it is released: ŠA PLAMMA GIS ŠU.A lattat. The Tutelary Deity had a spear associated with him that was used in some of the festivals, discussed below in the section on PLAMMA GIS Sukur.

We do not have a great deal of evidence for cult personnel for this god. A “singer of the Tutelary Deity” is attested once in the Old Hittite KI.LAM Festival. This singer plays the wooden Inanna instrument in a ceremony that involves beaded hunting bags, a procession of images of wild animals coming in, and the dog-men. In this ceremony, in which things relating to the hunt predominate, the singer of the Tutelary Deity makes his only appearance attested so far in the texts. The other functionary attested for PLAMMA is a priest (LºSANGA) who occurs in a variety of festivals.

We have a certain amount of ambiguous evidence for the cult of PLAMMA in the provinces. This title occurs in various local festivals in all periods. The problem is whether to understand the title PLAMMA in a text describing a provincial cult as “the Tutelary Deity” or to understand it as the tutelary deity of that particular cult center. It is likely that in a festival text intended to be celebrated at the local level there would be no need to modify the PLAMMA title, as it would be understood as the tutelary deity of that particular area. However, the occurrence of both PLAMMA GN and PLAMMA in local cult texts, for

169. KBo 26.223:5’, 7’, 9’.  
170. CTH 70: KUB 14.4 ii 5’, ed. Güterbock apud Laroche, Ugar. 3 (1956) 102–03. Güterbock suggested that the ē Našhekur PLAMMA might be something similar to an Na4 DINGIR-LIM, “mausoleum,” pointing out that the context in Muršili’s prayer made the general sense “graveyard” clear. He has since indicated to me in a personal communication that he is no longer sure of this, as PLAMMA presumably did not have a mausoleum. We should perhaps simply translate this term literally as “the stone house of the Tutelary Deity.”

171. KBo 3.8+KUB 7.1 iii 13.  
172. KBo 3.8+KUB 7.1 iii 31. See CHD sub la-6c on this text, translating “the throne of PLAMMA.”

173. See the description of the PLAMMA’s image which mentions the mari- spear in his right hand, KUB 38.2 ii 24’-26’, discussed above.


175. Naškunanaš KURSEŠ as a beaded hunting bag is suggested by Güterbock, FsKantor 116 with n. 23.

176. For example, KBo 30.87 obv. 12’ (Festival Celebrated by the Prince); KBo 10.23 vii 9 (KI.LAM Festival); KBo 4.9 ii 13, 14, 20, 27, 28 (AN.TAJ.SUM Festival for ZA.BA4.BA4); KUB 53.16 i 7’ (fest. frag.). See Pecchioli Daddi, Mestieri 360, for the priest of the Tutelary Deity.
example **DLAMMA** **URUKARAHNA** and **DLAMMA** in the cult inventory for **KARAHNA** indicates that at least sometimes **DLAMMA** in provincial cult practice denotes "the Tutelary Deity."

**DLAMMA** is featured especially in the Festival at Šarešša. The occurrence of this title in various other local festivals indicates that he was worshipped in Tuḫumiyara, Arinna, Zippalanda, and Šamuha. The Festival of Tuḫumiyara is an Old Hittite text containing sections in Hattic that show the antiquity of the worship of a local tutelary deity or the Tutelary Deity in provincial towns. Another Hattic-based festival in which **DLAMMA** plays a part is that of Tetešhabi. **DLAMMA** was also worshipped in later local festivals and in festivals that show Hurrian influence. He occurs for example in a Festival of Tešub of Aleppo, a New Hittite festival.

We also have evidence of cultic paraphernalia for **DLAMMA** from the provinces. An É **NAḫEKUR** **DLAMMA** is mentioned several times in an oracle concerning the cult of the god of Arušna. There was also one of these buildings at Zippalanda, as seen in the Festival celebrated there. A temple of the Tutelary Deity of Karahna is discussed below in the comments on that god. Not only did the local tutelary deity have a temple at Karahna, but a cult inventory for that city includes **DLAMMA** as one of the gods for whom there was also a temple, as opposed to the gods whose cult locus was simply a **HUWAŠI**-stela.

Although **DLAMMA** had a temple at Karahna, there were a number of cult sites where he had only a stela. In the Festival at Šarešša part of the cult ceremony is performed at the stela of the Tutelary Deity. A stela of this god with the prescribed offerings to be provided during the Spring Festival is listed in a cult inventory cataloguing the stelae of various gods. In another cult inventory text **DLAMMA** is listed among the gods who have stelae in the towns of Iššanašši (i 33') and Mallitta (iv 15'-17'). Thus the Tutelary Deity is a sufficiently important member of the pantheon to be worshipped throughout the provinces as well as in the capital, either at a temple or, more frequently, at a cult stela.

177. KUB 38.12 ii 5, iii 13'-16'.
179. Festival of Tuḫumiyara: CTH 739, KUB 12.8 ii 6'.
180. The Great Festival of Arinna: CTH 634, KUB 25.9 ii 8', iv 22.
181. CTH 635: fest. frag., KBo 22.209 rev. 7'.
182. Autumn Festival for Ištar of Šamuha: CTH 711, KBo 11.28 obv. iii 34'.
183. CTH 738: KBo 19.161 i 6'.
184. KBo 14.142 i 9.
185. CTH 566: KUB 22.70 obv. 13, 20, 73.
186. CTH 635: KBo 22.209 rev. 7'.
187. KUB 38.12 iii 13'-16'.
188. CTH 636: KUB 20.99 ii 18, 19, 25.
189. KUB 12.2 iii 5-6, ed. Carter, Diss. 77, 84.
190. KUB 38.6 i 33', iv 15'-17', restored from the duplicate KUB 38.10, ed. Rost, MIO 8 (1963) 187-88, 196.
We note above that when the Tutelary Deity appears in oath-deity lists in treaties, he is almost always in the group of tutelary deities. In the festivals and rituals he often receives offerings by himself, as well as appearing in groups that can include a great variety of other gods. There is however a certain tendency in many cult texts to associate the Tutelary Deity with the Sungod(dess) and Stormgod as a special group of three, either as the first three in a longer list of deities or as a discrete group. This may be seen in the occurrence of this triad in Old Hittite texts such as the Festival of Tuḫumiyara\(^{191}\) and the Ritual Against Curse.\(^{192}\) In the latter text these three are specifically named together, with the remainder of the pantheon disposed of under a phrase like “the thousand gods” or “all the gods.” Because these texts are Old Hittite we may posit a relative antiquity to this grouping and to the prominent place of the Tutelary Deity. That they are written in New Script allows the possibility that this triad is a late modification, but the evidence of the treaties discussed above indicates that DLAMMA tends to be less prominent in the Empire period. This may be due to an increased proportion of Hurrian over Hattic cultural influence on the Hittite cult in the Empire. The older treaties such as the Middle Hittite Treaty with the Kaškeans\(^{193}\) place the Tutelary Deity in a triad with the Sungod and Stormgod as the first three of the gods of Ḫatti. In the Festival of the Month this same group plus Mezzulla occurs at the beginning of a list of offerings of NINDA.KUR₄.RA.

Not only in the festivals but also in ritual texts is this same triad discernible. In “private” rituals such as that of Pupuwanni this group occurs as the first three of the gods of whom clay figures are made.\(^{194}\) In state rituals such as the Totenrituale, they appear together (with the Sungoddess of the Earth making a fourth) receiving drink offerings.\(^{195}\) In the Ritual by the Enemy Border these three are specifically mentioned before the phrase DINGIR.MEŠ-naš ḫuman[...]aš “all the gods.”\(^{196}\) In this text the Sun deity is specified as the Sungoddess of Arinna; in most other examples it is ḪUTU-un (Ištanun) or simply ḪUTU.

This divine group may also be seen at least once in the prayers, in the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal.\(^{197}\) It also occurs in the local cults, as evidenced particularly in the cult inventories. The list of the gods of the city Ḫapatḥa, for example, begins with these three, followed by ZA.BA₄.BA₄ and a local deity.\(^{198}\) In a cult inventory for Wiyanawanta and other towns this group appears immediately before or immediately after the local deity (divine mountain) whose cult is being described.\(^{199}\) In KBo 2.13 rev. 2’ the sun deity of the group is again identified as the Sungoddess of Arinna. In rev. 5’ of that text, there are four

---

191. CTH 739: KUB 12.8 ii 6’ (OH/NS).
193. CTH 139: KUB 23.77a+KUB 13.27+ obv. 3 (MH/MS).
194. CTH 408: KUB 41.3 obv. 20’–22’.
195. KUB 39.33 iii 7–9, ed. Oten, HTR 115.
196. CTH 422: KUB 4.1 i 3 (MH/NS).
197. CTH 375: FHL 3+KUB 31.123 obv. 9.
198. 15r v 15’–17’ (cult inventory fragment).
TUTELARY DEITIES AND THEIR CULTS

The great number of references to D_LAMMA indicate his important role in both cultic and non-cultic contexts. A good example for this is his occurrence in the Prayer of Muršili to all the gods, in which the one or two most important deities of a particular title are mentioned specifically and the rest covered with an all-inclusive term: [P]LAMMA D[LAMMA URU HATTI] D_LAMMA, MES ūhumantes D[ISTAR D[ISTAR...]]. DUTU-ŠI D[ISTAR URU Šamuḥa D[ISTAR UrU ūhumantes] D[Telipinsu D[Telipinsu ūh[umantes] DZA.BA4. BA4 DZA.BA4. BA4 ūhumantes]. In Muršili’s day D_LAMMA and D_LAMMA URU Zapatiskuwa were the two tutelary deities most prominent in the texts, and the occurrence of D_LAMMA in many texts as part of a threesome of which the other two were the most important gods in the pantheon indicates not only the Tutelary Deity’s first rank among all the tutelary deities but his very high position in the Hittite pantheon as well.

D_LAMMA PLUS GEOGRAPHICAL NAME

Some of the tutelary deities specified by locality played a major role in the Hittite state cult, while many others are very poorly attested in the festival texts discovered at the capital. Much of this is due to the nature of these gods; presumably all of them had a cult center and a festival dedicated to them at their home city, but since our textual evidence comes from the capital they do not play such a major role in the extant festivals. Those attested in the texts from Ḫattuša appear either as lesser deities in state festivals or in copies of festivals to be performed at their respective local cult centers.

D_LAMMA URU Ḫatenzuwa and D_LAMMA URU Zapatiskuwa

These gods play a central role in the kurša-Festival treated in Chapter 4, which describes the replacing of the old kurša- (cult symbol) of D_LAMMA URU Ḫatenzuwa and its subsequent renaming as D_LAMMA URU Zapatiskuwa. The Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenzuwa, obviously not originating in Ḫattuša, by some point in the Middle Hittite era (the text is MH) had become sufficiently important at the capital that the cult symbol was permanently housed there and a festival established for the regular replacing of that symbol. We would thus expect this god to occur in other texts on the basis of his stature in the capital, while we would expect to hear less of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa, who is sent to the provinces. This turns out to be the case on the basis of our present evidence. The Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa occurs only in these passages in the main text of the kurša-Festival. The Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenzuwa, by contrast, occurs in other fragments of festivals for tutelary deities. He also occurs in at least one other festival, where the god received a...
drink and bread offerings from a prince in the course of the festival. He is also among the gods listed in a prayer of Muwatalli, showing that his position was sufficiently important to be included in a royal prayer, although this list is quite long and includes many other gods as well. This god also occurs in a cult inventory text of Tudhaliya IV in which a statue of gold or silver is being described. This is an interesting development in light of this god’s close connection with the kurša- and the elaborate ceremony detailed in the main text of the kurša- Festival for ritually renewing the kurša- as his cult symbol. Apparently by this late period (Tudhaliya IV) the kurša- had been replaced as a cult symbol by a statue of precious metal. We may perhaps view Tudhaliya’s religious reforms partially as an attempt to standardize cult representations by replacing the unusual hunting bag with the more common anthropomorphic statue.

**DLAMMA URU HATTI**

The Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti is the best attested tutelary deity of this type. He occurs in lists of deities in a great number of Empire period historical texts. He is regularly one of the oath gods for treaties, including apparently the Egyptian language version of the international treaty between Ḫattušili III and Ramesses II. In oracle texts he also occurs more than any other tutelary deity except simple DLAMMA. In the oracles he is addressed only as one of a group of gods with the Stormgod of Ḫatti and others who are being questioned as to why they are angry with the Hittites.

---

possible second occurrence in KUB 58.13 obv. 6, "Ḫa-ti-en-za-ḫušḫušu", noted by Popko, KUB 58 Inhaltsübersicht and index. This name probably represents a god to be equated with DLAMMA URU Ḫatzenuwa. See Laroche, Rech. 24, for commentary and Appendix A for KUB 10.29.

203. The Festival Celebrated by a Prince, CTH 647: 316/t rev. 1.

204. KUB 6.46 ii 36.

205. KUB 38.35 i 9, see Jakob-Rost, MIO 9 (1963) 196.

206. Van Loon, Anatolia in the Second Millennium B.C. (Leiden, 1985) 29 notes that after Tudhaliya’s reforms most deities had anthropomorphic images. The exception which he does not note is Zitḫariya, who at the same city of Ḫatzenuwa had a new hunting bag image rather than an anthropomorphic one.

207. Written DLAMMA URU HA-AT-TI, e.g., KUB 2.13 v 5 (Festival of the Month, OH?/NS), KUB 14.16 i 28 (Detailed Annals of Muršili, NH); DLAMMA URU HAT-TI, e.g., KBo 26.166 ii 15 (cult inventory fragment), KUB 18.25 i 12 (lot oracle); and DLAMMA URU KU.BABBAR-TI, e.g., KUB 6.45 i 51 (Prayer of Muwatalli to the Stormgod piḫaššašši). I translate DLAMMA URU ḪATTI as “the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti” on analogy with gods such as URU HATTI “the Stormgod of Ḫatti.” However, because URU HATTI is the Akkadogram for the city Ḫattuša, and since with all the other tutelary gods of the type DLAMMA GN is the GN is a city name, this should perhaps be translated “the Tutelary Deity of Ḫattuša.” The form URU Ḫa-at-tu-ša-as URU-na-re-ča, “the tutelary deities of Ḫattuša,” in KBo 18.151 obv. 11 (lot oracle, OH/OS or MS) is an early example of inara used as a common noun to denote “tutelary deity,” and is also the only example to date of a tutelary deity of syllabically written Ḫattuša. Although properly the land of Ḫatti is written KUR URU ḪATTI, the capital Ḫattuša is often to be identified with the land of Ḫatti, so DLAMMA URU HATTI should be understood as the tutelary deity of the capital, and, by extension, of the land of Ḫatti.

208. See Wilson’s comments on Goetze’s interpretation of this in ANET201 with n. 16.

209. KUB 16.34 i 1–3, KUB 16.82+ i 1–5, KUB 18.25 i 12–15.
TUTELARY DEITIES AND THEIR CULTS

The Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti also occurs twice in cult inventory texts, in broken contexts which tell us that offerings to his image were listed as part of the inventory. In one text this is in Ḫattuša, in the other the context is a paragraph about the deities of Kizzimara. Although he is tutelary deity of the capital, he also has cult images and is worshipped in the provinces. In the prayer of Muršili to all the gods he is listed among the gods. He occurs immediately after “the Tutelary Deity” (simple ḏLAMMA) and is the only other tutelary deity singled out for individual mention. His occurrence in this text alongside ḏLAMMA shows that ḏLAMMA ḪATTI and ḏLAMMA are two distinct deities, a fact which is borne out by numerous other examples of these two divine names occurring together. The Hattic tutelary deities such as Ḫapantali(ya) and Zitḫariya, to whom Muwatalli prays in his prayer to the Stormgod pihṣšašši, as well as all the other tutelary deities, are not mentioned separately in Muršili’s prayer but are subsumed under the rubric ḏLAMMA.MES šumantes “all the tutelary deities.”

We have mentioned that in Muwatalli’s prayer most of the tutelary deities are not mentioned separately by name. The exception to this is the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti, who is placed rather with the major deities such as the Stormgod of Ḫatti and the Sungod of Ḫatti. Once again this god has preeminence over the other tutelary deities, showing his high position in the state pantheon during the late Hittite period. His importance in the late period is underscored by his inclusion in the lists of gods to receive offerings in the Festival of Istar of Šamuḫa. This text is not further evidence of his being singled out from among the other tutelary deities, however, because he is simply one in a list of these deities, which includes some of the early Hattic tutelary deities. His inclusion in a list of Hurrian gods is, however, an example of his special status among the tutelary gods in this late period, as he was taken over as a Hurrian god as well. Another example of his inclusion in a Hurrian cultic text is the Festival of Tešub of Aleppo, in which ḏLAMMA and ḏLAMMA ḪATTI are the only two tutelary deities included in the great list of gods to receive offerings, a list which includes Hittite, Hurrian, and Mesopotamian deities.

There is little evidence for his role in the cult in the early period; he seems to have become prominent only in the Empire period. The antiquity of his position in the pantheon is however suggested by a ceremony in the Festival of the Month in which he and some Hattic tutelary deities receive offerings while the singer chants in Hattic. Although his prominence among the tutelary deities in the later period is clear, his position relative to the entire state pantheon is not so prominent. He does not play as active a role in the cult as one might expect based on the evidence from other text genres. He receives offerings in

210. KBo 12.140 obv. 2, KBo 26.166 ii 15.
211. KUB 31.121+KUB 48.111 i 11’.
212. KUB 6.45 i 50–53 with duplicate KUB 6.46 ii 14–18.
213. KUB 27.1 i 64–67, ed. Lebrun, Samuha 77 and 88.
214. KUB 34.102+ ii 11–15’, iii 32’–35’.
216. KUB 2.13 v 4–9 (OH?/NS).
several different festivals, almost invariably as one of a group. That group is always other tutelary deities, not the major state gods in whose company he occurs in the Muwatalli prayer mentioned above. The only occasions in which he receives individual offerings are in two festival fragments. In a fragment of the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival\textsuperscript{217} he occurs in broken context between the Sungod, Mezulla, and the Stormgod of Zippalanda before him and Ḥapantali(ya) after him. In an unidentified festival fragment\textsuperscript{218} he receives individual offerings on the same scale as the Stormgod of Ḥatti and the Sungoddess of Arinna and third in line after them.

There are few references to cultic equipment and personnel for this deity. A priest of the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatti is attested several times, all in one fragment of a festival dedicated to tutelary deities.\textsuperscript{219} It is uncertain whether this text reflects the situation at a local cult center or at the capital. A temple of the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatti is mentioned just once.\textsuperscript{220} The context is broken, but it is clear that the king enters this temple to make offerings.

**PLAMMA URUKaraḥna**

One of the most important of these provincial tutelary deities was the Tutelary Deity of Karaḥna. I understand this particular local tutelary deity as a goddess on the evidence of the Egyptian language version of the Ḫattušili III-Ramesses II treaty, in which “the goddess of the town of Karahna”\textsuperscript{221} witnesses the treaty oaths. Goetze\textsuperscript{222} identifies this goddess as the Tutelary Deity of Karaḥna; the Egyptian scribe may have been mistaken in recording this unfamiliar deity in the feminine in the Egyptian text,\textsuperscript{223} but in the absence of evidence to the contrary it is likely that PLAMMA URUKaraḥna is a goddess. She is known to us better than most because of the existence of a text for a festival performed at Karaḥna and of a cult inventory text for this goddess. Her origins in the Hattic milieu are suggested by Beckman\textsuperscript{224} on the basis of the Birth Ritual KUB 30.29 obv. 9–15, in which PLAMMA-<a2> URUKaraḥna occurs as one of the gods in a mythological conjuration. She is the only tutelary deity of a locality besides PLAMMA URUKATTI to appear regularly in the lists of oath-deities in the New Hittite treaties.\textsuperscript{225} She was an important oath deity down to the very end of the Hittite state, as evidenced by her occurrence in a protocol of

\textsuperscript{217}IBoT 2.61 v 3–6.
\textsuperscript{218}KUB 20.2 obv. iii 1–9.
\textsuperscript{219}KUB 53.11 i 6', ii 7', iii 24, ed. Appendix A.
\textsuperscript{220}KUB 51.26 rt. col. 15' (cult inventory).
\textsuperscript{221}Translation Wilson, ANET 201 with n. 17.
\textsuperscript{222}Apud Wilson, ANET 201 n. 17.
\textsuperscript{223}Kammenhuber, ZA 66 (1976) 84–85, notes this evidence on the sex of PLAMMA in the treaty and the possibility of error.
\textsuperscript{224}StBoT 29 (1983) 29 with n. 38.
\textsuperscript{225}For example, \textit{A} = KUB 19.49+KUB 26.36+ iv 3, \textit{B} = KUB 19.50 iv 8 (Man.); KBo 5.3+KBo 19.43++ i 49 (Ḫuqq.).
Suppiluliuma II. She occurs in Muwatalli’s Prayer to the Stormgod *piḥaššaššī* between the Stormgod of Karahna, with whom she is associated by cult center, and Ala, with whom she shares the characteristic of being a tutelary deity. The importance of the city Karahna is evidenced by its inclusion as one of the cities whose gods are specifically addressed in this prayer. Also in the Empire period she appears in the Festival of Istar of Šamuḫa among an extended list of tutelary deities, showing that she also was active in the late period and held a sufficiently important position in the pantheon to be in a Hurrian festival.

Two texts which establish this deity’s importance in the Hittite cult are the cult inventory of the Tutelary Deity of Karahna and the Festivals of Karahna. The cult inventory details equipment and personnel for other deities in addition to *DLAMMA URU* Karahna, but the beginning of the text indicates that the inventory was done at Karahna and for its chief deity, probably its tutelary deity. From the text we learn that at least twenty-six people served this one goddess in addition to one priest (*LO*SANGA) assigned to her. In terms of cult buildings the text refers to temples of the Tutelary Deity and the Stormgod of the city: 2 Ė.DINGIR-*LIM* *DLAMMA URU* Karahna *DU* URU Karahna[a] “Two temples, of the Tutelary Deity of Karahna (and) the Stormgod of Karaḫna[a].”

For the text describing the Festivals of Karahna see the discussion in Chapter 2 below. The text itself describes offerings to many gods, with the Tutelary Deity of Karahna just one among them, but the colophon indicates the location for the festival as Karahna.

This particular tutelary deity seems quite important because of the festivals for her cult center and because she had her own cult inventory. The existence of a copy of her festival in the capital may indicate that it held a particularly important place in the cult calendar and was noted at the capital. Any deity who was the principal god of a local cult center normally had a festival dedicated to him or her. The cult inventory text is also something we would expect for most provincial cult centers. However, *DLAMMA URU* Karahna is the only localized tutelary deity besides *DLAMMA URU HAṬTI* who regularly appears in the oath-deity lists. This may be the best evidence of all for the special status of this particular tutelary deity in the state pantheon.

---

226. *ABoT* 56 ii 11.
231. *KUB* 38.12 i 1: *ŠU*.*NIGIN* 26 *LO*.*MES* *bilammateš*.
232. *KUB* 38.12 ii 1.
233. *KUB* 38.12 ii 5. Rost, *MIO* 8 (1963) 201, interpreted this as a double temple, for which there is the precedent of Temple 1 at Boğazköy, but 2 Ė DINGIR-*LIM* should mean “two temples.”
This is one of the best known of the local tutelary deities because the thirty-second day of the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival involves a journey to the grove of Tauriša and a festival for this god.\textsuperscript{235} The description of cultic activities for this day of the festival not only features the Tutelary Deity of Tauriša but includes offerings for other gods as well. From his inclusion in the AN.TAH.ŠUM cult journey in the environs of Ḫattuša Popko makes the likely suggestion that this god may have come from the Hattic tradition.

This inclusion of the local festival for the Tutelary Deity of Tauriša in a major state festival is clear evidence of the great importance ascribed to this god and his cult by the official state religion. However, we do not find many other references to this god in texts other than this one festival. He does occur in a few festival fragments, mostly in broken context.\textsuperscript{236} He occurs once among a number of other gods in a liver oracle.\textsuperscript{237} Again the context tells us little about this deity, except that in this particular case he was included in a text that is late and includes other better known local gods such as the Stormgod of Aleppo. The god also occurs in a fragment of a Kizzuwatnean ritual\textsuperscript{238} in a list of mostly Hurrian deities and in the Hittite version of a Luwian mythological text.\textsuperscript{229} There are possible examples of a priest of this deity in KUB 12.52 i 3 and 4, and ii 2. See that text in Appendix A for comments. The attestations of the Tutelary Deity of Tauriša indicate that he was part of the earliest Hittite cultic tradition with a local cult considered sufficiently important to be included in the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, and that he was active in the late period as seen in his inclusion in texts of the Hurrian and Luwian traditions.

Summary: Tutelary Deities of the Type DLAMMA plus Geographical Name

There are other tutelary deities of cities, none of which are well attested in the sources. The Tutelary Deities of Tatašuna and Tašhapuna are among the gods who receive offerings in the kurša- Festival and are discussed under kipikkišdu in Appendix B. In the portion of the Festival Celebrated by a Prince\textsuperscript{240} which takes place in the city of Kaštama, the priest of the Tutelary Deity lifts the kurša- of the tutelary deity of that city. Tutelary deities of Ankuwa, Ḫurma, Kalašmitta, Maḥhu[...], Pitamma, Wašha[ni(?)], and Wiyanawanta\textsuperscript{241} are attested, but the evidence is insufficient for us to say much about them.


\textsuperscript{235} CTH 617: see especially the colophon KUB 2.8 vi 4–6, mān-za LUGAL-uš INA "[^]Tauriša ANA DLAMMA URU[Tauriša] [EZE]N AN.TAH.ŠUM iyazi "When the king performs the AN.TAH.ŠUM festival in the grove of Tauriša for the Tutelary Deity of Tauriša.”

\textsuperscript{236} KUB 9.17 obv. 13'; KUB 12.52 i 3', 4', both ed. Appendix A; IBoT 2.67:6'.

\textsuperscript{237} KUB 5.6+KUB 18.54 iv 12–15 (NH).

\textsuperscript{238} KBo 8.97 obv. 17.


\textsuperscript{240} CTH 647, KUB 20.80 iii 14–15, noted by Popko, Kultobjekte 112 with no. 74.

\textsuperscript{241} The cult inventory KUB 38.1 i 1–9 describes for Wiyanawanta one or two DLAMMA LİL, “Tutelary Deity of the Countryside” images, and in l.e. 1–2 inventories a festival for unspecified DLAMMA. Del Monte, RGTC 6: 483, notes the existence of a Tutelary Deity of Wiyanawanta.
There are some tutelary deities of this type in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities who are unique to that text. A subset of this type of tutelary deity is attested in the one occurrence of $^6$LAMMA URU-LIM-ya “and the Tutelary Deity of the City.” This may refer to the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatti, although it may also have meant the tutelary deity of some particular city mentioned earlier in the text.

This type of god, the tutelary deity of a specific place, presents certain problems in our understanding of them. They are recognizable in the texts by title, but they probably also had names. We may know the names of some of them without realizing that they are to be correlated with those LAMMA titles. In the Hittite pantheon there is a plethora of localized deities like this, with the “Stormgod of GN” for example attested for many cities. Some cities had a well-known principal deity, for instance the Sungoddess of Arinna or Ištar of Šamūḫa. Given the nature of a tutelary deity, one may wonder if “LAMMA” was ever used to indicate the primary deity of a particular place. For instance could $^6$LAMMA $^\text{URU}$ Karahna simply be interpreted as the principal deity of Karahna, whoever that might have been, who would naturally take a protective attitude towards her city and could therefore perhaps be considered a tutelary deity of that city, or is she a specific goddess with protective functions?

In my opinion the evidence indicates that we should consider $^6$LAMMA GN a title denoting a specific god, “the Tutelary Deity of GN” and not “a tutelary deity of GN = principal deity of GN.” Evidence for this includes for example the possible double temple for the Stormgod and the Tutelary Deity of Karahna cited above. The Stormgod of Karahna may well have been that city’s chief deity, and he is kept separate from the Tutelary Deity of the city. The cult inventories also refer specifically to images of or festivals for the tutelary deity of a particular place in addition to other important local deities.

$^6$LAMMA PLUS EPITHET

Tutelary Deities of Objects

$^6$LAMMA $^\text{KUS}$kuršaš

“The Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag” is perhaps the most important of the tutelary deities with non-GN epithet. The kurša- Festival shows how closely related the hunting bag was to some tutelary deities, as four different tutelary deities each had a kurša- as their cult symbol. One of these four is the “Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag.”

242. See Archi, SMEA 16 (1975) 103–05, and Chapter 3 below.
243. $^\text{IBoT^3.18.4'}$ (fragment of a festival for the tutelary deities), edited in Appendix A.
244. See Popko, AOF 2 (1975) 67–68 with n. 17, and idem, Kultobjekte 112–13. The title is written once KUS kuršaš $^6$LAMMA-an in KUB 30.54 i 8’ (X $^\text{TUP-PU}$ catalogue, translit. Laroche, CTH p. 178) and once KUS kuršaš $^6$LAMMA-ri, in KUB 41.40 rev. 15’ (Ritual for the Stormgod of Kuliwišna). See Güterbock, FsKantor 113–19, and Appendix B sub kurša- for the translation “hunting bag.”
This deity occurs many times in a variety of text genres. Like many of the other tutelary deities, he occurs as an oath deity in several treaties.\textsuperscript{245} In the prayer of Muwatalli to the Stormgod \textit{piḫaššašši} he is addressed not with the main group of tutelary deities but with Zīṭhariya and the sacred mountains and rivers of Zīṭhara.\textsuperscript{246} This close connection between Zīṭhariya and the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag is apparent also in the \textit{kurša-} Festival, in which Zīṭhariya's old \textit{kurša-} becomes the \textit{ḎLAMMA KUS kuršaš}.\textsuperscript{247}

The Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag was involved in the state cult, although not in the large number of different festivals in which more major deities are seen. He receives drink offerings in at least two fragments of the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival\textsuperscript{248} and receives a male goat, a major item, as a sacrifice in another fragment of the same festival.\textsuperscript{249} In this example his title is written \textit{ANA ḎLAMMA KUS kuršaš EN-ı} “to the Tutelary Deity, the lord of the hunting bag,” or “to the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag, the lord.” He also appears in the \textit{kurša-} Festival as the new name for the former \textit{kurša-} of Zīṭhariya, but he is not mentioned explicitly in the preserved portions of the text which describe the cultic offerings of the festival. He receives bread offerings in \textit{KBo} 25.88:10’ (Festival of Moon and Thunder): \textit{nu ĹJAZU 1 NINDA.SIG kuršaš ḎLAMMA-ri parš [iya]} “The seer breaks one thin bread for the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag.” He is included in the very broken list of tutelary and other deities receiving offerings in \textit{KUB} 52.100 (line 6’) that may be a fragment of the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities.\textsuperscript{250} That this god was worshipped throughout the entire Hittite historical period may be inferred from his occurrence in both a festival fragment containing extensive sections in Hattic\textsuperscript{251} and in the Festival for Ištar of Samuha, a late text for a Hurrian-based cult.\textsuperscript{252} In the former example the \textit{ĽSANGA ḎLAMMA KUS gurš[aš]} is mentioned, the only attestation of a priest for this god.

In addition to these attestations in festival texts, this deity appears in several tablet catalogues that refer to as yet undiscovered/ unidentified festival or ritual texts in which he played a prominent role. In \textit{KUB} 30.60+\textit{KBo} 14.70 i 21’–22’\textsuperscript{253} we read: \textit{DUB 2 KAM QATI ŠA ḎLAMMA KUS kuršaš MAHRU TUPPU NU [.GÁL] [m]án-za LUGAL-uš ḎLAMMA KUS kuršan apāšla DƯ-zi} “Second tablet, finished, of the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag. The first tablet [is] not [there]. (Titled:) ‘When the king himself worships the Tutelary Deity, the Hunting Bag.’” This festival, performed by the king for this deity, is otherwise

\textsuperscript{245} For example \textit{KUB} 19.49+\textit{KBo} 26.36+ iv 4 (Man.); \textit{KBo} 5.3+\textit{KBo} 19.43++ i 49 (Ḫuqq.).
\textsuperscript{246} \textit{KUB} 6.45 i 59–60.
\textsuperscript{247} \textit{CTH} 683.1, \textit{KUB} 55.43 §5, edited in \textit{Chapter 4}.
\textsuperscript{248} \textit{KBo} 19.128 v 50’, ed. Otten, \textit{StBoT} 13 (1971) 14–15; \textit{KUB} 54.78 rev. 4’–5’.
\textsuperscript{249} \textit{KBo} 4.13+ i 11’.
\textsuperscript{250} See \textit{Chapter 3} for this text.
\textsuperscript{251} \textit{KUB} 28.103 vi 6’.
\textsuperscript{252} \textit{KUB} 27.1 i 66, ed. Lebrun, \textit{Samuha} 77 and 88.
\textsuperscript{253} \textit{DUB X KAM catalogue, translit. Laroche, CTH} p. 154.
unknown to us. In KUB 30.54 i 6’–14’254 three consecutive paragraphs describe festivals for this god, the last of which involves carrying kurša-š up to some place which is broken away in the tablet. In KUB 30.65+34/i++, ii 7–8255 we have a description of a ritual of invocation for the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag.

Besides this catalogue entry describing a ritual for this deity, we have ritual texts in which he occurs. Although he occurs in other rituals,256 the importance of this deity is most clearly evidenced by the Ritual of Anniwiyani257 and the Ritual for the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag,258 in each of which he is featured as one of the primary gods addressed in the ritual procedure.

**D*LAMMA KARAŚ

The Tutelary Deity of the Army plays a much smaller role in the festivals and in Hittite culture in general than one might expect. The **D*LAMMA KARAŚ or tuziyaš260 **D*LAMMA-ri occurs once in a fragment of an offerings list,259 once in the fourth plague prayer of Muršili II,260 and once in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities.261 In each of those cases he occurs only in a long list of gods and is not singled out for special treatment. There are no indications of special prayers or offerings for him at all. This is probably because among the Hittites the idea that the gods in general ran before them in battle was an integral part of their theology,262 and they therefore did not develop very fully the concept of a specific tutelary deity for the army.

**D*LAMMA MÁ.URU.URUś

All three pieces of hunting equipment in the cult scene on the Schimmel rhyton,263 the hunting bag, the quiver, and the spear, have tutelary deities attested in the textual material. Of these the Tutelary Deity of the Quiver is the most scantily attested, occurring in only three festival texts.264 From these we may determine that this deity at times received offerings, for example a male goat in the Karahna Festival, but did not play a role in the

258. *CTH* 433, part of which is edited by Rosenkranz, *Or* 33 (1964) 238–56.
259. *KBo* 17.82 obv? 14.
261. *CTH* 682, see Chapter 3. The tuziyaš260 **D*LAMMA-ri occurs in KUB 2.1 ii 73 and its duplicates.
262. See especially the annals of Muršili passim.
263. Discussed in *Appendix B* sub kurša-.
264. Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+ i 29 (Festivals of Karahna, see Chapter 2); KUB 34.93 obv? 12’ (fragment naming the SAL.MEŠ zintuhaš), written **D*LAMMA KUšI.É.MA.URUš; and 320/tc2’ (fest. frag.). Although the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities as preserved does not include a **D*LAMMA of the quiver, it does specify an Ala of the quiver in KUB 2.1 iv 4 with duplicate KUB 44.16 vi 7’.
major state festivals. The Tutelary Deity of the Quiver did not become important in the cult, while the hunting bag and the spear both functioned as cult symbols in the festivals, and therefore the tutelary deities of these objects had a significantly greater role in the cult.

**DLMMA GISGUKUR**

This god appears in a well-preserved cult inventory text in which his image is described as being a wooden figurine of a seated man, with a height of one hand, three fingers, and a fingernail. The text specifies that there is no daily offering bread or monthly festival for this deity but does list the required materials for his offerings at the fall and spring festivals, to be provided by the "men of the spear." He also occurs in a cult inventory of idols in the towns in a long list of gods for a particular town, whose name is broken away. Another example of his presence in local festivals is his occurrence immediately after the Tutelary Deity of Karaňna in the list of deities receiving animal sacrifices in the Festivals of Karaňna. This god also receives offerings in a few other festivals but does not occur regularly in the state cult. He does however show up in festivals for tutelary deities. He is included as one of the gods in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities. He also receives offerings along with a number of other tutelary deities in the kurša- Festival. In KUB 40.110 rev. 2' his offerings are accompanied by the barking of the "dog-men."

There is some possible confusion between this deity's name, written DLMMA GISGUKUR, and the phrase GISGUKUR DLMMA which occurs in certain major state festivals. In each case bread offerings are given to the GISGUKUR DLMMA, always by a palace attendant (DUMU É.GAL or GAL DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL), and always for this object alone. Is this to be understood as "the spear of the Tutelary Deity," or is it to be understood as Hittite syntax and translated "the Tutelary Deity of the Spear?" Singer comments on the importance of spears as cult symbols in the procession involved in the KILAM Festival, and it seems to me that this phrase must be understood as the description of a cult object of the Tutelary Deity that receives its own offerings in certain festivals. I would distinguish the (cultic) spear of the Tutelary Deity (GISGUKUR DLMMA) from the Tutelary Deity of the Spear (DLMMA GISGUKUR) obviously associated with the hunt. The spear is one of the three pieces of hunting paraphernalia from the Schimmel rhyton cult scene, all of which have tutelary deities attested in the texts.

265. KUB 38.19+IBoT2.102 obv. 9'-14', ed. Rost, MIO 8 (1963) 203-04.
266. KUB 38.10 iv 16, translit. Rost, MIO 8 (1963) 196.
267. KUB 25.32+ i 28; see Chapter 3.
268. KUB 40.110 rev. 2' with duplicate 158/o (fest. frag.), ed. Otten and Rüster, ZA 68 (1978) 277; 743/4 rev. 5', KUB 10.21 ii 5 (fest. frag.).
269. KUB 2.1 ii 14. See Chapter 3.
270. KUB 55.43 ii 31, [l.e. 1]; KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97 iv 20. See Chapter 4.
271. KBo 27.42 ii 21-25 (KILAM Festival), translit. Singer, SiBoT 28 (1984) 57; KBo 4.9 v 11-14, KUB 25.1 i 7-10 (AN.TAH.5UM Festival, 16th day).
Miscellaneous Tutelary Deities of Objects

A number of tutelary deities are attested in only one or two examples each. There is a Tutelary Deity of the Pot Stand (zeriyalli-) attested once in a cult inventory text,\(^{273}\) in which the offerings for him and the Stormgod of Zipalanda for the Autumn Festival are specified. There is also one example of a \(^{274}\)DLAMMA INBU, “Tutelary Deity of Fruit,” who occurs in a duplicate of a text of the Nerik cult, alternating with \(^{274}\)DLAMMA and receiving drink and bread offerings.

There are some less well understood tutelary deities of the type LAMMA plus noun. There is one example of a \(^{275}\)DLAMMA GISNÍG.KA\(^9\). The word NÍG.KA\(^9\) with a GIS\(^{}\) determinative is otherwise unknown at Boğazköy or anywhere else. The Akkadian for NÍG.KA\(^9\) is nikkassu, translated in the \(^{276}\)CAD “account, accounting,” or “property, assets, wealth.” As inventories and accounts were kept on wooden tablets at Ḫattuša, perhaps GISNÍG.KA\(^9\) refers to such an inventory, and \(^{275}\)DLAMMA GISNÍG.KA\(^9\) should be translated “the Tutelary Deity of the Inventory.”\(^{277}\)

A \(^{278}\)DLAMMA aniyattas is also attested, but only in the Aššella ritual. This deity appears in only one section of the ritual, in which two male goats are sacrificed to him and he receives three drink offerings. This is the only tutelary deity sacrificed to in this ritual. The title of the god is perhaps best translated “the Tutelary Deity of the Ritual Equipment,” which is approximately the same as Dinçöl’s “Kurban Malzemesinin Koruyucu Tanrı.”\(^{279}\)

Tutelary Deities of Locations

\(^{279}\)DLAMMA É.ŠÁ

The “Tutelary Deity of the Inner Chamber” occurs in the Luwian-based tablet of Lallupiya.\(^{280}\) He occurs between ŠA É[...DN] and ţilannaš\(^{281}\)p[...], two other architectural terms. The deity is otherwise unattested, but compare É.ŠÁ-aš\(^{281}\)DX[...].

---

\(^{273}\) KUB 42.87 v 16'.
\(^{274}\) IBoT 3.127:4', main text KUB 58.11 rev. 4', ed. (as Bo 2710) Haas, KN 216–17.
\(^{275}\) KBo 30.125 iii 9, festival fragment with Luwian and Hurrian divine names. This name is not read by Oten and Rüster in the KBo 30 indices to divine names. The final sign is the SANGA sign, read KA\(^9\) in Borger, AOAT 33A #597.
\(^{276}\) N vol. 2: 223.
\(^{277}\) Hoffner, personal communication.
\(^{278}\) See Dinçöl, Belleten XLIX/193 (1985) 1–40, for an edition of this text.
\(^{279}\) Belleten XLIX/193: 25.
\(^{280}\) CTH ‘771: KUB 25.37+KUB 51.9 iv 9'.
\(^{281}\) KUB 12.42 i 4.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

DLAMMA ḪUR.SAG.MES

These deities, attested in a Middle Hittite Kizzuwatnan evocatio,282 are somewhat analogous to the Tutelary Deity of the River. Mountains, like rivers are often divine; in KUB 15.34 iii 48–55, all the mountains, the Tutelary Deities of the Mountains, and the male gods of the mountains are invited to eat and drink of the offerings. The Tutelary Deity or Deities of the Mountains are distinct from the mountains themselves in the Hittite mind. In the Spring Festival at Mt. Tapala283 both Mt. Tapala and the Tutelary Deity of Mt. Tapala receive offerings. The tutelary deity of a divine being may be worshipped alongside the divine being itself.

DLAMMA İĐ

The Tutelary Deity of the River284 occurs once in a cult inventory description of a festival,285 with a sheep specified as the sacrifice for him. Beyond that, he occurs in the thirty-second day of the AN.TAH.ŞUM Festival (for the Tutelary Deity of Tauriša) and in texts which have been classified as festivals for the Tutelary Deity of the River.286 We should point out a difference here between tutelary deities of places like the inner chamber and a Tutelary Deity of the River. Rivers are often mentioned in cultic texts as divinities; a specific river such as the Maraššanta was treated as a god, or rivers in general could be invoked as divine. Thus with the Tutelary Deity of the River we may have the concept of the tutelary deity of another deity, discussed in more detail below.

DLAMMA LÍL

The Tutelary Deity of the Countryside is related to the hunt and derives much of his importance from his association with it. His name is written DLAMMA.LÍL, DLAMMA ŞERI, and gimraš DLAMMA. This god is especially important in establishing the link between the text attestations and extant cult representations. In KUB 38.1 ii 1ʿ–6287 his cult image is described as that of a male deity standing on a stag, with a bow in his right hand, an eagle and hare in his left, and a sword. This fits so closely with several extant relief

284. Written DLAMMA İĐ, e.g., KUB 2.8 ii 8 (AN.TAH.ŞUM Festival, 32nd day) and İD-aš DLAMMA, e.g., KUB 9.21:3ʿ (Festival for Tutelary Deities of the River). Laroche, Rech. 101, gives a spelling DLAMMA İĐ-aš with six references. None of his cited references, however, have such a spelling. KUB 20.2 iv 25, which reads...ANA İD DLAMMA..., is to be understood as “...the Tutelary Deity of the river....” KUB 2.8 v 28 does not have the Tutelary Deity of the River at all, and the other four examples read DLAMMA İĐ.
286. See Chapter 5 for discussion of these festivals and this deity.
images of the “god on the stag” that they have been identified as the Tutelary Deity of the Countryside. Nimet Özgüç connects the “Hunting God” of the Kültepe seals with DLAMMA LÍL, described by her as “the god who protects hunters in the fields.” The god on the stag on the Schimmel rhyton could be this god. The problematic broken entry in the inventory (KUB 38.1 ii 7–9'), which lacks the name of the god whose image is described, opens the possibility that the Tutelary Deity of the Countryside could take more than one form. Güterbock in a review of von Brandenstein’s Bilbeschr. in 1946 stated definitely that this entry described another DLAMMA LÍL, the second of whom stood on an awiti- (a winged lion-sphinx?). Almost forty years later he noted the difficulties of the passage, indicating that it could be a second representation of DLAMMA LÍL or another god worshipped together with DLAMMA LÍL.

The great variety of local festivals in which he receives offerings demonstrate how widespread was this god’s cult. In the Spring Festival at Mt. Tapala he receives drink offerings from the king and queen, whose presence signifies the importance of this ceremony on the level of the state cult. He receives both drink and bread offerings in the Ritual for the Stormgod of Kuliusna. In this ritual he receives offerings together with Istar of the countryside, and the offerings are accompanied by chanting in Hurrian. As befits a god of the open countryside he seems to have been worshipped primarily out in the provinces and not much in the capital. He occurs as one of a group of gods listed as having cult stelae (huwaši-) in the provinces. His significance in the later period is indicated by his inclusion in the late Festival of Istar of Šamuḫa. His importance in a Hurrian-influenced cult such as this is evidenced also by the Hurrian chanting with his offerings mentioned above.

That this god played a role in the “Hittite” cult as well as that of the Hurrian milieu may be seen from the ceremonies in which his offerings were accompanied by the chanting of the singers of Kaneš. This is evident in the description of offerings for this god at Mt. Tapala and in a ceremony of the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival which takes place in the capital. In a fragment of ritual the Tutelary Deity of the Countryside is paired with Ala, the goddess discussed above, who is normally (at least in the later period) seen with the

288. For example Yeniköy, Haci Bebekli, Karasu; see Introduction.
290. Güterbock, FsBittel (1983) 207, expressed reservations about this identification, but in FsKantor (1989) 114 he states that this must be the “tutelary deity of the open country.” The god is labeled in hieroglyphs with the antler logogram and an unidentified sign.
293. KUB 20.48 vi 7–9.
294. KBo 15.36+ iii 7–8’, KUB 41.0 rev. 8’–9’.
295. KUB 38.10 iv 3, translit. Rost, MIO 8 (1963) 196.
296. KUB 20.48+ vi 7–9.
298. KBo 29.211 i? 7’, vi? 7’.
Tutelary Deity. Unique among the tutelary deities is DLAMMA LÍL’s role in communicating directly with the king by appearing to him in a dream requesting offerings.299

DLAMMA GIS TIR

“The Tutelary Deity of the Grove” occurs in the list of gods detailed in the festival fragment KUB 52.100:2.300 Sacred groves were often a focus of activity in local cults and might therefore like rivers and mountains be expected to have tutelary deities. A priest of the Tutelary Deity of the Grove (ŁO SANGA DLAMMA GIS TIR) is in fact attested for a particular local cult, that of Karaḫna, in the cult inventory of the Tutelary Deity of Karaḫna.301 There could be a local Stormgod of the Grove as well, as in the thirty-second day of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival.302 There the DU GIS TIR is one of the deities who receives drink and bread offerings. That DLAMMA GIS TIR is the title of a specific deity may be seen in the list of cultic personnel in the above-mentioned cult inventory text, where a priest (ŁO SANGA) of the Tutelary Deity of the Grove occurs. In this local cult the sacred grove was an important locus for cultic ceremonies, important enough to have a priest dedicated to its tutelary deity.

Miscellaneous Tutelary Deities of Locations

There are a few other tutelary deities of locations. However, judging by the very few attestations of each, most of these are probably not specific deities like the Tutelary Deity of the Countryside but are examples of DLAMMA used as a common noun to denote the protectors of individual places. They occur almost exclusively in cultic texts. Unexpectedly, there are no tutelary deities of this type in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities except for KUB 52.100, which names a number of tutelary deities, including some of the type DLAMMA of a location. In line 5′ we have the title DLAMMA ASRI, “Tutelary Deity of the Place.” In the same list (line 4′) is the title DLAMMA É.DINGIR-LIM, “the Tutelary Deity of the Temple.” Again this god is otherwise unattested. In KUB 2.1 iii 20 and KUB 56.51 i 1–6 the otherwise unknown Tutelary Deity of the huwapra- building receives a ceremony of offerings.303

299. KUB 48.122+ KUB 15.5 iv 7–8.
300. Chapter 3, text 5.
301. CTH 517: KUB 38.12 ii 2.
302. KUB 2.8 v 22.
303. See the footnote to the translation of KUB 2.1 iii 20 in Chapter 3.
Tutelary Deities of Beings

\textbf{DLAMMA LUGAL}

The king and queen are, with one exception,\textsuperscript{304} the only people who have specific personal tutelary deities in the textual evidence as preserved. A Zitḫariya of the king and of the queen is discussed above. \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{DLAMMA LUGAL}}, the Tutelary Deity of the King, occurs several times in the cult inventories; his occurrence in a description of cult images\textsuperscript{305} is the only evidence (in broken context) we have for a cult representation of this god. He occurs once in a list of gods in a prayer\textsuperscript{306} and once in a ritual.\textsuperscript{307}

It is in the cult that this god appears most, taking an active role in at least two major state festivals. He is included in a list of tutelary deities in one festival fragment.\textsuperscript{308} He is seen most often in the AN.TAḪ.SUM Festival, although so far only in fragments that have not been fitted into the festival calendar.\textsuperscript{309} He receives drink and/or bread offerings also in the Festival of Procreation,\textsuperscript{310} in the Nerik cult,\textsuperscript{311} and in the Festival for Ištar of Šamuḫa.\textsuperscript{312} Although the Hittites were careful to supply him with offerings in certain festivals and thereby ensure his good will, he was not one of the major tutelary gods. Rather he was simply one of the rank and file of the Hittite pantheon, while individual Hittite kings sometimes took as their “patron deity” some particular deity, such as Muršili and the Sungoddess of Arinna, or Ḥattušili III and Ištar of Šamuḫa.

Tudḫaliya IV provides a unique exploration of possible variations on the theme of a tutelary deity of the king in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities.\textsuperscript{313} Here not only is there a tutelary deity of the king, but offerings are provided for the tutelary deity of the king’s shoulder, body, weapon, heroism, etc., with a number of analogous Ala deities as well. This text represents the logical conclusion of the idea that the king’s well-being is synonymous with that of the state and therefore should be protected as thoroughly as possible.

\textbf{DLAMMA UR.MAQ}

The Tutelary Deity of the Lion is the only tutelary deity of an animal attested in the pantheon. He occurs twice in the corpus. In a description of a festival in an oracle about

\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{304}} See discussion of personal Zitḫariya above.
\textsuperscript{305} KUB 38.19+ IBoT 2.102 obv. 1.
\textsuperscript{306} KUB 6.45 ii 56 (Prayer of Muwatalli to the Stormgod piḫaššašši).
\textsuperscript{307} KUB 41.10 rev. 17'-18' (Ritual for the Stormgod of Kuliwišna).
\textsuperscript{308} KUB 52.100, edited as CTH 682.5 in Chapter 3.
\textsuperscript{309} That is, among the texts which Laroche catalogues as CTH 625, specifically KBo 4.13+ ii 14', iii 32, iv 18 and 42; KBo 19.128 ii 3 and 31, ed. Otten, StBoT 13 (1971) 4–7.
\textsuperscript{310} CTH 633: EZEN ṭaššumaš, IBoT 1.29 obv. 16 and 27.
\textsuperscript{311} CTH 678: KUB 59.32 rev? iii 3, ed. (as Bo 3112) Haas, KN 313 and Otten, StBoT 13 (1971) 31.
\textsuperscript{312} CTH 712: KUB 27.1 i 66, ed. Lebrun, Samuḫa 77 and 88.
\textsuperscript{313} Main text KUB 2.1, edited in Chapter 3.
festivals\textsuperscript{314} the context is broken but indicates the performing of a festival in the É UR.MAḪ, an otherwise unattested cult building. This follows two paragraphs of description of a Festival at Mt. Piškurunuwa, so this ceremony with the Tutelary Deity of the Lion may also have been a very localized ceremony performed only there. The only other example of this deity occurs in an unassigned festival fragment\textsuperscript{315} in broken context. One cannot determine whether this is a fragment of a state or local cult, but two references to the rarely attested Stormgod of Ḫulašša probably indicate a local festival for this god, again suggesting that the Tutelary Deity of the Lion is a local manifestation only.

**Tutelary Deities of Divine Beings**

The few examples of tutelary deities of the type $\text{D}L\text{AMMA}$ of (divine name) indicate that a god or goddess could itself have a tutelary deity. The earliest example of this type of deity occurs in the Old Hittite Prayer to the Sun goddess of the Earth,\textsuperscript{316} in the title $\text{taknaš} \text{DUTU}-aš\text{D}L\text{AMMA}-ŠU" the Tutelary Deity of the Sun goddess of the Earth." The Stormgod of Zipalanda may have had a tutelary deity: $\text{män} \text{šE}_{13}^{\text{anti}} \text{ITU} 12 \text{KAM} \text{DKUS} \text{kurša}[\text{š}] \text{SA} \text{DU} \text{URU} \text{Zipalanda ANA KASKAL.IMGAL.ULU paizzi} "\text{If in the \text{[w]i}nter, in the twelfth month, the hunting bag of the Stormgod of Zipalanda goes on the south road}" \text{KUB} 10.75+\text{KUB} 20.25:2–5 (Journey of the kurša- in Winter), ed. Güterbock, \textit{JNES} 20 (1961) 92. As Güterbock points out, another interpretation is possible; this could also mean "... the hunting bag goes on the south road of the Stormgod of Zipalanda." A Tutelary Deity of Istar of Šamuḫa appears in a New Hittite Autumn Festival\textsuperscript{317} in which the tutelary deity receives drink and bread offerings to the accompaniment of singing in Hurrian. This deity plays no role in other festivals and is obviously a development of this local cult which emphasizes the hometown Istar.

$\text{SA} \text{D}7.7.\text{BI} \text{D}L\text{AMMA}$

There is apparently a Tutelary Deity of the Pleiades ($\text{D}7.7.\text{BI}$). In the Spring Festival at Mt. Tapala\textsuperscript{318} there is a paragraph in which $\text{D}7.7.\text{BI}, [\text{M}aliya(?), and the Tutelary Deity of $\text{D}7.7.\text{BI}$ ([S]A $\text{D}7.7.\text{BI} \text{D}L\text{AMMA}$) receive some unspecified offering three times. The paragraph is parallel to the one preceding it (discussed above sub $\text{D}L\text{AMMA} \text{HUR.SAG.MEŠ}$) in which Mt. Tapala and the Tutelary Deity of Mt. Tapala receive offerings together. To be distinguished from the Tutelary Deity of $\text{D}7.7.\text{BI}$ are the examples of a "heptad of the Tutelary Deity," for example $\text{KBo} 4.13+\text{i}14' (\text{AN.TAH.ŠUM frag.}): \text{D}L\text{AMMA}-aš $\text{D}7.7.\text{BI}$. Such a construction is not unusual, as heptads of other deities are known, for example $\text{DUTU}-aš \text{D}7.7.\text{BI};^{319} \text{SA} \text{DU} \text{D}7.7.\text{BI};^{320}$ and $\text{D}7.7.\text{BI} \text{SA} \text{D}I\text{STAR}.^{321}$

\textsuperscript{314} \textit{CTH} 568: \textit{KUB} 22.27 iv 37, duplicates \textit{KBo} 24.118+ \textit{vi} 27', 706/h:9'.

\textsuperscript{315} \textit{KBo} 25.191 rev? 10'.

\textsuperscript{316} \textit{CTH} 371: \textit{KBo} 7.28 i 17.

\textsuperscript{317} \textit{CTH} 711: \textit{KBo} 11.28 v 11'–13'. Written $\text{D}[\text{LA}]\text{MMA} \text{SA}\text{D}I\text{STAR}$.

\textsuperscript{318} \textit{CTH} 593: 755/h ii 7'–11'.

\textsuperscript{319} \textit{KBo} 4.13+ i 13' (\text{AN.TAH.ŠUM frag.}).

\textsuperscript{320} \textit{KUB} 28.4 iii 17 (\text{Moon That Fell From Heaven}).

\textsuperscript{321} 103/r:3', 10' (Istar cultic text), ed. Lebrun, \textit{Šumuḫa} 189–90.
A tutelary deity of Ἡῳασάνα occurs in the Great Substitution Ritual, in a long list of deities: [P]É.A ³DAM.Ki.NA ³LAMMA ³IŠTAR ³GAZ.BA.A ³LAMMA ³GAZ.BA.A ³LAMMA ³kuršaš ³Ziṭṭa‐rī[aš]. The duplicate, IBoT 3.36:1', has, instead of ³LAMMA ³GAZ.BA.A, the syllabic writing [³LAMMA ³Hwuash][aš]. The Tutelary Deity of Ἡῳασάνα also occurs in the cult of the goddess Ἡῳασάνα. The important role of ³LAMMA ³sar­laimmi‐ in Ἡῳασάνα's cult is discussed below; the only other tutelary deity among the gods worshipped at her city Ἡupertino is this Tutelary Deity of Ἡῳασάνα. The two best examples of this are two passages from fragments of the witaššiyaš Festival. This title may be restored elsewhere in these festival texts. As in the case of the Autumn Festival for Istar of Samuha we observe that at the level of a local cult, the primary god or goddess of that cult could have a tutelary deity who also received offerings.

Tutelary Deities with Adjectival Epithet

³LAMMA innarawanza

This deity is contrasted with ³LAMMA lulim(m)i‐ in the Anniwiyani Ritual. Sturtevant translates ³LAMMA innarawanza as “manly(?))” in opposition to his proposed “effeminate(?))” for ³LAMMA lulim(m)i‐. Puhvel translates in(n)arawant‐ “strong, forceful, rigorous” and translates this title as “potent L(AMMA).” This deity, so important in the Anniwiyani Ritual as a symbol for masculinity, occurs only in this ritual and plays no role in the state cult.

³LAMMA lulim(m)i‐

This title, like that discussed above, is apparently a local one used only in one or two texts. The epithet cannot yet be definitively translated. This god’s occurrences are restricted almost exclusively to the Anniwiyani Ritual. Sturtevant translates “³KAL, the effeminate(?))” on the basis of context. This god does occur in some tablet catalogues, including entries for the Anniwiyani Ritual, and for the Ritual of Ἡ위원[α]. KUB 30.65++ ii 4 reads [1 ὈΠΠΟΣ MAN‐za ³LAMM]A lulimin[IN D[U‐anzi" “One tablet, when they worship the lulimimi‐ Tutelary Deity,” indicating that there was a festival or perhaps a ritual of the same

322. CTH 421: KUB 17.14 obv. 12'‐13', ed. Kummel, StBoT 3 (1967) 60‐61. Cf. also ³GAZ.BA.AA ³LAMMA ³GAZ.BA.[A.A...], KBo 29.194:4' (rit. frag.).
323. CTH 692: KBo 29.82(+)KBo 14.95 iv 9' and KBo 29.99 i 13'.
324. Chrest. 109, 111.
325. HED 1‐2: 368 sub in(n)arawant‐.
326. CHD lulim(m)i‐, with previous literature.
327. Chrest. 107‐17.
328. KUB 30.65+34/i++ ii 4, 11, ed. Laroche, CTH pp. 169‐70, and possibly KUB 30.50++ v 19, ed. Laroche, CTH p. 167 (both X TUP‐PU catalogues.)
type as that of Anniwiyani for this god, the text of which has not yet been discovered or identified.

DALAMMA šarlaimi-

"The Exalted Tutelary Deity" is a god confined exclusively to the cult of Ḫuwaššana in the city Ḫupišna.²²⁹ He occurs in the witaššiyaš Festival, the šaḥḥan Festival, and many fragments of festivals for Ḫuwaššana. He receives offerings as part of a group of gods,²³⁰ paired with ZA.BA₄.BA₄,²³¹ and he also was sufficiently important in the cult to have a cult ceremony performed for him alone.²³²

The importance of this deity in the Ḫuwaššana cult at Ḫupišna can be seen not only in the fact that he sometimes received individual offerings but also in that he had a temple and cult personnel. É DALAMMA šarlaimi- is attested several times in texts describing this cult.²³³ In each case this temple occurs as part of the phrase LÚ.MEŠ É DALAMMA šarlaimiyaš “the personnel of the Exalted Tutelary Deity’s Temple.” In the witaššiyaš fragment (KUB 27.49 iii 10–12) these personnel occur in a group with other cult functionaries such as the male Ḫuwaššana priests (LÚ.MEŠ Ḫuwaššanalaš) and the singers who are to perform a drink offering. In the šaḥḥan Festival (KBo 14.89+KBo 20.112 i 2') they are part of a different group of cult personnel who are called the “lords of the gods” and are all called into an unspecified house/temple. In a fragment of the Ḫuwaššana cult (KBo 29.65 iv 13'–19') they are one part of a large group of personnel for whom offering tables are set up. It is interesting to note that except for a mention of the LÚ.MEŠ É DINGIR-LIM in KUB 27.49 iii 11, all the other cult personnel described in this text have specific titles such as ŠAL Ḫuwaššannalli; it is only the functionaries attached to the temple of the Exalted Tutelary Deity who have no native title, but are called “the men of the Exalted Tutelary Deity’s temple.” This might indicate that this deity was a later or outside addition, whose functionaries did not fit into the available local categories of cultic personnel and so have only a descriptive title and not a native term. This god is a good example of a tutelary deity who plays no role in the state cult but is one of the central deities of a provincial cult.

wašḥazza DALAMMA

This epithet may be a Luwian dative plural and is discussed in the note to the translation of Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+KUB 27.70+ i 27 in Chapter 2.

²²⁹. On šarlaimi- see Laroche, DLL 86. The DALAMMA ḫšarlaim[ᵊ] in KBo 16.100:13' (fragment of Ḫuwaššana cult) is presumably a scribal error.
²³⁰. For example KBo 29.99 i 12' and KBo 29.82(+)+KBo 14.95 iv 8' (fragments of witaššiyaš Festival).
²³¹. KUB 77.66 ii 22, with duplicate KBo 29.69:22' (witaššiyaš fragments).
²³². KBo 29.82 iii 8'–12' (witaššiyaš fragment); KBo 29.89+KBo 20.68 iv 31'–33' (šaḥḥan Festival).
²³³. KUB 27.49 iii 11 (witaššiyaš fragment); KBo 14.89+KBo 20.112 i 2 (šaḥḥan Festival); KBo 29.65 iv 19'; and KBo 24.27:9' (Ḫuwaššana cult fragments).
**TUTELARY DEITIES AND THEIR CULTS**

**DLAMMA GAL**

"The Great Tutelary Deity" occurs twice in the Ištanuwian thunder chant, receiving offerings in one passage and occurring in a Luwian passage whose meaning is obscure. His only other occurrence is in a cult inventory of Stormgods, in which he is simply one of many deities whose regular offerings are listed.

**OTHER TUTELARY DEITIES**

There are also a number of tutelary deities detailed only in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities, discussed in Chapter 3. These deities govern activities, attributes, belongings, and body parts of the king, as well as mountains and rivers of the Hittite kingdom. Most are attested only in this festival and indicate an attempt by the Hittites to extend the concept of the tutelary deity into new areas. See Archi’s categorization of these deities and the discussion in Chapter 3.

**DISCUSSION**

The manifestations of the tutelary deity among the Hittites are many and diverse. Some, such as the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag and Tutelary Deity of the Countryside, are associated with the hunt. Several cities of the Empire are attested with their own tutelary deity; many more probably had one which does not appear in the state archives. In addition to the tutelary gods inherited from the Hattian pantheon known to us by name the Hittites recognized many protective deities represented by the title DLAMMA. Laroche points out how varied is the Hittite use of this logogram, and Güterbock in 1943 recognized that several deities underlie the hieroglyphic and cuneiform word signs. In the early period the Tutelary Deity (DLAMMA) occupied a fairly prominent place in the pantheon as seen in his occasional inclusion in a triad with the Stormgod and Sun deity in older treaties. By the Empire period he was not so prominent among the oath deities who guaranteed the treaties, and his location in the procession of gods at the sanctuary of Yazılıkaya built at the end of the kingdom represents a kind of middle position within the pantheon.

The tutelary deities may be personal, but they also protect various aspects of nature or specific locations ranging from a single room or building to the entire state. Despite the potential of the tutelary deities for personal protective qualities, none of the kings who enjoys the special patronage or protection of one deity receives it from a tutelary deity. Muršili II was guided by the Sungoddess of Arinna, Muwatalli by the Stormgod, and

---

334. *KBo* 4.11:6, 56, transliterated in *DLL* 164.
335. *KBo* 2.16 obv. 4, 9.
339. The “Spezialgötter” of several kings are noted by Kammenhuber, *ZA* 66 (1976) 85.
The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities

Hattušili III by Ištar of Šamuha. Even Tudḫaliya IV, who perhaps sponsored the extensive Festival for All the Tutelary Deities treated in Chapter 3, chose Šarruma as his protector on the permanent monument which he erected at Yazılıkaya. As the many figurines and references to “our god” from the Old Assyrian period demonstrate, the tradition of a personal or household tutelary god is an ancient Anatolian response to the vagaries of human existence. However, for the Hittite king at the center of a powerful Empire, his personal deity was invariably a state god of a stature appropriate to his august majesty.

340. On a seal noted by van Loon, Anatolia in the Second Millennium B.C. (Leiden, 1985) 47 pl. XLVa Tudḫaliya is encircled by the protective arm of the Stormgod.
CHAPTER 2
THE FESTIVALS OF KARAJNA

THE TEXTS

CTH 681.1: Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+KUB 27.70+1628/u

Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+KUB 27.70+1628/u is a large four column tablet in a good state of preservation. The two large pieces, KUB 25.32 and KUB 27.70, are both in Istanbul and are physically joined together. The fragment 1628/u, containing the left edge of lines 47′-51′ of column iii, is in Ankara and has therefore not been glued into its place in the tablet. Bo 3298, containing column i 1-20, is also in Ankara. The surface of the tablet is in general well preserved.

There is a seal impression in the middle of the reverse, on which Dinçol and Darga comment briefly in their edition (p. 118). The seal is also published in copy in Bittel and Güterbock, Boğazköy 1 (1935) pl. 29.10, and as SBo II 92. In the literature on this seal it is usually cited as SBo II 92. The “hare” sign on the seal is discussed by Bittel and Güterbock in Boğazköy 1: 45 and by Güterbock in SBo II: 18. The seal itself has been discussed and interpreted by several different scholars. Laroche in 1956 compared it to the seal on RS 17.231 and to Boğazköy socle 2, reading the name on the KUB 25.32 seal as HARE+spur-mi = Tabrami. He connected this name with the Tabrammi of RS 17.337, who was a contemporary of Tudhaliya IV, and thus dated KUB 25.32 to that king’s reign. At that time he read only the name on the seal, not commenting on the other signs. Four years later, while not giving a transliteration of the whole seal, Laroche read the name on the RS 17.231 seal as “LIÈVRE+ra-mi = cun. mTap-ra-am-mi; même personnage à Boğazköy, SBo II 92 (= KUB XXV.32) ...” This reinforces his suggestion about the identification of the Ras Shamra Tabrammi with that of the KUB 25.32 seal.

1. Ugar. 3 (1956) 151-52.
2. HH 115 2a.
Meriggi, *HhGl* (1962) 201 no. 121, transliterates all the signs on the seal. He reads “(G 176)—121-*rmi-ku-wi*2.” G 176 = *HH* 441 is the sign at the top of the seal and 121 is the HARE sign in Meriggi’s list. He apparently confused the PALACE signs on either side of HARE (*HH* 254) with *ku* (*HH* 423). He also reads SCRIBE (*HH* 326) as *wi*2. Although Meriggi does not interpret this transliteration any further here, his understanding of the name as Taprammi is made clear in *HhGl* 213 no. 220b. He did not recognize the logograms PALACE and SCRIBE on the seal. Güterbock4 goes beyond the reading of the name to an interpretation of the logograms written to the left and right (PALACE) and under (SCRIBE) the name, which he understands as a compound, “Palast-Schreiber.” More recently Güterbock utilizes the evidence of the sign *HH* 254 ("PALACE") on the RS 17.231 seal to suggest that the logogram may stand for the title ša rēši, a palace official, and to read on the *KUB* 25.32 seal two titles for Tap(a)rami, ša rēši and scribe.

Based on this previous work on the seal, we may now read it in its entirety as “G 176 = *HH* 441 (an ornamentation?) / HARE+spur-*mī* = Tap(a)rami / ša rēši / scribe.” Laroche’s identification of this man Tap(a)rami with that of the RS 17.231 seal, although quite likely, is not certain. The seal on *KUB* 25.32 is different from and much simpler than that of RS 17.231. They may of course have belonged to the same person, who would have commissioned different seals as his title changed. This would explain the difference between his title(s), which in the *KUB* 25.32 seal include “scribe” and in RS 17.231 do not.

The script of this tablet is quite distinctive and facilitated the identifying of the three joins made so far for this text. The signs are small and somewhat sloppy. The scribe was not at all proficient; the tablet is full of erasures and extra wedges where he apparently wrote over mistakes without completely erasing them. There is very little consistency to the sign shapes, and the spacing of the signs is extremely uneven, with frequent large spaces between signs that all belong to the same word.

The tablet shows consistent late NS forms for the signs. The *ik*, *da*, and URU signs show their latest forms. The absence of any examples of older *li* or *ha* (i.e., with two winkelhakens) is another indication of late NS. Corroborating evidence for a late NS dating includes the use of AŠ for *INA* (many examples), the use of UGU for *sara* (ii 50, iii 13’, 29’ (twice), iv 14), and *liš* as *li₄* (ii 20). See table 1 in *Appendix C* for specific sign shapes. The late script is further evidence that the seal on the tablet belonged to a contemporary of Tudhaliya IV.

The text Bo 3298+*KUB* 25.32+*KUB* 27.70+1628/u, according to its colophon, records the festivals of Karahna. Laroche6 labels this text simply “Fêtes de Karahna” but puts it under the more general rubric “Cultes de ḏKAL.” The text is in fact not a festival exclusively dedicated to the Tutelary Deity of Karahna, but she is the only deity mentioned in the text who is specifically associated with Karahna. The Tutelary Deity of Karahna is a

3. That is, sign number 176 in Güterbock’s sign list in *SBo* II.
prominent goddess among the tutelary deities of cities and is discussed in Chapter 1. This text provides a good example of what a provincial festival was like, a festival not part of the cult celebrated at the capital but important for the maintenance of piety among the Hittites throughout their empire and not just at its political and religious center. The festival provides offerings to the entire pantheon of this particular town, with a few gods of surrounding cult centers singled out for more particular attention. It thus is meant to ensure harmonious relations with all the gods of the region, only one of which is the tutelary deity of this particular town.

The text has been edited by Dinçol and Darga, *Anatolica* 3 (1969–70) 99–118. Page numbers cited for Dinçol and Darga refer to this edition. The unpublished join piece 1628/u was utilized by Dinçol and Darga in their work on this text. I would like to thank Professor Heinrich Otten for graciously sending me a prepublication version of his hand copy of this fragment, so that I was able to check this piece for myself in preparing a new transliteration and translation. The fragment furnishes the beginnings of lines iii 47–52.

Since Dinçol and Darga's edition appeared, Hoffner has discovered another join to this tablet and has generously allowed me to use his discovery in my work on this text. The new fragment, Bo 3298, fits into the top of column i; its last three lines join the first three lines of *KUB* 25.32 i. The addition of this join adds twenty lines to the first column. Dr. Evelyn Klengel very kindly allowed me to look at this unpublished piece during my work in Berlin, and Professor Horst Klengel also provided a photograph of the text. This tablet fragment is now in Ankara. On the basis of this major new join and the results of my collations of the tablets in Istanbul and Berlin I have prepared a new transliteration of the tablet and an English translation. Although the new join piece does not actually preserve the top edge, comparison with column ii, whose top edge is preserved in *KUB* 27.70 ii, indicates that there is only room for about twenty lines above the 1' of *KUB* 25.32 i. The colophon indicates that this is the first and only tablet of festival description, and yet the first paragraph as preserved does not look like an introductory paragraph. It is thus conceivable that there was a very short paragraph before this one or at least another line or two introducing the text. There is however very little room for what are only conjectural additional lines, so I have taken the first line of Bo 3298 as line 1 of the tablet.

7. Other scholars cite passages from this text in various other publications. *KUB* 25.32 i 10'-14' is transliterated by Bossert, *Heth.Kön.* 55, *KUB* 25.32 iv 8–11 is transliterated and translated by Alp, *Anadolu* 2 (1957) 18, where he also transliterates *KUB* 27.70 iii 3'-4', now iii 37'-38' in the joined text. Dressler, *Plur.* 181–82, transliterates and translates *KUB* 25.32 iv 8–9. *KUB* 25.32 i 14'-19' is transliterated by Danmanville, *RHA* XX/70 (1962) 55. *KUB* 27.70 ii 19–21 is transliterated and translated by Coşkun, *Kap Isimleri* 14. Dinçol and Darga note places where Bossert's and Danmanville's transliteration differs from their own, but they do not comment on the passages worked on by Alp or Dressler.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+ KUB 27.70+1628/u

Transliteration

Obverse i

§1 1 [ o o o o o ] Ė? x[  
2 [ o o pár-ši-ya na-an-kán [A]-N[A  
3 [ o o o o o ]  

5 [na-an IŠ-TU?] DUG har-ši-ya-al10 ŠA ZIZ da-a-an-zí n [a-at-kán?]  
6 [ o o o o o ] x [ o ] GIS!? gur-ta-li iš-ḫu-wa-an-zí ma-[x-xl[ o o ]  
8 [ o o o o o ] l ṣ1 EGIS-ŠU DUMU.Ē.GAL kar-pa-an-zi [Ø]  
10 [nu A-NA DUG har-ši-ya-al 12 NIG.GIG ti-an-zi 3 NINDA[ta-wa-ra-[al  
11 [pár-ši-ya nu-kán!] ? me-ma-al še-er iš-ḫu-wa-a-an-zi [Ø]  
13 [ṣa wa-ga-a-t]a12 ṣal-zi-ya 3-ŠU a-ku-wa-an-zi [Ø]  
15 [UD 1 KAM?]14 o o-lat  

§3 16 [ma-a-an lu-kat-]a GIS KUṣNIG.BAR ME-an-zi [Ø]  
17 [LUGAL-uš AŠ Ė].ŠA DINGIR-LIM pa-iz-zi 1 GUD ŠEN 2 UDU [Ø]  
19 [ o o o o ] da-a-an-zi 3 NINDA[ta-wa-ra-al NINDA.Ī.Ē.DE.A me-ma-a[l]  
20 [ o o o AŠ ] l ƎL.ŠA DINGIR-LIM EGIS-pa da-a-i [Ø]  

8. The join piece Bo 3298 adds twenty to the Dinçol and Darga column i line numbers.  
10. The form har-ši-ya-al is not cited by Friedrich in HW, although he cites the occurrence of DUG har-ši-ya-li (as DUG haršiyališ) in this text, line ii 20. Without the examples from the join piece Bo 3298, there was almost no evidence for a form haršiyali except for line ii 22 of KUB 27.70. The join piece now adds three more examples of har-ši-ya-al, in lines i 5, 10, and 14. We may therefore posit an l-stem form haršiyali for this word in addition to Friedrich's haršiyali. On DUG haršiyali, see most recently Coşkun, Kap Işımleri 9-16.  
11. Or SAL.  
12. The trace fits -t]a quite well; the passage is restored from i 45 and ii 35.  
13. From intercolumnium of KUB 27.70, labeled obverse i 1'.  
14. The indication of the end of the first day of the festival is not preserved. In §§10 and 11, the last two paragraphs of column i, the tablet is broken in such a way that there could have been a short line denoting the end of day one in either of these paragraphs. There is a similar space here in i 15, and the following paragraph, if correctly restored, indicates the beginning of a new day in the ceremony.
THE FESTIVALS OF KARAHNA

Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+KUB 27.70+1628/u

Translation

Obverse i

§1 The few preserved words indicate that the text begins in its first paragraph with offerings and their preparation.

§2 He sacrifices. [...] x. [He places(?)]it in the storage vessel. [He libates beer and wine(?).] They take [it from] the wheat storage vessel. They pour [...] into the kurtali-vessel. x[ ...] They cover [the kurtali-vessel with a cloth]. The kurtali-vessel the first [time] he/they [...]. Afterwards the palace attendant lifts (it).15 He carries [it into the house of the miller].16 The singers run in front. They place liver(s) [in the stor]age vessel. [He breaks] three tawara[ ] breads and pours meal over (them). They place [them] back17 in the storage vessel. [A “tidbi]t” is called out. They drink three times. He breaks [(a bread type)]. They [place] it back in the wheat storage vessel. [They ... ] it.

§3 [When it dawns]s, they open the door. They remove18 the curtain. [The king] goes [into the inner] chamber of the god. At the [tarša]nzipa of the inner chamber of the god they slaughter one fattened ox (and) two sheep. They take [...]. He takes three tawara[ ] breads, sweet oil cake, meal [(and) ...] back [into] the inner chamber of the god.

15. The Hittite has a singular noun and a plural verb. The singular verb in the following sentence, in which the subject is probably still the palace attendant, indicates that the verb here should be singular.

16. This may be male or female; see the note to the transliteration of i 9.

17. See Commentary below for a description of the problems in translating the phrase ANA ĐUGḫaršiyal EGIR-pa tianzi and similar phrases that occur throughout the festival description.

18. Literally “take.”
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+KUB 27.70+1628/u

Obverse i (transliteration cont.)

22 UGULA /lgMES MUHALDIM š[a-o o ] šu-up-pf-ah-ḫi UGULA /lgMES MUHALDIM
LUGAL-i túḫ-ḫ[u-i-šar]
23 pa-ra-a el-e[p-zj] tāk-kán túḫ-ša[-i?]

§5 24 1 GUD SE (eras.) 7 UDU 2 [SILA A-1[NA (DN) ]
25 1 UDU A-NA UTU URU TUL-n[a 1 UDU A-NA (DN) 1 UDU A-NA ÊISTAR
ûruŠA-mu]-ḫa21
26 1 UDU A-NA ḫHē-pāt mu-šu-ni 1 U[DU A-NA (DN) 1 UDU A-NA (DN)]
27 1 UDU A-NA DLMAMMA wa-aš-ḫa-az-za 1 [UDU A-NA (DN) 1 UDU A-NA
DLIAMMA? ](-)x-ma-ti22
28 1 MĂŠ.GAL A-NA DLMAMMA URU Ka-ra-ah-[na 1 MĂŠ.GAL A-NA DLMAMMA GIS]ŠUKUR
29 1 MĂŠ.GAL A-NA DLMAMMA MĂ.URU.URU 6 MĂŠ.[GAL A-NA (DN)]
30 1 UDU A-NA Ē.KARA 1 UDU A-NA Ê İGUR 21 1 UDU[A-NA DZ]A.BA₂,BA₄
31 1 MĂŠ.GAL A-NA Dstellen wa-aš-ḫa-az-za 1 UDU A-NA
DLIAMMA? ](-)x-ma-ti22
32 1 UDU A-NA DINGIR.MES Ž.ĐINGIR-LİM 1 UDU A-NA ḫal-ki 1 UDU Ê[LTe-1]i-pf-nu
33 1 UDU A-NA D30 1 UDU A-NA DAn-ta-li-ya 1 UDU [P]Im]-mar-ni-za
34 1 SILA DMAH-ni 1 UDU D[SHA-aš 1 UDU D[SHA-[ša-mi]-li
35 1 UDU A-NA DINGIR.MES URU Ža-ši-iq-qa-ša-na-u-wa-an-d[a]

19. The tablet clearly has na-aš. We might expect the verb ḫwâwâ- in the break, which would require emending the text to na-at pf-an ḫ[u-u-ya-an]-zi “They run before.” If the pronoun is correct, we should not restore ḫwâwâ- in the break, as the king is never attested with piran ḫwâwâ-. I therefore restore fiuek- “slaughter.” This fits with the remainder of the paragraph.

20. From intercolumnium of KUB 27.70, there labeled obverse i 3.

21. Dinçol and Darga restore ŽUTU ŽUŠA-mu]-ḫa at the end of this line, but as they point out (p. 100 n. 6) a sun deity of Šamuḫa is not otherwise attested. They infer his/her existence from the fact that lines ii 19–54 describe a ceremony for ŽUTU which takes place in Šamuḫa (written Šapula). Worship of the Sungod in Šamuḫa need not, however, imply the existence of a Sungod of Šamuḫa. I therefore restore Ištar of Šamuḫa. There is too much space in this line for only one deity in the break.

22. Dinçol and Darga, in their commentary on this line (p. 112), suggest the possibility of reading the end of the line as [ ... DLMAMMA D DAG-it]. The sign which they read DAG quite definitely does not have a broken vertical. In addition, the first sign preserved after the break is not consistent with a reading GIS. Perhaps a place name is to be read here: “[the Tutelary Deity of ḫx-mati.”

23. Dinçol and Darga read this name as ŽU.GUR; Danmanville, RHA XX/70 (1962) 55, reads ŽLĪŠ. The traces would allow ŽLĪŠ ḫz, i.e., Ištar with an epithet. DÎSTAR LĪL would be unlikely, as this goddess is probably to be restored at the end of line 36. ŽU.GUR is certainly a possible reading if we take note that the U sign is written over an incomplete erasure. I read ŽU.GUR here because of the rarity of the use of ŽLĪŠ for Ištar, especially in a text that also uses the ÎSTAR sign, and because I cannot postulate a likely epithet for Ištar which fits the traces.

24. Danmanville, RHA XX/70 (1962) 55, transliterated A-NA here, as well as twice in line 34, where the tablet does not have it.
§4 The king comes out of the inner chamber and he [sacrific]es(?) in front. The overseer of the cooks purifies [...]. The overseer of the cooks hol[ds] forth tubh[weššar] to the king. He separa[tes(?)] (it).

§5 One fattened ox, seven sheep, two lam[bs] to DN [...], one sheep to the Sungoddess of Arinn[a], one sheep to Ištar of Šamu]a, one sheep to Ḫepat the True,25 one sh[ee]p to DN, one sheep to DN], one sheep to the waššaza Tutelary Deity,26 one [sheep to DN, one sheep to the Tutelary Deity of ... ]x-mati,27 one billy goat to the Tutelary Deity of Karah[na, one billy goat to the Tutelary Deity of the] Spear, one billy goat to the Tutelary Deity of the Quiver, one [billy] goat [to DN], one sheep to the Stormgod of the Army, one sheep to Nergal, one sheep [to Z]A.BA, one sheep [to] Pirwa, one sheep (to) Aškašipa, one sheep (to) [Kattahha], one sheep to the gods of the temple, one sheep to the Grain Deity, one sheep (to) [Tel]ipinu, one sheep to the Moongod, one sheep to Antaliya, one sheep (to) [the Im]marni deities,28 one lamb to the Mother Goddess, one sheep to the fate deities, one sheep to Ḥa[šamill], one sheep to the gods of Hašiqqaša[nauan][a],29

25. See CHD sub (4)muš(u)ni.
26. See the Dinçol and Darga comment on this title (p. 112 of their edition). To the occurrences which they cite add KBo 21.54+KBo 30.174 (fragment naming Zonekuruwa) 9': ŠA pŁAMMA wa-aš-h[a-; 10': ANA pŁAMMA wa-aš-ha-za; and 21': ]x wa-aš-ša-za pŁAMMA-ya. The word wašha(z)a in all its attestations occurs with pŁAMMA and is obviously an epithet for a tutelary deity or deities. The contexts in which it occurs are too few and indistinct to allow us to say what this epithet might mean. Laroche, DLL 109, cites this word under wašha- “maitre?” but in DLL 160 translates it in KUB 35.107 iii 10 as “dame(?).” In NH 327 he analyzes it as a derivative wašha(n)- from wašha- and notes that his translation “dame(?)” is only a conjecture. He also suggests that the word is an epithet “de la déesse 4KAL.” His evidence in NH 326 that wašha/- is an element only in feminine names is an indication that this particular tutelary deity is feminine. The case ending appears to be a Luwian dative plural ending -nza that has assimilated to -zza.
27. Or perhaps “[the Tutelary Deity] of the Throne.” See Dinçol and Darga’s commentary (p. 112) and my comments on line i 27.
28. Laroche, DLL 51, cites this as a plural acc./dat.(?) of “divinités de la campagne,” but there is really too little evidence to enable us to identify these deities specifically.
29. The gods of this city are attested only here and in the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, KBo 4.13 i 37. See RGTC6: 94.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+KUB 27.70+1628/u

Obverse i (transliteration cont.)

§5 36 1 UDU A-NA [D]H-a-a-ša-la 1 UDU A-NA PIŠTAR [LÍL]
(35 cont.) 37 1 UDU A-NA PIŠTAR URUTA-pi-ní-qa 1 UDU ad-da-aš [DINGIR.MEŠ-a]š!?
38 1 UDU A-NA PA-pa-a-ra 1 UDU A-NA [UR.SA]GZa-a-a
39 1 MÁŠ.GAL A-NA ḪUR.SAG GAL 1 MÁŠ.GAL A-NA [UR.SA]GZa-pa-a-la
Z[A]G.GAR.RA ḫu-u-kán-zi

42 [BAL]-an-zi nu-kán NINDA.Î.E.DÉ.A me-ma-al še-er [iš-h]u-wa-an-zi
43 [nam-m]a-aš 1 NINDA.KU, 40 NINDA ta-wa-ra-al A-NA ZAG.GAR.RA.n[i] ti-an-zi
44 [nu B]AL-an-zi Iš-[T]U KAŠ GEŠTIN ta-wa-al [wa-a]-l-[h]i

46 [3?-ṢU-a-ku-w]a-an-zi 3 NINDA.KUR.RA pár-si-ya na-āš-kán [GI]ZAG.GAR.RA
   ti-an-zi

§8 47 [nu an]-dur-za x[ o o] AS 35 É.LO[NINDA.DU.DU pé-[da]-i (eras.)
48 [U.UL]-pát-at-kán [ka-r]j-ya-an-zi LU.MEŠ[NAR] [pš]-an ḫu-u-i-ya-an-zi
   (Uninscribed space for 4 lines.)

30. Although Dinicol and Darga read the end of this line [DINGIR.MEŠ], there is a trace visible on the right side of this break at the end of the line, and that trace is not good for a reading MEŠ. It looks more like the end of an i or az. The phrase, addaš [DINGIR]-i "to the god of the ancestors," would fit spacing and trace well. The expected plural da-i addaš [DINGIR.MEŠ-a]š makes sense but does not fit the trace well and may be too long for the available space in the break.

31. Dinicol and Darga restore [KAŠ GEŠTIN] at the beginning of this line, which is too long for the break and necessitates emending the line considerably, as they have done: "[KAŠ GEŠTIN] BAL-an-zi <BI-IB-RU]-ka-n> Iš-TU KAŠ GEŠTIN ta-wa-al wa-al-ħi <ṣu-un-na-an-zi> "[Beer (and) wine] they libate. [They fill the rhyta] with beer, wine, tawal, (and) walḥi." No emendation is required with the transliteration suggested above, which could be translated, "[They fill the rhyta] with beer, wine, (and) walḥi."

32. Restored on the basis of Dinicol and Darga and the similar passage ii 35–36. The space in the break is tight for this restoration. Collation indicates a definite horizontal trace before an, which fits -wa-[a]- and eliminates the possible restoration [BA]-an-zi suggested by the similar spacing in i 44.

33. The Sumerogram AS for the Akkadian INA is used frequently throughout this text.

34. Dinicol and Darga read na-at-kán as the beginning of the line, but the left edge of the tablet is broken away here and there is space for one or two signs to the left of the preserved edge. They restored two signs in the same space in the line above. In line 48 the first preserved sign does not look like na, but more like nu or pāl. I posit a restoration that fits the space and signs and makes sense. It is also possible that a noun (probably a logogram) began the clause. [uzziN]G.GIG]-kān would only barely fit the signs but would make sense; see ii 9.
Obverse i (translation cont.)

§5 one sheep to the Hjašala River, one sheep to Ištar of the [Countryside], one sheep to Ištar of Tapiniga, one sheep to the Ancestral [God]s(?), one sheep to Apāra, one sheep to Mt. Zā, one billy goat to the great mountain, (and) one billy goat to Mt. Tapala, (at/on) the altar they sacrifice.

§6 They bring forth two lambs of the Stormgod of Zipalanda out of the inner chamber and place (them) back on the altar. They [sacrifice] (them) [to] the Stormgod of the Gate. They scatter sweet oil cake (and) meal over them. [The]n they place them, (and) one sweet bread (and) forty tawaral loaves, on the altar. They libate, with beer, wine, tawal, (and) [wa]lhlj, §7 and place [them] (on) the altar. A “tidbit” is called out.35 They [drink 3(?) times]. He breaks three thick breads and they place them (on) the altar.

§8 [In]side(?) he c[ar]ries x[ ... ] into the house of the baker. They [do not(?)] co[ver that same one.36 The singers run [in f]ront.

---

35. This is the only text where wagata- occurs without a NINDA determinative. See Hoffner, AllHeth 188, for examples of NINDA wagata- and the likelihood that this word is from the verb wak- “to bite.” Neu, StBoT 26 (1983) 208, proposes “Brotbissen(?).” Dinçol and Darga translate “Der Imbiss!” It is possible, in light of the lack of any other occurrences of wagata- without NINDA determinative, that this text’s scribe, who made mistakes throughout the tablet, for some reason neglected to write the determinative but intended NINDA wagata- in i 25 and ii 35. However, in view of the recurrence of the phrase waganna halziya, it also seems possible that the scribe may have somehow understood wagata without determinative as approximately equal to waganna. The phrase with halziya would then be “a ‘tidbit’ is called out” instead of “a ‘biting’ is called out.”

36. Or perhaps “They cover the [li]ver(s)”? See commentary on i 48 (n. 34 above) for possible readings of the Hittite.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+KUB 27.70+1628/u

Obverse i (transliteration cont.)

§9 49 [ooooooopar-ši]-ya ga-ip-pi-ya-an
50 [mr-ha-an ti-an-zi nu-kán] 4 NINDA.UTUL ku-it pár-ši-ya-an-na-a-i
51 [nu-kán 4 a-na-ḫi da-a-a-n-zi ta-at GISZAG.GAR.RA-ni ME-li[0]]
52 [ooooooiros-TU] IB-RI GUB-aš <3-ST a-ku-wan-an-zi> 3 NINDA.KUR.RA
53 [pár-ši-ya na-aš-kán GISZAG.GAR.RA ti-an-zi]

§10 54 [KASPGEŠTIN ta-wa-al wa-al-ḫi 4?-ST] ši-pa-an-da-an-zi
55 [nu-kán EGIR-pa DINGIR.MEŠ šu-u-m]a-an-te-eš ir-ḫa-a-an-zi

§11 56 [oooooo] ša-[?] ra-an-zi
57 [oooooo] da-an-zi
58 [oooooo] pe-e-da-an-zi

(bottom of tablet)

Obverse ii (transliteration)

§12 1 [oooooo]-us e-ez-za-i UZU-kán
2 [oooooo] ha-an-da-an-zi ta (eras.) GIS7.7.BI [BAL-an]-zi
3 [oooooo] x40 DUG KU-KU-UB ta-wa-la-kán ar-ḫa
4 [oooooo] ha-aš-ta-i-ma ar-ḫa BIL-an-zi
5 [oooooo] ha-aš-ši an-da ši-pa-an-da-an-zi
6 [ta 1 NINDA LA-A]B-KU pár-ši-ya-an-zi na-an-kán GUNNI ti-an-zi
7 [na-an-kán za-nu-w]a-an-zi 3 NINDA.KUR.RA pár-ši-ya (eras.)
8 [nu-kán? x42 NINDA]ḫa-a-li i-ya-an-zi

10 na-at AŠ Ė L0 MUHALDIM pé-e-da-an-zi (eras.) UD 2 KAM

37. Dinçol and Darga suggest the restoration [mar-ḫa-an ti-an-zi] at the beginning of this line. This is almost certainly correct, as (m[H]) marḫa- frequently occurs with the ippiya- plant. However, there is more space than this at the beginning of the line.
38. There is not enough space at the end of this line for Dinçol and Darga’s reading d[a-a-i]. Collation of the tablet shows a vertical wedge exactly in the crease of the left line of the intercolumnium, after which comes the horizontal, which in the copy is drawn as a continuation of the preceding ni sign.
39. The signs na-at are erased.
40. Probably meant to be erased.
41. Dinçol and Darga read ne-an-zi. I read instead BIL-an-zi because burning up the bones is attested fairly frequently in rituals and festivals and thus makes good sense here.
42. A number.
43. The mu sign of L0 MUHALDIM looks as if the scribe started to write L0 NINDA.DÜ.DÜ and then changed it to L0 MUHALDIM.
THE FESTIVALS OF KARAHNA

Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+KUB 27.70+1628/u

Obverse i (translation cont.)

§9 [... ] he [br]eaks. [They set out] ippiya- plant (and) [marha-stew]. Th[ey take four samples] of the four stew-breads which one regularly breaks, and he places them on the altar. <They drink> [DN] <3 times> [from a rh]yton, standing. [He breaks] three thick breads. They place [them (on) the altar].

§10 They libate [beer, wine, tawal, (and) walhi 4(? times)]. [Then] they treat all the gods] with offerings in sequence.


(bottom of tablet)

Obverse ii (translation)

§12 He eats the [ ... ]s. The flesh [ ... ] they prepare. They [sacrifice] (it) (to) the Pleiades. [ ... ] And a jar of tawal away [ ... ] The bones, however, they burn up. [ ... ] they libate into the [h]earth. They break [one moi]st [bread] and place it (on) the hearth. They [coo]k [it(?)]. He breaks three thick breads. They make [x] hali [breads].

§13 They cover the livers and take them up. They carry them to the house of the cook.

Second day.

44. Puhvel, HED 1–2 (1984) 57–58, suggests that the word anahi- could be either Hurrian or Luwian, although in his review of HW2, Lief. 1, in JAOS 97 (1977) 597, he refers to anahi- as "Hurrian-based." Laroche, GLH (1976) 48–49, cites anahi- as a Hurrian word but suggests that it is a borrowing from Luwian. Already in RHA XXVIII (1970) 70 Laroche had suggested that this word was originally Luwian and not Hurrian. The word is rather common in festivals and rituals. Hoffner, AlHeth (1974) 151, commenting on the problem of choosing between the readings NINDA anahi or 4 anahi, suggests that the examples in KUB 25.32+ were probably not NINDA anahi. Kammenhuber, HW3 Lief. 1 (1975) 73b, suggests that the examples in this text are to be read neither NINDA anahi nor 4 anahi, but NINDA anahi "des Brotes Kostprobe." Hoffner notes, AlHeth 151 n. 6, that in some texts NINDA is distinguished from 4 by an indentation of the middle vertical, but this tablet contains definite examples of NINDA with and without an indented middle vertical, so this criterion cannot be used to decide the question of whether to read NINDA or 4 before anahi in this text. Either is possible, but since in each case the samples are specified as being warmed bread and stew-bread the reading NINDA anahi as a further specification of the type of sample offering seems less likely than a reading 4 anahi.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

Bo 3298 + KUB 25.32 + KUB 27.70 + 1628/u

Obverse ii (transliteration cont.)

§14
11 I-NA UD 3 KAM ma-a-an lu-kat-ta GIS SIG ḫē-e-ša-an-zi
12 KUS NĪG.BĀR da-an-zi ta I-NA UDUN ḫal-zī-ya NINDA a-a-n NINDA.UTŪL
13 ku-e pār-šī-ya-an-na-i nu-kān 4 a-na-ḥi da-aš-kān-zi na-at-kān GIS ZAG.GAR.RA
14 EGIR-pa zi-ik-ki-iz-zi IŠ-TU BI-IB-RI 3-ŠU a-ku-wa-an-zi
15 3 NINDA.KUR₄.RA pār-šī-ya na-aš-kān GIS ZAG.GAR.RA-ni EGIR-pa ti-an-zi
16 DINGIR.MEŠ ir-ḫa-a-at-ti a-ku-wa-an-zi

§15
17 ŠU.NIGIN 1 GUD.ĀB ŠE₄⁵ 1 GUD.I AMAR 301 UDU.NITÁ 2 SILA₄ 8 MĀŠ.GAL
18 ŠU.NIGIN.GAL 40 UDU.I.HI.A UD 3 KAM tuḫ-ḫu-uṣ-ta

§16
19 ma-a-an lu-uk-kat-ta LUGAL-uš ĀŠ E.ŠĀ DINGIR-LIM pa-i-z-zi
20 (eras.) 1 NINDA.KUR₄.RA LA-AB-KU pār-šī-ya na-an-kān A-NA DUG ḫar-ši-ya-liₓ ZĪZ ME-i
21 ḫI KAŠ₁ GEŠTIN BAL-ti (eras.)

§17
23 iš-ḫ[u-wa-an]-zi GIS gur-ta-liₓ-kān IŠ-TU GAD ka-ri-ya-an-zi

45. This sign looks more like 50 than ŠE. However, 51 calves have not been sacrificed, nor would reading 50 agree with the grand total of 40 "sheep" (small livestock).
46. Or SAL; a female miller is also attested in the Hittite corpus. In the similar passage in i 9 the critical sign is also lost, so we cannot use it to restore this passage.
47. This DŪ-ta-ri must from context represent iyantari "they go." Kümmel, StBoT 3 (1967) 106-07, explains the possible confusion of DŪ = iya- "to make" with DU = iya- "to go" in his commentary on KBo 15.9 iv 28, where one encounters DŪ-at-ta-ri. He cites the passage here from the Karatna festivals as another example of this "Ideogrammübertragung."
§14 On the third day, when it dawns, they open the door. They remove the curtain. "In the oven" is called out. They take four samples of the warmed bread (and) the stew-bread which one regularly breaks, and he puts them back (on) the altar. They drink from a rhyton three times. He breaks three thick breads. They place them back on the altar. They drink the gods in order.

§15 A total of one fattened cow, one calf, thirty rams, two lambs, (and) eight billy goats. A grand total of forty small livestock. The third day is ended.

§16 When it dawns the king goes into the inner chamber of the god. He breaks one moist thick bread. He places it in the wheat storage vessel. He libates beer and wine.

§17 [From] the storage vessel they take wheat(?) They put it into the kurtali-vessel. They cover the kurtali- vessel with a linen cloth and carry it to the house of the miller. The singers go before it.

48. Literally "take."
49. This expression, which occurs once in each of the various festival proceedings described in this text (except in the third one, where it is probably in the broken section at the end of column ii), is somewhat unusual. It always occurs immediately before the taking of sample-offerings of the ceremonial breads. Since these sample-offerings always include "warmed bread," it seems likely that the point of calling out "In the oven" is to let the celebrants know that the offering bread is in the oven being warmed and therefore the ceremony is almost ready to begin.
50. Friedrich, HW (1952) 83, cites irṭattī as a Luwian form of irḫa- and translates "in der Reihe, rings herum." Laroche, DLL (1959) 52, cites a Luwian word irḥɑt- "série, cercle," and gives the examples from this text as dative. He gives only two other possible attestations of this Luwian word. Its meaning seems clear from the context in this text and its relation with the verb irḫai- in the meaning "provide with offerings in sequence." Laroche, RHA IX/49 (1948-49) 22, translates irḥɑtti in KUB 25.32+ as "à la ronde."
51. Literally "sheep," but this is to include the other small animals in the grand total.
52. The point of this paragraph seems to be that wheat is taken from a ḫaršiyal, into which thick bread broken as an offering has previously been placed, and taken to the miller in a ceremonial procession with singers. This wheat is presumably ground into meal, although the text does not specify what is done with it. Meal (memal) is utilized in the offerings to the Sungod described in the next paragraph, so perhaps we should understand §16 as an explanation of the preparation of such meal. I thus translate ZIZ here not as part of a genitive construct with ḫaršiyal, but rather as the object of da-.
53. This word occurs in ii 22 and 23 as ğu-ta-ili. Friedrich, HW 3. Erg. 21, under his lemma kurtal, cites both these occurrences as singular dative-locative. In ii 22 it is dative-locative, but this second occurrence, in ii 23, is singular nominative-accusative. Friedrich lists kurtal as a possible form for the singular nominative-accusative of this word and in fact has more examples of kurtali than of kurtal as the nom.-acc. form.
§18
25 DUTU-un-kán kat-[ta-an G]TI-[R]-ni pé-e-da-an-zi
26 na-an A-NA NA-ZI.KIN EGIR-pa t[li-ya-an-zi
27 1 GUD ŠE 7 UDU 1 SILA ši-pa-[an-da-an-zi]
28 ta NA-ZI.KIN ši-ḫu-u-kán-[zi [UZU]-šu-up-pa t[li-an-zi
30 1 NINDA.KU [eras. 12] NINDA.L.E.DÉ.A me-ma-al 1
     NINDA.KUR₄, RA KU₇
31 na-at-kán A-NA NA-ZI.KIN DUTU EGIR-pa ti-an-zi
32 KĀŠ! GEŠTIN wa-al-ḥi mar-nu-wa-an 4-ŠU BAL-[lan-zi]
33 BI-IB-RI A-kán IS-TU GEŠTIN šu-un-na-an-[fzi]
34 na-aš-kán A-NA NA-ZI.KIN DUTU EGIR-pa ti-an-zi
35 1 DUG KA.ŠI ti-an-zi ta wa-ga-ta ḫal-zi-ya
36 3-ŠU a-ku-wa-an-zi 3 NINDA.KUR₄, RA pár-ši-ya-an-zi na-aš-kán EGIR-pa
     A-NA NA-ZI.KIN
37 ti-an-zi
§19
38 nu IS-TI[N] DUN, DUN, NINDA.KUR₄ RA ú-da-an-zi
39 nu-kán NINDA.KUR₄, RA IS-TU GAD ka-ri-ya-an-za ULMES NAR p[í-an
40 ḫu-u-ya-an-zi 3 NINDA.KUR₄, RA pár-ši-ya ḫu-u-ma-an-l[a]-aš DINGIR.MEŠ-aš
     ZAG.GAR.RA ti-an-zi
42 nu KĀŠ! GEŠTIN wa-al-ḥi 3-ŠU BAL-[an-z]i
§20
43 nu I-NA UDU NAV ḫal-zi-ya-ta-ri NINDA[a]-a-an NINDA.UTÚ.L.HI.A ku-e
44 pár-ši-ya-an-na-an-zi nu-kán 4 a-na-ḥi da-a-an-zi
45 na-at-kán A-NA NA-ZI.KIN DUTU EGIR-pa ti-eš-kán-zi
47 IS-TU BI-IB-RI GUB-aš 3-ŠU a-ku-wa-an-zi 3 [NINDA.KUR₄, RA pár-ši-ya
48 na-aš-kán NA-ZI.KIN ti-an-zi (eras.)
49 DINGIR.MEŠ ū-ma-an-te-eṣ ir-ḫa-ti a-ku-wa-an-z[i [ ]
§21
50 DINGIR-LIM UGU da-a-an-zi na-<an> AŠ₄[DINGIR-LIM [pê-e-da-an-zi]
51 UZU NĪG.GIG-kan ka-ri-ya-an-zi ULMES NAR p[í-an-zi
52 UZU NĪG.GIG ȘA DINGIR-LIM E LMUHALDIM p[ê-e-da-an-zi]
53 na-at-kán G[ZAG.GAR.RA ni ti-an-zi [ O  ]
54 I-NA URU Ša-pu-ḥa UD 1 KAM [ ]
§18 They carry the Sungod down to the grove. They place him back on the ste[la]. [They] consecrate[te] one fattened ox, seven sheep, (and) one lamb. They slaughter (them) at the stela and set out [the flesh]. They break two(?) danna- breads. They cover the liver(s). (There are) one sweet bread, twelve tawaral breads, sweet oil cake, meal, (and) one sweet thick bread. They place them back on the stela (for) the Sungod. They libate beer, wine, walhi, (and) marnuwan four times. They fill rhyta with wine and place them back on the stela (for) the Sungod. They place one vessel of KA.DU beer. A “tidbit” is called out. They drink three times. They break three thick breads and place them back on the stela.

§19 They bring the thick bread from the house of the baker. The thick bread (is) covered with a linen cloth. The singers run in front (of it). He breaks three thick breads. They make sweet oil cake for all the gods. They place the three thick breads (and) sweet oil cake on the altar. They libate beer, wine, and walhi three times.

§20 “In the oven” is called out. They take four samples of the warmed bread (and) stew-bread which they regularly break, and they place them back on the stela (for) the Sungod. Sweet oil cake, however, they give to [a]ll. They drink three times from a rhyton, standing. He breaks three [thick breads], and they place them (on) the stela. They drink all the gods in order.

§21 They take the god up. [They carry] him into the temple. They cover the liver(s). The singers run in front. They carry the liver(s) (to) the house-of-the-cook of the god. They place them on the altar. [ ... ] In Šamuha, one day.

One erased line.

55. Note the use of šipant- with animals to mean “consecrate, offer.” That this verb does not indicate the actual slaughtering here and in §§22, 24’, 27’, 31’, and 34’ is obvious from the use of ḫuēk- in the sentence immediately following. See Goetze, JCS 23 (1970) 85–92, on the distinction between šipant- with an animal object and no sentence particle meaning “sacrifice” and the same verb with an animal object and a particle such as -kan meaning “to consecrate.” In general the use of šipant- in this text follows this rule; the two exceptions are here (ii 28) and iii 49’, in each of which the context makes it clear that despite the lack of a sentence particle, šipant- is used to mean “consecrate” and does not imply killing the animal.

56. My understanding of the two occurrences in this paragraph of ANA ₃⁻ŽI.KIN ᵃ UTU EGIR-pa as “back on the stela (for) the Sungod” instead of taking ᵃŽI.KIN ᵃ UTU as a genitive construction is conditioned by the similar phrase in iii 43’ and 45’, ANA ᵃŽI.KIN taknas ᵃ UTU-i EGIR-pa, in which it is clear that the DN is in the locative.

57. Note the unusual word order; the normal word order would be DINGIR.MEŠ-aš humandaš.

58. The verb here is a very unusual iterative form ti-šḫ-kān-zi. The more normal third person plural iterative of dai- is zikkans. There is no obvious reason why the action should call for an iterative verb here, but the iterative is used in similar contexts several times in the description of the festival.

59. The form URUŠapuha in this text is clearly an alternate spelling for URUŠamuha. Del Monte, RGTC 6: 339 and 350, cites several other examples of this alternate spelling.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+KUB 27.70+1628/u

Obverse ii (transliteration cont.)

§22 55 ma-a-an-za LUGAL-uš PŁAMMA URRU Ma-ah-ḫu-ut(-) i-ya-zi

§23 57 [nu NA.ZI.KIN] ḫu-u-kán-z[i ūzušu-up-pa ti-an-zi]
58 [ o o o o ] x x [ (approximately six lines missing from the bottom of the tablet)

Reverse iii (transliteration)

(approximately seven lines missing from the top of the tablet)

§24 59+1 ma-a-an-za LUGAL-uš PZA.BA₄.BA₄-an i-[1]-[ya-zi]
2’ LUGAL-uš ti-ya-zi nu-kán 1 GUD 4 U[DU]
3’ A-NA PZA.BA₄.BA₄ BAL-ti NA.ZI.K(IN-ši ḫu-u-kán-z[i]
4’ uzušu-up-pa ti-an-zi 1 NINDA [a-na-aš 1 NINDA K[U₇]
5’ 1 NINDA.KUR₄.RA KU₇ NINDA.İ.E.DE.A me-ma-al A-NA GIS[ZAG.GAR.RA]
6’ ti-an-zi BI-IB-RI[BU]-k[AN] İS-TU GEŠTIN š[ u-un-na-an-z[i]
7’ na-aš-kán EGIR-pa ti-an-zi KAŠ GEŠTIN wa-al-ḫi [3?-ŞU BAL-an-z[i]

§25 8’ İ-NA UDUN ḫal-zi-ya-ri NINDA[1-]a-an[BU] NINDA._UTUL.ḪI.A ku-e
9’ [pär-ši-ya-an-ni-an-zi]
10’ nu-kán 4 a-na-ḫi da-aš-kā[n-z]i na-at A-NA GIS[ZAG.GAR.RA IEGER[1]-[pa]
11’ ti-an-zi İS-TU BI-IB-RI GUB-aš 3-ŞU a-ku-wa-an-z[i]
12’ EGIR-pa ti-an-zi DINIGIR.MEŠ ḫu-ma-an-te-eš ir-ḫa-ti a-ku-wa-an-z[i]

§26 13’ DINIGIR-LUM uzušu-up-pa-ya UGU ME-an-zi na-at AŞ E İMUHALDIM
14’ pe-e-da-an-zi UD 1 KAM AŞ [UR.SAG] ḫu-ura

§27 15’ ma-a-an-za LUGAL-uš P[U.KARAS i-ya-zi
16’ LUGAL-uš ti-ya-zi tāk-kán 1 GUD.MAḪ ŞE 4 UDU ŞA.BA 1 SILA₄
17’ 4 MĀŠ.GAL ŞA.BA 1 MĀŠ.TUR A-NA P[U.KARAS ši-pa-an-ti

60. Or URRU Ma-ah-ḫu-w[a(-)]. The name is otherwise unattested.
61. Dinçol and Darga read the determinative as NA₄, which is the expected determinative for ZI.KIN. However, Gütterbock notes in KUB 25.32 that this word was written over an incomplete erasure; he is even able to decipher the original word: GIS[ZAG.GAR.RA[BU]. The scribe in changing this word did not do his task fully, neglecting to erase the GİŞ determinative and write NA₄ in its place.
Bo 3298 + KUB 25.32 + KUB 27.70 + 1628/u

Obverse ii (translation cont.)

§22 When the king [worships] the Tutelary Deity of Mah hut[(-)], the king steps (forward) and [consecrates] one ox (and) nine [sheep to the Tutelary Deity of Mah hut(-)].

§23 They slaughter (them) [(at) the stela and set out the flesh.] [ ... ]x [ ... ]

(approximately six lines missing from the bottom of the tablet)

Reverse iii (translation)

§24’ When the king wo[rships] ZA.BA4.BA4, the king steps (forward) and consecrates one ox (and) four sh[ee]p to ZA.BA4.BA4. [They slaughter] (them) (at) the stela and set out the flesh. They place one danna- bread, one swe[et] bread, one sweet thick bread, sweet oil cake, (and) meal on the a[ltar. They fil]l rhyta with wine and put them back. [They libate] beer, wine, (and) walhi [three times].

§25’ “In the oven” is called out. They take (iterative) four samples of the warmed bread (and) stew-bread which [they regularly break]. They place them bac[k] on the altar. They drink three times from the rhyton, standing. They break three thick breads and place them back (on) the stela. They drink all the gods in order.

§26’ They take up the god and the flesh and carry them to the house of the cook. One day, on Mt. Ḫura.

§27’ When the king worships the Stormgod of the Army, the king steps (forward) and consecrates one fattened bull, four sheep among which is one lamb, (and) four billy goats among which is one kid, to the Stormgod of the Army.
Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+KUB 27.70+1628/u

Reverse iii (transliteration cont.)

§28' 18' NA₄hu-wa-a-ši ḫu-u-kán-zi ṭurüšu-up-pa ti-an-zi
19' 1 NINDA=dan-na-aš 1 NINDA,KU, 12 NINDA=wa-ra-ral 1 NINDA,KUR₄,RA KU₇
NINDA,FE.DÉ.A me-ja-al
21' šu-un-na-an-zi na-aš-kán EGIR-pa ti-ya-zi
22' KAŠ GEŠTIN wa-al-hi 4-ST/BAL-zil!

§29' 23' AŠ UDUN ḫal-zi-ya-ri NINDA=a-an ṭA NINDA,UTUL,HIL A ku-e
24' pár-si-ya-an-ri nu-kán a-na-ḫi da-aš-kán-zi
25' na-at-kán EGIR-pa za-ik-kán-zi
26' IŞ-TU BI-IB-RI GUB-aš 3 Şu-a-ku-wa-an-zi 4 NINDA,KUR₄,RA pár-si-ya
27' na-aš-kán NA₄hu-wa-a-ši EGIR-pa ti-an-zi
28' LŪ.MEŠ da-pf-an-te-eš wa-ar-šu-li a-ku-wa-an-zi

§30' 29' DINGIR-LUM UGU ME-an-z[ī] ṭurüšu<-up>-pa-ya UGU ME-an-zi
30' na-at AŠ Ĕ ldu MUḪALDIM pé-e-da-an-zi ṭurüšu<-up>-pa-kan GISZAG,GAR,RA
GIN-z[ī] 64
31' DU.KARAŠ AŠ UD! 1 KAM URU=A-ka-li-ya-aš GISṬIR-ni

§31' 32' ma-a-an-za LUGAL-uš ták-na-aš ⁿUTU-un i-ya-zi
33' lLUGAL¹-uš ti-ya-zi ták-kán kiš-an BAL-ti
34' 1 GUD,ÂB ŠE 2 UDÚ ták-na-aš PUTU-i 酲BAL-an¹-zi
35' NA₄ZI,KIN!-ši ḫu-u-kán-zi GUD UDU ḫu-u?-[m]a-[a]n?-[da-a]n?
36' PA-NI NA₄ZI,KIN ti-an-zi

62. The text should perhaps be emended to ti-ya<-can>-zi, although three closely grouped examples (iii 20', 21', 38') of ti-ya-zi where ti-ya-an-zi is expected make one cautious about emending. Dinçöl and Darga, pp. 114–15, suggest the possibility of "Nasalreduktion" of the regular third person plural form to explain the occurrences of tiyazi. Such a phenomenon seems infrequent enough to merit our simply understanding these three examples as mistakes made by a scribe who made many other mistakes as well. Their further explanation of the odd use of DU in iii 30' as an ideogram for expected dai- is not impossible, but see my comment on iii 30'.

63. The complement on BAL is written with an odd sign that looks like a combination of an plus zi and could be read either BAL-zil! or BAL-an!-zi! Either way it must stand for șipandanzi.

64. The unusual writing DU-zi where tiyanzi is expected is an example of a very rare use of Sumerian GIN (DU) for Hittite dai-. Hoffner points out to me one other occurrence of this in the Milawata letter, where GIN is used for dai-as "to set (boundaries)." This festival text now provides a second example of this rarely attested equation. See CAD K 162b sub ƙamu A 3a for the use of GIN (read GUB by CAD) in Mesopotamia for the action of setting up cultic equipment such as censers and sacrificial implements.
§28' They slaughter (them) at the stela and set out the flesh. They place one danna-bread, one sweet bread, twelve tawaral breads, one sweet thick bread, sweet oil cake, (and) meal back on the stela. They fill rhyta with wine and put them back. They libate beer, wine, (and) walḥi four times.

§29' “In the oven” is called out. They take (iterative) samples of the warmed bread and stew-bread which they regularly break, and they put (iterative) them back. They drink three times from a rhyton, standing. He breaks four thick breads, and they put them back on the stela. All the men drink in the aroma.

§30' They take up the god and they take up the flesh. They carry them to the house of the cook. They place the flesh (on) the altar. (For) the Stormgod of the Army, in one day, in the grove of the city Akaliya.

§31' When the king worships the Sungoddess of the Earth, the king steps (forward) and consecrates (animals) as follows: They consecrate (one) fattened cow (and) two sheep to the Sungoddess of the Earth. They slaughter (them) at the stela. They place all of the cow (and) sheep before the stela.
The reading 1 NINDA.GE₆ [wa-g]a-ta-aš by Dinçöl and Darga is impossible because the sign which they read -g]a- is preserved mostly as a vertical wedge which cannot fit ga. In addition, there is a very clear trace after the GE₆ sign, despite the fact that Dinçöl and Darga indicate that their wa sign is completely lost in the break. There is in fact no space at all between mi and the trace following it. Dinçöl and Darga, in their commentary on this line, themselves point out that the construction *NINDA.GE₆ wagataš is otherwise unattested. The signs on the tablet do not support such a reading here either. In this position in similar lists of bread offerings in this text we have 12 NINDA.ta-wa-ra-al (ii 30), 1 NINDA.KUR₄.RA KU₇ (iii 4'–5') or 12 NINDA.ta-wa-ra-al 1 NINDA.KUR₄.RA KU₇ (iii 19'). Neither NINDA.taware₆ or NINDA.KUR₄.RA KU₇ fit the traces here, however.

This passage is cited in the CHD sub milit- in the morphology section, reading mi-li-ta-aš, which fits the traces quite well, except that the break in the middle of the word may be too large for the li sign to bridge and still show traces on either side of the break. For this reason I suggest that this word should be read NINDA mi-[i]-l[i]-t[a-aš, “bread of honey, honey bread,” for which there is sufficient room in the break. Either reading would be the only attestation for a syllabically spelled genitive of milit-, although the genitive LĀL-aš is attested. There are no other occurrences of NINDA miλištas, but NINDA.LĀL “honey bread” (AHeth. 123 and 202) is well attested. Hoffner, AHeth 209, commenting on bread names which allude to their ingredients and pointing out possibilities for the Hittite reading of logographically written bread names, cites as a hypothetical example mištas zuwaš as a possible reading for NINDA.LĀL. Thus the reading NINDA mi-[i]-l[i]-t[a-aš in this line, although providing a previously unattested spelling of a bread name, is certainly a possible reading and may be the first occurrence of a partially Hittite rendering of NINDA.LĀL.
§32’ They set out one danna- bread, one sweet bread, one ho[n]ey bread(?), sweet oil cake, meal, (and) the thigh\(^9\) back on the stela. They libate beer, wine (and) limma-beverage. They fill rhyta with wi[ne]. They place one vessel of KA.DÜ beer before the [st]ela.

§33’ “In the oven” is called out. They take (iterative) four samples of the warmed breads (and) stew-breads which they regularly break and put (iterative) them back on the stela for the Sungoddess of the Earth.\(^70\) They drink nine times from the rhyton, standing. They break eleven thick breads and place them back on the stela for the Sungoddess of the Earth. In one day, in the grove of the city Agaliya.

---

69. Friedrich, *HW 2. Erg. (1961)* 16, primarily on evidence from *KBo* 11.40, rejects the idea of Alp, *Anadolu* 2 (1957) 16–19, that *kudur* was the part of an animal immediately below the neck, and proposes in its place “Oberschenkel.” Goetze, *JCS* 17 (1963) 63, is less specific, suggesting the more general semantic range “part of the leg.” Poetto, *KZ* 99 (1986) 220–22, reviews the scholarship on *kudur* and suggests that it has an Indo-European etymology. He adduces possible cognates from Scandinavian languages which would support the identification of *kudur* with the calf of the leg or thigh.

70. Hoffner suggests the possible interpretation of *ANA* \(^{ki\textup{-}zi\textup{-}ki\textup{-}ni} \, taknaš\textup{-}\textup{D}U\textup{-}\textup{ti} as apposition: “on the stela, (namely) the Sungoddess of the Earth.” This would indicate an underlying conception of the stela not as an altar for the deity but as the deity itself.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+KUB 27.70+1628/u

Reverse iii (transliteration cont.)

§34' 47' ma-a-an-za LUGAL-uš dU É DÜ-zi
48' LUGAL-uš ti-ya-zi ták-kán ši-pa-an-ti
49' 1 GUD.MAH :pār!-za-ḫa!-fna-aš-siš-iš71 3 UDU 1 SILA₄ 2 MĀŠ.GAL 1 MĀŠ.TUR
50' A-NA dU É BAL-[an]-zi 8? UDUGISZAG.GAR.RA ḫu-kán-zi
51' 1 UDU A-NA dT[e-li-pf-n]u GISDĪM ḫu-u-kán-zi

§35' 52' [ o o o o o o o o ] x UZU NĪ.G.GIG GISZAG.GAR.RA
53' [ o o o o o o GIS]DĪM ti-an-zi

(bottom of tablet)

Reverse iv (transliteration)

§36' 1 [UZUš-up-pa ti-an]-zi²1 1 NINDA dan-na-aš 3 NINDA.KU,-SA
2 [ NIND]A? BABBAR 1 NINDA.KU, 30 NINDA ta-wa-ra-al
3 [pār-ši-ya-an-zi NIND]A.ḫE.ĐE.A-kán me-ma-al GISZAG.GAR.RA
5 [na-aš-kán EGIR-pa ti]-an-zi
6 [KAŠ GESTIN 2?-St] BAL-zi

§37' 7 [ GIS]AG.GAR.RA ti-an-zi

71. The word which Dinçol and Darga read as :pār!-za-ḫa!-fna-aš-siš-iš in the transliteration is discussed by them in their commentary (p. 115). There they mention the fact that Güterbock had communicated to them that he felt the first sign should be read pa and not pār! This word bridges the join 1628/u+KUB 27.70, with the sign in question being on the fragment 1628/u. Collation of a photograph of that fragment has convinced me that this somewhat unclear sign is not pār (UD) but is either pa or pār. Otten's hand copy shows a pa sign. Güterbock's understanding of the word with the first sign read as pa is detailed in Dinçol and Darga's commentary. He has since indicated to me that he now prefers the reading pār because it provides an attested form for the beginning of this word; see the form pār-za-ḫa-an-na-aš cited in Friedrich, HW 2. Erg. 21. In light of the evidence of the majority of other attestations of this word, which are spelled with an initial pī, it is conceivable that we should read this (and Friedrich's other example of pār-za-ḫa-an-na-aš) as pīr-za-ḫa-an-na-aš. See Laroche, Ugar. 5 (1968) 782, on the possibility of positing a pīr value for the BAR sign.

72. Based on a similar sequence in iii 18'f.
§34’ When the king worships the Stormgod of the House, the king steps (forward) and consecrates (animals thus): They consecrate one parzañana-(?) bull, three sheep, one lamb, two billy goats, (and) one kid to the Stormgod of the House. They slaughter eight animals\(^74\) (on) the altar. They slaughter one sheep to T[elipin]u (at) the pillar.\(^75\)

§35’ [ ... ] the liver(s) (on) the altar [ ... on/before(?)] the pillar they place.

(bottem of tablet)

Reverse iv (translation)

§36’ They [set out the flesh(?)]. [They break] one danna- bread, three sweet breads of [ ... (a number)] white [bread]s, one sweet bread, (and) thirty tawaral breads. Sweet oil [cake], (and) meal they place back (on) the altar. They fill rhyta and put [them back]. They libate [beer (and) wine 2(? times].

§37’ They place [ ... on the altar].

---

73. Or perhaps pazatiana-. See the comments on the transliteration of iii 49'.

74. Literally “sheep” (UDU), but this is obviously meant to denote the eight animals of various kinds listed in the previous sentence. See the note to the same use of UDU in ii 18 (§15).

75. Dinçöl and Darga follow Friedrich, HW 1. Erg. 25, in translating \(\text{g}^\text{š} \text{D} \text{IM}\) as “Brunnen.” See Otten, IM 19/20 (1969/1970) 85-91, on \(\text{g}^\text{š} \text{D} \text{IM}\) possibly standing for both kurakki- and šarḫuši-, with evidence for understanding it as an architectural element of a house and translating it as “pillar” or “post.” CAD M vol. 1: 143 cites the Akkadian word \(\text{m} \text{ak} \text{u} \text{tu}\) for \(\text{g}^\text{š} \text{D} \text{IM}\) and suggests the meaning “pillar(?).” Ünal, JCS 40 (1988) 102-04, provides a thorough discussion of pillars in Hittite architecture.
§38' 8 [ta AŠ UDUN ḫal-zi-ya-rį NINDA-a-a-an] NINDA.UTUL.ḪILA ku-e pār-ši-ya-an-z[i]
9 [tāk-kān 4 a-na-ḫi-tja]76 ar-ḫa da-aš-kān-zi na-at-kān GISZAG.GAR.RA-ȗn[i]
10 [EGIR-pa ti-an]-zi UZU[ku-du-ra-kan A-NA GISZAG.GAR.RA
11 [ti-an-zi İŠ-TU B][I-IB-RI GUB-aš 3-ŠU a-ku-wa-a[n-z]i
13 [ti-an-zi LŪ.IME]Š ḫu-u-ma-an-te-eš wa-a[l-ḫi ta-wa-a][? NAG-zī

15 [na]-at AŠ ĖU.LG.MUḪALDIM [p]e-e-da-an-z[i]
16 UD 1 KAM AŠ <Ē>78 SA Ùû É-[TTM] URU:ka-ili1-ya-aš

(blank space of about 13 lines)

Colophon (transliteration)

DUB 1 KAM QA-TI
ŠA EZEN.M[EŠ]
URUGa-ra-[aḥ-n]a

76. Alp, *Anadolu* 2 (1957) 18, reads the beginning of this line as [... na-a]t, as does Dressler, *Plur.* 181. Dinçol and Darga suggest reading [... a-na-ḫi-t]a, which fits the trace on the tablet better and makes very good sense in the sentence.

77. Lines 13–14 are restored based on the similar context of paragraphs 29'–30'. Although Dinçol and Darga's DINGIR-LIM is an excellent suggestion, there is too much space at the beginning of line 14 for just that. There is also a problem in having what looks like a word space between TÚZU77 and Š[u-.

78. Dinçol and Darga make the excellent suggestion of reading Ė without noting that the tablet does not actually have it. The divine name in this line looks like ṬLIŠ, but the vertical is faint on the tablet, and ṬU Ė is the god being worshipped in this particular ceremony, so I concur with Dinçol and Darga in reading this as ṬU Ė. The a in URU:ka-li1-ya-aš also has an extra wedge which shows no signs of being erased but should not be there.
§38'  ["In the oven" i]s [called out]. They take (iterative) away [four sample]s of the warmed breads and stew-bread which they break, and the[y place] them [back] on the altar. The thigh also [they place] on the altar. They drink three times [from a r]hyton, standing. They [break 4 thick breads and place] them [ba]ck [on] the altar. Every[one] drinks wa[lḥi (and) tawal].

§39'  They take up the [go]d [and] the fl[esh] and carry them into the house of the cooks. One day, in the <temple> of the Stormgod of the House of the city Akaliya.

(blank space of about 13 lines)

Colophon (translation)

One tablet, finished, of the festival[s] of Kara[ḥn]a.
Bo 1513 = IBoT 1.5 is a fragment measuring approximately 5 cm wide by 3.8 cm high. Its surface is fairly well preserved. Its script is quite neat and regular, with very clearly distinct wedges. There is not enough preserved text to allow a dating of the script. We can say, however, that the script is sufficiently different from that of KUB 25.32+ to preclude the possibility that this is a join to the main text.

Although Laroche, presumably on the basis of the occurrence of ԴU.KARAS in line 2',catalogues IBoT 1.5 as part of CTH 681, festivals of Karahna, there is not enough of the fragment preserved to make any kind of positive identification for it. Dinçöl and Darga do not include this piece in their edition because its relationship to KUB 25.32+ is too uncertain. A transliteration of the fragment is included below, but the information added by this piece, even if it is part of the same festival descriptions, is negligible.

**Transliteration**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{x+1} & \quad \{x \ I-NA \ x[ \\
2' & \quad \{x \ \text{LUGAL-uš A-NA} \ ԴU.KA[RAS} \\
3' & \quad \{x \ \text{I AMAR 4 UDU-ya ši-p[a-an-ti} \\
4' & \quad \{x \ A-NA ԴIB} \\
5' & \quad \{x \ ԴHal-k[i}
\end{align*}
\]

**COMMENTARY**

Dinçöl and Darga, in their edition of this text (pp. 116–18), make some comments on the festival described therein. They note that the first part of the tablet, ending with §15' (ii 17–18), describes a three day festival that included offerings to many gods and was probably held at Karahna. Following this three day festival are descriptions of six one day festivals, separated from each other by double paragraph lines and celebrated in several different locations. Dinçöl and Darga enumerate these six one day festivals and note that all seven festivals are probably independent of one another. The plural form EZEN.MES in the colophon is adduced as further evidence that these festival descriptions are considered as separate units. This interpretation seems the correct one for understanding the somewhat unusual organization of the tablet. There are none of the references to the king or other cultic personnel going from one place to another which might have indicated that this was a description of a cultic journey. Although the festivals take place in different localities and provide offerings for different gods, the formulas for the offerings and cultic procedure remain very similar throughout the text, indicating that the festivals were probably all performed in the same region with the same basic plan. One distinctive feature in the last festival, that for the Stormgod of the House, is the placing of one sheep at the ԴSabama, the pillar(?), in addition to the eight sheep at the altar. Whatever the exact meaning of ԴSabama may be, as noted above in the footnote at the end of §35' in the translation, it is some kind of architectural element such as “pillar.” It is therefore interesting to see the prominence given to this “pillar” when a deity specifically related to the house is worshipped. In the
foundation ritual KUB 55.26+Bo 7740

Throughout the text there are a number of phrases of the pattern ANA (noun) EGIR-pa tianzi. The noun is most commonly GIS ZAG.GAR.RA “altar” or NA.ZI.KIN “stela,” although it can also be other cult items such as a haršiyal vessel. The pattern varies somewhat; sometimes ANA is absent and the noun has a Hittite phonetic complement indicating dative-locative case, sometimes there is no indication of case for the noun, the form of the verb dai- may change, or, rarely, there may even be some other verb. This pattern has caused no little problem in translation and in thus trying to understand the ceremonial activities of the festival and their significance. Possible translations of, for example, n-at ANA GIS ZAG.GAR.RA EGIR-[pa] tianzi (iii 9'-10') could be “They put it behind the altar,” or “They put it back on the altar.” In favor of the first translation is the syntax that places appa (EGIR-pa) in the place of a postposition following a noun in the dative-locative, where it could mean “behind.” In addition, in none of the cases is there a mention of the offerings having previously been on the altar/stela, so it becomes difficult to understand how they can be put “back.” In favor of the second translation is our understanding of appa in general as an adverb, the normal postposition “behind” being appan. The Hittites did not always observe this distinction, however. In certain cases sense dictates the latter interpretation, such as i 19–20 (§3), where it makes more sense that the celebrants would be putting cereal offerings back into the inner chamber of the god than behind the chamber. An analogous situation may be seen all through the kursa- Festival, in which the offerings are put back on the kurša-. The syntax is different, but the idea of putting offerings back on the cult object is the same.

Perhaps all of the necessary offering materials were set out on the altars or stelae before the ritual of sacrificing began, which would explain how such offerings could then be placed “back” on the altar. This, however, cannot always be the case, as for example in §20, in which the samples were in the oven immediately before being placed “back” on the stela. In §18, if ii 26 is correctly restored, the Sungod is carried out to the grove where his cult-stela is and then is placed “back” on it. Another difficulty is that sometimes offering materials are simply placed (without appa) on the altar or stela. Does this imply that not all offerings were set out ahead of time? In iii 30’ and 36’ the flesh (šuppa-) or entire animals are placed on the altar or stela without appa. This makes sense when we consider how difficult it would be to keep an animal on an altar before it was sacrificed.

It may not make a great deal of difference whether the offerings, or in one case the god himself (ii 26), is placed on or behind an altar. I have chosen to translate this phrase to express the idea of putting materials back on the altar or stela rather than behind them. In

80. Friedrich, HW 25, suggests that appa could function as a postposition “behind” governing the ablative in some of the laws but notes the more regular postposition appan. Kammenhuber, HW2 1:148–49 sub appa (which includes appan and appanda), lists appa as an adverb and appan as the regular postposition.
81. KUB 55.43 passim; see Chapter 4.
my opinion this presents fewer problems in understanding the process of these ceremonies of offerings.

The city Karahna was an important cult center and as such has been discussed by several scholars. Jakob-Rost points out that the Tutelary Deity of Karahna was one of only a few deities for whom there was a daily regimen of cult offerings in operation and notes that any city whose deity received daily offerings must be an important cult city. Some of the evidence for Karahna as a major cult center is the existence of the cult inventory text for the city. In their article on Karahna, in the Reallexikon der Assyriologie, Otten and Röllig summarize the cultic activity attested for this city and cite occurrences of the Tutelary Deity of Karahna in other texts. The prominence given to the cultic tradition of this city provides an excellent example of the characteristic Hittite tendency to ensure the prosperity of local cults at some distance from the capital, the locus of the state cult. The king’s participation in all of the individual festivals to local deities indicates his role in preserving the state’s attitude of propitiation to the gods and the fact that those gods must be worshipped at their own cult loci. Del Monte, in the entry for Karahna in RGTC 6 (1978) 177–80, also gives an indication of the importance of the city. More recently Alp writes on the location of Karahna, and, citing evidence from Maşat texts, proposes that Karahna is north of and close to Maşat Höyük.

This northern localization of Karahna is interesting in light of the deities worshipped in this festival, seen especially in the list of deities who receive offerings in §5 of KUB 25.32+. Danmanville suggests that this list reveals a Hurro-Hittite syncretism, although she does not give any details of the Hurrian elements in the list. In fact the partially Hurrian nature of the list of deities in KUB 25.32+ §5 is seen only in Istar of Samuha (i 25) and Ḫepat mušuni (i 26), a Hurrian goddess with a Hurrian epithet. There is also at least one deity with a Luwian epithet, ḬAMMA wašhzazza in i 27. Beyond these few names, however, the names of the deities in this list seem all to be part of the Hattic or Hittite tradition. There is also the frequent employment of the Hurrian or Luwian word anahi, sample-offerings, another example of the inclusion in this festival of later elements from outside the older Hattic sphere.

That the worship of the Tutelary Deity of Karahna extended beyond this local cult and its northern homeland is clear from her inclusion in many other texts besides this festival. Otten and Röllig point out that the Tutelary Deity of Karahna occurs in KUB 30.29 obv. 11, a Birth Ritual among Hattic gods, and in KUB 27.1 i 67, the Festival of Istar of

82. MIO 8 (1963) 170.
83. KUB 38.12 with duplicate KUB 38.15; see Rost, MIO 8 (1963) 200–01; Darga, RHA XXVII/84–85 (1969) 5–11; and idem, İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları no. 1825 (1973) 1–45.
84. RLA 5 (1976–80) 403.
86. RHA XX/70 (1962) 56–57.
87. See comments on this word in the footnote to the translation.
88. RLA 5: 403.
THE FESTIVALS OF KARAḤNA

Šamuḫa,⁹⁰ among Hurrian gods. The evidence from the birth ritual has led Beckman to suggest that DLAMMA Ḫaraḫna might be a Hattic deity.⁹¹ The occurrences of her name among Hurrian gods and the late date for the writing down of these festivals is evidence that her cult remained active throughout the Hittite kingdom, and that she was included in newer cults. See Chapter 1 for further discussion of the Tutelary Deity of Karaḫna.

The language of the text reflects a mixing of old and new elements. The text is unusual in that frequently Sumerograms are written without any Akkadian preposition or Hittite phonetic complement to indicate their case, although syntax often indicates that their case must be dative-locative. It is possible that this is simply due to the lack of proficiency of the scribe, already noted above in the comments on the script. This text is dated OH/NS by the CHD; see for instance CHD sub (:)lim(m)a-, morphology section. Melchert⁹² also gives this text his equivalent of an OH/NS dating. Some elements of the language definitely indicate an Old Hittite date for the original composition. The location of the festivals around the cult city Karahna in the original Hittite homeland, if the northern localization is correct, is consistent with an Old Hittite composition. The use of the sentence particle ta in i 43, ii 28, ii 35, and elsewhere is very strong evidence for dating the original composition Old Hittite.

Despite the evidence for an Old Hittite archetype, in the recopying of the text in the late Empire some NH elements crept into the text. For example, there are numerous examples of a plural common accusative enclitic pronoun in -aš- instead of -uš-, i 46, ii 15, etc. In i 55 and iii 12' we have humantēš as a plural common accusative, and no examples of the expected Old Hittite form humanduš. In addition to the later forms of Hittite words, we have in mušuni, i 16, at least one definite Hurrian word, the Luwian word wasḫazza in i 17, the dative-locative irhatti in ii 16 and iii 12, which is probably Luwian and Hittite,⁹³ and repeated use of anaḫi, which may be Hurrian or Luwian. These newer elements should be understood as additions by the scribe who copied the tablet in the Empire period, even if the archetype was Old Hittite.

Laroche's identification of the Tap(a)rami named on the KUB 25.32+ seal with the Tabrammi mentioned in RS 17.231 and RS 17.337 and his consequent dating of the text to Tudḫaliya IV fit well with the evidence of the script. Although the identification of the Ras Shamra Tabrammi and the KUB 25.32+ Tap(a)rami is not certain, it is a very good possibility which Danmanville,⁹⁴ and Dincol and Darga (p. 118) accept. Laroche goes on to suggest that the writing of the festivals of Karaḫna during Tudḫaliya's reign accords well with what we know of the religious reorganization efforts of this king. We know that this reorganization included work at Karaḫna because of the cult inventory for that city now published as KUB 38.12 with duplicate KUB 38.15 (CTH 517).

---

⁹⁰ Ed. Lebrun, Samuha 77 and 88.
⁹¹ StBoT29: 29 n. 38.
⁹² Diss. 65.
⁹³ Cf. Laroche, DLL 52 sub irhatt-.
⁹⁴ RHA XX/70 (1962) 56.
The evidence of language, script, and contents indicate that this text is an Old Hittite composition that describes festivals dating to the early years of the Hittite state which was recopied and modified in the time of Tudḥaliya IV in the late thirteenth century. As such it demonstrates the conservative nature of the cult in second millennium Anatolia. Offerings ceremonies which go back not just to the beginning of the Hittite cult, but which, from the evidence of the Hattic divine names, are based on the cult antedating the Hittites, continued to be celebrated in the last days of the Empire. The history of this particular festival description thus epitomizes the Hittite monarch’s role in preserving ancient religious traditions from all over the empire, his active participation in maintaining those traditions, and his importance in providing for the continued celebration of those ceremonies right down to the last days of the Hittite Empire.
CHAPTER 3
THE FESTIVAL FOR ALL THE TUTELARY DEITIES

INTRODUCTION

Among the myriad festival texts preserved from the Hittite archives is a unique composition, preserved in numerous copies and two versions, which purports to enumerate and provide offerings for all the tutelary deities recognized by the Hittites.¹ This festival provides a fascinating insight into the Hittite religious perspective, as it apparently creates new tutelary deities to protect everything the writer can think of. Much of the festival description is simply a long listing of tutelary deities designed to protect the interests and life of the king, denoted by the royal title Labarna. Most of these deities are unattested elsewhere. The festival is now preserved in two distinct versions, one in which the gods are listed in large blocks under a few offering prescriptions (The Festival of Group Offerings), and another in which for each god the required offerings are prescribed individually (The Festival of Individual Offerings). Most of the copies of the festival are late, and several, including the main text KUB 2.1, mention the king Tudḫaliya IV several times. As discussed in the Commentary at the end of this chapter, the original composition may have been earlier than Tudḫaliya IV. The Hittite penchant for seeking out and worshipping all possible manifestations of the divine is illustrated beautifully by this experiment in diversification.

THE TWO VERSIONS OF THE FESTIVAL

The Festival of Group Offerings

I have called this version the Festival of Group Offerings because the texts describing this festival in general contain long lists of deities without specifying offerings for them.

¹ The text is catalogued by Laroche as CTH 682. It is discussed at length by Archi, SMEA 16 (1975) 89–117, in an article which includes a transliteration of the main festival text with a translation of individual epithets by category. Page numbers cited for Archi refer to this edition. While acknowledging my debt to Archi and his work on this text, I have included a new reconstruction of two different festivals with transliteration and translation. I also include here other tablets published since his article. See pp. 6f. in the Introduction for a complete text scheme.
individually. The emphasis seems to be on the diversity of the deities and not on the ceremony or offerings. I distinguish this from the festival treated later in the chapter, in which the same gods receive their offerings individually. The following reconstruction is based on the evidence of the ways the various duplicate texts overlap. The order is not in every case definite, and there are gaps in the text. The main text KUB 2.1 is almost exclusively a list of tutelary deities and specifies almost none of the cult offerings to be provided for those deities.

The reverse of KUB 44.16+IBoT 3.69 duplicates part of the list contained in the main text, but its obverse preserves part of the festival procedure.² Because the colophon is missing in the main text, KUB 2.1, we do not know how many tablets were utilized to describe this festival or where in that sequence (if there was more than one tablet) KUB 2.1 fell. KUB 44.16 cannot be a previous tablet of the same series as KUB 2.1, because it duplicates some of that text. Because the reverse of KUB 44.16 duplicates part of the obverse of KUB 2.1, the obverse of KUB 44.16 must be an earlier portion of the festival than KUB 2.1. If KUB 2.1 was in a series of tablets, the text of KUB 44.16 obverse must have duplicated the tablet before KUB 2.1 in that series. The preserved beginning of KUB 44.16 contains what looks like the usual preparations for a cult ceremony and may therefore be the beginning of the festival. The few preserved words of column iii in IBoT 3.69 indicate that column iii was not a list of deities such as is found on the reverse, but rather a description of festival procedure like column ii. The reverse of KUB 44.16 probably duplicated the first three columns of the main text, and the three columns of the obverse contained a description of the portion of the festival to be performed before the offerings to the long list of gods preserved in KUB 2.1. KUB 44.16+IBoT 3.69 is probably the first of a two-tablet series of which the second tablet duplicated the reverse of KUB 2.1.

KUB 2.1 was probably the second in a series, with a first duplicating the obverse of KUB 44.16+IBoT 3.69. KBo 22.189, whose column ii duplicates column ii of KUB 44.16, but whose reverse does not duplicate any part of KUB 2.1 but rather contains further descriptions of cult ceremony, seems to be a tablet which contained a cult ceremony to be performed before the lists of KUB 2.1. Although much of KBo 22.189 is broken away, enough of each column is preserved that we can be certain that the entire tablet (with the possible exception of column vi, which cannot be checked) contained descriptions of festival procedures and not the long list of all the LAMMA and Ala deities which the main text, KUB 2.1, contains.

Aside from the references to the king going into the temple of the Tutelary Deity (ii 3) and the temple of Inara (ii 8), there is no mention of tutelary deities in KBo 22.189. The only link with the list of LAMMA and Ala deities is KUB 44.16, which duplicates KBo 22.189 on its obverse (festival descriptions) and duplicates KUB 2.1 on its reverse (part of the list of all the tutelary deities). As KBo 22.189 has festival procedures in all six columns, it is apparently a fuller description of the festival (or a description of a longer

² Column v duplicates KUB 2.1 ii 22–41, column vi duplicates KUB 2.1 iii 46–iv 23. Presumably the lost column iv of KUB 44.16 duplicated the first column of the main text.
more extensive festival) than that in KUB 44.16. It is likely that either KBo 22.189 or one of its duplicates, KUB 11.21, IBoT 4.73, or 754/t, was originally the first tablet in a series of which KUB 2.1, containing the actual list of deities to receive offerings, was the second tablet. Whatever its exact relationship to KUB 2.1, KBo 22.189 is linked to it by the evidence of KUB 44.16 and is therefore an essential source for a portion of this festival before the long offerings lists of KUB 2.1. Reverse v of KUB 11.21 duplicates KBo 22.189 iii and its column iv thus perhaps fills in part of the ceremony lost in KBo 22.189 ii. The fragmentary state of all the tablets has required the conflation of exemplars from originally different series.

Text Scheme

A. KUB 2.1.
C. KUB 44.16 + IBoT 3.69. Columns i–iii describe offerings, column v duplicates A ii 22–41, vi duplicates A iii 46–iv 23.
E. KBo 22.189. Column i lost, column ii duplicates C ii 8'–25', but the reverse does not duplicate the main text KUB 2.1.
G. IBoT 4.73. Duplicates E v 6'–11'.

---

3. Based on the work of Laroche, CTH 682, Archi, SMEA 16 (1975) 105, and new material.
4. Join published after Archi’s article by Laroche, OLZ 72 (1977) 33. IBoT 3.69 ii x+1–11' joins KUB 44.16 ii 6'–16'. IBoT 3.69 provides a small portion of a third column on the obverse, so this tablet may now be recognized as a six column tablet, and the two columns preserved on the reverse of KUB 44.16 can be identified as v (labeled iii? in the copy) and vi (iv? in the copy). Archi’s iv? under KUB 44.16 in his text scheme is now v, and his v? is now vi. Archi, p. 111 n. 57, cites KUB 44.16 iv? 11 when he means v? (now secured as vi) 11.
5. Archi, p. 105 n. 25, suggests that this fragment might be part of the same tablet as KBo 2.38. Although I could not compare the two directly, collation of both indicates that they could possibly be from the same tablet.
6. KBo 22.189 is edited by Lebrun, Hethitica 2 (1977) 8–13. He suggests that this text is part of the multi-day festival for the AN.TAḪ,ŠUM plant. He gives, however, no convincing evidence for this, nor does he mention that part of KBo 22.189 duplicates KUB 44.16, which is firmly linked with KUB 2.1, the main text of the Festival of Group Offerings.
Transliteration

C = KUB 44.16+IBoT 3.69

Obverse i

§1'x+1 [LUGAL-uš-za KINḪI.A-ta] ḪUB.BIḪA KŪ.BABBAR
2' [ ... da-a-i LUGAL-uš-kán I-NA?] É.DU₁₀.ÚŠ.SA ú-iz-zi
3' [ ta-aš ḫa-le-en-tu-w]a-aš pa-iz-zi
4' [ GAL DUMU É.GAL gaškal-mu-juš LUGAL-i pa-a-i

§2' 5' [ na-aš-ta LŠAGI.A pár-aš-n]a?u-wa-aš ú-iz-zi
6' [ 2 DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL LUGAL-]i₁₁ pf-ra-an ḫu-u-ya-an<te>-eš
7' [ 1]L]Ü.MEŠ UR.BAR.RA-ya
8' [ a-ra-an-da

§3' 9' [ ]l₁ u-ya[-x-z]i
10' [ UŠ-K]E-EN.NU ?

(the column breaks off)

C = KUB 44.16+IBoT 3.69

Obverse ii

§4'x+1 x[

§5' 2' DINGIR.MEŠ
3' UR.M[AH

§6' 4' L0N[AR
5' LŪ.MEŠ x[

§7' 6' na-at x[
7' UGULA LŪ.MEŠ UR.BAR.RA i-ya-]at-ta-ri
8' ta-at r₇[(arki-ú-i)] [ti-ya]₁-an-zi

§8' 9' na-aš-ta LUGAL-uš [(ʃka-t)]al-pu-uz-ni-az
10' kat-ta ú-iz-[z][i]₁²

8. Restorations are from the similar texts KUB 11.35 i 10'–21' (Winter Festival) and KUB 10.21 i 4–13 (fest. fragment).
9. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
11. Text E ii 2: ʃka-ta-pu-uz-na-az, text H 3' has -n]a-az. This word is always attested as a pure a-stem except for this example in KUB 44.16+.
12. There is no paragraph divider following this word in text E.
Translation

C = KUB 44.16+IBoT 3.69

Obverse i

§1' [The king takes his festival attire:] the silver earrings [and ... The king] comes [into] the cultic washing house. [ ... ] He goes into the [halent]u- building. [The chief palace attendant] gives the [litu]us to the king.

§2' [ ... The cupbearer of squat]ting comes. [Two palace attendants] (are) running in front of [the kin]g. [ ... ] and the wolf-men. [ ... ] they [st]and.

§3' (too fragmentary to translate)

(the column breaks off)

C = KUB 44.16+IBoT 3.69

Obverse ii

§§4'–6' (Too fragmentary to translate.)

§7' Then x[... ]x. The overseer of the w[olf]-men [go]es [ ... ]. They step into the passageway.14

§8' The king comes down from the balcony(?).15

13. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

14. Singer, StBoT 27 (1983) 106–11, thoroughly discusses the evidence and previous work on the #arkiu-. He concludes that this word denotes the passageway in the gates. Kammenhuber, HW 2 Lief. 4 (1979) 307–09 does not commit herself as to what type of structure this is. Puhvel, HED 1–2 (1984) 148, translates “anteroom, foyer, vestibule,” apparently without having Singer’s StBoT 27 discussion available to him.

15. See Singer, StBoT 27 (1983) 116, on the kattapuzna- as a porch or balcony near the main exit of the palace. Alp, Tempel (1983) 196–97 n. 192, also localizes the kattapuzna- near a door by suggesting that it is near the “Vorhalle” and is the place where the king ascends the chariot during the celebration of the festival in KBo 10.24 (K.I.LAM). Lebrun, Hethitica 2 (1977) 14, had earlier suggested that it was a building of the sanctuary but did not adduce any evidence for such a suggestion.
C = KUB 44.16+IBoT 3.69

Obverse ii (transliteration cont.)

§9 11' LUGAL-uš I-NA[^EPLA[(MMA)] pa-iz-zi 2 DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL
12' 1 LÚ ME-ŠE-DI[^5ŠUKUR A[N].BAR-aš har-zi 1 DUMU É.GAL
13' AN.BAR-aš ma-a-ri-in[^6LUGAL-i pf-ra-an
H 14' ḫu-u-i-ya-an-

16' [nu? (L)]UGAL-uš I[NA[^EPLAMMA]]A pa-iz-zi[^12]

§11 17' [(ha-an-te-ez-zi KASKAL-NI NIN.DINGI)]R-aš
18' [(UGULA[13ME-ša-pf-ya-aš DUMU É.G])AL ḫi-lam-ni
19' [(a-ra-an-da)][^25]

§12' 20' [(NIN.DINGIR LUGAL-i ḫi-ik-zi) n]am-ma-aš ḫi-i-li-ya-aš
21' [ti-ya-z[^26]

§13' 22' [(DUMU É.GAL ME-E QA-TI pé-e-)]da-i
23' [(LUGAL-uš QA-TI-ŠU a-ar-ri GA)]L DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL[27 GAD-an
24' [(pa-a-i LUGAL-uš QA-TE[^MEŠ SU a-an-š)]i[^28]

E §14' 25' [(NI)N.DINGIR(R ḫ)i-(i-l)i ti-ya?-zi]
26' [ti-ya-z[^26]

16. Text E ii 3 omits INA.
17. Text E ii 4 has LÚ ME-ŠE-*ME-ŠE-*DI.
18. Text E ii 4: AN.BAR odŠUKUR.
20. Text E ii 6 before LUGAL-i has 1 LÚ ME-ŠE-DI.
21. Text E ii 7 has ḫu-ya-an-te-eš and no paragraph divider.
23. See Košak, FsGüterbock² 126–27 on lines ii 12’–15’. 
25. From text E ii 11, which has no paragraph divider.
26. Text E ii 12 has, after ḫi-kezi, LUGAL-uš ḫi-i-li ti-i-e-zi. It would be strange here in KUB 44.16 to express LUGAL-uš when the sentence already contains the enclitic -aš- as a subject. LUGAL-uš has therefore not been restored in the break in 21'. The form ḫiliyas is unique, although its identification as an otherwise unattested i-stem form of ḫila- is indicated by ḫili in the duplicate. It is most likely to be a genitive, as dative-locative plural would not make good sense in this sentence. This suggests that whatever was in the break in line 21' was something denoting a location within the courtyard in a genitive construction with ḫiliyas. Both a "gate" (KÁ) and a "door" (IG) of the ḫila- are attested, so perhaps "[T]hen he proceeds to the [gate/door] of the courtyard."
27. Text E ii 14: GAL DUMU É.GAL.
28. From text E ii 15, where again there is no paragraph divider.
§9' The king goes into the temple of the Tutelary Deity. (There are) two palace attendants. One royal bodyguard holds a ŠUKUR-spear of iron; one palace attendant holds a māri-spear of iron. They run in front of the king.

§10' The king holds the māri-spear of iron. The king goes into the temple of the Tutelary Deity.29

§11' On the first occasion the NIN.DINGIR priestess, the overseer of the ḫapiya-men, (and) the palace attendant stand in the gate house.

§12' The NIN.DINGIR priestess bows to the king. Then he proceeds to the [gate/door] of the courtyard(?).30

§13' The palace attendant carries (in) the hand-water. The king washes his hands. The chief of the palace attendants gives (him) a linen cloth. The king wipes his hands.

§14' The NI[N.DING]IR priestess [step]s(?) into the courtyard and [ ... ]'s.

29. Text E "temple of Inara."

30. See the footnote to the transliteration of KUB 44.16 ii 21'.
C = KUB 44.16+IBoT 3.69

Obverse ii (transliteration cont.)

§15' 27' [GAL MEŠED]-ma [LO SAGI] T[GŠ]-e[k]-nu-un e.ep-zi
28' [na-an LUGAL-i pa-ra-a pé-e-[Hu-te-ez-zi ... še-er d]a?-a-i
29' [ o o o o o o o o o o ]
31' [ o o o o o o o o o o ] [x x]

F = KUB 11.21

Reverse iv32 (transliteration)

§16'x+1 UGULA [LO MES MUḪALDIM] [NINDA]Ḫar-za-zu-un]
2' LUGAL-i? [pa-a-i]
3' LUGAL-uš [pa-ši-ya]
4' UGULA [LO MES MUḪALDIM] [NINDA]Ḫar-za-zu-un]
5' GIS ZAG.GAR.RA-[ni da-a-i]
6' 1 NINDAḪar-za-zu-[u n ḫa-aš-ši-i]
7' 1 NINDAḪar-za-zu-[un [GIS DAG-ti]
8' 1 NINDAḪar-za-zu-[un [GIS AB-ya]
9' 1 NINDAḪar-za-zu-[un GISḪ[a-at-tal-wa-aš]
10' GIS i 1 NINDAḪar-za-zu-[un nam-ma [Ḫa-aš-ši-i]
11' ta-pu-uš-za da-a-i

§17' 12' UGULA [LO MES MUḪALDIM] me-ma-al LUGAL-[i]
13' pa-ra-a e.ep-zi
14' LUGAL-uš me-ma-al GIS ZAG.GAR.RA-ni]
15' 6-ŠU iš-[Ḫu-u-wa-a-i

§18' 16' UGULA [LO MES MUḪALDIM] me-ma-li-it AS-Ř¹[LA]
17' ir-Ḫa-iz-zi ḫa-aš-ši-i 1-ŠU
18' GIS DAG-ti 1-ŠU GIS AB-ya 1-ŠU
19' GISḪa-at-tal-wa-aš GIS i 1-ŠU
20' nam-ma ḫa-aš-ši-i ta-pu-uš-za
21' 1-ŠU iš-[Ḫu-u-wa-i

§19' 22' UGULA [LO MES MUḪALDIM] ta-pi-ša-na-an
23' ta-wa-la-aš LUGAL-i pa-ra-a e-[p-zi]
24' LUGAL-uš-ša-an QA-TAM da-a-i
25' [ o o ]x iš-ta-na-ni[

(the tablet breaks off)

31. Restorations in §15' are from the similar texts KBo 20.67+ iii 9–10 and KUB 20.78 iv 13–14 (both Festival of the Month), and KBo 21.85+KBo 8.109 i 7–9 (Festival of the Moon and Thunder).
32. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
C = KUB 44.16+IBoT 3.69

Obverse ii (translation cont.)

§15' [The chief royal bodyguard] takes [the cupbearer by (his) cloak. [He leads him forth to the king ... on top] he [p]laces. [ ... ] [The king breaks (a bread type).] He gives [it b]ack [to the cupbearer]. [ ... ] I x x

(The column breaks off)

F = KUB 11.21

Reverse iv\(^{33}\) (translation)

§16' The overseer of the c[ooks gives harzazu- bread] to the king. The king [breaks (it)]. The overseer of the c[ooks places harzazu- bread on] the altar. One harzazu- bread [to the hearth], one harzazu- bread [to the throne], one harzazu- bread [to the window], one harzazu- bread to the wood [of the] do[or bolt], and finally one harzazu- bread next [to the hearth], he sets out.

§17' The overseer of the cooks holds out meal [to] the king. The king scatters the meal six times [on] the altar.

§18' The overseer of the cooks makes the rounds of the holy places with meal: To the hearth once, to the throne once, to the window once, to the wood of the door bolt once, and finally next to the hearth once he scatters (it).

§19' The overseer of the cooks hol[ds] out a pitcher of tawal to the king. The king takes it in his hand. [... ] to the altar [... ]

(The tablet breaks off)

\(^{33}\) After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

F = KUB 11.21

Reverse v\(3^\text{rd}\) (transliteration)

\(\text{§20'}\times+1\) [ o o o o o ] da-a-i

\(\text{§21'}\) 2'[UGULALMUḪALDIM \text{NINDA}\[\text{har-}]za-zu-un L[UGAL-i pa-a-i]

3'[UGULAL-usher-pär-ši-ya] 1 \text{NINDA}[\text{har-}]za[-zu-un]

4' [\text{ha-aš}-ši-i 1 \text{NINDA}\text{har-z}a[-zu-un \text{GISDAG}-ti]

5'[1 \text{NINDA}\text{har-za-zu-un \text{GIS}}\[\text{AB}-ya 1 \text{NINDA}\text{har-za-zu-un]

6'[GIS\[\text{ha-at-tal-wa-aš GIS-}]1 1 \text{NINDA}\text{har-za-zu-un}

7'[nam-ma \text{ha-aš}-ši-1]i1 ta-pu-uš-za da-a-i

\(\text{§22'}\) 8'[UGULAL-usher] x-az kat-ta ú-iz-zi

9'[GAL LÜ.MEŠ GEŠTIN?] 1? \text{DU}g\[\text{har-ši-ya-al-li]

10'[pa-ra-a e-cp-zi?] pa-iz-zi GAL \text{ME-ŠE-DI} e-eš-zi

11'[UGULALMUḪALDIM?] GAL LÜ.MEŠ GEŠTIN-y a EGIR LUGAL

12'[i-ya-an-ta-r]

\(\text{§23'}\) 13'[UGULALLÜ.MEŠ GIS}BAN\]SUR 1 NINDA.KUR₄,RA LUGAL-i

14'[pa-ra-a e-ej-p-zi LUGAL-usher QÀ-TAM da-a-i

15'[UGULALLÜ.MEŠ GIS}BAN\]SUR pär-ši-ya ta-an-kán\(^{36}\)

16'[\text{(D)}UG\[\text{har-ši-ya-al-lj} da-a-i\(^{37}\)] GAL LÜ.MEŠ GEŠTIN-kán\(^{38}\)

17'[\text{(D)}UG\[\text{har-ši-ya-al-J} li ki-nu-uš-zi\(^{39}\)

18'[GAL LÜ.MEŠ GEŠTIN?] GAL KÜ.BABBAR LUGAL-i pa-a-i

19'[LUGAL (GEŠTIN]IN ša-ra-a 3-ŠU ĥu-it-ti-ya-zi

20'[\text{(EGIR-S)\text{-}U}ma] 3-ŠU la-ḥu-u-wa-i\(^{40}\)

\(\text{§24'}\) 21'[nu (GAL)] DUMU.MEŠ Ė.GAL GAL KÜ.BABBAR ar-ḥa da-a-i

22'[na-aš?] GEŠTIN ša-ra-a 3-ŠU

23'[hu-it-ti-y]a-zi kat-ta-ya-at

24'[(3-ŠU)] la-a[-]u-wa-i GAL DUMU.MEŠ Ė.GAL

25'[t]a ta-pf-ša-ni KÜ.BABBAR

26'[la-ḥu-u-wa-]i1

\(\text{§25'}\) 27'[] \text{ú-iz}1-zi

(the tablet breaks off)

34. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

35. Text E iii 2: GAL LÜ\[.\]


37. Paragraph divider in text E.

38. Text E iii 4: GAL.GEŠTIN-kán.

39. Text E iii 5: ki-i-nu-uf[\text{z-zi}].

40. Text E has no paragraph divider.
§20' [ ... ] he sets out.

§21' [The overseer of the cooks gives ẖarzu- bread to] the king. The king breaks (it).] One ẖarz[zu-] bread [to the hearth], one ẖarz[a-] bread [to the throne, one ẖarza- bread] to the window, one ẖarz[zu-] bread to [the wood of the door bolt, and finally] one ẖarz[zu-] bread beside [the heart].

§22' [The king] comes down from the x. [The chief of the wine stewards(?) holds out(??)] a storage container. [x] goes. The chief royal bodyguard is (there). [The overseer of the cooks] and the chief of the wine stewards [walk] behind the king.

§23' [The overseer of the wait]ers [ho]lds [out] one thick bread to the king. The king takes it in his hand. [The overseer of the wait]ers breaks it. He places it in [the storage container]. The chief of the wine stewards breaks [the storage contain]er. [The chief of the wine stew]ards(?) gives a silver cup to the king. [The king] draws up the wine three times. Then he pours it out three times.

§24' The chief of the palace attendants takes away the silver cup. [He dra]ws the wine up three times, and he pours it down [three times]. The chief of the palace attendants [pour]s [x] into a silver pitcher.

§25' [ ... ] comes. [ ... ]

(the tablet breaks off)

41. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

E = KBo 22.189 Reverse iv\(^42\) (transliteration)

\(\$26'x+1\)

1] x [ LUGAL-i pf-ra-an
2'] ĥu-u-ya-an-t[e-eš? LUGAL-uš
3' a-ra-aḫ-za [ū-iz-zi

\(\$27'\)

4'] LUGAL-uš-kán a[n-da]
5' ṣḫa-le-en-[u-wa pa-iz-zi]
6' wa-ga-an-na ḫal-z[i-ya]
7' LUGAL-uš ṣḫa-le-[en-tu-az kat-ta]
8' ū-iz-zi 2 DUMU.M[EŠ Ė.GAL]
9' 1 L0ME-ŠE-DI L[U]GAL-i pf-ra-an
10' ĥu-i-ya-an-te-e[s a-ša-an-zi]
11' gal-gal-tu-ri a[r-kam-mi]
12' LŪ.MEŠ x[ SĪR-RU]

(bottom of tablet)

E = KBo 22.189 Reverse v\(^43\) (transliteration)

\(\$28'x+1\)

[KAŠ? GEŠTIN? x][
2'] EGIR-pa PA-NI tar-ša[-an-zi-pa-aš da-a-i?]
3' nu ka-a-aš-mi-iš-ša-a ḫal-[za-a-i][Ø]

\(\$29'\)

4'] DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL ME-E QA-TI pé-e-da-an-zi
5'] ŠA GIŠŠUKUR DUMU É.GAL ĥu-u-up-pa-ra-aš
6'] A-NA DUMU É.GAL \(^{44}\) kat-ta-an GÜB-la-az
7'] i-ya-at-ta-ri\(^{45}\) GAL DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL
8'] GAD-an ĥar-zi GAL ME-ŠE-DI-\(^{46}\) GIIŠŠUKUR
9'] ĥar-zi na-aš-kán me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da
10'] ar-ta-ri (eras.)\(^{47}\) LUGAL SAL.LUGAL QA-TE\(^{48}\) ŠU.NU
11'] a-ar-ra-an-zi\(^{49}\) GAL DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL
12'] GAD-an pa-a-i nu-za ŠU.MEŠ-ŠU-NU
13'] a-an-ša-an-zi GAL DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL-kán

(bottom of tablet)

42. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs. Transliterated and translated by Alp, Tempel, 236–37.
43. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
44. Text G 1': J\(^{11}\) DUMU[ É.GAL] or \(^{1ANA}\) DUMU [É.GAL].
45. Text G has a paragraph line here.
46. Text G 4': GAL ME-ŠE-DI.
47. Text G has a paragraph line here.
48. Text G 7': ŠU.MEŠ-ŠU[-NU.
49. Text G 8': \(^{1a1-ra-an-} [zi].

oi.uchicago.edu
E = KBo 22.189

Reverse iv\(^{50}\) (translation)

\(\S 26'\) x[ ... ] Th[ey] (are) running [in front of the king]. [ ... The king comes] from outside.

\(\S 27'\) The king [goes] in[to] the balentu- building. Refreshment\(^{51}\) is cal[led]. The king comes [down out of] the hale[ntu-]. Two [palace] attendants (and) one royal bodyguard [are] running [in front of the king]. The galgalturi- instrument (and) the ar[kammi- instrument] (are played). The x[ ... ]-men [sing].

(bottom of tablet)

E = KBo 22.189

Reverse v\(^{52}\) (translation)

\(\S 28'\) Beer, wine, x[ and x] back before the tarš[anzipa- he places]. He ca[l]ls “kašnišša.”

\(\S 29'\) The palace attendants carry in hand-water. The palace attendant of the spear walks with the palace attendant of the basin on (his) left. The chief of the palace attendants holds the linen cloth. The chief royal bodyguard, however, holds the spear. He stands in front. The king (and) queen wash their hands. The chief of the palace attendants gives (them) the linen cloth. They wipe their hands. The chief of the palace attendants ... \(^{53}\)

(bottom of tablet)

---

50. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
51. Literally “for biting.”
52. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
53. This sentence is continued at the top of reverse vi, now lost.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

E = KBo 22.189

Reverse vi (transliteration)

Colophon

x+1 [ ... ]-ša-aš?
2' [ PA]-NI mA-nu-wa-an-za
3' [ŠU m-x] IS-UR

A = KUB 2.1

Obverse i (transliteration)

(approximately 39 lines missing)

§30' 40 [ o o o o o o ] 4A-la-aš x]
41 [ o o o o (-)uš]-ša-la-am-mi-eš-še gi-im-ra-aš

§31' 42 2 [GUD GAL] A-NA $UM!UL A LAMMA ḫu-u-ma-an-da-aš
43 ne-pi-ša-aš 4LAMMA URGa-ra-ḫa-na-aš-ša
44 4LAMMA-ri 4Kar-ši 4Ḫa-ba-an-ta-li-ya
45 URGa-la-tarl-ma-aš 4LAMMA URSAŠa-lu-wa-an-da-aš
46 4LAMMA-ri URSAŠa-ar-pa-aš 4LAMMA-ri
47 4LAMMA URGa-lu-pa-aš-ša URGa-tu-tu-wa-aš
48 4LAMMA-ri 4LAMMA URHHa-ra-na
49 4LAMMA URGa-ri-iš-ša
50 4LAMMA URSAŠu-un-na-ra 4LAMMA URGa-Ku-um-ma-ra
51 4LAMMA foSi-ḫi-ri-ya 4LAMMA URHHal-la-at-ta

(bottom of tablet)

54. Only a part of the colophon is preserved from this column. It originally also contained the continuation of reverse v, which ends in mid-sentence.

55. Estimated by Figulla in the copy.

56. Compare iii 36. Both passages are cited by del Monte, RGTC 6: 6–7 sub Alatarma. Singer, ZA 75 (1985) 110 n. 61, also correctly reads this place name.
THE FESTIVAL FOR ALL THE TUTELARY DEITIES

E = KBo 22.189

Reverse vi\(^{57}\) (translation)

Colophon

[ ... ]x [...] before Anuwanza [...] the hand of \(^{mX}\) wrote.

A = KUB 2.1

Obverse i\(^{58}\) (translation)

(approximately 39 lines missing)

\(\S 30'\) [ ] Ala x[ ](\(\cdot\))uʃšalamiešše(?)\(^{59}\) of the countryside

\(\S 31'\) Two large oxen to the names of all the tutelary deities: the Tutelary Deity of the Sky and to the Tutelary Deity of Karāḫna, to Karši,\(^{60}\) to Ḥapantaliya, the Tutelary Deity of Alatarma, to the Tutelary Deity of Mt. Šaluwanda, to the Tutelary Deity of Mt. Šarpa, the Tutelary Deity of Šulupašša, to the Tutelary Deity of Tuttuwa, the Tutelary Deity of Ḥarana, the Tutelary Deity of Šarišša, the Tutelary Deity of Mt. Šunnara, the Tutelary Deity of the River Kummara, the Tutelary Deity of the River Šiḫiriya, (and) the Tutelary Deity of Ḥallatta.

(bottom of tablet)

57. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

58. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

59. The broken sign in i 41 which Archi reads as \(uʃš-\) is uncertain, although his reading does fit the trace. As there is no other example of a word *šalamišše or *uššalamišše, a reading for the broken sign or for any signs preceding it remains uncertain. It is some attribute of the tutelary deity Ala.

60. Variant for Karzi.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

A = KUB 2.1

Obverse ii (transliteration)

(approximately 8 lines missing)

§32 9 [ o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o -t]a
   10 [ o o o o o o o o o o o o ]x-ta-aš TÜL-i
   11 [ o o o o o o o o o o o o šA La-ba-an-na
   12 [ o o o o o o o o o o o o ]x-aš
   13 [šA La-ba-ar-na dLAMMA ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ
   14 [šA La-ba-ar-na] dLAMMA GIŠŠUKUR
   15 [šA La-ba-ar-na] dUR.SAGš-ša-aš dLAMMA-ri
   16 [šA La-ba-ar-na] tU-ša-aš dLAMMA-aš
   17 [šA La-ba-ar-na] tU-ša-aš dLAMMA-aš
   18 [šA La-ba-ar-na] tU-ša-aš dLAMMA-aš
   19 [šA La-ba-ar-na] tU-ša-aš dLAMMA-aš
   20 [šA La-ba-ar-na] tU-ša-aš dLAMMA-aš
   21 [šA La-ba-ar-na] tU-ša-aš dLAMMA-aš
   22 [šA La-ba-ar-na] tU-ša-aš dLAMMA-aš
   23 [šA La-ba-ar-na] tU-ša-aš dLAMMA-aš
   24 [šA La-ba-ar-na] tU-ša-aš dLAMMA-aš

61. Estimated in the copy. Based on the parallel KBo 11.40 i 23'-26', the lost lines probably continued the names of the provincial tutelary deities, including those of the cities Tidanda and Anza.

62. Read by Archi as dLAMMA-aš, but collation indicates that the trace is quite different from the other examples of LAMMA, and there is no compelling reason to read it as such.

63. Text C v 1': UR.SA[G-na-aš?

64. Text C v 2': dLAMMA KARA[š.

65. Text C v 3': dLAMMA x[. Read by Archi as dLAMMA-i, which is not impossible, but there is a clear space after LAMMA.
THE FESTIVAL FOR ALL THE TUTELARY DEITIES

A = KUB 2.1 Obverse ii (translation)

(approximately 8 lines missing)

§32 9 [ ] (traces)
10 [ ] to the spring of [ ]x-taš
11 [ ]x-aš
13 [the tutelary deity of horses [of the Labarna],
14 the tutelary deity of the spear [of the Labarna],
15 to the tutelary deity of [M]t. Iškiša [of the Labarna],
16 the tutelary deity[7] of the animals [of the Labarna],
17 the tutelary deity of the strengthening[8] [of the Labarna],
18 to the tutelary deity of the shoulder [of the Labarna],
19 the tutelary deity of the encircling(?)[9] [of the Labarna],
20 the tutelary deity of the divine power[10] [of the Labarna],
21 to the tutelary deity of the life [of the Labarna],
22 to the tutelary deity of the heroism [of the Labarna],
23 to the tutelary deity of the army [of the Labarna],
24 to the tutelary deity of battle [of the Labarna],

66. Note the difference in syntax between ii 13 and 14, in which ²LAMMA immediately follows ŠA Labarna, and most of the rest of the text, in which the regens of ŠA Labarna comes immediately after it. The difference probably stems from the fact that in ii 13 and 14 the regens is a Sumerogram without Hittite complement and the phrase was therefore put into a partially Sumerian word order; only partially, because the genitive ŠA Labarna still comes first. §31' shows both kinds of syntax with syllabically written names.

67. There are several occurrences (ii 16, 17, 19, [32], 39) of the form ²LAMMA-aš in this text. These could conceivably be dative-locative plural "to the tutelary deities," but nominative singular is more likely, as discussed below in the Commentary. The same question occurs with the entire list of manifestations of the deity Ala later in the text.

68. See Puhvel, HED 1–2: 370, on innara₄waḥhuwaš as the genitive of the verbal substantive of a verb innara₄waḥḥ-. No examples of a finite form of such a verb exist. There is an attested verb innaraḥ(š)-, which has a verbal substantive innaraḥhuar, cited by Puhvel, HED 1–2: 367 sub innar-. The form innara₄waḥhuwaš occurs only in this text and its duplicates. There is one example of the nominative form innara₄waḥhuwar, in KBo 17.60 rev. 10 (Birth Ritual), ed. Beckman, StBoT 29 (1983) 60–61, with the translation "fitness."

69. The word :walipattaššišš, a Luwian genitival adjective, occurs only here, in iii 45 of this same text, and in parallel text KBo 11.40 ii 11’. In the other examples there is no glossenkeil. This lack of other contexts makes it difficult to suggest a meaning. Laroche, DLL 105, cites the use of the word as a divine epithet and derives it from the Luwian verb walip- "enveloppcr?" Archi, p. 99, apparently following Laroche, translates "dell’aggrimento(?)."

70. The phrase para ḫandandatar is difficult to translate in a concise English phrase, but it conveys the concept of divine justice or power and the ability to order events. See Hoffner, Or 49 (1980) 315–16, on this Hittite phrase. This is a concept normally applied only to the gods; it is unusual or perhaps even unique in this text to speak of the para ḫandandatar of the Labarna. This line could possibly be translated "the Labarna’s tutelary deity of divine power." However, as para ḫandandatar is seen as a special protection or power with which the king was endowed (see Hoffner in Wiseman, ed., Peoples of the Old Testament [Oxford, 1973] 211), it could in some sense be seen as belonging to the king, not as the originator of it but as the receiver.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

A = KUB 2.1

Obverse ii (transliteration cont.)

(cont.) 25 [ŠA La-ba-ar]-na pī-ra-an ḫu-u-i-ya-u-wa-aš
26 [ŠA La-ba-a]r-na ŠU-an ap-pa-an-na-aš ḫaLMMA-ri
27 [ŠA La-ba]-ar-na ḫal-la-aš-ša-aš ḫaLMMA-ri
28 [ŠA La-b]a-ar-na ZI-aš ar-nu-um-ma-aš ḫaLMMA-ri
29 [ŠA La-b]a-ar-na śa-ki-ya-aḫ-ḫu-u-wa-aš ḫaLMMA-ri
30 [ŠA La]-ba-ar-na aš-ta-aš wa-aš-ta-aš <ḤaLMMA-ri> 72
31 [ o o ]-na-an-ta-aš La-ba-ar-na-aš ḫaLMMA-i

71. Text C v 4': ḫu-u-ya-u-wa-aš.

72. If one tries to take lines 30–31 together, it becomes very difficult to understand the occurrence of two Labarnas in the genitive. The addition of <ḤaLMMA-ri> solves this problem. The relevant portion of text C v 9' is broken away, so comparison to the duplicate is not possible.

73. Text C v 10': ŠA La-ba-a[r-na].
THE FESTIVAL FOR ALL THE TUTELARY DEITIES

A = KUB 2.1

Obverse ii (translation cont.)

25 to the tutelary deity of running in front\(^74\) [of the Labarn],
26 to the tutelary deity of holding up the hand [of the Labarn],\(^75\)
27 to the tutelary deity of the \(\text{ḥallāšša-}\) [of the Labarn],
28 to the tutelary deity of the fulfilling of the wish\(^77\) [of the Labarn],
29 to the tutelary deity of the omen-giving\(^78\) [of the Labarn],
30 <to the tutelary deity> of the \(\text{aštā- wāštā-}\)\(^79\) [of the Labor],
31 to the tutelary deity of the [ -]nanta- of the Labarn,\(^80\)

---

74. To provide protection.
75. That is, the deity takes the Labarna by the hand. Compare examples of this in the historical texts, for example Ḫatt. i 21.
76. The only example of a word \(\text{ḥal(l)}\text{ašša-}\) outside of this text and its duplicates occurs in \(\text{KBo}\) 8.73 ii 5' (mythological fragment), where \(\text{ḥa-la-aš-ša-an(-)a}\) [is a body part listed next to the head. Compare also \(\text{BEL}\) \(\text{ḥa-la-ša(-)}\), KUB 31.64++ ii 23' (campaigns of Muršili I). Arch. p. 102, points out that \(\text{KBo}\) 11.40 i 22 has \(\text{ḥallaššaš}\)\(^\text{pLAMMA-ri}\) where KUB 2.1 i 51 has \(\text{pLAMMA}\) \(^\text{UرHallatta}\). Del Monte, RGT 6: 69, cites a city name \(\text{Ḫalašša}\), with only these two occurrences and the broken word \(\text{ḥal-l[a}\) in the duplicate \(\text{KUB}\) 40.108 ii 5' attested. Given the nature of this list this \(\text{ḥallašša-}\) should not be a GN but would make sense as a body part of the king. The parallel \(\text{ḥallaššaš}\) \(\text{pLAMMA-ri}\) = \(\text{pLAMMA}\) \(^\text{UرHallatta}\) must have arisen from a similarity between the body part and the city \(\text{Ḫallatta}\).
77. Compare Forrer, KIF 1 (1930) 275 with n. 2, and Kammenhuber, \(\text{HW}\) 2 333a sub \(\text{arnu-}\), with the translation "dem KAL der Wunscherfüllung des [Herr]scheres."
78. The king is never attested as a subject of a finite form of \(\text{sakiyaḥh-}\), and it is unlikely that he would be giving an omen. Therefore this should be understood as "to Labarna's tutelary deity of omen-giving." Goetze, KIF 1 (1930) 406-07, understands this as the \(\text{sakiyaḥhwaš}\) of Labarna and discusses the difficulties of "Labarna" as a possible subject for the verb \(\text{sakiyaḥh-}\). He translates this verb "einen Erlaß ergeben lassen (der) ḥ(nlichen)," Forrer, KIF 1 (1930) 275-76, based on his conviction that \(\text{sakiyaḥhwaš}\) must depend on Labarna, utilizes this passage to argue a meaning "darken" for \(\text{sakiyaḥh-}\), a translation which has not proved tenable. What is meant is a tutelary deity who oversees the omens and protects the Labarna from evil omens given against him.
79. The phrase \(\text{aštā wāštāš}\) occurs only in this text; here and iii 49, where it stands in a genitive relationship to \(\text{Ala}\) in the phrase "Ala of aštā- waštā-." I can find no other examples of the word \(\text{waštā-}\). There is a word spelled \(\text{a-ašt-a}\) which Laroche interprets as a Luwian word in his transliteration of \(\text{KUB}\) 35.37++ ii 20' (Luwian ritual) in DLL 172. This may or may not be the same word as the \(\text{aštāš}\) of \(\text{KUB}\) 2.1; even if it is, it is not helpful, as its meaning is not clear in that text either.
80. In this sentence [ -]nanta- could be a participle in the genitive modifying Labarna, with a translation "to the tutelary deity of the [ -]nant- Labarna." The syntax would be unusual, as participles normally follow the words which they modify, but in the very next line this text uses unusual word order with participles.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES
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Obverse ii (transliteration cont.)

32 [(KUSkur)]-ša-an [š]u?-u-wa-an-za La-ba-ar-na-aš pL[AMMA-aš]
33 [(an-n)]a-fra-l-u-[(wa)-aš] La-ba-ar-na-aš D[AMMA-ri]
34 [(ŠA L)]0f[MU-UT-TI] La-ba-l-ar-na-aš D[AMMA-][ri]
35 [(pa)k]-aḫ-ḫu-na-aš ḫa-aš-ša-aš (LŪ) p[a?]-ḫu-ru-la-aš
36 La-ba-ar-na-aš D[AMMA-i NĪ.TE.ḪI.A-uš]
37 uš-ki-ya-u-wa-aš D[AMMA-i šA La-ba-ar-na]
38 D[AMMA ŠA BUR.SAGTu-ut-ḫa-li-ya]
39 [(m)e]-ḫu-na-aš D[AMMA-aš šA La-ba-ar-na]
41 šA La-ba-ar-na la-па-at-ta-li-ya-aš D[AMMA-ri]
42 šA [La]-ba-ar-na a-ra-u-wa-aš D[AMMA-i]

81. From text C v 11'.
82. From text C v 14'.
83. Text B ii? 1: 'KI.MIN and thereafter a paragraph divider. Text C v 15': šA La-b[a-ar-na].
86. Text B ii? 4: ḳu-la-na-aš KI.MIN D[AMMA-aš. From kulani- HW 115, “auszeichnen?” This occurrence is cited by Laroche, DLL 56 sub kulani-, as an uncertain form.
88. Text B ii? 6: a-ra-[u]-wa-aš KI.MIN D[AMMA-aš].
A = KUB 2.1 Obverse ii (translation cont.)

32 Labarna’s tutelary deity who fills the hunting bag.  
33 to the tutelary deity of the strong(?) Labarna,  
34 to the tutelary deity of the Labarna, the warrior,  
35–40 to the Labarna’s tutelary deity, the fire-tender of the fire (and) hearth,  
41 to the tutelary deity of the Labarna,  
42 to the tutelary deity of getting up of the Labarna,  
43 to the tutelary deity of the field(?) of the Labarna.

89. The position of the nominative participle šuwanza in the phrase makes it unclear what it is modifying. Archi, p. 109, restores the dative ending DL[AMMA-n], but Güterbock suggests to me that if the god’s title in this particular phrase were nominative, as it is for example in ii 39, the participle could modify the god. If we then take this as a rare example of the participle with an active sense, it could mean “the bag-filling tutelary deity”; see Güterbock, FsKantor 117 with n. 34. Because šuwanza immediately precedes Labarna, it could also be taken to modify Labarna. The association of tutelary deities with hunting and the chase compels me to understand DLMMA-as as the noun being modified; the scribe could not break up the genitive chain Labarnas DLMMA-a5. Archi, p. 96, translates only the participial phrase out of context and therefore does not discuss the problem of the various cases in the phrase. He also translates the participle as an active form but understands it as the verb šuwait, “to push,” translating “che [spinge(?)] lo scudo” (“who [pushes(?)] the shield”). If the kurša- is a hunting bag, “fill” makes more sense; the kurša- is filled in the Telipinu myth/ritual discussed in Appendix B sub kurša-.

90. On annarauwaš see Puhvel, HED 1–2: 63, with the translation “forceful.” This is the only example of a word annaru-; Kammenhuber, HW2 79, cites only this occurrence under the lemma *annaru-, without giving a translation. Archi, p. 97, takes annarauwaš as the genitive of a noun *annarauwar.

91. See CAD M, part 2: 313 for this second meaning of mutu, which makes more sense than “husband.”

92. Archi’s [(lA)]p]a?-bu-ru-la-aš is restored from text B (KBo 2.38) ii? 1. The word pahurula- is attested elsewhere as an implement, usually with a GIS determinative. The -ul ending is normally for nomina instrument, so this may be better interpreted LU pahurula-.

93. Archi, p. 97, translates “del vedere le persone.” The iterative form should indicate something like “guard” or “watch over.” Güterbock, SBo II: 9, translates “Dem Schutzgott des Die-Personen-Sehens (Var. des Sehens der Person(en)).” Here NI.TE.HI.A is to be taken as something like “the limbs” = “the body.” Text B ii? 2 has a singular form NI.TE-aš.

94. See CHD sub lamarrandatt-, which points out that the formally nominative plural common lamarrandattas hardly fits the context. If it is a mistake, perhaps a genitive was intended, as the only other example of the word, in iii 46 of this same text, occurs with the Luwian genitival adjective suffix. Archi does not translate this phrase.

95. A hapax legomenon.

96. Although the syntax is identical to other phrases in which the characteristic epithet may be that of Labarna, sense indicates that in this case the epithet applies to DLMMA. This phrase is a good example of the problems of interpreting the genitive phrases correctly. On ulili- see Hawkins and Morpurgo Davies, FsGüterbock2 73–74, who note a close parallelism between ulili- and LIL/gimra- “field.” Laroche, Rech. 70, equates DLMMA uliliyas (sic) in this passage with DLMMA SERI, “the Tutelary Deity of the Countryside.” Although the evidence does not indicate an exact equivalence, ulili- may be in the same semantic range.
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44 SA L[a-b]a-ar-na E GIR-pa a-ša-an-na-<(aš)>\textsuperscript{97} D LAMMA-i
45 SA L[a-ba-a]r-na ḫa-an-da-[fat-ta]-aš\textsuperscript{98} D LAMMA-i
46 SA La-b[a-ar]-na i[(š-ḫa)]-[šar-wa-an-][[(na-a)]]\textsuperscript{99} D LAMMA-i
47 SA La-ba[-ar]-na ḫa-an-te-ya-aš-ša-aš-ši-iš D LAMMA-i
48 SA La-ba-a[r]-na tar-pa-at-ta-as-ši-iš\textsuperscript{100} D LAMMA-i KI.MIN
49 ša-lu-ba-at-t[a-aš-ši]-iš <D LAMMA-i> KI.MIN nu-un-ta-ra-as D LAMMA-i\textsuperscript{101}
50 SA La-ba-a[r-n]a ma-ni-in-ku-wa-an ar-nu?-ma-aš\textsuperscript{102} D LAMMA-i\textsuperscript{102}
51 SA La-ba-a[r-n]a iš-ma-aš-šu-wa-la-aš D LAMMA-i
52 SA La-ba-a[r-n]a tāk-ša-an-na-aš D LAMMA-i
53 SA La-ba-ar-na

(bottom of tablet)

\textsuperscript{97} Text B ii? 7: E GIR-pa a-ša-an-na-aš K.I.M[IN].
\textsuperscript{98} Text B ii? 8: ḫa-an-da-at-ta-aš-ši-iš.
\textsuperscript{99} Text B ii? 9: iš-ḫa-šar-wa-na-aš K.I.M[IN].
\textsuperscript{100} Text B ii? 10: tar-pa-at-ta-aš K.I.M[IN].
\textsuperscript{101} Text B ii? 11: [nu-uni-tar-aš K.I.MIN D LAMMA-aš.
\textsuperscript{102} Text B ii? 12: [ma-ni-in-] ku-wa-an x]. The last preserved sign does not look like ‘ar’ on the copy, but collation indicates it as a good possible reading.
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Obverse ii (translation cont.)

44 to the tutelary deity of the Labarna’s sitting down again(?)\textsuperscript{103},
45 to the tutelary deity of the decision of the Labarna,
46 to the tutelary deity of the lordliness\textsuperscript{104} of the Labarna,
47 to the tutelary deity of the \textit{hantiyaśśa}\textsuperscript{105} of the Labarna,
48-49 to the tutelary deity of the \textit{tarpatta}- of the Labarna, <to the tutelary deity> of the \textit{śalubat[ta-]}\textsuperscript{106} of the same (i.e., the Labarna), [to] the tutelary deity of the swiftness\textsuperscript{107} of the same,
50 [to] the tutelary deity of the bringing near of the Labarna,
51 to the tutelary deity of the \textit{iśmaśuvala-}\textsuperscript{108} of the Labarna,
52 to the tutelary deity of the \textit{taksatar}\textsuperscript{109} of the Labarna,
53 (This line begins a phrase continued in column iii.)

(bottom of tablet)

\textsuperscript{103} Archi, p. 95, translates \textit{EGIR-pa aśannaś} as “dell’opposizione.” Puhvel, \textit{HED} 1–2: 291 and 294, claims \textit{-za appa(n) es-} for “resist,” and translates (p. 296) this line “to L(abarna)’s tutelary god of resistance.” This is certainly a possible interpretation. However, the evidence which Puhvel presents is not completely convincing, and when we consider this phrase as a contrast to the \textit{arauwaś}, “getting up,” of two lines earlier, “sitting down again” makes good sense.

\textsuperscript{104} The translation “lordliness” was suggested to me by an old file card of Hoffner’s in the CHD lexical files. More recently Puhvel, \textit{HED} 1–2: 387, conveys the same idea with a translation of this passage. He derives the word from \textit{iśhaśśara-} “lordship,” not from \textit{iśhaśśara-} “lady, mistress,” as Haas and Thiel, \textit{AOAT} 31 (1978) 121, do. Friedrich, \textit{HW} 85, translates “Freundlichkeit, Höflichkeit,” which is followed by Archi in his translation “gentilezza.”

\textsuperscript{105} Archi, p. 96, without giving evidence, translates \textit{hantiyaśśaśśiś} as “del particolare(?).” See the comments on the word \textit{hantiyaśśa-} in Appendix B.

\textsuperscript{106} This word, although partially broken, can be restored with near certainty as Archi has done. It has the Luwian genitival adjective suffix which is so common in this text. There is no other attestation of a word \textit{śalubatta-} or \textit{śalubattaśśi-} outside this text and the duplicate text B = \textit{KBo} 2.38 ii? 10’. Güterbock, \textit{Or} 25 (1956) 128, reads \textit{silumatt} \textit{[aśśiś].} The word is not in \textit{HW} or \textit{DLL}.

\textsuperscript{107} See Friedrich, \textit{ArOr} 6 (1934) 372, “dem Schutzgott der Eile(??).”

\textsuperscript{108} A hapax legomenon.

A = KUB 2.1

Obverse iii (transliteration)

§32' 1 (cont.) [an-na-ra-aš] ša tar-pa-aš 2LAMMA[-i]
3 [ša La-ba-ar-na KUR-e-aš ḫu-u-[m]a-an-da-aš 2LAMMA-i]
4 [ša La-ba-ar-na ta-ak-[ku]-wi-aš 2LAMMA-i]
5 ša La-bar-ar-na Na-TE-aš 2LAMMA-i
7 ša La-bar-ar-na ZAG-iš UZAG.UDU-aš 2LAMMA-i]
8 ša La-bar-ar-na GUB[-la]-aš UZAG.UDU-aš (2LAMMA-i)]
9 ša La-bar-ar-na UPAI-KI-i-ta-ûwa-a[n-ta-aš 2LAMMA-i]
10 ša La-bar-ar-na [(pt)-]-ba-ла-[-aš-da-aš-š((i-š))] 110
11 2LAMMA-i ša La-ba[-ar-na
12 šar-la-fat-ta-aš 2LAMMA-fiš
13 ša La-[b]-a[r]-na GIS TUKUL-aš 2LAMMA-i
14 ša La-[b]-a[r]-na mu-wa-ad-da-la-ḫi-da-aš
15 2LAMMA-i ša La-bar-ar-na
16 kur-ra-aš(-)tar-ra-aš-ši-ši 2LAMMA-i
17 ša La-bar-ar-na
18 :pa-ra-aš(-)tar-ra-aš-ši-ši 2LAMMA-i
19 ša La-bar-ar-na ša UD.SIG-ya 2LAMMA-i
20 ša La-bar-ar-na ḫu-u-wa-ap-ra-aš 2LAMMA-i
21 ša La-bar-ar-na La-ba-ar-na-aš pār-na-aš
22 2LAMMA-ri ša La-bar-ar-na
23 2LAMMA ša UTU-%R[-a]-tû-û-ḫa-li-ya
24 LUGAL.GAL UR.SAG
25 ŠU.NIGIN 1 ME 12 ŠUMUL 2LAMMA 1 GIS BANŠUR

110. Restorations in iii 8, 9 and 10 from the parallel KBo 12.60:1–4'. Laroche, DLL 38, without the duplicate, reads this as ḫaladdaššiš. Archi, p. 110, reads [(pt)-]-ba-[-la/ad]-aaš-aš-š((i-š)]. Although collation shows that the word’s third sign is clearly 1a and is followed by an ad sign, Archi suggests reading it with ad to be omitted because the parallel KBo 12.60:4 has pi-ḫa-ad-da-aš-ši-ši. On p. 102 Archi reads the word piḥaddaššiš. The word is attested only in these two texts; it seems that one of them has a mistake. Possibly KUB 2.1 has added a superfluous -ad- sign, as Archi suggests. Perhaps instead KBo 12.60 has omitted the -la- sign. The word may thus be either piḥaddaššiš or piḥaladdaššiš.
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§32' 1-2 to the [t]utelary deity of the [ ] of the Labarna,111 [to] the tutelary deity of the annari- and tarpi- spirit of the Labarna,112

(continuation)

3 to the tutelary deity of all the lands of the [Labarna],
4 to the tutelary deity of the place [of the Labarna],
5 to the tutelary deity of the takkuwi-113 of the Labarna,
6 to the tutelary deity of the body of the Labarna,
7 [to the tutelary deity of] the righ[t] shoulder of the Labarna,
8 to the tutelary deity [of] the le[f]t shoulder of the Labarna,
9 [to the tutelary deity of] Mt. Kitawa[nta] of the Labarna,
10-12 to the tutelary deity of the/pihadda/- of the Labarna, to the tutelary deity of praise of the Labarna,
13 to the tutelary deity of the weapon of the Labarna,
14-16 to the tutelary deity of the awe-inspiring ability(?) of the Labarna, to the tutelary deity of the kurraštarras- of the Labarna,114
17-18 to the tutelary deity of the :parastarras- of the Labarna,
19 to the tutelary deity of the propitious day of the Labarna,115
20 to the tutelary deity of the Labarna’s ẖuwapras- building,116
21-25 to the tutelary deity of the Labarna’s “house of Labarna,” the Labarna’s tutelary deity of His Majesty Tudhaliya, Great King, hero, a total of 112 names of tutelary deities, one (offering) table.

111. “Of the Labarna” is carried over from column ii.
112. Otten, MDOG 94 (1963) 19, suggests that annari- might signify “männliche Potenz.” On annari- and tarpi- see Hoffner, JNES 27 (1968) 61-68, especially 64-66, and Otten and von Soden, StBoT 7 (1968) 27-32. Hoffner discusses the other occurrences of these two terms and their significance when paired to denote a single beneficent spirit. Puhvel, HED 1-2; 62, and Kammenhuber, HW 79, summarize the evidence for annari-. Puhvel translates “strength, force, vigor” and Kammenhuber does not give a translation. Neither notes this particular passage, which shows a rare a-stem form for both words, although Kammenhuber suggests that the “Inari” Tarpi of the unpublished text 453/d (Otten and von Soden, StBoT 7: 29) may be contaminated forms of a-stems.
113. Laroche, DLL 89, cites a word dakkui- “sombre?” but does not include this passage or even this form. He points out that the translation is based only on the similarity to Hittite dankui-. Even if dakkui- means “dark,” line 5 remains difficult to translate; should it be “to the tutelary deity of the Labarna’s dark things?” Archi, p. 101, takes dakkui- not as an adjective but as an abstract noun, translating “dell’oscurità(?)”.
114. Although Archi, p. 110, reads kur-ra-aš tar-ra-aš-ši-iš in iii 16, there is not really any word space on the tablet. Laroche, DLL 57, reads this as one word, kur-ra-aš-tar-ra-ši-iš but does not propose a meaning. Güterbock, Or 25 (1956) 128, reads kurraš-(-)tarrasiš. Two lines after this word/phrase, in iii 18, there is a phrase :paraš tarrasiš, with a clear word space between paraš and tarrasiš. The syntax would fit better with one word, so perhaps it is line 18 which is wrong in having a word space.
115. The reason for the -ya on UD.SIG3 is unclear.
116. The word ẖuwapras occurs only here and in KUB 56.51 i 1, 2, and 4. It is not cited in HW or DLL. It looks like the full grade of a word ḫupra-, from which ḫupraš- (a potter?) may have been derived. Could the ẖuwapraš- then be a pottery-making shop? There is attested a word ḫupra- which seems to be a fabric, cited by Friedrich HW 75 and 1. Erg. 7. It is conceivable that the ẖuwapraš could also be derived from this.
§33' 26 1 GUD.ĀB gi-im-ma-ra-aš 3 MĀŠ.GAL
27 DA-a-la-aš ŠUM.UI.A-aš ḥu-u-ma-an-da-aš
28 DA-a-la-aš ḥu-e-eš-wa-an-na-aš
29 DA-a-la-aš ŠA ŠA-ME-E
30 DA-a-la-aš ŠA MĀŠ.ANŠE
31 DA-a-la-aš gi-iml-ra-aš
32 DA-a-la-aš mi-nu-um-ma-aš!
33 DA-a-la-aš a-aš-šu-la-aš
34 DA-a-la-aš URU HA-AT-ŠI
35 DA-a-la-aš KARAŠ
36 DA-a-la-aš URU A-la-l-tar-ma
37 DA-a[-l]a-aš [ŠA ŠU] RAG Ša-ar-lpa
38 DA-a-la-aš ŠA [I]UR.SAG Ša-lul-w[a-an-da]
39 DA-a-la-aš URU[?]u-tu
40 DA-a-la-aš URU S[u-l]u-pa-aš-ša
41 DA-a-la-aš URU H[a-ra]l-na
42 DA-a-la-aš gi-im-ma-ra-aš wa-ah-nu-w[a-an-da]-aš
43 DA-a-la-aš wa-ar-wa-an-ta-li-ya-aš
44 DA-a[-l]a-aš a-aš-ša-at-ta-aš-ši-ši
45 DA-a-la-aš wa-lil-l-pa-at-ta-aš-ši-ši
46 DA-a-la-aš la-fmar! ḫa-an-da-at-ta-aš{(-ši-ši)}
47 DA-a-la[-aš a]n-n[a-r]u-ma-ḫi-ta-aš-ši-[i][(š)]
48 DA-a-la-[aš o o (-)]x-k[u-ti]-ya«-ya»-a[t{(-ḫi-ta-aš-ši-ši)}]
49 DA-a-la-aš [aš-t]a-aš wa-aš-ta{(-aš)}

(bottom of tablet)

117. Archi reads this name A-at-tar-ma, but it is correctly noted as Alatarma by del Monte, RGTC 6: 7, and Singer ZA 75 (1985) 110 n. 61.
§33'26–27 one cow (and) three billy goats of the countryside,\(^{118}\) to all the names of Ala:\(^{119}\)

28 Ala\(^{120}\) of life,
29 Ala of the sky,
30 Ala of the animals,
31 Ala of the countryside,
32 Ala of kindliness,
33 Ala of favor,
34 Ala of Ḥatti,
35 Ala of the army,
36 Ala of the city Alatarma,\(^{121}\)
37 Ala [of] M[t.] Šarpa,
38 Ala of Mt. Šaluw[anda],
39 Ala of T[u]ttu,
40 Ala of Sulupašša,
41 Ala of Ḥarana,
42 Ala of the enclosed(?) countryside,
43 Ala of warwantali (ya)-,\(^{122}\)
44 Ala of the aššatta-.,\(^{123}\)
45 Ala of encircling(?)
46 Ala of “setting a time,”\(^{124}\)
47 Ala of forcefulness/power,\(^{125}\)
48 Ala of [(−)]x-kutiyaštita-,
49 Ala of ašta- wašta-,\(^{126}\)

(bottom of tablet)

118. This could be either a wild goat or perhaps one pastured on the prairie rather than kept penned near the house.

119. The form D\(\text{Alaš}\) here makes sense as a genitive. This first occurrence as D\(\text{A-a-la-aš}\) in the list may have conditioned the scribe’s continued use of this form where we would expect rather a dative-locative form.

120. As discussed below in the Commentary, the form of Ala’s name throughout this text is written D\(\text{A-a-la-aš}\) as opposed to dative-locative plural.

121. This Ala deity of Alatarma parallels the LAMMA deity of the same city mentioned in KUB 2.1 i 45.

122. Archi, p. 97, translates “di colui che genera(?)” (“of him who generates/begets[?]”), connecting warwantaliyaš with D\(\text{Warwaliyan}\), a name which Laroche, DLL 108, cites as a form of warwala/i-, translating “semence, progeniture.” The word warwantaliyaš is sufficiently different in form from warwala/i- that it looks to me like a completely different word perhaps best left untranslated.

123. Another hapax legomenon; Laroche, DLL 33, cites this passage and compares to Lycian B esetes and A ehetehi, “épipèthes divines.”

124. Archi, p. 96, follows Laroche, DLL 40 sub ḫandai-, in translating “della decisione immediata.” See now CHD sub lamarḫandataštši- and ii 40 above.

125. Archi, p. 97, translates annarumahitäšši- “della forza virile.” Kammenhuber, HW\(^2\) Lief. 1 (1975) 79, cites only this example and translates the line “A(ala) der Hoheitsmach/Lebenskraft.” More recently Puhvel, HED 1–2 (1984) 63 sub annari-, translates annarumahitäššiš as “of forcefulness.”

126. See the note to KUB 2.1 ii 30–31.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

A = KUB 2.1

Reverse iv (transliteration)

§33' 1 ḫa-la-aš wa-al-l[ya-a(n-na-aš)]
(cont.) 2 ḫa-la-aš šar-la-at-ta-ašš[(i-iš)]
3 ḫa-la-aš ṢA qašBAN ḫa-la-aš
4 ṢA KUB MĀ.URU.URU₆
5 ḫa La-ba-ar-na
6 ḫa-la-aš [(a-aš o)]x-da ṢA La-ba-ar-na
7 [(ḥa-an-ta-an-ta-an-na-aš
8 ṢA La-ba-ar-na] ḫa-la-aš
9 [(ḥal-z)i-y]a-u-wa-aš ṢA La-ba-ar-na
10 ḫa-la-aš o o [x]ḥal-z[i-y]-ya-u-wa[(a-aš)]
11 ṢA La-ba-a]r-n[a] ḫa-la-aš
12 ŠU-an? ša-r]a-a ap-pa-an-na-aš
13 [ o o o La-ba-a]r-na-aš
14 ḫa-la-aš h]a-an-ta-an-za
15 ḫa-la-aš]x-nu-u-ga?)[n-a-ši-[i][š]
16 ḫa-la-aš] la[pa-n][a-aš-ši-[i][š]
17 [ o o ṢA L]a-[ba-a]r-na
18 ḫa-la-aš]x-x-x-ra-aš-ši-[i][š]
19 ṢA La-ba-ar-n[a
20 ḫa-la-aš (x EGIS-pa DI)]B-an-na[-aš]
21 ḫa-la-aš o o o [x-an-na-aš
22 ḫa-la-aš o o o o KU]ṣkur-š[i(a-aš)]
23 ḫa-la-aš o o o o -w]a?-an-

128. Text C vi 9: KI.MIN.
129. Text C has only one epithet formed with ḫalzai-
130. Text C vi 12' ap-pa-an-na-aš KI.MIN.
131. Text C vi 14'-n[a]-aš
132. Text C vi 15'-n[a]-ašši-cš.
133. Archi, p. 112, reads the end of this line [(EGIR-pa-r)]a-an-na[(a-aš)], with the restoration from text C, (KUB 44.16) vi 17', and translates (p. 95) this as "dell'avvenire." However, Hoffner, BiOr 37 (1980) 201, notes that KUB 44.16 vi 17' (cited by him as iv 17) should be read ]x EGIS-pa DIB!-an-na-aš. KUB 2.1 iv 20 can be read DIB-an-na-aš.
134. Restored from text C vi 19', but only -ṣ[a-aš is preserved, so the attribution to this particular spot in the main text is not certain. If the -ṣ[a-aš goes somewhere else, then it is possible that [ḥa-la-aš šu-wa-an-za KU]ṣkur-š[i(a-aš)] could be restored, which would fit the spacing in text A and would provide a nice parallel to the description of ḫLAMMA in ii 32.
THE FESTIVAL FOR ALL THE TUTELARY DEITIES

A = KUB 2.1

Reverse iv (translation)

§33' 1 Ala of glory,
(cont.) 2 Ala of praise,
            3-5 Ala of the bow, Ala of the quiver, Ala of x[... ] of the Labarn, 
            6 Ala of the [x-da of the Labarn, 
            7-9 Ala of the divine power 135 of the Labarn, Ala of the calling up of the Labarn, 136 
            10-13 [Ala of the calling x[... ] of the Labarn, Ala of holding [u]p [the hand(?) ... ] of 
            the [Labarn], 
            14 [Ala] the just, 
            15 [Ala of (--)x-nugana-, 
            16-17 [Ala of the summer pastures [ ] of the Labarn, 
            18-19 [Ala of the x-ra- [of the Labarn], 
            20 [Ala of the refuge, 137 
            21 [Ala of the [... ]x-atar, 
            22 [Ala of the ... ] of the hunting bag, 138 
            (lines 23–26 do not preserve enough to identify the particular Ala deities)

135. See note 70 (p. 99 above) on parā handandatar and the similar phrase in the list of LAMMA tutelary deities.
136. Archi, p. 95, suggests "del convocare(?)."
137. The translation "of refuge" is Hoffner's, based on the fact that -za appa epp- means "to take refuge in."
138. Or perhaps "[Ala who fills] the hunting ba[g]. See note 134 (p. 110 above) to transliteration of iv 22.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

A = KUB 2.1

Reverse iv (transliteration cont.)

D (cont.)

24 [PA-a-la-aš o o o ]-an-[a-
25 [PA-a-la-aš o o o (-)]x-ah-hu-w[a-]
26 [PA-a-la-aš o o o -y]a-aš
27 [(D-A-a-la-aš pf-ra-a)]n hu-u-i-ya-u-wa-aš
28 [PA-a-la-aš o o ]-nu-un ka-ri-ya-u-wa-aš
29 [PA-a-la-aš o o o -jx
30 [PA-a-la]-aš x[- o o -]x
31 [PA-a-l]a-aš ŬUR.SAG.MEŠ-aš hu-u-ma-<(an)>-ta-aš
32 [PA-a-l]a-aš ÍD.MEŠ-aš hu-u-ma-an-ta-aš
34 [PA-a-la-aš Šu-up-pf-ya-an-t[al-aš]
35 [h]u-u-ma-an-ta-aš PA-a-la-aš
36 [ ]x-ku-uš-nu-wa-an-ti-iš
37 [PA]a-l]a-aš ŠA ŪUR.SAGŠa-ar-p[a]
38 [PA-a-l]a-aš GURUN-aš i-ya-at-na-aš
39 [PA-a-l]a-aš ŠA UD SIG,147
40 [PA-a-la-aš ]a-[al-aš]a-u-w[a-aš (Z)]I-aš

(bottom of tablet)

Text D 7 has [HUR.SAG.MEŠ-aš D]A-a-la-aš ÍD.MEŠ-aš D A-a-la-aš, which should correspond with text A iv 29–30. The traces on text A do not, however, fit the text of the duplicate, and text A has the mountains and rivers in fuller form in the following two lines.
Text D 8: hu-u-m]a-an-da-aš.
Text D 9: [hu-u-m]a-an-da-aš.
Text D 13: [ŠA GUR.SAGŠar-pa a-li-la-an-za i-ya-at-na-za. Archi reads A.ŠÌ-α-la-an-za i-ya-at-na-za (p. 112 n. 68) and translates “campagna fiorentre” (p. 100). The form alilanza is not otherwise attested but could be based on alií “blossom.”
THE FESTIVAL FOR ALL THE TUTELARY DEITIES

A = KUB 2.1

Reverse iv (translation cont.)

(lines 23–26 do not preserve enough to identify the particular Ala deities)

27 [Ala] of running [in front,
28 [Ala] of covering the [ ]-nu-,
(lines 29–30 preserve only traces)
31 [Ala] of all the mountains,
32 [Ala] of all the rivers,
33 [Ala] of all the duwaduna-,
34–36 Ala of all the springs(?), x-kušnuwanti- Ala,
37 Ala of Mt. Šarp[a],
38 [Ala] of abundance of fruit,
39 [Ala] of the propitious day,
40 [Ala of the g]lo[d] [sp]irit,

(bottom of tablet)

148. Archi, p. 96, takes the verbal substantive kariyauwaš as being from the verb kariya- (Med. 2) “to comply” and translates “dcH’accondiscendcre(?).

149. Archi, p. 101, translates “di tutte le doline(?)” on the basis of Gordon’s suggestion, JCS 21 (1967) 82, that duwaduna- is a sink-hole or düden (Turkish). Archi, p. 112 n. 65, reads the duplicate Bo 6113:10 (cited by him as 9) as [du-wa-du-na]-aš?, which is only just possible. The only other example known to me is the word du-wa-du-un in the unpublished tablet 2025/g, cited in Laroche, DLL 101, without translation. Gordon points out the significance of these openings to underground watercourses in Anatolian mythology; they may well have had an Ala deity.

150. Archi translates Šuppiyantaš as “fonti(?);” see Gordon, JCS 21 (1967) 82 with n. 32.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

A = KUB 2.1

Reverse v (transliteration)

§33' 1 DA-a-la-aš ŠA mTu-ut-ḥa-li-ya

(cont.) 2 ŠA Ė L[U]GAL? DA-a-la-aš

3 ŠA mTu-ut-ḥ[a-li-ya]

4 ŠU.NIGIN ŠU-ŠI [ŠUM]

5 1 BANŠUR A[D.KID?]"153

§34' 6 1 AMAR GUD.MAḪ [154

7 ḫu-u-ma-an-[aš

8 x[ (remainder of column broken away)

A = KUB 2.1

Reverse vi155 (transliteration)

§35' 1 ŠA KUR ḪAT-ḪI HUR.SAG.ḪI.A ḫu-u-ma-an-ta-aš

2 KUR-e-aš ḫu-u-ma-an-ta-aš ḪUTU-ŠI

3 mTu-ut-ḥa-li-ya-aš ku-e-eš la-aḥ-ḥi-ya-iš-ki-iz-zi

4 HUR.SAG ḫu-u-ma-an-ta-aš ŠA KUR ḪAT-ḪI

5 ḪUTU-ŠI mTu-ut-ḥa-li-ya-aš LUGAL GAL

6 ku-e-eš ši-ya-tal-li-iš-ki-iz-zi

7 HUR.SAG.ḪI.A ḫu-u-ma-an-te-eš ŠA KUR UGU-TI

8 ḪUTU-ŠI ku-e-eš ši-ya-tal-li-iš-ki-iz-zi

9 [Ma-a-laš [156] Ma-am-ra-an-ta-aš

(remainder of column broken away)


152. Text D 16: ] LUGAL-wa-aš pār-na-aš DA-a-[a-aš]. Text D reverses the order of these two deities from that of the main text.

153. What is preserved from text D 18-19 after the last Ala is named is UGU[NIG].[GIG] / ti-an-zi. This text specifies the offerings to be set out for the above-named deities.

154. Text D 20-23 preserves only the middle of the lines and may diverge from the main text at this point. It reads as follows:

20 ḪI.LA ŠA HUR.SAG.ḪI.A[

21 ši-pa-an-ti [ ]

22 mTu-ut-ḥa-li-ya-aš [ ]

23 -aš [ ]

155. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

156. Restored on the basis of the parallel KBo 11.40 vi 7f., which indicates that this last part of the festival was devoted to the deified mountains and rivers of the king’s domain. This includes the upper land, the Hurrian lands, Arzawa, Maša, the Luqqa lands, the Kaškean lands, and the land of Ḫatti.
THE FESTIVAL FOR ALL THE TUTELARY DEITIES

A = KUB 2.1

Reverse v (translation)

§33' 1-3 Ala of the palace [of Tudhaliya (and) [Ala(?)] of Tudh[aliya]  
(cont.) 4-5 Total: sixty [names]; one [icke(?)] (offering) table.

§34' 6-8 One bull calf [...] [to] all [...] x[...]

(remainder of column broken away)

A = KUB 2.1

Reverse vi  

§35' 1-3 To all the mountains (and) lands of the land of Ḥatti in which His Majesty Tudhaliya regularly campaigns/travels,
4-6 to all the mountains of the land of Ḥatti which His Majesty Tudhaliya, the Great King, hunts,
7-8 to(?) all the mountains of the upper land which His Majesty hunts,
9 [to the Mala river,] the Mamranta river,

(remainder of column broken away)

157. The duplicate text D, Bo 6113:16f., is somewhat broken and therefore difficult to interpret, but enough remains to show a slightly different version of this section: "[...] x to the A[la] deities of the king’s house, [...] to the Ala deities of the king, to the Ala deities [...] x, they place liver [on a table(?)]." There follows a paragraph line as in the main text and then references to mountains, libating, and possibly [Tudhaliya]. The Bo 6113 version differs from the main text in using Hittite syntax and in most cases the more general word "king" instead of the king’s name, Tudhaliya.

158. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

159. See Laroche, OLZ 58 (1963) 247, on šiyatalleški- as “chase, hunt.” Kammhuber, ZA 66 (1976) 73, does not follow this, translating the verb as “to seal.” All the occurrences of šiyatalleški- are in the various copies of this text, so no other contexts can be brought to bear on this verb. Early drafts of the treatment of this word in the CHD separate the verb šiyatalleški- from the verb šiyatallya- “to seal,” and point out that because all of the occurrences are from these festivals, “hunt” must remain conjectural.

160. The scribe wrote nominative plural humanteš instead of dative-locative plural humantaš here. This could be because of confusion with the relative pronoun kušš, which, although functioning as an accusative in its clause, is a form which in older Hittite would have been nominative plural.
The Festival of Individual Offerings

The tablets included here describe a festival that rather closely parallels the festival of KUB 2.1 and its duplicates. The primary difference is that this festival in general lists offerings for each of the names of D≥LAMMA and D≥Ala individually, rather than going through a whole list with one group of offerings. The separate treatment of these tablets reflects my understanding of this series of tablets as a different festival or a different version, perhaps earlier, of the ceremony. Although the gods are the same, the specific ceremony described for their worship differs significantly from that of the Festival of Group Offerings described above.

The reconstruction of the numerous tablet pieces for this festival is based on comparison to the parallel passages in KUB 2.1, the main text of the Festival of Group Offerings. Most restorations are from KUB 2.1. The reconstructed order of the tablets is naturally not certain. Most tentative is the placement of text D, KUB 40.107+IBoT 2.18 obverse i, at the beginning. This section looks like a description of an early part of a festival, with various ceremonies by cult functionaries described in preparation for the many offerings to be given during in the festival. The slaughtering of animals described in KUB 40.107+IBoT 2.18 §§2′-4′ and [8′] would make sense as preparations for the diverse flesh offerings described later.

Transliteration

D = KUB 40.107+IBoT 2.18 Obverse 161

\[\begin{align*}
\text{§1′} & \quad [x \, [\text{HUR.SAG.HI.A}^1] \\
\text{2′} & \quad [\text{hu-u-ma-an-te-eš Đ.HI.A} \, \text{hu-u-ma-an]}-t[e-eš š]A \, \text{KUR UR} \, \text{HA-AT-TI} \\
\text{3′} & \quad [\text{o o o } \text{DINGIR.MEŠ hu-u-ma-an-ṭe-eš } \text{A[[-N]A li OŠBANŠUR} \\
\text{§2′} & \quad [A-N]A \text{ ŠUMULIA DŁAMMA-aš } \text{hu-u-ma-an-da-aš} \\
\text{5′} & \quad [-]e-1-eš A-NA \, \text{Š[U]MULIA D-a-la-aš } \text{hu-u-ma-an-da-aš} \\
\text{6′} & \quad [x-kán UD} \, \text{[u]}-i-e-eš \\
\text{7′} & \quad [\text{hu-}]u^{1}\text{-ma-an-da-ašši-pa-an-da-aš} \\
\text{8′} & \quad [\text{na-aš-ta}^{162} \, \text{... pa-ra-a plé-en-ni-ya-an-zi} \\
\text{9′} & \quad [\text{nu pf-tal-wa-an-dja-an}^{163} \, \text{ar-ḥa mar-kán-zi}
\end{align*}\]

161. IBoT 2.18 joins KUB 40.107 on the right side of the obverse at the top and adds part of another column. Because the left edge of KUB 40.107 is preserved, the column labeled Vs? in the copy must be column i, so the columns identified as ii and iii in the IBoT 2.18 copy should now be i and ii. The space between ii 7′ and 9′ in IBoT 2.18 is now shown in the joined text to be another line, line Vs? 7′ of KUB 40.107. IBoT 2.18 adds one line to the beginning of the text as copied in KUB 40.107; line numbers are adjusted accordingly. Some restorations are from similar festival descriptions in KUB 32.135+KBo 21.85+KBo 8.109 iv 14-15 (Festival of the Moon and Thunder) and KUB 2.13 ii 55′-56′ and iii 5′-6′ (Festival of the Month). Because too little of obverse ii (preserved on the join piece IBoT 2.18) is preserved to allow a coherent transliteration, its description of offerings to the holy places of the temple and to names (of D≥LAMMA and Ala?) has not been integrated into the reconstructed festival.

162. Or perhaps [nu-uš-kán.

163. Or ... hu-u-ua-an-qi-an.
Text Scheme

A. *KBo* 11.40. Column i is parallel to *KUB* 2.1 i 47–51.
   Column ii is parallel to *KUB* 2.1 ii 15–24.
   Column v probably parallels lost portions of *KUB* 2.1 v.
   Column vi 1–8 are parallel to *KUB* 2.1 vi.

B. *KUB* 40.108. Column ii duplicates A i 18′–26′; column v is parallel to *KUB* 2.1 iv 7–10 and fills in some of the missing portions of A.

C. *KUB* 40.101. Duplicates A v 1′–23′.

D. *KUB* 40.107+*IBoT* 2.18. Column i may be from the early part of the festival. Reverse iv 17′–30′ duplicate A vi 2′–18′.

E. *KBo* 12.60. Parallel to *KUB* 2.1 iii 8–15, probably duplicate to missing portions of A = *KBo* 11.40 obverse iii. It is not an indirect join to *KBo* 11.40.

F. *KUB* 55.25. Parallel to *KUB* 2.1 iii 29–35 and probably duplicates some of the missing A = *KBo* 11.40 obverse iii.

Translation

D = *KUB* 40.107+*IBoT* 2.18 Obverse i

§1 [ ... all] the mountains [all] [the rivers, al]l t[he ... gods o]f the land of ḫatti, for one offering table.

§2 [ ... f]or the names of all the tutelary deities [ ... -]eš for the names of all the Alā
tutelary deities [ ... ] who [ ... ] a sheep [ ... ] to [all]l the [ ... ] he libated. They[d]rive [forth ... ] They butcher the [stri]pped (carcass).\(^{165}\)

---


165. Or “They butcher the [whole] (carcass).” See note 163 above for possible restorations.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

D = KUB 40.107+IBoT 2.18

Obverse i (transliteration cont.)

§3' 10' [ta LUGAL-uš e]-ša UGULA [L₃,ME₃]MUḪALDIM L₃,ME₃]MUḪALDIM[-y]a
    ḫu-u-ma-an-te-eš
11' [UDU,HIA o o ] ḫu-u-kán-zı L₃,ME₃]NAR URU [K]a-ni-iš ŠIŘ-RU

§4' 12' [1 LŪ ME]-SÉ-DI pa-iz-zi ta-aš-kán a-ú-ši [kat-t]a-an ti-ya-zı
14' [ o -z]i [LU]GAL-uš ša-ra-a ti-ya-zı UGULA [L₃,ME₃]MUḪALDIM]
15' ta-pf-ša-ni-in KŪ.G[I]x x x x [ ] na-an
16' LUGAL-i pa-ra-a e-ep-zi[ ] Ø?

§5' 17' UGULA [L₃,ME₃]MUḪALDIM iš-ta-na-nı pf-r[a-an ti-ya-zı? ]
18' [UGULA] [L₃,ME₃]MUḪALDIM UGULA L₃,ME₃ GIŠBANŠUR-ya [ ]
19' L₃ALAN.ZU, me-ma-i L₃,ME₃-pal-wa[-tal-la-aš pal-wa-a-iz-zi]
20' [L₃]ki-i-ta-aš ḫa-zal-a-[ ]

§6' 21' UGULA [L₃,ME₃]MUḪALDIM ḫa-aš-ši-i 1.-ŠU GIŠDAG-ti [1.-ŠU GIŠu-ut-tı-ya 1.-ŠU]
22' ḫa-tal-wa-aš GIŠ-i 1.-ŠU nam-ma ḫa-[aš-ši-i ta-pu-uš-za 1.-ŠU Ši-pa-an-tı]

§7' 23' [t]a LUGAL-uš e-ša [L₃,ME₃]MUḪALDIM x[ ]
24' ti-an-zı 3 ME MĀŠ.GAL 20 GUD[ ]
25' A-NA GUD-ma pf-ra-an GAL ME₃[E-DI]

§8' 26' [2] MĀŠ.GAL-ma-kán IŠ-TU x[ ]
27' [n]a-aš A-NA DKar-zı DḪa-pa[-an-ta-li-ya

§9' 29' ma-a-an ḫu-ke-eš-šar t[a-ru-up-ta-tı? ... na-aš-ta]
30' [d]a-ga-an-zi-pu-uš [ša-an-ḫa-an-zı

§10' 31' [ ]x ta-pf-ša-n[a
32' [ ]x LUGAL-uš QA-TAM[166
33' [ ]x ši-pa-a[n-tı
34' [ ] x x [ ]
    (the tablet breaks off)

166. Or QA-TAM[ -MA.
§3' [The king sits down. The overseer of the cooks and all the cooks slaughter [the sheep ... ] The singers of Kaneš sing.]

§4' [One royal bodyguard goes. He takes his stand [at] near the sacrificial animal(s)(?).\textsuperscript{167} \[Whe\]n they divide up the slaughtered animals equally, [they x one(?) billy goat. The [k]ing steps up. The overseer of the cooks [holds(?)] a pitcher of gold [and ... ] He holds [it] forth to the king. [Ø?]]

§5' The overseer of the cooks [steps] before the altar. [The overseer] of the cooks and the overseer of the waiters [ ... ] The ALAN.ZU\textsubscript{e}-man recites. The shouter(?) shouts(?). The kita-\textsubscript{t} man calls out.

§6' The overseer of the cooks [libates] once to the hearth, [once] to the throne, [once to the window,] once to the wood of the door bolt and finally [once next to the h]earth.

§7' The king sits down. The cooks place [ ... ] Three hundred billy goats (and) twenty oxen [ ... ] Before the oxen, however, the chief of the royal body[guard ... ]

§8' Two billy goats, however, with x[ ... ] They drive them for Karzi, Hapa[ntali,] [DN, and DN. They slaughter (them).]

§9' When the slaughtering is completed(?) ... They sweep the floors.

§10' [ ... ] a pitcher [ ... ] the king the hand\textsuperscript{168}[ ... ] he libates ... ]

(the tablet breaks off)

\textsuperscript{167}. On \textit{auli-} see most recently Kühne, ZA 76 (1986) 85–117, who suggests that an original meaning "throat" came to mean "sacrificial animal." He does not discuss this passage, but it does fit well with this idea.

\textsuperscript{168}. Or ... in that way ...
A = KBo 11.40

Obverse i (transliteration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§11'</td>
<td>x+1</td>
<td>[ ]x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§12'</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>[ ]NINDA tu-u-ḫu-ra-i 1 UZJU BAR.SĪL GUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3'</td>
<td>[ ]DUqta-la-i-mi-īš KAŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4'</td>
<td>[ ]URUŠu-l]u-pa-āš-ša-āš DLAMMA-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§13'</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>[ ]NINDA tu-u-ḫu-ra-i 1 UZJU da-a-an-ḫa-aš-ti GUD ZAG[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>[ ]DUqta-la-i-mi-īš KAŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7'</td>
<td>[ ]URUTu-ultu-wa-āš DLAMMA-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§14'</td>
<td>8'</td>
<td>[ ]NINDA tu-u-ḫu-ra-i 1 UZJU TI GUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9'</td>
<td>[ ]DUqta-la-i-mi-īš KAŠ URU Ha-ra-na-āš DLAMMA-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§15'</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>[ ]NINDA tu-u-ḫu-ra-i 1 UZJU RA-PA-AL-TUM GUD-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11'</td>
<td>[ ]DUqta-la-i-mi-īš KAŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12'</td>
<td>[ ]URUSAGŠa-ri-īš-ša-āš DLAMMA-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§16'</td>
<td>13'</td>
<td>[ ]NINDA tu-u-ḫu-ra-i 1 UZJU BAR.DŬ UDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14'</td>
<td>[ ]DUqta-la-i-mi-īš KAŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>[ ]URUSAGŠu-u[n]-na-ra-āš DLAMMA-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§17'</td>
<td>16'</td>
<td>[ ]NINDA tu-u-ḫu-ra-i 1 UZJU ku-du-ūr UDU ZAG-na-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17'</td>
<td>[ ]DUqTa-la-i-mi-īš KAŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18'</td>
<td>[ ]DUKu-um-ma-ra-āš DLAMMA-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§18'</td>
<td>19'</td>
<td>[ ](NINDA tu-u-ḫu-ra-i 1 UZJU da-ḫa-aš-ti UDU ZAG-na-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>[ ]DUqTa-la-i-mi-īš KAŠ DLKe-el-la-āš DLAMMA-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§19'</td>
<td>21'</td>
<td>[ ](NINDA tu-u-ḫu-ra-i 1 UZJU ku-du-ūr UDU IGI-zi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22'</td>
<td>[ ](DUqTa-la-i-mi-īš KAŠ DLHa-la-āš-ša-āš DLAMMA-ri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(no paragraph divider in text B)

169. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

170. Spacing favors this reading over [URUŠ]a-ri-īš-ša-āš. Del Monte, RGTC 6: 357, gives two examples of a URUSAGŠarrišša, although he cites this example under the city name, which is expected here with a tutelary deity. One of the two occurrences of Mt. Šarešša is KUB 40.101 rev. 2, a duplicate to column ν of this tablet. The scribe may have meant the city and written the mountain.

171. Text B ii 3': DLAMMA-i. The parallel KUB 2.1 ii 51 has the river Šilḫiriya instead of Kella.

172. Text B ii 5': 1 DUqTa-la-i-mi-īš KAŠ.
A = KBo 11.40

Obverse i (translation)

§11'  Traces only.

§12'  [One tuḫurai- bread, one] BAR.SĪL,173  [one t]alaimi- jug of beer to the Tutelary Deity of [Šul]upašša,

§13'  [One] tuḫurai- [bread], one right “double bone”174 of an ox, [one] talaimi- [jug] of beer to the Tutelary Deity of [Tu]ttuwa,

§14'  [One] tuḫurai- [bread], one ox rib, [one talaimi- [jug] of beer to the Tutelary Deity of [Tuj]tuwana,

§15'  [One tuḫurai- [bread], one ox haunch, [one talaimi- [jug] of beer to the Tutelary Deity of [Mt(?) Ša]ressa,

§16'  [One tuḫurai- [bread], one BAR.DŪ of a sheep, [one talaimi- [jug] of beer to the Tutelary Deity of [Mt. Šu]nara,

§17'  [One tuḫurai- [bread], one right thigh175 of a sheep, [one talaimi- [jug] of beer to the Tutelary Deity of [the river Kumma]ra,

§18'  One tuḫurai- bread, one right “double bone” of a sheep, [one talaimi- jug of beer to the Tutelary Deity of the river Kella,

§19'  One tuḫurai- bread, one front thigh of a sheep, one talaimi- jug of beer to the Tutelary Deity of Ḫallašša,

173. A body part in the groin used as a flesh offering. This festival utilizes a number of different parts of animals as flesh offerings; Goetze in his review of KBo 11, JCS 17 (1963) 63, notes this and compiles a list of them. ušū/BAR.SĪL, ušū/BAR.DŪ, and ušū/barpi- have not been identified.


THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

A = KBo 11.40 Obverse i (transliteration cont.)

§20' 23' [(1 NINDAtu-u-h))u-ra-i 1 UZU ku-du-úr UDU EGIR-iz-zi


§21' 25' [(1 NINDAtu-u-h)u-ra-i 1 UZU ŠÁ-ya

26' [(1 DUGta-l]a-i-mi-iš KAŠ URU An-za-aš [DL][(AMMA-i)]177

§22' 27' [1 NINDAtu-u-h]u-[ra-i 1 UZU]x UDU x[

28' [1 DUGta-la-i-mi-iš KAŠ UR]x [PLAMMA-ri]

(the tablet breaks off)

A = KBo 11.40 Obverse ii178 (transliteration)

§23'  x+1 p[f]-

§24' 2' 1 NINDA [u-u-hu-ra-i 1 UZUX ]

3' [HURSA] [š-ki-ša-aš] [PLAMMA]

§25' 4' 1 NINDA tu-u-hu-r[a-i 1 UZUX šA La-ba-ar-na]

5' ū-u-it-na-aš [PLAMMA-aš]

6' 1 NINDA tu-u-hu-r[a-i 1 UZUX šA La-ba-ar-na]

7' in-na-ra-u-wa[-aḫ-hu-u-wa-aš] [PLAMMA-aš]

§26' 8' 1 NINDA tu-u-hu-ra[-i 1 UZUX šA La-ba-ar-na]

9' pal-ta-na-aš179 [PLAMMA-ri]

§27 10' 1 NINDA tu-u-hu-ra-i 1 [UZUX šA La-ba-ar-na]

11' wa-li-pa-at-ta-a[š-ši-iš] [PLAMMA-aš]

12' 1 NINDA tu-u-hu-ra-i 1 [UZUX šA La-ba-ar-na]

13' pa-ra-a ḫa-lan-daš[a-n-da-an-na-aš] [PLAMMA]

§28' 14' 1 NINDA tu-u-hu-ra-i 1 [UZUX šA La-ba-ar-na]

15' TI-an-na-aš [PLAMMA-ri] x[

16' 1 NINDA tu-u-hu-ra-i 1 [UZUX][ar-pf-iš šA La-ba-ar-na]

17' tar-šu-i-la-an-na-aš [PLAMMA-ri]

§29' 18' 1 NINDA tu-u-hu-ra-i 1 UZU ŠA [šA La-ba-ar-na]

19' tu-uz-zì-ya-aš [PLAMMA-ri]

20' 1 NINDA tu-u-hu-ra-i 1 UZU[šA La-ba-ar-na]

21' za-aḫ-hi-ya-aš [PLAMMA-ri]

22' [1 NINDA tu-u-hu-ra-i 1 UZU Š[šA La-ba-ar-na]

23' [pf-ra-an ḫu-i-ya[-u-wa-aš] [PLAMMA-ri]

(the tablet breaks off)

176. Text B ii 7': [PLAMMA-ri.

177. Bottom of tablet in text B.

178. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

179. The parallel KUB 2.1 ii 18 has [UZU]ZAG.UDU-aš.
A = *KBo* 11.40 Obverse i (translation cont.)

§20' One *tuhurai-* bread, one rear thigh of a sheep, [one *talaimi-* [jug] of beer to the Tutelary Deity of Tidanda,

§21' One *tuhurai-* bread, one heart, one [*talaimi-* [jug] of beer to the Tutelary Deity of Anza,

§22' [One *tuhra[rail-* bread, one (flesh) offering) of a sheep x, [one *talaimi-* [jug] of beer to the Tutelary Deity of ...  

(the tablet breaks off)

A = *KBo* 11.40 Obverse ii\(^{180}\) (translation)

§23' Traces only.

§24' One *t[uhurai-* bread, [one (flesh offering) (to) the Tutelary Deity of] Mt. I[škiša],

§25' One *tuhur[aï]-* bread, [one (flesh offering) (to) the Tutelary Deity of] the animals [of the Labarna],  
One *tuhur[aï]-* bread, [one (flesh offering) (to) the Tutelary Deity of] the strengthen[ing of the Labarna],

§26' One *tuhurai-* bread, [one (flesh offering) to the Tutelary Deity of] the shoulder [of the Labarna],

§27' One *tuhurai-* bread, [one (flesh offering) (to) the Tutelary Deity of] encircling(?) [of the Labarna],  
One *tuhurai-* bread, [one (flesh offering) (to) the Tutelary Deity of] the divine pow[er of the Labarna],

§28' One *tuhurai-* bread, one [(flesh offering)] to the Tutelary Deity x of the life [of the Labarna],  
One *tuhurai-* bread, one *b[arpi- to] the Tutelary Dei[ty] of the heroism [of the Labarna],

§29' One *tuhurai-* bread, one heart [to the Tutelary Deity of the army [of the Labarna],  
One *tuhurai-* bread, one (flesh [offering]) to the Tutelary Deity x of battle [of the Labarna],  
One *tuhurai-* bread, one hea[rt to the Tutelary Deity of] runnin[gg before of the Labarna],  

(the tablet breaks off)

\(^{180}\) After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
E = KBo 12.60 (transliteration)

§30' x+1
DLAMMA-Il[1 NINDA-tu-hu-ra-i 1 uzuz. TI? ȘA La-ba-ar-na]
2' UJr.SAG Ki-da-u-wa-an-da-aš [DLAMMA-i]
3' 1 NINDA-tu-hu-ra-i 1 ma-ni-in-ku-w[a-an-da uzuz. TIi2 ȘA La-ba-ar-na]
4' pî-ha-ad-da-aš-ši-iš DLAMMA-i
5' 1 NINDA-tu-hu-ra-i 1 uzuz. da-an-b[a-aš-ti ȘA La-ba-ar-na]
6' šar-la-da-aš-ši-iš DLAMMA-i
7' [1 NINDA-tu-hu-ra-i 1 uzuz. bar-pî-i[§ ȘA La-ba-ar-na qîšTUKUL-aš DLAMMA-i]
8' [1 NINDA-tu-hu-ra-i 1 uzuz. bar-pî-i[§ ȘA La-ba-ar-na mu-wa-ad-da-la-ḫi-da-aš]
9' [DLAMMA-i] 1 NINDA-tu-hu-ra-i 1 uzuz. x

(the tablet breaks off)

F = KUB 55.25

Obverse (transliteration)

§31' x+1 [ ] x [
2' (completely abraded away)

§32' 3' (completely abraded away)
4' [ ] x [ ] DA-la-[aš]

§33' 5' [1 NINDA-tu-hu-ra-i 1 uzuz. BAR.ŠIL [ ]
6' [ ] x1 DA-la-

§34' 7' [1 NINDA-tu-hu-ru-a-Î]1 uzuz. bar-pî-iš x[
8' [gi-im-ru-aš] DA-la-

§35' 9' [1 NINDA-tu-hu-ra-i] 1 uzuz. bar-pîš KI.MIN mi-nu-ma[-aš DA-la-aš]

§36' 10' [1 NINDA-tu-hu-ra-i] 1 uzuz. bar-pé-eš KI.MIN aš-šu-la-aš DA[-aš]


(the tablet breaks off)

181. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs. Restored from the parallel KUB 2.1 iii 8–15.

182. See CHD sub man(n)i (n)kuwant- 1.a.2’.

183. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs. Restored from the parallel KUB 2.1 iii 29–35. The reverse is almost completely lost, although we may read DA-[aš] in line 4’, uzuz. du-dr in 5’, and DA-[la-] in 8’. Such minimal data have not allowed placement of the reverse into the main text of either festival.
E = KBo 12.60\textsuperscript{184} (translation)

§30' To the Tutelary Deity of [x],\textsuperscript{185} [one tuḫ] u[ra]- bread, one rib(?) to the Tutelary Deity] of Mt. Kidawanda [of the Labarna],
3' One tuḫurai- bread, one shor[t rib(?) to] the Tutelary De[ity] of the piḫadda- [of the Labarna],
5' One tuḫurai- bread, one “double [bone” to] the Tutelary De[ity] of praise [of the Labarna],
7' [One] tuḫurai- bread, one ḫarpi- [to the Tutelary Deity of the weapon of the Labarna],
8' [One tuḫurai- bread], one ḫarpi- [to the Tutelary Deity of the awe-inspiring ability(?) of the Labarna],
9' One tuḫurai- bread, [one (flesh offering) ... (the tablet breaks off)]

F = KUB 55.25\textsuperscript{186}

Obverse (translation)

§31' Traces only.

§32' Ala [of ...]

§33' [One tuḫurai- bread], one BAR.SIL, (to) Ala of x,

§34' [One tuḫurai- bread], one ḫarpi-, x (to) Ala [of the countryside],

§35' [One tuḫurai- bread], one ḫarpi-, the same (to) [Ala of] kindliness,

§36' [One tuḫurai- bread], one ḫarpi-, the same (to) [Ala of] favor,

§37' [One tuḫurai- bread, one ḫarpi(?), the same] to [Ala of] Hatti,

§38' [One tuḫurai- bread, one ḫarpi(?), the same] to [Ala of the arm[y],

184. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
185. From preceding lines now lost.
186. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

B = KUB 40.108 Reverse v\(^{187}\) (transliteration)

\[\text{§39'}\]
\begin{align*}
1 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 \text{UZU} \text{har-pf-i} \ 1 \text{DUG}ta[-la-i-mi-i} \text{š KAŠ]}
2 & \text{PA-a-la-aš} \text{pa-ra-a} \ \text{ha-an-da-an-da-a[n-na-aš]}
3 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 \text{UZU} \text{har-pf-i} \ 1 \text{DUG}ta-la-i-mi-i} \text{š KAŠ]}
4 & \text{PA-a-la-aš} \ \text{ša-ra-a} \ \text{hal-z}i-ya-fu-l-w[a-aš]
5 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 \text{UZU}x \ [1 \text{DUG}ta-la-i-mi-i} \text{š KAŠ]}
6 & \text{PA-a-la-aš} x[
7 & \text{[x x]}]
\end{align*}

C = KUB 40.101 Obverse\(^{188}\) (transliteration)

\[\text{§40'}\]
\begin{align*}
1 & \text{PA-a-la-aš ŠA mTu-ut-?} \text{ha?-li?-ya} \ 1 \text{PA-a-la-aš}
2 & \text{ŠA É.LUGAL ŠA ? mTju-ut-ha-li-y} \ 1 \text{GŠBANŠUR}\(^{189}\)
\end{align*}

\[\text{§41'}\]
\begin{align*}
3 & \text{ŠA mTu-ut-} \text{ha-1]i}-ya \ \text{A-NA} \ \text{HUR. SAG.MEŠ! da-pf-aš}
4 & \text{[1 NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-[-]}i] \ 1 \text{UZUTI GUD}
5 & \text{[A-NA} \ \text{HUR.SAG} \text{H}u-ul-la \ 1 \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i}
6 & \text{[1 UZU]x A-NA} \ \text{HUR. SAG}Tu-ut-\text{ha-li-y}
\end{align*}

A = KBo 11.40 Reverse v (transliteration)

\begin{align*}
2 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 \text{UZU} \text{da-an}\(^{190}\) h[(a-aš-ti)]
3 & \text{A-NA} \ \text{HUR.SAG} \text{Kam-ma-li-ya}[Ø]
4 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 \text{UZU}ku-du-úr [(A-NA} \ \text{HUR.SAG} \text{Da-a-ña}]
5 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 \text{UZU}ku-du-úr [(\text{HUR.SAG}iš-ku-ru-nu-wa)]
6 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 \text{UZU} \text{har-pf-i}[\text{š} \ \text{HUR.SAG} \text{Da-ag-gur-qa}]
7 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 \text{UZU}ku-du-úr [(\text{HUR.SAG}iš-ah-} \text{har-wa}]
8 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 \text{UZU} \text{har-pf-i} [(\text{HUR.SAG}šar-pa-aš)]
9 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 \text{UZU} \text{har-pf-i} [(\text{HUR.SAG} \text{Sa-re-es-sa}]
10 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 \text{UZU} \text{har-pf-i} [(\text{HUR.SAG}ša-re-eš-ša]}
11 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 \text{UZU} \text{har-pf-i} [(\text{HUR.SAG}ša-re-eš-ša)]
12 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 \text{UZU} \text{har-pf-i} [(\text{HUR.SAG}ša-re-eš-ša)]
13 & \text{H}a-te-en-zu-wa a[(l-da-an-ni)]
14 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-i} \ 1 [(\text{UZU} \text{MÁŠ!-QA GUD})]\(^{191}\)
15 & \text{A-NA} \ \text{HUR.SAG} [(aš-šu-ú)]
16 & \text{NINDA}tu-\text{hu-ra-[-i} \ 1 \text{UZU} \text{MÁŠ-QA GUD}
17 & \text{A-NA} \ \text{HUR.SAG} [(aš-šu-ú)-an-da-aš)]
\end{align*}

187. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
188. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
189. Restored from similar passages in the parallel festival, KUB 2.1 iii 21–25 and v 1–5, which have a different order.
190. Collation confirms this reading.
191. In text C the next three offerings are prescribed as KI.MIN, "the same."
B = KUB 40.108

Reverse v (translation)

§39' One tuhrail- bread, one ḫarpi-, one talaimi- jug [of beer] (to) Ala [of] divine power,
One tuhrail- bread, one ḫarpi-, one [talaimi- jug of beer] (to) Ala [of] calling up,
One tuhrail- bread, one (flesh [offering], one talaimi- jug of beer] (to) Ala [of x],
(Traces)

C = KUB 40.101

Obverse (translation)

§40' [(For) Ala of Tudḫaliya, Ala [of the palace of T]udḫaliya, one offering table.

§41' To all the mountains [of Tudhalj]iya:
[One tuhraili- [bread], one rib of an ox [to Mt. Ḥulla, one tuhrail- bread, [one
(flesh offering)] to Mt. Tudḫaliya,

A = KBo 11.40

Reverse v (translation)

One tuhrail- bread, one “double bone” to Mt. Kammaliya,
2' One tuhrail- bread, one thigh to Mt. Daḥa,
One tuhrail- bread, one thigh to [Mt. P]iškurunuwa,
6' One tuhrail- bread, one ḫarpi- to Mt. Daggurqa,
One tuhrail- bread, one thigh to Mt. Ḥahḥarwa,
8' One tuhrail- bread, one ḫarpi- to Mt. Ṣarpa,
One tuhrail- bread, one ḫarpi- (to) [Mt. Za]liyanu,
10' One tuhrail- bread, one ḫarpi- to Mt. Šarešša,
One tuhrail- bread, one ḫar[p]i- (to) the river Maraššanda,
12' One tuhrail- bread, one ḫarp[i-] to the spring [of] Ḥatenzuwa,
14' One tuhrail- bread, one ox hide to Mt. Kaššu,
16' One tuhrail- bread, [one ox hide] to Mt. Arnuwanda,

192. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
193. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

A = KBo 11.40

Reverse v (transliteration cont.)

§41' 18' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(h\)[u-ra-i 1 UZU\(MAS\)-QA GUD\(UR\).\(S\)(\(AG\)-A-ma-na)]
(\(cont\).) 19' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(h\)[u-ra-i 1 UZU\(MAS\)-QA GUD\(UR\).\(S\)(\(AG\)-Da-hal-mu-na-a\(š\))]
20' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(h\)[u-r(a-i 1 UZU\(ku\)-du-\(ur\)) \(UR\).\(SA\)(\(G\)\(T\)\(H\)\(A\)-\(hu\)-ra-an-x-an-\(ta\)-a\(š\))]
21' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(h\)-\(u\)-ra-(i 1 UZU\( \(Ş\)A\) A-N(A? x\(195\) I\(š\)-u-wa-an-da-a\(š\))]
22' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(h\)-\(u\)-ra-i 1 UZU\( \(Ş\)A\) x-ya-a\(š\)]
23' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(h\)-\(u\)-ra-i 1 UZU\(ku\)-du-\(ur\)
24' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(h\)-\(u\)-ra-i 1 UZU\(x\)

(the tablet breaks off)

C

D = KUB 40.107

Reverse iv\(^{197}\) (transliteration)

§42' x+1 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(har\)-\(pf\)-\(i\)\[\(S\) A-N\(A\)]
2' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(ELLAG\).\(GÜ\(N\).\(A\) [A-N\(A\)]
3' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(TI\) A-N\(A\)
4' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(TI\) A-N\(A\)
5' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(har\)-\(pf\)-\(i\) [A-N\(A\)]
6' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(ku\)-du-\(ur\) [A-N\(A\)]
7' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(har\)-\(pf\)-\(i\) A\(]\)-N\(A\)
8' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(har\)-\(pf\)-\(i\) p(u?\(^{198}\)
9' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(har\)-\(pf\)-\(i\)
10' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(har\)-\(pf\)-\(i\)
11' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(har\)-\(pf\)-\(i\)
12' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(x\)
13' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(har\)-\(pf\)-\(i\)
14' \(Ş\)A KUR.KUR.H\(I\).\(A\) \(hu\)-u-ma-an-da-a\(š\) \(]\)\(D\).\(UTU\)-\(Ş\)\(I\) [ku-i-e-\(e\)
\(şi\)-ya-at-tal-li-iş-ki-i\(z\)-\(z\)\(i\)]\(^{199}\)
15' 1 NINDA\(tu\)-\(hu\)-ra-i UZU\(har\)-\(pf\)-\(i\) \(H\)\(UR\).\(SAG\).\(H\).\(I\) A\(]\) [hu-u-ma-an-da-a\(š\)
16' [ x x \(]\)\(] x x 1 MA-HAR \(]\)\(D\).\(UTU\)-\(Ş\)\(I\) ku-i-e-\(e\)\(I\)-\(e\)\(ş\)

194. Or \(\?\)
195. The sign looks like ar, which I cannot interpret meaningfully.
196. Or \(\?\)
197. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
198. Or \(ş\)?\(…\)
199. This is the expected restoration here and in 16', although it would assume a wider column than is indicated by the restorations in §43'.
A = KBo 11.40

Reverse v (translation cont.)

18' One tuḫurai- bread, [one ox hide] to [M]t. Amana,
     One tuḫurai- bread, [one ox hide] (to) [M]t. Daḫalmuna,
20' One tuḫurai- bread, one thigh (to) [M]t.(?)²⁰⁰ Naḫuran-x-anta?
     One tuḫari- bread, one heart [to?] «x?» Isuwanda??
22' One tuḫurai- bread, [one (flesh offering)] (to) [M]t.(?)²⁰¹ X-ya-aš,
     One tuḫurai- bread, one thigh [to DN],
24' One tuḫurai- bread, [one (flesh offering) to DN],
     (the tablet breaks off)

D = KUB 40.107

Reverse iv²⁰² (translation)

§42' One tuḫurai- bread, (one) ḫarpi- [to
  2' One tuḫurai- bread, (one) kidney [to
     One tuḫurai- bread, (one) rib [to
  4' One tuḫurai- bread, (one) rib [to
     One tuḫurai- bread, (one) ḫarpi- [to
  6' One tuḫurai- bread, (one) thigh [to
     One tuḫurai- bread, (one) ḫarpi- [p[u-] to
  8' One tuḫurai- bread, (one) ḫarpi- [ to
     One tuḫurai- bread, (one) ḫarpi- [ to
  10' One tuḫurai- bread, (one) ḫarpi-i- to
     One tuḫurai- bread, (one) ḫarpi-i- to
  12' One tuḫurai- bread, (one) (flesh [offering]) to
     One tuḫurai- bread, (one) ḫarpi- [x] to
  14' of all the land [which] His Majesty [regularly hunts]
     One tuḫurai- bread, one ḫarpi- to all the mountains, ... which before His Majesty
     [...]

  200. Or river.
  201. Or river.
  202. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
A = KBo 11.40 Reverse vi (transliteration)

§43’ x+1

D iv 17’

2’ {[1 NINDA(t-u-hu-r(a-))] i 1 UZU|har-pf-iš ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ ṭu-u-ma-an-te-ēš
3’ [PUTU-§(i ku-)] i-e-ēš ši-ya-at-tal-li-iš-ki-iz-zi
4’ {[1 NINDA(t(u-h))] u-ra-i 1 UZU|har-pf-iš ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ ṭu-u-ma-an-te-ēš
5’ [SA KU(R UR)] UGU-ТИ DUTU-§I ku-i-e-ēš
6’ {[(ši-y)a-a]t-ta-al-li-iš-ki-iz-zi
7’ {[1 NINDA(t(u-h))] u-ra-i 1 UZU|har-pf-iš A-NA ḠMa-a-la
8’ {[1 NINDA(t(u-h))] u-ra-i 1 UZUTI A-NA ḠMa-am-ma-ra-an-da
9’ {[1 NINDA(t(u-h))] u-ra-i 1 UZUTI A-NA ḠGur-ma-li-ya
10’ {[1 NINDA(t(u-h))] u-ra-i 1 UZU|har-pf-iš ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ ṭu-u-ma-an-te-ēš
11’ [ID.MEŠ208] ṭu-u-ma-an-te-ēš SA KUR UR|Ḫur-ri
12’ [PUTU-§I ku-i-e-ēš ši-ga-at-tal-li-(iš)>-ki-iz-zi
13’ {[(1 NINDA)t(u-h)] u-ra-i 1 UZU|pár-ku-i ḫa-aš-ta-i
14’ [ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ] ṭu-u-ma-an-te-ēš ID.MEŠ ṭu-u-ma-an-te-ēš
15’ [SA KUR UR|Ar-za-u-uwa DUTU-§I ku-i-e-ēš
16’ {[(ši-ya-ta]-li-iš-ki-iz-zi
17’ {[1 NINDA(t(u-h))] ra-i 1 UZU|ÉLLAG209 ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ ID.MEŠ
18’ [SA KUR UR|Ma-a-ša DUTU-§I ku-i-e-ēš
19’ {[(ši-ya-a)]t-ta-li-iš-ki-iz-zi
20’ {[1 NINDA(t(u-h))] ra-i 1 UZU|ZAG.UDU ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ ID.MEŠ
21’ [SA KUR UR|Uu-qa-a DUTU-§I ku-i-e-ēš
22’ {[(ši-ya-ta]-li-e-ēš-ki-iz-zi
23’ {[1 NINDA(t(u-h))] ra-i 1 UZU|har-pf-iš
24’ [ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ ID.MEŠ SA KUR UR|Ga-aš-ga
25’ [PUTU-§I ku-i-e-ēš ši-ya-tal-le-e-ēš-ki-iz-zi
26’ {[1 NINDA(t(u-h))] ra-i 1 UZU|ÉLLAG.GUN.A ḤUR.SAG.MEŠ ID.MEŠ
27’ [SA KUR UR|ḪA-AT-TI A-NA ḠLAMMA ku-i-e-ēš
28’ [KUR.KUR.MEŠ ṭu-u-ma-Jan-te-ēš 1 GІS BANŠUR

Colophon (transliteration)

29’ [DUB] 1 KAM U-UL QA-TI
30’ [I-NA] ḠLAMMA gi-im-ma-an-d[a-aš
31’ [A-NA] GІS ḤUR-kan ḫa-an-d[a-an

203. This line is probably the same as D (KUB 40.107) iv 16’. There is no paragraph line in KBo 11.40.
204. Although text D prescribes the same flesh offerings as the main text, it does not specify a number.
205. From the Festival of Group Offerings, Bo 6113 iv 17’ and elsewhere: ḤUR.SAG.ḪI.A.
207. Text D iv 20’: [SA KU]R UR|I-LI-TI.
209. Text D iv 29’: UZU|ÉLLAG.GUN.A.
A = KBo 11.40

Reverse vi (translation)

§43' [One tuḫur]ai- [bread], one ḫarpi- (to) all the mountains which His [Majesty] regularly hunts:
4' [One] tuḫurai- [bread], one ḫarpi- (to) all the mountains [of] the upper [la]nd which His Majesty regularly hunts,
7' [One] tuḫurai- [bread], one ḫarpi- to the river Mala,
8' [One] tuḫurai- [bread], one rib to the river Mammaranda,
[One] tuḫurai- [bread], one rib to the river Gurmaliya,
10' [One] tuḫurai- [bread], one ḫarpi- (to) all the mountains (and) all [the rivers] of the Hurrian land which [His Majesty] regularly hunts,
13' One tuḫurai- [bread], one bare bone(?) (to) all [the mountains] (and) all the rivers [of the land] of Arzawa which His Majesty regularly [hu]nts,
17' [One tuḫur]ai- [bread], one kidney (to) the mountains (and) rivers [of the land of] Maša which His Majesty regularly [hu]nts,
20' [One tuḫurai- [bread], one shoulder (to) the mountains (and) rivers [of] the Luqqa [land] which His Majesty regularly [hu]nts,
23' [One tuḫur]ai- [bread], one ḫarpi- (to) [the mountains (and) r]ivers of the Kaškean land which [His Majesty] regularly hunts,
26' [One tuḫurai- [bread], one kidney (to) the mountains (and) rivers [of the land of Ḫ]atti. For the Tutelary Deity of [al]l of which [lands], one offering table.

Colophon (translation)

One [tablet], not finished. [In] the winter temple of the Tutelary Deity. True to the wooden tablet.
CTH 682.3: KBo 12.59

This tablet is included here because the festival described therein shows some resemblance to sections of the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities. The festival of KBo 12.59 does not, however, mention tutelary deities except Zitḫariya once in broken context. The similarity occurs in the portion of the festival in which the gods to be worshipped are geographical locations described as those in which the king regularly hunts or campaigns. The same formula is used for some of the deities in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities. The use of tuḫurai- bread for the bread offerings also parallels the Festival of Individual Offerings. These similarities do not necessitate taking this text as part of the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities, but it may have been a part of the ceremony now lost.

Transliteration

Obverse i

§1' x+1 [LUGAL-uš ku-i-e-eš ši-ya-tal-li-iš-ki-iz-zí]

§2' 2' [MĀŠ.GAL-]aš 1-an Ša-lu-wa-an-ta ḪUR.SAG-i mT[u-ut-ša-li-ya-aš]

§3' 3' [LUGAL-uš ku-in ši-ya-tal-li-iš-ki-iz-zí ū-u-r[-ni-is-ki-iz-zí]

§3' 3' [MĀŠ.GAL]-aš 1-an Ḫa-le-en-zu-wa ÍD-i mTu-ut-ša-li[-ya-aš LUGAL-uš]

§4' 5' [ku-i]n la-aḫ-ḫi-iš-ki-iz-zi Ku-um-ra ÍD-i Ke-[l-la ÍD-i]


§6' [h]u-u-wa-ar-ni-iš-ki-iz-zi Šal-ma-ku211 ÍD-i


§8' [mT]u-ut-ša-li-ya-aš a-aš-ši-ya-an-ti

§9' [mT]u-ut-ša-li-ya-aš

§10' [ŠU.NIGIN] 14 MĀŠ.GAL

§11' [ o o o o ] UZU[NĪG.GIG-ši NINDA-tu-ḫu-u-ra-i Ḫa-ḫu-pu-na-i

§12' [mT]u-ut-ša-li-ya-aš LUGAL-wa-aš pī-ra-an ti-an-ti212 (eras.)

§13' [ o o o o o o ] [x x] NINDA-tu-ḫu-ra-i Ḫa[x

§14' [ o o o o o o o o ] [x-iš-zí LUGAL-uš

(the tablet breaks off)

210. Utilized in both the Festival of Group Offerings, KUB 2.1 vi 1–9, and the Festival of Individual Offerings, KBo 11.40 vi 2'–26'.

211. Or Šal-ma-ma. Del Monte and Tischler, RGTC 6:546, read Šal-ma-ku for this hapax legomenon.

212. Scribal error for ti-an-zi.
Translation

Obverse i

§1' [ ... which the king regul[arly hunts (and) chases].

§2' One [billy goat] to the mountain Šaluwanta which T[udḫaliya the king] regularly hunts (and) chases.

§3' One [billy goat] to the river of Ḥalenzuwa in which Tudḫaliya the king regularly campaigns.
To the river Kumra (and) to the river Kel[la] which Tudḫaliya the king regul[arly hunts (and) chases.
To the river Šalmaku, the beloved of Ḫuwašana, to the river Šeḫiriya, the beloved of Tudḫaliya.

§4' [Total:] 14 billy goats.

§5' [x], liver, tuḫurai- bread for Zaḫpuna they place before [Tudḫ]aliya the king.

§6' [x], x, tuḫurai- bread to D[N ... ] he/she x-s. The king[ ... 

(the tablet breaks off)
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

CTH 682.3: KBo 12.59 (transliteration cont.)

Reverse iii

Only a few signs are preserved from the beginnings of the lines of §§7'-10'.

Reverse iv

§11' x+1
[\text{UZU} oo o o \text{ZA}G-na-an \text{NINDA}tu-ḥu-ra-i-ya a da]-a-i \text{NND} [ o o o ]
2' [ o o o ]x An-zi-ya TUL-i \text{mTu}-u-ha-li-ya-aš LUG[AL-wa-aš]
3' [a-aš-ši-ya-a]n-ta-aš ú-e-te-na-aš [ ]

§12' 4' [\text{UZU} oo o o \text{NJND}atu-ḥu-ra-i-ya ḫa-ri-nu-um-ma ḤUR.SAG-i
5' [\text{mTu}-u-ha-li-ya-aš LUGAL-uš ku-in \text{GŠER[IN w]}a-ar-ḥu-<wa>-nu-ut

§13' 6' [\text{UZU} oo o o ]x-an ḫa-aš-ta-i \text{NINDA}tu-ḥu-ra-i-ya ḫi-iš-da-a
7' [ o o o o o ]li \text{mTu}-u-ha-li-ya-an LUGAL-un
8' [ o o o o o ]x URU-an [k]u-i-e-es uš-kán-zi

§14' 9' [ o o o o o ]a?an-ta i-ya-an-zi

§15' 10' [\text{UZU} oo o o ]x \text{NINDA}tu-ḥu-u-ra-i-ya da-a-i nu kiš-an me-ma-i
11' [ o o o o o o o ]x ḫa-ah-pu-na-ā ḫu-u-ma-an-ta-aš
12' [ o o o o o ]LUGAL SA]LUGAL-aš

§16' 13' [\text{UZU} oo o o \text{NINDA}tu-ḥu-ra-i-ya da-a-i nu kiš-an me-fma-i]
14' [ o o o o o ]Zi-i[t]-ḥa-ri-ya-aš in-x[ o o o ]

(the tablet breaks off)

213. After a large gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
214. After a large gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
§§ 7–10' continue the flesh offerings of the festival.

Reverse iv

§11' He places a [ri]ght [(flesh offering)] (and) tuḥurai- bread. [To] D[N ... ] To the spring Anziya of the beloved water(?) of Tudḥaliya the king.

§12' [(Flesh offering)], tuḥurai- [br]eak to the mountain Ḥarinumma which [Tudḥ]aliya the king has planted with ced[ar].

§13' [x]-bone, tuḥurai- bread, ḫišda, the [x] who regularly see Tudḥaliya the king (and) the [x] city.

§14' They make [ ... -r]anta.

§15' [(Flesh offering)] and tuḥurai- bread he places. He recites as follows: [x?], Zaḥpuna, all[217] [the x, the king and qu]een.

§16' [(Flesh offering)] and [tuḥur]ai- [bread] he places. He recites as follows: [x] of [Zi][ḫariya in-x[ ... ].

(the tablet breaks off)

215. After a large gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
216. After a large gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
217. Although ḫumantaš in normal syntax would follow the word it modifies, sense and morphology indicate that it should modify not Zaḥpuna, but rather whatever followed in the break.
This and the following text fragment have been published and identified as part of a festival dedicated to all the tutelary deities since Archi's article was published. They are too fragmentary to be identified as duplicates to preserved portions of the attributed festival texts. It is not even certain that either of them is part of the same festivals described by the main texts.

The obverse is not sufficiently well preserved to yield a coherent translation of the festival procedure. The mention of [all] the names of Ala in line 11 and Karzi and Ḫapa[ntaliya] in line 14 indicate that this text may be part of the festival for all the LAMMA and Ala deities, but with so little preserved text we cannot match it with any part of that festival as preserved.

Transliteration

Obverse

§1 1 [x MĀŠ.GAL.ḪI.A an-da x[
3 ] 3 ME 50 MĀŠ.GAL [ḫ]u-u-kān-na-aš
4 EGR?-p]a da-a-u-wa-x[ hu-u-m]a?-an 3-šU [huυ]-u[-kān-zi?]
§2 5 [x-kān pa-[a]l[-iz -z]i
§3 6 LUGAL?-]uš ti-ya-z[i o o o -a]n BAL-ti
§4 7 LUGAL-[uš ti-ya[-zi o o o o ]
8 [x ši-ip-pa-an-[a-an-zi 1 U]DU 1 [GUD.ŠE] x[
9 ]218 GUD.AMAR.MAH x[ o o o ] [ ] [x]
10 [x-ar 1 UDU! ŠE 1 [ o o ]x x]
12 [ ḪUR.SAG.ḪI.A ĪD.MEŠ [ ]
§5 13 [x 2 SILA4 Ḫ.ŠA KŪ.GA ši-[p-pa-an-da-an-zi]
§6 14 -m[a]-aš-ma ḫKar-zi ḫfa-[a]-an-ta-li-ya]
15 [x pé-en-ni-ya-an-z[i
16 [x ap-pa-an-z[i

(the tablet breaks off)

Reverse

§7' x+1 (Only traces preserved.)
2' (-)p]e?-es-sa-na[(-)
3'–4' (Only traces preserved.)

218. Or 3.
THE FESTIVAL FOR ALL THE TUTELARY DEITIES

CTH 682.5: KUB 52.100

This text does not fit as a duplicate into the preserved portion of any of the other texts of the festival. It is a fragment of what looks like an extensive list of tutelary deities and therefore is likely to be part of the same festival. Like the Festival of Individual Offerings it contains descriptions of the offerings for individual deities.

Transliteration

x+1 ] x[  

2' ] ḫ[ALAMMA g̣ISTIR ḫG[AL.ZU?  

3' ] ḫ[ALAMMA LĪL GUB-aš 1-ŠU[e]-ku-zi  

4' ] ḫ[ALAMMA É.DINGIR-LIM ḫ[ALAMMA [  

5' ] ḫ[ALAMMA Aš-RI ḫ[ALAMMA LUGAL x[  

6' ] ḫ[ALAMMA KUS-gur-ša-aš GUB-aš 1-ŠU[e]-ku-zi  

7' ] ḫ[ABA-pa-liš-ya-an TUŠ-aš 1-ŠU[e]-ku-zi  

8' ] ḫ[Du-uhš-ka-ma-x[  

9' ] NINDA KAŠ x[  

(the tablet breaks off)

COMMENTARY

Each of the two versions of this festival requires a long and involved ceremony. The evidence of KUB 44.16, which duplicates part of KBo 22.189 on its obverse and part of KUB 2.1 on its reverse, indicates the presence of at least one tablet before KUB 2.1 in the series required to complete the Festival of Group Offerings. The Festival of Individual Offerings probably also required at least a two tablet series to complete its description. The festivals are long because they strive for completeness in circumscribing the province of the tutelary deity, and they are the best evidence we have for the Hittite conception of what tutelary deities might be expected to protect. Their great interest stems from the theological exploration embodied in their ceremony. This is most clear in KUB 2.1, which as preserved is almost exclusively a list of very precisely described LAMMA and Ala deities.

In the festivals the tutelary deities are organized in groups to some extent; for instance in KUB 2.1 the first column is mostly LAMMA deities of various locations and the second column is devoted to LAMMA deities mostly of Labarna’s attributes and possessions. Following this are the Ala deities of various attributes and areas of the kingdom intermingled. The last major element in the list is a series of offerings to the major regions of the king’s domain.
The list of Ala deities begins only after that for LAMMA deities is completed, and it duplicates some of the characteristics and epithets of the LAMMA deities. 

\( ^{p}\)LAMMA and \( ^{p}\)Ala are two distinct representations of the protective spirit; so much is clear from the overlap in this text, in which there are for example both a LAMMA and Ala tutelary deity of the army, of divine power (\( ^{p}\)para handandatar), and of many cities and mountains. However, the majority of epithets in this systematized list of gods as preserved occur with either the LAMMA or the Ala deities, which indicates the different spheres in which these two manifestations of the protective genius might operate. In Chapter 1 it is argued that \( ^{p}\)LAMMA and \( ^{p}\)Ala are a divine couple, both tutelary deities. Here we see them together in a few cases but in general controlling different areas. These texts are the only extensive evidence we have for how these two gods differed in Hittite perceptions. Many of the epithets of LAMMA and Ala deities are unique or very rare. This at times renders their understanding difficult but also serves as an indication of how far-ranging was this description of the nature of the tutelary deity in the Hittite universe. This is not a list of the standard divine epithets haphazardly applied to tutelary deities but rather a catalogue of very specific and distinctive deities to guard and protect narrowly defined aspects of the king’s and the state’s life.

In §33’ of the Festival of Group Offerings (\( KUB \) 2.1 iii 26), the point at which the Ala deities begin to be listed, there is a noticeable change in syntax in the titles. Whereas in the list of LAMMA epithets, the name LAMMA almost always came last in the phrase, with the names of the Ala deities they tend to come first in the phrase “to Ala of ... ,” in Akkadian or Sumerian syntax. This use of Akkadian syntax with the Ala names conditioned my understanding of the names beginning in iv 5 which include the Labarna element.

Many of the LAMMA titles are complemented \( ^{p}\)LAMMA-\( i \) or \( ^{p}\)LAMMA-\( ri \), some are \( ^{p}\)LAMMA-\( aš \), and the others occur without complement. In \( KBo \) 11.40 i 24’ \( ^{p}\)LAMMA-\( ri \) has the variant in the duplicate \( KUB \) 40.108 ii 7’ \( ^{p}\)LAMMA-\( i \). This kind of inconsistency demonstrates the care needed in deriving meaning from the morphology of these phonetic complements. Perhaps some of the differences in Hittite complementation on the Sumerogram LAMMA are important and reflect different underlying Hittite names for these gods. Because of the great consistency in using the Sumerian name for this god, we cannot draw on much outside evidence to indicate what those names may be. In several of the texts treated in this work there are examples of the name Inara alternating with \( ^{p}\)LAMMA. This name could be behind the writing \( ^{p}\)LAMMA-\( ri \), but it is not necessarily so. Because the emphasis in this text is on the variety of epithets, I see no need to postulate different Hittite names behind the different complementations of the Sumerogram in the festival. Most of the LAMMA deities in the list have been understood as dative case; see Güterbock, \( SBo \) II: 8 with n. 28, on understanding these names as dative. Ala is portrayed in a unique way in this text. In other texts Ala is the name of one particular deity and does not occur with epithets. She is a goddess who needs no further identifying title. In this festival, however, the name Ala serves as a kind of title in parallel structure with \( ^{p}\)LAMMA. As mentioned in the translation, the case of \( ^{p}\)A-a-la-aš, the form consistently
used throughout the text, is problematic. On the analogy of the preponderance of the
ative-locative case for the LAMMA deities, one could take DAlaš as plural dative-
locative. However, the use of the Luwian genitival adjective in the nominative case in
KUB 2.1 iii 44-48 and elsewhere indicates that singular nominative should be understood
for the form DAlaš. I have preserved in the translation distinctions of case in the Hittite,
although in lists such as this the cases often get confused, so we should not ascribe too
much meaning to this.

The list of deities presents some difficult points of translation, primarily because the
syntax of the epithets varies considerably and because most of the epithets are expressed
with nouns in a genitive construction. Some of them are expressed with Luwian genitival
adjectives, which consistently appear in the nominative regardless of the case of the noun
that they modify. Because of the way the genitive constructions are strung together in the
titles, it becomes problematic in places to determine the relationship between the various
elements. The primary problem is deciding whether certain attributes belong to the
Labarna or to the tutelary deity. There has been some discussion of this in past scholarship,
although there has been no comprehensive statement put forward by any scholar that all
the ambiguous phrases are to be interpreted either as Labarna’s attributes or the attributes
of the tutelary deity. Güterbock219 suggests that at least some of the lines are to be
interpreted as listing tutelary deities of the various attributes of Labarna. Friedrich,220
interpreting a few isolated lines of KUB 2.1, consistently takes the genitives as indicating
attributes of DŁAMMA, for example ii 23-24: [ŠA Labarn]a tuziyaš DŁAMMA-ri [ŠA
Labar]na zaḫniyaš DŁAMMA-ri “[Seiner Majestät Schutzgott des Heeres, (24) [Seiner
Majestät Schutzgott der Schlacht.” Forrer221 and Goetze222 show evidence for interpreting
selected lines as listing attributes of Labarna, not of the tutelary deity. We should not
attempt to interpret all the phrases including both Labarna and DŁAMMA in the genitive
one way or the other; each line must be interpreted individually according to the best
sense. The varied syntax, seen especially in §31’ of the Festival of Group Offerings (KUB
2.1 i 42-51), with both Hittite and Akkadian word order, indicates the variation in the text
and the consequent need for flexibility in interpreting for sense.223

Given the unique nature of these festivals, we naturally wonder about the date of their
composition. Are they an early manifestation of Hittite theological speculation, or do they
demonstrate a late development and thus an increasing sophistication in Hittite religious
perceptions? Archi224 suggests that all the texts which he treats are to be dated to the reign
of Tudḫaliya IV in the late 13th century. All of the copies are New Script; they may all

219. SBo II: 8.
220. ZA NF I (1924) 10-11.
221. KIF1 (1930) 275-76.
222. KIF1: 406-08.
223. Archi, pp. 90-91 mentions some of these difficulties, but he contents himself with pointing out that
some of the epithets are ambiguous without giving his own opinion in every case. His translating of the
epithets out of context does not always allow him to make his interpretation clear.
224. SMEA 16 (1975) 92.
even date from a period as late as Tudhaliya IV. However, indications in the language of some of the copies suggest an older, perhaps even Old Hittite, original of this text. *KUB* 44.16 of the Festival of Group Offerings has in i 8' an Old Hittite sentence particle in the sequence *ta-at*, and *KUB* 11.21 v 15' has *ta-an-kán*. In *KUB* 40.107+ of the Festival of Individual Offerings, we have *ta-ás-kán* in i 12’ and *[t]a* in i 23’. *KBo* 22.189 ii 8 of the Festival of Group Offerings has *DInaras pama paizzi*, an example of the Old Hittite allative case. In *KBo* 12.59 i 12’ the postposition *piran* governs the genitive LUGAL-*waš*, an Old Hittite construction. Thus *KUB* 44.16, *KUB* 11.21, and *KBo* 22.189 of the Festival of Group Offerings, *KUB* 40.107 of the Festival of Individual Offerings, and *KBo* 12.59 of uncertain attribution may go back to Old Hittite prototypes.

The name of Tudhaliya is quite prominent in most of the copies of the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities, a feature which is rather striking, as festivals usually transcended a given king’s reign and therefore did not specify monarchs by name. His presence in the descriptions of this festival indicate his role in at least the commissioning of the copying of the tablets. However, in *KBo* 11.40 he does not appear. In column vi, which parallels the description in *KUB* 2.1 column vi of Tudhaliya’s hunting grounds, the king is denoted simply by *DUTU-št* “His Majesty.” The consistency of his presence in the other exemplars emphasizes his absence in *KBo* 11.40; had this text been written or copied during his reign his name surely would have appeared in the catalogue of the kingdom’s districts in column vi. This one copy of the festival therefore may represent a tablet antecedent to Tudhaliya IV. Perhaps it is even the model that he used in the copies made during his reign. His use of older models is suggested also by *KBo* 12.59, in which the Old Hittite construction of genitive plus postposition is retained (i 12’), but which also mentions Tudhaliya (i 12’, iv 2’, 5’, 7’) specifically. There must have been an Old Hittite archetype for the festival, possibly in both of its forms. Or the original festival may have been the Festival of Individual Offerings, based on the absence of Tudhaliya in *KBo* 11.40. The Old Hittite forms in some texts of the Festival of Group Offerings could have been copied when that festival was being composed on the earlier model.

This exploration of tutelary deities is thus an early manifestation of the Hittite quest to perceive (and placate) all of their gods and not a special expression of Tudhaliya’s unique concentration on the religion of his kingdom. That notwithstanding, the fact remains that he took a great interest in this festival. One of the last Hittite kings, he was extremely active in religious reorganization by making one of his major priorities a census of the religious resources of his kingdom. He evinced a deep concern for maintaining the cult ceremony which ensured the prosperity of his realm by keeping the gods satisfied. The great number of copies of the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities from his reign attest to

225. The new texts *KUB* 51.36, *KUB* 52.100, and *KUB* 55.25 are not securely datable but could all be Empire period texts.

226. Kammenhuber, *ZA* 66 (1976) 74, suggests that Tudhaliya IV was trying to simulate a god-pair with *DLAMMA* and Ala but does not speculate on why he might have done so. The antiquity of the pairing of *DLAMMA* and Ala in the Hittite cult is discussed in Chapter 1.

the appeal which this systematic listing of tutelary deities held for this monarch in his role as priest and overseer of Hittite religious life.

The mention of both LAMMA and Ala deities of Alatarma as well as tutelary deities of the lands in which the king campaigns is interesting in light of the redating by Singer²²⁸ to Tudhaliya IV of KBo 4.14 ii 11, in which the king mentions Alatarma as part of the lands in which he has campaigned.²²⁹ This strengthens Singer's argument for assigning KBo 4.14 to Tudhaliya IV, as we know that the writer of that text had been in Alatarma, and in KUB 2.1 i 45 and iii 35 we have Tudhaliya IV including gods from there in the offering list. Alatarma does not occur in the other copies of the festival. It could therefore be a later addition by Tudhaliya after his campaigns there. Unfortunately the portion of KBo 11.40 which would parallel the KUB 2.1 column i occurrence of Alatarma is broken away, and KUB 55.25 obverse, which parallels KUB 2.1 obverse iii breaks one line before it might have mentioned Ala of Alatarma. The focus of the final section of the list (KUB 2.1 column vi and KBo 11.40 column vi) is to celebrate the gods of the lands which the king controls. Here the king's emphasis is on his prowess as a warrior and hunter.

Laroche in commenting on this festival suggests that we really have no longer to do with a deity at all, but rather with the development of a concept.²³⁰ Certainly it is the concept of protection or guarding which the Hittites are developing and exploring in this festival. The festival has as its primary purpose the listing of and offering to protective deities associated with the king's well-being. Implicit in this is the Hittite conception of the king as the state.²³¹ The festival then is of special importance for the state's well-being. Although Tudhaliya obviously promoted the celebration of this festival that provides for the worshipping of deities protective of the king, he himself recognized Šarruma as his own personal protective god as evidenced in the relief of the king and god at Yazılıkaya. The king's interest in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities may simply have been part of his efforts to organize the religious administration of the realm, it may indicate a special interest in these tutelary deities, or it may be a reflection of some particular concern on his part which resulted in his desire to placate or supplicate the tutelary deities which he believed to be protecting his interests.

²²⁸. ZA 75 (1985) 100–23.
²²⁹. Hoffner, personal communication, pointed out the relevance of KBo 4.14 with its mention of the rare place name Alatarma.
²³¹. The title “Labarna” used throughout refers to whoever the reigning king is. I am not certain why Labarna is used instead of “the king.”
CHAPTER 4
THE FESTIVALS FOR RENEWING THE \textit{\textsuperscript{K}}\text{kurša-s}

INTRODUCTION

Another group of festival texts which describes a part of the cult dedicated to tutelary deities is one which provides for the renewing of the cult symbols of certain tutelary deities, which take the form of \textit{kurša-s}, or hunting bags.\textsuperscript{1} These festivals are extremely important as evidence of the Hittite use of implements associated with a particular god as the actual cult representation of that god. Sections of the ceremony make it clear that the \textit{kurša-} is the god itself. The festivals thus describe for us how the Hittites renewed or replaced representations of the divine.

THE TEXTS

\textit{KUB} 55.43\textsuperscript{2}

Bo 2393+Bo 5138 = \textit{KUB} 55.43 is a rather large tablet measuring 14.6 cm high and 20 cm across at its widest point. Portions of its reverse are blackened by fire. The surface of the tablet is abraded in many places and is in general not well preserved. The contour of the preserved portion of the tablet indicates that less than half of each column is preserved; on the obverse the tops of columns i and ii are preserved, but the tablet's thickness is still increasing at the point at which it breaks off.

The script of the tablet shows many older forms. There is not much of the crowding together of signs which is typical of Old Script, although one may note the irregular word spacing with occasional crowding together of separate words, for example \textit{hantezzi palši} in obv. ii 1, and \textit{\textsuperscript{u}ruZapatiškuwa GUB-aš} in obv. ii 13. The \textit{da} and \textit{it} signs have very clearly broken middle horizontals, i.e., they do not show their very latest forms. They do not, however, show the indentation of the left edge typical of an Old Script form. Signs like

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} See Appendix B on the \textit{(KuS)kurša-} and its interpretation.
  \item \textsuperscript{2} The festival is catalogued by Laroche as \textit{CTH} 683, "Renouvellement de la 'toison' des dieux KAL." My treatment of it in this chapter includes texts not catalogued under \textit{CTH} 683. See p. 7 in the Introduction for this festival's text scheme. Lines i 1–27 and i.e. 4–8, the colophon, are edited by Otten in \textit{FsFriedrich} 351–59.
\end{itemize}
URU, e, KUŠ, zu, ra, and LAM show a first vertical wedge much shorter than the second vertical, an Old and Middle Script characteristic. In rev. iv 17' there are two rather different URU signs, with the second one looking more like New Script. Rev. iv 26' also contains a newer looking URU. The al, li, and ak signs do not occur in their later forms. The šar is written with the earliest of its forms. Consistent with these early forms is the writing of ANA in rev. iv 8' as a ligature. See table 5 in Appendix C for drawings of some of the more distinctive signs.

Although the script shows older characteristics, I do not think this is an Old Script tablet. Against an Old Script dating is the lack of the characteristic crowding, and examples of uk and az signs with subscripts. The other older characteristics of the ductus suggest a Middle Script dating for this tablet. Such a dating has already been tentatively suggested by Melchert, who assigned a Middle Script(?) dating to the tablet without any comment on the evidence for it.3

Transliteration

KUB 55.43 Obverse i

§1
1 [ma-a-an SA] Zi-it-ha-ri-ya ULAMMA URU Ha-te-en-zu-wa  
2 [2 KUS] kur-šu-uš EGIS-pa ne-c-u-wa-ah-ša-an-zi  
3 ma-a-an I-NA MU 9 KAM ma-a-na-ša ku-wa-pf ku-wa-pf ne-wa-aš-ša-an-zi  
4 me-šur UL du-uq-qa-a-ri

§2
5 nu ma-aš-ša-an 2 KUS kur-šu-uš GIBIL-TIM SA Zi-it-ša-ri-ya  
6 ULAMMA URU Ha-te-en-zu-wa ū-da-an-zi  
7 na-aš-kán I-NA E KUS kur-ša-aš an-da pé-e-da-an-zi  
8 na-aš-ta 2 KUS kur-šu-uš LA-BI-RU-TIM kat-ta da-an-zi  
10 a-wa-an kat-ta GUS KAK.HI.A wa-al-ša-an-te-eš nu-uš a-pf-ya ga-an-kán-zi

§3
11 A-SAR DINGIR-LIM ma 2 KUS kur-šu-uš GIBIL-TIM ga-an-kán-zi  
12 na-aš-ta ma-a-an URU Ha-at-tu-ši EZEN.HI.A ū-u-da-a-ak  
13 kar-pa-an-ta-ri na-aš-ta 2 KUS kur-šu-uš TIL-TIM pa-ra-a  
14 ū-u-da-a-ak ne-ya-an-zi ma-a-an EZEN.HI.A ma-za-lu-ga-n[u-a]n-zi  
15 nu ma-a-an ITU 1 KAM na-aš-ma ITU 2 KAM pa-iz-zi  
16 2 KUS kur-šu-uš TIL.HI.A ma-kán I-NA É kur-ša-aš-pát an-da  
17 ga-an-kán-te-eš

§4
18 ma-aš-ša-an-ma-kán EZEN.HI.A kar-pa-an-ta-ri (erasure)  
19 na-aš-ta 2 KUS kur-šu-uš TIL-TIM pa-ra-a QA-TAM-MA ne-an-z[i]

3. Melchert, Diss. 98.  
4. See Appendix B on tukk-.  
5. See Appendix B on the ŠE KUS kuršaš.  
6. See Appendix B sub ASRU.
Translation

*KUB* 55.43 Obverse i

§1 [When] they renew the [two] hunting bags [of] Zitḥariya and the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenuwa, whether in the ninth year, or whenever they renew them, the time is not prescribed.

§2 When they bring the two new hunting bags of Zitḥariya and the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenuwa, they take them into the temple of the hunting bag. They take down the two old hunting bags. The place is prescribed; the pegs are (already) driven in directly below the actual (-pat) place of the god. They hang them there.

§3 In the place of the god, however, they hang the two new hunting bags. If in Ḫattuša the festivals will be completed promptly, they send the two old hunting bags out immediately. If, however, they are postponing/prolonging the festivals, and one or two months pass, the two old hunting bags (remain) hanging in that same temple of the hunting bag.

§4 However, when the festivals (in Ḫattuša) are completed, they send out the two old hunting bags (to the provinces) in the same way.

7. The old hunting bags which have just been taken down from the “place of the god” so that the new ones can be hung there.

8. Compare *CHD* sub *nai*- for this meaning of *para nai*-; including citation of this passage: “they send off the old kurša-s right away.”
KUB 55.43
Obverse i (transliteration cont.)
§5 20 [nu] S[A D Zi-it-ḥa-[ri]-ya KUS kur-[š]-a TIL I-NA [URU Tu-u-ḥu-[u[p-pf-y]a]
22 [kat-[u]  ar-nu-an-z]  na-[an-za-kān] KUR-ya an-da [PLAMMA KUS kur-[š]-a-s]
27 [ḥal-z]  iš-[š]  a-an-
§6 28 [nu-uš ma-a-an?]  -[z]  [MU] ti ne-l-ya-an-z]  nu-uš-ma-aš
29 [ar-ḥa-y]  an EZEN12 a-pf?-[]  [ya]  U-UL ku-in-ki i-en-[z]  i
31 [nu EZEN.HI.A  ḥu-u-da-a-ak kar-pa-an-ta?-]  ji ma-a-na-aš-kān
32 [o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o y]a-[š]-zi
(the column breaks off)
Obverse ii13 (transliteration)
§7 1 nu [iš]  a-an-te-ez-zi pal-ši [PUTU TUŠ]-aš a-ku-w[a-an-z]  i
3 iš-ka-ra-an-ta-aš  še-er da-a-i EGIR-an-d[a-ma DIMP] GUB-aš]
4 e-ku-z]  1 NINDA. KUR4. RA pār-ši-y[a na-an-ša-an EGIR-[pa]
5 A-NA DINGIR-LIM iš-[ka]  ra-an-ta-aš  še-er da-a-i
§8 6 EGIR-an-da-ma [PLAMMA URU] ḥa-at-ti GUB-aš e-ku-z] [U.MES SIR SIR-RU]
7 LŪ.MES UR.GI14 wa-ap-pi-an-z] 1 NINDA-ta-kar-mu-un pār-š[i-y[a]
10 [a-ku-wa-an-z]  LŪ.MES SIR SIR-RU LŪ.MEŠ UR.GI wa-ap-pf-an-z]
11 1 NINDA-ta-kar-mu-un pār-ši-y[a na-an-kān EGIR-pa A-NA DINGIR-L[M]
12 iš-ka-ra-an-ta-aš  še-er ti-an-z]

9. Possibly something in the intercolumnium identifying the gate through which it was brought down, or a phonetic complement such as KÁ.GA[L-az].
10. There is no space for anything after mahha[n], unless it was written up the intercolumnium. One might expect ḥattuṣāṣ here on the analogy of line 21, or an Akkadian preposition to indicate the case of KÁ.GAL.
11. This is written over an erasure and is therefore somewhat unclear. Although not as good a reading, it could conceivably also be a-šu-ša-aš! Otten, FsFriedrich 353, reads a-šu-ša-aš without further comment.
12. Restored from the colophon, i.e. 7.
13. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
14. See Appendix B on the LŪ.MEŠ UR.GI.
15. See Appendix B on wappiya-.
They take away the old hunting bag of Zitḫa[ri]ya to Tuḫu[ppiya]. When they bring it down from Ḥattuša, (through) the [x?] gate, in the land\textsuperscript{16} they call it “the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag.” The [old] hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatenuzuwa, however, they take away to Durmitta. When they bring it down [from Ḥattuša?] (through) the ašuša-gate,\textsuperscript{17} they take its name away from it and call it the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa.


\textsuperscript{16} That is, outside the capital, in the provinces.

\textsuperscript{17} Or “down [through] the ašuša-gate ... ”

\[§7\]
The first time [they] drink the Sungod, seated. He breaks [one] takarmu- bread and places it back for the god upon the lined up ones. [But] afterwards he drinks [the Stormgod(?), standing]. He breaks one thick bread and places it back for the god upon the lined up ones.\textsuperscript{19}

\[§8\]
Afterwards he drinks the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatti, standing. The [ingers sing]. The dog-men bark. [He b]reaks one takarmu- bread. They place it back for <the god> upon the lined up ones. They sweep (it) off.\textsuperscript{20} They drink Zitḫariya, standing. The singers sing. The dog-men bark. He breaks one takarmu- bread. They place it back for the god upon the lined up ones.

\[16\]
That is, outside the capital, in the provinces.

\[17\]
Or “down [through] the ašuša-gate ... ”

\[18\]
After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

\[19\]
That is, the hunting bags?

\[20\]
See Line Commentary below, line ii 9, on translating n\~ašṭa šanḥanzi.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

KUB 55.43

Obverse ii (transliteration cont.)

§9' 13 EGIR-an-da-ma PLAMMA URU-Za-pa-ti-iš-ku-wa GUB-aš a-ku-wa-a[n-zi]
14 [L]OMES SIR ŚIR-RU LŪ.MEŠ UR.GI, wa-ap-pi-an-zī i[NINDA]ta-kar-mu-un]
15 [pár-]ši-ya na-an-ša-an EGIR-pa A-NA DINGIR-LIM iš-ka-r[a-an-ta-aš]
16 [še-e]r ti-an-zi EGIR-an-da-ma ki-pf-ik-ki-iš-d[u]
17 [Pa]p-pa-ri-ya-mu-un PLAMMA URUTa-ta-šu-na [Ø]
20 [še-e]r ti-an-[e]zi LOMES SIR ŚIR-RU LŪ.MEŠ UR.GI, wa-a[p-pi-an-zī]

§10' 21 [EGIR-an-da-ma PLAMMA URUHa-te-l-en-zu-wa GUB-aš a-ku[-wa-an-zī]
22 [L]OMES SIR ŚIR-RU LŪ.MEŠ UR.GI, wa-ap-pi-an-zī
25 [GUB-aš a-ku-wa-an-zī LOMES]IR ŚIR-RU LŪ.MEŠ UR.GI, w[a-ap-pi-an-zī]
28 [TUŠ-aš e-ku-zī 1 NINDA]ta-kar-mu-un pár-ši-ya n[a-an-kān]

31 [DINGIR.MEŠ e-ku-zi26 Pa-aš-g]a-la-a-an PLAMMA GIGŠUKUR GIGD[AG-an?]
33 [Pa]ma-ra-aš-ša-an-ta27 HUR.ISAG.1MEŠ ID.MEŠ28 ḫa-re-eš [o?]29
34 [ o 29 LOMES SIR ŚIR-RU LŪ.MEŠ U]JR.GI, wa-ap-pi-an-zī [1? NINDA]ta-kar-mu-un]
35 [pár-ši-ya na-an-kān EGIR-pa A-NA DINGIR-LIM iš-ka-r[a-an-ta-aš]

(1. The column breaks off)

21. Restored from the analogous passage in iv 23'.
22. Restored from iv 32'; see Line Commentary below on ii 27.
23. Restored from iv 33'.
24. See Appendix B sub ḫiššalla-.
25. Restored from iv 34'.
26. Restored from iv 34'.
27. Restored from l.e. 1.
28. See Appendix B on ḪUR.SAG and ID in cultic contexts.
29. The spacing indicates that a short word, presumably the last item in this list, began this line, before LOMES SIR. The fact that there is no -a, “and,” on ḫareš could indicate that there was at least one more item after it in this list.
30. This line is restored on the basis of the posited restoration of l.e. 2–3. There is too much space, however, for just LOMES SIR ŚIR-RU in the first break. What else might have been there is unclear.
According to the document, after the completion of rituals and offerings, a series of gods are consecrated and consumed. The offerings include bread [takarmu] and the gods are consumed after the drinking of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa, standing. The singers sing, and the dog-men bark. He breaks one bread and places it back for the god upon the lined up ones. Afterwards they drink the kipikkisdus: Kappardiyamu, the Tutelary Deity of Tatašuna, and the Tutelary Deity of Tašhapuna, standing. He breaks three breads. They place them back for the god upon the lined up ones. The singers sing. The dog-men bark.

Afterwards they drink the Tutelary Deity of Hatenzuwa, standing. The singers sing. The dog-men bark. He breaks one bread and places it back for the god upon the lined up ones. Afterwards they drink Hassaga, standing. The singers sing. The dog-men bark. He breaks one bread. They place it back for the god upon the lined up ones. Afterwards he drinks the gods of the city(?), seated. He breaks one bread. They place it back for the god upon the lined up ones.

Afterwards, seated, he drinks these gods, the ones (whose offerings have been) completed in sequence (and) the ones (whose offerings are) planned: Hassala, the Tutelary Deity of the Spear, Halmaššuitta, DN, DN, DN, the Fate Deities, Hilašši, Hašammili, the Marassanta river, (divine) mountains, rivers, valleys and x(?). The singers sing. The dog-men bark. He breaks one bread. They place it back for the god upon the lined up ones. [ ... ] The singers sing(?).

31. See Appendix B on kipikkisdu.
§12'x+l  [ o o ]33 x [du-uq-ql-a-r[i o o o o o o o o o o ]
2' [ o o o (-)]da-an-zi nu URU[Du[r-mi-it-ta? o o o o o o ]
3' [LU.MES]SANGA SAL.MES SANGA LODUDU [ o o o o o o o o ]
5' [ o o ]x LODUDUD ZAG-aš ŠA LÜ.MES U[R.GI  o o o o o o ]
6' [ o o ]I[PA-N?] DINGIR-LIM[A 33 ka-a-ša ḫal-zi[i-ի-ša-an-zi?]
7' [p]u35-[?url-pu-ru-uš-ša iš-ḫu-šš-kán-[zi o o o o o o ]

§13' 8' [n]a-aš-ta DINGIR-LAM I-NA 6ka-ri[i-im-mi an-da ar-nu-an-zi]
9' [IS-]TU 12 MĀŠ.[GAL-ya-kán 1 MĀŠ.GAL 6ka-ri-im-mi an-da]
10' [u-u]-ni-ya-an-zi an-du[r]-za-ma M[AŠ?GAL ši-pa-an-ti]
12' ma-ab-qa-an-na kán DINGIR-LAM I-NA 6ka-ri-im-mi an-da]
13' ar-nu-an-zi nu LODUDUD NINDA.KUR4.R[ A-NA DINGIR-LIM pär-si-ya]

§14' 15' nu DINGIR-LAM A-NA A-SAR DINGIR-LIM ga-a[n-kán-zi o o o o o o o ]
16' pa-ra-a[1 pa-iz-zi na-aš-ta 1[URU o o o o o o o o ]
17' ši-p[a-a]n-ti nu-uš-ša-an 6iš1-k[a-ša-an-ta-aš še-er?]
18' ti-a[n-z]i šu-up-pa-ma [u-šu]  o o o o o o o o ]
19' a-pu-[u]-ln-na ŠU-MA ma-an-ť[e-cš56 o o o o o o o o ma-a-an?]
20' a-k[u]-w[a-a]n-na İS-TU  x [ o o o o o o o o o o ]
21' a-aš-š[iu nu?] I[LU.MES URU-LIM 6iš57- o o o o ]x [ir1-ši-iš-1ki1-t-ta]
22' nu EGIR[ KAJ]SKAL1-ši ku-[1]-uš? ir-[h]a-a-an-zi hê-ma-aš-x[ o o ]
23' a-pí-y[a-a]x[ o o o o o ]

32. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
33. In the other occurrences of duqqari in this text, it was preceded by UL or by pēdan, but the trace before duqqari in this line does not really look like -UL or -a[. It is unclear what is to be restored for the beginning of this line.
34. Collation indicates this as a possible reading. Also possible is 9Ul 1[-šUL, but DINGIR-LIM makes better sense. The sign immediately before DINGIR could be LÜ. Even if this is the correct reading the beginning of the line is still unclear.
35. One might expect [NINDA]p[ur-pu-ru-uš-ša, which is possible, although spacing would be quite tight. The difference in spacing between line 7' and 11' makes restoring NINDA at the beginning of line 7' doubtful. A NINDA determinative is not necessary to indicate that the balls are bread; compare KBo 19.128 (AN.TAH.SUM fragment), ed. Otten, StBoT 13 (1971) 2-3, where the purpura- are bread, despite the absence of NINDA as a determinative. See Appendix B on purpura-.
36. A reading ḫu-uma-an-š[i is also possible, although -š[ fits the traces better.
37. The index to KUB 55 cites this as (URU)Ši-x[.]
KUB 55.43

Reverse iii\(^{38}\) (translation)

§12' [ ... ]x is prescribed. [ ... ]they take. The city Du[rmitta ... The] priests, the priestesses, the GUDU priest [and x break] thick breads be[fore] the god. [The] x, the dignitary of the right, [the x] of the do[g-men, and the x] ca[l out] “kaš”\(^{39}\) before the god. And [they] heap up (bread)-balls.

§13' [They bring] the god\(^{40}\) into the karimmi-[-]building. Out of twelve male goats they [d]rive one [into the karimmi-[-]building]. Inside, however, [they sacrifice] the goat. And [they heap up bread]-balls [in] his [karimmi-[-]building]. When, however, they bring the god into the karimmi-[-]building, the dignitary [breaks] thick bread [to the god] and [they heap up] bread-balls to the god.

§14' [They h]ang up the god in the god’s place. [x] goes forth. The x[-functionary] sacrificial[es] [x]. They place them [upon] the lined up ones(?)]. The raw(?) flesh, however, [they x]. They all x that one. [If] drinking from the [ x ] is good, [then (for)] the men of the city iš[- ... ]x is offered in sequence. The ones [whom] they treat in sequence the last [ti]me,\(^{41}\) [they x] the hemaš at that time.

38. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
39. The first part of the Hattic exclamation kak miš(s)ạ.
40. That is, the hunting bag representing him.
41. Or perhaps “on a later occasion.”
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Reverse iii (transliteration cont.)

25' 5 DUGi[su-u-ru-uš]-ú-ð]a-an-zì na-aš-ta 3 ŠA-A-T[I o o o ]
26' a-wa-an a[r-ḥa da-an-zì]jì na-at PA-NI DINGIR-LIM šu-fun?l-[n[a-an-zì]
27' nu DUGiš-n[u-u-ra-aš pí-r]a-an kat-ta LUGUDÜ pî-da-an[-zi nu 1-ŠU ?]
28' ši-pa-an-tì[ na-aš? DUGiš-nu-]ju-ri PA-NI DINGIR-LIM še-eš-zì [ ]
29' nu a-pé-e-[da-ni UD-tì]1 EZE NU.GAL ku-iš-ki

31' ša-ra-I-a kar!-pa-an-zì na-an É.UDUN pè[-e-da-an-zì]
32' na-ašâ nINDA.KUR.RA ša ŠA-A-TI i-en-zì ma-aḥ-ḥa-an-ma[-at ze-ya-an-ta-rì]
33' ka-aš-kâ GÎpa-a-pu-li ti-an-zì še-er-ma-aš-š[a-an GAD-it ]
34' LUGUDÜ ka-ri-ya-az-zì na-aš I-NA['É'][DINGIR-LIMì4 ú-da-an-zì?]
35' nu pî-ra-an pal-ú-iš-kâ-zì LÜ.IMEŠî[R]
36' SĪR-RU IS-TU É LUGU-ri-ya-an-ni-y[a ... 45]?
37' d[a-a-a]n-zì nu a-pu-u-un-na pî-ra-an BA[L-an-zì]

(bottom of tablet)

Reverse iv46 (transliteration)

§17'x+1 [ o o o o o o o o o o o o o o (-)d[a-an-zì ] ]
2' [ o o o o o o o o o o o ]IS-TU Ê ][-SU [ ]
3' x-x [ o o o o o o o o o o o o DUGiš-pa-a]n-du-uz-zì ú-da-a[-an-zì]

§18' 4' ma-aḥ-[r-ḥa-an-ma-aš]-ša-an a-ku-wa-an-na a-rì nu DUTU TÛS-aš a-ku-wa-an-zì
5' 1 nINDA[t-a-kar-m]u-un pâr-šì-yì na-an-kâ[k EGR-pa A-NA KUSkur-šì
6' DŁAMM[A] Ù]RUZa-pa-tì-iš-ku-wa ti-an-zì nu DİM GUB-aš a-ku-wa-an-zì[i]
7' nu 1 nINDA-ta-kar-mu-un pâr-šì-ya na-an-šã-an EGR-pa
8' A-NA DŁAMMA ÙRUZa-pa-tì-iš-ku-wa ti-an-zì nu DŁAMMA ÙRUZa-pa-tì-iš-ku-w[a]
9' GUB-aš a-ku-wa-an-zì LÜ.IMEŠ SĪR SĪR-LU.MES U.R.GI wa-ap-pî-an-zì
10' 1 nINDA-ta-kar-mu-un pâr-šì-yì na-an-kâ[KU]SKUR-šì še-er da-a-i

42. Restored on the basis of line 36' of this same column. Spacing on the tablet fits this restoration quite well. See Appendix B on the uriyanni.
43. Or DUGiš[šmurit. See Line Commentary below on this line.
44. Or possibly fÉ][KUSkur-šã-aš ...
45. A sacrificial animal was probably named in the break here, based on what follows in line 37'.
46. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
§15' In the morning they bring four BÂN-measures of [x] (and) five i[šnura]-vessels\textsuperscript{47} from the house of the uriyanni-official of the right. From it they take three SUTU [of x]. [They] fill them\textsuperscript{48} before the god. Th[ey] take the GUDÚ priest down [in front of the išn[ura]-vessel(s)].\textsuperscript{49} He libates [once]. He (the GUDÚ priest) spends the night by [the išn]ura- before the god.\textsuperscript{50} There is no festival of any kind on that day.

§16' The following day in the morning they immediately take up [the dough. They take it (into) the bakery. They make three thick breads of one SUTU (each). And when [they are baked], they place them on the bread tray(?).\textsuperscript{51} The GUDÚ priest covers them over [with a cloth]. [They take] them into the temple.\textsuperscript{52} They recite(?).\textsuperscript{53} The singers sing. They also take [(a sacrificial animal)] from the house of the uriyanni-official, and that one they sacrifice before (the god).

\textit{(bottom of tablet)}

Reverse iv\textsuperscript{54} (translation)

§17' [ ] they x. [ ] from his house(?) x[ ] They bring the [lib]ation vessel(s).

§18' Wh[en, however,] the drink arrives, they drink the Sungod, seated. He breaks one takarmu- bread. They place it back upon the hunting bag of the Tutela[ry Deity] of Zapatiskuwa. They drink the Stormgod, standing. He breaks one takarmu- bread. They place it back upon the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa. They drink the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa, standing. The singers sing. The dog-men bark. He breaks one takarmu- bread and places it upon the hunting bag.

\textsuperscript{47} Or possibly ... [in] five i[šnura]-vessels ... "

\textsuperscript{48} That is, the \textit{dug}išnura-s.

\textsuperscript{49} \textit{LGUDÚ} is singular, the verb is plural. If the verb's number is correct, we could translate "The GUDÚ priest(s) bring the išn[ura]-vessels down in front."

\textsuperscript{50} Or perhaps "It (the dough) spends the night in the [išn]ura- before the god."

\textsuperscript{51} See Appendix B sub 605papul-.

\textsuperscript{52} Or perhaps "into the temple [of the Hunting Bag]."

\textsuperscript{53} Or "shout"; see Appendix B on \textit{palwai}-.

\textsuperscript{54} After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
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Reverse iv (transliteration cont.)

§19' 11' nu dLAMMA URU HA-AT-TI GUB-aš a-ku-wa-an-zi LÜ.MEŠ SIR SIR-RU
12' LÜ.MEŠ UR.GI, wa-ap-pí-an-zi 1 NINDA ta-kar-mu-un pár-ši-ya
13' na-an-kán KUS kur-ši še-er da-a-i na-aš-ta ša-an-ḫa-an-zi
14' nu dZi-it-ḫa-ri-ya-an GUB-aš a-ku-wa-an-zi LÜ.MEŠ SIR SIR-RU
15' LÜ.MEŠ UR.GI, wa-ap-pí-an-zi 1 NINDA ta-kar-mu-un pár-ši-ya
16' na-an-kán EGIS pa dZi-it-ḫa-ri-ya da-a-i nu dKap-pa-ri-ya I mu
17' dLAMMA URU Ta-ta-šu-na dLAMMA URU Ta-ša-ḫa-pu-na GUB-aš a-ku-wa-an-zi
18' 2 NINDA ta-kar-mu-uš pár-ši-ya na-aš-kán «kán» EGIS pa KUS kur-ši da-a-i
19' LÜ.MEŠ SIR SIR-RU LÜ.MEŠ UR.GI, wa-ap-pí-an-zi

§20' 20' na-aš-ta ša-an-ḫa-an-zi nu dLAMMA URU Ja-te-en-zu-wa GUB-aš a-ku-wa-an-zi
21' LÜ.MEŠ SIR-SIR-RU LÜ.MEŠ UR.GI, wa-ap-pí-an-zi 1 NINDA ta-kar-mu-un pár-ši-ya
22' na-an-kán KUS kur-ši še-er da-a-i na-aš-ta ša-an-ḫa-an-zi
23' nu dḪa-aš-ga-la-a-an GUB-aš a-ku-wa-an-zi LÜ.MEŠ SIR SIR-RU
24' LÜ.MEŠ UR.GI, wa-ap-pí-an-zi 1 NINDA ta-kar-mu-un pár-ši-ya
25' na-an-kán KUS kur-ši še-er da-a-i

§21' 26' nu nam-ma dLAMMA URU Za-pa-ša-ku-wa GUB-aš a-ku-wa-an-zi LÜ.MEŠ SIR
27' SIR-RU LÜ.MEŠ UR.GI, wa-ap-pí-an-zi 1 NINDA ta-kar-mu-un pár-ši-ya
28' na-an-kán KUS kur-ši še-er da-a-i na-aš-ta GUNNI 1-ŠU wa-ḫa-an-zi SIR-ya
29' an-da ú-wa-an-zi na-aš-ta GUNNI 1-ŠU wa-ḫa-an-zi SIR-ya
30' nu-ša-ma-aš a-ku-wa-an-na pí-an-zi na-at-kán pa-ra-pa-a-an-zi
31' nu-za EGIS pa EGIS GIB.ḪA A-ŠAR-ŠU-NU ap-pa-an-zi

§22' 32' [E]GIS-an-da-ma DINGIR. MEŠ URU-LIM TUŠ-aš e-ku-zi 1 NINDA ta-kar-mu-un pár-ši-ya
33' [na-]an-kán KUS kur-ši še-er da-a-i EGIS-an-da-ма ir-ḫa-a-an-te-eš
34' [ḫi-]iš-ša-al-la-a-an-te-eš TUŠ-aš ku-u-uš DINGIR. MEŠ el-ku-zi

(bottom of tablet)

55. Written in above the line.
§19' They drink the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti, standing. The singers sing. The dog-men bark. He breaks one *takarmu-* bread and places it upon the hunting bag. They sweep (it off). They drink Zithariya, standing. The singers sing. The dog-men bark. He breaks one *takarmu-* bread and places it back upon Zithariya. They drink Kappariyamu, the Tutelary Deity of Tatašuna, and the Tutelary Deity of Tašhapuna, standing. He breaks two*56 *takarmu-* breads and places them upon the hunting bag. The singers sing. The dog-men bark.

§20' They sweep (it off). They drink the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenzuwa, standing. The singers sing. The dog-men bark. He breaks one *takarmu-* bread and places it upon the hunting bag. They sweep (it off). They drink Ḥaṣgalá, standing. The singers sing. The dog-men bark. He breaks one *takarmu-* bread and places it upon the hunting bag.

§21' They again drink the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa, standing. The singers sing. The dog-men bark. He breaks one *takarmu-* bread and places it upon the hunting bag. The singers of the place come in. They go once round the hearth and sing. They give them (something) to drink. They go out and again take their places behind the windows.

§22' Afterwards he drinks the gods of the city, seated. He breaks one *takarmu-* bread and places it upon the hunting bag. Afterwards, seated, he drinks these gods, the ones (whose offerings have been) done in sequence (and) the ones (whose offerings are) [pl]anned:

(bottom of tablet)

56. One would expect three breads to be broken, since there are three gods being honored here. In the parallel occurrence of these three gods in §9', three breads are broken.
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Left edge (transliteration)

§23' 1 [ ... DůHa-aš-ga-la-an DΛMMMA GISŠUKUR GIS' DAG-an? (DN) (DN) (DN) DGu]š-e-eš DůHi-la-aš-s]-i-in DůHa-aš-am-mi-li-in DůMa-ša-aš-aš-aš-aš-an-ta [ ... ]

2 [HUR.SAG.MES İD.MES ḫa-re-eš ... (?)]58 ŁO.MES SIR SIR-RU LÚ.MES UR.GI, wa-ap-pf-an-zi 1 NINDA-ta-kar-mu-un pár-ši-ya n[a-a]n-kán KUS kur-ši še-er da-a-i ŁO.MES SIR SIR-RU

3 [LÚ.MES UR.GI, wa-ap-pf-an-zi59 ... ]x

Colophon (transliteration)


5 [I-NA URU Dur-mi-it-ta pé-e-da-an-zi? n[a-an ŠA DΛMMMA URU Za-pa-iš-ku-wa KUS kur-ša-an i-ya-an-zi [Ø]


8 [63 iʔ-]jen-zi64

57. The names in the break are restored from obv. ii 31–32, the same list. Ḫašgala has been restored in this list because he probably occurs in ii 32; one should note, however, that he has already been honored individually in iv 23'–25'.

58. The evidence from ii 34 indicates that there is probably at least one more element in this list after ḫares.

59. Restored thus because this phrase almost invariably accompanies the phrase ŁO.MES SIR SIR-RU. However, there is more space than this available in this line; if the dog-men were here, they were probably at the beginning of line 3, and the end of the line then had something else. On the other hand, since all that is left is the colophon, and the remaining text to be written is quite small, it is quite possible that the scribe just centered this last short line. The trace on the tablet does not really look like -zi, but there is so little preserved that ŁU.MES UR.GI, wa-ap-pf-an-zi is not absolutely precluded.

60. Or UL QATI.


63. The location of the point of maximum thickness on the tablet indicates that the tablet was getting thinner here. Thus line 8 would have had less room to the left of the preserved portion than line 7 does. For this reason, it is possible that there was no room for anything besides [i]jenzi in line 8, which would fit very well as a direct continuation of line 7.

64. Much less has been restored in the breaks in the colophon than in l.e. 1–3. The colophon was restored based on sense; the disparity between the length of its lines and those of l.e. 1–3 may cast doubt on the restoration of one or the other. The colophon only seems to mention one of the two hunting bags which were renamed and sent out to other cities. The restoration of the entire left edge must remain tentative.
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\textbf{KUB 55.43}

Left edge (translation)

\textsection 23'  \[\text{Hasgala, the Tutelary Deity of the spear, Ḫalmaššuitta, DN, DN, DN, the Fate Deities, Ḫila[šš]i, Ḫašamili, the Maraššanta river, [(divine) mountains, rivers, valleys, and x. The singers sing. The dog-men bark. One takarmu- bread] he breaks and places upon the hunting bag. The singers sing. [The dog-men bar]k.}\]

Colophon (translation)

[First tablet, finished\(^6\text{5}\) ... ] How [they bring] the old hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenuzuwa fr[om Ḫatuušša to Durmitta and] make it into the hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiškuwa. [When, however, they take it up in order to bri]ng it for the regular festival in Durmitta, they do not perform any festival separately [for Zittiariya].

Comments on Individual Lines

Obverse i

i 9–10 (§2). The use of the participle \textit{waltanteš} instead of a finite form such as \textit{walhanzi} is significant; it indicates a completed action, i.e., that the pegs are driven in before the work on the \textit{kurša-s} begins. A finite form would imply that the pegs were driven in as part of the ceremony. The pegs were driven in permanently and never moved because the place was already prescribed. In the phrase \textit{ANA AŠAR DINGIR-LIM-pat}, the \textit{-pat} is there to indicate the contrast between the actual place of the god and the area below it where the pegs are fixed and where the old hunting bags are hung to make room for the new ones in the place of the god. See Hoffner, \textit{FsOtten} 105, for a discussion of how \textit{-pat} attaches itself to the modifier in a word+modifier construction. Although it is attached here to DINGIR-LIM, it modifies the whole phrase, \textquote{place of the god.} The phrase \textit{AŠAR DINGIR-LIM} occurs nowhere else in the published Hittite corpus except in this text, i 9 and iii 15'. There is, however, at least one other text in which the places of the god are mentioned: \textit{nu-za BELTI Ė-TI AŠRI \textsuperscript{UA} ȘA DINGIR-LIM IŠTU DINGIR-LIM arḫa ariezzi} \textquote{The mistress of the house makes an oracular inquiry from the deity concerning the places of the deity} \textit{KUB} 17.24 ii 9–10 (\textit{witašš(iy)aš Festival}).\(^6\text{6}\)

i 13 and 18 (§§3 and 4): \textit{karp-}. See Neu, \textit{StBoT} 5 (1968) 80–82 for the medio-passive use of \textit{karp-} and discussion of this passage.

i 20 (§5): \textit{tuḫuppiya}. Otten, \textit{FsFriedrich} 357–58, suggests that Tuḫuppiya and Durmitta, the two cities to which they take the old hunting bags after renaming them, must

\(^{65}\) Or \textquote{not finished.} \(^{66}\) \textit{CHD} first draft on \textit{peda-}.
be close to each other. See also Goetze, *RHA* XV/61 (1957) 93–99, on a “Reiseroute” that includes Tuğuppiya. Tuğuppiya is attested in Old Assyrian documents from Kültepe; see Bilgiç, *AfO* 15 (1945–51) 36.

**i 23 and 27 (§5):** \(\text{halzai}\). The verb \(\text{halzai}\) occurs often in festivals, but usually with the meaning “to cry out” or “to call (by name).” Here it is used to indicate declaring a new identity for something. Such a meaning for \(\text{halzai}\) is attested in the Instructions for Temple Personnel:

\[
\text{nu}^\mu\text{za A.Ś.Å DINGIR-LIM šumēl šalziyatteni šumēl-}^\mu\text{za A.Ś.Å A.Ś.Å DINGIR-LIM šalziyatteni (If you call the god’s field your own and your field the god’s field.) Its use with this meaning is unusual in a festival context, although there is at least one other similar example:} \quad \text{ANA L}[^1]\text{MEŠ SANGA-TIM šumandaš DUMU.MEŚ É.GAL LŬ.MEŚ MEŠEDI [ ] ūžUNĪG.GIG šušu piyan[i] }^\mu\text{za ūžUNĪG.GIG tašalai[n] šalziśanzi (The palace attendants and the royal bodyguards give the raw liver to all the priests. § They call it the tašalai-liver.) In this text as in } KUB 55.43 \text{ the construction involves the use of the sentence particle -za, a doubled object, and the iterative-durative form šalziśanzi.}

**i 25 (§5):** \(\text{KÁ.GAL ašušan}\). Although the basic semantic range of \(ašuša\)- as some kind of ornament is certain, a more precise meaning for it has not been agreed upon. See most recently Tischler, *HEG* Lief. 1 (1977) 90, as “ein Schmuckstück, Ohrgehänge”; Kammenhuber, *HW*² Lief. 6/7 (1982) 537–38, listing \(ašuša\)- in a genitive construction with KÁ.GAL as \(ašuša⁻¹\) and a separate word \(ašuša⁻²\) for \(ašuša\)- as some kind of ornament, perhaps “Ohrgehänge”; and Puhvel, *HED* 1–2 (1984) 220–22, with the meaning “ring.”

Otten in his commentary on this line in *FsFriedrich* 357 has already pointed out that \(ašuša\)- on the one hand is sometimes associated with a gate but on the other hand also appears in connection with cultic equipment, a point similar to the one made by Kammenhuber by dividing \(ašuša\)- into two distinct words. As noted in the transliteration, this word is sufficiently unclear on the tablet that both \(a-šu-ša-an\) and \(a-šu-ša-aš\) are possible readings. If it is to be read \(a-šu-ša-an\), it cannot be an accusative, as we already have the object of the sentence expressed with the enclitic pronoun \(-an\)- at the beginning of the sentence. It must be taken rather as an Old Hittite genitive plural, “gate of the \(ašuša\)-s.” If the reading \(a-šu-ša-aš\) is correct, it would also be a genitive (plural?). The existence of an \(ašuša\)-gate was noted by Alp, *Beamt.* (1940) 14 n. 1, and Otten *FsFriedrich* (1959) 355 and 357, and has been accepted by Kammenhuber, *HW*² 1: 537 and Puhvel, *HED* 1–2: 220. See Ünal, *FsBittel* (1983) 528–29, on the \(ašuša\)-gate as one of several gates at Ḫattuša whose names are known, and for a possible hieroglyphic reading for this gate name.

**i 25 (§5):** \(\text{SUMŠU}\). There are no other definite examples in the published corpus of taking the name away from a god, or in fact from anything or anybody. “Calling” (\(\text{halzai}\)-) and “speaking” (\(\text{te}\)-) the name are quite common, but this is the only text in which a name is taken away. This is so unusual and so concrete an expression that we may wonder if

68. *KUB* 25.36 v 35–39 (Festival Celebrated by the Prince). For some reason the text shows both neuter (\(ḥušu\)) and common (\(-an\)-, \(tašalain\)) agreement for ūžUNĪG.GIG.
there were names actually written on the kurša-s, perhaps on a medallion which was attached to the bag.

i 28 (§6). Restoring the broken section [ ... -z]i MU-ti has proved quite difficult. There are no examples of an ordinal number whose complement ends in -zi. The only adjective which might be appropriate to restore would be [hantezz]i. The problem with such a restoration is that [hantezz]i in i 28 would mean that sending out the hunting bags in the first year was being contrasted to sending them out promptly. This does not express the required contrast between the two different cases being described, so the restoration of i 28 remains uncertain.

Obverse ii

ii 2 (§7'): NINDA takarmu-. See Jakob-Rost, in H. Klengel, ed., Beiträge zur sozialen Struktur des alten Vorderasiens (Berlin, 1971) 114, and Hoffner, AlHeth (1974) 185. Jakob-Rost points out that, in texts in which the “singer from Kaneš” sings, the two breads almost invariably offered are NINDA.KUR4.RA and NINDA takarmu-. This and Hoffner’s idea in AlHeth that the word is probably Hattic might be an indication that NINDA takarmu- is an offering bread used from at least the earliest times of the Hittite cult and probably even earlier in Hattic festivals.

ii 3 and passim: išgar-. In column ii of KUB 55.43 this verb occurs a number of times, always in the same phrase and as a participle used substantively. The form iškarantaš could be either genitive or a dative-locative plural. There is little help to be gained from other texts; the iškarantaš occurs only two other times in the corpus, both in broken or unclear context. Translating it as a genitive, “for the god of the lined up one(s),” yields little sense. I have taken it as a plural dative-locative in a construction with šer as “upon the lined up ones,” probably the lined up hunting bags.

The use of the participial form išgarant- as a substantive is attested elsewhere: nu GISPA kue išgaranta n-āl-kan ḫittianzi n-āl-kan ANA NINDAparšulli šer ANA DU tianzi ŠA DZA.BA4.BA4 išgaranta ḫuṭītiyanzi n-āl-šan ANA 6 NINDAparšulli šer ANA DZA.BA4.BA4 tianzi “They pull the staff(s) which are lined up. They place them on the broken pieces of bread for the storm god. And the lined up ones (i.e., staffs) of ZA.BA4.BA4 they pull and place on 6 broken pieces of bread for ZA.BA4.BA4?” KBo 11.45 iv 9′–15′ (Festival Celebrated by the Prince).

ii 3 (§7′). Either dIM or dLAMMA uru Zapatiskuwa could be restored at the end of the line, based on the similar list of gods in col. iv. Spacing would favor the restoration of the shorter name dIM. This is reinforced by the fact that the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa receives drink offerings further down in this list, in ii 13. The Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa is less prominent and occurs further down in the order here than it does in col. iv; for possible reasons for this see the comments on the festivals below.

ii 9 (§8'). The phrase n-āšta šanhanzi is frequently used as an abbreviation for n-āšta daganzipan/uš šanhanzi “They sweep the floor(s).” Normally the 1UŠU.I would perform this task. Since the amount of crumbs generated during the ceremonies described in columns ii and iv would eventually necessitate the sweeping of the floor, it is quite possible that
n-ašta šanḥanzi in this text is to be understood as “They sweep (the floor).” A passage from a ritual procedure provides another possible interpretation for KUB 55.43 ii 9 and rev. iv 13', 20', and 22': (“They take away the broken thick breads from the tables”) n-ašta gšBanšur.Ḫila arḫa šanḥanzi Ė-ir-a-ka kan PanΊ Dingir-lim šanḥanzi “They wipe/brush off the tables. They also sweep the house in front of the deity” KBo 24.57 i 6–8 with dupl. KBo 23.43 i 6–8 (Ritual of šarraš). Here šanḥ- is used for cleaning off bread crumbs after they have been broken and set out as part of the cultic activity. Because in column ii there may be only two and in column iv only one hunting bag on which the bread offerings are placed, perhaps this phrase here indicates that they wipe/brush off the hunting bags periodically before putting on more bread offerings. However, the KUB 55.43 passages do not express an object of šanḥ- as the KBo 24.57 passage does, so the correct interpretation may be that the floors are being swept.

ii 27 (§10'). The whole of column ii as preserved is a list of gods to whom are given drink and bread offerings; an almost identical list begins in the second preserved paragraph (§18') of column iv and continues onto the left edge. Although this second list helps restore ii 27, the list of gods in column ii contains one less item than that of column iv. We must therefore choose between the last two elements of the column iv list, dLAMMA URU-Zapatiškuwa and Dingir.MES URU-LIM to restore in ii 27. I restore Dingir.MES URU-LIM from iv 32' rather than dLAMMA URU-Zapatiškuwa of iv 26' for two reasons:

(1) There is very little space at the end of ii 27, making the shorter restoration more likely.
(2) In all the places in which the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiškuwa receives offerings, they sing and bark as part of the ceremony. Because this does not happen with the offerings for the deity or deities broken away in ii 27, and because it is similarly omitted in iv 32'f. with the Dingir.MES URU-LIM, this seems the likelier possibility.

ii 30f. (§11'). The ceremonies of §11' and §§21'–22' involve the same sequence of activities and gods being honored. The sequence reconstructed from these two examples makes it clear that cultic singing by the Lú.MES sīr and barking by the Lú.MES UR.GI, accompany both drink offerings and bread offerings.

ii 33–34 (§11'). Although there may not be enough space for it, a possible restoration after ḫareš here would be [URU Ḥattušaš] / [LIM Dingir.MES-ya], “and the thousand gods of Ḥatti,” a logical way to end a list like this. Such a list is attested in KUB 9.28 i 7’–9’ (ritual for Heptad): dIŠTAR-iš dNiňašaš dKulittaš dṬara waš dGulšes dḪiššiš [ḪU].SAG.MES ÍD.MES URU-Ḫattušaš LIM Dingir.MES. Note here also that the Fate Deities and Ḫiššiši again occur next to each other, making the restoration of dGulšes in ii 32 even more likely.

Reverse iii

iii 8' (§13'). The ḫkarimmi- also occurs in the Ritual for the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag in 523/t rev? 8'. The exact meaning of ḫkarimmi- has not been agreed upon,
but it is clear that it is a kind of sacred building. The restoration \$kar[immi makes good sense here, as we could expect the god to be taken to the \$karimmi- or have something done for him there. There are, however, no other examples of a phrase like the one which we have in line 8’, nu DINGIR-LAM INA \$kar[immi …, so we cannot use the evidence of an analogous passage to restore the end of the line.

iii 22' (§14'). The word beginning ku-[l_x]- could be ku-[l_e]-[da-ni, ku-[i_s, ku-[l_e]-[e-e_s, or ku-[l_i]-[u_s. The translation reflects the last of these readings. The word \$he-ma-aš-\_x[ is a hapax legomenon; there are no occurrences even of a word beginning \$he-ma-. The trace after -aš does not suggest any possible reading to me; it looks most like a na sign without the vertical wedge, even though the break is such that the vertical would be visible if the sign were na. There are at least four occurrences in the corpus of \$he or \$he-e followed by a break, some of which could conceivably be this same word. The broken nature of KUB 55.43 at this point makes it difficult to say even what function the word served in the sentence; it was probably the subject or object of the action performed. The reading \$GAN-ma-aš-x[ has not been considered because GAN never occurs by itself.

iii 25' (§15'). Hoffner suggests restoring a form of DUGišnura- here on the basis of the trace in line 28’ in a context that seems to be referring to the same vessel and which could be read DUGiš-nu-[u-ri. In addition, the DUGišnura- is the vessel into which one puts išn[a-, “dough,” which is the case here. This could also conceivably be DUGišnuri[ with a translation “They [br]ing four BĀN [x] [in] five išnura-] vessels.” There is not space in the break for an enclitic “and” on the end of išnuruš if we restore udanzi instead of [d]anzi. The former verb has been restored here because uda- is frequently used in festival context with the expression İSTU İLuriyanni, while da- is not attested with this particular phrase.

iii 28' (§15'). As indicated in the translation, it is unclear whether the subject of the sentence [n-aš DUGiš][u]rI PĀNI DINGIR-LIM šešzi is the GUDU priest or the dough whose preparation is described in this paragraph. Each interpretation can be supported by a passage which shows similarities to it. Although there are no other occurrences of išna- “dough” with šeš- “sleep, spend the night,” similar foodstuffs/cultic materials do rarely occur with this verb, for example: § nu šuppa PĀNI DINGIR-LIM šešzi lukkatta- ma “at šara dahği n-e arha adanzi “The flesh spends the night before the god. In the morning I take it up and they eat (it)” KUB 7.1+KBo 3.8 i 17–18 (Ritual of Ayatarša). “The king drinks the gods of the city, standing. (They play) the large INANNA instrument. He breaks sour thick bread. The cupbearer brings it forth.” § G15BANŠUR.HJ.A pědi-pat kurkanzi GAD-it kariyanzi pědi-pat šešzi “They keep the tables in the same place and cover (them) with a linen cloth. It (the sour thick bread) passes the night in the same place” KBo 19.128 vi 25’–29’ (fragment of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival), ed. Otten, StBoT 13 (1971) 16–17. Otten translates the critical sentences “sie bedecken (sie) mit einem Linnen (und alles) bleibt an

69. Discussions of the \$karimmi- include Alp, Tempel (1983) 102; Melchert, Die Sprache 29 (1983) 11–12; Pieri, Atti e Memorie dell’Accademia Toscana di scienze e lettere “La Colombaria” 47 (1982) 8–9; Haas and Wilhelm, AOATS 3 (1974) 44; and Guterbock, CRRAI 20 (1972) 125. Melchert’s work is the latest to reaffirm Güterbock’s point that the \$karimmi- is not strictly the temple but rather has a more general meaning, perhaps best translated “sacred building.”
seinem Ort," by which he seems to mean that the sour thick bread as well as the tables remain for the night. In any case this is an example of NINDA.KUR₄.RA as the subject of šeš-. In these examples the subjects of šeš-, both šuppa- "flesh" and NINDA.KUR₄.RA EMŠA "sour thick bread," support the interpretation of išna- as the subject of the sentence in iii 28' in that they also are foodstuffs that are used in the cult.

In contrast to the interpretation of išna- as the subject of this sentence, it is also possible that it is the LUGUDU involved in the preparation of the dough in §15' who watches over it through the night. There are a number of examples of the client for whom a ritual is being performed (BĒL SISKUR) spending the night in a ritually significant locus, for example: mahhan nekuzzi nu'-za BĒL SISKUR.SISKUR ₄[N][BA]NŠUR-piran šešzi ṣ[N]Á-aš-ši ₄[BANSUR-piran katta tiyanzi "When it becomes night the ritual's client sleeps before that same table." KUB 7.5 ii 14'–16' (Ritual of Paškuwatti), ed. Hoffner, Aula Orientalis 5 (1987) 271–87. ⁷⁰ This and other examples like it differ from the proposed interpretation of the KUB 55.43 passage in that in the latter the GUDU priest is not a client for whom a ritual is being performed, and his spending the night before the god is therefore not done for his benefit. Rather the purpose would have been to watch over the carefully prepared dough until morning. The ritual client spending the night in a prescribed place does not guard anything, and the whole procedure is of course being performed in his interest and not as part of a state festival. In the absence of any more closely analogous passage to that of KUB 55.43 iii 28' we must remain undecided as to exactly who or what spent the night before the god by/in the išnura-.

iii 29' (§15'). The sentence in line 29' is unique, although there are examples of somewhat similar expressions. The only other possible example which I have been able to find of EZEN NU.GAL kuiški is: GRUKatapi DINGIR.MEŠ-aš ḫazzu EZE[-ya NU.GAL]? kuiški "[There is no] kind of ceremony or festival of the gods in the city Katapa" KUB 30.39 obv. 9 (AN.TAH.ŠUM outline), ed. Güterbock, JNES 19 (1960) 80 and 87. Güterbock reads the broken section as EZEN[-ya U-U]L ku-iš-ki, which may very well be the correct reading, especially when we consider the example which he cites of a similar phrase in IBoT 3.40:5' (AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, first day), which reads [EZE]N[-ya U-UL ku-i[t-ki]]. ⁷¹ Although Güterbock's reading may be correct, the trace in the copy is such that it could also be the end of a GAL (ik) sign. Evidence for the reading [NU.GAL]L kuiški in KUB 30.39 obv. 9 is the duplicate text KBo 10.20 i 12, which has at this point ḫazzwi NU.GAL kuški. I have found only one example of a sentence similar to that of iii 29' with regard to time specification: apēdani UD-ti ḫazzwe NU.GAL kuški "There is no kind of ceremony on that day" KUB 27.66 ii 13'–14' (frag. of witašš(iy)aš Festival).

iii 31' (§16'). This passage is the only one in the published Hittite corpus in which the É.UDUN occurs. Its meaning, however, seems quite obvious from its component parts. See

⁷⁰ See Hoffner, Aula Orientalis 5 (1987), especially p. 282, for a discussion of incubation, i.e., spending the night in a sacred location to facilitate access to a deity.

⁷¹ EZEN regularly takes common agreement, so the neuter kui [t]ki here is unexpected. The trace on the tablet as copied, however, does not allow the possibility of reading kui [ški].
Hoffner, *AlHeth* 137f., for comments on the UDUN. He points out there that explicit references to the oven in Hittite are rare, so we should not be too surprised that the E.UDUN is otherwise unattested. He also notes, based on *KBo* 15.33 ii 17 and iii 29–30, that the UDUN was the type of oven used to bake NINDA.KUR₄.RA/ḫarsī-, which accords well with our text, in which NINDA.KUR₄.RA is baked in the É.UDUN.

### iii 36' (§16'). The sentence beginning *IS-TU* É ... requires an object in the break to make sense. This object is something which in the following sentence the celebrants sacrifice (BAL). For this reason a sacrificial animal of some kind is suggested for the break. I take the -ya at the end of *uriyanni-* as the conjunction -ya, “and, also” and not as part of a form such as *ₙ⁺₀ uriyanni[y][aš]* because such a form is unattested, while there are numerous examples of É *ₙ⁺₀ uriyanni*. See Appendix B for more on the morphology of *uriyanni-*.. A stem form such as this is not uncommon in what we might call a quasi-Akkadographic writing. The conjunction -ya-, “also,” marks the contrast between the ceremony with the bread in the first part of the paragraph and the animal sacrifice that follows it.

### iii 37' (§16'). The trace read BA[L could conceivably be *aš-š[i-, but no Hittite word then suggests itself as a likely restoration. The verb *aššiya-* “to love” would make little sense here. With the exception of one occurrence, *aššiya-* is always written beginning a-*aš-ši-* ... One expects a verb denoting the action performed on the antecedent of *apūn*, thus BA[L as a logogram for šipant- seems to be the best reading. Given the similarity to the sentence in line 35’, it might have been possible to restore the verb *palwai-* , but the accusative form *apūn* in the sentence makes this impossible, as *palwai-* is always intransitive.

Reverse iv

### iv 29' (§21'). The verb *wehel-* occurs in other festivals, especially in the festivals naming the NIN.DINGIR, *CTH* 649, but this passage is the only occurrence with GUNNI as an apparent object of *wehel-* in the active voice, or with *ₙ⁺₀ MES SIR, “singers” as the subject. This festival is thus unique in prescribing ritual “turning” for the singers, who normally just sing. There is one example of a similar ceremonial prescription: *ₙ-ašta GUNNI ḫ-e ḫ-an-ta-ri nu kiššan SIR-ŘU* “‘They’ circle the hearth and sing as follows” *IBoΤ* 1.29 rev. 21'–22' (*ḥašsumāš* Festival). Because line 21' of the *IBoΤ* 1.29 passage begins a new paragraph, it is not clear who are circling the hearth and singing. Here as in the *kurša-* Festival the cultic singing is done while performing some kind of ceremonial dance or procession around the hearth.

Although this use of *wehel-* with the hearth is extremely rare, there are a number of occurrences of running around the hearth (*ḥaššan ḫuwai-*). This is attested with uncomplemented GUNNI: GUNNI-*kan ḫuβanzi, KBo* 11.32 obv. 15 (Festival for the Earth Deities); with GUNNI-an: GUNNI-*an-*kan ḫuβanzi, obv. 9 of the same text; and with *ḥaššan: n-ašta ḫaššan ḫuβanzi, KUB* 53.14 ii 7 (Festival for Telipinu). Although normally ḫuwai- is intransitive, here it takes an accusative and is translated “They run (around) the
hearth.” In the same way, in KUB 55.43 iv 29’, the normally intransitive verb weh- takes GUNNI as its direct object: “They circle the hearth.”

In cultic ceremonies various functionaries run around the hearth, including the DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL, “palace attendants” KUB 55.39 i 9’–10’ (Festival for the Earth Deities), translit. (as Bo 2372) Neu, StBoT 26: 366; the LŒ.MES.SANGA, “priests” KUB 10.39 obv. iii 7–8 (fest. fragment); and the LŒ.MES.NAPEŠ (cult functionaries), KBo 25.46:10’ (Festival of Teteš-api). Often the subject of huwai- is not expressed in this construction but is simply the impersonal “he/she” or “they” so common in festival procedure. Singing does not usually accompany the ceremony of running around the hearth. The one example of singers running around the hearth, interesting because it is singers who circle the hearth in KUB 55.43 iv 29’, is in KUB 55.28 iii 8’ (Building ritual),72 in which the LŒ.MES.NAR run around the hearth.

Left edge

1. e. 4 (colophon): TIL-RA. The complementation is for Akkadian LABIRA. This is a very unusual form, as TIL at Boğazköy is almost never provided with an Akkadian phonetic complement. The more frequent Sumerogram for “old” is LIBIR.RA.

1. e. 6 (colophon): ukturi-. Some festivals are described in their colophons as “regular” or “fixed,” to be celebrated on a regular basis at the appropriate time of the year.73 The ceremony for renewing the hunting bags was not regular; the introduction to the festival tells us that it was done as needed when replacing the hunting bags. There was, however, a regular festival related to the hunting bag which was performed in Durmitta, which is the city to which the old hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Hatenzuwa was taken. The word [petumman]zi, restored from line 4’ of the colophon of KUB 7.36 (CTH 683.3), is somewhat difficult to fit into the sentence, and the restorations and translation for 1. e. 6 and 7 are therefore tentative.

A = KBo 13.179  B = KBo 22.168

Bo 55/u =  KBo 13.179 is a fragment measuring 8.5 cm wide by 6.3 cm high. Although there is some abrasion of the surface, its state of preservation is in general quite good. The ductus of KBo 13.179, like that of KUB 55.43, looks like Middle Script. Even in such a small fragment we can see examples of older and newer forms of the same sign; the da sign for example shows forms both with and without a broken middle horizontal. The e sign occurs in an old form. The nam and en signs are not drawn in their very latest forms. The ik sign is written with the old form. The verticals have some of the typical Old Script slant to their tops, but there is no crowding together of signs. I suggest a Middle Script dating for this tablet as well.

Bo 412/u =  KBo 22.168 is a small fragment approximately 6 cm wide by 3.2 cm high. Its surface is very well preserved, and the tablet is written in a neat, careful script. The

73. See Singer, StBoT 27 (1983) 40 and 43, for comments on the concept of “regular” festivals.
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tablet’s small size makes it impossible to date the script precisely. The URU and $ik$ signs occur in later forms, while $nam$ does not have its very latest form. There is no slant to the tops of the vertical wedges. There is nothing definite to indicate anything but a New Script dating for this tablet.

Text Scheme

A. $KBo$ 13.179.
B. $KBo$ 22.168. Duplicates $KBo$ 13.179 ii 2′–13′.

Transliteration

Obverse ii

§1′  x+1  x x x x [x
2′  2 KUŠ GUD SA, 2 KUŠ [BABBAR? GUD? pa-an][-zi?]5
3′  nu ku-e-da-ni URU-ri $\text{kus}_1$ kuršu-uš [Ø]
4′  EGI-pa ne-wa-aḫ-ḫa-an -zi [Ø]
5′  na-at a-pí-ya a-ša-an -zi [Ø]

§2′ 6′  na-aš-ta! 1 MĀŠ.GAL an-da u-un-ni-ya-an[(-zi)]
7′  nam-ma-an wa-ar-pa-an-zi na-an-kán
8′  $ŠA$ Š.GAL-$\text{lim}_1$ Š.MEŠ ku-e-da-aš an-da
9′  pe-en-na-an-zi na-at-kán ša-an-ḫa-an-zi
10′  nam-ma-at ḫar-nu-wa-an -zi77

§3′ 11′ [na-a]š-ta MĀŠ.GAL LŪ.MEŠ UR.GI,
12′ [(a-pí-ni-i)š-sa-an ku-wa-aš-kán-zi
13′  [ o o o ]x-kán U-$\text{ul}_1$ ku-e-da-(ni)-ik-ki
14′  [ o o o o o-z]i? nu KUŠ (eras.) A-NA LŪ.MEŠ $\text{aš}_1$ $\text{gab}$
15′  [pʃ-y-a-an-zi? na-aš-t]a? [KUŠ-kur-šu1-uš (eras.)
16′  [GIbI-$\text{lim}_1$ LŪ.MEŠ $\text{aš}_1$ $\text{gab}$ i-ya-an?-zi]

Translation

Obverse ii

§1′  [... ] two hides of red oxen (and) two white (?) oxen hides go(?). In whatever city they renew the hunting bags, they remain there.

74. Only traces of two or three signs preserved from column i.
75. Only the barest traces are preserved here; $pa$-an- is restored from text B 1′: pʃ-a-ʃ$n$-. See Line Commentary below on this line on the possibility of objects such as cowhides going.
76. Text has -ṣa.
77. Or ḫur-nu-wa-an-zi. See Appendix B sub ḫ$n$ (uw)ai-.
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§2' [Th]ey drive in one billy goat and then wash it. They sweep and then sprinkle the buildings of the palace into which they drive it.

§3' The dog-men kill the goat in the same way. [... ] to no one [they(?)] x. They give the hide to the leatherworkers. [Fro]m (it) [the leatherworkers make] the [new] hunting bags.

Comments on Individual Lines

2' (§1'). The traces after the second KUS look good for BABBAR, and one would expect a color here to parallel the SA. However, if GUD is read correctly here, why would the word order be different from the preceding phrase? One expects (number) KUS (animal type) (color). Whatever the traces may be, it is clear that they cannot be read as some form of kus kurša-. Collation of KBo 13.179 indicates that the trace after BABBAR would also fit LÚ.MEŠ, which suggests the restoration 2 KUS BABBAR LÚ.MEŠ x x[danzi]. This is ruled out by the duplicate, which has 2 KUS o o o p[a]-a[n- [...] possibly to be restored ap-p[a-]nzi. The verb ep(p)-, "seize," would make sense here with the hides as direct object.

However, appanzi does not fit the preserved traces in the main text. We therefore restore panzi, which brings up the question of how cowhides may be said to go. In a possibly analogous situation the hunting bag goes, for example KBo 10.23 v 15' (KI.LAM Festival), ed. Singer, StBoT 28 (1984) 14: kunnanaš kuršaš p[a]zzi, "the beaded bag goes." This passage allowed Singer to restore another part of the KI.LAM Festival: nA-kunnanaš [kurš]eš panzi KBo 10.25 vi 3'-4', ed. Singer, StBoT 28: 52. In a similar vein are these passages: (24) lukkattî-ma URU-Arinnaz kus kuršaš uizzi "But in the morning the hunting bag comes from Arinna"; (26) [lukkattî-ma kus kurš(aš URU-Tau)niya paizzi "But in the morning the hunting bag goes to Tawiniya"; (33) nu kus kur[šaš] INA É ÐNISABA uizzi "The hunting bag comes into the temple of Nisaba" KBo 10.20 obv. i, restored from KUB 30.39 (outline of AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival), ed. (as 126/p+271/p+433/p+) Güterbock, JNES 19 (1960) 80–81. The verbs "go" and "come" describe the movements of the hunting bag as cult image while it is carried in procession. In KBo 13.179 obv. ii 2' the cowhides (as prospective hunting bags?) were carried into the city in which the hunting bag was going to be renewed, and this was expressed in the same way as is the carrying of the hunting bag totem in the KI.LAM and AN.TAH.ŠUM Festivals.

The phrase KUS GUD SA₃ occurs in at least one other Hittite text: 9 GISKAK ZABAR 9 URUDU waršiniš 2 KUS GUD SA₃ 2 KUS GUD BABBAR 2 DUG kantašualliš ZABAR § "nine pegs of bronze, nine copper waršini-s, two red cowhides, two white cowhides, two k- vessels of bronze," a list of equipment in KUB 7.29 obv. 10–11 (Ritual of mYarri). In line 20 of the same text we have: [A]NA PANI GISŠÚ.A- ma 1 KUS GUD SA₃ dai "He places one red cowhide in front of the throne." There are no other occurrences of KUS GUD SA₃, so apparently red cowhides were only very rarely used as cultic equipment or as material 78. Güterbock, FsKantor 116 with n. 23, suggests that kunnanaš kuršaš means "beaded bag."
from which to make such equipment.\textsuperscript{79} There are a number of examples of black cowhides, KUŠ GUD GE, and white cowhides, KUŠ GUD BABBAR. These examples demonstrate the Hittite preference for the hides of white or black cattle in ritual procedures. They also used the hides of other animals; there is attested for instance a goathide, KUŠ ÜZ in the ritual fragment \textit{KBo} 17.78 ii 14. The fact that white cowhides were used in cultic procedures lends support to the idea of reading the broken sign after the second KUŠ as BABBAR; the problem with this is that I can find no examples of the word order *KUŠ BABBAR GUD. This reading must therefore remain tentative, although the \textit{KUB} 7.29 passage quoted above is another clear example of red and white cowhides occurring together.

\textit{8'–9' (§2')}: É.GAL. There are no other occurrences in the published Hittite corpus of this phrase ŠA É.GAL-LIM É.MEŠ. There are many examples of É.GAL “palace” in the genitive, ŠA É.GAL(-LIM), but none in which the regens is “house” or “houses.” This expression must refer to the individual buildings or rooms of the palace complex. There are also no other occurrences of É.GAL with the verb \textit{penne-}; driving animals into the palace was not part of normal cult procedure.

\textit{12' (§3')}: \textit{kuen-}. Although Friedrich, \textit{HW} 113, gives the more common form of the iterative of \textit{kuen-} as \textit{kuennešk-}, in fact almost all of the rather few occurrences of this iterative are of the form \textit{kuaški-}. The form \textit{kuaškanzi} is ambiguous; there are occurrences of it which appear from context to be the verb \textit{kuaš-} “to kiss,” which does not fit in \textit{KBo} 13.179. The form \textit{kuaškanzi} could also be from the verb \textit{kuaš-}, \textit{kuaš-}, “to crush,” but that also is less likely in this context than “kill.” Because the dog-men are nowhere else attested killing, kissing, or crushing anything, we cannot derive any help from similar passages in other texts. Here the dog-men kill the goat to get its hide, from which the \textit{LO.MEŠAŠGAB} will make the KUŠ\textit{kurša-s}.

\textit{14' (§3')}: \textit{LO.AŠGAB}. There are not a great number of occurrences of the \textit{10.AŠGAB}, and only one other example in which he clearly receives a “hide” (KUŠ): KUŠGUD.HÌA UGULA \textit{LO.MEŠAŠGAB G[AL 10.MEŠx ]/ dan[zì] “The overseer of the leatherworkers and the chief of the [x] tak[e] the cowhides” \textit{KBo} 20.23 rev. 5’–6’ (Cult of Nerik fragment). The general context of the tablet is sufficiently broken that we cannot tell just what the chief of the leatherworkers did with the hides. Nevertheless, on the basis of lines 3’–5’, it may be understood that in 15’–16’ the leatherworkers are making the new hunting bags.

\textsuperscript{79} Is this because they had to be dyed red and so were less convenient than naturally occurring colors?
**KUB 7.36**

Bo 4912 = KUB 7.36 is a fragment approximately 9.8 cm wide by 9 cm high. Its surface is quite well preserved. The writing shows very strongly the crowding together of signs and words typical of Old Script. However, the az sign is written with a subscript za and the URU and SAG signs occur in later forms. These few observations do not constitute sufficient evidence to assign a dating to the script.

Transliteration

Reverse right

§1’x+1 [na-aš?-]ta ḫa-an-te-ez-zi [pal-ši A-NA (DN₁)]
2’ [ši-p]a-an-ti EGIR-an-da-ma-k[án$¹ 1 MÁŠ.GAL A-NA (DN₂)]
3’ ši-pa-an-ti 1 MÁŠ.GAL-ma-kán [A-NA (DN₂) ši-pa-an-ti]
4’ 1 MÁŠ.GAL-ma-kán A-NA $²Kap-[pa-ri-ya-mu $³PLAMMA $⁴URUTa-ta-šu-na]$³²
5’ $³PLAMMA $⁴URUTa-aš-ḫa-pu-na [U A-NA (DN₃)]
6’ ši-pa-an-ti na-aš iš-ta-n[a-na pi-ra-an da-a-i?]

8’ A-NA DINGIR-LUM SAG.DU-ŠU še-er d[a-an-zi$³⁴
9’ ke-e-ez ke-e-ez-zi-ya A-N[A
10’ na-at-kán še-er A-NA SAG.DU-[ŠUti-an-zi?]
11’ A-NA NINDA.KUR₄,RA.HI.A-ma-kán še-er x[ ... ti-an-zi?]
12’ na-aš-ša-an še-er A-NA DINGIR-LIM SA[G.DU-ŠU se-er ti-an-zi?]

§³’ 13’ A-NA DINGIR-LIM-ma pi-ra-an kat-ta da[-a-i]
14’ nu-uš-ša-an ŠA 3 MÁŠ.GAL $⁵U[ da-a-i? nu-uš-ša-an]
15’ ŠA $⁶PLAMMA $⁷URUZa-pa-ši-ku-wa $⁸kur-ši še-er da-a-i nu-uš-ša-an $⁵U[X A-NA]
16’ $⁹Kap-pa-ri-ya-mu $⁷PLAMMA $⁴URUT[a-ta-šu-na]
17’ $³PLAMMA $⁴URUTa-aš-ḫa-pu-na [U A-NA (DN₃)]
18’ $⁷kur-ši še-er da-a-i[l
19’ [ ]x x x ][

(the tablet breaks off)

80. Catalogued by Laroche as CTH 685, “Fragments de fêtes pour les dieux KAL.”
81. Collation reveals a trace of one or possibly two horizontals after ma which would fit kán.
82. Restored on the basis of KUB 55.43 ii 17–18.
83. This is the only occurrence of a plene spelling of AŠRU in the published Hittite corpus.
84. Or da-a-i “he places”?
The first [time] he [sacrifices] [to DN₁]. Then he sacrifices [one goat to DN₂] and one goat [to DN₃]. One goat he sacrifices to Kap[pariyanu, the Tutelary Deity of Tatašuna,] the Tutelary Deity of Tašhapuna, [and to DN₇]. [He places(?)] them [before(?)] the alt[ar].

[They carry] the god back to his place. [They take(?)] up its head away from the god. On this side and that to ... They place(?) it on [his] head. Upon the thick bread, however, [they place(?)] a[ ... ]. [They place(?)] them up on the god’s head.

He puts (it) down before the god. [He sets out(?)] the x[ ... ] of the three goats. [He places them on] the hu[n ting bag] of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa. He places [x] on the hunting bag for Kappariyanu, the Tutelary Deity of Tatašuna, the Tutelary Deity of Tašhapuna, an[d for DN₈].

(the tablet breaks off)

85. The deity to whom the preceding three gods are kipikkišdu. See Appendix B sub kipikkišdu for the identification of Kappariyanu, the Tutelary Deity of Tatašuna, and the Tutelary Deity of Tašhapuna as kipikkišdu.

86. Or “[He] places its head up for the god.”

87. A flesh part.

88. This refers to the three goats offered as sacrifices to deities in §1’.

89. The deity to whom these three are kipikkišdu.
KUB 7.36

Reverse left (colophon)\(^90\)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{x+1} & \quad [\text{DUB} 2? \text{ KAM QA77}\text{?1 URU}^{\text{LU}}\text{Ha-at-tu-ša?-}a\text{z} \\
2' & \quad [\text{ma-aḫ-ḫa-an SA} \text{ pLAMMA URU}^{\text{LU}}\text{Ha-te-en-zu-wa KUS}k\text{ur-ša-an TIL-RA} \\
2a' & \quad [\text{I-NA URU}\text{Dur-mi-it-ta p-e-da-an-zi}]^{92} \\
3' & \quad [\text{na-an SA} \text{ pLAMMA URU}Za-pa-ši-ku-wa KUSkur-ša-an} \\
4' & \quad [\text{i-ya-an-zi ... p}e\text{-tum-ma-an-zl} \\
5' & \quad [...]a-an-zl \\
6' & \quad [\text{A-NA URU}Zi-it-ḫa-rî-ya-ma-aš-ta} ar-ḫa-an \\
7' & \quad [\text{EZEN U-UL ku-in-ki i-ya-an-zl ... }x-pf^{93} \\
\end{align*}\]

\(\text{(the tablet breaks off)}\)

KUB 20.13\(^94\)

Bo 2130 = KUB 20.13 is a fragment 9.1 cm wide by 7.8 cm high whose surface is not particularly well preserved. Its script shows a mixture of older and newer forms and is probably to be dated to early New Script or conceivably Middle Script.

Transliteration

Obverse i

\[\begin{align*}
\text{§1'x+1} & \quad x [ \\
\text{§2'} & \quad 2' \quad \text{na-aš-kán [ o o o o o o o o o o o o o ]} \\
3' & \quad \text{na-aš i-ya-a[n-na-i]\text{?95 o o o o o o o o )} \\
4' & \quad \text{na-aš-ta URU}[a?- o o o o o o o o o o \ (one line blank) \\
5' & \quad \text{DINGIR-LUM-ma-kán GM[GIGIR-az kat-ta ú-wa-da-an-zi?96 o o]} \\
6' & \quad \text{ap-pé-šs-kir na-aš-ta [ o o o o o o o o ]} \\
7' & \quad \text{nu-uš-ša-an iš-ga-ra-an-t[a-aš? ṣ̄e-er ti-an-zi?]} \\
8' & \quad \text{MAS.GAL-ma řa-ap-pí-ni-[t z a-nu-an-zl]} \\
\end{align*}\]

90. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
91. Or UL QATIL.
92. There is room for this line on the tablet, and the sense of the colophon as reconstructed requires it.
93. This could conceivably be -[d]u-pí or G]AL KAŠ, neither of which is meaningful in the context of a colophon.
94. Catalogued by Laroche as CTH 685, “Fragments de fêtes pour les dieux KAL.”
95. Or perhaps na-aš i-ya-a[n-zi.
96. See CTH 685.2, KUB 9.17:24'-25', edited in Appendix A.
THE FESTIVALS FOR RENEWING THE $^{kus}_s$ kurša-

KUB 7.36

Reverse left (colophon)$^{97}$

[Second(?) tablet, finished(?).$^{98}$ How they take] the old [hu]nting bag [of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenzuwa] from [Ḫatuša to Durmitta and make it] the hunting bag [of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa]. [ ... f]or carrying [ ... ] they [i]ake. [For Zitḫariya, however, they do no] separate [festival]. [ ... ]x-pi(?)

(the tablet breaks off)

KUB 20.13

Translation

Obverse i

§1' (Only one trace preserved.)

§2' He [ ... ]. He goe[s(?)$^{99}$ ... ]. There the city L[a- ... ]. And they [bring(?)] the god [down on a chario]t. [ ... ] they seized. And [ ... ]. [On(?)] the lined up ones [they place(?)] them. But the billy goat [they cook with] flame.

---

97. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
98. Or "unfinished."
99. Or "[They] make them."
KUB 20.13

Obverse i (transliteration cont.)

§3' 9' nu ḥa-an-te-ez-zi pal-ši Ṝ[UTU? TUŠ-aš/GUB-aš e-ku-zi]
10' nu ṜU TUŠ-aš e-ku-zi Ł,MEŠ[S[IR? SIR-ŘU nu (DN)]
11' [GUBL-aš e-ku-zi Ł,MEŠ ALAN.ZIU o o o o ]
12' [nu ṜZi-i]t-ḥa-ri-ya-an GU[B-aš e-ku-zi]
13' [nu ṜLAMMA URU]Ta-t)a-šu-na GUB-aš [e-ku-zi]
14' [nu ṜKap-pa-ri-ya-m]u-un GUB[–aš e-ku-zi]
15' [nu ṜLAMMA URU]Ha-te-e)n-zu-wa Ṝ[x GUB-aš]
16' [e-ku-zi o o o o]x İS-TU[ o o o o ]
17' [o o o o o o o o NIND]A.KUR₄,R[A?₁₀₀ o o o o ]

Reverse iv¹⁰¹ (transliteration)

§4'x+1  x x x l
2' a-pé-e-da-aš-pāt DINGIR.MEŠ-aš zi-ik-ká[n-zi]
3' ḥa-aš-ši-i iš-tar-na pé-e-di da-a-i [A-NA?!
4' da-a-i ṜGAB-ya 4 AS-ŘA ṜG[DAG-ṭi ṜḤi-la-a[š-ši
5' še-ra-aš-ša-an ṜUZNĪG.GIG ṜUṢÁ ku-ra-a-an– z[i

§5' 6' ṜUZU-ima TU₇,ḤL.A i-en-zi ma-ah-ḥa-an-ma-aš-ša[-an o o o ]
7' nu-kán wa-al-la-aš ḥa-aš-ta-i ṜDU[UṬUL-az [da-an-zi]
8' na-ḥa-ri-ya-an GUR-pa A-NA DINGIR-LIM ti-an-zi [ Ø ]
9' nu DINGIR.MEŠ A-ku-wa-an-na a-pu-uš-pāt [a-an-zi]
10' ma-ah-ḥa-an-na ṜLAMMA₁₀₂ URU]Ha-ti-en-zu-wa [n
11' nu ne-ku-ma-an-te-eš ú-wa-an-zi [   

§6' 12' lu-uk-kat-ta-ma šu-up-pa-aš UD-a[z
13' [ x x x–zi] nu QA-TAM-MA i-e[n-zi]¹₀₃
14' [ o o o o ]ni?[   

(the tablet breaks off)

100. Collated.
101. After a large gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
102. The copy shows ṭal, but collation shows that the tablet actually has DINGIR as expected.
103. There is a very faint line across the tablet between 13' and 14'. It looks like a paragraph line, but it is so faint that it is unclear whether it was actually intended to mark a new paragraph or not.
KUB 20.13

Obverse i (translation cont.)

§3' The first time [he drinks the Sungod(?), seated/standing]. He drinks the Stormgod, seated. The singers sing. He drinks [DN], standing. The ALAN.ZU,-men

[...] [He drinks Zi]thariya, standing. [He drinks the Tutelary Deity of Tat]ashauna, standing. [He drinks Kappariyam], standing. [He drinks the Tutelary Deity of Ḫate]nzuwa (and) DN, standing]. [...] from/with [...]i[c[k bread [...]

(the tablet breaks off)

Reverse iv (translation)

§4' [...] [They] place [x] for those same gods. [...] he places on the hearth in the middle. On [...] he places. To the window, the four places, the (deified) throne, (and) Ḫilaš[ši [...] On (it) they cut up the entrails (and) heart.

§5' The fat, however, they make into stew. When, however, [...] [they take] the bone of the shank from the stew-pot. They place it back for the god. [They treat in sequence the gods, i.e., those same ones, for drinking. And when the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenzuwa [...] The naked ones come [...]]

§6' The next morning, the day of the meat [...] he [f]x's[l. In the same way they make]. (traces)

(the tablet breaks off)

104. On the 12ALAN.ZU, see most recently Güterbock, JNES 48 (1989) 307-09. The ALAN.ZU,-man is a cult functionary who most often "recites" in festivals.
A = KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97\textsuperscript{105} B = IBoT 2.69\textsuperscript{106}

The fragment 402/d+230/m = KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97 measures approximately 12.5 cm wide by 13.2 cm high. The smaller KBo 8.97 piece adds greatly to the preserved portion of column i but does not supplement column iv at all. The tablet must have been rather long originally; tablet thickness indicates that the preserved portion is less than half the height of the original tablet. The tablet is a distinctive brick red color and has a very hard, smooth surface. The script shows very cramped signs, small word spaces, and a great deal of slant to the tops of the verticals. The a, e, ra, zu, KAL, and URU signs occur in a form in which all but the last vertical are very short. The ak, ik, tar, and du signs occur in their older forms. All of the evidence indicates that the tablet is Old Script. See table 6 in Appendix C.

Bo 504 = IBoT 2.69 is a small fragment, approximately 1.9 cm wide by 4.0 cm high, with a well-preserved surface. Although the fragment is small, the preserved “Randleiste” and the angled surface discernible on the reverse allow us to securely assign obverse and reverse and column numbers. There are too few signs to date this piece, although one can see older forms of ḫa, li, da, and URU. The few available signs are consistent with a pre-New Script dating.

Text Scheme

A. KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97.

B. IBoT 2.69. Obverse i duplicates KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97 i 10'–18'. Reverse too small to interpret.

Transliteration

Obverse i\textsuperscript{107}

\begin{align*}
\text{§1'x+1} & \quad [ \quad ] x x \text{HI.A} \\
\text{§2' 2'} & \quad [ \quad ] \text{È NA₄KIŠIB} \\
3' & \quad [ \quad ] x a-ap-pa \\
4' & \quad [ \quad ] x-ḥa(-)la?-am-mi-iš-na \\
5' & \quad [ \quad ] x wa-a-tar \\
6' & \quad [ \quad ] x \\
\text{§3' 7'} & \quad [ \quad ] \text{HI.A}[ \quad o o o o o ] w-a-ḥ-nu-an-zi
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{105} KBo 8.97 preserves part of column i. An unpublished duplicate to KBo 8.97 is Bo 5572, noted by Otten in RLA 4 (1972–75) 134 sub ḫaṣkala.

\textsuperscript{106} Catalogued by Laroche as CTH 685, “Fragments de fêtes pour les dieux KAL.”

\textsuperscript{107} This column is labeled Rs? iv in the copy. The obverse of text B, IBoT 2.69, duplicates part of what is labeled reverse in KBo 21.89. Because IBoT 2.69 preserves the “Randleiste,” its assigned obverse and reverse are secure, and the obverse and reverse of KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97 are to be switched. KBo 8.97 joins §§3' and 4' of this column. Otten, FsFriedrich 356 and 358 n. 1, has already briefly compared IBoT 2.69 with KUB 55.43 and has noted the similarities between the two texts.
THE FESTIVALS FOR RENEWING THE "kurša-s"

KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97 (cont.)

Obverse i (cont.)

§3' 8' [ ]x ú-wa-fa^n1-[zi? o o o w]a-ar-pa-an-zı
§(cont.) 9' [ ] I-N]A TUL ar-ra-an-z[i n]a-aš-ta uSANGA
B obv. i
12' [ ] ]x ış-ga-ra-an-ta A-NA DZi-it-[h]a-ri-ya109
13' [o-d(a EGIR-pa ti-an-z)]i nu 3-ŠU ši-pa-an-ti ḥa-aš-ši-ya 1-ŠU
15' [EGIR-pa A-NA? DIN(G[IR]?M)]ES da-a-i

17' [DLAMMA URU[Ta-aš-ḫa-pu-n]a111] DLAMMA URU[Ta-a-ta-šu-ša
18' [DLAMMA URU[Ha-ṭi-en-zu]-wa] DLAMMA URU[Ha-ša-ga-la-a-i DLAMMA URU]Za-pa-t[i-i]-š-ku-wa
19' [ ] -ti-ya ḥa-aš-ši-i [DLAMMA URU]Za-pa-t[i-i]-š-ku-wa
20' [ ] DLAMMA GIŠ[UKUR112 o o o o] x-li
(traces in the intercolumnium and then the tablet breaks off)

Obverse ii

§5'x+1 [x]
2' nu[u]
3' nu x[
4' DLAMMA
5' DLAMMA [ n
6' 3-ŠU ši[-pa-an-ti
7' A-NA ZAG[.GAR.RA-ni?

108. Collation indicates that the only trace visible here is a single winkelhaken which would fit ḥa.
110. Text B 5' has nu? ḥa-aš-ši-i 1-ŠU BAL-t[i. I restore šipanti here because text A uses syllabically
spelled šipant- rather than the logogram BAL.
111. Restored from text B 10'. Although text B has DLAMMA URU[Ha-tašu]wa before DLAMMA
URU[Tašḫapuna, the transliteration reflects the suggestion that they were in reverse order from this in
text A. This keeps the triad of Kappariyamun, DLAMMA URU[Tatašuna, and DLAMMA URU[Tašḫapuna
together, as they are in KUB 55.43 ii 16-18 and iv 16'-17'. See Appendix B sub kipikkišda for
discussion of the reasons for these three deities occurring together as a group. The transliteration is
also based on a proposed consistency in the order of the listing of the tutelary deities as seen in the two
main lists in KUB 55.43 ii and iv. In KUB 55.43 iv 23' Ḥaššalat occurs between DLAMMA
URU[Haṭenzuwa and DLAMMA URU[Zapatiškuwa; this same order is preserved in the restoration of KUB
55.43 ii 24 and here in KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97.
112. Collation shows a definite GIS sign as read.
113. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97 (cont.)

Obverse ii (cont.)

§6’ 8’ nu ḫa-x[  
9’ nu ḫa-LAMMA  
10’ nu ḫa-a-[an-du-uš ḫa-iš-ša-al-la-an-du-uš-ša e-ku-zi]  
11’ NINDA.KUR,RA NU.GAL [  
12’ nu-us-kán Ē.ŠĀ [  

§7’ 13’ nam-ma-aš-kán pa-ra[-a  
14’ ḫal-zi-iš-ša-an-z[i  
15’ Ḫar-kán-zi na-aš-t[a  
16’ na-aš-ta 2 MĀŠ.GAL.KUR?[( )  
17’ an-da u-un-ni-ya-an[-zi  

§8’ 18’ nu DUG.GAL ta-an-na-ra[( )  
19’ la-a-ḫu-i nam-ma-kán x[  
20’ NAP-aš-ši-la-an-na-kā[ ]  
21’ nu Ḫuškur-šu-uš tuḫ-h[u-  
22’ a-ap-pa-ma-aš ú-e-eḥ-z[i  
23’ nu ḪU.TU É NAKIŠI[B  
24’ 1 ŠA-A-DU ZI-KU-KI[14 x[  

§9’ 25’ nu-kán MĀŠ.GAL.HI.A [  
26’ kur-ak-kán-zi [  
27’ pa-ra-a ū[-  
28’ x x] DINGIR.MEŠ [  

(the tablet breaks off)

Reverse iii[15

§10’x+1 x[  

§11’ 2’ ma-a-an [  
3’ nu-us ḫu-u-d[a-a-ak?16  
4’ Ḫuškur-šu-uš x[  
5’ Ḫuškur-šu-uš x[  
6’ ga-an-kán[- zi

114. A Hittite rendering of Akkadian isqāq, a type of flour, for which see CAD I/J: 202-03.
115. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
116. Collation shows a second horizontal trace on the broken edge which would fit da quite well.
§12' 7' nu 6 NINDA Kap-pa-ri-ya-mu-ú-i?
8' nu-uš-ša-an 3 x[...
9' EGIPI-pa ti-an-z[i
10' A-NA PLAMMA URU Ha-t[e-en-zu-wa

§13' 11' na-aš-ta MÁŠ.GAL.HÍ.A [...
12' nu-uš-ša-an in-ga-r[a-an-ta-aš
13' še-er ti-an-zi UZ[U
14' ke-e-da-aš DINGIR.MEŠ x[i
15' ḥu-ú-ma-an-da-aš t[i-
16' x117.MEŠ da-an-z[i

§14' 17' na-at A-NA [...
18' pf-di ti-an-z[i
19' 3-ŠU ši-p[a-an-ti
20' nu A-N[A
21' nam-ma [...
22' QA-TAM-M[A

§15' 23' nu-kán [...
24' NINDAP-u[r-pu-ru-uš?
25' SAL.MEŠ x[i
26' MÁŠ.GA[L
27' x HÍ.A][

(the tablet breaks off)

Reverse iv preserves only the very ends of the lines. ḫ]LAMMA URU Ha-te-en-zu-wa may be read in line 15'.

A tiny portion of B rev. iv? is preserved, which presumably duplicates some lost portion of the reverse of text A and cannot be integrated into the main copy of the text:

B = IBoT 2.69 Reverse iv
1 x nam-ma-aš [
2 KUS[ku]r?-ša-aš pé-e[-
3 ]x-i-li-y[a?
4 ]I x x x [I

(the tablet breaks off)

117. This sign has resisted all attempts at interpretation. It looks a little like uk/az, neither of which would make any sense. It could conceivably be GIR! with one superfluous vertical, but it would be unusual in this type of text. There is not enough context to guess at what the scribe intended.
The existence of the festival for renewing the kuruša-cult images preserved in KUB 55.43 has been known about since Otten published an edition of the first column and the colophon in 1959. Laroche in CTH 683 titles this text “The renewing of the ‘fleece’ (‘toison’) of the gods KAL.” Actually the text describes a festival not so much for the actual process of renewing or replacing the kuruša-as for officially “installing” the new kuruša-s, that is effecting the transfer from the old to the new hunting bags, including a description of what to do with the old hunting bags that have been replaced.

The main text is inscribed in four columns and an edge of one tablet; a partially broken colophon on the left edge would have made it clear whether the whole festival was described on this one tablet. Our understanding and interpretation of this festival are limited by not knowing whether it is complete on this tablet and by the fact that only half of the tablet is available to us. The four columns of the text divide up the different parts of the festival quite neatly. The first column describes the preparation for the festival and the disposition of the old hunting bags. When column ii picks up the description after a break in column i, a description of the actual festival activities has begun. The ḫantezzi pašši, “the first time,” of ii 1 may indicate that column ii initiates the description of offerings. This column is an offering list of gods who receive offerings of drink and takarmu-bread. These offerings are accompanied in most cases by singing and “barking” by cult functionaries. Seven of the ten gods receive individual offerings, while three are sacrificed to as a group. With the exception of the Sungod and Stormgod, the gods worshipped in this way are tutelary deities.

After this list of gods come the gods of the city, who receive their offerings as a group, followed by another list of deities, very broken, which are also offered to corporately. This last group is quite diverse, encompassing protective deities, specific deified localities, and mountains and rivers in general. The column breaks off here. There may have been more gods listed with drink and bread offerings, although this last group of deities at the end of the preserved portion of column ii were probably the last of the gods to be worshipped in that round of cultic offerings.

When the third column picks up after a large gap the festival has moved on to other cultic activities involving different equipment and materials: breaking other kinds of bread, taking the god (the kuruša-) into the karimmi-building, sacrificing animals, and preparing a special dough which is then made into offering bread, accompanied by cultic activities like singing and reciting or shouting (palwai-). Two occurrences of the word lukkatta, “the following morning,” indicate that it required at least three days to complete that portion of the festival described in the third column of the text.

The fourth column’s beginning lines are also lost. The first readable lines indicate that libation vessels, the vessels containing the drink offerings for the gods, are being provided from someone’s establishment. The festival then moves into a time “for drinking,” a session of systematic drink offerings to various gods. The order of the ceremony in column

iv is very similar to that of column ii; the two have been used in the transliteration to restore each other. There are some significant differences, however. In column iv, in the list of gods honored individually, the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa has been moved in front of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti to the first place in the list after the Sungod and Stormgod. The list in column iv contains eleven gods, not the ten of column ii, because this Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa appears not only at the beginning, but at the end of the list as well, before the gods of the city, with the word namma, best translated here “again.” He thus appears twice in the column iv ceremony, but only once in column ii. Furthermore, the list in column iv is followed by an extra ceremony in which the “singers of the place” come in, go once round the hearth while singing, are given something to drink, and then go and take their places again behind the windows. There is a distinction made here between the “singers,” who occur throughout the text without further specification, and the “singers of the place,” the local singers who occur only here. They are outside for most of the ceremony and therefore must come in before they sing.

Another significant difference between the cultic procedures described in these two columns of text is that in column ii the broken bread is placed “for the god on the lined up ones” (išgarantas), while in column iv it is placed on the kurša- (singular). Although it is not explicitly stated what the “lined up ones” are, they may be the two new hunting bags, lined up to have the bread offerings of the various deities placed on them. In §14’, after the kurša-s have gone into the karimmi- cult building for some bread offerings, they are hung up in the place of the god in the temple of the hunting bags. Before this they could have been “lined up” to receive offerings. The proposed restoration of an offering [on] the [lined up ones] in KUB 55.43 iii 17′-18′ soon after they hang up the god in iii 15′ raises difficulties for the interpretation of the two new kurša-s as the lined up ones. However, two partially broken lines intervene between the hanging up of the god and the offerings on the lined up ones, so it is possible the kurša-s were taken somewhere else and lined up again. Alternatively, since almost all of the gods in the ceremony are tutelary deities, they may all have had cult images in the form of hunting bags. The adjective išgarantas could refer to all the images, lined up. Would only two hunting bags be considered a sufficient number to be “lined up?” In the column iv ceremony there probably were only two hunting bags involved, those of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa and of Zithariya. The different terminology of the two descriptions strengthens the idea that column ii with its use of išgarantas was referring to a larger number of hunting bags.\footnote{Another possibility is that sacrificial breads were iškarant, “lined up” to receive the offerings, as is the case for example in another festival procedure, KUB 11.23 v 5-8 (AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, 33rd/34th day).}

However we interpret the išgarantas of column ii, the differences between the column ii and column iv descriptions indicate that these two columns represent two distinct ceremonies. The first one (column ii) is for the new hunting bags and takes place in Ḫattuša. The similarity of the second ceremony (column iv) to that of column ii indicates that its general purpose was the same. The consistent use of a singular kurša- throughout the column iv ceremony, the explicit reference to the (kurša- of) the Tutelary Deity of
Zapatiskuwa (the new name for the old kurša- of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenzuwa) in iv 5'-6' and 8', and the above-mentioned prominence given to the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa in the order of gods who receive offerings suggest that the ceremony described in column iv was performed in honor of the new hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa. This must be its installation ceremony in its new home. In the rites of column ii the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti was the first god after the Sungod and Stormgod to receive offerings; perhaps this precedence was dictated by the fact that the festival was taking place in his home city. In column iv the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa is the first to receive offerings after the Sungod and Stormgod, perhaps again because the festival was in his home city. Because §5 tells us that this new home was Durmitta, I suggest that this ceremony took place there rather than in Ḫattuša.

The idea that the column iv ceremony took place somewhere other than Ḫattuša would help explain the rather curious phrase pedaš. The singers of the place,” who must be the local singers of Durmitta. Their specific mention near the end of the Durmitta ceremony implies that the singers who sing throughout the ceremony previous to this are not local singers, but those from Ḫattuša. One wonders how much of the cultic personnel and equipment from the ceremony in the capital was brought to Durmitta for the local festival. The phrase DUG išpaĮnduzzi udanzi in iv 3’ may refer to the bringing of libation vessels from Ḫattuša for offerings. The gods themselves would not necessarily have been brought from Ḫattuša, as they could have received drink offerings without actually being there, or they could have had images in Durmitta as well. The bread offerings all seem to have been put on the one hunting bag, that of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa. The kurša-s of all the other gods given offerings in the column iv ceremony were not present; instead the offerings for these gods were placed on the hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa.

Another possible interpretation of the column iv ceremony is that the offerings for each god were put on his own kurša- symbol. The text lists them one at a time, so in each case the kurša- would still be in the singular. But then how would column iv differ from the column ii ceremony, where the terminology is different? In column iv, if each deity gets offerings on his own hunting bag, are they not then “lined up” just like the ones in column ii? It seems rather that although many of these gods probably had a kurša- symbol in Ḫattuša, they were not all brought to Durmitta for the festival. This idea is strengthened by the fact that even when a group of gods receives offerings together in lines 16'-18’, the form is still the singular kurši, indicating that only one hunting bag was used. The one exception to this is in iv 6’, in which the bread offering to Zithariya is placed not “on the kurša-,” but rather “on Zithariya.” We know from §1 that Zithariya had his own hunting bag; is this a reference to his new hunting bag, brought from Ḫattuša for the ceremony? From §1 it is clear that the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenzuwa also had his own kurša-, and yet this god, when he receives his bread offering, receives it simply “on the kurša-” with the same term used as with the other gods. Could this reference in iv 16’ conceivably be to the old hunting bag of Zithariya, which participated in the Durmitta ceremony before going on to its new home in Tuḫuppiya? If so, why is it not called by its new name, the Tutelary
Deity of the Hunting Bag, as is the old Tutelary Deity of Ḥatenzuwa, now the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa? In the individual offering lists in columns ii and iv, the other three deities associated with the old or the new hunting bags, Zitḫariya, the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatenzuwa, and the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa, each receive offerings, but the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag does not and in fact never again appears in the text as preserved after §5.

In these ceremonies of providing offerings for the gods, there are few deviations from the standard procedure; almost every god is honored the same way. However, there are a few gods who get slightly different treatment. Almost all of the gods in the list are protective deities, both Hattic deities listed by name and tutelary deities denoted with the title ḫLAMMA. The exceptions to this are the Sungod, the Stormgod, the gods of the city, and some of the deities in the large group at the end of the list. The ceremony of presenting offerings to the gods includes in most cases ceremonial singing and “barking.” This singing and barking does not, however, accompany the offerings for the Sungod and Stormgod, the first two gods in the list, or those for the gods of the city, the next to last item in the list. Perhaps this was because the singing (and/or barking?) was in Hattic and was considered appropriate only for the local, Hattic, tutelary deities and not for the more “universal” deities like the Sungod and Stormgod. Perhaps the tutelary deities’ association with the hunt conditions the role of the ḫLMES.UR.GI, “dog-men,” in their worship, while the Sungod and Stormgod have no such association.

One other minor point of difference is the use of NINDA.KUR₄.RA “thick bread” instead of takarku- bread for the [Stormgod’s] offerings in column ii. Again the significance of this is unclear; this is the only use of thick bread in the round of offerings detailed in columns ii and iv. The Stormgod does not always receive NINDA.KUR₄.RA for his bread offerings, as is shown by the fact that his bread offering in column iv is performed with takarku-.

There is also a difference in the way the celebrants “drink” the various gods; they drink the tutelary deities standing, but they are seated for the drink offerings to the Sungod, gods of the city and the large group of gods at the end of the list. We might expect the same treatment for the Stormgod, the other non-tutelary deity of the group, but according to the text the celebrants give his drink offering standing. This may have been a slip by the scribe after writing GUB-aš so many times; column iv is broken at this point and cannot be checked against column ii. In addition to this difference between drinking standing and seated, there is some variation between singular and plural forms of the verb eku- “to drink.” In the Ḫattuša ceremony the Stormgod and the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti receive drink offerings from a single celebrant. The significance of this is elusive; the same gods are honored with drink offerings by several celebrants in the Durmitta ceremony. The last two groups of gods, the gods of the city and the large group, are drunk by a single celebrant in the Durmitta ceremony, where the prescription is preserved. The spacing in both line 28 and line 31 in column ii, the Ḫattuša ceremony, requires that the singular verb be restored there as well. For some reason then, these gods who were given a drink offering as a group received it from an individual rather than several celebrants.
What is not clear, regardless of whether the verb is singular or plural, is who is performing these drink offerings. Nowhere in KUB 55.43 as preserved is the subject of eku- specified. The only place where we know who is drinking is iv 30’, in which the local singers are given something to drink, but this is an isolated case, the only place where these local singers appear in the text. In Hittite festivals it is often the king who drinks the gods, or the king and queen when the verb is plural. This may have been assumed in our text and thus the subject was never expressed. This would imply that the king and queen also went to Durmita for the ceremony there.

In both columns ii and iv the phrase irhantes hissallantes occurs modifying the long list of gods who receive offerings as a group. The verb hissalla- and this particular phrase are discussed in Appendix B. The use of this phrase here indicates that the gods in the list that follows it are all included in the group and receive offerings, whether or not they have already received offerings individually. For example, Ḥaşgala receives individual offerings in column ii (line 24, restored) and column iv (line 23’). The same god occurs (partially restored) in ii 31 as part of the final group of gods, along with a number of gods who definitely did not receive individual offerings in the first part of the ceremony. This final group thus includes gods who have and gods who have not previously received offerings in the ceremony.

In addition to the festival activities carried over from column iv onto the left edge of the tablet, the colophon is also inscribed on the left edge. Its preserved portion identifies the text as the festival performed when the old hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatenzuwa is [replaced] and made into the hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiškuwa. Although we know from the first paragraphs of the text that Zitḫariya, whose hunting bag becomes the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag, is also involved, the colophon as preserved and restored does not mention Zitḫariya. Its reference to the old hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatenzuwa does confirm that item’s importance in the festival and explains its important role in column iv.

The first paragraph of the text tells us that the hunting bags were periodically replaced; this was perhaps due to the fact that they were made from leather, a perishable material. The procedure for actually making the new hunting bags is not described at all. The text simply begins by describing how to proceed once the new kurša-s have been made. The time for replacing the hunting bags is not prescribed; the reference to nine years since the kurša- was installed may indicate a general expectation as to the duration of this cult symbol’s use in Ḥatuša. The reason for changing the kurša-s is not given. It does not seem to be because the old ones were worn out; leather does not normally deteriorate extensively in nine years, and we know that the old hunting bags were sent out and used in the provinces with new names. After disposing of the matter of the making of the new hunting bags in the first two lines by using the verb “renew,” the text concerns itself with describing how to proceed once they are ready and can take the place of the old ones. When the text says “the time is not prescribed,” it seems to be referring to the time for making the new kurša-s, not necessarily to the time assigned to celebrating the festival for the official installation.
All of §2 and the first line of §3 give background information on how and where the hunting bags were kept and how to effect the physical changing of the kurša-s from old to new. This was done with a total lack of ceremony; the new ones were taken into the Temple of the Hunting Bags and the old ones taken down whenever “they” (presumably the workmen assigned to the task of making new kurša-s) brought them. Hanging up these new hunting bags is thus not part of the actual festival. In the Temple of the Hunting Bags there is a special location, called the “place of the god,” where the new hunting bags are hung. There are pegs already in place below this “place of the god” for keeping the old ones until they are sent out to the provinces. The phrase ASAR DINGIR-LIM, unique to the two occurrences (i 9 and iii 15’) in this text, indicates that in this festival the “place of the god” plays an essential role, because the god is strongly associated with a particular locus.

Paragraphs 3–4 clarify the status of the old hunting bags until the festivals for installing the new ones (the “festivals” of i 12) can be performed. The old hunting bags must be retained, hung below the place of the god in the Temple of the Hunting Bags until the installation festivals are ready to be celebrated. It does not seem to matter if the new hunting bags must wait for a while in the temple of the hunting bags before being made official, and it is only when the new hunting bags are to be officially installed and thus become effective as deities that it is possible to get rid of the old ones. The old and new hunting bags wait together in the temple of the hunting bags until the old ones are no longer needed. When they become superfluous in Ḫattiša they are sent out to the provinces, to serve as cult symbols, but with new names. They are called by their new names “in the land” (the provinces), in contrast to their role in the capital Ḫattiša.

Although a number of the deities sacrificed to in the course of the festival are known to be tutelary deities, only two, Zitḫariya and the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenzuwa, are specifically said to have kurša-s in Ḫattiša. Otten points out that these two deities are very closely related, citing the evidence of Muršili’s annals, in which Muršili identifies Ḫatenzuwa as the city of Zitḫariya.\(^\text{120}\) The evidence of the two old hunting bags which go to two different places indicates, however, that each of these two gods had a hunting bag as cult symbol and that they were therefore two separate deities.\(^\text{121}\) The only other kurša-s specifically identified in the text is that of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa in iv 5′–6′ and 8′, where it is being used in the ceremony at Durmitta. In the two sentences in which it occurs the first reads ANA kuršī D'LAMMA URU Zapatiskuwa while the second one omits kuršī. This is very good evidence that the hunting bag was the image for these tutelary deities and thus perceived as the deity itself.

Further evidence from this text also demonstrates its equation of the god with the kurša-. In §13 they take “the god” into the karimmi-building and also heap up bread-balls to it. After doing this they take it back and in line iii 15′ hang it up in the “place of the god,” which i 11 tells us is the place where they hang the new hunting bags. The text thus uses DINGIR-LAM “god” and kurša- “hunting bag” interchangeably. The hunting bag of the

---

120. Otten, FsFriedrich 355. See comments on Zitḫariya in Chapter 1.
121. In the late period under Tudhaliya IV the image of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenzuwa was redone as an anthropomorphic statue. See discussion in Chapter 1 sub D'LAMMA URU Ḫatenzuwa.
Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa of column iv is simply the old hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Hatenzuwa after it has been renamed. Concerning the renaming of the old kurša-s, we may note that although the old hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Hatenzuwa is named the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa, it is taken not to Zapatiskuwa, but to Durmitta. It is unclear why only these deities are explicitly said to have hunting bags as cult representations, nor is it certain how many other deities had these symbols; in column ii the dative-locative plural išgarantaš modifying (apparently) the hunting bags allows the possibility that many or all of the deities involved in this festival had their own hunting bag as a cult symbol.

In the festival at Durmitta from column iv, by contrast, the consistent use of the dative-locative singular form kurši may indicate that only one hunting bag, that of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa, was involved. A second hunting bag, of Zithariya, very possibly was used in the offerings for that god only. Other Hittite religious texts attest to other deities who had their own kurša-s, for example: SA ḫantipuitti KUS kuršan kuiš karpan ḫarzi “... the one who has carried the hunting bag of Kantipuitti” KUB 10.13 obv. iii 19'-21' (fest. fragment); LUSANGA ḫLAMMA-za KUS gursan ḫLAMMA URUPitamma karapzi “The priest of the Tutelary Deity lifts the hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Pitamma” KUB 20.80 iii? 14' (Festival Celebrated by the Prince); mān ḫtišanti ITU 12 KAM ḫKUS kurša[S] SA ḫU URU Zipalanda ANA KASKAL.IM.GĀL.LU paizzi “If in the [wi]nter, in the twelfth month, the hunting bag of the Stormgod of Zipalanda goes on the south road” KUB 10.75+KUB 20.25:2-5 (Journey of the kurša- in Winter), ed. Güterbock, JNES 20 (1961) 92. This last example is somewhat tentative, because, as Güterbock points out, this could alternatively be translated “‘The Shield goes on the South Road of the Storm-god of Z.’”

Music was an integral part of the festival, as indicated by the singing after each round of offerings in columns ii and iv. Another distinctive feature of this festival is the central role of the dog-men, who bark as part of the ceremony of giving offerings to the gods. Their importance in this text affirms the close ties of hunting to the tutelary deities and is understandable in a festival devoted to gods whose cult symbols are hunting bags.

The colophon indicates the integral nature of the renaming ceremony in the festival. Here, at least in the preserved portion, this festival is identified by this act of replacing the old hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Hatenzuwa and making it into the hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa. We may say therefore that the description of the festival proper begins with §5, which tells how the old hunting bags were renamed.

We thus have preserved approximately half of one tablet which originally described all or part of a festival designed to install new cult symbols in the form of hunting bags, both in Ḫattuša, where the new ones were probably made, and in the provinces, where the “new” hunting bags were used ones from the capital, new in the sense of having newly come to their respective provincial cities. The kurša- is an old, Hattic cult symbol as may be seen in the Hattic-based Old Hittite mythological text KUB 33.59:22 of the disappearing deity

122. OH/MS, translit. Laroche, Myth. I: 149-50, under the title “Recherche d’une ‘égide.’”
pattern, in which it is the *kurša*- that is being searched out. Hattic elements such as the use of the exclamation “*kas*” in iii 6’, the occurrence of Hattic tutelary gods such as Ḫapantali(ya) and Zithariya, and the extensive offerings of *takarmu*- bread, which was possibly Hattic in origin,\(^{123}\) also make it likely that the festival was based on an earlier Hattic prototype. The tablet itself dates from the Middle Hittite period and represents a later rescension of what is probably a very old festival antedating the formation of the Hittite state. The festival may have continued on further tablets; *KUB* 7.36 may even be a later tablet of the same festival as indicated below in the comments on that text. Because the colophon is broken, we cannot know just how long the festival was, but the installing of new hunting bags in the capital was a major event requiring a specific festival lasting several days. Although not an enormous proceeding like the spring AN.TAH.SUM Festival, it was nevertheless extensive enough to provide an indication of the importance placed on these deities and their cult symbols by the Hittites.

This festival presents unusual or unique features in its ceremony and purpose. Outside of the very late cult inventory texts discussion of replacing cult images is rare, and the reuse of the old images is unique to this ceremony. One other description of cultic procedure in the Hittite corpus presents some interesting points of comparison. *KUB* 25.31, a tablet which describes some of the preparations for the *purulli*- festival, reads in obverse 6–13:\(^{124}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{KUŞ} & \text{kuršuš} \ U 2 \ G15 \ ūpp[ar]uš \ warnu\text{nzi} \ nu \ \text{EGIR-pa} \ \text{GIBIL-an iyanzi} \\
\text{§} & \text{A paragraph about cultic equipment brought from the house of the scribe of wooden tablets.}
\end{align*}
\]

§ 6 MAŞ.GAL GE₆ 2 MAŞ.GAL BABBAR nu KUŞ kuršuš iyanzi UGULA \(1\) MEŞ SIPAD pai ŞÂ.BA 2 MAŞ.GAL BABBAR LAŞIPAD.GUD DINGIR-LIM dai 2 MAŞ.GAL GE₆ LAŞANGA Telipinu dai 2 MAŞ.GAL BABBAR LAŞANGA ZA.BA₄.BA₄ 2 MAŞ.GAL GE₆ LAŞIPAD DINGIR-LIM dai nu KUŞ kuršuš ienzi “They burn the hunting bags and two basins. They make new (ones). § (Paragraph concerning other cult paraphernalia.) § Six black billy goats, two white billy goats. They make (them into) hunting bags. The overseer of the shepherds gives (them) out. From them the cowherd of the god takes two white ones, the priest of Telipinu takes two black ones, the priest of ZA.BA₄.BA₄ two white ones, (and) the shepherd of the god takes two black ones. They make hunting bags.”

Although this prescription shares with the *kurša*- Festival the goal of replacing the hunting bag images, the contrasts to the *kurša*- Festival are more striking than the similarities. Here we learn about the making of the new hunting bags, something not described in the *kurša*- Festival. Cult personnel, including both priests and tenders of the gods’ flocks, are responsible for making the new cult images. In contrast to the careful preservation, renaming, and reuse of the old hunting bags in the *kurša*- Festival, the *purulli*- preparations specify the thorough destruction of the old totems by burning. The *kurša*- Festival also prescribes a cultic procedure lasting several days for the installation of the new hunting bag images, and the old ones may not leave the temple until the new ones are

\(^{123}\) Hoffner, *AlHeth* 185.

cereemonially installed. In *KUB* 25.31, the old hunting bags may be destroyed before new ones are even made, and there is no specific mention of a ceremony for installing the new ones. The hunting bags in *KUB* 25.31 are associated with Telipinu and his temple, and there is no mention of tutelary deities. Why the kurša-s of different deities should be treated so differently is unclear, and this emphasizes the special nature of the care taken with the kurša- images of Zitḫariya and the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatenzuwa in the festival of *KUB* 55.43.

The fragment *KBo* 13.179 with its duplicate *KBo* 22.168 is concerned with kurša-s and may or may not be directly related to the kurša- Festival. It does not duplicate any of the preserved portion of *KUB* 55.43. The oxhides of the first paragraph and the goats who are driven in, washed, and killed indicate that this is a text describing some of the procedure for the actual making of the new hunting bags. This process may very well have been ceremonially prescribed, but as noted above it would have been a separate cultic operation from the festival of dedication for the hunting bag cult symbols described in *KUB* 55.43.

The third paragraph is very unusual; the LÜ.MES UR.GI₇, here described as killing the animals from whose hides the hunting bags will be made, are nowhere else attested killing anything. We have here an example of the “dog-men” doing something out of the ordinary for them, but we see from *KUB* 55.43 that they are quite involved in the festival for installing the new hunting bags, so it is likely that they would help in preparing them as well. There are no other examples in the known Hittite corpus of *apeniššan kuen*—“kill in the same way.” This phrase refers to an earlier, now lost, description of killing other animals occurring above the preserved portion of our text; it was probably a description of how to kill the cattle who provided the cowhides of line 2’.

The beginning of the preserved fragment was probably the last paragraph of a section that described preparing the cowhides and bringing them to the place where the new hunting bags were made. In §§2’ and 3’ the text had moved on to describe the preparation of goathides for the same purpose. The goats were killed in the same way as the cattle, and the making of the hunting bags required hides of both cattle and goats. Perhaps certain gods had hunting bags made of goathide and others had their hunting bags made of cowhide.

The sweeping and sprinkling mentioned in §2’ seems to have been more than a cleansing for cultic purity only, because the goat would have fouled these “rooms of the palace” while in them, and the room in which he was washed would have become dirty during that process. In contrast to many instances of cultic purification when the thing being cleansed is not necessarily physically dirty, there was a very good practical reason to sweep and sprinkle these rooms into which the goat had been driven.

The fragment *KUB* 7.36 bears a certain resemblance to *KUB* 55.43, especially in the occurrence of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiškuwa and two occurrences of the otherwise unattested triad Kappariyamu, the Tutelary Deity of Tatašuna, and the Tutelary Deity of Tašhapuna. The fragment describes what may have been another part of the festival for renewing the kurša-s, now lost in *KUB* 55.43, in which the deities receive flesh offerings. In the broken portion of *KUB* 55.43 the deities probably received flesh offerings. In §3’ of
KUB 7.36 the offerings are placed upon the hunting bag, just as were the bread and drink offerings in KUB 55.43 column iv.

The most striking point of similarity between KUB 55.43 and KUB 7.36 is in the colophons. Although in each text the colophon is only partially preserved, enough remains to show that they are very similar; restorations from KUB 55.43 fit very well in KUB 7.36. This text may very well be a duplicate of KUB 55.43 and as such would provide evidence that the festival for renewing the kūrša- included flesh offerings, now lost in the missing sections of KUB 55.43. Alternatively, the festival description may have required more than one tablet, and KUB 7.36 may be the second (or later) tablet describing the same festival.

The fragment KUB 20.13 shows strong resemblances to KUB 55.43 and may be part of this same festival of installation. The second paragraph, too poorly preserved to interpret meaningfully, is possibly a description of part of a cultic journey. It bears certain similarities to §§3'-4' of the festival fragment KUB 9.17. The isgarant[aš] of i 7' is reminiscent of column ii of KUB 55.43. It is quite likely that this participle here in KUB 20.13, as in KUB 55.43 column ii, refers to hunting bags lined up to receive offerings.

The third paragraph shows similarities to columns ii and iv of KUB 55.43. The preserved deities who receive drink offerings in this paragraph are all deities who occur in the lists of gods in KUB 55.43. The ALAN.ZU-men, seen here in KUB 20.13 i 11', do not, however, participate in the preserved ceremonies of KUB 55.43.

In §§4'-5', which are on the reverse and therefore follow §§1'-3' by an undetermined amount of text, the cultic activities have moved from drink offerings to flesh offerings. The celebrants cut up entrails and make stew. There is an unusual reference to “the naked ones” in close proximity to the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatenzuwa. This god is one of the two deities for whom a new kūrša- is dedicated in KUB 55.43, but it is unclear how he is related to the nekumanteš here in KUB 20.13. In §6' the word lukkatta indicates another day in the celebrating of the festival, which day seems to be the “day of the meat.” The flesh offerings continue, although the text breaks off here, making it impossible to follow the course of the festival any further.

Although KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97 is too broken to allow a coherent translation, it shows items of interest. There are three occurrences of the kūškūrša-, in ii 21' and iii 4' and 5', each time in the accusative plural. The example in iii 5' is followed in iii 6' by gankan[zi] “th[ey] hang.” This hanging up of the hunting bags is reminiscent of §§3 and 14' of KUB 55.43. Also similar to the main text of the kūrša- Festival are the two places (i 12' and iii 12') in KBo 21.89+ in which isgarant- occurs. In i 12' the form is neuter plural nominative-accusative and is used either as a substantive (“the lined up ones”) or as an adjective modifying the broken word preceding it (“the lined up [ ... ]x’s”). The second occurrence is mostly broken away, and we therefore do not know its case, but the šer tianzi which occurs after it in iii 13' probably indicates that something was being placed upon “the lined up (x).”

125. CTH 685.2, edited in Appendix A.
In §12' two gods who play a role in KUB 55.43 are mentioned. The Tutelary Deity of Ḥatenzuwa (iii 10') is one of the two gods for whom new hunting bags were made in the main text. In iii 7', because no bread name beginning kappa- is known, I read the divine name Kappariyamu instead of the triad who are kipikkisdu of some other deity. In KUB 55.43 Kappariyamu is one of a triad of deities who are kipikkisdu of some other deity.\(^{126}\) In ii 10' DIrhaṇduš has been restored because there is no other divine name in the published Hittite corpus that begins Ir-ḥa- ... Although the participle irhant- is attested a number of times in festival context,\(^{127}\) the restoration here is based on the only text in which irhandus appears with a DINGIR determinative: “They give to the queen to drink.” nu DAMAR.UTU DIr-ḥa-a-an-du-uš DHi-iš-ša-al-la-an-du-uš-ša ekuzi “She drinks Marduk, the divine ones offered to in sequence, and the divine ones (whose offerings are) planned” KUB 43.56 ii 19'-21' (frag. of the Ritual for the Stormgod of Kuliwišna). The phrase irhandus ḫiṣšallandus occurs twice in the main text and is therefore another point of similarity between that text and KBo 21.89+. In each festival, part of the ceremony includes offerings to groups of deities prescribed by this rare phrase.

In §§3', 5', and 14' libating (sipant-) is part of the cultic procedure. Libation offerings are not preserved in KUB 55.43. However, other items in KBo 21.89+ which call to mind the main text are the list of gods in §4', all of which occur in the main text in a list of gods to receive drink and bread offerings (columns ii and iv of KUB 55.43), the ḫatzišsanzi in ii 14', which is reminiscent of the renaming of the old hunting bags in §5 of KUB 55.43, and the purpurab- bread (bread-balls) of iii 24' (cf. KUB 55.43 iii 7', 11', and 14').

There are also elements in KBo 21.89 which do not occur in the extant portions of the main text. The Ė.ŠA of ii 12' is something not paralleled in KUB 55.43. So are the references to the Ṿa-pašilla- in ii 20'; the seal-house, i 2' and ii 23'; and “storing up,” ii 26'. This does not of course mean that KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97 is not part of the kurša- Festival; the tablet pieces copied in KUB 55.43 and KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97 each represent only approximately half of their original texts and therefore preserve different portions either of the same tablet or of different tablets of the festival.

This chapter presents several different texts which describe festivals devoted to a greater or lesser extent to the kurša-, a hunting bag which functioned as cult symbol for certain tutelary deities both in the capital, center of the state cult, and in provincial cult centers. This particular cult symbol required “renewing” periodically, perhaps because of the nature of the material (leather) from which it was made, or for other reasons which the Hittites did not specify within the ceremony. This very unusual ritual of replacing cult symbols is coupled with the equally rare practice of recycling these old cultic symbols by a ceremonial renaming that allows them to continue to function as divine representations. The Hittites perceived their representations of the divine as the deity itself but could also envision a genius or spirit separate from the representation that could animate a new cult symbol through the proper ceremony of offerings and incantations.

126. See Appendix B sub kipikkisdu.
127. See Appendix B sub ḫiṣšalla-.
CHAPTER 5
THE FESTIVALS FOR THE TUTELARY DEITIES OF THE RIVER

INTRODUCTION

There are several festivals or fragments thereof which include offerings to a tutelary deity of the river.\(^1\) These ceremonies do not show a great deal of uniformity, but they do afford some points of interest and have been collected for this chapter in order to explore this particular aspect of the concept of tutelary deities among the Hittites.

THE TEXTS

\(A = KUB \ 9.21 \quad B = ABoT \ 3^{2}\)

Bo 3576 = \(KUB \ 9.21\) is a fragment measuring approximately 5.6 by 7 cm. The signs are large and inscribed very clearly. There is no crowding together of the signs, and the scribe has left very large word gaps. It is difficult to assign a firm dating to such a small tablet, especially since the preserved portion contains almost none of the diagnostic signs which are most helpful in dating the script. The URU in line 8' is certainly a New Script form, and on the basis of this and the absence of evidence to the contrary I would posit a New Script date for the tablet.

An 6998 = \(ABoT \ 3\) is a small fragment measuring approximately 4.5 by 4.2 cm. Its surface is unusually well preserved, and the signs are somewhat small and very neat. The signs are not crowded together, and the word spaces are large. The paucity of preserved signs makes dating the script impossible; the only sign which might be said to be distinctive is \(ir\) in line 3', which has five small verticals inscribed in it.

---

1. These festivals are grouped together as \(CTH \ 684\) by Laroche. See p. 7 in the Introduction for a complete text scheme of this festival.
2. Lines 3'-10' of text A and 4'-5' of text B (as 11'-12') have been transliterated and translated by Goetze, Language 29 (1953) 273-74.
Text Scheme

B. ABoT 3. Duplicates KUB 9.21:8'-10' and adds two lines after it breaks off.

Transliteration

§1'x+1 [ o o ] x x x 1 [ 
2' [SİR]-RU

§2' 3' [EGIR-SU-] ma ÍD-an ÍD-aš dLAMMA ŠA [D DINGIR.MEŠ]
4' [DINGIR.MEŠ h]a-an-ti-ya-aš-ša-aš TUŠ-aš 3-ŠU e³[-ku-zi]
5' [3 NINDA]ta-kar-mu-uš pár-ši-ya LUN[AR URUKa-ni-eš SİR-RU]

§3' 6' [EGIR-SU-m]a wa-ap-pu-u-wa-aš dGul-še[-eš DINGIR.MAH.MEŠ]
7' [TUŠ-aš? 3-ŠU e-ku-zi 3 NINDA]ta-[ar-mu-uš pár-ši-ya]
8' [LUN]A[R URUKa-ni-eš SÍ[(R-R)U]

§4' 9' [EGIR-SU-m]a ÍD-a[(š dLAMMA <ŠA> ÍD DINGIR.ME)Š]
10' [DINGIR.MEŠ ḫa-an-]-ti-ya¹-a[(š-ša-aš ir-Ḫa-an-d)]u-uš]
B4' [ḫi-ša-al-la-an-d]u-uš 3-ŠU e[-ku-zi]²
B5' [3 NINDA]ta-kar-mu-uš pár-ši-ya LuoN[AR URUKa-ni-eš SİR-RU]

(the tablet breaks off)

3. Collated.
4. See Line Commentary below on the restoration of this line.
THE FESTIVALS FOR THE TUTELARY DEITIES OF THE RIVER

A = KUB 9.21  B = ABoT 3

Translation

§1'

[... They] sing [...]

§2'

[Nex]t [he drinks, seated, the river, the Tutelary Deity of the River, [the gods] of the ri[ver], (and) the gods of the ḫantiyašša-, ³ 3 times. [He ] breaks [3 ṭakarmu-breads. The sin[ger of Kaneš sings.]

§3'

[Nex]t he drinks the fat[e] ⁶ deities of the riverbank [and the MAH deities, seated, 3 t]imes. [He breaks ] 3 tak[armu-] breads. [The sin]ger of Kaneš sin[gs.]

§4'

[Nex]t [he drinks the river, the Tutelary Deity of the River, the god[s] of the River, [the gods] of [the ḥa]ntiyašša-, the (gods who have been) offered to in sequence (and) (the gods whose offerings are) [plann]ed, ⁷ three times. He brea[k[s three takarmu- breads]. The sing[er of Kaneš sings].

(The tablet breaks off)

Line Commentary

10'. The restoration is from text B (ABot 3) ³. Collation of text B indicates that the spacing at the end of line ³ is somewhat different than copied. The spacing between ḫa, an, and d[u is more uniform than drawn, and in fact the an just barely touches the du sign. Thus the spacing of the signs requires reading this all as one word. Lines ⁴ and ⁵ of B follow immediately after the point at which text A breaks off. In line B⁴', the -d[u of [ḥi-iš-ša-al-la-an-d]u-uš is more clear than the copy shows. See Appendix B on ḫiššalla-.

5. See Appendix B on ḫantiyašša-.
6. See Appendix B sub ḫGuššēš.
7. Goetze, Language 29 (1953) 274, translates irḫanduš ḥiššalandaš as “those to be included and those to be excluded.” See Appendix B sub ḫiššala- for commentary on this translation.
IBoT 1.2

Bo 63 = IBoT 1.2 measures approximately 9.7 by 10 cm. The shape of the preserved portion indicates that the original tablet had six columns. The script, while not distinctive, mixes older and newer forms to some extent. In signs such as a, e, and KAL the first vertical is sometimes significantly shorter than the second and sometimes equal in height. The ha sign has only a single winkelhaken, and es sometimes has four winkelhakens, both later forms. The da and en signs show later forms. The URU sign occurs in its latest form. However, the li sign occurs only in the older form, and nam does not have its very latest form. On the basis of this somewhat sparse evidence I would assign this tablet an early New Script date. See table 7 in Appendix C.

Transliteration

Obverse ii

§1' 1 [ ]-zi
2 [ PA-NI? N]a-ZI.KIN
3 [ US-GE-] EN?
4 [ -m]u NA-ZI.KIN
5 [ GU]D? UDU šu-up-pf-ya-āḥ-ḫi
6 [nam-ma šu-up-pf-y]a-āḥ-ḫu-u-wa-aš
7 [A-WA-TEMES m]e-ma-i

§2' 8 [ tuḥ-h]u-eš-šar8
9 [ ]
10 [ ]
11 [ ]

§3' 12 [ ]
13 [ ]

§4' 14 [ ]
(the tablet breaks off)

Translation

Obverse ii

§1' [...]he/they x. [...] before(?) the s]tela [...] he bow]s(?) [... ] the stela [...] (a number) catt]le and sheep he consecrates. [Furthermore,] he [sp]eaks [the words of cons]ecration.

§§2'–4' (not enough preserved of these paragraphs to translate, although §2' probably described a cleansing ceremony involving tuḥhucšar)

8. See Line Commentary below on the restoration of lines 5–8 based on KUB 20.59 ii 6f.
Transliteration

*IBoT* 1.2 Obverse iii

§5' 1. LUGAL-uš PA-NI NA-ZI.KIN
2. 2-ŠU ši-pa-an-ti
3. GUNNI 1-ŠU
4. KUŠ[k]ur-ši 1-ŠU
5. GIBDAG-ti 1-ŠU
6. GIB-ya 1-ŠU
7.  ха-tal-wa-aš GIŠ-[i]l 1-ŠU
8. nam-ma  ха-aš-ši-i
9. ta-pu-uš-za 1-ŠU

§6' 10. LUGAL-uš 3-e
11. ir-ха-a-u-wa-an-zí
12. ʰMa-ra-aš-ša-an-da
13. ʰLAMMA ÍD ka-lu-ti (eras.) <ti-ya-zi>

§7' 14. [su-u]p-pa ti-an-zí
15. [GAL-ĦI.A? u]k-ṭu-l-re-eš
16. [ir-ха-an-] z[i]? ʰ

(§7 breaks off)

Translation

*IBoT* 1.2 Obverse iii

§5' The king libates twice before the stela, (and) once to the hearth, once to the hunting bag, once to the throne, once to the window, once to the wood of the door bolt, (and) further once next to the hearth.

§6' The king <proceeds> to treat three with offerings in sequence: the Marasšanda river, the Tutelary Deity of the River, and (their) circle.

§7' [The me]at(?) they set out. Th[ey take round in offering the r]egular [cups(?)].

(§7 breaks off)

9. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
10. See *Appendix B* sub "three" for the unusual complementation 3-e.
11. Collation indicates lu as a good possible reading of this sign, although it may have been written over an erasure. There is an erased winkelhaken after kaluti and an erased ir sign below it.
12. After collating this sign remains problematic. A horizontal trace below the winkelhaken suggests the restoration [su-ul]p-pa. Spacing to the edge of the column is very good for this, and it would also make sense with the verb tianzi.
14. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
§8', x+i fx
1. [x bMa-ra-aš-ša1-an-da-an]
2. wa-ar-šu-
3. 1-ŠU e-ku-zi
4. 2 EN.MEŠ-ya-aš-ši
5. wa-ar-šu-li
6. IGI-an-da a-ku-wa-an-zi
8. LÖ.MES,NAR URUKa-ni-eš
9. SĪR- Ru

§9' 10. LUGAL-ūš GUB-aš
11. DLAMMA ÍD 1-ŠU e-ku-zi
12. 3 NINDA.KUR₄.RA pár-ši-ya
13. LÖ.MES,NAR URUKa-ni-eš SĪR-1Ru

Reverse v²₀ (transliteration)

§10'x+1 [----------------------------------------]x

§11' 2' [----------------------------------------]x
3' [----------------------------------------]x-an še-er i-ya-zi
4' [----------------------------------------]bMa-ra-aš-ša-an-da
5' [----------------------------------------](-)an-da i-ya-an-zi

§12' 6' [----------------------------------------]
7' [----------------------------------------]
8' [----------------------------------------]ni
9' [----------------------------------------]zi

(bottom edge of tablet)

16. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
17. Bossert, Heth.Kön. 48, suggests [bMa-ra-aš-ša-an-da-an], but both spacing and preserved traces require a reading [x bMa-ra-aš-ša-an-da-an.
18. There are no traces preserved in this abraded area after 1-ŠU, nor would anything be expected between 1-ŠU and eku-zi; why then is there so much space here? It may be that the shortness of the lines in general affected the way the scribe spaced his words for lines in which he could only fit two or three words.
19. Collation indicates 6 as a better reading over Bossert’s 5 (Heth.Kön. 48).
20. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
THE FESTIVALS FOR THE TUTELARY DEITIES OF THE RIVER

IBoT 1.2

Reverse iv21 (translation)

§8' He drinks [x the Marassjanda river by smelling, once, and two lords drink in the smell, facing him (i.e., the king).22 He breaks six thick breads. The singers of Kaneš sing.

§9' The king, standing, drinks the Tutelary Deity of the River, once. He breaks three thick breads. The singers of Kaneš sing.

(bottom edge of tablet)

Reverse v23 (translation)

§10' (not enough preserved to translate)

§11' He worships [...]x up [in ...]. [...] the river] Marasšanda [...] they worship.

§12' (not enough preserved to translate)

(bottom edge of tablet)

Line Commentary

Obverse ii

ii 5–8. The restoration of these lines is based on Goetze’s recognition of a similar passage in KUB 20.59.24 Although the IBoT 1.2 and KUB 20.59 passages appear to be sufficiently alike that they may be used to restore each other, it is not quite as obvious as he indicates. KUB 20.59 i 13'–15' reads: 2-SU šuppiyaḫḫi GUD-ya UDU[ ] / šuppiyaḫḫi namma šuppi[- ] / AWATEMLŠ memai. We do not have the word šuppiyaḫḫuwaš preserved whole in either text; we get its first half from KUB 20.59 and supply its ending from IBoT 1.2. Line 8 is restored on the basis of KUB 20.79 i 16; Goetze points out that in both texts the tuḫḫueššar ceremony follows the passage about speaking the words of purifying.

Obverse iii


21. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

22. Compare CHD sub menaḫḫanda 2c3', citing a very similar passage from IBoT 1.1. On waršula-as "smell, aroma," see HW 3. Erg. 36, and Güterbock, JKF 10 (1986) 212, who suggests that waršula-in the context of drink offerings means to do an offering by sniffing the aroma of the wine being offered.

23. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

24. Review of IBoT 1 in JCS 1 (1947) 87: "The passage II 6ff. can be restored from XX 59 I 13ff. and in turn yields for that passage the reading šu-up-pi-ia-ah-ḫu-u-wa-aš A-WA-TEMLŠ ‘the certa verba that go with purifying.'"
of the ḫuwašši- stela inside a building, which is the situation in this passage. See Popko, *Kultobjekte* 124, on the ḫuwašši- stela in the temple. There are several other festivals in which, like this ceremony, a celebrant (usually the overseer of cooks) libates before the stela and then immediately libates to the holy places. In one example, *KBo* 30.56 obv. iii 31'-35' (fest. fragment), the stela actually occurs in the list of holy places to which the overseer of cooks is libating. The fact that the celebrant libates to the holy places immediately after libating before the stela indicates that in these instances the stela must be in the temple. A silver NA「ZI.KIN, attested in *KUB* 17.35 ii 6, *KUB* 38.17 iv 6, and *KBo* 2.1 ii 12, would probably be located not outside the city but rather in a building where it could be guarded. *KUB* 11.22 i 2–3 (AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival) offers further evidence for a stela indoors: _WORDS_ "The stela of the Stormgod of Ḫatti stands in the _tamu_-building."

iii 10–13. For the extreme rarity of the expression 3-e see the discussion of “three” in Appendix B. The infinitive _irhawanzi_ is also only rarely attested. Besides our text, there is only one other occurrence of _irhawanzi_ in a sentence without a finite verb: 1_DUGPURZITUM _TU_hurutel NINDA.KU _UPNI _NINDA_punnikes _UPNI _AN.TAH.ŠUM_HI.A _ASR_IULUA _irhauwanzi EGIR-St AN.TAH.ŠUM_HI.A-it _TU_hurutel NINDA.KU _UPNI _NINDA_punnikit ASR_IULUA _irhanzī_ "One _PURZITUM_ container of stew, sweet bread of one half _UPNI_, one punniki- bread of one half _UPNI_, (and) nine AN.TAH.ŠUM plants (are) for treating the places with offerings in sequence. Then they treat the places with offerings in sequence, with AN.TAH.ŠUM, stew, sweet bread, (and) _punniki- bread" *KUB* 2.8 obv. ii 21–24 (AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, 32nd day). This text is different from _IBoT_ 1.2 iii 10–13 in that the infinitive occurs in a nominal sentence whose sense does not require the addition of a verb such as _tiyazi_. In this text the persons doing the offerings are not specified; it is simply an impersonal "they" who perform this activity. In all of the other occurrences of _irhawanzi_ in unbroken context it occurs as LUGAL-uš _irhawanzi tiyazi_ "The king proceeds in order to treat with offerings." This is the only example in which the king is designated as the one performing the offerings without some finite verb such as _tiyazi_. Such a verb was certainly intended. Bossert, *Heth.Kön.* 48, translates this paragraph "Der König gibt, um die drei (Trias?) abzufertigen, dem Fluss Marassandas (und) der Schutzgottheit des Flusses ein Opfer (unbekannter Art)." Goetze, *Language* 29 (1953) 274, translates "The king (proceeds) to treat three: the Marassandas River, Inar of the River, and (their) circle."

iii 15. Bossert, *Heth.Kön.* 48, restores [DINGIR.MEŠ uk-]tu-ri-eš. Collation of this text shows that a slightly oblique horizontal wedge preserved at the beginning of the line suggests the reading _ulki_. Bossert translates this line "Die [e]wigen [Götter]."

_A = KUB 51.79_   _B = IBoT 2.19_   _C = 412/s(±?)457/s_

_Bo 858 = KUB 51.79_ is a fragment measuring 9 by 13.2 cm. The surface of the tablet is badly abraded, with the obverse! being in worse condition than the reverse! The signs are rather large and show a good deal of the slant on the tops of the vertical wedges which is one of the characteristics of older script. The _li_ sign occurs in a very unusual and distinctive
old form with only three horizontal wedges. The e sign shows an Old Script form. The da sign occurs both with and without a broken middle horizontal. The al sign does not have its latest form. However, the az, tar, and URU signs occur in later forms. The tablet is probably Middle Script or early New Script. See table 8 in Appendix C for specific sign shapes.

Bo 1108 = IBoT 2.19 is a fragment measuring approximately 6.9 by 6 cm. Its surface is somewhat unevenly preserved; the left side is in good condition, while the right side shows some abrasion. The signs are quite small, with large word spaces. The tops of the verticals have some slant to them. Although this is a small fragment, it contains some diagnostic signs for dating. The a and e signs occur in an older form. The ha, ak, and li signs show their older forms. The al sign does not occur in its latest form. The du sign shows what seems to be a later form, with a long oblique wedge instead of a winkelhaken. The URU sign occurs in what may be an intermediate form, with two verticals of equal height, but no indenting of its left edge. These considerations suggest a date for this tablet of early New Script or perhaps Middle Script.

KUB 44.2, IBoT 2.19, and portions of KUB 51.79 (as Bo 858) are transliterated and translated by Lebrun, Samuha 176–78; in Hethitica 5 (1983) 51–57 Lebrun again worked on KUB 51.79 after it was published in hand copy. In this same article he also identifies the duplicate 412/s. Otten has very graciously supplied me with pre-publication copies done by Ms. Christel Rüster of 412/s, for which I would like to thank him. Included in this copy is a note that 412/s probably joins indirectly to 457/s, a copy of which Otten also provided. See the footnote to reverse! 12' of the main text for more on 457/s. IBoT 2.19 is also transliterated and translated in Goetze, Language 29 (1953) 273. Otten already in a review of IBoT 26 had noted that Bo 858 (KUB 51.79) was parallel to IBoT 2.19. The preserved portion of text B is also preserved in text A. This is helpful in that it allowed the texts to be identified as duplicates but unfortunate in that they do not supplement one another to provide restorations. The obverse and reverse of the copy of KUB 51.79 are to be switched.

Text Scheme

A. KUB 51.79.
B. IBoT 2.19. Duplicates KUB 51.79 rev! 10'–15'.
C. 412/s(+?)457/s. Obverse duplicates KUB 51.79 obv! 4'–15' and reverse 1'–7' duplicate KUB 51.79 rev! 14'–18'.

25. Treated below.
26. ZA 49 (1950) 345.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

A = KUB 51.79 \ B = IBoT 2.19 \ C = 412/s(+?)457/s

Transliteration

C obv. 1

§1’ x+1 [ o o o o o o o o GIŠ ρ(INAN]NA.GAL


3’ [ o o o o o o ]x ap-pa-an-zí

4’ [(nam-ma-aš-kán pa)-rí]a-a pé-e-da-an-zí

5’ [(NINDA.KUR₄.RA EM.§)]A ḫī-i-li pár-ši-ya-an-zí

§2’ 6’ [(nam-m)]a-1kán? ŁSAGIA.27 İ$-TU NINDA.KUR₄.RA

7’ [(2 NINDA)pár-šu-u)]l-pár-ši-ya nu-uš-kán

8’ [(NINDA)pçı-y)]a-an-ta-al-li da-á-i

9’ [(nu-uš-ká)]n an-da-an pé-e-da-a-i²⁸

10’ [1 (NINDA)pár)]-šu-ul-li LUGAL-i pa-a-i

11’ [LUGAL-úš-k]án wa-a-ki nam-ma-an-za-an

12’ [A-NA GISB(ANŠ)UR-ŠU da-a-i 1 NINDA)pár-šu-ul-li-ma

13’ [(A-NA SAL.LUGAL²⁹)] pa-a-i SAL.LUGAL-kán wa-a-ki

14’ [(nam-ma-an-zá-a)]n A-NA GISBANŠUR-ŠU da-a-i

C obv. §3’

15’ [1 UDU-ma-kán A-NA ]pÉ.A DAM.KI.NA pAG


17’ [ši-pa-an-zi³⁰ o o tar-u-ya]a-al-li

18’ [ o o o o o o o o o PA-N] ? GUNNI

19’ [ o o o o o o o o o ŁO]SANGA

20’ [ o o o o o o tar-u-ya-a]l-li-in

21’ [ o o o o o o o o o o ]tar-u-ya-al-li-in

22’ [ o o o o o o o o o ]x e-ku-zí

23’ [ o o o o o o o o o o S]İR-RU

24’ [ o o o o o o o o o o o ]

25’ [ o o o o o o o o o o o ]

26’ [ o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o ]lx x x l

(bottom of tablet broken away)

27. Text C has, instead of ŁSAGIA, ŁO:SANGA p[x], probably p[TÉ].[A.


29. Text A may have had SAL.LUGAL-ri instead of ANA SAL.LUGAL, based on obv! 10’, in which “to the king” is written LUGAL-i, with Hittite phonetic complement for the d.-i. rather than an Akkadian preposition.

30. Lines 15’ through šipanti are restored from the same list in KUB 20.59 i 25–27 (AN.TAH. SUM Festival, 29th day, “for Ea and his group”) and text C, 412/s rev. 10’–11’ (Lebrun, Hethitica 5 [1983] 56).
THE FESTIVALS FOR THE TUTELARY DEITIES OF THE RIVER

A = KUB 51.79   B = IBoT2.19   C = 412/s(±?)457/s

Translation

Obverse!

§1' [ ... ] [They play] the large [INAN]NA instrument. [The haliyar]-men sing. They hold [ ]x. Then they carry them out. They break sour thick bread in the courtyard.

§2' Then the cupbearer breaks 2 morsels from thick bread and places them on the piyantalli-bread. He brings them in. He gives [one] bread morsel to the king. [The king] bites (it). He then places it [on] his table. One bread morsel, however, he (the cupbearer) gives to the queen. The queen bites (it). She [then] places [it] on her table.

§3' [One sheep, however, he sacrifices to] Ea, Damkina, Nabû, Nisaba, Māti, (and) Ḫazzizzi. [ ... taruyalleri- (d.1.) [ ... befo]re(?) the hearth [ ... the p]riest. [ ... taruyalleri- (acc.) [ ... ]x he drinks. [ ... ] They sing. [ ... ]

(Not enough preserved of the last three lines to yield anything.)

(bottom of tablet broken away)
The tablet edge and therefore the length of the break is determined from the parallel text KUB 44.2, which in lines x+1-6' almost exactly duplicates what is preserved in lines 8'-13' of this text.

No attested mountain name suggests itself here. The mountain URSAQTaša (RGTC 6: 374-75) is precluded by the trace, which is not a ša sign. The one mountain name which could possibly fit is URSAQTapala. However, this name is never written T/Da-a-pa-la.

The trace looks more like ka-, but we expect another mountain name in such a list.

See Appendix B sub Karepa/Karepati for these names and a discussion of the RGTC 6 citations.

Restored from the parallel KUB 44.2:2', which has anda tarmandaš PA₅;lJIA[-aš.

See Line Commentary below on rev! 11' for this restoration.


Text B at this point has another three lines of deities and deified locations not included in the offering list of the main text. This section of text B is duplicated by the left column of 457/s (text C), which has [P]Zi-li-pu-ra-an in place of the unreadable DN after GUNNI in text B 4', the trace of which cannot be a zi sign. 457/s preserves traces of one line after šiššalandus, which reads x GAL x[]. The right column of 457/s preserves only the first few signs of 5 lines, in which pŠilašši can be recognized. The extra lines of the offering list added by text B read:

| 4' | o o DINGJR?MEŠ SA ĐE.A GUNNI Px[ o o ] |
| 5' | [Đi]-i-[l]-i-ašši-in ir-ša-a-<an>-1du-us |
| 6' | [išša]-ša-al-la-an-du-uš P[ o o o o ] |

"the [ ... god(s(?)), the hearth of Ea, the god x, [ž][läšši, (the gods who have been) treated with offerings in sequence (and) the gods whose offerings are] [pla]nned, the god [x]." Collation notes for IBôT 2.19: At the beginning of line 4' there are very clearly two verticals, not just one as copied. They are close together and suggest the restoration DINGJR?MEŠ. Goetze, Language 29 (1953) 273, reads DINGIR,LU,MEŠ; the collation does not allow such a reading. The traces at the end of line 5' very closely resemble the du sign in line 6'.

The phrase ištanteš šiššallanteš occurs in the kurša- Festival and is discussed in Appendix B sub šiššalla-. The phrase is also attested in other texts with the participles in the accusative plural, such as we have restored here. Lebrun, Samuha 177, reads ir-ša-a-<an>-zi? in line 5' and [ža-al-la-an-du-uš in line 6'.

Text B 7' as copied looks like -ža a-ku-an-zi. Collation reveals that what in the copy looks like a winkelhaken is probably an unintentional gouge in the clay. Text B thus may be read [an-dur-ža].
Reverse! (translation)

§4' [Ins]ide, they drink [ ... Ea, D]amkina, [ ... Mātji, [ ... ]], [Ištar] of Šamuḫa, [ ... x]-lili, [ ... ], Mt. Dā-š, [ ... ]e, [ ... ]x-za, M[t.(?) x], [ ... ] the spring Pinnat, [DN], [the spring Karepa], the spring Karepatti, D[x], the canals that join together, D[x], Ḫuwariyanzipa 42 of Šamuḫa, the Šaliwani 43 gods of [the gate]s, the river Nakkiliya, 44 (and) Inara of the River.

40. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
41. See Line Commentary below on KUB 51.79 rev! 8'-9' for interpretations of this line.
42. See Appendix B sub Ḫu(wa)riyanzipa.
43. See Appendix B.
44. See comments in Appendix B.
A = KUB 51.79  B = IBoT 2.19  C = 412/s(+?)457/s

Reverse! (transliteration cont.)

C rev. §5' 14' [L0.M]ESNAR ][:Ka-ni-eš SİR-RU
15' [LUGAL-][u]% NINDA.KUR₄.RA EM-ŠA pár-ši-ya
16' [na-a]t?-ša-an ((EG))IR-pa iš-ta-na-ni
17' [A-N]A PA-NI DINGIR-LIM L0AZU da-a-i

C rev. §6' 18' [LUGAL (SAL.LUGAL)] a-[k]u-an-na ú-e-kán-zi
19' [L0.MES][SAGI.]A1 a-aš-ka-az a-ku-wa-an-na
20' [Bi-IB-R]U[AL]7 ú-da-a]n-zi GIŠ DINAANNA.GAL
21' [ha]-az-zi-kán-zi L0.MES[Une]y]a-re-eš SİR-RU
22' [o o o o o o o o o o a]?-ku?]1-an-zi
23' [o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o z]i

(bottom of tablet broken away)

45. Text B has its paragraph line one line further down, after this reference to the singer of Kaneš. Text C has no paragraph line here.

46. Text C rev. 4': G1[ZAG.GAR.RA-ni].

47. Text C rev. 6'–7': a-ku-wa-an-na [u]-e1-ga-an-zi. After this it diverges from text A, reading

8' [nu]1 DINGIR.MEŠ ḫu-u-ma-an-te-eš [Ø]
9' ir-Ḫa-a-iz- zi
10' [D]E.A [DAM.KI.N][A]
11' D0AG D0NISA[BA D0Ma-a-ti?]

(bottom of tablet)

The list of deities looks like the same group as that of text A obv! 15'–17'. It continued onto the next column, now lost.
§5' The singers of Kaneš sing. The [kin]g(?) breaks sour thick bread. The seer puts [th]em back on the altar before the god.

§6' [The king (and) queen] request (something) to drink. The [cupbearer]s [bri]ng [rhyta(?)] from outside for drinking. [They play] the large INANNA instrument. The [hally]ari-men sing. They drink(?) [...] (and) th[ey ...]

Line Commentary

Obverse!

obv! 5': ḫila-. There are no other examples of breaking bread offerings in the courtyard. Most of the occurrences of this word involve a verb of motion “to the courtyard.” In this text the distinction between the courtyard, which is “outside,” and the “inside” locus (the temple) where most of the cultic activity is carried out, is emphasized by the action of “carrying them out” in obv! 4’, immediately preceding the breaking of the sour thick bread in the courtyard, and “bringing them in” in obv! 9’.

obv! 15’–17’. The gods worshipped together here are encountered as a group elsewhere, particularly in the twenty-ninth day of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival, which Laroche, CTH 616, describes as “pour Ea et son groupe.” This same group occurs in several duplicates of this portion of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival; of these texts KUB 20.59 is utilized to restore the passage in KUB 51.79. See Laroche, GLH 100 and 163, for his observations that ḫHazzizzi and ḫMāti almost always occur with Ea and that these are actually deified attributes of Ea. There are a number of examples of Māti used as a personal name.

Pago, although a rarely attested god, is not a hapax legomenon in this text, as Lebrun, Hethitica 5 (1983) 56, claims. This god also occurs in KBo 13.128:2’ and KUB 20.59 i 25 (AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival, 29th day); and KBo 13.193:11’ (Ritual for the Ancient Gods). In the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival passages Pago occurs in the same list as we have in KUB 51.79 obv! 15’–16’. Lebrun, Hethitica 5: 56, points out that this logogram stands for the god Nabû, a god associated with wisdom and scribes. For ḫDamkina, see Laroche, Rech. 126. A number of different spellings of her name are attested; to the examples of unusual spellings cited by Laroche add [(-pagination-break-)]e-en-na, 210/w:4’+KUB 47.37:9’ (Hurrian-Hittite ritual of šarraš), restored from KBo 24.57 iv 7’: ḫDam-ki-na; and ḫDam-gi-na, KUB 17.20+ iii 10’

48. For the construction akuanna wek- see Laroche, RHA XXVIII (1970) 41–42, and Kammenhuber, Materialien, Lief. 4, Nr. 5, p. 75.
49. Literally “from the gate.”
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

(Ritual for the Ancient Gods). Damkina occurs quite a few times in festival texts of which perhaps seventy-five percent are in conjunction with Ea.

obv! 17', 20', 21': taruyalli. This word is uncertain in both reading and meaning. It may be acephalic, or incorrectly restored in lines 17' and 20'. If it is complete as we have it in line 21', it is still difficult to identify it with a known Hittite word. There is a word taruyallis which occurs only in two bird oracles, spelled tar-u-ya-al-li-iš in KUB 50.1 iii 12' and 21', tar-u-ya-li-iš in KBo 22.263:6' and KUB 50.1 iii 17' and 21', and tar-u-ya-le-e-ess in KBo 22.263:4'. There may be a further example in KBo 4.2 ii 27 (Ritual of Ḫuwaru, the ᾬMUŠEN.DŪ): nu ᾫMUŠEN.DŪ Ḫuwanzi mān tar-ū-i-ya-al-li-iš tiyazi mān-kan EGIR-an šara aššuaz uizzi n-att gimri araḫza panzi. These examples may well be the full spelling of the term which occurs quite often in bird oracles and is spelled tar-liš/tar-li, tar-u-ya, and perhaps tar-u.50 This word looks like a common gender i-stem noun, with both singular and plural nominative forms attested in the oracle texts, in which case taruyallin and taruyalli in KUB 51.79 could be accusative and dative-locative forms of the same word. It is unlikely, however, that we would have a bird oracle term in this festival text.

There is also a word (G15)tar(u)wal(l)i-, discussed by Hoffner, EHGI 68–69 with n. 141, with the meaning “pestle” and briefly by Starke, KZ 95 (1981) 156 with n. 62, who rejects “pestle” and proposes “mortar.” The word does occur in festival texts and could conceivably be the same word as the taruyall- of KUB 51.79. Against such an equation, however, there are at least two objections: First, (G15)tar(u)wal(l)i- seems to be neuter. In seven of its eight occurrences the form is (G15)taruwal(l)i. Although some of those could be d.-l., in KBo 25.32 iii 13' and KUB 42.107 iv? 8'–9' it is definitely neuter nom.-acc. If taruyallin is the same word, it would be the only unambiguously common gender example of it. Secondly, (G15)tar(u)wal(l)i- is never spelled with a y glide but rather always has the form tarwal(l)i- or taruwal(l)i-. Although taruyall- in KUB 51.79 superficially resembles this word, the differences in morphology are too great to suggest that they are the same word. Lebrun, Hethitica 5 (1983) 56–57, although commenting on taruyall- briefly, does not offer a translation.

Reverse!

rev! 7'. Although three occurrences of the spring name TΩL-Pinnat are cited in RGTC 6: 542, two of them have only the beginnings of a name preserved and are quite conjectural. The KUB 51.79 passage is the only definite example of this spring in the published corpus. This list of deities contains several names which occur only in this text.

rev! 8'–9': anda tama-. Lebrun, Samuha (1976) 178, translates 9' as “les canaux qui se rejoignent les uns les autres!” and the parallel text KUB 44.2, from which this text was restored, as “les canaux qui sont joints les uns aux autres!” In Hethitica 5 (1983) 53 he translates the KUB 51.79 passage as “les canaux creusés”; in his commentary he elaborates on this translation as “les canaux creusés (dans le sol).” Lebrun does not

50. Güterbock, personal communication.
comment on the unusual syntax, in which this participle precedes the word it modifies, “canals.”

Lebrun’s two different translations of the KUB 51.79 passage reflect the uncertainty of the meaning of anda tarnant- in this context. There are no other occurrences of participles of tarna- used to modify names of deities or divine places such as we have here. None of the few examples of this preverb-verb combination anda tarna- resemble the context of KUB 51.79 rev! 8’–9’ or the parallel, but they can provide some clue to its meaning. The most helpful is the use of anda tarna- in certain rituals such as the Ritual of Uhha-muwa against plague:51 nu SIG ZA,GIN SIG SA₄ SIG SIG₄ SIG SIG₇ SIG GE₆ SIG BABBAR-ya anda tarnanzi “They join together blue wool, red wool, yellow wool, black wool, and white wool. (They make it into a crown and crown the ram with it.)” Clearly here anda tarna- means “to join/twine together.” Because canals too join together as they flow one into another, I favor Lebrun’s earlier translation in Samuha 178 over his later idea.

rev! 9’: PA₄. This word is comparatively rare in the Hittite corpus and is only attested once in a cultic context outside of this festival for the Tutelary Deity of the River, in the Ritual for the Sungoddess of the Earth.52 Since the occurrence in the Sungoddess ritual text is broken, the occurrences in this festival are the only definite examples of canals as deities receiving drink offerings.


A = KUB 44.2  B = KUB 44.3

Bo 539 = KUB 44.2 is a small fragment measuring approximately 6.1 by 6 cm. Even in such a small fragment there are some signs which provide evidence for dating. The script shows consistent late forms; ha, li, tar, and URU are the most distinctive and provide a definite New Script date for this tablet.

Bo 4489 = KUB 44.3 is also a small fragment, measuring 5.7 by 5.8 cm. The script is fairly large and not particularly cramped. Of the few signs that provide any clue to dating the tablet, the ak, e, ha, and li signs show older forms, while there are no specifically New Script forms on the preserved portion of the tablet. On the basis of the occurrence of older sign forms combined with a lack of the crowding of signs typical of Old Script, I would assign this fragment a Middle Script date.

This text has not been translated separately because its first paragraph differs so little from that of the parallel KUB 51.79, which has been translated above, while its second paragraph is too fragmentary to translate.

51. HT 1 ii 20–21, trans. Goetze, ANET 347.
52. IBoT 2.126:5'.
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

Text Scheme

A. KUB 44.2. Parallel to KUB 51.79 rev! 7'-13'.
B. KUB 44.3. Adds one line to the beginning of KUB 44.2 and duplicates 1'-7' of that tablet.

Transliteration

§1 B 1' [ o o o o ṭṭ]-p'i-[n-na-at D o-o]
2' an-da tar-na-an-da-aš PA₃.ḪI.A-[aš D o-o]
3' ṭ[u]Ša-mu-u-[ḫa-aš ḫJu-u-wa-ri-an-[zi-pa-aš]
4' KĀ.GAL.ḪI.A-aš ḫŠa-la-wa-na-aš]
5' ṭDNa-ak-ki-li-ya-aš ḫD-aš-[a]
6' ḫLAMMA-ri ṭš-pa-an-ti  ṭ ś-pa-an-ti

§2 B 9' [ ] rx-an DINGIR.MEŠ-ya x  ṭ ś-pa-an-ti
8' [ ] ṭar-[ḫa]-a-da-a-ti  ṭ ś-pa-an-ti
9' [ ] ṭ x-[u] ṭ ś-pa-an-ti

(bottom of tablet broken away)

COMMENTARY

There is not enough preserved of any of the texts here treated to allow a detailed look at the festivals described in them. The various texts have been gathered in this chapter because they are all festivals celebrated for gods associated with rivers, including the Tutelary Deity of the River. As preserved they have little else in common that is distinctive to them. In all of these festivals the giving of offerings is accompanied by cult music from the singer of Kaneš. Without more preserved text, however, we cannot say if the various tablets are describing different festivals or if some are actually different parts of the same festival.

53. Even though it contains the same list of deities and places to be offered to, KUB 44.2 with its duplicate seems to be only a parallel to KUB 51.79. KUB 44.2 has the verb ṣipant- where KUB 51.79 has eku-, and the paragraphs following these lists in the two texts are not the same.
54. Restored from KUB 51.79 rev! 7'.
55. Restored from text B 3'. See Appendix B sub ḫKarepa/Karepati.
57. Restoration from the parallel KUB 51.79 rev! 10'.
58. Text B 8': ḫLAMMA-ID.
59. At this point text B breaks off, preserving from this line only -š a ṭš. It is unclear how this fits into line 7' of text A.
60. Lebrun, Samuha 176, reads Šl[R-R[? The trace before ru, however, is not consistent with a reading Sir.
The existence of these festivals focusing on deities associated with rivers, springs, and canals points up how essential a role bodies of water played in Hittite economy and society. These festivals demonstrate the state's concern with ensuring adequate water supply by propitiating the deities associated with various sources of water. They point up also the distinctively Hittite fascination with water sources seen in the number of monuments erected near water which still exist today. The Mesopotamian kings chronicled their building and clearing of irrigation canals; the Hittites provided festivals for the deities who provided water.

The singers of Kaneš occur in each of the festivals treated in this chapter. See Jakob-Rost in Klengel, ed. Beiträge zur sozialen Struktur des alten Vorderasiien (Berlin, 1971) 111–15, for a discussion of these cult functionaries. As Jakob-Rost points out (ibid., p. 113), although we would expect the singer(s) of Kaneš to sing only for Hittite gods, they seem to sing not only for deities which have genuine Hittite names but also for a number of Hattic gods. Their occurrence in these festival texts cannot therefore be used as evidence for the ethnic background of the river deities being honored by the festivals.

*KUB* 9.21 is dedicated specifically to gods of the river. The use of *takarmu-* bread for the bread offerings is interesting in view of the very important role of that bread in the *kurša- Festival.* The use of this bread, thought by Hoffner to be Hattic in origin, may be evidence that this was a very old festival, perhaps antedating the Hittite state. There is nothing characteristically Old Hittite in the small amount of text preserved, and the copy probably dates to the Empire period. The festival provides evidence about conceptions of tutelary deities by distinguishing between the river, the tutelary deity of the river, and the gods of the river. The tutelary deity of a place or object is distinct from that object, whether it is divine or not. Among the deities receiving offerings are "the fate deities of the riverbank," who sound intriguing but difficult to conceptualize.

In *IBot* 1.2, with more preserved text than in *KUB* 9.21, we may note more distinctive prescriptions in the festival procedure. The ceremony preserved in obverse ii, probably near the beginning of the festival, takes place at a cult stela and concerns the consecrating and purifying of cattle and sheep preparatory to sacrifice.

When obverse iii resumes the description after a gap, the celebrants, including the king, are still at the cult stela. The libations to the holy places of the temple immediately after those at the stela indicate that the stela is in the temple. How then do we understand the following paragraph in which the king treats with offerings the Maraššanda river and the Tutelary Deity of the River? Possibly §6' describes activities done at the river, although usually festival descriptions detail the processions required to move to different cult loci within a ceremony. These offerings of §6' were therefore probably done in the temple as
well. This is good evidence that deified geographical features such as the river Marassanda had images in the temple and could thus receive regular offerings.

In §8' the rare waršula- drink offering is prescribed. Not only is this unusual type of offering part of the ceremony, but the celebrants are unusual; only rarely are "lords" specifically included in Hittite cultic ceremony. The preserved section of column iv seems to be an elaboration of the rather cryptic provisions of §6'. In §§8' and 9' we see similar offerings for two of the three receivers of offerings indicated in §6'. The top of column v probably continued with analogous offerings for their kaluti or "circle."

In this festival as in KUB 9.21, all the deities, with the exception of the holy places, are associated with the river. The copy was written in the early Empire period; I find nothing in the text to provide evidence as to when the festival itself was developed.

The festival in KUB 51.79 presents some distinctive features, most notably the extensive list in §4' of gods who are to receive drink offerings. The gods here worshipped are predominantly those having to do with sources of water: rivers, springs, and canals. Although the water motif dominates the selection of gods of this festival, there are also other deified geographical locations (mountains), and other gods both from the provinces and from the central cult. I do not see a unifying factor that holds all of these deities together, besides a concern for offering to all sources of ground water. Despite the predominance of deified locations, the ceremony takes place not at an outdoor cult site, but in a temple, as seen by the carrying of offerings from outside to inside and specific prescriptions for performing offerings inside. The king and queen are the primary celebrants of the festival.

Other points that distinguish KUB 51.79 and its parallel KUB 44.2 from the other texts in this chapter (as they are preserved) include the role of the seer in breaking and placing the bread offerings and the use of sour thick bread for those offerings. Although all the festivals of this chapter are done to the accompaniment of cult music of Kaneš, only in this text was other music used, the large INANNA instrument and the ḫaliyari- singers. There is also a rather unusual ceremony in which the "cupbearer" (LlJ SAGI.A) breaks thick bread into crumbs (an action denoted by a phrase unique to this text), and then gives a morsel each to the king and queen, who bite it and place it on their tables.

There is more linguistic evidence for dating to be gained from this festival than from the others in this chapter. Most of the copies were written in Middle Script and New Script, and there is evidence from the main text, KUB 51.79, for an Old Hittite or Middle Hittite dating for the text itself. In obv 7' the use of the older form -uš- for the common accusative plural pronoun in nu-uš-kan suggests an Old Hittite or Middle Hittite date. In obv 11', nam-ma-an-ža-an, the latter -an may be the rather rare Old Hittite sentence particle cited in Kammenhuber, HW 2 69–70, and Puhvel, HED 1–2: 51.66 Goetze, ArOr 5 (1933) 30–31.

66. To the literature cited in these two dictionary entries add Kammenhuber, FsLaroche 187, and Melchert, Diss. 110–11.
points out that the sequence -za-an actually stands for -za-šan in some cases, an idea followed by Friedrich, *HE* 1 (1960) §42b, and Carruba, *SMEA* 12 (1970) 71. Lebrun, *Hethitica* 5 (1983) 56, interprets this passage thus without discussing the reasons for it. Hoffner, *FsGüterbock* 2 93–94, points out that -an in this position can also be a doubled enclitic pronoun. I would not take this -an as such because, as Hoffner notes, such a feature only occurs in late New Hittite texts, which this text, based on other evidence, does not seem to be. I see no reason not to read it as the sentence particle -an, which would then indicate an Old Hittite date for *KUB* 51.79, as the use of this particular particle died out very early. The same particle almost certainly occurs in obv! 14'. This festival thus seems to be an old one, although the inclusion of Mesopotamian gods such as Ea may argue against a pre-Hittite Hattic prototype.

While the festivals of this chapter touch only obliquely on tutelary deities of the river, they are important evidence for the existence of this particular manifestation of the tutelary deity. This deity is distinguished from the river itself, which can also be deified. As noted in *Chapter 1*, divine beings may themselves have a protective deity, and in the Hittite conception of their world the rivers which represented such an important resource were provided with special gods to ensure their well being.
The Hittites accorded within the extensive cult that was so essential an element of the state’s institutional framework a rather large position to a type of god that we conventionally label tutelary or patron. Such gods may be identified either by a common title, **DLAMMA**, by explicitly protective functions, or simply by close association in the pantheon with other tutelary deities. Like much of Hittite culture, the worship of tutelary or patron deities can be perceived most readily in foreign religious traditions. The Hattians, the non-Indo-European Anatolians who antedate the Hittite entry into central Anatolia, had a very strong tradition of tutelary deities. All of the tutelary deities called by name in the texts seem to go back to Hattian prototypes. Many are attested from the earliest days of the Hittite kingdom. In the Old and Middle Hittite periods, when Hattian influence was strongest, the Tutelary Deity (**DLAMMA**) and the Tutelary Deity of Hatti seem to have had their greatest prominence within the pantheon. In Mesopotamia, another culture that influenced the Hittites greatly, the tradition of patron deities was also quite strong. Patron deities mediated between humankind and the divine realm on cylinder seals, colossal deities guarded the gates of Assyrian palaces, and the very title used by the Hittites to name many of their tutelary deities was borrowed from the Sumerian tradition. The third major tradition contributory to Hittite culture, the Hurrian, seems not to have had the same pattern of deities specifically tutelary. If anything, as Hurrian influence increased in the Empire period while Hattian influences decreased, the prominence accorded to tutelary deities may have waned somewhat. I know of no examples of a tutelary deity with a clearly Hurrian name, either spelled out or implied in a phonetic complementation for **DLAMMA**. An exception to this trend is the importance of the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities in the late period, under Tudḫaliya IV, attested in the many copies of this text datable to that king’s reign. Even there, this active religious reorganizer may have been building on an older festival procedure.

The evidence for the Hittite interest in tutelary deities involves both festivals devoted primarily to them and numerous references to them in a variety of texts. Their importance at the state level is manifest from the rather prominent place given them in the catalogue of deities who witnessed treaty oaths. Religious festivals, as the vehicle for corporate
worship, as the primary index of Hittite official piety, and as the institution that provided for systematic sacrificial offering, are a striking testimonial to the centrality in Hittite culture of maintaining the state's relationship with the divine. As such, the major state festivals were very elaborate ceremonial procedures which might last for weeks and require an enormous expenditure of the state's primary economic resource, agricultural produce, for offerings. In the great state festivals not specifically ordained for one particular deity the tutelary deities play a role similar to their role in the oath deity lists, never supplanting more universal gods like the Stormgod or the Sungod or Sungoddess but often receiving offerings in these festivals. The festivals celebrated primarily for tutelary deities, treated in this volume, are not of the magnitude of the great festivals like the KI.LAM or AN.TAH.ŠUM. However, the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities and the kurša- Festival are long ceremonies which almost certainly required the presence of the king and queen, the highest priests of the land, for their celebration. The kurša- Festival was sufficiently complex to require several days for its celebration.

Some of these festivals for tutelary deities are quite distinctive. The "Festivals of Karāḫna" text represents a characteristically Hittite concern that local festivals be recorded and performed. The Festival for All the Tutelary Deities is a monument of spiritual and intellectual investigation, a document manifesting the human desire for exploration of the divine realm and the need to know that world in order to relate better to it. The festival for renewing the hunting bag totems differs from the majority of Hittite festival descriptions, which usually prescribe processions, sacrificial offerings, and accompanying liturgy to be done on a regular basis. The kurša- Festival is performed only as needed and has the unusual (in Hittite culture) function of installing new divine images and providing for the recycling of the old ones. Some of these festivals go back to Old Hittite or perhaps earlier prototypes; the tradition of worship for tutelary deities is as old as the Hittite state. Some of the older compositions are extant in New Script copies, indicating how these cults were maintained throughout the history of the Hittite kingdom.

The great variety of tutelary deities is important evidence for the Hittite view of their world. In general the Hittites accepted any new deity they encountered as they confronted different cultures. Although in the later period especially, perhaps due to the influence of the well-developed and centralized Hurrian culture, the Hittite state had a clear conception of gods whose sway was universal; they maintained throughout their history a vital interest in localized deities and their individual cults. In all ancient civilizations local religious traditions flourished simultaneously with the state-sponsored religion, but few states consciously fostered and recorded in the state archives these local traditions as assiduously as the Hittites. The great number of tutelary deities deriving from the Hattian pantheon is probably a function of the political fragmentation of the Hattian cities, which produced a plethora of different gods, many of whom were taken over by the Hittites as they incorporated Hattian principalities into their united polity. For many of these deities the Hittites did nothing more than make them part of the pantheon, including them in the lists of gods who witnessed treaties and received offerings in the state cult. For some they apparently borrowed or adapted an entire cultic ceremony and performed it in the capital.
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An excellent example of this is the kurša- Festival, which was performed in the capital for two gods who came originally from other cult centers. Maintaining these two gods in Ḫattuša required providing a place for them, the “house of the hunting bags,” their temple. Thus the cults of certain provincial deities were transferred to the capital.

In other cases the variety of tutelary deities has its origins in the essential idea of protection inherent in the concept of a tutelary deity. In a festival involving the tutelary deity of the river,¹ the river, the gods of the river, and the tutelary gods of the river are all separately named. The distinction between the river, itself divine, and its tutelary deities is carefully maintained. Almost anything, human, divine, or inanimate, may have a deity assigned to its protection. Although many of these tutelary deities occupied only a minor place in the state pantheon, the Tutelary Deity, the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti, and Zitḫariya were at times accorded a prominent place. The Tutelary Deity in the earlier period was even at times addressed or worshipped as part of a triad with the Stormgod and Sungod(dess). He was apparently a universal god recognized throughout the empire, as attested by his worship in local cults as well as at the capital.

The existence of this body of tutelary or protective gods can readily be traced in the Hittite documents. What is more problematic is to discern their nature, what it is that makes them “tutelary.” As noted in Chapter 1, some deities are understood as tutelary deities because they occur with other better known gods of this general type in treaty witness lists or offering lists. Laroche² discusses the difficulty in recognizing a common trait among the gods grouped together in the treaty oath lists. The evidence of names is the most obvious clue; gods with ⁵LAMMA in their name or title are understood as tutelary deities. Iconography helps somewhat here, as some uniformity of representational conventions may be perceived among Hittite images of these gods. Two main iconographic traditions pertain to tutelary deities. Those tutelary deities who had anthropomorphic images about which we know something show fairly uniform elements. These include standing on a stag, carrying weapons, and holding animals in their hands. The second iconographic tradition for tutelary deities involves the use of a totem, a hunting bag. That hunting bag for the Hittites was the god, just as a statue of the deity was referred to as the deity. The use of an everyday object as a totem is distinctive and provides an iconographic clue for identifying tutelary gods.

Both types of representation of tutelary deities point up another characteristic which some tutelary deities seem to share: an association with the hunt. The anthropomorphic images portray a god whose close association with animals suggests the hunt. The use of the hunting bag as a totem strongly suggests that gods for whom it is a representation are gods who oversee hunting. The scene on the Schimmel rhyton portrays what is clearly a hunting scene, with the results of the chase represented. The scene contains as hunting equipment the bag, the spear, and the quiver. There is a tutelary deity of each attested in the Hittite corpus; probably all of these were therefore perceived as aiding the hunter. In the kurša- Festival, in which many tutelary deities are worshipped, the “dog-men” play a

1.  KUB 9.21 and ABoT 3, Chapter 5 above.
prominent role. These are probably handlers of hunting dogs, and their “barking” as a ritual litany to accompany offerings to these gods emphasizes the association of some tutelary deities with the hunt. This association demonstrates a protective side to the tutelary deity’s nature; gods who assist in the hunt are helping provide the Hittites with one of their most basic needs.

The very term “tutelary” or “protective” deity implies the modern understanding of these as deities who watch over the interests of people or gods. Their protective nature can be seen in the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities, in which there is, for example, a tutelary deity of running in front of the king, presumably to protect him. Their protective nature is also inferred from the fact that they are at times portrayed as personal gods. The Festival for All the Tutelary Deities lists tutelary deities for many personal attributes of the king. A Zিঃরিয is the king and a Tutelary Deity of the king are attested outside this festival. A few references in instructions and festivals to “my tutelary deity” (DDLAMMA-asū-miš) or “your tutelary deity” (DDLAMMA-KUNU) also indicate the potentially personal nature of a god of this type. Perhaps the clearest example of a tutelary deity’s protective nature is in the Instructions for Temple Personnel, in which the personal tutelary deity of an accused temple servant is given credit if that person is acquitted. Even other gods may have a personal tutelary deity.

There is a great deal of variation in status within the body of tutelary deities. Some occur only in listings of gods. Local tutelary deities like DDDLAMMA šarlama’s play no role at all in the state cult and yet are one of the major gods for a local cult, in this case that of Ḫuwaššana of Ḫūpišna. Many local cults clearly had their own tutelary deities; only a few are attested in the state archives. Sometimes a distinctive name, Hattic or Luwian, indicates the local cultural milieu from which they come. The Tutelary Deity (DDLAMMA) and to some extent the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti seem most important if one judges by their place in the lists of treaty oath witnesses or offerings. The Tutelary Deity is at times part of a triad of the highest gods of the land with the Stormgod and Sungod(dess). Yet this impression is not borne out by other textual attestations; the Hittites may have officially accorded the Tutelary Deity a high place in the pantheon, but they rarely singled him out for special attention or individual supplication. While occurrences of the Stormgod and the Sungod(dess) throughout the Hittite corpus attest to their real importance in Hittite religious consciousness, DDDLAMMA appears primarily in lists of gods. It is Zিঃরিয who on the basis of his activities may be the most prominent tutelary deity. He is very often included in the cultic journeys as part of festivals. Even more significantly he is the god whom the king takes on campaign and for whom a festival is celebrated when the king returns successfully.

Important for our understanding of the Hittite response to the tutelary deities is their conspicuous absence in prayers. Deities who are personal and protective might be expected to be an important part of Hittite personal piety and petition, but such is not the case. The

3. KUB 2.1 ii 25, edited in Chapter 3.
4. CTH 264, KUB 13.4 iv 32, 54. See Chapter 1 sub DDLAMMA.
prayers tend to be addressed to more universal gods of the pantheon. Thus, although the Hittite corpus provides a few examples of very personal tutelary deities, it is fewer than we might expect for gods who are supposed to be protectors for the individual. Perhaps the tutelary deities in general never attain the same status as the Stormgod and Sungod(dess) because they are gods of hunting while the latter two are gods who control the primary area of Hittite production, agriculture. The tradition of tutelary gods in the Hittite cult is to a great extent a borrowed tradition, which may also explain why they play such a small role in individual religious life as recorded in prayers and vows. The festivals treated in this work testify to the role played by the tutelary deities in the official cult, but at the individual level, where one might expect a special interest in protective deities, it is the major universal gods of the pantheon to whom the Hittites turn for special attention or protection.
APPENDIX A

FRAGMENTS OF FESTIVALS FOR TUTELARY DEITIES

INTRODUCTION

A number of tablet fragments of festivals appear to belong to festivals for tutelary deities. They range from fairly substantial fragments that clearly feature tutelary deities as the object of the festival to small pieces of text which merely mention a $LAMMA$. A transliteration of all the pertinent fragments identified by Laroche, as well as those discovered since CTH was published, are included here. Translations are provided for texts that are sufficiently substantial or interesting enough to warrant them. Each of the CTH 685 fragments was examined for the possibility that it belonged to one of the known festivals for tutelary deities. In a few cases a fragment was identified as a duplicate or parallel to one of those other festivals, and such texts are treated with their appropriate festival.

THE FRAGMENTS

KUB 7.36

The text KUB 7.36, catalogued by Laroche under CTH 685, was determined to be part of the kurša- Festival, CTH 683, and is therefore treated in Chapter 4.

KUB 7.40

Bo 3334 = KUB 7.40 is a small fragment approximately 6.2 cm wide by 5.4 cm high. The scribe has left very large spaces between words. It is difficult to assign a firm dating to such a small fragment; the only really characteristic sign for dating purposes is an $az$ with subscript za in 8', indicating an Empire date for the copy.

1. Laroche catalogues fragments of festivals for tutelary deities as CTH 685. See p. 8 in the Introduction for a revised text scheme of CTH 685.

2. The fragments are presented in the order in which they are catalogued as CTH 685.
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In this fragment a tutelary deity, possibly the goddess Inara with her name written logographically $^9$LAMMA-ri, receives offerings of bread, a libation, and meat. The festival represented is part of the state cult, as seen by the presence of the [king] and queen. The royal pair go down from somewhere during the ceremony and may be the ones who go up to the roof and come back down again. The occurrence of ḫukanzi in 9' probably indicates the slaughtering of the sacrificial sheep but could also refer to a cultic recitation, as there are two Hittite verbs which take this form in the third person plural.

KUB 7.40

Transliteration

$\textsection 1'$  
\[ x \times [ \] x  

$\times-ya \] 

$\textsection 2'$  
\[ -i [n] \]  

$\times$  

\[ pLAMMA-ri \] 

\[ 3 \]  

\[ NINDA \]  

\[ \ldots \]  

\[ pār-ši-ya \]  

\[ ]  

\[ 2-ŠU \]  

\[ BAL-an-ti \]  

\[ UDU.NITÁ-y[a \]  

\[ ]  

\[ 3 \]  

\[ LUGAL-uš \]  

\[ S\]AL?LUGAL-aš-ša \[ kat-ta \]  

\[ pa-a-an-[zi \]  

\[ ]  

\[ 4 \]  

\[ ]  

\[ pē-e-da-an-zi ku-it-[a] \]  

\[ ]  

\[ 5 \]  

\[ -kā[n]-zi na-at-kān \]  

\[ šu-uḫḫ-ḫi \]  

\[ ša-ra-a pē-e-da-an-zi? \]  

\[ ]  

\[ 6 \]  

\[ EGIR-an-da? \]  

\[ -]ma-at-kān \]  

\[ šu-uḫḫ-ḫa-az \]  

\[ k[ at-ta ú-wa-an-zi?] \]  

\[ ]  

\[ 7 \]  

\[ UDU.NITÁ?] \]  

\[ ḫu-u-kān-zi nu-za \]  

\[ a-d[a-5 \]  

\[ ]  

\[ 8 \]  

\[ ]  

\[ (the tablet breaks off) \]  

Translation

$\textsection 1'$  
(Not enough preserved to translate.)

$\textsection 2'$  
[ ... ] three \[ x \] breads for the Tutelary Deity [he breaks]. He libates \[ x \] twice. An[d] the wether \[ ... \] [The king] and [q]ueen go down. \[ ... \] they carry. And that which they \[ \] x, \[ they carry(?) \] it \[ up \] to the roof. [But afterwards they come down from the roof. \[ ... \] The wether(?) they slaughter.\textsuperscript{6} (traces)

KUB 9.17

This text describes a cultic journey that includes several stops at which tutelary deities are worshipped. The copy dates from the early Empire period. In $\textsection 1'$ the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti and Zitḫariya receive offerings. This portion of the festival probably took place in

3. Collation indicates a winkelhaken trace not shown on the copy which would suggest -i$n$ or $x-ni$.
4. See KUB 55.39 i 11 for a similar prescription, which provided this restoration.
5. Possibly a-d'[a-an-zi or a-d'[a-an-na. Another possibility is a-p[i-ya.
6. Or "[ ... ] They do an incantation."
Hattusa; we know from the kurša- Festival that Zithariya had a cult image there, as of course does the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti. The following paragraph describes a ceremony, still in the capital, at the temple of the Tutelary Deity. This ceremony involves three different types of attendants to the cult: the dog-men, barbers, and the \textit{Lú palwatalla}-. For \textit{palwai}-, the verb from which this last functionary’s title is formed, see Appendix B.

In §3 the cultic journey has begun, leaving the capital and stopping first at Tauriša, where local deities receive offerings. The sacred grove of Tauriša is one of the places where the cultic ceremonies take place. Groves occur throughout Hittite cultic literature as sacred places where local gods often have a stela or altar. The grove keeper (LÚ \textit{GIS}TIR) is presumably responsible for maintenance of the grove and assists in the local cult centered there. In this role he provides the sacrificial loaves for the ceremony. Given the importance of groves in local cults, one would expect the LÚ \textit{GIS}TIR to be attested frequently, but in fact he occurs very rarely. He does occur twice in a ritual fragment in broken context.\footnote{There is also a [L]Ú EN.NU.UN \textit{GIS}TIR \textit{LUN}Ner\textsl{[ik]} attested once in a list of personnel. This must be a guard for the grove and is probably not the same thing as the LÚ \textit{GIS}TIR, who in the \textit{KUB} 9.17 passage is a kind of priest who takes a role in the cultic ceremonies.}

The third and fourth paragraphs begin with the expression \textit{n-\textasciitilde{a}š iyanna\textbar}, “He sets out,” but do not specify the subject. Line 24 indicates that the god traveled on this cultic journey, so he could be the subject of \textit{iyanna\textbar}. The Hittite gods often traveled to cult sites. This would necessitate a change of subject in line 13, as it must have been the king or some cult functionary who drank Kalimma and the Tutelary Deity of Tauriša. It may be that the king is the understood subject of the prescription “he sets out.” His role in cultic journeys is sufficiently universal that the scribe setting down this ceremony may have felt it superfluous to specify him as the subject.

Based on §2, which takes place at the temple of the Tutelary Deity, and the fact that the text features several other tutelary deities, it is likely that “DINGIR-LUM” in 24, the god who is taking the cult journey, refers to the image of the Tutelary Deity.

In 20 we have a first person plural verb, which is unusual in a festival text. Apparently the cultic personnel involved in the festival put some type of garment on the god’s image before it “stepped” into the chariot to continue the cultic journey. Unfortunately the broken nature of the tablet does not allow us to learn how long this cultic journey was or what other locations and deities were involved. What it does contribute is a clear example of the importance not only of maintaining local cults but also of bringing along gods from the state cult to participate. The Hittite concern for maintaining the proper relationship with the divine manifests itself not simply in providing encouragement and funding for gods and their cult centers outside the capital, but rather in the active participation of the king as chief priest and of god(s) who had temples at the capital. The image of the god rides in a wagon, but the king appears to have walked, indicating that this is probably a cult site close to the capital.

\footnote{173/q ii 5', 7'.} \footnote{\textit{KBo} 12.65 v 6'.}
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KUB 9.17

Transliteration

§1'x+1 [ p]f-an-zi [ i o o o o ]
§2' [ e-klu-zi LÜ.MES ALA[N.ZU, SÍR-RU]
§3' [ o o o o o dLAMMA? UR HA-AT-TT e-ku-zi nu dZi[-it-ña-ri-ya-an]
§4' [ e-ku-zi nu LÜ.MES]ALAN.ZU,pát SÍR-RU [Ø]

§2' 5' [ x x l.HI.A ku-it IS-TU E dLAMMA ta-pí-fša!-a-mi-it K[U.o9 o o ]
§7' a-ku-wa-an-na 3-ŠU pí-an-zi A-NA PA-NI DINGIR-LIM-MA ku-it[ o o o o o11 ]
§8' pē-e ḫar-kán-zi nu A-NA LÜ.MES-ta-ḫi-ya-la-aš a-ku-wa-an[-na 3-ŠU?]
§9' a-pa-at pí-an-zi nu LÜ.MES-ta-ḫi-i-ya-li-iš EGIR-p[a]
§10' ne-ya-an-ți A-NA LÜ.pal-wa-tal-li-ya ŠA E dLAMMA
§11' 1 NINDA.KUR₄.RA pí-an-zi nu-za-kán a-pa-a-aš-ša EGIR-pa ne-ya[-ri]

§3' 12' na-ša i-ya-ana-ni na-an-kán LÜ.MES ALAN.ZU, EGIR-an a[p-pa-an-zi?]?
§13' na-aš URUTa-ú-ri-ša ti-i-e-ez-zi nu dLAMMA URUTa-ú-ri[-ša]
§14' ḫa-li-im-ma-an-na e-ku-zi na-ša i-ya-ni-na-i [Ø]
§15' nu gisTIR URUTa-ú-ri-ša pí-ra-an wa-aḫ-nu-zi nu LÜ GIS[TIR]
§17' na-an-ši-kán LÜ.SANGA ar-ḫa da-a i na-an pár-ši-ya
§18' nu dU GIS[TIR e-ku-zi na-an LÜ.MES UR.GL, EGIR KASKAL-pát a-da[-12-anz-zi?]?

§4' 19' na-ša i-ya-ana-ni na-ša-ša-an a-ú-ri-ya še-er ti-i-e-ez-zi[i]
§20' na-an wa-aš-šu-ǔ-e-ni na-aš-ša-an GISGIGIR-yā ti-i-e-ez-zi [ Ø ]
§21' na-ša ma-aḫ-ḫa-an URUḪa-a-hi-ša a-ri nu me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-da
§22' [SAL]MESḫa-az-ga-ra-a-i ú-iz-zi¹³ NINDA.KUR₄.RA-yā DUGḫu-u-up-pár KĀŠ
§23' [me-na-]ḫa-ḫa-an-da ǔ-da-an-zi nu NINDApur[UUR],pu-ru-uš¹⁴ kat-ta-a[n]
§24' [iš-ḫu-úwa-an-zi na-ša-ta DINGIR-LUM IS-TU GISGISGIR] kat-ta
§25' [ú-wa-da-an-?]zi nu UR[SAC]Ta-ḫa-an-1-ŠU E-ku-zi

§27' [ o o o o o o n]a?-aš QI-RU-UB URUMa-na-zi-ya-ra ti-i-e-ez[-zi]
§28' [ o o o o o o o ] x [ o o ] l[ar-ḫa]¹ 6 DUG KAŠ 16 NINDA a-a-an
§29' [ o o o o o o o o o o ] x ū-da-an-zi
§30' [ o o o o o o o o o o ] x EGIR KASKAL-ŇI x[ o o o ]
§31' [ o o o o o o o o o o ] šl-1pa[l-än-ti?
( the tablet breaks off)

10. Space for three or four signs, but nothing is required for sense.
11. There was a vessel or beverage name of neuter gender here.
12. The signs a-da- are written over an erasure.
13. The plural form [SAL]MESḫazgarāt often occurs with a singular verb.
14. See AlHeth 179 for Hoffner’s comments on why the scribe used this redundant writing.
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KUB 9.17

Translation


§2' They give the [x']s which the barbers bring from the temple of the Tutelary Deity in a g[old/si]lver tapišana- vessel to the dog-men to drink three times. They give that [x] which they hold out before the god to the barbers to drink[k] three(?) times. The barbers turn around. They give one thick bread of the temple of [the Tutelary] Deity¹⁷ to the reciter(?). He also turns around.

§3' He (the king[?]) sets out. The ALAN.ZU₉-functionaries follow(?) him. He arrives at Tauriša and drinks the Tutelary Deity of Taur[iša] and the god Kalimma. He (again) sets out. The grove of Tauriša assumes the first position(??). The grove keeper holds wista- bread (and) *unganai-ed¹⁹ bread [and] recites(?). The priest takes it (the bread) away from him and breaks it. He drinks the Stormgod of the Grove. The dog-men eat(?) it on the return trip(?).²⁰

§4' He sets out. He steps up on the lookout tower. We clothe him and he steps into the chariot. When he arrives at Ḫāhiša the hazgara- women come to (meet) (him). They bring forward thick bread (and) a ḫuppar vessel of beer. They heap up bread balls down (at his feet). They [bri]ng the god down on a chariot. He drinks Mt. Taḥa once.

§5' He proceeds up [to the alt]ars(?). [ ... ] He procee[ds] into the center of the city Manaziḫyara. [ ... ] six vessels of beer, 16 warm breads [ ... ]x they bring. [ ... ]x on the return trip x[ ... ] [ ... ] he lib[ates].

The tablet breaks off

One would expect a plural relative pronoun here because of the [ ... ].Ḫ.I.A at the beginning of the sentence. The noun which is broken away is probably neuter plural, which usually takes singular agreement.

15. This functionary occurs with tutelary deities or in analogous situations elsewhere. He is loosely associated with the Tutelary Deity and Ḫapantali(ya) in KBo 25.176 obv. 17–18 (K.I.LAM outline tablet), transl. Singer, StBoT 28 (1984) 93, and with the priest of the Tutelary Deity in IBoT 2.91 obv. iii 11'–12' (fest. fragment). They "release" the command of Inara, passim in the NIN.DINGIR Festival (CTH 649). They also hold the hunting bag in the NIN.DINGIR Festival (KBo 20.32 ii 7): ¹.0.MEš daḫiyaleš TŪG-aš kuršan ṭarkanzi "The barbers hold the hunting bag of cloth."

16. That is, provided by the temple of the tutelary deity.

17. That is, "becomes the first place to visit(?) ."

18. That is, "return journey, return," and cites this passage as one which seems to require such a translation. Another possibility would be "after the trip."
There is not enough preserved of this tablet to produce a coherent translation. It is a festival which involves drink and bread offerings to a number of deities in succession; the three preserved gods are tutelary deities. As in the kurša- Festival Zithariya and the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatti receive drink and bread offerings. Another deity who receives offerings in the kurša- Festival is the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatenzuwa; ḫHa-Hatenzawu of KUB 10.29:7' is probably the same deity. Laroche, Rech. 24, in his entry for ḫHa-Hatenzawu (attested only in this text and KUB 58.13 obv. 6'21) considered this possibility: “On songe au nom de ville Ḥatenzuwa dont ḫLAMA est précisément le patron ...”

Transliteration

§1\+x+1 J\+x-x\+1[  
2' -t\+a? p\-i-an-z\+i[  
3' ḫZi-it-h\+a-ri-ya\+22 GUB-aš \+e\+22[\-ku-z\+i[  
4' MJ\+EŞ?-in pār-ši-y[a  

§2' 5' ]x ḫLAMMA URU ḫAT-\+TI\+e\+1[-ku-z\+i[  
6' -i[n pār-ši-ya[  

§3' 7' ḫHa-ti-en-za-wu\+2(-)ú? [  
8' -i[n pār-ši-ya[  

§4' 9' J\+f x x \+x\+1[  
(the tablet breaks off)

22. Collated.
23. Collation shows two possible horizontal traces which would fit e perfectly.
Bo 2420 = KUB 10.93 is a fragment 16 cm wide by 9.9 cm tall. The back of column ii has been broken away, so that none of reverse iii is preserved. The tablet is inscribed in a large, very neat script which shows a mixture of older and newer forms. Although the signs gi and LAMMA occur in older forms, az, da, ḫa, id, li, and URU show their newer forms. The tablet is New Script, written in the early Empire period.

In addition to some standard drink and bread offerings, the first column involves a cultic meal, at which a variety of male and female cultic personnel eat. The conclusion of the meal is a series of drink and bread offerings. We cannot tell how extensive this series of offerings was, because column i ends after three rounds of offerings, and almost all of column ii is lost. The very end of column ii offers only tantalizing phrases of a somewhat unusual ceremony in which the throne is perhaps moved. In an unusual prescription the celebrant offers a drink offering to the name of the king.

In column iv we have two almost identical paragraphs which set out as part of the ceremony the performance by two different “old priests of the Tutelary Deity” of this festival for that god in Ḫattuša. It is important that it be done twice by two different priests; any tendency to save time and expense by cutting either ceremony short is specifically interdicted. The festival is to be celebrated in the autumn. However, the last paragraph in which anything readable is preserved mentions the festivals of spring. Perhaps the remainder of the fourth column described the special festivals for the Tutelary Deity and the duties of his priest in the spring festivals. The references to Ḫattuša and Ḫatti throughout the text suggest that the festivals described here took place in the capital and did not involve a cultic journey through the countryside.

24. Lines iv 1–2 are transliterated and translated by Sommer, HAB (1938) 175 with n. 3, and by Goetze, JCS 17 (1963) 100.
KUB 10.93

Transliteration

Obverse i

§1’x+1 [ o o o o o o o o x-d u-x o o o o o o ]
2’ [ o o o o o o o o -m]a? GUNNI ta-špu-ušš]-[za]
3’ [ o o o o o o o o ] ši-pa-an-

§2’ 4’ [nu A-NA LQ SANGA DLAMMA a-ku-wa-an-na pi-ya-an-zi
6’ [TUŠ/GUB-aš? e-ku-zi] SIR-RU

§3’ 7’ [nu LQ MElŠ MUHALDIM? TU],?HIL A i-en-zi GIM-an-ma-aš-ša-an
8’ [zé-ya-an-ta-r]ji nu A-NA LQ SANGA DLAMMA LQ Mešta-ži-ya-[li-ya-aš]
9’ [A-NA? LQ MElŠ aš]-mi-ya-aš LQ MElŠ KISAL LUḪ-TIM EN.E.GAL
10’ [У?] A-NA SAL URU HA-AT-TI SALSENI kal-li-iš-šu-u[-an-zi?]
11’ [u-]ša-an-ta-ri GIM-an-ma a-da-an-na

§4’ 13’ nu pU GUB-aš e-ku-zi GIŠ INANNA.GAL SIR-RU
14’ 1 NINDA.KUR₄.RA pár-ši-

§5’ 15’ pUTU-aš TUŠ-aš e-ku-zi GIŠ INANNA.GAL SIR-RU 1 NINDA.KUR₄.RA pár-ši-ya

§6’ 16’ nu nam-ma pU TUŠ-aš e-ku-zi GIŠ INANNA.GAL SIR-RU
17’ 1 NINDA.KUR₄.RA pár-ši-

(bottom of tablet)

Obverse ii²⁶

§7’x+1 [ o o o o o o ] x x [ ]

§8’ 2’ [ o o o o o ] GRU KÛ.BABBAR-I-TI’
3’ [GÉDAG-ti?]i-in ZAG.GAR.RA-ni p[i-ra-an da-a-i?
4’ nu šT/M-MI LUGAL-RI pZA.BA₄.[BA₄ e-ku-zi?
5’ nu tu-u-wa-az i-e-[z-zi
6’ [p] Ka-taḥ-ḥa-an ZAG.GAR.[RA-ni p[i-ra-an?

25. Collated. Laroche, Rech. 37, notes this form of the Hattic god, Wašizzil, also in KUB 10.86 i 5.
26. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
FRAGMENTS OF FESTIVALS FOR TUTELARY DEITIES

KUB 10.93

Translation

Obverse i

§1' (The fragmentary paragraph describes libations to the holy places in the temple.)

§2' They give [to the priest of the Tutelary Deity to drink. He drinks [the Tutelary Deity, standing/seated]. [He drinks] the Stormgod (and) Wašeazzali, [standing/seated]. They sing.

§3' [The cooks] prepare [ste]ws(?). When [they are cooke]d, they [se]nd in order [to] call the priest of the Tutelary Deity, the barb[ers], the [ša]rm[en], the washers of the court, the lord of the palace, [and] the woman of Ḫatti, the prophetess. They come and sit down to eat. When they have finished eating, however,

§4' he drinks the Stormgod, standing. (They play) the large Inanna instrument. They sing. He breaks one thick bread.

§5' He drinks the Sungod, seated.27 (They play) the large Inanna instrument. They sing. He breaks one thick bread.

§6' Further, seated, he drinks the Stormgod. (They play) the large Inanna instrument. They sing. He breaks one thick bread.

(below of tablet)

Obverse ii28

§7' (Nothing preserved to translate.)

§8' [ ... ] Ḫatti [ ... ] [He places(?)] the throne b[efore] the altar. [He drinks(?)] the name of the king, ZA.BA₄.[BA₄, ... ] He worsh[ips] from afar.29 [ ... ] Kataḫḫa [before(?)] the alta[r].

27. The ending for ṜTU-aš is unexpected, but this formula is so typical that we must understand it as accusative. Perhaps the scribe was thinking ahead to the phonetic complement on TUŠ-aš.

28. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

29. This is the only attested example of tuwaz with iya-; the translation is tentative.
Obverse ii (transliteration cont.)

§9' 7' GUNNI-NT\(^{30}\) ta-pu-uš-za[  

(bottom of tablet)

Reverse iii lost

Reverse iv\(^{31}\) (transliteration)

§10' 1 pa-ra-a-ma-aš-ša-an Ū-UL ku-it-ki na-a-i  
2 EGIR-pa-ya-kān Ū-UL ku-it-ki pē-eš-še-yā-zi

§11' 3 EGIR-an-da-ma ú-iz-zi L\(^{0}\) SANGA ŠU.GI  
4 ṢA\(^{\text{pl}}\) LAMMA ku-u-un\(^{32}\) EZEN-an a-pē-el  
5 I-NA É-ŠU\(^{\text{ur}}\) Ja-at-tu-ši zē-e-ni  
6 [A-NA\(^{\text{pl}}\) LAMMA ki-iš-ša-an i-e-ez-zi  
7 [pa-r]a-«ša»-ma-aš-ša-an Ū-UL ku-it-ki na-a-i]  
8 [EGI]R-pa-ya-kān Ū-UL ku-it-ki pē-eš-še-y[a-zi]

§12' 9 [EGI]R-an-da-ma nam-ma ta-ma-a-iš L\(^{0}\) SANG[A ŠU.GI]  
10 [Ṣ\(^{\text{p}}\) ]A\(^{\text{pl}}\) LAMMA ku-u-un EZEN-an a-pē-el I-[NA É-ŠU]  
11 [A-Å\(^{\text{pl}}\) LAMMA ur\(^{\text{ur}}\) Ja-at-tu-ši zē-e]-ni]  
12 [ki-i]š-ša-an i-e-ez-zi pa-ra-a-m[a?] aš-ša-an]  
13 [Ū-UL ku-it-ki na-a-i EGIR-pa-m[a?] o o o o o ]  
14 [EGIR-p]a-ya-kān Ū-UL ku-it-k[i pē-eš-še-y[a-zi]

§13' 15 [nu ḫa-me-eš-h]a-\(^{33}\) an\(^{\text{i}}\) ta-aš EZEN.HI.A[ o o o o o o o ]  
16 [ o o o o o ]\(^{\text{pl}}\) LAMMM\(^{\text{pl}}\) A\(^{\text{p}}\) [T-TI] o o o o o o o

§14' 17 [ o o o o o o o ]\(^{\text{i}}\) x [ o o o o o o o o o o ]  

(the tablet breaks off)

30. This unusual complementation for GUNNI (Hittite ḫašša-) is probably for Akkadian KINUNI. Friedrich notes this spelling in this passage in HW 276.

31. After a large gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

32. Written partly over an erasure.

33. Collated.
FRAGMENTS OF FESTIVALS FOR TUTELARY DEITIES

KUB 10.93

Obverse ii (translation cont.)

§9' Next to the hearth [ ... ]

(bottom of tablet)

Reverse iii lost

Reverse iv34 (translation)

§10' But he postpones(?) nothing, nor does he neglect(?) anything.35

§11' Afterwards the old priest of the Tutelary Deity comes and celebrates this festival in this way in his (the Tutelary Deity’s) temple36 in Ḫattuša in the autumn for the Tutelary Deity. But he postpones nothing, nor does he neglect[?] anything.


§13' The festivals of [ ... ] [... the Tutelary Deity of Ḫa[tti ... ].

§14' (Only one trace preserved.)

(the tablet breaks off)

KUB 12.52

Bo 2997 = KUB 12.52 is a small fragment approximately 7.8 cm wide by 7 cm high. There is not enough of it preserved to allow a meaningful translation, but it contains several items of interest. In i 2 we have the verb lipšaizzi; on lipšai-, whose meaning is still uncertain, see CHD for a possible meaning in this passage “break off” or “split open” in context with the fruit in i 1. See also Poetto, AIQN 1 (1979 [1980]) 120–21 with n. 13 and 14 for an additional attestation of lipšai- in a fragment of Hurrian ritual unpublished when the CHD came out.37 Poetto suggests “eat, consume” for this verb, but the evidence is still insufficient to make a definite judgement; Eichner38 suggests “abnutzen” or “abstoßen” for this verb in the same contexts as those used by Poetto. The Tutelary Deity of Tauriša or his priest is mentioned twice in column i and perhaps in ii 2.

In column ii we may note little beyond the description of the priest of the Tutelary Deity [of Tauriša(?)] using a vessel stand (zeriyalli-) as part of the cultic procedure. The

34. After a large gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
35. Goetze, JCS 17 (1963) 100, translates “He does not add anything nor does he leave off anything.” Sommer, HAB 175, translates “er verabsäumt nichts und vernachlässigt nichts.”
36. Or “ ... in his (the priest’s) own house ... ”
37. Poetto’s Bo 2133 is now KUB 55.35.
zeriyalli- is used in both the AN.TAH.ŠUM and KI.LAM Festivals. It is certainly possible that this text fragment is not from a festival for tutelary deities, but rather from one of these two major state festivals. The occurrences of the Tutelary Deity of Tauriša, or his priest, are almost the only distinctive feature of this fragment. That priest occurs elsewhere, most notably in the description of the sixteenth day of the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, for the Tutelary Deity of Tauriša. This is further evidence that this fragment could be a part of that festival.

Column iii does not add much information beyond the fact that once again some of the activities took place at a sacred grove, which is reminiscent of KUB 9.17 §3' (CTH 685.2). The word takkuwa[r] in iii 6' is difficult; it does not admit of ready recognition as a known Hittite word. It could conceivably be the verbal substantive of takk- "to be similar to," although how that would fit in this context is unclear.

Transliteration

Obverse i

§1 1 ḫa-me-]eš-ḥi IN-BA-]AM\l
2 ]li-ip-ša-iz-zi
3 LUSANGA? dLAM\M\]A URU]Ta-ú-ri-ša
4 LUSANGA? dLAM\M\]A URU]Ta-ú-ri-ša
5 -a]z-zi

§2 6 A-[N]\A? É-ŠU pa-a-i
7 ]x [ x 1 kiš-an
8 ) (traces)
   (the tablet breaks off)

Obverse ii39

§3' 1 ka-ru-ú x[ to
2 LUSANGA dLAM[MA URU]Ta-ú-ri-ša?
3 zé-ri-ya-all[-li(-)
4 kat-ta I-NA Š[É\]
5 pé-e-da-an [-zi?]

§4' 6 nu GIM-an ]\[O
7 kat-ta I-NA I[É?]\]
8 na-aš-kán x[ to
9 nu-uš-si x[ to
10 na-aš-k[án
   (the tablet breaks off)

39. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
FRAGMENTS OF FESTIVALS FOR TUTELARY DEITIES

Reverse iii\textsuperscript{40}

\begin{align*}
\S5'x+1 & \text{nu} [ \\
\S6' & 2' \text{GIM-ain} \\
3' & \text{pf-ra-ain} \\
4' & \text{nu A-NA[} \\
5' & \text{GIM-aš [} \\
6' & \text{ták\textsuperscript{41}-ku-wa-a[r} \\
7' & \text{ti-an-zi?\textsuperscript{42} [} \\
8' & \text{nu A-NA L\textsuperscript{43}SANGA x[} \\
9' & \text{GAL-in IS-T[U} \\
10' & \text{L\textsuperscript{43}NAR-ma UR[T]\textsuperscript{43}}
\end{align*}

(bottom of tablet)

Reverse iv

(The preserved portion of column iv is uninscribed.)

\textbf{KUB 20.13}

This text is catalogued by Laroche as \textit{CTH} 685. It is part of the \textit{kurša-} Festival and is treated in \textit{Chapter 4}.

\textbf{IBOT 2.22\textsuperscript{43}}

Bo 4001 = \textit{IBOT} 2.22 is a small piece 7.4 cm wide by 7.6 cm high. Part of its surface is completely broken away, leaving only a small area still inscribed. The portion of a festival which it describes is difficult to follow; without any part of either edge preserved, we can only conjecture how wide the column was originally and thus how the preserved sections relate to one another. The right edge indicated in the transliteration is very tentative, the left somewhat less so.

The only tutelary deity who definitely occurs in the text is the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag (line 3'); the same god probably occurs in line 4'. Some of §2' resembles §§2' and 3' of \textit{KUB} 9.21, \textit{CTH} 684.1, a festival for gods of the river treated in \textit{Chapter 5}. That resemblance is not sufficiently close to identify this fragment with \textit{KUB} 9.21. The L\textsuperscript{43}MUŠEN.DÜ, the augur, although very active in the taking of oracles which were pivotal in Hittite decision making and their relationship with the divine, does not usually participate in religious festivals. The references to animal skins in §2' combined with the

40. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
41. Collated.
42. The \textit{zi} sign was written over an erasure.
43. Lines 4'–8' are treated by Goetze in \textit{Language} 29 (1953) 275–26. His transliteration indicates a paragraph line after line 8' which is not on the tablet.
Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag could indicate that this text had to do with the making of new hunting bags (kurša-) as cult representations.

IBoT 2.22

Transliteration

§1' x+a+1 [ o o ] x x [
2' [ o ] x-zi a-pa-a-ša-a[z
3' [L0 MUŠ]EN?DÜ44 PLAMMA KUS kur-š[a-š

§2' 4' [nu LU]GAL-uš GUB-aš GAL-it DL[AMMA KUS kur-ša-aš e-ku-zì]
6' [e-k]u-zi [L0, MEŠNAR URU]Ka-ni-iš SĪR- RU ...]
7' [1 NIN.DAT]a-ker-mu-un pár-ši-ya na-an x]
8' [A-NA PA-J]Nī DINGIR-LIM da-a-i nu a-ap-pa [a-
9' [ o o o-u]š ša-ra-a da-an-zi x]
11' [ o o o hu?]-[i]-šu KUŠ.UDU KUŠ. MAŠ.GAL []
12' [ o o o o ] x la-aḥ-hur-nu-zì x]
13' [ o o o o o o ] x KASKAL-az [ (the tablet breaks off)

Translation

§1' [ ... ] He x[ ... ] That one (nom.) [ ... the aug]ur(?) [x’s] the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting B[ag].

§2' [The king, seated, [drinks] with a cup the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag. (As part of) tre]ating with offerings in sequence, he [dri]nks the (gods whose offerings have been) done in sequence [(and) the (gods whose offerings are) planned(?)].46 The singers of Kaneš [sing ... ] He breaks [one ḫakarmu- bread and places it x[ ... before the god. Behind, I[a- ... ] They take up the [x]’s. x[ ... ] they bring [before(?) the g]od. The [(some flesh part) ... ] [ra]w(?) [x], a sheepskin, a billy goat skin, [ ... ]x, greenery, x[ ... ]x from the road ...]

44. The augur would be very unusual in a festival text, but see below, CTH685.8: KBo 8.59:6'.
45. Goetze restores [DINGIR.MEŠ-uš] here, and his translation takes irḥanduš as modifying [DINGIR.MEŠ-uš].
46. Goetze, Language 29: 275, following his somewhat different transliteration, translates: “The king ‘drinks’ in a standing position with a cup Inar [of the shield] (and) [the gods] due for treatment.” This translation seems to ignore [irhiwa war.
IBOT 3.18

Bo 1528 = IBOT 3.18 is a very small fragment measuring 4.4 cm wide by 4 cm high. Although there are only a few signs preserved, the late forms of signs such as al, li, and URU indicate that the tablet is New Script.

The text is obviously part of a festival description and resembles KUB 10.29\(^47\) in form, being a kind of formulaic listing of standard offerings to a series of gods given in succession. The [Tutelary Deity of K]araḫna (line 2') and the Tutelary Deity of the City (line 4') receive drink and bread offerings. The Tutelary Deity of Karahna may be mentioned again in line 7'. The fragmentary nature of IBOT 3.18 precludes any attempt at establishing a definite connection with the festivals of Karahna (CTH 681) treated in Chapter 2.

Transliteration

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{§1'}x+1 \quad [ \quad ] x x [ \\
&\text{§2'} 2' \quad [\text{DLAMMA } \text{URU}\text{K}]a-ra-aḫ-na GU[B-aš e-ku-zi} \\
&\text{3'} \quad [\text{pár-si-ya } \text{GIS } \text{DINANNA!GAL } \text{SIR}-\text{RU}] \\
&\text{§3'} 4' \quad [\text{nam-ma } \text{DLAMMA URU-LIM}-ya GUB-aš [e-ku-zi} \\
&\text{5'} \quad [\text{pár-si-ya } \text{GIS } \text{DINANNA!GAL } \text{SIR}-\text{RU}] \\
&\text{§4'} 6' \quad [\text{DUGšar-ši-ya-al-li-aš-ma } \text{UDU x[ } \text{A-NA } \text{DLAMMA}?] \\
&\text{7'} \quad [\text{URUK}a-ra-aḫ-na } \text{pē-eš-kān-zi} \\
&\text{§8'} 8' \quad [ \quad ] (\text{There is just space at the bottom of the tablet for another short line.}) \\
&\text{(bottom of tablet)}
\end{align*}\]

Translation

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{§1'} \quad (\text{Only traces preserved.}) \\
&\text{§2'} \quad [\text{He drinks the Tutelary Deity of K}araḫna, standing. } \text{(A bread type) he breaks. (They play) the large wooden Inanna instrument. } \text{(They sing.)} \\
&\text{§3'} \quad [\text{The} ]\text{n [he drinks] the Tutelary Deity of the City as well, standing. } \text{(A bread type) he breaks. (They play) the large wooden Inanna instrument. They sing[.]} \\
&\text{§4'} \quad \text{In(?) the storage vessels, however, a sheep } x[ \text{ ... } ] \text{[ ... to the Tutelary Deity(?) of } \text{K}araḫna \text{ they give ... ]} \\
&\text{(bottom of tablet)}
\end{align*}\]

47. CTH 685.3, treated above.
**KBO 8.59**

The fragment *KBo* 8.59 is too small and broken to yield a meaningful translation. The **LÖ.MESMUŠEN.DÜ** mentioned in 6' do not usually play a role in the festivals.\(^{48}\) There is in fact little in this text to indicate definitely that it is a festival. The one occurrence of the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag without much preserved context is the only mention of a deity in the text. The imperative *huyanza es* “be running” in 8’ is certainly not expected in a festival. We may say that the text has something to do with the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag, but we cannot on the basis of the preserved context definitely state that this is a festival for that or any other deity. It could be a ritual or a conjuration.

**Transliteration**

\[\text{§1'x+1} \quad [o-]x-la[\]
\[2' \quad \text{ar-}[x][o \ o \ o][a-ra?][-]\]

\[\text{§2' 3'} \quad \text{na-}aš-ta[o \ o \ o] x \text{tu-uk}[-]\]

\[4' \quad \text{LUGAL-i-ya-kán [SAL].LUGAL-ri x[}\]

\[5' \quad \text{nu-}uš-\text{ma-}aš-kán ZI-an-za an-č[a}\]

\[6' \quad \text{A-NA LÖ.MESMUŠEN.DÜ-ya-kán z[i-}\]

\[\text{§3' 7'} \quad [nu] \quad \text{LUGAL-i SAL.LUGAL-ri A-NA x[}\]

\[8' \quad [ḥ]u?-ya-an-za e-eš nu KUR.KUR.Ḫ.LA[\]

\[9' \quad [LUG]AL-ša SAL.LUGAL-wa-ša tu-x[\]

\[10' \quad [nu] \quad \text{PLAMMA }\text{куš} \text{kur-ša-aš u-x[}\]

\[\text{§4' 11'} \quad \text{(traces only)}\]

\[\text{(the tablet breaks off)}\]

**KBO 21.89+KBO 8.97**

This text, with duplicate *IBoT* 2.69, is catalogued by Laroche as *CTH* 685. It is part of the *kurša-* Festival and is treated in *Chapter 4.*

\(^{48}\) *IBoT* 2.22:3’ (*CTH* 685.6) may be another example of the augur participating in festival proceedings.
KUB 44.24

Bo 235 = KUB 44.24 is a fragment broken and abraded in such a way that no complete sentences are preserved. There is not enough material to posit even a tentative dating of the script of this piece. The tablet contains tantalizing references to the É.DU₁₀.Ū.S.SA, "cultic washing house," and the giškalmu - "lituus"; the ceremony was a somewhat unusual one, making it all the more unfortunate that it is so poorly preserved. The best preserved portion of the tablet is the colophon. Even there the portion that would describe the ceremony's distinctive features is broken away. The priest of a tutelary deity is mentioned in i 9' in very broken context; we cannot tell which tutelary deity this was. The colophon indicates that some or all of the cult proceedings took place in the temple of a tutelary deity. That this was a major cult ceremony is indicated by the fact that after one six-column tablet the description of the festival was not completed. Obverse i resembles portions of the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival, and this text could belong to CTH 617, the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival for the Tutelary Deity of Tauriša.

Transliteration

Obverse i

§1' x+1 [nu? LUGAL-uš lE-TU] É.DU₁₀.Ū.S.SA ú[-iz-zi
2' [ o o o o DUMU]lE.GAL lgiškal-mu-uš [ 
3' [2 DUMU.MEŠ É.GAL] lME-ŠE-DI[
4' [ o o pí-ra-a]n ñu-u-i-ya-an-z[f]

§2' 5' [ o o ] x É? [ x x ]
7' [ x A-NA LÚ.MES[ pf-ra-an]
8' [hu-u]-i-ya-an- [zi

§3' 9' [1OSAN]GA [PLAMMA [ 
10' [lME-MES]SANGA[ 
11' [ x URUP][ 
12' [ x ] x 
13' [ o o ] ĤI.A[l 
14' [ o ] x x ]

(the tablet breaks off)

Reverse vi

§4' (No signs preserved.)

49. This first paragraph is restored from the similar festival description IBoT 1.3:8-11 (AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival).
50. After a large gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
KUB 44.24

Reverse vi (cont.)

§5'x+1  [ o o o o o ] 7 SUM !HΛA

§6' 2'  [ o o o ]x LAL 2 UDU A-N[ A 51
3'  [ o o o ]x-la-aš ši-pa[-an-ti?

Colophon

4'  DUB 1 KAM Û-UL [QA-ÒT]
5'  ma-a-an LUGAL-uš [  
6'  Í-NA É ²LÁMM[A
7'  iš-tar-ni-ya-aš [EGIR-an tar-nu-um-ma-aš]
8'  A-NA GIŠ.HUR-ká[n ḥa-an-da-a-an]
9'  KASKAL mPl-ḥa-U[R.MAḤ DUB.SAR.GIŠ
10'  mPal-lu-wa-[r]a(-)LÚ [DUB.SAR
11'  mHu-ul-la LÚ[
(smaller script)
12'  ŠU mHE-eš-ni[
13'  mNa-ni-y[a 52

KUB 51.40

Bo 1229 = KUB 51.40 is a fragment approximately 14 cm wide by 8.1 cm high, with a great deal of surface abrasion which obscures many of the signs. Although the paucity of signs makes dating the script tentative, the absence of any slant on the tops of the verticals, the even height of the verticals in the a, e, and ya signs, and the subscript za in the az sign all point to a very likely New Script date.

A coherent translation is not possible because of the broken nature of the text. This is a festival text that includes drink and bread offerings, some of which are for deified mountains. The first word of obverse iii 6’ is read as a mountain name on the basis of the similar name HUR.SAG Hu-wa-ah-ḫar-ma in KUB 1.15 obv. iii 5 (Festival of the Month) and HUR.SAG Hu-u-wa-ḫa[r]-ma in its duplicate KUB 40.104 obv. iii 6’.

The reverse of the tablet yields even less preserved context. Line 8’ indicates that part of the ceremonies took place at a ḫuwašši- stela. In line 10’ occur the ḫazgara- women, who

51. Or 2! x[.
52. This colophon is transliterated by Mascheroni, Hethitica 5 (1983) 97, with a discussion of it and similar colophons on pp. 98–104. Restorations are from Mascheroni’s transliteration. See further comments on this relatively common type of colophon by del Monte, OA 22 (1983) 320–21 (review of Hethitica 5), and Singer, StBoT27 (1983) 40–42. Güterbock, JNES 26 (1967) 79 n. 7, and private communication, suggests that the phrase EGIR-an tarnummaš most probably refers to an excerpt tablet.
also occur in much fuller context meeting the god’s image or the king in Ḫaḫiša in *KUB* 9.17:21'-22'.

*KUB* 51.40

Transliteration

Obverse iii

\[
\begin{align*}
§1^{'x+1} & \text{[x [ } \\
2^{'} & \text{[ (traces only) [ } \\
3^{'} & \text{-}a? \text{ (traces)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
§2^{'4^{'}} & \text{GUB/TU[JŠ-aš 1-ŠU a-ku-wa-an-zi} \\
5^{'} & \text{[x} \\
6^{'} & \text{[u-uh-ḫar-ma-an GUB-aš} \\
7^{'} & \text{[a-ku-wa-an-zi ...] x 1 NINDA.KUR₄.RA pár-ši-ya}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
§3^{'8^{'}} & \text{[x-}lzi1 \text{ nu [uR.SAG]Da-a-ḫa-an} \\
9^{'} & \text{[uR.SA]Da-a-ḫa GUB-aš} \\
10^{'} & \text{a-}k[\text{u-wa-an-zi} \\
11^{'} & \text{a-}k[\text{u-wa?-a}n-zi} \\
12^{'} & \text{P[A-N]DINGIR-LIM ti-ya-zi}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
§4^{'13^{'}} & \text{[x PA LAMMA-an TUŠ-aš} \\
14^{'} & \text{[a-ku-wa-an-zi ... NINDA.}KUR₄.RA pár-ši-ya} \\
15^{'} & \text{[TUŠ-aš 1-ŠU a-ku-wa-an-zi]} \\
16^{'} & \text{[E]GIR-ŠU[.I]ma x(-)1 ḫa-an-x[} \\
17^{'} & \text{[ (traces) [} \\
18^{'} & \text{[ (traces) [}
\end{align*}
\]

(The tablet breaks off)

Reverse iv

\[
\begin{align*}
§5^{'x+1} & \text{[x [ } \\
2^{'} & \text{[ x [ } \\
3^{'} & \text{-}zji \text{ [ } \\
4^{'} & \text{[x PA ZĪD.DA [È][[A] \\
5^{'} & \text{[DUG]KA.DÜ.A [ [Ø ]} \\
6^{'} & \text{-}ji55 \\
7^{'} & \text{a-}k[ju-wa-an-zi}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
§6^{'8^{'}} & \text{[x N[Ar]u-u-wa-ši?]!}
\end{align*}
\]

53. *CTH* 685.2, treated above.

54. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.

55. There is an erased -pát after ši.
KUB 51.40

Reverse iv (cont.)

9'
10' [SAL]ha-az-ga-ra-i-kán
11' -i]z-zi
12' -š]a-an-zi
13' ]x GEŠPŬ-Št
14' ]x-ya-an-zi
15' ] x x x [ (the tablet breaks off)

KUB 53.11

Bo 2309 = KUB 53.11 is a fairly large fragment measuring 13 cm wide by 13.7 cm high. Its script shows consistent use of older sign forms and is, I believe, an Old Script tablet.

The festival described in this fragment involves a variety of different types of offerings. In §§1'–7' there is not enough preserved to know exactly what is happening beyond the fact that bread and drink offerings are being given. In §8', after a break of several paragraphs, the ceremony has moved on to animal sacrifice and very specific flesh offerings. The following paragraphs, §§9'–10', prescribe bread and meal offerings, §11' again describes flesh offerings, and in §§12'–13' drink offerings are performed with tawal and with beer. Thus in this one fragment of festival are detailed a rather diverse range of offerings, with every major type of offering represented.

To what deities were these various offerings given? Again in §§1'–7' we can make little sense of the preserved portion, although in i 7' the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatti may be receiving offerings, and in i 12' the Marassanda river has been restored as the recipient of a drink offering. In §8' the flesh offerings are described without specifying for what deity they were being prepared. The next four paragraphs, §§9'–12', however, all specify offerings to the holy places of the temple, offerings of bread, meal, flesh, and drink. In each case Kappariyamu is included in the list of the holy places, and these four paragraphs of KUB 53.11 are the only example in the published corpus of this deity occurring in such a list. In ii 9'–10', her first occurrence in the text, this goddess receives her offering "on the pegs." This is reminiscent of the pegs in KUB 55.43 i 10, the kurša-Festival, where the pegs are driven in below the "place of the god" to hold the old kurša-s until they are sent out to the provinces. In that same text Kappariyamu appears in ii 17 and

56. Akkadian umašu.
57. Lines ii 9'–15' are transliterated and translated by Neu, StBoT 12 (1970) 71. Lines ii 29'–iii 5 are transliterated and briefly commented on (as Bo 2309) by Ehelolf, ZA 43 = NF 9 (1936) 183–84.
58. On this deity see Chapter 1 and Appendix B sub kipikišdu.
59. Treated in Chapter 4.
iv 16', both times in a group with the Tutelary Deity of Tatašuna and the Tutelary Deity of Tašhapuna, the three of whom are kipi̱ikiš̱duš to some other deity and who receive offerings together as a group. 60 KUB 53.11 ii 9'-10' does not specify what the pegs have to do with Kappariyamu. However, we know from the kurša- Festival 61 that pegs are associated with the place where the kurša-s are normally hung, that the kurša- very frequently appears in the list of holy places such as we have in KUB 53.11 §§9'-12', and that Kappariyamu nowhere else occurs in the list of holy places which receive offerings. In view of the consistent writing of the name Kappariyamu where one would normally expect the kurša- in all the paragraphs describing offerings to the holy places, and the fact that Kappariyamu receives her offerings at least once “on the pegs,” it seems that we have here an otherwise unattested use of Kappariyamu as a name for the kurša-, or perhaps more accurately an occurrence of the specific kurša- symbol of Kappariyamu included in the enumeration of the holy places. This particular use of a specific kurša- image may be seen in the fairly common use of Zitḥariya's kurša- in the offerings to the holy places. 62 Popko has briefly noted this unusual occurrence of Kappariyamu: “In ... Kol. II 29ff. ... steht der Name Ḫapparijamu statt Ḫkurši (Sg. Dat.) in der Aufzählung der ‘heiligen Stätten.” 63

After these offerings to the holy places there follow in §13' offerings to a group of gods, not necessarily tutelary deities, although the Tutelary Deity and Ḫapantali(ya) are included in the list. These offerings to deities are accompanied by music. Although the holy places received a series of offerings, including bread, meal, flesh, and drink, this group of gods in §13' receives only a drink offering at this point in the ceremony. This is performed by the mayor of the city and accompanied by cult music.

After this offering, the celebrants seat themselves for a cultic meal that includes several kinds of bread, marnuan, and beer. The conclusion of this refreshment is a drink offering by the mayor and another celebrant (lost in the break) for a deity whose name is lost in the break and Telipinu, and a bread offering by the priest of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti(?). The offerings are again accompanied by music.

The last two readable paragraphs, §§15'–16', are the only ones in the text that show the repetition typical of festival texts. The two paragraphs seem to be identical except for the gods who receive the offerings in each case. Paragraphs 14'–16' are important for our understanding of the duties of the priest of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti. In each case, although this priest is the one who places the bread offering, it is not the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti or indeed any tutelary deity who receives the offering. The one possible exception to this could be iii 18, in which the name of the deity is broken away, but there is no evidence to suggest that it was a tutelary deity who occurred in conjunction with Telipinu. Although the priest of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti plays a prominent role in the festival, the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti, if he occurs at all, is only one of many deities worshipped in the festival.

60. See Appendix B, commentary on kipi̱ikiš̱duš.
61. KUB 55.43 §2.
62. See discussion of this in Chapter 1 sub Zitḥariya.
63. Popko, Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 22 (1974) 310 n. 6. In 1978 (Kultobjekte 112 with n. 77) he again notes that Kappariyamu in this text is worshipped in the form of a kurša-.
APPENDIX A

KUB 53.11

Transliteration

Obverse i

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§1'x+1</th>
<th>] x x x x x x [</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§2' 2'</td>
<td>NINIDA!? KU? ŠA 1 UP-NI BA.BA.ZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
<td>NINDA L]A-AB-KU 30-li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4'</td>
<td>a-ku-w]a-an-na-ma 1 DUG KAŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>-e]l ME-EL-QI-TIM-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6'</td>
<td>] x [LPSANGA PLAMMA URU HA-AT-TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7'</td>
<td>PLAM]MA URU HA-AT-TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8'</td>
<td>URU HA-A]T-TI-YA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a'</td>
<td>(space on tablet for one more line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§3' 9'</td>
<td>] pī-an-zi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10'</td>
<td>] e-ku-zi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§4' 11'</td>
<td>T]UŠ-aš e-ku-zi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§5' 12'</td>
<td>[o]Ma-ra-aš-ša?]a]n-ta GUB-aš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13'</td>
<td>[e-ku-zi ... NINDA.KUR4.RA? N]U.GĀL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§6' 14'</td>
<td>]x-tu-ya-an-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15'</td>
<td>]x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§7' 16'</td>
<td>]x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17'</td>
<td>]x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18'</td>
<td>(the tablet breaks off)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obverse ii

| §8'x+1 | [ o o o ](-)riš-šar x[ o o o o ] x x x [ |
| 2' | [ o ]-x-kán-zi nu-kán ḫ[u-i-šu? uz]Šu-up-pa uzU |
| 3' | uzUZAG.UDU.ḪI.A SAG.DU.ḪI.A[ o o ]KUŠ.UDU.ḪI.A da-a[š-kán-zi? |
| 4' | na-at iš-ta-na-a-ni pī-ra-an kat-ta da-x[66 |
| 5' | uzUNĪG.GIG.ḪI.A-ma uzUŠÂ.ḪI.A ḫa-ap-pi-ni-it za-nu[-an-zi] |
| 6' | ma-a-an uzUNĪG.GIG.ḪI.A zé-e-a-ri [Ø] |

64. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
65. The tablet shows a word space, but no Hittite words begin with r.
66. The trace does not fit da-a[-i or da-a[š-kán-zi.
FRAGMENTS OF FESTIVALS FOR TUTELARY DEITIES

Translation

KUB 53.11 Obverse i

§1' (Only traces preserved).

§2' [ ... ] sweet [bre]ad(?) of one handful, groats [ ... ] moist bread of 30,67 [ ... ] But one vessel of beer for [drin]king [ ... e]l. The offering materials, however [ ... ] the priest of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti [... the Tutelary] Deity of Ḫatti [... x-ti-ya].

§3' [ ... ] they give. [ ... DN] he drinks.

§4' [ ... ] drinks [DN], seated.

§5' [The x drinks the Maraḫša]nda river(?), standing. [... ] There is no [thick bread(?)].

§§6'-7' (Only traces.)

(the tablet breaks off)

Obverse ii68

§8' (First line not capable of interpretation.) They [... ] They t[ake(?)] r[aw(?)] flesh, [(a flesh part)], the shoulders, the heads, [x], (and) the sheepskins. [They] x[ ... ]69 them down in front of the altar. The livers and hearts, however, [they] cook with flame. When the livers are cooked,

67. Presumably 30 units of some weight or volume which was not deemed necessary to be included here.
68. After a gap of an undetermined number of paragraphs.
69. One expects “he places” or “they place,” but the traces do not allow such a reading.
KUB 53.11

Obverse ii (transliteration cont.)

§9' 7' nu LO SANGA DLAMMA URU  ḤA-AT-TI 3 NINDA LA-AB-KU 30-1[i]
8' pár-ši-ya na-aš-ša-an iš-ta-na-a-ni PA-NI DINGIR-LIM [da-a-i]
9' 1 NINDA LA-AB-KU ma pár-ši-ya na-an-ša-an D Kap-p[a-ri-ya-mu-i]
10' GIS KAK ḤI.A aš da-a-i 1 NINDA LA-AB-KU pár-ši-ya nu-uš-š[a-an]
11' ḥa-aš-ši-i iš-tar-na pé-e-di da-a-i [t[a-1a][u-z]0]
12' pár-ši-ya nu 1 pár-šu-ul-li GIS_hal-ma-asīšu-it-ti [Ø]
13' 1 pár-šu-ul-li-ma GIS lu-ut-ti-ya 1 NINDA LA-AB-[KU]
14' pár-ši-ya nu ta-ra-u-ur GIS[ha gambling line]
15' da-a-i ta-ra-u-ur-ma ḥa-aš-ši-i ta-pu-uš-za da-a-i

§10' 16' na-aš a-ap-pa ti-e-e-z zi nu-kán GIS er-ḫu-ya-az?1
17' me-ma-al ḥa-aš-šu-un-ga-a-iz-zi nu-uš-ša-an iš-ta-na-a-ñi
18' 3 SU ū-uh-ḫa-a-i D Kap-pa-ri-ya-mu-di 1 SU GIS
19' ḥa-aš-ši-i iš-tar-na pé-e-di 1 SU GIS_hal-ma-aš-šu-it-ti
20' 1 SU GIS[u-uti-ya 1 SU GIS[ha at-ta lu wa-aš GIS-ru-i
21' 1 SU nam-ma ḥa-aš-ši-i ta-pu-uš-za 1 SU ū-uh-ḫa-a-i

§11' 22' nu-uš-ša-an SA GUD UDU ḤI.A-ya UZU GIS ḤI.A UZU GIS ḤI.A
23' iš-ta-na-a-ni A-NA NINDA KUR₆ RA ḤI.A še-er PA-NI DINGIR LIM da-a-i
24' 1 GIS ḤI.A ar-ḫa kur!?-aš-ki-[z-z]i GIS
25' nu-uš-ša-an D Kap-pa-ri-ya-mu-i da-a-i ḥ[a-aš-š]-i-[i]
26' iš-tar-na pé-e-di da-a-i GIS_hal-ma-aš-šu-it-ti [Ø]
27' GIS[ha at-ta lu wa-aš GIS-ru-i nam-ma ḥa-aš-ši-i [Ø]
28' ta-pu-uš-za da-a-
29' i [Ø]

§12' 29' nu-za LO SANGA DLAMMA URU  ḤA-AT-TI 1 DUG KU-KU-UB ta-a-u-w[a-la-aš]71
30' da-a-i nu iš-ta-na-a-ni pf-ra-an 3 SU ši-[pa-an-ii GIS
31' D Kap-pa-ri-ya-mu 1 SU ḥa-aš-ši-i iš-tar-na pe-[e-di]72
32' 1 SU GIS_hal-ma-aš-šu-it-ti 1 SU GIS lu-ut-ti-ya 1 [-SU GIS]

(bottom of tablet)

70. Neu, StBoT 12 (1970) 71, reads ta-ra-ų-[ur].
71. Ehelolf, ZA 43 = NF 9 (1936) 183, reads ta-a-u-w[a-aš]. My restoration is based on line iii 2 of the text.
72. Ehelolf, ZA 43 = NF 9: 183, reads p[í-di].
KUB 53.11

Obverse ii (translation cont.)

§9' the priest of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti breaks three moist breads of 30. [He places] them on the altar before the god. One moist bread, however, he breaks and places [for] Kapp[ariyamu] on the pegs. He breaks one moist bread and places (it) in the middle place of the hearth. He breaks (one) measuring vessel\textsuperscript{74} of \(x\), one morsel for the throne and one morsel for the window. He breaks one moist bread. He sets out a measuring vessel for the wood of the door bolt. And a measuring vessel he sets out next to the hearth.

\textsuperscript{73} Neu, \textit{StBoT} 12: 71, translates “(der) Gottheit K.\textsuperscript{15} [ ] zu den Pflöcken,” with footnote 15 reading “Vielleicht \(^\text{P}Kappariyamu\).”

\textsuperscript{74} See Riemschneider, \textit{FsGüterbock} 276 with n. 61, and Neu, \textit{StBoT} 12 (1970) 70–73, on \textit{tara\textsuperscript{r}} as “measuring vessel.”

§10' He steps back. He cleans/sifts(?) the meal by means of a basket\textsuperscript{75} and scatters (it) three times on the altar. He scatters (it) once to Kappariyamu, once to the middle place of the hearth, once to the throne, once to the [w]indow, once to the wood of the door bolt, and, further, once next to the hearth.

\textsuperscript{75} That is, uses a basket as a sieve?

§11' He places the livers and hearts of the cattle and sheep on the altar, on top of the thick breads, before the god. One liver and one heart, however, he cuts up. He sets out (the pieces) for Kappariyamu, (and) he sets (them) out for the middle place of the hearth, (and) he sets (them) out for the throne, the wood of the door bolt, and, further, next to the hearth.

§12' The priest of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti takes one jug of \textit{taw[al]}. He lib[ates] three times before the altar, and once (to) Kappariyamu, once to the middle pl[ace] of the hearth, once to the throne, o[nce] to the window,

(bottom of tablet)

\textsuperscript{76} See \textit{CHD} sub \textit{memal} a4 'b' for treatment of this passage.
KUB 53.11 Reverse iii (transliteration)

§12' l
GlSha-at-tal-wa-as GIS-i 1-5C7 nam-ma ha-as-s[i-i ... D/£a-aMtafl-x^-na-anDU KI.LAM DWaa-a-se-ez-za-al-li-in e-ku-zi GlS DINANNA.GAL SIR-RU.

§13^78
6 [n]u A-NA L^ HA-ZA-AN-N[ ... 78. Paragraph 13' is restored from the very similar list in a festival fragment, KUB 41.50 iii 6'-12', noted by Otten, RLA 5 (1976-80) 390. In KUB 41.50 the celebrant who performs the drink offerings is called the EN VRV ffA-AT-TI, "the lord of Hattusa."

§14' 13 [n]a-at-za wa-ga-a-an-na e-ša-an-ta-r[i o o o o ]
14 [x^3 NIN]DA a-a-an SA ^ SA-A-TI 3 NINDA.KU x[ o o o o ]
15 5 NINDA LA-AB-KU 30-li 5 NINDA ZÍD.DA.ŠE [1? DUGhu-u-up-p]ár KAŠ
16 [x^1^4 DUG]hu-u-up-pár mar-nu-an ḫ-TU ḫ x[ o ú-da-an-zii?]
17 nu-za a-da-an-zi nu A-NA L^ HA-ZA-AN-N[I o o o o o ]
18 a-ku-an-na tâk-ša-an pf-ani-zu nu [G][IŠ D]INANNA.GAL SIR-RU
19 DTe-li-pf-nu-un-na TUŠ-aš a-ku-an-z[i o o o o o ]
21 [PA-N]I DINGIR-LIM da-a-i GIŠ D]INANNA.GAL SIR-RU

23 [GIŠ D]INANNA.GAL SIR-RU 1 NINDA-ta-kar-m[u-un pár-ši-ya]
25 [PA-N]I DINGIR-LIM da-a-i [...] [Ø]

77. Ehelolf, ZA 43 = NF 9: 183, reads ḫa-aš-s[i-i iš-tar-na pi-di]. This is unlikely to be the correct restoration because this phrase has already occurred in this listing of the holy places, in ii 31'. Because the beginning of column iii is an immediate continuation of the list at the end of column ii, we must restore the element of this standardized list which has not yet occurred and which is normally (in this text) the last item in the list.

78. Paragraph 13' is restored from the very similar list in a festival fragment, KUB 41.50 iii 6'-12', noted by Ouen, RLA 5 (1976-80) 390. In KUB 41.50 the celebrant who performs the drink offerings is called the EN URU ḫA-AT-TI, "the lord of ḫattuša."

79. KUB 41.50 iii 8': ... D]UTU D]UTU URUTÜL-na DU DU URU Zi-l ip-la-l[a[n-da].
80. KUB 41.50 iii 9': D]LMAMM ḫa-pa-an-da-li D]AG-in ...
81. KUB 41.50 iii 10': D]LMAMM URU Ė-TIM Kân-di-wu-it-ti-en.
82. KUB 41.50 iii 11'-12': D Ka-at-tar-an^-1 na-un DU KILAM D Wl a-a-š-e-cz-za-al-li-in e-ku-zii GIŠ D]INANNA.GAL SIR-RU.

83. A number.
84. A number.
§12' once to the wood of the door bolt, (and), further, once [next to the h]earth he libates. [He puts dow]n the jug of tawal. He takes a jug of beer. [As] he offered in sequence with the tawal, so he also offe[rs in sequence] with beer in the same way. He puts down the jug of beer.

§13' They give to the mayor to drink. [The mayor] treats these gods with offerings in sequence: [He drinks] Ḫalki, [Telipinu], the Sungod, the Sungoddess of Arinna, the Stormgod, the Stormgod of [Ziplanda], the Tutelary Deity, Ḫapantaliya, the deified throne, ZA.BA₄.BA₄, GAL.ZU, the Stormgod of the House, K[antipuitti], Kattarmana, the Stormgod of the Gatehouse, (and) Wa[šezzil]. (They play) the large INANNA instrument. They sing.

§14' They sit down for some refreshment.⁸⁵ [(a number)] warmed breads of ½ SUTU each, three sweet breads, x[ ... ], five moist breads of 30, five breads of barley flour, [one(?) bow]wl of beer, x₁ bowls of marnuan from the house of x[... they bring(?)]. They eat. They give to the mayor [and the x] to drink together. They drink the god [x] and Telipinu, seated. [ ... ] he breaks. The priest of the Tutelary Deity of [Ḫatti(?)] places it [before the god]. (They play) the lar[ge] INANNA instrument. [They sing.]

§15' [Aft]erwards, however, [they drink] the Sungod (and) the Sungoddess of Ar[inna]. (They play) the large [IN]ANNA instrument. They sing. [He breaks] one takarn[u-] bread. The priest of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti places [it before the god].

⁸⁵. Literally “They sit down to bite.” On the use of the infinitive of wak- as “for refreshment, for a snack,” see Friedrich, ArOr 6 (1934) 375.

⁸⁶. In this break is either the title of an official whose estate provided materials for the festival, or the name of a god, whose temple (house) provided the offering materials.
KUB 53.11

Reverse iii (transliteration cont.)

§16' 26 [EGIR-an-da] DIM DIM URU Zi-ip-[a-la-an-da a-ku-an-zí]
27 [GIŠ PINANNA.GAL SÍR-R] U1 NINDATA-[kar-mu-ú[n pár-ši-ya]
28 [na-an-ša-an LD SANGA] DIM LamMA URU HA-AT-TÍ [PA-NI DIN GIR-LIM]
29 [da-a- ] [ i ]

§17' 30 [ o o o o o o o ] TIT TD [ o o o o o o o o o o ]
31 [ o o GIŠ PINANNA.GAL SÍR-RU [ o o o o o o o o o o ]
32 [ o o o o o o o ] LamMA [A o o o o o o o o o ]

(the tablet breaks off)

Reverse iii (translation cont.)

§16' [Afterwards they drink] the Stormgod (and) the Stormgod of Zipp[alanda]. (They play) the large INANNA instrument. They sing. [He breaks] one takarmu- bread. [The priest] of the Tutelary Deity of Ḫatti [places it before the god].

§17' (Another round of offerings and cult music too broken to translate.)

Reverse iv not preserved
APPENDIX B
PHILOLOGICAL COMMENTARY
HITTITE

ḥantiyašša-

*KUB* 2.1 ii 47 (Chapter 3); *KUB* 9.21:4', 10'; *ABoT* 3:3' (Chapter 5). Friedrich, *HW* 1. Erg. 4, gives the definition “männlich(?)” for this word, citing *KUB* 2.1 ii 47 and *KUB* 9.21:4'. He understands the form ḫantiyaššaš in *KUB* 9.21:4' as plural accusative(?) common gender. He derives the meaning for this word from what he tentatively calls a parallel to *KUB* 9.21:4', *KUB* 20.48 vi 13 (spring festival on Mt. Tapala), where the form is DINGIR.LU.MEŠ. His final comment on the situation is “alles sehr unklar!” The meaning of this word is indeed unclear, and in my opinion the *KUB* 20.48 passage is not sufficiently close to *KUB* 9.21 to provide a meaning for the word. The meaning “masculine” was difficult even when the only two texts in which ḫantiyašša- occurred were *KUB* 9.21 (with duplicate) and *KUB* 2.1 ii 47, where its meaning is also obscure. In the *KUB* 9.21 passage, although the text elsewhere consistently uses forms in -uš for accusative plural, the form of the word is ḫantiyaššaš. It therefore does not look like an adjective in the accusative plural as Friedrich parsed it but rather a noun in the genitive in the phrase [DINGIR.MEŠ ḫantiyaššaš “gods of the ḫantiyašša-.”] In the *KUB* 2.1 passage the form ḫanteyyaššaššiš is the Luwian genitival adjective modifying ḫLAMMA. In neither text does the context provide conclusive evidence for a meaning for ḫantiyašša-.

Since Friedrich’s dictionary was published, two more examples of ḫantiyašša- have come to light, both in *KBo* 20.107+*KBo* 23.50 (Ritual for the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag). Obverse ii 9–13 read: kāša ḫLAMMA ḫuṣkuršan arahzenaš KUR.KUR.MEŠ-az ḫūmandaz [H]JUR.SAG.MEŠ-az ḫāriyaz ÏD.MEŠ-az ḫa[n]tiyaššaš TUL.MEŠ-az welluważ [talli]škiwen mukiškiwen “We have implored (and) petitioned the Tutelary Deity of the

1. Archi, SMEA 16 (1975) 96, translates ḫantiyaššaššiš as “del particolare” without citing his reasons.
Hunting Bag from all the neighboring lands, from the mountains, the valleys, the rivers, the hantiyašša-s, the springs (and) the meadows." The same list is repeated in iii 26'-28'. The hantiyašša- is part of a list of locations from which the Hittites are petitioning the god to return. In these passages it could be a noun, or an adjective modifying either ID.MEŠ or TUL.MEŠ. If it is an adjective, the meaning "masculine" does not seem likely to modify rivers or springs. Neu notes this in his review of Tischler’s glossary.2 He also indicates there that the use of hantiyašša- in KUB 9.21 may denote a “landschaftliche Region.” In the KBo 20.107+KBo 23.50 passages hantiyašša- almost certainly is a noun denoting another topographical term, another place from which the Hittites called and petitioned the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag. The one topographical term which occurs to me as missing from this list is “lake” or “pond,” for which there is no known Hittite word.3 The idea that hantiyašša- is not an adjective but a topographical term, perhaps “lake, pond,” fits well in the KUB 9.21 passages and provides a parallel structure with the “gods of the river” in both passages there. In KUB 2.1 ii 47 the context does not provide conclusive evidence for or against this idea.

ha/urn(uw)ai-

KBo 13.179:10', dupl. KBo 22.168:6' (Chapter 4). This verb is attested as ha/urn(uw)ai-, ha/urniya-, and harnai-. See Friedrich, HW 76 and 2. Erg. 13, on the latter two stems and Neu, StBoT 26 (1983) 55 n. 261, for evidence that one should read the last of the stems listed as harnai- and not ħurnai- as HW 76 cites it. There are no examples as yet of either of the first two stems spelled with anything but an initial ħar/hur sign. Their vocalization thus remains uncertain, but all three stems seem to convey the same meaning. They are treated here as one verb.

The verb ha/urnuwai- occurs quite rarely and almost exclusively in ritual or festival contexts. Although it occurs once as a participle in a passive construction with GIS.taršes as the subject4 and possibly once with nakkusši- as its object,5 it usually takes as its object some kind of building. The one passage outside of rituals or festivals in which ha/urnuwai- occurs is: INA É.LU.NINDA.DU.DU ma-aš-kan kuedaš andan eššanzi n-at-kan šanhan harnuwan ešdu “Let the bakery in which they make them (breads) be swept and sprinkled.” In the rituals and festivals there are several examples of E.DINGIR-LIM as the object of ha/urnuwai-, one of ḤE-TIM as object, and our passage, ŠA E.GAL-LIM Ė.MEŠ as the object. It occurs with šanḥ- “sweep” in some of the other examples; it was the practice as a prelude to performing certain cultic procedures to sweep and sprinkle the room. In our passage the sweeping and sprinkling cleanses the room after the goat is washed and before

3. Hoffner, EHG1, does not list any Hittite, Akkadian, or Sumerian words for “lake” or “pond.”
it is (ritually?) killed. It makes sense that the Hittites would want to clean the room before cutting up meat. Sweeping and sprinkling the room in this case was done probably both for reasons of cultic purity and also for the very practical reason of cleansing a room in which an animal had been washed before killing and perhaps butchering it. The cleansing of a room could be a kind of final cleanup as the last cultic activity of the day, for example in KBo 24.45 obv. 22', in which after the prescription for sprinkling the temple the paragraph ends with UD 1 KAM QATI "First day, finished."

\( \text{hiššala-} \)

KUB 55.43 ii 30, iv 34'; KBo 21.89 ii [10'] (Chapter 4); KUB 9.21:[11'] and IBoT 2.19:6' (Chapter 5). Goetze, Language 29 (1953) 273 with n. 78, cites KBo 4.14 iii 13–16 (Tudḫ. IV treaty)\(^7\) and KUB 31.136 rev. 3 (frag. of a prayer to the god of Nerik) as evidence for a meaning "to block" for \( \text{hiššalla-} \), while in IBoT 2.19:6' and KUB 9.21:10'–11' he translates \( \text{irhanduš heššallanduš} \) as "included and excluded." Friedrich, AfO 17 (1954–56) 99, rejects Goetze's translation and offers a different interpretation of KUB 31.136 rev. 3, demonstrating that this is not an example of \( \text{hiššalla-} \). Goetze reads \( \text{tu-uk hé-e-ša-la??-t[i?-iš]} \), taking the broken word as a participle of \( \text{hiššalla-} \), while Friedrich reads \( \text{tu-uk hé-e-ša-te-e[š]} \), understanding it as a participle (for \( \text{hešanteš} \) of \( \text{haš-} \) "to open." The copy supports Friedrich's reading. As additional evidence that the word in KUB 31.136 rev. 3 is not the verb \( \text{hiššalla-} \) Friedrich notes that \( \text{hiššalla-} \) is always written with initial \( \text{hi} \) and doubled \( \text{s}. \)\(^8\) Laroche, DLL (1959) 45, simply cites the occurrence in KBo 4.14 iii 15 without positing a meaning. Otten, in a review of KUB 46 in ZA 66 (1976) 299, notes the other occurrences KUB 2.8 v 29', KUB 43.56 ii 21', Bo 2646 (now KUB 56.57) ii 21', and Bo 4086 (now IBoT 4.337:5'). He reads \( \text{m[hiššalduš} \) in KUB 46.18 obv. 17', but there is no compelling reason to restore a DINGIR determinative; it may be \( \text{hi-ša-la-an-du-uš} \). As Otten notes, Jakob-Rost's restoration \( \text{[P]}\text{jiššalandu-} \) in the KUB 46 Inhaltsübersicht and index of divine names is less likely than reading \( \text{hiššala-} \) here. In all of its occurrences except KBo 4.14 iii 15,\(^9\) \( \text{hiššalla-} \) occurs as a participle in a ritual or festival context, and with the same one exception, it always (where preserved) follows a participle of irhaïi.\(^10\) The KBo 4.14 passage is thus unique in several ways in that only here does \( \text{hiššalla-} \) occur a) in a non-cultic context, b) in a non-participial form, c)

7. See Singer, ZA 75 (1985) 100–23, on redating this text to Tudḫaliya IV from Šuppiluliuma II as Laroche has it in CTH.

8. The first of these two points must now be amended; in IBoT 4.337:5' it is written \( \text{[h]}\text{e-ša-al-la-an-te}-eš. \)

9. Lines iii 13–15 of this treaty read: \( \text{[ma-a-an-įa} \) LUGAL-\( i \) kuiki nakkieszi naššu LUGAL GIG-zi [našma]-kan KUR.KUR niiyar našma-kan \( 11' \) KUR ŠA KUR.KUR uizzi [nu QA] TAMMA :hi-ša-al-la QATAMMA-\( t \):\text{naḥhuwayadu} "If something becomes troublesome for the king: either the king falls ill, or lands defect, or the enemy invades the lands, in the same way plan(?), in the same way let there be concern to you!" Translation of the passage is adapted from the CHD discussion of :nahhuwa-, which treats this passage but not the sentence containing :hiššalla.

10. In KUB 56.57 ii? 4' irḫanteš is to be restored in the break at the end of the line.
without *irḫai-* and d) with a glossenkeil. Friedrich, in treating *KBo* 4.14 iii 15 briefly,\textsuperscript{11} declines to offer even a tentative translation of *hiššalla-* in *AfO* 17 (1954–56) 99 he tentatively translates it as “ins Auge fassen,” positing a meaning for the use of the paired participles of *irḫai-* and *hiššalla-* in cultic contexts as “die (schon) abgefertigten (und) die (noch zur Beopferung) vorgesehenen(??), ins Auge gefassten(??) Götter.” He retains this idea in *HW 1. Erg. 6*, where he cites the word as *heššalla-* translates it as “ins Auge fassen(??), planen(??),” and adds a note rejecting Goetze’s idea in *Language* 29. Stefanini edits *KBo* 4.14 iii 15 in *AANL* 20 (1965) 44–45 but does not translate *hiššalla-* merely noting in his translation that the form is a second person singular imperative. Friedrich’s idea seems to me to fit the evidence best, with the participle *irḫant-* denoting the gods whose offerings have been performed, and *hiššallant-* denoting those for whom offerings have been prescribed but not yet completed.

**kariya-**

*KUB* 25.32+*KUB* 27.70 ii 39 (*Chapter 2*); *KUB* 55.43 iii 34’ (*Chapter 4*). The occurrence of *kariya-* in *KUB* 55.43 is somewhat unusual; this verb is not often attested in the third person singular present and very rarely attested with this particular spelling. This is to date the only occurrence in the published Boğazköy corpus of the *lu*GUDŪ “covering.” This covering action occurs frequently in other festivals and very often includes the phrase *lš-TU* GAD or GAD-it “with a linen (cloth).” The verb *kariya-* does not require the adverb *šer* to have the meaning “to cover up” but *šer* is often used in combination with *kariya-* for example: *nu-kan* d’Ápin *šer* kariyazi “He covers up the ritual pit”;\textsuperscript{12} *n-*at-”kan *šer* kariyal(-) “They/He cover(s) it up.”\textsuperscript{13} As in the *kurša-* Festival, so also in the Festival of Karaḫna the bread is covered while being transported: *nu* IS-TU É *lu*NINDA.DÜ.DÜ NINDA.KUR₄.RA udanzi *nu-kan* NINDA.KUR₄.RA IS-TU GAD ka-ri-ya-an-za *lu*MESNAR pian ḥuyanzi3 NINDA.KUR₄.RA paršiya “They bring the thick bread from the house of the baker. The thick bread (is) covered with a linen (cloth). The singers run in front (of it). He breaks three thick breads.”\textsuperscript{14} Here not only is the NINDA.KUR₄.RA covered with a linen cloth, but musicians go in front of it, bringing to mind the prescription *piran palwiškanzi,* “they recite(?)” in the *kurša-* Festival.

**kipikkisišdu**

*KUB* 55.43 ii 16 (*Chapter 4*). This word occurs only a few times in the entire Hittite corpus, in the two basic forms *kipik*(k)išdu and *kipik*(k)ašdu.\textsuperscript{15} It occurs both with and without a DINGIR determinative. The presently known examples are: [LUGAL

\textsuperscript{11} *JCS* 1 (1947) 304.

\textsuperscript{12} *KUB* 41.8 iii 16–17 (Ritual for the Underworld Deities).

\textsuperscript{13} *KUB* 4.47 i 15 (Ritual against Insomnia).

\textsuperscript{14} *KUB* 25.32+*KUB* 27.70 ii 38–40 (Festival for the Tutelary Deity of Karaḫna), edited in *Chapter 2*.

\textsuperscript{15} Hoffner points out to me that *kipik*(k)išdu and *kipik*(k)ašdu must be variant forms of the same word and also suggests the idea put forward here that this word denotes a relationship between deities.

From the evidence of the examples cited above and the passage in the kurša- Festival, we may make some general observations about kipikkišdu. Despite the many variations in its spelling, the word always has the same ending, and shows no signs of Hittite noun inflection. Although it always functions as an accusative within its sentence, it never shows the expected accusative form, nor does it change its inflection for the plural in the KUB 20.19 and KBo 21.83 examples. These points could be explained by positing a neuter gender for kipikkišdu, but such a u-stem neuter would be very unusual and inappropriate to designate divine beings. It is more likely that kipikkišdu is a foreign word which the Hittites did not decline according to their inflectional system. The KUB 27.69 example, in which the kipikkišdu is Mezzulla, the KBo 21.83 passage, in which Zuliya is one of the kipikkišdu, and the KUB 55.43 passage, in which the kipikkišdu are Kappariyamu, the Tutelary Deity of Tatasuna, and the Tutelary Deity of Tašşapuna, and the Tutelary Deity of Tašşapuna, suggest that the word is Hattic, as all of these deities have Hattic antecedents.

It is clear that kipikkišdu is a designation of divine beings, as half of its occurrences have the DINGIR determinant. It usually occurs in the genitive construction “kipikkišdu(s) of DN,” and this suggests that kipikkišdu denotes some kind of relationship between deities, i.e., that certain deities are the kipikkišdu of other deities. The evidence is not sufficient for us to determine what that relationship was. Most of the deities thus described are not understood well enough for us to define their relationship to the deities for whom they are kipikkišdu. Of the few gods attested as kipikkišdu, we know that

16. The first paragraph of this passage has been restored based on the idea that the “three kipikišdu” of the second paragraph are named in the first.
Mezzulla is female\textsuperscript{17} and that Kappariyamu\textsuperscript{18} probably is as well. In the case of Mezzulla we also know that she is the daughter of the Sungoddess of Arinna. The $^0\text{UTU}$ in \textit{KUB} 27.69 i 8' and 9' may be the Sungoddess of Arinna, with \textit{kipikkišdu} in that passage expressing Mezzulla’s relationship as her daughter. This is however not the only possible interpretation, especially since we would expect the Sungoddess of Arinna to be more explicitly identified. The surrounding context of this passage gives no further clue as to what particular sun deity is being referred to, so it is quite possible that $^0\text{UTU}$ in the \textit{KUB} 27.69 passage is referring to some other sun deity, such as Istanu, and that \textit{kipikkišdu} denotes some other relationship to that deity, perhaps “consort.”

In the \textit{kurša}-Festival (\textit{KUB} 55.43 ii 16–18), Kappariyamu, the Tutelary Deity of Tatašina, and the Tutelary Deity of Taššapuna receive offerings as a group and are referred to as \textit{kipikkišdus}. The text does not indicate whose they are, but one possibility is that they are \textit{kipikkišdus} to the deity occurring immediately before them in the list, the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiškuwa. We learn in §5 of \textit{KUB} 55.43 that this is the new name for the old hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatenzuwa. In iv 16’–19’ of the same text, the three \textit{kipikkišdu} gods again receive offerings as a group, but without the label \textit{kipikkišdu}. Despite this absence of the actual word, here also these gods are grouped together to receive their offerings because they share the characteristic of being \textit{kipikkišdus} to some other deity. The Tutelary Deity of Zapatiškuwa no longer immediately precedes the \textit{kipikkišdu} group, having been moved to a more prominent place in the offering list for the column iv ceremony. His \textit{kipikkišdu} (if they are indeed his), however, remain in the same position in the offering list that they occupied in the column ii list.\textsuperscript{19} The same group of three deities occurs again in §1’ and §3’ of \textit{KUB} 7.36, another text of the \textit{kurša}- Festival. This tablet is too broken to offer any more evidence beyond that of \textit{KUB} 55.43 concerning the deity for whom they are \textit{kipikkišdus}, but these occurrences do provide confirmation of the consistent grouping of these three gods together.

\textit{kurša}-

\textit{KUB} 2.1 ii 32, iv 22 (Chapter 3); \textit{KUB} 55.43 passim; \textit{KBo} 13.179:3’, 15’; \textit{KBo} 22.168:2’ (Chapter 4). Early translations for this word were “shield” or “fleece.” The \textit{kurša}-has been written about extensively. Important recent discussions include: Popko, \textit{AOF} 2 (1975) 65–70, and idem, \textit{Kultobjekte} (1978) 108–20; Bittel, \textit{Beitrag zur Kenntnis der hethitischen Bildkunst}, SHAW 1976/4: 16; Alp, \textit{Tempel} (1983) 98–99; Dinçol, \textit{JKF} 9 (1983) 221 with n. 3; Beal, “The Organization of the Hittite Military,” Ph.D. diss. Chicago, 1986, 621–25; Güterbock, \textit{FsKantor} 113–19; and idem, \textit{FsAkurgal} Part 2 1–5.\textsuperscript{20} Popko

\textsuperscript{17} Laroche, \textit{Rech.} 30.

\textsuperscript{18} Laroche, \textit{Rech.} 27.

\textsuperscript{19} The fact that they do not move with the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiškuwa in the rearrangement of the order of the gods for the provincial festival described in column iv weakens the argument that they are his \textit{kipikkišdus}. No other obvious possibility presents itself.

\textsuperscript{20} My thanks to Güterbock for allowing me to utilize his ideas in the \textit{FsKantor} and \textit{FsAkurgal} articles before they appeared in print.
rejects the meaning shield and accepts the kurša- as a “fleece.” His very complete entry on this word in Kultobjekte collects most of the texts in which the kurša- occurs and thereby makes it convenient for other scholars to examine the evidence. He discusses the unusual nature of the kurša- as a cult symbol and points out the important text KUB 25.31 obv. 6–7 and 11–13, in which the kurša-s are burned and new ones made. Although he notes that it probably took the form of a “Schlauch” and even suggests that it may have been a container, he does not develop this idea but continues to refer to the kurša- as a fleece. Alp’s contribution (Tempel [1983] 98–99) is especially important because he is the first to suggest that the object on the Schimmel rhyton which Bittel describes as a hunting bag is the kurša-, although he continues to call it a fleece. Dinçol, using evidence from seals, concludes that the kurša- is a bag with a handle, represented in the cult scene on the Schimmel stag rhyton and on a number of seals in very similar cult scenes. Güterbock supports Dinçol’s conclusion (FsAkurgal) and further specifies this as a hunting bag (FsKantor).

I concur with Dinçol and Güterbock that the kurša- is a bag. The kurša- may be made of several different materials; determinatives for leather, wood, and reed are attested. The kurša-, the leather bag, occurs frequently in cultic texts and is the subject of the festival in KUB 55.43. The discussion here applies specifically to the kurša-. One interesting piece of evidence for the kurša- is in the Old Hittite vanishing deity myths and rituals, in which the hunting bag is hung on an eya-tree, after which good things designed to please the god are placed in it. Popko, who rejects the old translation “shield” but retains the meaning “fleece,” himself points out that the kurša- functions as a kind of cornucopia filled with a variety of goods. A bag certainly could hold the things mentioned in these rituals. However, the kurša- in these texts is described as being that of a sheep: giá<sub>1</sub>eyaz<sub>1</sub>-kan UDU-aš kurša<sub>2</sub>ś kanka<sub>3</sub>া “A kurša- of a sheep is hung from an eya-tree” KUB 17.10 iv 28 (Tel. myth). In this case the bag is not just leather but is actually made of a sheepskin. It would not be difficult to stitch up a sheepskin to make a bag out of it, and it therefore seems that in the rituals connected with the vanishing deity myths a particular kind of kurša-, a sheepskin bag, was used. The integral nature of the kurša-’s role in Old Hittite mythology and ritual, including a ceremony done in the temple of the Hunting Bag in an Old Script text containing Hattic, indicates that it was a cult symbol deriving originally from the Hattic tradition.

The kurša- made of leather is the most common; all the passages that mention the making of a kurša- discuss the preparation of oxhides or goathides. In KBo 13.179 red and white(?) oxhides are mentioned in conjunction with renaming of the kurša-s, probably the raw materials for their manufacture. The same text also describes the killing of a goat and the use of the hide by the leatherworkers to make kurša-s. The other texts of the kurša-

21. For the Schimmel rhyton see Muscarella, ed., Ancient Art: The Norbert Schimmel Collection (1974) no. 123; Alp, Tempel figs. 6a–h; Bittel, Hethiter 160, fig. 169; and Güterbock, FsAkurgal Part 2 1–5.
23. KBo20.69–KBo25.142:6–7’.
24. CTH 683.2 with duplicate KBo 22.168, Chapter 4.
Festival treated in Chapter 4 have to do with the ceremony for installation of the new hunting bags and not with their manufacture. Although in the Telipinu myth the kurša- was probably made from one sheepskin, elsewhere it appears to require several hides for its manufacture. An inventory text provides evidence on the composition of the kurša-:

\[6 \text{ KUŠ MĂŠ.GAL warhui SIG-anda GAL } \text{L.J.MES} \text{SI} \text{PAD AN[} (A \text{ UGULA } \text{L.J.MES} \text{ĂȘ}) \text{GAB pai} [\text{nu}'] \text{ SA DINGIR-LIM KUȘkuršan iyazzi} \text{“Six billy goat hides, rough (and) well worked, the}\]

chief of the shepherds gives to the head of the leatherworkers. He makes a hunting bag of the god.” Popko interprets this as distributive, i.e., one bag from each hide. This may well be the correct understanding, but we could interpret this brief inventory entry as a description of the making of one kurša- out of six goathides. Haas and Wäfler understand the prescription as six goathides for one kurša-, as does Güterbock. Here the color is apparently not important, but another characteristic is specified, that the skins be rough, that is with the hair left on. A description of preparations for the purulli- Festival provides information on how many hides might be used to make a kurša-:

\[6 \text{ MĂȘ.GAL GE} 2 \text{ MĂȘ.GAL BABBAR nu KUȘkuršuș iyanzi UGULA } \text{L.J.MES} \text{SI} \text{PAD pai ŠĂ.BA 2 MĂȘ.GAL BABBAR } \text{L.J.SI} \text{PA} \text{D.GUD DINGIR-LIM dai 2 MĂȘ.GAL GE} 6 \text{ L.J.SANGA } \text{D} \text{Telipinu dai 2 MĂȘ.GAL BABBAR L.J.SAN} \text{GA } \text{DZA.BA}_{4}. \text{BA}_{4} 2 \text{ MĂȘ.GAL GE} 6 \text{ L.J.SI} \text{PA} \text{D DINGIR-LIM dai nu KUȘkuršuș ienzi} \text{“Six black billy goats, two white billy goats. They make (them into) hunting bags. The overseer of the shepherds gives (them) out. From them the cowherd of the god takes two white ones, the priest of Telipinu takes two black ones, the priest of ZA.BA}_{4}. \text{BA}_{4} \text{ two white ones, (and) the shepherd of the god takes two black ones. They make hunting bags.” Presumably each functionary makes one hunting bag from the two hides allotted to him.}

In KUB 55.43 and other festival texts, the KUȘkurša- functions as the symbol of a deity and is therefore treated as a god. Güterbock points out that the protective deity Zitjariya’s representation is a kurša-. Popko, Kultobjekte 110, discusses the evidence of the kurša-Festival in showing that the kurša- of the tutelary deity is to be identified with that tutelary deity itself. This is most clear in KUB 55.43 iv 5’–6’ and 8’, where the phrase “the hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa” alternates with “the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa.” He also interprets the personal name mKurša-PLAMMA as evidence that

---


27. UF 8: 97 “Sechs (?) struppige Ziegenbockfelle von guter Qualität macht der Oberste der Hirten für den Vorsteher der Hirten(?) als Schild der Gottheit.”

28. FsKantor 116 with n. 18 “… and he makes the god’s kurša.”

29. See Košak, THeth 10: 64.

30. KUB 25.31 obv. 11–13, noted by Popko, AOF 2 (1975) 69 with n. 29, and idem, Kultobjekte 109, and Güterbock, FsKantor 116.

31. NHF 68, translated by him there as “Schild.”
the *kurša*- itself is divine with his translation “‘Vlies (ist) Schutzgottheit.’” Laroche, *NH* p. 283, interprets this name differently, arguing that it is of a familiar type in which a toponym or genitive precedes a divine name, and interprets this name as “‘dieu tutelaire de/à l’égide.’” Laroche’s comparisons to similar names are convincing, but Popko’s interpretation is not impossible and in fact seems likely.

The hunting bag was frequently included in the list of “holy places” within the temple, together with the throne, the hearth, the window, etc., to which the Hittites libated. There are a number of occurrences of the expression *D(kus)kurša-*, both in and out of the context of the offerings to the holy places. This is not necessarily conclusive evidence that the hunting bag was identified with the deity, because other items in the list of holy places also sometimes occur with a *DINGIR* determinative, but it is in accord with the idea of the *kurša*- being thought of as the god itself. The *kurša*- image of a particular god might be used as one of the holy places in ceremonial offerings. Almost always this was Zitḫariya’s *kurša*-h, although that of Kappariyamu was used at least once.32

One unusual text seems to describe a festival being provided(?) before the *kurša*-: 

```
[y]-a-[x]-ša-an INA Ė ABI ABI *DUT*[U-ŠI] [* ... -]i n-ašta apiya *mahḥan* [* ... A]*NA PANI *kus kurši EZEN aššanuzz[i] § “He [* ... ] the [* ... ] in the house of His Majesty’s grandfather. How he complete[s]/*prepare[s] (?) a festival there [* ... ] before the hunting bags §” 2011/u rev. 1–3 (catalogue, X *TUP-PU*), ed. Alp, *Tempel* 224–25. Alp identifies the text not as a catalogue but as part of a festival, perhaps the great festival of Arinna. The second sentence in this passage is quite an unusual construction. There are a few examples of similar but not identical expressions. There is an example of cups being prepared (*aššanu-*) *PANI D*U *piḥaššašši* Ü *PANI D*UTU *URU TUL-na “before the Stormgod piḥaššašši and before the Sungoddess of Arinna,”33 which resembles the 2011/u passage in that the action of *aššanu-* is performed before (a representation of) a deity. In the Ritual Against Epidemic in the Army34 a ritual (*SISKUR*) is *aššanu-*ed. One of the few clear examples of *EZEN* as the object of *aššanu-* is: *nu-kan mahḥan INA Ė ḫešti GAL-in EZEN-an aššanunun “When I completed(?) the great festival in the ḫešti- house” *KBo* 2.5+ iii 46–47 (Detailed Annals of Muršili), ed. Goetze, *AM* 190–91, translating *aššanu-* as “ausrichten.” Despite the lack of other occurrences of a construction *ANA PANI DN EZEN aššanu-*., it seems clear that the hunting bag in 2011/u was being honored with a festival.

The hunting bag was involved in other festivals besides this festival performed before it and the one celebrated for its installation, described in the texts of *Chapter 4*. Although its normal resting place was the “house of the hunting bags,”35 we know that a hunting bag was carried around to various temples and cult centers during the celebration of both the *KI.LAM* and *AN.TAH.ŠUM* festivals; see *Chapter 4*, commentary on *KBo* 13.179:2’ for examples from each of these festivals. In at least one instance it was taken to the *halentu-

---

32. See Appendix A, *KUB* 53.11 §§9’–12’.
34. *KUB* 7.54 iii 3.
35. See the entry on *Ė kus kuršaš* in this appendix.
building: ेहलेन्तुवाश-मा-कन अंडा [Ø?] ॐ S A S A L L U G A L दरियाश [Ø] [k]arū gankanza [Ø?] “In the हलेन्तु-, however, दरियाश of the queen (is) already hung.”36 The use of the verb gank- here makes it clear that it was the hunting bag of Zithariya as his cult symbol which was hung in the हलेन्तु- during the festival procedures. In the Festival for the Infernal Deities,37 besides receiving offerings as part of the regular list of holy places, the hunting bag was honored with individual drink offerings: UGULA 10, MUSHMATULDIM kuršaš pīran q[BA]NŠUR katta [3-SU] šipanti “The chief cook libates [3 times] before the hunting bag (and) under the [table].”

In KUB 55.43 column iv the offerings are placed directly on the hunting bag. So also in part of the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival38 the offering for Zithariya is placed on the kurša-. Another example of an offering provided specifically for the hunting bag is KBo 21.85 i 51′ (Festival of Moon and Thunder), in which an offering of a bread morsel is placed on it. The hunting bag also received offerings regularly in the various festivals in which it occurs as one of the holy places, for example: nu-kan UGULA 10, MUSHMATULDIM kattapalān dai ĥaššī 1-SU KUS kurši 1-SU GIS D AG-ti 1-SU GIS ĥattalwa<š> GIS-ru 1-SU ĥaššī tapušza 1-SU dāī “The chief cook sets out the kattapala-. On the hearth once, on the hunting bag once, on the throne once, on the wood of the door bolt once, (and) next to the hearth once, he places (it)” KUB 10.21 v 19–22 (fest. frag.), ed. Jestin, RA 34 (1937) 49 and 54.

ewahh-

KUB 55.43 i 2, 3; KBo 13.179:4′ (Chapter 4). Examples of simple newahh- are quite rare, as this verb is usually combined with the preverb appa. There seems in general to be no difference in meaning between newahh- and appa newahh-; they both normally mean “to renew.”39 Friedrich, HW 151, proposes, “wieder erneuern” for appa newahh- and simply “erneuern” for newahh- without preverb, but he also translates appa newahh- “wiederherstellen,” showing that this preverb-verb phrase could mean simply “renew, restore.” The occurrences of newahh- in KUB 55.43 are instructive as to the use and meaning of this verb. First of all, we may note that in its two occurrences in §1, referring to the same action, one occurs as EGIR-pa newahh- and the other simply as newahh-, without appa. Thus within this one text we have parallel examples, requiring the same meaning, of newahh- with and without the adverb appa. We may also note that although newahh- is normally translated “renew,” in our text at least “renew” means “replace.” This is clear from the discussion in the following paragraphs of the text about the old hunting bags and what is done with them.

36. 315/a i 12’–14’ (fragment of a festival celebrated by the queen), ed. Alp, Tempel 230–31.
37. CTHI 645, KUB 43.30 obv. ii 9’–10’.
39. The CHD does not specifically comment on appa newahh- but does comment without giving examples that the use with EGIR-pa emphasizes “making new again.”
The objects which can be “renewed” are quite diverse. In KUB 13.7 iv 3–6 (law text of a king Tudhaliya), a scribe *appa newaḫḫ-s* a broken tablet. In a fragment of a prayer\(^{40}\) translated by the CHD sub *mayantaḫḫ-* it is the king’s frame (*ešri*-ššet). In the *Bēl Madgaltī* instructions\(^{41}\) they renew the Š.EŠ LUGAL, the Š.EŠ GUD, the Š.NA-KIŠIB, and the *tarnu-* by replastering. Two examples apply more directly to our text: in the Prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal\(^{42}\) they renew both the statues (ALAM.HI.A) and implements (UNUTE) of the gods, so this verb is utilized elsewhere for renewing cultic equipment.

In the tablet catalogue KUB 30.56 rev. iii 6–7\(^{43}\) we have: [UR]U.BABBAR-az GIM-an DLAMMA ¹[RU] Ḥalinzua ¹[RU] Tu[ḫuppiya] [GI]BIL-anz paizzi “How the Tutelary Deity of Ḥalinzua goes from Ḥattuša to Tuḫuppiya for renewing.” This is so similar to what is happening in KUB 55.43 that it could be a reference to this tablet. It does not quite fit, however, because in the catalogue the Tutelary Deity of Ḥalinzua (Ḥatenzuwa in KUB 55.43) goes to Tuḫuppiya for renewing, while §5 of KUB 55.43 indicates that it is the hunting bag of Zitḫariya that goes to Tuḫuppiya, with that of the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatenzuwa going to Durmitta. Perhaps this catalogue is not after all referring to the tablet KUB 55.43, but to a similar festival text. The situation is made somewhat more complicated by evidence in the Annals of Muršili,\(^{44}\) in which Muršili refers to Ḥatenzuwa as the city of the deity Zitḫariya. One might suggest, based on this passage, that there was actually only one god, and that Zitḫariya is the syllabic name of the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatenzuwa. However, the evidence of KUB 55.43, especially §5, in which different destinations are assigned to the two old hunting bags being sent out to the provinces, makes it clear that the hunting bags of Zitḫariya and of the Tutelary Deity of Ḥatenzuwa are distinct. See a discussion of this in the comments on Zitḫariya in Chapter 1.

**palwai-**

KUB 55.43 iii 35‘ (Chapter 4). Although this verb occurs very frequently in festival texts as well as occasionally in other genres, its meaning is still unsure and has been the subject of some discussion. Güterbock\(^{45}\) prefaced his own comments on *palwai-* by noting Alp’s\(^{46}\) view, that *palwai-* usually seemed to be “eine Art kultisches Vortragen.” He points out, however, that the translation “to recite” does not fit the passage in the Song of Ulikummi\(^{47}\) concerning Tašmišu’s actions, which were a spontaneous response and not a memorized recitation. He also cites KBo 4.9 obv. i 45–50, a portion of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM

40. KUB 43.63 obv. 13–14.
42. KUB 17.21++ obv. i 18’–22’.
43. Ed. Laroche, CTH pp. 181–82.
46. Alp, Beamt. 77f.
47. KUB 33.106 rev. iv 15–18, now recopied with new joins as KBo 26.65 rev. iv.
Festival, which involves the ALAN.ZU, standing next to the king, holding his hands up, turning in place, and performing the action of palwai-. He notes that "recitation" is hardly likely when a turning movement is prescribed. He enumerates the following characteristics for palwai: 1) It is an expression of joy, 2) it is audible, and 3) it can be done two or three times (as in the Kumarbi passage about Tašmišu, where he palwaizzi three times and then two times). Hence he understands it as a short repeatable sound and suggests either to "emit a cry" or to "clap," with the latter more likely in view of the KBo 4.9 passage. He translates the relevant part of the Song of Ullikummi, KUB 33.106 rev. iv 15–18, as "er klatschte(?) dreimal." 48

Güterbock later translates the same passage as "three times he shouted," with the italics indicating uncertainty of translation. 49 He explains this change in his understanding of palwai- in JCS 6: 42 by citing the text 274/c (now KBo 24.76), in which the verb is followed by roperty- Le-el-hu-ri-iš-wa-kán. The -wa- direct speech particle in this phrase caused him to note that "... the following speech with -wa- clearly shows that palwai- is a verbum dicendi"; 50 he therefore gives up the idea of "clap" and opts for a verb of speech. Along these same lines, in his article on "The Hittite Temple According to Written Sources," 51 he defines the palwatallas, a cult functionary who most often performs this verb's action and whose title is obviously related to it, as "a kind of reciter." When I was preparing the present work as a dissertation, I noted the suggestion in an early draft of the CHD article on palwai- that the KBo 24.76 passage was not compelling evidence for palwai- being a verbum dicendi, since in Hittite the verbum dicendi is frequently omitted. The occurrence of the sentence particle -wa- does not invariably mean that the preceding sentence contained a verbum dicendi. Güterbock at that time (1987) accepted the idea that palwai- was not necessarily a verbum dicendi. Singer, in his glossary to his edition of the KI.LAM Festival, remains neutral by giving the definition "to recite(?) , clap(?)." 52 I therefore used the translation "clap(?)" primarily on the basis of the KBo 4.9 passage. In the interval between completion of the dissertation and its submission for publication Badali has published a thorough study of this verb. 53 Based on his many examples of palwai- in different text genres, he concludes that it must be a verbum dicendi and further that it means "to recite" ("recitare"). In my opinion this very specific translation is still problematic for the Song of Ullikummi (Badali translates palwai- in those passages as "shout" [gridare]), and a number of his examples do not conclusively require a meaning "recite" versus "clap." However, as he notes on pages 141–42, KBo 15.48 ii 5–9, 54 in which the palwatallas palwai-s but is also described as holding a cup of water and an eagle’s wing, is very strong evidence that

---

48. Kum. 28.
49. Ullik. (JCS 6 [1952]) 31.
50. Ullik. (JCS 6 [1952]) 42.
51. CRRAI 20 (1972) 125–32; see p. 131 for this comment on the palwatallaš.
53. "Il significato del verbo ittito palwae-," Or 59 (1990) 130–42.
54. His example III.11, a passage from the (h)išuwaš Festival.
palwai- does not mean “clap.” His examples III.4 and III.10 also argue, somewhat less conclusively, against a meaning “clap.” I therefore accept his conclusion that palwai- must be a verbum dicendi.

GIS papul-

KUB 55.43 iii 33' (Chapter 4). This word is a hapax legomenon. Although the signs on the tablet are somewhat difficult to read because of abrasion of the surface, GIS pa-a-pu-li seems to be the best reading. Although such a word is not attested elsewhere, no other word which would fit these signs suggests itself.55 This word looks like a nomen instrumenti in -ul (HE §47) declined here as a dative-locative.

There is one occurrence of a word GIS papu- that may be related to GIS papul-.56 From this single context all one can say about the meaning of GIS papu- is that it is used in a bakery.57 This strengthens the possible connection between GIS papu- and GIS papul-, because the latter occurs in KUB 55.43 iii 33' as an implement on which bread is placed when it comes out of the oven. The fact that the bread is then covered and taken to a temple indicates that the GIS papul- is not just a cooling tray, but something that is used to deliver bread from the bakery to its final destination.

purpura-

KUB 55.43 iii 7', 11', 14' (Chapter 4); KUB 9.17:23' (Appendix A). See Otten, StBoT 13 (1971) 35; Hoffner, AllHeth (1974) 151, 178–79, and 207; G. Jucquois and R. Lebrun, Heth. u. Idg. (1979) 106 n. 8; and Košak, FsGüterbock² (1986) 126. This word, whose semantic content primarily denotes a shape, a ball or lump, almost always occurs with some indication of the material from which it is made, either with a determinative or with a genitive of material. That material may be one of many different things. Košak discusses purpura- made of iron and points out that elsewhere in the corpus this word refers “to lumps of dough, bread, cheese, clay, or soap . . .” Hoffner discusses purpura- made of bread and dough, points out other materials from which purpura- are made, and makes note of the common cultic practice of scattering purpura- of dough or bread at the feet of the king and queen in a procession. I would note the further distinction which the Hittites made between a bread-ball, NINDA purpura-, and ball(s) of dough, written purpurēš išnaš in KBo 4.2 i 63 (Ritual of Ḫuwarlu), išnaš purpuran in i 56 of the same text, and išnaš purpurēš in KUB 27.67 ii 9 and iii 16 (Ritual of ḪTarpattašši). The Ritual of Ḫuwarlu contains the best evidence for the distinction between NINDA purpura- and išnaš purpurana-, as it makes use both of bread-balls (KBo 4.2 i 19) and of balls of dough (passages cited above). Clearly

55. Hoffner suggests reading the KUB 55.43 passage as GIS pawuli and points out to me the existence of GIS papu- and its possible relation to this word in the kurša- Festival.
56. KUB 16.34 i 14 (oracle question).
57. CHD first draft. Sommer, KIF 1 (1930) 344, on the basis of the similar passage KUB 5.7 obv. 24–25, suggests the possibility of GIS papu- as the Hittite word underlying GIS BANŠUR “table.” As pointed out in the CHD first draft on GIS papu-, this identification, although not impossible, is not compelling, and GIS papu- could be any wooden object likely to be found in a bakery.
purpura- išnaš/išnaš purpura- is to be distinguished from NINDA purpura- and understood as (unbaked) balls of dough.\(^{58}\) The “bread-balls,” NINDA purpura-, occur only in festival or ritual texts, and are most often used in the KILAM Festival. They are usually poured/heaped up, taking the verbs iššuwa(i)- or šuḫsha-. Since we have the verb iššuwa(i)- preserved in KUB 55.43 iii 7', we may restore the same verb in the broken lines 11' and 14' as well. Despite the lack of a determinative on purpura- in line 7', it is clear, because of the mention of NINDA purpura- in lines 11' and 14', that “bread-balls” were also intended here. There is at least one other similar example of purpura- in festival context without any determinative or indication of material, that is, Bo 68/215+ v 5'-6', [pu-u]r-pu-ru-uš LUGAL-ì kattan iššuwanzi “They pour out (bread?) balls for the king.”

Lû.MES šarmiya-

KUB 10.93 i 9' (Appendix A): There is no entry in HW or any of the Ergänzungshefte for the word šarmi-. Pecchioli Daddi, Mestieri 146–47 does not give a definition but cites this title in her section “Personale Palatino e Temple” and gives examples of the LûMES šarmi- in both palace and temple context. The šarmi- man or men occur once as a witness in a deposition,\(^{59}\) once in the inventory of Maninni,\(^{60}\) once in a fragment of a cult inventory,\(^{61}\) and approximately eight times in cultic texts, including the example in KUB 10.93 i 9'. Beyond the fact that he usually occurs in a list of cult functionaries and therefore must also be some kind of cult functionary, the contexts in which he occurs do not provide a clue as to his function. Jakob-Rost, Werner, and Neu\(^{62}\) all decline to attempt a translation of Lû.MES šarmi- in their treatments of passages in which they occur.

tukk-

KUB 55.43 obv. i 4, 9, iii 1' (Chapter 4). Friedrich in HW 227 gives for this verb the meanings “to be visible, to be seen, to be of importance,” with more bibliography in HW 3. Erg. 21 for the meaning “to be seen.” Neu, StBoT 5 (1968) 178–80, does not add any new meanings, giving the two basic translations “to be seen/be visible” and “to be considered/be of importance.” Other occurrences of the verb indicate that in addition to these meanings it can also mean “to be prescribed, specified.” A passage which seems to require this meaning occurs in a birth ritual:\(^{63}\) GIS BANSUR-\^ma\^kan ANA LÔ MUTIŠU-\^ya [tu-ug-g]a-a-ri [AN]A DAM-ŠU-\^at\^kan tu-ug-ga-a-ri ĐUG LûŠ.GAL-\^ya \^šmaš\^kan tu-ug-ga-a-ri “A table for her husband also [is prescribed and [for] the wife one is also prescribed. And a bowl for (each of) them is prescribed.” Beckman translates tuggari as “is required.” See CHD sub meḫur f, for a translation of KUB 55.43 obv. i 4 as “the time is not

---

58. CHD first draft, used with the permission of the editors.
59. KUB 13.34++ iv 21, ed. Werner, StBoT 4 (1967) 40–42.
60. ABoT 108 iv 8'.
61. KUB 38.129 obv. 2, ed. Jakob-Rost, MIO 9 (1963) 188–89.
63. KBo 17.65 obv. 21–22, ed. Beckman StBoT 29 (1983) 134–35.
important.” The passage is also translated by Haas and Jakob-Rost, AOF 11 (1984) 16: “der Zeitpunkt ist ohne Belang.” The occurrence of meḫur with duqqari is quite rare; it occurs in only one other passage, KUB 32.123 rev. iii 12 (İstanuvian festival): -ičanzi-ia meḫur iš kuítki tuqqari “No particular time, however, is prescribed for [x]-ing.”

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{o} \text{uriyanni-} \]

KUB 55.43 iii 24', 36' (Chapter 4). This title denotes a fairly important official of the Hittite court. Weidner already in 1923, commenting on the occurrence of \[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{o} \text{uriyanni-} \] in the Talmi-Šarruma Treaty,\(^\text{64}\) in a list of officials in Ḫatti before whom this treaty was written, noted that it occurs often in the texts and that it probably denoted a “bestimmte Priesterklasse.”\(^\text{65}\) Laroche\(^\text{66}\) favored identifying the \[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{o} \text{uriyanni-} \] with the \[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{o} \text{KARTAPPU} \], a groom or charioteer, while Goetze\(^\text{67}\) considered an identification with TARTENÜ, a word which von Soden\(^\text{68}\) translates tentatively as “Mann an zweite Stelle?” Friedrich\(^\text{69}\) proposed simply “(Art höherer Priester oder Tempelfunktionär?),” without providing any morphology information for this word. Liverani proposes \textit{uriyanni-} as the Hittite reading of \[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{o} \text{HAL} \], the diviner.\(^\text{70}\) However, his evidence for this, the existence of an \textit{uriyanni-} oracle bird and a possible connection with the seal Tarsus 43,\(^\text{71}\) is tenuous. Liverani rejects Laroche’s and Goetze’s ideas on the \[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{o} \text{uriyanni-} \] because they do not take into account all the various functions of this official, but his identification of the \textit{uriyanni-} as the \[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{o} \text{HAL} \] also does not really allow for the diverse duties attested for this official.

Pecchioli Daddi in 1975 commented briefly on the \textit{uriyanni-} official, pointing out that he was an official of some importance, based on his appearance as a witness in land donations and international treaties and as an owner of land himself.\(^\text{72}\) In addition, she suggested that this official probably belonged to the sacred sphere of the Hittite court, based on his participation in the festivals and the mention of an \textit{uriyanni-} official together with a GAL SANGA. Although she referred to some of Liverani’s observations on the duties of the \textit{uriyanni-} official, she did not comment on his or other previous proposals for identifying the \[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{o} \text{uriyanni-} \] with any Sumerographic or Akkadographic title. Two years later, in her article on the \[\text{\textsuperscript{1}}\text{o} \text{KARTAPPU} \],\(^\text{73}\) she specifically rejected Laroche’s and Goetze’s suggestions. Still later, in Mestieri (1982) 266–68, Pecchioli Daddi provided a very useful

\(^{64}\) KBo 1.6 rev. 19.
\(^{65}\) BoSt (1923) 88.
\(^{66}\) RA 43 (1949) 70–71.
\(^{67}\) RHA XII/54 (1952) 9.
\(^{68}\) AHw 3 (1981) 1332.
\(^{69}\) HW (1952) 235.
\(^{70}\) Storia di Ugarit (Rome, 1975) 73–74.
\(^{71}\) For this seal see Gelb in Goldman, Excavations at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus II (Princeton, 1956) 251. For the reading of the seal see Laroche, Syria 35 (1958) 259.
\(^{72}\) OA 14 (1975) 119–20 n. 93.
\(^{73}\) SCO 27 (1977) 187–88 n. 83.
summary of the available evidence for the *uriyanni-* official, including citation of occurrences, inflection, proper names attested for the *uriyanni-* official, and other details about this official.\textsuperscript{74} The entry in *Mestieri* provides a listing of occurrences divided according to the *uriyanni-* official’s various functions; its location in the section of the book devoted to specific terms for religious personnel reaffirms Pecchioli Daddi’s opinion as to his role as a religious official. To her section c (pp. 267–68) on his role in festivals may now be added Bo 3238 iii 11’, transliterated in *KBo* 30 p. IV sub number 73. Here the \textsuperscript{LO}uriyanni- occurs with a number of other cult functionaries such as the \textsuperscript{LO}palwatalla-.

Pecchioli Daddi’s entry in *Mestieri* effectively demonstrates that the *uriyanni-* official’s two main duties were participation in the official cult and acting as a witness in treaties and land donations. In addition to the texts cited in *Mestieri*, the *uriyanni-* official also occurs as a witness in the İnandık tablet,\textsuperscript{75} along with the GAL LÚ.MES GEŠTIN “chief of the wine stewards,” DUMU.LUGAL “prince,” and UGULA 1 LI \textsuperscript{LO}TI.S.M[EŞ] “overseer of 1,000 grooms.” Balkan does not comment on this word. The word occurs also in one Akkadian text from Ugarit.\textsuperscript{76} The *uriyanni-* official’s duties at Ugarit included carrying out orders for the king and placing boundary stones on the border between Ugarit and Siyannu. At Ugarit at least his duties seem to be those not of a religious official but rather of a high level administrator. Nougayrol does not attempt a translation of the word, simply inserting it in his translation as “l’uriyannu.” Von Soden, *AHw* 3 (1981), maintains a very noncommittal position, defining the \textsuperscript{LO}uriyanni- as “ein Funktionär.” Based on the occurrences of the word at Ugarit and in the İnandık tablet, he suggests that it may be a Hittite loan word into Akkadian. It can hardly even be termed a loan word, as it is presently attested only twice in Akkadian texts.

This word does occasionally occur declined as a Hittite i-stem noun, for example \textsuperscript{LO}u-ri-an-ni-iš in *KBo* 3.34 i 5 (Palace Chronicle), and \textsuperscript{LO}u-ri-ya-an-ni-in in *KUB* 23.87 i 3 (letter). In the expression “the house of the *uriyanni-,*” in which it occurs most frequently, it seems to be frozen in an Akkadographic writing Ė \textsuperscript{LO}uriyanni, without a Hittite genitive case ending. In the Ugarit example it is written as \textsuperscript{LO}uriyannu, with the correct vowel for the Akkadian nominative required in the sentence. In the İnandık tablet it is written \textsuperscript{LO}urianni, genitive following the *ANA PANI* which governs it.

Past scholars have attempted to place the *uriyanni-* official in either the religious or secular sphere. Although it is true that some officials at the Hittite court had duties which were almost exclusively one or the other, the Hittites did not observe the same sharp distinction between sacred and secular duty that some societies draw. Many Hittite officials occur in all types of Hittite texts and clearly have both “religious” and “secular” duties. Rather than trying to categorize the \textsuperscript{LO}uriyanni- as either a sacred or secular official, we may simply note his various duties and realize that they included responsibility in what we would term the sacred as well as the secular sphere.

\textsuperscript{74} Her list of occurrences does not include SBo 1.2 rev. 11, RS 17.368 rev. 5’, or İnandık rev. 25.

\textsuperscript{75} Balkan, İnandık 43.

The phrase which concerns us in KUB 55.43 is Ė^uriyanni "the house of the uriyanni-official." Aside from a very brief mention in Mestieri 268, this phrase has hardly been discussed in the previous literature on this official. It occurs a number of times in festival texts, in a context where something is being brought or driven out "from the house/estate of the uriyanni-official," (iSTU Ė^uriyanni). See for example KUB 53.49 obv. 9'-10' (fragment of the Nerik cult): iSTU Ė^u-ri-ya-an-ni x[... ] unniyanzi "They drive x[...] from the house of the uriyanni-official!"; Bo 3418:10'-11' (fest. frag.);77 [ta 1 UD]U.ŠE iSTU Ė^u-r[i-ya-an-ni] [un]ianzi "They [dr]ive [one] fattened [she]ep from the house of the ur[iyanni-] official." In the latter text the following paragraph, although quite broken, seems to indicate that the king sacrificed this fattened sheep provided from the house of the uriyanni-official. In the Festival for Telipinu78 animals again must be supplied from the house of the uriyanni-official, although not for sacrifice: INA UD 4 KAM mān lukuatta nu DINGIR-LAM-aš grišḫulugannin GUD.ḪI.A Ė>BEL Ė[IJURU] Ḫanāna turiṣṣi 2 GUD.APIN. LAL-Ša [i]STU Ė^u-ri-ya-an-ni Ė>BEL Ė[URU] Ḫanāna pai "On the fourth day, at dawn, the lord of the house of Ḫanāna harnesses the chariot of the god (with) oxen. And the two draft oxen the lord of the house of Ḫanāna gives from the house of the uriyanni-official." Clearly Ė here does not mean literally "house" but rather "household" or "estate," the resources or property of a domestic establishment. Another text of the Festival for Telipinu79 demonstrates not only the involvement of the "house of the uriyanni-official" in the cult but also indicates that this can mean a physical "house:" para-Ša KĀ Ė^u-ri-ya-an-ni 1 UDU appanzi n-ān ẖilammans DUṬU-i [ḥuk]anzi "Further, they seize one sheep (at) the door of the house of the uriyanni-official and [sacrifice] it to the Sungod of the gatehouse."

In addition to animals, there are several passages in which sacrificial bread is supplied by the house of the uriyanni-official, for example: iSTU Ė^u-ri-ya-an-ni GUB-laš-Ša 3 NINDA paštalli karu udanteš n-Ša-tan GUNNI ištarra piš kišanta "Three bread morsels have already been brought from the house of the uriyanni-official of the left. They are placed on the hearth, in the middle" KUB 53.13 iv 16'-19' (Festivals Celebrated by a DUMU-aš); [i]STU Ė^u-ri-ya-an-ni x[...?] 3 NINDA.KUR₄ RA-Ša udand[i ... ] "They bring x[...?] and three thick breads from the house of the uriyanni-official" KUB 53.49 rev. 2-3 (cult of Nerik).

What light do these various examples of the Ė^uriyanni shed on the occurrences in KUB 55.43? First of all, we may note that the house of the uriyanni-official often incurs the responsibility of supplying animals and bread for offerings in the cult. Bo 3418:10'-11', cited above, in which sacrificial animals are brought from the house of the uriyanni-official, is good evidence that in KUB 55.43 iii 36' some sacrificial animal is also to be restored in the break at the end of the line as the item which they take from the house of the uriyanni-official. In addition, the occurrence of the "uriyanni-official of the left" in

77. Edited by Alp, Tempel 20-21, transliterated in KBo 30 p. IV sub number 74.
78. KUB 53.3 obv. i 18'-22'.
KUB 53.3 rev. 16' (cited above) implies that there was an "uriyanni- official of the right," which we now have attested in line 24' of our text. The text SBo 1.2 is quite interesting in this regard, as it includes in rev. 11, in a list of witnesses, two uriyanni- officials: "mZū[z]zu U mMarāššā L0.MES ụranni. We very probably have here the names of the uriyanni- official of the right and the uriyanni- official of the left.

wappiya-

KUB 55.43 passim in columns ii and iv (Chapter 4). See also the discussion of the LÚ.MEŠ UR.GI7 below. Although this verb is rarely attested, the contexts in which it occurs make its meaning clear. Goetze notes that this verb, cited by him as wapp-, is undoubtedly "bellen."80 Friedrich notes the phrase LÚ.MEŠ UR.GI7 wappianzi in the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival81 and translates "sie bellen."82 The thirteen occurrences of wappiya- in the preserved portion of KUB 55.43 constitute approximately half of all known occurrences of this verb. Of the examples outside of this text that occur in clear context, three have as subject UR.GI7, two the LÚ.MEŠ UR.GI7, and two are uncertain. The three examples with UR.GI7 are most useful in determining the meaning of wappiya-: KA x[ ] = A-MU-U = UR.GI7 ku-it wa-ap-pēš-[k]-iz-zi[l] Hittite: "what the dog barks";83 [UR.GI7], wappiyazi šAH-aš ūntarnuzzi [nu DINGIR]-LAM le kuelqa īštamašīi "[The dog]g barks, the pig grunts. Do not, [O g]od, hear (the sounds) of these";84 UR.GI7-aš wappiyazi apiya=ma-aš arī n=āš karuššiyazi "The dog barks, but (when) he comes there (the stonehouse), he is silent."85 Both of the examples of the LÚ.MEŠ UR.GI7 with wappiya- outside of our text are in festivals.86 With the publication of KUB 55.43 we now have the dog-men well attested with wappiya-. Beyond establishing quite clearly that the dog-men do indeed wappiya- as part of certain cult ceremonies, these examples do not provide any further context that might be used to complement the occurrences of wappiya- with UR.GI7 in determining the meaning of this word. The very designation dog-men indicates that these men in cultic contexts imitate the actions of dogs. Whatever the meaning of wappiya-, we may expect the dog-men to do it because dogs are attested doing it. Thus it is reasonable to assume that the dog-men barked as part of their cultic role.

The other two occurrences of wappiya- in relatively unbroken context are both in column iv of KUB 20.90 (frag. of fest. naming the NIN.DINGIR): iv 4'–7': [ṭa? Ṝ]iṭḫariyana TUŠ-aš ekuzi [ašešš]ar arta wappiyanzi [o-o]-x-uzzaš uizzī L0.MES ḫapiyaš

80. Madd. (1928) 145.
81. KBo 4.13 vi 7.
82. ZA 15 (1950) 253 n. 3.
83. KBo 1.44+KBo 13.1+KBo 26.20 ii 30 (Erimḫuš Boğ.), edited in MSL 17: 108.
84. KBo 12.96 i 12'–13' (Ritual of the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag), ed. Rosenkranz, Or 33 (1964) 239 and 241; and Neu, StBoT 5 (1968) 105; also compare CHD sub lē a2'b'.
85. KUB 13.8:7 (Instructions of Ašmunikal to the Guardians of the Stonehouses).
86. KBo 4.13+ vi 7 (AN.TAH.ŠUM) and 158/o:2' (fest. frag.), translit. Otten and Rüster, ZA 68 (1978) 277–78.
Gsiknus pessiyanzi "He drinks Zithariya, seated. [The assembly] stands. 'They' bark. He comes to (?) the ... x-uzza-s. The hapiya-men throw (off) the(ir) cloaks(?)."

Because the assembly here is a collective noun and occurs with a singular verb, it should not also be the subject of wappiyanzi. That subject is not expressed, although it is clearly a group of cultic personnel and therefore (because of the singular form ekuzi) different from the celebrant who drinks Zithariya. The passage does not provide any further clues as to who was barking as part of the ceremony. A paragraph concerning the NIN.DINGIR and further activities involving the assembly follows the above-cited passage, and then comes the last paragraph of the tablet, iv 14'-16': DZaiun TUS-aš IŠTU BIBRI KU.G[I GEŠ]TIN pianzi ašeššar arta Gsiknus pessiyanzi wappianzi ŠU-i "They give the deity Zaiu (to drink) from a gold rhyton of wine. The assembly stands. 'They' throw (off) the(ir) cloaks and bark. To the hand ... " (continued on the next column, which is now broken away). The assembly is consistently construed as a collective noun with a singular verb. The subject of these two plural verbs is not expressed, although we know from the earlier paragraph of this same text cited above that it is the hapiya-men who throw off their cloaks after the barking takes place. They may well be the understood subject, again throwing off their cloaks as they did two paragraphs earlier. They must then also be the ones who bark, as the verb wappianzi immediately follows the sentence concerning the throwing off of the cloaks. It is uncertain what significance the throwing off of the cloaks has for the barking, especially as the sequence is different in the two examples. In the first case, the barking occurs before the throwing off of the cloaks, with a sentence concerning the [ ... ]x-uzza-s in between these two actions. In the second example the barking follows the throwing off of the cloaks with no intervening activity. Although these examples from a festival involving the NIN.DINGIR do not provide evidence either to confirm or to call into question our understanding of the meaning of wappiya-, they are important evidence for showing that the use of this verb is not restricted to dogs and dog-men and for confirming that "barking," not by a dog but by a cult functionary, can be a part of cult procedure, as it is throughout KUB 55.43.

SUMERIAN

KUB 55.43 iv 31' (Chapter 4). Only rarely in the Hittite cult are functionaries placed behind the windows as in this portion of the kurša-Festival. A fragment describing part of the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival contains a similar prescription:9 KUB NINANNA.GAL LU.MEŠ halliyares [Ś]ıR-].[U] SAGI.A-aš NINDA.KUR₄.RA KUₗ [ašg]az pai LÜ.MEŠ UR.GI₇ E[G]IR GsAB.ḪI.A "(There is) the large Inanna instrument. The cult singers sing.

87. Or "It (the assembly) comes .... ."
88. Goetze, Madd. 145, notes briefly that wappiya- occurs with three possible subjects, dogs, dog-men, and, in his interpretation of these passages, the assembly. Friedrich, ZA 15 (1950) 253 n. 3, also interprets the KUB 20.90 passages as referring to the assembly.
The cupbearer gives out one sweet thick bread from outside. The dog-men behind the windows ... " Otten translates the relevant passage “Die Hunde-Leute hinter den Fenstern,” taking the verb of this sentence to be lost in the break at the beginning of column v. This is almost certainly correct, even though there is space in iv 53' after GIS.AB._HI.A for one more word of 4–5 signs. Perhaps this sentence resembled iv 31' of KUB 55.43, with the dog-men rather than the local singers taking their places behind the windows. On the analogy of the passage cited below, they may also have sung behind the window, but if the end of the sentence was simply SIR–RU, why did the scribe not write it in the empty space available at the end of iv 53'? This is one of the very few occurrences of uncomplemented GIS.AB._HI.A outside of the Old Hittite mythological texts. A similar passage, also from a possible fragment of the AN.TAH.ŠUM Festival is: [LUGAL SAL].LUGAL TUŠ-aš D LAMMA ašgaza akuwanzi [LÚ.MEŠ U]R.GI, EGIR GIS.AB–ya SIR–RU 1 NINDA. KUR₄.RA paršiya “[The king (and) queen] drink the Tutelary Deity, seated, outside. [The dog-men] sing behind the window. He breaks 1 thick bread.”

There is a clear example of a festival celebrant moving to the window in the Festival of the Month: SAL.LUGAL–kan anda paizzi n–aš ištanani DINGIR.MEŠ-naš UŠGEN n–aš šarazzı GIS.AB–ya tapušza tiyazzi š n–ašta DUMU É.GAL. HI.A L₀.MEŠ MEŠEDI anda uwanzi nu–za–kan ANA SAL.LUGAL menaḥanda ZAG–az AŠARŠUNU appanzi L₀.MEŠ ALAN.ZU₇–az EGIR GUNNI AŠARŠUNU appanzi “The queen goes in. She does reverence at the altar of the gods. She steps to the side of the upper window. § The palace attendants (and) the royal bodyguards come in. They take their places before the queen on the right. The ALAN.ZU₇—men take their places behind the hearth.”

The window is one of the “sacred places” in the temple that receives offerings regularly as part of most festival celebrations. As a kind of ceremonially fixed locus it can also serve as a reference point by which those celebrating festivals navigate and find their proper places for a ceremony. In the Festival of the Month example the queen, having come into the cella first, establishes her position at the window. The other cult functionaries can then find their assigned places for the ceremony relative to her or to another of the fixed sacred places, the hearth. In the other examples cited the windows seem to be a kind of partial border between sacred and secular loci. In the kurša- Festival the local singers take part in the ceremony but only for a short period. They are involved throughout, but for most of the ceremony only by watching from the windows while cult personnel from the capital perform a state ceremony in the local temple.

É kus kuršaš

KUB 55.43 i 7, 16 (Chapter 4). The phrase “temple/house of the hunting bags” is written É kus kuršaš in our text, É d kuršaš,92 É kuršaš93 and kus kuršaš
The house of the hunting bags occurs only in cultic context, either in festivals or festival descriptions in oracles. The two questions that have most occupied scholars concerning the house of the hunting bags are: 1) is it a separate building or part of a cult building complex? and 2) is it a temple where cult activity takes place or merely a house/room where the hunting bags are kept until they are needed elsewhere for some cultic ceremony? Otten in 1959 suggested that the $\text{E KU5kur}śaš$ was probably not a building, but just a room within the sanctuary. Güterbock has pointed out the role of the house of the hunting bags in furnishing all the offering materials at the various stations of a cultic journey of the hunting bag, as well as the fact that a festival takes place in the house of the hunting bags upon Zitḫariya’s return from his cultic journey on the third day of the nuntarriyašhaš Festival. He refuted Otten’s idea and suggests not only that the house of the hunting bags was a building of its own but further, based primarily on the fact of its providing offering materials, that it was a temple. Güterbock reiterates this position, using $\text{Ku}śkurśaš parna$ as an example of parna- meaning “temple,” and translates $\text{E KU5kur}śaš$ in the festival fragment $\text{KBo 10.27 iii 18}$ as “temple … of the Divine Shield.” Popko favors Otten’s idea, suggesting that the house of the hunting bags was a permanent resting place for the hunting bag and that it was probably a room within the temple, although he does not cite any specific evidence for this position. Most recently Singer cites the Old Hittite example $\text{ABoT 5+ ii 18'}$ (with many duplicates): $\text{kurśaš E-irza DIN} \text{GiR MEŚ uenzi}$ and translates “the gods come from the ‘house of the fleece,’” without commenting on what that might be.

As noted most emphatically by Güterbock, there are several examples of offering materials being supplied from the house of the hunting bags, in for example $\text{KUB 22.27 iv 35}$ and $\text{KUB 50.82:9', 13'}$ (both oracles about festivals). There are also a number of examples of cultic activity being performed in the house of the hunting bags. Examples include: $\text{kuedani-ma UD-ti DUTU-SI IN[A o o o ]x paizzi INA E D kurśaš-ma EZEN nu x[ o o o ]x ripači LÜ.MEŚ UR.GI, \text{unniyanzi KUR-eya ḥuma[ndaš a]rkammaš ISTRU E D kurśaš-a 1 GUD ŠE 3 G[UD? unni]yanzi ḥalkueššar šA E D kurśaš-pat “On the day that the king goes to [x], (there is) a festival in the house of the hunting bags. The dog-men drive (in) [ … ]x’s. (It is) the [t]ribute of all the lands. And from the house of the hunting bags they [drive] one fattened ox (and) three o[xen(?)]. (They are) the offering materials of that same house of the hunting bags”; NIN.DINGIR $\text{ma šara INA E KU5kurśaš paizzi piren D K} \text{n} \text{ti} \text{p} \text{u} \text{ti} \text{yaš KU5kurśaš iyatta LÜ.MEŚ Ḥapeš ú-nu-wa!-an-t[e-eš?] iyanta LÜ.MEŚ}}$
APPENDIX B

UrU Anunuw[a SĪR]-[I]R[u]₁ Salmēš ziuntuhiyas EGIR-a[n SĪR]-[I]R[u]₁ Salmēš arkammiyaleš ści arkammı-galgalturi GUL-ahḫannieškanzi § mān NIN.DINGIR ina E kuš kuršaš ari n-ašta ḫilamni andan [x x x] SĪR-R[u] NIN.DINGIR-kan andan paizzi “The NIN.DINGIR goes up to the house of the hunting bags. The hunting bag of Kantipuitti₁⁰³ goes before. The ḫapīya- functionaries, adorned(?), proceed. The men of Anunuw[a si]ng. The female arkmı- players play the arkmı- and galgalturi-instruments. § When the NIN.DINGIR arrives at the house of the hunting bags, the [x x x] sing in the gate house. (Then) the NIN.DINGIR goes in.” (A cult ceremony follows.)¹⁰⁴ Otten, commenting on this last passage, interprets it as evidence that the house of the hunting bags was near the gatehouse.¹⁰⁵ Guterbock refutes this idea, citing other evidence that the house of the hunting bags was a “selbständiges Gebäude” and interpreting ḫilamni in this passage as the gate house of the house of the hunting bags, where some cult functionaries stop and sing before the NIN.DINGIR actually enters the building.¹⁰⁶ In several passages in the KI.LAM Festival and other festivals cult ceremonies are described, after which comes the prescription “The gods come from the house of the hunting bags.”¹⁰⁷ Important also is an Old Script chant in Hattic¹⁰⁸ “When the priest [co]mes from the house of the hunting bags.” Thus both priests and gods went into the house of the hunting bags, presumably (based on the other evidence of cult ceremonies there) for celebrating festivals or parts of festivals.

All of this is evidence that this structure was some kind of temple. The writings É Dkuš kuršaš and kuš kuršaš parna exactly parallel the normal forms used for writing the names of other temples.¹⁰⁹ Several examples demonstrate the role of the house of the hunting bags in providing offering materials. These may also indicate that the house of the hunting bags was not simply a room in a larger temple complex but a free-standing building. Certainly the passage about the gate house of the house of the kurSa-s cited above, if interpreted correctly by Guterbock, is good evidence for this. In addition, the examples of cultic ceremonies being held in the house of the hunting bags lead to the conclusion that this structure is a temple.¹¹⁰

---

₁⁰³ That is, the image of Kantipuitti as a hunting bag. Popko, Kultobjekte 112, points out the importance of this passage as an example of the kurša-as a divine image.
₁⁰⁴ KBo 10.27 iii 10’-20’ (Festival naming the NIN.DINGIR).
₁⁰⁵ FsFriedrich 356.
₁⁰⁶ NHF 68 n. 63.
₁⁰⁷ For examples in the KI.LAM, see AbOT 5+ ii 18’ (Singer, StBoT 27: 91, “from the house of the fleece”), KBo 20.33+ obv. 13-16, translit. Singer, StBoT 28: 89. The same prescription occurs in another festival fragment: KBo 20.5 rev? 6’ with duplicate KBo 22.224 obv. 4’. Popko, Kultobjekte 110, understands these references to the gods coming from the house of the kurša-s as the kurša-s themselves, as gods, coming out, which seems quite likely.
₁⁰⁸ KBo 25.142+KBo 20.69 obv? 6’-7’, CTH 742, edited by Neu, StBoT 25: 229.
₁¹⁰ Houwink ten Cate, FsOtten² 190, mentions the festival for Zithariya in what he calls the “Temple of the (Divine) Fleeces.”
The additional evidence from the text treated in Chapter 4, KUB 55.43, allows for three main conclusions. First, the house of the hunting bags is the place where the hunting bags were normally hung, with a regular place, the Ašar Dingir-Lim, “place of the god,” prepared for them. This evidence of a special locus for the hunting bags to reside is supplemented by one reference to the “place of the kurša-s” (kuršaš-pat pedi) in a festival fragment. The context of this fragment does not really provide information about what the place of the kurša-s might be, but in light of the opening passages of the kurša- Festival it is clear that the place of the kurša-s is the same as the Ašar Dingir-Lim “place of the god” of the kurša- Festival. There were of course occasions when the hunting bags like any other divine image were taken out of their own temple to other cult sites for a particular festival celebration, for example: ḫalentuwaš-ma-kan anda [Ø] Ša sallugal Ziḫariyaš [Ø] [k]arū gankanza [Ø] “In the ḫalentu- building, however, Ziḫariya of the queen (is) already hung.” The use of the verb gank- here indicates that it was the hunting bag of Ziḫariya as his cult symbol which was hung in the ḫalentu- during the festival procedures. In the Thunder Festival the kurša- is moved out of a cult site: ḫuldalaša ḫa[(lentiuaz kurs)an dai “The ḫuldala- functionary takes the hunting bag from the ḫalentu- building.” Second, more than one hunting bag was hung there, and therefore we must take kuršaš in the construction É kuš kuršaš (and other writings of the phrase) as a genitive plural and translate accordingly as “temple of the kurša-s.” Third, the kurša-s function as the cult symbols for certain tutelary deities and therefore would be kept in a temple.

It is possible that the “house of the kurša-s” may be the same structure as the temple of Ziḫariya discussed in Chapter 1 under that god. Popko implies this understanding of the house of Ziḫariya. Since Ziḫariya is represented as a hunting bag and resides according to the kurša- Festival in the Temple of the Hunting Bags, the occurrences of Ziḫariya’s house may be another way of referring to this temple.

ḪUR.SAG

KUB 55.43 ii 33, [i.e. 2] (Chapter 4). (Deified) mountains occur in lists of gods in several different kinds of texts, including treaties (list of oath deities), prayers, and festivals. Since in such a context ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ almost always occurs with İD.MEŠ, it is discussed together with İD.

İD

KUB 55.43 ii 33, [i.e. 2] (Chapter 4); KUB 9.21.3’, 9’, IBoT 1.2 iii 13, iv 11’, KUB 51.79 rev! 12’, KUB 44.2:5’ (Chapter 5). Besides occurring in the list of oath deities in treaties, in evocations, and in prayers, İD.MEŠ, “rivers,” as deities appear also in the

111. KUB 34.130 ii? 11, noted by Popko, Kultobjekte 109–10.
112. 315/t i 12’-14’ (fragment of a festival celebrated by the queen), ed. Alp, Tempel 230–31.
114. Kultobjekte 112.
festival texts. Rivers are sacrificed to in several different ways. Offerings in general: DINGIR.MEŠ-naš ḫumandaš ANA ḪUR.SAG.ḪI.A ID.MEŠ ḫumandaš šippantu “He makes offerings (or “libates”) to all the gods and all the mountains (and) rivers.” These offerings to the mountains and river were considered important enough to be included in the BĒL MADGALTI instructions: ANA ḪUR.SAG.ḪI.A ID.ḪI.A kuēdaš SISKUR.SISKUR ešzi n-aš šipanzakandu “The mountains and rivers for which there is a ritual, let them regularly (iterative) make offerings to them.”

Some texts are more specific in describing the offerings for the mountains and rivers: 1 UDU ANA ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ 1 UDU ANA ID.MEŠ 1 UDU “One sheep t[o] the mountain[s, one she]ep to the river[s 1 sheep ... ].” In addition to animals being sacrificed, bread was broken to the mountains and rivers on a few occasions: [n]-ašta kī kue ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ ID.MEŠ [n]epiš tekan šUM-it ḥalzišai [NIN]DA.Ī NINDA.KU,-ya paršiyannai “These mountains (and) rivers, sky (and) earth which he calls by name, he regularly breaks fat bread and sweet bread (to them).” Later in the same festival drink offerings for the mountains and rivers are again called for: EGIR-SU-ša tekan GUB-aš 1-STU ekuzi EGIR-SU-ma ḪUR.SAG.MEŠ ID.MEŠ [GU]-aš 1-STU ekuzi “Afterwards he drinks the sky (and) earth once, standing. Afterwards he drinks the mountains (and) rivers once, standing.”

One might expect ID.MEŠ to occur frequently with ḫare “valleys,” but in fact there is only one other occurrence of ID with ḫare- besides KUB 55.43 ii 33 and [i.e. 2]. Although also in a text devoted to a tutelary deity, the Ritual for the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag, the context is different: D Lamma KUS kurṣa[n] arahženaš KUR.KUR.MEŠ-az ḫumandaz [Ḫ]UR.SAG.MEŠ-az ḫariyaz ID.MEŠ-az ḫan[i]yaššaz TUL.MEŠ-az ueluwaz [talli]škiwen mukiškiwen “We called and implored the Tutelary Deity of the Hunting Bag from all the surrounding lands, from the mountains, the valleys, the rivers, the lakes(?), the springs, (and) the meadows.”

LÛ.MEŠ UR.GI,


115. KBo 4.1 i 6–7 (Ritual by the Enemy Border).
116. KUB 13.2 iii 8 (BĒL MADGALTI Instructions), ed. von Schuler, Dienstanw. 47.
117. KUB 2.2+ iv 18 (Hattic bilingual for the consecration of a temple), ed. Schuster, HHB 76.
118. KUB 10.72 ii 19’–21’ (fest. frag.).
119. KUB 10.72 v 20–22 (fest. frag.).
120. The broken passage in KUB 55.43 is the only one in which “valleys” receive offerings.
121. See above discussion of ḫantiyašša- in this appendix.
122. KBo 20.107+KBo 23.50+ ii 10–13.
they almost always occur in cultic context, the exceptions being the laws (§88) and the
myth of Keṣṣi (KUB 33.121 ii 3'), and that their primary role in the cult is to bark or to
sing. Pecchioli Daddi in Mestieri suggests that LŪ UR.GI can mean two different things,
“hunter” and “dog-man.”

These studies summarize the available information about the LŪ(.MEŠ) UR.GI very
well. What the new evidence from KUB 55.43 adds to our knowledge of this title is the
close association of the LŪ.MEŠ UR.GI with the hunting bag as seen in their important
role in the kurša- Festival. Another passage in which the dog-men are involved with the
hunting bag is in an oracle about festivals: INA Škuršaš-ma EZEN x[ o o UD]U.HILA
LŪ.MEŠ UR.GI, unniyanzi “The dog-men drive [the she]ep into the temple of the hunting
bags for the festival of [x].” This passage not only associates the dog-men once again
with the hunting bag but also demonstrates that one of their duties was driving sheep into
the temple of the hunting bags during the performing of a festival. It is even possible that
the festival being inquired about in KUB 22.27 iv 17 was in fact the festival of the
renewing of the kurša-s, since the dog-men are nowhere else attested in festival context
driving animals, and the temple of the hunting bags and the dog-men both play important
roles in the kurša- Festival. This brings to mind KBo 13.179:11’–12’, treated in Chapter 4,
in which the dog-men kill a goat after it has been driven into certain “buildings of the
palace.” The evidence from the KUB 22.27 passage leads us to ask if the impersonal
“they” who drive in the goat in KBo 13.179 §2 were the dog-men. The most important point
to be derived from the KUB 22.27 passage is not the fact that the LŪ.MEŠ UR.GI are
attested in this one text driving animals, but that, as in KUB 55.43, they are closely
associated with the hunting bag.

Perhaps the most important evidence for understanding the role of the dog-men in the
cult is the fact that, as noted in the comments on wappiya-, the dog-men are one of only
three possible subjects attested for wappiya-, which, from its occurrences with UR.GI, is
secure in its meaning “to bark.” With the new examples from KUB 55.43 of the dog-men
barking, they are by far the most common subject of wappiya-. In addition, these
occurrences in the kurša- Festival are the most examples of dog-men barking in one
festival. Their barking throughout the festival (and in other festivals) might indicate that
they are representing dogs, but it may also show nothing more than that they bark as part of
their duties. This could be expected of hunters who use hunting dogs or of professional dog-
handlers. If they are hunters, Pecchioli Daddi’s distinction between hunters and dog-men
becomes unnecessary. The prominent role of the dog-men in the kurša- Festival points out
their close connection with the tutelary deities and the hunting bag and reinforces the idea
that they may very well be hunters or handlers of hunting dogs.

123. KUB 22.27 iv 17.
124. Güterbock, FsKantor 118, suggests that they were perhaps the men in charge of the hunting dogs.
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NUMBERS

3-e

IBoT 1.2 obv. iii 10 (Chapter 5). The form 2-e also occurs and is more frequent than 3-e. The complementation 3-e is most unusual; it only occurs in four other places. The best preserved of these is KUB 11.30+IBoT 4.197 rev. iii 22′–23′ (Festival of Zippalanda): LUGAL-uš iršawanzi tiyazi 3-e! iršaizzī “The king proceeds in order to treat with offerings. He makes offerings in sequence to 3 (gods).” Reverse iv 6′–7′ of the same text reads: LUGAL-uš iršaw[anzi tiyazi] 3-e! NINDA iršaizz[i] “The king [proceeds] in order [to] treat with offerings. He makes offerings in sequence to 3 (gods) (with) bread.” I would restore the third example, 355/t rev. 7′–8′ as follows: ta LUGAL-u[š iršawanzi tiyazi] 3-e irrha[izzī] on the basis of the KUB 11.30+ passage. In the only other occurrence of 3-e outside of our text, KBo 25.66 obv. ii 2′, the word after 3-e is broken away, leaving only a trace of the first sign, which is consistent with the ir sign. This third attestation thus probably also occurs with a form of the verb iršaiz-. In the IBoT 1.2 passage 3-e also occurs with iršaiz-. This consistent use of 3-e only with the verb iršaiz- provides a clue as to what this particular complementation of “three” denotes, although the examples are too few to posit a definite meaning for this complementation of the numeral “3.” Friedrich, HW 302, lists 3-e as an alternate form of the accusative. This may be correct, as it could be interpreted in its known attestations as an object of iršaiz-, considering an understood (gods) as the actual object and 3-e the adjective modifying this understood object. It is also possible that it is a locative, “in three places,” which also would make sense in the examples which we have of 3-e.

AKKADIAN

AŠRU (AŠAR DINGIR-LIM)

KUB 55.43 i 9, 11, iii 15′ (Chapter 4). This phrase, “the place of the god,” is attested only in this one text. The place of the god, which in this text is a location assigned as the place where the hunting bag was normally hung, was not something that needed to be specified in other cultic texts. Lines i 9 and 11 when taken together are instructive as to its nature, as they describe how the old hunting bags are hung below the AŠAR DINGIR-LIM, and the new ones on it. The only examples known to me of AŠAR in a phrase similar to this occur in KUB 53.12 obv. iii 22′ and 24′ (Festival for Telipinu), which describe holding a sheep in the AŠAR ḫattāḥa “place of Kattāḥa.” This is the only text which specifies the place of a particular deity. Oten comments on AŠAR DINGIR-LIM-pat in i 9, with the tentative translation “Götterbild, Götterstatue, göttlicher Ort” and the alternative suggestion that the phrase indicated a “Kultplatz” where the hunting bag was hung.125 Presumably the place of the god is normally the niche where his cult statue was placed. Because of the unusual (if not unique) nature of the hunting bag as a cult representation, it

125. FsFriedrich 356.
required a special sacred locus or "place of the god." Hence this text, which describes the festivals for the gods thus represented, uses a term unnecessary for most cultic prescriptions. This locus is also prescribed in the festival fragment KUB 34.130 ii? 11:126 [KUB34.130 ii? 11:126] *kuršan kus kuršaš-pati pedi kan kanzi* "[They hang the hunting bag in the very place of the hunting bags."

**DIVINE NAMES**

**Ḥu(wa)riyanzipa**

*KUB 51.79 rev! 10′ and all duplicates; KUB 44.2:3′ with duplicate KUB 44.3:5′ (Chapter 5).* See Laroche, *RHA* VII/45 (1945–46) 7; idem, *Rech.* (1947) 67; Kammenhuber, *KZ* 77 (1961) 187–88 with n. 2; Otten and von Soden, *StBoT* 7 (1968) 28 n. 3; Frantz-Szabó, *RLA* 4 (1972–75) 503–04. This god is very poorly attested; Laroche comments, *RHA* VII/45 (1945–46) 7, that "Ḥurijanzipa est très obscur." He later catalogues this name with those divine names that are formed with a suffix -sipa, a substantive with the sense of "genie or demon," and proposes a tentative meaning "genie du ḫurija?"127 This god's name is attested in two different stems. As Ḫuriyanzipa- he occurs once in a Ḫurri bird oracle question (*KUB* 5.7 obv. 17) and three times in festival texts (*KBo* 22.192 rev. 9, *KUB* 20.4 i 13′ and 16′). As Huwariyanzipa- he occurs in one of the fragments naming the Salmaš zintuḫeš (*KBo* 30.164+*KUB* 44.13 obv. iii 24′), in two different festival fragments (*KBo* 20.101:14′ and *IBoT* 2.30:7′), and in our text, a festival for the Tutelary Deity of the River. The specifically localized deity "Ḥuwariyanzipa of Šamuḥa" which we have in the tutelary deity festival does not occur in any of the other examples.

**Gulšeš**

*KUB 9.21:6′ (Chapter 5).* On Gulšeš in general see Otten, *RLA* 3 (1957–71) 698, with previous literature cited there. More recently the Gulšeš are discussed by Otten and Siegelová, *AfO* 23 (1970) 32–38, and Beckman, *StBoT* 29 (1983) 80 n. 196 and 241–45. The expression that concerns us in *KUB* 9.21:6′, wappuwaš Gulšeš, is extremely rare, occurring in two other places. One is in a ritual fragment: n-"aš EGIR-pa tuq AB[(A ÎD wap)]wašša Gulšša DINGIR.MAḪ.MEŠ paiz[(zi)] "He goes to you, the river, and to the fate deities of the riverbank, (and) the MAḪ deities."128 The second passage is in a ritual against sorcery: ezzatten wappuwaš Gulššuš, *KUB* 17.27 ii 20′, translated by Goetze, *ANET* 347 as "Eat, ye demons of the clay pit!" Goetze translates the *KUB* 9.21:6′ passage

as "[Afterwards] he 'drinks' the Guššēš of the clay pit." The occurrence of wappuwaš in KUB 9.21 in a festival for the Tutelary Deity of the River and in a context where gods of the river are receiving drink offerings argues for a translation "fate deities of the riverbank" instead of the "clay pit."

See Chapter 1 for a discussion of the various names and titles of the tutelary deities.

KUB 51.79 rev! 11'; IBOT 2.19:2'; KUB 44.2:4'; KUB 44.3:6' (Chapter 5). On this group of gods see Laroche, NH 259 n. 25; Otten, StBoT 7 (1968) 28; Jakob-Rost, THeth 2 (1972) 83; and Kammenhuber, HW², Lief. 6/7 (1982) 411b, 412b sub aška-. This name always occurs in the plural denoting a group of gods, they occur only in festival and ritual texts, and they are always (where the text is sufficiently well preserved) described as "of the gate(s)." In almost every case the gate is unspecified, but in KBo 10.27 iv 28–29 (fest. frag. naming the NIN.DINGIR) we have KÁ.GAL aššašašŠalawanaš, "the Šalawani-deities of the gate of the ašša-s," in a list of gods who are to receive offerings.

GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

KUB 51.79 rev! 11'; KUB 44.2:1' with duplicate KUB 44.3:2'–3' (Chapter 5). As with other geographical locations, these names can occur as deified loci with a divine determinative. Concerning these names two questions suggest themselves: First, are these two separate entities or simply variants of one name? Second, what kind of name(s) are they? They are attested only in CTH 684.3, in the main text, the parallel, and a duplicate to the parallel text. The only other passage cited in RGTC 6: 533, KBo 11.21 (right column) 3', should be read ŠUL-Ka-ri-t[a(-). Tischler treats Karepa and Karepati as one name under the rubric Kari-pa and categorizes it as a "Quellname," but the evidence suggests that the situation with these names is more complex than he indicates in RGTC 6.

KUB 44.3:2'–3' is the most important passage for answering our first question. There we have secure evidence that there are two separate names, ṚKa-re-e-[pa in line 2' and ṚKa-][re-e-pa-ti in line 3'. Although he cites both of these passages in RGTC 6: 533, Tischler does not take KUB 44.3 as evidence that Karepa and Karepati may actually be two different names. As KUB 44.3 is a fragment of a list of deities who are to receive offerings, it is unlikely that there would be variant spellings of the same name in one list. RGTC 6 reads line 2' as Ṛx ka-ri-e[-, but there is no word space before the ka sign, so the broken sign preceding it is probably a determinative. The preserved trace of this determinative is ambiguous but would allow either DING[IR or ŠUL to be read. In KUB 44.3:3' the beginning of the name, including the determinative, is completely lost. KUB 44.3 thus

129. Language 29 (1953) 274.
serves to demonstrate the existence of the two distinct names Kare[pa] and [Kajrepati but provides no evidence for our second question as to what type of name these are, whether they be divine name, spring name, or something else.

For this second question we have the evidence of KUB 51.79 rev! 8' and KUB 44.2:1'. The KUB 51.79 passage is the only place in which either word occurs with a preserved TUL determinative. The RGTC 6 citation of Bo 858 is now KUB 51.79 rev! 8' and should be corrected to ṭa-ka-re-e-pa-a-at-ti. This one clear example is sufficient to indicate that there was indeed a spring named Karepatt(i)i. In KUB 44.2:1', although most of the signs in the first line are partially broken away, the line is sufficiently readable for us to be sure that the determinative for Karepa is DINGIR, and that Kar[epati], if correctly restored from the duplicate KUB 44.3, also has a DINGIR determinative. RGTC 6 reads KUB 44.2': as ḫa-a-ri-pa-an, but there is a word space after ka-a-ri-pa, and the following an sign may therefore be read as a DINGIR determinative. Tischler's reading as an accusative form would be suspect in this text anyway, as all the other names in the list are d.-l. forms, indirect objects of šipant-. In KUB 44.2:1', in a list of deities such as this, one would expect another divine name. Lebrun, Samuha 176, reads the sign as a DINGIR determinative but restores ḫKa-aṣ[ta-ma. The duplicate KUB 44.3:3' and the parallel KUB 51.79 rev! 8' indicate, however, that the correct restoration must be ḫKar[epati].

This occurrence of ḫKar[epati] in KUB 44.2:1' in conjunction with ṭaI-Karepatt(i) in KUB 51.79 rev! 8' indicates that Karepatt(i)i was the name of a spring, like many others a holy place whose name could be written either with a TUL or a DINGIR determinative. Although the name Karepa may also have been a spring name in KUB 44.3:2', where the trace of the determinative is inconclusive, and in KUB 51.79 rev! 8', where the name has been completely restored, the only attested determinative for Karepa is DINGIR, in KUB 44.2:1'. It is quite possible then that Karepa is the name of a deity only, in which case the (divine) spring name Karepatt(i)i may be derived from that deity's name. Using the evidence discussed above, I restore ḫKarepa in KUB 51.79 rev! 8'.

**fD**Nakkiliya

KUB 51.79 rev! 12'; IBoT 2.19:3'; KUB 44.2:5'; KUB 44.3:7' (Chapter 5). All but one of the occurrences of this river cited in RGTC 6: 540-41 are from the various duplicates of this text. The exception is Bo 983, now KUB 57.32, which is a small fragment that does not seem to be related to our text. The KUB 57 passage is the only one in which a clear ID determinative is preserved to indicate that this is definitely a river name. The list of deities receiving drink offerings in KUB 51.79 §4' is an unusual list because it contains several deified locations which are either unique in this text or at least extremely rare, and this river is one of those. Tischler points out in RGTC 6: 541 that fDNakkiliya is very probably the same river as fDNakkiliyata. This latter form of the name is also very rare; all the occurrences which he cites are in KUB 36.89 (Ritual to bring back the Stormgod of Nerik). KUB 57.32, which contains the only occurrence of the river Nakkiliya outside of CTH 684.3, is a duplicate of this ritual. To the RGTC 6 references for fDNakkiliyata add KUB 36.88 obv. 12 (Prayer to the god of Nerik) and KUB 36.49 obv. i 11 (mythological
There is a personal name Nakili(a)t (NH #850) on which Laroche, NH 309, comments briefly in relation to this river name.

**Zapatiskuwa**

*KUB 55.43, passim; KUB 7.36 rev. rt. 15', rev. left [3']; KBo 8.97+KBo 21.89 iv 18' (Chapter 4). All occurrences of this city name are in the phrase *pLAMMA Zapatiskuwa*, "the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa," and the passages cited above are the only occurrences of this phrase. Thus the city of Zapatiskuwa is never mentioned outside of cultic texts for tutelary deities, and its only importance seems to have been in connection with its own Tutelary Deity. The fact that the old hunting bag of the Tutelary Deity of Hatenzuwa is renamed the Tutelary Deity of Zapatiskuwa but is taken to Durmitta may indicate that Zapatiskuwa was a Hattian city which had at some point given its name to this particular tutelary deity but had since diminished in its importance in the cult to the point that even the tutelary deity named for the city no longer resided there but was now taken to Durmitta.
APPENDIX C

TABLES OF SIGN SHAPES FOR SELECTED TABLETS

As noted in the Introduction, paleography of script is an essential aid in the dating of individual Hittite tablets and, in turn, an essential part of reconstructing Hittite history. The paleography of many of the festival texts is discussed in the commentaries of Chapters 2–5. The following tables of selected sign shapes for eight of the larger texts are intended to supplement those discussions. Signs that are generally agreed upon as “diagnostic,” whose changes over the course of Hittite scribal history have been traced by modern scholars, are included. Numbers refer to the system developed by Rüster and Neu, *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon.*
Table 1. Bo 3298+KUB 25.32+KUB 27.70+1628/u

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 tar</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>187 e*</td>
<td>i 10 ii 14' iii 42'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 gi</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>192 SAG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 nam</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>197 un</td>
<td>iii 32' iv 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 en</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>209 zu</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 ru</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>214 da*</td>
<td>i 54 ii 2 ii 24 iii 24'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 ip*</td>
<td>i 52 iii 6' iii 39' iii 44'</td>
<td>215 it</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 ik</td>
<td>i 35 ii 14</td>
<td>229 URU*</td>
<td>i 25 i 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 KU</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>265 U</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 ni*</td>
<td>i 33 iii 31'</td>
<td>313 ki</td>
<td>i 32 iii 15' iii 17'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 ak</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>343 li*</td>
<td>i 33 ii 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 az</td>
<td>i 27</td>
<td>353 šar</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 uk</td>
<td>ii 19</td>
<td>357 me*</td>
<td>i 42 ii 30 iv 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 LUGAL*</td>
<td>ii 46 iii 15'</td>
<td>360 MEŠ*</td>
<td>i 32 ii 16 iii 12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 du</td>
<td>ii 47 iii 30'</td>
<td>364 ANA*</td>
<td>i 29 ii 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183 al*</td>
<td>i 43 ii 30 iii 19'</td>
<td>367 ḫa*</td>
<td>i 27 ii 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More than four examples
### Table 2. KUB 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 tar*</td>
<td>i 45</td>
<td>187 e*</td>
<td>ii 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii 22</td>
<td>ii 28</td>
<td>iii 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 gi</td>
<td>iii 26</td>
<td>i 45</td>
<td>ii 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii 31</td>
<td>iv 37</td>
<td>iv 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 nam</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>iii 42</td>
<td>vi 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 en</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>i 50</td>
<td>ii 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 ru</td>
<td>ii 35</td>
<td>209 zu</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 ip</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>214 da*</td>
<td>i 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 ik</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>i 43</td>
<td>i 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 KU</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>i 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 ni</td>
<td>ii 30</td>
<td>215 it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 ak</td>
<td>iii 5</td>
<td>313 ki*</td>
<td>ii 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 az</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>ii 37</td>
<td>iii 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 uk</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>vi 3</td>
<td>vi 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 LUGAL</td>
<td>vi 5</td>
<td>343 li*</td>
<td>i 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 du</td>
<td>iv 33</td>
<td>iii 12</td>
<td>iv 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183 al</td>
<td>iv 1</td>
<td>353 šar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214 da*</td>
<td>i 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215 it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229 URU*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265 U</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 ki*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343 li*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353 šar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357 mc</td>
<td>iii 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 MEŠ</td>
<td>ii 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364 ANA</td>
<td>i 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367 ha*</td>
<td>i 43</td>
<td>ii 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More than four examples
Table 3. *KBo* 22.189

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>tar</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>e*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>gi</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>SAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>nam</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>ru</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>da*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>ip</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>ik</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>URU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>KÜ</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>ak</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>az</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>šar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>uk</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>me*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>LUGAL*</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>MES*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>du</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>ANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>al</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>ṣa*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More than four examples*
## Tables of Sign Shapes for Selected Tablets

Table 4. KBo 11.40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 tar</td>
<td>ii 17'</td>
<td>187 e*</td>
<td>vi 3' vi 21' vi 27'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 gi</td>
<td>vi 30'</td>
<td>192 SAG*</td>
<td>ii 3' v 15' vi 10' vi 26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 nam</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>197 un</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 en</td>
<td>v 13'</td>
<td>209 zu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 ru</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>214 da*</td>
<td>i 5' i 24'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 ip</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>215 it</td>
<td>i 26' vi 11'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 ik</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>229 URU*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 KU</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>265 U</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 ni</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>313 ki*</td>
<td>vi 3' vi 12' vi 16' vi 22'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 ak</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>343 li*</td>
<td>ii 11' v 3' vi 6' vi 12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 az</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>353 šar</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 uk</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>357 me</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 LUGAL</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>360 MEŠ*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 du*</td>
<td>i 21' v 5'</td>
<td>364 ANA*</td>
<td>v 17' vi 7'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183 al</td>
<td>i 10'</td>
<td>367 ha*</td>
<td>v 13' vi 13'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More than four examples
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>tar</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>i 7 i 21 ii 4 iii 29'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>gi</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>SAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>none clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>nam</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>ii 17 iv 5' iv 27'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i 1 i 6 iii 32' iv 20'</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 1 i 23 ii 21 iv 20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>ru</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i 8 i 14' iii 30'</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>ip</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii 33'</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 1 i 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>ik</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>URU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii 16 iii 29'</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 6 i 12 i 20 i 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>KU</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 1 i 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 29 ii 16 ii 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>ak</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>iii 33’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>az</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>šar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i 21 i 34’</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 11 iv 31’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>uk</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i 4 iii 30’</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>LUGAL</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>MES*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 7 ii 20 ii 33(1st) iv 27’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>du</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>ANA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i 9 iv 26’</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 9 iv 8’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>al</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>ḫa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i 10 iv 34’</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 2 iii 12’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More than four examples
Table 6. *KBo 21.89+KBo 8.97*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>tar</em></td>
<td>30</td>
<td><em>gi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td><em>nam</em></td>
<td>192</td>
<td><em>SAG</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td><em>en</em></td>
<td>197</td>
<td><em>un</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td><em>ru</em></td>
<td>209</td>
<td><em>zu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td><em>ip</em></td>
<td>214</td>
<td><em>da</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td><em>ik</em></td>
<td>215</td>
<td><em>it</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td><em>KU</em></td>
<td>229</td>
<td><em>URU</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td><em>ni</em></td>
<td>265</td>
<td><em>U</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td><em>ak</em></td>
<td>313</td>
<td><em>ki</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td><em>az</em></td>
<td>343</td>
<td><em>li</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td><em>uk</em></td>
<td>353</td>
<td><em>šar</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td><em>LUGAL</em></td>
<td>357</td>
<td><em>me</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td><em>du</em></td>
<td>360</td>
<td><em>MES</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td><em>al</em></td>
<td>364</td>
<td><em>ANA</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>367</td>
<td><em>ha</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More than four examples*
Table 7. IBoT 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 tar</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>187 e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 gi</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>192 SAG</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 nam</td>
<td>iii 8'</td>
<td>197 un</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 en</td>
<td>ii 3</td>
<td>209 zu</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 ru</td>
<td>iv 9'</td>
<td>214 da*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 ip</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>215 i</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 ik</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>229 URU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 KÜ</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>265 U</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 ni</td>
<td>iv 13'</td>
<td>313 ki</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 ak</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>343 li</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 az</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>353 šar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 uk</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>357 me</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 LUGAL</td>
<td>iii 10</td>
<td>360 MES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 du</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>364 ANA</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183 al</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>367 ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More than four examples*
Table 8. **KUB 51.79**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 tar</td>
<td>obv! 21'</td>
<td>187 e*</td>
<td>obv! 4' rev! 8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 gi</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>192 SAG</td>
<td>rev! 5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 nam</td>
<td>obv! 11'</td>
<td>197 un</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 en</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>209 zu</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 ru</td>
<td>obv! 2' obv! 23' rev! 21'</td>
<td>214 da*</td>
<td>obv! 9' obv! 9' rev! 17'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 ip</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>215 it</td>
<td>rev! 14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 ik</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>229 URU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 KU</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>265 U</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 ni</td>
<td>rev! 16' rev! 17'</td>
<td>313 ki*</td>
<td>obv! 11' rev! 1' rev! 12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 ak</td>
<td>rev! 12'</td>
<td>343 li*</td>
<td>obv! 5' obv! 10' rev! 11'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 az</td>
<td>obv! 16'</td>
<td>353 šar</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 uk</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>357 me</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 LUGAL</td>
<td>obv! 10'</td>
<td>360 MEŠ</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 du</td>
<td>rev! 9'</td>
<td>364 ANA</td>
<td>obv! 14'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183 al</td>
<td>obv! 8' obv! 21'</td>
<td>367 ha</td>
<td>obv! 16' rev! 10'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More than four examples*
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LEXICAL INDEX

This index includes words for which I have suggested new meanings, provided information about attestations in the corpus, or given a summary of other scholarly work. Foreign or loan words from languages other than Sumerian or Akkadian have been included in the Hittite section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HITTITE</th>
<th>kipikkisdu</th>
<th>248–50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-an</td>
<td>kuen-</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annari-</td>
<td>kurrašarra-</td>
<td>107 n. 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barkiu-</td>
<td>kurša-</td>
<td>20–22, 182–84, 250–54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aššatta-</td>
<td>lipšai-</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aššaš</td>
<td>milittaš</td>
<td>72 n. 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aššuša-</td>
<td>newahk</td>
<td>254–55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫa(ar) ašša-</td>
<td>palwai-</td>
<td>255–57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫalzai-</td>
<td>papu-GR</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫantiyasša-</td>
<td>papul-GR</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫa/um(u)ai-</td>
<td>parašarra-</td>
<td>107 n. 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫuššiyyal</td>
<td>parzahannaš</td>
<td>74 n. 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫuššairai</td>
<td>pihaladdsšiš</td>
<td>106 n. 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫilha-</td>
<td>pihaddaššiš</td>
<td>106 n. 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫhilammar</td>
<td>purpura-</td>
<td>150 n. 35, 257–58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫiššala-</td>
<td>šakiyabḫu-</td>
<td>101 n. 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫuwaši-</td>
<td>šanḫ-</td>
<td>159–60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫuwapraš</td>
<td>šarlaimi-</td>
<td>50 with n. 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫtai-</td>
<td>šarmiya-LU.MR-</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫhatti</td>
<td>šiyatalški-</td>
<td>115 n. 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫhašarwannaš</td>
<td>šuwant-</td>
<td>103 n. 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫgar-</td>
<td>NINDS takarmu-</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫkariya-</td>
<td>takšatar</td>
<td>105 n. 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫkarimmi-</td>
<td>takkuwar</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaš</td>
<td>takkuwi-</td>
<td>107 n. 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kattapuzna-</td>
<td>tarna-</td>
<td>204–05, 234 n. 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE HITTITE STATE CULT OF THE TUTELARY DEITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divine Names</th>
<th>Sumerian</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ala</em></td>
<td>11-14, 138-39</td>
<td>11-14, 138-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dag</em></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dAlad</em></td>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Damkina</em></td>
<td>203-04</td>
<td>203-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hapantali(ya)</em></td>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>14-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hatsgalu</em></td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hatenzawu</em></td>
<td>222 with n. 21</td>
<td>222 with n. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inara</em></td>
<td>24-27</td>
<td>24-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kantipuitt</em></td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kappariyamu</em></td>
<td>18, 236-37, 249-50</td>
<td>18, 236-37, 249-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Karepa</em></td>
<td>272-73</td>
<td>272-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Karzi</em></td>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gulis</em></td>
<td>271-72</td>
<td>271-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sullivan*</td>
<td>23-33</td>
<td>23-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan aniyatta</em></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan ASRI</em></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan E.Dingir-Lim</em></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan E.SA</em></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan GAL</em></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan GAZ.BA.A</em></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan Hatenzuwa</em></td>
<td>33-34</td>
<td>33-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan ID</em></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan INBU</em></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan innarawanza</em></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan Karan</em></td>
<td>36-37, 80-81</td>
<td>36-37, 80-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan KARA</em></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan KUR kursha</em></td>
<td>39-41</td>
<td>39-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan LIL</em></td>
<td>44-46</td>
<td>44-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan LUGAL</em></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan lulum(mi)-</em></td>
<td>49-50</td>
<td>49-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan MURU.URU</em></td>
<td>41-42</td>
<td>41-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan NIG.KA</em></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan sharaimi</em></td>
<td>50 with n. 329</td>
<td>50 with n. 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan SUKUR</em></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan TaShapuna</em></td>
<td>38, 249-50</td>
<td>38, 249-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan Tatsuna</em></td>
<td>38, 249-50</td>
<td>38, 249-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan Tauri</em></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sullivan TUR</em></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lexical Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLAMMA UR.MAH</td>
<td>47-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLAMMA URUZapatiškuwa</td>
<td>33-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezzulla</td>
<td>249-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠA 7.7.BI DLAMMA</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šalawani</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wašḥazza DLAMMA</td>
<td>50, 59 n. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zithariya</td>
<td>19-23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Geographical Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>^Alatarma</td>
<td>96 n. 56, 109 n. 121, 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^KarepaKOi</td>
<td>272-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakkiliya</td>
<td>273-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnat</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuhuppiya</td>
<td>157-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapatiškuwa</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Personal Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tap(a)rami</td>
<td>53-54, 81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDEX OF TEXTS TREATED

### FULL EDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Full Edition</th>
<th>Pages</th>
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