

# Hittite Cult Inventories – Part One: The Hittite Cult Inventories as Textual Genre

Michele Cammarosano

---

## Summary

The Hittite cult inventories constitute a corpus of ca. 550 fragments dating to the Late Empire period, dealing with offerings and festivals in provincial towns. Due to their nature as local reports, they display great variability both in content and in layout, a fact which may raise ambiguities with other textual genres. The paper argues for a clear-cut demarcation between ‘cult inventories’ and ‘festival texts’, based on the analysis of their colophons and incipits as well as on the identification of special features, which are peculiar to each of these genres. This facilitates the attribution of fragmentary texts and aims to define a boundary between textual genres which seem to have existed already in ancient times. The proposed definition is tested through a discussion of uncertain and significant cases and through an extensive revision of the current attribution of these fragments within the *Catalogue des Textes Hittites*.

## 1.0. Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Fragments labelled as ‘cult inventories’ are grouped in the eighth chapter of the *Catalogue des textes hittites* (henceforth, CTH). In the 1971 edition of this major reference tool, E. Laroche included here 132 fragments and labelled the chapter *Administration religieuse*. He wrote:

*Nous désignons sous ce titre les tablettes qui décrivent des objets du culte et qui appartiennent à la série des inventaires de sanctuaires. Elles semblent avoir été rédigées sous le règne de Tudhaliya IV; on les interprète dans le cadre d'une réforme ou d'une révision générale des idoles, du clergé, des fêtes, des rations alimentaires et des victimes sacrificielles.*<sup>2</sup>

---

1 This article develops some topics treated in the Ph.D. dissertation I submitted to the University of Naples ‘L’Orientale’ in May 2012. I am indebted to S. de Martino, J. Hazenbos, J. Lorenz, D. Schwemer, for valuable comments on earlier drafts of this paper, and to G. Wilhelm for the permission of consulting the filecard and photo collections at the *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur* in Mainz (March 2011). I am also grateful to G. Konstantopoulos and Ch. Steitler who helped me make my English understandable. The research was funded by a doctoral grant from the University of Naples ‘L’Orientale’ and by a short-term DAAD scholarship at the Freie Universität Berlin. Abbreviations are those of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary.

2 Laroche 1971: 87. On the origin of this CTH chapter, see § 1.8.1.

Some forty years later, the up-to-date online version of the Catalogue, edited by S. Košak,<sup>3</sup> lists within the ‘cult inventories’ group no less than 642 fragments. Such a rich corpus is of great interest for many reasons, not least because these documents focus mainly on cult objects and festivals in local towns and thus provide “considerable evidence to answer an important and seldom asked or answerable question: ‘What’s going on outside the center(s) of power?’”<sup>4</sup> Ch. Carter opened his 1962 Chicago Doctoral Dissertation on the Hittite cult inventories, still the main reference work on the subject, with the following words: “Among the myriads of clay tablets found in the ruins near the present-day Turkish village of Bogazköy, there are many that are known by the name ‘cult-inventories’. This term is quite inclusive: the texts it labels are almost as heterogeneous a mixture as one could want. This fact alone makes the task of understanding the character of the texts difficult. When, in addition, the question of purpose is asked, the undertaking becomes an even more laborious one.”<sup>5</sup> Interestingly, such a heterogeneous and eclectic character can be observed not only in the content, but also in the formal layout of these documents. Indeed, cult inventories form the “most diverse and complicated group” within W. Waal’s recent study on Hittite colophons, tablet layout, and record management.<sup>6</sup>

If so, however, what is a cult inventory actually? According to which criteria is a fragment classified as such? And are these criteria purely modern classificatory means or do they rather mirror some ancient text-managing principles? These questions are investigated in the present article, which constitutes the first part of a broader study about the Hittite cult inventories. Today, fifty years after Carter’s dissertation, a great number of new texts and of specific studies allow a better understanding of these texts. In particular, a closer look at the criteria currently adopted to define the corpus may be welcome. The distinction between cult inventories and festival texts (*Festrituale, Festbeschreibungen*) will deserve special attention.

The second part of the study focuses on the texts’ dating and on the related question concerning the much debated ‘cult reorganization’ allegedly promoted by Tudḫaliya IV.<sup>7</sup>

The corpus I considered includes all fragments catalogued under CTH 501–525 in the latest available version of the *Konkordanz der hethiti-*

3 At <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/>.

4 So R. Beal in his review of Hazenbos 2003 (Beal 2005/06: 363).

5 Carter 1962: 1. This groundbreaking work has since enjoyed wide circulation among scholars, despite having never been published.

6 Waal 2010: 263. I am grateful to the author for discussing her views with me and for kindly giving me access to her Ph.D. Dissertation. A revised version of this work will be published in the series *Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten*, Wiesbaden.

7 Hittite cult inventories – Part two: The dating of the texts and the alleged ‘cult reorganization’ of Tudḫaliya IV’, *AoF* 39 (2012) 3–37.

*schen Texte* online (version 1.84), plus a considerable number of cult inventory fragments catalogued under CTH 530 (CTH 526-529 are vacant). The sample has been augmented to include texts that in my opinion should be considered cult inventories despite being presently classified under other CTH numbers, whereas texts catalogued within CTH 501-530 that do not seem to be true cult inventories have been excluded (see §§ 1.8.2–1.8.3). This provides a corpus numbering more than 200 fragments. Since most of the remaining texts are scraps or very poorly preserved fragments, the results of this study may be regarded as significant for the textual genre as a whole.

The corpus of cult inventories used in the present study includes the following texts and fragments:

KBo series:

2.1; 2.7–8; 2.13; 2.16; 12.56–57; 12.138; 12.140; 13.231; 13.235; 13.237–238; 13.246; 13.250; 13.251 (+) IBoT 2.104; 13.252; 18.167; 19.131; 21.81 (+) 34.106; 23.58; 24.117 (+) 39.48 + 40.42; 25.140; 26.147 + 55.174; 26.148–152; 26.154; 26.159–161; 26.176; 26.179; 26.182; 26.187–188; 26.194; 26.196; 26.199; 26.201; 26.212; 26.218; 26.221; 26.224; 26.228; 30.130; 31.168; 39.49; 41.123; 45.178; 45.180; 46.82; 47.213; 47.215; 48.109; 49.205; 49.300; 51.104; 51.107; 51.113; 52.94–95; 53.94; 54.164; 55.172; 55.187; 57.112; 58.15; 58.58; 59.63–64; 59.131; 60.87; 61.9.

KUB series:

7.24 + 58.29; 12.2–3; 12.36 + 60.9; 13.32; 17.35–36; 20.89; 25.22; 25.23 (+) 59.34 (+) KBo 57.113 + Bo 4615; 25.24; 25.30; 27.68 + 42.100 + KBo 26.181 + Bo 3289 + Bo 3758; 30.37; 31.24; 34.87; 38.1–5; 38.6 + Bo 6741; 38.7; 38.8 (+) 38.9; 38.10 + 38.10a; 38.11–18; 38.19 + IBoT 2.102; 38.20–21; 38.23–25; 38.26 (+) 38.27; 38.28–35; 38.37–38; 42.41; 42.85 (+) 54.94; 42.88; 42.91–92; 42.105 + 54.45 + Bo 6572; 44.1; 44.4 + KBo 13.241; 44.20–21; 44.29; 44.42; 46.17; 46.21; 46.27; 46.34; 48.105 + KBo 12.53; 48.113–114; 51.3; 51.23 +<sup>2</sup> 57.108; 51.26; 51.33; 51.47; 53.21; 54.61 (+) 54.90; 55.14–15; 55.48; 56.39–40; 56.56; 57.58; 57.67; 57.88; 57.97; 57.102–104; 57.106; 58.7; 58.58; 59.14; 60.27; 60.127; 60.140; 60.162–163.

Other series:

ABoT 1.55; 2.116–123; HT 4; 14; 71 + IBoT 3.100; IBoT 2.103; 2.105; 2.131; 3.120; KuSa I/1.3–13; 39; VBoT 26; VSNF 12.111; Bo 3245; 3432; 3512a; 3998; 4370; 5554; Ku 99/153; KuT 54; Privat 48; YH 2005/1.

### 1.1. General remarks

The best presentation of what are called ‘Hittite cult inventories’ may well be that provided by H.G. Güterbock in 1964:

*Über zahlreiche in kleineren Orten des Reiches ausgeführte Kulte unterrichteten Texte, für die sich die Bezeichnung ‘Kultinventare’ eingebürgert hat. Diese Inventare, die meist nach Städten angeordnet sind, nennen den Namen des in der betreffenden Stadt verehrten Gottes und fügen Angaben über das Aussehen seines Kultbildes oder sonstigen Kultobjekts, über die für ihn gefeierten Feste, und oft auch über das Kultpersonal hinzu. Obwohl oft alle diese Angaben in kürzerer oder ausführlicherer Fassung zusammen vorliegen, lassen sich in der Praxis zwei Typen unterscheiden, von denen der eine mehr Gewicht auf die Bildbeschreibung, der andere auf die Beschreibung der Feste legt.<sup>8</sup>*

Both these basic types of cult inventory are now dealt with by a number of studies. The excellent Chicago dissertation by Ch. Carter still contains, however, the only methodological discussion about the definition of this textual genre. As already noted, the ‘cult inventories’ differ greatly from each other both in content and in layout.<sup>9</sup> This is due to the very nature of this kind of document. Basically, they were reports on the situation of the cults in one or more specific places at a specific time, and could be written down based on information of various kind. This could be made up of both oral and written sources, the former ones resulting from investigations and interviews with local priests or savants in the respective towns,<sup>10</sup> the latter consisting basically of previous documents with descriptions of local rites.<sup>11</sup> In addition,

8 Güterbock 1964: 70–71.

9 For an overview on this, see Carter 1962: 1–8.

10 See, e.g., KUB 30.37, KUB 38.37, KUB 42.100+, KuSa I/1.3.

11 This is made explicit when on the tablet there is a PAP sign (KUB 38.12 i 3, 7) or a reference to other tablets. Usually, these statements assert that the rites are being checked against or copied from an older document. Interestingly, these statements normally refer to wooden writing boards, as the terms GIŠ.HUR, *gulzattar*, *kurta* and *gastarḫa(i)ta* all refer to this type of document (for more on these terms, see Marazzi 1994; Schwemer 2005/06: 223–224; Waal 2011: 22–25; all with further literature). I am aware of the following cases:

(1) KUB 42.100+ (ed. Hazenbos 2003: 14–24; Haas 1970: 300–303): reference to ‘rites searching activity’ in different kinds of written documents: *kurta* and *gulzattar* writing boards; i 35–37: “from a *kurta* writing board of Muwatalli (ŠA<sup>m</sup> NIR.GÁL GIŠ<sup>is</sup>kur-ta-za): 12 monthly festivals, 1 spring festival. The autumn festival, however, (is) not celebrated. As for the *gulzattar* writing boards which are in the ‘house of the tablet’ (É *tup-pa-ašša ku-e gul-za-tar*<sup>HI.A</sup>): the spring festival is celebrated; the autumn festival, however, [...]”; i 38: “from a [*kur*]ta writing board of the grandfather of My Sun” (ŠA A-BI A-BI<sup>d</sup> UTU<sup>SI</sup>-m[a GIŠ<sup>is</sup>kur]-ta-za); similarly iii 22’, iv 10’ and iv 33’–34’: “on an old *kurta* writing board” (*an-na-al-li* GIŠ<sup>is</sup>kur-ta); ‘old’ (clay) tablets are referred to in the following lines: i 40: *an-na-a[l-l]a tup-pí* “on an o[l]d tablet” (similarly in ii 6’, iv 3’, 9’); iii 26’: [*an-na-l]a-za-ma tup-pí-za* E[Z]EN<sup>MEŠ</sup><sub>4</sub> ḫa-zi-ú-i UL<sup>l</sup> ku-it-ki KAR-u-en “from [the ol]d tablets we did not find any rite (or) festivals’); iv 17’: “they found Telpinu within the rites (recorded) on the tablets (*A-NA TUP-PA*<sup>HI.A</sup>) of the *purulli*-festival”; cf. also the mention of GIŠ<sup>is</sup>gulzattar, I-NA É *tup-pa-aš*, KAR-u-en and *kur-da-za* in the unpublished join Bo 3289 (see Beckman 1983: 162; Schwemer forthcoming, fn. 30).

(2) KUB 38.12: occurrence of the formula EZEN<sup>MEŠ</sup><sub>4</sub> GIŠ<sup>is</sup>.HUR *gaštarḫaita tarrawan* “the festivals have been established according to the *gaštarḫaita* writing board” (i 18, ii 7, ii 22, iii 24’); on the reading *gaštarḫaita*, see Neu *apud* Marazzi 1994: 135 n. 13. (3) KUB 55.48: reference to (clay) tablets in i 14’: [...<sup>m</sup>]A-at-ta-a *tup-pí-ia-za* UL ku-it-ki ar-ḫa x [...] “Atta [did] not [...] any [...] from the tablet”); to *kurta* writing boards in i 16’: [...] 1 *gur-da-za* Ū ŠA<sup>m</sup> NIR.GÁL 1 *gur-da*-[za ...]. (4) KUB 58.7: reference to (clay) tablets and *gulzattar* writing boards in ii 23’: TUP-PA<sup>HI.A</sup> -ma-aš *gul-za-at*<sup>l?</sup> -tar<sup>HI.A</sup> [...] (5) KUB 38.19+: reference to a

there was information pertaining to prescriptions and measures taken by the central authority (i.e., the king or his representatives), either yet to be executed or already carried out or even a mixture of both – and such kind of information might be directly dictated by the king (or representative) or might result in turn from previous documents dealing with the cult under investigation<sup>12</sup> Finally, one problem that needs to be integrated into the picture is that of the place of origin of the fragments found in Boğazköy. Since the reports pertain to local communities, do they come at least in part from the peripheral towns? Or are they copies or excerpts of such reports? If so, what about the original tablets? Were they usually written on perishable material? And what about the inventories containing royal prescriptions yet to be carried out? Are they, at least in part, archive copies or excerpts of prescriptive texts actually sent to the peripheral villages? Not all of these questions can be addressed in the present article. Suffice it to say that, as far as the issue of their classification is concerned, cult inventories can be safely regarded as a fairly consistent corpus, whatever the origin of this or that fragment might be. The cult inventories recently discovered in the Hittite town of Şarişša (present day Kuşaklı in the district of Sivas) confirm this: the locally archived copies from Şarişša display very much the same features as their counterparts from the capital.<sup>13</sup>

## 1.2. Cult inventories and festival texts

Cult inventories share some features also with votive texts, ‘magical’ rituals, inventory texts outside the sphere of the cult, and lists of persons and goods. Festival texts, however, are the only group posing serious classification problems – which arise from the fact that a great number of cult inventories contain ‘embedded’ festival descriptions (cf. § 2.5). It is certainly true that, as Carter observed, “in so far as the festival text provides a record of cult activities, it is a cult-inventory text. That is, it inventories a festival (or festivals), and such is (are) a part of the cult. It is not correct, therefore, to state that the festival text and the cult-inventory text are completely

---

*kurta* writing board in rev. 4’–5’: *ka-ru-ú-[i]-li-ia-za-at-kán* <sup>GIŠ.HUR</sup> *gur-da-[za] / ar-ḫa gul-aš-ša-an-za* “it is written up from an anc[e]nt *kurta* writing board” (see Beckman 1983: 162; differently Starke 1990: 458 and HED 4, 277). (6) KUB 38.28: 4’: *tup-pí-ia-az* in fragmentary context. (7) IBoT 2.131 obv. 21’: reference to the “sealed wooden writing boards of Pirwa” (<sup>GIŠ.HUR</sup> *šiyanteš šA* <sup>d</sup> *Pirwa*); see § 2.3. (8) KUB 53.21 obv. 8’: reference to (clay) tablets: [x x (x) \*KI]N-an-te-eš na-at\* <sup>TUP-PA</sup> <sup>H1A</sup> *ḫa-an-ti* [...]).

12 Most texts preserving a reference to the king (<sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup>) as responsible for cult measures have been treated in Hazenbos 2003.

13 For an edition of these texts, see Müller-Karpe 1995: 6–8; Wilhelm 1997; Wilhelm 2000: 324–328; Wilhelm 2002: 351; Hazenbos 2003: 149–165. Reportedly, cult inventories have been found also in Örtaköy/Şapinuwa (Süel 1992: 490).

distinct entities”<sup>14</sup> But, as a matter of fact, the two text groups form very different genres. The differences between the two can be summarized as follows:

A festival text provides detailed information about the performance of specific festival(s). Whether performed in the capital, in local towns, or in more than one location, these rites normally pertain to the so-called ‘state cults’. In short, this basically means that the king takes part in the ceremonies.<sup>15</sup> As is well known, this kind of document provides by no means true ‘descriptions’ of festivals, but rather concise ‘running protocols’.<sup>16</sup> The basic aim of these texts was to pass on over time the information needed for the correct execution of those specific festivals. Thus, within the basic dichotomy of the Hittite written sources<sup>17</sup> they belong to the texts attested in multiple copies.

In contrast, the purpose of a cult inventory is not to pass on information for the correct execution of specific festivals, but rather to provide informative or prescriptive reports on the cults of a given town at a specific time. Consequently, cult inventories were, as a rule, *not* copied or revised with the objective of creating a new version; rather, they were discarded as soon as they were obsolete and/or replaced by a new report. This explains both why virtually no duplicate manuscripts of cult inventories are attested (see § 1.9), and why almost all cult inventories date from a narrow time span in the late Empire period (see § 2.2): probably only the most recent records were still present in the archives.<sup>18</sup> As recently argued by W. Waal, cult inventories have a status between ‘temporary’ and ‘permanent’ records. Like other kinds of texts such as oracle reports and court depositions, these documents were often compiled on the basis of even more ephemeral documents. Although not intended for permanent preservation, they could be kept in the archives for a quite long time before being discarded. This is also why cult inventories

---

14 Carter 1962: 10.

15 On the distinction between the “political Hittite religion of the state” (state cults), the “religious expression of the common people” and the “dynastic religion of the royal family”, see most recently Hutter 2010: 411–413, based on previous studies by Taracha, Schwemer, and others (p. 412 fn. 52).

16 See Klinger 1996: 729, with further bibliography (on pp. 727–738 fundamental aspects of Hittite festivals and festival texts are discussed). For lists of Hittite festivals see Hoffner 1967: 39–41; Neu 1982: 125–127; van Gessel 2001: 281–287.

17 For this bipartition see van den Hout 2002 and 2008; cf. also Oppenheim 1977: 13 ff.

18 Of course, this picture is somewhat simplified. If the capital was abandoned by the royal court at the time of Šuppiluliyama II (see Seeher 2001), it would be conceivable that some of the very latest cult inventories were among the documents being brought away for administrative purposes. From a more general point of view, it is simply not likely that the inventorying of local cults took place like a modern census, i.e., at one fixed time for the entire nation: on the contrary, we may well admit a high degree of overlapping and case-by-case operations in the whole process.

normally do have a colophon, but many exceptions exist: in this respect too, they behave halfway between ‘temporary’ and ‘permanent’ records.<sup>19</sup>

Thus, festival texts focus on specific festivals, while cult inventories were written with regard to specific towns. The primary concern of a cult inventory is to provide a report on the state of the cults in one or more town, a report which is first of all focused on the listing of cult objects, offerings, and festivals, and only secondarily on the ‘description’ of festivals.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, almost half of the inventories do contain festival descriptions.<sup>21</sup> But the festival description is never autonomous: on the contrary, it is embedded in the higher-level section of the text pertaining to the relevant town. Furthermore, the cult inventories are *never* concerned with the so-called state cults; they treat festivals which do not involve the king.<sup>22</sup> Finally, certain differences in the way the festivals are described can be detected (see §§ 1.4–1.7).

### 1.3. Colophons and incipits

#### 1.3.1 Colophons

Colophons provide an insight into the practices of record management. A perusal of the colophons of the festival texts and cult inventories confirms that the two text groups were perceived as two different textual genres by the Hittite themselves.

Cult inventories normally do have a colophon, although this feature lacks in a limited number of fragments.<sup>23</sup> But differently from all other Hittite

19 Cf. Waal 2010: 299–300.

20 Note that the *Instructions for the BÉL MADGALTI*, dealing with the sending of cult inventories, mentions the deity’s “cultic implements” (*ša DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup> UNUTUM*) and *not* the festivals (KUB 13.2 ii 42’–43’, discussed in § 2.3). Indeed, many cult inventories do not contain festival descriptions at all. While the so-called ‘state cults’ were, in principle, *all* put in writing, we may well assume that at least a great number of ‘minor’ cults (i.e., ‘non-state’ cults) had *never* been treated in written sources.

21 The statement refers to the corpus I considered (see § 1.0), but a perusal of the remaining fragments within CTH 530 shows that the proportion would be even greater if all these were to be included.

22 Again, the dichotomy lies between ‘state’ vs. ‘non-state’ cults, *not* between ‘cults performed in the capital’ vs. ‘local cults’: as already noted, those local cults where the king takes part are treated in festival texts and not in cult inventories. It is also worth observing that while the cult inventories *never* treat state cults, the converse is not true: i.e., a festival text may treat either a ‘state’ or a ‘non-state’ cult.

23 The relevant fragments are the following: (1) KUB 38.32 (CTH 508): the signs KU/URU<sup>21</sup>-*ar-tap-pa-aš*, written in clear script on the lower edge of the tablet, cannot be interpreted as a colophon; also a possible connection with the town <sup>URU</sup>*Ta-ap-pa-x[-t]a<sup>2</sup>-aš* mentioned in line iv 31’ is problematic; (2) KBo 21.81 (+) KBo 34.106 (CTH 509): the very last lines of the reverse are badly damaged, but they do not seem to constitute a colophon; (3) KUB 38.19 + IBoT 2.102 (CTH 521): this case is uncertain; the preserved part of the reverse after line 7’ is blank, but the colophon may have been placed further below; (4) KUB 57.88 (CTH 525 or

textual genres, their colophons do not display a standard pattern. However, one crucial character may be detected: the colophons regularly focus on the town(s) treated in the text. Indeed, they often consist of a mere list of the towns inventoried in the text:

*kedani=kan/=ššan ANA TUPPI ...* “On this tablet (the towns so and so are treated)”<sup>24</sup>

In case of a series, i.e., of an inventory extending over more than one tablet, the positioning of the tablet in the series is noted first:

DUB.X.KAM ... “Tablet no. x ...” (KUB 7.24+, KUB 38.14, KUB 44.18, IBoT 1.9)

x TUPPU ... “Tablet no. x ...” (KUB 25.23(+), KUB 56.39)

TUP-X-PU ... “Tablet no. x ...” (KBo 26.182,<sup>25</sup> KUB 38.12)

Further information is sometimes added to the list of towns. For example, we find mention of festivals (KBo 26.182, KUB 38.26(+)), totals of personnel or supplies (KUB 38.12, KUB 38.25), notes about the absence of certain towns from the inventory (KUB 38.12), or remarks about the circumstances in which the tablet had been written down including archival notes.<sup>26</sup> Such additional information does not alter the general character of the cult inventories’ colophons. Some other texts behave differently, see in particular KUB 42.100+ discussed in § 1.7. The following is a comprehensive list of the cult inventories which preserve (parts of) the colophon:

KBo 2.7; KBo 2.13; KBo 12.140; KBo 13.234+; KBo 13.237; KBo 26.152; KBo 26.161; KBo 26.182; KBo 26.207; KBo 26.228; KUB 7.24+; KUB 13.32; KUB 25.23(+); KUB 42.100+; KUB 30.37; KUB 38.10; KUB 38.12; KUB 38.14; KUB 38.15; KUB 38.17; KUB 38.25; KUB 38.26(+); KUB 38.35; KUB 44.1; KUB 44.18; KUB 51.31; KUB 51.33; KUB 51.53; KUB 56.39; KUB 56.40; KUB 57.97; KUB 58.58; ABoT 2.118; IBoT 1.9; IBoT 4.335.

---

530, cf. § 1.8.4): after rev. iv 3’ a large portion of blank space is preserved, yet the possibility that the colophon may have been placed even further below cannot be entirely ruled out. (5) KBo 2.8 (CTH 519). (6) KUB 38.7 (CTH 521). (7) VS.NF 12.113 (CTH 530, comm. W. Waal). Note that VS.NF 12.112 (CTH 530) is not a cult inventory (see § 1.8.2). The four lines partly preserved on the left edge of KBo 12.140 (CTH 521) can be regarded as a true colophon listing the persons in charges of the inventorying procedures (note the unusual expression *ha-ti-ú-i-ta-iz-zi* “(he) inventories” in lines 1 and 4). For IBoT 2.131, see § 1.9.

24 KBo 2.7, KBo 2.13, KUB 38.26(+), ABoT 2.118. Interestingly, the same phrase is found in the colophon of VS.NF 12.58, a tablet which collects six rituals written “in the manner of the town of Arušna” (see Miller 2012) and is labelled *EGIR-an tarnumaš* (see § 1.9 no. 5).

25 Pace Hazenbos 2003: 70 with fn. 43. On this writing see GrHL § 9.51.

26 See in particular the colophon of KUB 25.23(+), a tablet which may have been written before the king himself, and the phrase (*TUPPU*) *EGIR-an tarnum/waš* in the colophons of the cult inventories KBo 2.7, KUB 42.100+, KUB 44.18 and KUB 56.40 (see § 1.9 no. 5).

In contrast the colophons of festival texts focus on the festival or festivals treated in the tablet. They are never arranged by towns but regularly begin with the sign EZEN<sub>4</sub><sup>(MEŠ)</sup> ... “festival(s) ...” or with the formula *mān* ... “When ...” which both refer to the specific festival treated in the text. Among dozens of examples, the most telling colophons are those of festival texts pertaining to the autumn and spring festivals, for these are the rites most frequently treated in the cult inventories. The difference to the colophons of the cult inventories is striking:

KBo 22.219 (CTH 592) 1’-6’<sup>27</sup>

[DU]B.1.KAM / [EZE]N<sub>4</sub><sup>URU</sup> *Zi-ip-pa-l[a-an-da]* / [zē]-<sup>ṛ</sup>*e*-<sup>ṛ</sup>*na-an-da-aš* / [*ḫa-me*]-<sup>iš</sup>*ḫa-an-da-aš* / [<sup>ū</sup>-U]L QA-TI § [A-NA] ṚGIŠ.ḪUR<sup>ṛ</sup>-k[*án ḫa-an-da-an*] [Tab]let 1: [festiv]al in Zippal[anda], of [aut]umn (and) [spr]ing. [(The text is) no]t finished. § [Corresponding to the] wooden writing board.<sup>28</sup>

KBo 11.50 (CTH 592) vi 16’-19’<sup>29</sup>

DUB.1.KAM <sup>ū</sup>-UL QA-TI / [E]ZEN<sub>4</sub><sup>URU</sup> *Zi-ip-la-an-da* / <sup>ṛ</sup>*zē*-<sup>ṛ</sup>*na-an-da-aš ḫa-me-eš-ḫa-an-da-aš* § (2 blank lines) § A-NA ṚGIŠ.ḪUR<sup>ṛ</sup>-k<sup>án</sup> *ḫa-an-da-an* Tablet 1, (the text is) not finished: [fe]stival in Zip(pa)landa, of autumn (and) spring. § (2 blank lines) § Corresponding to the wooden writing board.

Compare also the following passages from the so-called archive shelf lists or ‘catalogues’:

KUB 8.69 (CTH 276.7) obv. iii 10–12<sup>30</sup>

DUB.3.KAM ŠA EZEN<sub>4</sub> *ḫa-me-eš-ḫa-an-da-aš*<sup>URU</sup> Ḫur-ma / I-NA<sup>URU</sup> Ḫur-ma ma-aḫ-ḫa-an<sup>ṛ</sup>LU<sup>ṛ</sup>EN<sup>ṛ</sup> EZEN<sub>4</sub><sup>MEŠ</sup> / *e-eš-ša-i* ...

27 Text after Popko 1994: 168.

28 As Lorenz (forthcoming) shows through a systematic analysis of the findspots, all tablets bearing the formula ANA ṚGIŠ.ḪUR *ḫandan* pertain to festivals that were celebrated at the time the tablet was written, and not only copied for preservation in the archives. Furthermore, as argued by Schwemer (forthcoming, §§ 3 and 6, with previous literature), the comparison of the formula with KUB 28.80 iv 9’–11’ supports its traditional interpretation: “true to the ṚGIŠ.ḪUR”, “true to the wooden writing board”, and not “prepared for the ṚGIŠ.ḪUR” (Starke 1990: 459–460 with fn. 1668, followed by Lorenz) or “fixed on the ṚGIŠ.ḪUR” (HW<sup>2</sup> III 166b). A slightly different interpretation is given by CHD P 166a: “collated against the ṚGIŠ.ḪUR”, but cf. CHD L-N 136a. In my opinion, the formula states that the text written on the tablet corresponds to the text recorded on the wooden writing board; however, this does not necessarily imply that the former is based on the latter, as is traditionally assumed, or that the reverse, as proposed by Starke, is true. The fact that this formula is found only on tablets pertaining to the ‘living festival tradition’ may support the interpretation of the unmarked translation “corresponding to the ṚGIŠ.ḪUR”.

29 Text after Popko 1994: 168.

30 Text after Dardano 2006: 60.

Tablet 3 of the spring festival (of) Ҳурма. When the Lord celebrates the festivals in Ҳурма ...

KUB 30.60+ (CTH 276.11) obv. left col. 30'–32':<sup>31</sup>

[DUB.X.KAM QA-TI] *ma-a-an zé-e-ni šu-up-pí-iš*<sup>LÚ</sup> SANGA / [<sup>URU</sup> *Zi-ip-pa-l*] *a-an-da* MU-ti {MU} I-NA É-ŠU / [<sup>DUG</sup> *ḥar-ši-ia-al-l*] *i ki-nu-ma-an-zi na-an-na-i* QA-TI

[Tablet x, (the text is) finished:] when in the autumn, in the course of the year, the sacred priest goes to his house [in Zippal]anda in order to open [the *ḥaršiyall*]i-[vessel]. (The text is) finished.

### 1.3.2 Incipits

The difference between the two types of colophons reflects analogous differences in the incipits of the two genres. Festival texts regularly begin with the opening *mān* ... “When ...”, e.g.:

KBo 21.78+ (CTH 596.1.a)<sup>32</sup> i 1–2

[*ma-a-an* LUGAL-uš *zé-e-ni* <sup>URU</sup> *Ma-ti-il-la* / [*pa-i*]z-zi nu *ma-a-an* LUGAL-uš <sup>URU</sup> *Ma-ti-il-la a-ri*

[When the king, in autum]n, [g]oes to Matilla, when the king stays in Matilla ...

Compare the colophon:

KBo 21.78+ (CTH 596.1.a) iv 4'–7'

DUB.1.KAM QA-TI *ma-a-an* LUGAL-uš / *zé-e-ni* A-NA EZEN<sub>4</sub> GAL / <sup>URU</sup> *Ma-ti-il-la pa-iz-zi* / (1 blank line) § A-NA GIŠ.ḤUR-at-kán *ḥa-an-da-a-an*

Tablet 1, (the text is) finished: when the king, in autumn, goes to Matilla for the Great Festival. (1 blank line) § Corresponding to the wooden writing board.

What about cult inventories? Quite the opposite. To my knowledge, the incipit is preserved in the following texts: KBo 2.13, 12.140, 13.235, 13.237, 21.81(+), 26.179, KUB 12.36+ // 30.37, 38.3, 38.4, 38.12, 38.14, 38.32, 38.35, 58.29+, IBoT 3.120 (?) Of these, all but a few cases begin *in medias res*, i.e., directly addressing the first of the towns inventoried in the text. No preambles or introductory phrases occur. Apart from KUB 12.36+ // 30.37, which is a totally unparalleled case (see § 1.9), the exceptions are KUB 38.35 (celebratory preamble by Tudḥaliya IV), KBo 26.179 (fragmentary, mention of Tudḥaliya IV), KUB 38.23 and IBoT 3.120 (interpretation uncertain due to

<sup>31</sup> Text after Dardano 2006: 75.

<sup>32</sup> Ed. Lebrun 1977: 144–148 (without joins).

the tablet's fragmentary state). It seems no coincidence that at least two out of four exceptions date back to Tudḫaliya: his self-congratulatory attitude accounts very well for them (on this point see § 2.8.1).

### 1.3.3 Countercheck cases

The consistent distinction between the two types of colophon and of incipit proves that festival texts and cult inventories were kept apart from each other as distinct textual genres already in their authors' times. Two countercheck cases may corroborate this view.

The fragment KUB 51.1(+) constitutes the first tablet of a series dealing with a travelling festival for the god Telipinu (the relevant fragments are grouped under CTH 638). Since the text focuses on a specific festival, we would guess that the document may well be classified as 'festival text'. This is confirmed by both colophon and incipit:

Colophon (KUB 51.1(+)) iv 8'-9'<sup>33</sup>

DUB.[(1)].KAM QA-TI m[(a-a-a)]n ᵀ-[(NA MU.9.KAM LI-IM UDU<sup>H1.A</sup> 50 GU<sub>4</sub><sup>H1.A</sup>)] / URU Ka-a-aš-ḫa A-NA [(<sup>d</sup>Te-li)i-pí-nu (ú-iz-zi)]

Tablet 1, (the text is) finished: when in the 9<sup>th</sup> year 1000 sheep (and) 50 oxen come to Kašḫa for Tel[ipinu].

Incipit (ibidem, i 1-2)<sup>34</sup>

[(ma)]a-an I-NA MU.[(9.KAM LI-IM)] UDU<sup>H1.A</sup> 50 GU<sub>4</sub><sup>H1.A</sup> U[(<sup>RU</sup>Ka-a-aš-ḫa A-NA <sup>d</sup>Te-li)]pí-nu / [(pa)]-iz-zi

'When in the 9<sup>th</sup> year 1000 sheep (and) 50 oxen come to Kašḫa for Telipinu ...'

On the fourth day, the celebrations took place at a *ḫuwaši* sanctuary in the town of Kašḫa: this part of the festival is dealt with in the fragment KUB 53.8.<sup>35</sup> Now, thanks to a very fortuitous case, a fragment which preserves a cult inventory dealing precisely with the very town of Kašḫa has come down to us: KUB 38.28. Although neither incipit nor colophon are preserved, the nature of this text is very different: indeed, the focus is here not on the festival but rather on the town, whose temples, cult objects, and cult supplies are carefully listed. Thus, although the fragment is currently classified as CTH 638.17, it would better be included among the cult inventories as CTH 530.

33 Text after Haas/Rost 1984: 44.

34 Text after Haas/Rost 1984: 40.

35 Haas/Rost 1984: 68-70, No. 12.

The second example is provided by the well-known fragment KUB 25.32(+) (CTH 681.1).<sup>36</sup> Since it deals with the local cults of the important town of Karaḥna, this large tablet might at first sight be thought to be a cult inventory. Indeed these local festivals show a number of similarities with those frequently treated in the cult inventories. Despite this, crucial elements can be detected which do not occur at all among cult inventories (cf. § 1.5), the most important being the participation of the king in the rites. In view of this, the fragment could be classified as festival text. Colophon and incipit are both preserved and confirm this assumption. The latter, although not fully preserved, certainly began with the *mān*-formula typical of festival texts;<sup>37</sup> the former reads:

KUB 25.32(+) iv 17–19

DUB.1.KAM QA-TI / (1 blank line) / ŠA EZEN<sup>M[EŠ]</sup> / URU Ga-r[a-aḥ-n]a

Tablet 1 – (the text is) finished – of the festival[s] (celebrated) in Kar[aḥn]a.

#### 1.4. Festival descriptions: Carter’s criteria

Small or medium-sized fragments which preserve only festival descriptions in fragmentary context often pose problems of classification. How may we classify such fragments? Are there elements that would allow for a safe attribution either to the festival texts or to the cult inventories?

Only Ch. Carter dealt with this problem explicitly. After presenting the typical kind of festival description to be found in the cult inventories,<sup>38</sup> he observed that in so far as the festival descriptions are concerned, the differences between festival texts and cult inventories are basically of three types, as they pertain to the “range of the features of the cult that are inventoried, the manner in which some of these components of the cult are introduced into the texts, and the personnel mentioned in the texts as participating in the festivals described therein.”<sup>39</sup> As for the first two points, “the cult-inventory text essays to record all the components of the cult (whether or not in complete detail), not just the activities associated with one or the other festival or festivals. Thus, the cult-inventory text lists (and frequently

36 Ed. McMahon 1991: 53–82. As McMahon convincingly argued, the tablet dates back to the reign of Tudḥaliya IV. This tablet presents a unique feature: it is sealed in the middle of the reverse with the seal of the officer Taprammi.

37 The recently detected join KBo 57.202 allows an almost complete restoration of the opening lines of the tablet (see Miller 2008: 247; cf. already McMahon 1991: 53–82). The *mān*-formula introduces not only the first but also the subsequent festivals treated (lines ii 55, iii 1’).

38 Carter 1962: 8–9.

39 Carter 1962: 10–11.

describes) images, symbols, tables, stands, and offering materials, among other cult paraphernalia, separately and apart from any mention of these items in a festival description contained in the text; the festival text, on the other hand, alludes to such particulars, not in a separate statement (note the qualification presently), but in the description of the festival and at such places in that description where said items are instrumental to and necessary for the execution of some phases of the festival being described.”<sup>40</sup> However, in the meantime a great number of fragments which hardly support Carter’s assumption have been published. Most cult inventories treat just some components of the cult, not all.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, just a few texts display lists of cult items separately from the festival descriptions.<sup>42</sup> In regard to the third point Carter noted the already-mentioned absence of the king as a participant in the festivals treated by the cult inventories, adding some other personnel who never occur in such texts: <sup>LÚ</sup>ALAM.ZU<sub>9</sub>, <sup>LÚ</sup>haliyari(ya)-, <sup>LÚ</sup>kīta-, <sup>LÚ</sup>MEŠEDI, <sup>LÚ</sup>SAGI, DUMU É.GAL. This point is still confirmed by the texts available today, and especially the king’s absence is an important element. However, its reliability is limited by two facts: first, the festival texts are not confined to festivals involving the king; second, this is a negative argument: in the case of fragmentary texts, we cannot exclude that the king did not actually appear within the lost part of the text.

Another problematic point of Carter’s discussion is the observation that “there is a marked preoccupation, in the cult-inventory texts, with the spring and fall festivals. This cannot be said of the festival texts. Even those festival texts which are concerned with the spring and fall festivals treat only one or the other of these festivals, not both.”<sup>43</sup> This statement is contradicted by colophons or shelf lists like those quoted above (§ 1.3.1), which bear witness to festival texts treating both autumn and spring festivals.

---

40 Ibidem.

41 Some glaring examples: KBo 2.7 (no mention of cult objects, which are however treated in the parallel version KBo 2.13, see § 1.9 no. 5), KUB 38.7 (exclusively descriptions of cult objects), KUB 56.56 (no mention of cult objects; mention of festivals without their description), KUB 38.10 (mention of cult objects and festivals, but no information about the cult supplies), KUB 56.39 (nothing but festival descriptions). The great variance of the treated components is indeed the very reason to elaborate some typological sub-classification within the corpus.

42 In a cult inventory the offerings are normally listed precisely “in the description of the festival and at such places in that description where said items are instrumental to and necessary for the execution of some phases of the festival being described” (Carter 1962: 11, referring to the festival texts). Among dozens of possible examples see, e.g., KUB 38.26(+), KUB 17.35, VS.NF 12.111. What is more, the very few cases of separate listings of cult offerings are sometimes problematic in their correspondence with the amount of offerings mentioned within the festival description (see, e.g., KUB 17.35 i 17’–37’; KBo 26.182 i 1–18).

43 Carter 1962: 11. This reasoning seems to motivate Carter’s reluctance to classify KUB 25.32(+) as a festival text, as it treats more than one festival and thus may be considered an ‘inventory of festivals’ (Carter 1962: 12–13). For similar cases, see the fragment KBo 26.178 (CTH 523) which treats no fewer than 12 different festivals (Torri 2010: 324–326), and perhaps the fragment YH 2005/1 found at Yassihüyük in 2005 (de Martino 2007: 606–607).

### 1.5. Festival descriptions: rules of thumb

It is well known that the festival descriptions embedded in cult inventories often display a ‘stereotypical’ character. This applies especially to autumn and spring festivals.<sup>44</sup> However, the stereotypical pattern consists of a set of recurring elements which leave much space for a great variability both in form and substance.<sup>45</sup> Therefore, not even this aspect can function as a reliable criterion of distinction. The most reasonable way of dealing with this question is to single out a set of *rules of thumb* which should allow us to assign fragments to the one or the other genre on an individual basis through cumulative evidence. The certainty of any identification will depend on the number and strength of the relevant clues.

1. As already noted, the presence of the king among the participants in the festival constitutes a determining factor for considering the fragment a festival text. Indeed, most festival texts happen to treat ‘state cults’ involving the king. Mention of high functionaries may serve as a good hint as well. On the other hand, as we know, the *absence* of the king is no reliable criterion for identifying a fragment as a cult inventory.
2. Descriptions of ‘non-state’ cults display a typical division of the offerings; the two portions are labelled “at the altar” and “of the supplies” (*aššanumas*) respectively.<sup>46</sup> This never occurs within the descriptions of state cults. Since information about cult offerings frequently occur, this is a very useful clue.
3. Festival texts normally treat the celebrations in greater detail and entail a great variety of ritual acts, whereas cult inventories are more concise and often focus on those basic elements that form the above-mentioned standard pattern. Although somewhat vague and of limited reliability due to the variability displayed by the texts, also this aspect may be of some help in the classification.
4. As observed by G. Torri (2008: 548; see also § 2.5.1), festival texts use the archaizing conjunction *ta*, while this conjunction is absent from the cult inventories. This difference in the technical language can help us in the attribution of fragments to one of the two genres.<sup>47</sup> Even a small fragment in which *ta* is present can be confidently considered a festival text.

---

44 See Carter 1962: 8–9; Hazenbos 2003: 168–170.

45 For a discussion of this point, see § 2.5.

46 For more on this, see Carter 1962: 178–179 (with an outdated interpretation); Archi 1973: 9 and *passim*; Houwink ten Cate 1992: 95–96; Hazenbos 2004: 243; Cammarosano 2012: 237–253. To my knowledge, true exceptions to this feature among the festivals treated in the cult inventories are confined to KBo 2.8 i 17–30 and KUB 55.15, which however might be a festival text.

47 Another element pointing in the same direction is that the use of certain sign values is typical for cult inventories, as observed by Berman in his review of KUB 46 (Berman 1978: 123–124).

The following table gives an overview of the typical characteristics of the two text groups:

Festival texts	Cult inventories
The king usually participates ('state cults')	The king never participates
No division of offerings 'at the altar' / 'of the supplies'	Division of offerings 'at the altar' / 'of the supplies'
Greater detail, great variety of ritual acts	More concise character, standard set of ritual acts
Possible presence of archaic or archaizing <i>ta</i>	Absence of archaizing <i>ta</i>

### 1.6. Towards a clear-cut definition of 'cult inventory'

Based on the previous discussion, the following provisional definition may be put forward. A cult inventory is a text that meets two basic conditions:

1. It deals with certain deities in relation to one or more specific towns and treats at least one further component of the cult.<sup>48</sup>
2. It is arranged by town(s) and not by festival(s) or other components of the cult. It tends towards a comprehensive treatment of the relevant components of the cult.

The aim of this tentative definition is to provide useful guidelines for *our* classification of fragments – it would be unrealistic to assume that Hittite scribes were busy with such classification matters, although festival texts and cult inventories were clearly perceived and treated as two distinct textual genres. The first criterion should prevent texts like lists of personnel or cult objects from being catalogued as cult inventories. Although these documents deal with the cult administration, they have little to do with the texts traditionally labelled as cult inventories. Those lists are by no means reports on local cults and should be considered together with lists of goods and palace or temple inventories: 'Mannini's inventory' KUB 12.1(+) (CTH 504) is a good example, as already pointed out by Ch. Carter and S. Kořak.<sup>49</sup> In addition to the mention of deities linked to the relevant towns, 'true' cult

<sup>48</sup> Typical components of the cult treated in the cult inventories are cult objects, temples, cult offerings and people charged with their supply, listing of festivals, festival descriptions, cult personnel, negligence concerning delivery of supplies, rites or maintenance of cult object and temples.

<sup>49</sup> Carter 1962: 15; Kořak 1978: 99.

inventories treat at least one further component of the cult.<sup>50</sup> The second criterion is aimed at articulating the main divide between festival texts and cult inventories, preventing documents like the ‘Karaḥna festivals inventory’ KUB 25.32(+) from being included among the cult inventories (see § 1.3.3 above). We must not be misled by the fact that some cult inventories are seemingly arranged by gods rather than by towns (e.g. KUB 46.17, KBo 13.238, cf. Berman 1978: 124). In these cases the texts’ fragmentary state does not preserve the listing of the cities, and only the divine names are extant. However, we should still expect the city names to have been present on the original, complete tablet (cf. the structure of better preserved texts like KUB 12.2, ed. Carter 1962: 74–89, cf. Collins 2006).

If correct, the proposed definition provides criteria for a clear distinction between cult inventories and other textual genres; the criteria employed reflect differences in scribal practices and technical language which show that the Hittite scribes and administrators regarded the cult inventories as a specific text group. In the following paragraphs, I will test this definition on ambiguous and problematic cases and provide a critical review of the current CTH framework for the cult inventories.

### 1.7. Counterchecking the rule: ambiguous, uncertain, and significant cases

The proposed definition leaves wide margin for ambiguity and uncertain cases. This is due mostly to the fragmentary state of the texts, but there are also cases of intrinsic ambiguity – to be sure, both facts may well conspire. Apart from the texts relating to the town of Kašḫa, which have been examined in § 1.3.3, an interesting example of a problematic classification is provided by the fragments KUB 51.33 (CTH 530), KUB 55.14 (CTH 525; in my opinion: 530), KUB 57.102 (CTH 530), and KUB 58.71 (CTH 670). They all mention the same group of deities and seem to be related to each other.<sup>51</sup> Although their mutual relationship is somewhat elusive, a clear divide can be traced between the first three texts and the latter one. KUB 51.33, KUB 55.14, and KUB 57.102 display typical marks of cult inventories. In KUB 58.71, on the contrary, none of the diagnostic elements discussed above is present, and the ritual acts are referred to in a different way. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the first ones are cult inventories, whereas the latter is a festival text. In the following, other relevant instances are discussed.

50 Examples of ‘minimal’ cult inventories are KUB 38.7 (lists deities and cult objects), KUB 38.18 (ditto, but in reversed order), KBo 39.48(+) (lists the deities of the town, festivals, and the people responsible for providing offerings).

51 Hazenbos 2003: 94.

### 1.7.1 Fragmentary texts

Texts which are preserved in a very fragmentary condition and only contain remains of festival descriptions represent the most frequent cases of ambiguity. If diagnostic elements can be detected, it is possible to include the text tentatively in the one or the other group. Otherwise, it is simply impossible to classify the fragment. This applies in my opinion to dozens of fragments, like KBo 25.140 (MS?),<sup>52</sup> KBo 52.95, and KUB 42.85(+). A specific CTH number may well be appropriate to collect such fragments. Some of these uncertain fragments come from Büyükkale A: KBo 31.168 (MS?),<sup>53</sup> KBo 38.278, KBo 39.49, KBo 39.50, KBo 39.51, KBo 39.52, KBo 40.44, KBo 40.45, KBo 46.84, and KBo 47.216 (all CTH 530). Since the building was primarily used as a library,<sup>54</sup> they are more likely to be festival texts rather than cult inventories. Some small fragments similar to cult inventories should rather be classified as temple inventories (lists of temple goods which do not meet the conditions for being considered cult inventories in the strict sense). This is the case for KUB 38.11, KUB 38.13, KUB 38.17, KUB 38.20, and KUB 38.38 (all CTH 522). Other fragments lack some diagnostic elements, but can be regarded quite safely as cult inventories thanks to other features. This is the case for KUB 46.27 (presently catalogued as CTH 651 because of the mention of the *ḫazkarai*-women) or KUB 60.127 (CTH 525; in my opinion: 530). Both fragments contain references to athletic contests of a kind which is attested only among cult inventories and therefore can be included in this group.<sup>55</sup>

### 1.7.2 Tablets treating more than one town, towns being treated in more than one tablet

Since they normally deal with small peripheral towns or villages, most cult inventories consist of a single tablet treating more than one town. Tablets treating just one town also exist.<sup>56</sup> But what happened with bigger provincial settlements or important religious centers, which could not be inventoried on just a single tablet? Normally a series was created, the colophons providing as usual the number of each tablet within the sequence.<sup>57</sup> However, KUB 42.100+ shows that the deities might be split up in groups. According to its colophon,<sup>58</sup> the tablet treats six deities of Nerik, which are subsequently

52 On this fragment, see § 2.2.

53 On this fragment, see § 2.2.

54 See Košak 1995.

55 On the complementary distribution of athletic games among festival texts and cult inventories, see Cammarosano forthcoming, § 2.3.

56 See KUB 56.56, treating the town of Hurma (ed. Pecchioli Daddi/Baldi 2004).

57 So KUB 7.24+, KUB 38.14, KUB 44.18, KUB 56.39.

58 Ed. Haas 1970: 302.

named in sequence. Once more the difference with the colophons of festival texts is telling, since it is the *deities*, and not the festivals, that are listed.<sup>59</sup>

### 1.7.3 CTH 524 and 678: local cults in Nerik

Local cults in the sacred town of Nerik deserve special consideration. Texts concerning these cults are assigned either to CTH 524 or to CTH 678 depending on their being cult inventories or festival texts respectively. As far as the currently known fragments are concerned, they all date from the times of Ḫattušili III and Tudḫaliya IV, when the cults of the town were restored and revitalized.<sup>60</sup> Attributing these documents to a specific genre is, however, often difficult due to their fragmentary condition. The current classification of the parallel texts KUB 58.31+ and KUB 55.60+ as festival texts (CTH 678) is seemingly confirmed by the absence of the division of offerings ‘at the altar’ / ‘of the supplies’.<sup>61</sup> Similarly, the inclusion of KUB 25.22 and KUB 25.24 among the cult inventories (CTH 524) is supported by the presence of this very division, as well as by the absence of any mention of the king and high functionaries. Two more fragments may be added to the CTH 524 group: KBo 20.95 (presently CTH 530) and KUB 53.21 (presently CTH 678; this fragment dates to Ḫattušili III or Tudḫaliya IV). They deal with festivals to be performed in Nerik or with offerings for deities which are very typical of Nerik.<sup>62</sup>

Finally, KUB 25.21 constitutes an uncertain case. This fragment is currently catalogued as CTH 524.1 and is dated to Tudḫaliya IV. The reverse preserves a few lines of a festival description; here, however, no diagnostic element can be found. The preserved passage from the obverse, column ii,<sup>63</sup> contains celebratory narratives. This would be very unusual in a cult inven-

59 Carter 1962: 13–14 considered KUB 27.68 to be a festival text. However, the recent join with KUB 42.100+ leaves no doubt that this is a typical cult inventory. KUB 42.87 (ed. Popko 1994: 320–325) apparently constitutes an analogous example for the town of Zippalanda, but its colophon is not preserved.

60 Cf. §§ 2.3, 2.8.1. Indeed, the difference between cult inventories and festival texts seems to be less pronounced in these fragments, just because they pertain all to the same wave of cult restorations. To my knowledge, there is only one fragment which might not date to the late Empire period (KBo 23.63, MS?).

61 For an appraisal of these fragments, see Corti 2009.

62 KBo 20.95 (Haas 1970: 310–311): among other deities the text mentions the Storm-god of Kašt[ama], Ḫašamili, Zababa, Ḫalki, and Zaḫpuna. KUB 53.21: on the obverse the towns Ḫakmiš, Nerik, Ḫawal[kina] (?) as well as the *daḫanga* building (9', 11') are mentioned; on the reverse the text deals with festivals to be performed at Nerik (5', 6', 8').

63 Although being labelled in the hand-copy as column iii, this is referred to by Klinger (2002: 444) as column ii (see also the photo available online: [hethiter.net/](http://hethiter.net/): PhotArch BoFN01883b). If the numbering of the columns in the hand-copy was correct, the fragment could safely be assigned to the festival texts, for three-columned tablets are normal among them and very rare among cult inventories.

tory. However, since that feature occurs in inventories dating to the reign of Tudḫaliya (see KUB 38.35), the nature of this fragment remains uncertain.

#### 1.7.4 Local cults among other textual genres

Treatments of local cults can be found not only among cult inventories and festival texts, but rarely also among other textual genres. With respect to this, the edict issued by Tudḫaliya IV to regulate the monthly festival in Nerik (CTH 672) constitutes a most interesting case.<sup>64</sup> Here, the treatment both of the monthly festival (main text) and of the daily ‘thick bread’ offering (manuscripts A and D, left edge) bear some similarities with that usually found in the cult inventories; see in particular the absence of king and high functionaries and the amounts of offerings listed together with the people responsible for providing supplies, in the end of the tablet. The ‘at the altar / of the supplies’ division, however, is lacking. Had we neither incipit nor colophon, we would classify this text with good reason as a festival text pertaining to local cults. But these elements are actually preserved, bearing witness to the document’s true nature as a royal edict.<sup>65</sup> This confirms once more that only the colophons unravel with absolute certainty the true classification of a text, and that our problems are mainly due to the more or less fragmentary state of most of the texts.

### 1.8. Cataloguing the Hittite cult inventories

#### 1.8.1 The CTH classification: General remarks

It is hard to overestimate the importance of the CTH for Hittite studies. The creation of a reliable framework for the classification of the cuneiform texts from Boğazköy (and beyond) has been one of the major achievements of E. Laroche: without this research tool, it would be hard to navigate among the thousands of fragments preserved to us. What is more, since 2002 the CTH has been continuously updated and refined by S. Košak within the framework of the *Hethitologie Portal Mainz* online.<sup>66</sup> Scholars worldwide contribute by suggesting corrections and updates, a fact which leads to continuous improvements in classifying and grouping the available texts.

A systematic review of the CTH chapter devoted to cult inventories seemed appropriate in consideration of the great number of new fragments

64 See now Součková 2010.

65 A i 1: *UMMA* d[UTU<sup>st</sup> ... “Thus (speaks) M[y Sun ...”; D iv 27’–28’: *INIM tabarna LUGAL GAL kī=kan / išḫiūl lē kuiški waḫnuzi* “(This is) the word of the *tabarna*, great king; nobody shall corrupt this edict!”

66 At [www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/HPM/hethportlinks.html](http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/HPM/hethportlinks.html).

and studies. The cult inventories are currently subdivided into 30 numbers (CTH 501–530). The subgroups are very heterogeneous: four are still blank numbers (CTH 526–529), others, like CTH 512 (*Ausstattung der Göttin von Arinna*), contain but one fragment; in contrast, CTH 530 includes almost 500 ‘cult inventory fragments’. Inconsistencies within this system of classification originate from different causes: (a) an increase of published fragments disproportionate to the established framework, (b) overlap between different CTH groups, and (c) uncertainty or ambiguity in the evaluation of fragments. Problems of the first kind are self-evident if we consider that the CTH classification of the corpus is still basically that developed by Laroche at a time when just some dozens of texts were known, whereas now they total some 650 fragments. On the other hand, each cult inventory is, according to its very nature, a *unique* document – as a rule, there are no copies, duplicates or parallel texts – so that it would seem appropriate in principle either to have as many CTH numbers as there are cult inventories, or to group them according to some typological subdivision. Many inconsistencies within the current CTH framework are due to the fact that there is a mix of organisational principles. While about half of the 30 groups are devoted to single well-preserved inventories,<sup>67</sup> others are labelled after categories of various kind: typological,<sup>68</sup> geographical,<sup>69</sup> chronological,<sup>70</sup> related to specific deities<sup>71</sup> or elements.<sup>72</sup> And finally, there is the huge group of ‘fragments’.<sup>73</sup>

Such a system might well have provided a good framework for the classification of the texts known some forty years ago, but the rapid increase of the published material has excessively crowded the ‘fragments’ group while leaving untouched those devoted to single inventories. However, the major problem with the current classification is probably the overlap between categories of a different nature, a fact which leads to intrinsic inconsistencies.<sup>74</sup> Some of the overlaps between groups *within* the cult inventories chap-

---

67 CTH 501, 502, 503, 506 (cf. § 1.8.4 below), 507, 508, 512, 514, 515, 519. To these one may add five groups devoted to ‘parallel texts’ pertaining to the same inventory: CTH 504, 505, 516, 517, 518.

68 CTH 511 (*Stelenverzeichnisse*), 521 (*Bildbeschreibungen der Gottheiten*).

69 CTH 524 (*Der Kult von Nerik*).

70 CTH 525 (*Heiligtumsinventare unter Tudḫaliya IV.*).

71 CTH 520 (*Die Göttin MUNUS.LUGAL*).

72 CTH 513 (*Metallobjekte mit Namen Muršilis II.*). This group includes only KUB 38.8 (+) 9 and KBo 61.9, which, however, mentions a certain Nerikkaïli, not Muršili (see van den Hout 1995: 97; the classification of this fragment is correctly marked by S. Košak with a question mark).

73 CTH 530.

74 For example, should a text that deals with the deity MUNUS.LUGAL and can be dated to Tudḫaliya IV be classified under CTH 520 or CTH 525? The group CTH 522 (*Fragmente der Beschreibungen von Götterstatuen und verschiedenen Objekte*) provides another telling example. At first sight, one may assume that this group is devoted to texts preserving *only* cult object descriptions, since a number of fragments preserving *also* cult object descrip-

ter could be removed by establishing a clear hierarchy of attribution criteria and additional entries for significant large fragments that, for the time being, are subsumed under broad categories like CTH 530. But, unfortunately, overlaps do also exist with CTH groups *outside* the cult inventories chapter. In particular, a number of cult inventories are hidden away in the groups CTH 237 (*Liste von Personen*),<sup>75</sup> 651 (*Festfragmente, nennend die hazgarai-Frauen*), and 670 (*Festritualfragmente*). Classification inconsistencies between CTH 530 and CTH 670 are especially frequent. There is no reason for fragments like KUB 44.29 or KUB 51.47 to be catalogued as CTH 670, since they clearly are cult inventories. While in most cases pertaining to the first and third group a fresh appraisal may simply lead to move the relevant fragments to the cult inventories chapter according to diagnostic criteria, the second case has to do with true intrinsic overlap, since the *hazkarai*-women occur both in festival texts and cult inventories.

Thus classifying the cult inventories is often a matter of individual scholars' good sense and personal experience rather than a work done according to explicit standards. In respect to this, one major source of confusion has to be addressed: the question of the texts which are thought to be part of the alleged 'cult reorganization' conducted during the reign Tudḫaliya IV. Despite the uncertainty both about the real occurrence of this reorganization and the dating of anonymous inventories to this king, a lot of fragments are currently catalogued as CTH 525 simply because of the assumption that the bulk of the cult inventories may be linked to the alleged 'cult reform' *tout court*.<sup>76</sup> In consideration of the attribution criteria discussed above and of the opportunity of periodical CTH updates, I have attempted a provisional review of the cult inventories chapter of CTH. This is conceived as a first step towards a better classification of the fragments, whose ultimate goal is to facilitate the study of the relevant texts both for Hittitologists and for scholars from other fields.

---

tions (besides, e.g., festival descriptions) is classified under CTH 530 (see, e.g., ABoT 2.117, ABoT 2.118, KUB 60.162, Privat 48). But a closer look at the texts reveals that also fragments that preserve both cult object and festival descriptions are catalogued within CTH 522 (e.g., KUB 38.24 [see lines 6'ff.], KBo 26.201 [see r. col. 11'ff.]). Thus, there is no reason to exclude from this group the texts listed above.

75 So Hazenbos 2003: 107, referring to HT 4 (CTH 237.2), KBo 9.88 (CTH 237.5), and KBo 12.52 (CTH 233.3). However, the classification of the latter two fragments remains uncertain: KBo 9.88 is a scrap, KBo 12.52 mostly lists 'houses' with NAM.RA personnel, but nothing proves that this is actually a cult inventory.

76 For details, see §§ 1.8.4, 2.7. As already noted, Laroche explicitly states this view in the definition of the cult inventories chapter of the 1971 edition of CTH.

### 1.8.2 Texts erroneously classified as cult inventories

Within the texts catalogued as CTH 501-530 there are some fragments which are not to be considered cult inventories. They differ in character from the other texts and do not meet the criteria discussed above. One of the most noteworthy among them is KBo 20.90, a fragment of Middle Hittite annals which has been catalogued as a cult inventory of Tudḫaliya IV. The relevant fragments are the following:<sup>77</sup>

- VBoT 87 (CTH 503). The so-called ‘inventory of the Seal’s House’ has to be considered an inventory text, not a cult inventory.<sup>78</sup>
- KUB 12.1(+), KUB 42.78, KBo 31.54 (CTH 504). These fragments pertain to the so-called ‘Mannini’s inventory’. Also this document, as already noted by Carter and Košak,<sup>79</sup> is not a cult inventory but rather an inventory text. KBo 18.166 (presently classified under CTH 522) belongs to this group as well.<sup>80</sup>
- KBo 13.239 is the only fragment catalogued under CTH 512. This number was characterized by Laroche<sup>81</sup> as *Ornements de la déesse d’Arinna*. Like KBo 18.72 (see presently), it is a list of temple goods, and not a cult inventory in the strict sense.
- VBoT 83 (CTH 521.5). Despite the presence of cult object descriptions, the expression *zilaš* SIG<sub>5</sub> ‘outcome: favorable’ recurring at the end of each paragraph shows that this is an oracle report.<sup>82</sup>
- KBo 18.172 (CTH 522) lists various objects and paraphernalia, often made of precious materials; neither divine nor place names occur in the preserved part of the tablet. Therefore, it would be better included among the temple inventories.
- KUB 38.36 (CTH 522) is a ritual text and not a cult inventory.<sup>83</sup>
- CTH 523: *Versorgungen (melqētu) für lokale Festlichkeiten*. The so-called *MELQĒTU*-lists are ration tablets which contain detailed lists of goods, mainly food and beverages used to feed the participants of a specific festival and perhaps also as cult offerings.<sup>84</sup> As is well known, such texts are to be kept

77 The texts are listed according to their current CTH number (version 1.84). The review takes into account all groups from CTH 501 to CTH 525 plus a significant sample from CTH 530 (see the list in § 1.0).

78 Indeed, it is included among the texts studied by Siegelová (1986: 453). The inclusion of this fragment and of the Mannini’s inventory (CTH 504) in the cult inventories chapter goes back to the treatment of both kinds of texts as ‘inventaires’ in the pioneer CTH version published by Laroche in the *Révue Hittite et Asiatique* (for these fragments, see RHA 15/60, 1957, 30).

79 Carter 1962: 15; Košak 1978: 99. Cf. also Hazenbos 2003: 1 fn. 1; van den Hout 2006: 86–87.

80 Imparati 1979: 170 fn. 9; colophon, iv 1’–2’: ... ] *QA-TI* / [ ...š]<sub>A</sub><sup>m</sup> *Ma-an-ni-in-ni*.

81 Laroche 1971: 88.

82 On this fragment, see Taggar-Cohen 2006: 361–362.

83 See already Rost 1963: 197–198.

84 On these texts, see Singer 1983: 139–170 (general discussion; *KILAM* festival ration lists). For examples relating to cults celebrated in Zippalanda, see KBo 20.2+ i 1’–14’, KBo 16.71+

separate from the cult inventories,<sup>85</sup> for they are arranged according to specific festivals rather than towns and none of the crucial cult inventory criteria is met. Their close relationship with festival texts explains why many of these lists date back to the ‘Middle Hittite’ age, a fact that would be rather unexplainable in the case of cult inventories.<sup>86</sup>

- KUB 54.70 (CTH 524) deals with some vows made by Urḫi-Teššob (Muršili III) and cannot be considered a cult inventory.
- KBo 20.90 (CTH 525.9) preserves part of a paragraph beginning after a wide blank space:

rev.?

(ca. 15–20 blank lines)

---

1 <sup>?</sup>	[U] <sup>M?</sup> -MA <sup>m</sup> Du-udḫa-li-ia LUGAL GAL LUGAL KUR <sup>U</sup> [ <sup>RU</sup> Ḫa-at-ti(?)
2 <sup>?</sup>	[nu] <sup>87</sup> É <sup>MEŠ</sup> DINGIR <sup>MEŠ</sup> ḫu-u-ma-an-du-uš wa-a[r-nu-(e-)er (?)
3 <sup>?</sup>	[É <sup>?</sup> ] <sup>MEŠ</sup> DINGIR <sup>MEŠ</sup> ḫu-u-ma-an-du-uš EGIR-pa [
4 <sup>?</sup>	[x x] ú-it ITU.3.KAM <sup>URU</sup> Zu-un-na-ḫ[a-ra
5 <sup>?</sup>	[x a-r]e-eš-ki-nu-un nu-uš-ša-an x[
6 <sup>?</sup>	[x (x)] x É <sup>MEŠ</sup> DINGIR <sup>MEŠ</sup> na-ak-ki-i- <sup>r</sup> e <sup>-</sup> [eš
7 <sup>?</sup>	[x x-r]a-aš a-ri-ia na-aš<-ta> ú-wa-nu-[un
8 <sup>?</sup>	[x-x]-x-an-te-eš <sup>NA4</sup> ḫu-wa-ši <sup>88</sup>
9 <sup>?</sup>	[                    ]x <sup>r</sup> nu <sup>-</sup> -un x[
	(the fragment breaks)
1 <sup>?</sup>	[T]hus (speaks) Tudḫaliya, Great king, king of the land of [Ḫatti ...]
2 <sup>?</sup>	[and] all the temples of the gods (they) bu[rned ...]
3 <sup>?</sup>	[the temple]s of the gods [I build up] again [...]
4 <sup>?</sup>	[...] (he/she) came; in the third month (in?) the town of Zunnah[ara ...]
5 <sup>?</sup>	[...] I kept [cons]ulting the oracles, <sup>89</sup> and ... [...]
6 <sup>?</sup>	[...] ... the temples of the gods (were) har[d] (to reach) [...]
7 <sup>?</sup>	[...] ... “consult the oracles!” – then, I cam[e ...]
8 <sup>?</sup>	[...] ... stela[(e) ...]
9 <sup>?</sup>	too fragmentary

i 1<sup>?</sup>–30<sup>?</sup> etc. (Popko 1994: 94, 98–104): these texts, however, are catalogued as CTH 635, since they pertain to the cults of Zippalanda.

85 Hazenbos 2003: 1 fn. 1.

86 Five of in total fourteen fragments are pre-NS according to the *Konkordanz* (version 1.84). Interestingly, the different nature of these ration lists as compared to the cult inventories is reflected and confirmed by their findspot. Three of the five fragments whose provenance is known come from Büyükkale, one from the area of Temple I and one from the House on the Slope: a proportion which is inverse to that of the cult inventories (see § 2.6).

87 Cf. KUB 31.122+ i 3.

88 After šī Otten could see traces of another wedge, perhaps a horizontal, but these are not visible on the photo.

89 On Hitt. *ariya-* ‘to investigate using divination’, see Kimball 2000.

Otten and Rüter tried to explain the peculiar layout of the fragment by suggesting it might be part of a colophon,<sup>90</sup> but this seems rather unlikely. The parallel text KUB 31.122 + FHL 42 (CTH 591),<sup>91</sup> unfortunately, is equally fragmentary; the possibility of an indirect join with KBo 20.90 can be excluded on the basis of the handwriting (photo collated):

obv. i	1	[UM] <sup>r</sup> MA <sup>m</sup> Du-ud-ḫa-li-ia LUGAL GAL LU[GAL KUR <sup>URU</sup> Ḫa-at-ti (?)
	2	ka-ru-ú ku-wa-pí <sup>URU</sup> Kum-ma-an-ni x[
	3	nu É <sup>MEŠ</sup> DINGIR <sup>MEŠ</sup> ḫu <sup>r</sup> -u-ma-an-du-uš [
	4	nam-ma-mu ú-e-er DINGIR <sup>MEŠ</sup> na-ak-k[i-i-e-eš
	5	nu É <sup>MEŠ</sup> DINGIR <sup>MEŠ</sup> ḫu-u-ma-an-du-uš x[
	6	I-NA KUR <sup>URU</sup> Zu-na-ḫa-ra-ma x[
	7	ṚMUŠEN a-ra-a-an ḫar <sup>r</sup> -ta Ṛnu-mu <sup>r</sup> x[ (the fragment breaks)
	1	[Th]us (speaks) Tudḫaliya, Great king, ki[ng of the land of Ḫatti ...]
	2	Formerly, when (in) the town of Kummanni ... [...]
	3	and all the temples <sup>acc.</sup> of the gods [...]
	4	then they came to me; the <temples of the> gods (were) ha[rd (to reach) ...]
	5	and all the temples <sup>acc.</sup> of the gods ... [...]
	6	but in the land of the town of Zunaḫara ... [...]
	7	a(n augural) bird had risen, <sup>92</sup> and for me ... [...]

Although it deals with cult restorations, this peculiar document cannot be regarded as a cult inventory. Both the character of the text and the findspot of KBo 20.90 (Büyükkale D) militate against that classification. Furthermore, its dating has to be reconsidered. KBo 20.90 was related by Laroche to the ‘cult reform’ of Tudḫaliya IV; this dating was accepted by Trémouille, and Freu and Mazoyer recently used the fragment to introduce their overview on the alleged reform.<sup>93</sup> However, this interpretation does not fit with the clear pre-NS palaeography of both fragments.<sup>94</sup> This conclusion is further corroborated by the OH forms ḫu-u-ma-an-du-uš

90 Otten/Rüter: KBo 20, IX.

91 The reasons supporting this classification are unclear to me.

92 Cf. nu=mu MUŠEN arān ḫarta in the Annals of Muršili II, KBo 5.8 i 17.

93 Laroche 1975: 90 no. 3; Trémouille 2001: 62; Freu/Mazoyer 2011: 38.

94 Although the palaeographical date provided by the *Konkordanz* is NS, the following signs all have the older form (photo collated): ḪA (KBo 20.90: 1', KUB 31.122+: 1, 6 [the latter based on the hand-copy]; in KBo 20.90: 4' the sign is fragmentary), URU (KBo 20.90: 4', KUB 31.122+: 2 [based on the hand-copy], 6), AK (KBo 20.90: 6', KUB 31.122+: 4), LI (KBo 20.90: 1', KUB 31.122+: 1; both these occurrences, however, are inconclusive, since the old shape is frequently used to write the king's name even in late times).

(acc. pl.)<sup>95</sup> and *na-ak-ki-i-<sup>r</sup>e<sup>r</sup>-[eš* (nom. pl.), and by the use of the sign DU in the royal name, since in spellings of Tudḫaliya IV's name the sign TU is consistently used. Therefore, this Tudḫaliya cannot be identical with Tudḫaliya IV and has to be sought among his homonymous predecessors. Based on their palaeography, language, and character, these may well be fragments of annals of Tudḫaliya I/II; if this is true, the geographical names Kummanni and Zunaḫara<sup>96</sup> will set the operations described in the text in the frame of his Kizzuwatnean campaigns. Both fragments should be reclassified as CTH 211 or 214.

- HT 53 (CTH 530). As already noted by Carter,<sup>97</sup> there is nothing to indicate that this text is a cult inventory.
- KBo 52.97 (CTH 530) preserves the fragmentary incipit of a text issued by Tudḫaliya IV.<sup>98</sup> After the king's genealogy we find the remains of a prologue, where the king seemingly takes pride in having restored temples and festivals.<sup>99</sup> Finally, the text deals from line 11 on with a festival description. Although there is no crucial hint at this being either a cult inventory or a festival text, the presence of the king's genealogy points towards the latter hypothesis.<sup>100</sup>
- KBo 19.126 = IBoT 4.39 + KUB 57.74 (CTH 530). These duplicate texts are to be regarded in my opinion as ration lists, not as cult inventories.<sup>101</sup> Therefore, they should be better classified as CTH 523.
- KBo 25.83 (CTH 530, OS)<sup>102</sup> would be the only OS cult inventory, something that is enough to question such a classification. Indeed, it preserves a list of cult offerings which diverges from the usual pattern to be found in cult inventories; furthermore, it mentions a "king" in line 6' in fragmentary context. Therefore, the fragment can safely be identified as a festival texts.

95 In principle, *ḫu-u-ma-an-du-uš* could be a post-OH nom. pl.; the context, however, points at an acc. pl.

96 On the Kizzuwatnean town of Zunaḫara, perhaps to be identified with classical Misis, see Trémouille 2001: 62 and Wilhelm *apud* Müller-Karpe et al. 2006: 233.

97 Carter 1962: 15 fn. 5.

98 Lines 1–3; see in particular lines i 1–2: <sup>m</sup>*Tu-ud-ḫa*[-<sup>r</sup>*li<sup>r</sup>-ia* LUGAL GAL X [... / ...] <sup>m</sup>*Mur-ši-li* LUGAL GAL [...]. The dating to Tudḫaliya IV is based on palaeography: the signs LI (i 1 and 2), URU (i 3, 13), ID (i 5), and TAR (i 10) show the late form; cf. also the use of the logogram UGU (i 10).

99 Lines 4–10; see in particular i 4: *an-na-{an-}al-la-an*; i 7: ...EZEN<sub>4</sub>(?) I]TU<sup>KAM</sup>UD MAH-RU-Ú; i 8: É<sup>MES</sup> DINGIR<sup>MES</sup> *ḫu-u-ma-an-da-a*[š ...; i 10: ...] X<sup>MES</sup>-tar *ḫu-u-ma-an* UGU ú-w[a-nu-un](?).

100 Indeed, Corti admitted the possibility of considering it a festival text (KBo 52, VII). If considered a cult inventory, the fragment should be classified as CTH 525, not CTH 530.

101 IBoT 4.39+ is transliterated in Groddek 2007: 29 (line ii 7' restore 16 NINDA SIG rather than 15 NINDA KU<sub>7</sub><sup>?</sup>, cf. KBo 19.126 ii 12' and see already Hagenbuchner-Dresel 2002: 146). These two fragments are true duplicates: KBo 19.126 (A) ii 5<sup>r</sup>-17<sup>r</sup> = IBoT 4.39+ (B) ii 1<sup>r</sup>-12<sup>r</sup> (only orthographical variants).

102 Neu 1980: 163.

- KBo 41.61, KBo 48.117, KBo 57.118 (CTH 530, MS?). There is no reason to regard these small fragments as cult inventories. They pertain in all likelihood to festival texts or offering lists (for details see § 2.2).
- VS.NF 12.112 (CTH 530) deals with supplies for persons (rather than gods), a fact which suggests an attribution to CTH 523 or similar; moreover, in obv. 1–3 tasks pertaining to the maintenance of cult statues are referred to with the verb *maniyahḫ-*, i.e., in a very different way than in the technical language of the cult inventories.
- The following fragments catalogued under CTH 530 come from the ‘palace library’ of Büyükkale A: KBo 31.168 (MS?);<sup>103</sup> KBo 38.278; KBo 39.49; KBo 39.50; KBo 39.51; KBo 39.52; KBo 40.44; KBo 40.45; KBo 46.84; and KBo 47.216. Since this findspot is unusual for cult inventories (§ 2.6) and the texts themselves do not show any of the typical characteristics of this genre, it seems more likely that they are festival texts (CTH 670) or *MELQĒTU* lists (CTH 523).

### 1.8.3 Cult inventories in other CTH chapters

The following cult inventories are currently wrongly attributed to text groups outside the cult inventories chapter of CTH:<sup>104</sup>

- HT 4: CTH 237.2 → CTH 530.<sup>105</sup>
- KUB 42.41: CTH 250 → CTH 522(?).  
On the classification of this fragment see Košak 1982: 180.
- KUB 38.28: CTH 638.17 → CTH 530; see § 1.3.3.
- KUB 46.27: CTH 651 → CTH 530.  
This text preserves festival descriptions. The athletic contests dealt with on rev. 1–4 clearly point at a cult inventory rather than a festival text.<sup>106</sup>
- KBo 12.138, KBo 59.131, KUB 44.29, KUB 51.47, KUB 54.61(+), KUB 56.39, Bo 3432, Bo 3512a, Bo 4370, Bo 5554: CTH 670 → CTH 530.  
All these fragments preserve festival descriptions with elements that are typical of cult inventories.<sup>107</sup>

103 On this fragment, see § 2.2.

104 Again, texts are listed according to their current CTH number (*Konkordanz*, version 1.84). Of course, the following list is by no means exhaustive. There is little doubt that many more cult inventories are still awaiting identification, especially within the group CTH 670.

105 See Hazenbos 2003: 107–109 with an edition of the fragment; perhaps KUB 57.108 is an indirect join (Lorenz/Rieken 2007: 470).

106 Cammarosano forthcoming, §§ 2.1, 2.3.

107 For Bo 3432, Bo 3512a, Bo 4370, Bo 5554 the assumption is based on old transcriptions by H. Ehelolf. In KUB 51.47 rev. 5', Groddek 2004: 76 reads [ ... ]x<sup>H1.A</sup>-ia ta NINDA.GUR<sub>4</sub>.R[A ...], but the sign TA here stands for the logogram TA “with”, not for the OH conjunction (which would require the fragment to be classified as a festival text). The correct reading is: <sup>DUG</sup>ḫar-ši-ia-a]L<sup>-</sup>li<sup>ḫ1.A</sup>-ia TA NINDA.GUR<sub>4</sub>.R[A ... (photo collated); cf. KUB 17.35 ii 10', VS.NF 12.111 rev. 18, 20.

- KBo 30.130 (MS), KBo 54.164, KUB 58.58: CTH 670 → CTH 530(?). Ditto, but the case is more uncertain than for the previous fragments.<sup>108</sup> For the MS text KBo 30.130, see § 2.2.
- KUB 42.100+: CTH 673 → CTH 524 or 525.<sup>109</sup> This well-known cult inventory is still classified as CTH 673. Its official CTH label, *Die Tafel des Verzeihens der Gottheiten von Nerik*, goes back to an interpretation put forward by Haas for the formula EGIR-an tarnuwaš.<sup>110</sup> The tablet would now be better classified as CTH 524 or 525 (depending on whether one gives more weight to its attribution to Tudḫaliya IV<sup>111</sup> or to its concern with the town of Nerik), and the CTH 673 number left blank.
- KUB 53.21: CTH 678 → CTH 524(?); see § 1.7.
- KUB 25.30: CTH 690 → CTH 530. This text is a typical cult inventory. It deals with various festivals for the goddess Ḫuwaššanna and records, as usual, institutions or people responsible for providing cult offerings. Thus, it would seem appropriate to catalogue it as CTH 530 and leave the number 690 blank.
- KBo 49.300: CTH 832 → CTH 530(?). The text preserved on this small fragment resembles that of KUB 17.35 i 18'-19'.<sup>112</sup>

#### 1.8.4 Reclassification proposals within the cult inventories group

The following reclassification proposals concern texts which are already catalogued as cult inventories (CTH 501-530). The most intriguing group is that of CTH 525 (*Heiligtumsinventare unter Tudḫaliya IV.*). This label is somewhat misleading, since the current group on the one side includes texts for whose dating to Tudḫaliya evidence is scant, and on the other side does not include some cult inventories which can be dated to that king with certainty. Again, the fragments are listed according to current CTH numbers:

- KBo 26.182: CTH 506 → CTH 530. Laroche attributed CTH 506 to KUB 7.24 (now joined by KUB 58.29), labeling it “*Dieux de Takkupsa, Hawarkina, etc.*”<sup>113</sup> Apparently, the fragment KBo 26.182<sup>114</sup> is included because of the mention of the town <sup>URU</sup>*Ma-li-*

108 For KUB 58.58, see already Taracha 2007: 191.

109 See already Laroche 1972: 112.

110 Haas 1970: 303.

111 For the dating, see Hazenbos 2003: 14, and also § 2.3 fn. 31.

112 Torri, KBo 49, VI.

113 Laroche 1971: 87; now *Kultinventar der Götter von Takkupša, Ḫawarkina usw.*, ed. Hazenbos 2003: 26-30.

114 Ed. Hazenbos 2003: 68-71.

「*ma*<sup>7</sup>-*li-ia*<sup>2</sup> in the colophon (iv 8'). However, this reading is uncertain,<sup>115</sup> and it is not safe to deduce that the inventory actually referred to the same area as KUB 7.24+, just because in the latter text a homonymous divine mountain is treated.<sup>116</sup>

- KBo 2.16: CTH 509.2 → CTH 522.

The fragment contains descriptions of cult objects pertaining not only to storm gods but also to other deities, therefore it should better be catalogued as CTH 522.

- KBo 51.113: CTH 518.? → CTH 530.

Nothing suggests that this small fragment refers to the cult of Pirwa.<sup>117</sup>

- KBo 12.140: CTH 521.7 → CTH 530.

The fragment does not contain cult object descriptions.

- KUB 51.26: CTH 521 → CTH 670 / 530(?).

This fragment too does not contain cult object descriptions. In the preserved part of the text, each paragraph begins by naming a deity and goes on with festival descriptions. The expression *kuwapi*<sup>dUTU</sup> *paizzi*<sup>ŠI</sup> in line 16' points to a festival text rather than a cult inventory.

- KBo 18.166: CTH 522 → CTH 504; see § 1.8.2 above.

- KUB 38.27: CTH 522 → CTH 507.

This fragment indirectly joins KUB 38.26,<sup>118</sup> hence the classification as CTH 507.

- KUB 20.89: CTH 524.6 → CTH 524(?).

This fragment preserves a festival description which may belong to a festival text as well as a cult inventory. The text has <sup>UR</sup>]U *Ne-ri-ik* EZEN<sub>4</sub> x [ in obv. 1, but the place name might be part of a divine name, therefore the attribution to CTH 524 is uncertain.<sup>119</sup>

- KBo 48.109; KUB 17.35; KUB 42.105+; KUB 44.21; KUB 44.42; KUB 48.113; KUB 55.14; KUB 55.15; KUB 55.48; KUB 57.67; KUB 57.103; KUB 60.127; KUB 60.140; IBoT 3.120; VBoT 26: CTH 525 → CTH 530.

115 Forlanini 1992: 178 with fn. 50, reads *Ma-li-i[t-ta*. However, on the basis of the hand-copy, Hazenbos' reading seems preferable.

116 See already Hazenbos 2003: 68 fn. 38. Indeed, Hazenbos classifies KBo 26.182 as CTH 530.

117 M.-C. Trémouille (KBo 51, VI) proposed to classify this fragment as CTH 518, perhaps because of the expressions *ul* *sum-anzi* (line 3') and *peškir* (line 4'), which recur also in IBoT 2.131, a large cult inventory focusing on the cult of Pirwa. However, these formulas occur frequently in dozens of such texts, and Pirwa is not even mentioned in the fragment under examination.

118 Rost 1963: 187; Güterbock 1968/69: 383; Cammarosano 2012: 429–452.

119 Also the classification of KBo 52.95 as a cult inventory of Nerik, proposed by Corti (KBo 52, XXI), is most uncertain. This fragment does not contain any element typical of the cult inventories.

Like hundreds of other (L)NS fragments, these cult inventories may well date to the reign of Tudḫaliya IV. But there is no certainty about this, since neither the king's name nor other indications for this date occur in the text. For a more detailed appraisal of the cult inventories dating to Tudḫaliya IV, see §§ 2.6, 2.7, 2.8.2. For the large and important cult inventory KUB 17.35<sup>120</sup> a separate CTH number would seem appropriate.

- KBo 45.180; KUB 57.88; KUB 48.114 (MS); KUB 57.103; KUB 55.48: CTH 525 → CTH 530(?).
  - Ditto, but the case is less certain than for the above fragments. For the MS text KUB 48.114, see § 2.2.
  - ABoT 2.117; ABoT 2.118; KUB 60.162; Privat 48: CTH 530 → CTH 522.
- The fragment Privat 48 partially preserves in line i 2 a cult object description and consequently can be classified under CTH 522.<sup>121</sup> The remaining text deals with a spring festival; note the reference to <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup> (i 3'), probably in connection with a (re)institution of cult offerings. ABoT 2.117, ABoT 2.118, and KUB 60.162 contain both cult object and festival descriptions. Since similar texts are currently classified under CTH 522,<sup>122</sup> it seems reasonable to move these fragments there.
- KBo 20.95: CTH 530 → CTH 524; see § 1.7.

### 1.9. Duplicates and parallel texts among the cult inventories

Within the corpus of the cult inventories a few rare cases of duplicates or parallel texts<sup>123</sup> are attested. How is the existence of copies to be explained for documents that are intrinsically ephemeral?<sup>124</sup>

In the following, the relevant texts will be examined case by case. The table gives an overview of the texts discussed:

120 Ed. Carter 1962: 123–153.

121 Photo collated.

122 E.g., KUB 38.24 (see lines 6'ff.), KBo 26.201 (see r. col. 11'ff.).

123 'Parallel texts' are (sections of) texts of analogous but not identical content, whereas 'duplicates' have exactly the same text (except for matters of layout and spelling or scribal mistakes). Parallels are marked with a double forward slash, whereas duplicates are marked with double bars.

124 Van den Hout observed (2002: 874–875) that "all four cases [CTH 510, 516, 517 and KBo 19.126 = IBoT 4.39+ (CTH 530)] belong in all likelihood to the category of final report [...] describing the changes in the cult. In that sense, again, these texts are prescriptive, and duplicates may be expected. However, if so, we would have expected more duplicates among the cult inventories." In my opinion, neither CTH 510 nor KBo 19.126 = IBoT 4.39+ are prescriptive texts, which makes a different explanation of the duplicates even more necessary.

---

 Duplicates and Parallels
 

---

	Text	CTH	Notes
1.9.1	KUB 38.12 = KUB 38.15	517	Duplicates
1.9.2	KUB 12.36 + KUB 60.9 (MS) = KUB 30.37	516	Duplicates (KUB 30.37 from Temple I)
1.9.3	KUB 38.6+, KUB 38.10, KUB 57.106, KUB 57.58	510	Parallel texts
1.9.4	IBoT 2.131 // Bo 3245	518.1	Parallel texts
1.9.5	KBo 2.7 // KBo 2.13 (nos. 1.9.5 and 1.9.6 are pairs of subsequent versions of the same cult inventory)	505	Parallel texts (both from Büyükkale E)
1.9.6	VS.NF 12.111 // KUB 57.97	530	Parallel texts

---

Another pair of duplicate texts currently attributed to the cult inventories is KBo 19.126 = IBoT 4.39 + KUB 57.74 (CTH 530; KBo 19.126 from Temple I). But the text is clearly a *MELQĒTU* list and should therefore be assigned to CTH 523; note that the existence of copies is not unusual in this group of texts.<sup>125</sup>

1.9.1. and 1.9.2. are pairs of true duplicates. The former case may have arisen because of the great importance of Karaḥna as a cult center, whereas the latter may be due to the special involvement of Ḥattušili III or Tudḥaliya IV in the cults of Nerik. 1.9.3.-1.9.6. do not represent true duplicates, but rather parallel texts. 1.9.5. and 1.9.6. are two subsequent versions of inventories which pertain to the same geographical area. 1.9.4. may involve an oracular inquiry. Finally, 1.9.3. is a group of closely related cult inventories. Although the precise relationship between them still escapes understanding, it is clear that we are not dealing with true copies, but with two or three versions of the same inventory, slightly differing from each other.

### 1.9.1 KUB 38.12 = KUB 38.15 (CTH 517)

The well-known tablet KUB 38.12 pertains to the town of Karaḥna.<sup>126</sup> As far as we can see, the smaller fragment KUB 38.15 is a true duplicate of the text.<sup>127</sup> Both manuscripts bear witness to the same prescriptive measures concerning the restoration of personnel and cult supplies.<sup>128</sup> The fact that even the verbal tenses used are the same in the two manuscripts proves that they are true duplicates and not subsequent versions of the same in-

---

<sup>125</sup> On these fragments, see § 1.8.2.

<sup>126</sup> Perhaps to be localized at Sulusaray (classical Carana/Sebastopolis), see de Martino 2008: 132, with further bibliography. Editions: Darga 1973; Pecchioli Daddi 1982: 210–212 (partial); Cammarosano 2012: 417–428. On the problematic line i 17, see now Weeden 2011: 129–130.

<sup>127</sup> KUB 38.15 i 1–15 = KUB 38.12 i 1–14; KUB 38.15 iv 1'–6' = KUB 38.12 iv 6'–10'.

<sup>128</sup> KUB 38.12 i 6, 8 = KUB 38.15 i 7, 9.

ventory.<sup>129</sup> The scribe of KUB 38.12 twice uses the PAP sign, showing that the manuscript had been copied or composed based on other written documents, a feature which cannot be investigated for KUB 38.15 due to its fragmentary condition. The existence of a duplicate may be linked in this case to the great importance of Karaḫna and its cults. The great amount of personnel and cult supplies dealt with in this text has no parallel among the cult inventories and the existence of a copy of this prescriptive document may be ascribed to its importance and exceptional nature.

### 1.9.2 KUB 12.36 + KUB 60.9 (MS) = KUB 30.37 (CTH 516)

The great significance of these texts comes from the MH/MS dating of ms. B (KUB 12.36 + KUB 60.9),<sup>130</sup> whereas ms. A (KUB 30.37) is a later NS copy.<sup>131</sup> This inventory is exceptional also in that it contains a report on cult objects and festivals of the deity Šulinkatti of Tamarmara which originates from a certain “Tarḫini, man of Tamarmara”. This account forms the very incipit of the text and seems to be the main focus of the document, differently from analogous accounts which are sporadically found within the cult inventories.<sup>132</sup> Accordingly, this is not a cult inventory in the strict sense or, in other words, it is one of a very special kind,<sup>133</sup> and this fact may well be the reason why this text was preserved over such a long period of time. Ms. A preserves on the reverse the colophon’s last line, where a “festival of the storm god of Ner[ik]” is mentioned. The reference to this deity may corroborate the view that the existence of a late copy is motivated by the involvement of Ḫattušili III or Tudḫaliya IV, who both took special care of that god.<sup>134</sup>

### 1.9.3 KUB 38.6+, KUB 38.10, KUB 57.106, KUB 57.58 (CTH 510)

All these manuscripts are written in LNS and refer clearly to the same inventorying operation. They seem to deal with small or partly abandoned vil-

129 Only layout and orthographical differences can be detected: presence vs. absence of paragraph line (KUB 38.15 i 4–5 = KUB 38.12 i 4), *ep-pi-ir* vs. *DAB-ir* (i 7 // i 6).

130 See van den Hout 1994: 121; Košak 1994: 288; Hazenbos 2003: 142. Based on the photograph, the shape of *DU* (line 8) does not contradict a MS palaeographical date (*pace* Hazenbos 2003: 142). Edition: Hazenbos 2003: 142–143 (ms. A); Groddek 2006: 8 (transliteration of ms. B; lines 13–14 are omitted).

131 As far as one can see, only orthographical differences can be found (A i 1 <sup>m</sup>*Tar-ḫi-ni* vs. B i 1 <sup>m</sup>*Tar-ḫi-ni-i*).

132 Tarḫini’s report is placed at the very beginning of the tablet; moreover, the particle *-wa(r)* does not occur at all in the text.

133 KuSa I/1.3, a cult inventory containing depositions of priests, was labelled by Wilhelm 1997: 19 as a “Protokoll zur Gattung ‘Kultinventar’ mit Bezug auf Kultfeste”. This definition may apply also to the present case.

134 Cf. van den Hout 2002: 874.

lages<sup>135</sup> and do not contain any hint of prescriptive measures. However, the exact relationship between the manuscripts is still beyond our grasp, so that a detailed study based on collation of the original fragments would be welcome.<sup>136</sup> Two or three slightly different versions are involved; we are clearly dealing with parallel texts, not with duplicates:

- A: KUB 38.6 + Bo 6741<sup>137</sup>  
 B: KUB 38.10 + 10a (// KUB 38.6+)<sup>138</sup>  
 C: KUB 57.106<sup>139</sup>  
 D: KUB 57.58 (// KUB 57.106)<sup>140</sup>

Why these different versions were produced is still unclear.

#### 1.9.4 IBoT 2.131 // Bo 3245 (CTH 518.1)

IBoT 2.131 is a single-column tablet; the upper portion of the obverse is probably broken off.<sup>141</sup> It deals with the cult of Pirwa and a few other deities in various towns.<sup>142</sup> The text's main theme is the listing of cult offerings, which had been systematically neglected "since the days of the father of My Sun"<sup>143</sup> Prescriptive measures are not recorded. The small fragment Bo 3245 preserves a parallel text, though the precise relation between the two frag-

135 Cf. KUB 38.10 iv 24'-25' (colophon): *ke-e-da-n[i-pá]t' / [A-NA TUP-PI(?) X UR]U<sup>D</sup>IDL<sup>L</sup>.H<sup>L</sup>.A a-ni-ia-an*. The geographical area is probably that of the middle Kızılırmak (cf. Forlanini 1992: 178; 2009: 45-49; Schwemer 2008: 151-152).

136 Ms. A partly parallels ms. B (KUB 38.10 iv 1'-10' // KUB 38.6+ iv 15'-25', KUB 38.10a: 1'-12' // KUB 38.6+ iv 1'-13'; on the positioning of KUB 38.10a, see van den Hout 1990: 430). The small fragment KUB 57.58 parallels ms. C (KUB 57.58 2'-12' // KUB 57.106 ii 10-20). According to van den Hout 1990: 430, ms. C might form a sandwich join with ms. B; against this hypothesis, see however Cornil 1988: 22 (ms. B regularly has *zé-ni*, while ms. C has *zé-na-aš*). See: Rost 1961: 185-190, 195-197; Cornil 1988; cf. Carter 1980; Otten-Rüster 1982: 141; Güterbock 1983: 211 fn. 60; van den Hout 1990: 430; Forlanini 2009: 60; Cammarosano 2012: 531-535. In the hand-copy of KUB 57.106, both the preserved part of the reverse and large parts of the obverse are omitted (cf. now the photos available online). A new edition of this group of texts is in preparation.

137 Ed. Rost 1961: 185-190. The fragment KBo 45.178 (House on the Slope), bears similarities with ms. A in so far as three deities are mentioned in both texts (cf. A iv 21'-23'); but it cannot be regarded as a parallel text.

138 Ed. Rost 1961: 195-197. KUB 38.10 iv 1'-10' // KUB 38.6+ iv 15'-25', KUB 38.10a: 1'-12' // KUB 38.6+ iv 1'-13'.

139 Ed. Cornil 1988, based on the incomplete hand-copy.

140 KUB 57.58 2'-12' // KUB 57.106 ii 10-20.

141 Based on the hand-copy (cf. also Imparati 1990: 166 fn. 2).

142 Cf. Imparati 1990; van den Hout 1995: 156-157; Forlanini 2009: 39-42.

143 *ša ub<sup>KAM</sup> ABI d<sup>U</sup>TU<sup>ŠI</sup> UL SUM-anzi*, or a variant of this formula. The reference to the "father of My Sun" suggests that this inventory may date to Tudḫaliya IV.

ments escapes our understanding.<sup>144</sup> IBoT 2.131 is peculiar also in that the reverse is blank after line 33, still neither a ‘concluding’ expression nor a colophon is present. Does this mean that the tablet was left unfinished and Bo 3245 represents a new copy? But if so, why was the unfinished version apparently not discarded? A tentative hypothesis would be to link these cult inventories to an oracle inquiry. F. Imparati argued that IBoT 2.131 may be connected with the oracular tablet KBo 14.21, which deals with noncompliance related to the cult of Pirwa.<sup>145</sup> If so, copies or excerpts of the cult inventories providing information on this may have been requested within the oracular procedures, and we may deal with one of these.<sup>146</sup>

#### 1.9.5 KBo 2.13 // KBo 2.7 (CTH 505) and the meaning of the phrase *appan tarnumaš*

These two manuscripts are neither duplicates nor true parallel texts.<sup>147</sup> They rather represent two subsequent versions of a cult inventory pertaining to the same area. Both manuscripts are large LNS single-column fragments and both colophons are preserved. In the following I will refer to KBo 2.13 as ms. A, to KBo 2.7 as ms. B. Manuscript B treats six towns,<sup>148</sup> refers to royal measures only in the preterite, mentions the cult objects without describing them, and does not go beyond essential information when treating a festival. On the contrary, manuscript A deals only with the three last towns of ms. B,<sup>149</sup> refers to restoration of cult objects using the present tense,<sup>150</sup> and provides detailed accounts of the festivals. It is therefore clear that both cult inventories refer to the same operation and that ms. A represents an earlier version.<sup>151</sup> This impression is further supported by the fact that, apart from

144 Bo 3245: 1’–13’ // IBoT 2.131 rev. 22–31. Bo 3245 is transliterated by Imparati 1990: 166 fn. 2. In view of some slight differences in layout and wording, this fragment cannot be regarded as a true duplicate.

145 Imparati 1990: 181–187.

146 KBo 14.21 comes from Büyükkale K. The findspots of the two cult inventories are unknown.

147 Ed. Carter 1962: 90–104, 105–115; cf. Cammarosano 2012: 328–333, 522–525. Güterbock 1943: 303 fn. 22 calls the relevant segment of KBo 2.13 “ausführlicherer Paralleltext”.

148 Artešna, one unknown town, Wiyanuanta, Panišša, Mammananta, Laršilia.

149 Panišša, Mamnanta, Laršiliya. The parallel section begins on B rev. 10, corresponding to A obv. 1.

150 Obv. 1, 21, 22, 24.

151 The two tablets look very different. A is made of fine, reddish clay; the tablet is written in a clear, stylish hand. B, on the contrary, is made of coarse clay, now of a sienna color. The tablet is unusually thick and curved and is inscribed in a cursive script. These features also occur in some other cult inventories, among them KBo 2.8 (ed. Hazenbos 2003: 131–141), which comes from Bükükkale E as well (the fragments have been collated at the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations in Ankara in September 2012).

one scribal mistake<sup>152</sup> and two minor discrepancies,<sup>153</sup> and despite their different character, both texts correspond exactly to each other in the listing of cult supplies. Thus, ms. B treats more towns and displays a ‘summary’ character because it was written down some time later than ms. A, at a relatively late stage of the procedure.<sup>154</sup>

Since ms. A clearly refers to an earlier phase than ms. B and since both texts correspond almost exactly to each other in their listing of the cult offerings, one may wonder whether A served as a model for B. Interestingly, a closer look at the text shows that this was not the case. Both manuscripts mention the “Storm god of <sup>m</sup>Ziyazi(ya)”.<sup>155</sup> This personal name is not attested elsewhere; according to Carter, the determinative has to be understood as URU.<sup>156</sup> If so, the fact that both manuscripts have the same mistake suggests either that one of them served as model for the other or that both of them shared a common model. In ms. A, the name of the divine mountain associated with the storm god of Ziyazi(ya) is inconsistently written throughout the text. The writing *Kikkališa* (a variant of *Kenkališa*) appearing in lines obv. 3 and 5 alternates with *Kilinuna* in lines obv. 1, 2, and 14. In contrast, ms. B consistently has *Kenkališa* (rev. 10, 11, 12, 13, and 20). Since it seems unlikely that both *Kikkališa* and *Kilinuna* are interchangeable names for the same mountain, we must admit that the three occurrences of *Kilinuna* in A are scribal mistakes.<sup>157</sup> Did the scribe of ms. B ‘rectify’ the errors he read in ms. A? We do not know. Another peculiar mistake is found in the section pertaining to the town Mam(ma)nanta. In ms. A, the divine spring Dupša is erroneously mentioned twice within the listing of the offerings for the autumn festival (obv. 27, 28). As Carter pointed out, “Dupša here must be dittography. Note line 24 where this name is erased”.<sup>158</sup> Indeed, Dupša was correctly mentioned within the general list of deities on obv. 23, while

152 Ms. B erroneously omits on rev. 21 part of the offerings for mount Kenkališa, cf. A obv. 16–17.

153 Town of Panišša, A obv. 1: “3 + 3 *PARISU* of wheat” vs. B rev. 11: “3 + 3 *BÁN* of wheat”; A obv. 8: “3 + 3 loaves of ‘sweet bread’” vs. B rev. 16–17: “3 + 3 loaves of thick bread”.

154 So already Houwink ten Cate 1992: 105, followed by Hazenbos 2003: 212–213 (with further examples of cult inventories referring to cult restorations yet to be done). Since B is more concise, more towns can be treated than in the previous ‘detailed’ version A. There is no reason to suspect that “the relationship between the two parallel-versions indicates that, as time passed by, the work progressed and at the same time the area into consideration increased” (thus Houwink ten Cate, loc. cit.).

155 A obv. 2: <sup>d</sup>U <sup>m</sup>Zi-ia-zi-ia // B rev. 10: <sup>d</sup>U <sup>m</sup>rZi<sup>7</sup>-[ia-]zi.

156 Carter 1962: 103–104. A town named <sup>URU</sup>Zi-ia-zi-ia-aš / <sup>URU</sup>Zi-iz-zi-ia-aš is attested in KUB 23.68(+) rev. 14, 15, 16 (CTH 133), a fact which corroborates Carter’s assumption (see RGTC 6, 499).

157 The question is made more puzzling by the fact that, as Carter notes (1962: 115), in A obv. 14 “there seems to have been a correction of the writing of the name of the mountain. The traces present read more easily *Ki-li-nu-na* than *Ki-iq-qa-li-ša*.”

158 Carter 1962: 115.

on the following line an erasure probably hides the redundant occurrence of this name. Ms. B has the opposite mistake, for Dupša is correctly listed within the preamble on rev. 25 but subsequently omitted within the treatment of the autumn festival in rev. 30. This shows that the scribe of ms. B did *not* have A before his eyes while writing down the tablet: it would have been very unusual to omit the only name which appeared twice in the alleged model. In conclusion, it is clear that ms. A did not serve as the direct model for ms. B, but the two manuscripts possibly shared a common model. Although the precise relationship between the two texts eludes us, this case further illustrates the complexity of the processes involving inventorying, improving, and restoring local cults by the central authority in Ḫattuša. Such operations implied a coming and going of manuscripts of different nature and materials and their precise reconstruction lies far beyond our grasp. Indeed, the case of KUB 42.100+ proves that the compilation of cult inventories could be based on more than a single previous document (cf. § 1.1).

It is worth noting that both documents come from the same place, namely building E at Büyükkale,<sup>159</sup> and that ms. B is labelled in the colophon as EGIR-*an tarnūw*[aš]. The meaning of this phrase, lit. “(tablet) of leaving behind”, is open to debate. It is found mostly in colophons of festival texts,<sup>160</sup> but is also present in other textual genres; namely, cult inventories,<sup>161</sup> the royal funerary ritual,<sup>162</sup> and a collection of rituals labelled “in the manner of the town of Arušna”<sup>163</sup>. Today it is most commonly translated as “(tablet) of re-editing”<sup>164</sup> following an analysis by Carter which Singer considered to

159 See the *Konkordanz* online: “O. Weber, KBo 2, Vorw.: ‘Die in diesem Hefte veröffentlichten Texte stammen aus der Gruppe A...’; F. Hrozný, MDOG 56, 1915, 21: ‘Gruppe A, gefunden auf dem ‘Westabhang von Bójük-Kale ... besonders in den Räumen eines Palastes...’”.

160 See the lists in Singer 1983: 41–42 fn. 17, 19. KBo 35.144 (CTH 705) is not to be included in this group since the traces at the end of line 7’ do not agree with a reading *t[ar-...]* (photo collated). The ‘MS?’ palaeographical dating of KUB 34.126 (CTH 635) in the *Konkordanz* is perhaps based on the sign TAR in line 6’; in my opinion, however, this fragment is more likely to be labelled NS (photo collated; see also Popko 1994: 220).

161 KBo 2.7 (from Büyükkale E), KUB 27.68+ (from the area of Temple I), KUB 44.18 and KUB 56.40 (findspot unknown).

162 KUB 39.6 (CTH 450), from Büyükkale A.

163 VS.NF 12.58+ (CTH 495), see Miller 2012: 99–100. Lines iv 1’–2’ read: [DU]B.1.KAM QA-TI EGIR-*an tar-nu-ma-aš i-wa-ar* [U]<sup>RU</sup> A-*ru-uš-na* / *ke-e-da-ni-eš-ša-an* A-NA TUP-PI 6 a-ni-ur a-ni-ia-an; Miller translates as follows: “Tablet 1, finished, of ‘re-editing/excerpting’ (*appan tarnumas*) in the manner of the [c]ity of Arusna (*iwar Arusna*). On this tablet six rituals are inscribed (lit. ‘done’)”. I would propose to consider the phrase *appan tarnumaš* autonomous, like in the other relevant colophons; the expression *iwar Arušna* could refer to DUB (“Tablet 1, finished, ‘of leaving behind’, (drafted) in the manner of the [c]ity of Arušna”) or perhaps to *aniyan* (“Tablet 1, finished, ‘of leaving behind’). On this tablet six rituals are inscribed in the manner of the [c]ity of Arušna”). On the palaeographic peculiarities of this tablet, see Miller 2012.

164 E.g., Miller 2012: 100; Gordin 2011: 193.

be “plausible”, while, at the same time, admitting Güterbock’s translation as “abridged or excerpted version”.<sup>165</sup>

In some festival texts the phrase occurs in the extended form *ištarniyaš EGIR-an tarnum(m)aš*, together with the already discussed phrase *ANA GIŠ.ĪUR handan* “corresponding to the wooden writing board”. Lorenz (forthcoming) shows that all provenienced fragments within this group come either from Büyükkale E or the House on the Slope. Furthermore, he illustrates how an analysis of the findspots of these fragments indicates that these fragments all pertain to the ‘living’ festival tradition, i.e., to ongoing celebrations. He interprets *appan tarnu-* as “to make available” (“freimachen für, verfügbar machen”). This comes close to the tentative interpretation put forward by W. Waal (“spare copy”),<sup>166</sup> and to the meaning of the phrase suggested by Melchert, who supposes that it might refer to tablets which were not to be discarded, but to be preserved for the future: “(Tafel) der Überlieferung”.<sup>167</sup>

Indeed, the hypothesis that this label may mark tablets to be re-edited or excerpts has never been checked against the content of the fragments themselves. If these tablets were to be re-edited, why were some of these texts copied and recopied without changes?<sup>168</sup> The proposal of Güterbock that these would be ‘abridged versions’ is problematic as well. This interpretation could possibly account for KBo 2.7, which preserves a more concise text than the previous version KBo 2.13, and for the outline tablets KUB 39.6 (CTH 450.II.1, royal funerary ritual)<sup>169</sup> and KUB 9.16+ (CTH 626.Ü.1.A, festival *nuntarriyašha*), but it certainly cannot explain the other fragments. There is no evidence at all to support the idea that tablets like KUB 2.8 (CTH 617.1, AN.TAĪ.ŠUM festival), KUB 41.26+ (CTH 750.2), and KUB 44.24 (CTH 685) are abridged versions of longer texts. Even if this were the case, these tablets are in format and content no more ‘abridged’ than many other tablets pertaining to the same series or text groups not marked in their colophons as *appan tarnumaš*. On the contrary, the analysis of the findspots and the fact that the phrase occurs in different groups within the body of texts dealing with cult administration allows for the possibility that it was an archival term rather than a reference to text editing procedures.<sup>170</sup> Over-

165 Carter 1962: 102; Güterbock 1967: 79 fn. 7; Singer 1983: 41. For a different interpretation, see Mascheroni 1983: 99–100.

166 Waal 2010: 137–142. Gordin 2011: 193 sustains that this interpretation “require[s] too much abstraction from the original meaning”.

167 Melchert *apud* Waal 2010: 139 fn. 451.

168 In fact, duplicates of some of these tablets are preserved: see KUB 39.43 (duplicate of KUB 39.6), KUB 54.78 (duplicate of KUB 2.8).

169 This is the only *appan tarnumaš* tablet which comes from Büyükkale A, a building which was primarily used as a library. The duplicate KUB 39.43 comes from the House on the Slope.

170 So already Waal 2010: 137 and Lorenz (forthcoming).

all, on the basis of the available evidence, it is reasonable to suspect that *appan tarnumaš* was used to mark tablets which were not to be discarded or re-edited but rather made readily available in the archives, perhaps as reference tablets.

### 1.9.6 KUB 57.97 // VS.NF 12.111 (CTH 530)

A relationship similar to that of KBo 2.13 and KBo 2.7 can be observed between KUB 57.97 and VS.NF 12.111 (henceforth: A and B).<sup>171</sup> Here, however, the comparison is limited by the highly fragmentary condition of B, and the findspot of both fragments is unknown. As in the previous case, manuscript A is more detailed, contains descriptions of cult objects and uses the present tense to refer to royal measures.<sup>172</sup> On the contrary, B is more succinct, uses the preterite tense and does not describe cult objects. The offerings correspond to each other in both versions except for one minor detail.<sup>173</sup> A treats three or four towns, most probably the last ones of those treated in B,<sup>174</sup> the feasible comparison, however, is limited to the parallel sections concerning the deities *Iyaya* and *Kuwannaniya* of the town *Annitešša*; see A i 1–18 (the text breaks after line 18) corresponding to B rev. 7–16. Whereas A is a two-column tablet, B is a single-column tablet and contains many inaccuracies and carelessly written signs.<sup>175</sup>

Thus, this pair of tablets too represents two subsequent cult inventories pertaining to one single procedure of cult restorations within the same geographical area. The typological similarity between KBo 2.13 and KUB 57.97 on the one hand, and KBo 2.7 and VS.NF 12.111 on the other hand, is supplemented by an interesting formal feature. Both the summary versions KBo 2.7 and VS.NF 12.111 display two peculiar formulae referring to royal measures: <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup> *tarrāuwait* / EZEN<sub>4</sub>(-šU ...) *tarrāuwānza* in KBo 2.7 and <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup> SI×SÁ-*it* / EZEN<sub>4</sub> SI×SÁ-*anza* in VS.NF 12.11<sup>176</sup> Unlike other formulae that are fre-

171 Ed. Hazenbos 2003: 62–65 (A); 55–62 (B). For additional notes, cf. Miller 2005: 311; Cammarosano 2012: 497–500.

172 See already Hazenbos 2003: 63.

173 Within the offerings ‘of the supplies’ for the autumn festival in *Annitešša*, A i 12 has 2 DUG KAŠ, whereas we find 1 DUG<sup>g</sup> *huppar* KAŠ in B rev. 11.

174 The last two lines of the colophon are partly preserved on the reverse of A.

175 Hazenbos 2003: 56. Hazenbos compares the ‘sloppiness’ of this text to that of KUB 25.23(+), a document which may have been written before the king himself. Based on VS.NF 12.111 obv. 16’, read <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup> AS-KU-[UN<sup>2</sup> ...] in the edition, it would be tempting to assume that this document too was hastily written on dictation by the king himself. However, collation of the photo shows that the correct reading is <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup> r SI×SÁ<sup>˘</sup>-[it ...] (cf. also Hazenbos 2003: 57 fn. 11). The latter is the recurrent formula throughout the text, together with <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup> ME-iš, whereas the use of the first person would be *hapax* within the whole corpus of the cult inventories. The reading “<sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup> aš-šU” in Groddek et al. 2002: 158 is not convincing.

176 <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup> *tarrāuwait*: KBo 2.7 obv. 18’, rev. 10–11, 27; EZEN<sub>4</sub>(-šU ...) *tarrāuwānza*: KBo 2.7 obv. 5’, 8’, 22’, rev. 9, 15, 23; <sup>d</sup>UTU<sup>ŠI</sup> SI×SÁ-*it*: VS.NF 12.111 obv. 16’, rev. 7, 17, 25; EZEN<sub>4</sub>

quently attested in the body of cult inventories, these two specific formulas are virtually absent from all other texts of this genre, which makes the analogy even more striking.<sup>177</sup>

## References

- Archi, A. 1973. Fêtes de printemps et d'automne et réintégration rituelle d'images de culte dans l'Anatolie hittite, UF 5, 7–27.
- Beal, R.H. 1992. *The Organisation of the Hittite Military*, TH 20, Heidelberg.
- Beal, R.H. 2005/06. Rev. of Hazenbos 2003, AfO 51, 361–363.
- Beckman, G.M. 1983. *Hittite Birth Rituals. Second Revised Edition*, StBoT 29, Wiesbaden.
- Berman, H. 1978. Rev. of L. Rost, KUB 46, JCS 30, 121–124.
- Cammarosano, M. 2012. *Gli inventari di culto e la politica religiosa ittita nell'età di Tudhaliya IV*, PhD dissertation, Napoli.
- Cammarosano, M. forthcoming. Rejoicing in the Gods: the Formula “DINGIR<sup>LUM</sup>/MEŠ =šmaš=kan dušk(išk)anzi” and the Cheese Fighting among Hittite Festivals, in: P. Taracha (ed.), *Proceedings of the 8<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Hittitology*, Warsaw.
- Carter, C. 1962. *Hittite Cult-Inventories*, PhD dissertation, Chicago.
- Carter, C. 1980. Notes on the Name Written DINGIR IŠ EL KU UŠ in Hittite Texts, JNES 39, 313–314.
- Collins, B. J. 2006. A Note on Some Local Cults in the Time of Tudhaliya IV. In: Th.P.J. van den Hout (ed.), *The Life and Times of Hattušili III and Tudhaliya IV – Proceedings of a Symposium held in Honour of J. De Roos, 12–13 December 2003, Leiden, Leiden*, 39–48.
- Cornil, P. 1988. La fête de l'automne et du printemps de KUB LVII 106 = Bo 594, OLP 19, 17–23.
- Corti, C. 2009. Hattušili III. and the Cult Management of the Holy City of Nerik (II), in: F. Pecchioli Daddi – G. Torri – C. Corti (eds.), *Central-North Anatolia in the Hittite Period – New Perspectives in Light of Recent Research. Acts of the International Conference Held at the University of Florence (7–9 February 2007)*, Studia Asiatica 5, 13–23.

---

SI×SÁ-anza: obv. [9'], 15', rev. 3 (*handanza*), 16, 24. Both sets of formulas basically mean “My Sun has established” / “The(ir) festival has been established”, but the use of *handai*-(SI×SÁ) may imply a reference to oracular practices (this is not certain: see Klinger 1996: 337–338, 535, *contra* Cotticelli-Kurras 1989: 32–33 [*handai*- II. jheth. B. 3 Passiv]; cf. also Beal 1992: 97 fn. 350).

177 On recurrent formulas in cult inventories, see Hazenbos 2003: 202–203; Cammarosano 2012: 113–119. The only other attestations known to me for the formulas discussed above are KUB 38.12 i 18, ii 7–8, 22, iii 24' (EZEN<sub>4</sub><sup>MEŠ</sup> ... SI×SÁ-anza).

- Cotticelli-Kurras, P. 1989. *Materialien zu einem hethitischen Thesaurus, Lief. 11: ḫandai-*, Heidelberg.
- Dardano, P. *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Ḫattuša (CTH 276–282)*, StBoT 47, Wiesbaden.
- Darga, M. 1973. *Karahna şehri kült-envanteri*, Istanbul.
- de Martino, S. 2007. Das Fragment von Yassihüyük YH 2005/1, in: K. Strobel – Ch. Gerber, Tavium (Büyüknefes, Provinz Yozgat) – Bericht über die Kampagnen 2003–2005, IM 57, 547–621: 606–7.
- de Martino, S. 2008. The Hittite City of Šamuḫa: Its Location and Its Religious and Political Role in the Middle Kingdom, in: K. Strobel (ed.), *New Perspectives on the Historical Geography and Topography of Anatolia in the II and I Millennium B.C. Proceedings of the International Symposium, Udine 15th-16th December 2006*, Eothen 16, Firenze, 131–143.
- Forlanini, M. 1992. Am mittleren Kızılırmak, in: H. Otten – H. Ertem – E. Akurgal – A. Süel (eds.), *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Sedat Alp*, Ankara, 171–179.
- Forlanini, M. 2009. *On the Middle Kızılırmak II*, in: F. Pecchioli Daddi – G. Torri – C. Corti (eds.), *Central-North Anatolia in the Hittite Period – New Perspectives in Light of Recent Research. Acts of the International Conference Held at the University of Florence (7–9 February 2007)*, 39–69.
- Freu, J. – Mazoyer, M. 2011. *Le déclin et la chute du Nouvel Empire Hittite. Les Hittites et leur histoire*, Paris.
- Gordin, S. 2011. The Tablet and Its Scribe: Between Archival and Scribal Spaces in Late Empire Period Ḫattusa, AoF 38, 177–198.
- Groddek, D. 2004. *Hethitische Texte in Transkription. KUB 51, DBH 15*, Dresden.
- Groddek, D. 2006. *Hethitische Texte in Transkription. KUB 60, DBH 20*, Dresden.
- Groddek, D. 2007. *Hethitische Texte in Transkription. IBoT 4, DBH 23*, Wiesbaden.
- Güterbock, H.G. 1943. Hethitische Götterdarstellungen und Götternamen, *Belleten* 7, 295–317.
- Güterbock, H.G. 1946. Rev. of C.-G. von Brandenstein, *Hethitische Götter nach Bildbeschreibungen in Keilschrifttexten*, Leipzig 1943, Or NS 15, 482–496.
- Güterbock, H.G. 1967. The Hittite Conquest of Cyprus Reconsidered, JNES 26, 73–81.
- Güterbock, H. G. 1968/69. Rev. of L. Rost, KUB 38; Otten H., KUB 39; Klengel H., KUB 40; Oriens 21–22, 381–384.
- Güterbock, H.G. 1983. Hethitische Götterbilder und Kultobjekte, in: R.M. Boehmer – H. Hauptmann (eds.), *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasien. Festschrift für Kurt Bittel*, Mainz, 203–217.
- Haas, V. – Jakob-Rost, L. 1984. Das Festritual des Gottes Telipinu in Ḫanḫana und in Kašḫa. Ein Beitrag zum hethitischen Festkalender, AoF 11, 10–91, 204–236.
- Haas, V. 1970. *Der Kult von Nerik. Ein Beitrag zur hethitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Studia Pohl 4, Roma.
- Hagenbuchner Dresel, A. 2002. *Massangaben bei hethitischen Backwaren*, DBH 1, Dresden.

- Hazenbos, J. 2003. *The Organization of the Anatolian Local Cults during the Thirteenth Century B.C. An Appraisal of the Hittite Cult Inventories*, CM 21, Leiden – Boston.
- Hazenbos, J. 2004. Die lokalen Herbst- und Frühlingsfeste in der späten hethitischen Großreichszeit, in: M. Hutter – S. Hutter-Braunsar (eds.), *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität. Akten des religionsgeschichtlichen Symposiums “Kleinasiens und angrenzende Gebiete vom Beginn des 2. bis zur Mitte des 1. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.”* (Bonn, 20.-22. Februar 2003), AOAT 318, Münster, 241–248.
- Hoffner, H.A. 1967. An English-Hittite Glossary, RHA 25/80, 6–99.
- Houwink ten Cate, Ph.H.J. 1992. The Hittite Storm-God: His Role and His Rule According to Hittite Cuneiform Sources, in: D.J.W. Meijer (ed.), *Natural Phenomena. Their Meaning, Depiction and Description in the Ancient Near East*, Amsterdam – Oxford- New York – Tokyo, 83–148.
- Hutter, M. 2010. Methodological Issues and Problems in Reconstructing “Hittite Religion(s)”, in: A. Stiel (ed.), *VII. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri, Çorum 25–31 Ağustos 2008 – Acts of the VIIth International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, August 25–31, 2008*, Ankara, 399–416.
- Imparati, F. 1979. Une reine de Hatti vénère la déesse Ningal, in: *Florilegium anaticum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, Paris, 169–176.
- Imparati, F. 1990. Obligations et manquements culturels envers la divinité Pirwa, Or NS 59 (Gs von Schuler), 166–187.
- Kimball, S. E. 2000. Hittite *ariya*–: “Consult an Oracle”?, in: Y.L. Arbeitman (ed.), *The Asia Minor Connexion. Studies on the Pre-Greek Languages in Memory of Charles Carter*, Leuven - Paris, 133–149.
- Klinger, J. 1996. *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion des hattischen Kultschicht*, StBoT 37, Wiesbaden.
- Klinger, J. 2002. Die hethitisch-kaşkäische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der Großreichszeit, in: S. de Martino – F. Pecchioli Daddi (eds.), *Anatolia antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, Eothen 11, 437–451.
- Košak, S. 1978. The Inventory of Manninni (CTH 504), *Linguistica* 18, 99–123.
- Košak, S. 1982. *Hittite inventory texts (CTH 241–250)*, TH 10, Heidelberg.
- Košak, S. 1994. Rev. of H. Klengel, KUB 60, ZA 84, 288–290.
- Košak, S. 1995. The Palace Library “Building A” on Büyükkale, in: Th.P.J. van den Hout – J. de Roos (eds.), *Studio historiae ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, PIHANS 74, Leiden, 173–179.
- Laroche, E. 1971. *Catalogue des Textes Hittites*, Paris.
- Laroche, E. 1972. *Catalogue des Textes Hittites. Premier supplément*, RHA 30, 94–133.
- Laroche, E. 1975. Le réforme religieuse du roi Tudhaliya IV et sa signification politique, in: F. Dunand – P. Lévêque (eds.), *Les Syncrétismes dans les religions de l'antiquité. Colloque de Besançon, 22–23 octobre 1973*, Leiden, 87–95.

- Lebrun, R. *Textes religieux hittites de la fin de l'empire*, Hethitica 2, 93–153.
- Lorenz, J. – Rieken, E. 2007. “Auf dem Weg der Stadt Šaššuna ...”, in: D. Groddek – M. Zorman (eds.), *Tabularia Hethaeorum – Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, DBH 25, Wiesbaden, 467–486.
- Lorenz, J. forthcoming. Der hethitische König: Herr der tausend Feste?, in: P. Taracha (ed.), *Proceedings of the 8<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Hittitology*, Warsaw.
- McMahon, G. 1991. *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities*, AS 25, Chicago.
- Marazzi, M. 1994. Ma gli Hittiti scrivevano veramente su “legno”?, in: P. Cipriano – P. Di Giovine – M. Mancini (eds.), *Miscellanea di studi linguistici in onore di Walter Belardi*, Roma, 131–160.
- Mascheroni, L. M. 1983. Apropos d'un groupe de colophons problématiques, Hethitica 5, 95–109.
- Miller, J.L. 2005. Rev. of Hazenbos 2003, ZA 95, 308–312.
- Miller J.L. 2008. Joins and Duplicates among the Bogazköy Tablets (46–60), ZA 98, 230–250.
- Miller, J.L. 2012. The Palaeography and Orthography of Six Rituals ‘Redacted’ in the Manner of Arusna, in: E. Devecchi (ed.), *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age*, PIHANS 119, Leiden, 95–110.
- Müller-Karpe, A. – Müller-Karpe, V. – Rieken, E. – Sommerfeld, W. – Wilhelm, G. – Zeiler, M. 2006. Untersuchungen in Kayalıpınar 2005, MDOG 138, 211–247.
- Müller-Karpe, A. 1995. Untersuchungen in Kuşaklı 1992–94, MDOG 127, 5–36.
- Neu, E. 1980. *Althethitische Ritualtexte im Umschrift*, StBoT 25, Wiesbaden.
- Neu, E. 1982. Studie über den Gebrauch von Genetivformen auf *-was* des hethitischen Verbalsubstantivs *-war* in: E. Neu (ed.), *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae. Gedenkschrift für Heinz Kronasser*, Wiesbaden, 116–148.
- Oppenheim, A. L. 1977. *Ancient Mesopotamia: Portrait of a Dead Civilization. Revised Edition*, Chicago.
- Otten, H. – Rüter, C. 1982. Textanschnisse und Duplikate von Boğazköy-Tafeln (81–90), ZA 72, 139–149.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F. – Baldi, M. 2004. Un inventario di culto della città di Hurma, in: D. Groddek – S. Röfle (eds.) *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer*, DBH 10, Dresden, 495–506.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F. 1982. *Mestieri, professioni e dignità nell'Anatolia ittita*, Roma.
- Popko, M. 1994. *Zippalanda. Ein Kultzentrum im hethitischen Kleinasien*, TH 21, Heidelberg.
- Rost, L. 1961. Zu den hethitischen Bildbeschreibungen, 1. Teil, MIO 8, 161–217.
- Rost, L. 1963. Zu den hethitischen Bildbeschreibungen, 2. Teil, MIO 9, 175–239.
- Schwemer, D. 2005/06. Lehnbeziehungen zwischen dem Hethitischen und dem Akkadischen, AfO 51, 220–234.
- Schwemer, D. 2008. Fremde Götter in Hatti. Die hethitische Religion im Spannungsfeld von Synkretismus und Abgrenzung, in: CGDOG 6, 137–158.

- Schwemer, D. forthcoming. Quality Assurance Managers at Work: the Hittite Festival Tradition, in: *Liturgie oder Literatur? Die Kultrituale der Hethiter: Workshop 2.–3. Dezember 2010, Akademie der Wissenschaften und Literatur Mainz*.
- Seeher, J. 2001. Die Zerstörung der Stadt Hattuša, in: G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie, Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999*, StBoT 45, Wiesbaden, 623–634.
- Siegelová, J. 1986. *Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis im Lichte der Wirtschafts- und Inventardokumente*, Praha.
- Singer, I. 1983. *The Hittite KLLAM Festival, I*, StBoT 27, Wiesbaden.
- Součková, J. 2010. Edikt von Tuḫaliya IV. zugunsten des Kults des Wettergottes von Nerik, in: J. Klinger – E. Rieken – C. Rüster (eds.), *Investigationes Anatolicae. Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*, StBoT 52, Wiesbaden, 279–300.
- Starke, F. 1990. *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschriftluwischen Nomens*, StBoT 31, Wiesbaden.
- Süel, A. 1992. Ortaköy: Eine hethitische Stadt mit hethitischen und hurritischen Tafelentdeckungen, in: H. Otten – H. Ertem – E. Akurgal – A. Süel (eds.), *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Sedat Alp*, Ankara, 487–492.
- Taggar-Cohen, A. 2006. *Hittite Priesthood*, THeth 26, Heidelberg.
- Taracha, P. 2007. Rev. of D. Groddek – J.V. García Trabazo, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription*. KUB 58, DBH 18, Wiesbaden, BiOr 64, 188–193.
- Torri, G. 2008. Rev. of Hazenbos 2003, AJA 112, 547–549.
- Torri, G. 2010. Hittite Scribes at Play: The Case of the Cuneiform Sign AN, in: J. Klinger – E. Rieken – Ch. Rüster (eds.), *Investigationes Anatolicae – Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*, StBoT 52, Wiesbaden, 317–327.
- Trémouille, M.-C. 2001. Kizzuwatna, terre de frontière, in: E. Jean – A.M. Dinçol – S. Durugönül (eds.), *La Cilicie: espaces et pouvoirs locaux (2e millénaire av. J.-C. – 4e siècle ap. J.-C.)*, Actes de la table ronde internationale d'Istanbul, 2–5 novembre 1999, Istanbul – Paris, 57–78.
- van Gessel, A.H.L. 2001. *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon, Part Three*, HdO 33/3, Leiden – New York – Köln.
- van den Hout, Th.P.J. 1990. Rev of A. Archi KUB 57, BiOr 47, 423–432.
- van den Hout, Th.P.J. 1994. Rev. of H. Klengel, KUB 60, BiOr 51, 119–126.
- van den Hout, Th.P.J. 1995. *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung*, StBoT 38, Wiesbaden.
- van den Hout, Th.P.J. 2002. Another View of Hittite Literature, in: S. de Martino – F. Pecchioli Daddi (eds.), *Anatolia antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, Eothen 11, Firenze, 857–878.
- van den Hout, Th.P.J. 2006. Administration in the Reign of Tuḫaliya IV and the Later Years of the Hittite Empire, in: Th.P.J. van den Hout (ed.), *The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tuḫaliya IV – Proceedings of a Symposium held in Honour of J. De Roos, 12–13 December 2003, Leiden*, Leiden, 77–106.

- van den Hout, Th.P.J. 2008. A Classified Past: Classification of Knowledge in the Hittite Empire, in: CRRAI 51, 211–219.
- Waal, W. 2010. *The Source as Object. Studies in Hittite Diplomatics*, PhD dissertation, Leiden.
- Waal, W. 2011. They Wrote on Wood. The Case for a Hieroglyphic Scribal Tradition on Wooden Writing Boards in Hittite Anatolia, AnSt 61, 21–34.
- Weeden, M. 2011. *Hittite Scribal Schools Outside of Hattusa?*, AoF 38, 116–134.
- Wilhelm, G. 1997. *Keilschrifttexte aus Gebäude A*, KuSa 1/1, Rahden/Westf.
- Wilhelm, G. 2000. Ein weiterer Tontafelfund aus dem Gebäude A in Kuşaklı, MDOG 132, 324–328.
- Wilhelm, G. 2002. Die Keilschriftfunde der Kampagne 2001 in Kuşaklı, MDOG 134, 342–351.