

Hittite Cult Inventories - Part Two: The Dating of the Texts and the Alleged 'Cult Reorganization' of Tudhaliya IV

Author(s): Michele Cammarosano

Source: Altorientalische Forschungen 39, 2012, 3-37.

Stable URL: <https://osf.io/j69tt>

MICHELE CAMMAROSANO

Hittite Cult Inventories – Part Two: The Dating of the Texts and the Alleged ‘Cult Reorganization’ of Tudḫaliya IV

Abstract

The Hittite cult inventories constitute a corpus of ca. 550 fragments dating to the Late Empire period, dealing with local offerings and festivals in provincial towns. They are commonly viewed against the background of an assumed reorganization of local cults promoted by Tudḫaliya IV. Within such an extensive operation, local festivals would have been restyled and standardized to some degree. The paper aims at casting doubts on these assumptions, presenting a reappraisal of the questions concerning the dating of the texts and a minimalist interpretation of Tudḫaliya’s ‘cult reorganization’. It also provides an overview of the extant Middle Hittite fragments and on restorations of local cults pre-dating Tudḫaliya IV. The main conclusions are that (1) the arguments behind the assumption that the majority of the surviving fragments should be dated to Tudḫaliya IV are debatable; (2) the measures taken by Tudḫaliya reflect practices that are attested from at least the Middle Hittite period, without any substantial innovation; and (3) despite their stylistic similarities, the texts tend to treat the local festivals, the origins of which in all likelihood go back to ancestral times, in a faithful way.

Keywords: cult inventories, cult reorganization, Tudḫaliya IV, local Hittite festivals

2.0. Questions Addressed*

The present article focuses on the dating of the Hittite cult inventories and on the related question of the much debated ‘cult reorganization’ allegedly promoted by Tudḫaliya IV. Today there is a broad consensus that no actual ‘reform’ ever took place, but rather some sort of ‘reorganization’, and that some kind of cult inventories indeed had to have existed already in earlier times. Still, both the nature and the scope of such a ‘reorganization’ remain unclear. Thus, a systematic reappraisal of the dating of these texts and of the significance of the alleged reorganization seems appropriate.

* This article develops some topics treated in the PhD dissertation I submitted to the University of Naples ‘L’Orientale’ in May 2012. I would like to express my gratitude to Profs. Stefano de Martino, Joost Hazenbos and Jared L. Miller for their precious advice and for valuable comments on earlier drafts of the paper. My thanks go also to Prof. Jörg Klinger and Dr. Giulia Torri for their useful remarks. 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. Obverse and reverse are noted only for single- and three-columned tablets.

This paper constitutes the second part of a broader study on the Hittite cult inventories. The first part focuses on the texts' nature and classification and is presented as a separate article due to size limits (Cammarosano in press a). Sections of the first and second parts are numbered '1.n' and '2.n', respectively.¹

2.1. General Remarks

There are three main questions regarding the dating of Hittite cult inventories:

- (1) Most texts are written in the so-called New (NS) or Late New Script (LNS). In other words, assuming that they are not copies of older texts, they date from the latest phase of the Empire. A very few texts, however, are palaeographically older, showing the so-called Middle Script (MS). How is this to be accounted for?
- (2) Texts that can be dated to a specific ruler all date to Tudḫaliya IV. Does this warrant the conclusion that the great bulk of the cult inventories is likely to date to this king as well?
- (3) Are the cult inventories to be viewed against the background of some sort of cult re-organization promoted by this very ruler?

The first question entails no particular problems. Due to their ephemeral administrative nature, such documents have a short life span and are not copied and recopied through time. The almost total lack of cult inventories from pre-NH times can be easily accounted for by assuming that older texts were systematically discarded. Further, it can be assumed that some part of the relevant sources was likely written on perishable material, and it comes as no surprise that these are likewise missing.

Responses to the latter questions, in contrast, have gone through a significant evolution over the years. This topic is addressed in §§ 2.4–2.8.

2.2. Middle Hittite Cult Inventories

According to the *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln* (Kořak 2012), the cult inventories are divided palaeographically along the following lines:²

¹ The corpus considered includes all fragments catalogued under CTH 501–525 in Kořak (2012) 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 presently being 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 (for a full list, with detailed discussion of reclassification proposals, see Cammarosano in press a). Since most of the remaining texts are scraps or very poorly preserved fragments, the results of the study can be regarded as significant for the textual genre as a whole.

² The fragments classified as CTH 504 (Mannini's inventory) and CTH 523 (ration lists) are excluded, since these are not cult inventories. Of course, some further (L)NS fragments should likely be excluded and some others should likely be included, but for now the exact number of (L)NS fragments has no

Script	Fragms.	Pub. / Inv. No.	CTH	Findspot
OS	1	KBo 25.83	530	Büyükkale A
MS	4	KUB 48.114	525	?
		KUB 12.36+KUB 60.9	516.2	?
		KuT 54	511	Kuşaklı <i>Kuppe</i>
		KBo 55.188	530	Temple I
MS?	6	KBo 41.61	530	Büyükkale A
		KBo 31.168	530	Büyükkale A
		KBo 48.117	530	area of Temple I?
		KBo 57.118	530	Temple I
		KBo 25.140	530	Temple I
		KBo 55.187	530	Temple I
(L)NS	508			
Total	519			

Closer examination might reduce this list even further. First, it should be stressed that all pre-NS fragments are very small pieces, except for KUB 48.114 and KUB 12.36+. Inclusion of KUB 48.114 within the cult inventory corpus is not certain, as it contains none of the diagnostic features discussed in § 1.5 and may therefore be a simple list of cult offerings.³ Its current classification as CTH 525 (Heiligtumsinventare unter Tudḫaliya IV.) is in any case clearly inconsistent with the MS displayed by its text.⁴ KUB 12.36+ is a text of a very special nature. As seen in § 1.9 no. 2, this fragment deals with a report on cult objects and festivals originating with a certain ‘Tarḫini, man of Tamarmara’.

A number of the small fragments, in my opinion, are not to be considered cult inventories. For KBo 25.83 see above, § 1.8.2. In KBo 57.118 the signs DA and Á appear in the typical OS shape (l. 4’),⁵ but the mention of *BIBRU* and *ḫuppar* vessels in lines 2’–3’ does not seem sufficient for including the text among the cult inventories, so that it may be better to

relevance. Moreover, fragments in NS and those in LNS are grouped together, as evaluating the division of these sub-groups would unnecessarily complicate the present analysis. At the moment, KuT 54 is the only pre-NS cult inventory that is still unpublished (on this fragment see Wilhelm 2002: 351). The palaeography of the other MS fragments has been examined on the photos available in the online *Konkordanz* (Kořak 2012).

³ In particular, there is no reference to towns. On the obverse cult offerings for various Gulšař and DINGIR.MAḪ deities are listed. Noteworthy are the mentions of a king [Tud]ḫaliya (i 9’–10’: ^d*Gul-ša[-ař DINGIR.MAḪ(-ař) řA(?) mTu-ut-ḫ]a-li-ya LUGAL / ũ řA[...]*; cf. already Sommer 1932: 34) and of the ‘wife of řaḫurun(u)wa’ (i 7’: DINGIR.MAḪ-_Lař řA_L DAM ^m*řa-ḫu-ru-un-wa*). Klengel (1965: 93) identified the latter with the well-known contemporary of Tudḫaliya IV, but this dating is inconsistent with the MS of the fragment, and namesakes are indeed attested from the Middle Hittite period (cf. Imparati 1974: 15; van den Hout 1995: 151–154; Marizza 2007: 128–130).

⁴ Cf. the shapes of řA (i 5’ [2x], possibly i 9’), LI (i 9’), UN (i 7’), E (iv 11’), Á (iv 5’), EN (i 4’).

⁵ That said, one must stress that the shape of DA and Á cannot be considered conclusive proof of OS or MS; see Popko (2007) and Weeden (2011: 43 n. 190, 47).

classify it as CTH 670. Similarly, there is no reason to consider KBo 41.61, KBo 48.117 and KBo 55.187 as cult inventories. The first one preserves an older variant of E in l. 3'; the text contains a reference to a specific year (l. 1': MU.2.KAM) and mentions 'pigs' or similar (l. 2': 7 šA[Ḫ]). Since both elements would be highly untypical in a cult inventory and since MS cult inventories are extremely rare, it seems safer to consider this fragment a *MELQĒTU* list (CTH 523) or a festival text (CTH 670). In the second, there are one occurrence of DA in its typical MS shape in l. 6' (the same sign appears in the OS shape in ll. 2' and 4') and a listing of cereals and loaves of *ḫarši*-bread. Again, the mention of great quantities of loaves (30 in l. 3', 140 in l. 7') and the absence of elements typical of cult inventories suggest a classification of this fragment as CTH 523. The third one (note the sign D[A in the OS shape in l. 4') mentions 'autumn' (ll. 3'–4') and contains the expressions 3-šU *akua[nz]*i, '(they) dr[in]k three times' (l. 1'), and *āppai*, '(it) ends/is over' (l. 2'), which rather points to a festival text.

Some of the fragments, however, might indeed be cult inventories, including KBo 25.140 and KBo 31.168. The former refers to the supplying of cult offerings (i. e. *pāi*, 'he provides', in ll. 11' and 12') and mentions the ^LAGRIG of Kaštama in fragmentary context (l. 11'). Palaeographically significant are the OS shapes of E, ḪA and DA. KBo 31.168 also refers to supplying offerings, though in highly broken context; 'men' are mentioned in l. 2', *ḫuma[nda]*, 'al[l]', in l. 3', *išTU É-šU*, '(... provides) from his house', in l. 4' and *udai*, '(he) brings', in l. 5'. The sign DA appears in MS shape in l. 5'. Even more uncertain is the classification of the fragment KBo 55.188, probably dealing with cult offerings (a 'priest' is mentioned in ll. 3' and 5'; the deity Wurunzimu in l. 2'⁶); the sign DA appears in MS shape in ll. 6' and 7'. Finally, there is the unpublished MS fragment KuT 54 from Kuşaklı/Şarişša. According to Wilhelm (2002: 351) it lists cult offerings for no fewer than ten deities celebrated in the form of stelae. To the MS fragments listed in Koşak (2012) one may add KBo 30.130. This text is presently classified as CTH 670, but it is more likely a cult inventory, as Hazenbos (2003: 144) has noted.

Thus, the chart may therefore be adjusted as follows:

Script	Fragms.	% (rounded to decimal)	Pub. / Inv. No.	CTH	Findspot
MS	5	1 %	KUB 48.114	525 (or 530?)	?
			KUB 12.36+	516.2	?
			KBo 30.130	670 (or 530?)	Büyükkale A
			KuT 54	511	Kuşaklı <i>Kuppe</i>
			KBo 55.188	530?	Temple I
MS ⁷	2	0,4 %	KBo 31.168	530?	Büyükkale A
			KBo 25.140	530?	Temple I
(L)NS	508	98,6 %			
Total	515	100 %			

⁶ See Klinger (1996: 145 n. 69).

Thus, all but a handful of cult inventories are in (L)NS, that is to say, they all date to the later phase of the Hittite Empire (from the reign of Ḫattušili III onwards). Besides four small pieces and one unpublished fragment from Kuşaklı, only two are written in MS. Of these, KUB 48.114 lacks conclusive evidence to allow it to be classified as a cult inventory, while KUB 12.36+ is a text of a very special nature. Again, two facts are to be stressed. By itself, these reclassifications mean neither that cult inventories did not exist in pre-NH times nor that all or most of them date to a single ruler within the NH/(L)NS span. Regardless of how many cult inventories might have existed in older periods and what material they were written on, it is reasonable to assume that such documents were systematically discarded from time to time due to their ephemeral nature.

2.3. Restorations of Local Cults before Tudḫaliya IV

While the search for older cult inventory tablets thus seems unlikely to be met with success, one may look for hints at their existence in texts of a different nature. As already pointed out by other scholars (Houwink ten Cate 1992: 102; Hazenbos 2003: 1), several passages show that documents at least analogous to the (L)NS cult inventories had to have existed in previous times. In the following a brief review of the evidence is presented.

The MH Instructions to Commanders of Border Garrisons

It is well known that the MH Instructions to Commanders of Border Garrisons (CTH 261) provides the most explicit evidence about the existence of cult inventories in earlier periods.⁷ This text shows that the king was very interested in the care of the local cults of provincial towns. The commander of a border garrison (*BĒL MADGALTI*) was required to keep track of cult objects, chapels, cult personnel, the correct execution of festivals and the regular supply of cult offerings. He had to restore cult objects and chapels and ensure that sufficient cult offerings and personnel were available. The text stresses the importance of maintaining the temples and of celebrating festivals at the proper time. Importantly, the *BĒLŪ MADGALTI* are required to write down a report on the cultic paraphernalia and send it to the king; in other words, they are to compile cult inventories and send them to the capital:

KUB 13.2 ii 42'–43': *nam-ma šA DINGIR-LIM Ū-NU-TUM a-ú-wa-ri-ya-aš EN-aš gul-aš-du / na-at MA-ḪAR^d UTU-<šD> up-pa-ú*

'Furthermore: The margrave is to write down the cultic implements of the god and send it (the record) in to His Majesty' (after McMahon 1997: 224).

⁷ Carter (1962: 17); Houwink ten Cate (1992: 102); Hazenbos (2003: 1). The relevant passage is KUB 13.2+(+) ii 26'–iii 8 // KUB 13.1+ iii 7'–19', i.e. §§ 19'–34'; edition: Pecchioli Daddi (2003: 134–146); cf. also McMahon (1997: 223 f.).

The verb *gulš-* suggests that such reports were drawn on wooden writing boards, possibly using the hieroglyphic script.⁸ Be that as it might, this passage proves beyond doubt that at least by the time of this MH text cult inventories similar to those known were regularly written down and sent to the capital, or at least this is what the king wanted to happen.

Arnuwanda I

In Arnuwanda's day, control of the sacred city of Nerik was lost, and for a long period the cults of Nerik were celebrated in Ḫakmiš.⁹ The prayer of Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal (CTH 375; Singer 2002: 40–43, with previous literature) witnesses the royal couple's regret over the forced decay of those cults and insists on the importance of celebrating the deities both at the proper time and with the proper offerings; once more, the text stresses the importance of periodical restoration and enhancement of the cult objects:

KUB 17.21+ i 14'–23': 'Furthermore, your divine images of silver and gold, when anything had grown old on some god's body, or when any objects of the gods had grown old, no one had ever renewed them as we have (⁽¹⁴⁾*nam-ma š[u-] me-en-za-an* DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*aš ku-e* ALAM^{HL.A-KU-NU ŠA KÙ.BABBAR GUŠKIN} (⁽¹⁵⁾*nu-uš-ša-an [k]u-e-da-ni* DINGIR-LIM-ni *ku-it tu-e-ek-ki-iš-ši* (⁽¹⁶⁾*an-da ú-iz-z[a-p]a-an* DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*ša ku-e Ú-NU-TE*^{MEŠ} *ú-iz-za-pa-an-ta* (⁽¹⁷⁾*na-at an-z[e-]el i-wa-ar* EGIR-*pa Ú-UL ku-iš-ki* (⁽¹⁸⁾*ne-u-wa-aḫ-ḫa-a[n ḫar-t]a*).¹⁰ Furthermore, no one had established such respect in the matter of the purity of the rituals (var.: recitations) for you; no one had set up for you like this the daily, the monthly and the annual seasonal rituals and festivals' (after Singer 2002: 41).

Muršili II

Another well-known text implying the king's concern in assuring the correct execution of festivals in provincial towns is KUB 32.133 (CTH 482; Miller 2004: 312–319). In this text, Muršili II refers to the introduction of the cult of the Deity of the Night in Šamuḫa promoted by his forefather Tudḫaliya, and regrets that a number of tablets preserving the rites

⁸ See most recently Waal (2011). For a different interpretation see Marazzi (1994: 138–140, 142). At the 8th ICH (Warsaw 2011) Waal opted for the older logographic interpretation *GUL-š-*.

⁹ On the location of Ḫakmiš see recently Alparslan (2010). Insight on the transfer and preservation of cultic tradition pertaining to the lost city of Nerik is found in the colophon of KUB 28.80 (CTH 737, NH/NS), where it is related that when Nerik was lost refugee priests fled to Ḫakmiš and assured the preservation of rites (*malteššar*) from the sacred city: 'Tablet of the recitation of the regular festival of Nerik. (This is) now a new tablet. When in the years of w[a]r they started to perform the festival of Nerik in Ḫakmiš, the man of the Stormgod (and) the GUDU₁₂-priest ... came from Nerik and they took this re[cit]ation from those (refugee priests) (*nu=kan kī mal[teš]šar apēdaš dāēr*). I[t] does not correspon[d] to the former recitations' (KUB 28.80 iv 1'–10', after Waal 2010: 293; cf. Kühne / Otten 1971: 27; CHD L-N, 136a; Taggar-Cohen 2006: 233–234). It is not known whether these priests brought written tablets with them or rather dictated such rites once in Ḫakmiš. Moreover, the passage does not deal with cult inventories, nor can Nerik be considered an ordinary local town. Still, this colophon provides valuable evidence on the importance of handing down cult practices through Hittite history.

¹⁰ See von Schuler (1965: 152).

had been incessantly altered by the cult personnel; hence the ‘new edition’ ordered by the king:

KUB 32.133 i 2–7: ‘When my forefather, Tudḥaliya, Great King, split the Deity of the Night from the temple of the Deity of the Night in Kizzuwatna and worshipped her separately in a temple in Samuḥa, those rituals and obligations which he determined in the temple of the Deity of the Night ((⁴)... *nu-za ḥa-az-zi-wi₅-ta iš-ḥi-ú-li^{HLA}-ya ku-e* (⁵)*I-NA É DINGIR GE₆ kat-ta-an ḥa-ma-an-kat-ta*) – it came about, however, that the wooden tablet scribes and the temple personnel began to incessantly alter them – I, Mursili, Great King, have reedited them from the tablets ((⁷)... *tup-pí-ya-az EGIR-pa a-ni-ya-nu-un*)’ (after Miller 2004: 312).¹¹

Muwattalli II

The ‘prolonged neglect of southern cults, which has obviously raised the anger of the gods,’ may be considered the leitmotif of the prayers of Muwattalli II (Singer 2002: 80). In the prayer to the Stormgod concerning the cult of Kummanni (CTH 382),¹² the king stresses his desire to restore the neglected cults of that region. Displaying his typical ‘idiosyncratic spirit of meticulous precision’ (Singer 2002: 80) Muwattalli states that he will use every means available to investigate the original state of such local cults, ranging from wooden records (GIŠ.ḪUR, (^{GIŠ.ḪUR})*gulzattar*)¹³ to memories obtained by interviewing local ‘venerable old men’ and, failing all this, he asks the gods to reveal it in his dreams. Once more, one finds explicit reference to restoration of cult objects and sacred places:

KBo 11.1 obv. 20–24: ‘But when I, My Majesty, solicit the gods to the Land of Kummanni [...], [what(?)] does not fulfill the requirements of the gods, [I will ask(?)] the people who are still there and who were there with my father and [my grandfather(?)]. And whatever I, My Majesty, discover now in the written records (obv. 21: [GIŠ.ḪUR^{HLA} ḫ gul-za-at-ta-na-az-z[i-y]a), I will carry out. [But whatever] requirements (obv. 22: *ša-ak-la-a-ya-aš*) [of the gods] I do not manage

¹¹ The phrase *tuppiyaz EGIR-pa aniyannun* has been translated by van den Hout (2010: 260) as follows: ‘I [...] laid them down again in writing (lit. with a tablet/with tablets).’ A tempting but uncertain hypothesis would be to link the reference to scribes on wooden tablets (^{LÜ.MEŠ}DUB.SAR.GIŠ, on this see Waal 2011, especially p. 22, *contra* van den Hout 2010) to the possibility that the rites were formerly written on wooden boards, whereas Mursili wanted the new edition to be made on clay tablets (*tuppi*-).

¹² KBo 11.1; see Houwink ten Cate / Josephson (1967); Singer (2002: 81–85; translation and discussion). Note that this tablet, like KUB 6.46 (CTH 381.B), was seemingly dictated by the king himself (see Singer 1996: 135, 142, 161).

¹³ For the interpretation as ‘wooden writing board’ see Marazzi (1994: 154–157). Singer (2002: 83–84) cautiously translates ‘written records’. Houwink ten Cate / Josephson (1967: 116) translate ‘hieroglyphic records’, but Houwink ten Cate (1992: 139 n. 41) later opted for ‘wooden tablets and (written) records’. Indeed, if the term *gulš-/GUL-š-* really refers to hieroglyphic script, then the derivation *gulzattar* would imply the use of this kind of writing (so also Waal 2011, according to whom the *gulzattar* tablets were in all likelihood not inscribed on wax but rather on wood; cf. Symington 1991: 113–114). The logogram GIŠ.ḪUR refers to wooden writing boards (possibly from an original meaning of ‘plan, scheme’, see Marazzi 1994: 144–148, 153, with further literature), and may function as determinative of *gulzattar* at least in some of these occurrences.

to fulfill, [that] you know, O Storm-god, my lord. When I consult a venerable old man, [as] they remember [each(?)] requirement and report it, thus I shall carry it out’;¹⁴

Obv. 26–27: ‘While I am resettling the land, and until it recovers(?), I shall indeed perform the protocol o[f the god]s (š[A DINGIR^M]^{EŠ}-*ma iš-ḫi-ú-ul*)¹⁵ which I am rediscovering, and it shall be henceforth carried out’;

Obv. 33–37: ‘Those towns that are inhabited and have a *sinapsi*-sanctuary, they shall be surveyed and [shall be set right]. In accordance with the consecration (rites), they shall be reconsecrated precisely. If there are any *sinapsi*-sanctuaries in any of the deserted towns, [as they used to celebrate(?)] them, so precisely shall they begin to celebrate them’;

Obv. 40–42: ‘If someone has overturned (obv. 40: *kat-ta la-ak-nu-ut*) the throne of the Storm-god, or a stela (obv. 40: *ḫuwaši*), or if he has blocked a sacred spring, [...], I will set it right again. But what I do not find or discover in a written record (obv. 41: GIŠ.HUR *gul-za-at-ta-na-az*), [or] what a venerable old man does not report to me, clarify this matter to me, O god, in a dream’.

What is meant by GIŠ.HUR and (GIŠ.HUR)*gulzattar* here? Cult inventories or festival texts? This may never be known, but it seems likely that both kinds of texts were involved, and possibly even more, such as reports, depositions, oracle inquiries, etc.

Measures taken by this king with regard to the inspection, restoration and improvement of local cults are referred to also in a few later texts. KBo 14.142 (CTH 698.I.A), a tablet dating to Ḫattušili III or Tudḫaliya IV and dealing with the cult of Teššob and Ḫebat of Aleppo in and outside Ḫattuša, preserves in line iii 34’ the phrase ^mNIR.GÁL LUGAL.GAL *katta ḫamakta*, ‘Muwattalli, Great King, established’. The cult inventory KUB 42.100+, dating to Tudḫaliya IV and referring to local cults in Nerik, mentions in line i 35 ‘12 monthly festivals, 1 spring festival [(and) 1 autumn festival], (treated) in a *kurta* tablet of Muwattalli’;¹⁶ and refers at least twice to cult objects dedicated by that king.¹⁷

Muršili III

An interesting passage from the cult inventory IBoT 2.131¹⁸ mentions cult offerings that Urḫi-Teššob¹⁹ (Muršili III) instituted for the deities Pirwa and Ḫašgala but that had subsequently been neglected.

¹⁴ This and the following passages are quoted after Singer (2002: 83–85); for transliteration see Houwink ten Cate / Josephson (1967: 106–110).

¹⁵ Note the use of *išḫiul* with reference to regulations concerning festivals, as in KUB 32.133 quoted above.

¹⁶ šA ^mNIR.GÁL GIŠ*kur-ta-za* 12 EZEN₄.ITU.KAM 1 EZEN₄ Ú.BAR₈ [1 EZEN₄ *zé-e-ni*; see Hazenbos (2003: 15, 17).

¹⁷ In lines iv 13’ (Hazenbos 2003: 24 n. 44), iv 38’ and probably also iii 32’.

¹⁸ CTH 518.1.A; see Imparati (1990); van den Hout (1995: 156–157); Forlanini (2009: 39–42); cf. also above, § 1.9 no. 4. This text can be dated to Tudḫaliya IV (see below, § 2.6).

¹⁹ Obv. 17’: ^mUr’-ḫi-^dX’-^lub^l (see now HW² Ḫ, 374). These signs were differently interpreted by Imparati (1990: 168–169 with n. 18).

IBoT 2.131 obv. 15'–21':

- 15' A-NA ^dPi-ir-wa-ma ^{GIŠ}KIRI₆.GEŠTIN_L kat-ta_L pa-a-an-te_L-eš 2 ^{DUG}ḫar-ši-ya-a[l-li]
 16' 1 ^{DUG}ḫar-ši-ya-al-li šA_L ^dPi-ir-wa 1_L [^{DUG}]_L ḫar-ši-ya-al-li-ma šA ^d[Ḫaš-ga-la^(?)]²⁰
 17' nu ^mUr¹-hi-^dX¹-ub_L ku-wa-pí_L ^dPi-ir-wa-an EGIR-pa ta-ni-nu-ut
 18' na-aš me-mi-eš-ta ku-it-ma-an-wa [^{GI}]_L ^{GIŠ}KIRI₆.GEŠTIN EGIR-pa DÙ-an-zi [Ø]
 19' GEŠTIN-ma-wa IŠ-TU É.DINGIR-LIM pé-eš-kán-du nu a-pé-ez-za UD^{KA}[^M-az]²¹
 20' ^{DUG}ḫar-ši-ya-al-li šA_L ^dḪaš¹-ga_L-la GUB-ri Ū-UL¹ ¹šī¹ SUM-an-zi [Ø]
 21' ^{ḪUR.SAG}Li-iḫ-ša-aš ^{GIŠ}.^{ḪUR}ši-ya-an-te-eš šA ^dPi-ir-wa ḫar-zi

- 15' The vineyards for Pirwa are neglected.²² (There are) 2 ḫaršiyal[li]-vessels,
 16' 1 ḫaršiyalli-vessel of Pirwa and 1 ḫaršiyalli-[vessel] of [Ḫašgala^(?)].
 17' And when Urḫi-Teššob reestablished (the cult of) Pirwa,
 18' he spoke (as follows): 'As long as they rebuild the vineyards,
 19' let the wine be provided by the temple!', and from that da[y] on
 20' the ḫaršiyalli-vessel of Ḫašgala is (there). (Now), they no longer provide it (with cult offerings).
 21' He (i.e. the priest?) of Pirwa holds the sealed wooden writing boards of Mount Lihša. (?)²³

Such sealed wooden tablets likely contained ritual prescriptions for the correct celebration of festivals and information on things like cult offerings, personnel, cult objects and so on. Again, it would be hopeless to attempt to further classify the tablets as festival texts, cult inventories or otherwise. Significant is that this passage is among the few texts bearing witness to measures taken by Muršili III, and it so happens that it deals with a restoration of local cults.

Ḫattušili III

Although no cult inventory can be dated with certainty to Ḫattušili III, references to cult offerings instituted by the 'father of His Majesty' in cult inventories of Tudḫaliya IV show that such measures were indeed carried out (see below, §§ 2.3, 2.6). Moreover, Ḫattušili strongly promoted the restoration of the cults of Nerik, an effort no doubt entailing the writing down of a number of reports or, in other words, cult inventories. Moreover, many cult inventories refer to the king by means of the term ^dUTU-šI, 'My Sun', without men-

²⁰ So HW² Ḫ, 374.

²¹ So HW² Ḫ, 374.

²² Literally 'gone down', 'declined'.

²³ Differently RGTC 6, 246 ('Der Berg L. bewahrt ...') and Imparati (1990: 180; 'La montagne Lihša a/tient ...'), followed by Forlanini (2009: 41 n. 8). Interpreting 'Mount Lihša' as the subject of the 'holding' of the writing boards seems problematic. Although I am not aware of parallels for such a formulation, one might perhaps interpret the wording ^{ḪUR.SAG} Lihšaš as the denomination of a settlement or of some complex. Both a mountain and a town bearing this name are attested once (plus one occurrence without determinative) (RGTC 6, 246; RGTC 6/2, 95); Beckman (1983: 62 with n. 163) considered it a variant spelling of Lihš/zina. What is meant by 'wooden boards of Mount Lihša' is likewise unclear. It might refer to documents that came from that place and/or pertained to cults celebrated there.

tioning the author by name; *ceteris paribus*, one cannot rule out the possibility that some of these may date to Ḫattušili III or Šuppiluliyama II. Measures concerning the introduction or restoration of local cults, which will now be discussed briefly, took place along with intense activity involving the review and reediting of tablet collections (Torri 2011: 142–143).

In the decree of Ḫattušili III and Puduḫeba regarding the estate of Arma-Tarḫunta (CTH 86.1.A), it is related that the king instituted in certain towns the cult of Šaušga of Šamuḫa:

KUB 21.17 ii 11–14: *nu-za-kán* DINGIR-LUM ŠÀ URU^{MEŠ} DUG *ḫar-ši-ya-al-li* (12) *te-eḫ-ḫu-un ḫal-ki-ya-aš-ši* DUG *ḫar-ši-ya-al-li* (13) *te-eḫ-ḫu-un* ŠA GEŠTIN-ya-aš-ši DUG *ḫar-ši-ya-al-li* (14) *i-ya-nu-un nu-kán* ALAM EGIR_┘an_┘ [i-ya-n]u-un²⁴

‘And for the deity (i.e. Šaušga of Šamuḫa) I instituted in the (above mentioned?) towns the *ḫaršiyalli*-vessel. For her I instituted one *ḫaršiyalli*-vessel of grain, and for her I made (them make) one *ḫaršiyalli*-vessel of wine: and I m[ad]e (them make) the (cult) statue(tte)’ (cf. also ll. iii 4’ and 15’–17’).

Interestingly, the expression DUG *ḫaršiyalli teḫhun* is directly comparable to that of a number of cult inventories (^dUTU-šI DUG *ḫarši(yalli) dāiš*, see § 2.5).

Also KBo 14.142 (CTH 698.I.A), a text regulating the cult of Teššob and Ḫebat of Aleppo in and outside Ḫattuša, is likely to date to Ḫattušili III (Archi 2006: 159). In lines iii 9’ and iv 3’–4’ are references to the cult of the Storm-God of Aleppo outside Ḫattuša (Archi 2006: 160 with n. 54). The cult of the rock sanctuary of Pirwa (CTH 88) and the rites taking place on the 30th day of the *nuntarriyašha*-festival were established by this ruler as well (Archi 2006: 155 with n. 34).

Above all, it was Ḫattušili III who started restoring the cults of Nerik after the reconquest of that area. Although one must be aware of the king’s propagandistic agenda, which resulted in some rather exaggerated claims,²⁵ there are at least some documents bearing witness to the institution of festivals and offerings by Ḫattušili. It is entirely reasonable to assume that such operations involved the writing of various reports, among them probably also texts that could bear the label of cult inventories. On cult restorations at Nerik promoted by Ḫattušili III see in particular the following texts:

(1) The fragments KBo 22.73(+), KUB 21.11(+), KBo 60.3 partly preserve an edict on the restoration of cults in Nerik (CTH 90).²⁶ Here Ḫattušili, while still king of Ḫakmiš, and Puduḫeba tell of celebrating the ‘festival of the torch’ for the Stormgod of Nerik:

²⁴ Cf. Ünal 1974: 22 (read in line 13 *te-eḫ-ḫu-un* rather than *te-eḫ-u-un*).

²⁵ Archi (1971: 194–197); Klínger (2009: 102–105). In KUB 21.19+ iii 19’–25’ (CTH 383) and KUB 21.11(+) obv. 12 (CTH 90), the king claims he had rebuilt the entire city (Haas 1970: 8–14; Cornil / Lebrun 1972).

²⁶ Cf. Corti (2009: 13–16). According to Corti, the expression [...^{URU}Ne]rik *tarnai* in rev. 12’ suggests that the festivals mentioned in the text were performed in Nerik.

Rev. 17'–19': *nu* A-NA dX URUN[e-ri-ik ku-i-e-eš EZEN₄MEŠ] e-šer EZEN₄ GIŠ zu-up-pa-ru-pát-ši^(18') L₁SIXSÁ/DÜ₁(?) e-eš-ta nu-uš-š[i mHa-at-tu-ši-li-iš LUGAL U]RU Ha-ak-ki-me-iš^(19')[^fP]u-du-ḫi-pa-aš-š[a MUNUS.LUGAL] L₁e₁[-eš-š]u-e-en²⁷

‘and [the festivals which] existed for the Stormgod of N[erik] – above all the torch festival had been established[?] for him – [(we), Ḫattušili, king of] Ḫakmiš, [and] Puduḫeba, [the queen], have ce[lebr]ated’.

In rev. 13'–14' is a listing of festivals in fragmentary context:

LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL e-ša[-an-ta] EZEN₄ nu-un-tar-aš ku-i-e-eš aš-ša-nu-uš-kán-zi / EZEN₄ BURU₁₄-ya-kán E[ZEN₄(?)]X EZEN₄ zé-na-an-za GIM-an UZU šu-up-pa-ya-aš UD-az (see also Corti 2009: 15)

‘The king (and) the queen si[t down] who take care of the *nuntara*-festival; and the festival of summer/harvest, the fe[stival](?)] the festival – the next/following autumn, when the day of the meat (comes) ...’

(2) Also the votive text KUB 48.119 is likely to date to Ḫattušili III (see del Monte 1978: 179–181, 189–192; de Roos 2007: 208–213). In obv. 3'–13' the text reads:

And [if], o god, you heal for me this unknown illness, [then] I will institute for (you), o god, a festival not yet worked out (ANA DINGIR-LIM EZEN₄ *dammelin kuinki teḫḫi*), and I will celebrate for you in Ḫakmiš the *purulli*-festival, and I will celebrate it for you separately also in Nerik. [I]f (however) the oracle determines that I should celebrate them in just a single place, (i.e.) in Nerik,²⁸ [then] I will celebrate [i]t only there.

And now, my Lord, [as soon a]s they bring [awa]y ([*arḫ*]a *pēdanzi*) the god from Utruna to Nerik, they will bring him a thousand sheep in the *daḫanga*-, and on the day when for My Sun the mist goes away [from ...], I will offer to the god one fat ox (and) eight sheep.

The expression ANA DINGIR-LIM EZEN₄ *dammelin kuinki teḫḫi* in line 4' can be compared with the ‘technical’ use of *dāi*- that occurs in cult inventories of Tudḫaliya IV, demonstrating again that such usage was not exclusive to Tudḫaliya. Several hints suggest dating the text to Ḫattušili, including analogies with other votive texts, the mention of Šaḫurunuwa as an active officer²⁹ and reference to the god’s imminent homecoming from Utruna back to

²⁷ See already Corti (2009: 14; correct ‘obv.’ to ‘rev.’). Corti translates ‘and for the Stormgod of Ne[rik those who] were [the festivals], notably the festival of the torch for him was established/maked^(sic) and for hi[m, Ḫattušili, king of the] city of Ḫakmiš and Puduḫeba, [the queen,] we have [celebra]ted it.’

²⁸ Or ‘to celebrate that in one place in Nerik’ (so de Roos 2007: 211).

²⁹ Van den Hout (1995: 13–15, 151, 215) dates the document to Tudḫaliya IV; cf. however on p. 312 (‘Ḫatt.’).

Nerik. With regard to the latter point, it may be noted that the cult inventory KUB 42.100+ concerning Nerik mentions the celebration of the *purulli*-festival in Utruna at the time of the ‘father of My Sun’.³⁰ This fact corroborates both the dating of the cult inventory to Tudḫaliya and that of KUB 48.119 to Ḫattušili III.³¹

(3) At least two more fragments concerning cult restorations in Nerik date to Ḫattušili: KUB 21.8 and KUB 21.9 (CTH 101; see Cornil / Lebrun 1972: 17–24). The latter partially preserves the colophon, which reads [... DU]B QA-TI ŠA HUR.SAG Ḫa-har[-wa ...]. ‘[... tab]jet, (the text is) finished, of (divine) mount Ḫaḫar[wa ...]’.

Of course, many more texts of various natures pertain to the restoration of the cults of Nerik. Most of them, however, cannot be dated with certainty to any particular king.³²

Summary

The preservation and maintenance of local cults, including the restoration of cult objects and oversight of the regular supply of cult offerings, had been a normal concern for Hittite kings at least from the MH period onwards. Although no cult inventory can be dated with certainty to any ruler other than Tudḫaliya IV, such reports likely existed in earlier periods as well. The ephemeral nature of these documents probably allowed them to be discarded after some time, a fact that seems to account for the dearth of MH/MS cult inventories. The fact that nearly all known cult inventories are in (L)NS does not necessarily imply that they all date to Tudḫaliya IV.

2.4. Tudḫaliya IV: On Reforms and Reorganizations

Güterbock was the first to talk of ‘cult reforms’ promoted by Tudḫaliya IV. In his *Vorwort* to KUB 25 (1930) he pointed out that ‘in den Nrr. 18–24 ist von „Festformen“ des Tutḫaliyaš die Rede. Nr. 21 III gibt die historische Begründung für solche „Reformen“. – Nr. 23 gehört inhaltlich zu KUB XVII 35–37, ebenso Nr. 25, ohne daß in dem erhaltenen Textstück eine „Reform“ erwähnt wäre’. Later, Goetze (1957: 169 with n. 13) opted for the more cautious term ‘reorganization’, observing that ‘er [Tudḫaliya] hat geradezu den Kult neu organisiert. Von ihm stammen eine ganze Anzahl von Kultordnungen’.³³ Güterbock again dealt with the nature and background of this endeavour in his review of von Brandenstein’s *Bildbeschreibungen*, insisting in particular on the matter of the replacement of

³⁰ KUB 42.100+ iv 15’–17’: *nu-wa-za A-BI* ^dUTU-ŠI [...] / *ku-wa-pí I-NA* ^{URU}Ut-ru-ú-na EZEN₄ *pu-ru-ul-li-lyaj[-aš] / i-ya-at* (cf. Hazenbos 2003: 20).

³¹ For this reasoning cf. already del Monte (1978: 189). In principle, as Beal (2005/06: 362–363) has pointed out, KUB 42.100+ could even date to a later ruler.

³² See e.g. the fragments grouped under CTH 678.3. Corti (2009: 21) dates them to Ḫattušili, but in my opinion the possibility that they might date to Tudḫaliya cannot be ruled out.

³³ The texts referred to by Goetze are KUB 7.24, KUB 11.31 and KUB 25.18–24. The reference to a reorganization rather than a reform is already present in the first edition (1933: 160 n. 1).

cult objects.³⁴ In 1961, Rost (1961: 167) suggested that Tudḫaliya might have promoted his ‘cult reform’ during the latest period of his reign in order to win the gods’ favour and prevent the collapse of the empire. In his outstanding study of the cult inventories, Carter (1962: 24) observed that ‘in spite of the manifest typological heterogeneity of the cult-inventory texts, there are reasons for seeing in them a collection of reports on the work of one man that were composed at one relatively limited period of time’. Carter (1962: 21–25) insisted in particular on two points: the mention of Tudḫaliya in a certain number of fragments and the stylistic similarity among such texts.

The most forceful appraisal of the alleged cult reform was an article published in 1975 by E. Laroche, according to whom it was based on two major elements: (1) the restoration of cult objects and the replacement of aniconic and theriomorphic cult objects with anthropomorphic figurines, and (2) the transfer of stelae from open air sanctuaries into the temples in the towns. There is ample textual evidence, however, proving both claims to be false. A number of texts explicitly contradict the former point (cf. above), and a number of passages from the seasonal festivals insist precisely on the importance of the procession to the open air stelae sanctuaries outside town. Moreover, according to Laroche (1975: 93), ‘la notion d’entretien paraît être un concept nouveau, à quelque degré révolutionnaire. Car le respect que le primitif doit à l’image sacrée veut que le corps de la divinité ne soit ni altéré ni même touché’. This assumption is even more surprising, since Laroche certainly knew that at least the MH Instructions for the *BĒL MADGALTI* prescribed precisely such an ‘*entretien*’. Laroche viewed the alleged ‘cult reform’ against the background of broader changes in contemporary society and religion, stressing both the centralization of the process and its theological implications:

Les inventaires suivent un ordre géographique, allant de ville en ville, comme ont dû le faire les inspecteurs chargés de mission par le roi (p. 91); ... Une telle réforme religieuse avait à concilier des contraires: sauver la tradition et unifier les pratiques culturelles. Il fallait maintenir le groupement local par dieux et déesses, montagnes et sources; mais pour parvenir à une homogénéité de croyances, reflet de l’unité impériale, il fallait réduire la multiplicité des figures à quelques prototypes: dieux de l’orage, de la vie végétative, de la guerre, déesses de fécondité. En introduisant plusieurs idoles sous le même toit, le roi crée des syncrétismes virtuels, ou il renforce les anciens (p. 93).

Although no one has since stated the case so categorically, the idea of the cult inventories referring to one unitary operation has had a lasting impact. The dating of the so-called temple quarter in the upper city of Ḫattuša to Tudḫaliya IV seemed to offer the most impressive confirmation of the alleged ‘reform’.³⁵ This however, as is now well known, is no longer a feasible dating (cf. Seeher 2001; 2006a; 2006b).

³⁴ Güterbock (1946: 489, 491) rightly pointed out that a certain preference for therio- and anthropomorphic figurines rather than aniconic representations seems to develop during the Late Hittite Empire. This does not mean, however, that aniconic cult objects, and in particular stelae (*ḫuwaši*), were no longer venerated, praised and restored, as indeed they were (cf. recently Collins 2005: 40–41).

³⁵ For a telling example see Gonnet’s observations *apud* Neve 1987.

The most detailed appraisal of the ‘cult reform’ is still that offered by Houwink ten Cate (1992: 101–109). He acknowledged both that the attribution of most texts to Tudḫaliya is uncertain and that reports on the cults of local towns must have existed already in older periods (1992: 101–103). He wrote that (p. 102) ‘[t]he uniqueness of the “Cult Reform” thus depends on its geographical scope and the special character of this inquiry, manifesting, as indeed it does, the aspects of both intensification and restoration and showing furthermore in its application a remarkable amount of personal involvement of His Majesty himself.’ Such an interpretation, however, is based on the assumption that not only the few texts mentioning Tudḫaliya by name but also the bulk of the cult inventories in general date to this ruler and is therefore dependent on the reliability of this assumption. Within his extensive historical reconstruction, Houwink ten Cate stressed the centralized and progressive character of the process and the effort to extend the standard seasonal festivals (autumn and spring) to the whole country, i.e. also to those towns where they were not celebrated by that time. He again bases his conclusion on the stylistic similarities among such texts as well as on specific passages. These points too will be discussed in the following paragraphs. Hazenbos (2003) basically follows Houwink ten Cate’s interpretation. The ideas of a unique operation and of the likely dating of most cult inventories to Tudḫaliya IV are retained. According to Hazenbos (2003: 3 with n. 28), however, ‘a radical change [...] can only be found back in the texts with reference to the celebration of the two festivals of autumn and spring,’ so that the term ‘reform’ is replaced with the more cautious ‘reorganization’, with explicit reference to the term put forward by Goetze no later than 1933.

Only a closer look at the relevant texts may shed some further light on the question of the alleged ‘reform’ or ‘reorganization’ of Tudḫaliya. First of all, the arguments used in support of the dating of the anonymous cult inventories to Tudḫaliya IV must be carefully evaluated. Two issues in particular deserve special attention, i.e., the significance of technical formulas and the question of stylistic similarities in the descriptions of festivals. Only then can the nature and scope of the process be investigated through a thorough analysis of the restorations and changes attested in the relevant fragments.

2.5. Centralization, Standardization and Innovation: On the Antiquity of Hittite Seasonal Festivals

2.5.1. Centralization and Standardization

There is little doubt that the cult inventories, as van den Hout (2011: 66) has remarked referring to those found in Kuşaklı, ‘bear witness to the grip the central administration exerted on local affairs’. Alone the fact that an impressive corpus of texts dealing with the cults of local towns and villages has been recovered in Ḫattuša shows that the central authority was very much concerned with such local cults, and this is surely a form of centralization. That the cult inventories found in Kuşaklı are very similar to those found in Boğazköy confirms this impression. However, this does not necessarily imply that these texts reflect a process of standardization of local cults, just because they were commissioned by the central administration. According to Houwink ten Cate (1992: 104), ‘the texts

frequently mentioning royal measures and also containing highly stereotyped descriptions of festivals are likely to have been compiled in the capital'. However, even apart from the fact that such texts represent only a limited portion of the cult inventories, it must be admitted that it remains unknown what sources served as the basis for the compilation of these texts. They might well be based on various previous documents, such as reports, older inventories, depositions, festival texts and so on. Houwink ten Cate (1992: 104) concludes that 'the implication must be that the concise festival descriptions sometimes contained in this type of text and usually pertinent to the Festivals of the Spring and the Autumn are not necessarily *always* a description of what traditionally happened, but *may have been, at least in part*, rather prescriptive in character' (emphasis added). Hazenbos (2003: 169) goes a step further, writing that

the similarity in the descriptions of autumn and spring festivals is striking indeed and calls for comment. The only explanation one can think of is that these festivals, in the form that we know them, were instituted by a central source. Apparently it was of importance for the authorities in Ḫattuša to regulate the way the local autumn and spring festivals were celebrated in order to make them equal. Without doubt these regulations were an important part of the cult restoration of Tudḫaliyaš IV.³⁶

Do the available texts really support this claim? In my view, this striking similarity lies rather in the fact that most seasonal festivals share a basic pattern made up of a set of recurring elements such as the division of the offerings 'at the altar' / 'of the supplies',³⁷ a procession to a stela sanctuary outside of the town and the use of a vessel called *ḫarši(yalli)* to store the wheat, which is subsequently baked into 'thick bread' loaves. These and other features are usually described in the texts by means of standard expressions, while many texts contain no mention of royal measures at all. The implication, it seems, is that these kinds of administrative documents were compiled according to a quite standardized style, at least during the latter half of the 13th century, the time span to which palaeography dates them. Thus, one is not forced to assume that they reflect an effort to standardize the local ceremonies themselves; that the style is somewhat standardized does not necessarily mean that the cults described therein are standardized as well.

³⁶ Cf. Carter 1962: 20. A radical example of this standpoint was expressed by Klinger (1996: 23), who wrote that 'Ganz anders gelagert ist das, was man gemeinhin als bewußte Kultreform Tudḫaliyas IV. bezeichnet; jetzt wirkt der zentrale Staatskult direkt nach außen auf die lokale Kulte ein. Diese selbst werden am Ort umgewandelt, typisiert oder sogar verfremdet, d.h. einem offiziellen Modell angepaßt. Dieser Prozeß ist von den älteren, oben geschilderten synkretistischen Tendenzen grundsätzlich zu unterscheiden, da er offensiv und – so ist zu vermuten – unter Zwang durchgesetzt wurde, insofern als ein Bruch mit den lokalen Traditionen bewußt angestrebt wird, um eine einheitliche, staatsübergreifende Götter- und Vorstellungswelt durchzusetzen.'

³⁷ This part of the offerings is labelled *aššanumaš* and was probably consumed by priests, cult personnel and possibly also other participants in the festival (Archi 1973: 9; Houwink ten Cate 1992: 95–96; Hazenbos 2004: 243; for a different interpretation see Carter 1962: 178–179).

Indeed, a number of clues point toward an entirely different conclusion. First, the stylistic similarities of the texts leave ample room for a great deal of variation.³⁸ If these descriptions often follow the same general pattern, they display at the same time great variety with regard to minor aspects, details, quantity of prescribed supplies, etc., a fact which might be difficult to explain against the background of an operation imposing a standard on peripheral areas.³⁹ Both the high degree of variation and the peculiarities attested within the descriptions not only in many different local festivals,⁴⁰ but even in the autumn and spring festivals, as well as the meticulous records of slightly diverging quantities of cult offerings suggest that the cult inventories normally aim at providing a faithful record of (or report on) the celebrations.⁴¹ This is not to deny that many Hittite ‘festival descriptions’ have in fact a ‘prescriptive’ character, in so far as they have a practical purpose and do not aim at providing a true ‘description’ of festivals (see § 1.2). Moreover, some degree of ‘prescription’ may be admitted even if not explicitly stated, e.g., in the listings of offerings and supplies, which might have been drawn up on royal initiative (though this is normally made explicit). What seems unlikely is the interpretation of the similarities in such descriptions as an indication that these festivals in their attested local forms were instituted by central authority.

Another argument relates to festivals that frequently entail a procession to the *huwaši*-sanctuary outside the town, the texts of which are no less highly stereotyped than others.⁴²

³⁸ Among many possible examples, compare e.g. the descriptions contained in KBo 2.8 or KUB 38.95 with those of KBo 2.7 or KUB 17.35.

³⁹ In further comments based on his thesis, Hazenbos (2004: 244–247) concedes that the similarity in the descriptions is basically due to the conciseness of the texts and admits that minor variations from place to place do occur, but maintains that the ubiquitous core rites relating to the filling and opening of the *harši(yalli)*-vessel cannot be due to chance, which would suggest a superimposed restyling and standardization of such seasonal festivals. It may be suggested, alternatively, that this basic uniformity reflects rather a common ancient pattern of festivals. It is certainly striking that the MS cult inventory KUB 12.36+ (dupl. KUB 30.37, see § 1.9) couples a *winter* festival with the spring one (cf. Hazenbos 2004: 246), but this unexpected juxtaposition could be more a matter of terminology than evidence for the standardization of local festivals in the post-MH period: cf., e.g., the use of BURU₁₄ (lit. ‘summer, harvest’) for *hamešha-*, ‘spring’, in KUB 42.100+KUB 27.68(+) i 2 (cf. summary in l. 25; in l. 2 just ‘2 EZ[EN₄]’ is to be restored, *pace* Haas 1970: 300); note also the pairing of BURU₁₄ and autumn festivals in KUB 53.21 (CTH 678; or 524?) rev. 3’, 5’ and 7’, where the logogram might likewise refer to a spring festival. Analogously, the autumn festival is normally listed first, but exceptions do exist (*pace* Hazenbos 2003: 169; 2004: 242), such as the inverse order in the oracular fragment KuT 68 (Wilhelm 2004: 113) and in the cult inventories KUB 12.3, KUB 55.15, KBo 13.231 and KUB 42.100+ (Cammarosano 2012: 181; interestingly, the last two fragments show both the standard and the aberrant sequences). I am deeply indebted to Prof. Hazenbos for useful discussion on this topic.

⁴⁰ *Pace* Hazenbos (2003: 171): ‘the descriptions of most of these festivals use the same formulae as the autumn and spring festivals where offerings, ritual actions as the washing of the deity and athletics games are concerned. This even heightens the impression of conformity and centralization that one gets when reading descriptions of autumn and spring festivals’ (cf. also Hazenbos 2004: 245f.).

⁴¹ Just to note one example among many, if indeed there had been a sort of standardization, then why of the three deities treated on the rev. of KUB 58.29+ would two of them deserve only a spring festival, one of them (Yarri) only an autumn festival? Many analogous cases could be recalled.

⁴² A non-exhaustive listing of cult inventories dealing with these processions includes KBo 2.7 // KBo 2.13, KBo 2.8 (procession to sacred spring), KBo 13.246, KBo 26.151(?), KBo 26.159(?), KBo 26.182

The exceptional importance of such places is made apparent by the fact that local festivals reached their climax as the theriomorphic or anthropomorphic figurines were carried in procession from the temples in the town to the open air stelae-sanctuaries to be worshipped together with the *huwaši*. It is clear that the deities were considered to be embodied both in the figurines and in the stelae; unlike the figurines, however, the stelae seemed to be perceived as going back to ancestral times. This can be interpreted as further evidence for the claim that the festivals were already in place by the time the tablets were written down, since the *huwaši*-sanctuaries were certainly not instituted by the king(s) responsible for these texts.⁴³ Other elements supporting this view are references to the consultation of older tablets and the questioning of local cult personnel as well as the occurrence of particular formulas.⁴⁴

Moreover, the basic uniformity of these festival descriptions might just as well be explained by assuming that they reflect the same widespread, firmly rooted, genuine ‘Hittite’ type of seasonal festival.⁴⁵ In other words, the texts might be basically similar because the festivals were basically similar, which implies neither that the scribes could not have added some further degree of ‘uniformity’ in the way they outlined such rites nor that the king might not have wanted to (re)introduce the basic autumn and spring festivals in those few places where they might have been found to have been neglected.

Furthermore, the fact that the cult inventories date overwhelmingly from a late period reveals little about the original antiquity of the festivals dealt with in them. The lack of the archaic/archaizing conjunction *ta* in the festival descriptions embedded in the cult inventories was interpreted by Hazenbos (2003: 169) as confirmation that these descriptions, unlike those of the festival texts, were composed ‘at a relatively late date’ and as a further hint that these festivals were instituted by central authority. However, Torri (2008a: 548) has pointed out that, as argued by Rieken, *ta* was often inserted in festival texts by late

(procession to sacred spring), KBo 26.227, KUB 12.2(?), KUB 17.35 (including procession to sacred spring), KUB 25.23(+), KUB 38.26(+), KUB 38.32, KUB 44.42, KUB 46.21, KUB 51.47 (procession to a sacred spring?), KUB 55.14 (restored), KUB 55.15, KUB 56.40, KUB 57.102(?), KUB 58.29+, KUB 60.163, VSNF 12.111 // KUB 57.97. On the importance of such processions within local Hittite festivals see Carter (1962: 26–40); Archi (1973: 21–24); on stelae sanctuaries as a possible place of worship for common people see Hutter (2010: 406–407); on the location of such sanctuaries see Cammarosano (in press b).

⁴³ Otherwise, this presumably would have been explicitly noted in the texts themselves. In principle, one might suppose that the *huwaši*-sanctuaries already existed in some cases, but that they had been neglected, so that the procession itself could be (re)instituted by the central authority; but again, if this were the case, one would expect to find some traces of it in the texts, as is seen in similar cases.

⁴⁴ See in particular the ‘sunset formula’ GIM-an(=ma) ^dUTU AN-E lahḫurnuzziš appanzi, ‘When the branches catch the Sungod of heaven’, which, with a single exception, occurs only in cult inventories (see CHD L-N, 16a, with previous bibliography; further attestations and discussion in Cammarosano 2012: 300–304). Since this formula seems to be related to the area of Ḫakmiš, it is tempting to consider it a ‘regional’ expression that found its way into these documents despite their conciseness. If so, this would further corroborate the view that such texts are more faithful in reflecting local traditions than normally supposed. The references to the consultation of older tablets are listed in § 1.1.

⁴⁵ Similarly Güterbock (1964: 67): ‘... Auch zu diesen lokalen Festen gehört jedesmal das Öffnen der Vorratsgefäße. Diese Einzelzüge deuten auf ein allen anatolischen Frühjahrsfesten gemeinsames Grundschema hin’. On the institution of the *ḫarši(yalli)*-vessel see further below.

scribes as an archaizing form, and thus, that its presence is no robust indication of an old tradition. She rightly observes that ‘the lack of *ta* in the cult inventories shows, most of all, that the administrative language was controlled by a set of rules different from those of the festival texts’.⁴⁶

2.5.2. Innovation

In a very few cases, the cult inventories state that the king ‘instituted the *ḫarši*-vessel’:⁴⁷

– KBo 26.182 i 3: ^dUTU-*ši-kán* ^{DUG}*ḫar-ši* *ša* 3 *BÁN* *zíz da-a-i[š]* (Hazenbos 2003: 69)

‘My Sun institut[ed] a *ḫarši*-vessel of 3 *BÁN* of wheat’;

– KUB 13.32 obv. 7’-9’:⁴⁸ *GIM-an ḫa-mi-iš-hi DÙ-ri te-et-ḫ[a-i* ^{DUG}*ḫar-ši-ya-al-li] / ku-e*
^dUTU-*ši mTu-ud-ḫa-li-ya-aš [da-a-iš na-at] / ge-nu-wa-an-zi* (Laroche 1975: 90 with n. 13)

‘When the spring comes (and) it thund[ers], (they) open [the *ḫarši(yalli)*-vessel] that My Sun, Tudḫaliya, [instituted]’;

– KUB 55.14 rev. 9’-10’: ^{DUG}*ḫar-ši UL e-eš-ta* ^dUTU-*ši-kán* ^{DUG}*ḫar-ši* *ša* 1 *PA* [...] / ^{DUG}*ḫar-ši* *ša* 1 *PA*
GEŠTIN ME-iš (Hazenbos 2003: 95)

‘There was no *ḫarši*-vessel. My Sun instituted a *ḫarši*-vessel of 1 *PARĪSU* of [...] (and) 1 *PARĪSU* of wine’.

Houwink ten Cate (1992: 104), referring to KUB 55.14,⁴⁹ suggested that ‘the pithos ceremony [...] was, on royal initiative, extended to towns and townships where it had not been practiced before.’⁵⁰ Given the basic and widespread nature of the autumn and spring festivals, it may be suggested that the expression ‘there was no *ḫarši*-vessel’ might perhaps be understood as ‘there was *no longer* a *ḫarši*-vessel’, i.e. that it had been neglected since a certain point in time. If so, these measures might represent restorations rather than the

⁴⁶ This probably applies also to orthographic trends; cf. the remarks by Berman (1978: 123–124) on the use of a number of peculiar sign values in cult inventories (see § 1.5).

⁴⁷ On the crucial importance of the *ḫarši(yalli)*-vessel in the local festivals see Güterbock (1964: 67); Archi (1973: 14–18); Hazenbos (2003: 170); Cammarosano (2012: 183–200).

⁴⁸ For the aberrant or elliptic form *GIM-an ḫamišḫi DÙ-ri tethai* cf. KUB 25.23(+) i 8’; see Carter (1962: 185); differently Hoffner (1974: 19).

⁴⁹ On p. 104 correct KUB 13.32 to KUB 13.27. At least two more passages might in principle be added to the list: VSNF 12.111 obv. 17’: [x x z]z ^dX 2 *BÁN* *zíz* ^{HUR.SAG}*Ḫuḫušna* ^{DUG}*ḫarši* ^dUTU-*ši ME-iš*, ‘My Sun instituted [...] of whe[at for the Storm-God, 2 *BÁN* of wheat for the (divine) mountain *Ḫuḫušna*, (and)? the *ḫarši*-vessel’ (similarly in rev. 8’ [restored], 18’, 26’), and KUB 56.40 iii 15’-16’: ^{L3}*BÁN* *zíz* ^dX 3 *BÁN* *zíz* ^dUTU 3 *BÁN* <*zíz*> ^dLAMMA / ^{DUG}*ḫarši* ^dUTU-*ši da-a-iš*. However, ^{DUG}*ḫar-ši* is better interpreted here as a dative, ‘for the *ḫarši*-vessel’.

⁵⁰ Hazenbos (2003: 170) more cautiously states that ‘The phrase [His Majesty has instituted the *ḫarši*-vessel] would then mean that these festivals were introduced *or re-introduced* in the town treated in the text’ (emphasis added).

founding of institutions *ex novo*, much like the case explicitly labelled as such in a cult inventory from Kuşaklı:

– Ku 99/153 ii' 8'–9': ^dUTU-*ši-kán ku-e-da-ni-ya A[-NA]* DINGIR-LIM / [... ^{DUG}*har-ši-*]_Lya-li_L ŠA 3 BÁN ZÍZ EGIR-*an-da* ME-iš (Wilhelm 2000:324)

'My Sun has re-instituted f[or] each deity [... a *harši*]yali-vessel of 3 BÁN of wheat'.

In the case of KUB 55.14, such an interpretation is further favoured by the fact that the festival concerned is described as *annalli-*, 'old, pre-existing', in rev. 6'.

Finally, even if these few occurrences might refer to the occasional introduction of festivals that had not been in place before, it is important to emphasize that the much more frequent reference to the setting of a certain amount of wheat or flour 'of/for the *harši*-vessel' does *not* refer 'to the same type of improvement in a more veiled manner' (Houwink ten Cate 1992: 104; examples pp. 141–142 n. 47). As the context of the passages clearly shows, these cases deal with the restoration or increase of supplies, not with the founding of new institutions.⁵¹

2.6. Cult Inventories of Tudḫaliya IV

This section is devoted to the question of the dating of the extant texts. The cult inventories mentioning Tudḫaliya (IV) are presented first, followed by those more or less probably datable to this ruler. Finally, criteria for dating the countless 'anonymous' texts will be discussed.

Texts Naming Tudḫaliya

The following cult inventories can be safely attributed to Tudḫaliya IV on the basis of the explicit mention of the king's name: KBo 12.57 (NS), KBo 26.179 (NS), KBo 26.188 (NS), KUB 7.24+ (LNS), KUB 13.32 (LNS), KUB 25.22 (LNS), KUB 25.23(+) (LNS⁵²), KUB 25.24 (LNS), KUB 31.24 (LNS), KUB 38.35 (LNS), KUB 58.7 (LNS), Bo 3998 (NS).⁵³ Notably, most of these fragments are written in the so-called LNS, and the absence of LNS diagnostic elements in the first three might be due merely to their small size. This fact might be significant, although its importance should perhaps not be overestimated. As is well known, some older sign shapes continued to be used alongside the later ones until the very end of the Empire, so that any NS text might at least in principle date to the latest Hittite king. Indeed, the script of some cult inventories most probably dating to Tudḫaliya can be classified as NS, e. g., in the case of KUB 56.56 (see below). Apart from these texts, one may

⁵¹ See already Archi (2006: 151 n. 22): 'the context only enables us to interpret this as indicating that the king had fixed the amount of the different goods for the festival, *including* the emmer for the pithos [...], *not* that the king himself had introduced the pithos rite'.

⁵² NS according to Košak (2012), but see Hazenbos (2003: 30, 43).

⁵³ On Bo 3998 see Cammarosano (2012: 495). I thank Dr. J. Marzahn for allowing collation of the photo of this fragment at the Vorderasiatisches Museum in Berlin.

recall that ‘Tudḫali(ya)’ (IV) is also mentioned in KUB 46.34 (CTH 834),⁵⁴ an interesting fragment preserving what have been interpreted as some writing tests as well as a sort of cult inventory draft (see Torri 2010: 324).

Texts Likely Dating to Tudḫaliya

The following cult inventories most probably date to Tudḫaliya IV as well. The writing ‘URU *Tudḫaliya*[š]’ in KUB 38.23 (LNS) likely refers to this king rather than to a homonymous but otherwise unattested town.⁵⁵ Two further fragments can be confidently attributed to Tudḫaliya on the basis of their content, KUB 42.100+ (Hazenbos 2003: 14; see also above, § 2.3) and KUB 56.56 (van den Hout 1995a: 226, 231 n. 431; Pecchioli Daddi / Baldi 2004: 504; Pecchioli Daddi 2006: 125–127).

Another group of fragments may be attributed to Tudḫaliya as well, though more cautiously, i.e., the cult inventories mentioning the ‘father of My Sun’ (*ABU / ABI* ^dUTU-ŠI), an expression which is frequently found in texts of Tudḫaliya IV,⁵⁶ but not in those of Ḫattušili III. The relevant fragments are IBoT 2.131 (NS),⁵⁷ KuSa I/1.5, KuSa I/1.39 and KuSa I/1.3 (found in Kuşaklı, all LNS). In contrast, it seems safer to cautiously leave aside three other texts: KBo 21.81(+) (LNS, ‘*ŠA ABIABI LUGAL*’ in l. iv 20’ in fragmentary context), KBo 39.48(+) (LNS, *ABI LUGAL* in l. v 43’’ in fragmentary context)⁵⁸ and KUB 51.26 (NS, *ABI* ^dUTU-ŠI in right col. 8’ and *kuwapi* ^dUTU-ŠI *paizzi* in right col. 16’, but perhaps a festival text).

Thus, at least twelve cult inventories can be attributed to Tudḫaliya IV’s reign with certainty, and eight more are very likely to date to him as well.

The Findspots of the Cult Inventories

The palaeography and the findspots of these twenty texts are presented in the following table.

	<i>Palaeo.</i>	<i>Findspot</i>	<i>Grounds for dating</i>
KBo 12.57	NS	<i>Haus am Hang</i>	explicit ref. to Tudḫaliya
KBo 26.179	NS	Temple I, L/19 <i>Grabungsschutt</i>	explicit ref. to Tudḫaliya
KBo 26.188	NS	Temple I, <i>unterstem Grabungsschutt</i> L/19	explicit ref. to Tudḫaliya
KUB 7.24+	LNS	?	explicit ref. to Tudḫaliya

⁵⁴ Unique among the names of Hittite kings, Tudḫaliya’s was occasionally abbreviated; apart from *Tu-ud-ḫa-li* (KUB 46.34 ii 2’), one finds in the cult inventory KUB 25.22 the curious writing ^m*Tu-ud* (ii 15’).

⁵⁵ KUB 38.23 i’ 4: [x *ku-wa-pi* *I-NA* URU ^{<m>}*Tu-ud-ḫa-li-ya*[(-)? ‘...], ‘when Tudḫaliya [arrived?] in the town(?) [...]’; differently Rost (1963: 176) and RGTC 6, 445.

⁵⁶ Including the cult inventories KUB 25.22 and KUB 42.100+ discussed above.

⁵⁷ This fragment could not be collated on photos. Here, reference to measures taken by Urḫi-Teššob (see above, § 2.3) corroborates the dating to Tudḫaliya IV.

⁵⁸ Note however *A-B*]I’ ^dUTU-ŠI in line vi 23’’, which pleads for inclusion in the previous group. Another peculiar element of this cult inventory is its three-columned layout.

KUB 13.32	LNS	?	explicit ref. to Tudḫaliya
KUB 25.22	LNS	?	explicit ref. to Tud(ḫaliya)
KUB 25.23(+)	LNS	? ⁵⁹	explicit ref. to Tudḫaliya
KUB 25.24	LNS	?	explicit ref. to Tudḫaliya
KUB 31.24	LNS	?	explicit ref. to Tudḫaliya
KUB 38.23	LNS	?	likely explicit ref. to Tudḫaliya
KUB 38.35	LNS	?	explicit ref. to Tudḫaliya
KUB 42.100+	LNS	Temple I, <i>Fallschutt vor Mag. 12, L/19</i>	content; ref. to ‘father of My Sun’
KUB 46.34	NS	?	explicit ref. to Tudḫali(ya) (draft)
KUB 56.56	NS	?	content
KUB 58.7	LNS	?	explicit ref. to Tudḫaliya
IBoT 2.131	NS	?	ref. to Urḫi-Teššob and ‘father of My Sun’
KuSa I/1.3	LNS	Kuşaklı, 28/31 S 2	ref. to ‘father of My Sun’
KuSa I/1.5	LNS	Kuşaklı, 28/31 S 2	ref. to ‘father of My Sun’
KuSa I/1.39	LNS	Kuşaklı, 28/31 S 2	ref. to ‘father of My Sun’
Bo 3998	NS	?	explicit ref. to Tudḫaliya

Four of the five provenienced fragments from Boğazköy come from square L/19 in the area of Temple I. This fact of and by itself is not overly significant, since a great number of texts of every sort comes from this area. More relevant is that four fragments come from the Temple I complex, only one from the House on the Slope. As van den Hout has suggested, ‘one can hypothesize a first-line role for the *Haus am Hang* in the political and cultic administration, with the no-longer-quite-current documents being moved to the storerooms surrounding Temple 1. The next destination was either recycling or Building A.’⁶⁰ An examination of the cult inventories fully confirms van den Hout’s results. The relevant corpus consists of 611 fragments,⁶¹ the findspots of about one half of which (285) are known:

⁵⁹ The indirect join with KBo 57.113 (Temple I, L/19 *Grabungsschutt*) would indicate that the tablet had been stored in the Temple I complex.

⁶⁰ Van den Hout (2006a: 89; 2008: 217–218; quotation from p. 218). On the function of the House on the Slope see also Klinger (2006); Torri (2008b).

⁶¹ I.e. the 642 fragments listed in the *Konkordanz* (Kořak 2012) as CTH 501–530, minus 31 texts and fragments reassigned to other genres (see § 1.8.2) and 15 found outside Ḫattuša (14 from Kuşaklı and 1 from Yassihöyük), plus 15 fragments which have been interpreted as cult inventories but are presently classified within other CTH groups (see § 1.8.3). The provenienced MS cult inventory fragments (see § 2.2) have been excluded as well. Of course, the total number is just an approximation, since further fragments presently classified as cult inventories may at some point be excluded and vice versa. In particular, note that at least nine of the 17 fragments from Büyükkale A are likely to be festival texts, not cult inventories (see 1.7 no. 1).

Findspot	Cult inv. frags.			Total frags. from area	% of cult inv. among frags.
Büyükkale	A	17	<i>total: 34</i>	5486	< 1 %
	C	1			
	D	4			
	E	5			
	K	3			
	N	1			
	–	3			
Haus am Hang	98			1470	6.6 %
Temple I complex	148			4553	3.3 %
Lower city	5			286	1.7 %
<i>Total</i>	285				

Might the fact that most provenienced fragments dating to Tudḫaliya IV come from the Temple I complex rather than from the House on the Slope suggest that a significant portion of the cult inventories found in the House on the Slope is likely to date from a later period? In view of the very limited evidence available, one should be very cautious about embracing such an assumption. Moreover, this fact might have to do with other factors, such as some specific characteristics of the fragments naming Tudḫaliya or perhaps a greater importance of the Temple I complex in the cultic administration during certain periods.⁶² Be that as it may, this data should be kept in mind when discussing the alleged major cult reorganization promoted by Tudḫaliya. A thorough study of the provenienced fragments from both a palaeographical and a philological point of view might provide very interesting results concerning possible links between findspot and the dating of these cult inventories.

2.7. Dating the ‘Anonymous’ Fragments

As noted, all fragments that explicitly mention a specific king and therefore can be attributed with certainty to a particular ruler date to Tudḫaliya IV. At first glance, this would seem to suggest that at least the bulk of the cult inventories dates to Tudḫaliya as well.⁶³ Statistical arguments, though, should be evaluated with all due caution. ‘Only Tudḫaliya is mentioned in the texts’ – so goes the argument – ‘and therefore one may suppose that also the bulk of the anonymous fragments likely dates to him.’ However, the fact that some 15 or

⁶² One should recall that, according to van den Hout (2008: 218 with n. 32), economic administration seems to have been handled almost exclusively in the Temple I complex.

⁶³ See most recently Hazenbos (2003: 3): ‘it seems therefore likely (though this is not provable) that Tudḫaliyaš was responsible for at least most, if not all, of the 13th-century Hittite cult inventories.’ For Carter’s and Houwink ten Cate’s views cf. above, § 2.4.

20 fragments from ca. 515 (less than 4 %) are datable to X, even with 0 fragments datable to others, does not necessarily suggest that most or even the bulk (over 50 %) of the remaining 96 % is likely to date to X as well. From a statistical point of view, the probability that this inference would hit the mark is entirely dependent on the sample's degree of representativeness, ranging from a maximum of 1 (the fragments attributable to Tudḥaliya IV constitute a fully representative sample → the inference has a high probability of being correct) to a minimum of 0 (only during the reign of Tudḥaliya IV were attributable texts produced → nothing can be inferred regarding the dating of the other fragments). In other words, the strength of the 'statistical argument' would be considerably diminished if it were to be demonstrated that some specific circumstances are responsible for Tudḥaliya being the only ruler to whom cult inventories can be attributed. The stronger the correlation between Tudḥaliya and the very possibility of dating a fragment is, the weaker the statistical argument becomes. Since some clues would seem to suggest just such a correlation (see presently), one should be very careful in accepting this reasoning.

Another common argument against a formula occurring quite often within the corpus as a whole, i.e. ^dUTU-*ši dāiš*, 'My Sun instituted', as well as much rarer expressions based on *katta ḥamenk-*, 'to establish'.⁶⁴ Since both formulae are in some cases overtly linked with Tudḥaliya, should one not suspect that the bulk of the anonymous fragments dates to him as well? Also this argument, however, is not as strong as it may appear. Apart from the fact that such formulae occur in only a minority of the texts, the number of formula attestations datable to Tudḥaliya specifically is extremely limited. The former formula occurs in only two texts datable to Tudḥaliya, KBo 12.57 and KUB 25.23(+), as well as in three further fragments likely dating to him (KUB 13.32, KUB 38.23, Bo 3998). The latter expression (hardly a formula in the strict sense) occurs in only four texts likely dating to him (KUB 38.23, KUB 42.100+, KUB 56.56, KuSa I/1.3). That the number of attestations is rather limited should perhaps suggest greater caution in drawing conclusions concerning a corpus that counts hundreds of texts. Moreover, the statistical relevance of these attestations is again dependent on the sample's degree of representativeness, as noted above.⁶⁵ Finally, a link between Tudḥaliya and these expressions can be established only within the cult inventory corpus itself, for an examination of other textual genres reveals that such expressions are demonstrably *not* typical of him. While one can point to ^dUTU-*ši ... Tudḥaliyaš ... dāiš* in KUB 25.18 (CTH 618.1) iii 9–10, the formula is also found in the edict KUB 21.17, datable to Ḫattušili III, and in the votive text KUB 48.119, which most likely dates to him as well (see above, § 2.3; in both texts the formula appears in the first singular). As for the latter expression, Hazenbos has pointed out that the verbal phrase *katta ḥamenk-* occurs

⁶⁴ For more on these formulas see Hazenbos (2003: 202–203); Cammarosano (2012: 117–118).

⁶⁵ An interesting observation concerns the occurrence of formulae referring to the king himself, in particular *dāiš*, *kattan ḥamank'ta*, *pāiš*, *iyat*, *tarrawait* and *ḥandait* (for a detailed overview see Cammarosano 2012: 113–121). Usually, these formulae are anonymous. In the 20 cult inventories attributable to Tudḥaliya IV, however, an occurrence of these formulae is always coupled with Tudḥaliya's name, i.e., in these fragments they are never anonymous, except perhaps for two cases, in KUB 25.23(+) iv 48' and KUB 38.23, 13'. Although the number of occurrences is limited, and there seem to be two exceptions, one wonders if this distribution might be significant.

also in the votive text KBo 33.216, which may date to Tudḫaliya as well. However, neither is this expression exclusive to Tudḫaliya; as noted above (§ 2.3), it is also seen in a document of Muršili II (KUB 32.133 i 5; see already Archi / Klengel 1980: 151).

These observations allow the formulation of an alternative interpretation concerning Tudḫaliya IV being the only royal name mentioned in the cult inventories and the dating of the anonymous fragments. Cult inventories are administrative texts, written down for practical purposes and are not aimed at a wider audience. As with palace inventories or oracle reports, one does not expect to find explicit mention of the ruling king in them, unless some specific reason requires it. Therefore, a reasonable hypothesis would be that the explicit mention of Tudḫaliya IV within these texts represents a break with the usual *habitus* of anonymous tablets. Such an innovation linked specifically with Tudḫaliya IV would have led to an ‘overexposure’ of his name within this text genre.

Interestingly, this is precisely what is observed in the case of the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities (CTH 682). As McMahon (1991: 140) points out, ‘[t]he name of Tudḫaliya is quite prominent in most of the copies of the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities, a feature which is rather striking, as festivals usually transcended a given king’s reign and therefore did not specify monarchs by name.’ One fragment, however (KBo 11.40), does not mention Tudḫaliya, referring to the king merely as ^dUTU-*šI* (vi 5’ and *passim*); in all likelihood this copy constitutes an older manuscript, perhaps even a model for the version commissioned by Tudḫaliya (*ibidem*).

Indeed, recent studies have emphasized that a reorganization of texts, archives and *scriptoria* had already begun during the reign of Ḫattušili III (e.g. Torri 2011: 142–143),⁶⁶ even if this is not immediately apparent due to the traditional anonymity of many of the texts. One can only speculate about the reasons behind such a break with the tradition of anonymity. Tudḫaliya’s innovative path might well be due to his concerted efforts to stress his own merit, a typical proclivity of this king, in particular with regard to religious matters.⁶⁷ This might be seen as the or a reason why all attributable fragments date to Tudḫaliya IV.

Again, the point here is not to maintain that the bulk of the cult inventories is unlikely to date to Tudḫaliya IV, but to argue that the available evidence is not sufficient to support the conclusion that they are. In other words, it makes little sense to say that the ‘majority’ or ‘most’ fragments are ‘quite likely’ or ‘very likely’ to date to Tudḫaliya. Since the statistical relevance of Tudḫaliya’s ‘sole agency’ within the corpus is open to debate and can be interpreted differently, it is very difficult to define the degree of likelihood of such assumptions.

Palaeography is of course a great aid in dating the fragments, but can hardly be used to distinguish, e.g., between a text from Tudḫaliya IV and one from Ḫattušili III. First, since the ‘older’ sign shapes never disappear completely, any smaller NS fragment can in principle date to one of the latest Hittite kings; as is well known, scribes sometimes used both

⁶⁶ In-depth research on this topic is just beginning.

⁶⁷ A telling example of this is found in KUB 25.21 (CTH 524.1; see § 1.7). In the preamble to this festival description, Tudḫaliya glosses over his father’s achievements in Nerik’s restoration, thus implicitly taking the credit for it for himself (KUB 25.21 ii 2–17; see von Schuler 1965: 186; on the reading of l. 4 see Klinger 2002: 444).

the ‘older’ and the ‘later’ shape of a sign even within the same tablet.⁶⁸ Thus, palaeographical dating must always work through cumulative evidence, which is unavailable in the case of very fragmentary texts, as indeed most cult inventories are.⁶⁹ Second, scribal customs neither change all at once nor at that point in time when a new king ascends the throne, so that there are no diagnostic elements that enable dating a fragment to a specific king. At most, one may hope to identify sign shapes that provide a *terminus ante quem non*.

Summary

It is simply not known to which Hittite kings most cult inventories date. It may well be that most of them indeed date to Tudḫaliya IV, but there is no decisive argument in favour of this conclusion. The fact that only Tudḫaliya among the Hittite kings is mentioned within the corpus is not sufficient for the attribution to him of hundreds of anonymous fragments. This fact may be explained with reference to further considerations, so that it is presently impossible to define what part of the corpus is ‘likely’ or ‘very likely’ to date to him. Of course, many more fragments than the 20 datable to Tudḫaliya presumably date to him, and the same may even be true for most of the tablets of the corpus. However, such an assumption is not substantiated by conclusive evidence, and one should accept the possibility that some 10%, 30%, 50% or even more fragments might date to other rulers.⁷⁰ Further research is needed to clarify the dating of the fragments. In particular, in-depth studies focusing on palaeography, ductus, formulaic expressions, content, layout and physical features of the tablets will surely improve our understanding of such texts; but the dating of the cult inventories should proceed on a case-by-case basis and through careful evaluation of all available features.

2.8. The Alleged Cult Reorganization of Tudḫaliya IV

If the attribution to Tudḫaliya of the anonymous cult inventories remains far from certain, there are nevertheless a number of documents firmly datable to him that attest to his ‘religious policy’, including prayers, edicts, oracular inquiries, festival texts and cult inventories. In the following paragraphs an overview of these texts will be presented in order to set the background for a thorough appraisal of the cult inventories dating to him.

⁶⁸ For some random examples from cult inventories cf. KBo 13.238 iii 2’ vs. 4’ (LI); KUB 56.39 i 15’, 21’, ii 6’, 12’ and *passim* vs. ii 25’, 29’, iv 14, 27 (DA), iv 30 vs. ii 9’, 10’, 13’ (URU); KUB 53.21 [on the classification of this fragment see § 1.7] obv. 6’ vs. obv. 7’, 8’, 9’, 11’, rev. 6’ (ḪA), rev. 6’, 11’ vs. rev. 8’, 9’ (LI); KUB 56.56 iv 9 vs. iv 11 (Á).

⁶⁹ On the complex questions involving palaeographical and orthographical dating cf. now van den Hout (2012: 47–50) and the detailed overview in Weeden (2011: 42–52; see also 2012: 245–246). This is why § 2.2 does not split LNS from NS fragments, which might have led to misunderstandings, since it is likely that a considerable number of small NS fragments would be classified as LNS were they better preserved.

⁷⁰ I.e. Ḫattušili III, Arnuwanda III or Šuppiluliyama II, given the palaeographical dating of the corpus.

2.8.1. Religious Policies of Tudhaliya IV

Tudhaliya's prayer to the Sun Goddess of Arinna (CTH 385.9; KBo 12.58+KBo 13.162; Lombardi 2002; Singer 2002: 108–110; Hazenbos 2003: 11–13) suggests itself as a starting point for an appraisal of the so-called cult reorganization. In this prayer the king promises not to neglect any longer the goddess's festivals, to celebrate them at the proper time and to restore its cult objects. The text is then broken until the final part of the prayer, where the king promises to go on a sort of pilgrimage to Mount Tagurka if the goddess grants him victory in battle. The opening lines read as follows:

[...] Tudhaliya has made [a plea] as follows: I have sinned [against the Sun-goddess of Arinna], my lady, and I have offended the Sun-goddess of Arinna, [my lady]. [And when] I began to get oracular guidance, (it turned out that) I neglected your festivals. [If you], O Sun-goddess of Arinna, my lady, became angry with [me] on account of some festivals, take care [of me] again, O Sun-goddess of Arinna, my lady! May I defeat the enemy! [If you, O Sun-goddess] of Arinna, my lady, will step down [to me], and I shall defeat the enemy, I shall [confess] my sin [before you] and never again [shall I omit] the festivals. I will not again interchange the spring and [autumn festivals]. [The festivals of spring] I shall perform only in the spring, [and the festivals of] autumn I shall perform only in the autumn. I shall never leave out [the festivals(?)] in [your] temple. (KBo 12.58+KBo 13.162 obv. 1–10; after Singer 2002: 108).

The following paragraph is highly fragmentary. The crucial lines 11–13 read as follows:

(11)[*ma-a-an-mu zi-ig* ^dUTU ^{URU}PÚ-na GAŠAN-Y]A DINGIR^{MEŠ}-ni-ma ku-it-ki GAM pa-a-an-ti še-er TUKU[.TUKU-e-eš-t]a nu DINGIR^{MEŠ}-tar ₁ku-it₁ GAM pa-it (12)[I-NA UD-MI ŠA A-BI ^dUTU-ŠI ŠA A-BIA-BI] ₁^dUTU-ŠI GAM pa-it I-NA UD-MI ^mŠu-up-pí-lu[-li-u-ma] pé-ra-an (13)[*ki-ša-at*]⁷¹

[If you, o Sun goddess of Arinna, m]y [lady, g]ot ang[ry] because of some cult object which had deteriorated (lit. 'went down,' 'declined') – well, concerning the fact that some cult object had deteriorated, it deteriorated [in the days of the father (and/or) of the grandfather^(?) of] My Sun, [(or it) happened] (even) previously, in the days of Suppiluliuma!⁷²

⁷¹ Restorations after Houwink ten Cate (1992: 144 n. 54; but correct the misprint ^mŠu-up-pí-[lu-li-u-ma]). Cf. also Lombardi (2002: 498–499); Hazenbos (2003: 12 n. 9).

⁷² Similarly Hazenbos (2003: 12); for a different interpretation see Houwink ten Cate (1992: 144 n. 54), followed by Lombardi (2002: 500): '[If You, Oh Sun Goddess of Arinna, m]y [mistress], became an[gr]y [with me] on account of a Deity who diminished (in position; lit. went downwards) in some respect, and (if) some cult object diminished (in state), [(or if) during the days of the father of My Majesty, of the grandfather] of My Majesty it diminished (in position or state), (or if) it [came about] during the days of Suppiluliuma] (I), ...'. However, DINGIR^{MEŠ}-ni-ma in line 11 is analogous to DINGIR^{MEŠ}-tar further on. Moreover, *kuit* cannot be interpreted in the same way as *kuitki*.

According to Hazenbos (2003: 12, following Houwink ten Cate 1992: 106–107), ‘probably we have an indication here of the circumstances leading Tudḫaliyaš to his cult reorganization, of which the cult inventories ascribed to him are the written reports. It can hardly be a coincidence that the festivals Tudḫaliyaš is referring to in the prayer (i.e. the seasonal festivals of spring and autumn) precisely are the two festivals that are treated in some detail in the cult inventories.’ However, the autumn and spring festivals are the most basic Hittite festivals of all, so that a connection between the seasonal festivals of the Sun Goddess of Arinna and those celebrated for countless gods in numerous peripheral towns is likely to be very weak. Swapping the two festivals is stigmatized already in the pre-NH Instructions for the Temple Personnel (CTH 264 § 9; McMahon 1997: 219), and mismatching something is itself (also) a literary *topos*.⁷³ Finally, Tudḫaliya refers in his prayer to cult objects of a specific deity, not to a general revision and restoration of festivals and cults around the country. All in all, the text bears witness to the king’s concern for the restoration of cult objects and the proper celebration of festivals, but it applies to a specific episode, with no clear implications for an alleged ‘cult reorganization’.

The restoration of the cults of Nerik is probably the best known of the religious undertakings of Tudḫaliya IV. Among the texts surely dating to him are the fragment KUB 25.21 (cf. above, § 1.7), the protocol of the so-called Month Festival in Nerik (CTH 672), the cult inventories KUB 25.22, KUB 25.24 and KUB 42.100+ and possibly the fragments KUB 55.60+ and 58.31+ (CTH 678.3).⁷⁴ On the other hand, it is well known that the restoration of Nerik was initiated under his father Ḫattušili III.⁷⁵ Even crediting him with some special involvement in the operations, one can hardly consider this an innovative undertaking of Tudḫaliya.

In a number of cases Tudḫaliya promoted reviews and new editions of festival texts, concerning both major ‘state cults’, such as the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM⁷⁶ and *nuntarriyašha*⁷⁷ festivals, as well as other less important local cults. To the latter case pertain the tablet KUB 25.32+, which treats the festivals of Karaḫna (CTH 681.1; cf. above, § 1.3.3), and probably the fragment KBo 26.178, dealing with no fewer than 12 different festivals (Torri 2010: 325). On the occasion of the compilation of such new editions, the king might order enrichments of cult objects and supplies or improvements and expansions within this or that festival’s schedule. The introduction of new cults, however, was an absolute exception. This can usually be proven through careful analysis of the relevant sources. As for the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festival, for instance, recent studies make it clearer that Tudḫaliya’s intention was not to innovate, but rather to refresh or to strengthen, to ‘revitalize’ traditional versions and elements, as Gal-

⁷³ Cf. e.g. the mythological passage where the angry god Telipinu mismatches his shoes (KBo 55.8+ KUB 17.10 i 13’–14’, ed. Rieken et al., CTH 324.1. Erste Version des Telipinu-Mythos, hethiter.net/: CTH 324.1 [INTR 2012-05-10]).

⁷⁴ Corti (2009: 21) attributes both fragments to Ḫattušili III. However, offerings for a group of deities that had a special relationship with Tudḫaliya IV (LAMMA.LUGAL, DAG and Tawannanna; KUB 55.60+ iv 7’, KUB 58.31+ iii 20’) may suggest that they should rather be dated to the latter king.

⁷⁵ Cf. Corti (2006; 2009). Even during the preceding age, however, Nerik was probably not as deserted and ruined as maintained by Ḫattušili; see Klinger (2009: 102–105). In any case, Tudḫaliya seeks to assume the credit for the whole undertaking (cf. n. 68 above).

⁷⁶ See KUB 20.63+ i 1–10 (CTH 611.1.A), KUB 20.42 i 1–9 (CTH 611.1.B) (Groddek 2004: 111 and 71).

⁷⁷ See KBo 11.43+ i 1–7 (CTH 626; Nakamura 2002: 172 f.).

marini has demonstrated with regard to the cult of Mount Puškurunuwa.⁷⁸ According to him, comparison among the fragments surely dating to Tudḫaliya (in particular KUB 25.18, CTH 618.1) and the other versions shows that Tudḫaliya's edition tends to reflect faithfully the older patterns,⁷⁹ in contrast to other late versions, such as that of summary tablet G. If so, Tudḫaliya neither 'instituted' nor strictly speaking 'restored' that cult, but rather sought to revitalize it based on older local traditions.⁸⁰ The new edition of the Festival for All the Tutelary Deities (CTH 682) is another good case in point. As McMahon (1991: 140) pointed out, Tudḫaliya's new edition was carefully compiled on the basis of older models and, more importantly, no major theological innovation can be detected within his revised version.⁸¹ Thus, Tudḫaliya is primarily concerned with the preservation, restoration and intensification of cults, not with major innovations. In Singer's (2009: 180) words, 'if Ḫattušili III was a great *innovator* in many respects, [...] his son was a great *consolidator* of the state institutions and the religious legitimacy of his reign'.⁸²

2.8.2. *Cult Inventories of Tudḫaliya IV: An Overview*

One might ask at this point what Tudḫaliya actually did for certain with regard to local cults. A perusal of the measures attested in the 20 cult inventories that certainly or very likely date to this king (§2.6) yields the following results:⁸³

- KBo 12.57 (Hazenbos 2003: 44–45; geographical scope:⁸⁴ area of Nerik?): restoration of previously neglected cult supplies (ll. 2', 4').
- KBo 26.179 (Hazenbos 2003: 45–46; g. s. unknown): the text is too fragmentary.
- KBo 26.188 (Hazenbos 2003: 25–26; g. s. unknown): the text is too fragmentary.
- KUB 7.24+ (Hazenbos 2003: 26–30; g. s.: Takkupša, Ḫawalkina: area of Nerik): The text begins by relating that 'formerly, there were no divine representations' of Mt. Malimaliya (i 1: ḪUR.SAG *Malimaliyaš annalaz* DINGIR^{MESŠ}-*tar UL ēšta*). The king ordered the construction of an anthropomorphic figurine for the temple of Mt. Kukumuša (i 2–3), while 'as a *ḫuwaši*, they place him in the town of Taḫniwara, on a *stone pedestal*' (i 4: NA₄ZI.KIN=*ya=an=kan* INA URU *Taḫniwara paššui šer tiyanzi*). According to Güterbock (1983: 210–211), the *ḫuwaši* was probably the old cult object, which was then superseded

⁷⁸ I.e. the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM^{SAR} festival, days 32–35/36; Galmarini (forthcoming).

⁷⁹ Cf. summary B, dating back to Muršili II; see already Houwink ten Cate (1986: 106).

⁸⁰ I thank Niccolò Galmarini for kindly providing me with this information.

⁸¹ Neither does the divine couple LAMMA : Ala constitute an innovation as previously supposed (McMahon 1991: 13–14, 140). This does not prevent one from considering Tudḫaliya's new edition as 'an attempt to extend to their logical limits all the functions and attributes of both the LAMMA tutelary deity and of Ala', and thus, in a certain sense, as 'a unique experiment in theology' (p. 13).

⁸² Tudḫaliya's hypothetical deification *in vita* would certainly be the most dramatic 'innovation' in religious policy (see van den Hout 1995b). It must be stressed, however, that even the offering of a libation to Tudḫaliya IV was just a culminating step in a long path towards the identification of the king with the divine (Singer 2009: 179–180; de Martino 2010: 90–91).

⁸³ KUB 46.34 is not included here, as it does not constitute a true cult inventory (Torri 2010: 324; cf. above, § 2.6).

⁸⁴ Henceforth: g. s.

- by the anthropomorphic figurine and thus moved to Taḥniwara. However, since the word *šuniyatar* is not restricted to anthropomorphic representations,⁸⁵ the text could also be interpreted in the sense that two cult objects were built, the figurine to be kept in the temple and the stela to be placed on the pedestal in Taḥniwara.⁸⁶
- KUB 13.32⁸⁷ (Hazenbos 2003: 46–48; cf. Miller 2005: 310; g. s.: area of Nerik?): institution of the *ḥarši(yalli)*-vessel (obv. 7'–9'; on this passage see above, § 2.5.2).
 - KUB 25.22⁸⁸ (Haas 1970: 238–243; g. s.: Nerik): institution of cult offerings in addition to those already established by Ḫattušili III (referred to as 'father of My Sun' in ii 12'–15').
 - KUB 25.23(+)⁸⁹ (g. s.: Ḫakmiš and surrounding area): erecting of a stela for the Storm-God of the Rain, presumably in Ḫakmiš (iv 47'–48'; the cult object was probably housed in the temple of the Storm-God of Ḫattuša; see Carter 1962: 172; Hazenbos 2003: 39 n. 87); restoration of cult offerings, possibly in the town of Parduwata (ii 36'; iii 1–2).
 - KUB 25.24 (Haas 1970: 244–247; g. s.: Nerik): institution of a (spring?) festival (ii 7').
 - KUB 31.24 (g. s. unknown): preserves only traces of *Bildbeschreibungen*.
 - KUB 38.23⁹⁰ (Rost 1963: 175–179, ll. 1–14; g. s. uncertain): to two pre-existing stelae are added three new cult objects:⁹¹ a bull-shaped iron figurine 1 *šekan* high for the Storm-God of Ariuwa, an iron figurine 1/2 *šekan* high in form of a woman for a solar deity⁹² and one adorned mace for Mt. Ḫuitnanta. Interestingly, the latter deity is not included in the list of (pre-)existing cult objects in ll. 7–8. It is difficult to say, however, whether this implies the exceptional introduction of a new cult by Tudḫaliya or simply that the relevant cult object had been lost. Ll. 12–13 attest the institution of cult offerings.⁹³
 - KUB 38.35 (Hazenbos 2003: 48–51; cf. Miller 2005: 310; g. s.: Ḫalinzūwa, area of Nerik): restoration of cult objects within the framework of a general restoration of the town (i 1–5).
 - KUB 42.100+⁹⁴ (g. s.: Nerik): references to inquiries carried out by royal representatives.
 - KUB 56.56 (Pecchioli Daddi / Baldi 2004; g. s.: Ḫurma):⁹⁵ no explicit reference to measures taken directly by the king. However, as Pecchioli Daddi and Baldi (2004: 504)

⁸⁵ In KUB 38.35, e.g., the term refers to a ^{KUŠ}*kurša*; on this term see also Collins (2005: 21).

⁸⁶ For another view see Miller (2005: 309): 'They place him on a *ḫuwasi*-stone, (i.e.) on a *passu*-platform.' In my opinion, however, this interpretation is not convincing.

⁸⁷ For the quoted passage see Laroche (1975: 90 with n. 13).

⁸⁸ Tudḫaliya is mentioned in fragmentary context in ll. ii 1', 3' and again as ^m*Tu-ut* in l. ii 15'.

⁸⁹ See Hazenbos (2003: 30–40) for KUB 25.23; (ibid.: 43–44) for KUB 59.34; Cammarosano (2012: 472) for KBo 57.113+; cf. Taracha (2004: 349); Miller (2005: 309–310).

⁹⁰ On the dating of this fragment see above, § 2.6.

⁹¹ The latter are labelled in l. 8 ^{DINGIR}^{MEŠ} *annallaš*, 'old deities' (i.e. pre-existing divine representations, *annallaš* [with notional agreement, i.e. nom. sg. for expected pl.]; cf. Rost 1963: 179), whereas the new figurines are labelled in l. 11 ^{DINGIR}^{MEŠ} *GIBIL*, 'new deities'. Here the logogram ^{DINGIR} conveys Hitt. *šuniyatar*, 'divine representation, cult object', and the term *GIBIL* does not imply establishment of new cults (cf. Schwemer 2008: 150 with n. 48).

⁹² Cf. in l. 16: 2 UDU ^dX BAL-*an-zi* ŠA.BA 1 UDU ^dUTU[(collated on photo).

⁹³ In l. 12 the writing 1 PA is probably a scribal mistake for 1 BĀN. The latter is likely to apply to the solar deity.

⁹⁴ See Haas (1970: 300–303) for KUB 27.68; Hazenbos (2003: 14–24) for KUB 42.100 and KBo 26.18.

⁹⁵ Probably in the Anti-Taurus area; cf. de Martino (2008: 132 n. 14, with further bibliography).

- argue, Tudḫaliya IV might have instituted the cult of the deities LAMMA.LUGAL DAG and Zitḫariya.
- KUB 58.7 (Hazenbos 2003: 41–43; g. s.: Kašaya?):⁹⁶ references to a ‘great festival of the king’s journey’ (ii 21’) and to the king’s arrival (ii 22’). In l. ii 23’ both (clay) tablets and (wooden) *gulzattar* writing boards are mentioned.
 - IBoT 2.131 (Imparati 1990; Forlanini 2009: 39–42; g. s.: Cappadocia, probably area of Kaneš): recurring references to cult offerings neglected ‘since the days of the father of My Sun’; no mention of measures taken by the king.
 - KuSa I/1.3 (Wilhelm 1997: 19–20; Hazenbos 2003: 159–163; g. s.: area of Šarišša): reference to inquiries about the state of the cults; restoration of cult offerings or festivals (obv. 7’–8’); reference to measures previously taken by Ḫattušili III (rev. 6).
 - KuSa I/1.5 (Wilhelm 1997: 21–22; Hazenbos 2003: 156–159; g. s.: area of Šarišša): reference to negligence concerning provisions of cult supplies; no explicit mention of royal measures.
 - KuSa I/1.39 (Wilhelm 1997: 31; Hazenbos 2003: 159; g. s.: area of Šarišša): probable mention of the ‘father of My Sun’ in l. 3’.
 - Bo 3998 (Cammarosano 2012: 495; g. s. unknown): inquiries and an ‘inventory’ are mentioned in lines 8’–10’.

This short review shows that most if not all measures taken by Tudḫaliya deal with the *restoration* of neglected offerings or deteriorated cult objects. Only the construction of new cult objects, which join the pre-existing ones rather than replacing them, and the possible introduction of a triad of gods among the cults of Ḫurma might be called *innovation*. Of course, both kinds of measures are also attested in a great number of anonymous texts. Moreover, some of the cult inventories of Tudḫaliya refer explicitly to analogous measures taken by Ḫattušili III. All this confirms the conclusions drawn above both on the uncertain dating of the anonymous documents and on the traditional character of the alleged cult reorganization. With regard to geographical scope, the cult inventories of Tudḫaliya show a particular focus on the northern area of Nerik and Ḫakmiš (7 texts), but deal with eastern, central and southern areas of the Hittite homeland as well.⁹⁷

2.8.3. Epilogue

From the evidence reviewed in this paper the following conclusions can be drawn:

(a) Only a very limited group of cult inventories can be safely attributed to Tudḫaliya IV. Of course, many more texts, perhaps even the greatest part of the available fragments, surely date to this ruler. However, a considerable number of fragments might date to Ḫattušili III or to Šuppiluliyama II. Although Tudḫaliya is the only king to be explicitly mentioned in such texts, the references to activities of his father show that he carried on

⁹⁶ District of Šalma, south of Ḫattuša; Forlanini (2008: 158–159 with n. 107; 2009: 40 n. 5).

⁹⁷ Area of Šarišša: three texts; Ḫurma, Kaneš and probably Šalma: one text each. For an overview of the towns treated in the corpus of cult inventories see Cammarosano (2012: 120–150).

a program of review and restoration of local cults that was already in place during his father's reign. That solely Tudḫaliya is mentioned in the available texts might be due to specific reasons; this fact does not necessarily suggest that the bulk of the anonymous inventories should be attributed to him. While dating them to Tudḫaliya remains a reasonable hypothesis, it still needs further corroboration.

(b) Regardless of the number of texts actually stemming from this or that king, the alleged 'cult reorganization' of Tudḫaliya IV consisted at most in restoration or enrichment of cult objects, chapels and offerings. Such practices, as well as reports on local cults, had been carried out since MH times at the latest, although possibly at an erratic rate and strength over time. No systematic introduction of new cults took place in Tudḫaliya's 'reorganization'. Its innovative character might lie, following Houwink ten Cate (1992: 102), in its geographical scope and intensity, but this assumption is dependent on the number of anonymous texts one attributes to Tudḫaliya and therefore cannot be convincingly proven. Moreover, stylistic similarity among these documents does not necessarily hint at efforts to introduce standard seasonal festivals in the whole country. Despite their common basic pattern, these festivals present a great deal of variety. On the contrary, considerable evidence supports the view that the texts tend to treat the local festivals they deal with, the origins of which in all likelihood go back to ancestral times, in a faithful way.

Future research will surely improve both the dating of the fragments as well as our understanding of these texts and, more generally, of religious administration and text management during the reigns of the last Hittite rulers. Whatever the extent and nature of the measures taken by Tudḫaliya IV with regard to local cults, such measures did not tend to impose standard festivals in provincial towns, and they probably had a much less homogeneous character than often assumed.

References

- Alparslan, M. (2010): Das Land Hakmiš. Geschichte, Lokalisation und politische Bedeutung einer hethitischen Metropole. In: A. Süel (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, 29–44.
- Archi, A. / H. Klengel (1980): Ein hethitischer Text über die Reorganisation des Kultes, *AoF* 7, 143–157.
- Archi, A. (1971): The Propaganda of Ḫattušiliš III, *SMEA* 14, 185–215.
- Archi, A. (1973): Fêtes de printemps et d'automne et réintégration rituelle d'images de culte dans l'Anatolie hittite, *UF* 5, 7–27.
- Archi, A. (2006): Hurrian Gods and the Festivals of the Hattian-Hittite Layer. In: Th. P. J. van den Hout (ed.) (2006b), 147–163.
- Beal, R. (2005/06): Rev. of J. Hazenbos (2003), *AfO* 51, 361–363.
- Beckman, G. (1983): *Hittite Birth Rituals* (StBoT 29), Wiesbaden.
- Berman, H. (1978): Rev. of L. Jakob-Rost, *KUB* 46, Berlin 1976, *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. (in press a): *Hittite Cult Inventories. Part One. The Hittite Cult Inventories as Textual Genre*, *WdO*.
- Cammarosano, M. (in press b): *The Location of Cult Stelae According to the Hittite Cult Inventories*. In:

- A. Bobokyan (ed.), Proceedings of the Workshop “The Vishapakar in the Historical and Cultural Context of the Armenian Plateau”, Erevan, 28–29 October 2011.
- Carter, Ch. (1962): Hittite Cult-Inventories, PhD dissertation, Chicago.
- Collins, B. J. (2005): A Statue for the Deity. Cult Images in Hittite Anatolia. In: N.H. Walls (ed.), *Cult Image and Divine Representation in the Ancient Near East*, Boston, 13–42.
- Cornil, P./ R. Lebrun (1972): La restauration de Nérik (KUB XXI 8, 9 et 11 = Cat. 75), *Hethitica* 1, 15–30.
- Corti, C. (2006): Hattušili III e la gestione del culto della città santa di Nerik (I). In: C. Mora / P. Piacentini (eds.), *L’ufficio e il documento. I luoghi, i modi, gli strumenti dell’amministrazione in Egitto e nel Vicino Oriente antico*, Milano, 313–329.
- Corti, C. (2009): Hattušili III and the Cult Management of the Holy City of Nerik (II). In: F. Pecchioli Daddi et al. (eds.) (2009), 13–23.
- del Monte, G. F. (1978): Utruna e la festa *purulli-*, OA 17, 179–192.
- 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.) (2008), 131–143.
- de Martino, S. (2010): Symbols of Power in the Late Hittite Kingdom. In: Y. Cohen et al. (eds.), *Pax Hethitica*. Studies on the Hittites and their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer (StBoT 51), Wiesbaden, 87–98.
- de Roos, J. (2007): Hittite Votive Texts (PIHANS 109), Istanbul – Leiden.
- Forlanini, M. (2008): The Central Provinces of Hatti. An Updating. In: K. Strobel (ed.) (2008), 145–188.
- Forlanini, M. (2009): On the Middle Kızıllırmak II. In: F. Pecchioli Daddi et al. (eds.) (2009), 39–69.
- Galmardini, N. (forthcoming): The Festivals of Mount Puškurunuwa. In: P. Taracha (ed.), Proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw.
- Goetze, A. (1957): *Kleinasien*, München (2nd ed; 1st ed. 1933).
- Groddek, D. (2004): Hethitische Texte in Transkription. KUB 20 (DBH 13), Dresden.
- Güterbock, H.G. (1946): Rev. of C.-G. von Brandenstein, *Hethitische Götter nach Bildbeschreibungen in Keilschrifttexten*, Leipzig 1943, OrNS 15, 482–496.
- Güterbock, H.G. (1964): Religion und Kultus der Hethiter. In: G. Walser (ed.), *Neuere Hethiterforschung*, Wiesbaden, 54–73.
- 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. (1970): *Der Kult von Nerik*. Ein Beitrag zur hethitischen Religionsgeschichte (Studia Pohl 4), Rome.
- 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 “Kleinasien 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. (1974): *Alimenta Hethaeorum*. Food Production in Hittite Asia Minor (AOS 55), New Haven.
- Houwink ten Cate, Ph. H. J. (1986): Brief Comments on the Hittite Cult Calendar. The Outline of the AN.TAḫ.ŠUM Festival. In: H. A. Hoffner / G. Beckman (eds.), *Kanišsuwar*. A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on his seventy-fifth Birthday, May 27, 1983 (AS 23), Chicago, 95–110.
- 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.
- Houwink ten Cate, Ph. H. J. / F. Josephson (1967): Muwatalli’s Prayer to the Storm-God of Kummanni (KBo XI 1), RHA 25/81, 101–140.
- Hutter, M. (2010): Methodological Issues and Problems in Reconstructing “Hittite Religion(s)”. In: A. Süel (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. (1974): Una concessione di terre da parte di Tudhaliya IV (RHA 32), Paris.
- Imparati, F. (1990): Obligations et manquements culturels envers la divinité Pirwa, *OrNS* 59, 166–187.
- Klengel, H. (1965): *Geschichte Syriens im 2. Jahrtausend v. u. Z. Teil 1. Nordsyrien*, Berlin.
- Klinger, J. (1996): *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht (StBoT 37)*, Wiesbaden.
- Klinger, J. (2002): Die hethitisch-kaškäische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der Großreichszeit. In: S. de Martino / F. Pecchioli Daddi (eds.), *Anatolia antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati (Eothen 11)*, Firenze, 437–451.
- Klinger, J. (2006): Der Beitrag der Textfunde zur Archäologiegeschichte der hethitischen Hauptstadt. In: D. P. Mielke et al. (eds.) (2006), 5–17.
- Klinger, J. (2009): The Cult of Nerik Revisited. In: F. Pecchioli Daddi et al. (eds.) (2009), 97–107.
- Košak, S. (2012): Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln. Online-Datenbank Version 1.84, URL <<http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/>>
- Kühne, C. / H. Otten (1971): *Der Šaušgamuwa-Vertrag. Eine Untersuchung zu Sprache und Graphik (StBoT 16)*, Wiesbaden.
- Laroche, E. (1975): La 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.
- Lombardi, A. (2002): Sfondò storico e analisi strutturale della preghiera di Tudhaliya IV alla dea Sole di Arinna (CTH 385.9). In: S. de Martino / F. Pecchioli Daddi (eds.), *Anatolia antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati (Eothen 11)*, Firenze, 497–506.
- Marazzi, M. (1994): Ma gli Hittiti scrivevano veramente su “legno”? In: P. Cipriano et al. (eds.), *Miscellanea di studi linguistici in onore di Walter Belardi*, Roma, 131–160.
- Marizza, M. (2007): *Dignitari ittiti del tempo di Tuthaliya I/II, Arnuwanda I, Tuthaliya III (Eothen 15)*, Firenze.
- McMahon, G. (1991): *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities (AS 25)*, Chicago.
- McMahon, G. (1997): Instructions. In W. W. Hallo (ed.), *The Context of Scripture 1. Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, Leiden, 217–230.
- Mielke, D. P. et al. (eds.) (2006), *Strukturierung und Datierung in der hethitischen Archäologie. Voraussetzungen – Probleme – Neue Ansätze. Structuring and Dating in Hittite Archaeology. Requirements – Problems – New Approaches. Internationaler Workshop Istanbul, 16.–27. November 2004 (BYZAS 4)*, Istanbul.
- Miller, J. L. (2004): *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals (StBoT 46)*, Wiesbaden.
- Miller, J. L. (2005): Rev. of J. Hazenbos (2003), *ZA* 95, 308–312.
- Nakamura, M. (2002): *Das hethitische nuntarriyašha-Fest (PIHANS 94)*, Leiden.
- Neve, P. (1987): *Boğazköy-Hattuša. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen in der Oberstadt, Anatolica* 14, 41–71.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F. (2003): *Il vincolo per i governatori di provincia (StMed 14)*, Pavia.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F. (2006): The System of Government at the Time of Tuthaliya IV. In: Th. P. J. van den Hout (ed.) (2006b), 117–130.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F. et al. (eds.) (2009): *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 (StAs 5)*, Rome.
- Pecchioli Daddi, F. / M. Baldi (2004): *Un inventario di culto della città di Hürma. In: D. Groddek / S. Röbke (eds.), Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer (DBH 10)*, Dresden, 495–506.
- Popko, M. (2007): *Zu den Datierungsfragen in der Hethitologie. In: D. Groddek / M. Zorman (eds.), Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag (DBH 25)*, Dresden, 575–581.
- 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. (2008): *Fremde Götter in Hatti. Die hethitische Religion im Spannungsfeld von Synkretis-*

- mus und Abgrenzung. In: G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Ḫattuša – Boğazköy. Das Hethiterreich im Spannungsfeld des Alten Orients*. 6. Internationales Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 22.–24. März 2006, Würzburg (CDOG 6), Wiesbaden, 137–158.
- Seeher, J. (2001): Die Zerstörung der Stadt Ḫattuša. In: G. Wilhelm (ed.), *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie*, Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999 (StBoT 45), Wiesbaden, 623–634.
- Seeher, J. (2006a): Chronology in Ḫattuša. *New Approaches to an Old Problem*. In: D. P. Mielke et al. (eds.) (2006), 197–211.
- Seeher, J. (2006b): Ḫattuša – Tuḫaliya-Stadt? Argumente für eine Revision der Chronologie der hethitischen Hauptstadt. In: Th. P. J. van den Hout (ed.) (2006b), 131–146.
- Singer, I. (1996): *Muwatalli's Prayer to the Assembly of Gods through the Storm-God of Lightning* (CTH 381), Atlanta.
- Singer, I. (2002): *Hittite Prayers* (WAW 11), Atlanta.
- Singer, I. (2009): "In Ḫattuša The Royal House Declined". *Royal Mortuary Cult in 13th Century Hatti*. In: F. Pecchioli Daddi et al. (eds.) (2009), 169–191.
- Sommer, F. (1932): *Die Aḫḫijavā-Urkunden*, München.
- Strobel, K. (ed.) (2008): *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.
- Symington, D. (1991): Late Bronze Age Writing-Boards and their Uses. *Textual Evidence from Anatolia and Syria*, AnSt 41, 111–124.
- Taggar-Cohen, A. (2006): *Hittite Priesthood* (THeth 26), Heidelberg.
- Taracha, P. (2004): Rev. of J. Hazenbos (2003), *BiOr* 61, 348–351.
- Taylor, J. (2011): *Tablets as Artefacts, Scribes as Artisans*. In: K. Radner / E. Robson (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, New York, 5–31.
- Torri, G. (2008a): Rev. of J. Hazenbos (2003), *AJA* 112, 547–549.
- Torri, G. (2008b): *The Scribes of the House on the Slope*. In: A. Archi / R. Francia (eds.), *Atti del 6^o Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia II*, SMEA 50, 771–782.
- 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.
- Torri, G. (2011): *The Phrase TUPPU URUḪatti in Colophons from Ḫattuša and the Work of the Scribe Ḫanikkuiili*, AoF 38, 135–144.
- Ünal, A. (1974): *Ḫattušili III. Teil 1. Ḫattušili bis zu seiner Thronbesteigung 2: Quellen und Indices* (THeth 3–4), Heidelberg.
- van den Hout, Th. P. J. (1989): *Studien zum spätjunghethitischen Texte der Zeit Tudhalijas IV*. KBo IV 10+ (CTH 106), PhD dissertation, Amsterdam.
- van den Hout Th. P. J. (1995a): *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag. Eine prosopographische Untersuchung* (StBoT 38), Wiesbaden.
- van den Hout Th. P. J. (1995b): *Tudḫaliya IV. und die Ikonographie hethitischer Großkönige des 13. Jhs.*, *BiOr* 52, 245–273.
- van den Hout, Th. P. J. (2006a): *Administration in the Reign of Tuḫaliya IV and the Later Years of the Hittite Empire*. In: Th. P. J. van den Hout (ed.) (2006b), 77–106.
- van den Hout, Th. P. J. (ed.) (2006b): *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 (PIHANS 103), Leiden.
- van den Hout, Th. P. J. (2008): *A Classified Past. Classification of Knowledge in the Hittite Empire*. In: R. D. Biggs / J. Myers / M. T. Roth (eds.), *Proceedings of the 51st Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale Held at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. July 18–22, 2005* (SAOC 62), Chicago, 211–219.
- van den Hout, Th. P. J. (2010): *LÚ_{DUB}.SAR.GIŠ = "Clerk"?* *Or NS* 79, 255–267.
- van den Hout, Th. P. J. (2011): *The Written Legacy of the Hittites*. In: H. Genz / D. P. Mielke (eds.), *Insights into Hittite History and Archaeology*, Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA, 47–84.
- van den Hout, Th. P. J. (2012): *The Ductus of the Alalah VII Texts and the Origin of Hittite Cuneiform*. In:

- E. Devecchi (ed.), *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age* (PIHANS 119), Leiden, 147–170.
- von Schuler, E. (1965): *Die Kaškäer. Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasien* (UAVA 3), Berlin.
- 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 Logograms and Hittite Scholarship* (StBoT 54), Wiesbaden.
- Weeden, M. (2012): *Assyro-Mittanian or Middle Assyrian?* In: E. Devecchi (ed.), *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age* (PIHANS 119), Leiden, 229–251.
- 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.
- Wilhelm, G. (2004): *Die Keilschrifttextfunde der Kampagne 2002 in Kuşaklı*, *MDOG* 136, 112–114.

Michele Cammarosano
Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg
Institut für Altertumswissenschaften
Altorientalistik
Residenzplatz 2, Tor A,
D - 97070 Würzburg
michele.cammarosano@gmail.com