

Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie

Begründet von
E. Ebeling und B. Meissner

fortgeführt von
E. Weidner und W. von Soden

herausgegeben von D. O. Edzard

unter Mitwirkung von
M. Krebernik · J. N. Postgate · U. Seidl
M. Stol · G. Wilhelm

Redaktion
Gabriella Frantz-Szabó

Band 10 · 1./2. Lieferung

Oannes – Pabilsaĝ(a)

2003

Sonderdruck

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

nian Public Buildings in the Diyala Region I, Excavations at Ishchali, The Kititum Complex (= OIP 98) 7-75. - B. Mallowan 1993: Assyrian Temple Furniture, in: Fs. N. Özgüç, 383-387. - D. M. Matthews 1990: Principles of Composition in Near Eastern Glyptic of the Later Second Mill. B. C. (= OBO SA 8). - S. M. Maul 1994: Zukunftsbewältigung (= BagF 18) 48-59: Das Opfer. - J. Oates 1974: Late Assyrian Temple Furniture from Tell al Rimah, Iraq 36, 179-184. - E. Peltenburg 1991: Spouted Libation Beaker, in: The Burrell Collection. Western Asiatic Antiquities, 110-112. - L. Speleers 1921: Le mobilier de l'Asie antérieure ancienne, Annales de la Société royale d'archéologie de Bruxelles 30, 149-179. - Ch. Watanabe 1992: A Problem in the Libation Scene of Ashurbanipal, BMECCJ 6, 91-103. - K. Wigand 1912: Thymiateria, Bonner Jahrbücher 122, 1-41.

U. Seidl

Opfer. A. II. Nach schriftlichen Quellen. Anatolien.

§ 1. Sources. - § 2. Recipients. - § 3. Officiants. - § 4. Occasion. - § 5. Purpose. - § 6. Location. - § 7. Time. - § 8. Materials. - § 9. Types. - § 10. Procedure. - § 11. Vocabulary. - § 12. Substitution.

We may define an offering or sacrifice as the ceremonial transfer of a physical object from an individual human or a community of humans into the possession of a deity, demon, personified numinous entity, or any other para-human being for the sustenance of that being and/or for the purpose of securing goodwill and thereby influencing his/her/its actions. Evidence from Boğazköy/Ḫattuša and other Hittite sites constitutes the single largest body of material available for the study of sacrifice in ancient Western Asia. In accordance with the hybrid nature of Hittite religion, sacrificial practice was not a homogenous system, but a constantly developing amalgam of conceptions and procedures drawn from Indo-European (Hittite and Luwian), Mesopotamian, Hurrian, and indigenous Hattic cultural strata.

§ 1. Sources. The most significant witnesses to Hittite ritual practice are the cuneiform texts from the royal archives, in particular the festivals ("Festrituale" [EZEN]: CTH 591 ff.) and rituals ("ma-

gische Rituale" [SISKUR, SISKUR]: CTH 390 ff.), which often describe offering procedures in detail. The "royal lists" (CTH 661; Otten 1951, 64-70) record the number of livestock to be slaughtered for deceased kings, queens, and princes, while the requisition (*MELQĒTU*) lists from the KILAM festival (CTH 523; Singer, StBoT 27, 141-170; StBoT 28, 102-119) set forth the material requirements for the celebration and the official or community responsible for their supply.

Further information is given in the Instructions for Temple Personnel (CTH 264; Süel 1985) and the "cult inventories" ("Bildbeschreibungen": CTH 501 ff.; Rost 1961, 1963). Scattered passages in texts of other genres, such as myths, prayers, vows, and divination reports, also contribute to our knowledge of Hittite sacrifice.

A handful of Hieroglyphic Luwian texts mention offerings, particularly of sheep and bovines (Hawkins 2000, 147, 270).

Artistic depictions of offering scenes are found on rock reliefs (Fraktin), orthostats (Alaca Höyük, Malatya), cultic vessels of precious metal (*BIBRŪ*: Schimmel rhyton, Boston "fist"; Carruba 1967), large jars decorated in appliqué relief (Bitik, Inandık, and Hüseyindede A vases), and occasionally in glyptic (e. g., Beyer, Emar VI, sealings A 62, A 70, A 71). Examples of Schnabelkannen - the Hittite libation vessel *par excellence* - and offering utensils of other shapes, as well as pieces of miniature votive pottery, have been recovered at Boğazköy and other sites. See below, Opfer. B. II. Anatolien. § 3 and Willemaers 1973, 1977.

§ 2. Recipients. Those to whom sacrifice was made include gods and goddesses both prominent and obscure; indeed, many of the "Thousand Gods of Ḫatti" are known solely from their appearance in lists of offerings. Anthropomorphic deities were customarily present in the form of statues (ALAM = *ešri*-) or stelae (^{na}*ḫuwaši*-; Hutter 1993, 91-95). Offerings to divinized mountains (Lombardi 2000) and springs (Haas 1994, 464-466) and those to personified objects of majesty, such as the throne

(^dHalmašuit-; Starke 1979), and locations in sacred buildings (*AŠRĪ^{bi.a} = peda*, including the four corners, pillars, wall(s), windows, and hearth – for a typical list see KUB 25, 18 iv 24–32; CHD P, 332–333; Haas 1994, 262–275) were mostly delivered directly to the recipient.

Deceased kings and their close relatives, having attained the status of minor deity, might be allotted modest offerings in the course of their funerary rites (Otten 1958; van den Hout 1994) and periodically afterwards (see CTH 661). The beneficiary of such attention, which may be viewed as simply a grander version of the devotion due to all ancestors, is generally designated as “the dead” (GIDIM = *akkant-*) or “the soul” (ZI = *ištanza(n)-*). Finally, demonic forces like Wišuriant, “the Strangler,” could be appeased with appropriate gifts (Carruba, StBoT 2).

§ 3. *Officiants.* In theory, the king was the chief priest of all of the Hittite gods, and he was accordingly most frequently the offerant (“Opferherr”) in ceremonies of the state cult, although in animal sacrifices the actual slaughter and butchery were commonly left to cultic culinary specialists. In somewhat later texts, the queen might assist the monarch, or even preside in her own right. A prince (DUMU.LUGAL, e. g., CTH 647; DUMU-*aš*, CTH 648) could also be delegated to represent the royal house.

Religious professionals (^{lú}SANGA = *šan-kunni-*) and palace personnel (DUMU.É.GAL, “palace servant”; ^{lú}SAGI, “cup-bearer”; UGULA ^{lú}MUḪALDIM, “chief cook”) also performed offerings in the state cult. We must also assume that responsibility for the poorly documented routine sacrifices in provincial temples and village shrines fell to local officials. In magical rites, practitioners bearing various titles (most importantly ^{lú}AZU/ḪAL, “seer”; ^{munus}ŠU.GI = *ḫašawa-*, “old woman”; and *patili-*) were responsible.

The client or patient for whom a magical rite was carried out, designated in general terms by the available prescriptive texts as EN.SISKUR, “subject of the rite” (“Ritu-

alherr”, e. g., KUB 12, 49 i 16), or EN/BĒL.É^{tim}, “householder” (e. g., KBo. 15, 33 iii 9), might make simple offerings on his or her own behalf.

§ 4. *Occasion.* The more important gods and goddesses of Ḫatti received daily bread and beverage offerings (Goetze 1957, 163–164). Thus temple employees were required to be at their posts “in the morning at the gods’ breakfast” (*lukkatti* DIN-GIR.MES-*aš addanaš meḫuni*, KUB 13, 4 iii 72–73). Depending on local tradition (see Rost 1961, 1963), various periodic (monthly, yearly) and seasonal festivals (spring, autumn, and others tied to particular agricultural activities) featuring lavish sacrifices were also dedicated to these divinities. Certainly the cultic calendar of the capital was an elaborate one (Güterbock 1970, 177) and included offerings for most if not all of the deities honored in Hittite territory. In addition, each spring and autumn the king and members of the royal family made a progress through the realm (see Güterbock 1960; Košak 1976), presiding at rites calling for sacrifices to the pantheons of numerous towns.

Other ceremonies, particularly those designated as SISKUR, were executed along with their attendant offerings as need arose. These occasions included the construction of a new temple, the purification of a defeated army, *rites de passage* such as birth, puberty, and death, personal crises like impotence, insomnia, family strife, etc.

§ 5. *Purpose.* The goal of sacrifice was to assure the flourishing and goodwill of Ḫatti’s deities and to secure their cooperation in the smooth functioning of the universe. As in Mesopotamia, the gods were believed to be literally dependent upon humans for their sustenance (Haas 1994, 640–641).

§ 6. *Location.* Offerings were most often performed in a place demarcated from the profane sphere. Monumental buildings or parts thereof – temple, chapel, enclosed courtyard, ^é*arkiu-* (“cult-niche”?), “canopy”?), and palace (^é*ḫalentuwa-*) –

were frequent locations for sacrifice in the state cult. In such a setting, the divine image, the altar (*ištanana-*), and/or offering-table (⁶¹⁸BANŠUR(.SISKUR); Ünal 1994, provided the focus of activity.

In magical rites, offerings took place in a special building reserved for purifications (⁶*šinapši-*; Beckman 1983, 113), in an uncultivated place (*dammeli pedi*; CHD P, 339), or at some other location far removed from habitations and agricultural plots – for instance, on a rock outcropping (^{na}*peruna-*, KBo. 15, 10 ii 3), on a riverbank (*wappu-*, KUB 12, 58 i 3'), a spring or well (*luli-*, KBo. 16, 49 i 6' ff.; PÜ = *wattaru-*, KUB 30, 24 a i 5), or simply "in the open air" (*nepiši kattan*, KUB 24, 5 obv. 31). Some offerings to chthonic deities required the digging of an artificial offering pit (*hatteššar*, KUB 36, 89 obv. 4; Hurrian loanword *aabi*; HW² I 181–183; Hoffner 1967).

§ 7. Time. Often the texts specify the time of day at which an offering should be given. A rite might be scheduled for the early morning (*lukkatti*; CHD L–M, 77; *karuwariwar*; HED 4, 86–87) or at midday or afternoon (UD.KAM-*ti ištarna pedi*, KUB 7, 5 ii 22). Evening (*nekuz mehur*; CHD L–M, 240) is frequently specified, more picturesquely described as "when at night a star twinkles" (*maḥhan-ma nekuz mehur* MUL *watkuzi*, KUB 9, 22 ii 46–47). Nighttime (*išpanti*, *išpantaz*; HED 1–2, 432–433) and the predawn twilight (*kuitman-kan* ^dUTU-*uš nāwi epzi*, KUB 4, 47 i 11) also occur.

§ 8. Materials. Since sacrifice was held to nourish the gods, the preponderance of offerings were foodstuffs. These included raw products like honey, oil (Öl(baum)*) and fruit (Obst* A. II. § 2) processed foods such as flour, ghee, and cheese; and a wide array of baked goods, some in peculiar shapes. (See in general Hoffner 1974). Potable liquids (wine, beer, milk, *tawal*, *walḫi*, etc.) were employed in the frequent libations.

Hittite deities enjoyed a diet far more extravagant than that of the ordinary Anatolian peasant, as evidenced most strikingly

in their prodigious consumption of meat, sometimes in astounding quantities (in one festival 1000 sheep and 50 oxen; Haas/Jakob-Rost 1984, 16–17). The usual sacrificial animals in Hatti were those domestic creatures whose meat humans also ate most frequently – sheep, goats, and cattle. Wild animals, such as gazelle, stag, bear, boar, and leopard, were offered but seldom. Dogs (Collins 1990), swine (Collins 2002, 323), and horses (Haas 1994, 417–418) were killed only for special purposes, primarily to appease chthonic forces and the dead.

Sacrificial victims had to be pure (*šuppi-*), that is, healthy and unblemished. Severe sanctions applied to any temple worker found to have substituted his own inferior animal for a prize specimen intended for a deity (KUB 13, 5 ii 17 ff. and dupls.). On occasion it was necessary that a female animal be virgin, and sometimes the victim had to be of the same gender as the offerant. As a general rule, black animals were offered to chthonic gods, white or light-colored ones to all other divinities (Haas 1994, 647–649).

Although raptors (eagle, falcon) appear infrequently already in Old Kingdom rites, the sacrifice of fowl, usually through incineration, was introduced rather late, as part of the Hurro-Luwian "Kizzuwatnaean" cult. See § 10.

Non-food gifts to the gods, including silver, precious objects, latifundia, and persons, are mentioned in vows (de Roos 1984), and were doubtlessly assigned to temples and their associated economic establishments. In any event, such donations do not really constitute sacrifices in the sense intended here.

§ 9. Types. The bewildering variety of Hittite sacrifices can be reduced to five ideal types: 1) attraction offerings, in which paths of fruit, sweets, and colored cloth intended to draw in the honored deities were laid out converging on the ritual site (the main feature of CTH 483–485); 2) non-blood offerings consisting primarily of baked goods and libations of beer, wine, etc.; 3) animal sacrifice followed by a com-

munal meal; 4) burnt offerings (restricted to ceremonies adopted from Syrian or Cilician sources – “Kizzuwatnaean” cult); and 5) “god drinking.”

It must be recognized that these ideal types do not reflect any native Hittite terminological distinctions. Only in the Empire Period was an elaborate vocabulary borrowed from Hurrian and Luwian to designate types of offering (Haas/Wilhelm 1974, 59–126), and then it was employed only in texts of the “Kizzuwatnaean” milieu. Some of these numerous terms designate the procedure to be followed (e. g., *ambašši*, “burnt offering”), others the material employed (*zurgi*, “blood”), the purpose of the rite (e. g., *itkalzi*, “purification”), or the problem to be addressed (e. g., *arni*, “sin”).

§ 10. Procedure. Offerings were always only a part of larger ceremonial programs. In the case of festivals, the business at hand also included entertaining the deity or deities through singing, comedic performances, athletic contests, etc. Through a sequence of physical acts, incantations, and offerings, magical rituals manipulated and cajoled the god(s) or demonic force(s) to accede to the needs and desires of the patient.

The general principle informing Hittite offering technique was that the material given had to be destroyed, in whole or in part, in order to pass over to its recipient in the divine world. Thus liquids were poured out (on the ground, offering table, or altar), breads were broken or crumbled, vessels were smashed, and animals were killed.

Bearing in mind that any particular rite might show considerable variation, and that the scribes frequently omitted mention of one or more features, we may summarize Hittite sacrificial procedure (see Kühne 1993):

The priest or officiant, cultic implements, and the offering itself were ritually purified (*šuppiyahb-*), after which the offerant washed his hands in water (*ŠU.MEŠ wetenit anš-*). In the state cult, either of these acts might involve the use of *tubhues-*

šar (Alp 1983; Zeilfelder 2000) or some other aromatic substance (de Martino 1998). If the offering was small in size it was handed to the offerant; if it was large, he set his hand upon it (*QĀTAM dāi-*; Wright 1986), thereby establishing his patronage of the ceremony. The offering was made (through breaking, scattering, libating, etc.) by either the officiant or the offerant him- or herself. The sacrifice concluded with the obeisance of the offerant before the deity (*aruwai-*, *hink-*).

Animal sacrifice was somewhat more complicated (Kühne 1986). After the initial ritual cleansing, the victim, which might have been gaily decorated with ribbons or objects of precious metal, was driven into (*anda unna-*) the temple or sacrificial location and dedicated (*šipant-*) to the recipient. A “sample” (*anahī-*) of the animal – probably a lock of hair – was conveyed to the deity, after which the beast was driven out (*parā penna-*) once more. The victim was then killed (*huk-*, “to slaughter”; *kuer-* “to cut”; *hattai-* “to pierce”) and butchered (*ark-*, *mark-*; CHD L–M, 188; Ünal 1985) or dismembered (*arḫa ḫappešnai-*), usually away from the immediate offering site. The animal’s death might be accompanied by a joyous shout from the participants (Collins 1995a).

There followed the consumption of the slaughtered beast by the god(s) and worshippers (Rosenkranz 1974; Archi 1979; Collins 1995b). Divine taste favored fat and those internal organs thought to be the site of life and the emotions – liver and heart above all, but also the gall bladder and kidneys. These entrails were roasted over the flame (*ḫappinit zanu-*), chopped, and served to the recipient on bread, as a kind of open-faced sandwich. The remainder of the carcass was dismembered, cooked as a stew, and shared by the humans present. The skin or hide of the victim could fall to the offerant, the officiant, or the butcher.

Certain rites attributed particular importance to the victim’s blood (Haas 1993; Beckman forthcoming). In these instances the throat of the animal was slit in the presence of the deity and the stream of blood

directed from the neck arteries (*auli-*; Kühne 1986); upward (*šarā hūek-*) or downward (*katta hūek-*) toward the divine statue or symbol, or into a bowl or a pit. If purification was the purpose of the ceremony, the person or object to be cleansed might be smeared with the blood.

The later Hurro-Luwian burnt offerings were holocausts, with little or nothing remaining for the human participants. The victims – most often birds but sometimes also a sheep or goat – were incinerated in a portable brazier, optionally accompanied by condiments such as bread crumbs, honey, fruit, flour, salt, etc. (Haas 1994, 558–565).

A practice peculiar to the Hittites was “god-drinking,” which was performed only by the king or by the royal couple, often for a long series of divinities in succession (see Libation* A. II. § 1, p. 5). This act is expressed by the syntagma DN/DINGIR^{lam} *eku-*. Grammatically, the divinity is the direct object here, and some scholars (Kammenhuber 1971; Güterbock 1998) believe that we must take this construction literally as denoting some sort of mystical partaking of the essence of the god or goddess by the royal person(s). Others (Puhvel 1957; Melchert 1981) interpret this as a shorthand expression for “drinking to the honor of” or “toasting” a deity. The matter remains uncertain.

§ 11. Vocabulary. General terms in Hittite for sacrifice are simple *pai-*, “to give” (CHD P, 46), and BAL = *šipant-*, literally “to libate” a liquid, which has acquired the extended meaning “to dedicate, devote” an offering of any sort, including animals (Goetze 1970). Baked goods were customarily “crumbled” (*paršnai-*), flour “strewn” (*išhūwai-*, *šuhḫa-*), and liquids “poured out” (*lahūwai-*). For the special usage of *eku-* “to drink (a god)” and technical terms of butchery, see § 10.

The Hieroglyphic Luwian verb for “sacrifice” is ^{LIBARE}*sarli-*, *sasarla-* (Hawkins 2000, 629).

§ 12. Substitute or “scapegoat” rituals (Janowski/Wilhelm 1993, 109–169) do not

belong in the category of offerings as conceived here, because their purpose was not the bestowal of a gift on a deity, but rather the disposal of impurity, sin, blood-guilt, or other unwanted quality. This goal was accomplished through the transferal of the moral or literal pollution from the patient onto a living carrier, who was then either driven off into the wilderness or killed. In the latter instance the victim, along with the associated evil, was indeed definitively removed from the human realm, but this practice is really a magical one. The few attestations of “human sacrifice” (Menschenopfer*; Kümmel 1967, 150–168) in Hittite texts are to be interpreted in this manner.

S. Alp 1983: Zum Wesen der kultischen Reinigungssubstanz *tuhḫueššar* und die Verbalform *tuhša*, Or. 52, 14–19. – A. Archi 1979: Das Kultmahl bei den Hethitern. TTKY VI/8, 197–213.

G. Beckman 1983: Hittite Birth Rituals (= StBoT 29); id. forthcoming: Blood in Hittite Ritual, in: Gs. E. Neu (= Hethitica). – D. Beyer 2001: Emar VI. Les sceaux. – N. van Brock 1959: Substitution rituelle, RHA 65, 117–146.

O. Carruba 1966: Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišurianza (= StBoT 2); id. 1967: Rhyta in hethitischen Texten, Kadmos 6, 88–97. – B. J. Collins 1990: The Puppy in Hittite Ritual, JCS 42, 211–226; ead. 1995a: Greek ὄλοζω and Hittite *pahwai-*: Exultation in the Ritual Slaughter of Animals, Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 26, 319–325; ead. 1995b: Ritual Meals in the Hittite Cult, in: (ed.) P. Mirecki/M. Meyer, Ancient Magic and Ritual Power, 77–92; ead. 2002: Animals in the Religions of Ancient Anatolia, in: (ed.) B. J. Collins, A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East (= HdOr. I vol. 64) 309–334.

G. Frantz-Szabó 1995: Hittite Witchcraft, Magic, and Divination, CANE III 2007–2019. – A. Goetze 1957: Kleinasien², 161–167; id. 1970: Hittite *šipant-*, JCS 23, 77–94. – H. Gonet 1992: Les espaces hittites du sacrifice, leur aménagement et leur utilisation, in: (ed.) H. Otten et al., Fs. S. Alp, 199–212. – O. R. Gurney 1977: Some Aspects of Hittite Religion, 28–34. – H. G. Güterbock 1960: An Outline of the Hittite AN.TAḫ.ŠUM Festival, JNES 19, 80–89; id. 1970: Some Aspects of Hittite Festivals, CRRA 17, 175–180; id. 1998: To Drink a God, CRRA 34, 121–129.

V. Haas 1993: Ein hurritischer Blutritus und die Deponierung der Ritualrückstände nach hethitischen Quellen, in: (ed.) B. Janowski et al., Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Klein-

asien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament (= OBO 129) 67–85; id. 1994: Geschichte der hethitischen Religion, 640–673. – V. Haas/L. Jakob-Rost 1984: Das Festritual des Gottes Telipinu in Ḫanḫana und in Kašḫa, Aof 11, 10–91, 204–236. – V. Haas/G. Wilhelm 1974: Hurritische und luwische Riten aus Kizzuwatna. – J. D. Hawkins 2000: Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. – H. A. Hoffner 1967: Second Millenium Antecedents to the Hebrew 'QB, JBL 86, 385–401; id. 1974: Alimenta Hethaeorum. – Th. van den Hout 1994: Death as a Privilege. The Hittite Royal Funerary Ritual, in: (ed.) J. M. Bremer, Hidden Futures, 37–75. – M. Hutter 1993: Kultstelen und Baityloi. Die Ausstrahlung eines syrischen religiösen Phänomens nach Kleinasien und Israel, in: (ed.) B. Janowski et al., OBO 129, 87–108.

B. Janowski/G. Wilhelm 1993: Der Bock, der die Sünden hinausträgt, in: (ed.) B. Janowski et al., OBO 129, 109–169.

A. Kammenhuber 1971: Heth. *ḫaššuš 2-ekuzi*, "der König trinkt zwei," SMEA 14, 143–159. – S. Košak 1976: The Hittite *nuntarrijas-ḫas*-Festival (CTH 626), Linguistica 16, 55–64. – C. Kühne 1986: Hethitisch *auli*- und einige Aspekte altanatolischer Opferpraxis, ZA 76, 85–117; id. 1993: Zum Vor-Opfer im alten Anatolien, in: (ed.) B. Janowski et al., OBO 129, 225–283. – H. M. Kümmel 1967: Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König (= StBoT 3).

R. Lebrun 1993: Aspects particuliers du sacrifice dans le monde hittite, in: (ed.) J. Quaegebeur, Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East, 225–233. – A. Lombardi 2000: Il culto delle montagne all'epoca di Tudḫaliya IV: continuità e innovazione, CRRA 44, pt. 3, 83–88.

G. McMahon 1995: Theology, Priests, and Worship in Hittite Anatolia, CANE III 1981–1995. – H. C. Melchert 1981 "God-Drinking": A Syntactic Transformation in Hittite, Journal of Indo-European Studies 9, 245–254.

H. Otten 1951: Die hethitischen "Königslisten" und die altorientalische Chronologie, MDOG 83, 47–71; id. 1958: Hethitische Totenrituale. – J. Puhvel 1957: On an Alleged Eucharistic Expression in Hittite Rituals, MIO 5, 31–33.

J. de Roos 1984: Hethitische Geloften: Een teksteditie van Hethitische geloften met inleiding, vertaling en critische noten. – B. Rosenkranz 1974: Kultisches Trinken und Essen bei den Hethitern, in: (ed.) K. Bittel et al., Fs. H. G. Güterbock, 283–289. – L. Rost 1961: Zu den hethitischen Bildbeschreibungen (I. Teil), MIO 8, 161–217; ead. 1963: Zu den hethitischen Bildbeschreibungen (II. Teil), MIO 9, 175–239.

I. Singer 1983–1984: The Hittite KILAM Festival (= StBoT 28–29). – F. Starke 1979: Ḫalmašuit im Anitta-Text und die hethitische Ideologie vom Königtum, ZA 69, 47–120. – A. Süel 1985:

Hitit kaynaklarında tapınak görevlileri ile ilgili bir direktif metni.

A. Ünal 1985: Beiträge zum Fleischverbrauch in der hethitischen Küche, Or. 54, 419–438; id. 1994: Zur Beschaffenheit des hethitischen Opferfisches aus philologischer und archäologischer Sicht, in: (ed.) P. Calmeyer et al., Fs. B. Hrouda, 283–291. – N. Willemaers 1973: Contribution iconographique à l'histoire du rituel hittite, Revue d'archéologie et histoire d'art de Louvain 6, 7–18; id. 1977: Contribution iconographique à l'histoire du rituel hittite, II – Confrontation avec les textes, Hethitica 2, 53–78. – D. Wright 1986: The Gesture of Hand Placement in the Hebrew Bible and in Hittite Literature, JAOS 106, 433–446.

D. Yoshida 1999: Zur Kultmusik beim "Trankopfer" (Gott NN *eku*- "trinken") in Festen hattisch-hethitischer Kultschicht, in: (ed.) K. Watanabe, Priests and Officials in the Ancient Near East, 329–352. – S. Zeifelder 2000: Heth. *tuhḫuessar* und der Thymian, in: 125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz, 498–508.

G. Beckman

Opfer. B. II. In der Bildkunst. Anatolien.

§ 1. Neolithikum bis Frühe Bronzezeit. – § 2. *Kärum*-Zeit. – § 3. Althethitische Zeit bis Ende des II. Jts. – § 4. Großreichszeit.

§ 1. Neolithikum bis Frühe Bronzezeit. O.handlungen sind in den prähistorischen Kulturen Anatoliens sicher ein wesentlicher Bestandteil der Religion gewesen. Jedoch ist der zweifelsfreie archäologische Nachweis einer kultischen Funktion bestimmter Installationen in der Regel sehr schwierig. Man wird bis in das III. Jt. v. Chr. in den Regionen Anatoliens nördlich des Taurus eher von einer Kombination profaner Arbeiten und sakraler Tätigkeiten (auch Opfer) in Kulthäusern (Kulthaus* § 1–4) als in monofunktionalen Tempeln* sprechen können. Die religiösen Vorstellungen und die damit verbundenen O. sind in diesen Kontexten archäologisch kaum zu erschließen. O.handlungen werden erst mit der Entstehung institutionalisierter Religionsformen in der Bildkunst sicher greifbar. Im späten III. und frühen II. Jt. v. Chr. können parallel zur Entstehung urbaner Strukturen erstmals ausschließlich sakral genutzte Bauten, z. B. die Tempel in Kültepe (Kaniš* *Kärum*. B. § 4), nachgewiesen werden.