The following article has to be conceived as one of my responses to a long standing and enigmatic question-mark which I have been carrying incessantly in mind since my first acquaintance with cuneiform writing and archaeology: Are there interactive implications between archaeological record and textual context in Hittite Anatolia at all? One might promptly and spontaneously expect that as a principle there must have been close relations between both sorts of data, since, first of all, they are mental and material products of the same people. Why are, then, the results gained from comparisons of archaeological and philological material disappointingly feeble considering that Hittitology is in a very lucky position in being supplied abundantly by both sorts of material? The temporary results gained from the comparative studies by other scholars as well as by myself were often disappointingly meagre. This is one of the reasons why I have frequently pointed out in a pessimistic way inconsistencies between archaeological objects and information supplied by the written sources in Hittite culture.3

In a recent study on Hittite construction ritual and architecture I had opportunity to deal with the textual evidence for games, sports, athletics and agonistic fights as they are attested occasionally in the Hittite cultic practices. As we know well, these games, originally taken from the native folklore, make up an important part of entertainments in the course of festivals which aim at

---

appeasing the deities, amusing them and the participating dignitaries as well. By means of information gathered from the written sources I was hoping to elucidate some archaeological monuments, especially the depiction of what is known as the “sword swallowing jester” (Gauklerszenen) on the Alaca Höyük orthostats, which although known for more than a century still remain a puzzle. At that time, however, the results were disappointing because the texts attesting acrobats swallowing a dagger as a spectacle were still unpublished (see below). Therefore I was able only to refer to a passage from a text which, frankly, I did not believe could be related to this pictorial depiction. Today we can disregard the sentence in this text for our purposes, since it refers to a special phrase or saying, namely to a cultic act associated with swearing an oath. The knives would be functioning as a threat, reminding the swearer what would happen if he breached the oath. Besides this we have now more coherent textual material pertaining to the subject matter. In that study I could not even decide precisely what the proper duty of the “dagger man” (LUGIR) in the rituals was, i.e. whether he was dealing with daggers, swords or knives, whether he was doing something with them or in charge of producing them.

I am glad to have found finally the pertinent textual passages and the important clue which provide us with one of the very exceptional cases where texts and archaeological data relate to each other and illuminate one another. In these texts we certainly do not have a minute textual description, including every detail of the cultic and acrobatic scenes on the orthostats. We have never such a coincidence in the Hittite culture. In general we must state that the texts refer merely to some strips of the scenes; they never give a full account of the entire representations. The observation is critical because it explains why too many efforts looking for the textual references which would illustrate them as a whole had to fail from the beginning; examples are the depiction of deities in Yazılıkaya, illustrations on the Bitik and Inandık vases, the silver rhyton from the Schimmel collection and the recently published bowl from Kastamonu region.

The fragmentary texts published recently belong to an extensive assemblage of festivals celebrated in honour of the Hattic deity Tetešhapi consisting of at least 40 tablets, most of them unfortunately fragmentary. This festival

---


4 KUB 54.1 obv. ii 24: nu-wa-mu-kán EN-YA ANA 2 GIR pask[i], “My lord has stood/planted me in front of two knives/daggers.” See the translation by Archi and Klengel, AOF XII (1985), 59.

5 H. Th. Bossert was also right in his estimation that the depictions on the orthostats of Alaca Höyük would eventually be explained by the ritual texts, Altanatolien (1942) 51.


(a) General view of the four excavated terraces with from above to below the remains of a Roman "house", the Neon Library, the late Hellenistic fountain building and the peristyle (?) building.

(b) Area to the west of the fountain house with in front the upper part of the drain and at the back two water supply systems (third to sixth centuries A.D.).

(c) Hydraulic installations west of the fountain house, with left the third century A.D. drain and right a third and sixth century A.D. terracotta pipe.
(a) View of the stuccoed back wall of the peristyle (?) building in front of the fountain house. Left and right later wall divisions.

(b) Terracotta head found in the fill of the peristyle building.

(c) Back wall of the Neon Library. In the background the polygonal wall (A), the foundations (B) and the upper wall sections (C) of the Roman "house", the Roman drain cut through for the construction of the library (D), and the late fourth century A.D. drain (E).
(a) Fragment of a stucco moulding for a niche of the early third century A.D. remodelling of the library.

(b) Polygonal wall behind the Neon Library.

(c) Bronze statuette of Aphrodite Pudens found in the Roman "house" behind the library (first-second century A.D.)
(a) Remains of the late fourth century A.D. drain arranged in the fill behind the Neon Library.

(b) View from the north of the room to the west of the Library with left the remains of the stepped alley covering various water systems.

(c) Terracotta pipes (left) and runnel covering a third pipeline (right) below the stepped alley arranged in the room to the west of the library (third quarter of the fourth century A.D.).
(a) Large storage vessel from the room east of the Neon Library (early fifth century A.D.).

(b) Temporary arrangement of the upper gallery from the east façade of the bouleuterion (late second century B.C.).

(c) View from the north of the Upper Agora after the rearrangement of the pavement slabs and the re-erection of some honorific monuments.
(a) Capital of the honorific column supporting the statue of Krateros (Augustan period).

(b) Canopy roof of an early Imperial honorific monument along the southern edge of the Upper Agora.

(c) Late Roman stairway along the western edge of the Upper Agora.
(a) View from the north of the eastern part of the chapel of St. Michael(?).

(b) Architrave-frieze block of the late Antonine "portico" along the northern edge of the Upper Agora.

(c) Dynastic monument honouring the emperors Valentinianus II (left pedestal) and Gratianus (right pedestal), as well as the empress Eudoxia (central elevated base).
(a) View from the west of part of the Lower Agora with the Roman baths in the background. Two doors (one blocked) of the late Roman shops are visible.

(b) View of an early Byzantine drain(?) covering the late Roman shops of the Lower Agora.

(c) View of one of the excavated late Roman shops along the eastern edge of the Lower Agora. In the sondage pit remains of the first century A.D. shops.
Yılanlı kalesi: site from north looking over the valley of the Küçük Menderes with the town of Kiraz visible in the plain below.
(a) Yilanı kalesi: large stones of phase I wall, and phase II inner wall from west.

(b) Yilanı kalesi: phase II inner wall, bastion.
(a) Yılanlı kalesi: phase II inner wall, north-west face.

(b) Yılanlı kalesi: wall-walk in section to the north of west gate.
(a) Yilanli kalesi: south-east face of bastion to east of south gate.

(b) Yilanli kalesi: section of phase II wall south of west gate.
Yilanli kalesi: north tower of phase II circuit, west face.
(a) Yilanh kalesi: drainage channel in phase II wall.

(b) Yilanh kalesi: west bastion of phase III additions, abutting bedrock and phase II circuit wall.
(a) Alaca Höyük. General view.

(b) The orthostats.

(c) The "Jester Scene".
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has many peculiarities which diverge a great deal from other sorts of festival practices.8 The unusual traits in these festivals are certainly due to the unique nature of the deity they are celebrated for, i.e. Tetešapi, a name which can be parsed as a Hattic composite noun with the meaning of “great deity”, i.e. tet(t)i = Hitt. šallī- “great”, asḫapi = Hitt. šimmī- “god”, thus comparable with DGAL.9 The sex of the deity is so far not clearly indicated in the available textual material. Daddi observes correctly that the NIN.DINGIR, i.e. a priestess meaning “sister of deity”10 plays a leading rôle in this festival and even, at times, represents the incarnation of Tetešapi and recites as her proxy on one occasion.11 From this Daddi concludes that Tetešapi could be a female deity.12 This observation is certainly very critical and will aid us below in identifying the deity’s pictorial representation on the Alaca Höyük orthostats.

As stated, the cult of Tetešapi has a lot of unique aspects. First of all some of the cultic persons acting in it are either attested only in these texts or they perform quite unusual actions unknown from other festival texts. These cultic personnel consist of 1) ALAN.ZU, 2) GISBANŠUR, 3) DUMU.É.GAL, 4) DUMU.SAL, 5) GIR, 6) GUDU, 7) ḫapi-, 8) ḫartaggas-, 9) SAPAR.KID, 10) GIS.KUN, 11) LUGAL, 12) MAŠDĀ, 13) meneyya-, 14) MUHALDIM, 15) NAR, 16) NIN.DINGIR, 17) GIVI, 18) PAR, 19) LUGAL, 20) LUGAL, 21) LUGAL, 22) SANGA, 23) SIH.SU.DO., 24) SIR, 25) SŪ.TAM, 26) ḫeral-, 27) ḫwanzama- (SAL.AMA.DINGIR), 28) ḫlayaya-(?), 29) tanpi [...], 30) ḫlukanti-13, 31) ūšur[pušuratalli]-, 32) ūšur[pušuratalli]-, 33) GAR.ER.CAL, 34) UBAR., 35) lamb, 36) hankuriya- and piglet.15 The festival reveals also some clues which connect it with the Hattic purulli-festival and the Anatolian myth of Illuyanka.18 Since dance, music, games and acrobatics belong to the main structure of this festival in honour of Tetešapi19 I used to call Tetešapi in my pre-

8 Daddi, op. cit. p. 362 f.
11 KBo 21.90 lines 51–4.
12 Daddi, op. cit. p. 363.
13 With its various writings.
14 KBo 32.114 obv. 14.
15 For the NIN.DINGIR’s occurrences in Hattic milieu see L. E. Amantea, op. cit. p. 125 f.
16 Daddi, op. cit. 366, 367.
17 parāša-, ṣaša-, SILA, UR.BAR.RA, ḫankuriya-, ŠAH.TUR, KBo 21.103 + KUB 32.82 rev. ! 27 f. with dupl. KBo 21.90 obv. 51 f.; Bo 6594 iii 4.
18 Daddi, op. cit. p. 368.
19 Music seems not to have been limited to Hattic rituals though: the (ḫ)jišuwa-ritual from Hurrian milieu also contains music as well as some military games, KBo 15.52 v 1 ff., CTH 628, but its purpose here is quite different, and its usage is not as extensive as in the festivals of Hattic origin.
vious studies a *deus jocundii* which, because of her possible feminine sex, must now be altered to *dea jocundi*.

Another peculiarity of the Teteşhani festival is its relatively early, i.e. Middle Hittite, date. It means that the festival goes back to a period when the Hattic traditions may have been much more prevalent and vivid in Hittitic culture. This early text chronology is very significant for the origin and proposed Middle Hittite or earlier date of the friezes on the Alaca Höyük orthostats, although P. Neve most recently proposed a later dating for them. In favour of an earlier date I wish to state here that the friezes on the orthostats render without exception Hittic cultic practices and it would be impossible to imagine that the Hittite kings of the 13th century B.C. would be interested in setting up a huge cultic city with a monumental city gate like Alaca Höyük which is pre-eminently dominated by Hattic elements only 20 miles away from the capital city of Ḫattuša. As is well known, 13th-century cults and cult places are exclusively dominated by Hurrian influences; during this period there were no more defenders of Hattic culture among the ruling class and dynasty and Hattic elements were being replaced by Hurrian ones. It suffices to mention here the open-air sanctuary of Yazılıkaya with its Hurrian pantheon and the newly discovered archive with a great deal of Hurrian text material at Ortaköy which shows how far Hurrian influences intruded into every nook of northern Cappadocia. The texts discussed below will prove that the pictographic representations on the reliefs go back to Hattic origins. This is indeed commensurate with the archaeologically attestable history of the city of Alaca Höyük, whatever its ancient name may be. As we know, mostly through the royal tombs, Alaca Höyük was from the chalcolithic period on a genuine Hattic city. It is thus not surprising that, in spite of Hittite dominance, it could maintain its native Hattic identity during the Middle Hittite and Hittite Empire periods. It goes without saying that I cannot follow the current trend among scholars who on account of a few feeble stylistic elements and some historical speculations would identify the third millennium owners of the royal tombs at Alaca Höyük as the Indo-Europeans and forerunners of the Hittites. Admittedly, some cultural connections between the culture of Central Anatolia and the Caucasian Kurgan culture may have existed, but these connections existed independently of the Indo-Europeans. Cross references between the friezes and the texts are

---


21 Daddi, op. cit p. 364.


24 Arinna, Tawiniya, Zippalanda etc. have been so far proposed, see below.


given very clearly. Therefore we must scrutinize the pertinent archaeological and philological material once more under this new aspect.

We must start our comparison by analyzing the details of these pictorial scenes on the Alaca Höyük orthostats [Pl. XLVII (a)], as far as we can visually interpret their contents, and try to figure out what exactly the ancient artist(s) intended to express through them. We know that “the reliefs represent the illustration of rituals in continuous narrative strips, superposed in succession of events”27 (though they are not of course strictly continuous). Among these strips we can with some certainty recognize the following components [Pl. XLVII (b)]: Stormgod represented by his attribute animal bull, the king, a woman,28 asitting goddess, worshippers, two men facing each other and holding a stick or standard between them, a dwarfish nude man facing a robed priest carrying a ceremonial axe or looped staff, attendants or cult personnel carrying sacrificial animals such as a goat and rams, a “guitar” or “lute” player, a man carrying a monkey(?) or a dog, hunters of deer, wild boar and lion, two dwarfish men wearing short skirts secured with sashes which fall down in the middle like tassels,29 one of them mounting a ladder while the second one stands in front of the ladder just getting ready to undertake something. Probably he is just getting prepared to follow his companion up the ladder to the roof (see immediately below). At the deteriorated upper end of the ladder there must originally have been visible the edge of the roof of an edifice on which the ladder leaned. It is hard to assume that the ladder was unsupported, as maintained by Eduard Meyer30 and H. Frankfort;31 this is impossible, because an unsupported ladder at this angle would simply fall over.32 The second person is typically Hittite in his physiognomy while the other one climbing the ladder is depicted intentionally sturdy and dwarfish; his head is shaven and has a single tress,33 has a bulging nose and thus possesses nothing common with Hittite features. Ethnically he may be of Hattic origin although lilliputians, as he seems to be rendered here, can be found in any society.34

At the rear of these two dwarfish figures there is another man turned with his back against the first two men; he is depicted taller than the two. His physiognomy is again commonplace Hittite with his flat cap, a pigtail hanging at his back, a short loin-cloth and upturned shoes. In his raised hands he is holding a dagger or sword, not a trumpet or wind instrument (as formerly supposed, see below), its pointed end stuck partly in his mouth [Pl. XLVII (c)]. The inverted crescentic pommel is very Hittite and can be found very frequently on almost every sword depicted in rock monuments and other representations.35 This type

28 Interpreted up to now as the queen.
29 The Hittite or, say better, the Sumerian name of this sash seems to be UGE.IB. KUN “Quastenschleifen”, J. Siegelová, Hethitische Verwaltungspraxis im Lichte der Wirtschafts- und Inventardokumente 1 (1986) 220 f. note 4.
30 Reich und Kultur der Chethiter (1914) 79 “eine frei dastehende Leiter”.
32 Observation of Professor O. R. Gurney.
33 Professor Gurney points to parallels from Thera and Crete, citing Marinatos, AthMitt 1983, 2–3.
34 On the foreign character of these figures see A. Unal, “Hittite Architect and a Rope-Climbing Ritual,” Belleten 205 (1988) 1499.
35 Swords with crescent-shaped pommel from Boğazköy, Yazılıkaya, Gavurkale, Alaca Höyük etc.
of pommel has most probably to be reconstructed on the bronze swords which have turned up in recent years in Boğazköy and in the region of Kastamonu.

This portion of the scene including a ladder-mounting man and a dagger-swallowing acrobat has been interpreted by various scholars in different ways. The true recognition of the scene as “bateleurs”, i.e. “jesters” was already observed by Perrot and Chipiez and was repeated by Makridi Bey. It was van Lennep who first thought that the ladder-men were “masons laying stones, with musicians blowing a wind instrument”. Mrs. Canby repeats without further reference this view of the dagger-swallower. Garstang is the first scholar who has given a full account of the whole scene in great detail. He also thought that the dagger-swallowing man was a “trumpeter”, a view which is shared by Eduard Meyer. Garstang, like van Lennep, interpreted the two men in connection with the ladder as masons dressing the wall-face. His view is worth citing here fully, because it has been totally ignored in the literature as Prof. Gurney correctly points out: “It may be seen that the man upon the ladder is not holding the ladder in order to climb up higher. There is plain to careful scrutiny a small thin implement projecting below the clenched hand, which is just clear of the ladder near the top. The right hand is raised aloft and grasps a rounded implement (more clearly seen in another picture), in a natural attitude of striking a blow. He is working with a chisel and mason’s hammer. . . .” But how is one to explain the abrupt interruption of the pure ritual and acrobatic scene and its replacement by an architectural performance? One construction ritual gives a clue: a mason or carpenter (LUNAGAR) per-

...
forms a similar “extravaganza”, i.e. a rope-climbing act, after his completion of a roof-construction, which could be compared with this scene of the Alaca Höyük frieze. The ladder-climbing man would represent then a sort of “self-portrait” of the artist. However, we have to consider that these two men are represented dwarfishly, making it possible that they are performing here rather an acrobatic show than fulfilling a masonry work. The idea that they were jesters was adopted by H. Frankfort and followed without any comment by many scholars such as H. G. Güterbock, E. Akurgal, K. Bittel and J. M. Mellink. Although, confessedly, it is difficult to decide whether the two men are masons at work or acrobats, in view of the texts attesting a “ladder-man” and a “jester” mounting a ladder, but never a mason dressing a wall-face using a ladder, I like to follow H. Frankfort and interpret the group as part of a jester scene. It is also possible that the ladder-men were on their way to the roof to perform there some cultic act: the roof (Hitt. šuhha-) occurs many times in the Hittite corpus as a place of cultic activities.

To be able to identify this scene with any description in the Hittite texts we must first gather information from the texts and archaeological material. Fortunately the texts belonging to the cult of Tetešapi which I want to relate to this scene include most of the components we have seen above. They supply also the material setting such as zalwani-, buildings like an inner chamber (tunnakešna-, E.ŠA), temple of Tetešapi, courtyard (ḫila-), inn (tārzanana-), gate-house (ḫilammar), storage pit (ARAH), window (šutti), gate (šupalla KÁ.GAL), taršanzipa-, daggers (GİR), ašuša-, and most importantly a ladder (ilana-) and ladder-men (LU.MES.E.GIR.KUN.).

I will not treat here the texts belonging to the cult of Tetešapi and attesting the “dagger-man” without any further detail, since they are well known to the Hittitologists and will be edited by Mrs. F. Pecchioli-Daddi. Rather I like to deal with the recently published and therefore less known four fragments KUB 60.56, KBo 32.106, 114 and KBo 27.394 which, as mentioned, attest the “dagger-man” in his new rôle swallowing a dagger.

1. KUB 60.56 obv. i? (right middle part of left col.) (1) ------. MIEŠ x-x-x (2) ---]x-an-zi // (3) ---] LÜ.SANGA LÜ.MES.GUDU LÜ.MES.da-ha[-ya (4) --- LÜ.da-ha-ya-a-aš-za-da-pi-za-pie-da-an (5) ša-an-ab-zi GAL DU[MU.MES.E.GAL (G)[E]šata-al-wa-ni-in (6) [da-a-i na-a?] INA E.ŠA pi-e-da-i // (7) [mu LÜ URU.Ḫa]-ḫar-na GİR pa-aš-zi (8) ----. SAL.MES.KAR.KID [U]RUDU.a-šu-šu-uš GUŞKIN (9) [da-(a)-an-zi

---

49 E. Akurgal, Die Kunst der Hethiter (1961) p. 85 and fig. 93.
50 K. Bittel, Die Hethiter (1976) 201 and fig. 218.
52 See above note 31.
54 The text parallels KUB 60.56; I am grateful to Dr. T. van den Hout for this kind information communicated in a letter; see now BiOr 51 (1994), 123.
55 Restoration is not sure; the majority of the texts attesting the “sweeping the ground” (daganzipuš šan-) by LÜ.MES.ȘU.I have the local particles -ašta or -šan.

The text is too fragmentary to be given in full translation. It is evident, however, that a fellow from the city of Harḫarna carries out here the rôle of a dagger swallower.58 Line 8 mentions also asusa-‘s made of gold as trinkets which should be identical with the earrings59 on the ears of the two jesters as well as the other figures.60 The verb at the end of the broken text “he/she comes [down]” which occurs in line 10, may be attributed to the jester’s descending from the ladder after finishing the performance. It is significant to find the “ladder-men” in line 9 who obviously occur here as acrobats climbing the ladder.


As in the preceding case the text is again too fragmentary to reconstruct the exact context. It attests, however, six bronze daggers (1. 3) which will be swallowed in the following by the dagger-man (1. 12). It seems that beforehand a person, specially in charge of a duty, distributes the daggers equally to the clown and dagger-eater, giving three daggers to each of them. The dagger-eater takes them (line 11), after doing something obscure with them, he “swallows them again” (line 12). Besides the regular daggers (GIR) there exists a special sort of knife or sword (1. 7)61 which will apparently be stuck in the ground.62


This text again attests six daggers which will be swallowed in the course of the festival.

56 Gurney proposes to restore [LUMES] šal-li-rí!-eš! GIS KUN, 6 zī-d[a?] comparing StBoT 28.37.IV 6–9; for this reading see, however, below KBo 27.39 right col. 13 (text 4).
57 For this restoration cf. KBo 4.9 i 42–4. In view of the parallel passage KBo 27.39 right col. 13 f. (below, text 4) Gurney suggests restoring pa-a-a-n-zí instead of tar-ú-is-kán-zí.
58 See the duplicate text KBo 27.39 r. col. 11.
59 Although it is questionable whether ašuša- really means “earring” or not, cf. HW s. v. ašuša-.
60 Akurgal, Kunst der Hethiter fig. 93.
61 Called kınḫu-, KBo 18.173 ii 10; KBo 18.178 obv. 5; KUB 42.11 ii 10; KUB 42.58 line 5; cf. kínḫu-imma- KUB 35.143 ii 4.
62 Besides la-ga-a-ri, ša-li-ga-a-ri, du-ug-ga-a-ri and wa-ag-ga-a-ri iškar- is the only possible reading in the broken line 8.

5. *KBo* 22. 194 left col. 9–10 demonstrates that besides the ladder-man (LUGEŠ KUN) the clown (ALAN.ZUŋ) also climbs a ladder and enters somewhere.65

The Teteshapi ritual *KBo* 19.163 i 24 shows clearly that the acrobatic games have probably taken place in the courtyard (hila-); indeed on the orthostat the structure against which the ladder is laid looks like the roof of a building. This can be a perspective view from the inside of the courtyard. The ladder-climbing acrobats on the orthostats are thus possibly to be identified with ALAN.ZUŋ. From an exhaustive study on Mesopotamian ALAN.ZUŋ, by Römer68 we see that the Akkadian word for “jesters”69 is probably of Anatolian origin.70 He disguises himself like a woman or a king, thus holding kings as well as religious persons up to public ridicule; he is “Imitator” and “Persiflator”, i.e. satirizer. He deals with tamed bears, billy goats and appears as tightrope-walker (Seiltänzer) and glutton (Vielfrass); he sits on chamber pots and lets off farts. He pretends to eat unimaginable foods. The scope of his activities is very wide.

In the absence of *KBo* 27.39; *KBo* 32.114, 106 and *KUB* 60.56 attesting LUGEŠ and the man of Ḥarḥarna as dagger swallowers Daddi assumed that the LUGEŠ was in charge of slaughtering and peeling off the skins of sacrificial animals. He may have had such a butchering function; however, his main occupation must have been to act as jester, which is also supported by the Alaca Höyük reliefs. As I have already stated in a previous study, swallowing of a metallic (bronze ZABAR) dagger would—even in an acrobatic sense—be improbable. The literal meaning of paš- can therefore be deduced here as “to stick (the point of the dagger) into one’s mouth”; the acrobat can play with it freely however he wishes, i.e. he can fling it away, bite or hold it between his teeth (Pl. XLVII (c)). We may also have here a scene which I compared with bucolic games in modern Turkey, the thrusting, hurling or flinging of knife or dagger using the teeth.71 The fact that in *KBo* 32.106 rev.? (above, text no. 2) the dagger-swallowing persons are each given three daggers would support the

---

63 Reading suggested by Gurney.
64 Reading suggested by Gurney.
67 LUGEŠ ALAN.ZUŋ GIST-la-aš (10) [...] ti-i-e-zi.
69 aluzinnu, sum. u-da-tus, a-tar-du.
70 Römer, op. cit. p. 46.
flinging theory, which means that the daggers would have been hurled in quick succession one after another using the teeth. Another possibility is to compare it with thrusting a dagger by means of the teeth in some Caucasian folk dances (“hançer atma”). Actually it is stated that the daggers are “pointed” (alpuemar), which may refer to the fact that the jesters are dealing with real knives. The artist may, in fact, have intended to conceal the acrobat from the precise view of the spectators by depicting the dagger-“swallowing” jester from the rear, in contrast to other figures in the same row of the relief. This effort of the stone cutter to render an exact panorama of the ritual events would explain also the sudden interruption of the scene by figures facing in opposite directions.

We have in the texts another sort of game in connection with daggers in a text which CHD 3/3 (1986) 352 translates “The acrobats turn toward the (or on a) sword”; but the exact meaning is obscure.

Alaca Höyük certainly constituted the main cultic centre of the Hattic goddess Teteshapi. It is unfortunate that the name of this city is not mentioned in these ritual texts. If we knew this name, it could be, on account of the congruence between archaeology and philology, straightforwardly identified with Alaca Höyük. Against an identification of Alaca Höyük with Arinna we must say that in the festivals in honour of the Sungoddess of Arinna similar festive scenes with music, dance and acrobatics, as we see them in the Teteshapi rituals, are absolutely lacking. For the same reasons the identification of Alaca Höyük with the important Hattic-Hittite cult centre of Zippalanda proposed by M. Popko is also unfortunately not decisive. The occurrence of Tawiniya during a cultic journey of Teteshapi is ambiguous.

Finally we must try to identify some of the figures with their names as they are attested in the texts. It is worth noting that the reliefs do not render the events in cinematical form in the course of the festival, they rather reflect only some clips from the cultic scenes. This is also true in every case of pictorial, narrative representations such as İnandik and Bitik vases, seals, rhyta and vessels. On the Alaca Höyük orthostats it seems that the cult of Teteshapi is embedded in the cult of the Stormgod with his Hattic name Tarhu or Taru who is represented as a bull standing at the top of an altar at the left side of the city gate. The festival texts for Teteshapi attest indeed that many deities were involved and incorporated into the festival, such as the Sungoddess, Sungoddess of Arinna, Mezulla, Stormgod of Zippalanda, Katahha, Inar (LAMMA), H/Kapantaliya, Tundurmiša, UD.SIG,, Telipinu, W/Purunkatte and Huwariyanzipa.

At the right hand of the sphinx gate there is a sitting goddess who has been considered up to now as the Sungoddess of Arinna because of her prox-
imity to the Stormgod, her divine spouse. Here at the sphinx gate of Alaca Höyük the general layout and composition have close affinities with the concept of Yazilikaya’s focal scene, i.e. at the left side Tešub and at the right side Ḥepat. It seems to me that the sitting goddess in her long gown can also be identified with Tetešapī. However, she is not the only goddess in this complex. There is inside the city gate, at the left hand door-jamb still another severely damaged female figure standing on a double headed eagle who also might be identified with Tetešapī, if one wanted to insist on seeing the Sun-goddess of Arinna in the person of the sitting goddess. In general we must remark that many sculptured slabs are lost or they are not yet arranged properly. This means that many strips are still lacking. The three men walking toward the sitting goddess all carry long spears, daggers at their belts and probably bags; these men can be certainly identified with meneya’s, “hunters” of the texts. Here they are going to offer the goddess some sacrificial parts of their game which they carry in their hunting bags; at least on the body of the central figure an animal head seems to me distinguishable. The men shooting at deer, wild boar and lion with arrows or spear can be again identified with the hunters.

It is striking that there are no women attendants among the figures whom we could identify with the NIN.DINGIR, the chief person acting very frequently in the Tetešapī rituals. She can hardly be equated with the female figure immediately behind the king who has been taken up to date as the queen, because she appears here as elsewhere in the queen’s typical garb as an inseparable companion of the Hittite king. The sceptre-men could possibly be identified with the two men each grasping with one hand a vertical pole between them (above, p. 211). I have already mentioned that the LU ḫUN, and the ALAN.ZU, can be identified with the ladder-climbing acrobat(s). The GİR is very clearly visible in his pretense of swallowing or eating a dagger. The man of the city of Ḫarḫarna, as we have seen above, represents another example of a dagger swallow. The priests playing a central role in the Tetešapī rituals as well as in any of the festival texts can be recognized in the three men striding in behind the sacrificial animals, or in the long-robed person carrying a looped

---

76 For example K. Bittel, Die Hethiter (1976) 201.
77 Cf. Mellink, Fs Güterbock p. 205.
78 Bittel, op. cit. fig. 209, 216.
79 On account of its bad preservation this figure has so far been observed and noted only by very few scholars such as Makridi Bey and J. Garstang. In a recent study “A Great Queen on the sphinx piers at Alaca Höyük” (AS XXXIX, 151 ff.) R. L. Alexander claims that it represents a Hittite Great Queen, while the better-preserved male figure on the inner face of the eastern sphinx pier opposite (E. Akurgal, Kunst der Hethiter (1961) fig. 88; Bittel, op. cit. fig. 210) is interpreted by him as the King.
82 H. Frankfort, Art and Architecture fig. 55; Akurgal, op. cit. fig. 97; Bittel, op. cit. figs. 224–6.
83 Bittel, op. cit. fig. 214.
84 Bittel, op. cit. fig. 220.
85 Akurgal, op. cit. fig. 93; Bittel, op. cit. fig. 218.
86 Bittel, op. cit. fig. 212.
staff,87 or in the two other men dressed in typical priestly garb and carrying some sort of staves, one of which is similarly looped, but which Bittel calls “lances”.88 Since lances as weaponry would not be fitting for the priests we would better assume them to be some cultic implements.

87 Bittel, op. cit. fig. 220 right side.
88 Bittel, op. cit. fig. 222.