

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

“WORD OF THE OLD WOMAN”: STUDIES IN FEMALE RITUAL PRACTICE IN HITTITE
ANATOLIA

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF NEAR EASTERN LANGUAGES AND CIVILIZATIONS

BY
HANNAH MARCUSON

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JUNE 2016

Copyright © 2016 Hannah Marcuson
All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures	v
List of Tables	vi
Acknowledgments	vii
Introduction	2
Chapter 1: Old Hittite and Festival Texts	40
1.1: Introduction	40
1.2: The Old Women and Hittite royal authority	41
1.3: The Old Woman and Hittite religio-cultural spheres	71
1.4: Festival Texts	83
1.5: Conclusion	95
Chapter 2: Oracle Texts	97
2.1: Introduction	97
2.2: Excursus: The snake-oracles	98
2.3: The KIN-oracle questions	100
2.4: The KIN-oracle method	107
2.5: KBo 18.151: An Old Hittite oracle	164
2.6: What makes a KIN-Oracle favorable or unfavorable	167
2.7: The KIN-oracles and the Old Women in Hittite religious context	170
2.8: Old Women as royal advisors	172
Chapter 3: Rituals and Incantations	176
3.1: Introduction	176

3.2: Ritual purpose	179
3.3: Ritual method	184
3.4: Conclusion	324
Chapter 4: Ritual Acts	328
4.1: Introduction	328
4.2: The problem of categorization	328
4.3: Evil as restraint: binding and burdening the patient	358
4.4: Evil as something inside the patient: taking items out of the patient's body	367
4.5: Evil as dirt: washing, wiping, and cleansing the patient's body	373
4.6: Evil as something separate from the body	377
4.7: Sorcerers	382
4.8: Disposal	385
4.9: Offerings	388
4.10: Conclusion	392
Conclusion	396
Appendix A: The KIN-Oracle Texts	421
Appendix B: Ritual Purpose	516
Appendix C: Catalogue of Ritual Texts	520
Bibliography	560

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: A map of Hittite Anatolia

1

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: The KIN-oracle symbols in order of frequency	116
Table 2.2: The symbolic relationships among the four most common symbols	129
Table 2.3: The favor/anger subsystem	159
Table B.1: Ritual purpose	517

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first and foremost like to thank Professors Theo van den Hout and Petra Goedegebuure, for their excellent instruction in Hittite, their guidance through the process of writing this dissertation, and their warm acceptance and support throughout my time at the University of Chicago. Their teaching and mentorship has been invaluable. I would also like to thank Professor Bruce Lincoln for generously agreeing to join my committee, and for his wisdom and expertise on ritual, which has greatly expanded and benefited my own perspectives.

Thanks are also due to Professor Chris Woods and the Oppenheim fund for providing funding for a portion of my candidacy. Thanks also to Tony Lauricella and the CAMEL lab for the map of Anatolia.

Most of all, I would like to thank the other graduate students in Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations at the University of Chicago. Their friendship and collegiality has been of immeasurable help to me during my time here.



Fig. 1: A map of Hittite Anatolia (Oriental Institute CAMEL Lab)

INTRODUCTION

Of the thousands of cuneiform documents left behind by the Hittite empire, religious texts are the majority. The Hittites recorded festival procedures, oracle inquiries, myths, prayers, vows, and rituals against sickness, sorcery, guilt, and other evils. Attested in most of these genres, and particularly in the oracles and the rituals, are the religious professionals known as the “Old Women” (written logographically in Hittite as ^{MUNUS.MEŠ}ŠU.GI). The broad attestation of the Old Women across so many genres has limited any easy definition of them in the Hittitological literature; not only are they diviners and ritual practitioners both, but they seem to have come from all over Anatolia, and addressed problems ranging from domestic quarrels to sorcerous attacks to military campaign paths to royal succession issues. They are attested as reciting incantations in five different languages, they had intimate access to the king and the royal family, and texts authored by them were copied over centuries, down to the Hittite empire’s collapse around 1200 BC.

Given the Old Women’s prominence and rich attestation, it is surprising that no study has yet been done on these powerful Hittite religious professionals. The only single work devoted to the Old Women is a sixteen-page article, “Nota sulla ^{sal}ŠU.GI ittita,”¹ which was published over thirty years ago and focuses on the logographic term ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI rather than on the function of the women who bore it. In the general literature, the Old Woman has also received very little attention. Taggar-Cohen, for example, explicitly excludes the Old Woman from her work on Hittite priests and priestesses,² and Trémouille limits herself to two sentences’ description in her

¹ B. Benedetti, *Mesopotamia* 15 (1980): 93–108. The determinative meaning “woman” has, over the course of time, been conventionally transliterated by scholars as SAL, MÍ, and (currently) MUNUS.

² *Hittite Priesthood*, THeth 26 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 2006), 5. For abbreviations used in this dissertation, see CHD vol. P, front matter.

article on Hittite ritual, characterizing her as more of a low-level wise woman than a royal functionary.³ Popko's *Religions of Asia Minor* refers to her as a "characteristic figure of Anatolian magic"⁴ and moves on, and Haas' far longer *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*⁵ has no definition of the "Beschwörerin": beyond a brief mention of their frequent appearance in the rituals on p. 888, the Old Women are mentioned only in passing during discussion of specific texts.

The discussion of specific texts is, in fact, where most of the scholarship on the Old Women has been located to date. A detailed history of scholarship can demonstrate the ways in which the nature of our discipline has influenced the study of the Old Women, and indeed the study of religious practice in general:

History of Scholarship

Hittitology has always been a very small and insular discipline, and scholarly focus has centered around philological concerns. Scholarship on the content of Hittite texts has progressed slowly, following attempts to refine our understanding of the language, and this is perhaps most apparent for religious texts. The history of scholarship on the Old Woman rituals clearly demonstrates this. The first translation of an Old Woman ritual was done by Hrozný in 1919, on one exemplar of Maštigga's ritual against domestic quarrel (CTH 404.1), four years after he deciphered Hittite.⁶ A short two-page introduction addressed Maštigga's identity, the possible context of the document's production, and the content of the ritual in the briefest of terms before proceeding to the text: his primary goal was to gain as full an understanding of the language as

³ "L'officiante del rito, di magia Bianca nel caso della nostra documentazione, ma presumibilmente anche di magia nera, è principalmente una donna, la 'Vecchia' (^{munus}ŠU.GI). Si tratta probabilmente non di una sacerdotessa in senso stretto, bensì di una persona che per età e esperienza era in grado di offrire rimedi empirici, anche di natura magica" ("I rituali magici ittiti," *RANT* 1 [2004]: 184).

⁴ Trans. I. Zych (Warsaw: Academic Publications Dialogue, 1995), 82.

⁵ HdO I:15 (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

⁶ *Hethitische Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi: In Umschrift, mit Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Boghazköi-Studien 3 (Leipzig, 1919), 60–89.

possible, as well as to provide the field with examples of the various Hittite text genres. The latter goal was also clearly espoused by J. Friedrich, who published a partial translation of CTH 398, Ḫuwarlu's ritual, in 1925, in a collection of translated Hittite texts with very minimal commentary.⁷

The next edition of an Old Woman ritual did not follow until 1938, when Goetze published *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi*,⁸ an edition of CTH 409.I, Tunnawi(ya)'s "Ritual of the River," that is still in use today. As Goetze himself notes in the introduction to this book, Hittite scholarship had until that point focused most of its attention on historical texts, which were easier to read, while religious texts had been mostly overlooked.⁹ Goetze provides extensive philological commentary, with occasional references to other (at that point unedited) ritual texts, once again maintaining the primary goal of understanding the words of the text as best as possible. At the end of the book (pp. 98–102) is a summary of the ritual actions. Some interpretive force is of course necessary to provide such a summary, but nowhere does Goetze explicitly attempt an analysis of the ritual method.

Goetze does briefly characterize the Old Women: "[ŠU.GI appears w]ith preceding SAL as the designation of a priestess who acts as the professional magician and seer. To equate this term with the Old Babylonian *šugītum* may seem attractive at first sight, but is impossible, nevertheless,"¹⁰ with an accompanying footnote: "Such priestesses seem to be organized into a guild...at the head of this guild is the GAL SAL.MEŠ ŠU.GI..."¹¹ This does not appear in an introduction or separate chapter, however, but under his commentary on line i 1 of the text,

⁷ *Aus dem hethitischen Schrifttum: Übersetzungen von Keilschrifttexten aus dem Archiv von Boghasköi, 2. heft: Religiöse Texte* (Leipzig, 1925), 13–16.

⁸ A. Goetze, in cooperation with E.H. Sturtevant, *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1938).

⁹ As Goetze notes in a footnote (*ibid.*, 1n2), less than ten ritual texts had at that point been translated, including CTH 409.I.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 30.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 30n20.

concerning the meaning of the logogram ŠU.GI, which appears in the incipit. Analyses of the ritual acts in the text also occasionally appear in the philological commentary; the most extensive example is on pp. 72–75, where Goetze discusses the function of substitute-figurines in Hittite ritual under his commentary on line i 49, in the process of defining the word *šena-* (figurine). This method of discussion, standard in cuneiform studies to this day, is most useful to any specialist reading carefully through the text. However, it subordinates any analysis of the content of a text to the analysis of the text's *words*, which results in some problems with both argumentative structure and accessibility. Any scholar interested in the text's ritual method must go through the commentary line by line. In addition, an effective analysis of ritual method requires examination of the text as a whole (see ch. 4 for more discussion of this point), and a philological commentary is not at all suitable for this. However, this method of publishing ritual texts was to persist exclusively for several decades, and still continues today.

Since Hittitology was at this point an overwhelmingly German discipline, the Second World War halted scholarship for the subsequent decade. The next advancement in the publication of Old Woman rituals came in 1950, with Pritchard's *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*.¹² In this volume, Goetze published translations of a small fragment of CTH 780.II, Allaituraḫḫi's ritual (KUB 17.27); portions of CTH 391, Ambazzi's ritual (KUB 27.67); and a new translation of Maštigga's ritual against domestic quarrel (CTH 404.1), with more exemplars than had been available to Hrozný in 1919. These were plain translations, with no commentary or discussion, intended purely as a reference. However, over the next twenty years, many more detailed editions began to appear: L. Rost published a new

¹² J. B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.

edition of CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual, in 1953 (with new joins provided by H. Otten);¹³ Otten published an edition of the royal funerary ritual in 1958;¹⁴ H. Kronasser published an edition of CTH 390, the rituals of Ayatarša, Wattiti, and Šušumanniga, in 1961,¹⁵ and an edition of CTH 398, the ritual of Huwarlu, in 1962¹⁶; B. Rosenkranz published an edition of CTH 433.1, a ritual for the tutelary deity of the hunting-bag on behalf of the augurs, in 1964¹⁷; and Otten and V. Souček published an edition of CTH 416, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple, in 1969¹⁸ (not, at that time, definitively recognized as an Old Woman ritual; see ch. 1). These editions maintained, almost exclusively, the philological standard of subsuming any attention to ritual practice under the line-by-line textual commentary. For example, Rost includes a discussion of the nature of the god ^dAndaliya,¹⁹ speculation about the role of the fish in ritual context,²⁰ and discussion of the "former kings" mentioned in the ritual and what that might mean for religious thought²¹ only in the philological commentary on their respective lines. She does include a section on the purpose and possible cultural context of the ritual at the very end of the article, but it is only two pages long. Kronasser's treatment of CTH 390 begins with a brief²² discussion of the function of ritual in Hittite society, with a focus on ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean context, while any analysis of the individual ritual acts (such as his comparison of Ayatarša's ritual with Ovid on pp. 145–46, or his comparison of magic and myth on p. 160) falls in the commentary on each individual section of the text. Kronasser's treatment of CTH 398 has no broad introduction and is almost entirely philological. Rosenkranz' treatment of CTH 433.1 is

¹³ "Ein hethitisches Ritual gegen Familienzweist," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 1 (1953): 345–79.

¹⁴ *Hethitische Totenrituale* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958).

¹⁵ "Fünf hethitische Rituale," *Die Sprache* 7 (1961): 156–62.

¹⁶ "Das hethitische Ritual KBo IV 2," *Die Sprache* 8 (1962): 89–107.

¹⁷ "Ein neues hethitisches Ritual für ^dLAMA ^{KUŠ}kuršaš," *Orientalia* 33 (1964): 236–56.

¹⁸ *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar*, StBoT 8 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1969).

¹⁹ "Ein hethitisches Ritual gegen Familienzweist," 371.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 372.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 376.

²² "Fünf hethitische Rituale," 140–41.

similar, with the exception of a brief paragraph addressing the function of speaking place-names in the ritual under his commentary on i 14f., the lines in which they appear.

Scholarly attention, therefore, was at this stage almost entirely captivated by linguistic issues, and any discussion of the texts' content was subordinated to the discussion of its language. This overall problem can be encapsulated by Otten's statement in the introduction to his 1958 edition of the funerary ritual,

Ferner soll sogleich hier darauf hingewiesen werden, daß weder der Schreiber noch auch wohl die philosophische Haltung seiner Zeit Klarheit in metaphysischen Fragen zu gewinnen suchte (Verhältnis von Leib und Seele, die Seele nach dem Tode, Fortexistenz des Toten u.a.), Fragen, die ja auch für eine spätere Zeit kaum widerspruchsfreie Antwort aus den Texten erhalten. Hier muß von einer Erörterung dieser Fragen Abstand genommen werden, da das Ziel der Arbeit in einer philologischen Darbietung des Materials liegt, zudem lexikalische Untersuchungen der Begriffe "Seele," "Toten(geist)" usw., gerade auch hinsichtlich ihrer Bedeutungsdifferenzierung gegenüber dem Akkadischen, von dem das Schriftbild (ZI, GIDIM) übernommen ist, noch ausstehen; doch siehe jeweils im Kommentar.²³

Otten and Souček, in 1969, did include a four-page discussion of elements of the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple, which included geographical and historical context, gods and personnel, and parallels with other texts (and thus was necessarily quite brief about each topic). The main focus of their work, however, is clear from the sections on the text's exemplars and fragments (pp. 3–15), transliteration and translation (pp. 16–41), script and palaeography (pp. 42–55), phonology (pp. 56–59), morphology (pp. 60–88), syntax (pp. 89–92), and semantics (pp. 93–102), leaving brief room for "Allgemeines zum Ritual" (pp. 103–107) before the indices (pp.

²³ *Hethitische Totenrituale*, 13.

108–34). All of the scholarship on the Old Woman texts thus far, therefore, had been exclusively or almost exclusively focused on philological goals: to understand the language used to write the ritual rather than the ritual itself. This scholarly approach is also made clear by another type of publication that occasionally analyzed ritual acts: lexical studies. For example, some commentary on ritual disposal had already been made at this point by Otten; however, the article was titled, “Beiträge zum hethitischen Lexikon,”²⁴ and his commentary on ritual burying was subordinated to a discussion of the Hittite verb *hariya*- “to bury.” Scholarship of this type is essentially invisible to any nonspecialist. This practice is still quite common today, making scholarship on Hittite ritual virtually impossible for anyone who is not a Hittitologist—and, just as importantly, continuing the subordination of the study of ritual to the study of words, with noticeable consequences for ritual interpretation (see further in ch. 4).

Some attempts at a more general characterization of Hittite religion, including ritual practice, had been made by this point: Goetze, in his general study on ancient Anatolia (published in 1933 and revised and updated in 1957)²⁵ included a short section on “Die Magie” (151–61), G. Furlani published *La Religione degli Hittiti* in 1936, M. Vieyra published articles on Hittite purification rituals²⁶ and Hittite sorcery²⁷ in 1939 and 1966 respectively, and H. Otten included a very brief section on ritual in his summary of Anatolian religion.²⁸ These works suffered from the opposite problem of the editions: faced with limited evidence and often also limited space in which to work, they were broad in scope and contained numerous inaccuracies and overgeneralizations. Goetze did arrive at some important insights into how Hittite magic

²⁴ *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 51 (1955): 124–29.

²⁵ *Kulturgeschichte Kleinasiens*, 2nd ed. (München, 1957).

²⁶ “Rites de purification hittites,” *RHR* 119 (1939): 121–53.

²⁷ “Le sorcier hittite,” in *Le monde du sorcier*, Sources orientales 7 (1966), 99–125.

²⁸ “Die Religionen des alten Kleinasien,” in *Religionsgeschichte des alten Orients I*, HbOr I:8:1 (Leiden: Brill, 1964), 112–13.

worked, but was limited by his evidence and also by his time period; for example, he accurately points out, “Bei vielen Zauberhandlungen ist das Objekt des Zaubers nicht selbst greifbar, sei es, daß es zu groß, sei es daß es überhaupt abwesend ist. In solchen Fällen kann für das Objekt sein Bild eintreten,”²⁹ but unfortunately follows it up with the explanation, “In orientalischer Auffassung sind Bild und Gestalt und Persönlichkeit aufs engste verbunden.”³⁰ Overall, his specifics are quite accurate, but his broader reasoning and general statements suffer greatly in comparison. Of the Old Women, he notes only, “Die eigentliche Zauberin ist die ‘Alte’...die wir schon bei den KIN-Orakeln kennengelernt haben.”³¹ Otten, in his two-page discussion of ritual in “Die Religionen des alten Kleinasien,” also only briefly characterizes the Old Women, noting their role “als Verfasserinnen einer grossen Zahl von Ritualen, als Beschwörungspriesterinnen, als Wahrsagerinnen, deren Hilfe auch der König sucht.”³² These works, most particularly Goetze’s *Kleinasien*, were the main general resources for Hittite religion and ritual for some time.

By the 1970s, however, most of the reasonably complete Old Woman rituals had been published at least in part, and a number of ritual texts unassociated with the Old Women had received similar treatment. Therefore, more accurate comprehensive work was now possible. In 1970, D. Engelhard wrote his PhD dissertation on Hittite ritual techniques,³³ providing a more comprehensive look at ritual practice, which remains the only book-length general work on Hittite ritual today. He divided his treatment into four sections: “Magical practitioners,”

²⁹ *Kleinasien*, 158.

³⁰ Ibid. Another example: Goetze correctly states, “Sehr nahe liegt es, die eingetretenen Unreinheit wie sichtbaren körperlichen Schmutz entfernen zu wollen” (p. 155) and goes on to list several possible ways to wash the dirt off, but then says, “Alle die zur Verwendung kommenden Stoffe sind natürlich vor dem Gebrauche besonders zu behandeln” (ibid.), which is based on only two pieces of evidence and is certainly not a widespread phenomenon in Hittite ritual.

³¹ Ibid., 160.

³² “Die Religionen des alten Kleinasien,” 112.

³³ *Hittite Magical Practices: An Analysis*, PhD diss., Brandeis University, 1970.

“Occasions which necessitated the use of magic,” “Ritual implements and their uses,” and “Location and time of rituals.” Included under “Magical practitioners” is the first analysis of the Old Woman’s function longer than a sentence or two. However, Engelhard was, similar to Goetze, somewhat hampered by his time period: for example, he engages with the issue of magic vs. religion (though concludes that the Hittite texts demonstrate no such division³⁴), and spends some time addressing the possibility that the Old Women were “Old” because they were post-menopause, since menstruation must necessarily make a woman impure and therefore unsuited for religious activity. He concludes that this is not the reason, but only because magical rituals involved contact with impurities and therefore practitioners could *not* be required to be pure; there is no acknowledgement of the complete lack of evidence that Hittite women were considered impure while menstruating.³⁵ He does ultimately reach the plausible conclusion that the best explanation for the Old Women being “Old” was that age was a mark of “greater wisdom and experience.”³⁶

In addition to being somewhat out-of-date by this stage, Engelhard’s analysis is not very systematic, and ultimately quite descriptive. When discussing the Old Woman, he spends a number of pages carefully going through various rituals in which she is a participant, and concludes,

At this point we should recapitulate and outline the various functions of the ^{Mi}ŠU.GI. She was active in the *mugawar* ritual where she sought to evoke the Sungod so that he would return to Hatti and revitalize the earth and enliven its animal and plant life.

³⁴ *Hittite Magical Practices*, 221.

³⁵ The one mention of menstrual blood in religious—or indeed any—context in a Hittite text is Ammiḫatna’s ritual, which addresses the problem that arises if a person is in a consecrated state and someone gives them various inappropriate things to eat or drink, including menstrual blood (“blood of a woman’s body”). It does not seem to me that evidence that menstrual blood is impure to drink should necessarily imply that women are impure while menstruating.

³⁶ *Hittite Magical Practices*, 8.

Then it was briefly noted that the ^{MÍ}ŠU.GI played a very important role in the omen literature. In addition we examined several magical texts in which she enacted rituals which (1) removed family quarreling, (2) purified a worshipper, (3) counteracted sorcery and (4) cured a sickly child from his paleness or intestinal decay. Finally, our investigation observed the ^{MÍ}ŠU.GI functioning in the funerary rituals. For the well-being of the Hittite community, the ^{MÍ}ŠU.GI was truly indispensable.³⁷

The “function” of the Old Woman is simply a list of the texts he has discussed; the single larger consideration invoked is the importance of ritual for the community, which itself is not investigated very far. Engelhard certainly drew together many sources that had not yet been examined in conjunction with one another, but unfortunately did not provide much in-depth or systematic analysis, nor did he advance any comprehensive theories about the methods used in Hittite ritual.

In 1972, Liane Jakob-Rost published CTH 402, Allī’s ritual (at this time still known as Malli’s ritual), the single remaining Old Woman text of reasonable preservation.³⁸ Her edition was very much in line with the philological tradition; in addition to the philological commentary, she included a very brief (8 pages) section on “Religion im Malli-Ritual,” largely devoted to the various gods present in the ritual, but with short sections on ritual practice, the places the ritual was performed, and the personnel. Her primary goal in this discussion seems to be associating CTH 402 with a Luwian tradition, and indeed, she says of the Old Woman:

Die ^{SAL}ŠU.GI, heth. *ḫašawa-*, die “Alte,” spielt in den Ritualen als ausführende Person, als “weise Frau” eine große Rolle. Sie ist vor allem mit den Ritualen luwischer Herkunft oder Beeinflussung verbunden. Ihre Erwähnung in einem Text galt lange Zeit

³⁷ Ibid., 22.

³⁸ L. Jakob-Rost, *Das Ritual der Malli aus Arzawa gegen Behexung (KUB XXIV 9+)*, THeth 2 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1972).

geradezu als Kriterium für dessen Zuordnung in den luwischen Bereich. Sie scheint nicht so sehr eine Priesterin im Sinne einer Tempelbediensteten als vielmehr eine Art Magierin gewesen zu sein, die in der Volksreligion ihren Platz hatte.³⁹

Two points of note appear in this paragraph: first, Jakob-Rost assigns the Old Women to the “Volksreligion,” in which assessment she is not alone. However, as will be seen in ch. 1, while there certainly may have been Old Women operating on the popular level, the textual material from Ḫattuša attests rituals intended for use by the highest echelons of Hittite society, certainly including the royal family, and Old Women were employed to serve the king.

Secondly, Jakob-Rost’s desire to place the Old Woman within a single cultural tradition is reflective of an overall tendency in Hittite religious scholarship (still present today) to try to separate out strands of religious thought and trace them to a geographical origin. The difficulty inherent in this point of view is that all of these texts were produced by the Hittite state, and the supposed non-Hittite origins of these traditions are invisible to us. It is often possible to identify the difference between older central Anatolian traditions and later (particularly Hurrian) influences (see ch. 1 for more discussion of this); however, the various traditions clearly cross-influenced one another over the centuries. For example, texts with elements in Hurrian may also include deities that would appear to be at home in a Luwian context, and so on.

With respect to the Old Woman rituals, the situation is quite complicated. Jakob-Rost was not correct that they were primarily associated with a Luwian tradition; the Old Women seem to have been present in nearly every linguistic context attested at Ḫattuša (Sumerian/Akkadian excepted). This was subsequently noted in 1976 by Kammenhuber in her

³⁹ Ibid., 88.

book on Hittite divination,⁴⁰ in which she includes a list of sources where the Old Women appear. In line with the goals discussed above, she states, “Hier nur zu zwei Problemen...: Es gibt dreisprachige ^{SAL}ŠU.GI’s, die auf hethitische Rituale ‘à la Hurri’ und ‘à la Luwiya’ anbieten; sind darin immer beide Schichten sauber getrennt?”⁴¹ Her following list is separated into sections based first on text genre, second on dating, and finally on cultural context. This did not, however, stop attempts to separate out traditions within Old Woman rituals, or even to locate the Old Women specifically in a single tradition (see further below and ch. 1).

In 1974, A. Archi’s article “Il sistema KIN della divinazione ittita”⁴² was published; it was the first and only treatment of the KIN-oracles, which were performed by the Old Women. Archi’s article is a careful investigation of the evidence of the best-preserved texts, shedding great light on the extremely opaque KIN method. Though he was not comprehensive in his treatment, he was as thorough as possible for the space of a short article, and elucidated much about the ways in which the oracular symbols interacted with one another. However, he focuses exclusively on interpreting the difficult methodology and terminology, with extensive transliteration and translation, and pays no attention to the nature of the Old Woman beyond dubbing her a “maga.” Closer investigation shows that the nature of the symbols, and the ways in which they interact with one another, in fact reveals quite a bit about the Old Woman’s position vis-à-vis Hittite religious thought (see ch. 2).

In 1978, V. Haas and H. J. Thiel published *Die Beschwörungsrituale der Allaiturah(h)i und verwandte Texte*,⁴³ an edition of two Old Woman rituals, those of Allaiturahhi (only very partially published in translation by Goetze in *ANET*) and Šalašu (unpublished and extremely

⁴⁰ *Orakelpraxis, Träume und Vorzeichenschau bei den Hethitern*, THeth 7 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1976).

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 123.

⁴² *Oriens Antiquus* 13 (1974): 133–44.

⁴³ AOAT 31 (Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978).

fragmentary). This edition, for the first time, went explicitly beyond the philological in its goals. In the several chapters of discussion before the text translations, the authors discuss personnel, deities, magical and mythological motifs, and structural/metrical qualities of the incantations. Although more than forty years later many of their conclusions about ritual no longer stand (for example, subsuming all ensorcellment under the metaphor of “binding” and all anti-sorcery practice under the metaphor of “release”; see ch. 4), it was a step beyond the standard practice of editions up until that time. However, unfortunately, their discussion was heavily involved with the notion of geographic traditions; their primary concern was an identification of Hurro-Mesopotamian traditions within the Hittite texts (see further on this topic below). Therefore, the overall goal was to trace motifs in these rituals to foreign origin, rather than to locate them in a broader Hittite ritual context, and their treatment of the Old Women’s function was minimal.

Despite this example of scholarship on ritual, the next ten years of scholarship on the Old Woman rituals were quite sparse. The single major textual publication was F. Starke’s publication of the cuneiform Luwian texts, in 1985.⁴⁴ This monograph did the important work of assembling the various fragments into composite texts, without which any study of their content would have been impossible. However, Starke did not translate the texts, and limited his discussion of their content to elements that allowed him to assign sections to one text or another. His purpose in publishing these texts was to further the study of the Luwian language—as seen by his follow-up work on the lexicon⁴⁵—rather than to make any comment on ritual practice.

Several more publications appeared in 1988. Haas and I. Wegner published *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen* ^{SAL}ŠU.GI,⁴⁶ which provided updated and much improved editions of Allaituraḫḫi and Šalašu’s rituals, as well as a number of other texts with Hurrian recitations,

⁴⁴ *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*, StBoT 30 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1985).

⁴⁵ *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*, StBoT 31 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1990).

⁴⁶ ChS I/5 (Rome: Multigrafica Editrice, 1988).

including CTH 490, Ašdu's ritual. The publication of the rituals was part of the series *Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler*, and the primary goal was to provide further evidence for the understanding of the Hurrian language. The texts were presented in transliteration and translation (of the Hittite sections) with a second volume glossary, but no commentary, philological or otherwise. However, approximately simultaneously, Haas published an entry on Hittite magic and sorcery in the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*,⁴⁷ in which he analyzed Hittite ritual method, with the view that, "Die (heth.) Magie folgt einem Denksystem in Gegensatzpaaren der Kategorien negative-positiv: also unrein-rein, gebunden-gelöst, unfruchtbar-fruchtbar, krank-gesund usw."⁴⁸ This is not an inaccurate picture of Hittite ritual, but this dualism seems to be a clear result of the practical purpose of the rituals: to solve problems. There thus naturally arises a division between the current state (sick, unclean, sterile, etc.) and the desired state (healed, pure, fertile, etc.). The system of thought behind moving from one state to another seems to be more complex than simply a set of dualisms (see chs. 3 and 4).

Haas also discusses the Old Women, but the discussion is unfortunately quite dated and inaccurate. In addition to a list of most of the various rituals they performed,⁴⁹ he says of female ritual practitioners in general, "Weit mehr als den Männern scheint die Ausübung der Magie indes den Frauen oblegen zu haben. Die magische Autorität der Frau beruht auf dem Vorgang des Gebärens...der Menstruation...sowie ihrer Eigenschaft zur Hysterie, so daß ihre nervösen Krisen sie übernatürlichen Kräften auszuliefern schienen."⁵⁰ This is the only place in the twenty-page entry that Haas cites a non-Hittitological source: Marcel Mauss's *Théorie de la magie*, originally published in 1902. It is telling that female ritual authority was the only phenomenon so

⁴⁷ "Magie und Zauberei. B. Bei den Hethitern," in *RIA* 7 (1987–1990): 234–55.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 235.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 242.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 239. In support of these views, Haas cites Mauss's "Theory of Magic" in a German-language edition of 1974, which obscures its original publication date of 1902.

inexplicable that Haas chose to look beyond the Hittite sources and Hittitological scholarship for an answer. That answer was not only out of date, but also did not reflect the evidence concerning the expertise of the Old Women—by far the most common female ritual practitioners—in any way. For more on this subject, see below.

Also published in 1988 was Manfred Hutter's edition of CTH 409.II, Tunnawiya's *taknaz dā-* ritual (literally "taking-from-the-earth"; see ch. 3 for a discussion of these rituals).⁵¹ Hutter followed his philological commentary with sections on structural analysis of the text, the ritual's occasion and purpose, the deities in the text, and finally the position of the ritual within the apparent Hurrian-Luwian-Hittite continuum of religious traditions. Though there was again no discussion of the function of the Old Women, and Hutter's analysis of ritual efficacy was limited to the places it served the above goals, the edition was significantly more than a presentation of the text. Bracketing this publication were two articles by Taracha on the *taknaz dā-* rituals,⁵² in which he first put together a list of fragments composing *taknaz dā-* ritual texts (in 1985) and then discussed what he believed to be the content and structural components of those rituals (in 1990). Also in 1990, G. Beckman followed up Hutter's publication of CTH 409.II with an edition of the extremely similar CTH 409.IV, the "Ritual of the Ox";⁵³ however, this was just a short article and included only a brief philological commentary. The same can be said for Popko's 1991 edition of CTH 418, the fragmentary ritual for when a stranger commits an offense against the king and queen;⁵⁴ apart from assigning it to Taracha's list of *taknaz dā-* rituals, his commentary was entirely philological.

⁵¹ *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung: das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königspaar aus mittelhethitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 – KUB IX 34 – KBo XXI 6)*, OBO 82 (Freiburg [Schweiz]: Göttingen, 1988).

⁵² "Zu den hethitischen *taknaz da*-Ritualen," *AoF* 12/2 (1985): 278–82, and "More about the Hittite *taknaz da* Rituals," *Hethitica* 10 (1990): 171–84.

⁵³ G. Beckman, "The Hittite Ritual of the Ox," *OrNS* 59 (1990): 41ff.

⁵⁴ M. Popko, "Weitere Fragmente zu CTH 418," *AoF* 18:1 (1991): 44–53.

The scholarship of the following decade was extremely sparse; it was 2002 before there was another publication of an Old Woman ritual. In 1994, Haas published his thousand-page *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, but the section on “Magie und Beschwörungsrituale” was only a minor reworking of his entry in the *RIA*, reproducing the same views, including those on female ritual practitioners—with the addition of characterizing the ^{MUNUS.MEŠ}SUḪUR.LÁL as “vielleicht Prostituierte,”⁵⁵ for which there is no evidence whatsoever. In “Magie und Zauberei,” the ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL is rather called a “Hierodule,”⁵⁶ which is less explicit but still invokes the myth of the cultic prostitute.

The overall view is clear: for a woman to have participated in ritual, the physical aspects of womanhood—i.e., the reproductive organs—must have been central to her practice.⁵⁷ A more reasoned version of this view can also be seen in Beckman’s 1993 article, “From Cradle to Grave: Women’s Role in Hittite Medicine and Magic,”⁵⁸ whose assumption rather (as he makes explicit) comes from (1) the possibility that the Hittite word behind ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI is *hašawa-*, which can be etymologically connected to *haš-* “to give birth”⁵⁹; (2) the evidence that midwives were indeed respected female authorities; and also presumably (3) his own greater experience with the birth rituals (on which he wrote his dissertation). However, countering all of these views is the unequivocal fact that although *midwives* (^{MUNUS.MEŠ}ŠÀ.ZU or ^{MUNUS.MEŠ}*haššanupalla-*) do participate in rituals having to do with birth, the Old Women and the ^{MUNUS.MEŠ}SUḪUR.LÁL are

⁵⁵ *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, HbOr I:15 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 888.

⁵⁶ P. 242.

⁵⁷ This view is further reinforced by Haas’ 2003 article on scapegoat rituals (“Betrachtungen zur Traditionsgeschichte hethitischer Rituale am Beispiel des ‘Sündenbock’-Motivs,” in *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. G. Beckman, R. Beal, and G. McMahon [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003], 140), in which he assumes that in CTH 394, Ašhella’s ritual against plague in the army camp, the king must have had a ritual marriage and/or sexual contact with the woman brought in as a substitute for him, even though nothing of the kind is preserved in the (completely preserved) text.

⁵⁸ *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 8 (1993): 25–39.

⁵⁹ See the Conclusion for a discussion of this possibility.

never once attested participating in a birth ritual,⁶⁰ or a ritual involving sexual activity of any kind. Their ritual authority appears to have come from knowledge and training in ritual skills, rather than any inherent sex-specific trait—just as men’s did.

The 2000s began a new trend in Hittite ritual scholarship. Classic philological editions continued to be published—for example, Kassian et al.’s 2002 updated edition of the royal funerary ritual,⁶¹ Mouton’s 2013 updated edition of CTH 402, the Ritual of Allī,⁶² and of course the new project to put editions of ritual texts online, with minimal commentary, at the Hethitologie Portal Mainz.⁶³ However, there was a new attention toward (1) ritual method, and (2) ritual texts’ *Sitz im Leben*. The former could be seen with scholars such as A. Mouton and B.J. Collins, who have published numerous articles on specific ritual phenomena,⁶⁴ and once again with Volkert Haas, particularly with Haas’ 2003 publication (with the help of Daliah Bawanypeck) of *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica: Ein Beitrag zur Heilkunde im Alten Orient*.⁶⁵ *Materia Magica* assessed the ritual or medical function of each individual item catalogued in its 922 pages, and included an extensive introduction discussing ritual healing. In

⁶⁰ There is one reasonably complete birth ritual, KBo 17.61 (and one catalogue entry for a birth ritual, KUB 30.43), which attest a ^{MUNUS}hašawa; however, (1) she is removing evil from the baby, rather than assisting the birth, and (2) the relationship between the ^{MUNUS}hašawa and the ^{MUNUS}SU.GI may be more complicated than this; see the Conclusion for further discussion. There is one Old Woman, Tunnawiya, who authored a birth ritual (CTH 409.III), but in that ritual, she is called ^{MUNUS}ŠA.ZU, not ^{MUNUS}SU.GI as she is in her rituals against contamination, further evidence that the ^{MUNUS}MEŠŠU.GI were not midwives.

⁶¹ A. Kassian, A. Korolev, and A. Sidel’tsev. *Hittite Funerary Ritual: šalliš waštaiš*. AOAT 288. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002.

⁶² A. Mouton, “Le rituel d’Allī d’Arzawa contre un ensorcellement (CTH 402): une nouvelle édition.” In *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, ed. B.J. Collins and P. Michalowski (Atlanta: Lockwood Press, 2013), 195–229.

⁶³ http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/txhet_besrit/textindex.php?g=besrit&x=x, including at the time of this writing CTH 398, CTH 402, CTH 404.1, CTH 416, CTH 439, CTH 440, CTH 448.2, CTH 456.2, CTH 458.1, CTH 474, and CTH 780.III.

⁶⁴ E.g., Mouton, “Le porc dans les textes religieux hittites,” in *De la domestication au tabou. Le cas des suidés au Proche-Orient ancien*, ed. B. Lion and C. Michel (Paris: De Boccard, 2006), 255–65; “Hittite Witchcraft,” in *Acts of the VIIth International Congress of Hittitology (Corum, August 25-31, 2008)*, ed. A. Süel (Ankara, 2010), 515–28; *Life, Death, and Coming of Age in Antiquity*, ed. A. Mouton and J. Patrier, PIHANS 124 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2014). Also, Collins, “The Puppy in Hittite Ritual,” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42/2 (1990): 211–26; “Necromancy, Fertility, and the Dark Earth: The Use of Ritual Pits in Hittite Cult,” in *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, ed. P. Mirecki and M. Meyer (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 224–41.

⁶⁵ 2 vols. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003).

that introduction is a section on the Old Women, which is primarily a descriptive list of the various well-attested Old Woman rituals, separated by cultural tradition, though Haas does note that the Old Women practiced offensive as well as defensive magic (see ch. 3). Haas' introduction also includes an extensive discussion of ritual traditions, in which he places heavy emphasis on Mesopotamian influence, on which see more below.

Haas also discusses specific ritual methods, and his focus is—in line with the nature of the monograph—on the various items used to perform them. In addition, particularly during his overview of methods of removing contamination from a patient,⁶⁶ he separates various ritual techniques based on the physical actions being performed (e.g., swinging, spitting, washing, combing, etc.). This is a clear continuation of the philological methods seen in the previous decades of scholarship: discussion of ritual in Hittitology has always been subordinated to the discussion of words. Even when ritual scholarship is done on its own, without being attached to an edition of a particular text, ritual acts are considered with reference to the words—nouns/objects and verbs/actions—used in the texts. Haas' approach also seems to stem from the confluence of ritual and medical practice. The Old Women, as will be seen in ch. 3, do *not* practice medicine; that is, they do not treat parts of the body for ailments, but rather remove sorcery or contamination with the understanding that they are addressing the ailments' underlying cause. As a result, the individual actions or items are tied up in the changing metaphors used to conceive of evil—*not* the symptoms of illness—and therefore must be taken in a larger context. This will be discussed further in chapters 3 and (especially) 4.

Haas' book was written with the aid of Daliah Bawanypeck, and in the acknowledgments, he thanks his students for help, including Birgit Christiansen, Susanne Görke, and Rita Strauß. All of these scholars have since published editions of ritual texts, and all but

⁶⁶ Pp. 70–79.

Strauß on Old Woman rituals, with much more extensive commentary on the ritual acts than the philological tradition used to require: Bawanypeck of the augurs' rituals in 2005,⁶⁷ Christiansen of Ambazzi's rituals in 2006,⁶⁸ and Görke of Aštu's ritual in 2010.⁶⁹ These books are all extremely useful from a comparative perspective: following Haas' methodology, these scholars have focused on the items and the actions used in their rituals, and drawn comparisons with rites in other texts that use similar items or perform similar actions.⁷⁰ However, as already noted above, this heavily philological perspective is not sufficient for a larger understanding of Hittite ritual methodology. For further discussion of the limitations of philological methods and an alternative way of approaching the Old Woman rituals, see chs. 3 and 4.

Scholarship on ritual, therefore, has been noticeably renewed in the last fifteen years, and certain specific issues have dominated recent publications. As a result, this discussion will benefit from concluding its chronological accounting and turning to a thematic discussion. Two questions have most notably concerned contemporary scholars of Hittite ritual: (1) that of scribal context and textual transmission, and (2) that of cultural contexts and geographic origins. This dissertation, however, will rather be focusing on Hittite religious thought and practical method, and therefore will not be overly concerned with either question. The following discussion will demonstrate why I believe the questions to be peripheral to my own concerns. Though they are not unrelated, I will address each in turn.

Ritual Transmission

⁶⁷ D. Bawanypeck, *Die Rituale der Auguren*, THeth 25 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 2005).

⁶⁸ B. Christiansen, *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi: Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429 und CTH 463*, StBoT 48 (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2006).

⁶⁹ S. Görke, *Das Ritual der Aštu (CTH 490): Rekonstruktion und Tradition eines hurritisch-hethitischen Rituals aus Boğazköy-Hattuša*, CHANE 40 (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

⁷⁰ See, e.g., the tables in Bawanypeck's *Die Rituale der Auguren* on pp. 153, 182, 209, 221, 234, 249, 254, and 294; the lists of parallels in Christiansen's *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi* on pp. 139–54 and 259–72; and Görke's comparison-based reconstruction in *Das Ritual der Aštu*, pp. 172–267.

In 2004, Jared Miller published a new edition of Maštigga's ritual corpus.⁷¹ Miller's purpose was not to discuss ritual method, but rather to investigate the differences among the various copies of these texts and put forward a theory as to how they were produced, transmitted, and used. He engages in a long discussion of the various possibilities for how a ritual text with a named author (like most Old Woman rituals) might have come into being, with extensive references to the previous literature supporting these various points of view: i.e., a scribe interviewing a ritualist and writing down her words in real-time, including possible questions-and-answers; a scribe witnessing a ritual performance; or a literate ritualist writing the text herself.⁷² He demonstrates the reasons why these possibilities, as they have been presented by other scholars in the past, are unlikely, and suggests:

An alternative paradigm, however, seems more likely. [Tunnawiya's] rituals may well have been composed with no reference whatsoever to a Tunnawiya living at the time. A scribe or scribes may have created the compositions from their own resources, including their personal experience as participants in or observers of such rites, as well as the archives to which they had access. To lend their composition legitimacy, they would have attributed them to Tunnawiya, who had perhaps lived some generations before, at which time she had acquired a name as a worthy ritualist. Whether some of the material from their archives in fact was to be directly traced to Tunnawiya herself is more difficult to ascertain, and should not be categorically excluded.⁷³

Miller has carefully considered the evidence of the texts before coming to this conclusion: for example, despite incipits in the first person (i.e., "Thus So-and-So: when there is such-and-such a

⁷¹ J.L. Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*, StBoT 46 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004).

⁷² *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 469–532, with literature.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 522.

problem, I treat it as follows”), ritual texts often switch immediately to the third person (“she takes this”), sometimes abruptly, in a way that does not suggest the text is the continuous speech of an individual.⁷⁴ Ritual texts sometimes refer to material existing on other tablets, as, for example, in CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya’s “Ritual of the River,” in which certain of her incantations are said to have already been written on a different tablet.⁷⁵ Further evidence for possible textual material in rituals can be seen in the potential for parallels between, e.g., some of Allaiturahhi’s incantations and Mesopotamian literature.⁷⁶ Miller also considers it likely that there was a written tradition already existing in Kizzuwatna, the overseers of which “may have commissioned literate persons to create [ritual] compositions, and these literati, in turn, would have drawn upon a lifetime of experience in cultic and ritual practice to create them...these first texts would presumably have been used as reference material in the creation of future compositions.”⁷⁷

On the other hand, Miller also acknowledges an alternative possibility in which a practitioner is allowed a role in the creation of the ritual text:

Though probably a secondary or tertiary phenomenon in relation to those just discussed, an ‘interview’ scenario, according to which the literati interviewed the various ritualists in order to compose their texts, may have played a limited role in the transition from oral to written. Of course the ‘composer’ of any particular ritual may have been not a scribe, but the practitioner who was accustomed to performing the rites. S/He, most likely him/herself in the employ of the royal court, may have employed a scribe to record a

⁷⁴ Ibid., 493–96.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 511–23.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 510–11, citing Strauß, “Elemente mesopotamischer Ritualistik in hethitischen Texten: Das ‘Šamuḫa-Ritual,’ CTH 480,” in *Brückenland Anatolien? Ursachen, Extensität und Modi des Kulturaustausches zwischen Anatolien und seinen Nachbarn*, ed. H. Blum et al. (Tübingen, 2002), 323–38.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 531.

composition which s/he had created orally and/or mentally, but had not the technical skills to write down... This composer may have either attributed his/her text, and perhaps especially any incantations within it, to a well-known ritualist from days gone by, in which case the incipit would also be attributable to the ‘composer.’ Alternatively, the scribe may have prepared the incipit, attributing the composition to the one from whom he was hearing it.⁷⁸

However, though presented as a plausible scenario, this suggestion comes as something of an afterthought. Throughout his discussion, Miller privileges scribal agency whenever he discusses the creation or editing of ritual texts, and the language of this passage heavily deemphasizes the practitioner’s role. It is clear that he does not consider it at all likely that ritual practitioners authored the texts attributed to them.

His own suggestion of scribal composition, however, is quite speculative, particularly considering that he locates these scribal “literati” in Kizzuwatna, where no texts have yet been discovered. As it happens, other explanations for the problems he identifies are also plausible. For example, a recent study by myself and Theo van den Hout demonstrated that certain ritual texts (including the text with which Miller begins his study, Maštigga’s ritual against domestic quarrel, CTH 404.1), can be seen to have been memorized.⁷⁹ Taking this evidence into consideration, the role of the practitioner/author could be much greater. Perhaps these texts were communicated by authors like Tunnawiya to scholars and/or scribes, who memorized them and reproduced them in whole or in part (thus explaining why Tunnawiya’s incantations might have already been set down on a different tablet); the formulaic incipits could have been a textual phenomenon developed to more easily recognize individual compositions, which would explain

⁷⁸ Ibid., 531–32.

⁷⁹ Marcuson and van den Hout, “Memorization and Hittite Ritual: New Perspectives on the Transmission of Hittite Ritual Texts,” forthcoming in *JANER* 2016.

the awkward transitions from first-person incipit to third-person text. Nothing whatsoever suggests that ritual practitioners could not have been familiar with mythological or literary texts from Mesopotamia and used that material in their compositions; not being able to read in no way barred a wealthy, powerful individual (as these hypothetical prominent employees of the Hittite and/or Kizzuwatnean court must certainly have been) from accessing textual material. One could even take the reconstruction a step further and assume that it was the practitioners themselves who memorized and reproduced the texts or parts of the texts, as their own liturgical instructions (see, for example, the ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI liturgy tablets for the long, complicated, and generously-staffed royal funerary ritual [CTH 450], in which only the Old Women's incantations are recorded), dictating them to scribes.

These scenarios are, in my opinion, at least as plausible as Miller's. However, there is, of course, no way to prove any of them. Though we may learn more about their transmission, the *composition* of these texts is invisible to us. Whether the named authors like Tunnawiya were agents in setting the texts' content down on tablets, or whether scribes composed the texts based on their general understanding of ritual practice, or whatever other scenarios arise, the evidence is insufficient to come to a final answer.

However, when weighing the possibilities and judging which is the most likely, one final piece of evidence should be mustered: one of the purported authors of two so-called "Kizzuwatna Rituals" is the ^{MUNUS}ŠUHUR.LÁL Kuwattalla. Kuwattalla is named as an author of CTH 759, the *dupaduparša*-ritual, and CTH 761, the "Great Ritual," both of which have Luwian incantations (and both of which have a co-author Šillaluḫi, who is an Old Woman). A Kuwattalla, ^{MUNUS}ŠUHUR.LÁL, also appears as the recipient of a land grant from the Hittite

king and queen Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal, in which she is called their “servant” (GÉME).⁸⁰ Kuwattalla receives an enormous amount of land and personnel from the royal couple. Of course, the two Kuwattallas may not be the same person. However, the earliest copies of Kuwattalla’s rituals are in Middle Script, suggesting that they were written during approximately the same time period (insofar as palaeographic dating can be accurate) as the land grant; at least the same century can be safely assumed. Given that there *was* a wealthy, powerful ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL named Kuwattalla in service to the king and queen and gifted with Hittite land, and this was approximately contemporary to when a ritual text ascribed to a knowledgeable authority named Kuwattalla appeared in the Hittite royal archives, the possibility that the author and the land grant recipient are the same person should not be dismissed.⁸¹

In addition to the suggestion that scribes authored ritual texts, recent scholarship has also assigned scribes a major role in the continuing redaction of these texts—that is, that they were not simply copied by scribes, but deliberately modified over the centuries. Miller and Birgit Christiansen have both identified inconsistencies in the texts they have edited (Miller in Maštigga’s rituals,⁸² Christiansen in Ambazzi’s⁸³), and considered those inconsistencies to be

⁸⁰ KBo 5.7, ed. Ch. Rüster and G. Wilhelm, *Landschenkungsurkunden hethitischer Könige*, StBoTB 4, 231–44.

⁸¹ Miller refers to this text only in a footnote on the second page of his general discussion, in which he states, “Taracha...claims that both [festivals and rituals] can be traced back to OH roots, against which might militate the case of Kuwatalla, ^{MUNUS}SU.GI [*sic*], generally identified with the Kuwatalla, ^{MUNUS}SU.GI [*sic*], who receives a land grant from Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikkal...On the other hand, one must consider the possibility that Kuwatalla herself may have made use of compositions dating to an earlier epoch” (*Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 442n697). Here he seems himself to be assuming that Kuwattalla is a ritual author, *contra* his later reconstruction of how these texts were composed.

⁸² For example, the fact that the list of ritual items at the beginning of Maštigga’s first ritual does not exactly correspond to the items used in the ritual, for which Miller suggests the explanation that, “there may have existed a textual tradition of Mastigga rituals, which had perhaps already diverged to some degree, and that the scribe copied the list and the various elements of the ritual performance from Mastigga sources that were no longer completely compatible, and that no great care was taken to scrupulously compare for complementarity the passages assembled from the various sources” (*Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 240).

⁸³ Christiansen focuses mainly on the fact that CTH 391 switches between (1) a first- and third-person narration of the practitioner’s actions, and (2) singular and plural ritual patients (*Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi*, 113–22), which leads her to conclude that the text is not intended for practical use (“Vielmehr weist dieser Befund darauf hin, daß die hethitischen Schreiber den Text in erster Linie als gelehrte Überlieferung betrachteten, die es für nachfolgende Generationen zu tradieren galt” [idem, 126]), and is likely already a product of scribal redactors (“Das

evidence of scribal redaction. They propose that the texts were compiled by scribes from varying written sources, and as different materials were interwoven, logical and grammatical flaws arose. However, this now seems less likely: as recently demonstrated by myself and Theo van den Hout in “Memorization and Hittite Ritual: New Perspectives on the Transmission of Hittite Ritual Texts,” these inconsistencies are for the most part easily explained by memorization errors. That is to say, in many cases, scribes were *not* deliberately modifying these texts—on the contrary, they were attempting to reproduce them as accurately as possible. I certainly do not exclude the possibility of modification of texts throughout the centuries—for example, the ascription of CTH 780.III, the ritual for Šuppiluliyama II, who ruled around 1200 BC, to Allaiturahḫi, who first appears as a ritual author around the fifteenth century, suggests some later editing. However, it does not seem to me as prevalent as previously assumed, nor as clear that these redactors were in fact scribes and not ritual experts themselves, who did not need to be able to read and write to modify a text. There might also have been some collaboration between the two.

In addition, the presence of inconsistencies in the ritual texts should not preclude their inclusion in the realm of Hittite ritual practice (rather than assignation to a “scribal” or “literary” context, which has not been very well-defined in any case). Anyone who has regularly participated in religious ceremonies can attest that simply because there are errors or inconsistencies in instructions, scripts, bulletins, or similar, does not mean that those written documents cannot be used to direct the progress of those ceremonies. And the presence of personal names of kings like Šuppiluliyama II (as mentioned above) suggests a relationship to

auffällige, auf der synchronen Ebene unvermittelt erscheinende Schwanken zwischen 1. und 3. Person in den schildernden Passagen sowie zwischen Singular und Plural in der Zahl der Ritualherren nebst Wechseln zwischen Sprecher und Angesprochenem in den Rezitationen weist darauf hin, daß die auf uns gekommene Textfassung aus verschiedenen Vorlagen kompiliert wurde, wobei die sich daraus ergebenden Spannungen meist nicht ausgeglichen wurden” [idem, 311]).

ritual practice.⁸⁴ Even if these texts were kept as records of rituals that *had* been performed,⁸⁵ the content of the texts would still attest to Hittite ritual practice.

And although the possibility that they were not practical cannot be excluded,⁸⁶ the Old Woman ritual texts demonstrate an internal coherence of problem and method (see chs. 3 and 4), despite their apparent far-flung geographic origins, that must be indicative of Hittite religious thought. Therefore, whatever the *Sitz im Leben* of the physical tablets, it is in my opinion most productive to discuss the *content* of these ritual texts as representative of religious thought, rather than as “literary,” particularly if assignation to a “literary” context results in the assumption that they need not make practical sense.⁸⁷

The possibility remains that the texts were produced for some other purpose, of course. The above discussion should demonstrate, however, that the questions of how the Hittite ritual texts came into being, who the named ritual authors actually were,⁸⁸ and what relationship they had with the Hittite scribes, while tantalizing, are ultimately not very productive, producing a multitude of potential explanations, all of which are somewhat plausible. The answers to these questions are invisible to us, given the current evidence. It seems rather preferable to frame the question differently: that is, what does the writing and copying of these texts, and their ascription

⁸⁴ Though Christiansen does not agree: “Am Anfang standen übliche Anweisungstexte. Diese wurden von einem Schreiber auf eine bestimmte Situation und bestimmte Ritualmanddanted zugeschnitten, nämlich auf das Königspaar Tutḫaliya und Nikkalmati. Diese Spezifizierung geschah jedoch nicht aus einem praktischen Bedürfnis heraus, also nicht, um tatsächlich ein oder mehrere Rituale für das Königspaar durchzuführen. Vielmehr handelt es sich um einen Versuch der ‘Historisierung’ der Tafel. Der Prozess wäre also ähnlich zu bewerten wie die Zuschreibung von Texten an bedeutende Persönlichkeiten” (“Ein Entsühnungsritual für Tutḫaliya und Nikkalmati? Betrachtungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte von KBo 15.10,” in *SMEA* 49 [2007]: 100).

⁸⁵ Though not, as adequately demonstrated by Miller (*Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 483–35; 500–506) and Christiansen (*Ambazzi*, 123–25), as descriptions of a specific ritual performance.

⁸⁶ Consider, for example, the fact that certain ancient Near Eastern law codes, such as Hammurabi’s, seem entirely practical at first glance, but there is no evidence whatsoever in the extensive Babylonian legal documentation that Hammurabi’s laws were ever in fact put into practice. Without more evidence, Hittite ritual practice is out of our reach.

⁸⁷ A view espoused by Miller when discussing the term *šer arḫa wahnu-* in his commentary on CTH 404.1 (*Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 111), for which see further discussion in ch. 4.

⁸⁸ Also given lengthy consideration by Miller, e.g. Tunlawiya (*Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 452–58) and Allaiturahi (506–511).

to named ritual authors, tell us about the perspective of the Hittite administrative apparatus on ritual? And what does it mean for our understanding of Hittite religious thought?

Examination of the texts' framing methods may help answer this question. Authored ritual texts begin with a standard formula: "Thus So-and-So (of some profession), (from some place): when there is such-and-such a problem, I treat it as follows." For example, CTH 397: "Thus Hebatarakki, Old Woman of Zuharuwa: when I free an ensorcelled person"⁸⁹; CTH 402: "Thus Alli, woman of Arzawa: if a person (is) ensorcelled, I treat him as follows"⁹⁰; CTH 409.II: "Thus Tunnawiya, Old Woman of Hatti: When I take the king and queen from the earth, I take this."⁹¹ The colophon, at the very end of the ritual, approximately replicates the incipit, using the formula, "The word (*AWĀT/INIM*) of So-and-So," rather than "Thus So-and-So." (For more examples of incipits and colophons in Old Woman rituals, see Appendix C.) The tablet catalogues, which are disproportionately concerned with authored material, use these colophons as their catalogue entries.⁹² The texts are thus very concerned with representing authorship. This concern can also be seen in the catalogue entry, "1 tablet—the name of [the Old] W[oman] is not there—when the Old Woman invokes the Storm-God."⁹³ The scribe creating the catalogue felt

⁸⁹ KUB 24.14 i 1 *UM-MA* ^fHé-bat-^fta-ra^l-ak-ki ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI ^{URU}Zu[?]-ḫa[?]^l-ru-wa

2 ^fma^l-a-an al-wa-an-za-aḫ-ḫa-na-ta-an UN-an EGIR-pa la-a-mi

⁹⁰ KBo 11.12 (CTH 402.D₁) i 1 *[UM]-MA* ^fA-al^l-li-i ^{MUNUS} ^{URU}Ar-za-wi₅ ma-a-an an-tu-wa-^faḫ-ḫa^l-aš
2 al-wa-an-za-aḫ-ḫa-an-za na-an ki-iš-ša-an a-ni-ia-mi

See Mouton, *Le rituel d'Alli*, 196; note that Mouton erroneously ends her transliteration of line 1 with [(al-wa-an-za-aḫ-ḫa-an-za)]; that line is not broken and the word is preserved whole at the beginning of line 2 (as she correctly transliterates).

⁹¹ KBo 21.1 i 1 *[UM-MA* ^fTu₄-na-wi₅-ia ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI ^{URU}^fḪa^l-[a]t-ti

2 [m]a-an-kán LUGAL ^{MUNUS}.LUGAL ták-na-a-az da-aḫ-ḫi nu ki-i da-aḫ-ḫi

See Hutter, *Behexung*, 14–15, for edition.

⁹² This is made clear by a catalogue tablet in which a mistake in the colophon of CTH 390 is replicated in the entry for that text; see W. Waal, *BiOr* 67, 2010, 555.

⁹³ KBo 31.27++ i 19' 1 *TUP-PU ŠUM-MI* ^f^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI N]U.GÁL ma-a-an ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI ^dU-an mu-ga-iz-zi

See Dardano, *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattuša (CTH 276–282)*, StBoT 47 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 150–51, for edition.

the need to inform the reader that he was not simply leaving out a name, but that there was no name to record.

The question of what these incipits and colophons mean in terms of textual composition has received some attention in the scholarship.⁹⁴ I am not here preoccupied with whether “Thus” or “Word of” implies that the content of the text was actually spoken aloud by the person quoted. Rather, I am concerned with the fact that the text *represents itself* as being spoken by that person. Hutter⁹⁵ looks at the *UMMA* PN formula as being drawn from letters, but notes that there is no verb of speech (*QIBI-MA*) in ritual incipits, which in his opinion differentiates the ritual texts and indicates that “In den Ritualtexten scheint *UMMA* im Incipit ebenfalls die ‘Autorität’ des (fiktiven) Verfassers des Rituals mit diesem formelhaften Beginn auszudrücken, ohne jedoch—anders als in den Briefen, die eine Rede (vgl. das *Verbum dicendi* im Imperativ) wiedergeben—den folgenden Ritualtext als Rede zu charakterisieren.”⁹⁶ Miller similarly considers *UMMA* to be used as a “tool of attribution”⁹⁷ rather than an indication that the words were spoken by the ritual author.

Hutter and Miller are both concerned with how these texts came to be, and whether the framework of direct speech might serve a purpose other than representing direct speech. However, having arrived at the conclusion that it does not, they do not venture very far into larger considerations of what that representation implies.⁹⁸ Some implications may become clear by comparing the ritual incipits not to letters, which—as Hutter notes—do not use the exact simple *UMMA* PN formula that ritual texts do, but rather to royal documents. Edicts, treaties,

⁹⁴ Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 493–96; M. Hutter, “Die wirkmächtigen Reden der Ritualexperten in hethitischen Texten: Anrufung der Götter, ‘Historiolae,’ und performative Funktion,” in *Wenn Götter und Propheten reden – Erzählen für die Ewigkeit*, ed. Amr el Hawary (Berlin: EB-Verlag, 2012), 153–71.

⁹⁵ “Die wirkmächtigen Reden,” 155–56.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 156.

⁹⁷ *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 496.

⁹⁸ The concept of “authority” is invoked by Hutter, as seen in the quote above, but put in quotes and not given much attention.

annals, and decrees likewise begin with “Thus PN (professional title) (geographic origin)” —for example, the Apology of Hattušili (CTH 81): “Thus Tabarna Ḫattušili, Great King, King of Ḫatti, son of Muršili, Great King...” et cetera. Now, a similar argument could be brought to bear about whether the content of these documents actually issued from the king’s mouth, how much the king participated in producing them, and where the scribes fell in the process, with a similar lack of complete certainty in the conclusions. However, there is no doubt that the primary purpose of beginning treaties, edicts, etc. with “Thus the king of Ḫatti” is to imbue the text with the necessary authority, and to ensure its efficacy. As we learn from certain royal decrees, “The words of Tabarna are of iron: they are not to be cast aside or broken.”⁹⁹ We can even see the “Thus the king” formula in religious texts: for example, CTH 672, an edict of Tudḫaliya IV concerning festival practice for the Storm-God of Nerik, begins *UMMA* ^d[UTU-ŠI...] ^mTudḫali[ya...] (“Thus [His] Ma[jesty...] Tudḫali[ya...]),¹⁰⁰ which is representative of Tudḫaliya IV’s personal interest in festival practices and cult reform, and his desire to impose his own authority on them.

The concern on the part of the Hittite administration with authorship in ritual texts, and the representation of these rituals as the speech of the authors, in my opinion is a similar phenomenon. The texts do not say: “when there is such-and-such a problem, you do as follows” (as can be seen in Mesopotamian ritual¹⁰¹), nor even, most of the time, “the Old Woman does as follows.” Instead, they recount what Tunnawiya, Allaituraḫḫi, Allī, etc. would do when there is such-and-such a problem. Thus, Tunnawiya, Allaituraḫḫi, Allī, etc. are considered by the

⁹⁹ E.g., in Kuwatalla’s land grant, KBo 5.7, rev. 49–50 (Rüster and Wilhelm, *Landschenkungsurkunden*, 238–39).

¹⁰⁰ See J. Součková, “Edikt von Tuthaliia IV. zugunsten des Kults des Wettergottes von Nerik,” in *Investigationes Anatolicae: Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*, ed. J. Klinger, E. Rieken, and C. Rüster, StBoT 52 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 288.

¹⁰¹ E.g., Maqlû; see T. Abusch, *The Magical Ceremony Maqlû: A Critical Edition*, Ancient Magic and Divination 10 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 367ff.

creators and curators of these documents *to add authority* to these rituals. We can turn here to CTH 323, the Disappearance of the Sun-God, which may have been first composed before this formula was standardized (see ch. 1), and quote Annanna’s lines: “And I am Annanna...I t[o]ok the words of the gods, and I poured them [...]...I lost none of the gods’ words. But whenever Telipinu becomes burdensome for anyone, I [sp]eak the w[ords] of the gods, and I invoke him.”¹⁰² As will be discussed in ch. 3, within their texts, Old Women are often concerned with representing themselves as powerful agents, and the framing of these texts seems to cooperate with that preoccupation.

So, what we can see is that the Hittite religious/administrative apparatus valued named, individual religious authority—as well as a (purported, at the very least) multicultural repertoire, for which see more below. There was clearly an impetus, beginning at least in the fifteenth century BC, to gather and preserve these people’s ritual expertise. The fact that the rituals represent themselves as direct speech from these ritualists’ mouths is more than just a “tool of attribution”—the fact that they are as a *whole* represented as speech might even be related to the vital importance of ritual speech within these texts themselves (see ch. 3).¹⁰³ Named authors and direct speech representation distinguish ritual texts from festivals, oracles, Hurro-Hittite myth, and many Mesopotamian “scholarly” texts, but connect them to decrees, treaties, and other expressions of royal authority.

¹⁰² VBoT 58 iv 3 ú-ug-ga ^{MUNUS}an-na-an-na-aš e-eš-mi

...
5 d[a-ah]-hu-un DINGIR^{MEŠ}-an ud-da-a-a-r ne-ez-za-a[n]

6 []x šu-uh-ha-ah-hu-un

...
8 ʾDINGIR^{MEŠ} ʾ-aš ud-da-a-ar ʾUL ku-it-ki har-ni-in-ku-un ma-a-an-ša-an

9 ʾTe-li-pí-nu-ša ku-e-da-ni-ik-ki na-ak-ke-eš-zi ú-ga DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš u[d-da-ar]

10 [me]-ma-ah-hi ta-an mu-ga-mi

Ed. Rieken, hethiter.net/: CTH 323.1

¹⁰³ Though I do not venture into any speculation about the oral-literate continuum or previous oral traditions, as it would be absent any factual basis.

To venture somewhat further into speculation, it might be possible to connect the focus on individual knowledge and power in the texts to the knowledge and power enacted during the rituals—not over the antagonists, as will be discussed in ch. 3, but over the patients. In several Old Woman rituals, the king and queen are explicitly named as the patients, and overall, if we are to allow that these texts represent ritual practice, their inclusion in the Hittite state archives implies that the patients were the Hittite elite. As will be discussed in ch. 1 regarding CTH 416, and will also be apparent throughout the discussion in ch. 4, in these rituals the Old Women had intimate access to their patients’ bodies and sometimes homes. In cases where these patients were the king and queen, an exceptional level of knowledge, power, and authority would be required in order to permit such access, and that appears to be what is represented by these written documents.

Foreign Ritual Traditions

The Hittite imported gods, religious practice, and religious textual material. This can most dramatically be seen with Hurrian material, which seems to appear around the time the Hittites conquered Kizzuwatna and permanently incorporated it into their kingdom, in the fifteenth century, but the texts attest material claiming to originate from all over Anatolia, from Syria, and from Mesopotamia. The Old Woman rituals appear to be in line with this aggressively ecumenical practice: ritual authors are said to be from Ḫattuša (Tunnawiya), from Durmitta, in north-central Anatolia (Mallidunna), from Pāla in the far north toward the Black Sea (Annā, unfortunately attested only in an extremely fragmentary text¹⁰⁴), from Arzawa in the west (Allī), from Kizzuwatna in the southeast (Maštigga, Šalašu, perhaps Ašdu¹⁰⁵), and even from Syria

¹⁰⁴ KBo 17.47 (CTH 470) preserves only the first few lines, and so we know the author and something of the ritual purpose—it involves the “sleeping Storm-God”—but nothing else.

¹⁰⁵ Ašdu is a “MUNUSŠU.GI URU Hurlaš,” which is somewhat ambiguous, though must mean somewhere in the southeast.

(Allaituraḫḫi). This once again seems to begin around the fifteenth century; the older textual material appears to be somewhat more homogenous (see ch. 1).

Naturally, there have been attempts to isolate various ritual “traditions” based on these purported geographic origins, particularly considering the added factor of incantations in foreign languages, some of which—as in the case of Allaituraḫḫi and Šalašu—were translated into Hittite. Allaituraḫḫi’s ritual, for example, has two versions: one shorter (CTH 780.I), almost entirely in Hurrian, and one longer (CTH 780.II), almost entirely in Hittite, and only very partially preserved. It is thus very easy to posit an original Hurrian ritual text, translated and expanded into the longer Hittite version. However, even if that scenario is accepted, many problems remain: was it translated by scribes? By Old Women practicing Allaituraḫḫi’s rituals? By Allaituraḫḫi herself, if she existed? In addition, perhaps that is not what happened: the copies of CTH 780.I are palaeographically older, but that does not mean that the text *must* originally have been translated from Hurrian into Hittite, rather than the other way around; older Hittite copies could simply not be extant. There could have been two simultaneous versions of the ritual practiced, each written down separately. None of these possibilities can be proven or disproven.

To further complicate the issue, Haas has used the appearance of some of the words and phrases found in the sixth tablet of Allaituraḫḫi in a Sumerian/Akkadian/Hittite lexical list¹⁰⁶ to present the possibility that Allaituraḫḫi’s rituals had Sumerian and/or Akkadian *Vorlagen*, rather than the Hurrian version being the original, but as he admits, no physical evidence of these texts is extant.¹⁰⁷ Another possible explanation for this connection could be that since the Hittites

¹⁰⁶ KBo 1.42 i 42ff.

¹⁰⁷ “Dies sowie die Übereinstimmungen des Listenabschnitts mit den entsprechenden Partien der sechsten Tafel... sprechen dafür, daß die hethitischen Beschwörungspartien Übersetzungen sind, deren Vorlagen gewiß nicht die zitierten hurritischen Abschnitte (ChS I 5 Nr.23 und Nr.24) sind, sondern wohl eben jene sumerischen und akkadischen Beschwörungen, aus denen auch die Liste exzerpiert und in Hattuša mit der hethitischen Spalte versehen worden ist. Es haben somit der Liste und einzelnen Partien des Rituals die gleichen Vorlagen zugrunde gelegen. Es ist fernerhin davon auszugehen, daß diese sumerischen und akkadischen Beschwörungen dann auch die

themselves were interested in both Hurrian ritual and Mesopotamian scholarly texts, that they could have written out entries using vocabulary seen in certain rituals¹⁰⁸—particularly considering that this list does not conform to the canonical Mesopotamian order, at least so far as extant.¹⁰⁹

Overall, excessive attention to potential ritual traditions can lead very quickly into speculation about the earlier phases of these traditions, which are invisible to us. In addition, the identification of discrete strands of a tradition within single texts is difficult, if not impossible. Hittite ritual texts do not have, for example, the type of inconsistent historical narrative that allows for source criticism on the Pentateuch. In fact, as will be demonstrated in chs. 3 and 4, the Old Woman rituals, at least, display a great deal of internal *consistency* in their method and even, where well-enough preserved, in their structure. Inexplicable ritual acts are usually either in extremely broken context, or accompanied by incantations that we cannot understand, and therefore there is no way to connect them to the larger methodological framework the Old Women use. In addition, even if certain elements of a text can be identified as being *concerned*

Vorlagen zu den hurritischen Entsprechungen von ChS I 5 Nr. 23 und Nr. 24 darstellten. Hier stellt sich die Frage, wie das Serienwerk eigentlich zustande gekommen ist: Wurde es auf der Grundlage des mh. Rituals (ChS I 5 Nr. 1 und Nr. 2) mit Partien aus einer sumerisch-akkadischen Ritualliteratur erweitert und weiterhin mit den Namen der Allaiturah(h)i versehen? Und—sollte dem so sein—wo sind dann diese postilierten sumerisch-akkadischen Rituale zu suchen? Aus Hattuša, aus Ugarit und ein Jahrtausend früher aus Ebla sind sumerische-sumero-akkadische und akkadische Beschwörungen bekannt. Die vergleichsweise wenigen Texte zeigen zwar keine überzeugenden inhaltlichen Bezüge zu den Ritualen der Allaiturah(h)i; kompositionell jedoch entspricht ihnen eventuell ein sumerisch-akkadisches Ritual aus Ugarit, das akkadische Beschwörungen enthält, die mit sumerischen Beschwörungsformeln und Ritualanweisungen—also ähnlich wie im Serienwerk der Allaiturah(h)i—wechseln” (“Die hurritisch-hethitischen Rituale der Beschwörerin Allaiturah(h)i und ihr literarhistorischer Hintergrund,” in *Hurriter und Hurritisch*, ed. V. Haas [Konstanz: Universitätsverlag Konstanz, 1988], 117–44.

¹⁰⁸ Haas says of the surest and longest match with Allaiturahhi, KBo 1.42 i 49, URUDU.DA-za kuiš DUMU-an karpan harzi “the nurse who has lifted the child,” that “Aus jener und anderen lexikalischen Listen aus Boğazköy wird deutlich, daß mit diesen merkwürdigen hethitischen Relativsätzen versucht wird, einen sumerischen und akkadischen Begriff, zu dem kein hethitisches Äquivalent vorhanden ist, wiederzugeben” (“Die hurritisch-hethitischen Rituale,” 129). However, as noted by Hoffner (“Birth and Name-Giving in Hittite Texts,” *JNES* 27:3 [1968]: 200), this entry is unusual in that it is phrased in the *perfect* (“the nurse who has lifted”) rather than the imperfective present (“the nurse who habitually lifts,” *karpiškezzi*). One wonders, then, if perhaps the Hittite text of Allaiturahhi already existed at the time this lexical list—or at least the Hittite entries in it—were created, and elements were being excerpted from the ritual for the list, rather than the other way around.

¹⁰⁹ See *Izi = isatu, Ka-gal = abullu and Nig-ga = makkuru*, ed. M. Civil, MSL 13 (Roma: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1971).

with a certain geographic area (e.g., Nineveh, as seen in Allaituraḥḫi and Šalašu's rituals), no comment can be made about whether those elements *originate in* that geographic area.¹¹⁰ Even comparisons with existing texts can lead too quickly to an assumption of causality.¹¹¹

Certain elements in incantations—including what language they are in, or whether they seem to have been translated from that language—can lead to the identification of particular origins. In particular, *historiolae* may feature certain gods, or certain mythologems, that can be grouped together or placed in a certain ethnic or geographic milieu. For example, in Allaituraḥḫi's ritual, there are references to Ereškigal and the Annunaki, Mesopotamian underworld gods. There is a *historiola* about the Hurrian Storm-God Teššub and his sister Ištar/Šauška. However, perhaps at the end of that same *historiola*, or perhaps immediately following its end (the text is broken), there is a narrative sentence about ^dŠišummi, who may be the oldest Hittite (not Hurrian) god extant.¹¹² In addition, there are offerings at the beginning of the text to the Gulšeš, the Hittite fate-goddesses, and an (unfortunately mostly broken) extended sequence of actions involving the Sun-Goddess of the Earth, a Luwian deity. It is easy to see from this that Allaituraḥḫi's ritual is a product of Ḫattuša. It is, in my opinion, too difficult and

¹¹⁰ As already pointed out by Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*. The only Old Woman ritual that mentions a geographical place where ritual acts are actually conducted is CTH 416, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple, and those places are Ḫattuša, Arinna and Katapa, all located in the Hittite heartland of central Anatolia (see ch. 1).

¹¹¹ D. Schwemer has recently published an excellent article detailing the careful consideration that should be taken before determining that any ritual text is a result of a Mesopotamian precursor ("Gauging the influence of Babylonian magic: The reception of Mesopotamian traditions in Hittite ritual practice," in *Diversity and Standardization: Perspectives on social and political norms in the ancient Near East*, ed. E. Cancik-Kieschbaum, Jörg Klinger, and Gerfrid G.W. Müller [Akademie Verlag, 2013], 145–71). In particular should be noted his statement that, "Especially since Hittite Anatolia and second millennium Mesopotamia form part of a common larger cultural area and share the same level of civilization, the possibility of cross-cultural similarities that are not due to contemporaneous cultural borrowing should not be dismissed too easily. The sheer existence of a rich local Anatolian tradition of magic rituals demands that potential examples of cultural borrowing stand up to close methodological scrutiny, and the decisive criteria for identifying borrowed ritual motifs and techniques must be (a) their specificity (e.g., an Akkadian loanword like *apiši-* "exorcist"), (b) their exceptionality and unexpectedness (e.g., the use of dates in a Hittite ritual) and (c) ideally, their occurrence within a context that contains not only one isolated, apparently borrowed motif, but a number of words, motifs and actions for which an origin in the tradition of Babylonian ritual and incantation literature seems plausible" (pp. 147–48). It is certainly my opinion that no Old Woman ritual meets these criteria, and Schwemer indeed does not include any in his list of texts "which clearly exhibit Babylonian traits or originate in Babylonia" (p. 148).

¹¹² See Otten, "Zur Kontinuität eines altanatolischen Kultes," *ZA* 52 (1959): 179–81.

uncertain to tease out that various possible “traditions” that might have gone into creating this text, and it is also impossible to say who—scribe, practitioner, or some combination of the two—had a hand in composing and/or adapting it. As Görke says of the ritual of Ašdu (CTH 490)—which likewise exists in a shorter and a longer version, and has Hurrian incantations:

Unter diesem Blickwinkel erscheint es wahrscheinlich, dass das Ritual der Aštu nicht in einem Landesteil wie Kizzuwatna entstanden ist, sondern dass vielmehr erst die Kenntnis verschiedener Traditionen diese rituelle Vielfalt möglich machte. Damit rücken die Schreiber der hethitischen Hauptstadt Ḫattuša ins Visier, für die die verschiedenen Traditionen des Landes u.a. in Form von Texten in den Archiven verfügbar waren. Darüber hinaus lassen sich für die eingangs zu diesem Kapitel postulierte Möglichkeit einer Charakterisierung einer hurritischen Ritualtradition keine Anhaltspunkte finden. Dafür wären weitere Belege der Singularitäten in eindeutig verortbaren Texten vonnöten.¹¹³

Görke is of course also operating from the perspective that this ritual was created by scribes—although in her perspective, these are scribes at Ḫattuša (as opposed to Miller, who is postulating scribes from Kizzuwatna). Once again, I do not think there is enough evidence to concretely determine exactly who was composing rituals like Aštu’s or Allaituraḫḫi’s, just as there is not enough evidence to find the traditions that may have existed behind some of these texts.

This is not to say that there are not certain limited elements that can be confined to certain apparently limited geographic origins. However, the Old Woman corpus allows for very few of these. Allaituraḫḫi and Šalašu seem to share a *historiola* about falling stones (Allaituraḫḫi’s is extremely fragmentary), and both of their rituals have Hurrian incantations. The Disappearing God myths are a similar common mythologem, assuming that the

¹¹³ Aštu, 299–300.

Disappearance of Telipinu and/or other deities may be attributed to Old Women as the Disappearance of the Sun-God may, which appears to be of central Anatolian context. Kuwattalla and Šillaluhi (CTH 761) share their particular scapegoat-method with Tunnawiya, and Maštigga practices something fairly similar; as will be discussed in ch. 3, all of these rituals show Luwian elements (though Maštigga's are more limited than the others'). But this only tells us what is true about *these* texts, not about what texts may have hypothetically come before them, nor about where these elements may have originated. It is also worthwhile to note that Tunnawiya, despite her apparent Luwian context, is said to be an Old Woman "of Ḫattuša," while Kuwattalla may be the only author of an Old Woman ritual for whom there is actual historical data, i.e., the land grant from Arnuwanda and Ašmunikkal, and therefore was certainly involved in the happenings at the capital. Therefore, one of the most easily recognizable "foreign" ritual motifs cannot be easily divorced from ritual practice at Ḫattuša.

Conclusion

Scholarship on the Old Woman rituals has, for most of Hittitological history, been focused primarily on the language of the texts, rather than the content. Most of the commentary on ritual acts has been appended to philological editions of specific texts, often hidden in the notes on the translations of individual lines. As scholarship on ritual acts developed, from the eighties into the 2000s, the primacy of philological method was retained: rituals were categorized based on the items used in them or the actions performed on those items, that is, according to specific words in the text. This dissertation will demonstrate that this method is not very productive, and that the larger context of the ritual should be examined in order to inform the meaning of each individual act within that ritual.

In addition, Hittitological scholarship has, in the last fifteen years, focused on scribes as agents of ritual composition and/or redaction, which has placed these texts in an undefined “scribal” or “literary” context. However, that view likewise does not seem very productive. As has been demonstrated, the tablets themselves attest to a certain amount of translation and adaptation, and to both memorization and copying traditions, but the individuals who instigated those activities are invisible to us. We are therefore left mainly with the content of the texts themselves. Since, as will be demonstrated in chs. 3 and 4, that content attests to an internally coherent, consistent ritual method designed to address a specific set of problems, it seems to me most productive to cautiously assume that these texts do indeed reflect Hittite religious thought, and perhaps even practice. Using this approach, it can be demonstrated that the purpose and method of the Old Women’s ritual texts is not far removed from the purpose and method of their oracle texts, allowing for a more complete view of how the Hittites approached divine and/or supernatural problems.

Finally, there is the question of foreign ritual traditions. The possibility of Hurro-Mesopotamian influence on these texts also cannot be discarded out of hand, considering the authors’ claimed origins, particularly those claiming to come from Kizzuwatna or (in the case of Allaituraḫḫi) Syria, and the Hurrian incantations spoken during these rituals. However, without more evidence of ritual texts or practice from these places, very little can be said about their possible backgrounds. In addition, since Allaituraḫḫi and especially Šalašu and Ašdu’s rituals are so fragmentary, even the evidence of the tablets we have from Ḫattuša is thus far insufficient to truly establish any separate “Hurrian” ritual method for these texts. Finally, the evidence of the Luwian authors (i.e., Tunnawiya being an Old Woman “of Ḫattuša” and Kuwattalla being attested in a Hittite land grant) suggests that even if there were something singular about Hurrian

Old Woman rituals in particular, that does not mean that these rituals were not practiced at Hattuša. And in fact, the earliest evidence demonstrates that the Old Women occupied positions of authority in central Anatolia from the very beginning of the Hittite kingdom. This will be the focus of chapter 1.

CHAPTER 1: OLD HITTITE AND FESTIVAL TEXTS

1.1: Introduction

Although most of this dissertation will be organized according to genre, this first chapter instead centers around a chronological period: the earliest part of the Hittite kingdom. This is motivated by a desire to establish the Old Women's social and cultural position, before moving onto an examination of their methods. To date, scholarly literature has tended to place the Old Women in the domestic sphere, rather than in any official state capacity. They have been referred to as "popular ritualists,"¹ "itinerants,"² and practitioners who played a secondary role to other ritualists like the ^{LÚ}HAL and ^{LÚ}AZU.³ In addition, the number of Old Women who were from foreign cities (i.e., outside of central Anatolia), has led to some confusion about whether they were native to the Hittite kingdom. Both of these questions will be answered in the ensuing chapter: when the evidence is examined, it is clear that the Old Women were employed by the state at the highest level, to serve the royal family, and they were at home in the Hittite heartland of central Anatolia. The Old Hittite texts demonstrate that this was true from the very earliest stages of the kingdom.

Some caveats are necessary first. The problem of discussing the Old Hittite period based on existing texts is well-known in Hittitology. Since the cuneiform tablets from Hattuša are the remains of a single collection, which evolved throughout the Late Bronze Age and was abandoned at the beginning of the twelfth century BC, any document extant in the archives was relevant to the Hittites at the end of the empire. Older texts were less likely to be relevant, and therefore more likely to be discarded. Accidental preservation

¹ J. Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*, StBoT 46 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004), 509.

² A. Taggar-Cohen, *Hittite Priesthood*, THeth 26 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 2006), 5.

³ B. Benedetti, "Nota sulla ^{sal}SU.GI ittita," *Mesopotamia* 15 (1980): 97.

of older texts appears to be quite rare. In addition to the problem of preservation, there is some question as to how many Hittite-language documents were being produced before approximately 1500 BC⁴ (during the reign of Telipinu). Therefore, early texts are much fewer in number, and barring the accidental preservation of a tablet in secondary context, they present a picture of the past consciously manipulated by the overseers of the tablet collections.

The problem is compounded when investigating the Old Women, who are overwhelmingly attested in ritual and oracle texts: Old Hittite ritual texts are extremely rare,⁵ and thus far there is only a single Old Hittite oracle preserved (possibly by accident⁶). Each attestation, or possible attestation, of the Old Women in Old Hittite texts will therefore be carefully examined in this chapter, to gain as complete an understanding as possible of the evidence from this period. In addition to the Old Hittite texts, all of the festival texts have been included, even the later documents, both because of their small number and because they present a cohesive picture when placed alongside the older texts (see below). Due to the nature of the evidence, this chapter will first focus on kingship and royal documents, and then turn to a discussion of cultural and linguistic affiliations.

1.2: The Old Women and Hittite royal authority

⁴ Th. van den Hout, “Reflections on the Origins and Development of the Hittite Tablet Collections in Ḫattuša and Their Consequences for the Rise of Hittite Literacy” in *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), ed. F. Pecchioli Daddi, G. Torri, and C. Corti, *Studia Asiana* 5 (Roma 2009), 71–96.

⁵ The well-known StBoT 25, E. Neu’s *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1980), is in fact mostly festival texts (*Festrituale*), i.e., regular celebrations of and offerings to the gods, which contain ritual action, but which are distinguished in Hittitological terminology from ritual texts, which address a specific problem.

⁶ KBo 18.151. In addition to it being the single example of an Old Hittite oracle, it was found in the relatively unusual findspot of Building M on Büyükkale in Ḫattuša, rather than one of the more usual archival buildings like A, D, or E (for a map, see J. Seeher, *Hattusha Guide: A Day in the Hittite Capital*, 2nd ed. [Istanbul: Ege Yayınları, 2002], 104). For a dissenting opinion on its date, see J. Klinger, “Zur Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches,” *OLZ* 95 (2000): 10.

The small number of Old Hittite texts attesting the Old Women all show some relationship to the king, the queen, and the highest levels of the Hittite state. Although some of the evidence may seem ambiguous at first, overall it presents a very cohesive picture of the Old Women as supporters, and employees, of the Hittite royal family. Each text will be carefully examined from this perspective before we turn to considering geographical and cultural concerns.

1.2.1: The Bilingual Testament of Ḫattušili I

Given the paucity of evidence from the Old Hittite period in general, it is somewhat inconvenient that the earliest attestation of the Old Women in the textual record is an outlier in all respects: in time (it is likely significantly earlier even than the other Old Hittite texts), in genre (it is the only historical text that mentions the Old Women), and in content. This text is the Testament of Ḫattušili I (CTH 6),⁷ the first historical king, and the following passage is from the final paragraphs:

The Great King, Labarna, is speaking to Haštayar: “Do not ignore me! Do not let the king speak thus about her: ‘The palace servants say, “This one is constantly consulting the Old Women.”’ (Will) the king speak [thu]s [about her]: ‘Now [she is] *still* [consulting] the Old Women’? I do not know. [Do not] ignore me any longer! [In] the future, consult [only] me! I will [disclose] m[y] words [to you.]”⁸

⁷ Edited by F. Sommer and A. Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Ḫattušili I. (Labarna II.)* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1974).

⁸ KUB 1.16+KUB 40.65; the Hittite version in iii 64-71 reads: (64) LUGAL.GAL la-ba-ar-na-aš A-NA Ḫa-aš-ta-ia-ar me-mi-iš-ṛ ki-iz ṛ-zi (65) le-e-ma-mu-uš-ša-an pa-aš-ku-<<aš>>i-it-ta le-e-ma-an-še (66) [LUGA]L-uš ki-iš-ša-an ṛ te ṛ-ez-zi DUMU^{MEŠ} É.GAL-ša da-ra-an-zi (67) [ka-a-š]a[?]-wa-az^{MUNUS.MEŠ} ŠU.GI-uš pu-nu-uš-ki-iz-zi LUGAL-ša-aš[-še?] (68) [ki-iš-ša-]an te-ez-zi ki-nu-un-wa-az nu-u-wa^{MUNUS.MEŠ} ŠU.GI (69) [pu-nu-uš-ki-iz-zi]i Ṫ-UL ša-ag-ga-ah-hi nam-ma-mu-uš-ša-a[n] (70) [le-e] pa-aš-ku-i-it-[t]a[]x[EG]IR-pa-mu-za pu-nu-uš-ki[-pát?] (71) [nu-ut-ta] ud-da-a-ar-ṛ me ṛ[-et]x-ki-mi. The restorations in the translation are primarily motivated by the corresponding Akkadian text in col. iv, which reads: (64) [LUGAL.GAL l]a-ba-ar-na a-na Ḫa-aš-ta-ia-ar i-qab[-

Dating from probably the last quarter of the seventeenth century BC, the text is a testament of the first king concerning his heir, his ex-heir, and the state of the royal family and the kingdom. This passage is difficult,⁹ but the overall sense is unambiguous: Ḫattušili forbids the woman Haštayar, whose identity is uncertain,¹⁰ to continue asking the Old Women for advice, and insists that she come to him instead. At first glance, this passage is extremely compelling: the first time the Old Women appear in the Hittite corpus, they are the object of royal condemnation. It suggests some dispute with the royal authority, and there is a temptation to extrapolate beyond this text to an institutionalized conflict or difficulty integrating the Old Women into the court, particularly considering the number of Old Women in later texts who hail from foreign countries.¹¹

However, both the wording and the context of the passage suggest an explanation more dependent on Ḫattušili I's situation and personality. The text itself emphasizes Ḫattušili and his desire to be obeyed without any opposing views getting in the way¹²—his admonishment against consulting the Old Women is framed by two repetitions of “Do not ignore me!” in the Hittite

bi] 𐎶 la 𐎶[-a] (65) [te-e]p-pé-ri-ik-ki-i-an-ni la-a i-nu-ma LUGAL ki-e-a-am i-qa-ab[-bi] (66) [D]JUMU^{MES} É.GAL i-qa-ab-bu-ú-šum an-nu-ú^{MUNUS.MES} ŠU.GI (67) [t]a-aš-ta-na-al ù LUGAL ki-e-a-am i-qa-ab-bi a-di i-na-an-n[a] (68) 𐎶^{MUNUS.MES} ŠU.GI iš-ta-na-al ú-ul i-di la-a te-ep-pé-ri-ik-ki[-an-ni] (69) la-a te-ep-pé-ri-ik-ki-an-ni ši-ta-i-li-in-ni ši-ta-i-li-in[-ni] (70) ù a-wa-te^{MES-ù}-ia lu-ú uk-ta-na-al-la-ma-ak-ki, translated: “The Great King, Labarna, spea[ks] to Haštayar: “Do not [ig]nore (lit. stop) me! Let the king not now spea[k] thus [about her?]: ‘[]the palace [s]ervants are saying about her: “This one keeps consulting the Old Women!”’ And will the king speak thus: ‘She stil[l] keeps consulting the Old Women?’ I do not know. Do not ignore (lit. stop) me! Do not ignore (lit. stop) me! Keep asking me, keep asking m[e], and I will certainly disclose my words to you.” See also Sommer and Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue*; other translations include G. Beckman in *The Context of Scripture*, vol. II: *Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*, ed. W.W. Hallo and K.L. Younger (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 79–81 (whose translation of this passage differs somewhat from mine), and P. Goedegebuure in M. Chavalas, *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources in Translation* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), pp. 222–28.

⁹ Most notably, the number of embedded quotations is unclear.

¹⁰ For the existing source material on Haštayar and some speculation as to her identity and relationship to Ḫattušili, see S. de Martino, “Ḫattušili I e Haštayar: un problema aperto,” *Oriens Antiquus* 28/1 (1989): 1–24.

¹¹ As, e.g., de Martino, “Ḫattušili I e Haštayar,” who speculates (pp. 19–21) that the Old Women and their various magics might have been newly integrated into Hittite society from the southwest, perhaps even at the instigation of Haštayar herself (who, he theorizes, may have been a princess of Hurma), and that Ḫattušili was resisting a foreign influence. I disagree with the theory that the Old Women were imported from outside the bend of the Maraššantiya river (with O. Soysal, “Analysis of a Hittite Oracular Document,” *ZA* 90/1 [2000]: 115–16; for more on their geographical and cultural context in the Old Hittite period, see below), but whatever their origins, the evidence is too scanty to make so specific a statement about their official position at the time of Ḫattušili I.

¹² As is also apparent in the Tikunani Letter, where he likewise admonishes the recipient against listening to dissenting views, and ends the letter with “Support my word!” (*awātiya ušur*). (See M. Salvini, *The Ḫabiru Prism of King Tunip-Teššup of Tikunani* [Roma: Istitute editoriali e poligrafici internatzionali, 1996], 107–114.)

version, and in the Akkadian, the phrase is repeated three times. The focus is on him and his wants, rather than any negative qualities of the Old Women. In addition, in the preceding passages, Ḫattušili has explicitly disinherited his nephew in favor of his grandson, and gone on to discuss the various betrayals of his family members, including his nephew, sister, son, and daughter, and even all of the citizens of Ḫattuša. He insists on the absolute loyalty of his advisors to his new heir (§7) and stresses the paramount importance of a sole kingly authority and a unity of purpose among his subjects (§9–11). It is clear that he wants no dissenting voices and no further power struggles among the Hittite elite, and forbidding consultations with the Old Women fits neatly within this pattern.

The singular importance of the king is also illustrated throughout this text in other ways. The Testament is an expression of both royal and paternal authority, of political and personal conflict. The king's emotions and state of mind are surprisingly (for a Near Eastern context) present in this text, and receive perhaps the most interesting treatment in the passage where Ḫattušili condemns his former heir Labarna: "But he showed himself a youth not fit to be seen. He didn't shed tears; he didn't show mercy; he was cold; he was heartless."¹³ Ḫattušili is using this statement as justification for disinheriting Labarna, and in §3, he goes on to say, "...he showed no sympathy when commanded by the king. How then can he show sympathy on his [own] toward Ḫattuša?"¹⁴ According to this argument, (the appearance of) emotional expression and identification with the population of Ḫattuša are essential qualities of kingship.¹⁵

These qualities are quite well-known in the Hittitological world from the reign of Muršili

II. Three hundred years after the Testament's composition, in a prayer asking for a cure for the

¹³ Beckman, *Context of Scripture*, 79.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ For responsibility to the populace, see also the decree of Pimpira: "Look at the sick man and give him bread (and) water; if the heat strikes him, put him in a cool place; if the cold strikes him, put him in a warm place!" (KBo 3.23 obv. 5–8, ed. M. Cammarosano, *Il decreto antico-ittita di Pimpira*, Eothen 14 (Firenze: LoGisma, 2006), 19.

plague rampaging in Anatolia, Muršili begged the gods, “Send away the worry from my heart, take away the anguish from my soul!”¹⁶ Muršili presents a national crisis as overwhelmingly personal for him, and the king’s suffering is the focal point of his request for the gods to end the plague. Rather than showing himself an exception, in these texts, he is acting entirely in accordance with Ḫattušili’s characterization of a good king—and in fact, there are also (fewer and more fragmentary) Middle Hittite prayers that show similar expressions of suffering.¹⁷ It seems worthwhile, therefore, to maintain some awareness of textual presentation of the Hittite king’s purported personal emotions, sympathies, desires, and well-being.

Of course, this text still does not suggest that the Old Women had any privileged position with respect to those emotions. But there are some other texts from the Old Hittite period, less individual than the Testament, that allow for a better understanding of the institutional relationship the Old Women had with the king in general, despite (and/or alongside) whatever disputes they may have had with Ḫattušili I in particular. Even the Testament itself gives some clues in that direction: for example, the Old Women were clearly operating in a royal context, and even in that context, their intellectual authority was great enough for Ḫattušili to feel threatened by it—or to desire to control it. Ḫattušili says nothing about whether he is willing to engage their services for himself, only that he does not want other people doing so. And, in fact, the few ritual and oracular documents from the Old Hittite period attest to a significant presence of the Old Women in the royal sphere.

1.2.2: The Benedictions for the Labarna

CTH 820, the Benedictions for the Labarna, is a group of texts containing incantations for the well-being of the king or the royal family, incantations of a type that, as Archi has

¹⁶ I. Singer, *Hittite Prayers*, WAW 11 (Atlanta: SBL, 2002), 64.

¹⁷ E.g., CTH 374, Singer’s Text 4b (*Hittite Prayers*, 33–36).

demonstrated, are well-known in Hittite textual material, particularly rituals and prayers.¹⁸ These recitations may be performed by the king himself (in prayers) or by religious functionaries (in ritual and festival context) and may be in Hittite or in other languages, i.e., Hattic or Palaic. One of these texts, KBo 13.122 + KUB 20.54 (CTH 820.5), its duplicate KUB 55.2, and the Old Script parallel KBo 21.22 (CTH 820.4),¹⁹ together make up a set of these incantations. The Old Woman is explicitly attested as the speaker of the incantations only in the later version, since the earlier version is in the first person only, but the later text is in the nature of an expansion and clarification rather than any more drastic revision (see below), and thus the practitioner is unlikely to have changed.

Unfortunately, many of the passages in both the older and later exemplars are too fragmentary or opaque to interpret fruitfully. For example, there is an extremely broken section near the beginning of KBo 21.22 (the older version): “Come, eagle: go [...]! Go forth to the *kinubi*-vessel [...] Bring [...]!”²⁰ These lines show a clear relationship to CTH 414, an Old Hittite ritual for building a palace, which begins with a lengthy series of dialogue and recitations designed to ensure the health, strength, and long life of the king. In one section, an eagle is sent to get a *kinubi*-vessel from a funeral pyre, and in the *kinubi*-vessel are combined a body part (*šišai*-, untranslatable) of a lion and one of a leopard, which are then merged (or equated?) with the king’s soul (*ištanzana*-) inside his heart.²¹ The passage in CTH 820 is too fragmentary to

¹⁸ A. Archi, “Auguri per il Labarna,” in *Studia Mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata*, ed. O. Carruba, StMed 1 (Pavia, 1979), 27–51.

¹⁹ Edited both by Archi, “Auguri,” 44–47 (in part, and including a transliteration of KBo 13.122+ in fn. 32), and G. Kellerman, “The King and the Sun-God in the Old Hittite Period,” *Tel Aviv* 5 (1978): 199–208 (in full, and including a transliteration of KBo 13.122+ on p. 201). Archi does not include KUB 55.2 (Bo 2226); Kellerman includes it but counts it as a join to KBo 13.122+, rather than a duplicate as the Konkordanz now has it.

²⁰ 9’ -]aš’ e-hu ha-a-ra-aš i-it

10’ n]a-aš-ta ki-nu-u-bi pa-ra-a i-it

11’] ú-da

²¹ Kellerman, *Recherche sur les rituels de fondation hittites*, PhD diss., Université de Paris, 1980, p. 28, and G. Beckman, “Temple Building among the Hittites,” in *From the Foundations to the Crenellations: Essays on Temple*

make any statements about its relationship to this episode in CTH 414, even though a lion and a leopard are also mentioned in the following paragraph of KBo 21.22; the existing text does not, unfortunately, support an exact parallel to CTH 414.²² However, it is likely that CTH 820 is also expressing a relationship between the king's spirit and a lion and leopard.

There does follow a fairly well-preserved passage about the king's soul (*ištanšana-*) in CTH 820: the Old Woman says, "Whatever Labarna, the king, desires in (=of) his soul (and) his [heart], let it reach him! [Whateve]r Tawananna, the queen, desires in (=of) her soul (and) her heart(!), let [i]t reach her!"²³ The king (and queen)'s feelings and desires come to the forefront once again, this time in ritual context; in CTH 820, the Old Woman explicitly asks that the king and queen get whatever they want. And of course there are implications beyond the personal; incantations for the benefit of the king in Hittite texts often segue directly from requests for health, life, vigor, etc. into requests for royal progeny, military success, and well-being for the country.²⁴

Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible, ed. M.J. Boda and J. Novotny, AOAT 366 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2010), p. 74. Kellerman ("The King and the Sun-God," p. 201–202) restores the passage in KBo 21.22 somewhat further based on KUB 29.1 ii 40'–43', but in my opinion the parallel is not quite close enough for restoration.

²² Collins ("Ḫattušili I, the Lion King," *JCS* 50 [1998]: 19), argues that the two texts were composed by the same author (based on this passage and the renewal passage discussed below), but I do not believe that there is enough evidence for that.

²³ 14' ...nu-za ku-it la-ba-ar-na-aš LUGAL-uš iš-ta-an-za-na-aš-ša-aš

15' [ŠÀ-aš-š]a-aš i-la-a-li-iš-ki-iz-zi na-at-ši an-da a-ra-a-an e-eš-tu

16' [nu-za ku-i]t^{MUNUS} ta-wa-[n]a-an-na-aš MUNUS.LUGAL ŠA ZI-ŠU ŠA ZI[?]-ŠU i-la-li-iš-ki-zi

17' [na-a]t-ši an-d[a] a-ra-an e-eš-tu

Restorations after Kellerman ("The King and the Sun-God," p. 199). The problem of the second, difficult ZI[?] sign in ln. 16' has no easy answer; Kellerman (n. 4) suggests an equation of "ZI" with "ŠÀ," "heart," citing Kammenhuber ("Die hethitischen Vorstellungen von Seele und Leib, Herz und Leibesinnerem, Kopf und Person," *ZA* 22 [1964]: 164–67), but one would not expect to see the same sign twice in a row meaning different things in a Hittite text, and the fact that the ŠÀ in the previous line is restored makes the equation even less certain. Archi ("Auguri," 45) instead transcribes ŠA ZI-ŠU ŠA^{UZU}<ŠÀ>[?]-ŠU, but the sign is not quite an UZU, and so this reading would require adding one sign and emending another, also somewhat unsatisfactory. However, I have no more satisfying solution to offer. In any case, the sense of the passage is clear.

²⁴ See, e.g., Archi, "Auguri," p. 27 (KUB 24.1, CTH 377), pp. 29–30 (KUB 36.89, CTH 671), pp. 33–34 (KUB 43.23, CTH 820.3), and perhaps in particular pp. 50–51 (KUB 36.110, CTH 820.1), for which see also below. For more analysis of incantations for the benefit of the king and queen, see ch. 4.

In this case, KBo 21.22 continues (18'–21'): "Here, I raise the scale: I am measuring out the long years of Labarna; here, I raise the scale: I am measuring out the long years of the Tawananna. The incantation of the scale is finished outside."²⁵ The "long years" of royal personages are well-known throughout Hittite history, attested in rituals, prayers, and oracles (see ch. 2), and the Old Woman "measuring them out"²⁶ with a scale is clearly an attempt to ensure that their lives are long; and once again, the (in this case physical) success of the king and queen can easily be equated to the success of the Hittite kingdom. Compare also once again CTH 414, the Old Hittite temple building ritual, in which the eagle, again a messenger, reports to the deified throne, "(The gods Išduštaya and Papaya) are spinning the years of the King. There is no limit or number to the years."²⁷ The years of the king (and/or queen) are given physical qualities, weight in CTH 820 and length in CTH 414, suggesting an attempt to pin down the future, concretely and visibly, in the present. The recitation over the scale is also reminiscent of the dialogue between two Old Woman in the Hittite royal funerary ritual, CTH 450, in which the scale is used in part of a (difficult to interpret) debate about the deceased king or queen's soul (see chs. 3 and 4).

The final passage in KBo 21.22 that is reasonably accessible is a dialogue, and is paralleled in the later copy, which has no composite edition as yet; therefore, the Hittite reads:

KUB 20.54 + KBo 13.122 vi²⁸ 1–10 (duplicated by KUB 55.2 obv. 5'–7', rev. 1–5)

1 [DUMU] É.GAL te-ez-z[(i ḫé-e-eš ^{MUNUS}ŠU.G)]I te-ez-ṛ zi ṛ [ku-e-ez-za]

²⁵ Transliterated by Kellerman, "The King and the Sun-God," 199–200.

²⁶ Perhaps with some kind of transactional sense, given the scale.

²⁷ Beckman, "Temple Building among the Hittites," 73.

²⁸ Ehelolf labels the fragment as column vi in KUB 20, in line with the volume's label as "hethitische Festrituale," but in fact there is no indication of how many columns the tablet originally had, and "iv" might be more appropriate. The Old Hittite copy has only one column.

2 ú-wa-at-te-ni *UM-M*[(*A DUMU É.GAL š*)]u-up-pa-ia-za-wa 𐎶 pé-e[?] 𐎶[-da-az *UM-MA*
^{MUNUSŠ}(*U.GI*)]

3' nu-wa ku-e-e-ez-za šu-up-pa-i[a-za] *UM-MA DUMU É.GAL* za-ḫa-<ne>-i[t-ti-en-na-za]

4' nu-wa ku-e-ez-za za-ḫa-ne-it-ti-en-na-za *UM-MA* [(*DUMU É.GAL x*²⁹)]

5' ^dUTU-aš-wa pá^r'-na-az [(*U*)]*M-MA* ^{MUNUSŠ}*U.GI* nu-wa-ra-aš *GI*[(*M-an* ^dUTU-uš)]

6' e-eš-ri-iš-še-et-wa ne-e-u-wa-an *GABA-ŠU*-wa ne-e-[(u-wa-an)]

7' pí-iš-na-tar-še-et-wa ne-e-u-wa-an *SAG.DU-ZU AN.BAR*[-(aš)]

8' *ZU*^{HI.A}-*ŠU*-wa *ŠA UR.MAH* ša-ku-wa-še-et-wa ḫar-ra-n[a-aš]

9' nu-wa ḫa-a-ra-ni-li ša-a-ku-uš-ki-iz-zi

10' 𐎶 ut 𐎶-<<da>>³⁰-ni-iš-še-ta-wa ne-e-u-wa-an

“The palace [servant] says, ‘Open up!’³¹ The Old Woman says, ‘[Where] do you (pl.) come [from]?’ Thus the palace servant: ‘From a pure pl[ace].’ [Thus the O]ld [Woman]: ‘So, from what pure place?’³² Thus the palace servant: ‘[From] the *zahanit*[*tenna*]-.’ Thus the Old Woman:

²⁹ This sign is copied as an *UM* in KUB 55.2, but on the photo it is not an *UM* as written in the rest of the text, and it is noticeably lighter than the rest of the line—perhaps partially erased? Comparison with the Old Hittite parallel KBo 21.22 suggests that there should be nothing between *DUMU É.GAL* and ^dUTU-aš.

³⁰ This line is not in KBo 21.22. However, in the Hattic parallel to this text (KUB 28.74, see below), this line is preserved (rev. line 5). The Hattic word is *te-wu_u-ur = te=wu_ur*, “his land,” and therefore *ud-da-ni* must be a mistake for *ut-ni* (O. Soysal, *Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlieferung*, HdO I:74 [Leiden: Brill, 2004], 812), a welcome emendation, since *uddani=ššet* is ungrammatical.

³¹ *Contra* Kellerman (“The King and the Sun-God,” p. 202); see E. Rieken, *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*, StBoT 44 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999), p. 21 n.75, who points out that since in the duplicate KUB 55.2 (which Kellerman had interpreted rather as a join to KUB 20.54+), the line reads *he-e-eš* rather than *ha-a-aš* as in the older text, it cannot mean “washing-powder,” but must be the imperative of *haš-/heš-* “to open.” In support of Rieken, the composite later version also makes it clear that the Old Woman does not say “*hēš*,” but begins speaking immediately after, and therefore it cannot be a vocative address to the other party in the dialogue, as Kellerman translated it.

³² For “nu” as “then” or “so” in this context, see H.A. Hoffner, “Asyndeton in Hittite,” in *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. D. Groddek and M. Zorman, DBH 25 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 388.

‘So, from what *zahanittenna*-?’ Thus the palace servant: ‘From the temple of the Sun-God.’

Thus the Old Woman: ‘He is like the Sun-God.’³³ [...?]

‘His form is new, his breast is new, his manhood is new; his head is of iron, his teeth are a lion’s, his eyes are an eagle[’s], and he sees like an eagle. His land is new.’”

The older passage, on the other hand, is nearly complete by itself, and reads, “‘Open up!’ ‘Where do you come from?’ ‘I come from a pure place.’ ‘So, from what pure place?’ ‘From the *zahanittenna*-.’ ‘So, from what *zahanittenna*-?’ ‘From the temple of the Sun-deity.’ ‘So, from what Sun-deity?’ ‘His form is new, his breast is new, his [head] is new; his manhood is new. His [teeth] are a lion’s; [his] eyes are an [e]agle[’s, and] he se[es] like an [e]agle.’”³⁴

The later version of the text seems to be changed mostly for the purpose of clarification: the speakers are identified, and the difficult transition from the dialogue to the description of the king is made easier and more explicit by the line, “He is like the Sun-God,” rather than “From what Sun-God?” as in the older version. The only substantial changes are (1) the role the palace servant takes is plural, rather than singular (*uwaši* in KBo 21.22 obv. 22, as opposed to *uwatteni* in KUB 20.54+ vi 2), and (2) the addition of the final line of the section, “His land is new.” That this is likely also in the nature of a clarification or expansion, rather than an insertion of a new idea, can be argued based on the loose parallel of this passage in CTH 414, the Old Hittite building ritual, which is introduced by the sentence, “Sun-God³⁵ and Storm-God, allocate the land to the king again” (KUB 29.1 ii 48–49). The passage in CTH 414 might also be interpreted as the king’s strength and renewal being a prerequisite for his being worthy of the land (e.g., allocate the land to him again *because* of the following qualities), but in CTH 820.5, it seems

³³ Or perhaps, “How is the Sun-God?”

³⁴ KBo 21.22 22’–28’. Transliterated by Kellerman, “The King and the Sun-God,” p. 200, and Archi, “Auguri,” p. 46.

³⁵ For a discussion of the gender of the Sun-God in this text, see Kellerman, *ibid.*, 205–207.

rather to be a natural progression from the renewal of one to the renewal of the other, similar to other texts, as noted above. Thus, once again the king is equated to the land, this time with focus on his physical qualities. Compare one of the other Benedictions for the Labarna, CTH 820.1 (KUB 36.110) rev. 11–12: “Labarna the king is strong, and the whole land is (becoming) strong in/with/like him.”³⁶ This text is a plural recitation, and the speakers seem to be representing the populace, stating that they depend on the king’s strength (“May Labarna the king of Hatti be our fortress,” lines 8–9) and affirming that if the king’s body is strong, the land will likewise be strong.

The rest of both the older and the later versions of this text are unfortunately too difficult or fragmentary to subject to much productive analysis. There is an extremely broken section that is summarized as “*AWAT GAL-riaš*” (KBo 21.22 line 35’), the “word of the cup,” which may be related to the Old Woman speaking a Palaic incantation “of cups” in CTH 750, the Festival of Ziparwa (see below).³⁷ There are also two paragraphs describing springs, one of the Sun-god, and one of the Storm-god, which seem to have some protective function for the king. Finally, there is a fragmentary paragraph in which the divine throne is mentioned. Not much can be said about these final sections of the text; however, the understandable passages by themselves demonstrate an official role for the Old Woman in support of the king.

1.2.3: The Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple

The Benedictions for the Labarna are truly *benedictions*; that is, they are simply intended to have a positive effect. There is no indication in the text of troubles to be dispelled, or negative

³⁶ Edited by Archi, “Auguri,” pp. 50–50, and Hoffner, “The Political Antithesis and Foil of the Labarna in an Old Hittite Text,” in *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, ed. I. Singer (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 2010), 131–32. For the intransitive use of *inarahh-*, see N. Oettinger, *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums* (Nürnberg: Verlag Hans Carl, 1979), 240 n. 3.

³⁷ E.g., KUB 59.49 obv ii, 9’-14’.

influences to be averted. It is for this reason that the text does not fall under the usual category of “ritual texts” as they are defined in Hittitology (CTH 390–500 and 725–91), i.e., as texts designed to address a specific issue, solve a problem, avert an approaching crisis, counter sorcery, and so on. And in fact, Old Hittite texts of this type are extremely rare. By far the longest and most complete Old Hittite ritual against negative influences and/or effects is CTH 416, the Old Hittite ritual for the royal couple.

This text, already edited by Otten and Souček in 1969,³⁸ features a series of ritual actions designed to remove troubles from the king and queen and ensure their continued life and health. It is relatively well-preserved, but the practitioner is never identified. The very beginning and the very end are missing from all exemplars, meaning that there is neither an incipit nor a colophon, which might have named an author, and the ritual actions (like in CTH 820’s KBo 21.22 above) are in the first person, so the actor is never labeled. An Old Woman has always been considered a serious possibility: Otten and Souček suggested “etwa ‘Priester’ oder ‘Weise Frau’?”³⁹ in their edition, while Volkert Haas has considered an Old Woman to be a likely option simply because the ritual is in the first person.⁴⁰ First person ritual texts are not limited to Old Woman practitioners,⁴¹ but an examination of the comparative evidence shows that Haas is correct: CTH 416 was almost certainly performed by an Old Woman (see below and chs. 3–4 for more detailed discussion).

It is also clear that CTH 416 is not one ritual but four, closely related to one another in purpose, in technique, and in materials, but clearly demarcated in the text. Each ritual is designed

³⁸ *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar*, StBoT 8 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1969).

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁴⁰ V. Haas, *Materia magica et medica hethitica* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 18.

⁴¹ For example, CTH 394, the ritual of Ašhela, the man of Hapalla, CTH 474, the ritual of Kuwanni, the priestess of Hebat, and CTH 758, the ritual of a Mr. Puriyanni, whose title is not attested—among others—are all in the first person.

to help rid the king and queen from various afflictions, including slander/sorcery (literally “tongues”), sickness, uncleanness, blood(shed), general evil and terrible things, and pain and worry. None of these seem to imply guilt; there is no *waštul*, “sin,” in any of the lists of items to be dispelled, and none of these terms require the possessor to have any agency in their creation. Even “uncleanness” (*paprātar*) may be inflicted on someone by outside means (although it also may be the result of a transgression). These rituals do not, therefore, seem to be rituals of expiation, but rather a dispelling of evil influence brought on the king and queen through no fault of their own.

The first ritual contains two separate lists of things to be taken away from the king and queen: first, “the tongues of the populace” (=slander/sorcery) and sickness in the heart and the head,⁴² and second, uncleanness, terrible tongues (*hatugauš laluš*: *hatuga-* is a quality that can be attached to thunder, gods, and evil omens), and bloody [...] of the Ḫantašepa-deities,⁴³ perhaps demons of some kind (this may stand for violent or perhaps vengeful intentions). In order to get rid of these evil qualities, the following actions are taken (this section is published as Otten and Souček’s Text 2 x+1 – Text 1 ii 18, pp. 16–24; the very beginning is broken):

⁴² Whether this could refer to emotional rather than physical affliction, as might be inferred from a modern statement like this, is not clear.

⁴³ These lines are more broken in Otten and Souček’s edition, but the restoration of “Ḫantašepa” (replacing the edition’s AN.B[AR...?]) based on a parallel text can be found in HW² s.v. *hatuga-*, p. 529. The Ḫantašepas are wearing bloody garments earlier in the ritual (KBo 17.1 i 24’), and that is what Kammenhuber restores in this break, but just because the adjective is the same does not mean the noun is. (It cannot be their ‘eyes,’ which are also bloody earlier in the ritual, because the adjective is common-gender.) These deities/demons are attested only in CTH 416, in KBo 18.14, a fragmentary letter, in a section concerning fugitives (H.A. Hoffner, *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*, WAW 15 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009], 88), and in very fragmentary context in KUB 44.56, a fragment attributed to CTH 457 (edited on the Konkordanz by F. Fuscagni, hethiter.net/: CTH 457.6) that displays some interesting parallels to CTH 416 (e.g., spitting, the Labarna, evil tongues), but with enough differences (e.g., it seems to take place by a river and sea, and is significantly later in date) that it is unlikely to be an unrecognized duplicate or join, though it should be noted that CTH 402, the ritual of Alli, which likewise displays many similarities to CTH 416, is also later in date and takes place by a river.

--...the king and queen put iron tongues in their mouths, hang something on their fingers, and spit on a clay figurine (*šena-*, likely anthropomorphic) and an ox (perhaps also clay, see the following page). The text breaks.

--The rite's practitioner, most likely an Old Woman, says, "I have hereby taken the tongues of the populace from you; I have taken sickness from you: I have taken it both from your heart and from your head!"⁴⁴ They wash their mouths three times with pure water, and pour the water into a vessel containing two "heavens," one of iron and one of copper, and nine pegs.

--A palace servant takes the tongues from the king and queen's mouths and the things from their fingers. The practitioner puts them in an area near the temple,⁴⁵ and they go inside.

--The practitioner has "Ḫantašepa-deities"⁴⁶ made of wood, girded for battle, who hold human heads and spears, and whose eyes and garments are bloody (or blood-red). Cups are brought in, filled with *tarlipa*, which they call blood, and the king and queen each get a Ḫantašepa and a cup. There are (clay) troops set on top of bread, and a bronze knife on top of that, and they are brought in while the palace servant holds a torch over them.

--The practitioner slaughters a clay ox (?), and the text breaks.

--Following the break, the Ḫantašepas, the cups, and the clay men are mentioned, and then the practitioner digs a hole and buries something (probably some/all of the objects). A sheep is offered to the Sun-God of heaven, and other (broken) offerings to at least three other deities, and fire, honey, and oil are mentioned.

⁴⁴ KBo 17.1 i 11' [(ka)]-a-ša-ta-aš-ma-aš-kán ut-ni-ia-an-da-an la-a-lu-uš da-a-aḫ-ḫu-[un]
12' [(ir-m)]a-aš-ma-aš-kán da-a-aḫ-ḫu-un kar-di-iš-mi-ia-at-kán da-a-aḫ-ḫu-un
13' [(ḫar-ša)]-ni-iš-mi-ia-at-kán da-a-aḫ-ḫu-un

With restorations from KBo 17.3 6'-8'; see *Ein althethitisches Ritual*, 18.

⁴⁵ The *hantezumna-*, of unclear meaning; HW² (vol. H, p. 187) says it is a place "in/bei der Tempel," but in this context at least, the depositing of items there is followed by *wēš=a namma anda [p]aiwani*, "and then we go inside" (KBo 17.1++ i 21'-22'), so outside seems most likely.

⁴⁶ Written with a divine determinative.

--The practitioner asks the gods for mercy, and says that she has taken the uncleanness, the terrible tongues, and the Ḫantašepa-deities' bloody [...] of the king, queen, and children, and of Ḫattuša,⁴⁷ and tells the gods to [...] them.

--They eat and drink; the practitioner goes to Ḫattuša while the king goes to the cult city Arinna, and then to Katapa, and if the king so instructs, the practitioner goes to the "house of the children."

The parallels to Old Woman rituals are extremely clear in this ritual. First of all, spitting in ritual context (to deal with curses or evil words, to expel pain and woe, et cetera) is entirely limited to Old Woman rituals.⁴⁸ Malicious tongues are more commonly attested (e.g., the LÚAZU in CTH 446, the ritual to purify a house, includes evil tongues in two of the long lists of problems to be removed from the house),⁴⁹ but they feature especially prominently in the Old Woman corpus (see ch. 4). In addition, anthropomorphic *šena*-figurines, when used in ritual context, are overwhelmingly attested in Old Woman rituals.⁵⁰ Finally, as will be demonstrated in chs. 3 and 4, the act of drawing evil out of a patient itself is a specialty of the Old Women (see the Conclusion for more detailed comparisons between the Old Women and other practitioners).

As for the ritual itself, first, there are clearly two parts to it, separated by the entrance into the temple. The first half is broken at the beginning, but the ritual actions are familiar; as mentioned above, spitting to rid oneself of evil influence, curses, or sorcery is well-known in Hittite texts, as are model tongues to symbolize harmful speech. Contact as a way of transferring

⁴⁷ Otten and Souček (*Ein althethitisches Ritual*, 23) have it as "the children of Ḫattuša," meaning its citizenry (though with further discussion on pp. 103-104), but the word order suggests otherwise, and children are mentioned explicitly elsewhere in the text.

⁴⁸ Based on a consultation of the Chicago Hittite Dictionary files, outside of CTH 416, there are 71 attestations of the verb in Old Woman rituals, and four attestations in rituals with no practitioner preserved.

⁴⁹ See H. Otten, "Eine Beschwörung der Unterirdischen aus Boğazköy," *ZA* 54 (1961): 114-57, and B.J. Collins, "Purifying a House: A Ritual for Infernal Deities," in *Context of Scripture I*, 170-71.

⁵⁰ Out of several dozen texts containing the word, nineteen are rituals conducted by Old Women, compared to only four that are rituals conducted by various other practitioners.

any evil effects is also well-known, so that may be the function of iron tongues in the king and queen's mouths and the objects on their fingers. However, it should be noted that those items are not disposed of, but simply put out of the way—but the ending is broken, so it is impossible to say if they are left in the *ḥantezumna*-, or perhaps buried, as the other objects (probably) are, at the end of the second half. If they were not, perhaps they had some kind of protective function, rather than as receptacles for evil.

The second half of the ritual seems to be dealing with a higher level of evil influence; there are more items to be disposed of, there are the violent and supernatural *Ḫantašepas* involved, and the gods are solicited for help. This is particularly noticeable in the recitations: in the first half of the ritual, the recitation of “I have taken the tongues and the sickness” is worded like a *fait accompli*, but actually precedes some final actions: the royal couple wash their mouths with pure water, and pour the water into the vessel with the copper and iron “heavens” and the pegs. (It is unclear whether this is the remaining clean water, or the water that has been used to wash their mouths. The “heavens” are perhaps a purifying influence, and the pegs may themselves be purified by the water and heavens, to lend them strength to hold any contamination down in the earth, supposing the water is in fact clean.) In the second half, the recitation, which is again in the past tense, “I have taken...”⁵¹ is followed only by the meal; the statement is only made once the ritual is finished. The recitation is also preceded by offerings to the gods, and it opens with “Mercy, O gods!” and ends with a (slightly broken) request for the gods to lend their aid somehow. Therefore, it looks as though at first, when the problem is slander/sorcery and sickness, the practitioner is capable of addressing it herself, but after they move into the temple and bring out the more serious, more dangerous problems (uncleanliness, terrible tongues, and the violent *Ḫantašepas*), she enlists divine help, and prefaces her recitation

⁵¹ The Hittite (*dahhun*) is a preterite, but it is conventionally translated as a perfect in ritual context like this.

with offerings. However, according to the recitation, she is still the one to have “taken” the problems away, and she is in fact the one who has dug a hole and buried what needed to be disposed.

At the end of the ritual, the participants eat and drink, and then go their separate ways, the practitioner to Ḫattuša (likely home), but the king to Arinna and Katapa, which are Hattic cult cities (see below for a discussion of the Hattic religious sphere), so perhaps there are other ritual or cultic activities scheduled after this is completed. Finally, the last episode in each of the four rituals of CTH 416 is the practitioner’s optional visit to the “house of the children,” which presumably expresses the possibility of performing the same or a similar ritual on the princes and princesses.

The second ritual (Otten and Souček’s obv. ii 19–rev. iii 19, pp. 24–32, supplemented by Neu’s *Althethitische Ritualtexte* Text 3 ii 26’–33’⁵²) is as follows:

--A live eagle is caught; the practitioner makes clay figurines of men, and has four cups of *tarlipa*, bread, a vessel of wine and one of beer, a sheep, and two spears.

--In the evening, the practitioner gives a cup each to the king, the queen, the throne, and the hearth. The palace servant swings the eagle over the king and queen three times, and the practitioner swings the figurines three times over them, and the king and queen spit on the figurines three times (while a bronze knife is on top of them). The eagle and figurines are swung over the king and queen again. Two palace servants have the bronze spears, and they strike them three times.

--The eagle is brought away, and a servant puts the four cups on the figurines and [someone] brings them and the spear(s) into the “inner chamber” and puts them at the king and queen’s heads. The eagle is brought to the gatehouse, and everyone sleeps.

⁵² E. Neu, *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift*, StBoT 25 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1980), 8.

--In the morning, the practitioner comes into the king and queen's chamber. The palace servant swings the eagle over the king and queen three times. The figurines, cups, and spears are brought from the inner chamber and parceled out again, and the bronze spears are struck three times. The practitioner swings the eagle three times, and it is brought out, as are the spears.

--The practitioner goes to the mountain facing the sun, and says, "Mercy, O Sun-God [a]nd Storm-God! The eagle is their [me]diator(?).⁵³ The king has a sickle, and the queen [has] a millstone. Th[ey? prepare?] *harši*-bread and *išpanduzzi*-libations for you eternally. Just as the Sun-God, the Storm-God, heaven, and earth are eternal, let the king, queen, and children be eternal!" Then she releases the eagle, and says, "I did not let it go; the king and queen let it go. Go and keep saying to the Sun-God and the Storm-God: 'As the Sun-God and Storm-God are eternal, likewise let the king and queen be eternal!'"⁵⁴

--The practitioner buries the clay men and the cups in the earth, and fixes them there (probably with pegs)⁵⁵ and tells the Sun-God and Storm-God that here she has buried the sickness, the blood, the evil, and the terror (or terrible thing) of (and for) the king, queen, and children in Ḫattuša, and implores that they not come back up, and that the enemy take them away. The practitioner makes sheep-, bread-, wine-, and beer-offerings; they eat, and come up and bring the bronze spears.

--If the king and queen so direct, the practitioner goes to the house of the children, but if not, she doesn't.

The eagle is here used as a messenger between the royal couple and the Sun-God and the Storm-God, which is reminiscent of the fragmentary passage in CTH 820.4 above. The eagle

⁵³ A. Kloekhorst, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, 1007, suggests *teriyala=šmiš*, i.e., "their third," meaning "mediator" for x-ri-ia-la-aš-mi-iš. It is clear from context at least that the eagle is serving as an intercessor.

⁵⁴

⁵⁵ The verb *tarma*- literally means "to peg," and in ritual context the cognate accusative "pegs" often appears with it (Haas, *Materia Magica*, 734–41), and of course pegs are attested in the first ritual in CTH 416.

appears in Anatolian mythology as a messenger of the Sun-God: when the fertility god Telipinu has disappeared, the Sun-God makes the first attempt at finding him by sending out a swift eagle. In addition, the goddess Kamrušepa is later able to use an eagle's wing when stopping Telipinu's anger (the method is unclear), and in the more fragmentary second and third versions of the myth, the eagle seems able to move a mortal using his wing. These myths are likewise closely connected to the Old Women (see below), and show the eagle to be a powerful figure.

Other than the eagle, this ritual is quite similar to the first one; once again, there are clay figurines, and the king and queen spit on them to transfer the evils from themselves to the figures. In this ritual, however, the final part is fully preserved, and it can be seen that the practitioner buries the figurines and fixes them into the ground, so that they may not come back. In addition, in this ritual, both the figurines and the eagle are swung over the king and queen, and it is clear that the harmful influences are attached to the figurines, which are then buried down in the ground, while something else (the king and queen's need and desire to be freed of them, perhaps, or—based on the recitation—their piety and future intentions) is attached to the eagle, which is then sent up to the sky. Likewise, the practitioner is the one who buries the figurines and the cups, with the king and queen not mentioned at all in that paragraph, while she explicitly disavows her own agency in releasing the eagle, and says that it was the king and queen. It is perhaps also notable that during the ritual, she is the only one to swing the figurines (while on the other hand, she swings the eagle only once, just before the recitation, and the rest of the time, a palace servant does it). The practitioner is thus shown as the appropriate person to expose herself to the dangerous elements after they have been removed, while she makes no effort to put herself between the royal couple and the gods, who should be as close as possible.

The need for an intermediary in this ritual also suggests that the problem is quite serious, which the rest of the ritual seems to support. It spans two days, first of all; the items that collect the evil are left in the king and queen's chamber overnight, presumably so as to better absorb it. The cups of *tarlipa-* are given not only to the king and queen, but to the throne and hearth, perhaps indicating wider problems with the household and/or kingdom. The eagle's help is needed to enlist divine aid, and rather than simply asking the gods for mercy and help during the disposal process, as in the first ritual, there is an entirely separate episode where the practitioner has to physically go to a mountain and release the eagle to ask for mercy on the king and queen's behalf. It is only after this that she buries the cups and figurines, and rather than saying, "I have taken..." the evils, she says only, "I have buried" them, and asks the gods to make sure that they do not reappear. Finally, the list in this ritual is, "their sickness, their blood, their evil, and their terrible thing(s)" (*hatuga=šmet*, difficult to translate: see above on *hatuga-*). The list is less specific and more all-encompassing than the sickness and slander in the first ritual, and suggests more troubles. In addition, in this ritual there is no assumption of human agency, no "tongues" to be countered. Considering the elaborate efforts with the eagle, and the practitioner's insistence on the king and queen's piety in her recitation, perhaps the ritual was designed to negotiate help from deities who might be displeased.

The third ritual (Otten and Souček's rev. iii 19–iv 12, pp. 32–36), and the most fragmentary, is as follows:

--Then, the practitioner takes the terrible thing, the blood, [perhaps something else], and the uncleanliness of the king and queen. At night, twice [...]; she makes *zuwaluwal*, cooked with(?) blue wool. She winds something. She makes cups for the king and queen; the *kunkumati*^{SAR}-plant is mentioned. She has a basket with seeds [...] and a torch inside. There are *muriyala*-breads

hung on the horns of two billy-goats (one on each side), and she is holding nine perforated [...] *muriyala*-breads. At night, she gives a *zuwaluwal* and a cup each to the king and the queen.

--[fragmentary: actions involving the bread, the horns of the goat, the basket; the goat is driven out, something is burned, offerings are made]

--[fragmentary]; the practitioner says that she has taken away the terrible things, the evil, sickness, and uncleanness: "Let it not come back! Let the enemy take it away."

--Bread- and wine-offerings are made, and they eat and drink. [somewhat fragmentary] When it becomes light, the ^{LÚ}A.ZU and the practitioner go and look at the "*tarlipa* of blood," the cup, and the hearth, and tell the king and queen what signs there are. Further bread- and wine-offerings.

--If the king and queen say, the practitioner goes to the "house of the children," but if they don't, she doesn't. She used to go often, but now she doesn't go at all.

This ritual is the most difficult of the four, and consequently, the least may be said about it. The ^{LÚ}A.ZU (not to be confused with the well-attested male ritual practitioner the ^{LÚ}AZU) is commonly rendered with its Mesopotamian translation of "physician," and these people are attested in a plain medical context, but also conducting rituals against sickness and participating in festival activity not at all related to medical practice.⁵⁶ They are not nearly as commonly-attested as the Old Women, although they appear alongside them more than once in fragmentary context.⁵⁷ It is difficult to say why they might be called on for the interpretation of signs specifically. The Old Women, on the other hand, were professional diviners as well as ritual

⁵⁶ G. Beckman, "From Cradle to Grave: Women's Role in Hittite Medicine and Magic," *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 8 (1993): 27–28.

⁵⁷ KBo 41.22 r.c. 12', KUB 43.43, and of course the twelve female ^{MUNUS.MEŠ}A.ZU, alongside an Old Woman in one of the more fragmentary tablets of the royal funerary ritual (KUB 39.31 r. col. 19', "Indeterminate Fragment 3" in A. Kassian, A. Korolëv, and A. Sidel'tsev, *Hittite Funerary Ritual: šalliš waštaiš*, AOAT 288 [Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002], 675–79, perhaps connected to Day 8).

practitioners, so the inclusion of this action in the ritual is not surprising, although it is not a type of divination known from the oracle texts.

The actions with the *muriyala*-breads are likewise difficult; the *muriyala*-bread seems to be a bread in the shape of a cluster of fruit;⁵⁸ it is not very well-attested and seems mainly confined to older contexts. Similarly, *zuwaluwal* and *kunkumati*^{SAR} are impossible to translate. Overall, this particular ritual is too unusual and fragmentary to subject to much interpretation. The lists of things taken away from the king and queen in this ritual are likewise fragmentary; however, they are all (the terrible thing, blood, uncleanness, evil, and sickness) attested in the previous two rituals. This ritual ends with the standard statement about going to the “house of the children” if the king and queen so desire; however, tacked on to that paragraph is the curious sentence, “Formerly, I used to go [to] the house of the children, but now, I don’t go at all.” This side note suggests a regularly-conducted ritual performance.

The final ritual (Otten and Souček’s rev. iv 14–40 and KBo 17.7+ rev. iv, pp. 36-40) is as follows:

--When the practitioner is taking pain, woe, and anxiety from the king and queen, the queen gives her five small threads: white, black, red, yellow/green, and blue wool. One thread is hung on each of the five branches of a tree.

--There are two small woodpiles, a clay figurine, and bound heads of barley and emmer, and the practitioner puts them in a basket and puts them at the heads of the king and queen, with linen thrown over them so that no man sees them.

--*Harši*-bread and an *išpanduzzi*-vessel of *marnuwan* lie there. When it becomes light, the practitioner and a deaf man go inside and take them up. She wraps the thread around the king and queen’s fingers; she also has a thorny branch (?—*hahhal*) and a figurine. The woodpiles and

⁵⁸ CHD L–N s.v. *muriyala*-, pp. 333-34.

barley and emmer are at the royal couple's feet. She says to the figurine, "Take the pain, woe, and anxiety of the king and queen," and takes the thread from their fingers with the thorny branch.

--She separates the thread from their fingers; the king and queen spit three times into a cup, and she closes it with a cover of lead. She has two *partuni*-birds hidden, and she releases them onto a branch. The king and queen are afraid, and she says, "I have taken the pain, woe, and anxiety from them!"

--[fragmentary: the thread is mentioned]

--[fragmentary—she is bringing the ritual implements(?—at least including the heads of grain and the birds) outside]. She fixes them (with pegs?) and says, "I have taken the pain, woe, and anxiety from the king and queen—from their seat, from their bed, from their hearts, from their [...] I have taken it." [Further fragmentary speech, about one or two sentences, in which she addresses the Sun-God of heaven, the Sun-Goddess of the earth, and probably one other deity, and tells them to "take" and "give," although the objects are broken]

--[fragmentary: the practitioner comes to a city, and what looks like a reiteration of the statement about the "house of the children," and thus probably the end.]

This ritual contains perhaps the most compelling Old Woman parallel. In CTH 402, the Ritual of Allī, an Old Woman redirects sorcery that has been cast on a ritual patient by touching white, black, red, yellow/green, and blue wool to the patient, making it into thread (*gapina*—CTH 416 and CTH 402 are the only attested rituals that use *gapina*-threads), and winding the threads around clay figurines, which in this case symbolize the enemy sorcerer, whose magic should then come back upon him/her (see ch. 3 for a comprehensive discussion of this text). Such a close parallel also suggests an approximate restoration of the actions in the break in CTH

416. Before taking the thread from the king and queen's fingers, the practitioner tells the figurine, "Take the pain, woe, and anxiety of the king and queen." In the following break, the only preserved word is "thread." The figurine's role, then, was probably to literally take on the burden of the pain, anxiety, and woe that had been removed with the threads, and they were to be wrapped around it.

Concerning the fourth ritual overall, it is notable that the events are once again spread over two days. The first action is hanging the five colors of thread on the trees: these are all of the colors that generally appear in ritual, and so the sense is of an all-encompassing focus (related also, at least in this specific context, to all five fingers of the hand). Compare again the Ritual of Allī, where the practitioner recites, "If the sorcerer is making him black(/white/etc...)" when she uses each color of thread, clearly attempting to cover all possible types of malicious magic. After that, the wood and grain are put in a basket and covered over to spend the night at the heads of the king and queen; the lacuna makes determining these objects' exact function in the ritual difficult, but another parallel presents itself. In CTH 398, the Ritual of Huwarlu, an Old Woman places bread and dough balls in a basket that is put under the king and queen's bed for protection or aversion of evil omens. Referring to another set of dough-balls used in Huwarlu's ritual, the Old Woman later says, "Just as grain continually sustains the life of the person, the ox, the sheep, and any animal, likewise let this grain sustain the king, the queen, and this house from the evil thing."⁵⁹ So it is possible that these items are intended primarily to protect the king and queen through the night, rather than to absorb harmful influences (see ch. 4 for more discussion of this).

⁵⁹ Obv. i 58–60. Edited by D. Bawanypeck, *Die Rituale der Auguren*, THeth 25 (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2005), 28. See ch. 3 for a detailed treatment of this text.

Also in the king and queen's chamber overnight are *harši*-bread and an *išpanduzzi* of *marnuwan*, which are offering-items, but which are not broken or poured out in the text (as it is preserved). However, there is a parallel with the second ritual, above, where the practitioner recites to the Sun-God and Storm-God, "The king has a sickle, and the queen [has] a millstone. Th[ey? prepare?] *harši*-bread and *išpanduzzi*-libations for you eternally." These items are presented as something of an ideal or a representation of pious behavior, so it is possible that they remained in the chamber overnight to demonstrate that to the gods.

In the morning, the practitioner comes in, and there is then the familiar series of removing the harmful influences into an object through proximity or touch, and spitting them out, although in this case the thread is then probably wound around another object (reminiscent not only of the ritual of Allī, but of Ambazzi's scapemouse ritual (CTH 391), in which a piece of tin is tied to the patient, and then once the negative elements have been transferred, is then tied onto a mouse, which is chased away). The spittle is sealed inside a vessel with a lead cover. Since the part of the ritual with the disposal of these items is unfortunately broken, it is impossible to be certain what is done with them, although burial seems likely, given the other rituals. Finally, the practitioner startles the king and queen with the *partuni*-birds (a *hapax*), which is extremely difficult to interpret, particularly since the text breaks immediately afterward. They are clearly afraid (*werite*-, "be afraid," is not a well-attested word;⁶⁰ however, its cognate noun *weritema* means "terror, fear, fearsomeness" and is often paired with *nahšaratt*-, "fear"), but what that fear is meant to accomplish is difficult. Perhaps this is another way of being all-encompassing: anything on the surface is transferred to the threads, anything inside the body is spit out, and anything purely emotional is brought to the surface using surprise or shock.

⁶⁰ Though it is attested in fragmentary context immediately following "[When] the Storm-God thu[nders] frightfully" in one of the versions of "The Moon that Fell from Heaven" (KUB 28.3 i 2).

Following the break, the practitioner fixes/pegs some of the items (the objects are broken; this probably again after the things have been buried), and recites the final incantation: the practitioner once again says, “I have taken” the pain, woe, and anxiety, perhaps indicating confidence in her own ability to deal with the problem, though she also asks the gods for help as she finishes speaking, this time from both the Sun-God of Heaven, above, and the Sun-Goddess of the Earth, below. There follows a fragmentary one-line paragraph with “I come to the city” at the end, probably more dispersal directions as after the first ritual above, and finally a fragmentary paragraph that is clearly a reiteration of the standard statement about the “house of the children.”

The list of things to be taken away in this section is entirely different from the previous three rituals; rather than evil, sickness, or slander, it is the king and queen’s *aī-*, *waī-*, and *pittuliya-* that are undesirable. *Aī-* and *waī-* are conventionally translated as “pain and woe,” but in reality they are onomatopoetic words (HW² in fact translates *aī* with “Das Ach; ach [Weh-Ruf]”), and *waī* is connected to the cognate verb (*u*)*wai-*, “to cry out.” These terms are easily related to the somewhat better-attested *ahra-* and *wahra-*,⁶¹ meaning essentially the same thing, which are known from Luwian-language Old Woman rituals, and which can also be spit out. *Pittuliya-* can mean either “worry” or “anguish.”⁶² These terms can be connected to the foregoing analysis of the importance of the king’s emotional well-being in the textual record. The word *pittuliya-* is also attested in a Middle Hittite prayer, in which the author Prince Kantuzzili says, “Because of the sickness, my house has become a house of anguish (*pittuliya-*), and because of anguish my soul drips away from me to another place.”⁶³ In addition, it is attested

⁶¹ See Melchert, *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon* (available online at <http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/Melchert/LUVLEX.pdf>) s.v. *ahra-* (p. 4) and *wahra-* (p. 249).

⁶² CHD P, p. 366

⁶³ KUB 30.10 rev. 14–15, translated by Singer, *Hittite Prayers*, 33.

in Muršili's plague prayers as well: as mentioned above, he ends his first prayer with, "Send away the worry from my heart, take away the anguish (*pittuliya-*) from my soul!"

In addition to the ritual's emotional content, it should also be noted that a large part of it is conducted in the king and queen's bedchamber. It is not the only time the "inner chamber" is entered in CTH 416—in the second ritual, there is a brief episode in the inner chamber with the servant(s) present as well—but here, the practitioner enters alongside only a deaf man, suggestive of privacy and/or secrecy. There is no mention of the palace servants, or any other actors, in this ritual at all; this is also the only ritual of the four in which the implements are covered "so that no man will see them." The practitioner also touches the king and queen, winding the thread around their fingers, and frightens them with the *partuni*-birds. This final ritual, therefore, is the most intimate of the four, involving the closest interaction—in terms of access to space, physical closeness, and emotional contact—between the practitioner and the subjects.

Concerning the question of whether an Old Woman in fact conducts CTH 416, the typological parallels are extremely convincing. There is no other type of practitioner who would be very likely: GUDU₁₂-priests do recitations for the health of the king and queen in this period, but do not perform rituals of disposal like this one; the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}AZU (not to be confused with the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}A.ZU), the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}HAL, and the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}MUŠEN.DÙ do rituals to avert or dispose evil, but they do not use the same techniques as the Old Women (see further in ch. 4 and the Conclusion), and are much more likely to call extensively on divine help rather than treat a patient directly using analogic practices like those seen here. No other option presents itself, and the presence of the Old Women in a position of power as early as the Old Hittite period has already been established, so concluding that CTH 416's practitioner is an Old Woman seems appropriate.

The role of the Old Woman in this ritual, then, is first of all as the “ritual expert” (as ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI is sometimes translated), that is, the person who knows the correct things to do and say to solve the problem. As seen above, she makes the figurines, she prepares the cups and the bread, cooks the *zuwaluwal*, etc., speaks all of the recitations alone, and leads the ritual actions. In addition, although there are palace servants who help her with certain things, and the servants may hand objects to the king and queen, she is the only one to interact with anything while it is being disposed of: that is, once the evil is removed from the king and queen, the Old Woman is the one qualified to handle it and the person most appropriate to be exposed to whatever danger it may hold. (The single possible exception is the iron tongue and ‘pierced things’ from the first ritual, but these may not require disposal, see above.) Her recitations show a combination of confidence in her own ability to take away the evils present in the king and queen, and attempts to convince the gods to help with offerings and with the eagle messenger. She has privileged access to the king and queen’s bedroom and person, particularly in the final ritual, where she is also helping with (and manipulating) their emotional state.

The importance of that emotional state, as well as the physical well-being (e.g., sickness and blood in rituals 1, 2, and 3) and ritual purity (e.g., uncleanness in rituals 1 and 3) to the well-being of the country is also present in this text. For the most part, this ritual’s focus is on the persons of the king and queen. However, as mentioned above, in the second ritual, cups of *tarlipa* are also given to the hearth and the throne, suggesting a wider issue. In addition, in the final recitations of both the second and third ritual, the Old Woman imposes the removed evils onto “the enemy” (^{LÚ}KÚR), and in the fourth ritual, the last (broken) sentences of the last recitation implore the gods to first “take” (presumably the evils) and then “give” (them to someone else?). Taking problems specific to the king and queen and sending them to the

“enemy” is at least somewhat suggestive of military conflict, and implies that healing the royal couple might give Hatti an advantage over other countries. The Old Hittite period, the time between Ḫattušili I and Telipinu, was a time of great unrest, military difficulties, political intrigue, and assassination. Any of these issues might be the ultimate reason for rituals like this, and it should also be noted that the language of the ritual (particularly, for example, the “house of the children” paragraphs) implies that they were performed regularly, indicating ongoing problems.

1.2.4: KBo 18.151: an oracle in archaic speech

In addition to being ritual practitioners, the Old Women were diviners: they performed one of main oracle types commissioned by the Hittite state, the KIN-oracles.⁶⁴ Almost none of these are preserved from the Old Hittite period, or even the Middle Hittite period: oracle texts appear generally to have been discarded when they were no longer relevant to current events, and so are attested almost exclusively from the last century of the empire. There is only one oracle text, KBo 18.151 (CTH 827), a KIN-oracle, that survives from the Old Hittite period.⁶⁵ It is thus our only evidence for oracle practice in this period, although the ephemeral nature of the oracle texts suggests that it represents some larger corpus. The oracle’s practitioner is an “Old Woman of Ḫattuša” ([^{UR}U] Ha-at-tu-šu-ma-aš ^{MUNUS}ŠU.ṛ GI ṽ).

KBo 18.151 does not include a question, only a description of the oracular method used to answer the question (e.g., “Symbol X arose, took Symbol Y, and gave it to Symbol Z,” see further in ch. 2), but in this case, the symbols involved are specific enough that the general

⁶⁴ The oracle texts will be further explored in chapter 2. Descriptions of the KIN-oracle method are too opaque to allow for an easy translation of the name, which literally means “work.”

⁶⁵ On the dating of this text see Soysal, “Analysis of a Hittite Oracular Document,” 108–16, who also suggests that based on personal names, the text may date to Ḫattušili I’s reign (p. 112, although that is not the only possibility acknowledged), and Th. van den Hout, “The Ductus of the Alalah VII Texts and the Origin of Hittite Cuneiform,” in *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age*, ed. E. Devecchi, PIHANS 119 [Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2012], 166.

subject matter may be discernible.⁶⁶ Included among these symbols are death, destruction, a Hurrian attack,⁶⁷ the sin of the people, the king and queen themselves, and the throne,⁶⁸ and the text as a whole is suggestive of serious political and military matters (very common in the Old Hittite period, as noted above). However, other symbols in the text include the king's difficulty⁶⁹ and illness, and there is also the following paragraph: "The kin[g] (of?) [...]aršini took the throne. He put anxiety (*pittuliya-*) b[ef]ore the king. He put anxiety b[efor]e the queen. He went [for]th t[o] the gods."⁷⁰ In an oracle concerning what seem to be major political issues, the symbols include anxiety and illness. Once again, the personal state of the king (and queen) is closely related to the well-being of the kingdom.

In addition to further illustrating the relationship between the royal personages and the state, KBo 18.151 joins CTH 416 as evidence that the Old Women were sometimes part of that relationship. Whatever Ḫattušili I's personal opinions of the Old Women, it is clear that their services were used by the state to support the royal family in the Old Hittite period, both in their capacity as ritual experts and as diviners. As mentioned above, KBo 18.151 is likely one accidentally-surviving example of a larger corpus of Old Hittite KIN-oracles (and perhaps this oracular consultation is what Haštayar was having the Old Women do for her in Ḫattušili's Testament). Further evidence for an official and continuing relationship between the Old Women and the royal family is the likelihood that the rituals in CTH 416 were regularly performed (see above). In both cases, the Old Women would have been in both a privileged and supportive role, with access to knowledge about the royal family's personal and political problems, and the

⁶⁶ For further discussion on the possibility of connecting the KIN-oracle methods to their questions, see ch. 2.

⁶⁷ See Soysal, "Analysis of a Hittite Oracular Document," 95–96 for the somewhat difficult *ulhal(l)i-*.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 101–102 for the difficult writing of this word.

⁶⁹ See ibid. pp. 94–95, for this translation of *nakki-*.

⁷⁰ Transliterated (with very similar translation) by ibid., pp. 90–91.

perceived ability to help solve those problems (and, of course, the possibility of provoking their animosity, as in the case of Ḫattušili I).

The picture of the Old Women as popular, secondary, possibly even traveling ritualists has, therefore, been demonstrated to be flawed: at least in the Old Hittite period, they were rather employed by the state and served the king and queen in an official capacity. KBo 18.151 demonstrates their capacity as consultants for practical, political, and military matters; CTH 416 shows that they were performing rituals to protect and cleanse the king and queen concerning slander, contamination, and emotional distress; the Benedictions for the Labarna demonstrate that they were involved in supporting the institution of the throne and the king as a powerful and divinely-supported entity; and even Ḫattušili's Testament reveals that the king respected their power enough to be threatened by it.

It now remains to examine their cultural affiliation: as noted above, it has not always been clear in the literature whether the Old Women should be considered native to central Anatolia or not. There are a number of later ritual texts conducted by Old Women that were imported from Kizzuwatna in southeast Anatolia, and show foreign-language influence. It is therefore worthwhile to look at the possible linguistic and geographic affiliations of the Old Hittite texts.

1.3: The Old Woman and Hittite religio-cultural spheres

The problems inherent in dealing with the various cultural influences on Hittite religious practice are well-attested in the literature. It is difficult even to label something as "Hittite," since most identifiable religious traditions in the textual record are associated with other languages such as Hattic, Luwian, Palaic, Hurrian, Akkadian, and Sumerian, and the question of what "Hittite" means beyond the linguistic is difficult, since the Hittites almost never used ethnic

designations at all. Deities may have different geographic or linguistic affiliations, which can suggest a specific cultural context, but this is complicated by the fact that sometimes the same text may show elements of different apparent “traditions.” Unfortunately, there is almost no information on how any of the Hittites viewed their various religious traditions. In addition, the vast majority of the Hittite corpus is from the last century of the empire, when religious practices originating from all over Anatolia, Syria, and Mesopotamia had been written down, modified, and blended for centuries. Given that the Hittites were not exaggerating when they boasted of “the thousand gods of Hatti,” the origins of deities and practices are often completely inaccessible.

However, the separate traditions clearly do exist. In particular, a division may be made between central and northern Anatolian practices, with Hattic-language (and sometimes Palaic-language) elements, and southeastern Anatolian practices, with Hurrian- and Luwian-language elements. In general, a chronological divide can also be made, with the Hattian tradition present in the very earliest texts, and the Hurro-Luwian tradition not appearing until the Middle Hittite period, perhaps the fifteenth century. In this case, the linguistic and palaeographical evidence appears to match up with the political situation, since the Hittite kingdom was based in central Anatolia where the Hattic tradition was at home (and which was explicitly called the “Land of Hatti”; thus, text in Hattic is labeled ^{URU}*hattili*, “in the manner of the land of Hatti”), and the southeastern land of Kizzuwatna was not incorporated into the Hittite empire until the Middle Hittite period. Old Hittite religious texts like those already discussed, therefore, might be expected to have Hattic influence or elements present.

1.3.1: KBo 18.151: an oracle in archaic speech

The Hattic influence on this text is very clear. Soysal⁷¹ has demonstrated that the text shows clear evidence of Hattic syntax (see above under CTH 416) and morphology, as well as odd phonological characteristics. In particular, an analysis of the case endings shows that the person who was composing this document was probably a native speaker of Hattic. The presence of Old Women who were native speakers of Hattic in pre-Empire Ḫattuša is supported by a few Hattic-language documents, most particularly KBo 37.23, a ritual text almost entirely in Hattic (and, of course, nearly impossible to read), whose colophon (iv 7–8) reads DUB.II.KAM ŠA ʿKu-ru-ru / ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI-aš, “The second tablet of Ms. Kururu, Old Woman.” These two pieces of evidence support and influence one another: the Hattic influence on KBo 18.151 is made more likely by the presence of an actual Old Woman text in Hattic, and conversely KBo 18.151 supports the idea that Ms. Kururu (or some practitioner like her) was a native speaker of Hattic rather than working with a memorized ritual incantation in an archaic religious language. KBo 37.23 cannot be confirmed to be Old Hittite,⁷² however, so it will be considered in more detail in chapter 3.

1.3.2: The Benedictions for the Labarna

The Hattian relationship to this text is likewise very easy to confirm. There is a Hattic-language parallel, KUB 28.74, which unfortunately does very little to aid our understanding of the Hittite text,⁷³ but which at the very least shows that the incantation, “His head is new” etc. was also present in Hattic. One should note, however, that the Hattic contains the line, “His land is new,” which is *not* in the older version of the Benedictions. The Hattic copy is also quite

⁷¹ “Analysis of a Hittite Oracular Document,” 113–14.

⁷² It is considered “mh.” on the Konkordanz, and shows inconsistently-written old E, as well as old AK, AL, AZ, IG, and LI, and Á and DA with even horizontal wedges, rather than the “stepped” variety characteristic of Old Hittite. In addition, the recent work by Ch. Rüster and G. Wilhelm (*Landschenkungsurkunden hethitischer Könige*, StBoT Beiheft 4 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012]) has shown that our understanding of what constitutes “old script” versus “middle script” is somewhat shaky in any case. Therefore, in the absence of enough Hittite in the document to analyze its linguistic age, it is safest to refrain from labeling it Old Hittite.

⁷³ With the exception of the error in KUB 20.54+ vi 10, see above.

late,⁷⁴ although there is not enough Hittite preserved to judge from the language whether it could be a later copy of an older text. The possibility of an original Hittite-language incantation translated into Hattic, therefore, cannot be discounted. However, the presence of a Hattic version, whether earlier than the Hittite or not, indicates that to the Hittite mind, this text was appropriate to a Hattian context.

1.3.3: The Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple

This ritual is an excellent example of the possibility of confusion in the cultural sphere of a text. The parallels I made above to demonstrate that it is most likely an Old Woman practicing this ritual were taken from texts that claim noticeably different origins: in CTH 402, the ritual of Allī, Allī is said to be a woman from Arzawa, in the west; in CTH 404, the ritual of Maštigga, Maštigga is said to be a woman from Kizzuwatna, in the southeast; while CTH 820, the Benedictions for the Labarna, has a very clear Hattian connection (see below). Based on the content of CTH 416, the Old Hittite ritual for the royal couple, scholars have argued for both a Hattian⁷⁵ and a (Hurro-)Luwian⁷⁶ origin for the ritual.

However, as noted above, there is a chronological distinction between central Anatolian and southeastern Anatolian religious texts. The language of CTH 416 is Old Hittite, noticeably older than the oldest of the Hurro-Luwian ritual texts, and so it should not have been influenced by Kizzuwatnean texts. The place names are also telling: in addition to Ḫattuša, CTH 416 mentions the cities of Arinna and Katapa, both seats of Hattian religious practice. Finally, the deities in the text are confined to the same sphere: in addition to the ubiquitous Sun-God and Storm-God, the gods attested in the ritual are [Ḫant]itaššu, Inar, and the Queen of Katapa, all

⁷⁴ Late New Script; the text has late LI, late HA, and late EN.

⁷⁵ Soysal, “Analysis of a Hittite Oracular Document,” 122.

⁷⁶ P. Taracha, *Ersetzen und Entsühnen: Das mittelhethitische Ersatzritual für den Großkönig Tuthaliya (CTH *448.4) und verwandte Texte*, CHANE 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 207–210, though note also the comparison with the Palaic-Luwian text KBo 8.74++.

central Anatolian/Hattic deities. The typological connections to later texts should not override these concrete pieces of evidence for the ritual being at home in central Anatolia. This is particularly the case considering that overall, it seems like Old Woman rituals demonstrate a noticeable consistency in methodology, even given apparent differences of geographic origins (see ch. 4).

Thus, all three of these extremely old texts, the Benedictions for the Labarna, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple, and the Old Hittite oracle Kbo 18.151, show some connection to the Hattic language and/or the central Anatolian geographic sphere. They are also all very concerned with the royal person, well-being, and emotional state. The indication, then, is that in the Old Hittite period, the Old Women were very close to the king and were working with, coming from, or operating within the Hattian religious sphere. Therefore, the classification of Old Women as more likely to practice popular and domestic ritual may simply be a function of their purpose in the Hurro-Luwian sphere. This will be discussed further in ch. 3.

1.3.4: Disappearing God Myths

Though the Testament, the Old Hittite ritual for the royal couple, the Benedictions for the Labarna, and the oracle in archaic speech are the only Old Hittite documents that show the Old Woman in close contact with the king, the Old Women are also integral to the most common narrative in the attested mythology of Hattian deities. The ‘disappearing god’ myth is a central Anatolian trope, and there are myths about the disappearances of several of the gods of the Hattian pantheon (e.g., Telipinu, Hannahanna, Inara, etc.). When a god has disappeared, conditions immediately worsen: when Telipinu the fertility god disappears, crops cannot ripen, humans and livestock cannot become pregnant, etc.; when the Sun-God disappears, the land is gripped by frost. The gods take action, which usually blends into human ritual action, a

description of which may follow the story of the disappearance, and which is needed to bring the god back and restore the world to a better state. The rituals are fairly similar from myth to myth, although they are also usually quite fragmentary, and almost no practitioners are attested. However, in the Disappearance of the Sun-God (CTH 323), the concluding ritual action is relatively complete, and is made up of (entirely expected) libations and bread- and meat-offerings, fine and aromatic things set out to attract the deity back, and so on.

The first attestation of an actor in this text, almost immediately after the setup of all of the necessary items, reads (in both the Old Hittite and the later copies), *nu*^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI *BE-EL* DINGIR-LIM *hu-uk-ma-a-uš hu-uk-zi*, “The Old Woman, the Lord of the Deity, speaks conjurations.”⁷⁷ This is the only attestation of the Old Woman in this text; the rest of the actions, including bread-, meat-, and drink-offerings, and further speaking of conjurations, are all apparently performed by the *BĒL* DINGIR-LIM. The odd construction of this sentence has caused some difficulty with translation, though, since there are two apparent subjects (without a conjunction, although this is not problematic in Hittite) and a singular verb.⁷⁸ One solution presents itself, however: Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani, in their edition, translated the passage as though the Old Woman was acting in the role of the *BĒL* DINGIR-LIM, i.e., “The Old Woman speaks conjurations *as* the Lord of the Deity.”⁷⁹ In light of the entry *šiu-* “deity” in the CHD,⁸⁰ this now seems the most plausible explanation: with examples like, “The ritual patient, the

⁷⁷ VBoT 58 iv 37–38, KUB 53.20+ iv 12’.

⁷⁸ Groddek, in his edition of only the ritual actions at the end of the text, suggests instead that *BĒL* DINGIR-LIM and *hukmāuš* are a σχῆμα καθ’ ὅλον καὶ μέρος, to be translated, “The Old Woman speaks the conjurations of the Lord of the Deity” (D. Groddek, “Die rituelle Behandlung des verschwundenen Sonnengottes [CTH 323],” in *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. P. Taracha [Warsaw, 2002], 130, my italics), and his translation is followed by Rieken in the online Konkordanz edition; however, this construction is not an Old Hittite phenomenon, and in addition, it is normally limited to inalienable possession (e.g., body parts), so this interpretation is unlikely. Mazoyer (*Télipinu, le dieu au marelage: Essai sur les mythes fondateurs du Royaume hittite* [Paris: L’Harmattan, 2003], 182) translates, “La ‘magicienne du Seigneur du dieu...’” which is grammatically unproblematic, but an “Old Woman of [a person]” is attested nowhere else.

⁷⁹ “...la ‘vecchia’ (che svolge la funzione di) ‘signora del dio,’” F. Pecchioli Daddi and A.M. Polvani, *La mitologia ittita*, Testi del Vicino Oriente antico 4 (Brescia: Paideia, 1990), 70.

⁸⁰ Š/3 s.v. *šiu-* 1s, p. 484.

singer, and the exorcist sit down to eat in the tent. Then no other ‘lord of the deity’ goes into the tent to eat,”⁸¹ the CHD clearly demonstrates that the “Lord of the Deity” is not a profession itself, but signifies a role or relationship that a person enters into with certain actions, and is attested in apposition to specific professions.⁸² The gender of the *BĒL DINGIR-LIM* (as with e.g. the similar term *BĒL SÍSKUR*, “lord of the ritual,” which simply means “ritual patient,” male or female) is not fixed. In this text, then, the Old Woman is the *BĒL DINGIR-LIM*, and so performs the offerings and conjurations throughout the text. This would also explain why, in the identical passages throughout the rest of the ritual (the *BĒL DINGIR-LIM* burns fine things, speaks conjurations, and pours libations three times, exactly as in the first passage), the Old Woman was apparently no longer necessary.

The conjurations the Old Woman is speaking seem likely to be the myth itself (though it is labeled a *mugawar*, an invocation, so there may be some other explanation for the *hukmāuš*). This is in line with the very end of the mythological section, before the double paragraph line where the ritual setup begins, which is an extremely difficult and fragmentary passage in the first person. Translatable lines include, “I t[o]ok the words of the gods, and I poured them [...],”⁸³ and, “I lost none of the gods’ words. But whenever Telipinu becomes burdensome for anyone, I [sp]eak the w[ords] of the gods, and I invoke him.”⁸⁴ It should be noted that the ritual actions at the end of the text are directed to both the Sun-God and to Telipinu, although this sentence might also indicate that the person who speaks these words conducts the ritual in the Disappearance of Telipinu myth as well (for which see below).

⁸¹ KUB 12.11 iv⁷ 12–14; see CHD, *ibid*.

⁸² It should be noted, however, that the passage under discussion is included in the lemma, but is only quoted beginning after “^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI,” with no attention to the double subject.

⁸³ d[a-ah]-hu-un DINGIR^{MES}-an ud-da-a-a-r ne-ez-za-a[n] / []x šu-uh-ha-ah-hu-un (VBoT 58 iv 5–6).

⁸⁴ 𒀭 DINGIR^{MES} 𒀭-aš ud-da-a-ar 𒀭-UL ku-it-ki har-ni-in-ku-un ma-a-an-ša-an / ^dTe-li-pi-nu-ša ku-e-da-ni-ik-ki na-ak-ke-eš-zi ú-ga DINGIR^{MES}-aš u[d-da-ar] / [me]-ma-ah-hi ta-an mu-ga-mi (VBoT 58 iv 8–10).

What seems to be the introduction to this first-person narrative, coming at the end of another extremely difficult and fragmentary third-person paragraph, is the line *ú-ug-ga*^{MUNUS} *an-na-an-na-aš e-eš-mi*, “And I am ...” The meaning of^{MUNUS} *annannaš* has been debated; it has been interpreted as “grandmother,”⁸⁵ as a female personal name “^fAnnanna,”⁸⁶ and as a title of some kind, “*annanna*-woman.”⁸⁷ However, there is another word for grandmother, *hanna-*, and *annanna*-woman as a profession is attested nowhere else. As Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani noted, however, ^fAnnanna as a personal name is attested several times in the Hittite texts (and frequently at Kültepe as well),⁸⁸ including an ^fAnnanna,^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI, in several separate tablet catalogues.⁸⁹ Paola Dardano, the editor of the tablet catalogues, connects these entries to the ^fAnnanna of CTH 323 in her commentary,⁹⁰ and a detailed examination of the evidence shows that this view is almost certainly correct.

The first catalogue entry is for a text entitled: “Word of Ms. Annana, the Old Woman of Zigazhur: when I invoke ^dMiyatanzipa.”⁹¹ A similar entry in a different catalogue is entitled, “Word of Ms. Annanna, Old Woman of^{URU} Zigazhura: when they [invo]ke the Tutelary Deity.”⁹² Two other entries, from a Middle Hittite tablet, read: “[Word of] Ms. Annanna, Old Woma[n of^{URU}] Zi[gazhur(a)...] of the invocation of [the tutelar]y deity, [of] the Sun-God, [...] of ^dHann[a]hanna, [of] ^d[...], of ^dTelipinu, [of] ^dWal[za....]” and in the following paragraph, “Two

⁸⁵ “Ich bin eine Großmutter (*annanna*-Frau),” V. Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur: Texte, Stilistik, Motive* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 119, with commentary noting that *annanna* “ist entweder der Personennamen einer Magierin oder die Bezeichnung einer Frauenklasse,” and noting that it could be a reduplication of *anna-*, “mother.”

⁸⁶ Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani, *La mitologia ittita*, 68 with note 25, Mazoyer, *Télipinu*, 180, and perhaps Kammenhuber, as it is not included in her dictionary. Note also that ^f and^{MUNUS} are the same cuneiform sign.

⁸⁷ Hoffner and Melchert, *Grammar*, 364, and E. Rieken, online edition (hethiter.net/: CTH 323.1), line 112 with n. 35.

⁸⁸ T. Zehnder, *Die hethitischen Frauennamen: Katalog und Interpretation*, DBH 29 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 115–16.

⁸⁹ *La mitologia ittita*, 68 n. 25: “Una maga Annanna...è nota da tavolette di catalogo come autrice di invocazioni per varie divinità e di rituali...è la stessa persona?”

⁹⁰ P. Dardano, *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattuša (CTH 276–282)*, StBoT 47 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006), 30.

⁹¹ KBo 31.8+ iv 12–13, *ibid.*, 26.

⁹² KUB 30.51+ i 22’–23’ (and duplicate KBo 31.27++ 21’–22’), edited by *ibid.*, 128, 150.

tablets: W[or]ld of Ms. Annanna, Old Woman of ^U[^{RU}Zigazhur(a)]: When she invoke[s] the Sun-Goddess of Arinna.”⁹³ The gods in this catalogue are all Hattic, and the Sun-God, Hannahanna, and Telipinu all have disappearance-myths attested. The deity Miyatanzipa, from the first catalogue, is a personification of abundance and the growth of plants and livestock (from Hittite *mai-/miya-*, “to grow, be born, thrive”) who appears in Hattic context,⁹⁴ and in particular, in the ritual section of the Telipinu myth: “And all the gods are sitting: [Papaya], Istustaya, the Fate Goddesses, the Mother Goddesses, the Grain Goddess, Miyatanzipa, Telipinu, the Tutelary deity, Hapantali [and...]. I have treated the gods under (the hawthorn) for long years [...]. I have purified him.”⁹⁵ Note the order of the gods: Miyatanzipa, Telipinu, and the tutelary deity are listed together. Whether Miyatanzipa and the tutelary deity each had disappearing god myths is unknown, but they clearly belong to a group of deities that did. There is one final tablet catalogue entry for a Ms. Annana, Old Woman, with no city; absent any other evidence, the lack of a city would make it impossible to say whether she is the same woman, but the catalogue entry reads, “When they invoke the Storm-God.”⁹⁶ There are several (extremely fragmentary) versions of a “disappearing Storm-God” myth,⁹⁷ and so it does seem likely that this is also Ms. Annanna of Zigazhura.

Returning to the Disappearance of the Sun-God: if Ms. Annanna was an Old Woman who authored invocations (*mugawar*) of Hattic deities, and there is a *mugawar* of a Hattic deity with an Old Woman speaking and “I am Ms. Annanna” both, the two are almost certainly identical. For a practitioner to identify herself by name in the middle of a text like this would be extremely

⁹³ KBo 31.1++ iii 8’–13’, edited by *ibid.*, 196.

⁹⁴ E.g. CTH 336, Myths of the Goddess Inara (H.A. Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 2nd ed., WAW 2 [Atlanta: SBL, 1998], 31), and CTH 627, the KI.LAM festival (I. Singer, *The Hittite KI.LAM Festival, Part Two*, StBoT 28 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1984], 78 [KUB 20.4 v 7’]).

⁹⁵ Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 17.

⁹⁶ KBo 31.8+ i 3–4, Dardano, *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge*, 22.

⁹⁷ Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 24–26.

unusual, but the myth of the Disappearing Sun-God is Old Hittite,⁹⁸ and so predates most of the ritual texts with attested authors. Ordinarily, ritual texts begin similarly to the tablet catalogue entries, “Word of [So-and-so]: when...” However, those ritual texts are first attested in Middle Script (the same palaeographic date as the earliest tablet catalogues), and therefore, the conventions of the identification of authors may not have been established when the Disappearance of the Sun-God was composed.⁹⁹ As for authorship in general, without outside evidence of Annanna and her work, there is no way to say whether she genuinely composed or transmitted this text, or if she was someone to whom other Old Hittite authors thought appropriate to ascribe a myth. However, the Hittites represented her as the author, which itself is relevant even in the absence of any other data.

In addition, whatever the name of the author of the text, an Old Woman did recite the myth of the Disappearance of the Sun-God, and also performed the ritual associated with it. This raises the question, of course, of the rest of the Disappearing God myths. Most of them are too fragmentary to say anything significant about the ritual actions, but the well-known Disappearance of Telipinu is relatively complete. In the best-preserved version of this myth, after the story of Telipinu’s anger and disappearance and the efforts of the gods to get him back, the text continues in the first person, with the practitioner describing all of the attractive things (e.g. fruit, nuts, honey, fine oil) that have been set out to tempt Telipinu back, and reciting

⁹⁸ E. Neu, in “Zur Morphologie und Syntax einer mythologischen Erzählung aus althethitischer Zeit,” in *Novalis Indogermanica: Festschrift für Günther Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. M. Fritz and S. Zeilfelder (Graz: Leykam, 2002), has made a detailed reference for all of the grammatical elements in CTH 323, and concludes that, “Daß diese Textkomposition in althethitischer Zeit entstanden ist, daran läßt diese Dokumentation trotz der insgesamt sehr lückenhaften Textüberlieferung keinen Zweifel” (330).

⁹⁹ It should also be noted that neither the very beginning nor the very end are preserved in any disappearing-god myth (with the exception of the disappearance of the Storm-God of Nerik, which is extremely different in form and content from the rest of the myths, and which is conducted by a GUDU₁₂-priest), so the author might have been identified there. The problem of her identifying herself by name in the main text would remain, however.

incantations to impart their sweetness and other good qualities onto his disposition. The text then returns to narrative form:

Telipinu came, raging. He thunders with a lightning bolt (and) strikes the Dark Earth below. Kamrusepa saw him and moved [...] an eagle's wing (for) herself. The anger: she stopped it. The wrath: [she stopped it]. She stopped [sin]. She stopped sullenness.

Kamrusepa says back to the gods: "G[o], O gods! Now t[*end*] the Sun God's sheep for Hapantali, and separate out twelve rams, so that I may treat Telipinu's *w[ar]ku-*. I have taken for myself a basket (with) a thousand holes (lit. 'eyes'), and I have poured *karas*-grains, the 'rams of Kamrusepa,' over the top of it."¹⁰⁰

"And I have burned back and forth over Telepinu, on one side and the other. I have taken from Telipinu's evil from his body: I have taken his sin; I have taken his anger; I have taken his wrath; I have taken his *warku-*; I have taken his sullenness."¹⁰¹

It is already relatively clear from this section that Kamrusepa's words and actions are the practitioner's, and the text continues with more analogic magic and entreaties to Telipinu to stop his anger. It is also very clearly similar to CTH 416, in which the practitioner says, "I have taken" lists of evils. And in fact, a first-person statement of ritual accomplishment is extremely characteristic of Old Woman rituals, and very rare elsewhere (see ch. 3 and the Conclusion for more detailed discussions of this phenomenon).

Two other passages are of particular interest; the first is near the end of the myth, just before Telipinu's return:

¹⁰⁰ This is quite reminiscent of the Old Woman's sieve in CTH 759, the *dupaduparša*-ritual, for which see ch. 4.

¹⁰¹ For transliteration and restorations, see E. Rieken, hethiter.net/: CTH 324.1, §24''–27''.

The gatekeeper opened the seven doors. He drew back the seven bars. Down in the Dark Earth stand bronze vats. Their lids are of lead. Their latches are of iron. That which goes into them doesn't come up again; it perishes therein. So may they seize Telipinu's anger, wrath, sin, and sullenness, and may they not come back (here).¹⁰²

This is obviously reminiscent of both the second ritual of CTH 416, in which the Old Woman buries the king and queen's sickness, blood, evil and terrible thing, and says, "Let them not come back up!" and also the fourth ritual, in which the king and queen spit into a cup whose cover is lead in order to get rid of their pain, woe, and anxiety. The second passage comes almost immediately after the first, when Telipinu has returned: "Then the mother looked after her child. The sheep looked after her lamb. The cow looked after her calf. And Telipinu too <looked after> the king and queen and took account of them in respect to life, vigor, and longevity."¹⁰³ The king and queen's personal status and health is still of concern in a myth about the suffering of the entire land, apparently so much so that the god's relationship to the royal couple is compared to that of a mother nurturing a child.

The arguments for an Old Woman as the practitioner in the Telipinu myth are not as strong as with CTH 323, since there is no Old Woman actually attested in the text, but it seems quite possible. First, in CTH 323, the Old Woman Annanna says in so many words, "But whenever Telipinu becomes burdensome for anyone, I [sp]eak the w[ords] of the gods, and I invoke him." Secondly, the ritual acts described in this myth—performed by some practitioner acting as an avatar for Kamrušepa, who is a goddess of magic and healing,¹⁰⁴ and whose function in general seems to be very similar to the Old Woman's—are absolutely characteristic of Old Woman rituals: in addition to the use of first person, in this myth Telipinu's anger is analogically

¹⁰² Ibid., 17.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 18.

¹⁰⁴ See Haas, *Geschichte*, 438–41.

transformed into (1) sweet, good, harmless things, and (2) things that can be neutralized or gotten ride of (e.g., fire; see chs. 3 and 4 for more discussion of this technique in Old Woman rituals).

Although this evidence is not necessarily conclusive, taken all together, it is quite suggestive.

These myths' function is relatively uncontroversial: they address either the changing of the seasons or some agricultural or climatological crisis, which is explained by the disappearance of whatever god governs that particular area. The ritual actions are designed to bring the god back and thus restore fertility, warmth, rain, etc. If the Old Woman is indeed the primary practitioner in both CTH 323, the Disappearance of the Sun-God, and CTH 324, the Disappearance of Telipinu, she would then be instrumental in ensuring the continuing survival of the land as a whole, as well as the king and queen's well-being. And if the Old Woman Annanna was credited with composing these myths, developing the ritual attached to them, or (most likely) being the main source of transmitting them, then this is more evidence for the Old Women being educated and respected members of the Hittite religious elite, alongside their authorship and performance of extensive royal rituals, and their divinatory prowess.

1.4: Festival Texts

So far, the Old Woman's function in the Old Hittite period has included rituals and recitations for the health and happiness of the king and queen, the disposal of evils within them, oracular inquiry about military matters, and communication with the gods so as to reverse crises of climate and agriculture (see above). The final genre to be addressed in this chapter is festival texts. Unlike the other examples, which are confined to Old Hittite texts and any relevant closely-related documents, all of the attested festival texts will be included, because unlike the rituals and oracles, they are few enough not to warrant their own chapter, and taken together, they offer strong support for the overall argument of this chapter. The poor attestation of Old

Women in the festival texts may be connected to their general function as troubleshooters (see chs. 2–4 and the Conclusion): they were perhaps not at home in the normal running of cult practice, but were rather called upon when things were not going well.

The Hittite festival was a regular celebration and appeasement of a deity or deities; by the end of the empire, there were apparently dozens of them celebrated throughout the year, some lasting over a month. The textual record of festival celebrations includes outline-tablets, which summarize the events of multi-day festivals with a sentence or two per day; day-tablets or programs of events, which describe every action taken during the festival; liturgy-tablets, which gather together all of the recitations performed during a given festival; and ration-tablets, or *MELQĒTU*-tablets, which describe the allotments of food, drink, and livestock to the participants. The oldest festival texts in which the Old Women are attested are *MELQĒTU*-tablets.

There are two particular ration texts with Old Women; one is KBo 16.72+, edited by Neu,¹⁰⁵ and the other is KBo 17.14++, edited by Popko.¹⁰⁶ The first is extremely fragmentary, and the Old Women are attested in the most complete paragraph, which can barely be translated: “And the juni[or?] AGRIG of Nerik[...] / from the storehouses, 1 *wageš*[šar]-bread [...] / 1 pithos of wine, 1 pithos [of...] / the Old Women (and) the *tešanteš*-women [...]”¹⁰⁷ The question is even open whether the Old Women are giving or receiving goods, although based on the second text, it is more likely that they are receiving. The *tešanteš*-women, with whom they are apparently associated, appear only in this text, and so provide no additional information. The fact that the paragraph begins with the AGRIG (steward) of Nerik, however, may indicate that these

¹⁰⁵ Neu, *Althethitische Ritualtexte*, Nr. 10.

¹⁰⁶ M. Popko, *Zippalanda: Ein Kultzentrum im hethitischen Kleinasien*, THeth 21 (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1994), 96–124.

¹⁰⁷ Obv(?) ii 4’-7’, transliterated Neu, *Althethitische Ritualtexte*, 27.

Old Women are associated with the northern cult city of Nerik (closely connected to central Anatolian cult; see more below). In addition, the pithoi (*harši*-vessels) show that large quantities of wine are involved (although *wageššar*-bread seems to have been an ordinary ration-bread).¹⁰⁸

The second *MELQĒTU*-text is more complete, though still quite fragmentary in places, and belongs to an Old Hittite festival conducted in Zippalanda, another major central Anatolian cult city. In it, a ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI É.GAL, an Old Woman of the Palace (likely the palace of Zippalanda, or at least the institution of same¹⁰⁹), first receives one pig limb each from representatives of the cities of Šalampa, Katapa, and Kardabaha,¹¹⁰ who have slaughtered “their” pigs for this purpose. The labeling of the pigs as “theirs” suggests that they might be functioning here as representatives of their cities, bringing in tribute to be parceled out to religious functionaries employed by the state. The dependence of larger cult cities on smaller surrounding towns to supply them with things is well-known in the Hittite texts,¹¹¹ although in this case, the three pigs’ legs may be symbolic. Similar items are given to a variety of cult personnel in this text: immediately beforehand, the same ration was given by the same people to the “Man of the Scepter,” and immediately afterward, the same people give a pig’s head to the “cupbearers.”

Later in the text,¹¹² the same “Old Woman of the Palace” receives some amount of bread; the text is too fragmentary to be absolutely certain who is doling it out, but the likeliest actor is the SANGA-priest (the head priest), who breaks bread in the previous paragraph. In this paragraph, the list of recipients of bread is: the Man of the St[orm-God?], the cupbearer of the

¹⁰⁸ H.A. Hoffner, Jr., *Alimenta Hethaeorum: Food Production in Hittite Asia Minor*, AOS 55 (New Haven: AOS, 1974), 188.

¹⁰⁹ Popko, *Zippalanda*, 18.

¹¹⁰ KBo 20.3 ii 4’–7’, *ibid.* 108.

¹¹¹ I. Rutherford, “The Dance of the Wolf-Men of Ankuwa. Networks and Amphictionies in the KILAM Festival,” in *Acts of the Vth International Congress of Hittitology: Çorum, September 02-08, 2002*, ed. Y. Hazırlayan and A. Süel (Ankara, 2005), 623–640.

¹¹² KBo 16.71+ iii 8–9, *ibid.* 118.

god, the *arnala*-man (untranslatable¹¹³), the Old Woman of the Palace, the singer of the god, the *palwatalla*-man (a man who recites or calls out), the men of the w[eapons? of Zippalanda?], and the man of the b[ronze] spear. Finally, in a very broken paragraph later in the text,¹¹⁴ the Old Woman appears in a list of people receiving bread and meat (actor unclear), although the specific amount and type is broken. The preserved list is: the *tazzili*-priest, the *hamina*-priest, the GUDU₁₂-priest, the *šiwanzanna*-priestess (=MUNUS AMA.DINGIR-LIM), the ^{LÚ}*arzanala*- (perhaps a cult functionary associated with the *arzana*-building), the *lahhiyala*-men (perhaps “travelers”), the elders of Zippalanda, the Old Woman of the Palace, the *kantikepa*-men (untranslatable), after which the text becomes too fragmentary. The first four titles in this list are all standard priests for Zippalanda, but beyond that, in both of these lists, it is extremely difficult to determine whether the order is hierarchical, or even what the groups mean precisely, given the obscurity of some of the terms.

However, it appears that the Old Woman does not have a standard place in the list of personnel in this festival (unlike, for example, the priests, who often come in the same order).¹¹⁵ She does not appear in the same group of personnel in any of the passages, and the text is too broken to do any sort of systematic analysis of why people appear together. It seems possible that rations were being doled out based on who had participated in certain specific activities in the festival, which is in line with the more general views of Singer: “...on the whole, these rations were intended to fill the needs of the numerous cult functionaries assembled in the capital for the celebrations.”¹¹⁶ Thus, perhaps the Old Woman of the Palace performed several different actions in this festival, and was thus compensated accordingly for each.

¹¹³ See H. Otten, “Bemerkungen zum Hethitischen Wörterbuch III,” *ZA* 71 (1981): 216.

¹¹⁴ KBo 16.71 iii 26’, *ibid.* 120.

¹¹⁵ A. Taggar-Cohen, *Hittite Priesthood*, THeth 26 (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2006), 27.

¹¹⁶ Singer, *The Hittite KILAM Festival, Part One*, StBoT 27 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983), 141.

The ration-tablets, therefore, paint a somewhat uneven picture, but they are also too fragmentary by far to give any real information, beyond that Old Women were present at

10' SANJGA? ^dTe-li-pi-nu 2 UDU ^{LÚ}SANGA ^d[
11' ^dISTAR 2 UDU ^{LÚ}SANGA ^dZi-li-p[
12' a]r-wa-an-za UDU ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI ^{URU}A-r[i-in-na
13' ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI ^{URU}Ha-at-ti 2 UDU ^{LÚ}MES x[

festivals in Arinna, Zippalanda, and (probably) Nerik, and received food during those festivals. However, this information is already fairly significant: Arinna, Zippalanda, and Nerik were the three most important Hattic cult cities in Anatolia. Old Women living there and participating in their cult further reinforces the Hattic connection, and their titles (“Old Woman of the Palace,” “Old Woman of Arinna”) make explicit the official state-sponsored function that was so heavily implied by the other Old Hittite texts.

There is one festival which has several complete attestations of the Old Woman in the detailed program of events: CTH 750, the Festival of Ziparwa, which was part of the month-long festivals of the spring (EZEN₄ AN.TAH.ŠUM^{SAR}, the “festival of the crocus”), and fall (EZEN₄ *nuntarriyašha*- the “festival of haste”).¹¹⁹ The Festival of Ziparwa (who was the head of the Palaic pantheon) existed at least beginning in the Middle Hittite period, and in it, the Old Woman, present in the temple of Ziparwa with the king and the chief of the palace servants, recited incantations in Palaic, a language related to Hittite from Pala in northern Anatolia, and whose pantheon seems closely related to the Hattian (e.g. the main Palaic goddess, Katahziwuri, is also Hattian). The relationship of the Old Women to the Palaic pantheon is clear from the small fragment KBo 17.47 (CTH 470), the beginning of a ritual of Ms. Ānnā of Pala, which attests to the [^{MUNUS}Š] U.GI ŠA É ^dZi-pár-wa_a-a, “The [O]ld [Woman] of the temple of Ziparwa” (line 3). It is likely, then, that the Old Woman who speaks Palaic in the temple of Ziparwa at Hattuša in this text is this “Old Woman of the temple of Ziparwa.” In addition, if this specific Old Woman were truly attached to this deity and this temple in any permanent way, she might have been closer to priesthood than previously thought.

¹¹⁹ H. Marcuson, “The Festival of Ziparwa and the AN.TAH.ŠUM and *nuntarriyašha*- Festivals,” *AoF* 38/1 (2011): 63–72.

The Festival of Ziparwa is also, unlike the *MELQĒTU*-texts quoted above, attested in multiple copies from the Middle Hittite period down to the very end of the empire. As part of the AN.TAH.ŠUM and *nuntarriyašha*-festivals, it was a standard semi-annual performance in the thirteenth century. In the festival, some number of Old Women collectively participate in preparing the offerings before the festival begins,¹²⁰ and in the temple, a single Old Woman (the Old Woman of the temple of Ziparwa?) appears to at least once make some bread-offerings herself,¹²¹ amid the multiple offerings made by the king and palace servants around the temple to the various Palaic gods (which appears to have made up the bulk of the festival-action). For the most part, however, the Old Woman's function in this festival was to speak the Palaic incantations. These incantations seem to have concerned the offerings, since they are called, e.g., the "words of the thick bread,"¹²² the "word of the meal,"¹²³ and speaking "for the cups."¹²⁴ The incantations themselves are unfortunately not included in the festival text. There are possibilities among the few attested Palaic texts for these incantations or incantations like these, although our understanding of Palaic is simply not sufficient to understand them.¹²⁵ The possibility that this Old Woman was a native speaker of Palaic is made more likely by the text of Ms. Ānnā of Pala mentioned above; at the very least, whether there was an Old Woman from Pala in Ḫattuša in all periods (depending, presumably, at least somewhat on the strength of the Hittites' hold on the north), one is likely to have been originally reciting the incantations for the festival.

Nearly all of the other festivals the Old Woman appears in are, unfortunately, likewise fragmentary, and it is often impossible to say what function she is performing. For example, in

¹²⁰ KUB 20.8 i 1–8.

¹²¹ VSNF 12.114 obv. 6'–9'; the subject of "paršiya" is not entirely clear here, but the Old Woman is the most likely option.

¹²² ŠA NINDA.GUR₄.RA^{MEŠ} *uddār*, IBoT 2.38 iii 3'–5'.

¹²³ *memalaš uddar*, IBoT 2.37 iv 3'–5'.

¹²⁴ ANA GAL^{HLA} ...*memiški[zzi]*, KUB 59.49 ii 9'–14'.

¹²⁵ These will be further addressed in chapter 4.

KUB 25.11 (CTH 650), the GAL^{MUNUS.MEŠ}ŠU.GI, the chief of the Old Women, appears four times, but the text is so fragmentary that not once is there a verb attested to show what she is doing. The most complete section of the entire six-column tablet is one fragmentary sentence, which reads, “When they bring barley into the temple of Hannahanna, the Chief of the Old Women [offers?] one sheep t[o...].”¹²⁶ There is one other section where she appears to be in a dialogue with the chief of the palace servants (GAL DUMU^{MEŠ}É.GAL), based on the presence of a quotative particle, and says something about the Land of Hatti conquering or being conquered (*taruh-*).¹²⁷ The festival also has *zintuhi*-women, who are professional Hattic singers, and the “land of the enemy” is mentioned once,¹²⁸ but ultimately there is very little that can be done with it beyond to say that it is a Hattian festival which is also concerned with the protection of Hatti against enemies. Not much more can be done with the parallel KUB 20.77 (also CTH 650), which is a smaller fragment with a more complete passage: “The *zintuhi*-women [...] sin[g] in Hattic. The name of the enemy land lies on the clay ox th[at?...]. It (common-gender: the ox?) falls back down out of the *arkammi*-musical instrument. The Chief of the Old Women¹²⁹ p[icks] it up and [holds] it o[ut] to the chief of the palace servants.”¹³⁰ Once again, this passage

¹²⁶ Obv. ii 12' GIM-an-ma 𐎶 hal-ki 𐎶-in I-NA É^dMAH
13' ar-nu-wa[-an-zi] 𐎶x 𐎶 GAL^{MUNUS. 𐎶MEŠ}Š[U].GI

14' 1 UDU A[-NA] 𐎶x

¹²⁷ Obv. iii 12' KUR^{URU}Ha-at-ti-wa tar-uh[...]

¹²⁸ Obv. iii 6' nu-𐎶 uš 𐎶ša-an ŠA KUR LÚ.K[ÚR...]

¹²⁹ Discussed further below.

¹³⁰ obv iii (?) 2' ^{MUNUS.MEŠ}zi-𐎶 in-tu-ḫi 𐎶[

3' ḫa-at-ti-li ŠĪ[R

4' nu-uš-ša-an A-NA GU₄ IM ku-𐎶 e 𐎶[-da-ni?

5' ŠA KUR^{LÚ}KÚR ŠUM-an ki-it-t[a

6' na-aš-kán^{GIŠ}ar-kam-mi-ia-az[

7' EGIR-an kat-ta ma-uš [-zi]

8' na-an GAL^{MUNUS.MEŠ}ŠU.GI ša-ra-a d[a-a-i]

9' na-an A-NA GAL DUMU^{MEŠ}É.GAL pa-r[a-a e-ep-zi?]

N.b.: if the 𐎶 e 𐎶 in line 4' is correct, this text is potentially OS, since the vertical wedge is quite low. The LI and AZ are also old.

clearly involves protection of the Land of Hatti from enemies, but the context is entirely missing and the ritual action is essentially opaque.

Another festival attesting to the Old Woman is in itself relatively complete, but her preserved participation is brief and, once again, slightly broken. This text is KUB 56.48 (CTH 672), which is an edict of the thirteenth-century king Tudhaliya IV concerning the cult of the northern city of Nerik.¹³¹ He decrees that this festival be conducted: the beginning of the text is in the third-person imperative (“Let them do...”), rather than the usual third-person present indicative of festival texts (“They do...”), and the text is called an *išhiul*, a binding agreement. So far as attested, the Old Woman [ext]inguishes(?)¹³² something, after which the SANGA-priests, the scribe, the wood-scribe, the Old Woman, the diviner (^{LÚ}HAL), the “lords of the stew” (EN^{MES} TU₇), and some other personnel in a lacuna, wash themselves.¹³³ This seems to imply that they are all making themselves pure enough to participate in further festival activities within the temple, but the Old Woman is unfortunately nowhere preserved during those activities.

One further festival text concerning Nerik is attested; this is KUB 31.57 (CTH 672), which Klinger has demonstrated is likely to be a later copy of an Old Hittite text concerning the administration of the cult at Nerik (and which deals with enormous amounts of supplies, e.g., thousands of loaves of different kinds of bread).¹³⁴ Column ii, in which the Old Woman appears, is completely fragmentary: there is only a single word or less at the beginning of each line, but one of those words is ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI, following ^mHuz[ziya, Man of the Storm-God], and ^{LÚ}AGRIG

¹³¹ Edited by J. Součková, “Edikt von Tuthaliia IV. zugunsten des Kults des Wettergottes von Nerik,” in *Investigationes Anatolicae: Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*, ed. J. Klinger, E. Rieken, and C. Rüster, StBoT 52 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 279–300.

¹³² ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI ki?-i]š-ta-nu-ud-du, KUB 56.48 i 13 (ibid., 289).

¹³³ KUB 56.48 i 15–17 (ibid.).

¹³⁴ J. Klinger, “The Cult of Nerik – Revisited,” in *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)*, ed. F. Pecchioli Daddi, G. Torri, and C. Corti (Roma: Herder, 2009), 101.

(“steward”), and preceding ^{LÚ}*hatalw[ala]* (“doorkeeper”).¹³⁵ So, once again, the fragmentary nature of the text prevents any understanding of the Old Woman’s function in the cult, but is more evidence for her presence at Nerik in all periods: in the *MELQĒTU*-texts and in KUB 31.57, from the Old Hittite period before Nerik was lost, and under Tudhaliya IV at the end of the thirteenth century, after it was regained.

There are several other festival fragments containing the Old Woman which are too broken for translation. In one (KBo 20.1+ ii 6’, CTH 670), another “Old Woman of the Palace” is included in a paragraph with a list of personnel that also includes ten wives of SANGA-priests and two *nanšalli*-men (a *hapax*), but is otherwise broken; in another, the Old Woman participates in some activity in the “house of the Man of Bronze” (KUB 54.57 9’–10’, CTH 670); in another, she is speaking conjurations (KUB 41.54 obv. 11’–12’, CTH 670). There is one fragment in which she and one of the well-attested AMA.DINGIR-*LIM* priestesses are acting together (KBo 59.124 7, CTH 670), but the verb is not preserved. In another fragment, she and an EN DINGIR-*LIM*, a Lord of the Deity (see above in the discussion of CTH 323) appear together, but once again, there is no verb (IBoT 3.73 5’, CTH 670). In a better-preserved festival (KBo 11.32, CTH 645), on the obverse, the king makes offerings to a series of deities: the moon-god Sîn, the fate-goddesses (Gulšeš), the male gods and ^dMaliya (a wine-goddess),¹³⁶ but the Old Woman appears only at the very bottom of the reverse, which overall only preserves about one word in three, and it is impossible to translate. In a quite well-preserved festival, CTH 638, the Festival of Telipinu in Hanhana and Kašha, which was part of the multi-day *purulli*-festival celebrating the New Year,¹³⁷ the “Old Woman of the Palace” (this time probably the palace in Ḫattuša, since this

¹³⁵ KUB 31.57 ii 5’–8’, edited by V. Haas, *Der Kult von Nerik: Ein Beitrag zur hethitischen Religionsgeschichte* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1970), 116.

¹³⁶ V. Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, HbOr I:15 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 410 with n. 260.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 742–47.

activity is in Hanhana, which does not seem to have had an É.GAL¹³⁸) appears in one of the many preserved fragments.¹³⁹ However, once again she is only in a list of personnel, including at least one GUDU₁₂-priest, and two *damš[atalla]*-men (perhaps “butchers”), after which it seems as though they all sit down to a meal with the prince (DUMU.LUGAL), but then the text breaks, so there is once again no way to know what the Old Woman’s function in the festival was. In another better-preserved festival (CTH 719, the festival of Ištar, Hu(r)duma, and Aruna¹⁴⁰), the majority of the preserved text is a series of bread- and drink- offerings, and the section with the Old Woman is extremely opaque: “When they draw the god from the road,”¹⁴¹ the Old Woman performs some action involving a basket and two headdresses, one red and one white—the verbs are mainly broken, excepting only when the Old Woman places the basket before ^dAruna, the deified sea. This festival is perhaps the most strange in terms of cultural affiliation, since Ištar is well-known in Hittite texts from the Hurrian and Mesopotamian milieu, unlike the primarily Hattian-sphere documents so far attested otherwise. Hu(r)duma is only attested in this festival, and ^dAruna, the deified sea, is otherwise known only in fragmentary context—though this includes, e.g., KUB 33.108, which is CTH 350, Fragments Mentioning the Goddess Ištar.¹⁴² Finally, the Old Woman is attested in the outline of the *nuntarriyašha*-festival, in the brief description of the eighteenth day, in which she and the treasurers (LÚ.MEŠŠÀ.TAM) go to Arinna “to burn *ganzu(wa)-*” (*ganzuwaš warnummanzi*) before the chief of the treasurers celebrates the

¹³⁸ P. Camatta, “Die Stadt Hanhana und ein Identifizierungsvorschlag,” *AoF* 33/2 (2006): 267–68.

¹³⁹ KUB 53.4 i 27’, edited by V. Haas and L. Jakob-Rost, “Das Festritual des Gottes Telipinu in Hanhana und in Kašša: Ein Beitrag zum hethitischen Festkalender,” *AoF* 11/1 (1984): 72–79 (No. 14).

¹⁴⁰ Edited by G. Beckman, “The Sea! The Sea! A Rite from the South of Anatolia (CTH 719),” in *Saeculum: Gedenkschrift für Heinrich Otten anlässlich seines 100. Geburtstag*, ed. A. Müller-Karpe, E. Rieken, and W. Sommerfeld, StBoT 58 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015), 15–29.

¹⁴¹ KUB 20.1 iii 13: ma-aḫ-]ḫa-an-ma DINGIR(over erasure)-LAM KASKAL-az ḫu-u-it-ti-ia-an-zi

¹⁴² Obv. ii 17: ^dU-aš ^da-ru-na-an tar-uḫ-zi, “The Storm-God conquers the sea.”

deified “queen of the storehouse.”¹⁴³ Unfortunately, the tablets describing the eighteenth day in detail are not preserved, so no more information is available.

Since nearly all of the festival texts in which the Old Woman appears are so fragmentary, it seems at first as though very little can be said about the Old Woman’s relationship to the Hittite cult. However, in fact, when taken all together, the festival texts are quite telling. They are from, or conducted in: Ḫattuša, Arinna, Zippalanda, Nerik, and Ḫanḫana, all cities in the central Anatolian heartland connected to the Hattian cult. In particular, the existence of an “Old Woman of Arinna” is extremely relevant since, as noted by Popko, the cult of Arinna (as attested at Ḫattuša) shows almost no Hurrian influence, even at the end of the empire when it would be expected, but retains its entirely Hattian character.¹⁴⁴ Zippalanda and Nerik are likewise extremely Hattian cult cities, and the presence of Hattic singing (by others) and Palaic recitation (by the Old Woman) in these festivals is likewise significant. The festivals are also nearly all honoring Hattic or Palaic gods (Telipinu, Ḫannaḫanna, Ziparwa and Kataḫziwuri). There is only one text that shows any other cultural affiliation (CTH 719, the Festival for Ištar, Hu(r)dumana, and Aruna). Once again, therefore, the Old Woman remains solidly within the Hattian cultural sphere, native to the Hittite heartland.

The presence of the Old Women in the festivals at all is also an indication of their support by (and of) the state: as mentioned above, the “Old Woman of the Palace,” the “Old Woman of Hatti,” the “Old Woman of Arinna,” and the “Chief of the Old Women” suggest official standing, both in the capital and in the major cult cities. In addition, these texts are spread across

¹⁴³ M. Nakamura, *Das hethitische nuntarriyašḫa-Fest*, PIHANS 94 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2002), 51–53 (Übersichtstafel 3 iv 13’–16’).

¹⁴⁴ “Im Gegensatz zu anderen Städten und Kultzentren des Hattilandes sind in Arinna fremde, luwische und hurritische Einflüsse kaum nachweisbar, und dies bezieht sich ebenfalls auf spätere Urkunden, in denen solche aus anderen Kulturkreisen entlehnte Elemente ja zu erwarten wären,” M. Popko, *Arinna: Eine heilige Stadt der Hethiter*, StBoT 50 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009), 83.

the whole of Hittite history, rather than just being confined to the Old Hittite period. In a cultic context, at least, the Old Women maintained some official standing up through the thirteenth century.

1.5: Conclusion

The evidence presented in this chapter clearly demonstrates that from the Old Hittite period, the Old Women were operating at the highest levels of Hittite society. They were called upon to do oracular consultations on political and military matters, they supported the Hittite king's institutional and divine authority, and they ritually treated the king and queen in quite an intimate fashion for problems such as slander, sickness, divine anger, and even emotional distress. They were also practitioners of rituals addressing climatological and/or agricultural difficulties, maintaining a close relationship with central Anatolian gods. In addition, the evidence of the festivals shows that they had institutional positions at important cities in the Hittite heartland and operated in some organized fashion with a leader of their own (GAL). Nothing about these older texts suggests any foreign origins, or anything like a popular, domestic, or marginalized context: they were employed by the state and served the king directly.

One final point of significance remains: the official presence of the Old Women in old central Anatolian cult cities in the earliest festival texts, their performing Hattic-context texts like the Benedictions and the Old Hittite ritual for the royal couple, the demonstrable archaism of their KIN-oracles, and their responsibility for the Disappearing God myths and rituals indicates that they were not an innovation of Ḫattušili's kingdom. It is likely that they were present in central Anatolia before the Hittite state was. Their integral involvement with royal ritual and their relationship to the gods (as demonstrated by, e.g., the eagle episode in CTH 416, the request to the gods for long years for the king and queen in CTH 820, their skill as diviners, and their

involvement with the myths) could even mean that the Hittite kings relied in part on them for legitimacy. Returning to Ḫattušili's Testament, if this were the case, it is easy to see why a personality such as his would not have appreciated the Old Women's dissenting opinions.

CHAPTER 2: ORACLE TEXTS

2.1: Introduction

Divination was a cornerstone of decision-making in Hittite administration: cult practice, dream interpretation, personnel installation, royal health, accession procedures, and campaign itineraries were all common subjects of oracular inquiries. In particular, the placation of angry gods was a topic of primary concern; extensive series of questions were recorded in which, responding to some negative event or sign, the asker tried to determine whether a god was angry, which god of the thousand gods of Ḫatti it might be, what that god was angry about, and what might be done to repair the matter. Since only yes-or-no questions were permitted, these series could be quite lengthy. Oracle texts, therefore, could be hundreds of lines long, in the case of compilations of related questions about a single topic. However, questions could also be recorded singly, on very small tablets, or in small series of just a few questions. Oracles could be also be requested by letter, performed at the letter's destination, and the results returned in another letter.

There were six different oracular techniques used by the Hittites,¹ each of which could be mixed and matched, and the results of one checked with another. The techniques were as follows: extispicy (the examination of the liver and intestines of sheep, borrowed from Mesopotamia and performed by the ^{LÚ}ḪAL, a male diviner), the “bed”-oracles (also performed by the ^{LÚ}ḪAL, in which the behavior of the sheep prior to slaughter for extispicy was observed), augury (bird-watching, performed by the ^{LÚ}MUŠEN.DÙ—literally “the man who does the birds”—or ^{LÚ}IGI.MUŠEN, “bird-watcher”), the *HURRI*-bird oracles (performed by the ^{LÚ}ḪAL

¹ For an overview of the various techniques, see, e.g., Th. van den Hout, “Orakel B. Bei den Hethitern,” in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 10 (2003): 118–24, and R. Beal, “Hittite Oracles,” in *Magic and Divination in the Ancient World*, eds. L. Ciraola and J. Seidel (Leiden: Brill/Styx, 2002), 57–81.

using a technique that is mostly opaque to us, but was certainly different from augury), the snake-oracles (in which a snake-like animal—perhaps an eel—was put in a basin of water and its path was observed, discussed below pp. 68–69), and finally the KIN-oracles, performed by the Old Women. The KIN-oracles were treated in a seminal article by Archi in 1974,² which carefully and thoroughly analyzed the methods of recording the oracular procedure, but little research has been done on them since, and much about them remains opaque.

The Sumerian logogram KIN literally means “work” (Hittite *aniyatt-*), and can also be used to mean “ritual” (*aniur*, sometimes written KIN-*ur*). Its exact meaning in oracular context is unclear,³ and even less is known about the technique itself (see below for a discussion of some proposed possibilities). The KIN-oracles were the most commonly recorded oracular technique,⁴ followed closely by the liver- and bird-oracles; these three types often appear in texts alongside one another, when answers were being double- and triple-checked. It seems, therefore, that the Hittites were interested in maximizing the methods by which they might learn the gods’ opinions of their actions.

2.2: Excursus: The snake-oracles

The snake-oracles seem to be oracles conducted by placing a snake or eel in a basin of water, which was demarcated with various named areas, and observing how it swims. This

² A. Archi, “Il sistema KIN della divinazione ittita,” *OA* 13 (1974): 113–44.

³ As Archi states, “È pertanto possibile che questo sistema di divinazione—anche in relazione alla preparazione di cui necessitava, per la disposizione dei numerosi elementi che lo componevano—fosse denominato con un termine alquanto generico, quale ‘opera, procedimento’ (ibid., 130).

⁴ According to the Konkordanz, CTH 572 (the KIN-oracles) comprises 124 tablets, CTH 573 (the bird-oracles) 111 tablets, CTH 570 and 571 (the liver-oracles) 77 tablets, CTH 574 (*HURRI*-bird oracles) 28 tablets, CTH 575 (the snake-oracles) 10 tablets, and CTH 576 (the bed-oracles) 14 tablets. (Note: I am using the uncorrected numbers for CTH 572 [see Appendix A]; presumably a small number of the texts in all of these groups has been miscategorized.) Moreover, CTH 578 (combined liver- and KIN-oracles) comprises 62 tablets and CTH 580 (combined bird- and KIN-oracles) 48 tablets, while CTH 579 (combined liver- and bird-oracles) only 32. All of these numbers are quite rough, but when taking into account that some of the longest specialized oracle texts (CTH 561, 563, and 565) are also KIN-oracles, there does seem to be a slight but real preference for the KIN-oracle method in the preserved material. All of these texts are almost exclusively from the thirteenth century, and their findspots are distributed primarily among Büyükkale, Temple 1, and the Haus am Hang.

method is quite poorly attested compared to the other oracular methods (only ten texts are preserved, and most are quite fragmentary), and may have been more specialized: the questions all seem to concern the king personally.⁵ The snake-oracles have commonly⁶ (though not exclusively⁷) been considered the domain of the Old Women as well, based on the somewhat similar use of symbols in these methods, and on direct speech from “Mezzulla and the Old Women” in the most complete snake-oracle, IBoT 1.33 (the only snake-oracle in which Old Women are mentioned). However, a more careful reading of this text reveals that it actually suggests the opposite.

IBoT 1.33 is an oracle about whether various years are favorable or unfavorable for the health of the king. Each paragraph asks about a specific year: this year, the second year, the third year, etc., up through the twentieth year. During this inquiry, the fourth year and the eighth year are both found to be favorable. However, it becomes clear that there is a conflict: after the twentieth year is finished, the text says, “Concerning that fact⁸: that Mezzulla and the Old Women said, ‘For His Majesty, the fourth and eighth year are unfavorable.’ (Will it happen) thus, just as the Old Woman (said)?”⁹ Here, Mezzulla and the Old Women are very clearly *contradicting* the current text, where it has already been ascertained that the fourth and the eighth year are both favorable. Thus, these lines are a cross-check, since the Old Women, using KIN-oracles, came up with a different answer for those years. Therefore, there is no real evidence that the Old Women performed the snake-oracles.

⁵ See D. Lefèvre-Novaro and A. Mouton, “Aux origines de l’ichthyomancie en Anatolie ancienne: sources textuelles et données archéologiques,” *Anatolica* 34 (2008): 10–36, for transliterations and translations of most of the attested snake-oracle texts.

⁶ E.g., V. Haas, *Hethitische Orakel, Vorzeichen und Abwehrstrategien* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 23; E. Laroche, “Lécanomancie hittite,” *RA* 52 (1958): 160.

⁷ Beal, “Hittite Oracles,” 74: “It is not clear what the title of the practitioner of these was.”

⁸ *eni kuit*, indicating new information; see P. Goedegebuure, *The Hittite Demonstratives: Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus*, StBoT 55 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015), 164–66, for a demonstration of how this phrase can be used to refer to information taken from a different oracle inquiry entirely.

⁹ IBoT 1.33 rev. 83–84, transliterated by Laroche, “Lécanomancie hittite,” 154.

2.3: The KIN-oracle questions

Oracle texts were records of what the Hittites considered to be communication with the divine. The texts—both the KIN-oracles and the other methods—show an overwhelming preoccupation with the gods’ state of mind: the oracle questions are devoted to determining (a) whether the gods are angry, (b) what they are angry about, (c) what may be done to placate them, and (d) whether they will approve of future actions. In Hittite ideology, major misfortunes were likely to be traced back to an angry god, so oracles about problems such as sickness or defeat in battle are, at heart, always about divine disapproval. Likewise, oracles about the success or failure of specific plans of action were explicitly phrased as requests for divine sanction for such plans. Sometimes an unfavorable answer could lead to an inquiry into the god’s reasons for disapproving: for example, in the campaign oracle KUB 5.1+ (CTH 561, primarily a KIN-oracle text), there is a section where the gods have said that a certain attack will not succeed. The questioner attempts to figure out why, and it is revealed that the gods’ statues have been mistreated, and so divine disapproval will cause the attack to fail.¹⁰ Soon afterward, another campaign path, planned by a general named Temeti, is refused, and again there is a digression to determine whether the gods disapprove of Temeti personally, and when that is confirmed, if his life might even be in danger.¹¹ Thus, even in military context, divine opinion was paramount.

Oracle questions, therefore, did not predict the future in a general sense. The only information that could be determined through oracle was what the gods thought, wanted, had done, or planned to do. This is easily confirmed by looking at the texts: of 90 KIN-oracles with enough of a question preserved to analyze their content (64 texts in which only KIN-oracles are preserved, and 26 that are a combination of methods), every single preserved text conforms to

¹⁰ Col. iii 33–45.

¹¹ Col. iii 65–96.

this interpretation. Of these texts, 39 (43%) are explicitly about whether one or more deities are angry, and/or whether the offerings and cult activities dedicated to them are sufficient;¹² 20 (22%) are about whether the gods approve campaign strategies or border placements,¹³ 4 (4%) are about campaign paths as well as angry gods and/or cultic actions,¹⁴ 15 (17%) of them are about the gods' influence on the lifespan of, or danger to, the king or a member of the royal family,¹⁵ 4 (4%) are about someone's sin,¹⁶ 4 (4%) are about the divine interference in the royal accession,¹⁷ 2 (2%) are about fixing something that is wrong,¹⁸ 1 (1%) is about dream interpretation,¹⁹ and 1 (1%) is about divine approval of personnel installation.²⁰ It should be noted that these categories are somewhat artificial, and several of the texts overlap—for example, KBo 57.130+ is about an angry god, but the anger has been determined through a dream, so it is also a confirmation of dream-interpretation. As already mentioned above, though, all of these subjects are either issues that the gods have caused and/or can fix (e.g., in the case of a person's illness), or that should be submitted to them for approval (in the case of campaign strategy, accession, or personnel installation).

The longer preserved KIN-oracle texts mainly belong to the second category, and preserve series of questions as to whether certain actions will be acceptable to the gods or not.

¹² KBo 14.21, KUB 5.6+, KBo 24.123, KBo 24.125, KBo 40.50, KBo 41.151, KBo 41.152, KBo 41.158, KBo 41.161, KBo 41.163, KBo 41.165, KBo 41.166, KBo 41.167, KBo 41.172, KBo 41.173, KBo 49.207, KBo 52.280, KBo 58.64++, KUB 16.21, KUB 18.21, KUB 22.57, KUB 49.77, KUB 49.82, KUB 50.20, KUB 50.42, KUB 50.81, KUB 50.91, KUB 50.111, KUB 52.68, KuT 26, KBo 57.130+, KUB 16.77, KUB 5.11, KuT 1, KUB 16.66, KBo 44.219(+), KBo 44.210, KUB 50.103, KBo 48.272.

¹³ KUB 5.1+, KBo 13.76, KBo 41.170, KBo 46.119, KBo 49.180, KBo 59.79, KUB 49.70, KUB 49.76, KUB 50.13, KUB 50.40, KUB 50.52, KUB 50.58+, KUB 50.79, KUB 50.118, KUB 52.85, KBo 22.264, KUB 22.51, KUB 49.79, KUB 50.108, KuT 44+.

¹⁴ KUB 22.25, KBo 41.162, KUB 16.18, KUB 50.57.

¹⁵ KUB 5.3+, KUB 5.4, KBo 41.153, KBo 41.156, KBo 41.159+, KBo 41.174, KUB 6.3, KUB 6.7+, KUB 18.34, KUB 50.39, KUB 52.41, KBo 2.2, KBo 44.204+, KUB 22.61, KBo 18.142.

¹⁶ KBo 41.168, KUB 50.67, KUB 50.101, KBo 44.211.

¹⁷ KUB 16.58, KBo 2.6+, KUB 16.20, KBo 16.98.

¹⁸ KUB 52.45, KUB 52.51; these probably fit into one of the other categories, but neither is well-preserved enough to determine what the problem is.

¹⁹ KUB 49.92.

²⁰ KUB 22.57.

There are five main extant texts or groups of texts with these long series: one (KUB 5.1+) about campaign strategy, one (KUB 5.3+ and KUB 5.4+) about where the king will spend the winter, one (KBo 14.21) about the neglect of offerings, one (KUB 6.7+) about danger to the king's life, and one (CTH 569) about obstacles to the royal accession. These texts are our best source for the questioning process, although it is by no means clear how much time passed between questions, or if every question in a given compilation indeed followed the question before it.²¹

By far the longest of the oracle compilations is KUB 5.1+, a campaign oracle.²² This text presents a series of complicated campaign paths for approval, for example:

“His Majesty will come back to the city of Ḫakmiš from the city of Nerik. He will strike the city of Talmaliya and destroy the troops of Mt. Ḫaḫarwa. His Majesty will sleep in the city of Iupapaena, but when he comes down from Mt. Haharwa, he will give the *ŠUTU*-troops to Mr. Temeti. They will carry off the city of Ununiya. Afterward, he will catch up with His Majesty, and he will take care of the matter of the cities of Taptena and Ḫuršama. He will not strike the city of Tanizila. (If this is all acceptable), let the KIN be favorable.”²³

A number of variations on this plan are put forward in this text. If something is unfavorable, specific lines of inquiry may be pursued to determine what exactly the problem is (for example, the matter of General Temeti, discussed above) and if it is possible to get around it. As already

²¹ It is sometimes clear that this is *not* the case; see, e.g., KUB 22.70 obv. 51–52, discussed in P. Goedegebuure, *The Hittite Demonstratives*, 167–68, where a question refers not to the immediately preceding question, but instead to one from a separate inquiry altogether.

²² Edited by A. Ünal, *Ḫattušili III. Teil I: Ḫattušili bis zu seiner Thronbesteigung*, THeth 4 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag, 1974), 32–102; an updated translation has been made by R. Beal, in “Seeking Divine Approval for Campaign Strategy: KUB 5.1+KUB 52.65,” *Ktema* 24 (1999): 41–54. All translations here are my own.

²³ KUB 5.1+ ii 45–49, transliterated by Ünal, *Ḫattušili III*, p. 58.

pointed out by Beal,²⁴ the questions do not stop when one option is approved; the questioner rather establishes which possibilities are viable and which are not, and the process leaves the Hittite king with several approved options from which to choose.

The majority of KUB 5.1+ uses only the KIN-oracle technique, but somewhere in the broken first half of the fourth column, the questioner instead begins to turn first to extispicy, and only double-checks the answers with the KIN-oracles. A comparison of the two sections yields interesting results: for example, in column i, there is a series of questions about plague at Mt. Ḫaḫarwa. It begins, “His Majesty will go up to Mt. Ḫaḫarwa and sleep up there. If we have nothing to fear for His Majesty’s person (lit. head), let it be favorable.”²⁵ The answer is unfavorable: the king should not sleep up on Mt. Ḫaḫarwa. The next two questions ask if going up to Mt. Ḫaḫarwa is dangerous for the king no matter what (it is not), and then if simply sleeping up there is prohibited (it is). There follows a question about whether the king is in danger of catching a plague, and then, “His Majesty will go up to Mt. Ḫaḫarwa and he will sleep up there. If there will not be a plague among the troops, like (there was for) Mr. Manini, let it be favorable,”²⁶ to which the answer is favorable. One further confirmation that there will not be a plague is put forth, after which the questioner seems to be satisfied that there will at least be no danger to the army, and moves on.

Much later, however, in column iv, the same question from column i is repeated: “He will go up to Mr. Ḫaḫarwa. If there will be no plague among the troops, let it be favorable.”²⁷ The question is answered first by extispicy, and then (again) by the KIN-oracle (which is favorable). The next question is, once again, “He will sleep up on Mt. Ḫaḫarwa. Is it all right with the

²⁴ Beal, “Gleanings from Hittite Oracle Questions on Religion, Society, Psychology and Decision Making,” in *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko*, ed. P. Taracha (Warsaw: Agade, 2002), 33.

²⁵ KUB 5.1+ i 32–33, transliterated by Ünal, *Ḫattušili III*, p. 36.

²⁶ KUB 5.1+ i 40–41, *ibid.* p. 38.

²⁷ KUB 5.1+ iv 52, *ibid.* p. 86.

gods?”²⁸ There seem to be two explanations for this repetition: first, that in addition to the common Hittite practice of checking a single question with more than one oracular method, the same question could be brought back to the gods again using the same method, either (in the case of the question about the plague) to make absolutely certain that it was favorable, or (in the case of whether the king might sleep up on Mt. Ḫaḫarwa) to check if the unfavorable answer might have changed. Secondly, the text of KUB 5.1+ states explicitly that there was more than one inquiry about this campaign, not all of which are preserved. Perhaps KUB 5.1+ is a compilation of two (or more) inquiries, one using KIN-oracles and the other a combination of methods, which were asking some of the same questions concurrently with one another.

Another argument toward KUB 5.1+ potentially being a compilation of several separate inquiries is that the text switches back and forth from the third person (“His Majesty will campaign...”) to the first (“I, My Majesty, will campaign...”).²⁹ The reason for this is difficult to determine, however; the king may have been present for some questions but not for others; the questions may have been relayed, and some written down verbatim and others not; or some questions may have been relayed by the king and others asked by lower officials.

A question in the first person does not, of course, necessarily mean that the king himself authored it; however, in column iii, there is a direct response from the king to a combination of negative results:

“Concerning this: that (s)he (*sc.* the deity) keeps strangling the campaign to Tanizila. It was also unfavorable through the augur and the (male) diviner. The gall bladder was *turapšita*; there were fourteen intestinal coils. I will decide, and I, My Majesty, will act according to my own will. If you, Storm-God of Nerik, are my personal

²⁸ KUB 5.1+ iv 57, *ibid.*

²⁹ For a discussion of the likelihood of changes in person signaling a compilation of more than one text, see Christiansen, *Ambazzi*, 1–30.

god, just as you have been helpful before, now will you likewise run before me on this campaign, wherever I turn? Will you step on fear for me? Will I destroy it, and bring away courage for myself? Let it be favorable.”³⁰

This question seems unlikely to be anything but a real communication from the king. It is also a rare explicit example of a Hittite king deciding to go against an oracular decision—though of course, he puts that decision to an oracle as well. Perhaps the situation with respect to divine opinion was too complicated for a straight oracular answer; it seems that the king was requesting support from the Storm-God of Nerik against the ill-will of the (unidentified) divinity who was “strangling” the campaign. In any case, even an unequivocal negative response to a proposed action could be bargained with, and questions could be repeated and double-checked no matter what the gods seemed to think, although this example suggests that the king might have had to attend to these matters personally.

On the other hand, sometimes the questioner did have to give up. The two next-longest KIN-oracle texts, KUB 5.4+ and KUB 5.3+,³¹ are records of two different inquiries about the same series of questions; the king plans to spend the winter in the capital, Ḫattuša, and an oracle inquiry has been set up to determine whether it will be safe. Using a combination of KIN-oracles and extispicy, the texts ask whether His Majesty will be in danger from sickness, from fire, from a chariot accident, from internal revolt, and so on. Ultimately, sickness is ascertained to be a danger, and upon further inquiry into the reason behind the sickness, a new deity of kingship(!) is determined to be angry, and will not be easily appeased. The final stages of questioning about this problem are too broken to read, but the last few paragraphs of both texts are preserved, and show that after extensive questioning concerning this problem, the questioners changed tactics

³⁰ KUB 5.1+ iii 51–57, Ünal, *Ḫattušili I*, 73–74.

³¹ Translated by R. Beal in *The Context of Scripture I: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, ed. W. Hallo and K. Lawson Younger, Jr. (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 207–211.

and asked instead if His Majesty might spend the winter in Aleppo, Katapa, Ankuwa, or Zithara. Sometimes, therefore, even the extensive system of double-checking was not enough to get a single desired result.

Another relatively well-preserved KIN-oracle tablet is KBo 14.21,³² which also deals with an angry god. In this case, the god Pirwa is angry, and the questioners have gone to the temple staff to determine why. They learn that, among other problems, one of the monthly festivals has been skipped and that certain offerings have been embezzled. Much of the preserved text is dedicated to proposing restitutions: for example, they offer to make up the omitted festival and give extra offerings of bread and beer, which is rejected. Next they offer to perform the festival twice and give an ox and a sheep, which is accepted. The questioners' communications with the temple staff are recorded using direct speech, e.g., in col. i 7'–10: "Concerning [th]is (matter), with respect to which a n[egl]ect was determined, we asked the priest, and he said, '[...] the monthly festival of the sixth month f[or] the god was omitted.' Shall they thereupon make up the festival of the month once, in the sixth month, and in addition give restitution with bread (and) beer? (Will you,) O deity, (have it) likewise?" Oracle questions like these can shed light on daily religious practice: for example, it is noteworthy that whenever there is an investigation into cult neglect, plenty of neglect is there to be found.

Another KIN-oracle with a series of questions preserved is KUB 6.7+³³; the intact part of the tablet is a repetition of, "Do you, O deity, see me perishing in the" first year, second year, etc., up to the ninth year. The sections of the tablet immediately preceding and following seem to go into more detail about danger from foreign kings (Aḫḫiyawa and Babylon are preserved), but are too broken to translate. One assumes the questioner is the king (or a representative). Finally,

³² For a transliteration and translation of this text, see Appendix A.

³³ Edited by G. Beckman in Beckman, T.R. Bryce, and E.H. Cline, *The Aḫḫiyawa Texts*, WAW 28 (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 234–41.

another series of oracles very concerned with the king is the group of texts under CTH 569,³⁴ which are inquiries (using a combination of methods) about the appropriate time for the king's coronation, and if problems such as illness, metaphysical contamination, and/or angry deities or ghosts might be an issue. Both of these texts attest to the constant divine presence in the king's life and career; it was not only necessary to secure the gods' approval before accession, but also to repeatedly check in with them about upcoming dangers.

Keeping a finger on the divine pulse required an extensive support staff, and the Old Women must have been available to be consulted regularly about whatever military, religious, or personal issue the royal family or the administration required help with. There are no texts attesting to the presence of Old Women in the field during a campaign, but they may have been consulted by letter (though there is no direct evidence for this). In addition, KIN-oracles are attested at various provincial sites such as Maşat Höyük and Kuşaklı, demonstrating an Old Woman presence around the Hittite heartland: a network of diviners allowing for consultation by officials at any major Anatolian center. This, it should be noted, correlates with the evidence from the festival texts of Old Women in official positions at Arinna, Zippalanda, and Nerik. This network seems to have existed throughout the Hittite period, if not before: the KIN-oracles span the greatest timespan of any oracular method. KBo 18.151, the Old Hittite KIN-oracle, is the oldest attested oracle text (based on palaeography and prosopographical data, see below), there are a few Middle Hittite KIN-oracles, and the KIN-oracles are attested alongside the other methods down to the end of the thirteenth century. The Old Women, therefore, were intermediaries between the Hittite state and the gods for as long as the kingdom existed.

2.4: The KIN-oracle method

³⁴ For which see Th. van den Hout, *The Purity of Kingship: An Edition of CTH 569 and Related Hittite Oracle Inquiries of Tuthaliya IV*, DMOA 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

After an oracle question is posed, the text will say, “Let the KIN be favorable” or “Let the KIN be unfavorable,” depending on whether confirmation of the question is desirable or not.³⁵ For example, a question such as “Are they performing the festival completely?” as in the first example below, would be followed by “Let it be favorable,” whereas a question such as “Is the deity angry” would be followed by “Let it be unfavorable.” Following this is a description of the oracular procedure, and finally the answer, favorable or unfavorable. The KIN-oracle procedure is extremely difficult to understand. The descriptions make it clear that the Old Women must have been using some kind of symbol to represent each entity in the procedure, but it is not at all clear what those symbols were, or what physical actions were being performed to produce these descriptions. In a typical procedure, one entity, usually a person or deity, takes one or more items (or concepts), and gives them to or places them near (or within) another entity. For example:

KBo 14.21, concerning cult celebrations:

“If they are celebrating this yearly festival for the god completely, and [l]eaving nothing out, let the KIN be favorable. **The deity too[k] the whole soul for itself and placed it in anger.** Unfavorable.”³⁶

KUB 5.1+, concerning campaign strategy:

“When I campaign against them at Lihayama, will the outcome for Nerik be favorable because of that? Let it be favorable. **The king took for himself rightness, strength and power, well-being, and battle; to the gods. Second: Ḫannaḫanna arose (and) took goodness and the weapon of**

³⁵ As already noted by Archi: “Vale a dire che se nel corso dell’indagine, per chiarire ad esempio l’atteggiamento di qualche divinità, si prospetta una situazione negativa, chiedendo allora che l’omen ‘non sia favorevole,’ non è che ci si auguri una risposta che avvalori quanto esposto nella domanda, dunque: ‘sfavorevole,’ NU.SIG₅; un tale responso invece, verrebbe semplicemente a confermare che la deplorabile situazione prospettata corrisponde purtroppo a realtà, e non è smentita, come invece si auspicherebbe nel qual caso allora la risposta dovrebbe essere: ‘favorevole,’ SIG₅” (“Il sistema KIN,” 118).

³⁶ Obv. i 51’–54’; see Appendix A for transliteration.

Hatti; to the great sickness. Third: the enemy took for himself hidden sin, a peace treaty, and a campaign; into emptiness. Favorable.³⁷

KUB 16.36, concerning the location of an event:

“Or will it happen in Šankuwa? Let it be unfavorable. **Goodness took the house; to the great sickness. Second: the god took the whole <soul> and the favor of ^dNAM for itself; they were(!)³⁸ given to the *panku*.** Favorable.”³⁹

So far, no literal description of what the Old Women were doing is attested. In the past, some scholars have speculated that they were casting lots, and each symbol was a token that was thrown or that was resting on a board of some kind;⁴⁰ others have suggested that the first, active symbol was some kind of animal (as in the snake-oracles), which moved around an enclosure and interacted with other named items and demarcated areas.⁴¹ Unless a document describing the process is discovered, however, these speculations remain unconfirmed; the extant texts simply do not provide enough information to confirm any guess as to what performing a KIN-oracle might have looked like.

The descriptions of the oracle procedures, however, are more accessible, and have already been comprehensively analyzed by Archi.⁴² To use Archi’s terminology,⁴³ there are

³⁷ Obv. ii 17–21: for transliteration, see Ünal, *Hattušili III*, p. 54. The final clause of each of these sentences is a separate sentence, but the verb in each is elided; I have represented this using semicolons to stand in for the Hittite *nu*.

³⁸ The KIN-oracles regularly lack anaphoric agreement; in this case, the pronoun =aš and the singular common-gender participle SUM-*za* should both be plural, to reflect the “whole soul” and the “favor of ^dNAM.” No explanation has yet been found for this problem. The obvious grammatical explanation, that they refer instead to the singular active symbol (“the god” in this case), is rendered unworkable by passages such as KUB 5.1+ i 21, in which the active symbol is also plural, but the participle remains singular.

³⁹ 11’ [n]a-at-za ^{URU}Ša-an-ku-wa-ma DÜ-ri NU.ŠE-du SI[G₅]-za É ME-aš ANA GI[G].⁷ GAL⁷ (12’) 2-NU DINGIR-za da-pí <ZI> ^dNAM-aš mi-nu-mar ME-aš na-aš pa.-i SUM-za SIG₅

⁴⁰ See, e.g., Archi, “Il sistema KIN,” 130–31, and J. Orlamünde, “Überlegungen zum hethitischen KIN-Orakel,” in *Kulturgeschichten. Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. Th. Richter, D. Prechel, and J. Klinger (Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker und Druckerei und Verlag, 2001), 309–311.

⁴¹ See, e.g., Beal, “Hittite Oracles,” 76–77.

⁴² For examples of all of the following possible constructions, organized by grammatical elements, see Archi, “Il sistema KIN,” 127–29.

active (A) symbols, passive (P) symbols, and final (F) symbols (for a complete list of symbols classified by type, see below). If the active symbol is a divinity (with the exceptions of DINGIR-*LUM* and ^dGUL-ša-), it will first “arise”⁴⁴ before acting on passive symbols. Whether divine or not, in general an active symbol “takes”⁴⁵ anywhere from one to seven passive symbols, and then “gives”⁴⁶ them to, or “places”⁴⁷ them near, a final symbol. For example:

DINGIR^{MEŠ} GUB-ir TI-tar *dāir* n=at pangauī piēr

“The gods arose, too[k] life, and gave it to the *panku*.” (KBo 14.21 i 39’)

DINGIR-*LUM*=za *dapi*an ZI-an ME-aš n=an=za=an=kan karpi *dāiš*

“The deity too[k] the whole soul for itself and placed it in anger.” (KBo 14.21 i 53’–54’)

When the passive symbols are “placed,” their position in relation to the final symbol is not always expressed (i.e., the final symbol may simply be in the dative case, as in the example above), but sometimes they are “to the left,” “to the right,” or “back to/behind” the final symbol. Sometimes, the active symbol will take the passive symbols, but then, rather than an active verb, the passive symbol(s) are said to “be given to” or to “lie”⁴⁸ near the final symbol. On the other hand, sometimes the final action is elided entirely. For example:

DINGIR^{MEŠ} GUB-ir IZI ŠU ^{LÚ}KÚR ME n=aš ANA ^{LÚ}KÚR GÜB-za GAR-ri

“The gods arose, took fire and the hand (of?)⁴⁹ the enemy; they(!)⁵⁰ lie to the left of the enemy.”

(KBo 13.76 obv. 15–16)

DINGIR=za *dapi* ZI [^dN]AM-aš *minumar* ME-aš nu=kán ANA GIG.TUR

⁴³ “Il sistema KIN,” 115.

⁴⁴ Hittite *arai-*, usually spelled with the logogram GUB.

⁴⁵ Hittite *dā-*, usually spelled with the logogram ME.

⁴⁶ Hittite *pai-/piya-*, usually written SUM.

⁴⁷ Hittite *dai-/tiya-*, often also written ME, distinguishable from *dā-* by the phonetic complements.

⁴⁸ Hittite *kiš-*, usually spelled with the logogram GAR.

⁴⁹ For this ambiguity, see below under “the enemy.”

⁵⁰ The Hittite common-gender singular =aš cannot grammatically resume any of the previous items; “the gods” are plural, and “fire” and “the hand” are both neuter. This is an example of the KIN-oracles’ standard lack of anaphoric agreement (see above).

“The deity took the whole soul (and) the favor of ^dNAM for itself; to(/by/near?) the small sickness.” (KUB 16.36 7’–8’)

Sometimes, no active symbol is named, and thus all of the verbs are passive: the passive symbol is “taken” and then “given” to the final symbol. For example:

āššu ME-an n=at DINGIR.MAḪ SUM-an

“Goodness was taken, and it was given (to) Ḫannaḫanna.” (KBo 14.21 i 71’)

These last types of actions can be said to constitute a subsystem within the larger KIN system (see below).

Some symbols have specific actions that are restricted to them. Items may be taken “from/by the long years,” but never “from/by” anything else. “Evil” and “the great sickness” may “hold (symbols) confined”; they may also “come forth through evil and the great sickness.” For more on these actions, see below under the discussion of those symbols. Quite rarely,⁵¹ in the military oracles, the active symbol may “cross the wall” (BÀD *zāi-*), during or after its collection of passive symbols. Finally, in lieu of a final symbol, passive symbols may be “thrown” or “brought away,” although this is only attested two or three times, in fragmentary context.⁵²

The standard action “A took P and gave it to F,” and its possible variations, may occur one, two, three, or four times in a single question, but usually occurs either once or three times.

The first occurrence is unmarked; the second and third may be introduced with “on the

⁵¹ Haas (*Hethitische Orakel*, 20, citing Archi and Gurney) states, “Das Orakelfeld, vielleicht eine Art Spielbrett, scheint in zwei Sektionen eingeteilt zu sein, die durch eine Markierung ‘Wand, Mauer’ (Sumerogramm BÀD, hethitische Lesung *kutt-*) genannt, getrennt.” This overlooks the fact that the “wall” is attested, once again, quite rarely—Archi cites only three texts in *Il sistema KIN* (p. 129), KUB 5.1, KUB 22.25, and KUB 16.75, and only one more is known to me, KBo 22.264—and only in military oracles, whose symbol system is somewhat different in any case (see below). It therefore seems doubtful that this “wall” was always a part of the physical setup for the KIN-oracle performances.

⁵² KUB 49.70 throughout, and possibly KUB 50.52 2’ (*arḫa pedan*), and KUB 5.11 (*arḫa peššeyanteš*). Archi (“*Il sistema KIN*,” 129) also notes KBo 13.76 rev. 6’, which he transliterates nu-kán DINGIR^{MES} ZAG[?] pi-še-it ZAG-za[, but this is the end of the KIN-oracle (“the gods” is the final symbol), followed by one line of a liver-oracle, similar to two other paragraphs on the reverse of this text, to be transliterated instead nu-kán DINGIR^{MES}-aš (erasure) ni ZAG pé-še-et ZAG-za[.

second/third day” (*INA* UD.2/3.KAM), with “second” or “third” (2-*NU*, 2-*ŠU*), or simply with “2” or “3.” If there is a fourth exchange, it is introduced with “4 *urkiš*” or “the fourth ‘trace,’” which is of uncertain meaning in this context—perhaps “path” or even “iteration”?⁵³ Very rarely, *urkiš* may also be used to introduce an earlier exchange (e.g., “second trace:” rather than the more usual “second day:” in KUB 5.17+ ii 19’). A result with only two exchanges is fairly rare, and seems to be mainly confined to specific texts: for example, KUB 5.1+, which has nine total (as opposed to the next-longest texts, KUB 5.3+ and KUB 5.4+, with zero), and KUB 6.7+, in which most of the procedures are only two exchanges. Results from four exchanges are extremely rare; there is only one fully-preserved including a result (favorable),⁵⁴ although other less-complete examples also exist. The exchanges, no matter how many, are always within a single paragraph (with the possible exception of KBo 18.151, see below), and the final verdict of “favorable” or “unfavorable” always comes at the very end.

2.4.1: Favorable vs. Unfavorable Exchanges

When all of the complete questions are recorded and tallied, a distinction between the favorable and unfavorable results is immediately clear: when there has only been one symbolic exchange, the result is unfavorable, and when there have been three, the result is favorable. There is only one certain exception to this (KBo 13.76 rev. 7’–8’, in which a single exchange yields a favorable result) out of 136 fully-preserved examples. Procedures with two exchanges may have either answer, and, as mentioned above, the single fully-preserved example with four

⁵³ The word seems to literally mean “track” or “trace,” as in record of something having gone by (e.g., checking for any trace of the enemy, in KUB 13.2 i 4–6). It can also refer to some mark on the liver, in extispicy texts.

⁵⁴ KUB 5.4+ i 16–25.

exchanges is favorable. This tendency has not yet been noticed in the general literature, although J. Orlamünde notes it in her study on KUB 5.1+. ⁵⁵

The first possible explanation for this is that a single unfavorable exchange turned the whole outcome unfavorable. That is, that the Old Women would start performing the exchanges, knowing that all three had to be favorable to produce an overall favorable result, and once a single unfavorable exchange happened, they stopped. ⁵⁶ However, this is not possible. If that were the case, there would inevitably be sets of three in which the first two exchanges were favorable, and the last unfavorable, and which thus produced an unfavorable result. We would therefore see this in the texts: sets of three exchanges followed by “Unfavorable.” However, that does not occur; sets of three are always favorable. The second possible explanation, that the number and not the content of the oracles was what decided the answer (i.e., that the actions arose spontaneously, and whether they did so once or three times was significant) is not likely given the complicated nature of that content, and is also inconsistent with a Middle Hittite letter in which the Old Woman Ms. Iya is quoted as saying, “I inquired by oracle about the matter completely, four times”, ⁵⁷ she clearly implies that she has instigated the action four times.

That same letter, however, may suggest an explanation. The entire relevant passage states: “Iya, Old Woman, spoke to me thus: ‘The traces were bad. The following traces’ ⁵⁸ happened: Evil was taken, and it was behind the throne-dais. I inquired by oracle about the

⁵⁵ “Überlegungen zum hethitischen KIN-Orakel,” 306. However, KUB 5.1+, despite being the longest KIN-oracle text by far, is unusual in some respects (see below), and therefore not ideal for a single example on KIN-oracle method, as will be demonstrated immediately below.

⁵⁶ This is the explanation assumed by Orlamünde (“Aus dem oben gesagten ergibt sich, daß ein sich aus der Konstellation der jeweils verwendeten Marken ergebener ‘ungünstiger’ Befund im ersten Schritt der KIN-Orakelausführung auch durch folgende Schritte nicht mehr geändert werden kann. Man darf wohl ebenfalls annehmen, daß die Orakelausführung, für die ein ‘günstiger’ Befund gefordert ist, abgeschlossen ist, wenn nach dem zweiten Schritt bereits ein ‘ungünstiges’ Ergebnis eintrat,” *ibid.*, p. 307).

⁵⁷ KuT 49 obv, 8–9, transliteration by Wilhelm, “Zwei mittelhethitische Briefe aus dem Gebäude C in Kuşaklı,” *MDOG* 130 (1998): 178.

⁵⁸ This is the same word, *urkiš*, that is used to introduce a fourth exchange.

matter completely, four times, and *all four times*, it was unfavorable.”⁵⁹ Her report that “evil was taken, and it was behind the throne-dais” is entirely normal for a single action in a KIN-oracle text. However, she does not report the other three unfavorable results. Apparently, in order to demonstrate that the oracle was unfavorable, she only felt the need to deliver a single result out of the four. Perhaps, therefore, the same thing is happening in the KIN-oracle reports: the oracle action may be done three (or four) times, but if the result is unfavorable, only one action (the most relevant? the least favorable?) need be reported.

This greater accountability for favorable answers may be related to the type of inquiries: as discussed above, oracles are asking for the gods’ opinion. Assuming that an answer is unfavorable when, in fact, it was favorable might result in a plan of action not being taken or an extra set of offerings being given. However, assuming a favorable answer when, in fact, the answer was *unfavorable* could lead to divine punishment, which was a source of deep and abiding fear throughout much of Hittite history. As an example: the questioner might be asking, “Will I experience positive thing X? Let it be favorable.” An incorrect favorable answer might lead to overconfidence, which could be dangerous. An incorrect unfavorable answer would lead only to overcaution, which would not be dangerous. Similarly, the questioner could ask, “Will I experience negative thing Y? Let it be unfavorable.” Once again, an incorrect favorable answer would lead the questioner to overconfidence (i.e., there would be no negative thing), whereas an incorrect unfavorable answer would only lead to overcaution.

Considering the situation from this light, it might be conceptually useful to think of oracular answers as “Safe” or “Dangerous,” in addition to “Favorable” or “Unfavorable.” More reassurances are required for the questioner to be certain that they are safe. Therefore, it is

⁵⁹ KuT 49 obv 3–9, *ibid.*, emphasis theirs.

understandable that a lesser justification was required for an unfavorable answer than for a favorable one.

2.4.2: The Symbols

The KIN-oracles contain an enormous number of symbols, representing gods, people, objects, and concepts. When examining any single exchange, the interaction among the various entities can appear nonsensical, and even when all of the evidence is mustered, it is clear that there was a context and a background available to the Old Women that must at least partially escape us. However, although we may never fully understand how the KIN-oracles work, careful study reveals that the symbols were part of a comprehensible system; thus, we can at least understand how the symbols relate to one another. In the following catalogue, I will discuss each of the common symbols individually and in relation to certain other symbols, and by the conclusion, it will hopefully be clear that nearly every symbol fits into an overarching conceptual framework, and positive or negative results depend on the relationships between symbols within that framework. The nature of the symbols can also be seen to be relevant to our understanding of the Old Women's function within Hittite religious practice and thought.

The following symbols are attested in the KIN-oracles:⁶⁰

⁶⁰ This list excludes symbols that are too broken to be intelligible. The numbers are drawn from the texts of CTH 572 that are transliterated in Appendix A, as well as the following edited/transliterated texts from CTH 561: KUB 5.1+ ed. Ünal, *Ḫattušili III* 32–102 and Beal, “Seeking Divine Approval,” 41–54; CTH 562: KUB 22.25, ed. E. von Schuler, *Die Kaškäer* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1965): 176–83; CTH 563: KUB 5.3+ and KUB 5.4+, trans. Beal, *CoS I*, 207–11; CTH 572: KUB 6.7+KUB 18.58, ed. Beckman, *Aḫḫiyawa Texts*, 234–41; CTH 569: KBo 2.6++, ed. van den Hout, *Purity*, 194–217; CTH 577: KUB 16.58, ed. idem, 190–92, KBo 16.98, ed. idem, 93–105; KBo 44.204++, ed. Y. Sakuma, “Neue Kenntnisse hethitischer Orakeltexte 1,” in *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. D. Groddek and M. Zorman, DBH 25 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 599–606; KBo 48.28, translit. D. Groddek, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 48*, DBH 38 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012), 19–22; KBo 44.206, translit. H. Roszkowska-Mutschler, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 44*, DBH 22 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 189; KBo 57.130++, translit. Th. van den Hout, *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag: Eine prosopographische Untersuchung*, StBoT 38 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995), 245–67; KBo 2.2, ed. van den Hout, *Purity*, 124–36; KUB 16.77, ed. idem, 242–53; KUB 5.11, ed. A. Mouton, *Rêves hittites: Contribution à une histoire et une anthropologie du rêve en Anatolie ancienne*, CHANE 28 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 193–97; KBo 22.264, ed. S. Heinhold-Krahmer, “Zu Salmanassars I. Eroberungen im Hurritergebiet,” *AfO* 35 (1988): 101–104; KUB 22.51, ed. F. Imparati, “Il testo oracolare KUB XXII 51 (CTH 577),” *Hethitica* 14 (1999):

Active Symbol	#	Passive Symbol	#	Final Symbol	#
deity	86	rightness	158	<i>panku</i>	99
gods	71	the whole soul	110	the gods	89
king	61	life	80	emptiness	63
<i>panku</i>	59	evil	57	Ḫannaḫanna	55
Ḫannaḫanna	49	left-ness	53	the whole soul of the deity	38
enemy	38	year	43	into goodness	36
the throne-dais	31	fire	38	behind the throne-dais	34
goodness	30	well-being	38	king	32
the Sun-God of Heaven	27	the campaign	37	the small sickness	30
the men of Ḫatti	21	goodness	37	the Sun-God of Heaven	24
the great sickness	18	good of the house	35	the great sickness	22
the Storm-God	18	battle	34	men of Ḫatti	16
the army	11	protection	32	into evil	15
evil	9	blood	32	anger of the deity	12
emptiness	6	great sin	28	the army	12
the priest	5	hidden anger	27	the Storm-God	10
the small sickness	4	favors of the gods	25	the whole soul of the fate-goddess	9
the fate-goddess	3	evocation ritual	24	long years	9
the Sun-God	2	release	22	anger	5
the men of the temple	2	bread-offering	21	behind the enemy	4
the one who is nearby	2	vigor	20	sin of the enemy	4

Table 2.1: The KIN-oracle symbols in order of frequency

153–77; KUB 49.92, ed. D. Crasso, “Alcuni aspetti culturali della città ittita di Ankuwa,” *AoF* 33/2 (2006): 332–36; KuSa 1/1.14, ed. V. Haas and I. Wegner, “Die Orakelprotokolle aus Kuşaklı – Ein Überblick,” *MDOG* 128 (1996): 110–14; KUB 16.66, ed. G. del Monte, “Ulmitešub re di Tarhuntaša,” *EVO* 14–15 (1991–92), 143–44; KUB 49.79; CTH 578: KUB 22.61, ed. A. Mouton, “KUB 22,61 (CTH 578): comment traiter les yeux de Mon Soleil?” *WO* 36 (2006): 206–212; KBo 44.209+, translit. H. Roszkowska-Mutschler, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 44*, 192–96, 209–211; KBo 44.210, translit. idem, 196–200; KBo 44.211, translit. idem 200–202; KUB 50.103, ed. Tischler, *Das hethitische Gebet der Gassulijawija*, IBS 37 (Innsbruck, 1981), 56–57; KUB 50.108, ed. F. Imparati, “Il testo oracolare,” 154 n. 4; KUB 50.87, ed. van den Hout, *Purity*, 154–57; CTH 580: KBo 58.87, translit. D. Groddek, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 58*, DBH 39 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012), 58; KuT 20, ed. Haas and Wegner, “Die Orakelprotokolle,” 115–16; KuT 28, ed. Haas and Wegner, “Die Orakelprotokolle,” 113–15; KuT 44+, ed. Haas and Wegner, “Die Orakelprotokolle,” 116–19; KuT 45, ed. Haas and Wegner, “Die Orakelprotokolle,” 119; KBo 48.272, translit. Groddek, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 48*, 165–67; CTH 581: KBo 18.142, ed. A. Mouton, “Au sujet du compte rendu oraculaire hittite KBo 18.142,” in *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. D. Groddek and M. Zorman, DBH 25 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007), 551–55.

the king of Carchemish	1	wine-offering	18	that man	3
the lords	1	good of the land	16	the enemy	3
the daughter	1	angers of the gods	14	into the land	3
that man	1	^d Zababa	13	to the heir	2
the city	1	radiance	13	sickness	2
the heir	1	the campaign of the king	12	left of the chief of the wood-scribes	2
lands	1	hidden sin	12	sin	2
the "lords of the matter"	1	evil omen	11	to the right of Ms. Šaušgatti	2
the queen	1	sin	11	battle	2
that one's evil	1	king's blood	10	peace treaty	2
the enemy of the city of Az.	1	the throne-dais	10	his sin	2
LÚ SUM-za	1	the matter	8	the fate-goddess	2
the chief of the wood-scribes	1	fire from the heart	8	the friend	2
the land	1	the whole soul of the king	8	left of the stewards and charioteers	1
the emptiness of the enemy	1	sight	8	to the daughter of Babylon	1
the city of Nerik	1	king's battle	8	left of daughter of Babylon	1
Mr. Temeti	1	favor	8	<i>palwatalla</i> -man	1
the child	1	favor of ^d NAM	6	the Sun-God	1
		king's sight	6	left of the city	1
		the king's rightness	6	anger of the gods	1
		enemy	6	his left	1
		courage	6	on the left	1
		anger	5	temple men	1
		from long years	5	the king's sin	1
		favours [of...?]	5	to him	1
		goodness [of...?]	5	their left	1
		hidden[...]	4	behind Mr. Allamu	1
		the future	4	right of the man of the land of Az.	1
		years	4	behind the king	1
		[... 's?] blood	4	whole fate	1
		strength and power	4	the enemy's treaty	1
		land	4	the enemy's destruction	1

Table 2.1, cont.

		the city	4	left of the enemy	1
		favor of the gods	4	left of the friend	1
		the weapon of Ḫatti	4	the battle of the friend	1
		anger [of...?]	3	the land of the enemy	1
		the great sickness	3	the king of Tarḫuntašša	1
		[...s?] sight	3	the priest	1
		favor [of?...]	3	on the right	1
		favor of the fate-goddess	3	the heart	1
		fire of the enemy	3	sin in/of the head(?)	1
		ritual	3	person	1
		dream	3	revolt placed in sin	1
		the wall	3	deity?	1
		weapon of the enemy	3	anger of [...?]	1
		the weapon	3		
		death	3		
		the eyes in the head(?)	2		
		house	2		
		the life of the fate-goddess	2		
		the sight of Ḫannaḫanna	2		
		long years	2		
		hand	2		
		releases	2		
		the forward strike of the day(?) ⁶¹	2		
		the city of Ḫattuša	2		
		peace treaty	2		
		release (of?) the enemy	2		
		vows	2		
		the army	2		
		the campaign of the enemy	2		
		fire of Ḫatti	2		

Table 2.1, cont.

⁶¹ UD(.KAM)-aš SAG.KI-za RA-ar; see Appendix A, KUB 6.3 line 18.

		destruction of battle	2		
		<i>pariyan wastul</i> ⁶²	2		
		hand of the enemy	1		
		sin of the enemy	1		
		the city of Tiḫuli	1		
		the sight of the fate-goddess	1		
		blood of the daughter of Babylon	1		
		Ḫannaḫanna	1		
		king	1		
		sin of the heart	1		
		man	1		
		clan	1		
		sickness	1		
		bread and beer	1		
		his hand	1		
		person	1		
		the whole soul of the king of Aššur	1		
		thunder	1		
		the chief of the wood-scribes	1		
		festival	1		
		life of the community	1		
		left-ness of the gods	1		
		fever(?) (<i>tapašša-</i>)	1		
		the border of the land of Ḫatti	1		
		[...]evocation ritual for kings(?)	1		
		the campaign of Hatti	1		
		rightness of the wife of Mr. Á-LÚ	1		
		sins	1		
		the small sickness	1		
		the city of Ḫaḫarwa	1		
		the border of the friend	1		

Table 2.1, cont.

⁶² Meaning uncertain; some kind of sin (see CHD P s.v. *pariyan* 6, p. 153).

		the campaign of the friend	1		
		the battle of the enemy	1		
		the whole soul of the deity	1		
		<i>pa-an parḫuwar</i> ⁶³	1		
		the release of the friend	1		
		big thick bread	1		
		child's blood	1		
		hidden left-ness	1		
		curse	1		
		anger of the gods	1		

Table 2.1, cont.

2.4.2.1: Active/Final Symbols

The active and final symbols are most often gods, people, or basic forces/concepts. For example, the divine symbols Ḫannaḫanna (the grandmother-goddess), the Sun-God of Heaven, the Storm-God, Ḫalmašuit- (the deified throne-dais), ^dGUL-ša- (the fate-goddess), “the gods,” and “the deity” may all be found in either active or final position. However, in final position, “the deity” is found exclusively in the constructions “the deity’s whole soul” (*ANA DINGIR-LIM-ni dapi ZI-ni*, on which see below), and “the deity’s anger” (*ANA DINGIR-LIM-ni karpi*). “The fate-goddess’ whole soul” is also attested. In addition, in final position, Ḫalmašuit- is always in the construction “behind the throne-dais” (EGIR ^{GIŠ/d}DAG). Other than that, in final position, deities’ attributes are usually simply in the dative case, without any local adverbs. In active position, the deities appear alone (i.e., simply “the deity” rather than “the deity’s whole soul” etc.).

Common human symbols also appear in both active and final position; these include “the king,” the *panku*, and (in military oracles) “the enemy,” “the men of Ḫatti,” and “the army”

⁶³ Meaning uncertain; “chasing across”? (See CHD P. s.v. *pariyan* 6, p. 153.)

(KARAS^{HIA}). Individual people or specific groups of people (e.g., “the men of the temple”) that are relevant to the oracle question may also appear in either the active or final positions. In final position, it is more common to see “to the left” or “right” of the person or people, and sometimes “behind” or “back to” them. In addition, a person’s “sin” (*waštul*) may appear in final position, but not in active position.

The “land” or “lands,” and the “city” or the name of a city may also appear, either active or final. There are also the forces “good” and “evil,” as well as the enigmatic symbol “emptiness,” and finally “great sickness” and “small sickness.” The only relatively common final symbol (appearing nine times) that is not attested as an active symbol is the “long years” (MU^{HIA} GÍD.DA); however, in oracles phrased passively, things may be taken “*from*” or “*by*” the long years (see below).

Overall, therefore, the active and final symbols are largely identical. The main differences are (1) the phrasing: final symbols may include directions, and sometimes do so exclusively (e.g., items are always placed “behind the throne-dais” rather than given to it), and (2) the specifications of attributes: final symbols may be “the whole soul,” “the anger,” or “the sin” of an entity, rather than the entity itself. Other than that, the inventory is quite similar; in fact, the fifteen most common symbols of each type are approximately the same.⁶⁴ At first glance, in these symbols one can already see a preoccupation with divinity, good and evil, the king and perhaps the Hittite court (if the *panku* can be so interpreted, see below), sickness, and military concerns. And in fact, these are all issues that the Old Women also addressed in the ritual texts. Evocation and pacification of deities was a major function of theirs, as was curing

⁶⁴ Complicated slightly by the fact that the “active” list has only “the deity” and “the enemy,” while the “final” list has both the “whole soul” and the “anger” of the deity, and “to the left,” “to the right,” and “behind” the enemy. The single real exception is “the small sickness,” which is much more common as a final symbol (30 attestations) than an active symbol (4 attestations).

sickness and dealing with potential disputes among the royal family and upper officials,⁶⁵ and, of course, dispelling evil. This will be discussed in more detail in the following overview of the common symbols. It should be noted that whenever there is an assessment of a symbol's influence on a favorable/unfavorable result, all data is taken *only* from fully-preserved examples with a final result written down, so the numbers will differ from those in the table above, which are taken from all texts, no matter how broken.

2.4.2.1.1: The Deity

“The deity” (DINGIR-*LUM*) is the most common active symbol, appearing 86 times in 144 texts, although “the whole soul of the deity” is only attested 38 times as a final symbol and “the anger of the deity” 12, for a total of 50 (the fifth most common; for an analysis of the “whole soul” vs. the “anger,” see below). It is unclear whether the identity of “the deity” bears any relationship to the specific oracle question in which it appears, although examples such as the first question of KUB 5.4+ (CTH 563), which asks whether the gods *collectively* approve an action, and in which “the deity” is the first symbol named, suggest otherwise. The remaining possibilities seem to be (1) that there is a specific, unnamed deity to which the KIN-oracles are always addressed (unfortunately unlikely to be the fate-goddess, see below), or (2) “the deity” is meant to be a representation of any relevant god. The latter seems more likely, since no specific deity names outside of the standard group are ever mentioned. In addition, oracles are generally concerned with divine anger, and a closer examination of the passive symbols “the deity” takes reveals a careful attention to “the deity’s” possible anger. This may be particularly relevant considering that in the ritual texts, the Old Women do not have a particular relationship with a

⁶⁵ See, for example, the long list of personnel whose “tongues” might be a problem in Tunawiya’s ritual CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, discussed in chs. 3 and 4.

single specific god (although they do have something of an affinity with DINGIR.MAH of the river-bank and the Sun-God, see below), but rather call upon many different deities.

Almost without exception,⁶⁶ the first symbol “the deity” takes will always be one of two options: “the whole soul” (*dapi-an*), or “hidden anger” (EGIR *arḥa karpin*). In addition, as noted above, “the deity” never appears alone as a final symbol, but always as part of “the deity’s whole soul” or “the deity’s anger.” The meanings of “the whole soul” and of “hidden anger,” not immediately apparent, become clear when considered in context with one another. In Hittite, to do something “with one’s entire soul” means to do it “wholeheartedly,” with no secret qualms.⁶⁷ When juxtaposed with “hidden anger,” then, “the whole soul” suggests that there is *no* hidden anger—that is, that this symbol is the representation of the transparency of the deity’s feelings. This interpretation is also appropriate to the subject matter: oracles in general are concerned with securing the gods’ approval and appeasing their anger, and the amount of cross-checking and repetition of questions suggests that the askers were not always satisfied that they had heard the truth. This concern can also be seen explicitly in the oracle questions themselves; for example, in KUB 6.3, “Have you, O deity, hidden evil from us?”⁶⁸

“The deity,” therefore, seems most likely to be representative of any possible deity who might be involved in the subjects of oracles, and the main concern is whether that deity is angry, and if so, whether (s)he has revealed that anger to the questioners. In addition to being appropriate to oracular context, this also nicely echoes the preoccupation with divine reticence in, e.g., Hittite prayers. In the plague prayers, Muršili is worried that the plague has not ended

⁶⁶ There is one exchange in KUB 5.1+ in which the deity takes “battle” first, but “the whole soul” follows immediately afterward. In addition, there are a very few cases where the “anger” is unqualified.

⁶⁷ This is unfortunately always expressed with *šakuwaššar-* for “entire,” rather than *dapi-*, but it does not seem impossible that the sense is the same. To do something “with your entire heart,” for example, would mean approximately the same in English as to do it “wholeheartedly.” See CHD Š p. 63, s.v. *šakuwaššar(ra)*- 1 g.

⁶⁸ Line 22: nu-ṛun-na-aš-kán ṛ DINGIR ṛ-LUM ḪUL-lu [š]a-an-na-aš.

because the gods are angry about something as-yet-undiscovered; he urges them to reveal the real reason for their displeasure to him, but the plague continues, which seems to be evidence that, for reasons of their own, they simply will not say. Divine anger is also a major part of the Old Women's purview in ritual texts (see chs. 3 and 4); they were therefore employed both to identify it, and to deal with it once it became a problem.

2.4.2.1.2: The King

The king is the most common human active symbol (61 attestations), just as the deity is the most common divine active symbol. However, just as “the whole soul of the deity” is far less common, “the king” is only attested 32 times as a final symbol. Approximately half the time (18 occurrences), items are placed to his right or left, rather than given directly to him, which is characteristic of individual human symbols. Semantically, “right” and “left” seem to imply favorable/unfavorable connotations (as they certainly do in the liver-oracles, for example⁶⁹), but at least in this case, these directions do not automatically result in a corresponding favorable/unfavorable answer. For example, in KUB 22.61 obv. i 12'–13', the deity places “the whole soul,” “fire,” and “dream” to the king's right, but the answer is unfavorable.⁷⁰ The most likely explanation for this is that the (assumed) favorable connotation of “right” is cancelled out by the negative symbol “fire,” but overall, this example again proves that the interactions between symbols are complicated enough to make interpretation extremely difficult—which in turn shows why specialists were required to perform that interpretation.⁷¹

Similar to the deity's “whole soul,” the first item the king takes is, almost without exception, *ZAG-tar*, “rightness,” which stands for straightness, justice, and correct-ness

⁶⁹ Beal, “Hittite Oracles,” 60.

⁷⁰ See Mouton, “KUB 22.61 (CTH 578),” p. 207.

⁷¹ One might also wonder whether the Old Women's interpretive process ever included some personal influences on the answer, if the results were not necessarily clear to a layperson.

(rectitude, literally), as well as physical right. In one of the few exceptions, in KUB 5.1+, the king instead takes “hidden sin” (EGIR *arḥa waštul*) and “left-ness” (GÙB-*tar*), and gives them to the army, for an unfavorable answer. ZAG-*tar* and GÙB-*tar* are obvious semantic opposites, perhaps in this case standing for positive, productive action, versus destructiveness or malevolence (see below). The significance of “hidden sin” (a passive symbol attested twelve times and always taken by mortals) is also quite clear: it parallels the “hidden anger” of the deity. The king’s anger would be irrelevant to an oracular decision, because it would not affect the gods’ actions, but his sin (that is, an action that might anger the gods), or any human’s sin, certainly might. Like the deity’s “whole soul,” “the whole soul of the king” is also a passive symbol, attested eight times, and the king may also take the “whole soul,” in second position after ZAG-*tar*. In this case, rather than the deity’s lack of anger, it presumably stood for a king’s blamelessness and/or pure motives. In this case, therefore, there are two options for positive and negative behavior: hidden sin vs. a clear conscience, and productive vs. destructive intentions or actions.

“The king” is closely associated with favorable results: of the 29 attestations of the active king in fully-preserved questions, 5 are unfavorable (17%), as opposed to the ratios for the “men of Hatti” (5 of 13, or 38%), the *panku* (9 of 23, or 39%), “the gods” (9 of 28, or 32%), or “the deity” (18 of 41, or 44%). Of the well-attested active symbols, only H_{anna}hanna compares, at 3 out of 20, or 15%. (This does not, it should be noted, mean that only five, nine, eighteen, etc. attestations *are* unfavorable, but that the rest appear as part of favorable sets of three: see above on the oracle method. Thus, this method is only useful for relative analysis of positivity, not absolute.) All of the king’s unfavorable results have very clearly negative passive or final symbols. Since the interaction between the active, passive, and final symbols is not perfectly

understood, it is difficult to say exactly what about an active symbol influences the final result, but the comparisons speak, unsurprisingly, toward the king (and Ḫannaḫanna, see below) being positive forces. This is reinforced by the king only taking GÜB-*tar* once, as opposed to the more even alternation between ZAG-*tar* and GÜB-*tar* as taken by the *panku*—see below—or “the deity’s” more frequent taking of “hidden anger.”

In keeping with the importance of the king’s purity and good standing with the divine in Hittite thought, therefore, as a symbol, he is (1) a positive influence, and (2) kept in close contact with symbols representing blamelessness and correct decisions. The Old Women’s connection to the king’s innocence and purity can once again be seen in the ritual texts, where the Old Women purify ritual patients (sometimes explicitly the king or the royal couple) of guilt and contamination.⁷²

2.4.2.1.3: The Gods

“The gods” are the second most common active symbol (71 attestations) and also the second most common final symbol (89 attestations). However, it should be noted that 38 of those final attestations are from KUB 5.1+, the longest KIN-oracle. If KUB 5.1+ were removed from the accounting, “the gods” would still be the second-most common, but the numbers would be: *panku* 91; “the gods” 51; “emptiness” 49, rather than *panku* 99; “the gods” 89; “emptiness” 63. It is not clear why “the gods” are four times as common as any other final symbol in KUB 5.1+, but the result is that the numbers are skewed.

The nature of “the gods” does not require much explanation; as was discussed above, the oracles are used as a method of communicating with the gods, and the gods also appear as a

⁷² For example, CTH 416, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple (see ch. 1); CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, Tunnawiya’s ritual to purify the king and queen of any of a long list of contaminants including guilt and divine anger; CTH 398, Ḫuwarlu’s ritual against some kind of evil, expressed through bad omens, that is contaminating the palace (see chs. 3 and 4).

symbol in the oracles, manipulating as symbols things that they might manipulate in real life. There are no symbols that they must always or nearly always take, as with the deity or the king; they do *not* take “rightness” or “left-ness,” since these are limited to human subjects, and they also do not take “hidden anger” as the deity does. They also do not take “favor” or “anger”; their good- or ill-will is expressed by the passive symbols “favors” or “angers of the gods,” which appear in their own symbolic subsystem (see below).

By far the most common symbol “the gods” take is “life,” which is attested in eleven exchanges, while no other symbols appear more than five times; the implication of divine ability to give and take life is likely implied. In addition, it should be noted that the passive symbol inventory is, for the most part, things the gods might be expected to either receive or provide: offerings and rituals, health, longevity, vigor, victory, material success, etc. (see below under “Passive Symbols”). Finally, “the gods” show some kind of attachment to the *panku*⁷³ (see immediately below): in the 44 fully-preserved exchanges in which “the gods” are the active symbol, the *panku* is the final symbol 20 times, while no other symbol is attested more than five times, and most only once or twice.

2.4.2.1.4: The *Panku*

The *panku*- is the most common final symbol (attested 99 times), and the fourth most common active symbol (attested 59 times); it may be abbreviated as *pa* (nominative) or *pa-u-i* or *pa-i* (dative). *Panku*- is a noun attested from the Old Hittite period; it developed from the adjectival form, meaning “all” or “every,” into a word meaning an assembly, a congregation, or an advisory body. In the Old Hittite period, it specifically meant the Hittite nobility assembled as the king’s advisors. The Chicago Hittite Dictionary states, “The basic sense of the noun is ‘all

⁷³ As already noted by Archi regarding KUB 5.1+ (“Il sistema KIN,” 116).

those present (on a given occasion) or involved (in a given situation).”⁷⁴ In oracle translations, it has been conventionally rendered as “assembly”⁷⁵ or “congregation,”⁷⁶ or left untranslated. Given that the other symbols are usually related to either the situation in particular or to the oracular process in general, it seems likely that the actual meaning of *panku-* in the oracle texts is “all those involved with the question,” “all people under the gods’ purview,” or that it retains the older meaning of “the nobility” (since they are the people mostly likely to be involved in any case). Considering that the KIN-oracles began in the Old Hittite period, perhaps this last is most likely; however, *panku* does not appear in the only attested Old Hittite oracle, KBo 18.151. *Panku* is never qualified in any way, so it is difficult to know for certain. However, one is also reminded of the “tongue of the *panku*,” which is one of a standard list of four problems in the Old Woman Tunnawiya’s ritual texts: “pain, woe, the anger of the gods, and the tongue of the *panku*.”⁷⁷ In that context, “tongue of the *panku*” seems to mean “curses from the community,” and so perhaps “nobility,” “court,” or some other term for the community of Hittite elite is appropriate in this context.

Like the king, the *panku-* may take *ZAG-tar* as its first passive symbol; unlike the king, however, the *panku* alternates nearly evenly between *ZAG-tar*, “rightness” and *GÜB-tar*, “leftness.” There are two exceptions, where instead the first item is *ŠÀ-az IZI*, “fire from the heart” (of uncertain meaning).⁷⁸ For the most part, *ZAG-tar* and *GÜB-tar* correspond to favorable and unfavorable answers respectively (with logical deviations such as when *ZAG-tar* is placed “into evil” or when *GÜB-tar* is placed “into emptiness”), although there are puzzling exceptions, such

⁷⁴ CHD P s.v. *panku-* B, p. 92.

⁷⁵ E.g. Beal, *Context of Scripture*, 210.

⁷⁶ E.g., Beckman, *The Aḫḫiyawa Texts*, 237.

⁷⁷ To be compared with the Luwian semi-equivalent, found in CTH 760.II and CTH 761: pain, woe, *taparu-*, *tattariyaman-*, and *hirun-*curses, and the “tongue of the *maya-*,” perhaps a Luwian equivalent to *panku*; see ch. 3.

⁷⁸ KBo 2.6+ iii 27–28, for which see van den Hout, *Purity*, p. 208, and KBo 58.64++ iii 1’–2’, for which see Appendix A.

as in KUB 52.85 ii 8', when the *panku*- takes ZAG-*tar* and “the campaign” (KASKAL), gives them to “the gods,” and the result is unfavorable. As noted above, the *panku* and “the gods” are connected; when the *panku* is the active symbol, the connection is less strong, but still noticeable: in 11 out of 29 complete transactions, the *panku* gives its items to “the gods,” compared to the next-highest symbol with four attestations.

2.4.2.1.5: The deity, the gods, the king, and the *panku*

From the evidence, it is clear that “the deity” and “the king” are connected; they each possess a “whole soul,” and each may have something “hidden,” anger or sin respectively (though the king much less often). They show a very slight affiliation towards one another as active and final symbols (perhaps not enough to be statistically significant; for example, the king gives to the “whole soul of the deity” five times, which is the most of any of the final symbols, but only by one). It is also quite clear that “the gods” and “the *panku*” are connected, as noted above. The semantic relationship here is fairly straightforward: the king, a single human, corresponds to “the deity,” a single god, while the *panku*-, a collective of humans, corresponds to “the gods,” a collective of deities (see Fig. 1). These relationships correspond, once again, to the purpose of the oracles: maintaining the relationship between mortals and deities. It is not surprising to find these relationships in the Old Women’s oracular system, since maintaining the relationship between mortals and deities was the largest part of their job, as diviners and as ritual practitioners. The symbols used in the KIN-oracles reflect major concerns not only of Hittite religious thought, but of the Old Women’s professional responsibilities.

GODS	GOD
é	é
ê	ê
PANKU	KING

Table 2.2: The symbolic relationships among the four most common symbols

2.4.2.1.6: Hannaḥanna

Hannaḥanna, written DINGIR.MAḪ, is a benevolent matriarch goddess who appears in mythological, ritual, and festival texts. She is by far the most common named deity to occur in the KIN-oracles, appearing 104 times in total, 49 active and 55 final (compare: the deified throne-dais, ^{GIŠ/d}DAG, appears a total of 65 times, the Sun-God of Heaven 51, and the Storm-God only 28). It is clear that this deity is Hannaḥanna, rather than the generic “Mother-goddesses” (DINGIR.MAḪ^{MEŠ})⁷⁹ because the term is always singular, and in the dative, her name is written with the phonetic complement *–ni* (for Hannaḥanni).⁸⁰

Hannaḥanna is an Anatolian goddess who appears in Hattic context and mythological narratives, as well as in southern Anatolian and Luwian ritual.⁸¹ In the mythological texts, she is the highest authority and a source of wisdom;⁸² it is she who finds the vanished deities in the “Disappearing God” myths, after the Storm-God has failed (it is not clear who finds her in the extremely fragmentary “Disappearance of Hannaḥanna”), and it is she who settles the dispute

⁷⁹ See Beckman, *Hittite Birth Rituals*, 239–48, for the occasional confusion of the singular and plural terms.

⁸⁰ However, the fact that DINGIR.MAḪ is used both for Hannaḥanna and for these “Mother-goddesses” certainly implies a connection, in the same way that there seems to be one primary “Fate-goddess” who appears in the oracle texts and in the myths alongside Hannaḥanna, as opposed to the plural “Fate-goddesses,” which may include personal fate-deities (see below). Essentially, it seems reasonable to assume that Hannaḥanna was the chief of the “Mother-goddesses,” which may reduce the problems that stem from the difficulties in distinguishing between DINGIR.MAḪ and DINGIR.MAḪ^{MEŠ}.

⁸¹ I disagree with Taracha’s argument (“Anatolian Hannaḥanna and Mesopotamian DINGIR.MAḪ,” in *Investigationes Anatolicae: Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*, ed. J. Klinger, E. Rieken, and C. Rüster, StBoT 52 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010], 301–310) that Hannaḥanna is only another name for the Mesopotamian ^dNIN.TU, and that “starting from the early Empire period onwards the Mesopotamian Mother-goddess DINGIR.MAḪ/^dNIN.TU is well attested in Anatolian cult and magic, while there are no weighty arguments for the existence of an indigenous goddess Hannaḥanna” (p. 310). According to his arguments, Hannaḥanna would then have been inserted into the Anatolian mythological narratives as the supreme source of wisdom guiding native Anatolian deities such as Telipinu, and that this would have been accomplished in the Middle Hittite period (or earlier; his point that the oldest mythological texts including Hannaḥanna are “OH/MS” does not acknowledge the imprecision of palaeographical analysis nor include any discussion of the linguistic age of the texts), and not the “early Empire period,” as he states. I find this prospect extremely unlikely. In addition, the willingness of the Hittites to import deities near-identical to those they already possessed and worship them beside, in addition to, in place of, or alternating with “indigenous” gods should restrain any arguments *against* the existence of specific deities.

⁸² See G. Kellerman, “La déesse Hannaḥanna: son image et sa place dans les mythes anatoliens,” *Hethitica* 7 (1987): 109–47, esp. 128–29.

between Telipinu and the Sea God in “Telipinu and the Daughter of the Sea God.” She is also closely associated with the fate-goddess(es), ^dGUL-ša-/^dGUL-šeš (see below), alongside whom she dispenses help and favors. It should be noted that, although in the myths the other deities have failed and transgressed, respectively, she does not punish them, but instead solves their problems for them.

In the ritual texts, she likewise benefits humans, both at birth and when they ask for her help (see below under “Life, Well-being, Protection, Vigor, Radiance, Long Years”). The Old Women had some connection with her: she appears in *historiolae* in Old Woman rituals,⁸³ aiding the Old Woman in helping the patient. There are evocation rituals for Ḫannaḫanna performed by Old Women,⁸⁴ and the Chief of the Old Women participates in a very fragmentary festival that takes place at least in part in the temple of Ḫannaḫanna (KUB 25.11).⁸⁵ The benevolent healing deity “DINGIR.MAḪ of the riverbank,” a powerful force in several Old Woman rituals⁸⁶ cannot be explicitly connected to Ḫannaḫanna, but it is notable that they are written with the same logogram DINGIR.MAḪ. The semantic association between a matriarch or grandmother-goddess and a profession called the “Old Women” is also obvious. In addition, the “sight of Ḫannaḫanna” is twice attested as a passive symbol in the KIN-oracles, suggesting that her observations and/or knowledge are significant. She seems, therefore, to be appropriate as the main deity involved in an oracular system, and her character in other texts confirms her role as a positive influence toward humans in the grip of uncertainty or difficulty. This role is even more

⁸³ Most notably in CTH 390.C and CTH 390.D, which do not have named practitioners, and in CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, Tunnawiya’s ritual for the king and queen (see ch. 3).

⁸⁴ E.g., CTH 403.2, Mallidunna’s ritual for when Ḫannaḫanna is “terrifying” to someone, and Annanna’s evocation rituals attested in the tablet catalogue KBo 31.1+.

⁸⁵ It might be possible to consider this support for the idea that Ḫannaḫanna is herself the chief of the DINGIR.MAḪ^{MES}, though the idea is tentative at best.

⁸⁶ E.g., CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya’s “Ritual of the River,” CTH 402, Allī’s ritual against sorcery, and certainly implied by the presence of powerful riverbank clay in CTH 398, Ḫuwarlu’s ritual; see chs. 3 and 4.

clearly evident in the oracles, in which she is an unambiguously positive symbol (see above under “the king” and below under “the favor/anger subsystem”).

2.4.2.1.7: The Sun-God of Heaven

The Sun-God of Heaven is attested 27 times as an active symbol, and 24 as a final symbol.⁸⁷ He is not overwhelmingly common as a symbol, therefore, but his role in the KIN-oracles is unusual. In the Hittite textual material, the male Sun-God of Heaven is thought to be an all-seeing judge. In treaty texts, he is called on first of all as a divine witness to the oaths (notably before the Sun-Goddess of Arinna and the Storm-God of Hatti, the technical heads of the state pantheon). In the ritual appeasing the dangerous goddess Wišuriyanza (“the strangler”), after an offering has been made to her, the practitioner says, “You, O Sun-God, be a witness! If it happens that she hid[es] it somehow, you, [O Sun-God of] Heaven, shall know it!”⁸⁸ In Muwattalli’s prayers, the Sun-God seems to have power over other gods’ actions; e.g., to halt or summon them.⁸⁹ The Sun-God of Heaven is, therefore, a powerful, omniscient figure, capable of seeing any transgressions.

Ordinarily he was benevolent, and available to help mortals in need, and in fact he is attested in Old Woman rituals as a deity who helps the Old Woman treat the patient.⁹⁰ He was, however, capable of punishment as well. In a royal substitution ritual (CTH 419), the king seems to consider the Sun-God responsible for the danger that he is in: “Sun-God of Heaven, my lord, what have I done? You have taken the throne from me and given it to another. You have named me among the dead. I am here with the dead. I have appeared to you, Sun-God of Heaven, my

⁸⁷ There are, in addition, two attestations of a plain ^dUTU; however, these are both in texts with a great deal of abbreviation (KUB 6.7+ and KBo 55.195), and so it seems most likely that ^dUTU AN was meant.

⁸⁸ KBo 15.25 obv. 35–37, transliterated by O. Carruba in *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišuriyanza*, StBoT 2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966), 4.

⁸⁹ Singer, *Hittite Prayers*, 87.

⁹⁰ E.g., CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya’s “Ritual of the River,” CTH 402, Allī’s ritual against sorcery, and CTH 404.1, Maštigga’s ritual against domestic quarrel (see chs. 3 and 4).

lord. Let me go to my (divine) fate to the gods of heaven and [free] me from the dead!”⁹¹ In conjunction with this text is the role the Sun-God of Heaven plays in the royal funerary ritual, where he, as a celestial deity, is placed in opposition to the Sun-Goddess of the Earth, who is the god of the sun at night, when it is underground, and who seems to be in charge of the spirits of the dead. The Sun-God seems, then, to be able to influence whether the king ascends to heaven along with the deities, or descends to the netherworld with the rest of non-royal humanity, presumably based on the king’s behavior.

Perhaps as a result of this association with punishment, in the KIN-oracles, the Sun-God of Heaven does not appear as a positive figure. There are several places where he seems to be the entity producing a negative result: for example, when “the favors of the gods” or “goodness” are given the Sun-God, the result is negative, while “the angers of the gods” or “evil” given to the Sun-God seem to garner a positive result (see below). In KUB 5.3+, Ḫannaḫanna takes the favors of the Fate-Goddesses and gives them to the Sun-God of Heaven, and the result is unfavorable;⁹² in KUB 5.4+, the gods take “the city” and give it to the Sun-God of Heaven, likewise for an unfavorable result. As always, in positive exchanges, the influence of any particular symbol is difficult to determine from within the set of three; however, when the answer is unfavorable, sometimes the Sun-God of Heaven in fact seems to be the only possible source of negative influence.

The Sun-God of Heaven also seems to be set in opposition to Ḫannaḫanna; they are the only two gods to be involved in the subsystem of “the favors of the gods” and “the angers of the

⁹¹ KUB 24.5+KUB 9.13, transliterated by H.M. Kümmel in *Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König*, StBoT 3 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967), 62. It is possible that the reason for this ritual was an eclipse, following the Mesopotamian tradition and the evidence from Hittite prayers that an eclipse was a premonition of royal death. In this case, then, the Sun-God would literally have been turning his face from the king.

⁹² The fact that the Sun-God is the unfavorable influence and not Ḫannaḫanna is indicated by the fact that he is in the final position, which is more influential (see below).

gods,” and almost the only two to be interacting with “good” and “evil” when they are passive symbols (see below). A final odd point is that the Sun-God of Heaven is the only common active/final symbol that has no interaction with the king at all: he neither gives any passive symbols to the king, nor receives any from him. This may be an accident of preservation, or it may instead be an indication that, in this oracular tradition, the Sun-God is dangerous, and is purposefully kept away from the king.⁹³ If this is the case, it would be quite unusual; ordinarily, the male Sun-God, as supreme judge, is a symbol of kingship rather than a danger to it.

2.4.2.1.8: Halmašuit-

Halmašuit- is the deified throne-dais (also written ^{GIŠ/d}DAG). It is attested 31 times as an active symbol (the ninth most common) and 34 times as a final symbol (the seventh most common), as well as 10 times as a passive symbol. Halmašuit’s origin and gender are uncertain;⁹⁴ however, (s)he is attested already in the Old Hittite period, most notably in the Anitta text (CTH 1), whose subject is a pre-Hittite king, and in the Old Hittite building ritual CTH 414. In the latter text, among other opaque and difficult exchanges, the king calls Halmašuit- his “friend,”⁹⁵ and states that (s)he brought royal authority and the royal chariot to him from the sea.⁹⁶ The role of this tradition in later periods is uncertain, but Halmašuit- is attested already in KBo 18.151, the Old Hittite KIN-oracle, and so it may be possible to see him/her as an originator of royal power in these oracles. Halmašuit- is also attested physically as the place where the throne is set up,⁹⁷ and as a place where offerings can be made, perhaps as a manifestation of kingship, or perhaps as a separate divine being; the distinction is difficult.

⁹³ The other possibility, that the king is here considered an embodiment of the Sun-God and they are identical, seems unlikely given their relative positive/negative valences.

⁹⁴ For an overview of the various positions on these topics, see Beckman, *Birth Rituals*, p. 27f.

⁹⁵ KUB 29.1 i 34–35.

⁹⁶ i 23–24.

⁹⁷ Beckman, *Birth Rituals*, 27f.

In the KIN-oracles, Ḫalmašuit- is attested with either possible determinative, GIŠ for “wood” (48 times) and ^d for “deity” (27 times), though never both in the same text (interestingly, in KBo 58.64++, which is an inquiry about whether various gods are angry, Ḫalmašuit- is spelled GIŠDAG when appearing as a symbol (obv. i 4), but ^dDAG when appearing in the question (rev. iii 1’)). When appearing as a final symbol, it is always accompanied by EGIR, “behind.” This calls to mind offering-locations, but that specific location is not attested in any non-oracular texts.

Unfortunately, Ḫalmašuit- is not attested enough times to discuss his/her affiliation with other symbols with any certainty; however, unsurprisingly, Ḫalmašuit- is at least loosely associated with other royal symbols, taking “the king’s campaign,” “the king’s whole soul,” “the king’s rightness,” and “the king’s blood.” The most common symbols (s)he takes are “the year,” four times (perhaps “long life,” see below) and “the whole soul,” three times. (S)he never, however, takes “hidden anger,” perhaps suggesting benevolence, which would not be surprising. Beyond positivity and an association with kingship, however, the poor attestation limits conclusions about Ḫalmašuit-’s role in the system.

2.4.2.1.9: The Storm-God

The Storm-God is attested 18 times as an active symbol, and 10 times as a final symbol. His name is always written ^dU (as opposed to ^dIM), and never qualified; however, in the dative, it is written ^dU-ni, for Hittite *Tarḫunni. Beyond this, there is little to say about the Storm-God in the KIN-oracles; his presence is not very surprising, since he is the head of the pantheon, and as a symbol, he does not behave in any notable or unusual ways, nor does he seem restricted to any type of question. He is connected to kingship, both as the head of the pantheon and as the

template for the warrior-king (as seen in Hittite iconography), but nothing of that connection is explicit in the oracles.

2.4.2.1.10: ^dGUL-ša-, the Fate-goddess

The ^dGUL-šeš are well-known in the Hittite tradition as goddesses of fate, who carve out (GUL-š-) the destinies of mortals.⁹⁸ They are to be distinguished from Išduštaya and Papaya, the Hattic fate-goddesses, who spin threads of fate, and also (somewhat) distinguished from Ḫutena and Ḫutellura, the Hurrian fate-goddesses, who were related to the Mesopotamian tradition.⁹⁹ They are usually attested in the plural, and when singular, are often qualified somehow (e.g., the personal fate-deity of someone in particular, or an “evil fate-goddess” who is causing someone trouble). However, in the KIN-oracles, they seem to be attested exclusively in the singular,¹⁰⁰ as ^dGUL-ša-. Alone, ^dGUL-ša- is attested only three times as an active symbol; however, “the whole soul of ^dGUL-ša-” appears nine times as a final symbol, and “the eyes of ^dGUL-ša-,” “the favor of ^dGUL-ša-,” and “the life of ^dGUL-ša-” are all attested as passive symbols.

The meaning of the singular “Fate-Goddess,” without any specific qualification, may be found in the mythological texts; in the Disappearance of the Storm-God, for example, the Storm-God’s father goes “to the Fate-Goddess (and) Ḫannaḫanna”¹⁰¹ to ask for advice about his

⁹⁸ See W. Waal, “Changing Fate: Hittite *gulš*/GUL-š-, ^d*Gulšeš*/^dGUL-šeš, Cuneiform Luwian *gulzā(i)*-/GUL-zā(i)-, Hieroglyphic Luwian REL-za and the *Kuwanšeš* deities,” in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, 5–9 September 2011*, ed. P. Taracha with the assistance of M. Kapeluš (Warsaw: Agade, 2014), 1016–33.

⁹⁹ For a detailed discussion of the differences among these goddesses, see A. Archi, “The Anatolian Fate-Goddesses and their Different Traditions,” in *Diversity and Standardization: Perspectives on social and political norms in the ancient Near East*, ed. E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, J. Klinger, and G.G.W. Müller (Akademie Verlag, 2013), 1–26.

¹⁰⁰ The genitive is ambiguous, but the “favor” and “life” of ^dGUL-ša- are most often singular, unlike, e.g., the “favors of the gods.”

¹⁰¹ KUB 33.34++ i 37': ^d[I]M-na-aš at-ta-aš ^dGUL-ša-aš ^dNIN.TU kat-ta-an pa-it; ^dGUL-ša-aš is clearly the singular genitive here (rather than the plural dative or genitive), because in the next line there appears the nominative ^dGUL-ša-aš (not ^dGUL-šeš). The genitive is allowed given the Old Hittite language of the text. Taracha erroneously assumes (“Anatolian Ḫannaḫanna and Mesopotamian DINGIR.MAḪ,” p. 310 w. n. 46) that ^dGUL-ša- and Ḫannaḫanna are in apposition here, but this cannot be correct, since in the Disappearance of the Sun-God (CTH 323, VBoT 58 i 37), the unambiguously singular “Fate-Goddess (and) Ḫannaḫanna” (^dGUL-aš-ša-an DINGIR.MAḪ) are resumed with *apē* “they” (see following note).

problems, and in the Disappearance of the Sun-God, the life of the Fate-Goddess (and) Ḫannaḫanna are considered critical for the survival of the land.¹⁰² It seems, therefore, that alongside Ḫannaḫanna as the possible chief of the DINGIR.MAH^{MES} (see above), there was also a single chief goddess of the ^dGUL-šeš, who was closely connected to Ḫannaḫanna and also available to help the gods in times of need. This may account for some of the texts in which the plurality of the Fate- and Mother-goddess(es) is ambiguous, changes from one passage to the next, or is expressed for one but not the other.

In the KIN-oracles, the Fate-Goddess is the only named deity to behave as “the deity” (DINGIR-*LUM*) does. Like “the deity,” ^dGUL-ša- does not “arise” before acting; in all three of her attestations as an active symbol, she takes the “whole soul” first, like the deity does; and she is usually not attested as a final symbol alone, but as “the whole soul of ^dGUL-ša-” (expressed as a possessive dative, ^dGUL-še, just as “the deity” is in those constructions, see below).¹⁰³ It is tempting to conclude from this that “the deity” always refers to the Fate-Goddess, and in fact, a fate-goddess seems a likely candidate for a patron deity of oracular practice. Unfortunately, there are several texts where ^dGUL-ša- and “the deity” both appear,¹⁰⁴ (even, in KBo 14.21 i 17’–19’, in the same question: “the whole soul of ^dGUL-ša-” as the final symbol in the first exchange, and “the deity” as the active symbol in the third). This makes an equation unlikely, especially since “the deity” is likely to be a more generic term (see above). However, since they never appear as active and final symbols in the same exchange, perhaps it is not impossible.

¹⁰² CTH 323, VBoT 58 i 37. The exact consequence of their possible deaths is not made explicit; Hoffner (*Hittite Myths*, 28) interprets the line, “If they have died, [then] these too may have died” as implying the deaths of the unborn, i.e. the future of the land, which does not seem impossible, but is certainly not expressed in the text. In any case, the Storm-God clearly believes that their survival is an urgent matter.

¹⁰³ There are two exceptions, where ^dGUL-še is the final symbol by itself; both are in KUB 6.7+, in which ^dGUL-še *dapi* ZI-ni is also attested.

¹⁰⁴ E.g., KBo 14.21, KBo 18.142, KBo 41.159+, KUB 5.1+, KUB 6.7.

2.4.2.1.11: The Men of Ḫatti/The Army

In the military oracles, a number of military symbols may be used, symbols that do not appear in oracles about non-military questions; these may fall under the category of “specific symbols” below, but they are standard enough that they rather seem to be part of a military-specific subsystem. Two of these symbols are “the men of Ḫatti” (LU^{MEŠ} URU^{URU}Ḫatti) and “the army” (KARAS^{ḪI.A}). They behave similarly to other human symbols, particularly the *panku-*, in that the first item they take must be either rightness or left-ness (with one exception: the “men of Ḫatti” instead take “hidden sin” first in KUB 5.1+ obv. ii 42–44). They both appear to be positive symbols: when they are active, unfavorable answers only come when they have taken “left-ness” (or hidden sin, as above). When they are final, the only unfavorable answers are when they have had something placed “on their left” or, in one case, when “the king” has given “hidden sin” and “left-ness” to the “army.”¹⁰⁵ Like other human symbols, they may have things placed to their left or right, rather than only given to them. There is no “whole soul” attested for either of them, perhaps to be expected for a plural symbol, nor do they ever participate in the “favor/anger/good/evil” subsystem. Unsurprisingly, most of the passive symbols they do take are also military (e.g., the “campaign,” the “battle,” “strength and power,” etc.); however, they also may take, e.g., “life,” “vigor,” “the year,” etc.

The distinction between these two symbols is not entirely clear. KARAS^{ḪI.A} may mean “army,” “troops,” “the entire population of a campaign,” “non-soldier members of a campaign,” or “infantry,”¹⁰⁶ and of course there is no context in the oracles to allow for more specificity. “The men of Ḫatti” (or “the people of Ḫatti”?) could conceivably be even broader in meaning, although its confinement to military oracles does suggest a military context: perhaps it is the

¹⁰⁵ Recalling, again, that any single exchange within a favorable set of three might be unfavorable.

¹⁰⁶ R. Beal, *The Organisation of the Hittite Military*, THeth 20 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1992), 9–23.

portion of the army from Hatti proper (i.e., central Anatolia)? Both terms are attested in the same texts, and even within the same question (though it seems as though they are never A and F in the same exchange), so it is unlikely that they are identical.

2.4.2.1.12: The Enemy and the Friend

“The enemy” (LÚ.KÚR) is another symbol attested only in military oracles, and it is unusual and sometimes confusing in its behavior; for example, it is almost the only symbol that may be active and final in the same question.¹⁰⁷ In these cases, the final clause will include EGIR-*pa*; e.g., “The enemy took the battle and the whole soul, and they were given (sg.!) back to the enemy” (KUB 5.1+ ii 65).¹⁰⁸ “The enemy” also occurs as a passive symbol, although it can be difficult to tell whether it is alone or belongs to a genitive construction; e.g., “the campaign of the enemy” or “the campaign *and* the enemy” might each be written KASKAL LÚ.KÚR.¹⁰⁹ However, some unambiguous examples show that “the enemy” may actually be given to itself; for example, in KUB 5.1+ iii 82: “The gods arose, took vigor, release, and the enemy (*innarawatar* DU₈ LÚ.KUR=*ia*); they were given (sg.!) back to the enemy.”¹¹⁰ No other symbol appears in a construction like this.

“The enemy” is also often attested in other unusual constructions in final position, outside of the “left” or “right” found with most human symbols. Items may be placed “in destruction for the enemy” (*n=aš=kan ANA LÚ.KÚR ḫarki GAR-ri*), “in a peace treaty (of/for) the enemy” (*n=aš=kan LÚ.KÚR takšuli GAR-ri*), or “within the enemy land” (*n=aš=kan LÚ.KÚR ŠÀ KUR-TI GAR-ri*; in cases where “the enemy” was also the active symbol, *n=aš=šši=aš=kan ŠÀ*

¹⁰⁷ The other is the Sun-God of Heaven (see above). The Sun-God example, however, does not show the same logical phrasing of “giving back.”

¹⁰⁸ For a transliteration, see Ünal, *Hattušili III*, p. 60.

¹⁰⁹ It is clear that each one occurs (for example, *ŠA LÚ.KÚR KASKAL* or *KASKAL LÚ.KÚR=ia*), but a number of attestations are ambiguous.

¹¹⁰ Ibid. p. 78.

KUR-*TI*, “it is within his land” or *nu=šmaš=kan ŠÀ* KUR-*TI* “it is within their land” are attested). One exchange simply says, “Emptiness took release (and/of?) the enemy and gave it/them back” (SUD-*liza* DU₈ LÚ.KÚR ME-*aš n=at* EGIR-*pa paiš*, KUB 5.1+ ii 58–59). Overall, “the enemy” is more often involved in creative constructions, with a wide range of directional language, than other symbols; essentially, it breaks out of the standard formula in a way that other common symbols do not. It is attested 38 times as an active symbol and 19 times as a final symbol, but in only three of those 19 attestations is it simply alone; the other 16 times, it is in some kind of construction.

The enemy also, like the other human symbols, usually takes ZAG-*tar*, “rightness,” or GÜB-*tar*, “left-ness,” first, although there are a few exceptions. Notably, GÜB-*tar* is only attested twice with “the enemy,” as opposed to ZAG-*tar*’s 17 times. This is unexpected, since semantically, it seems as though “the enemy” must necessarily be a negative symbol. However, since it is rarely attested in single unfavorable exchanges, its effects on the oracle results are difficult to untangle. It does appear in 7 out of the 11 fully-preserved procedures with only two exchanges:¹¹¹ 5 times as the second active symbol, once as the first final symbol, and once as the second final symbol.¹¹² All of the 7 occurrences are in KUB 5.1+, and 4 are unfavorable, 3 favorable. Perhaps the presence of “the enemy” is somehow connected to a procedure with only two exchanges. It should also be noted that, in KUB 5.1+, an active “enemy” is always in the last exchange, whether there are one, two, or three exchanges in the procedure. This is *not* true in the single other text where “the enemy” appears as an active symbol in a fully-preserved exchange, KBo 22.264; in that case, it is the second of three. In sum, “the enemy” exhibits unusual behavior for a symbol, but it is difficult to say why, or what effect it has on the result.

¹¹¹ “Fully-preserved” in this case means “including a final result”; there are a number of intact two-exchange sets in KUB 6.7+, but the scribe of that text did not write down the final favorable/unfavorable results.

¹¹² In the construction “they lie near(?) the sin of the enemy” (*n=at* LÚ.KÚR *waštul* GAR-*ri*, ii 27).

“The friend” (*ara-*) is also attested, though far fewer times—it never appears as an active symbol, only three times in genitive constructions with passive symbols (“the border of the friend,” “the campaign of the friend,” and “the release of the friend”), and five times alone or in constructions as a final symbol. All but one of these instances are within KUB 5.1+. ¹¹³ Overall, it seems to behave the same way as the enemy does: more likely to appear within a phrase than alone. For more on the military symbols, see below under “Passive Symbols,” but it should be noted already that the strong military component to the KIN-oracles indicates that the Old Women’s gender did not influence the topics about which they advised the king.

2.4.2.1.13: Specific Symbols

As Archi has already noted, ¹¹⁴ sometimes symbols are specific to the question asked. For example, in KUB 5.1+, there are questions about the fate of the general Temeti, and Temeti himself appears as a symbol. In KBo 14.21, which is about cult neglect, “the priest” appears twice as a symbol. These symbols may even be hypothetical; for example, in KUB 5.4+, there is a question about a potential revolt, and the final line of the exchange is “and took the sin of those who will start a revolt” (*nu BAL kuiēš DÜ-anzi n=an=kan apēdaš waštul ME-iš*). ¹¹⁵ Other specific symbols are “the city,” “the land,” “the battle,” “the peace treaty,” “the queen,” “the king of Carchemish,” etc. Final specific symbols are, like “the enemy” and “the friend,” likely to be found in constructions, and sometimes are simply a pronoun resuming a relevant person from the question. Overall, there are 27 specific active symbols and about 38 (a few are ambiguous) specific final symbols, which as a category makes them of about average frequency.

¹¹³ The single exception is in KBo 41.156 ii 4’, as part of a final symbol, and it is unfortunately partially broken (see Appendix A).

¹¹⁴ “Il sistema KIN,” 116–17.

¹¹⁵ KUB 5.4+ i 31–32.

2.4.2.1.14: Good and Evil

“Good” and “evil” are both attested as active, passive, and final symbols. “Good” is usually written *āššu* (*āššauwanza* when ergative), a word for “good” to be distinguished from “favorable” (*lazzi-*), but which may also be written SIG₅. As a noun, *āššu* seems to share connotations with English “good(ness)”; for example, it is a general desirable trait that the gods may give the king (“Fill Labarna with goodness!”¹¹⁶) but it may also mean a “good” in the sense of “possession, valuable item.” As an adjective, it often means “good” when describing objects, in the sense of “high-quality, fine,” but may also be contrasted with “evil,” as in an “evil word” versus a “good word.”¹¹⁷ When describing people, it most often means “dear,” as in when someone is “dear to” someone, or some deity.¹¹⁸ However, “evil” (*idalu* or *ḪUL-lu*, *idaluwanza* in the ergative), to which *āššu* is opposed in the KIN-oracles, may be used to mean “an evil person” as well as “evil words,” “evil sorcery,” and “evil omens.”¹¹⁹ When used in the oracles, “good(ness)” and “evil” are, at least in final position, absolutely straightforward: each of the nine attestations of “into evil” in final position of a fully-preserved exchange is unfavorable, and each of the fifteen fully-preserved attestations of “into goodness” as a final symbol is part of a favorable set. Though it is impossible to say with complete certainty that a single exchange is favorable, since it is part of a set of three, it seems likely from the numbers that “into goodness” cancels out negative elements in a way that other positive symbols do not.

When active, these symbols are more ambiguous; “goodness” twice appears as the active symbol in an unfavorable exchange (although one of those examples has “into evil” as its final symbol), and “evil” twice appears as an active symbol in a favorable set. This seems to confirm

¹¹⁶ *nu labarnan āššu šuwai*, see HW² A p. 497.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 492–527.

¹¹⁹ J. Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary Volume 2: Words Beginning with E and I* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), 487–89.

that the final symbol has greater influence on the outcome than the active symbol does. “Evil” also appears in combination with “the great sickness” in six exchanges: twice in final position, in the construction “evil and the great sickness hold (a passive symbol) confined” (*n=an* HUL-*uwanza* GIG.GAL=*ia anda dammaššan ḥarkanzi*)¹²⁰ and four times in active position, in the construction, “(a passive symbol) came out through evil and the great sickness” (HUL-*uwaza=aš=kan* GIG.GAL=*ia ištarna arḥa uit*)¹²¹ or “(an active symbol) came out through the great sickness and evil” (*IŠTU* GIG.GAL HUL-*uwaziya ištarna arḥa uit*).¹²² Three of these occur in sets of only two exchanges (two favorable, one unfavorable), and three in sets of three (one favorable, two with no result recorded, but likely favorable), so it is difficult to make any statements about their effects on the result.

In comparison to the rest of the symbols, both “good” and “evil’s” behavior is somewhat unusual; in particular, they are a major part of the favor/anger subsystem (see below). In addition, when in active position, “good” behaves almost like a deity; there is one text (KUB 6.7+ iii 22’) in which it “arises” before acting, like most divine symbols do; in addition, the most common symbol it takes is “life,” similar to “the gods.” “Evil” does not seem to exhibit the same behavior, although it is attested as an active symbol far fewer times than “good” is (9 times vs. 30). Overall, though, the inclusion of “good” and “evil” in this system is not at all surprising, given its focus on positive vs. negative behavior, outcome, actions, and results.

2.4.2.1.15: Emptiness

¹²⁰ Both in KUB 5.1+, ii 8–9 and iii 31 (see Ünal, *Hattušili III*, 52–53 and 70–71).

¹²¹ KUB 5.1+ i 48–49, ii 57–58, and iv 75 (see *ibid.*, 40–41, 60–61, and 88–89).

¹²² KUB 16.20 obv. 13’–14’ (see Appendix A) and KUB 6.7+ iii 19’ (see Beckman, *Ahhiyawa*, 238–39, though he erroneously translates this fragmentary line as though it is part of the question).

“Emptiness” (written SUD-li₁₂, SUD-*liyanza*, or *šannapili*) has already been interpreted as a symbol of negation, cancelling out the passive symbols that are given to it,¹²³ and when it is a final symbol, this is clearly correct. To choose the most obvious examples, when “evil” is taken and put “into emptiness,” it is part of a favorable set (three examples), and when “goodness” is taken and put “into emptiness,” the answer is unfavorable (one example); all other complete attestations support this interpretation. “Emptiness” is only attested as an active symbol six times, however (as opposed to 63 times as a final symbol, the third most common), and so its interpretation in that position is less certain, in particular since all of the attestations are either fragmentary or part of favorable sets of three. Therefore, there is no way to be certain if and how active “emptiness” affects the result of an exchange. “Emptiness” does not appear as a concept elsewhere in Hittite religious thought, which makes it tempting to continue interpreting it as some physical feature of the KIN-oracle procedure representing “out of bounds,” or similar. In that case, though, once again, the interpretation of active “emptiness” becomes difficult. Overall, the effect of “emptiness” is very clear, but its position in the oracular system is not.

2.4.2.1.16: The Long Years

“The long years,” meaning “long life,” is a symbol that behaves somewhat oddly in the KIN-oracles; in addition to being a passive symbol (attested twice), and a final symbol (attested nine times), it appears in an unusual phrasing “X was taken from/by the long years,” often in the favor/anger subsystem (see below). The phrasing is ambiguous (*IŠTU* or TA is used to represent the ablative-instrumental case, “from/by”), so it is impossible to say if the “long years” are another active symbol whose actions must be phrased differently for some reason, or if they function in a different way, holding symbols before they are taken. The former may be more likely, since they are only attested like this when no active symbol is expressed. For more on the

¹²³ Archi, “Il sistema KIN,” 122.

meaning and context of this symbol, see below under “Life, Well-being, Protection, Vigor, Radiance, Long Years.”

2.4.2.1.17: The Great and Small Sicknesses

The “great sickness” (GIG.GAL) and the “small sickness” (GIG.TUR) are terms exclusively confined to the KIN-oracle corpus. There are several words for illness in Hittite that might be behind these logograms, and one possible suggestion comes from KBo 18.151, the Old Hittite KIN-oracle (see below), which has *ištarnikaīn* “ailment, affliction,” and *henkan* “plague, death” as passive symbols (together on obv. line 12; *ištarnikaīn* appears also in obv. line 5, and *henkan* in rev. lines 2 and 7). “Ailment” as “small sickness” and “plague” as “great sickness” would be a logical connection. The logogram for *henkan*, however, is usually ÚŠ, and ÚŠ does occur as a passive symbol in KUB 6.7+, a text concerned with dangers to the king’s life. On the other hand, ÚŠ may also be *akkatar* “death,” without the association of sickness. It is not unusual for oracles to use technical terms, abbreviations, or unusual logograms, so perhaps GIG.GAL is a term for *henkan* in an oracular context, particularly likely considering it appears nowhere else. It also seems possible that GIG.GAL—whether *henkan* is behind it or not—stands for an illness affecting a population, while GIG.TUR is an illness affecting only one person (see below under “the favor/anger subsystem”). It should further be noted that sickness (usually written *inan*) was a major consideration in the Old Women’s ritual practice, and was usually considered to be caused by sorcery or—notably!—divine anger, which would fit very well within the KIN-oracle system.

Whatever the Hittite words behind them, GIG.GAL and GIG.TUR are more to the oracular method than reflections of real-world sicknesses: unlike the military symbols, they do *not* appear only in texts dealing with illness, but are part of the basic KIN-oracle system.

GIG.GAL appears as an active symbol 18 times, and GIG.TUR only four; however, GIG.GAL is a final symbol 22 times, and GIG.TUR 30 times. GIG.GAL also appears as a passive symbol three times, and GIG.TUR once; in addition, plain “sickness” (GIG) is a passive symbol once, and a final symbol twice. The two sicknesses are unexpected as active/final symbols: all other active/final symbols are gods, people or groups of people (including cities or lands), forces (evil/good), or “emptiness” (which may have a physical meaning; see above). In addition, in KBo 18.151, they are not active/final symbols at all, only passive.

Sickness’s prominence in the KIN-oracle system can probably not be explained with any level of certainty, but there seem to be three possibilities. First, perhaps “great sickness” and “small sickness” are not literal sicknesses at all, but have a broader meaning of “affliction” or “death” in the more general sense of suffering and destruction. Secondly, as noted above, the Old Women often treated sickness in their rituals, and in those cases, the sickness was considered to have a supernatural or divine origin. In that case, “sickness” as a manifestation of the KIN-oracles’ primary concern, divine anger, would make perfect sense. Thirdly, and by no means mutually exclusive with the previous options, it should certainly be noted that sickness, and plague in particular, was a source of great anxiety for the Hittites, and was considered to be a punishment from the gods for wrongdoing. Muršili II endured a plague for twenty years, explicitly stated that he conducted extensive oracle inquiries to find out the reason, and said in so many words in a prayer, “The sin that you have seen, O gods (i.e., that caused the plague)—either let an ecstatic come and tell of it, or let the Old Women, diviners, or augurs tell of it, or let a person see it in a dream.”¹²⁴ Thus, although we do not have any oracle texts from the time of Muršili’s inquiries, the sources make it very clear that KIN-oracles were conducted, likely many KIN-oracles, over a very long period of time, solely to find out the reason for a sickness in Ḫatti.

¹²⁴ KUB 24.3+ ii 19–20, w. dup. KUB 24.4 obv. 10–12; transliteration in CHD Š3 s.v. ^(LÚ)šuniyant-, p. 506.

Perhaps sickness figured so prominently in oracular symbolism for so long (an entire generation!) that the symbols for great and small sickness became intrinsic to the system itself.

2.4.2.2: Passive Symbols

The passive symbols are much more numerous than the active and final symbols; however, they fall into categories somewhat more easily. Among the 30 symbols that appear at least 10 times each, there are first the symbols that certain active entities *must* take: rightness (ZAG-*tar*), and leftness (GÜB-*tar*); the whole soul (*dapian* ZI-*an*), and hidden anger (EGIR *arḫa karpin*) and hidden sin (EGIR *arḫa waštul*). Second, there are the military symbols: the campaign (KASKAL), battle (MÈ), release (DU₈), the war-god ^dZABABA, and fire (IZI). There are the symbols that are gifts from the gods: life (TI-*tar*), the year/longevity (MU), well-being (SILIM-*an*), protection (PAP-*mar*), radiance (ZALAG.GA), vigor (*innarawatar*), the good of the house (*parnaš* SIG₅), and the good of the land (KUR-*eaš* SIG₅); and there are symbols that are gifts to the gods: an evocation ritual (*mukiššar*), a bread-offering (NINDA.GUR₄.RA), and a wine-offering (*išpantuzzi*). There are symbols that are a sign of or a prelude to divine disfavor, such as an evil (lit. “red”) omen (SA₅ IZKIM), the “great sin” (*šalli waštul*), or blood (*ADAMMA*). Finally, there are the basic positive/negative dualities: goodness (SIG₅), evil (HUL-*lu*), the favors of the gods (DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*aš minumar*), and the angers of the gods (DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*aš karpiuš*).

2.4.2.2.1: Rightness and Left-ness

Right-ness (**kunnatar*, spelled ZAG-*tar*) is derived from Hittite *kunna*-, “right,” which in addition to the physical sense of “on the right,” has the connotation of “correct, successful.”¹²⁵ The opposite, GÜB-*tar*, “left-ness,” seems to have the sense of “wrongdoing,” “plot,” or

¹²⁵ See J. Puhvel, *HED K*, p. 247. It is not to be confused with *āra*, which has the more moral sense of “just, right-thinking.”

“(secret) evil action.”¹²⁶ Only human subjects take *ZAG-tar* or *GÙB-tar*, and so they seem to stand for people’s correct, productive action vs. wrong-headed or harmful acts. The correspondence in e.g. the liver-oracles between the right side and a favorable answer, and the left side and an unfavorable answer should also be noted: *ZAG-tar* is something correct, that indicates that proceeding is a good idea, whereas *GÙB-tar* is something to be avoided, that will lead to bad consequences. The difference between “left-ness” and “sin” seems to hinge on the fact that “sin” is rather something that automatically offends the gods (considering its relationship with “anger”), whereas “left-ness” is more of a human-level transgression. The association of “left-ness” with secrecy also fits quite well with the oracular system’s general concern about “hidden” wrongdoing. This is also something that seems to be an overall concern for the Old Women: for example, Tunlawiya’s ritual for the king and queen (CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1) contains a long, long list of people who may have been secretly cursing them; Allaiturahi’s ritual (CTH 780.II) contains an incantation in which she speculates about the activities the sorcerer may have been performing in an unknown place, in secret.¹²⁷ For more detailed analyses of these symbols’ appearances in the oracles, see above under “the king,” “the *panku*,” and “the army/the men of Hatti.”

2.4.2.2.2: The Whole Soul

“The whole soul” occurs as a passive symbol alone (*dapi*an *ZI-an*, for *dapi*an *ištanzanan*, sometimes abbreviated to *dapi* *ZI* or occasionally even just *da* *ZI*) or in a genitive construction (e.g., “the whole soul of the king”). As a final symbol, it never appears alone, but always in a

¹²⁶ Outside of the KIN-oracles, it is only attested a few times; the Instructions for the Courtiers state that “If you hear about an evil matter concerning His Majesty, or a *GÙB-tar* in someone, you must te[II] His Majesty” (KUB 26.1+, edited by J. Miller, *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts*, WAW 31 [Atlanta: SBL, 2013], p. 302; translation mine), and similarly a treaty of Šuppiluliyama II states, “If anyone brings to you an evil (or?) *GÙB-tar* concerning the king, you must not conceal it from the king” (KBo 4.14 iii 69–70, nu-ut-ta LUGAL-wa-aš HUL GÙB-tar ku-iš-ki ú-[d]a-i / zi-ik-ma-an-kán LUGAL-i le-e ša-an-na-at-[t]i). So the general sense does seem to be “plot, wrongdoing.”

¹²⁷ See chs. 3 and 4 for more discussion of these texts.

possessive dative construction (e.g., DINGIR-*LIM-ni dapi ZI-ni*, for *šiuni dapi ištanzani*, “the deity’s whole soul”). In the past, these final symbols have been translated as “to the whole soul (and) the deity”¹²⁸ or “to the whole soul for the deity,”¹²⁹ but the evidence demonstrates that “whole soul” is inextricably attached to either “the deity” or “the fate-goddess”; it never appears in final position without them. Combined with the fact that both “the deity” and “the fate-goddess” always first *take* “the whole soul” (or “hidden anger”), the likeliest explanation is either a possessive dative or, since the “whole soul” is also in the dative, partitive apposition, “the deity’s whole soul.”

Possessive constructions with “the whole soul” are limited to “the deity,” “the fate-goddess,” “the king” (only when a passive symbol), or, in one text, “the king of Aššur”; however, the unmodified “whole soul” may also be taken by “the throne-dais,” “the Sun-God of Heaven,” and “the enemy.” No groups (e.g. “the gods,” the *panku*) may take “the whole soul,” which makes good sense if it does mean a single transparent state of being (see above). The *panku* and “the men of Hatti” do take “the whole soul of the king” five out of the eight times it is attested; two other occurrences are taken by “the throne-dais” (and the final one is broken). This is too small of a number to draw any conclusions about the relationships among these symbols; however, to speculate briefly, the king’s subjects and his kingship might be affected by his transgressions in ways that, e.g., the gods would not be. For more discussion of the function of “the whole soul” in the KIN-oracle system, see above under “the deity” and “the king.”

2.4.2.2.3: Life, Well-being, Protection, Vigor, Radiance, Long Years

These six symbols are well-attested in other genres as items a person might ask the gods to grant them. For example, in the letter HKM 81, a Mr. Tarḥunmiya writes to his parents, “May

¹²⁸ E.g., Beckman, *Aḫḫiyawa Texts*, 241 (“to the fate-deities and the intact soul”).

¹²⁹ E.g., Beal, “Seeking Divine Approval,” 42 (“to the ‘whole soul’ for ‘the deity.’”)

the Thousand Gods keep you alive, and may they hold (their) hands benevolently around you (lit. “around you in well-being”) and protect you. May [they] continually give you life, heal[th], vigor, l[ong] years, divine love, divine favor, and joy of spirit.”¹³⁰ In Muršili II’s hymn and prayer to the Sun-Goddess of Arinna (CTH 376.A), Muršili asks the Sun-Goddess to “Turn benevolently (lit. in well-being) toward your servant, Muršili the king, (and) toward the Land of Ḫatti. Continually give life, health, [vi]gor, [rad]iance of spirit for (lit. of) the future, and long [years] to [Muršili], your servant!”¹³¹ In a ritual asking the DINGIR.MAH^{MEŠ} and ^dGUL-šeš for clemency, the ^{LÜ}AZU says, “Turn (and) step benevolently (lit. in well-being) toward him (i.e., the ritual patient)! Give him [life], health, vigor, long years, divine joy, divine favor, (and) radi[ance] of spirit!”¹³² In another ritual asking for the realization of a favorable dream from the same deities, the practitioner says, “Benevolently (lit. in well-being) protect the king, the queen, and the princ(ess)es! Keep them alive and healthy, and give them long years! ... At the time when a person is born, on that day when the ^dGUL-šeš and the DINGIR.MAH^{MEŠ} set down well-being for him—this is that day. ^dGUL-šeš and DINGIR.MAH^{MEŠ}, on this day for the king and queen set down life, [heal]th, vigor, long years, [happi]ness, the bringing of rightness, [the favor] of the gods, the love of [the gods...]!”¹³³ A similar list is also attested in an Old Woman ritual, CTH 760.II; however, the list is in Luwian: “[May (the god) look] at the body of the ritual patient with life, virility, [future] time, health, divine [favor], (and) long years!”¹³⁴

¹³⁰ HKM 81, lines 5–13. Transliteration in H.A. Hoffner, Jr., *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*, WAW 15 (Atlanta: SBL, 2009), 240–41.

¹³¹ KUB 24.3++ iii 15–20, with duplicate KBo 52.16++. See CHD L-N p. 29 for transcription.

¹³² KUB 15.31+ i 52–56, with duplicate KUB 15.32++ i 54–57. See the online Konkordanz edition by F. Fuscagni for transcription (hethiter.net/: CTH 484).

¹³³ KUB 43.55 ii 4–6, 13–21. Edited by Haas, “Das Ritual gegen den Zugriff der Dämonen ^DDÌM.NUN.ME und die Sammeltafel KUB XLIII 55,” *Oriens Antiquus* 27/1–2 (1988): 85–104.

¹³⁴ KUB 35.43 i 36–40; see F. Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*, StBoT 30 (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1985), p. 145.

Life (TI-*tar*), and vigor (*innarawatar*), are attested in these lists and many others, identical to the symbols appearing in the oracle texts. The rest of the items do not necessarily appear in the same form in the oracles as they do in the lists. The “long years,” for example, may be abbreviated somewhat in the oracles: passive symbols include attestations of MU^{HLA} GÍD.DA, MU.KAM GÍD.DA, MU GÍD.DA MU^{HLA}, MU.KAM, and MU. Plain MU, “year,” is by far the most numerous, at forty-two attestations. Since it does not co-occur in a single question with “years” or “long years,” it seems possible that it is an abbreviation for MU.KAM^{HLA} GÍD.DA. “Lifespan” or “(long) lifespan” would be a close fit with the other passive symbols, and also make sense as the most common of all of the positive gifts.

“Radiance” (ZALAG.GA or *lalukkiman*) is more often in a genitive construction with “spirit” (or “soul,” ZI) in the lists, but it likewise may simply be abbreviated in the oracles. “Protection” appears in verb form in prayers and ritual (i.e., the speaker asks the gods *to* protect him or others, rather than *for* protection), but the root is the same (*paḥš-* vs. *paḥšnumar*). “Well-being” (*aššul-*) is slightly different; the word for “health” usually found alongside “life,” “vigor,” “longevity” etc. in the lists is *ḥaddulatar*, not *aššul-*. However, the dative, *aššuli*, is often found in requests for protection or favor, translated “benevolently,” and, in the final example above, it is considered to be something the Fate-Goddesses and the Mother-Goddesses set down (GUL-š-, lit. “carved”) for a person at birth.

The Fate-Goddesses and the Mother-Goddesses are another notable point; although there are several different gods to whom appeals for these items are directed (in addition to the Sun-Goddess of Arinna, there is also the Storm-God, the male Sun-God, Ištar of Nineveh, and of course the gods as a collective whole), these female deities are the most common. The connection is understandable, since these are the deities present at the moment of birth, who

dictate a person's life and the fate. It is therefore also quite interesting that the singular DINGIR.MAḪ and ^dGUL-ša- are present in the oracles (see above under Ḫannaḫanna and ^dGUL-ša- for the possible connections between the singular and plural deities). The semantic connection between (1) the gifts the gods choose to bestow on mortals who ask for them, and (2) the method of finding out whether the gods are benevolently inclined to the asker or not (i.e., the oracle system) is obvious, and in this case, the connection seems to be realized in the mechanics of the method (see further below, pp. 65 and 72–74). A connection can be made to the Old Women's ritual texts, in which gifts such as these (or identical to these, as seen above in CTH 760.II) are actually requested of the gods.

2.4.2.2.4: The Good of the Land/House

These symbols (KUR-*eaš* SIG₅ and *parnaš* SIG₅) seem to be reasonably self-explanatory, and along the same lines as those in the previous section; although they are not attested in lists, good fortune and protection for both the land of Ḫatti and the royal household is something requested from the gods in prayers, the prosperity of the house and land of friends (as well as their family and possessions) is a standard item requested in the well-wishing at the beginning of diplomatic correspondence,¹³⁵ and the destruction of same is a standard curse at the end of treaties.¹³⁶

2.4.2.2.5: Hidden Anger/Hidden Sin

Literally “anger/sin back away” or “behind away” (*appan arḫa karpin*), this has variously been translated as an indication of the direction the sin/anger was taken (e.g., “the deity took anger away behind”),¹³⁷ and as a qualification of the noun, “hidden” or “secret.”¹³⁸ Since this

¹³⁵ See, e.g., G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, WAW 7 (Atlanta: SBL, 1996), p. 133.

¹³⁶ E.g., *ibid.*, p. 54.

¹³⁷ E.g., Archi, “Il sistema KIN,” 128.

¹³⁸ See Beal, “Hittite Oracles,” 78 n.130.

combination is not attested outside of the oracle texts, there is no comparative evidence; however, the (admittedly somewhat free) tendencies of Hittite word order would suggest that if *appan arḫa* were functioning as an indication of direction, it would come either in initial position or before the verb, not always before the noun. In any case, since *appan arḫa* does always precede the nouns, whatever its physical sense, the quality is clearly inextricably linked to the meaning of these two symbols.¹³⁹ To me, the more likely solution is that the symbol is considered to be “hidden” or “secret.” If something is “behind” and “away,” it is removed, out of sight. Since *appan arḫa* alternates with “whole soul,” there is (as mentioned above, p. 25) a contrast between hiding something that might have negative consequences and revealing all. For more discussion of “hidden sin/anger” in the oracle texts, see above under “the deity” and “the king,” and for the Old Woman’s concern with “hidden” problems, see above under “rightness/leftness.”

2.4.2.2.6: Campaign, Battle, Release, Weapon, ^dZABABA, Courage, Strength and Power

There are a number of military-themed passive symbols, primary among which are the campaign (KASKAL), battle (MÈ), “release” (DU₈ or *tarnumar*¹⁴⁰), the weapon (^{GIŠ}TUKUL), the war-god ^dZABABA, courage (A.A or *muwa-*), and “strength and power” (GÉŠPU *ḫaštai*), which always appear together. These symbols are only attested in military-themed oracles, and they seem similar to the specific symbols (discussed above, p. 43), that is, referencing items that appear in the question. It is not always possible to say for certain how specific they are, however: for example, in KUB 5.1+, every question is about a campaign, so the symbol “campaign” may stand for a specific campaign in the question, or for the general concept of a military campaign.

¹³⁹ The only occurrence of another term used with EGIR *arḫa* is one attestation of EGIR *arḫa* GÜB-*tar*, “hidden left-ness,” another negative symbol (i.e., something it might be natural to conceal).

¹⁴⁰ Both Tischler (*Hethitisches Handwörterbuch*, p. 217) and the CHD (L–N, p. 1) equate DU₈ with *la(i)-*, but since both *tarnumar* and DU₈ are attested in the KIN-oracles—in military context of releasing captives, which is not a meaning of *la(i)*—this seems to be the more likely interpretation in oracular context.

But even if the meaning is general, given their confinement to military oracular documents, it is clear that these symbols are more concerned with the circumstances of the text than with the relationship between humans and gods. “*ZABABA*,” the war-god, might seem to be an exception; however, he does not behave at all like the other gods in the oracles. He is the only god who appears as a passive symbol, he is never active or final, he is never qualified in any way (e.g., with “anger” or “favor”), and it seems likely that he symbolizes military strength or success, rather than any divine will.

Often these symbols are qualified, e.g., “the king’s campaign” or “the enemy’s campaign”; “release of the enemy,” or “release of the friend”; “the weapon of Ḫatti,” or “the weapon of the enemy,” which may make them more likely to be specific symbols. In these cases, though, the symbol may still not appear to have a place in the question: e.g., in KUB 5.1 iii 61ff., the question is “His Majesty will strike the land of Talmaliya, down from Mt. Ḫaḫarwa. All of the Kaška-men will strike it up alongside. Will you, O deity, give it (over)?”¹⁴¹ and one of the symbols is “the release of the friend.” There is no captive friend mentioned in the question, so either there is something in the circumstances of the question that makes “release of the friend” relevant (certainly possible), or the symbol is general.

Sometimes “the enemy” appears alone as a passive symbol, although often it is difficult to say if LÚ.KÚR is in a genitive construction or not (see above under “the enemy”). “Fire” is sometimes part of this inventory, particularly if qualified (e.g., “the fire of Ḫatti”), but not always (see below).

2.4.2.2.7: “Great sin”

“Great sin,” or *šalli waštul*, is a relatively common passive symbol (28 attestations), which shows no attachment to any specific active symbols, and which tends to appear as part of a

¹⁴¹ For transliteration, see Ünal, *Hattušili III*, p. 74.

list, rather than by itself or only with a standard item like “whole soul” or “rightness.” The question of whether it means a “major sin” (i.e., a transgression that would greatly anger the gods), a “royal sin,” or perhaps the death of a king (otherwise attested as *šalliš waštaiš*), has remained unclear.¹⁴² However, it should be noted that ordinarily when qualifying something as “royal,” the KIN-oracles have *ŠA LUGAL* (and “the king’s sin,” *LUGAL-i wašduli*, is attested once as a final symbol). The death of a king may instead be represented by the term “king’s blood” (*ŠA LUGAL ADAMMA* or *MUD*, unless this specifically refers to “murder,” see immediately below). One might also consider the possibility, though, that *šalli* stands for the whole royal family, rather than just the king. The literal meaning “major sin” is also a plausible option for this sign.

2.4.2.2.8: Blood

“Blood” is a common passive symbol; it is attested a total of 48 times, 32 of them alone, and four of them fragmentary. There are ten attestations, however, of “the king’s blood,” one of “the blood of the daughter of Babylon,” and one of “the child’s blood.” “Blood” in Hittite is a euphemism for “death,” or even “murder,” and so in this case, it seems as though the symbol might be either a human sin or a divine punishment; it is also attested as a problem in several Old Woman rituals.¹⁴³ “The child’s blood” seems to make it more likely that the qualifications are referring to the victim than to the perpetrator, although *DUMU* may also simply mean “son.” “Blood” seems to show no specific affiliation with any other signs.

2.4.2.2.9: Fire

Fire (*pahhur*, written *IZI*), appearing 38 times, is a difficult symbol; it is clearly negative (for example, as mentioned above [p. 26], in one exchange “the deity” takes “the whole soul”

¹⁴² See, e.g., Archi, “Il sistema KIN,” p. 137, CHD Š s.v. *šalli- i 2’*, p. 99, van den Hout, *Purity*, 234–35.

¹⁴³ CTH 416, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple (for which see ch. 1), CTH 404.3, Maštigga’s Ritual for Bloodshed; CTH 448.2, the ritual for the Sun-Goddess of the Earth, CTH 788, Šalašu’s ritual.

and “fire” and places them to the right of “the king,” for an unfavorable result), but the sense of it is not certain. “The fire of Ḫatti,” or “the fire of the enemy” is a military sign, but for the most part “fire” is not qualified, and no other military symbol appears in non-military oracles. Fire might be something sent by the gods as punishment, or it might be a euphemism for fever, or simply a destructive force; in Old Woman rituals, it is often used as an analogy for evil.¹⁴⁴ In addition there is “fire from the heart” or “fire of the heart” (ŠÀ-*az* IZI or ŠÀ-*aš* IZI), which also seems to be negative, but is not attested outside of the oracle texts, and so has no obvious definition. Overall, fire is attested in too many contexts and represents too many things to pin down its exact meaning in the KIN-oracle system.

2.4.2.2.10: Evocation/Offerings

The evocation ritual (*mukiššar*) is a ritual designed to gain the attention of a deity, usually for the purpose of soliciting their aid;¹⁴⁵ thick bread (NINDA.GUR₄.RA), and the *išpantuzzi*-libation are standard offerings for the placation of deities. The Old Women themselves are well-attested as performing all three. All of these symbols are relatively common (*mukiššar* appears 24 times, thick bread 21 times, and *išpantuzzi* 18 times; the bread-offering and wine-offering are usually found side-by-side). They all have to do with soliciting the attention and favor of the gods, and they are not confined to questions about cult practice or restitution offerings (as items of military practice are), so it is appropriate to include them in the assessment of the KIN-oracle system as representing the human relationship with the divine. The offerings are certainly favorable; the only times NINDA.GUR₄.RA and *išpantuzzi* appear in an unfavorable result, they are alongside an obviously negative symbol (e.g. *šalli waštul*). However, there is one exchange

¹⁴⁴ See CHD P s.v. *paḥḥur*, pp. 12–16, and ch. 4.

¹⁴⁵ See CHD L–N s.v. *muke/iššar*, pp. 324–26.

in KUB 5.3+ where “the gods” take *mukiššar* and give it to the *panku*, for an unfavorable result, for which I can see no explanation, so the situation may be more complicated.

2.4.2.2.11: Favor/Anger

Divine “favor” or “goodwill” (*minumar*) is the ultimate goal of the oracular process, and is attested in lists of good things to request (see above under “Life, Well-being, Protection, Vigor, Radiance, Long Years”), while “anger” (*karpi-*) is the outcome to be prevented at all costs. “Favor” is attested a total of 54 times in various constructions, always as a passive symbol; it appears by itself only eight times. The “favor(s) of the gods” is most common construction (29 attestations); “the favor of ^dGUL-ša-” is also attested three times, and “the favor of ^dNAM” is attested six times. It is possible that ^dNAM is an abbreviation for ^dNAM.TAR, a Mesopotamian death- and fate-deity,¹⁴⁶ likely not to be equated with ^dGUL-ša- (“the favor of” each is attested in KUB 5.1+, and “the whole soul of ^dGUL-ša-” and “the favor of ^dNAM.TAR” are attested in the same set of three exchanges in IBoT 1.32 obv. 3); in KUB 16.18+, ^dNAM is blamed for a defeat in battle, suggesting some influence over death and fate. “Favor,” therefore, is associated either with the gods as a whole, or with specific fate-deities, and when attested alone, the “divine” aspect is certainly implied.

“Anger” is attested a total of 69 times, 50 as a passive symbol and 19 as a final symbol, and also most often as “the anger(s) of the god(s),” a total of 28 times; however, it is also attested 27 times as “hidden anger” (see above). “Anger” appears alone five times as a passive symbol and five times as a final symbol; all of these exchanges are unfavorable, and all are the same so far as preserved: when “anger” is passive, “the deity” takes it and gives it to “evil” (fully preserved three times; twice, the final symbol is broken). It is tempting to interpret these

¹⁴⁶ See CAD N 147–49 s.v. *namtaru*. Rüster and Neu (*HZL*, p. 110) have suggested that ^dNAM-*aš* in the oracle texts may in fact (“möglichlicherweise”) be ^dNAM-*RU* for ^dNAMTARU, which does not seem impossible. ^dNAM.TAR is only attested once, in IBoT 1.32 (CTH 577).

exchanges as “the deity is angry *at* evil,” but this may be reading too much into the meaning of the exchange. When “anger” is final, “the deity” takes “the whole soul” and gives it to “anger” (fully preserved all five times), and in this case it does not seem to be going too far to say that this means, “the deity is wholeheartedly angry.” In either case, it is not at all surprising that these exchanges are never favorable, since this is the least desirable response to an oracle question.

“Favor,” on the other hand, does not have the same all-encompassing power as “anger” does; it is never attested in the (most influential; see below) final position, and when it is a passive symbol, it may still be part of an unfavorable exchange. This fits both with the KIN-oracle system (unfavorable elements may outweigh favorable ones) and with the logic of Hittite human-divine relations: favor is continuously asked for, and may be removed at any time, but anger can be long-lasting and requires serious effort to extinguish. But, although they may behave differently when alone, “favor” and “anger” are clearly at opposite ends of the KIN-oracle spectrum, as demonstrated by a smaller subsystem of the core oracular themes.

2.4.3: The Favor/Anger Subsystem

As mentioned above (p. 14), sometimes no active symbol is attested in an exchange, but the passive symbol “is taken” and “given” to the final symbol. For the most part, these types of exchanges involve a limited set of symbols. Of 61 relatively-well-preserved occurrences of symbols “being taken” without a named agent, 50 of those occurrences are confined to four symbols: goodness (*āššu*, written phonetically or SIG₅), evil (*idalu*, usually written with the logogram 𒄩UL), the “favours of the gods” (*ŠA DINGIR^{MEŠ} minumar^{HLA}*), and the “angers of the gods” (*ŠA DINGIR^{MEŠ} karpiuš*).¹⁴⁷ In all of these cases, the passive symbol appears alone, rather

¹⁴⁷ The other eleven occurrences include: three occurrences of “the blood of the king” (*ŠA LUGAL ADAMMA*), and once each of: life (TI), “great sin” (*šalli waštul*), vigor (*innarawatar*), “the king’s rightness” (*ŠA LUGAL ZAG-tar*), the “small sickness” (GIG.TUR), “sight” (IGI^{HLA}-*waš uwatar*), “...the evocation ritual and the man’s campaign” (*]-da mukiššar KASKAL.LÚ-ia*), and “...and the good of the land” (JKUR-*ašš=a* SIG₅).

than in a list. The “favors” and the “angers” of the gods, in these situations, may be given to one of six final symbols: the king, the goddess Ḫannaḫanna, the Sun-God of Heaven, the “long years” (MU^{HI.A} GÍD.DA), the “small sickness,” and “goodness.” Sometimes, when they are taken, they are taken “from/by the long years” (TA or *IŠTU* MU^{HI.A} GÍD.DA).

This small subsystem is not entirely confined to passive constructions. When an active symbol *does* take the “favors” and “angers” of the gods, it is always either Ḫannaḫanna, the Sun-God of Heaven, or “goodness” (usually spelled SIG₅-*uwanza*). Similar, though less universal, tendencies may be observed for the symbols “goodness” and “evil”; see the following table, in which each passive symbol heads a column, and the active and final symbols around it are enumerated (indicated by an arrow: the active symbol is to the arrow’s left, and the final symbol to its right).

“favors of the gods”		“angers of the gods”		“goodness”		“evil”	
--- → ^d MAḪ	5	--- → ^d MAḪ	2	--- → ^d MAḪ	2	--- → emptiness	7
--- → ^d UTU AN	2	--- → ^d UTU AN	2	--- → GIG.TUR	1	--- → ^d UTU AN	1
--- → goodness	1	--- → GIG.TUR	3	--- → anger of the god	2	--- → GIG.TUR	1
--- → king	1	^d UTU AN → GIG.TUR	1	--- → emptiness	1	--- → behind the throne-dais	1
^d MAḪ → king	2	^d UTU AN → ^d UTU AN ¹⁴⁸	1	^d MAḪ → anger of the god	1	--- → <i>panku</i>	2
^d MAḪ → long years	1			^d MAḪ → GIG.GAL ¹⁴⁹	3	--- → the gods	2
^d MAḪ → <i>panku</i> ¹⁵⁰	1			^d MAḪ → men of Ḫatti	1	--- → the priest	1

Table 2.3: The favor/anger subsystem

¹⁴⁸ This is the only attested occurrence of a symbol giving something to itself, with the exception of certain actions by “the enemy,” which involve more descriptive language; see above under “enemy.”

¹⁴⁹ In these three occurrences, “goodness” is not the only passive symbol, but accompanied (in two cases, both from KBo 22.264) by “Zababa” and (in one, from KUB 5.1+) by “the weapon of Ḫatti.”

¹⁵⁰ In this case (KUB 6.3 10), “the favors of the gods” is accompanied by “the years,” perhaps standing for “the long years.”

^d MAḪ → ^d UTU AN	1		the god → ^d MAḪ	1	GIG.GAL → ^d MAḪ	1
^d UTU AN → ^d MAḪ	1		the god → GIG.TUR	1	GIG.GAL → ^d GUL-ša's whole soul	1
goodness → ^d MAḪ	1		<i>panku</i> → the anger of the deity ¹⁵¹	1	GIG.GAL → the gods	1
goodness → king	1		the god → the gods	1	<i>panku</i> → sin of Mr. Arma-ziti	1
goodness → long years	1					
king → ^d MAḪ	2					

Table 2.3, cont.

It is clear that “evil” and “goodness,” while participating in this subsystem, are not confined to it; they appear in exchanges with different symbols as well. The active and final symbols in the table, like Ḫannaḫanna, the king, et cetera, also occur outside the subsystem. The “favors” and the “angers” of the gods, on the other hand, are almost exclusively attested inside this subsystem; there are only a few apparent exceptions (e.g., when the “favors” are given to the *panku*). “Anger” and “favor” both appear alone and in other constructions elsewhere, however (see above).

It should also be noted that “the favor of ^dGUL-ša-” appears three times: once (KUB 5.1 i 37), “the gods” take “the favor of ^dGUL-ša-” and give it to “the whole soul of the deity” (no result recorded). The second occurrence (KUB 5.4+ i 23–24) has “goodness” take “the favors of ^dGUL-ša-” and give them to “the whole soul of ^dGUL-ša-” (a favorable set). Finally, in KUB 22.37 obv. 8’–10’, “the Sun-god of Heaven” takes “the long years,” “life,” “protection,” “the favor of ^dGUL-ša-,” “the whole soul,” and “the house,” and places them in “evil” (unfavorable).

It can be seen from these examples that “the favor of ^dGUL-ša-” interacts with the same symbols,

¹⁵¹ In this case (KUB 5.1+ iii 17–18), goodness is accompanied by “left-ness” (though the *panku* must always take either “left-ness” or “right-ness” first) and “[evil] omen”.

but not exclusively; unfortunately, it is not attested enough times to adequately integrate it into the subsystem.

This subsystem is small enough that it is one of the few places where some contrasts in what makes an answer “favorable” or “unfavorable” may be observed, because some exchanges differ only by a single variable. For example, there are two occasions where the “angers of the gods” are taken and then given to 𐎡𐎴𐎧𐎶𐎵. Both result in an unfavorable answer.¹⁵²

However, when the “angers of the gods” are taken and given to the Sun-God of Heaven, it is in a set of three resulting in a favorable answer,¹⁵³ and when the Sun-God takes the “angers of the gods” and gives them to the Sun-God, it is also part of a favorable set.¹⁵⁴ Already it is clear that 𐎡𐎴𐎧𐎶𐎵 and the Sun-God have opposite effects on the oracular result: the Sun-God seems to negate the nature of these Ps, while 𐎡𐎴𐎧𐎶𐎵 confirms them.

The same opposition is visible when the “favors of the gods” are the passive symbol. When the favors are taken and then given to 𐎡𐎴𐎧𐎶𐎵, all five attestations are part of favorable sets. However, when the favors are taken and then given to the Sun-God of Heaven, both results are unfavorable. The opposition continues when the data set is expanded: when goodness is given to 𐎡𐎴𐎧𐎶𐎵, the result is favorable; on the other hand, when evil is given to the Sun-God, that result is also favorable. No exceptions are attested: when favor/goodness is directed toward 𐎡𐎴𐎧𐎶𐎵, the answer is favorable, and when anger/evil is directed toward her, it is unfavorable, while the opposite is true for the Sun-God of Heaven. Considering their respective characters (see above), 𐎡𐎴𐎧𐎶𐎵 seems to have been seen as a divinity who

¹⁵² Interestingly, the other fourteen attestations of 𐎡𐎴𐎧𐎶𐎵 as a final symbol in completely-preserved passages with an answer recorded are part of favorable sets.

¹⁵³ The other two actions are, “the king takes rightness and puts it to the right of Ms. Šaušgatti,” and “the small sickness is taken and put into goodness.”

¹⁵⁴ The other two actions are, “the king takes rightness and blood and gives them to the *panku*” and “evil is taken and put into emptiness.”

dispensed favor and help, while the Sun-God of Heaven was a source of punishment for wrongdoing, which may have contributed to a simple positive-negative opposition for their symbols in the oracle system.

Overall, this subsystem seems to represent a central core of what the KIN-oracles are about: humans incurring the wrath or the favor of deities. The symbols are the most important human (the king); the most important favorable deity (Ḫannaḫanna); the most important wrathful deity (the Sun-God of Heaven); the most important favor (long life); the most important punishment (sickness);¹⁵⁵ favor; anger; good; and evil. It is certainly not the oldest set of symbols (see immediately below under KBo 18.151), but it contains some of the most basic principles. It is interesting that the *panku*, otherwise the second-most-common overall symbol, appears only twice (both times in an exchange with two passive symbols rather than one, another anomaly): the *panku*, representing some greater human population, therefore does not seem important to this subsystem. Perhaps this represents the KIN-oracle system as surrounded the person of the king? This would explain the lack of any other people, and of GIG.TUR rather than GIG.GAL; in addition, it would make sense for it to be a later development (since it does not appear in KBo 18.151), because if the Old Women were already performing oracles under Ḫattušili I, their system was unlikely to have been devoted to the nonexistent Hittite king when it was first developed. One might also consider that this group of symbols could serve as a basic construction of entities present in Old Woman rituals against evil (see chs. 3 and 4): a single patient (the king); evil to be dispelled and goodness to be brought in; sickness to be cured and long years to be attained; divine anger to be placated and divine favor to be solicited; and two of

¹⁵⁵ The main reason that I can think of for it to be primarily GIG.TUR rather than GIG.GAL is that GIG.TUR does, in fact, mean an illness affecting only one person, and that that person is the king. Why “sickness” might be most important rather than, e.g., “death,” is difficult: we may perhaps again see here the influence of the plague (see above).

the primary deities appearing in the Old Women's rituals against evil, DINGIR.MAḪ and the Sun-God.

2.4.4: The Symbol System

Once all the evidence has been carefully examined, it is clear that the KIN symbol system is a relatively straightforward representation of the human relationship with the divine. At the top are the largest concerns of human misbehavior (which seems to encompass both sin, *waštul*, and left-ness, *GÙB-tar*) and divine anger, or correct behavior and divine favor. Another primary concern is full disclosure, on the parts of both humans and divinities, in the form of the “whole soul,” as opposed to “hidden” anger or sin. The major human players are the king and the *panku*, with others (e.g., military forces) coming to the fore when they are relevant to the question. The gods are overwhelmingly present, both as a collective and in the form of the generic “deity” who may be concerned with the matter at hand; in addition, Ḫannaḫanna is present as a beneficiary, and the Sun-God of Heaven as a punisher, while Ḫalmašuit- and the Storm-God, less common, are present perhaps simply as important components of any system centered around the king. The symbols also include elements of whatever issue is at hand (e.g., military campaigns), as well as positive results that could come from divine good opinion (well-being, long life), and negative results that could come from divine poor opinion (fire, sickness, blood). Despite the length and variety of the symbols in the table at the beginning of this section, all of the terms that can be adequately translated (with the possible exception of the enigmatic “emptiness”) in fact fit easily into this system. The system itself is appropriate to the purpose of the oracles, which is to communicate with the gods in order to either a) secure divine favor, or b) learn about divine anger and determine how to fix or avoid it.

2.5: KBo 18.151: An Old Hittite oracle

KBo 18.151 is an Old Hittite KIN-oracle.¹⁵⁶ The question is not preserved, only the method (expressed as the direct speech of the “Old Woman of Ḫattuša”). The method, for the most part, follows the same pattern as later texts, e.g.: “The Storm-God of Heaven arose, took affliction, took the king’s difficulty, and gave (them to) Zikiltu” (obv. 5–7). Some important differences:

1. There is no question recorded. Based on the symbols, however, it is certainly a military oracle (see Soysal, “Analysis of a Hittite Oracular Document,” for an extensive analysis of the possible historical context).
2. The answer is not expressed as “favorable” or “unfavorable.” Ünal and Kammenhuber and Soysal have interpreted the final paragraph as, “Ms. Aškaliya arose, (saying), ‘The evil has gone!’”¹⁵⁷ and thus perhaps representing a favorable answer. The lines (rev. 18–19) read ^f*Aškiliaš araiš / italuwa bait*. In Kammenhuber and Soysal’s interpretations, *italuwa* is *idalu* “evil” plus the quotative particle =*wa*; van den Hout¹⁵⁸ has more plausibly interpreted it as *idaluw=a*, with the enclitic conjunction =*a*. The other possibility that I see is an allative form of *idalu*: thus, “Ms. Aškaliya arose (and) went to evil.” In the latter two cases, this would not be a result but simply another action. In the first case, as in Soysal’s interpretation, perhaps Ms. Aškaliya is, in fact, the “Old Woman of Ḫattuša” performing the oracle, and the scribe is recording her delivery of the answer.

¹⁵⁶ Edited by A. Ünal and A. Kammenhuber, “Das althethitische Losorakel KBo XVIII 151,” *KZ* 88 (1974–74): 157–80, and by O. Soysal, “Analysis of a Hittite Oracular Document.”

¹⁵⁷ “Das althethitische Losorakel,” 165 and 173, and “Analysis of a Hittite Oracular Document,” 91 and 106–107.

¹⁵⁸ “Bemerkungen zu älteren hethitischen Orakeltexten,” in *Kulturgeschichte: Altorientalistische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Th. Richter et al. (Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag, 2001), 425.

3. There are ten paragraphs of recorded action, each with a single active symbol performing exchanges.¹⁵⁹ It is not clear whether these are all intended to answer the same question. Later texts have no more than four exchanges per question, all in the same paragraph.
4. The order and type of operations sometimes differs. For example, in rev. 9–12, “The king of [...]aršini took ^dHalmašut; he put anxiety b[e]fore the king, he put anxiety b[efo]re the queen, and went [for]th to the gods.” In this exchange, symbol A ‘takes’ a different symbol than he ‘places,’ and there are three separate final symbols, one of which A ‘goes’ to, which is not attested in any later text. In other exchanges, the final action may also be “carried over to” (*parā peda-*), as opposed to “gave to.” Finally, there is one occurrence of *arḥa tuḥšet* “cut out, separated off” as a final action (rev. 8), although unfortunately that paragraph is fairly broken so the context is not entirely clear.
5. The symbol inventory is not the same as in later texts. The symbols are:

Active/Final: Mr. Zikiltu, the gods, the Storm-God of Heaven (written ^dIM), “the Hurrian,” ^dInare of Ḫattuša, the city of Ḫaššu(wa), the city of Kaneš, evil, goodness of the land(?),¹⁶⁰ the king of [...]aršini(?), the king, the queen, the city of [...]atuma.

Passive: the king’s difficulty, affliction, plague/death, destruction, the Hurrian’s attack, the throne-dais, anxiety, evil (of?) people, the king’s battle(?), the sin of the lands, *arši-* (untranslatable).

The active/final symbols are all people, symbols, deities, or good/evil, including “the good of the land,” which is a passive symbol in later texts, if that is indeed what is written. The goddess Inara is not otherwise attested in the KIN-oracles. Some symbols

¹⁵⁹ This does not count Aškaliya and the final paragraph, and also assumes that there is not a full paragraph in the short break between obv. 16 and rev. 1.

¹⁶⁰ KUR, “land,” is broken enough in rev. line 8 to be uncertain.

are passive in this text, rather than active/final as they are in later texts, such as affliction and plague (see above under “Great and Small Sicknesses”), and the throne-dais (written syllabically as ^dHalmašut). Most of the passive symbols are either transgressions or punishments, with the exception of the two military symbols (unless the Hurrian’s attack may be regarded as a punishment, and provided that “the king’s battle” is correct), and ^dHalmašut, the throne-dais.

Given only one text, it is impossible to characterize the entire Old Hittite KIN-oracle system, but venturing into speculation for a moment, the inventory of symbols in KBo 18.151 suggests a system with a slightly different orientation than the later texts. Nothing is “hidden” or “wholehearted,” and there is only one passive symbol out of eleven that is known to be positive (the throne-dais). The favor/anger subsystem is not in evidence at all. Overall, the symbols seem to be focused on contemporary issues and problems, even in addition to the military symbols: “the anxiety of the king” is a problem specifically addressed in the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple (CTH 416), and “the king’s difficulty,” “the evil of(?) the people,” and “the sin of the lands,” are all problems of this period (see, e.g., the Telipinu Proclamation). One could perhaps theorize that the KIN-oracles began as a very specific system, in which the Old Women would name symbols after issues appearing within the question, and then over time, as they were employed by the Hittite court to address consistent institutional problems, the system standardized. However, without further evidence, this must remain speculation. And in addition, apparent specificity may be an illusion; sickness, for example, seems like a specific fear, but in the later texts has been generalized throughout the system. On the whole, KBo 18.151 is an interesting example of the Old Hittite KIN-oracle system, and excellent evidence against any

attempts to generalize certain elements of the later system backwards, but should not be used to theorize an entire Old Hittite system by itself.

2.6: What makes a KIN-Oracle favorable or unfavorable

In the past, scholars have put forth reasonably simple equations for determining whether a KIN-oracle result is favorable or unfavorable. Archi, for example, suggests that favorable results are determined by: 1) A, P, and F all being positive, or 2) A being negative, while P and F are positive. On the other hand, negative results come from 1) Positive A, Negative P, Positive F (where one negative P is enough to outweigh any others), 2) Positive A, Positive P, Negative F, and 3) Negative A, Negative P, Positive F. He does not mention any examples with both Negative P and Negative F. Following this analysis, however, he notes that the interaction among all of the symbols over the course of several movements are overall very difficult to interpret.¹⁶¹ Beal, meanwhile, has said:

“If the active, passive and receptacle tokens were all positive, clearly the oracular result was positive. If a negative symbol took positive symbols and gave them to a positive, the result was still positive. However, a negative result ensued if a positive took negative symbols and gave them to a positive, or a positive took positive symbols and gave them to a negative or a negative took negative symbols and gave them to a negative. A positive and a negative passive symbol together totaled a negative.”¹⁶²

These explanations fit a certain number of KIN-oracles, but they do not fit all of them. For example, in KUB 5.3+, “the god” takes the “whole soul” and gives it to the *panku* (all apparently positive symbols) for an unfavorable result; in KBo 13.68 rev. 16’–17’, “goodness,” takes “life,”

¹⁶¹ Archi, “Il sistema KIN,” 121–22.

¹⁶² Beal, “Hittite Oracles,” 79–80. Both Archi and Beal also discuss the canceling properties of “emptiness.” Note that Beal does not address the possibility of a negative symbol taking a negative symbol and giving it to a positive symbol.

“vigor,” “evocation ritual,” and “festivals,” and gives them to “the king” (again, all apparently positive) for an unfavorable result. In KUB 5.4+, in a set of three, “the gods” take “life” and give it to the *panku*; “the angers of the gods” are taken and given to “small sickness”; and “Hannahanna” takes “life” and “well-being” and gives them “great sickness,” for a favorable result; the middle exchange contains only negative symbols, and the final exchange has positive symbols being given to a negative symbol. Either the system is more complicated than first appears, or these (and other) examples are mistakes or conscious manipulation of the results on the part of the askers. Both options are possible, and neither immediately presents itself as more likely than the other. Despite this difficulty, however, there are some more specific observations that may be made:

- The final symbol is worth more than the active symbol: for example, in KUB 18.21, “goodness” takes “radiance” and “the life of ^dGUL-ša-,” and puts them “into evil.” The result is unfavorable. In addition, all four occurrences of “the deity” taking “hidden anger” and placing it “into goodness” are in favorable sets. Also, “emptiness” works its canceling effect from the final position. Overall, the tendency is very clear.
- When in final position, “goodness” and “evil” are favorable and unfavorable respectively, without exception. Note that this disproves the claim that a negative symbol given to a positive symbol must produce a negative result.
- When in final position, “the anger of the deity” is always unfavorable. Since this is the ultimate concern of Hittite divination, this makes sense. Conversely, in final position, “long years” are always favorable. Long life indicates divine favor.
- In final position, Hannahanna is nearly always favorable. The two exceptions (out of seventeen examples) are when she is given “the angers of the gods.” The same is true for

Halmašuitt-, the throne-dais; the one unfavorable example (out of thirteen) is when (s)he is given “evil.”

- Some nonsensical results may be explained through context. KBo 13.68 preserves the following question: “[...] His Majesty will cancel the ... festival and the winter(?) festival. If this is good for him, let it be favorable. Goodness took life, vigor, evocation, (and) festivals; they were(!) given to the king. Unfavorable.”¹⁶³ At first glance, this does not appear to be an unfavorable exchange: a positive symbol gives positive symbols to a positive symbol. However, *in the question*, the king wants to cancel festivals, and during the inquiry, “Goodness” literally gives “festivals” to him, with the ultimate result that he may not cancel them. Perhaps the presentation of “festivals” (and evocation rituals as well!) to the king is what, in this specific instance concerning festivals, provokes an unfavorable result.
- On the other hand, in final position, “great sickness” is favorable ten out of eleven times, twice when “the king” takes “rightness” and “the whole soul” and gives them to it (though in neither of these examples do the other two exchanges in the set lend themselves to easy interpretation). “The small sickness,” on the other hand, is unfavorable half of the time (six out of twelve), and is favorable only when obviously negative passive symbols such as “the angers of the gods” (four out of six times) are given to it.

Overall, the multiplicity of symbols and lack of single-exchange favorable answers makes determining the exact workings of the system extremely difficult. There are certainly not enough

¹⁶³ KBo 13.68 rev. 14'' []x-ma-za-kán ^dUTU-Š/EZEN₄ x-im-ma
 15'' [EZ]EN₄ ŠÈD^{??} kar-ap-zi ma-a-an-ma-ši a-aš-šu ŠE-ru
 16'' ŠIG₅ 1-za TI-tar in-nir-wa-tar mu-kiš[!]-šar
 17'' EZEN₄^{HI.A} ME-aš na-aš LUGAL-i SUM-za ŠNU[!].SIG₅

exchanges that differ by only one variable to make it easy to see which symbols are “positive” and which are “negative” in which circumstances. In addition, the context of the exchange may change the valence of a symbol, and possibly the context of the question as well. It is easy to see, in light of this analysis, why the Hittites employed specialists to interpret these oracles. The opacity of the system must have bestowed a certain amount of power on the Old Women; for example, the possibility of purposeful manipulation of the answers for their own ends must be considered. Even outside of that opportunity, however, the effectiveness of such an inaccessible system can be seen simply in the fact that they were employed as diviners for all of Hittite history.

2.7: The KIN-oracles and the Old Women in Hittite religious context

As has already been discussed, in addition to being an active part of the Hittite relationship with the divine, the KIN-oracles described that relationship within their system. This system appears elsewhere in the Hittite textual record, perhaps most explicitly in the plague prayers of Muršili II. In the Hittite world, gods might be pleased or displeased with humans—most particularly the king—and would react by rewarding or punishing humankind. Upon receiving punishment, the humans—again, most particularly the king—would suffer, and in order to relieve their suffering, would communicate with the gods (through oracles) to discover what might be wrong, and then act (through ritual) to placate the gods. Once satisfied, the gods would theoretically stop the punishment, and the people would no longer suffer. The plague prayers of Muršili are a demonstration of a snag in the system: Muršili has discovered every possible sin that might have been committed by himself or his father, has acted as best he can to right these wrongs, and the suffering has not stopped. In assuring the gods he has done

everything right, and asking them why they have not fulfilled their end, he eloquently describes a system of thought which manifests itself directly in the symbolism of the KIN-oracles:

“Because you, O gods, my lords, [have] taken vengeance for the blood of Tudhaliya, those who killed Tudhaliya [have made] restitution for the blood.”¹⁶⁴

“I will keep removing the causes of the plague which have been established through oracle, and I will keep making restitution for them. With regard to the problem” (i.e., the previous king’s breaking) “of the oath of the gods which was established as a cause for the plague, I have offered the ritual of the oath for the Storm-God of Hatti...”¹⁶⁵

“[And if] perhaps people have been dying for this reason, then during the time that I set it right, let there be no more deaths among those makers of offering bread and libation pourers to the gods who are still left. [Or] if people have been dying because of some other reason, then let me either see it in a dream, or let it be established through an oracle...”¹⁶⁶

“Turn benevolently toward your servant, Muršili the king, (and) toward the Land of Ḫatti. Continually give life, health, [vi]gor, [rad]iance of spirit for (lit. of) the future, and long [years] to [Muršili], your servant!”¹⁶⁷

The sin of the king, the rightness or wrongness of people’s actions, the favor or the anger of the gods, the suffering of the people through sickness, and the offering of restitution in the hopes of divine gifts are all apparent in these texts. The KIN-oracle system therefore fits neatly into the religious world as it was known and described by the Hittites.

As has also been discussed, these are likewise problems that can be seen in the Old Woman rituals. The Old Women did not do rituals specifically against plague,¹⁶⁸ but rather

¹⁶⁴ Singer, *Hittite Prayers*, 63.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 59.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 60.

¹⁶⁷ See n. 131 for transliteration.

treated only one or two patients at a time; however, these rituals were explicitly concerned with sickness, transgression, divine anger, and the placation of the gods (see ch. 3). In addition, a primary strategy that they used to deal with these problems was concretization—that is, embodying an intangible concept such as evil, contamination, sickness, or divine anger with a physical object, such as fire, cloth, etc. Since we do not know anything about the physical reality of the KIN-oracles, we cannot identify any specifics; however, it does seem as though there *was* a physical reality: these symbols embodied intangibles such as divine anger in some physical form. In ritual, the Old Women constructed vessels, figurines, braids of cloth, etc., in order to represent evils, patients, and sorcerers, and here in their oracular system, they seem to have been doing the same. They also seem to have taken up a position absolutely central to Hittite religious practice and thought: as intercessors to the gods when things began to go wrong. If the KIN-oracle system embodies the Hittites' relationship with the gods, it is no accident that the Old Women were the masters of this system. As has been demonstrated already in ch. 1, they were operating at the very highest level of Hittite society, in close contact with the royal family, and occupied positions of considerable power. This is reflected in their field of professional control: at the heart of the king's relationship with the gods.

2.8: Old Women as royal advisors

The KIN-oracle questions make it clear that the Old Women were consulted with regard to questions of appropriate religious behavior, of political appointments, of military strategy, and of royal life, health, and accession. Added to this is the evidence from the symbol system, which shows that the Old Women based their divinatory technique on the mechanics of human-divine

¹⁶⁸ These seem to have been a specific genre of ritual confined to male practitioners, clearly also grouped together by the Hittites, as can be seen by the gathering of three of them (CTH 394, CTH 757, and CTH 410) on a single *Sammeltafel*, KUB 9.31 (and duplicate KBo 13.212+).

relationships, indicating a certain expertise in the workings of those relationships, which is supported by their status as ritual experts as well as diviners.

In the texts of the KIN-oracles themselves, however, the Old Women are rarely named. In single-method oracles, there is no need to continually restate who is performing the divination. In combination oracles, a paragraph using a KIN-oracle method is introduced by *IŠTU* ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI or “through the Old Woman” (as opposed to *IŠTU* ^{LÚ}ḪAL for extispicy, or *IŠTU* ^{LÚ}IGI.MUŠEN for bird-oracles), but for the most part, that is the only explicit reference to the Old Women in the oracle documents. However, there are a very few texts that include direct speech from the Old Women during the oracular procedures (see, e.g., above under the discussion of the snake-oracles), unfortunately mostly broken. There is one very short passage, KUB 6.14 rev. 10’–10b’, that suggests that the Old Women might offer some kind of interpretation of the oracle beyond “favorable” or “unfavorable. In the text, an oracle report finishes, followed by direct speech from: “...took the fever; to the small sickness. Thus Ms. Wati[...]: “The fever will be small.”¹⁶⁹ Assuming Ms. Wati[...] was the Old Woman performing the oracle, this certainly seems to be her interpretation of the meaning of the foregoing exchange.

There are also two other texts (KBo 41.156 and KUB 49.79¹⁷⁰) in which the oracle procedure is recorded, followed by fragmentary direct speech. KUB 49.79 18’–22’ reads (following three previous exchanges): “[Fourth t]rack: [Ḫannaḫan]na arose, [took] protection, the campaign of Ḫat[ti, (and?)...], and gave them(!) to the men of Hatti. Thus the [Old] Women: “[...?] Ḫannaḫanna arose, [took] protection, the campaign of Ḫat[ti, (and?)...], and gave them(!)

¹⁶⁹ 10’]ta-pa-aš-ša-an ME-er nu-kán A-NA GIG.TUR UM-MA ¹Wa-ti[] (10b’) ta-pa-aš-ša-aš-wa te-pu-uš e-eš-z[i].

¹⁷⁰ This text, as well as KUB 6.14 above, have already been noted by H. Berman in his review of KUB 49 (*Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 34 [1982]: 122 w.n. 12) as some of the very few examples of quoted speech responding to oracle results; his other examples are KUB 5.13 i 5 (which is a Mr. Kadū responding to a KIN-oracle result), and KUB 22.51 obv. 9’ and KUB 49.30 rev? 22, both of which are fragmentary and uncertain.

to the men of Hatti. [...] before this road...the cit[y...]"¹⁷¹ In this case, there seem to be three possibilities: first, that the Old Women are emphasizing the fourth exchange in order to make some point about the answer; second, that the questioner is repeating the fourth exchange in order to clarify some point about the question; or third, that the Old Women themselves are seizing on a point of the answer to further the questioning in a direction of their own. KBo 41.156 seems to be an example of the latter case; lines 5'–15' read:

“Concerning this: that a sin of [...] was determined] for His Majesty after the trip, the charioteers and the stewards will go and enjoin [...], while if...[...]. Will it be favorable for His Majesty on account of this matter? Let the KI[N be favorable.] The Sun-God of Heaven arose, took the blood of the king, and it [lies to the left] of the stewards (and) the charioteers. Thus the Old Women: ‘Concerning this: [The Sun-God of Heaven arose] and took the blood of the king, and [it] lie[s] to the left of [the stewards] and the charioteers [...] will they also enjoin [...] will they let something (or: [no]thing) go [...]’¹⁷²

Although the quotative particle has disappeared by the end of the paragraph, the fact that it is the Old Women who are saying, “Concerning this” strongly suggests that it is also they who are continuing the line of questioning. This demonstrates that the Old Women themselves could be

¹⁷¹ 18' [4 ú]r-kiš [DINGIR.MA]Ḫ (over erasure) GUB-iš PAP-nu-mar KASKAL URUḪat-[ti...] 19' [n]a-an A-NA LÚ^{MEŠ} URUḪat-ti pa-^r iš ^r UM-MA MUNUS^{MEŠ} [ŠU.GI...] 20' DINGIR.MAḪ GUB-iš nu-wa PAP-nu-mar KASKAL URUḪat-[ti...] 21' nu-wa-ra-an A-NA LÚ^{MEŠ} URUḪat-ti pa-iš[...] 22' a-pé-e-da-ni KASKAL-ši pé-ra-an x ^{URU} [...] ¹⁷² KBo 41.156 ii 5' ki-i ku-it A-NA ^dUTU-ŠI [n]a²-aš wa-aš-túl EGIR KASKAL-NI [SIXSÁ-at] 6' nu pa-a-an-zi LÚ^{ME.EŠ} KAR-TAP-PU-TI LÚ^{ME.EŠ} SAG-ia[] 7' iš-ḫi-ú-la-aḫ-ḫa-an-zi ma-a-an-ma e-er-šu-x[] 8' A-NA ^dUTU-ŠI a-pé-e-ez INIM-az SIG₅-ri nu KI[N (NU.)SIG₅-ru/du] 9' ^dUTU AN-E GUB-iš ŠA LUGAL A-DAM-MA ME-aš[] 10' na-at A-NA LÚ^{ME.EŠ} SAG LÚ^{ME.EŠ} KAR-TAP-PU [GÜB-za GAR-ri] 11' UM-MA MUNUS^{ME.EŠ} ŠU.GI ki-i-wa ku-it[] 12' nu-wa ŠA LUGAL A-DAM-MA M[E]-aš nu-wa-r[a-at A-NA LÚ^{ME.EŠ} SAG] 13' LÚ^{ME.EŠ} KAR-TAP-PU-TI-ia GÜB-za GAR[-ri]] 14' iš-ḫi-ú-la-aḫ-ḫa-an-zi-i[a] 15' ku-it-ki tar-na-an-zi []

involved in the questioning process; note also that in both of these texts, it is a *group* of Old Women speaking, suggesting a council of experts. If the Old Women were indeed able to offer input into the questions, as well as the answers, their function would have not only been as technical experts in divination, but as true advisors on policy and decision-making—whether they were accompanied in this function by the other diviners, the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}ḪAL and ^{LÚ.MEŠ}MUŠEN.DÙ, is not clear. Given their presence alongside the royal family from the time of Ḫattušili I and their clearly vast collection of knowledge and expertise, in ritual as well as in divination, if this is true, it would not be at all surprising.

CHAPTER 3: RITUALS AND INCANTATIONS

3.1: Introduction

By far the largest portion of textual material attesting the Old Women is the Hittite ritual corpus. Ritual texts, in Hittitological terminology, are texts purporting to address a specific problem or issue (as opposed to festival texts, which describe ritual acts to be regularly performed at specific times). Attested in the Hittite corpus are rituals designed to cure illness, bewitchment, or some other affliction or undesirable state; to invoke or pacify deities; to purify temples or divine statues; to ensure that life events such as birth or death were felicitous; to imbue the foundation of a temple or palace with felicitousness; to ensure military success or do away with negative effects from military defeat; to facilitate the life, health, and fertility of the royal couple, and more.¹ Over a third of these texts attest Old Women as authors, practitioners, or both.²

Ritual texts have enjoyed a larger amount of scholarly attention in the last fifteen years than ever before in Hittitology. This dissertation relies heavily on the meticulous editions of ritual texts ascribed to Tunnawi(ya),³ Maštigga,⁴ Huwarlu the augur,⁵ Ambazzi,⁶ Aštu,⁷ and Allī,⁸

¹ For a more detailed list of problems addressed by ritual means, see A. Ünal, “The Role of Magic in the Ancient Anatolian Religions According to the Cuneiform Texts from Boğazköy-Hattuša,” in *Essays on Anatolian Studies in the Second Millennium B.C.*, ed. H.I.H. Prince Takahito Mikasa (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988), 71–74.

² This is a rough but conservative estimate based on CTH-numbers.

³ A. Goetze and E.H. Sturtevant, *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi* (Yale: American Oriental Society, 1938); M. Hutter, *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung: das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königspaar aus mittelhethitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 – KUB IX 34 – KBo XXI 6)*, OBO 82 (Freiburg [Schweiz]: Göttingen, 1988); G. Beckman, “The Hittite ‘Ritual of the Ox’ (CTH 760.1.2–3),” *OrNS* 59 (1990), 41–55.

⁴ J.L. Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*, StBoT 46 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004).

⁵ D. Bawanypeck, *Die Rituale der Auguren*, THeth 25 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 2005).

⁶ B. Christiansen, *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi: Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429 und CTH 463*, StBoT 48 (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2006).

⁷ S. Görke, *Das Ritual der Aštu (CTH 490): Rekonstruktion und Tradition eines hurritisch-hethitischen Rituals aus Boğazköy-Hattuša*, CHANE 40 (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

all of which attest an Old Woman as the primary practitioner, and without which a comprehensive study would have been impossible.⁹

However, since so many ritual texts have only recently been edited, or had their editions updated—and since many still remain to be edited—scholarship on more general aspects of Hittite ritual has been minimal. Until very recently, it was focused primarily on two goals: (1) the philological, that is, to enhance our understanding of Hittite grammar and vocabulary with a translation of a new text,¹⁰ and (2) to identify elements belonging to separate religious traditions, and trace their diachronic progression¹¹ (see the Introduction for further discussion of this). As noted already in chapter 1, Hittite religious texts are full of deities from foreign places, incantations in languages other than Hittite, and explicit claims of foreign geographical origin. Teasing out the differences among these traditions, and assigning texts to one or another of them

⁸ A. Mouton, “Le rituel d’Alli d’Arzawa contre un ensorcellement (CTH 402) : une nouvelle édition,” in *Beyond Hatti. A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, ed. B.J. Collins and P. Michalowski (Atlanta, Lockwood Press: 2013), 195–229.

⁹ The relevant pages from the editions will be referenced whenever a text is translated, but unless otherwise stated, all transliterations and translations are my own.

¹⁰ Older scholarship was sometimes focused almost exclusively on philological goals, as can be seen in e.g. Otten and Souček’s edition of CTH 416 (*Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar*, StBoT 8 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1969]), which has sections on the text makeup, transliteration and translation, script and palaeography, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics, while discussion of the events of the ritual take up less than five pages. Starke’s publication of the Luwian rituals in transcription (*Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*, StBoT 30 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1985]) focuses on the events of the rituals only insofar as it aids in reconstructing composite texts; his aim was a better understanding of the Luwian language (as seen in the book he published to follow, *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*, StBoT 31 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1990]). Both of these works remain the only publications of these texts available.

¹¹ To demonstrate with a few examples: Hutter’s *Behexung*, the only edition of CTH 409.II, follows up the transcription and translation with philological commentary and then short sections on the date of the text, the structure of the ritual and function of various parts (nine pages), the possible historical context, the gods in the ritual, and the place of the ritual in the Luwian cultic tradition. Taracha’s edition of CTH 448.4 (*Ersetzen und Ensühnen: Das mittelhethitische Ersatzritual für den Großkönig Tuthaliya (CTH *448.4) und verwandte Texte*, CHANE 5 [Leiden: Brill, 2000]) has sections on the historical context, composition, function of gods and ancestors in the text, the tradition of the text, and then the overall tradition of substitute rituals in Hittite texts and their origins. Haas’ various publications on Allaiturahi’s ritual (V. Haas and H. J. Thiel, *Die Beschwörungsrituale der Allaiturah(h)i und verwandte Texte*, AOAT 31 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978]; V. Haas and I. Wegner, *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen* ^{SAL}ŠU.GI, ChS I/5 [Rome: Multigrafica Editrice, 1988], V. Haas, “Die hurritisch-hethitischen Rituale der Beschwörerin Allaiturah(h)i und ihr literarhistorischer Hintergrund,” in *Hurriter und Hurritisch*, Xenia 21 [Konstanzer, 1988], 117–43; “Notizen zu den Ritualen der Frau Allaiturah(h)i aus Mukiš,” *Festschrift Ilse Wegner*, *AoF* 34:1 [2007]: 9–36) have been focused almost exclusively on philological issues and the identification of a Hurro-Mesopotamian origin and tradition for rituals such as Allaiturahhi’s. R. Strauß’s goals are made clear in the title of *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006).

(or to a combination), and ordering these texts and traditions chronologically, has been integral to most scholarship on ritual since the earliest editions of ritual texts. This dissertation will not be focused on either of those goals. I will not be re-editing any of the texts under examination, and philological problems will be dealt with only as they arise in focal passages. I will be addressing the concept of different traditions peripherally here and in chapter 4; however, it is my opinion that at least in the Old Woman texts, there are only a few identifiable differences among the various linguistic/geographical groups of texts, and in point of fact all of these rituals were collected by the Hittite administrative system and may have influenced one another during this process (once again, see the Introduction for more discussion of these points), so this will not be a major part of my own analysis either.

More recently, a new goal has emerged in Hittitological scholarship: the explication of scribal culture through ritual texts. These texts were often copied over the course of several hundred years, and as a result, have been described as “scribal” or “scholarly” products, and thus focus has shifted to textual transmission, redaction, and even composition on the part of scribes.¹² For a discussion of these points, again see the Introduction, where it is demonstrated why I will not be treating these texts as “scribal” or “literary” products, but rather as representative of practical religious thought.

In this chapter and the next, I will rather be addressing the following questions: (1) What were the goals of the Old Women’s rituals? (2) How did they go about achieving those goals? (3) How did the Old Women represent themselves, or how were they represented,¹³ as they worked to achieve those goals? That is to say, I will be focused primarily on ritual efficacy. Insofar as Hittitological scholarship has discussed ritual efficacy, the methods have been heavily

¹² E.g., Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*; A. Mouton, “Le rituel d’Alli d’Arzawa contre un ensorcellement (CTH 402): texte et contexte,” *CollAn* XI (2012): 247–66; Christiansen, *Ambazzi*; Görke, *Aštu*.

¹³ For the question of authorship, see the Introduction.

philological: ritual methods have been categorized and analyzed based on specific acts and objects, and categories of texts and of rites have been advanced based on the individual elements that make them up.¹⁴ It is my opinion that a wider view is needed for a fuller understanding of Hittite ritual. To that end, I will start with an analysis of the incantations spoken during the Old Women's rituals (in this chapter). Incantations accompanied most ritual acts throughout Old Woman texts, and provided context and meaning to many of those acts. A comprehensive study of these incantations will therefore advance an understanding of the framework in which they were operating and allow for a more holistic analysis of the physical actions they performed (the following chapter).

First, however, it is necessary to answer question (1) above: what were the goals of the Old Woman rituals?

3.2: Ritual purpose¹⁵

Overall, there are fifty-six Old Woman ritual texts that are well-preserved enough to provide at least a rough idea of their purpose. In addition, there are twelve entries in the tablet catalogues that attest other, unpreserved Old Woman rituals designed for a certain purpose. Therefore, sixty-eight separate ritual texts can be identified with which to characterize the Old Women's field of ritual expertise. (See Appendix B for a list of these rituals with a brief description of their purpose and state of preservation; see Appendix C for a more detailed catalogue of each text and the available information about it.)

¹⁴ E.g., Bawanypeck, *Die Rituale der Auguren*; R. Strauß, *Reinigungsrituale*; Haas, *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica: Ein Beitrag zur Heilkunde im Alten Orient* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003); Görke, *Aštu*; D.H. Engelhard, *Hittite Magical Practices: An Analysis*, unpubl. PhD diss., Brandeis, 1970. For more discussion of the methods used in these and other works, see ch. 4.

¹⁵ I am referring here to the purpose that is claimed in the text; the actual function of these texts at Hattuša will be discussed later on.

When these texts are examined, it becomes immediately clear that the Old Women performed rituals almost exclusively for two purposes, often both within the same text: (1) to rid a patient of some kind of supernatural affliction, whether that be sorcery, curses, guilt, divine anger, uncleanness, etc., and/or (2) to invoke a deity or other supernatural entity, and enjoin them to help (or to stop harming). Sometimes a ritual served both purposes at once. There are a few apparent exceptions that may be due simply to lack of preservation or understanding—e.g., KUB 55.57 (CTH 470), which seems to deal with a snake going into a house, and is not easily interpreted in the context of other ritual texts.¹⁶ Certain rituals also suggest that the Old Women had an affinity with the underworld and the dead (CTH 448.2, the ritual for the Sun-Goddess of the Earth, and several quite fragmentary rituals for invoking the dead, the underworld gods, or pacifying a ghost¹⁷), which explains their presence in CTH 450, the royal funerary ritual, in which they appear to be directing the king’s soul to its correct celestial destination and perhaps ensuring a fruitful afterlife (see ch. 4 for further discussion of this). Primarily, however, the Old Women addressed afflictions, contaminations, and other troubles, which could originate either from a human in the form of sorcery or curses, or from an angry deity.

This is apparent, for example, in the Old Woman rituals that purport to address sickness: in nearly all cases, it is plainly obvious from the text that the sickness was a secondary result of some other external cause. For example, in CTH 391, the ritual of Ambazzi, the patient’s *inan-*

¹⁶ Another apparent exception is from the tablet catalogues, which contain an entry for an Old Woman’s ritual in which “they are placing a KIN-an of clay” (KBo 31.5 ii 5; see P. Dardano, *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattuša* (CTH 276–282), StBoT 47 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006], p. 162), which defies interpretation. However, the very fragmentary KBo 41.42, an Old Woman ritual that is part of CTH 470 (ritual fragments), contains the phrase “plac[ing] a KIN-an” in its colophon as well as during the ritual action, and is clearly a ritual for dealing with divine anger. Whether this is the actual text that the tablet entry references is not certain, but the purpose of “placing a KIN-an” does fit with the overall pattern of problems the Old Women addressed.

¹⁷ KUB 39.61, KUB 58.85, KUB 39.57; see Appendix B.

sickness is due to the negative attention of the hostile divinities/demons named in the text,¹⁸ and in CTH 402, the ritual of Allī, sickness is a consequence of sorcery.¹⁹ In CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya's "Ritual of the River," Tunnawiya treats a patient for reproductive difficulties that might have arisen from hostile words on the part of an enemy. In CTH 404.3, Maštigga's ritual for "When someone commits bloodshed," one of the copies states that the guilty ritual patient has been afflicted by "bloodshed, tears, and sickness," suggesting that guilt could also cause sickness.²⁰ When the Old Women treated sickness, what they were truly treating was the sorcery, ritual uncleanness, and/or hostile supernatural attention that was causing it, and this was wholly reflected in their methods, as will be demonstrated. If it was unclear what specifically was behind the physical affliction, a ritual might have a list of possible problems; Tunnawiya's *taknaz dā*- ritual (CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1) is the least certain of what could be causing the patient's suffering, listing forty-seven different potential issues, and so might be considered a panacea.²¹ All of the most complete Old Woman rituals²² treat patients for some kind of affliction; in several cases, these patients are explicitly named as the king and queen.

¹⁸ Christiansen, *Ambazzi*, 133. The incipit of CTH 391 states, "when I treat ^dZa[rniza (and) ^dTarpat]tassi," two of the hostile divinities in the text.

¹⁹ Mouton, "Allī," pp. 200, 222 (KUB 12.126(+) i 25).

²⁰ Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 136 (KBo 43.319 i 15'). Though it should be noted first that exemplar A has *ḫaratnanza* "offense, misconduct" in the place of *inananza* "sickness," and second that in the preceding sentence of KBo 43.319 the list is also "bloodshed, tears, (and) misconduct." On the other hand, there is plenty of evidence from Hittite prayers that the gods could send sickness to punish a guilty party.

²¹ A composite list: *ḫulturamma*-sickness of the head, *aḫraman*-sickness of the skull, *taškupiman*-sickness of the skull, burden of the soul, heaviness of the body, *witrišša*-sickness of the bone (and) flesh, beating of the year (and) month (=old age?), sudden death, the *šarkiwalīeš nakkiwēš*-demons, bloody Nergal, the fire of the *meiliyaš*, anger, uncleanness, perjury, sorcery, defeat,]-*uwa ḫanda*, evil terror, evil dreams, evil bird-omens, *tapaššan*-fever of the body, short years, divine anger, the tongue of the multitude, the evil tongue of the conspirators, the tongue of the palace servant, the tongue of the temple-woman, the tongue of the royal bodyguard, the tongue of the GUDU₁₂-priest, the tongue of the SANGA-priest, the tongue of the AMA DINGIR-LIM-priestess, the tongue of the army, the tongue of the troops, the tongue of the court, the tongue of the assembly, the tongue of perjury, the tongue of the ^{LÚ}*aušiyawaš*, the tongue of the tribe, the tongue of the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}*lulaḫiyaš*, the tongue of the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}*ḫapiriyaš*, the tongue of the dead (and) living, the tongue of the manservant (and) maidservant, the tongue of the eater (and) drinker, the tongue of the faster, the tongue of the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}*šarikuwain*, the tongue of all sorcery.

²² CTH 390A, Ayatarša's ritual, CTH 390D, the "Incanation of binding," CTH 391, Ambazzi's ritual, CTH 398, Ḫuwarlu's ritual, CTH 402, Allī's ritual, CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual against domestic quarrel, CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya's "Ritual of the River," and CTH 416, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple.

Maintaining good relations with the gods was also certainly a large part of the Old Women's function, as apparent from the many rituals invoking or pacifying a deity. Fully half of these rituals, unfortunately, are only attested in the tablet catalogues, and only give the information "when the Old Woman invokes (X deity)," without saying what the deity was then supposed to do. The extremely fragmentary CTH 403.2, a ritual of Mallidunna, provides the tantalizing incipit: "[If Ḫannahanna] (is) terrifying to someone"²³ (restoration assured from the colophon), suggesting some noticeable real-world consequence of Ḫannahanna's anger, but the preserved fragments of the ritual do not allow for any speculation as to what it might be. Similarly, CTH 434 (KUB 58.108) is to help a person with an "evil fate-goddess"; the fragmentary incipit says, "[If] for some[one] the fate-goddess [...] a matter of ruling [...], makes [...] for him/her], and howev[er] (s)he is [pla]cing(?) it, it does not turn out in his/her favor, I treat the evil fate-goddess thus for him/her..."²⁴ which seems like it could be intended for general misfortune, though the possibility of something more specific (perhaps legal, considering the "matter of ruling"?) concealed in the lacunae remains. The Disappearance of the Sun-God (see ch. 1), on the other hand, describes the result of a world in the grip of frost,²⁵ but whether this ritual was intended to be performed in the case of extreme climatic events or simply every winter is difficult to say. It is rarely clear what has upset the deity in the first place; the only completely unambiguous case is CTH 423, in which the deities belong to a conquered city, and the Old Woman is attempting to entice them over from the enemy side, and so is working with a

²³ KUB 33.70 (note: the Rückseite is erroneously labeled Nr. 69 in the handcopy) iii 7 [ma-a-an DINGIR.MAḪ k]u-e-da-ni-ik-ki ḫa-tu-ga-aš

²⁴ KUB 58.108 i 1 [ma-a-an UN-š]i ku-e-ḫda¹-ni ḫGUL-š[a]

2 [] ta-pár-ri-ia-aš me-mi-ia-a[š]

3 [nu-uš-ši]ḫa¹-ni-ia-zi na-at-za-kán ku-it i[m]-m[a]

4 []zi-i]k-ki-iz-zi na-at-ši ḫUL ki-ik-ki-ḫiš-ta-ri¹

5 [nu-u]š-ši ḫUL-lu-un ḫGUL-ša-an kiš-an BAL-aḫ-ḫi

Restorations from the colophon. For the edition, see F. Fuscagni, *hethiter.net*: CTH 434.5.

²⁵ See Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 27–28.

preexisting bias. Hittite prayers and oracles provide ample suggestions for what might bring down divine anger, however, so one may imagine bloodshed, oathbreaking, incest, improper cult practice, profane speech, and so on.

As mentioned above, many rituals dealt with both of the Old Women's specialties at once. For example, CTH 433 is a group of rituals designed to cleanse a group of augurs who have committed some offense; however, large parts of the three rituals in the group are also dedicated to pacifying the deity who was upset by the offense. CTH 448.2, a ritual for the Sun-Goddess of the Earth, is primarily designed to divert supernatural harm destined for the royal couple by invoking the Sun-Goddess of the Earth and providing her with substitutes to whom the harm may come instead. In CTH 391, Ambazzi's ritual, Ambazzi both draws existing evil out of the patient and pacifies the demons or minor gods who caused it. In addition, even in rituals designed to counter problems of human origin such as sorcery, the Old Women drew on divine aid to help them defeat those problems.

Overall, the Old Women were capable of dispelling negative effects from sorcery, curses, sin, or divine displeasure, by directly addressing those causes, rather than the symptoms like sickness, nightmares, fear, or other suffering. As already noted by Mouton,²⁶ sorcery in particular seems to have been a specialty of theirs. Given their relative lack of attestations in the festival texts (see ch. 1), but their prominence in the oracles and rituals, it seems as though they were primarily troubleshooters, rather than part of the extensive cultic personnel the Hittite administration dedicated to maintaining the religious status quo. One possible exception could be the Benedictions for the Labarna (see ch. 1), which are a blessing for the king, and do not state whether they are also a response to some problem, or instead were to be regularly performed.

²⁶ "Sorcellerie hittite," *JCS* 62 (2010): 116.

There are also several well-attested types of Hittite ritual that the Old Women did *not* do (always maintaining the possibility that these omissions are accidents of preservation). For example, they are not attested consecrating divine statues, although there is an “Old Woman of the temple of Ziparwa” attested, and an oracle text stating that, after mutilated people had gone into a temple, an Old Woman of Ḫatti should act “however she usually acts” to purify it,²⁷ so they were at home in temples. There are no Old Women attested in any ritual against plague in the army (of which there are several attested, all performed by men), in any building/foundation ritual, or in any ritual for the purification of a city or town. They also did not perform birth rituals, although they might cure a sick baby or child. They were not midwives, and it is worthwhile to note here that there is nothing to suggest that any anachronistically gendered assumptions of “women’s magic” or the “domestic sphere” should apply to the Old Women’s ritual expertise.²⁸ Rather, they were employed by the state²⁹ to handle problems military, religious, medical, emotional, and political.

3.3: Ritual method

As has been demonstrated, most extant Old Woman ritual texts were designed to counter affliction in a patient brought on by some kind of evil intent or force, which was frequently not very well-defined in the ritual. Consequently, these texts are noticeably concerned with the problem of a lack of concreteness. They address problems that cannot be seen or touched, such

²⁷ *nu* ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI ^{URU}Ḫatti mahḫan anniškizzi [ANA DIN]GIR-LIM QATAMMA aniyazi, KUB 5.7 obv. 36–37; see R. Tognon, “Il testo oracolare ittita KUB V 7,” *KASKAL* 1 (2004): 63.

²⁸ *Contra*, e.g. Beckman’s identification of the Old Women as midwives in “From Cradle to Grave: Women’s Role in Hittite Medicine and Magic,” *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 8 (1993): 37–39, which has its basis in a possible etymology of *ḫašawa*, which may or may not be the Hittite word behind the logogram ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI (see the Conclusion); even if so, a potential etymological background should be greatly subordinated to the evidence from the actual texts, which do not ever attest Old Women as midwives (though I do not dispute the Hittite ascription of divine favor to midwives). Also to be refuted is the completely unfounded statement by Haas that “Die magische Autorität der Frau beruht auf dem Vorgang des Gebärens, der Menstruation sowie ihrer Eigenschaft zur Hysterie, so daß ihre nervösen Krisen sie übernatürlichen Kräften auszuliefern scheinen” (*Geschichte*, 882).

²⁹ The texts do not attest to any private or other institutional powers who might have used their services, but since the texts are all produced by the Hittite administration, that does not mean other employers did not exist.

as contamination, sorcery, and divine anger; sometimes they cannot even name the problem as specifically one of these items. The Old Women solved this conundrum using two primary methods: they either (a) brought to bear a force other than their own actions, one that was able to access the evil directly, such as a god, and instructed that force to defeat the evil on their (and the patients') behalf, or (b) imposed some metaphor on the evil, or in some cases on the patient, a metaphor that *could* be seen and touched, and acted upon the metaphor in the hopes that the action would be transferred to the evil—for example, conceiving of the evil as a fire and then extinguishing the fire. That is, they concretized evil.³⁰ Both of these methods relied heavily on incantations.

It is very clear from the evidence that incantations were essential to the Old Women's ritual practice: every ritual text larger than a small fragment preserves some ritual speech. These recitations could be entreaties to the gods, ritual analogies, imperative commands, mythological stories (*historiolae*), benedictions, or dialogues with the ritual patient or with each other. The incantations were often in Hittite, but could also be in Hattian, Palaic, Luwian, or Hurrian. Unfortunately, we cannot understand these languages as well as Hittite; parallels with Hittite-language incantations help with particularly the Luwian and Hurrian incantations, but many passages remain opaque to us. However, even given these difficulties, it is obvious that a large part of the Old Women's ritual effectiveness came from the power of speech. This can even be seen in rituals that they did not author, but only participated alongside many others: in the two-week-long royal funerary ritual, the Old Women's duties were primarily incantations. With

³⁰ A term already suggested by Vieyra in 1966, ("Le sorcier hittite," in *Le Monde du Sorcier*, Sources Orientales 7 [Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966], 99–125), and taken up by Wright (*The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature*, SBL Dissertation Series 101 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987], 41. Both of them, however, use this term as one category of rite accompanied by many others, while I would rather say it encompasses the greater part of Hittite ritual acts. For more on this subject, see ch. 4.

almost no exception,³¹ their rituals had incantations all throughout the text, closely interspersed with the actions.³²

In “The Magical Power of Words,”³³ Stanley Tambiah observes of ritual language:

There is a sense in which it is true to say that language is outside us and given to us as a part of our cultural and historical heritage. At the same time language is within us; it moves us, and we generate it as active agents. Since words exist and are in a sense agents in themselves which establish connections and relations between both man and man, and man and the world, and are capable of ‘acting’ upon them, they are one of the most realistic representations we have of the concept of force which is either not directly observable or is a metaphysical notion which we find it necessary to use.

This falls well in line with the use of ritual incantations in the Hittite texts: they are designed to influence that which is “not directly observable or is a metaphysical notion.” As Beckman has already noted, “The establishment of [the] equation [between ritual object and affliction], however, could be announced and brought about only through oral means, that is, by the

³¹ CTH 390.A, Ayatarša’s ritual, only has two brief entreaties to the Sun-God preserved, while the treatment of the sick child is for the most part carried out silently. However, there is a gap of several paragraphs near the end of the ritual, so it may be that some ritual speech has been lost. Ayatarša’s ritual is the only Old Woman text larger than a small fragment that does not preserve (or indicate the presence of, e.g. by saying “she is speaking incantations” without recording them) extensive ritual speech.

³² Interestingly, this is not true of all practitioners attested in the Hittite corpus. For example, the ritual of Pabanegri, the *patili*-priest of Kizzuwatna, has only one incantation on the entire well-preserved tablet (and he twice cries out *keldi*, the Hurrian well-wishing word). The short “Ritual between the pieces” (CTH 426, no practitioner attested) has no incantations at all. Even the AZU-men, who are often compared to the Old Women, do not seem to have been as invested in ritual speech: CTH 484, the evocation ritual for the Gulšeš performed by a ^{LÚ}AZU, preserves only one (reasonably lengthy) incantation at the beginning; CTH 471, the ritual of Ammiḫatna, conducted by ^{LÚ.MEŠ}AZU and relatively well-preserved, preserves only four incantations—two of which, interestingly, are only indicated by saying that the ^{LÚ}AZU “charms” (*udnalliya*-) the ritual patient in Hurrian, a word never used for Old Woman incantations. Old Woman rituals of similar length and preservation rather have fifteen or twenty incantations. In CTH 472, the ritual of Ammiḫatna, Tulpi, and Madi (perhaps a different Ammiḫatna), most of the incantations are spoken not by the AZU-man, but by the “great pure woman of the temple,” whose general function is unclear. The AZU-men did recite long incantations on occasion, for example in the *itkalzi* ritual, but they did not use them as often as the Old Women did, and perhaps not in precisely the same way (see below).

³³ Tambiah, “The Magical Power of Words,” in *Culture, Thought, and Social Action: An Anthropological Perspective* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985), 29.

incantation. As a Hittite proverb puts it, ‘the tongue is a bridge.’”³⁴ The Old Women’s incantations were designed to integrate the physical and the supernatural worlds. In fact, all of the speech recorded in their texts can be interpreted as having this purpose: there are no instructions to the patient, descriptions of the purpose of the ritual,³⁵ or any other speech that is not somehow connected to the metaphysical world(s) the ritual is attempting to affect.³⁶ Rather, the Old Women would speak in order to explicitly link their physical actions and manipulation of objects to the untouchable supernatural forces that they were attempting to influence; and, on the other hand, to impose positive supernatural forces onto the physical body of the patient. On the one hand, this can be interpreted as for the purpose of ritual efficacy: e.g., that the speech was performative, enacting the ritual effects, and the physical action would not work, or would not work as well, without the incantation to direct it. On the other hand, one can consider the (wealthy and powerful) patients, who were an implicit audience for the incantations, even as the supernatural forces were the explicit audience. The incantations would make it clear to the patient that every action the practitioner took had a specific, targeted purpose. It seems most likely that both considerations were at work.

In addition, the incantations are often vital to a modern scholar’s understanding of how the ritual was supposed to work and what it was designed to accomplish; when incantations were not spoken, are not preserved, are too opaque to translate, or lack the context necessary to interpret them, the ritual acts also become difficult or impossible to interpret with any certainty,

³⁴ “From Cradle to Grave,” 36. Beckman prioritizes the role of the gods in these incantations more than I do—i.e., his idea is that the gods are persuaded that the evil is like an object, and so when the object is destroyed, they destroy the evil alongside it. In my opinion, the involvement of the gods vs. the practitioners’ own power in ritual efficacy is much more ambiguous (see below).

³⁵ Apart from the incipit, which is framed as speech but does not seem to be intended to be recited during a performance. For more on this topic, see the Introduction.

³⁶ It is possible to imagine that other kinds of speech might happen during a ritual performance—for example, when the text says something like, “The Old Woman seats the patient,” perhaps she would tell him to sit down. If so, it was not considered important enough to write down.

as will be seen immediately below in the following case study. To demonstrate the ways in which the above generalizations about Old Woman rituals were implemented, this chapter will include several case studies. The first is CTH 398, the Ritual of 𒂍𒌷𒍪𒌵, which, despite a few irregularities, is in many ways representative of the Old Woman corpus as it is preserved:

3.3.1: Case Study: CTH 398, the Ritual of 𒂍𒌷𒍪𒌵

This ritual is unique in the Old Woman corpus in that it has a named author who is male: 𒂍𒌷𒍪𒌵, an augur. The person who performs the bulk of the ritual acts, however, is an Old Woman. The augur's expertise in the matter must come from the fact that the ritual is designed to negate whatever prompted ominous bird-oracles threatening the well-being of the royal family. Overall, though, the ritual is extremely characteristic of Old Woman rituals, in that it is designed to extract evil from the patients (and in this case, their residence) and pacify deities. CTH 398 also has a protective element to it, which is less common but still present in a few other Old Woman texts. An edition of this and several other augurs' rituals has been published by Daliah Bawanypeck, in 2005.³⁷

The first part of CTH 398 takes place inside the palace. Ritual items are prepared by an anonymous "they," perhaps meaning the Old Woman and the augur in cooperation, or a group of augurs. They make a clay model of what they have seen, likely in the form of a bird or birds (the text is slightly broken at the beginning, but as Bawanypeck notes,³⁸ in addition to the fact that what was seen was surely a bird, a similar concretization of omens as birds is seen in CTH 393, the ritual of Anniwiyani, the mother of an augur). They moisten it with a feather and put it in a vessel filled with oil, which they cover. They also make another figurine, this one of tallow (its form is broken; Bawanypeck restores "donkey," which is not impossible, since a donkey is called

³⁷ *Die Rituale der Auguren*, cited above note 5.

³⁸ Pp. 154–55.

on to face down the evil omens later in the ritual) and put it in the vessel with the figurine of the omen. This is most likely an attempt to render the negative omen inert—first putting it in a concrete, controllable form, using a figurine, and then containing it in a vessel filled with a positive substance (oil is exclusively positive in Old Woman rituals) and a (presumably) stronger figurine to counter it.

They then roast a number of different kinds of grains and seeds and extinguish the roasting fire with water, after which the augur and the Old Woman say together, “The gods have sent heralds here to us from heaven, (saying), ‘Go and drive the ominous thing out of the palace! Go and extinguish the terrible birds!’ Just as these seeds are extinguished, likewise let the ominous things and the terrible birds also be extinguished!”³⁹ Here, both of the primary methods used by Old Women are brought to bear: the agents of the gods are invoked and divine support is established, while at the same time, the bad omens are analogized as the soluble problem of burning grains, which are extinguished. Thus, the practitioners do not simply ask the heralds to drive away the evil, but also perform their own ritual acts. Extinguishing a fire in analogy to extinguishing evil is well-known in Old Woman rites (see ch. 4).⁴⁰

They then make twelve breads and twelve balls of dough, in preparation for a later act, and a puppy of tallow. They put the puppy on the palace door-bolt, and the Old Woman says, “You are the puppy of the king and queen’s table. Just as you do not let a stranger into the house

³⁹ KBo 4.2+ i 14 ka-a-ša-wa-an-na-aš ʔpí¹-i-e-er DINGIR^{MEŠ} ne-pí-ša-az LÚ^{MEŠ} GIŠ¹ GIDRU
 15 it-tén-wa-kán IŠ-TU É.GAL-LIM kal-la-ar INIM-tar pa-ra-a šu-u-wa-at-tén
 16 nu-wa i-it-tén h[a]-ʔtu¹-ga-uš MUŠEN^{III.A} ki-iš-ta¹-nu-ut-te-en
 17 nu-kán ke-e NUMU[N^{III}]^{rA1} ma-aḥ-ḥa-an ki-iš-ta-ri kal-la-a-ra-ia<<-ra-ia>>-kán
 18 ud-da-a-ar ḥa-tu-ga-ú-ša MUŠEN^{III.A} QA-TAM-MA ki-iš-ta-ru

Edited Bawanyeck, *Die Rituale der Auguren*, pp. 22–24. Bawanyeck does not interpret lines 15–16 as the heralds’ speech, but the disappearance of the quotative =wa after line 16 suggests to me that interpreting 15–16 as a quote-within-a-quote is most likely.

⁴⁰ There is also the possible interpretation of the seeds, which are equated to the evil, being rendered impotent through the roasting process. Bawanyeck subscribes to this interpretation, and cites several parallels (pp. 158–60), but none that are explicit about the function of the grain.

by day, do not let the ominous thing in tonight!”⁴¹ In this case, the incantation seems to be necessary to give the figurine its identity (loyal to, and protective of, the king and queen) and the agency for its task. Animal figurines, and calling on an animal to perform its normal function in ritual context, are both well-known from other Old Woman rituals (e.g., Tunnawiya’s “Ritual of the Ox”, CTH 409.IV, has a puppy lick away a patient’s affliction; see ch. 4 for more examples). Protective rites are less common in the Old Woman corpus than extraction and eradication of existing evil; however, this ritual is focused on future evil foretold by the augurs’ birds, and so protection for the royal couple is to be expected.

There follows a series of actions with cloth: the Old Woman binds the king and queen’s hands, feet, midsections, and necks, as well as the four corners, the threshold, and the door-bolt of the palace (presumably places where evil might enter or collect). She does this twice with *ašara*-⁴² cloth, which she twice cuts off and puts in her basket, and then a third time with red cloth, which she leaves overnight, while the twelve breads and balls of dough are left under the patient’s bed. She sleeps in the palace, and a live puppy sleeps inside as well. In the morning, she cuts off the red cloth and puts it in her basket. Unusually, no incantations are spoken during these actions, which limits any certainty of interpretation;⁴³ Bawanyepeck sees the cloth as having absorbent properties, so that when it is tied to the patients and the building, it takes in the evil, and “Im Morgengrauen nimmt die Ritualexpertin dann die symbolische Abtrennung der über Nacht absorbierten Unheilstoffe vor, in dem sie das rote Band abschneidet.”⁴⁴ While this

⁴¹ KBo 4.2+ i 23

zi-ik-wa-az

24 ŠA LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL GİŠBANŠUR-aš UR.TUR nu-wa-kán UD.ʽKAMʽ-az ma-aḥ-ḥa-an

25 da-ma-a-in an-tu-uḥ-ša-an pá-r-na-aš an-da Ú-UL tar-na-ši

26 ke-e-ti-ma-wa-kán GE₆-an-ti kal-la-ar ut-tar an-da le-e tar-na-at-ti

Edited *ibid.*, pp. 24–25.

⁴² The definition of *ašara*- is disputed; for a summary of the discussion, see below. It might either be “white” or “band/binding cloth.” Either possibility could fit here.

⁴³ See below and ch. 4.

⁴⁴ *Rituale die Auguren*, p. 165.

interpretation is possible, I prefer to interpret the cloth as *representing* the evil, instead of (or in addition to) absorbing it. Symbolic “binding” of a patient is relatively common in Old Woman rituals—much more common than absorption⁴⁵—and the fact that the Old Woman and the puppy sleep inside the palace fits well with the idea that the symbolic evil is also there throughout the night, and the practitioner and the dog are thus both guarding against it.

Bawanypeck also suggests that the red cloth symbolizes blood and therefore life-force, which makes it a better absorbent,⁴⁶ but the multivalence of blood in ritual context makes this only a speculative possibility;⁴⁷ colors are likewise a poor indicator of ritual force, since they can be multivalent even within a single text (see, e.g., the ritual of Allī, below). Rather than the cloth, I would argue that the bread and the dough, which Bawanypeck also interprets as absorbent,⁴⁸ should be considered as possessing life-giving substance, which is how another ball of dough will be used the next morning, and are left under the bed so as to lend that substance to the patients. The patients are therefore sustained and protected overnight in the face of the evil overlaying the house, represented by the cloth. (Another possibility is that, if the red color does represent life-force, the cloth would instead be an additional protective element.)

In the morning, after she cuts off the red wool, the Old Woman makes a ball of ground soapwort, and presses it to the king and queen’s bodies and around the building. She says, “Just as this soap cleans stained linens, and they become white, likewise let it also clean the bodies of the king, the queen, and the royal children, (and) the palace complex!”⁴⁹ She puts the ball in the

⁴⁵ *Contra* Bawanypeck; see ch. 4 for a discussion of both binding and absorption.

⁴⁶ P. 165.

⁴⁷ See Beckman, “Blood in Hittite Ritual,” *JCS* 63 (2011): 95–102.

⁴⁸ P. 161. She cites as parallels CTH 394, Ašhella’s ritual, and CTH 402, Allī’s ritual. It is my opinion that the bread and beer in CTH 394 are to be interpreted as offerings, rather than “die Übertragung der Krankheitserreger auf die Substitute...intensivieren.” For the grain and bread underneath the patient’s bed in CTH 402, see below.

⁴⁹ KBo 4.2+ i 44 ka-a-aš-wa GIM-an

45 ḫa-a-aš GADA^{HLA} iš-ku-na-an-ta¹ pár-ku-iz-zi nu-wa-ra-at ḫar-ke-e-eš-zi

46 ŠA LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL DUMU^{MES} LUGAL NÍ.TE-aš-ši-iš E^{HLA} LUGAL QA-TAM-MA pár-ku-ud-du

basket when she is finished. There should be no difficulty whatsoever in interpreting this analogical cleaning: the incantation creates a metaphor in which evil is dirt, and can be washed away with her cleansing agent. (The possibility of a secondary metaphor in which the cloth-as-symbolizing evil is considered to be cleaned as well should not be discounted.)

She then makes a ball of riverbank clay, and again presses it to the king and queen and the building; this time, she says, “Whatever evil thing the gods are foreseeing in this house, the house and the mortal will not conquer it. This riverbank clay has conquered it! Let it bring it back to the riverbank, and let the dark earth conquer it.”⁵⁰ She puts the clay balls down in her basket. This incantation is in the past tense, which may be a function of the riverbank clay’s power as opposed to the other items. Extinguishing fire and washing linen have only analogic force, whereas clay from the riverbank carries with it the power of DINGIR.MAH of the riverbank, a goddess who is capable of disposing of evil herself,⁵¹ and the underworld power of the “dark earth.” This incantation also acknowledges the powerlessness of the ritual patients against the omens, which is perhaps appropriate in a rite where the evil force is not concretized so that the practitioner can attack it with a physical object; rather the more powerful non-corporeal forces of the goddess and the underworld are brought to bear against it.

Following this, they make a ball of dough, and she repeats the pressing action, while saying, “Just as grain continually sustains the life of humanity, oxen, sheep, and any animal, likewise let this grain also sustain the lives of the king, the queen, and this house through the

Edited *ibid.*, pp. 26–27.

⁵⁰ KBo 4.2+ i 50 ku-it-wa-kán ku-it DINGIR^{MEŠ}

51 *I-NA É-TIM* kal-la-ar ut-tar EGIR-an uš-kán-zi nu-wa-ra-at-za É-TIM

52 DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-ia Ú-UL tar-uḫ-zi na-at-za ka-a-aš wa-ap-pu-wa-aš IM-aš

53 tar-uḫ-ḫa-an ḫar-zi na-at-za EGIR-pa wa-ap-pu-i pé-e-da-ú

54 na-at-za da-an-ku-i-iš KI-aš tar-ḫu-du

Edited *ibid.*

⁵¹ She is attested with a similar role in other texts, as Bawanypeck notes; see further below.

ominous things!”⁵² She once again puts the dough ball down in her basket. Following the driving out of the evil, then, the patients are still to be protected through analogy (and perhaps were already protected in the same way overnight, by the bread and the dough under the bed). Bawanypeck again interprets the dough as having absorbent properties,⁵³ but in my opinion there is nothing to indicate this. The incantation calls upon the dough’s nature as a source of nourishment and strength; it does not seem to be extracting evil. With the soap, the clay, and the dough, three different methods of addressing the evil are used: the evil is concretized as dirt and cleaned by the practitioner, divine force is called upon to combat it, and the patients are strengthened with positive force.

Finally, all of the items used thus far are swung around⁵⁴ the house three times in the Old Woman’s basket, while she says, “The heralds of the Storm-God have come here: let them drive out whatever ominous, evil thing is in this house! Let them bring the evil things out; let them take the copper spear and drive out the ominous thing!”⁵⁵ The swinging of the basket may be a final mopping-up action, or perhaps a demonstration to the heralds of what has already been done.⁵⁶ Incantations invoking the divine heralds therefore bracket the actions that the Old

⁵² KBo 4.2+ i 58 ḫal-ki-iš-wa ma-aḫ-ḫa-an NAM.LÚ.U₁₉.LU GU₄ UDU

59 ḫu-i-ta-ar-ra ḫu-u-ma-an ḫu-iš-nu-uš-ki-iz-zi LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL ki-i-ia

60 É-er ka-a-aš ḫal-ki-iš kal-la-ri-it ud-da-na-az QA-TAM-MA ḫu-iš-nu-ud-du

Edited by Bawanypeck, *Die Rituale der Auguren*, p. 28.

⁵³ *Rituale der Auguren*, p. 167. She again compares this to a similar rite in Allī’s ritual, which I likewise interpret as sustaining and not absorbent; see below.

⁵⁴ In Hittite, *šer arḫa wahnu-*; for an analysis of this difficult phrase, see ch. 4.

⁵⁵ KBo 4.2+ i 66 ka-a-ša-wa ŠA^dIM LÚ^{MES} GIS^dGIDRU ú-wa-an-te-eš₁₇ nu-wa-kán ku-it ku-it

67 kal-la-ar i-da-a-lu ut-tar ke-e-da-ni É-ri an-da

68 nu-wa-ra-at-kán pa-ra-a šu-u-wa-an-du nu-wa-kán i-da-a-lu ud-da-a-ar

69 pa-ra-a pé-e-da-an-du nu-wa-az^{GIS}tu-u-ri-in ku-wa-an-na-na-aš da-an-du

70 nu-wa-kán kal-la-ar ut-tar pa-ra-a šu-u-wa-an-du

Edited *ibid.*, pp. 28–29.

⁵⁶ Bawanypeck says, “Zweck des Schwenkritus ist zum einen die Herstellung eines Kontaktes zwischen den zu reinigenden Personen bzw. Lokalitäten und den kathartischen Materien, zum anderen die Übertragung der Unheilstoffe auf die Materien” (p. 168) both of which may be at work here, although surely there is some punctuating element to the rite as well.

Woman conducts without the augur in the house, though it should be noted that although they appear at the beginning and the end, they are not called upon at all in the interim.

They bring out the items from the palace (and set them somewhere that is not preserved in the text), and she waves a live puppy that spent the previous night in the house over the king and queen and toward the palace, and she says, referring to the puppy, “What[ever ominous] thing is in the bodies of the king (and) queen, and in the palace, thi[s donkey]: (his) penis is great, his heart is great; further, he, this donkey, [will] lift (the evil). He has conquered it: let him bring away the evil, o[minous thing]! Where the gods have designated it, let him bring it there.”⁵⁷ Bawanypeck notes the parallels to the rituals of Ašḫella and Puliša in this incantation;⁵⁸ it should further be noted that in those rituals, the animals are being praised explicitly so that they will be more desirable to the angry gods than the humans are, whereas here in CTH 398, the animal’s aggrandizement is to demonstrate its ability to lift the burden of evil and carry it away. Like the tallow puppy above, the live puppy is given a more powerful identity through an incantation. (Why they do not use a real donkey is not made clear.⁵⁹) It seems also as though the evil is once again being concretized, this time as a burden, which may be borne away by the

⁵⁷ KBo 4.2+ ii 8

LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL-wa-kán ku-it [ku-it kal-la-ar]

9 ut-tar NÍ.TE-ši an-da I-NA É-TI-ia-wa nu ka-¹a¹-[aš ANŠE²]

10 (over erasure) ^{UZU}ÚR-za šal-li-iš ŠÀ-ŠU-wa šal-li nam-ma-wa-ra-aš ANŠE-aš kar-pí-ia-[zi]

11 nu-wa-ra-at-za tar-uḫ-ḫa-an ḫar-zi nu-wa-kán i-da-a-lu ka[l-la-ar ut-tar]

12 pé-e-da-a-ú nu-wa-ra-at ku-wa-pí DINGIR^{MES} lam-ni-ia-an

13 ḫar-kán-zi nu-wa-ra-at a-pí-ia ar-nu-ud-du

Transliterated Bawanypeck, *Die Rituale der Auguren*, pp. 28 and 30. Restorations after Bawanypeck, with the exception of line 11, where she follows Starke (*Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*, p. 355 w. n. 1260) in emending/restoring i-da-a-lu <ut-tar> ka[l-la-ar] at the end of the line. While Starke is correct that ka[l-la-ar] already brings one over the edge of the tablet, line 27 of this column has ša-ra-a written almost entirely on the edge, so I see no reason the shorter [ut-tar] could not be restored. At the very least, if the text were to be emended, I would place the <ut-tar> in the break rather than before it, which would keep the word order more consistent with the rest of the text.

⁵⁸ Pp. 169–70.

⁵⁹ Mouton (“Rituels de ‘boucs émissaires’ en Anatolie hittite,” in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology Warsaw, 5–9 September 2011*, ed. P. Taracha with the assistance of M. Kapelusz [Warsaw: Agade, 2014], 559–60) suggests it is a scribal error which arose while adapting a text in which a donkey is used: “il me paraît alterner âne et chiot un phénomène purement scribal” (560).

standard beast of burden, the donkey. As they bring it out, they also pick up the tallow puppy from the door-bolt, while she continues, “Just as you did not let the ominous thing into the palace during the night, now, the ominous, evil things that the heralds of the gods drove out, do not let them back into the palace! Wherever, to whatever (place) that the gods have designated for them, let these ominous things go there!”⁶⁰ Now, the evil is considered to be an invading force, to be stopped by a guard dog and sent away.

The second half of the ritual, out on the steppe, is unfortunately much more fragmentary; however, some of the actions are complete enough to continue the analysis. After everything is brought out into the steppe and poured onto the ground, the Old Woman says, “We brought the terrifying birds that [...] to the horses as fodder and to the hounds as a sn[ack]. Let them take them there, and let [...] step away from the divine path!”⁶¹ This is yet another concretizing analogy: the evil will be disposed of like waste or perhaps even carrion, left out for the animals to eat. There is a clear progression to these final three metaphors: evil is lifted up like a burden to be taken away, guarded against like an invading force so it cannot come back, and left out to be disposed of like inert and/or dead waste or carrion.

Next, they dig a pit and bury something, perhaps the figurine of the evil omen that they made at the beginning of the ritual, which was brought out with the rest of the materials from the

⁶⁰ KBo 4.2+ ii 18 GE-az-wa-kán ma-aḥ-ḥa-an *I-NA É-TIM* kal-la-ar ut-tar an-da
 19 *Ú-UL* tar-na-aš ki-nu-na-wa-kán ku-e kal-la-ar i-da-a-lu
 20 ud-da-a-ar LU^{MES} GIŠ^{GIŠ} GIDRU ŠA DINGIR^{MES} pa-ra-a pé-ner^{er}
 21 nu-wa-ra-at EGIR-pa *I-NA É-TIM* le-e tar-na-ši
 22 nu-wa-aš-ma-aš ku-wa-pi DINGIR^{MES} ku-e-da-ni lam-ni-e-er nu-wa ke-e
 23 kal-la-ar ut-tar a-pi-ia pa-id-du

Transliterated *ibid.*

⁶¹ KBo 4.2+ ii 32 ku-i-e-eš-wa ḥa-tu-ga-e-eš wa-at-ta-e-eš nu-wa-r[a-]
 33 *A-NA ANŠE.KUR.RA*^{HLA} im-mi-ú-ul *A-NA UR.GI*^{HLA}-ma wa-g[e-eš-šar]
 34 ú-tum-me-en nu-wa-[r]a-at-za a-pi-ia da-an-du nu []
 35 *A-NA DINGIR-LI*[*M*] KASKAL-ši ar-ḥa ʾar-ta¹-ru

Transliterated *ibid.* p. 30. Restorations again after Bawanypeck, with the exception of lines 32 and 34; in line 32 she transliterates nu-wa-aš[according to the copy, which would be ungrammatical; the photo rather supports a possible r[a; in line 34: she suggests restoring “the heptad” here, which is plausible, given ^d7.7.BI’s association with evil omens in CTH 425 and CTH 433, but not assured, as they do not appear anywhere else in this particular text.

palace (as Bawanypeck notes, this would be parallel to CTH 393, Anniwiyani's ritual, in which clay birds are buried out on the steppe). There is an extremely fragmentary sequence involving a river (perhaps further disposal, or perhaps an invocation of DINGIR.MAH of the riverbank, whose power was called upon earlier), after which offerings are made, including the slaughter of a goat, and the bisection of the puppy after it is waved over the king and queen, followed by an incantation that seems to be requesting the gods' goodwill (also very fragmentary). Any interpretation of this sequence, beyond the supposition that they are soliciting help from the gods, would be too speculative, considering the fragmentary nature of the text. After this, they build three gates, at least one of which is of hawthorn, and then they set up the puppy of tallow and tell it not to let [the evil, presumably] go further [...]. There is then a passing-through rite, in which the king and queen go through the gate, while the Old Woman runs behind them. As Bawanypeck notes (with extensive citations),⁶² parallel texts strongly suggest that the evil is conceived of as being torn from them by the thorny wood of the gates (see ch. 4 for discussion of these types of rites). There follow some more actions which are too fragmentary for analysis.⁶³

After the passing-through rite is another incantation requesting the gods' help, and then the king and queen wash in the river, there are more offerings, and the final incantation is the Old Woman (or perhaps the augur?) telling the Sun-God that (s)he has removed the evil omens, and asking for good omens in the future: "*Malali*-Sun-God...I made on this day...the ominous...I removed...Build me...*šarla*-[...] road! The good birds I ask for, continuously give them to me there!"⁶⁴ It can be seen, then, that in this text the rites of disposal involve more requesting aid

⁶² Pp. 175–78.

⁶³ See Bawanypeck, 178–79, for some speculations.

⁶⁴ KBo 4.2+ iii 35 ma-la-li-Γ¹eš^dUTU-uš ku-x-[]
 36 ke-e-da-ni UD.KAM-ti i-ia-nu-un nu-w[a-r]a-az kal-la-a[r]
 37 a-wa-an ar-ḥa ti-it-ta-nu-nu-un nu-w[a]-mu šar-la-x[]
 38 KASKAL-an ú-i-ta-at-te-en nu-wa ku-i-e-eš MUŠEN^{HLA} SIG₅ []

directly from the gods than the rites of extraction do, and are accompanied by offerings. The end of the text likewise involves offerings and a request for divine favor, appropriate to wrap up the ritual.

The progression of the ritual is thus as follows: the omens are concretized as figurines and then rendered (presumably) inert by their placement in oil with another figurine to counter them. The heralds are called upon, while the omens are encouraged to disappear, like an extinguished fire. Then protection is set up, in case the foretold evil arrives. The evil inside the house is symbolically cut off twice using the cloth, and then whatever remains is symbolized by red cloth overnight, while the patients are protected (by the Old Woman and the puppy) and sustained (by the bread and dough under their bed) throughout the night. There follow the three incantations accompanying balls pressed to the king and queen: first soapwort, to clean them of contamination as though it is dirt; then river-clay, to conquer the evil once and for all and bring it away to the underworld domain where it belongs; and finally grain, to sustain them in the future. The heralds are called upon again; they seem to be functioning as general divine support for the ritual actions, and are invoked at the beginning and end of the rites in the house. Finally, as they exit the house, the two puppies, the one live and the other of tallow, are told to take the evil away (as a donkey) and keep it from coming back (as a guard dog), respectively. The ritual paraphernalia, and any evil adhering to it or symbolized by it, is disposed on the steppe like carrion, after which (perhaps) the omens are buried, and something else may be thrown into a river, or the riverbank-goddess called upon, or both. There are sacrifices and appeals to the gods, after which the king and queen cleanse themselves with a passing-through rite. There are more

39 ú-e-wa-ak-mi¹ nu-wa-ra-aš-mu a-pí-ia pí-iš-kat-te-[en]

For this passage, see Lorenz and Taş, “Zwei neue Anschlüsse zu hethitischen Beschwörungsritualen,” *KASKAL* 9 (2012): 45–46, where the new join, Bo 8293, is incorporated (with photos of the fragment). I modify their transliteration only in line 36: nu-¹wa¹-az is not grammatical, and the traces in the photo are compatible with a RA.

appeals to the gods, the king and queen bathe in the river, and finally there are more offerings, and the last request to the Sun-God for good things in the future, now that the evil has been removed.⁶⁵

CTH 398 is an excellent example of the two methods of addressing noncorporeal evil discussed above: sometimes the Old Woman renders evil concrete using any of a number of different metaphors, and physically addresses that metaphor in some way, and sometimes she calls upon another noncorporeal power to combat the evil. These two methods, and the various ways they are put into play, will be the primary subject of the next two chapters. Incantations, as already noted, are a vital part of the Old Women's ritual practice and figure prominently in both of the methods to be discussed; they will be the focus of the remainder of this chapter. We will begin with what is often the first incantation in a ritual text: the appeal to the god.

3.3.2: The participation of deities in ritual

Every Old Woman ritual text of reasonable preservation attests some kind of address to or invocation of a deity. In some of them, a pattern to these addresses can be identified: for example, we have already seen a certain structural element to appeals to deities in CTH 398. In that text, the divine heralds are called upon at the beginning and the end of the rites inside the palace, but not during the bulk of the rites themselves. During the disposal on the steppe, the passing-through rite, and the ritual washing in the river, there are a number of offerings and appeals to gods, and the ritual ends with divine appeal. A similar, though not identical, structure can be seen in some of the other Old Woman rituals. Most are not complete enough for structural analysis, so this discussion will be focused on the few that are: CTH 391, Ambazzi's ritual, CTH

⁶⁵ Bawanypeck rather breaks up the ritual structure thus: "Vorbereitende Handlungen," with the omen- and donkey-figurines; "Ritualhandlungen," the roasted seeds up through the passing-through rite, "Entsorgung der Schadensstoffe," with offerings and burying, "Besänftigungs- bzw. Versöhnungsoffer," "Reinigungsriten," and "Dankopfer (und) Kultmahl" (p. 153).

402, Allī's ritual, CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual against domestic dispute, CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya's "Ritual of the River," and CTH 416, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple.

In several of these rituals, the appeal to the deity comes at the very beginning. Haas describes this as "Die Legitimation des Akteurs des Rituals"; he says, "Zu Beginn des eigentlichen Ritualgeschehens, d.h. nach der Zurüstung der Ritualien, stellt der Akteur des Rituals eine Beziehung zwischen sich und den Göttern her,"⁶⁶ thus presumably to establish and/or demonstrate divine support of the practitioner. The universality of his statement is misleading; one of the two passages he cites comes from tablet 6 of Allaiturahhi's ritual CTH 780.II, not from the beginning, and there are a number of rituals in which an appeal to a deity is not the first move; for example, CTH 391 and CTH 416, above, do not begin with appeals. However, many rituals do open this way, and as noted above, gods are always addressed somewhere in the text. This can be seen both as enlisting divine support (or the appearance of same) and, as Haas puts it, "die Beschwörungen erfolgen auf zwei Ebenen—der göttlichen und der menschlichen," though I would prefer to say that the divine level is being brought down to the human sphere through the incantations. That is, the ritual action is performed by humans, but some element of the divine is, after this stage, also present.

Haas' prime example for "Legitimation" is CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya's "Ritual of the River." At the beginning of this ritual, Tunnawiya goes to the riverbank and makes offerings, while saying, "DINGIR.MAḪ of the riverbank, I have hereby come back to you! You, DINGIR.MAḪ of the riverbank where this clay is taken, take your hand and scrub(?) this ritual patient with it, and purify his/her twelve body parts!"⁶⁷ Then she takes clay to use in the ritual; it

⁶⁶ *Geschichte*, 891.

⁶⁷ KUB 7.53+KUB12.58 i 30 wa-ap-pu-wa-aš dMAḪ-aš ka-a-ša EGIR-pa tu-uk ú-wa-nu-un nu-kán ka-a-aš IM-aš
31 ku-e-ez wa-ap-pu-wa-az da-an-za nu zi-ik wa-ap-pu-aš dMAḪ tu-e-el
32 ŠU-TI-KA da-a nu ku-u-un [E]N.SISKUR a-pé-e-ez ša-pí-ia-i na-an 12 ^{UZU}ÚR

will be made into figurines, and it can therefore be assumed that the goddess of the riverbank's power imbues those figurines as they are used. What Haas does not note is that with this incantation, the Old Woman asserts an existing relationship with the deity: she says, "I have hereby come *back* to you," demonstrating to the audience and/or to the goddess that she has been here before and the goddess knows her. She also demonstrates that later, it will be the hand of DINGIR.MAḪ of the riverbank reaching out through the clay to purify the patient—similar to the passage in CTH 398 where the riverbank clay is pressed to the patients' bodies. The efficacy of the ritual is therefore both assumed (given her relationship to the goddess) and requested in the same incantation.⁶⁸ The ritual proceeds without any further mention of DINGIR.MAḪ, however, until it is nearly at an end: after the patient has been entirely cleansed of evil, the Old Woman returns to the riverbank, makes more offerings, and says, "DINGIR.MAḪ of the riverbank, the twelve body parts have hereby been cleansed and purified by your hand!" and follows with a similar incantation to the Sun-God, who did not appear earlier, and at the very end of the ritual is a sequence of generous offerings to both deities, including animal sacrifices and a ritual meal. Appeals to deities therefore bracket the entire ritual, similar to how the episode inside the palace is bracketed by the heralds of the gods in CTH 398.

A very similar format is seen in CTH 402, the ritual of Allī against sorcery, which begins with a brief presentation of the figurines representing the sorcerers to the Sun-God, and ends with a similar offering sequence and ritual meal to the Sun-God and DINGIR.MAḪ of the riverbank. Allī, however, does call upon the gods in the middle of her ritual: after she has performed her rites of extraction, the gods are asked to help with and maintain the disposal, and

33 pár-ku-nu-ut

Edited by Goetze, *Tunnawi*, p. 6. For a discussion of *šapiya*- "scrub(?)," and the related verbs, see CHD Š s.v. *šapp*-, p. 202, and s.v. *šapiya*- B, p. 206; whatever its origin and exact meaning, the sense in this text is quite clear.

⁶⁸ *Geschichte*, 891.

then the final section of the ritual calls upon the gods for protection (see below for a detailed analysis of this ritual). The extraction of evil, therefore, is bracketed by divine appeal, again similar to CTH 398. The ritual of Ayatarša, CTH 390A, likewise starts out with an appeal to the Sun-God for the health of her patient, accompanied in this case by offerings, but the end of her text is broken, and so there is no way to tell if there was also an appeal when the ritual was over.

There is also an appeal to a god at the beginning of CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual against domestic quarrel. Maštigga opens the ritual with offerings to the Sun-God and an incantation: "Sun-God, my lord: I have set out venomous(?) tongues here for you; today they will hereby treat the tongues for them under the Sun(-God)." ⁶⁹ A relationship is again asserted with "my lord"; the presentation of the tongues to the Sun-God, as well as the assertion that the ritual will be performed under the Sun-God's eye, all set up his presence as an assumed reality throughout the ritual. This is the only appeal to him, or to any other deity, in Maštigga's ritual; there is no offering sequence with sacrificial animals like there is at the end of CTH 398 and CTH 409.I, although offerings of bread and wine are made (without mention of a specific deity) throughout the ritual. It is, however, quite interesting that in CTH 404.2, Miller's "Analogous Text," which seems to be a poorly-remembered, out-of-sequence *aide-mémoire* or similar for CTH 404.1, ⁷⁰ a fragmentary offering sequence *is* preserved. It can thus be inferred that in the mind of at least one Hittite scribe, such an offering sequence was expected.

⁶⁹ KBo 39.8 i 23 ^dUTU-i iš-ḫa-a-mi ka-a-ša-wa-at-ta
 24 pa-ra[(-a)] ti-it-[(t)]a-nu-nu-un ma-an-ta-al-li-i-e-^reš¹
 25 ^rEME^{III.A}-eš¹ nu-w[a]-aš-ma-aš ka-a-^rša¹ ke-e-da-ni UD-ti ^DUTU-i
 26 k[(at-ta-an)] ^rEME^{III.A} ^ra¹[(ni-i)]a-an-zi

(Restorations from dup. KBo 44.17 i 23'ff.) Edited by Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, p. 64. Miller translates ^dUTU-*i kattan* as "for the Sun-God below," but I would expect any mention of a sun-deity "below" to be the Sun-Goddess of the Earth, who would be written instead *taknaš* ^dUTU and referred to as "my lady" rather than "my lord." An interpretation of *kattan* as a postposition communicating "under the Sun-God" seems much more plausible, both here and when the expression is used again later in the ritual.

⁷⁰ See Marcuson and van den Hout, "Memorization."

Another example of an introductory appeal to the gods is from CTH 780.II, Allaiturahhi's ritual, though it is not the passage cited by Haas above. This incantation is also not the first one in the text—Allaiturahhi begins by discussing the problem of the enemy sorcerer (see below)—but it comes early in the ritual, in col. ii of the first tablet. The lines preceding this section are broken, but what is preserved reads:

⁷² CTH 760.II, a Luwian ritual, has a fragmentary incantation in which ^dAtaliya appears to be cutting evils such as *wahra*- “woe” and *hirut*- “curse”; CTH 458.1 has another fragmentary incantation in which ^dAntaliya is said to be turning [something] with a knife.

“I will bring [woo]d(?) (and) water, and I will bring [...] from the *lablana*-wood. I [will] raise the virgin earth. We will ask the ancient gods, [Erešk]igal and the Anunnaki, and [we will] not rebel against them. We will ask [...], and we will not call them for quarrel. This person’s [...] and [thi]s person’s form, for his/her well-being, we will give a part to them. [...] We will set up the rite for them.”⁷³

Despite the lacunae, it is clear that in this case, Allaiturahhi is claiming the ritual actions for her own, but joining with the ritual patient in appealing to the deities. This incantation is also much more of an entreaty, or anticipation of an entreaty; there are no assumptions, nothing is in the past tense (thus suggesting a *fait accompli*), and there is noticeable caution about behaving correctly. This could be because of the nature of the deities involved: Ereškigal and the Annunaki are powerful Mesopotamian underworld gods, and Allaiturahhi is less diffident with other deities. Soon after this incantation, she goes, as Tunnawiya did, to the riverbank, breaks bread, and says, “Eat, fate-goddesses of the riverbank! If a man of sorcery, an evil person, has given this person’s statue to the riverbank or to the river’s current, now give it back to him!”⁷⁴ It is not unusual for ritual practitioners to use the imperative with gods, particularly when accompanying their commands with offerings (the *do ut des* deal of food in exchange for

⁷³ KUB 12.50 ii x+1 [nu GIŠ[?]]-[ru¹-[u]n wa-a-tar ú-d[(a-aḥ-ḥi GIŠ¹la-ab-la-na-za-ká)n...]

2’ [x ú-da-aḥ-ḥi dam-me-la-an d[a-g(a-zi-pa-an pá-r-ga-aḥ)-ḥi]

3’ [pu-n]u-uš-šu-u-e-ni ka-ru-ú-i-li-[(ia-aš DINGIR^{ME})^S]

4’ [EREŠ.K]I.GAL^dA-NUN-NA-AK-KI-ia na-aš Ú-[UL (BAL)-u-e-ni]

5’ [x-u-wa pu-nu-uš-šu-u-e-ni]

6’ [(Ú-UL-m)]a-aš šu-ul-la-an-ni ḥal-zi-ia-u-e-n[(i UN¹ ke-e-el)]

7’ [ke-e-el-l]a UN-aš e-eš-ri-še-et aš-šu-li[(-iš-ši)]

8’ [(nu-uš-ma)]-aš ḤA.LA pí-iš-ga-u-e-ni []

9’ [(nu-uš-m)]a-aš ḥa-az-zi-wi₅ ša-ra-a ti-i[t(-nu-um-me-e-ni)]

(Restorations from dup. KUB 58.74 obv. 1ff.) Edited by V. Haas, “Notizen zu den Ritualen der Frau Allaiturahi aus Mukiš,” *AoF* 34/1 (2007): 15. As Hittite has no separate future tense, the verbs might also be in the present; however, since this is the beginning of the ritual, I have chosen to translate them as future.

⁷⁴ KUB 17.27 ii 20’ e-ez-za-at-tén wa-ap-pu-wa-aš^dGUL-šu-uš nu ma-a-an ke-e-el¹UN¹-aš

21’ LA-AN-ŠU UḤ₇-na-aš LÚ ḤUL-aš UN-aš na-aš-šu wa-ap-pu-i

22’ na-aš-ma ÍD-aš a-ar-šar-šu-ri pa-iš ki-nu-na-at-ši EGIR-pa pé-eš-tén

Edited *ibid.* p. 16.

services is often very clearly implied), so Allaiturahhi is not being particularly presumptive here, but the earlier caution is missing. That caution may be in response to the underworld gods, but it also sets up a sense of danger to the ritual as a whole, coming so early.

Divine support, on the other hand, is more convincingly found in the passage cited by Haas, in the middle of the ritual rather than at the beginning or end. Allaiturahhi says, “While I have taken the sorcery from him/her through Ištar with words, with commands, with (my) tongue, I myself also have taken it from him/her. The words are of Ištar, but they are also incantations (for) mortals. Let them be for you, Ištar, ten times, and let them be for me once!”⁷⁵ Here, Allaiturahhi appears to be claiming that she is borrowing her incantations from the goddess, whose power thus imbues her words and adds to her own (considerable) skills (on this, see further below).

Sometimes, divine support is not established at the beginning of a ritual because the gods are the problem: the ritual is designed entirely to appeal to deities (or other supernatural forces) who are offended or hostile. These are cases in which caution like Allaiturahhi’s in the face of the underworld deities might be expected; however, it is not much in evidence. For example, in CTH 423, the evocation of the gods of an enemy nation, the Old Woman sets up the items for the invocation and then says, “I have hereby placed for you, O deities of the enemy city, a decorated drinking-vessel, and I have also placed tables adorned [on the] r[ight] and left for you, and I have laid down paths for you with white, red, and blue cloth—let these cloth paths be for you! Walk

⁷⁵ KBo 12.85++ i 33 UH₇-tar-ma-aš-ši ^dIŠ²STAR-za me-mi-ia-[n(a-a)]z wa-tar-na-aḥ-ḥa-¹az¹

34 EME-za ar-ḥa da-aḥ-ḥu-u-un ú-uq-q[a-(at-š)]i-ia-at-¹kán¹

35 ar-ḥa da-aḥ-ḥu-u-un ŠA ^dIŠ²STAR ud-da-¹a¹-[a]¹r

36 DUMU.LÚ^{MEŠ}.¹U₁₉.¹LU-ma-at ḥu-uk-ma-uš tu-uk-at A-NA ^dIŠ²STAR

37 10-ŠU e-eš-du ú-uq-qa-at 1-ŠU ¹e¹-eš-du

See Haas and Wegner, *ibid.*, 126–27, for the edition; for this passage in particular see also Beckman’s review of Haas and Wegner (*BiOr* 48 [1991]: 583).

out over them! Turn in benevolence toward the king, and further, step away from your land!”⁷⁶

There is obviously no assumed relationship to be had with enemy gods, but even absent that, this is a straightforward Hittite *evocatio*, with no hesitation or assumption of danger.

A bit more circuitous appeal is found in CTH 433, the small group of rituals designed to pacify the tutelary deity of the hunting-bag and the divine heptad (a dangerous group of deities).⁷⁷ Unfortunately, none of the three texts is preserved at the very beginning, so we cannot know how the Old Woman introduced the ritual action. It is clear, however, that the augurs have done something to anger these deities. The Old Woman invokes the tutelary deity itself, with offerings, but immediately follows this with another incantation:

“But just as man encircles you, the hearth, by [day], the gods will encircle you by night, and if the gods ask you thus: ‘What is this that they have been doing? Have they invoked the tutelary deity of the hunting-bag and the heptad?’

“You, O hearth, also speak favorably across to the tutelary deity of the hunting-bag, the heptad, and to all of the gods: ‘Be inclined benevolently toward the king, the queen, and the royal children! Constantly give them life (and) vigor!’

⁷⁶ KUB 7.60 ii 22 ka-a-ša-wa šu-ma-a-aš A-NA DINGIR^{MEŠ} []
23 URU-LIM LÚ.KÚR^{DUG} KA.GAG.A GUL-ša-an []
24 te-eḫ-ḫu-un^{GIŠ} BANŠUR^{HLA} -ia-aš-ma-aš Z[AG-az]
25 GÜB-la-az-zi-ia ú-nu-an-da te-eḫ-ḫu-u[n]
26 KASKAL^{MEŠ} -ia-wa-aš-ma-aš IŠ-TU TÚG BABBAR TÚG SA₅
27 TÚG ZA.GIN kat-ta-an iš-pár-ra-aḫ-ḫu-un
28 nu-uš-ma-aš ke-e TÚG^{HLA} KASKAL^{MEŠ} a-ša-a[(n-du)]
29 nu-kán ke-e-da-aš še-er ar-ḫa i-ia-an-ni-ia-tén
30 nu-kán A-NA LUGAL aš-šu-li an-da ne-ia-at-tén
31 šu-me-el-ma A-NA KUR-TI a-wa-an ar-ḫa
32 nam-ma ti-ia-at-tén

(Restorations from dup. VBoT 67 + KBo 43.52 obv. 9’ff.). Edited by F. Fuscagni, “Una nuova interpretazione del rituale CTH 423,” *KASKAL* 4, (2007): 189.

⁷⁷ See Archi, “The Heptad in Anatolia,” *Hethitica* XVI (2010): 21–34.

“May the children (and) the descendents of the king (and) queen encircle you, the hearth, forever and ever. Also, constantly give the way to them! Constantly give the way to the augurs!”⁷⁸

She follows this with an analogic rite accompanied by another incantation: she mixes bread with sheep fat, offers a little to the tutelary deity, and then puts it into the augurs’ mouths and says,

“Tutelary deity of the hunting-bag and the heptad:

“Once more throw away evil, anger, and sullenness! Let the fat-bread lie once more in their mouths, and let oil flow forth from their mouths! If some augur has said an evil word before the god, or some (augur) has angered you,

“let the augurs’ mouths also be wiped clean by the fat-bread.”⁷⁹

The Old Woman uses two different strategies to deal with the angry deities: she calls upon an intercessor, the genius of the hearth—who, one may assume, is a friendly, benevolent deity—alongside her invocation of the tutelary deity itself. Therefore, although some of the gods are

⁷⁸ KBo 17.105+ ii 15’ tu-ga ḥa-a-aš-ša-an ma-aḥ-ḥa-an [UD-a]z DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU an-da ḥu-u-la-li-iš-ki-iz-z[i]
16’ iš-pa-an-da-az-ma-at an-da DINGIR^{MES}-eš ḥu-u-la-a-le-eš-kán-zi
17’ nu-ut-ta ma-a-an DINGIR^{MES} ki-iš-ša-an pu-nu-uš-ša-an-zi ki-i-wa
18’ ku-it i-e-eš-šir ^dLAMMA ^{KUS}kur-ša-aš-wa ^d7.7.BI-ia mu-^lki^l-iš-ki-ir

19’ na-aš-ta zi-ig-ga ḥa-aš-ša-a-aš A-NA ^dLAMMA ^{KUS}kur-ša-aš ^d7.7^l.BI
20’ Û A-NA DINGIR^{MES} ḥu-u-ma-an-da-a-aš pa-ra-a-an-da a-aš-šu me-^lmi^l-iš-ki
21’ LUGAL-wa-kán MUNUS.LUGAL-ri A-NA DUMU^{MES} LUGAL an-da a-šu-ú-li ne-^le-ia^l-an-te-eš
22’ e-eš-tén nu-wa-aš-ma-aš TI-tar in-na-a-ra-u-wa-tar pí-iš-ki-tén

23’ nu-wa tu-uk ḥa-aš-ša-a-an uk-tu-u-ri-pát LUGAL-wa-aš MUNUS.LUGAL-aš DUMU^{MES} LUGAL
24’ ḥa-aš-še-eš ha-a-an-za-aš-še-eš an-da ḥu-u-la-li-iš-kán-du KASKAL-an-na-wa-aš-ma-aš
25’ pí-iš-ki-tén A-NA ^{LÚ.MES}MUŠEN.DÙ-wa KASKAL-an pí-iš-ki-tén

See also the edition by Bawanypeck, *Die Rituale der Auguren*, p. 88.

⁷⁹ KBo 17.105+ ii 31’ ^dLAMMA ^{KUS}kur-ša-aš ^d7.7.BI-aš-ša

32’ i-da-a-lu-un kar-di-mi-ia-at-ta-an ša-a-u-wa-ar ar-ḥa nam-ma
33’ pé-eš-ši-ia-tén nu-uš-ma-aš-kán PU-U-i-ia-aš-mi NINDA.Ì.E.DÉ.A nam-ma ki-it-ta-ru
34’ na-aš-ma-aš-kán KAXU-az pa-ra-a Ì-an ar-aš-du ma-a-an ^{LÚ}MUŠEN.DÙ
35’ ku-iš-ki PA-NI DINGIR-LIM i-da-a-lu ut-tar me-mi-an ḥar-zi na-aš-ma-at-kán
36’ kar-di-ma-nu-wa-an ku-iš-ki ḥar-zi

37’ na-aš-ta ^{LÚ.MES}MUŠEN.DÙ-ia ^{UZU}KAXU-ŠU-NU IŠ-TU NINDA.Ì.E.DÉ.A ar-ḥa
38’ a-an-ša-an-te-eš a-ša-an-du

Edited *ibid.*, pp. 88–89.

angry, there is still one god on her side, who, the incantation suggests, has the ear of the rest of the gods, and may persuade them to help. Secondly, she performs an analogic rite, which provides some incentive (in the form of the desirable fat-bread) and perhaps additional power to her entreaty and offerings; in addition, during the rite, she reminds the gods that the augurs were once in their favor (“Once more”) and could be again, and cleanses their mouths with more fat-bread.

The classic Hittite examples of angry and recalcitrant deities are, of course, the myths of the disappearing gods. As demonstrated in ch. 1, the ritual actions in CTH 323, the Disappearance of the Sun-God, and potentially also those in CTH 324, the Disappearance of Telipinu, were performed by Old Women. Here, the Old Women make use of *historiolae*, mythological stories connected to ritual action (see below), as well as extensive fine offerings and analogies (see also below). There is not, however, any protestation of innocent intentions or actions, as in Allaiturahhi’s ritual (e.g., “I am not rebelling...” or similar). In fact, at least in Telipinu’s myths,⁸⁰ the practitioner’s statements are all, again, positive *faits accomplis*, e.g., “I have taken” (Telipinu’s anger, rage, etc.). It seems, therefore, that even when gods were angry or hostile, the Old Women had tools at their disposal to counter the displeasure, convince the deities to change their minds, and turn the situation to their patients’ advantage. As already seen above in CTH 433, those tools could take the form of help from other, friendly deities.

This is certainly true in the Disappearance of Telipinu, where the ritual action is introduced as the goddess Kamrušepa’s actions, rather than a mortal’s. As noted above in ch. 1, it is clear from the text that a human practitioner, perhaps an Old Woman, was also performing the

⁸⁰ Unfortunately, for the most part, the past tense first-person statements from ^fAnnanna in the Disappearance of the Sun-God are too fragmentary and difficult to understand. She does make the relatively confident statement, “If Telipinu is troublesome for anyone, I speak the wor[ds] of the gods and I [in]voke him” (ma-a-an-ša-an / ^dTe-li-pi-nu-ša ku-e-da-ni-ik-ki na-ak-ke-eš-zi ú-ga DINGIR^{MES}-aš u[d-da-ar] / [me]-ma-ah-hi ta-an mu-ga-mi, VBoT 58 iv 8-10.)

ritual, which contains incantations and actions with many parallels elsewhere in the Old Woman ritual corpus, and that the mythological section was a *historiola* (see below). An assumption of the identity of Kamrušepa would allow a greater confidence on the practitioner's part when facing another angry deity; this would also be quite a strong assertion of a relationship with this particular god. Kamrušepa was a goddess associated with magic, and a similar myth-ritual text (practitioner unattested) ends with the sentence, "The words (are) not mine; (they are) the words of Kamrušepa,"⁸¹ which is quite reminiscent of Allaituraḫḫi's claiming the words of Ištar, above.⁸² Speaking incantations that were literally the words of the gods could function as a way of bringing the power of the divine world into the physical actions of the ritual, while also imbuing the practitioner herself with a sense of divine power.⁸³ This is also, again, reminiscent of Maštigga's statement that it was ^dAndaliya who cut the patients' tongues, although Maštigga performed the physical action of cutting the thread.

One final way in which the Old Women might assert a relationship with a deity could be with a foreign language. Many Old Woman rituals had incantations spoken in languages other than Hittite, such as Luwian, Hattian, Palaic, and Hurrian. In these rituals, the description of the action is always in Hittite; it is the incantations that are in foreign languages. Although sometimes the incantations were translated into Hittite (for example, Allaituraḫḫi's second ritual, CTH 780.II, which seems to be a revised and expanded version of CTH 780.I with many of the incantations translated into Hittite), or parallel Hittite-language rituals were developed (for example, Tunnawiya's CTH 409.II, which is not a translation of the Luwian CTH 760.II, but

⁸¹ KUB 33.52 (CTH 336.1) iii 9' *Ú-UL* am-me-el ud-da-a-ar ^dKam-ru-še-pa-aš ud-da-a-a[r]. A similar passage occurs in Ḫantitaššu's ritual (see B.J. Collins, "The Place of *KBo* 13.145 in the Ḫantitaššu Text Tradition," in *Beyond Hatti. A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, ed. B.J. Collins and P. Michalowski [Atlanta, Lockwood Press: 2013], 67).

⁸² It is not clear if here the practitioner was assuming Kamrušepa's identity—as seems to be the case in CTH 324—or if the words were simply thought to be authored or somehow otherwise belong to Kamrušepa.

⁸³ For more examples of divine words, see Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, pp. 881–82.

certainly closely parallels it),⁸⁴ quite a few texts with foreign-language incantations were copied into the thirteenth century. One plausible explanation for this is that it was considered best to use the language most appropriate to the deities in the ritual; Allaituraḫḫi's ritual includes Hurro-Mesopotamian gods such as Teššub, Ḫebat, Kumarbi, and (as seen above) Ereškigal and the Annunaki, while the Luwian rituals regularly address (in the vocative) *warpalli Tarhunza*, a Storm-God with a Luwian epithet, and refer also to the male Luwian Sun-God, Tiwat. The Palaic rituals address Ziparwa/Zaparwa and the Palaic pantheon, while the Hattian rituals include Telipinu. It is also possible that foreign languages were used out of respect for a certain author or tradition, or to lend a ritual a sense of mystery (though there were certainly speakers of Hurrian and Luwian, at least, at the Hittite court), but it seems likely that the deities were considered to respond best to their own languages. This might also be supported by the festival texts, in which similar foreign-language incantations were sometimes used to celebrate deities of the appropriate geographic origin.

Sometimes the Old Women had to deal with forces that we might anachronistically term demons—the Hittites had no word to distinguish lesser supernatural forces from gods, but there are certain gods who appear exclusively, or almost exclusively, in ritual context, where they are making trouble for a patient and must be diverted or banished, rather than appeased. For example, in the first of the three nearly-identical rituals recorded in CTH 391.1, the Ritual of Ambazzi, Ambazzi performs an analogic rite to purify her patients and then says, “^dZarniza, ^dTarpatašša: do not keep striking them any longer—go and henceforth strike this do[or-latch]! Drive the evil do[wn off] of them.”⁸⁵ She offers the divine entities an alternate target—why the

⁸⁴ It should be noted that this is an assumption; it is not impossible that existing Hittite-language incantations or compositions were modified into foreign languages, rather than the other way around.

⁸⁵ KUB 9.25++ i 30 [(^dZa-ar-ni)-za ^dTa(r-pa-at-t)a-aš]-^rši¹-iš le-e-wa-r[u-uš]
31 [(nam-ma za-aḫ-ḫi-iš-ki-ši i-i)]t-wa-za ku-u-un ^{GIS}t[ar-zu-un]

door-latch is attractive as such is not clear—to encourage them to leave the patient alone and take their evil with them. Soon after this, she performs an analogic rite to move the evil from the patients to a mouse (see further below), and after she lets it go, she says, “^dZarni[za], ^dTarpatašša: You take [th]is! We will [giv]e [you] something [else] to eat!”⁸⁶ Here, the attraction of the alternate target is quite clear: the proposed offering is to take the place of the patient. There follows a broken section that, based on the parallel rites, included an animal sacrifice as a substitute for the divine entities to eat, and perhaps also an offering of precious metals and stones. In the second ritual on the tablet, addressing a different hostile entity, that offering is followed by another incantation:

“[Alauwai]ma, [I have] hereby [given] you silver, gold, (and) lapis: you go and speak well for me before the gods!

“Give [...]iauwat, and give sight to my eyes! If another one [speak]s evil before (you), since you are powerful, speak well [before] all of the gods [for me]!”⁸⁷

This implies that the entities’ negative attention may have been solicited by another human—a common theme in Old Woman rituals against evil—and that Ambazzi has now co-opted this one to intercede on her behalf with the gods. There is no assumption of friendliness and existing

32 [(^rnam-ma¹ za-aḫ-ḫi-iš-ki nu-wa-aš)]-ma-aš i-da-a-lu kat-t[a-an ar-ḫa]

33 [(n)]a-an-ni

(Restorations from dup. KBo 53.21 i 2’ff.) Edited Christiansen, *Ambazzi* p. 38.

⁸⁶ KUB 9.25++ i 42 [(^dZa-ar-n)i-za ^d]rTar-pa¹-at-ta-aš-ši-iš

43 [ku-u]-un-za zi-i[(k da-a a-da-an-na-ma-a)t-ta da-ma]-^ri¹-in

44 [pí-i]-ú-e-ni

(Restorations from dup. KBo 53.21 i 13’ff.); Edited *ibid.* p. 40.

⁸⁷ KUB 9.25+KUB 27.67 ii 63 [^dA-la-u-wa-i]-^rmi¹ ka-a-ša-at-ta KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.SIG₁₇^{NA4}ZA.GÌN

64 [pé-eḫ-ḫu-un] zi-ik-mu i-it PA-NI DINGIR^{MES} a-aš-šu me-mi-iš-ki

65 [i]a-u-wa-ar pa-a-i IGI^{HI.A}-aš-mu ú-wa-a-tar pa-a-i

66 [ma]-^ra¹-an pé-ra-an i-da-a-lu da-ma-iš

67 [me-ma]-i zi-ga-az da-^raš¹-šu-uš ku-it

68 [nu-mu]-kán ḫu-u-ma-an-da-aš DINGIR^{MES}-aš

69 [pé-ra-an] a-aš-šu me-mi-iš-ki

Restorations after *ibid.* p. 48.

relations such as is seen in the Old Woman’s appeal to the hearth in CTH 433.2; rather, this seems to be more in the nature of a straightforward bribe.

Another ritual dealing with what might be called “demons” is CTH 397, Ḫebatarakki’s ritual. This text is unfortunately quite fragmentary, but the first few paragraphs are fully-preserved. Ḫebatarakki begins by making a dough to press on the patient’s body—including, among other things, incense, goat hair, gypsum, and dog excrement—as well as two figurines, which she sets on the patient’s shoulders. She begins speaking: “I have set ^dAgalmati up far away from you, while I have divorced ^dAnnamiluli completely from your head! I have extinguished the fire on your head, and I have set it alight on the head of the sorcerer...”⁸⁸ Here, she presents her victory over the divine entities as a *fait accompli*, and turns her attention almost immediately to the rival practitioner, to whose work the rest of the preserved section of col. i is dedicated. Though she may have returned her attention to ^dAgalmati and ^dAnnamiluli later in the ritual—particularly if they are represented by the figurines, although this is not made clear—from the available evidence, they seem to have been easily dealt with.

In both Ambazzi’s ritual and in Ḫebatarakki’s, the incantations addressing the divine entities bring the physical world and the supernatural world into closer connection: the physical ailment is assigned a supernatural cause when they address the supernatural entities behind it. The resolution in this case is the opposite: the entities are pacified or distracted, removing the supernatural cause (and thus hopefully curing the affliction). Similarly, in the disappearing god myths, and in CTH 433.2, problems such as weather or difficulty with augury are given divine agency, and when the gods are appeased, the danger from these divinities is (or should be) gone.

⁸⁸ KUB 24.14 i 18 ^dA-gal-ma-ti-in-ta’ a-wa-an ar-ḫa ti-it-ta-nu-nu-un
 19 ^dA-an-na-mi-lu-li-in-ma-ták-kán SAG.DU-az a-wa-an ar-ḫa
 20 šu-wa-nu-un A-NA SAG.DU-KA-ma-ad-du-uš-ša-an pa-aḫ-ḫur
 21 ki-iš-ta-nu-nu-un na-at-ša-an al-wa-zé-ni UN-ši
 22 SAG.DU-i wa-ar-nu-nu-un

This can be contrasted to the situations in the other example texts, in which the malevolent forces are human. In those cases, the origin of the problem is not a concern. Rather, the incantations are designed to get the gods' attention, remind them of an existing relationship, and/or use that existing relationship as a basis for the solution, bringing their divine force to bear against the noncorporeal evil the Old Woman is facing. They are often called upon at the beginning of a ritual or at the end, or both; however, sometimes in the course of ritual action, they are used to the practitioner's advantage in protective rites, rites of disposal, and in mythological recitations, or *historiolae*.

3.3.3: *Historiolae*

A *historiola* is a mythological story contained within a ritual. They are well-known in the Hittite ritual corpus, although there has not been much literature devoted to the general phenomenon in Hittite. Most scholarship on these *historiolae* has focused on mythological themes from historical perspectives,⁸⁹ sometimes with the primary goal of separating out various cultural traditions.⁹⁰ In this case, my goal is rather to demonstrate the ways in which *historiolae* are used in ritual, and how they contribute to ritual efficacy, and to come to a better understanding of the function and content of some of the specific *historiolae* in the Old Woman corpus.

⁸⁹ E.g., A. Gilan, "Das Huhn, das Ei und die Schlange. Mythos und Ritual im Illuyanka-Text," in *Hethitische Literatur: Überlieferungsprozesse, Textstrukturen, Ausdrucksformen und Nachwirken: Akten des Symposiums vom 18. bis 20. Februar 2010 in Bonn*, ed. M. Hutter and S. Hutter-Braunsar, AOAT 391 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2011), 99–114, or M. Hutter, "Die wirkmächtigen Reden der Ritualexperten in hethitischen Texten: Anrufung der Götter, "Historiolae," und performative Funktion" in *Wenn Götter und Propheten reden – Erzählen für die Ewigkeit*, ed. Amr el Hawary (Berlin: EB-Verlag, 2012), 153–71, who focuses on the types of speech attested in a small number of ritual texts with attention simply to categorizing speech and considering the texts' origins and development along the oral-literate continuum, rather than considering the function of that speech in ritual context.

⁹⁰ E.g., V. Haas, "Ein hethitische Beschwörungsmotiv aus Kizzuwatna: seine Herkunft und Wanderung," *Or NS* 40 (1971): 410–30; M. Bachvarova, "Adapting Mesopotamian Myth in Hurro-Hittite Rituals at Hattuša: Ištar, the Underworld, and the Legendary Kings," in *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, ed. B.J. Collins and Piotr Michalowski (Atlanta, 2013): 23–44.

Historiolae can be used to apply the situation, and often the resolution, present in the mythological narrative to the problem addressed by the ritual.⁹¹ David Frankfurter describes *historiolae* as “the performative transmission of power from a mythic realm articulated in narrative to the human present,”⁹² while also noting that “it is not simply undifferentiated power that is unleashed through *historiolae*, but precedence or paradigm...The *historiola*’s link between [mythic and present] times is not as important as its link between a human dimension where action is open-ended and a mythic dimension where actions are completed and tensions have been resolved.”⁹³ Hittite *historiolae* function in exactly this way,⁹⁴ and fit easily into this chapter’s ongoing theme of ritual incantations being designed to join the physical actions of the practitioner to the supernatural world of the gods and/or of the magical effects of sorcery.

The classic example of a Hittite *historiola* is of course the myths of the disappearing gods, at least some of which were ascribed to and/or recited by Old Women (see ch. 1). In the most complete myth, the disappearance of Telipinu, the narrative, once reconstructed from the three fragmentary attested versions, is very clear: Telipinu, an agricultural deity, becomes angry and disappears, and the land suffers as a result. The gods cannot find him, not even the Storm-God, until finally the grandmother-goddess Ḫannaḫanna sends out her servant, the bee, which stings Telipinu until he gets up. Although he has been found, Telipinu is now even more angry, and must be placated. The remainder of the text is ritual incantations—some of which narrate

⁹¹ This basic fact had already been noted by V. Haas and H. J. Thiel, *Die Beschwörungsrituale der Allaiturah(h)i und verwandte Texte*, AOAT 31 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978), 37 (“Die Krankheit wird lösbar, da das analog gesetzte kosmische Geschehen ja die Lösung impliziert. Dies ist der Sinn der Analogie”) and is understood throughout the literature, although often not stated in so many words.

⁹² “Narrating Power: The Theory and Practice of the Magical *Historiola* in Ritual Spells,” in *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, ed. M. Meyer and P. Mirecki, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 129 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 464.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 465–66.

⁹⁴ This has already been noted by Torri (“The Great Sun God Made a Feast”: A Mythical Topos in Hittite Ritual Literature,” in *Festschrift für Gernot Wilhelm anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 28. Januar 2010*, ed. Jeanette C. Fincke [Dresden: Islet, 2010], 338), who also cites Frankfurter, though she focuses primarily on the single motif of the Sun-God’s feast.

ritual actions—designed to replace Telipinu’s anger with a sweet and calm temperament.⁹⁵ They are of a familiar type: for example, “[Just as] hon[ey] is sweet, and just as ghee is pleasant, also likewise let Telipinu’s soul be sweet, and likewise let it be pleasant!”⁹⁶ and “Telipinu: his soul is angry, [his] in[nards] are a burning fire. Just as this fire [is extinguished], likewise let the anger, fury, and sullenness [be extinguished]!”⁹⁷ As mentioned above, in the first version of the text, a large part of the ritual action is framed as though Kamrušepa, goddess of magic and healing, is performing it.

This mythological narrative is very easily interpreted as functioning in a ritual context.⁹⁸ The human problem—agricultural failure, drought, famine, or perhaps simply winter—is given divine agency, and then a narrative is presented in which the offending deity is placated by other deities. Those deities’ actions are mapped onto the human practitioner’s, and since the divine problem is presumably resolved (no ending is preserved), the human problem likely will be as well. Despite many difficulties with dating, restoration, relating the manuscripts to one another, and interpretation of certain details, in this respect the Telipinu myth is entirely straightforward:

⁹⁵ For a full translation, see Hoffner, *Hittite Myths*, 15–18.

⁹⁶ KUB 17.10 ii 25’

LÀL-i[t ma-a’-aḫ-ḫa-an]

26’ ma-li-id-du Ì.NUN ma-a-aḫ-ḫa-an mi-ú ^dTe-li-pi-nu-wa-aš-ša ʾZIʾ-[ŠU]

27’ QA-TAM-MA mi-li-ti-iš-du na-aš QA-TAM-MA mi-i-e-eš-tu

For an edition, see Rieken et al., hethiter.net/: CTH 324.1.

⁹⁷ KUB 17.10 iii 21 ^dTe-li-pi-nu-uš kar-di-mi-ia-u-wa-an-za ZI-ŠU k[a-ra-a-az-ši-iš]

22 ú-ri-wa-ra-an pa-a-aḫ-ḫur nu ki-i pa-aḫ-ḫur ma-a-aḫ-ḫa-[an ki-iš-ta-ri]

23 kar-pi-ša kar-di-mi-ia-az ša-a-u-wa-ar QA-TAM-M[A ki-iš-ta-ru]

For an edition, see *ibid.*

⁹⁸ As already noted throughout the literature; Haas (*Geschichte*, 707–718) situates the myth within the *purulli*-festival; R. Della Casa (“A Theoretical Perspective of the *Telepinu Myth*: Archetypes and Initiation in Historical Contexts,” *Antiquo Oriente* 8 [2010]: 110–111) rather situates it in periods of political unrest; while Kellerman (“The Telepinu Myth Reconsidered,” in *Kaniššuwat: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, May 27, 1983, ed. H.A. Hoffner, Jr. and G. Beckman, AS 23 [Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1986], 120–23) comes closest to my own interpretation in assuming that the disappearing god myths are intended to pacify angry gods that might cause agricultural or fertility disasters. Polvani and Pecchioli Daddi (*La mitologia ittita*, 75) instead prefer to interpret the ritual as part of a mythological narrative, rather than the myth as serving a ritual purpose (“Si dirà che alcuni di questi motivi si ritrovano in realtà nella descrizione del ritual magico e non nella narrazione vera e propria... Tuttavia in nessun altro genere di testi le similitudini hanno questa carica espressiva, tanto che, rovesciando l'usuale prospettiva che considera il mito funzionale al rito, possiamo in realtà considerare quest'ultimo come parte integrante del racconto mitico”). However, I do not agree that a “narrazione vera e propria” must be divorced from ritual context, nor that ritual context precludes literary merit.

it is both “the performative transmission of power from a mythic realm articulated in narrative to the human present” and a “link between a human dimension where action is open-ended and a mythic dimension where actions are completed and tensions have been resolved.”⁹⁹

Of course, other *historiolae* are somewhat less straightforward. For example, in Tunnawiya’s *taknaz dā-* ritual/“Ritual of the Ox,” CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, there is quite a difficult *historiola*, which has defied coherent analysis until this point.¹⁰⁰ I would interpret it as follows:

After the extensive scapegoat ritual on Tablet 2 of the ritual (for which see below), a piglet of clay and a live piglet are brought in; the latter is waved far away by support staff, while the Old Woman takes the piglet of clay and continues speaking. The *historiola* begins:

“Great god,¹⁰¹ you have driven from Lanta (and) released those running forward to the center.¹⁰² The tongues of sickness, who have frightened him/her and who have made him/her anxious—” she calls the person she is conjuring by name.¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Frankfurter, “Narrating Power,” 465–66; see above.

¹⁰⁰ Hutter (*Behexung*, 125) interprets this *historiola* as expressing that the Sun-God is angry and his servants the Ilaliyant-deities are those attacking the patient. I would rather interpret the Sun-deity as benevolent, which is supported by the parallel in CTH 458.1 (see below). I also do not agree with Hutter’s statement that, “Das Verhältnis der Götter zueinander, wie es in diesem mythologischen Abschnitt zum Ausdruck kommt, ist wohl eine auf die mythologische Ebene transponierte menschliche Erfahrung. Was hier als mythologische Auseinandersetzung zwischen den Göttern im Ritual nachvollzogen wird, dürfte eine Variation jener Vorstellung sein, daß eine Behexung und das dazugehörige Ritual immer auch eine Rechtsangelegenheit zwischen dem Behexten (=Opfermandant) und dem Behexer sind. Der “Große Gott” und Hannahanna als “gute Götter” sind dabei diejenigen, die sich der Rechtssache des Opfermandanten annehmen, um sie zu einer positiven Lösung zu führen, ähnlich wie die Sonnengöttin der Erde und Nergal aufgrund der erhaltenen Opfer dem Opfermandanten Wohlergehen schenken sollen” (126), as will be demonstrated throughout my analysis. Beckman (“Ritual of the Ox,” 46–47) seems to see the sun-deity (whom he interprets as the Sun-Goddess of the Earth) as a positive force, but he does not offer up an analysis of the *historiola*. His assignation of the lines of dialogue, however, differs somewhat from my own.

¹⁰¹ Perhaps an angry deity? Hutter (*Behexung*, 123) notes, citing Ünal (RIA 6, 487), that this may be Kunniyawanni, the deity of Landa; if so, there are no parallels elsewhere in any Old Woman ritual to suggest what role this god would play.

¹⁰² This may be a reference to her earlier attempt to drive the affliction off to all sides—up, down, right, and left. It may also be an equivalent to the Luwian term *parittarwa-*, translated “rushing forward” by Yakubovich’s Luwian Corpus (though rather “supine” by Melchert, LUVLEX). Others have rather translated this in apposition to “the tongues of sickness” etc., and assumed an implied object to the previous sentence. Beckman (“Ritual of the Ox,” p. 46) translates “loosed (your team),” which is also possible; in CTH 458.1 (see below), there is a pun between the meaning of *lā-* as “to loose an animal,” and the meaning “to release someone from sorcery/evil.” Perhaps here the

In the next paragraph, she switches to the first person, indicating that the subject is now the “tongues of sickness.” As already noted by Hutter and Beckman, “the moving knee” and “the seeing eye” are euphemisms for the patient (i.e., a person who is alive and/or healthy):

“‘We go to seek him/her, the moving knee, the seeing eye.’ The Sun-god became angry; he¹⁰⁴ sent the Ilaliyant-deities (who said): ‘Where will you take him/her, the moving knee, the seeing eye?’”¹⁰⁵

Although grammatically, the question could also come from the Sun-God, the narrative rather supports the interpretation that the Ilaliyant-deities, as the Sun-God’s servants, are interrogating the evil “tongues of sickness” who are attacking the patient. The following paragraph seems to begin with the response from the malevolent forces. (Beckman interprets it as the speech of the benevolent Ilaliyant-deities, but the correspondence between the patient being “sweet” in this paragraph and the scapegoat-pig being “sweet” to the evil entities at the end of the section indicates otherwise to me.)

“‘We saw him/her, the ruling household,’¹⁰⁶ we saw the eyebrow, we saw the eyelash, we saw (them) together with the twelve body parts, and (s)he became sweet to us.”¹⁰⁷

pun is implied. Hutter (*Behexung*, 39) translates rather, “Großer Gott, du bist aus Landa herbeigeeilt (und) has gelöst (=entsühnt),” which I find less likely.

¹⁰³ KUB 9.34 iii 28’ šal-li-iš-wa-kán DINGIR-LIM-iš URU^{URU}La-an-ta-az u-un-ni-eš

29’ la-i-iš-wa ták-ša-ni pé-ra-an hu-i-ia-an-te-eš

30’ i-na-na-aš la-a-la-aš ku-iš-ša-an ú-e-ri-te-nu-er

31’ ku-e-ša-an-kán la-aḥ-la-aḥ-ḥi-nu-e-<<nu-e>>-er

32’ nu hu-uk-ki-iš-ki-iz-zi ku-in na-an-kán ŠUM-ŠU te-ez-zi

Edited by Hutter, *Behexung*, pp. 38–39.

¹⁰⁴ I am interpreting this god as the male celestial sun-deity, since that god appears elsewhere in rituals paired with DINGIR.MAḤ, as seen above, and if this were the Sun-Goddess of the Earth, I would expect to see *taknaš*.

Beckman (“Ritual of the Ox,” 52) prefers to assume the *taknaš* has been omitted, which cannot be discounted. The Sun-Goddess of Arinna is never securely attested in Old Woman rituals against evil (she is only attested in CTH 403, Mallidunna’s evocation ritual, out of all the Old Woman rituals), so it is unlikely to be her.

¹⁰⁵ KUB 9.34 iii 33’ pa-a-i-wa-ni-wa-ra-an ša-an-ḥi-eš-ki-u-e-ni

34’ i-ia-an-da-an ki-nu-un ú-wa-an-da-an IGI^{HLA}-in

35’ ^dUTU-uš kar-pí-ia-at-ta nu ^dI-la-li-ia-an-du-uš

36’ pí-i-e-et ku-wa-pí-wa-ra-an ta-at-te-ni

37’ i-ia-an-ni-ia-an gi-nu-un

38’ ú-wa-an-da-an IGI^{HLA}-in

“Then, however, Ḫannaḫanna¹⁰⁸ saw him/her, and she anointed (him/her) with *karšikarši-* before them, the evil gods. Then the evil *šiwanneš*¹⁰⁹ saw, (and she said),¹¹⁰ ‘Cut them off of the eyebrow, cut them off the eyelash! Cut [them off] of the twelve body parts!’¹¹¹

“‘Let them go and take him in, and also let them make him a lord of(!) the city, and let them make him a! (text: his) husband (of) his wife, and let them make him a father (of) children, and let them make him a servant of long years to the gods.’”¹¹²

¹⁰⁶ This word, *taparamma*, has been translated as “Regierung” by Hutter and Starke, and “Verwaltung” by Kronasser (see Tischer, HED T/D 1, p. 119, for a summary); Beckman does not translate it. Melchert, however, interprets it as a nominative-accusative plural participle, “ruling,” in CLL, and this seems to fit the context best; É-er is therefore the nominative-accusative neuter plural of “house” meaning “household.”

¹⁰⁷ I follow the CHD (p. 252) in taking the attested na-an-ši-ia-aš-kán in KUB 9.34 iii 42’ as a mistake for the nu-wa-an-n[a-aš-aš-kán] attested in CTH 409.IV, KUB 9.4 iii 4.

¹⁰⁸ Written DINGIR.MAH-aš.

¹⁰⁹ Of unclear meaning, attested only in these rituals; the CHD suggests that it may be a byform of *šiu(ni)-* “deity,” meaning “demon” or similar. In any case, it almost certainly refers to the same group of beings as “evil gods” does.

¹¹⁰ In CTH 409.IV, there is an extra sentence in here; preserved is only *nu[-wa...] iyaweni*, “And we will treat/do [...]” Beckman translates this as “They look[ed] at him, [the evil] deities (saying:) ‘And [...] we will treat.’” and continues as though the evil deities are speaking. I find this unlikely: although it is possible that the evil deities are suggesting that something else (Ḫannaḫanna’s *karšikarši*?) be cut from the patient’s body parts, elsewhere any language about removing something from the patient’s body parts is directed against evil forces; in addition, the following paragraph (see below) is not something evil deities would say. I would say that either *iyaweni* is the evil deities speaking, and there is an unmarked switch in speaker between the sentences, or—more likely—Ḫannaḫanna is speaking, and is referring to herself and the ritual practitioner.

¹¹¹ Here Ḫannaḫanna is making a pun: the imperative of “to cut” is *karši*. Ḫannaḫanna’s anointing of the patient with *karšikarši-* has already prepared the way for the necessary actions on the part of the ritual practitioner. Whether the final paragraph is still Ḫannaḫanna speaking, or whether it is only the Old Woman speaking is not explicit; however, I believe that it is most likely to be Ḫannaḫanna, since she seems to continue speaking later (see below).

¹¹² KUB 9.34 iii 39’ É-er-an ta-pa-ra-am-ma a-ú-me-en

40’ i-ni-ra-an a-ú-me-en la-ap-li-pa-an-za-an a-ú-me-en

41’ IŠ-TU 12 UZU^UUR^{HLA} a-ú-me-en

42’ na-an-ši-ia-aš-kán an-da me-li-te-iš-ta

43’ [a]n-da-ma-an-kán a-uš-ta DINGIR.MAH-aš nu-uš-ma-aš-ša-an pé-ra-an

44’ [ka]r-ši-kar-ši-ia-za iš-ki-it ḪUL-u-wa-aš DINGIR^{MES}-aš

45’ [a]n-da-ma-kán a-ú-e-er [Ḫ]UL-u-¹e¹-eš ši-wa-an-ni-eš

46’ [i]-ni-ra-za-¹wa¹-ra-aš k[ar-š]i l[a]-¹ap-la¹-pa-za-wa-ra-aš ¹kar-š¹

47’ [1]2 UZU^U<UZU>^UUR^{HLA}-[za-wa-ra-aš k]ar-ši

Here, KUB 9.34 (CTH 409.II) breaks; the duplicate KUB 9.4++ (CTH 409.IV) continues.

KUB 9.4++ iii 17 (=handcopy 13) pa-an-du-wa-ra-an an-da ap-pa-an-[du]

18 URU-an-na-an ¹EN¹-an i-ia-an-du

19 DAM-ŠU-ma-an ^{LU}MU-ŠA-ŠU i-ia-an-[du]

20 DUMU^{MES}-ma-an at-ta-an i-ia-an-du

21 DINGIR^{MES}-na-aš-ma-an ŠA MU^{HLA} GÍD.DA

22 ÌR-an i-ia-an-du

KUB 9.34 edited by Hutter, *Behexung*, 38–41; KUB 9.4 edited by Beckman, “Ritual of the Ox,” 38–39 and 46–47.

The identity of “them” in the final paragraph is unclear. There are many options: the deities, the humans working on the ritual (the Old Woman, as mentioned already, is assisted by support staff), or the several substitute animals that are taking afflictions away. The closest plural entity preceding the paragraph, however, is the evil deities; evil deities would certainly not perform any of the actions in this paragraph of their own volition, but perhaps Ḥannaḥanna is ordering them to behave more appropriately.

To this point, therefore, the evil deities have sought out the patient; the Sun-deity has become angry and sent his/her servants to question them. The evil deities tell the Sun-deity’s servants that they found the patient and (s)he was sweet to them, but Ḥannaḥanna put her protection on him/her and ordered the deities to be cut away, and for the patient to be returned to his normal state and/or raised even higher than before.¹¹³ At this point, the *historiola* has successfully been brought to the point of performing the ritual, with the support of the Sun-deity, his/her servants the Ilaliyant-deities, and Ḥannaḥanna, who are aware of the problem and working to protect the patient. As it continues, the incantation is no longer in the past tense: the Old Woman speaks patient’s name again, and she says,

“Let him go and intrude into my house, and let the piglet of (the god) Panunta be fitted to him! [I] will give the piglet of Panunta to those who brought the si[ckness] of the soul (and) the heaviness [of] the body. It [...] from the *šiggašigga-* and let it be sweet to them.”¹¹⁴

¹¹³ Hutter (*Behexung*, 110) suggests that the wish to be a husband and father may be connected to the “tripling and quadrupling” incantation elsewhere in the ritual, which may imply a wish for fertility; see below.

¹¹⁴ KUB 9.4++ iii 24 (handcopy: 20) pa-id-du-wa-kán

25 É-[r]i-mi ša-li-ka-ru nu-wa-ra-aš-ši-k[án]

26 ḥa-a[p-pa]-ṛru¹ ŠAḤ.TUR ŠA^d Pa-an-nu-[un-ta]

27 ku-i-ṛe¹-[eš-ša-a]n ú-te-er ZI-aš i[m-pa-an]

28 NÍ.TE-[aš] ṛta¹-aš-ṛši-ia¹-tar nu-uš-ma-aš-[ša-an-kán]

29 pí-iḥ-[ḥi] ŠAḤ.TUR ṛŠA¹ Pa-an-nu-un-[ta]

It seems most likely that Ḫannaḫanna is still speaking here: the verb *šalik(i)-*, here translated as “intrude into,” ordinarily has a connotation of inappropriateness, of touching or entering something in a negative or taboo fashion. Here, then, *šalik(i)-* would refer to the inappropriate action of a human entering into a god’s house—and the patient entering into the divine sphere of protection would be more consistent with Hittite ritual norms than the patient entering the Old Woman’s actual home. The possibility of “my house” meaning a structure or space so delineated for the ritual—a ritual tent, for example—cannot be excluded, but given that there is nothing to say that Ḫannaḫanna is *not* still speaking, and the unusual use of *šalik(i)-* in the context of entering a building,¹¹⁵ the explanation that a divinity is speaking seems most likely (her house could of course be symbolized by a ritual structure). If this is the case, the following two paragraphs show a gradual movement from the deity’s speech to the practitioner’s, very similar to what is seen in the Disappearance of Telipinu with Kamrušepa and the practitioner.

The following paragraph details the effectiveness of the pig as an analogical tool: “It roots up the meadow and turns over *artarti*-plant; it roots up the mountain, and turns over water. Let it root them out (of) his twelve body parts, and in his vigorous knee!”¹¹⁶ There follows a long list of evils to be rooted out (see above). Finally, the Old Woman says the patient’s name again

30 ši-ṛig¹-ga-ši-ig-ga-az x x x []

31 nu-ṛuš¹-ma-ša-aš-kán an-da

32 mi-li-<<ta>>-te-eš-du

Edited by (and restorations after) Beckman, “Ritual of the Ox,” pp. 39 and 47.

¹¹⁵ See CHD Š1, 102f.; ordinarily when referring to a spatial movement, *šalik(i)-* involves an invasion (e.g., of a foreign land) or intrusion (e.g., inappropriately into a temple, or somewhere else a person is not authorized to go).

¹¹⁶ KUB 9.4++ iii 33 (handcopy 29) ú-el-lu-un mu-ú-ta-iz-zi

34 na-aš-ta ar-ta-ar-ti-in ne-ia-ri

35 ṛHUR¹.SAG-an mu-ú-ta-iz-zi

36 na-aš-ta wa-a-tar ne-ia-ri še-er ar-ḫa-at-kán

37 mu-ú-da-id-du 12 ^{UZU}ṛUR^{HLA}.ŠU

38 ma-ia-an-ti-ia gi-nu-uš-ši

Edited Beckman, “Ritual of the Ox,” 39.

and says, “‘Whoever placed him [for] ^dU.GUR of the bronze ŠAGARI,¹¹⁷ now [I am] ta[king] him from ^dU.GUR of the bronze ŠAGARI and placing it, the piglet of ^dPanunta.’”¹¹⁸ This is the end of the second tablet of CTH 409.II; the second tablet of CTH 409.IV continues, but the final two paragraphs are quite broken. Insofar as they can be interpreted, they seem to be reiterating the sentiment of removing the patient from a malevolent person or entity’s influence and putting the piglet of ^dPanunta in his place. There is an ambiguity here between the piglet as a tool for “rooting out” the evils from the patient (later, as Hutter¹¹⁹ and Beckman¹²⁰ both interpret the passage, to be disposed of, bringing the impurity to the underworld with it), and the piglet as a desirable meal for the evil deities (perhaps thus also to be disposed of as an offering to them). This may have to do with the fragmentary and difficult nature of the passage (perhaps there were two piglets?), but it also may simply be a result of the ambiguous nature of substitute/scapegoat-animals in Hittite ritual (see below for a full discussion).

This *historiola*, therefore, can be formed into a coherent narrative, once the various quoted passages are assigned to appropriate speakers. A drama is acted out, in which the evil deities become attracted to the ritual patient’s healthy body. The Sun-God notices and sends his servants the Ilaliyant-deities to demand an explanation from the evil deities, who explain their desire for the patient. However, Ḫannaḫanna—as usual in Hittite myth, the one with a solution¹²¹—anoints the patient with an astringent (a “cutting” substance, see above), and orders

¹¹⁷ This difficult word is clearly an aspect, avatar, or relation of Nergal, the plague deity; I follow Beckman in interpreting ŠAGARI as part of Nergal’s name rather than as the object of the verb as Hutter interprets it.

¹¹⁸ KUB 9.34 iv 20’ [k]u-iš-ma-an-kán [A-NA] ^rd¹U.GUR ^{URUDU}ŠA-GA’-RI^{HLA} ṚZABAR¹ da-a-iš
21’ Ṛki¹-nu-<<kán>>-na-kán d[a-aḫ-ḫi A-NA]A ^dU.GUR ^{URUDU}ŠA-<GA>-ṚRI^{HLA}¹
22’ [na-a]n-kán te-eḫ-ḫi ^dP[a-nu-un-d]a-a ŠA[Ḫ.TUR]

¹¹⁹ *Behexung*, 111.

¹²⁰ “Ritual of the Ox,” 53–54.

¹²¹ For a study of Ḫannaḫanna’s presence in mythological context, see G. Kellerman, “La déesse Ḫannaḫanna: son image et sa place dans les mythes anatoliens,” *Hethitica* 7 (1987): 109–47. As Kellerman says, “Toutes ces activités suggèrent que Ḫannaḫanna est une des plus grandes divinités anatoliennes; elle se révèle comme une sage reine, une civilisatrice et bienfaitrice inconditionnelle des dieux et de l’humanité” (129).

that the evil deities be cut away and that the patient be given blessings. She then invites the patient to shelter in her house and she or the Old Woman puts forth the piglet of ^dPanunta as a substitute given to the evil deities. Once again, although there are a number of difficulties in the details of translation, the function of the story is extremely straightforward, and in fact seems to be tailored to fit this particular situation.¹²²

There is a parallel version of this *historiola*, unfortunately much more fragmentary and difficult, in CTH 458.1, possibly part of the same ritual. The text begins in the middle of col. i with,

Then, she kneels,¹²³ and she waves it (presumably a substitute-animal) [over] him/her, while concurrently she says, “[...] The Sun-Deity came up, [and?] from the ^{Giš}*arimpa-* [...]”. He stepped to the high mountains,

“he stepped to the deep valleys, he stepped to the flowing river. He released the sheep; he released the ox.” She calls the person she is treating by name. “May he remove from this person (the following):”¹²⁴

There follows a list of evils, shorter than the main list; it begins exactly the same, but stops less than halfway through. When the list is finished, she resumes, “His/her *dammašḫa*¹²⁵ came

¹²² A standard function of *historiolae*; see Frankfurter, “Narrating Power,” 469–76.

¹²³ “Kneel” is ordinarily expressed by the verb *ginuš(š)ariya-*, but another translation of “she takes herself to the knees” (or, “she puts herself on the knees”) does not immediately present itself.

¹²⁴ KBo 17.54++ i x+1 [EG]IR-an-da-¹ma-az gi-nu-aš da-a-i na-an-ši-kán¹ [še-er ar-ḫa]
2’ wa-aḫ-nu-zi me-mi-iš-ki-iz-zi-ia ki-iš-ša-a[n]
3’ ^dUTU-uš-kán ša-ra-a ú-it ^{Giš}a-ri-im-pa-a-¹za¹ []
4’ pá-r-ga-u-wa-ša-aš-kán ḪUR.SAG-aš ti-ia-at

5’ ḫal-lu-u-wa-ša-aš-kán ḫa-a-ri-ia-aš ti-ia-at ÍD a-ar-ša-an-ti-i[a]

6’ ¹ti¹-ia-at [U]DU-un la-a-i GU₄-un la-a-i nu an-ni-iš-ki-iz-zi

7’ ku-in an-[tu-u]ḫ-ša-an na-an-kán ŠUM-ŠU te-ez-zi

8’ ¹ke¹-e-da-ni-[i]a-wa-kán an-tu-uḫ-ši še-er ar-ḫa la-a-ú

Edited F. Fuscagni, hethiter.net/: CTH 458.1.1.

¹²⁵ HEG T, D: “Schädigung, Gewalttat” (p. 75). Kloekhorst agrees: “damaging, act of violence, punishment” (*Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, 825). How the *dammašḫa-* should therefore be defined as an entity is unclear, apart from its obvious destructive nature.

away from the meadow(s), and they brought away the *inan*-sickness of the *dammašḥas*.’ She calls the ritual patient by name.”¹²⁶ In CTH 458.1, *dammašḥa-* takes the place of the “evil tongues of sickness” in CTH 409.II. In the following paragraph the *dammašḥas* take up the same refrain as the tongues:

“‘We will proceed to find them: the wa[lking knee], the seeing eye.’ The Sun-god [became] ang[ry], and sent the Ilaliyant-deities.” She calls [the ritual patient] by name.

“‘Where [are you] ta[king] him, the walking knee, the seeing [eye]?’ A rope li[es] on the path.

“^dAntaliya is turning [a/with a?] knife [...] on the path...”¹²⁷

After this, the text becomes too fragmentary to translate and quickly breaks off altogether.

However, it is clear that this *historiola* in CTH 458.1 is another version of the *historiola* recited in the related passages in CTH 409.II and CTH 409.IV. In this passage, the metaphor of releasing yoked animals and removing sicknesses from the patient’s body is explicit, rather than (likely) implied as in CTH 409.II; the Sun-deity “releasing” the animals and “removing” the evils are both communicated with the verb *lā-* (though the latter meaning includes the preverbs *šer arḥa*). The *dammašḥas* substitute for the “tongues of sickness,” and the Sun-God’s response is the same: he gets angry and sends the Ilaliyant-deities to investigate. This time, however, rather than

¹²⁶ KBo 17.54++ i 17’ ú-el-lu-wa-ṛaz¹-kán ṛar¹-ḥa dam-ma-aš-ḥa-aš-ši-e-eš ú-e-er

18’ na-aš-ta ṛar¹-ḥa dam-ma-ṛaš¹-ḥa-aš i-na-an ú-te-er

19’ na-aš-ta EN SÍSKUR [ŠU]M-ŠU ṛte-e¹-z[i]

Edited Fuscagni, hethiter.net/: CTH 458.1.1.

¹²⁷ KBo 17.54++ i 20’ pa-i-wa-ni-wa-an ša-an-ḥi-iš-k[i]-wa-ni i-i[a-an-ta-an gi-nu-un]

21’ ú-wa-an-da-an IGI^{HI.A}-wa ^dUTU-uš kar-[pí-ia-at-ta]

22’ nu ^dI-la-li-ia-an-du-uš pí-i-e-et [na-aš-ta EN SÍSKUR]

23’ ṛŠUM-ŠU¹ te-ez-zi ku-wa-pí-ṛwa¹-ra-an da-a[t-te-ni]

24’ i-ia-an-ta-an gi-nu-un ú-wa-an-da-an [IGI^{HI.A}-wa]

25’ KASKAL-ši-kán šu-ma-an-za-an ki-i[t-ta-ri]

26’ KASKAL-ši-kán ^dAn-ta-li-ia-aš []x-[m]a? GÍ[R?]

27’ wa-aḥ-nu-uš-ki-iz-zi

Edited ibid.

a response from the malevolent forces and Ḫannaḫanna's intervention, the focus turns to the deity ^dAntaliya, who is attested in the context of ritual cutting of ropes or thread in several other rituals (see above). Unfortunately, this section quickly becomes too fragmentary to understand, but it seems as though the basic framework of this *historiola* appears in different versions. These versions would start with the same scenario—someone making trouble for the patient, the Sun-deity noticing, becoming angry, and sending his/her servants to investigate—and then split off into various possibilities, involving the interference of some other deity performing some ritual action (anointing or cutting—though recall also that Ḫannaḫanna's anointing seems to be associated with cutting as well) on behalf of the patient. This again supports the characterization of *historiolae* as mythological stories that might be tailored to specific situations in ritual context.

Another Old Woman ritual, the fourth ritual on the *Sammeltafel* CTH 390, is almost entirely made up of a *historiola*. The text reads:

The great river bound its waters; it bound a fish in the upstream¹²⁸ water; it bound the high mountains, it bound the deep valleys, it bound the 'meadows of the storm-god' (=wild areas?), the [pure] rushes. It bound the eagle's wing, it bound the [be]arded snakes in the co[il].

It bound the deer under the *eya*-tree; it bound the leopard(?) at a strong place, it bound the *ulipana*- (perhaps a wolf) at a high place, it bound the lion at the *zamniššan*, it bound the *šaša*-animal at the *huratti*, it bound the milk of the *šaša*-, it bound the throne of the tutelary deity.

¹²⁸ *ḫantiyara*: Thus Oettinger, "Nochmals zu luwisch-hethitisch *hantiyara*-, *hantiyassa*- und *summiyara*," *Belkıs Dinçol ve Ali Dinçol'a Armağan/Festschrift in Honor of Belkıs Dinçol and Ali Dinçol*, ed. M Alparslan et al. (Istanbul: Ege Yayınları, 2007), 543–47.

And you, Ištar, told this to ^dMaliya, and ^dMaliya told it to ^dPirwa, and ^dPirwa told it to ^dKamrušepa, and Kamrušepa harnessed her horses and drove to the great river. And Kamrušepa was conjuring the great river, and she conjured the fish in the upstream water, and the great river, its waters were released again, and the upstream fish was released.

And the high mountains were released, and the deep valleys were released, and the meadows of the Storm-god were released, and the pure rushes were released, and the [eagle's] wing was released, and the bearded snakes [in the coil] were released.

[The deer] was released (from) under the *eya*-tree, and the panther was released from [the heavy] place, and the *ulipzaš* was released from [the high place], and the lion was released from the *zamnaš*, and the [ša]ša-goat was released from the *hurattiša*, and the milk of the *šaša* was released, and the throne of the tutelary deity was released.¹²⁹

¹²⁹ KBo 3.8 iii 1 šal-li-iš ÍD-aš hu-un-hu-ma-az-zi-ši-it ha-mi-i[k-ta]

2 na-aš-ta an-da KU₆^{1?}-un I-NA ha-an-ti-ia-ra ú-i-ti[

3 ha-mi-ik-^rta¹ HUR.^rSAG^{HLA} pár-ga-mu-uš ha-mi-ik-ta

4 ha-a-^rri¹-uš h[al-l]u-ú-wa-u-uš ha-mi-ik-ta

5 ^dIM-aš ú-e[l-lu h]a-mi-ik-ta na-aš-ta an-da [šu-up-pí]

6 šu-ma-an-za ha-mi-[i]k-ta pár-ti-an-za ha-a-ra-aš

7 ha-mi-ik-ta [ša-m]a-an-ku-úr-wa-du-uš-kán MUŠ^{HLA}-uš¹

8 an-da hu-u-la-[liš-ni] ha-mi-ik-ta

9 DARA.MAŠ-an ^rkat¹-ta ^{GIS}e-ia ha-mi-ik-ta pár-ša-na-aš

10 ta-aš-ša-i pí-di ha-mi-ik-ta ú-li-pa-na-an pár-ga-u-e-i

11 ha-mi-ik-ta UR.MAH za-am-ni-ša-an (erasure)

12 ha-mi-ik-ta ša-a-ša-an hu-u-ra-at-ti-ša-an ha-mi-ik-ta

13 ša-ša-aš GA ha-mi-ik-ta ŠA^dLAMMA ^{GIS}ŠÚ.A ha-mi-ik-ta

14 na-at ^dIŠTAR A-NA ^dMa-a-li-ia me-e-ma-at-ti

15 ^dMa-li-ia-ša-at A-NA ^dPí-ir-wa me-mi-iš-ta

16 ^dPí-ir-wa-ša-at A-NA ^dKam-ru-ši-pa me-mi-iš-ta

17 ^dKam-ru-ši-pa-aš-za ANŠE.KUR.RA^{HLA}-ŠU tu-u-ri-it nu I-NA ÍD.GAL

18 pé-en-ni-iš nu hu-uk-ki-iš-ki-iz-zi ^dKam-ru-ši-pa-aš

19 ^rGAL-in¹ ÍD-an na-aš-ta an-da ha-an-ti-ia-ra KU₆-an ú-i-ti

20 hu-uk-ki^{1?}-iš-ki-iz-zi GAL-iš ÍD hu-un-hu-ma-az-ši-it

21 EGIR-pa la-a-at-ta-at an-da KU₆-uš ha-an-ti-ia-ra-aš la-at-ta-at

22 pár-ga-u-uš HUR.SAG^{HLA} la-a-at-ta-at hal-lu-u-e-eš ha-a-ri-i-e-eš

23 la-^ra-at¹-ta-at ^dIM-aš ú-el-lu la-a-an-ta-at

24 [na-aš-ta] an-da šu-up-pí šu-ma-an-za la-a-at-ta-at pár-ti-an-za

25 [ha-a-ra-aš]^{MUSEN} la-a-ad-da-at ša-ma-an-ku-úr-wa-an-te-eš MUŠ^{HLA}

The main mythological section of the incantation ends here. Oettinger has already made comparisons between this text and the Disappearing God myths; as he states, there is clearly a narrative theme in these myths that was available to Hittite authors for adaptation to different situations.¹³⁰ In this case, the river has not vanished, but it has ceased its normal function, and there is a similar cessation of normal functioning in the land—although here the focus is on wild animals, rather than agriculture and husbandry. In addition, in this text Kamrušepa is able to fix the problem apparently at will, without any explicit magical actions to be mirrored by the practitioner, as is seen in Telipinu.

The text continues with the earthly analogue to the myth:

And the young child [wh]o (is here): he was bound with respect to (his) pure hair, while below, he was bound with respect to the scalp, [he] was bound with respect to his nose, he is [boun]d with respect to his ears, he is bound with respect to (his) mouth, he is bound, his tongue, he is bound; he is bound with respect to (his) t[rache]a, he is bound with respect to his esophagus; while below, he is bound with respect to the breast, he is bound with respect to the lung/diaphragm, he is bound with respect to the liver; he is bound with respect to the *genzu* (scrotum?), he was bound with respect to his bladder(?), he was bound with respect to his anus; he was bound with respect to his knee, while above he is bound with respect to his hands.

26 [ḫu-u-la-liš]-ni la-a-at-ta-at

27 [DÀRA.MA]Š kat-ta-an ^{GIŠ}r¹-ia la-a-at-ta-at PÌRIG.TUR-aš-ša

28 [ta-aš-š]a-i pí-di la-a-ad-da-at ú-li-ip-za-aš-ša-an

29 [pár-ga-u]-e la-a-ad-da-at UR.MAḪ za-am-na-aš la-a-at-ta-at

30 [ša-š]a-aš ḫu-u-ra-at-ti-ša-an la-a-at-ta-at

31 [ša]-ša-aš GA la-a-at-ta-at ŠA ^dLAMMA ^{GIŠ}ŠÚ.A la-a-at-ta-at

Edited by Kronasser, “Fünf hethitische Rituale,” *Die Sprache* 7 (1961): 156–62.

¹³⁰ “Entstehung von Mythos aus Ritual: CTH 390A,” in *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität: Akten des religionsgeschichtlichen Symposiums “Kleinasien und angrenzende Gebiete vom Beginn des 2. bis zur Mitte des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.”* (Bonn, 20.-22. Februar 2003), ed. M. Hutter and S. Hutter-Braunsar, AOAT 318 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2004), 354–55. Unlike Oettinger, however, I do not believe that the search for a “basic structure” of a myth is likely to be productive.

The messenger went to ʔannaʔanna: “When we act, how do we act?” Thus ʔannaʔanna: “Go and bring the ^{MUNUS}ḥašawa. Let her conjure over the scalp for him. Let her conjure him with respect to (his) pure hairs, let her conjure him with respect to his ears, let her conjure him with respect to (his) nose, let her conjure him with respect to his mouth, let her conjure him with respect to his tongue.

“Let her conjure him with respect to (his) trachea, let her conjure him with respect to (his) esophagus, him with respect to (his) breast likewise, him with respect to (his) lung/diaphragm likewise, him with respect to (his) liver likewise, him with respect to (his) heart likewise, him with respect to (his) *genzu* likewise, him with respect to (his) bladder(?) likewise, him with respect to his anus likewise, him with respect to (his) knee likewise, while above him with respect to his hands likewise.”

“I have released him with respect to his scalp etcetera; I have released his pure hairs, I have released his ears, I have released his nose, his mouth likewise, his tongue likewise, his trachea likewise.

“His breast likewise, his lung/diaphragm likewise, his *genzu* (scrotum?) likewise, his thigh (!) likewise, his anus likewise. I have released his knee, while above his hands likewise.

This matter, however, is important [...] let him/her go and [speak] the incantation [of] bind[ing] well! [H]is/[H]er [name] is not there.¹³¹

¹³¹ KBo 3.8 iii 32 [ku]-e-ša DUMU-aš ḥu-el-pi-iš na-aš šu-up-pi-iš te-e-ta-nu-uš
 33 [ḥ]a-mi-ik-ta-at kat-ta-an-ma-aš ḥu-pal-la-aš ḥa-mi-ik-ta-at
 34 [na-aš] ti-i-ti-ta-an ḥa-mi-ik-ta-at na-aš ^{UZU}GEŠTU^{ḤI.A}-ŠU
 35 ḥa-mi-ik-ta¹ na-aš ^{UZU}KAXU-iš¹ ḥa-mi-ik-ṛta¹ na-aš ^{UZU}EME-ŠU
 36 ḥa-mi-ik-ṛta na-aš ^{UZU}ḥ[u-uh-ḥur-ti-i]n ḥ[a-mi-ik-ta]
 37 (=KUB 7.1 iii 3) na-aš ^{UZU}pa-ap-pa-aš-ša-la-an ḥa-mi-ik-ta kat-ta-ma-aš
 38 ^{UZU}GABA ḥa-mi-ik-ta na-aš ^{UZU}ḥa-aḥ-ri ḥa-mi-ik-ta
 39 na-aš ^{UZU}NIG.GIG ḥa-mi-ik-ta na-aš ge-en-zu ḥa-mi-ik-ta
 40 na-aš ^{UZU}pa-an-tu-u-ḥa-aš-ša-an ḥa-mi-ik-ta-at

The human problem here is sickness, not (as is generally assumed for the Disappearing God myths) some kind of climatological issue, and it only appears after the divine problem has been resolved. However, the analogy is made very clear by the use of the same verb to describe what has happened to the child's body parts (*hamenk-*, “to bind”) as what happened to all of the wild animals when the river stopped up. The repetitive incantation, going through a long list of body parts, is reminiscent of the scapegoat rituals of Tunnawiya (discussed below), and was likely intended to convey the ritual's comprehensive application.

In this *historiola*, Kamrušepa and Hannaḥanna demonstrate their respective expertises: Kamrušepa is a goddess proficient in magic, and is easily able to solve the problem of the river. Hannaḥanna is a wise goddess, who is represented in myth as the one with the answers to insoluble problems; she does not heal the child herself, but she of course knows who should:

41 na-aš^{UZU} ar-ra-aš-ša-an ḥa-mi-ik-ta-at na-aš^{UZU} gi-nu-uš-ši-it
 42 ḥa-mi-ik-ta-at še-er-ma-aš ŠU^{HLA}-ŠU ḥa-mi-ik-ta

43 nu A-NA^d NIN.TU ḥa-lu-ga-aš pa-it GIM-an-wa DÜ-u-e-ni
 44 ma-a-an-wa i-ia-u-e-ni UM-MA^d NIN.TU i-it-wa^{MUNUS} ḥa-a-ša-wa-an
 45 pé-e-ḥu-te nu-wa-aš-ši-iš-ša-an še-er^{UZU} ḥu-pal-la-aš ḥu-ik-du
 46 na-an šu-up-pa-uš te-e-ta-nu-uš ḥu-ik-du na-an^{UZU} GEŠTU^{HLA}-ŠU
 47 ḥu-ik-du na-an^{UZU} ti-i-ti-ta-an ḥu-ik-du na-an KAXU-ŠU
 48 ḥu-ik-du na-an EME-ŠU ḥu-ik-du

49 na-an^{UZU} ḥu-uḥ-ḥur-ti-in ḥu-ik-du na-an^{UZU} pa-ap-pa-aš-ša-li-in
 50 ḥu-ik-du na-an^{UZU} GABA KI.MIN na-an^{UZU} ḥa-aḥ-ḥa-ri KI.MIN
 51 na-an^{UZU} NÍG.GIG KI.MIN na-an^{UZU} ŠA KI.MIN na-an^{UZU} ge-en-zu KI.MIN
 52 na-an^{UZU} pa-an-du-ḥa-an KI.MIN na-an^{UZU} ar-ra-aš-ša-an KI.MIN
 53 na-an^{UZU} ge-e-nu KI.MIN še-er-ma-an ŠU^{HLA}-ŠU KI.MIN

54 še-e^r-ra-an^{UZU} ḥu-pal-la-aš la-a-ú-un na-an šu-up-pa-uš
 55 te-ta-nu-uš la-a-ú-un na-an^{UZU} PI^{HLA}-ŠU la-a-ú-un
 56^{UZU} ti-ti-ta-an la-a-ú-un na-an^{UZU} KAXU-ŠU KI.MIN
 57 na-an^{UZU} EME-ŠU KI.MIN^{UZU} pa-ap-pa-aš-ša-la-an KI.MIN

58 na-an^{UZU} GABA KI.MIN na-an^{UZU} ḥa-aḥ-ḥa-ri KI.MIN na-an^{UZU} g[e-e]n-zu
 59 KI.MIN na-an^{UZU} ú-la-an KI.MIN na-an^{UZU} ar-ra-an K[I.MIN]
 60 na-an^{UZU} ge-e-nu la-a-ú-un še-er-ma-an ŠU^{HLA}-ŠU KI.^rMIN¹

61 ki-i-ma ut-tar na-ak-^rki-i¹ [p]a-id-du-wa-at
 62 a-aš-šu ŠI-PAT ḥa-mi-i[n-ku-wa-aš me-ma-a-ú ŠUM-Š]U NU.GÁL

Edited by Kronasser, “Fünf hethitische Rituale,” *Die Sprache* 7 (1961): 156–62.

clearly the ^{MUNUS}*hašawa* (perhaps another word for the Old Woman, or a profession with a similar scope; see the Conclusion for further discussion of this). And of course the ^{MUNUS}*hašawa* does have the solution, although we cannot see from the text if she performs any actions or simply recites the incantation; in any case, it seems likely to be her own voice at the end, stating that she has released the child's body parts (*lā-*, the same verb appearing in CTH 458.1's *historiola*, above). Unfortunately, there is no solid indication of what connection, if any, there is between Ḫannaḫanna (often written DINGIR.MAḪ), and DINGIR.MAḪ of the riverbank, who is seen in other Old Woman rituals, above. Whether Ḫannaḫanna's support of the ^{MUNUS}*hašawa* is the same as *wappuwaš* DINGIR.MAḪ's support of Tunnawiya is thus unclear. However, the message in the *historiola* is very clear: Ḫannaḫanna, the wise goddess who knows all of the answers, knows who to patronize in cases of sickness. It is not hard to see how a *historiola* of this type might serve the practitioner.

The same blatant use of a divinity for self-promotion may be seen in another ritual on this tablet, CTH 390D, which is unfortunately quite a bit more fragmentary; however, the context is clearly another *historiola*. It begins, “When ton[gues come to someone, I] r[ub] his tongue with beer-bread [and] I smear [his tongue with ghe]e [...]”¹³² The following section is quite fragmentary, but it involves Kamrušepa, Ḫannaḫanna, and a dialogue, and resumes midway through the next paragraph with,

“‘I [have] brou[ght?]”¹³³ the ^{MUNUS}*hašawa*. [Let her go, and] let her cleanse his tongue.’

Then the ^{MUNUS}*hašawa* went, and she cleansed his tongue.”

¹³² KBo 3.8+KUB 7.1 ii 52 ma-a-an-kán EM[E^{HIA} ku-e-da-ni ú-wa-an-zi na-an]-kán EME-ŠU
53 BAPPIR-it ša[r-ta-a-mi na-an EME-ŠU IŠ-TU Ì.NU]N
54 is-ga-a-mi

Restorations after Haas, “Ein jatro-magisches Ritual gegen einen Fluchzwang,” in *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and Their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*, ed. Y. Cohen et al., StBoT 51 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 178–82.

¹³³ This could also be present/future tense.

“The sons of the sun-deity: ‘Let the *hašawa*-woman take [beer-b]read and smear his tongue. Then let her anoint it with ghee. Then let her wipe off his tongue with honey.

Let the mortal be well!’” (S)he spits three times in his/its/her mouth.¹³⁴

The text ends here with the simple label, “The incantation of tongues.”¹³⁵ Although the actual *historiola* is mostly missing, parts of it are still clear: Kamrušepa and Ḫannaḫanna confer, and it is decided that the ^{MUNUS}*hašawa* is the appropriate person to handle the problem; the sons of the sun-deity (perhaps the Ilaliyanteš of Tunlawiya’s ritual¹³⁶) have more specific instructions for what she should do. The last line about spitting into someone or something’s mouth might imply a scapegoat animal (see below for the connection), but the text does not preserve any other mentions of one so there is no way to be certain.

Another ritual featuring *historiolae* is Allaiturahhi’s CTH 780.II, although the *historiolae* in this text are much less easy to understand. One of the more accessible passages is in column ii of Tablet 6. The column is fragmentary to start; when it becomes legible, the Old Woman is making a mixture of sand/dust, alkali, meal, and bitter vetch. She rubs it on the patient’s body and says,

“Bitter vetch (is) pure like a lion; it wipes down Še[ri] and Ḫurri,¹³⁷ [and] fur[ther], (it is) like a *bašmu*-snake; it raised and purified Allani alongside it(?). Allani has assigned you to the Storm-God, the king in heaven. Ištar asked of her beloved brother, ‘Cut me free,

¹³⁴ KBo 3.8+KUB 7.1 ii 63 ^{MUNUS}ḫa-sa-wa-an pé-e-ḫu-te-e[ḫ-ḫu-un na-aš pa-id-du na-an-kán E]ME-SU
64 ša-aḫ-du nu ^{MUNUS}ḫa-a-sa-wa-as pa[-it na-an-kán] EME-ŠU ša-aḫ-ta

65 nu ŠA ^dUTU DUMU.NITA ^{MEŠ}nu-za ^{MUNUS}ḫa-a-^lša^l-u-wa-as [B]A[PP]IR da-a-ú
66 na-an-kán EME-ŠU šar-ta-a-id-du EGIR-ŠU^l-ma-an
67 IŠ-TU Ì.NUN iš-ki-id-du nam-ma-an IŠ-TU LĀL-it
68 EME-ŠU ar-ḫa a-an-aš-du nu DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU SIG₅-ru
69 nu-uš-ši-iš-ša-an I-NA KA^xU-ŠU an-da 3-ŠU al-la-pa-<ḫi>
Restorations after Haas, *ibid*.

¹³⁵ ŠIPAT EME

¹³⁶ See Haas, *Geschichte*, 381.

¹³⁷ The Hurrian Storm-God’s bulls.

purify my body—give it, Storm-God, my brother!’ The Storm-God said to Ištar, ‘I have given it to you, too(?)—what will you do?’

“They arrived, (i.e.) the kings, and the heroic ones worried. Mankind lies at his feet around/for *turduttim*,¹³⁸ while the ritual patient speaks! To whom(pl.) (s)he is dear, let him/her be bowed down before me with respect to them, but let him be a lordly person before the heroes. Let the mortals be crouched down at my feet, and let me stand over their bodies! [...]

“When [(s)he] rub[s] his/her eyes with bitter vetch, [let him/her be] a lor[dly one] before everyone! See me from the breast [...]”¹³⁹

The first paragraph of this incantation seems relatively straightforward; although we do not have a broader mythological context for Allani’s situation at the beginning, she has clearly been given some power, and has assigned the ritual patient (as I interpret the second person here) to the

¹³⁸ Bachvarova (“Adapting Mesopotamian Myth in Hurro-Hittite Rituals at Hattuša: Ištar, the Underworld, and the Legendary Kings,” in *Beyond Hatti. A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, ed. B.J. Collins and P. Michalowski [Atlanta, Lockwood Press: 2013], 34n51) suggests “restitution,” after Akkadian *turdum*.

¹³⁹ KBo 12.85++ ii 19 (=VBoT 120 ii 5’) ʾGÚ.SIS¹-aš UR.MAH-aš ʾGIM¹-an šu-up-pí-iš^{GU} ʾŠe-[ri-in]

20 ʾGU⁴Hur-ri-in ar-ḥa ʾa-ar¹-iš-ki-iz-zi an-[da-ma]

21 ʾMUŠ^ŠŠA.TÙR ʾGIM¹-an ʾGAM¹-an-ma-aš-ši^d Al-la-ni-[in]

22 ʾšal-la-nu-ut¹ pá-ku-nu-ut^d Al-la-a-ni-iš-ma-at-t[a?]

23 ʾU-ni ne-pí-ši LUGAL-i ma-ni-ia-aḥ-ta a-aš-ši-ia-an-t[i]

24 ʾŠEŠ-ni¹ ʾIŠTAR-ʾiṣ¹ ú-e-ek-ta kar-aš-mu

25 NÍ.TE-IA pá-ku-nu-ut [n]a-at pa-a-i^d U-aš ŠEŠ-IA

26 ʾU-aš A-NA ʾIŠTAR me-mi-iš-ta pé-eḥ-ḥu-un-na-at-ta

27 na-at ku-it DÙ-ši

28 e-[r]i-ra-at LUGAL^{MEŠ} nu šar-ga-u-e-eš pít-ʾtu¹-le-ʾe¹-er

29 DUMU^{MEŠ} LÚ^{MEŠ} EL-LU-TI-ma-aš-ši A-NA ŠA-PAL GÌR^{[M]EŠ}-ŠU

30 AŠ-ŠUM TÚR-DU-UT-TIM ki-ia-an-ta-ri EN ʾSÍSKUR¹-ma te-ez-ʾzi¹

31 a-aš-ši-ia-an-za-aš-za-kán ku-ʾe¹-da-aš na-at-mu GAM-an ka-ʾni-na-an-za¹

32 e-eš-du šar-ga-u-wa-aš-ma-za pé-ra-an iš-ḥa-aš-šar-wa-ʾan-za e-eš-du¹

33 DUMU.<LÚ>.U₁₉-LU-TI-ma-mu GÌR^{MEŠ}-aš GAM-an ka-ʾni-na¹-an-te-eš ʾa-ša-an-du¹

34 nu-uš-ma-aš še-er NÍ.TE-iš-ši ar-ḥa-ḥa-ru x[]

35 ma-a-an-za IŠ-TU GÚ.SIS IGI^{HIA}-wa pa-ši-ḥa-ʾa¹-[iz-zi]

36 nu-za ḥu-u-ma-an-ti-i pé-ra-an iš-ḥa-aš-ša[r-wa-an-za e-eš-du]

37 a-uš-tén-mu^{UZU} GABA-az

Edited Haas and Wegner, *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen*, 132–34.

Storm-God's protection. The Storm-God, we see next, has the power to cut even a goddess free (cutting is a frequent metaphor for freeing a person from sorcery or other affliction) and to purify her body. The second paragraph is more difficult; there is no context at all with which to understand who the "kings" and "heroic ones" are, or even whether they are the same group or two different groups. I am choosing to interpret "the ritual patient speaks" as a description of what is happening;¹⁴⁰ therefore, this is a request that the patient be appropriately submissive (to a deity, perhaps Ištar?), but otherwise of a lordly manner. Then the incantation continues with "Let the mortals be crouched down at my feet," which again makes much more sense for a deity.

After this, the incantation becomes quite fragmentary. However, in the following broken paragraphs are attested the god ^dŠišummi, and sweet substances like *gal[aktar]*, as well as the request that the patient's word become sweet like honey, before it again descends into unintelligibility. The presence of *galaktar* and aromatics is reminiscent of central Anatolian (i.e. non-Hurrian) evocation rituals, e.g., the Disappearance of Telipinu; in addition, ^dŠišummi seems to be a reference to a deity who goes all the way back to one of the oldest Hittite texts, the proclamation of Anitta. We also can see something similar in the Luwian text CTH 759, the *dupaduparša*-ritual, with the request that the patient's words be sweet like honey (discussed below). Despite the *historiola* featuring Hurro-Mesopotamian-context deities such as Allani and Ištar, then, elements from several different "traditions" can be identified here.¹⁴¹

After this, the incantation once again becomes difficult to understand and impossible to interpret, and soon comes to an end. However, at the bottom of the next column there is another *historiola*, featuring the Storm-God, Hebat, Ištar, and Ea. The final sentence before the column

¹⁴⁰ If what follows is the ritual patient's speech, there is nothing at all that seems to make sense as the subject of the imperatives, unless the patient is speaking of themselves in the third person.

¹⁴¹ See the Introduction for more on this subject.

breaks is, “Facing the fea[r] of the lion and the terror of the snake [...],”¹⁴² which clearly hearkens back to the “bitter vetch” of column ii, which has the qualities of the lion and the snake, and purifies the Storm-God’s bulls and raised Allani up to a position of power. There may, therefore, have been a larger narrative running through the entire text; unfortunately, with several full tablets missing and the rest fragmentary, it is impossible to know for certain.

One other *historiola* in this text is relevant; Tablet 6 begins with what is clearly a fragmentary *historiola* about Teššub and Ḫebat; the *historiola* itself is far too fragmentary to translate, but it ends with an excellent example of how *historiolae* often function. The text reads, “Like Teššub, [let] him/her [be] pure, let [...] be [...like] Ḫebat, [let him/her be pure]!” (The restorations are assured by a Hurrian parallel that reads, “May I be pure in the same way as Teššob!... May [I] be pure [in the same way as Ḫebat!]”¹⁴³) Although the content of the *historiola* is completely opaque, its function can be understood by the concluding statement: a story about the heads of the Hurrian pantheon, Teššub and Ḫebat, is designed to be projected onto the status of the patient.

Another Hurrian-language Old Woman ritual is CTH 788, the ritual of the Old Woman Šalašu. Very little of this long text is preserved. CTH 788.1.A, KBo 19.145, is a single-column tablet that splits into two columns for the incantations: one side in Hurrian, one in Hittite. It is quite fragmentary, but on the reverse there is a reasonably well-preserved *historiola*. The incantation is introduced by, “[she speaks] thus in Hurrian”—indicating that the Hurrian version

¹⁴² KBo 12.85++ iii 47 (6’ in copy) nu ʾIGI-an-daʾ ŠA ʾUR.MAHʾ na-aḫ-š[a-ra-at-ta-an...] 48 ŠA MUŠ-ia ʾú-e-riʾ-te-ma-an

Edited Haas and Wegner, *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen*, 140.

¹⁴³ KBo 23.23++ rev. 64’ (=46’ in the handcopy) ʾIM-pu-na-aʾ-at pá-r-nu-uš-du-uš...[ʾḫé-bat-u-na-a-at] 65’ pá-r-nu-uš-du-uš

See D. Campbell, *Mood and Modality in Hurrian*, Languages of the Ancient Near East 5 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 138, for this passage.

of the incantation was the one to be pronounced aloud, while the Hittite version was likely there to inform the reader of the text what the incantation meant. It reads,

“Where did they come from, the hot [stones]? From what mountain did they fall, the hot stones? The hot stones came from the mountain of Ninuwa... [...] like [...] they came facing Ištar. Ištar [...] is asking the hot [ston]es, ‘Where [did you] come from? From what [mountain]?’ ‘We came from the house of the ritual patron. We released the him who was bound; we let out the caged man.’

“I freed the ensorcelled woman at the gate; I freed the ensorcelled man at the gate. If you(pl.) go, go to the gatehouse/courtyard and take the *šuwantiya*-bull. Straightaway free the bound one, release the ca[ged] man from the cage. Free the [ensor]cel[led] woman at the [gat]e; [fre]e the [ensor]celled man [at the gate.]”¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴ KBo 19.145 iii 30' [(ku)]-¹e¹-e[(z-za-at-ká)]n ¹ú¹-(¹e-er¹) a-a-an-te-e[š NA₄^{HLA}]
 31' [(ku)]-¹e¹-(ez-z)a-[(at-ká)]n [(HUR.SAG)-az] kat-ta ma-¹uš-še¹-er
 32' [(a-a-an-te-eš NA₄^{HLA} a)-a-a]n-¹te¹-eš-¹kán NA₄^{HLA}¹
 33' [(^{URU}ni-i-nu-wa-az HUR.SA)G...š]a-zi-i[a] x x
 34' [(pa-ra-a ú-e-er x)...]x-ša-aš-kán []¹ta¹-x
 35' [(i-wa-ar)] ¹A-NA¹ [(^dIŠ)TAR me-n]a-aḥ-ḥa-an-d[a] ¹ú¹-e-¹er¹
 36' [(^dIŠTAR a-a-an-du))-¹uš¹ [NA₄]^{HLA} pu-¹nu-uš-ki¹-iz-zi
 37' [(¹ku-e-ez-za-w¹)]a-kán ú-wa-¹at¹-(tén) ku-e-ez-za-wa-¹kán¹
 38' [HUR.SAG-az] kat-ta IŠ-TU É EN SÍSKUR-¹ma¹
 39' ¹pa¹-(r)a-a ¹ú¹-wa-u-en iš-ḥ[i-i]a-an-ta-an-wa-ra-an ar-ḥa
 40' la-a-u-e-en ^{LÚ}GIŠ-[r]u-w[a-a]n-da-an-ma-kán ar-ḥa tar-nu-me-en

41' a-aš-ki-kán an-¹da¹ al-wa-an-za-aḥ-ḥa-an-da-an MUNUS-an
 42' la-a-nu-un a-aš-k[i-ká]n an-da al-wa-an-za-aḥ-ḥa-an-da-an
 43' ^{LÚ}-an la-a-nu-u[n m]a-a-an i-ia-ad-du-ma
 44' na-aš-ta ḥi-i-e[l-l]i i-it-tén nu GU₄-aš šu-wa-an-ti-ia-an
 45' da-a-at-tén ki-i[t pa]-an-da-la-az iš-ḥi-ia-an-da-an
 46' [l]a-a-at-tén ^{LÚ}GIŠ-[ru-wa-a]n-da-an-ma-kán GIŠ-ru-wa-az
 47' [ar-ḥ]a tar-na-at-(tén a-aš-k[i-kán] an-da
 48' [al-wa-an-z]a-a[ḥ]-ḥ[a-an-da-a]n MUNUS-an la-a-at-tén
 49' [a-aš-ki-kán an-da al-wa-an-z]a-aḥ-ḥa-an-da-an ^{LÚ}-an
 50' ¹ar-ḥa¹ [tar-na-at-te]-en

With restorations from duplicate KUB 34.101; for the edition, see Haas and Wegner, *Beschwörerinnen*, 214–15.

Although there is not much that can be said about the content of the myth,¹⁴⁵ the desired efficacy is made clear in the latter part of the incantation: the hot stones are part of some narrative in which a bound, ensorcelled person or deity is freed. Invoking them, therefore, helps free the currently bound, ensorcelled patient. The second paragraph seems to be Ištar speaking, since it is in the singular, and so her abilities and success may be mapped onto Šalašu's later actions, as seen already in both CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1 and in CTH 390C.

There are a few other fragmentary *historiolae* attested in Old Woman rituals; the Old Woman Mallidunna authored at least two evocation texts, one for the Sun-deity, and one for Ḫannaḫanna, and in each of them there is a *historiola* featuring the target deity; however, they are both too fragmentary for any productive analysis. In CTH 404.5, Maštigga's *taknaz dā*-ritual, there are two incantations containing what seem to be very brief *historiolae* about animals, but they are also fragmentary, and the context is unfortunately invisible to us, making them impossible to interpret. Finally, it is clear that there are mythological references being made in the Hurrian incantations in Ašdu and Allaituraḫḫi's rituals (for example, CTH 780.I, the Hurrian version of Allaituraḫḫi's ritual, seems to refer to the Kumarbi myth on the obverse, in particular the birth (*fud*) of Teššub, the Hurrian Storm-God and king of the gods,¹⁴⁶ while the reverse includes a narrative about Teššub, and refers to the gods all seating themselves, and going into their temples¹⁴⁷). Unfortunately our understanding of the Hurrian language is for the most part too limited to make much of those texts. A similar situation arises in the almost completely

¹⁴⁵ Hot stones are used frequently in Hittite ritual; sometimes liquid such as wine is poured over them to produce aromatic steam, and sometimes they are placed in washing-water (see Haas, *Materia*, 192ff.). This usage does not, unfortunately, lend much understanding to this particular *historiola*.

¹⁴⁶ Dennis Campbell, personal communication.

¹⁴⁷ D. Schwemer, *Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen: Materialien und Studien nach den schriftlichen Quellen* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001), 456n3764.

incomprehensible Hattian rituals: there appears to be a mythological narrative in KBo 37.23, but for the most part we cannot read it.¹⁴⁸

Finally, there are two texts that, rather than recited *historiolae*, preserve dialogues that seem to function in a similar manner. CTH 820, the Benedictions to the Labarna, has the Old Woman and a palace servant playing two parts that are unfortunately not entirely clear from the preserved text, but it ends in an encomium (probably) to the king (a detailed analysis of this text has already been made in ch. 1). The other text is CTH 450, the Royal Funerary Ritual. The Old Women appear throughout the ritual's fourteen days, and their first appearance is when two of them have a dialogue over a scale on the second day,¹⁴⁹ after the deceased's bones have been burned. On the morning of the second day, a group of women gathers up the bones and extinguishes the pyre, dips the bones in fine oil and wraps them in cloth, and places them on a royal chair. They make offerings, and have a meal, and drink to the deceased's soul. A statue is placed on the pyre and decorated with fruits, and offerings are made. Then an Old Woman takes a scale, and on one side of it she puts silver, gold, and precious stones, and on the other side of it she puts clay. She then has a dialogue with another Old Woman, which goes as follows:

The first Old Woman says, “(S)he will bring the dead one (the name, thus). Who will bring him/her?”

Her colleague says, “The men of Ḫatti (and?) the *uruhhi*-men will bring him/her.”

The first Old Woman responds, “Let them not bring him/her!”

¹⁴⁸ P. Goedegebuure has translated one small passage as “We have hit the human child on the head” (“Central Anatolian Languages and Language Communities in the Colony Period: A Luwian-Hattian Symbiosis and the Independent Hittites,” in *Anatolia and the Jazira During the Old Assyrian Period*, ed. J.G. Dercksen, PIHANS 111 [Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2008], 155–56) which, added to the presence of divine entities in the lines immediately preceding, seems like it could be analogous to the *historiola* in CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, where the malicious entities talk about attacking the patient.

¹⁴⁹ For a discussion of the various versions of the second day of this ritual, see M. Kapeluś, “Les descriptions du deuxième jour du grand rituel funéraire des rois hittites,” in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology Warsaw, 5–9 September 2011*, ed. P. Taracha with the assistance of M. Kapeluś (Warsaw: Agade, 2014), 370–89.

Her colleague says, “Take the silver (and) gold for yourself!”

She says, “I will not [tak]e it for myself!” She repeats this three times, and on the third time, she says, “[I will] take the clay for myself!” She breaks the scale apart, and holds the pieces up to the Sun-God, and laments, wailing.¹⁵⁰ There follows a fragmentary offering sequence.

This dialogue is also opaque in places, but the best guess for its interpretation seems to be that they are staging a debate over the king or queen’s soul, and the Old Woman who refuses to take a bribe(?) of precious metals and stones is allowing the royal person to go up to join the gods rather than down into the underworld.¹⁵¹ In this case, therefore, the actions of the speakers are mapping onto the supernatural world, rather than the other way around.

Overall, it can be seen that the purpose of most *historiolae* is to model the current situation in a narrative about the gods, creating an analogue which then can influence the participants. The effectiveness of the gods’ solution to the problem in the narrative is transferred to the patient. This can be seen most explicitly in CTH 390C, in which the gods fix the problem of the river in the same way as the practitioner is fixing the problem of the child’s illness. These narratives can even involve the patient themselves, as in CTH 490.II/490.IV/458.1, where one story is adapted in two different ways to specifically discuss the patient’s situation, and the gods

¹⁵⁰ KUB 30.15++ obv. 29 [nu] ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI ^{MUNUS}a-re-eš-ši me-na-aḥ-ḥa-an-da ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i GIDIM-[m]a-kán

30 [ú]-^re¹-da-iz-zi-wa-ra-an *UM-MA ŠU-UM* nu-wa-ra-an ku-iš ú-e-da-[i]z-zi

31 [^{MUNUS}]^ra¹-ra-aš-wa-ša te-ez-zi LÚ^{MES URU}Ḥat-ti-wa-ra-an ^{LÚ.MES}u-ru-uḥ-ḥe-e[š] ^rú¹-e-da-an-zi

32 [a-pa]-a-aš-ša te-ez-zi le-e-wa-ra-an ú-e-da-an-zi a-ra-a-š-ši-š[a t]e-ez-zi

33 [K]Ú.BABBAR-az KÚ.SIG₁₇ da-a a-pa-aš-ša te-ez-zi *Ú-UL*-wa-ra-at-za [da-a]ḥ-ḥi nu 3-*ŠU QA-TAM-<MA>* me-ma-i

34 [*I-NA*] 3 KASKAL-*NI*-ma l-iš ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i šal-i-iš-li-in-wa-za da-a[ḥ-ḥi nu] ^rGIŠNUNUZ ZI.B¹[A.NA]

35 [ar-ḥa] du-wa-ar-ni-ia-iz-zi na-at-kán ^dUTU-i me-^rna-aḥ¹-ḥ[a-an-da e-ep-zi]

36 [kal-ga?]-li-na-iz-zi nu ú-e-iš-ki-u-wa-an [da-a-i]

Edited by Kassian et al., *Hittite Funerary Ritual*, pp. 266–69.

¹⁵¹ This interpretation is supported by the possibility that Tudḫaliya IV had this section of the ritual taken out, due to his desire to be recognized as divine during his life (and therefore in no danger of descending to the underworld after death). See Th. van den Hout, “Zu einer Stratigraphie der hethitischen Totenrituale,” in *Saeculum: Gedenkschrift für Heinrich Otten anlässlich seines 100. Geburtstags*, ed. A. Müller-Karpe, E. Rieken, and W. Sommerfeld, StBoT 58 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015), 301–306.

in the story are attending to the patient's problems. *Historiolae* also allow the practitioner to self-aggrandize somewhat, as seen particularly in CTH 390, where the *ḥašawa*-woman is specifically named by the gods to be the best person to deal with the problem. The use of metaphor to demonstrate (and/or achieve) ritual efficacy is, as has already been stated, one of the Old Women's primary tools, and in the following section it will be discussed more fully.

3.3.4: Ritual Analogies

The ways that the Old Women created an analogue so as to bring divine power to bear on the patient's problems have just been discussed. Analogy was also used to concretize those problems into the physical world so that they could be addressed by human means. For example, in CTH 391, the ritual of Ambazzi, Ambazzi pours grains into a vessel and roasts them. She extinguishes them with water and says, "Just as I have extinguished this, also let the evil burdening¹⁵² the patients likewise be extinguished!"¹⁵³ Most incantations like this use the standard Hittite formula "Just as...also likewise" (Hittite *mahhan...=ia QATAMMA*); they are common enough that a book has already been written on them, *La similitudine nella magia analogica ittita*, by Giulia Torri.¹⁵⁴ Torri focuses on the syntax and literary characteristics of incantations that use this formula; she categorizes a large number of analogies based on their linguistic structure. However, given the focus of the book on linguistic and literary elements of similes, Torri does not include the many analogies that elide or imply the analogic relationship, without using the simile formula; for example, one of the more evocative images in Hittite ritual is from CTH 402, the ritual of Allī:

¹⁵² Literally "on top of."

¹⁵³ KUB 9.25++ ii 7 ma-aḥ-ḥa-an-kán ki-i ki-iš-ta-nu-nu-un i-da-a-lu-ia-kán
8 A-NA EN^{MES}-TIM še-er QA-TAM-MA ki-iš-ta-ru
Edited by Christiansen, *Ambazzi*, pp. 42–43.

¹⁵⁴ Rome: Herder, 2003.

If a [woman] has performed (ritual acts against) him/her—you, O Sun-God, know her—let them be a headdress for her; let her wear them on her head. Let her take them back to herself! Let them be a girdle for her, and let her gird herself with them. Let them be shoes for her, and let her wear them on her feet!¹⁵⁵

Here the analogic relationship is clearly “Just as a woman wears a headdress on her head, let the sorceress likewise wear her sorcery on her head,” but the text sets up the metaphor without using that phrasing. There are quite a few such elided analogies in Old Woman rituals, and, as will be demonstrated, the concept of analogy in ritual goes beyond single incantations. From the point of view of ritual efficacy, therefore, there is still quite a bit to be gained from a study of analogies.

As Torri already notes,¹⁵⁶ the items used as objects of comparison in Hittite ritual tend to be commonplace, household items or things found in the natural world. Items of comparison in Old Woman rituals include: cloth, fire, water, clay and mud, silver, doors and parts of doors, gates, animals (including cows, sheep, pigs, mules, donkeys, dogs, lions, and ants), plants (including seeds, grain, soapwort, cumin, hawthorn, trees, fields, grapevines, shrubs), bread, wine, oil, honey, fruit, fat, garden implements, combs, vessels of various types, towers, stones, knives, and gods. Gods appear as analogical reference points only when the object of the analogy is the patient; i.e., the patient is to be eternal (CTH 416) or pure (CTH 780.II) as the gods were. Otherwise, comparisons were to physical items or plants and animals: things that were accessible and understandable.

¹⁵⁵ KBo 12.126+ i 16 [ma]-a-na-an [MUNUS]-^rza?-ma¹ i-ia-an ḫar-zi na-an zi-ik ^dUTU-uš ša-ak-ti

17 [(na-a)t ^{TUG}ku-re-eš-šar e-eš-du na-at-ša-an *I-NA* SAG.DU-ŠU ši-ia-an ḫar-du

18 [(ne-z)a EGIR-pa da-a-ú iš-ḫu-zi-ša-at-ši e-eš-du

19 [ne]-ez iš-ḫu-zi-id-du ^{KUŠ}E.SIR-ma-at-ši e-eš-du na-at-za šar-ku-ud-du

(Restorations from duplicates KBo 11.12+ i 18ff. and KBo 52.27++ i 15ff.) Edited by A. Mouton, “Le rituel d’Allī,” pp. 199 and 222.

¹⁵⁶ *La similitudine*, 23f.

Looking at the texts from a practical standpoint (rather than with an eye to literary analysis of the language of the analogies, which is the basis of Torri's categories), there are four main types of analogy:

1. an attempt to impose an action or quality on the evil afflicting the patient
2. an attempt to impose an action or quality on the sorcerer who inflicted the evil
3. an attempt to impose an action or quality on the patient
4. an attempt to impose qualities of the patient on something else (i.e., a substitute).

Point (1) might be further subdivided into (a) analogies attempting to get the evil out of the patient, (b) analogies attempting to destroy the evil, (c) analogies attempting to put or keep the evil at a distance, and (d) analogies attempting to transform the evil into something good.

Some examples:

1a, removing evil from the patient: "I have here a *šarra*- (a cutting implement).

Whoever has been disabling the (patient's) twelve body [parts] with evil uncleanness—now I am cutting away evil, uncleanness, sorcery, spellcasting, the anger of the gods, (and) the horror of the dead from your twelve body parts! Let them be cut completely away from him/her!" (CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya's "Ritual of the River")¹⁵⁷

1b, destroying evil: (The Old Woman fills 7 *hupuwai*-vessels with various food items, pours them out, and smashes them.) "May they shatter—the *hupuwai*-vessels together with the mouth (and) tongue!" (CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual against domestic quarrel)¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁷ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 iii 6 ka-a-ša ^{GIŠ}šar-ra-an ḥar-mi nu-za ku-iš 12 ^{UZU}[ÚR]
 7 i-da-la-u-wa-az pa-ap-ra-an-na-az ar-ḥa šar-ri-[iš]-¹ki-it¹
 8 ki-nu-na-at-ta ^{IŠ-TU}12 ^{UZU}ÚR i-da-lu
 9 [p]a-ap-ra-tar al-wa-za-tar a-aš-ta-ia-ra-tar DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš ¹kar-pi-in¹
 10 ¹ag-ga¹-an-da-aš ḥa-tu-ga-tar a-wa-an ar-ḥa šar-ri-¹iš-ki-mi¹
 11 [na-a]t-ši a-wa-an ar-ḥa šar-ra-an e-eš-du

Edited Goetze, *Tunnawi*, p. 16.

¹⁵⁸ KBo 39.8 iii 34 tu-wa-ar-na-at-ta-ru-wa-ra-at
 35 ^{DUG}ḥu-pu-wa-ia KAxU-it EME-it

1c, keeping evil from coming back: “Just as this puppy’s eyes are stuck together, and it has not yet seen the sky, and it has not yet seen the earth, and it has not (even) already seen its mother’s teat”—she calls the person she is treating by name—“also let the evil day, the short year, the anger of the gods, and the tongue of the *panku* not ever see this person’s [vig]orous knee [amon]g their twelve body parts!” (CTH 409.IV, Tunnawiya’s “Ritual of the Ox”)¹⁵⁹

1d, transforming evil into good: (The Old Woman rinses grain with water and puts the grain in a reed container, then mixes wine, honey, and sesame oil together in a clay cup. She takes these containers in either hand, with a shallow dish underneath the reed container, and a basket on top of that. She pours the liquid over the grain, which flows down into the basket and through it down into the shallow dish, and speaks in Luwian:) “The one who spoke *hirut-* and cursed (the patient):): Let now the wine, honey, sesame? oil [and ...] flow! Let them [bec]ome oil (and) [honey]: the *tapāru*-curses, the [*hir*]ūt-curses, (and) the [*tatarriyamman*-curses] of the dead (and) the livi[ng, ...] the [...], of a brother (and) a sister [...] of the *lulaḫi* (and) the *ḫa[piri-]*, of the [army] (and) the assembly [...].” (CTH 759, Kuwatalla’s *dupaduparša* ritual)¹⁶⁰

Edited Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, pp. 89–90.

¹⁵⁹ KBo 9.125+HT 6 i 21’ ka-a-aš-ma UR.TUR ma-aḫ-ḫa-an IGI^H[(^{LA}-wa an-da)] da-me-in-kán-za na-a-ú-i ne-pí-iš a-u[(š-zi)]

22’ na-a-ú-i-ma ta-ga-an-zi-pa-a[n] a-uš-zi na-a-ú-i-ma-za an-na-aš

23’ ti-i-ta-an ḫu-u-da-a-a[k] a-uš-zi

24’ [n]u an-ni-eš-ki-iz-zi ku-i[n an-t]u-uḫ-ša-an na-an-kán *ŠUM-ŠU* te-ez-zi

25’ [k]u-u-un-na-wa an-tu-uḫ-š[a-a]n i-da-a-lu-uš UD-az ma-ni-in-ku-wa-a-an-za MU^{HLA}-za

26’ [DINGI]R^{MEŠ}-aš kar-pí-iš pa-a[n-ga]-u-wa-aš EME-aš le-e ku-wa-pí-ik-ki a-uš-zi

27’ [*A-N*]₄ 12 ^{UZU}[Ú]R^{HLA} [ma-i]a-an-da-an gi-nu-uš-^ši¹-in

(Restorations from dup. KUB 35.149.) Edited Beckman, “The Hittite ‘Ritual of the Ox,’” pp. 42 and 48.

¹⁶⁰ KUB 9.6+KUB 35.39 i 23 ku-iš ḫi-i-ru-ta-ni-[ia-at-t]a ti-wa-ta-ni-ia-at-ta

24 ¹na¹-a-nu-um-pa-ta ma-a[d-du-ú-i]n-zi ma-al-li-ti-in-zi

25 da-a-i-ni-in-zi x[]x-al-la-an-zi a-ar-ši-ia-an-du

26 [t]a-a-i-in-t[i]-¹ia¹-[ta ma-al-li a-i-]¹ia¹-ru ta-pa-a-ru-wa

27 [ḫi-ru]-ú-ta [ta-ta-ar-ri-ia-am-na u-w]a-la-an-te-ia

those who are *ḫatištantiyaš*!¹⁶⁴ Let them then go (to) the twelve body parts of the donkey!”¹⁶⁵ (CTH 458.1, similar to Tunnawiya’s *taknaz dā*- ritual)

3.3.4.1: Analogies for evil

By far the most common, of these categories is type 1, for reasons that have already been discussed: analogies were designed to impose the physical, concrete world, where the practitioner could manipulate or easily describe objects, onto the supernatural, which could not be directly manipulated and was difficult to describe or even identify. The Old Women thus had to resort to metaphors to concretize it such that it could be affected. The type 1 analogies are designed to do that; as mentioned above, the items used for analogies were nearly all recognizable, common items from nature or from the household. Evil could therefore be conceived of in ways that made sense to the practitioner and to the patient.

In most rituals, the evil would be presented in several different ways throughout the text, which let the practitioner combine different methods of eradication. For example, in CTH 391, the ritual of Ambazzi, she first compares evil to hot coals¹⁶⁶ and roasting grain, which she extinguishes. Next, she calls evil a “pull”¹⁶⁷ which may be “drawn,” first in analogy to a cloth, and then to a bowstring. It seems possible that this is a description of a symptom of the patient’s *inan*-sickness. Finally, she wraps linen around the patient and says, “Just as the washermen make [this] linen plain, and purge the lint [from] it, and it becomes white, likewise may the gods purge

¹⁶⁴ Words for malevolent divine or semi-divine entities.

¹⁶⁵ KBo 20.73++ iv 5 [na-a]t-ta-at-za tar-¹ah¹-ta ka-a-aš an-tu-wa-ah-ḫa-aš 2 GÌR^{MEŠ}-ŠU

6 [n]a-at-za ANŠE-aš 4 GÌR^{MEŠ}-ŠU tar-uḫ-zi 12 ^{UZU}ÚR^{HI.A}-at-za tar-ru-uḫ-zi

7 ar-ḫa-ma-at tar-na-an-du ke-e-el DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU 12 ^{UZU}ÚR^{HI.A}

8 ku-i-e-eš ši-wa-an-ni-e-eš ku-i-e-eš ḫa-ti-iš-ta-an-ti-ia-aš

9 na-at EGIR-an ŠA ANŠE 12 ^{UZU}ÚR^{HI.A} pa-a-an-du

(Restorations based on Fuscagni’s transliteration of the unpublished duplicate Bo 2567c.) Edited by Fuscagni, hethiter.net/: CTH 458.1.1

¹⁶⁶ *ḫuwalli*, interpreted thus by Haas (*Materia*, 288). Christiansen (*Ambazzi*, 86ff.), who is followed by HW², suggests rather that *ḫuwalli* is “juniper.”

¹⁶⁷ Hittite *ḫuiteššar*, attested only in this text; the exact meaning is unclear, but it is clearly meant to refer to a type of affliction, perhaps pain or illness. The verb translated as “draw,” *ḫuittiya-*, is cognate.

the evil *inan*-sickness from this person's body!"¹⁶⁸ (For more on the gods as actors in analogies, see below.) The analogy of cleaning evil from a patient as one cleans dirt from a cloth is attested in other rituals as well, and the focus of the analogy can switch between the evil-as-dirt (as here) and the patient-as-cloth (as in CTH 398, *Huwarlu*, and CTH 402, *Alli*). In the latter two rituals, however, the Old Woman is actually pressing a cleansing agent to the patient's body, and so the purificatory action seems to draw the incantation's focus to the patient, rather than here, where the object is a cloth and cleaning is only mentioned in the incantation. In the main version of Ambazzi's ritual, the divine entities are also invited to strike part of a door instead of the patient (see above). However, in the fragmentary version 2, there is a fourth analogy: "Just as the *hattalwant*- drives back the SAG.KUL, and the door opens, also let it likewise halt the abomination(s) of evil people, sexual misconduct, uncleanness, (and) *:mulātar* in/for the king!"¹⁶⁹ Despite some difficulties with translating various terms,¹⁷⁰ it is apparent that the evils are to be equated with a physical part of the door that moves.

¹⁶⁸ KUB 9.25++ ii 26 [ki-i-ká]n GADA-an ma-aḥ-ḥa-an^{LÚ.MEŠ} AZLAG ta-an-na-ra-an
 27 [an-ni-ia]-an-zi nu-uš-ši-kán SÍG ma-ri-iḥ-ši-in
 28 [ar-ḥa] pár-ku-nu-wa-an-zi na-at ḥar-ki-iš-zi
 29 [ke-e-e]l-ma an-tu-uḥ-ša-aš i-da-a-lu i-na-an DINGIR^{MEŠ}
 30 [NÍ.T]E-az ar-ḥa QA-TAM-MA pár-ku-nu-wa-an-du
 Edited by Christiansen, *Ambazzi* pp. 44–45.

¹⁶⁹ KBo 13.109 iii 6^{GIŠ} ḥa-at-tal-wa-an-za GIM-an
 7^{GIŠ} SAG.KUL EGIR-pa na-an-na-a-i
 8^{GIŠ} IG-ia EGIR-pa ḥé-eš-ki-iz-zi
 9 LUGAL-i-ia ḤUL-wa-aš UN^{MEŠ} AN-ZE-EL-LU
 10 ḥur-ki-il pa-ap-ra-tar :mu-la-a-tar
 11 QA-TAM-MA ar-ḥa a-ra-id-du
 Edited *ibid.* p. 156.

¹⁷⁰ See CHD L–N s.v. (:) *mulatar*, p. 327, for a summary; given the occasional lack of logical correspondence between the verbs in analogic halves, I do not object as strenuously as they do to interpreting *arai*- with its first meaning "to arise" rather than "to stop," particularly since the interpretation of *hattalwant*- as the agent of the second half of the analogy as well as the first is unusual. In that case, the translation would rather be, "...also let the abomination(s) of evil people, sexual misconduct, uncleanness, (and) *:mulātar* likewise arise from the king!" If the SAG.KUL were a door-part that habitually rose vertically in order to allow the door to open, this translation would certainly make more sense; however—as noted by the CHD—SAG.KUL and *hattalu* are sometimes equated in the dictionaries, so it is clear that our understanding of what these items are is not as concrete as it might be.

In one ritual, therefore, the evil afflicting the patient is equated to: (1) coals and burning grains, (2) something that “pulls,” like a bowstring (3) dirt and lint on white cloth, and (4) part of a moving door mechanism. It can therefore be (1) extinguished, (2) pulled in the opposite direction, (3) washed clean, and (4) driven back or lifted away. This multiplicity of methods seems to allow for a mindset of comprehensiveness: by approaching the evil in so many different ways, the practitioner can create the impression that it has been thoroughly eradicated (think, for example, of an advertisement for a cleaning product or pest control, which might similarly suggest that it uses several methods at once to get rid of dirt or infestations, and is therefore more effective). This strategy is used throughout the Old Woman ritual corpus; a similar comprehensive approach has already been seen in CTH 398, where multiple analogies are also used. The specific ways in which evil can be concretized and attacked will be discussed further in chapter 4.

More rarely, evil can be transformed into something good, as seen above in the example from CTH 759 where it is supposed to become honey, oil, and wine, and flow away. Another example is from CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya’s “Ritual of the River,” in which the patient passes through gates of thorny wood, which is intended to pull the evil from them like tufts of hair off of sheep. After the patient goes through the gate, (s)he throws bread back behind him- or herself, and the Old Woman says, “Let the evil uncleanness turn completely into grain behind him/her!”¹⁷¹ One could also interpret the passage from CTH 433 invoking the hearth in this way: the Old Woman says, “Let the fat-bread lie once more in their mouths, and let oil flow forth from their mouths!”¹⁷² perhaps indicating that the evil words contaminating their mouths should

¹⁷¹ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 iii 46 i-da-lu-uš-ši pa-ap-ra-<tar> EGIR-an ar-ḥa
47 ḥal-ki-iš na-a-¹ú¹

¹⁷² KBo 17.105+ ii 33’ nu-uš-ma-aš-kán *PU-U-i-ia-aš-mi* NINDA.Ì.E.DÉ.A nam-ma ki-it-ta-ru
34’ na-aš-ma-aš-kán KAxU-az pa-ra-a Ì-an ar-aš-du

actually be transformed into oil. Note that all of these items are formless: wine, honey, oil, and grain. This may once again be the result of evil's miasmic nature: it is not transformed into something with an existing shape, but something that is also without one.

3.3.4.2: Analogies for enemies

Type 2, analogies focused on an enemy person, seems to be almost entirely particular to the Old Women. In Torri's corpus, there is only one analogy focused on an evil person that is definitely not from an Old Woman ritual; it is from CTH 729, Ḫattic-Hittite conjurations, conducted by the Man of the Storm-God ("Just as the birds (and) foxes eat this one's sheep's insides, so also let the birds (and) foxes likewise eat the strength of the evil person and his wives, children, (and) troops."¹⁷³). There are also three texts with analogies of this type that have no practitioner attested: first, CTH 426.1, a ritual to aid the army in battle, in which the enemy troops are cursed through analogy; second, another military ritual, CTH 427, the soldier's oath, in which divine punishments for the violation of the oath are articulated using analogy; and third, CTH 458.2, a text designed to help someone whose compatriot (*TAPPU=ŠU*) has said something reprehensible to him.¹⁷⁴ However, neither of those are directed against another ritual practitioner. Outside of Torri's corpus, CTH 392, the ritual of the woman Anna of Kaplawiya, should also be noted (she digs holes for hawthorn-plants and says, "Let the evil person, the evil words, and the

¹⁷³ KUB 24.14 iv 19b nu k[e]-ḫe¹-el UDU-un GIM-an
 20b ZI-ŠU MUŠEN^{HLA} KA₅.A^{HLA}
 21b a-da-an-zi ḪUL-lu-uš-ša
 22b UN-aš Ḫ ŠA DAM^{MES}-ŠU
 23b DUMU^{MES}-ŠU ÉRIN^{MES} UZU GÉŠPU
 24b MUŠEN^{HLA} KA₅.A^{HLA}
 25b QA-TAM-MA a-da-an-du

See Torri, *La similitudine*, 107f., for this passage.

¹⁷⁴ Torri ("A Hittite Magical Ritual to be Performed in an Emergency," *JANER* 4 (2004): 129–41) believes that this is a ritual for a private citizen to perform.

evil eyes be fixed below with hawthorn!”¹⁷⁵); in the incipit of her ritual, Anna is identified by her city of origin and her husband’s name, rather than any profession.

Even considering these examples, then, the Old Women seem to have been the primary professionals who dealt with sorcery.¹⁷⁶ Practitioners such as the AZU-men did not conduct rituals attempting to send sorcery back to its practitioner, or destroy or incapacitate antagonists. Rather, they performed purification rituals such as CTH 446 or CTH 491, in which evil is dispelled but its origin is not conceived of as another person, or CTH 471 and 472, in which there is an offender behind the impurity but no retribution is meted out, or CTH 484, in which an evil person is hypothesized to have drawn the gods’ attention elsewhere, but the only solution is to draw it back with their own evocation.

Thus it seems as though ritual action against a sorcerer was more appropriate for female than for the male practitioners. It was not quite exclusive to the Old Women: in CTH 408, the ritual of Pupuwanni, the female augur,¹⁷⁷ a figurine is made of an evil sorcerer, so likely she performed something similar, but the text is too broken to say what actions were taken; a similar situation is seen in CTH 417, the small fragment of a ritual of a woman Nikkaluzzi, who makes a figurine of an enemy of the king, and whose profession is not attested (perhaps it fell in the break in line 1 of the text). In addition, in CTH 443, the ritual against Tudhaliya I’s sister Ziplantawiya, the practitioner likewise attempts to turn Ziplantawiya’s sorcery back on her; however, this

¹⁷⁵ KUB 12.44 iii 6’ i-da-a-lu-uš-wa-aš-ša-an

7’ an-tu-u-wa-aḥ-za i-da-a-lu-uš EME-aš

8’ i-da-a-la-wa IGI^{HLA}-wa GIŠ^hha-tal-ki-iš-ni-ṛit¹

9’ kat-ta tar-ma-a-an e-eš-du

See Mouton, “Sorcellerie,” 111 and Haas, “Magie in hethitischen Gärten,” in *Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae: Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. E. Neu and C. Rüster (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988), 121–42.

¹⁷⁶ As Mouton has already suggested (“Dans la sphère humaine, l’expert le plus fréquemment mentionné en relation avec les rituels de contremagie est la Vieille Femme,” [“Sorcellerie,” 116]), though her study is not comprehensive.

¹⁷⁷ See Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 490n858 for a summary of the views on Pupuwanni’s profession and convincing argument that she is both the single ritual author and a female augur.

practitioner is never identified. It should be noted that several of the exceptions noted here and above could have had Old Women as their practitioners, but are not well-preserved enough to tell. Ritual attacks against enemies are attested in the Old Woman rituals CTH 391, CTH 397, CTH 402, CTH 409.I, CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, CTH 418, CTH 435, CTH 759, CTH 761, and CTH 780.II. Therefore, one might term the Old Women both “offensive” and “defensive” ritual practitioners, as opposed to the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}AZU and ^{LÚ.MEŠ}HAL, who were purely “defensive.”¹⁷⁸ One can see this “offensive” attitude even in CTH 391, the ritual of Ambazzi, in which Ambazzi is *not* performing a ritual against an evil sorcerer—however, she still says, “Draw away the evil pull from their heads, hands, feet, and all their body parts! Give it to evil ones, to enemies!”¹⁷⁹

The reason analogy in particular was used to attack sorcerers should be clear: like evil, they were inaccessible by physical methods, simply because they were not present, and often were not identifiable. For the most part, they were analogized using anthropomorphic figurines, like the example from Tunnawiya’s ritual quoted above, in which she melts figurines of tallow and wax so that the sorcerers will likewise melt. However, there is the occasional use of a nonhuman metaphor so as to impose some other destructive force. The specific methods for attacking sorcerers will be further discussed in chapter 4. For the moment, it should be noted that although different analogies could be used for sorcerers, there is generally only one attested per text: sorcerers did not need to be given many different forms in the same ritual, since their form was already known. The only type of multiplicity of form that appears is in CTH 402, the ritual

¹⁷⁸ Mouton (“Sorcellerie,” 109) has noted something similar, but she frames it somewhat differently: “Ces quelques exemples indiquent que la magie malveillante pouvait être pratiquée par les spécialistes de la magie « officielle » que nos textes mentionnent, la Vieille Femme étant le personnage prédominant.”

¹⁷⁹ KUB 9.25++ iii 25 ar-ḥa-aš-ma-aš-kán i-da-a-lu ḥu-it-te-eš ḥu-it-ti-[ia]

26 SAG.DU^{MEŠ}-it ŠU^{MEŠ}-it GÌR^{MEŠ}-it ḥu-u-ma-an-ti-[it]

27 ^{UZU}UR¹-it na-at i-da-a-la-u-wa-aš ḥar-pa-n[a-al-li-ia-aš p]é-eš-ki

Edited by Christiansen, *Ambazzi* pp. 50–51.

of Allī, in which both a male and female figurine are made, to guarantee success whether the sorcerer was a man or a woman.

3.3.4.3: Analogies for positive force

Type 3 is analogies directed to the patient. This is the inverse of Type 1; rather than negative force being concretized so that it can be negated, positive force is concretized so that it can be used. This is much less common than the previous types, since Old Woman rituals are primarily focused on the eradication of evil, but it does appear: we have already seen it in CTH 398, where dough is used to ritually nourish and sustain the patients in the face of evil. Another example is from CTH 409.I, Tunnaviya's "Ritual of the River": she takes hold of the horn of a cow or a bull (depending on the gender of the patient), and she says:

“Sun-God, my lord, just as this cow is propitious, and she is in a propitious pen, and she is filling the pen with bulls (and) cows, likewise let the ritual patient hereby be propitious, and fill his/her house with sons, daughters, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, together with [descen]d[ents]¹⁸⁰ in successive generations.”¹⁸¹

In this case, no action is necessary: the cow or bull is simply indicated, and the incantation does all of the necessary work to transfer the qualities of the one onto the other. On the other hand, in CTH 780.II, Allaiturahhi's ritual, in a somewhat fragmentary but easily interpretable passage, she takes mud from a spring while reciting several different incantations: “As the [sp]ring lifts [m]ud [u]p from the da[rk earth], and [presents] it to the sun, let also [...] bring this man's form up! As the grapevine lifts [...] up [from] the ear[th] and presents it to the sun, [likewis]e [let it]

¹⁸⁰ For this restoration see HW² H p. 381.

¹⁸¹ KUB 7.53++ iv 8 ^dUTU *BE-LI-IA* ka-a-aš ma-aḥ-[ḥ]a-an GU₄-iṣ ṽu¹-ša-an-ṽa¹-ri-iṣ

9 na-aš-kán u-ša-an-ta-ri ḥa-[l]i-ia an-da nu-za-kán ḥa-a-li-<<it>>

10 ṽGU₄¹.NÍTA-it GU₄.ÁB-it ṣ[u-u]n-ni-eš-ke-ez-zi k[a]-a-ša

11 EN.SISKUR *QA-TAM-MA* u-ṽša¹-an-da-ri-iṣ e-eš-du¹ nu-za-ṽkán¹ É-er

12 *IŠ-TU* DUMU.NITA^{MES} ṽDUMU.MUNUS^{MES} ḥa-aš-še-et ḥa-an-za-aš-ši-it [ḥar[?]]-ṽdu[?]-it[?]

13 ḥar-tu-u-wa-ṽḥar-tu¹-wa-ti *QA-TAM-MA* ṣu-un-ni-id-du

also [bring] this man's form and rectitude up!"¹⁸² She heaps up various kinds of earth (mud from the spring, soil from the grapevine, among others) and recites another incantation, involving what is perhaps an animal that roots up the earth, with the same sense. Here, not only is ritual action involved, but we can see the same use of a multiplicity of analogies to achieve a single goal for the patient.

In addition to comprehensiveness through variety, however, analogy may be brought to bear in other ways. Types 1, 2, and 3 all appear together in a notable example of analogic force in CTH 402, the Ritual of Allī:

3.3.4.4: Case Study: CTH 402, the Ritual of Allī¹⁸³

In the ritual of Allī, CTH 402, most of the analogies have to do with cloth. Wright¹⁸⁴ and Mouton¹⁸⁵ have already pointed out that the succession of analogies involving different-colored threads in one passage (see below) compound on one another to create a powerful ongoing

¹⁸² KUB 12.50++ ii 14' [ša-k]u-ni-ia-aš-kán GIM-a[n] ʾpu¹-[u]-ʾru-ut¹ [(G)E₆-az KI-az ša-r(a-a)]

15' [(m)]u-ta-a-iz-zi ʾna¹-a[(t^dUTU-i) ʾi-in-ik-zi]

16' [k]e-ʾe¹-el-la-kán [(UN-a)š (L)A-A-A(N-ŠU ʾal)-]

17' [š]a-ra-a ú-d[(a-ad-du^{GIŠ}GEŠTIN-ʾaš-kán<<kán>> GIM-an tá)k-na-az]

18' (=KUB 17.27 x+1) x x x ʾša-ra-a¹ [(mu-ta-iz-zi na-at^dUTU-i)]

19' ʾi-in-ik-zi ke-e-ʾel-la-kán¹ [(UN-aš LA-A-AN-ŠU)]

20' la-az-zi-ia-u-wa-ʾar-še-et¹ [QA-TAM-M(A ša-ra-a) ú-da-ad-du)]

There seems to be some confusion about the copies of this section of Allaituraḥḫi's ritual. The primary text is 780.II.Tf01.G, which begins with the fragment KUB 12.50 (according to which this transliteration is numbered). According to the Konkordanz's Joinskizze, KUB 12.50 joins directly with KUB 17.27 ii. Assuming this is correct, there are traces of line 18' (=KUB 17.27 ii x+1) in both fragments, the top of the line in KUB 12.50 and the bottom of the line in KUB 17.27. Despite this, in his updated partial edition of 2007 ("Notizen zu den Ritualen der Frau Allaituraḥḫi"), Haas transliterates the text as though the composite line does not exist, extending line 17 and restoring the content entirely from the duplicate H (and thus transliterating a tentative [p]a-ra-a from H, rather than the ʾša-ra-a¹ clearly visible in the first line of KUB 17.27 ii). Haas' line 18 is therefore KUB 17.27 ii 2, which is incorrect; it should instead be line 19. Further complicating the issue, Lorenz and Taş ("Neue Zusatzstücke zur ersten Tafel der Rituale der Frau Allaituraḥḫi") designate KUB 12.50 as a separate exemplar entirely, M. Without testing the join, it still seems to me that the transliteration rendered above is the most correct.

¹⁸³ This text was first edited by L. Jakob-Rost (*Das Ritual der Malli aus Arzawa gegen Behexung (KUB XXIV 9+)*, THeth 2, [Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1972]); Alice Mouton has recently made an updated edition ("Le rituel d'Allī," and also hethiter.net/: CTH 402).

¹⁸⁴ "Analogy in Biblical and Hittite Ritual," in *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament: Internationales Symposium Hamburg, 17–21. März 1990*, ed. B. Janowski, K. Koch, and G. Wilhelm, OBO 129 (Fribourg/Göttingen, 1993): 493ff.

¹⁸⁵ "Le rituel d'Allī: texte et contexte."

In this ritual, the first preparations are made without any incantations; the Old Woman arranges all of the items in the correct place, and then holds the clay figurines she has made (some male, some female), along with a vessel, up to the sun. She says,

“If a [woman] has performed (spells against) him/her—you, O Sun-God, know her—let them be a headdress for her; let her wear them on her head. Let her take them back to herself! Let them be a girdle for her, and let her gird herself with them. Let them be shoes for her, and let her wear them on her feet!

¹⁸⁶ Mouton emends copies A and G from *ne-za EGIR-pa ša-a-ú to ta¹⁹-a-ú* to match copy D, which reads *da-a-ú*, “let him take them to himself (or: place them on himself).” However, in light of the following paragraph, which also contains *šai-/šiye-* with the meaning “to wear as a hat” (*n=at=šan INA SAG.DU-ŠU šīyan ḥardu*), I do not see why emendation is necessary, particularly given the many variations among copies in this text, and also considering that *dā-* is only rarely spelled with the *ta*-sign. CHD Š does not include any examples of *šai-/šiye-* mng. 2 in which someone is putting a hat on themselves (as opposed to “having put on,” *šīyan ḥar(k)-*), but *=za* would be expected in an instance of putting something on oneself. *EGIR-pa* does, admittedly, fit better with *dā-* (“to take back”) than with *šai-/šiye-*, but a translation of “again,” with the sense of the sorcerer re-girding himself (to choose a better English clothing metaphor) with his own sorcery is, I think, workable.

¹⁸⁸ Without further supporting evidence, I am not yet willing to fully accept Melchert's hypothesis ("Hittite *tuk(kan)zi*- "cultivation, breeding," *Ktema* 24 [1999]: 20–22) that the incantation is wishing the sorceress to be raped by a pig and receive the sorcery into her womb in the form of sperm. Beyond the singularity (to my knowledge) of such an incantation in the Hittite ritual corpus, the photos of the tablets suggest that the final sign of whatever word follows *dukanzi* ends in a Winkelhaken, and thus a restoration of A.A = *muwa*, "manliness, vitality"—which Melchert would interpret as a euphemism for sperm—is not possible.

13 [(a)]l-wa-an-ze-ni-eš an-tu-uh-ši-iš nu ku-u-un UN-an ma-a-an LÚ-iš i-ia-an har-zi

“‘Come, give us back the things we have done!’ Thus the mortal: ‘We will no longer endure.¹⁹¹ We have exerted ourselves(?).¹⁹² We have treated the sickness. Take them back again! Take them back to yourself!’

Let there be fodder [for] the horses! [Let] the person b[e] the figurines of clay!"¹⁹³

This incantation is clearly setting up the second main metaphor, personifying the figurines as the sorcerer(s) while simultaneously setting the patient up opposite them, demonstrating that the patient is participating in a ritual to defeat their sorcery and is also protected by deities.

Those deities are obscure—the “Sun-God of the hand” is only attested in this text, although as a Sun-God, this deity can perhaps be connected to the Sun-God(s) in other Old Woman rituals. It is not clear who the “hunter” is. This passage has been interpreted as referring to a real hunter who is participating in the ritual,¹⁹⁴ but I would expect that in that case he would be more present in the description of the actions. As it is, he otherwise only appears in some quite difficult passages later on (see below) during two other incantations and an offering sequence. I interpret the latter passage as an offering *to* him, rather than *by* him,¹⁹⁵ and therefore classify the hunter as a supernatural entity of some kind, protecting the patient (as also seen in that passage). This may be supported by the fact that tutelary/protective deities (^dLAMMA) are usually represented as hunters in Hittite iconography.¹⁹⁶

The incantation also sets up the idea that the sorcerers’ magic will be turned back on them through the figurines. The next set of actions, the sequence of incantations with threads mentioned above, enacts that reversal. It proceeds as follows:

24 [EGIR-p]a pé-eš-ti-en *UM-MA* ¹DUMU¹.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-¹MA¹ ¹Ú-UL-wa nam-ma ma-az-zu-u-e-ni

25 [(kat-t)]a-an-wa da-a-ri-ia-u-en nu-wa i-na-[an] ¹a²-ni-ia-u-e-en nu-wa-ra-at-za EGIR-pa

26 [n(a)]m-ma da-a-at-tén ne-ez pé-e-da-at-te-en

27 [ki-i]š-še-ra-aš ^dUTU-uš ^{LÚ}UR.GI₇-aš-ša LÚ-aš pé-ra-an nu-uš-ši ^{GIŠ}PAN-¹ŠU¹ e-eš-z[i]

28 [nu-uš-ši ^{GIŠ}G]^{HI.A}-ŠU e-eš-zi nu-uš-ši *A-NA* UR.GI₇-ŠU 4 UR.GI₇-ŠU e-eš-z[i]

29 [*A-NA* A]NŠE.KUR.RA^{MEŠ} i-mi-ú-ul e-eš-du nu UN-aš ALAM^{HI.A} IM ¹e¹-[eš-du]

(Restorations from dup. KBo 55.41++ i 22’ff.) Edited by Mouton, *ibid.* pp. 200–201 and 222.

¹⁹⁴ See Haas, “Der heilkundige Jäger,” *SMEA* 40/1 (1998): 143–45.

¹⁹⁵ ^{LÚ}UR.GI₇-aš LÚ-aš *kuiēš peran weḫanda* 1 NINDA.SIG *miyanit* EME *paršiya*; syntactically it makes sense for the hunter to be the subject of this sentence, since he can be easily interpreted to be a nominative—but this is also true for “the ones who turn before,” who are elsewhere attested as divine, and are considered to be the recipients of the offering by Mouton, who translates the hunter as the subject. So it is clear that the grammar of this sentence is confused no matter what the translation, and the rest of the text suggests to me that the hunter is not physically participating, but is a noncorporeal entity of some kind.

¹⁹⁶ See G. McMahon, *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities*, AS 25 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 3–4.

- 1) She lays black wool on the patient's knees and up on his/her head. She says, "The one who is b[inding?¹⁹⁷ and bew]itching him/her: now I a[m taking the spells] from him/her, and [I am] gi[ving] them back to their owner."¹⁹⁸ She then takes the black thread and winds it around the figurines.
- 2) She repeats the action with a red thread and says, "[The one who] has been making him/her bloody, who [has been] bewitch[ing] him/her: I am taking the [bloo]dy spells and I am [giv]ing them back [to their owner]."¹⁹⁹
- 3) She repeats the action with a yellow or green thread (the word is ambiguous), and says, "[The one who] has been bewitching this person, who [has] been making (him/her) yellow/green, I am now taking his/her yellow-green spells, and I am giving them back to their [owner]."²⁰⁰
- 4) Next is blue wool: she says, "The one who was making him/her blue, now I am hereby taking the blue day from his/her entire body, and I am giving it back to its owner."²⁰¹

¹⁹⁷ Mouton restores *d[ankūyanuškezzī]*, "making him/her dark," but although what was copied is consistent with a DA, the traces on the photo do not look like a DA to me. Iš is more likely, so I am following Miller's suggestion of *i[šhiškezzī]* ("Joins and Duplicates among the Boğazköy Tablets (21–30)," *ZA* 97 [2007]: 136), but the restoration is entirely tentative. The sign could also easily be a ŠA.

¹⁹⁸ KBo 12.126+ i 33 ku-iš-wa-ra-an i[š-ḫi-iš-ki-iz-zi?]

34 [al-wa-a]n-za-aḫ-ḫi-iš-ki-iz-zi ki-nu-na-aš-š[i¹⁹-kán al-wa-an-za-ta]

35 [da-aš-k]i-mi na-at EGIR-pa iš-ḫi-i[š-š]i pé-[eš-ki-mi]

Edited by Mouton, "Le Rituel d'Alli," pp. 201 and 222–23.

¹⁹⁹ KBo 12.126+ i 38 [ku-i-š]a-an iš-ḫar-nu-uš-ki-it ku-i-ša-an ṛal¹-wa-ṛan¹-za-a[ḫ-ḫi-iš-ki-it]

39 [iš-ḫa]r-nu-wa-an-da al-wa-an-za-ta da-aš-ki-mi na-[a]t ṛEGIR-pa¹ [iš-ḫi-iš-ši]

40 [pí-i]š-ki-mi

Edited by ibid., pp. 201 and 223.

²⁰⁰ KBo 12.126 i 42 (=KUB 24.9 i 40) [ku-i-ša-an k]u-u-un UN-an al-wa-an-za-aḫ-ḫi-i-it ku-i-ša ḫa-aḫ-la-aḫ-ḫi-iš-k[e-et]

43 [(ki-nu-n)]a-aš-ši-kán al-wa-an-za-ta SIG₇.SIG₇-ta da-aš-ki-mi na-at EGIR-pa

44 [iš-ḫi-i]š-ši pé-eš-ki-mi

(Restorations from dup. KBo 55.41++ i 41' ff.) Edited by ibid.

²⁰¹ KBo 12.126+ i 46 (=KUB 24.9 i 44) ku-i-ša-an an¹-ta-ri-iš-ki-it ki-nu-na-aš-ši-kán ka-ṛa¹-[ša]

47 [an-d]a-ra-an-da-an UD-an ḫu-u-ma-an-da-az tu-eg-ga-az da-aš-ki-m[i]

48 [n(a-a)]t EGIR-pa iš-ḫi-iš-ši pí-iš-ki-mi

(Restorations from dup. KUB 41.1 i 4' ff.) Edited by ibid., pp. 202 and 223.

5) There follows white wool: she says, “The one who was bewitching (him/her), who was making him/her white (or: binding him/her),²⁰² now I am hereby taking (the sorcery) from all of his/her limbs and giving it back to its owner.”²⁰³

As Wright²⁰⁴ and Mouton²⁰⁵ have already noted, the combination of all of the colors is both comprehensive, i.e., every type of affliction has now been addressed since every color has been used (and the meaning of each incantation depends on the meaning of the others), *and* accumulative: the ritual builds as it goes on, each repeated variant of the incantation increasing the sense of what the ritual is accomplishing. Mouton interprets the wool as an absorbent, drawing the evil out of the patient and infecting the figurines with it,²⁰⁶ I would also or instead interpret it as symbolizing the evil that was put onto the patient by the sorcerer, now removed and wrapped around the sorcerer through analogy (see ch. 4 for further discussion of absorbent vs. symbolic substances).

The set of incantations does not end with the final color, however; Allī continues, this time with what may be a thread of linen,²⁰⁷ and she says, “Sun-God, I am hereby wiping this

²⁰² *ašarešket*: the interpretation of this verb depends on the interpretation of *ašara*-cloth found elsewhere in ritual; for a summary of the debate about whether it is “white” cloth or a “band” of cloth, see Christiansen, *Ambazzi*, pp. 99–101. Unfortunately, in this section of CTH 402 the “white wool” is always written SÍG BABBAR, rather than syllabically, so no light is shed on the debate from the sequence of colors in this text. If *ašara*- is “white” cloth (which also calls into question why the normal word *harkī*- was not used), the verb should be “to make white,” which obviously makes sense in this context; otherwise it would be interpreted as “to bind,” which likewise fits with the actions. Mouton has rather translated it as *entraver* (*Le Rituel d’Allī*, p. 223), perhaps also on the basis of “to bind.”

²⁰³ KBo 12.126+ i 51 (=KUB 24.9 i 49) [k(u-iš-š)]a-an al-wa-an-za-aḥ-ḥi-iš-ki-it ku-i-ša-an a-ša-^rre-eš¹-k[(i-it)] 52 [(ki-nu-na)]-aš-ši-kán ka-a-ša ḥu-u-^rma¹-an-da-az^{UZU}ÚR-na-^raz¹ [(da-aš-ki-m)i] 53 [n(a-at EGIR-p)]a iš-ḥa-aš-ši pí-^riš-ki¹-mi

(Restorations after dup. KUB 41.1 i 8’ff.) Edited by Mouton, *Le Rituel d’Allī*, pp. 203 and 223.

²⁰⁴ “Analogy,” p. 494.

²⁰⁵ “Le rituel d’Allī: texte et contexte,” 253.

²⁰⁶ “Ce geste s’explique par le fait que la laine colorée est vue comme ayant le pouvoir d’absorber le mal du patient. La laine “infectée” de l’ensorcellement du patient est ensuite mise en contact avec la représentation de l’ensorceleur qui absorbe à son tour le mal qu’il a lui-même engendré” (ibid.).

²⁰⁷ The linen thread is only attested in copy H, which differs sharply from copy I in this paragraph, so it is possible that copy I, from which my translation is taken, had some other object instead. Manuscript H instead reads, “The one who has been destroying him/her, now I [am taking] the evil [...]s from him/her, and [I am] giv[ing] them back to their owner.” (I translate *harganuškit* as “has been destroying”; Mouton instead translates this as though it is

mortal with [...], while you, Sun-God, wipe him/her with [...]! [...] him/her with a pure [...]²⁰⁸
 Give them (i.e. the spells) to these statues!”²⁰⁹ Then she takes a black cloth, and she says,
 “[He]re I have black wool. The one who has been making this mortal black, (and) bewitching
 (him/her), now I am [ta]king the black sorcery from him/her, and I am giving [it to] the
 figurines!”²¹⁰ Then she takes wine, and she says, “The one who has been making this [mor]tal
 drunk, (and) bewitching him/her, [now] I am making [him/her] completely drunk, and I am
 intoxicating them [...] by the figurines! Let the figurines take [...]!”²¹¹ The next two paragraphs
 are extremely fragmentary, but involve red wool and yellow/green wool respectively; the latter
 paragraph also preserves the words “bewitch[ing]” and “mak[ing] yellow/green,” and a final
 sentence exhorting the sorcerer to take the sorcery back to himself (if a man) or herself (if a
 woman). This sequence, in addition to being much more fragmentary and difficult to translate, is
 also less clear in its progression; the repetition of black, red, and yellow/green (but not white or

harganu-²: “a rendu blanc.” Given that the color of the linen is not indicated here—and that elsewhere in Hittite ritual, white linen is considered a positive metaphor, not a negative one; see above—I prefer *harganu*-¹ “vernichten, zugrunde richten” [HW² p. 304]. The relevance of this conundrum to that of *ašara*-, discussed above in note 202, should be noted.) For the likelihood that copy H is a mis-remembered paragraph on the part of the scribe, see Marcuson and van den Hout, “Memorization.”

²⁰⁸ I am following CHD P (p. 164)’s interpretation of *parkuwāit* as the instrumental of *parkui*, but since this requires an instrumental noun and a verb to be restored in the relatively small space at the beginning of line 5, I do not discount Mouton’s interpretation of this as a 3rd person singular preterite form of *parkuwa*- “(S)he has been purified.” This of course would require something else to be inserted between the end of that sentence and the beginning of the next.

²⁰⁹ KBo 21.8 ii 2 ^dUTU-uš ka-a-ša ku-u-un LÚ.U₁₉.LU

3 [-i]t ^ra¹-an-aš-ki-mi zi-ga-an ^dUTU-uš

4 []x-ta-ni-it a-an-aš na-an pár-ku-wa-a-it

5 []na-at ke-e-da-aš A-NA ALAM^{HLA} pa-i

Edited by Mouton, “Le Rituel d’Allī”, pp. 203 and 223.

²¹⁰ KBo 47.4 3’ [ka-a-(ša SÍG GE₆ har-mi nu ku-iš ku-u-u)]n LÚ.U₁₉.LU-an da-an-ku-wa-nu-uš-k[(i-it)]

4’ [(al-wa-an-za-aḫ-ḫi-iš-ki-it ki-nu-n)]a-aš-ši-kán da-an-ku-tar al-wa-a[n-za-tar]

5’ [da-(a-aš-ki-mi) na-at A-NA A]LAM^{HLA} pí-iš-ki-mi

(Restorations from dups. IBoT 2.123+ ii 2’ff., KUB 41.1 i 17’ff., and KBo 21.8 ii 7ff.) Edited by ibid., 203–204 and 224. All three of the duplicates finish the incantation with “May it be [bla]ck by this person!” rather than “I am giving it to the figurines.”

²¹¹ KBo 21.8 ii 12 [(ku-iš ku-u-un) DUMU.LÚ.]^rU₁₉.¹UDU ú-i-ia-ni-iš-ki-it al-wa-za-aḫ-ḫi-iš-ki-it

13 [ki-nu-na-aš-ši-ká]n ar-ḫa ú-i-ia-ni-iš-ki-mi na-at-^rša¹-an

14 [(kat-ta)...] A-NA ALAM^{HLA} ú-i-ia-ni-iš-ki-^rmi¹

15 [...]x-e ALAM^{HLA} ap-pa-an-^rdu¹

(Restoration from dup. IBoT 2.123+ 6’ff.; KBo 47.4 departs at this point, referring to a red thread instead of wine.) Edited by ibid., pp. 204 and 224.

blue, unless they were contained in one of the lacunae), in a different order and with wine inserted in the middle, does not immediately provoke an illuminating analysis. However, the cloth metaphor remains, interrupted momentarily by the wine; first, with the linen thread and then the colored cloths, both unfortunately in too fragmentary a context to analyze. It is possible, at least, to consider this as an attempt to generalize this metaphor outside of the tight five-color sequence immediately preceding. The position of the wine relative to the rest of the sequence remains unclear, however.

In the final paragraph of this sequence, the Old Woman takes white wool, and she says, “Just as this sheep’s wool makes a powerful hostility peaceful, let this white wool also likewise purify these spells and impurities! Either someone has done evil to him/her before [the gods], or [someone] has done evil to him/her before mortals. But let this white wool take (the evil) from all of his/her limbs and give it to the sorcerer! Let this person be pure before (all?)!”²¹²

She throws “all this”—perhaps everything following the white thread—on the figurines. This sequence allows the cloth metaphor to be expanded: in addition to cloth representing negative forces and the power of the sorcerer, in this case the cloth is considered instead to be a positive, protective force, expelling the sorcery and purifying the patient. This analogy is something of a blend between Types 1 and 3 above as well: the focus is split nearly evenly between the evils and the patient, and the white cloth seems to be applied to both. Thus, whatever the interpretation of

²¹² KBo 12.126+ ii 8’

[(ka-a-aš SÍG UDU)]

9’ GIM-an na-ak-ki ku-ru-ur ták-šu-la-iz-zi

10’ ki-i-ia al-wa-an-za-ta pa-ap-ra-ta

11’ ka-a-aš¹ SÍG BABBAR *QA-TAM-MA* pár-ku-nu-ud-du na-aš-šu-wa-^ran *A*¹[(*NA P*)*A-NI* DINGIR^{MEŠ}]

12’ ku-iš-ki i-da-lu i-e-et na-aš-ma-an *A-NA PA-NI* DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.L[(U ku-iš-ki)]

13’ HUL-lu i-e-et ki-nu-na-aš-ši-kán ka-a-aš SÍG BABBAR hu-u-ma-a[n-(da-az)]

14’ ^{ÚZU}ÚR^{HLA}-az da-a-ú na-at al-wa-ze-ni UN-ši pa-a-^rú¹

15’ ka-a-aš UN-aš pé-ra-an pár-ku-iš e-eš-du

(Restorations from dups. KBo 55.41++ ii 4’ff. and ABoT 2.25 ii 2’ff.) Edited by *ibid.*, pp. 205–206 and 224.

the previous difficult sequence, by this paragraph, the cloth metaphor has been expanded out of the discrete five-colors-of-sorcery set.

Following this, the Old Woman disposes of the ritual implements (*aniuraš* KIN^{HLA}) outside by burying them and securing them with pegs; this sequence is a break from the cloth metaphor. She says, “The one who has been bewitching this person: now I have taken his/her spells back and I have put them down in the earth; I have fixed them in place! Let the spells and the evil dreams be fixed! Let them not come back up again! Let the dark earth hold them!”²¹³ Fixing used ritual paraphernalia in the ground with pegs or stakes is a common disposal method (see ch. 4); this passage demonstrates the multiplicity of methods discussed above: the sorcery is not only sent back onto its owner, but also buried in the earth for the underworld powers to deal with, in a similar fashion to CTH 398’s passage with the river-clay. Following this is a sequence of offerings to various (mainly obscure) deities, overall quite straightforward: the deities are asked to ensure that the rite of disposal is effective, and given offerings to help secure their cooperation. The disposal and the offerings mark the end of the first section of the ritual.

After this, *ašara*-cloth²¹⁴ is tied at the head and the foot of the patient’s bed and a basket of grain, bread, and a bow and arrows is placed underneath, and these remain there overnight. This sequence is particularly reminiscent of CTH 398, although I would interpret it somewhat differently: in this text, white wool has been established as a protective force, and this cloth *may* also be white (see note 202). The cloth is not tied to the patient’s body as it is in CTH 398, but rather surrounds the bed, and there is no repetition of tying and cutting it off as there is in CTH

²¹³ KBo 12.126+ ii 21’ ku-iš ku-u-un al-wa-an-za-aḥ-ḥi-iš-ki-it ki-nu-na a-pé-e-el al-wa-an-za-ʾtaʾ

22’ EGIR-pa da-aḥ-ḥu-un na-at-kán ták-na-i kat-ta-an-da te-e-ḥu-un

23’ na-at tar-ma-a-nu-un nu al-wa-an-za-ta i-da-la-u-e-eš te-eš-ḥu-uš

24’ tar-ma-a-an-te-eš a-ša-an-du na-at-kán nam-ma ša-ra-a le-e ʾúʾ[i]z-zi

25’ na-at da-an-ku-i-iš da-ga-an-zi-pa-aš ḥar-du

Edited by *ibid.*, 206–207 and 225.

²¹⁴ See above, note 202.

398. In this case, I prefer to interpret the cloth, alongside the rest of the items, as representing a positive influence, although there is no way to be certain (as was also the case in CTH 398). The bow and arrows must be a reference to the hunter, who has already been established as a protector and will be called upon again in the morning, and the grain and bread are sustaining, strengthening forces, as already seen in CTH 398 and considered as such also here in CTH 402 (see below). The patient is therefore protected overnight by a deity, by the sustaining force of grain and bread, and (perhaps) by cloth, which continues the ritual's overarching metaphor. In the morning, the Old Woman waves the basket with the grain products and the bow and arrow over the patient and says, "You, hunter-man, give these spells back to the sorcerer! Let them be your ingredients!"²¹⁵ Then she separates the white cloth from the bed, and proceeds to repeat the first day of the ritual (the text says, "On the second day, she seats the mortal in the same way facing the Sun-God, (and) [she performs] the ritual in the same [way]"²¹⁶). The repetition once again compounds the force of the metaphors created on the first day.

On the third day, there seems to be only a short ritual sequence in the evening, which is partially fragmentary; she has three women helping her, and there are tongue-figurines set up, and implements (*UNUTE*^{MEŠ}) of clay and wax whose function is unclear. She sets up a vessel in the shape of a bird and wax figurines on either side of the bed, to stay there throughout the night, and she says, "Let them lift these (evils) from this side! Let them lift these from that side! Let them lift these from [his/her] head! Let them lift these from his/her bed!"²¹⁷ Unfortunately, the

²¹⁵ KBo 52.26 29'(CTH 402.C₃ ii 43'') ^{LÚ}UR.GI₇-aš LÚ-aš ke-e al-wa-an-za-ta al-wa-an-^Γze-ni UN-ši^Γ
30' EGIR-pa zi-ik pa-a-i na-at tu-^Γe^Γ-el wa-aš-š[i]^{ΓH.A} e-eš-du^Γ
For the edition, see *ibid.* 210–11

²¹⁶ KUB 24.10 (CTH 402.B) ii 12' [I]-NA UD.2.KAM ^ΓDUMU^Γ.U₁₉.LU-^ΓUT^Γ-TI -^Γkán ^dUTU^Γ-(i)
13' [(Q)]A-TAM-MA a-ša-a-ši ^Γa^Γ-(ni-u-ur QA-TA)M-MA i-ia-zi]

With restorations from KBo 52.26 (CTH 402.C₃) ii 47'–48'' and KBo 10.41 (CTH 402.E) ii 13'. For the edition, see *ibid.* 211.

²¹⁷ KUB 24.10 (CTH 402.B) ii 25' ^Γke^Γ-e-ši-kán ke-e-ez kar-pa-an-[(du)]

breaks in the text and the vagueness of the description make analysis difficult; the tongues are without a doubt representative of evil words (well-attested in Old Woman rituals; see ch. 4), but the rest is somewhat opaque, beyond the obvious intention to remove the evils from the patient.

The next morning, after she takes the items from the bed, she puts linen thread on the figurines (invoking the thread-ritual from the previous days, perhaps?), and then takes a braid or a strip of fabric²¹⁸ filled with pistachio²¹⁹ dust, wraps it around the patient and says, “Just as this dust cleans thoroughly, in the same way let it clean all of this person’s body parts; in the same way let it clean his/her house, altar, (and) hearth, together with his/her wife (or) husband (and) child.”²²⁰ She follows this by wrapping another braided cloth filled with dough²²¹ around him, and says, “Just as [this] continually sustains a person’s life, in the same way let it sustain the life of all of [this mo]rtal’s body parts [and] his/her [...]!”²²² Here we return to the classic analogic incantation again; however, elsewhere when a cleansing agent or grain are applied to a patient’s body (e.g., in CTH 397, Ḫebatarakki’s ritual, CTH 398, the ritual of Ḫuwarlu, and CTH 404.1, the ritual of Maštigga), they are either formed into balls and pressed to the person (CTH 397,

26’ ke-e-ez kar-ap-pa-an-du ke-e-e[š-ši-k(án SAG.DU-za)]

27’ kar-pa-an-du ke-e-ma-aš-ši-ká[(n ša-aš-ta-za)]

28’ kar-ap-pa-an-du

With restorations from KUB 41.1 iii 7–9 (CTH 402.H); see Mouton, “Le rituel d’Allī,” 212, for the edition.

²¹⁸ *taluppi-*; Mouton translates *bande de tissu*. However, “braid” is more likely, given *taruppai-/taluppai-* “to braid,” attested with different colors of thread in e.g. CTH 394, the ritual of Ašhella (the former spelling, KUB 9.31+ iii 21), and in CTH 598, the winter festival for the Sun-Goddess of Arinna (the latter spelling, KUB 2.6 iv 8). The possibility that this is not cloth (see, e.g., the “braid of dough” from CTH 761) should be considered, but given the prevalence of cloth in the ritual and the fact that it would be difficult to braid dust, I believe this to be the likeliest explanation.

²¹⁹ Thus Mouton (“Le rituel d’Allī,” 226); Haas (*Materia*, 290) is less certain.

²²⁰ KUB 24.9++ (CTH 402.A) iii 9’ ka-a-aš SAḪAR^{HLA} GIM-an kat-ta pá-ku-nu-z[(i)]

10’ [(nu k)]u-u-un UN-an ^U[Z]^UUR^{HLA} ḫ[u]-u-ma-an-da QA-TAM-MA [(pár-ku-nu-ud)-du]

11’ nu-uš-ši É-ZU^U ḫiš-ta-[(na-na-a)]n ḪUNNI^U QA-DU DAM-[ZU]

12’ ^{LU}MU-DI-ŠU DUMU^{MES}-ŠU Q[(A-TAM-MA)] pá-ku-nu-ud-du

With restorations from KBo 52.26 (CTH 402.C₃) 4’–7’ and KUB 41.1 iii 15–19 (CTH 402.H).

²²¹ This could also simply be a “braid of dough” as seen in CTH 761, the *šalli aniur*, where no fabric is mentioned.

²²² KBo 52.26 iii 10’ (CTH 402.C₃) [...(GIM)]-an UN-an ḫu-iš-nu-uš-ki-iz-zi

11’ [(ku-u-u)n DUMU.L]U.U₁₉-UT-TI ḫu-u-ma-an-da ^{UZU}UR^{HLA}

12’ [^MES^U-ŠU QA-TAM-MA ḫu-iš-nu-ud-du

Restorations from KUB 24.9++ (CTH 402.A) iii 14’–16’; for edition see Mouton, “Le rituel d’Allī,” 214.

CTH 398) or sprinkled onto the person (CTH 404.1), and no cloth is involved at all. If this is indeed cloth, it represents a physical modification of existing standard analogies to incorporate the larger metaphor of this text. In addition, the first analogy here looks back to the first (and second) days of the ritual, where cloth removes sorcery and purifies the ritual patient, while the second analogy looks forward, to where cloth will protect him or her (see below). The cloth is integrated with other items that make the two functions of the cloth explicit: a cleansing agent and a nourishing agent. Note also the linen thread placed on the sorcerer's figurines, symbolizing the final existing function of cloth: the evil sorcery turned back onto its agent.

After this, Allī seats the person facing the sun and, holding the wax figurines, she says,²²³

“Whatever people have been performing the spells, now they have performed them. They stand here before you. Thus the mortal: ‘We are invoking.’ (Variation: ‘We invoked further.’) Thus the statues: ‘Bring (the enchantments?) here! We will bring them away.’

While opposite, let the hunter clothe him/her! Let him put them (i.e. the spells) on them (i.e. the figurines) as shoes, and let him protect him/her! Let him bring them away!”²²⁴

²²³ The pronouns in this section are, in my opinion, clear enough to distinguish among the various persons and objects, particularly in copy A. The figurines/sorcerers are plural =*šmaš*, the patient is singular common-gender =*an*, and the spells are plural =*at*. However, there is some ambiguity in copies B and C, in which the object of *paḥšanuddu* “let him protect” is =*at* (rather than =*an* as in copy A); in addition, copy C does not include the sentence-opener IGI-*anda*=*ma*=*šši* that makes it clear that the object of *waššiya*- “to clothe” is singular, as opposed to the plural object of *šarkuya*- “to put on shoes” (*waššiya*- takes a dative object of person clothed, and absent another object, I choose to so interpret =*šši*, rather than it being governed by *menahḥanda*, as Mouton translates), and preserves LÚ-aš “man” instead of LÚ¹UR.GI₇-aš “hunter” in copy A. These issues, along with the lack of explicit speech marking in the last few sentences, have led to different translations. Mouton translates (with a different interpretation of *dariya*- “invoke”), “Ainsi (parle) le mortel: ‘Nous sommes fatigués.’ Ainsi (parlent) les figurines: ‘Apportez (l’ensorcellement)! Nous allons (l’)emporter. Face à lui/elle, que le chasseur (s’)habille (avec cela)! Qu’il chausse cela pour eux! Qu’il se charge de cela! Qu’il emporte cela!’” (*Le Rituel d’Allī*, 227), and similarly, CHD Š translates from copy C, “The mortal says, ‘We invoked(?) (them).’ Then the statues say: ‘Bring (it). We will carry (it) away.’ Let the man dress (them?)...and let him put it (i.e., the sorcery?) on their feet. Let him keep it. Let him carry it away” (CHD Š s.v. *šarkuya*-, p. 272).

²²⁴ KUB 24.9++ (CTH 402.A) iii 19’ ku-i-e-eš ku-i-e-e[š (al)-wa-a]n-za-ta [(e-eš-ši-ir)]

20’ ki-nu-na-at i-e-er na-at k[(a)]-¹a¹-ša pé-ra-an-t[(i a-ra-an-ta)]

21’ UM-MA DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-MA ta-a-r[i-i]a-u-e-ni UM-MA AL[(AM^{HLA})]

22’ ú-da-at¹-tén pé-e-du-mi-ni IGI-a[n-d]a-ma-aš-ši LÚ¹UR.GI₇-¹a[š]

23’ wa¹-aš-ši-id-du na-at-ša-ma-š(a-p)a šar-[k]u-i[(a-ad-du)]

24’ na-an pa-aḥ-ša-nu-ud-du na-at [a]r-ḥa p[(é-e-da-ú)]

The dialogue clearly parallels the one earlier in the ritual, despite some slight difficulties in interpreting each one. In the first dialogue, the figurines speak first (“Come, give us back the things we have done!”) and then the mortal (“We will no longer endure. We have exerted ourselves. We have treated the sickness. Take them back again! Take them back to yourself!”), followed by the statement that the Sun-God of the Hand and the hunter are protecting the patient, together with hunting accoutrements and hounds, and then the final incantation, “[Let] the person b[e] the figurines of clay!”²²⁵

The first dialogue also follows the Old Woman’s incantation commanding that the sorcerers wear their sorcery like clothing. In this final dialogue, there is first the statement that the figurines are the sorcerers (“They stand here before you”), no longer in the imperative but now the indicative. Then once again the mortal’s statement that they are treating the problem (or have treated it, in one copy) and only then the figurines’ invitation to give them the sorcery, that they will take it away. Then the hunter is invoked, this time not only as a vaguely protective figure, but now with specific tasks to do. He repeats what the Old Woman has done earlier in the ritual, putting the sorcery on the enemies like clothing, and further protects the patient. Here, of course, the protection involves cloth: the hunter is to clothe the patient (while putting the sorcery on the figurines as shoes). Therefore, while the sorcerers are clothed in evil, the patient is clothed in the hunter’s protection. The last two lines of the incantation (not quoted) encourage the hunter to destroy the sorcery with a rake and a shovel (attested in the list of ritual items at the beginning, so there is likely some indication of them, or action with them, that has been elided), and to perform some final, unfortunately broken, action with wool.

With restorations from KUB 24.10 (CTH 402.B) iii 5’–10’ and KBo 52.26 (CTH 402.C₃) iii 14’–20’.

²²⁵ See above n. 193.

There follow some—now quite broken—purification rites with liquids and grain. It is clear from the preserved text that as the Old Woman pours various things on the patient, she speaks incantations. Only the first two are preserved: first, she says, “I have hereby cut off the evil ton[que...the evi]l curse, the evil sorcery [...] from him/her! Gods, pro[tect] him/her! [Do] not let the evil go back to him/her again!”²²⁶ The following incantation (after an unknown substance called *warduli* is poured) is, “Gods, wr[ap] this person in goodness [...] of *warduli*! Keep [him/her] alive! [Let] them hold him, his children, his grandchildren, [and all the de]scendants wrapped!”²²⁷ The verb “wrap,” *ḫulaliya-*, is the same one used for winding threads around the figurines earlier in the ritual.

After this, the text becomes too fragmentary to translate, but one can safely assume that the following incantations are similarly for the well-being of the patient. There is then a lacuna of a few paragraphs, and when the text resumes, the Old Woman is again disposing of ritual implements in a pit. Finally, there is a sequence of offerings and a ritual meal, very characteristic of rituals of this type, as noted above. Before they cook and eat the meat, she says, “Sun-God of Heaven, be a [wit]ness to this ritual!”²²⁸ and afterwards, the Old Woman goes down to the riverbank and does more offerings, and “says the name of DINGIR.MAḪ of the riverbank,” followed by the incantation, “You, [...]s of the river, eat and drink! Give the [...] water to this

²²⁶ KUB 24.10 (CTH 402.B) iii 25’ ka-a-ša-aš-ši-kán ḪUL-un EM[E-an...]

26’ [ḪU]L ḫu-u-ul-la-an-za-tar ḪUL UḪ₇-tar x[...]

27’ [x kar-ša’-a-nu-un na-an DINGIR^{MES} pa-aḫ-[ḫa-aš-tén]

28’ [nu-uš-š]i-kán ḪUL¹ an-da le-e nam-ma tar-na-a[t-te-ni]

Copy I departs somewhat here but it is too fragmentary to see exactly how. For the edition, see Mouton, “Le rituel d’Alli,” 218.

²²⁷ KUB 24.10 (CTH 402.B) iii 30 ku-u-un UN-an DINGIR^{MES} wa-ar-du-la-a[š...]

31 [-a]r a-aš-šu-<la>-an-ni an-da ḫu-u-la-li-[ia-at-tén]

32 [x TI-nu-an ḫar-tén na-an an-da DUMU^{MES} DUMU.DUMU^{ME}[š ḫa-aš-šu-uš]

33 [ḫa-a]n-za-aš-šu-uš ḫu-la-li-ia-an ḫar-kán-[du]

²²⁸ KUB 41.1 (CTH 402.H) 14’ ^dUTU-an ke-e-da-ni-za A-NA SISKUR

15’ [ku-ut-r]u-wa-aš e-eš

For edition see *ibid.*, 219–20. The witness is often the Sun-God’s role, particularly the Sun-God of Heaven: see e.g. the Ritual of Ḫatiya (hethiter.net/: CTH 396.1.1), obv. 34ff., for an explicit request that the Sun-God of Heaven be a witness in case another deity misbehaves.

[...]!”²²⁹ There is a libation, a few broken sentences involving wine and sheep, and she(?) bathes, after which the ritual ends. The combination of the Sun-God and DINGIR.MAH of the riverbank as supportive deities for the Old Women should again be noted.

With this analysis, it is apparent that the Ritual of Allī uses cloth as a representation of magical power—both positive and negative—throughout the text, and that cloth interacts with (and further empowers?) the rest of the analogies in the text, such as the implied figurines=sorcerers analogy, and the explicit analogies about cleansing dust and sustaining dough. Cloth as sorcery is found elsewhere in Hittite ritual—to pick just one example, in CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya’s ritual of the river, the patient dresses in dark clothing to symbolize his or her ensorcelled state, and Tunnawiya rips the clothing off of him or her in the process of undoing the sorcery. However, Allī’s ritual develops the analogy into a powerful text-spanning tool, in which the cloth not only symbolizes evil sorcery, but sustaining and cleansing ritual power, and divine protection. The extensive repetition in the ritual heavily reinforces the metaphor, which surrounds the other analogies in the text—in the cases of the dust and the dough, quite literally.

We can see, therefore, two different strategies at work to concretize an evil miasma into a form that the rituals can address. On the one hand, the Old Women can characterize it in many different ways, allowing for the possibility of any of several different forms that might correspond best to the evil’s actual nature. These forms are usually items that can be easily destroyed or nullified, using techniques like breaking, cutting, washing, etc. (see ch. 4 for greater detail on this topic). Sometimes, the concrete item invoked is a good, sweet, or pleasant substance that evil might transform into, such as honey, oil, wine, grain, etc., items without a fixed shape. On the other hand, a single analogy can be used to create the ongoing impression

²²⁹ KUB 24.9++ (CTH 402.A) iv 15’ wa-ap-pu-u-wa-aš DINGIR.MAH-aš ÍD-aš ŠUM-ŠU te-ez-[z]i ÍD-aš
16’ [M]EŠ šu-me-eš az-zi-ṽik-ki ṽtén ak-ku-uš-ki-[it]-tén ke-e-da-ni
17 [-]ne-ia-an wa-a-tar pé-eš-kiṽ-ten

that a substance like cloth is representative of noncorporeal power. In both cases, the incantations recited throughout the ritual create these metaphors, connecting the physical objects used and actions taken with the evil they are supposed to affect.

3.3.4.5: Substitutes and/or Scapegoats

Sometimes, rather than creating an analogy for the evil, the practitioner creates an analogy for the patient. The evil can target the analogue instead of the patient (a substitute), or the evil can be moved from the patient to the analogue (a scapegoat). These two phenomena have long traditions in Near Eastern literature, but in Hittite context, they can be somewhat blurred together.²³⁰ And in fact, as will be demonstrated, there is some confusion of terminology to address.

The substitute (the usual translation of Hittite *tarpalli-* or Luwian *tarpašša-*) was a well-known phenomenon in Hittite ritual. The royal substitute rituals (CTH 419, 420, and 421), in which a prisoner of war was put in the king's place to be the victim of foretold disaster, have long been demonstrated to owe at least some of their content to Mesopotamian textual traditions,²³¹ but the word *tarpalli-/tarpašša-* also appears in contexts without any indication of Mesopotamian origin, including Old Woman rituals. Substitute rituals can also be found in the prayers: Muršili offers a substitute woman, cow, ewe, and nanny-goat for his sick wife Gaššuliyawiya in his prayer to Lelwani (CTH 380).²³² A substitute is obviously an analogue *par excellence*: the person, animal, or object is considered to be equivalent to the patient, and therefore can be presented as an appropriate vessel for whatever evil is to come upon him or

²³⁰ E.g., Mouton: "...un bouc émissaire sera défini comme un substitut gardé vivant et chassé du territoire après avoir absorbé l'impureté du patient" ("Rituels de 'boucs émissaires,'" 558). Taracha (*Ersetzen und Entsühnen*, 207ff.) sees the origins of substitute rituals like CTH 448.4 in the transfer of evil to figurines, scapegoat-fashion, seen in the Old Hittite CTH 416. H. Kümmel (*Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König*, StBoT 3 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967]) sees a regional difference, with the substitute as a Mesopotamian phenomenon, and the scapegoat as north Syrian/Anatolian.

²³¹ See Kümmel, *Ersatzrituale*, esp. pp. 188ff.

²³² See Singer, *Prayers*, pp. 71ff.

her.²³³ There are five Old Woman rituals that mention *tarpalli-/tarpašša*-substitutes: CTH 448.2, a ritual for the Sun-Goddess of the Earth providing substitutes for the royal couple, CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual, CTH 761/762, the Luwian "Great Ritual" of Kuwattalla, and CTH 780.II and CTH 780.III, Allaiturahhi's rituals. CTH 448.2 provides the clearest depiction of what the substitute is meant to do; certain of the participants in the ritual (the text is broken, so it is unclear if it is the Old Women alone, if they are accompanied by others, or if it is only the patients) say:

“Sun-Goddess of the Earth and gods of the earth, (in the matter) of the[se evil word]s, blood, tears, oath, cu[rse], sorcery, uncleanness, *ieššar*-evil, in the matter of speaking evil [to/before?] the gods, in the [matte]r of gods and men, know these substitutes henceforth! Hold released for the ritual patients long years, life of the future, (and) health henceforth! Since we have hereby set up these substitutes in place of those evil words, you, Sun-Goddess of the Earth and gods of the earth, be witnesses! Know these people for those evil words henceforth! Count nothing in (their) place!”²³⁴

As seen in this incantation, the point of the ritual is to demonstrate that the substitutes are equivalents to the patients (the king and queen) specifically in the eyes of the underworld gods, whose attention has presumably been attracted by “evil words.” The ritual practitioners,

²³³ See Kümmel, *Ersatzrituale* p. 191.

²³⁴ KUB 60.161 ii 1 [t]ák-na-aš ʾ^d[UT]U-uš ták-na-aš-ša DINGIR^{MEŠ}
 2 a-pé-ʾe¹-[da-aš HUL-lu-wa-aš ud-da-a-n]a-aš e-eš-[ḥa-a]-na-aš iš-ḥa-aḥ-ru-wa-aš
 3 li-in-ki-ʾia-aš ḥu¹-[ur-ti-ya-aš a]l-wa-an-zé-[n]a-aš pa-ap-ra-an-na-aš
 4 i-e-eš-na-aš DINGIR^{MEŠ}-kán[]x HUL-lu me-mi-ia-u-wa-aš ud-da-ni-i
 5 DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš an-tu-uḥ-ša-aš-š[a ud-da-a-a]n-ni EGIR-an ku-u-uš tar-pa-al-li-uš še-ek-tén
 6 A-NA EN^{MEŠ} SÍSKUR MU.[KAM GÍD.D]A ʾŠA¹ EGIR.UD-MI TI-tar ḥa-at-tu-la-tar
 7 EGIR-an tar-na-an ḥar-tén ka-ʾa¹-š[a] a-pé-e-da-aš ku-it i-da-la-u-wa-aš
 8 ud-da-a-na-aš pé-di ku-u-uš tar-[p]a-al-li-uš ti-it-ta-nu-um-me-en
 9 nu-za zi-ik ták-na-aš ʾUTU-uš ták-na-aš-ša DINGIR^{MEŠ} ku-ut-ru-e-eš e-eš-tén
 10 nu-za a-pé-e-da-aš i-da-la-u-wa-aš ud-da-na-aš ku-u-uš EGIR-an še-ek-tén
 11 nu-za pé-di le-e ku-it-ki kap-pu-u-wa-at-ʾte¹-ni
 Restorations after Görke, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.1.4.

including some unknown number of Old Women, present both anthropomorphic figurines and living substitutes, a man and a woman who are dressed in particular clothing (though the text does not say “royal clothing,” as, for example, CTH 419 does), to divert the deities’ negative attention onto the substitutes and free the king and queen from any (further) consequences. The incantation is straightforwardly designed to affect the gods’ perception of the substitutes, so that they will see them in place of the royal couple.

The presence of substitutes in Old Woman rituals is thus easily demonstrated. The presence of scapegoats, that is, vehicles onto which *existing* evil is transferred (rather than placeholders onto which *future* evil should be directed), is also easily demonstrated: for example, we have already seen it in CTH 391, Ambazzi's ritual. In this text, Ambazzi wraps a little bit of tin with a bowstring, ties it to the patients' hand and foot, and then takes it off and ties it to a mouse, after which she says, "I have taken the evil away from them, and I have tied it to a mouse. Let this mouse take it to the high mountains, the deep valleys, (and) the far roads!"²³⁵ She then lets the mouse go. The evil is removed from the patient and placed on the mouse, quite literally. There are many other rituals, some by Old Women (discussed further below) and some not, in which evil is clearly transferred onto an animal.²³⁶

The substitute and the scapegoat are clearly two different concepts, and the literature has occasionally distinguished two different Hittite words that should be assigned to each: on the one hand, there is *tarpalli-* or *tarpašša-*, considered to mean “substitute,” and on the other hand, there is the word *nakkušši-*, considered to mean “scapegoat.” For example, Haas states, “Man

235 KUB 9.25+ ii 37 ar-ḫa-wa-aš-ma-aš-kán
 38 da-aḫ-ḫu-un i-da-a-lu nu-wa-ra-at-kán *A-NA* ṚPÉŠ¹.TUR
 39 ne-eḫ-ḫu-un nu-wa-ra-at ka-a-aš PÉŠ.TUR pá-r-ga-u-wa-aš HUR.SAG^{MEŠ}-aš
 40 ḥal-lu-u-wa-aš ḫa-a-ri-ia-a-š da-a-lu-ga-u-wa-aš KASKAL^{ḪLA}-aš pé-e-da-a-ú
 For the edition, see Christiansen, *Ambazzi*, 44–45.

²³⁶ For an overview of these rituals, see Mouton, "Rituels de 'boucs émissaires,'" 558–87.

unterscheidet je nach Funktion zwei verschiedene Arten von Substituten: Wird das Substitut einem Unheilsdämonen oder einer erzürnten Gottheit, von denen das Unheil bzw. die Erkrankung ausgehen, angeboten, so ist es hethitisch-luwisch als *tarpašša* oder *tarpalli* und hurritisch als *puḫugari* ‘Tausch, Ersatz’ bezeichnet. Hat das Substitut nur die Aufgabe, die Lymata an einen sicheren Ort zu transportieren, so führt es die (hurritische) Bezeichnung *nakušši*.²³⁷ In addition, Mouton, in her article on scapegoats, includes *nakkušši*-scapegoats but not *tarpalli*/*tarpašša*-substitutes (she does not distinguish explicitly between the terms, but notes that “Les textes montrent par ailleurs que le *nakkušši*- sert à la fois de bouc émissaire et d'offrande aux dieux”²³⁸). The CHD defines *nakkušši*- as “scapegoat, carrier (to remove evils),”²³⁹ and notes further, “The term *nakkušši/a*- designates living beings to whom sins are transferred and who are then released (*tarna*-) in order to carry off the evils (*peda*-)...Gurney advocates keeping a strict distinction between *tarpalli*- “substitute” and *nakkušši*- “scapegoat...”²⁴⁰

The distinction, however, is not always so clear. For example, there is some confusion in CTH 404.1, the Ritual of Maštigga, which has several rites that are relevant to this discussion. First, there is a sequence with two sheep: the ritual personnel (unidentified, beyond “they”) bring in a sheep, which is held over the ritual patients. The Old Woman says, “Here is a *tarpalli*-substitute for you! Let it be a *tarpalli*-substitute for your bodies, with respect to the curses on the mouth and tongue!”²⁴¹ The patients spit into its mouth, and she says, “Spit out the evil curses!”²⁴²

²³⁷ *Geschichte*, 896. Taracha also seems to make this distinction, by referring to the “eliminatorischen *nakušši*-Ritus” (*Ersetzen und Entsühnen*, 221) in contrast to the substitute-king, which “ist wohl aus Mesopotamien importiert worden” (ibid.).

²³⁸ “Rituels de ‘boucs émissaires,’” 567.

²³⁹ CHD L–N, 376.

²⁴⁰ Ibid. 377.

²⁴¹ KBo 39.8 ii 27

ka-a-ša-wa-aš-ma-aš

28 tar-pa-al-li-iš nu-wa-aš-ṛma¹-aš tu-eg-ga-aš tar-pa-al-li-iš

29 e-eš-tu ṛKAxU¹-i EME-i ḫu-u-ur-ta-a-uš

They then dig a pit and slaughter the sheep down into it, with offerings of bread and wine, and cover it over. Next, a black sheep is brought in. The Old Woman says, “The black sheep is a *tarpalli*-substitute for your heads and your entire persons, also again with respect to the curses on the mouth and tongue!”²⁴³ This sheep is waved over the patients before they spit into its mouth, without an incantation this time. They slaughter the sheep, dismember it, make a hearth, and burn it up, with offerings of honey, olive oil, bread, and wine—and *without* roasting the liver and heart and having a ritual meal, as is usual during an offering sequence; that is, the sheep is entirely disposed of. Thus, each sheep takes on the role of the patient(s), assuming either the negative effects or the guilt of the curses, and is disposed of by burying or burning. The use of different methods, as well as the use of both a white²⁴⁴ and a black sheep, may be another attempt to use multiple methods to ensure efficacy, as already discussed above. Unlike CTH 448.2, this text’s incantations do not indicate that the *tarpalli*-substitutes are meant to divert divine attention, nor is there any indication that they are offerings to any specific deities (as opposed to vehicles for disposal, as is suggested by the spitting).²⁴⁵ Therefore, it seems as though *tarpalli*- can *also* mean “scapegoat,” not only “substitute.”

Edited by Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, pp. 73–74. I have chosen to translate *hūrtāuš* as an accusative of respect, rather than implying another *ēšdu* as Miller does (“...(and let it be) the curses in the mouth (and) on the tongue!”).

²⁴² KBo 39.8 ii 31 i-da-a-la-u-e-eš-wa-ṛkán¹ ḥu-u-ur-ta-a-uš pa-ra-a al-la-pa-aḥ-te-en

Edited by *ibid.*, 74. Miller consistently translates *allapaḥten* as “You have spat out”; however, in the plural, the second-person imperative and preterite forms are identical. In similar rituals such as Tunnawiya’s *taknaz dā-*, which have singular patients, the incantation after spitting is imperative, and so I choose to translate it thusly here. (Maštigga’s single exemplar with one patient, Miller’s copy III, does not preserve an ending to *allapaḥ-* in any of these incantations.) In the Luwian-language incantations, it should be noted, the verb is generally *tapatta*, “(s)he spat out,” so the imperative is not required.

²⁴³ KBo 39.8 ii 36 SAG^{III.A}-aš-ma-aš tu-eg-ga-aš ṛḥu-u¹-ma-an-da-a-aš
37 tar-pa-al-li-iš UDU GE₆ KA_xU-i EME-i¹ ḥu-u-ur-ta-uš-ša EGIR-an

Edited by *ibid.*, 75. Here Miller translates the curses as an independent clause again: “Curses, too, (are) behind the mouth and tongue(?)” I believe that interpreting EGIR-an temporally, as “again” (or perhaps even “after”?) makes more sense than a spatial relationship “behind.”

²⁴⁴ One of the copies may have an explicit “white”; see Miller, *ibid.*, p. 74 n. 150.

²⁴⁵ In CTH 448.2, offerings are made into a pit to the Sun-Goddess of the Earth (*taknaš* ^dUTU). It is tempting to see the Sun-Goddess of the Earth here in CTH 404.1, since she is contacted in CTH 448.2 by means of a pit, and also appears in the substitute-incantation (see above), but CTH 404.1 does not mention her, so she may not be involved

Later on in Maštigga's ritual is a rite with a puppy which is essentially identical to that of the white sheep; the Old Woman again names the animal a *tarpalli-* for the patients' entire bodies, and the patients spit into its mouth, after which she again says, "Spit out the curses of that day!" and the puppy is killed and buried in a pit. Once again, the *tarpalli-* seems to be a scapegoat. However, soon after this, another sheep (color unspecified) is brought in and is called *nakkušši-*, not *tarpalli-*. The Old Woman makes bread- and wine-offerings and says, "O Sun-God, here is a *nakkušši-* for them, together with the mouths (and) the tongues!"²⁴⁶ Then the Old Woman "offers" (*šipant-*) the sheep, but does not kill it; instead, she breaks thick bread and takes the sheep for herself (*n=an=za*^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI=*pat dāi*). It is not made explicit in the ritual whether this is to be considered payment (as it has been interpreted²⁴⁷), or if she somehow disposes of it, as she explicitly does e.g. the seven copper pegs that she "takes for herself" (with *=za*) immediately afterward, or some other possibility.²⁴⁸ So we can see that, despite the fact that *nakkušši-* is more often translated "scapegoat" and *tarpalli-* "substitute," in Maštigga's ritual, the animal *tarpalli*-substitutes are subjected to a rite of transference of evil substance, i.e. the spitting, followed by disposal, while the *nakkušši*-scapegoat is not: it is simply designated a *nakkušši-* and presented to the Sun-God, and then taken away without indication of what happens to it next.

The final occurrence of *tarpalli-* in Maštigga's ritual is somewhat different from the others: she waves a pot over the patients' heads and puts a bowl at their feet, and says, "Here, the

(though see above; though I am arguing against it here, if Miller is correct about "the Sun-God below," perhaps she is named in the text). If her presence is implied by the pit, one could easily imagine her able to take control of any negative forces that have been dispelled down into the earth (and the Sun-God in heaven, above, to take control of anything going upward in the form of smoke?). This is speculative, however.

²⁴⁶ KBo 39.8 iii 41 ^dUTU-i ka-a-ša-wa-[aš]-ma-aš na-ak-ku-uš-ši-iš [(KAxU-it EME-it)]

With restorations from duplicate KBo 9.106++ (CTH 404.1.III) ii 57. Edited *ibid.*, 92.

²⁴⁷ See, e.g., Görke, *Aštu*, 185.

²⁴⁸ Mouton ("Rituels de 'boucs émissaires,'" 564–65) suggests that perhaps she removed it to a safer, enclosed place away from the patients.

pot is a *tarpalli*-substitute for your head, (and) here is the bowl: you will crack²⁴⁹ all the words with your feet!”²⁵⁰ She breaks the pot, the patients break the bowl with their feet, and she says, “Let them be broken—all the words and the curses!”²⁵¹ In this case, *tarpalli*- does seem to mean “substitute.” There is no transfer of evil to the pot in this rite; rather, the pot is simply considered to be the patients’ heads, and is then destroyed, taking the evils with it. If the pot and the bowl were both round, the analogy would have been aided by the correspondence in shape. This also seems to be an exception to the traditional definition of *tarpalli*:- there is no indication whatsoever that the pot is an offering to any deity, nor is it attracting any future evil attention from that deity. Rather, the destruction of the pot is supposed to analogically destroy the evil *already* inside the patients’ heads.

It is clear, then, that at least in the context of Maštigga’s ritual, *tarpalli*- and *nakkušši*- do not have a one-to-one correlation with traditional definitions of “substitute” and “scapegoat” respectively. The rest of the occurrences of *tarpalli*-/ *tarpašša*- and *nakkušši*- in the Old Woman corpus are unfortunately mostly fragmentary, but a few more facts can be determined from them. *Tarpašša*- appears in extremely broken context in CTH 761, Kuwattalla’s “Great Ritual”; the passage is too fragmentary and opaque for analysis. *Tarpalli*- appears in somewhat fragmentary context in two rituals of Allaituraḥḫi. In CTH 780.III, Allaituraḥḫi’s ritual for Šuppiluliyama II, the text reads, “[...]for Šuppiluliyama, the evil, so[rcery, impur]ity, *ieššar* in his body...[...]s

²⁴⁹ This verb is difficult; see the discussion by Miller in *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, p. 123.

²⁵⁰ KBo 39.8 iv 11 [ka-a-š]a ^{DUG}UTUL SAG.DU-KU-NU tar-pa-al-li-iš k[(a-a-ša-wa)]

12 [(^{DUG}DÍLIM.G)]AL nu-wa-^raš-ma-aš ḫu¹-u-ma-an-da ud-da-a-ar *IŠ-TU*

13 ^rGÌR^{H1A}-KU-NU a[(r-te-ni)]

With restorations from KBo 2.3++ (404.1.II.A) iii 31–33 and KBo 53.27++ (404.1.II.C₂) iii 40–43; see Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 100–102.

²⁵¹ KBo 39.u iv 15 tu-wa-ar-na-at-ta-ru-wa-ra-at

16 ḫu-u-ma-an-da ud-[d]a-a-ar ḫu-ur-ta-a-uš-ša

See *ibid.*

stand as *tarpalli*-substitutes.”²⁵² The text is broken, and so unfortunately does not preserve who or what are standing as substitutes. However, in CTH 780.II, there is the following passage: “This man’s form has grown. What form the sorcerer has taken for a *tarpalli*-substitute, wherever he placed it, I do not know. If he set [it] up in [this?] city [...]”²⁵³ In this case, it seems as though the *tarpalli*- is a figurine that the antagonist is hypothetically using to perform rituals *against* the patient, in which case the transfer of evils would be moving the opposite direction: from the substitute to the patient, instead of the other way around.

Nakkušši- appears in four Old Woman rituals apart from CTH 404.1, and three of the attestations are too fragmentary for any analysis: CTH 404.3, Maštigga’s ritual for someone who has committed bloodshed, CTH 761, the Luwian “Great Ritual,” and a fragmentary Luwian ritual KBo 29.6 (CTH 763). However, the final attestation is extremely telling: in CTH 448.2, the ritual quoted above in which the *tarpalli*-substitutes are given to the Sun-Goddess of the Earth in what seems to be uncontrovertibly a substitute-ritual, they are presented to her “in the status of a scapegoat” (*nakkuššahiti*).²⁵⁴ This makes it even more apparent that *tarpalli*-/*tarpašša*- and *nakkušši*- may not have much of a semantic difference after all; from other texts, it is clear that transfer of impurities can be made onto *nakkušši*-²⁵⁵, but it is clear from these texts that the same can be done to a *tarpalli*-. The difference may be primarily regional: Mouton²⁵⁶ has suggested that *nakkušši*- is a Kizzuwatnean word for “scapegoat,” since it appears only in rituals that

²⁵² KUB 41.21 iv 3 [A-N]A mŠu-up-pí-lu-li-ia-ma
4 HUL-lu [U]H₇-t[ar pa-ap-r]a-tar i-e-eš-šar NÍ.TE-ši
5 an-da nu-wa-x[]x tar-pal-lu-uš a-ra-an-ta
Edited Haas and Wegner, *Beschwörerinnen*, 163.

²⁵³ KUB 17.27++ i 19’ (=VS NF 12.57) [ke-(e-el U)]N-aš ʾLA¹-A-AN-ŠU ma-a-iš tar-pa-an tar-pa-al-li-ma-an
20’ [ku-i(t al-wa-zé-na)]-aš ʾda-a¹-aš na-at ku-wa-pí ku-wa-pí da-a-iš na-at Ú-U[(L)]
21’ [(I-DI ma-a-na)-at?] x x URU-ri a-še-eš-ni da-a-iš
With restorations from duplicates FHL 39 (CTH 780.II.P) 8’–10’ and KBo 59.15 (CTH 780.II.N) 4’–6’. See Lorenz and Taş, “Neue Zusatzstücke,” 117.

²⁵⁴ KUB 17.18 ii 24’; see Görke, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.1.1.

²⁵⁵ See Mouton, “Rituels de ‘boucs émissaires,’” pp. 564–68.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 571.

appear to be from southeast Anatolia. However, the two do not seem to indicate discretely separable ritual practices, at least in Old Woman rituals.²⁵⁷ One might then therefore consider Melchert's point²⁵⁸ that *nakkušši*- might be from Hurrian *nakk*- "to release," in which case the division could refer to the method of disposal, which would certainly fit with the evidence from Maštigga's ritual, in which the *tarpallis* are all killed or destroyed while the *nakkušši*- is not. However, the evidence of CTH 448.2, where the *tarpallis* are also labeled as being *nakkuššaḫiti*-, suggests that the matter may yet be more complicated.

In any case, both of these terms are used in two ways: as a diversion of negative divine attention from the patient to some expendable person, animal, or thing, and as a vehicle for disposal of negative effects through destruction. The question of whether the diversion of divine attention also involves the transfer of negative qualities or substances is a difficult one. The blending of these two terms suggests that it does, but some texts (such as Muršili's prayer to Lelwani, in which he extols the *virtues* of the substitute, indicating very clearly in the text that Lelwani is simply supposed to find the substitute more desirable than his wife) suggest that it does not. The ritual of Puliša (CTH 407) suggests that both might be possible at once:

They bring the one male and one female prisoner forward to him (i.e. the king), and they take the rich clothes from his body, and they put them on the man, while they [dress] the woman in rich women's clothes, and concurrently the king speaks thus to the man... "If some male deity of the enemy land has caused this death: here, I have given an adorned man to him as a substitute. This one's head is great, (his) heart is great, and his loins (are)

²⁵⁷ Strauß (*Reinigungsrituale*, 119–26) notices this overlap, but maintains the separation of terms: "Der Funktionsbereich der in Kizzuwatna-Ritualen *nakkušši*- genannten Lebewesen greift in der echter Substitute mit der Bezeichnung *tarpašša*-/tarpalli- und *pūḫu*/puḫugari über, die den Göttern oder Dämonen als Ersatz für den Ritualherrn angeboten werden" (122).

²⁵⁸ "Hittite *nakku(wa)*- '(spirits of) the dead,'" in *Munus amicitiae: Norbert Oettinger a collegis et amicis dicatum*, ed. H.C. Melchert, E. Rieken, and Th. Steer (Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 2014), 225.

[grea]t. You, O deity, be pacified with this adorned man! [Furthe]r, tu[rn] benevolently toward [the lords], toward the a[rmy and toward] the land of Ḫatti! And [let] this prisoner of war li[ft] the sickness [...] Let him take [it] back [to the land of the enemy]!”

And he speaks concurrently of a [fema]le de[ity...] to the woman exactly likewise.²⁵⁹

Kümmel uses this example, among others, to suggest that elements of a north-Syrian/Anatolian scapegoat ritual had been blended with the Mesopotamian “pure” substitute ritual,²⁶⁰ which is certainly possible. Whatever the transmission history, it is clear that, in Hittite texts, the “substitute” and the “scapegoat” were overlapping concepts. It seems possible that this is the result of Hittite notions of culpability as the source of punishment: it may be that simply putting a substitute in one’s place was not sufficient, but rather that the contamination or guilt that prompted the punishment also had to be removed.

Despite the unfortunate fragmentary nature of many of the attestations of *tarpalli-* and *nakkušši-*, there are quite a few rituals that attest the transfer of evil onto animal vehicles, some of them without using (or at least preserving) these terms at all. I will refer to these as “scapegoats,” although as has already been established, the term is not entirely accurate. For

²⁵⁹ KBo 15.1 9

1 ʾLÚŠU.DAB-ia-šiʾ

10 1 MUNUS-TUM-ia pé-ra-an ú-e-da-an-zi nu-za-kán NÍ.TE-ŠU TÚG NÍG.LAM^{MEŠ}

11 ar-ḫa da-a-i na-at A-N[A] ʾLÚʾ wa-aš-ši-ia-an-zi A-NA MUNUS-TI-ma

12 TÚG NÍG.LAM^{MEŠ} ŠA MUNUS-TI [wa-aš-ši]-ʾiaʾ-an-zi nu-kán A-NA LÚ LUGAL-ʾuš an-da-kiš-anʾ

13 me-ma-i

...

14 ʾma-ma-an-waʾ

15 ʾkiʾ-i ÚŠ-an ŠA KUR LÚ KÚR ʾku-iš-kiʾ DINGIR-LIM LÚ DÚ-at nu-wa-aš-ši k[a-a-š]a LÚ ú-nu-wa-an-ta-an

16 A-NA LÚ PU-ḪI-ŠU pé-eḫ-ḫu-un IŠ-TU SAG.DU-ŠU-wa ka-ʾaʾ-[aš šal-l]i-iš

17 UZU ŠA-za-wa ka-a-aš šal-li-iš ÚR-ʾazʾ-za-ia-wa k[a-a-aš šal-li]-iš

18 nu-wa-kán zi-ik DINGIR-LIM LÚ k[e-e-ez] LÚ ú-nu-wa-an[-ti-it pa-ra-a] ga-la-an-ga-za

19 e-eš A-NA LUGAL-i-ma-wa A-N[A EN^{MEŠ}] A-NA K[ARAŠ Ú] A-NA

20 KUR URU Ḫa-at-ti an-da aš-šu-[li nam-m]a ne-[eš-ḫu-ut...]x-ma-wa

21 ʾÚŠʾ-[a]n ka-a-aš LÚ ŠU.DAB ka[r-ap-du] EGIR-[pa-wa INA KUR LÚ KÚR p]é-e-da-ú

22 [A-N]A MUNUS-TI-ma-kán an-da ŠA DIN[GIR MUNUS-TI]ʾ ʾme-maʾ-[i...-m]a QA-TAM-MA-pát

Edited by B.J. Collins, hethiter.net/: CTH 407.

²⁶⁰ *Ersatzrituale*, pp. 191–95.

example, there is a focus on equivalence between the patient and the vehicle in these rituals that is suggestive of substitutes. The “scapegoat” rituals that do not use *tarpalli-* or *nakkušši-* include CTH 391, the ritual of Ambazzi, already discussed above; CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya’s “Ritual of the River”; and CTH 409.II (and related texts), Tunnawiya’s *taknaz dā-* ritual, as well as CTH 760.II, a Luwian ritual perhaps also of Tunnawiya.²⁶¹ All of the scapegoat rituals, those containing the words *tarpalli-* and *nakkušši-* and those without, either contain Luwian incantations, or are associated with the Luwian language through terminology and/or deities. However, it should be noted that the phenomenon of the scapegoat is also well-known from western Anatolian rituals,²⁶² which, as has recently been pointed out by Melchert, show very little association with the Luwian language at all,²⁶³ so the scapegoat cannot be called a “Luwian” phenomenon. The western Anatolian scapegoat rituals are mainly rituals to eradicate plague from a military group, however, and this does not seem to have been under the Old Women’s purview. What was clearly under their purview was removing sickness and/or other afflictions from an individual person using a scapegoat animal.

The Old Woman who most often uses scapegoat-animals is Tunnawiya: they are present in every one of her authored texts.²⁶⁴ In each of Tunnawiya’s rituals, extensive incantations are spoken concerning these animals, though unfortunately in CTH 409.I, the text only says, “she pronounces the incantation of the sheep,” or the piglet or the puppy, at the appropriate moment, and does not record the content of those incantations. In CTH 409.II and related texts (CTH 409.IV, and CTH 458.1, likely the same ritual), on the other hand, the incantations concerning

²⁶¹ CTH 760.II has notable similarities to some of Tunnawiya’s rituals, particularly CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, for which see further below, but does not preserve an incipit, or any colophons, so its author is not known.

²⁶² Though, as noted above, the term *nakkušši-* is not used; generally the animal is not called anything at all (see Mouton, “Rituels de ‘boucs émissaires.’”).

²⁶³ “Luvian Language in ‘Luvian’ Rituals in Hattuša,” in *Beyond Hatti. A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, ed. B.J. Collins and P. Michalowski [Atlanta, Lockwood Press: 2013], 170–72.

²⁶⁴ This includes CTH 409.III, a birth ritual in which Tunnawiya is called ^{MUNUS}ŠÀ.ZU, “midwife,” and not ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI, and so is not included in this study.

the scapegoat are by far the largest portion of the preserved text. These incantations often emphasize the correspondence of the animal scapegoat to the human patient, in a way that suggests a substitute-like character to the animal. A detailed analysis follows.

3.3.4.5.1: Case Study: CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, Tunnawiya's *taknaz dā*- and associated texts

This ritual is called a *taknaz dā*- in one version (CTH 409.II), and the “Ritual of the Ox,” in another (CTH 409.IV). It seems likely that the ox is a scapegoat-animal based on the very brief attestations of it (although these are only in CTH 458.1). A *taknaz dā*-ritual is literally a ritual of “taking (a patient) from the earth.” There has been some debate about what this is supposed to mean, exactly;²⁶⁵ it seems most likely to me that it refers to removing a patient from the influence of, contamination by, or danger from the underworld. Tunnawiya's CTH 409.II is by far the most complete *taknaz dā*- ritual, and so characterizing the group based on content is nearly impossible. However, they do all seem to be rituals designed to remove evil from a patient.

CTH 409.II and CTH 409.IV make a composite text; CTH 458.1 cannot be placed into the sequence, but there is more than one gap large enough for it to fit. This case study will therefore address CTH 409.II/IV first, and CTH 458.1 afterward. The composite text is fragmentary: Tablet 1 preserves the first several paragraphs each of cols. i and ii (the content of which is only the incipit, the list of ritual items, and offerings to the Sun-Goddess of the Earth), and only very fragmentary sections of cols. iii and iv (more offerings to the Sun-Goddess of the Earth in col. iii; col. iv is too fragmentary to discern what is happening). The second tablet is mostly preserved; the third is missing; the fourth preserves only a few paragraphs of the obverse and a very fragmentary section of the reverse, while the fifth tablet preserves half or more of

²⁶⁵ For an overview of the relevant discussion, see Taracha, *Ersetzen und Entsühnen*, 213–15 (esp. n2). It is my opinion that the evidence is too sparse to be certain of Taracha's reconstruction of the *taknaz dā*-'s relationship with the royal substitute ritual.

columns i and iv only. The colophon states that the text was not finished, so there was at least one more tablet, now missing. CTH 458.1, if indeed part of the same text, may fit into any of the large lacunae.

Nearly all of the ritual's preserved content, therefore, is on the second and fifth tablets, which are almost entirely incantations. The first section of Tablet 2, however, is too fragmentary to analyze in detail: it includes what seems to be the end of a *historiola*,²⁶⁶ and an extremely difficult paragraph that may be an analogy about animal behavior. Following this, the tablet becomes more complete, and begins a series of long, repetitive incantations of a type that will become familiar. The text reads, “[She calls] the one whom she is treating [by name]: ‘(S)he has not conquered [the *hūltaramma*-sickness] of the head, the *āhraman*-sickness of the skull...’”²⁶⁷ and the incantation continues with a long list of sicknesses, misfortunes, bad omens, and the “tongues” of people who might have spoken evil to or about the patient. The column breaks before the list is over, but parallel lists suggest that there were approximately 44 potential evils that the patient has not conquered.²⁶⁸ This is reminiscent of CTH 398, Ḫuwarlu's ritual, during the rite with the river-clay, in which the patients were said not to have overcome the evil,

²⁶⁶ This includes, or is followed by, what seems to be a Hittite version of the difficult Luwian incantation in CTH 409.I (see ch. 4), which is unfortunately too fragmentary to expand our understanding of the Luwian at all.

²⁶⁷ KUB 9.34 i 20' nu an-ni-iš-ki-iz-zi ku-in UN-an [*ŠUM-ŠU* te-ez-zi]

21' ¹UL-wa-ra-za tar-uḫ-ta SAG.DU-aš [ḫu-u-ul-ta-ra-am-ma-an]

22' [tar]-na-aš-ša-an a-aḫ-ra-ma-an

Edited by Hutter, *Behexung*, 26–27; restorations are assured from parallel passages (see following note).

²⁶⁸ A composite list: *hūltaramma*-sickness of the head, *āhraman*-sickness of the skull, *taškupiman*-sickness of the skull, burden of the soul, heaviness of the body, *witrišša*-sickness of the bone (and) flesh, beating of the year (and) month (=old age?), sudden death, the *šarkiwalīeš nakkiwēš*-demons, bloody Nergal, the fire of the *meiliyaš*, anger, uncleanness, perjury, sorcery, defeat,]-uwa *ḫanda*, evil terror, evil dreams, evil bird-omens, *tapaššan*-fever of the body, short years, divine anger, the tongue of the multitude, the evil tongue of the conspirators, the tongue of the palace servant, the tongue of the temple-woman, the tongue of the royal bodyguard, the tongue of the GUDU₁₂-priest, the tongue of the SANGA-priest, the tongue of the AMA DINGIR-LIM-priestess, the tongue of the army, the tongue of the troops, the tongue of the court, the tongue of the assembly, the tongue of perjury, the tongue of the ^{LÚ}*aušiyawaš*, the tongue of the tribe, the tongue of the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}*lulaḫiyaš*, the tongue of the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}*ḫapiriyaš*, the tongue of the dead (and) living, the tongue of the manservant (and) maidservant, the tongue of the eater (and) drinker, the tongue of the faster, the tongue of the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}*šarikuwain*, the tongue of all sorcery.

whereas the river-clay had. The assumption in the incantation, then, is that a solution is upcoming.

The text resumes in column ii, in the middle of another iteration of the same list. From parallel texts (see below), we can assume that at the end of the previous column, the Old Woman said that the scapegoat animal, unlike the patient, *will* conquer all of these evils. In this ritual, just as in several other Old Woman rituals discussed above, we see a presentation of comprehensiveness. The list of evils includes bodily sickness, death, future evils and the fear of same, divine anger, and human agency of any kind—to the point of including the tongues of both “the eater and drinker” and “the faster.” No matter what it is that the patient cannot overcome, the ritual will overcome it.

When this list is finished, the text continues on the same theme:

She [call]s the person whom she is treating [by name]: “(S)he has hereby followed the road: [whether] (s)he brought [so]mething [somehow], or [...] to him/her, or (s)he saw something with (his/her) eyes, [or somehow to]ok [something], or stepped somehow with (his/her) [...feet],

[Or...] in [unclean]lines, sorcery, (or) defeat [...someone/(s)he] spoke before the gods with an evil tongue,

[Or] someone [...or] someone [...].²⁶⁹

²⁶⁹ KUB 9.34 ii 12 [nu] an-ni-iš-ki-iz-zi ku-in UN-an
 13 [na-an-kán ŠUM-ŠU te-ez-z]i ka-aša-wa KASAL-an na-an-ni-iš-ta
 14 [na-aš-ma ku-it ku-i]t-ki ú-da-aš na-aš-ma-aš-ši-kán
 15 []na-ašma IGI^{H1.A}-it ku-it-ki a-uš-ta
 16 [na-aš-ma ku-it ku-it-ki e-e]p-ta na-aš-ma-aš-ša-an
 17 [GİR]-it ku-it ti-ia-at

18 [pa-ap-r]i-eš-ni UH₇-eš-ni hu-ul-la-an-ze-eš-ni
 19 []-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš pár-ra-an-da HUL-it ʾEME¹-it me-mi-iš-ta

20 []x-la-aš ku-iš-ki

The Old Woman continues by describing how she is arranging the substitute animal with respect to the human patient: all the body parts correspond to one another. The head is arranged by the head, the neck by the neck, and so on, down to the toenails, tendons, and blood. (The text does not, unfortunately, make clear what this should look like.) She finishes by saying, “I have [arran]ged his twelve body parts. [Now], the body parts of the ram [hereby] ask for the *inan*-sickness of the [body part]s of this huma[n].”²⁷¹ There follows another list, this time in the third-person imperative: let the head carry away the sickness of the head, the neck the sickness of the neck, et cetera. When this list ends, there are only two words remaining before the column breaks: “The grunting pig...”²⁷² This is likely the beginning of what might be a different section, perhaps some kind of analogy. If it is parallel to a later passage in CTH 409.IV, it may have been an analogy about evil being rooted out similar to a pig rooting in the ground (see below).

Though broken and isolated, the sequence of the incantations in the better-preserved portion of these two columns is clear. The Old Woman recounts how the patient has not been able to conquer his/her affliction alone; then states that a scapegoat animal will take the affliction on for him/her (in CTH 458.1, where this portion is preserved, it is implied that the animal is hardier or more capable than the patient, see below)—no matter what form that affliction is taking, or what might have happened to bring it upon the patient. The patient could have sinned or committed some misstep to bring on the illness, but now that the animal is present, aligned exactly with the patient, it will carry the effects of that misstep, sin, or malign intention away into itself. The sequence is notable for its attempt at comprehensiveness; the lists of possible evils, possible adversaries, possible sins, and of body parts are all quite long, and though verbs may be elided (or replaced with KI.MIN, “ditto”), each item is faithfully repeated in each list, so far as they are preserved.

In addition, the list of body parts is important not only in relation to the theme of comprehensiveness (that is, no matter where the affliction resides, it will be drawn out), but also in terms of the nature of the scapegoat. This sort of incantation depends on the scapegoat being analogous in shape to the patient, such that all of the body parts *can* be aligned. The ritual is in effect creating an analogy, emphasizing the similarity of the animal to the patient. The naming of the patient perhaps contributes to the focus on identity.²⁷³ The equation of the patient and the scapegoat is effected by the long lists of evils: that is, the patient is first presented in relation to the evils, and then the patient is deleted from that list and the scapegoat is put in. The list of corresponding body parts reinforces the validity of that equation.

²⁷³ Hutter (*Behexung*, 105–107) considers the points where the patient is named to be critical for a structural analysis. I do not agree; the formula of name-calling (“She calls the person she is treating by name”) is in my opinion an indication that “this person” or similar in the incantations should be replaced by the patient’s actual name, and so appears whenever that substitution is required, not to mark a new section of the ritual.

By the time the text resumes again in col. iii, it has moved on from the lists, and perhaps is now using a new animal; in col. ii the animal is referred to as a ram (UDU.ŠIR) and in col. iii simply as a sheep (UDU), so it is possible that the Old Woman has moved on to a different scapegoat. In any case, col. iii begins with a fragmentary passage that is much better preserved in CTH 409.IV, which reads,

“The Old Wo[man holds] the sheep over²⁷⁴ [him/her and] speaks [thu]s: ‘I drew it [u]p, it took [his/her...]; I drew it down, and it took down from him/her.

“‘I made it run to your left, and it took left-ness from him/her,²⁷⁵ while I made it run²⁷⁶ to your right, and it took evil terror from you.’”²⁷⁷

It is unfortunate that the correspondence of basic directions with types of evil is not better-preserved; however, as already seen in the oracle texts (see ch. 2), “left-ness” is a negative quality by itself, and apparently in this case, the right side corresponds to fear (perhaps logical: it is the fear of evil, rather than the quality of it, that is associated with the “righteous” side). This incantation once again associates physical realities—in this case directions—with metaphysical

²⁷⁴ For discussion of *šer epzi* “hold over” and related terms, see ch. 4; it is likely that there were some support personnel involved in this rite.

²⁷⁵ Beckman assumes this is an error and translates “your! leftness” which is certainly possible (“Ritual of the Ox,” 46).

²⁷⁶ Here, CTH 409.IV has “I drew,” *hūittīyanun*, as opposed to “I made run,” *hūinunun*. This might be a memorization error (Beckman also suggests that it is erroneous, p. 51); it seems possible that it is due to some less-than-perfect correspondence in meaning between *hūinu-* and its Luwian cognate *hūinu(wa)-*, found in the parallel incantation in CTH 760.II (see below).

²⁷⁷ KUB 9.4 ii 13 [nu-uš-ši-ká]n^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI UDU-un še-er ep-zi
14 [nu ki-iš-ša-a]n te-ez-zi

15 š[a-ra-(a)]-an ḥu¹-it-ti-[(i)]a-nu-un nu-uš-ši-kán
16 ^{UZU}[] e-ep-ḥu¹ ta¹ <<kat-t[a-a]n-ma>> kat-ta-ma-an
17 ḥu-[(it-t)]i-ia-nu-un nu-uš-ši-kán kat-ta IŠ-BAT

18 GÜB-ḥu¹-la¹-[a]z-za-an-ta ḥu-u-i-nu-nu-un
19 nu-uš-ši-kán GÜB-la-tar da-a-aš ZAG-na-ma-an-da
20 ḥu-u-i-nu-nu-un nu-ut-ták-kán i-da-a-lu
21 ha-ḥu¹-ga¹-tar da-a-aš

Edited Beckman, “Ritual of the Ox,” 37 and 46. With restorations from KUB 9.34 iii 2’ff (ed. Hutter, *Behexung*, 34–37); KUB 9.34 omits “I made it run to your left, and it took left-ness from him/her” (perhaps a memorization error).

constructs, and links physical ritual actions with their supposed supernatural consequences.

Moving a scapegoat in different directions pulls the various evils likewise in different directions.

The text continues, “Then, she takes up this conjuration and begins to conjure. She makes the rounds of the twelve body parts likewise.”²⁷⁸ Presumably this is once again a recitation of the correspondences between the patient’s body parts and the scapegoats; at this stage, the text is no longer reproducing every list in its entirety, but it may be assumed that the Old Woman would have been reciting it again. She repeats the sequence twice, once while the patient is face-down and once while (s)he is face-up—once again, an indication of comprehensiveness; not only is every body part indicated, but they are all indicated on each side of the patient. In between the sequences, after the patient has moved to lie face-up, she says, “A plowed field they triple, they quadruple—this mortal I am also tripling, quadrupling.”²⁷⁹ The exact sense of this is unclear, although as noted by Hutter,²⁸⁰ it may have some reproductive connotations, as seen in Tunnawiya’s “Ritual of the River” (see ch. 4). In any case, the analogy with productive fertility must be positive.

When she is finished holding the animal over the patient, (s)he spits twice into its mouth, and the Old Woman says, “Spit out the pain and woe! Spit out the anger of the gods (and) the tongue of the *panku*, three times, four times!”²⁸¹ “Pain” and “woe” here are the Luwian words *aḫra-* and *wahra-*, also attested in Luwian incantations, and likewise reminiscent of Hittite *āi-*

²⁷⁸ KUB 9.4 22 nu-za ʾnam¹-ma ki-i ḫu-u-ʾuk-ma-i¹ e-ʾep¹-zi

23 nu ḫu-u-uk-ki-iš-ki-u-wa-a[n] da-a-i

24 nu ʾ12¹ UZU¹ UR¹ QA-ʾTAM¹-MA ir-ḫa-iz-zi

Ed. Beckman, *ibid.*, 38 and 46.

²⁷⁹ KUB 9.34 iii 16 ʾA.ŠÅ¹ te-ri¹-ip-pi-wa 3¹-i-ia-aḫ-ḫa-an-zi 4-i-ia-ʾaḫ-ḫa¹-[an-zi]

17 ku-u-un-na-wa ʾDUMU.ʾLÚ.U¹⁹.LU 3-i-ia-mi 4-i-ia-mi

Edited Hutter, *Behexung*, 36–37.

²⁸⁰ *Behexung*, 109. He also notes that this may be connected to the wish for the ritual patient to be a husband, father, and a servant of the gods in the *historiola* (p. 110).

²⁸¹ KUB 9.34 iii 22 ʾa-aḫ-ra¹ wa-ʾaḫ-ra¹-an al-la-pa-aḫ DINGIR^{MEŠ} kar-pi-in

23 <<ap>> pa-an-ga-u-wa-aš EME-an 3-ŠÚ 4-ŠÚ al-la-pa-aḫ

Edited *ibid.*

and *wāi-* from CTH 416, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple (see ch. 1). Taken together, these four items are an all-encompassing symbol of potential evils, a shorter and more general version of the long lists in cols. i and ii: *aḫra-* and *wahra-* stand for the patient’s suffering, the “anger of the gods” obviously stands for any sort of divine origin for that suffering, and the “tongue of the *panku*”—often translated as “multitude,”²⁸² see ch. 2—for any human origin. This incantation is exhortatory—urging the patient to continue doing what (s)he has already done—but also makes explicit the metaphysical meaning of the physical action, explaining or enacting (or both) what is actually being spit out. The statement “three times, four times” following the patient spitting twice is surely an attempt to extend the effect of the patient’s actions beyond their real-time duration, and must also be connected to the “tripling and quadrupling” of the patient earlier.

After this, a piglet of clay and a live piglet are brought in; the latter is waved far away by support staff, while the Old Woman takes the piglet of clay and continues speaking. Here, the *historiola* discussed above begins: a story of evil entities seeing and attacking the patient, and the Sun-God and Ḫannaḫanna collaborating to stop them, is recited. When the *historiola* is over, the focus returns to the piglet, who seems to be some combination of offering and disposal mechanism, and the text breaks. The third tablet of both texts is missing; CTH 409.II resumes with Tablet Four, which is fragmentary. The obverse preserves the end of some action with *šena-* figurines, and a repetition of the Old Woman’s incantation exhorting the patient to spit out evils. There follow some extremely fragmentary and difficult analogic incantations, after which the tablet ends.

CTH 409.IV, however, preserves a fifth tablet. The beginning is broken, but col. i resumes with the standard long list of evils, framed in a parallel fashion (as Beckman points out)

²⁸² Beckman, “community,” “Ritual of the Ox,” 52 with ref.

to the section in the second tablet where the piglet is exhorted to “root out” all of these evils from the patient’s body. This time, it becomes clear, the subject is a puppy, and it is being told to lick the evil off of the patient; the implied analogy of licking a physical substance off of something is obvious. Immediately following the end of the list is a more explicit analogy: “Just as this puppy’s eyes are stuck together, and it has not yet seen the sky, and it has not (even) already seen its mother’s teat”—she calls the person she is treating by name—“also let the evil day, the short year, the anger of the gods, and the tongue of the *panku* not ever see this person, the [vig]orous knee [amon]g the twelve body parts!”²⁸³ This analogy is somewhat reversed from a similar one in Maštigga’s ritual, in which the piglet is about to die, and likewise will not see the sky, or other piglets; in this case, rather, the puppy is too close to birth to see anything. Whether this puppy should be considered a scapegoat animal is unclear, as there is no indication as to whether the evils, once licked off, remain inside the puppy, or if the puppy is ultimately disposed of somehow (as both the analogic piglet and the substitute puppy are disposed of in Maštigga). There is also no alignment of body parts between the patient and the puppy preserved in the text.

Columns ii and iii of this tablet are missing; it resumes with col. iv, where the Old Woman is once again in the middle of a list of possible offenses the patient may have committed to bring an affliction on him- or herself. She finishes with, “You, luxuriant grain, set it down!”²⁸⁴ presumably meaning the offense, although what exactly the verb is supposed to convey is unclear.²⁸⁵ Here it seems as though grain has actual combative force, even beyond the sustaining power seen already in CTH 398 and CTH 402, above. Then the patient spits and the Old Woman repeats her standard incantation urging him to spit out pain, woe, divine anger, and the tongue of

²⁸³ See above, n. 159, for transliteration.

²⁸⁴ KBo 9.125+HT 6 (CTH 409.IV.Tf05.A) iv 3
4 ta-m[e-tar]-wa-an-za n[a¹-a]t-ša-an zi-ik da-a-i
Edited Beckman, “Ritual of the Ox,” 43 and 48.

²⁸⁵ Beckman (ibid., 48) suggests an implied “elsewhere.”

ḫal-ki-iš

the *panku*. After this, she takes a rope, waves it, and says, ““The sea was in pain,²⁸⁶ and in the sea, the rope cried out. I am drawing the rope from the sea.””²⁸⁷ There is a paragraph break, and she continues, ““I am drawing the red wool from the arranged and red-bound²⁸⁸ things.””²⁸⁹ She cuts something with a knife, while enumerating a list of evils, and finishes by saying she is immobilizing(?)²⁹⁰ various body parts with the rope, after which the text breaks. This seems to be another fragmentary *historiola*, as well as the use of a binding metaphor for the patient’s affliction (see ch. 4 for further discussion of this). The final preserved sentence may possibly be an attack on an antagonist, if the translation is correct.

The third text that fits into this group is CTH 458.1, which Fuscagni has suggested,²⁹¹ and I would argue to be the case pending any evidence to the contrary, is in fact a missing piece to one or both of the above texts. As already noted, even if CTH 409.II and CTH 409.IV are identical but for the colophons and may be restored based on each other’s text, which is not certain, there would still be at least two full tablets, as well as large portions of two more, entirely missing. The preserved portion of CTH 458.1 could easily belong to one of those missing tablets, although situating it with any precision is unfortunately impossible.

CTH 458.1 begins in the middle of col. i with another version of the *historiola* recited in the related passages in CTH 409.II and CTH 409.IV (discussed above). After the *historiola* becomes too fragmentary to understand, the text resumes with an incantation that is familiar in

²⁸⁶ This is my own entirely speculative interpretation of the hapax *āhriyatta*: that it is a medio-passive verb related somehow to *ahra*- “pain.”

²⁸⁷ KBo 24.3+ (CTH 409.IV.Tf05.D) i 3 ʾa-ru¹-na-aš a-aḥ-ri-ia-at-ta a-ru-ni-ma-kán ʾan¹-da
4 šu-ma-an-za-an da-aš-ku-pa-a-it a-ru-na-az-kán šu-ma-an-za-a[n]
5 ḥu-it-ti-ia-mi

Ed. Beckman, “Ritual of the Ox,” 43 and 48.

²⁸⁸ Again, a tentative interpretation, this time based on speculation by the CHD; see vol. L–N, p. 305.

²⁸⁹ KBo 24.3+ i 6 ḥa-an-da-ni-ma-az-kán mi-i-da-ni-ma-az SÍG mi-ti-in
7 ḥu-it-ti-ia-mi

²⁹⁰ See Beckman, “Ritual of the Ox,” 55.

²⁹¹ hethiter.net/: CTH 458.1.1; Fuscagni also cites V. Haas, “Ein hethitisches Beschwörungsmotiv aus Kizzuwatna, seine Herkunft und Wanderung,” *OrNS* 40, 410–30 (pp. 418–19).

form: “She calls [the patient] by name; ‘But now [...] lift them! I am [...]ing the *inan*-sickness [of the mort]al, the *ḫuwaltaraman*-sickness of the head, the *daškupiman*-sickness of the neck likewise, the [...] of the eyes, the *inan*-sickness [...] likewise, the *inan*-sickness of the *ḫuwarnapištaš* (and) *aulyaš* likewise.’”²⁹² Although it includes two of the items from the standard list of evils—the *ḫuwaltaraman*-sickness of the head and the *daškupiman*-sickness of the neck—the other items in this paragraph are not from the list, and unfortunately the lacunae in the text and the obscurity of the terms does not allow for much analysis, beyond the fact that all of these items are sicknesses. However, it should be noted that the Old Woman states, “I am [...]ing” the list of sicknesses, rather than “let the (body part) lift the sickness,” as seen above. In this section it is necessary or important for her to emphasize her own role in the ritual within the incantation itself; for more discussion on this topic, see below.

The incantation continues in the following paragraph:

“‘This person has [no]t conquered them (with) his two feet: the donkey’s four feet will conquer them! The twelve body parts will conquer them! Let them release the twelve body parts of this mortal, those who are *šiwanniēš*²⁹³ (and) those who are *ḫatištantiyaš*! Let them then go (to) the twelve body parts of the donkey!

“‘Let them drink the blood, let them eat the fat, let them cut the tendons, let them shatter the bones!’”²⁹⁴

²⁹² KBo 20.73++ iv 1 [na-aš-ta EN SÍSKUR ŠU]M-ŠU te-ez-zi ki-nu-na-wa-ra-at kar-a[p²-du]

2 [nu ŠA DUMU.L]Ú.U₁₉.LU i-na-an SAG.DU-aš ḫu-wa-al-ta-ra-ma-an

3 [i]š²-ki-mi tar-aš-na-aš da-aš-ku-pi-ma-an KI.MIN IGI^{HLA}-aš

4 [x i-na-an KI¹.MIN ḫu-wa-ar-na-pi-iš-ta-aš a-ú-li-ia-aš i-na-an KI.MIN

Ed. Fuscagni, *ibid.*

²⁹³ This is the same word used for the “evil deities” in CTH 409.II, above.

²⁹⁴ KBo 20.73++ iv 5 [na-a]t-ta-at-za tar-uḫ-ta ka-a-aš an-tu-wa-aḫ-ḫa-aš 2 GÌR^{MES}-ŠU

6 [n]a-at-za ANŠE-aš 4 GÌR^{MES}-ŠU tar-uḫ-zi 12 UZU¹ÚR^{HLA}-at-za tar-ru-uḫ-zi

7 ar-ḫa-ma-at tar-na-an-du ke-e-el DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU 12 UZU¹ÚR^{HLA}

8 ku-i-e-eš ši-wa-an-ni-e-eš ku-i-e-eš ḫa-ti-iš-ta-an-ti-ia-aš

9 na-at EGIR-an ŠA ANŠE-aš 12 UZU¹ÚR^{HLA} pa-a-an-du

Following this is a section where the Old Woman washes the patient's hands and extinguishes hot stones by pouring liquid on them, but the incantation accompanying these actions unfortunately is quite fragmentary; the only intelligible sentences are, "I hold Telipinu over him. Just as this is extinguished, likewise let the evil enemy [...] be extinguished!"²⁹⁶ There is no indication of what "holding (the god) Telipinu over" the patient is meant to mean, but the second sentence is very familiar.

10 nu e-ě-ħar ak-ku-uš-kán-du ^{UZU} I.UDU a'-az-za-ku-wa-an-du ^{UZU} SA-ma
 11 túh-ša-an-ni-ia-an-du ha-aš-ta-i-ma du-wa-ar-ni-iš-kán-du

²⁹⁵ 12 ʾna-an¹-kán a-ra-ah-za-an-da 3-ŠU wa-ah-nu-wa-an-zi I-NA 4 KASKAL-ma-an

14 pé-en-¹na¹-an-zi^{MUNUS} ŠU.GI-ma me-ma-i a-ah-ra-an wa-ah-ra-an al-la-p[(a-a)h]

Ed. Fuscagni, *ibid.*

13' [nu] ki-i ma-ah-ha-a[n] ki-iš-ta-a-ri i-da-a-lu-ša har-pa-na-al-li-[iš]

286

- 409.II T1 i–ii • incipit and list of ritual items
- (break)
- 409.II T1 iii • sheep- and goat-offerings to the Sun-Goddess of the Earth
- (break)
- 409.II T2 i • short and difficult *historiola*(?)
- 409.II T2 i–ii • the patient has not conquered a list of evils, [but the scapegoat animal will conquer] a list of evils
- 409.II T2 ii • ways in which the affliction may have come upon the patient
- 409.II T2 ii,
409.IV T2 i • 12 body parts are arranged: each body part of the patient is aligned with the corresponding body part of the ram
- may each ram’s body part carry away the sickness of each patient’s body part
- (break)
- 409.IV T2 ii • fragmentary analogic incantation involving garden implements; offering of a blood-red hide to the Sun-Goddess of the Earth
- 409.II T2 iii,
409.IV T2 ii • sheep held over the patient; incantation about drawing it up, down, left, and right, and taking evils away from each side
- she makes the rounds of the 12 body parts while the patient is on his/her back and on his/her front, while reciting “in the same way”
- sheep held over the patient; incantation about tripling and quadrupling the patient like a plowed field
- she makes the rounds of the twelve body parts “in just the same way”
- the patient spits twice into the sheep’s mouth; incantation of spitting

- A live piglet and a model piglet are brought in; the live piglet is waved elsewhere, while the Old Woman takes the model piglet
- 409.II T2 iii,
409.IV T2
iii–iv
- she recites a complicated *historiola* about the Sun-God and Ḫannaḫanna, which ends with a description of the “piglet of Panunta”
- 409.II T2 iv,
409.IV T2 iv
(break)
- let the piglet remove a list of evils; piglet is offered to an underworld deity
- 409.II T4 i
- action with figurines; incantation of spitting
 - analogy about a door-hinge
 - difficult and fragmentary analogic incantations about wild animals
 - incantation: “Spit out divine anger and wi[tchcraft], three times, four times!”
- (break)
- 409.II T4 iv
- analogy about extinguishing fire; the patient spits
- (break)
- 409.IV T5 i
- may the puppy lick a list of evils off the patient’s body
 - analogy about the blind puppy not seeing the evil
- (break)
- 409.IV T5 iv
- let grain remove the patient’s affliction, no matter what of a list of reasons might have brought it upon him or her
 - incantation of spitting
 - difficult *historiola* about rope and the sea

- she cuts the rope and says, “I am cutting off” the tongues of various people

(break)

- 458.1 i
- *historiola* about the sun-deity, which includes a request that the deity remove a list of evils from the patient

(break)

- 458.1 iv
- she states that she is performing some action on a list of sicknesses
 - the patient has not conquered them with two feet; let the donkey conquer them with four feet, and with its 12 body parts, and let the evil entities attack the donkey instead of the patient
 - the patient spits three times; spitting incantation
 - she washes the patient’s hands, extinguishes hot stones, and recites an analogy about extinguishing

(break)

Whether these texts are three fragments of the same ritual, or three very closely related rituals, they can be clearly distinguished from some of the other rituals involving scapegoat animals, such as Ambazzi’s scapemouse ritual quoted above, or the male-authored Arzawa group such as Iriya, Ašhella, and Zarpiya’s rituals. These rituals do not enumerate a list of evils like Tunnawiya’s do, nor a long list of body parts, nor do they use the motif of the “twelve body parts” to signify the entire body. In addition, none of them contains long and detailed *historiolae* at all, let alone one comparable to the story of the Sun-Deity and other gods included here (see below). There is some connection to be made with Maštigga’s ritual, which has the same rite of spitting into an animal’s mouth, and references ^dAntaliya in connection to cutting rope/evil, as

CTH 458.1 also does; however, Maštigga likewise does not treat the scapegoat-sheep with long incantations detailing how they correspond to the patient.

However, there are some rituals that do. Two rituals with Luwian-language incantations are quite similar to CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, also preserving long incantations focused on scapegoat animals: CTH 760.II and CTH 761. It is true that, as Starke already stated in 1985,²⁹⁷ the Luwian incantations are not exact translations or even very close parallels to the Hittite; in addition, the Luwian texts are also quite fragmentary, and have the added difficulty of being primarily in a language that is not as well-understood as Hittite. The Hittite sections are generally quite short, punctuating long incantations that span paragraphs and contain quite a bit of obscure vocabulary. I will not, therefore, be doing comprehensive case studies of these texts, but I will devote some detailed attention to their method for scapegoat rites.

CTH 760.II has been grouped with Tunnawiya's rituals based on the aforementioned similarities;²⁹⁸ it has no colophons preserved, and therefore the ordering of the tablets, and any estimation of how much of the ritual might be missing, is impossible. However, there are two main tablets with large portions of text preserved, as well as numerous fragments, some of which duplicate or parallel the two larger tablets; therefore, productive analysis is still possible, particularly considering the similarities with the Hittite-language rituals. One of CTH 760.II's best-preserved tablets, KUB 35.43+, begins in col. ii (col. i is almost entirely lost) with a list of places and/or actions the patient's affliction may have come from, a familiar theme from the Hittite-language rituals. In CTH 409.II and 409.IV, the list is of things that the patient may have done ("Or he saw something with (his) eyes, or he seized something with (his) hand, or he

²⁹⁷ *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, 136–37.

²⁹⁸ Starke (*ibid.*) assigns it rather to Kuwattalla.

stepped on something with a heavy foot...”), whereas in CTH 760.II, the list is of where the curse may have originated, without any claim to agency:

“...whether (it is) something of [dr]y land, [something] of the waters, [or] (it is)

something of a mortal, [or] (it is) something of a living person

“[or] (it is) something past (or) future, [or] of a mother (or) a father, [or]

something (of) a [bro]ther (or) a sister,

“[or] something from an eye, or something from a mouth, [...] or he heard from

something of an eye²⁹⁹ [...]. (Something) of [d]ry land, of water [...] let this one drive out!”³⁰⁰

The last two lines of the paragraph are too broken and difficult to translate, although the word “sheep” is mentioned, no doubt the scapegoat who will be “driving out” the evils. It is clear that this parallel, while similar in content, is not a Luwian translation of Tunnawiya’s Hittite incantation. However, it is most plausibly interpreted as an enumeration of the possible origins of the curse, although one could also consider that it is an alternative list of evils (and indeed, when the patient’s agency is taken out of the questions, the two are not very different).

²⁹⁹ Following Starke (*Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, 144n12) and Melchert (CLL, 224), I would say that *tawaššati* here is likely an error.

³⁰⁰ KUB 35.43 ii 1 [ḫa-ta-a]n-ta-al-li-ia-an ʾku¹-i-ḫa ma-a-an ú-i-ta-an-ta-al-li-[a]n
2 [ku-i-ḫa ma-a-am-p]a ú-la-an-ta-al-ʾli-ia-an¹ ku-i-ḫa
3 [ma-a-an ḫu-i]-du-wa-ʾ<<la>>-li-ia¹-an ku-i-ḫa

4 [ma-a-an p]u-ʾwa¹-ti-[i]l ʾpa-a-ri¹-ia-na-a-al ku-i-ḫa
5 [ma-a-an a-a]n-ni-ʾia¹-an ta-a-ti-i-ia-an
6 [ma-a-an ŠE]Š-an NIN-an ku-i-ḫa

7 [ma-a-na-ta t]a-a-ú-wa-ti ku-i-ḫa ma-a-na-ta i-iš-ša-ra-ti [k]u-i-ḫa
8 [t]a ma-a-an ta-wa-aš-ša-ti ku-i-ḫa tu-um-ma-an-te-et-ta
9 [ḫa-t]a-ʾan¹-ta-al¹-li-ia-an-za ú-i-ta-an-ta-al-li-ia-an-za
10 []x za-aš pa-ra-ad-du

Restorations after Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, 143–44, and Melchert, CLL.

It is in the following paragraphs of CTH 760.II that the parallels with the Hittite texts become much more compelling. KUB 35.43+ continues:

“Let it [take] (and) drive (them) out with four legs, with [...] with the crook of a horn, wi[th...], with the pupil of the eye, with the heart and the liver and the twelve body parts!

“I caused it to run from him/her with (my) left hand; it took left-ness from him/her. I caused it to run from him/her with (my) right hand; it took evil and violence from him.”³⁰¹

There follows a sequence of actions (in Hittite) where the Old Woman makes the rounds of the sheep’s body parts while on the patient’s right, left, front, and back, while speaking conjurations “in exactly the same way.” The sheep is then waved over the patient three times, held forth, and the patient spits into the its mouth while the Old Woman says, “(S)he has spit out [*aḫra*]n, *waḫran*, *taparu*-speech, *tatarriamma*-speech, *ḫirun*-speech, (and) the tongue of the *maya*.”³⁰²

This sequence of actions is, of course, almost identical to that preserved in, e.g., the beginning of col. iii of tablet two of CTH 409.II. There are differences—for example, in CTH 409.II, the verb is *ḫuittiya*- “draw” rather than *ḫuinu*- “make run” (with one exception; see above for a discussion of these two verbs). The Hittite incantation also includes up and down, not just right and left, as well as the extra incantation, “They triple (and) they quadruple a plowed field—this mortal I am

³⁰¹ KUB 35.43 ii 12 [la-la-i-d]u-ut-ta pa-ap-ra-ad-du-ut-ta 4-ti pa-a-ar-ta-a-ti
13 [x]-ti ḫa-ar-ši-ni-ia-ti ar-pu-wa-na-a-ti
14 [-ti] da-a-u-wa-aš-ṛša-an¹-za-ti ti-ti-ta-a-ti
15 [^{UZU}Š]Ä-ṛti¹ ^{UZU}ṛNÍG.GIG¹-[ti]i ṛ12¹-ta-a-ṛti^{UZU}ṛḫa¹-ap-pi-ša-a-ti

16 i-pa-la-a-ti-du-wa-an ḫ[u]-ṛi¹-[n]u-wa-aḫ-ḫa a-du-ut-ta i-pa-la-a-ti-en
17 la-at-ta i-šar-ú-i-la-t[i-p]a-du-wa-an ḫu-u-i-nu-wa-aḫ-ḫa
18 a-du-ut-ta at-tu-wa-li-in ḫ[a-a]t-ta-aš-ta-ri-in la-at-ta

See also Starke, *ibid.*, 144.

³⁰² KUB 35.43 ii 29 [a-aḫ-ra-a]n wa-aḫ-ra-an tap-pa-a-at-ta ta-a-pa-ru
30 [t]a-ta-ar-ri-ia-am-ma-an ḫi-i-ru-ú-un ma-a-ia-ši-in EME-in

See also Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, 145. Melchert (CLL) translates *maya*- as “adult” and Yakubovich (<http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus>) as “multitude”; it surely cannot be anything other than a Luwian equivalent to *panku*-, whatever the exact semantic relationship between the two.

also tripling (and) quadrupling!” which CTH 760.II omits. In addition, after this sequence is over, CTH 409.II iii brings in the piglets and begins the *historiola*, while CTH 760.II instead begins a sequence of offerings, with a request to the Storm-God for favor for the substitute-animal and the patient.³⁰³

After this paragraph, the text breaks, and resumes only in col. iii, with a broken paragraph that seems to be condemning whoever has brought the affliction onto the patient. The text continues with the Old Woman treating “all the [body] parts” and speaking an incantation already known from CTH 409.II:

“(S)he does [not] conquer it with the head; ditto no[t] with the [*alalatta*-body part]; ditto not [with the *mannahunna*-part, ditto not] with the pupil of the eye, ditto [not] with the heart, the liver, (or) the twelve [body parts...]!”³⁰⁴

“This one (i.e. the scapegoat) will conquer it [with the head]! This one ditto with the *alalata*-part, ditto [with the *mannahunna*-part, with the pupil] of the eye, ditto [with the heart], the liver, (and) with the twelve [body parts]!”³⁰⁵

³⁰³ The sequence of offerings is also followed by an incantation that is not preserved anywhere in CTH 409.II, 409.IV, or 458.1: a request to the Storm-God for favor for the substitute-animal and for the patient: “[Warpal]li Tarḫunza, look at the [fattened] animal(?)! [May he look] at the body of the ritual patient with life, virility, [future] time, health, divine [favor], (and) long years!” (i 36–40, Starke p. 145) It is not at all surprising to find a request for divine favor in a ritual of this type, and several other Hittite-language rituals preserve requests for blessings like this. It seems possible that an incantation of this type might have been preserved in the lacunae in the Hittite parallels, although of course that is impossible to know. The content of the list is noticeably similar to the positive symbols found in the KIN-oracles; see ch. 2. In any case, it should also be noted that the offering-sequences in CTH 409.II are to the Sun-Goddess of the Earth, not to the Storm-God.

³⁰⁴ Based on the Hittite parallels, I follow Yakubovich (<http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus>) in interpreting “nāwa=ti=ata” as a negative, a reflexive pronoun, and an enclitic pronoun, rather than Melchert (CLL) as “nāwati=ata,” an ablative of an adjective “new.” I admit that leaves the two forms in KUB 35.25 rev. 7’ and 8’ ([na]-ṛa¹-ú-wa-ti-ia-ti and [na-a-ú-]wa-ti-ia-ti, respectively) difficult to interpret, as =ti does not seem to double elsewhere. However, a reflexive pronoun is not at all unexpected with the verb *muwa-*, since it seems to be a Luwian counterpart to Hittite *taruḫḫ-*; =ti is also attested elsewhere with *muwa-* in positive statements, e.g. *mannahunnati=ti=ata zaš mūwai* in KUB 35.24++ obv. 9’.

³⁰⁵ KUB 35.43 iii 6’ [na-a-ú-wa-te-ia-t]a ḫar-ma-ḫa-ti mu-u-wa-i na-a-ṛa¹-[wa-te-ia-ta]
7’ [a-la-la-at-ta-t]i KI.MIN na-a-ú-wa-te-ia-ṛa¹ [ma-an-na-ḫu-un-na-ti K]I.MIN
8’ [na-a-ú-wa-te-ia-ta t]a-a-u-wa-a-aš-ša-an-za-<ti> ti-ti-t[a-a-ti KI.MIN]
9’ [na-a-ú-wa-te-ia-ta ^UŠA-ti ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG-ti 12[-ta-a-ti ḫa-ap-pí-ša-ti]
10’ []x KI.MIN

Once again, the passage is nearly identical in sense to one from CTH 409.II. In Hittite, Tunnawiya says, “(S)he has not conquered (all of the evils),” and then there is a break, in which likely it is said that the scapegoat-animal *will* conquer the list of evils. Then there is the list of things the person may have done to bring on the affliction. Finally, she says that the body parts have all been arranged according to one another, and requests that each of the scapegoat’s body parts carry away the sickness from each of the patient’s body parts. The Luwian incantation is therefore a condensed version of the Hittite incantations, or the Hittite incantations are an expansion of the Luwian. In Luwian, the list of possible origins comes first, after which the incantation states that the patient’s body parts do not conquer the sickness, whereas the scapegoat’s body parts do (or will); there is no list of evils. The body parts *are* listed, which, as discussed above, seems to establish the equation of the scapegoat-animal with the patient.

After this, CTH 760.II continues with three extremely fragmentary paragraphs, preserving only a few (Luwian) words in total;³⁰⁶ the fourth paragraph is better preserved, and states:

“Let it [take] (and) drive out with (its) four legs, with the [crooked ho]rn(?), with the *mannahunna*-part, with the [pup]il of the eye, with the heart, the liver, (and) the twelve [body par]ts!

11’ [ḫar-ma-ḫa-ti-ti-ia-t]a za-aš mu-u-wa-i a-la-la-ta-[ti-ti-ia-t]a za-aš KI.MIN

12’ [ma-an-na-ḫu-un-na-ti-ti-i]a-at KI.MIN ta-a-ù-wa-aš-š[a-an-za-ti-ti-]ia-ta¹

13’ [ti-ti-ta-a-ti^{UZU}ŠÀ-ti^{U¹ZU}NI]G.GI-ti 12-ta[a-ti ḫa-ap-p]i-ša-ti KI.MIN

Restorations after Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, 145–46; he in turn bases his restorations off of the near-identical passage in KUB 35.24++ (p. 83). This is the source of the restoration of the missing part of the parallel incantation in CTH 409.II, see above.

³⁰⁶ Starke (ibid.) restores the third paragraph as a repetition of the “I caused to run with my right hand...” incantation, based on a (fragmentary) duplicate; however, there is only one word and a fragment of another actually preserved, and since these incantations seemed to be mixed and matched throughout the text, I would be more cautious.

“Let it [tak]e the *taparu*-speech, the *tatarriyamman*-speech, (and) the [*hir*]un-speech of the *ērhuwa*-, of those rushing forward(?), of the dead,³⁰⁷ of the living, the past, of the future, of the ^{LÚ}*lulaḫi*, of the *ḫappiri*, of the army, of the assembly!”³⁰⁸

This is certainly familiar. The “four legs” are reminiscent of CTH 458.1, where the patient will not conquer the evil with two legs, but the donkey will with four. The list of evils is much truncated, but it corresponds quite well to the parts of the Hittite-language lists that refer to human “tongues.” Following the incantation, the ritual personnel wave a piglet over the ritual patron, and (s)he spits on the pig from a distance, while the Old Woman recites the familiar spitting conjuration in Luwian. Then they move to the threshold of a tent, and the text breaks. Perhaps there followed some analogous actions to the section with the piglet in CTH 409.

The other better-preserved tablet, CTH 760.II.2 (KUB 35.45, with main duplicates KUB 35.48 and KUB 35.49), begins in col. ii (col. i is almost entirely missing) with list of evils: “[...the *taparu*-speech, the *tatarriyamman*-speech] (and) the *ḫīrūn*-speech of the past (and) future, of the mother, the father, the sister, the brother, the manservant (and) maidservant, the ^{LÚ}*lulaḫi*, the ^{LÚ}*ḫappiri*, the army (and) the assembly.”³⁰⁹ Family members are never included in the Hittite lists, so again this is not an exact translation, only similar in sense.

³⁰⁷ *walliya*; Yakubovich notes in his Cuneiform Luwian corpus that he believes this to be an error (presumably for *ulantalliya*-, elsewhere attested as “of the dead”).

³⁰⁸ KUB 35.43 iii 24” [la-la-i(-du-ut-ta pa-a)]p-ra-ad-du-ut-ta 4-ti pa-a-ar-ta-ti

25” [ar-pu-w(a-na-a-ti)] ma-a-an-na-ḫu-wa-an-na-a-ti da-a-u-wa-aš-ša-ti

26” [ti-ti(-ta-a-ti ^{UZU}Š)]A-ti ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG 12-ta-a-ti

27” [^{UZU}ḫa-ap]-ḫ-pí-ša-a¹-ti

28” [la-l]a-du-ut-ta ta-ḫpa-a-ru¹ ta-ta-ri-ia-am-ma-[a]n

29” [ḫi-i-ru-ú-u]n e-er-ḫu-u-wa-ḫra-li¹-ia-an pa-ri-it-tar-wa-al-li-ia-an

30” wa-a[l(-l)]i-ia-an ḫu-u-i-it-wa-li-ia-an pu-u-wa-ti-i-il

31” [pa-a-ri-i]a-na-al-la ^{LÚ}ḫu-la¹-ḫi-ia-an ḫa-ap-pí-ri-ia-an

32’ [ku-wa-ar-š]a-aš-ša-aš-ša tu-ú-li-ia-aš-ša

Restorations from duplicate KUB 32.14+; see Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, 147 and 149.

³⁰⁹ KUB 35.45 ii 1 ḫi-i¹-ru-ḫ¹-un pu-ú-wa-la-a pa-ri-ia-na-al-la-ḫan¹

2 AMA-ia-an ta-a-ti-ia-an ŠEŠ-ia-an NIN-ia-an

The next paragraph is a new incantation: “(S)he has relocated (the evils) to the high mountains, to the deep valleys(?),³¹⁰ to the rivers (and) the watery meadows.”³¹¹ This is reminiscent of the ritual of Ambazzi, where the scapemouse is called upon to bring the evils away to the high mountains, the deep valleys, and the far roads. Perhaps, therefore, an animal has just been driven away (as, for example, the donkey is driven away in CTH 458.1). The incantation continues in the following paragraph, “(S)he has relocated into the patient, using life, virility, long years, future time, divine favor, (and) vitality!”³¹² This process—that of transferring good things to the patient, in addition to taking the bad things out—is likewise not seen in the Hittite-language texts, although this could be an accident of preservation. This section seems to be the end of a scapegoat sequence, given the presentation of the removal of evils as a *fait accompli*. If so, the repetition should be noted: in addition to a sequence of evils being recited *before* the scapegoat is removing them, and *while* the scapegoat is removing them, a sequence is also recited *after* the scapegoat has removed them.

It is clear from these passages that Starke was correct that CTH 760.II is not simply a Luwian translation of CTH 409.II (or vice versa); even the passages that are parallel do not exactly translate the Hittite. However, the parallel sections are certainly not accidental; the

3 İR-ia-an GÉME-ia-an LÚ¹lu-u-la-ḫi-ia-an LÚ¹ḫa-pi-ri-ia-an

4 kur-ša-aš-ša-an tu-ú-li-ia-an

See also Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, 151.

³¹⁰ The text reads x-ṛú¹pa-ia-an-za za-ar-ri-ia-an-za, neither of which words has a known definition according to Melchert or Yakubovich. Melchert suggests a geographic feature for *zarriya*-, and parallel incantations in, e.g., the ritual of Ambazzi would suggest that following the “high mountains” should come the “deep valleys,” so until another definition presents itself, I am tentatively translating it thus.

³¹¹ KUB 35.45 ii 5 [a-a]n-ta-at-ta a-ar-la-nu-wa-at-ta pár-ra-ia-an-za ḪUR.SAG^{MES}-za

6 []x-ṛú¹pa-ia-an-za za-ar-ri-ia-an-za ÍD^{MES}-an-za Ú.SAL^{HLA}-an-za ú-i-da-an-za

See also Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, 151.

³¹² KUB 35.45 ii 7 ṛa-l-an-ta-pa-ṛat-ta¹ a-ar-la-nu-wa-at-ta SÍSKUR-aš-ša-an-za-<an> EN-ia

8 ḫu-i-it-wa-la-ḫi-ṛti¹ a-an-na-ru-um-ma-ḫi-ti MU.KAM^{HLA} GÍD.DA

9 EGIR.UD-M^{HLA}-ti ṛDINGIR^{MES}¹-aš-ša-za-ti wa-aš-ša-ra-ḫi-ta-ati

10 ḫu-i-tum-ma-na-ḫi-ta-ti

See also Starke, *ibid.*, 151–52. Once again, note the similarity between this list and the KIN-oracle symbols.

enumeration of the scapegoat-animal's body parts and the request that they remove the evil from the patient's body parts; the statement that the practitioner has driven the evil away from the patient's four sides, and even the list of places or actions the curse may have originated from are compelling parallels. And, of course, there may have been more parallels in the lacunae.

Another point to make about CTH 760.II is that the incantations repeat themselves among the duplicates, not always in the same order. So it seems that either the ritual was long and repetitive, such that incantations recurred throughout it in various sequences, perhaps as new scapegoat-animals were brought out—certainly possible, considering the Hittite ritual corpus, and considering that some incantations repeat themselves on the same tablets—or there were multiple versions of the ritual that put the incantations in different order—also possible (see the Introduction). The following is a summary of the content of CTH 760.II, including some of the passages that were not discussed in detail above:

- KUB 35.43 ii
- incantation: list of possible origins for the affliction
 - let the scapegoat-sheep drive the affliction out with 4 legs and 12 body parts
 - “I caused it to run from him/her” with the right and left hands
 - She makes the rounds of the ritual patient four times with the sheep, reciting “in exactly the same way,” then makes the rounds of the sheep.
 - The patient spits into the sheep's mouth; the spitting incantation
 - offerings to *warpalli* Tarhunza with an appeal to sustain the patient's wellbeing

(break)

- KUB 35.43 iii
- perhaps a condemnation of the antagonist (fragmentary)

- the scapegoat animal will overpower the affliction with all the 12 body parts
- perhaps another iteration of “I caused to run...” (very fragmentary)
- let the scapegoat animal drive out a list of evils with a list of body parts
- the patient spits, while she recites the spitting incantation
- fragmentary beginning of actions with a piglet at the *hīlammar*

(break)

KUB 35.45 ii

- list of evils
- incantation saying that bad things have been transferred out of, and good things into, the patient
- offerings; figurines held up to the sun with an incantation about the offenses of the antagonist and a request for his punishment
- offerings, and fragmentary beginning of a sequence with red wool

(break)

KUB 35.45 iii

- may [the gods deliver the patient?] from a list of evils; let the gods not let evils attach themselves to the patient’s body and be a heavy weight
- something is shattered; list of evils
- something is *šer arḥa waḥnu*’d; patient spits and she recites the incantation of spitting

KUB 35.48 iii

- (duplicates first section of KUB 35.45, then) she cuts [something] with a bronze knife, and states that ^dAtaliya cuts/will cut the evils.

(break)

KUB 35.49 iv

- may all the evil things be transformed, rendered inert

(break)

KUB 35.58 ii • may the ritual patient be purified of evils [like?] the pure braid of dough

(break)

- rest of texts too fragmentary for translation

The other Luwian ritual that shows compelling similarities to the Tunnawiya group is CTH 761, the *šalli aniur*, or “Great Ritual.” This text does preserve colophons, some of which attribute the tablet to a Kuwattalla, ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL, and some of which attribute the tablet to Kuwattalla and a Šillaluḫi, ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI. However, in the text of the ritual itself, the practitioner is always called a ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI. The incipit reads, “[Thus Ms. Kuwattalla], ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL, and Ms. Š[illaluḫi], ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI: when we do the ritual of ‘beat[ing] down’ for a person, when [on] the third day we finish the r[itua]l of ‘beating down,’ on the third day we take him/her forth (for) the ‘Great Ritual,’ and we take this.”³¹³ followed by a list of different types of sheep, at least eight separate animals.³¹⁴ Based on the text, it seems possible that many or most of these sheep were to be used as scapegoats.

The preserved ritual action³¹⁵ begins with a fragmentary list of evils in the ablative—perhaps, as above in CTH 760.II, a request for the patient to be delivered from them. The

³¹³ KUB 35.18 i 1 [UM-MA ʿKu-wa-at-tal-la] ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL

2 ʾUʾ ʿš[i-la-al-lu-u-ḫi] ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI ma-a-an an-tu-uḫ-š[i]

3 kat-ta wa-al-ḫ[u-u-wa-aš SÍSKU]R ši-pa-an-du-wa-ni

4 na-aš-ta ma-aḫ-ḫa-an [I-NA] UD.3.KAM

5 ʾkatʾ-ta wa-al-ḫu-u-wa-aš S[ÍSKU]R aš-nu-me-ni

6 [n]a-an I-NA UD.3.KAM pa-ʾraʾ-a GAL-ʾliʾ-pát a-ni-u[r]

7 [a]p-pu-ú-e-ni nu ki-i tum-m[e-n]i

See also Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, 91.

³¹⁴ However, there is another tablet with a colophon, KUB 35.20++ (CTH 761.8), claiming to be the first tablet of the *šalli aniur*. The author’s name is broken, but there is not room for both Kuwatalla and Šillaluḫi. Starke restores only Kuwatalla’s name (p. 86), which, since she is elsewhere attested as the sole author of the *šalli aniur*, is reasonable. The incipit is not preserved.

³¹⁵ On KUB 35.20++, 761.8 (see previous note).

following paragraph continues, “(S)he does [no]t overpower them [with] the head, [(s)he does] not [overpower them with the *ālalatta*-part], (s)he does [no]t overpower them with the *mannahunna*-part; (s)he does n[ot] overpower [them] with the [pu]pil [of the eye], (or) with the heart, the liver, (or) the twelve [body parts].”³¹⁶ This is already known from CTH 760.II, as is the continuation in the next paragraph: “This one will overpower them with the [hea]d, [this one will overpower them] with the *ālalatta*-part, this one will overpower them with the *mannahunna*-part, [this one will overcome them with the pupil] of the eye, with the heart, with the liver, (and) with the twelve body parts!”³¹⁷ This, then, seems to be a standard Luwian or Luwian-context incantation to do when putting evil from a patient onto a substitute animal, as it is present in three rituals authored by at least two different people/groups of people.

In the next two paragraphs, the Old Woman makes the rounds of a (fragmentary) list of body parts. The following paragraph is still fragmentary, but the incantation is familiar: “I made it run from him/her with (my) left (hand) [...] I made run with (my) right hand [...] let it take (and) dr[ive [...]] from the *mannakuna*-part, [from the pupil of the] e[ye, from the heart, form the liver], (and) from the twelve body parts!”³¹⁸ This almost exactly duplicates the reverse of KUB 35.43, CTH 760.II.1.A, and it continues with the same, “Let him/her take from him” the

³¹⁶ KUB 35.20++ 5’ [na-a]-ṛú-wa¹-ti-ia-ta ṛḥar¹-m[a-ḥa-a-ti] mu-u-wa-i na-ú-wa-ti-[ia-ta a-a-la-la-at-ta-ti mu-u-wa-i]

6’ [na]-ṛa-ú¹-wa-ti-ṛia¹-ta ṛma¹-an-[n]a-ḥu-un-na-ti mu-u-wa-i n[a-a-ú-wa-ti-ia-ta da-a-u-wa-aš-ša-an-za-ti]

7’ [ti]-ti-ṛta-a¹-ti mu-u-wa-i ^U[^{ZU}]ŠÀ-ti ^{UZU}ṚNÍG.GIG-ti 12-ta-ṛa¹-[ti ḥa-ap-pí-ša-a-ti mu-u-wa-i]

Restorations after Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, 83.

³¹⁷ KUB 35.20++ 8’ [ḥar]-ṛma-ḥa-a¹-ti-ia-ta za-aš ṛmu¹-u-wa-i a-a-ṛla¹-la-at-ta-ti-ti-[ia-ta za-aš mu-u-wa-i]

9’ [m]a-an-na-ḥu-un-na-ti-ti-ia-ta za-aš mu-u-wa-i da-a-u-wa-aš-ša-[an-za-ti-ti-ia-ta ti-ti-ta-a-ti]

10’ ^{UZU}ŠÀ¹-ti ^{UZU}ṚNÍG.GIG-ti 12-ṛta¹-a-ti ḥa-ap-pí-ša-a-ti [za-aš mu-u-wa-i]

Restorations after Starke, *ibid.*

³¹⁸ KUB 35.20++ 17’ (=KUB 35.20 6’) i-pa-la-ti-du-wa-an ḥu-i-nu-wa-a[ḥ-ḥa...]

18’ ṛi¹-šar-ú-i-la-ti ḥu-i-ṛnu¹-[w]a-aḥ-ḥ[a....]

19’ [l]a-la-i-du-ut-ta pa-ap-r[a-ad-du-ut-ta...]

20’ ṛma¹-an-na-ku-na-ṛa¹-ti d[a-a-u-wa-aš-ša-an-za-ti ti-ti-ta-a-ti ^{UZU}ŠÀ-ti ^{UZU}ṚNÍG.GIG-ti]

21’ 12-ta-a-ti ṛḥa¹-ap-pí-š[a-a-ti...]

Restorations after Starke, *ibid.*, 85.

beginning of a list of evils. The text breaks for a few lines at this point, and resumes in the next paragraph with another duplicate incantation—though no longer following the order of KUB 35.43³¹⁹—the request for the Storm-God to look at the substitute, and look with favor and a (quite fragmentary) list of good things on the ritual patient. After this the scapegoat rite seems to be over, and the tablet becomes quite a bit more fragmentary. A very fragmentary paragraph on the reverse, however, begins a further sequence of “(s)he does not overcome” with various body parts, suggesting that another scapegoat-animal has been brought in by that point, but then the text breaks.

The next tablet with a colophon preserved, KUB 32.9++, is the third tablet—this one again attributed only to Kuwattalla. The obverse does not preserve any scapegoat-rites, but in the first preserved paragraph on the reverse, there is a fragmentary “evil,”³²⁰ and two lines down, “with four l[imbs...] with the heart, [with] the liver [...],” suggesting a recitation encouraging the scapegoat-animal to overcome the evil in the patient with all of its body parts, analogous to CTH 760.II. The patient spits; the spitting incantation is recited, offerings of bread and beer are made, and then there is another incantation found also in CTH 760.II: the Old Woman asks the Storm-God to look at the scapegoat (perhaps instead of the patient; the text is too broken to say), and at the patient “with long years, future [time, divine fav]or, (and) liveliness!”³²¹ This seems to be the end of the scapegoat-rite.

Most of the other tablets of CTH 761 are too fragmentary for analysis; CTH 761.3 (KUB 35.16 as A, KUB 35.17 as B) preserves another version of the incantation urging the god to look at the sacrifice, and to look at the patient with favor; the sacrifice in this case receives its own

³¹⁹ If one follows Starke’s reconstructed order (see his Joinskizze on p. 84).

³²⁰ KUB 35.21 rev. 2’ [ad]-du-wa-l[a...]

³²¹ KUB 35.21 rev. 13’ []a-ar-ra-ia-ti MU^{III.A}-ti EGIR-ṛpa-ra¹-an-ta-t[i a-a-ra-ti]

14’ [DINGIR^{MES}-aš-ša-an-za-at wa-aš-š]a-ra-ṛḫi¹-ta-ti ḫu-i-tum-na-a-ḫi-ta-ti

Restorations after Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, 89.

(quite fragmentary) paragraph, and is given the label *ikkunaunta*, which is one of the types of sheep included at the ritual list in the very beginning; there are two of them taken for the ritual, but that is the only clear scapegoat-rite in the remaining fragments. The following is a summary of the understandable content of CTH 761, including parts that were not discussed in detail here:

KUB 35.18 i

- incipit and beginning of list of ritual items

(break)

KUB 32.9++ obv.

- she presses the dough braid to the patient and speaks a difficult incantation about a grindstone and a *gulluštanni*; perhaps an analogy
- let a list of evils not bind the patient
- the patient spits on the dough and she recites the incantation of spitting, and throws the dough away
- the patient washes his/her hand, and she recites, “the patient washes off” a list of evils
- fragmentary analogy, perhaps about a list of evils not being fruitful within the patient
- the patient spits, and she recites the spitting incantation

(break)

KUB 32.9++ rev.

- incantation encouraging the scapegoat animal to overcome evil with 4 legs and 12 body parts (fragmentary)
- the patient spits; she recites the spitting incantation
- offerings; she appeals to a deity to look with favor on the scapegoat and the patient

- repeated incantation about a *gulluštani* (fragmentary)
- repeated incantation about evils not [binding] the patient
- repeated spitting, and incantation of spitting
- repeated throwing away of dough, washing, and incantation of washing

(break)

KUB 35.20++ obv.

- fragmentary list of evils in the ablative
- the patient does not overpower the evils with the 12 body parts; the scapegoat animal will overpower them with the 12 body parts
- she makes the rounds, with an incantation listing body parts (fragmentary)
- incantation: “I made run” with left and right hand
- let [the scapegoat-animal] take a list of evils from the 12 body parts

(break)

- appeal to *warpalli* [Tarhunza] to look favorably on the scapegoat animal and the patient
- she holds something to the patient’s body; incantation involving cutting

(break)

KUB 35.20++ rev.

- incantation listing patient’s qualities and possessions (fragmentary)

(break)

- patient does not overcome with a list of body parts (fragmentary)

(break)

- KUB 35.16 i
- offerings; let [the deity] look [favorably] at the scapegoat-animal
 - let him/her look favorably on the patient
- (too fragmentary for translation)

(break)

- KUB 35.30(+)
- let him/her come from/with [something] of Nineveh and Kaplawiya
 - she breaks a vessel, presses pure dough to the patient's body and recites a fragmentary incantation of purification

(break)

(remaining tablets too fragmentary for translation);

We can see that there are a number of incantation motifs that reappear among CTH 409.II/IV, CTH 760.II, and CTH 761/762. Primary among these is the incantation accompanying the patient spitting: in Hittite, “Spit out the pain (and) woe! Spit out the anger of the gods (and) the tongue of the *panku*, three times, four times!” while in Luwian, “(S)he has spit out the pain, woe, *taparu*, *tatariyamman*-, *hirut*-, (and) the tongue of the *maya*-!”³²² The multipliers in the Hittite support the accompanying incantation, “A plowed field they triple, they quadruple—this mortal I am also tripling, quadrupling,” which is not found in the Luwian texts.

The other most common incantation theme is the request that the substitute animal's body parts remove the sickness and evil from the human patient's body parts. The lists of body parts and the lists of evils are close to identical within the Hittite- and Luwian-language groups, but differ between the languages. The Luwian texts also do not attest the long description of the setup of the substitute congruent to the human, such that all the body parts are arranged with respect to one another. Overall, in fact, the Luwian lists tend to be shorter.

³²² The Luwian in particular, it should be noted, has quite a rhyming and alliterative quality: *aḫran waḫran tapatta taparu tatariyamman ḫirun mayaššan lālin*.

Finally, there is the incantation of driving out evil from the patient's various sides, in which the practitioner says, "I made (it) run from you with (my) right hand; I made (it) run from you with (my) left hand, and it took evil violence from you," in Luwian, with a slightly expanded version, "I drew it up, and it took his [...]; I drew it down and it took his [...] down. I made it run to your left, and it took his/her left-ness. I made it run to your right, and it took evil terror from you," in Hittite. Other, more fragmentary or more tenuous parallels exist: the theme of cutting off evils, sometimes with the presence of ^dA(n)taliya, and the list of places or actions the curse might have come from, for example.

There are also notable differences. As mentioned above, the Hittite texts do not include a request for a list of favors from the deity, as the Luwian ones both do. The Luwian texts do not include anything like the lengthy *historiola* present in both CTH 409.II and CTH 409.IV. Either of these omissions could be due to an accident of preservation—perhaps more likely for the former than the latter, given the respective length of the omissions. It is also possible that in CTH 409, the *historiola*, which attests to Ḫannaḫanna's attention to and care for the patient, replaced the detailed requests for favor in the Luwian texts (or vice versa). One other particular difference of note is that the colophons of the Hittite texts CTH 409.II and 409.IV explicitly designate the patients to be the "king and queen," whereas the Luwian text CTH 761/762 mentions only a "person" as patient (CTH 458.1 and CTH 760.II do not preserve the incipit or colophon).

Ultimately, however, it is clear that the existing correspondences cannot be an accident. For discussion of what may (and may not) be said about those correspondences, see the Introduction. For now, looking more closely at them, it is possible to see the basic building blocks of the type of scapegoat ritual that appears in all of these texts, and the way in which they fit together to form an overarching structure:

- 1) A statement that the patient has not conquered a list of evils (CTH 409, CTH 761)
- 2) (a) A statement that the scapegoat *will* conquer the evils, using its corresponding body parts (CTH 760, CTH 761, CTH 409 (“lift” rather than “conquer”)), or
(b) A third-person imperative: *let* the scapegoat conquer the list of evils with its corresponding body parts (CTH 409, CTH 760, CTH 761)
- 3) The incantation either of the Old Woman drawing evil (*huittiya-*) from each side (CTH 409), or of her causing it to run (*huinu-*) with each hand (CTH 760, CTH 761)
- 4) The Old Woman makes the rounds of all the body parts while reciting one or more of the above incantations (CTH 409, CTH 760, CTH 761)
- 5) The patient spits into the scapegoat’s mouth and the Old Woman recites either an imperative “Spit out” the evils (CTH 409) or a past-tense “(S)he has spit out” the evils (CTH 760, CTH 761).
- 6) The Old Woman appeals to the deity to look favorably on the scapegoat (CTH 761) and on the patient (CTH 760, CTH 761, CTH 409 [very fragmentary or contained within *historiolae*]), usually accompanied by offerings.

These building blocks are interspersed with various analogies, offerings, and other rites of disposal in the texts under consideration. They do not always appear in the same order, nor does every one appear in every scapegoat rite. However, every rite in every one of the texts under consideration preserves at least three of these elements, and most of those sequences are missing their beginnings or ends, so it is likely that there were often more. Item (2), concerning the scapegoat’s ability to conquer the affliction with its (like a human) 12 body parts, and sometimes additionally its (greater than a human) 4 legs, is attested in every preserved rite.

These six items each provide an element of a ritual whole. Point (1), that the patient has not conquered the evils, asserts the ritual's (and the practitioner's) relevance and necessity, but also, as already discussed above, begins a formula in which the patient is presented in relation to a long list of evils, so that when the scapegoat-animal is substituted in, its function and equivalency is already established. The list of evils also begins the theme of the ritual's comprehensive effectiveness toward any problem that could possibly be afflicting the patient. Point (2), always included, puts heavy emphasis on that equivalency, with its long list of corresponding body parts, sometimes also giving the impression that the animal (with its four legs) is a stronger, more resilient (and more disposable) version of the patient. The list of body parts also reinforces the comprehensive attention to any part of the body that could be afflicted. Point (3), always in the first person (*I have drawn/I made run*), emphasizes the Old Woman's agency and power, while also taking up the theme of comprehensiveness: in Luwian, she has made the evil run with both her left and right hand; in Hittite, she has drawn the evil from all four sides of the patient, up, down, left, and right. Point (4) is a physical application of the preceding incantations to the patient's and/or the scapegoat's actual body parts, as the Old Woman goes around to each of them. Point (5), in which the patient spits, is a metonymic physical transfer of the patient's material into the scapegoat-animal. As always, however, the action of spitting is not enough; the Old Woman must state either what the patient is doing ("Spit out the *aḫran, waḫran...*") or what (s)he has done ("(S)he has spit out the *aḫran, waḫran...*"). Point (6) is the appeal for divine approval and support for the rite.

These extensive incantations demonstrate the power of ritual language in these texts. In the case of the scapegoat rituals, the long, repetitive lists, while perhaps dull for a modern scholar to translate, if used in practice would likely have created an atmosphere in which the

equivalencies between the patient and the animal were in effect, and the ritual might indeed be addressing any possible affliction that could be affecting any possible part of the patient's body. The incantations themselves reinforce this: in Luwian, for example, the spitting incantation—repeated all throughout the rituals, always with exactly the same word order—is *aḫran waḫran tapatta taparu tatariyamman ḫirun mayaššin lalin*. The rhyming, assonance, and consonance could easily have created a hypnotic effect for any listeners. These texts' incantations demonstrate the intent to create a world in which (once again going through the essential points) (1) the ritual was the solution to an insoluble problem, (2) the scapegoat was metaphorically the patient, (3) the Old Woman had the power to draw the evil from the patient into the scapegoat, (4) the patient's body parts were perfectly aligned with the scapegoat's body parts, (5) the evils had been transferred from the patient into the scapegoat, and (6) the gods would maintain the transfer and sustain the patient's well-being hereafter.

3.3.4.6: Language in ritual

A comprehensive study of the Old Women's ritual methods, therefore, has revealed that almost every strategy that they use relies on language. Appeals to the gods are made verbally. Recited *historiolae* map a divine situation onto a human one, bringing the power of the gods to bear on the patient and also creating an impression of success for the patient to see. Analogic incantations concretize evil such that it can be physically attacked, removed, transformed, disposed of, and/or guarded against. Scapegoat-incantations analogize the scapegoat-animal to the patient, such that the patient's situation may be projected onto the animal, and, when combined with analogic acts such as spitting, that projection purports to effect a physical transfer of evil. Language, therefore, is a major component of the Old Women's ritual method. However, it may also have a function beyond ritual efficacy.

3.3.5: The presence of Old Women as agents in ritual incantations

In most Old Woman rituals, the incantations narrate the practitioner's actions. Commonly, the texts demonstrate a noticeable emphasis in the incantations on the practitioner herself and what she is accomplishing (using, for example, the formulas "I have just..." and "I am hereby..." as she performs ritual actions), although there are some exceptions. As already noted, it is most productive to compare the more complete texts, that is, CTH 391, the ritual of Ambazzi; CTH 398, the ritual of ̒uwarlu; CTH 402, the ritual of Allī; CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual against domestic quarrel; CTH 409.I, Tunlawiya's "Ritual of the River,"; and CTH 416, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple. To this list may be added CTH 780.II, Allaiturahhi's ritual for an ensorcelled person, because although less than half of the ritual is preserved, the use of the first person is quite dramatic.

Of these texts, CTH 398 and CTH 404.1 use the first person very little or not at all, noticeably unlike the rest of the rituals. The unusual lack of the first person is easily explained for CTH 398, a ritual against ominous bird-oracles: it is not authored by an Old Woman, but by an augur, though the Old Woman performs nearly all the ritual activity alone. This makes the lack of personal agency on the Old Woman's part very understandable. However, the same explanation is not available for CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual against domestic quarrel. Maštigga is also not called an Old Woman in the incipit or the colophon of this ritual; however, the incipit clearly states that when family members quarrel, "I treat them thus" (*n=uš kiššan aniyami*), and the Old Woman is the only practitioner in the ritual, so it is safe to assume that the author and the practitioner are the same. Yet the only occurrence of the first person in this ritual is in one of the two paragraphs that are inserted in copy III, and are most likely a memorization error on the part

of the scribe.³²³ Perhaps, for whatever reason, Maštigga and/or her tradition did not view emphasis of the practitioner’s accomplishments to be appropriate. Two of her other three rituals, CTH 404.3 and 404.5, do have first-person passages preserved; however, in both she simply states that she is making (CTH 404.3) or has made (CTH 404.5) an offering to the gods, rather than making any claims of ritual success.

This can be contrasted to first-person speech in other Old Woman rituals. An excellent example is Tunnawiya’s “Ritual of the River” (for a more detailed analysis of this text as a case study, see ch. 4). As noted above, at the beginning of the ritual, Tunnawiya approaches DINGIR.MAH of the river-bank, leaves offerings and takes some clay to use in the ritual, and emphasizes her own relationship with the accompanying incantation (see above). During the main portion of the ritual, however, DINGIR.MAH is not mentioned; the only mention of a god is the Storm-God’s appearance in a brief two-line Luwian incantation that is unfortunately too opaque to analyze. Otherwise, the preserved incantations focus entirely on Tunnawiya’s own actions.

For example, the following incantation states, “Whoever (pl.) has been loading and burdening his form, bone, (and) flesh with this uncleanness, I am hereby loading and burdening the body of the sorcerer of the impurity in return!”³²⁴ She does not say, “May the body of the sorcery be likewise loaded and burdened,” or something similar. The use of the first person not only emphasizes her own role, but suggests that the results are already being enacted—the verb

³²³ See Marcuson and van den Hout, “Memorization.”

³²⁴ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 ii 9 ku-i-e-eš-ša-an ALAM-ŠU ḥa-aš-ta-i mi-i-lu¹-li ʾke¹-e-ez
 10 pa-ap-ra-an-na-az ti-ia-ni-eš-kir e-la-ni-eš-kir ki-nu-na
 11 pa-ap-ra-an-na-aš al-wa-zé-na-aš ALAM-ŠU ḥa-aš-ta-i mi-i-lu-ú-li
 12 ka-a-ša EGIR-pa ti-ia-ni-eš-ki¹-mi¹ e-la-ni-eš-ki-mi
 See Goetze, *Tunnawi*, 10–11.

is in the indicative, rather than a modal, and the function seems performative. Another incantation states:

“Whoever was making him/her dark (and/or) yellow, (and who) made him/her unclean—whether someone made him/her unclean before the gods, or made him/her unclean before the dead, or made him/her unclean before a mortal, I am hereby performing the ritual of uncleanliness (for) him/her!”

“I am taking it away from him/her: I am taking from his/her twelve body parts the evil, the uncleanliness, the sorcery, the spell-casting, (and) the anger of the deity. I am taking away the terror of the dead from him/her, I am taking away the evil tongue of the *panku* from him/her.”³²⁵

Once again, the first person is used, now several times: “I am performing the ritual of uncleanliness” and “I am taking away” all of the possible evils. It should be noted that the text does not use KI.MIN, “ditto,” as in some other rituals where a verb is repeated over and over, but instead repeats “I am taking” every time, reinforcing the picture of Tunnawiya as an effective agent (though of course this might simply be a reflection of scribal convention). The speculation as to the sorcerer’s actions is in line with the “offensive” nature of the Old Women’s anti-sorcery magic, discussed above. The correspondence between the emphasis on the first-person actions of the practitioner and focus on an enemy can also be noted in other rituals (see below).

³²⁵ ³²⁵ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 ii 30 ku-i-e-ša-an da-an-ku-ni-eš-šir ḥa-aḥ-la-n[i-eš-k]ir
31 pa-ap-ra-aḥ-<ḥi>-ir na-aš-šu-wa-an PA-NI DINGIR^{MES} ku-iš-ki
32 pa-ap-ra-aḥ-ta na-aš-ma-an ag-ga-an-da-aš ku-iš-ki pé-ra-an
33 pa-ap-ra-aḥ-ta na-aš-ma-an PA-NI DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU ku-iš-ki pa-ap-ra-aḥ-ta
34 na-an ka-a-ša pa-ap-ra-an-na-aš SÍSKUR a-ni-iš-ki-¹mi¹

35 na-at-ši-kán ar-ḥa da-aš-ki-mi ¹IS¹-TU 12 ^UZU[¹U]R-ŠU
36 i-da-lu pa-ap-ra-tar al-wa-an-za-¹tar¹ a-aš-ta-ia-ra-tar
37 ŠA DINGIR-LIM kar-pí-in da-aš-¹ki¹-mi ag-ga-an-ta-aš-ši-kán
38 ḥa-tu-ga-tar da-aš-ki-mi ¹ŠA¹ DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-¹ma¹-aš-ši-kán
39 pa-an-ga-u-wa-aš i-da-lu-[u]n EME-an da-aš-ki-mi
See Goetze, *Tunnawi*, 12–15.

Later in the ritual, a figurine of the patient is made. The Old Woman has an assistant comb the patient while she says:

“I am wiping all of the body. Let the evil, uncleanness, sorcery, spellcasting, anger of the gods, (and) fear of the dead be combed down from him/her!

“I have here a *šarra*-. Whoever was disabling (*arḥa šarra*-) the twelve body [parts] with evil uncleanness, now I am disabling the evil, uncleanness, sorcery, spellcasting, anger of the gods, (and) fear of the dead from your twelve body parts! Let them be separated completely away from him/her!”³²⁶

In this passage, it is not even the Old Woman who performs the action, but a ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL (some kind of temple functionary). Yet she still claims in the incantation to be wiping down the patient’s limbs and cutting away the evil herself.

At the end of the ritual, however, the direction of responsibility changes: the Old Woman goes back to the riverbank, makes more offerings, and says, “DINGIR.MAḪ of the riverbank, the twelve body parts have hereby been scrubbed and cleansed by your hand!”³²⁷ There follow more offerings at the spring, after which she says, “Sun-God, my lord, the twelve body parts have hereby been scrubbed and cleansed by the clay of the spring!”³²⁸ Next are two analogies to

³²⁶ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 iii 2 ʾka¹-a-ša-kán NÍ.TE ḥu-u-ma-an-da ša-aḥ-ḥi-iš-ki-mi
3 nu-uš-ši-kán kat-ta ki-ʾša¹-a-an e-ʾeš-du¹ i-da-ʾlu¹
4 pa-ap-ra-tar al-wa-za-tar a-aš-ʾta-ia¹-ra-tar DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš
5 kar-pí-iš ag-ga-an-ta-aš ḥa-tu-ga-tar

6 ka-a-ša^{GIS} šar-ra-an ḥar-mi nu-za ku-iš 12 ^{UZU}ʾÚR
7 i-da-la-u-wa-az pa-ap-ra-an-na-az ar-ḥa šar-ri-[iš]-ʾki-it¹
8 ki-nu-na-at-ta IŠ-TU 12 ^{UZU}ʾÚR i-da-lu
9 [p]a-ap-ra-tar al-wa-za-tar a-aš-ʾta-ia-ra-tar DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš ʾkar-pí-in¹
10 ʾag-ga¹-an-da-aš ḥa-tu-ga-tar a-wa-an ar-ḥa šar-ri-ʾiš-ki-mi¹

11 [na-a]t-ši a-wa-an ar-ḥa šar-ra-an e-eš-du
³²⁷ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 iv 1 wa-ap-pu-wa-aš ^{dr}MAḪ¹-aš
2 ka-a-ša-za 12 ^{UZU}ʾÚR¹ pa-ap-ra-an-na-an-za tu-e-el

3 ŠU-it ša-pí-i-ia-an[-za] pár-ku-nu-wa-an-za nam-ma ša-ku-n-ia
³²⁸ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 iv 5 ^dUTU BE-LÌ-IA ka-a-ša-ʾaz¹
6 12 ^{UZU}ʾÚR ša-ku-ni-ʾia¹-aš IM-it ša-pí-ia-an-ʾza¹ pár-ku-nu-wa-an-za

ensure the patient's reproductive success (the point of this ritual), one focusing on a fertile cow and another on a fruit-laden tree. She then makes offerings to the Sun-God, and she says, "Su[n-God, my lord, come] and eat! [Of what uncleanness] the twelve body [parts have] hereby [been] cleansed [and purified] by [your], the Sun-God's, word, you, Sun-god, [kee]p [it completely] away!"³²⁹ Once again, she abdicates responsibility to the Sun-God. There is one more incantation to DINGIR.MAH, but it is too fragmentary for analysis; it is followed by more offerings, and the ritual ends.

At the end of this text, then, rather than claiming her own agency, the Old Woman is relinquishing responsibility for the ritual, placing it in divine hands. The ritual is therefore bookended by a sense of outward, divine agency: she approaches DINGIR.MAH at the beginning and states that the ritual's power comes from her (note that this ritual is called the "Ritual of the River" in its colophon). However, during the course of the ritual action, for the most part she states that *she* is the one who is enacting the ritual's effects: she is taking the evil from the patient and putting it on the evil sorcerer. But then at the end, as she is wrapping up, she is careful to once again acknowledge the divine power behind her own actions. It seems to me that this structure produces a compelling combination of a self-promoting focus on the practitioner's own skill and power with a sense of divine support and thus effectiveness to the ritual. The gods are said to be working through the Old Woman, are appropriately acknowledged and placated with incantations and offerings, and are the first and the last foci of both actions and speech. The patient enters and leaves the ritual with a sense of divine approval. However, during the concrete actions of drawing out the evil from the patient and putting it on the ritual's

³²⁹ KUB 7.53++ iv 25 ^dU[TU BE-LI-IA i-it-wa]
26 az-zi-ik-ki ka-a-ša-az ṛ 12¹ UZ[^UUR ku-e-ez pa-ap-ra-an-na-an-za tu-e-el]
27 ^dUTU-aš ud-da-na-an-za ša-a-pí-[a]n-za [pár-ku-nu-wa-an-za ar-ḥa-at]
28 zi-ik ^dUTU-uš tar-na-an ḥ[ar-ak]

antagonist, the gods are not mentioned at all; although their presence may be implied by modal verbs (e.g., the implied agent behind “Let them melt!” may be the gods), so far as explicit subjects go, it is the Old Woman herself who claims to be exercising her own skill to conquer the evil sorcery. Tunnawiya even paints a brief picture of the antagonist, over whom she assumes complete mastery. In addition, at the beginning of the text, she employs the first person to connect herself to DINGIR.MAH of the river-bank (see above) and therefore unite these two elements of the ritual as it starts, a connection that may be upheld whenever she combines the first person indicative (“I am taking...”) with a following modal (“Let the evil be...”). It should also be noted that all of Tunnawiya’s first-person statements are in the present tense (“I am hereby...”) while all of the statements in the past tense are given divine agency (“The twelve body parts have hereby been cleansed...”).

A similar situation can be seen in the ritual of Allī, analyzed above. Allī entreats more deities than Tunnawiya, and continues entreating and offering to them throughout the ritual, so CTH 402 does not have exactly the same “bookend” situation as CTH 409.I. However, during the part of the ritual most focused on extracting evil (rather than on the patient’s protection), on the first day, when she is winding the different colors of thread around the figurines representing the sorcerer(s), the repeated incantations are entirely in the first person, e.g., “[The one who] has been bewitching this person, who [has] been making (him/her) yellow/green, I am now taking his/her yellow-green spells, and I am giving them back to their [owner].”³³⁰ She ends the long sequence of the different-colored cloths by burying her equipment and saying, “The one who has been bewitching this person: now I have taken his/her spells back and I have put them down in the earth; I have fixed them in place! Let the spells and the evil dreams be fixed! Let them not

³³⁰ See above, n. 200, for transliteration.

come back up again! Let the dark earth hold them!”³³¹ Only then do the gods come back into the picture, with a sequence of offerings for several different deities. The first day of Allī, therefore, actually does seem to follow the same “bookend” structure as Tunnawiya’s ritual does. However, on the third day (the second, as noted above, is simply a reiteration of the first day’s activities), which is focused on the patient’s protection more than the extraction of evil from him or her, the gods are much more highly featured, and the analogic incantations have more modal verbs than first-person (though there are several fragmentary paragraphs, so it is difficult to characterize the text with confidence). Allī does make past-tense assertions in the first person, unlike Tunnawiya, but only after the full rite of different-colored threads has been completed, when she is burying the ritual items in the ground.

This “bookend” format is also seen in CTH 398, the Ritual of Huwarlu (analyzed above). Although the incantations do not use the first person in the same way as Allī’s and Tunnawiya’s incantations do, there is still no divine presence during the extraction of evil from the house; the divine heralds are called upon only at the beginning and the end of that section of the ritual, while most of the actions are carried out by the Old Woman without appeals and offerings to deities.

Another ritual with a strong focus on the person of the practitioner is CTH 780.II, Allaituraḥḫi’s ritual against sorcery, discussed briefly above under *historiolae*. The structure of Allaituraḥḫi’s entire ritual is impossible to analyze, since the text only preserves parts of Tablets 1, 5, and 6 of the composition; in addition, some of the existing content is too opaque to competently analyze. However, the more accessible sections are extremely interesting. Allaituraḥḫi’s first incantation has already been discussed above: she says, “This man’s form has grown. What form the sorcerer has taken for a *tarpalli*-substitute, wherever he placed it, I do not

³³¹ See above, n. 213, for transliteration.

know. If he set [it] up in [this?] city [...]”³³² Though fragmentary, this incantation already demonstrates the tendency in Allaituraḥḥi’s ritual to characterize the evil sorcerer and speculate as to his actions.

The text resumes in column two with the appeal to Ereškigal and the Annunaki, the Mesopotamian underworld gods, and her analogic raising up of the patient by heaping up various kinds of earth (see above). She offers to the gods of the trees and the goddesses of the riverbank. Finally, she goes into an “empty city,” into an inner chamber, in a “secret place.” She puts three clay vessels facing the sun, and she has a fire burning, and a knife, and she puts water and broken bread inside and says,

“What words the sorcerer has been speaking, whatever he twined and whatever he spun—in what place he worked, I do not even know that. The sorcerer built up sorcery like a tower; he twined it together like a rope. I hold him forth. I have toppled his sorcerous words like a tower; I have unraveled them like a rope.”³³³

She knocks over the clay vessels, and smashes them and puts them into the fire. Then she unravels a rope, and continues, “The sorce[rer]: If he spun to the right, *I* am unwinding it back [from the right], while if [he] spu[n] to the left, [I am] unw[inding] it back from the left!”³³⁴ Here the column ends, but one can assume that she went on, and perhaps used her knife to cut the rope

³³² See above, n. 253, for transliteration.

³³³ KUB 17.27++ ii 45’ (= copy 28’) Uḫ₇-na-aš UN-aš ku-e ud-da-a-ar me-mi-eš-ki-it ta-ru-up-pí-ia-ṛat¹

46’ ku-e ma-al-ki-ia-at ku-e e-eš-še-iš-ta ku-e-da-ni pé-ṛdi¹

47’ nu a-pa-a-at-ta *Ú-UL I-DE* Uḫ₇-na-aš UN-aš nu Uḫ₇-tar AN.ZA.GÀR ṛGIM¹-an

48’ ú-e-te-eš-ki-it na-an iš-ḫa-mi-na-an GIM-an an-da

49’ ta-ru-up-pé-eš-ki-it na-an-kán IGI-an-da e-ep-mi

50’ Uḫ₇-na-aš ud-da-a-ar-še-et AN.ZA.GÀR GIM-an ar-ḫa pí-ip-pa-aḫ-ḫu-un

51’ iš-ḫa-mi-na-an-ma-an GIM-an ar-ḫa la-a-nu-un

Edited Haas and Wegner, *Rituale der Beschwörerinnen*, Nr. 36 (p. 192).

³³⁴ KUB 17.27++ ii 55’ (=copy 38’) Uḫ₇-na-a[š UN-aš]

56’ ma-a-an ṛZAG¹-za ta-ru-up-pí-ia-at ú-ga-at EGIR-p[a ZAG-za]

57’ la-a-iš-ki-mi ma-a-na-at GÜB-la-az-ma ta-ru-ṛup¹-p[í-ia-at]

58’ ma-a-ṛnat¹-at EGIR-pa GÜB-la-za la-ṛa¹-[iš-ki-mi]

Edited Haas and Wegner, *ibid.*, 193.

to pieces. This is the sort of analogy that has been seen before, where the evil sorcery is concretized into a destructible form, and that form is then destroyed, with the intention that the effects will transfer to the evil. However, in this ritual, again, there is speculation as to the actions of the sorcerer, building him up quite effectively into a sinister figure, working in secret, crafting a malevolent force—a force that has multiple strong qualities about it, tall and strong like a tower but also complicated and sinuous like a rope.³³⁵ Then, Allaiturahhi demonstrates her own superior powers (using the emphatic “I,” *ūk*). Similar to the rituals discussed above, there is no mention of divine aid during this passage.

Column iii is not very well preserved; there is only one complete paragraph, which is entirely made up of an incantation. The Old Woman says,

“I conquered them, the words of the sorcerer. The words [th]at are above,³³⁶ my words conquered them. I have thrown [h]is words back on the sorcerer a second time, I have spat on them, I have trampled them [wi]th (my) feet. May a horse keep urinating (on) them; may an ox keep defecating (on) [them]. Let the person [who] walks all over (them) keep [sp]itting on (them)! Let them [b]e spat on, the words of [sorcery] and the man of sorcery!”³³⁷

³³⁵ I find Mouton’s idea that in this passage “elle prétend en effet que l’ensorceleur n’a pas pratiqué son rite d’ensorcellement correctement” (“Sorcellerie,” 119–20) less likely. Allaiturahhi’s statement of ignorance seems rather to fit with the well-attested ability of Old Women to deal with any problem even if they do not know how it came about.

³³⁶ Lorenz and Tas (p. 120 n. 16) interpret this as meaning “belonging to this world.”

³³⁷ KUB 17.27++ iii 8 tar-uḫ-ḫu-na-at-za Uḫ₇-na-aš ʾud-da-a-ar¹ [ku]-ʾe ud-da-a-ar¹

9 ʾša¹-[ra-a]z-zi na-at-za am-me-el ud-ʾda¹-na-a-an-te-ʾeš tar¹-[ḫu]-ʾe-er¹

10 ut-tar-[še]-ʾet¹ 2-e-pát Uḫ₇-na-aš Uḫ₇-tar pé-eš-ši-ia-nu-un

11 nu-uš-[m]a-aš-kán še-er al-la-pa-aḫ-ḫu-un na-at an-ʾda¹

12 GĪR-[i]t iš-pár-ra-aḫ-ḫu-un na-at-kán ANŠE-aš eš-ḫur-re-eš-ʾki-id-du¹

13 na-[at]-kán GU₄-uš kam-mar-ši-eš-ki-id-du DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-uš-ša-an

14 ku-i[š] še-er ar-ḫa i-ia-at-ta-ri nu-uš-ša-an še-er

15 a[l-l]a-ap-pa-aḫ-ḫi-iš-ki-id-du al-ʾla¹-ap-pa-aḫ-ḫa-an-wa-ʾra-at¹ [e]-ʾeš-du¹

16 U[ḫ₇-n]a-aš ud-da-a-ar Uḫ₇-na-aš-ša UN-aš

The rest of this tablet is fragmentary and/or opaque; there is an incantation appealing to the gods to “judge for themselves” the patient’s “case,” indicating a trial setup, seen in a few other Hittite rituals with the patient as the defendant; this is the only certain attestation of this format in the Old Woman corpus.³³⁸ In the final action preserved on the first tablet, the Old Woman is constructing a model garden, in which she sets up divine statues of the Sun-Goddess of the Earth, Išḫara, and others. Unfortunately, the text breaks before the garden’s purpose becomes clear.

“I purified the sorcery from the bod[y parts] (and) the head; [I] t[ook?] the sorcery, which is called paralysis(?).³³⁹ I took away the binding from your mouth. Let them take away the haze from your eyes; let them take it away from you by means of an image. Let it remain inside of³⁴⁰ its height; let it remain inside of its width, the evil word that the sorcerer has cast.”³⁴¹

³⁴¹KUB 24.13 ii 2 [...a]l-wa-an-za-tar NÍ.T[E^{MES}-az]

The idea of confining an evil word inside of a statue is unique in the Old Woman ritual corpus, but seems to fit well with the idea of the substitute/scapegoat: the figurine presumably corresponds to the patient because of its shape, and although Allaituraḥḥi does not seem to need the long equations that Tunnawiya uses, the concept is similar. Allaituraḥḥi continues:

“Let it be wiped away: wherever the sorcery has gone in, let the sorcery be wiped away by means of nobility and goodwill. Whatever words of the sorcerer there were, let them be wiped away: from fertility, from virility, from the sexual parts, from the loins. While underneath, may the sorcery be wiped from your *šatta-*; behind, from your limbs; and in front may it be wiped from your fingers. Let it be wiped from (your) nails, together with impurity; let it be wiped from (your) feet; let it be wiped from your soles, the evil sorcery.”³⁴²

This is again reminiscent of the Luwian rituals, with the list of body parts from which the evil is to be drawn. The continuation is a departure, however:

3 [ḥ]ar-ša-na-za-ṛat-kánṛ kat-ta-an pá-ku-nu-nu-un
4 al-wa-an-za-tar tin-ni-ša-an ku-it ḥal-zi-ia-an d[a²-ah-ḥu-un?]
5 iš-ša-aš-ta dam-me-in-ku-wa-ar ar-ḥa da-aḥ-ḥ[u-u]n
6 IG^{III.A}-wa-aš-ma-ták-kán kam-ma-ra-an ar-ḥa da-an-du
7 e-eš-ša-ri-ta-at-kán da-an-du pá-ki-eš-ni-ta-at-kán
8 an-da-an e-eš-du pal-ḥi-eš-ni-ták-kán an-da e-eš-du
9 al-wa-an-zi-na-aš ku-it ḤUL-lu ut-tar e-eš-še-eš-ta
Edited by Haas and Wegner, *Rituale der Beschwörerinnen* Nr. 15 (p. 109).
³⁴² KUB 24.13 ii 10 ar-ḥa-ták-kán ṛan¹-ša-an e-eš-du al-wa-an-za-tar an-da-an
11 ku-wa-pí pa-iš-ki-it-ta iš-ḥa-aš-šar-wa-an-ni-ta-at-kán
12 a-aš-ši-ia-u-wa-an-ni-it al-wa-an-za-tar ar-ḥa
13 an-ša-an e-eš-du al-wa-an-zé-na-aš ku-e ud-da-a-ar
14 e-eš-ta ar-ḥa-ták-kán an-ša-an e-eš-du
15 al-wa-an-za-tar MUNUS-an-na-za ḥa-aš-ša-an-na-za^{UZU}ÚR-za
16 gi-nu-wa-az kat-ta-an-ma-ták-kán ša-at-ta-za
17 an-ša-an e-eš-du al-wa-an-za-tar EGIR-an-ta-ták-kán
18 UZU-na-az pé-ra-an-ma-ták-kán ṛŠU¹.SI-az an-ša-an
19 e-eš-du al-wa-an-za-tar ša-an-ku-i-ša-at-kán
20 pa-ap-ra-an-na-za an-ša-an e-eš-du GİR^{MES}-at-kán
21 an-ša-an e-eš-du pa-tal-ḥa-za-at-kán an-ša-an e-eš-du
22 ḤUL-lu ṛan¹-wa-an-za-tar

Edited by Haas and Wegner, *Beschwörerinnen* Nr. 15, pp. 109–110; see also CHD Š2, p. 311, for updates and improvements on readings.

The next paragraph seems to continue the list, but unfortunately preserves only a fragmentary “[...furiou]s eyes[...]” before the column breaks. This is once again quite reminiscent of Tunnawiya’s rituals, except that instead of “tongues” as symbolic of people’s evil intent or action, Allaituraḥḫi uses “eyes.”³⁴⁶ The emphasis on Allaituraḥḫi’s own agency in this paragraph is dramatic; she does not only say “I” but “I, the Old Woman.” This is the only attested passage in which an Old Woman claims her profession aloud.

Column iv preserves only one quite fragmentary paragraph,³⁴⁷ in which she continues describing ways that she has done away with the sorcery (scraped it, shattered it, scattered it, wiped it with various substances). Preserved in very fragmentary context in this paragraph are a few uses of the emphatic first-person pronoun *ūk*, that is, “I have taken” rather than simply “I have taken.” Though fragmentary, the content is very clear: it is a list of all the ways in which Allaituraḥḫi has banished evil from the ritual patient. This is the last preserved paragraph of Tablet 5, and when all of this tablet is taken into account, Allaituraḥḫi’s focus on self-aggrandizement permeates the text. Column ii’s three preserved paragraphs begin with what she has done, in the past tense (“I have purified...”) continue with a third-person imperative (“let the evil remain inside...let the sorcery be wiped away...”) which quickly becomes a first-person past

18 ar-ḥa-ma-at-ši-kán da-aḥ-ḫu-un^{MUNUSŠU.GI}
 19 na-at-ši-kán ar-ḥa an-šu-un KUR-e-an-da-aš tar-ku-wa-an-da-ṛaš¹
 20 IGI^{HLA}-wa LUGAL MUNUS.LUGAL URU-aš ṛÉ¹ ad-da-aš an-na-aš
 21 LÚ.MEŠ^{RA-BU-TIM} LÚ^{HA-AZ-ṛZI¹-IA-AN-NI}
 22 LÚ^{ma-ni-ia-aḥ-ḫi-ia-aš} EN-aš LÚ.MEŠ^{DUMU É.GAL}
 23 tar-ku-wa-an-da IGI^{HLA}-wa da-aḥ-ḫu-un pa-ga-u-wa-aš
 24 [m]a-ni-in-ku-wa-an-da tar-ṛku¹-wa-an-da IGI^{HLA}-wa
 25 ŠA É-TIM SAG.GÉME.İR^{MEŠ} tar-ku-wa-an-da
 26 [I]GI^{HLA}-wa da-aḥ-ḫu-un

Edited *ibid.*, 112–13.

³⁴⁶ See Mouton, “Le ‘mauvais œil’ d’après les textes cunéiformes hittites et mésopotamiens,” in *Pensée grecque et sagesse d’Orient. Hommage à Michel Tardieu*, ed. M.-A. Amir-Moezzi et al., Bibliothèque de l’École des Hautes Études Sciences Religieuses 139 (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 2009), 425–39, for evil eyes, which are less common than evil tongues in the Hittite texts but still occasionally attested.

³⁴⁷ KUB 41.19(+)KBo 57.215 iv x+1–15’.

tense again (“I have wiped away...”). Column iii contains the extraordinary sentence, “I, the Old Woman, have taken them from him!” in a list of things she has taken away. Column iv’s single preserved paragraph seems to be a reiteration of all the things she has done, with emphatic focus on herself as the agent. We can see here more focus on a comprehensive approach, seen in lists, as in Tunnawiya’s rituals, and in a combination of methodologies, as seen in CTH 391, the ritual of Ambazzi, discussed above. Allaiturahhi, however, spends more time detailing all of the methods she has used than Ambazzi does.

The content of Tablet 6 is in some places quite difficult, and overall less relevant to this discussion. However, one incantation is extremely pertinent:

“On this day: they³⁴⁸ have let hi[m/her,³⁴⁹ the... one] go from the wood; we have unbound the bound one from [bond]age; I have freed the bewitched [perso]n again at the gate. While I have taken the sorcery from him/her through Ištar with words, with commands, with (my) mouth, I myself also have taken it from him/her. The words are of Ištar, but they are also incantations (for) mortals. Let them be for you, Ištar, ten times, and let them be for me once!”³⁵⁰

This incantation simultaneously invokes Ištar—perhaps Ištar of Nineveh, given the mention of Nineveh earlier in the text, or perhaps simply the Hurrian Ištar-equivalent Šauška—to the point

³⁴⁸ Probably the gods, who appear two lines earlier as the subject of another broken 3pl. preterite.

³⁴⁹ Haas and Wegner (*Rituale der Beschwörerinnen*, 127) restore a[n?], and the copy supports a[t] more than a[n], but the photo is more clearly a[n] (with slanted horizontals as seen in the AN sign in the line immediately below).

³⁵⁰ KBo 12.85++ i 30 (=KUB 27.29 i x+1) [k]a-a UD-at na-a[n t]ja-ʾanʾ GIŠ-ru-za ar-ḫa tar-nir

31 iš-ḫi-ia-an-ta-an-ma-an-ʾkánʾ [iš-ḫi-ia-l]a-az ar-ḫa ʾlaʾ-a-u-en

32 a-aš-ʾkiʾ-ma-kán an-da Uḫ7-an-ʾda-anʾ [UN]-an EGIR-pa la-a-nu-un

33 Uḫ7-tar-ma-aš-ši ʾIŠTAR-za me-mi-ia-[n(a-a)]z wa-tar-na-aḫ-ḫa-ʾazʾ

34 EME-za ar-ḫa da-aḫ-ḫu-u-un ú-uq-q[a-(at-š)]i-ia-at-ʾkánʾ

35 ar-ḫa da-aḫ-ḫu-u-un ŠA ʾIŠTAR ud-da-ʾaʾ-[a]r

36 DUMU.LÚ^{MEŠ}.ʾU19ʾ.LU-ma-at ḫu-uk-ma-uš tu-uk-at A-NA ʾIŠTAR

37 10-ŠU e-eš-du ú-uq-qa-at 1-ŠU ʾeʾ-eš-du

See Haas and Wegner, *ibid.*, 126–27, for the edition; for this passage in particular see also Beckman’s review of Haas and Wegner (*BiOr* 48 [1991]: 583).

of ascribing Allaituraḥḫi's words to her, while also emphasizing the practitioner's own role. In particular, the power of the incantation *as possessed by the practitioner* is stressed: Ištar may be the origin of the incantations, "but they are also incantations (for) mortals," and Allaituraḥḫi *herself* (emphatic *ūk*, "I") has acted. In addition, one can see at the beginning of this passage a progression from the gods (they), to Allaituraḥḫi together with the gods (we), to Allaituraḥḫi herself (I) as the ones who achieved ritual success.

Allaituraḥḫi's case is particularly dramatic, but as already noted, emphasis on the skills of the practitioner appears in most of the best-preserved Old Woman rituals. Ambazzi similarly refers to the ritual acts as her own accomplishments in CTH 391, for example, "I have taken the evil away from them, and I have tied it to a mouse. Let this mouse take it to the high mountains, the deep valleys, (and) the far roads!" After she lets the mouse go, she continues, "Alauwaima, you drive this away! I will give you a nanny-goat to eat!" Although the relationship she establishes with the deities/demons during this ritual (see above) is for the benefit of the patient, Ambazzi herself instigates and controls it, which is very clear from the incantations. In CTH 416, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple, the Old Woman makes similar statements; e.g., "I have hereby tak[en] the tongues of the populace from you; I have taken the sickness from you; I have tak[en] it from your heart(s); I have taken it from your head(s)."³⁵¹ Thus, in this ritual, and in Tunlawiya's, Allī's, Allaituraḥḫi's, and Ambazzi's rituals, the incantations make it very clear who has the skills necessary to solve the ritual problem, and what she has accomplished with her actions.

On the other hand, in CTH 416 there is also a more ambiguous situation: when the Old Woman releases an eagle as a messenger for the king and queen, she says, "I did not let it go; the king and queen let it go. Go and keep saying to the Sun-God and the Storm-God: 'As the Sun-

³⁵¹ See ch. 1, n. 38, for transliteration.

God and Storm-God are eternal, likewise let the king and queen be eternal!’’³⁵² Thus, in this particular instance, she is explicitly abdicating responsibility (as discussed in chapter 1), just as Allaituraḥḥi does when she says that she is speaking Ištar’s words. However, the fact that the Old Woman *can* act for the king and queen is a statement of power and agency itself—similar to how Allaituraḥḥi can speak for Ištar, and how Tunnawiya can expect to draw on DINGIR.MAḤ’s power, and Maštigga can make use of ^dAntaliya’s power. In several of these Old Woman rituals, gods are kept in specific sections at the beginning and end of the ritual, while in the middle the focus is on the practitioner’s own skill. Even when the gods are called upon, though, the Old Women’s relationship with them is an expression of power and skill itself. As noted at the beginning of this chapter, the patients of these rituals may be in an antagonistic relationship with a deity. The Old Women, on the other hand, are expressly in an advantageous position vis-à-vis the gods. As the Old Woman Annanna states in CTH 323, the Disappearance of the Sun-God, “And I am Annanna...I t[o]ok the words of the gods, and I poured them [...]...I lost none of the gods’ words. But whenever Telipinu becomes burdensome for anyone, I [sp]eak the w[ords] of the gods, and I invoke him.”³⁵³ Annanna’s skill, her identity, her knowledge of the gods’ words, and her relationship with them are all emphasized in her own incantation.

3.4: Conclusion

Through a comprehensive examination of the texts, the Old Women’s areas of ritual expertise are clear. They were primarily troubleshooters, conducting rituals to cure patients of

³⁵² See ch. 1, n. 47, for transliteration.

³⁵³ VBoT 58 iv 3 ú-ug-ga^{MUNUS} an-na-an-na-aš e-eš-mi

...
5 d[a-ah]-hu-un DINGIR^{MEŠ}-an ud-da-a-a-r ne-ez-za-a[n]
6 []x šu-uh-ha-ah-hu-un

...
8 𒀭DINGIR^{MEŠ} -aš ud-da-a-ar Ú-UL ku-it-ki har-ni-in-ku-un ma-a-an-ša-an
9 ^dTe-li-pi-nu-ša ku-e-da-ni-ik-ki na-ak-ke-eš-zi ú-ga DINGIR^{MEŠ} -aš u[d-da-ar]
10 [me]-ma-ah-hi ta-an mu-ga-mi
Ed. Rieken, hethiter.net/: CTH 323.1

afflictions and to appease angry gods, and did not seem to be involved with the types of rituals that did not solve problems, such as building rituals or birth rituals. Though they treated patients for afflictions, they did not practice medicine; rather, they directly addressed the supernatural causes *behind* any physical sickness or mental distress a patient might be experiencing. They were particular specialists in sorcery; they seem to have been the Hittites' primary resource for dealing with sorcerous attacks, and they were the only practitioners who regularly practiced "offensive" magic, imposing harmful magic onto enemy sorcerers as well as curing patients. Overall, their rituals were primarily focused on the eradication of evil and/or danger, rather than soliciting favor or maintaining divine goodwill.

Incantations were an enormous part of their ritual repertoire, even more so than other Hittite practitioners. These incantations accomplished several things:

1. They appealed to friendly gods to help with the ritual process. The Sun-God and various forms of DINGIR.MAH were particularly associated with the Old Women (see the Conclusion for more discussion of this). The incantations generally indicate confidence in divine help, and sometimes assert a pre-existing relationship with the relevant deity. These appeals usually bracketed the Old Women's own ritual actions, creating a recognizable ritual structure that is common but not universal in the most complete Old Woman texts.
2. They pacified, distracted, or bribed hostile gods, to keep them from further troubling the ritual patients. This could be conceived of in one of two different ways: either the god's anger itself could be a kind of evil, to be transformed through ritual (as in the Disappearing God myths), or the god could be convinced to turn its attention elsewhere,

through a combination of tempting offerings (as more attractive targets) and the purification of the patient (making them a less attractive target).

3. They recited or acted out *historiolae*, to bring supernatural resolution to human problems. Friendly deities such as the Sun-God and Ḫannahanna (DINGIR.MAH), and (in the Hurrian rituals) the Storm-God and Ištar, were frequent participators in these *historiolae*. Sometimes the Old Woman was explicitly pointed out in the narrative to be the solution to the patient's problem.
4. They used analogy for several purposes. First, they concretized evil forces such that they could be removed or destroyed; second, they attacked sorcerers, also with concretized forces; third, they imposed protective and sustaining forces on the patient; and fourth, they created analogues for the patient (substitutes/scapegoats) onto which they transferred the patient's affliction. This final type of analogic rite can be seen in the most detail in the Luwian or Luwian-context corpus of Old Woman texts, and a comprehensive look at the evidence reveals a consistent structure that the Old Women used to establish the animal as an analogue and demonstrate the transfer of evil.
5. They demonstrated how their own actions were effecting consequences on the world, using first-person statements and performative elements ("I am hereby removing the evil...") and sometimes even setting themselves up in explicit opposition to antagonist practitioners.

These incantations connected the physical actions and the objects that they manipulated—such as offerings, analogic acts like extinguishing fires, substitute-animals, etc.—to the non-physical realities that they were attempting to affect. Even when the incantations were in foreign languages such as Luwian and Hurrian, they served the same function (so far as we

can understand) as the Hittite incantations. There is, of course, no way to be certain whether the incantations were primarily intended to increase ritual efficacy—that is, whether certain actions would have been considered to be *ineffective* without the accompanying incantation—or whether they were primarily intended to make clear to the (human and/or divine) audience what was happening. Likely both elements were in effect. Rituals like CTH 390D, which is entirely made up of an incantation, and types of incantations like *historiolae* that were not necessarily accompanied by actions, suggest that the incantations themselves had ritual power; however, the emphasis on the personal power of the Old Woman in many of the incantations also suggests that they were intended for an audience, whether that audience was the patient, the gods, spectators, or some combination.

Now that the methods by which the Old Women created frameworks for their ritual acts have been studied, it is possible to move on to a study of those acts. The incantations rarely occurred without some kind of physical accompaniment, and it can be seen that these physical actions, and the objects used in these actions, were closely bound to the incantations. This will be the subject of the following chapter.

CHAPTER 4: RITUAL ACTS

4.1: Introduction

A survey of Old Woman rituals reveals three broad categories of ritual acts. First, the Old Women use a variety of methods to extract evil from infected people (or occasionally buildings), and sometimes also keep it from coming back. Second, they must safely dispose of ritual implements that may have become infected with evil or are otherwise dangerous. Sometimes they will achieve both of these goals at once by performing an analogic act. Finally, they use offerings to attract the positive attention of deities. In the better-preserved rituals, it is possible to see how these various methods are combined or practiced in sequence. While no Old Woman ritual shows a progression of ritual acts that is identical to any of the others, they do share many of the same “building blocks.” This has already been seen in the previous chapter: there are several different rituals that extinguish fires, construct gates, bind patients with cloth, use scapegoats, have a ritual meal, etc. Through close study, it is possible to create a typology of the Old Woman’s ritual method using these “building blocks.” However, the method must first be carefully considered.

4.2: The problem of categorization

There has not been a great deal of scholarship on Hittite ritual method. The very few works that address the matter head-on have been either quite general and brief,¹ have not been

¹ E.g., M.-C. Trémouille, “Les rituels magiques hittites: aspects formels et techniques,” in *La Magie: Du monde babylonien au monde hellénistique* vol. I, ed. A. Moreau and J.-C. Turpin (Montpellier, 2000), 77–92; M. Vieyra, “Le sorcier hittite,” in *Le Monde due Sorcier*, Sources Orientales 7 (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966), 99–125; A. Mouton, “Sorcellerie hittite,” *JCS* 62 (2010): 105–25; Haas, “Magie und Beschwörungsrituale,” in *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, 876–911; M. Hutter, “Die wirkmächtigen Reden der Ritualexperten in hethitischen Texten: Anrufung der Götter, “Historiolae,” und performative Funktion” in *Wenn Götter und Propheten reden – Erzählen für die Ewigkeit*, ed. Amr el Hawary (Berlin: EB-Verlag, 2012), 153–71. All of these works make broad statements about how Hittite ritual functions based on only a small number of individual examples. Beckman (“From Cradle to

done by specialists,² or, most commonly, have approached the problem from an overly philological standpoint. Philological scholarship is predisposed to categorize things by their words. This is a method that has consistently been applied by Hittitologists to ritual texts: that is, various rites are categorized either by the items used in them (e.g., “cloth rites,” “gate rites,” “roasted grain rites”), or by the verbs used to express what is happening (e.g., “pressing,” “binding,” “turning.”).³ Ritual texts are compared to one another based on mutual use of these nouns or verbs, as can be seen in the commentary of virtually every edition of a Hittite ritual text: a rite using grain, for example, will prompt notes on other texts attesting rites with grain; a rite with cloth, other texts attesting cloth; a rite with washing, other rites with washing, etc. On the other hand, when referring to rites in terms of their ritual efficacy, the scholarly terms are

Grave: Women's Role in Hittite Medicine and Magic,” *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 8 [1993]: 25–39) comes the closest, in my opinion, to a thoughtful and accurate characterization of ritual method, i.e., “As we can observe from the ritual excerpts thus far presented, the most important concepts underlying Hittite magical healing were those of reification and analogy. By the first principle, an evil was conceived of as a quasi-substance which could be removed from the patient much like ordering soiling...or transferred to a magic figure...By the second principle, evil could be identified with a material or an object employed in ritual, and the destruction of the object would bring about the removal of the evil” (35). However, the circumscribed nature of his study leads to a much greater focus on midwifery as the source of women’s magical authority than is warranted from the evidence (see ch. 3).

² E.g., D.P. Wright, *The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature*, SBL Dissertation Series 101 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987). Wright’s treatment of Hittite ritual is more conceptual than most; he creates ten categories of Hittite purifactory method: transfer, detergents, substitution, entreaty and appeasement, analogy, concretizing, annulment, disposal, prevention, and invigoration. It is my opinion, however, that the categories are too artificial: for example, a comprehensive look at the texts suggests rather than his “transfer,” “detergent,” and “annulment” categories fit easily under both “analogy” and “concretization,” which should be conflated, and that “invigoration” might either fall under “entreaty and appeasement” or “analogy.”

³ E.g., Bawanypeck’s discussion of CTH 398 classifies the various rites according to items: “Riten mit gerösteten Sämereien” (*Rituale der Auguren*, 158), “Ein Ritus mit Brot” (160) “Wollriten” (163), etc.; both Bawanypeck and Christiansen (*Ritualtradition der Ambazzi*, 139–54) focus their analysis on parallels with other ritual texts that use the same items. A similar focus can be seen in Görke’s (*Das Ritual der Aštu*) reconstruction of CTH 490 based almost entirely on the list of ritual items preserved at the beginning of the text and parallels with other rituals that use the same or similar items. One of Engelhard’s (*Hittite Magical Practices*) four chapters is “Ritual implements and their uses.” Haas’ catalogue of items (*Materia Magica*) is one of the only published monographs that deals generally with Hittite ritual as an overarching subject. Haas also has a section on ritual techniques (70–79) in which he discussing various ritual techniques classified primarily by verb. Görke states that, “Die dafür ausgeführten rituellen Handlungen der Unheilsvernichtung umfassen Vorgänge wie Abwsichen, Massieren, Abreiben, Kämmen, Abbürsten und Ablecken...” (*Aštu*, 173). Strauß (*Reinigungsrituale*) uses both nouns and verbs as categories for Kizzuwatnian rites. Trémouille (“Les rituels magiques hittites”) organizes her “aspects techniques” by items used. This tendency is also exacerbated by the many short philological articles, too numerous to cite here, designed to correctly define a certain Hittite word or group of words attested in ritual texts, which discuss their meaning in relation to ritual efficacy.

broad and not always well-defined: “contact rite,” “elimination rite,” “purification” or “cathartic” rite, “transference,” without comprehensive attention to what these terms might mean in Hittite ritual framework.⁴ This can result in erroneous characterizations of ritual acts, where, e.g., something may be classified as a “transference rite” when in fact it is no such thing.⁵ In point of fact, the same verb or noun may be used to accomplish different ritual acts depending on its context, and determining that an act or object accomplishes “purification” (or whatever the goal) in one text because it did so in another text is not always correct.

This is not to say that comparison among texts is useless, or that a better-preserved or clearly-explained rite in one text may never be used to shed light on a difficult passage in another. Nor is it true that the repetition of a word, whether item or action, is never significant. However, troubles arise when rites are classified independent of context, or when the significance of one rite is imposed upon a superficially similar one without consideration of different goals or parameters that might change that significance. This can easily happen with ritual items, particularly since most of the common items used by Old Women in their rituals are used for several different things: water can be used to purify, to dispose, and to extinguish; barley to nourish (symbolically and literally) and to be rendered impotent as an analogy of unfruitfulness; clothing to imply richness or contamination, to conceal or to reveal; a basket as a carrier or as a sieve; spit as a carrier of contamination or as an expression of disgust. Sheep and goats may be offerings or receptacles; birds may be slaughtered as offerings or let go as messengers; dogs may be symbolic guards, sacrifices, or methods of disposal; pigs may be receptacles of evil or symbols of fertility. Cloth in particular is extremely multivalent (as seen in

⁴ E.g., Görke, *Aštu*, 172–74; Christiansen, *Ambazzi*, 139–54; Haas, *Geschichte*, 889–98.

⁵ See, e.g., Strauß on *šer arḫa waḫnu* (*Reinigungsrituale*, 72–76), discussed further below, or Görke, *Aštu*, 173, in which she creates a dichotomy between “Übertragungsriten” and “Reinigungsriten” that, in my opinion, is far too dualistic, and considers the passing-through-rite to be a “Zwischenstufe zwischen den Übertragungs- und Reinigungsriten,” which from a structural perspective is certainly not correct.

CTH 402, the ritual of Allī, in chapter 3). In addition, there are several hundred different ritual items attested overall in the corpus of Old Woman rituals. The Old Women were clearly in command of an enormously varied array of physical tools with which to avert negative supernatural effects, and might use different items to achieve the same goal, as well as using the same item to achieve different goals.

This multivalence can also be seen with verbs representing ritual acts; for example, the case study of CTH 398, the ritual of Ḫuwarlu, in ch. 3 discussed a sequence in which soapwort, river-clay, and grain were each “pressed” to the patients’ bodies, accomplishing three different things. In CTH 402, the ritual of Allī, *ḫulaliya*- “wrap” was used both to show how (negative) sorcery was being attached to the sorcerers, and how (positive) protective forces were being applied to the patient. Those cases are relatively straightforward; however, sometimes confusion can arise. Further light may be shed on this problem through an analysis of the widespread and difficult Hittite phrase *šer arḫa waḫnu*-:

4.2.1: *šer arḫa waḫnu*-

One of the most common actions in rituals against evil is the Hittite verbal phrase *šer arḫa waḫnu*-, which is usually translated simply as “to wave over.”⁶ It is attested in twenty-one Old Woman rituals. Rita Strauß has collected occurrences of *šer arḫa waḫnu*- in ritual context in a section of her book on purification rituals, and she says of this action, “Durch das

⁶ The CHD (Š3 s.v. *šer 7 b 2’ b’ 10’*’, pp. 431–32) translates “waves over (and) away (from),” which seems an unnecessarily awkward phrase; to “wave something over” something else in English surely implies both an approaching and retreating motion already; another possibility might be “waves back and forth over.” Trémouille’s suggestion of “encircling” (“Toutefois, il me semble que le geste exprimé par le verbe *waḫnu*-...indique plutôt l’acte magique qui consiste à entourer ou la personne à purifier, ou le simulacre divin, ou encore le temple, en quelque sorte la création d’un “cercle magique.” [“La religion des Hourrites: état actuel de nos connaissances,” in *Nuzi at Seventy-Five*, ed. D.I. Owen and G. Wilhelm, SCCNH 10 (Bethesda: CDL Press, 1999), 285]), which bears a closer relationship to the common German translation “umschwenken,” “to swing around,” does not seem impossible but is not explicitly suggested by any of the contexts known to me; see also Beal, “Dividing a God,” in *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, ed. P. Mirecki and M. Meyer, RGRW 141 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), p. 207 n. 54, who distinguishes *šer arḫa waḫnu*- “wave” an accusative object “over” a dative from *arḫa waḫnu*- as perhaps to “circle” an accusative object “with” an instrumental.

Umschwenken oder Umkreisen der zu reinigenden Person bzw. des zu reinigenden Objektes wird ein Kontakt zwischen diesem und der Schwenksubstanz hergestellt, auf welche die Unreinheitsstoffe gelenkt und übertragen werden.”⁷ More broadly, when discussing the rite as a phenomenon in general, and in particular when connected with *hušt*-substance and with birds, Görke states that “Schwenkriter zählen innerhalb der hethitischen Ritualistik zu den geläufigen Vorgehensweisen, um entweder die Unheilsstoffe der umkreisten Person oder des Objektes aufzunehmen oder um den Kontakt zu der Person oder dem Gegenstand herzustellen.”⁸ However, after a full examination of all of its attestations, it can be seen that neither of these definitions is quite adequate.

Some problems of translation must be addressed before an analysis of *šer arḥa waḥnu*’s efficacy can be made. Miller has objected that in Maštigga’s ritual against domestic quarrel and in Tunnawiya’s *taknaz dā*- rituals, the Old Woman is said to *šer arḥa waḥnu*- (and in Maštigga and Tunnawiya, also *šer ēpp*-, “hold over”) a sheep, which, as he points out,⁹ is physically unlikely. His suggestion is that if the ritual texts are scribal creations, plausibility need not have been taken into account (on which discussion see more below), with an acknowledgment of the other possibility¹⁰ that Luwian or Hurrian language interference could be causing an awkward translation from a metaphorical foreign phrase to a literal Hittite expression. The CHD’s volume Š, fascicle 3 suggests instead that the sheep might be scale models.¹¹

None of these possibilities seems overwhelmingly convincing to me: there is nothing else in CTH 404.1 that seems impossible (and assuming that a text does not need to make any sense

⁷ *Reinigungsrituale*, p. 72

⁸ *Aštu*, p. 281.

⁹ *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 110–12.

¹⁰ Suggestion by Sidel’sev, “Inverted Word Order in Middle Hittite,” in *Anatolian Languages*, ed. V. Shevoroshkin and P.J. Sidwell, Association for the History of Language Studies in the Science and History of Language 6 (Canberra, 2002): 137–88.

¹¹ P. 432.

should, in my opinion, be only a last resort), nor is there any other indication that the text was translated from another language.¹² Elsewhere in the Hittite ritual corpus, the scribes do not seem to be shy about indicating when something is a model and when it is real, and interpretation of the sheep as a model would require the entire sequence of “driving the sheep in” (using the animal-wrangling verb *ūnna-*), slaughtering it, cutting it into pieces, and burning it up to be understood to be elaborate pageantry without any explanation of such in the text; not impossible, but one would like to discover another explanation. The only one that has not yet been suggested that seems plausible to me is simply that the Old Woman had help. In CTH 416, as noted in ch. 1, it is not the Old Woman who waves an eagle over the king and queen, but the palace servants (DUMU^{MEŠ} É.GAL)—but later the Old Woman says, “When *I* wave the eagle...” though it was clearly not her in the previous paragraph. Frequently in Old Woman rituals there is evidence for the presence of uncredited “support staff.” In Maštigga, “they” drive in the sheep that are later waved over the patient; “they” are not identified, but I see no reason why they could not have helped her lift the sheep. In Tunnawiya’s “Ritual of the River,” a tent is set up for the Old Woman on the steppe, in the passive voice, without even an unidentified “they” as an agent. In addition, in Tunnawiya’s ritual, even when a helper is named, the ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL, the Old Woman claims full agency of the ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL’s actions in her incantation. It therefore seems plausible that a sentence “she waves the sheep over the ritual patient” could indeed be representing a live sheep being lifted and moved back and forth over the patient, if one pictures several other people participating in the process, but not being important enough to mention. The Old Woman could have had her hands on the sheep to symbolize her own participation without taking any of its weight at all.

¹² The untranslatable terms *tiššatwa* and *tiwariya* are clearly marked as *termini technici* in the ritual text, and do not, in my opinion, suggest that the entire text is a translation.

Whether this explanation is convincing or not, *šer arḥa waḥnu*- clearly refers to physically placing an accusative direct object in proximity to a dative indirect object. As mentioned above, rituals of Maštigga and Tunnawiya also use *šer ēpp*-, “hold over,” which seems to have a very similar function. In many cases, these actions associate the object with the patient and his, her, or their woes, and overall they seem to be a smaller component of larger ritual actions. For example, they are used with an animal prior to spitting into the animal’s mouth in CTH 404.1, CTH 760.II, and CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1; the spitting physically transfers part of the patient, and the evil inside them, to the animal, but in all cases, either *šer arḥa waḥnu*- or *šer ēpp*- or both are performed first. This action is likewise used with various objects prior to analogic incantations/actions in CTH 404.1 and 404.2, CTH 780, and CTH 788: for example, in CTH 404.1, Maštigga makes tongues out of clay to symbolize the patients’ antagonistic words to one another, *šer arḥa waḥnu*’s them over the patients, speaks a short incantation explicitly identifying the tongues with the words, and then destroys them. In these cases, the preliminary nature of *šer arḥa waḥnu* seems very clear.

In CTH 398, Țuwarlu, the order of operations is slightly different: the Old Woman has a basket full of absorbent and analogical materials, all of which were deposited in it *after* the appropriate rites were performed, and as a final act, she *šer arḥa waḥnu*’s the basket in the contaminated house, calls on the Storm-God’s heralds to protect the house, and the basket is taken out of the house, the contents later to be disposed of out on the steppe.¹³ Here, the sense seems to be of a final mopping-up; each individual item has been pressed or tied to bodies or walls, or left by the bed overnight, and at the very end, everything collected together is waved

¹³ Immediately following this, she *šer arḥa waḥnu*’s a live puppy over the king and queen and recites an incantation that suggests that it is supposed to behave as a protector to the king and queen (presumably in a similar fashion to the figurine of a puppy earlier in the ritual), and in this case the *šer arḥa waḥnu*- is once again clearly a preliminary action, but the subsequent ritual acts with the puppy are in the most fragmentary section of the text, and so difficult to interpret or connect to the incantation.

around the house one last time. Similarly, in Maštigga's ritual, immediately prior to the rite with the seven tongues described above, she removes figurines of hands and tongues that had been sitting on the patients' heads (along with a few other objects, see below), breaks them, *šer arḥa waḥnu*'s them, and says, "Let that day's tongues be removed; let that day's curses be removed!" and throws them in the fire. The *šer arḥa waḥnu* is a last associative act, perhaps intended to make clear who the incantation is about.

There are other examples of *šer arḥa waḥnu*- that do not involve drawing evil out of a patient, but rather associating him or her with something positive. In CTH 441, offering materials are *šer arḥa waḥnu*'d over the ritual patient prior to an incantation of offering, presumably to make it clear that the patient should benefit from the offering even though it is the practitioner who is performing it; similarly, in both CTH 390, Ayatarša's ritual, and in CTH 416's second ritual,¹⁴ a bird is *šer arḥa waḥnu*'d over the patient prior to letting it go to the Sun-god. More opaque is CTH 433.1, in which the Old Woman pours out roasted grain and then *šer arḥa waḥnu*'s the (remaining?) grain first over the statue of the deity, then over the augurs; this is paralleled by a few other occasions where different practitioners *šer arḥa waḥnu* an object over a deity, then either the same¹⁵ or an identical object¹⁶ over the patient; the purpose is never explicit, though one may assume that the overall goal is to increase the deity's sympathy to the patient. The offering has an association with the patient, even though the practitioner is the one who physically performs it.

Overall, then, the Old Women seem to use *šer arḥa waḥnu* to increase the association between the object and the patient. It cannot be used to extract evil by itself, but it can

¹⁴ CTH 416 uses the earlier equivalent *šer waḥnu*; see CHD Š3 s.v. *šer* 2 c 3' e'.

¹⁵ E.g., a single bird, by a ^{LÚ}AZU with the queen and princes in CTH 707, KUB 45.47 i 35ff., before they go and bow to the deity.

¹⁶ E.g., first one fish and then another, by the *šankunni*-priest in CTH 718, the *babilili*-ritual, KUB 37.71 ii 34ff.

accompany other rites that do, either preceding or following them. However, another use of *šer arḫa waḥnu* can be seen in the texts. In CTH 715, for example, an AZU-man *šer arḫa waḥnu*’s a purificatory substance called *ḫušt-*, perhaps sulfur, at the entrance to a temple.¹⁷ A similar action is performed in CTH 718, the *babili* ritual, in which a priest *šer arḫa waḥnu*’s *lueššar*, likely a kind of incense, over a deity’s statue.¹⁸ The ^{MUNUS.MEŠ}SUḪUR.LÁL do the same with both *ḫušt-* and *ḫupanni-*, another purificatory substance, explicitly to clean the bathhouse in Allaituraḫḫi’s ritual. These examples show that *šer arḫa waḥnu* can also be used to spread the object’s influence around a space in the same way as, for example, one might do with a censer.

The very nature of *šer arḫa waḥnu*, therefore, requires scholarly interpretation to exceed a bare definition of the term. It associates its accusative object (the item “waved”) with its dative object (the person or space): it is therefore immediately necessary to take into account what those objects are. Even beyond that, it is commonly used as a preliminary or a punctuating action in a longer rite, and must be considered alongside that longer rite for any accurate analysis. Therefore, any flat definition of the term, absent context, must be inadequate for ritual analysis, as seen in both of the definitions quoted above: *šer arḫa waḥnu-* is not always intended to draw evil out into the object that is swung, as Strauß claims. Nor, taking Görke’s definition, is it even always intended to create contact between that object and a person or item, in the strictest sense: spreading incense around a space lies somewhat outside even that quite broad definition.

And in fact, Strauß’s adherence to a single ritual role for this term leads her to misinterpret some of her comparative evidence: for example, in CTH 416, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple, an eagle is *šer arḫa waḥnu*’d over the couple and then released to fly to the

¹⁷ KUB 10.63; see I. Wegner, *Hurritische Opferlisten aus hethitischen Festbeschreibungen Teil I: Texte für IŠTAR/ŠA(W)UŠKA*, ChS I/3-1 (Rome, 1995), 164ff.

¹⁸ Görke, *Aštu*, 206–210.

Sun-God and Storm-God and ask for blessings. Strauß calls the eagle an “Unreinheitsträger,”¹⁹ but nowhere in the text is it suggested that the eagle is bearing *uncleanliness* to the gods; rather, it is functioning as a messenger, asking for mercy and goodwill. The role of *šer arḫa waḥnu* in this instance should be compared to the passages in which it is used to increase a patient’s affinity with an offering. Similarly, even though Görke’s discussion of *šer arḫa waḥnu*- is particularly focused on its use with *lueššar* and *ḫušt*-, she does not incorporate an interpretation of the “Schwenkritus” as used on a space or a deity into her definition, but focuses entirely on its use with persons and objects. Neither scholar’s understanding of Hittite or collection of evidence is lacking; it is simply that in Hittite ritual, many acts and items were multivalent to such an extent that a careful consideration of context is always necessary.

As discussed in ch. 3, the most helpful element for understanding the purpose of ritual acts is an incantation. For example, in CTH 416, the eagle can be seen to be a messenger because, as it is let go, the Old Woman directs it to ask the gods that the king and queen be eternal. When no incantations are preserved, interpretation becomes much more difficult. A demonstration of the necessity of context and preserved incantations for interpreting ritual acts can be made with a case study; in the following text, some of the ritual acts are extremely simple to interpret because the incantations fully explain them; some, on the other hand, do not have explanatory incantations, or those incantations are opaque or vague, and as a result, there is no way to be certain of what the act is intended to accomplish. Certain parts of this ritual have already been discussed in ch. 3 (in particular in the section on Old Women’s agency in rituals), but now it will be analyzed in full.

4.2.2: Case Study: CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya’s “Ritual of the River”

¹⁹ *Reinigungsrituale*, p. 73.

The Old Woman Tunnawi(ya)’s “Ritual of the River” is a ritual designed to address reproductive dysfunction. However, as should be expected by now, the content of the ritual is not focused on the patient’s reproductive faculties; rather, the ritual action is tailored to address the ultimate cause of the dysfunction: uncleanness (Hittite *papratar*), likely brought on by some hostile action on the part of an antagonist. This is clear from CTH 409.I’s incipit:

Thus Ms. Tunnawi, Old Woman: When a person, either a man or a woman, is put into any uncleanness—either someone else has named him/her with respect to uncleanness, or for a woman her children keep dying, or she keeps miscarrying, or for a man or a woman their(!) sexual parts are disabled by an unclean matter.

(If) this person is experiencing uncleanness, and this person—either a man or a woman—offers the ritual of uncleanness as follows, they call it the ritual of the river, and it is only one ritual.²⁰

The list of physical symptoms is entirely related to reproductive problems (one may assume that in this context ^{UZU}ÚR^{HLA}, “limbs” or “members,” is referring, as it sometimes does, to sexual parts). However, the first listed cause is “if another person names them with respect to uncleanness,” indicating hostile action. The second paragraph does not mention reproductive issues at all, only uncleanness. This is consistent with the Old Women’s function: as seen in ch.

²⁰ KUB 7.53++ i 1 *UM-MA* ^FTu₄-un-na-ú-i ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI ma-a-an-kán an-tu¹-uḫ¹-ḫaš² na-aš-šu
 2 LÚ-*LIM* na-aš-ma ^{MUNUS}-za pa-ap-ra-an-ni ku-e-da-ni-ik-ki an-da ti-an-za
 3 na-aš-ma-an-kán¹ ta-ma-iš ku-iš-ki pa-ap-ra-an-ni še-er ḫal-zi-an
 4 na-aš-ma-kán ^{MUNUS}-ni DUMU^{MES}-ŠU ak-ki-iš-kán-zi na-aš-ma-aš-ši-kán
 5 ^{UZU}šar-ḫu-u-wa-an-da-ma ma-uš-ki-iz-zi na-aš-šu LÚ-ni na-aš-ma ^{MUNUS}-ni
 6 pa-ap-ra-an-na-aš ud-da-na-an-za ^{UZU}ÚR^{HLA}-ša ar-ḫa šar-ra-an

7 nu-za-kán a-pa-a-aš an-tu-uḫ-ša-a[š] pa-ap-ra-tar uš-ki-iz-z[i] ʾnu-za¹ a-pa-a-aš
 8 an-tu-uḫ-ša-aš na-aš-šu LÚ-aš na-aš-ma ^{MUNUS}-za pa-ap-ra-na-aš SÍSKUR
 9 ki-iš-ša-an ši-pa-an-ti ŠA ÍD-at-za SÍSKUR ḫal-zi-iš-ša-an-zi
 10 nu ki-i SÍSKUR 1-EN-pát

3, they appear hardly at all in birth rituals, but consistently in rituals against sorcery and other sources of impurity.

After the incipit comes a long list of the equipment needed for the ritual, which is a common but not ubiquitous feature of Old Woman ritual texts (nor is it exclusive to the Old Women); there are scape-animals and items of clothing that are specified to be of the gender appropriate to the patient, while the rest of the material is the same whether the patient is male or female. The list is interrupted by the first ritual action: at nightfall, the Old Woman goes to the riverbank and makes offerings of bread, fat, grain, and wine, saying, “DINGIR.MAḪ of the riverbank, I have hereby come back to you! You, DINGIR.MAḪ of the riverbank from which this clay is taken, take your hand and scrub(?)²¹ this ritual patient with it, and purify his/her twelve body part(s)!²² She then repeats the same offerings at a spring, and says, “Just as you, spring, keep welling mud back up from the dark earth, likewise from the body parts of this person, the ritual patient, completely remove evil uncleanness!”²³ She takes some clay from the spring. The appeal to DINGIR.MAḪ has already been discussed in ch. 3. The request from the spring is not simply an appeal, but also includes an analogy (for a discussion of analogic incantations, also see ch. 3). The analogy seems to indicate a lesser power on the part of the spring, and “spring” is not written with a divine determinative: presumably only a god may be asked to reach her hand out and cleanse the patient. Another notable point here is that the analogy is spoken before the ritual actions are being performed on the patient; the analogy seems to be imbuing the clay with the power to act in the future, rather than acting at this moment.

²¹ This word is only attested in this text; see CHD Š1 pp. 205–206. It must mean some sort of cleansing action.

²² KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 i 30 wa-ap-pu-wa-aš^d MAḪ-aš ka-a-ša EGIR-pa tu-uk ú-wa-nu-un nu-kán ka-a-aš IM-aš
31 ku-e-ez wa-ap-pu-wa-az da-an-za nu zi-ik wa-ap-pu-aš^d MAḪ tu-e-el

32 ŠU-TI-KA da-a nu ku-u-un [E]N.SISKUR a-pê-e-ez ša-pí-ia-i na-an 12 UZU^UUR

33 pár-ku-nu-ut

²³ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 i 36 ʾzi-ik-kánʾ ma-aḫ-ḫa-an ša-ku-<ni>-iš GE₆-az KI-az pu-ru-ut EGIR ša-ra-ʾa¹

37 ša-ku-ni-eš-ki-ši nu e-da-ni an-tu-uḫ-ši A-NA EN.SISKUR IŠ-TU UZU^UUR^{ḫi}ʾA-ŠU

38 i-da-lu pa-ap-ra-tar ar-ḫa QA-TAM-MA mu-ta¹-a-i

The Old Woman then sets up all of her ritual paraphernalia out on the steppe, where a tent has already been set up for her (no agent is stated). The list of items resumes with a series of clay figurines: two anthropomorphic figurines, twelve tongues, two clay oxen, and two clay door-hinges. Since the clay taken from the river and spring does not elsewhere appear in the ritual, and since the list was interrupted for the Old Woman to get the clay, it can be assumed that she used it to make these figurines.²⁴ It can further be assumed that of, e.g., the two oxen, one is made of the riverbank's clay and one of the spring's clay. The list continues after the figurines, but not every item in this final section of the list is attested during the ritual actions, which may indicate that either further actions are elided (some are already clearly elided, as already seen in the formation of the figurines, and further below) or that the list has fallen victim to errors of memorization on the part of the scribe.²⁵ She collects her items in a reed basket.

The patient comes to her tent at dawn and puts on the black clothes; as seen explicitly later in the ritual, these symbolize the uncleanness with which (s)he is afflicted. The Old Woman has a braid of blue and red wool, which she unravels and throws over the patient's body. No explanatory incantation accompanies this action. The unraveling of cloth in some cases symbolizes a disentanglement of sorcerous effects from the person of the patient,²⁶ and it is possible that the wool is draped over the patient's body to transfer the disentangling effects; on the other hand, plain wool draped on a patient can itself symbolize sorcery, as seen in Allī's ritual. These interpretive possibilities will be further discussed below.

²⁴ *Contra* Haas (*Materia*, 69) who interprets this as a preparation for the application of mud packs (not attested elsewhere in the text).

²⁵ As in, e.g., the list in CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual against domestic quarrel; see Marcuson and van den Hout, "Memorization."

²⁶ As can be seen in Allaituraḥḫi's ritual (see the analysis in ch. 3) with an accompanying incantation to make the meaning explicit.

The Old Woman then holds a black sheep over the patient, after which she recites the “incantation of holding over (*šer appanaš*),” which is in Luwian: “Storm-God of the mountain, run up to Kašī(?); from(!)²⁷ heaven above (and) on earth, run!”²⁸ Unfortunately—given the prevalence of “holding over” in certain ritual texts, discussed above—this incantation is quite opaque; it is not clear what Kašī is, or even if it is indeed a proper noun, nor why the Storm-God should be running. It is certainly possible that it is, as Goetze already suggested in his edition in 1938,²⁹ a request that the Storm-God come observe the ritual. It may also, however, be an extremely brief *historiola*, referring to some mythologem that is not otherwise attested. (For *historiolae* in Old Woman rituals, see ch. 3). After this is an unfortunately summary-like series of actions:

Next, she holds the piglet over him/her, and she speaks the incantation of the piglet. Next, she holds a puppy over him/her, and speaks the incantation of the puppy.

Next, she holds a clay tongue over him/her, and speaks the incantation of the tongue. Next, she holds 2 *šena*-figurines over him/her; next, she holds a door-hinge over him/her; next, she holds clay oxen over him/her; next, dough; next, cord; next, she takes a wing and waves it over, while speaking conjurations. It is already written on a tablet (lit. “made with a tablet”).³⁰

²⁷ Or “in(!) heaven above,” as Melchert emends (LUVLEX p. 208), following Starke (*Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*, StBoT 31[Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1990], p. 97).

²⁸ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 i 58 a-ri-ia-ad-da-li-iš^d IM-an-za^d šar¹-ri¹ ka¹-ši-i¹ ḫu-u-e-ḫu-u-i-ia¹
59 tap-pa-aš-ša-¹it¹ šar-ri ti-ia-mi ḫu-i-ḫu-i-ia

²⁹ Tunnawi, p. 99

³⁰ KUB 7.53++ i 36 EGIR-an-da-ma-aš-ši-iš-ša-an ŠAḫ.TUR še-er e-ep-zi nu ŠA ŠAḫ.TUR
37 ḫu-<uk>-ma-in ḫu-uk-zi EGIR-an-da-ma-aš-ši-ša-an UR.TUR še-er
38 e-ep-zi nu ŠA¹ UR¹.TUR ḫu-uk-ma-in¹ ḫu-uk¹-zi

39 EGIR-an-da-ma-aš-ši-iš-ša-an EME IM še-er e-ep-¹zi¹ nu ŠA EME

40 ḫu-uk-ma-in ḫu-uk-zi EGIR-an-da-ma-aš-ši-ša-an

ii 1 2 še-e-nu-uš e-ep-zi EGIR-an-<da>-ma-aš-ši-ša-¹an¹

2 wa-wa-ar-ki-ma-an še-er e-ep-zi EGIR-an-da-ma-aš-ši-ša-an

3 GU⁴^{HLA} IM še-er e-ep-zi EGIR-ŠU-ma iš-ša-na-an

Some of the items are singular, when they were plural in the original list of ritual items (the tongue, the door-hinge); I am inclined to believe that all of items are implied, given the abbreviated nature of the list and the fact that the two anthropomorphic (*šena-*) figurines and oxen are both used. The tablet on which these incantations were written is not extant. Some inferences might still be made: based on other texts of this author, one might expect scapegoat-style incantations in which the animals' body parts were said to correspond to the patient's, and the evil was thus drawn from the patient into the animal (as in Tunnawiya's ritual(s) 409.II/409.IV/458.1, for which see ch. 3); and analogic incantations, in which some property of the objects was imposed upon the patient or the uncleanness (see also ch. 3). For example, for the door-hinge, there is the following example from a very fragmentary section of Tunnawiya's ritual CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1: "As the door turns in the hinge, [may] the [evil da]y, the short year, the anger of the gods, (and) [the tongue of] the mult[itude] turn back from the path."³¹ Perhaps a similar incantation was spoken here.

Based on the previous incantation with the sheep in this text, however, one wonders if, instead of scapegoat-incantations, there might have been a continuation of the Luwian *historiola* about the Storm-God. Tunnawiya's CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1 also includes a *historiola* featuring a piglet, so here the animals might be connected to myths. There is also an incantation in CTH 391, the Ritual of Ambazzi, where a god is invited to *strike* a door-hinge rather than a patient, so

4 EGIR-ŠU-ma šu-um-ma-an-za-na-an EGIR-ŠU-ma pát-tar

5 da-a-i na-at-kán še-er ar-ḫa wa-aḫ-nu-zi

6 ḫu-uk-ma-iš-ma ḫu-uk-ki-iš-ki-iz-zi na-at tup-pí-za

7 ka-ru-ú i-ia-an

The "it" that "has already been made with a tablet" must be the collected group of incantations. Incantations being set apart on their own tablet are already known from CTH 450, the royal funerary ritual, which has a separate tablet with only the Old Women's incantations written on it, KUB 39.41 (though in this case the incantations are also written out in the main text).

³¹ KBo 21.6 obv. 6 [m]a-aḫ-ḫa-an-ma-aš-ša-an ^{GIŠ}IG ^{GIŠ}wa-wa-ar-ki-mi ú-e-e[(ḫ-zi) i-da-a-lu-uš]

7 [U]D-az ma-ni-in-ku-wa-an-za MU-za DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš kar-pí-iš pa-an-[ga-u-wa-aš EME-aš]

8 KASKAL-az EGIR-pa ne-i[(a-ru)]

Edited Hutter, *Behexung*, 44–45, with restorations from KBo 25.193.

perhaps the hinge was a decay rather than a metaphor. Oxen, dough, cords, and feathers or wings are used for far too many different things in Hittite ritual to make any sort of concrete assumption about their purpose here.³² Overall, it can easily be seen here how a lack of incantations opens up too many interpretive possibilities for any certainty to be had.

After this, the text resumes its step-by-step process through the ritual. The Old Woman next holds two *tiyadu* over the patient, and says, “Whoever (pl.) has been loading and burdening his form, bone (and) flesh, with this uncleanness, I am hereby loading and burdening the body of the sorcerer of the impurity in return!”³³ She then puts the *tiyadu* in her reed basket. It seems most likely that *tiyadu* is from Akkadian *tīyatu*, “*asa foetida*,” which could be used to make a sedative drug.³⁴ However, the word translated as “to load” is *tiyani-*, suggesting a pun, which would make it more likely that *tiyadu* is a native Hittite word; if so, it could be any burdensome item. It is also possible that the word was borrowed from Akkadian (rather than being rendered as a logogram disguising a Hittite word underneath). No matter the definition, however, the incantation allows us to assume that *tiyadu*, whether a plant or not, had some burdensome connotation—if *asa foetida*, perhaps as a result of its sedative function.

Next, she holds two anthropomorphic figurines, one of wax and one of tallow, over the patient, saying, “Whoever (pl.) has been making this person unclean, now I have the sorcerers, two figurines, and I am hereby loading and burdening this one.”³⁵ This incantation transitions from the “burdening” connotation of the *tiyadu* into the presentation of the figurines as the

³² See Haas, *Materia*, 426–31 (for oxen); 386–91 (for dough); 663–71 (for cords); 484–85 (for eagle-feathers).

³³ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 ii 9 ku-i-e-eš-ša-an ALAM-ŠU ḥa-aš-ta-i mi-i-lu-ú-li ʾkeʾ-e-ez

10 pa-ap-ra-an-na-az ti-ia-ni-eš-kir e-la-ni-eš-kir ki-nu-na

11 pa-ap-ra-an-na-aš al-wa-zé-na-aš ALAM-ŠU ḥa-aš-ta-i mi-i-lu-ú-li

12 ka-a-ša EGIR-pa ti-ia-ni-eš-ki-mi¹ e-la-ni-eš-ki-mi

³⁴ See Hoffner, *Alimenta Hethaeorum* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1974), 110, for this point of view.

³⁵ *ibid.* ii 15 ku-u-un an-tu-uḥ-ša-an ku-i-e-eš

16 pa-ap-ra-aḥ-ḥi-iš-kir ki-nu-na ka-a-ša al-wa-zé-nu-uš 2 še-e-nu-uš

17 ḥar-mi nu ka-ʾa-ša¹ ku-u-un ʾti¹-ia-ni-eš-ki-mi e-la-ni-eš-ʾki¹-mi

hypothetical antagonists. The Old Woman then melts the figurines, and says, “Whatever evil people have been making him/her unclean, let them likewise melt!”³⁶ This is a very standard example of analogical action and speech in Old Woman rituals: the use of figurines to represent antagonists is common, and destructive actions such as melting, breaking, extinguishing, etc. are all usual ways of symbolizing the defeat of evil or evil persons (see below).

Then the Old Woman washes her hands with wine, and there is an incantation over some hot stones from a brazier that is, again, on a different tablet. She then washes herself with water. Wine, water, and hot stones are frequently attested together in purificatory context in Hittite ritual;³⁷ it is tempting to interpret this as a self-purification in reaction to the violent rite with the melted figurines, but there is no parallel after similar destructive rites in Old Woman rituals. Another possibility is from a parallel in CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, in which hot stones are extinguished in analogy to the sorcerer being extinguished. Without the incantation, however, any interpretation is again quite speculative.

Following the rite with the stones, she takes the blue and red wool off of the patient’s body and says,

“Whoever(pl.) was making him/her dark (and) yellow, (and who) made him/her unclean—whether someone made him/her unclean before the gods, or made him/her unclean before the dead, or made him/her unclean before a mortal, I am hereby performing the ritual of uncleanliness (for) him/her!”

“I am taking it away from him/her: I am taking from his/her twelve body parts the evil, the uncleanliness, the sorcery, the spell-casting, (and) the anger of the deity. I am

³⁶ *ibid.* ii 18 i-da-la-u-e-ša'-an

19 ku-i-e-eš an-tu-uḫ-ši-iš pa-ap-ṛa-ḫi¹-[i]š-<ki>-ir

20 na-at ar-ḫa QA-TAM-MA šal-la-ṛan-ta¹-ru

³⁷ Haas, *Materia*, 192ff.; e.g., there are rituals with pebbles placed in water that is later used for washing.

taking away the terror of the dead from him/her, I am taking away the evil tongue of the *panku* from him/her.” She puts the blue and red wool down into the basket.³⁸

The long list of possible causes for affliction is a characteristic formula in Tunlawiya’s rituals in particular, but the lack of a concrete evil to address is common to many Old Woman rituals (see ch. 3).

In this case, she states that she is taking the sorcery away at the same time as she takes the red and blue wool away. Viewing this passage in isolation, it would seem as though removing the wool is analogous to removing the evil effects of the spell. However, earlier in the ritual it also seemed as though the red and blue wool, having been disentangled, might have symbolized *freedom* from entangling evil afflictions. There is also the matter of the colors: the uncleanness is characterized as being black and yellow, while the wool is red and blue, which would seem to support an interpretation of it as a counter to the uncleanness rather than a symbol of it. One could also consider the interpretation that the wool is intended to absorb and nullify the evil effects of the sorcery, based on its state of disentanglement and its opposite colors, in which case it might be combating the sorcery *both* while resting on the patient *and* while being removed. Once again, it is clear that when the incantation is not specific enough, interpretation becomes very difficult.

The next action, however, is quite straightforward:

³⁸ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 ii 30 ku-i-e-ša-an da-an-ku-ni-eš-šir ḥa-aḥ-la-n[i-eš-k]ir
31 pa-ap-ra-aḥ-<ḥi>-ir na-aš-šu-wa-an PA-NI DINGIR^{MES} ku-iš-ki
32 pa-ap-ra-aḥ-ta na-aš-ma-an ag-ga-an-da-aš ku-iš-ki pé-ra-an
33 pa-ap-ra-aḥ-ta na-aš-ma-an PA-NI DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU ku-iš-ki pa-ap-ra-aḥ-ta
34 na-an ka-a-ša pa-ap-ra-an-na-aš SÍSKUR a-ni-iš-ki-¹mi¹

35 na-at-ši-kán ar-ḥa da-aš-ki-mi ¹IS¹-TU 12 ^{UZU}[U]R-ŠU
36 i-da-lu pa-ap-ra-tar al-wa-an-za-¹tar¹ a-aš-ta-ia-ra-tar
37 ŠA DINGIR-LIM kar-pi-in da-aš-¹ki¹-mi ag-ga-an-ta-aš-ši-kán
38 ḥa-tu-ga-tar da-aš-ki-mi ¹ŠA¹ DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-¹ma¹-aš-ši-kán
39 pa-an-ga-u-wa-aš i-da-lu-[u]n EME-an da-aš-ki-mi
40 nam-ma-aš-ša-an SÍG ZA.¹GÌN SÍG¹ SA₅ pád-da-¹ni¹ kat-ta da-a-i

Next, the Old Woman tears the black shirt that (s)he is wearing off of him/her from top to bottom, and she takes the black spats(?) off of his/her feet, and takes the black wool from his/her ears, and she says,

“I am hereby taking from him/her the black and yellow (that came) from the matter of uncleanness; before³⁹ what matter of uncleanness (s)he became dark and yellow, I am taking away (that) spellcasting.” Then, she takes the black things (s)he has [put o]n away from him/her, and she puts [them] down in one place.⁴⁰

The interpretation of this is very simple. The dark clothing is a concrete representation of the darkness coming from the uncleanness (though it is interesting that there is no yellow clothing). Tearing it from the patient’s body is a concrete representation of removing the uncleanness. This incantation does not mention a human enemy, as the one about the blue and red wool does. One could also speculate, therefore, that the blue and red wool, having been twined together, symbolize something created by another person (again see the analysis of Allaituraḥḥi’s ritual in ch. 3, in which the sorcerer “twined” his spells together “like a rope”), while the black clothing simply symbolizes the uncleanness, without any comment to its origin. The text continues:

[The]n, she wa[v]es an empty pot over him/her, and smashes it. She conjures. Then she lines up *ḥupuwai*-vessels at his/her feet, and she says, “I am hereby performing the ritual

³⁹ Goetze translates “on account of” here (*Tunnawi*, 15), which would seem to be implied by the context, but according to the CHD, *peran* is not attested with that meaning. Perhaps she is referring to her list of possible causes of the affliction.

⁴⁰ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 41 nam-ma ^{TUG}GÚ.È.A ¹GE₆-TIM ku-e wa-aš-ša-an ḥar-zi
42 na-at-ši-ša-an ^{MUNUS}ŠU¹.GI še-er kat-ta iš-kal-la-i-iz-zi
43 ^{TUG}GADA.DAM GE₆-ia-š[i]-ša-an GİR-az pa-ra-a da-a-i
44 IŠ-TU GEŠTUG^{III.A}-ŠU-[š]a⁷-ši-ša-an ^{SIG}e-ḥu-ra-ti-uš GE₆-TIM
45 ar-ḥa da-a-¹i¹ nu ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i

46 ka-a-ša-wa-aš-š[i-ká]n da-aš-ki-mi pa-ap-ra-an-na-aš
47 ud-da-na-az [d]a-an-ku-i ḥa-aḥ-la-u-¹wa¹-an-da pa-ap-ra-an-na-aš-ša-aš
48 ud-da-ni-¹i¹ ku-¹e-da¹-ni pé-ra-an da-an-ku-iš-ki-it ḥa-aḥ-ḥa-le-eš-ki-it
49 ¹a-aš-ta-ia¹-ra-tar da-aš-ki-mi nam-ma da-an-ku-wa ku-e
50 [wa-aš-ša-a]n ḥar-zi na-at-ši-kán ar-ḥa da-a-i
51 [na-at-ká]n ¹kat¹-ta ¹l¹-e-da-ni pí-¹di¹ da-a-i

of uncleanness. I have the black equipment of [unc]leanliness: let it out! The evil, uncleanness, sorcery, spellcasting, anger of the gods, fear of the dead, (and) iniquity of mankind: let it out!”⁴¹

In this case, judging from both the context of this ritual and of parallel texts,⁴² the incantation spoken while the pot is smashed (represented only by the statement, “She conjures”) is likely to be an analogy—i.e., “Just as this pot is smashed, likewise let the evil uncleanness also be smashed,” or similar. The implication of the lineup of black vessels is unclear—one would expect them to be broken (as happens in Maštigga’s ritual against domestic quarrel, CTH 404.1, with vessels set at the patient’s feet), or perhaps, given the content of the incantation, opened up or tipped over. It seems possible that they were destroyed, and that this action was elided, as several things are in this text, or mistakenly left out,⁴³ but once again, one cannot be certain.

Then the ritual patient “goes to bathe”—it is unspecified where—while the Old Woman brings in nine boxwood combs and an anthropomorphic clay figurine. She washes the figurine and has a temple-woman (^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL) comb the figurine once with each of the nine combs, while the Old Woman says,

“I am wiping all of the body. Let the evil, uncleanness, sorcery, spellcasting, anger of the gods, (and) fear of the dead be combed down from him/her!

⁴¹ KUB 7.53+KUB12.58 52 [EGIR-Š]Ú-ma-aš-ši-kán ^{rDUG}ÚTUL¹ da-an-na-ra-an še-er ar-ḫa

53 ʾwa¹-[aḫ-n]u-zi na-an ar-ḫa du-wa-ar-ni-iz-zi

54 nu ḫ[u-u]k-zi nam-ma-aš-ši GÌR^{MEŠ} kat-ta-an

55 ^{DUG}ḫ[u]-u-pu-wa-i-ia iš-ga-a-ri nu ʾme¹-ma-i

56 k[a-a-š]a pa-ap-ra-an-na-aš a-ni-u-ur an-ni-eš-ʾki¹-m[i]

57 nu [pa-a]p-ra-an-na-aš GE₆-in ʾKIN¹-an ḫar-mi na-at ʾar-ḫa¹

58 tar-ʾna¹ i-da-lu pa-ap-ra-tar al-wa-za-a-tar a-aš-ta-ia-ra-tar

59 DINGIR^{MEŠ} kar-pí-in ag-ga-an-ta-aš ḫa-tu-ga-tar

60 DUMU-la-an-na-aš ḫu-i-pa-ia-ta-ʾan¹ na-at ar-ḫa tar-na

⁴² E.g., CTH 788, Šalašu’s ritual; see below for discussion of this type of rite.

⁴³ A memorization error, perhaps? See Marcuson and van den Hout, “Memorization.”

“I have here a *šarra*-.⁴⁴ Whoever was disabling (*arḥa šarra*-) the twelve body [parts] with evil uncleanness, now I am disabling the evil, uncleanness, sorcery, spellcasting, anger of the gods, (and) fear of the dead from your twelve body parts! Let them be separated completely away from him/her!”⁴⁵

Old Women rarely bathe or wash patients⁴⁶ (the reasons for this are unfortunately entirely unclear), so the patient going off alone to bathe is not unexpected. However, in this case, the patient’s own bathing is augmented by the analogic washing and combing of the figurine. The Old Woman claims the ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL’s actions as her own in the incantation, indicating that the person who physically performs the action is not as important as the person who is directing the ritual (see already in ch. 3). Note also that although the combs are explicitly said to be used by the ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL, the *šarra*- is not; it is either sufficient to indicate the *šarra*- rather than using it (a possibility known from other Old Woman rituals⁴⁷), or the *šarra*-ing is elided in the text.

Here, the analogy contains a pun, and in this case, it is a multi-level analogic pun. When a body part is *arḥa šarra*-, it is disabled, and this is the exact term used in the text’s incipit:

“...for a man or a woman their(!) body parts are disabled...” However, *arḥa šarra*- also means “to separate away,” and the implement itself is called a *šarra*-. The multiple meanings of this

⁴⁴ This object is only attested in this text and in a fragmentary inventory; see CHD Š2 p. 228 for a summary of various speculations as to whether it could be a brush, a scraper, tweezers, or some similar item.

⁴⁵ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 iii 2 ʾka¹-a-ša-kán NÍ.TE ḥu-u-ma-an-da ša-aḥ-ḥi-iš-ki-mi

3 nu-uš-ši-kán kat-ta ki-ʾša¹-a-an e-ʾeš-du¹ i-da-ʾlu¹

4 pa-ap-ra-tar al-wa-za-tar a-aš-ʾta-ia¹-ra-tar DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš

5 kar-pi-iš ag-ga-an-ta-aš ḥa-tu-ga-tar

6 ka-a-ša^{GIS} šar-ra-an ḥar-mi nu-za ku-iš 12^{UZU} [ʾUR]

7 i-da-la-u-wa-az pa-ap-ra-an-na-az ar-ḥa šar-ri-[iš]-ʾki-it¹

8 ki-nu-na-at-ta IŠ-TU 12^{UZU} ʾUR i-da-lu

9 [p]a-ap-ra-tar al-wa-za-tar a-aš-ʾta-ia-ra-tar DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš ʾkar-pi-in¹

10 ʾag-ga¹-an-da-aš ḥa-tu-ga-tar a-wa-an ar-ḥa šar-ri-ʾiš-ki-mi¹

11 [na-a]t-ši a-wa-an ar-ḥa šar-ra-an e-eš-du

⁴⁶ See below for a discussion of when patients bathe or are bathed.

⁴⁷ For example, in CTH 391, Ambazzi indicates clean linen during a washing analogy, rather than washing it herself.

word allow for a pun with analogic force, so that the Old Woman turns around the *disabling* force of the sorcery such that it *separates* from the patient by means of her cognate implement.

The Old Woman then disposes of most of the ritual items in the river, without performing any ritual acts or incantations (so far as indicated), while the piglet and perhaps the puppy (the text is slightly broken) are burned. The Old Woman, however, does not participate in the burning; instead she constructs gates of hawthorn and *alanza(n)*-wood. These paragraphs are quite fragmentary, but it is clear that bread- and meal-offerings are made, and that the hawthorn-gate is bound with white wool, and the *alanzana*-wood gate with black wool. The patient goes through the gate of hawthorn, and the Old Woman makes one of the clearest statements of ritual analogy in Hittite textual material:

“[You, hawthorn, clothe yourself in whi]te [in the spring, while in autumn], you clothe [yourself in blood-red].⁴⁸ The sheep passes underneath you, and you pull off its *pūttar*,⁴⁹ the bull passes underneath, and you pull off its *šukšuka*-. ”

“In the same way pull the evil, uncleanness, sorcery, spell-casting, anger of the gods, perjury, tongue of the multitude, (and) the short year off of this ritual patient!”⁵⁰

⁴⁸ This restoration is assured by the parallel in CTH 334, the Disappearance of Ḫannaḫanna, first noted by Otten (“Ein Reinigungsritual im Hethitischen: ^{GIŠ}ḫatalkišna-,” *A/O* 16 [1952–53]: 69–71), who also noted that Goetze’s join (*Tunnawi*, 18) was off by two lines in col. iii. For the passage in CTH 334, see Rieken, hethiter.net/: CTH 334.1.1, §8”.

⁴⁹ A hairy body part; see CHD P, p. 402.

⁵⁰ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 iii 35 [zi-ga-az ^{GIŠ}ḫa-tal-kiš-na-aš ḫa-mi-eš-ḫi-ia-az BAB]BAR

36 [wa-aš-ša-ši BURU₁₄-ma-az iš-ḫar-wa-an-da] wa-aš-ša-a-ši

37 [UD]U²-uš-¹ták¹-kán kat-¹ta¹-an ¹ar-ḫa¹ pa-iz-zi

38 nu-uš-¹ši¹?-kán¹ ^{SI}pu-¹u-ut¹-tar ḫu-it-<ti>-ia-ši GU₄-k[án]

39 kat-ta-an ar-ḫa pa-iz-z[i]

40 nu-uš-ši-kán ¹šu-uk-šu-qa-an¹ ḫu-it-ti-ia-š[i]

41 ke-e-da-ni-ia-¹kán¹ A-NA EN.SISKUR i-da-¹lu¹

42 pa-ap-ra-¹tar¹ al-wa-za-tar a-aš-ta-ia-ra-tar

43 DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš ¹kar¹-pí-in NI-IŠ DINGIR-LIM pa-an-ga-u-wa-aš EME-an

44 ma-ni-¹in¹-ku-u-wa-an-da-an MU-an ar-ḫa QA-TAM-MA ḫu-¹it¹-ti-ia

Some difficulties in the specifics of wool and hair terminology aside, the meaning of this passage is absolutely clear: the hawthorn is a thorny plant, and when animals pass through it, their wool or fur is pulled off and left behind. The gate of hawthorn is to have the same effect on the ritual patient's affliction. The evil/uncleanliness has been concretized, conceived of as a physical object attached to the outside of the patient's body in the same way as fur or hair, which can be pulled off.

The text continues: "Next, (s)he throws a thin bread behind him/herself, and the Old Woman says, 'Let the evil uncleanliness turn completely into grain behind him/her!'"⁵¹ This is clearly intended as a follow-up to the rite with the gate: the evil is pulled off of the patient by the hawthorn, and then once it has left the patient, after they pass through the gate, the evil should turn into benign grain (rather than lingering to cause more difficulties).

Then the patient goes through the gate of *alanza*-wood, and the Old Woman says, "Just as this *alanza*-wood cleanses one thousand, ten thousand shepherds (and) cowherds, in the same way completely cleanse evil, uncleanliness, sorcery, spell-casting, perjury, bad dreams, anger of the gods, (and) fear of the dead from the twelve body parts of this ritual patient!" Then (s)he throws thin bread behind him/her while the Old Woman speaks in exactly the same way.⁵²

⁵¹ 45 (=KUB 7.53 iii 9) nam-ma-za-kán NINDA.SIG ʾEGIR¹-pa ši-i-e-ez-zi nu^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI

46 me-ma-i i-da-lu-uš-ši pa-ap-ra-<tar> EGIR-an ar-ḥa

47 ḥal-ki-iš na-a-ʾú¹

⁵² KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 iii 49 (=KUB 7.53 iii 13) nu me-ma-i ka-a-aš ʾGIŠ¹a-la-an-za ma-aḥ-ʾḥa¹-an

50 *LI-IM* SIG⁷ LÚSIPA UDU LÚSIPA GU⁴ ʾpár¹-ku-nu-uš-ki-iz-zi

51 ke-e-da-ni-ia-kán *A-NA* EN.SISKUR *IŠ-TU* 12 UZU¹ÚR

52 i-da-lu pa-ap-ra-tar al-wa-a-za-tar a-aš-ta-ia-ra-tar

53 *NI-<IŠ>* DINGIR-*LIM* i-da-ʾla¹-mu-uš za-aš-ḥi-mu-uš DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš

54 kar-pi-in ag-ga-an-ta-aš ḥa-tu-ga-tar a-wa-an

55 ar-ḥa *QA-TAM-MA* pár-ku-nu-ut nam-ma-za-kán NINDA.SIG

56 EGIR-pa ši-i-ia-iz-zi^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI

57 *QA-TAM-MA*-pát me-ma-i

Though *alanza(n)*-wood has not been identified,⁵³ once again it is very clear what is happening; the evil is first removed from the patient through an explicit analogic action involving this wood, and then turned into something nourishing.

After the passing-through rites, the Old Woman goes back to the riverbank, makes more offerings, and says, “DINGIR.MAH of the riverbank, the twelve body parts have hereby been scrubbed and cleansed by your hand!”⁵⁴ She then goes to the spring, makes more offerings, and says, “Sun-God, my lord, the twelve body parts have hereby been scrubbed and cleansed by the clay of the spring!”⁵⁵ Note that the spring is no longer being addressed, but instead the more powerful Sun-God. Here the Old Woman is relinquishing responsibility for the purification ritual, perhaps to solidify the sense of effectiveness for the patient (see ch. 3 for further discussion). This is the end of the rites designed to draw evil out of the patient.

After the offerings, she takes hold of the horn of a cow (in the list of ritual items at the beginning of the text, it is specified that if the patient is male, it should be a bull), and she says:

“Sun-God, my lord, just as this cow is propitious,⁵⁶ and she is in a propitious pen, and she is filling the pen with bulls (and) cows, likewise let the ritual patient hereby be propitious, and fill his/her house with sons, daughters, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, together with [descen]d[ents]⁵⁷ in successive generations.”⁵⁸

⁵³ Haas (*Materia*, 292) suggests oak, based on Akkadian *allānu*.

⁵⁴ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 iv 1 wa-ap-pu-wa-aš^{dr} MAH¹-aš
2 ka-a-ša-za 12^{UZU} UR¹ pa-ap-ra-an-na-an-za tu-e-el

3 ŠU-it ša-pi-i-ia-an[-za] pār-ku-nu-wa-an-za nam-ma ša-ku-n-ia

⁵⁵ KUB 7.53+KUB 12.58 iv 5^d UTU BE-LI-IA ka-a-ša-^raz¹

6 12^{UZU} UR¹ ša-ku-ni-^ria¹-aš IM-it ša-pi-ia-an-^rza¹ pār-ku-nu-wa-an-za

⁵⁶ Thus Melchert, LUVLEX, following Starke, *Untersuchung*, 165.

⁵⁷ For this restoration see HW² H p. 381.

⁵⁸ KUB 7.53++ iv 7 nam-ma-za-kán GU₄ u-ša-an-ta-ri-in SI^r e-ep¹-[z]i nu me-ma-i

8^d UTU BE-LI-IA ka-a-aš ma-aḥ-[h]a-an GU₄-iš^r u¹-ša-an-^rta¹-ri-iš

9 na-aš-kán u-ša-an-ta-ri ḥa-[l]i-ia an-da nu-za-kán ḥa-a-li-it

10^r GU₄¹.NÍTA-it GU₄.ÁB-it š[u-u]n-ni-eš-ke-ez-zi k[a]-a-ša

11 EN.SISKUR QA-TAM-MA u-^rša¹-an-da-ri-iš e-eš-du¹ nu-za-^rkán¹ É-er

12 IŠ-TU DUMU.NITA^{MES} ^rDUMU.MUNUS^{MES} ḥa-aš-še-et ḥa-an-za-aš-ši-it [ḥar[?]]-^rdu[?]-it[?]

They drive the cow back into the pen, and then she goes to a tree covered (literally “clothed,” now a positive use of the metaphor that was already seen in the patient’s black clothing) in fruit and says, “[Su]n-[God], my lord, just as this tree is clo[thed], [and just a]s it ha[s] driven up shoots, likewise let [the ritual patien]t be clothed in [...] life, health, vi[gor...] grandchildren [and great-grandchildren...]...[...], [and let him/her...] with grandchildren (and) great-grandchildren!”⁵⁹ The sense of both of these analogies is quite clear, despite the lacunae. Unfortunately, the list of benevolent qualities that should clothe the patient is fragmentary, but what is preserved is familiar from the auspicious items in the KIN-oracle system (see ch. 2). This is the only part of the entire ritual that focuses explicitly on fertility and children. Again, as is quite common in Old Woman rituals, the vast majority of the ritual is focused on removing the evil uncleanness that caused the affliction. In many cases, there is no mention of the patient’s specific symptoms at all; these final two analogies do focus on fertility, but are presented only after all of the cleansing rites are finished.

She then makes offerings to the Sun-God, and she says, “Su[n-God, my lord, come] and eat! [Of what uncleanness] the twelve body [parts have] hereby [been] cleansed [and purified] by [your], the Sun-God’s, word, you, Sun-god, [kee]p [it completely] away!”⁶⁰ This is notable

13 ḫar-tu-u-wa-ḫar-tu¹-wa-ti *QA-TAM-MA* šu-un-ni-id-du

⁵⁹ KUB 7.53++ iv 15 [nam-ma] GIŠ-ru *IN-BU* wa-ša-a-an ku-wa-pí ar-ta [?]

16 [na-aš a-p]i-ia pa-iz-zi na-at-za-kán pa-iz-zi e-e[p-zi]

17 [nu me-ma-i] ^dUTU¹ *BE-EL-IA* ki-i GIŠ-ru ma-aḫ-ḫa-an wa-š[a-a-an]

18 [na-at ma-aḫ-ḫa-a]n ša-ra-a ^{GIŠ}tar-ša pé-en-ni-ia-an ḫar[-zi]

19 [] ^rnu-wa TI-tar ḫa-at¹-tu-la-tar in-n[a-ra-u-wa-tar]

20 [] x-aš-^rše¹-iš []

21 [] x-an [] x-iš a-š[a-]

22 [EN.SISKU]R *QA-TAM-MA* wa-aš-[š]a-an-za e-eš-du []

23 [ḫ]a-aš-še-et [ḫ]a-an-za-aš-še-et []

Goetze, *Tunnawi* 22; J. Lorenz and I. Taş, “Zwei neue Anschlüsse zu hethitischen Bewschwörungsritualen,” *KASKAL* 9 (2012): 47–48.

⁶⁰ KUB 7.53++ iv 25 ^dU[TU *BE-LI-IA* i-it-wa]

26 az-zi-ik-ki ka-a-ša-az ^r12¹ ^UZ[^UUR ku-e-ez pa-ap-ra-an-na-an-za tu-e-el]

27 ^dUTU-aš ud-da-na-an-za ša-a-pí-[a]n-za [pár-ku-nu-wa-an-za ar-ḫa-at]

28 zi-ik ^dUTU-uš tar-na-an ḫ[ar-ak]

simply because unlike DINGIR.MAH of the riverbank—and unlike some other rituals involving the Sun-God, such as CTH 402 and CTH 404.1—there is no address to the Sun-God at the beginning of the ritual; however, the responsibility still does seem to be at least partly his. It is not clear whether the implication of his presence would have been obvious to the Hittite eye in a way that it is not to ours, whether he was present in some of the elided incantations, or whether this is simply another way for the practitioner to enlist as much divine support as possible.

Finally, after more offerings, she makes what is probably a similar request to DINGIR.MAH of the riverbank; the incantation is quite fragmentary, but “eat!” is again attested. Though fragmentary, as the final incantation of the ritual, it nicely bookends the texts, which also begins with an incantation to DINGIR.MAH of the riverbank. Following this, there are more offerings, and she drinks to the river and to DINGIR.MAH three times each, and then she goes up to the city and the ritual ends.

Structural analysis of this text is unfortunately somewhat difficult due to the unpreserved incantations, but it is not entirely impossible. For example, as already discussed in ch. 3, the ritual is framed by offerings and appeals to DINGIR.MAH of the river-bank and the spring (at the beginning) and the Sun-God (at the end), who are supposed to work on the patient through the clay used in the figurines. Within the framing device of the offerings, there are also four distinct sections to the ritual. First, there are the rites inside the tent. During most of this part, the patient is wearing the black clothing symbolizing sorcery, and has the red and blue wool draped on top of that. The Old Woman performs the holding-over rites that are unfortunately absent their accompanying incantations, but surely involved extracting the evil from the patient; she attempts to send the sorcery back to the person who originated it using analogy; she washes her own hands over hot stones; and then she first takes away the red and blue wool, and then tears

off the black clothing. This is punctuated by the rites involving pots, where one is smashed above the patient's head, and then she lines up the black pots ("equipment of uncleanness"), perhaps also smashes them, and requests that the evils be released. These rites all involve the Old Woman bringing objects close to the patient, putting them on the patient's body, taking them off the patient's body, etc., several of them must have been quite dramatic, and all of them are conducted in the confined space of the Old Woman's tent.

Following this, the patient goes elsewhere to bathe, while the Old Woman and her assistant the ^{MUNUS}SUḤUR.LÁL perform the rites of combing and separating on a figurine representing the patient. This could be interpreted as simply a result of the fact that the Old Women never bathe patients, as already noted above; it could be an attempt to use multiple methods of purification simultaneously so as to cover all of the bases—very characteristic of Old Woman rituals, as may already be seen from the several ways of removing evil used in this text—or from a structural perspective it could be considered a denouement: the main rites on the patient's body, including the (perhaps climactic moment of) tearing off of clothing, have already been performed, and therefore the patient and the practitioner may separate, and purification may be performed without direct contact with the patient's body. A combination of these interpretations is also possible. Finally, the Old Woman disposes of the items used thus far in the river, clearly marking an end to this section.

The next section of the ritual is the passing-through rite, conducted outside. Rites with gates are quite common in Old Woman rituals (see below), and when the ritual is well-preserved, are often (though by no means always) conducted near the end of the text. The patient, having undergone a number of purification rites already, finally passes through the physical thresholds of the gates into a cleansed state (while behind him/her, the evil turns into harmless grain). Once

(s)he is through, the Old Woman states that the patient has been cleansed, and there are the offerings at the river and the spring.

Finally, now that the patient is clean, there is the analogic request for fertility, with reference to the fecund cow/bull and the tree covered in fruit. This is quite clear from the perspective of structural analysis: now that the negative elements have been extracted, the positive may be invited in. The ritual ends with more offerings.

4.2.3: Ritual categorization, resumed

It can be seen through this case study how much of our interpretation of ritual acts is dependent on incantations. The red and blue wool is especially notable: there is the possibility of the disentanglement of the wool symbolizing the dissolution of the sorcery and/or of the red and blue color functioning as a counter to the yellow and black of the sorcery. On the other hand, red and blue are sometimes colors of sorcery themselves (e.g., in CTH 402, the ritual of Allī, discussed in ch. 3, or possibly CTH 404.1, the ritual of Maštigga), and when the wool is removed, the incantation states that the sorcery has also been removed. As stated above, perhaps the wool absorbs the evil, or perhaps it symbolizes different things at different points in the ritual. Without explicit incantations indicating so, however, interpretation is difficult.

Since so many interpretive possibilities exist for some of the Old Women's ritual acts, and since classifying single acts into a single ritual context can lead to errors of interpretation, another method is called for. Rather than looking at ritual acts according to the physical actions and objects, it is instead more productive to consider the metaphoric structure within which they are working. And in fact, as seen already in ch. 3, this is the function of many ritual acts: as a concretizing metaphor to address evil. This can easily be seen in CTH 409.I, in which evil

appears as clothing which is ripped off, as a color that may be changed⁶¹ or removed, as a burden which is taken off the patient and transferred to an antagonist, as a pot that may be smashed,⁶² as dirt that may be washed or combed away, and as tufts of hair that may be yanked off by thorny branches. The antagonists, who are also hypothetical and cannot be seen or touched, appear as wax figurines that can be melted. This is true of other texts we have seen as well. In CTH 398, for example, which was treated in ch. 3, bad omens were likewise rendered as figurines which could be shut away inside a vessel, while the general evil in the house appeared as burning seeds which could be extinguished, as a stranger that was kept out of the house by a guard dog, as binding cloth that could be cut,⁶³ as a stain that could be cleaned off with soap, as hunger or weakness that could be conquered with food, as carrion to be eaten by steppe-animals, as a burden for a donkey(?) to lift, and also perhaps as tufts of wool.⁶⁴

Physical actions sometimes also function as foci for noncorporeal power called upon by the practitioner. In CTH 409.I, DINGIR.MAH of the river-bank, the spring, the Storm-God, and the Sun-god are all called upon to help with the ritual, and the river-clay is explicitly stated to have a metaphysical positive power, stemming from the goddess it belongs to, that will meet and defeat the negative power of the evil. The clay figurines used throughout the ritual are doing double-duty: that of concretization and analogy, and *also* that of bringing the power of the river-bank and the spring to bear on the evil. The river-clay in CTH 398, on the other hand, is not connected to any analogic magic at all: it is pressed to the afflicted people and space, and it is said to be capable of defeating the evil and bringing it back to the river, where the dark earth (i.e., the netherworld) will conquer it, but the method is not at all explicit. The divine heralds,

⁶¹ If this is truly a function of the blue and red wool.

⁶² If my assumed restorations of the elided text are correct.

⁶³ Again, assuming this interpretation of the cloth is the correct one.

⁶⁴ If the gates are to be considered as using the same metaphor in this text as they do in CTH 409.I; the section with the gates is quite fragmentary.

who are called upon more than once, are asked to drive the evil out using a copper spear, but the evil itself is still not given any form and it seems more likely that the copper spear is an accoutrement of the heralds than a statement as to the evil's form. These forces, therefore, meet the evil as it is, which the practitioner is not able to do; she cannot even define what the evil is, but must analogize it somehow.

Once this is understood, the reason that philological methods are sometimes inadequate becomes clear. It should not be stated that an item such as cloth or grain has some ritual power attached to it (e.g., that it is an "absorbent," as is sometimes said of grain⁶⁵) but rather that it has qualities that can be used for various types of metaphors: for example, cloth may be used to bind a person or thing, which limits and discomfits them; therefore, a ritual author may choose cloth to represent sorcery, which is likewise limiting and discomfiting the patient. Clothing surrounds a person and covers their whole body; it may therefore be used as a metaphor for an affliction, as in CTH 409.I, for a sorcerous attack, as in CTH 402, Allī's ritual, *or* for a protective force or for a quality like fertility, as simultaneously seen in both of these rituals. Grain sustains life, defeats hunger, and grows more of itself; therefore, as is explicit in CTH 398, it can be used as a metaphor for strengthening a patient against evil, and represent an opposing force to the affliction. However, it can also represent the affliction itself: when roasted, it is used as a metaphor for rendering something infertile and unable to grow (also possible in CTH 398). Often these metaphors are made explicit through analogic incantations. However, in point of fact, analogic incantations are simply the most explicit form of a phenomenon that pervades Hittite ritual, whether stated aloud or not: the concretization of noncorporeal forces.

Therefore, when ritual acts are categorized based on nouns or verbs, it will usually be the case that a noun or verb must be admitted to be functioning in different ways, as already seen

⁶⁵ E.g. Haas, *Materia*, 374ff.; see further below.

with *šer arḥa waḥnu* above, as well as the examples in the preceding paragraph. (It should be noted that *šer arḥa waḥnu*'s function of creating association should be even more logical in this context of the ongoing creation of analogues, since it reinforces the connection between the analogue and the patient.) Straightforward philological method, while productive for demonstrating the multivalence of certain objects and actions, is not adequate for discussing ritual techniques. Rather, it is more productive to look at the types of metaphors that are used to concretize the intangible forces at work.

4.3: Evil as restraint: binding and burdening the patient

This is one of the most common ways Old Woman rituals conceive of evil: as something physically limiting the patient, which the practitioner may then remove (and which must then be disposed of; see below under “Disposal”). The evil may be thought to be binding or tying the patient, hobbling them, weighing them down, etc. An object is used to represent this, and may either literally be tied to or put on top of the patient's body, or sometimes simply indicated as a representation of the evil's nature. This perspective requires reinterpretation of certain passages: in Hittitological scholarship, objects attached to the patient and subsequently removed have often been interpreted as “absorbents.”⁶⁶ That is, through contact with the patient's body, the object absorbs evil from the patient, as, for example, has been suggested for the cloth in CTH 398 (see ch. 3). I do not dispute that this might be *one* function of these rites, and there are a very few passages that seem to suggest a possible absorption of evil by certain objects (e.g., the bird-shaped vessel in CTH 402, see below). However, for the most part, it seems more likely that these objects are metaphors for the evil itself.⁶⁷ Here, I will be assuming that they are metaphors,

⁶⁶ E.g. Haas, *Materia*, 192 (regarding stones); 374ff. (regarding grain, meal, dough, bread, etc.); 414, 423–24, 457 (regarding animal flesh); 649ff. (regarding cloth); 690ff. (regarding gates).

⁶⁷ Or have a completely different function, such as the dough in CTH 398, which undoubtedly sustains the patient rather than absorbing evil.

but without disallowing the possibility that absorption could also be at work alongside the metaphorical forces (and see further on absorption below).

4.3.1: Binding

Binding, tying, wrapping, etc. in ritual context has been well-known to the Hittitological literature for some time; already in 1971, Gabriella Szabó put together a list of attestations of “Beispiele für die Beschwörungspraktik des Bindens, des Fesselns, des Umwickelns” in Hittite ritual.⁶⁸ However, once again, attention has been on a collection of actions represented by identical or similar lexemes, rather than on the application of binding toward ritual efficacy.⁶⁹ As will be seen below, there are several cases where the simple act of binding can represent more than one method of cleansing a patient. First, however, we will examine the metaphor of evil as a binding force itself.

There are several incantations attested that make the metaphor of binding extremely explicit. For example, in CTH 761, the Luwian “great ritual,” the practitioner states, “Let them not bind the ri[tual] patient:” followed by a list of evils.⁷⁰ CTH 780.II, Allaituraḫḫi’s ritual, and CTH 788, Šalašu’s ritual, refer to the patient as “the bound one.”⁷¹ CTH 390.D not only refers to the patient as “bound,” but is labeled in its colophon the “incantation of binding.” CTH 402, the Ritual of Allī, *may* include a reference to evil “binding” the patient in two different places.⁷²

These occur during a sequence where Allī places various colors of wool on the patient’s head

⁶⁸ *Ein hethitisches Entsühnungsritual für das Königspaar Tuthaliia und Nikalmati*, THeth 1 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1971), 95ff.

⁶⁹ Haas and Thiel (*Die Beschwörungsrituale*, 40ff.) consider a metaphorical construct of this fashion, but their consideration is not systematic, being based primarily on Allaituraḫḫi and Šalašu’s rituals, both of which use a binding/caging-release metaphor (see below), and their conclusions too general (e.g., “Die hethitische Magie ist von dem Begriffspaar “binden” und “lösen” – Katadesis-Apölysis – bestimmt. Dabei ist die Praktik des Bindens die schwarze Magie schlechthin, die weiße Magie aber ist die Praktik des Lösens” [40]).

⁷⁰ KUB 32.9++ obv. 7 ni-i-ša-an ḫa-ṛ pi¹-ti ma-a[l-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ši-in E]N-an

⁷¹ *išḫiyant-*

⁷² One passage is very broken, with only *iš* preserved for the verb; Miller suggests *iš[ḫeškizzi]*, which is quite plausible. The other verb is *ašarešket*, which may mean “bound” or “made white,” depending on the interpretation; see ch. 3 for a more detailed discussion.

and knees, makes it into thread, and winds it around figurines, while stating that she is taking the sorcery from the patient and “giving it back to its owner” (see ch. 3 for a detailed analysis of this text), in this case in the form of binding them. A similar passage appears in the fourth ritual of CTH 416, where the Old Woman wraps the king and queen’s fingers with thread, removes it, and tells a figurine to “Take the pain, woe, and anxiety of the king and queen.”⁷³ Though the text becomes fragmentary after this, the extant words suggest that she then winds the thread around the figurines. In CTH 780.III, Allaituraḥḫi’s fragmentary ritual for Šuppiluliyama II, Alaituraḥḫi cuts a rope in an unfortunately fragmentary way, but the following incantation is mostly preserved:

“Just as I have cut this rope off [...?], also likewise let the king’s sorcery (and) [...] be cut off,

“and let them no longer rema[in] on his body!”⁷⁴

This can be compared to a passage in Tablet Five of Tunnawiya’s ritual CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, in which she cuts a rope and says, “I am cutting off the evil tongue of the opponents!”⁷⁵ Finally, in CTH 404.1, Maštigga’s ritual of domestic quarrel, she makes blue and red wool into thread and places it on the patients’ bodies. Later, she removes it, and even later, she wraps (the same?) blue and red wool around a salamander and tells it to take the “evil tongue” away, which is suggestive of binding, particularly alongside the rites previously cited, but could also simply be a practical way to keep the wool from falling off of a moving

⁷³ See ch. 1 for further discussion of this passage.

⁷⁴ KUB 41.21 iv 12’ ki-i-wa GIM-an ŠU.SAR ar-ḫa [...?]
13’ kar-šu-un ŠA LUGAL-ia Uḫ₇-tar i-ia[]
14’ QA-TAM-MA ar-ḫa kar-ša-an e-eš-d[u]

15’ na-at-ši-kán nam-ma NÍ.TE-ši le-e ṛa¹-[ri]

For edition, see Haas and Wegner, *Rituale der Beschwörerinnen I*, 160–64.

⁷⁵ KBo 24.3+ 9 [(i-d)]a-a-lu-un ḫar-pa-na-al-la-aš EME-an kur-aš-ki-mi
For edition and duplicates see Beckman, “Ritual of the Ox,” 43.

Where physical actions are attested in the above examples, they use thread, rope, or cloth to physically represent the binding. It is therefore tempting to see a binding metaphor whenever similar actions appear. However, the use of thread and of tied cloth is not confined to binding metaphors. For example, in another rite early in the same ritual cited above, Maštigga severs a red cloth with a knife and says, “What you quarreled with each other about on that day—^dAndaliya has hereby cut the tongues of those days with a knife.”⁷⁶ Here, the cloth is not tied to the patient, and the incantation does not say “cut *away from you*,” so it seems that rather than cutting a metaphorical binding, the cloth simply symbolizes evil and she is destroying it (for more on this, see below). In CTH 391, the ritual of Ambazzi, clean linen is bound to the patient as part of a metaphor of cleaning dirt (=evil) off of them and making them white like the cloth, imposing its cleanliness on the patient (see below). In CTH 402, the ritual of Allī, a band of cloth containing a cleansing agent is wrapped around the patient for the purpose of cleaning the patient off with the dust, while the cloth is part of a larger metaphor within the text (see ch. 3). Physical binding, therefore, may be used for many things. This is what leaves passages like the binding of the patients and the bedroom in CTH 398 unclear: while it seems most likely to me that this rite is part of the tendency to conceive of evil as binding, and to represent that using cloth, it still remains possible that there is some other interpretation. The cloth could be absorbing the evil, as Bawanyeck suggests, or it could be a protective force, similar to the puppy and the dough under the bed.

361

Another explicit type of restraint is the collar, hobble, or fetter, represented in three different Old Woman rituals, though all are fragmentary. In CTH 788, the ritual of Šalašu, the patient has a fetter (*patalḫa*) placed on his or her neck, and on his or her right foot; the ritual also includes the incantation, “...free the bound one, release the ca[ged] man from the cage.”⁷⁷ However, unfortunately the text is too fragmentary to make much more of the events. Two even more fragmentary attestations are CTH 474, in which the patient has a collar or chain around his or her neck, and Bo 3330 (CTH 470, “Ritual fragments”) which has not been published in hand copy; however, two lines were quoted by Eichner as reading, “The Old Woman puts one collar around his/her neck in [...]”⁷⁸ Since they are so fragmentary, it cannot be said that the collars represent evil restraint, but it is possible.

Another metaphor of restraint is found in CTH 391, the ritual of Ambazzi, in which the evil is conceived of as pulling the patient like a bowstring. Throughout the ritual it is referred to as “the evil pull,”⁷⁹ and in this text, cloth is used as a representation of that metaphor: first *ašara*-cloth, and then a bowstring, are “pulled” all over the patient so as to “pull away the evil pull.”⁸⁰ The metaphor continues in what seems to be the focal rite of the text:

She winds a bowstring around a little tin, and winds it around the ritual patients’ right hand (and) foot.

Then, she takes it off of them and ties it to a mouse. “I have taken the evil away from them, and I have wound it around the mouse. May this mouse take it away to the high mountains, the deep valleys, and the wide roads!”

⁷⁷ KBo 19.145 iii 45’ iṣ-ḫi-ia-an-da-an
⁴⁶’ [l]a-a-at-tén LÚ GIŠ-[ru-wa-a]n-da-an-ma-kán GIŠ-ru-wa-az
⁴⁷’ [ar-ḫ]a tar-na-at-[tén]

Edited Haas and Wegner, *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen*, 215.

⁷⁸ “Einige Fehlschreibungen und Fehllesungen in hethitischen Texten,” *Die Sprache* 21 (1975): 162.

⁷⁹ *idalu ḫuittiyaššar*

⁸⁰ With cognate verb *ḫuittiya*- “pull” or “draw.”

She lets the mouse go.⁸¹

The tying of the patient's hand and foot to one another may also suggest a symbolic binding, although the incantation is not explicit. The overall metaphor, however, is symbolized by the bowstring (the tin is not explained). Tying the items to the mouse is reminiscent of CTH 404.1's salamander; the concept of taking the evil off of the patient and attaching it to an animal, that is, a scapegoat rite, was discussed in ch. 3 and will be addressed further below.

4.3.2: Burdening and covering

The concept of evil or affliction as a burden is also not uncommon in Old Woman texts; we have already seen it in CTH 409.I, in the rite with the *tiyadu*, where the evil is considered to be “loading and burdening” the patient. This concept is also clear in CTH 391, Ambazzi's ritual, in which she extinguishes burning plants and says, “Just as I have extinguished this, also let the evil on top of the patients likewise be extinguished!”⁸² In this text, as just noted, the main metaphor for the evil is as something “pulling” the patient, but the idea of evil as an object resting on top of the patient is also invoked. Similarly, in both CTH 398 and CTH 402, items are exhorted to “lift” evil from the patients: in CTH 398 this is the puppy/donkey (see ch. 3), and in Allī's ritual it is an unclear number of vessels and wax figurines, which are left beside or under the patient's bed overnight, as Allī says, “Let them lift these things from him on this side! Let

⁸¹ KUB 9.25+ ii 34 ʾnu-uš-ša¹-an NAGGA te-pu ^{SIG}iš-tág-ga-i an-da ʾu-u-ʾla¹-li-i-e-ez-zi
35 na-at-ša-an A-NA BE-LU-TIM ku-un-ni A-NA QA-TI-ŠU GÌR-ʾŠU¹ na-a-i

36 nam-ma-at-ša-ma-ša-at-kán ar-ḥa da-a-i
37 na-at-kán A-NA PÉŠ.TUR na-a-i ar-ḥa-wa-aš-ma-aš-kán
38 da-aḥ-ḥu-un i-da-a-lu nu-wa-ra-at-kán A-NA ʾPÉŠ¹.TUR
39 ne-eḥ-ḥu-un nu-wa-ra-at ka-a-aš PÉŠ.TUR pá-r-ga-u-wa-aš HUR.SAG^{MES}-aš
40 hal-lu-u-wa-aš ḥa-a-ri-ia-a-š da-a-lu-ga-u-wa-aš KASKAL^{HIA}-aš pē-e-da-a-ú

41 nu PÉŠ.TUR ar-ḥa tar-na-a-i

For the edition, see Christiansen, *Ambazzi*, 44–45.

⁸² KUB 9.25++ ii 7 ma-aḥ-ḥa-an-kán ki-i ki-iš-ta-nu-nu-un i-da-a-lu-ia-kán
8 A-NA EN^{MES}-TIM še-er QA-TAM-MA ki-iš-ta-ru

Edited by Christiansen, *Ambazzi*, pp. 42–43.

them lift these things from him on that side! Let them lift these things from [his/her] head! Let them lift these things from his/her bed!”⁸³ A similar incantation is seen in CTH 409.II/409.IV.458.1, where the scapegoat-donkey is encouraged to “lift” (*karap-*) the evils from the patient (see ch. 3; more commonly, these animals “conquer” (*tarḥ-*) the patient’s affliction).

The Old Women sometimes place representations of evil on top of the patient’s body: for example, in CTH 404.1, Maštigga’s ritual, she puts anthropomorphic figurines of dough and wood, tongues and hands made of dough, and blue and red wool thread on the patients’ heads, bodies, and at/on their feet. The objects remain there for the next few rites, and then Maštigga takes them off, breaks the hands and tongues, waves them over the patient (*šer arḥa waḥnu*), speaks the incantation “Let that day’s tongues be removed; let that day’s curses be removed!”⁸⁴ and throws them in the fire. The anthropomorphic figurines’ role is not clear (perhaps the patients in their role as mutual antagonists?), but the tongues and hands are clearly meant to represent the negative communications between the ritual patients, and it has already been demonstrated that the red and blue wool represent the evil tongues. Placing them all over the patients’ bodies is certainly a symbol of their affliction. Similarly, in CTH 397, Ḫebattarakki’s ritual, two figurines (perhaps representing demons, perhaps sorcerers) are placed on the patient’s shoulders at the beginning of the rite (the only section preserved). Certain examples quoted above regarding “binding” might also fit here: Allī, Maštigga, and Tunnawiya all put cloth or

⁸³ KUB 24.10 (CTH 402.B) ii 25’ ʾke¹-e-ši-kán ke-e-ez kar-pa-an-[(du)]

26’ ke-e-ez kar-ap-pa-an-du ke-e-e[š-ši-k(án SAG.DU-za)]

27’ kar-pa-an-du ke-e-ma-aš-ši-ká[(n ša-aš-ta-za)]

28’ kar-ap-pa-an-du

With restorations from KUB 41.1 iii 7–9; see Mouton, “Le rituel d’Allī,” 212, for the edition.

⁸⁴ KBo 39.8 ii 13 [tú(h)^{uh}-(š)]a-ru a-pé-el UD-aš EME^{HrA1} túh^{uh}-ša-ru-wa [(a-pé-el)]

14 ʾUD¹-aš [h]u-u-ur-ta-a-uš

With restorations from KBo 45.191++ i 27’. For the edition see Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 71.

thread on top of patients, which could be representing evil as a burden on the patient's body rather than, or in addition to, as a restraining force.

Finally, clothing can be used as a representation of evil covering a patient's body. This is already seen above in CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya's Ritual of the River, in which she tears off the black clothing symbolic of the evil affliction. In a similar passage near the end of CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual, the patients themselves throw off the fine garments they are wearing, and the Old Woman takes them; however, there is no incantation attached to this rite to indicate that its function is similar to Tunnawiya's. In CTH 402, the ritual of Allī, the clothing metaphor is used for sorcery, but only when Allī is turning the sorcery back on the ritual's antagonist; when referring to the patient, the clothing metaphor is only used with a protective connotation. This is once again similar to CTH 409.I, in the passage at the end when the fruit-bearing tree is said to be "clothed" in fertility.

The above is a comprehensive discussion of all places in the Old Woman corpus that can be convincingly interpreted as conceiving of evil as a restraining or burdening object. One of these concepts is attested in every relatively complete Old Woman ritual: evil as binding is clearly attested in CTH 390, CTH 402 and CTH 416, probably in CTH 398, and possibly in CTH 391, CTH 404.1, and CTH 409.I (as well as in the less-complete CTH 780.II, Allaituraḥḥi's ritual, CTH 788, Šalašu's ritual, and other fragments); while evil as a burden is clearly attested in CTH 391, CTH 398, CTH 402, and CTH 404.1, and CTH 409.I. These metaphors were very productive for the Old Women, which is no surprise, since they allowed the evil to be addressed by attaching a physical object to the patient's body, and then "untying" or "unburdening" the patient by removing it.

4.3.3: Gates and the passing-through rite

The passing-through rite with a gate is another way evil was conceived of as something attached to a patient's body. It has been treated extensively elsewhere in Hittitological literature;⁸⁵ as has been noted, its function is made very explicit in Tunlawiya's "Ritual of the River," where it is supposed to pull evil from the patient's body as tufts of hair are pulled from animals, as seen above. There are quite a few other rituals with gates of hawthorn and/or *alanza(n)*-wood: of the Old Woman texts, they are attested in CTH 398, 409.I, 409.II (in the list of ritual items), 418, 433.1, and CTH 490. In several cases, however, the passing-through rites are fragmentary; for example, in CTH 398, Huwarlu's ritual, enough is preserved to know that there were three gates constructed and at least one was of hawthorn, likely with other items on either side of them, and that the tallow figurine of a puppy was involved in the passing-through rite, but otherwise the text is too fragmentary to make out. In CTH 433.1, one of the rituals for the tutelary deity of the hunting-bag, the gate is of hawthorn, something is bound to it, and there is a kiln on either side, and incantations are spoken, but the text is once again too fragmentary for greater understanding; the rest of the examples are even more fragmentary or opaque.⁸⁶ In this case, since the function is so closely tied to the form of the thorny gate, it seems relatively safe to assume that in most or all of the fragmentary texts with gates made of hawthorn, evil was similarly being pulled from the patient's body by the thorns. This is particularly likely given that

⁸⁵ E.g., Haas, *Materia*, 297ff., Bawanyeck, *Die Rituale der Auguren*, 175ff., Görke, *Aštu*, 277ff..

⁸⁶ These are CTH 418, the ritual for if a foreigner commits an offense against the king and queen, breaks off after the king and queen have walked through two hawthorn gates (the text says "two sets of gates," so there is also a possibility that it is four gates in total), one of the king and one of the queen, with a *kureššar*-cloth also drawn through them; it is unclear if the drawing is part of the rite, or if it is, e.g., laid out for them to walk on. There are again bread-offerings on either side of the gate, and burning log-piles, and also there are nine anthropomorphic figurines in an unpreserved location. The other passing-through-rite in a reasonable state of preservation is CTH 490, which has its own particularities; immediately before the rite with the gates, the ritual patient crawls either through or into and out of a large vessel, accompanied by an extremely short and difficult Hurrian incantation (perhaps something to do with oaths). Then the patient goes through hawthorn gates with birds bound to them, after which the Old Woman smashes the gates and kills the birds, and speaks another very short and untranslatable Hurrian incantation. The ritual with the *palhi*-vessel is unparalleled anywhere else in the Hittite corpus, and without a better understanding of the accompanying incantation, its meaning will likely continue to escape us. It is likewise unfortunate that the Hurrian incantation after the passing-through rite is so short and difficult, and that the text breaks off immediately afterwards.

Tunnawiya's explanation about the function of the gate is also attested in three other texts, two disappearing god myths and the festival of the Storm-God of Kuliwišna.⁸⁷

4.4: Evil as something inside the patient: taking items out of the patient's body

Sometimes, rather than an item burdening or binding the patient, evil appears as something inside the patient, which must then be gotten out. The physical methods which address this problem are limited; the most common one is spitting. As already discussed in chapter 1, spitting is an action unique to Old Woman rituals. It appears in eleven separate rituals, although in only two of the most complete texts (CTH 404.1 and the fourth ritual of CTH 416). Maštigga's CTH 404.1 provides an excellent example of the well-known ritual in which the patient transfers evil to a substitute through spitting:

They drive a sheep in, and the Old Woman holds it over the two ritual patrons, and she speaks as follows: "Here is a *tarpalli*-substitute for you. Let it be a *tarpalli*-substitute for your bodies: the curses in (its) mouth (and) tongue!" And they spit into its mouth, and she speaks as follows:

"Spit out the evil curses!" And they dig a pit, and slaughter the sheep downward, and then they place it down in (the pit) and they place sweet thick bread down by it. She also libates wine, and they cover it over.⁸⁸

⁸⁷ As first noted by Otten; see above n. 48.

⁸⁸ KBo 39.8 ii 26 nu UDU u-un-na-an-zi na-an-kán^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI A-NA 2 BE-EL SÍSKUR

27 še-er e-ep-zi nu ki-iš-ša-an te-ez-zi ka-a-ša-wa-aš-ma-aš

28 tar-pa-al-¹li-iš¹ nu-wa-aš-¹ma¹-aš tu-eg-ga-aš tar-pa-al-li-iš

29 ¹e-eš-tu KAXU¹-i EME-i ḥu-u-ur-ta-a-uš nu-uš-ši-kán iš-ši-¹i¹

30 an-da al-la-pa-¹aḥ¹-an-zi nu ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i

31 i-da-a-la-u-e-eš-wa-¹kán¹ ḥu-u-ur-ta-a-uš pa-ra-a al-la-pa-aḥ-te-en

32 nu te-e-kán pád-da-an-zi nu-kán UDU kat-ta-an-da ḥa-at-ta-an-zi

33 nam-ma-an-kán kat-t[a]-an-da ti-an-zi nu-uš-ši NINDA.GUR₄.RA KU₇

34 a-wa-an kat-ta ti-an-zi GEŠTIN-ia ši-pa-an-ti nu še-er an-da ap-pa-an-zi

See Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, pp. 73–74, for transliterations and translation. Copy B's only significant variation is that it has what is probably a BA[BBAR] sign after UDU, indicating that the sheep is white.

The ritual is straightforward (with the possible exception of the meaning of *tarpalli-*, for which see ch. 3): the sheep is declared explicitly to be the vehicle for the patients' contamination, they spit the curses from their mouths to its, and then it is disposed of down in a pit where the underworld gods are capable of dealing with any evil attached to it, with offerings to smooth the way. The whole sequence is repeated twice more in this text, once with a black sheep, which is burned, and once with a puppy, which is again buried.

There is a question of whether the ritual rids a patient of guilt from the curses they spoke, or negative effects of the curses that were spoken against them, or both. Since the patients appear to be expelling curses from their mouths, and since Maštigga's two other rituals with clear purpose are for offenders (guilty of bloodshed and striking someone on the head, respectively), the former option seems most likely. On the other hand, the other rituals where the patient clearly spits into an animal's mouth (CTH 409.II/409.IV/758.1, Tunnawiya's *taknaz dā-* and attached texts, and CTH 760.II, a very similar text with incantations in Luwian; see ch. 3) purport to combat a long, long list of potential woes, most of which do not seem to be the patient's fault, and in general, spitting seems to be a metonymic action, in which the spittle represented contamination in the entire body. Tunnawiya's ritual and CTH 760.II both explicitly state that the patient is spitting out his "pain and woe" (Luwian *aḫran* and *wahran*), as well as divine anger and other people's "tongues."⁸⁹ Spitting out evil is also seen in the fourth ritual of CTH 416 (and thus was already in use in the Old Hittite period), in which the patients also spit out their "pain

⁸⁹ Spitting into an animal's mouth does seem to be a ritual of Luwian context, since it is confined to the Maštigga and Tunnawiya corpora, and possibly also to the Old Woman's "incantation of tongues" in CTH 390 (The final line of the "incantation of tongues," the only action following the mythological incantation that makes up the bulk of the ritual, is *nu-uš-ši-iš-ša-an I-NA KAḫU-ŠU an-da 3-ŠU al-la-pa-ḫ[i]*, "And (s)he spits into his/her/its mouth three times" [KUB 7.1 ii 69. Presumably it is the patient doing the spitting, and presumably the owner of the mouth is an animal, but no other information is provided), which is another ritual of clear Luwian context (e.g., Melchert, *The Luwians*, HbOr I/16 [Leiden: Brill, 2003], 21 w.n.23, who also dates the five rituals on this tablet to the Old Hittite period based on linguistic grounds). However, spitting out afflictions is known in central Anatolia from the Old Hittite period, as is clear from CTH 416. For more on the subject of regionalisms in Hittite ritual, see the Introduction.

and woe” (Hittite *āi-* and *wāi-*), in this case into a vessel, which is then covered over. This is similar to the second ritual of Maštigga, CTH 404.2, in which the patient spits into a pot, and the Old Woman smashes it. Likewise, in CTH 761, Kuwattalla and Šillaluḫi’s *šalli aniur*, the patient spits onto braided dough, accompanying the standard Luwian incantation about spitting out his or her woes, and the dough is then thrown away. In all of these texts, it seems that spitting performs a metonymic function, where the small part of the patient’s insides that is expelled represents the evil affliction as a whole. However, the fact that these rituals all also address harmful speech should not be ignored; the connection between spitting, the mouth, and “evil tongues” is compelling.

To continue the argument that actions do not always mean the same thing, however, it should be noted that spitting does not always represent the expulsion of evil. In CTH 780.II, Allaituraḫḫi’s ritual, the final attestation of spitting in an Old Woman ritual, Allaituraḫḫi spits as an expression of belittlement:

She [sa]ys: “I conquered them, the words of the sorcerer. The words [th]at are above,⁹⁰ my words conquered them. I have thrown [h]is words back on the sorcerer a second time, I have spat on them, I have trampled them [wi]th (my) feet. May a horse keep urinating (on) them; may an ox keep defecating (on) [them]. Let the person [who] walks all over (them) keep [sp]itting on (them)! Let them [b]e spat on, the words of [sorcery] and the man of sorcery!”

Next, the Old Woman spits once, and [spe]aks t[hus]: “Let the thousand gods keep cursing him, the sorcerer!...”⁹¹

⁹⁰ J. Lorenz and I. Taş (“Neue Zusatzstücke zur ersten Tafel der Rituale der Frau Allaituraḫi aus Mukiš,” *ZA* 101:1 [2012]: 120 n. 16) interpret this as meaning “belonging to this world.”

⁹¹ CTH 780.II.T01.G (KUB 17.27++) iii 8’ [nu me-m]a-i tar-uḫ-ḫu-na-at-za Uḫ₇-na-aš ʽud-da-a-ar¹ [ku]-ʽe ud-da-a-ar¹

Allaituraḥḫi's ritual, therefore, preserves quite a different symbolic act of spitting than the more common one,⁹² although once again interpretation is quite straightforward: spitting on the sorcery is an act of disgust and of dominance, symbolizing her victory.

Spitting is also not the only method used to remove evil from inside the body. Other methods include the one attested in CTH 762,⁹³ fragments of the *šalli aniur*, in which the Old Woman takes blue wool from the patient's head (where it must have been placed in the preceding broken section) and puts it in a cup full of honey and olive oil, which seems to fit best with the metaphor of evil as a burden; however, after the Old Woman takes the wool, the patient also tugs out bits of hair, eyebrow, and eyelash, and puts them in the cup along with it. The cup is then set on fire. Unfortunately, this passage is an isolated fragment and more context is unavailable, but the destruction of disposable body parts seems to fit into the same conceptual framework as spitting: that is, part of the infected body metonymically symbolizes the whole of the affliction. In this case, the parts are easily removable: attached to the body, but once they are separated, they are disposable. Spit might be conceived of in the same way. It is also worthwhile here to consider CTH 780.III, Allaituraḥḫi's ritual for Šuppiluliyama II, in which she conceives

9 ʾša¹-[ra-a]z-zi na-at-za am-me-el ud-ʾda¹-na-a-an-te-ʾeš tar¹-[ḫu]-ʾe-er¹
 10 ut-tar-[še]-ʾet¹ 2-e-pát Uḫ₇-na-aš Uḫ₇-tar pé-eš-ši-ia-nu-un
 11 nu-uš-[m]a-aš-kán še-er al-la-pa-aḫ-ḫu-un na-at an-ʾda¹
 12 GĪR-[i]t iš-pár-ra-aḫ-ḫu-un na-at-kán ANŠE-aš eš-ḫur-re-eš-ʾki-id-du¹
 13 na-[at]-kán GU₄-uš kam-mar-ši-eš-ki-id-du DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU-uš-ša-an
 14 ku-i[š] še-er ar-ḫa i-ia-at-ta-ri nu-uš-ša-an še-er
 15 a[l-l]a-ap-pa-aḫ-ḫi-iš-ki-id-du al-ʾla¹-ap-pa-aḫ-ḫa-an-wa-ʾra-at¹ [e]-ʾeš-du¹
 16 U[ḫ₇-n]a-aš ud-da-a-ar Uḫ₇-na-aš-ša UN-aš

17 [nu^{MUNUS}Š]U.GI EGIR-an-da 1-ŠU al-ʾla¹-a[p]-pa-aḫ-ḫi nu k[i-iš-ša-an te-ez]-zi
 18 []x-wa-ra-an Uḫ₇-an UN-an ʾLI-IM¹ DINGIR^{MES} ḫur-za-aš-ʾkán-du¹

For transliterations and translations, see primarily J. Lorenz and I. Taş, *ibid.*, 120–21, which includes the new join KUB 40.67, though also see V. Haas, “Notizen zu den Ritualen der Frau Allaituraḫi aus Mukiš,” *AoF* 34:1 (2007): 17–18 and 27. Restorations follow Lorenz and Taş. The reading of the partially-broken signs as ḫur-za-aš-ʾkán-du¹ in line 18 does not find much support in the copy, but the photo is more consistent with this interpretation.

⁹² It is possible that this could be due to Allaituraḥḫi's ritual being part of a Hurrian tradition, as opposed to the Luwian/central Anatolian context of the other rituals.

⁹³ 762.3 = KUB 32.5+KUB 32.8 (transliterated by Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, pp. 118ff.).

of the sorcerer possibly attacking the king using (among other things) his spit or his hair.⁹⁴

Clearly these elements retained a connection to the patient even after they were removed.

Finally, in the most medical-like Old Woman text, Ayatarša's ritual (CTH 390A), the Old Woman gives a sick child what seems to be a purgative medicine.⁹⁵ In this text, it is specifically the child's innards (Hittite *karateš*) that are said to be sick, so it is also possible that this was designed to physically address a digestive issue; however, the child is also washed, for example, so metaphor was at work in the text. The child is seated on what seems to be a toilet-seat and then the text breaks off.

The issue of "absorbents" should be taken up once again here, since that interpretation assumes that evil inside the patient is absorbed into the item used. As already discussed in ch. 3, there is no indication that the cloths in CTH 398, the ritual of Huwarlu, are intended to absorb instead of symbolically bind. Grain and dough are hardly ever, to my knowledge, incontrovertibly demonstrated to be absorbents: when used in CTH 398, the grain symbolizes the evil and is roasted and extinguished as an analogy for destroying the evil, and the dough is pressed to the patients' bodies not to absorb evil from them, but (explicitly in the incantation) to metaphorically sustain them the way grain sustains the lives of humans and animals. Items left in baskets under beds are likewise not absorbents, as has been suggested;⁹⁶ in CTH 398, it is bread and dough that are left under the bed, which, given the evidence from this same text, should be

⁹⁴ See Haas and Wegner, *Beschwörerinnen*, 160–70, for this text.

⁹⁵ See Melchert, "Pudenda Hethitica," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 35:3 (1983): 137–45.

⁹⁶ Haas, *Materia*, 706 ("Ein mit absorbierenden Materien gefüllter Korb soll die pathogenen Substanzen an sich ziehen, sei es, daß man den Korb über dem Ritualherrn schwenkt bzw. halt....oder daß man den Korb während der Nacht...unter das Bett des Ritualherrn stellt," citing as his examples CTH 409.I, CTH 398, CTH 391, CTH 402, and CTH 393, Anniwiyani's ritual), followed by Bawanypeck (*Die Rituale der Auguren*, 160–61 and 168). Mouton suggests that this is what she calls a "private therapeutic incubation," so giving it a positive interpretation, but does not discuss the individual items in the basket and their function, rather focusing on the therapeutic effects of sleep in ritual ("Use of Private Incubations Compared to 'Official' Ones in Hittite Texts," in *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität: Akten des religionsgeschichtlichen Symposiums "Kleinasien und angrenzende Gebiete vom Beginn des 2. bis zur Mitte des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr."* (Bonn, 20.–22. Februar 2003), ed. M. Hutter and S. Hutter-Braunsar, AOAT 318 [Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2004], 293–300).

interpreted as a rite for sustaining the patients' strength. In CTH 402, the ritual of Allī, grain and bread are again left under the bed in a basket, again in a text with an incantation about bread dough sustaining people's lives; alongside them are a bow and arrows, which in this text are symbolic of the hunter-god, who is explicitly a protective force (see the analysis in ch. 3). Therefore, once again, this seems to be sustaining and protective rather than absorbent.⁹⁷ The impression that they are intended to absorb evil might arise from the fact that they are disposed of at the end of the ritual; however, as a matter of course the Old Women seem to dispose of all of their ritual equipment at the end of a text (an exception is Maštigga, CTH 404.1, who disposes of most things along the way). It seems to me that the idea that ritual equipment might become infected through contact with an infected person is quite different from the idea that a product is meant to absorb evil completely, such that it does not remain inside the patient any longer.

It does seem possible that the complicated dough-mixture that Ḫebattarakki makes in CTH 397 could be intended to absorb evil, since she presses it to the patient's body and says, "...I am now drawing it (the evil) away from you, and I am throwing it away..." (see below for more analysis of this passage). Likewise, the figurines and the bird-vessel that Allī puts beside the bed in CTH 402 might be intended to absorb evil, since she says, "Let them lift these things from" the patient.⁹⁸ In CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual, dough is sprinkled on the patients, and waved over them, to "purify" them; the dough is then thrown in the hearth, which may indicate that it absorbed contamination. However, it might also be a purificatory substance that has lost its pure state by coming into contact with the patient. In fact, none of these instances is conclusive. For the most part, it seems that when evil is conceived of as being inside the body, it

⁹⁷ A similar interpretation can easily be made of the heads of barley and emmer left at the head of the king and queen's bed in CTH 416 (see ch. 1), although no explicit incantations describe the function of grain in that ritual.

⁹⁸ See above pp. 364–65.

must be extracted using parts of the patient's actual body, such as spit or hair, rather than through contact with the patient's skin.

4.5: Evil as dirt: washing, wiping, and cleansing the patient's body

Another common metaphor for evil in the Old Woman texts is dirt. This can be treated in several ways; the most obvious is of course washing, but Old Women do not often perform this task. There is one passage in CTH 390A where Ayatarša washes the sick child's mouth, discussed immediately below. There is also a slightly fragmentary section in CTH 458.1 in which the Old Woman pours wine over the patient's hands over a brazier with small stones on it; judging by the following incantation, part of the point of this exercise is certainly to extinguish the fire as an analogy to the evil. Beyond these two examples, washing seems to be something the Old Woman is unlikely to do herself: in CTH 402, the ritual of Allī, the patient is bathed by an anonymous "they," three times near the end of the ritual. On the other hand, in CTH 398, 404.1, 409.1, 418, 448, 490, 761, and 780, the patients wash themselves; this is also true of separate passages in Ayatarša's and Allī's rituals, in which the patients wash themselves in addition to being washed.

However, the Old Women may occasionally sprinkle (*papparš-*) patients with purificatory substances; Maštigga does this in CTH 404.1, and the text literally states, "The Old Woman takes water and dough, and she sprinkles the water over them, and purifies them. Further, she waves the dough over (*šer arḥa wahnu-*) them, and speaks as follows: 'Be pure again, from the mouth and the tongue!' And she throws the dough in the hearth."⁹⁹ In CTH 490,

⁹⁹ KBo 39.8 ii 21 nu ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI wa-a-tar iš-na-an-na da-a-i na-[at-(ša-ma-aš-kán)]

22 ša-ra-a pa-ap-par-aš-ṛzi¹ na-aš šu-up-pí-ia-ṛaḥ-ḥi¹ n[(am-ma-aš-ma-aš-kán)]

23 iš-na-an mc-e-er ar-[(ḥa)] wa-aš-nu-zi nu ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i

24 pá-ku-wa-e-eš-wa-aš-ma-aš ṛnam-ma¹ e-eš-te-en KAxU-it EME-it

25 nu-kán iš-na-an ḥa-aš-ši-i da-a-i

With restorations from KBo 2.3++ (404.1.II.A) i 34'-27'; see Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, p. 73.

the ritual of Aštu, Aštu sprinkles the patient with water from a *šuwaru* (meaning unclear), speaks an opaque Hurrian recitation, and only then does the patient bathe him- or herself. In CTH 780.I and 780.II, Allaituraḥḫi's rituals, she sprinkles the ritual buildings with water to purify them (as explicitly stated in the text). In CTH 759, the Old Woman sprinkles wine behind the deity's altar, but it is possible, if not probable, that this is more in line with an action of offering than of purification.

There are also a few occasions in which the Old Women physically wipe contamination from the bodies of their patients. Probably the most well-known and evocative example of this is in CTH 780.I and 780.II, Allaituraḥḫi's rituals:

Next, the Old Woman takes two *parneški*-objects with her two hands, and then runs behind his/her back and seizes him/her, from the head, top to bottom. And she presses all of his/her body parts to hers, and keeps wiping him off while she conjures thus:

“I, the Old Woman, have taken them from him! I have wiped them off of him, I have taken the furious eyes of the land...”¹⁰⁰

If the *parneški*- is, in fact, a brush, as Haas suggests, this would be somewhat parallel to a passage in CTH 402, the ritual of Allī, which is unfortunately fairly broken, in which she uses a comb on the patient, although the passage only says, “The comb touches once on each side,”¹⁰¹ which does not quite suggest the vigorous brushing of Allaituraḥḫi, although the verb *šalik*- can have an intrusive meaning.¹⁰² Allī's following incantation says, “I have cut off” the evils from the patient, which perhaps suggests a more aggressive motion than simply touching the comb once to the patient, although it is impossible to say for sure. This would likewise parallel CTH

¹⁰⁰ See ch. 3, n. 340, for transliteration.

¹⁰¹ KBo 21.8 (CTH 402.I) iii 13' ku-e-ez-zi-ia ^{GIŠ}GA.ZUM 1-ŠU ša-li-ga
See Mouton, *Le Rituel d'Allī*, 218.

¹⁰² The duplicate B reads only *ANA* ^{GIŠ}GA.ZUM *šaliga* (ibid.), “she touches the comb,” which only confuses the issue more.

purge the lint [from] it, and it becomes white, likewise may the gods purge the evil *inan*-sickness from this person's body!"¹⁰⁶

The final type of cleansing is focused, once again, on the patient's mouth. In CTH 390's "incantation of tongues," the patient's tongue is smeared with beer-wort, anointed with ghee, and wiped off with honey, explicitly for the purpose of "cleansing" (*ša(n)h-*) it. Similarly, in CTH 433.2, a ritual for the tutelary deity of the hunting-bag, the Old Woman puts fat-bread (sweet bread mixed with sheep fat) into the mouths of the augurs, as well as placing some before the deity, and says, "O Tutelary Deity of the Hunting-Bag and Heptad:

"Once more throw away evil, anger, and sullenness! Let the fat-bread lie once more in their mouths, and let oil flow forth from their mouths! If some augur has said an evil word before the god, or some (augur) has angered you,

"let their mouths be wiped clean by the fat-bread."¹⁰⁷

Then she throws the fat-bread that was before the deity into the fire, and the augurs take it from their mouths and throw it in the fire. The concept here is clear: the augurs' mouths have been contaminated by something they said or did (such that their predictions are negative), and now the mouths are being cleansed (so that they may make positive predictions again). Finally, in CTH 759, the *dupaduparša*-ritual, the Luwian incantations strongly suggest a similar action with the theme, "Let the curses become oil and honey," though the fragmentary text does not preserve any corresponding actions. In all of these cases, contact with the mouth is directly related to the problem of evil words, whether coming from someone else (as seems to be the case in CTH

¹⁰⁶ KUB 9.25++ ii 26 [ki-i-ká]n GADA-an ma-aḥ-ḥa-an ^{LÚ.MEŠ}AZLAG ta-an-na-ra-an

27 [an-ni-ia]-an-zi nu-uš-ši-kán SÍG ma-ri-iḥ-ši-in

28 [ar-ḥa] pár-ku-nu-wa-an-zi na-at ḥar-ki-iš-zi

29 [ke-e-e]l-ma an-tu-uḥ-ša-aš i-da-a-lu i-na-an DINGIR ^{MEŠ}

30 [NÍ.T]E-az ar-ḥa QA-TAM-MA pár-ku-nu-wa-an-du

Edited by Christiansen, *Ambazzi* pp. 44–45.

¹⁰⁷ See ch. 3, n. 77, for transliteration.

416), or coming from the patient (in CTH 433.1). One exception to this may be in CTH 390A, Ayatarša's ritual, in which she washes the child's mouth before pouring in her purgative medicine; there is no indication in the preserved portions of this text that the child's sickness has been brought on by evil words.

4.6: Evil as something separate from the body

There are some rites where evil is metaphorically considered to be a separate object, not necessarily inside or on the patient's body. That object is then destroyed or rendered inert, or its qualities invoked in some way, and the action or qualities are transferred to the evil (usually by means of an incantation; for more on this topic, see ch. 3). These objects are sometimes already-existing items (e.g., fire, pots, cloth), but may also be figurines constructed specifically for the purpose of the ritual, often by the Old Woman during the ritual proceedings.

One of the common metaphors for evil during these rites is fire. A representative example can be found at the very beginning of CTH 391, the ritual of Ambazzi:

I pour ^{GIŠ}*huwalli*¹⁰⁸ into a red DILIM.GAL-vessel. I pour *halki*- and *karaš*-grains on top, and they roast them. I extinguish the ^{GIŠ}*huwalli*- with water, and I say:

“Just as I have extinguished these things, likewise may the evil above the patients be extinguished!”¹⁰⁹

The metaphor of extinguished fire → extinguished evil has already been seen several times in ch. 3. The same fire metaphor is also found in CTH 398, CTH 324, CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, and possibly in Tablet 5 of CTH 780.II, Allaituraḥḥi's ritual (quite fragmentary, and the incantation is in Hurrian, and very opaque). Fire makes for an excellent ritual metaphor: it is easily characterized as harmful, and also easily and visibly conquered.

¹⁰⁸ Meaning unclear, although the determinative suggests it is a type of wood. Christiansen (*Ambazzi*, 86–89, with an extensive summary of previous discussion) suggests juniper-wood, while Haas (*Materia*, 288) suggests charcoal.

¹⁰⁹ Transliterated in Christiansen, *Ambazzi*, p. 34.

Another possible metaphor is evil as a vessel of some kind, which may be smashed. For example, in CTH 404.1, the ritual of Maštigga, she takes seven vessels, fills them with wine, olive oil, honey, dates, raisins, sinew, salt, and tallow. She then pours them into the hearth, and smashes them, while reciting the incantation, “May they shatter—the vessels together with the mouth (and) tongue!”¹¹⁰ The “mouth” and “tongue” represent the curses the patients spoke to one another. A few paragraphs later in the ritual, Maštigga waves a pot over the patients’ heads and puts a bowl at their feet, and she says, “Here, the pot is a *tarpalli*-substitute for your head, (and) here is the bowl: you will crack all the words with your feet!”¹¹¹ She smashes the pot, and the patients smash the bowl with their feet, and she says, “Let them break—all the words and the curses!” (For *tarpalli*-substitutes, see ch. 3.) A similar passage is found in CTH 788, Šalašu’s ritual, in which Šalašu waves (*šer arḥa wahnu*) a vessel over the patient and says, “Like the *ḥupuwai*-vessel let them shatter,” followed by a fragmentary list of evils, “let them shatter like the *ḥupuwai*-vessel!”¹¹² The following sentence is broken, but one can assume she or the patient smashes the vessel. Vessels are likewise smashed without preserved incantations in CTH 390A, Ayatarša’s ritual, and CTH 761, the Luwian “Great Ritual.” The cathartic ritual force of smashing dishware should be easily understood.

Sometimes, rather than vessels, the evil is represented with a figurine. In Hittite ritual thought, evil was often conceived as “tongues,” which represented the curses, sorcery, or harmful speech that the ritual was addressing. “Tongue” is a general term for harmful speech in Hittite ritual (see, for example, Tunawiya’s list of harmful forces including “tongues” of

¹¹⁰ See ch. 3, n. 157 for transliteration.

¹¹¹ See ch. 3, n. 250 for transliteration.

¹¹² The Hittite in this passage is quite broken, but for once it may be confidently restored based on the Hurrian; see M. Giorgieri, “Die erste Beschwörung der 8. Tafel des Šalašu-Rituals,” in *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi 10/2*, ed. D.I. Owen and G. Wilhelm, *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians 9* (Bethesda: CDL Press, 1998), 71–86, for a detailed transliteration, translation, and commentary; see also D. Campbell, *Mood and Modality in Hurrian*, *Languages of the Ancient Near East 5* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 142, for a similar translation.

various people, above),¹¹³ and the evil resulting from this speech could therefore be concretized as a figurine of an actual tongue. These figurines may be made of dough, wax, clay, iron, or lead, and are present in CTH 402, CTH 404.1, 404.2, and 404.4, CTH 409.I, CTH 416, CTH 760.II, and several ritual fragments, although the actions toward them are not always well-preserved or understandable. The purpose of tongues is clearest in Maštigga's ritual against domestic quarrel, CTH 404.1, in which she makes tongues of dough, wax, and clay. Throughout the ritual, they are placed on and near the ritual patients, removed (see above), and ultimately twisted, broken, burned, and fixed with pegs, to symbolize the defeat of the ritual patients' evil words toward each other. Other attestations are more difficult: for example, in CTH 416, iron tongues are put in the king and queen's mouths, but whether they symbolize sorcery from outside or misguided speech from the king and queen themselves is unclear (see ch.1). In CTH 402, the ritual of Allī, the leather hunting-bag is full of tongues, but its purpose and usage is not very clear, and the text is fragmentary at that point, making interpretation more difficult. In CTH 409.I, tongues are held over the ritual patient, but the incantation is not written out on the tablet. The other attestations are even more fragmentary and difficult.

Evil omens could be made into figurines; in CTH 393, the ritual of the augur's mother Anniwiyanni, they are made into birds (in which the birds are buried out on the steppe), and this parallel may perhaps be applied to CTH 398, the ritual of Huwarlu, above: the omens are given *some* form as figurines, not specified, and put in a vessel of oil along with a figurine of (probably) a donkey to defeat them. In KBo 41.42 (CTH 470, ritual fragments), divine "angers" are made into figurines, but the text is fragmentary and there is unfortunately no indication of what they look like or what happens to them. Other, miscellaneous forms for evil can be found in, e.g., CTH 780.II, Allaiturahhi (she kicks over clay vessels and unravels a rope: "the sorcerer

¹¹³ Also see Mouton, "Sorcellerie," 113–14 for a discussion of "evil tongues" and evil speech as sorcerous method.

built up sorcery like a tower; he twined it together like a rope...I have toppled his sorcerous words like a tower; I have unraveled them like a rope”¹¹⁴). In Maštigga’s ritual against domestic dispute, CTH 404.1, she erects *huwaši*-stones, which are likened to the evil words, and the patrons knock them over.

In some cases, the concretized evil is not destroyed. Rather, some metaphorical action is performed on an item, and an analogy is invited. In these cases, there is often a clearer connection between the item and the problem; for example, in CTH 759, the *dupaduparša*-ritual, the Old Woman pours a combination of wine, sesame oil, and honey down through a complicated setup of receptacles (some of which are sieve-like, allowing the liquid to pass through), over cracked grain resting inside a reed container, while she recites (in Luwian): “The one who spoke *hirut*- and cursed (the patient): Let the wine, honey, and [sesame?] oil flow! Let them [bec]ome oil (and) [honey]: the *tapāru*-curse, the [*hir*]ūt-curse, (and) the [*tatarriyamman*-curse] of the dead (and) the livi[ng, ...]”¹¹⁵

We seem to see something similar in CTH 450, the royal funerary ritual.¹¹⁶ This ritual makes extensive use of agricultural imagery, best attested in Day 7,¹¹⁷ where straw or chaff is burned; in Day 8, where “the pig diverts water” (see below), and a “meadow” is cut (see below); in Day 9, which is quite fragmentary but seems to be about churning butter; in Day 10, which features a plow and a threshing-floor; perhaps in Day 11, which is only attested in the outline and features something untranslatable for a male death and a flower for a female death; in Day 12, in which a grape-vine is cut; and in Days 13 and 14, which feature some kind of ground-dwelling

¹¹⁴ For transliteration, see ch. 3 n. 330.

¹¹⁵ For transliteration, see ch. 3 n. 159.

¹¹⁶ Entitled, in Hittite, *šalliš waštaiš*, “great wrong,” and therefore well in line with the Old Women’s function of addressing supernatural problems.

¹¹⁷ It should be noted that the contents of Day 3 are disputed (see ch. 3n139), Day 4 is extremely fragmentary, and Days 5 and 6 are not preserved at all.

birds (*lahhanza* or ^{MUŠEN}*HURRI*, depending on the season). Most of these actions are somehow fragmentary, but the Old Woman is certainly involved with the straw (she brings the ashes to the deceased), and speaks incantations concerning the pig and the meadow on Day 8. When the plow is burned on Day 10, she again disposes of the ashes, and the Old Woman's liturgy tablet (KUB 39.41) preserves a fragmentary incantation about the plow and the threshing; there is also another very fragmentary incantation featuring a heap of something, feeding, and an ox on this tablet; these actions are not preserved in the main text. A very fragmentary incantation on Day 12 is identical to parts of her incantations on Day 8. The contents of the incantations suggest that these items are intended to provide the royal personage with plenty in the afterlife; for example, on Day 8, a piece of field is cut and the Old Woman holds the turf with a bread-offering to the Sun-God, and says, "Also, Sun-God, have this meadow made right for him/her! Let no one take (it) from him/her (or) sue! Let the oxen and sheep, horses, (and) mules graze on this meadow for him!"¹¹⁸ These items are disposed of in the place where heads of oxen and horses have already been burned. The incantations seem to be concerned with setting the royal personage up appropriately in the afterlife. In this case, therefore, the incantations are imposing positive physical objects onto a noncorporeal/divine space: using a physical piece of turf to create a divine meadow in the afterlife.

4.6.1: Evil as an invader

Evil can also be conceived of as something encroaching on the patient, to be protected against; the figurine of the puppy in CTH 398, placed on the palace door to guard against evil throughout the night, is one example of this. Another can be found in Maštigga's ritual against

¹¹⁸ KUB 30.24+ ii 1 ku-un-na-wa-aš-ši Ú.SAL-LAM^dUTU-uš a-a-ra i-ia-an ḫar-ak

2 nu-wa-ra-aš-ši-iš-ša-an šar-ri-iz-zi ḫa-an-na-ri le-e

3 ku-iš-ki nu-wa-aš-ši-kán ke-e-da-ni A-NA Ú.SAL GU^{HLA} UDU^{HLA}-ia

4 ANŠE.KUR.RA^{rMES} ANŠE.GİR.NUN.NA^{HLA} ú-še-ed-du

Ed. Kassian et al., *Hittite Funerary Ritual*: šalliš waštaiš, AOAT 288 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002), 384–85.

domestic quarrel, CTH 404.1, in which a piglet is killed with the analogy that it will no longer see the sky, or other piglets, and “Likewise, also let the evil curses not see these ritual patients!”¹¹⁹—the curses are now unable to find the patient from wherever they might be, wandering around. Similarly, in CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, there is the analogy to the newborn puppy: “Just as this puppy’s eyes are stuck together, and it has not yet seen the sky, and it has not (even) already seen its mother’s teat”—she calls the person she is treating by name—“also let the evil day, the short year, the anger of the gods, and the tongue of the *panku* not ever see this person’s [vig]orous knee [amon]g their twelve body parts!”¹²⁰ Another possible example of this appears in the extremely fragmentary CTH 435, the ritual to the Sun-God, in which the Old Woman asks that the patient be “covered,” “encircled,” and “girded,” though the text is too broken to discover with what, but the actions appear to be protective.

4.7: Sorcerers

One clear example of evil as something separate from the patient’s body is that of an evil person: a sorcerer. The Old Women’s specialty in defeating sorcerers has already been discussed in ch. 3; however, now it can be seen that their methods are essentially identical to how they address any other inaccessible evil. Most commonly, they make anthropomorphic (*šena*-) figurines out of clay, dough, wax, or fat. These figurines represent the sorcerer, and are the

¹¹⁹ KBo 39.8 ii 47

nu ku-u-ša

48 *BE-EL* SÍSKUR i-da-a-[(la-u-e-eš)] ḫu-ur-ta-uš *QA-TAM-MA*

49 le-e ú-[(wa-an)]-zi

With restorations from KBo 2.3++ (404.1.II.A) ii 1–2; see Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 76–77.

¹²⁰ KBo 9.125+HT 6 i 21’ ka-a-aš-ma UR.TUR ma-aḫ-ḫa-an IGI^H[(^{LA}-wa an-da)] da-me-in-kán-za na-a-ú-i ne-pí-iš a-u[(š-zi)]

22’ na-a-ú-i-ma ta-ga-an-zi-pa-a[n] a-uš-zi na-a-ú-i-ma-za an-na-aš

23’ ti-i-ta-an ḫu-u-da-a-a[k] a-uš-zi

24’ [n]u an-ni-eš-ki-iz-zi ku-i[n an-t]u-uḫ-ša-an na-an-kán *ŠUM-ŠU* te-ez-zi

25’ [k]u-u-un-na-wa an-tu-uḫ-š[a-a]n i-da-a-lu-uš UD-az ma-ni-in-ku-wa-a-an-za MU^{HIA}-za

26’ [DINGI]R^{MEŠ}-aš kar-pí-iš pa-a[n-ga]-u-wa-aš EME-aš le-e ku-wa-pí-ik-ki a-uš-zi

27’ [*A-N*]*A* 12 ^{UZU}[U]R^{HIA} [ma-i]a-an-da-an gi-nu-uš-^ši¹-in

With restorations from dup. KUB 35.149. Edited Beckman, “The Hittite ‘Ritual of the Ox,’” pp. 42 and 48.

subject of analogic magical acts; for example, as seen in CTH 402, the ritual of Allī, the sorcery is turned back on its caster by Allī wrapping different colors of threads around a figurine to send the effects back to him or her. In that case, there are different figurines prepared for whether the sorcerer is a man or a woman, one male, one female. In CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya's "ritual of the river," figurines of the sorcerer are made of wax and fat, and melted, with an incantation to transfer this effect onto the sorcerer as well (see above). A similar situation can be seen in CTH 760.II, in which the Old Woman takes two figurines and holds them up to the Sun-God, libates, and says (in Luwian):

"Give them to the lord [...] of the sun¹²¹: the enemies, the vengeful ones, the lords of the words (and) of spells, of *taparu*-words, of *tatariyamman*-words, (and) of *hirut*-words, the ones who enslaved him/her, who distrained him/her, the patient, (and his/her) figure, *mīšan*-body part, bone, *halhalzani*-body part, strength, mobility, eyelash, eyebrow, (and) divine path (i.e., fate).

"If (s)he is alive, let the Sun-God deliver him/her up. If (s)he is dead, then let the Sun-Goddess of the Earth deliver him/her, the lord of *tatariyaman* and *hirut*." ¹²²

¹²¹ Melchert and Yakubovich both interpret this odd and broken apparent divine name (note the lack of a DINGIR!) as a vocative, as does Starke (see also the parallel he cites, ^dHuwaššanna *BELIYA* tiwalya, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, p. 152 n. 49) but I think the passage as a whole makes much better sense if it is interpreted as a dative, which is formally identical in any case.

¹²² KUB 35.45 ii 18 x x EN-ia ti-wa¹-a-¹li¹-ia pi-¹ia¹-aš LÚ.KÚR^{MES}-in-¹zi¹
 19 kat-¹ta-wa-at¹-na-al-li-in-za ú-ut-na-aš-ši-in-za hi-iš-¹hi-ša-aš-ši-i[n]-za
 20 ta-pa-ru-wa-aš-¹ši-in¹-za ta-a-ta-ri-ia-am-ma-na-aš-ši-in-za hi-i-ru-t[a-aš]-ši-in-za
 21 EN^{MES}-an-za ku-i-ša-an ša-aḥ-¹ḥa-ni-iš-ša-at-ta ku-i-ša-an
 22 ip-pa-tar-ri-ša-at-ta EN ¹SÍSKUR¹-aš-ši-in ALAM-ša mi-i-ša-an-za
 23 ḥa-aš-ša ḥal-¹ḥa-za-ni-in ú-wa-ra-an-na-¹hi-ša i-ú-na-¹hi-ša
 24 la-al-pi-in ku-wa-an-na-ni-in ma-aš-ša-na-al-li-in KASKAL-an

25 ma-a-na-aš ḥu-i-du-wa-li-iš šar-¹ri¹-ia-an ^dUTU-za da-ra-u-id-du
 26 ma-a-na-aš ú-la-an-ti-iš a-an ti-ia-¹am¹-ma-aš-ši-iš ^dUTU-za da-ra-ú-id-du¹
 27 ¹ta-ta-ri¹-ia-am-ma-na-aš-ši-in hi-ru-ta-aš-ši-in EN-an
 See also Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, 152–53.

Following this, the old Woman sets the *šena*-figurines at the patient's feet, places the beer at the offering-table, and then begins some kind of action with red and [blue?] wool which unfortunately breaks away almost immediately. However, it is clear that the figurines are meant to represent the evil person or people.

However, this does not mean that anthropomorphic figurines must always represent a sorcerer: figurines may also be substitutes for the ritual patient. For example, in CTH 404.3, Maštigga's ritual against bloodshed, two figurines are made of dough, placed before the deity Apritta, and declared to be substitutes (*tarpalli-*) for the offender; they are then broken into pieces. Substitute-figurines are also treated in CTH 448.2, before the living human substitutes are brought out, but the incantation over them is not written on the tablet and their ultimate disposal is not included/preserved. There are also small figurines of deities (to be distinguished from statues that might be present in a temple, which may also be found in Old Woman rituals such as e.g. CTH 439, the ritual for Anzili and Zukki); for example, in CTH 434, the ritual against an evil fate-goddess, there is a small figurine of the "evil fate-goddess of naming" (perhaps the one named in the ritual? or perhaps one who has named the ritual patient, i.e., designated him as destined for an evil fate?), which is dressed in women's clothes. Likewise, in Allaituraḥḥi's model garden, she sets up small figures of the Sun-Goddess of the Earth and other deities, although the ultimate treatment of the divine figurines in either of these rituals is not preserved.

In addition to figurines not always representing sorcerers, sorcerers were not always represented by figurines. As already noted in ch. 3, nonhuman metaphors could be used for human antagonists. In CTH 458.1, the same analogy that has already been quoted more than once, of an extinguished fire, is used, only instead of "the evil" being likewise extinguished, it is the enemy. In CTH 759, the Luwian *dupaduparša*-ritual, the sorcerer is a reed vessel, which is

crushed while the Old Woman recites, “Whoever carries out evil on the ritual patron, let the gods break him like¹²³ pieces of reed...”¹²⁴ In CTH 418, arrows are placed face-down in a vessel, and the Old Woman says, “May the gods likewise hurl the foreigner who committed an offense against the king and queen face-down!”¹²⁵ Note that in these last two examples, divine aid is called upon in addition to the analogic force of the ritual act.

4.8: Disposal

We have already seen disposal in Old Woman rituals: in the case of evil being a vessel that is smashed, a fire that is extinguished, or a figurine that is destroyed, the evil is disposed of during the course of the act. In the scapegoat rituals (see ch. 3), disposal is accomplished during the course of the rite as well: the animal is killed and buried, burned, or driven away, taking the evil with it.

However, in the most complete rituals, there is usually (CTH 391, CTH 398, CTH 402, CTH 409.I, and CTH 416) a point where most of the items used in the ritual are disposed of all at once. Sometimes they are not listed: CTH 391 just states that Ambazzi pours out the *kuptar* (i.e., the remains or garbage), without saying what specifically is included or where it goes. Similarly, Allī’s ritual, CTH 402, has two disposal rites, and in one, the items being disposed are called the “ritual implements” (*aniuraš* KIN^{III.A}), which are buried in the earth and fixed in place with pegs, while in the other (extremely fragmentary) rite, they are again called *kuptar*. At least in the first rite, however, Allī’s incantation explicitly states that she is burying the sorcery, to be held in place by the dark earth forever. In CTH 398, the items are listed: the roasted seeds, the bread and

¹²³ This is in my opinion the most likely meaning of this word, particularly in this context; Yakubovich (“The reading of Luwian *ARHA* and Related Problems,” *Altorientalische Forschungen* 39:2 (2012): 327ff.) has suggested that it may instead be an intensifier.

¹²⁴ KUB 9.6+ iii 25 ku-iš-tar ma-al-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ša-an-za-an EN-ia
26 a-ad-du-wa-la a-an-ni-ti a-an DINGIR^{MEŠ}-in-zi

27 a-aḫ-ḫa na-a-ta-at-ta ta-ta-ar-ḫa-an-du

See Yakubovich, *ibid.*, and Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte*, 115.

¹²⁵ See ch. 3, note 151, for transliteration.

the grain, the balls of various substances, and the cloth are all poured out onto the steppe to be left for carrion animals. Not included are the Old Woman's basket or the knife she (presumably) used to cut off the cloth earlier in the rite, so it seems as though her tools are exempt from disposal. (The puppy of tallow and the live puppy are also not included; however, they are brought out onto the steppe and used in the second half of the ritual, where it seems as though the live puppy is sacrificed.) In CTH 409.I, there is a similar list of items—the combs, the *šarra*-, the eagle's wing, the clothing, the *šena*-figurines—that are dumped in the river, but the list also includes the *kuptar*, which could include anything else. At least two of the animals used in the ritual, interestingly, are burned instead; therefore, it seems as though in general, animals are disposed of separately from objects. (There are no animals used in Allī's ritual, except during the sacrificial meal at the end. Ambazzi's ritual includes the scapemouse, which is released, as well as offerings.) In CTH 416's first two rites (the only ones with the endings preserved), only the clay figurines and the cups used in the rituals are disposed off; they are buried and in the better-preserved second rite, fixed in place with pegs with an incantation similar to Allī's, equating the buried items with the evils removed in the ritual and appealing to the gods to keep them away in the future.

These disposals happen at specific moments during the ritual. In CTH 391, the *kuptar* is poured out after all of the rites to draw out evil have been done, just before the offering-sequence (which happens in “a different place”). In 398, the items are disposed of after they leave the palace, as they arrive on the steppe for the second half of the rite, and once again precedes an offering-sequence. In CTH 402, there are two disposals; one immediately follows the long sequence of various-colored wool, and precedes an offering-sequence asking that the patient be protected and the sorcery remain fixed in the ground and not come back; the second, very

fragmentary sequence, comes at the very end of the ritual, right before the patient bathes and they have the sacrificial meal. In CTH 416, disposal also happens at the end of each individual rite and is followed by a sacrificial meal. In CTH 409.I, on the other hand, the disposal happens right before the passing-through rite with the gates of the hawthorn and *alanza(n)*-wood—though these are followed by offerings. It seems, therefore, that disposals are required before offering-sequences, which is understandable from several perspectives: (1) that the impurity needs to be gone from the vicinity of the participants before they entreat the gods; (2) that appeal to the gods is a punctuating final moment in the ritual (or in a specific section of the ritual), and disposal is the last thing that needs to be done for the removal of contamination, and therefore logically precedes offering; (3) that the gods' help is particularly required to keep the evil from returning, and so offerings are most needed at the moment when the removal of evil seems to have been accomplished (perhaps best-supported by the incantations in CTH 402 and CTH 416); (4) that disposal marks the last moment of the Old Woman's own personal physically-based ritual skills, which (as noted in ch. 3) do not often involve appeals to the deities, and therefore once she is finished, the deities may be called upon without interrupting her own work. Any or all of these considerations may be at work in this ritual structure.

There is one final well-preserved rite to consider, and that is CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual against domestic quarrel. This text is an exception. Maštigga's ritual happens next to a hearth, and she disposes of her ritual implements as she is finished with each one; e.g., she takes a fish, recites an incantation that analogizes the fish's removal from the sea with the curses' removal from the ritual patients, and then throws the fish into the hearth. The disposal is not part of the analogy; she does not say, "Just as this fish is destroyed, so let the evil likewise be destroyed." Throwing the fish in the hearth at the end of the rite is disposal of a ritual implement

similar to those seen in the rituals above, and this is how Maštigga punctuates many of her individual rites, all throughout the text. There is no larger disposal rite at the end of Maštigga's text—just as there is no larger sacrificial rite, only smaller offerings throughout. Maštigga's ritual, therefore, does not share the larger structural similarities seen in CTH 391, CTH 398, CTH 402, and CTH 409.I. This may be true of other, less-complete rituals as well; for example, in the fragmentary CTH 418, the ritual for if a foreigner commits an offense against the king and queen, there is a disposal of *kuptar* (placed in a small pot and buried on the steppe), which is followed by a passing-through rite and an offering sequence—however, at the very end of the text, after a long break, there is another “pouring out” of evil, after which there is the analogy where arrows are turned face-down into a vessel, and the Old Woman says, “May the gods likewise hurl the foreigner who committed an offense against the king and queen face-down!”¹²⁶ Only then does the text end. None of the complete rituals has a final analogic rite, after the last sacrificial meal. Another departure from this structure is seen in CTH 433.2, the ritual to cleanse the augurs, in which the Old Woman places fat-bread in the augurs' mouths and lays it before the tutelary deity, speaks her incantation to wipe the augurs' mouths clean with the fat-bread, and then disposes of it in the hearth; this is not followed by an offering-sequence, but is rather reminiscent of Maštigga's disposal as she goes. Therefore, it seems as though there was a structure to some of the Old Woman rituals, seen in the rites of Ambazzi, Allī, Huwarlu, and Tunnawiya (note that there is no geographical or linguistic consistency among these texts), but it was not a rigid requirement.

4.9: Offerings

Offerings to the gods are part of every single Old Woman ritual. Breaking bread and pouring libations are the most common acts of sacrifice, followed by killing a sheep or a goat,

¹²⁶ See ch. 3 for transliteration.

cooking it, offering parts of it (usually the liver and heart) to the gods, and having a meal. As noted above, there also seem to be structural requirements for offerings in some texts. CTH 391, for example, contains a sequence of three nearly-identical rituals, addressed to three different deities. There is no offering at the beginning of the text; however, the practitioner pours a libation for the new deity at the beginning of the second and third ritual, perhaps to switch gears. The main offerings, however, are at the end of each ritual: a meal, where breads and parts of a cooked goat are arranged on foliage for several gods, including the divinity on whom the ritual is focused, and bits of precious metals and stones poured out. The offerings are accompanied by incantations to obtain the divinity's goodwill.

CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya's "Ritual of the River," is similarly bracketed by offerings. At the beginning of the ritual, just after the list of ritual materials, she goes to collect the final necessary items, clay from the river and the spring. She offers bread, cakes with fat, and wine to DINGIR.MAH of the river-bank and to the spring. There follow the ritual actions, and at the end of the ritual, she returns to the river and the spring with offerings of thanks. Next are bread- and libation-offerings and appeals to the Sun-God to help the ritual patron in the future, and then a similar sequence of offerings as in CTH 391, with bread, cheese, beer or wine, and a cooked sheep and a lamb, with a meal and drinking to the river-goddess, ^dMAH of the river-bank. Insofar as it is complete, CTH 416, the Old Hittite ritual for the royal couple, seems also fairly similar: although none of the three rituals whose beginnings are preserved start with offerings, all three of the rituals with preserved endings end with offerings. Though one is somewhat fragmentary, and none of them are as detailed in their descriptions as CTH 391 or CTH 409, the sequences seems similar, with bread, libations, and a sheep slaughtered for a meal, with parts offered to the gods.

At first, CTH 402 seems slightly different; there are no offerings at the beginning, but there are offerings midway through the text, as well as at the end. However, the ritual does begin with a verbal appeal to the Sun-God for help, although it is not accompanied by offerings. In addition, it is clear that—similar to CTH 391 and CTH 416—the mid-ritual offerings punctuate the end of one set of ritual actions and the beginning of another. After Allī performs the action with the woolen threads wrapped around figurines and disposes of all of the ritual equipment in the ground (see above), she breaks bread for chthonic deities, for the Sun-God, and for deities of the road and the gate (to keep sorcery from coming in along those paths, judging from the preserved parts of the accompanying incantations). Then she smashes a vessel (to indicate finality?), and then they come in from the steppe to the ritual patron’s home, where she begins the next set of ritual actions, which involve putting things under the patron’s bed. The offerings mark a change of method and of location, and even somewhat of purpose: the first set of actions is focused primarily on transferring the sorcery back to the sorcerer, while the second is focused on protecting the patient. Once this second series is over, there is another (quite fragmentary) disposal of ritual implements, ritual bathing, and then a major offering, once again with a lamb cooked, and parts of it offered (along with bread) to the Sun-god. The text follows this offering sequence with, “[Whe]n they have finished the treatment of the wax figurines...” (one of the pieces of the equipment) and then goes into a final set of offerings, which again involves a sheep slaughtered and cooked with bread and libations, this time for DINGIR.MAH of the river-bank. Therefore, it seems as though the first set of offerings is the final act of the ritual conducted in the house, and the second set of offerings punctuates the entire ritual contained in the text.

CTH 398, the ritual of Ḫuwarlu, is similar. There is no offering at the beginning; however, there is again a change of location, this time from the house to the steppe. After all the

ritual items used in the house are disposed out on the steppe, there is a fragmentary sequence of offerings involving bread and libations arranged on foliage and a slaughtered goat. There follows a passing-through rite with a hawthorn gate, and other fragmentary actions, then ritual bathing, and finally offerings of bread and various (aromatic?) plants to the Sun-God. In this case, two sets of offerings, one for the second half and one for the entire ritual, do not seem to have been necessary.

CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual against domestic quarrel, as noted above under "Disposal," is noticeably different. Rather than offerings punctuating the end of major sections of the ritual, there are ongoing offerings throughout the text. There is an offering of bread, cheese, and wine at the beginning accompanying an appeal to the Sun-God for help with the ritual, but no offering at all at the end. In addition, there is no meal at all; instead, animals are used in this ritual as vehicles for disposal: when evil is transferred from the patient to the animal, it is either buried or burned in its entirety, and offerings of bread, wine, and (when the black sheep is burned) honey and olive oil are made into the pit or hearth where it is deposited. Although it is not made specific, based on the other rituals, it seems most likely that these offerings are to encourage whatever divinities are inhabiting the place the evil has gone (clearly down into the netherworld, in the case of the pits; perhaps up into the sky with the smoke, when they are burned?) to deal with it and keep it from coming back.

There is also a sequence of offerings in the series of analogic actions after the disposals are done; she shatters seven vessels and throws bread into the hearth with each; she consecrates a sheep for the sun-god and calls it a scapegoat, and breaks bread—but the sheep is not killed; rather, she "takes it for herself" (perhaps as payment, although this is not explicit in the text; see also ch. 3 on scapegoat disposal). She fixes seven copper pegs into the ground—as an analogy;

nothing else is deposited—an action which is framed with bread-, cheese-, and wine-offerings. Finally, there is the analogic toppling of seven *huwaši*-stones, again accompanied by bread- and wine-offerings. Although there are several ritual acts following this—one further analogy, two acts of purification, and a disposal—there are no more offerings. As already noted in ch. 3, however, it is very interesting that in CTH 404.2, the poorly-memorized analogue or notes for CTH 404.1, a ritual meal *is* preserved, so the structure of offerings seen in other texts, even though not required for Maštigga, was present in the mind of the person who memorized it.

4.10: Conclusion

Overall, it can be seen in these texts that the Old Women had a fairly consistent ritual method. Though many different materials, items, and tools may be used to accomplish the Old Women's goals, overall, the inventory of ritual actions is quite similar. For example, in every one of the most complete rituals, the Old Woman performs explicit analogic actions/incantations ("Just as this (physical action/reality is happening), so also let (metaphysical action/reality happen)!"). Every complete ritual also contains a transfer of evil from the patient to an object or animal, and there is always a corresponding ritual disposal. Every complete ritual also contains offerings and verbal appeals for divine help or cessation of anger. Most of these elements do not have to come in any particular order (though see the analysis of disposal and offerings, above), but there does seem to have been a regular set of "building blocks" of desired ritual actions. More specifically, the metaphorical frameworks used in the rituals are likewise fairly consistent: there is always a characterization of the evil as binding or burdening—that is, as a physical restraint on the patient's body—and (with the exception of CTH 416, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple) always a characterization of the evil as dirt. Evil as a separate object that may be destroyed is likewise found in every complete text. Evil was therefore conceived of as an

intruding force (as can likewise be seen from protective rites such as the guard dog in the ritual of Țuwarlu), a foreign object that infected, restrained, attacked, or otherwise harmed the patient until it was removed and/or destroyed—and once removed, was still dangerous and had to be disposed off.

On the other hand, the idea of evil as something *inside* the patient is more limited. Of the most complete rituals, it appears only in CTH 404.1, Maštigga's ritual, and CTH 416. It is, however, seen very commonly in some of the more fragmentary texts with Luwian characteristics: CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, CTH 760.II, and CTH 761. Evil as an invader is limited to CTH 398 (where this theme seems to be consistent with the idea of evil omens foretelling misfortune in the future), and CTH 404.1 and CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, where in both cases the metaphor is that evil should not be able to "see" the ritual patient, as a blind or a deceased animal cannot see. The physical elements of these rituals likewise vary: for example, disposal might be done into a river (CTH 409.I), into fire (CTH 404.1), into the ground (CTH 398, CTH 416), into a covered vessel (CTH 398, CTH 416, CTH 404.1) or simply by pouring the residue away (CTH 391). Transfer of evil might be to figurines (e.g., CTH 402, CTH 416), to an animal (e.g., CTH 404.1, 409.II), or to a hawthorn gate (e.g., CTH 409.I, CTH 398). Ritual washing or purification could be done with water from a vessel (CTH 404.1) or a river (CTH 398), with wine (CTH 409.I) or even with dough (CTH 404.1) or other substances (CTH 402).

The Old Women also often made the elements used in these rituals themselves: for example, in CTH 390.1 and CTH 788, Ayatarša and Šalašu mix together a number of plants; in Ayatarša's case, at least, she is making a medicine of some kind. Šalašu's ritual is unfortunately too fragmentary to tell what her mixture is used for, but it includes some of the same plants as Ayatarša's, so perhaps the purpose was the same. Țebattarakki (CTH 397), Allaituraḫḫi (CTH

780), and the practitioner of CTH 435, the ritual of the Sun-God, each make a dough-like mixture to plaster to the ritual patient. Hebattarakki also makes figurines, as does Tunnawiya in CTH 409.1 the practitioner of CTH 416, the Old Hittite ritual for the royal couple, and of KBo 41.42, an unidentified ritual fragment. Allī (CTH 402) and Maštigga (CTH 404) both make thread out of wool; Maštigga also makes tongues out of clay and wax; and she, Mallidunna (CTH 403) and the practitioner of CTH 416 make vessels to use in their rituals. Tunnawiya makes a hawthorn gate, as (perhaps) does the practitioner of CTH 433.1, although the text is fragmentary. The practitioner of CTH 433.2, and of CTH 416, both make bread. Finally, Allaituraḥḥi (CTH 780), in addition to the dough mentioned above, lays hearths, constructs complicated offering-piles of different types of earth and clay, and constructs a complex small model walled garden, with small figurines of the gods, which she also makes, set up inside it (though unfortunately, the text breaks before we can learn what it was used for).

In these texts, therefore, we can see creative variation within a very consistent, internally logical system. The Old Women's specialty was removing contamination and the problems it caused, and that contamination was considered to be attached to the patient somehow, on or in their body. This could not be done without the positive attention of the gods—who were sometimes part of the problem, in any case—but simply asking them to deal with the problem was not sufficient. The evil had to be concretized so that it could be physically accessed, and either removed from the body or destroyed. This was done using analogies easily understood by the patient and any spectators: extinguishing fire, spitting out something bad, untying or cutting a binding rope. However, none of the specific analogies was required over any other. Though some were shared across various rituals, like extinguishing fire etc., others were unique to a single practitioner or text: e.g., Tunnawiya tears off the patient's clothing; Maštigga removes a

fish from its water; Allī uses cloth as an all-encompassing metaphor; Ambazzi ties tin to a mouse with a bowstring; the Old Woman of Țuwarlu's ritual sets up a guard dog; Allaituraḥḥi physically wraps herself around the patient and wipes them off from head to toe. All of these acts are operating within the metaphor of evil as a physical thing that can be removed and kept away, but each practitioner addresses that metaphor with her own methods.

CONCLUSION

This dissertation has pursued two goals: (1) to establish as securely as possible the position and function of the Old Women in Hittite society, and (2) to better understand the system(s) of magic and divination the Old Women used. These two goals are necessarily closely connected: the Old Women's professional and social status must certainly have been related to the types of services they provided for the state. While certain conclusions have already been drawn, they have not yet been presented in conjunction with one another and with a comprehensive eye towards the dissertation's goals.

The Old Women's position in Hittite society

The near-complete lack of historical, legal, and/or prosopographical evidence for Old Women, outside of their position of ritual authors, makes this question difficult. There is no evidence for how one became an Old Woman, where the Old Women lived and/or worked, or even whether the Old Women truly had to be old. However, some things can be stated: the Old Women had a "chief" (GAL) and so they (or some of them) were likely part of an organization. This can be supported by the fact that in several texts, they can be seen to be working as a group: for example, the snake-oracle IBoT 1.33 states, "We asked Mezzulla and the Old Women" for corroborating evidence as to the snake-oracle's results about the bad omens for the king.¹ The king Muršili II requests in the plague prayers that the "Old Women" (among other diviners) find the cause of the plague.² In addition, in CTH 456.2, Ammā's ritual, it is stated that "the priests,

¹ See ch. 2, and Laroche, "Lécanomancie hittite," 154.

² "The sin that you have seen, O gods—either let an ecstatic come and tell of it, or let the Old Women, diviners, or augurs tell of it, or let a person see it in a dream" (KUB 24.3+ ii 19–20, w. dup. KUB 24.4 obv. 10–12; transliteration in CHD Š3 s.v. ^(L1)*šuniyant-*, p. 506).

the augurs, the Old Women and the ENSI-women”³ haven’t been able to sustain the patient’s life, but Ammā, Old Woman of the Sun-God,⁴ will do so (what this means about Ammā’s relationship to the rest of the Old Women is unclear). There are a few texts that attest Old Women working in concert: for example, in CTH 448, the invocation of the Sun-Goddess of the Earth, a group of Old Women recite incantations together; in CTH 450, the royal funerary ritual, two Old Women have a dialogue (the text says, “the Old Woman speaks facing her colleague” [araš]).⁵ Finally, as noted in chapter 1, Ḫattušili I admonishes the woman Ḫaštayar to stop “consulting the Old Women” for advice. Thus, there seems to have been some kind of organized group of Old Women, who had a leader (perhaps at the time of IBoT 1.33, it was Mezzulla?), and who could work separately or together. They also may have had different functions within that group (e.g., the “Old Woman of the Sun-god” attested above, and see the following paragraph).

The evidence of chapter 1, of the Old Hittite and the festival texts, has already demonstrated that the Old Women were operating in central Anatolia from the very beginning of the Hittite kingdom and perhaps before, and that they were officially employed by the Hittite state. The texts do also attest to Old Women from outside central Anatolia (from the north, the west, and the southeast, and even Syria) as ritual authors, who may or may not have been operating at Ḫattuša, but whose rituals were collected and recorded by the Hittite administration. If foreign Old Women did visit Ḫattuša and operate there, it would be well in line with Hittite policy, as there is also evidence for, e.g., Babylonian physicians living at Ḫattuša and leaving

³ See F. Fuscagni, hethiter.net/: CTH 456.2.

⁴ This is clearly the male Sun-God of heaven, since he is referred to as “king of heaven” and invoked as a judge.

⁵ See Kassian et al., *Hittite Funerary Ritual*, 266.

textual records of their medical expertise.⁶ However, the Old Women were also well-established in the native central Anatolian government hierarchy. The presence of an “Old Woman of the palace” in Zippalanda,⁷ for example, as well as an “Old Woman of Arinna,”⁸ and also the “Old Woman of the temple of Ziparwa”⁹ and the “Old Woman of the Sun-God” mentioned above, shows that the Old Women occupied official state and religious positions in the Hittite heartland.

The evidence of the ritual texts (see chs. 3 and 4) only serves to corroborate this: several texts are explicitly for treating the king and/or the queen for sorcery, contamination, sin, divine anger, etc. (CTH 391.3, CTH 398, CTH 409.II, CTH 416, CTH 418, CTH 423, CTH 449, CTH 450, CTH 780.III, CTH 820), which in many cases involves intimate access to their bodies and their homes. The types of problems they addressed, both as ritual practitioners and as diviners, support this interpretation: angry deities, sorcery, sin, palace and family conflicts, sickness, succession issues, and military difficulties are all well-attested in the Old Women’s ritual and oracle texts (see chs. 2 and 3), and also well-attested in the historical texts as major problems that faced the Hittite royal family. Every king that we have a reasonable amount of evidence for, from Hattušili I to Šuppiluliyama II, dealt with some of these issues. It is therefore easy to see the Old Women as specialists whose main function was troubleshooting common problems high up in the Hittite social and political hierarchy.

This is further reinforced by the way their rituals are framed: “Thus Ms. [Personal Name], from [Geographic Area]: when there is [a problem], I treat it as follows.” This formula can be connected to the formula used to begin royal documents, and is very clearly intended to

⁶ See D. Schwemer, “Gauging the influence of Babylonian magic: The reception of Mesopotamian traditions in Hittite ritual practice,” in *Diversity and Standardization: Perspectives on social and political norms in the ancient Near East*, ed. E. Cancik-Kieschbaum, Jörg Klinger, and Gerfrid G.W. Müller (Akademie Verlag, 2013), 145–71.

⁷ See ch. 1, and Popko, *Zippalanda*, 108.

⁸ KBo 23.92+ iv 9’–13’; see ch. 1 for discussion.

⁹ KBo 17.47 obv. 1–3.

ascribe the content of the ritual text to an individual with the appropriate knowledge and authority to solve the intended problem. Old Women made up over a third of the named authors attested in the Hittite ritual corpus, more than any other profession, and were thus clearly considered to be a major source of ritual knowledge and skill. (See the Introduction for a more detailed discussion of ritual incipits.)

The Old Women's ritual method

The Old Women's rituals addressed human problems with supernatural origins. Those origins might be divine, in which case the ritual would pacify or distract the angry or malicious deity (e.g., in CTH 323, the Disappearance of the Sun-God), and perhaps purify the ritual patient, if guilt or contamination was a factor (e.g., in CTH 433, the ritual for the augurs). The origins of the problem might also be human, in which case the ritual would neutralize the sorcery or curses, and sometimes send them back onto the human antagonist (e.g., in CTH 402, the ritual of Allī). Sometimes a ritual would address both of these possibilities at once (e.g., CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, Tunnawiya's ritual for the king and queen; see Appendix B for a full list of the purposes of Old Woman rituals, and the introduction to ch. 3 for a detailed discussion). Both of these sources of difficulty, divine and human, were considered to be capable of causing sickness or general physical or mental distress in a patient. The Old Women were therefore healers of sickness; however, they did not practice "medicine" per se, in that they did not treat patients' body parts for specific illnesses,¹⁰ but rather removed guilt, contamination, sorcery, curses, and/or other evils that were thought to be causing the illness. The evidence also clearly demonstrates that they were the Hittites' foremost experts on sorcery and specialized in offensive magic against sorcerers (see chs. 3 and 4).

¹⁰ There is one exception: CTH 390A, Ayatarša's ritual.

Many of these texts are fragmentary, but the better-preserved texts such as the rituals authored by the women Ambazzi (CTH 391), Allī (CTH 402), Maštigga (CTH 404), and Tunnawiya (CTH 409), as well as by the augur Huwarlu (CTH 398) and the unattested author of CTH 416, allow us to gain a better understanding of what an Old Woman's ritual against evil might entail. The more fragmentary texts of Kuwattalla (CTH 759, CTH 761) and Allaituraḥḥi (CTH 780) still preserve enough material to contribute significantly to the picture, and what little is preserved of the many very fragmentary rituals does seem to be reasonably consistent with the less-broken texts. Essentially, the Old Women used a combination of two methods to combat evil (that is, sorcery, divine anger, and so on): (1) they imposed concrete metaphors on the evil, so as to transform it into something they could see and touch, and therefore remove and/or destroy, (2) they called upon other intangible forces (i.e., deities) to combat the evil for them. Most rituals of any significant preservation use both of these methods.

When concretizing evil, the Old Women would usually express the form that they desired it to take in words, while also enacting it physically; for example, they might say, "Just as I am extinguishing this fire, let the evil likewise be extinguished!" while extinguishing a fire. Any ritual is likely to have a combination of several different concrete metaphors imposed onto the evil (most commonly: evil as binding or burdening a patient, as dirt on the patient, as contamination inside the patient's body, or as a separate object to be destroyed) expressed in incantations with concomitant purificatory actions. The sense of this seems to be to address the evil in as many different ways as possible to be certain of achieving a result. Some rituals work with one overarching metaphor (in particular Allī's ritual, where supernatural power is represented as cloth; see ch. 3) that continues throughout the text—which does not, however, prevent other metaphors being used as well. Most common physical concretizations of evil

appear in several different Old Woman rituals without apparent pattern; however, the use of the scapegoat-animal as an analogue for the patient (thus to better take on their affliction) is restricted to rituals with Luwian-language elements, so far as it is attested.

When calling upon a deity to help eradicate the evil, the Old Women might appeal directly, with offerings, or they might recite a *historiola*, a myth in which the problem (or a similar one) is resolved, or in which divine attention is brought to the present situation. The supernatural world was thereby imposed upon the physical reality of the ritual. *Historiolae* were not a requirement; several of the Old Women rituals do not contain them. However, direct appeals to a god or gods were always used. These appeals usually bracketed the ritual, or major sections of the ritual, while the concretizing ritual acts above were usually performed without direct appeal or offerings. In this way, the Old Women could demonstrate divine support for their actions, and their close relationship with certain deities, while still emphasizing their own personal knowledge and skill (see ch. 3).

It can be seen, therefore, that the Old Women's ritual method was a complex interaction of various techniques, going far beyond a rigid set of dualisms such as pure-impure, fruitful-unfruitful, bound-released, etc.¹¹ Rather, evil was characterized in many different ways using analogic comparisons, and combated with a number of physical techniques, while concurrently, positive forces were brought to bear on the patient, also using several different methods. The system of thought behind the Old Women's ritual method was, in fact, quite versatile.

The Old Women's oracle method

The Old Women also performed a method of divination known as KIN-oracles (see ch. 2), in which they solicited divine opinion on state decisions, including succession procedures,

¹¹ Hittite ritual is characterized thus by Haas, "Magie und Zauberei. B. Bei den Hethitern," in *RIA* 7 (1987–1990): 235. See the Introduction for more specific discussion of this point.

military campaigns, and official cult practice. They may also have functioned in an advisory capacity on their own merits, although this is more difficult to be certain about. The KIN-oracle system consisted of manipulating symbols that represented the relationship between humans and gods; the symbols were embodiments of divine favor and anger, of the king and important human actors, of specific deities, and of positive and negative forces and results. When a question was asked (for example: “Will the king be safe at Ḫattuša over the winter? Let it be favorable”), the symbols would interact with one another to produce a favorable or unfavorable answer (for example: “Ḫannaḫanna arose, took goodness, and placed it in the deity’s anger. Unfavorable”). The physical manifestations of the symbol’s interactions are not described in the texts, so it remains unclear whether the Old Women were casting lots, manipulating some other kind of tokens, releasing animals into an enclosure, or another form of divinatory action.

However, the relevance of the symbols themselves is quite clear. Divine favor was overwhelmingly important for the Hittites, and disasters of any kind were frequently attributed to divine anger. The oracle questions, as well as other genres of Hittite literature such as prayers, reveal a deep concern about whether the gods had truly revealed their feelings on important matters, or whether they might be concealing something. The KIN-oracle symbols reflect these concerns: symbols such as “divine favor” and its opposite “divine anger,” and “hidden anger” and its opposite “wholeheartedness” (lit. “the whole soul”) exist alongside symbols such as “the king,” “the *panku*” (perhaps “community” or “nobility”), and “sin.” There are also symbols of specific favors such as “(long) life,” “well-being,” “vigor,” and specific punishments such as “great sickness,” “small sickness,” (perhaps) “blood,” etc. The main deities present in the system are Ḫannaḫanna (DINGIR.MAH), in a positive role (perhaps as an intercessor or problem-solver, which would be consistent with her role in Hittite mythology; see below) and the Sun-God of

Heaven, in a negative role (perhaps in his capacity as a judge, responding to human sin?). The system as a whole therefore represents the Hittite royalty's relationship with the divine, and the Old Women's command of it demonstrates their crucial role at the center of that relationship.

Rituals and oracles

Some consistency can be seen between the Old Women's ritual expertise and their oracular expertise. In both cases, one of their main concerns is divine anger; another is the well-being of the king and the royal family. Both sets of texts are heavily focused on maintaining a good relationship between the king and the gods. (This, it should be noted, is no doubt a result of the fact that our texts were produced by the Hittite state and therefore record the Old Women's practice as it was relevant to them.) The oracles are less concerned with sorcery than the rituals are, and the oracles address specific questions of military and political procedure, while the rituals do not (except insofar as the gods are involved¹²), so the overlap is not total, but it is clear that solving problems between the king and the gods was a major part of the Old Women's professional responsibilities. In some cases, specific problems can be seen in both an oracle and a ritual text, as, for example, "the anxiety of the king" used as a symbol in the Old Hittite oracle KBo 18.151, and the royal couple's "pain, woe, and anxiety" as the problem addressed in CTH 416, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple.

The standard set of symbols used in the KIN-oracles (see ch. 2) can also be closely related to the ritual texts: once again, divine anger is a familiar problem in rituals, and divine favor is often requested specifically. The possibility of "hidden" problems such as anger or sin, seen in the KIN-oracle symbols, can perhaps be related to rituals such as Tunnawiya's CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, where the problem is unknown, and a long list of possibilities (including divine anger and the ritual patient's own misstep) are put forth as potential causes. Positive

¹² For example, CTH 423, the invocation of enemy gods.

symbols such as life, health, and long years appear in requests for divine favor in the ritual texts (e.g., in CTH 391, CTH 448.2, CTH 760.II, CTH 762, and CTH 820) as well as in the KIN-oracle symbol system. One of the most common negative KIN-oracle symbols, sickness (“great” or “small”), is also one of the most common problems addressed by the Old Women in their rituals. In addition, “evocation” and bread- and wine-offerings are common symbols used in the KIN-oracles, whose relationship to ritual practice should be obvious. Finally, the main deities of the KIN-oracle system, Ḫannaḫanna and the Sun-God, are well-known from the Old Women’s ritual texts (see further below).

The smaller subsystem within the KIN-oracle system (see ch. 2) involves a limited number of symbols interacting with one another: good, evil, divine favor, divine anger, the king, Ḫannaḫanna, the Sun-God of Heaven, “long years” (=long life), and the “small sickness,” which may possibly refer to sickness of a single person (rather than “great sickness” as a plague; see ch. 2 for this and other possible interpretations). We can see in this subsystem something of an archetype for the Old Woman rituals: the Old Woman, treating the king for a sickness that is caused by evil and/or divine anger, solicits divine favor with the help of Ḫannaḫanna and/or the Sun-God¹³ so as to bring goodness and long life. Tunnawiya’s ritual for the king and queen, CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, is an excellent example of this (see ch. 3 for a detailed discussion of this text).

There is no evidence in the oracular symbols for one of the most important characteristics of the Old Women’s ritual practice, that is, the use of analogic techniques to concretize evil so it can be manipulated. However, it is still present in the oracles: not in the symbols, but in the oracular process itself. As noted above, we do not know what physical form the KIN-oracle

¹³ Though it is once again important to note that the Sun-God of Heaven appears to have a punishing role in the KIN-oracle system; however, this could still fit into the ritual setup if he were to be appeased by the ritual acts.

process took, but it must have involved some manipulation of objects that represented the concepts named in the method. We can therefore see that when acting as diviners, the Old Women used the same techniques as they used when acting as ritual practitioners: they concretized intangible concepts into physical items that could be affected and/or observed. The respective goals of the techniques were different: in the rituals, the intangible was concretized so that the Old Women could act upon it, whereas in the oracles, the intangible was concretized so that the Old Women could observe it acting. However, the method was the same.

This can be contrasted to other oracular techniques: all other Hittite oracular methods involve observing natural phenomena and taking certain aspects of it (i.e., liver lobes or bird flights) to be favorable or unfavorable. The only other oracles that name elements of the oracle method and make them symbols of something else are the rare snake-oracles, whose practitioners are unfortunately unattested (see ch. 2). Augury and extispicy, however—never practiced by Old Women, but rather by men—do nothing of the kind. This leads into a new and important point: situating the Old Women in context with other Hittite ritual practitioners. The Old Women’s focus and method has been outlined above, and it will be seen that certain elements of their expertise appear to be unique to them, while others are shared among different practitioners:

The Old Women vs. other female ritualists

Not all female ritualists were called ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI: there are several ritual texts with female authors that do not attest the word “Old Woman” anywhere. Of course, many of these texts are extremely fragmentary, which can make it difficult to tell whether a ritual was performed by an Old Woman or not, and even if it is clear, there may not be much content to compare. However, there are a very few relatively complete texts authored by apparently non-professional women: CTH 393, the ritual(s) of Anniwiyani, the “mother of the augur Āmati,

servant of ̕uwarlu,” against bad bird-omens; CTH 395, the ritual of ̕antitaššu, the “Woman of the city of ̕urma,” against “troublesome years”; CTH 396, the ritual of ̕atiya, the “Woman of the city of Kanzapida,” to appease an angry goddess; CTH 406, the ritual of Paškuwatti, the “Woman of Arzawa who lives in Parašša,” against sexual/reproductive dysfunction; and CTH 767.7, the ritual of Pittei, who has no title or geographic designation, for when a woman is pregnant.

The most noticeable difference between these texts and the Old Woman texts is in the incantations. As discussed in ch. 3, most Old Woman rituals are notable in their use of the first person and their expression of agency on the part of the practitioner: there are many incantations of the type, “I have just taken the evil from you,” “I am now taking the evil from you,” and so on. In addition, gods are usually called upon at the beginning and the end of the ritual, or bracketing specific sections of the ritual; while Old Women are performing rites to remove or destroy evil, they do not usually invoke or offer to the gods at the same time. From this, it is possible to infer a sense of professional skill: the Old Women represent themselves as having abilities independent of simply asking a god for help. (See ch. 3 for a more detailed discussion.)

However, in these other texts, there is no such representation in the incantations. In fact, there is hardly any first-person at all: ̕atiya, ̕antitaššu, and Paškuwatti all make first-person statements about offerings or services they are performing for a deity, which certainly asserts a relationship with that deity, but does not express independent skill; Anniwiyani and Pittei make no first-person statements at all. Paškuwatti has one incantation reminiscent of the Old Women, when she has the patient go through reed gates carrying a spindle and distaff. She takes the spindle and distaff from the patient, gives him a bow and arrow and says, “I have hereby taken

female-ness from you and given male-ness back to you!”¹⁴ However, it is the only incantation of this type in the text, and it is bracketed by offerings and immediately followed by a very long incantation entreating the goddess Uliliyašši to help the patient: very different from an Old Woman ritual, where one would expect a number of incantations of this type.

In fact, entreating deities is the largest part of all of these rituals. This is, of course, something the Old Women also frequently did; however, when treating patients, the bulk of the content of their rituals is their own attempts to remove evil or contamination from the patient. Offerings and appeals are part of these rituals, but a noticeably smaller part (see ch. 3). The rituals discussed here, on the other hand, seem to be the reverse. In Paškuwatti’s ritual, the rite with the gate mentioned above is at the very beginning of the text, and the rest of the content is direct entreaties of the goddess and attempts to connect the ritual patient to her—very different from Tunnawiya’s ritual CTH 409.I, which is also against reproductive dysfunction (see ch. 4 for a detailed discussion of this text). Ḫatiya’s ritual for when a person has some (unfortunately broken) problem is centered around the invocation and appeasement of the goddess Wišuriyanza (literally “the strangler”). She washes the goddess’ statue, provides her with offerings, and calls upon the fate-goddesses and the mother-goddesses to look out for the patient, and on the Sun-God of Heaven to ensure that Wišuriyanza behaves in the future. There is no direct treatment of the patient at all; it is all done through interaction with the gods. This can be contrasted to CTH 433, where an Old Woman is treating augurs who appear to have offended the tutelary deity of the hunting-bag; in addition to rites of appeasement, the Old Woman uses analogic rites to cleanse the augurs themselves.

¹⁴ KUB 7.8++ i 26–27, ed. H.A. Hoffner, Jr., “Paskuwatti’s ritual against sexual impotence (CTH 406),” *Aula Orientalis* 5 (1987): 271–87.

Ḫantitaššu's ritual is somewhat fragmentary, too much so to make any definitive statement about the order of operations, but in the substantial preserved text, every single incantation appeals to or invokes the gods in some way. The same is true for Anniwiyani's ritual, although that text does include ritual actions that are quite reminiscent of Old Woman rituals (wool tied to the patient's bed and items left underneath in a basket overnight; models made of bird-omens; the augurs go out to the steppe and pass through a hawthorn gate). However, the only incantations are appeals to the gods, unlike, for example, Ḫuwarlu's ritual, which has quite similar actions performed by an Old Woman with no attached appeals (see ch. 3 for a detailed discussion of this text). Finally, most of Pittei's ritual is taken up by a *historiola*, although the final incantations suggest that she might simultaneously be manipulating tongue-figurines, similar to an Old Woman ritual.

Since the sample size of these texts is so small, it is difficult to make definitive statements. However, it does seem as though the Old Woman rituals differ from the rituals practiced by women without a stated profession. The Old Women perform more analogic rites by far, and appeal to the deities much less often. In addition, Old Women are likely to make first-person statements about their own accomplishments, while the other practitioners are not. It therefore seems as though there may actually have been some professional standard for a practitioner to be called an "Old Woman," which resulted in more expressed confidence in her own ritual skills, and more types of independent ritual actions performed directly on patients, rather than through the intercession of deities.

The ^{MUNUS.MEŠ}SUḪUR.LÁL

Two of the Old Woman rituals, CTH 759 and CTH 761, are co-authored by the Old Woman Šillalluḫi and another woman, the ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL Kuwattalla. In addition, unnamed

^{MUNUS.MEŠ}SUḪUR.LÁL act as “support staff” for Old Women in Tunnawiya’s “Ritual of the River,” CTH 409.I, and Allaiturahhi’s main ritual, CTH 780.II. The definition of ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL is somewhat difficult. For example, a ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL is contrasted with a “free woman” in the admonition against looking at palace women (“either a free woman or a ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL”¹⁵) in Huqqana’s treaty, which has led to translations such as “maidservant,” and, when added to their association with the temple and cult, “hierodule” (or even “prostitute,” which is utterly unsupported by the evidence). However, it is not clear what the distinction of status exactly is in that text; there is certainly room to interpret it as, e.g., “a woman serving a palace function” vs. “a woman not attached to the palace in any official way.” In the lists of people who may have cursed the patient in Tunnawiya’s ritual CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, the ^{MUNUS.MEŠ}SUḪUR.LÁL appear between the DUMU^{MEŠ} É.GAL, literally the “sons of the palace,” perhaps best translated “palace attendants,” and the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}MEŠEDI, the royal bodyguard.

There is also evidence that they had, or could have, quite a high status: particularly Kuwattalla, as a ritual author and recipient of an enormous royal grant of land (see the Introduction), seems to have possessed a fair amount of power, money, and authority. There is one other ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL attested as a ritual author, a woman named Māla, but the ritual (KUB 60.146) is unfortunately too fragmentary to judge its content. Elsewhere in the texts, they are seen as being attached to a specific god (e.g., a ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL “of” a deity) and participating in festivals; in the myth of Ullikummi, they are Ḫebat’s attendants. “Temple woman” certainly seems to fit many contexts (except Huqqana, in which context “palace woman” would seem more appropriate). In this sense they can be contrasted to the Old Women, who do occasionally appear in temples (e.g., Annā, the Old Woman of the temple of Ziparwa¹⁶)

¹⁵ *mān=aš ELLUM mān=aš* ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LAL; see G. Wilhelm, hethiter.net/: CTH 42, §31’.

¹⁶ KBo 17.47 obv. 3.

but for whom this does not seem to be a primary function (see ch. 1). The evidence rather suggests that the Old Women were primarily troubleshooters, and were less involved in the day-to-day normal functioning of the cult.

Were the Old Women midwives?

In 1952, H. Otten published an article in which he posited that the Hittite word behind the Sumerian logogram ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI, “Old Woman,” was ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa*, which can be connected to the word for “to give birth” in Hittite (see below).¹⁷ He based this on CTH 390 (KBo 3.8+KUB 7.1), a *Sammeltafel* with five rituals on it. One of them is authored by a woman named Šušumanniga, who is called a *hašauwa* in the tablet’s colophon. In the small label KUB 30.48, however, which is clearly a record of this exact text, she is instead called a ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI. In addition, Šušumanniga’s ritual, the fifth on the tablet, begins, *AWAT* ^fŠ[*ušumanniga*, ^{MUNUS}ŠU.G]I, “Word of Ms. Š[*ušumanniga*, Ol]d [Woman]”; only a tiny fraction of the GI is visible on the tablet, but given the label, it is unlikely to be anything else. In addition, there is another ritual on KBo 3.8+ which is referred to in the colophon as, “If tongues come to someone, the Old Woman treats him/her thus,” while in the fragmentary *historiola* that makes up most of the ritual, the goddesses Kamrušepa and Ḫannaḫanna call upon a *hašauwa* to cleanse the patient, not a ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI. The two titles therefore seem to be used interchangeably in this text. One likely reason for this, as Otten concluded, is that *hašauwa* is the Hittite word conventionally rendered logographically as ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI.

This argument as it stands is fairly convincing, and has been adopted with greater or lesser certainty by most of the scholars who have since discussed the Old Woman in Hittitological literature. One result of the equation of ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI and ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa* has been the intrusion of etymology into the interpretation of the Old Woman’s function. As already noted

¹⁷ “Beiträge zum hethitischen Lexikon,” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 50 (1952): 230–36.

by Otten in 1952, *hašauwa* can be interpreted without any difficulty as a verbal noun deriving from *haš-/heš-*, “to give birth.” This led to the interpretation of the word as “midwife.” However—as also noted by Otten—there is another word in Hittite that clearly does mean “midwife,” ^{MUNUS}*haššanupalla-* (derived from the same verb). The subsequent reasoning is summed up nicely by Beckman, who first establishes the ^{MUNUS}*haššanupalla-* as the midwife and then continues:

The word ^{SAL}*hašauwa-* has also been thought to indicate the midwife, due to its obvious derivation from *haš-* by way of the verbal substantive. However, while leaving open the exact relationship between ^{SAL}*haš(ša)nupalla-* and ^{SAL}*hašauwa-*, Otten has shown that the latter term is the phonetic reading of ^{SAL}ŠU.GI, “old woman.” This is a title which is often borne by female ritual practitioners in the Hittite texts, and it is not surprising that such a practitioner should be known by a term originally indicating a connection with childbirth. By the time in which our Hittite texts were inscribed, however, ^{SAL}ŠU.GI/^{SAL}*hašauwa-* seems to have become a general term for a female ritual practitioner, including various, more specialized, occupations under its rubric.¹⁸

This once again seems relatively unproblematic. However, one fact should be addressed. The ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa* is quite poorly-attested: the word appears only in CTH 390, in two birth rituals (KBo 17.61 and KBo 24.17), and in three tablet catalogue entries, one of which refers to CTH 390,¹⁹ one of which refers to the second birth ritual KBo 24.17,²⁰ and one of which is too fragmentary for interpretation.²¹ In the birth rituals, the babies appear to be sick, and the *hašauwa* is thus there to heal them. As mentioned above, CTH 390 contains five rituals, and all

¹⁸ *Hittite Birth Rituals*, 232–33.

¹⁹ KBo 31.4+ iv 12–28, ed. Dardano, *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge*, 102–103.

²⁰ KUB 30.48 iii 20’–22’, ed. *ibid.*, 40–41.

²¹ KUB 8.68 i 6’–8’, ed. *ibid.* 56–57.

of them are likewise for healing sick children.²² It therefore certainly does seem as though the etymological connection between *hašauwa* and “to give birth” has been realized in practice: the ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa* is a healer of babies and children.

However, there now arises a problem with the equation of ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa* and ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI. Unlike the ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa*, the ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI is *never once* attested in a birth ritual. And the two are only equated in a single text, CTH 390, which is also the only text in which the ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI appears in explicit connection to children. It therefore seems possible that, rather than *hašauwa* being the Hittite word behind ŠU.GI, other explanations could be mustered: for example, (1) a woman could be both a ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa* and a ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI—as, for example, Tunnawiya is both a ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI and a midwife (^{MUNUS}ŠÀ.ZU, the logographic reading of ^{MUNUS}*haššanupalla-*); (2) the duties of the ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa* were subsumed under the duties of the ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI; that is, ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI was a more general term, and so any ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa* might also be called a ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI (which seems to be the position taken by HW², which subsumes ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI under its lemma ^{MUNUS}*hašawa*-²³); or (3) the ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa* was an older or more obscure term that might not have been in widespread use, and ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI was a more common and familiar term that was substituted.

Further complicating the question is the fact that, when preserved, the ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa*’s actions seem well in line with Old Woman ritual practice. The “incantation of binding” and

²² The first is Ayatarša’s ritual, for a child whose innards are “devoured.” The second is Wattiti’s ritual, for a sickness that is “devouring the innards of a person or a child.” The third is the ritual for “when tongues come to someone,” but DUMU.NÍTA^{MES}, “male children,” are mentioned in the text. The fourth is a ritual for a “young child” whose body parts are “bound.” The fifth is Šušumanniga’s, who offers “to ^dHašameli of the month for a child.”

²³ The note at the end of the dictionary entry states, “Unbekannt ist die Zahl weiterer heth. Bezeichnungen von Beschwörerinnen unter dem Sumerogramm ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI. Nach Beckman, StBoT 29, 233, und Hutter, Behexung (1988) 56f., hat die ^{MUNUS}*hašawa*- zumindest ursprünglich Funktionen beim Geburtsvorgang ausgeübt. Die Verallgemeinerung der Bezeichnung ^{MUNUS}*hašawa*- (ohne unmittelbaren Bezug zur Geburt) führte dazu, daß jede Ritualhandlung von einer ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI durchgeführt werden konnte, während der Spezialbereich Geburt auf die ^{MUNUS}ŠÀ.ZU (= *haš(ša)nupalla-*) “Hebamme” übertragen wurde. Denkbar wäre jedoch auch, daß die ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI schon immer alle Rituale vornehmen konnte, aber erst die Verallgemeinerung der Bedeutung ^{MUNUS}*hašawa*- die Identität der beiden Titel ermöglichte” (419).

“incantation of tongues” in CTH 390 both involve the ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa* being called upon by Kamrušepa and Ḫannaḫanna to heal a patient, attested for Old Women in, e.g., Tunnawiya’s ritual CTH 409.II/CTH 409.IV/CTH 458.1 (see ch. 3). “Binding” and “tongues” are common problems that the Old Women address (see ch. 4). In the birth ritual KBo 17.61, the ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa* arranges a scapegoat’s body parts against the patient’s body parts in a sequence extremely reminiscent of the Old Woman scapegoat rituals (see ch. 3). This inclines me more toward explanation (2)—that the ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa* was an appropriate name for someone performing rites similar to the ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI’s specifically for children. However, the possibility that the two are identical, or that there was some chronological or cultural difference, cannot be completely discounted. One thing is clear: neither the ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI nor the ^{MUNUS}*hašauwa* is ever attested acting as a midwife; even in the birth rituals, their purpose is to cure sickness using ritual methods.

The Old Women vs. male ritualists

The main titles for male ritual practitioners are the ^{LÚ}AZU and ^{LÚ}ḪAL. The difference between the two is not entirely clear; sometimes one copy of a text will use one title for the practitioner, and another copy will use the other. No specific study has been done on these practitioners, but there are small sections of more general works devoted to them.²⁴ These smaller studies, as well as an examination of the texts, reveal that the ^{LÚ}AZU(/ḪAL) was more at home in the temple than the Old Women were. In addition to a greater number of attestations in the festival texts than the Old Women (see ch. 1), the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}AZU purified temple-spaces and accoutrements—including deities’ statues—more often than people, quite unlike the Old Women.²⁵ They also performed evocation rituals (e.g., CTH 484, an invocation of the fate-

²⁴ E.g., Görke, *Aštu*, 244–56, Engelhard, “Hittite Magical Practices,” 24–45.

²⁵ See the examples cited in Görke, *Aštu*, 247–49.

goddesses and the mother-goddesses which attempts to coax them back from a hypothetical evil person who has seduced them with offerings and appeals), which is more similar to the Old Women's practice.

In some texts, the difference between the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}AZU and the Old Women seems to be similar to what was seen with the female practitioners who did not have a named profession. For example, in CTH 471, Ammiḫatna's ritual for when a person has been given something unclean to eat or drink, the ^{LÚ}AZU's ritual actions are primarily offerings; there is an extensive series of offerings in this text, and apart from the patient washing, only one analogic act: at the very end of the text, he puts silver in the patient's mouth and asks that the patient be pure before the gods like the silver. There are, however, very few incantations in this text (two of which are indicated by saying that the ^{LÚ}AZU "charms" (*udnalliya-*) the ritual patient in Hurrian, a word never used for Old Woman incantations), which seems to be another difference between the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}AZU and the Old Women.²⁶ When engaging in purificatory acts, the ^{LÚ}AZU seems most often to use water, as seen in, for example, CTH 491 and the *itkalzi* ritual.²⁷

However, there is one AZU-ritual in particular that shows analogic acts similar to an Old Woman ritual: CTH 446, a ritual for purifying a house of bloodshed. Although the contamination is in a space rather than in a person, certain methods are quite similar: the ^{LÚ}AZU/^{LÚ}ḪAL (depending on the copy) speaks analogic incantations such as, "Just as the ram mounts the ewe, and it becomes pregnant—let this this town (and) house become a ram, and let it mount the dark earth in the field, and let the dark earth become pregnant with blood, uncleanness, (and) sin!"²⁸

²⁶ Ammiḫatna's ritual only has four, while Old Woman rituals of similar length and preservation rather have fifteen or twenty; CTH 484, the evocation ritual for the Gulšeš performed by a ^{LÚ}AZU, preserves only one (reasonably lengthy) incantation at the beginning. In CTH 472, most of the incantations are recited by the "great pure woman of the temple" rather than the ^{LÚ}AZU. The AZU-men did recite long incantations in some texts (e.g. the *itkalzi* ritual), but speech seems not to have been as essential for their practice as it was for the Old Women.

²⁷ See Haas, *Materia*, 141ff.

²⁸ KBo 41.8+ iv 29–32; see Torri, *La similitudine*, 136, for transliteration.

He also recites a *historiola* about Ištar. These acts are very similar to those found in Old Woman rituals (see ch. 3); however, offerings and appeals to the gods are continuous throughout the text, and there is no assertion of the practitioner's own agency independent of divine intercession. It therefore seems as though the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}AZU/^{LÚ.MEŠ}HAL were able to perform rituals similar to the Old Women's, they were more closely connected to cultic practice and operated primarily through their relationship with the divine. These men (in the oracles usually referred to as ^{LÚ.MEŠ}HAL²⁹) also performed extispicy, one of the main oracle methods used by the Hittites (though imported from Mesopotamia), which also demonstrates their close relationship with the gods. It does not, however, use a representative system of symbols like the Old Women's KIN-oracles, as noted above.

In addition to the ^{LÚ}AZU-rituals, there is one other common type of rite performed by men: rituals against plague in the army camp.³⁰ The rituals of Ašhella (no profession), Uḫḫamuwa (no profession), Zarpiya (a doctor), Puliša (no attested profession; the incipit is broken), Maddunani (an augur) and Dandanku (also an augur) are all designed to combat plague in the army. Several of these rituals show techniques similar to Old Woman rituals: for example, scapegoat-animals are common, the deities are bribed or distracted (as in, e.g., Ambazzi's ritual; see ch. 3), and analogies are sometimes used. However, the scapegoat-technique is not at all similar to what is seen in Old Woman rituals: there is no spitting into the animal's mouth, there are no long incantations delineating the similarities between the respective body parts, and there is no incantation transferring the evil from a person to an animal. Rather, the incantations are appeals to the gods to accept the animals in the place of the humans in the army camp. For

²⁹ See Kammenhuber, *Orakelpraxis*, 131, for attestations of diviners being called ^{LÚ}AZU.

³⁰ One might consider here the natural connection between male practitioners and military activity; however, it should be noted that the very fragmentary CTH 436 is a ritual done on the border of an enemy land as the army comes away from it, and attests an Old Woman as a practitioner.

example, Uḫḫamuwa says, “Whatever god of an enemy land has made this plague, here, we have driven this wreathed sheep to you, O god, in peace! Just as a fortress is strong, and it is at peace with this sheep, you, O deity who has made this plague, be likewise at peace with the land of Ḫatti! Further, turn benevolently toward the land of Ḫatti!”³¹ This is the only incantation in Uḫḫamuwa’s short ritual, which therefore differs dramatically from Old Woman scapegoat rituals. The other rituals similarly focus on appeasing deities with scapegoat-animals, offerings, appeals, and ritual meals. The creation of metaphor can play a part, as seen in Uḫḫamuwa’s incantation above, but is focused on the deity—as, for example, in Dandanku’s ritual, in which a bow and arrows are laid out with the recitation, “O deity, keep shooting the enemy land with these arrows! But when you come to the land of Hatti, may your quiver be closed!”³² There are no first-person statements like those seen in Old Woman rituals. Therefore, these rituals also seem to depend primarily on the practitioners’ relationships with or ability to connect to deities, rather than the practitioners’ own skill at cleansing, drawing out, and/or destroying evil. This particular area of expertise seems to have been mainly confined to the Old Women’s ritual practice.

The Old Women and the gods

Of course, it should not be forgotten that the Old Women also participated in the evocation and pacification of deities. This can be seen in rituals such as CTH 391, the ritual of Ambazzi, where Ambazzi pacifies and diverts the attention of the malicious divine entities who are attacking the patient; CTH 433, the rituals for the augurs, where the Old Woman purifies the augurs and pacifies the tutelary deity of the hunting-bag through offerings, incantations, and calling upon the divine hearth as an intercessor; CTH 423, the evocation of enemy gods, where

³¹ See Görke, hethiter.net/: CTH 410, §2, for transliteration.

³² KUB 7.54 iii¹ 22’–26’; see Bawanypeck, *Die Rituale der Auguren*, 144, for transliteration.

the Old Woman lays out “paths” of cloth for the enemy gods to come along toward the offerings she is making; etc. These rituals are unfortunately not as well-attested as rituals against curses, sorcery, or more general lists of evils,³³ but the tablet catalogue entries attest to a number of rituals in which an Old Woman evokes or pacifies a deity or deities.

As seen in chs. 3 and 4, many different deities were attested in the Old Women’s rituals. In some cases the main divine figure appears to have been decided by the problem: for example, in CTH 433, the group of rituals for the augurs, the Old Woman appeals to deities that are associated with the augurs and whom the augurs have apparently angered: the tutelary deity of the hunting-bag and the heptad. However, in other cases, the Old Woman seems to appeal to gods simply for support in the ritual, not because they are personally involved with the ritual patient’s problems. In some cases, this may have been decided by cultural context: for example, one might note the ritual of Allaiturahhi’s, an Old Woman from Syria, where the Mesopotamian underworld deities are invoked, and the Storm-God Teššub, his wife Ḫebat, and the Hurro-Mesopotamian Ištar/Šauška seem to be the main sources of support (though note also the Sun-Goddess of the Earth, a Luwian deity, and ^dŠišummi, a Hittite god, in this text; see the Introduction for more discussion of multicultural elements in rituals). The Old Women also seem to have some connection to the underworld deities, as seen by (among other texts; see ch. 3), their participation in the funerary ritual and their invocation of the Sun-Goddess of the Earth in CTH 448.2. Many of the divine attestations in the Old Women’s rituals, unfortunately, remain too poorly-attested, too varied, or too open to endless interpretive possibilities to devote much time to analysis.

³³ It is unclear why this should be. Perhaps these rituals were overall shorter and/or fewer copies of them were made, making preservation less likely.

There are, however, two gods who often appear in a supportive role: these are the Sun-deity (in various forms), and Ḫannaḫanna (often written DINGIR.MAḪ) and/or DINGIR.MAḪ “of the riverbank” (see ch. 3).³⁴ These two deities are additionally notable because of their prominence in the KIN-oracle symbol system (see ch. 2). The Old Women therefore seem to have an association with them. This can further be supported by the “Chief of the Old Women” appearing prominently in a festival in the temple of Ḫannaḫanna (see ch. 1), particularly in light of how poorly-attested the Old Women are in the festival corpus.

The Sun-deity’s relationship to the Old Women does not yield much in the way of explanation or context (particularly considering his unusual, apparently dangerous, role in the KIN-oracles, for which see ch. 2). It seems possible to view the support of the Sun-deity as indicative of royal support, considering the close affinity between the king and the male Sun-God of Heaven, and the Old Women’s demonstrable closeness to the king, as seen particularly in, e.g., the Benedictions for the Labarna, where she recites incantations for the king’s benefit; CTH 416, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple, where she treats the king and queen in an intimate fashion for political and personal troubles; CTH 398, Ḫuwarlu’s ritual, where she has likewise intimate access to the king and queen’s bedroom and bodies; and CTH 450, the royal funerary ritual, where two Old Women perform a rite that seems to ensure the king’s soul passage into divinity rather than down into the netherworld. This can be supported by the presence of the Sun-deity in rituals involving the king where the Old Woman is not a practitioner (e.g., CTH 419/420/421, the royal substitute rituals, CTH 777, the *itkalzi/itkaḫi* rituals; CTH 394,

³⁴ These gods appear together in CTH 390, the rituals of Ayatarša, Wattiti, and Šušumanniga; in CTH 402, the ritual of Allī; in CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya’s “Ritual of the River”; in CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, Tunnawiya’s *taknaz dā-*; and in CTH 433, the rituals for the augurs. Mallidunna’s two attested rituals are for the appeasement of the Sun-deity (CTH 403.1) and Ḫannaḫanna (CTH 403.2). Annanna’s invocation rituals include appeasement of both the Sun-deity and Ḫannaḫanna. In CTH 398, DINGIR.MAḪ of the riverbank is indirectly invoked by the power of the river-clay, and the Sun-deity is appealed to directly. The Sun-deity also appears alone in CTH 404, CTH 416, CTH 435, CTH 440, CTH 448, CTH 456, CTH 490, CTH 759, CTH 760.II, and CTH 780 (where the “Fate-goddesses of the riverbank” also appear).

Ašhella's ritual). However, the Sun-deity is also present in many rituals that do not explicitly mention the royal couple, so it is difficult to be certain of the nature of the connection.

The Old Woman's relationship to Ḫannaḫanna, on the other hand, may be easier to explain. As already discussed in ch. 2, Ḫannaḫanna is a grandmother-goddess who is particularly notable in central Anatolian mythology for her ability to solve problems for the gods. In fact, she is the one the gods turn to for help when they are having difficulties, and she always has a solution for them, often one she carries out herself on their behalf. The semantic connection between an old goddess who solves problems and Old Women who solve problems is obvious. So perhaps one might be able to tentatively posit the Sun-God's support as representing royal authority, and Ḫannaḫanna's support as representing ritual authority.

Conclusion

The goddess Ḫannaḫanna's role as a troubleshooter and support to the gods in times of trouble is directly mirrored by the Old Women's professional expertise as is represented in the textual evidence. Although that evidence is occasionally fragmentary and difficult, when taken all together, it presents a remarkably consistent picture: The Old Women were employed by the Hittite state to solve problems with divine or otherwise supernatural origins, and they accomplished this both by determining the cause of those problems, using divination, and neutralizing the cause, using ritual. Their expertise centered around the ability to concretize intangible forces, such as evil, contamination, divine anger, protection, and purification, into physical forms that could be manipulated, thus either revealing information about those forces (in the oracles) or allowing the Old Women to affect them directly (in the rituals). In addition, they occupied a privileged position with respect to the gods, allowing them to invoke, appeal to, or pacify deities when it was required. All of these skills were brought to bear in service to the

Hittite king and queen, and the Old Women appear to have been an integral part of the workings of the Hittite court for the whole of Hittite history.

APPENDIX A: THE KIN-ORACLE TEXTS

The following is a transliteration of the texts comprising CTH 565, “Oracles concerning the cult of Pirwa)”¹ and CTH 572, KIN-oracles.² The texts transliterated are as follows, in order of appearance; texts listed in bold are also translated, while the rest, if complete enough to determine the contents, are briefly summarized:

CTH 565

KBo 14.21

CTH 572

IBoT 4.43

KBo 13.76

KBo 24.123

KBo 24.125

KBo 40.50

KBo 41.149

KBo 41.150

KBo 41.151

KBo 41.152

KBo 41.153

KBo 41.156

KBo 41.158

KBo 41.159+KUB 6.5

KBo 41.160

KBo 41.161

KBo 41.162

KBo 41.163

KBo 41.164

KBo 41.166

KBo 41.167

KBo 41.168

KBo 41.169

KBo 41.170

KBo 41.171

KBo 41.172

KBo 41.173

¹ Only KBo 14.21 is currently available in handcopy; the only other text in CTH 565 is Çorum 5, which does not have a photo, handcopy, or transliteration.

² With the exception of KUB 6.7 + KUB 18.58, a longer text that has already been edited by Beckman in *The Ahhiyawa Texts*, pp. 232–41.

KBo 41.174
 KBo 41.175
 KBo 41.176
 KBo 46.119
 KBo 47.220
 KBo 48.22
 KBo 49.180
 KBo 49.207
 KBo 52.280
 KBo 54.102
 KBo 55.193
 KBo 55.195
KBo 58.64(+)Kbo 53.108+Kbo 57.127b(+)**KBo 57.127c(+)**KBo 57.127a+KUB 16.30+KUB
16.82
 KBo 59.79
 KBo 59.80
 KBo 61.93
KUB 6.3
 KUB 6.23
KUB 16.18+50.30
KUB 16.20
 KUB 16.21+KUB 16.80
KUB 16.36
KUB 18.21
 KUB 18.34
 KUB 18.43
KUB 22.37
KUB 22.57
 KUB 46.58
 KUB 49.70
 KUB 49.76
 KUB 49.77
 KUB 49.82
 KUB 49.89
 KUB 49.91
 KUB 50.13
 KUB 50.15
 KUB 50.18
 KUB 50.20
 KUB 50.25
 KUB 50.26
 KUB 50.37
 KUB 50.39
KUB 50.40
 KUB 50.42
 KUB 50.51

KUB 50.52
 KUB 50.57
 KUB 50.58+50.59b
 KUB 50.59a
 KUB 50.67
 KUB 50.73
 KUB 50.74
 KUB 50.79
 KUB 50.81
 KUB 50.86
 KUB 50.91
 KUB 50.97
 KUB 50.101
 KUB 50.102
 KUB 50.111
 KUB 50.118
 KUB 52.41
KUB 52.45
 KUB 52.51
 KUB 52.68
 KUB 52.71
 KUB 52.85
 ABoT 2.130
 ABoT 2.133
 ABoT 2.134
 AboT 2.135
 HFAC 80
 HFAC 81
 HKM 115
 KuSa 1/1.15
 KuSa 1/1.17
 KuSa 1/1.19

Not every text that the Konkordanz lists under CTH 572 belongs there, however; the following texts should be placed under different CTH numbers instead (and are thus not included in this appendix):

KBo 13.76 is CTH 578, a combination of KIN and SU oracles, but has been retained in this appendix because the liver-oracles, which are only on the reverse, have clearly been added as an afterthought, e.g., written in below the final line of a paragraph.
 KBo 39.55+KUB 49.15 is CTH 580, a combination of KIN and MUŠEN oracles
 KBo 40.59+KBo 40.375 is CTH 578
 KBo 41.154 is CTH 573, a MUŠEN oracle

KBo 41.155 is CTH 578
 KBo 41.157 is CTH 573
 KBo 41.165 is CTH 582, oracle fragments (the method is not preserved)
 KBo 41.177 is CTH 580
 KBo 58.81 is CTH 578
 KUB 16.63+VBoT 96 seems to be a combined KIN, MUŠEN, and *HURRI*-bird oracle
 KUB 18.37 is CTH 578
 KUB 22.43+22.42 is CTH 575, a MUŠ oracle
 KUB 49.84 is CTH 578
 KUB 50.104 seems to be CTH 570, a SU oracle
 KUB 50.106+KUB 52.53 is CTH 580 (the method does not appear to have been recorded)
 VSNF 12.108 is CTH 582 (the second paragraph begins *IŠ-TU LÚ*[...])
 ABoT 2.129 is CTH 582 (only parts of the question and a final NU.ŠE are preserved)
 ABoT 2.131 is CTH 582 (line 3' begins *IŠ-TU*^{MUNUS}ŠU.G[I], so this is not only a KIN-oracle)
 ABoT 2.132 is CTH 582 (it only preserves part of the question and a final NU.SIG₅)

The Texts

KBo 14.21³

Obv. i

(only about 1 line missing)

x+1 []x x x[]
 2' []^{HUR.S}AG⁴ Li[?] ʾiḥ-ša[]x x[]
 3' []^URU^r An-ku-uš-na ʾÚ- UL ʾḥal-ʾ zi-an ʾ-z[i]
 4' [nu ma-a-an tu-uk *A-NA* DINGIR-*LIM* ku-u-un ʾ EZEN₄ ʾ ITU.KAM ʾ ša-ra ʾ-a ʾ ti-ia ʾ-an-
 t[a-an]
 5' [e-eš-ša-an-zi kat-t]a-kán ʾ Ú-UL [k]u-it-ki da-a-li-iš-kán-z[i]
 6' [nu KIN] ʾ SIG₅ ʾ[-ru ḤUL-l]u ME-an *A-NA* ʾ LÚ ʾSANGA pí-ia-an NU.SIG₅
 7' [k]i-i ʾ ku ʾ-it d[a-a-li-i]a-u-wa-ar SIxSÁ-at nu LÚ SANGA pu-nu-uš-[š]u-u-en
 8' [U]M-MA ŠU-MA (erasure) ʾ A ʾ[-NA] x²⁵ DINGIR[?]-*LIM*-wa EZEN₄ ITU.KAM ŠA
 ITU.6.KAM ʾ kar ʾ-ša-an
 9' nu-kán pa-a-n-ʾ zi I ʾ-NA ITU.6.KAM EZEN₄ ITU.KAM 1-ŠU ḥa-pu-ša-an-zi
 10' ʾ kat ʾ-ta-an-na za-an-ʾ ki ʾ-la-tar *IŠ-TU* NINDA KAŠ pí-an-zi DINGIR-*LUM*-za KI.MIN
 (erasure)
 11' ʾ nu KIN ʾ SIG₅-ru DINGIR-*LU*[M-z]a da-pí-an ZI-an ME-aš na-an-za-an-kán ʾ kar ʾ-pí
 12' ʾ da-a ʾ-iš NU.SIG₅

³ Previous partial treatments of this text include: F. Imparati, “Obligations et manquements culturels envers la divinité Pirwa,” OrNS 59.2 (1990): 166–87 (transliteration of i 28'–41', 61'–72'; ii 55'–75'; iii 60–61, with discussion), and van den Hout, *Ulmitešub-Vertrag*, 155–56, (transliteration and translation of ii 55'–70').

⁴ See Beckman, *Birth Rituals*, 62 n. 163 for this reading.

⁵ This trace is uncertain; it does not seem to be a NA, but all the necessary information is already present with *A-NA* DINGIR-*LIM*.

13' [k]i- i ʔ ku-it (erasure) [nu-k]án pa-a-an-zi ʔ ŠA ʔ ITU.6.KAM EZEN₄ ITI.KAM
 14' ʔ 2 ʔ-ŠU ʔa-pu-ša-a[n-zi ^{LÚ.MEŠ}Š? SANGA-ia IŠ-TU] ʔ 1ʔ ʔ GU₄(erasure) 1 UDU-ia za-an-ki-
 la-an-zi
 15' [d]u-ud-du-nu-wa-an-z[i-a]n DINGIR^{MEŠ?} (over? erasure) LÚ^{MEŠ} URU An-ku^ʔ-uš^ʔ-na-ia A-NA
 IZ-ZI še-er? IŠ-TU NINDA KAŠ za-an-ki-la-an-zi
 16' [d]u-ud-du-nu-wa-an-z[i] DINGIR-LUM-za KI.MIN ʔar-ti nu KIN SIG₅-ru ^dDAG-iš GUB-
 eš
 17' [pár-n]a-aš a-aš-šu ʔ MU ʔ-t[i-ia M]E-aš nu-kán ^dGUL-aš-še da-pí-i ZI-ni (erasure)
 18' [I-N]A UD.2.KAM ^dUTU ʔ AN ʔ GUB[-iš] aš-šu-ul ME-aš na-at pa-an-ga-u-i pa-a-i
 19' [I-]ʔ NA UD.3.KAM ʔ DINGIR-LUM-za EG[IR]-ʔ an ʔ ar-ʔa kar-pí-in ME (erasure)
 20' [nu](over erasure)-ʔ kán ʔ an-da a-aš-ʔ šaʔ ʔ-u-i SIG₅

21' [A-N]A ^dPí-ʔ ir ʔ-wa MUNUS.LUGAL-i[a]ʔ A ʔ-NA EZEN₄ MU.KAM 1 GU₄ 9
 [U]DUʔ ^{HIA} ʔ
 22' [Š]À-ʔ BA ʔ 1 MÁŠ.GAL ŠA ʔ ^dʔ.7.BI 10 NINDA.GUR₄.RA ^{HIA} ŠÀ-ʔ BA ʔ 1
 ʔ NINDA ʔ.GUR₄.RA ʔa-zi-la-aš
 23' []x NINDA ʔa-az-zi-la-aš 2 ME NINDA.GUR₄.RA GAL 12 DUG KAŠ 1 ^{DUG}NAM-MA-
 AN-DU
 24' []x ^{LÚ}SANGA IŠ-TU É-Š[U] pé-eš-ki-iz-zi (erasure)
 25' [nu] m[a]-ʔ a ʔ-[a]n tu-uk A-NA DINGIR-LIM ku-u-un EZEN₄ ITI.KAM ša-ra-a ti-ia-an-ta-
 an
 26' ʔ e-eš ʔ-[š]a-an-zi kat-ta-kán ^ÚUL ku-it-ki da-a-li-iš-kán-zi
 27' ʔ nu ʔ KIN [S]IG₅-ru a-aš-šu ME-an na-at-kán DINGIR-LIM kar-pí GAR-ri NU.SIG₅

28' ʔ ki-i ʔ ku-ʔ it ʔ da-a-li-ia-u-wa-ar SÍxSÁ-at nu ^{LÚ}SANGA pu-nu-uš-šu-u-en

29' ʔ UM-MA ŠU-MA ʔ (erasure) A-NA ^dPí-ir-wa-wa-kán 2 UDU.NÍTA iš-ʔ ki ʔ-ia-an-te-eš
 30' ʔ e-eš-šir ʔ GIM-an-ma-wa EZEN₄ ʔ MU ʔ.KAM ki-ša-ri nu-wa-ra-aš A-NA ^dPí-ir-wa
 31' ʔ iš-kán ʔ-zi MU.IM-MA-ma-wa-[r]a-<aš> ^mPal-la-aš LÚ ʔ ^{URU}An-ku-uš-na
 32' ʔ ap ʔ-pa-at-ri-ia-at nu-wa-r[a]-aš-kán ku-en-ta-pát
 33' [k]i-nu-na pa-a-an-zi (erasure?) u-ni-uš 2 UDU[NÍ]TA (erasure) ^{LÚ}SANGA (erasure) ta-ma-
 a-uš EGIR-pa pa-a-ʔ i ʔ
 34' ʔ kat ʔ-ta-an-na za-an-ki-la-tar I[Š-T]U NINDA KAŠ pí-an-zi
 35' DINGIR-LUM-za KI.MIN ʔar-ti nu KIN SI[G₅]-ru ʔUL-lu ME-an nu-kán [E]GIR-pa
^dDAG-ʔ ti ʔ NU.ʔ SIG₅ ʔ

36' ʔ ki ʔ-i ku-it <<ku-it>> NU.SIG₅-ta nu pa-a-an<-zi> ^mPal-la-aš (over erasure)-ša 2
 UDU.NÍTA
 37' ʔ A-NA DINGIR ʔ-LIM EGIR-pa šar-ni-ik-ʔ zi ʔ kat-ta-an-na za-an-ʔ ki ʔ-la-tar
 38' [I]Š-TU NINDA KAŠ pa-a-i du-ud-d[u-nu-w]a-an-zi-an DINGIR-LUM-za ʔ KI.MIN ʔ ʔar-ti
 nu KIN SIG₅-ru
 39' ʔ DINGIR^{MEŠ} ʔ GUB-ir TI-tar da-a-i[r n]a-at ʔ pa ʔ-an-ga-u-ʔ i ʔ (erasure) pí-i-ʔ e ʔ-er
 40' INA UD.2.KAM ʔ a ʔ-aš-šu ME-an nu-k[án EG]IR-pa ^dDAG-ʔ ti ʔ I-NA UD.3.ʔ KAM ʔ
 ʔUL-lu ME-an
 41' [n]u-kán an-da SUD-l[i₁₂ SIG₅]

42' [A-NA]^d Pí-ir-wa^U [RU[?] X A-NA EZ]EN₄ ITI.KAM 1 UDU 1 DUG KAŠ 10 NINDA^{H₁A} 7
(erasure)

43' [LÚS]ANGA IŠ-TU^r É 7 [-ŠU p]é-eš-^r ki 7-i[z-z]i nu ma-a-an ku-u-un^r EZEN₄ 7
ITI.KAM

44' [ša-r]a-a t[i-ia-a]n-ta-an e-e[š-š]a-an-^r zi 7 kat-ta-kán Ú-UL ku-it-ki

45' [da-a-l]i-^r iš-kán 7[-z]i nu KIN^r SIG₅ 7-ru x-x[]-uš[?]-za^r 7 ZAG 7-tar MU-an-na ME-aš

46' [na-at pa-an-g]a-u-i^r pa 7-a-iš INA UD.2.KAM (erasure)^r ŠA 7 DINGIR^{MEŠ} mi-nu-mar^{H₁A}
ME-an-^r te 7-eš

47' []-i ZAG-za (erasure) ki-ia-an-ta-ri SIG₅

48' [] ku-]wa-pí šu-up-pa-i pé-e-da-an-zi nu-wa^{LÚ} SANGA IŠ-TU É-ŠU

49' [pa-a-i]^{H₁} 7^A 90 NINDA^{H₁A} ŠA 1 UP-NI 9 DUG KAŠ 3 ME NINDA.GUR₄.RA GAL

50' [A-NA]^d Pí-ir-wa MUNUS.LUGAL-ia (over erasure) A-NA^d 7.7.BI-ia 1 MÁŠ.GAL 1 DUG
KAŠ

51' []-i]a (over erasure)^r pé-eš 7-ki-iz-zi nu ma-a-an A-NA DINGIR-LIM ku-u-un EZEN₄
MU.KAM

52' [š]a-^r ra-a 7 ti-ia-an-ta-an e-eš-ša-an-zi kat-ta-kán Ú-UL^r ku-it 7-ki

53' [da-]a-li-iš-kán-zi nu KIN SIG₅-ru DINGIR-LUM-za da-pí-an ZI-an ME-a[š]

54' ^r na-an 7-za-an-kán kar-pí da-a-iš NU.SIG₅

55' [ki-]7^r i 7 ku-^r it 7 da-a-li-ia-u-wa-ar SIxSÁ-at nu (erasure) pa-a-an-zi EZEN₄ MU.KAM ŠA
MU.1.KAM

56' [] x-aš[?]-x-x-na[?]-an[?] DÙ-an-zi kat-ta-an-na 1^{LÚ} SANGA za-an-ki-la-tar (over erasure)

57' [IŠ-T]U NINDA KAŠ 1^r UDU 7-ia pa-a-i du-ud-du-nu-wa-an-zi-an DINGIR-LUM-za
KI.MIN (erasure)

58' [nu KI]N SIG₅-^r ru IŠ-TU 7 MU^{H₁A} GÍD.DA TI-tar ME-an nu-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ}-ni⁶ da-pí-i
ZI-ni

59' [I-N]A UD.2.KAM^r ŠA DINGIR^{MEŠ} 7 mi-nu-mar^{H₁A} ME-an-te-eš na-at DINGIR.MAḪ-ni
SUM-an-te-eš

60' [I-NA]^r UD.3.KAM^{LÚ} SANGA 7-za ZAG-tar SISKUR-ia ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš
SIG₅

61' [A-NA]^d Pí-ir 7-wa A-NA^r EZEN₄ 7 MU.KAM IŠ-TU É^m A-li-LUGAL-ma 1 GU₄ 8 UDU
62' [x^{DUG}K]A.GAG 1 PA ZÌ.DA DUR₅^r 2 7 PA ZÌ.DA ḪÁD.DU.A 3^r BÁN 7 BA.BA.ZA pé-
eš-ki-ir

63' [m]a-^r a 7-an A-NA DINGIR-LIM^r ki 7-i SISKUR ša-ra-a ti-ia-an pé-eš-kir

64' [kat-t]a-kán Ú-UL ku-it-ki da-a-li-iš-kán-zi nu KIN SIG₅-ru

65' [] x-za da-pí-an ZI-an PAP¹-nu-mar-ra ME-aš na-at DINGIR.MAḪ pa-a-iš NU.SIG₅

66' [ki-i ku-i]t da-^r a 7-li-ia-u-wa-ar SIxSÁ-at nu^{LÚ} SANGA pu-nu-uš-šu-en UM-MA ŠU-MA
(over erasure)

⁶ CHD Š3 (s.v. *šiu-* p. 463) cites this as a legitimate singular dative-locative form of *šiu-*, and I hesitate to emend to the expected DINGIR-LIM-ni in light of the same form in KBo 13.76 rev. 8' and KUB 16.36 18' below.

67' []x-x-aš[?] ku-it *A-NA* DINGIR-*LIM* SISKUR *A-NA* EZEN₄ MU.KAM pé-eš-ki-it
 68' [nu k]a-a-aš MU.2.KAM ku-it-wa-ra-at *Ú-UL* pa-a-i nu pa-a-an-zi SISKUR ŠA
 MU.2. KAM ̳
 69' [ša-ku]- wa-aš ̳-šar pa-a-i GAM-an-na za-an-ki-la-tar *IŠ-TU* NINDA KAŠ 2 UDU-ia pa-a-i
 70' [DINGIR-*LUM*]-za KIMIN ̳. MIN ̳ar-ti nu KIN SIG₅-ru DINGIR-*LUM*-za da-pí-an ZI-an ME-
 aš
 71' [na-an] pa-an-ga-u-i pa-a-iš *INA* UD.2.KAM a-aš-šu ME-an na-at DINGIR.MAH SUM ̳-
 an (over erasure)
 72' [*INA* UD.]3. KAM ̳ DINGIR-*LUM*-za EGIR-an ar-ḫa kar-pí-in ME-aš nu-kán an-da a-aš-
 ša-u-i SIG₅

73' []x *A-NA* EZEN₄ MU.KAM ^{URU}Pa-al-ku-un-ta-aš 1 UDU 1 DUG KA.GAG (erasure)
 74' [ZÌ.DA]A[?] pé- eš-ki ̳-iz-zi ^{URU}Gur-ga-an- ta ̳-aš 1 UDU 1 DUG NAG DÙ 1 PA ZÌ.DA
 pé-eš-ki-iz-zi
 75' [] li[?] ̳-im-ma-aš 1 UDU 1 DUG KA.GAG ̳ ½ PA ZÌ.DA pé-eš-ki-iz-zi
 76' [ma-a-a]n *A-NA* DINGIR-*LIM* ki-i SISKUR ̳ša-ra-a ti-ia-an (erasure) e-eš-ša-an-zi
 77' [GAM-kán] *Ú-UL* ku-it-ki da- a-li ̳-iš-kán-zi DINGIR-*LUM*-za da-pí-an <ZI-an> PAP-
 nu-mar-ra ME-aš
 78' [na-a]t x-i pa-a-iš NU.SIG₅

79' [ki-i ku-i]t da-a-li ̳-ia- u ̳-w[a-a]r SIxSÁ ̳-at nu ^{LÚ} ̳[S]ANGA pu-nu-uš-šu-en *UM-
 MA ŠU- MA* ̳
 80' []x- aš-ši[?] ̳x[]x pí[?] ták ̳-ša-an š[a]r-ra-an pé-eš-kán- zi ̳
 81' []x-x-x-x-wa *Ú-UL* pé- eš-kán ̳-zi nu-kán pa[?]-iz[?]-zi[?]-pát[?] ̳
 82' []x x^{HLA} ki-i SISKUR ̳ 2-ŠU ḫa-pu ̳-ša-an-zi GAM-an ̳-na za-an-ki ̳-la-tar
 83' [*IŠ-TU*]x x x x[pí-an-zi DINGI]R- *LUM*-za KIMIN ̳ nu KIN SIG₅-ru ̳

Obv. ii

x+1 x x?[]x[
]
 2' nu-kán x[]

3' ki-i ku-it d[a]- a ̳-[li-ia-u-wa-war SIxSÁ-at nu ^{LÚ}SANGA pu-nu-uš-šu-en
]
 4' *UM-MA ŠU-MA* x[]
 5' 1 PA ZÌ.DA pé-eš-k[i-
]
 6' nu pa-iz-zi ^{LÚ}SA[NGA]
 7' kat-ta-an-na za-an-ki-l[a-tar
]
 8' DINGIR-*LUM*-za KIMIN nu KIN SIG₅-r[u DINGIR^{MEŠ} GUB-ir...ME-er]
 9' na-at pa-an-ga-u-i SUM-er x[
]
 10' *INA* UD.3.KAM DINGIR-*LUM*-za EGIR-an ar-ḫ[a kar-pí-in]
 11' *A-NA* ^dZA-BA₄-BA₄ ^{URU}Ik-šu-na-aš[?] x[]

(3 or 4 lines blank)

12' ki-i ku-it da-a-li-ia-u-wa-ar SIxSÁ-at nu ^{LÚ}S[ANGA pu-nu-] ʾuš-šu ʾ[en]
13' UM-MA ŠU- MA ʾA-NA DINGIR-LIM-wa EZEN₄ MU.KAM MU. 2' KAM kar'-ša'-an' ʾ
[]
14' nu pa-a-an- ʾzi ʾʾ EZEN₄ ʾša-ku-wa-aš-šar-an[]ki' nu' x? [e-eš-ša-an-zi]
15' GAM-an-na za-an-ki-la-tar IŠ-TU NINDA KAŠ 1 UDU- ʾia ʾpí-an-z[i]
[]
16' DINGIR-LUM-za KI.MIN nu KIN SIG₅- ru ʾ[]x x-za x x x[]
17' na-at-za a-ra-aš a-ri ʾpa'-a'-iš ʾINA ʾUD.2 ʾKAM ŠA DINGIR^{MEŠ} m[i]- ʾnu ʾ[mar^{HLA}]
18' na- ʾat ʾDINGIR. ʾMAḪ ʾni SUM-an-t[e]- ʾeš ʾINA ʾUD.3 ʾKAM ʾ^dDAG ʾiš GUB-i[š]
19' pár-na-aš a-aš-šu ME-aš n[a-a]t LUGAL-i pa-a-iš SIG₅

(blank paragraph of about 2 lines)

20' A-NA ^dPí-ir-wa [^U]^{RU} Ḫa-še-nu-wa x x x x ʾA-NA EZEN₄ ʾx x[]
21' 4 UDU ŠÀ-BA 1 MÁŠ.GAL A-NA ^d 7.7.BI ʾx x (TA-PAL?) x x x[]
22' 2 ^{DUG}KA.GAG ʾ50' ʾNINDA^{HLA} 10 NINDA. ʾGUR₄ ʾ[R]A ʾGAL ʾʾ ^{LÚ}SANGA ʾIŠ-
TU É-ŠU []
23' nu ma-a-an A-NA DINGIR-LIM ku-u- ʾun EZEN₄ ša-ra-a ʾti[-ia-an-ta-an]
24' e-eš-ša-an-[z]i GAM-kán Ú- UL ku-it-ki ʾda- ʾa ʾl[i-iš-kán-zi]
25' nu KIN SIG₅-ru ^{LÚ}SANGA-za GÜB- ʾtar ME ʾaš ʾSISKUR-ia ʾME-aš nu-k[án?]

26' ki-i ku- it ʾda-a-li-ia- u ʾ[w]a- ʾar SIxSÁ-at nu ^{LÚ}SANGA ʾ[p]u-nu-u[š-šu-en]
27' UM-MA Š[U-M]A ka-a-aš-wa x x x x x x x UDU^H[^{L.A}]
28' A-NA ^dx[]a?-wa ku-wa-pí i-x x x x (LÚ??) an/DINGIR []x []
29' nu-wa x[]-a'-ri-in KÙ.SIG₁₇ ʾURUDU' DINGIR-LIM da-an-zi' ʾx x x[]
[]

30' nu-wa-ra-an x-pár-na pé-e-da ʾpé-e? ʾx-x[]
[]

31' 20 NINDA^{HLA} ʾ20' ʾ[NI]NDA.GUR₄.RA GAL ^{LÚ}SANGA IŠ-TU ʾÉ ʾŠU p[a-a-i]
32' EZEN₄ Ú- UL ʾDÜ-nu-un ki-nu-na pár'-x x[]
33' GAM-an-na za-an-ki-la-tar IŠ-TU NINDA KAŠ x x x? [pí-iḫ-ḫi]
34' DINGIR-LUM-za KI.MIN nu KIN SIG₅-ru DINGIR-LUM- ʾza <da-pí-an> ZI-an ʾx[]
35' nu-kán an-da a-aš-ša-u-i INA UD.2.K[AM] ŠA DING[IR] ʾ^{MEŠ} ʾx[]
36' na-at A-NA ^dUTU AN SUM-an-te-eš INA ʾUD.3. ʾKAM ʾḪUL ʾl[u ME-an]
37' nu-kán an-da SUD-li_x SIG₅ []

38' A-NA ʾEZEN₄ GURUN ʾia-aš-ši 4 UDU ^{LÚ}MÁŠ.GA[L] ʾpé-eš-ta ʾ[]
39' ʾ10 NINDA.GUR₄ ʾRA GAL ^{LÚ}SANGA IŠ-TU É-ŠU pé-e[š?]- ʾta ʾ[]
40' nu ʾma ʾa-an A-NA DINGIR-LIM ku-u-un ʾEZEN₄ ʾša- ʾra-a ʾt[i-ia-an-ta-an]
41' ʾe-eš ʾša-an-zi GAM-kán ʾÚ-UL ku-it-ki ʾd[a]- ʾa ʾl[i-iš-kán-zi]
42' ʾnu KIN ʾSIG₅-ru IŠ-TU MU^{HLA} ʾGÍD.DA ʾšal ʾli wa-a[š-túl]
[]

43' n[a]-at pa-an-ga-u-i (erasure) SI[G₅]

44' ki-i ku-it da-a-li-ia-u-wa-ar ʔ SIxSÁ ʔ-at ʔ nu ^{LÚ}SANGA ʔ p[u-nu-uš-šu--u-e]n
 45' UM-MA ŠU-[M]A EZEN₄ GURUN-wa ku-wa-pí DÙ-ʔ an-zi ʔ nu-ʔ wa ʔ-r[a]x-ʔ zi ʔ
 46' ša-an-ḥa-a-an-zi nu-wa-ra-an ʔ ša ʔ-an-na-pí-ʔ la-aḥ ʔ[-ḥa-an-z]i⁷
 47' nu-ʔ wa ʔ ^{LÚ}SANGA IŠ-TU É-ŠU 1 UDU 2 GU₄ pé-eš-ʔ ta? ʔ 11+??[]
 48' pé-eḥ-ḥu-u[n] ʔ EZEN₄ GURUN² ʔ Ú-UL DÙ-nu-un ki-nu-na 1 x x []
 49' ʔ EZEN₄ ša ʔ-ku²-wa-aš-ša-ra-an pí-an-zi kat-ta-ʔ an-na ^{LÚ}SANGA ʔ
 50' za-an-ʔ ki ʔ-[l]a-tar IŠ-TU NINDA KAŠ 1 UDU-ia pa-a-ʔ i ʔ
 51' DINGIR-LUM-z[a K]I.MIN nu KIN ʔ SIG₅-ru ʔ DINGIR-ʔ LUM-za da ʔ-pí-an ʔ ZI-an ʔ
 52' TI-tar-ra [M]E-aš nu-kán A-NA MU^{HL.A} GÍD.DA INA UD.2.KAM ʔ ŠA DINGIR^{MEŠ} mi-nu-mar^{HL.A}
 53' ME-an-te-eš ʔ na ʔ-at DINGIR.MAḥ-ni SUM-an-te-eš INA UD.3.KAM ^{LÚ}SANGA ʔ [?]
 54' EGIR-an ar-ḥa wa-aš-ʔ túl ʔ ME-aš na-at A-NA ^dUTU AN pa-a-ʔ iš ʔ []SIG₅

(about 1 line blank)

55' A-NA ^dPí-ir-wa^{URU} Ḥ[ar?]-mi?-ig-ga A-NA ʔ EZEN₄ ʔ ITU.ʔ KAM ʔ 1 UDU 1 ʔ GU₄ ʔ [?]
 56' 1 PA ZÌ.DA ^{LÚ}SANGA IŠ ʔ-TU É-ŠU pé-eš-ki-iz-zi
 57' ^mḤa-at ʔ-tu-ša-^dLAMMA-a[š-š]a EZEN₄ ITU.KAM ša(-)x x x[]
 58' ʔ e-eš ʔ-ša-i nu-wa 3 UDU 3 ^{DUG}KA.GAG 3 PA ZÌ.ʔ DA ʔ []
 59' ʔ pé-eš-ki ʔ-iz-zi nu ma-a-an A-NA DINGIR-LIM ku-u-un EZ[EN₄ ITU.KAM]
 60' ša-ra-a ti-ia-an-ta-an ʔ e ʔ-eš-ša-an-zi
 61' GAM-kán Ú-UL ku-it-ki da-a-l[i]-iš-kán-zi n[u] ʔ KIN ʔ [SIG₅-ru]
 62' ^{LÚ}SANGA-za-kán ŠÀ-za IZI ME-aš n[a-a]t pa-an-ʔ ga-u ʔ-[i]
 63' ki-i ku-it da-a-li-ia-u-wa-ar SIxSÁ-at [n]u ^{LÚ}SANGA ʔ pu-nu ʔ[-uš-šu-(-u-)en]
 64' UM-MA ŠU-Ú-MA A-NA MU.KAM-ti-pát-wa-ká[n] ku-it x[]
 65' URU-az ar-ḥa pa-a-an e-eš-ta nu-wa[]x x x[]
 66' ^mḤa-at-tu-ša-^dLAMMA-aš-ša Ú-UL i[-ia-at?]
 67' am-mu-uq-qa-wa Ú-UL e-eš-ša-aḥ-ḥu-un[]
 68' ITU.KAM-wa kap-pu-u-wa-an-zi nu ma-ši-ia[-an-ki]
 69' kar-ša-an-te-eš nu SISKUR a-pé-el ŠA ITU[.KAM?]
 70' ʔ SUM ʔ-an-zi GAM-an-na za-an-ki-la-tar (over erasure) ʔ IŠ ʔ-T[U NINDA KAŠ SUM/pí-an-zi]
 71' DINGIR-LUM-za ʔ KI ʔ.MIN nu KIN SIG₅-ru GIG.GA[L]-za x[]
 72' na-at A-NA ^dUTU AN pa-a-iš INA UD.2.KAM x x x[]
 73' IZI ME-aš nu-kán an-da ša-an-na-ʔ pí ʔ-[i]
 74' INA UD.3.KAM ^{LÚ}SANGA-za EGIR-an ar-ḥa¹ GÙB-t[ar]
 75' na-at-za ZAG-za da-a-iš SIG₅

(about 1 line blank, then column ends)

Rev. iii

(Lines 1–43 too broken to read, and not rendered in the handcopy.)

44 A-N[A?]x x x[]x ^{LÚ}SANGA IŠ-TU É-ŠU ʔ Ú-UL ʔ [pé-eš-ta]

⁷ Reading after CHD Š1 s.v. *šannapilahḥ-*, p. 159.

45 nu x[]x x x x x-ki?-x-zi GAM-an-⁷ na ⁷ za-an-ki-l[a-tar]
 46 IŠ-⁷ TU NINDA KAŠ ⁷ 1 UDU-ia pa-a-⁷ i ⁷ DINGIR-⁷ LUM ⁷-za KI.MIN nu KIN [SIG₅-ru]
 47 x x[]ra ME-an na-⁷ at ⁷ DINGIR.MAḪ-ni [S]UM-an INA UD.2.KAM []
 48 DINGIR-⁷ LUM-za EGIR ⁷-an ar-ḫ[a k]ar-pí-in ME-aš na-⁷ an ⁷ A-[NA]
 49 INA U[D].⁷ 3 ⁷.KAM ḪUL-lu ME-an nu-kán an-da SUD-li₁₂ S[IG₅]

50 A-NA ⁷ EZEN₄ tar ⁷-ša-aš 1 UDU 1 ⁷ ^{DUG} KA.GAG 1 PA ZÌ.⁷ DA ⁷ []
 51 ^{LÚ} SANGA ⁷ IŠ-⁷ TU ⁷ É-ŠU pé-eš-ki-iz-[z]i nu ma-⁷ a ⁷-[a]n []
 52 A-NA DINGI[R-L]IM EZEN₄ tar-ša-aš ša-ra-a ti-⁷ ia-an ⁷-ta[-an]
 53 e-eš-ša-an-zi GAM-kán ⁷ UL ⁷ ku-it-⁷ ki ⁷ [d]a-a-⁷ li ⁷-iš-kán-zi]
 54 nu KIN ⁷ SIG₅-ru ḪUL ⁷-lu ME-an nu-kán ^d X-ni ⁷ NU[.SIG₅]

55 ki-i ⁷ ku ⁷-i[t d]a-⁷ a^{1?} ⁷-[l]i-i[a]-u-wa-⁷ ar SIxSÁ ⁷-at nu ^{LÚ} SA[NGA]
 56 p[u]-nu-uš-š[u-u?-en U]M-MA ⁷ ŠU-Ú-MA ^{GIŠ} KIRI₆ DINGIR-LIM-wa []
 57 e-eš-ša[-i?/-an-zi? ku-i]t-ma-an A-NA DINGIR-⁷ LIM ⁷ ḫa-a[z]
 58 ⁷ na-at? ⁷ []x nu-wa ma-an-ni-in-ku-wa-a[n]
 59 []x(zi?) []z[i ki-nu-na-w[a[?]-ra?]-]an []
 60 [...^mḪa-at-tu-š]a-^dLAMMA x(da/it?)-[t/š]a-ru(-)iš-kán-zi []
 61 []ARAD^{MEŠ} ^mḪa-at-⁷ tu ⁷-ša-^dLAMMA iš-ḫi-x[]
 62 []x-aš KAŠ 1 UDU-ia za-an-ki-la-an-zi []
 63 [DINGIR-LUM-z]a ⁷ KI ⁷.MIN nu KIN ⁷ SIG₅ ⁷-ru DINGIR^{MEŠ} GUB-⁷ ir ⁷ TI-ta[r ...? ME-aš]
 64 ⁷ na ⁷-at pa-an-ga-u-i ⁷ SUM ⁷-ir INA UD.2.KAM x x x M[E?]
 65 nu-kán EGIR-pa ^{GIŠ} DAG-ti INA UD.3.KAM ḪUL-⁷ lu ⁷ [] []
 66 nu-kán an-da SUD-li₁₂ ⁷ SIG₅ ⁷

67 A-NA ḪUR.SAG DINGIR-ni EZEN₄ ḫa-me-eš-ḫi 1 GU₄? 2[?][]
 68 EZEN₄ zé-e-ni-ia-aš-š[i]⁷ 1 GU₄? ⁷ []x[]
 69 ^{LÚ} SANGA IŠ-TU É-ŠU [pa-a-i]
 70 nu ma-a-an A-NA DINGIR-LIM k[e-e EZEN^{MEŠ}]
 71 ša-ra-a ti-ia-a[n-ta-an e-eš-ša-an-zi GAM/kat-ta-kán[]
 72 ⁷ UL ku-it-k[i da-a-li-iš-kán-zi nu KIN SIG₅-ru]
 73 DINGIR-LUM-za ⁷ da ⁷-pí-a[n ZI-an...]
 74 INA UD.2.KAM a-aš-š[u]
 75 INA UD.3.KAM DINGIR[]
 76 na-at[]

Translation:

§1 (i x+1–6')

They are not calling [...] Ankusna? [...] If they are performing] this monthly festival [for you, O deity, complete[ly], and leaving nothing [o]ut, [let the KIN be] favorable. [Evi]l was taken, and given to the priest. Unfavorable.

§2 (i 7'–12')

Concerning [th]is (matter), with respect to which a n[egl]ect was determined, we asked the priest, and he said, "[...] the monthly festival of the sixth month f[or] the god was omitted." Shall they thereupon make up the festival of the month once, in the sixth month, and in addition give restitution with bread (and) beer? (Will you,) O deity, (have it) likewise? Let the KIN be favorable. The deity took the whole soul for itself, and placed it in anger. Unfavorable.

§3 (i 13'–20')

Concerning this (matter), shall they thereupon make up the monthly festival of the sixth month twice? And shall the priests also make restitution with one ox and one sheep? Should they show him mercy(?)? [...] and the men of Ankusna ...? make restitution with bread and beer? Should they show mercy(?)? Will you, O deity, have (it) likewise? Let the KIN be favorable. ^dDAG arose, took the good of the [hous]e [and] the year, (and they were placed) by the whole soul of the fate-goddess. [O]n the second day, the Sun-God of heaven aro[se], took well-being, and gives(sic!) it to the *panku*. [O]n the third day, the deity took hidden anger for itself and (it was placed) into goodness. Favorable.

§4 (i 21'–27')

For ^dPirwa an[d] the queen [...], for the yearly festival, the priest is giving one ox, nine [sh]eep, among which one goat of ^d7.7.BI, ten thick breads, among which one thick bread of *hazzila*-weight [...] breads of *hazzila*-weight, two hundred big thick breads, twelve vessels of beer, one vessel [...] from his household. If they are performing this monthly festival for you, O deity, completely, and leaving nothing out, let the KIN be [fa]vorable. Goodness was taken, and it lies by the anger of the deity. Unfavorable.

§5 (i 28'–35')

Concerning this (matter), with respect to which a neglect was determined, we asked the priest. He said, "They established two rams (to be) anointed, and when the yearly festival takes place, they will anoint them for ^dPirwa. But last year, Mr. Palla, the man of Ankušna, commandeered <them>, and he simply killed them." So now should they thereupon—as for those two rams, the priest will give back others—give additional compensation with bread (and) beer? Will you, O deity, have (it) likewise? Let the KIN be favorable. Evil was taken and (placed) behind ^dDAG. Unfavorable.

§6 (i 36'–41')

Concerning this (matter) which was unfavorable. Should they go(?) and should Mr. Palla also give restitution back to the god for the two rams? And in addition, should he give a compensation with bread (and) beer? Should they pa[r]don him? Will you, O deity, have it likewise? Let the KIN be favorable. The gods arose, too[k] life, and gave it to the *panku*. On the second day, goodness was taken, and (placed) behind ^dDAG. On the third day, evil was taken, [a]nd (placed) into emptiness. [Favorable.]

§7 (i 42'–47')

[Fo]r ^dPirwa of [..., for the] festival of the month, the priest is giving one sheep, one vessel of beer, and ten breads from [his] house [...?]. If they are celebrating this festival of the month [c]omp[le]tely, and [lea]ving nothing out, let the KIN be favorable. [...] took rightness (and) the year [and] gave [them] to [the *pan*]ku. On the second day, the favors of the gods were taken; they lie to the right of [...]. Favorable.

§8 (i 48'–54')

[W]hen they bring [...] to the holy (place), the priest [gives] from his house. He is giving [...], ninety breads of one handful (each), nine vessels of beer, (and) 300 great thick breads [for] ^dPirwa and the queen, and for ^d7.7.BI, one goat, one vessel of beer [an]d [...]. If they are celebrating this yearly festival for the god completely, and [l]eaving nothing out, let the KIN be favorable. The deity too[k] the whole soul for itself and placed it in anger. Unfavorable.

§9 (i 55'–60')

Concerning [thi]s matter, with respect to which a neglect was determined, shall they thereupon celebrate the yearly festival of the first year [...]? And in addition, shall one SANGA-priest give a restitution [o]f bread, beer, and one sheep? Will they pardon him? (Will you), O deity, (have it) likewise? Let the [KI]N be favorable. Life was taken by the long years, and (given) to the whole soul of the deity. [O]n the second day, the favors of the gods were taken, and they were given to Ḫannaḫanna. [On] the third day, the SANGA-priest took rightness and offering/ritual for himself, and (they were given) to the gods. Favorable.

§10 (i 61'–65')

[For] ^dPirwa, for the yearly festival, from the house of Mr. Ali-Šarruma, they were giving one ox, eight sheep, x jugs of beer, one *parīsu* of wet meal, two *parīsu* of dry meal, and three *sūtū* of barley mash. If they have been giving this offering to the god completely, and they are leaving nothing out, let the KIN be favorable. [...] took the whole soul and protection, and gave them to Ḫannaḫanna. Unfavorable.

§11 (i 66'–72')

[Concerning this matter, with respect to whi]ch a neglect has been determined, we asked the priest, and he said, Since [...] was giving the offering to the god for the yearly festival—[t]his is the second year—since he does not give it, they will go and he will give the [en]tire offering of the second year, and in addition, he will give a restitution of bread, beer, and two sheep. Will you, [O deity], have (it) likewise? Let the KIN be favorable. The deity took the whole soul for itself, and gave [it] to the *panku*. On the second day, goodness was taken, and it was given (to) Ḫannaḫanna. [On] the third [day], the deity took hidden anger for itself, and (it was placed) into goodness. Favorable.

§12 (i 73'–78')

[...] for the festival of the year, the city of Palkuntas is giving one sheep, one jug of beer, [and X amount of me]al (?). The city of Gurgantas is giving one sheep, one vessel made for drinking (?), (and) one *parīsu* of meal. [The city of ...]limmas is giving one sheep, one jug of beer, (and) one-half *parīsu* of meal. If they are performing this offering completely, and leaving nothing out, (let

the KIN be favorable). The deity took the whole <soul> and protection for itself and gave [them] to [...]. Unfavorable.

§13 (i 79'–83')

[Concerning this matter, with respect to whi]ch a neglect has been determined, we asked the priest, and he said, “They are giving half [...] They are not giving [...] he will definitely go(?) [...] Shall they make up this offering twice [with ...]s, and in addition, [shall they give] a restitution [of...]? (Will you), [O deit]y, (have it) likewise? Let the KIN be favorable.

ii

§x+14 (ii x+1–2')

[...]

§15' (ii 3'–10')

Concerning this matter, with respect to which a neg[lect has been determined, we asked the priest,] and he said, [“...” He] is giving 1 *parīsu* of meal [...] Shall the pr[iest] thereupon [...]and in addition, [give] a restitu[tion of...] (Will you), O deity, (have it) likewise? [Let] the KIN be favora[ble. The gods⁸ arose and took...] They gave it/them to the *panku*, [...] On the third day, the deity [took] hidden [anger...].

§16' (ii 11')

For Zababa of Ikšuna [...]

§17' (ii 12'–19')

Concerning this matter, with respect to which a neglect has been determined, we [as]ked the p[riest], and he said, “The yearly festival for the god of the second year was omitted.” They will thereupon celebrate [...] the entire festival, and in addition, they will give restitution of bread, beer, and one sheep. (Will you), O deity, (have it) likewise? Let the KIN be favorable. [.....]and gave them, one to another. On the second day, the favors of the gods [were taken], and they were given to Ḫannaḫanna. On the third day, ^dDAG aros[e], took the good of the house, and gave [i]t to the king. Favorable.

§18' (ii 20'–25')

For ^dPirwa of Ḫašenuwa [...] for the festival [...], the priest [is giving] four sheep, among which one goat for ^d7.7.BI, two jugs of beer, fifty(?) breads, (and) ten big thick breads fro[m his household.] If they are celebrating this festival for the god compl[etely], and leav[ing] nothing out, let the KIN be favorable. The priest took left-ness for himself and also took the offering, and [...]

§19' (ii 26'–37')

Concerning this matter, with respect to which a neglect was determined, [we a]sk[ed] the priest, and he said, “This [...] sheep [...]for ^d[...]awa, when [...] They are taking(?) [...] the gold (and) copper(?) of the deity. [...] and [...] it ... the priest [will] g[ive] twenty breads (and) ten big thick breads from his house. I have not celebrated the festival, but now [...]and in addition, [I will give] a restitution of bread, beer [and? ...] (Will you), O deity) have (it) likewise? Let the KIN

⁸ This is the only likely plural active symbol.

be favorable. The deity [took] the <whole> soul [and? ...] for itself; (it/they were placed) into goodness. On the secon[d] day, [...] of the gods [were taken] and they were given to the Sun-God of heaven. On the third day, evi[l was taken] and (placed) into emptiness. Favorable.

§20' (ii 38'–43')

(S)he also gave four sheep (and) one shepherd to him(?) for the festival of fruit. The priest gave ten big thick breads from his household. If they are celebrating this festival for the god compl[etely], and lea[ving] nothing out, let the KIN be favorable. The great si[n] [was taken] from the long years, and it (was given) to the *panku*. Favored[ble].

§21' (ii 44'–54')

Concerning this matter, with respect to which a neglect was determined, [we] a[ske]d the priest, and he said, “When they perform the festival of the fruit, they search/scour [...] They ma[ke] it empty.(?) The priest gave one sheep and two oxen from his household. I gave 11+ [...] I did not celebrate the festival of the fruit (?), but now they will give one [...] with regard to(?) the entire festival, and in addition, the priest will give a restitution of bread, beer, and one sheep. (Will you), O deity, (have it) [li]kewise? Let the KIN be favorable. The deity took the whole soul and life for itself, and (gave them) to the long years; on the second day, the favors of the gods were taken, and given to Ḫannaḥanna; on the third day, the priest [...] took hidden sin, and gave it to the Sun-God. Favorable.

§22' (ii 55'–62')

For ^dPirwa of Ḫ[ar]migga, for the monthly festival, the priest is giving one sheep, one ox, (and) 1 *parīsu* of meal from his household. Ḫattuša-^dLAMMA [al]so celebrates the monthly festival [...] “He is giving 3 sheep, 3 jugs of beer, and 3 *parīsū* of meal [...] If they are performing this [monthly] fest[ival] for the deity completely, and leaving nothing out, [let] the KIN [be favorable] The priest took fire from the heart(?) for himself, and [gave i]t [to] the *panku*. []

§23' (ii 63'–75')

Concerning this matter, with respect to which a neglect was determined, [we] ask[ed] the priest, and he said, “What [is given?] for the year only has come from the city, and [...] and Mr. Ḫattuša-^dLAMMA has/does not [celebrate it?] and also I have not been celebrating (it). They keep account of the months.(?) However ma[n]y times(?) [...] they were omitted, they will give an offering of that month. And in addition, [they will give] compensation of [bread (and) beer]. (Will you), O deity, (have it) likewise? Let the KIN be favorable. The gre[at] sickness [took...] for itself, and gave it to the Sun-God of heaven. On the second day [...] took fire, and [placed it] into emptiness. On the third day, the priest [took] hidden left-[ness] for himself and placed it on the right. Favorable.

iii

§x+y+24 (iii 44–49)

The priest [has not given ...] fo[r...] from his household. He will [...] and in addition, he will give a restitu[tion] of bread, beer, and one sheep. (Will you), O deity, (have it) likewise? [Let] the KIN [be favorable.] [...] was taken, and it was [g]iven to Ḫannaḥanna. On the second day, the deity took hidden anger for itself, and [gave] it t[o...] On the third day, evil was taken and placed into emptiness. Fav[orable].

§25'' (iii 50–54)

The priest will be giving 1 sheep, 1 jug of beer, and one *parīsu* of meal from his house for the festival of drying/sprouting(?). If they are celebrating the festival of drying/sprouting for the god completely, and leav[ing] nothing out, let the KIN be favorable. Evil was taken, and given to^d[...]. Un[favorable].

§26'' (iii 55–66)

Concerning this matter, with respect to whi[ch a n]eglect was determined, [we] ask[ed] the pr[iest], and he said, “[...] cultivat[e(s)] the deity’s garden. [...] When [...] for the god [...] ‘nea[r...] [...] ‘but now [...] [...^mHattuš]a-^dLAMMA [...] [...] binding? the servants of Hattuša-^dLAMMA [...] they will make restitution [with...], beer, and one sheep (Will you), [O deity], (have it) likewise? Let the KIN be favorable. The gods arose, took life [and?...] and gave it/them to the *panku*. On the second day, [...] was taken(?) and (was placed) behind^dDAG. On the third day, evil [was taken], and (placed) into emptiness. Favorable.

§27'' (iii 67–76)

For this mountain-god (?) for the festival of the spring, one ox?, two? [...] For the festival of the fall [...] one ox? [...] the priest [will give] from his house. If [they are celebrating] th[ese festivals] for the god completel[y, and] [leaving] nothin[g out, let the KIN be favorable. The deity [took] the entir[e soul and...] for itself. On the second day, goodness[...] On the third day, the god [...] it[...]

IBoT 4.43

x+1 [...]x x x [...]

2' [...]x

3' (blank)

4' [...] ʾ Aʾ ʾ NAʾ x x atʾ-ta-a-x [...]

5' [...]tar a-pé-e-da-aš uš-ki[-ši...]

6' [...] ʾ pé ʾ-ra-an-ma

7' [...]x LÚ^{MES} URU Ĥat-ti GÙB-z[a...]

8' (blank)

9' [...]x-at

10' [...]nu ʾ KIN ʾ NU.ʾ SIG₅ ʾ-d[u...]

11' [...]n]a-aš a-a[š-ša-u-i...]

12' [...] x [...]

Topic: Military activity.

KBo 13.76

Obv.

1 []x]

2 []x-i SIG₅-x[]
 3 [-] na ʾ LUGAL KUR Kar[-qa-maš]
 4 []x-za ZAG-tar ME-aš n[u]
 5 x[S]UM-za

9

6 nu-un-na-aš-kán an-da-ma da-la-i NU.ŠE-d[u]
 7 LUGAL KUR Kar-qa-maš-za ZAG-tar KASKAL ME-aš na-aš LUGA[L...]

8 u-ni-in-kán ZAG a-pé-el ŠA ZAG BE-LU^{HI.A}
 9 an-ʾ da ʾ¹⁰ da-li-ia-an-zi u-ʾ i-ia ʾ-an ku-e-eš ʾar-k[i-ir]
 10 NU.SIG₅-du EN^{MEŠ}-ma-aš GUB-tar INIM-an MU.KAM
 11 in-ʾ nir ʾ-tar ME nu-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš

12 ^dUTU-ŠI kiš-an DÙ-zi BE-LU^{HI ʾA}-za ku-e-eš
 13 ^dUTU-ŠI ZI-ni GAM-an I-DI na-aš-kán ar-ʾ ʾa ʾ
 14 ʾal-ʾ za-a ʾ-i^{11 URU?} na[?]-ma-kán pa[!]-ra-a na-a-i¹² a-pé-ez-za ma-li-eš-ku-eš-zi SIG₅-ru
 15 DINGIR^{MEŠ} GUB-ir IZI ŠU^{LÚ} KÚR ME
 16 na-aš A-NA^{LÚ} KÚR ʾ GUB-za GAR ʾ-ri 2-NU DINGIR.MAḪ GUB
 17 PAP-mar IZI ša[l-li wa-aš-túl? ...? LÚ.]ʾ KÚR ʾ ME-aš
 18 [Š]A[?] LÚ KÚR wa[-aš-túl]

19 ʾ kiš ʾ-an[]
 (break)

Rev.

x+1 []x x[]

2' []x-ʾ it A-NA ʾ^{LÚ} KÚR SIG₅-x[]
 3' ʾ :ku-la[?] ʾ-na nu-ʾ u-wa[?] ʾ uš-ki-ši :k[u-la-na]
 4' nu-u-wa e-eš-zi A-NA^{LÚ} KÚR x[]
 5' ^{LÚ} KÚR-za ʾ GUB ʾ-tar INIM NINDA.GUR₄.RA iš-pa-d[u-zi ME-aš]
 6' nu-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš (erasure) ni ZAG pé-še-et ZAG-za[]

7' :ku-la-na-aš-ma NU.SIG₅-du LUGAL-za ZAG-tar A-TAM-MA
 8' INIM ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ} ʾ-ni da-pí ZI-ni ʾ SIG₅ ʾ

9' [KA]RAŠ ʾ ka[?] ʾ-x-x-aš[?] KUR UGU NU.SIG₅-ʾ ri ʾ
 10' [K]ÚR :ku-la-ʾ na ʾ na-a-wi₅ ʾ KARAŠ ʾ^{HI.ʾA} ʾ-ma
 11' []x pa-iz-zi nu-uš-ma-aš DINGIR-LUM ke-da-ni MU.[K]AM
 12' []x uš-ki-ši NU.ŠE-du
 13' []x-ma-aš ZAG-tar SIG₅ ʾ LUGAL-aš IGI^{HI.A} ʾ-as ʾ IGI.LAL ME-er ʾ¹³

⁹ No line apparent in photo, but the others are very faint, so perhaps it is just not visible.

¹⁰ There is an AŠ here in the handcopy, but in the photo it appears to just be a dent in the tablet.

¹¹ The next few words are written above the line.

¹² The text returns to the line here.

¹³ Following CHD Š1, pp. 66 and 75.

14'¹⁴ [] I[Š-T]U^{LÚ}HAL ni NU.GÁL ZÉ ħi-[li₈]

15' [KARA]Š[?]-ma GIM-an A-NA LÚ.KÚR (erasure)NU.S[IG₅[?]

16' []x [DI]NGIR-LUM ħar-kán-na-aš ku-⁷ la ⁷-a-na[]

17' [uš-k]i-ši an-za-a-aš-ma-kán an-da da-l[i]

18' ⁷ an-da ⁷ da-⁷ li ⁷-u-wa-an-zi NU.SIG₅-du[]

19' ⁷ ZÉ ħi ⁷-li₈ GÜB-kán RA-ni zu¹-lu-kiš a-da-n[i]

20' ^{URU}Ti-ħu-li-ia-aš-kán ne-ia-ri[]

21' DINGIR.MAĦ⁷ GUB ⁷-iš INIM ^{URU}Ti-ħu-li ME-aš na-a[š]

22' [^{UR}]U^UTu-ħu-ni-qa-a-as :ku-wa-ia-ta-x[]

23' [K]ÚR[?] ták-šu-la-iz-zi[]

(text breaks)

Translation:

Obverse

§1'

...favorable...the king of Kar[kamis]...took [...] (and) rightness [...] was given [...].

§2'

Will (s)he/it let us go there? Let it be unfavorable. The king of Karkamis took rightness for himself and [gave] it¹⁵ [to] the king [...?].

§3'

With respect to that border—will the lords of that border, the ones who ha[ve] sent (or: whom they have sent), let us go in? Let it be unfavorable. The lords took disadvantageousness, the matter, the year, (and) vigor for themselves, (and gave them) to the gods.

§4'

His Majesty will act thus: The lords whom His Majesty knows in his soul—he will call them away, but the city he will send forth(?). Will (the bad situation) become less serious?¹⁶ Let it be favorable. The gods arose, (and) took fire (and) the hand (of?) the enemy.¹⁷ They¹⁸ lie to the left of the enemy. Second: Hannahanna arose (and) took protection, fire, the gre[at sin, ...? (and) the ene]my, (and) [gave] (them) [to] the s[in?] of(?) the enemy.

§5'

[His Majesty will act] thus [...]

(break)

¹⁴ This line is smaller; it seems to have been written in between the previous line and the paragraph line after the latter was drawn in.

¹⁵ Common-gender!

¹⁶ See CHD L–N p. 130 for this translation.

¹⁷ “The hand (and) the enemy” is also possible; “enemy” appears as a P symbol in KUB 5.1, and “hand” appears apparently alone in KBo 46.58 obv. 7' (though the context is broken and there is nothing preventing, e.g., a possessive pronoun).

¹⁸ Common-gender.

Reverse

§1'

[...]

§2'

...good to/for the enemy...Do you still see the army? Does the a[rmy] still exist?¹⁹ For the enemy [...]. The enemy [took] disadvantageousness, the matter, (and) bread and win[e] for himself, and (gave them) to the gods. *Nipašuri* p.-ed (fallen?) to the right; on the right [...]

§3'

And let the army be unfavorable: The king took rightness, blood, (and) the matter for himself, (and gave it) to the whole soul of the deity.²⁰ Favorable.

§4'

...the army...up [to/above?] the land, to/for the unfavorable [...] the enemy army is not yet [...], while the troops will go [...]. Do you, O deity, see [...] in this year for them? Let it be unfavorable. [...] took rightness, goodness, and the king's sight [...]. The *nipašuri* is not there, the gallbladder is *hilipšiman* [...]

§5'

And if the enemy has an [arm]y, unfavorable?...Do you, O deity, [se]e an army of destruction [for us?]. [Will you?/they?] le[t] us go in? [...] to let go in, let it be unfavorable. [...] The gallbladder is *hilipšiman*; to the left is destroyed [...].

§6'

Will the city of Tiḥuli defect? [...] Ḫannaḥanna arose, took the matter of the city of Tiḥuli, [...].

§7'

The city of Tuḥuniqa ...[...] Will the [ene]my make peace? [...]

KBo 24.123

Obv.?

x+1 [...]x x x[]x x

2' [...]x šar-ni-in-ku-u-^r e ^r[-ni]

3' [...]x ḪUL ME-an

4' [...da-pí-i] ^r ZI ^r-ni NU.SIG₅

5' [...]x NINDA.GUR₄.RA UD-*MI*

6' [...]EG]IR-pa-ma na-a-wi₅

7' [...] ^r er ^r SIG₅-^r ru ^r

8' [...] na-at DINGIR.MAḪ-ni ^r SUM ^r-[a]n-te-eš

9' [...ka]r-pí-in ME-aš

¹⁹ For this translation see CHD L–N p. 469.

²⁰ See n. 6 on this form in KBo 14.21.

10' [...a-aš]-^Γ šu ^Γ ME-an
11' [... SI]G₅
(lower edge)

Rev.?

(Upper edge? + ~3 lines)

x+1 [...] x x x x x

2'²¹ [...a-ši Û-TUM A-NA MUNUS.LUGAL ^dDN I-NA ^{URU}Š]a-pí-nu-wa pa-ra-a IŠ-BAT

3' [...]-an NU.SIG₅

4' [...]x nu KIN NU.^Γ SIG₅ ^Γ-[d]u

5' [...DINGIR-LIM]-ni da-pí-^Γ i ^Γ Z[I-n]i NU.SIG₅

6' [...]A²-NA MUNUS.LUGAL

7' [...pa-]ra-a IŠ-BAT nam-ma-ma KI.MIN

8' [...]x NU.SIG₅

9' [...]x-ni-uš 2 Û^{MES} A-NA MUNUS.LUGAL

10' [...]x pa-ra-a IŠ-BAT

11' [...]NU.SIG₅

Topic: Problems with cult offerings and offered restitutions: “we will make restitution” (obv. 2’), “daily bread-offering” (obv 5’) and the queen’s dreams (rev. 9’).

KBo 24.125

x+1 [...]x x [...]

2' [...] SIG₅ []

3' [...]x-na ^{URU}Ta-^{hur}-pa ^{URU}Ka-^Γ a ^Γ[-ta-pa...]

4' [...]x EZEN₄ AN.TA^h.ŠUM^{SAR} x[...]

5' [...]h]a[?] UL ku-iš-ki w[a]-x[...]

6' [...]x-an-aš EZEN₄^{MES}-ia x[...]

7' [...]pa-a]n-ku-uš-za G^ÜB-la-t[ar...]

8' [...]x ZAG-tar da-pí-a[n ZI-an...]

(1 line blank, then broken)

Topic: Festivals, including the AN.TA^h.ŠUM-festival, involving the cities of Ta^hurpa and Ka[tapa].

KBo 40.50

l.c.

x+1 [...]x-it x²²-kán[

²¹ Restoration of this line is after Mouton, *Rèves*, 228–29; I do not follow her in assuming that this text has a combination of methods, since the traces are not certain.

2' [...a]n-zi KI.MIN ŠE-ru
3' [...]x-iš MU-an
4' [...]ZAG-tar tar[?]-da²³ ME-er

(a blank paragraph of about 4 lines)

(1 or 2 lines blank so far as preserved, then broken)

r. c.

x+1 x[...]
2' ^dZA-BA₄-B[A₄...]
3' na-aš-kán x[...]

4' šar-ra-aš ku-uš[...]
5' nu-za DINGIR-LUM a-pu-u[...]
6' SA₅ IZKIM MU.KA[M[?]...]

7' nu šar-ra-aš šar-x[...]
8' nu KIN NU.ŠE-du pa[-an-ku-uš-za...]
9' 2-Ú DINGIR.MAH G[UB-iš...]
10' nu-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ}[-aš...]
11' na-aš ^mNa²⁴[...]

(broken)

Topic: Shares of offerings(?) for specific gods.

KBo 41.149

x+1 [...]x AN x[...]
2' [...]x-za da-pí-an Z[I-an...]
3' [...]a-at LUGAL-i pa-iš[...]
4' [...Š]A DINGIR^{MEŠ} mi-nu-mar^{HI}[^A...]

5' [...k]i-i ku-it [A]N.ŠUR-x[...]
6' [...]ʾ ki-i[?] ʾ[...]
(text breaks)

Topic: Unclear.

²² HAR seems most likely, but the photo looks more like ŠE.

²³ See n. 68.

²⁴ Or ME-x?

KBo 41.150

x+1 [...] x x [...]
 2' [...]x-ki-ši(-)k[i-...]
 3' [...nu]-kán an-da SUD-li *IN*[A UD.2.KAM...]
 4' [...M]E²⁵-aš nu-kán an-da SIG₅-u-^Γ i ^Γ[...]
 5' [...] *IN*A UD.3.KAM DINGIR.MAḪ GUB-iš x[...]
 6' [...]na-at pa-an-ga-u-i SUM-an [...]

(lower edge)

Topic: Unclear.

KBo 41.151

Obv.

x+1 [...]SI]G₅-^Γ in ME-aš nu ^Γ-[kán]
 2' [...nu]-kán an-da SUD-li₁₂ x[]
 3' [...]x ME-an-te-eš
 4' [...]SUM-an]-te-eš SIG₅

5' [...]ma ŠA DINGIR^{MES} kar-pí-uš ME-an-te-iš
 6' [...]SUM-an-t]e-eš NU.SIG₅

7' [...]LU]GAL-uš ku-e-da-aš pé-ra-an EGIR-pa
 8' [...]x NU.SIG₅-du
 9' [...]ME-an-te]-^Γ eš ^Γna-at-kán *A-NA* GIG.TUR

10' [...]]-^Γ e ^Γ-eš kat-ta pa-a-an-te-eš
 11' [...]NU.SIG₅-du
 12' [...]nu-kán an-da ḪUL-u-i
 13' [...]SI]G₅

14' [...]k]u-it SIxŠÁ-at
 15' [...]n]a-aš-kán ŠÀ KUR-*TI* ú-e-eḫ-zi
 16' [...]x pa-a-an-te-eš
 17' [...]ú-]e-eḫ-zi
 18' [...]x-mi-ia-zi
 19' [...]x-an
 20' [...]x SIG₅-aḫ-ḫa-an-zi
 21' [...]SI]G₅[?]-ri
 (text breaks)

Rev.

x+1 [...]ḪUL-l]u ME-^Γ an ^Γx x[]

²⁵ Reading based on the tablet photo.

2' [...]x da-pí-an ZI-[a]n

3' [...]pa-iš

4' [...]n-te-⁷ eš ⁷

5' [...]

6' [...]n TUKU.TUKU-u-an-za

7' [...]an nu-⁷ kán ⁷ DINGIR-*LIM*-ni

8' [...]a?

9' [...]a]t x-x[?]-kán-za ku-iš x-aš

10' [...]d]a-pí-an ZI-an TI-tar-ra ME-aš

11' [...]NA UD.2].KAM ^{GIS}DAG GUB-iš

12' [...]x nu-kán EGIR-pa ^{GIS}DAG

13' [...]ME-an-te-eš

14' [...]t]e-eš SIG₅

15' [...]TUR-aš e-eš-ta

16' [...]ú-wa-an ḥar-ta

17' [...]N]U.SIG₅-du GIG.GAL

18' [...] DINGIR-*LIM*-ni

19' [...]

20' [...]]x[]

(text breaks)

Topic: Obverse: travels of some kind, involving the king; reverse: an angry god.

KBo 41.152

x+1 [...] ^URU D[u[?]]

2' [...]ti te²⁶[-]

3' [...]x-ú-i kar-x[]

4' [...]x-zi GAM-na maš-kán[]

5' [...]Z]I-an a-pé-e-ez wa-ar-ši-ia-⁷ du ⁷ x?[]

6' [...]

7' [...] ^{URU}Zi-ip-p]a-la-an-da A-NA EZEN₄ AN.TAḪ.ŠUM^{SAR} ú-iz-z[i]

8' [...]DINGIR^{MES} ŠA ^{URU}Zi-ip]-pa-la-an-da TUKU.TUKU-u-an-te-eš pé-an *UL* [ti-ya-an-zi]

9' [...]x GIG.GAL ḪUL-lu ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR^{MES}-aš

10' [...] NU.SIG₅

11' [...]DINGIR^{MES} ŠA ^{URU}Zi-ip-pa-l]a-an-da TUKU.TUKU-at-ti SIxSÁ-at

12' [...]ḥ]a-zi-wi₅-aš še-er TUKU.TUKU-u-an-te-eš

13' [...]x an? NU.SIG₅-du

²⁶ Or ka[r-.

14' [...-a]n-te-eš NU.SIG₅-du

15' [...]x-pa-aš-pát

16 [...]x-ma-ma KI.MIN

(1 line blank so far as preserved, then broken)

Translation:

§1'

[...]in addition, a propitiatory gift [...] Will the spirit [of X deity] be satisfied by that?

§2'

[His Majesty?] will come to [Zipp]alanda for the AN.TA₂.ŠUM-festival. Will the angry [gods of Zip]palanda not step before [His Majesty? then]? [...] took the great sickness (and) evil; to the gods. Unfavorable.

§3'

Since [the gods] of Zippalanda were ascertained to be angry (lit. for anger), are they angry on account of rites/cult provisions? [...] Let it be unfavorable.

§4'

Are they [angry because of...?] Let it be unfavorable.

§5'

[...If it is] only [th]is... and [fur]ther, ditto. [...]

KBo 41.153

x+1 [...] ZÁ[H[?]...]

2' [...ZÁ]H[?]-du[...]

3' [...]x-pát I[R[?]...]

4' [...]a(x[?])-aš na[...]

5' [...]x A-NA DUMU[...]

6' [...]x nu KIN SI[G₅-ru...]

7' [...]x na-[┐] at-kán [┐][...]

8' [...da-p]í-an ZI-an pa[...]

9' [...]x pa-iš [...]

10' [...k]u-e-da-ni A-NA ZÁH[┐] DUMU.NITA [┐][...]

11' [...]EME ÌR GEME₂-ia[┐] pa-ra-a [┐][...]

12' [...EME AMA] A-BI-ŠÚ-ma EME AMA.AMA-ŠÚ-i[a ...]

13' [...]an-za nu KIN SIG₅-ru HUL-lu x[...]

14' [...]x-i SUM-an [...]?

15' [...]x-ni *A-NA ZÁḤ DUMU.NITA ŠA* x[...]
 16' [...]x EME AMA *A-BI-ŠU* EME ʾ[...]
 17' [...]x-ra-an-za ʾ nam-ma ʾ x[...]

Topic: The perishing of an heir; the “tongues” (likely curses) of his maternal and paternal grandmothers.

KBo 41.156

(column i blank as far as preserved)

Obv. ii

x+1 na-ʾ at ʾ]

2' nu *A-NA* ^dUT[U-ŠI]
 3' ḤUŠ-u-e-ni nu K[IN (NU.)SIG₅-ru/du p]a-an-ku-uš-za ʾ GÜB-tar ʾ [...? ME-aš]
 4' na-at^{LÚ} a-ra-aš x[]x NU.SIG₅

5' ki-i ku-it *A-NA* ^dUTU-ŠI [n]a[?]-aš wa-aš-túl EGIR KASKAL-*NI* [SIxSÁ-at]
 6' nu pa-a-an-zi ^{LÚ.ME.EŠ}*KAR-TAP-PU-TI* ^{LÚ.ME.EŠ}SAG-ia[]
 7' iš-ḥi-ú-la-aḥ-ḥa-an-zi ma-a-an-ma e-er-šu-x[]
 8' *A-NA* ^dUTU-ŠI a-pé-e-ez INIM-az SIG₅-ri nu KI[N (NU.)SIG₅-ru/du]
 9' ^dUTU AN-*E* GUB-iš ŠA LUGAL *A-DAM-MA* ME-aš[]
 10' na-at *A-NA* ^{LÚ.ME.EŠ}SAG ^{LÚ.ME.EŠ²⁷}*KAR-TAP-PU* [GÜB-za GAR-ri]
 11' *UM-MA* ^{MUNUS.ME.EŠ}ŠU.GI ki²⁸-i-wa ku-it[]
 12' nu-wa ŠA LUGAL *A-DAM-MA* M[E]-aš nu-wa-r[a-at *A-NA* ^{LÚ.ME.EŠ}SAG]
 13' ^{LÚ.ME.EŠ}*KAR-TAP-PU-TI*-ia GÜB-za GAR[-ri]
 14' iš-ḥi-ú-la-aḥ-ḥa-an-zi-i[a]
 15' ku-it-ki tar-na-an-zi []

(lower edge)

Rev. iv (iii uninscribed)

1 [...]x a-aš-šu ME-aš
 2 [...]DINGIR^{MEŠ} kar-pí-uš
 3 [...]SIG₅

4 [...]x UD-aš i-wa-ar
 5 [...]x
 (~ 3 blank lines, then broken)

Translation:

ii

²⁷ Over erasure.

²⁸ Over erasure.

§1'

(too fragmentary for translation)

§2'

[...]for His Majes[ty...] should we fear? [Let the] K[IN be (un)favorable.] The *panku* [took] leftness [and...?] for itself, and the friend [gave] it/them [to...]. Unfavorable.

§3'

Concerning this: that a sin of [...] was determined] for His Majesty after the trip, the charioteers and the stewards will go and enjoin [...], while if...[...]. Will it be favorable for His Majesty on account of this matter? Let the KI[N be favorable.] The Sun-God of Heaven arose, took the blood of the king, and it [lies to the left] of the stewards (and) the charioteers. Thus the Old Women: "Concerning this: [The Sun-God of Heaven arose] and took the blood of the king, and [it] lie[s] to the left of [the stewards] and the charioteers [...] will they also enjoin [...] will they let something (or: [no]thing) go [...]"

iii blank, iv too fragmentary for translation.

KBo 41.158

Obv. ii?

x+ 1 [...]x[...]

2' [...]SIG₅-ru

3' [...] -u-i pa-iš 𐎶 SIG₅ 𐎶

4' [...]š]a-an-zi

5' [...]x x ka-ru-ú [ku]-𐎶 i 𐎶-e-eš

6' [...]pí-ia ku-𐎶 it-ki da-a 𐎶-li-i[a-an-zi]

7' [...]x DINGIR-*LIM*-ni d[a-p]i-i ZI-ni S[IG₅]

8' [...]E]ZEN₄^{MES} DÜ-an-te-eš

9' [...]a-an na-a-wi₅-ma ku-𐎶 i 𐎶[-e-eš]

10' [...]da-𐎶 a 𐎶-li-an-zi nu KIN [(NU.)SIG₅-ru/du]

11' [...]x-x-a ME-aš

12' [...]N]U.SIG₅

(lower edge)

Rev. iii?

x+1 [...]x-𐎶 ki?-ta 𐎶[]

2' [...]x []

3' [...]x-uš nu[]

4' [...] x ZAG[?]-za? x[]

5' [...]x[]

6' [...]x x[]
 7' [...]x x x[]
 (text breaks)

Topic: Festival neglect.

KBo 41.159+KUB 6.5

Obv.

x+1 ku-i[t]
 2' ^{URU}x[]
 3' ma-⁷ a ⁷[-an]
 4' nu K[IN?](erasure) ME-aš
 5' x[]
 ...
 y+1²⁹ []x-zi EGIR-an SIxSÁ-an-za
 2'' [LUG]AL-uš-za ZAG-tar *A-TAM-MA* NINDA.GUR₄.RA
 3'' [... ME-aš na-aš pa-]an-ga-u-i pa-iš *INA*¹(erasure) UD.2.KAM GIG.GAL
 4'' []x *INA* UD.3.KAM DINGIR-*LUM*-za EGIR-an ar-*ḫa* (erasure) <<ME-aš³⁰>>
 5'' [kar-pí-in *A-NA*] GIG.TUR SIG₅

6'' []x-na a-ri-ia-še-eš-šar *A-NA* ^dUTU-ŠI
 7'' []zi-ia-aš IGI-an-da pé-e-⁷ du ⁷um-me-e-ni
 8'' [z]i nu an-za-a-aš SIG₅-ru DINGIR.⁷ MAḪ ⁷ GUB-iš
 9'' []na-aš *A-NA* LUGAL GÙB-za GAR-ri *INA* UD.2.KAM
 10'' [šal-l]i wa-aš-túl GÙB-tar-ra ME-er nu-kán an-da SUD-li₁₂
 11'' [*INA* UD.3.KAM ME]-er na-an pa-an-ga-u-i SUM-er SIG₅

12'' [*A-NA* ^dUTU-ŠI SIG₅-ru
 13'' []-kán IGI^{HLA}-wa SAG.DU-i
 14'' [] NU.SIG₅

15'' []x SIG₅-u-wa-an[-za] x[]⁷ i⁷ ⁷ia-aš :i-ia-an-da-aš
 16'' [da-pí-an]ZI-an MU-a[n ...? IGI^{HLA}-aš] ⁷ ú ⁷wa-tar TI-tar-ra ME-aš
 17'' []da-pí-an ⁷ ZI ⁷-an x[]*A-TAM-MA* ME-aš
 (lower edge) 18'' [p]a-an-ku-uš-za EGIR-an a[r-ḫ]a
 19'' []an-da SUD-li₁₂ SIG₅

20'' [SI]G₅?-an-za ta-x(⁷ḫu⁷)-uš-ša-iz-zi-kán

²⁹ KUB 6.5 begins in this line.

³⁰ The angles of the photos of this tablet do not allow a look at these signs, but as it is, the line does not make sense. Following DINGIR-*LUM* EGIR *arḫa* should be *karpin*, and even if they are functioning as preverbs in this instance, there is no object for ME-aš. In addition, if ME-aš already appears at the end of the line, the contents of the beginning of line 5'' are a mystery. Therefore, it seems most likely that ME-aš was also intended to be part of the erasure and, since it is placed far onto the edge of the tablet, it was not erased as thoroughly.

21'' [LU]GAL-uš-za ZAG-tar ŠA DINGIR^{MEŠ}-ia
 22'' [DINGIR.]MAḤ-ni SUM-an-te-eš
 23'' []tar ^dGUL-ša-aš-ša IGI^{HI.A}-wa-aš
 24'' [^d]GUL-še da-pí-i ZI-ni
 25'' [EG]IR-an ar-ḥa kar-pí-in
 26'' []DINGIR.MAḤ-ni SUM-an SIG₅

 27'' []x ŠA DUMU.MUNUS KUR Kar-an-du-ni-ia-aš GIG-an-za
 28''³¹ []x[K]I.MIN nu KIN SIG₅-ru DINGIR-*LUM*-za da-pí-an ZI-a[n]
 29'' [SILIM[?]-] ul-la[?] ʾ [M]E-aš na-aš *A-NA* DUMU.MUNUS KUR Kar-an-du-ni-ia-aš
 30'' []*I-NA* UD.2.KA[M]x-za ZAG-tar NINDA.GUR₄.RA-ia ME-aš
 31'' [DINGIR.MA]Ḥ-ni pa-iš *I-NA* U[D.II]I.KAM DINGIR-*LUM*-za da-pí-an ZI-an
 32'' [ŠA DUMU.MUNUS KUR] Kar-an-du-ni-ia-aš-ša [?]*A-DAM-MA* ME-aš
 33'' [na-at] *A-NA* DUMU.MUNUS^{KUR} Kar-an-du-n[i]-ia-aš GÜB-za GAR-ri
 34'' [] SIG₅ []

 35'' []*UL*-ma du-wa-ar-na-a-i ki-x[]x
 36'' [aš-]ša-u-wa-an-za EGIR.UD.KAM-*MI* ŠA DUMU.MUNUS-i[a]
 37'' [n]a-at pa-an-ga-u-i SUM-an *I-NA* <UD>.2.KAM ^d[]
 38'' TI-tar-ra ME-aš na-at DINGIR.MAḤ-ni pa-iš ʾ *I* ʾ-*NA* UD.3.KAM]
 39'' a-aš-šu ME-an na-at¹ DINGIR.MAḤ-ni SUM-a[n]

 40'' a-ri-ia-še-eš-šar ku-it^{1?} ŠA DUMU.MUNUS KUR Kar-an-d[u-ni-ia-aš]
 41'' SIG₅-kat-ta-ri ke-e-da-ni-ia-at INIM-ni x[]
 42'' GIG-ši-kán iš-ta-an-ta-iz-zi nu-za-kán TI[]
 43'' an-da zi-en-na-a-i nu *A-NA* DUMU.MUNUS NU.SIG₅-d[u]
 44'' DUMU.MUNUS-za ZAG-tar da-pí-an-na ZI-an ME-aš
 45'' na-at pa-an-ga-u-i pa-iš *I-NA* UD.2.KAM ŠA DI[NGIR^{MEŠ}]
 46'' da-an-te-eš na-at DINGIR.MAḤ-ni SUM-an-te-eš *I-N*[A UD.3.KAM]
 47'' ḤUL-lu ME-an nu-kán an-da [S]UD-li₁₂ ʾ SIG₅ ʾ

 48'' nu-kán *A-NA* DUMU.MUNUS KUR [Kar-an-du-ni-ia-aš]
 49'' ʾ nu[?] *A-NA*[?] GIG[?] ʾ x[]
 (text breaks)

Translation:

§1' (x+1–5')

(Too fragmentary for translation.)

§2'' (y+1–5'')

[...] after(?) [...] has been determined [...let the KIN be...] The king [took] rightness, blood, bread [and...] for himself [and] gave [them] to the [*pa*]nku. On the second day, the great sickness [took...(and gave it) to...]. On the third day, the deity took hidden [anger] for itself, (and gave it) [to] the small sickness. Favorable.

³¹ KBo 41.159 begins again in this line.

§3'' (6''–11'')

[...] the oracle for His Majesty [...] we took [...] to [...]. [...]. Let it be favorable for us! Ḫannaḫanna arose [and took...]; it lies to the left of the king. On the second day [the gods arose], took [..., the gre]at sin, and disadvantageousness; into emptiness. [On the third day, the gods arose, too]k [...] and gave it to the *panku*. Favorable.

§4'' (12''–14'')

[...] Let it be favorable [f]or His Majesty [...] eyes in his head(?) [...] Unfavorable.

§5'' (15''–19'')

[...] is/was favorable [...] ...? [...] took [the whole] soul, the year [...]? (and) someone's? si]ght [(and gave it to)...second, ...] took [...] the whole soul, [...], (and) blood [...Third], the *panku* [took] the hidden [...and?...] for itself; into emptiness. Favorable.

§6'' (20''–16'')

[...] is/was [favo]rable? (S)he will submit/endure [...]The king [took] rightness, [...] of the gods [and...] for himself; they were given to Ḫannaḫanna. [Second...took...] and the eyes of the fate-goddess [and... (and gave them) to the whole soul of the fate-goddess. [Third...took] hidden anger [and...] they(!) were given to Ḫannaḫanna. Favorable.

§7'' (27''–34'')

[...] the sickness of the daughter of Babylon [...] ditto: let the KIN be favorable. The deity took the whole soul, [...] and [well-be]ing for itself, [and gave them] to the daughter of Babylon. On the second day, [...] took rightness and bread for himself, and gave [them] to [...]. On the third, day, the deity took the whole soul and the blood [of the daughter] of Babylon for itself, and [they] lie to the left of the daughter of Babylon. Favorable.

§8'' (35''–39'')

[If] it will not break, [let the KIN...] Goodness [took] the future and(/of?) [the ...] of the daughter, and they were given to the *panku*. On the second <day>, ^d[...] took [...] and life, and gave them to Ḫannaḫanna. O[n the third day...and?] goodness (was/were) taken, and given to Ḫannaḫanna. [Favorable.]

§9'' (40''–47'')

Since the oracle of the daughter of Babyl[on] has been favorable, and in this matter it is [...] Is the illness delayed for her? Will [her] life stop? Let it be unfavorable for the daughter. The daughter arose, took rightness and the whole soul for herself, and gave them to the *panku*. On the second day, [...] of the go[ds] were taken, and they were given to Ḫannaḫanna. On [the third day...(and?)] evil (was/were) taken: into emptiness. Favorable.

§10'' (48''–49'')

For the daughter of [Babylon...] for? the sickness? [...]

x+1 [...]x KUR.KUR x[...]
 2' [...]x mi-nu-m[ar...]
 3' [...]ka-lu?-x[...]
 4' [...]na-aš ANA ^{LÚ}[...]

 5' [...NU.SI]G₅-du LUGAL-za x[...]
 6' [...]i³² ^dDAG TI¹³³ ME[...]
 7' [...] NU.SIG₅[...]

 8' [...nu KI]N NU.SIG₅-du GI[G...]
 9' [...da-pí Z]I ME-aš nu-kán ^d[...]
 10' [...]T¹ ME-aš ANA ^{LÚ}pal-wa-[ta]l-[la...]
 11' [...] NU.SIG₅[...]

 12' [...KI]N NU.SIG₅-du DINGIR^{MEŠ}[...]
 13' [...]x[]ma-li[...]
 14' [...]]x[...]
 15' [...]]x[...]
 16' [...]]x[...]
 (text breaks)

Topic: Perhaps festival performance and/or misbehavior of cult personnel (the *palwatalla*-man).

KBo 41.161

Obv.?

x+1 [...]x x[...]

2' [...Š]A ŠÀ É DIN[GIR-LIM...]
 3' [...]x-an-za nu KI[N (NU.)SIG₅-ru/du...]
 4' [...]n]u-mar ME-aš na-aš[...]

 5' [...]x ḥar-kán-ti-ma ^ÚNU-T[E...]
 6' [...]i]š in-na-ra-wa-a-tar[...]

 7' [...DINGIR-L]UM ku-it kar-ša-an-da-aš [...]
 8' [...MUNUS^M]^{ES} É DINGIR-LIM -aš ÈN.TAR-en UM-MA MUN[US...]
 9' [...K]AM BAL kar-ša-an INA ITI.1.KAM x[...]

 10' [...]x EZEN₄ GURUN 6 UDU 6 PA ZÍD.DA[...]
 11' [...]r LAM² ᵐ GUR² r A-NA² ᵐ EZEN₄ TE-ŠI x[...]
 12' [...]]x x x[...]

³² Or perhaps TUR¹, for [GIG.]TUR?

³³ This sign seems halfway between a TI and a BAL; since it lacks the extra horizontal wedge present in the BAL of line 10', TI is more likely.

Rev?

x+1 [...]x u[š...]

2' [...]ti?[...]

3' [...]x x[...]

4' [...]SIG₅-r[u...]

5' [...]x[...]

Topic: Festival neglect, including the fruit- and spring-festivals. Destroyed cult implement(s).

KBo 41.162

r.c.

x+1 []x[...]

2' nu a-ši GUL LUGA[L...]

3' nu KIN NU.SIG₅-du[...]

4' ma-a-an a-ši GUL LUG[AL...]

5' KI.MIN nu KIN SIG₅-ru[...]

6' nu-kán DINGIR-*LIM*-ni da[-pí ZI-ni...]

7' nu-kán an-da SIG₅-u-^Γ i ^Γ[...]

8' nu-kán an-da SUD-[li₁₂...]

9' ^dNIN.GAL ku-it!^{1?} SIxSÁ-^Γ at ^ΓDIN[GIR?...]

10' wa-aš-du-la-aš še-er TUKU.TUKU-a[n...]

11' na-a-wi₅ ku-it-ki ti-x[...]

12' nu KIN NU.SIG₅-du DINGIR-*LUM*-za GU[B-iš...]

13' šal-li-ia wa-aš-túl ME-aš na-a[t?...]

14' ma-a-an-za-kán ^dNIN.GAL me-ek-k[i...]

15' wa-aš-du-la-aš še-er KASKAL-ši na-a?[...]

16' nu-za DINGIR-*LUM* a-pád-da-an-pát še-er [...]

17' nu KIN SIG₅-ru DINGIR^{MEŠ} GUB-er TI[...]

18' ^Γ ME ^Γ-er na-at pa-an-ga-u-i[...]

19' [U]D.2.KAM a-aš-šu ME-an nu-kán[...]

20' [UD.]3.KAM DINGIR-*LUM*-^Γ za ^Γkar-pí-in[...]

(text breaks; left column blank so far as preserved)

Translation:

§1'

(Too fragmentary for translation.)

§2'

This strike of the king[...] Let the KIN be unfavorable. [...]

§3'

If this strike of the king [...] ditto, let the KIN be favorable. [...] to the wh[ole soul] of the deity [...] into goodness [...] into empti[ness...]

§4'

Since ^dNIN.GAL was determined, [...] angr[y] on account of sin [...] not yet [...] anything [...] let the KIN be unfavorable.

§5'

If you, ^dNIN.GAL, are very[? angry?] on account of sin on the road(?) [...] Is it only because of this that you, O deity, [are angry]? Let the KIN be favorable. The gods arose, took life [and...? and gave] it/them to the *panku*. On the second day, goodness was taken [and given to...]. On the third day, the deity [took] anger [...] for itself....

KBo 41.163

l.c.

(at least 2 paragraphs, 1 and 2 lines respectively, blank)

x+1 [...]x BAL-kán ŠÀ MU-ti ta-ra-an-za

2' [...]GU]B-^r iš 𐎶 MU-an mu-kiš-šar-ra ME-aš

3' [...] NU.SIG₅

4' [...]z]i nu KIN NU.SIG₅-du a-aš-šu ME-an

5' [...]x-aš[?]-za EGIR-an ar-^r ḫa 𐎶 kar-pé-en

6' [...]x x []x x[]

(text breaks)

Topic: Neglect of promised yearly offerings.

KBo 41.164

x+1 [...]x ^dDAG-na ME-aš na-at a-^r pé 𐎶-d[a-ni SUM...]

2' [...]SILIM-ul (erasure) MU.KAM-ia ME-aš³⁴ na-an a-pé-da-ni SUM-i[š]

3' [...]DINGIR.MAH SUM-iš

4' [...]

5' [...]IGI^{HLA}-wa-aš ú-wa-tar ME-an na-at a-pé-da-ni SUM-an

6' [...]MU-ia ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR^{MES}-aš

³⁴ This word is written above the line.

7' [...] wa-aš-túl IZI-ia ME-aš na-at ANA ^dUTU AN SUM-iš 2-ŠÚ DINGIR.MAH-aš 𐎶 GUB 𐎶
[iš]
8' [...EGI]R-pa ^dDAG 3-ŠÚ a-pa-a-aš-za EGIR-an ar-ḥa wa-aš-túl da-pí-an ZI-an [ME-aš...]

(about 3 lines blank, then broken)

Topic: Unclear.

KBo 41.166

x+1 [...]x]x

2' [...]x[]x x[]x x[]x BAL-𐎶 ŠU[?] 𐎶
3' [...]x pa-an-ku-uš-za wa-aš-𐎶 túl 𐎶 an/^dx x ME-aš³⁵
4' [...] NU.SIG₅

5' [...] ^dSîn BAL-pát i-ši-iḥ-ta INIM[?] x 𐎶 TU^{??} 𐎶
6' [...]SIG₅-ru pa-an-ku-uš-za GÛB-𐎶 la 𐎶-tar ME-aš
7' [...] NU.SIG₅

8' [...]x ŠA ^dSÎN A-NA KUR ^{URU}KÛ.BABBAR-ti
9' [...]ta nu 𐎶 KIN 𐎶 NU.SIG₅-du BAL-x x-za[?]
10' [...]x ME-aš na-at [an-da]𐎶 ḤUL-u-i 𐎶[pa/SUM]-iš NU.𐎶 SIG₅ 𐎶

11' [...] ^{MES}ši/IGI-x[]
12' [...]t]a URU[?][]
13' [...]x-an nu-ká[n]

(text breaks)

Topic: Offerings for the moon-god.

KBo 41.167

l.c.

x+1 [...da-a]-li-ia-u[?]-𐎶 ar[?] 𐎶 SIxSÁ-at
2' [...]x ú-wa-𐎶 an[?] 𐎶-[z]i
3' [...]x-aš e-eš-ša-an-za
4' [...]x-ma ku-e-da-aš pé-e-da-aš
5' [...]a-r]i-ia-še-eš-šar DÛ-an-zi
6' [...]x x [-z]i

³⁵ The handcopy shows an extra vertical wedge here, but on the photo it seems as though it is just a hole in the tablet.

r.c.

x+1 x-ni-u[š?...]

2' na-^Γ at ^Γx[...]

3' pé-ra-an x[...]

4' *A-DAM-MA*-i[a...]

5' *INA* UD.2.KAM ^d[...]

6' *INA* UD.3.KAM [...]

7' nu-kán ^d[...]

8' na-aš EGI[R...]

9' [SI]G₅ ME-a[n...]

(text breaks)

Topic: Most likely festival neglect.

KBo 41.168

Obv.

x+1 [...]^Γx-ki ÉRIN[?]/wa[?]-x *IŠ-TU* x[]

2' [...]^Γx-ma[?] da-me-e-^Γ da ^Γ-az *Ú-UL* x[]

3' [...]^da-pí-an ZI-an ME-aš na-an-za-an-ká[n]

4' [...]^Γx NU.SIG₅-ta nu-kán e-d[a]-ni *A-NA* ^mGE₆-aš-L[Ú]

5' [...]^Γmar-la-an-n)a-aš INIM-ni iš-ḫar-ra ku-it-ki pa-ra-a a-r[a-iz-zi]

6' [...]^ΓNU.SI]G₅-du ḪUL-lu ME-an na-at pa-an-ga-u-i SUM-an NU.S[IG₅]

7' [...]^ΓNU.SIG₅-ta nu-kán ke-e-da-ni *A-NA* ^mGE₆-aš-LÚ^{!?}

8' [...]^Γpa-r)a-a a-ra-a-an nu KIN NU.SIG₅-du

9' [...]^Γnu-kán DINGIR-*LIM*-ni da-pí-i ZI-ni NU.SIG₅

10' [...]^Γe[?] ^Γ-da-ni *A-NA* ^mGE₆-aš-LÚ ^Γmar-la-an-na-aš INIM-ni

11' [...]^Γx DÜ[?](erasure)-tar-ra pa-^Γ ra-a ^Γx-x-[i]š[?] nu ^ΓKIN ^ΓSIG₅-ru

(about 4 lines unreadable)

(about 3 lines blank, then broken)

Rev.

(the end of one line, wrapping around onto the obverse)

x+1 [...]^Γx SIG₅

Translation:

§1'

(too fragmentary for translation)

§2'

[Concerning what] was unfavorable in that matter of [foolish]ness for Mr. GE₆-aš-LÚ, will some blood also ari[se]? Let [the KIN] be [unfavora]ble. Evil was taken, and given to the *panku*. Unfavorable.

§3'

[Concerning what] was unfavorable in this [matter] for Mr. GE₆-aš-LÚ, has [...something already?] arisen? Let the KIN be unfavorable. [...] To the whole soul of the deity. Unfavorable.

§4'

[...] in this matter of foolishness for Mr. GE₆-aš-LÚ [...]...Let the KIN be favorable. [...]

(reverse only shows a trace and a SIG₅ trailing onto the front of the tablet)

KBo 41.169

x+1 [...]x x[...]

2' [...]x NU.SIG₅ UL [...]

3' [...]x(tar?) DINGIR-LIM-za x[...]

4' [...]x(ša?)-aš-ma ZAG-tar[...]

(about 3 lines blank, then broken)

Topic: Unclear.

KBo 41.170

Obv.

x+1 [...]u]z-za-u³⁶

2' [...]SIG₅

(lower edge)

Rev.

1 [...]x-it³⁷ iš-ta-ma-aš-šu-u-en x[]tu[?]-x ku-it É KUR mi[]

2 [...]x-a-aš-šu-wa KASKAL-aḥ-ta na-aš []x-an Ú-UL a[?]-ri

3 [...]G]AM?-an 𐎶 ar 𐎶𐎵 NÍG.SI<.SÁ>[?] ma-a-an-ma-aš-kán A-NA 𐎶UTU-ŠI Ú-UL

4 [...]z]i? ZAG-ši-kán Ú-UL d[a]-𐎶 a 𐎶-i nu KIN SIG₅-ru

5 [...]x na-at DINGIR.MAḥ-ni SUM-an INA UD.2.KAM pa-an-ga-u-i³⁸ (erasure)

³⁶ This seems to be a Hattic word.

³⁷ Reading based on the photo.

³⁸ This is unexpected. Either it is a mistake—though *pa-an-ga-u-i* for expected *pa-an-ku-uš-za* would be quite odd—or, perhaps, the first two symbols of this oracle procedure were exactly the same as the previous procedure, and therefore only the final one was recorded. The next line is also somewhat irregular.

6 [...-r]i[?] nu-za-kán ŠÀ-za IZI ME-aš nu-kán an-da SUD-li₁₂
 7 [...LU]GAL-uš-za ZAG-tar TI-tar-ra ME-aš na-at ^dU-n[i[?]] x x

8 [...]x ^{URU} ʾNe-ri-iq-qa-aš ú-e[]
 9 [...]ma-a-an ke-e-da-ni MU-ti[]
 10 [...S]IxSÁ-ri DINGIR-*LUM*-ma-kán ku-ʾ e ʾ?[]
 11 [...]x-za na-an-za-an a-ri-ia¹⁹[]
 12 [...]x-mu DINGIR-*LUM* HUL-an-n[i]
 13 [...]x zi-la-du-wa-mu-za[]
 14 [...]a]r-ḥa *Ú-UL IŠ-BAT* x[]
 15 [...]an-na ME-er na-at x[]
 16 [...]x-ʾ mar[?] ʾ ME-an ʾ nu? ^{d?} ʾ[]
 (text breaks)

Topic: Difficult; border placement?

KBo 41.171

x+1 [...] a[n...]
 2' [...]a a?[...]
 3' [...]x me? pa? x[...]
 4' [...]SIG₅ [...]

5' [...]x-na ^dU?[...]
 6' [...]pa-ʾ at? ʾ an[...]
 7' [...Š]A LUGAL ZAG-tar[...]
 8' [...]x nu-kán DINGIR^{MES}-aš *INA* UD.3.K[AM...]
 9' [...]da-pí-i ZI-ni SIG₅ [...]

10' [...]ŠA É DUMU-an-na-aš ^{URU} KÙ.BABBAR-aš DUMU x[...]
 11' [...]ta-pa-aš-ša ^dU-tar-ma pa-ra[...]
 12' [...]x DINGIR-*LUM*-za da-pí-an ZI[-an...]
 13' [...]DINGIR-*LUM*-ni kar-pí GAR-r[i³⁹] x[...]

14' [...]x-ta-aš-ša[...]
 15' [...]pa-ra[...]
 (text breaks)

Topic: Difficult; something to do with the “house of the children” (line 10') and the Storm-God.

KBo 41.172

x+1 [] x [
 2' [] IZI M[U

³⁹ Reading based on photo.

3' []x
4' [] NU.ŠE

5' na-at DINGIR-*LUM*-ma ku-iš-ki
6' TUKU.TUKU-za DÙ-zi NU.ŠE-du
7' 𒀭 DINGIR.MAḪ 𒀭 GUB-iš SIG₅ DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš GÙB-tar-x?
8' []-ši-kán IGI^{HLA}-wa¹ SAG.DU-i
9' []x-aš-kán kar-pí GAR-ri

10' [k]u⁷ it SIxSÁ-at ⁷
 11' [x S]R-zi⁴⁰
 12' []wa-aš-túl a-pé-ez-za
 (about 3 lines blank, then broken)

Translation:

§1'
(too fragmentary for translation)

§2'
Is some angry god doing it? Let it be unfavorable. Hannahanna arose, [took] goodness (and) the left-ness of the gods(?) [...] his(?) eyes in(?) the head; it lies by anger.

§3'
[...] what was determined [...] he/she sings [...] sin, and on account of that [...]

KB0 41.173

Rev. iii?

x+1 nu-ká[n[?]...]
2' x x[...]

3' x [n]e² x [...]
 4' x x mu x [...]
 5' *INA* UD.2.KAM SIG₅[...]
 6' *INA* UD.3.K[AM...]

7' x x[...]
(text breaks)

iv
x+1 [...]x[
2' [...]x-aš? ti x[

⁴⁰ This is a very clear ŠĪR sign. Although ŠĪR-*RU* is expected, Hittite phonetic complements are attested, e.g. ŠĪR-an-zi (VS 28.31 i 18) and ŠĪR-ki-iz-zi (KUB 10.20 ii 49). Without more context, it is impossible to tell if it could be a mistake for a similar sign, or even a rare attestation of the KEŠDA value of ŠĪR.

3' [...]x-iš-wa x[]
 4' [...]G]U₄.^r MAḤ ⁴¹ 1 UDU *A-NA* ^r d? ^rU? ^{URU}[]
 5' [...]x-ḥu-ru DINGIR^{MEŠ} LÚ^{MEŠ} []
 6' [...]n]u ^r KIN ^r SIG₅-ru SIG₅-u-an-za x[]x-aš
 7' [...] *INA* UD.2.KAM NINDA.GUR₄.R[A i]š-^r pa-an ^r-d[u-zi]
 8' [...]x SUM-er *INA* UD.3.KA[M] pa-a[n-k]u-u[š-za]
 9' [...]da x (x) x x []

10' [...]x x x x[]x x
 11' [...]x x(^dUTU?)[]u-ut?
 12' [...]x[]
 (text breaks)

Topic: Offerings.

KBo 41.174

Obv.

1 []x-aš? GIG *A-NA* DUMU.MUNUS GAL NA[M^{??}]

2 na-at-ši DINGIR-*LIM*-na-tar-ma NU.ŠE-du
 3 DINGIR-za da-pí ZI-an SA₅ IZKIM ME-aš
 4 nu-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš NU.ŠE

5 na-at-ši ḥar-ga-ni-^r ma ag ^r-ga-^r an ^r-ni
 6 NU.ŠE-du SIG₅-an-za []
 7]x ^r EGIR ^r-pa^d[DAG []

8 []x?[]
 (text breaks)

Translation:

§1

[...] sickness for the Great Daughter [...]

§2

Is it her (personal?) divinity? Let it be unfavorable. The deity took the whole soul and the red omen for itself; to the gods. Unfavorable.

§3

Is it into destruction (and) death for her? Let it be unfavorable. Goodness [took...] behind the thr[one-dais...]

§4

(Too fragmentary for translation.)

⁴¹ Reading based on photo.

KBo 41.175

x+1 [...DINGI]R-*LUM*-za

2' [...]*x* DINGIR.MAḪ-ni pa-iš 𐎶 NU.SIG₅ 𐎶

3' [...]*x*-aš-ši GAM-an GUB-a[š?]

4' [...]*KUR*-aš-ša SIG₅ ME-[a]n

5' [...pa]-an-ku-uš-za ZAG-𐎶 tar 𐎶⁴²

6' [...]*x*

7' [...kar]-pi-in ME-aš

8' [...SI]G₅

9' [...]*an*-za

10' [...]*x*-at

11' [...]*x*-ma ti-[a]n-zi

12' [...pa]-an-ga-u-𐎶 i 𐎶 []*x* *x*

13' [...]-an

14' [...N]U.SIG₅

(text breaks)

Topic: Unclear.

KBo 41.176

(1 blank paragraph)

x+1 [...nu]-kán DINGIR-ni da[-pí ZI-ni...]

2' [...]

3' [...]*x* ME-er nu-kán[...]

(text breaks)

Topic: Unclear.

KBo 46.119

x+1 []*x*-tar² *KUR*-aš S[IG₅...]

2' 3-ŠU LUGAL-za ZAG-tar da[-pí-an ZI-an...]

⁴² Reading based on photo both for this sign, and for *ku* (copied as UTU).

3' nu-kán ZAG ^{URU}Ne[-ri-ik?...]
4' HUL-wa-za ZAG N[e-ri-ik?...]

5' nu-kán ZAG ^{URU}Iš[...]
6' []x-^r iš? ^r[...]
(text breaks)

Topic: Border placement.

KBo 47.220

Obv.

1 [...š/t]a? na-aš ma-a-an
2 [...nu KI]N NU.SIG₅-du
3 [...]ZALAG.GA-an-na da-a-aš
4 [...UM-MA ^{MUNUS.M}]EŠ⁴³ŠU.GI ^dU-aš-wa
5 [...]x-an-za
6] [...]X.KAM DINGIR^{MEŠ}
7 [...p]a-an-^r ga ^r-u-i

8 [...]x-mi-ia-u-wa-an
9 [...]x GAR-ri
(text breaks)

Topic: Unclear.

KBo 48.22

(about 2 lines blank)

x+1 [...KU]R Aḥ-ḥi-ia-w[a...]
2' [...]wa-x LÚ.MEŠ Aḥ-ḥ[i-ia-wa...]
3' [...da-p]í ZI TI¹-tar¹ ME-aš[...]
4' [...]ZAG-tar MÈ Š[A...]
5' [...]x[...]
(text breaks)

Topic: Aḥḥiyawa (Greece).

KBo 49.180

Obv.

x+1 [...]DINGIR-LIM na-x[]
2' [...]na-an-kán GÜB-li[]
3' [...]nu-uš-ši ka-a-aš KASKAL-x[]

⁴³ The hand copy does not show any traces, but there may be the end of a MEŠ in the photo.

4' [...]pa-ra-a *UL* ME-i NU.SIG₅-du
5' [...]ŠÀ-aš wa-aš-túl MU-an in-na-ra-wa-tar ME-e[r]

6' [...]]r ti ʾ-ia-zi LÚ^{MEŠ} Ḫat⁴⁴-ti-ma-aš-ši-kán
7' [...]]x-ri na-an-kán *A-NA* r ME ʾ
8' [...]]r ŠU ʾ GAR a-pé-ez-za
9' [...]]x(UL?) x[]x-za

Rev.

x+1 x[...]

2' x[...]

3' x[...]

(text breaks)

Topic: Military campaigns.

KBo 49.207⁴⁵

Obv.

x+1 [...]]x-an-x[...]

2' [...] n]a^{!?}-aš DINGIR.MAḪ r SUM-za ʾ[...]

3' [...]x-en^{HI.A}-*KA*-ma a-pí-i[a] r kar ʾ-an-z[i...]

4' [...]uš-ma zi-la-an a-pí-ia z[i[?]...]

5' [...]wa-a]š-du-li[!] mu-kiš-šar MU.KAM-ia ME-aš n[a[?]...]

6' [...] Š]A INIM ^mLÍL-^dLAMMA^{!?}-ma wa-ar-pa-d[u...]

7' [...]]x-ri-ia-an wa-aš-túl ZAG-tar KIN-u[r ...]

8' [...]

9' [...]]x-li-ia-an-ti *UL* TI-eš-nu-zi TA ^{MUNUS}ENSI-k[án...]

10' [...]]x ÌR-ŠÚ r INIM[?] ʾ *MA-MIT*-ia SIxSÁ-at e-ni ku-it x x[...]

11' [...]]i-en-ki-ir nu a-pa-a-at NU.ŠE-du [...]

12' [...]]x-aš IZI šal-li wa-aš-túl ME-er [...]

13' [...] i]n[?] [...]

14' [...]]r ia[?]-er[?] ʾ nu a-pé-el x[...]

15' [...]]x x PAP-nu-mar x?[...]

(break)

Rev.

x+1 [...]]x[...]

⁴⁴ TAP in copy, but vertical clearly visible in photo

⁴⁵ I find the Konkordanz' suggested indirect join with KBo 13.68 to be very uncertain.

- 2' [...]x-u-uš *A-NA* IG x x[...]
3' [...]x-zi-ia 𐎶 SIxSÁ 𐎶[...]
-
- 4' [...]ke-e-da-ni-iš-ši-kán[z]i-ik pa-r[a...]
5' [...EGIR a]r-ḫa kar-pé-en ME-a[š]x-ri(ar?) 𐎶HU[L...]
-
- 6' [...]𐎶 MAḪ[?] 𐎶 KI.MIN zi-la-𐎶 aš 𐎶 MU.AŠ DINGIR^{MEŠ}[S]IG₅ x x[...]
-
- 7' [...]x-u-en nu ^dIS[?]TAR^{URU} La-a-ru-na ^dx[]x x[]x[...]
-
- 8' [...]^dLIŠ^{URU} La-ru-na ke-e-da-ni-iš-š[i...]
9' [...]ḪUL-wa-za ^dDAG ME-aš na-aš-kán *A-N*[A...]
-
- 10' [...](erasure) ^dPí-ir-wa-aš-ša SIxSÁ-at [] [...]
-
- 11' [...]x-aš? ke-e-da-ni-iš-ši-kán GIG[]ig[?] x? ru? a-r[a? ...]
12' [...]x? ME[?]-aš nu-kán ŠĀ SU[D-li₁₂[?] ...]
-
- 13' [...]x 𐎶 e 𐎶-ni ŠĀ ŠEŠ-ŠÚ DUMU-𐎶 ŠÚ 𐎶 ŠĀ SAG 𐎶 GÉME ÌR 𐎶x[...]
14' [...]x nu a-pa-a-at NU.Š[E? ...]
15' [...]
-
- 16' [...]da-pí-a]n ZI ^dNAM-aš m[i-nu-mar ...]
-
- 17' [...]l]i-ia x[...]

Topic: Very difficult. Clearly a matter having to do with Mr. LÍL-^dLAMMA and his(?) household, something having to do with oaths, and something concerning various gods. Perhaps also sickness (rev. 11').

KBo 52.280⁴⁶

obv

- x+1 x[...]
2' x-𐎶 da 𐎶-x[...]
3' da-i-ú-𐎶 en 𐎶x[...]
4' pár-𐎶 na[?] 𐎶-aš-ša-aš [...]
-
- 5' šal-𐎶 li 𐎶 GIG i-d[a-a-lu...]
6' na-aš-ta an-da [...]
7' 𐎶 ta[?] 𐎶-x[n]a^{??} mu-x[...]
8' i-da-l[u]x da-a-a[n...]

⁴⁶ Corti's edition of this text in "The History of the Exploration of Uşaklı/Kuşaklı Höyük (Yozgat) and the 'Rediscovery' of a Middle Hittite Tablet" (CollAn 9 [2010]: 193–212) includes some signs that are very difficult to make out on his handcopy in KBo 52; since the photo is also quite difficult to read, I am following him in certain readings.

9' x[] ʾ DUMU.SANGA ʾma KI.MIN[...]

10' []x-mu-šu²-i-pa x[...]

11' [i-d]a-a-lu da-a-aš pa-an[-ga-u-i...]

12' [d]a²-a-an x-at-ta x[...]

13' x-na x x^dIM x[...]

14' []x x[] ʾ ra ʾ da-a-x[...]

15' x x x² x x x[

16' x x [d]a-a-aš²[]x š[a² ...]

17' ʾ DINGIR-*LUM* ʾ-x-za kar-pí-in [d]a-iš x[...]

18' [na-a]š²-ta an-da i-da-a-la-u[-i...]

(rev.) 19' []x-an ku-it DUMU.SANGA KIN-ti?[...]

20' []x pa-an-ku-u[š]-ʾ za ʾ wa-aš-túl da[-a-aš ...]

21' [GÚ]B-la-az da-iš nu DUMU²-l[i² ...]

22' ku-wa-at-ga na-a-ḥu-wa-n[i...]

23' ku-ʾ iš ʾ-ki ma-a-na-aš LÚ[-aš...]

24' [d]a²-la-a-i-za mu-ga-u[...]

25' nu DUMU.SANGA wa (erasure)[...]

26' LÚ MUNUS-za LÚ^{URU} (erasure)⁴⁷ [...ku-is]

27' im-ma ku-ʾ iš ʾ x(na²) [...]

28' DINGIR^{MEŠ} a-ri-er⁴⁸ nu x[...]

29' pa-an-ga-u-i pí[-e-er...]

30' nu DUMU.SANGA an-d[a² ...]

31' i-x[]x[...]

(text breaks)

Topic: A junior priest's transgressions (?).

KBo 54.102

(1.5 paragraphs of several lines blank)

x+1 [...]^{URU}Aš-šur-ma GAM (erasure) pé-eš-ši[...]

2' [...]ZA[G]KASKAL-ia ME-aš [...]

3' [...]x-da² dam-ma-aš-ša[...]

(several more lines blank, then broken)

⁴⁷ Ha-at-ti is clearly visible under the erasure.

⁴⁸ HW² A does not list this as a form of *arai-* “to rise,” but only as the 3rd plural preterite of *ariya-* “to inquire by oracle” (p. 290) and of *ar-/er-* “to stand” (p. 208). However, the context suggests no other interpretation, and since the word also appears in the correct position for “arose” in KUB 50.51 obv. 1 below, interpreting it as *arai-* seems most plausible.

Topic: Campaigns against Assyria,

KBo 55.193

Obv.?

x+1 [...n]u[?]-kán[] DINGIR^{MEŠ} 𒌦
(one line blank)

2' [...] nu KIN NU.SIG₅-du

3' [...]

4' [...]GÉME^mZu-ú

5' [...]x^{URU[?]}U-wa-tar-ra

6' [...]

7' [...](erasure⁴⁹)

8' [...]x-uš ZAG-za GAR-ri

9' [...]x

(one line blank)

(one line blank so far as preserved, then broken)

Rev.?

x+1 [...]x ME-aš

(a few lines blank)

y+1 [...]x-za[?]

Topic: Mr. Zū's maidservant.

KBo 55.195

x+1 [...ZA]G[?]x[...]

2' [...]ITU x[...]

3' [...]M^{EŠ}GUB[?]EGIR.UD[...]

4' [...]ANA^{LÚ}KÚR wa-aš-du[-li...]

5' [...]x INA KUR (erasure?)^mSUM-u[...]

6' [...]dUTU GUB ZAG-tar x[...]

7' [...]2-Ú^{LÚ}KÚR

8' [...]x AN.TA x[...]

(erasure)

⁴⁹ Clearly SIG₅.

Topic: Military activity.

KBo 58.64(+)+Kbo 53.108+Kbo 57.127b(+)+KBo 57.127c(+)+KBo 57.127a+KUB 16.30+KUB 16.82

Obv. i

1⁵⁰ ma-a-an-za-^r kán ^r ^dU ^{URU} Ĥat-ti ^dLAMMA ^{URU} Ĥat-ti[]
2 ^dZA-BA₄-BA₄ ^{URU} Ĥat-ti ŠÀ É^{MES} DINGIR^{MES} -ŠU-M[U]
3 Ú-UL ku-it-ki TUKU-an-te-eš nu KIN SIG₅-ru
4 ^{GIS}DAG-iš <<u?>> GUB-iš da-pí-an ZI-an in-na-ra-u-wa-t[ar ME-aš]
5 na-at ^dU-ni pa-iš NU.SIG₅
(about fourteen lines blank)

6 []x x[] ŠÀ É DINGIR-LIM Ú-U[L ku-it-ki...]
7 []x x x-^r za ^r x[...]

Rev. iii

x+1 ^dDAG-iš ŠA LÚ ^{GIS}GIDRU pa-an-ku-u[š-za-k]án ŠÀ-za IZI šal-li-ia NINDA.GUR₄.RA iš[-
pa-an-tu-zi ME-aš]
2' nu-kán DINGIR^{MES} -aš NU.SIG₅
(rest of paragraph, ~8 lines, is blank)

3' []x[]x[]i⁷-ih-[z]i-na ŠÀ É DINGIR-LIM-KA
4' [(join unpub., but one assumes (UL) ku-it-ki TUKU.TUKU)-a]n⁵¹-za nu KIN SIG₅-ru
5']x ZAG-tar A-TAM-MA MU-an
6']x(uš) ME-aš na-at pa-an-ga-u-i pa-iš
7']NU.SIG₅
(text breaks)

iv

52

(4 or 5 lines blank)

x+1 [...]x ŠÀ É NA₄ DINGIR-LIM UL ku-it-ki
2' [...]x ME-an nu-kán an-da ĤUL-u-i NU.SIG₅

3'⁵³ [...]x []x-ma
4' [...]a-ša-an-te-eš
5' [...]ma-a-an ki-i-pát nam-m[a]
6' [...] ŠA DINGIR^{MES} mi-nu-mar^{HI.A} ME-an-te-eš
7' [...] NU.SI]G₅

⁵⁰ Bo 2508 (KUB 16.82)

⁵¹ Reading based on photo.

⁵² 1115/v (KBo 57.127a)

⁵³ 1446/u (KBo 58.108)

(~8 lines blank, then broken)

...

54

y+1 [...]É NA₄ DINGIR-*LIM UL* ku-it-ki

(~8 lines blank, then broken)

z+1⁵⁵ [...] ʾ SIG₅ ʾ x[

2''' [...]x-da ŠE-ʾ ru? ʾ[

(one line blank)

3''' [...]x pa-an-ku-uš-za x[...]

(about 3 lines blank)

4''' (x+1)⁵⁶ [...]x-za ap-pa-aš LÚ[D]AM.GÀR a-aš-šu-u-wa-an-za

5''' [...]u-kán *A-NA* GIG.TUR NU.SIG₅

(4 lines blank)

6''' (3') ma⁵⁷-a-an-za-kán DINGIR^{URU} A[n?] ŠÀ É DINGIR-*LIM UL* ku-it-ki

7''' TUKU.TUKU-u-an-za nu KIN SIG₅-ru[-z]a[?] ZAG-tar *A-TAM-MA* NINDA.GUR₄.RA-ia
ME-aš

8''' na-at *A-NA* dUTU A[N-E pa-iš? NU.SIG₅]

9''' (6') ki-i ku-it NU.SIG₅-ta [n]u ʾ LÚ^{MES} É DINGIR-*LIM* pu ʾ-n[u]-uš-šu-u-en (erasure??)

10''' *UM-MA-ŠU-NU*-ma ʾ 3 *TA* ʾ-P[A]L? EZEN₄ ITU-wa kar-š[a]-an

11''' (8') TA^{LÚ.MES} ZABAR.DAB[]x dTe-li-pí-nu 3 *TA-PAL* EZEN₄ ITU kar-š[a]-an

(5 lines blank)

12''' (9') dTe-li-pí-nu-uš ŠA^{LÚ} GAD.TAR

(3 lines blank)

13''' (10')⁵⁸ ma-a-an-za-kán dWu_u-ru-na-an-ni-ga-aš ŠÀ É DINGIR-*LIM UL* ku-it-ki TUKU-u-
an-za

14''' nu KIN SIG₅-ru a-aš-šu ME-an *A-NA* GIG.TUR NU.SIG₅

15''' (12') ki-i ku-it NU.ʾ SIG₅-ta ʾ nu LÚ^{MES} É DINGIR-*LIM* ʾ pu-nu ʾ-uš-ʾ šu ʾ-u-en ʾ *UM*^{!?}-
MA-ŠU ʾ-*NU*-ʾ ma ʾ []

16''' ʾ EZEN₄ ʾ ŠA ʾ MU.2 ʾ.KAM iš-ša-an-te-eš nam-ma KI.MIN

17''' [?]x x-za⁵⁹ ZAG-tar *A-TAM-MA* KUR-e-aš-ša a-aš-šu ME-aš nu-kán dU[TU AN-E pa-iš]

⁵⁴ 349/v (KBo 57.127c); the placement of this fragment is uncertain.

⁵⁵ 332/v + 885/v (KBo 57.127b)

⁵⁶ Bo 2831+10146 (KUB 16.82)

⁵⁷ From photo.

⁵⁸ Copy indicates erasure here (as though the *ma* was originally begun a little too far to the left).

⁵⁹ The copy (KUB 16.82 iv 14') has DINGIR-*LUM*-za, but the photo shows the tablet to be so deteriorated as to be unreadable, and in no other KIN-oracle does “the deity” take “rightness.”

18''' NU.SIG₅
(lower edge)

Left edge:
1 [...]TUKU-u-an-za
2 [...S]IG₅

Translation:

i

§1

If the Storm-God of Ḫatti, the tutelary deity of Ḫatti, [...?], or Zababa of Ḫatti are not angry about anything in their temples, let the KIN be favorable. ^{GIS}DAG arose, [took] the whole soul (and) vigor, and gave them to the Storm-God. Unfavorable.

§2

[...]no[thing] in the temple [...]

iii

§3'

(Is it) ^dDAG of the herald? The *panku* took fire from the heart and big thick bread [and?] li[bations for itself]; to the gods. Unfavorable.

§4'

[...Are you, Storm-God? of] Liḫzina, [ang]ry [about anything] in your temple? Let the KIN be favorable. [...] took rightness, blood, the year [...] and gave them to the *panku*. [...?]
Unfavorable.

iv

§5''

[...] not [angry] about anything in the stone house of the god? [...] was taken; into evil.
Unfavorable.

§6''

[...] seated(?) [...] Further if it is only this [and nothing else? let the KIN be favorable...] the goodwills [of] the gods were taken [...unfavora]ble.

§7'' [...] not [angry] about anything [in] the stone house of the god?

§8'''-§9'''

(Too fragmentary for translation.)

§10'''

[...] the good merchant(?) [...] them back? [...] to the small sickness. Unfavorable.

§11'''

If you, O god of ^{URU}A[n?...], are not angry about anything in the temple, let the KIN be favorable. [...] took rightness, blood, and thick bread, and [gave] them to the Sun-God [of] heaven. [Unfavorable.]

§12'''

Concerning that which was unfavorable, we asked the men of the temple, and they said, “Three sets of the monthly festival have been stopped.”

§13'''

From the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}ZABAR.DAB: [...] Telipinu, three sets of the festival of the month [have been] stopped.

§14'''

Telipinu of the ^{LÚ.MEŠ}GAD.TAR:

§15'''

If you, Wurunanniga, are not angry about anything in the temple, let the KIN be favorable. Goodness was taken, (and given) to the small sickness. Unfavorable.

§16'''

Concerning that which was unfavorable: we asked the men of the temple, and they said, “[...]performing the festival of the second year,” and further ditto. [...] The deity took rightness, blood, and the good of the land for itself [and gave] (them to) the Sun-God [of Heaven]. Unfavorable.

left edge

§17'''

(Too fragmentary for translation)

KBo 59.79

x+1 [...]a]n[?]-za NU.SIG₅-du x[]
2' [...]da ME-aš nu-kán an-da SIG₅-u-i S[IG₅]

3' [...]x nu la-aḥ-ḥi-ia-iz-zi

4' [...]pa-ra-a na-a-i ḥa-m[i]-eš-ḥi-ma[?] MU.20 x[]

5' [...]da mu-[┐] kiš [┐]-šar KASKAL LÚ-ia ME-an

6' [...]SIG₅

7' [...]a-mi ki-nu-un-ma DINGIR^{MEŠ}-tar

8' [...]x-da-an ta-nu-um-mi [┐] SIG₅-ru [┐] []

9' [...]x SILIM-[┐] ul [┐] PAP-[┐] mar ME-aš [┐]

(text breaks)

Topic: Military campaigns.

KBo 59.80

Obv.?

x+1 𐎶^dUTU-ŠI 𐎶 [...]

2' ú-e-tu[m-...]

3' INIM-ti[?] u[?][...]

4' NU.GÁL IG[I...]

5' (erasure)

(3 or 4 lines blank)

6' 𐎶^dHi-eš-x[...]

7' ma-a-a[n...]

8' NU.GÁ[L...]

9' []x[...]

(text breaks)

Rev.?

x+1 [...]*az* x[...]2' [...]*še-ni a-ri* x[...]3' [...]*SIG₅-ru ša[-an-na-pí-li[?]...]*

4' [...U]D.2.KAM pa-an[-ku-uš-za...]

(about four lines blank)

5' [...]*x-kán* 𐎶^d 𐎶[UT]U-ŠI x x[...]6' [...n]*a[?]-aš-du^{??} MUNUS[?]* x[...]7' [...]*x A-NA* 𐎶^dUT[U-ŠI...]8' [...S]*IG₅-ru* 𐎶 LUGAL 𐎶-uš[-za...]9' [...]*x[]* 𐎶^d *SIG₅* 𐎶 [...]

10' [...]*𐎶 A 𐎶-NA* 𐎶^dUTU-ŠI[...]11' [...KA]*R-TAP-PU* na-x[...]12' [...]*x-at pa-an-ku-𐎶 uš-za 𐎶 x* x[...]13' [...pa-a]*n-ku-uš-za ZAG-tar ME-aš*[...]14' [...INA U]D.3.KAM [] 𐎶^d 𐎶UTU AN GUB-iš x[...]15' [...DINGIR.M]AH-n[i] pa-iš *SIG₅*[...]

16' [...]*ku-i-e-eš a-pé-el*[...]17' [...]*x 𐎶^dUL-u-an-za* [...]18' [...p]*a-iš NU.SIG₅* [...]

19' [...]*𐎶^dUTU-ŠI a 𐎶-x*[...]

(text breaks)

Topic: Very unclear; something to do with the king.

KBo 61.93

rev. iii

(1 line blank)

x+1 na-at-ši-k[án...]

2' nu KIN (over erasure) SIG₅-du[...]

3' na-at-za GUB-za[...]

(about 3 lines blank, then lower edge; iv blank as far as preserved)

Topic: Unclear.

KUB 6.3

1 DINGIR^{MEŠ} ŠA dUTU-ŠI^Γ TI ʾ-tar^Γ GIM-an ʾ DINGIR-LIM-ni e-eš-x []

2 ŠA MU^{HLA} GÍD.DA-aš nu KIN SIG₅-ru LUGAL-uš-za ZAG-tar da-pí-an Z[I-an]

3 aš-šu-la-an-na ME-aš nu-kán an-da SIG₅-u-i I-NA UD.2.KAM DINGIR.M[AḪ GUB-iš]

4 TI-tar ME-aš na-at A-NA LUGAL SUM-an I-NA UD.3.KAM TA MU^{HLA} GÍD.DA?]

5 ŠA LUGAL A-DAM-MA ME-an nu-kán EGIR-pa^{GIS} DAG SIG₅

6 DINGIR-LUM TI-tar ku-e-da-ni (erasure?) i-li-eš-ni uš-ki-ši

7 ka-ru-ú-uš-ši ku-e-eš MU^{HLA} a-ri-ia-še-eš-na-za me-ma-an-te-eš

8 a-pé-e-da-ša-aš MU^{HLA}-aš pa-ra-a TI-an-za nu KIN SIG₅-ru

9^{GIS} DAG GUB-iš[!] A-DAM-MA mu-kiš-šar ME-aš nu-kán A-NA MU^{HLA} GÍD.DA

10 I-NA UD.2.KAM DINGIR.MAḪ GUB-iš ŠA DINGIR^{MEŠ} mi-nu-mar^{HLA} MU^{HLA}-uš-ša ME-aš

11 na-aš pa-an-qa-u-i pa-iš I-NA UD.3.KAM dGUL-ša-aš-za da-pí-an ZI-an

12 TI-tar ka-lu-ta-aš-ša TI-tar ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš SIG₅

13 ki-i ku-it TI-an-ni SIG₅-^Γ iš ʾ ta pa-an-gur-za pa-ri-an-da

14 ši-an-na⁶⁰ GIM-an ta-pár-ti DINGIR-LUM-an ar-nu-ši a-pé-e-da-ni

15 me-e-ḫu-ni i-la-aš-ša-na-aḫ-ḫi-at-za SIG₅-ru dU GUB-iš A-DAM-MA

16^Γ TI ʾ-tar ME-aš na-at pa-an-qa-u-i pa-iš I-NA UD.2.KAM LUGAL-uš-za ZAG-tar

17 TI-tar pa-an-gur-ra ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR-LIM-ni da-pí-i ZI-ni

18 I-NA UD.3.^Γ KAM ʾ ḪUL-u-an-za^Γ UD ʾ-aš SAG.KI-za RA-ar ME-aš

19 nu-kán an-da SUD-li₁₂ SIG₅ 4 úr-kiš TA MU^{HLA} GÍD.DA

20 in-na-ra-u-wa-tar ME-an na-at pa-an-qa-u-i SUM-an

21 ki-i ku-it da-pí-an SIG₅-iš-ta me-ḫu-ur-ši ma-ni-in-ku-wa-an

22 nu-^Γ un ʾ-na-aš-kán^Γ DINGIR ʾ-LUM ḪUL-lu [š]a-an-na-aš nu KIN NU.SIG₅-du

23 x x x x[]x-mar[?] a-aš-šu ME-er na-at^Γ pa-an-qa-u-i SUM-er ʾ

24 []d[a]x^Γ na-aš[?] ʾ a-aš-šu x[

25]x x x x[

⁶⁰ For a discussion of this form see P. Goedegebuure, “A New Proposal for the Reading of the Hittite Numeral ‘1’: *ša*,” in *The Life and Times of Hattušili III and Tuthaliya IV. Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Honour of J. de Roos, 12–13 December 2003, Leiden*, ed. Th.P.J. van den Hout, PIHANSt 103 (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2006), 180.

Translation:

§1

As the gods [...] the life of His Majesty for the deity [...] of the long years, let the KIN be favorable. The king took rightness, the whole so[ul (...)] and well-being, and (they went) into goodness. On the second day, Ḫannahanna [arose], and took life; it was given to the king. On the third day, the blood of the king was taken from/by the [long] year[s]; behind ^{GIŠ}DAG. Favorable.

§2

In what sign you, O deity, see life—what years have already been spoken for him by oracle, will he live in excess of those years?⁶¹ Let the KIN be favorable. ^{GIŠ}DAG arose, took blood (and) evocation, (and gave them) to the long years. On the second day, Ḫannahanna arose, took the goodwill of the gods and the years, and gave them to the *panku*. On the third day, the fate-goddess took the whole soul, life, and the life of the community(?) for herself, (and gave them to) the gods. Favorable.

§3

Since this was favorable for the life (of the king), just as you command, beyond the clan, even the foremost,⁶² will you, O deity, bring him to that time? Does it signify (that)? Let it be favorable. The Storm-God arose, took blood (and) life, and gave it to the *panku*. On the second day, the king took rightness, life, and the clan for himself, and (gave it) to the whole soul of the deity. On the third day, evil took the forward strike of the day(?)⁶³; into emptiness. Favorable. Fourth “track”: Vigor was taken from the long years, and it was given to the *panku*.

§4

Since this was all favorable, is the time near for him (or: is his time short?)? Have you, O deity, hidden evil from us? Let the KIN be favorable. [...] and took(plural) [...] -mar (and) goodness, and gave them to the *panku*. [...] goodness [...]

KUB 6.23

Obv.

x+1 [...]x x[]

2' (blank)

3' [...]a-pí-an ZI[-an]

4' [...]pa-an-ga-u-i SUM-a[n]

5' [...]x ^{GIŠ}DAG-iš GUB[-iš]

6' [...]IGI^{HL.A}-w]a-aš ú-wa-tar ZAG-tar

7' [...]A-NA MU.GÍD.DA

8' [...]x 𐎶 ŠA 𐎶 DINGIR^{MEŠ} kar[-pí-uš]

⁶¹ For a slightly different translation of this line, see S.E. Kimball, “Hittite *ariya*- ‘Consult an Oracle’?” in *The Asia Minor Connexion: Studies on the Pre-Greek Languages in Memory of Charles Carter*, ed. Y. L. Arbeitman (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 136.

⁶² For this translation, see again P. Goedegebuure, “The Hittite Numeral ‘1’,” 180.

⁶³ This is unclear. HW² *hant*- – *happinešš*- translates “‘das vorn Schlagen des Tages’ (vielleicht Anspielung auf das Unglück, mit dem ein Tag zuschlagen kann)” (p. 194).

9' [...] ^{MEŠ} []
 10' [...]x[]
 (probably about 6 lines to the edge)

Rev.

x+1 [...] (blank)

2' [...]x

3' [...]x ŠÀ SA₅ [IZKIM]

4' [...]x nu-kán an-da SIG₅-u-i

5' [...]p]a-an-ku-uš-za ZAG-tar

6' [...]x ME-aš nu-kán ʾ EGIR ʾ-pa ^{GIŠ}DAG

7' [...] M]U.GÍD.DA

8' [...]mi-nu-ma]r^{HI.A} ME-an-ʾ te-eš ʾ

9' [...] SUM-an SIG₅

(3 or 4 lines blank)

10' [...]x-ma ŠA li[]

11' [...]Ḫ]UL?-zi x[]

12' [...]nu x[]

13' [...]x[]

Topic: Unclear.

KUB 16.18+KUB 50.30

Obv.

1 ku-u-uš LUGAL ÉRIN^{ME}[^Š] ŠU-TUM ku-e-ez-za

2 ḫu⁶⁴-ul-li-iš-kat-ta-ri ^dNAM-za NU.ŠE-du[?]

3 DINGIR-za EGIR-an ar-ḫa kar-pí-in SIG₅ ME-aš na-aš DINGIR.MAḪ-ni⁶⁵ SUM^{!?} <<ME-aš>>

4 2 GIG.GAL pár-na-aš SIG₅ ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš

5 ʾ 3 ʾ x GÜB-tar <da>-pí^{!?} ZI in-na-x(ra^{!?}) ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ} NU.ŠE

6 nu DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš-ma TUKU.TUKU-za NU.ŠE-du

7 DINGIR^{MEŠ} GUB-ir SA₅[!] IZKIM ME[!]-er

8 nu-kán ANA GIG.GAL

9 nu DINGIR^{MEŠ} ^{GIŠ}TUKUL^{HI.A}-ma ku-i-e-eš nu a-še?[]

10 TUKU.TUKU-an-te-eš na-at a-pé-ez-za ZI[?][]

11 NU.ŠE-du GIG.GAL-za ḪUL TI M[E-aš]

(one line blank, then break)

⁶⁴ E. Neu (*Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen*, StBoT 5 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1968], 183 s.v. *ul(l)ai-*) transliterates Ú rather than ḪU here, but HW² includes this form under *ḫulla/e-*, *ḫulliya-* (p. 686). The photo is difficult, but it favors ḪU over Ú.

⁶⁵ Over erasures(?).

x+1 []TUKU?
 2' []x URU??[]

 3' []x
 4' []a]n-za ʀ GIG ʀ.GAL-a[n]
 5' [] (blank)

 6' [] TUKU.TUKU-za KI.MIN NU.ŠE-du
 7' []at-kán DINGIR-ni kar-pí GAR-ri
 (one line blank)

 8' []kat^{??}-t[a]x DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš TUKU.TUKU-za NU.ŠE-du
 9' []x ŠÀ SUD-li₁₂ NU.ŠE

 10' []x NU.ŠE-du
 11' [] (blank)
 12' []ká]n? DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš

Rev.

x+1 [...] pa-ra-a DUGUD-zi NU.ŠE-du
 2' [...] GUB-ir GIG NINDA¹ KAŠ ME-er
 3' [...] -aš-kán *A-NA* GIG.GAL

 4' [...]x DINGIR^{MEŠ} GUB-ir TI-tar ME-i[r
 5' [...] (erasure) ʘUL

Left edge

1 [...]x x DINGIR^{MEŠ?}-aš?
 2 [...]ʀ na-an[?] ʀ-kán

Translation:

§1

By what were these *ŠUTU*-troops (of) the king defeated? (Is it) you, ^dNAM? Let it be unfavorable. The deity took the hidden anger (and) goodness for itself, and they were(!) given to ʘannaʘanna. 2: The great sickness took the good of the house; to the gods. 3: The king(?) took (...?), the whole soul(??) and vigor(???).⁶⁶ (To) the gods. Unfavorable.

§2

(Is there) an angry one of the gods? Let it be unfavorable. The gods arose (and) took the red omen; to the great sickness.

§3

The gods who (are) of(?) weapons [...] angry(pl.) [...] Is it on account of that [...]? Let it be unfavorable. The great sickness to[ok] evil (and) life for itself[...]

⁶⁶ This oracle procedure is extremely irregular and difficult to read.

§4

(Too fragmentary for translation)

§5

[...] angry (sg.)? Ditto. Let it be unfavorable. [...] It lies near(?) the anger of the god.

§6

[...]in addition?[...] of the gods is angry? Let it be unfavorable. [...] Into emptiness.
Unfavorable.

§7

[...] Let it be unfavorable. [...] to the gods [...]

Reverse

§8'

[...] oppress(?)? Let it be unfavorable. [The gods] arose, took sickness, bread and beer, (and they were given) to the great sickness.

§9'

[...] the gods arose, took life [...] (to?) evil.

left edge

§10'

(too fragmentary for translation)

KUB 16.20⁶⁷

Obv.

x+1 []x x[wa-]aḥ-nu-um-m[e-en...]

2' [nu-za-kán]r^d UTU-ŠI LUGAL[-u-iz-na-ni e-ša-ri ma-a-an-ma-za]

3' [A-NA^d]r UTU ʾŠI I-NA ITU[.x.KAM LUGAL-iz-na-ni a-ša-a-tar]

4' [ma-la-a-a]n ḥar-te-ni r A-NA SAG.DU ʾ[^dUTU-ŠI...]

5' []x SIG₅-in KI.MIN nu KIN SIG₅-r[u] DIN[GIR^{MEŠ}]

6' [GUB-er NINDA.GUR₄.R]A iš-pa-an-du-zi ME-er nu[-kán...]

7' [DINGIR-LU]M-za EGIR-an ar-ḥa kar-pí-i[n... ME-aš]

8' [nu-kán A-NA] GIG.TUR NU.SIG₅ [...]

(3 or 4 lines blank, with erasures)

9' M[U ku-i]t wa-aḥ-nu-um-me-en nu A-NA MU-ti k[u-it ITU.12.KAM SIxSÁ-at']

10' nu-r za-kán ʾ^dUTU-ŠI LUGAL-u-iz-na-ni e-ša-ri m[a-a-an-ma-za]

11' A-NA^dUTU-ŠI I-NA ITU.12.KAM LUGAL-iz-na-ni [a-ša-a-tar]

12' ma-la-a-an ḥar-te-ni A-NA SAG.DU^dUTU-ŠI[...]

⁶⁷ Restorations after van den Hout, *Purity*, 124–26.

13' SIG₅-in KI.MIN nu KIN SIG₅-ru *IŠ-TU* G[IG.GAL]
 14' HUL-u-wa-zi-ia iš-tar-na ar-ḫa 𐎶 ú 𐎶[...NINDA.GUR₄.RA]
 15' iš-pa-an-du-zi-ia MU-ti-tar-ra ME-a[š...]
 16' *I-NA* UD.2.KAM LUGAL-uš-za ZAG-tar da-pí-an [ZI-an ME-aš...]
 17' [n]a-an pa-an-qa-u-i pa-iš *I-NA* UD.3.KAM[...]
 18' 𐎶 ZALAG.GA 𐎶-an mi-nu-mar-ra ME-aš nu-𐎶 kán^d 𐎶[...]

(break)

Translation:

§1

[...] We [ch]anged [...]will] His Majesty sit down in] king[ship]? [If] you (pl.) have [approve]d [sitting down in kingship for] His Majesty in the [...] month, (and) it is well for the person [of His Majesty...], let the KIN be favorable. The gods [arose], took [bread-offerin]g and wine-offering, and [gave them to...]. The deity [took] for itself hidden anger [and...; to] the small sickness. Unfavorable.

§2

[Sin]ce we changed the year, s[ince it was determined] in this year [to be the twelfth month], will His Majesty sit down in kingship? [If] you (pl.) have approved [sitting down] in kingship for His Majesty in the twelfth month, (and) it is well for the person of His Majesty, let the KIN be favorable. (Something?) ca[me] out through [the great] si[ckness] and evil, [took bread-offering], wine-offering, and the year, [and gave them to...]. On the second day, the king [took] rightness (and) the whole [soul] for himself, and gave them(!) to the *panku*. On the third day, [...] took radiance and favor, [and gave them to] ^d[...].

KUB 16.21+KUB 16.80

1 [...]𐎶 ŠA 𐎶^dTe-li-pí-nu ME-za EGIR ar-ḫa[]
 2 [...]x ŠÀ IZI GIG.GAL ME-aš nu DINGIR-ni [da. ZI]
 3 [...]x (zi?)
 (about one line blank)

4 [...]x ^{URU}Ša-mu-ḫa^dDAG (erasure) GUB-iš
 5 [...]x wa-aš-túl ME-aš 𐎶 nu 𐎶[D]INGIR-ni da. ZI
 (about one line blank)

6 [...] ^{ME}Š É DINGIR-*LIM*-ma-aš GUB-tar
 7 [...] ME]-𐎶 er 𐎶 nu DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš

8 [...] G]AR-ri pa.-za ZAG *A-TAM-MA*
 9 [...]]x 2-*NU* GIG.GAL
 10 [...]]ar ME-aš nu-kán ŠÀ SUD-li₁₂

11 [...]]x ^{URU}N[e]
 12 [...]]x kar-p[i]

(gap)

y+1 tar-ta⁶⁸ LUGAL.LUGAL ^dU x[...]

2'' IZI šal-li¹ wa-aš-túl-aš ME[...]

3'' GÙB-za GAR-ri

4'' tar-ta ^mKán-tu-zi LÚ^{MEŠ}[...]

5'' EGIR-an ar-ḥa wa-aš-túl x[...]

6'' na-aš-kán *ANA* GIDIM wa-aš-túl[...]

7'' ḥar-kán *Ú-NU-TUM* DINGIR-za da. Z[I...]

8'' SA₅ IZKIM ME-aš nu EGIR-pa ^r ^d ^ṽ[DAG...]

9'' [] x x-^r an-ti ^ṽi⁶⁹]x(da?)

10'' [] nu x[...]

(break)

z+1 [...]a-uš^{??} ^r ú^{??} ^ṽ

(Rev. is unreadable, perhaps another language.)

Topic: Temple neglect.

KUB 16.36

x+1 [] SIxSÁ-du x[]
2' [] M]E-ir nu DINGIR-ni d[a-pí ZI-ni]

3' [na-at-za] x DÙ-ri NU.ŠE-du ḤUL-za ŠA URU-LIM A-TAM-MA

4' [] n]u DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš NU.ŠE

5' [na-at-za ^{URU?}] x-še-pal-da-ma DÙ-ri NU.ŠE-du DINGIR-za da¹-pí ZI

6' [] mi-n]u-mar PAP-mar ME-aš nu DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš NU.ŠE

7' [na-a]t-za ^{URU}Ka-tap-pa-ma DÙ-^r ri ^ṽ NU.ŠE-du DINGIR-za da-pí ZI

8' [^dN]AM-aš mi-nu-mar ME-aš nu-kán *ANA* GIG.TUR NU.ŠE

9' [n]a-at-za ^{URU}An-ku-wa-ma DÙ-ri NU.ŠE-du DINGIR-za da-pí ZI IZI ME-aš

10' [n]a-aš *ANA* URU-LIM GÙB-za GAR-ri

11' [n]a-at-za ^{URU}Ša-an-ka-wa-ma DÙ-ri NU.ŠE-du SI[G₅]-za É ME-aš *ANA* GI[G].^r GAL ^ṽ

12' 2-NU DINGIR-za da-pí <ZI> ^dNAM-aš mi-nu-mar ME-aš na-aš pa.-i SUM-za SIG₅

⁶⁸ This is also apparently attested in KUB 40.50 l.c. 4' as a symbol (tar²-da²); however, the meaning is entirely unclear. What relationship it bears to the adjective *tartan-*, whose meaning is not known, is likewise unclear.

⁶⁹ O. Carruba ("Stato e società nel Medio Regno eteo," in *Stato Economia Lavoro nel Vicino Oriente antico* [Milano: Franco Angeli, 1988], 205–206) sees a Mr. Ḥantili in this line, which is not impossible but not at all certain.

13' na-⁷ at ⁷-za ^{URU}Ḫu-piš-na-ma DÙ-ri NU.ŠE-du URU-za GÙB-tar¹ da¹-pí ZI
14' []x ME-aš nu DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš NU.ŠE

15' [na-at-za ^{URU}K]um-man-ni-ma DÙ-ri NU.ŠE-du DINGIR^{MEŠ} GUB-ir SA₅ IZKIM
16' [ME-e]r nu DINGIR-ni da-pí ZI NU.ŠE

17' [na-at-za ^{URU}Š]a-mu-ḫa-ma DÙ-ri NU.ŠE-du SIG₅-za ^dNAM-aš mi-nu-mar ME-aš
18' []x x DINGIR^{MEŠ⁷⁰}-ni ⁷ da ⁷-pí ⁷ ZI ⁷ NU.ŠE

Translation:

§1'

(Too fragmentary for translation)

§2'

Or will [it] happen [in X city?]. Let it be unfavorable. Evil [took] the blood of the city [and ...].
To the gods. Unfavorable.

§3'

Or will [it] happen in X-šepalda? Let it be unfavorable. The deity took the whole soul, the favor
of [^dNAM], (and) protection for itself; to the gods. Unfavorable.

§4'

Or will it happen in Katappa? Let it be unfavorable. The deity took the whole soul (and) the
favor of ^dNAM for itself; to the small sickness. Unfavorable.

§5'

Or will it happen in Ankuwa? Let it be unfavorable. The deity took the whole soul (and) fire for
itself; to the left of the city.

§6'

Or will it happen in Šankawa? Let it be unfavorable. Goodness took the house; to the great
sickness. Second: the deity took the whole <soul> (and) the favor of ^dNAM for itself; they
were(!) given to the *panku*. Favorable.

§7'

Or will [it] happen in Ḫupišna? Let it be unfavorable. The city took left-ness (and) the whole
soul [...] for itself; to the gods. Unfavorable.

§8'

Or will [it] happen in Kummani? Let it be unfavorable. The gods arose, [t]ook the red omen
[and...]; to the whole soul of the deity. Unfavorable.

§9'

⁷⁰ See n. 6 on this form in KBo 14.21.

Or will [it] happen in Šamuḫa? Let it be unfavorable. Goodness took the favor of^dNAM [...] to the whole soul of the deity. Unfavorable.

KUB 18.21⁷¹

ii

1 ma-a-an-za-kán ^mŠu-up-pí-lu-li-u-ma-aš ŠÀ É.NA₄ DINGIR-*LIM UL* ku-i[t-ki] x?
2 TUKU-an-za nu KIN SIG₅-ru a-aš-šu-wa-an-za ZALAG.GA-an ^dGUL-ša-aš-ša 𐎶 TI 𐎶-t[ar ME-
a]š
3 nu-kán an-da 𐎶UL-u-i NU.SIG₅

4 nu LÚ^{MES} É.NA₄ DINGIR-*LIM* pu-nu-uš-šu-u-en *UM-MA-ŠU-NU*-ma
5 5 ^{DUG}𐎶u-up-pár GEŠTIN-wa *A-NA* IGI.DU₈.A 𐎶 LÚ^{MES} 𐎶 NU.^{GIS}KIRI₆ pé-e 𐎶ar-ki-ir
6 ki-nu-na-wa ka-a-ša 𐎶 MU.2.KAM 𐎶 ku-𐎶 it 𐎶-wa-ra-a[š] 𐎶kar-ša-an-te-eš
7 ma-a-an ki-i-pát nam-𐎶 ma 𐎶-ma 𐎶 KI 𐎶.MIN nu KIN [SIG₅]-ru

8 GIG.GAL-za 𐎶UL-lu ME-aš nu-kán ^dGUL-še da-p[í]-𐎶 i 𐎶 ZI-ni
9 NU.SIG₅
(8 lines blank, then broken; reverse blank)

Translation:

ii

§1

If you, O Šuppiluliuma, are not angry about anything in (your) divine stone house, let the KIN be favorable. Goodness took radiance and the life of the fate-goddess; into evil. Unfavorable.

§2

We asked the men of the divine stone house, and they said, “The gardeners used to bring five *ḫuppar*-vessels of wine for a gift, but now it is two years since they have stopped. If it is only this, and further, ditto (i.e., and nothing more), let the KIN be [favora]ble.

§3

The great sickness took evil for itself; to the whole soul of the fate-goddess. Unfavorable.

KUB 18.34

Obv.

1 []x-ki-iq-qa pa-𐎶 ra 𐎶[...]
2 []x-wa-an-zi u-i-ia-mi[...]
3 []x-ma[?]-mu DINGIR-*LUM* a-ri-ia-x[...]
4 []-an[?] me-ma-i nu KIN SIG₅[-ru...]
5 DINGIR^{MES} GUB-ir DINGIR.MAḪ-aš IGI^{HLA}-aš 𐎶 ú 𐎶[-wa-tar...]
6 ME-er na-aš-kán DINGIR^{MES}-ni kar-𐎶 pí 𐎶[...]

⁷¹ For other translations and discussion of sections of this text, see M. Kapelus, “La <<maison (le palais) des ancêtres>> et les tombeaux des rois hittites,” *RANT* 4 (2007): 222f, and R. Beal, “Gleanings from Hittite Oracle Questions,” 25.

7 x-x u-i-ia-an-zi⁷²
(2 or 3 lines blank)

8 *I-NA* ^{URU}Zi-ip-la-an-da LÚ.𐎶 SANGA ku 𐎶ru-𐎶 ta 𐎶u-w[a...]
9 𐎶 ku 𐎶e-da-ni pé-di še-𐎶 eš-ki 𐎶iš-ki-𐎶 iz 𐎶zi[...]
10 [] a-pé-e-da-ni pé-di LÚ mi-ne⁷[-a⁷³ ...]
11 []x x x[...]

Rev.

(2 or 3 lines blank)

x+1 LUGAL KUR ^{URU}dU-aš-ša ŠA SAG.DU ^dUTU-Š[I...]
2' x x uš?? *INA* É ^dUTU ^{URU}PÚ-na EGIR-pa x[...]
3 𐎶 ma-a-an-ma 𐎶aš-ši (erasure) DINGIR-*LUM* 2-an me-ma-𐎶 i 𐎶[...]
4 [nu] KIN SIG₅-ru [...]
(several lines blank, and then lower edge)

Topic: Temple etiquette and/or offerings.

KUB 18.43

Obv.

x+1 [...]𐎶 zi 𐎶 x []
2' [...]IGI^{HIA}-aš IGI[]
3' [...]A-NA ^dUTU AN[]
4' [...]EGIR a]r-ḫa kar-p[í-in]
5' [...] (blank)[]

6' [...]x A-NA[]
7' [...]x kar-p[í]
8' [...]x-an-zi[]
9' [...]x kar-ap-zi
10' [...]x-za ke-e-da-aš
11' [...] *INA* MU.4.KAM-ma MÈ
12' [...]mu-]kiš-šar
13' [...]DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš

14' [...]2⁷ KAM-ma-za
15' [...]an-zi
16' [...]x-kán kar-ap-zi
17' [...] (erasure)
18' [...]𐎶 mi-nu-mar-ra⁷ 𐎶

⁷² Written much more lightly than above and below.

⁷³ Restoration after Taggar-Cohen, “Hittite Priesthood,” 154 (“on which place the SANGA-priest with the horned headware of Zippalanda usually sleeps, on that place the *min*[*ea*?]-man [will sleep?]”).

Rev.

x+1 [...]x[]
2' [...]x-⁷ li ⁷ GAR-ri

3' [...]^dUTU-ŠI ki-i SIG₅ x[]
4' [...]S¹IG₅ ME-aš nu-kán ŠA SUD-li₁₂

5' [...]x ŠE-ru
6' [...]x mi-nu-mar
7' [...]x[]SUM-za

8' [...]^{UR}^U Aš-šur IGI[-an-d]a ke-e-za UL
9' [...]pa.-za GÜB-ta[r] ŠA LUGAL A-TAM-MA ME-aš
10' [...]x

11' [...]x-pát ke-e-za wa-ar-ši[]x
12' [...]HUL ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR-LIM-ni d[a-pí Z]I-⁷ ni ⁷

13' [...]DÜ-zi ki-nu-un-kán KUR.[K]UR ^{URU}[]
14' [... z]i KUR ^{URU}Kum-ma-ni-ia-kán []
15' [...]x-aš ar-nu-wa-an-zi nu-kán[]
16' [...]^{URU}Kum-ma-an-ni GAM-an-da pa-iz[-zi]
17' [...]x-an DINGIR-LUM kar-ap-zi nu[]
18' [...]MÈ KI.MIN ŠE-ru pa.-za GÜ[B-tar]
19' [...]A²-TAM-MA mu-⁷ kiš-šar ⁷[]

20' [...]x ⁷ DÜ-an? ⁷[]
21' [...]x[]
(text breaks)

Topic: Military campaigns.

KUB 22.37

Obv.

x+1 [K]AM^{2H.A}-aš ku-⁷ e-da ⁷[]
2' []x-kán a-pé-e-el EN x[]
3' []ka²-ia-zi IŠ-TU DINGIR-LIM-aš ma-l[a?]
4' [n]u KIN SIG₅-ru DINGIR.MAH GUB-iš PAP-nu-mar[]
5' a-pé-⁷ el-la ⁷ŠU-an ME-aš na-aš-ši GÜB-⁷ za ⁷[]
5a (erasure)

6' nu-za ^mKu-wa-ar-wa-šu-un (erasure)ti-it-ta-nu-zi
7' ⁷ IŠ-TU² DINGIR-LIM a-pa-a-aš ma-la-a-an-za nu KIN SIG₅-ru
8' ^dUTU AN-E GUB-iš MU^{2H.A} GÍD.DA TI-tar PAP-nu-mar
9' ^dGUL-⁷ ša ⁷-aš mi-nu-mar da-pí-an ZI-an É-ia ME-aš

10' nu-kán an-da HUL-u-i NU.SIG₅

11' nu-z[a]i-ia-A.A.-an x(erased) da-a-i

12' [IŠ-TU DING]IR-LIM a-pa-a-aš 𐎶 ma-la 𐎶-a-an-za nu KIN SIG₅-ru
(several lines blank)

13' (traces)

Rev.

x+1 []pa-ra-a x-x-x[]x

2' []x^{MEŠ} ku-i-e-𐎶 eš 𐎶

3' []𐎶 a 𐎶ša-a-an-zi

4' []x-ir-ni-iš ar-ma(ku?)-an-ni-iš

5' []x(hu??)-lu-uš-zi na-aš-kán EGIR-pa pár-za hu-lu-uš-zi

6' []KARAŠ HUL-lu a-ra-i

7' ma-a-an ZÉ IGI-zi-az ha-tar-ni-it-ti

8' SIG?-ma-aš-ma-aš pé-e-da-an 1-an A-tar 1-an

9' LUGAL^{MEŠ!} ták-šu-𐎶 la-a 𐎶-an-zi nu-𐎶 uš-ma 𐎶-aš KUR-TUM

10' tar-ra-nu-an-zi

(about 2 lines blank, then broken)

Translation:

Obverse

§1'

[...] in what [days/months/years?...] his lord [...]s. Is he app[roved?] by the deity? Let the KIN be favorable. Hanaḥanna arose, and took protection, [...], and his/her hand. On his/her left [...].

§2'

He will install Mr. Kuwaršu. Is he approved by the deity? Let the KIN be favorable. The Sun-God of heaven arose, took the long years, the life, protection, the goodwill of the fate-goddess, the whole soul, and the house; into evil. Unfavorable.

§3'

He will take/place [Mr. ...]-liya-muwa for himself. Is he approved [by the dei]ty? Let the KIN be favorable.

Reverse: The reverse appears to no longer be a KIN-oracle.

KUB 22.57

Obv.

1 𐎶^d 𐎶UTU^{URU} PÚ-na-kán ku-it ŠÀ É DINGIR-LIM TUKU.TUKU-ti S[IxSÁ-at]

2 a-ri-i[a]-u-en-ma na-aš ANA EZEN₄^{MEŠ} kar-ša-an-du-uš INI[M?]-ia

3 [š]e-er TUKU.TUKU-ti ʀ SIxSÁ-at ʀ nu-kán INIM ti-ia-u-e-ni
 4 ʀ nu ʀ EZEN^{MEŠ} kar-ʀ ša-an-du ʀ-uš pa-ra-a šar-ni-in-ku-e-ni
 5 GAM-an-na maš-kán za-an-ki-la<-tar> SUM-qa-u-e-ni *A-NA MA-AN-TA-DU-TI*-(erasure)-kán
 6 UN-an pa-ra-a ʀ ne ʀ-ia-u-e-ni EGIR^{1?}-az-za-ma maš-kán
 7 za-an-ki-la-tar SUM-ʀ u-e ʀ-ni DINGIR-*LUM* ke-e-ez-za ZI-an wa-ar-ši-ia-ši
 8 a-pé-e-da-ni-na-aš-kán UD-ti pé-an *UL* ti-ia-ši??
 9 nu SIG₅-ru ^dDAG-iš GUB-iš GAL wa-<aš>-túl NINDA.GUR₄.RA iš-pa-an-du-zi ME-aš
 10 nu-kán DINGIR-*LIM*-ni da-pí-i ZI-ni NU.SIG₅
 (2 lines blank)

11 x ʔ HAL? ku-it *IT-TI* ^dUTU-ŠI TUKU.TUKU-ti ʀ SIxSÁ-at ʀ
 12 ʀ nu x x ʀ-[a]n 1-an mu-u-kiš-šar^{HLA} kar-ap-pu-u-e-ni
 13 nu[] ʀ TUKU? ʀ[] an-zi?? ʀ x x pa-ra-a (erasure) ʀ e ʀ-ep-pu-u-e-ni
 14 nu-uš-ši EGIR-pa ták-šu-la-u-ʀ e ʀ[-ni] nam-ʀ ma ʀ-aš-ši (erasure)⁷⁴ ar-ku-wa-ar
 15 ti-ia-u-wa-aš še-er maš-kán za-[-an-k]i-la-tar SUM-an-zi
 16 ku-it-ma-an ^dUTU-ŠI ú-ez-zi nu-ut-ta ^dUTU-ŠI KASKAL-ši-aḥ-zi
 17 DINGIR-*LUM* a-pé-ez-za ZI-an wa-ar-š[i-i]a-ši *A¹-NA* ^dUTU-ŠI
 18 a-pé-e-da-ni UD-ti SIG₅-in x-ma?-at-ti SIG₅-ru
 19 ʔUL-u-an-za GAL wa-ʀ aš-túl IZI ʀ-[i]a [ME-a]š nu-kán ^d[]xʀ NU. ʀS[IG₅]
 (about 3 lines blank, then broken)

Rev.

x+1 []x ʔR(x? ni-x?) x[...]
 2' []SIG₅ ME-aš nu-k[án...]
 3' []EGIR-pa ^dDAG-ti[...]
 (one line blank)

4']x ŠÀ É.ŠÀ KÙ.GA zi-la-aš x-i[a? ...]
 5']x [I]NIM ša-aš-ta-aš-pát DINGIR-*LUM*-ma nam-ma da[m-ma-i...]
 6' nu KIN (erasure) SIG₅-ru DINGIR.MAḥ GUB-iš SIG₅ [...ME-aš]
 7' na-aš pa-an-ga-u-i SUM-an-za *INA* UD.2.KAM ^dDA[G GUB-iš...]
 8' SILIM-an-na ME-aš n[a-at *A-NA*] ʀ DINGIR.MAḥ ʀ-ni SUM-an[-te-eš...]
 (about 2 lines blank)

9 tu-uk ʀ *A* ʀ-N[A...]
 10 a-pé-e-za-pát x[...]
 11 še-ek-ku-wa-u-e-ni[...]
 12 ^dU GUB-iš in[-na-ra-w]a-tar x[...]
 13 NU.SIG₅

(several lines blank)

Translation:

Obverse

⁷⁴ A partially-erased NU.

§1

Since the Sun-Goddess of Arinna [was] as[certained] concerning anger in the temple, we inquired by oracle, and she was ascertained to be angry (literally “for anger”) about neglected festivals and (inappropriate) word[s?]. We will address the matter. We will fully make up for the neglected festivals, and in addition, we will keep giving a propitiatory gift (and) restitution. We will send a man for a pledge, and after that we will give the propitiatory gift (and) restitution. Will your spirit, O deity, be soothed by this? Will you not step before us on that day? Let it be favorable. ^dDAG arose, took the great sin, thick bread (and) libation-offering; to the deity’s whole soul. Unfavorable.

§2

Since [...] was ascertained for anger with His Majesty, we will cancel [...] 1 [...] (and) evocation rituals. [...] angry? [...] we will present [...] we will make peace with him/her again. And further, they will give him/her a propitiatory gift (and) restitution for presenting a defense, and His Majesty will pacify you. Will your spirit, O deity, be soothed by that? On that day, will you [...] well for His Majesty? Let it be favorable. Evil took the great sin and fire; [to] the dei[ty]. Unfavorable.

Reverse

§3’

(too fragmentary for translation)

§4’ [...] Within the pure inner chamber, the oracular outcome [...] (If it is) only the [ma]tter of the bed, and you, O deity [nothing] fur[ther...] let the KIN be favorable. Ḫannaḫanna arose (and) [took] goodness; it was given to the *panku*. On the second day, ^dDAG [arose], took [...] and justice, and [they were] given to Ḫannaḫanna. [...]

§5’

(too fragmentary for translation)

KUB 46.58

Obv.

x+1 [...] ṽ pé-eš ṽ-x[...]
 2’ [...]ME²-an pa-iz-ṽ zi ṽ x x[...]
 3’ [...]x-ut²-ma-ia ME-aš n[a...]
 4’ [...]x-ia ME-aš nu-kán x[...]

5’ [...]x-an pé-e-da-an-zi[...]
 6’ [...]x-i pé-an-ma-aš a-x[...]
 7’ [...]GÜB-tar ŠU-an-na x[...]

8’ [...]x ŠA^dḪ[é]-bat [...]
 9’ [...]x-aš nu² KUR^{URU}Ḫa[t-ti...]
 10’ [...]x mu-kiš-šar-r[a...]
 11’ [...] (blank)[...]

12' [...]BE?[...]
(broken)

Topic: Unclear.

KUB 49.70

Rev.?

x+1 x[...]
(one line blank)

2' nu-kán[...]

3' ku-it-man MU-an-ni ke-e-d[a-ni...]
4' šal-li-kán wa-aš-túl ar-ḥa p[é-e-da-an...]

5' BE-an ke-e-da-ni MU-ti x? na-aš-m[a...]
6' LUGAL-i SAG.DU-i i[m]-x x x šu IŠ-TU[]x x[...]
7' IŠ-TU^{LÚ}KÚR-m[a?]ZI MÈ ar-ḥa pé-^ḫ e ʾ[da-an...]
8' INA UD.2.KAM x[pé]-^ḫ e ʾ-da-an ŠA^{LÚ}KÚR-kán[...]
9' ar-ḥa p[é-e-da-an]x^{LÚ}KÚR-kán x^{HI.A} x[...]

10' BE-an-kán[]x^{GIŠ}TUKUL ŠÀ^ḫ KUR^{ṽMEŠ URU}Ḥat[-ti...]
11' Ú-UL ú-i[z-zi]ti a-aš-šu MÈ x[]x-pí-x [...]
12' INA UD.2.KAM[]ar-ḥa pé-e-^ḫ da-an ʾ[] [...]

13' a-ši ku-iš?[]^{UR₁U?}Za-al-la-ra[]^{UR₁U}Za-al-la-r[a...]
14' nu ANA/1? LÚ^{URU}A[h?]]x LÚ^{URU}A[h] pé]-^ḫ e ʾ-da-an[...]
15' [I]Š-TU^{LÚ}KÚR[]-kán i?[]x-at SIG₅

16' [nu-k]án LUGAL KUR^{UR₁U}]DUGUD-eš-zi[]x-it-ti-ia-an[...]
17' []^{URU}Mi-ra[T]I-tar mi-nu-mar[]NU.ŠE

18' BE-an-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ} ANA? x[d]a[?]-ni? MU-ti A-NA[]pu TA LUGAL-kán[...]
19' []x-ta-at ANA^mKi-x[]da-pí-aš ZI[]x-a?-ta-at SIG₅

20'⁷⁵ [BE-an-ká]n??^ḫ ke-e-da ʾ-ni^ḫ MU ʾ-[t]i e-el ŠA LÚ^{URU}Az-z[i^{GIŠ}TUKUL ŠÀ KUR^{MEŠ}
^{URU}GIDRU-TI Ú-UL u-iz-z]i DINGIR^{MEŠ} a-ši LÚ^{URU}Az[-zi...]
21' []x-ti-ia-an A-NA LÚ^{URU}A[z-zi a]r-ḥa pé-e-da-an [...]
22' []U]D.x.KAM TA^{URU}Ḥa[t-ti d]a-an [...]

⁷⁵ Restorations after P. Goedegebuure, “Deictic-emphatic -i and the Anatolian demonstratives,” in Ex Anatolia Lux. *Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*, ed. R. Kim, N. Oettinger, E. Rieken, and M. Weiss (Ann Arbor - New York: Beech Stave Press, 2010), 57.

(lower edge)

left edge:

1 [...z]i? ^{GIŠ}TUKUL KUR^{MEŠ URU} Ĥat-ti *UL* ú-wa-an-zi

Topic: Military campaigns.

KUB 49.76

x+1 [...] DINGIR^{MEŠ} ʾ-aš NU[.SIG₅...]

2' [...Š]A KARAS^{Š^{HLA}} ĥu-ul-lu-mar SIxSÁ-at[...]

3' [...]x-ir KARAS^{Š^{HLA}}-ša-ma-aš GÙB-tar KASKAL-NU[...]

4' [...nu KI]N NU.SIG₅-du KARAS^{Š^{HLA}} ʾ-ša ʾ-ma-aš GÙB-tar x[...]

5' (illegible line continued from the other side, rest of paragraph blank)

6' [...]IŠ-TU MU^{HLA} GÍD.DA ŠA LUGAL ZA[G-tar...]

7' [...p]a-an-ga-u-i ʾ pa ʾ-iš 2-NU DINGIR^{MEŠ} GUB-ʾ ir ʾ[...]

8' [...S]IG₅

9' [...DA]G-iš GUB-iš ŠA x[...]

Topic: Military defeat.

KUB 49.77

ii

x+1 [...]x x[]

2' [...]x DINGIR-LUM A-NA DINGIR x[]

3' [...-u]š-za ʾ pé[?]-an[?] ʾ-x-x[]

4' [...]GÙB-tar ĥu-ul-la-a-x[]

5' [...]ak-wa-za-aš-kán iš-x[]

6' [...]x []-ia x[]

7' [...] a]r[?]-ĥa ši-x[]

8' [...]x a-x[]

iii

x+1 x[]x x-i?[a?] ʾ ŠA ʾ^dU^{U^{RU}}]

2' uš-g[a]-š[a?]-iz-zi nu KIN SI[G₅-ru]

3' DINGIR-LUM[-za EG]IR-an ar-ĥa kar-p[í-in]

4' na-a[n pa-a]n-qa-u-i pa-iš NU.S[IG₅]

5' na-aš[]A-NA ^{GIŠ}KUN₄ DINGIR-LIM^dU^{URU}x[]

6' iš-t[a]-an-ta-iz-zi nu KIN SIG₅-ru []
 7' LUGAL-uš-za ZAG-tar da-pí-an-na ZI-an ME-aš
 8' na-an-za-[a]n[?] GÙB-za ME-iš NU.ŠE

(3 or 4 lines blank, then broken)

iv

(~2 blank lines)

x+1 [...]iz *INA*[?] *IR-TUM* SIG₅ x
 2' [...]x-li-iš GÙB-x x [p]ár-za
 3' [...NU.SI]G₅-du
 4' [...DINGIR]^{MES}-aš
 5' [...]x-ia ME-^Γ er [┐]
 6' [...]GUB-iš ^Γ ŠA [┐] DINGIR.MAH IGI^[HLA]-^Γ wa-aš ú-wa-tar [┐]

(3 or 4 lines blank, then broken)

Topic: Somewhat unclear, but probably cult actions.

KUB 49.82

Obv. ii?

(~3 lines blank)

x+1 [...]d^U ^{URU}Ne-ri-iq-qa
 2' [...]x
 3' [...]qa[?]-pa-^Γ ku^{??}-uš[?] [┐]
 4' [...]in-ma DIB[?] GIDRU-ti^{??} DÙ-an-zi
 5' [...] ^Γ d [┐]UTU PÚ-ma-wa(-)an-na-ni-ia
 6' [...]x-an-zi
 7' [...]i pé-ra-an-ma-aš-ši
 8' [...]x EZEN₄ zé-na-an-da-aš

9' [...]x x
 10' [...] ^{LÚ}pa-ra?(-)wa-ar-x
 11' [...]x a-ku-wa-an-z[i]

12' [...]3-ŠU
 13' [...]3-ŠU
 14' [...]z[i] []

Rev. iii?

x+1 [...]x x x
 2' [...]x *ANA* GIG.TUR

3' [...]ME-aš nu-kán EGIR-pa ^{GIS}DAG[-ti]

4' [...DINGIR]-*LIM*-ni⁷⁶ da-pí-i ZI-ni[]
5' [...]x *ANA* GIG.TUR

6' [...]EGIR-pa^dDAG-ti
7' [...] (blank)

8' [...]𐎶 *A* 𐎶-*DAM-MA* SILIM-an ME-aš
9' [...]x DINGIR-*LIM*-ni da-p[í]-𐎶 i 𐎶 Z[I-n]i
10' [...]GI]G.𐎶 GAL 𐎶

(2 lines blank, then broken)

Topic: Cult activities, an autumn festival (ii 8').

KUB 49.89

l.c.

x+1 [...]x
2' [...]
3' [...] -*TUM*
4' [...] -zi
(space)
5' [...]x-aš [M]E?
6' [...]x-an
(space)
7' [...] -x
8' [...] -x
9' [...] -x

r.c.

x+1 [] -x[...]
2' x-ša-an-x[...]
3' na-at pa-i i[...]

4' nu-za DINGIR-*LUM* pár-na[...]
5' SIG₅-an-za IZI šal-l[i wa-aš-túl...]
6' nu-kán EGIR-pa^{Giš}[DAG...]

7' nu-za DINGIR-*LUM* x x(over erasure)[...]
8' ^{LÚ.MEŠ}É DINGIR-*LIM*-ša-ma[-aš...]
9' 𐎶 nu-kán 𐎶 DINGIR-ni da-pí-i[ZI-ni...]

10' nu-za DINGIR-*LUM* EME-ma še-e[r...]
11' DINGIR-za da-pí ZI SA₅ I[ZKIM...]

⁷⁶ Reading based on photo.

12' nu DINGIR-*LUM* mar-za-aš-tar-ri-ma[...]
 13' LÚ^{MEŠ} É DINGIR-*LIM*-ma-aš 𐎶 GÙB 𐎶⁷⁷-tar[...]
 14' na-aš-kán DINGIR-ni da[-pí ZI] GAR[...]

15' nu-za ma-a-an DINGIR-*LUM* []ku-e-da[...]
 16' nam-ma-ma GUR-i Ú-*UL* k[u?...]
 17' UN ZAG-tar pár-na-aš SIG₅ MU[...]
 18' 2-*NU* TA EGIR UD.KAM SILIM-aš[...]

19' ki-i x[...]
 20' nu ^{LÚ}x[...]
 (text breaks)

Topic: An angry god.

KUB 49.91

Obv.

x+1 []ni/ir?[...]
 2' []x-pu?[...]

3' []*UL* m[a? ...]
 4' [d]a-pí ZI-n[i...]
 5' []-in[?] INIM LU[GAL[?]]-aš LUGAL-i ZAG-za[...]
 6' 3-ŠÚ GIG.GAL UD.KAM-aš SAG.KI-za RA-ar ME-aš nu-kán[...]

7' [L]UGAL-uš-ša-an ša-ku-wa-aš-šar-ri-it ZI-ni [...] ...]
 8' zi-la-an-za-kán LUGAL a-pa-a-at ZAG-tar DÙ-𐎶 ti 𐎶 [...] ...]
 9' DINGIR.MAḪ GUB-iš ŠA LUGAL KUR ^{URU}Aš-šur da-pí [ZI...]
 10' nu-kán ŠA SUD-li₁₂ NU[!].ŠE

(2 or 3 lines blank, then lower edge)

Rev.

1 nu-uš-ši a-u-wa-an ar-ḫa-ma x[...]
 2 zi-la-an-za-kán LUGAL-i a-pa-a-a[t? ...]
 3 LUGAL-za ZAG-tar *A-TAM-MA* IZI ma[...]
 4 nu-kán []x [GI]G? [...] ...]
 (broken)

Topic: Unclear; likely military, since the king of Assyria is involved (obv. 9').

KUB 50.13

(1 or 2 lines blank)

⁷⁷ Reading based on photo.

x+1 [...]x 𒀭 BAL 𒀭zi⁷⁸ ŠE-rù[...]

2' [...]URU Har-zi-ú-na-ma hu-uš-ki-ia-zi x[...]

3' [...LÚ^{MES} U^{RU} Hat-ti-[m]a-aš GÙB-tar GÉŠPU ha-aš-ta-𒀭 i 𒀭[...]

4' [...]LUGAL-i SUM-za TA LÚ KÚR ZAG-tar IZI[...]

5' [...]x ZAG-tar a-pa-a-at DÙ-ri ŠE-rù [...]

6' [...]x in-nir-wa-tar ME-aš nu (erasure)x[...]

7' [...]x-za BAL-zi ŠE-rù[...]

(text breaks)

Topic: Military campaigns.

KUB 50.15

x+1 [...]x[𒀭] SIG₅ 𒀭ru DINGIR.MAH-𒀭 aš GUB 𒀭i[š...]

2' [...]𒀭 É-TI 𒀭ŠÀ É DINGIR-LIM UL ku-it-ki TUKU.TUKU nu KI[N...]

3' [...]x É DINGIR-LIM IZI-ia ME-aš na-aš A-NA LÚ^{MES} 𒀭 É 𒀭[DINGIR-LIM...]

4' [...]Š]À? É [DI]NGIR-LIM TUKU.TUKU-za IT-TI^dUTU-ŠI-ma-za UL ku[-it-ki?...]

5' [...]x SILIM-an KUR-e-aš SIG₅ ME-aš nu-kán an-da i[-...]

6' [...]UTU-ŠI TUKU.TUKU-ti SIxSÁ-at IŠ-TU É DINGIR-LIM-kán[...]

7' [...]mi-nu-mar^{HI.A} ME-aš na-aš A-NA^dUTU AN SU[M (over erasure) ...]

8'⁷⁹ [...]x x x 𒀭 É DINGIR-LIM nu-kán 𒀭ar-ḥa[...]

9' [...] (?) blank

10' [...]] x x(na?)[...]

(text breaks)

Topic: A god is angry with the king.

KUB 50.18

x+1 [...]e]š?-ni [...]]

2' [...]SI]G₅ [...]]

3' [...]S]IG₅-ru[...]

4' [...]x ME-aš nu-kán[...]

⁷⁸ Based on the photo, the mark following this seems to be a scratch on the tablet rather than something belonging to the sign.

⁷⁹ Everything from here on is erased.

5' [...]x DÛ-zì[...]

6' [...]er [...]

7' [...]x GUB-iš[...]

8' [...] GIG.TUR[...]

9' [...]a]t? pa-an-q[a-u-i...]

10' [...] x^{MES} x x[...]

(text breaks)

Topic: Unclear.

KUB 50.20

Vs. i

x+1 []x x?[...]

2' []x DINGIR-*LIM*-ni d[a-pí-i ZI-ni...]

3' [n]a-at DINGIR.MAH₃-ni ʾ SUM ʾ[...]

4' nu ta-pa-aš-ša-an[...]

5' DINGIR-*LUM*-za da-pí-an Z[I-an...]

6' DINGIR-*LI*[*M*] ʾ ku-it-ki? ʾ x[...]

7' ma-a-an DINGIR.LÚ-pát DINGI[R/an...]

8' na-[a]t DINGIR.MAH₃-ni pa-i[š...]

9' *INA* UD.3.KAM HUL-lu[...]

10' DINGIR.LÚ ku-iš SIxSÁ-a[t...]

11' ma-a-an ^dU-tar-pát d[a...]

12' nu-kán DINGIR-*LIM*-ni d[a-pí-i ZI-ni...]

13' *INA* UD.3.KAM ^dUTU ʾ AN ʾ[...]

14' ^dU-tar ku-it ʾ SIxSÁ ʾ-[at...]

15' ʾ HUL-lu ʾ ME-an[...]

16' ma-a-an ^dU^{H₁A} ʾ[...]

17' nu KIN SIG₅-ru HUL[L-...]

18' ^dU ku-it ŠA x[...]

19' nu KIN NU.SIG₅-du ^d[...]

20' na-at LUGAL-i x[...]

21' *INA* UD.3.KAM ^dU GUB[-iš...]

22' nu ^dU é-i-an x[...]

23' mu-[┐] kiš [┐]-šar ME-aš[...]

(several lines blank, then broken; reverse blank so far as preserved)

Topic: An angry Storm-God.

KUB 50.25

x+1 [...]x-uš x x[...]

2' [...]nu-kán an-da[┐] SUD [┐][-li₁₂...]

3' [...]x-ia-zi na-an-kán ku-en-z[i? ...]

4' [...]x-ri-ia-zi nu-za ZAG-tar ME-a[š...]

5' [...da-pí]-an ZI-an KASKAL-*NU*-ia ME-aš nu[...]

6' [...]x nu-kán[┐] *A-NA* [┐]GIG.TUR SIG₅ [...]

7' [...k]u-wa-pí ke-e-ez GUB-ri n[a]-a[t? ...]

8' [...N]U.SIG₅-du LUGAL-uš-z[a ...]

9' [...p]a-iš GUB-la-a[z? ...]

10' [...]x x[...]

(text breaks)

Topic: Unclear.

KUB 50.26

Obv. ii?

x+1 [...] x uš[?] x x MUD

2' [...]

3' [... da-pí] ZI x mu-kiš-šar ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš

4' [...] NU.ŠE

5' [...]x šal-[┐] li [┐]wa-aš-túl ME-aš nu-kán *ANA* GIG.GAL

6' [...]

7' [...]

(two lines blank)

8' [...ar-]ḫa KASKAL-aḫ-zi

9' [...z]i INIM LÚ^{KUR}Me-ra

10' [...]

11' [...]LUGAL-*RU*-ma-za-kán

12' [...] a [┐]-pí-za ar-ḫa

13' [...] -aš

(lower edge)

Rev. iii?

1 [...] [...]

2 [...]x-ni

3 [...]A.A-an

4 [...]

5' [...wa]-aš-túl ME-aš

6 [...]

7 [...]a MÈ ME-aš

8 [...]

9 [...]

10 [...]x-aš

Topic: Military campaigns, the land of Mira.

KUB 50.37

x+1 [...]x(na?)-ša-za[...]

2' [...]aš *INA* UD.3.KAM [] x x x x[...]

3' [...]pa-a]n-ga-u-i SUM-er[...]

4' [...]ú-iz-zi ku-iš UN-aš nu-za GÙB[...]

5' [...]x-i pa-iš *UM-MA*^{MUNUS.MEŠ}ŠU.GI x[...]

6' [...]𐎶 ma 𐎶-wa iš-ta-ma-aš-ša-an-zi x[...]

7' [...]x-iš UN-aš ŠA DUMU.NITA ú-iz-zi nu[...]

8' [...]x-ša NÍ.TE-ŠÚ 𐎶UL-lu ú-da-a[š? ...]

9' [...]DINGIR.MA]𐎶 GUB-iš TI-tar ŠA LUGAL-ia *A-DA*[*M-MA* ME-aš...]

10' [...]x *A-NA* DUMU.NITA pa-iš *INA* UD.2.KAM x[...]

11' [...]da-p]í-an ZI-an KUR-aš-ša SIG₅ ME-aš[...]

12' [...]II]I.KAM ŠA DINGIR^{MEŠ} mi-nu-mar^{HI.A} ME-a[n-te-eš...]

13' [...]ma-]𐎶 a 𐎶-an-mu ku-u-uš úr-ki-uš ša-k[u...]

14' [...]nu?-m]u-za 𐎶a-a-la-ir *A-NA* DUMU.NITA x[...]

15' [...]SIG₅-ru DUMU.NITA-za ZAG-tar ME-aš[...]

16' [...]𐎶 *INA* UD.]𐎶 2 𐎶.KAM LUGAL-uš-za ZAG-tar IGI^{HI.𐎶} A 𐎶[ú-wa-tar(?)...]

17' [...]𐎶 *A-NA* 𐎶 DUMU.NITA pa-iš x[...]

18' [...]]x x *A-DAM-𐎶MA*𐎶[...]

(text breaks)

Topic: The safety(?) of an heir.

KUB 50.39

x+1 [...]x[...]
 2' [...]g]a?-aš x[...]
 3' [...]Ú-UL EGIR-x[...]
 4' [...]Ú-UL DÙ-ri a[n...]
 5' [...]EGIR-an a]r-ḥa kar-pí-in[...]
 6' [...]š]a-aš-za da-pí-an ZI[-an...]
 7' [...]ZA]G-za GAR-ri *INA* UD.3.KAM DINGIR^{ME}[^š...]
 8' [...]p]a-an-ga-u-i SUM-an SIG₅[...]

9' [...]x-u?-aš ŠA^dUTU-ŠI HUL ša[...]
 10' [...]KI]N NU.SIG₅-du DINGIR^{MEŠ} GUB-er KUR-^r e ʾ[-aš SIG₅...]
 11' [...]x *A-NA* MU.KAM GÍD.DA *INA* UD.2.KAM x[...]
 12' [...]x-an pa-an-ga-u-i pa-iš ʾ*INA* UD.III.KAMʾ[...]
 13' [...]x^r na-aš ʾx[...]
 (text breaks)

Topic: Unclear.

KUB 50.40

Obv.?

(about 12 lines blank)

x+1 *IR-TUM* kiš-an-pát nu GUL-aḥ-mi-ma kat-t[a...]
 2' :ku-wa-la-na-al-li-i še-eš-mi KI.MIN nu K[IN...]
 3' nu-kán *A-NA* GIG-i NU.SIG₅
 4' *IR-TUM* kiš-an-pát nu GUL-aḥ-mi-ma še-er-r[a...]
 5' [DI]NGIR-*LUM*-za nu KIN SIG₅-ru LÚ^{MEŠ URU}Ḥat-ti-ma[-aš...]

(end of column; reverse is uninscribed so far as preserved)

Translation:

§1

The question is just the same. However, I will attack [...]. I will sleep with the army. Ditto (i.e., is this acceptable?). [Let the] KIN [be...] To sickness. Unfavorable.

§2

The question is just the same. However, I will also attack up [...] Is/does the deity [...?]. Let the KIN be favorable. The men of Ḥatti [took...] for [themselves...]

KUB 50.42

l.c.

x+1 [...]x x x[t]a-aš-ti-r[a?

2' [...]x na-aš *A-NA*[

3' [...] NU.]ŠE-du

4' [...]]

5' [...] n]a-aš DINGIR.MAḪ SUM-za

6' [...]]

7' [...]]

8' [...]]

9' [...] EGIR-pa]r^{GIŠ}DAG ʾ-ti

10' [...]]NU.ŠE-du

11' [...]]-nu-mar ME-aš

12' [...]]SIG₅ MU-an

13' [...]]-an SILIM-an

14' [...] EG]IR-an ar-ḫa

15' [...]]

16' [...]]x-ši/*LIM* x[]x-ti17' [...]]x-ḫa-am[?]-x[]x ME[?]

18' [...]x []x-aš

19' [...]an[?] UDU SUM-kir []6 *PA* GEŠTIN MU-ti-li

20' [...]x-ma ku-wa-p[í]an-zi a-pa-a-at-ma-x[

21' [...]x(uš?) x x[]x-ma[?] 3 r *PA*[?] ʾ ŠE.GIŠ.Ì

22' [...]x-pa[]x-ra-za pé-e ḫa[r]-x[]

23' [...]]

24' [...]eš(30?)-ki-x[^dUT]U[?]-ŠI kar-ša[]

25' [...]]-ni ku-it-ta x[]

26' [...]x[]x-ša-an

27' [...]Š-*TU*[?] x x[]kar-ša-an 6 DUG[]28' [...]x ki *KA-PA-M*[U]x-i *KA-PA-NU*29' [...]x ḫar-kir *IŠ-TU* []^dUTU-Š[*I*]30' [...]]x ŠEŠ ^dUTU-ŠI x[]x31' [...]]x-e-x *I-NA* x?

(break)

r.c.

x+1 nu[...]

2' ki-x[...]

3' ma-a-an[...]

4' 2-Ú LÚ[...]

5' ḫar-kán-ga-x[...]

6' 5^{GIŠ} GAG KÙ.BABBAR x[...]

7' ma-a-an ke-d[a-ni...]

8' na-aš pa^{1?}-<an>-ga-u-^r i ^r[...]

9' ma-a-an-za-kán[...]

10' []x-za[...]

(text breaks)

Topic: Offerings.

KUB 50.51

Obv.

1 [...DINGIR^{MEŠ}] ^r a-ri ^r-er⁸⁰ TI-tar la-lu-^r ki ^r-m[a-an...]

2 [...]x-ši pí-i-e-er pa[]x[...]

3 [...L]UGAL ZAG-tar da-a-aš[...]

4 [...] -iš [...]

5 [...]x-ša-aš a-ra-iš[...]

6 [... Š]À-BA a-ra-iš[...]

7 [...]x-me-ta x[...]

(break)

Topic: Unclear.

KUB 50.52

x+1 [...]x x x a-pé-e-da-aš[...]

2' [... k]án? ar-ḫa pé-e-da-an in-nir-r[a-wa-tar...]

3' [...]x KÙ.GA¹ GI.GÌR⁷⁸¹ an-za-a-š SIG₅[-rù ...]

⁸⁰ See n. 48 on this form in KUB 52.280 rev. 28'. Seeing the word spelled out rather than written GUB-er suggests an older date for this text, which is supported by the palaeographical evidence: the E sign in line two has a low first vertical.

4' [...]-i GÙB-za [...]

5' [...]-ma NU.ŠE-du ^{LÚ}KÚR-za GÙB-tar ŠÀ-aš x[...]

6' [...]x SUM-za 2-NU ^{LÚ}KÚR-za ZAG-tar MÈ KASKAL[...]

7' [...]DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš [...]

8' [...]x-iš ^{LÚ}KÚR URU-LUM-ma-aš UL x[...]

9' [...]-ga SIG₅-rù SIG₅-za EGIR.UD-MI[...]

10' [...u]š? ŠA ^{LÚ}KÚR IZI MÈ KASKAL[...]

11' [...]x-ku URU KAL ša-ra-a[...]

12' [...]-ta NINDA.LÀL[...]

13' [...]x a[r-...]

(text breaks)

Topic: Military matters (perhaps tribute?).

KUB 50.57

x+1 [...]x-^r er? ʾ[[...]x[...]

2' [...]x-zi a-pé-ez-za GÙB-x[...]

3' [...]DINGIR.MAH GUB-iš TI-tar ŠA[...]

4' [...SU]M-an ^r NU ʾ.SIG₅ [...]

5' [...-]ra-a-ma la-aḥ-ḥi-ia-^r zi ʾ x-ma? ^{md}G[E₆-LÚ...]

6' [...]x nu KIN NU.SIG₅-du LUGAL-uš-za ZAG-tar M[È...]

7' [...]INA UD.2.KAM ^{LÚ}KÚR-za MÈ DU₈^{HLA} KASKAL-i[a...]

(erasure)

8' [...]x-kán GAM IZI-ia-r[i n]a-at-za x[...]

9' [...]x ME-er na-at pa-an-ga-u-i SU[M...]

10' [...]A-NA ^{md}GE₆-LÚ wa-aš-túl GAR-r[i...]

11' [...n]a-at LUGAL-i ZAG-za GAR-ri SIG₅[...]

12' [...]x-nu-an-zi nu KIN NU[.SIG₅-du...]

13' [...]x-^r ri? ʾ nu-kán A-NA k[i? ...]

14' [...pa-an-]^r ga ʾ-u-i SUM-an INA UD.2[.KAM...]

15' [...]^{HLA} ME-aš na-at LUGAL-i[...]

16' [...]^ʾ ^{LÚ.MEŠ}x[...]

17' [...L]UGAL-uš¹-za x[...]

18' [...]ME-er x[...]

(text breaks)

⁸¹ HZL is unsure about this reading (p. 105, “fraglich”).

Topic: Campaigns and the transgressions of Mr. ^dGE₆-LÚ.

KUB 50.58+50.59b

x+1 [...]x[]

2' [...]x a-pé-el ku-^Γ e ^Γ[]

3' [...]x-ga-nu-uz-zi nu KIN []

4' [...]x ku-iš-ki GAM pé-eš-ši-ia-x[]

5' [...]x-an DÜ-ri nu [KA]RAŠ^{H¹A} UL []

6' [...]x-nu-še-er [NU.]SIG₅-du (erasure)SIG₅ []

7' [...]e-da-za ZI-an-za tar-na-i nu a-pé-ez-za iš-^Γ ta-an-ta-nu ^Γ-[u]z-zi

8' [...]NU.SIG₅

9' [...]ki-nu-un-pát :a-ša-an-du-la-iz-zi pa-ra-a-ma la-aḥ-ḥi-ia-zi

10' [...]S₁IG₅-ru DINGIR.MAḤ-aš GUB-iš TI-tar KASKAL LUGAL *A-TAM-MA*-ia ME-aš

11' [...]*IN*[A UD.2.KAM SIG₅-u-an-za ŠA DINGIR^{MEŠ} mi-nu-mar-ri^{H¹A} pár-na-aš SIG₅

12' [...]^{D₁}^{NGIR}MAḤ-ni SUM-an *INA* UD.3.KAM pa-an-ku-uš-za (erasure) GÜB-tar ḤU[L]

13' [...]na-at-kán *A-NA* ^{md}GE₆-LÚ-pát wa-aš-tul GAR-ri SIG₅

14' [...]x ḤUL-ia ME na-at-kán *A-NA* ^{md}GE₆-LÚ x[]

15' [...]x x x *A-NA* ^{md}[GE₆-LÚ]

Topic: Arriving on time for campaigns; Mr. ^dGE₆-LÚ again.

(+?)KUB 50.59a

x+1 []-kán ka/INIM[...]

2' nu-kán ^Γ ŠÀ KUR ^Γ.KUR^{H¹A}-ma [...]

3' nu a-pé-ez-za iš-ta-an-t[a-nu-uz-zi...]

4' nu-mu-an-ma ku-it-ki ME[?]-a[n^{??}...]

5' NU.SIG₅-du

6' [U]GU-aš-kán ti-ia-z[i...]

7' ^Γ e ^Γ-ep-zi ŠU-za x[...]

8' [n]a-at pa-an-ga-u-i SUM-a[n? ...]

9' [T]I-tar-ra ME-aš na[-at...]

10' [A]*NA* ^{md}GE₆-LÚ ZAG-tar[...]

11' []x[...]

Topic: Again, campaign tardiness and Mr. ^dGE₆-LÚ.

KUB 50.67

x+1 [...]x-tar[...]

2' [...]e-ez-za wa-aš-ta-nu-zi[...]

3' [...-p]i an-da KI.MIN SIG₅-ru[...]

4' [...DINGIR^M]EŠ-aš 2-NU LUGAL-za ZAG-tar da-p[i-an ZI-an...]

5' [...]-an GAL-li wa-aš-túl ME-aš nu-kán x[...]

(about 2 lines blank as far as preserved)

(text breaks)

Topic: Making someone sin (line 2').

KUB 50.73

x+1 [...]x x[...]

2' [...]eš SAG-Š[U[?]...]

3' [...]x-an-ma-aš-š[i[?]...]

4' [...]ma[?]-na-aš-kán Z[I...]

5' [...]DÛ-mi GAM-m[a...]

(blank space)

6' [...SU]D-li₁₂

7' [...]x ^dDAG-in ME-aš[

8' [...-r]i

(blank space)

9' [...]-tar ŠA LUGAL-ia[

10' [...]x

(text breaks)

Topic: Unclear.

KUB 50.74

x+1 [...]x-zi m[a...]

2' [...]x[]^dU GUB-iš[...]
 3' [...*INA* U]D.2.𐎶 KAM 𐎶^dUTU AN GUB-iš[...]
 4' [...]x EGIR-pa ^{GIŠ}DAG *INA* U[D.3.KAM...]
 5' [...]x an-da GIG.TUR S[IG₅]

(text breaks)

Topic: Unclear.

KUB 50.79

Obv.?

x+1 [...] 𐎶 šī' 𐎶-kán?[...]
 2' [...]x MÈ[!] MU-an M[E]-aš[...]
 3' [...]ku/ma-ia-an-za ME-aš na-aš *A-NA* ^mK[i'-'...]
 4' [...]x[]n[a-aš-kán TA ^dU za-aḥ-ta-ri NU.ŠE[-du...]
 5' [...]in-n]ir-tar mu-kiš-šar 𐎶 IGI 𐎶.LAL ME-aš na-aš pa.-u-i SUM-z[a...]
 6' [...]a]n-zi nu ZAG-TUM ni-ni-ik-zi 𐎶 NU 𐎶.ŠE- du[...]
 7' [...]u-TUM x SIG₅ MU-an ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš 2[!]-NU[...]
 8' [...]ZAG-tar da. ZI ^dDAG ME-aš na-aš pa.-i SUM-za[...]
 9' [...]x-an-za-aš me-eq-qa-uš x ar-ḥa tar-na-i [...]
 10' [...]ša-at *INA* ^{URU}Piš-ša-at x-wa-𐎶 ar 𐎶 pa-iz-zi[...]
 11' [...]at ti-ša-iz-zi []ŠE-rù ^{m?}Ki-ia-an-za-x[...]
 12' [...]ZA]G-tar ME-aš nu-kán[...](erasure)

Rev.?

1 [...]x[]x[]e-ni ma-a-an-ma-x[]x x[...]
 2 [...]x-zi ŠE-rù EN^{MEŠ} INIM-ma-aš ZAG-tar INIM SILIM-an 𐎶 tar 𐎶[...]
 3 [...]2-NU (doodles)

4 [...] ^{GIŠ}TUKUL ŠA KUR ^{URU}Ḥat-ti *Ú-UL* ú-da-i [...]
 5 [...]a-pa-a-aš x *Ú-UL* piš-ši-ia-zi ŠE-rù [...]
 6 [...]x(erasures? x x(ar?) x [...]
 (one line blank)

7 [...]x [k]u-it-ki 𐎶 UGU 𐎶 iš-pár-x[...]
 8 [...]x *Ú-UL* piš-[ši-ia-zi...]
 9 (traces—erasure?)
 10 [...]ME-aš n[a...]

11 [...]x KÜ-x[...]
 12 [...]x[...]
 (text breaks)

Topic: Military and/or diplomatic matters.

KUB 50.81

Obv. i

x+1 e-ni-kán ku-it-k[i...]
2' ki-ša-at nu k[a...]
3' nu KIN NU.SIG₅-du[...]
4' DINGIR-*LUM* (erasure) ku-iš-ki[...]
(two lines blank)

5' KIN *A-NA* SAG.DU x[...]
6' pár-na-aš a-aš-^𒀭 šu ^𒀭 x[...]
7' x[...]

Rev. iv

x+1 [] x x[...]
2' *INA* UD.2.KA[M] x[...]

3' nu *A-NA* ^{MUNUS} x[...]
4' *UM-MA* ^{MUNUS.MEŠ} [...]

5' ma-a-an DINGIR-*LU*[*M*...]
(several lines blank, then broken)

left edge

1 [...] x i-ši-ia-aḥ-ta nu[...]
2 [...] x-ma-aš i-ši-ia-aḥ-ta nu x[...]
(one line blank)
3 [...] x-zi nu DINGIR-*LUM* a-pa-a-at i-ši-ia-aḥ-ta ki[-...]
4 [...] x *INA* UD.3.KAM ḪUL-lu ME-an nu-kán an-da SUD-li₁₂[...]

Topic: An angry god.

KUB 50.86

Obv.

1 [...] -ru [] x ZAG-ta[r] da-^𒀭 pí ZI ^𒀭
2 (blank)

3 [...] MU IZI ŠU LÚ MUD ME-aš
4 (blank)

5 [...] EGI]R-an ar-ḡa wa-aš-túl ^{GIŠ} DAG ŠU LÚ.NITA[?] ME-aš

6 (blank)

7 [...]a-aš-šu ŠE-ru ^{GIŠ}DAG GUB-iš ŠA LUGAL da-pí ZI

8 [...]x^{HIA}

(one line blank)

(reverse blank)

Topic: Unclear.

KUB 50.91

Rev. iii

x+1 []x[...]

2' nu-kán *A-NA*[...]

3' nu-kán ^dx[...]

4' NINDA.GUR₄.RA i[š-pa-an-du-uz-zi-ia ...]

5' MUNUS.LUGAL-za-ká[n...]

6' nu-wa-mu-ká[n...]

7' ^d*IŠTAR* ^{U^{RU?}}[...]

8' ^r ^{GIŠ?} ^ṽni-ni-x[...]

9' x x x[...]

10' a-x[...]

11' x[...]

12' x[...]

(broken)

iv

x+1 [...] ^r ^{URU} ^ṽHal-^r pa-ma[?] ^ṽ x x[]

2' [...]x-li-ia-u-wa-aš am[]

3' [...]x ^{HUL} ME-an nu-k[án]

4' [...]x ḥu-u-it-ti-an-zi SIS[KUR] ME [] ^r GAM ^ṽan-na za-an-ki-la-tar SUM-an-zi

5' [...]x nu KIN SIG₅-ru LUGAL-uš-za ZAG-tar SISKUR-ia ME-aš na-at DINGIR.MAḥ-ni pa-iš

6' [...DINGIR^{ME}]^š GUB-er SILIM-ul NINDA.GUR₄.RA iš-pa-an-du-uz-z[i]-ia da-a-ir

7' [...pa-an-ga-]u-i pa-iš *INA* UD.3.KAM DINGIR-*LUM*-za da-pí-an ^r ZI ^ṽan

8' [...] nu-kán EGIR-pa ^dDAG-ti SIG₅

9' [...] ^r *Iṽ-NA* ^{URU} U-uš-ša *I-MUR* ^fPu-ut-ti-in⁸² GIM-an

10' [...]x ^r uš ^ṽki-it TÚG^{HIA}-ia GIM-an *Ú-UL* SIG₅-an-da

⁸² Or ^fŠe-na-ti-in; see Zehnder, *Hethitischen Frauennamen*, 256–57.

11' [... ^fPu-u]t-ti-iš 𐎶 GIM 𐎶⁸³-an pa-ap-ra-an-ti-it
 12' [...]x 𐎶 iš[?]-ḫi-iš 𐎶ki-it ^{MUNUS}ENSI pu-nu-uš-šir
 13' [... ^Eš]i-nap-ši ^{URU}U-uš-ša-ia SIxSÁ-ta-at

14' [...]x-ad-da še-er SIxSÁ-at
 15' [...]-a ar-ḫa da-a-aš
 16' [... d]a-a-aš SIxSÁ-at zi.-aš

17' [... ^U]RU 𐎶 Te 𐎶ka-ra-m[a]
 18' [...]x-ta []
 19' [... EG]IR x[]
 20' [...]x[]
 (text breaks)

Topic: Restitution for contaminated(?) offerings; the queen is somehow involved (iii 5').

KUB 50.97

x+1 [...]x x x[...]
 2' [...]^UUL ku-i[š-k]i[?] da?-𐎶 a 𐎶[...]
 3' [...p]a-an-𐎶 ku 𐎶uš-za ZAG-tar [...]
 4' [...iš-pa-an-t]u-zi-ia ME-aš [...]
 5' [...GI]G.TUR 𐎶 NU 𐎶SIG₅[...]

6' [...]x-na NINDA.GU[R₄].RA UD.KAM da-a-li-i[a...]
 7' [...LU^{MEŠ}] 𐎶 É 𐎶 DINGIR-LIM 𐎶 pu 𐎶nu-uš-šu-u-e-en[...]
 8' [...]^UM-MA GIM-[a]n-x-wa-an-na ŠA x[...]
 9' [...]x-za ^UUL tar-ra-nu-x[...]
 10' [...I-N]A UD.3.KAM na-aš-x[...]
 11' [...]x x [...]

Topic: Neglected offerings.

KUB 50.101

1 [...]^UHUL-u-wa ŠA x KIR₄⁸⁴ ^UHUL-x x[]
 2 [...IN]IM?-az DIB-mi [ma]-a-an-ma-𐎶 kán 𐎶 a-pé-ez ^UHU[L-]
 3 [...]^UKUR-Š^U ^UHUL GÙB-tar ki-ša-ri na-at 𐎶 tar?? 𐎶[]
 4 [...]^UDINGIR^{MEŠ} ḫa-ra-tar wa-aš-túl GÙB-la-an SILIM-eš[-]
 5 [...]x-ši :zi-la-du-wa ḫa-ra-tar wa-aš-túl []
 6 [...]nu KIN SIG₅-ru DINGIR.MAḫ GUB-iš ŠA ^dUTU-ŠI
 7 [...]x ME-aš na-aš-kán LUGAL-i wa-aš-du-li GAR-ri NU[.SIG₅]

8 [...] 𐎶 KALAG 𐎶.GA-ia-za-ma-an INIM-za DIB-mi

⁸³ Reading based on photo.

⁸⁴ Reading based on photo.

9 [... I]NIM^{MEŠ} SIG₅-ta ma-a-an-ma-kán x[]
 10 [... M]^{ES}-za-at KI.MIN nu KIN SI[G₅-ru]
 11 [...]ME-aš nu-kán an-da (erasure)SIG₅[-u-i]
 12 [...]x TI-tar-ra ME-aš []
 13 [... DINGIR^{ME}]^Š GUB-er KUR-e-aš S[IG₅]

14 [...]x SAG.DU-ŠÚ[]
 15 [...]u-i a-x[]
 16 [...]^Γ SIG₅ ^Γ[]
 (text breaks)

Topic: Some kind of transgression, rebellion, or sin.

KUB 50.102

(blank space of 5 or 6 lines)

x+1 e-da-ni-kán []x x[...]
 2' a-pa-a-aš-ma *INA?* t[i'[?]]x x [...]
 3' [m]a-a-an-ma-at-kán DINGIR-*LUM* x[...]
 4' []x-da *Ú-UL* ša-an-n[a...]
 5' [wa]-aš-túl GÙB-tar ME-a[š...]

6'] x x[...]
 (text breaks)

Topic: An angry god.

KUB 50.111

x+1 [...]x[...]
 2' [...]x(ME/x-aš?) NU.SIG₅[...]

3' [...]x pé-an an-da e-ep-pu-u-^Γ e ^Γ[-ni...]
 4' [... ^{URU}K]um-ma-an-ni pé-e-ḫu-tu-me'-e-n[i...]
 5' [...]x KASKAL ^{URU}Kum-ma-an-ni ti-e[š...]
 6' [... i]t? pa-ra-a MU-an-ni GI[G...]
 7' [...]x ar-ḫa a-ra-a-ši nu KI[N...]
 8' [...] ŠA LUGAL da-pí-an ZI-an[...]
 9' [...]x-i na-at-ši-kán wa-aš-t[úl...]
 10' [...] NU.SIG₅[...]

11' [... M]^{ES} EGIR-pa DIB-zi[...]
 12' [...]^Γ ^dUTU-ŠI ú-da-an-z[i...]
 13' [...]ia-an-zi nu x[...]
 14' [...]x GIG pa-ra-a[...]

15' [... ḥ]a[?] a-ra-a-ši nu[...]
 16' [...]-na š[i...]
 17' [...]x x[...]

Topic: Unclear; perhaps offerings brought to Kummani concerning a sickness?

KUB 50.118

Obv. i

x+1 ŠÀ[...]
 2' DINGIR.M[AḤ[?] ...]
 3' 2-NU DINGIR[...]
 (one line blank)

4' nu ta-ma[...]
 5' nu-kán an-d[a...]

6' 𐎶^d UTU-ŠI KASKAL KUR.x[...]
 7' 𐎶DAG-[i]š GUB[-iš...]
 8' 𐎶 2 𐎶-NU KUR.KUR^{HLA} pa[...]
 (2 lines blank)

9' 𐎶^d UTU 𐎶-ŠI KASKAL KUR^U[^{RU} ...]
 10' [n]a-at 𐎶x[...]
 11' [n]a-aš-kán x[...]
 (one line blank)

12' []-ši I-N[A...]
 13' []x-za[...]
 14' []x-uš?[...]

Rev. iv

x+1 []x[...]
 2' []x-pí[...]

3' e-ni-ká[n...]
 4' ku-e-d[a...]
 5' na-at [...]
 (one line blank)

6' nu-za 𐎶 SIxSA[?] 𐎶[...]
 7' na-at x[...]

8' []x GU₄ [...]
 9' []x[...]

Topic: Military campaign.

KUB 52.41⁸⁵

Vs?

1 [...]x x x x x ʾ *NA*^{URU} *Ḫat-ti*[...]
2 [...]a-ri-ia-an-zi nu-uš-ši ku-i[t...]
3 [...-z]i x x x ʾ *NA* DUMU.NITA pa-r[a-a...]
4 [...]x ʾ SIG₅ ʾ x[...]

Rev?

(1 line blank)

x+1 [...]ša-ma e-ep-zi^{NA4} ZI.x[]
2' [...] ku-]wa-pí a-ri-iš-kat-ta-ri ma-a-an-ma-x[]
3' [...] ^mḪu-uz-]zi-ia DIB-an-na ma-a-la-an ḫar-te-ni
4' [...]x ḪUŠ-u-e-ni nu KIN SIG₅-ru pa-an-ku-uš-za GÙB-ta[r]
5' [...]ʾ^d ʾU-ni pa-iš NU.SIG₅

(about three lines)

7' [...] ^mḪu-uz-z]i-ia-aš *A-NA* GIS₁KIRI₆^{HLA} iš-ga-ra-an-ta-aš-ma e-ep-zi
8' [...] ma-a-an-ma-za DINGIR^{ME} ʾ^Š GIS₁KIRI₆^{HLA} i[š-g]a-ra-an-ta-aš *A-NA* ^mḪu-uz-zi-ia DIB-an-
n[a]
9' [...] ma-a-la-an ḫar-te-]ni *A-NA* SAG.[D]U-ŠÚ IGI[-ŠÚ] Ú-UL ku-it-ki ḪUŠ-u-e-ni nu KI[N]
10'⁸⁶ [...]x x ʾ na ʾ-at pa-an-ga-u-i pa-iš *INA* UD.2.KAM^d DAG GU[B]-iš x x[]
11' [...] da-pí-i]ZI-ni ʾ *INA* UD ʾ.3.KAM DINGIR-*LUM*-za EGIR-an a[r-ḫa kar-pí-in]
12' [...]](erasure) SIG₅
(lower edge)

Topic: The safety of a Mr. Ḫuzziya, somehow involving a garden (with whose care he is charged, perhaps).

KUB 52.45

Obv.

x+1 [] ʾ zi ʾ[] x[] x x[]
2' [] x ME-aš na-ʾ at ʾ DINGIR-*LIM*-ni da-pí-i Z[I-ni]
3' [] x-aš-kán x x[] x ḪUL-u-wa-za pu-nu-ʾ uš ʾ-š[a]-ʾ an-zi ʾ

⁸⁵ For a discussion of this text in historical context, see van den Hout, *Ulmitešub-Vertrag*, pp. 106–107, along with a translation of rev. lines 7'–10': “[...] wird [Huzz]ija für den/im *i*-Garten nehmen. Wenn ihr, [Gött]er, damit [einverstanden se]id, dass Huzzija den/im Garten nimmt, werden wir dann für sein Leben nichts zu befürchten haben?”

⁸⁶ These last three lines are smaller and lighter than what comes before.

4' 𐎶 nu KIN 𐎶 SIG₅-ru ZAG-tar-za [M]E-aš na-at ^dUTU AN-E
5' pa-iš NU.SIG₅

6' na-aš DINGIR-*LIM*-ni-ma tar-na-an-zi nu KIN SIG₅-ru
7' ŠA DINGIR^{MES} mi-nu-mar^{HLA} ME-an-te-eš
8' [n]a-at ^dUTU AN-E pa-i[š] NU.SIG₅

9' []x-ru-un-kán ar-ḥa pé-e-[d]a-[a]n-zi
10' [n]a-an *I-NA* ^{URU}Ša-aḥ-ḥu-u-wa-li-ia pé-e-da-an-zi
11' [DINGIR-*L*]UM²-za KI.𐎶 MIN 𐎶 nu KIN SIG₅-ru ZAG-tar-za 𐎶 šal 𐎶-li-ia
12' [w]a-aš-túl ME-aš na-at-kán DINGIR-*LIM*-ni da.-i ZI-ni NU.SIG₅

(lower edge)

Rev.

1 []a-r-𐎶 ḥa 𐎶-ma 𐎶 pé-e 𐎶-d[a-an-zi? nu KI]N SIG₅-𐎶 ru 𐎶
2 []x-za da-pí-an ZI-an x[]ME-aš
3 [n]a-at pa-an-ga-u-i pa-iš *INA* U[D.2.KAM GU]B-iš
4 [Š]A DINGIR^{MES} kar-pí-uš ME-aš []x 𐎶 ^d[U]TU AN pa-iš
5 [*INA*] UD.3.KAM ḤUL-lu ME-an n[u-kán a]n-da SUD-li₁₂ SIG₅

(6 or 8 lines blank, then broken)

Translation:

Obverse

§1'

(Too fragmentary for translation.)

§2'

Should they ask [...] about the evil? Let the KIN be favorable. He(?) took rightness for himself, and gave it to the Sun-God of Heaven. Unfavorable.

§3'

Or should they let them go to the god? Let the KIN be favorable. The favors of the gods were taken, and he(?) gave them to the Sun-God of Heaven.

§4'

They will bring [...] away; they will bring him/it to Šahḥuwaliya. Are you, O [dei]ty, ditto (i.e., all right with this course of action)? Let the KIN be favorable. He(?) took rightness and the great sin for himself; they (were given) to the whole soul of the deity.

Reverse

§5'

Or should [they] bring [...] away? Let the KIN be favorable. [...] took the whole soul [and...] for himself, and gave them to the *panku*. On the [second] d[ay,] arose, took the angers of the

gods, [and] gave [them] to the Sun-God of Heaven. On the third day, evil was taken; into emptiness. Favorable.

KUB 52.51

Obv.

1 [...]-an x x PAP/KÚR pé-an ar-nu-um-mi
 2 [...]x DINGIR-LIM-mu UL KAR-zi SIG₅-ru
 3 [...DINGIR]-LUM-za da-pí-an ZI-an A-TAM-MA ^dGUL-aš TI-tar
 4 [...]x-ia ME-aš na-at pa-an-ga-u-i pa-iš
 (4-5 lines blank)

5 [...] a]r-nu-mi DINGI[R^M]EŠ-aš-kán
 6 [...]]^r UL ^r SIxSÁ-mi SIG₅-ru
 7 [...] T]I-tar ME-aš n[u]-kán DINGIR-LIM-ni ^r da-pí ^r-i ZI-ni
 8 [...] da-pí-a]n ZI-an mi-nu-mar ZALAG.G[A]aš
 9 [...] U]D.3.KAM DINGIR^{MEŠ} GUB-ir x[
 10 [...]]x ^r pa-an-ga-u-i ^r[

Rev.

x+1]^r IZKIM ^rH¹.A
 2' [...š/t]a-aš x[a]r-ḫa a-ra-a-ši
 3' [...SI]G₅-ru DINGIR x[]da-pí-an ZI-an
 4' [...]ME-aš nu-^r kán? ^r x[]u-wa-za SIG₅ BÚN
 5' [...]ME-aš na-aš ANA LUGAL[-i]
 6' [...]]^r ḪUL ^r-lu M[E-a]n x x[]an-da SUD-li₁₂

7' [...] x x[]x?-mi-ni-u-uš ku-e-eš
 8' [...]]x A-TAM-MA
 10' [...]]x?
 (lower edge)

Topic: Unclear (obv. 2': "Will the god not find me?").

KUB 52.68

Obv. i

x+1 [...]]x
 2' [...]]x x[]x
 3' [...]]x pí? x x[
 4' [...]]x
 5' [...]]x É-ia ME-er
 6' [...]]x-iš-ta

7' [...]x-ri/tal-li-ia-an 𐎶 SIxSÁ 𐎶-at
8' [...]x-ti x/erasure? ta-𐎶 ru 𐎶-up-pa-𐎶 šá-ni 𐎶-x [H]UŠ-u-en
9' [...]𐎶 SIxSÁ 𐎶-at x KASKAL LUGAL-ia 𐎶 MÈ 𐎶

10' [...pa-r]a-a ar-te-ni ka-ru-ú-kán 𐎶 INIM 𐎶^{MEŠ}
11' [...]𐎶^{dU?} 𐎶 GUB-iš SA₅ IZKIM MU-an-na ME-aš na-aš pa-i SUM-za

12' [...]iš DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš mi-nu-mar^{HLA} ME-aš nu-kán *A-NA* GIG.TUR

13' [...]x SA₅? DINGIR-*LIM* kar-ša-an-x-wa ú-x-en
14' [...]x pa-ra-a[!] a-ra-an-za NU.ŠE-du
15' [...]x ME-er na-aš 𐎶 pa-i 𐎶(over erasure) SUM-za NU.ŠE

16' [...]x ka-ru-ú-ia INIM^{MEŠ} DINGIR^{MEŠ} TA^{MUNUS} ENSI
17' [...]SA₅ IZKIM IZI-ia ME-aš na-aš pa-i SUM-za

18' [...]x-at

19' [...]SIG₅ ME-er na-an-kán DINGIR-ni kar-pí GAR-ri

20' [...]x IZI⁸⁷ ME-aš na-aš pa-i[]

ii

x+1 x[]
2' x[]

3' x x[]
4' x x[]
5' x x[]
6' TA MU ^{HLA} []
7' nu-kán an/DINGIR[]
8' x x[]

9' IR- <i>TUM</i> x x[]
10' x KIN/TUKU? x[]
11' 𐎶 <i>INA</i> UD.3.KAM 𐎶[]
12' t[a]

13' x[]
14' x[]
15' []ša []
16' []x-za? x[]

⁸⁷ Reading based on photo.

17' []x ME-aš nu- ⁷ kán ⁷ []x[]
18' []x[]na[]
19' []
20' []x-ia-kán x x x x[]x-zi[]
21' []DÙ-zi maš- ⁷ kán ⁷ []x []-i[]
22' []x-šar x[]x x[]kán-z[i]
23' []x[]x[]
24' []
25' []i SUM-a[n]
26' [] DINGIR- <i>LUM ŠA</i> []x-x x[]
27' []x ⁴ NAM-aš mi-nu-ma[r] x x[]
28' [ḪUL-]lu TI-tar É-x[]
29' [MU ^{HI} ⁷ ^A ⁷ GÍD.DA DINGIR ^{MEŠ} -aš mi-nu-mar ^{HI.A} []
30' [d]a-pí-i ZI-ni[]
31' [ma]r? x-ša-an- ⁷ za ⁷ nu a-x[]x ⁷ tu? ⁷	
32' []x ḪUL-lu-i[a]x GIG.GAL	
33' []x x(aš?) ⁷ ku ⁷ -it DAM x?[]x(-)a-pí-iz nu x[
34' []x x <i>UL</i> uš-ki-ši nu ⁷ KIN ⁷ []x ZAG-tar	
35' [da-p]i-an ZI-an ME-aš na-aš pa-i SUM-za 2[]GUB-iš	
36' [DINGIR ^M ^{ES} -aš mi-nu-mar ^{HI.A} ME-aš na-aš ⁷ pa-i ⁷ [SU]M-za[]x ZAG-tar	
37' [IGI-w]a ú-wa-tar-ra ⁷ ME-ir ⁷ nu-kán ŠÀ SIG ₅ -u-[-i]	
38' []x?-iš []x-an-za na-aš x x[]
39' [] ⁷ a ⁷ -an pa-ra-a ne-an-zi nu x(za?)? šu?[]
40' []x-at?-kán URU? PU? x[]x[]
41' [ḫ]u ⁷ -u-ma-an(-)ma/ku-i?? x x x[]
42' []šu?-pu-nu-x-x-x pí-an-zi[]
43' []an-zi x ^{MEŠ} x x[]
44' []x ZAG-za GAR-r[i]
45' [] ⁷ SUM ⁷ -za? 3-aš ⁷ x[]
(break)			
Rev. iii			
x+1 []x x x(ša?) nu[]
2' []GAL DUB.SAR GI[Š] GÙB-za G[AR?]	
3' []x GÙB-tar x[]x nu[]
4' []x(MEŠ?) me-eg-g[a	
5' []ḪUL-lu-pát u[š-ki ⁷]
6' []x GAL DUB.SAR GIŠ ZAG-tar d[a]	
7' [m]i-[-n]u-mar INIM UDU TI-tar x[]	

8' []x TI-tar-ra ME-aš nu x[]MEŠ[]
9' []x x-u-e-ni ku-e-da-n[i?]x x EGIR[]]
10' []x EGIR-an SIxSÁ-at x[]]
11' [Š]E-ru ^d DAG-iš GUB-i[š]]
12' []x x 2 [?] SIG ₅ -an- ^r za ^r x[]]
13' []x	[]]
14' [] ^r URU ^r -ni k[i?	GA]L ^r DUB ^r .SAR ^{GIŠ} x[]]
15' []x(ša?) ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR-ni da- ^r pí ^r [ZI-ni]x x]]
16' []x(iš?) ME-aš na[]x x x za?]]
17' []x[]]
18' []]
19' []]
20' []x[ZA]G?-za]]
21' []ZI-an[]]
22'-25' broken			
26' x[]]
27' DINGIR x[] -aš
28' 2 DINGIR.M[AḪ]ZAG GÙB[]]
29' nu-kán ^d x[]]
30' SIG ₅ -an-za a[n?]x x[]x]
(one paragraph preserved but blank)			
31' ^r ^d Ta ^r -ru-up-pa- ^r šá ^r -ni-iš ^{URU} In-nu-ta-ḫa-pa[]]
32' nu a-ri-ia-u-e-en na-aš A-NA ANŠE.KUR.RA a[š??]]
33' kar-tim-mi-ia[-at-]ti SIxSÁ-at	[]	[]]]
34' DINGIR-LUM ke-e-da-ni A-NA ANŠE.KUR.RA []]
35' e-eš-ta NU.ŠE-du ḪUL-wa-za NINDA.GUR ₄ .R[] ^r iš ^r -p[a-a]n-t[u-uz-zi-ia]]
36' na-aš A-NA GAL DUB.SAR GIŠ GÙB-za GAR-ri	[]]]
37' pé-di-iš-ši u-i-ia-an-zi nu a-pí-ia SU[M]]
38' []x ar-ḫa pár-ku-nu-wa-an-zi KI.MIN ŠE-rù]]
39' []x-ga-an ^d NAM-aš mi-nu-mar ME-aš]]
40' []d]a-pí-i ZI-ni []]
41' [^d Ta-ru]-up-pa-šá-ni- ^r iš ŠA ^r KASKAL ku-i[t]]
42' []x? ^{MEŠ} /eš?? x x[]]
43' []x pa-za EGIR-an ^r a ^r -ri(-)x[]]
44' [] ^{URU} In-nu-ta-ḫa-pa x[]]

45' [] 𒄀 GUB-iš PAP-nu 𒄀[-mar]

Rev. iv

x+1 [... n]u? DINGIR-*LUM*

2' [...]x IZKIM

3' [...]

(one line blank)

4' [...]x 𒄀 pé-di? 𒄀 an-da ú-e-ri-ia-at-ta-at

5' [... Š]A^{??} 2 x SIKIL[?] INIM-an ME-aš

6' [... z]a? GAR-ri 2 ^dDAG-iš GUB-iš

7' [... a]n? mu-kiš-šar-ra ME-aš nu-kán *A-NA* MU^{HLA} GÍD.DA

8' [...]^dU GUB-iš NINDA.GUR₄.RA ^dDAG

9' [...]x ME-aš na-aš pa-i SUM-za

10' [...]x[...]x 𒄀 iš 𒄀 ME-an 𒄀 ḫar[?]-zi 𒄀

11' [... a-p]é-el GUB-tar M[E]-aš

12' [...]

13' [...]

14' [... *A-N*]A GIG.GAL

15' [...]

16' [...]x-zi

17' [... w]a-ra-aš

18' [...]

19' [...]

20' [...]x-in

Topic: Neglected offerings and angry gods.

KUB 52.71

Rev.

x+1 []x-𒄀 ki? 𒄀-nu-un x[...]

2' [] 𒄀 x-i?-ia? 𒄀-x-x-ma-da?[...]

3' []x 𒄀^{URU} x x an-du-ka 𒄀^{URU}[...]

4' []x-𒄀 la? 𒄀-aš??-𒄀 kán 𒄀 a-pé-e-da-ni a[n? ...]

5' []x x x SUM-an x-pu []ni x[...]

(about 1 line blank)

6' x x-za-kán??-x-ra??-x-x-x[...]

7' pa-ra-a x?-x?-x-an?? *A-NA* x[...]

8' x^{HLA} x x x x x x[...]

9' 𐎒 nu KIN NU.SIG₅ 𐎗-du 𐎒 SIG₅ 𐎗-[u]-a[n-za[...]]
 10' 𐎎𐎗 INA UD.2.KAM DINGIR^{M[ES]} GUB-𐎒 ir 𐎗 Š[A[?]...]
 11' [𐎎𐎗 U]D.3.KAM ^dDAG GUB-𐎒 iš 𐎗 x[...]
 12' [n]a-at DINGIR.MAH-𐎒 ni 𐎗 pa-i[š...]

13' 𐎒 KI 𐎗.MIN na-an-𐎒 kán 𐎗 A-NA pa[-]x x x[...]
 14' nu-wa kiš-an x-iš-𐎒 ki 𐎗[]x[]x-x[...]
 15' 𐎒 SIG₅ 𐎗 DINGIR-LIM a?-x-wa-x-w[a??] x x[]x-za[?]-at-x nu x[...]
 16' 𐎒 pa 𐎗-an-ku-uš-za x x x[]x x ME-aš 𐎒 na 𐎗-aš A-𐎒 NA 𐎗[...]

17' TA?? ki x x x x x nu KIN 𐎒 SIG₅ 𐎗-ru DINGIR-LIM-za x[...EGIR-an]
 18' [a]r-ḥa kar-pí-𐎒 in 𐎗 x[]nu-kán an-da- SIG₅-u-𐎒 i 𐎗[...]
 19' [𐎎𐎗 U]D.𐎒 2.KAM 𐎗 HUL ME⁸⁸-an [nu]-kán an-da 𐎒 SUD 𐎗-li₁₂[...]
 20' [𐎎𐎗 UD].3.𐎒 KAM 𐎗 ŠA DINGIR^{MES} kar-p[í-u]š da-an-𐎒 te 𐎗-eš x[...]
 21' []^dUTU AN []x DÚ? SIG₅ [...]

22' []x ŠA []x x x x x[]x ap? x x[...]
 23' []x-iš GUB-𐎒 tar 𐎗[...]
 24' []x-iš TI-tar [...]
 25' []x x []x-i [...]
 26' []x[]IGI?[...]

(break)

Topic: Unclear.

KUB 52.85

Obv. ii

x+1 [...]x[]x x x []
 2' [...]x-an 𐎒 ar-ḥa 𐎗-an ka[-]
 3' [...]x-zi nu KIN SIG₅-ru[]
 4' [...]mu-u-wa-an PAP-nu-mar ME[-]

5' [...]ni A-NA KASKAL-NI an-da[]
 6' [...]x ša^{1?}-ak-ti ^{LÚ}KÚR A-N[A]x x[]
 7' [...]x nu a-ši úr-kiš^{1?} a-pa-a-at i-ši-ia-aḥ-ḥi[?]
 8' [...]x-za šal-li wa-aš-túl IZI-ia ME-aš
 9' [...]x INA UD.2.KAM pa-an-ku-uš-za GUB-tar ME-aš
 10' [...]x GAR-ri INA UD.3.KAM ^dUTU AN GUB-iš
 11' [...]x-at DINGIR.MAH-𐎒 ni pa-iš SIG₅

12' [...]x ^{URU}Pa-pa-an-ḥa INIM-za-ma ku-iš-ki
 13' [...]x(aš?) Ú-UL pa-iz-zi nu KIN NU.SIG₅-du
 14' [...]M]E-aš nu-kán 𐎒 DINGIR^{MES} 𐎗 NU.SIG₅

⁸⁸ Reading based on photo.

(lower edge)

Rev. iii

x+1 [...	z]i nu KIN NU.SIG ₅ -du	
2' [...]	NU.SIG ₅
3' [...	z]i	nu KIN NU.SIG ₅ -du
4' [...]		
5' [...]	SIG ₅
6' [...]x 𐎶 ku 𐎶-it <i>I-NA</i> KUR ^{URU} Pa-pa-an-ḫa pa-iz-zi		
7' [...ma-a-an-]ma-kán ši-na-aḫ-ḫa-aš an-da <i>UL</i> ku-wa-pí-ik-𐎶 ki 𐎶 SIxSÁ-iz-z[i]		
8' [...KI]N SIG ₅ -ru pa-an-ku-uš-za ZAG-tar KASKAL-ia ME-aš nu-kán DINGIR ^{MEŠ} -aš		
NU.S[IG ₅]		
9' [...] x x INIM ši-na-aḫ-ḫ[a]
10' [...]x x x[]
(text breaks)		

Topic: Military campaigns, ambushes.

ABoT 2.130

Obv.

x+1 [...]x-x
2' [...D]UGUD
3' [...]x
4' [...DIN]GIR.MAḫ-aš
5' [...]x 𐎶 ku 𐎶-ez [?] -qa [?]
6' [...]š-ḫi [?] ki/di [?] um/du [?]
7' [...]x-qa [?] [

Rev.

x+1 [...]x
2' [...]x

Topic: Unclear.

ABoT 2.133

x+1 [...] SI]G ₅ [...]
2' [...NU.S]IG ₅ -du NU.SIG ₅ ...]
3' [...] SIG ₅ [...]

4' [...] 𐎶 DINGIR 𐎶-*LUM* da-pí-an ZI-an x[...]
 5' [...]x x x x[...]
 (break)

Topic: Unclear.

ABoT 2.134

x+1 [...]x x

2' [...]x
 3' [...]K]I.MIN
 4' [...]ŠA DINGIR^MES mi-nu-mar^HLA
 5' [...]S]IG₅

6' (trace, prob from other side)

Topic: Unclear.

ABoT 2.135

x+1 [...]x[...]
 2' [...]d]a-x[...]
 3' [...]x GAL.SAN[GA...]
 4' [...]d]a-pí-an Z[I-an...]
 5' [...]ZAG-za GAR-r[i...]
 6' [...]x pa-an-ga-u-𐎶 i 𐎶[...]
 7' [...]x mi-nu-mar^{HLA}[...]

Topic: Unclear.

HFAC 80

x+1 [...]x-ar x x[]
 2' [...]da-pí-a]n ZI-an
 3' [...]x A-NA^dU[TU] AN pa-iš[]

4' [...]x-an GUB-an
 5' [...]da-p]í ZI-ni NU.𐎶 SIG₅ 𐎶x?

6' [...]ZI-aš x x x
 7' [...]da-pí-a]n ZI-an x x-an-na
 8' [...] NU.SIG₅
 9' [...]x[]
 (break; reverse uninscribed)

Topic: Unclear.

HFAC 81

1' [...NU.SIG₅]-du DINGIR-*LUM*-za da-pí-an Z[I-an]

2' [...]da-iš

3' [...]x LUGAL[?] *IK-RI-BI* pé-ra-an ti-ia-a[n]

4' [...N]U.SIG₅-du DINGIR-*LUM*-za da-pí-an ZI-[an]

5' [...]x *INA* UD.2.KAM DINGIR.MAḪ GUB-iš TI[]

6' [...]x *INA* UD.3.KAM DINGIR-*LUM*-za kar-pí-i[n⁸⁹]

7' [...] SIG₅

Topic: The prayers of the king(?).

HKM 115⁹⁰

1 𐎲 ki 𐎠i ku-it 𐎠U KU[R[?]]

2 SIxSÁ-at x AB x

3 [ku]-it-ki kar?-x-mi-ni?

4 nu KIN NU.SIG₅-du

5 2

Topic: Angry god?

KuSa 1/1.15 (KuT 42)

x+1[...]x[...]

2' [...] LUGA[L...]

3' [...]

4' [...]u-ia-z[i...]

5' [...]ḫi[?] ME-er n[a...]

6' [...]i SUM-za 3-ŠÚ x[...]

7' [...]

8' [...]a-pí-x[...]

Topic: Unclear.

⁸⁹ Reading based on photo.

⁹⁰ For a discussion of this text, see Th. van den Hout, “Bemerkungen zu älteren hethitischen Orakeltexten,” in *Kulturgeschichte. Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. Th. Richter, D. Prechel, and J. Klinger (Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker und Druckerei und Verlag, 2001), 425–26, 433–34.

KuSa 1/1.17 (KuT 26)

(several lines blank)

x+1 [...]ši x da EZEN₄^{HI.A} 10/u x[...]
 2' [...]an-za x x peš-ši-at DINGIR^{MES} x[...]
 3' [...]x-ši-ma-kán TI-an-ni UL ku-i[t...]
 4' [...]da-aš-x 1-zi DINGIR x x x[...]
 5' [...]na-aš-wa SUM-za x-za? ZAG-tar 𐎶 EZEN₄ 𐎶[...]

6' [...]x *A-NA* 𐎠UTU-𐎶ŠT𐎶 *IT-T*[I...]
 7' [...]GÙB-tar TI[...]
 8' [...]x[...]

Topic: Festival neglect and an angry god.**KuSa 1/1.19 (KuT 43)**

1 [...]x x x[]x x
 2 [...]x ŠÀ pa-za 𐎶 nu? 𐎶[]x x x?[...]

3' [...]URU-*LUM*[]x na-aš pa-i SUM-z[a]
 4' [...] (blank) [...]

5' [...] [...]

6' [...]x-za x x(na? *INA* UD?[...]

Topic: Unclear.

APPENDIX B: RITUAL PURPOSE

The following is a table for quickly referencing the ritual texts discussed in chapters 3–4, their purposes, and their approximate state of preservation. For a fuller catalogue, see Appendix C.

Ritual text	Purpose	State of preservation
CTH 323, the Disappearance of the Sun-God	Invoking a missing deity	Somewhat fragmentary
CTH 390A, Ayatarša's ritual	Treating a sick child	Nearly complete
CTH 390C, incantation of tongues	Treating a victim of "tongues"	Nearly complete
CTH 390D, incantation of binding	Treating a sick child	Complete; missing only a few words
CTH 390E, Šušumanniga's ritual	Treating a sick child with offerings	Very fragmentary; only the very beginning preserved.
CTH 391, Ambazzi's ritual	Treating a person afflicted with sickness caused by demons (or similar entities).	Nearly complete
CTH 397, Ḫebattarakki's ritual	Treating an ensorcelled person	Very fragmentary; only the beginning preserved.
CTH 398, ritual of the augur Ḫuwarlu	Treating the king, queen, and palace for evil that has brought on bad omens	First half complete; second half somewhat fragmentary.
CTH 402, Allī's ritual	Treating an ensorcelled person	Nearly complete
CTH 403.1, Mallidunna's first ritual	Invocation of the Sun-God	Very fragmentary
CTH 403.2 Mallidunna's second ritual	Invocation of Ḫannaḫanna	Very fragmentary
CTH 404.1, Maštigga's first ritual	Treating relatives who have cursed one another	Complete; missing only a few words
CTH 404.3, Maštigga's third ritual	Treating a person who has committed bloodshed	Very fragmentary; preserves only portions of the second tablet
CTH 404.4, Maštigga's fourth ritual	Treating a person who has struck someone on the head	Very fragmentary
CTH 404.5, Maštigga's fifth ritual	Treating a patient by "taking them from the earth"	Very fragmentary

Table B.1: Ritual Purpose

CTH 409.I, Tunnawiya's "Ritual of the River"	Treating a patient for reproductive difficulties brought on by sorcery or other supernatural ill-will	Nearly complete
CTH 409.II/409.IV/458.1, Tunnawiya's <i>taknaz dā-</i> /"Ritual of the Ox"	Treating the royal couple for affliction brought on by sorcery, guilt, or other supernatural ill-will	Perhaps half of (at least) six tablets preserved.
CTH 416A, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple	Treating the royal couple for "tongues" and uncleanness	Partially broken: missing the beginning
CTH 416B, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple	Treating the royal couple for sickness, blood, and evil	Nearly complete
CTH 416C, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple	Treating the royal couple for terrible things, blood, and uncleanness	Fairly fragmentary
CTH 416D, the Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple	Treating the royal couple for pain, woe, and anxiety	Partially broken: missing the end
CTH 418, ritual against a foreigner's offense	Treating the royal couple for evil brought on by a foreigner	Quite fragmentary; missing at least one full tablet
CTH 423, invocation of enemy gods	Invoking the gods of an enemy land after victory	Quite fragmentary; missing at least half of the text
CTH 433, ritual of the mother of Punawašḫa for the augurs	Treating augurs for some offense that has angered the tutelary deity of the hunting-bag	Quite fragmentary; three variations are preserved but even altogether at least half of the text is missing.
CTH 434, ritual fragments for the fate-goddesses	Treating a person who has an "evil fate-goddess"	Extremely fragmentary
CTH 435.3, ritual for the Sun-God	Treating a patient with protective magic and entreaties	Extremely fragmentary
CTH 436, ritual of the sea	Preventing evil coming from an enemy land after the army departs it	Extremely fragmentary
CTH 439, Ritual of Anzili and Zukki	Invocation of the deities Anzili and Zukki	Extremely fragmentary
CTH 440, Ritual of Išḫara and Ḥamrišḫara	Treating a person for "tongues"	Extremely fragmentary
CTH 441, "Ritual of the river"	Treating a person for (most likely) sickness	Quite fragmentary; only a few paragraphs fully preserved
CTH 445, Ritual for the expiation of incest	Treating a person who has committed incest	Extremely fragmentary; only the first few lines preserved

Table B.1, cont.

CTH 448.2, Ritual for the Sun-Goddess of the Earth	Treating the king and queen for an unknown affliction	Quite fragmentary; the best-preserved version has about 7 paragraphs
CTH 449, rituals naming the underworld deities (KUB 58.85)	Invocation of underworld gods, perhaps for military success	Extremely fragmentary
CTH 449, rituals naming the underworld deities, KUB 7.4	Offerings to primordial deities; the purpose is unclear	Extremely fragmentary
CTH 449, rituals naming the underworld deities, KUB 39.57	Treating a person who is being bothered by a ghost	Extremely fragmentary
CTH 450, the royal funerary ritual	A ritual for when a member of the royal family dies	About half preserved.
CTH 452, fragments of substitute rituals	Treating a patient for some unknown affliction	Extremely fragmentary
CTH 456.2, fragments of purification rituals (“Ritual of the River”)	Treating a patient for some affliction caused by supernatural ill-will	Quite fragmentary; about one-third preserved.
CTH 456.3, fragments of purification rituals	Treating a patient whose personal deity has been incapacitated somehow.	Extremely fragmentary.
CTH 458.45, fragments of conjuration rituals	Treating a sick patient	Extremely fragmentary
CTH 458.113, fragments of conjuration rituals	Treating a patient afflicted with a sickness of supernatural origin	Extremely fragmentary
CTH 463, ritual against a snake in the bed	Against bad omens.	Extremely fragmentary; only the very beginning preserved.
CTH 470, ritual fragments, KBo 17.47 (Annā’s ritual)	Invoking a missing deity(?).	Extremely fragmentary; only the very beginning preserved
CTH 470, ritual fragments, KUB 39.61	Treating a patient who is bothered by a ghost.	Extremely fragmentary; only the very beginning preserved
CTH 470, ritual fragments, KUB 55.57	Finding an Old Woman’s snake(?)	Extremely fragmentary.
CTH 474, Kuwanni’s ritual	Treating a patient who is angry with the gods.	Quite fragmentary.
CTH 487, Healing ritual for Išhara	Treating a patient for an unknown affliction	Extremely fragmentary
CTH 490, Ašdu’s ritual	Treating an ensorcelled patient	Quite fragmentary; perhaps one-quarter preserved.

Table B.1, cont.

CTH 759, the <i>dupaduparša</i> ritual	Treating a patient for curses.	Quite fragmentary; less than one full tablet of 9 preserved.
CTH 760.II, Luwian ritual similar to Tunnawiya's corpus	Treating a patient for an affliction caused by some supernatural ill-will.	Quite fragmentary; perhaps half or three-quarters of a tablet preserved in total(?).
CTH 761/761, the "Great Ritual"	Treating a patient for an affliction caused by some supernatural ill-will	Quite fragmentary.
CTH 780.I and II, Allaituraḥḫi's ritual	Treating an ensorcelled patient	Perhaps one-third preserved.
CTH 780.III, Allaituraḥḫi's ritual for Šuppiluliyama II	Treating the king for sorcery.	Quite fragmentary; only a few paragraphs preserved.
CTH 788, Šalašu's ritual	Treating a patient for an affliction from some supernatural ill-will	Extremely fragmentary; missing at least seven tablets.
CTH 820.4 and 5, the Benedictions for the Labarna	Requesting life, health, and fertility for the royal couple	Quite fragmentary
CTH 276, tablet catalogues (Kueša's ritual)	Ritual treating a patient for sickness.	Catalogue entry
CTH 276, tablet catalogues (Tunnawiya's ritual)	Ritual invoking the dead.	Catalogue entry
CTH 277, tablet catalogues	Ritual invoking the Storm-God	Catalogue entry
CTH 277, tablet catalogues (Annanna's ritual)	Ritual invoking the tutelary deity.	Catalogue entry
CTH 277, tablet catalogues	Ritual treating the king and queen.	Catalogue entry
CTH 277, tablet catalogues (Kāli's ritual)	Ritual for "placing a KIN-an of clay"	Catalogue entry
CTH 277, tablet catalogues (Mallī's ritual)	Ritual invoking the Storm-God	Catalogue entry
CTH 277, tablet catalogues	Ritual invoking ^d Walliyara	Catalogue entry
CTH 277, tablet catalogues	Ritual invoking ^d Kurwašu	Catalogue entry
CTH 277, tablet catalogues (Annā's ritual)	Ritual invoking the Storm-God of the wealthy	Catalogue entry
CTH 278, tablet catalogues (Annanna's ritual)	Invocation of central Anatolian deities	Catalogue entry
CTH 278, tablet catalogues (Annanna's ritual)	Invocation of the Sun-Goddess of Arinna	Catalogue entry
CTH 282, tablet catalogues	Ritual invoking a deity.	Catalogue entry

Table B.1, cont.

APPENDIX C: CATALOGUE OF RITUAL TEXTS

CTH 390: The rituals of Ayatarša, Wattiti, and Šušumanniga

Exemplars: 3

State of preservation: Mostly preserved; missing much of the end of col. i and the beginning of col. iv, which correspond to the end of Ayatarša's ritual and most of Šušumanniga's, respectively (see below).

Findspot(s): Büyükkale D (390.B), Temple 1 (390.C).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): H. Kronasser, "Fünf hethitische Rituale." *Die Sprache* 7 (1961): 140–67, with "Nachträge und Berichtigungen" in *Die Sprache* 8 (1962): 108–13. Of Text 4: N. Oettinger, "Entstehung von Mythos aus Ritual. Das Beispiel des hethitischen Textes CTH 390A." In *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität: Akten des religionsgeschichtlichen Symposiums "Kleinasien und angrenzende Gebiete vom Beginn des 2. bis zur Mitte des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr."* (Bonn, 20.–22. Februar 2003), eds. M. Hutter and S. Hutter-Braunsar. AOAT 318. Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 347–56.

Incipit/Colophon: Word of Ms. Ayatarša, maidservant of Ms. Nawila: when a child is *ālpant-* or his/her innards are devoured, I offer thus (to) the Sun-God of sickness for him/her; word: when Ms. Wattiti, woman of Kunaššarwa—when a person's innards are devoured, its word is thus; if tongues have come to someone; incantation of binding; word of Ms. Šušumanniga, Old Woman: when I offer to Ḫašameli of the month for a child.¹

¹ This is in fact the full text of the small label KUB 30.48 (CTH 390.D); the colophon of CTH 390.A (KBo 3.8+) reads instead, "First tablet, finished: word of Šušumanniga, ^{MUNUS} *hašawa*: when she offers (to) Ḫašameli of the month for a child; word of Ms. Ayatarša, maidservant of Ms. Nawila: when a child is *alpant-* or his innards are eaten, she offers thus the Sun-God of sickness for him/her; word of Ms. Wattiti, woman of Kunaššarwa: when

Summary: CTH 390 is a collection of five rituals on one tablet, four of which can be connected to the Old Women (see above). Ayatarša's ritual is to cure a sick child, through offerings to the "Sun-God of sickness" and treatment with medicine; Wattiti's ritual is likewise for a sick child (or person), this time mainly through sympathetic magic and incantations. The exact difficulty being treated by the "incantation of tongues" is unclear; the Old Woman rubs the patient's tongue with purificatory substances while citing a (fragmentary) mythological origin or parallel to the ritual, featuring the goddesses Kamrušepa and Ḫannaḫanna. The "incantation of binding" is an incantation with a mythological section, again of Kamrušepa and Ḫannaḫanna, to free a child whose body has been "bound." The final ritual, of Šušumanniga, is again for a child, but is broken away after only a series of offerings to Ḫašameli.

CTH 391: The ritual of Ambazzi

Exemplars: There are two, or perhaps three, versions of this text; 391.1 has 3 exemplars; 391.2 has 3 exemplars; and 1 small fragment (KBo 48.103) may be part of a third version.

State of preservation: 391.1 is nearly entirely preserved, excepting the very end of col. i and the very beginning of col. iv; 391.2 preserves only about 40 lines (approximately 1/7th of the text, if it is comparable in length to 391.1), and 391.5? is only a small fragment of approximately 12 fragmentary lines.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale D (391.1.A), Haus am Hang (391.2.A, 391.2.C), Temple 1 (391.1.B).

Language(s): Hittite.

someone is(! text "I am") devouring the innards of a person or a child, its word is thus; if tongues come to someone, the Old Woman acts thus (for) him/her." The colophon omits the "incantation of binding," a mistake by the scribe, since the incantation is included on the tablet. In addition (as already noted by Waal, BiOr 67, 2010, 555) the order of the rituals indicates that the scribe first wrote the title of the final ritual, which he had just finished copying down, before going back to the beginning and listing the others. The tablet catalogue entry KBo 31.4+ iv 12–28 reproduces both of these peculiarities.

Edition(s): B. Christiansen. *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi. Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429, und CTH 463*. StBoT 48. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006, pp. 34–180.

Incipit/Colophon: Thus Ms. Ambazzi: when I treat ^dZa[rniza (and) ^dTarpat]tassi.

Summary: CTH 391 is a ritual text ascribed to the woman Ambazzi, in which the patient(s) are afflicted with *inan*-sickness. There are three versions of the same ritual on the tablet, and what seems to be a second, similar ritual in the fragmentary col. iv. The complete rituals are designed to remove sickness and the negative attention of certain supernatural entities from the ritual patient, using analogic incantations, a “scapemouse,” which is sent away after the evil has been transferred to it, and tempting offerings for the offending entities. The ritual in col. iv may also contain a passing-through rite, given several references to a gate.

CTH 397: The ritual of 𐎶ebattarakki

Exemplars: 3

State of preservation: About the first 30 lines of 397.A completely preserved, after which col. i breaks; the extant sections of cols. ii and iii only preserve about the first 3–5 signs of each line. From col. iii 8' onward, the text is the second ritual of this *Sammeltafel*, which is classified under CTH 729 and cannot be ascribed to 𐎶ebattarakki—or any other ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI—with any certainty. 397.B and C are only relatively small fragments, which duplicate the extant beginning of the text.

Findspot(s): Temple 1 (397.B, 397.C).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): N/A

Incipit/Colophon: Thus Ḫebattarakki, Old Woman of Zuharuwa (C adds: of the land of Mu[kiš?]): when I free an ensorcelled person.

Summary: The preserved beginning of the ritual suggests that Ḫebattarakki is drawing sorcery from an afflicted person and sending it back to the sorcerer, using dough, dog excrement, and various plant materials, from which a dough is made, as well as figurines and incantations.

CTH 398: The ritual of Ḫuwarlu

Exemplars: 2

State of preservation: Mostly preserved; from col. ii 36 until the ritual ends at iii 39, the lines are only partially preserved, of varying length. The second text on this *Sammeltafel* is a copy of CTH 486, Muršili's Aphasia.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale H (398.B).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): D. Bawanypeck. *Die Rituale der Auguren*. THeth 25. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 2005, pp. 21–50.

Incipit/Colophon: [Thus Mr. Ḫ]uwarlu, the augur: when [terrible bi]rds, a[ll] the birds that [...], whatever they are seeing, they make [it out of] clay.

Summary: The Old Woman averts evil omens seen by the augurs, using analogic incantations, absorbent materials such as dough and cloth, the purificatory properties of the river, the protective properties of a puppy and a donkey, and a passing-through rite, as well as offerings to the gods. The ritual is carried out first within the palace, then out on the steppe.

CTH 402: The ritual of Allī

Exemplars: 13

State of preservation: Nearly complete; two fragmentary paragraphs in col. ii and a lacuna at the end of col. iii/beginning of col. iv.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (402.I), Büyükkale K (402.D, 402.E), Büyükkale debris (402.L), Haus am Hang (402.A, 402.J), Temple 1 (402.C, 402.G, 402.K).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): A. Mouton, “Le rituel d’Allī d’Arzawa contre un ensorcellement (*CTH* 402): une nouvelle édition.” In *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, ed. B.J. Collins and P. Michalowski. Atlanta: Lockwood Press, 2013, pp. 195–229.

Incipit/Colophon: Thus Ms. Allī, woman of Arzauwa: if a person is ensorcelled, I treat him/her as follows.

Summary: Allī turns sorcery back on a sorcerer, with the particular help of the “Sun-God of the Hand,” using incantations, figurines, different colors of thread (as analogy for various kinds of sorcery), a pit dug in the earth (where the sorcery may be disposed of), offerings to protective deities, hunting implements, grain and cloth (as absorbents), and offerings to the river.

CTH 403: The rituals of Mallidunna

Exemplars: There are two rituals under this heading; CTH 403.1 has two exemplars, and CTH 403.2 has four exemplars.

State of preservation: Extremely fragmentary; CTH 403.1 preserves several lines each in cols. i, ii, and iii; CTH 403.2 preserves a few fragmentary paragraphs in cols. i and iv.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A, N

Language(s): Hittite

Edition(s): G.F. Del Monte: “Sui rituali di Malidunna di Turmita,” *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. P. Taracha.

Warsaw: Agade, 2002, pp. 63–75; S. Görke, hethiter.net/: CTH 403.1; hethiter.net/: CTH 403.2.

Incipit/Colophon: “[Thus Ms. Mallid]unna, Old Woman [of Turmitta]: when I invoke the Sun-God” (CTH 403.1); “Word of [Ms. Mall]idunna, Old Woman of Durmitta: [if Hannahanna] (is) terrifying to someone, [I] invo[ke] her thus” (CTH 403.2).

Summary: In CTH 403.1, Mallidunna, the king, and the queen make offerings to the Sun-God; there is one fragmentary incantation preserved about the Sun-God being reconciled to the king and queen; 403.2 is extremely fragmentary, but there is what seems to be a mythological background to Ḫannaḫanna’s anger in the first column, and an offering sequence in col. iv.

CTH 404.1: Maštigga’s ritual against domestic quarrel

Exemplars: There are three (only slightly variant) versions of this text; 404.1.I has approximately 6 exemplars, 404.1.II has approximately 11 exemplars, and 404.1.III only 1.

State of preservation: Nearly entirely preserved.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (404.1.I.A, 404.1.I.D, 404.1.I.C₃), Büyükkale D (404.1.I.C₁), Büyükkale G (404.1.III) Büyükkale H (404.1.I.C₂), Büyükkale K (404.1.I.B), Büyükkale debris (404.1.II.D₂), Haus am Hang (404.1.II.A, 404.1.II.B), Temple 1 (404.1.II.F, 404.1.II.C₂, 404.1.II.E).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): J.L. Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. StBoT 46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004, pp. 61–124.

Incipit/Colophon: Thus Ms. Maštigga, woman of Kizzuwatna: when a father and a son, or a husband and his wife, or a brother and a sister quarrel, I treat them thus.

Summary: Maštigga rids the ritual patients of the negative effects of their harsh words using figurines made of various materials including wax, tallow, thread, and clay, the purificatory properties of water and dough, and scapegoat animals including a fish, sheep, a piglet, a salamander, and a puppy, analogic incantations, sympathetic destruction of ritual materials including vessels and standing-stones, and ritual washing.

CTH 404.2: Analogous to Maštigga's ritual against domestic quarrel

Exemplars: 1

State of preservation: Parts of cols. i and ii preserved

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A.

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): J.L. Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. StBoT 46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004, pp. 125–32.

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: The Old Woman treats a patient for curses that he or she spoke; in the preserved text, she uses ritual destruction of vessels and standing stones, a substitute sheep and fish, offerings to the sun-deity, figurines of wood and dough, wool and plants. This seems to be a poorly-remembered out-of-order version of CTH 404.1.

CTH 404.3: Maštigga's ritual against bloodshed

Exemplars: Approximately 7, perhaps fewer.

State of preservation: Much of col. i and part of col. iv of the second tablet preserved; first tablet entirely missing.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale E (404.3.B₂), Haus am Hang (404.3.C₂), Temple 1 (404.3.A₂, 404.3.B₄).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): J.L. Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. StBoT 46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004, pp. 133–42.

Incipit/Colophon: Word of Maštigga, woman of Kizzuwatna: when someone commits bloodshed, I treat [him/her thus].

Summary: Maštigga treats a violent offender; in the preserved section, she uses incantations, offerings to the gods, a substitute-sheep and substitute-figurines of dough.

CTH 404.4: Maštigga's ritual for when a man strikes his fellow man

Exemplars: 1

State of preservation: Only the very beginning of col. i and the very end of col. iv preserved.

Findspot(s): Temple 1.

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): J.L. Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. StBoT 46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004, pp. 144–45.

Incipit/Colophon: Thus Ms. Maštigga, woman of Kiz[zuwatna: when] a person strikes a fellow perso[n on the head, I treat] him/her thus.

Summary: Maštigga treats a violent offender; most of the preserved text is simply a list of materials, including bread, cloth, tongue-figurines, person-figurines, fruit, sheepskin, and clothing.

CTH 404.5: Maštigga's *taknaz dā*-

Exemplars: There are three different versions of this text; 404.5.I has 1 exemplar; 404.5.II has 4 exemplars, and 404.5.III has 2 exemplars.

State of preservation: Version one is a small fragment, with only parts of the first ten lines preserved; version two has part of col. i, fragments of cols. ii and iii, and part of col. iv preserved; both exemplars of version three are small fragments of the very beginning of the text.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (404.5.I), Büyükkale K (404.5.III.A), Temple I (404.5.II.B, 404.5.II.D, 404.5.III.B).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): J.L. Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. StBoT 46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004, pp. 146–56.

Incipit/Colophon: Word of [Ms.] Maštigga, [woma]n of Kizzuwatna: when I take a woman or a man from the earth.

Summary: A *taknaz dā*- ritual; in the preserved text, Maštigga treats the patients by evoking a deity near the dwelling-places of various animals, speaking incantations, digging sacrificial pits, and making offerings into the pits.

CTH 409.I: Tunnawiya's "Ritual of the River"

Exemplars: Approximately 4.

State of preservation: Nearly complete.

Findspot(s): Haus am Hang (409.I.C?), Temple 1 (409.I.D)

Language(s): Hittite, Luwian.

Edition(s): A. Goetze with the assistance of E. Sturtevant, *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi*. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1938.

Incipit/Colophon: Thus Tunnawi, Old Woman: when a person—either a man or a woman—is standing inside some uncleanness, or someone else has called him onto uncleanness, or, for a woman, her(!) children keep dying, or she keeps miscarrying, or for a man or for a woman through words of uncleanness their genitalia/body parts are disabled (lit. cut off). (If) this person is seeing uncleanness, this person, either a man or a woman, performs the ritual of uncleanness thus. They call it the ritual of the river—this is only one ritual.

Summary: Tunnawiya treats a patient for reproductive issues using analogic incantations, the purificatory properties of a river and spring, substitute animals, figurines of clay and wax, symbolic washing and undressing of the patient, and destruction of ritual implements, as well as a passing-through rite, and offerings to the Sun-God and ^dMAḪ of the riverbank.

CTH 409.II: Tunnawiya's *taknaz dā*-

Exemplars: Approximately 9.

State of preservation: First tablet: first several paragraphs of cols. i and ii, and only the very ends of cols. iii and iv, are preserved; second tablet: missing the ends of cols. i and ii and the beginnings of cols. iii and iv; third tablet entirely missing; fourth tablet: only the beginning of col. i and the end of col. iv preserved. According to the fourth tablet's colophon, there was at least one more tablet that is now missing.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (409.II.Tf01.A), Büyükkale B (409.II.Tf04.B), Büyükkale D (409.II.Tf04.C), Büyükkale N (409.II.Tf01.B, 409.II.Tf04.A), Temple 1, (409.II.Tf01.D,

409.II.Tf01.K, 409.II.Tf02.H, 409.II.Tf01.J, 409.II.Tf02.B, 409.II.Tf02.D, 409.II.Tf02.G, 409.II.Tf02.J, 409.II.?).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): M. Hutter. *Behexung, Entsöhnung und Heilung: das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königspaar aus mittelhethitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 – KUB IX 34 – KBo XXI 6)*. OBO 82.

Freiburg (Schweiz): Göttingen, 1988.

Incipit/Colophon: When the Old Woman takes the king and queen from the earth.

Summary: A *taknaz dā*- ritual; in the preserved text, Tunnawiya treats the king and queen by making offerings to the Sun-Goddess of the Earth, speaking incantations, using different colors of wool (the method is not preserved), with a substitute sheep, a substitute piglet, and analogic magic. Perhaps part of the same text as CTH 409.IV and CTH 458.1.

CTH 409.IV: Tunnawiya's "Ritual of the Ox"

Exemplars: Approximately 4.

State of preservation: Tablet 1 is entirely missing; Tablet 2 is mostly preserved, missing the ends of cols. i and ii and the beginnings of cols. iii and iv; Tablets 3 and 4 are entirely missing, Tablet 5 preserves the last several paragraphs of col. i and the first few several paragraphs of col. iv; the colophon indicates at least one further missing tablet.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (409.IV.Tf05.C), Büyükkale H (409.IV.Tf05.A), Büyükkale fill (409.IV.Tf05.D), Temple 1 (409.IV.Tf02.C, 409.IV.Tf05.B), Lower City, K/20, I/II, excavation debris (409.IV.Tf02.B).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): G. Beckman, “The Hittite ‘Ritual of the Ox’ (CTH 760.1.2–3)” *OrNS* 59 (1990): 41–55.

Incipit/Colophon: When the king, the queen, and the Old Woman perform the Ritual of the Ox.

Summary: In the preserved sections, Tunnawiya treats the royal couple using a substitute sheep, a substitute piglet, incantations and analogic magic. Perhaps part of the same text as CTH 409.II and CTH 458.1.

CTH 416: The Old Hittite Ritual for the Royal Couple

Exemplars: 3

State of preservation: Mostly preserved; missing the very beginning, the very end, and part of col. iii.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (416.A), Temple 1 (416.B, 416.C).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): H. Otten and V. Souček. *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar*. StBoT 8.

Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1969.

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: Four rituals for removing contamination from the king and queen; in the first, figurines of tongues, of demons(?), and of troops are used, and the king and queen spit and wash out their mouths; in the second, an eagle is sent to intercede on behalf of the king and queen with the gods; the third is too fragmentary to interpret; and in the fourth, pain, woe, and anxiety are removed from the king and queen by pulling threads from their fingers, having them spit into a vessel, and startling them with a bird.

CTH 418: Ritual for when a foreigner commits an offense against the king and queen

Exemplars: Approximately 10.

State of preservation: The first several paragraphs of col. ii, the final several paragraphs of col. iii, and the final few paragraphs of col. iv. The colophon is broken, but seems to indicate there was at least one tablet preceding this one.

Findspot(s): Temple 1 (418.?, 418.B [probably]).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): M. Popko. “Weitere Fragmente zu CTH 418.” *AoF* 18:1 (1991): 44–53.

Incipit/Colophon: Very fragmentary, preserves only a LUGAL.

Summary: The Old Woman treats the king and queen for evil brought on them by a foreigner, using burnt offerings, ritual washing, a passing-through rite, sacrificial pits for the Sun-Goddess of the Earth and the male deities, and analogic incantations.

CTH 423: Ritual to evoke enemy gods

Exemplars: 4

State of preservation: Perhaps a little more than half of cols. ii, iii, and iv, although the exemplars’ numbering does not match up; e.g., midway through col. ii of A (13–15 signs per line) is still col. i in B (19–21 signs per line), making estimation complicated. There is no indication as to whether this was the only tablet of the ritual or not.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale D (423.B).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): F. Fuscagni. “Una nuova interpretazione del rituale CTH 423 alla luce di tre nuovi duplicati.” *KASKAL* 4 (2007): 181–220; differently, G. del Monte, “The Hittite Herem,” in

Memoriae Igor M. Diakonoff, ed. L. Kogan. Babel und Bibel 2. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005, 27–45.

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: The Old Woman invokes the deities of a destroyed enemy city, using fine foodstuffs, cloths, incense, and offerings of sheep and libations. She speaks incantations for the enemy gods, while the king recites for the Storm-God. The king drinks several gods, a SANGA-priest prepares offerings, and liver-oracles about the Storm-God's opinion are reported.

CTH 433: The rituals for the augurs

Exemplars: There are three versions of this text; version one has 3 exemplars, version two has 1 exemplar, and version three has 2 exemplars.

State of preservation: Version one is quite fragmentary, preserving only parts of cols. i and iv; version two preserves only fragmentary paragraphs of cols. i and iv but probably more than half of cols. ii and iii; version three preserves only fragments of col. i and iv but several paragraphs each of cols. ii and iii.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (433.2, 433.3.A, 433.3.B), the Haus am Hang (433.1.A), Temple 1 (433.1.B, 433.1.C).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): D. Bawanypeck. *Die Rituale der Auguren*. THeth 25. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 2005, pp.72–122.

Incipit/Colophon: [Word of...] mother of Ms. Punawašha, [when they invoke the tutelary deity of the hunting-bag] from all [the foreign lands, the mou]ntains, the valleys [the rivers, the

hantiyassa-places, the springs, the fields, the roads [...]. The houses of the lords, from the accumulated [...] they let go [...] they [...].

Summary: In the first version, in the preserved text, the Old Woman treats the ritual patron using grain and clay as absorbents, fat-bread, incantations, a passing-through rite, bread- and sheep-offerings, and libations. In the second version, the Old Woman pacifies the tutelary deity of the hunting-bag and the heptad by speaking incantations, purifying the augurs' mouths with sweet fat-bread, using grain as an absorbent, bread- and meat-offerings and libations. In the third version, the Old Woman invokes the tutelary deity of the hunting bag and the Šalawana-deities of the gates with incantations, fat-bread, libations, perhaps a falcon and a captive (preserved only in an incantation), and tempting food-offerings.

CTH 434: Ritual fragments for the fate-goddesses

Exemplars: 2 (KUB 58.108 and KUB 59.58).

State of preservation: Only the first 2.5 paragraphs of col. i and the final three paragraphs of the composition are preserved. The colophon indicates that there were no other tablets.

Findspot(s): N/A

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): D. Groddek, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription* KUB 59. DBH 14. Wiesbaden:

Harrassowitz, 2004, p. 98, and J.V.G. Trabazo and D. Groddek. *Hethitische Texte in*

Transkription KUB 58. DBH 18. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005, pp. 273–75 (in transcription only), and S. Košak. Review of *KUB 58*. *ZA* 80:1 (1980): 150 (in transcription only).

Incipit/Colophon: (Incipit) [If] for some[one] the fate-goddess makes (or [does not] make?) a matter of ruling [...], and howev[er] (s)he is [pla]cing(?) it, it does not turn out in his/her favor

(lit. for him/her), I treat the evil fate-goddess thus for him/her; I put it away from him/her.

(Colophon) When for a person there is [an evil] ^dGul[šaš], and for him [...] what [...]...[...].

Summary: Quite fragmentary, but in the preserved text, the Old Woman treats a patient for whom there is an “evil fate-goddess,” using offerings to (more than one?) fate-goddess and to the Sun-God of Heaven, figurines, clothing, and seeds (the actions involving the latter three items are not preserved, however).

CTH 435.3: Ritual for the Sun-deity

Exemplars: 2 (KUB 41.4 and KUB 51.83).

State of preservation: Col. ii preserves one full paragraph and a few more fragmentary lines, and only a few fragmentary lines in col. iii.

Findspot(s): N/A

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): V. Haas and I. Wegner. *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen* ^{SAL}ŠU.GI. ChS I/5. Roma: Multigrafica Editrice, 1988, pp. 201–207.

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: Quite fragmentary; the Old Woman entreats the Sun-deity, Ištar/Šauška, and the Storm-God for protection for her patient, offers bread and libations, and makes what may be a dough for pressing or plastering on the patient using plants, clay of a tablet, and dust of a footprint. The final paragraph suggests some kind of analogic magic involving encircling the patient with protective forces.

CTH 436: Ritual of the sea

Exemplars: 3

State of preservation: The obverse preserves the first few paragraphs of col. i and the very beginning of col. ii, and the reverse only a few isolated signs.

Findspot(s): Temple 1 (436.C).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): N/A

Incipit/Colophon: [...] comes away, and if they kill [...] the enemy land, and [i]f they come away from the enemy land, they do the ritual of the sea at the border [...], and they call out the ritual of the sea.

Summary: Quite fragmentary, but it appears to be a ritual done at the border of an enemy land after a (victorious?) battle to banish any evil effects from enemies or enemy deities. A model chariot with horses and riders is constructed of clay, precious stones are scattered, offerings of animals, bread, and wine and beer are made out on the steppe, and the Old Woman performs some ritual with a male piglet and speaks incantations, and fixes the border with metal pegs.

CTH 439: Ritual for Anzili and Zukki

Exemplars: 2

State of preservation: The first few paragraphs of col. i, with a few paragraphs of fragmentary lines continuing on, and a large portion of the middle of col. ii. The beginning of the text suggests that there was at least one tablet preceding this one.

Findspot(s): N/A

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): F. Fuscagni, at the Hethitologie Portal Mainz: hethiter.net/: CTH 439

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: The Old Woman invokes ^dAnzili and ^dZukki with incantations, tempting food items including breads, stews, water, milk, beans, and meat, heated stones waved over the deity and extinguished with wine, and a pig- and a boat-figurine of dough.

CTH 440: Ritual for Ḫamriṣḫara

Exemplars: 1

State of preservation: A single-columned tablet, with (sometimes very) partial lines from a large part of each side preserved.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A.

Language(s): Hittite, Luwian.

Edition(s): F. Fuscagni, at the Hethitologie Portal Mainz: hethiter.net/: CTH 440

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: Too fragmentary for any coherent translation. The preserved text suggests that the Old Woman is entreating the goddesses Iṣḫara and Ḫamriṣḫara on behalf of a patient who has committed or been the victim of some kind of harmful speech, using Hittite and Luwian incantations, seeds, precious stones, bread- and meat-offerings and libations, and analogic magic.

CTH 441: Ritual of the river

Exemplars: 2 (KUB 12.26, KUB 12.64)

State of preservation: In 441.1 (KUB 12.26), col. i preserves only the ends of a few paragraphs' worth of lines. Col. ii preserves the first three paragraphs, and col. iii the final four paragraphs. 441.2 (KUB 12.64) preserves only a few fragmentary lines.

Findspot(s): N/A

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): The mythological section has been edited by A. Archi, “Kamrusepa and the Sheep of the Sun-God,” *OrNS* 62:4 (1993): 406–407, and C. Watkins, “Toward a Hittite Stylistics: Remarks on Some Phonetic and Grammatical Figures,” in *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of H. Craig Melchert on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. R. Kim, et al. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 2010, pp. 358–61.

Incipit/Colophon: N/A.

Summary: Fairly fragmentary. The Old Woman treats a sick person or child, using bread-offerings, and a mythological incantation involving the Sun-God of Heaven and Kamrušepa, followed by offerings in a garden, more incantations, stones and a river (in fragmentary context), and finally various food items placed in a basket, which is waved over the patient, and harmful(?) forces are encouraged to take them (instead of the patient?).

CTH 445: Ritual for the expiation of incest

Exemplars: 1 (KBo 59.59)

State of preservation: Only parts of the first 9 lines preserved.

Findspot(s): Temple 1.

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): H.A. Hoffner, Jr. “Incest, Sodomy and Bestiality in the Ancient Near East” in *Orient and Occident: Essays presented to Cyrus H. Gordon on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. H.A. Hoffner, Jr. AOAT 22. Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, 1973, pp. 81–90.

Incipit/Colophon: If a man [sleeps] with [his] mother, [his daughter?], or one of (his) family [...] if he is a low-ranked [person or a high-ranked one?...].

The person who has sinned [...]. And all the city [shall] a[ssemble?...] to that city ...[...] they perform the Old Woman[’s] ritual [...]. And the man of the storm-god [...]

Summary: The only preserved text is the incipit, above.

CTH 448.2: Ritual for the Sun-Goddess of the Earth

Exemplars: There are three versions of this text, some of which have minor variants; CTH 448.2.1.1 has 4 exemplars, 448.2.1.2 has 1 exemplar, 448.2.1.3 has 1 exemplar, and 448.2.1.4 has 4 exemplars; 448.2.2.1 has 2 exemplars and 448.2.2.2 has 1 exemplar; and 448.2.3 has 1 exemplar.

State of preservation: The best-preserved version of this text is CTH 448.2.1.1, with about seven full paragraphs extant; CTH 448.2.1.4 preserves about two full paragraphs, and CTH 448.2.2.1 preserves one full paragraph and several more which are well-preserved enough to make out the content. All other versions are quite fragmentary.

Findspot(s): Temple 1 (448.2.1.1.B, 448.2.1.1.C, 448.2.1.4.B, 448.2.2.1.B, 448.2.2.2).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): S. Görke, at the Hethitologie Portal Mainz, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.1.1, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.1.2, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.1.3, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.1.4, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.2.1, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.2.2

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: In this ritual, a man and a woman are clothed and presented to the Sun-Goddess of the Earth as substitutes for the king and queen, while the ritual patrons make offerings and speak

incantations to both the Sun-Goddess of the Earth and the Sun-God of Heaven. The Old Women's participation is largely fragmentary; the only clear description of their actions is when they speak incantations as a group (!).

CTH 449: Rituals naming the underworld deities

Exemplars: 3 separate Old Woman texts are classified under CTH 449.

State of preservation: KUB 58.85 preserves only fragments from cols. iii and iv; KUB 7.4 preserves only about three paragraphs of fragmentary lines; KUB 39.57 preserves 1.5 long paragraphs on the obverse, and five lines of a list on the reverse.

Findspot(s): Haus am Hang (KUB 39.57).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): J.V.G. Trabazo and D. Groddek. *Hethitische Texte in Transkription* KUB 58. DBH 18. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005, pp. 219–21 (KUB 58.85, in transcription only).

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: KUB 58.85 is far too fragmentary to translate, but it seems as though the Old Woman and a SANGA-priest are performing a ritual for military success in an upcoming campaign. KUB 7.4 is too fragmentary to restore anything but offerings to primordial deities. In KUB 39.57, the Old Woman is treating a patient (who is perhaps being bothered by the spirit of a dead person) using vessels made out of lead in the shape of various body parts, including a soul, which she fills with river-water and then pours out, and then fills them with oil and honey, after which she appeals to underworld deities.

CTH 450: The royal funerary ritual

Exemplars: There are currently 71 tablets assigned to CTH 450; their organization is complicated and occasionally quite difficult.

State of preservation: Perhaps slightly more than half of the fourteen days of the royal funerary ritual is preserved.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A, B, H, and K; the Haus am Hang; Temple 1.

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): A. Kassian, A. Korolev, and A. Sidel'tsev. *Hittite Funerary Ritual: šalliš waštaiš*.

AOAT 288. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002.

Incipit/Colophon: When a great loss occurs in Ḫattuša.

Summary: The fourteen-day royal funerary ritual. The Old Woman participates throughout the ritual: two Old Women perform a dialogue over a scale concerning the deceased's soul; an Old Woman brings offerings to the deceased, speaks incantations to the Sun-God, and disposes of the ashes of ritual implements after they have been burned. There is also an Old Woman attested alongside 12 A.ZU-women in an obscure and unconnected fragment of the ritual.

CTH 452: Fragments of substitute rituals

Exemplars: 1 (KBo 38.174)

State of preservation: Only fragments of two paragraphs preserved.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A.

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): N/A

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: Only just enough preserved to suggest that this is part of a substitute ritual, in which both an Old Woman and an AZU-man are participating.

CTH 456.2: Ritual of the river

Exemplars: There are three variants of this text; CTH 456.2.1 has 7 exemplars; CTH 456.2.2 has 1 exemplar, and 456.2.3 has 2 exemplars.

State of preservation: Only fragments of the first and third tablets (according to the numbering of A) are preserved; Tablet 2 preserves a large part of col. i, fragmentary portions of cols. ii and iii, and most of col. iv.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale C (456.2.1.B), Haus am Hang (456.2.?), Temple 1 (456.2.1.C, 456.2.1.D, 456.2.1.E, 456.2.1.F, 456.2.2, 456.2.3.A, 456.2.3.C)

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): F. Fuscagni, at the Hethitologie Portal Mainz, hethiter.net/: CTH 456.2.1, hethiter.net/: CTH 456.2.2

Incipit/Colophon: The ritual of the river.

Summary: The Old Woman treats a patient by a river; they dig a pit and offer a pig into it; she speaks incantations to the Sun-God of Heaven on behalf of the patient; unclear ritual actions are carried out with a figurine of a person and (figurines of?) a frog and a puppy, as well as cloths, and a young woman.

CTH 456.3: Punauwašḫa's ritual to restore someone's personal god

Exemplars: 4

State of preservation: Quite fragmentary; about 7 broken paragraphs are preserved.

Findspot(s): Temple 1; Haus am Hang; Büyükkale

Language(s): Hittite

Edition(s): F. Fuscagni, hethiter.net/: CTH 456.3

Incipit/Colophon: “Word of Ms. Punauwašḫa: If a person’s male or female deity is called away(?),² ensorcelled, or fixed in place, [I] make him/her well thus.”

Summary: The text is quite fragmentary; it preserves mostly offerings and a few broken analogic incantations for exterminating evil.

CTH 458: Fragments of conjuration rituals

Exemplars: There are 3 separate Old Woman texts under CTH 458; 458.1 has two versions; 458.1.1 has 2 exemplars, and 458.1.2 has 1 exemplar; 458.45 has 1 exemplar; and 458.113 has 1 exemplar.

State of preservation: 458.1 preserves a large portion of col. i and the first several paragraphs of col. iv, 458.45 (KBo 41.2) preserves only the ends of several lines in the left column (perhaps i) and the beginnings of several lines in the right column. 458.113 (KUB 60.157) preserves the end of col. ii and the beginning of col. iii.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (458.1.1.A, 458.45).

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): F. Fuscagni, at the Hethitologie Portal Mainz, hethiter.net/: CTH 458.1.1,

hethiter.net/: CTH 458.1.2, hethiter.net/: CTH 458.45. D. Groddek, *Hethitische Texte in*

Transkription KUB 60. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006, 165–69 (458.113).

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

² In the incipit, Fuscagni translates “vertrieben,” indicating that he is interpreting *arḫa ú-i-ia-an-za* as “sent away,” but *wiya-* “to send” is always spelled with initial *u*, not *ú*. However, in the colophon, he translates “weggerufen,” indicating that he is interpreting the word correctly as *wai/wiya-* “to cry out.”

Summary: In 458.1, the Old Woman treats a patient for illness, using incantations (including mythological elements about the Sun-deity), a substitute donkey, hot stones, and ritual washing. In 458.113 (KUB 60.157), the Old Woman treats a patient for illness using incantations to the moon-god, and what seems to be offerings and incantations to hostile supernatural forces (performed at night). 458.45 (KBo 41.2) is quite fragmentary, only complete enough to suggest that the Old Woman is treating a sick patient using pegs, baskets, a brazier, and bread-offerings.

CTH 463: Ritual of []azzi against omina

Exemplars: 2

State of preservation: Only the first two paragraphs, fragmentarily preserved.

Findspot(s): N/A

Language(s): Hittite

Edition(s): B. Christiansen. *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi. Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429, und CTH 463*. StBoT 48. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006, pp. 288–300.

Incipit/Colophon: [Thus Ms. Amb]azzi, Old Woman: if a bee seizes [...], or seizes a wave, [or] and eagle [...] at the city wall or gutter(?), or a snake dies at an altar, [or] it dies in a supply-vessel, or [at/from(?)] the ceiling/covering [...]s, or dies in bed, or also there [...] or a halliya-animal dies in bed, or an ant comes into a place inside the house from the altar or hearth or it, or an asku-animal from the (roof)-beams or inside the house springs out from whatever place, [or] a tree blooms for the second time, or whichever sign happens, its ritual is this.

Summary: Other than the incipit (above) all that is preserved is the beginning of the list of ritual materials, mainly food items of various kinds.

CTH 470: Ritual fragments

Exemplars: KBo 3.49, KBo 7.33, KBo 9.112, KBo 12.133, KBo 13.177, KBo 13.240, KBo 17.47, KBo 19.134, KBo 22.110, KBo 22.122, KBo 22.140, KBo 22.255, KBo 24.8, KBo 31.111, KBo 31.133, KBo 34.53, KBo 34.71, KBo 38.200, KBo 38.207, KBo 38.223, KBo 38.231, KBo 38.248, KBo 40.111, KBo 40.115, KBo 40.154, KBo 41.8, KBo 41.22, KBo 41.23, KBo 41.42, KBo 44.60, KBo 44.72, KBo 44.81, KBo 45.227, KBo 46.38, KBo 49.229, KBo 49.268, KBo 49.276, KBo 53.52, KBo 53.58, KBo 55.151, KUB 12.13, KUB 39.53, KUB 39.61, KUB 51.43, KUB 54.93, KUB 54.96, KUB 55.7, KUB 55.57, KUB 58.53, KUB 58.78, KUB 58.86, KUB 58.102, 528/t, Bo 3330, Bo 4794, ABoT 1.26, Haluk Perk Museum Tablet, HT 27, HT 49, HT 52, HT 61, IBoT 2.127, IBoT 4.25. None of these 63 texts has more than one copy currently identified.

State of preservation: All quite fragmentary.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (KBo 17.47, KBo 24.8, KBo 34.53, KBo 34.71, KBo 38.200, KBo 38.207, KBo 38.223, KBo 38.231, KBo 38.248, KBo 40.111, KBo 40.115, KBo 40.154, KBo 41.22, KBo 41.23), Büyükkale D (KBo 7.33), Büyükkale E (KBo 41.8), Büyükkale G (KBo 9.112, KBo 44.60), Büyükkale H (KBo 31.133, KBo 41.42), Büyükkale K (KBo 46.38), Büyükkale N (KBo 44.81), Büyükkale fill (KBo 44.72), Haus am Hang (KBo 12.133, KBo 13.177, KBo 13.240, KBo 45.227, KBo 49.229, KBo 49.268, KBo 49.276, KUB 39.53), Temple 1 (KBo 19.134, KBo 22.110, KBo 22.122, KBo 22.140, KBo 22.255, KBo 53.52, KBo 53.58, KBo 55.151, 528/t)

Language(s): Hittite, Hurrian (KBo 13.177)

Edition(s): J.V.G. Trabazo and D. Groddek. *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KUB 58*. DBH 18. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, p. 143 (KUB 58.53), pp. 201–202 (KUB 58.78), pp. 222–23 (KUB 58.86), p. 143 (KUB 58.102). D. Groddek, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 22*. DBH 24. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008, p. 103 (KBo 22.110), pp. 113–15 (KBo 22.122), pp. 132–33 (KBo 22.140), p. 224 (KBo 22.255), (transcription only). A. Mouton. *Rêves hittites*. CHANE 28. Leiden: Brill, 2007, pp. 152–55 (KUB 39.61). D. Groddek. *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KUB 55*. DBH 4. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002, 15–16 (KUB 55.7), 103–104 (KUB 55.57) (transcription only). H.A. Hoffner, Jr. “Incest, Sodomy and Bestiality in the Ancient Near East” in *Orient and Occident: Essays presented to Cyrus H. Gordon on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. H.A. Hoffner, Jr. AOAT 22. Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, 1973, p. 84 (KUB 58.78).

Incipit/Colophon: “[Thus] Ms. Ānnā, the Old Woman of Pal[a...when] they [...] and [...] the sleeping Storm-God [...] the [O]ld [Woman] of the temple of ^dZiparwā perform[s...] in [...].” (KBo 17.47 1–4). “Thus Ms. Ūnki, O[l]d [Woman] [...] no one [...] him [...] pure girl [...] spins/unravels [...] they go down [to/from] the city [...] they come up [...]” (KBo 22.110 1–6). “[...] or [...] or his/her parent [...] or he spoke [...] the king [...] his lip(?), but if (s)he dies, and (s)he begins to see the dead person in a dream, or begins to see him/her nightly in dreams, how do I cut him/her off from him/her?” (KUB 39.61 1–7). “Thus [Ms.] ..., Old Woman [...] When [...] a vessel [...]” (KUB 51.43 i 1–3). “[Thu]s(?) [...], Old Woman of Hatti: if an Old Woman’s snake goes in [...], first, I take [...] and into what house it has gone, I do the following ritual in that house.” (KUB 55.57 i 1–4).

Summary: Most of the CTH 470 texts are too fragmentary to summarize. Some better-preserved fragments include KBo 41.22, which seems to be a ritual against a list of possible afflictions in

which the Old Woman speaks incantations on behalf of the patient, and a ^{LÚ}AZU also participates, although his actions are broken away. KUB 39.61 appears to be a ritual in which the Old Woman stops the spirit of a dead person from bothering the patient, in part by entreating the Sun-Goddess of the Earth with offerings in a sacrificial pit. KUB 55.57 is a ritual by an Old Woman for if an Old Woman's snake has gone into someone's house, although only the list of ritual materials is preserved; it includes foodstuffs, precious stones, and several kinds of vessels.

CTH 474: Ritual of the priestess Kuwanni

Exemplars: 3, and 2 associated frags.

State of preservation: The beginning of col. i is preserved; cols. ii, iii, and iv preserve only fragmentary lines.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (474.A, 474.B), Temple 1 (474.?).

Language(s): Hittite

Edition(s): D. Groddek, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 39*. DBH 11. Wiesbaden:

Harrassowitz, 2004, pp. 44–45, 57–58. *ibid.*, *AoF* 23, 1996, 300–301, R. Akdoğan, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription ABoT 2*. DBH 33. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010, pp. 42–43.

Incipit/Colophon: “[Thu]s Ms.! (text Mr.) Kuwanni, woman of the temple of Hebat of Kummanni: When (something) from the gods has angered a person, the angry one also offers; I act thus.”

Summary: After the incipit, most of the preserved sections of this text are the list of materials and the process of making offerings; there is one extremely broken section that suggests action being taken on the patient's bed before he goes to sleep. The Old Woman is attested only once in fragmentary context in col. ii.

CTH 487: Healing ritual for Išḫara

Exemplars: 1 (KBo 22.105)

State of preservation: Only about 12 fragmentary lines on each side of the tablet are preserved.

Findspot(s): Temple 1.

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): D. Groddek, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 22*. DBH 24. Wiesbaden:

Harrassowitz, 2008, pp. 96–97 (transcription only), and D. Prechel, *Die Göttin Išḫara: Ein Beitrag zur altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte*, ALASPM 11, Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1996, 131n325.

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: Extremely fragmentary. The obverse preserves part of an incantation requesting a deity's favor, and the reverse a fragmentary section in which a vessel is broken, and a ghost is mentioned.

CTH 490: The ritual of Ašdu

Exemplars: There are at least 3 versions of this text (as well as a number of associated fragments). Version A has 4 tablets attested; the first tablet has 6 exemplars, the second 1 exemplar, the third 4 exemplars, and the fourth 3 exemplars. Version B has 3 tablets; the first has 2 exemplars, the second is not attested, and the third has 4 exemplars. Version C has 3 tablets; the first tablet has 1 exemplar, the second is not attested, and the third has 6 exemplars.

State of preservation: In Version A, the first tablet preserves much of col. i and fragments of col. iv; the second tablet preserves only the colophon; the third tablet preserves several paragraphs

each of cols. i, ii, and iii, and only a few signs of col. iv; and the fourth tablet preserves several paragraphs each of cols. i and iv. In Version B, the first tablet preserves a large portion of col. i and a few fragmentary lines of col. ii; the second tablet is not preserved; and the third tablet preserves only fragments of col. i, several paragraphs of cols. ii and iii, and only the colophon of col. iv. In Version C, the first tablet only preserves three fragmentary paragraphs; the second tablet is not preserved; and the third tablet preserves four paragraphs of col. i, only a few signs of col. i, and a few fragmentary lines of col. iv.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (490.3.A.4, 490.3.A.1, 490.3.B.3), Büyükkale K (490.?), Büyükkale G (490.E5), Haus am Hang (490.3.A.2), Temple 1 (490.1.A.1, 490.1.A.3, 490.2.A.1, 490.3.B.2, 490.3.B.4, 490.3.C.3, 490.3.C.4, 490.3.C.5, 490.3.C.6, 490.4.A.1, 490.4.A.2, 490.E3, 490.E4, 490.?).

Language(s): Hittite, Hurrian.

Edition(s): S. Görke, *Das Ritual der Aštu (CTH 490): Rekonstruktion und Tradition eines hurritisch-hethitischen Rituals aus Boğazköy-Hattuša*. CHANE 40. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Incipit/Colophon: “Thus Ašdu, Old Woman of Hurli: When I make an ensorcelled person well again (and) I take him from the earth.”

Summary: A *taknaz dā*- ritual. Ašdu treats a patient invoking the deities using precious stones, food-offerings, and incense, reciting incantations in Hurrian, two different passing-through rites (one, uniquely, involving crawling into a large vessel), binding red thread to the patient, and ritual washing. She and a ^{LÚ}AZU both engage in ritual actions involving a scale, and the ^{LÚ}AZU also performs a swinging rite with the purificatory substance *hušta*-.

CTH 495.I: Expiation ritual

Exemplars: 1

State of preservation: Only a few fragmentary lines preserved, at the beginning of col. i and the end of col. iv.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A.

Language(s): Hittite.

Edition(s): N/A

Incipit/Colophon: Word of [...Old Woman] of ^{URU}Zi[...].

Summary: Too fragmentary for any coherent translation; the preserved text only suggests that the action takes place inside a temple and preserves a few ritual objects such as stones and vessels.

CTH 500: Fragments of rituals from Kizzuwatna

Exemplars: KBo 9.117, KBo 22.161, KBo 24.71+KBo 27.124, KBo 33.159, KBo 53.87, KUB 44.55, KUB 48.112, VBoT 109. None of these 8 texts has a duplicate.

State of preservation: All quite fragmentary.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (KBo 24.71, KBo 33.159) Temple 1 (KBo 22.161, KBo 53.87).

Language(s): Hittite, Hurrian (KBo 24.71+KBo 27.124, KBo 33.159)

Edition(s): D. Groddek, *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 22*. DBH 24. Wiesbaden:

Harrassowitz, 2008, p. 150–51 (KBo 22.161).

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: None of these fragments is well-preserved enough to summarize.

CTH 734: Fragments of Hattic rituals and conjurations

Exemplars: KBo 37.23

State of preservation: KBo 37.23 preserves several paragraphs each of cols. i, ii, and iii, and all 8 lines of col. iv; the colophon suggests that there was one tablet preceding.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A

Language(s): Hittite, Hattian

Edition(s): N/A

Incipit/Colophon: “Second tablet of Ms. Kururu, Old Woman,” KBo 37.23 iv 7–8.

Summary: Nearly all of KBo 37.23 is Hattian incantations, very difficult to read. The fourth column, however, preserves a list of items in Hittite, which comprises a set of fine materials ordinarily used in evocation, and three anthropomorphic figurines made of cheese, beer-wort, and bread, respectively.

CTH 759: The *dupaduparša*-ritual of Kuwatalla and Šilalluḫi

Exemplars: At least 3 (based on the findspots).

State of preservation: Only Tablets 1, 3, 8, 9 are certainly preserved; two other fragmentary tablets are associated with the ritual but cannot be placed within the ritual order. The first tablet preserves only the very end of col. iv; the third tablet preserves the first several paragraphs of cols. i and ii and the final few paragraphs of cols. iii and iv; the eighth tablet preserves only the colophon; and the ninth tablet preserves only a few fragmentary sentences.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (759.1), Büyükkale D (759.?), Büyükkale M (759.?) Temple 1 (759.4).

Language(s): Hittite, Luwian.

Edition(s): F. Starke. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. StBoT 30. Wiesbaden:

Harrassowitz, 1985, pp. 111–18, 123–24, and H. Roszkowska-Mutschler. *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 44*. DBH 22. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007, 176–77.

Incipit/Colophon: The dupaduparša-ritual: word of Ms. Šilalluḫi, Old Woman, and Ms.

Kuwattalla, ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL.

Summary: The first tablet preserves only the Old Woman speaking aloud and fixing something in the ground with a peg; on the third tablet, the Old Woman performs analogic magic with Luwian incantations, purificatory rituals with wine, oil, and honey, and destruction of ritual implements; there is also the beginning of ritual action with a sheep, which breaks off. The ninth tablet preserves an attempt to pacify hostile forces using clay of the riverbank, and further incantations.

CTH 760.II: Luwian scapegoat ritual

Exemplars: There are perhaps three tablets that can be assigned to this text; CTH 760.II.1 has 3 exemplars, CTH 760.II.2 has perhaps as many as 6 exemplars; CTH 760.II.3 has 2 exemplars, and there are several uncertain fragments.

State of preservation: CTH 760.II.1 preserves most of cols. ii and iii; CTH 760.II.2 also preserves most of cols. ii and iii; and CTH 760.II.3 only preserves a few fragmentary paragraphs.

Findspot(s): Temple 1; Büyükkale A; Büyükkale H

Language(s): Hittite and Luwian

Edition(s): F. Starke. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. StBoT 30. Wiesbaden:

Harrassowitz, 1985, pp. 71, 143–60, 164–65, 390.

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: In the preserved text, the Old Woman treats the ritual patient with a substitute sheep and incantations in Luwian, as well as perhaps a substitute piglet (in fragmentary context), offerings to the Storm-God and the Sun-God, figurines of dough, different colors of wool (in fragmentary context), and analogic magic with a bronze knife.

CTH 761, 762: The Great Ritual of Kuwatalla and Šilalluḫi

Exemplars: There seem to be at least two versions of this text, one authored by Kuwatalla, and one authored by both Kuwatalla and Šilalluḫi. However, the text is too fragmentary to say if there is more than one exemplar of each version.

State of preservation: CTH 761.8 (Tablet 1 of the single-author version) preserves much of the obverse and a few fragmentary paragraphs on the reverse. CTH 761.2 (Tablet 3 of the single-author version) preserves perhaps a third of its content. All other tablets are smaller fragments, most assigned to CTH 762.

Findspot(s): Temple 1; Büyükkale A; Büyükkale K; Büyükkale M

Language(s): Hittite, Luwian

Edition(s): F. Starke. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. StBoT 30. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1985, pp. 83–104, 117, 160–71; 197.

Incipit/Colophon: “[Thus Ms. Kuwatalla], ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL, and Ms. Š[illaluhi, ^{MUNUS}Š]U.GI: when we do the ritual of “beat[ing] down” for a person, when [on] the third day we finish the r[itua]l of “beating down,” on the third day we take him/her forth (for) the ‘Great Ritual,’ and we take this:”; “Third tablet of Ms. Kuwatalla, ^{MUNUS}SUḪUR.LÁL, unfinished: when I treat a person (using) the ‘Great Ritual.’”

Summary: The first tablet of 761.1 only preserves the collection of 8 sheep and 1 goat for an unspecified purpose; on the third tablet, the Old Woman purifies the ritual patient with a “pure braid of dough,” Luwian incantations, and ritual washing (actions that are repeated twice in the preserved text). Another tablet preserves only fragmentary Luwian incantations and libations. The version classified as 761.8, with only Kuwatalla’s name in the colophon, preserves a first tablet with Luwian incantations and the Old Woman pressing something to the patient’s body. Further fragments (classified under CTH 762) preserve actions with a substitute goat; actions out on the steppe; actions with bread, libations, and stones; actions with blue wool pulled from the patient’s head along with hair, eyelashes, eyebrows, and nail clippings, as well as honey and oil in a clay cup.

CTH 763: Ritual fragments with Luwianisms

Exemplars: KUB 9.7, KUB 27.26, KUB 32.70, KUB 35.3, KUB 35.5, KUB 35.13+, KUB 35.62, KUB 35.64, KUB 35.66, KUB 35.67, KUB 35.71, KUB 35.74, KUB 35.80, KUB 35.82, KUB 35.116, VBoT 43

State of preservation: All quite fragmentary.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (KUB 32.70, KUB 35.64, KUB 35.71), Büyükkale D (KUB 35.80, KUB 36.82).

Language(s): Hittite, Luwian

Edition(s): F. Starke. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. StBoT 30. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1985, pp. 133, 167–70, 172–73, 178–79, 181–83, 186–92.

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: Most of these texts are too fragmentary to summarize; more complete fragments include KBo 29.6, in which bread- and meat-offerings are made, and the Old Woman recites analogic incantations in Luwian, and KUB 9.7, which seems to preserve (substitute?) animals including a sheep, a piglet, and a puppy, and Luwian incantations.

CTH 780.I: Allaituraḫḫi's ritual: Hurrian version

Exemplars: 2

State of preservation: CTH 780.I.A preserves about 20 lines on each side; CTH 780.I.B preserves what may be most of the text.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A

Language(s): Hittite, Hurrian

Edition(s): V. Haas and I. Wegner. *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen*^{SAL} ŠU.GI. ChS I/5. Roma: Multigrafica Editrice, 1988, 48–64.

Incipit/Colophon: [X tablet of Ms. Alla]ituraḫi, woman of Muki[š]: when [...]

Summary: Allaituraḫḫi treats the ritual patient with Hurrian incantations, ritual washing (with water and urine), and a very opaque series of actions in which she slaps the patient, places twigs and bread on statues (of deities?), hides them in a cloak, then disposes of them in a river, after which there is more ritual washing out on the steppe, followed by the purification of the building in which the ritual is taking place. The patient is then purified again with stones, and again as the Old Woman wipes down his body.

CTH 780.II: Allaituraḫḫi's ritual: Hittite version

Exemplars: Perhaps as many as 17, but most of these are small fragments and some could easily be part of the same tablets.

State of preservation: Tablet 1 is largely preserved; tablets 2, 3, and 4 are missing; tablet 5 preserves three or four paragraphs in each column; tablet 6 preserves a large part of the obverse but only a few paragraphs on the reverse.

Findspot(s): Temple I, Haus am Hang, Büyükkale A, E.

Language(s): Hittite, Hurrian

Edition(s): V. Haas and I. Wegner. *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen* ^{SAL}ŠU.GI. ChS I/5. Roma: Multigrafica Editrice, 1988, pp. 65–159; V. Haas, “Notizen zu den Ritualen der Frau Allaituraḫi aus Mukiš,” *AoF* 34:1 (2007): 11–29; J. Lorenz and I. Taş, “Neue Zusatzstücke zur ersten Tafel der Rituale der Frau Allaituraḫi aus Mukiš,” *ZA* 101:1 (2012): 115–29.

Incipit/Colophon: “Word of Allaituraḫi, woman of Mukiš: when I make an ensorcelled person well again.”

Summary: On the first tablet, Allaituraḫi treats an ensorcelled patient by laying hearths in an “empty city,” then performing analogic magic with various kinds of earth and plants. She entreats the fate-goddesses of the riverbank with offerings and incantations, and then performs more analogic magic in the city with vessels and a rope and incantations. The third column of the tablet preserves only curses that she speaks on the sorcerer, and in the final column she makes a model garden, sets up figurines of deities inside, and gives them offerings. The ritual resumes on the fifth tablet, on which she speaks incantations in Hittite and Hurrian on behalf of the patient, with analogic actions to dispel the sorcery and any negative divine attention, and cursing the sorcerer, and bread-offerings and libations to the gods. On the sixth tablet, there is more ritual washing and incantations to the gods in Hittite, after which she performs the ritual with slapping

and twigs and bread inside a cloak, followed by more ritual washing (see above CTH 780.I).

After the purification of the house, she recites an incantation with mythological elements while rubbing the patron with an astringent dough. There follows a fragmentary action with stones, more ritual washing, and then the patient and the house are anointed with fine oil. Finally, there are more Hurrian incantations, and then the ritual ends.

780.III: Allaituraḫḫi's ritual for Šuppiluliyama II

Exemplars: 3

State of preservation: Extremely fragmentary: only a small part of cols. i and iv are preserved.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale E

Language(s): Hittite

Edition(s): Haas and I. Wegner. *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen*^{SAL} ŠU.GI. ChS I/5. Roma: Multigrafica Editrice, 1988, pp. 160–70.

Incipit/Colophon: “The words of Ms. Allaituraḫḫi; the associated equipment is on a separate tablet.”

Summary: Allaiturahhi treats Šuppiluliyama II for bewitchment; the preserved sections of the obverse are incantations about the possible sources of his affliction, and the reverse is analogic magic with incantations.

CTH 788: Šalašu's ritual

Exemplars: At least 3.

State of preservation: Extremely fragmentary. The eighth tablet (CTH 788.1) preserves several complete paragraphs on the obverse and on the reverse, and there is one other tablet (CTH 788.2) that preserves several fragmentary paragraphs. The rest of the text is only small fragments.

Findspot(s): Temple I, Haus am Hang, Büyükkale A, K.

Language(s): Hittite, Hurrian

Edition(s): Haas and I. Wegner. *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen*^{SALŠU.GI. ChS I/5}. Roma: Multigrafica Editrice, 1988, 208–30.

Incipit/Colophon: Word of Šalašu, [Ol]d W[oman] from Kizzuwatna: [when I] make [an ensorcelled man] well [again], I offer [this ritual].”

Summary: Šalašu treats the ritual patient by making a dough out of various plant-materials, then constructing statuettes and fetters of dough; she puts a fetter on his or her neck and speaks incantations in Hurrian, and breaks it, and waves dough over the patient’s body, and presses it on him or her, and speaks more incantations in Hurrian.

CTH 790: Fragments of Hurro-Hittite rituals and conjurations

Exemplars: KBo 38.57, KBo 17.92, KBo 22.164+, KUB 27.78+, KUB 27.34, KUB 27.35, KUB 32.48

State of preservation: All quite fragmentary

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (KBo 38.57, KBo 17.92), Temple I (KBo 22.164+)

Language(s): Hittite, Hurrian

Edition(s): Haas and I. Wegner. *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen*^{SALŠU.GI. ChS I/5}. Roma: Multigrafica Editrice, 1988, pp. 338–44, 399–407, 444–46, 468–69.

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: Most of these texts are too fragmentary for translation; among the better-preserved fragments are KBo 17.92, in which the Old Woman brings the ritual patient into a sheep pen, and performs (fragmentary) ritual actions with wool, and offerings of bread and wine, and speaks Hurrian incantations; and KUB 27.28+, in which the Old Woman clothes figurines of wood and wax, speaks incantations in Hurrian, and makes offerings of birds, bread, grain, fruit, salt, and honey.

CTH 820.4, 820.5: Benedictions for the Labarna

Exemplars: There are 2 versions of this text, one older (CTH 820.4), one later (CTH 820.5).

State of preservation: Extremely fragmentary; only a few paragraphs preserved in each version.

Findspot(s): Büyükkale A (CTH 820.4), Haus am Hang (CTH 820.5)

Language(s): Hittite

Edition(s): A. Archi, “Auguri per il Labarna,” in *Studia Mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata*, ed.

O. Carruba, *StMed* 1 (Pavia, 1979), 44–47; G. Kellerman, “The King and the Sun-God in the Old Hittite Period,” *Tel Aviv* 5 (1978): 199–208.

Incipit/Colophon: N/A

Summary: A series of incantations and dialogues for the health and strength of the king and queen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abusch, T. *The Magical Ceremony Maqlû: A Critical Edition*. Ancient Magic and Divination 10. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Akdoğan, R. *Hethitische Texte in Transkription ABoT 2*. DBH 33. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.
- Archi, A. "Il sistema KIN della divinazione ittita." *Oriens Antiquus* 13 (1974): 113–44.
- . "Auguri per il Labarna." In *Studia Mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata*, edited by O. Carruba, 27–51. StMed 1. Pavia, 1979.
- . "Kamrusepa and the Sheep of the Sun-God." *OrNS* 62:4 (1993): 404–409.
- . "The Heptad in Anatolia." *Hethitica* XVI (2010): 21–34.
- . "The Anatolian Fate-Goddesses and their Different Traditions." In *Diversity and Standardization: Perspectives on social and political norms in the ancient Near East*, edited by E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, J. Klinger, and G.G.W. Müller, 1–26. Akademie Verlag, 2013.
- Austin, J. L. *How to do things with Words*, 2nd ed., edited by J. O. Urmson and Marina Sbisa. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Bachvarova, M. "Adapting Mesopotamian Myth in Hurro-Hittite Rituals at Hattuša: Ištar, the Underworld, and the Legendary Kings." In *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, edited by B.J. Collins and Piotr Michalowski, 23–44. Atlanta: Lockwood Press, 2013.
- Bawanypeck, D. *Die Rituale der Auguren*. THeth 25. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 2005.
- Beal, R. *The Organisation of the Hittite Military*. THeth 20. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1992.
- . "Seeking Divine Approval for Campaign Strategy: KUB 5.1+KUB 52.65." *Ktema* 24 (1999): 41–54.
- . "Gleanings from Hittite Oracle Questions on Religion, Society, Psychology and Decision Making." In *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko*, edited by P. Taracha, 11–37. Warsaw: Agade, 2002.
- . "Dividing a God." in *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, edited by P. Mirecki and M. Meyer, 197–208. RGRW 141. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

- . “Hittite Oracles.” In *Magic and Divination in the Ancient World*, edited by L. Cirola and J. Seidel, 57–81. Leiden: Brill/Styx, 2002.
- Beckman, G. *Hittite Birth Rituals*. StBoT 29. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983.
- . “The Hittite ‘Ritual of the Ox’ (CTH 760.1.2–3)” *OrNS* 59 (1990): 41–55.
- . “From Cradle to Grave: Women’s Role in Hittite Medicine and Magic.” *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 8 (1993): 25–39.
- . *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*. WAW 7. Atlanta: SBL, 1996.
- . “Temple Building among the Hittites.” In *From the Foundations to the Crenellations: Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible*, edited by M.J. Boda and J. Novotny, 71–89. AOAT 366. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2010.
- . “Blood in Hittite Ritual.” *JCS* 63 (2011): 95–102.
- . “The Sea! The Sea! A Rite from the South of Anatolia (CTH 719).” In *Saeculum: Gedenkschrift für Heinrich Otten anlässlich seines 100. Geburtstag*, edited by A. Müller-Karpe, E. Rieken, and W. Sommerfeld, 15–29. StBoT 58. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015.
- Beckman, G., T.R. Bryce, and E.H. Cline. *The Ahhiyawa Texts*. WAW 28. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- Bell, C. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Benedetti, B. “Nota sulla ^{sal}ŠU.Gi ittita.” *Mesopotamia* 15 (1980): 93–108.
- Berman, H. “Review of Archi, Alfonso. *Hethitische Orakeltexte*, KUB 49 and 50.” *JCS* 34/1–2 (1984): 118–26.
- Camatta, P. “Die Stadt Hanhana und ein Identifizierungsvorschlag.” *AoF* 33/2 (2006): 263–70.
- Cammarosano, M. *Il decreto antico-ittita di Pimpira*. Eothen 14. Firenze: LoGisma, 2006.
- Campbell, D. *Mood and Modality in Hurrian*. Languages of the Ancient Near East 5. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- Carruba, O. *Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišuriyanza*. StBoT 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966.
- . *Das Palaische: Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon*. StBoT 10. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970.

- Chavalas, M. *The Ancient Near East: Historical Sources in Translation*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Christiansen, B. *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi. Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429, und CTH 463*. StBoT 48. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.
- Civil, M. (ed). *Izi = isatu, Ka-gal = abullu and Nig-ga = makkuru*. MSL 13. Roma: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1971.
- Collins, B.J. "Hattušili I, the Lion King." *JCS* 50 (1998): 15–20.
- . "Necromancy, Fertility, and the Dark Earth: The Use of Ritual Pits in Hittite Cult." In *Magic and Ritual in the Ancient World*, edited by P. Mirecki and M. Meyer, 224–41. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . "The Place of KBo 13.145 in the Hantitaššu Text Tradition." In *Beyond Hatti. A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, edited by B.J. Collins and P. Michalowski, 63–74. Atlanta, Lockwood Press: 2013.
- . "Ritual of Puliša (CTH 407)." Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified July 23, 2014, [hethiter.net/CTH 407](http://hethiter.net/CTH_407).
- Cornil, P. "La tradition écrite des textes magiques hittites." *Ktema* 24 (1999): 7–16.
- Crasso, D. "Alcuni aspetti culturali della città ittita di Ankuwa." *AoF* 33/2 (2006): 328–46.
- Dardano, P. *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattuša (CTH 276–282)*. StBoT 47. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.
- de Martino, S. "Hattušili I e Haštayar: un problema aperto." *Oriens Antiquus* 28/1 (1989): 1–24.
- del Monte, G.F. "Ulmitešub re di Tarhuntaša." *EVO* 14–15 (1991–92), 123–48.
- . "Sui rituali di Malidunna di Turmita." *Silva Anatolica: Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by P. Taracha, 63–75. Warsaw: Agade, 2002.
- . "The Hittite Herem." In *Memoriae Igor M. Diakonoff*, edited by L. Kogan, 27–45. Babel und Bibel 2. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- Della Casa, R. "A Theoretical Perspective of the *Telepinu Myth*: Archetypes and Initiation in Historical Contexts." *Antiguo Oriente* 8 (2010): 97–116.
- Eichner, H. "Einige Fehlschreibungen und Fehllesungen in hethitischen Texten." *Die Sprache* 21 (1975): 157–65.

- Engelhard, David. *Hittite Magical Practices: An Analysis*. Ph.D. Diss., Brandeis, 1970.
- Farber, W. "Witchcraft, Magic, and Divination in Ancient Mesopotamia." In *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, edited by J. Sasson. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995.
- Frankfurter, D. "Narrating Power: The Theory and Practice of the Magical *Historiola* in Ritual Spells." In *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, edited by M. Meyer and P. Mirecki, 455–76. *Religions in the Graeco-Roman World* 129. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Friedrich, J. *Aus dem hethitischen Schrifttum: Übersetzungen von Keilschrifttexten aus dem Archiv von Boghasköi, 2 heft: Religiöse Texte*. Leipzig, 1925.
- Fuscagni, F. "Una nuova interpretazione del rituale CTH 423 alla luce di tre nuovi duplicati." *KASKAL* 4 (2007): 181–220.
- . "Rituale per le dee Anzili e Zukki (CTH 439)." Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified August 30, 2011, hethiter.net/: CTH 439.
- . "Beschwörung und Mythos: Fragment eines zweisprachigen (hattisch-hethitischen) Textes (CTH 457.6)." Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified December 19, 2012, hethiter.net/: CTH 457.6.
- . "Fragment eines Beschwörungsrituals (CTH 458.45)." Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified January 14, 2014, hethiter.net/: CTH 458.45.
- . "Ein Fragment des Flussrituals der Ammā, ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI des Sonnengottes (CTH 456.2.2)." Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified February 28, 2014, hethiter.net/: CTH 456.2.2.
- . "Ein Flussritual der Ammā, ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI des Sonnengottes, für die Reinigung des Ritualherrn (CTH 456.2.1)." Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified October 13, 2014, hethiter.net/: CTH 456.2.1.
- . "Reinigungsritual der Punaušha für eine vertriebene Gottheit (CTH 456.3)." Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified February 17, 2015, hethiter.net/: CTH 456.3.
- . "Fragment eines Beschwörungsrituals mit mythologisch-erzählenden Partien (CTH 458.1)." Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified December 22, 2015, hethiter.net/: CTH 458.1.1.
- Gilan, A. "Das Huhn, das Ei und die Schlange. Mythos und Ritual im Illuyanka-Text." In *Hethitische Literatur: Überlieferungsprozesse, Textstrukturen, Ausdrucksformen und Nachwirken: Akten des Symposiums vom 18. bis 20. Februar 2010 in Bonn*, ed. M. Hutter and S. Hutter-Braunsar, 99–114. AOAT 391. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2011.

- Giorgieri, M. “Die erste Beschwörung der 8. Tafel des Šalašu-Rituals.” In *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi 10/2*, edited by D.I. Owen and G. Wilhelm, 71–86. Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians 9. Bethesda: CDL Press, 1998.
- Goedegebuure, P. “Central Anatolian Languages and Language Communities in the Colony Period: A Luwian-Hattian Symbiosis and the Independent Hittites.” In *Anatolia and the Jazira During the Old Assyrian Period*, edited by J.G. Dercksen, 137–80. PIHANS 111. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2008.
- . *The Hittite Demonstratives: Studies in Deixis, Topics and Focus*. StBoT 55. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015.
- Goetze, A., in collaboration with E. Sturtevant. *The Hittite Ritual of Tunnawi*. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1938.
- . *Kulturgeschichte Kleinasiens*, 2nd ed. München, 1957.
- Görke, S. *Das Ritual der Aštu (CTH 490): Rekonstruktion und Tradition eines hurritisch-hethitischen Rituals aus Boğazköy-Hattuša*. CHANE 40. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . “Ein taknaz-da- und Ersatzfiguren-Ritual (CTH 448.2.1.1).” Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified December 15, 2015, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.1.1.
- . “Ein Paralleltext von CTH 448.2.1.1 (CTH 448.2.1.2).” Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified January 14, 2011, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.1.2.
- . “Ein Paralleltext von CTH 448.2.1.1 (CTH 448.2.1.3).” Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified January 14, 2011, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.1.3.
- . “Ein Paralleltext von CTH 448.2.1.1 (CTH 448.2.1.4).” Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified January 25, 2012, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.1.4.
- . “Ein taknaz-da- und Ersatzfiguren-Ritual mit Nennung von König und Königin (CTH 448.2.2.1).” Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified January 25, 2012, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.2.1.
- . “Ein Paralleltext zu CTH 448.2.2.1 (CTH 448.2.2.2).” Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified May 2, 2012, hethiter.net/: CTH 448.2.2.1.
- . “Ein Ritual der Mallidunna für den Sonnengott (CTH 403.1).” Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified April 15, 2015, hethiter.net/: CTH 403.1.
- . “Ein Ritual der Mallidunna für Ḫannaḫanna (CTH 403.2).” Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified June 8, 2015, hethiter.net/: CTH 403.2.

- Groddek, D. "Die rituelle Behandlung des verschwundenen Sonnengottes (CTH 323)." In *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by P. Taracha, 119–31. Warsaw, 2002.
- . *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KUB 55. DBH 4*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002.
- . *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 39. DBH 11*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004.
- . *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KUB 59. DBH 14*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004.
- . *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KUB 60*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006.
- . *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 22. DBH 24*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008.
- . *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 48. DBH 38*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012.
- . *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 58. DBH 39*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012.
- Haas, V. *Der Kult von Nerik: Ein Beitrag zur hethitischen Religionsgeschichte*. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1970.
- . "Ein hethitische Beschwörungsmotiv aus Kizzuwatna: seine Herkunft und Wanderung." *OrNS* 40 (1971): 410–30.
- . "Magie und Zauberei. B. Bei den Hethitern." in *RIA* 7 (1987–1990): 234–55.
- . "Die hurritisch-hethitischen Rituale der Beschwörerin Allaiturah(h)i und ihr literarhistorischer Hintergrund." In *Hurriter und Hurritisch*, 117–43. Xenia 21. Konstanzer, 1988.
- . "Das Ritual gegen den Zugriff der Dämonen ^DDÌM.NUN.ME und die Sammeltafel KUB XLIII 55." *Oriens Antiquus* 27/1–2 (1988): 85–104.
- . "Magie in hethitischen Gärten." In *Documentum Asiae Minorie Antiquae: Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by E. Neu and Ch. Rüster, 121–42. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988.
- . *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. HdO I:15. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . "Der heilkundige Jäger." *SMEA* 40/1 (1998): 143–45.
- . *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica: Ein Beitrag zur Heilkunde im Alten Orient*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.
- . "Betrachtungen zur Traditionsgeschichte hethitischer Rituale am Beispiel des 'Sündenbock'-Motivs." In *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the*

- Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by G. Beckman, R. Beal, and G. McMahon, 131–41. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- . *Die hethitische Literatur: Texte, Stilistik, Motive*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.
- . “Notizen zu den Ritualen der Frau Allaituraḫi aus Mukiš.” *AoF* 34:1 (2007): 11–29.
- . *Hethitische Orakel, Vorzeichen und Abwehrstrategien*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- . “Ein jat-ro-magisches Ritual gegen einen Fluchzwang.” In *Pax Hethitica: Studies on the Hittites and Their Neighbours in Honour of Itamar Singer*, ed. Y. Cohen et al., 178–82. StBoT 51. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.
- Haas, V. and L. Jakob-Rost, “Das Festritual des Gottes Telipinu in Hanhana und in Kašha: Ein Beitrag zum hethitischen Festkalender.” *AoF* 11/1 (1984): 10–91.
- Haas, V., and H. J. Thiel. *Die Beschwörungsrituale der Allaiturah(h)i und verwandte Texte*. AOAT 31. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978.
- Haas, V., and I. Wegner. *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen*^{SAL}ŠU.GI. ChS I/5. Roma: Multigrafica Editrice, 1988.
- . “Die Orakelprotokolle aus Kuşaklı – Ein Überblick.” *MDOG* 128 (1996): 105–120.
- Hallo, W.W. and K.L. Younger. *The Context of Scripture*, vol. II: *Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Heinhold-Krahmer, S. “Zu Salmanassars I. Eroberungen im Hurritergebiet.” *Afo* 35 (1988): 79–104.
- Herbordt, S. *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbulln aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa*. BoHa 19. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2005.
- Hoffner, H. A. (Jr.). “Birth and Name-Giving in Hittite Texts.” *JNES* 27:3 (1968) 198–203.
- . “Incest, Sodomy and Bestiality in the Ancient Near East” in *Orient and Occident: Essays presented to Cyrus H. Gordon on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday*, edited by H.A. Hoffner, Jr., 81–90. AOAT 22. Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, 1973.
- . *Alimenta Hethaeorum: Food Production in Hittite Asia Minor*. AOS 55. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1974.
- . “Paskuwatti’s ritual against sexual impotence (CTH 406).” *Aula Orientalis* 5 (1987): 271–87.
- . *The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition*. DMOA 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

- . *Hittite Myths*. 2nd edition. WAW 2. Atlanta: SBL, 1998.
- . “Asyndeton in Hittite.” In *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by D. Groddek and M. Zorman, 385–99. DBH 25. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007.
- . *Letters from the Hittite Kingdom*. WAW 15. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- . “The Political Antithesis and Foil of the Labarna in an Old Hittite Text.” In *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis: Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, edited by I. Singer, 131–39. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 2010.
- Hoffner, H.A. and C. Melchert. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language, Part I: Reference Grammar*. LANE 1. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- Hrozný, F. *Hethitische Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi: In Umschrift, mit Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Boghazköi-Studien 3. Leipzig, 1919.
- Hutter, M. *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung: das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königspaar aus mittelhethitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 – KUB IX 34 – KBo XXI 6)*. OBO 82. Freiburg (Schweiz): Göttingen, 1988.
- . “Die wirkmächtigen Reden der Ritualexperten in hethitischen Texten: Anrufung der Götter, ‘Historiolae,’ und performative Funktion.” In *Wenn Götter und Propheten reden – Erzählen für die Ewigkeit*, edited by Amr el Hawary, 153–71. Berlin: EB-Verlag, 2012.
- Imparati, F. “Il testo oracolare KUB XXII 51 (CTH 577).” *Hethitica* 14 (1999): 153–77.
- Jakob-Rost, L. *Das Ritual der Malli aus Arzawa gegen Behexung (KUB XXIV 9+)*. THeth 2. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1972.
- Kammenhuber, A. “Die hethitischen Vorstellungen von Seele und Leib, Herz und Leibesinnerem, Kopf und Person.” *ZA* 22 (1964): 150–212.
- . *Orakelpraxis, Träume und Vorzeichenschau bei den Hethitern*. THeth 7. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1976.
- Kapeluś, M. “Les descriptions du deuxième jour du grand rituel funéraire des rois hittites.” In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology Warsaw, 5–9 September 2011*, edited by P. Taracha with the assistance of M. Kapeluś, 370–89. Warsaw: Agade, 2014.
- Kassian, A., A. Korolëv, and A. Sidel'tsev. *Hittite Funerary Ritual: šalliš waštaiš*. AOAT 288. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002.

- Kellerman, G. "The King and the Sun-God in the Old Hittite Period." *Tel Aviv* 5 (1978): 199–208.
- . *Recherche sur les rituels de fondation hittites*. PhD diss., Université de Paris, 1980.
- . "The Telepinu Myth Reconsidered." In *Kaniššuwat: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday, May 27, 1983*, edited by H.A. Hoffner, Jr. and G. Beckman, 115–23. AS 23. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1986.
- . "La déesse Hannahanna: son image et sa place dans les mythes anatoliens." *Hethitica* 7 (1987): 109–47.
- Klinger, J. "Zur Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches," *OLZ* 95 (2000): 5–13.
- . "The Cult of Nerik – Revisited." In *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)*, edited by F. Pecchioli Daddi, G. Torri, and C. Corti, 97–107. Roma: Herder, 2009.
- Kronasser, H. "Fünf hethitische Rituale." *Die Sprache* 7 (1961): 140–67.
- . "Das hethitische Ritual KBo IV 2." *Die Sprache* 8 (1962): 89–107.
- . "Nachträge und Berichtigungen zu 7/1961, 140–167." *Die Sprache* 8 (1962): 108–13.
- Kümmel, H.M. *Ersatzrituale für den hethitischen König*. StBoT 3. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967.
- Laroche, E. "Lécanomancie hittite" *RA* 52 (1958): 150–62.
- Lefèvre-Novaro, D., and Alice Mouton. "Aux origins de l'ichthyomancie en anatolie ancienne: sources textuelles et données archéologiques." *Anatolica* 34 (2008): 7–52.
- Lorenz, J. and I. Taş. "Neue Zusatzstücke zur ersten Tafel der Rituale der Frau Allaituraḫi aus Mukiš." *ZA* 101:1 (2012): 115–29.
- . "Zwei neue Anschlüsse zu hethitischen Beschwörungsritualen." *KASKAL* 9 (2012): 45–48.
- Marcuson, H. "The Festival of Ziparwa and the AN.TAH.ŠUM and *nuntarriyašha*- Festivals." *AoF* 38/1 (2011): 63–72.
- Marcuson, H. and Th. van den Hout. "Memorization and Hittite Ritual: New Perspectives on the Transmission of Hittite Ritual Texts." *JANER* 15:2 (2016).

Mazoyer, M. *Télipinu, le dieu au marecage: Essai sur les mythes fondateurs du Royaume hittite*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2003.

McMahon, Gregory. *The Hittite State Cult of the Tutelary Deities*. AS 25. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

———. “Cultural Boundaries in Hittite Ritual.” In *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Gary Beckman, Richard Beal, and Gregory McMahon, eds. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003: 265–80.

Melchert, H. C. “Pudenda Hethitica.” *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 35:3 (1983): 137–45.

———. “Hittite *tuk(kan)zi*- ‘cultivation, breeding.’” *Ktema* 24 (1999): 19–23.

———, ed. *The Luwians*. HbOr I/16. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

———. “Luvian Language in ‘Luvian’ Rituals in Ḫattuša.” In *Beyond Hatti. A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, ed. B.J. Collins and P. Michalowski, 159–72. Atlanta, Lockwood Press: 2013.

———. “Hittite *ḫuwapp*-, *ḫuppā(i)*-, and *ḫuppiya*.” In *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by D. Groddek and M. Zorman, 513–19. DBH 25. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007.

———. “Hittite *nakku(wa)*- ‘(spirits of) the dead.’” In *Munus amicitiae: Norbert Oettinger a collegis et amicis dicatum*, edited by H.C. Melchert, E. Rieken, and Th. Steer, 219–27. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 2014.

Miller, J. L. *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*. StBoT 46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004.

———. “Von Syrien durch Kizzuwatna nach Hatti: Die Rituale der Allaiturahhi und Gizija.” In *Motivation und Mechanismen des Kulturkontaktes in der Späten Bronzezeit*, edited by D. Prechel. *Eothen* 13. Firenze: LoGisma, 2005.

———. “Joins and Duplicates among the Boğazköy Tablets (21–30).” *ZA* 97 (2007): 133–41.

———. “Six Rituals ‘Edited’ in the Manner of Arusna.” In *Acts of the VIIth International Congress of Hittitology* vol. I, edited by A. Süel. Ankara: Aralık, 2010.

———. *Royal Hittite Instructions and Related Administrative Texts*. WAW 31. Atlanta: SBL, 2013.

Mouton, A. “Use of Private Incubations Compared to ‘Official’ Ones in Hittite Texts.” In *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität: Akten des religionsgeschichtlichen Symposiums “Kleinasien und angrenzende Gebiete vom Beginn*

- des 2. bis zur Mitte des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.*” (Bonn, 20.–22. Februar 2003), edited by M. Hutter and S. Hutter-Braunsar, 293–300. AOAT 318. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2004.
- . “KUB 22,61 (CTH 578): comment traiter les yeux de Mon Soleil?” *WO* 36 (2006): 206–216.
- . “Le porc dans les textes religieux hittites.” In *De la domestication au tabou. Le cas des suidés au Proche-Orient ancien*, edited by B. Lion and C. Michel, 255–65. Paris: De Boccard, 2006.
- . “Au sujet du compt rendu oraculaire hittite KBo 18.142.” In *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by D. Groddek and M. Zorman, 551–55. DBH 25. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007.
- . *Rêves hittites: Contribution à une histoire et une anthropologie du rêve en Anatolie ancienne*. CHANE 28. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . *Les rituels de naissance kizzuwatniens: un exemple de rite de passage en Anatolie hittite*. Paris: De Boccard, 2008.
- . “Le ‘mauvais œil’ d’après les textes cunéiformes hittites et mésopotamiens.” In *Pensée grecque et sagesse d’Orient. Hommage à Michel Tardieu*, edited by M.-A. Amir-Moezzi et al., 425–39. Bibliothèque de l’École des Hautes Études Sciences Religieuses 139. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 2009.
- . “Hittite Witchcraft.” In *Acts of the VIIth International Congress of Hittitology (Corum, August 25-31, 2008)*, edited by A. Süel, 515–28. Ankara, 2010.
- . “Sorcellerie hittite.” *JCS* 62 (2010): 105–25.
- . “Le rituel d’Allī d’Arzawa contre un ensorcellement (CTH 402): texte et contexte.” *CollAn* XI (2012): 247–66.
- . “Le rituel d’Allī d’Arzawa contre un ensorcellement (CTH 402): une nouvelle édition.” In *Beyond Hatti: A Tribute to Gary Beckman*, edited by B.J. Collins and P. Michalowski, 195–229. Atlanta: Lockwood Press, 2013.
- . “Rituels de ‘boucs émissaires’ en Anatolie hittite.” In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology Warsaw, 5–9 September 2011*, edited by P. Taracha with the assistance of M. Kapeluś, 558–87. Warsaw: Agade, 2014.
- Mouton, A. and J. Patrier, eds. *Life, Death, and Coming of Age in Antiquity*. PIHANS 124. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2014.
- Nakamura, M. *Das hethitische nuntarriyašša-Fest*. PIHANS 94. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2002.

- Neu, E. *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift*. StBoT 25. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1980.
- . “Zur Morphologie und Syntax einer mythologischen Erzählung aus althethitischer Zeit.” In *Novalis Indogermanica: Festschrift für Günther Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*, edited by M. Fritz and S. Zeilfelder, 315–31. Graz: Leykam, 2002.
- Oettinger, N. *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg: Verlag Hans Carl, 1979.
- . “Entstehung von Mythos aus Ritual. Das Beispiel des hethitischen Textes CTH 390A.” In *Offizielle Religion, lokale Kulte und individuelle Religiosität: Akten des religionsgeschichtlichen Symposiums “Kleinasien und angrenzende Gebiete vom Beginn des 2. bis zur Mitte des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.” (Bonn, 20.–22. Februar 2003)*, edited by M. Hutter and S. Hutter-Braunsar, 347–56. AOAT 318. Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 2004.
- . “Nochmals zu luwisch-hethitisch *hantiyara-*, *hantiyassa-* und *summiyara-*.” *Belkıs Dinçol ve Ali Dinçol’a Armağan/Festschrift in Honor of Belkıs Dinçol and Ali Dinçol*, edited by M. Alparslan et al., 543–47. Istanbul: Ege Yayınları, 2007.
- Orlamünde, J. “Überlegungen zum hethitischen KIN-Orakel.” In *Kulturgeschichten. Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Th. Richter, D. Prechel, and J. Klinger, 295–311. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker und Druckerei und Verlag, 2001.
- Otten, H. “Beiträge zum hethitischen Lexikon.” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 50 (1952): 230–36.
- . “Beiträge zum hethitischen Lexikon.” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 51 (1955): 124–29.
- . “Ein Reinigungsritual im Hethitischen: ^{GIŠ}ḫatalkišna-.” *AfO* 16 (1952–53): 69–71.
- . *Hethitische Totenrituale*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958.
- . “Zur Kontinuität eines altanatolischen Kultes.” *ZA* 52 (1959): 179–81.
- . “Eine Beschwörung der Unterirdischen aus Boğazköy.” *ZA* 54 (1961): 114–57.
- . “Die Religionen des alten Kleinasien.” In *Religionsgeschichte des alten Orients I*, 92–116. HbOr I:8:1. Leiden: Brill, 1964.
- . “Bemerkungen zum Hethitischen Wörterbuch III,” *ZA* 71 (1981): 215–20.
- Otten, H., and V. Souček. *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar*. StBoT 8. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1969.
- Paul, J. R. *Mesopotamian Ritual Texts and the Concept of the Sacred in Mesopotamia*. Ph.D. Diss., UCLA, 1992.

- Pecchioli Daddi, F. and A.M. Polvani. *La mitologia ittita*. Testi del Vicino Oriente antico 4. Brescia: Paideia, 1990.
- Popko, M. *Zippalanda: Ein Kultzentrum im hethitischen Kleinasien*. THeth 21. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1994.
- . “Weitere Fragmente zu CTH 418.” *AoF* 18:1 (1991): 44–53.
- . *Religions of Asia Minor*. Translated by Iwona Zych. Warsaw: Academic Publications Dialogue, 1995.
- . *Arinna: Eine heilige Stadt der Hethiter*. StBoT 50. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009.
- Prechel, D. *Die Göttin Išhara: Ein Beitrag zur altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte*. ALASPM 11. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1996.
- Pritchard, J.B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.
- Rieken, E. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. StBoT 44. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999.
- . “CTH 323.1 - Vom Verschwinden und der Wiederkehr der Sonnengottheit.” Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified August 12, 2009, hethiter.net/: CTH 323.1.
- Rosenkranz, B. “Ein neues hethitisches Ritual für ^DLAMA ^{KUŠ}kuršaš.” *Orientalia* 33 (1964): 236–56.
- Rost, L. “Ein hethitisches Ritual gegen Familienzwist.” *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 1 (1953): 345–79.
- Roszkowska-Mutschler, H. *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 44*. DBH 22. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2007.
- Rüster, Ch. and G. Wilhelm. *Landschenkungsurkunden hethitischer Könige*. StBoT Beiheft 4. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012.
- Rutherford, I. “The Dance of the Wolf-Men of Ankuwa. Networks and Amphictionies in the KI.LAM Festival.” In *Acts of the Vth International Congress of Hittitology: Çorum, September 02–08, 2002*, edited by. Y. Hazırlayan and A. Süel. 623–40. Ankara, 2005.
- Sakuma, Y. “Neue Kenntnisse hethitischer Orakeltexte 1.” In *Tabularia Hethaeorum: Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Košak zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by D. Groddek and M. Zorman. DBH 25, 599–606. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007.

- Salvini, M. *The Habiru Prism of King Tunip-Teššup of Tikunani*. Roma: Istitute editoriali e poligrafici internatzionali, 1996.
- Schwemer, D. *Die Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen: Materialien und Studien nach den schriftlichen Quellen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001.
- . “Gauging the influence of Babylonian magic: The reception of Mesopotamian traditions in Hittite ritual practice.” In *Diversity and Standardization: Perspectives on social and political norms in the ancient Near East*, edited by E. Cancik-Kieschbaum, Jörg Klinger, and Gerfrid G.W. Müller, 145–71. Akademie Verlag, 2013.
- Seeher, J. *Hattusha Guide: A Day in the Hittite Capital*. 2nd ed. Istanbul: Ege Yayınları, 2002.
- Sidel'tsev, A. “Inverted Word Order in Middle Hittite.” In *Anatolian Languages*, ed. V. Shevoroshkin and P.J. Sidwell, 137–88. Association for the History of Language Studies in the Science and History of Language 6. Canberra, 2002.
- Singer, I. *The Hittite KILAM Festival, Part One*. StBoT 27. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983.
- . *The Hittite KILAM Festival, Part Two*. StBoT 28. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1984.
- . *Hittite Prayers*. WAW 11. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Sommer, F. and A. Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I. (Labarna II.)*. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1974.
- Součková, J. “Edikt von Tuthaliia IV. zugunsten des Kults des Wettergottes von Nerik.” In *Investigationes Anatolicae: Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*, edited by J. Klinger, E. Rieken, and Ch. Rüster, 279–300. StBoT 52. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.
- Soysal, O. “Analysis of a Hittite Oracular Document.” *ZA* 90/1 (2000): 85–122.
- . *Hattischer Wortschatz in hethitischer Textüberlieferung*. HdO I:74. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Starke, F. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. StBoT 30. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1985.
- . *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. StBoT 31. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1990.
- Strauß, R. “Elemente mesopotamischer Ritualistik in hethitischen Texten: Das ‘Šamuḫa-Ritual,’ CTH 480.” In *Brückenland Anatolien? Ursachen, Extensität und Modi des Kulturaustausches zwischen Anatolien und seinen NACHbarn*, edited by H. Blum et al., 323–38. Tübingen, 2002.

- . *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kultugeschichte*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.
- Szabó, G. *Ein hethitisches Entsühnungsritual für das Königspaar Tuthaliia und Nikalmati*. THeth 1. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1971.
- Taggar-Cohen, A. *Hittite Priesthood*. THeth 26. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 2006.
- Tambiah, S.J. “The Magical Power of Words.” In *Culture, Thought, and Social Action: An Anthropological Perspective*, 17–59. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Taracha, P. Zu den hethitischen *taknaz da*-Ritualen.” *AoF* 12/2 (1985): 278–82.
- . “More about the Hittite *taknaz da* Rituals.” *Hethitica* 10 (1990): 171–84.
- . *Ersetzen und Entsühnen: Das mittelhethitische Ersatzritual für den Großkönig Tuthaliya (CTH *448.4) und verwandte Texte*. CHANE 5. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . “Anatolian Ḫannaḫanna and Mesopotamian DINGIR.MAḪ.” In *Investigationes Anatolicae: Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*, edited by J. Klinger, E. Rieken, and C. Rüster, 301–310. StBoT 52. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.
- Tischler, J. *Das hethitische Gebet der Gassulijawija*. IBS 37. Innsbruck, 1981.
- Tognon, R. “Il testo oracolare ittita KUB V 7.” *KASKAL* 1 (2004): 59–81.
- Torri, G. *La similitudine nella magia analogical ittita*. Studia Asiana 2. Rome: Herder, 2003.
- . “A Hittite Magical Ritual to be Performed in an Emergency.” *JANER* 4 (2004): 129–41.
- . “‘The Great Sun God Made a Feast’: A Mythical Topos in Hittite Ritual Literature.” In *Festschrift für Gernot Wilhelm anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 28. Januar 2010*, edited by Jeanette C. Fincke, 383–94. Dresden: Islet, 2010.
- Trabazo, J.V.G. and D. Groddek. *Hethitische Texte in Transkription KUB 58*. DBH 18. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005.
- Trémouille, M.-C. “La religion des Hourrites: état actuel de nos connaissances.” In *Nuzi at Seventy-Five*, edited by D.I. Owen and G. Wilhelm, 277–91. SCCNH 10. Bethesda: CDL Press, 1999.
- . “Les rituels magiques hittites: aspects formels et techniques.” In *La Magie: Du monde babylonien au monde hellénistique* vol. I, edited by A. Moreau and J.-C. Turpin, 77–92. Montpellier, 2000.

- . “I rituali magici ittiti.” *RANT* 1 (2004): 157–203.
- Ünal, A. *Ḫattušili III. Teil I: Ḫattušili bis zu seiner Thronbesteigung*. THeth 4. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1974.
- . “The Role of Magic in the Ancient Anatolian Religions According to the Cuneiform Texts from Boğazköy-Ḫattuša.” In *Essays on Anatolian Studies in the Second Millennium B.C.*, edited by H.I.H. Prince Takahito Mikasa, 52–85. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988.
- Ünal, A. and A. Kammenhuber. “Das althethitische Losorakel KBo XVIII 151.” *KZ* 88 (1974–74): 157–80.
- van den Hout, Th. *Der Ulmitešub-Vertrag: Eine prosopographische Untersuchung*. StBoT 38. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995.
- . *The Purity of Kingship: An Edition of CTH 569 and Related Hittite Oracle Inquiries of Tuthaliya IV*. DMOA 25. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . “Bemerkungen zu älteren hethitischen Orakeltexten.” In *Kulturgeschichten. Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Th. Richter, D. Prechel, and J. Klinger, 423–40. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker und Druckerei und Verlag, 2001.
- . “Orakel B. Bei den Hethitern.” *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 10 (2003): 118–24.
- . “Reflections on the Origins and Development of the Hittite Tablet Collections in Hattuša and Their Consequences for the Rise of Hittite Literacy.” In *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)*, edited by F. Pecchioli Daddi, G. Torri, and C. Corti, *Studia Asiana* 5, 71–96. Roma, 2009.
- . “The Ductus of the Alalah VII Texts and the Origin of Hittite Cuneiform.” In *Palaeography and Scribal Practices in Syro-Palestine and Anatolia in the Late Bronze Age*, edited by E. Devecchi, 147–70. *PIHANS* 119. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2012.
- . “Zu einer Stratigraphie der hethitischen Totenrituale.” In *Saeculum: Gedenkschrift für Heinrich Otten anlässlich seines 100. Geburtstags*, edited by A. Müller-Karpe, E. Rieken, and W. Sommerfeld, 301–306. *StBoT* 58. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015.
- Vieyra, M. “Rites de purification hittites.” *RHR* 119 (1939): 121–53.
- . “Le sorcier hittite.” In *Le Monde due Sorcier*, 101–25. *Sources Orientales* 7. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1966.
- von Schuler, E. *Die Kaškäer*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1965.

- Waal, W.J.I. *The Source as Object: Studies in Hittite Diplomatics*. Ph.D. diss., University of Leiden, 2010.
- . “Changing Fate: Hittite *gulš*/GUL-š-, ^d*Gulšeš*/^dGUL-šeš, Cuneiform Luwian *gulzā(i)*-/GUL-zā(i)-, Hieroglyphic Luwian REL-za and the *Kuwanšeš* deities.” In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Hittitology, Warsaw, 5–9 September 2011*, edited by P. Taracha with the assistance of M. Kapehuš, 1016–33. Warsaw: Agade, 2014.
- Watkins, C. “Toward a Hittite Stylistics: Remarks on Some Phonetic and Grammatical Figures.” In *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of H. Craig Melchert on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by R. Kim, et al., 356–62. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 2010.
- Wegner, I. *Hurritische Opferlisten aus hethitischen Festbeschreibungen Teil I: Texte für IŠTAR/ŠA(W)UŠKA*. ChS I/3-1. Roma: Multigrafica Editrice, 1995.
- Wilhelm, G. “Zwei mittelhethitische Briefe aus dem Gebäude C in Kuşaklı.” *MDOG* 130 (1998): 175–87.
- . “Vertrag Šuppiluliumas I. mit Ḫukkana von Ḫajaša (CTH 42).” Hethitologie Portal Mainz, last modified February 24, 2013, hethiter.net/: CTH 42.
- Wright, D.P. *The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature*. SBL Dissertation Series 101. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- . “Analogy in Biblical and Hittite Ritual.” In *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament: Internationales Symposium Hamburg, 17–21. März 1990*, edited by B. Janowski, K. Koch, and G. Wilhelm, 473–506. OBO 129. Fribourg/Göttingen, 1993.
- Yakubovich, I. “The reading of Luwian *ARHA* and Related Problems.” *Altorientalische Forschungen* 39:2 (2012): 321–39.
- Zehnder, T. *Die hethitischen Frauennamen: Katalog und Interpretation*. DBH 29. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.