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Bo Inventory numbers of the Boğazköy tablets
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### General Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adj.</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adverb</td>
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| C | consonant (e.g., -IC-)
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Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNS</td>
<td>Late New Script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luw</td>
<td>Luwian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med</td>
<td>middle (voice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mng unkn</td>
<td>meaning unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Middle Script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>neuter (gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>New Script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>unknown number (in transliteration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obv</td>
<td>obverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opt</td>
<td>optative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Old Script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pers</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pers comm</td>
<td>personal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poss</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postpos</td>
<td>postposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres / prs</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pret / prt</td>
<td>preterite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prev</td>
<td>preverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prohib</td>
<td>prohibitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pron</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ptc / ptcp</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ptcl</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refl</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rev</td>
<td>reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V / v</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb subs</td>
<td>verbal substantive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc</td>
<td>vocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>first, second, third person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols

- ? = reading of a sign is doubtful
- ! = mistaken placement; designation of column or tablet side differs from hand copy
- ma (BA) = mistaken sign. The sign before the exclamation mark is the expected sign, whereas the sign between parentheses is the mistaken sign visible on the tablet (whenever identifiable).
- [ ] = encloses lost text
- [( )] = encloses restorations according to a duplicate
- † † = encloses damaged but legible signs
- ⟨ ⟩ = omitted by scribal error
- ⟨⟨ ⟩⟩ = sign to be omitted
- x = illegible sign (in transliteration)
- [x] = erased sign
- [o o] = indicates amount of space in gaps; each o = space for one sign
- ma (BA) = sign written over erasure
- + = fragments joined directly
- (+) = fragments joined indirectly
- : = Glossenkeil
- § = paragraph
- §§ = paragraphs
- < = evolved from
- > = evolved into
- /…/ = phonological transcription
- * = reconstructed form
- = = separates morphological elements within words (in transcription)
- ( ) = word implied (in translation)
The present volume arose out of the international project *Luwili: Luwian Religious Discourse between Anatolia and Syria*, sponsored by the ANR (France, ANR-17-FRAL-0007-01) and DFG (Germany, YA 472/2–1). Alice Mouton and Ilya Yakubovich acted as the principal investigators of the French and German parts of the project, respectively, while Laura Puértolas Rubio was employed as a research associate in its French module.

The work on the text edition was organized as follows. The input for it was provided by a lexicographic database and online glossary of Luwian cuneiform texts prepared by Ilya Yakubovich within the framework of the *Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts* project (ACLT, Moscow) and *The Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Anatolian Corpus Languages* (eDiAna, Marburg-Munich). Laura Puértolas Rubio collated this database with the up-to-date list of Hittite-Luwian ritual texts available through the concordance of the Boğazköy cuneiform texts at the *Hethitologie-Portal Mainz*. This led to the expansion of the original corpus: we are deeply grateful to Timofey Arkhangelskiy, the erstwhile programmer of the ACLT project, who continued to assist us with this task. The next stage was the philological restoration of the available fragments, primarily conducted by Ilya Yakubovich, and their preliminary paleographic classification, primarily performed by Alice Mouton. This work went hand-in-hand with independent effort by David Sasseville, which resulted in establishing a number of joins involving Hittite-Luwian ritual texts, as well as the demonstration that a number of additional fragments belong to the relevant corpus. We are grateful to David Sasseville, who informed us of some of his discoveries ahead of their communication to the *Hethitologie-Portal Mainz*.

The translations of the texts published in the first volume were drafted by Alice Mouton and edited by Ilya Yakubovich. The preparation of the commentaries to individual fragments involved three project participants: Laura Puértolas Rubio summarized and evaluated the impact of previous scholars upon the interpretation of the relevant passages, Ilya Yakubovich focused on the new linguistic and philological insights, while Alice Mouton tackled the new anthropological interpretations. Naturally, many entries represent the result of joint effort, and all of them were approved by both co-authors. Ilya Yakubovich elaborated on the classification of the ritual fragments on the basis of the paleographic input provided by Alice Mouton. As for the new joins reached by project participants and other scholars, their attribution is provided in the editions of the relevant fragments.

The chapters of the second volume in part summarize and amplify the results that were reached in the course of preparing the text edition, and in part represent focused essays on several topics connected with the form or substance of the edited texts. The texts of the last group are set apart as appendices. Ilya Yakubovich drafted Chapters 1, 3, and 5, as well as Appendices I and II, Alice Mouton drafted Chapters 2 and...
and 4 and prepared the glossary, while Laura Puértolas Rubio wrote Appendix III. The co-authors read and amended one another’s drafts, but Appendix III remains the sole responsibility of Laura Puértolas Rubio, except for the personal communications that are explicitly acknowledged.

The preparation of the edition was delayed somewhat through the COVID-19 pandemic, and further as a result of applying for the permission to collate the relevant tablets at the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations in Ankara. Such an opportunity emerged first in October-November 2021. Over the two weeks spent in Ankara, Alice Mouton and Laura Puértolas Rubio were able to confirm the majority of the proposed joins and discovered several others. Although the new discoveries triggered the necessity to reshuffle our manuscript one more time, after the project funding period had ended, we deem this delay worthwhile. We would like to thank Yusuf Kır aç, director of the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations in Ankara, as well as all the members of the museum’s department of cuneiform and hieroglyphic inscriptions for their welcome and precious help.

All the contributors delivered several talks related to their work on the present monograph. Alice Mouton gave guest lectures at the University of Toulouse (December 2018), the University of Verona (March 2022), and the University of Mainz (September 2022), spoke at the seminar of the unit “Mondes sémitiques” at CNRS, Paris (January 2019), presented at the 65th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Paris, July 2019), the joint colloquium of the Luwili and PAaC partner projects (Verona, February 2021), and the joint DFG-ANR colloquium (Paris, June 2022). Together with Ilya Yakubovich, she gave presentations at the colloquium of the Luwili project (Paris, December 2019), the 24th Tronsky Memorial Conference (Saint-Petersburg, June 2020), and the 11th International Congress of Hittitology (Çorum, Turkey, December 2021). Laura Puértolas Rubio delivered talks on topics related to this volume at the 64th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Innsbruck, July 2018), the 6th workshop “Luwic dialects: Inheritance and diffusion” (Barcelona, March 2019), the 65th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Paris, July 2019), the colloquium of the Luwili project (Paris, December 2019), and the 11th International Congress of Hittitology (Çorum, Turkey, December 2021). She also gave an invited lecture at the University of Barcelona (June 2021). Ilya Yakubovich was invited to talk on the relevant topics at Wolfson College, Oxford (February 2022) and the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (October 2022); in addition, he presented at the 65th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Paris, July 2019), the joint colloquium of the Luwili and PAaC partner projects (Verona, February 2021), and the 67th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Turin, July 2021). We are grateful to all the participants at these gatherings who gave us feedback after the talks, either in public or in private.

In addition to the present monograph, the activity of the Luwili project has resulted in the publication of some twenty research papers. In the majority of cases, they show no intersection or only a limited overlap with the present edition; if they provide a background for some of our interpretations, they are naturally referenced and included in the bibliography. In two cases, however, we are obliged to report a more substantial overlap. At the beginning of the Luwili project, Alice Mouton and
Ilya Yakubovich prepared a paper “Where did one speak *luwili*? Geographic and linguistic diversity of Luwian cuneiform texts”, which was eventually published in *Journal of Language Relationship* 19/1 (2021): 25–53. A substantial part of this article addresses the stratification of the Hittite-Luwian rituals treated in this edition, and therefore it seemed appropriate to present these conclusions in some detail in Chapter 4, in particular in Section 4.3. Furthermore, Alice Mouton and Ilya Yakubovich published the Russian version of Appendix I as "Пролептическая конструкция в лувийском языке" in the almanac *Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philology* (XXIV: 206–33). This publication was a prerequisite for presenting on the relevant topic at the 24th Tronsky Memorial Conference (Saint-Petersburg, June 2020).
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(CTH 758–763)
RITUAL OF PURIYANNI AGAINST IMPURITY IN A HOUSE,
LARGE TABLET (IN THE 3RD PERS.)
CTH 758.1

Table of Manuscripts
A KUB 35.54 Bo 2450 + Bo 3369 + Bo 9473

Transmission and Research History
This is the best-preserved version of the one-tablet Puriyanni ritual, containing most parts of columns two and three and a small section of column one. All the relevant fragments have been published in the autograph together; their find-spot remains unknown. The ductus of the tablet shows the typical features of Middle Script (see Fig. 2.1). The tablet was acknowledged as the principal tablet of the Puriyanni tradition and published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 65–69. Significant portions of the text have been published as excerpts (e.g., Carruba 1982a, 3–4; Watkins 1987, 423–24; van den Hout 2001, 168, 182; Haas 2003, 226, 444, 712–14; Torri 2003, 58–59; Melchert 2003b, 145–46, Mouton and Yakubovich 2019, 214–15).

Transliteration
§ 1’
Obv. i
A i 1’ [GU₄.MAḪ 3 UDU.NÍTA 1 UDU.SÍR 1 MÂŠ.GAL 1-NU-TIM TUGNÍG.LÁMMEŠ 1? TUGU.É.A] TA-ḪAP-ŠÍ
A i 2’ [KUŠE.SÍRḪ Á ŠA EN SÍSKUR ú-e-eš-šu-w]a-aš
A i 3’ [nam-ma 1 TÚG ar-ḫa-ia-an ... NINDA.GUR₄.RA tar-na-a]š
A i 4’ [22 NINDA mu-la-ti-iš ŠA 1/2 UP-NI 20 NINDA.SIG 9 KU-KU-UB GEŠTIN]
Contents

 §§ 1′–5′ List of ritual implements
 § 6′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation
 §§ 7′–9′ Ritual waving of the *taluppi*-lump, with its Luwian incantation
 §§ 10′–11′ Presentation of items
 § 12′ Presentation of a wooden figurine acting as the substitute for the ritual patron
 §§ 13′–15′ Presentation of seeds, silver and gold to the Storm-god of the Open Country
 § 16′ Presentation of (symbols for) Heaven and Earth
 §§ 17′–21′ Ritual waving of a billy goat, with its Luwian incantation
 §§ 22′–25′ Sprinkling the ritual patron and his house with salted water, with its Luwian incantation
 § 26′ Presentation of salted water (twice; each time with a distinct Luwian incantation)
 § 27′ Removal of the ritual items, disposal of the animal substitute
 § 28′ Scattering of the ritual items
 § 29′ Fragmentary; mention of the ritual space as an uninhabited and uncultivated place

A peculiarity of CTH 758.1 vis-à-vis CTH 758.2 is the consistent use of the third person with reference to Puriyanni’s actions.

Translation

§ 1′

Obv. i

1′–2′ [Two bulls, three rams, one breeding ram, one billy goat, one set of fine clothes, (namely) one shirt] (of) felt [(and) shoes (that) the ritual patron wears (on occasions)];

2′–3′ [in addition, one piece of clothing (comes) separately].

3′ [x thick breads of *one tarn*-a-measure,

4′ [22 *mulatt*-breads of half a handful, 20 flat breads, 9] jugs of wine,
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§ 2′
A i 5′ [... LÚ.GA te-pu IN-BU ḫu-u-ma-an ku-[i]t-ta te-pu
A i 6′ [LÂL 2 NINDA.GUR₉.RA TÜR ṢA GA.KIN AG
A i 7′ [...]

§ 3′
A i 8′ [2 ḫu-pu-wa-i 2 GIŠ in-ta-lu-ziše URUDU 2 GIŠ mu-ú-i-la-aš URUDU
A i 9′ [2 GIŠ ḫa-ah-ra-an URUDU 2 GIŠ ti-du-ul-ri URUDU 2 GIŠ MAR URUDU
A i 10′ [2 ne-pi-iš URUDU 2 te-kân URUDU ...] ‘I te-pu
A i 11′ [1-NU-TIM ga-la-a-am-ma ...x-da]

§ 4′
A i 12′ [... še-ep-pi-it e-wa-an ka]r-aš GÚ.GAL
A i 13′ [...]x-ūš-ši-iš

§ 5′ [... GIŠ ḫAŠḤUR
A i 15′ [...]x šu-ma-an-za
A i 16′ [...] na-a]k-ki-u-eš

§ 6″
Obv. ii
A ii 1′ a-ʾan-t[a ...]
A ii 2′ ku-wa-at-ʾti x[...]
A ii 3′ ku-wa-at-ti DINGIR-LIM-n[i ...]
A ii 4′ a-du za-am-ma-an-za ú-[tar-ša ...]
A ii 5′ EMＥ-ma ŠU-ta-ia-[...]

§ 7″
A ii 6′ nu-ūš-ši iš-na-aš ši-i-n[a-an še-er ar-ḫa wa-aḥ-nu-zi]
A ii 7′ na-aš-ta an-da ki-[iš-ša-an me-ma-i]

§ 8″
A ii 8′ za-a-ū-i-ia-aš ta-lu-up-pí-[iš a-aš-ta]
A ii 9′ ku-ra-ma-ti ḫa-ar-ta-t[i kar-ša-am-mi-iš]
A ii 10′ ku-lu-ūš-ta-na-ti ta-a[l-ku-um-mi-iš]

§ 9″
A ii 11′ a-at-ta ta-al-ku-du "a"-[at-ta kar-aš-du]
A ii 12′ EN SÍSKUR a-ap-pa a-ad-d[u-wa-al-za]
A ii 13′ ú-tar-ša EN SÍSKUR DINGIR₉₉₉₉-za [pâr-ra-an ni-iš]
A ii 14′ im-ra-aš-ša ṭLM-aš-ša-an-za [ḥal-li-iš-ša]
A ii 15′ pa-a a-an-da pu-u-na za-aš [ta-lu-up-pi-iš]
A ii 16′ la-a-la-ad-du
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§ 2′
5′ [...] a little bit (of) fine oil, fruits, all of everything in small quantity,
6′ [honey, two small] of cheese-bread,
7′ [...]...

§ 3′
8′ [2 kitchen pots, 2 copper shovels, 2] copper mūila-tools,
9′ [2 copper rakes, 2 copper tiddutri-tools, 2] copper spades,
10′ [2 copper nepiš-vessels, 2 copper hoes ...], a small quantity,
11′ [one set of brooms ...].

§ 4′
12′ [...] šeppit-grain, ewan-grain, ka]raš-grain, chick pea.
13′ [...]

§ 5′
14′ [...] apple(tree),
15′ [...] rope(s)
16′ [...] the na]kkīu-

§ 6′
Obv. ii
1′ “Insid[...]e.
2′ To whom [...].
3′ To which deity [...].
4′ the bewitched ma[ter ...].”
5′ With the tongue and hand [...].

§ 7′
6′ [He waves] the dough figuri[ne over] him
7′ and, at the same time, [he says] t[hus]:

§ 8′
8′ “Here (is) the taluppi-lump.
8′–9′ [It has been separated] by cutting (and) crush[ing] (and) flattened by the rolling tool.
10′ [...]

§ 9′
11′–12′ (Likewise), may he flatten them! [May] the ritual patron [separate them]!
12′–13′ [May] the ev[il] matter [not (be)] again [in the presence] of the deities of the ritual patron
14′ [(and turn into) the defilement] of the Storm-god of the Open Country!
15′–16′ So may this [taluppi-lump] take all (of those)!"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 10</td>
<td>A ii 17</td>
<td>[n]u-šša-an Ū-NU-TE MEŠ ḫu-um-a-an-[da]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 18</td>
<td>[kat-t]a ẖi-in-ki-iš-ke-ez-zi na-[š-ta an-da]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 19</td>
<td>[ki-iš-š]a-an me-mi-iš-ke-ez-zi [r]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 11</td>
<td>A ii 20</td>
<td>[...] x x x [...] GIŠŠÚ.A-an-za GIŠŠÚ.A-aš KI.MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 21</td>
<td>[...] GIŠku-up-pí-iš-ša GIŠGÌR.GUB KI.MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 22</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 12</td>
<td>A ii 23</td>
<td>[...]x-an ši-i-na-an GIŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 24</td>
<td>[...]x-li-iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 25</td>
<td>[...]BE-EL SÍSKUR tar-pa-a-aš-ša-aš za-a]m-ma-an-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 26</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 13</td>
<td>A ii 27</td>
<td>[nu-šša-an] KŪ.BABBAR KŪ.GI NU[MUN][r] GIŠ ḫu-um-a-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 28</td>
<td>[...]GIŠḫa-aḫ]-ra-an GIŠmu-ū-ī-la-ʾ an GIŠ in-ta-lu-zí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 29</td>
<td>[...]GIŠMA̱R GIŠ ti-id-du-ur-ri kat-t[a] ẖi-ik-zi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 30</td>
<td>’na-aš-ša-an da-ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 14</td>
<td>A ii 31</td>
<td>za-a-ú-i zi-ia-ar NUMUN[ça]-na [p]u-u-na-a-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 32</td>
<td>in-za-ga-a-an wa-aš-ḫa a-ta [BE]-EL SÍSKUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 33</td>
<td>GIŠḫa-at-ta-ra-a-ti ḫa-at-ta-[r]i-it-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 34</td>
<td>GIŠtu-ur-ra-ta-ta tu-u-[r[a-a]-t-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 35</td>
<td>a-ta im-ra-aš-ša-[an] ḫim-u[n-t]i pa-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 36</td>
<td>ta-ra-a-u-i-it-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 15</td>
<td>A ii 37</td>
<td>a-ta pi-ia-at-ta im-ma-[r]a-aš-ša-an GI₉M-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 38</td>
<td>[a]-’ta za-ʾap-pa-at-ta at-tu-[wa]-al-za ú-tar-ša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 39</td>
<td>GIŠḫa-[a]-iš-ša a-ta [ap-p]a DINGIRMEŠ-an-za</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 40</td>
<td>’SA EN SÍSKUR pár-ra-an ni-[iš]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 16</td>
<td>A ii 41</td>
<td>a-ú-i-ti za-a-ú-i-pa t[ap-paš-š]a ’ti’-ia-am-mi-iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 42</td>
<td>pa-a-ti ku-wa-a-ti-in [tap-paš]-ša ti-ia-am-mi-iš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 43</td>
<td>na-a-wa a-a-ia-ri [ti-i]a-am-mi-iš-pa-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 44</td>
<td>[t]ap-paš-ša na-a-w[a-a-ia-ri za-a-ḫa SÍSKUR-aš-ša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii 45</td>
<td>[...]x a-ʾpa-ti-i’ ni-iš a-a-ia-ri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§ 10
17’–18’ He [pr]esents al[li] the items
18’ and, [at the same time],
19’ he say[s thu]s:

§ 11
20’ “[...] a stool (from among) the stools ditto,
21’ [... a footstool (from among) the footstool(s) ditto,
22’ [...]”

§ 12
23’ [...] a wooden figurine [...] (saying):
24’–25’ “[... the substitute for the ritual patron [...].
25’–26’ May this one pick up [a]ll the [b]ewitched [offerings]!”

§ 13
27’–29’ He presents silver, gold, all the see[ds], the [ra]ke, mūila-tool, shovel, [spa]de
and, [at the same time], he says thus:

§ 14
31’ “Here lie [a]ll (kinds of) seeds
32’ (and) underground treasures.
32’–33’ The ritual [p]atron has han[d]led them with the ḫattara-tool.
34’ He has han[d]led them with the tur[i]-tool.
35’–36’ He handed them over to the Storm-g[o]d of the Open Country.

§ 15
37’ He gave them to the Storm-god of the Open C[o]untry,
38’ [so that] he (i.e. the Storm-god) treated (ritually) the e[v]il matter
39’ (and) [defile]ment.
39’–41’ May they no[t] come b[ac]k into the presence of the deities of the ritual patron!

§ 16
41’ Here (are) h[ea]ven (and) earth!
42’ So, as [heav]en does not become earth
43’–44’ and (as) [e]arth does no[t b]ecome [h]eaven,
44’–45’ may these offerings likewise not become [...]!”
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§ 17
46’–47’ He waves the billy goat at the corners of the house,
47’ and, at the same time,
48’ he says [t]hus:

§ 18
49’–51’ "May they [l]et it go, (namely) the household (deities), the [p]odium, the hearth, the ḫuwahḫūrisant-, the ground

§ 19
Rev. iii
1 (and) the frame (of the house): the ev[il matter],
2 defilement, impuri[ty],
3 past (or) [p]resen[t],
4 internal (or) e[x]terna[l],
5 of the dead (or) the livi[ng]!

§ 20
6–8 Afterward, may it not (be) in the presence of these deities (and turn into) the defilement of the Storm-god of the Open Country!

§ 21
9 May the billy goat carry it away,
10 with (its) four legs, with (its) snout,
11 with (its) horns! May it carry it away!"

§ 22
12–13 (Regarding) the water [w]hich (is) poured into a ceramic cup,
13 salt (is) also poured into (it)
14 and then he [s]prinkles it in the house.
15–16 He also sprinkles (it) on the ritual patron
16 and he [s]ays thu[s]:

§ 23
17 "[W]ater (is) [bro]ught from the watercourse,
18 and [s]alt (is) brought from the remote (salt-lick) rock-f[ace].
19–20 In the futur[e, w]ater will [n]ot go (back) to the [watercourse],
20–21 and [in] the future, salt will no[t g]o (back) to the [rem]ote (salt-lick) rock-
face.

§ 24
22 (Likewise), may the [e]vil m[atter, def]ilement,
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A iii 23 [pa-r]a-at-ta-an-za a-ap-pa za-’a’-[at-ti] pár-ni
A iii 24 [zi-i]a ni-iš a-ú-i-t[i]

§ 25”
A iii 25 [wa]l-’a’-ar-ša ku-wa-ti-i-in ḫa-[la]-a-al
A iii 26 [a]-ta ḫa-la-a-al a-aš-du za-’a’ [p]á-r-na-an-za
A iii 27 [Di]NGIRIMES-ni-in-zi ḫu-u-u-[u]-ḫu-rša-a[n-ti]-i-in-zi
A iii 28 [d]a-a-ru-ša ti-ia-am-mi-iš ḫ[u-u-u]m-ma-ti-iš
A iii 29 [GU]NNI-ti-iš GIŠkat-ta-lu-uz-[zi]-ša
A iii 30 ’a’-ta ḫa-la-a-al a-aš-[d]u

§ 26”
A iii 31 [GAL.G]IR₄ da-a-i n[u BE-EL SÍSKUR pa-r]a-a e-ep-zi
A iii 32 [nu me-m]a-i la-ú-na-’i’-[mi-ša-a]š-du ḫu-u-um-ti-iš
A iii 33 [GAL.GIR₄ n]am-ma da-a-i nu pa-r[a-a] [e]-ep-zi
A iii 34 [nu me]-ma-i la-a-ú-na-i-mi-ša-’aš a-aš-du
A iii 35 [ta]-ru-uš-ša ti-ia-am-mi-iš [INGIRMES-]e-n-zi
A iii 36 [hu]-’u-u-ḫu-u-ša-an-ti-i-n-i zi GUN-[U]-ti-iš [GIŠkat-ta-lu-uz-zi]-ša
A iii 37 [a-a]-t-ta za-a-ú-i la-ḫu-ni-i-ḫa a-[ad-du-wa-al]-za
A iii 38 [u]-tar-ša a-ta [x] a-ap-pa DI[N]GIRIMES-an-[za pár-ra-an ni-iš a-ú-i-ti]

§ 27”
A iii 39 [n]u Ú-NU-TEMES ḫu-u-[ma-a]-n-d[ [...] a [...] ]
A iii 40 [k]u-it ku-it A-NA SÍSKUR […] na-at]
A iii 41 ’E’-er-za pa-ra-a ú-da-[i […]]
A iii 42 ’pa’-ra-a u-un-na-i na-a[t […]]

§ 28”
A iii 43 nu Ú-NU-TEMES ḫu-u-[ma-a]-n-[da […]]
A iii 44 ar-ḫa iš-ḫu-wa-a-i […]
A iii 45 a-ni-u-ri ḫar-ta nu ŠU[R’ […]]

§ 29”
A iii 46 ku-wa-pi-ša GIŠMAR.G[ID.DA […]]
A iii 47 ḫar-ša-u-wa-ar-[r[a […]
A iii 48 ’na-’a[t […]

Commentary

i 1’–13’: These paragraphs are restored based on KUB 7.14(+) §§ 2–4 (CTH 758.2.1) and IBoT 3.96+ §§ 1’–4’ (CTH 758.3.1).

i 1’: The expression ‘fine clothes’ designates expensive pieces of clothing that are usually worn by members of the Hittite social elite, including the royal family. This
23–24  [im]purity not come back to th[is] house [in the fu]ture!

§ 25”
25  As [w]ater (is) pu[r]e,
26–29  may this [h]ouse, (its) [de]ities, ḫuwaḫḫurša[nt]-[s], [fr]ame, ground, po[di]um, [he]arth, and thres[ho]ld be pure!
30  Ma[y] it be pure!”

§ 26”
31  He takes the [ceramic cu]p, he holds (it) [towa]rd [the ritual patron],
32  [and] he [say]s: "May the podium [be] wash[ed]!"
33  He takes [the ceramic cup a]gain, he holds (it) towa[rd] [the ritual patron],
37–38  Here, I have washed off the evil matter.
38  [May] it [not come] back [into the presence of] the deities!”

§ 27”
39–40  All the items, [w]hatever [... he had] for the ritual,
40–41  he bring[s them] out of the house.
41–42  He [also] drives [the substitute] forth
42  and [he ...] it.

§ 28”
43–44  He scatters away all the items [...].
44–45  [whatever ...] he had for the ritual, [he ...].

§ 29”
46  Wherever a wagon [...]
47  an[d] a plowed field [(are) not present],
48  [...] it.

shows that the ritual is aimed at a high-ranking person, which is further confirmed by the high quantity of breads mentioned in lines 4′ ff.

§ 2′: SA EN SÍSKUR uēššuwaš (lit. ‘of wearing of the ritual patron’). These clothes might be the same as those mentioned in KBo 22.137+ § 2′ (CTH 758.2.2) for dressing the likely substitute for the ritual patron.
i 6’: For the translation ‘cheese-bread’, see the commentary to KUB 7.14(+). i 11 (CTH 758.2.1).

i 7’: Because of the restricted space in this line, one expects either $\text{NINDA el-wa-ti-ia-ti-is}
\text{tar-na-aš}$ or $\text{sa-ku-wa-an}
\text{gzu-pa-ri}$ to be restored here, in the light of KUB 7.14(+). § 3 (CTH 758.2.1).

i 10’: The Hittite noun $\text{tekan}$ designates a tool, namely a hoe or a mattock (Ünal 2007, 711). Its homophony with $\text{tekan}$ “earth” is clearly being used in the incantation occurring in § 16’. Similarly, we believe that this first occurrence of $\text{nepiş}$ designates a vessel (see CHD L–N, 453a where iron $\text{nepiş}$-objects are mentioned) and that its homophony with $\text{nepiş}$ “sky, heaven” is also exploited in the incantation. The suggestion to interpret this object as a vessel is mainly based on the shape of the Anatolian hieroglyphic logogram CAELUM, graphically a cup. For a similar suggestion, see Soysal 2021.

i 16’: For the $\text{nakkiu}$-spirits, see Mouton 2020b. This is the only reference to these supernatural entities in the preserved part of the Puriyanni tradition, but ritual actions involving the $\text{nakkiu}$-spirits are attested several times in the Kuwattalla tradition. For a possible role of these spirits in the ritual, see the commentary to CTH 758.3.1.

ii 4’: The phrase $\text{za-am-ma-an-za}
\text{ú-[tar-ša]}$ ‘bewitched matter’ apparently represents a synonym of ‘evil matter’ (for which see below under ii 13’) and thus refers to the miasma. The adjective /tsammant(i)-/, with the variant /tsamnant(i)-/, is ostensibly derived from the noun /tsamman-/ ‘witchcraft’, which in turn is formally related to the verb /tsappa-(ti)/ ‘to treat ritually’ (see under ii 38’ below).

ii 5’: One would expect this mention of the tongue and hand to belong to the Luwian incantation, but it is difficult to provide a Luwian identification of $\text{SU-ta-ia-[-...].}$ Therefore, we provisionally decided to consider this line to be in Hittite. The tongue and hand represent a metaphoric reference to acts of witchcraft and evil speech. Compare the ritual destruction of the hand and tongue made of dough or paste in the Kuwattalla tradition.

ii 6’: This gesture is widespread throughout Hittite Anatolia (see Mouton 2015a, 82). In this context, it may designate the waved figurine as a ritual substitute for the patient or alternatively expose the agent of evil marked for the subsequent destruction. The choice between these two possibilities depends on whether the figurines under discussion are to be identified with the evil $\text{nakkiu}$-spirits (see the commentary to CTH 758.3.1).

ii 8’: For /talupp(i)-/ ‘lump, clod’ and its likely regional connections see Melchert 1998. For the use of the $\text{taluppi}$-object in Hittite ritual texts, see Haas 2003, 389–90. The manipulations with this object are common to the Puriyanni and Kuwattalla traditions, but its function appears to have been different. In the Puriyanni tradition its deformation metaphorically symbolizes the destruction of the miasma. Note also the consistent use of /kuramman-/ ‘cutting’ in CTH 758 vs. /kurattar-/ ‘cutting’ in CTH 761. The association of the figurine with the $\text{taluppi}$-lump in this context suggests that it is made of dough, which finds direct confirmation in the mention of /NINDAšina- in KBo 39.181(+), § 3 (CTH 758.6).
H. Craig Melchert suggests that /kuramman-/ refers to a cut off piece of dough involved in the preparation of the figurine, while the form ku-ra-ma-ti has the ablative rather than instrumental function (pers. comm.). See the Luw. 'ku/-ra-am-ma-an 'cut-off piece' attested in KpT 1.39 ii 4 (Cammarosano 2018, 68–69, 77). While the source function can be expressed by the dative case with the verb /kars-(ti)/ ‘to separate’, as is the case throughout the Kuwattalla tradition, the use of the ablative-instrumental in ku-ra-ma-ti is possibly influenced by the following ha-ar-ta-tl. In this context, we thought it best to interpret both ku-ra-ma-ti and ha-ar-ta-tl as abstract nouns.

For the Luwian verb /talku-(di)/ as the likely cognate of Hitt. ištalk- ‘to flatten, smash’, see Sasseville 2020c, 195. The context suggests that Luw. /kullustann(a/i)-/ represents a wooden instrument of strong physical impact, associated with the verb /talku-(di)/. In the Kuwattalla tradition, it appears alongside the millstone as a crucial device in the manufacturing of the taluppi-lump made of dough. The attempted translation ‘rolling tool’ follows the personal communication of H. Craig Melchert, who analyzes Luw. /kullustann(a/i)-/ as a derivative of the Proto-Indo-European root *kweelh₁ ‘to turn’. Compare the use of the rolling pin for shaping and flattening dough in modern households.

The verb [kar-aš-du] is tentatively restored based on KUB 35.55 (CTH 758.3.2).

Because the phrase /attuwaltsa udarsa/ is frequently associated with /xalissa/ ‘defilement’ and /parattantsa/ ‘impurity’ in CTH 758, we suggest that it refers to the miasma and is better translated as ‘evil matter’ as opposed ‘evil speech’ in such contexts. Hitt. idalu uttar constitutes a close parallel to this Luwian concept.

For the attestations of the “Storm-god of the Open Country”, see Haas 1994, 327–28 fn. 102, van Gessel 1998, 777 and Appendix III in this book. The expression “defilement of the Storm-god of the Open Country” seems to indicate that this god might be gravely affected by the impurity engendered by the ritual itself (differently Hutter 2003, 252). On this topic, see also Appendix III.

This fragmentary Luwian passage must be considered together with the mention of other items of furniture, apparently offered in KUB 35.68.9′–11′ (CTH 763.1.3.a). The offering of polluted furniture (probably to the Storm-god of the Open Country) might be a way to let this god deal with its impurity. The expression ‘a stool from (among) the stools’ might suggest that only one item of each category is offered as representing all the similar items. For a different morphosyntactic interpretation of this passage involving roughly the same translation, see the discussion of nominal morphology in the introduction to Melchert 2023. In this way, the totality of the polluted furniture is being transferred to the god for purification. As far as the ritual rhetoric is concerned, it is noteworthy to compare the structure of this “furniture” incantation with the frequent anatomical conjurations attested in several Hittite ritual texts; their structure usually compares the head of an animal substitute to that of a human ritual patron in the shape “a head for a head, an arm for an arm, (…)”; see Haas 2003, 70–75. The choice of using the same rhetoric for the furniture of the house has the result to personify the house. See also iii 1 for the translation ‘frame’.
ii 25′–26′: The wooden figurine acts here as the substitute for the ritual patron, see KUB 7.14(+)* § 5′ (CTH 758.2.1). For Luw. /arija-\(0{\bar{u}}\)/ 'to carry', distinct from /ari(ja)-\(0{\bar{u}}\)/ 'to raise', see Sasseville 2020c, 21–22. Based on the present context and the additional likely attestation of the same verb in KUB 35.15 ii1 5′, CTH 761.2.5 (q.v.), we modified its interpretation to 'to pick up'. For /malkassa/ 'offerings' see Appendix II.

ii 31′–45′: For a hypothesis about the metric character of this passage, see Francia 2014, 8–11.

ii 32′: The interpretation of in-za-ga-a-an wa-aš-\(a\)-\(a\) as 'underground treasures' assumes as a starting point that this is a designation of the precious metals. The reference to silver and gold appears to impose itself both on the basis of the previous § 13 and the parallel passage KUB 7.14(+) § 7′ (CTH 758.2.1), where the respective concept is expressed by Sumerograms KÙ.BABBAR 'silver' and KÙ.GI 'gold'. For a plausible etymology of wa-aš-\(a\) implying the meaning 'god', see Blažek 2017. Nevertheless, Luw. /wasx(a)/ appears to be synchronically distinct from the Luwian word for 'gold', which is hidden behind the spelling KÙ.GI-\(a\)[\(\hat{n}\)] in the parallel passage under discussion. As for the adjective /intskan(i)-/, this stem can be analyzed as a reflex of *int-tkan(i)- > *intstkan(i)- 'under-ground', where the first morpheme is presumably cognate with /inta/ 'below' (KUB 32.81+ § 5′, CTH 761.1.b q.v.) or possibly 'en-tskan(i)-' 'in-humated', with the same basic sense. The last possibility echoes Melchert 2003b, 145–48, who translated in-za-ga-a-an as 'things inhumated' and wa-aš-\(a\) as 'sacralized objects'. All the other interpretations offered for this phrase appear to be more problematic. In Melchert 2015a, 410, wa-aš-\(a\) is interpreted as referring to 'the seeds symbolizing evils that are to be relegated to the divine sphere', which is contradicted by the new combinatorial evidence. Melchert 2023 translates in-za-ga-a-an as 'compensatory offering' and remains agnostic about its etymology, while wa-aš-\(a\) is interpreted in the same dictionary as 'pledge, votive object'. The combination of 'compensatory offering' and 'votive object' seems, however, far too complicated as a paraphrase for 'silver' and 'gold'. Kloekhorst (2008, 861–62) assumed that in-za-ga-a-an designates the agricultural implements listed in the previous paragraph and translated this word as 'tools', which is again contradicted by the new combinatorial evidence.

ii 34′: For the implement /tur(i)-/, whose exact translation remains elusive, see Kloekhorst 2008, 900.

ii 35′–36′: While the seeds may metaphorically stand for the miasma that are destroyed in the course of the ritual, silver and gold must represent an offering to the Storm-god of the Open Country for accepting to remove the impurity, although this is a supposition (on this topic, see Appendix III). The combined transfer of offerings and polluted ritual items deemed to be destroyed in the course of the same rite has parallels in Hittite ritual texts—for example, CTH 448.4.9.a §§ 6′–7′ (Taracha 2000, 88–89).

ii 38′: The Luwian verb /tsappa-(ti)/ was first translated as either 'to slay (a victim) sacrificially' or 'to offer sacrificially (to a deity)' (see Poetto 2010; Sasseville and Yakubovich 2016). The translation 'to treat (ritually)', proposed here, modifies the first
meaning in the light of the present context and fits well with the etymological connection between /tsappa-/) and /tsamman-/ ‘witchcraft’ (Nikolaev 2019, 190–91, fn. 49 with ref.). Melchert 2023 (sub zappa) suggests a more narrow first meaning ‘to make accursed, damn’, which does not seem to be the optimal way of referring to the neutralization of impurity.

ii 39′–41′: The incantation indicates that the deities of the ritual patron are in danger of contamination if the ‘evil matter’, ‘impurity’ and ‘defilement’ come into their presence (see § 20″). Note that the paragraph division in this passage is unorthodox. Nevertheless, both the grammar and the known parallels to this incantation confirm the conclusion that the paragraph line is not aligned here with the clause boundary.

ii 41′–45′: The passage involving heaven and earth most probably refers back to the homophonous items listed at the beginning of the text (§ 3′). Although not mentioned in the accompanying ritual instruction (§ 13″), they are probably part of the tools being presented together with the precious metals, seeds and tools. The last sentence of this incantation might be a wish that the offerings not become impure again: the very process of offering them to the Storm-god of the Open Country would trigger their purification. The incantation, as a whole, focuses on removing them permanently from the household. For a possibility of offering a polluted ritual substitute and purifying it by this very gesture, see Mouton 2014a.

ii 46′–47′: Ritual treating the four corners of a house is a well-known technique for purifying it (HW² H, 28–29). This shows that not only the ritual patron (and potentially his gods), but also his whole house has been contaminated, as confirmed by the incipit of KUB 7.14 (+) (CTH 758.2.1). Through the waving of the billy goat at the corners of the house, the billy goat becomes a substitute for all inhabitants of the house. For the combination of the particle =ašta in the second position and the particle =kan outside the second position in the same clause, see Neu 1993, 139–140. Note that the phrase pár-ni ḥal-ḥal-tu-ra-aš-kàn ’at the corners of the house’ features partitive apposition.

ii 49′–iii 5: In this sentence, the parts of the house function as grammatical subjects while the miasma function as direct objects. For the interpretation of merisms in this passage, see Mouton and Yakubovich 2019, 214. The Luwian collocation /xallissa parattantsa/ ‘defilement (and) impurity’ finds a counterpart in the juxtaposition of ritual terms ha-la-iš and pur-ta-hi-eš in the Palaic incantation (KBo 19.153 iii 5), where these nouns apparently designate two types of blemish in a sacrificial animal (Mouton and Yakubovich 2019, 214 fn. 10). This yields further support to the connection between Luw. /paratt(a)-/ and Hitt. paprätar ‘impurity’ (see Kloekhorst 2008, 628–29).

ii 49′: The plural form pár-na-an-ti-in-zi (lit. ‘those possessing the house’) probably refers to household deities, which are mentioned before the ritually significant parts of the house. The ergative plural form ‘houses’ would make little sense in context. Furthermore, the incantation of § 26″ explicitly mentions the deities (of the household) together with the architectural elements we find here.

ii 50′: [h]u-u-um-ti-iš, variant [h]u-u-um-ti-iš (iii 32), cannot be separated from the noun ("PODIUM") hu-ma-ti in hieroglyphic transmission (KARKAMIŠ A11b, § 17),
indicating the space where statues of deities can be placed. In the context of a private house, such a space can also be called ‘podium’, although the interpretation that it is a niche cannot be ruled out.

iii 1: The ergative form ta-ru-ša-an-ti-šiš ostensibly belongs to the same paradigm as the nom.-acc. form [d]a-a-ru-ša (iii 28), variant [t]a-ru-uš-ša (iii 35), which in turn cannot be separated from ta-a-ru-uš-[š][a] (KUB 35.18(+)) iii 3’), variant ALAM-ša (KBo 29.3+ ii 22), the designation of the human body/shape in the Kuwattalla tradition, as well as (STATUA)ta-ru-sá ‘statue, image’, attested many times in hieroglyphic transmission. In the Puriyanni tradition, the same noun presumably refers to the structure of the house. In terms of morphology, we must be dealing with the stem /taru-/, extended by /-sa/ in nom.-acc.sg. (see Jasanoff 2010), while ta-ru-ša-an-ti-šiš is the secondary formation (the original ergative form would have been /taruwantis/). It seems likely that the stem /taru-/ was in general on its way to be reanalyzed as /tarus-/ in the dialect of the Puriyanni and Kuwattalla tradition, hence the dominant spelling ta-a-ru-uš-ša/da-a-ru-uš-ša in later texts. In contrast, in Late Luwian the same stem underwent reanalysis as /tarud-/, see e.g. KARKAMIŠ A1a § 31 dat.sg. /STATUA-ru-ti-i. No doubt, the nom.-acc.sg. form /taru-sa/ again played a role in this process. When applied to the human body, /tarus-/ is associated with /mijasantsa/ and designates the shape of a person, his silhouette vs. /mijasantsa/ which designates the flesh. Therefore, we chose to render ta-ru-ša-an-ti-šiš as ‘frame’ in the current context, which hints at the polysemy with the anatomical term. The use of an anatomically connoted term for a part of the house is echoed by the incantation occurring in § 11”.

iii 6–8: This clause seems to indicate that the pollution engendered by the ritual under discussion might contaminate not only the personal deities of the ritual patron, but also the divine participant in the present ritual, namely the Storm-god of the Open Country. If the latter gets severely polluted during the ritual which occurs
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partly in his domain, i.e. in the open country, one would have to perform a second ritual in order to purify this god (see also Appendix III).

iii 10: For the body part /mannax(wann)i/-, see Yakubovich 2016a, 76 fn. 11 and Oettinger 2019. For /part(a)i/- 'leg', see Oettinger 2015a, 269–72.

iii 12–16: For other examples of the use of water with salt in purificatory rites, see Strauß 2006, 70.

iii 18–21: The adjective /al(a)i/- 'remote' is discussed in Rieken and Yakubovich 2022, whereas previously it was analyzed as either adjective 'high' or noun 'sea' (see Car-ruba 1982b, 47–48). For /uwaniya/- '(salt-lick) rock-face', see Watkins 1995, 145 fn. 19.

iii 23: For a similar restitution za-[t]i[pár]-ni, see Goedegebuure 2010b, 85 fn. 30.

iii 27: [DI]NGIRMES.-ni-in-zi ḫu-ḫu-ur-ša-a[n-t]-i-in-zi can alternatively be interpreted as 'ḫuwaḫḫuša[a][n-t]-s of the deities'. However, in the light of the list occurring in §§ 18″–19″, we prefer translating these two nouns as two independent entities.

iii 41–42: The billy goat functioning as a substitute for the household is probably disposed of (either sent away alive as a scapegoat to a distant land or slaughtered and buried/burned).

iii 47: This restoration is partly based on an analogous passage occurring in KUB 12.58+ (CTH 409.I) i 39–42: EGIR-an=ma=(š)šan ı-ı peran GIŠZA.LAM.GARḪA ŠA GI karū iyanta iyanzi=ma kuwapi nu kuwapi ḫaršauwar maninkuwan NU.GÁL [GIŠAPI]N U.L aranza nu GIŠZA.LAM.GAR apiya iyanza "Behind, a reed hut (has) already (been) made in front of the watercourse. Where do they make (it)? Where there is no cultivation nearby, (and in a place that) the [plo]w (has) not reached, (this is) where the hut (is) made." This space serves either as a depot of the ritual remnants (with their highly contaminating power) or as a liminal space for further ritual actions.

Transmission and Research History

This New Script tablet contains small portions of all four columns of a one-tablet ritual attributed to Puriyanni, including the incipit of the ritual. Judging by the find spot of A₃, the tablet comes from Temple I. The fragments A₁–A₄ were published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 60–61, 62–64, while A₅ was identified as part of CTH 758 and published in transliteration in Groddek et al. 2002, 100. The indirect join A₃ (+) A₄ is reported in Starke 1985, 63, the direct join A₃ + A₅ is offered in Sasseville 2020c, 553–55. Alice Mouton integrated the fragments A₄ and A₅ into the same tablet based on the analysis of their scribal hands (see Fig. 2.2).
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Transliteration

§ 1

Obv. i

A₁ i 1  UM-MA {x} ¹PU-RI-LA-AN-NI ma-a-an-kán UN-ši pár-ni
A₁ i 2  pa-ap-ra-tar ku-it-ki an-da e-eš-zí nu LI-LIT-aš ²²-pre-an
A₁ i 3  Pa-ra-at-ta-aš-ši in ki-iš-sa-an BAL-ḫi
A₁ i 4  nu ki-i da-ah-ḫi

§ 2

A₁ i 5  2 GU₄ MAH 3 UDU.NÍTA 1 UDU.SIR 1 MĀŠ.GAL 1-NU-TIM ³³TU-GU-LÁ[MES]
A₁ i 6  '1³³ TUGU.EA TA-ḪAP-SI₂₂.SIR(HA SA EN SISKU[R]
A₁ i 7  ú-e-eš-šu-aš nam-ma 1 TUĜ ar-ḫa-ia-an

§ 3

A₁ i 8  [o o] NINDA.GUR₄ RA tar-na-aš 22 NINDA mu-la-ti-[š]
A₁ i 9  [ŠA] 1/2 UP-NI 20 NINDA.SIG 9 ĐUS.KU-KU-UB GESṬIN
A₁ i 10  [o o] L.DO.GA te-pu IN-BU ḫu-u-ma-an ku-it-[a]
A₁ i 11  [te-pu] LAL 2 NINDA.GUR₄ RA TUR ŠA GA.KIN.AG
A₁ i 12  [x NINDA]₂₂.TI¬-wa¬-ti-ia-ti¬-šsar-na-aš ša-ku-wa-a[n GESzu-pa-ri]

§ 4

A₁ i 13  [2 ĐU-GU]-pu-wa-i 2 GES in-ta-lu-zi-iš [URUDU]
A₁ i 14  [2 GES]-ḫu-ia-lu-aš URUDU 2 GES ḥa-aḫ-ra-[a]n URUDU
A₁ i 15  [2 GES]-ḪU-IA-ta-lu-zi-iš URUDU 2 GES Mar URUDU [U 2 ne-pi-iš URUDU]
A₁ i 16  [2 te-kán URUDU] x x [...]

§ 5′

Obv. ii

A₂,i ii 1′ [...] x [...] x [...] x [...] x [...]
A₂,i ii 2′ [...]-I-e-eš-ši-ia-an-da-an na¬-da²₂-aš²²-ta-ḫi-[I]}
§ 14” Sacrifice of meat cuts and fruits
§ 15” Fragmentary Hittite passage

A peculiarity of CTH 758.2 vis-à-vis CTH 758.1 is the common use of the first person with reference to Puriyanni’s actions. Although §§ 2–11 of CTH 758.2.1 find counterparts in CTH 758.1, the deviations between the formulations of the respective paragraphs concern not only the style but also the substance of the ritual.

Translation

§ 1
Obv. i
1 Thus (speaks) Puriyanni:
1–2 If there is some impurity in a person’s house,
2–3 I perform the following sacrifice to the Storm-god of the Open Country—(that is), ‘(that) of impurity’.
4 I take this:

§ 2
5 Two bulls, three rams, one breeding ram, one billy goat, one set of fine cloth[es],
6 (namely) one shirt (of) felt (and) shoes (that) the ritual patron wears (on occasions);
7 in addition, one piece of clothing (comes) separately.

§ 3
8 [...] thick breads of one tarna-measure, 22 mulati-breads
9 [of] half a handful, 20 flat breads, 9 jugs of wine,
10 [...] a little bit of fine oil, fruits, all of everything
11 [in small quantity], honey, two small loaves of cheese-bread,
12 [...] lwatiyati-breads of one tarna-measure, one soaked [torch],

§ 4
13 [2 kitchen pots, 2 [copper] shovels,
14 [2] copper [n]āila-tools, 2 [copper] rakes,
16 [2 copper hoes ...]

§ 5’
Obv. ii
1’–2’ “[...]ēššiyandan nadātaḫi [...].

DOI: 10.13173/9783447119955.1.002
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC BY-SA 4.0 license. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/deed.en
The terms of the CC licence apply only to the original material. The use of material from other sources such as charts, illustrations, photographs and text extracts may require further permission for use from the respective rights holder.
© by authors
Rev. iii

A₃ iv 1' [...]x-[t]a-li-iš EN SISKUR tar-pa-ašša-aš
A₃ iv 2' [...]ma-an-t[a ma-al-][a an-da za-aš pu-na-ta’
A₃ iv 3' [...]a-ri-ia-[a-]du

§ 6’

A₃ iv 7’ [...]mu-ša-an GIL[š]MAR GIL[š] in’-ta-lu-zis in’-TI-du-ut-ri
A₃ iv 8’ [kat-ta ḫi-i]n-ga-mi ’na-ašša ta an-da kis-an me-ma-aḫ-ḫi

§ 7’

A₃ iv 9’ [za-a-ū i z]i-i-ia-ri ’NUMUN[N]A-na pu-u-na-[t]a KU.BABBAB-an KU.GI-a[n]
A₃ iv 10’ [a-ja EN SISKUR tu-u-’ar’a’-ti tu-ūr-[r]a-at-ta
A₃ iv 11’ [a-ja EN SISKUR] GIL[š]a-’ra-ri a-at-ta-ra-ri-[t]-ta’
End of col. ii

§ 8’

Rev. iii

A₄ iii 1’ [...] x x x [...]
A₄ iii 2’ [...] N SISKUR-ašša’aš-[an-za DINGIRMES.an-za ...]
A₄ iii 3’ [KU.BABBAB’-pa-a-ti] ku-wa-ti’-[t]-[in-]...
A₄ iv 4’ [...] ha-la-a]-li-iš EN SISKUR[R ...]
A₄ iv 5’ [...] ha-la-a]-li-iš a-aš-du

§ 9’

A₄ iii 6’ [na-aš-ta MĀŠ.GAL pár-ni ħa][l-tu-ma-ra-aš-kán ’an’-di[a]
A₄ iv 7’ [wa-aš-nu-mi na-aš]-a’-ra-an me-aḫ-hi

§ 10’

A₄ iv 8’ [ša-an-du-wa-ta pár-na-aš]-ši-in-zi ħu-un-tni-[n-zi]
A₄ iv 9’ […] wa-ḫu-rā-ša-an-ti-tn-[i]
A₄ iv 10’ […] ti-ia-am-mi-iš ta-ru-ša]-an-ti-in-zi

§ 11’

A₄ iv 11’ […] ad-du-wa-al-za ḫal-li-iš-ša pa-ra’-at’-ta-an-za
A₄ iv 12’ […] i-na-[n]-ta-an-ri]-[a]-na-an ir-wa-ašša pa-ri-it-tar-u-wa-ašša
A₄ iv 13’ […] [hu-it-wa-li-ia-an u-la-an-ta]-l-ia-ia-an pa-[a ad-du-wa-al-za)
A₄ iv 14’ […] ur-ta-ša ni-iš za-ašša-an-za DINGIRMES.an-za pár-[a-]an
A₄ iv 15’ […] im-ra-ašša GIL-āt-ša-an-an-za ḫal-l]-e-ešša’a’

§ 12’

Rev. iv

A₅ iv 1’ […]p]u’-[...] [...]
A₅ iv 2’ […]s]u’[s’... [...]}
3′ […] substitute for the ritual patron.
4′–5′ May this one [pic]k up all the [bewitche]d offerings!"

§ 6′
6′–8′ I [pre]sent [s]ilver, gold, all the seeds, the rake, [mūl]a-tool, spade, shovel (and) tiduri-tool
8′ and, at the same time, I speak thus:

§ 7′
9′ “[Here l]ie all (kinds of) seeds, silver (and) gold.
10′ The [rit]ual [patron] has handled [them] with the turi-tool.
11′ [The ritual patron] has handle[d] them with the hattara-tool.”
End of col. ii

§ 8″
Rev. iii
1′–2′ “[… to the deities] of the ritual [pa]tron […].
3′–4′ A[s silver] (is) [pu]re,
4′–5′ may the ritua[l] patron be [pu]re […]!”

§ 9″
6′–7′ [I wave the billy goat] a[t the c]orners [of the house],
7′ [and], at the same time, I speak thus:

§ 10″
8′–10′ “[May they let it (go)], (namely) the podiums, [hearth]s, the ħu]waḫuršant-s, [ground (and) fra]mes of the [hou]se:

§ 11″
11′ [the evil matter], defilement, impurity,
12′ [past (or prese]nt, interna[l (or) external],
13′ [of the living (or) the dea]d!
13′–15′ The[ν may the evil matter not (be)] in the presenc[e of the ritual patron’s de]ities [(and turn into) the de]filement of [the Storm-god of the Open Country]!”

§ 12″
Rev. iv
1′–2′ […]
Ritual of Puriyanni (CTH 758)

A₅ iv 3’ [EGIR²-an³]-da-ma […]
A₅ iv 4’ […]-da-arth […]
A₅ iv 5’ [ar-ḫa² du-w]a²-ar³-n[a-i …]
A₅ iv 6’ [ḫu-šaš]-w[a-an-ti-išši …]
A₅ iv 7’ [nu]N[ SÍSKUR […]x
A₅ iv 8’ [o] a-uš-zi

§ 13”
A₅ iv 9’ [EGIR-an³]-da-ma A-AN-NI […]
A₅ iv 10’ […]-ṣa-pår-shi-a x […]
A₅ iv 11’ […]-x-pat’ a³-ša-an-[du …]
A₅ iv 12’ […]x A-NA EN SÍSKUR
A₅ iv 13’ […] MUKAM] GID.DA I-NA EGI[R.U₄-MI …]
A₅ iv 14’ [ḫa-ašš]-u-uš ḫa-an-za-ašš[u-uš …]

§ 14”
A₅ iv 15’ [EGIR-an³]-n-da-ma UZU zi-x […]
A₅ iv 16’ […]-ṣa-ašš-uḫḫu-r[a-i …]
A₅ iv 17’ […]-ṣa-ašš-[a]-ašš-ta-[i …]
A₅ iv 18’ [ašš]-ṣa-ašš-[a]-ašš-ta-[i …]

§ 15”
A₅ iv 19’ [EGIR-an³]-da-ma-ašš-ša-an […]
A₅ iv 20’ […]-išši-x […]

Commentary

i 1–3: Compare this incipit with the entry of the tablet-catalog KBo 31.6 iii 17’–18’ (Dardano 2006, 186): [x TUPPU INIM] ḫPRIYANNI mān–kan UN-ši parni papa[ratar kuitki anda ēšzi n-an] parkunnumni qaTI “[xth tablet. Words] of Puriyanni. If [there is some] impu[rit]y in a person’s house, I purify [him]. Finished.” Compare also the colophon of CTH 758.2.3.

i 1: This proper name is preceded by the determinative of masculine names. The fact that the main ritual expert is a man is noteworthy. The most frequent male ritual expert is the AZU-ritual practitioner, who is also in charge of purification rituals. Yet, other possibilities might be contemplated as well, so that it is difficult to determine Puriyanni’s social status with certainty. Miller (2004, 492 fn. 879) stresses the fact that Puriyanni is also preceded by the male determinative in KBo 29.1 iv 3’ and KUB 35.57 i 1 but is accompanied by the female determinative in the tablet-catalog KBo 31.6 iii 17’. Furthermore, he shows that this gender confusion appears with six ritual experts (Miller 2004, 488–92, table 19). These data are adduced in support of the hypothesis that Anatolian ritual experts "to whom the compositions were ascribed may also have
§ 13”
9’–10’ [Afterward, Puriy[anni] crumbles [the ... bread an]d [...] (saying):
11’ “May they be [...] 
12’ [...] for the ritual patron:
13’ (namely) [...] the long [years], fut[u]re time [...] 
14’ [the de]scendants, [...]!”

§ 14”
15’–18’ [Afterward, he sacrifi[c]es the meat (of) [...] toget[her with the muh][r(ai-body part, ...], the backbone, [...] and the [fru]its.

§ 15”
19’ [Afterward, ...] 
20’ [...]
i 11: For another interpretation of NINDA,GUR₄,RA ŠA GA,KIN,AG, see Fritzsche 2011, 35. We decided not to follow this interpretation here, since the parallel expression NINDA,GUR₄,RA ŠA ĠISPÈŠ mentioned by this author shows that NINDA,GUR₄,RA cannot be reduced to the concept of loaf, but implies bread.

i 12: According to HW³ I, 48 this bread name is otherwise only attested in KBo 39.181(+) (CTH 758.6).

ii 3': CTH 758.1 § 12" shows that this ritual substitute is a wooden figurine.

iii 1’ and followings: the collation of the original fragment A₁ at the Ankara museum shows that this fragment corresponds to the first third of column three.

iii 3’–5': This tentative restoration is based on the attestations of silver in line 15 and the parallels attesting the purification power of silver (see Strauß 2006, 179–80).

SMALLER FRAGMENTS (IN THE 1ST PERS.)

CTH 758.2.2

Table of Manuscripts

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>KBo 22.137</td>
<td>Bo 69/116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>+ KBo 29.4</td>
<td>+ 1053/u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₃</td>
<td>(+?) KUB 35.47</td>
<td>(+?) Bo 8756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmission and Research History

This New Script tablet probably contains the small fragments of all four columns of the one-tablet ritual attributed to Puriyanni. Judging by the find spots of A₁ and A₃, the tablet was kept in Temple I. The three fragments of this tablet were published in transcription as separate pieces (Starke 1985, 64–65, 67, 99–100; see Groddek 2008, 130–31), the first two were recognized as belonging to the Kuwattalla tradition in Starke 1985. The fragments A₂ and A₃ were indirectly joined to A₁ by Alice Mouton on the basis of paleographic considerations (see Fig. 2.3) and in view of the independent recognitions of A₂ and A₃ as parts of CTH 758 by Ilya Yakubovich. Later, what was first interpreted as an indirect join between A₁ and A₂ ended up to be a direct join thanks to Alice Mouton’s collation campaign at the Ankara museum. The indirect join with A₃ remains uncertain because of its small size. The indirect join between KBo 29.3 and KBo 29.4, assumed in KBo 29, IV and followed in Starke 1985, 98, has not found confirmation. The hypothesis that KUB 35.45, KUB 35.46 and KUB 35.47 belong to the same tablet (Otten in KUB 35, II) had been abandoned long ago and need not be resurrected.
iii 6′–15′: §§ 9″–11″ are restored based on CTH 758.1, §§ 17″–20″.

iii 6′: For the clitic =kan outside the second position combined with =ašta in the second position, see Neu 1993, 139–40.

iii 8′–10′: Note the deviation of list of the ritually significant parts of the house from its counterpart in KUB 35.54 ii 49′–iii 1 (CTH 758.1). The noun pár-na-an-ti-in-zi ‘household (deities)’ was presumably misunderstood and replaced here with the possessive adjective [pár-na-aš]-ši-in-zi, but since the latter must agree with plural head nouns, we end up with the description of a house with many podiums, hearths and frames.

iii 11′–13′: The miasma listed here constitute the direct object of the clause beginning in the preceding paragraph.

iv 9′–10′: Note the change from the first-person to the third-person discourse in the final part of the ritual.

Contents

§ 1′ Fragmentary Hittite passage
§ 2′ Dressing up the patient’s wooden substitute(?) before the ħuwaši-stone
§§ 3′–4′ Fragmentary Hittite passage mentioning a bull. Taking a rope and cutting off a dough figurine by the ritual expert, with its Luwian incantation
§§ 5′–6′ Cutting a ritual item (perhaps a dough figurine), with its Luwian incantation(?)
§§ 7″–8″ Sprinkling salted water, with its Luwian incantation
§ 9″ Fragmentary Hittite passage
§ 10″ Breaking ritual implements; sprinkling water over the ritual patron; bread offering to the Sun-god and the Storm-god of the Open Country, with its Luwian incantation

§ 4′ and §§ 7″–8″ find approximate parallels in CTH 758.1 and CTH 758.3.2, but show difference in detail.
Translation

§ 1′

Obv. ii
A₁ ii 1 x[...][x−']u-wa’-an nu a-pé’-e’-[...]
A₁ ii 2 [...][x QA-TAM-[x]MA [...]
A₁ ii 3 [...][x ū-ra-a-ni [...]

§ 2′

A₁ ii 4 nu E[N SÍSKUR ALAM?] GIŠ? ...][A-NA NA-hu-u-wa-[i-ia]
A₁ ii 5 kat-ta-a[n da-a-i na-aš] ...][ti-ia-zi nu TÚG-L[AMMES]
A₁ ii 6 ku-e ha-an’-[da-a[n-ta TÚG]\']A ṭA-ṭAP-[ši]
A₁ ii 7 KUSE.SIR[HA] na-’at [E][N ’SÍSKUR] a-pé-e-[da-aš]
A₁ ii 8 A-NA TÚG-LÁMMEŠ še’-er’ ar-ha wa-aš-[ši-ia-az-zi]

§ 3′

A₁ ii 9 nu GU₄ MAH u-un-ni-an-z[ti] na-’an [E]-NA’ [x][...]
A₁,₁₂ ii 10 ’ti-ia’-[ta-nu-wa-an-[zi] [...][x šu-ma’-an za-⟨zö⟩-an da-a-an da-ały-ḥi
A₁ ii 11 [na-aš-ta ši-i-na-an a-wa-an ar]-ha kur-aš-ke-mi
A₁ ii 12 [an-da-ma lu-u-i-li ki-iš-ša]-an me-mi-iš-ke-mi

§ 4′

A₂ ii 13 [a-aš-ta ḫar-ta-ti ku-ra-am-m]a-ti kar-ša-am-mi-iš
A₂ ii 14 [a-aš-ta NA₂ aRA₅-ti guš-uš-t]a-an-na-ti kar-ša-mi-iš
A₂ ii 16 [u-tar-ša a-ta im-ma-ra-aš-š]a ṭIM-aš-ša-an-za ḫ[a-li-iš-ša ni-iš]
A₂ ii 17 [pa-ta a-an-da ḫa-la-a-li-i]n-z[li a]-aš-a-an-du

§ 5′

A₂ ii 19 [...][da-a-i na-at-kán [...]
A₂ ii 20 [...][x [šu ku-er-zi [...]
A₂ ii 21 [...][QA-TAM-M[a [...]

§ 6′

A₂ ii 22 [...][x x x [...]

§ 7′

Rev. iii
A₃ iii 1’ ’pa’-ap-pár-aš-[mi nu ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-ały-ḥi]

§ 8′

A₃ ii 2’ wa-a-ar-[š[a-at-ta i-ti na-na-am-ma-an MUN-ša-pa a-a-la-ti]
A₃ iii 3’ u-wa-ni-ia-[ti u-pa-am-ma-an wa-a-ar-aš-at-ta zi-i-la i-i an-da]
A₃ iii 4’ na-a-wa [i-ti MUN-ša-pa-at-ta zi-la]
Transliteration

§ 1′

Obv. ii
1–2 [...] that/those [...] likewise.
3 [...] burns [...]

§ 2′

4–5 The [ritual] p[atron] places the wooden figurine near the ḫuwaši-stone.
5 He steps [...]. The fine cloth[es]
6 which (have been) prepa[red], (namely) [a shir]t [of] fel[t]
7 (and) shoes, the ritual [p]atron
7–8 dress[es] it up with tho[se] fine clothes.

§ 3′

9–10 They drive a bull (in) and [they] ins[tall] it in [...].
10 I take the rope for the second time,
11 I cut [o]ff [the figurine],
12 [and, at the same time], I speak [thu]s [in Luwian]:

§ 4′

13 "[It has been] separated by [crushing (and) cutti]ng,
14 [it has been] separated by the [millstone (and) roll]ing tool.
15 (Likewise), [may] the ritual patron [separate] the evi[l]
16 [matter. May it not] (become) the de[filement] of the Storm-god of [the Open Country]!
17–18 May [all these deities] of the ritual [patron also] be [pur]e!"

§ 5′

19–20 He takes [...], he cuts it [... with] his [...].
21 [...] in the same way [...].

§ 6′

[...]

§ 7″

Rev. iii
1′ I sprinkle [... and I speak thus]:

§ 8″

2′ "Water (is) [brought from the watercourse],
2′–3′ [and salt (is) brought from the remote] (salt-lick) rock-face.
3′–4′ [In the future, water will] not [go (back) to the watercourse],
Ritual of Puriyanni (CTH 758)

A₃ iii 5’ a-a-li-i [u-wa-a-ri-ia na-a-wa i-ti]

§ 9” ’-A-NA’ E[N SÌSKUR ...

§ 10”
A₁ ii 1” [...] x x [...]”MES [...] x x […]
A₁ ii 2” DUG KU-KU²-UB ’GESTÍN’ a[r-h]a ’du-wa-ar¹-na-[a]-h₁]
A₁ iii 3” nu EN SÍSKUR ú-e-te-ni-it ar-ḥa [pa-ap-pár-aš-mf]
A₁ iii 4” nu GAL.GIR₄ A ar-ḥa dú-[wa-na]-ah-h₁ E[N ...
A₁ iii 5” da²-ah-h₁ nu 1-EN A-NA Ṣ’TU” pár-š-i-a-mi 1-[EN-ma]
A₁ iii 6” A-NA gi-im-ra-aš ṢU-ni pár-š-i-a-mi […]
A₁ iii 7” ḥa-asš-i-[pa]-ra-a pé-eš-ši-a-mi ’nu’ m[e-ma]-ah-h₁]
A₁ iii 8” Ṣi-wa-ta ḥu-wa-1-ū-na-ti a-aš-x […]
A₁ iii 9” za-ap-pa-at-ta za-am-ma-an-za ú-”tar²-rs […”
End of col. iii

Commentary

A₁ ii 4–8: The ḥuwṣṭa-stone being the representation of a divine agent (maybe the Storm-god of the Open Country himself), the deity bears witness to the designation of the wooden figurine as the ritual patron’s substitute through dressing it with his clothes. About clothing and transfer of identity in Hittite religious texts, see Mouton forthcoming. Differently Haas (2003, 621), who suggests that the ritual patron gets rid of his clothes near the ḥuwṣṭa-stone in order to put them on the bull mentioned in the next paragraph, which would act as his substitute. However, the text shows that the bull is driven in once the dressing up already took place. This justifies our restoration in line ii 4.

A₁ ii 10–12: Because of the association between the Luwian incantation which immediately follows this passage and the ritual use of the figurine made of dough (ritually waved over the ritual patron in other versions: CTH 758.1 and CTH 758.3.2), we expect this object to be cut off in the present sequence. The rope mentioned in ii 10 was presumably used for attaching the dough figurine to the ritual patron (see CTH 758.6 § 3’). Cutting the figurine could have occurred either after or before its ritual waving over the ritual patron’s head, since such a waving might have occurred several times over the course of the ritual. It is worth noticing that these two distinct ritual actions (ritual waving and cutting) are associated with very similar incantations, a standardization that probably reflects scribal intervention. However, there is one major difference between the two sequences: the incantation associated with the first (?) ritual waving of the figurine over the patient’s head mentions the patient becoming pure, whereas cutting the figurine would be associated with the incantation mentioning the patient’s gods becoming pure again.
4’–5’ [and in the future, salt will not go (back)] to the remote (salt-lick) [rock-face].”

§ 9”

6’ [...] to the [ritual] pa[tron].

§ 10”

1” [...]  
2” (and) [I brea[k] down the jug of wine.  
3” [I sprinkle] the ritual patron with water.  
4” and (then) I break down the ceramic cup of water.  
4”–5” I take [the ...-breads]. I crumble one to the Sun-god  
5”–6” [and] I crumble on[e] to the Storm-god of the Open Country.  
6”–7” [Then] I cast [...] into the hearth and [I s]ay:  
8” “Sun-god! Through running [...]  
9” you treated (ritually) the bewitched matter [...]”

End of col. iii

A₂ ii 13–18: §4’ is partially and tentatively restored based on KUB 35.55 § 3’ (CTH 758.3.2). Within the Puriyanni tradition, this is the only preserved incantation involving the lump of dough where the Luwian verb /talku-(dī) to flatten/ does not seem at all to appear. Since the verb /kars-(dī)/ to cut off, separate can hardly serve as an equivalent of /talku-(dī)/ we suspect that its generalization reflects an error of preservation, or perhaps the influence of the Kuwattalla tradition.

A₂ ii 19–20: Since the ritual expert expresses himself in the first person singular in this text, the author of the action has to be the ritual patron. It is worth noticing that the ritual patron imitates the ritual expert in the gesture of cutting an object.

A₃ iii 1’: In the light of the parallel versions, we expect salted water to be mentioned as the direct object in this gap.

A₃ iii 2’–5’: these lines are restored after CTH 758.1 § 23’. Here too, the water incantation presumably underscores the irreversible character of the substitution rite, but contrast its different placement in CTH 758.3.2.

A₃ iii 1”–9”: Contrast CTH 758.1 §§ 27”–29” and CTH 758.2.1 §§ 12”–15”. This is the only version of the Puriyanni ritual where we find a mention of a Sun-deity (Appendix III).

A₃ iii 2”: Concerning ritual breaking of a pot, see Haas 2003, 749.

A₃ iii 8”: Although van Gessel 1998, 408 considers Šiwata to be a Luwian form of the deified Day Šiwatt, Hutter 2003, 252 (followed by Steitler 2017, 385) interprets Šiwata as a Hittitized form of the Luwian Sun-deity Tiwad. This second interpretation has the advantage to echo the mention of a Sun-deity on line iii 5”.
Ritual of Puriyanni (CTH 758)

SMALLER FRAGMENT (IN THE 1ST PERS.)

CTH 758.2.3

Table of Manuscripts

A  KBo 29.1  80/p

Transmission and Research History

This fragment contains a colophon featuring a direct speech of Puriyanni. It was found in the lower city, and its ductus is New Hittite Script. It was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 65 and translated in Waal 2015, 519.

Transliteration

§ 1’
Rev. iv
A iv 1’  [ma-a-an-kân] UN-ši pár-ni ‘pa-ap’-r[a-tar ku-it-ki an-da e-eš-zî]
A iv 2’  [nu LIL-aš ˣ[U]-an ki-iš-ša-an a-ni-lá-m[i nu ki-i da-aḫ-ḫî]
A iv 3’  [DUB.1.KAM A]-WA-AT ˡPU-RI-IA-AN-naissance [...]

Commentary

iv 1’–2’: The first three clauses of this fragment are restored based on CTH 758.2.1 § 1. Note that there the Storm-god of the Open Country is introduced without additional epithets. The use of the expression “to celebrate (the Storm-god of the Open Country)” (aniya-) is the functional equivalent of “to perform a sacrifice to (the Storm-god of the Open Country)” (BAL) of CTH 758.2.1.

SMALLER FRAGMENTS (IN THE 3RD PERS.)

CTH 758.3.1

Table of Manuscripts

A₁  IBoT 3.96  Bo 4027
A₂  + ABoT 2.241  + AnAr 14839a
A₃  + ABoT 2.237  + AnAr 11502b
Contents

§ 1′ Colophon

The fragment is classified as CTH 758.2.3 based on the similarity of the colophon to the incipit of CTH 758.2.1.

Translation

§ 1′

Rev. iv

1′ [If there is some] impurity in a person’s house,
2′ I celebrate thus [the Storm-g]od [of the Open Country. I take this].
3′ [First tablet. W]ords of Puriyanni [...].

iv 3′: It is assumed that the first-person version of the Puriyanni ritual consists of one tablet, just as CTH 758.1 does, in view of the overall parallelism of content among the preserved fragments of both versions, except perhaps for their concluding parts.

Transmission and Research History

This tablet contains small portions of columns one and two of a one-tablet ritual attributed to Puriyanni. The provenance of the tablet is unknown, its ductus appears to
be Middle Script. The fragment $A_1$ was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 61–62 as part of the Kuwattalla tradition, while Akdoğan (2010, 118, 120), supplied the transliterations of $A_2$ and $A_3$ and tentatively identified $A_3$ as belonging to CTH 758. The direct joins $A_1 + A_2 + A_3$ belong to Alice Mouton, where $A_1 + A_2$ is based on the identification of $A_2$ as part of CTH 758 by Ilya Yakubovich. Alice Mouton is also responsible for identifying $A_3$ as belonging to the tablet under discussion on paleographic grounds (see Fig. 2.4), while Ilya Yakubovich defined its place on the tablet based on the parallel version CTH 758.3.3. The direct join $A_2 + A_3$ was ascertained through Alice Mouton’s collation of the original fragments at the Ankara museum.

### Transliteration

#### § 1′

| Obv. i | A₁ | i 5′ | [2 GU₄.MAH 3 UDU.NITA 1 UDU.SIR 1 MĀŠ.GAL 1-NU-TIM TU]NÉG.LÅ[MÉS] |
| A₁ | i 6′ | [¹² TÜG.GU.E.A TA-ḪAP-ŠI KUSE.SIR ŠA E]N SĪSKUR |
| A₁ | i 7′ | [u-e-eš-šu-wa-aš nam-ma 1 TŪG ar-ḫa-la-an] |

#### § 2′

| A₁ | i 8′ | [... NINDA.GUR₄.RA tar-na-aš 22 NINDA mu-la-ti-iš Š]A 1/2 UP-NÍ |
| A₁ | i 9′ | [20 NINDA.SIG 9 DUG.KU-UB GEŠTİN ... LDUG.GA I]e-pu IN-BU |
| A₁ | i 10′ | [ḫu-u-ma-an ku-it-ta te-pu LĀL 2 NINDA.GUR₄.R]A TUR ŠA GA.KIN.AG |
| A₁ | i 11′ | [x NINDA-ia-ti-iš tar-na-aš ša-ku-wa]-an ŠŠU-pa-ri |

#### § 3′

| A₁ | i 12′ | [2 DUG ḫu-pu-wa-i 2 Ḫa-in-ta-lu-Š]I URUDU |
| A₁ | i 13′ | [2 Ḫa-ah-ra-a]N URUDU |
| A₁ | i 14′ | [2 Ḫa-du-ut-ri URUDU 2 Ḫa-MAR U]RUDU 2 ne-pí-iš URUDU |
| A₁ | i 15′ | [2 te-kān URUDU ... te-p]U 1-NU-TIM ga-la-a-am-ma |
| A₁ | i 16′ | [...]-x-da |

#### § 4′

| A₁ | i 17′ | [... še-ep-p]I-iš e-wa-an kar-aš |
| A₁ | i 18′ | [GU.GAL ...]X te-pu |
| A₁ | i 19′ | [...-uš-Š]I-iš |
Contents

§§ 1′–4′ List of ritual implements
§§ 5′–6′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation mentioning a bread offering
§§ 7′–8′ Fragmentary Hittite passage mentioning a rope and destructive actions
§ 9′ Accompanying Luwian incantation referring to the destruction of evil
§ 10′ Fragmentary Hittite passage

A peculiarity of CTH 758.3 vis-à-vis CTH 758.2 is the use of the third person with reference to Puriyanni’s actions. CTH 758.3.1 §§ 1′–3′ close parallels CTH 758.2.1 §§ 2–4. CTH 758.3.1 §§ 6′–9′ are partially parallel to CTH 758.3.3, as seen by David Sasseville. Due to parallels, we can surmise that four lines are certainly missing at the beginning of column one. For this reason, we start the line numbering at i 5′.

Translation

§ 1′
Obv. i
5′ [Two bulls, three rams, one breeding ram, one billy goat, one set] of fine clothes,
6′ [(namely) one shirt (of) felt (and) shoes (that) the] ritual [pa]tron wears (on occasions);
7′ [in addition, one piece of clothing (comes) separately].
§ 3′
12′ [2 kitchen pots, 2] copper [shovel]s,
13′ [2 copper múla-tools, 2] copper [rake]s,
14′ [2 copper tidutri-tools, 2 c]opper [spades], 2 copper nepiš-vessels,
15′ [2 copper hoes ..., a small quant]ity, one set of brooms
16′ [...].
§ 4′
17′ [... šepp]it-grain, ewan-grain, karaš-grain,
18′ [chick pea, ...], a small quantity,
§ 5"

Obv. ii
A₁ ii 1 ḫi-in-za-ḫa [...] 
A₁ ii 2 a-ad-du-w[a-al-za ú-tar-ša ...] 
A₁ ii 3 ku-wa-at-ti p[ar-ni ...] 
A₁ ii 4 DINGIR-LIM-ni NINDA.GUR₄.R[A ...]

§ 6"

A₁ ii 5 a-du a-ap-pa {x} [za-at-ti pár-ni zi-la ni-iš a-ū-i-ti] 
A₁ ii 6 a-ad-du-wa-a[l-za ú-tar-ša DIN[GIRMES-an-za] 
A₁ ii 7 pár-ra-an

§ 7"

A₁₊₂ ii 8 šu-ma-an-za-ma [...] 

§ 8"

A₁₊₂ ii 9 na-aš-ta A-NA [...] 
A₁₊₂ ii 10 še-er ar-ḫa wa-∅[h-nu-zi nam-ma-aš A-NA EN SISKUR pa-ra-a] 
A₁₊₂ ii 11 e-ep-zi na-aš [N SISKUR ...] 
A₁₊₂ ii 12 an-da pu-uš-ša-[i[z-zi ...]

§ 9"

A₁₊₂ ii 13 za-[r[i-i]-"du-wa"-t[a EN SISKUR a-ad-du-wa-al-za ú-tar-ša] 
A₁ ii 15 [p]a-ri-tar-wa-a[š-ša u-la-an-ta-al-li-ia-an] 
A₁ ii 16 ḫu-it-wa-[i-i-ia-an]

§ 10"

A₁ ii 17 'a"-ap-pa-aš x[...]
A₁ ii 18 [x]-x-at-ti [...] 
A₁ ii 19 [...] x [...] 

Commentary

i 5′–16′: §§ 1′–3′ are restored based on CTH 758.2.1 §§ 2–4. 

i 17′–19′: § 4′ is restored based on CTH 758.1 § 4′.

ii 1: The interpretation of ḫi-in-za-ḫa as /xints-xa/ ‘I have handed over’ is based on its assumed Hittite cognate ḫink-(mi) ‘to offer, hand over’. See the derivatives of the same Hittite root occurring in better-understood contexts in column two of KUB 35.54 (CTH 758.1). The orthography of ḫi-in-za-ḫa presumably reflects inherent difficulties with rendering triconsonantal clusters in cuneiform.

ii 9–13: § 8″ is restored based on CTH 758.3.3 § 2′. The object of this paragraph are not necessarily the ropes, although such an interpretation is grammatically possible,
§ 5"
Obv. ii
1 "I have handed over [...].
2 [...] the evi[... matter [...].
3 In which h[...ouse ...]
4 to the deity the thick bread [...].

§ 6"
5–6 [In the future, may] the evi[... matter not come] back [into this house],
6–7 into the presence of his [deities]!"

§ 7"
8 [...] rope(s) [...].

§ 8"
9–10 [He] wa[ves] (them) over [...].
10–11 [Then] he holds [them toward the ritual patron],
11 and the [ritual] patr[on ...]
12 chops them up [...]:

§ 9"
13 "May [the ritual patron] chop the evil matter],
14 [p]as[t (or) present, internal (or)
15 [e]xternal, of the dead]
16 (or) the livi[...ng]!

§ 10"
17–19 He [... back [...]."

since Luw. /summant(i-)/, the equivalent of Hitt. šumanza(n)-, is probably a common
gender noun. As an alternative, one can identify the object with the nakkıu-spirits,
which are mentioned in the immediate proximity of the ropes in KUB 35.54 i 16′
(CTH 758.1). Perhaps the ropes were used for attaching the figurines to the ritual pa-
tron (see CTH 758.6 § 3′). If these figurines were subsequently chopped, it is only
natural to interpret them as representations of the evil nakkıu-spirits. The ritual pa-
tron seems to be the author of this ritual action, which would fit the accompanying
incantation referring to his destruction of the evil matter. The active participation of
the ritual patron in his own purification is comparable to what can be observed in the
Mašṭıgga ritual (see Mouton forthcoming).
SMALL FRAGMENT (IN THE 3RD PERS.)
CTH 758.3.2

Table of Manuscripts
A KUB 35.55 Bo 568

Transmission and Research History
This New Script fragment preserves a part of column two or three of a Puriyanni ritual. Its find spot remains unknown. It was published in transliteration as part of the Puriyanni tradition in Starke 1985, 70–71.

Transliteration

§ 1
Rev. iii?
A iii? 1’ [...] x [...]  
A iii? 2’ ḥal-[i-iš-ša ...]

§ 2
A iii? 3’ EGR-an-da-ma ʾ[š-na-aš ši-i-na-an A-NA EN SISKUR]  
A iii? 4’ še-er ar-ḥa wa-ā[ḥ-nu-zī nu ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i]

§ 3
A iii? 5’ za-a-ū-i-ia-aš ta-lu-p[i-iš a-aš-ta a-ri-im-mi]  
A iii? 6’ [k]u-ū-ra-am-mi kar-ša-a[m-mi-iš a-aš-ta]  
A iii? 7’ [gul-lu-us-ta-a-ni ta-a[ɪ-kumu-mi-iš]  
A iii? 8’ [k]a[r-āš-((wa))]-du-wa-at-ta [x] ’a’-[ap-pa EN SISKUR]  
A iii? 9’ [a-ad-d]u-wa-al-za ū-tar-[š[a ḥal-li-iš-ša pa-ra-at-ta-an-za]  
A iii? 10’ [pa-aš] DINGIR$^{985}$-an-za pár-ra-an ’ḥa’-[la-li-iš a-aš-tu]

§ 4
A iii? 11’ [EGR-an]-da-ma-za GAL.GIR₄ ú-i-[f e-na-aš]  
A iii? 12’ [da-a]-1’ an-da-ma-kán šu-u-w[a’-ru]  
A iii? 13’ [ki-it-ta]-ri ’MUN-ia-kán’ [an-da iš-ḥu-wa-a-an]
Contents

§ 1’ Fragmentary Luwian incantation

§§ 2’–3’ Ritual waving of the *taluppi*-lump accompanied by its Luwian incantation

§ 4’ Mention of water, a *šuwaru*-plant(?) and salt poured into a ceramic cup

The fragment is classified as belonging to the Puriyanni tradition based on the characteristic set of miasma mentioned in the Luwian incantation. The presentation of the *taluppi*-lump in the fragment under discussion shows marked differences in detail from the description of the same ritual act in CTH 758.1.

Translation

§ 1’
Rev. iii’
1’–2’ “[…] defile[ment …].”

§ 2’
3’–4’ Afterward, [he] wav[es] the do[ugh figurine] over [the ritual patron],
4’ [and he speaks thus]:

§ 3’
5’ “Here (is) the *talup[i]-lump*.
5’–6’ [It has been] separat[ed] (by) [c]utting [from the raised cut-off piece].
6’–7’ [It has been] flat[tened] by the rolling tool.
8’ May [the ritual patron sepa]rate a[gain]
9’ [the ev]il matte[r, defilement (and) impurity]!
10’ [Then may he be] p[ure] in the presence of (his) deities!”

§ 4’
11’–12’ [After]ward, he [tak]es a ceramic cup of wat[er].
12’–13’ Inside (it) [lie]s a *šuwaru*-plant.
13’ Salt (is) also [poured in].
Commentary

iii? 5': The sign AŠ in za-a-ú-i-ia-aš is added above the line.

iii? 5’–10': For the restoration of § 3', see CTH 758.1 §§ 8"–9" and CTH 758.2.2 § 4'. Note the use of the dative case instead of the expected ablative-instrumental with the nouns governed by the participle /karsammis/ and /talkummis/, and contrast the use of the ablative-instrumental case in parallel incantations in KUB 35.54 ii 9’–10’ (CTH 758.1) and KBo 29.4 ii 13–18 (CTH 758.2.2). Perhaps this is due to the fact that the source of separation is normally expressed by the dative with the Luwian verb /kars-(ti)/, as is always the case in the texts of the Kuwattalla tradition. In contrast, the ablative-instrumental complements of /karsammis/ in the other passages of the Kuwattalla tradition presumably reflect the means of separation (‘cutting’ and ‘crushing’). The use of a different construction in the passage under discussion may be due to the interference with the Kuwattalla tradition in the scribal milieu. This hypothesis underlies the tentative restoration of a-ri-im-mi ‘raised’ in iii? 5’.

iii? 8': The verbal form [k]a-r-aš-wa-du is attested only in this passage, as opposed to numerous occurrences of Luw. /kars-(ti)/ ‘to separate’ in the taluppi-incantations.

SMALLER FRAGMENTS (IN THE 3RD PERS.)
CTH 758.3.3

Table of Manuscripts

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>KBo 53.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>(+) KBo 60.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmission and Research History

This is the first edition of indirectly joined New Script fragments, both found in Temple I, which arguably preserve parts of columns two and three of a ritual attributed to Puriyanni. The identification of A₁ as part of CTH 758 is due to David Sasseville, who noted its partial parallelism with CTH 758.3.1. The identification of A₂ as part of CTH 758 was reached by David Sasseville in cooperation with Ilya Yakubovich. On paleographic grounds (Fig. 2.5), Alice Mouton observed that A₁ and A₂ belong to the same tablet, and thus arguably form an indirect join, since all the versions of CTH 758 appear to consist of just one tablet.
Therefore, we follow the personal communication of H. Craig Melchert, according to which the insertion of WA in [\(ka\)-aš-\(<\text{wa}\>\)-\(du\)-\text{wa-at-ta}\) is an error of anticipation, prompted by the second occurrence of this sign in the same phonetic word. The emphasis on separation rather than destruction of the miasma makes this particular instantiation of a taluppi-incantation similar to those of the Kuwattalla tradition.

iii² 11’–13’: For the restorations in the transliteration of this paragraph, see Soysal 2002, 469.

iii² 12’–13’: If this restoration is correct, it would be the only occurrence of the šu-waru-plant in this corpus of texts. Although its exact nature is yet to be determined, this substance is most often used for ritual sprinkling or bathing: see CHD Š, 545–46 and Soysal 2002.

iii² 13’: The adjacency of the incantations involving the taluppi-lump and water/salt finds a parallel in CTH 758.3.3. For the ritual sprinkling of salted water, see also CTH 758.1 § 22”, where, however, this purification rite is not adjacent to a taluppi-rite.

Contents

§ 1’ Luwian incantation against the evil matter
§ 2’ Ritual patron destroys objects symbolizing the evil matter
§ 3’ Accompanying Luwian incantation featuring merisms
§ 4’ Unclear
§ 5’ Unclear incantation
§§ 6”–7” Ritual waving of the taluppi-lump, with its Luwian incantation
§§ 8”–9” Sprinkling salted water, with its Luwian incantation
§ 10’ Unclear

This version of the ritual uses the third person for the direct speech of the ritual practitioner, like CTH 758.1, but the closest available parallel in terms of structure is CTH 758.3.2.
Transliteration

§ 1′
A₁:1′ [a-ta ni-iš] 'a-ú’i-ti ad-[du-wa-al-za û-tar-ša]
A₁:2′ [DINGIRMES-an-za] šA EN SISKUR pá[r-ra-an]

§ 2′
A₆:3′ [EGIR-an-da-ma]-aš A-NA EN SISKUR pa-ra-[a e-ep-zi]
A₆:4′ [na-aš EN SISKUR a]n-da pu-uš-ša-[i]z-zi nu ki-iš-ša-an’]
A₆:5′ [me-ma-i]

§ 3′
A₆:6′ [...] x-ú-la-an-[il-ša]-nu-i-it-wa-li-i-iš]

§ 4′
A₆:8′ [...] x-ú-zi[iš]

§ 5′
A₆:9′ [...] x iš-ša]-ri-iš EME-iš […]
A₆:10′ [...] x a-ri-[iš]-a[X[…]
A₆:11′ […] x[…] u-u-ra-a-[i […]

§ 6′
A₆:12′ [na-aš-ta iš-na-aš ši-i-na-an A-N]A EN SISKUR
A₆:13′ [še-er ar-ḫa wa-ah-nu-zi na-aš-t]a an-da
A₆:14′ [ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i]

§ 7′
A₆:15′ [a-aš-ta kar-ša-am-mi-iš gu]-l[u-uš-ta-ni ta-al-ku-um-mi-iš]
A₆:16′ [kar-ad-du-wa-at-ta EN SISKUR] 'a’-ad-du-wa-al-[za ú-tar-ša]
A₆:17′ [a-ta a-ap-pa im-ma-ra-aš-[ša bU-uš-ša-an-[za ḫal-li-iš-ša]
A₆:18′ [za-aš-ta-an-za DINGIRMES-an-za-pa-r-ra-an ni-iš]

§ 8′
A₆:19′ [na-aš-ta wa-a-tar MUN-ia A-NA] EN SISKUR-ša-[an]
A₆:20′ [ša-ra-a pa-ap-pár-aš-zi nu me-ma]-i

§ 9′
A₆:21′ [wa-a-ar-ša i-ti na-na-am-ma-an] MUN-PA a-[a-ti u-wa-ni-ia-ti]
A₆:22′ [u-pa-am-ma-an wa-a-ar-ša-at-t]a zi-la i[-i an-da]
A₆:23′ [na-a-wa i-ti MUN-pa-at-ta zi]-i-la
A₆:24′ [a-a-li-i u-wa-ni-ia na-a-wa] ’i’-ti
Translation

§ 1′ “[May] the evil matter not come (back) into the presence of the deities of the ritual patron!”

§ 2′ [Afterward, he holds] them toward the ritual patron, [the ritual patron] chop[s them up].

§ 3′ “… hand (or) tongue …”

§ 4′ […]

§ 5′ “… the deities ….”

§ 6′ “… hand (or) tongue …”

§ 7′ “… of the dead (or) the living,”

§ 8′ “past (or) future …”

§ 9′ […]

§ 10′ “… the deities ….”

§ 11′–12′ “… the deities ….”

§ 13′–14′ “… the remote (salt-lick) rock-face.”

§ 15′–16′ “… the remote (salt-lick) rock-face.”
Commentary

A₁:1–2: § 1’ is restored based on CTH 758.3.1 § 6’.

A₁:3–5: § 2’ is restored based on CTH 758.3.1 § 8’. For the restoration of the third person discourse in the fragment under discussion, see § 8’ below. For [a]nda puššai[zzî], see CHD P, 398–99.

A₁:6: For the dichotomy of hand and tongue, more clearly articulated in the Kuwat-talla tradition, see nevertheless CTH 758.1 § 6’.


A₂:7–10: The restoration of this incantation is obviously tentative. In comparison with CTH 758.3.2 § 3’, the presentation of the taluppi-lump appears to have been compressed.

“2ND RITUAL” OF PURIYANNI
CTH 758.4

Table of Manuscripts

A
KUB 35.57
Bo 2328

Transmission and Research History

This fragment contains a small part of column one of a “second ritual” attributed to Puriyanni, including the incipit. Its find spot is unknown. Its ductus is New Script. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 70.

Transliteration

§ 1

Obv. i
A i 1 ma-a-an ‘Pu-ri-ia-an-ni-iš ’A-NA’ x[...]
A i 2 ši-pa-an-ti pé-ra-an ar-’ha-kán’ x[...]
A i 3 ta-wa-na-a-ti ma-at ku-wa-p[i...]
The incipit contains the designation SISKUR dān ‘second ritual’. The list of ritual implements shows marked differences from CTH 758.1–3. Hence, we assign the fragment to CTH 758.4.

Translation

Obv. i

1–2 When Puriyanni makes a sacrifice to [...],

2 [...].

3 While [...] it from the tawani,
Ritual of Puriyanni (CTH 758)

A i 4  na-at ar-ḫa-ia-an ap-̀ pa-x-x[...]
A i 5  SISKUR da-a-an ḫal-zi-ìš-̀ ša-an-̀-z[i]

§ 2
A i 6  1 MAŠ.GAL šal-la-aš na-.begin-ìš-̀ ūh[i]-ti ...
A i 7  wa-ar-nu-zi-ìa-an 1 UDU x x[...]

§ 3
A i 8  1 TŪG na-an-za 'la-̀-x-x-x-x-x[...]
A i 9  1 tar-pa-la-aš 'SÌG ZA.GLN 1' [ar-pa-la-aš SÌG ...]
A i 10  LÀL te-pu GIŠ IN-BIḪ[...]
A i 11  pa-rû-a te-pu'[...]

§ 4
A i 12  'ne-pî-iš' [URUDU ...]
A i 13  'in-ìa'[u-u-z-zi-ìš' URUDU ...]
A i 14  x[...]

Commentary

i 3: The noun /tawan(i)-/ is probably derived from the verbal root /ta-/ 'to stand', and cognate with the adjective /tawan(i)-/ 'standing, upright' (see the commentary to CTH 762.1.k). Its meaning is conjectural, but see Late Luwian (DOMUS+SCALA)tá-wa/ni-zi (KARKAMIŠ A11a § 20), a word for an architectural installation, possibly 'gynaeceum' (Hawkins 2000, 99b).

UNDETERMINED VERSION
CTH 758.5

Table of Manuscripts
A  KUB 35.72   Bo 2751

Transmission and Research History

This fragment contains a small part of a right column of a Middle Script tablet together with a portion of the intercolumnium. Its find spot is unknown. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 396 without an attribution to any spe...
4   […] it separately.
4–5  They call [it] the second ritual […].

§ 2
6    A šalla- billy-goat as a scapegoa[t …].
7    He burns it. A sheep […].

§ 3
8    One piece of clothing […] it.
9    One tarpala-fabric of blue wool, one tarpala-fabric of … wool, […],
10   honey, a little bit, fruits, […]
11   a little bit of each, […].

§ 4
12   a nepiš-vessel [of copper, …],
13   a shov[el of copper, …]
14   […].

i 5: The word da-a-an has previously been considered as a Luwian hapax legomenon with unknown meaning (Starke 1990, 206, Melchert 1993, 204). Nevertheless, the context seems to point out to the interpretation of dān as the Hittite adverb ‘twice, second time’ (see also Giusfredi 2016, 298–99).
i 6: On šalla-, see CHD Š, 82a.

cific tradition. The indirect join KUB 35.72 (+) KUB 35.35, offered in Sasseville 2020c, 562–63, is rejected in the present edition, since the fragments appear to belong to two different compositions and also have too few paleographic elements in common to be certain that they are written by the same hand. Moreover, some sign shapes seem to differ between the two fragments (see Fig. 2.6).
Contents

§ 1’ Unclear

§§ 2’–3’ Animal sacrifice and wine libation to the Storm-god of the Open Country, with their Luwian incantation

§§ 4’–5’ Mentions of food offerings

Transliteration

§ 1’
Right column
A r.col. 1’ x[...]
A r.col. 2’ nu’a-ú-t’[...]

§ 2’
A r.col. 3’ nu’UZUNIG.G[IG UZUŠÀ ...]
A r.col. 4’ gi-im-r[a-aš A-NA piM ...]
A r.col. 5’ nu GESTIN §t-pa-an-...

§ 3’
A r.col. 6’ za-a-ú-i-d[u ...]
A r.col. 7’ pa-a za-a[r-za ...]
A r.col. 8’ ik-ku-wa-a[r ...]
A r.col. 9’ za-ap-pa-at-[ta ...]
A r.col. 10’ ni-iš [a-ú-i-ti]

§ 4’
A r.col. 11’ ŠA UZUZAG.L[U ...]
A r.col. 12’ na-at ar-[ha ...]

§ 5’
A r.col. 13’ NINDA.SIG 1 N[ND ...]
A r.col. 14’ [...] x [...] 

Commentary

r.col. 4’: Despite the fragmentary character of the passage, the form gi-im-r[a-aš] ‘open country’ appearing in the context of a sacrifice is conducive to the restoration of the Storm-god of the Open Country, which in turn allows us to classify this Hittite-Luwian fragment as part of a Puriyanni ritual. The reference to an animal liver...
The attribution of this fragment to CTH 758 is proposed here for the first time, for the reasons see the commentary. No direct overlaps with other fragments of CTH 758 are, however, available.

Translation

§ 1′
Right column
1′–2′ […]

§ 2′
3′ The liver [(and) heart …]
4′ [to the Storm-god of] the Open Country […].
5′ […] li[bate(s)] wine […] :

§ 3′
6′ “Here […] for you.
7′ So […] hea[rt …]
8′ live[ […]
9′ you/he treate[d (ritually) …].
10′ May [it] not [come]!”

§ 4′
11′ […] of the should[er …]
12′ […] it.

§ 5′
13′ A flat bread, one […]-bread […]
14′ […]

and heart is to be interpreted as an animal sacrifice being offered to the Storm-god of the Open Country (see the ikkunatt-sacrifice in the Kuwattalla tradition).

r.col. 9′–10′: See “za’-ap-pa-at-ta … ni-[is] a-ui-i-ti ‘he treated (ritually) … may it not come’ in CTH 758.1 § 15′.”
UNDETERMINED VERSION

CTH 758.6

Table of Manuscripts

| A₁ | KBo 39.181 | 2495/c |
| A₂ | (+) KBo 39.180 | (+) 2472/c |
| A₃ | + KUB 35.104 | + 883/c |
| A₄ | + KUB 35.120 | + 928/c |

Transmission and Research History

These fragments belong to a right column of a double-columned tablet, most likely column two. The fragments were found in or around Building A of Büyukkale and might reflect the Middle Script. The joins A₁ (+) A₂ and A₃ + A₄ are published in Košak 1999, 254 and Kammenhuber 1959, 313 respectively. The joined fragments A₁ (+) A₂ and A₃ + A₄ are published in transliteration in Groddek 2004, 232 and Starke 1985, 409–10. Alice Mouton identified both A₁ (+) A₂ and A₃ + A₄ as belonging to the same tablet (on paleographic grounds; see Fig. 2.7) and as specimens of the Puriyanni tradition, while Ilya Yakubovich advanced a hypothesis that A₁ (+) A₂ precedes A₃ + A₄. The collation of the original tablet fragments at the Ankara museum showed that the join between A₂ and A₃ is actually a direct join. This new join shows enough surface to determine that we are dealing with column two, since the surface is flat (the surface of column three would have been curved).

Transliteration

§ 1’

Obv. ii

A₁₁,₂ ii 1’ […] x x […] x […]

§ 2’

A₁₁,₂ i 2’ […] pa-a]b-ḫur pa-ra-a […] da-an-zi
A₁₁,₂ ii 3’ […] pé-r]a-an iḫ-ši-[i-STEM x ti-an-zi

§ 3’

A₁₁,₂ ii 4’ [EGIR-an-d]a-ma 4 NINDA še-e-nu-[uš 4 NINDA]il-wa-t]i-ia-ti-in-za
A₁₁,₂ ii 5’ […]x-uš da-a-i nu ’2’ [NINDA še-e-nu-uš 2 NINDA]il-wa-ti-ia-ti-[n-za
A₁₁,₂ ii 6’ […]-ši ki-it-kar-az x[…]
A₁₁,₂ ii 7’ [nu ke-e-e]z 1 NINDA ši-]i-na-an 1 NINDA [il-wa-ti-ia]-ti-in
A₁₁,₂ ii 8’ [A-NA TÜ]G-sa-an an-da ḫa-m[an-an-ki ke]-e’-e-zi-ia-aš-sa-an
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The mention of šēna-breads and ilwatiyati-breads supplies a double rationale for assigning this tablet to the Puriyanni tradition. Although the šēna-figurines are fairly common in Hittite-Luwian rituals, the reference to such an object next to a taluppi-incantation in CTH 758.1 § 7 suggests that their variety in use in the Puriyanni tradition was made of a flexible material, such as bread. The mention of the ilwatiyati-bread finds a direct parallel in CTH 758.2.1 § 3, while this bakery item does not appear at all to be attested outside the Puriyanni tradition (HW² I, 48a). Judging by CTH 758.1, the manipulations with the šēna-breads belong to column two of the ritual against the impurity in the house, and this conclusion can be tentatively extrapolated to its present version. At the same time, the lack of attestations of the ilwatiyati-bread in the preserved part of CTH 758.1 invites caution: perhaps this item was added at a later point in the development of the tradition and was accompanied by the extension of the whole ritual.

Translation

§ 1′

Obv. ii

1′ […]

§ 2′

They take […] the fire.

2′ […] in the courtyard [bef]ore […] they place […].

§ 3′

4′–5′ Afterward, he takes four šēna-breads [(and) four ilwatiyati-breads […].

5′–6′ […] two [šēna-breads (and) two] ilwatiyati-[bread]ds

6′ […] on top […].

7′–8′ [He] ti[es] one šēna-bread (and) one [ilwatiya]ti-bread to [this sid]e (of the patient)’s [gar]ment,
A₁₂ ii 9’ […] x 1 NINDAši-i-na-(an) 1 NINDAil-w[a-ti-ti-i]n A-NA TŪG-ša-an
A₁₂ ii 10’ [an-da] ḥa-ma-an-ki

§ 4’
A₁₂ ii 11’ […] x […] x […] ke-e-c[e]z 1 NINDAši-i-na-an
A₂ ii 12’ [1 NINDAil-wa-ti-ia-ti-in […]] ’an-da’ ḥa-ma-an-ki
A₂ ii 13’ [ke-e-ez-zi-ia-aš-ša-an 1 NINDAši-i-na-an 1] NINDAil-wa-ti-i[a-ти-in]
A₂ ii 14’ […] an-da ḥa-ma-an-ki […] x-aš is-[TU […] x x
A₂ iii ii 15’ […] (vacat) […] ki-iš-s]a-an [me-ma-i’]

§ 5’
A₂ ii 16’ […] wa-aš-’ši-na-ašši-in-z[i …]
A₂ ii 17’ […]x-in-z[i il-wa-ti-ia-[ti-in-z[i]
A₂ ii 18’ […]a’n-ti-in-z[i da-a-im-x[…
A₂ ii 19’ […]x-aš an-da-ma-aš-ta x[…
A₂ ii 20’ […] wa’t]-’a’-ar-[a] da-a-i-n-an-za x x x[…
A₂ ii 21’ […] (vacat)

§ 6’
A₂ ii 22’ […] x […] z]-in-za ḥa-pa-a-in-du
A₂ ii 23’ […] [ta]r]-pa-al-li-in-za
A₂ ii 24’ […] a al-la-ti-in-za
A₂ ii 25’ […]-za

§ 7’
A₂ ii 26’ […]x-ki-iš-x[…]

§ 8’
Rev. iii
A₂ iii ii 1’ […]vš]a-ši

Commentary

ii 2’–3’: The meaning of this Hittite passage is unclear due to its fragmentary character. The reference to the fire makes it, however, likely that the portion of the ritual immediately before the act of tying the šēna- and ilwatiyati-breads contains the description of sacrificial offerings. See the mention of two bulls and three rams in the list of ritual implements in CTH 758.2.1 § 2 as well as the reference of animal body parts in the context of a ritual offering in CTH 758.5.

ii 4’–12’: The act of tying the šēna-figurines to the patient must precede their forcible separation from his body, as described in CTH 758.1 §§ 7″–8″. As a parallel for attaching symbols of impurity to the human body before cutting them off, see for example CTH 404.1.1.A § 8–10 (Miller 2004, 64–66). For a possibility of indentifying the šēna-
8′–10′ and [...] he also ties one šēna-bread (and) one ilw[atiyati]-bread [to that] side (of the patient)’s garment.

§ 4′
11′–12′ [...] He ties one šēna-bread [(and) one ilwatiyati-bread to this sid]e (of) [...],
13′–14′ [and he also ties one šēna-bread (and) one] ilwatiy[atti]-bread [to that sid]e (of) [...].
14′ [...] wi[th ...]
15′ [...] He speaks thu]s:

§ 5′
16′ "[...] of the body [...]"  
17′ [...] ilwatiyati-breads [...]  
18′ [...] ... oil [...]  
19′ [...] Furthermore, [...]  
20′ [...] and oily [water [...]  
21′ [...]...

§ 6′
22′ [...] May they moisten [t]hose  
23′ [...] r]ival  
24′ [...] allatinza  
25′ [...] ..."

§ 7′
26′ [...] ...

§ 8′
Rev. iii
1′ [...]
would support the conjecture that the *ilwatiyati*-breads likewise contribute to cleansing the ritual patron from the miasma.

**ii 22**: Following the personal communication of H. Craig Melchert (02/01/22), we tentatively assume for contextual reasons that *ḥa-pa-a-in-du* belongs to the paradigm of /xab(a)i-(d)/i 'to moisten' and not /xab(a)i-(d)/i 'to bind'. Presumably, the verb /xab(a)i-(d)/i represents a derivative of Luw. /xab(i)/i 'river'.

**ii 23**: Luw. /tarpall(a/i)/ certainly relates to Hitt. *tarpalli*'s meaning 'substitute' in ritual texts. For the Hittite vocabulary of substitutes, see Mouton 2004b. Yet the likely
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This New Script fragment is not associated with a known find spot, nor can anything be said of its original position on a tablet, except for the possibility that its right edge is broken along an intercolumnium. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 173 as belonging to an identified Old Woman Ritual—that is, to the Kuwattalla tradition.

#### Transliteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 1’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:3’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

3': The use of the Akkadographic case marker *A-NA* with the Sumerogram *SISKUR* suggests that this heterographic expression is embedded in a Hittite context, because the Sumerograms in Luwian contexts are normally combined with phonetic comple-
function of [ta]²-pa-al-li-in-za as a direct object headed by the verb ḫa-pa-a-in-du ‘let them moisten’ would rather support its negative connotations. For the negative use of tarpalli- in Hittite mythological texts, where it resembles tarpanalli- ‘rival’, see for example Rutherford 2018, 8. Furthermore, Luw. tar-pa-li-iš (KUB 29.38 rev. 18’, CTH 769) appears to be an adjective rather than a noun on syntactic grounds. For the present context, we tentatively adopt the translation ‘rival’, which is likewise compatible with an adjectival interpretation.

Contents

§ 1’ A ritual passage featuring the word ‘in Luwian’

In theory, the fragment can belong to any ritual with Luwian insertions, its attribution to the Kuwattalla tradition, as per Starke, is not to be fully ruled out. Nevertheless, the occurrence of the Sumerogram SISKUR in isolation tips the scales in favor of its classification as part of the Puriyanni tradition, since the Kuwattalla tradition knows only references to the ritual patron. The size of the fragment provides an obvious argument against any further speculations.

Translation

§ 1’
1’ [...] in [L]uwian [...] a[gain]
2’ [...] to the offerings

ements for the purpose of expressing their grammatical features. This implies that either the adverb luwili ‘in Luwian’ is followed by a Hittite utterance, or the lost Luwian passage was very short.
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<td>A₁</td>
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<td>A₂</td>
<td>KUB 35.39</td>
<td>+ Bo 9592 + Bo 2778 + Bo 4451 + Bo 8864 + Bo 2737 + Bo 6956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmission and Research History

While A₁ was published separately in KUB 9, all the fragments of A₂ were joined together and to A₁ in KUB 35. The result of this join yields one of the best-preserved tablets of the Kuwattalla tradition: one third to one half of its original texts came down to us. The preserved portions include the upper part of columns one and two as well as the lower part of columns three and four, including the colophon. The ductus of the tablet is New Script, which is consistent with the prosopography of the scribe (active mid-13th-century BCE). The find spots of the fragments remain unknown. The tablet was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 111–16. An edition of the text with French translation can be found in Puértolas Rubio 2019a, 491–504. Significant portions of the text have been published as excerpts (e.g., Starke 1990, 538; Reichardt 1998, 35, 79; Haas 2003, 105–6, 253; Torri 2003, 59–60; Waal 2015, 519).

Contents

§ 1 Rinsing grits (?) with pure water in a sieve
§ 2 Mixing wine, honey and vegetal oil and pouring the mixture into a ceramic cup
§ 3–7 Manipulations of the sieve and the cup, with their Luwian incantation

Transliteration

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv. i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ 1</td>
<td>‘ma-ah’-ḥa-an-ma MUNUS.GI pa-ak-uš-šu-wa-an-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ 2</td>
<td>[pā]-r-ku-wa-ia-az u-e-te-na-az ar-ḥa a-ar-ri nam-ma-at-ša-an {x x}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ 3</td>
<td>EGI.R-pa ku-it ḫa-pāt-ta-a-ni kat-ta šu-ul-ḥa-a-i pāt-tar-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ 4</td>
<td>IGI.U-a ša-ra-a na-a-i nam-ma-at kat-ta-an A-NA GISEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ 5</td>
<td>ŠA GI da-a-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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§§ 8–9 Unclear manipulations involving oil, with their fragmentary Hittite incantation
§ 10’ Luwian incantation mentioning purification with oil and honey
§§ 11’–13’ Incantation for purifying the gods of the ritual patron’s household with oil and honey
§§ 14’–16’ The Old Woman moves inside the house and sprinkles wine at the house altar uttering a Luwian incantation
§ 17’ Unclear Hittite passage
§§ 18”–19” Unclear Hittite passage
§ 20” Luwian incantation mentioning purification with oil and honey
§§ 21”–22” Disassembling the device for mixing grīts(?) with oil and honey (?)
§§ 23”–25” The Old Woman and the ritual patron break the reed pipes; the Old Woman utters a Luwian curse
§ 26” Unclear
§§ 27”–29” Manipulations involving the sieve and cedar wood
§§ 30”–32” Dedicating the sheep of the ikkunawar-sacrifice
§ 33” Colophon

According to the colophon, this is the sixth tablet (less likely the fifth tablet) of the dupadupārśa-ritual written by the scribe Duwa under the supervision of Anuwanza. The content of this tablet overlaps with that of KUB 32.8 (+) KUB 32.5 (CTH 759.10.b), which likewise features purification with oil and honey and contains the description of the ikkunatt-sacrifice, corresponding to the ikkunawar-sacrifice of the present tablet. The progression of the narrative in the present version of the ritual is, however, much slower.

Translation

§ 1

Obv. i
1–2 After the Old Woman rinses grīts with [p]ure water,
2–3 then, as she pours them down on the sieve again,
3–4 she turns the holes (of) the sieve upward.
4–5 Then she places it under reed pipe(s).
§ 2
A₁, i 6 EGI-R-an-da-ma MUNUSŠU.GI GES-TIN LÀL GÎŠ-ia an-da tâk-ša-an
A₁, i 7 im-mi-ia-az-zi na-at-ša-an kat-ta 1-e-da-ni
A₁, i 8 A-NA DIL.GIR₄ la-â-ḥu-i

§ 3
A₁, i 9 nu-za DIL.GIR₄ ZAG-az [x] SU-az e-e-p-zí GES-TIN-ša-an
A₁, i 10 GÎŠ LÀL-ia ku-e-da-ni la-a-ḥu-wa-an GÛB-la-az-za-ma-az
A₁, i 11 SU-az ŠA-pâ-tar da-a-i pa-ak-ku-uš-šu-wa-an-da-aš-ša-an
A₁, i 12 ku-e-da-ni šu-uḥ-ḥa-an GÎŠ-za-ni-ma kat-ta-an DIL.GAL TUR e-e-p-zí

§ 4
A₁, i 13 nu kat-ta-an DIL.GAL TUR ki-it-ta-ri še-er-ma-âš-ša-an GÎŠ[p]ât-tar
A₁, i 14 ki-it-ta-ri GÎŠ-pâ-dâ-na-i-ma-aš-ša-an še-er pa-ak-ku-uš-š[ù]-wa-an-º da’
A₁, i 15 šu-[uḥ-ḥ]a-[a]-º an nÀ-at GÛB-la-az SU-az A-NA GÎŠ SENHA
A₁, i 16 ŠA GI ka[r-t]a-º-an e-e-p-zí

§ 5
A₁⁺, i 17 ZAG-az-za-ma-âš-ša-an SU-º az IŠ-TU DIL.GIR₄ GES-TIN GÎŠ LÀL-ia
A₁⁺, i 18 A-NA 2 GÎŠ SENHA ŠA GI la-a-ḥu-i’ nu-º uš-ša-an IŠ-TU GÎŠ SENHA
A₁⁺, i 19 kat-ta še-er ’pa’a-k-ku-uš-[š]u-wa-an-‘da’aš ar-aš-zi
A₁⁺, i 20 pa-ak-ku-uš-šu-wa-[a]n-da-[z-]m[aš-ša-an kâ-ta GÎŠ-pâ-dâ-na]
A₁⁺, i 21 ar-aš-zi GÎŠ-pâ-dâ-na-[az-maš]-ša-an kat-ta A-NA DIL.GAL TUR
A₁⁺, i 22 ar-aš-zi MUNUSŠU.GI ma [kî]-šša-an me-ma-i

§ 6
A₁⁺, i 23 ku-iš ḥi-i-ru-ta-ni-[i-a-t]a ti-wa-ta-ni-ia-at-ta
A₁⁺, i 24 ma-a-nu-um-pa-ta ma-[d-du-ú]-in-zi ma-al-li-ti-in-zi
A₁⁺, i 25 da-a-i-ni-in-zi x[...][x]-al-la-an-zí a-ar-ši-ia-an-du
A₁⁺, i 26 [t]-a-a-i-in-ti-ia-[t]a ma-al-li a-i] ia-ru ta-pa-a-ru-wa
A₁⁺, i 27 [hi-ru]-ú’-ta’ [t]-a-ar-ri-ia-am-na w[à]la-an-te-ia
A₁⁺, i 28 ’hu-u-i-it-wa’-[l]-e-ia a-an-ni-e-ia ta-a-t]i-e-ia na-a-ni-e-ia
A₁⁺, i 29 na-a-na-aš-ri-[e-ia]

§ 7
A₁⁺, i 30 lu-ú-la-[i]-i-e-ia [h]-a-pi-r-e-ia ku-wa-ar-š]a-º-ša-an
A₁⁺, i 31 tu-ú-li-ia-aš-ša-a[n pu-wa-ti-i-la na-nu-un]-ta-ri-i-a-al

§ 8
A₁⁺, i 32 EGI-R-an-da-ma-kán MUNUSŠU.GI NINDA’º ar-ḥaº
A₁⁺, i 33 te-pù pâr-ši-ia-az-[i [...][x]-i-šaº
A₁⁺, i 34 GÎŠ ku-it ar-ḥa-[i-an ki-it-ta-rùº]
A₁⁺, i 35 na-at-kán LÎŠ GÎŠ IŠ-TUº
§ 2
6–7 Afterward, the Old Woman mixes together wine, honey and vegetal oil and she pours it down into a ceramic cup.

§ 3
9 She holds with (her) right hand the ceramic cup, into which wine, vegetal oil and the honey (were) poured.
9–10 She takes with (her) left hand the sieve, into which grits (were) poured.
10–11 She holds a small bowl under the sieve.

§ 4
13 The small bowl lies below, whereas the sieve lies above.
14–15 The grits (had been) poured into the sieve.
15–16 She holds it under the reed pipes with (her) left hand.

§ 5
17–18 With (her) right hand, she pours wine, vegetal oil and honey from the ceramic cup into the two reed pipes.
18–19 It (i.e. the mixed liquid) flows from the pipes down on the grits,
20–21 it flows from the grits down into the sieve,
21–22 (and then) it flows from the sieve down into the small bowl.
22 The Old Woman speaks thus:

§ 6
23 “Whoever perjured himself, (whoever) enraged the Sun-god,
24–25 now, may the pipes (full) of wine, honey, and oil wash it (away)!
26 May they become oil and honey: judgments,
27 [per]juries, [curses] of the [dead]
28 (or) the living, [of the mother (or) fat[her, of the brother
29 (or) sister,

§ 7
30 of mountain-dwellers (or) desert-dwellers, of an army
31 (or) assembly, [past (or) present]!”

§ 8
32–33 Afterward, the Old Woman crumbles a little bit [of bread ...]
33 [...].
34 The vegetal oil that [lies] separately[y ...],
35 the vegetal oil [...] it with [...].
A₁ i 36 l.GIS ku-it épáda-n[a-az ú-iz-zi'][...]
A₁ i 37 ar-aš-zi na-as-ta l[GIS ...]
A₁ i 38 A-NA GESTIN za-ap-nu-u[z-zi ...]

§ 9
A₁ i 39 EN SISKUR-kän SUM-ŠU [ḥal-za-a-i’ me-ma-i-ma’ ki-iš-ša-an’]
A₁ i 40 ka-a-ša-wa-a[z ...]
A₁ i 41 [...] x x [...]

§ 10′
Obv. ii
A₁ ii 1 ‘ḥa’-[a-l]a-‘an’-[nu-uš-ša-an-da-am-ma-aš]
A₁ ii 2 a-ad-du-wa-a-[al ...] x x [...]
A₁ ii 3 da-a-i-na-ti [ma]-‘al’-li-i-[t[a]-’a’-t[i a-a-aš-ša]
A₁ ii 4 e-le-el-ḥa-an-du DINGIRMES-in-‘zi’

§ 11′
A₁ ii 5 na-aš-ta ku-i-e-eš DINGIRMES A-NA EN SISKUR
A₁ ii 6 a-aš-ša-u-e-eš DUTU DHE-PA-du-uš
A₁ ii 7 na-aš-kän ḫu-u-ma-an-du-uš IS-TU KAXU-SU
A₁ ii 8 ú-a-gi-[iš-ke-ez-zi] GIM-an-[ma a-pu-u-uš
A₁ ii 9 DINGIRMES ir-ḥa-a-iż-zi nam-ma EGIR-an-da kiš-an te-ez-zi
A₁ ii 10 a-a-aš-ša-um-am-ma-aš e-le-el-ḥa-a-an-du ta-a-i-na-a-ti
A₁ ii 11 ma-al-li-i-ta-a-ti

§ 12′
A₁ ii 12 ta-a-i-in-ti-‘ia’-ta ma-al-li a-i-ia-ru
A₁ ii 13 ta-pa-a-ru-ḥi-i-ru-ū-ta ta-a-ar-ri-ia-am-na

§ 13′
A₁ ii 14 a-a-aš-ša-ti e-el-ḥa-a-du tap-pa-ša-an-ti-iš
A₁ ii 15 ti-ia-am-ma-an-ti-iš ta-a-i-in-ti ia-ta a-‘i-ia’-ru
A₁ ii 16 ma-al-li-ti-ia-ta [a]-‘i-ia-ru’

§ 14′
A₁ ii 17 na-aš-ta MINUSLUGI[a]n-‘da’-an E:ri pé-i’e-[da-an e-ep-zī]
A₁ ii 18 EN SISKUR-ma-[kân] a-pi-ia-pāt ḫi-lam-ni pé-ra-[an]
A₁ ii 19 A-ŠAR-ŠU ḫar-zi na-aš-ta GIM-an MINUSLUGI [E-ri]
A₁ ii 20 an-da-an a-ri nu ḫi-TU GA-AN-GA-TI GES[TIN]
A₁ ii 21 EGR-an-da EN SISKUR-MA-ni EGIR-PA A-NA DINGIRMES me-na-aḥ-[ḥa-an-da]
A₁ ii 22 pa-ap-pār-aš-ki-ua-wa-an da-a-i me-mi-iš-ke-ez-zi [i-ma ki-iš-ša-an]

§ 15′
A₂ ii 23 ḫa-la-la-an-nu-uš-ša-an-da-am-ma-aš a[a][d-du-wa-a-al]

DOI: 10.13173/9783447119955.1.054
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC BY-SA 4.0 license. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/deed.en
The terms of the CC licence apply only to the original material. The use of material from other sources such as charts, illustrations, photographs and text extracts may require further permission for use from the respective rights holder.
© by authors
The vegetal oil that comes from the sieve, [...] flows [...].

She makes the vegetal oil [...] drip into wine [...].

§ 9
39 [She calls] the ritual patron (by) name [and speaks thus]:
40 "Hereby [...]
41 [...]"

§ 10′
Obv. ii
1 "They have purified themselves (from) evil...
2 (from) evil [...].
3–4 May the gods wash [(their) mouths] with oil (and) [h]oney!

§ 11′
5–6 The deities who (are) dear to the ritual patron, (namely) the solar deity, the Storm-god (and) Hepat,
7–8 she calls all of them with her mouth.
8–9 As she treats those deities one by one afterward, she says thus:
9–10 "May they wash their mouths with oil
11 (and) honey!

§ 12′
12 May they become oil (and) honey:
13 judgments, perjuries, curses!

§ 13′
14–15 May Heaven (and) Earth wash their mouth(s)!
15 May they become oil;
16 may they [b]ecome honey!"

§ 14′
17 The Old Woman takes (her) place inside the house,
18–19 but the ritual patron keeps his place there, (namely) before [the gatehouse].
19–20 As the Old Woman arrives inside [the house],
20–22 she starts again sprinkling wi[ne] with a gangati-plant at the altar, befo[re] the deities,
22 [and she] speaks [thus]:

§ 15′
23 "They have purified themselves (from) evil."
A₂ ii 24  na-a-nu-um-pa-am-ma-aš wa-a-šu-wa-aš-ša-an-z[a]
A₂ ii 25  ḫa-la-la-an-nu-uš-ša-an-du pu-u-na-ti-[in-zí DINGIRMES.in-zí]
A₂ ii 26  a-aš-ša-am-ma-aš e-le-el-ḫa-a-an-du
A₂ ii 27  ta-a-i-na-ti ma-al-li-ta-a-ti’

§ 16′
A₂ ii 28  ta-a-i-in-ti-ia-ta ’a-i’-ia-ru m[a-al-li-ti-ia-ta]
A₂ ii 29  a-i-ia-ru ta-pa-a-ru-w[a ḫi-r]u-ú-[ta ta-ta-ar-ri-ia-am-na]
A₂ ii 30  na-at-kán EN SISKUR A-[NÁ’ ...]
A₂ ii 31  nu-uš MINUŠU.GI b[u-u-ma-an-du-uš ir-ḫa-a-iz-zí]

§ 17′
A₂ ii 32  EGIR-an-da-ma-[

§ 18″
Rev. iii
A₂ iii 1′  x [...]
A₂ iii 2′  [ [...]
A₂ iii 3′  ḫa-x[...]
A₂ iii 4′  ku-ḫ[x[...]
A₂ iii 5′  ša-ra-a t[...]

§ 19″
A₂ iii 6′  nu MINUŠU.GI ’EN SISKUR’ [...]
A₂ iii 7′  ki-’ ḫa-ša-an’ me-ma-i

§ 20″
A₂ iii 8′  u-un-za-h[a-a]t-ta a-ap-pa ma-a-an x[...]
A₂ iii 9′  a-ad-[u]-wa-li-ḫa ma-a-ra-an[-[...]
A₂ iii 10′  ’a-at-ta’-ni-i a-am-ma-aš a-a-[aš-ša ta-a-i-na-a-ti]
A₂ iii 11′  [ma-al-li-t]a-a-ti e-el-ḫa-[ta-ni]

§ 21″
A₂ iii 12′  [...]x DUGDÍLIM.GAL ’TUR’ x[...]
A₂ iii 13′  [...] x x [...]
A₂ iii 14′  x x x [...]

§ 22″
A₂ iii 15′  a-pa-a-[t [...]
A₂ iii 16′  ku-ḫ[t-[a-...] x [...]
A₂ iii 17′  ḫa-x[... x [...] an-’ da ḫa’-x[...-z]i
A₂ iii 18′  na-aš-[a-an] kat-ta CEpád-da-ni [pē-eš-ši-ia]-az-zi
A₂ iii 19′  ŠA G[I]-ma 2 GERŠENA A-NÁ EN S[ISKUR pa-ra]-’a’ e-ep-zi
24–25  Now, may all the [gods] purify their goods!
26  May they wash their mouths
27  with oil (and) honey!

§ 16′
28  May they become oil,
28–29  may they become h[oney]:
29  judg[ments, per]jur[ies, curses]!”
30  The ritual patron […] them to […]
31  and the Old Woman [treats] them a[ll one by one].

§ 17′
32  Afterward, […].

§ 18″
Rev. iii
1′  […]
2′  […]
3′  […]
4′  which […]
5′  […] up.

§ 19″
6′  The Old Woman […] the ritual patron […]
7′  she speaks thus:

§ 20″
8′–9′  “And if also the evil māran-[…] to you (pl.) again,
9′–10′  you (pl.) will a-[…].
10′–11′  [You (pl.)] will wash your mouth[hs] with [oil (and) honey].”

§ 21″
12′  […] the small bowl […]
13′  […]
14′  […]

§ 22″
15′  That […]
16′  wal[l […]
17′  from […] in […].
18′  She [thro]ws them down into the sieve
19′  but she holds the two re[ed] pipes [towa]rd the ri[tual] patron.
§ 23

A₁ iii 20′ nu 2 GIŠÑŠAnga Ša GI ap-pé-ez-[i-ia]-az
A₁ iii 21′ MINUSU.GI āra-zi EN SISKUR ma-āš-si-ia-āš me₇ na₃ [h-h]a-an-da
A₁ iii 22′ IS-TU QA-TI-ŠU e-ep-zi nu-us ÁH-da
A₁ iii 23′ ū-e-šu-ra-an-zi nu-uš ar-μa du-wa-ar-an-zi
A₁ iii 24′ MINUSU.GI ma ki-is-sa-an me-ma-i

§ 24

A₁ iii 25′ ku-is-tar ma-al-μa-āš-sa-āš-sa-an-za-an EN-ia
A₁ iii 26′ a-ad-du-wa-la a-an-ni-ti a-an DINGIRMEŠ, in-zi
A₁ iii 27′ a-āš-μa na-a-ta-at-ta ta-ta-ar-μa-an-du
A₁ iii 28′ ū-i-it-pa-ni-im-pa-an ū-i-da-a-in-du
A₁ iii 29′ ’pa₇-du-w[a-a]n an-na-an pa-a-ta-an-za du-ū-wa-an-du

§ 25

A₁ iii 30′ ’nu₃ MINUSU.GI GIANG As NA EN SISKUR
A₁ iii 31′ ’ŠA₇-PAL GIRMES, SU da-a-i nam-ma-āš-si-ia-āš
End of col. iii

§ 26

Rev. iv
A₁ iv 1′ x[...]
A₁ iv 2′ ma-x[...]

§ 27

A₁ iv 3′ nu MINUSU[U.GI ...]
A₁ iv 4′ ANA MINUSU[U.GI ...]
A₁ iv 5′ pé-e-da-i x[...]
A₁ iv 6′ pa-iz-zi GI₇-pår₇-[tar ...]

§ 28

A₁(2) iv 7′ a-pa-a-ša-kán MINUSU.GI [...] x x[...]
A₁(2) iv 8′ ar-μa da-a-i na-at [a-pād-a]n[ a-ra-a e-ep-zī]
A₁(2) iv 9′ EN SISKUR me-na-āš-μa-an-d[ a SU-[a]n-ša-an ’da-a’-[i]

§ 29

A₁(2) iv 10′ ma-a-an me-eq-qa-a-u[š-ša an]-ni-iš-kán-zi
A₁(2) iv 11′ na-aš-ta ku-e-da-ni-[ia ar-μa]-ia-an GİRERIN
A₁(2) iv 12′ ki-is-sa-ri-iš-si [...]x-iš-si da-a-i

§ 30

A₁(2) iv 13′ EGR-an-da-ma-kán ’I’-[ik-ku-ū-n]a-ú-na-āš-si-in 1 UDU an-d[a]
A₁(2) iv 14′ u-un-ni-ia-an-zi [nu MINUSU.GI] I 1 bug KU-KU-UB GESTIN
A₁(2) iv 15′ GIŠBANŠU[R]-”az’ d[aa-i na-a]n A-NA EN SISKUR pa-ra-a
A₁(2) iv 16′ pa-a-i MINUSU[U.GI]-ma-”kán” [NIENDA.KU]₂ SA 1/2 UP-N accord GIŠBANŠUR-az
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§ 23

20′–21′ The Old Woman holds the two reed pipes from the back, whereas the ritual patron seizes them with his hand(s) from the front.
22′–23′ They twist them together until they break them off.
24′ The Old Woman speaks thus:

§ 24

25′–26′ "Whoever causes evil to the ritual patron, may the gods tear him into pieces (like) reed! May they smite his testicles! May they place him at his feet!"

§ 25

30′–31′ The Old Woman places the reeds at the feet of the ritual patron. Then, she [...] to him.

End of col. iii

§ 26

Rev. iv

1′ [...] 2′ [...] 3′ The Old Woman ...]. 4′ To the Old Woman ...] 5′ brings [...] 5′–6′ goes [...] sieve ...].

§ 27

7′–8′ That Old Woman removes [...] and [holds] it forward in the sieve.
9′ The ritual patron places his hand in front of (it).

§ 28

10′ If they [t]reat man[y], 11′–12′ she places the cedar wood in each one’s hand [...] separately.

§ 29

13′–14′ Afterward, they lead inside one sheep of the [kkun]awar-sacrifice. 14′–15′ [The Old Woman]an [akes] one jug of wine from the table[e] 15′–16′ [and] she hands [i]t over to the ritual patron. 16′–17′ The Old Woman an [ak]es [sweet breads] of half a handful from the table
Commentary

i 1–4: For the translation of this passage, see CHD Š, 76a with ref.

i 1: For the tentative translation of Hitt. pakkuššuwant- as ‘grits’, see CHD P, 59a. Haas (2003, 105–6) suggests that this lexeme refers here to a sort of aromatic paste.

i 4: The Hittite verb šarānai- ‘to turn upward’ seems to describe here a circular movement, likely slightly upward, which may help to drain the water from the sieve. Given the context, this movement is different from turning the sieve around.

i 4: For the metaphoric use of “eyes” with the meaning ‘holes’, see for instance Dar- dano 2002, 337.

i 23: Compare the pair ḫi-i-ru-ta-ni-[ia-at-ta] ti-wa-ta-ni-ia-at-ta with the theonym /xirudallis Tiwats/ ‘Sun-god of the Oath’, mentioned later in iv 21’. It is worth mentioning that neither the pair nor the theonym appear in the texts of the Kuwattalla tradition grouped under CTH 761: they apparently represent an innovation in the development of the tradition. A similar but not identical pair is restored in the Tauriša tradition: see KBo 12.89 ii ! 9 ar-ra-a ḫa-ni-in ti ti-wa-da-ni-in-ti, KBo 12.89 ii 19 ar-ra-ar-[a]-ha-ni-it-ti ti-wa-da-ni-it-ti ‘they swear and enrage the Sun-god’. For the comparison between the two pairs see Rieken 2017b. A different approach is offered in Giorgieri 2002, 303–4 with fn. 15, according to which the verb ti-wa-ta-ni-ia- ‘to take the deity as witness’ may also imply negative consequences for someone who perjured himself or was cursed before the Sun-god. For a further discussion of this verb with previous bibliography, see Puértolas Rubio 2019b, 64.
17′–18′ —the sweet breads of half a handful [w]hich [li]e on the wickerwork tab[l]e—,
18′–19′ and she holds them ove[r] the sheep’s hea[d].

§ 31
20′–21′ Afterward, the ritual patron consecrates the sheep to the Sun-god of the Oath
with the jug of wine.

§ 32
22′ Only one sheep (is) for the ikkunawar-sacrifice.
23′ (Even) if they treat many,
24′ they tak[e] only one sheep of the ikkunawar-sacrifice.

§ 33
25′ Sixth tablet of the dūpaduparša-ritual.
26′ Not finished.
27′ Hand of Dūwā.
27′–28′ He wrot[e] before Anuwanza.

i 25: The verbal form a-ar-ši-ia-an-du certainly shares the root with Hitt. ārš-,
aršiye/a- ‘to flow’ (Kloekhorst 2008, 208–9), but the context suggests that it has the
causative meaning, similar to that of Hitt. aršanu- ‘to let flow’, which takes the mas-
sa as objects. The stem is presumably /arsija-(b)/, and thus not lexically cognate
with Hitt. aršiye/a- (see Sasseville 2020c, 23).

i 26–27: This passage introduced the standard triad of ‘judgments’, ‘curses’, and ‘per-
juries’, the standard triad of harmful events that characterizes the Kuwattalla tradi-
tion, as opposed to ‘evil matter’, ‘impurity’ and ‘defilement’, typical of the Puriyanni
tradition. For the tentative translation of /tabaru-/, see the commentary to KUB 32.9(+)
obv. 8–9 (CTH 761.1.f). For the combinatorial analysis revealing the meaning of
/xirun/d-‘perjury’, see Laroche 1955, 78–81.

i 27–31: For the restoration of merisms, see KBo 29.3+ ii 1–4 (CTH 760.2; within the
context of a different rite).

i 30: For the previous treatments of Luw. /k wars(a/i)-/, see Maier 2013, 214–15. The
crucial argument for translating this noun as ‘army (camp)’ comes from the juxtapo-
sition of KUB 9.34 iv 11′ ĖRIN.MEŠ KARAŠ-aš EME-an ‘tongue of the army camp’ and
KUB 9.34 iv 12′ tu-li-ia-aš EME-an ‘tongue of the assembly’ in the Tunnawiya tradi-
tion (CTH 409.II.Tf02.A). Here the army and the assembly are contrasted in the same
merism as two distinct groups of people united by a common purpose (see further
Vol. 2, Section 4.2). For the polysemy between the notions of ‘army’ and ‘army camp’
in Hittite, which is parallel to the state of affairs reconstructed here for Luwian, see Melchert 2016c, 299, fn. 3.

i 34–37: The interpretation of these fragmentary lines is not an easy matter, but at least in line i 35 we are dealing with a transitive clause. Since the vegetal oil seems to function there as the subject, then it is probably the subject in its other occurrences within the same passage, while ‘it’ of line i 35 is the direct object. Alternatively, one can venture an interpretation of the clause in line i 35 with two direct objects: ‘it’ and ‘vegetal oil’. For a possible interpretation of the ritual actions associated with this passage, see Appendix III.

ii 1–2: This clause, restored on the basis of ii 23 below, features a rare case of a reflexive pronoun in the function of the direct object, combined with the indirect object ‘evil’ expressed by the accusative of respect. For a parallel construction, see KUB 32.9 rev. 6‘–7’ (CTH 761.1.f). The subject of this clause might be the ritual patron and his wife/family (for more details, see Appendix III).

ii 3: For the ritual use of oil and honey, see Haas (2003, 501–2), who proposes that, in this case, they serve to change curses into blessings (for a similar view, see Hagenbuchner-Dresel 2010, 160 fn. 49). Hutter (2003, 263) argues that oil and honey express here recovery and well-being. On the washing of the deities’ mouth, see Appendix III.

ii 5–6: The deities in the list apparently function as gods of the ritual patron’s household, since the continuation of the ritual takes place near their altar, see §§ 14‘–16’ below.

ii 10–16: This Luwian passage is the best-preserved example of an incantation addressed to the gods of the ritual patron’s household within the Kuwattalla tradition. Presumably, the impurity through bewitchment or personal transgression can spread from a patient to his gods and lead to their alienation (see Appendix III). This danger is more explicitly acknowledged in the incantations of the Puriyanni tradition: see e.g. KUB 35.54 ii 37‘–41’ (CTH 758.1). Note that heaven and earth are called to act as agents of purification. On the parallels in the Tunnawiyiya tradition, see the discussion of Pattern 3 in Vol. 2, Section 4.2.

ii 17: The Hittite phrase *pe[dan épz]* is restored based on the parallel *A-SAR-SU ḫar-zi = pēdan ḫarsi* in line ii 19.

ii 20–22: The purification with the help of the gangati-plant is assured only for the texts of CTH 759 within the Kuwattalla tradition. The same holds for the use of the cedar wood (see § 28′ below). For the use of the gangati-plant in Hittite texts, see Haas 2003, 328–35. On the cathartic rites involving the gangati-plant in rituals from Kizzuwatna, see Strauß 2006, 101–8.

ii 24: The form *wa-a-su-wa-aš-[sa]-an-zi[a]* ‘(items of) goods’ is formally a possessive adjective derived from /wasu-/ ‘goods, goodness’. The use of this form next to ‘evil’ in a syntactically parallel construction is likely a deliberate pun, although the meanings of the two clauses are actually rather different.

iii 10: The interpretation of the Luwian 2pl. form ‘a-at-ta’-ni-i remains problematic. One cannot exclude that it belongs to the paradigm of ‘a-(d)b’/ ’to do, make; treat’ (Car-
ruba 1968, 15; CLL, 39; Melchert 2003a, 192, fn. 20), but both interpretations face formal
difficulties. The object of this clause are presumably the evil māran[...]. For ‘treating’
the negative phenomena in the context of the Kuwattalla tradition see KUB 35.15 iii'11–13 (CTH 761.2.5); we are grateful to H. Craig Melchert for this parallel. Melchert
also indicates a possibility that the sentence ending with 'a-at-ta'-ni-i is interrogative
in view of the final plene spelling in this form (pers comm., 15/08/2021).

iii 20’–31’: In Puértolas Rubio 2022, this ritual sequence is analysed as an example of
a curse aiming at subjugating the bewitcher by means of a physical attack. The plac-
ing of the broken reeds at the feet of the ritual patron is interpreted as a symbolic
representation of the ritual patron’s domination over his adversary. For analogous
cases found in the Maštigga tradition, see Mouton forthcoming.

iii 22’–23’: For anda uesuriya- ‘to twist together’, see Melchert 2016b, 216.

iii 26’: For Luwian /anni:-(/di)/ ‘to cause’, see Yakubovich 2010b.

iii 27’: The Luwian noun /nadatt(a)-/, attested only in this passage, is derived from
Luw. /nad(i)-/ ‘reed’ (see Kloekhorst 2008, 597). Since the preceding Hittite passage
refers to the reed pipes (GIŠŠEN), not to the raw material, the meaning of the derived
noun /nadatt(a)-/ was probably ‘reed object’ or something of the sort. The meaning of
/ahha/ in this context is debatable, see the remarks in Sideltsev and Yakubovich 2016,
118–19 with fn. 43 (for a different opinion, contrast Melchert 2013a). For a possible
etymology of Luw. /tadarxa-/ see Kloekhorst 2008, 838–39. The same metaphor of
being snapped off by the deities like reeds appears in the treaty between Šuppilu-
luma I and Šattiwazza from Mittani (CTH 51.I), this time in Akkadian: ū at-ta 1Sā-ti-
u-a-za ni-iš dingirmes an-nu-ti qa-du kur-ti-ka ki-i gi li-ḫa-ši-is-šu-ka (Reichardt 1998,
34). Wilhelm (2016, § 17*) translates this passage as ‘Und dich, Šattiwazza, sollen diese
Götterreide mitsamt deinem Land wie ein Rohr zerknicken!’; for other attestations of
the verb ḥašāšu with this meaning, see CAD Ḥ, 131a). In Hittite, the same expression
is found in the Song of Ullikummi (see Puértolas Rubio 2019b, 66 with fn. 39; for an
dition of the passage, see Rieken et al. 2009a, §§ 8″–9″) and the Song of Kummarbi
(Rieken et al. 2009b, § 13), see further CHD L–N, 407a.

iii 28’: For a tentative interpretation of Luw. /witpan(i)-/ as ‘testicles, scrotum’, see
Garrett and Kurke 1994. At the same time, given that the incantation under discus-
accompanied breaking a reed pipe (which was previously interpreted as a box), the
alternative translation ‘penis’ deserves a fair hearing.

iii 29’: Traditionally, the first sign of this line has been read as A (Starke 1985, 115;
Kloekhorst 2008, 838; Yakubovich 2012, 327). However, the traces visible on the tablet
are incompatible with a reading A (see, for instance, the presence of a clear horizon-
tal). A PA sign seems to be the best option considering both epigraphic and gram-
matical perspectives.

iv 9’: For a ritual patron, the gesture of placing one’s hand on an offering is a way to
state that this offering comes from him (Wright 1986). Placing one’s hand in front of
an offering without touching it is directly linked to the patient’s state of impurity:
since he is not yet purified, he cannot be in direct contact with the item destined for the divine. On this aspect, see Mouton 2013b, 232.

**iv 11’–12’**: The explicit reference to the varying number of patients in this late tablet (see also § 32” below) may indicate that the scribe Dūwā had access to the diverging versions of the ritual composed for one vs. many ritual patrons. Compare the presence of multiple ritual patrons in CTH 759.3 as well as the variation in the number of ritual patrons in the Maṣṭigga tradition (Miller 2004, 232–38). For various ways of using cedar wood in Hittite rituals, see Haas 2003, 277–82.

**iv 13’**: The ikkunawar-sacrifice of this tablet must be identified with the ikkunatt-sacrifice of several other tablets belonging to the Kuwattalla tradition (including KUB 35.78(+), likewise demonstrably belonging to CTH 759). Both terms, tentatively translated as ‘anointing(?)’ by some scholars in the past (CLL 86–87; HW² I, 36a), now appear to be derived from /ikkwar/, gen.sg. *ikkun-, the likely designation of ‘liver’ in Luwian (Sasseville 2020c, 191–93). While treating gods with liver as part of the ikkunatt-rite is textually attested, here the relevant part of the rite is lost in the lacuna. Some discrepancies between the ikkunawar- and ikkunatt-sacrifices are also noted below. Nevertheless, the affinity between these two sacrificial offerings is supported by their identical place within the respective rituals: here the ikkunawar-sacrifice follows the purification with oil and honey, and the same is true of the ikkunatt-sacrifice in KUB 32.8(+) (CTH 759.10.b).

**CTH 759.2.a**

**Table of Manuscripts**

| A₁ | KUB 35.94 | Bo 9739 |
| A₂ | (+) KUB 35.83 | (+) Bo 3920 |

**Transmission and Research History**

These two mid-13th-century fragments contain a part of the right edge of a tablet together with the last signs of the respective parts of column two and column three. The fragments were published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 406–7 and Starke 1985, 399–400 respectively, where they were not yet treated as belonging to the Kuwattalla tradition. Since the fragments probably belong to the same tablet series as KUB 35.40+ (see below), one can surmise that they were found in the Temple I area. The reason for treating them as parts of the same tablet is the reconstructed subsequent mention of the gangati-plant and cedar wood in column three (see the commentary).
iv 18′–19′: Holding a bread over a sacrificial victim is a dedication gesture, which associates the two kinds of offerings.

iv 20′–21′: Contrast KUB 35.16(+) i 1′–4′ (CTH 760.3.b), where the animal of the ikkunatt-sacrifices is apparently consecrated with a jug of beer.


iv 22′–24′: This statement is in contrast with KUB 35.18(+) i 10 (CTH 760.1.a), where two animals of the ikkunatt-sacrifice appear in the list of implements for the ritual. Only one animal of the ikkunatt-sacrifice is, however, mentioned in Bo 4388:4 (CTH 763.2.1).

iv 25′–28′: For the previous edition of the colophon, see Waal 2015, 519.

iv 25′: According to KUB 35, Inhaltsübersicht, this is the sixth tablet of the ritual. Although the numeral is damaged, the available traces agree better with 6 than with 3, contra Starke 1985, 116.

iv 27′: The handcopy shows AN instead of PA. Nevertheless, the collation of the tablet photograph and the comparison with others PA signs of the same tablet suggests that the sign under discussion is a broken PA (see Starke 1985, 116; Torri 2017, 310–11; contra Waal 2015, 519). On the scribe Duwa who worked under Anuwansa’s supervision, see Gordin 2015, 197 and Torri 2015, 580.

Contents

§§ 1′–3′ Unclear
§ 4″ Luwian incantation mentioning several deities
§§ 5″–6″ Fragmentary Hittite passages
§ 7′ Luwian incantations for purifying parts of the house with a gangati-plant
§ 8″ Unclear
§§ 9″–10″ Fragmentary Hittite passages
§ 11″ Unclear
§ 12″ Manipulations with the gangati-plant
§ 13″ Fragmentary Hittite passage
§ 14″ Luwian incantation mentioning cedar wood
§ 15″ Luwian incantation mentioning a hearth
§ 16″ Fragmentary Luwian incantation

The ductus of both fragments suggests Ziti II as their scribe (see Fig. 2.9), while their content too is consistent with the extended version of the dupaduparša-ritual. Consequently, we attribute it to the same tablet series as KUB 35.41 (CTH 759.2.b) and KUB 35.40+.
(CTH 759.2.c). Note that column three shows suggestive parallels to the purification rite involving the gangati-plant as presented in KUB 9.6+ ii 17ff. (CTH 759.1).

**Transliteration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv. ii7</td>
<td>1′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 1′ […]x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 2′ […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 3′ […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 4′ […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 5′ […]x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 6′ […]x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 7′ […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 8′ […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 9′ […]x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 10′ […]x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 11′ […]x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 12′ […]da-a-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 13′ […]da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14′</td>
<td>A₁ ii7 14′ […]m[je]-ma-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Most parts of the fragments are, however, incomprehensible due to the fragmentary state of their preservation.

Translation

§§ 1′–3′
Obv. ii′
(not attempted)

§ 4′
1′ "[...]
2′ [...]  
3′ [...]  
4′ [...]  
5′ [...]  
6′ [...] of the [h]amrit-sanctuary  
7′ [...] Great Goddesses.”

§ 5′
8′ [...] the ritual patron  
9′ [...]  
10′ [...] places [... on] the wickerwork [ta]ble.

§ 6′
11′ [...]  
12′ She takes/places [...]  
13′ [...]  
14′ She [s]ays:
§ 7"
A₃ ii 15" [[Giš-]du na-a-im-mi]-iš
A₃ ii 16" [a-aš-du ḫa-la-ma-aš-š]u-it-ti-iš-du
A₃ ii 17" [ga-an-ga-ta-a-im-m]-iš
A₃ ii 18" [a-aš-du ma-na-an-d]-a-ri-en-zi
A₃ ii 19" [GUNNI-zi ḫa-ar-ša-an-za]a-tar-šu-[li]-"iš‘
A₃ ii 20" [ga-an-ga-ta-im-ma-a]n a-[a]-[š-du]

§ 8"
Revi. iii
A₃ iii 1’ [...]x-da-i

§ 9"
A₃ iii 2’ [...] nam-ma
A₃ iii 3’ [...] h]i-lam-ni
A₃ iii 4’ [...]iš [x] an-da
A₃ iii 5’ [...]x-ni
A₃ iii 6’ [...]"i-e-ez-zi

§ 10"
A₃ iii 7’ [...]x-ia
A₃ iii 8’ [...] TEXT UTUL

(lacuna of four lines)

§ 11"
A₃ iii 13’ [...] x x x [...]i

§ 12"
A₃ iii 14’ [...]x wa-al-ḫa-a[n-zī]
A₃ iii 15’ [...] GA-AN-[G]A-TI da-a-i
A₃ iii 16’ [...] ša-r]a-a e-ep-’zī‘
A₃ iii 17’ [...] kat]-ta da-a-i
A₃ iii 18’ [...] ḫur-[l]i-li an-da me-ma-i

§ 13"
A₃ iii 19’ [...] ē-ri ‘an-da’
A₃ iii 20’ [...] x x x [...]x
A₃ iii 21’ [...] x [...]
§ 7

15"–16" [May the pillar be *nai]-ed [for him!]
16"–18" [May the throne [be purifi]ed [by the *gangati-plant] for him!
18"–20" [May the dom]estic [altars, *harši-bread (and) *taršu]iš b[e purifi]ed [by the *gangati-plant!]

§ 8

Rev. iii

1′ [...]

§ 9

2′ [...] then
3′ [...] in the [g]atehouse
4′ [...] in
5′ [...] 6′ [...] [...]

§ 10

7′ [...]
8′ [...] pot

(lacuna of four lines)

§ 11

13′ [...]

§ 12

14′ [They] strike [...].
15′ She takes the [gang]ati-plant [...].
16′ She holds [... u]p [...].
17′ [...] takes [do]wn [...].
18′ At the same time, [the Old Woman] speaks in [Hur]rian.

§ 13

19′ [...] in the house
20′ [...] 21′ [...] (lacuna of uncertain length)
§ 14"
Rev. iii?
A₁ iii? 1° [...]-ip-pa-tar
A₁ iii? 2° [...]-li-in-tar
A₁ iii? 3° [...]-a]n-du
A₁ iii? 4° [...] ga[SERIN-in
A₁ iii? 5° [...] 

§ 15"
A₁ iii? 6° [...] ha-aš-ša-ni-it-ti-in
A₁ iii? 7° [...]-u-wa-a-na-pa
A₁ iii? 8° [...]x-zi
A₁ iii? 9° [...]z\i

§ 16"
A₁ iii? 10° [...]x kum-ma-in-zi
A₁ iii? 11° [...]x-i-tar ti-ia-mi
A₁ iii? 12° [...] x x x

Commentary

ii? 1°–7°: While only the last two lines of this paragraph can be partially translated, the use of the plural endings and the absence of verbal endings earlier on suggests the presence of several more theonyms. Perhaps we are dealing with a sequence of verb-initial sentences of the type ‘May god X be A-ed’, where X is a variable and A is a constant.

ii? 10°: One can surmise that the item(s) placed on the wickerwork table were deployed in the preceding rite (see KBo 29.3+ ii 14, 29–30, CTH 760.2).

ii? 15°–20°: This incantation is restored based on the parallel passage KUB 35.67:1’–6’ (CTH 759.8.c). See the commentary ad locum.

ii? 3°: See the mention of the gatehouse in connection with the rite of the gangati-plant in KUB 9.6+ ii 18 (CTH 759.1).

ii? 16°: See KUB 35.67:10’–11’ (CTH 759.8.c). Here too the gangati-plant is presumably proffered toward the Sun-god.
§ 14"
Rev. iii
1" 
2" 
3" May they [...] 
4" [...] cedar [...] 
5" [...] 

§ 15"
6" [...] the hearth (acc.) 
7" [...] 
8" [...] 
9" [...] 

§ 16"
10" [...] pure (nom. pl.) 
11" [...] to the earth 
12" [...]"

iii 18: This is the only mention of the use of a Hurrian incantation in the context of the Kuwattalla tradition. Contrary to the practice of always citing the Luwian incantations in Luwian within the context of this tradition, here the Hurrian incantation is either not cited at all or translated into Hittite.

iii 4*: See the mention of the gangati-plant in line iii 15* above. The rite involving cedar wood immediately follows the purification with the gangati-plant in the abbreviated version of the dupaduparša-ritual (KUB 35.78(+) iv 14–18, CTH 759.3). This constitutes the principal rationale for assigning KUB 35.94 iii below KUB 35.83 iii on the same tablet.

iii 6*: See the unextended lexeme /xassa-/ 'fireplace' as one of the items treated by the gangati-plant in KUB 35.67:4 (CTH 759.8.c). Here the hearth is likely used for burning cedar wood, whose odor is meant as an offering to the gods.
Table of Manuscripts

A₁  KUB 35.41  Bo 3495

Transmission and Research History

This mid-13th-century fragment contains a tiny portion of column three (barely a single preserved word) and a part of column four featuring the colophon. Its find spot is not retrievable from the available records, but judging by the find spot of KUB 35.40+, another piece belonging to the same tablet series (see Fig. 2.9) but not to the same tablet, it was probably found in the Temple I area. The dating of the fragment follows from the scribe’s prosopography and is consistent with paleographic analysis (see Fig. 2.8). The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 116–17, while its colophon was translated in Waal 2015, 520.

Transliteration

§ 1’
A iii 1’  x […]  
A iii 2’  x […]  
A iii 3’  na-x[…]  
A iii 4’  pa-a[…]

§ 2’
A iii 5’  x […]

§ 3’
Rev. iv
A iv 1’  […] x x […]

§ 4’
A iv 2’  [DUB.8.KAM ŠA ŠEŠKUR du-pi-du-pa-ar-š[a]  
A iv 3’  ṭA³-WA-AT ṭŠ-La-AL-LU-ḪI  
A iv 4’  ṭU⁴ IKU-WA-AT-TAL-LA ṭSUHUR.LA₄  
A iv 5’  [Š]U’LÙ DUMU NU₆ŠKIR₇  
A iv 6’  [PA-N]U₁A-NU-WA-AN-ZA SAG ṭˇS-ḪUR
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The fragment belongs to the eighth tablet of the dupaduparša-ritual written by the scribe Ziti II under the supervision of Anuwanza. As is clear from the tablet number, this is the extended version of the ritual, but there are no hints of the rites that may characterize this particular tablet.

Translation

§ 1′
Rev. iii
1′  [...] 
2′  [...] 
3′  and [...] 
4′  [...] 

§ 2′
5′  [...] 

§ 3′
Rev. iv
1′  [...] 

§ 4″
2′  Eighth [tabl]et of the dupaduparš[a]-ritual. 
3′  Word(s) of Šilalluḫi 
4′  and Kuwattalla, the female attendant. 
5′  [Ha]nd of Ziti, son of NU.146.KIRI₆. 
6′  He wrote [befor]e Anuwanza, the SAG-official.
Commentary

iv 3’–4’: For the Old Woman Šillaluhi, see de Martino 2011, 70–71; Kaynar 2017, 160–61; for the female attendant Kuwattalla, see Haas 2003, 22–23; Kaynar 2017, 159–60 (with bibliography); for the discussion of Kuwattalla’s professional title, see Güterbock 1983, 159.

CTH 759.2.c

Table of Manuscripts

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>KUB 35.40 Bo 8022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>+ KBo 29.8 + 1062/u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmission and Research History

The direct join between these mid-13th-century fragments was first mentioned in Otten and Rüster 1972, 235. It yields the left upper corner of the tablet with the beginning of column one and the end of column four, including the colophon. Judging by the find spot of A₂, the tablet comes from the Temple I area. The dating of the fragments follows from the scribe’s prosopography and is consistent with paleographic analysis. The two joined fragments were published again in transliteration in Starke 1985, 117, while the colophon was translated in Waal 2015, 519.

Transliteration

§ 1

Obv. i

A₁, i 1  

\( nu \ na-ak-ki-u-e-eš \ ku-e-da-[\ldots] \)

A₁, i 2  

\( ša-ku-ni-ia-aš \ Im-aš^*da^-an-za \ na-a[n \ldots] \)

A₁, i 3  

\( 'a-\text{pê-}da-ni \ \text{pê-e’-}[di \ldots] \ x \ x \ x \ [\ldots] \)

§ 2’

Rev. iv

A₁, iv 1’  

\( s'[\ldots] \)

§ 3’

A₁, iv 2’  

\( hu-u-uk^-[\ldots] \)

A₁, iv 3’  

NU.GÁL  \( ku^-[\ldots] \)

A₁, iv 4’  

\( ne-e-a-an \ [\ldots] \)
iv 4': For the collaboration between the Old Woman and a female attendant and its parallel in the Tunnawiya tradition, see the discussion of Pattern 7 in Vol. 2, Section 4.2.

iv 5': For the prosopography of Ziti II, a scribe belonging to the circle of Anuwanza, see Gordin 2015, 179–85.

Contents

§ 1 Hittite fragment mentioning clay of the spring and the nakkıu-spirits
§ 2’ Unclear
§ 3’ Unclear Hittite fragment
§ 4’ Colophon

According to the colophon, this is the ninth tablet of the dupaduparša-ritual, while the paleographic analysis (see Fig. 2.9) suggests that it belongs to the same tablet series as KUB 35.41 (written by Ziti II under Anuwanza’s supervision). The rite of § 1 finds a likely parallel in KUB 35.116 (CTH 759.13).

Translation

§ 1
Obv. i
1–2 The nakkıu-spirits, to which [...] 
2 [...] the clay of the spring (is) taken,
2–3 [...] in that plac[... i[t [...].

§ 2’
Rev. iv
1’ [...] 

§ 3’
2’ [...] (v. conjur[e] ...]
3’ there is not [...] 
4’ turned [...].
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A₁ iv 5’ $\text{MUNUSŠU.GI} [...]$

§ 4’
A₁₂ iv 6’ DUB.9.KAM ŠA SISKUR du-pi-du-pa-ar-[ša]
A₁₂ iv 7’ $\text{A-WA-AT}ŠI-ŁA-AL-LU-HI}^\prime \text{MUNUSŠU}^\prime,GI$
A₁₂ iv 8’ $\text{Ü}^\prime \text{KU-WA-AT-TAL-LA}^\prime \text{MUNUSŠU.GI}^\prime,ŁA_5$

Commentary

i 1–3: The clay of the spring is used in Tunnawiya’s ritual of the watercourse (§§ 9–14) for fashioning figurines, whose use in communication with the Storm-god is accompanied by Luwian conjurations (according to Alice Mouton’s unpublished edition of CTH 409.1). It is fairly likely that the clay of the spring is also used for substitute figurines in the context of the dupaduparša-ritual (see the commentaries to KUB 35.116

CTH 759.3

Table of Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A₁</th>
<th>KUB 35.81</th>
<th>373/f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>(+) KBo 71.94</td>
<td>(+) Bo 2019/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₃</td>
<td>(+) KUB 35.78</td>
<td>(+) 277/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₄</td>
<td>(+) KUB 35.37</td>
<td>(+) 1652/c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmission and Research History

All these four New Script fragments, characterized by the identical ductus (see Fig. 2.10), were found in the area of Building A of Büyükkale, except for A₂, which was also found at Büyükkale but in a secondary context. The fragments A₁, A₃, and A₄ were edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 189, 134, and 111 respectively. In addition, the colophon was translated in Waal 2015, 520. This is the first edition of A₂. The identity of A₄ as part of CTH 759 was self-evident from the beginning, while A₃ was identified on independent grounds as its part in Hutter 2003, 262. The fragments were joined by Alice Mouton and Ilya Yakubovich in the course of the Luwili Project. The horizontal join between A₁ and A₂ yields the restoration of the complete paragraph; the vertical join between A₃ and A₄ is undertaken on the assumption that the end of A₃ belongs can conclude that A₃ (+) A₄ belongs to column four of the tablet. Judging by the to the same paragraph as the beginning of A₄. Since A₄ contains the colophon, one content of A₁ (+) A₃, this joined fragment comes before A₃ (+) A₄ in the sequence of the
The Old Woman [...].

§ 4’ 
Ninth tablet of the *dupadupar*[ša]-ritual.

7’ Word(s) of Silalluhi, the Old Woman
8’ and Kuwattalla, the female attendant.

and CTH 759.13), but here they are apparently used in communication with the *nak-kiu*-spirits (on which see Mouton 2020b).

iv 1’: A restoration *[i-pa-an-ti]* ‘sacrifices’ is contextually likely but obviously uncertain.

rites reconstructed for the Kuwattalla tradition; and since A₄ demonstrably belongs to the first tablet of the ritual, this warrants a further indirect join between A₁ (+) A₂ and A₃ (+) A₄, which is consistent with the paleography of the respective fragments. We assume that A₁ (+) A₃ belongs to column one, judging by the approximate place of the respective fragment in the structure of the ritual, but this is uncertain. Note that A₄ has a lower sign density than the other tablet fragments of the ensemble. After the collation of the original fragments, they show the same scribal hand as KUB 35.42 (CTH 761.2.3.a) and KUB 34.62+ (CTH 761.2.3.b), although the signs are smaller in the last two fragments (see Fig. 2.10).

**Contents**

| § 1’ | Ritual spitting, with its Luwian incantation |
| § 2’ | Waving and then breaking the tongue of dough, each with its Luwian incantation; spitting rite, with its Luwian incantation; *taluppi*-rite |
| § 3’ | Unclear |
| § 4’ | Unclear |
| § 5’ | Presentation of sacred meat cuts to the Sun-god, with its Luwian incantation; nailing down liver and heart, with its Luwian incantation; *ikkunatt*-sacrifice; presentation of the sacred meat cuts of another sacrificial victim to the Sun-god, with its Luwian incantation |
§ 6’ Offerings of bread; purification with a gangati-plant; purification with cedar wood
§ 7’ Nailing down of the nakkiu-spirits, with its Luwian incantation
§ 8’ The Old Woman goes into town
§ 9’ Colophon

According to the colophon, this is a version of the dupaduparša-ritual. A special feature of this tablet series is the alternation of concise Hittite instructions and Luwian

Transliteration

§ 1’

§ 2’

§ 3’

§ 4’

§ 5’
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incantations within each full paragraph. Both this feature and the quick progression of rites suggest that we are dealing with its abbreviated version. The fragment $A_1$ (+) $A_2$ addresses the manipulations that find the best-preserved counterpart in KBo 29.3+ iii (CTH 760.2), while $A_3$ (+) $A_4$ addresses the ikkunatt-sacrifice, which presumably corresponds to the ikkunawar-sacrifice, recorded on the sixth tablet of the extended version of the dupaduparsa-ritual (KUB 9.6+ iv, CTH 759.1).

Translation

§ 1′

Obv. i

1′ [...] 2′ [... spits] down [...] and she says: 2′–3′ "[He] spa[t (out) woe (and) pa]in." [...] 4′ [and] she [sa]ys: "May [...] be [...]!"

§ 2′

5′ [She] wave[s] the tongue (figurine) [o]ver [the ritual patron], (saying): 6′ "[May he be pure]!" 6′–7′ He [br]eaks [off] the tongue of [d]ough together wit[h the hand (figurine)] 7′ [and she says]: 7′–8′ "He is breaki[n]g the [e]vil [tong]ue!" 8′–9′ He [s]pits do[w]n (on) them and [she says]: 9′–10′ "[He sp]at (out) woe (and) pa[in]." [She takes the pure] taluppi-lump 11′ [and she] says: "[May they be pu[r]e]!"

§ 3′

14′ [...] 15′–16′ She holds [the liv]er, heart (and) raw meat in front o[f the Sun-god] 16′ and says: "[...] 17′–18′ Sun-god [of the oat]h (acc.)." The Old Woman 18′ nails down [the liver (and) heart] and sa[ys]: 19′ "[Whoever (causes evil)] to the [rit]ual patron[s]..."

§ 4″

Rev. iv

1′ [...] 2′ [...] 13′–14′ She holds [the liv]er, heart (and) raw meat in front o[f the Sun-god] 14′ and says: "[...] 15′–16′ Sun-god [of the oat]h (acc.)." The Old Woman 16′ nails down [the liver (and) heart] and sa[ys]: 17′ "[Whoever (causes evil)] to the [rit]ual patron[s]..."
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A₃ iv 8’ [nu i-ik-ku-n]a-at-ta-aš ši-pa-an-ti nu me-ma-[i]
A₃ iv 9’ [hi-ru-ta-al]-i-iš ŠU-UTU-wa-za na-as-ta MUNUSŠU-GI
A₃ iv 10’ [UZUNI.GIG UZUŠÀ ŠI-i-u-i-šu DUTU-i me-na-ah-ha-[an-da]
A₃ iv 11’ [e-ep-zi’i n]u me-ma-i hi-i-ru-ú-ta-al-li-iš ŠU-UTU-wa-za]

§ 6”
A₃ iv 12’ [...x pár-ši-ia nu me-ma-i hi-i-ru-ta-al-li-[iš ŠU-UTU-wa-za]
A₃ iv 13’ [... NINDA.GI]R₄.RA da-a-i nu me-ma-i hi-i-ru-ta-al-li-[iš ŠU-UTU-wa-za]
A₃ iv 14’ [nu MUNUSŠU GI]A-AN-GA-TI da-a-i nu me-ma-i
A₃ iv 15’ [ga-an-ga-ta-i]m-nu-in-zi-ia-ta(AT) a-ša-an-du
A₃ iv 16’ [...] i nu me-ma-i EN SISKUR-an-za.
A₃ iv 17’ [... A-NA E[N SISKUR G]ERIN ar-ha’ da-a-t’
A₃ iv 18’ [...]x-ra-ma-aš-ta G]ER[EN...

§ 7”
A₃ iv 19’ [... na]-’ ak-ki’-u-aš pa-ra-a [...] 
A₃ iv 20’ [... pu]-’u-wa-ti’-[li-in-zi [...] 
(1–2 lines possibly missing)
A₄ iv 1’ [...x a-’da-x [...] 
A₄ iv 2’ [š]a-ra-a da-a-i nu-x[...]
A₄ iv 3’ i-it-tén nu i-da-a-la-mu-[uš na-ak-ki-uš kat-ta
A₄ iv 4’ tar-ma-a-iz-zi nu me-ma-i [...] 
A₄ iv 5’ : a-x[...]

§ 8”
A₄ iv 6’ nu MUNUSŠU.GI URU-ri an-da p[a-iz-zí’ ...]

§ 9”
A₄ iv 7’ DUB.1.KAM ŠA SISKUR du-ú-pa-du-[pa-ar-ša]
A₄ iv 8’ [... WA-AT [ku-wa-at-la-ul [ŠI-AL-AL-LI-ḪI]
A₄ iv 9’ [U]-UL QA-TI
A₄ iv 10’ [...] x x x [...] 

Commentary

i 2’–3’: For the gesture of spitting in Hittite and Luwian rituals, see Kammenhuber 1985 and Haas 2003, 564–66, as well as the discussion of the parallels in Tunnawiya and Maštigga traditions in Vol. 2, Sections 4.2 and 5.2 respectively. For the translation of the pair āḫra- wahrə-, see Cll 4, 249. Haas 2003, 562 proposes that this rite is related to the idea of “evil saliva” as the origin of curse and bewitchment. In his opinion, spitting as a form of witchcraft is based on the assumption that oral secretions spat out against a person or object with evil intent are equivalent to a curse. For a complete DOI: 10.13173/9783447119955.1.054
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8’ He consecrates one sheep of the [ikkun]att-sacrifice and [she] say[s]:
9’ “Sun-god of the Oath!” The Old [Woman]
10’–11’ [holds the liver], heart (and) raw meat in front of the Sun-god
11’ and says: “[Sun-god] of the Oath!”

§ 6’
12’ She crumbles [...]-bread and says: “[Sun-god] of the Oath!”
13’ She takes a [thick br]ead [...] and says: “[Sun-god] of the Oath!”
14’ [The Old Woman] takes a [gangati]-plant and says:
15’ “May they be treated [with the gangati-plant]!”
16’–17’ [...] and says: “To the ritual patrons […].”
17’ She takes the cedar wood [from] the ritual [pa]tron, (saying):
18’ “The ce[edar wood …].”

§ 7’
19’ [...] forth to the [...]-spirits [...]
20’ “[… f]orm[er …]”
(1–2 lines possibly missing)
1’ [...]–2’ She takes [u]p [...] and [...].
3’ “Go!”
3’–4’ She nails [down] the evil [nakkiu-spirits]
4’ and says: “[…]”
5’ [...]

§ 8’
6’ The Old Woman g[oes] into town [...].

§ 9’
7’ First tablet of the dūpadu[parsa]-ritual.
8’ [W]ord(s) (of) Kuwattalla and [Silalluḫi].
9’ Not finished.
10’ [...]
i 7': Contrast the hi-conjugation form \([du-w]a-a-r-na-a-i\) 'breaks' with \([du-w]a-ar-ni-iz-zi\) occurring in the parallel context in KBo 22.254(+) iii 5 (CTH 762.3.2).

i 7'–8': The comparison of this clause with the longer incantation in KBo 22.254(+) iii 6–9 ostensibly demonstrates that the present version of the dupaduparša-ritual has deliberately been shortened. It could not serve as an instruction for someone who has not learned the Luwian incantations beforehand, and it was presumably intended for the ritual specialists who had general familiarity with the Kuwattalla tradition but did not precisely remember the sequence of rites.

i 9'–10': The spitting rite also follows the destruction of the evil hand and tongue in KBo 29.3+ iii 21'–25' (CTH 760.2).

i 11': The subject of this abbreviated clause may be the gods of the ritual patron(s). See a similar incantation in KUB 32.79:6'–8' (CTH 762.1.h), even though this fragment does not contain a reference to a taluppi-rite. In contrast, immediately below in our text one finds yet another iteration of a taluppi-rite leading to the purification of the ritual patron, or perhaps of his spouse (see the mention of multiple patients earlier in the same tablet series).

iv 3'–11': If this paragraph is correctly restored, it refers to two consecutive presentations of liver and heart, presumably preceded by two consecutive sacrifices of the ikkunatt-sheep. This corresponds to the provision of two such sheep in KUB 35.18(+ ) i 10 (CTH 760.1.a), but contrast KUB 9.6+ (CTH 759.1), where just one sheep is provided for the ikkunawar-sacrifice. For the cognates of Hitt. ikkunatt- and their attestations, see Starke 1990, 537; for its derivation from the Luwian word for 'liver', see Sasseville 2020c, 191–92 and Vol. 2, Section 1.4.

iv 5': The mention of the Sun-god of the Oath constitutes a parallel between this text and KUB 9.6+, the best-preserved fragment of CTH 759 (extended version). It is, however, unlikely that the introduction of this theonym constitutes an innovation limited to CTH 759, since it is also tentatively reconstructed in KBo 22.254(+) ii 7' (see the commentary ad locum).
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iv 6': For the ritual gesture of nailing down, see Haas 2003, 735–41 and see the discussion of the parallel in the Maštigga tradition earlier in this book.

iv 7': For the full version of the related curse formula within the context of the ikkunatt-rite, see KUB 35.16(+) i 7″–10″ (CTH 760.3.b) and KUB 32.8(+) iv 21″–27″ (CTH 759.10.b). The curse is directed against the evildoer’s liver and heart, to be snatched from him and nailed down (for an analysis of this curse, see Puértolas Rubio 2022). The difference in this formula consists in the mention of more than one ritual patron, a feature shared with several other incantations below in the same fragment. See the option of several ritual patrons mentioned in KUB 9.6+ (§§ 29″, 32″; CTH 759.1).

iv 14′–16′: It seems likely that the treatment with the gangati-plant is directed at the gods of the ritual patron(s) rather than at the ritual patrons themselves. Presumably, after the gods are treated with the gangati-plant, they are expected to show favor to the ritual patron. For the juxtaposition of gods and (treatment with) the gangati-plant, see KBo 29.24 ii′ 3′–5′ (CTH 759.8.b). Note also the treatment with cedar wood, a common way of attracting gods in Hittite religious texts (Haas 2003, 279 and Mouton 2013a, 58–62), mentioned immediately below.

iv 15′: The spelling [ga-an-ga-ta-i] m-mi-in-zi-ia-at instead of [ga-an-ga-ta-i] m-mi-in-zi-ia-ta reflects an error of a bilingual scribe, who replaced the Luwian clitic pronoun /=ada/ ith its Hittite equivalent =at. Furthermore, it seems likely that the final vowel of /=ada/ ‘they’ merged in pronunciation with the initial vowel of the following ašandu, which facilitated the confusion.

iv 20′: For the reconstruction of [pu]-u-wa-ti-[li-in-zil] ‘former’, see the use of the same adjective in connection with the nakktiu-spirits in KUB 35.13+ r.col. 15′ (CTH 762.3.4).

iv 6′: See KUB 35.116 i 8′ (CTH 759.13), where the Old Woman apparently returns from town with the clay from the well, also while dealing with the nakktiu-spirits.
### CTH 759.4

#### Table of Manuscripts

| A | KUB 35.38 | Bo 7028 |

#### Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment, whose find spot is unknown, contains tiny fragments of column one and column four, including the colophon. The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 118 as part of CTH 759. For the treatment of the colophon, see Waal 2015, 520.

#### Transliteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 1’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv. i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A i 1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A i 2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A i 3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A i 4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A i 5’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 2’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A i 6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A i 7’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A i 8’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 3’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rev. iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A iv 1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A iv 2’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

i 7’ The form DUMUNAM.[LÚ].U₁₉.LU- in is used in the meaning ‘human’ in the Luwian context in the Zarpiya ritual (KUB 9.31 ii 27). In contrast, the Tauriša tradition appar-
Contents

§ 1’ Unclear Luwian passage
§ 2’ Unclear Hittite passage
§ 3” Colophon

The fragment is tentatively classified as part of CTH 759 based on the colophon, but any further analysis is impossible.

Translation

§ 1’
Obv. i
1’ “[...]
2’ [...] 
3’ [...] 
4’ [...] 
5’ [...]”

§ 2’
6’ [...] it [...] 
7’ [...] t]o the hu[man ... 
8’ [...] 

§ 3”
Rev. iv
1’ [...] 
2’ [...] dīpa[duparša-ritual]

...ently uses the Sumerogram DUMU.LU₂₉,LU in the more specialized meaning 'human child'; see e.g. KBo 13.260 ii 30.
### Transmission and Research History

This fragment was found in Building D of Büyükkale. Its position on the tablet cannot be determined. The ductus of the fragment is Middle Script. The fragment was published in transliteration in Roszkowska-Mutschler 2007, 176–77.

### Transliteration

| § 1’ | A:1’ | [...] x [...] |
| A:2’ | [...]-ša-a[r-...[ |
| A:3’ | [...]-ša-an 5 me-x[...[ |
| A:4’ | [...] in-ma x x x x x [...] |
| A:5’ | [...] a-a-pi-ia x[...[ |
| A:6’ | [...] [x x x] ĠDUG.GA na-x[...[ |
| A:7’ | [...] Ḫ-NA 𒀀AMAR.UTU ū-u-k[ u-wa-an-zī’ [...] |

| § 2’ | A:8’ | [...] ṣu-ni-ia-zī [...] |

| § 3’ |
| A:9’ | [...] x-rî-iš SÍSKUR du-ú-p[a-du-pár-ša ... |
| A:10’ | [...] ’anḫ ū-u-p-ra-aš na-x[...[ |
| A:11’ | [...] ū-u’-u’]-ku-wa-an-zī’ da-a’-[i ... |
| A:12’ | [...] x x [...] |

### Commentary

4’: Roszkowska-Mutschler 2007, 177 believes that -in-ma belongs to line 5’.

5’–7’: Neither the ṣapi-pit nor the god Šanta is otherwise attested in the Kuwattalla tradition. Note, however, that Šanta is addressed in the Luwian language in the Zarpiya ritual (CTH 757).

7’: There are some erased signs visible on top of this line, which are interpreted as a separate line in the handcopy. There is, however, hardly enough space to squeeze a whole line between 6’ and 7’.
Contents

§ 1’ Ritual manipulations, invocation to Šanta is mentioned
§ 2’ Ritual treatment of buildings
§ 3’ Further ritual manipulations; the dupaduparša-ritual is mentioned

The mention of the dupaduparša-ritual constitutes the sole reason this fragment is classified as part of the Kuwattalla tradition. Its distinct feature is the absence of Luwian passages. Its closest structural counterpart within the tradition is KBo 46.55 (CTH 763.2.2). Both texts are likely to reflect the abridged versions of the ritual with the omitted incantations.

Translation

§ 1’
1’ [...] 
2’ [...] 
3’ [...] five [...] 
4’ [...] 
5’ [...] in the āpi-pit [...] 
6’ [...] fine oil [...] 
7’ [...] starts/finishes conjuring] to Šanta.

§ 2’ 
8’ [...] treats (ritually) the buildings [...] 

§ 3’
9’ [...] dup[aduparša]-ritual [...] 
10’ [...] sash(es) [...] 
11’ [...] start[s conj]uring [...] 
12’ [...] 

7’ and followings: several lines appear on the tablet, which are most probably preparatory lines, since double paragraph lines are not expected in this context (there is no colophon following this passage and this is probably not a compilation tablet). We, therefore, interpreted these as single paragraph lines.

10’: The sashes are mentioned in the Zarpiya ritual in connection with the Innara-want-deities, the attendants of Šanta (HT 1 i 31’, KUB 9.31 ii 24).
Dupaduparsi-ritual (CTH 759)

CTH 759.6?

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.58 Bo 3450

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment contains small parts of columns two and three and preserves the right edge of the tablet. The find spot of the fragment is unknown. The fragment is published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 164–65 as part of an unspecified "Old Woman" ritual.

Contents

§ 1′ Unclear
§§ 2′–3′ Luwian incantations that accompany a taluppi-rite

Transliteration

§ 1′

Obv. ii
A ii 1′ [...] x
A ii 2′ [...](-)ma-aš²-x x [...] 

§ 2′
A ii 3′ [ha-la-a-li-ša]-aš a-[aš]-du EN S[ISKUR ...]x-ti
A ii 4′ [...]-ta ’hi’-ru-ta-ni-ia-’am-ma’-[t]i ti-wa-ta-ni-ia-am-ma-ti
A ii 7′ [ha-la-la-nu-wa-at-tu pa]-’a’-aš ħa-la-li-iš a-aš-du

§ 3′
A ii 8′ [zi-la-du-úr DINGIR³⁵ES-in-z]i za-am-ma-an ħi-i-ru-ú-[u[n]
A ii 11′ [a-ap-pa ka-al-du-ni-ia] ’ū’-i-[t-ta-ri]
A ii 12′ [...] x x [...]
The attribution of the fragment to CTH 759 or CTH 762 is based on the use of the phrase "ḫi-i-ti-wa-ta-ni-am-ma-ti" which implies a reference to the Sun-god of the Oath, a likely late innovation within the Kuwattalla tradition (see the commentary). An informed choice between these two alternatives is impossible, but since the segregation of CTH 762 follows stricter criteria, the attribution of the fragment to CTH 759 represents the default solution. Although several formulæ of this incantation find counterparts in the first tablet of CTH 760, the hypothesis that the present fragment belongs to the first tablet of the ritual cannot be regarded as compelling, since taluppi-rites demonstrably occurred at various points in the ritual proceedings. The relative order of the two sides of the fragment cannot be considered certain either.

Translation

§ 1’
Obv. ii7
1’–2’ "[…]"

§ 2’
3’ May the ritual patron be [pure] from […],
4’ […] committing perjury, rage of the Sun-god
5’–6’ the [t]ongue of [judgment, curse (or) [perjury]]!
6’–7’ [May] the pure taluppi-lump [purify] him.
7’ [Th]en may he be pure!

§ 3’
8’–9’ [In the future, may the gods no[t bind] witchcraft, perjur[y, judgment, curs]e, to his body!
10’ [May they not (be experienced) again by him (as) a h]eavy bur[den]!
10’–11’ [May they not be] exp[erienced again by him (as) a thrashing]!
12’ […]"
§ 4'
Rev. iii? 1' [...] x [...] 
A iii? 2' [...]¬-a¬-li-ia-[...]
A iii? 3' [...]¬-ri-ia-at-[a]
A iii? 4' [...]¬-li-ia-An-d[u]

§ 5'
A iii? 5' [...]¬-x pa-ra-a hi-ik-zi
A iii? 6' [...]¬-a/i/i¬-a¬-pa¬-at
A iii? 7' [...]¬-x-an-zi

§ 6'
A iii? 8' [...]¬-u¬]¬ ar-ha pi-ip-pa¬-i
A iii? 9' [...]¬ ki-iš-ša]-an me-ma-i

§ 7'
A iii? 10' [...]¬-ta¬-pa¬-a-ru¬ hi-ru¬-ú¬-un

Commentary

ii? 4': The noun /tiwadanijamm(a)-/ ultimately represents a derivative of the theonym Tiwad, but its more immediate base is the verbal stem /tiwadanija-(ti)/ (Sasseville 2020c, 32), which is juxtaposed to /xirudanija-(ti)/ in KUB 9.6+ i 23 (CTH 759.1) and KBo 22.254(+) rev. 9' (CTH 762.3.2). Perhaps /tiwadanija-/ literally means 'to enrage the Sun-god', while its lexicalized participle /tiwadanijamm(a)-/ refers to the negative consequences of such an act (see the commentary of KUB 9.6+ i 23). This collocation cannot be separated from the divine name /xirudallis Tiwaz/ 'Sun-god of the Oath', likewise introduced into the Kuwattalla tradition at a late stage in its development.

ii? 7': The precise meaning of the restored verb, let alone its Luwian form, represents a matter of conjecture. Nevertheless, the mention of the taluppi-lump in the clause under discussion indicates that the incantation of the following paragraph, as well as its counterparts in other fragments of CTH 760/762, is connected with a taluppi-rite. The contrast between this group and the divergent incantations deployed in the taluppi-rites in CTH 761 is important for stratifying the Kuwattalla tradition.

ii? 8’–11': Restored on the basis of KUB 35.48 iii 10′–13′ (CTH 760.4). For the translation of this passage see the commentary ad locum.
§ 4″
Rev. iii:*
1’ "[...]
2’ [...]
3’ [...]
4’ Ma[y] they [...]!"

§ 5″
5’ [...] hands over [...].
6’–7’ [...] They [...] that [...].

§ 6″
8’ [...] overturns [...].
9’ [...] speaks [thu]s:

§ 7″
10’ "[...] judgment, perjury,
11’ [curse, the to]ngle [of the multitudes]!"

ii⁷ 10’–11’: See the commentary to KBo 29.3+ iii 11’–12′ (CTH 760.2) and KUB 35.48 iii 13′ (CTH 760.4).

iii⁷ 8’: Kammenhuber 1985, 84 restores [₁₄ᵣ₂₋₄ₑ₋ₑ₋ₑₓ₋ₑ₋ₑ₋ₑₑ₋ₑᵤ]š ar-ḥa pi-ip-pa-i. If this restoration is correct, it would be the only attestation of this expression in the Kuwattalla tradition. However, the gesture of turning up the šeknu-garment is usually rendered by the expression šeknu šar-ḥa pippa- (see CHD P, 270a–71b). For the relationship between this expression, perjury, and witchcraft, see Puértolas Rubio 2019a, 187–93 (with the discussion of the previous bibliography). It seems more probable that the objects to be toppled or overturned (arḥa pippa-) symbolize the miasma mentioned in the accompanying incantation. In the light of the ritual of Maštigga, these objects could be tanid-stones representing miasma (Miller 2004, 98–99; for a commentary, see Mouton forthcoming), although this is merely one possibility among others.

iii⁷ 11’: The accusative EME-an, instead of the expected Luwian EME-in, is influenced by the norm of the Hittite matrix language.
CTH 759.7

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.50 Bo 6832

Transmission and Research History

The find spot of this New Script fragment is unknown. There are no clues to determine its position on the tablet. The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 175 as belonging to an unspecified "Old Woman" ritual.

Transliteration

§ 1'

A:1' [...] x [...] 
A:2' [...] x x x x x [...] 

§ 2'

A:7' [...] x zi-in-za mu-u-w[a-an-du ...] 
A:8' [...] x-ta zi-in-'za'[mu-u-wa-an-du ...] 
A:9' [...] x-ta zi-in-za'[mu-u-wa-an-du ...] 
A:10' [...] x-'in' [...] 

Commentary

3’–6’: The specific similarities between this fragment and KUB 32.8(+) consist in the use of the pair ‘downstriking hand, downstriking tongue’ in lieu of its more usual counterpart ‘evil hand, evil tongue’ and the placement of ‘misery’ between ‘curse’ and ‘perjury’ in the list of negative phenomena. While the words for ‘misery’ and ‘perjury’ are fully restored, space considerations are in favor of such a solution. For a different restoration, see Goedegebuure 2010a, 303.
Contents

§ 1′ List of miasma
§ 2′ Transferring the control of the miasma to a ritual substitute (?)

For the formulaic similarities between this fragment and KUB 32.8(+), see the commentary. Thanks to these similarities, we assign the present tablet to the early “standard” version of CTH 759 (see the discussion under CTH 759.10.b).

Translation

§ 1′
1′ “[...]
2′ [...] the [dow]nstriking [hand, downstriking]
3′ [...] the tongue of judgmen[t], curs[e, misery],
4′ [perjury], bad year, [bad month],
5′ [the i]nterior [of shrouds, the tongue of] the multitud[es].

§ 2′
7′ [May [...] overcome these [...]..
8′ [...] may they overcome these [...],
9′ may they [overcome ...]!
10′ [...]”

6’: For the expression “tongue of the multitudes”, see the commentary to KUB 35.21 rev. 24’ (CTH 761.1.d).

7’: The sequence of the list of the miasma in the previous paragraph and the muwai-clauses here is reminiscent of KUB 35.24+ obv. 1′–7′ (CTH 761.1.c), but the grammatical and lexical differences between the two tablets illustrate their attribution to two different specimens of the Kuwattalla tradition.
CTH 759.8.a

Table of Manuscripts

A  KUB 35.3  Bo 8220

Transmission and Research History

This tiny New Script fragment does not yield any cues for determining its position on a tablet. The identity of the scribal hand suggests that it belongs to the same tablet series as KBo 29.24 (CTH 759.8.b), which in turn speaks in favor of its origin in the Temple I area. A further fragment that probably belongs to the same tablet series is

Transliteration

§ 1’
A:1’  [..]  $^\text{MUNUSŠU.GI}  lu-ú-š-š-[i ...]
A:2’  [..]

§ 2’
A:3’  [..]  $^\text{[... ]á-ñ-a-a-š-š-[i ÏNÎRMEŠ-in-zi }...
A:4’  [..]

§ 3’
A:5’  [..]  $^\text{GAL.GIR} [...]

Commentary

3’: See the reference to the household deities in KBo 22.254(+) ii 6’ (CTH 762.3.2). These are presumably the deities of the ritual patron’s household, whose effigies are situated in his house (see KUB 9.6+ ii 20–22; CTH 759.1). Given the mention of the...
KUB 35.67 (CTH 759.8.c). The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 172 as belonging to an unspecified "Old Woman" ritual.

Contents

§§ 1’–2’ Fragmentary rite, with its Luwian incantation mentioning household deities
§ 3’ Hittite passage mentioning a ceramic cup

The passage apparently belongs to an ablution or sprinkling rite. It is classified as part of CTH 759 primarily based on its ductus.

Translation

1’–2’ [...] The Old Woman [says] in Luwia[n]:

3’–4’ "[... h]ousehold [deities ...]."

5’ [...] ceramic cup [...]
Dupaduparša-ritual (CTH 759)

CTH 759.8.b

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 29.24 1008/z

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment was found in the Temple I area. It contains the intercolumnium, miniscule fragment of the left column, and a somewhat larger fragment of the right column. It was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 200 as belonging to an unspecified "Old Woman" ritual.

Transliteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 1'</td>
<td>A i? 1'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A i? 2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2''</td>
<td>A ii? 1'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ii? 2'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| § 3''   | A ii? 3'   | DINuRMEŠ.i[n-zi ...] |
|         | A ii? 4'   | ga-an-g[a-ta-im-mi-in-zi a-aš-du ...] |
|         | A ii? 5'   | DINuRMEŠ-a[n-za ...] |
|         | A ii? 6'   | na-a-na-x[...] |
|         | A ii? 7'   | ma-al-h[a-aš-ša-aš-... EN-...] |

| § 4''   | A ii? 8'   | nam-ma x[...] |
|         | A ii? 9'   | e-ep-z[i ...] |
|         | A ii? 10'  | EGIR-pa x[...] |
Contents

§ 1′ Unclear
§ 2″ Unclear Hittite passage
§ 3″ Luwian incantation for the purification of gods by means of a gangati-plant
§§ 4″–5″ Unclear Hittite passages
§ 6″ Unclear Luwian incantation

The fragment bears the same scribal hand as KUB 35.67 and KUB 35.3 (see Fig. 2.11). Although the signs of KUB 35.3 are smaller than those of KBo 29.24, this does not exclude the possibility that the two fragments belong to the same tablet series. The mention of the gangati-plant speaks in favor of its attribution to CTH 759. There is a considerable probability of an indirect join between KBo 29.24 and KUB 35.67 (see the commentary). If this hypothesis holds, then KBo 29.24 is probably to be arranged first, since it mentions the purification of household deities, while KUB 35.67 refers to the purification of ritually significant parts of the house.

Translation

§ 1′
Obv. i?
1′ [...]

§ 2″
Obv. ii?
1′ [...] 2′ t[o ...]

§ 3″
3′–4′ "[May] the gods [...] be purifi[ed] by the gang[atti-plant]! [...] 5′ [To] the gods [...] 6′ brother[(...)] 7′ the ritu[al patron]."

§ 4″
8′–9′ Then she hold[s ...]. 10′ Afterward, [...].
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§ 5’
A ii? 11’ EGR-an-[a ...]
A ii? 12’ iš-TU [...] 
A ii? 13’ EGR-pa [...] 

§ 6’
A ii? 14’ išša-[a-...]
A ii? 15’ a-aš-[u ...]

Commentary

ii? 3’–4’: See the application of the gangati-plant to the effigies of gods in KUB 9.6+ ii 20-22 (CTH 759.1). In fact, it is likely that the passage under discussion continues the rite that begins in column two of KUB 9.6+ but is broken there in the middle. The same rite is also likely reflected in KUB 35.67, which would imply that KBo 29.24 and KUB 35.67 belong not only to the same tablet series but also to the same tablet—that is, form an indirect join. None of these suggestions, however, can be regarded as certain, since the dupaduparša-ritual could be punctuated by purification rites involving the gangati-plant at various points.

CTH 759.8.c

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.67 Bo 2993

Transmission and Research History

This New Hittite fragment of uncertain provenance is broken along the intercolumnium and contains a fragment of the right column, which does not reach the right edge of the tablet. The identity of the scribal hand (see Fig. 2.11) and the similarity of the subject matter suggests that it belongs to the same tablet series as KBo 29.24, which in turn supports its origin in the Temple I area. The fragment was edited in
§ 5′
11′ Afterwar[d, ...
12′ from [...]  
13′ Afterward [...]  

§ 6′
14′ "[...] the han[d ...]  
15′ [.. m]ay be [...]!"

ii? 6′: Based on the collation of the fragment, the reading na-a-na-ṣḫi-[...], entertained in Starke 1985, 200, appears over-optimistic: the traces visible on the tablet rather look like a more complex erased sign. While one cannot exclude the possibility that the fragmentary form na-a-na-x-[...] belongs to the paradigm of /nanayid-/ 'brotherhood', assigning it to /nan(i)-/ 'brother' is arguably a more economical solution.

transliteration in Starke 1985, 182–83 as belonging to an unspecified “Old Woman” ritual. After collation of the original fragments, it appears that KUB 35.67 most probably belongs to the same tablet or tablet series as KUB 35.3.

Contents
§ 1′ Luwian incantations for purifying parts of the house with the gangati-plant  
§ 2′ Manipulations involving the gangati-plant  
§ 3′ Presenting the gangati-plant to the Sun-god  

The use of the gangati-plant for the purification of the house finds a parallel in KUB 9.6+ ii 17ff. (CTH 759.1).
Transliteration

§ 1′
Right column
A:1′ ṣar?-ḫu-li-iš-du’ na-a-i[m-mi-iš]
A:2′ a-aš-du ḫal-ma-aš-šu-ḫ-[ti-iš-du]
A:3′ ga-an-ga-ta-im-mi-iš a-aš-du[u]
A:4′ ma-a-na-an-ta-rí-i-n-[zi ḫa-aš-ša-[a-n-zí]
A:5′ ḫa-ar-ša-an-za ta-a-tar-šu-ū-li-[i§]
A:6′ ga-an-ga-ta-i-m-ma-an a-a-š-du

§ 2′
A:7′ nu MUNUS.GI a-pa-a-at-ta GA-AN-G[A-TI pa-ra-a]
A:8′ e-ep-zî nu a-pa-a-at-ta ku-x[...]
A:9′ nam-ma-at-ša-an MUNUS.GI x[...]

§ 3′
A:10′ ḫEGIR]-an-da-ma MUNUS.GI GA-AN-G[A-TI PUTU-§]
A:11′ [me-na-a]ḫ-ha-an’m-da ṣ̄a-ra-a e-[ep-zî ...]
A:12′ [... x x x [...] x [...]]

Commentary

1′–6′: This incantation is restored with the help of the parallel passage KUB 35.94(+)
ii 15′–20′ (CTH 759.2.a). The comparison between the two passages was first offered
in Meriggi 1957, 75.

1′: The interpretation of ṣar?-ḫu-li-iš-du’ faces some epigraphic difficulties. The
reading of the initial sign as ŠAR, offered in Starke 1985, 182 and Hoffmann 2000, 178,
is not absolutely assured in view of the little space available. Semantically, however,
Luwian ṣar?-ḫu-li-iš would represent a straightforward cognate of Hittite šarhlul- ‘pillar(?)’ (CHD Š, 254–55) and thus a good match for the throne mentioned immediately
below.

1′–2′: One can contrast the Luwian incantation for purifying ritually significant parts
of the house with water in the Puriyanni tradition (KUB 35.54 iii31–38; CTH 758.1),
where the throne seems to be absent from the list. The mention of the throne in the
present case need not suggest that the house purified with the gangatiplant in the
paragraph under discussion is of a palatial type. This would indeed be rather unexpected
for the Kuwattalla tradition, where the ritual patron is never called a king.
More likely, the throne might have been reserved for divine effigies.

4′: We tentatively take /manantar(i)-/ as a functional equivalent of Hitt. tamnaššara-
‘domestic’, for which see Melchert 2001, and analyze this adjective as a compound
§ 1’ Right column

1’–2’ "May the pillar be nai-[ed] for him!

2’–3’ May the throne be purified by the gangati-plant [for him]!

4’–6’ [May] the domestic altars, ĥarši-bread, (and) tataršuliš be purified by the gangati-plant!"

§ 2’

7’–8’ The Old Woman also holds that (very) gang[ati]-plant [toward (the ritual patron)].

8’ (He) also [...] that [...].

9’ Then, the Old Woman [...] on it.

§ 3’

10’–11’ Afterward, the Old Woman holds the gang[ati]-plant before [the Sun-god].

12’ [...]
Dupaduparša-ritual (CTH 759)

CTH 759.9

Table of Manuscripts

A  KUB 35.118  Bo 8537

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment is not associated with a known find spot. Its position on the tablet likewise cannot be determined. It was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 411–12 with no attribution to a particular text.

Transliteration

§ 1′
A:1′ [...]-[n ...]
A:2′ [...]-[iš-t[i? ...]

§ 2′
A:3′ [...]-[a]li-[n,z[i ...]
A:4′ [...]-ta-al-[i-in-[ ...]
A:5′ [...]-[za-an ga-an-[ga ...]
A:6′ [...] x x [...]

CTH 759.10.a

Table of Manuscripts

A  KBo 8.129  247/m

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment, found in the area of Building A of Büyükkale, contains the left edge of the tablet with the beginning signs of the adjacent parts of column one and column four. It was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 192–94 as part of an unspecified “Old Woman” ritual.
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Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Unclear Luwian incantations

A very tentative assignment of this tiny fragment to CTH 759 hinges on a possible mention of the *gangati*-plant in line 5′. There are no other arguments in support of its classification.

Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 1′</th>
<th>“[...]]]“</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2′</td>
<td>“[...]”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 2′

| 3′ | “[...]” |
| 4′ | “[...]” |
| 5′ | “[...]*gan*[gati-plant [...]]]“ |
| 6′ | “[...]]]“ |

The fragment is written in the same hand and very likely belongs to the same tablet series as the better-known joined fragment KUB 32.8 (+) KUB 32.5 (see Fig. 2.12). It
preserves a part of the ritual containing, among other things, invocations to various gods. Judging by the other available fragments of the Kuwattalla tradition—for example, KBo 29.3+ (CTH 760.2), KBo 29.55+ (CTH 761.3.8), or KBo 22.254(+) (CTH 762.3.2)—

Transliteration

§ 1′
Obv. i  
A i 1′  an-[
A i 2′  ta-a-x[
A i 3′  wa-aš-ši-na-a[š-ši-in-zī ḫar-ma-ḫa-aš-ši-in-zī]
A i 4′  tar-pa-a-aš-sa-a[n-zī ...]
A i 5′  ú-na-i-im-mi-i[n-zī ...]
A i 6′  a-a-an-na-na-a-x[...
A i 7′  ḫu-u-li-ia-aš-[ši-in-zī ...]
A i 8′  zi-i-in-z[i ...]

§ 2′
A i 9′  za-an-da du-[ū-pa-im-mi-in-zī ...]
A i 10′  zi-in-z[i ...]
A i 11′  [ça]ŠSU.A-ti [...
A i 12′  x-u-x[...
A i 13′  za-a-aš [...
A i 14′  za-a-a[p-...
A i 15′  du-x[...
A i 16′  i-iš-[

§ 3′
A i 17′  pár-na-x[...
A i 18′  [ça]ŠSU.A-t[i za-ap-pu-un-ta ...]
A i 19′  za-ap-[u-′un-ta ...]
A i 20′  za-ap-[pu-un-ta ...]
A i 21′  iš-[

§ 4′
A i 22′  nu-u[š-...

§ 5″
Rev. iv  
A iv 1′  x[...
A iv 2′  n[a-...
such invocations tend to occur in the initial part of the ritual. Therefore, we tentatively order the fragment under discussion before KUB 32.8(+), which contains the description of the *ikkunatt*-sacrifice.

Translation

§ 1′

Obv. i

1′  “[...]
2′  [...]
3′–4′ the substitut[es for] the body [(and) the head [...]
5′  the know[n ones [...]
6′  [...]
7′  [... o]f the violent [...]
8′  these [...]  

§ 2′

9′  the downst[riking ...]
10′  these [...]  
11′  from (among) the stools [...]
12′  [...]  
13′  this [...]  
14′  [...]  
15′  [...]  
16′  [...]  

§ 3′

17′  [...] house [...]  
17′–18′ [We treated (ritually) a stool] from (among) the stools,  
19′  [we] tre[ated (ritually) [...],  
20′  [we] tre[ated (ritually) ...]  
21′  [...]"

§ 4′

[...]

§ 5″

Rev. iv

1′  [...]  
2′  [...]  
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§ 6”
A iv 3’ ša[r-…]
A iv 4’ x[…]
A iv 5’ a-[…]
A iv 6’ nu-[…]
A iv 7’ wi-ak[k-][…]

§ 7”
A iv 8’ [n][a]-aš-x[…]
A iv 9’ [n][u]-uš-[…]
A iv 10’ [h][a]-an-[…]
A iv 11’ [p]ār-na-[…]

§ 8”
A iv 12’ šar-li-[…]
A iv 13’ šar-li-[…]

§ 9”
A iv 14’ nu E[N SISKUR …]
A iv 15’ na-aš-t[…]
A iv 16’ nu MINUS[U.GI …]

§ 10”
A iv 17’ šar-la-a[m-mi iš P]UTU …]
A iv 18’ DINGIR[MEŠ-an-z[a pár-ra-an …]
A iv 19’ EN SISKU[R …]
A iv 20’ ḫu-u-it-w[a-la-ḫi-ti …]

§ 11”
A iv 21’ na-aš-ta x[…]
A iv 22’ IS-TU NINDA […]
A iv 23’ KLIN ma […]
A iv 24’ EN SISKUR […]
A iv 25’ x x[…]

Commentary

i 4’: The identity of substitutes mentioned here is uncertain. In the Puriyanni tradition, manipulations with furniture are likewise mentioned (KUB 35.54 ii 20’–21’; CTH 758.1). On the substitutes in the Kuwattalla tradition, see further Taracha 2000, 155 and Hutter 2003, 261.

i 7’: For the base noun, see KUB 35.15 iii 11 (CTH 761.2.5). For its tentative translation, see the commentary to KBo 9.141 iv 5’ (CTH 761.2.4).
§ 6′

"[...]

§ 7′

[...]

§ 8′

"Supreme [...]"

§ 9′

The [ritual] patron [...].

§ 10′

"Exalted Sun-god, [...]"

§ 11′

[...] with bread [...]

ditto. Then [...] the ritual patron [...]

i 17′–18′: This clause is tentatively restored after its better-preserved counterparts in KUB 35.68:9′–11′ (CTH 763.1.3.a). The restoration of the first plural preterit ending is, of course, conjectural.

iv 11′: It seems likely that the invocation to follow is addressed to the household deities. For deities preceding the Sun-god in the list of divine patrons, see KBo 22.254(+) iii 6′–8′ (CTH 762.3.2).
iv 17: The epithet šar-la-[m-mi-iš] 'exalted' is formally a participle from the Luwian verb /sarla(i)-/ 'to praise, exalt', which is otherwise attested through 1pl.opt. [šar-l]a-a-u-un-du (KUB 35.16(+ i 22″). The verb /sarla(i)-/ must in turn represent a factitive derived from the adjective /sarl(a/i)-/ 'supreme', also attested as an epithet of the Sun-god in the same line KUB 35.16(+ i 22″ (CTH 760.3.b). The independent evidence for the Exalted Sun-god in the tablet under discussion (CTH 759.10) is found in

CTH 759.10.b

Table of Manuscripts

| A₁ | KUB 32.8 | 264/b |
| A₂ | (+) KUB 32.5 (+) 218/a |

Transmission and Research History

The indirect join between the fragments A₁ and A₂, both found in Building A of Büyükkale, had already been proposed in Otten 1953, 73 and 89. The New Script tablet consisting of these two pieces has a very characteristic ductus. Its preserved parts comprise large sections of columns three and four, but column four requires much restoration on the basis of the parallel passages in other versions of the Kuwattalla tradition. The tablet was edited in transliteration and attributed to CTH 759 in Starke 1985, 118–20. An edition of the text with French translation can be found in Puértolas Rubio 2019a, 505–12. Significant portions of the text have been published as excerpts (e.g. Taracha 2000, 154, 209–10; Haas 2003, 559, 737; Goedegebuure 2010a, 303–4; Kloekhorst 2012, 259).

Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Placing a strand of blue wool, hair, eyelash, and eyebrow hair of the patient in a cup filled with oil and honey, with its Luwian incantation
§§ 3′–4′ Burning a straw(?) over the cup with oil and honey, with its Luwian incantation
§ 5″ Lifting of the first animal of the ikkunatt-sacrifice
§§ 6″–7″ Dedication of the first animal of the ikkunatt-sacrifice, with its Luwian conjuration
§§ 8″–9″ Dedication of the second animal of the ikkunatt-sacrifice; nailing down(?) of its liver and heart on a bread loaf, with its Luwian conjuration
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KUB 32.8(+) iv 31. Furthermore, the Hittite calque šarlānza ṢUTU-ūš occurs in the Maštigga ritual text (KBo 39.8 iii 53: Miller 2004, 96 and Steitler 2017, 344 fn. 1112). Note the contrast with several other tablets classified under CTH 759, where the Sun-god of the Oath takes the place of the Exalted Sun-god. This is one of the arguments for treating the present tablet as the most archaic one among those subsumed under CTH 759.

§§ 10″–11″ Removal of the liver and heart; lifting of the animal of the šarlatt-sacrifice, with its Luwian incantation
§ 12″ Unclear

Column four of the tablet under discussion contains the same sequence of ritual acts as column one of KUB 35.16(+) (CTH 760.3.b) but displays significant innovations in the formulaic language, which suggests that it is not the part of CTH 760. The elimination of the phrase ‘offense (and) fault’ rules out its attribution to CTH 762. The ductus of the tablet (Fig. 2.12), which bears a close resemblance to that of Ziti II (see Fig. 2.8) although not identical to it, suggests that the tablet comes from Anuwanza’s scribal workshop and thus tips the scales in favor of CTH 759. The additional arguments that may bear on this attribution are the common use of the phrases ‘downstriking tongue’ / ‘downstriking hand’ and the specific list of miasma involving ‘misery’ (see the commentary).

In terms of the length of the text, the tablet under discussion can probably be defined as "standard", which contrasts with both the extended version of the dupaduparša-ritual (CTH 759.1 and CTH 759.2) and its abridged version (CTH 759.3). Its archaizing feature is the use of BE-EL SĪSKUR in KUB 32.8 ii 6″. At the same time, the "standard" version displays some genuine archaisms vis-à-vis the extended version—for example, the reference to the ikkunatt-sacrifice, as opposed to the ikkunawar-sacrifice of the extended version. It is likely that the "standard" version of the dupaduparša-ritual was the first one to be produced in Anuwanza’s workshop, perhaps as an adaptation of a tablet belonging to the CTH 760 group.

For determining the position of this tablet within the ritual procedure, one can point out the content similarities to KUB 9.6+ (sixth tablet of the extended version of the dupaduparša-ritual; CTH 759.1). Since the description of the rites in KUB 9.6+ tends to be more detailed, KUB 32.8(+) may belong to the third through fifth tablet of the "standard" version.
§ 1′

Rev. iii
A₁ iii 1′ "nu-uš-ša-an" A-NA GAL.GIR₄ LÀL₄ [1₄\textsuperscript{GIR}SE\textsubscript{ER-DI}]
A₁ iii 2′ la-ḫu-u-wa-an na-at-kán an-da a-pí-ia
A₁ iii 3′ da-a-i MUNUS\textsuperscript{GU} Gt-ia īs-śi-ša-an
A₁ iii 4′ iš-TU SAG DU-ŠU SİG ZA.GİN ar-ḥa da-a-i
A₁ iii 5′ na-at-kán A-NA GAL. gi₄ na-da da-a-i
A₁ iii 6′ ku-it-ma-an-ma-za-an \textit{BE-EL SISKUR}
A₁ iii 7′ iš-TU SAG DU-ŠU te-e-ta-(na) an la-ap-le-e [pa-an]
A₁ iii 8′ e-ni-e-ra-an-na ḥu-u-it-ti-ia-an-ša-an
A₁ iii 9′ MUNUS\textsuperscript{GU} ma lu-u-ik-ša-an
A₁ iii 10′ ḥu-u.uk-ki-šš-ka-ez-zi

§ 2′

A₁ iii 11′ ḥar-ma-a-ḥa-ti-ti-ia-an-ta tap-pa-a-mi-in
A₁ iii 12′ la-a-at-ta za-an-da du-ū-pa-i-mi-in
A₁ iii 13′ īš-ša-ri-in za-an-da du-ū-pa-i-mi-in
A₁ iii 14′ EME-in la-al-pi-in in-it-ta
A₁ iii 15′ la-a-ad-da ku-wa-an-na-in in-it-ta
A₁ iii 16′ la-a-ad-da īš-ša-ra-(aš-ša)-an za-pa-ti-it-ta
A₁ iii 17′ pa-a-ta-aš-ša-an za ta-am mu-u-ga la-a-at-ta
A₁ iii 18′ za-an-da du-ū-pa-im-mi-in īš-ša-ri-in
A₁ iii 19′ za-an-da du-ū-pa-im-mi-in EME-in

§ 3′

A₁ iii 20′ nu-kán A-NA GAL. gi₄ ku-e-da-ni LÀL₄
A₁ iii 21′ "1₄\textsuperscript{GIR}SE\textsubscript{ER-DI} la-a-a-a-a-a₄-u-wa-an"
A₁ iii 22′ "nu-uš-ša-an" \textit{GIR} wa-ar-ša-ma-an še-e-er
A₁ iii 23′ lu-uk-ke-ez-zi na-at ar-ḥa ū-ra-a-ni
A₁ iii 24′ MUNUS\textsuperscript{GU} ma lu-u-i-li ki-šš-ša-an
A₁ iii 25′ ḥu-u.uk-ki-šš-ka-ez-zi

§ 4′

A₁ iii 26′ la-a-in-ti-ia-aš a-a-ia-ru \{x\}
A₁ iii 27′ ma-al-(li)-ti-ta-(aš) a-a-ia-ru za[a]n-da]
A₁ iii 28′ du-ū-pa-im-mi-i iš-ša-[ri-iš]
A₁ iii 29′ "za-an" \{d\}a du-ū-pa-[m-mi-iš EME-š]

§ 5′

Rev. iv
A₁ iv 1′ [...]x
A₁ iv 2′ [...] da-a-ḥ-zí
§ 1′
Rev. iii
1′–2′ Honey (and) olive oil (are) poured into a ceramic cup.
2′–3′ He places it in there.
3′–4′ The Old Woman removes the blue (strand of) wool from his head
5′ and places it in the ceramic cup.
6′–8′ While the ritual patron pulls a hair, an eyelashes[h] and an eyebrow(-hair) from
his own head,
9′–10′ the Old Woman conjures thus in Luwian:

§ 2′
11′–12′ "He has taken a hair from his head,
12′–13′ (as) the downstriking hand
13′–14′ (and) downstriking tongue.
14′–15′ He has taken his eyelash.
15′–16′ He has taken his eyebrow(-hair).
16′–17′ He has taken the nails of his hands (and) feet,
18′ (as) the downstriking hand
19′ (and) downstriking tongue."

§ 3′
20′–23′ He lightens straw over the ceramic cup in which honey (and) olive oil (have
been) poured
23′ and it burns up,
24′–25′ and the Old Woman conjures thus in Luwian:

§ 4′
26′ "May they become oil,
27′ may they become honey,
27′–28′ the downstriking hand
29′ (and) downstriking tongue]"

§ 5′
Rev. iv
1′ [...]  
2′ He/she [...].
A₁ iv 3'  
[... ik-ku-na-a]t-ta-aš-ši-in
A₁ iv 4'  
[an-da un-ni-ia-an-zi na-an EN SÍSKUR a-ra-a-iz-zi]  
MUNUSŠU.GI-ma-kán
A₁ iv 5'  
[... wa-a][t-aḥ-zi
A₁ iv 6'  
[...]x-i-ti

§ 6'
A₁ iv 7'  
[...]-ia-an-zi
A₁ iv 8'  
[... na-at-ša-an
A₁ iv 9'  
[...]x-kán an-da ú-da-an-zi
A₁ iv 10'  
[na-an-kán EN SÍSKUR is-tū]  
DUK-KU-UUB KĀŠ BAL]-ti nu  
MUNUSŠU.GI
A₁ iv 11'  
[lu-u-ili ki-iš-ša-an ḫu-u-uk-ki-iš-ke-e]z-zi

§ 7'
A₁ iv 12'  
[PUU-wa-ta UZUŠÀ-tar UZUŠÀ]  
NIG.GIG za-a-aš-tji ma-am-ma-an-na
A₁ iv 13'  
[ma-al-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ši-pa-tar EN-aš a-pa]-a-aš-ša-an-za
A₁ iv 14'  
[wa-aš-ši-na-an-za ma-am-ma-an-na-a]-d-du ḫu-it-wa-la-ḫi-ti
A₁ iv 15'  
[an-na-ru-um-ma-ḫi-ta-ti a-ar-ra-ia-ti MÍI-k[a]-ti a]-ap-ra-an-da-ti
A₁ iv 16'  
[ra-a-ti DINIG][AŠ-aš-ša-za-ti wa-aš-ša-ra-ḫi-ta-ti ḫu-([0]-tu,]  
[um-na-hi-ta-ti

§ 8'
A₁ iv 17'  
[na-aš-ta MUNUSŠU.GI ik-ku-na-at-ta-aš-ši-in i-NA AŠ-R]-SU pa-ra-a
A₁ iv 18'  
[pé-en-na-i nu NINDA.GUR₄-RA ḫi-pa-an-ü nam-ma-at kâ]t-ta da-a-i
A₁ iv 20'  
[ki-]iš-ša-an [ḫu-u-uk-ki-i]š-ke-ez-zi-ma

§ 9'
A₁ iv 21'  
[ku-i]š-du-ur a-([ad]-du-wa-a[n-za a-an-ni-i]-ti'-(i-ia)-a-du-ut-ta
A₁ iv 22'  
[ta]-ni-mi-in-zi DINIG][AŠ-z][i UZUŠÀ]  
NIG.GIG  UZUŠÀ  
SÁ šar-ra za-a-ti-i
A₁ iv 23'  
[pu]-Ḏ-‘wa-an-du a-ta-tar za-[n-ta o o] tar-ma-in-du URUDU-ia-ti
A₁ iv 24'  
[tar]-ma-ti URUDU-pa-tar zi-la p[a-ri-i na]-a-wa i-ti UZUŠÀ-pa-an
A₁ iv 25'  
[t]-a-pa-an KIN-an na-a-wa a-ti [za-aš-ti-]t[a] ta-pa-a-ru
A₁ iv 26'  
[t]-a-ta-ri-am-ma-an a-aš-ši-wa-an-t[a-am-tar] ḫe-e-re-ru
A₁ iv 27'  
zi-la a-pa-ti-in ni-iš [a-ū]-'t-i-ti

§ 10'
A₁ iv 28'  
[n]u UZUŠÀ  
NIG.GIG UZUŠÀ QA-DU NINDA.GUR₄-RA-SU ḫi-pa-a  
[da-a-]i na-at-kân
A₁ iv 29'  
A₁ iv 30'  
[na-aš]-ta a-pu-u-un-na EN SÍSKU[Ř a-ra-a-iz-zi]  
nu MUNUSŠU.GI te-ez-zìi

§ 11'
A₁ iv 31'  
[... ] šar‘-la-mi-i[ḏ PUU ... u-w]a-at-tar-ša
A₁ iv 32'  
[...] x [... ma-na-a-d]u i-ta-wa-ni-ti-an-za
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3′–4′ [They lead in the (animal of) the *ikkuna* tt-sacrifice.]
4′ [The ritual patron lifts it], and the Old Woman
5′ […] st]rikes […]
6′ […]

§ 6′
7′ They […]
8′ […]
9′ They bring in […].
10′ [The ritual patron consecra]tes [it with a jug of beer]. The Old Woman
11′ [conjur]es [thus in Luwian]:

§ 7′
12′ “[Sun-god], look [at the liver (and) heart of this o]ne!
13′–14′ May [the ritual patron loo]k at his own [body] with life,
15′ [virility, long years, f]uture
16′ time, [favor (and) e]nlivenment [of the deities]!”

§ 8′
17′–18′ [The Old Woman drives the (animal) of the *ikkunatt*-(sacrifice)] out into its
place.
18′ [She sacrifices a thick bread and then] puts [it do]wn.
19′ [She nails down l]iver (and) heart [on top of] the thick [bread]
20′ and [conju]res [t]hus:

§ 9′
21′ “[Whoe]ver [cause]s him evil,
21′–23′ may [a]ll the gods [sn]atch up his [liver] (and) heart in this way!
23′–24′ In the future, (this nail of) copper will [n]ot go aw[ay].
24′–25′ The smith will not process it as *taba*-work.
25′–27′ In the future, may judgment, curse, miser[y], perjury not [co]me (back) [to
this one] in the same way!”

§ 10′
28′ She takes the liver (and) heart together with [their thick] bread
28′–29′ and [c]arries them out. They lead [i]n the (animal) [of] the *šarlatt*-sacrifice.
30′ The ritual patro[n lifts] that one, too, and the Old Woman says:

§ 11′
31′ ”[…] exalte[d Sun-god … v]iew.
32′ [Ma]y he [see …] fertility,
Commentary

iii 3′–5′: Compare strands of wool mentioned in KBo 9.147(+) ii 7′ (CTH 761.2.1.a) and KBo 29.3+ ii 31 (CTH 760.2), as objects symbolizing the miasma. In this particular case, to put the blue wool in direct contact with the head of the patient probably served to absorb the impurity from him (Strauß 2006, 61–62). Note that the patient’s head represents the whole person. For other examples of this phenomenon in Hittite texts, see Mouton 2020a, 127. Burning a straw (?) over the cup filled with the blue wool strand and also, most probably, with the patient’s hair is a way to purify the patient from his bewitchment, as the conjuration iii 26′–29′ illustrates. For the purifying function of fire (both through its flame and its smoke), see Mouton 2006b.

iii 6′–29′: For the ritual use of body residues, see Haas 2003, 557–61. For the ritual use of hair in ritual contexts, see Mouton 2019a, 146–49 (with an analysis of this passage on p. 96). For the use of body residues in the context of witchcraft, see Puértolas Rubio 2019a, 146–49 (with an analysis of this passage on pp. 147–48).

iii 7′–8′: The pair eyebrows and eyelashes is also mentioned in conjurations of the Tunnawiya tradition (see KUB 9.34 iii 40′, 46′; Hutter 1988, 38–41). Within the Kuwattalla tradition, they are otherwise embedded in the longer list of body parts beginning with shape, flesh, and bones.

iii 12′–14′: The pair ‘downstriking tongue’ and ‘downstriking hand’ represents a variation on a theme of the ‘evil tongue’ and ‘evil hand’ (Haas 1994, 884; Goedegebuure 2010a, 303). Both pairs symbolize witchcraft affecting the ritual patron, but the second one is much more common in the Kuwattalla tradition. At the moment of the ritual act, the evil is not yet fully overcome, which precludes the translations ‘oppressed tongue’ and ‘oppressed hand’ offered in Goedegebuure 2010a and necessitates the translation of /tubaimm(a)i/ as the active participle (Elisabeth Rieken, pers. comm.). The phrasal verb /tsanta tub(a)i/ (lit. ‘to strike down’) cannot be separated from its Hittite equivalent katta walḫuwaš SISKUR ‘The ritual of striking down’ in KBo 29.3+ i 3 and KUB 35.18(+) i 5 (both belonging to CTH 760). The expression ‘downstriking tongue/hand’ seems to be related to the ritual gesture of ‘striking down a person’, interpreted by Mouton 2015b, 77 as a way of bewitching someone. Thus, it could refer to the kind of bewitching technique used by the bewitcher to attack the patient (Puértolas Rubio 2019a, 134–36). For other examples where the bewitched person is described as nailed/struck down, see Puértolas Rubio 2020, 144–46.
33’ [with children, grandchildren, greatgrandchildren, long]
34’ [years, future time].
34’–35’ [favor (and) enlivenment of the deities]!”

§ 12”
36’ [...]
37’ [...]

iii 15’–19’: For a different interpretation of this passage, see Taracha 2000, 154, who translates ‘er hat das Haar aus der Braue entfernt, (und dadurch) die Hände (und) die Beine (des Hexers). Die Fingernägel hat er entfernt, (und dadurch) die heimgesuchte Hand (und) die heimgesuchte Zunge.’ It is not fully clear whether pa-a-ta-aš-ša-an-za is the form of pā(i)- ‘foot’ (poss. adj. / acc.pl.c.) or pātašš(a/i)- ‘toe’ (dat.pl.). For the possibility of ‘toe’ being derived from ‘foot’ within Luwian, see García Trabazo 2014.

iii 22’: For the possible translations of ḫa4-warsama-, see HEG IV, 359–61.

iii 23’: For this interpretation, see CHD Š, 415a. For a different one, see Francia 2002, 37.

iii 26’–29’: This incantation is particularly close to KUB 9.6+ ii 12–13 (CTH 759.1). Both this fragment and KUB 9.6+ feature this incantation at some point before the description of the ikkunatt- / ikkunawar-sacrifice.

iv 4’: Lifting the animal of the ikkunatt-sacrifice is tentatively restored based on § 10” below, where it is said that the animal of the šarlatt-sacrifice is also lifted, with the implication of an earlier act of lifting. The gesture of lifting the animal can be interpreted as a way of presenting it to the gods. Alternatively, one can attempt the restoration ši-pa-an-ti ‘sacrifices’.

iv 7’–35’: From § 6” on, this fragment is restored largely based on KUB 35.16(+) (CTH 760.3.b). Compare the commentary to KUB 35.16(+) for the discrepancies between these two versions.

iv 13’: The possessive adjective [a-pa]-a-aš-ša-an-za-an-za with plural possessor, implying multiple patients, ostensibly contrasts with the use of singular pronoun /=du/ in iv 21’ and the references to BE-EL SISKUR as the sole ritual patron elsewhere in the tablet. The parallel passage features the expected form a-pa-a-aš-ša-a-an-za, without the expression of a plural possessor, in KUB 35.16(+) i 9’. Note, however, the explicit references to multiple patients in KUB 35.8(+) (CTH 759.3) and the option of multiple patients mentioned in KUB 9.6+ iv 23’ (CTH 759.1). For alternations between one and two ritual patrons in the same tablet, see typologically the situation in the Maštigga tradition (Miller 2004, 233–36).

iv 19’: We suggest restoring the verb ‘nail down’ because it occurs in the abridged version of this passage (KUB 35.81(+) iv 5”–6”; CTH 759.3) most probably associated with the same Luwian incantation. The gesture consisting of nailing down consecrated meat
cuts on a bread in association with a curse inserted in the conjuration of § 9° has the advantage of combining two rites in one: a sacrifice and an act of witchcraft (nailing rite).

iv 21’–27’: For an analysis of this incantation, see Puértolas Rubio 2022 (with the previous bibliography).

iv 21’: The clause-initial [ku-][š-du-ur presumably reflects the phonetic syncope in /kwa=du=dar/; compare the use of the particle /=dar/ in the parallel passage KUB 35.16(+) and the similar contraction [zi-la-d]u-ûr corresponding to /tsila=du=dar/ in KUB 35.48 iii 10’ (contrast Giusfredi 2014 for a different analysis). The form /attuwantsa/ ‘evil’ is typical of the Luwian dialect of Hattuša and the surrounding area (Yakubovich 2014, 285–86), and therefore its use here is likely to reflect the interference of a Hattuša copyist. The form [a-an-ni-i]-‘tti’-⟨⟨ia⟩⟩ is best taken as a scribal error. The intrusive ⟨⟨ya⟩⟩ probably reflects a secondary glide formed in front of the following a-du-ut-ta in the context of dictation. For alternative interpretations of this form, see Melchert 2016a, 209, who suggests the reading pi-ia-⟨i⟩, and Goedegebuure 2010b, 85, who put forward the form piya(tti?). The reading TI has been confirmed by the collation of the original fragment.

CTH 759.10.c

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.85 257/d

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment was found in the area of Building B of Büyükkale. Its position on the tablet cannot be determined. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 401 without an attribution to any specific text.

Transliteration

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A:1’ | [...]x-ḫa-[i]x[...]
| A:2’ | [...]x pa-ri-i-[
| A:3’ | [...]ta za-a-ti-[i ...]
iv 23': For the meaning of /pu-(di)/ 'to lift, snatch', see Melchert 2016a. For a different restitution of the gap, see Kloekhorst 2012, 259, who suggests za-[a-ти]-l'. The presence of traces after the gap cannot be assured after the collation of the original tablet.

iv 24': For a different restitution of the gap, see Haas 2003, 737, who suggests x[... ku-wa-ti-in na]-a-wa.

iv 25′–27′: The list of the miasma in this clause differs sharply from the 'offense (and) fault' in the parallel passage KUB 35.16(+) (CTH 760.3.b). Given that the pair 'offense (and) fault' is not at all attested in the version under discussion, its elimination in favor of a more standard list of miasma can be ascribed to an editorial innovation. An interesting feature of the new list is the position of the noun a-aš-šī-wa-an-t[a-at-tar] 'misery', which differs from the one observed in both KUB 35.49(+) (CTH 761.2.1.a) and KBo 29.3+ (CTH 760.2). Starke 1985, 120 and Haas 2003, 737 both restore [ta(r-mi-iš-ti-t)]a in line iv 25′ and [(ma-na)]-a-ti in line iv 27′, treating KBo 9.143 iii 1–3′ as a duplicate of this passage.

iv 29′: For the attestations of the šarlatt-sacrifice, see CHD Š, 275b–77a.

Contents

§ 1′ Unclear Luwian incantation
§ 2′ Mention of a pot, wine, and beer
§ 3′ Offering of the pot to a Sun-deity; an eagle’s feather is mentioned

The attribution of this fragment to CTH 759 primarily hinges on its ductus (see Fig. 2.12), identical to that of larger fragments KUB 32.8(+) and KBo 8.129. Given the offering of victuals to the Sun-god is attested many times within the Kuwattalla tradition, its content is at least compatible with the hypothesis that it shares the tablet series with the other two fragments. Furthermore, after the collation of the original tablet fragments, it appears that KUB 35.85 and KUB 32.8(+) may belong to the same tablet. Regrettably, the small size of the fragment is not conducive to determining its relative order vis-à-vis the other two fragments.

Translation

§ 1′
1′ "[...]
2′ [...] thus [...]
Commentary

10: The use of an eagle’s feather as materia magica is attested in the text of the ḫiššawa-festival, where it is placed into a pitcher of wine (CHD P, 199). For additional examples of the ritual use of the same object, see Haas 2003, 484–85.

CTH 759.11

Table of Manuscripts

A  KUB 35.35  Bo 8271

Transmission and Research History

This Middle Script(?) fragment with undetermined find spot contains a part of a left column. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 174–75 as belonging to an unspecified “Old Woman” ritual. The hypothesis of the indirect join KUB 35.72 (+) KUB 35.35 (Sasseville 2020c, 562–63) cannot be endorsed here (see under KUB 35.72).

Transliteration

§ 1’
A:1’  [...] x x [...] 
A:2’  [...] x ‘ta-a’-an-ti-iš” za-a[m?~...]
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4’ May [...] be [...]!”

§ 2’
5’ [...] the pot [...]
6’–7’ [...] wine (and) beer t[o ...].
7’ Then [...].

§ 3’
8’ [...] the pot together with [...] 
9’ [...] befo[re] the S[un-deity ...]
10’ [...] eag[le’s fe[ather ...]
11’ [...]
Commentary

3': For the identification of a derivative of the root for ‘liver’ in this line, see Sasseville 2020c, 562. Note that this conclusion does not rely on the putative join KUB 35.72 (+) KUB 35.35, which we consider to be incorrect. David Sasseville (pers. comm.) also indicates the possibility of restoring the word in the line above as [za-a]r-ta-a"-an-ti-iš. This could be either the ergative form of Luw. /tsart-/ ‘heart’ or a derivative ‘having a (fat) heart’, but the context is too fragmentary for a reasonable choice between these two options or even the affirmation of the proposed restoration.

CTH 759.12

Table of Manuscripts

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>KUB 35.71</td>
<td>447/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>+ KUB 35.31</td>
<td>591/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₃</td>
<td>(+) KUB 35.30</td>
<td>261/c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmission and Research History

All the fragments of this Middle Script tablet were found at or near Building A at Büyükkale. The indirect join between A₂ and A₃ is already mentioned by Heinrich Otten in the foreword to KUB 35, while Alice Mouton added the direct join with A₁ on the basis of the photographs of the fragments. The joins were confirmed through the collation of the original fragments. The pieces thus joined yield 16 lines of column two and tiny pieces of column one and column three. The upper edge (without Randleiste) and the right edge of the tablet are partially preserved. The fragments A₁ and A₃ (+) A₄ were edited separately in transliteration in Starke 1985, 186–87 and 102–103 respectively. The join A₄ (+) A₅ was already assigned to CTH 759 in Starke 1985 (contra Otten, who attributed it to the Great Ritual in KUB 35, II).
3′  [...] having a (fat) liver [...]  
4′  [...] again before [...]  
5′  [...]”

§ 2′
6′  (S)he cooks the meat [...]  
7′  [...]  

6′: See KUB 35.78(+) iv 3′, 10′ (CTH 759.3), the only other fragment belonging to the Kuwattalla tradition where (raw) meat is mentioned alongside liver and heart. The context of this better-understood passage is the offering to the Sun-god as part of the ikkunatt-sacrifice.

Contents

| § 1 | Unclear Luwian passage |
| § 2 | Unclear |
| §§ 3′–4′ | Luwian incantation presenting a pot, which functions as the substitute for the patient’s head |
| § 5′ | Destroying the pot |
| §§ 6′–8′ | Pressing the taluppi-lump on the patient’s body, with its Luwian conjuration |
| § 9′ | Unclear |
| §§ 10′–11′ | Several gods are mentioned |

The rite featuring an empty pot functioning as the substitute for the patient’s head is attested in KBo 29.63 (CTH 762.1.k) and KBo 29.6(+) (CTH 762.2). In the fragment under discussion, this rite is secondarily linked with a Luwian incantation, a counterpart of which is likewise found in CTH 762.2 but in a different rite (see the commentary). The difference between the two incantations consists in eliminating references to the negative concepts of ‘offense’ and ‘fault’ in the present case. Since the relevant concepts are otherwise known to be avoided in CTH 759, this is an argument for treating this fragment as part of the dupaduparša-ritual. An independent argument in favor of the same conclusion is the accumulation of Hurrian divine names in the fragment under discussion.
Transliteration

§ 1
Obv. i
A₁ i 1 [...]-uš
A₁ i 2 [...]  
A₁ i 3 [...]  
A₁ i 4 [...]x  
A₁ i 5 [...]-ni-in-z[ī]
A₁ i 6 [...]  
A₁ i 7 [...]-ia-ta  
A₁ i 8 [...]  

A₁ i 9 [...]x

§ 2
Obv. ii
A₂ i 1 za-ū-ī-na-aš ū-ī-s[ī-ta ḫa-ša-al-li-iš ta-wa-ni-iš]
A₂ i 2 ta-wa-an-ta-an-[za na-a-wa-aš ma-al-wa-am-mi-iš]
A₂ i 3 ḫa-ša-aš-ša-aš a-at-ta  
A₂ i 4 DUGÚTUL-iš za-aš-t[ī ḫa-aš-ta ku-wa-ti-in]
A₂ ii 5 za-ū-i-〈im〉-mi-i[š!(ŠA)]

§ 3′
A₁ ii 1 za-ū-ī-na-aš ū-ī-s[ī-ta ḫa-ša-al-li-iš ta-wa-ni-iš]
A₂ ii 2 za-wa-an-ta-an-[za na-a-wa-aš ma-al-wa-am-mi-iš]
A₂ ii 3 ḫa-ša-aš-ša-aš a-at-ta  
A₂ ii 4 DUGÚTUL-iš za-aš-t[ī ḫa-aš-ta ku-wa-ti-in]
A₂ ii 5 za-ū-i-〈im〉-mi-i[š!(ŠA)]

§ 4′
A₁ i 1 za-ū-ī-na-aš ū-ī-s[ī-ta ḫa-ša-al-li-iš ta-wa-ni-iš]
A₁ i 2 ta-wa-an-ta-an-[za na-a-wa-aš ma-al-wa-am-mi-iš]
A₁ i 3 ḫa-ša-aš-ša-aš a-at-ta  
A₁ i 4 DUGÚTUL-iš za-aš-t[ī ḫa-aš-ta ku-wa-ti-in]
A₁ ii 5 za-ū-i-〈im〉-mi-i[š!(ŠA)]

§ 5′
A₁ i 1 za-ū-ī-na-aš ū-ī-s[ī-ta ḫa-ša-al-li-iš ta-wa-ni-iš]
A₁ i 2 ta-wa-an-ta-an-[za na-a-wa-aš ma-al-wa-am-mi-iš]
A₁ i 3 ḫa-ša-aš-ša-aš a-at-ta  
A₁ i 4 DUGÚTUL-iš za-aš-t[ī ḫa-aš-ta ku-wa-ti-in]
A₁ ii 5 za-ū-i-〈im〉-mi-i[š!(ŠA)]

§ 6′
A₂ i 1 za-ū-ī-na-aš ū-ī-s[ī-ta ḫa-ša-al-li-iš ta-wa-ni-iš]
A₂ i 2 ta-wa-an-ta-an-[za na-a-wa-aš ma-al-wa-am-mi-iš]
A₂ i 3 ḫa-ša-aš-ša-aš a-at-ta  
A₂ i 4 DUGÚTUL-iš za-aš-t[ī ḫa-aš-ta ku-wa-ti-in]
A₂ ii 5 za-ū-i-〈im〉-mi-i[š!(ŠA)]

§ 7′
A₂ i 1 za-ū-ī-na-aš ū-ī-s[ī-ta ḫa-ša-al-li-iš ta-wa-ni-iš]
A₂ i 2 ta-wa-an-ta-an-[za na-a-wa-aš ma-al-wa-am-mi-iš]
A₂ i 3 ḫa-ša-aš-ša-aš a-at-ta  
A₂ i 4 DUGÚTUL-iš za-aš-t[ī ḫa-aš-ta ku-wa-ti-in]
A₂ ii 5 za-ū-i-〈im〉-mi-i[š!(ŠA)]

§ 8′
A₂ i 1 za-ū-ī-na-aš ū-ī-s[ī-ta ḫa-ša-al-li-iš ta-wa-ni-iš]
A₂ i 2 ta-wa-an-ta-an-[za na-a-wa-aš ma-al-wa-am-mi-iš]
A₂ i 3 ḫa-ša-aš-ša-aš a-at-ta  
A₂ i 4 DUGÚTUL-iš za-aš-t[ī ḫa-aš-ta ku-wa-ti-in]
A₂ ii 5 za-ū-i-〈im〉-mi-i[š!(ŠA)]
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Translation

§ 1
Obv. i
1–8 [...]
§ 9"

Rev. iii
A₃ iii 1’ [...]x
A₃ iii 2’ [...]x-i
A₃ iii 3’ [...]z]i²
A₃ iii 4’ [...]x {x]
A₃ iii 5’ [...]x

§ 10"
A₃ iii 6’ [...] ḫḪIM
A₃ iii 7’ [...]š-ti

(gap of several lines)

§ 11"
A₃ iii 1’ o x-x-e³ x x x x [...]
A₃ iii 2’ DŠTAR-aš ṢDu-ú-[i-ni-iš ...]
A₃ iii 3’  طبيعي Ni-na-at-ta-[aš ...]
End of col. iii

Commentary

ii 1–3: See a similar incantation accompanying the presentation of an empty pot in KBo 29.63 (CTH 762.1.k) and KBo 29.6(+) iii 20–23 (CTH 762.2). See the commentary to the relevant passages.

ii 6–9: This sentence does not follow the presentation of the empty pot in CTH 762. A similar incantation appears instead following a presentation of a different vessel, apparently not functioning as a substitute, in KBo 29.6(+) i 19′–21′, CTH 762.2). The restoration of the theonym Ḫeššē has a provisional character; for this theonym, see van Gessel 1998, 148–49. The intrusive character of this incantation is supported by the contrast between the implied positive reference to the pot and its subsequent destruction.
§ 9"
Rev. iii
1′–5′ [...] 

§ 10"
6′ "[... ] Storm-god
7′ [...]"
(gap of several lines)

§ 11"
1″ "[... ]
2″ Šawoška, Tu[wini ...]
3″ Ninatta [...]"
End of col. iii

ii 11: The Hittite verb duwarna/e- ‘to smash’ appears in both mi- and ḫi-conjugation in the Kuwattalla tradition, but the only assured ḫi-conjugation form is KUB 35.81(+) i 7″ [du-w]a-a-ar-na-a-t (CTH 759.3).

ii 12–14: The act of pressing the taluppi-lump to the body of the ritual patron is otherwise attested only in CTH 761, while the specific verbal form ta-ma-aš-[i] used for the act of pressing otherwise has parallels only in CTH 761.1. It is, however, impossible to attribute the passage under discussion to the Great Ritual given the number of Hurrian deities mentioned in this relatively small fragment (§§ 4′, 11″), which constitute the principal reason for tentatively assigning it to CTH 759.

iii 2″: For the theonym Duwini(ya), see van Gessel 1998, 531–32.
Dupaduparša-ritual (CTH 759)

CTH 759.13

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.116 Bo 4147

Transmission and Research History

This New Hittite fragment contains part of a left column, together with a small portion of the intercolumnium. The content of the text is probably from a column one, although this is uncertain (see below). The find spot of the fragment remains unknown. The fragment is edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 191 as belonging to an unspecified "Old Woman" ritual.

Transliteration

§ 1'
Obv. i
A i 1' [...] x'ša' na-ak-ki-[uš']
A i 2' [...] x' as IM-an 2 AŠ-RA da-a[nn-zí']
A i 3' [...] ḫa-ia-an-ashi-šu-wa-a-i a-pá-ta-aš-[a-an]
A i 4' [...] na-ak-ku-wa-aš ar-ḫa-ia-an i-da-la-[wa-aš-ša]
A i 5' [...] na-ak-ki-wa-aš ...

§ 2'
A i 6' [...] NINDA.L.E.D.E.A pár-ši-ia-an ša-ra-a da-a-i
A i 7' [...] zi

§ 3'
A i 8' [...] ša-ku-n]i-ia-aš pu-ru-ut URU-ri-az MUNUSŠU.GI
A i 9' [...] IM-n]i-ša-la-ak-zi nu-uš-ši ma-ši-e-e[š]
A i 10' [...] x ti-ia-an-zi nu a-pé-ni-iš-šu-[a-an-te-es]
A i 11' [...] a-aš-ša-an ziZ-na-aš G[kur-ta-a-ši
A i 12' [...] x

§ 4'
A i 13' [...] x-te-eš na-ak-ki-uš-ša [x x]
A i 14' [...] ša-an a-p[a-š-šu-aš ar-ḫa-i[a-an]
A i 15' [...] MUNUSŠU.GI GIS žu-up-pa-riMA
Contents

§ 1′ Manipulations with clay for the benefit of the dead and the nakkiu-spirits
§ 2′ Manipulations involving crumbled cake
§ 3′ Fashioning clay figurines
§§ 4′–5′ Manipulations involving torches, with their Luwian incantation
§ 6′ Unclear

The closest parallel to this fragment is the beginning of KUB 35.40+ (CTH 759.2.c), where the clay of the spring is mentioned in connection with the nakkiu-spirits. Consequently, one cannot exclude the possibility that the fragment under discussion likewise belong to column one of the ninth tablet of the extended version of the dupaduparša-ritual. Contrast KBo 29.6(+)(CTH 762.2), where the manipulations involving the nakkiu-spirits appear to be rather different.

Translation

§ 1′
Obv. i
1′ [...] nakkiu-spirits.
2′ [They] take clay of [...] (at) two (different) places.
3′ She scatters them separately [...].
3′–5′ On top of that [...] separately for the dead (and) separately for the evil [nakkiu-spirits].

§ 2′
6′ She picks up the crumbled [cake] [...].
7′ She [...].

§ 3′
8′–9′ The Old Woman kneads the mud of the [spring] from the city with the [clay] [...].
9′–10′ As many [...] step [...] for him/it,
10′–11′ so many [...].
11′–12′ [...] a basket of emmer wheat (straw).

§ 4′
13′ [...] and the nakkiu-spirits [...] 
14′–15′ [...] those ones separately as well.
15′–16′ The Old Woman [...] torches.
A i 16′  [...] na-aš ki-iš-ri-‘it’ da-a-‘it’"  
A i 17′  [...] (vacat)  

§ 5’  

A i 18′  [...] ta-ta-ri-ia-am-m na-aš-ši-in-zi  
A i 19′  [...]x  

§ 6’  

A i 20′  [...] x x [...]  

Commentary  

i 1′–5′: Note the reconstruction of line i 5′, which is not attempted in Starke 1985, 191, and the renumbering of the subsequent lines. For a difference between the Hittite stems nakku- and nakkiu- and particularly for another example of their co-occurrence in the same passage, see Melchert 2014, 221. We assume that nakku- refers to the dead, whose primary ritual significance consists in their ability to cause contamination, whereas the nakkiu- are netherworld spirits, which can be both good and evil (see their contrast in CTH 762.2).  

i 2′: The restoration [ša-ku-ni-i]a-‘as’ ‘of the spring’, ventured in Starke 1985, 191 is rather unlikely, since later in § 3′ the clay of uncertain origin is mentioned next to the mud of the spring.  

CTH 759.14  

Table of Manuscripts  

A  KUB 35.77  1331/c  

Transmission and Research History  

This New Script fragment was found in Building A of Büyükkale. It represents a small corner piece containing the lower part of column two and upper part of column three (if the tablet was double-columned). The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 187–88 as belonging to an unspecified “Old Woman” ritual.
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She takes them by the hand.

"[...] of the [cur]se

"[...]

Compare the instructions of Tunnawiya’s first ritual (CTH 409.I § 9), according to which the figurines made of the clay of the riverbank and the clay of the spring are arranged on a basket (Goetze and Sturtevant 1938, 8–9). Accordingly, it is likely that the paragraph under discussion likewise addresses fashioning figurines and, in particular, calculating their number. For the connection of this procedure to the communication with the nakkiu-spirits, see also KUB 35.40+ § 1 (CTH 759.2.c).

The use of torches in this fragment remains largely unclear due to the fragmentary state of preservation (see Haas 2003, 171). Given that the Luwian incantation to follow probably contains a list of miasma, one cannot exclude the possibility that the torches are deployed for burning them in the context of a purification rite, in which case the Luwian incantation can be tentatively interpreted along the lines: ‘May the X of judgment, curse, and perjury be burned’.

Contents

§ 1’ Fragmentary Luwian incantation probably containing a list of miasma

§§ 2’–3’ Taking something (possibly a figurine) out of the patient’s mouth, with its Luwian conjuration

§§ 4’–5’ Manipulation with an unclear object (possibly a pig figurine), with its Luwian conjuration

§ 6’ Placing an eagle’s feather(?) into the patient’s mouth

The attribution of this fragment is uncertain, but the mention of an eagle’s feather(?) appears to represent an innovation, comparable to the reference to an eagle’s feather in CTH 759.10.c (no eagles are otherwise mentioned in the Kuwattalla tradition). Another argument that tips the scales in favor of the dupaduparsa-ritual is the presence of the participial form du-u-pa-im-mi-in.
Transliteration

§ 1′

Obv. ii
A ii 1′ [...] x [...]  
A ii 2′ [...] x-ša-ša-an’  
A ii 3′ [...] x EME-iš

§ 2′

A ii 4′ [...] IS-T]U[ZULAXU-SU  
A ii 5′ [...] d]a-a-i  
A ii 6′ [...] lu-ú-i-li kisša-an ḫu-uk-zi

§ 3′

A ii 7′ [...] du du-u-pa-im-mi-in  
A ii 8′ [...] ta]-ta-ri-am-na-aš-si-in  
A ii 9′ [...]  

§ 4′

A ii 10′ [...] tāk-ni-i e-ep-zi  
A ii 11′ [...] lu-ú-i-li kisša-an ḫu-uk]-zi

§ 5′

A ii 12′ [...] a]n mu-ta-mu-ti-’ta’ [...]  
A ii 13′ [...] aš-du  
End of col. ii

§ 6′

Rev. iii
A iii 1 [...] EM-in  
A iii 2 [...] ta-ta-ri-a]m-na-aš-si-in

§ 7′

A iii 3 [...] K][AXU-SU an-da TI₈MSEN  
A iii 4 [...] x-ar-ra  
A iii 5 [...] x-ma  
A iii 6 [...] x-i

Commentary

ii 3′: After this line, there is only one final paragraph line. The second line appearing under the first one is to be interpreted as an erasure, since traces of erased signs also appear on top of it (according to the collation of the original tablet fragment).
§ 1′

Obv. ii
1′ “[…]
2′ […]
3′ […] tongue.”

§ 2′

4′–5′ She [t]akes [… fr]om his mouth
6′ […] she conjure[s] thus in [Luwia]n:

§ 3′

7′ “[…] the striking one,
8′ […] (that of) the [c]urse,
9′ […]”

§ 4′

10′ She seizes [… to] the ground
11′ [and] she [conjur]es [thus in Luwian]:

§ 5′

12′–13′ “May […] it to the pig […]

End of col. ii

§ 6′

Rev. iii
1 […] the to]ngue
2 […] of the cur]se!”

§ 7′

3–4 […] in his [m]outh […] an eagle
5 and […].
6 […]

ii 4′–5′: Presumably this is the patient’s mouth, while the removed object may be a figurine absorbing the miasma.
ii 10’–11’: A pig figurine may be missing in the lacuna.

ii 12’–iii 2: For the identification of *mutamuti*—‘pig’ in Hittite, see Oettinger 2015a, 275; here we are gaining the Luwian cognate of this noun. A known function of a pig in the Tunnawiya tradition is removing evil by “digging it out” from the patient’s body parts (Hitt. *mudai*, see CHD L-N, 335–36). It is possible that in this passage the
pig is invited to perform a different action, namely, to bury the miasma in the ground (see the preceding paragraph).

iii 3-4: Compare the mention of an eagle’s feather in KUB 35.85 (CTH 759.10.c). The references to eagles are more typical in rituals from the Hattian milieu; within the Kuwattalla tradition, they likely represent innovations.
GREAT RITUAL AND DUPADUPARŠA-RITUAL
CTH 760.1.a

Table of Manuscripts

| A₁ | KUB 35.18 | Bo 1829 + Bo 3177 |
| A₂ | (+) KUB 35.66 | (+) Bo 9161 |
| A₃ | (+) KBo 29.11 | (+) 1076/z |
| A₄ | (+) KBo 29.10 | (+) 587/v |

Transmission and Research History

The Middle Script tablet to which these fragments once belonged must have been stored in the Temple I complex. All four fragments were published in transliteral in Starke 1985, 91–92 (A₁), 157–58 (A₃), 160 (A₄) and 181–82 (A₂); the fragments A₃, A₄, and A₁ are assigned to the "third ritual", while A₂ is treated as belonging to an unspecified "Old Woman" ritual in Starke’s publication. The indirect join between these four fragments was reached in the course of the Luwili Project based on the similarity of their paleographic features (see Fig. 2.13) and, in the instance of A₁, A₃, and A₄, the parallelism of their content with that of KBo 29.3+ (CTH 760.2). The join A₁ (+) A₂ was proposed by Alice Mouton, while Ilya Yakubovich added A₃ and A₄ to the same tablet. The weakest link in the chain is A₂, due to the small size of the fragment. After the collation of the original fragments, all the indirect joins are plausible, and the indirect join between KUB 35.18 and KUB 35.66 is highly plausible. If the reconstruction is correct, we have fragments of all four columns of the tablet, including the incipit and the colophon. According to the shape of the tablet fragment, A₂ is close to the end of the column. The excerpts from the incipit of the ritual are frequently cited—for example, Unal 1978, 120; Haas 2003, 450; Mouton 2015b, 76–77; and Marcusson 2016, 299. An edition of the colophon can be found in Waal 2015, 522.

Transliteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv. i</th>
<th>§ 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 1</td>
<td>[UM-MA kish-wa-at-ta-la] MUNUSUḪUR.LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 2</td>
<td>’u-šiḫ-[i-la-al-la]-u-hu MUNUSŠiGi ma-a-an an-tu-ḫi-[š]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 3</td>
<td>kat-ta wa-ḫ-[u]-wa-aš ŠISKU]R ši-pa-an-du-wa-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 4</td>
<td>na-aš-ta ma-’aḫ-ha’-an [i-na] U₄.3.KAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 5</td>
<td>kat-ta wa-al-ḫu-u-wa-aš ŠISKU]R aš-nu-me-ni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The fragments belong to the first tablet of the combined version of the “ritual of striking down” and the Great Ritual attributed to the tandem of Kuwattalla and Šilalluḫi. In comparison with KBo 29.3+ (CTH 760.2), the first tablet of this tablet series appears to cover fewer ritual acts. For example, the same manipulations with the symbols of evil hand and tongue that are attested in columns two and three of CTH 760.2 appear in column four of CTH 760.1.a. This suggests that the tablet series beginning with CTH 760.1 consisted of a larger number of tablets than the one beginning with CTH 760.2.
Great Ritual and dupaduparša-ritual (CTH 760)

§ 2
A₁ i 6 [nu-z]a-an ti-na U₄.3.KAM pa-ra-a GAL”l”-pát a-ni-u-u[r]
A₁ i 7 [a]p-pu-u-e-ni nu ki-i tum-me-ni

§ 3
A₁ i 8 [...] x [...]x-uš GIRMES-SU-NU a-aš-ḫar-nu-um-ma-[‘i]-[ti]
A₁ i 13 [...] x [...][A ...]
A₁ i 14 [...] I-N[4.KAM ke-el-di-ia-aš]
A₁ i 15 [A-NA SISKUR ... da-an]-zi

§ 4
A₂ i 17 [...] x x [...]x

§ 5′
A₂ i 1′ ‘2” x x [...]x

§ 6′
A₂ i 2′ 1 tar-pa-a-la-aš SIG S[A₂ 1 tar-pa-a-la-aš SIG ZA.GIN]
A₂ i 3′ 1 tar-pa-a-la-aš SIG SIG[SIG ...]
A₂ i 4′ E.IB TA-ḪA-AP-SI 3-ū[s’ ...]
A₂ i 5′ 1 GIŠBANŠUR AD.KID 2 DUGDÍLIM.G[AL ...]
A₂ i 6′ ‘x+3” DUG[GAL] 1 SI GU N[A₄ ...]
A₂ i 7′ [...] x RA-BU-Ū AD.AŠ x[ ...]
A₂ i 8′ [...] I/A-NA ŠA.BI GIŠ ū’-x[ ...]

§ 7′
A₃ i 9′ [nu] ki-i ū-hu-um-[a-n ...]
A₃ i 10′ [a-p]é-e-da-aš-pát-kán [...]}
A₃ i 11′ [nu a-r]a”-aḫ-za ku-e(-)x[ ...]

§ 8″
Obv. ii
A₃ ii 1′ x [...]x
A₃ ii 2′ 1 [...]x
A₃ ii 3′ x [...]
6–7 we undertake further the Great Ritual itself on the third day.
7 We take these:

§ 2
8 [Eight] sheep and one billy goat.
8–9 [A]mong the eight sheep, one black sheep,
9 among those (eight sheep), two sheep of the (Great) Ritual,
10 [one] white sheep (and) one black sheep, two sheep of the ikkunatt-sacrifice,
11 [one sheep] of the šarlatt-sacrifice, [one e]we—
11–12 they [c]all it 'sh[ee]p (with) [su]cklings'.

§ 3
13 [One sheep with whose] blood they smear their [...] feet,
14–15 [one sheep ..., which on] the fourth day they [tak]e [to] the keldi-rite.

§ 4
16 [...] him/it t[o ...]
17 [...] in the sheepfold [...] 
18 [...] 
several lines are missing.

§ 5'
x+1 Two [...].

§ 6'
2’ One strip of re[d] wool, [one strip of blue wool],
3’ one strip of yellow/gre[en] wool, [...],
4’ a belt of felt, three [...],
5’ one wickerwork table, two large bowl[s, ...]
6’ x + three ceramic cups, one bull horn, [...] of sto[ne, ...]
7’ [...] large ... [...] 
8’ [...] among which [...].

§ 7'
9’ [...] al[l] this.
10’ [...] to [th]ese ones.
11’ [Ou]tside [...].

§ 8''
Obv. ii
1’ [...] 
2’ One [...] 
3’ [...]
§ 9"
A₃ ii 1” [...] -"zf"
A₃ ii 2” [...] SISKUR
A₃ ii 3” [...] x
A₃ ii 4” [...] x

§ 10"
A₃ ii 5” [...] x
A₃ ii 6” [...] x
A₃ ii 7” [...] x
A₃ ii 8” [pu-ú-wa-ti-il pa-ri-i]a-na-al-la-an
A₃ ii 9” [AMA-ia-an ta-a-tli-i’ia-an ŠŠ-ia-an’ NIN-ia-an
A₃ ii 10” [...] Lr-ia-an GEME-ia-an

End of col. ii

§ 11"
Rev. iii
A₄ iii 1’ [ku-i-ša-an ša-aḫ-ša-ni-iš-ša-at-t]a
A₄ iii 2’ [ku-i-ša-an ip-pa-tar-ri-iš-ša-at-ta
A₄ iii 3’ [SISKUR-aš-ši-in EN-an] ta-a-tu-uš-š[a]
A₄ iii 4’ [mi-i-ša-an-za ḫa-a-vero-s]a ḫal-ḫal-zu-a-ni-in
A₄ iii 5’ [u-wa-ra-an-na-ḫi-ša i]-”u-na”-ḫḫi-ša
A₄ iii 6’ [la-al-pi-in ku-wa-a]n-na-ni-i-in
A₄ iii 7’ [ma-aš-ša-na-al-li]-i-in KASKAL-an

§ 12"
A₄ iii 8’ [ma-a-na-aš ḫu-i-du-wa]-a-li-iš šar-ri-ia-an
A₄ iii 9’ [”UTU-za da-ra-u-id-d]u ma-a-am-pa-aš
A₄ iii 10’ [u-la-an-ti-iš ...] x-”uš-ša-an”

§ 13"
Rev. iv
A₄ iv 1’ [...] x x [...] x
A₄ iv 2’ [a]-aḫ-ša-[...] x
A₄ iv 3’ ni-i-ša-[n ...]
A₄ iv 4’ a-a-la-a-la-(at)-t[i ...]
A₄ iv 5’ ni-i-iš-pa-an [...] x

§ 14"
A₄ iv 6’ [n]u MUNUSŠU.G[i ...]
A₄ iv 7’ [i]-š-na-aš $[U^?] ...]
A₄ iv 8’ [...] x [...] x

§ 15"
A₁ iv 1” ’na”-x[ ...]
§ 9″
1″ [...] 
2″ [...] ritual 
3″–4″ [...] 

§ 10″
5″–7″ [...] 
8″ [past (or) fut]ure, 
9″ [of the mother (or) the fat]her, of the brother (or) the sister, 
10″ [...] from the male (or) female servant.”

End of col. ii

§ 11″′
Rev. iii
1′ “[whoever restraine]d [him], 
2′ [whoever distrai]ned [him, (namely)] 
3′ [the ritual patron], (his) shap[e], 
4′ [flesh, bon]e(s), joint(s), 
5′ [strength, m]obility, 
6′ [eyelash, eye]bow(-hair), 
7′ [divi]ne path!

§ 12″′
8′ [If he (is) a living bei]ng, 
8′–9′ may [the Sun-god] above [deliver] him (to the ritual patron)! 
9′–10′ But if he (is) [a dead (spirit), [...].”

§ 13″′
Rev. iv
1′–2′ “[...] (v. to separate) [...]. 
3′–4′ May [...] not [...] hi[m ...] with the alalatt-body part! 
5′ May [...] not [...] him [...]!”

§ 14″′
6′–7′ The Old Woma[n ...] 
7′ the h[and] of [d]ough. 
8′ [...] 

§ 15″′
1′ [...]
Commentary

i 1–2: The reference to the tandem of performers sets apart this tablet series from KBo 29.3+ (CTH 760.2) more than any other feature. While the immediately following context features a number of first plural verbal forms, which contrast with the first singular verbal forms in the incipit of KBo 29.3+, this appears to be a result of secondary elaboration, because the main part of both texts most probably contains the third person references to the Old Woman.

i 6: The restoration \([\text{nu-}z]\)a-an implies the clitic sequence \(\text{nu} + \ -\text{za} + \ -\text{san} (/\text{nu}=\text{ts}(a)\text{san}/), where -za is the reflexive particle, which is in turn compatible with translating the clause predicate as 'to take upon oneself, to undertake'.

i 9: For the ritual use of black sheep in Ancient Anatolia, see Haas 1994, 648 fn. 77; for the reference to the Great Ritual, see Vol. 2, Section 5.3.

CTH 760.1.b

Table of Manuscripts

A  KBo 58.225  672/z

Transmission and Research History

This Middle Script fragment was found in the Temple I area. It does not contain any clues to determine its position on a tablet. It was published in transliteration and identified as a text with a Luwian incantation in Groddek 2012b, 155.
§ 16†

2″ First tablet. Not finished.
3″ When Kuwattalla, the female attendant
4″ [and] Šilalluḫi, [the Old Woman …].
5″–6″ When they perform the Great Ritual for a person.
7″ Clean tablet.

Contents

§§ 1–2″ Manipulations with figurines, with their Luwian incantation

The paleographic analysis suggests that this text and CTH 760.1.a are written by the same scribe (see Fig. 2.13). The content of the fragment is compatible with the assumption that it belongs to the first tablet (see the commentary to the translation), and therefore an indirect join between CTH 760.1.a and CTH 760.1.b remains the most likely hypothesis, under which KBo 58.225 is probably to be placed between KUB 35.66 and KBo 29.11. Yet, since the parallel versions of this passage in the other tablet series of the Kuwattalla tradition are unknown thus far, we prefer to err on the side of caution and treat here CTH 760.1.a and CTH 760.1.b as mere parts of the same tablet series.
Transliteration

A1’
[...] MUNUS[ŠUGI ...]

A2’
[...] a)n’ na-at-x[...]

A3’
[...] sisktu][z] a-ni-iš-ke-e[z-zi]

A4’
[...] še-e-na-aš li-x[...]

A5’
[lu-ú-i]-li ki-iš-Š ša-an [u-uk-ki-iš-ke-ez-zi]

§ 2’

A6’

A7’

A8’

Commentary

4’: The mention of the figurines, if correctly restored, supports the attribution of the fragment under discussion to the first tablet of the ritual. The incantation featuring the possessive adjective [hi-iš-Š]a-aš-ši-in-za ‘of traps’ supports the same conclusion, again if the form under discussion is correctly restored. For the co-occurrence of both forms—see for example, KBo 29.3+ ii 15–24 (CTH 760.2 §§ 9’–10’).

6’: The Luwian verb /xarts(a)ssa-(i)/ presumably represents an imperfective of /xarts-(ti)/ ‘to take hold’, attested as hara/i-za- in hieroglyphic transmission, itself probably a cognate of Hitt. ḫark-‘m to have, hold’ (Hawkins 2000, II, 545 sub ASSUR letter b

CTH 760.2

Table of Manuscripts

| A₁ | KBo 29.3 | 474/u |
| A₂ | + KUB 35.45 | + VAT 7429 + Bo 3955 + Bo 3488 + Bo 3645 |

Transmission and Research History

The joined piece comes from Temple I and is written in a New Script ductus (see Fig. 2.14 and Klinger 1996, 38 fn. 23). Both fragments are published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 98–100 and 151–54 respectively and joined in Kammenhuber 1986, 86–92. Although this join was rejected in Starke 1990, 595 based on the erroneous as-
Translation

§ 1′
1′ [...] the [Old Woman ...]
2′ [...]perform[s the r"
3′ [...] perform[s the ritual].
4′ [...] figura"
5′ conjures thus in [Luwian:

§ 2′
6′ "[Her]e, we are holdin[g] (back) (the lords) [of the (evil) words],
7′ [...] traps, jud[gment],
8′ [...] curse, [perjury]!"

§§ 6–7). Alternatively, ḫa-ar-za-aš-šu-[un-ni] may represent a redundant spelling of the base form /xarts-unni/, since H. Craig Melchert reminds us that the cognate Hittite verb ḫark- ‘to hold, have’ lacks imperfective derivatives (see Melchert 2023 sub ḫarz- ‘to hold (back)’). The meaning ‘to hold back’ follows from the context. The reconstructed 1pl. ending correlates with the use of 1pl. Hittite forms in KUB 35.18(+)(CTH 760.1.a). We do not have enough information to fully reconstruct the rite associated with this incantation, but it seems likely that the figurines symbolize the evil-doers and are metaphorically restrained, perhaps with the help of ropes.

8′: See the same rare orthography of the word for ‘curse’ in KUB 35.58 (CTH 759.6?).
Contents

§ 1 Incipit of the Great Ritual combined with the dupadūparša-ritual
§ 2–3 List of ritual implements
§ 4 Unclear
§ 5’–6’ Luwian incantation for the transfer of evil to remote places
§ 7’ Luwian incantation for replacing evil with positive phenomena
§ 8’ Dedication of beer and bread
§ 9’–11’ Presentation of two figurines to the Sun-god, with its Luwian incantation
§ 12’ Placement of the two figurines at the patient’s feet
§ 13’ Tying tongue and hand figurines of dough to the ritual patron’s fingers with colored wool

Transliteration

§ 1

Obv. i
A₁ i 1 [UM-MA ...] ḪU₂-ȚI-LU-NA {x} ma-a-an an-tu-uḫ-si
A₁ i 2 [kat-ta wa-al-ḫu-wa-aš SISKUR] ’šl’-pa-an-ta-ah-hi na-aš-ta ma-aḫ-ḫa-an
A₁ i 3 [I-NA U₄.3.KAM kat-ta wa]-al-ḫu-wa-aš SISKUR aš-nu-mi nu-za-an I-NA
A₁ i 4 [pa-ra-a GAL-li-pät a-ni-u-u]r e-ep-mi nu ke-e da-ah-ḫi

§ 2

A₁ i 5 [8 UDU HA 1 MĀŠ.GAL ŠÀ.B]A 2 UDU HA a-ni-u-ra-aš BABBAR GE-aš
A₁ i 6 [2 UDU HA ik-ku-na-at-ta-aš 1] UDU šar-la-at-ta-aš 1 UDU.ŠIG+MUNUS” ti-ta-
an-ta-[aš]
A₁ i 7 [...] GIR MES-ŠU-NU ku-e-ez iš-ḫar-nu-ma-an-zi
A₁ i 8 [...] I-NA U₄.4.KAM ke-el]-di-ia-aš A-NA SISKUR da-an-zi
A₁ i 9 [...] k]at-ta-an na-ak-ku-uš-ša-hi-ti da-an-zi

§ 3

A₁ i 10 [...] Ū-UL an-da na-ak-ku-uš-ši-i-šš
A₁ i 11 [...] M]ĀŠ.GAL na-at-ša-an ap-pé-ez-zi
A₁ i 12 [...]-ia-an-te-eš

§ 4

A₁ i 13 [...] U₄-ti ku-wa-pi ši-pa-an-t[ā] {...}
A₁ i 14 [...] da-a-an-zi na”at’[...] ...
A₁ i 15 [...]x-za u-uš-ša-x[...] ...
A₁ i 16 [...]”UZU”ŠÀ x [...]
§§ 14’–15’ Luwian incantations, which arguably accompany a taluppi-rite
§§ 16’–17’ Breaking the tongue and hand figurines, with its Luwian incantation
§§ 18’–19’ Waving the hand and tongue figurines over the patient’s head and the patient’s spitting on these figurines, with its Luwian incantation
§ 20’ Fragmentary colophon

As is obvious from the presence of the incipit, this is the first tablet of the ritual. The reference to both the “ritual of striking down” and the Great Ritual in the incipit suggests the attribution of this text to CTH 760.

Translation

§ 1

Obv. i

1 [Thus (speaks) …] of Ziluna.
1–2 When I perform the sacrificial [ritual of striking down] for a person, once
3 I complete the ritual of [striking down on the third day],
3–4 I [under]take [further the Great Ritual] [itself] on the third day. I take these:

§ 2

5 [Eight sheep and one billy goat among which two sheep of the (Great) Ritual, (one) white and (one) black,
6 [two sheep of the ikkunatt-sacrifice, one] sheep of the šarlatt-sacrifice, one
ewe having sucklings,
7 [one sheep] with whose blood they smear their […] feet,
8 [one sheep, which on the fourth day] they take to the [kel]di-rite,
9 [one billy goat, which] they take along to the scapegoat rite.

§ 3

10 Scapegoats […] not among […].
11 […] b]illy goat.
11–12 They (are) […]-ed at the end.

§ 4

13 On the day when […] he/she sacrific[es …],
14 they take […] and […].
15–16 “[…] heart […]”
§ 5′
Obv. ii
A₂ ii 1 ḫi-i-ru-ū-un pu-ū-wa-(ti)-il pa-ri-ia-na-al-la-an [AŠ]
A₂ ii 2 AMA-ia-an ta-a-ti-ia-an ȘES-ia-an NIN-ia-an
A₂ ii 3 lître-ia-an GÉMÉ-ia-an l¹ṭu-ul-ḫi-ia-an l¹ḫa-pi-ri-ia-an
A₂ ii 4 kur-ša-aš-ša-an tu-ū-li-ia-(aš-ša)-an

§ 6′
A₂ ii 5 [a]n-ta-at-ta a-ar-la-nu-wa-at-ta pár-ra-ia-an-za ḪUR.SAGMAS-za
A₂ ii 6 x-x-lu-pa-ia-an-za za-ar-ri-ia-an-za 1.MES-an-za Ú.SAL-ša-an-za ú-i-da-an-za

§ 7′
A₂ ii 7 ′a-an-ta-pa-at-ta a-ar-la-nu-wa-at-ta SISKUR-aš-ša-an-za-ḫu EN-ia
A₂ ii 8 ṭu-i-it-wa-la-ḫi-ši-ti a-an-na-ru-ul-me-ni iš-ša-an-za ti NIN-ia-an
A₂ ii 9 EDIR.U-MES-ša ti DINGIR-ša-za-ta aš-ša-an-za ti wa-aš-ša-ra-hi-ta-ti
A₂ ii 10 ṭu-i-tum-ma-na-ḫi-ta-ti

§ 8′
A₂ ii 11 nu ḪUR.SUGI ku-it 1.NINDA a-an-ḫu KU-UB [KAS] KAŠ-ia ḫar-zi
A₂ ii 12 na-at-ENA EN SISKUR pa-ir-a e-e-p-zu nu-uš-ša-ḫa-an-za ṭE-TAM da-a-i
A₂ ii 13 nam-ma ḪUR.SUGI NINDA-ša-an-ḫa EN SISKUR aš-ša-an-za ḪU-UB-ša-an-za
A₂ ii 14 ṭE-TAM da-a-i

§ 9′
A₂ ii 15 nu-za ḪUR.SUGI EDIR-ša-an-da iš-na-aš 2 ši-ˇe e-nu-ˇuš da-a-i
A₂ ii 16 na-aš-kan ḪU-UB-ša-an-dā ˇe e-pˇe-[z]i
A₂ ii 17 nam-ma ši-pa-an-ta ḥu-uk-ki-iš-ke-[ˇe]-zi-ma-[ˇe]-zi [k]-iš-ˇa-an

§ 10′
A₂ ii 18 ḪU-UB-ša-an-dā ˇe e-pˇe-[z]i
A₂ ii 22 ip-pa-tar-ri-ˇiš-ša-at-ta EN SISKUR-aš-ši-in ALAM-ša mi-i-ša-an-za
A₂ ii 23 ˇH-aš-ša ša-hal-ša-ni-in ú-ṭut-na-ša-an-za
A₂ ii 24 la-al-pi-in ku-wa-an-za ša-hal-ša-ni-in ma-aš-ša-na-al-li-in KASKAL-ša

§ 11′
A₂ ii 26 ma-a-na-aš ú-la-an-ti iš-ša-an ti ia-am-ma-aš-ši-iš ḪU-UB-ša-an-dā ˇe e-pˇe-[z]i
§ 5′

Obv. ii
1 “Perjury, past (or) future,
2 maternal (or) paternal, of the brother (or) the sister,
3 of the male (or) female servant, of the mountain-dwellers (or) desert-dwellers,
4 of the army (or) the assembly.

§ 6′

5 It has relocated them to the high mountains,
6 deep valleys, watercourses, meadows, lakes.

§ 7′

7 It has replaced them for the ritual patron,
8 with life, virility, long years,
9–10 future time, favor (and) enlivenment of the deities.”

§ 8′

11 The warm bread and the jug of beer which the Old Woman holds,
12 she holds them toward the ritual patron. He places (his) hand on (it).
13 Then the Old Woman brings the warm bread back to its location,
14 (i.e.) she places it on the wickerwork table. However, she (still) holds the jug
15 of beer.

§ 9′

15 Afterward, the Old Woman takes two figurines of dough
16 and she hol[d]s them before the Sun-god.
17 Then, she makes a libation and she conjures [t]hus:

§ 10′

18 “Sun-god, divine lord, give (him) the enemies,
19–21 the lords of vengeful words, traps, judgments, curse, perjury.
21 Whoever restrained it, whoever
22 distracted it, (namely) the ritual patron’s shape, flesh,
23 bone(s), joint(s), speech, mobility,
24 eyelash, eyebrow(-hair), divine path!

§ 11′

25 If he (is) a living being, may the Sun-god above deliver him (to the ritual patron)!
26 If he (is) a dead (spirit), may the Sun-goddess of the earth deliver him (to the
ritual patron),
A₃ ii 27 'ta-ta-ri³-ia-am-ma-na-aš-ši-in ḫi-ru-ta-aš-ši-in EN-an

§ 12′
A₃ ii 29 [ŠA-PAL GIRMES.Š][U da-a-i GUG-KU-UB KAŠ-ma A-NA GI-BANŠUR AD.KID
A₃ ii 30 [pē-ra-an kat-ta d]a₃-a₃-i

§ 13′
A₃ ii 31 [nu SIG SA, SIG ZA.GIN SIG SIG,]¹Sig-ia² an-da ta-ru-up-pa-an
A₃ ii 32 [...]a₃-an A-NA EN SISKUR QA-TEMES(EŠ)-[SU iš-ḫa-a-f]²
A₃ ii 33 [nu iš-na-aš EME SU ka-[il]-ur-lu-pa₃-a₃ A-NA EN SÍSKUR
A₃ ii 34 [...]a₃-pē-e-a₃-x [...]

§ 14′
Rev. iii
A₃ iii 1′ [...]x
A₃ iii 2′ [za-a-ū-i-ti e-li-el-ḫa-a-i ma-al-ḫa-aš-ša-ši-iš EN-a]š
A₃ iii 3′ [ta-pa-ru-wa-ti ta-a-ta-ri-ia-am-na-ti ḫi-ru-ū-ta-t]i
A₃ iii 4′ [pa-ḫa-la-li-ši a-aš-du ma-al-ḫa-aš-ša-ši-iš EN-a]š
A₃ iii 5′ [ad-du-wa-la-ti ŠU-TI ad-du-wa-la-ti EME-ti ta-pa-ru-wa-aš-ša-an-z]a-ti
A₃ iii 6′ [ta-a-ta-ri-ia-ma-na-aš-ša-an-za-ti ḫi-ru-ū-[t(a-aš-ša-an-z)]a-ti
A₃ iii 8′ [ha-pi-ri-ia-ti ku-wa-ar-aš-ša-t]i tu-ū-[l(i-ia-aš-ša)-a-ti

§ 15′
A₃ iii 9′ [zi-la-du-ūr DINGIRMES-in-zi za-am-ma-an t]a-pa-ru-ta-a-ta-ri³-i-[a-am-ma-an]
A₃ iii 11′ [ni-iš-du-wa-at-ta a-ap-pa ku-wa-an-z]i UN-an ni-iš-du-wa-at-ta
A₃ iii 12′ [a-ap-pa ka-al-du-ni-i-ia ū-i-i]t-ta-ri³]

§ 16′
A₃ iii 13′ [nu EN SISKUR] iš-[na-aš EME-uš iš]-na-aš-ša ki-iš-ša-ru-uš
A₃ iii 15′ [A-NA MUNUSŠU.GI] ki-iš-ša-ri-i kat-ta z[a-ik-ke-ez-zi
A₃ iii 16′ [MUNUSŠU.GI] ma kiš-an ḫu-uk-ki-iš-ke-ez-zi

§ 17′
A₃ iii 17′ [m(a-am)-ma-al-wa-ia-an EN SISKUR-iš ad-du-wa-li-in EME-in
A₃ iii 18′ ta-a-ri³-ia-am-ma-na-aš-ši-in ḫi-ru-ta-aš-ši-in
A₃ iii 19′ a-aš-ša-wa-an-ta-at-ta-na-aš-ši-in [x] ma-a-i-ia-aš-ši-in EME-in

§ 18′
A₂₊₁ ii 20′ na-aš-ši-kán MUNUSŠU.GI še-er ar-ḫa wa-aḫ-(nu)-uz-zi
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27  (namely) the lord of curses (or) perjuries!"

§ 12′
28–29  [The Old Woman] places the two [figurines of dough [at the feet] of the ritual patron,

§ 13′
31  [Red wool, blue wool] and [yellow/green] wool [are] intertwined.
32  [She binds …] to the hands of the ritual patron,
33  [and] she attaches tongue (and) hand of dough to (his) [f]ingers.
34  […]

§ 14′
Rev. iii
1′  […]
2′  "[The ritual patron] [is washing himself]
3′  [from judgment, curse, perjury].
4′  [Then may the ritual patron] [be pure]
5′  [from the evil hand, from the evil tongue], from [(those of) judgments].
6′  [curses, perjuries],
7′  [internal (or) external], (of) mountain-dwellers [or] desert-dwellers [or] army [or] assembly!
8′  [(or) the ass[emb]ly!

§ 15′
9′–10′  [In the future, may the gods not bind [bewitchment, j]udgment, cu[rse, perjury] to his body!]
11′–12′  [May they not (be experienced) again by him (as) a heavy burden! May they not (be) [experienced [again] by him (as) [thrashing]!"

§ 16′
13′–14′  [The ritual patron] starts [break]ing [the tongues] of dough and the hands
14′–15′  and then places them one by one in the hand [of the O]ld Woman.
16′  [The Old] Woman conjures thus:

§ 17′
17′  "The ritual patron is breaking the evil tongue,
18′  (the tongue) of curse, perjury,
19′  misery, the tongue of the multitudes."

§ 18′
20′  The Old Woman waves them over them.
Great Ritual and dupaduparša-ritual (CTH 760)

A₂₊₁ iii 21’ nam-ma-aš A-NA EN SISKUR pa-ra-a e-ep-zı nu-uš-ša-an
A₂₊₁ iii 22’ EN SISKUR kal-ta al-la-pa-aḫ-ḫi MUNUS.SU.GI ma kis-an
A₂₊₁ iii 23’ ḫu-uk-ki-iš-ke-ez-zi

§ 19’
A₂₊₁ iii 24’ a-ḥ-ra-(an) wa-ḥ-ra-an tap-pa-at-ta ta-a-pa-ru ta-a-ta-ri-i’am’-ma-an
A₂₊₁ iii 25’ ḫi-i-(ru)-ú-un ma-a-ia-aš-ši-in EME-in

End of col. iii

§ 20”
Rev. iv
A₁ iv 1’ [...] ki-i pár-kü-i t[up-ši]

Commentary

i 1: The identity of the performer from Ziluna remains uncertain, but Šilalluḫi emerges as a much more likely candidate than Kuwattalla (Sasseville 2020b, 113). Note that the town of Ziluna was situated on the road from the Hittite heartland to Syria (Bryce 2005, 201). Nevertheless, one cannot absolutely exclude the possibility that this version is assigned to a performer different from both, since the Old Woman Šilalluḫi is not associated with this town elsewhere.

i 5–6: The list of animals is restored after the quasi-parallel incipit of KUB 35.18(+) (CTH 760.1.a). The absence of the piglet on the list correlates with the absence of references to this animal throughout CTH 760, which is in contrast with CTH 761. Note, however, that the reference to a piglet and a puppy is found among the ritual implements in Bo 4388:7’ (CTH 763.2.1), below the list of sacrificial sheep and in a different paragraph. Therefore, one can assume that a comparable reference is lost in a lacuna in CTH 760.2. For the ambivalent status of the pig in Hittite religious texts, see Mouton 2004a, Mouton 2006a, and Collins 2006.

i 6: For Hitt. titant-, see Starke 1990, 229–30 and HEG T, 384.

i 7–9: This paragraph contains the Hittite technical term keldi- and the Luwian technical term /nakkusayid-/ both of Hurrian origin. For the term keldi-, see Haas 1998, 227; for its presence in Kizzuwatna rituals, see Strauß 2006, 115–18. Note that smearing blood of sacrificial animals is generally typical of Kizzuwatna rituals; see Miller 2004, 297 and Feder 2010 (although the latter confused two different blood rites; see Mouton 2014b). The restorations are again based on KUB 35.18(+) (CTH 760.1.a).

i 10: This paragraph features the Hittite technical term nakkušši- ‘scapegoat’ of Hurrian origin, which is also related to the Luwian abstract noun /nakkusaγid-/ mentioned in the previous paragraph.

ii 1–10: For a discussion of this incantation, see Marcuson 2016, 295–96. For the translation of /puwadi(i)- as ‘past’ and its etymology, see Ivanov 2001.
Then she holds them toward the ritual patron, so that
the ritual patron spits on (them).

The Old Woman conjures thus:

§ 19”

"He spat (out) woe (and) pain, (namely) judgment, curse,
perjury, the tongue of the multitudes."

End of col. iii

§ 20”

Rev. iv

1’  […] This (is) a clean t[ablet].

ii 1–4: This paragraph finds a direct counterpart in KUB 35.49(+ i 5′–9′ (CTH 761.2.1.a). For a similar chain of merisms in the context of a different rite, see KUB 35.21 obv. 9′–10′ (CTH 761.1.d).

ii 5–10: The interpretation of §§ 6′–7′ is crucially dependent on the analysis of the Luwian verb /arlanu(wa)-[i]/ ‘to relocate, replace’ (Yakubovich 2017/2018, 10–14). It is assumed that the subject of both clauses is a scapegoat. Compare a similar list of landscape features in the scapegoate rite featuring a mouse in the ritual CTH 391.1 belonging to the Ambazzi tradition (Christiansen 2006, 38–41, §§ 9–10).

ii 6: The adjectival interpretation of /wid(a/i)-/ (Starke 1990, 567 and CLL, 270), is contextually unlikely given that single adjectives usually precede their head nouns in Luwian texts. Therefore, we interpret this Luwian form as a lexical cognate of the Hittite noun wida-. The contexts of its use adduced in Kloekhorst 2008, 1015–16 speak for its meaning ‘lake, creek’, rather than ‘water’, and the same meaning can be proposed for its Luwian cognate based on the passage under discussion. For a possible additional attestation of the same Luwian lexeme, see Melchert 2023 sub widi-.

ii 8: The optional syncope in a-an-na-ru-um-ma-ḫi-ti is phonetically real, as suggested by the parallels in KUB 35.16(+ ii 11′ (CTH 760.3.b) and KBo 29.9 obv. 1′ (CTH 760.9). Its licensing condition would probably be the position of /a/ in unstressed open syllable between two identical consonants; see ḫu-i-it-wa-la-ḫi-ti’ at the beginning of the same line. Consequently, the emendation to ḫu-i-it-wa-la-ḫi-〈ta〉-ti or a-an-na-ru-um-ma-ḫi-〈ta〉-ti would amount to hyper-normalization.

ii 13–14: The jug of beer and bread were presumably used in the course of the preceding manipulation with the scapegoat. For an example of their simultaneous use accompanied by a blessing formula—for example, KUB 35.43+ ii 31–35 (CTH 761.3.8).

ii 15–30: Although it is not explicit in this context, the figurines might be anthropomorphic, since they visibly represent the patient’s adversaries. Since the identity of
those evildoers might be unknown to the ritual patron, it is probable that one figurine represents a man and the other a woman, so that they cover both possibilities in the context of this ritual sequence. This procedure is quite widespread all over Hittite Anatolia (Mouton 2010, 117–18). For an analysis of this ritual sequence, see Mouton 2019a, 94–95 and Puértolas Rubio 2022. Haas 2003, 591–92 considers that this rite precedes the destruction of the figurines representing the enemies.

**ii 15–16:** The figurines are stretched toward the Sun. Note that the dupaduparša-ritual (CTH 759) features invocations to the “Sun-god of the Oath”, a specific solar deity and not necessarily to be identified with the Sun as heavenly body.

**ii 18:** For the translation ‘divine lord’, see Steitler 2017, 189 fn. 606 and 385 fn. 1200. For a summary on this question, see Melchert 2019, 244. The word for ‘enemies’ features here the Luwian ending /-intsi/, which is restricted to nom.pl. in the original dialect of the incantations but can also function as acc.pl. in the Luwian dialect of Ḫattuša. Its use with the direct object in the form under discussion is to be accounted for as an error of a Ḫattuša copyist (Yakubovich 2010a, 29).

**ii 21:** It is assumed that /saxxanisatta/ ‘restrained’ is cognate with Hittite saḫḫan ‘type of feudal service’, etymologically "bond" (see Kloekhorst 2008, 691–92). Note that in other contexts the same list of body parts co-occurs with the adjective /saywaštall(i)-/ ‘(one) for binding’ and other derivatives of the verb ‘to bind’. For a different interpretation, see Rieken 1999, 340–41.

**ii 22:** For the translation of /ippadarrissa-(i)/, see CLL 91.

**ii 22–24:** This is the best-preserved example of a list of body parts and attributes, which begins with ‘body’ and ‘flesh’ and is aligned with a specific group of incantations, many of which feature the concept of ‘binding’. For the parallels to the initial part of this text in the Tunnawiya tradition, see the discussion of Pattern 5 in Vol. 2, Section 4.2. For the etymological connections of Luw. /mi(j)a)s(a)-/ ‘flesh’, see now Rieken 2019 contra Poetto 1995. The noun /xalxaltsan(i)-/ is tentatively interpreted as ‘joint(s)’ both because it forms a natural pair with /xas(t)-/ ‘bones’ and because of its perceived relation to Hitt. Ḫalḫaltumari- ‘corner, cornerstone’ (for additional possibilities, see Melchert 2003c, 286–87). We interpret /warannaγid-/ as ‘speech, ability to speak’ and ultimately a derivative of the verbal root /war-/ ‘to speak’ following Sasseville 2020c, 329. The ‘divine path’ most likely designates the path that links a human being with the beyond; see Mouton forthcoming₅. For an analogous interpretation, see Hutter 2019a, 345–46.

**ii 25–27:** The role of the solar deities in this incantation has been discussed in Hutter 2003, 261; Taracha 2009, 109 with fn. 581; Beckman 2012, 130–31; and Steitler 2017, 385–86, among others.

**ii 26:** See KUB 35.13+ r.col. 12’ [wa]-‘a’-la-an-ti-in-z[i] (CTH 762.3.4), where this noun is unequivocally used as a functional equivalent of Hitt. nakkiu- ‘dead spirit’.
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ii 28–30: The tentative restorations in this paragraph are based on KBo 9.147(+) ii 4′–6′ (CTH 761.2.1.a).

ii 31–33: The content of this paragraph cannot be separated from that of KUB 32.10+ obv. (see *ad locum* CTH 761.1.b). Tying of the evil hand and tongue to the ritual patron is presumably necessary for the purpose of ritually dealing with his grave condition. This action must have constituted a prelude to uttering the appropriate incantations and then untying the symbols of evil affecting the ritual patron.

ii 31: The tentative restoration of this sentence is based on the calculation of the length of the broken space in KBo 29.3+ ii 31 (CTH 760.2), KBo 9.147(+) ii 7′ (CTH 761.2.1.a), and particularly in KUB 35.66(+) i 2′–3′ (CTH 760.1.a), where the reference to strips(?) of both red and yellow wool is preserved. The reference to the blue wool occurs within the same tradition in KUB 32.5(+) iii 4′ (CTH 759.10.b).

ii 33: The PA sign was originally written as LU, presumably via dittography, and then partially adapted to PA by erasing the extra wedges.

ii 34: This fragmentary sentence may refer to removing something—for example, the two figurines at the feet of the ritual patron.

iii 1′–8′: This paragraph is restored based on the closely parallel version KUB 35.48 iii 5′–9′ (CTH 760.4).

iii 3′: This restoration assumes that the incantations in this and the two following paragraphs accompany a *taluppi*-rite (see KUB 35.58 ii 3′–11′, CTH 759.6?), or perhaps the ablution rite.

iii 9′–12′: This paragraph is restored after KUB 35.48 iii 10′–13′ (CTH 760.4). For its interpretation, see the commentary *ad locum*.

iii 9′–10′: Note a partial similarity between this incantation and the incantations against binding in CTH 761, which likewise normally accompany a *taluppi*-rite—for example, KUB 32.9(+) obv. 7–10 (CTH 761.1.f).

iii 13′–15′: These must be the same objects that had been bound earlier on to the hands of the ritual patron. Presumably, they were untied in the lacuna (see the discussion of KUB 32.81+ obv. 11′, CTH 761.1.b).

iii 19′: The Luwian noun /assiwantattar/ ‘misery’ (vel sim.) appears in a limited number of instances alongside the more familiar miasma, such as judgment, curse, and perjury. In those cases where the context allows us to judge, this occurs in Tablets 1 and 2 of the ritual, but even there the use of /assiwantattar/ does not have a systematic character (contrast § 17″ and § 19″). One generalization that can be made is that the placement of this noun immediately before ‘the tongue of the multitudes’ is typical of CTH 760.
Great Ritual and *dupaduparša*-ritual (CTH 760)

CTH 760.3.a

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.51 Bo 2567b + Bo 3963 + Bo 8116 + Bo 8268 + Bo 9338

Transmission and Research History

The autographs of these five fragments, belonging to columns two and three of a double-columned tablet, have already been published as a join in the edition of KUB 35. The find spots of all the fragments remain unknown. The join was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 175–77 as belonging to an unspecified "Old Woman" ritual.

Transliteration

§ 1′

Obv. ii7
A ii7 1′ […] x […]
A ii7 2′ […] A-NA E[N SISKUR pa-ra-'a'
A ii7 3′ [e-ep-zi nu-uš-ša-an EN SISKUR kat-[t]a al-la-pa-ah-ḫi

§ 2′

A ii7 4′ [MUNUS.GI-ma ki-iš-ša-an ḫ]u-uk-zi a-ah-ra-an
A ii7 5′ [wa-ah-ra-an KLMIN n]a-aš-ta a-pa-at-ta-ia
A ii7 6′ [ir-ḫa-a-iz-zi QA-TAM]-MA-pāt ir-ḫa-aš-ša-an ḫu-u-ma-an
A ii7 7′ [ar-nu-uz-zi nam-[m]a-kān e-ēš-ša-na-aš pār-kū-in
A ii7 8′ [ta-lu-up-pī-in kar-aš-[s]a ku-it te-pu A-NA EN SISKUR
A ii7 9′ [še-e[r ar-ḫa wa-aḫ-nu]-uz-zi na-at-kān pa-ra-a
A ii7 10′ […] x 'n[a]-at pa-iz-zi a-pī-ia
A ii7 11′ […] pé-en-n]a-a-i

§ 3′

A ii7 12′ [na-aš-ta wa-a-tar] IS-TU DUGAL GIR, pa-ra-a QA-TA[M-MA]
A ii7 13′ [ap-pa-an-zi nu E[N SISKUR ŠUMAR-ŠU a-ar-rī
A ii7 14′ [MUNUS.GI-ma A-NA] DINGIR-LIM QA-TAM-MA ḫu-uk-zi

§ 4′
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§§ 1′–2′ Spitting on an unclear target, with its Luwian conjuration, waving of the ta-luppi-lump over the ritual patron

§§ 3′–4′ Ritual ablution, with its Luwian conjuration

§§ 5′–6′ Waving of an uncertain substance, possibly vegetable soup, with its Luwian incantation (features merisms)

§ 7′ Luwian incantation for the purification of the ritual patron

§§ 8′–10′ Pressing an item against the body of the ritual patron, with its Luwian conjuration

Note that the order of the obverse and reverse side is not fully certain. One side of the tablet (§§ 2′–6′) shows the same sequence of ritual acts as KUB 32.9(+) obv. 1–16 (CTH 761.1.f, §§ 1–6). The identity of scribal hand between this tablet and KUB 35.16(+) (CTH 760.3.b; see Fig. 2.15) prompts assigning it to CTH 760.3. For the structural overlap between this fragment and CTH 761.1, see Vol. 2, Section 3.7.

Translation

§ 1′

Obv. ii?

1′ [...] 

2′–3′ [She holds …] toward the ritual [pato]tron, 

3′ [so that the ritual patron] spits [on (it)].

§ 2′

4′ [The Old Woman c]onjures [thus]: 

4′–5′ "Ditto woe (and) pain."

5′–6′ [She treats] those too [one by one].

6′–7′ [She arranges] everything in order exactly in the same way.

7′–9′ [The]n the pure [taluppi-lump] of dough [an]d [the karas-grain], which she [wav]es a little [over] the ritual patron.

9′–10′ [...] it out.

10′–11′ Thereupon she proceeds to [dri]ving […] it there.

§ 3′

12′–13′ In the same w[ay, they hold water] in a ceramic cup 

13′ [and] the ritual [pat]ron washes his hands.

14′ [The Old Woman] conjures in the same way [to] the deity:

§ 4′ “The ritual patron [is washing himself] (from) jud[g]ment,
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A ii? 16’ [hi-ru-ú-un ta-ta-r]i-ia-am-ma-an na-at-kán me-mi-ia-u-wa-an-zi
A ii? 18’ [...] x x [...]  

§ 5’
A ii? 19’ [...] ‘t-ia-an-za
A ii? 20’ [...]x
A ii? 21’ [...] ar-[š a-ša-ša-a-ša-an-za-ti
A ii? 22’ [...]x

§ 6’
A ii? 23’ [...]ma-al-li-iš
A ii? 24’ [...] x x [...]x-an-te-eš
A ii? 25’ [...]iš ū-ur-x[...-l]a-[š-an-ša-an-eš
A ii? 26’ [a-an-ta-at-ta] na‘-a-ni-i-an a-an-ta-at-ta
A ii? 28’ [ir-šu-wa-al]-li-i-ia-an a-an-ta-ša-[t-t]a
A ii? 29’ [pa-ri-it-tar-w]a-al-li-ia-an

§ 7’
Rev. iii?
A iii? 1’ [...] x [...]  
A iii? 2’ [a-ad-du-wa-la-ti EME-ti a]-’ad‘-du-wa-l[a-ti]
A iii? 3’ [i-is-ša-ra-ti ta-pa-ru]-wa-aš-ša-an-za-ti
A iii? 4’ [hi-ru-ta-aš-ša-an-za-ti ta-ta-ša-an-za-ti]
A iii? 5’ [ma-a-ia-aš-ša-an-za-ti EME]-’š-iš

§ 8’
A iii? 8’ [nu ki-iš-ša-an ū-uk-z]i

§ 9’
A iii? 9’ [...] (vacat)
A iii? 10’ [...] (vacat)
A iii? 11’ [...] ‘ša-ap-pi-ša-a-ti
A iii? 12’ [...] (vacat)

§ 10’
A iii? 13’ [...] ‘ša-a-ša-a-ša-a-ša
A iii? 14’ [...] ‘š-a-iš
A iii? 15’ [...] ‘a-ta-ta
A iii? 16’ [...] ‘a-ti
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[perjury, curse]."
She speaks of them [one by one].
She arranges [them] in order.

§ 5'
(is) made.
She waves [...]

§ 6'

§ 7"  
Rev. iii"  
[...] (that) of the brother,
also (that) of the sister, also (that) of the mountain-dwellers,
the internal (one),
also the external (one)."

§ 8"  
[The Old Woman] presses [it] against the head (and) body of the ritual [patron exactly in the same way]

§ 9"  
[...] with the limbs

§ 10"  
[...] sh]eep
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Commentary

ii? 2′–3′: The target of spitting is lost in the lacuna. Note, however, that in those cases where we can observe the sequence of ritual acts (CTH 761.1.d, CTH 761.2.1.c), the combination of a taluppi-rite and ritual ablution directly follow a rite with a ritual carrier within the Kuwattalla tradition.

ii? 6′–7′: This clause is restored with the help of § 4′ below. Presumably, the Hittite expression *irḫaš-ša(n) armuzzi* ‘arranges’ (lit. ‘delivers to its boundary’), has roughly the same meaning as *irḫāizzi* ‘treats in order’. The use of this verb, as well as the abridged description of the ritual act with reference to the preceding text, constitutes a parallel with KBo 29.55+ (CTH 761.3.8).

ii? 8′: For the possible restoration of the karas-grain, see KBo 22.143 i 1–4 (CTH 761.3.2.c, § 1).

ii? 10′: We are thankful to H. Craig Melchert for his indication of the likely serial use of pa-iz-zi in this line.

ii? 11′: Starke 1985, 176 reads [...] *daʾ-a-i*. Yet, the comparison with the other signs DA and NA found on the same tablet yields support to the reading NA.

ii? 15′–16′: Note the unusual word order with ‘curse’ rather than ‘perjury’ in final position. The same permutation also occurs late in § 7″ and finds a parallel in KBo 29.55+ iii 36″–37″ (CTH 761.3.8, § 22″). It seems possible that both innovations were independently driven by Behagel’s Law (*tadarijamman* /’curse’ is a longer word than /xirun/ /’perjury’).

ii? 17′: For the restoration of *ir-ḥa-iz-zi* governing the infinitive, see KUB 35.43+ ii 19–20 (CTH 761.3.8).

ii? 19′: The subject of this clause is lost in the lacuna, but one is tempted to think that this is the counterpart of the vegetable soup mentioned in KUB 35.21 obv. 6′–7′ (CTH 761.1.d,

CTH 760.3.b

Table of Manuscripts

| A₁ | KUB 35.16 | Bo 2885 |
| A₂ | (+) KUB 35.14 | (+) Bo 3849 + Bo 7708 |

Transmission and Research History

The find spots of these two New Script fragments remain unknown. They were edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 93–94 and 124–25 and attributed to CTH 761
§ 7). Its presentation in CTH 761.1 is preceded by a taluppi-rite and ablution rite and followed by the incantation containing several forms in -antis/ and merisms in the accusative. All these features have counterparts in the passage under discussion.

ii' 23′–25′: The translation of this passage is not provided, but it presumably describes the newly introduced ritual item (vegetable soup?) as a destroyer of witchcraft.

ii' 26′–29′: The restoration of this paragraph is tentative and implies that we are dealing with a shortened list of the usual merisms modifying the miasma in the Kuwattalla tradition; see for example, KUB 35.21 obv. 11′–16′ (CTH 761.1.d, § 5′). The arbitrary shortening is probably due to scribal errors at some point in the history of transmission (not necessarily in the process of compiling this particular tablet series). At any rate, there is no space for the full list in the column, the left margin of which can be securely established at a distance of approximately four signs from the beginning of the preserved part of the passage.

iii' 1′–5′: The passage beginning with § 7″ must all be describing an incantation accompanying a substitution rite. For a parallel incantation in such a context, see KUB 35.24+ obv. 1′–4′ (CTH 761.1.c, § 1′).

iii' 6′–7′: This sentence is restored based on KBo 22.143 i 1–4 (CTH 761.3.2.c, § 1) and similar passages. The object pressed could be a figurine of a sheep, because of the mention of a sheep below in § 10″; or it could be another item, perhaps the taluppi-lump, which must have been mentioned in the gap preceding § 7″. The act of pressing the taluppi-lump against the patient’s body is attested in KUB 35.71+ (CTH 759.12). The verb anda épzi contrasts with tamašzi and tamaškezzi, deployed for the pressing act in CTH 761.1 and CTH 761.3 respectively, but it is closer to appiškezzi, found in the same function in two tablet series classified under CTH 761.2.

and CTH 759 respectively. The indirect join between A₁ and A₂ was proposed by Alice Mouton in the course of the Luwili Project, although the similarity of their scribal hands had already been noticed by Heinrich Otten in KUB 35, II. The decisive reason for joining the fragments was the observation of their mutual overlap with the parallel passages in KBo 29.9 (CTH 760.9) and KUB 32.8(+) (CTH 759.10.b). The collation of the original fragments confirms the plausibility of this indirect join. The piece obtained as a result of the join preserves the central part of the tablet, including considerable portions of columns one and four and smaller portions of columns two and three. In contrast, the indirect join between KUB 35.14 i 7′–10′ and KUB 35.117 l.col.
Great Ritual and dupadaparša-ritual (CTH 760)

1’–4’, proposed in Goedegebuure 2010a, 305 fn. 30, does not find support in the reconstruction of the two fragments and in the paleographic evidence (see Fig. 2.15 and CTH 760.10). An edition of KUB 35.14 with French translation can be found in Puértolas Rubio 2019a, 511–16, while the partially preserved colophon of the tablet is edited in Waal 2015, 521–22.

Contents

§§ 1’–2’ Patient’s dedication of the first animal of the ikkunatt-sacrifice, with its Luwian incantation
§ 3’ Blessing formula
§§ 4’–5” Patient’s dedication of the second animal of the ikkunatt-sacrifice
§§ 6’–8” Offering of the liver and heart, with its Luwian curse formula against potential evildoers
§ 9” Luwian incantation for untying the offense and fault from the patient’s body

Transliteration

§ 1’
Obv. i
A₁ i 1’ [na-aš-ta A-NA EN SISKU]R TD ṅ KU-KU-UB KAS₃
A₁ i 2’ [ú-da-an-zi na-an-kán E]N SISKUR
A₁ i 3’ [IS-TU D ṅ-KU-KU-UB KAS] BAL-ti
A₁ i 4’ [MINUSLI.GI-ma lu-ú-i-li ki-ilšša-an ḫu-uk-zī]

§ 2’
A₁ i 5’ [a-ri-in wa-ar-ma-a-un-t]a ḫa-a-ra-tar-ša wa-aš-ku-wa-al-li-ma-an-za
A₁ i 6’ […][a-a-nu-ú-un-pa i-ik-ku-na-a-ú-un-ta
A₁ i 7’ [šar-li-iš PUTU-wa-az za-a-a]r-Za-tar za-a-āš-ti
A₁ i 8’ [ma-am-ma-an-na UDGL.GIG-tar] za-a-āš-ti ma-am-ma-an-na

§ 3’
A₁ i 9’ [ma-al-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ši-iš-pa]-tar EN-aš a-pa-a-aš-ša-a-an-za
A₁ i 10’ [wa-aš-ši-na-an-za a-an-nu-un-n]a-an-za ma-a-am-ma-an-na-ad-du
A₁ i 11’ [hu-it-wa-la-ḫi-ta-ti an-na-r]u-un-ma-ḫi-ti a-(ar)-ra-ia-a-ti
A₁ i 13’ [wa-aš-ša-ra-ḫi-ta-ti] {x x}

§ 4’
A₁ i 14’ [na-aš-ta a-pu-u-un i-ik-ku]-”u’-na-at-ta-aš-ši-in
A₁ i 15’ [EGIR-pa i-NA AŠ-RI-SU pa-ra-a pé-ḫu-da]-”an-zī” (1 line possibly missing)
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The preserved parts of the tablet contain the *ikkunatt*-rite, *šarlatt*-rite, and *nakkušši*-rite (scapegoat rite). The colophon is nearly identical to that of CTH 760.1. For additional reasons to classify these fragments as part of CTH 760, see the commentary.

Translation

§ 1’

Obv. i
1’–2’ [They bring] a jug of beer [to the ritual] [patron]
2’–3’ [and] the ritual [pa]tron consecrates [it with the jug of beer].
4’ [The Old Woman] conjures [th]us [in Luwian]:

§ 2’

5’ “[For a while we] have been [performing conjurations] (on account of) offense (and) fault.
6’ […] Now, we have performed the *ikkunatt*-sacrifice.
7’–8’ [Supreme Sun-god, look at the heart of this one, look at [the liver] of this one!]

§ 3’

9’–10’ May the [ritual] patron look at his own [body (and) soul]
11’ [with life, vir]ility, long
12’ [years, future] time,
12’–13’ [favor] of the deities!”

§ 4’

14’–15’ [They le]ad [that] (animal) of [the *ikkunatt*-sacrifice [back to its place].
(1 line possibly missing)
§ 5
A₂ i 1” [...] x x x [...]  
A₂ i 2” [na-a] t-kán EN SIS[KUR ši-pa-an-ti]  
A₂ i 3” [nam]-ma-at kat-ta [da-a-i]  

§ 6
A₂ i 4” [nu[MUNU]]ŠU.GI ‘NINDA.GÚ’[GAL A-NA EN SISKUR da-a-i]  
A₂ i 5” [nu]-uš-š[a]-“[UZU[NIG.GIG UZUŠÀ kat-ta’ tar-ma-iz-zī]  
A₂ i 6” [n]a lu-Š[u]-[i-lu li-iš-ša-an ḫu-uk-ki-iš-ke-ez-zī]  

§ 7
A₂ i 7” [ku]-i’-iš-tar ma-al-[ḥa-āš-ša-āš-ša-an-za-an EN-ia a-ad-du-wa-a-al]  
A₂ i 8” [a]-an-ni-i-ti a-du-[ut-ta DINGIR[MEŠ-in-zi UZU[NIG.GIG UZUŠÀ]  
A₂ i 9” [ṣa]-r-ra za-a-ti-i’ [pu-u-wa-an-du a-ta-tar za-an-ta]  
A₂ i 10” [tar-m]a-a-i-im-ma-an [a-aš-du URUDU-ia-ti tar-ma-ti]  

§ 8
A₂ i 11” [za]-ašt[-ši-ta pa’[pa] URUDU-iš z[i-la pa-ri-i na-a-ū-wa i-ti]  
A₂ i 12” [LIŠMU.GI-a-iš-pa-an [zi-la na-a-ū-wa ša-a-i]  
A₂ i 13” [t]a’-a-pa-am-pa-[U] [KIN-an na-a-ū-wa a-ia-a-ti]  

§ 9
A₂ i 14” [ni]-i-ša-an ḫa-[pi-ti ma-al-[ḥa-āš-ša-āš-ši-iš EN-an]  
A₂ i 15” [ḥa]-ra-at-nā-āš-š[i-iš wa-aš-ku-wa-al-li-ma-āš-ši-iš EME-iš]  

§ 10
A₂ i 16” [na-āš]-ta MUNU[SU.[GI UZU[NIG.GIG UZUŠÀ QA-DU NINDA.GÚ.GAL]  
A₂ i 17” [pa]-r[a]-a pe-i’e”-[da-i nam-ma-at kat-ta da-a-i]  
A₂ i 18” [ṣa]-r-[l]a-a-at-t[a-aš-š[i-in an-da u-un-ni-ia-an-zi]  
A₂ i 19” [o]x-ku”-ra”-[x [...]  

§ 11
A₂ i 20” [a-ri]-in wa-a-ar-ma-a-ū-u[n-ta na-a-nu-ū-un-pa]  
A₂ i 21” [na]-ak-ku-uš-ša-ū-un-t[a [...  
A₂ i 22” [ṣa]-r[-l]a-[a-u-un-du ša-r-[l][i-in IUTU-an [...]  
A₂ i 23” [ma-al’]-[ḥa]-aš-ša-āš-ši-iš E[N-aš [...]  
A₂ i 24” [...] x [...]  

§ 12
A₂ i 25” [...] z[i-la [...]  
A₂ i 26” [...]x-an”-za a[- [...]  
A₂ i 27” [...] x [...]
§ 5
1° ...  
2° The ritual patron [dedicates it].  
3° Then he [puts] it down.

§ 6
4° The Old Woman [takes] the pea bread [from the ritual patron]  
5° [and] she nails down the liver (and) heart on top.  
6° [She conjures thus in] Luwi[an]:

§ 7
7°–8° "[W]henever causes [evil to] the ritual patron,  
8°–9° may the gods snatch [his] liver (and) heart in this way!  
9°–10° [May (those) be nailed down with a copper nail]!

§ 8
11° In the future, [this] (nail) of copper [will not go away].  
12° [In the future, the smith will not let] it [go].  
13° [He will not make a taba]-work (out of it).

§ 9
14°–15° [M]ay [the tongue of offense [(and) fault not bind [the ritual patron]]!

§ 10
16°–17° The Old [Woman] carries out [the liver (and) heart together with the pea bread].  
17° [Then, she places them down].  
18° [They lead in (the animal of) the šar]latt-sacrifice.  
19° [...]  

§ 11
20° "[F]or a while, [we have been] performing conjurations [...]  
20°–21° [Now, we performed the scapegoat rite [...].  
22° Let us [pr]aise the Supreme Sun-god [...]!  
23°–24° [May the ritual pa[tron ...]!

§ 12
25°–27° In the future, [...]”
§ 13
Obv. ii
A₁ ii 1’  pa-ra-a p[é-e-da-i na-at kat-ta da-a-i nu MUNUSŠU.GI]
A₁ ii 2’  ḫ₂A[KU-KU-[U 𐤓 Ri-Q-Q] da-a-
A₁ ii 3’  na-aš-ta B[ABA.ZA te-pu an-da pé-eš-ši-ia-zi]
A₁ ii 4’  K[U.GI]-ia-ká[n KU.BABBAR ḥu-u-ma-an ku-it-ta]
A₁ ii 5’  te-pu an-da [pé-eš-ši-ia-zi na-at …]
A₁ ii 6’  na-at A-NA [EN SISKUR pa-ra-a e-e-ep-zi nu MUNUSȘU.GI]
A₁ ii 7’  ki-iš-ša-an [x] [ḥu-uk-zī]

§ 14
A₁ ii 8’  za-a-ú-[i]-ia-ta [ḥ-i]-š[i-ta ša-pi-ia-aš-ša-an-za wa-ar-ra-ana-za’]
A₁ ii 9’  ku-wa-a-ti-[na-at-ta ḥa-a-ša-ti a-u-i-im-ma-an ša-pi-ia-ti-pa-at-ta]
A₁ ii 10’  a-u-i-[i]m-ma-an a-[u-i-du]-wa-aš-ta ma-al-ḥa-aš-aš-ši-iš EN-aš]
A₁ ii 11’  ḥa-ra-[a][t-na-a-ti wa-aš-ku-li-im-ma-a-ti]

§ 15
A₁ ii 12’  za-a[š-pa-at-ta ku-wa-a-ti-in za-am-mi-ta-a-ti-iš NA]-ḥa-ra-a-ti ...
A₁ ii 13’  x[…]

§ 16
Rev. iii
A₁ iii 1’  x x […]
A₁ iii 2’  kat-ta-wa-a-[t-na-al-li-in …]
A₁ iii 3’  EN-an a-[d-du-wa-li-in …]

§ 17
A₁ iii 4’  nu MUNUSȘU.GI […]
A₁ iii 5’  a-ap-pa IŠ-T [U …]
A₁ iii 6’  na-an ši-[pa-an-ti nu lu-ú-i-li ki-iš-ša-an]
A₁ iii 7’  ḥu-uk-z[i]

§ 18
A₁ iii 8’  ḥi-i-ša-a[li-la-…]
A₁ iii 9’  a-lu-ú-n[i-…]
A₁ iii 10’  za-a-ti-i […]

§ 19
Rev. iv
A₂ iv 1’  [a-a-ri-in] wa-a[r-ma-a-ū-un-ta ta-pa-a-ru-wa]
A₂ iv 2’  [ta-a-t]a-ar-[ri-ia-am-ma ḫi-i-ru-ū-ta pu-u-wa-ti-la]
A₂ iv 3’  [na-a-nu] un-t[a-ri-ia-la wa-la-an-ti-ia ḥu-it-wa-li-ia]
A₂ iv 4’  [na-a-nu]-ū-(um)-pa [na-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ū-un-ta pa-a]
A₂ iv 5’  [na-ak-k]u-uš-ša-[a-ḫi-ti ku-wa-an-zu-ni-im-ma-an a-aš-du]
§ 13”

Obv. ii
1’ [She] carries (it) out and places it down.
2’ [The Old Woman] takes one [empty] jug.
3’ [She] throws a little bit of porridge inside (it).
4’–5’ [She] also throws gold [and silver], a little bit [of each], inside (it).
5’ [...].
6’ [She holds] it [toward the ritual patron].
6’–7’ [The Old Woman conjures] thus:

§ 14”

8’–9’ “Here (has) appeared the [vessel of cleansing].
9’ As (it) comes (from) from the ashes,
9’–10’ but comes through cleaning,
10’–11’ [so may the ritual patron come (out) from] the offense (and) fault!

§ 15”

12’ [As] this flour (is coming out) from the millstone ...
13’ [...]”

§ 16””

Rev. iii
1’ “[...]
2’ vengeful ...
3’ lord, evil ...

§ 17””

4’–5’ The Old Woman [...] again from [...].
6’ [She] sacrifices it
6’–7’ [and she] conjures thus in Luwian:

§ 18””

8’ “[...] hiša[lla-...]
9’ ene[my ...]
10’ thus/here [...]”

§ 19””

Rev. iv
1’–3’ “[For a while we have been] performing conjurations (on account) of judgments, curses, perjuries, past (or) present, of the dead (or) the living.
4’ [Now, we have performed the scapegoat rite].
4’–5’ [May (those) be affected with the scapegoat rite]!”
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Great Ritual and dupadaparša-ritual (CTH 760)

§ 20“"
A₂ iv 6’ [nu MA]Š.GAL ar-ḫa [pé-en-ni-ia-an-zi]
A₂ iv 7’ [na-an-zad]-an [MUNUSŠU.GI] da-ā-

§ 21“"
A₂ iv 8’ [[MUNUSŠU].GI ma a’-pu’-un 1 N[INDA LA-AB-KU ar-ḫa pār-ši-ia]
A₂ iv 9’ [na-an-š]a-an a-[pê]-'e’-da- [aš A-NA 3 NA₂ še-er da-ā-
A₂ iv 10’ [[DUG.ŠU.KU-KU-UB K[Aš-ia-ša]n 'A']-[NA EN SISKUR ar-ḫa da-ā-
A₂ iv 11’ [nu pê]-ra-an k[at-ta ši-pa-an-ti me-e-ma-i-ma ki-iš-ša-an]

(1-2 lines possibly missing)

§ 22“"
A₁ iv 12’ [x-ra]-’x-x’-[x-in-zi ḫu-u-wa-li-ia-an-zi]
A₂ iv 13’ [a-t]a-[m-mi-in-zi ū-wa-am-mi-in-zi a-ša-an-du]
A₂ iv 14’ [a-t]a ’a’-[ni-e-ia-an-ti-in-zi ...
A₂ iv 15’ [a-ša-a]n-du

Commentary

i 1’–2’: For the restoration of the verb, see the parallel passage in KUB 32.8(+) iv 9’ (CTH 759.10.b).

i 1’: Starke 1985, 93 (with fn. 31) interprets DUG-KU-KU-UB-KAŠ as belonging to the next line.

i 3’: The Hittite text features the verb šipant- which, strictly speaking, describes the patient’s dedication of the sacrificial victim to the divine recipient, not the ritual consecration (a phase that occurs before this, is handled by a ritual practitioner, and involves preparing the animal to be offered to the deities). For the sake of English grammar, we had to change the expected translation of šipant- ‘to dedicate’ into ‘to consecrate’ because of the presence of the complement “with beer”.

i 5’: A peculiarity of the part of the Great Ritual reflected in the tablet under discussion and its parallel versions is the frequent use of the negative concepts ‘offense (and) fault’ instead of the usual triad ‘judgment, curse (or) perjury’. See § 9’ and § 14’’ below and contrast KUB 35.51 (CTH 760.3.a), apparently a part of the same tablet se-
§ 20””

6’ [They lead the bill]ly goat away
7’ [and] the Old Woman [takes] it for herself.

§ 21””

8’ [The Old Woman] crumbles that [soft] bread
9’ [and she places it] on those [three stones].
10’ [She takes the jug of beer away] from the ritual patron,
11’ [she makes a libation in front (of the three stones)] and speaks thus:

§ 22””

12’–13’ “[May the ... violent ones be eating (and) drinking]!
14’–15’ May they [be treated ...]!”

1–2 lines possibly missing

§ 23””

1’ She says [...].

§ 24””

2’ [... the tablet. Not finished. When] Kuwattalla,
3’ [the female attendant and Šilallūḫi], the Old Woman
4’–5’ [... when they perform the Great Ritual [for a person].
5’ [This (is) a clean tablet].

ries featuring the standard triad. The use of two different sets of miasma in the same ritual text constitutes an argument for its compilation in a scribal milieu. Contrast the absence of the pair ‘offense (and) fault’ in the tablet series of CTH 761 (Great Ritual) and its secondary elimination in the tablet series of CTH 759 (*dupaduparsa*-ritual).

i 5’–6’: It is assumed that /arin/, etymologically a derivative of /ar(i)-/ ‘time’, functions here as an adverb with the literal sense “for (some) time” and is contrasted with /nanun/ ‘now’. Morphologically, it is more likely to be the accusative of time than the adverb in /-in/, for which see Goedegebuure 2007. The Luwian first person plural preterit ending /-unta/ was first identified in the course of the Luwili Project and will be addressed in Melchert and Yakubovich forthcoming. The Luwian denominative verb /warma(i)-(di)/ ‘to perform conjurations’ is presumably derived from *warm(a)- (or perhaps *warman- ’spell, conjuration’ and is ultimately cognate with /warannayid-/ ’speech’ (for a slightly different analysis, see Sasseville 2020c, 198). The denominative
verb /ikkuna(i)-(di)/ ‘to treat with liver, to perform the ikkunatt-sacrifice’ is directly derived from *ikkun-, the oblique stem of /ikkwar/ ‘liver’ (differently Sasseville 2020c, 191–93).

i 7′–13′: See the same incantation mentioned several times following the presentation of an animal substitute in the version of CTH 761 attributed to Kuwattalla (e.g. KUB 35.21 rev. 11′–14′, CTH 761.1.d).

i 14′–3″: Based on a comparison with the structure of KUB 32.8(+) (CTH 759.10.b), it is almost certain that § 4′ and § 5″ represent one and the same paragraph, although the distinction between them is kept here for methodological reasons. For the content of the lacuna, see the closely parallel version KBo 29.9 (CTH 760.9).

i 15′: The word for ‘place’ is restored based on the parallel passage KUB 32.8(+) iv 17′–18′ (CTH 759.10.b).

i 4″: For the earlier reading of this line, contrast Starke 1985, 124.

i 5″: For the restoration of ‘liver’ and ‘heart’, see KUB 32.8(+) iv 19′ (CTH 759.10.b).

i 7″–9″: It is presumed that the ritual treatment of heart and liver goes together with an incantation directed against the heart and liver of the evildoer. See the likely parallel case in KBo 29.13+ (CTH 759.5) where the presentation of the figurines symbolizing evil tongues is accompanied by a similarly framed incantation directed against the tongue of the evildoer. For an analysis of these two incantations, see Puértolas Rubio 2022.

i 9″–10″: Contrast the synonymous active construction deployed in KUB 32.8(+) iv 23′–24′ (CTH 759.10.b). Different interpretations of this passage, reflecting incremental progress in its decipherment, can be found in Goedegebuure 2010b, 86 and Melchert 2016a, 210.

i 10″: Two readings have been traditionally suggested in the bibliography for the first sign visible on this line: LA and MA. The restoration [tar-m]a-a-i-im-ma-an was offered by P. Goedegebuure (2010a, 305 fn. 33 with previous bibliography); against this reading, see Melchert 2016a, 210 fn. 32.

i 14″–15″: Contrast KUB 32.9(+) obv. 7–9 (CTH 761.1.f) and similar curses, used in the other parts of CTH 760, where the same basic protective formula has a different set of objects, beginning with the evil tongue and evil hand. Also contrast KUB 32.8(+) iv 25′–27′ (CTH 759.10.b) for a different protective formula in the parallel context.

i 14″: For a different interpretation, see Starke 1985, 124.

i 16″–18″: This passage is restored based on KUB 32.8(+) iv 28′–30′ (CTH 759.10.b). The šarlatt-sacrifice is frequently translated as ‘thanksgiving’, but here such a translation is avoided since nothing in the context to follow, either here or in the parallel versions, is indicative of the expression of gratitude. What can be stated positively is that the name of the šarlatt-sacrificial rite is cognate with the verb /sarła(i)-(di)/ ‘to praise, exalt’, on which see below under i 22″, as well as the titles of the Sun-god used within it, such as *šar*-la-mi-[ś] ‘exalted’ in KUB 32.8(+) iv 31′ and probably šar-[ī]-... in § 11″ below. On etymological grounds, one could interpret the šarlatt-rite as “the rite of exaltation”.
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The Luwian verb /nakkussa(i)- (di)/ 'to release a scapegoat, perform a scapegoat rite' is presumably derived from *nakkuss(i)-'scapegoat', itself a loanword from Hurrian (differently Sasseville 2020c, 194–95). The abstract noun /nakkussayid/- 'scapegoat rite' must represent a secondary derivative from this denominative verb. The release of the scapegoat is not otherwise explicated in the preserved part of the šarlatt-rite of the Kuwattalla tradition. A parallel suggests that the animal featured in this rite is lifted up, perhaps toward the Sun-god (KBo 9.143 ii’6’, CTH 763.1.6). Contrast § 19 below, where a similar incantation is uttered in the context of a scapegoat rite. Consequently, one cannot rule out that the form [na]-ak-ku-ša-a-ú-un-š[=a] in this context reflects an error of anticipation.

The restored form [šar]-l-a-a-ú-un-du must belong to the denominative verb /sarla(i)-(di)/ 'to praise, exalt' and features the 1pl.opt. ending /-untu/ matching the first person plural preterit ending /-unta/. Presumably, the name of the šarlatt-sacrifice is ultimately derived from the verb under discussion (see above).

This and the preceding paragraph are restored based on the parallel passage KBo 29.6(+i) 14’–21’ (CTH 762.2).

This incantation is obviously parallel to the better-preserved one in KBo 29.6(+) i 22’–24’ (CTH 762.2), but the distribution of information across lines is unclear and the beginning of line ii 13’ resists restoration.

Perhaps EN-an refers here to the [ritual] patron, but alternatively this could be a reference to a hostile vengeful lord, see e.g KBo 29.3+ ii 18–27 (CTH 760.2).

The fragmentary paragraphs §§ 17”″–18”″ find a close parallel in an equally fragmentary passage KUB 35.17 (CTH 762.1.1). Unfortunately, this parallel is not conducive to additional restorations.

The Luwian noun ḫi-iša-[l-la-…] is otherwise attested as a designation of an empty pot (see the commentary to KBo 29.63, CTH 762.1.k).

The form a-lu-ú-ni-[…] need not be separated from the Luwian noun 'enemy' attested in hieroglyphic transmission as *(a)-la/i-(lu/a/i)-ni-, also á-rú-ni- (Rieken and Yakubovich 2010, 204–5). For the reconstruction of this noun as *alwann(i)- 'enemy' in the late second millennium BCE, see Rieken and Yakubovich 2022. The contraction *alwann(i)- > /alunn(i)- however, must have already taken place in the dialect of our corpus, as suggested by the 1pl.pres. verbal ending *(w)anni > /-unni/.

This passage is restored according to the parallel versions KUB 35.15 iii’1–10 (CTH 761.2.5) and KBo 9.141 iv 14’–22’ (CTH 761.2.4).

It is assumed that the subjects of this clause are miasma listed in the first clause of the paragraph. As neuter nouns, they trigger verbal agreement in the singular.
iv 12’–15’: The restoration of this incantation is problematic, since each of the parallel passages, KUB 35.15 iii 11–13 (CTH 761.2.5) and KBo 29.12 iv 3’–5’ (CTH 761.3.3), is likewise badly mutilated. See the commentary to KUB 35.15 (CTH 761.2.5).

iv 2’–5’: The colophon clearly indicates that this version of the ritual is attributed to both Kuwattalla and Šilalluḫi. Its restoration here follows the hypothesis that it is parallel to the colophon of CTH 760.1. It should be contrasted with the colophon of CTH 760.4.

Table of Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>KUB 35.48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bo 3600 + Bo 3693 + Bo 3962 + Bo 4534 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bo 7343 + Bo 7552 + Bo 8121 + Bo 8847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmission and Research History

This New Script piece consists of many fragments, all of which had been joined already before its publication in autography. The fact that the tablet is ruled (vorliniert), together with an unusually large number of errors, is conducive to a hypothesis that we are dealing with a draft or scribal exercise. Since we assume that we are dealing with a double-columned tablet, the preserved parts would correspond to columns two and three. Alternatively, we would be dealing with a single-columned tablet. The find spot of the tablet remains unknown. The joined fragments are published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 155–57 as part of the “third ritual”.

Transliteration

§ 1’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv. ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ii 1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ii 2’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 2’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A ii 3’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[nu MUNIGIU GI ku-it 1 NINDA a-a-an 1 DUG]KU-KU-UB KAS ḫar-zi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ii 4’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KBo 29.12, which follows the same Luwian incantation mentioning “the violent ones” but is attributed to Šilallulu alone, refers to the performance in the open country, and is accordingly conducive to classifying the relevant fragment as belonging to CTH 761.3. This implies that the incantation mentioning “the violent ones” may occur in various versions of the Kuwattalla tradition.

Contents

§ 1′ Fragmentary blessing formula
§ 2′ Manipulations with bear and bread remaining from the preceding rite
§§ 3′–5′ Presentation to the Sun of the two figurines symbolizing a living person and a dead spirit, with its Luwian conjuration
§ 6′ Fragmentary Hittite passage
§§ 7″–9″ Unclear
§§ 10″–11″ Luwian incantations that arguably accompany a taluppi-rite
§ 12″ Cutting the wool strips from the ritual patron
§ 13″ Luwian conjuration addressed to the goddess Andaliya
§ 14″ Almost completely lost
§ 15″ Fragmentary Hittite passage
§ 16″ Luwian curse formula against potential evildoers
§§ 17″–18″ Hittite passage mentioning tongue figurines and the Sun-god, with its Luwian incantation

The first part of the text closely parallels a sequence of rites in column two of CTH 760.2 (see commentary), which implies that we are likewise dealing with the first tablet of the ritual. The second part helps to fill in a large lacuna between the preserved parts of columns two and three of CTH 760.2.

Translation

§ 1′
Obv. ii
1′ “[…] with […].
1′–2′ [with favor (and) enliven[ent [of the deities].”

§ 2′
3′ [The warm bread] (and) the jug of beer [which the Old Woman] holds,
4′ she holds [them toward the ritual patron].
A ii 5′ [nu-uš-ša-an QA-TAM da-a-i] nam-ma MUNUSŠU.GI NINGA-a-an E[GIR-pa I-NA AŠ-RI-ST] 
A ii 6′ [pē-e-dai na-at-ša-an EGIR-p]a A-NA GIBANSUR kat-ta da-[a-i] 
A ii 7′ [DUG-KU-KU-UB KAS-ma ḫar-z]i-pāt

§ 3′ 
A ii 8′ [nu-za MUNUSŠU.GI EGIR-an-da i]š-na-aš 2 šē-e-nu-uš da-a-i 
A ii 9′ [na-aš-kān pUTU-i me-n]a-ah-ḥa-[a]n-da e-ep-zi 
A ii 10′ [nam-ma ši-pa-an-ti] ḫu-uk-zi-ma ki-iš-ša-an

§ 4′ 
A ii 11′ [pUTU-ta EN-i]a ti-wa-li-ia pi-ia-aš 1lok[r]-in-zi 
A ii 14′ [ḥi-i-ru-ta]-aš-ši-in-za EMES-an-za ku-i-ša-an ḫa-ni-eš-ša-(at)-ta 
A ii 15′ [ku-i-ša-a]-n i-ip-pa-[ar-re-eš-ša-(at)]-ta SISKUR BA-ši-in EN-an 
A ii 16′ [ta-a-ru]-u]-aš-ša mi-ia-ša-an-za 2U3GIR .PA.DU ḫal-(ẖal)’-za’-ni-in 
A ii 17′ [u-wa-ra-an]-na-ẖi-ša i-ẖu-na-ẖi-ša ku-wa-an’-na-ni-in 
A ii 18′ [ma-aš-ša]-na-al-li-in KASKAL-an

§ 5′ 
A ii 19′ [ma-a-na-aš ḫ]u-’u’-it-wa-li-’iš ḫ[ar-ri]-’ia-an pUTU-wa-za 
A ii 20′ [da-ra-u-i-id-du ma-a-na-aš ū-l]a-an-ti-iš 
A ii 21′ [a-an ti-ia-am-ma-aš-ši-iš pUTU-wa-za da]-ra-u-i-id-du 
A ii 23′ [ta-ta-ri-ia-am-ma-aš-ši-in ḫ]i-i-ru-ta-aš-ši-in (EN-an)

§ 6′ 
A ii 24′ [nu MUNUSŠU.GI 2 ši-e-nu-uš iš-na-aš] ’A-NA EN’ SISKUR 
A ii 25′ [SA-PAL GIRMES-SU da-a-i] 

§ 7″ 
Rev. iii 
A iii 1′ [...] x [...] 
A iii 2′ [...] x at [...] 

§ 8″ 
A iii 3′ [...] EN S]ISKUR

§ 9″ 
A iii 4′ [...] (vacat)
5’ [He places (his) hand on (it)]. Then the Old Woman
5’–6’ [brings] the warm bread [ack to its location],
6’ (i.e.) she pla[ces it b]ack on the table.
7’ [However, she] still [hold[s the jug of beer].

§ 3’
8’ [Afterward, the Old Woman] takes two figurines of [d]ough
9’ [and] she pla[ces it ba]ck on the table.
10’ [Then, she makes a libation] and she conjures thus:

§ 4’
11’ "[Sun-god], divine [lord], give (him) the enemies,
14’ Whoever restrained it,
15’ [whoever] distrained [i]t, (namely) the ritual patron’s
16’ [shap]e, flesh, bone(s), joint(s),
17’ [spee]ch, mobility, eyebrow(-hair),
18’ [div]ine path!

§ 5’
19’ [If he] (is) a [l]iving being,
19’–20’ [may] the Sun-god ab[ove deliver] him (to the ritual patron)!
20’ [If he] (is) a [de]ad (spirit),
21’ may [the Sun-goddess of the earth de]liver [him] (to the ritual patron),
22’–23’ (namely) (the lord) [of (vengeful) words, trap]s, judgments, [curses (or) p]erjuries!"

§ 6’
24’–25’ [The Old Woman places the two figurines of dough at the feet] of the ritual
patron.

§ 7*
Rev. iii
1’ […]
2’ […]

§ 8*
3’ […] r]itical [patron].

§ 9*
4’ […]

DOI: 10.13173/9783447119955.1.138
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC BY-SA 4.0 license. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/deed.en
The terms of the CC licence apply only to the original material. The use of material from other sources such as charts, illustrations, photographs and text extracts may require further permission for use from the respective rights holder.
© by authors
§ 10″
A iii 5′ [pa-a ḫa-la-a-li-iš a-aš-d]u ’ ma-al ḫa-aš-ṣa-aš-ṣi-iš’ EN-aš
A iii 6′ [a-ad-du-wa-la-ti EM]E-ti a-ad-du-wa-la-ti ŠU₁⁵MES-ti
A iii 7′ [ta-pa-r]u-w[a-ṣa-an-zA-t]j i ta-ta-ri-ia-am-ma-ṣa-an-za-ti

§ 11″
A iii 10′ [zi-la-d]u-ūr DINGIRMES-in-zī za-am-ma-an ta-pa-ru
A iii 11′ [ta-t]a-ar-ia-[m-m]a ḥi-i-ru-un wa-aš-ṣi-mi ni-iš b[a-pa-in-ti]
A iii 13′ [a-ap-pa k]a-al-du-ni-i-ia ṭi-i-it-t[a-ri]

§ 12″
A iii 15′ [pa-ra-a e-ep-z]i nu SÍG ḫa ku-re-es-ke-ez-z[i]
A iii 16′ [MUNUSGI-ma ḫu-uk-z]i kiš-an

§ 13″
A iii 17′ […] ’A-ta-li-ia-aš ta-na-ma-t[i …]
A iii 18′ […] ’a’-aš-su-wa-al ku-wa-al-ti
A iii 19′ […] a-ḥa-ra-an] wa-aḥ-ra-an ku-wa-ar-ti da-[a-pa-ru]
A iii 20′ […] ta-ta-ri-ia-am-ma-an ku-wa-a]r-ti ḥi-i-ru-un ku-wa-ar-[ti …-t]i
A iii 21′ […] T]-a-an ḫ[U]-lu-un GE₆₇-[i …]
A iii 22′ […] x x […]

§ 14″
A iii 23′ […] A₇ x […]
A iii 24′ […]
A iii 25′ […]
A iii 26′ […]

§ 15″
A iii 27′ […] [nu] kiš-an b[ũ-uk-z]i

§ 16″
A iii 28′ [ku-īš-tar SISKUR₂₂, ḡa-an-zA-an EN-ia ad-du-w]a-al
A iii 30′ [EME-in […]x-du
A iii 31′ [pa-du-wa-an-ta za-ti-i …-d]u
§ 10"
5' "[Ma]y the ritual patron [be pure]
6' from [the evil tongue], the evil hand,
7' (the tongue) of [j]udgments, curses,
8' [p]erjuries, internal (or) ext[ernal]
9' (those) of [m]ountain-dwellers (or) the desert-dwellers, an ar[my (or) an as-

§ 11"
10'–11' [In the future], may the gods not b[ind] to his body bewitchment, judgment,
12' [c]ur[s]e, perjury!
12'–13' May they n(o)lt be experienced [again by him] (as) [th]rashing!

§ 12"
14' [The Old Woman] take[s] a br[on]ze [knife]
14'–15' a[nd holds] (it) [toward] the ri[tual] patron,
15' [so that] he cuts off [the wool] (strips).
16' [The Old Woman conjur]es thus:

§ 13"
17'–18' "Goddess Andaliya, you cut [...] with an unsheathed [knife].
19' You cut [woe] (and) pain [...].
19'–20' You [cu]t [judgment, ..., curse].
20' [cu]t perjury, [you] cut [...]
21' [... mon]th, evil night [...]
22' [...]"""

§ 14"
23' [...]"""
24' [...]"""
25' [...]"""
26' [...]"""

§ 15"
27' [... She] conjures thus:

§ 16"
28'–29' "[W]hoever causes evil [to the ritual patron],
29'–30' may [all] the [g]ods [... his tongue]!
31' [T]hen] may [they ... it in the same way]!"""
Great Ritual and dupadaparsi-ritual (CTH 760)

§ 17”
A iii 32’ [nu MUNUS.GI GİR ZABAR hi-la]n²-na pa-ra-a pé-e-da-i
A iii 33’ [...] š-na-aš EMES
A iii 34’ [...] ṜUTU-i
A iii 35’ [...] ḫu-uk-zi-ma ki-ḫa-an]

§ 18”
A iii 36’ [...] DINIRMES-i]n-zi
A iii 37’ [...] x x [...] [...

Commentary

ii 6’: Contrast the mention of the wickerwork table in KBo 29.3+ ii 14 (CTH 760.2, § 8’). In general, §§ 1′–6′ of this tablet exhibit close similarity to CTH 760.2 §§ 7′–12′.

ii 12′–14′: In comparison with the matching sentence in KBo 29.3+ ii 19–21 (CTH 760.2, § 10′), one is dealing here with more extensive confusion between the forms in /-ints(a)/ and /-intsi/, which reflect the original Luwian dialect of the incantations and that of the Ḫattuša copyist respectively.

ii 22′–23′: Contrast the shorter phrase ‘the lord of curses (and) perjuries’ in KBo 29.3+ ii 27 (CTH 760.2, § 11’).

iii 11′: For the reading wa-aš-ši-ni over erasure, see Laroche 2016, 235–36.

iii 12′–13′: It is assumed that Luw. /kalduni(ja)-/ ‘beating, thrashing’ is derived from /kaldun(n)i-/ ‘shank(bone), club’ as a substantivized possessive adjective. We take ū-i-it-[a-ri] as a passive form cognate with au(š)/-uw-[ḫi] to see’ (see Sasseville 2020c, 343–44), and therefore the more literal translation of the passage under discussion could be: “May they not recur/reappear for him as a heavy burden! May they not appear for him as a thrashing!” For the evil conceived as a load, see Marcuson 2016, 363–65.

iii 14′–16′: While §§ 10′–11′ above find close counterparts in KBo 29.3+ iii 1′–12′ (CTH 760.2, §§ 14′–15′) and indeed help to restore these passages of KBo 29.3+, this is not the case of the paragraph under discussion. Contrast KBo 29.3+ iii 13′–16′ (CTH 760.2, § 16′), where the ritual patron breaks the figurines of evil hand and tongue, apparently with his bare hands. Since cutting of the strips tying the symbols of evil to the ritual patron logically precedes the destruction of such figurines, it stands to reason that §§ 10′–12′ in our text, and its remaining part in general, must be ordered before CTH 760.2 §§ 14′–16′. The repetition of the same incantations accompanying purification rites in two different contexts is in itself hardly surprising,
§ 17”

32’ [The Old Woman] carries [the bronze knife] out to the [gate]house.
33’ [...] the tongues of [d]ough
34’–35’ [...] to the Sun-god
35’ [and she conjures thus]:

§ 18”

36’ “[...] gods
37’ [...]”

since the purification rites can occur at various points in the ritual (see for example the structure of KUB 32.9(+), CTH 761.1.f).

iii 17: For other mentions of the goddess Andaliya in the context of cutting threads, see Miller 2004, 257 fn. 390. These parallels constitute the most important reason for restoring [SÍGḪÁ] ’wool (threads)’ in the previous paragraph. For the other occurrences of the goddess Andaliya, see van Gessel 1998, 32–33. For ta-na-ma-t[i] as a form of Luw. /tannam(a/i)-/ ’bare, unsheathed’, see Starke 1990, 544 fn. 2013.

iii 27: This paragraph follows the lacuna of some four lines, probably containing an additional paragraph line. The general content of the lacuna is clearly based on KUB 35.59+ (CTH 760.5). The ritual patron spits on the detached object(s), while the Old Woman pronounces the usual incantation accompanying the spitting rite. In the beginning of § 15” the Old Woman brandishes the bronze knife or performs a similar gesture matching the incantation to follow.

iii 28’–31: This incantation is partially restored based on the parallel passage KUB 35.59+ iii 7’–9’ (CTH 760.5). The curse seems to be directed against the tongue of the evildoer; whether his hands are also involved remains unclear. As a hypothesis, the gods are expected to detach his tongue and then cut it into pieces. On this passage and its comparison with other incantations associated with a knife in the context of curses, see Puertolas Rubio 2022. In any case, compare the similar incantation involving the heart and liver of the evildoer in KUB 32.8(+) iv 21’–24’ (CTH 759.10.b).

iii 32’–35’: It seems likely that this paragraph refers to the presentation of evil tongues (and hands?) to the Sun-god, in a manner similar to the presentation of the figurines symbolizing evildoers to the Sun-god earlier in § 3’. It is likely that this presentation is eventually followed by the destruction of the figurines representing evil, as reported in KBo 29.3+ iii 13’–16’ (CTH 760.2, § 16”).
Table of Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$</td>
<td>KBo 29.13 977/v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2$</td>
<td>+ KUB 35.59 + Bo 4115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmission and Research History

The two fragments of this New Script fragment were joined in Kammenhuber 1985, 82. Small parts of two adjacent columns and a portion of the intercolumnium have been preserved. Judging by the find spot of $A_1$, the tablet comes from the Temple I area. The fragment is heavily worn away. It is published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 165 as part of the “third ritual”.

Transliteration

§ 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv. i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$ i 1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$ i 2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$ i 3’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv. ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_{1+2}$ ii 1’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$A_{1+2}$ ii 2’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$nu\ MUNUS\GI\ a-pu-u-[\text{...}]\ al-la-[\text{...}SISKUR\ pa-ra-a\ e-ep-\text{-zi}]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$A_{1+2}$ ii 3’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$na-at\ EN\ [\text{...}SISKUR\ p-pa-\ah-\hj\ MUNUS\GI\ ma\ ki-is-\ša-an\ ū-\uk-\text{-zi}]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$A_{1+2}$ ii 4’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-\ah-ra-an\ [wa-\ah]-ra-an\ tap-pa-a[t-ta\ ta-pa-ru\ ta-a-ta-r-ia-am-ma-an]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$A_{1+2}$ ii 5’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hi-i-\ru-\un\ [ma]'-a-a-\aš-\ši-in E[M-\in]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$A_{1+2}$ ii 6’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$nu\ MUNUS\GI\ G\IR\ ZABAR\ x\ x\ x\ [...]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contents

§ 1′ Unclear Hittite passage
§ 2″ Fragmentary passage; Luwian incantations that accompany a taluppi-rite(?)
§§ 3″–4″ Spitting rite, with its Luwian incantation
§§ 5″–6″ Rite involving a bronze knife, with its Luwian curse formula against potential evildoers
§ 7″ Mention of tongue figurines made of dough

A part of this fragment close parallels CTH 760.4 § 15″–§ 17″ and contributes to the restoration of this passage (see commentary). Note that the relative order of columns is hypothetical; what is provisionally analyzed here as columns one and two may turn out to belong to columns four and three respectively.

Translation

§ 1′

Obv. i
1′ [...] 2′ [...] ritual [...] 3′ [...] thus.

§ 2″

Obv. ii
1′ [...] 2′ [...] 3′ [...] thus.

§ 3″

2′ The Old Wo[man holds that] one [toward the ritual patron], 3′ so that the [ritual] patron spi[ts] (on) it. [The Old Woman conjures thus]:

§ 4″

4′ "He spa[t (out)] woe (and) [pain, judgment, curse],
5′ perjury, the to[nque] of the [multitudes]."

§ 5″

6′ The Old Woman [...] the bronze knife. [She conjures thus]:
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Great Ritual and dupaduparša-ritual (CTH 760)

§ 6"
A₁ ii 7’ ku-[i]š-tar EN ŠISKUR-an-za-⟨an⟩ ʾad’-[d][u-wa-a-al a-an-ni-ti a-du-ut-ta]
A₂ ii 8’ [DINGIR\textsuperscript{MES}-i]n-zi EME-in […-du]
A₂ ii 9’ [pa-du-wa-a]n-ta za-ti-i […-an-du]

§ 7"
A₃ ii 10’ [nu \textsuperscript{MUN}SU.G]I GİR Z[ABAR ḫi-la-am-ni pa-ra-a pé-e-da-i]
A₃ ii 11’ [… iš-⟨a⟩-⟨a⟩-⟨a⟩ EME … PITU-⟨i⟩]
A₃ ii 12’ […] x […]

Commentary

i 1’: The reading follows the collation of the original tablet fragment contra the autograph.
ii 6’–10’: See the commentary to the parallel passage KUB 35.48 iii 28’–31’ (CTH 760.4).

CTH 760.6

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.11 VAT 16407

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment contains a small portion of a right column (probably column two), broken along the right edge of the intercolumnium. The provenance of the fragment remains unknown. It was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 163 as part of the “third ritual”.

Transliteration

§ 1’
Obv. ii?
A ii? 2’ ta-t[a-ri-ia-am-na-aš-ši-in ḫi-i-ru-ta-aš-ši-in]
A ii? 3’ a-aš-ši-’u’-[wa-an-ta-at-na-aš-ši-in ma-ia-aš-ši-in EME-in]

§ 2’
A ii? 4’ nu-uš-ši-k[⟨an …]
§ 6
"Who[e]ver [causes] ev[il] against the ritual patron,
[may the go]ds [...] his tongue!
[Then may they ...] it in the same way!"

§ 7
[The Old Woma]n [carries out] the b[ronze] knife [to the gatehouse].
[… the to[n]gue] of [d]ough [...] to the Sun-god.
[…]

ii 10′–12′: This paragraph is restored based on the parallel passage in KUB 35.48 iii 32′–34′ (CTH 760.4).

Contents

§ 1′ Luwian incantation containing a formulaic list of miasma
§§ 2′–3′ Removing items representing the miasma from various body parts of the ritual patron, with its Luwian incantation
§ 4′ Unclear Hittite passage

The content of the final part of the fragment is very close to that of KUB 35.12 (CTH 762.1.f), and there is no doubt that the two fragments reflect an identical rite. Nevertheless, the formula in § 1′ tips the scales in favor of classifying the fragment under discussion as part of CTH 760 (see the commentary).

Translation

§ 1′
Obv. ii′
1′ "the (evil) ha[nd, the evil tongue, (the tongue) of judgment],
2′ (that) [of] cu[rse, (that) of perjury],
3′ (that) [of] mise[ry, the tongue of the multitudes]."

§ 2′
4′ [...] to him [...]
Great Ritual and *dupaduparša*-ritual (CTH 760)

A ii\(^7\) 5': *iš-ki-ša-* az' [... ] *Iš-TU 2 [\(\leq\)] ZAG.LU [... ]
A ii\(^7\) 6': *ge-nu-wa-az* x[... ar-ḫa da-aš-ke-ez-zi]
A ii\(^7\) 7': *nu lu-u-i-li kiš*- [an ḫu-u-uk-ki-iš-ke-ez-zi]

§ 3'
A ii\(^7\) 8': ni-iš-pa-aš a-ah-ḫa-ša-[am-mi-iš SISKUR-iš EN-aš da-a-ru-uš-ša]
A ii\(^7\) 9': mi-ša-an-za ḫa-aš-ša ḫ[al-ḥal-za-ni-in ú-wa-ra-an-na-a-ḫi-ša]
A ii\(^7\) 10': i-ú-na-a-ḫi-ša la-[al-pi-in ku-wa-an-na-ni-in]
A ii\(^7\) 11': **DINGIRMES-**-li-in [KASKAL-an]

§ 4'
A ii\(^7\) 12': 'nu **MINŠU.GI** ku-�示' [...]
A ii\(^7\) 13': [...] x [...]

**Commentary**

**ii\(^7\) 3':** The position of 'misery' in the list of miasma is here identical to that in KBo 29.3+ (CTH 760.2) and KBo 29.19 (CTH 760.7.b). The similarity between the incantation under discussion and KBo 29.3+ iii 17′–19′ is particularly remarkable. Contrast the parallel incantations in KBo 22.254(+ ii 6–9 (CTH 762.3.2) and KBo 29.5:2′–4′ (CTH 762.1.g), which lack 'misery' altogether.

**CTH 760.7.a**

**Table of Manuscripts**

| A₁ | KBo 29.22 | 867/v |
| A₂ | + KBo 57.226 | + 632/v |

**Transmission and Research History**

Both fragments were found in Temple I and belong to the left column of a double-columned New Script tablet. They were published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 199 and Groddek 2011b, 119–20 respectively and joined in Sasseville 2020c, 558. The direct join was confirmed by Alice Mouton’s collation of the original fragments.
[she removes ...] from the back [...] from the two shoulders [...], from the knee and [she conjures] th[us] in Luwian:

§ 3′

"May [the ritual patron] not be separat[ed with respect to (his) shape], flesh, bone(s), j[oints, speech], mobility, ey[elash, eyebrow(-hair)], divine [path]!"

§ 4′

Whatever the Old Woman [...]

12′

13′

ii? 4′–7′: The restorations in this paragraph follow KUB 35.12 obv. ii 2′–5′ (CTH 762.1.f).

ii? 8′–11′: The restorations in this paragraph follow KUB 35.12 obv. iii 1–4 (CTH 762.1.f).

For the image of the patient’s body parts being “separated” (i.e. malfunctioning), see the exact Hittite calque with arḫa šarra- in the watercourse ritual of Tunnawiya KUB 7.53+ i 5, iii 7–11 (CTH 409.I).

Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Rite in front of a deity, with its Luwian incantation

§§ 3′–4′ Luwian incantation about transferring the control of the miasma onto the substitute

The identity of ductus with KBo 29.19 (CTH 760.7.b; see Fig. 2.16) supports the contention that this fragment also belongs to CTH 760. See CTH 760.7.b for further discussion.
Transliteration

§ 1′
Left column
A₁, l.col. 1′ [A-N[A ’DINGIR’-LIM-m[a ...
A₁, l.col. 2′ ’lu’-ú-i-li-m[a ki-iš-ša-an ḫu-u-uk-zī]

§ 2′
A₁, l.col. 3′ za-a-ú-i-ia-an ḫal-[li-na-i ma-al-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ši-in]
A₁, l.col. 4′ E[N-an ti-iš-ša-’at’-[wa²-an²-ti²-iš² ...]
A₁, l.col. 5′ n[i-i]š a-ap-ти ḫu-u-[x[...

§ 3′
A₂, l.col. 6′ [na-a]-’ú-wa-ti-ia-ta’ ḫar-ma-[a-ti mu-u-wa-i]
A₂, l.col. 7′ [na-a-ú-w]a-ti-ia-ta ’a’-[a-la-at-ta-ti mu-u-wa-i]
A₂, l.col. 8′ [na-a-ú-w]a-ti-ia-ta ma-[an-na-ḫu-wa-an-na-ti KLMIN]
A₂, l.col. 9′ [na-a-ú-wa-t]i-ia-ta ti-[a-a-u-wa-aš-ša-ti ti-ti-ta-a-ti KLMIN]
A₂, l.col. 10′ [na-a-ú-wa-t]i-ia-ta 1/2[SA-ti 1/2][NG.GIG-ti 12-ta-a-ti]
A₂, l.col. 11′ [ḫa-ap-pí-ša-a-t]i [KLMIN]

§ 4′
A₂, l.col. 12′ […] X […]

Commentary

L.col. 1′: The presentation of the substitute is usually addressed to the Warlike Storm-god in CTH 761, but since this deity is not attested outside CTH 761, the divine addressee in the present fragment remains uncertain.

L.col. 4′: According to H. Craig Melchert (pers. comm.), Luw. /tissadw(a)-/ may represent a derivative of the verb /tissa(i)-/ ‘to fashion’ with the etymological meaning ‘fabrication’ (see now Melchert 2023 sub tiššatwa-). For the matching noun tiššatwa- in Hittite context, see HEG T, 380–81 and see HEG U–Z, 459–60 (sub wazza-). It is clear that we are dealing with a negative concept, which can arise in connection with evil speech and is symbolized by particular objects, such as the piece of tallow deployed as a substitute in the Maštigga ritual (see Miller 2004, 66–68). In this case, too,
§ 1′
Left column
1′ [...] o the deity [...].
2′ and [...] conjures thus in Luwian:

§ 2′
3′–4′ “Here, the tiššat[wa-substitute] deconta[minsates the ritual] patron.
5′ (May he) n[o]t get [...].

§ 3′
6′ [He n]o (longer) [overcomes] it [with] his hea[d].
7′ [He no (longer) overcomes] it [with] his a[alatti-body part].
8′ [Ditto no] (longer overcomes) it [with] his n[ose].
9′ [Ditto no] (longer overcomes) it [with the pupils of] his e[yes].
10′–11′ [Ditto no] (longer overcomes) it with [hi]s [heart, liver, twelve limbs].’”

§ 4′
12′ [...]

we are in the middle of a substitution rite, while ti-iš-ša-[at′-...] functions as the subject of a transitive clause, referring to a substitute that decontaminates the ritual patron. Therefore, H. Craig Melchert proposes the restoration of the ergative form /tissadwantis/.

Lcol. 5′: As argued in Sasseville 2020c, 261–62, the form /aptti/ is the only attestation of the Luwian lexical cognate of the Hittite verb ĕpzi / appanzi.

Lcol. 6′–11′: This paragraph is restored based on KUB 35.24+ obv. 5′–7′ (CTH 761.1.c, § 2′). The subject of all the clauses here is the ritual patron, to be contrasted presumably with the substitute in the next paragraph.
CTH 760.7.b

Table of Manuscripts
A KBo 29.19 235/q

Transmission and Research History
This New Script fragment was probably found in the Temple I area, and this information is indirectly supported by the find spot of CTH 760.7.a. The fragment’s original place on the tablet cannot be determined. It was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 198 as belonging to an unspecified “Old Woman” ritual.

Transliteration

§ 1
A:1’ [...]šši-x x [...] [...
A:2’ [na-at EN SISKUR a]-la-ap-pa-ah-hi
A:3’ [MINUSU.GI-ma ki-i]šša-an ḫu-u-uk-[zi]

§ 2
A:4’ [a-ah-ra-an wa-ah-r]a-an tap-pa-at-ta t[a-a-pa-ru]
A:5’ [ta-a-ta-ri-ia]-am-ma-an ḫi-ru-’ú’-[un]
A:6’ [a-aš-ši-wa-a]n-ta-at-tar ma-a-[a-aš-ši-in EME-in]

§ 3
A:7’ [na-aš-ta MINUSU.GI]pi-x x[...]

Commentary

2’: A fragmentary sign is seen after [a]-la-ap-pa-ah-hi ‘spits’ on the broken edge of the tablet. There is, however, no space for another sentence on this line, nor is it expected in this standard passage. Therefore, the trace is probably to be attributed to a scribal error or an erasure.
Contents

§§ 1'–2' Spitting rite, with its Luwian conjuration
§ 3' Unclear Hittite passage

The order of the miasma listed in § 2' (see commentary) speaks in favor of classifying this small fragment as part of the first tablet of CTH 760. The fragment likely belongs to the same tablet series as CTH 760.7.a on paleographic grounds (see Fig. 2.16), but since the spitting rite occurs several times in the course of the ritual, the position of the two fragments vis-à-vis each other cannot be determined.

Translation

§ 1'
1' [...] 
2' [The ritual patron spits (on) [it]. 
3' [The Old Woman] conjure[s th]us:

§ 2'
4' "He spat (out) [woe (and) pai]n, ju[dgmens],
5' [cur]se, perjur[y],
6' [mise]ry, [the tongue of] the multit[udes]!"

§ 3'
7' [The Old Wo]man [...].

6': The position of 'misery' in front of 'the tongue of the multitudes' in the formulaic list of miasma parallels that in KBo 29.3+ iii 19' (CTH 760.2) and KUB 35.11 ii 7' 3' (CTH 760.6), supporting the classification of this fragment as part of CTH 760.
Great Ritual and dupadaparia-ritual (CTH 760)

CTH 760.8

Table of Manuscripts
A KUB 9.36 Bo 4597

Transmission and Research History
This New Script fragment probably belongs to a left column of a double-columned tablet. The find spot of the fragment is unknown. It was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 168–69 as belonging to an unspecified “Old Woman” ritual. The palaeographic data do not lend support to its join with KUB 35.46 (see Fig. 2.14), contrary to what is proposed in Starke 1990, 596–97.

Transliteration

§ 1
A:1′ a-[aš-r]a-an wa-aš-ʾḫaʾ-[ra-an tap-pa-ad-da ta-a-pa-ru ta-ta-ar-ri-ia-am-
ma-an]
A:2′ ḫi-i-ru-u-un a-(aš)-ši-wa-an-[ta-at-tar ma-ia-aš-ši-in EME-in]

§ 2′
A:3′ [n]a-aš-[f] a-pu-uʾ-[un]’ [...] 
A:4′ [pe]-e-da-i nu ḫu-u-ma-an ku- [...] 
A:5′ [a-pu]-u-un-na NINDA.GUR₄.RA TUR A-[N] [...]

§ 3′
A:6′ [...] (vacat) [...]

Commentary

1′: The reading -ʾr[a-], suggested in Starke 1985, 169, is not possible. Two verticals and part of a Winkelhaken are clearly visible on the tablet’s photograph before the gap.
2′: The position of ‘misery’ in the formulaic list of the malign phenomena suggests the attribution of this fragment to CTH 760. See KBo 29.3+ iii 19′ (CTH 760.2) and see the commentary to CTH 760.7.b for further parallel attestations.
Contents

§ 1’ Luwian incantation accompanying the ritual spitting
§ 2’ Fragmentary Hittite passage mentioning the Old Woman and bread
§ 3’ No text preserved

This fragment can be attributed to CTH 760 on phraseological grounds (see the commentary). Since ritual spitting can take place at various points within the performance, the specific rite to which this fragment belongs cannot be determined.

Translation

§ 1’
1’ “[He spat (out)] w[o]e (and) pai[n, judgment, curse],
2’ perjury, miser[y, the tongue of the multitudes].”

§ 2’
3’–4’ The Old Woman [c]arries that [...].
4’ [She ...] all that.
5’ [She] also [... th]at small bread to [...].

§ 3’
6’ [...]

5’: This is the sole attestation of a small loaf of bread (NINDA.GUR₄.RA TUR) in the available fragments of the Kuwattalla tradition. Contrast the attestations of a sweet loaf of bread (NINDA.GUR₄.RA KU₇) in CTH 761, including those adjacent to a description of spitting—namely, KUB 35.21 rev. 9’ (CTH 761.1.d) and KUB 35.43+ ii 31 (CTH 761.3.8).
Great Ritual and dupaduparsa-ritual (CTH 760)

CTH 760.9

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 29.9 1271/v

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment was found in a secondary context in the area of Building M at Büyükkale. Its location on the tablet remains uncertain. The tablet was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 123–24 as part of the dupaduparsa-ritual.

Transliteration

§ 1
Obv.
A obv. 1’ [ḫu-it-wa-la-ḫi-ta-ti an-na-ru-um-ma]-’a’-ḫi-(ta)-ti [a-ar-ra-ia-a-ti uš-ša-a-ti ap-pa-ra-an-ta-ti]  
A obv. 2’ [a-ra-a-ti DINGIRMES-ša-an-za-ti w]a-aš-ša-’a’-ra-a-[ḫi-ta-ti]

§ 2’
A obv. 3’ [nu EN SISKUR ik-ku-na-at-ta-aš-ši-in iš-ša-ši-[k]U DUG KU-UB KAS ši-pa-an-[ti]  
A obv. 4’ […] ’u’-ta-an-zi nu-uš-ši-kán  
A obv. 5’ [A-NA SAG.DU-SU še-er NANDA.GÜ.GAL] tar-na-aš ti’-an’-zi[ ]  
A obv. 6’ [nam-ma-at-kán EGIS-ša-an-da] EN SISKUR ši-pa-an-[ti na]m-ma-at  
A obv. 7’ [kat-ta da-a]-i  

§ 3’
A obv. 8’ [nu MUNUSŠU.GI NINDA.GÜ.GAL A-NA] EN SISKUR [da-a-i nu]-uš-ša-an  
A obv. 9’ [UZIGN.GIG kat-ta’ tar-ma-iz-zi’ nu] lu’-u’-[i-li ki-iš-s]a-an [x] ḫu-u-u[k-ki-iš-k-e-z-zī]

§ 4’
A obv. 10’ [ku-iš-tar SISKUR-an-zu-an EN-ia] ’a’-ad-du-[wa-a-a]l a-an-ni-ti a-tu-ut-ta  
D[INGIRMES-in-zi]  
A obv. 11’ [UZIGN.GIG UZIGN šar-ra za-a-ti’-i] pu-u-wa-[ka-ka] a-at-ta za-an-ta
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§ 1′ Luwian blessing formula
§ 2′ Patient’s dedication of the second animal of the ikkunatt-sacrifice
§§ 3′–5′ Nailing(?) the liver and heart to the pea bread, with Luwian curse formula against potential evildoers
§ 6′ Luwian incantation for untying the offense and fault
§ 7′ Old Woman’s disposal of the liver and heart
§ 8′ Unclear

The preserved fragment closely parallels §§ 3′–9′ of KUB 35.16(+) (CTH 760.3.b), which can be contrasted with the deviant rendering of the same rites in KUB 32.8(+) (CTH 759.10.b).

Translation

§ 1′
Obv.
1′ “[with life, virility, [long years, future]
2′ [time, the favor of the deities].”

§ 2′
3′ [The ritual patron] consecrates [the (animal) of the ikkunatt-sacrifice with] a jug of beer.
4′ They bring [...].
4′–5′ They put [a pea bread] on its [head].
6′ [Then, afterward] the ritual patron dedicates it.
6′–7′ [Then he] puts it down.

§ 3′
8′ [The Old Woman takes the pea bread from] the ritual patron
8′–9′ [and she nails down the liver (and) heart] on top. [She] conjures them in
Luwian:

§ 4′
10′ “[Whoever] causes evil to the ritual patron,
10′–11′ [may] the gods snatch up his [liver (and) heart]
Great Ritual and dupaduparša-ritual (CTH 760)

A obv. 12′ [tarr-ma-i-im-ma-an a-aš-du URUDU]-’ia’-[ti tarr-ma]-ti

§ 5′
A obv. 13′ [URUDU-pa-tar zi-la pa-rī-i na-a-ū-wa i-t]i LIŠIMUG.a-iš-pa-an z[i-la]
A obv. 14′ [na-a-ū-wa ša-a-i ta-a-pa-am-pa-ti KIN-an] na-a-ū-wa a-ia-a-[ti]

§ 6′
A obv. 15′ [ni-i-ša-an ha-pī-ti SISKUR-aš-šī-in EN-an ha-]-a-a- at-nə-a-ši-〈(in)〉-iš E[ME-iš]
A obv. 16′ [wa-aš-kū-ši-im-ma-aš-ši-ıš] EME-[iš]

§ 7′
A obv. 17′ [na-aš-ta MUNUS.GI HI]NIG.GIG LIŠIŠA QA-DU NIN.DA.GAL pa-r[a-] [p]é-e-da-i
A obv. 18′ [...] a’ an-da [...] a obv. 19′ [...] x [...] x

§ 8′
A obv. 20′ [...] x [...] x

Commentary

Obv. 4′–5′: This line presumably fills in the space between the indirectly joined pieces KUB 35.16 and KUB 35.14 in column one.

CTH 760.10

Table of Manuscripts

| A | KUB 35.117 | Bo 7525 |

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment of uncertain provenance contains small parts of two adjacent columns, together with the intercolumnium. The order of the two columns is uncertain; the tentative order proposed below implies that this is the reverse of the tablet containing columns three and four. The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 122 as part of the dupaduparša-ritual. The claim of Goedegebuure 2010a, 305 fn. 30 about a possible indirect joint between KUB 35.14 i 7′–10′ and KUB 35.117
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11′–12′ and (then) [may (those) be nailed] down with a [copper nail]!

§ 5′
13′ [In the future, (this) copper (nail) will not go] away.
13′–14′ In the future, the smith [will not let] it [go]. [He] will not make [taba-work] out of it.

§ 6′
15′–16′ [May] the tongue of [offense, the tongue of fault not bind the ritual patron]!"  

§ 7′
17′ [The Old Woman] carries [out] [the liver (and) heart together with the pea bread]
18′ [...] in [...].
19′ [...]  

§ 8′
20′ [...]  

lcol. (= iv′) 1′–4′ was refuted through the restoration of the relevant passages (see the edition of CTH 760.3.b) and in the light of the paleographic evidence (see Fig. 2.15).  

Contents

§ 1′ Unclear Hittite passage
§§ 2′–3′ Luwian incantation accompanying the ritual treatment of an animal’s liver and heart

The specific similarity between KUB 35.117 §§ 2′–3′ and KUB 35.16(+) §§ 7′–8′ (CTH 760.3.b) supports the attribution of this small fragment to CTH 760, with all the necessary caveats that befit its size.
Transliteration

§ 1′
Rev. iii?
A iii7 1′ E[N SISKUR ...]
A iii7 2′ nu-[a ...]
A iii7 3′ kat-[a ...]
A iii7 4′ x[...]

§ 2″
Rev. iv?
A iv7 1′ [ku-iš-tar SISKUR-an-za-an EN-ia ad-du-wa-a]-al
A iv7 2′ [a-an-ni-ti a-du-ut-ta ta-ni-mi-in-zi DINGIR]-in-zi
A iv7 3′ [UDIG.GIG UDIza-ar-za šar-ra za-a-ti-i] pu-wa-an-du
A iv7 4′ [a-ta-tar za-an-ta tar-ma-im-ma-an a-aš-du URUDU]-i-a-ti
A iv7 5′ [tar-ma-ti]

§ 3″
A iv7 6′ [URUDU-pa-tar zi-la pa-ri-i na-a-w]a i-ti

Commentary

iv7 1′–6′: these lines are restored based on the closely parallel version KUB 35.16(+) (CTH 760.3.b). The phrasing of the same incantation in KUB 32.8(+) (CTH 759.10.b) appears to be less close.
Translation

§ 1′
Rev. iii²
1′ [ritual] pat[ron ...]
2′ [...] 
3′ [...] down [...].
4′ [...] 

§ 2″
Rev. iv³
1′–2″ “[Whoever causes evil [to the ritual patron],
2′–3″ may [all the god]s snatch [up his liver (and) heart in this way]
4′–5″ [and (then) may (those) be nailed down] with a [copper nail]!

§ 3″
6″ [In the future, (this nail of) copper will no]t go [away].”
Table of Manuscripts

A  KUB 35.23  164/c

Transmission and Research History

This Middle Script fragment is written by the same scribe as the rest of the texts grouped under CTH 761.1 (see Fig. 2.17). It comes from Building A of Büyükkale and was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 87–90, where it is also reported that CTH 760.1.c, CTH 761.1.d, and CTH 761.1.f are written by the same scribe.

Transliteration

§ 1′

A:5′ [EME-ti]

§ 2′

A:6′ [nu MUNUSŠU.GI i-iš-šu-wa-an-ta-a[n KU₆ ? da-a-i na-an-kān A-NA]
A:7′ [BE-EL SÍSKUR še-e]r ar-ḫa wa-af-[nu-zi nu te-ez-zi]

§ 3′

A:8′ [za-ú-i ú-i-ši]-ta a-la-‘a’-[aš-ša-am-mi-iš ...]
A:9′ [...n]a’]-ti-ia-aš-[ta ...]
A:10′ [...](-)‘ap’-pu”(-)[...]
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§§ 1′–2′ Luwian incantations accompanying the ablution of the ritual patron
§ 3′ Waving an object over the ritual patron, with its Luwian incantation

The tentative identification of the waved object as a fish prompts treating this fragment as the first one in the ritual sequence of CTH 761.1. For a more detailed discussion of this issue, see Vol. 2, Section 5.3.

Translation

§ 1′
1′ "The ritual patron is washing himself [from] judgment, curse,
2′ [perjury], the tongue[e] of the [multitudes]. [May he be pure]
2′–5′ [from the evil] tongue, [the evil hand, (the tongue) of judgment, curse, [perjury, the tongue of the multitudes in the presence of the deities]!"

§ 2′
6′ [The Old Woman takes live [fish]
6′–7′ and wave[s it ove]r [the ritual patron].
7′ [She says]:

§ 3′
8′ "[Here (has appeare]d [the bull of the] sea[
9′ […]
10′ […]"
Commentary

1′–5′: The incantation is restored based on KUB 32.9(+) rev. 6′–10′ (CTH 761.1.f, § 9′).

6′–7′: If the reconstruction [ḫu]-iš-šu-wa-an-ta-[n] is correct, it necessitates the assumption that the rite to follow involves a live animal.

8′: The restoration [za-á-ia-ša ú-i-sí]-ta, implying clitic doubling, may look more appropriate than [za-á-ı ú-i-sí]-ta but would strain the available space. No clitic doubling is required, however, if what follows is a new referent (see Appendix II). The restoration a-la-⸢a-⸣-[aš-ša-am-mi-iš] ’of the sea’ (the stem /aššami(ja/i)-/) is prompted by a comparison with the Maštigga ritual (CTH 404.1, § 11), where the fish

CTH 761.1.b

Table of Manuscripts

| A₁ | KUB 32.81 | 35/a |
| A₂ | + KUB 32.10 | + 749/b |
| A₃ | + KUB 35.19 | + 101/f |

Transmission and Research History

These fragments, all of which were found in Building A of Büyükkale, belong to a single-columned tablet characterized by a Middle Script ductus. A small part of the lower edge of the obverse is preserved. Heinrich Otten noted the join between the three fragments in his introduction to KUB 35. He also observed there the similarity of physical and linguistic features between this group and the fragments listed here under CTH 761.1.c, CTH 761.1.d, and CTH 761.1.f. This conclusion was not followed in Starke 1985, 162, where the joined fragments were published as belonging to the

Transliteration

| Obv. | § 1′ |
| A₁, A₂ obv. 1′ | [ki-iš-ša]-an A-NA BE-⸢EL⸣ S[I]SKU[ R te-ez-zi] |

| § 2′ |
| A₁, A₂ obv. 2′ | [za-a-ú]-⸢i-⸣-ia-ta ú-i-sí-ta d[u-ú-pa-ni-ia-an-za ša-ḫu-i-da-an-tal-li-ia-an-za] |
| A₁, A₂ obv. 3′ | [ū-i-t]a-an-tal-li-ia-an-za p[a-a ma-a-an ša-ḫu-i-da-an-tal-li-ia-an ku-i-ḫa] |
is called a-ru-na-aš GU₄ MA-H-aš 'bull of the sea' (Miller 2004, 66). The meaning of Luw. /alassamm(i)-/ (variant /alissamm(i)-/ 'sea' can be established based on the mythological text CTH 764.1 containing the question KUB 35.107+ ii 4' a-a-li-iš-[a-mi-s]-a-[t]-u-i-ti pa-an ku-š-[a-r]-ri-it-ti 'Here comes the sea; who will lift it?' and the matching answer KUB 35.107+ ii 12' [A.AB.BA.-]n kur-ša-[a]-na-an-ti-in-[z]i a-r-i-in'-[t]a] 'The islands lifted the sea' (differently Steitler 2017, 391). The implication of this analysis is the necessity to restore a ritual waving of a fish in the previous paragraph. See further Melchert 2023 sub alašša/i(m)mi- 'sea'.

"third ritual", but the paleographic analysis of Alice Mouton has confirmed that all the fragments of CTH 761.1 reflect the same scribal hand (see Fig. 2.17).

Contents

§§ 1–3' Old Woman presents the ritual patron’s substitute(?) on his behalf with the accompanying Luwian incantation
§ 4' Luwian incantation for restoring the integrity of the ritual patron
§ 5' Old Woman unties dough figurines with the Luwian incantation addressed to solar deities and including blessings for the ritual patron

The present fragment exhibits specific parallels with KBo 29.3+, the first tablet of CTH 760.2 (see the commentary). The comparison with the rite sequence of CTH 404.1 is conducive to tentatively assigning it shortly after KUB 35.23 (CTH 761.1.a) in the rite sequence of CTH 761.1. For a more detailed discussion of this issue, see Vol. 2, Section 5.4.

Translation

§ 1'
Obv.
1’ [She says thu]s for the r[i]tual patron:

§ 2’ "[He]re appeared the one for stri[king, the one for binding],
3’ the one for [sm]iting. T[hen, whether anything (is) of binding],
Great Ritual, 1st group (CTH 761) 204

A₁₊₂, obv. 4’ [ma-a-a][n ú-i-ta-an-tal-li-ia-a[n ku-i-ḫa ma-a-an ta-a-ú-wa-ti ku-i-ḫa ma-na-a-ta]
A₁₊₂, obv. 5’ [ma-a-a][n iš-ša-ra-a-ti ku-i-ḫa [a-a-ia-ta ma-a-an ta-wa-aš-ša-ti ku-i-ḫa tu-um-ma-an-ti-it-ta]
A₁₊₂, obv. 6’ [ma-a-a][n u-wa-la-an-ta-li-ia-an k[u-i-ḫa ma-a-an ḫu-’it’-wa-l[i-ia-an ku-i-ḫa]

A₁₊₂₊₃, obv. 7’ § 3’ [laʔ-aʔ-aʔ][aʔ-an-du-wa-ta DINGIRMES-zi du-’uʔ]-[pa]-’ni-iʔ]-ti š[a-ḫu-i-da-an-tal-li-ia-ti]
A₁₊₂₊₃, obv. 8’ § 4’ [ú-i-t]a-’an-tal-li-ia-ti


A₂₊₃, obv. 11’ § 5’ [nu EMEḪ][i]-iš-na-a-aš [MUNUSŠU.GI 'ar-ḫa la-a-iʔ]-[zi nu te-ez-zi]
A₂₊₃, obv. 12’ [... ša-ri] Ti-wa-ta i-in-ta-ḫa 'Ti-wa-ta’ [...] A₂₊₃, obv. 13’ [...] a-al-pa-an zi-i-la la-’a-la’ ma-al-[ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ši-iš-pa EN-aš ... DUMUMES-][ti]
A₂₊₃, obv. 15’ [DINGIRMES-aš-s]a-an-za-ti wa-a[s-ša]-ra-ḫi-t[a(ŠA)-ti ḫu-i-tum-na-a-ḫi-ta-ti]

Commentary

Obv. 2–3’: The base /saŋwid-/ from which several Luwian lexemes are derived, presumably denotes some negative condition. We connect it with the Hittite stem isḥāi-/ isḥiya- ‘to bind’ and accordingly translate /saŋwid-/ as ‘binding’. Compare further the Glossenkeil word KUB 6.2 obv. 23: ša-ḫu-i-da-ra-... likely denoting an undesirable state of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM plant (CHD Š, 12b), for which one can suggest the translation ‘knotted’. The derivatives of /saŋid-/ form a regular merism with the derivatives of a different stem with negative connotations, arguably derived from the Luwian root /wid-/ ‘to strike’ and therefore translated as ‘smiting’. This merism and the related collocations comprise the subject of Melchert and Yakubovich 2022.

Obv. 5’: For the restoration, see KUB 35.43+ ii 7–8 (CTH 761.3.8).

Obv. 7–8’: Pragmatically, ‘the one for striking, the one for binding, the one for smiting’ must designate the patient’s substitute.
§ 3’
7’–8’ May the gods [take it through the one for striking, the one for binding, the one for smiting!]

§ 4’
9’ May the ritual patron [take] (back his) shape, flesh, bone(s), joint(s), speech, mobility, eyelash, [eyebrow(hair), divine path!]

§ 5’
11’ The Old Woman unties the tongues of dough [and says]:
12’ “[… Oh, Tiwad [above] and Tiwad below […],
13’ in the future, take him [back]!
13’–14’ [May] the ritual patron […] with [children, descendants, long years, future time],
15’ favor (and) [enlivenment of the deities]!”

Obv. 9’–10’: For the restoration of the clause predicate, see KUB 35.43+ iii 2’ (CTH 761.3.8). The list of nouns in this clause refers to the specific body parts and attributes of the ritual patron that are suspected of being manipulated or attacked in the course of witchcraft (see Mouton 2019a, 95). One can reconstruct the presumption that the body parts are liable to smiting, while the attributes of the ritual patron, such as mobility or “divine path”, can be bound by supernatural means.

Obv. 11’: For binding threads to the hands of the ritual patron, see KBo 29.3+ ii 31–33 (CTH 760.2). Later on the same tablet we encounter the destruction of hand and tongue made of dough/paste (KBo 29.3+ iii 8’–9”). Hence one can propose a reconstruction, according to which the hand and tongue made of dough (or paste), which symbolized bewitchment and curse, were tied to the ritual patron at some point dur-
ing the Great Ritual, then untied, and eventually destroyed. If so, the clause under discussion refers to the middle point in the proceedings.

Obv. 12: See the invocation mentioning the Sun-god Tiwad and presenting the figurines symbolizing the performers of witchcraft in KBo 29.3+ ii 18–24 (CTH 760.2). The reference to a solar deity "above" and to another(?) "below" may be compared with the reference made to the Sun-god (of heaven) as the deity responsible for the living vs. the Sun-goddess of the earth responsible for the dead in KBo 29.3+ ii 25–26. An independent instance of in-da as a Luwian epithet of Sun-deities is found in KUB 35.90 r. col. 7. The adverb i-in-ta 'below' is translated based on context, but see Luw. (i-)in-za-ga-an, the designation of a precious metal, probably 'silver', which can be etymologically analyzed as "int-tsagan(i)" "(found) under-ground" (see the com-
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| A₁ | KUB 35.24 | 398/c + 434/c |
| A₂ | + KUB 35.20 | + 232/a |
| A₃ | (+) KUB 32.12 | (+) 496/b |
| A₄ | (+) KUB 35.22 | (+) 564/c |
| A₅ | (+) KUB 35.25 | (+) 517/d |

Transmission and Research History

These are the fragments of a single-columned tablet, coming from Building A of Büyükkale, the ductus of which displays typical features of Middle Script. The fragments were written by the same scribe as the rest of the texts grouped under CTH 761.1 (see Fig. 2.17). The joined pieces were published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 83–86. An edition of the colophon can be found in Waal 2015, 521. After the collation of the original fragments, the indirect join between KUB 35.24 + KUB 35.20 and KUB 35.22 is highly plausible. The other indirect joins are also plausible although less obvious.
mentary to CTH 758.1). Whether the root under discussion can be shown to be ultimately related to Vedic adhās ‘under, below’, ādharā- ‘lower’, and Lat. inferus ‘lower’, must depend on tracing the origin of its initial vocalism.

Obv. 13: The clause [a-a]p-pa-an zi-i-la la-’a-la’ ‘in the future, take him [b]ack’ may refer to the evildoer in view of the contrast with the following clause concerning the patient.

Obv. 15: Luw. /xwidumna /xid-/ is obviously cognate with /x wid(u)wala /xid-/ ‘life’ but has a different meaning. In the available incantations it is always paired with /wassaraγid/- ‘favor’ as a gift that the gods can bestow upon humankind; hence the proposed translation ‘enlivenment’.

Contents

§ 1’ Luwian incantation for the purification of the ritual patron
§§ 2’–3’ Luwian incantation transferring the control of the miasma onto the animal (piglet?) acting as a ritual substitute
§§ 4’–5’ Luwian incantation matching the limbs of the substitute with those of the ritual patron
§§ 6’–7’ Luwian incantation mentioning the substitute’s running to the left and right of the ritual patron
§ 8” Luwian dedication of the substitute to Warlike Tarḫunt as a food offering; blessings on the ritual patron
§§ 9”–10” Pressing the taluppi-lump on the patient’s body, with its Luwian incantation
§ 11” Unclear
§ 12” Luwian incantation for the removal of the miasma
§ 13” Luwian incantation for restoring the integrity of the ritual patron
§§ 14”–15” Unclear Luwian incantation mentioning several substitutes
§ 16”” Luwian incantation describing the lack of the ritual patron’s control over impurity
§ 17”” Colophon

The tablet number in the colophon is illegible, but the similarities between the Luwian incantations in §§ 1’–8” and those accompanying the presentation of the substitute piglet in KUB 35.43+ iii (CTH 761.3.8) help to anchor this fragment within the sequence of rites reconstructed for the earliest version of the Kuwattalla tradition. See Vol. 2, Section 5.4 for more details.
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Obv. 18′

\[\text{Transliteration} \]
§ 1’

Obv.
1’ “[May the ritual patron be purified from the evil tongue],
2’ [the evil hand, from (those) of] judgment, [from (those) of] curse,
3’ [from (that) of the dead (or) living, internal (or) external],
4’ from (those) of [perjury, from the tongue of the multitude!]

§ 2’

5’ He [no] (longer) overcomes it with his head. He no (longer) [overcomes it with his alalatt-body part].
6’ He [no] (longer) overcomes it with his nose.
6’–7’ He [no] (longer) overcomes [it] with the pupils [of (his) eyes].
7’ (He no longer overcomes it) with (his) heart, liver, twelve limbs.

§ 3’

8’ This one overcomes it with its head. [This one overcomes it] with its alalatt-body part.
9’ This one overcomes it with its snout.
9’–10’ (It overcomes) [it with the pupils] of (its) eyes, with (its) heart, liver, twelve limbs.

§ 4’

11’ [The head decontaminates the head. The alalatt-body part decontaminates the alalatt-body part].
12’ [The snout decontaminates the nose].”
12’–13’ She treats all the limbs one by one.

§ 5’

14’ “Here, it decontaminates the ritual patron …],
15’ [the substitute] for (his) body (and his) head, […]
16’ walz-ed into affliction, […]

§ 6’

17’ I have made it run to his left, [so that it took his sinisterness].
18’ I have made (it) run to (his) right, [so that it took his evil terror].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>obv. 20′</td>
<td>[m]a-an-na-ku-na-a-ti d[a-a-u-wa-aš-ša-an-za-ti ti-ti-ta-a-ti UZUŠÀ-ti UZUNÍG.GIG-ti]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>obv. 21′</td>
<td>12-ta-a-ti ḫa-ap-pi-§[a-a-ti]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>obv. 23′</td>
<td>[e-e]-ḫu-wa-al-[l]-[i-ia-an pa-ri-tar-wa-al-li-ia-an ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 7 ″</td>
<td>A₃₍₊₎₄ obv. 1″</td>
<td>[m-a-n-tar wa-r]a-ʾ-paʾ-2-[l]-li-š[Tar-ḫu-un-za u-wa-i]a-an-ti ș[a-ak-nu-wa-an-ti]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₃₍₊₎₄ obv. 2″</td>
<td>ma-an-na-kū-nā-ti d[a-a-u-wa-ša-an-za wa-aš-ši-na-an-z[a a-a-an-nu-un[n[a-an-za]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₃₍₊₎₄ obv. 3″</td>
<td>ma-a-am-ma-an-š[a-ad-du ḫu-i-du-un-na-ti an-na-ru-um-ma-ḫi-ta-ti] a-ar-ra-ia-ti [MUḪà-ti]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₃₍₊₎₄ obv. 4″</td>
<td>EGIŔ-pa-ra-an-t[a-ti a-ra-a-ti DINGIRMES-aš-ša-za-ti w]a-aš-šaʾ(_TA)-ra-ḫi-ta-t[i]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₃₍₊₎₄ obv. 5″</td>
<td>ḫu-i-tum-na-[a-ḫi-ta-ti]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₃₍₊₎₄ obv. 7″</td>
<td>A-NA RA-M[A-NI-ŠU an-da ta-ma-aš-zi nu te-ez-zi]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 9″</td>
<td>A₃₍₊₎₄ obv. 8″</td>
<td>zu-ʾi-[ia-aš ú-i-ši-ta ḫa-la-a-li-iš ta-lu-up-pi-iš a-ri]-im-mi-ia-aš-ta ku-ra-a[t-ni]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₄ obv. 9″</td>
<td>kar-ša-mi-š[NAARAS]-ia-aš-ta gul-lu-uš-ta-an-ni kar-ši[ma-ma-na-ú-w[a-aš-ta]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₄ obv. 10″</td>
<td>[NAARAS]-ri i-ti na-ú-wa-aš-ta gul-lu-uš-ta-an-ni i-ti n[a-ú-wa-aš-ta an-[ta]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₄ obv. 11″</td>
<td>ku-ra-at-ni i-ti ...-an ma-a-ar-da-a-ti du-u-pi-ti n[a-a-ú-w[a ... ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev.</th>
<th>§ 11″</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₂ rev. 1′</td>
<td>x [... ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ rev. 2′</td>
<td>ma-[-... ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ rev. 3′</td>
<td>x [... ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ rev. 4′</td>
<td>du-[-... ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ rev. 5′</td>
<td>ku-x[... ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It [t]akes them (away from) him, it carri[es] (them) away [from him with (its) four legs, head, forehead],

[s]nout, [the pupils of (its)] e[yes, (its) heart, liver],
twelve limb[s].

§ 7’
It takes (away from) him jud[gment, curse, perjury, ...],
[internal (or) external, ...]."

§ 8"
"[Wa]rl[ike Tarḫunt, look at] (this) f[atty anim]al!
May the ritual patron look at [his own body (and) soul]
with life, virility], long [years],
future time, fa[vor (and) enliv[enment of the deities]"

§ 9"
The Old Womən takes the pure taluppi-lump of dough].
[She presses] it [on] the bo[dy] of the [ritual patron] and says:

§ 10"
"Here [(has) appeared the pure taluppi-lump].
[It (has been) separated] (by) cutti[ng] from the [ra]ised cut-off piece,
it (has been) sepa[rated from the millstone (and) the rolling tool].
[It will] not [go (back to) the millstone, it will not go (back) to the rolling tool],
it will [n]ot [go (back) to the cut-off piece. One strikes ... with words ... n]ot [...].

§ 11"
Rev.
[...]
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§ 12
A₂ rev. 6′ la-a-x x x [... x x^MES^ e^2^-x(-)[...

§ 13
A₂ rev. 8′ [la-a]-l[a]-ad-du-pa-aš ma-al-[ḫ]-a-aš-š[a-aš-ši-iš EN-aš da-a-ru-uš-ša mi-i-ša-an-za ḫa-a-ša-ša ḫal-ḫal-za-ni-in]
A₂ rev. 9′ [ū-wa-ra-an]-[a]-ḫi-š[a i]-ū-na-[ḫ]-i-š[a la-al-pi-in ku-wa-na-an-ni-in ma-aš-ša-na-al-li-in KASKAL-an]
A₂ rev. 10′ [ma-al-[ḫ]-a-aš-ša-ši-ilš-š-pa^7^ EN-a[š^7^ ...]

§ 14
A₂ rev. 1′ [... x [...

§ 15
A₂ rev. 2′ [... x x x x x-[o]-ni-in-zi ša-w[a^2^-...]
A₂ rev. 3′ [... $]ar^3^-li-aš-ši-in-zi tar-pa-a-aš-ša-an-z[...]
A₂ rev. 4′ ma-a-na-aš *MUNUS^7^-iš za-ū-i-ḫa-aš a-x[... za-ū-i-na-aš]
A₂ rev. 5′ ma-a-na-aš an-na-ū-li-iš ma-a-na-aš tar-pa[a[š-ša-aš ...]
A₂ rev. 6′ *SAG^7^DU ma-am-[ḫ]-u-it-ta-ri zi-ti-pa-du-[...]

§ 16
A₂ rev. 7′ [na]-a-[ū]-wa-ti-ia-[ḫ]-ḫar-[ḫ]-ma-[ḫ]-a-ti mu-u-wa-i [na-a-ū-wa-ti-ia-ti a-ala-at-ta-ti mu-u-wa-i]
A₂ rev. 8′ [na-a-ū]-wa-ti-ia-[ḫ]-da-a-ū-wa-aš-ša-an-za-t[ī ti-ti-ta-ā ti UZULSA-ti UZUNG.GIG-ti]
A₂ rev. 9′ [ḫa-ap-pi-ša]-a^-ti x^2^-in-du-pa i-pi-x[... za-an-ta du-pa-a-im-mi-in i-iš-ša-ri-in]
A₂ rev. 11′ [hi-ru-ū-un ma]-a-ia-aš-ši-in E[ME-in]

§ 17
Left edge
A₃ left edge 1 [DU]B."X.KAM ŠA Ṃ[KU-WA-TAL-LA ... Q]A-TI ma-a-an GAL-][i a-ni-u-ur an-i-a-zÎ]"

Commentary

Obv. 1′–4′: Restored based (in part) on CTH 761.1.d § 2′ and CTH 761.1.f § 9′.
Obv. 5′–23′: For parallels to this incantation found in the Tunnawiya tradition, see the discussion of Pattern 2 in Vol. 2, Section 4.2 as well as Section 1.4.
Obv. 5′–10′: It is assumed that § 2′ refers to the ritual patron while § 3′ refers to the sheep functioning as a substitute. In view of the parallel passage KUB 9.34 i 20′–24′ in...
§ 12”
6’–7’ [...] severed through the one for binding, [the blows through the one for smiting].

§ 13”
8’ May the ritual patron take (back his) [shape, flesh, bone(s), joint(s)],
9’ [speech, mobility, eyelash, eyebrow(-hair), divine path]!
10’ [The ritual] patron [...] .

§ 14”
1” [...] .

§ 15”
2”–3” [...] substitutes for the superior [...] ,
4” whether she (is) woman, (then) here she (is). Whether he (is) [...] , (then) here he (is).
5” Whether he (is) of equal rank, whether he (is) a substitute [...],
6” the head mamhui-, thus [...] him [...].

§ 16”
7” He [no (longer) overcomes it with his head. [He no (longer) overcomes it with his alalatt-body part].
8” (He) [no (longer overcomes) it] [with the pupils] of (his) eyes, [(his) heart, liver, twelve]
9” [lim]bs. May they [...] the downstriking hand],
10” [the d]ownstriking tongue, judgment, curse,
11” [perjury, the ton[gue] of the [multitudes].”

§ 17”
Left edge
1 [...] th[t]ablet of [Kuwattalla...] Finished. When [she performs] the Great Ritual.

the Tunnawiya tradition (CTH 409.II.Tf02.A; Hutter 1988, 26–27), na-(a)-ú-wa... in § 2’ must consistently be interpreted as the negation and not the stem of the otherwise unattested Luwian adjective ‘new’, pace CLL, 157.

Obv. 8’: The body part /alalatt(i)-/ appears to be in a complementary distribution with /arpuwar/ ‘forehead’. Both nouns occur in very similar lists, being flanked by
identical body parts, but belong to different formulae. The former is typical of clauses with the predicates /muwa-(i)/ 'to overcome' and /xallina-(i)/ (on which, see immediately below), while the latter occurs following the phrase 'may it take it, may it carry it away'.

Obv. 11': For the interpretation of the Luwian verb /xallina-(i)/ as 'to absorb impurity (of), decontaminate', which is also prompted by a parallel in the Tunnawiya tradition, see Vol. 2, Section 1.4. In the translation, a shorter but less precise rendering 'to decontaminate' is used to emphasize that /xallina-(i)/ is a transitive verb governing an accusative direct object (see CTH 761.3.5.b, § 7').

Obv. 15': The expression “substitute for the body (and) the head” (Luwian /wassinasis xarmayassis tarpassas/) reminds us of the following sentence included in an incantation of Maštigga’s ritual text (CTH 404.1 § 22: Mouton 2016a, 392–93): SAGI^{th} = a-*šmaš tueggaš ḫuṁandāš tarpalliš UDU GE₆ “For your heads (and) your whole persons (lit. ‘bodies’), the substitute (is) a black sheep.” See further the commentary to KUB 32.8(+) iii 3’–5’ (CTH 759.10.b). For other examples of Luwian texts showing this close association of body and head, see Hutter 2003, 261.

Obv. 16': The interpretation of this phrase follows H. Craig Melchert (pers. comm.). We assume that the stem /walts(a)-/ is cognate with Hitt. walk(iya)-, a verb of strong physical impact (HEG U–Z, 266–67).

Obv. 19': For Luw. /pabra-(i)/ 'to carry' see Melchert 2016a, 203–6.

Obv. 23': The approximate size of the gap between § 7’ and § 8″ is eight lines. This can be calculated based on the reconstruction of the colophon on the left edge and is broadly confirmed by the content of the gap, as inferred from the closely parallel version CTH 761.1.d. See Starke 1985, 85 fn. 14–5 with the misleading join sketch (Starke 1985, 84).

Obv. 1”': Literally [wa-r]a’-pa’-[a]-l-li-iš Tarḫ-ḫu-un-za] is to be understood as “Tarḫunt of the Weapon” or “Weapon-wielding Tarḫunt”. For Luw. /warp(i)-/ ‘weapon’, see Yakubovich 2019. Luw. /wajant(i)-/ ‘animal’ has been plausibly compared with /wajyiyd-/ ‘vitality’ in Rieken 2021. Luw. /saknuwant(i)-/ can be formally compared with either Hitt. šaknuwant- ‘impure’ (CHD Š, 47–48) or rather Hitt. šaknuwant- ‘fatty, oily’ (CHD Š, 48–49). The first solution is deemed more plausible in Hutter 2019a, 343 fn. 27, while the second one is preferred in this edition. We certainly agree that the substitute animal is sacrificed in a ritually impure state, but an incantation addressed to its designated divine recipient is rather more likely to extoll its positive qualities. For animal substitutes offered to deities, see in general Mouton 2014a. For an incantation in which the animal substitutes are described as fatty and appealing to the god (“very fatty with their liver (and) heart”), see for instance Ašḫella’s ritual
against an epidemic (KUB 9.31 iii 38 and duplicates; Chrzanowska 2016, § 4). In Melchert 2023, the interpretation proposed here necessitates the assumption that /saknuwant(i)-/ is a Hittite loanword in Luwian.

**Obv. 2"**: For the expression ‘body and soul’, see the commentary to CTH 761.1.d rev. 12’.

**Obv. 8"**: Starke 1985, 85 reads ku-ra-a[m-mi] instead of ku-ra-a[t-ni] (see also Starke 1990, 485). According to the traces visible on the tablet, a reading AM seems plausible, since small wedges are visible. Although the stem /kuramman-/ seems to be otherwise restricted to the Puriyanni tradition, ku-ra-a[m-mi] may here represent a secondary rhyme formation based on arimmi. For other commentary to this incantation, see CTH 761.1.d.

**Rev. 6"**: For possible connections of ma-am-hu-it-ta-ri, which do not clarify the meaning of this form, see Melchert 2023 sub mamḫ-.

**Rev. 7–8"**: For the restoration of this passage, see KBo 29.37:3–4’ (CTH 763.2.10), KUB 35.43+ ii 9–11 (CTH 761.3.8), KUB 35.73:6–8’ (CTH 763.2.9), and KUB 35.74:7–8’ (CTH 761.1.i). Despite lexical similarity to CTH 761.1.b, § 3’, this is clearly a different incantation. According to the context, ‘the one for binding’ and ‘the one for smiting’ designate a ritual substitute.

**Rev. 9–10"**: See KUB 32.81+ (CTH 761.1.b) § 4’.

**Rev. 3": If the form [š]ar?-li-aš-si-in-zi is correctly restored, it is likely to belong to the paradigm of the otherwise unattested noun /sarlija-/ ‘superior’, a derivative of the adjective /sar(a/i)-/ ‘supreme’.

**Rev. 7–9": The beginning of § 16″ is very similar to § 2’ above, but note the ungrammatical na-a-ú-wa-ti-ia-ta instead of the expected na-a-ú-wa-ti-ia-ta. The easiest explanation of this phenomenon is scribal dittography. Both in rev. 7" and rev. 8", the TI signs are written over an erased sign. The TI sign of 8” is particularly unclear, perhaps as a result of the scribe’s hesitation.

**Rev. 9–10": For the translation of /tsanta tubaimm(a/i)-/ as ‘downstriking’, see the edition of KUB 32.5 (+) KUB 32.8 (CTH 759.10.b). This is the only instance where this combination appears in CTH 761; otherwise it is attested in CTH 759, where its occurrences are rather more frequent.

**Left edge 1**: Starke 1985, 86 indicates the presence of the lower part of a vertical corresponding to numeral ‘one’; hence his transliteration [DU]B 1KAM (followed in Waal 2015, 521). Nevertheless, the trace of a single vertical is not clearly identifiable on the tablet, while the tablet’s focus on substitution rites speaks against its being the first tablet of the ritual (see Vol. 2, Section 5.3). For a different restitution of the gap, see Waal 2015, 521.
CTH 761.1.d

Table of Manuscripts

A  KUB 35.21  224/a

Transmission and Research History

This is a fragment of a single-columned tablet, the ductus of which displays typical features of Middle Script. It was written by the same scribe as the rest of the texts grouped other CTH 761.1 (see Fig. 2.17). The indirect join between KUB 32.9(+) and KUB 35.21, reported in Starke 1985, must be rejected after the collation of the original fragments. The thickness of KUB 35.21 is incompatible with that of KUB 32.9(+), and therefore the two fragments cannot belong to the same tablet. The fragment comes from Building A of Büyükkale. It was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 87–90.

Contents

§§ 1′–2′  Patient’s ritual ablution, with its Luwian incantation
§§ 3′–4′  Pouring of something into a pot with the vegetable soup, with its Luwian incantation

Transliteration

§ 1′

Obv.

A obv. 1′  [...] n ar-ḫa pe-eš-ši-ez-z[ i ...]
A obv. 2′  [...] BE-EL SISKUR QA-TI-SU a-ar-r[i nu MUNUS.GI te-ez-z]

§ 2′

A obv. 5′  [ta-pa-ru-wa-aš-sa-an-za-ti da-a-ta-rį]-ia-am-na-aš-sa-an-za-ti ḫi-ru-ta-aš-

§ 3′

A obv. 6′  [...] 'A'-NA DUG'TU'TUŠ, SAR GĒ, iš-ḫu-wa-a-an [...]
A obv. 7′  [nu MUNUS.GI] te-ez-z
§ 5′ Incantation for untying the effects of impurity; likely reference to the ingredients of the vegetable soup

§§ 6′−7′ Spitting into the vegetable soup with its Luwian incantation

§ 8′ Removal of the vegetable soup

§ 9′ Pressing the taluup-pi-lump on the patient’s body

§ 10′′ Incantation for the removal of impurity by an animal acting as ritual substitute

§ 11′′ Spitting into the animal’s mouth, with its Luwian incantation

§§ 12′′−13′′ Bread and beer sacrifice to the god over the animal’s head, with its Luwian incantation (including blessings on the ritual patron)

§§ 14′′−15′′ Pressing the taluup-pi-lump on the patient’s body, with its Luwian incantation

§ 16′ Incantation for untying the effects of impurity

§ 17′ Spitting on the taluup-pi-lump, with its Luwian incantation

§ 18′ Unclear

For the position of this piece vis-à-vis other fragments of CTH 761.1, see the hypotheses in Vol. 2, Section 5.3. Note, in particular, that much depends here on the identity of the substitute animal referred to in §§ 10′′−11′′: the parallels with spitting into the sheep’s mouth in KBo 51.220 r.col. 2′ (CTH 761.3.5.a) and KUB 35.43+ ii 27 (CTH 761.3.8) are fully compatible with the contention that it is a sheep, but the position of this rite after the one involving vegetable soup rather suggests that it is a puppy.

Translation

§ 1′

Obv.
1′ […] throw[s] away […], […]
2′ […] The ritual patron wash[e][s] his hands [and the Old Woman says]:

§ 2′

3′ “[The ritual p]atron […] (from) judgment, curse, [perjury, the tongue of the multitudes].

4′−5′ [So may he be pure] from the evil to[ngue, the evil hand, from (the tongue) of judgment, cur]se, [from] (the tongue) of perjur[y, from the tongue of the multitudes] in the presence of [the go]ds!”

§ 3′

6′ […] poured into a black pot of vegetable soup […]

7′ [and the Old Woman] says:
§ 4′
A obv. 8′ [...]-iš ti-in-ti-na-an-ti-iš ta-ru-pí-na-a[n-ti-iš ...]
A obv. 9′ [...] AM-A-ia-an ta-a-ti-ia-a[n SEŠ-an NIN-an lu-ú-la-ḫi-ia-an lu-ú[a-pí-ri-ia-
an]
A obv. 10′ [ku-wa-ar-ša-aš-ša-an tu-ú-li-ia-aš-ša-an]

§ 5′
A obv. 11′ [...] GIŠ-i na-a-ú-wa i-ti du-ú-wa-ša-pa-at-[ta ...]
A obv. 12′ [...](-d)a’-a-ma-an-pa-ti-ia-ta NUMUN-an na-a-ú-wa [a-a-ia-ri]
A obv. 14′ [i-iš-ša-ri-iš ta-pa-rwu-aš-ši-iš da-a-ta-ra]-ia-am-na-aš-ši-iš EME-iš ḫi-ru-
ú-ta-[aš-ši-iš EME-iš]
A obv. 15′ [MUKAM-šiš ad-du-wa-li-iš ITILKAM-aš ad-du-w]a-li-iš wa-aš-pa-ana-ta-aš-ši-
in-z[i e-e-ḫu-wa-an-z[i]
A obv. 16′ [ma-a-ia-aš-ši-iš EME-iš]

§ 6′
A obv. 17′ [nu MUNUSŠU.GI DUGÚTUL TU₇ SAR GE₆ A-NA BE-EL SIS]KUR pa-ra-a e-e-z[i na-an al-ll[a-pa-ah-ḫi]
A obv. 18′ [nu MUNUSŠU.GI te-e-z[i]

§ 7′
A obv. 20′ [ma-a-ia-aš-ši-in EME-in ta-ap-pa-a-at-ta]

§ 8′
A obv. 21′ [nu MUNUSŠU.GI DUGÚTUL TU₇ SAR GE₆ ar-ḫa pē-e]š-ši-e-z[i]

§ 9′
A obv. 22′ [nu MUNUSŠU.GI iš-na-a-āš pár-ku-in ta-lu-u]p-pí-in d[a-a-i na-an-ša-an A-NA
BE-EL SIS KUR]
A obv. 23′ [A-NA RA-MA-NI-ŠU an-da ta-ma-aš-z[i]

§ 10′
Rev.
A rev. 1′ [...] x [...] A rev. 2′ [i-šar-ū-i-la-ti ḫu-i-nu-wa-aḫ-ha a-du-ut-ta ad]-du-wa-[l-li-in ḫa-at-ta-aš-
tar-ri-in la-a-ta]
A rev. 3′ [...] la-a-la-i]-du-ut-ta [ta-pa-r]u da-a-ta-ra-ia-am-ma-an ḫi-ru-ú-un ma-a-ia-
aš-ši-in EME-in]
A rev. 4′ [la-a-la-i-du-ut-ta pa-ap-ra-i-du-ut-ta] ma-a-ua-wa ti [a-a-ar-ta-ta-ti ḫar-
ma-ḫa-a-ti ar-pu-wa-na-ti ma-an-Ḫu-wa-na-a-ti]
§ 4′
8′ "[...] tintinanti tarupina[nti ...]
9′ [... of the mother (or) father], of the brother (or) sister, of the mountain-dwellers (or) desert-dwellers,
10′ [of the army (or) the assembly].

§ 5′
11′ [...] does not go (back) to the tree [...]. The tuwaš-food [...].
12′ [...] does not [become] seed.
13′–16′ [May] the evil tongue, the evil hand, the tongue [of judgment, curse, [the tongue of] perjury, bad year, bad month, [the interiors] of the shrouds, [the tongue of the multitudes not bind the ritual] patron!"

§ 6′
17′ [The Old Woman] holds [the black pot of vegetable soup] toward the ritual patron. He spits (on) it
18′ [and the Old Woman says]:

§ 7′
19′ "[He spat (out) woe (and) pain],
19′–20′ he spat (out) judgment, curse, perjury, the tongue of the multitudes.”

§ 8′
21′ [The Old Woman throws away the black pot of vegetable soup].

§ 9′
22′ [The Old Woman] takes the pure talu|ppi-lump [of dough].
22′–23′ [She presses it on the body of the ritual patron].

§ 10′
Rev.
1′ "[...]
2′ [I have made (it) run to (his) right, so that it took his evil terror].
3′ [...] it takes (away from) him [judgment, curse, perjury, the tongue of the multitudes].
4′ [It takes them (away from) him (and) it carries them (away from) him] with (its) four [eggs, head, forehead, snout].
[with the pupils of (its) eyes], with (its) heart, live[r, twelve limbs].”

§ 11″
[The ritual patron] spits into [the mouth of the puppy] and [the Old Woman says]:

§ 12″
[The ritual patron] spits into [the mouth of the puppy] and [the Old Woman says]:

§ 13″

§ 14″

§ 15″

§ 16″

May the evil tongue, [the evil hand, the tongue] of judgment, curse, perjury, the tongue of the multitudes."

"He spat (out) woe (and) pain,
[he spat (out) judgment, curse, perjury, the tongue of the multitudes]."

[The ritual patron] spits into [the mouth of the puppy] and [the Old Woman says]:

Then, the Old Woman] makes a libation of [b]eer [(with) one jug].
[She holds] one sweet thick bread [over] its [head and says]:

"[Warlike Tarḫunt, I]ook at (this) fatt[yl] anima[l]!
[May the ritual patron look at] his own body (and) soul [with life],
[virility], long years, future [time, health],
[favor (and) enlivenment [of the deities]!"

[The Old Woman] takes the [pure] taluppi-lump of [dough].
[She presses it [on the body] of the [ritual patron] and the Old Woman says:

[Here (has) appeared the pu]re taluppi-lump.
[It (has been) [separated] [by] cu[tting] from the raised cut-off piece,
[it] (has been) separated [from the millstone] (and) the rolling tool.
[It will not go (back to) the millstone, it will not] go (back) to the rolling tool, it will not
[go (back) to the cut-off piece]. One strikes […] with words […] not […]

May] the evil tongue, [the evil hand, the tongue] of judgment, curs[e, the tongue of perjury], bad year, ba[d] month, [the in]terior[s [of the shrouds],
the tongue of the multitudes [not bind the ritual patron]!”
Commentary

Obv. 2': Washing one’s hands is a common gesture in Anatolian rituals. Compare, for instance, the Arzawa ritual of Aššella CTH 394 § 6 (the ritual patrons wash their hands with salted water), the Kizzuwatna ritual of Pāpanikri CTH 476 § 28 (both the ritual practitioner and the ritual patron wash their hands with an unspecified liquid), the Kizzuwatna ritual of Maštigga CTH 404.1 § 44 (the ritual patrons wash their hands, heads and eyes with water mixed with natron), and the prayer CTH 385.10 § 4 (both the goddess and the sankumē-priest wash their hands with an unspecified liquid). For the translation of these fragments, see Mouton 2016a, 182–83, 272–73, 416–17, and 540–41 respectively. What is less widespread is the association of this gesture with an incantation, as is the case here.

Obv. 4': The bipartite merism consisting of the ‘evil tongue’ and ‘evil hand’ is restored here based on KUB 32.9(+) rev. 8’ (CTH 761.1.f). This is likely more than a purely descriptive designation of witchcraft and curse; it is likely that the ‘evil hand’ and ‘evil tongue’ were physically tied to the patient earlier in the course of the ritual, see CTH 761.1.b, § 5’.

Obv. 6': The complex Sumerogram for ‘black pot of vegetable soup’ is read here for the first time; contrast Starke 1985, 88 x x SAR MI.

Obv. 8’–10': For the restoration of a chain of merisms indicating relatives and social groups as potential sources of witchcraft, see for example KBo 29.3+ ii 2–4 (CTH 760.2). For additional parallels in Hittite texts and hypotheses about the pragmatic interpretation of these and similar pairs, see Mouton and Yakubovich 2019, 224–26. It seems probable that the pair of adjectives tintinantiš tarupina [ntiš] refers to the pot of vegetable soup or its content.

Obv. 11': The form du-wa-ša is otherwise attested in KBo 29.34+ i 10’ (CTH 770) in a context suggesting that this is a type of food. For its likely etymology and possible meaning ‘harvest, fruit’, see Rieken 2007, 296.

Obv. 13’–16': The final sentence of this paragraph is the same as in KUB 32.9(+) obv. 7–10 (CTH 761.1.f), where it follows the taluppi-incantation. Consequently, one can formulate a hypothesis that the pragmatics of the incantation earlier in the paragraph is similar to that of the taluppi-incantation. A structural feature common to both in-
The ritual patron spits (on) [... talupp]-lump and [she says]:

“[... he spat (out) [ju]gment, curse, perjur[y ...].”

The ritual patron [...]

Commentary

cantations is the repeated use of negation, which is compatible with the assumption that cooking vegetable soup is conceptualized as an irreversible process, incompatible with the return of its ingredients to their original state. For a likely parallel in the Maštigga tradition, see KBo 39.8 iii 1–7 (Miller 2004, 80; see further Vol. 2, Section 4.3). Note that the seeds represent the locus of the miasma associated with the Storm-god of the Open Country in the Puriyanni tradition (CTH 758.1, § 14″).

Obv. 22″–23″: This sentence presumably introduces the taluppi-incantation, identical to the one in KUB 32.9(+) obv. 3–6 (CTH 761.1.f) and § 15″ below, which is lost in the extensive lacuna. The frequent iteration of the taluppi-incantations represents a distinctive feature of CTH 761.

Rev. 2″–3″: The demarcation of two distinct clauses here is based on the parallel passage KUB 35.24+ obv. 19″–23″ (CTH 761.1.c, §§ 6″–7″). It is clear, however, that the space here is not sufficient to restore all the forms corresponding to obv. 19″–23″ of CTH 761.1.c. Consequently, one cannot rule out that here they were collapsed into a single clause on the tablet under discussion.

Rev. 2″: Restored on the basis of the closely parallel version CTH 760.1.c § 6″.

Rev. 6″: The structure of this paragraph is restored on the basis of KUB 35.43+ ii 27 (CTH 761.3.8). Since the specific animal functioning as the ritual substitute is never explicitly mentioned in the preserved part of CTH 761.1, its identity represents an element of interpretation (see further the general discussion of the content above).

Rev. 9″: Restored on the basis of KUB 35.43+ ii 34–35 (CTH 761.3.8).

Rev. 11″–14″: For the restoration of this blessing formula, see KUB 35.43+ ii 36–40 (CTH 761.3.8).

Rev 12″: The pair wa-aš-ši-na-an-za a-a-an-nu-un-na-an-za occurs several times in CTH 761.1, but only here is it fully preserved. Both nouns must appear in dat.pl., in accordance with the argument structure of the predicate /mammanna-/. Since the patient has just one body, we must be dealing with a kind of associative plural where both elements of a merism are pluralized through their close association with one another. The natural counterpart of /wassin(a/i)-/ 'body' is 'soul'; therefore, we tentatively assume this lexical meaning for a-a-an-nu-un-na-an-za. Formally, this dat.pl. form is
likely to belong to the paradigm of the noun /annuman-/ or perhaps /annumar/n-; see instr. [ḥu-i-du]-un-i-na-a-ti (KUB 35.44:9), derived from /xwidumar/n-/ 'life'. For the irregular use of [a-pa-aš-ša-a]n-za-an-za with plural possessor, see the commentary to KUB 32.8(+) iv 13′ (CTH 759.10.b).

Rev. 15′: Note that the taluppi-object is introduced by the Hittite word šena- in the Puriyanni tradition (CTH 758.1, § 7″), whereas the Kuwattalla tradition consistently deploys Hitt. taluppi-, presumably a loanword from Luwian. The term šena- is used in the Kuwattalla tradition for various figurines but not for the taluppi-object.

Rev. 17′–18′: Note the consistent use of /karsammis/ with dependent nouns in the dative case in the Kuwattalli tradition, whereas the Middle Script tablet CTH 758.1, by
the sense in a quasi-parallel passage (KUB 35.54 ii 9′–10′). Following H. Craig belonging to the Puriyanni tradition, deploys the ablative-instrumental forms required Melchert (pers. comm.), we assume that Luw. /kars-(ti)/ ‘to separate’ governs the dative-case argument with an ablative function (source of separation), whereas the adjunct denoting the instrument of separation is always expressed by the ablative-instrumental case.

Rev. 24′: See already CLL, 146 for the equivalence of this Luwian idiom with Hitt. pangawaš lala- ‘tongue of the community’. We believe that the literal interpretation ‘tongue of the multitude(s)’ (as per Starke 1990, 506) would yield a closer parallel to the Hittite expression than Melchert’s ‘tongue of the adults’. The implied base here is the adjective /ma(ja/i/-/ ‘many’, the cognate of Hitt. mekki- ‘many’, with or without secondary substantivization.

Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Incantation for removing impurity from the ritual patron’s limbs by means of an animal acting as a substitute

The fragment is too small to be ordered vis-à-vis other fragments of the same tablet series with any degree of certainty; for a hypothesis, see Vol. 2, Section 5.3.

Translation

§ 1′ 1′ ["I have made (it) run to his right, so that it took his evil te]rror.
2′ [It takes it (away from) him, it carries it (away from) him with (its) four legs, head], forehead,
3′ [snout, with the pupils of (its) eyes, with (its) hear]t, liver,
4′ [twelve limbs]!

§ 2′ 5′–6′ [It takes (away from) him (and) carries (away from) him judgment, curse, perjury], intern[al (or) external, ...]!”
6′ [...] horn [...]
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Commentary

1': The translation of ‘evil terror’ was suggested in Laroche 1958, 102 (for a different interpretation of the same phrase, see Starke 1990, 390–93).

2': The body part /arpuwar/ always follows the head in the list of body parts typical of the formula under discussion. It is tentatively assigned the meaning ‘forehead’ because of the phrase za-ar-wa-ni-ia-ti ar-pu-wa-na-a-ti ‘with the horned arpuwar’ (vel sim) in KUB 35.43+ ii 13 (CTH 761.3.8). Note that /alalatt(i)/ of unknown meaning replaces /arpuwar/ in other formulae (see the commentary to CTH 761.1.c obv. 8').

3': The restoration da-a-u-wa-aš-ša-an-za-ti ti-i-ti-ta-a-ti (lit. ‘pupils of (its) eyes’), as opposed to da-a-u-wa-aš-ša-ti ti-i-ta-a-ti ‘eye-pupils’, is proposed for reasons of space and in conformity with the other attestations of this phrase in CTH 761.1.

CTH 761.1.f

Table of Manuscripts

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>KUB 32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>242/b + 630/b + 596/b + 694/b + 543/b +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>538/b + 292/b + 405/b + 636/b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>(+) KUB 32.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(+) 426/b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmission and Research History

These are the fragments of a single-columned tablet, the ductus of which displays typical features of Middle Script. They were written by the same scribe as the rest of the texts grouped other CTH 761.1 (see Fig. 2.17). This join was already reported in Starke 1985; the position of the indirectly joined fragments vis-à-vis each other can be established rather precisely based on context. The further indirect join between KUB 32.9(+) and KUB 35.21, reported in Starke 1985, must be rejected after the collation of the original fragments (see further under CTH 761.1.d). The tablet comes from Building A of Büyükkale. According to the colophon, this is the third tablet of the

Transliteration

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv.</td>
<td>§ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ obv. 1</td>
<td>[nu MUNUS]U.GI is-na-a’-aš pár-ku-[i]n ta-lu-up-pi-in da-a-i na-an-ša-an A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA BE-EL SISKUR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5': See a similar restoration in KUB 35.21 rev. 1′–5′ (CTH 761.1.d, § 10′′).

6': This is the unique fragmentary attestation of Luw. /sawadar-/ 'horn (for drinking)' or its derivative in the Kuwattalla tradition. One wonders, however, whether it might be referentially identical to the Sumerogram SL.GU₄ (lit. 'bull horn'), which occurs in a list of ritual implements in KUB 35.18(+) i 6′ (CTH 760.1.a) and also plays an important role in the Maštigga tradition (Miller 2004, 105–6). Unfortunately, it remains unclear how such an artifact fits into the passage under discussion.

Ritual. The joined pieces were published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 87–90. A partial edition of the text (obv. 1–16), with a philological commentary and parallels, can be found in Kammenhuber 1986, 97–101. The colophon is edited in Waal 2015, 521.

Contents

§§ 1–2 Pressing the taluppi-lump on the patient’s body, with its Luwian incantation
§ 3 Incantation for untying the effects of impurity
§ 4 Spitting on the taluppi-lump, with its Luwian incantation
§§ 5–6 Patient’s ritual ablution, with its Luwian incantation
§ 7’ Fragmentary Hittite passage, with its Luwian incantation
§§ 8′–9′ Patient’s ritual ablution, with its Luwian incantation
§ 10’ Colophon

For the difficulties of determining the position of this piece vis-à-vis other fragments of CTH 761.1, see Vol. 2, Section 5.3.

Translation

§ 1

Obv.
1–2 [She] pres[ses it on the b]ody [of the ritual patron and says]:
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§ 2
A₁₋₂ obv. 3 z[a-ú-i-n]a-aš ú-i-ši-ta ḫa-la-a-[li-iš] ‘ta’-lu-up-pí-i[š a-ri-im-mi-ia-aš-ta ku-ra-at-ni]
A₁₋₂ obv. 4 ka[r-ša]-am-mi-iš §[nu]RA₄ ia-aš-ta gu][lu-uš-ta-a[n-ni kar-ša-am-mi-iš na-ú-wa-aš-ta]
A₁₋₂ obv. 5 N[AR₄ i-ti n[a-ú-wa-aš-ta gu][lu-uš-ta-a[n-ni i-ti na-ú-wa-aš-ta an-ta]
A₁₋₂ obv. 6 ku-ra-[a]t-ni i-ti i[t²-...-a]n ma-a-ar-[da-ati du-u-pí-ti na-ú-wa ...

§ 3
A₁ obv. 9 ḫi-ru-ta-aš-š[i]-iš EME-iš§ MUKAM-iš ad-du-wa-li-iš ITLKAM-aš ad-du-wa-li-iš
A₁ obv. 10 wa-aš-pa-an-ta-aš-[ši-in-zí e-]r[e-ḫu-wa-an-zí ma ia-aš-ši-iš EME-iš]

§ 4
A₁ obv. 11 nu MUNUSŠU.GI pár-k[u-in ta-lu-up-pí-in A-NA BE-EL SÍSKUR pa-ra-a e-ep-zí]
A₁ obv. 12 na-an al-[pa-ah-hi] nu MUNUSŠU.GI ki-iš-ša-an te-ez-zí a-ah-ra-an wa-ah-ra-an ta-ap-pa-a-at-ta]
A₁ obv. 14 t[a-ap-pa-a-at-ta]

§ 5
A₁ obv. 15 A-NA BE-EL SÍSKUR pa-ra-a e-[ep-zí ...

§ 6
A₁ obv. 16 [i-li-i]-l[h(a)-i-t[i] 'ma-al-ḫa’-aš-[a-aš-ši-iš ...

§ 7’
Rev.
A₁ rev. 1’ nu [...]
A₁ rev. 2’ a-a[li-rah-an wa-ah-ra-an ...]
A₁ rev. 3’ ma-a-[ia-aš-ši-in EME-in ...]

§ 8’
A₁ rev. 4’ nu MUNUSŠU.GI [...]
A₁ rev. 5’ a-ar-ri’ n[u] MUNUSŠU.GI k[i]-iš-ša-a[n te-ez-zí]

§ 9’
A₁ rev. 6’ li-li-il-ḫa-a-i-ši m[a-al]-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ši-iš [EN-aš t]a-pa-ru da-a-’t[a’-[ri-ia-am-ma-an]
§ 2

3 “H[ere] (has) appeared the pur[e] *taluppi*-lump.
3–4 [It] (has been) se[parated] [(by) cutting from the raised cut-off piece],
4 [it has been] separated from the mi[lstone] (and) the [roll]ing tool,
4–5 [It] will [not] go (back to) the [millstone], [it will] n[ot go (back) to the]
5–6 [it will] [not] go (back) to the cut-off piece. [One strikes ... with] word[s ... not ...].

§ 3

7–10 May the e[vil tongue], ... the tongue of the multitudes] not bind the ri[tual] patron!”

§ 4

11 The Old Woman [holds] the pur[e] *taluppi*-lump toward the ritual patron.
12 [He] spi[ts] (on) it [and the Old Woman says thus: “He spat (out) woe (and) pain],
13 [he] [s]pats (out)] judgment, curs[e, perjury, the tongue of the multitudes].”

§ 5

14–15 [She] ho[lds ...] toward the ritual patron. [...]

§ 6

16 “The ritu[al ...] is [w]ashing him[self ...]”

§ 7′

Rev.
1′ [...] woe (and) pain ...,
2′–3′ [...] the tongue of the] multi[tudes].”

§ 8′

4′–5′ The Old Woma[n ...]
4′–5′ [...] washes [...] an[d the] O[ld Woman says t]hu[s]:

§ 9′

6′ “The ri[tual] [patron] is washing himself (from) judgment, cur[se],
7′ perjury, the tongue of the multi[tu]des. So may the ri[tual patron] be [pu]re
Commentary

Obv. 1–2: Restored after KUB 35.21 rev. 15′–16′ (CTH 761.1.d); see also KUB 35.71+ ii 12–14 (CTH 759.12). For a slightly different restitution, see Starke 1985, 87 and Kammenhuber 1986, 98. The gesture of pressing a purificatory/healing substance on the patient’s body is also attested in Arzawa rituals, such as that of Huwarlu (CTH 398 § 8; Bawanypeck 2016: a lump made of vegetal ash) and that addressed to the tutelary deity of the kurša-bag (CTH 433.1 § 2; Bawanypeck 2005, 73: a taluppi-lump of clay). Another attestation of the same gesture comes from the text of the ritual of Hebattarakki, likely a practitioner from Mukiš (for an edition of the text, see Melzer and Görke 2016). An analysis of this gesture can be found in Strauß 2006, 60–61.

Obv. 3–6: For the restoration of this paragraph, see KUB 35.21 rev. 17′–20′ (CTH 761.1.d) as well as CTH 761.1.c, § 10′. While certain lacunae cannot at present be filled, the general sense of the incantation appears to be clear: it underscores the irreversible character of separating the taluppi-object from the tools of its production, which metaphorically stands for the irreversible character of removing the miasma from the ritual patron. Thus, the emphasis of the taluppi-incantation in CTH 761 is different from CTH 758; pragmatically, it resembles more closely the incantation involving water and salt in the Puriyanni ritual (see e.g. CTH 758.1, § 23′). Note also the consistent use of /kurattar-/ ‘cutting’ in CTH 761 vs. /kuramman-/ ‘cutting’ in CTH 758.

Obv. 3: Kammenhuber (1986, 98) reads [za-a-ú-i-n]a-aš at the beginning of the line, contra Starke (1985, 87), who prefers [za-ú-i-i]a-aš. Based on the collation of the original tablet, the height of the vertical is more compatible with a NA sign (see the other signs NA and IA from the same tablet).

Obv. 4: Starke (1985, 87) and Kammenhuber (1986, 98) read n[a-ú]-w[a-aš-ta] instead of n[a-aš-ta], which is, however, not supported by the traces visible on the tablet. The NA sign is written over an erasure.

Obv. 6: Starke (1985, 87) reads ku-ra-[a]n-ni at the beginning of the line. However, after collation of the original tablet, the traces seem to match better with a reading AT (trace of a low horizontal), while the form /kuranni/ would be unparalleled in our corpus.
from the [e]vil tong[ue, the e]vil han[d, from (the tongue) of judgment, cur[s]e, from (the tongue) of perjur[y], from the tongue of the multitudes in the presenc[e] of the deities!"

§ 10

11′ Third tablet of Kuwatalla, the female attendant. Not finished.
12′ [W]hen I perform the Great Ritual for a person.

**Obv. 7–10**: For the restoration of this paragraph, see KUB 35.21 obv. 11′–16′ and rev. 21′–24′ (CTH 761.1.d). For the metaphor of evil as a bond that restrains the patient, see Marcuson 2016, 359–63 and Puértolas Rubio 2020, 140–44.

**Obv. 8–9**: For the triad of ‘judgment’, ‘curse’, and ‘perjury’, which is peculiar to the corpus of the Kuwattalla tradition, see Mouton and Yakubovich 2019, 212–13 fn. 6. Although the term /tabaru/- derived from the Luwian verbal stem /tabar-/ ‘to rule’ is the simplest formal solution available, it is not necessarily conducive to assigning a specific meaning to this noun. In Mouton and Yakubovich 2019, we preferred the translation ‘manipulation’, while here we rather opt for ‘judgment’ (lit. ‘ruling’), which seems to agree better with the concept of a curse as a punishment for perjury and thus represents a better match to the other two members of the same triad. Certainty, however, can be reached only by identifying a parallel formula in a related Near Eastern tradition. See the agnostic stance of Melchert 2023 regarding the meaning of this noun ‘(something evil)’.

**Obv. 10**: For an analysis of /waspaantassintsi irxwantsi/, see Mouton and Yakubovich 2019, 216–17. The Luwian stem /waspa-/ may mean either ‘clothes’ or ‘shroud’, just as its Hittite cognate wašpa- does (see Yakubovich 2016b, 470 fn. 22). In this context, however, the second meaning appears to yield a more satisfactory sense, because ‘the interiors of the shrouds’ likely represent a euphemistic or taboo designation of the nak-kiu-spirits, whose connection with death is addressed in Mouton 2020b. These spirits are directly mentioned in a number of rituals belonging to the Kuwattalla tradition, but not in CTH 761.

**Obv. 11**: Restored after KUB 35.21 obv. 17′–18′ (CTH 761.1.d).

**Obv. 12–13**: The incantation accompanying spitting out the miasma is restored after KUB 35.43+ ii 29–30 (CTH 761.3.8) and KBo 29.3+ iii 24′–25′ (CTH 760.2). Note, however, that in CTH 761.1 it always consists of two clauses, whereas other rituals of the Kuwattalla tradition suppress the second predicate /tappatta/, which must be regarded as their common innovation. The restoration of /[a-ap-pa-a-at-ta] is based on the inspection of a photograph of the tablet.
All three fragments of this Middle Script tablet were found in Büyükkale (Buildings A and H). Their indirect join was proposed by Alice Mouton and Ilya Yakubovich within the framework of the Luwili Project, based on the distinct similarity of their ductus (see Fig. 2.18) and the possibility to align all of them with the parallel version KBo 29.3+ (see the commentary). After the collation of the original fragments, all the indirect joins seem plausible. Fragment \( A_1 \) corresponds to the preserved parts of columns one and four, fragment \( A_2 \) corresponds to the preserved part at the beginning of column two, and fragment \( A_3 \) corresponds to the preserved part of column three. All three fragments were published in transliteration in Starke 1985 as belonging to the “third ritual”; see Starke 1985, 150–51 \((A_1)\), 158 \((A_2)\), and 159 \((A_3)\).

Transliteration

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Obv. i} & \quad \text{§ 1'} \\
A_1 \text{ i 1'} & \quad \ldots-a[\ldots] n^{7'}-\text{na' x[\ldots]} \\
A_1 \text{ i 2'} & \quad \ldots \text{pár-ra-i-ia'-a'}-[\text{ti } \text{ HURLSAG}^{MES}-\text{ti } \ldots] \\
A_1 \text{ i 3'} & \quad \ldots \text{za'}-[\text{re-e-ia-ti x[\ldots]} \\
A_1 \text{ i 4'} & \quad \ldots \text{šar-ra ḫa-at-t[a-\ldots]} \\
A_1 \text{ i 5'} & \quad \text{[ta-pa-ru ta-ta-ar]-ri-ia-a-am-ma-an [ḫi-i-ru-ū-un]} \\
A_1 \text{ i 6'} & \quad \text{[pu-ū-wa-(ti)-il pa-ri-i]a-na-al-la-an ĀMA-[ia-an ta-a-ti-ia-an]} \\
A_1 \text{ i 7'} & \quad \text{[na-a-ni-ia-an NIN-ija-an ḫu-tar-li-i-ia-[an GĒME-ia-an]} \\
A_1 \text{ i 8'} & \quad \text{[tū-u-la-ḫi-ia-an] ḫa-a-pi-i-ri-ia-an k[u-\text{wa-ar-ša-aš-ša-an]} \\
A_1 \text{ i 9'} & \quad \ldots \text{tu-ū-[i-i-ia-aš-ša-an [\ldots]}
\end{align*}
\]
Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Incantation for relocating impurity to remote locations
§ 3′ Conjuration addressed to the Sun-goddess of the earth
§§ 4′–5′ Manipulations with two dough figurines and colored wool strips
§§ 6′–7′ Ritual patron’s spitting, with its Luwian incantation
§ 8′ Unclear
§ 9′′ Unclear incantation
§§ 10′′–12′′ Incantation for the destruction of impurity in manifold ways
§ 13′′ Ritual patron’s spitting

This is the first tablet of an archaic version of the Great Ritual, while several more fragments written in the same ductus are likely to reflect additional tablets belonging to the same tablet series. Although the parallels between the preserved parts of the present tablet and those of KBo 29.3+ (CTH 760.2) are reasonably close, there is no doubt that the text under discussion reflects an older layer of the Kuwattalla tradition.

Translation

§ 1′

Obv. i

1′ “[…]”
2′ […] from the high [mountains, …]
3′ […] from [the deep va]lleys, […]
4′ […]
5′ [judgment, cu]urse, [perjury],
6′–9′ [past (or) fut]ure, (the tongue) of the mothe[r (or) the father, of the brother (or) the sist]er, of a male (or) [female servant, of mountain-dwellers] (or) de-
sert-dwellers, of an a[rmy (or) assem]bly […].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10’</td>
<td>[a-ta-at-ta a]-a[r]-la-nu-wa-at-ta pár-r[a-ia-an-za ḪUR.SAG₃₅₁-za]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11’</td>
<td>[e-o-₁₄₁₅-pa-ia-a]-n-za za-re-e-ia-an-za ₁/₃₅₁-₃₅₁-an-za</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12’</td>
<td>[u-₁₄₁₅-da-an-za]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>End of col. i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>1’</td>
<td>[a-an ti-ia-am-ma]- […] [aš-ši]-[iš DUTU-za da-ra-u-id-du]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>2’</td>
<td>[u-u]-[n-na-aš-ši]-in Ḫ₁₄₁₃-[s-hi-ša-aš-ši-in ta-pa-ru-wa-aš-ši-in]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3’</td>
<td>[a-ta-ar-ri-ia-a]-[am-na-aš-ši-in Ḫ₁₄₁₃-i-ru-ta-aš-ši-in EN-an]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 4’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[nu]-MUNUSŠU.GI ₂ [š-e-e-nu-uš iš-na-aš A-NA BE-EL SÍSKUR]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ŠA-PAL GIB₃₅₁₅-S[U da-a-i]-DRU-KU-UB KAŠ₃₅₁₅-ma A-NA GIB-BANŠUR AD.KID]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[nu]-SIG SA₅ [SIG ZA.GIN SIG SIG SIG SIG SIG SIG]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[a-a-ḫ]-ra-an wa-a-ḫ]-ra-an] tap-pa-a-at-ta [ta-a-pa-ru]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[nu]-MUNUSŠU.GI-ma kiš-an Ḫ₁₄₁₃-u-uk-z₃₅₁₅]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 7’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[a-a-ḫ]-ra-an wa-a-ḥ]-ra-an] tap-pa-a-at-ta [ta-a-pa-ru]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 8’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[nu]-MUNUSŠU.GI-ma kiš-an Ḫ₁₄₁₃-u-uk-z₃₅₁₅]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 9’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[a-a-ḫ]-ra-an wa-a-ḥ]-ra-an] tap-pa-a-at-ta [ta-a-pa-ru]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rev. iii**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5’</td>
<td>[na-aš-ši-kán MUNUSŠU.GI še-er a]-r-[a wa-aḥ-nu-uz-zí]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6’</td>
<td>[na-at MUNUSŠU.GI I […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7’</td>
<td>[nu]-QA-ṬESP₃₅₁₅-STU […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8’</td>
<td>[ha-ma-a]-n-ki š[a”…]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>[nu]-SA₅ [SIG ZA.GIN SIG SIG SIG SIG SIG SIG]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>[a-a-ḫ]-ra-an wa-a-ḥ]-ra-an] tap-pa-a-at-ta [ta-a-pa-ru]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>§ 7’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>[nu]-MUNUSŠU.GI-ma kiš-an Ḫ₁₄₁₃-u-uk-z₃₅₁₅]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rev. iv**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1’</td>
<td>[...] EMEMEŠ-in-zi […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2’</td>
<td>[...] EMEMEŠ-in-zi tar-pa²-tar²-pi-x […]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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§ 2′

10′ He has re[located them] to the high[er mountains],
11′ deep valleys, watercourses, meadows,
12′ lakes.”

End of col. i

§ 3″

Obv. ii
1′ “[May the Sun-goddess of the ea]rt[h deliver him],
2′–3′ [(namely) the lord of (evil) words, trap(s), judgment, curse (or) perjury]!”

§ 4″

4′–5′ The Old Woman [places] the two fi[gurines of dough] at the feet [of the ritual
patron],
5′–6′ but [she places the jug of beer] in front of [the wickerwork table].

§ 5″

7′ Red wool, [blue] wo[ol, and yellow/green wool (are) intertwined].
8′ The Old Woman […] it.
9′ […] his hands […].
10′ She […] it.

§ 6″

Rev. iii
1′ [The Old Woman waves them over him].
2′ [Then she holds them] toward [the ritual [patron],
3′ [so that the ritual patron s]pit[s on (them)].
4′ [The Old Woman conjure]s [thus]:

§ 7″

5′ “He spat (out) [woe (and) pain, judgment],
6′ [curse], perjur[y, the tongue of the multitudes].”

§ 8″

7′ […] carries [ou]t […].
8′ […] those too […].

§ 9″

Rev. iv
1 “[…] the tongues, […]
2 […] the tongues tarpatarpi– […]

© by authors
§ 10
A₁ iv 3 [...] -i`-ta-a-at-ta-aš pa-ah-ḫi-it-ta-ru [...]  
A₁ iv 4 [...] -a`-ad-du-wa-a-li-iš i-iš-ša-ri-iš x[...]
A₁ iv 5 [...] -ru-u-i-it-ta-ru pa-du-ú-ki-la-a-at-ta-[aš ...]
A₁ iv 6 [...] -a`³-at-ta-aš ša-aš-la-at-ta-ru ḫal-la-t[a-...]
A₁ iv 7 [...] -ta`-ru tar-pa-tar-pa-at-ta-pa-aš ḫa-la-`la`-[...]

§ 11
A₁ iv 8 [a-ad-du-wa-a]-li-iš EME-iš a-ad-du-`wa-a`-li-[iš i-iš-ša-ri-iš]  
A₁ iv 9 [a-ad-du-wa]-`a`-li-iš da-a-u-i-iš a-ad-du-wa-a-[i-iš o-ar-ḫa-iš]  
A₁ iv 10 [ḫa`-a`-ni³-i]a-a-ti-iš MU.KAM-iš

§ 12
A₁ iv 12 [hi-i-ru-ta-aš-ši-iš] a-ša-šu-wa-ann-at-t[a-na-aš-ši-iš EME-iš]  
A₁ iv 13 [u-la-an-ta-al-li-iš ḫu]-i-it-wa-a-li-i-iš pu-[u-wa-ti-li-iš]
A₁ iv 15 [Īr-i-ī GEME-i-iš i-iš u-u-lā-hi]-i-iš u-a-p[ī-i-ri-i-iš]
A₁ iv 16 [ku-wa-ar-aš-aš-ši-iš tu-ú-l]-i-aš-ši-iš m[a-a-ia-aš-ši-iš EME-iš]

§ 13
A₁ iv 17 [nu-uš-ša-an BE-EL SISKUR kat-ta al-]a-pa-ah-ḫi
A₁ iv 18 [MUNUSŠU.GI-ma ki-iš-ša-an ḫu-ú-u]k-zi

Commentary

i 1′–12′: These lines are restored after KUB 35.45+ ii 1–10 (CTH 760.2).

ii 1′–6′: These lines are restored after KUB 35.45+ ii 25–30 (CTH 760.2).

ii 7′–10′: The content of this paragraph partially overlaps with the equally badly preserved passage KUB 35.45+ ii 31–34 (CTH 760.2). For the tentative interpretation of the ritual act, see the commentary there.

ii 10′: Starke 1985, 158 reads kat-[...] at the end of the line. This reading matches well with the sign drawn on the copy of the tablet. Nevertheless, the traces visible on the tablet are different from the GAD sign in ii 6′, showing a structure closer to a ŠA sign.

iii 1′–6′: These lines are restored after KUB 35.45+ iii 20′–25′ (CTH 760.2).

iv 3–7: This paragraph contains various negative wishes concerning the evil hand, and possibly some additional miasma. The mentioned entity is repeatedly expressed by the clitic pronoun /=as/, which is added to dative-case nouns denoting various calamities it is expected to undergo. Reichardt (1998, 142) correctly doubts whether this formula can be considered a genuine curse, given that it is directed against impurity.
§ 10
3–4 May the evil hand burn in [...]!
4–5 May [it ...] be [tu]rned to wood!
5 [May it ...] in padugilatta-!
6 May [it ...] be šašla-!”
6–7 May [it ...]!
7 [May it ...] in tarpatarpa-!

§ 11
8 [The evil] tongue, the evil [hand],
9 [the evil eye], the evil[...],
10 the [bad] year.

§ 12
11–12 [The tongue] of [judgment, curs[...], perjury, miser[y],
13 [of the dead (or) the li[ving, pa[st (or)]
14 [future, of the m]other (or) the fathe[r, of the brother (or) the sister],
15 [of a male (or) female servant, of mountain-dwel]lers (or) the desert-
d[wellers],
16 of [an army (or) assem]bly, [the tongue of the] mu[llitudes].”

§ 13
17 [The ritual patron s]pits [on (it)],
18 [The Old Woman conjur]es [thus].

instead of a person. This passage should rather be understood as a wish for the neu-
tralization of impurity, addressed to the gods.

iv 2: /tarpatarp/i-/ is probably a verbal form cognate with /tarpatarpatt(a)-/ in iv 6–7. This reduplicated formation arguably represents a derivative of /tarp(a)i-(d)i/ ‘to at-
tack’ and therefore probably has a negative meaning.

iv 3: The meaning of the verb /paxxi-/ ‘burn’ is proposed based on another occur-
rence of the same verbal root in KBo 47.136:10’ (CTH 763.2.13; see the commentary
ad locum).

iv 6–7: As per the discussion above, the noun /tarpatarpatt(a)-/ probably denotes
some sort of calamity. It may be derived from the reduplicated form of the verb
/tarpa-/ ‘to tread, trample’, or possibly /tarp(a)i-(d)i/ ‘to attack’. It is remarkable, how-
ever, that the associated verb ū ha-la-”la”-[... ] is probably related to /xalal(i)-/ ‘pure’.
H. Craig Melchert (pers. comm.) suggests that the likely subject of this clause is ū ha-
la-”[a(-)... ] and that this noun is related to /xallis-/ ‘defilement’. If so, one can envis-
age a wish that an impure substance may undergo purification by violent means.
Table of Manuscripts

A  DBH 46/2.33  Bo 4700

Transmission and Research History

The ductus of this Middle Script fragment, identified as part of the Kuwattalla tradition in Sasseville 2020a, 53, shows non-trivial resemblance to that of other fragments classified under CTH 761.2.1, as noted by Alice Mouton (see Fig. 2.18). The fragment was first published in transliteration in Akdoğan 2016, 19–20. The exact find spot of the fragment remains unknown, but based on its attribution one can conjecture that it was Büyükkale.

Transliteration

§ 1
A:1' [...] ku [...]  
A:2' [...] UZ wa-al-[a-...]
A:3' [...] EGI[r7]-an-ta x-x[...]

§ 2'
A:4' [...] 1 NINDA.SIG ŠAL-MU da-a-i [...] 
A:5' [...] š-e-[...] da-a-i š-e-er-ma-aš-ša-an GEŠTI[N ...]
A:6' [...] nam-ma-[a2 MUNUS]ŠU.GI EGIR-an-da
A:7' [GR]š-a-ah-[ḫur]-nu-uz-zî te-pu da-a-i an-da-ša-[a-an’] 
A:8' [SIG ...]G SA₅ iš-[ḫi-ia-a-an-[te-eš]

§ 3'
A:9' [...] A-NA B]E-EL-TI SISKUR pa-ra-a e-ep-[zi]  
A:10' [še-er-ma-aš-ša-an BE-E]L-TI SISKUR QA-TAMP pa-ra-a [da-a-i]  
A:11' [MUNUSŠU.GI ma lu-ú-i-li a]n-da ki-iš-ša-an me-e-ma-[i]

§ 4'
A:13' [a-an-zi ... EN-i]a-aš-ša-ra-a ku-w[a-...]
A:14' [...] ’a-aš ’iš-x-x[...]
A:15' [...] ’i’[...]
Contents

§ 1’ Unclear Hittite passage; a shank is mentioned
§ 2’ Food offering and mention of leafy branches with attached threads
§§ 3’–4’ The ritual patroness lays hands on a food offering, with its Luwian incantation

The place of this fragment within the structure of the ritual cannot be precisely determined, but the topos of attached threads is rather compatible with being its initial part (see the attached colored wool strips in CTH 761.2.1.a, § 5’).

Translation

§ 1’
1’ [...]  
2’ [...] shank [...]  
3’ [...] after ward [...].

§ 2’
4’ [...] takes one whole flat bread  
4’–5’ [and] she places [it on to]p of [...].  
5’–6’ On top, [she pours] win[e [...]. Then, afterward, the Old Woman  
7’ takes a small amount of [leafy bra]nches.  
7’–8’ Furthermore, [... wool] (and) red [wo]ol (are) boun[d] (to them) o[n top].

§ 3’
9’ [She] hold[s [... toward the ritual [p]atroness  
10’ [and] the ritual [p]atroness [places] (her) hand [on] (it).  
11’ [A]t the same time, [the Old Woman] speak[s] thus [in Luwian]:

§ 4’
12’–13’ ”[Whoever has made] ev[il (things) against the rit]ual pat[ron],
13’ [...] to the [lady ...]  
14’ [...]  
15’ [...]”
Commentary

9': This is the sole fragment within the Kuwattalla tradition that explicitly refers to the ritual patroness (BÉLTI SÍSKUR). Yet, the mention of multiple ritual patrons occurring in several other fragments (see for example CTH 759.1, CTH 759.3) is compatible with the assumption that these texts were likewise adapted to the needs of married couples or even extended families.

CTH 761.2.1.c

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.34 Bo 6582

Transmission and Research History

The exact find spot of this Middle Script fragment is unknown, although it might be Büyükkale. The fragment partially preserves a right column of a double-columned tablet. Its ductus displays non-trivial similarities to that of other fragments classified under CTH 761.2.1 (see Fig. 2.18), which suggests that they reflect one and the same tablet series. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 173–74 as belonging to an unspecified “Old Woman” ritual.

Transliteration

§ 1'
Right column
A r.col. 1’ [...] x [...] x [...] 
A r.col. 2’ [MUNUS]ŠU.GI-ma ki-iš-ša-an’ [me-ma-i]

§ 2’
A r.col. 3’ ša-ap-pa-ta-am-mi-im-ma-t[i [...] 
A r.col. 4’ tu-u-um-ma-a-ta-i-im-mi-iš ku-x[...] 
A r.col. 5’ nam-ma šAḪ.TUR-ia ESAGḪ-aš še-er x[...] 
A r.col. 6’ na-an a-pí-ia ūr-kān-zi

§ 3’
A r.col. 7’ [MUNUS]ŠU.GI-ma-az EGIR-an-da nam-ma pár-ku-[i]n ta-lu-up-pí-in 
A r.col. 8’ [d]a-a-i na-an-ša-an A-NA BE-EL SÍSKUR ’A-NA’ [RA-MA-NŠ-U] 
A r.col. 9’ [a-n-d]a QA-TAM-MA-pát ap-pi-iš-ke-ez-zi me-mi-iš-[ke-et-ma] 
A r.col. 10’ [ha-a]n-te-ez-zi pal-ši ma-ah-ḫa-an ki-nu-na QA-TAM-[MA-pát me-ma-i]
13′: The restoration [EN-]a-aš-ša-ra-a ‘to the lady’ is tentative but derives support from the mention of the ritual patroness in the immediately preceding context. From the morphological viewpoint, the dative form [EN-]a-aš-ša-ra-a represents a derivative of EN-la- ‘lord’ endowed with the feminine suffix /-sara-/.

Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Rite involving a piglet, with its Luwian incantation
§ 3′ Pressing the taluppi-lump on the patient’s body. Pouring oil.
§ 4′ Repeated ablution of the ritual patron
§ 5′ Unclear

The use of the heterogram BE-EL SÍSKUR as the designation of the male patient must be compared with BE-EL-TI SÍSKUR used for the female patient in CTH 761.2.1.b. Apparently, the tablet series under discussion features a version of the Great Ritual meant for a married couple. The reference to a rite involving a piglet is consistent with the fragment belonging to the central part of the ritual.

Translation

§ 1′
Right column
1′ [...] 
2′ and the [O]ld Woman [speaks] thus:

§ 2′
3′ “By sevenfold [...] 
4′ glorified [...].”
5′ Then, [...] the piglet over the pits
6′ and they keep it there.

§ 3′
7′-8′ Then, the Old Woman [t]akes back the pur[e taluppi-lump]
8′-9′ and she presses it on the [body] of the ritual patron in the same way.
9′-10′ The way she spo[ke] the [f]irst time, now, [she speaks exactly] in the same wa[y].
Great Ritual, 2nd group (CTH 761)

A r.col. 11’ [nam-m]a-an-ša-an A-NA [DILIM.GAL kat-ta d[a-a-i]]

§ 4’
A r.col. 12’ [EGIR-an]-da-ma-az ú-i-te-na-aš [DILIM.GAL, a-a-i]
A r.col. 13’ [nam-m]a-an A-NA BE-EL SÍSKUR [pa-ra-a QA-TAM-MA-pát e-ep-zi]
A r.col. 14’ [nu-za] BE-EL SÍSKUR [QA-TI-SU a-ar-riMUNUSU.GI-ma QA-TAM-MA-pát]
A r.col. 15’ [me-ma-i] ḫa-an-’te-ez’-z [i pa-lši ma-ah-ḥa-an me-mi-š-ke-et]

§ 5’
A r.col. 16’ [... x x x [...]

Commentary

r.col. 3’–4’: The fragmentary Luwian incantation is unclear. A very tentative translation of individual forms is based on etymological considerations and mostly follows CLL. It is tentatively assumed that tu-u-um-ma-a-ta-i-im-iš is a participle from /tummant(a)i-(di)/ ‘to make known, glorify’.

r.col. 5’–6’: Pig sacrifice in ritual pits is a known feature of Kizzuwatna rituals (see Haas 2003, 415–25, Collins 2006, 174–75, and Mouton 2019b). However, the last clause of § 2’ is also consistent with the hypothesis that the piglet is alive at this point.

r.col. 7’–10’: For the presentation of the taluppi-lump and the accompanying incantation, see KUB 35.21 rev. 15’–27’ (CTH 761.1.d, §§ 14’–17’). The use of the verb ap-

[A]fterwa[rd, [she takes the ceramic] cu[p] of water

[and th]en [she holds] it [toward] the ritual patron [exactly in the same way].

The ritual patron [washes his hands].

[The Old Woman speaks exactly in the same way],

[as she spoke] the first time.

pi-iš-ke-ez-zi for pressing an object to the patient’s body finds a parallel in KBo 47.290 (CTH 761.2.2.b), while CTH 761.1 uses ta-ma-aš-zi in the same function.

r.col. 11: See the explicit reference to pouring olive oil and honey in KUB 32.8(+ iii 20’–21’. In contrast, the Sumerogram I in its use with reference to animal fat seems always to be accompanied by the determinative UZU in the Kuwattalla tradition.

r.col. 12’–15’: For the ritual ablution with water and the accompanying incantation, see KUB 32.9(+ rev. 4’–10’ (CTH 761.1.f, §§ 8’–9’).
Great Ritual, 2nd group (CTH 761) 244

Transliteration

§ 1
A:1’ [...] x-mi²-x x [...]  
A:2’ [...] x a-an-t[a ...]  
A:3’ [...] -ru

§ 2
A:4’ [nu DINGIRMES] hu-u-ma-ăn-du-uš i[r-ḥa-iz-zi]  
A:5’ [nam-ma-kān G]IR-ăn-da kī-iš-šā-an me-m[a-i]

§ 3
A:7’ [o-o-i]a-an ma-an-na-u-wa-al-la-a-i-[m-mi-in-zi a-ša-an-du]  
A:8’ [ma-al-ḥa-a][š-ša-aš-šī-iš-pa EN-aš ta-‘a’-[i-na-ti ma-al-li-ta-ti]  
A:9’ [ma-an-na-u-wa-a]l-la-a-i-im-mi-iš a-aš-[du]  
A:10’ [...] x a-an-ta l-i LĀL-‘i’ [...]  

§ 4
A:11’ [...] x x t-a-u-e-[ia-an ...]  
A:12’ [...] m²-mi-iš ‘a’-[aš-du ...]

Commentary

4’: The clearest parallel for the incantation mentioning the gods of the ritual patron within the Kuwattalla tradition is KUB 9.6+ ii 5–16 (CTH 759.1), which also involves their treatment with oil and honey.

7’: The participle /mannawallimm(a/i)-/ is attested thus far only in the fragment under discussion. The above-mentioned parallel with KUB 9.6+ (CTH 759.1) suggests that it refers to a desirable outcome of a purification rite, yet /mannawallimm(a/i)-/ is distinct from the lexemes referring to purification in other Luwian contexts. For its compelling etymological connections, see Rieken forthcoming, where the meaning ‘endowed with potency, (male) reproductive power’ is inferred on the basis of its cognates. While such a meaning is suitable for the ritual patron, it is contextually less
§ 1’
1’–3’ “May […] in […]!”

§ 2’
4’ [She] t[reats] all the [deities one by one].
5’ [Then af]terward she speak[s] thus:

§ 3’
6’–8’ “[May a]ll the [deities of] the ritua[l patron be] stren[thened …] .
8’–9’ [May] the [ri]tual patron be [strengthe]ned [with] oi[l (and) honey]!
9’–10’ […] oil (and) honey in […].

§ 4’
11’–12’ [May] he b[e …] towar[d …]!”

appropriate for his patron deities. Therefore, preference is given here to a more neutral translation ‘strengthened’.

10: The status of this clause is problematic: is it Luwian or Hittite? It is easier to explain a-an-ta as a Luwian form, but the remaining contexts mentioning oil and honey within the Kuwattalla tradition display the distribution between the phonetic spelling of these lexemes in the Luwian contexts and their heterographic spellings in the Hittite contexts. While exceptions are always possible, the least likely context for an exceptional use of the Sumerograms in Luwian is the next line after the same Luwian words are spelled phonetically.
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CTH 761.2.1.e

Table of Manuscripts
A KUB 35.82 47/c

Transmission and Research History

This Middle Script fragment, found in the area of Building D of Büyükkale, contains a small part of column one or four, with the left edge preserved. Its ductus shows non-trivial similarities to other fragments assembled under CTH 761.2.1 (see Fig. 2.18). After the collation of the original fragments, it is highly plausible that KUB 35.82 and KUB 35.69 are indirect joins (see KUB 35.69, CTH 761.2.1.d). Its first paragraph follows an empty space corresponding to at least two lines. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 189–90 as belonging to an unspecified “Old Woman” ritual.

Transliteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 1’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:4’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 2’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:7’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 3’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:8’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:9’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary

1’: For \text{NINDA} \text{kātai}–, see Rößle (2004), who considers it to be a noun of Akkadian origin and hypothesizes that it came to Anatolia through the Hurrians.

5’–7’: The offering of bread accompanied by the invitation to consume it with the use of the Luwian participle /adamm(a/i)-/ ‘eating’ finds a parallel in KUB 35.16 (+) KUB 35.14 iv 8’–15’ (CTH 760.3.b) and related passages. For another instance of a Luwian
Contents

§§ 1′−2′ Breaking the bread, with its Luwian incantation inviting the Itmari-deities to eat the bread

§ 3′ Further rites involving the bread

The offering of bread to supernatural beings accompanied by an explicit invitation to consume it finds a parallel in a number of texts. Of particular interest is CTH 761.2.5 (q.v.), where it immediately follows the scapegoat rite, presumably situated in the final part of the ritual. Although the addressees of the invitation are apparently different in this case, it seems probable that such banqueting formulae cluster in the final part of the ritual regardless of the expected attendants.

Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 1′</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 2′</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5′−7′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 3′</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

agent-oriented participle in /-mm(a/i)-/, see the discussion of /tsanta tubaimm(a/i-)/ under CTH 759.10.b. For parallel rare instances of agent-oriented function of Hittite participles in -ant-, see for example the discussion of pahšanuwant- in CHD P, 9b.

6′: For the other occurrences of the Itmari, always in the plural, sometimes deified and sometimes not, see Ünal 1990, 357 and van Gessel 1998, 208.
Transmission and Research History

This fragment was found in Building M of Büyükkale. It is probably a Middle Script fragment, because of the geometric shape of the signs, which reminds us of other MS fragments of our corpus. There are no clues that could help to reconstruct its original place on a tablet. The fragment seems to be written in the same hand and probably reflects the same tablet series as CTH 761.2.2.b (see Fig. 2.19), also found in Building M; but whether the two fragments belong to the same tablet is difficult to say.

Transliteration

§ 1′
Obv. 1′ […] x […]
Obv. 2′ [ma-ar-da-ti du-ú-pi]-ti na-a-ú-w[a …]

§ 2′
Obv. 3′ [ni-i-ša]-an ḫa-pi-ti ma-al-ḫa-(aš)-ša-[aš-ši-in EN-an ad-du-wa-li-iš EME-iš]
Obv. 6′ [wa-aš-pa-an-ta-aš]-ši-in-zi e-er-[u-wa-an-zí ma-ia-aš-ši-iš EME-iš]

§ 3′
Obv. 7′ […] b[E-EL SISKUR x […]
Obv. 8′ […] x […]

Commentary

Obv. 3′–6′: Restored after several occurrences of the same incantation in KUB 32.9(+) (CTH 761.1.f) and KUB 35.21 (CTH 761.1.d).
The fragment was attributed to the Great Ritual and published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 102.

Contents

§ 1’ Luwian incantation related to the *taluppi*-lump (end)
§ 2’ Luwian incantation for untying the effects of impurity
§ 3’ Fragmentary Hittite passage

The preserved Luwian incantations find precise counterparts in CTH 761.1, but the ductus of the fragment is different. The spelling *BE-EL SÍSKUR* of the heterogram for ‘ritual patron’ prompts assigning it to CTH 761.2.

Translation

§ 1’

Obv.

1’ “[…]

2’ One [strikes ... with words ...] no[t ...].

§ 2’

3’–6’ [May the evil tongue, the evil hand, the tongue [of judgment, curse, perjury, [bad] y[ear, bad month], the int[eriors of the shrouds, [the tongue of the multitudes not] bind the ritua[l patron]!”

§ 3’

7’ The ritual patron […].

8’ […]
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Transmission and Research History

This fragment was found in Building M of Büyükkale and published in transliteration in Groddek 2011a, 224–25. It is probably a Middle Script fragment, because of the geometric shape of the signs, which reminds us of other MS fragments of our corpus. The fragment seems to be written in the same hand (see Fig. 2.19), has the same find spot, and almost certainly reflects the same tablet series as CTH 761.2.2.a; but whether

Transliteration

\[\text{Obv.}
\]
§ 1′
A obv. 1′ [...]x \text{*ap-pi-iš-k[e-ez-zi]…}\nA obv. 2′ [...]  

§ 2′
A obv. 3′ [na-a-ú-wa-ti-ia-ta ḫa-r-ma-ša-a-ti mu-u-wa-i na-a-ú-w-ba-ta-a-la-l[a-\text{a-ta-ti mu-u-wa-i]}]
A obv. 5′ [ti-ti-ta-a-ti na-a-ú-wa-ti-ia-ta UZUŠA-ti UZUNÍG.GIG-ti] 12-’ta-a’-ti ḫa-’ap’-[pi-ša-ti]  

Commentary

\textbf{Obv. 1’}: Soysal 2013, 703 reads \textit{[an-d]a ’ap’-pi-iš-k[i-ez-zi].} The vertical of a possible sign DA is visible on the tablet; however, no horizontals can be seen before it. Within the Kuwattalla tradition, the use of the verbal form \textit{ap-pi-iš-ke-ez-zi} appears to be restricted to CTH 761.2, where it denotes bringing various ritual items into physical
the two fragments belong to the same tablet is difficult to say. Its original place on a tablet likewise remains undetermined.

Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Probable substitution rite with its Luwian incantation, transferring the control of the patient’s body parts onto the animal substitute

The preserved Luwian incantation finds a precise counterpart in CTH 761.1, but the ductus and find spot of the fragment prompt assigning it to CTH 761.2.2. There is no way of ordering CTH 761.2.2.a and CTH 761.2.2.b vis-à-vis one another, since the incantations preserved in both fragments occur many times in the course of the ritual.

Translation

§ 1′

Obv.

1′ [...] seize[s ...]
2′ [...] § 2′

3′ “[He no (longer) overcomes it with his head. He no (longer) overcomes] it [with] his alall[atti]-body part.

4′–5′ [He no (longer) overcomes it with his nose]. (He) no (longer overcomes) it [with the pupils of (his) eyes].

5′ [(He) no (longer overcomes) it with his heart, liver], twelve lim[bs].”

contact with the patient (in this case it must be a ritual substitute). CTH 761.1 uses ta-ma-aš-zi in the same function. 

Obv. 3′–5′: Restored after KUB 35.24+ obv. 5′–7′ (CTH 761.1.c, § 2′).
CTH 761.2.3.a

Table of Manuscripts

A  KUB 35.42  119/d

Transmission and Research History

The small fragment under discussion, not found in situ, preserves a part of the right edge of the tablet. Detlev Groddek identified this fragment as belonging to the same tablet series as CTH 761.2.3.b (see S. Košak, hethiter.net/: hetkonk (v. 1.992); see also Fig. 2.10). The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 148 as part of the "third ritual".

Transliteration

§ 1′
Right column
A r.col. 1′ [la-la-i-du-ut-ta pa-ap-ra-i-du-ut-ta 4-ti pa-a-ar-t]a-ti
A r.col. 2′ [ḫar-ma-ḫa-a-ti za-ar-wa-ni-ia-ti ar-pu-w]a-na-a-ti
A r.col. 3′ [ma-an-na-ku-na-a-ti da-a-u-wa-aš-ša-ti ti]-‘i’-ti-i-ta-a-ti
A r.col. 4′ [UZUŠÀ-ti UZUNÍG.GIG-ti 12-ta-a-ti UZUḫa-ap-p]i-i-ša-a-ti

§ 2′
A r.col. 5′ [i-pa-la-a-ti-du-wa-an ḫu-i-nu-wa-ah-ḫa a-du-u]lt-ta i-pa-la-a-ti-i[n]
A r.col. 6′ [la-a-la-at-ta i-šar-ū-i-la-ti-pa-du-wa-an ḫu]-‘i’-nu-wa-ah-ḫa’(ZA)
A r.col. 7′ [a-du-ut-ta at-tu-wa-li-in ḫa-at-ta-aš-ta]r-ri-in la-a-la-ā[t-ta]

§ 3′
A r.col. 8′ […]x 'DINGIRMESPt x[...]

Commentary

r.col. 2′: The restoration of the ‘horned forehead’, required for reasons of space, suggests that the fragment under discussion refers to a ram or goat, rather than to a piglet, in the function of a ritual carrier.

r.col. 7′: Note the reduplicated form /la-latta/ contrasting with /latta/ in CTH 761.1.
Contents

§§ 1′–2′  Luwian incantation for removing the effects of impurity from ritual patron’s limbs by means of an animal substitute
§ 3′  Unclear

The first two paragraphs of CTH 761.2.3.a generally run parallel to KBo 29.55+ ii 12–18 (CTH 761.3.8, §§ 7″–8″). Consequently, it is likely that the animal substitute featured in the fragment is a white sheep; if so, CTH 761.2.3.a is to be ordered before CTH 761.2.3.b within the same tablet series. The probability that we are dealing with an indirect join is considerable, although the alternative possibility that CTH 761.2.3.a and CTH 761.2.3.b belong to the two successive tablets of CTH 761.2.3 cannot be ruled out. The collation of the original fragment shows that KUB 35.42 belongs to a right column, with the remnants of the right edge of the tablet.

Translation

§ 1′

Right column
1′  "[It takes it (away from) him (and) carries it (away from) him with (its) four leg]s,
2′  [head, horned forehe]ad,
3′  [snout, eye-p]upils,
4′  [heart, liver, twelve li]mbs.

§ 2′
5′–6′  [I have made it run to his left],
5′–6′  [so that it took his] sinisternes[s]. I have [m]ade [it] run [to his right],
7′  so that it too[k his evil terro]r."

§ 3′
8′  […] deitie[s ...]

r.col. 8′: If this restoration is correct, the paragraph under discussion is clearly distinct from KBo 29.55+ ii 19–23 (CTH 761.3.8, § 9″), where no deities are mentioned. For a different interpretation of the traces and a different restoration, based on the hypothesis of a duplicate, see Starke 1985, 148 and compare the discussion in Vol. 2, Section 1.5.
Table of Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>KUB 34.62</td>
<td>334/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>+ KUB 32.14</td>
<td>+ 8/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₃</td>
<td>+ KBo 34.247</td>
<td>+ 228/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmission and Research History

All the fragments were found in Building A of Büyükkale. Only one side of the tablet and its right edge have been partially preserved. The frequent use of the PAP signs is compatible with the assumption of a copy taken from a damaged version (see Waal 2015, 82). The ductus of the tablet is New Script (see Starke 1985, 142) and is identical to that of KUB 35.42 (CTH 761.2.3.a; see Fig. 2.10). There is a possibility that KUB 34.62+ is a double-columned tablet. If this is really the case, then the preserved text would probably correspond to col. ii. The fragments A₁ + A₂ were published in

Transliteration

§ 1′

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Obv. ii?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁ ii? 1′</td>
<td>[...x-li-i-iz]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ ii? 2′</td>
<td>[...]x [...x-ad-du]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 2′

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Obv. ii?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁ ii? 3′</td>
<td>[i-pa-la-a-ti-d]u-wa-’an’ [ḥu-i-nu-wa-aḥ-ḥa a-du-u]t[t[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ ii? 4′</td>
<td>[i-pa-la-a-ti-i]n la-[a-la-at-ta i-šar-ū-i-l]a-ti-pa-[du-wa-an]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ ii? 5′</td>
<td>[ḥu-i-nu-wa-a]ḥ-ḥa a-du-[ut-ta ad-du-wa-li]-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ ii? 6′</td>
<td>[ḥa-at-ta-a]š-tar-ri-in [la-a-la-at-ta]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 3′

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Obv. ii?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁ ii? 8′</td>
<td>[ar-pu-w]aj-[a-na-a]-ti ma-an-na-k[u-un-na-a-ti da]-’a’-u-wa-aš-ša-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ ii? 9′</td>
<td>[ti-i-t]-i-ta-a-[ti u][ti ع]-[NIG.GIG-ti 12-ta-a-ti ḫa-ap ’pi-ša-ti]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 4′

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Obv. ii?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁ ii? 10′</td>
<td>[la-la]-’i’-du-ut-ta ta-a-pa-ru ’ta’-ta-ar-ri-i-am-ma-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ ii? 11′</td>
<td>[hi-i-ru]-un e-er-wa-al-li-ia-an pa-ri-it-PAP PAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ ii? 12′</td>
<td>[ū-la-ta]-’al-li-ia-an’ ḫu-u-i-it-wa-a-li-ia-an PAP PAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ ii? 13′</td>
<td>[IR-ia-an GĒME-ia-a]n [la-ū]-la-hi-ia-an [li-ḫa-a-pi-i-ri-PAP PAP]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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transliteration in Starke 1985, 149–50 as belonging to the "third ritual". The direct join with $A_3$ is reported in Groddek 1999, 307–8. The inscribed surface of $A_1 + A_2 + A_3$ is situated near the lower edge of the tablet.

Contents

§ 1' Unclear Luwian incantation

§§ 2'–4' Luwian incantation for removing the effects of impurity from ritual patron’s limbs by means of an animal substitute

§§ 5'–6' Waving and then spitting on the animal substitute from a distance, with its Luwian incantation

§§ 2'–5' of the joined fragments under discussion are parallel although not identical to KBo 29.55+ iii 17'–35' (CTH 761.3.8, §§ 19'–21'”), which suggests that the animal substitute acting there is a piglet. The use of the heterogram BE-EL SÍSKUR prompts assigning the joined piece to CTH 761.2. It is probably to be ordered after CTH 761.2.3.a (q.v.).

Translation

§ 1'

Obv. ii?

1' “ […]

2' […]

§ 2'

3' [I have made] it [run to [h]is [left],

3'–4' [so that it] too[k his sinisternes]s.

4'–5' I have [made it run] to [his right],

5'–6' [so that it took] his [evi]l [ter]ror.

§ 3'

7' [It takes] it (away from) him (and) car[ries it (away from) him] with (its) four legs,

8'–9' [foreh]ead, sno[ut, e]ye-[pu]pils,

9' hea[rt], liver, twelve limbs.

§ 4'

10' It [take]s (away) from him judgment, curse,

11' [per]jury, internal (or) external,

12' of the [de]ad (or) the living,

13' [of a male (or) female serva]nt, of mountain-dwellers (or) desert-dwellers,
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A₂ ii? 14’ [ku-wa-arša-ašša-an tu-ú-li-ia-(ia))-ašša-an

§ 5’
A₂ ii? 15’ [na-aš-ta ŠAḪ.A-NA] [BE-EL ŚISKUR tu-u-wa-az(U) še-e[r ar-ḥa]
A₂ ii? 16’ [wa-ah-nu-wa-an-zi nam-m]a-an BE-EL ŚISKUR tu-u-wa-az a[l-la-ap-pa-ah-hi]
A₂ ii? 17’ [MUNUSŠU.GI-]ma lu-ú-i-li ki-išša-an me-ma-i

§ 6’
A₂ ii? 18’ [...] x x [...] x x x [...] 

Commentary

ii? 2’: As Groddek points out, the trace visible on the tablet right before the sign AD is consistent with a double-headed vertical (Groddek 1999, 307 fn. 25).
ii? 3’–6’: The incantation is restored based on KBo 29.55+ ii 16–18 (CTH 761.3.8, § 8”).
ii? 7’: The restoration of /lalai/ ‘takes’, and by extension also /pabrai/ ‘carries’ in the following clause, is forced by the preserved final vowel of /lalai/ ‘takes’ in § 4. Note that the same construction with the indicative forms /lalai/ and /pabrai/ must be reconstructed throughout CTH 761.1. In contrast, the late tablet series CTH 761.3.8 contains the form pa-ap-ra-ad-du-ut-ta /pabrattu=○=tti/ ‘may it carry (it away)’ in § 7’

CTH 761.2.4

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 9.141 18/o

Transmission and Research History

This Middle Script fragment was found in a secondary context in the area of Building G at Büyükkale. It contains portions of column one and column four, both adjacent to the left edge of the tablet. The tablet was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 126–27 as part of the dupaduperša-ritual.
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14’ of [an army] (or) assembly.”

§ 5’

15’–16’ [They wave the piglet] ove[r] the ritual patron from afar,
16’ [th]en the ritual patron s[pits] on it from afar
17’ [and the Old Woman] speaks [t]hus [in Luwian]:

§ 6’

18’ “[...]

(KBo 29.55+ ii 12), which must be interpreted as a copyist’s error for pa-ap-ra-i-du-ut-
ta /pabrai=du=○=tta/ ’it carries it (away from) him’.

ii’ 15’–16’: The present fragment is attributed to a substitution rite involving a piglet,
because the ritual patron performs his actions from a distance. For more details, see
the commentary to KBo 29.55+ (CTH 761.3.8).

ii” 16’: Since the use of BE-EL SÍSKUR as the designation of the ritual patron is normally
aligned with Middle Script ductus, its use in this Early New Script tablet supports the
assumption of an exceptionally faithful copy taken from an older version.

Contents

§ 1’ Luwian incantation mentioning family members
§ 2’ Unclear Luwian passage
§§ 3’–4’ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing a rite, with its Luwian incantation,
which mentions a deity acting as “mother and father” of the supplicant
§ 5’ Unclear Luwian incantation
§ 6’ Luwian incantation likely mentioning feeding a deity and his/her response
§ 7’ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing an unclear action of the ritual patron
§§ 8’–9’ Ritual patron dedicates the animal scapegoat, with its Luwian incantation
§ 10’ Old Woman takes the scapegoat for herself as payment
§ 11’ Offering of bread and libation (very fragmentary)

Column four of this text is broadly parallel to column four of KUB 35.16(+) (CTH 760.3.b).
On the other hand, the content of column one does not find a counterpart in
KUB 35.16(+) or elsewhere in the available fragments of the Kuwattalla tradition. The
reference to the patient as BE-EL SÍSKUR constitutes the formal rationale for attributing
this fragment to CTH 761.2.
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Transliteration

§ 1

Obv. i
A i 1’ ʿzaʔ-x [...]  
A i 2’ a-an-n[i-ia-ti [...]  
A i 3’ ḫu-u-ʿha-ti(·) [...]  
A i 4’ na-a-ni-ia-t[i [...]  

§ 2

A i 5’ pa-ri-i-ʾitʾ-[...]  
A i 6’ pa-ri-ʾi-[...]  
A i 7’ ku-wa-a[n-zu-...]  
A i 8’ Š[ [...]  

§ 3

A i 9’ ʾnaʔ-[...]  
A i 10’ ʾnaʔ-ʾan-ʾzaʔ [...]  
A i 11’ MUNUSŠU.GI-m[...]  
A i 12’ ḫuʾ-i-ta-an-da-an-na Š[...]  
A i 13’ ʾnuʾ ki-iš-ša-an ḫu-u-uk-[zi]  

§ 4

A i 14’ za-a-ú-i-na-aš ú-i-ši-ta ti-[...]  
A i 15’ a-ʾpā-ti a-a-ri-[a-an-na-r[...]  
A i 16’ a-a-ia-šī a-ti a-an-ni-iš u-t[a-an-ni-in [...]  
A i 17’ u-ra-an-ni-iš-pa-ti a-an-ni-in Š[...]  
A i 18’ a-ti a-an-ni-iš a-an-na-wa-an-n[i-iš [...]  
A i 19’ [t]a-ʾš-ʾti-iš-pa-ti ta-a-ta-wa-an-ni-[š [...]  

§ 5

A i 20’ [x-x] ḫi-i-[ru-ū]-ʾunʾ a-a-ia-an-ta pa-[...]  
A i 21’ [...] x [...]-ʾni-i ku-wa-ar-r[i(·)...  
A i 22’ [...]-dam-ma ti-i-[š-...]  
A i 23’ [...] x x x [...]  

§ 6

Rev. iv
A iv 1’ ʾtiʾ-ʾwa-d[a-aš-ša-an(·)]  
A iv 2’ a-ta-ri-i[t-ta ...  
A iv 3’ iš-ri-i[š ...  
A iv 4’ a-aš-ta na-ʾaʾ-[nu-um-pa-du a-a-ri-ia-aš-ši ...  
A iv 5’ ḫu-u-wa-li-[a-an-za ... za-ap-pa-aš-ši]  
A iv 6’ pa-ʾa na-a-wa-pa [...]  
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Translation

§ 1′
Obv. i
1′ "[...]
2′ [from (that) of] the mother [...]
3′ [from (that) of] the grandfather [...]
4′ from (that) of the brother [...]

§ 2′
5′ [...] 
6′ [...] 
7′ heavy [...] 
8′ [...]"

§ 3′
9′ [...] 
10′ [...] 
11′ The Old Woman [...] 
12′ [...] and huitant-
13′ [She] conjure[s] thus:

§ 4′
14′ "Here (has) appeared [...] 
15′–16′ at that time, you make [...] willfully. 
16′ (As) a mother, you [...] the gra[ndmother], 
17′ and (as) a grandmother, you [...] the mother. 
18′ (As) a mother, you are mother-li[ke], 
19′ And (as) a father, you are father-like.

§ 5′
20′ They made an oath [...] 
21′ [...] in the field [...] 
22′ [...] 
23′ [...] 

§ 6″
Rev. iv
1′–2′ He fed [...] of the Sun-god. 
3′–4′ The han[d was ..., the ...] was [...]. 
4′–5′ No[w, you (will) pick up from him ... (and) offer ...] (to) the vio[lent ones]. 
6′ Then [...] not [...]."
§ 7

A iv 7'  UM-MA BE-EL SÎ[SÍKUR ...]

§ 8

A iv 8' ma-ah-ḫa-an-ma "7"-[SU ...]

A iv 9' 1 DUKU-KU-UB KAS A'-NA' [BE-EL SÍKUR ki-iš-ri kat-ta zi-ik-ke-ez-zt]

A iv 10' 'a-pu-u-un' 1 NINDA LA-A-[b-KU da-a-i A-NA 3 NA[NA ku-iš]

A iv 11' 'a-wa-an kat-ta' ki-[t-ta-ri na-an-ša-an A-NA MÀS.GAL]

A iv 12' A-NA SAG.'DU-[SU' kat-t[a e-ep-zi nam-ma-an-kân EGIR-an-da]

A iv 13' BE-EL SÍKU[R S]i-"pa"-a[n-ti]

§ 9

A iv 14' a-a-ri-in wa-ar-[ma-a-ū-un-ta ta-pa-a-ru-wa]

A iv 15' ta-ta-ri-ia-am-m[a ḫi-i-ru-ū-ta pu-u-wa-ti-la]

A iv 16' na-a-nu-un-tar-ri-ia-[a wa-la-an-ti ia ḫu-it-wa-li-ia]

A iv 17' na-a-nu-um-pa na-ak-ku-u[š-ša-a-ū-un-ta]

A iv 18' pa-a na-ak-ku-uš-ša-ḫ-ii-t[i ku-wa-an-zu-ni-im-ma-an a-aš-du]

§ 10

A iv 19' nu MÀS.GAL ar-ḫa p[é-en-ni-ia-an-zi na-an-za MUNUS.GI da-a-i]

§ 11

A iv 20' MUNUS.GI-ma a-pu-[u-un 1 NINDA LA-AB-KU ar-ḫa pár-ši-ia]


A iv 22' [DU]KU-KU-"UB' KAS-[i-ki-kán A-NA BE-EL SÍKUR ar-ḫa da-a-i]

Commentary

i 3': The expected form would be ḫu-u-ḫa-[a-ti], but the stem /xuja(ja)/- 'of the grandfather' is so far not attested elsewhere. Alternatively, one can think of the possessive adjective ḫu-u-ḫa-a[š-ša-ti].

i 12': The form huitant- arguably represents a Hittite participle derived from the Luwian verbal root /xwid-/ 'to live', which would make it a borrowed equivalent of Hitt. ḫuiswant- 'living, (a)live'.

i 15': The tentative interpretation of a-an-na-[r(a-...]) as 'willfully' is not imposed by context, although it certainly does not contradict it either. The main argument for such an analysis is the comparison with Hitt. innarā 'explicitly, willfully, purposely' (Kloekhorst 2008, 386). Other examples of this lexeme are not attested in Luwinian, but see Luw. /annarummm(a/i)-/ 'forceful', a cognate of Hitt. innarwant- 'strong, vigorous', or Luw. /annarummayid-/ 'virility', a cognate of Hitt. innarawātar 'strength, force, vigor'.

i 16'–17': Within the context, the noun /uranni(-)/- is supposed to designate a type of relative, since it appears to alternate with /ann(i)-/ 'mother' in a symmetrical con-
§ 7’ The ritual patron [...] in this way.

§ 8’ As [...] seven [times], [she places] one jug of beer on [the hand of the ritual patron]; [she takes] that soft bread, [which is] placed on the three stones. [She holds it over] the head of [the billy goat]. [Then, afterward], the ritual patron [dedicates it].

§ 9’ "For a while we [have been performing] conjurations (on account of) judgments, curses, (and) perjuries, past (or) present, [of the dead (or) the living]. Now, [we] performed the scapegoat rite. [May (those) be affected by] the scapegoat rite!"

§ 10’ They lead the billy goat away [and the Old Woman takes it for herself].

§ 11’ The Old Woman [crumbles] that soft bread and then [she places] it on [the three stones]. [She also takes] the jug of beer [away from the ritual patron]

Commentary

The interpretation of /ur-ann(i)-/ as ‘grandmother’ (Carruba 1992, 252) is based on its etymological analysis as a compound of /ur(a/i)-/ ‘great’ and /ann(i)-/ ‘mother’. The other occurrences of this lexeme support rather than contradict the proposed interpretation: KBo 7.68 ii 13’ [mu]-ut-ti-i-iš u-ra-an-ni-iš ‘mighty grandmother’ may be an epithet of the goddess Ḥannahanna, while KBo 29.33 r.col. 10’ DINGIR8ES u-ra-an-ni-in-za can be interpreted as ‘gods of the grandmothers’.

i 18’–19’: These lines indicate that the whole paragraph represents a conjuration address to a deity, probably the Sun-god. For the examples of the Sun-god (or the Sun-goddess of Arinna) being called ‘father and mother’ in Hittite texts, see Yakubovich 2005, 111.

i 20’: The reference to taking an oath may begin a historiola presenting the etiology to the present ritual. Since /xirun/d-/ ‘oath’ is the final member of the triad of negative phenomena that characterizes the Great Ritual, it is conceivable that it was performed to treat the negative effects of breaking an oath. See further the commentary to CTH 762.3.2.
iv 1′–2′: The third person interpretation of the verbal form /adaritta/ is made on the assumption that its subject is the ritual patron, who has fed the violent spirits with a special offering.

iv 5′: The noun ū-u-wa-li-[ia-an-za] ‘violent ones’ is restored here based on KUB 35.15 iii11 [ū-u-wa-li-ia-an-zi] (CTH 761.2.5), KBo 29.12 iv 3′ ū-li-ia- [an-zi] (CTH 761.3.3), and KBo 8.129 i 3′ ū-u-li-ia-aš-[ši-in-zi] (CTH 759.10.a). Note that the former two parallels belong to the identical incantation, which is situated relatively close to the one discussed here within the text of the Great Ritual. The tentative interpretation ‘violent ones’ is ventured here on the assumption that this noun is a cognate of Hitt. ħulla- < *xulne- ‘to smash, defeat’ (Kloekhorst 2008, 358–60). For a new Indo-

CTH 761.2.5

Table of Manuscripts
A KUB 35.15 Bo 3102 + Bo 4315

Transmission and Research History
This Middle Script fragment of undetermined find spot contains the contiguous portions of column two and column three, both adjacent to the intercolumnium. The two pieces constituting it had already been joined in the autographic edition. It was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 127–28 as part of the dupaduparaša-ritual. KUB 35.15 seems to reflect the same scribal hand as KUB 35.54 (CTH 758.1; see Fig. 2.1), even though the two fragments do not belong to the same composition.

Transliteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 1’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv. ii’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ii’1′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 2’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ii’2′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ii’3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ii’4′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ii’5′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ii’6′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
European etymology of this root, see Melchert forthcoming; for the syntax of the relevant sentence, see the commentary to the parallel passage in CTH 761.2.5.

**iv 7**: In the closely parallel version KUB 35.15 (CTH 761.2.5), this sentence is attached to the following paragraph. Note also the difference between BE-EL SÎSKUR in this line and LÚ BE-EL SÎSKUR in KUB 35.15 ii′ 7′ and 12′.

**iv 7′–22′**: These lines were restored based on the better-preserved parallel version KUB 35.15 (CTH 761.2.5) and, to some extent, also KUB 35.16(+) (CTH 760.3.b). See the commentary to the respective translations.

**iv 10′–13′**: For this ritual sequence, see Mouton 2014a, 565 and 569.

### Contents

| § 1′ | Unclear |
| § 2′ | Luwian incantation likely mentioning feeding a deity and his/her response |
| §§ 3′–4′ | Ritual patron dedicates the animal scapegoat, with its Luwian incantation |
| § 5′ | Old Woman takes the scapegoat for herself as payment |
| §§ 6′–7′ | Offering of bread and libation, with its Luwian incantation |
| § 8′ | Unclear |

The two joined fragments under discussion closely parallel the content of column four of KBo 9.141 (CTH 761.2.4). For this reason, and because of the patient’s designation as LÚ BE-EL SÎSKUR, KUB 35.15 is classified within the same subgroup of CTH 761 as KBo 9.141.

### Translation

**§ 1′**

Obv. ii′

1′ […]

**§ 2′**

2′–3′ […] fed […] of the [S]un-god.

3′–4′ The […] was […], the […] was …].

5′–6′ Now, you (will) pick [up] from him […] and offer […] (to) the violent ones.

6′ So […] not […].”
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§ 3′
A ii! 7′ UM-MA LÉ BE-EL SÍSKUR [...] 
A ii! 8′ ma-ah-ḫa-an-ma 7ŠU aš [...] 1 ĐIKU UB KAS []
A ii! 9′ A-NA LÉ BE-EL SÍSKUR ki-[š-ri kat-ta zi-i̯k-ke-ez-zi a-pu-u-un] 
A ii! 11′ na-an-ša-ša-an A-NA MÁŠ.GAL A-NA [SAG.DU-ŠU kat-ta e-e-p-zi] 
A ii! 12′ nam-ma-an-kān EGIR-an-da LÉ BE-EL [SÍSKUR ši-pa-an-ti] 
End of col. ii!

§ 4′
Rev. iii! 
A iii! 1 [a-a-ri-in] 'wa-ar'-[ma-a-ú-un-ta ta-pa-a-ru-wa] 
A iii! 2 'ta-ta-ar'-[ri-ia-a-am-[ma ḫi-i-ru-ū]-ta]' [pu-u-wa-ti-la] 
A iii! 3 na-a-nu-um-ta-ri-ia-'la' [wa-la-an]-'ti-e-ia [ḫu-it-wa-li-e-ia] 
A iii! 4 na-a-nu-um-pa na-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ú-un-ta pa-'a' n[a-ak-ku-uš-ša-a-ḫi-ti] 
A iii! 5 ku-wa-an-zu-ni-im-ma-an a-aš-du

§ 5′
A iii! 6 nu MÁŠ.GAL ar-ḫa pé-en-ni-ia-an-zi na-an-zá MINUSŠU.G[1 da-a-i]

§ 6′
A iii! 7 MINUSŠU.GI-ma a-pu-u-un 1 NINDA-ŠA-AB KU ar-ḫa pár-ši-[i] 
A iii! 9 ĐIKU UB KAS-ša-kān A-NA LÉ EL SÍSKUR ar-ḫa da-a-[i] 
A iii! 10 nu pé-ra-an kat-ta ši-[p[a-a]₄ n-ti me-e-ma-i-ma ki-iš-ša-[an]

§ 7′
A iii! 11 x-ša-[a]-x [o-o-i]n-z[ih]u-u-wa-li-ia-an-zi a-da-am-[i-in-zí] 
A iii! 12 [u-wa-am-mi-in-zí aš]a-an-du a-ta a-ni-e-ia-an-[i-in-zí] 
A iii! 13 [...] aš[a-an-du]

§ 8′
A iii! 14 [...] a-š-at-ta' x x [...] 

Commentary

ii! 5′–6′: The reconstructed juxtaposition of the verbs /arihja-(6i)/ and /tsappa-(6i)/ in this passage is reminiscent of a situation in column two of KUB 35.54 (CTH 758.1), where the occurrence of the same verbs is reconstructed for two adjacent rites. It seems likely that the action denoted by the ditransitive verb /arihja-(6i)/ logically precedes that of /tsappa-(6i)/ 'to offer, treat (ritually)', while formally /arihja-(6i)/ is probably cognate with /arihja-(6i)/ 'to raise, rise'; hence the proposed translation 'to pick up'. The best candidate for the subject of both verbs is the scapegoat, which picks up the misama from the ritual patron and delivers them to the violent spirits.
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The ritual patron [...] in this way.

As [...] seven times,

[she places one jug of beer on] the hand of the ritual patron;

she takes [that] soft bread, [which is placed] on the three stones.

[She holds] it over the [head] of the billy goat.

Then, afterward, the [ritual] patron [dedicates] it.

End of col. ii

Rev. iii

"[For a while we have been performing] conjurations (on account of) judgments, curse[s, perjur]ies, [past] (or) present, [of the de]ad [(or) the living].

Now we have performed the scapegoat rite.

May (those) be affected [by] the scapegoat rite!"

They lead the billy goat away and the Old Woman [takes] it for herself.

The Old Woman crumbles that soft bread and (then) she places it on those three stones.

[She] also takes the jug of beer away from the ritual patron.

She libates (with) it and says thus:

"May the [...] violent ones be eating (and) drinking! 
May they [be] treated ...!"

It is possible that there is an additional clause 'she says as follows' at the end of the paragraph, but this would probably require writing a part of it in the intercolumnium.

For the verb /nakkussa(i)-(di)/ 'to perform the scapegoat rite', see the commentary to CTH 760.3.b i 20–21.

More literally, "May (those) be loaded with the scapegoat rite!" The participial form ku-wa-an-zu-ni-im-ma-an is derived from the verbal stem /kwantsuni-/, itself
a factitive of /k"antsu-/ 'heavy'. Note that the subject here consists of judgments, curses, and perjuries, as opposed to the similar incantations in the context of the ik-

kunatt- and šarlatt-sacrifices, where 'offense' and 'fault' have the same function.

iii 6: See the indication of the Old Woman’s receiving living animals, presumably as a fee for her services, in KBo 10.42 iv 5′ (CTH 761.3.1). See also Hutter 2019b for other contexts.

iii 11–13: The parallel incantations in KBo 29.12 iv 3′–5′ (CTH 761.3.3) and KUB 35.16(+) iv 12′–15′ (CTH 760.3.b) are also badly preserved but nonetheless help the restoration. The subject of this incantation is apparently /xʷaliya-/ı, the lexeme that is also restored above in § 2 based on the parallel version, was tentatively translated as
'violent ones' (see the commentary to the translation of KBo 9.141, CTH 761.2.4). One has to decide whether the predicative participle is ‘eaten’ or ‘eating’, since /adammintsi/ can, in principle, mean both. The fact that the incantation under discussion follows the offering of soft bread and a jug of beer supplies /adammintsi/ with an implicit inanimate object and thus supports the latter solution. See, furthermore, KBo 29.6 iii (CTH 762.2), where the “good” nakkiu-spirits receive offerings, although the nakkiu-spirits in general have negative connotations (Mouton 2020b). It is worth observing the complementary distribution between the offering to ‘the violent ones’ and the nakkiu-spirits: the former rite is mentioned only in CTH 760 and CTH 761, where the nakkiu-spirits are not at all attested.
GREAT RITUAL, 3RD GROUP
CTH 761.3.1

Table of Manuscripts

A  KBo 10.42  318/p

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment, found in Building K of Büyükkale, contains part of column four of a double-columned tablet, constituting the final tablet of the ritual, including the colophon. The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 161 as part of the “third ritual”, while its colophon was tentatively translated in Waal 2015, 520–21.

Transliteration

§ 1
Rev. iv
A iv 1’ [...] ‘A-NA EN SISKUR’ ŠU-’I’ da-[a-i]
A iv 2’ [...]x šš-pa-an-ti nam-ma-aš-kán pa-[r]a-[a]
A iv 3’ [...] in ar-ša pé-e-da-an-zi
A iv 4’ [...]x UDU MÁŠ.GAL na-ak-ku-uš-ši’it
A iv 5’ [...] T]-i-an-du-uš-pát MINUSU.GI da-a-i

§ 2
A iv 6’ [DUB.X.KAM ... ma]-a-an ÍKu-wa-at-tal-[l]a-aš MINUSUHUR.LA
A iv 7’ [IŠ-šI-lu-šI-ša MINUSU.GI a]-aš-[ža gi-im-ri (ša)]-I-li
A iv 8’ [a-ni-u-ur a-ni-ia-an-zi ...]-an pa-ra-a {DA}
A iv 9’ [...] hi-lam-ni-kán an-da
A iv 10’ [pę-en-na-an-zí šA GI A-N AĞZ.LA] M.GAR1A ku-it
A iv 11’ [hi-lam-mar pé-ra-an GI] A-TI

Commentary

iv 4’: This is the only context where one encounters the Hittite term nakkušši ‘scapegoat’ in CTH 761. Compare, however, references to the scapegoat rite in CTH.761.2.4 and CTH 761.2.5.
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Contents

§ 1′ The ritual patron(?) dedicates scapegoats before the Old Woman receives them as payment
§ 2′ Colophon

The colophon mentions a performance in the open country, which prompts assigning this fragment to CTH 761.3.

Translation

§ 1′

Rev. iv

1′ She places [...] into the hand of the ritual patron.
2′–3′ He dedicates [...] Then, [...].
3′ They bring [...] away.
4′–5′ [...] with a sheep (and) a billy goat acting as scapegoats [...].
5′ The Old Woman takes [them] alive.

§ 2′

6′ [xth tablet ... W]hen Kuwat[al]la, the female attendant
7′–8′ [and Šilalluḫi, the Old Woman, perform the Gr]eat [ritual ou]tside in the open country.
8′–9′ [...].
9′–10′ [They drive out ...] to the gatehouse,
10′–11′ which [gatehouse] (is) [before the reed h]uts. [Fi]nished.

iv 7′: The restoration of Šilalluḫi’s name in the lacuna is assured. It is remarkable that the preserved colophons of CTH 761.1 attribute the ritual to Kuwattalla alone, CTH 761.3.2 features the colophon mentioning Šilalluḫi alone, and here we encounter a tandem of the two ritualists.
iv 10'-11': The mention of the gatehouse in front of the reed huts constitutes a highly specific parallel between this colophon and the content of CTH 761.3.8, as noted in Starke 1985, 135–36. We translate Hitt. ḫilammar as 'gatehouse' rather than

CTH 761.3.2.a

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 30.190 1059/u

Transmission and Research History

This fragment contains small parts of columns two and three belonging to a ruled tablet, which was found in Temple I and shows a New Script ductus. It is written in the same hand as KUB 35.28 (CTH 761.3.2.b) and KBo 22.143 (CTH 761.3.2.c), likewise pre-ruled fragments (see Fig. 2.20), which makes it fairly likely that they belong to the same tablet series. An indirect join between KBo 22.143 and KBo 30.190, suggested by Alice Mouton, seems very likely after the collation of the original fragments. The transliteration of the fragment was first published in Starke 1985, 201, where it is attributed to an unspecified "Old Woman" ritual, and most recently in Groddek 2002, 260.

Transliteration

| § 1′ |
|---|---|
| Obv. ii |
| A ii 1′ | [...]x-ku""-wa-aš |
| A ii 2′ | [...] x x x |
| A ii 3′ | [...] a-aš-du |

| § 2′ |
|---|---|
| A ii 4′ | [...]x-ša-ri-ia |
| A ii 5′ | [...] x |
| A ii 6′ | [...]-iš |

| § 3″ |
|---|---|
| Rev. iii |
| A iii 1′ | [a-ad-du-wa-la-ti EME-ti a-ad-du-wa-la-ti] ‚iš-ša-ra-a-ti’ |
as ‘portico’, in an attempt to avoid the connotations of a monumental structure in the context of an outdoor ritual. The translation provided for the relative clause is rather literal, which prompts us to specify that we are dealing here with the restrictive clause: ‘the gatehouse that is before the reed huts’.

Contents

| §§ 1′–2′ | Fragmentary Luwian incantation |
| § 3″    | Luwian incantation accompanying a purification rite |
| §§ 4′–5′ | The ritual patron places his hand on an unidentified object, with its Luwian conjuration |

The incantation in CTH 761.3.2.c (q.v.) tips the scales for assigning the fragments to the free-standing version of the Great Ritual, but further specification is impossible. There is likewise no way of establishing the relative order of CTH 761.3.2.a, CTH 761.3.2.b, and CTH 761.3.2.c within the text of the ritual. According to the shape of the tablet fragment, column three of KBo 30.190 corresponds to the last third of the column.

Translation

| § 1′    |
| Obv. ii |
| 1′–3′   | “May […] be […]! |

| § 2′    |
| 4′–6′   | […] |

| § 3″    |
| Rev. iii|
| 1′      | [from the evil tongue, the evil hand, |
| 2′      | [from (the tongue) of judgment, curs]e, |
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Great Ritual, 3rd group (CTH 761)

A iii 3′  [hi-ru-ú-ta-aš-sa-a-ti ma-a-i]a-aš-sa-an-za-ti EME-ti

§ 4′
A iii 4′  [...-a]ž’ na-at A-NA EN SISKUR
A iii 5′  [pa-ra-a e-ep-zí še-ra-aš-sa-an] EN SISKUR ki-iš-si-ra-an
A iii 6′  [da-a-i MUNUSŠU.GI ma lu-ú-i-li ki-[i]š-sa-an ḫu-u-uk-zí

§ 5′
A iii 7′  [...]-šu ?-wa-ma-an-za ú-tar-ša
A iii 8′  [...]-ú-wa-aš ḫa-ru-wa-aš-ta
A iii 9′  [...] x x x [...]  

Commentary

iii 1–3′: Restored after KUB 32.9(+) rev. 6′–10′ (CTH 761.1.f, § 9′).

iii 4′–6′: For the restoration, see DBH 46/2:33:9′–11′ (CTH 761.2.1.b) and KBo 29.16 ii 12′–14′ (CTH 761.3.5.c). Although the object on which the hand is placed remains unclear, see the commentary to KUB 9.6+ iv 9′ (CTH 759.1) for the ritual placing of one’s hand on an offering.

CTH 761.3.2.b

Table of Manuscripts

A  KUB 35.28  Bo 2673

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment, found in an uncertain location in Boğazköy, contains portions of columns one, two, and four, including a fragmentary colophon. The fragment is ruled (vorliniert). It was identified as part of the Great Ritual and published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 96–97, while the edition of its colophon can be found in Waal 2015, 522. The alleged vertical direct join KBo 22.143 + KUB 35.28, offered in Sasseville 2020b, 114–15, must be rejected after the collation of the original fragments—although both fragments, as well as KBo 30.190, show the same scribal hand (see Fig. 2.20). The pre-ruling is much lighter and less systematic on KUB 35.28 than that on KBo 22.143 or KBo 30.190. For this reason, we suggest that KUB 35.28 might come from the same tablet series as KBo 22.143 and KBo 30.190, but from a different tablet of that series.
3′ [perjury, from the tongue of the [mul]titudes!"

§ 4′
4′–5′ [...] and [she holds] it [toward] the ritual patron.
5′–6′ The ritual patron [puts] (his) hand [on (it)]
6′ [and the Old Woman] conjures [th]us [in Luwian]:

§ 5′
7′ “[...] word/matter
8′ [...] path
9′ [...]”

iii 7′: Starke (1985, 201) reads [...]x ’šu’-wa-ma-an-za, which he then interprets to contain a participial form of the Luwian verb šuwa- ‘to fill’ (Starke 1990, 466, followed by CLL, 198). Yet, the traces of the leftmost sign are too close to what follows to be certain that they belong to a different form. Furthermore, the reading ŠU is not altogether clear.

Contents

§ 1′ Luwian incantation of unclear content
§ 2′ Luwian incantation for untying the effects of impurity
§ 3′ Luwian incantation mentioning a dog(?) and the ritual patron spitting out the miasma
§ 4′ Rite involving the taluppilump
§ 5′–6′ Unclear
§ 7′ Unclear
§ 8′ Colophon

The proposed restoration of the colophon, which is based on CTH 761.3.3, implies a reference to a performance in the open country; hence the fragment is assigned to CTH 761.3.
Great Ritual, 3rd group (CTH 761) 274

Transliteration

§ 1′
Obv. i
A i 1′ [...]-an ma-ar-da-a-tj i du-u-p[i-ti na-a-wa ...]

§ 2′
A i 2′ [ni-i-ša-an ḫa-pi-ti ma-al]-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ši-in E[N-an]
A i 3′ [ad-du-wa-li-iš EME-iš ad]-du-wa-li-iš iš-ša-ra-iš
A i 5′ [MU.KAM-iš ad-du-wa-li-iš IN-aš]TL.KAM-aš ad-du-wa-li-iš

§ 3′
A i 7′ [...] za-ú-wa-ni-i-iš
A i 8′ [wa-ar-ḫi-i-ta-ti-iš ...]-ṫ-i-ia-ni-in ša-a-i
A i 10′ [ta-ta-ri-ia-am-ma-an ḫi-ru-ú-u]n ma-a-ia-aš-ši-in(IŠ) EME-iš

§ 4′
A i 11′ [na-aš-ta MUNUS.GI iš-na-a-aš pár-k]u-in ta-lu-up-pi-in
A i 12′ [...] x [...] 

§ 5′
Obv. ii
A ii 1′ w[a²-...]
A ii 2′ e-x[...]
A ii 3′ kat-t[a ...]

§ 6′
A ii 4′ a-[...]
A ii 5′ x [...] 

§ 7′
Rev. iv
A iv 1′ [...] x [...] 

§ 8′
A iv 2′ [DUB.X.KAM UD-UL QA-TI ma-a-an ṫiš-ši] a-al-lu-ḫi-iš [MUNUS.GI]
A iv 4′ [ki-i pár-ku-i ṫi]up-pi
§ 1’
Obv. i
1’ “[One] strik[es ... with word]s. [... not ...].

§ 2’
2’–6’ [May the evil tongue, the evil hand, [(the tongue) of perjury, judgment, curse, [bad year], bad [month, the interiors [of the shrouds], the tongue of the multitudes [not bind the ritual patron!]

§ 3’
7’–8’ [...] down [...].
9’ May [the ritual patron spilt (out) judgment, 10’ [curse, perjury, the tongue of the multitudes!”

§ 4’
11’–12’ [The Old Woman ...] the [pure taluppi-lump [of dough].

§ 5”
Obv. ii
1’–3’ [...] down [...].

§ 6”
4’–5’ [...]  

§ 7”
Rev. iv
1’ [...]  

§ 8”
2’ [...] tablet. Not Finished. When Šīlalluhi, [the Old Woman], 3’ [goes outside into the open country and] perform[s the Great Ritual. 4’ [This (is) a clean tablet.  
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i 2′–6′: The Luwian incantation in § 2′ shows no appreciable differences from the incantation introducing the taluppi-lump in CTH 761.1. Contrast substantially divergent incantations introducing the same object within the Puriyanni tradition (CTH 758.1, §§ 8′–9′, CTH 758.2.4, § 3′, CTH 758.3.2, § 5′).

i 7′: The Luwian word /tsuwan(i)-/ ‘dog’ is securely attested in Hieroglyphic transmission. Its attestation in CTH 760.2 is uncertain, because the parallel version KUB 35.29+ i 5′ (CTH 761.3.5.b, § 2′) shows the unexpected spelling […]-w-a-a-n-i-iš. As an alternative, one can propose that […]-zu-ú-wa-ni-i-iš (sic!) in our passage represents a fragmentary adjective with the possessive suffix /-wan(ni)-/ (Elisabeth Rieken, CTH 761.3.2.c

Table of Manuscripts
A KBo 22.143 Bo 69/978

Transmission and Research History
This ruled fragment contains a portion of column one adjacent to the upper edge of the tablet. It was found in Temple I and shows a New Script ductus (see Fig. 2.20). A further indirect join with KBo 30.190 (CTH 761.3.2.a) is fairly likely. The fragment was published in transliteration firstly in Starke 1985, 101–2, where it was already attributed to the Great Ritual, and most recently in Groddek 2008, 136–37. The alleged

Transliteration

§ 1
Obv. i
A i 1 […]x.TUR-ma-za nam-ma pär-ku-in ta-[u-up-pi-in]
A i 2 […]x kar-aš-ša da-a-i na-an-ša-an [A-NA EN SISKUR]
A i 3 [A-NA 5]AG.DU-ŠU RA-MA-NI-ŠU-ia [hu-u-[ma-an-it]
A i 4 [an-da t]a-ma-aš-ke-ez-zi [hu-uk-ki-iš-k]e-ez-zi-ma kiš-an]

§ 2
A i 5 [za-ú-i-ia-aš] ú-i-ši-ta ḫa-la-a-li-[iš ta-lu-up-pi-iš]
A i 6 [a-ri-im-mi-ia-a]š-ta ku-ra-at-[iš kar-š[a-am-mi-iš]
A i 7 [ḥar-ri-ia-aš-t]a ḫa-gul-lu-uš-[t[a-an-ni kar-ša-am-mi-iš]
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pers. comm.). If, however, zu-ū-wa-ni-i-iš does mean ‘dog’, its behavior is probably compared to the act prescribed for the ritual patron in the following clause.

i 9–10: See the discussion under KUB 35.29+ i 6’–8’ (CTH 761.3.5.b, § 2’).

iv 2’–3’: For a different restoration of the gaps, implying shorter lines, see Starke 1985, 97 (followed in Waal 2015, 522).

iv 3’: For the restoration of the reference to the ‘open country’, see KBo 70.54 (CTH 761.3.4). The emphasis on the performance in the open country represents the defining feature of CTH 761.3.

vertical direct join KBo 22.143 + KUB 35.28, offered in Sasseville 2020b, 114–15, turns out to be physically impossible (see under CTH 761.3.2.b).

Contents

§§ 1–2 Old Woman’s pressing the taluppi-lump and karaš-grain against the ritual patron’s body, with its Luwian incantation

Since a taluppi-rite is present in all the varieties of CTH 761, it does not seem possible to assign this fragment to any specific version of the Great Ritual, beyond stating certain similarities to CTH 761.4.3 (q.v.).

Translation

§ 1

Obv. i

1–2 [...] takes back [...] the pure tal[uppi]-lump [...] and the karaš-grain.

2–4 She [p]resses it on the [h]ead and all the body (parts) [of the ritual patron]

4 and she conju[res thus]:

§ 2

5 "[Here] (has) appeared the pur[e taluppi]-lump] .

6 It (has been) sepa[rated] from the [raised] cut-off piece,

7 [it (has been) separated from the millstone] (and) the roll[ing tool].
Great Ritual, 3rd group (CTH 761)

A i 8 [na-a-wa-aš-ta ḫaṛ]-ri i-ti na-a-w[a-aš-ta Gīgul-lu-uš-ta-an-ni]
A i 9 [i-ti na-a-wa-aš-ta an-t]a ’ku’-ū-ra-[at-ni i-ti ...]

Commentary

i 4: The form [t]a-ma-aš-ke-ez-zi ‘presses’ contrasts with Hitt. tamašzi and appiškezzi, attested in identical functions and parallel contexts in CTH 761.1 and CTH 761.2 re-

CTH 761.3.3

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 29.12 169/w

Transmission and Research History

This tiny New Script fragment was found in Building A of Büyükkale. It partially preserves the final section of column four, including the colophon. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 161 as part of the "third ritual". An edition of the colophon can be found in Waal 2015, 521.

Transliteration

§ 1’
A:1’ [...] x x [...] 
A:2’ [nu pé-ra-an kat-t]a ši-pa-a[n-ti me-ma-i-ma ki-iš-ša-an]

§ 2’
A:3’ [o o o o o]-zi ḫu-li-ia-[an-zi a-da-am-mi-in-zi] 
A:4’ [ū-wa-am]-mi-in-zi a-ni-ia-a[n-ti-in-zi ...] 
A:5’ [a-ša-a]n-du nu [...] me-ma-i]

§ 3’
A:6’ [DUB].77.KAM Ū-UL QA-TI [ma-a-an ’Ši-la-al-lu-ḫi-iš MUNUSŠU.GI] 
A:7’ [a-ra]-aḥ-zā gi-im-[ri pa-iz-zi nu GAL-li a-ni-u-ur] 
A:8’ [a-ni-i]a-az-[i]
[It will not] go (back to) [the millstone], it will not go (back) to the rolling tool, [it will not go (back) to] the cut-off piece ...]."

spectively, but might be comparable to KBo 48.181 r.col. 'da-a'-ma-a-[š-ke-ez-zi] (CTH 761.4.3).

Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Libation, with its Luwian incantation inviting “the violent ones” to eat and drink
§ 3′ Colophon

The attribution of this fragment to CTH 761.3 is made based on the reference to a performance in the open country preserved in the colophon.

Translation

§ 1′
1′ [...] 2′ [She] liba[tes dow]n [in front (of them) and speaks thus]:

§ 2′
3′–5′ "May the [...] violen[t ones b]e [eating, drink]ing, (and) treate[d ...]". 5′ [...] she says ...].

§ 3′
6′ 7th [tablet]. Not finished. [When Šilalluhi, the Old Woman], 7′–8′ [goes out]side into the open count[ry and perfor]ms [the Great Ritual].
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Commentary

1': Starke 1985, 161 reads [...]x-āš-t[a]. Yet, the horizontal could also belong to the same sign as the traces immediately before it. The reading TA cannot be confirmed either.

2': Restored after KUB 35.15 iii 10 (CTH 761.2.5).

3’–5’: Restored after KUB 35.15 iii 11–13 (CTH 761.2.5) and KUB 35.16 (+) KUB 35.14 iv 12’–1” (CTH 760.3.b). For the translation of /xulija-/, see the commentary to KBo 9.141 iv 5’ (CTH 761.2.4). The participle [ū-wa-am]-mi-in-zi ‘drinking’ is restored after ‘eating’ in view of the mention of both bread and beer as the relevant offerings in a parallel version of the same rite (KUB 35.15 iii 7–10) and taking into consideration the Luwian collocation/adammis uwammis/ ‘eating (and) drinking’ attested in hieroglyphic transmission (KULULU 2 § 3).

CTH 761.3.4

Table of Manuscripts

| A | KBo 70.54 | EBo 48 |

Transmission and Research History

This tiny fragment of a New Script tablet contains parts of what are probably columns one and four, including the colophon. The exact find spot of the tablet is unknown. This is the first edition of the fragment. Its connection to the Kuwattalla tradition was proposed by Fatma Kaynar (see S. Košak, hethiter.net/: hetkonk (v. 1.992) ad locum).

Transliteration

§ 1
Obv.
A obv. 1 [...]r[a²-a
A obv. 2 [...]x
A obv. 3 [...]x [...]x-an kat-t[a [...]
A obv. 4 [...]x' [...]ma' x[...
A obv. 5 [...] 'an²r-da w[a²-...
A obv. 6 [...] x x x [...]
A obv. 7 [...] x x [...]
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6′–8′: The colophon indicates that the ritual is to be performed in the open country single-handedly. Since the other available colophons of the Kuwattalla tradition mention either the tandem of Kuwattalla and Šilalluši or Šilalluši alone in connection with the open country, the restoration of Šilalluši’s name in the lacuna represents the best available option.

6′: Waal 2015, 521 suggests the reading 8′ for the tablet number. Although the traces could match such a reading, it is impossible to be certain (see also Starke 1985, 161 fn. 85, who hesitates between the readings 8 and 9).

Contents

§ 1 Fragmentary Hittite passage
§ 2 Colophon

The attribution of this fragment to CTH 761.3 is based on the reconstruction of its colophon as close to that of CTH 761.3.3. Note the partial preservation of the word for ‘open country’.

Translation

§ 1

Obv.
1–2 […]
3 […] down […]
4 […]
5–7 […]
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Rev. 1’] [DUB.X.KAM Ü-UL QA-TI ma-a-an] ʾṭī-laš-[al-lu-ḥi-ši]
A rev. 3’ [a-ni-ia-az-zi ki-i pār-ku-ši] tūp-pī

Commentary

Rev. 1’–3’: This colophon appears to represent a shortened version of KUB 35.28 iv 2’–4’ (CTH 761.3.2.b, § 8”).

CTH 761.3.5.a

Transliteration

§ 1’
A:1’ [nam-ma-an-ši] ʾpa-ra-a [e-ep-zi na-aš-ta EN SISKUR]
A:2’ [ŠA UDU ʾšši-ša-šši] a[n da a-la-ap-pa-aḫ-ḫši]
A:3’ [MINUSGU].ʾgaš-ša-anša-an ʾḫu-u-uk-zi

§ 2’
A:4’ [a-aḫ]-ra-an wa-aḫ-ra-a[n tap-pa-a-at-ta ta-a-pa-ru]
A:5’ [Ia-ta-ri-ia]-ma-an [ḫi-i-ru-šun ma-a-ia-aš-išši-in EME-in]
§ 2′

Rev.
1′ [... th tablet. Not finished. When] Šila[llu hi],
2′–3′ [the Old Woman, performs] the Great Ritual outside in the open country.
3′ [This (is) a clean] tablet.

Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Ritual patron’s spitting into the mouth of an animal substitute, with its Luwian incantation
§ 3′ Driving the animal substitute to a gatehouse

The fragment displays similarities to the parallel passage KUB 35.43+ ii 24–35 (CTH 761.3.8, §§ 10″–12″). For minor differences between the two passages, see the commentary. Although it is likely that KBo 51.220 (CTH 761.3.5.a) and KUB 35.29+ (CTH 761.3.5.b) belong to the same tablet series, their relative order cannot be established with certainty, because manipulations with various animal substitutes may occur more than once in the course of the same ritual within the Kuwattalla tradition. In any case, the mention of a gatehouse, a typical attribute of the outdoor performance, is conducive to assigning the fragment to CTH 761.3.

Translation

§ 1′
1′ [Then, she holds it] toward [him, so that the ritual patron]
2′ [spits] into [the sheep’s m]outh.
3′ [The Old Woman] [conjures thus] in Luwian:

§ 2′
4′ “[He spat (out) w]oe (and) pai[n, (namely) judgment],
5′ [c]urse, [perjury, the tongue of the multitudes].”
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§ 3′

A:6′ ‘nu’-za MUNUSŠU.GI 1 [NINDA.GUR₄ RA KU₇ 1 DU₅ KU-UB KAŠ-ia da-a-i]
A:7′ nam-ma-kān UDU paₐ-ra[a-ḫi-ram-ni pé-en-na-i]
A:8′ ‘ŠA₂ GI A-NA GI[ZA.LAM.GAR₄ ka-it hid-lam-mar pé-ra-an]
A:9′ [o] x x x […]

Commentary

2′: Contrast the phonetic spelling [iš-ši-ši] ‘in its mouth’, apparently reflecting the misunderstanding of the archaic possessive pronoun in the course of scribal transmission, with KAXU-i in KUB 35.43+ ii 27 (CTH 761.3.8, § 10′).

CTH 761.3.5.b

Table of Manuscripts

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>KUB 35.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>+ KBo 52.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₃</td>
<td>(+) KUB 35.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmission and Research History

The fragments were found in Temple I and display a New Script ductus (see Klinger 1996, 38, fn. 23). The fragments A₁ and A₃ were published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 97–98 and 190 as belonging to the Great Ritual and an unspecified “Old Woman” ritual respectively. As for A₂, this is its first edition. The direct join A₁ + A₃ was made by Jared Miller, while Laura Puértolas Rubio and Ilya Yakubovich are responsible for the indirect join A₂ (+) A₃ (see Konkordanz sub KUB 35.29). CTH 761.3.5.b overlaps with KUB 35.28 (CTH 761.3.2.b). It shows the same scribal hand (see Fig. 2.21) as KBo 51.220 (CTH 761.3.5.a) and KBo 29.16 (CTH 761.3.5.c). The

Transliteration

§ 1′

Left column

A₁ l.col. 1′ [hi-ru-ta-aš-ši-iš ta-pa-a-ru-wa-aš-ši-iš ta-ta-ta-[a-am-na-aš-ši-iš]
A₁ l.col. 2′ [MU.KAM-iš ad-du-wa-li-iš ITIL.KAM-iš a]d-du-wa-li-iš
A₁ l.col. 3′ [wa-aš-pa-an-ta-aš-ši-in-zi e-e]-wa-an-zi
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§ 3’
6’ The Old Woman [takes] one [sweet loaf of bread and one jug of beer].
7’ Then, [she drives] the sheep to [the gatehouse],
8’ [which gatehouse (is) before] the reed [huts].
9’ [...] 

3’: So far, this is the only known spelling of /luwili/ ‘in Luwian’ with the sign WI₅, see CHD L–N, 73b.

joined fragments A₁ to A₃ contain parts of left and right columns and a portion of the intercolumnium.

Contents

§ 1’ Luwian incantation for untying the effects of impurity
§ 2’ Luwian incantation mentioning a dog(?) and the ritual patron’s spitting out the miasma
§§ 3’–4’ Ritual waving on the taluppi-lump and then ritual patron’s spitting on it, with its Luwian incantation
§ 5’ Dispensing with the taluppi-lump(?)
§§ 6’–8’ Matching the limbs of an animal substitute and those of the ritual patron

The text of CTH 761.3.5.b, §§ 1’–3’ closely matches KUB 35.28 i (CTH 761.3.2.b), while KBo 51.220 (CTH 761.3.5.a) belongs to the same tablet series. Both arguments support assigning the joined piece under discussion to CTH 761.3.

Translation

§ 1’
Left column
1’ “[the tongue) of perjury, judgment, cu]rs[e],
2’ [bad year, b]ad [month],
3’ [the in]terior[s] [of the shrouds],
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Great Ritual, 3rd group (CTH 761)

A₁ l.col. 4’ [ma-ia-aš-ši-iš EME]-iš

§ 2’
A₁ l.col. 5’ [...] zu-w]a-a-an-ni-iš wa-ar-ḫi-i-ta-ti-iš
A₁ l.col. 6’ [...]-i-ia-ni-in ša-a-i] ma-al-ḫa-as-ša-(aš)-ši-iš-pa EN-aš
A₁ l.col. 7’ [tap-pa-ad-du ta-a-pa-ru ta-ta-ri-i]a-am-ma-an ḫi-ru-ū-un {x]
A₁ l.col. 8’ [ma-a-ia-aš-ši-in EME]-in

§ 3’
A₁ l.col. 9’ [na-aš-ta MENŠU.GI is-na-a-aš] pár-ku-in ta-lu-up-pí-in
A₁₋₂ l.col. 10’ [A-NA EN SÍSKUR še-er ar-ḫa] wa-aḫ-nu-zì nam-ma-an-ši-ša-an
A₁₋₂ l.col. 11’ [kat-ta e ep-zì nu-uš-ša-an] EN SÍSKUR kat-ta al-la-pa-aḫ-ḫī
A₁₋₂ l.col. 12’ [MENŠU.GI-ma lu-ū-i-li ki-ši-š]a-an ḫu-u-uk-zi

§ 4’
A₁₋₂ l.col. 13’ [aḫ-ra-an wa-aḫ-ra-an tap-pa-at-t]a ta-pa-a-ru
A₁₋₂ l.col. 14’ [ta-ta-ri-ia-am-ma-an ḫi-ru-ū-u]n ma-a-ia-šš-si-in EME-in

§ 5’
A₁ l.col. 15’ [...]x pár-ku’-i-in [...]
4′  [the tongue of the multitudes]!

§ 2′
5′–6′  [...] the warhîdant-[d]og [releases ...].
6′–7′  [May] the ritual patron [spit (out) judgment, curse, perjury, the tongue of the multitudes]!

§ 3′
9′–10′  [The Old Woman] waves the pure taluppi-lump [of dough over the ritual patron].
10′–11′  Then, [she holds] it [down] toward him,
11′  [so that] the ritual patron spits down [on (it)].
12′  [The Old Woman] conjures [th]us [in Luwian]:

§ 4′
13′  "He [spat (out) woe (and) pain], (namely) judgment,
14′  curse, perjury, the tongue of the multitudes."

§ 5′
15′  [...] the pure [...].

§ 6″
Right column
1′  "[...] decontaminates [...].
2′  [...] decontaminates [...].
3′–4′  [...] [...].
5′–6′  [the throat decontaminates] the throat [...].

§ 7″
7′  The heart, the heart, the liver ditto the [live]r.
8′  The colored kidney ditto the colored kidney.
9′  The [bel]ly ditto the belly.
10′  The šargāt-body parts ditto the šargāt-body parts.
11′  The uwašuwa-body part, the uwašuwa-body part,
12′  alan[a]- decontaminates [...].

§ 8″
13′  [...] ditto [...].
14′  [...] decontaminates [...].
15′–16′  [...] [...].
17′  [...] decontaminates [...]"
Commentary

l.col. 1–4': Restored after KUB 35.28 i 2’–6’ (CTH 761.3.2.b, § 2’). According to the general sense of the reconstructed incantation, the miasma listed here are conjured not to bind the ritual patron.

l.col. 5': For the Luwian word /tsuwan(i)-/ ‘dog’, see the commentary to KUB 35.28 i 7' (CTH 761.3.2.b). For the Luwian word /warxidant(i)-/, of unknown meaning, see HEG W–Z, 325.

l.col. 6’–8': While spitting out the miasma is a commonplace in the Kuwattalla tradition, a special formula prescribing such an act for the ritual patron appears to be limited to CTH 761.3, while other versions merely report this act (sometimes several times).

l.col. 9’–12': While waving the taluppi-lump constitutes part of its rite in the Puriyanni tradition (see for example CTH 758.1, § 7″), the rituals of the Kuwattalla tradition typically prescribe the rotation of various implements immediately before the spitting rite, which in turn does not seem to play any role in the rituals attributed to Puriyanni.

l.col. 10': The reading nam-ma-an-ši-ša-an was first suggested in Kammenhuber 1985, 80 contra Starke 1985, 98, who reads nam-ma DINGIR-LIM-⸢ša⸣-an.

CTH 761.3.5.c

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 29.16 469/z

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment, found in the area of Temple I, contains the lower right part of a tablet, with a well-preserved right edge. The fragment preserves 17 lines of column two and only one sign of column three. The surface of the tablet is badly worn away. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 196–97 as belonging to an unspecified “Old Woman” ritual. The ductus of the fragment suggests that it belongs to the same scribal hand as other fragments grouped under CTH 761.3.5 (see Fig. 2.21), and nothing contradicts the assumption that it is also the same tablet series, although the poor state of the tablet’s preservation invites caution.
**Lcol. 13′–14′:** Restored after KBo 29.3+ iii 24′–25′ (CTH 760.2). Presumably, ‘woe (and) pain’ represent the symptoms of the patient’s condition, while the other nouns in the same sentence refer to its probable supernatural causes. Contrast § 2′ above, where only causes but not symptoms receive a mention. A common innovation of all the versions of the Great Ritual other than CTH 761.1 is the omission of /tappatta/ at the end of this clause. See KUB 35.21 rev. 7′–8′ (CTH 761.1.d, § 11′′) where the parallel passage is organized as two clauses, which is also the case in the Tunnawiya tradition.

**r.col. 1′–6′:** The proposed segmentation of § 6″ is approximate and follows tablet lines rather than clauses. One can assume that the structure of § 6″ is identical to that of the better-preserved § 7″—that is, it consists of the list of matching body parts that purify each other. Curiously, none of the body parts attested in these two paragraphs find counterparts in the parallel lists belonging to other fragments of the Kuwattalla tradition. For /xallinai/ ‘decontaminates’, see the commentary to KUB 35.24+ obv. 11′ (CTH 761.1.c).

**r.col. 9′:** See CHD Š, 253–54 for Hitt. šarḫuwant- ‘belly’ (with previous bibliography).

**r.col. 10′:** The body part UZU šar-ga-a-t[a] is possibly related to the Glossenkeil word šar-ga-ša-am-mi-iš indicating an unfavorable disposition (CHD Š, 266b). We are grateful to Norbert Oettinger for this suggestion. See, however, García-Ramón 2019 for an alternative set of potential cognates of šar-ga-ša-am-mi-iš.

---

**Contents**

§§ 1′–2′ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing a rite, with its Luwian incantation
§ 3′ Offering of bread and a shank, with its Luwian incantation
§ 4′ Dedication of a bread offering by the ritual patron, with its Luwian incantation
§ 5′ Unclear

The unique reference to the ritual patron as /warann(i)-/ ‘speaker’ may suggest that the fragment reflects a specific part of the ritual where he addresses the gods.
Transliteration

§ 1
Obv. ii7
A ii7 1’ ...x'-ša'[...] x [...]x-un
A ii7 2’ [...x nu me-ma'-i

§ 2
A ii7 3’ [...] wa-n][a]-'ti-ia-ti'[ia] šar-ri ma-am-ma-al-šu'-un-ni
A ii7 4’ [...]-wa-na-tyia-ti-ia šar-ri
A ii7 5’ [ma-am-ma-a]šu-un-ni

§ 3
A ii7 6’ [nam]-ma 1 NINDA.GUR,RA pár-ši-ia še-ra-aš-ša-an\textsuperscript{1} wa-al-la-aš
A ii7 7’ [ha-aš]-ta-i da-a-i nu PA-NI DINGIR-LIM da-a-i\textsuperscript{2} ma me-ma-i
A ii7 8’ [kal-d]u-ni-iš ku-wa-ti'-in i'-šar-wa-ia ha-aš-ta-i
A ii7 9’ [ut'-ra?] i-šar-ú'a-[ia] 'a-ša-ad-du wa-ra-ani-iš 'ma-aš'-ša-an-n[a-an-za]
A ii7 10’ [pár-ta-an 2-an 'i-šar-ú'-i'-li-ia-an tar-pa-an-du
A ii7 11’ [ma-aš-ša]-ni-in-zi

§ 4
A ii7 12’ [n]u 'nam'-ma 1 NINDA.GUR,RA tar-na-aš pár-ši-ia še-ra-aš-ša-an
A ii7 13’ [k]i'-ši-ši-ra-an' da-a-i na-at PA-NI DINGIR-LIM 'da-a-i'
A ii7 14’\textsuperscript{3} ma me-ma-i 'ku-wa-a-ri' la-al-la-at-ta x[...]
A ii7 15’ [...]x 'wa-ra-an-ni-iš 2\textsuperscript{2}-ša' iš-ša-ri-iš a-x[...]
A ii7 16’ (traces) [...] a[n-']ra-un-ma-ḫu'-t[a-ti ...]
A ii7 17’ (traces) \textsuperscript{5} ma me-ma-i 'ku-wa-a-ri' la-al-la-at-ta x[...]
End of col. ii7

§ 5
Rev. iii7
A iii7 1’ [...]-ša

Commentary

ii7 3’–4’: For /wanadijadi(ja)/ 'female genitalia', see the hieroglyphic curse formula KARKAMĬŠ A11c §§ 26–29 (Hawkins 2000, I: 104). The present context, however, is almost certainly not a curse formula, so it seems reasonable to assume that two different objects are broken above the genitalia of the ritual patron’s wife, perhaps as part of a fertility rite.

ii7 6’: For the use of a shank in rites involving the ritual patron’s wife, see DBH 46/2.33 (CTH 761.2.1.b). The fact that both KBo 29.16 and DBH 46/2.33 belong to the tablet.
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Translation

§ 1′

Obv. ii

1′  [...]  
2′  [...] and she says:

§ 2′

3′  "We are breaking [...] above [her genitalia.  
4′ – 5′  We are [break]ing [...] above her genitalia."

§ 3′

6′  [Th]en she crumbles one thick bread,  
6′ – 7′  she puts the shankbone on top (of it) and (then) places (them) before the deity.  
7′  The Old Woman says:  
8′  "As the [shankbone is] truly a bone,  
9′ – 10′  may the speaker say [the words] truly [be]fore the gods!  
10′ – 11′  May the [gods return] the justice twofold!"

§ 4′

12′  She crumbles one more thick bread of a tarna-measure,  
12′ – 13′  he places (his) [hand] on (it) and (then) she places it before the deity.  
14′ – 15′  The Old Woman says: "If the speaker took [...],  
15′ – 16′  [May] the hand [...] twice [...] with virility [...]"  
17′  The Old Woman [...]  
End of col. ii

§ 5′

Rev. iii

1′  [...]  

series featuring the male ritual patron (EN SÍSKUR / BE-EL SÍSKUR) undermines the hypothesis of a special ritual for a female patient.

ii 8′: Note the use of ḫa-aš-ta-i 'bone', apparently a Hittite loanword, instead of the expected Luwian lexeme ḫa-aš-ša. According to Starke (1990, 121 fn. 356), this could be a mistake based on the spelling ḫa-aš-TA for ḫa-aš-ŠA, as the parallel erroneous spelling [m]a-aš-ša(TA)-ni-in-zi in line 11′ seems to indicate (see below ad locum). For this last reading, see the commentary below). The interpretation of /kaldunn(i)-/
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as 'shank' was suggested in Poetto 1983, 38, but the present context rather calls for the more specific meaning 'shankbone'.

ii? 9: The noun /warann(i)-/ (lit. 'speaker') is the derivational base of the noun /ni-warann(i)-/ 'child' (lit. 'one unable to speak') (Sasseville 2020c, 329). Judging by the preceding context, it appears that the speaker is to be identified here with the ritual patron, not with his wife (see the reference to 'virility' in the following paragraph).

ii? 10: The verb /tarpa-/ 'to provide as substitute, give in return' is presumably derived from *tarpa- 'substitution, compensation' and represents the base of Luw. /tarpasa-/ 'substitute'. For the derivation of /isarwili(ja)-/ 'justice' from /isarwil(i)-/ 'right', see for example German Gerechtigkeit 'justice' vs. recht 'right'. We are thankful to H. Craig Melchert for a thorough discussion of this difficult clause and the whole incantation it belongs to (pers. comm.).

CTH 761.3.6

Table of Manuscripts
A KUB 35.44 Bo 7383

Transmission and Research History

The find spot of this fragment is unknown, while its ductus rather seems compatible with a New Script attribution because of its "late" AM sign. Its preserved part is limited to a portion of one column, probably belonging to a double-columned tablet. It was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 148–49 as part of the “third ritual”. The claim that the fragment belongs to column two in Starke 1990 (see, for instance, p. 34

Transliteration

§ 1


§ 2’

A:6’ [wa-ra-pa-al-li-iš Tar-h]u-un-za ma-am-m[a-an-na-tar]
ii? 11: Starke (1985, 196) reads \([m]a-aš-ša\)(TA)-ni-in-zi. Although the hand copy of the tablet supports the TA sign, the collation of the original tablet shows that the first small vertical in it represents an erased trace.

ii? 14′–16′: The general sense of this incantation can be restored as follows: as a compensation for the presented thick bread, the gods are expected to endow the ritual patron’s hands with double strength. Although the ritual patron is addressed as /warann(i)-/ ‘speaker’ (perhaps more specifically ‘supplicant’), it is the Old Woman who does the actual speaking. It is possible, although not certain, that the speech of the ritual patron, perhaps in the form of a short prayer, preceded the preserved fragment within the text of the ritual. As a precedent for the ritual patron directly addressing the gods, one can compare the Zarpiya ritual (KUB 9.31 ii 19–34).

fn. 32 and p. 136) is based on the problematic assumption that this is a duplicate of KBo 29.55+ (CTH 761.3.8).

Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Dedicating an animal substitute, with its Luwian incantation
§ 3′ Unclear

The fragment shows general overlap with KUB 35.43+ ii 31–40 (CTH 761.3.8, §§ 12′–13′) and is therefore provisionally classified under CTH 761.3, although its attribution to CTH 761.4 remains a viable alternative. In any case, CTH 761.3.6 appears to be more archaic than CTH 761.3.8.

Translation

§ 1′
1′ […]
2′–3′ […] the Old Woman holds [do]wn [the sweet loaf of bread …]
3′ […].
4′ She consecrates [it with a ju]g of beer
5′ and she [conjur]es [thus]:

§ 2′
6′ “[Warlike Tarḫ]unt, loo[k] at …
Great Ritual, 3rd group (CTH 761)

§ 3

A:7’ [wa-ia-a-an-ti ša-ak-nu]-wa-a-an-ti ma-a-[l-ḫa-āš-ša-āš-ši-š]-ma-tar EN-aš]
A:8’ [a-pa-āš-ša-an-za wa-a-š]-i-na-an-za a-an-n[u-un-na-an-za]
A:9’ [ma-am-ma-na-ad-du ḫu-i-du]-un-na-a-ti a[n-na-ru-um-ma-ḫ]-ti-ti]
A:10’ [...] x [...] a[a]-ar-[r]a-a-[ia-ti] a-[uš-ša-a-ti]
A:11’ [...] a-ap-[pa]-ra-an-t[ar-ti a-a-ra-a-ti]

Commentary

2’–3’: Contrast KUB 35.43+ ii 31–35 (CTH 761.3.8, § 12”), where the bread loaf is held over the sheep’s head.

CTH 761.3.7

Table of Manuscripts

A HFAC 18 NBC 1879

Transmission and Research History

The precise find spot of the fragment is unknown; there are not enough characteristic signs to establish its Middle Script attribution. The preserved part is limited to a fragment of one column, probably belonging to a double-columned tablet. The fragment is published in transliteration in Starke 1990, 596. The attribution of the fragment to

Transliteration

§ 1

A:1’ [ta-ta-ri-ia-am-ma-an ḫi-i-ru¬]-ṭu”-[un ma-a-ia-aš-ši-in EME-in]
A:2’ [...] MANUS.GI 1 NINDA.GUR[RA KU], 1 DOG[KU-U]-U[BU[KAŠ-ia da-ar-ia]
A:3’ [...] pa-ra-a ḫi-lam-ni pé-e]ni-na-i [...]
7’ (this) [fat]ty [animal]!
7’-9’ [May] the ri[tual patron look at] his own [b]ody (and) so[ul]
9’ with [li]fe, [v]irility,
10’ [...], [l]o[n]g [years]
11’ [...], future [time]!”

§ 3’
12’ [...]
13’ [...]
14’ [...]
15’ [...]

9’: The reconstructed [hu-ı-du]-un-’na-a-ti’ apparently represents an instrumental case form derived from the archaic heteroclitic noun /x*widthummar/* ‘life’. Contrast CTH 761.3.8, § 13” (KUB 35.43+ ii 38), where the innovative stem /x*widthalayid/* is used in its place.

column two in Starke 1990, 595–96 appears to be based on the exaggerated claim by Beckman and Hoffner (1985, 3) that this is a duplicate of KBo 29.55+ (CTH 761.3.8).

Contents

§ 1’ Dedicating an animal substitute

The content of the fragment shows close overlap with KUB 35.44 (CTH 761.3.6), but the line division is clearly different. The contextual similarities to CTH 761.3.8 are more distant. The reference to a gatehouse prompts assigning this fragment to CTH 761.3.

Translation

§ 1’ "[curse, per]j[ury, the tongue of the multitudes]."
1’ [... the Old Woman takes one sweet loaf of bread and one] j[ug of beer].
2’ [... , she [d]rives [... to the gatehouse],
3’ [...]
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A:4′ [... ku]-r it’ hi-lam-ma[ŋ r pé-ra-an]
A:5′ [... MUNUS[GG]I NINDA.GUR.kU[ ...]
A:6′ [... ka]t-ta e-el[p-zi]
A:7′ [... IS- diferença ku-UB KAS ši-[pa-an-ti]
A:8′ [nu ki-šaš-an] te-ez-[zi]

Commentary

3′: The reconstruction ‘Then she drives the sheep to the gatehouse’ appears very likely on contextual grounds, but it is not easy to squeeze all the required signs into the available space.

3′–4′: The reconstruction ‘which gatehouse is before the reed huts’ is also contextually very likely, but again one does not seem to have enough space to accommodate it.

6′: The preposition kat-ta ‘down’ represents a common feature of this fragment and KUB 35.44 (CTH 761.3.6), whereas KBo 29.55+ (CTH 761.3.8) has še-er ‘up, above’ in the comparable passage involving a white sheep. It is unclear whether this difference reflects a different version of the ritual or rites with a different animal substitute. In

CTH 761.3.8

Table of Manuscripts

| A₁ | KBo 29.55   | 522/u    |
| A₂ | + KUB 35.43 | Bo 2313 (+) Bo 9685 + Bo 3124 + Bo 4397 |
| A₃ | + KUB 35.56 | + Bo 10030 |

Transmission and Research History

The tablet shows typical features of the New Script and can be securely dated to the 13th century BCE (see Starke 1985, 142). Its available parts comprise a small fragment of column one and considerable portions of columns two and three. All three fragments are published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 71 (A₁), 143–47 (A₂) and 390 (A₃); the largest fragment A₂ played an important role the formulation of Starke’s hypothesis about the “third ritual”. The join between A₁ and A₂ is first reported in Kammenhuber 1986 (see Starke 1990, 596), while the join between A₁ and A₃ was determined by Alice Mouton and Ilya Yakubovich within the framework of the Luwili Project (see Fig. 2.22). The collation of the original fragments confirmed the direct join between A₁ and A₂. A₃ could not be physically installed in its expected spot because of the way the other fragments were pasted together, but the direct join between the
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3’-4’ [wh]ich gatehou[se] (is) [before ...].
5’-6’ [...] the Old Wom]an hol[ds do]wn the swe[et] loaf of bread.
7’ She con[secrates ... with the j]ug of beer
8’ [and] say[s thus]:

the latter case one can probably think of a contrastive rite involving a black sheep. For the contrastive use of šarā ‘up’ and katta ‘down’ in the context of animal sacrifices, see Kühne 1986, 94–96.

8’ Starke 1990, 596 suggests the reading KI instead of TE, which is less compatible with the traces on the photograph. The turn of phrase used here is again closer to the one preserved in KUB 35.44 (CTH 761.3.6) rather than the one attested in KBo 29.55+ (CTH 761.3.8). Since this is the last line of the paragraph (in view of the empty space underneath), we suspect that it might have remained in part empty; hence our suggested short restoration.

three fragments is highly plausible. Since A₁ was found in Temple I, the join revealed the provenance of the whole tablet. A large excerpt from A₂ was translated in Laboche 1959, 147–51, which represented a substantial step forward in the decipherment of the Luwian language. The text was partially edited in Kammenhuber 1986, 92–97; its content is discussed in detail in Marcuson 2016, 291–96.

Contents
§ 1’ Unclear
§ 2’ Fragmentary Luwian incantation addressed to deities
§ 3’ Unclear
§§ 4”–8” Listing potential sources of impurity and designating a sheep as ritual carrier
§§ 9”–10” Making rounds while repeating the conjuration of §§ 4”–8”
§ 10” Treating the sheep’s limbs one by one and waving the sheep over the ritual patron
§§ 10”–11” Ritual patron’s spitting into the sheep’s mouth, with its Luwian incantation
§§ 12”–13” At the gatehouse, dedicating the sheep to Warlike Tarḥunt, with its Luwian incantation
Great Ritual, 3rd group (CTH 761)

§ 14” Unclear

§ 15” Incantation for restoring the integrity of the ritual patron

§§ 16”–17” Transferring the control of impurity onto an animal substitute

§ 18” Matching the limbs of the animal substitute with those of the ritual patron

§§ 19”–21” Incantation for removing impurity from ritual patron’s limbs by means of the animal substitute’s acting as a ritual carrier

Transliteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 1’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv. i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 3’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 4’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 2’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 6’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 7’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 3’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 8’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₁ i 9’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 4’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obv. ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ ii 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ ii 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 5’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₂ ii 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ ii 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ ii 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 6’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₂ ii 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂ ii 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§§ 21”–22” Waving the piglet and then spitting on it from afar, with its Luwian incantation
§ 23” At the gatehouse, preparations for dedicating the piglet(?)

This tablet is by far the largest and best-preserved fragment of CTH 761.3. The setting of the ritual includes a gatehouse and reed huts, which illustrates an outdoor performance (see the colophon of CTH 761.3.1).

Translation

§ 1’
Obv. i
1’ “[…]
2’ […]
3’ […]
4’ […]

§ 2’
5’ […] deities
6’ […] paternal
7’ […] deities.

§ 3’
8’ […]
9’ […]

§ 4”
Obv. ii
1 “[Whether] (it be) anything of [bin]ding, whether (it be)
1–2 [anything] of smiti[n]g, [whether (it be)] anything of the dead,
3 [whether (it be)] anything of the [li]ving,

§ 5”
4 [whether (it be)] anything [p]ast (or) future,
5 [whether (it be)] (anything) of the mother (or) the father,
6 [whether (it be)] anything of the [bro]ther (or) the sister,

§ 6”
7 [whether] he saw something with (his) [e]yes,
7–8 (or) he [di]d something with (his) hands, whether he heard something with (his) ears,
9 (that of) [bin]ding, smiting,
A₂ ii 10 [na-nu-un-p]a za-aš pa-ra-ad-du a-ar-ra-az-za-(aš) ḫa-a-ū-i-iš
A₂ ii 11 [sa-ḫu-i-t]a-an-ta-an ū-i-ta-at-ta-an

§ 7"
A₂ ii 13 [har-ma-ḥa]-‘a’-ti za-ar-wa-ni-ia-ti ar-pu-wa-na-a-ti

§ 8"
A₂ ii 16 i-pa-la-a-ti-du-wa-an ḫu-‘i’-[n]u-wa-aḫ-ḥa a-du-ut-ta i-pa-la-a-ti-en
A₂ ii 17 la-at-ta i-šar-ū-i-la-t[i-p]a-du-wa-an ḫu-u-i-nu-wa-aḫ-ḥa

§ 9"
A₂ ii 19 nu-uš-ša-an MUNUSŠU.GI UDU BABBAR A-NA E[N SISKU]R an-da ap-pa-a-an-na
[na-aš]
A₂ ii 22 ḫu-uk-ki-iš-ke-ez-zi ma QA-TAM-MA-pāt ŠA UDU [UZU GURA]
A₂ ii 23 ḫu-u-ma-an QA-TAM-MA ir-ḫa-a-an-zi

§ 10"
A₂ ii 24 ‘I-NA 4’ KASKAL- Ni-ma GIM-an ir-ḫa-a-an-zi
A₂ ii 25 [nu ŠA UDU] UZU GURA ḫu-u-ma-an-da QA-TAM-MA i[r-ḫa]-a-iz-zi
A₂ ii 26 [nam-ma]-kān MUNUSŠU.GI UDU A-NA EN SISKUR še-er ḫa-a-nu-uz-zi
A₂ ii 28 [MUNUSŠU.GI]t-ma lu-ū-i-li(ZL) kiš-an ḫu-u-uk-zi[i]

§ 11"
A₂ ii 29 [a-ah-ra-a]n wa-aḫ-ra-an tap-pa-a-at-ta ta-a-pa-ru
A₂ ii 30 [t]a-ta-ar-ri-ia-am-ma-an ḫi-i-ru-ū-un ma-a-ia-(aš)-ši-in EME-in

§ 12"
A₂ ii 31 [nu-za] MUNUSŠU.GI 1 NINDA.GUR₄ RA KU₃ 1 DUG KU-UB KAŠ-ia da-a-i
A₂ ii 32 [nam-ma-kā]n UDU pa-ra-a ḫi-lam-ni pé-en-na-i šA Gí
A₂ ii 33 [A-NA GUR]ZA.LAM.GARHA ku-it ḫi-lam-mar pé-ra-an
A₂ ii 34 [nu-uš-ša-a]n MUNUSŠU.GI NINDA.GUR₄ RA KU₃ A-NA UDU A-NA SAG.DU šE-er e-e-p-zi
A₂ ii 35 [na-an-kā]n IS-TU DUG KU-UB KAŠ ši-ip-pa-an-ți ḫu-uk-zi-ma kiš-an
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10 [now], may this white sheep carry away
11 the [bo]nd (and) blow!

§ 7″
12 May it [take] it (and) carry it away with (its) four legs,
13 (its) [hea]d, (its) horned forehead,
14 (its) [snou]t, pupils of (its) eyes,
15 [hea]rt, liver, twelve limbs!

§ 8″
16 I have ma[d]e it run to his left,
16–17 so that it took his sinisterness. I have made it run to his right,
18 so that it took his evil [e]rror.”

§ 9″
19–20 The Old Woman holds the white sheep toward the [ritual] pa[tron] four
times in turn,
20 first to the [r]ight, afterward
21 to the left, afterward in front, afterwar[d] behind,
22 and (each time) she conjures exactly in the same way.
22–23 They treat every [limb] of the sheep one by one in the same way.

§ 10″
24 When they make the rounds for the fourth time,
25 she tr[e]ats all the limbs [of the she]ep one by one in the same way.
26 [Then], the Old Woman waves the sheep three times over the ritual patron.
27 [Then], she holds it toward him, so that the ritual patron spits into the
28 [sh]eep’s mouth.
29 [The Old Woma]n conjure[s] thus in Luwian:

§ 11″
29 “He spat (out) [wo]e (and) pain, (namely) judgment,
30 [c]urse, perjury, the tongue of the multitudes.”

§ 12″
31 The [O]ld Woman takes one sweet loaf of bread and one jug of beer.
32 [Then], she drives out the sheep to the gatehouse,
32–33 which gatehouse (is) before the reed huts.
34 The Old Woman holds the sweet loaf of bread over the head of the sheep,
35 she consecrates [it] with the jug of beer, and she conjures thus:
§ 13″
A₂ ii 36 [wa-ar-pa-al]-li-iš ṯ Tar-ḥu-un-za ma-am-[m]a-na-tar wa-ia-an-ti
A₂ ii 37 [ša-ak-nu-wa-an-t]i ma-al-ḥa-aš-ša-aš-ši-iš-pa-tar EN-ā a-pa-a-ša-an-za
wa-āš-ša-na-an-za
A₂ ii 40 [wa-aš-ša-ra-ḥi-ta-ti] a-ar-ra-a-ti uš-ša-a-ti

§ 14″
A₂ ii 41 [...] x [...] x x x [...] x...

§ 15″
Rev. iii
A₂ iii 1′ [...] x x x [...] x...
A₂ iii 2′ [...] 'la-a-la-ad-da’ da-a-ru-[š-ša mi-ša-an-za]
A₂ iii 3′ [ḥa-aš-ša ḫa-ḥal-za-ni-in] i-ū-na-ḥi-ša wa-a-'ra-na’-[ḥi-ša la-al-pi-in]
A₂ iii 4′ [ku-wa-an-na-ni-in ma-aš-ša-na-al-li-in KASKAL-a[n]

§ 16″
A₂ iii 5′ [...] [UZUÙ][Ḫ] hu-u-ma-an-da an-n[i-iš-ke-ezi-zi ṭu-uk-zė-ma kiš-an]
A₂ iii 6′ [na-a-ū-wa-te-ia-ta] ḫa-mar-ḥa-ti mu-u-wa-i na-a-ū-[wa-te-ia-ta]
A₂ iii 7′ [a-la-la-at-ta-t]i KLIN a-û-wa-te-ia-ta [ma-an-nu-ḥu-un-na-ti] KLIN
A₂ iii 8′ [na-a-ū-wa-te-ia-ta ]a-a-uu-wa-a-ša-an-za-(ti) ti-ti-[a-a-ti KLIN]
A₂ iii 10′ [UZU[U]R]² KLIN

§ 17″
A₂ iii 11′ [ḥa-mar-ḥa-ti-ti-ia-t]a za-aš mu-u-wa-i a-la-la-(at)-ta-[ti-ti-ia-t]a za-aš KLIN
A₂ iii 12′ [ma-an-na-ḥu-un-na-ti-ti-i] a-at KLIN ta-a-ū-wa-a-š[a-ti-ti]-ia-(ta)

§ 18″
A₂ iii 14′ [ḥa-mar-ḥi-iš ḫar-ma-ḥi-in ḫal]-li-i-na-i [a-la-la-at-ti-iš]
A₂ iii 15′ [a-la-la-at-ti-in KLIN m]a-an-aa-ḥu-w[a-ni-iš ma-an-n]a-ḥu-wa-an-ni-in
KLIN
A₂ iii 16′ [...] x [...] x...

§ 19″
A₂,₃ iii 18′ [...] du-ū-pa-na wa-al-z[a-am-mi-iš t[a-... ...]’i-li]-ni-iš
A₂,₃ iii 19′ [wa-aš-ši-na-aš-ši-iš ḫa-ar-ma-ḥa-aš]-iš-iš tar-p[a-a-ša-aš]
A₂,₃ iii 20′ [i-pa-la-a-ti-du-wa-an ḫu]-i-nu(MU)-u-wa-[ḥa-ḫa a-du-ut-ta]
A₂,₃ iii 21′ [i-pa-la-a-ti-en la-la-at-ta]
§ 13
36–37 "[Warl]ike Tarḫunt, look at (this) [fatty] animal!
37–38 [May] the ritual patron [look] at his own body with [l]ife, virility,
39 [future] time, health, divine
40 [favor], long years!"

§ 14
41 […]

§ 15
Rev. iii
1′ […]
2′ […] took (back his) sha[pe, flesh],
3′ [bone(s), join]t(s), mobility, spe[ch, eyelash],
4′ [eyebrow(-hair), di[jine path]!

§ 16
5′ [She] (ritually tr[eats] all the [li]mbs [and conjures thus]:
6′ “He [no] (longer) overcomes [it] with [his] head.
6′–7′ Ditto n[o] (longer overcomes) [it] with [his alalatt-body part].
7′ [D]itto no (longer overcomes) it [with] his [nose].
8′ [Ditto no (longer overcomes) it with] the pupi[ls] of [his e]yes.
9′–10′ Ditto [no (longer overcomes) it] with [his] heart, liver, twelve [limbs].

§ 17
11′ This one overcomes [i]t with [its head]. This one ditto (overcomes) [i]t [with its] alalatt-body part.
12′ (This one) ditto (overcomes) it with [its snout].
12′–13′ [Ditto] (overcomes) it [with the pupils] of [its] eyes, ditto [by (its) heart],
liver, twelve [lim]bs.

§ 18
14′ [The head decontaminates [the head. The alalatt-body par]t]
15′ [ditto the alalatt-body part. The s]nout[t] ditto [the no]se.
16′ […]

§ 19
17′ [Here, it decontaminates the ritua[l patr]on,
18′–19′ the subs[titute of (his) body (and his) hea]d, […] walz]-ed [for/in striking, …].
20′ I have m]ade [it r]un [to his left],
20′–21′ [so that it too]k [his sinisterness].
Commentary

i 5’–7’: This fragmentary divine list is likely a remainder of an incantation addressed to those gods. A better preserved although arguably shorter Luwian incantation of the same type is found in the Zarpiya Ritual (CTH 757, §§ 17, 20; Görke 2015).

ii 1–18: Several formulae of incantation find perfect counterparts in CTH 761.1. This represents one of the principal arguments for treating the free-standing version of the Great Ritual (CTH 761.1–3) as a coherent group, distinct from the other specimens of the Kuwattalla tradition.

ii 1–9: The closest parallel to this list of merisms, including binding and smiting, is found in KUB 32.81+ obv. 2’–6’ (CTH 761.1.b, § 2’). Note, however, that the gods are invited to remove the affliction in CTH 761.1, whereas here this task is entrusted to the animal substitute.
[I have made it run to his right],
so that it took [his evil terror].

§ 20"
May it take it (and) carry it away with (its) four legs,
([its] forehead), (its) snout, [the pupils] of (its) eyes,
(its) heart, liver, twelve limbs!

§ 21"
May it take (away from him) judgment, curse,
perjury, internal (or) external,
of the dead (or) the living, past
(or) future, of mountain-dwellers (or) desert-dwellers,
of an army (or) assembly!
They wave the piglet over the [ritual] patron.
[Then], he spits (on) it from afar. The Old Woman conjures [thus]:

§ 22"
"He spat (out) woe (and) pain, (namely) judgment, perjury,
curse, the tongue of the multitudes."

§ 23"
They carry [the piglet] out to the gatehouse,
which gatehouse is before the reed [hus].
The piglet which she has got, she gives a sweet loaf of bread [...] from afar.
End of col. iii

ii 9–11: The treatment of this passage in Carruba 1982b, 46–47 precedes the recognition of the paired miasma /saywidant(a)-/ ‘bond’ and /widatt(a)-/ ‘blow’. For additional paired derivatives from the same root, see the preceding footnote together with the commentary to CTH 761.1.b.

ii 10: For /para-/ ‘to carry away’, see Melchert 2016a, 203–6. The Luwian adjective /arratsa-/ is interpreted as ‘male’ on etymological grounds in Oettinger 2016, but no specific reference to rams is found anywhere else in the Kuwattalla tradition. In view of the specific mention of the white sheep below in § 9″, we assume that /arratsa-/ is the Luwian word for ‘white’. This interpretation has no implications for the etymology of /arratsa-/; we simply assume that the combinatorial evidence is stronger than the etymological one in this case. See also Melchert 2023 sub ārrazza- ‘white’. 
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ii 12: The spelling pa-ap-ra-ad-du-ut-ta here and [pa-a]p-ra-ad-du-ut-ta in iii 24' below implies the morphological analysis /pabrattu=○=tta/ 'May it carry (it away from him)' (see the commentary to CTH 761.2.3.a). Accordingly, we restore la-la-ad-du-ut-ta corresponding to /lalattu=○=tta/ 'may it take (it from him)’. For the zero expression of the pronominal clitic ‘it’ in both groups, see Rieken and Yakubovich forthcoming. In contrast, Starke (1985, 144) restores [la-la-i-d]u-ut-ta ‘it takes (it) from him’ on the basis of the parallel passages, which would imply, however, that an indicative verbal form is juxtaposed here with an imperative one. The complex la-la-ad-du-ut-ta in the tablet under discussion represents a late replacement of la-la-i-du-ut-ta, as argued in the final section of Appendix I.

ii 13: Or ‘its horn, its arpuwar’. It is not quite clear whether /tsarwanijadi/ is a form of a possessive adjective or a result of its secondary substantivization, although the former interpretation is morphologically more straightforward. In any event, see a form of the basic stem si-na-ti ‘with (its) horn’ in KUB 35.54 iii 11 (CTH 758.1, § 21’).

ii 19–30: These lines appear to represent an expanded version of KUB 35.21 rev. 6’–8’ (CTH 761.1.d, § 11’).

ii 32–33: The mention of the gatehouse and the reed huts, apparently having no counterpart in CTH 761.1, represents a link between the tablet under discussion and the colophon KBo 10.42 (CTH 761.3.1; see already Starke 1985, 135–36).

ii 36–40: This incantation is shortened vis-à-vis KUB 35.21 rev. 11’–14’ (CTH 761.1.d, § 13’), and the mention of the gods is omitted (see the commentary to § 6” above).

iii 2’–4’: The subject of this sentence is presumably the ritual patron. See in particular KUB 32.81+ obv. 9’–10’ (CTH 761.1.b, § 4’) and KUB 35.24+ rev. 8’–9’ (CTH 761.1.c, § 13’).

iii 5’–35’: The content of these lines closely resembles KUB 35.24+ obv. 5’–23’ (CTH 761.1.c, §§ 2’–7’), and both passages are used for mutual restoration.

CTH 761.3.9

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 60.73 Bo 69/460

Transmission and Research History

This small fragment, possibly written in the Middle Hittite ductus, was found in the Temple I complex. Its original position on the tablet remains unknown. The fragment was identified as part of a Hittite-Luwian ritual in Soysal 2016, 435. No edition of the fragment has been available until now.
iii 10': Kammenhuber (1986, 94) reads [\(\text{Ḫa}^{-}\text{ap-pí-ša-a-t}\)]. Yet, the traces visible on the tablet correspond better to the end of an A sign (for the plural ḪÁ), instead of a TI sign. Starke (1985, 146 fn. 22) also considers the reading TI very unlikely, but what he interprets as the end of a horizontal rather resembles the head of a vertical.

iii 11': The subject of this sentence is presumably the piglet, which acts as a substitute throughout the rest of the preserved part of the tablet (see § 21”). For the successive use of a living sheep and a living piglet in similar functions in the Tunnawiya tradition, see Hutter 1988, 34–39. As argued in Chapter 5, a similar succession is also found in the Maštigga tradition.

iii 14': Starke 1985, 146 reads [KI].MIN at the end of this line. However, the reading IŠ fits better the traces visible on the tablet, with a wedge which is very close to the first vertical.

iii 25': For the distributional difference between /alalatt(i)-/ and /arpwar/n-/, see the commentary to CTH 761.1.c obv. 8’.

iii 28’–32’: For an analysis of this list of merisms and its further parallels, see Mouton and Yakubovich 2019, 211–13.

iii 34': Spitting from afar presumably reflects the perceived uncleanliness of the piglet; contrast spitting in the sheep’s mouth in § 10” above. Since the pig is considered impure in Kizzuwadna (Mouton 2004a) but not in the Lower Land (Mouton 2006a, 260), this rite clearly reflects the Kizzuwadna influence on the Kuwattalla tradition. Unfortunately, it seems impossible to establish whether it was present in the original version of the Great Ritual or was added there at a later point.

iii 39’–40’: Contrast § 12” above, where one holds the bread loaf above the sheep’s head, and see the previous comment.

Contents

§ 1’ Fragmentary Luwian incantation
§ 2’ Hittite passage mentioning huts and the Old Woman
§ 3’ Unclear

The reference to huts constitutes the only reason the fragment under discussion is assigned to CTH 761.3.
Transliteration

§ 1′
A:1′ [...]-ta a-an’-x [...] 
A:2′ [...] ad-d]u-wa-a-li-in m[a-...

§ 2′
A:3′ [...]Š U aš-nu-zi nam-m [...] 
A:4′ [...]x GIŠZA.LAM,GAR HA nu x [...] 
A:5′ [...]x na-an-za MUNUSŠU.GI [...] 
A:6′ [...]x-an MUNUSŠU. ‘GI’ [...] 

§ 3′
A:7′ [...] x x x [...]
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§ 1′

1′ “[…]

2′ [... e]vil [...].”

§ 2′

3′ She takes care of [h]is […]. The[n, …]

4′ […] huts[…]

5′ […] The Old Woma[n …] him.

6′ The Old Woman […].

§ 3′

7′ […]
GREAT RITUAL, FRAGMENTS
CTH 761.4.1

Table of Manuscripts
A KBo 13.262 239/u

Transmission and Research History
This New Script fragment was found in secondary context in or near the Haus am Hang. Its geometry provides no clues regarding the part of the tablet it belongs to. The tablet is published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 194, where it is classified as part of an “Old Woman” ritual, and then in Torri and Barsacchi 2018, 296–97. For the list of secondary literature, see Torri and Barsacchi 2018, 297.

Transliteration

§ 1′
A:1′ [...](c)′A^3(=)x [...] 
A:2′ [...](c)wa-x x-‘in’(=)[…] 
A:3′ [...x ‘ta’[…] 
A:4′ [...in na-a-‘ú’-[wa …] 
A:5′ [...r]i-ia n[a-a]‘ú’-w[a …]

§ 2′
A:8′ [ta-a]t[a-‘ri’-ia-am-ma-na-[aš-ši-iš ḫi-i-ru-ta-aš-ši-iš] 
A:9′ [ma-a-ि]a-aš-ši-iš [EME-iš]

§ 3′
A:10′ [...x ‘ar’-ḫa du-wa-[ar-ni-iz-zi …]

§ 4′
A:11′ [ma-am-ma]-al-wa-at-[t]a ‘ta’[…] 
A:12′ [ḫi-ru-ú]-‘un ma-a-ia-aš-ši-[in EME-in]
Contents

§ 1′   Luwian incantation concerning the taluppi-lump
§ 2′   Luwian incantation for untying the effects of impurity
§§ 3′–4′ Breaking the symbols of evil (lost in the lacuna), with its Luwian incantation

The phraseology of §§ 1′–2′ clearly indicates that the fragment under discussion belongs to CTH 761, although further classification appears to be impossible. Contrast KBo 29.3+ iii 1′–19′ (CTH 760.2, §§ 14″–17″) for the incantations used in the parallel passage of CTH 760. The fragment’s place within the structure of the Great Ritual cannot be determined, since purification rites can take place at various points within the performance.

Translation

§ 1′
1′   “[…]
2′   […]
3′   […]
4′   […] n[ot …].
5′   […] n[ot …].

§ 2′
6′–9′ May [the evil hand, the evil tongue, (that) of judgment, (that) of curse, (that) of perjury, the tongue of the multitude] not bind the ritual patron!"

§ 3′
10′   […] brea[ks …]

§ 4′
11′   “[… broke […]
12′   [perju]ry, [the tongue of the] multitude.”
Commentary

1′–5′: There is little doubt that the incantation in this paragraph is similar to KUB 35.24+ obv. 39′–42′ (CTH 761.1.c, § 10′) and other instances of the presentation of the taluppi-lump within the Kuwattalla tradition, but the scarcity of signs preserved is not conducive to its restoration.

2′: Starke (1985, 194) and Torri and Barsacchi (2018, 297) read ŠI instead of WA. However, there are clearly two wedges before the vertical; hence our reading.

6′–9′: Restored after KUB 32.9(+o) obv. 7–10 (CTH 761.1.f, § 3) and related passages. This incantation suggests that the fragment under discussion belongs to a freestanding version of the Great Ritual. Contrast a different incantation preceding the act of breaking evil tongues and heads in KBo 29.3+ iii 9′–42′ (CTH 760.2).

CTH 761.4.2

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.46 Bo 4600 + Bo 8285

Transmission and Research History

These joined New Script fragments with unknown find spot are conducive to restoring a small part of one column, the location of which on the tablet cannot be determined. The two fragments were published as a join in KUB 35 and transliterated in Starke 1985, 159–60, where they were attributed to the "third ritual". The contention of Starke 1990, 596–97 regarding the additional direct join with KUB 9.36 is contradicted by the transparent paleographic difference between the two parts of the supposed join (see Fig. 2.14). The hypothesis that KUB 35.45, KUB 35.46 and KUB 35.47

Transliteration

§ 1′

Rev. iv
A iv 1′ [ni-i-ša-an ḫa-pi-ti EN] 'sISKUR-in’ ad-d[u-wa-li-iš EME-iš]
6': Starke (1985, 194) and Torri and Barsacchi (2018, 297) read EN SISKUR-a[š-…]. According to our collation of the original tablet fragment, the low position of the horizontal and the presence of small traces over it point to a reading SISKUR over erasure, rather than AŠ.

10′–12′: The act of breaking some object(s) and the accompanying incantation in these lines cannot be separated from KBo 29.3+ iii 13′–19′ (CTH 760.2, §§ 16′–17′), where the ritual patron destroys the symbols of the evil hand and evil tongue. Note that the preceding paragraphs of CTH 760.2 likewise contain incantations typical of purification rites, albeit showing innovations that characterize CTH 760 as a group.

11′: Lit. ‘broke completely’, if one interprets the reduplication as having the intensive function. This would echo the Hittite form of line 10′, with the preverb arḫa.

belong to the same tablet (Otten, KUB 35, II) likewise has no merit. Nevertheless, KUB 35.45+ and KUB 35.46 seem to be written by the same scribal hand (see Fig. 2.14).

Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Luwian incantation for untying impurity from the patient’s body
§§ 3′–4′ Patient’s spitting rite, with its Luwian incantation

The phraseology of the incantations reveals non-trivial similarities to KUB 35.49(+) (CTH 761.2.1.a), although this is clearly a different tablet series (see the commentary). Regrettably, the fragment’s place within the structure of the Great Ritual cannot be determined, since purification rites can take place at various points within the performance.

Translation

§ 1′
Rev. iv
1′–4′ "[May] the evil tongue, the evil hand, the evil eye, the evil ..., [the tongue] of judgment, curse, perjury, misery [not bind] the ritual [patron]!"
Great Ritual, fragments

§ 2′
A iv 7′ [šu-tar-li-i-iš ḠEME]-‘i’-iš iš ḠEME-la- średniotims ša-pi-[ri-iš]
A iv 8′ [ku-wa-ar-ša-aššu-iš]-ša tu-li-ia-ašši-iš ma-[a-aššu-iš EME-iš]

§ 3′
A iv 9′ [nu MUNUŠŠU.GI a-pu-u-un] A-NA EN SÍSKUR pa-ra-a e-[ep-zi]
A iv 10′ [na-an EN SÍSKUR al-la-pa]-a-ḫu-iš-la-ḫu-MUNUŠŠU.GI-ma ki-iš-[a-an šu-u-uk-zi]

§ 4′
A iv 11′ [a-ah-ra-an wa-ah-ri]a-a-an tap-pa-[a]d-da t[a-a-pa-ru ta-ta-ar-ri-ia-am-
ma-an]

Commentary

iv 1′–4′: This incantation is indicative of the versions of the Great Ritual grouped under CTH 761. Compare e.g. KUB 32.9(+) obv. 7–10 (CTH 761.1.f, § 3) and contrast a different incantation featuring the same Luwian verb /xab(a)i-(di)/ ‘to bind’ in KBo 29.3+i+ii 2′–12′ (CTH 760.2, §§ 14″–15″) and related passages. A specific parallel between KUB 35.46 iv 4′ (CTH 761.4.2) and KUB 35.49(+) iv 12 (CTH 761.2.1.a) is the expression /assiwantatnassis lalis/ ‘the tongue of misery’ followed by merisms. Although the distant position of the two components of this collocation are attested elsewhere, their juxtaposition remains a classifying feature that tips the scales in favor of treating the fragment under discussion as part of CTH 761.

CTH 761.4.3

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 48.181 46/o

Transmission and Research History

The find spot of this New Script fragment is unknown. It belongs to a double-columned tablet and preserves a small part of a right column on one side. The fragment was published in transliteration in Groddek 2012a, 117, where its formulaic similarity to KBo 22.143 (CTH 761.3.2.c) was also highlighted.
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§ 2’

5’ [(The tongue) of the dead (or) the living, past (or) future, of the mother (or) the father, of the brother (or) the sister, of a male (or) female servant, of mountain-dwellers (or) desert-dwellers, of an army (or) assembly, [the tongue of] the multitude].”

§ 3’

9’ [The Old Woman] holds that one toward the ritual patron,

10’ [so that the ritual patron spits (on) it]. The Old Woman [conjures thus]:

§ 4’

11’ “He spat (out) woe (and) pain, judgment, curse.”

iv 5’–8’: A particularly close combination of merisms, featuring both the pairs ‘of the dead (or) the living, past (or) future’ and the references to the close relatives of the ritual patron, is found in KUB 35.49(+) iv 13–16 (CTH 761.2.1.a). This constitutes another argument for grouping the present fragment under CTH 761.

iv 9’: The designation of the ritual patron as EN SÍSKUR suggests that we are dealing with a later version of the ritual than KUB 35.49(+), which uses the more archaic heterogram BE-EL SÍSKUR.

Contents

§§ 1–2” Fragment Hittite passage
§ 3” Fragmentary Luwian incantation mentioning the taluppi-lump and karaš-grain
§ 4” Pressing the taluppi-lump on the body of the ritual patron

For similarities to CTH 761.3.2.c, see the commentary. It seems likely that CTH 761.3.2 and CTH 761.4.3 belonged to versions of the Great Rituals sharing common innovations.
### Transliteration

**§ 1**

**Left column**
- A l.col. 1′ [...] ar-ḫa
- A l.col. 2′ [...]  
- A l.col. 3′ [...]  
- A l.col. 4′ [...] i  
- A l.col. 5′ [...] š  
- A l.col. 6′ [...] x-aš  
- A l.col. 7′ [...] x x x  
- A l.col. 8′ [...] x-an-zi  

**§ 2**

**Right column**
- A r.col. 1′ [...]  

**§ 3**

- A r.col. 2′ MUNUSŠU.GI te-e[... z-zi ...]  
- A r.col. 3′ kar-aš-na-ia za-x [...]  
- A r.col. 4′ păr-ku-iš-ša-an [ta-šu-up-pí-in da-a-i]  
- A r.col. 5′ kar-aš-ša a-x [...]  

**§ 4**

- A r.col. 6′ na-ša-an A-N [...]  
- A r.col. 7′ Ū RA-MA-N [...]  
- A r.col. 8′ da-a-ša-a[š-ke-zi]  

### Commentary

**r.col. 3′**: The word kar-aš-na-ia is otherwise unattested. We tentatively assume that this is a Luwian possessive adjective ultimately derived from karaš-grain. This is consistent with the interpretation of this clause as the Old Woman’s direct speech.

**r.col. 4′–5′**: For the use of the karaš-grain with the taluppi-lump, see KBo 22.143 i 1–4 (CTH 761.3.2.c, § 1).
§ 1′
Left column
1′–2′ […]
2′–4′ […]
5′–8′ […]

§ 2″
Right column
1′ […]

§ 3″
2′ The Old Woman says: “…”
3′ […] of Karaš-grain […].”
4′ [She puts] the pure [taluppi-lump] on top.
5′ And […] the Karaš-grain.

§ 4″
6′–8′ [She] presses it on [the head] and [all] the body (parts) of the ritual patron.

r.col. 6’: na-ša-an is presumably the abbreviated spelling of na-aš-ša-an reflecting the clitic sequence n-an-šan.

r.col. 8’: The Hittite imperfective dimaškezzi, if correctly restored, is another argument for treating the content of this small fragment as a close counterpart of a ta-luppi-rite in CTH 761.3.2.c.
GREAT RITUAL AND **HALLIYATTANZA-RITUAL**  
CTH 762.1.a

Table of Manuscripts

A  KBo 44.241  50/m

Transmission and Research History

This tiny late-13th-century fragment was found in the area of Building A of Büyükkale. Its position on the tablet cannot be determined. The ductus of this fragment shows the hand of Pariziti (Fig. 2.23), while the character size is typical of CTH 762.1. The fragment was published in transliteration in Roszkowska-Mutschler 2007, 232.

Transliteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 1’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:1’</td>
<td>[...] x [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:2’</td>
<td>[...] ki-[š-ša-an ...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>§ 2’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:3’</td>
<td>[...] ṭUTU-w]-a-az TU[KU.TUKU-...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:4’</td>
<td>[...] t]u-um-ma-[an-ti(-)...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:5’</td>
<td>[...] ḫu-]-’u]-wa-rt[i(-...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:6’</td>
<td>[...] [hu]-t]a-aš-ša-an-za-t[i ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:7’</td>
<td>[...] ud-]a-ar [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:8’</td>
<td>[...] ’EME’(-)[...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary

3’–4’: The only parallel involving the Luwian list of deities followed by the verb ‘to hear’ is KBo 22.254(+) i 9’–12’ (CTH 762.3.2). This parallel, however, is hardly compelling, since more incantations featuring such trivial combinations are likely to have been lost.
Contents

§§ 1’–2’  Fragmentary Hittite passage describing a rite, with its Luwian incantation arguably mentioning a Sun-deity

The place of the fragment within the text of the tablet series cannot be exactly determined. Note, however, that the initial part of CTH 760 features invocations to the Sun-god (see for example KUB 35.45 ii 18–27, CTH 760.2). It is possible, although not provable, that this incantation likewise belongs to the initial part of the ritual.

Translation

§1

1’  [...] 2’  [She conjures] thu[s]:

§2

3’  “[... The Sun-god (is) ang[ry...]
4’  [...] hear(-)[...]
5’  [...] curs[e [...]
6’  [...] from (that) of [per]juries, [...]”
7’  [...] word [...]
8’  [...] tongue [...].

5’: It is tentatively assumed here that the sequence [ḫuʔ]-w-a-ar-t[...] is a cognate of Hitt. ḫu(wa)rt- ‘to curse’, ḫurtāi- ‘curse’. The same sequence might formally be interpreted as a form of Luw. /xʷart(i)-/ ‘decoction’, but such a lexeme is contextually rather unlikely.
CTH 762.1.b

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 29.45 68/r

Transmission and Research History

This tiny late-13th-century fragment was found in the area of Building A of Büyük-kale. It contains a small part of the left column together with a portion of the inter-columnium. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 384 but not

Transliteration

§ 1’
Left column
A l.col. 1’ [...]m-mi-in-[zi]
A l.col. 2’ [...]Šar-ru-um-[a-aš]

§ 2’
A l.col. 3’ [...]ši-in-zi
A l.col. 4’ [...] EN-an-zī AMA-in-zi
A l.col. 5’ [...] ha-a]n-ta-wa-at-ta-al-li-in-zi
A l.col. 6’ [...] DINGIRMEŠ-in-zi
A l.col. 7’ [...] x DINGIRMEŠ-in-zi
A l.col. 8’ [...] Šar-ru-um-ma-aš
A l.col. 9’ [...] x-zi
A l.col. 10’ [...] x-ni-zi
A l.col. 11’ [...] x-li-in-zi

Commentary

Lcol. 2’: On this god of Hurrian origin and its presence in Luwian texts, see Tré-mouille 2006, 206 with fn. 45.

Lcol. 4’–7’: For incantations addressed to categorized groups of deities within the Kuwattalla tradition, including ‘paternal gods’, see KBo 29.55+ i 5’–7’ (CTH 761.3.8).
attributed to any particular composition. The ductus of this fragment shows the hand of Pariziti (Fig. 2.23), while the character size is typical of CTH 762.1.

Contents

§§ 1′–2′ List of deities

Although the incantation addressed to multiple groups of deities can occupy various positions within the ritual, we tentatively group it together with the incantation mentioning the Sun-god (CTH 762.1.a).

Translation

§ 1′
Left column
1′ "[...]
2′ [...] Šarrum[a].

§ 2′
3′ [...] lords, maternal
4′ [...] royal
5′ [...] gods
6′ [...] gods
7′ [...] Šarruma,
8′ [...] Šarrum[a],
9′ [...] 
10′ [...] 
11′ [...]"

Although there is no guarantee that these incantations occur only once per ritual, there are no proofs to the contrary, while the rarity of the relevant fragments is overall compatible with such a conclusion.

Leol. 4′: See KBo 29.33(+) r.col. 10′ DINGIRMES u-ra-an-ni-in-za (CTH 694.1.A) (lit. ‘gods of the grandmothers’).
CTH 762.1.c

Table of Manuscripts

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>KBo 34.245</td>
<td>2133/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>+ KUB 35.64</td>
<td>+ 1585/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A₃</td>
<td>+ KBo 40.276</td>
<td>+ 1656/c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmission and Research History

All three late-13th-century fragments were found in the area of Building A of Büyük-kale. The join between the fragments A₁ and A₃ is mentioned in Groddek 2015, 22 fn. 114 and Waal 2015, 523, while the fragment A₂ was added by David Sasseville (see Konkordanz sub KBo 34.245). The direct joins were confirmed by the collation of the original fragments. This yielded a small portion of column four and the colophon, written on the left edge of the tablet. Fragment A₂ was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 179, where it was attributed to an unspecified "Old Woman" ritual, while the colophon was transliterated and translated in Waal 2015, 523. For the transliteration of all three joined fragments, see Sasseville 2020c, 561–62.

Transliteration

§ 1
Rev. iv
A₁₂ iv 1’ pa[r[i-ia-na-al-la-an AMA-ia-an ta-a-ti-ia-an]
A₁₂ iv 2’ ŠEŠ-ia-an [NIN-ia-an İR-ia-an GÈME-ia-an]

§ 2'
A₁₂ iv 3’ LÚlu-ú-la-[ḥi-[a-an LÚḥa-pi-ri-ia-an ku-ur-ša-aš-ša-an]
A₁₂ iv 4’ tu-li-ia-aš-[ṣa-an MUKAM-in ad-du-wa-li-in]
A₁₂ iv 5’ ṬTI-an ad-du-[wa-li-in wa-aš-pa-an-ta-aš-ši-in-za]
A₁₂ iv 6’ e-er-ḥu-u-wa-an-[a ma-a-ia-aš-ši-in EMÈ-in]

§ 3'
A₁₂ iv 7’ nu-kán MUNUSṭG[ ...]
A₁₂ iv 8’ 2(A) še-e-nu-uš an-[a ...]
A₁₂ iv 9’ nu te-ez-[z ...]

§ 4'
A₁₂ iv 10’ LÚ-iš-ti-ia-ta LÚ-[ti-ia-ti pa-ra-ad-du MUNUS-iš-ti-ia-ta]
A₁₂ iv 11’ MUNUS-ti-ia-ti pa-ra-a[d-du ...]
A₁₂ iv 12’ GIšKAXG[ ...]
Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Luwian incantation containing the list of miasma
§§ 3′–4′ Rite involving two figurines, with its Luwian incantation
§ 5′ Fragmentary Hittite passage
§ 6′ Colophon

The manipulation with two figurines establishes a parallelism between the tablet under discussion and the second column of KBo 29.3+. This is the argument that it belongs to the first tablet of the ritual, just as KBo 29.3+ reflects the first tablet of CTH 760.2. Nevertheless, the present version also displays significant differences from CTH 760.2 (see the commentary). The colophon provides crucial information about the scribe Pariziti, which is conducive to assigning to him all the fragments that are assembled under CTH 762.1–2 and written in the same hand (Fig. 2.23).

Translation

§ 1′
Rev. iv
1′ “fu[ture, of the mother (or) the father],
2′ of the brother (or) [the sister, of a male (or) female servant],

§ 2′
3′ of mountain-dwell[ers (or) desert-dwellers, of an army]
4′ (or) assem[bly, bad year],
5′–6′ ba[d] month, the interior[s of the shrouds],
6′ [the tongue of the multitudes].”

§ 3′
7′ The Old Woman […]
8′ two figurines in […]
9′ and she say[s]:

§ 4′
10′ “[May] the man [carry] it [with] ma[le (implements)].
10′–11′ [May the woman] carry [it] with female (implements).
11′–12′ […] in wooden box […]

DOI: 10.13173/9783447119955.1.318
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC BY-SA 4.0 license. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/deed.en
The terms of the CC licence apply only to the original material. The use of material from other sources such as charts, illustrations, photographs and text extracts may require further permission for use from the respective rights holder.
© by authors
Great Ritual and ḫalliyattanza-ritual (CTH 762)

A₁ iv 13′ gi[... ta-pa-a-ru]
A₁ iv 14′ ta-[ar-ri-ia-am-ma-an ḫi-ru-ú-un a-aš-ši-wa-an-ta-at-tar]
A₁ iv 15′ ma-a-[ia-aš-ši-in EME-in]

§ 5′

A₁ iv 16′ nu-ká[ ...]
A₁ iv 17′ iš-x[ ...]
A₁ iv 18′ nam-m[a ...]
A₁ iv 19′ 'nu-us'[ ...]

§ 6′

Left edge
A₁,3 Ledge 1 PA-NI UR.MAḪ.LU GAL DUB.SAR MES[ ...]
A₁,3 Ledge 2 Pa-ri-LU DUB.SAR İŞ-TUR

Commentary

iv 1′–4′: The incantation in these lines finds a direct counterpart in KBo 29.3+ ii 1–4 (CTH 760.2), likewise in the context of manipulating two figurines.

iv 4′–6′: This part of the incantation is absent in KBo 29.3+ (CTH 760.2) and appears to represent a later addition. For an identical appendix to what is otherwise a self-sufficient incantation, see KUB 35.50:5′–6′ (CTH 759.7).

iv 10′–11′: For an animal substitute carrying miasma on its body parts, see for example KUB 35.54 iii 9–11 (CTH 758.1). The peculiarity of the present context consists in the use of human substitutes, presumably represented by figurines. The incantation

CTH 762.1.d

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 32.4 149/b

Transmission and Research History

This late-13th-century fragment was found in the area of Building A of Büyükkale. It contains a small part of a left column together with a portion of the intercolumnium. The ductus of this fragment shows the hand of Pariziti (Fig. 2.23), while the character size is typical of CTH 762.1. The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 166 as part of the “third ritual”.
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13’–15’ [... judgment], cu[rse, perjury, misery, the tongue of the] mu[ltitudes].”

§ 5’
16’ [...] 
17’ [...] 
18’ The[n, ...]. 
19’ [...] 

§ 6’
Left edge
1 Before Walwaziti, chief of the scribes [...],
2 Pariziti, sc[ribe, wrote (this)].

seems to imply that a man and a woman are expected to carry impurity on gender-specific items, which were listed immediately below but are mostly lost in the lacuna. A similar formula can be found in the text of Allī’s ritual against witchcraft (of Arzawa origin), where the Old Woman holds two figurines representing the bewitchers in front of the solar deity and utters a gender-sensitive incantation to make them carry the bewitchment (for an edition of this passage, see Mouton 2016a, 194–97).

iv 12’: Note also the reference to a basket or another type of wickerwork container in line 13’.

Ledger 1–2: For the scribal circle of Walwaziti, see Gordin 2015, 148–65.

Contents

§§ 1’–2’ Luwian incantations accompanying a purification rite
§ 3’ Fragmentary Luwian incantation

The incantations in §§ 1’–2’ find approximate counterparts in KUB 35.48 iii 5’–13’ (CTH 760.4). Judging by the structure of CTH 760, they most likely accompany a ta-luppi-rite. This closest parallel, however, lacks the reference to ‘bond (and) blow’, which is present in the fragment under discussion but usually accompanies substitution rites.
Transliteration

§ 1′
Left column
A l.col. 1′ [...]x-ar-.Alignment-1wa Alignment-2-x[...]
A l.col. 2′ [lu-la-ḫi-ia-ti ẖa-pi-ri-ia-ti kur-ša-aš-ša]-a-ti
A l.col. 3′ [tu-ú-li-ia-aš-ša-ti pa-du-úr zi-in-zi DINGIR[463]-in-z[i]
A l.col. 4′ [za-am-ma-an ta-pa-a-ru ta-ta-ar-ri-[i]a-ṃ-ṃ-śa-an
A l.col. 5′ [ẖi-ru-ú-un wa-aš-ši-ni ni-iš ḫa-pa-in]-ti

§ 2′
A l.col. 6′ [ni-iš-du-wa-at-ta ku-wa-an-zu GUN-an k]a-al-du-ni-ia
A l.col. 7′ [ú-i-it-ta-ra ḫu-i-ta-an-ta-an ú-i-ta]-t[a]-i-at-ta-an

§ 3′
A l.col. 8′ [...-z]i
A l.col. 9′ [...]t[a]-ti
A l.col. 10′ [...] x x x

Commentary

L.col. 1′: The fragmentary word in this line could be restored as [pa-ri-it-ta]-.Alignment-1-ar-.Alignment-1wa-al]-[li-ia-t]i ‘of the external’ on the assumption that its final part bends upward, yet the orthography -ta-ar- instead of the simple -tar- sign would be quite unusual.

L.col. 3′–5′: The restoration of the beginning of this sentence has a tentative character. See KUB 35.48 iii 10′–11′ [zi-la-d]u-úr DINGIR[463]-in-z[i] za-am-ma-an ta-pa-ru
§ 1′
Left column
1′ "[...]
2′–3′ from [that of mountain-dwellers (or) desert-dwellers, of and army or assembly].
3′–5′ [Then may these gods not bind] [bewitchment, judgment, curse, perjury to his body]!

§ 2′
6′–7′ [May the bond and blow] [not be experienced by him (as) a heavy burden (or) thrashing!]

§ 3′
8′ [...]
9′ from [...] 10′ [...]"

"[ta-t]a-ria-a-[m-m]a bi-i-ru-un wa-aš-ši-ni ni-iš b[a-pa-in-ti] ’[In the future], may the gods not bind] witchcraft, judgment, curse, perjury to his body’! (CTH 760.4).

Lcol. 7: The merism 'bond (and) blow', also attested in KUB 35.43+ iii 2–11 (CTH 761.3.8), seems to be associated with a specific rite where a white sheep plays the key role. The other versions of the incantation mentioning 'heavy burden' and 'thrashing' do not refer to 'bond (and) blow'. Consequently, it is likely that in this case we are dealing with two incantations cross-contaminating each other.
Transmission and Research History

This little fragment was found in Building A of Büyükkale. It belongs to the lower part of a right column, being adjacent to a horizontal edge of the tablet and preserving a portion of the intercolumnium. It was written in the late 13th-century BCE and its ductus is that of the scribe Pariziti (Fig. 2.23), while the size of the characters

Transliteration

§ 1
Right column
A r.col. 1’ [...] x x [...] 

§ 2
A r.col. 2’ nu MUNUSŠU.G[...]
A r.col. 3’ me-na-ali-ha-[n-da ...]
A r.col. 4’ an-da-ma-kān [...] 

§ 3
A r.col. 5’ ku-wa-ar-ta [...]
A r.col. 6’ ti-wa-ō-ta -[i-ia-am-ma-...]
A r.col. 7’ x x [...]  
End of r.col.

Commentary

r.col. 5’: The only other reference to cutting in the Kuwattalla tradition is KUB 35.48 iii 17’–20’ (CTH 760.4), where it is attributed to the goddess Andaliya. Because of the parallels in Maštigga and other traditions, we assume that the object of cutting in
suggests its attribution to CTH 762.1. It was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 170 as part of the “third ritual”.

Contents

§ 1′ Unclear
§§ 2′–3′ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing an unclear rite, with its Luwian incantation

The reconstructed order of the fragment within the tablet is based on the hypothesis that cutting the threads that symbolize the ritual patron’s impurity precedes the destruction of the evil hand and tongue.

Translation

§ 1′
Right column
1′ [...] 

§ 2′
2′ The Old Woman[ ...]
3′ befor[e ...].
4′ At the same time, [she says]:

§ 3′
5′ “He cut [...] 
6′ Sun-god’s ra[ge ...] 
7′ [...]”
End of r.col.

that context consists of the threads that symbolize the ritual patron’s impurity. The size of this fragment is clearly insufficient to determine whether it refers to the same episode, but this is the only available guess.
Great Ritual and ḫalliyattanza-ritual (CTH 762)

CTH 762.1.f

Table of Manuscripts
A KUB 35.12 638/c

Transmission and Research History
This late-13th-century fragment was found in the area of Building A of Büyükkale. It consists of a tablet fragment featuring the lower part of column two and the upper part of column three. The ductus of this fragment shows the hand of Parizitti (Fig. 2.23), while the character size is typical of CTH 762.1. The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 164–65 as part of the "third ritual".

Transliteration

§ 1
Obv. ii
A ii 1’ [...](-)x-’im’[(-) [...]]
A ii 2’ [...] ḫi-[ša-az ...]
A ii 3’ [...] BA[ TU 2 ]UZU[ZAG.L[U ...]
A ii 4’ [...]Ḫ[ ar-ḫa da-aš-ke-ez-[zi]
A ii 5’ [...][nu lu-ú-i-li ki-iš-š]a-an ḫu-u-uk-ki-iš-k[ e-ez-zi]
End of col. ii

§ 2’
Rev. iii
A iii 1 [ni-iš-pa-aš a-a]ḫ-ḫa-ša-a-mi-iš SISKUR-iš EN-aš
A iii 2 [da-a-ru-uš-ša] mi-ša-an-za [x] ḫa-a-ša ḫal-ḫal-za-ni-in
A iii 3 [u-wa-ra-an-n]a-a-ḥi-ša i-ú-na-a-ḥi-ša [a-al-pī-in]
A iii 4 [ku-wa-an-na-n]i-in ma-aš-ša-na-a-al-[i-in KASKAL-an]

§ 3’
A iii 5 [nu MIN:]GI ku-it ...] x [...] x-’a’-[...] x [...] 

Commentary
ii 2’–4’: Presumably, the objects (strands of wool?) removed from various body parts of the ritual patron symbolize impurity. This action provides a background for the
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Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Removing symbols of impurity from various body parts of the ritual patron, with its Luwian incantation

§ 3′ Fragmentary Hittite passage

Removing symbols of impurity should logically precede their destruction. Furthermore, the verb /ax(xa)sa-(i)/ 'to remove, separate' is otherwise attested in proximity to the evil hand in KUB 35.18(+) iv 2′ (CTH 760.1.a), which suggests that, at the point of the relevant incantation, it has not yet been destroyed. Therefore, we tentatively order this fragment shortly before the destruction of the (models of) evil hand and evil tongue, symbolizing witchcraft.

Translation

§ 1′
Obv. ii

1′ [...] 2′ [from] the b[ack ...] 3′ [...] form the two shou[lders ...] 4′ [she] removes [...] 5′–6′ [and she] conjure[s th]us [in Luwian]: End of col. ii

§ 2′
Rev. iii

1 “[May] the ritual patron [not] “be separated” 2 (with respect to his) [shape], flesh, bone(s), joint(s), 3 [spe]ech, mobility, e[yelash], 4 [eyebro]w(-hair), divine [path]!”

§ 3′

5 [The Old Woman ...].

incantation to follow, where the gods are asked to protect the ritual patron from forf-eitng his body parts.
iii 1–4: This incantation is restored with the help of a closely parallel version KUB 35.11 ii 8′–11′ (CTH 760.6).

iii 1: The proposed interpretation of \[a-a\][h]-ha-ša-a-mi-iš represents an elaboration on the one offered in Yakubovich 2012. See the separation (i.e. malfunction) of body

CTH 762.1.g

Table of Manuscripts

A  KBo 29.5  134/r

Transmission and Research History

This late-13th-century fragment was found in the area of Building A of Büyükkale. Its position on the tablet cannot be determined. The ductus of the fragment and the size of its characters favor its attribution to CTH 762.1 (Fig. 2.23). The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 92, where it was attributed to the Great Ritual, and then, with additional restorations, in Starke 1990, 595.

Transliteration

§ 1′
A:1′ \[...  ud-da]-‘a-ar-ma’ x[...]

§ 2′
A:2′ [ma-am-ma-lu-wa-i ad-du]-wa-li-in ŠU-i[n ad-du-wa-li-in EME-in]  
A:3′ [ta-pa-a-ru-wa-aš-ši-in t]a-ta-ar-ri-i[am-na-aš-ši-in]  
A:4′ [hi-ru-ta-aš-ši-in ma-ia-aš]-ši-in EME-i[n]

§ 3′
A:5′ [ta-pa-a-ru ḫi-ru-ú-un na-a]-t-[kā]n me-mi-ia-’ u-[wa-an-zi in-mi-iz-zf]  
A:6′ [... me-mi-iš-ke-ez-z]i šum-m[a-an-ti-...]
A:7′ [...  MUNUSŠ]U.G[...]

Commentary

1′: Hitt. uddār ‘words’ is restored according to the traces of signs and based on the occurrence of the same form in KBo 22.254(+) rev. 2 (CTH 762.3.2).
parts in the Tunnawiya tradition: KUB 7.53+ i 5–6 naššu LÚ-ni našma MUNUS-ni pāparrnaš uddanaņza UZUÚR ḪÁ-ša arḫa šarran ‘Either a man’s or a woman’s body parts are “separated” because of the matter of impurity’ (CTH 409.I; Goetze and Sturtevant 1938, 4–5).

Contents

§ 1’ Fragmentary Hittite passage
§ 2’ Luwian incantation accompanying the destruction of the evil hand and tongue
§ 3’ Luwian incantation mentioning a rope

The fragment represents a closely parallel version of KBo 22.254(+) rev. (CTH 762.3.2) and is largely restored based on this better-preserved piece. § 2’ of our fragment finds a close counterpart in KBo 29.3+ iii 17’–19’ (CTH 760.2). The mention of a rope constitutes a link between the piece under discussion and KUB 32.79, an adjacent fragment of the same tablet series (CTH 762.1.h).

Translation

1’ [...] words [...]:

2’ "[H]e is breaking the evil hand, [the evil tongue],
3’–4’ (the tongue) of [judgment, curse, perjury], the tongue of [the multitudes],

5’ [judgment, perjury." W]hen [she finishes] spea[king]
6’ [... say]s: "[...] the rop[e]."
7’ [The Ol]d Woma[n ...].

5’: These two words logically belong to the preceding paragraph, where they are indeed placed in the closely parallel version KBo 22.254(+) (CTH 762.3.2). They are restored
here in order to fill in the space at the beginning of line 5’. One has to reconstruct a scribal error consisting in drawing the paragraph line after § 2’ in this fragment before finishing the last two words, admittedly unusual for the structure of the incantation. Then the scribe added these two words at the beginning of the next paragraph.

CTH 762.1.h

Table of Manuscripts

A  KUB 32.79  168/a

Transmission and Research History

This late-13th-century fragment was found in the area of Building A of Büyükkale. Its position on the tablet cannot be determined. The ductus of this fragment shows the hand of Pariziti (Fig. 2.23), while the character size is typical of CTH 762.1. The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 170–71 as part of the “third ritual”.

Transliteration

| § 1’ | A:1’ | [...]-zīʔiʔ-[...]
| A:2’ | [...] |
| § 2’ | A:3’ | [...]x irta-a-iz-z[i ...
| A:4’ | [...]x-ta a-pu-u-uš DINGIRMES’ x[...]
| § 3’ | A:5’ | nu-uš  ...-ez-zī nam-ma MINUSG[1 ki-iš-ša-an te-ez-zī]
| A:7’ | [ti-wa-ta-ni-am-ma-t[i ḫū]-ru-ta-ni-am-m[a-ti ta-pa-ru-va-aš-ša-ti]
| A:8’ | [ta-ta-ar-ri-ia-am-na-a[DINGIRMES-in-zî]
| A:9’ | [...][u-ma-an-za-an A-[NA ...]
| A:10’ | [...  MINUSG[1  kīʔ-iš-š[1  a-an te-ez-zī]
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6: The Luwian stem /summant(i)-/ cannot be separated from Hitt. šummanza(n)- ‘rope’, which occurs in the adjacent fragment of the same tablet series, KUB 32.79 (CTH 762.1.h; see the discussion in its commentary and in Vol. 2, Section 1.3).

Contents

§ 1’ Unclear
§ 2’ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing a rite addressed to several deities
§ 3’ Luwian conjuration for the purification of the deities

The reference to ‘rope’ provides a link between this fragment and CTH 762.1.g. Note also that an extended purification rite is recorded in shorthand in KUB 35.81(+) (CTH 759.3) shortly after the incantation accompanying the breaking of the evil tongue and the evil hand. This is another argument for ordering the present fragment after KBo 29.5 (CTH 762.1.g).

Translation

§ 1’
1’ “[...]
2’ [...]”

§ 2’
3’ She treat[s ... one by one]
3’−4’ [...] those deities [...]...

§ 3’
5’ She/he [...]. Then, the Old Woma[n says thus]:
6’ “May all the gods be [pure]
7’ from [the rage of the Sun-god], committing perjury,
7’−8’ [the tongue] of [judgment (and) curse]!”
9’ [...] rope t[o ...]
10’ [...] the Old Woma[n says th[us]:
Commentary

3′–4′: Although the precise restoration of the paragraph is impossible, it apparently contains the list or description of gods that are relevant to the ritual patron. For a parallel within the Kuvattalla tradition, see KUB 9.6+ ii 5–9 (CTH 759.1); for a shorter formula see KUB 35.69:4′–5′ (CTH 761.2.1.d).

6′–8′: The whole incantation should be compared with KUB 35.58 ii 2′–6′ (CTH 759.6?). Compare the commentary to this fragment for the discussion of the terms ‘rage of the Sun-god’ and ‘committing perjury’. Note, however, that the incantation in KUB 35.58 concerns the ritual patron himself, whereas the present one is directed at his gods. Another incantation for the restoration of the deities’ purity is reconstructed in the

CTH 762.1.i

Table of Manuscripts
A KUB 35.74 704/c

Transmission and Research History

This late-13th-century fragment was found in the area of Building A of Büyükkale. Its position on the tablet cannot be determined. The ductus of this fragment shows the hand of Pariziti (Fig. 2.23), while the character size is typical of CTH 762.1. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 101 as part of the Great Ritual.

Transliteration

§ 1′
A:1′ [..]–tuš-pât\textsuperscript{MUNUS\textsuperscript{ŠU}.G}[I ...]
A:2′ [..]–\textsuperscript{IAZ\textsuperscript{UDU A-N}[A ...]
A:3′ na-at-kân \textsuperscript{UTU-i me-na-ab-ha-a[n-da e-e-p-zîl]
A:4′ [me-má-i-ma] ki-is-[ša-an]

§ 2′
A:5′ [za-ú-i-na-aš] ú-i-ši-ta UDU BABBAR [..]
A:7′ [..-t]a ša-hu-i-t[a-an-ta-an]
A:8′ [..-t]a ú-i-‘ta’-[at-ta-an]
A:9′ [..] t\textsuperscript{DUTU-za x}[...]
Puriyanni tradition (KBo 29.4(+) ii 17–18, CTH 758.2.2). Furthermore, KUB 35.81(+) I 11′ ḫa-la-[li-in-z]i-ia-ta a-ša-[an-du] may well reflect the beginning of a similar passage in the abridged version of the dupaduparša-ritual (CTH 759.3).

9′: This is the only mention of Hitt. šummanza(n)- ’rope’ in the Kuwattalla corpus, although its Luwian equivalent occurs there several times. For various functions of šummanza(n)- in Hittite rituals, see now CHD Š, 583–86. Given that the preceding incantation is dealing with removing contamination from the deities, one can hypothesize that this object was used for linking the figurines of gods to the symbols of impurity, but this is just one possible interpretation.

Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Hittite passage describing the presentation to the Sun-god of an item made of sheep fat, with its Luwian incantation

The reference to the white sheep, not recognized in the previous treatment of this fragment, is conducive to comparing the substitution rites reflected here and in KUB 35.43+ ii (CTH 761.3.8). Note, however, that the white sheep in this fragment likely represents a figurine made of tallow.

Translation

§ 1′

1′ The Old Woma[n ...]
2′ and also sheep fat to [...].
3′ [She holds it] in front[t] of the Sun-god
4′ [and says] th[us]:

§ 2′

5′ "[Here] (has) appeared the white sheep [...]",
6′ one for [binding, one for] s[miting].
7′ [It ...]-ed the bo[nd].
8′ [It ...]-ed the bl[ow].
9′ [...] the Sun-deity [...]."
Commentary

2’: The reference to sheep fat probably suggests that a figurine of white sheep made of tallow is presented or/and dedicated to the Sun-god in this fragment. Contrast the evidence of KUB 35.43+ ii (CTH 761.3.8), where the account breaks off after a live white sheep is presented to the Storm-god. Both types of offerings are attested in Maštigga’s ritual against domestic quarrels (see CTH 404.1.I, §§ 20–21 and CTH 404.1.III, § 25” in Miller 2004 for the sacrifice of a white sheep and offering of its model respectively). Whether the Sumerogram izzi.LU.DU ‘sheep fat’ must be read in Hittite as appuzzi- ‘tallow’ may at present be left open.

CTH 762.1.j

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 32.7 721/b

Transmission and Research History

This late-13th-century fragment was found in the area of Building A of Büyükçale. It preserves one fragmentary sign belonging to the left column of a double-columned tablet, as well as the beginnings of several lines belonging to the matching right column. The ductus of this fragment shows the hand of Pariziti (Fig. 2.23), while the character size is typical of CTH 762.1. The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 132–33 as part of the dupaduparša-ritual.

Transliteration

§ 1′
Left column
A l.col. 1′ [...]x

§ 2″
Right column
A r.col. 1′ x[...]
A r.col. 2′ nu A-N[...]
A r.col. 3′ nam-ma[...]
A r.col. 4′ me-ma-i-m[a ki-iš-ša-an]
5′–6′: The association of the white sheep with the removal of binding and smiting appears to be a persistent feature of the Kuwattalla tradition, at least starting at a certain point in its development. See KUB 35.43+ ii 10–11 (CTH 761.3.8), where the live animal carries ‘the bond (and) blow’. Contrast the earlier version of the Great Ritual, KUB 32.10+ obv. 7′–8′ (CTH 761.1.b), where the task of removing binding and smiting is directly assigned to the gods.

7′–8′: The approximate restoration of the syntax of these two lines is informed by KUB 35.24+ rev. 6′–7′ (CTH 761.1.c), KBo 29.37:3′–4′ (CTH 763.2.10), and KUB 35.73:6′–8′ (CTH 763.2.9).

Contents

§ 1′ Unclear
§§ 2″–3″ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing an unclear rite, with a Luwian incantation mentioning peg(s)
§§ 4″–5″ Putting something on the pegs, with its Luwian incantation mentioning a heart

The rite addressed here is presumably the *ikkunatt*-sacrifice, which features impaling the liver and heart of a sacrificial animal and a matching curse formula directed against the liver and heart of the evildoer. The description of the *ikkunatt*-sacrifice offered here displays differences from its presentation in other versions of the Kuwattalla tradition (see the commentary).

Translation

§ 1′
Left column
1′ […]

§ 2″
Right column
1′ […]
2′ […] t[o …]
3′ Then, […]
4′ she speaks [thus]:
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Commentary

**r.col. 9′−10′**: Compare the opposite request in KUB 35.16(+) i 7′−8′ (CTH 760.3.b). The present version could refer to the patient’s body parts, which should be rejected by the gods as meal in favor of those of the animal substitute’s, which also functions as sacrificial victim in this context.

**CTH 762.1.k**

**Table of Manuscripts**

A KBo 29.63 1570/c + 1569/c

**Transmission and Research History**

The two late-13th-century fragments, both found in the area of Building A of Büyük-kale, had already been joined in the autographic edition. Their position on a tablet cannot be precisely determined; according to the hypothesis reflected in KBo 29, they belong to column two. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 185–86.
§ 3’
5’–6’ "May the [...]s of the peg(s) be [...]!"

§ 4’
7’ The ritual patron [...] 
8’ an[...] on the pegs [...] 

§ 5’
9’–10’ "[Do not look at the heart] of this one, [do] not look at [the liver] (of this one)!
10’–11’ [Whoever causes] evil to the ritual patron], 
11’–12’ [may all the gods snatch up his] heart [and liver in the same way]!
13’ [...] b[reak [...]"

r.col. 11’–12’: This sentence is restored based on KUB 32.8(+) iv 21’–23’ (CTH 759.10.b) and KUB 35.16(+) i 7’–9’ (CTH 760.3.b).

Contents

§§ 1’–2’ Waving of an empty pot over the patient’s head, with its Luwian incantation, which designates the pot as the substitute for the patient’s head

§§ 3’–4’ Patient’s interaction with the pot, with its Luwian incantation

The ductus of this fragment shows the hand of Pariziti (Fig. 2.23), while the character size is typical of CTH 762.1. The rite reflected in this fragment finds a close counterpart in KBo 29.6(+) ii 18–29 (CTH 762.2). The rite sequence in KUB 35.16(+) (CTH 760.3.b) and KBo 29.6(+) implies that the ritual waving of the cooking pot follows the ikkunatt-sacrifice, which suggests that the present fragment follows KUB 32.7 (CTH 762.1.j) in the sequence of the tablet series CTH 762.1.
Transliteration

§ 1′
Obv. ii7
A ii7 2′ [nu ki]-iš-ša-an [te-ez-zl]

§ 2′
A ii7 3′ [za-a]-”ú’i-na-aš ú-i-ši-ta ḫi-ša-[al-la-aš]
A ii7 4′ [n]a-a-ú-wa-aš ma-al-wa-a-am-mi-[š]
A ii7 5′ [t]a-a-wa-ni-iš ta-’wa’-an-ta-an-[za]
A ii7 6′ [ḥar-ma-ḫa-aš-ši-iš ’tar’-pa-aš-ša-a-aš

§ 3′
A ii7 7′ [nu E[N SISKUR DERUTUL ZAG-Za ŠU-az še-er kat-t[a]
A ii7 8′ [o]x-ah-ḫi kat-ta-an ša-ra-a-ia-[an ...]
A ii7 9′ [MINUSU].GI-ma ki-iš-ša-’an’ [te-ez-zl]

§ 4′
A ii7 10′ [a-ar-ši-iš pu-u-[r]ji-’in’-z[i na-a-ú-wa a-a-ia-ri]
A ii7 11′ [...]-ša-an ḫa-a-[...]
A ii7 12′ [...] x wa-a-[li-...]
A ii7 13′ [...] x x [...]
§ 1
Obv. ii°
1° [waves an empty (pot) over the ritual patron]
2° [and says thus]:

§ 2°
3° "[He] re (has) appeared the hiša[Ila-].
4° It (is) not broken,
5° upright to the (two) eyes,
6° the substitute for the [head]."

§ 3°
7°–8° The ritual patron [strokes] the pot top down with (his) right hand
8° and [he strokes it] bottom up.
9° [The Old] Woman [says] thus:

§ 4°
10° "[The bottom does not become] the rim.
11° […]
12° […]
13° […]"

ii° 6°: Presumably, the pot is introduced here as a substitute for the patient’s head. It is conjectured that the pot is eventually destroyed, just as it is in CTH 759.12, a different version of the same basic rite, as well as in its counterpart in the Maštigga tradition (Miller 2004, 100–102).

ii° 10°: The meaning of nom.pl. pu-u-[r]i’m’-z[i] is extrapolated from that of Hitt. puri- ‘lip, rim’ (CHD P, 384–86), while nom.sg. [a-a]r-ši-iš is restored as a lexical cognate of Hitt. arra- ‘arse, bottom’ < Proto-Indo-European *orṣo (vel sim.) ‘arse’. We are grateful to H. Craig Melchert (pers. comm.), who reminded us of the crucial Hittite passage KBo 24.63+ ii 11°–14° (CTH 490), confirming that the Ancient Anatolian vessels were believed to be endowed with both puri- ‘rim’ and arra- ‘bottom’ (see Görke 2010, 82 with fn. 226). Presumably, the turn of phrase ‘the bottom does not become the rim’ avails itself of the pot as an ostensive example but strives to underscore the irreversible character of the natural order of events, possibly referring to the imminent destruction of the same pot. As the closest parallel within the Luwian corpus, one can mention the saying ‘the heaven does not become the earth’, probably accompanied by the manipulation of objects symbolizing heaven and earth in the course of a Puriyanni ritual (KUB 35.54 ii 42°–43°; CTH 758.1).
Great Ritual and ḫalliyattanza-ritual (CTH 762)

CTH 762.1.1

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.17  553/b

Transmission and Research History

This tiny fragment was found in the area of Building A of Büyükkale. Together with the other fragments of CTH 762.1, it can be dated to the late 13th century BCE. It contains a tiny part of the right column of a double-columned tablet together with the adjacent portion of the intercolumnium. The ductus of this fragment shows the hand of Pariziti (Fig. 2.23), while the character size is typical of CTH 762.1. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 95 and attributed to the Great Ritual, following Otten, KUB 35, II.

Transliteration

§ 1’
Right column
A r.col. 1’  a-a[pa ...]
A r.col. 2’  na-q[n śi-pa-an-ti ...]

§ 2’
A r.col. 3’  ḫi-i-ša-[al-la-...]
A r.col. 4’  a-lu-ú-ni-x[...]
A r.col. 5’  za-a-ti-i ma-[...]

§ 3’
A r.col. 6’  pa-ra’-a-ma 3 N[A₄ ...]
A r.col. 7’  [...]x  an-da  [...]
A r.col. 8’  [...]x-ta- [...]  

Commentary

r.col. 3’: The attribution of the fragments KBo 29.63 and KUB 35.17 to the same tablet series supports the referential identity of ḫi-i-ša-[al-la-...] here and ḫi-ša-[al-la-aš] in KBo 29.63 ii7 3’ (CTH 762.1.k).

r.col. 4’: The form a-lu-ú-ni-x[(-)...] need not be separated from the Late Luwian word for ‘enemy’ (for the attestations, see Rieken and Yakubovich 2010, 204–5). See further the discussion of KUB 35.16(+) iii 9’ (CTH 760.3.b).
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§§ 1′–2′ Fragmentary Hittite passage, with its Luwian incantation
§ 3′ Fragmentary Hittite passage possibly mentioning three stones

A close match to § 2′ is attested in column three of KUB 35.16(+) (CTH 760.3.b), while the restoration of the three stones in column four of CTH 760.3.b suggests that § 3′ is situated at the beginning of a rite of considerable length. On the other hand, the noun ḥi-i-ša-[al-la-...] restored in § 2′ finds a counterpart in KBo 29.63 (CTH 762.1.k), where it apparently refers to a cooking pot functioning as the substitute for the head. Accordingly, one can hypothesize that the present fragment contains the end of the cooking pot rite and the beginning of the next rite possibly featuring three stones.

Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 1′</th>
<th>Right column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1′</td>
<td>ba[ck ...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2′</td>
<td>and [dedicates it ...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 2′</th>
<th>&quot;[...] ḥiša[l-la- ...]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3′</td>
<td>ene[my ...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4′</td>
<td>thus [...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 3′</th>
<th>Three st[ones ...] forth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6′</td>
<td>[...] in [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7′</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8′</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r.col. 6′: Compare the mention of three stones in KUB 35.15 ii′ 10′, iii′ 8 (CTH 761.2.5), also restored in KUB 35.16(+) iv 9′ (CTH 760.3.b) at a distance of approximately one column from the parallel version of the fragment under discussion (KUB 35.16(+) iii 4′–10′).
Transmission and Research History

All three late-13th-century fragments were found in the area of Building A of Büyük-kale. The join between the two fragments belonging to A₁ had already been made in KUB 35; the join between the fragments A₁ and A₂ is proposed in Sasseville 2020c, 556–57. After the collation of the original fragments, this indirect join seems highly plausible. The resulting piece comprises the adjacent parts of columns three and four, including the colophon. A₁ and A₂ were published in transliteration as separate fragments in Starke 1985, 95–96 and 198–99 as parts of the Great Ritual and unspecified Old Woman ritual respectively. The colophon was transliterated and translated in Waal 2015, 522–23. The ductus of the joined piece fragment shows the hand of Pariziti (Fig. 2.23), while the character size is typical of CTH 762.1.

Transliteration

| § 1’ |  |
| Rev. iii |  |
| A₂ iii 1’ | [...] x [...] |
| A₁x₂ iii 2’ | x [...] ḫal-li-i-n[a-i] |
| A₁x₂ iii 3’ | ẖG.LGU₄ [ẖG.LGU₄-an-t]e-eš ḫal-li-n[a-i] |
| A₁x₂ iii 4’ | ma-an-na-w[a-an-ni-in] ma-an-na-wa-an-na ḫal-li-na-i |

| § 2’ |  |
| A₁x₂ iii 5’ | ḫa-a-aš-ša [ḥa-ša-an-te-e]š ḫal-li-i-na-i |
| A₁x₂ iii 6’ | ḫal-ḥal-za-ni-[i]n [ḥal-ḥal-za-na]-an-te-eš ḫal-li-na-i |

| § 3’ |  |
| A₁x₂ iii 7’ | la-la-’t]-[du-ut-ta pa-ap-ra]-’t]-du-ut-ta |
| A₁x₂ iii 8’ | ẖa-[ar-ta-ti SAG.DU-ti ar-pu-w]a-na-ti |
| A₁x₂ iii 9’ | ma-[an]-[na-wa-an-na-ti da-wa-aš-š]a-an-za-ti ẖU[ti-ta-ti UZṢa-ti] |
| A₁x₂ iii 10’ | ẖU[IG.GIG-ti 12-ta-a-ti ḫa-a]p-pi-ša-a-t[i] |

| § 4’ |  |
| A₁x₂ iii 11’ | x [...] x [...] |
Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Luwian incantation matching the body parts of an animal substitute with those of the patient
§ 3′ Luwian incantation for transferring impurity from the patient’s affected body parts to those of the animal substitute
§ 4′ Unclear
§ 5′ Colophon

The place of CTH 762.1.m within the text of the ritual cannot be precisely determined, since other fragments of CTH 759–762 do not contain references to bovines. The argument for listing this fragment last in the sequence of CTH 762.1 is purely formal: according to the colophon, the sub-ritual follows the Great Ritual, while the use of the verb /xallina-(i)/ ‘to decontaminate’ in the present fragment suggests that it is a part of the sub-ritual ḫalliyattanza. The force of this argument, however, need not be exaggerated (see the commentary). An alternative possibility would be to reconstruct the position of this fragment near CTH 762.1.1 (substitution rite involving a white sheep).

Translation

§ 1′
Rev. iii
1′–2′ “[...] decontaminat[es ...],”
3′ [cow fa]t decontaminat[es] cow fat,
4′ the snou[t decontaminates] the nos[e].

§ 2′
5′ the [bon]e decontaminates the bone,
6′ the [join]t decontaminates the joint.

§ 3′
7′ It takes [them (away from) him], it [carri]es (them away from) him
8′ with [its] four le[gs, head, fore]head,
9′ sn[out, eye-pupil]s, [heart],
10′ li[ver, twelve l]imbs.”

§ 4′ [...]
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Rev. iv

§ 5"
A₁ iv 1’ [DUB.X.KAM 6-t]-L QA-[t][m]a-a-an Și-la-al-lu-ḫi-iš
A₁ iv 2’ [MUNUS.GI] 1Ku-at-tal-la-aš-ša MUNUS.HU.RA
A₁ iv 3’ [ša-al-li a]-ni-u-ur a-ni-ia-an-zi
A₁ iv 4’ [ma-a-an ší]KUR ḫal-li-ia-at-ta-an-za
A₁ iv 5’ [ši-pa-an-d]a-an-zi

Commentary

iii 3’: The reference to ‘cow fat’ might suggest that the animal participating in the rite under discussion is a bovine. Compare the reference to ‘sheep fat’ in the passage KUB 35.74:2 (CTH 762.1.i) belonging to the same tablet series, as a part of the rite involving a white sheep. The problem of our fragment is that ‘cow fat’ is attested in the direct object position, where one expects to find a reference not to the animal body parts but rather to those of the ritual patron. A way out of this paradox would be to assume that in the absence of a standard Sumerogram for human fat, the scribe extended the designation of cow fat to the matching part of the human body.

iii 5’: The restoration of the ergative form of the word for ‘bone’ is problematic, since its otherwise attested forms are limited in cuneiform transmission to nom.-acc. sg. ḫa-aš-ša. In Late Luwian, we have the two types of instrumental forms attested in hieroglyphic transmission: ("314") ḫa-sa-ti-i/xassadi/ ‘by force’ (KARKAMIŠ A11b+c § 30) and ("314") ḫa-sa-ta-na-ti-i/xastanadi/ ‘with support’ (CEKKE § 6b, TELL AHMAR 6, §§ 6, 23), both presumably derived from the same stem for ‘bone’, with different metaphoric extensions. This speaks for the earlier Luwian paradigm nom.sg. *xast-sa -

CTH 762.2

Table of Manuscripts

| A₁ | KBo 29.6 | 87/b + 346/w + 477/w |
| A₂ | (+) KUB 35.70 | (+) 1671/c |

Transmission and Research History

All three fragments belonging to A₁ had already been joined in KBo 29 (the earlier autographic publication KUB 35.75 is limited to 87/b). The indirect join between A₁ and A₂ was proposed by Alice Mouton and Ilya Yakubovich in the course of their work on the Luwili Project. After the collation of the original fragments, this indirect
§ 5’

Rev. iv

1’ [...th tablet. No]t finish[ed W]hen Šilalluhi,

2’ [the Old Woman], and Kuwattalla, the female attendant,

3’ perform [the Great Ritual],


/xas-sa/ vs. dat.sg. *xastani (see for example Vedic nom.sg. āsthi, instr.sg. asthā, instr.pl. asthābis ‘bones’), followed by the concurrent generalization of the direct and oblique stems. The proposed tentative restoration [ha-ša-an-te-e]š assumes that the ergative form was derived from the secondary direct stem /xas-/ . See the discussion of ta-ru-ša-an-tii-iš in KUB 35.54 iii 1 (CTH 758.1).

iv 4’–5’: This is the only colophon containing a reference to the hallyattanza-sub-ritual. There is no doubt that this term is etymologically related to the verbal form /xallina-(i)/ ‘to absorb contamination, decontaminate’ and therefore refers to the part of the Great Ritual where individual body parts of the ritual patron and substitute animals are matched with each other. Note, however, that the respective rites do not constitute the peculiarity of CTH 762; in fact, one of them is mentioned in a fragment of the earliest version of the Great Ritual available to us (KUB 35.24+, CTH 761.1.c). Therefore, the status of hallyattanza as a separate sub-ritual in CTH 762 has arguably less to do with restructuring the text of the Great Ritual than with emphasizing its particular component (see Vol. 2, Section 3.4).

join seems highly plausible. For the rationale to join the two fragments, see the commentary to ii 11 and iii 2’. As a result of this join, we obtain portions of all four columns of a double-columned tablet, which are particularly substantial in the case of columns one and two. Parts of column one and column four belong to A₁; parts of column two and column three belong to A₂. All four fragments were found in or around Building A of Büyükkale and can be dated to the late 13th century BCE on paleographic grounds. The ductus of the tablet shows the hand of Pariziti (Fig. 2.23), also the scribe of CTH 762.1, but the size of the characters is markedly smaller than that of the tablet series CTH 762.1. The parts of the tablet corresponding to A₁ and A₂ were edited in transliteration separately in Starke 1985, 128–31 and 183–85, being attributed to the dupadaparśa-ritual and an unspecified Old Woman ritual respectively.
Great Ritual and ḫalliyattanza-ritual (CTH 762)

Contents

§ 1′ Luwian blessing formula accompanying the šarłatt-sacrifice

§§ 2′–4′ Offering of the liver and heart of the animal of the šarłatt-sacrifice together with bread, with its Luwian incantation

§§ 5′–10′ Filling an empty jug with foodstuffs and precious metal and holding it toward the patient, with its Luwian incantations

§§ 11′–12′ Fragmentary Hittite passage mentioning a basket, with its Luwian incantation

§ 13′ Unclear

§§ 14″–17″ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing an unclear rite involving a head, with its Luwian conjuration

§§ 18″–19″ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing a rite involving the tanid-stones, with its Luwian conjuration

§§ 20″–23″ Ritual waving of an empty pot over the patient’s head, with its Luwian incantation, which describes the pot as the substitute for the patient’s head

§ 24″ Unclear

Transliteration

§ 1′

Obv. i

A₁ i 1′ […]-wa [...] x[...]
A₁ i 2′ [...]x-ša x[...]
A₁ i 3′ [a-ar-ra-i]a-ti MU.KAM-t[i a a-ra-ti ap-pa-ra-an-ta-ti ḫa-at-tu-u-la-a-ḫi-ta-ti]

§ 2′

A₁ i 5′ [na-aš-ta] EN SISKUR šar-la-a-at-[ta-aš-ši-in …]
A₁ i 6′ […]-zī nam-ma-an-kān pa-ra-[a … pe-en-ni-a-ḫi-an-zi]
A₁ i 7′ [MUNUSŠU.GI-ma] UZUNÍG.GIG UZUŠÀ[...]
A₁ i 8′ [nu-uš-ša-an A-N][NDA.GUR₄.RA tar-n[a-aš zi-ik-ke-ez-zi]

§ 3′

A₁ i 9′ [na-š-ta EN SISK]UR UZU[NIG₄][GIG] UZU[ŠÀ QA-DU NINDA.GUR₄.RA-ŠU da-a-i]
A₁ i 10′ nam-m[a-at k]u-wa-aš-zi nu-[zə] [a-pa-a-at UZU[NIG.GIG UZU[ŠÀ]
A₁ i 11′ QA-DU NINDA.GUR₄.RA-ŠU pa-ra-a-‘e-p-zi […]
A₁ i 12′ MUNUSŠU.GI-ma ki-iš-[a-a]n [ḫu-u-uk-zi]
§ 25" Bread offering to the good nakku-spirits

§§ 26”–27” Nailing down the evil nakku-spirits, with its Luwian incantation

§ 28” Lifting the wooden pegs, with its Luwian incantation

§ 29” Fragmentary Hittite passage mentioning the act of smearing feet(?) with blood

§§ 30”–32” Ritual sequence taking place on the third day and involving the patient’s dedication of a sheep

§ 33” Fragmentary Hittite passage mentioning a scapegoat

§ 34” Fragmentary Hittite passage mentioning a bronze object

The ritual sequence in CTH 762.2, §§ 20”–23” closely parallels the content of CTH 762.1.k, and there is a distinct possibility that the whole tablet CTH 762.2 represents a duplicate of CTH 762.1. The overlaps with KBo 22.254(+) (CTH 762.3.2) and KUB 35.13+ (CTH 762.3.4) likewise appear to be rather precise, even though these fragments reflect different scribal hands. As expected, the similarities to the parallel passages in different versions of the Kuwattalla tradition, such as KUB 35.16(+) (CTH 760.3.b), KBo 9.143 (CTH 763.1.6), KUB 35.37(+) (CTH 759.3), and KUB 35.71+ (CTH 759.12), are more remote.

Translation

§ 1’

Obv. i
1’ “[…]
2’ […]
3’ [with [lon]g years, [future time, health],
4’ [vir][ility, [favor (and) enlivenment of the deities].”

§ 2’

5’–6’ The ritual patron […] the (animal) [of] the šarlatt-sacrifice.
6’ Then, they [drive] it awa[y …].
7’ [The Old Woman takes] the liver (and) heart of [(the animal) of the šarlatt-sacrifice]
8’ [and she places them on] a thick bread [of] (one) tarn[a-measure].

§ 3’

9’ [The rit]ual [patron takes] the liv[er (and) heart together with its thick bread].
10’ The[n], he kisses [it].
10’–11’ [She holds that liver (and) heart] together with its thick bread toward [the Sun-god …].
12’ The Old Woman [conjures th]us:
§ 4′
A₁ i 13′ a-a-ha-ta du-ú-wa-at-ta ḥa-at-ta-a[z-...]

§ 5′
A₁ i 14′ na-ša-ta EN SISKUR UZP.NIG.GIG UZIŠÁ QA-DU NINDA.GUR pa-ra-a pé-e-da-ī
A₁ i 15′ na-at kat-ta da-a-i nu-za MINUS.GI.DUG.KU-UB.RI-[Q-Ql da-a-i]
A₁ i 16′ na-ša-ta BA.BA.ZA te-pu an-da pé-eš-ši-ia-zi na-[aš-ta KÜ.GI KÜ.BABBAR ḥu-u-
ma-an]
A₁ i 17′ ku-it-ta pa-ra-a te-pu an-da ’pè’-eš-ši-ia-zi na-a[t ...]
A₁ i 18′ na-at A-NA EN SISKUR pa-ra-a e-ep-zi nu MINUS.GI [ḥu-u-uk-zi]

§ 6′
A₁ i 19′ za-ú-i-ia-ta ú-i-ši-ta ša-pí-i[a-aš]-ša-an-za wa-ar-ra-an-[za’ a-at-ta ku-wa-ti-in]
A₁ i 20′ ħa-a-ša-ti a-ú-i-im-ma-an ša-p[i]-ia-tti-at-ta a-’ú’-[i-im-ma-an]
A₁ i 21′ a-ú-i-du-wa-aš-ta ma-al-ḥa-aš-ša-aš-ši-[i]$h EN-aš ḥa-ra-at-na-[a-ti wa-aš-
ku-li-im-ma-a-ti]

§ 7′
A₁ i 22′ za-ša-pa-at-ta ku-wa-ti-in za-am-mi-ta’-a-ti’-iš NAḥar-ra-a-ti [...]  
A₁ i 23′ a-ú-i-im-mi-iš a-ú-i-du-pa-aš-ta ma-[a]l-ḥa-aš-(ša-aš)-ši-iš EN-aš h[a-ra-at-
na-a-ti]
A₁ i 24′ wa-aš-kü-li-im-ma-a-[ti]

§ 8′
A₁ i 25′ i-in-za-ga-an-za-pa ku-wa-ti-in ša-pí-ia’-im’-ma-an a-ú-i-di-wa-[aš-ta ḥa-
ra-at-na-a-di]
A₁ i 26′ wa-aš-kü-li-im-ma-a-ti ma-al-ḥa’-aš’-ša-aš-ši-[iš EN-aš]

§ 9′
A₁ i 27′ za-a-pa ku-wa-ti-in wa-aš-ḥa-ša-u-ra ku-wa-an-z[u-wa ]’a-at’-[ta ...]
A₁ i 28′ ku-un-zu-ni-in-du ma-al-ḥa’-aš’-ša-aš-ši-iš [EN-aš ...]
A₁ i 29′ DUMU.MUNUS.MES-ti ku-ra-a-ti ḥa-am’-ša’-a-ti ḥa-am-[šu-uk-kal-la-a-ti]

§ 10′
A₁ i 30′ za-aš-pa ku-wa-ti-in ku-um-ma-aš NA-aš-šu-u[š ...]
A₁ i 31′ ku-um-ma-ia-at-ta u-ra-an-nu-un-’du’ [...]
§ 4’
13’ “He has removed ḫatta[...].”

§ 5’
14’ The ritual patron [carries away] the liver (and) heart together with its thick bread
15’ and places it down. The Old Woman [takes] an emp[ty] jug.
16’ She throws in a little bit of porridge.
16’–17’ She (also) throws in [gold (and) silver], a little bit [of each].
17’ [...].
18’ She holds it toward the ritual patron. The Old Woman [conjures] (thus):

§ 6’
19’ “Here (has) appeared the vessel of cleansing.
19’–20’ [As] it comes [from] the ashes, but comes [through cleaning],
21’ (likewise), may the ritual patron come (out) of offenses (and) fault!

§ 7’
22’–23’ As this flour is coming from the millstone [(and) ...].
23’ (likewise), may the ritual patron come (out) of offense (and) fault!

§ 8’
25’–26’ As precious metals are cleaned, (likewise) may the ritual [patron] come (out) of offense (and) fault!

§ 9’
27’ As these wasḥašaura-tools are heavy, (likewise) [...]
28’ may the ritual [patron and his wife] be gravid
29’ with sons, daughters, grand-children (and) great-grand-children!

§ 10’
30’ As this sacred stone [...],
31’ May [...] grow in sacredness!”

§ 11’
32’–33’ [...] (v. to leave) a basket [...]. They are/sit [...].
33’ The Old Woman [...] one [...].
34’ The Old Woman [...] to [...].
35’–36’ [She places] it down [be]fore those [...].
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§ 12′
A₁ i 37′ [...x-a-i-x- [...]

§ 13′
A₁ i 38′ [... x [...]

§ 14′
Obv. ii
A₂ ii 1 [...x-ма ḫal-ze-eš-ša-an-zi nu EN SISKUR SAG.D[U-SÚ ...

§ 15′
A₂ ii 2 [... ḫu-u-uk-zi-ma ki-iš-ša-an

§ 16′
A₂ ii 3 [...x-ia za-a-du-ud-du [x] ap-pa-an za-an-ta
A₂ ii 4 [... x x [... x x x [...x-’ta-a’-im-ma-an
A₂ ii 5 [ta]-pa-a-ru ta-t[a-ar-ri-ia-am-ma-an ḫi-i-ru-ū-un ma-a-i]a-[aš]-ši-(in) EM-E-in

§ 17′
A₂ ii 6 [na-a]š-ta MUNUSŠU.G[1 ... x x [...
A₂ ii 7 [nu M]UNUSŠU.GI A-N[A ...]
A₂ ii 8 [I]š-TU SAG.D[U-ŠU ...

§ 18′
A₂ ii 9 [ga]šA,GAL-ma m[e-...]
A₂ ii 10 [n]a-aš IG[BI]-wa kat-[a ...]
A₂ ii 12 [d]a-a-ni-i-ta-ia x[...]
A₂ ii 13 [M]UNUSŠU.GI-ma ša- [...]
A₂ ii 14 [h]u-u-uk-zi-ma [ki-iš-ša-an]

§ 19′

§ 20′
A₂ ii 18 nu-za MUNUSŠU.GI DEŠUTUL da-[an-na’]-r[an A-N A-NA EN SISKUR]
A₂ ii 19 še-er ar-[hā] ‘wa-ar-nu-uz’-zi [nu ki-iš-ša-an ḫu-u-uk-zi]

§ 21′
A₂ ii 20 za-ā-ū-i-na-aš ħi-iš-ta [ḥi-ša-al-la-aš]
A₂ ii 21 ‘na’-a-ū-wa-aš ma-al-wa-[m-mi-iš]
§ 12′
"[...]

§ 13′
[...]

§ 14′
Obv. ii
1 They call [...]. The ritual patron [... his] head.

§ 15′
2 [...]. She conjures thus:

§ 16′
3 “May [...]!
3–4 [...] it down again
4–5 [...] judgment, cu[rs[e, perjury], tongue of [the multi]tudes!”

§ 17′
6 The Old Woma[n ...].
7 The Old Woman [...] to [...] from [his] hea[d ...].

§ 18′
9 [...] the gate [...].
10 [...] down the eyes.
11 Before the gate, [...]...
12 And [...] the tanid-stones.
13 The Old Woman [...] and she [c]onjures [thus]:

§ 19′
15 “May we place the tanid-stones [...]!
15–16 May we place [...], may we place ḫuwallar(i)- [...]!
17 May judgment, [curse, perjury] be petrified!”

§ 20′
18–19 The Old Woman waves the empt[y] pot over [the ritual patron]
19 [... and she conjures thus]:

§ 21′
20 “Here (has) appeared [the ḫiṣalla-].
21 It (is) not broken,
Great Ritual and *ḫalliyattanza*-ritual (CTH 762)

A₂ ii 22 [d]a-a-u-wa-ni-iš da-a-u-wa-an-t[a-an-za]
A₂ ii 23 [ḥar-m]a-ḥa-aš-ši-iš tar-pa-a-aš-ša-aš

§ 22″
A₂ ii 24 [nu] EN SISKUR "DUGUTUL ZAG-az ki-i[š-ša-ra-az še-er kat-ta x-x-ah-hi]
A₂ ii 25 [kat-t]a-an ša-ra-a-ia-an [...]
A₂ ii 26 [MINUS]U.GI ma ki-i[š-ša-an ḫu-u-uk-zl]

§ 23″
A₂ ii 27 [a-a]r-ši-iš p[u-u-ri-in-zi na-a-ú-wa a-a-ia-rí]
A₂ ii 28 [a-a]r-ši-[n ...]
A₂ ii 29 [...] x [...]  

Rev. iii
A₂ iii 1′ [...]-a-r-ša-a²-x[...]-²ša²-a[I-...]

§ 25″
A₂ iii 2′ [EGR-an]-da-ma SIG₃-an-da-aš na-ak-ki-u-wa-a[š ...]
A₂ iii 3′ [...] x ŠA 1/2 ŠA-A-TI 3 NINDA.KU; ŠA 1/2 UP-N[l ...]
A₂ iii 4′ [...]-li-u-wa-aš SA 1/2 UP-N[ ...]
A₂ iii 5′ [MIN⁹₃]ma-a[b-ḫu-u-i-la-aš SA 1/2 UP-N 9 NINDA][ša ...]
A₂ iii 6′ [1 b]u-u-pár KAS 1 DUG-KU-KU-UB GESTIN 1 DUG-KU-[KU-UB ...]

End of col. iii

Rev. iv
A₁ iv 1′ [...] x x [...]  
A₁ iv 2′ [nu-u]š-ša-an [i-da-la-a-mu-uš na-ak-ki-uš kat-ta tar-ma-a-iz-zi]
A₁ iv 3′ [MINUS]U.GI-ma [ki-iš-ša-an ḫu-u-uk-zl]

§ 26″″
A₁ iv 6′ a-ša-an-[u pu-wa-a-ti-li-in-zi ...]
A₁ iv 7′ pa-a-iš-a-[ri-in ...]
A₁ iv 8′ a-am-ma-aš [...]  
A₁ iv 9′ a-la-la-[at-ta-an-za ...]
A₁ iv 10′ ta-a-ar-x[ ...]

§ 27″″
A₁ iv 11′ EGR-an-da-ma […] [GAG⁴⁹⁹]
A₁ iv 12′ GAG ta-a-ru-[wa-aš a-ra-a-iz-zi [MINUS]U.GI ma ki-iš-ša-an ḫu-u-uk-zl]
22 Upright to the eye[s],
23 the substitute for the [he]ad."

§ 22"
24 The ritual patron [strokes] the pot [top down] with (his) right ha[nd]
25 and [he strokes it bott]om up [...].
26 The [O]ld Woman [conjures] th[us]:

§ 23"
27 "[The b]ottom does not become the r[im].
28 [...] b ottom.
29 [...]"

Rev. iii

§ 24"
1’ "[...]

§ 25"
2’ [Afte]rward, [...] to the good nakk[iu]-spirits
3’ [...] of half a SÛTU, three sweet breads (made) of half a handfu[1,...]
4’ [...]-breads of half a handful,
5’ [ma]bhui[a]-breads of half a handful, nine ša-[-]-breads,
6’ [one b]owl of beer, one jug of wine, one ju[g of ...].
End of col. iii

§ 26"
Rev. iv
1’ [...]  
2’ [She nails down the evil nakk[iu]-spirits]
3’ and the Old Woman [conjures thus]:

§ 27"
4’ "[May the evil dead spirits be] naile[d (down)]
5’ —the Ol[d Woman calls] them [(by) their names]—!
5’–6’ May [the former ...] be [separated ....]!
7’ Then [...] the han[...] 
8’ [...] to their [...] 
9’ [...] to alalatt-body parts [...] 
10’ [...]"

§ 28"
11’–12’ Afterward, [he lifts the] wood[en pegs ...]
12’ [and the Old Woman conjures thus]:
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A₁ iv 13' a-ri-i-it-[ta ...]
A₁ iv 14' a-pa-ti-i-[n ...]
A₁ iv 15' a-ap-pa a-x[...]

§ 29"
A₁ iv 16' na-aš-ta m[a-...]
A₁ iv 17' ú-iz-zi [...]
A₁ iv 18' a-aš-ḥar-nu-um-m[i-ti ...]
A₁ iv 19' a-aš-zi nu [...]

§ 30"
A₁ iv 20' nam-ma-a[z ...]
A₁ iv 21' i-NA U₄."³'[KAM ...]
A₁ iv 22' a-pé-e-[...]
A₁ iv 23' šal-li-[i[š ...]

§ 31"
A₁ iv 24' nu 1 UDU EN [SISKUR ...]
A₁ iv 25' BAL-an-[ti ...]
A₁ iv 26' az-zī-[ik-...]

§ 32"
A₁ iv 27' nu 1 UDU [a-r ...]
A₁ iv 28' na-at [...] x x [ ...]
A₁ iv 29' [i][GI]NG.G[IG U₄][S]A da-a-i nu-uš-š[a-an ...]
A₁ iv 30' [na-a]t'"A'[NA] bANŠUR pé-ra-an [...] +
A₁ iv 31' [ši-i]p'-"pa-an'-za-kē-ez-zi ma ta-x[ ...]

§ 33"
A₁ iv 32' [nam]-ma TU₃ ḫ-i-a-an-z[i ...]
A₁ iv 33' [ME-E]-L-QÍ-SÚ-ia ku-iš[ú-[ ...]
A₁ iv 34' [...]i na-ak-ku-uš-š[i-...]
A₁ iv 35' [...]g]i na-aš-za ḫu-ur-[ma-an- ...]

§ 34"
A₁ iv 36' [...]Z]ABAR-ia ku-s[š[ ...]
A₁ iv 37' [...]x ku-it'"im"-[ma ...]
A₁ iv 38' [...]x-zi an-tu-uh-[ ...]
A₁ iv 39' [...]"a" nu-za a'-"pu"-[u-un ...]
"[He] lifted [...]"

thus [...] back [...]."

§ 29"

 [...] thus [...]
16’ [...] comes [...]
17’–18’ [...] smears[s] with blood [...]."
18’–19’ [...] remains [...].

§ 30"

Then, [...] on the third day [...] great [...]

§ 31"

24’–25’ The [ritual] patron dedicates[es] one sheep [...].
25’–26’ [...] eat [...] the table [...] great [...]

§ 32"

27’ [...] one sheep [...].
28’ [...] (S)he takes the live[r (and) the he]art and [...] on [...]?
30’ [...] it before the table [...].
31’ (S)he [sa]crifices [...].

§ 33"

32’ [Th]en, they make soups [...],
33’–34’ who [...] its content [...]
33’–35’ [...] scapegoat [...]
35’ [...] All [...].

§ 34"

36’ [...] of bronze, whic[h [...]
37’ [...] whichever[er [...]
38’ [...] person[...]
39’ [...] th[at one [...].
Commentary

i 3’–4’: These two lines are restored based on KBo 9.143 ii’ 14’–15’ (CTH 763.1.6).

i 5’–8’: The rite described in this paragraph finds a close counterpart in the instance of the ikkunatt-sacrifice; see KUB 32.8(+) iv 17’–20’ (CTH 759.10.b).

i 6’: This verbal form, restored based on KBo 9.143 ii’ 17’ (CTH 763.1.6), suggests that the animal is still alive at this point. Slaughtering it apparently takes place behind the scene.

i 10’: For other examples of the kissing gesture in ritual context, see de Martino 1988, 60–63 and Kühne 1999.

i 13’: See Yakubovich 2012, 328.

i 16’: For the restoration of ‘gold’, see its occurrence in KUB 35.16(+) ii 4’ (CTH 760.3.b), in a parallel version of the same rite. The restoration of ‘silver’ is not directly prompted by the parallel version, where the context after ‘gold’ is lost in a lacuna, but rather follows from the interpretation of i-in-za-ga-an-za below in line 25’.

i 19’: The interpretation of wa-ar-ra-an-[za?] as ‘vessel’ is conjectural and projected from the preceding Hittite context. Alternatively, one can attempt to interpret wa-ar-ra-an-[za?] as ‘means’ and connect in with the Luwian verb /warrija-(i)/ ‘to help’ (vel sim.), attested in hieroglyphic transmission.

i 20’: Hitt. ḫašš(-) can mean both ‘ash(es)’ and ‘soap’ (HED ḫ, 210–12; HW2 ḫ, 388b), and the same ambiguity is also likely in the instance of Luw /xas(a)-/. Although the two meanings are historically related, since ashes supplied the raw material for soap production, in this context they yield contradictory overall interpretations: a pot can be polluted by the ashes and purified with the application of soap. Since the clauses featuring /xas(a)-/ and ‘purification’ are contrastive, we prefer the former meaning ‘ash(es)’.

i 22’–23’: For Luw. /tsammidad(i)-/ ‘flour’ as a likely Akkadian loanword, see Starke 1990, 445 fn. 1601. The ‘flour’ in this context apparently correlates with the ‘porridge’ of the Hittite incantation immediately above. The ‘millstone’ is usually paired with ‘rolling pin’ in Luwian incantations involving the taluppi-lump, but the application of a rolling pin to flour would make little sense.

i 25’: The process that is apparently implied here is cleaning silver of tarnish. Since gold is not tarnished to the same extent, it is likely that Luw. i-in-za-ga-an-za refers to silver, or perhaps to a combination of gold and silver, not to gold alone. Compare the apparent equivalence of KÙ.BABBAR KÙ.GI ‘silver (and) gold’ in KUB 35.54 ii 27’ and in-za-ga-a-an wa-aš-ḫa-ša-u-ra ‘underground treasures’ in KUB 35.54 ii 32’ (CTH 758.1). From the formal viewpoint, i-in-za-ga-an-za must reflect the substantivization of /intskan(i)-/ ‘underground’ or ‘inhumated’; for the discussion of the extension -za, see Jasanoff 2010. For other examples of analogical rites involving silver in Kizzuwatna rituals, see Strauß 2006, 179–80.

i 27’: The compound wa-aš-ḫa-ša-u-ra consists of the element /wasx(a)-/ ‘treasure, precious object’, for which see the commentary to i 25’, and /saur(a)-/, comparable to Hurrian sauri ‘weapon’, also perhaps ‘tool’ (Richter 2012, 340–41). Accordingly, wa-aš-ḫa-ša-u-ra must refer to ‘precious implements’ thrown into the vessel. A slightly
different translation, ‘votive tools’, is offered in Melchert 2023. For the presence of golden objects in the rite under discussion, see the commentary to i 16’ above.

i 28’: The finite form ‘may they be gravid’ clearly has the metaphoric sense ‘may they be endowed’; for a syntactic pattern involving the same verb and the instrumental complement, see KUB 35.15 iii¹ 4–5 (CTH 761.2.5).

i 30’–31’: A version of the same incantation is likely to be reconstructed in KBo 9.143 iii¹ 10’–12’ (CTH 763.1.6), where the lexemes ‘heavy’ and ‘grow’ can be restored. Its pragmatics largely remains opaque. In particular, the preserved part of the Hittite instructions does not contain any mention of the stone(s) thrown into the vessel in the context of the relevant rite (perhaps this information is lost in the lacuna in line 17’). One thing that is clear is the genetic connection between ku-um-ma-aš in line 30’ and its formal derivative ku-um-ma-ia in line 31’. Whether ku-um-ma-aš is an adjective, ‘sacred’ modifying š-a-aš-šu-u[š] ‘stone’, or an appositional noun, ‘sacred place’ (vel sim.), the adjective ku-um-ma-ia… ‘holy, sacred’ must represent its counterpart in the second half of the simile. The translation ‘May they grow in sacredness …’ is a paraphrase of a more literal rendering: ‘May they grow sacred …’; the likely subject here, anticipated by the clitic doubling, is the patient’s family. Although the Luwian verb /urannu(wa)-/ consistently and expectedly functions as transitive in hieroglyphic texts, a secondary anti-causative meaning is contextually necessary and typologically possible; see CHD P, 210–11 sub ♦ paštarnu-.

i 32’: The Sumerographic expression ṭi-PISAN ‘basket’ is not otherwise attested in our corpus. One wonders whether it may be not only synonymous but also coreferential with ṭi-pattar ‘basket’, attested many times in the text of the dupaduparša-ritual (CTH 759.1). See typologically the disposal of ṭi-ŠENḪÁ ‘pipes’, which takes place considerably later than their actual use in the rite sequence of CTH 759.1.

ii 1–4: Although the structure of this fragmentary ritual sequence cannot be reconstructed, it is possible that some object is attached to and then removed from the patient’s head.

ii 11: See the mention of the gate in KBo 9.143 iii¹ 14’ (CTH 763.1.6), where, however, the respective rite arguably immediately follows the incantation corresponding to § 10’ of this tablet (see the commentary to i 30’–31’ above). This double comparison with CTH 763.1.6 supports the adjacency of the rite of filling a jug and that of the tanid-stones in the present tablet, which in turn yields support to the indirect join between KBo 29.6 (column one) and KUB 35.70 (column two) across the missing intercolumnium.

ii 15: For the role of the tanid-stones in Hittite-Luwian rituals, see Mouton forthcoming; for its etymological connections, see Giusfredi 2016. Note that the ḫuwaši-stones and tanid-stones are juxtaposed with each other in the Maštigga ritual against domestic quarrels (KBo 2.3+ iii 17–22 and duplicates, Yakubovich 2010a, 278–79; see Miller 2004, 99). This parallel is particularly significant, given that the rite involving the stones is directly followed by the presentation of an empty pot in both Maštigga and Kuwattalla traditions. Luw. /tanid/- presumably represents an equivalent of Hitt. ḫuwašir-.
ii 15–17: The form /tuntu/ ‘may we place’ represents an additional piece of evidence for first person plural optative in Luwian alongside the fragmentary /sarlauntu/ ‘may we praise’ in KUB 35.16(+). i 22” (CTH 760.3.b, q.v.). The contraction ‘tuvunta > /tuntu/ ‘may they place’ would be entirely unmotivated in the Luwian language of the second millennium BCE.

ii 20–23: This incantation appears to be identical to the one in KBo 29.63 ii ? 3–6’ (CTH 761.1.k), up to the line division. The surrounding Hittite passages also appear to be identical in KBo 29.6(+1) and KBo 29.63, in contrast to KUB 35.71+ (CTH 759.12), where the presentation of the empty pot is followed by a different incantation, reminiscent of the one in § 6’ above. This proximity correlates with the identity of scribal hand in the case of KBo 29.6(+) and KBo 29.63.

ii 27–29: Although the end of this ritual sequence is lost in a lacuna, it seems likely that the pot is eventually smashed (see the commentary to CTH 762.1.k).

iii 2’: For the role of the nakkiu-spirits, certainly connected with the dead in Hittite religious texts, see Mouton 2020b. Within the Kuwattalla tradition, a distinction is apparently made between the good nakkiu-spirits, to be propitiated with offerings, and the evil ones, to be nailed down. The thematic contiguity between the episodes in § 25” and §§ 26”–27” supports the indirect join between KUB 35.70 (column three) and KBo 29.6 (column four), implying at the same time that § 26” is close to the beginning of column four.

iv 1’–10’: These two paragraphs are restored based on KUB 35.13+ r.col. 8’–16’ (CTH 762.3.4). See also the reference to nailing down the evil nakkiu-spirits in CTH 759.3 (KUB 35.37(+)) iv 3’–4’). What the handcopy considers to be a double line appearing after line iv 10’ is actually a simple line only doubled at the beginning, as it sometimes happens on tablets (see also the line after iv 23’ on this tablet).

CTH 762.3.1

Table of Manuscripts

A DBH 43/2.164 Bo 8477

Transmission and Research History

This tiny fragment contains several signs on two lines belonging to a colophon. The find spot of the fragment remains unknown. The fragment was first published in transliteration in Taş 2014, 64, but several more signs were recognized by David Sasseville, who is also responsible for identifying this fragment as part of the Kuwattallatradition (see Konkordanz sub DBH 43/2.164).
iv 11′–12′: This conjectural restoration is based on the use of wooden pegs for nailing down the nakkiu-spirits in KUB 35.13+ r.col. 7′ (CTH 762.3.4).

iv 18′: Compare the Luwian form KUB 35.18(+) i 13 a-as-ḥar-nu-um-ma-ʾin’-[ti] ‘they smear with blood’ (CTH 760.1.a), which is likewise embedded in a Hittite context and matches its Hittite synonym iš-ḥar-nu-ma-an-zi in the parallel context KBo 29.3+ i 7 (CTH 760.2). Both contexts belong to the incipits of CTH 760 and contain the lists of sacrificial animals. For a possible alternative restoration, see Melchert 2023 sub ašḫarnumm(ā)ī– ‘to cover with blood’.

iv 21′: The restoration of the numeral ‘3’ is prompted by the comparison with the incipit of CTH 760, according to which the Great Ritual is performed on the third day of the combined ritual. It seems unlikely that CTH 762 would alter the number of days required for its performance without a good reason. Starke (1985, 130) restores ‘2’.

iv 24′–25′: The final sheep in the list of animals reconstructed in KBo 29.3+ and KUB 35.18(+) (CTH 760.2 and CTH 760.1.a respectively) is dedicated in connection with the keldi-rite. Since the sheep mentioned in the present passage is likewise situated between the animal used for smearing feet with blood and the scapegoat, one can venture a hypothesis that §§ 30″″–32″″ refer to the keldi-rite.

iv 33′–35′: The description of the scapegoat rite in KUB 35.16(+) (CTH 760.3.b), KBo 9.141 (CTH 761.2.4), and KUB 35.15 (CTH 761.2.5) suggests that the scapegoat of the Kuwattalla tradition was a real goat. Accordingly, the goat concluding the list of animals in KBo 29.3+ i 10 (CTH 760.2) must have been meant for the nakkušši-rite. If § 33″ contained a brief description of the nakkušši-rite, then the order of rites of § 28″″ ff. appears to match the final part of the animal list in the incipit to CTH 760.2. It seems equally likely, however, that the final part of the tablet merely contained a brief mention that the Old Woman takes the scapegoat for herself as a payment for her services.

Contents

§ 1′ Colophon

Only the first two lines of the colophon can be restored based on the available traces; the restoration of the third line is an extrapolation. While the attribution of the fragment to the Kuwattalla tradition is reasonably secure, its specific attribution to CTH 762 remains a hypothesis, which is ultimately based on the content of the missing third line (see the commentary).
Transliteration

§ 1′

Rev. iv

A' iv 1′ [DUB.X.KAM] 'Ū'-UL QA-TI ma-a-an š(GL-LA-AL-LU-ḪI MINUS U GI Ū]
A iv 2′ [(KU-WA-TAL-LA MINUS)] SUḪUR.LA šal'-li 'a'-[ni-ur ur a-ni-ia-an-zī]
A iv 3′ [ma-a-an ŚISKUR ḫal-li-ia-at-ta-an-za ši-pa-an-da-an-zī]

Commentary

iv 2′: The stem form ḫKU-WA-TAL-LA is restored for the reasons of space: the phonetic spelling ḫKu-wa-at-ta-al-la-aš-ša would have too many signs for the lacuna, whose size was determined based on line iv 1′.

CTH 762.3.2

Table of Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A₁</th>
<th>A₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KBo 22.254</td>
<td>(+) KBo 29.18 (+) 1032/z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bo 68/72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transmission and Research History

Both New Script fragments were found in the Temple I area. They are tentatively joined by Alice Mouton and Ilya Yakubovich based on the compatibility of their scribal hands (see Fig. 2.24) and the assumption that A₂ refers to the same rite as the final part of A₁ (see the commentary). Fragment A₁ contains the beginning of column two and the end of column three, while fragment A₂ is presumed to belong to the beginning of column four. The thickness of A₂ seems to confirm this suggestion. The two fragments were published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 194–96 and 197–98 respectively as parts of unspecified Old Woman rituals. A₁ is also published in transliteration in Groddek 2008, 242–44.
Translation

§ 1′
Rev. iv

1′  [...th tablet]. Not finished. When Š[ilalluḫi the Old Woman and]
2′  [Kuwattalla the female] attendant [perform] the Great Ri[tual],
3′  [when they perform the sacrificial ritual haliyattanza].

iv 3′: The reconstruction of this line belongs to David Sasseville and is driven by the exclusive resemblance of the two initial lines to the colophon of CTH 762.1.m. While it is theoretically possible that the colophon consisted of just two lines, which would then prompt its assignment to CTH 761, the formulation of the colophon would lack parallels within this group.

Contents

§ 1′  Ritual waving of items over the patient’s head, with its Luwian incantation
§ 2′  Breaking the effigies of the evil hand and tongue, with its Luwian incantation
§ 3′  Fragmentary Luwian incantation and fragmentary Hittite passage describing an unclear rite
§§ 4′–6′  Rite involving a vessel filled with oil and objects of silver and gold, with its Luwian incantation, which mentions the deities of the house and the Sun-god of the Oath
§§ 7′–8′  Fragmentary Luwian incantation mentioning the Sun-god of the Oath
§ 9′  Fragmentary Hittite passage mentioning golden objects

The content of §§ 1′–2′ finds a very close match in KBo 29.5 (CTH 762.1.g), while the other parallels, such as KBo 29.3+ iii 13′–19′ (CTH 760.2), KBo 13.262:10′–12′ (CTH 761.4.1), and KUB 35.81(+ i 5′–7′ (CTH 759.3), are more remote. Therefore, A₁ (+) A₂ is assigned here to CTH 762. Since the parallel passage KBo 29.3+ iii 13′–19′ (CTH 760.2) belongs to the first tablet of the ritual, one probably has to assume that A₁ (+) A₂ belongs either to the first or the second tablet. Under the former scenario, the narrative of CTH 762 is more condensed than that of CTH 760; the latter scenario would imply that CTH 762 is more verbose than CTH 760. Based on the holistic evidence, the former scenario appears to be more likely.
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Transliteration

§ 1′

Obv. ii
A₁ ii 1 [EGI]-R-an-da-ma-aš-kán ú-ez-zi A-NA E[N SISKU] [še-er]
A₁ ii 2 [a]-ḫa wa-ḥ-nu-uṣ-[k] i-u-wa-an da-a-i 'ud-da'-a-ša-r-ma
A₁ ii 3 [lu-f]-li a-pé-e-pát m[e]-mi-iš-ke-ez-zi šum-ma-an-'ti'-[...]

§ 2′

A₁ ii 4 [nam]-ma MUNUS.GI iš-[n] a-aš SU-an EME-ia ar-ḫa
A₁ ii 5 [du-w]a-ar-ni-iz-zi [ud-d]a-ar-ma-kán an-da ki-[iš-ša-an]
A₁ ii 6 [me-ma]-i ma-am-ma-lu-wa-i [a]d-du-wa-li-in [zi] §[U-in]
A₁ ii 7 [ad-du-w]a-li-in EME-e[n] ta-pa-ru-wa-aš-ši-i[n]
A₁ ii 8 [ta-ta-ti]a-am-na-aš-ši-en [hi]-ru-ta-aš-ši-i[n]
A₁ ii 9 [ma-ia-aš-ši-i]n EME-en 'ta'-pa-a-ru ḫi-‘t’-[ru-ú-un]

§ 3′

A₁ ii 10 [ma-a-an me]-mi-ia-u-wa-an-zí [i-in-ni-iz-zi ...]
A₁ ii 11 [me-mi-iš-ke]-ez-zi šum-m[a-an-ti ...]
A₁ ii 12 [... MUNUS.GI x[...]

§ 4″

Rev. iii
A₁ iii 1′ [...]-ṣa-[a]nu ku-e-[x[...]
A₁ iii 2′ [Ü-N-U]-T KŪ.BABBAR Ü-NU-UT K[U.GI ...]
A₁ iii 3′ [...] ku-īt A-NA DUGDÍLIM.GAL I x[...]
A₁ iii 4′ [...]x an-da SU-it an-da E[ME-it ...]
A₁ iii 5′ [MUNUS.GI]-ma-‘kán’ an-da me-mi-iš-ki-‘u’-[wa-an da-a-i]

§ 5″

A₁ iii 6′ [...]-un-ta [pá]r-na-aš-ša-an-za-an-za DINGIRMES-‘an’-[z[a
A₁ iii 7′ [hi-ru-tal]-l]-pa-t[a] Ṭ[UTU]-ti tap-pa-ši-i ti-ia-a[m-mi]
A₁ iii 8′ [pár-ra-an a]-an-d[a] du-un-ní

§ 6″

A₁ iii 9′ [ku-iš bi-t]u-[a-ni]-ia-at-ta ku-iš ti-wa-ta-ni-[ia-at-ta]
A₁ iii 10′ [ma-a-na-aš] LÚ-[if][š ma]-‘a’-na-aš MUNUS-iš tap-pa-ša-aš-ši-in-[zi]
A₁ iii 11′ [ti-ia-am-m]a-aš-ši-[in-z]i ku-in-zí DINGIRMES-in-z[i a-ta]
A₁ iii 12′ [na-a-ú-wa] [x] [tu]-u-ma-an-ti-in-ta
End of col. iii

§ 7″

Rev. iv? 1′ [...] ‘ta’-ar-‘ta’-x[...]
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Translation

§ 1'

[Afterward, she comes and starts waving them [over] the [ritual] patron]

1–2 and she pronounces those exact words in [Luwian]:

2–3 "[...] the rope."

§ 2'

[Then the Old Woman breaks off the hand and tongue of dough.]

4–5 At the same time, she [pronounced] (these) [words]:

5–6 "He is breaking the evil hand,

7 the evil tongue, (the tongue of) judgment,

8 of curse, of perjury,

9 the tongue [of the multitudes], judgment, perjury."

§ 3'

10 [When she] finishes speaking,

10–11 she says: "The rope [...]"

12 [...] the Old Woman [...]"

§ 4'

Rev. iii

1' [...] which [...] 

2' the silver items (and) golden items [...] 

3' [...] which [...] in the bowl (filled with) oil [...] 

4' At the same time [...] with the hand (and) with the tongue.

5' At the same time, [the Old Woman] starts speaking:

§ 5'

6' "We [...] to the deities of the house.

7'–8' We are putting it inside [in front of] the Sun-god of [the oath], Heaven, (and) Earth.

§ 6'

9' [Whoever perjured [himself], (whoever) enraged] the Sun-god,

10' [be it] a man or woman,

10'–11' the gods who are in Heaven (and) Earth,

11'–12' they did [not listen to him]."

End of col. iii

§ 7’

Rev. iv

1' [...]
A₂ iv² 2’ [...d]u MUNUS-ša-ta [...] 

§ 8”

A₂ iv² 3’ [...x-[t]a’ ḫi-ru-ta-al-li-i-...

§ 9”

A₂ iv² 4’ [...x [... a]n-da Ú-NU-UT KÙ.G[1 ...
A₂ iv² 5’ [...x [...-s]a-an ‘im-ma’ [...
A₂ iv² 6’ [...x ‘MUNUSSu’[Gî ...]

Commentary

ii 1: The identification of this side as belonging to the obverse of the tablet is supported by context. It is impossible to imagine that the content of §§ 1’–3’ at the beginning of the column directly continues that of §§ 4”–6” at the end of the column. In contrast, the proposed sequence leaves ample space between the beginning of column two and the end of column three for a transition to a different rite.

ii 3: There is space for just one or two short signs in the lacuna at the beginning of the line; accordingly, one can suspect a contracted form [lu-í]-li or [lu-ú-li] instead of the usual lu-ú-i-li (see KBo 29.58 r.col. 4’ lu-i-[-li] and KBo 12.100 obv. 3 lu-ú-li, and see further Simon 2016). For a different restoration of the lacuna, see Grodek 2008, 243. The lacuna at the end of the line presumably contains a verbal form governing the noun ‘rope’ as a direct or indirect object. See the discussion of the same noun in the parallel version KBo 29.5 (CTH 762.1.g). Contrast the absence of this incantation before the act of breaking the effigies of the evil tongue and evil hand in KBo 29.3+ iii 13’–19’ (CTH 760.2) and KBo 13.262:10’–12’ (CTH 761.4.1).

ii 6–9: The correct segmentation of the Luwian incantation in this case can be contrasted with the error made in KBo 29.5 (CTH 762.1.g), where the last two words are erroneously attached to the next paragraph.

iii 2’–3’: Although the precise restoration of this fragment is impossible, one can surmise that the items of silver are placed in a bowl filled with oil as a propitiation gift for the household deities. For similar rites in the context of a different ritual se-
§ 8“ [... Sun-god] of the Oath [...].”
§ 9“ [... golden items [...] inside [...] [...]
 [...] the Ol[d] Woman [...]

quence, involving placing golden and silver items in a pot filled with porridge, see KBo 29.6(+) i 15′–18′ (CTH 762.2) restored with the help of the parallel passage KUB 35.16(+) ii 2′–7′ (CTH 760.3.b).

iii 7: The restoration of the Sun-god of the Oath in this passage is consistent with his mention below in § 8”. Thus, the fragment under discussion supports the contention that the incantations addressed to this deity were nor restricted to CTH 759 but probably constituted the common innovation of the Kuwattalla tradition in the 13th century BCE.

iii 9: The same clause occurs in KUB 9.6+ i 23 (CTH 759.1). The fact that it is followed in either of the two contexts by a sanction formula, but the emphasis is rather on neutralizing the effects of the wrong behavior, suggests that the implied evildoer in this case was the ritual patron and/or his associates.

iv? 1′–6′: The placement of KBo 29.18 as part of column four of the tablet under discussion is based on its content. The mention of a woman, golden items, and the Sun-god of the Oath constitutes the non-trivial similarity between this small fragment and column three (§§ 4″–6″), to the extent that one can assert that the two passages reflect the same rite. This rite, however, appears to begin in § 4″, so it seems impossible to assign KBo 29.18 above it in column three. It stands to reason that the incantation starting at the bottom of column three continues at the beginning of column four and is then followed by additional rites with the items of gold and silver.
CTH 762.3.3

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 29.60 514/z

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment was found in the Temple I area. Its position on the tablets remains unknown. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 392, with no indication of the composition it belongs to.

Transliteration

§ 1’
A:1’ [...]x pu-u-[ri-...]
A:2’ [nu-kå]n ar-ra-an ’ṭp ... x[...
A:3’ [nu]Š-TU QA-TI-SU IM-[aš ...]
A:4’ [da]-’a-’i an-da-ma-aš-ša-an [...]  
A:5’ [nu]l[u-ú-i-li an-da kiš-[an me-mi-iš-ke-ez-zí]

§ 2’
A:7’ [a-ar-ši]-iš-pa pu-r[i²-in-zí na-a-ú-wa a-ia-ri]  
A:8’ [...]x ’in’ [...]

Commentary

6’: The restoration of this line becomes possible through comparison with KBo 29.63 ii’ 10’ [a-a]r-ši-iš pu-u-[r]i²-in-zí i na-a-ú-wa a-a-ia-ri] ’[the] bottom [does not become the] rim’ (CTH 762.1.k, q.v.), enhanced by the mention of the bottom and probably rim of a clay vessel in § 1 above. For the pragmatics of such a statement, see KUB 35.54 ii 41’–45’ (CTH 758.1) ”Here (are) heavens (and) earth! So, as heaven does not become earth and (as) earth does not become heaven, may these offer-
Rite with a clay object, most likely an empty pot, with its Luwian incantation

The ductus of the fragment (see Fig. 2.25) is the same as that of KUB 60.36 (CTH 762.3.5) and KBo 29.58 (CTH 762.3.6), while the incantation referring to the bottom and rim of an empty pot finds parallels in KBo 29.63 ii1 10′ (CTH 762.1.k) and KBo 29.6(+) ii 27–28 (CTH 762.2). Both considerations, and particularly the former one, support the attribution of the fragment to CTH 762.

Translation

§ 1′  
1′  [...] ri[m ...]  
2′  [...] bottom and [...]  
3′–4′  [...] ta]kes [... of] clay with his hand.  
4′  [...] into [...]  
5′  At the same time, [she speaks] th[u]s in [L]uwian:

§ 2′  
6′  "As [the ri]m [does not become] the bo[t]tom  
7′  and the [bo]ttom [does not become] the r[im],  
8′  [...]"

ings likewise not become [...]!=. The incantation under discussion was presumably accompanied by stroking(?) a clay pot, while the one in CTH 758 was presumably accompanied by presenting bronze items symbolizing heaven and earth.

7′: A defective reading of what is otherwise written pu-u-ri-in-zi is the most probable solution in this context in the light of the traces on the tablet fragment.
Great Ritual and ḫallīyattanza-ritual (CTH 762)

CTH 762.3.4

Table of Manuscripts

A₁  KUB 35.13  Bo 3921 + VAT 14618 + Bo 9707
A₂  + CHDS 2.99  + Bo 9647
A₃  + KUB 35.36  + Bo 7589

Transmission and Research History

The join between A₁ and A₂ belongs to Oğuz Soysal (communication to Konkordanz in February 2011), while A₃ was added to this direct join in Sasseville 2020c, 559–61. The direct joins were confirmed by the collation of the original fragments. The joined piece belongs to a right column of a double-columned tablet. The fragments A₂ and A₃

Transliteration

§ 1

Right column

A₁ r.col. 1’  [...] ma ku-i-e-eś [...]
A₁ r.col. 2’  [...] k[i]n ku-na-an-te-eś n[...]...
A₁ r.col. 3’  [...] pár-š[...a-íz-zi nam-ma-a[š...]
A₁ r.col. 4’  [...] s[...a-an še-er ša URUDU [...]
A₁ r.col. 5’  [...] ŠA URUDU-ia ŠA GIST[...]
A₁₂ r.col. 6’  [EGR-an-da 20’ GAGI ZABAR 20’ GIS[...]
A₁₂ r.col. 7’  ’30’ GAGI GAGI GAGI-GIS’-ru-wa-aš da-a-i
A₁₂ r.col. 8’  nu-uš-ma-aš [x] i-da-la-a-mu-uš na-ak-ki-[uš]
A₁₂ r.col. 9’  kat-ta tar-ma-a’ iz’-zi MUNUSŠU.GI lu-ú’-f’-[li an-da]
A₁₂ r.col. 10’  ki-šš-sa-an [eras.] (mē)-ma-i

§ 2

A₂₁₂ r.col. 11’  tar-ma-a’-i-im’-m[i-in-zi-la-t] a a-ša-an-du
A₃₁₂ r.col. 12’  a-ad-du-[wa-li-in-zi wa]’-a’-š-an-ti-in-z[i]
A₃₁₂ r.col. 13’  nu-kás MUNUSŠU.GI na-ak-[k] i-uš ŠUMP’ MA’-[TE-SU-NI]
A₃₁₂ r.col. 14’  Šal-za-a-i a-[ah-ša-am-m]-i-in-z[i-ša-ta a-ša-an-du]
A₃₁₂ r.col. 15’  pu-u-wa-a-t[i-ši-in-zi o-t][i-ša-ta a-ša-an-du]
A₃₁₂ r.col. 16’  ḪUTU-ti p[ar-ra-an pa-a i]š-ša-ri-i[n [...]
A₃₁₂ r.col. 17’  ’a-ri’-[i]n[...]x ni-i-iš [...]
A₁ r.col. 18’  [...] iš-ša-ra-z[...]
A₁ r.col. 19’  [...] a-ša-[a-ša-t[a-za ...]
A₁ r.col. 20’  [...] za-šš-ša-in [...]
A₁ r.col. 21’  [...] x-in-z[i [...]
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are broken along the intercolumnium. The find spot of the tablet remains unknown; the ductus of the joined fragments is New Script. The fragments A₁ and A₃ were published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 133 and 131 respectively and attributed to the dupaduparša-ritual, while A₃ was first published in transliteration as a join to A₁ in Soysal 2012, 190.

Contents

§§ 1’–2’ Nailing down the nakkīu-spirits, with its Luwian incantation

The text of the fragments treated here runs parallel to that of KBo 29.6(+) iv 1’–10’ (CTH 762.2); hence the proposed CTH attribution. While the act of nailing the nakkīu-spirits is also mentioned in KUB 35.81(+) iv 3”–4” (CTH 759.3), this parallel is far less precise.

Translation

§ 1’
Right column
1’ […] those who […]
2’ […] (are) killed […].
2’–3’ She [crj]umbles […].
3’–4’ Then, […] of copper on […].
5’ […] of copper and of […].
6’–7’ [Aft]eward, she takes twenty nails of bronze, twenty [nails of …] (and) thirty pegs of wood.
8’–9’ With them, she nails down the evil nakkīu-[spirits].
9’–10’ [At the same time], the Old Woman speaks thus in Luwian:

§ 2’
11’–12’ "May the evil dead be nailed (down)
13’–14’ — the [Old] Woman calls the [nakk]ū-spirits by [their] names—!
14’–16’ [May] the former (spirits) be separated […] before the Sun-god!
16’–17’ [Then] may […] not […] hand […].
18’–19’ […] to their] hands […] to their) alalatt-
20’–21’ […] of this […]!"
Commentary

r.col. 8’–9’: For the Old Woman as the subject of this sentence, and presumably those that immediately precede it, see KUB 35.81(+) iv 5”–6” (CTH 759.3).

r.col. 12’: The noun [wa]-’a’a-la-an-ti-in-z[i] presumably represents the Luwian designation of the nakkiu-spirits. We analyze it as a form of the substantivized possessive adjective /walanti(ja/i)/ ‘those of the dead’, although the interpretation /walant(i)/- ‘the dead’ is also possible (and preferred in Melchert 2023). This etymology is consistent with the identification of the nakkiu-spirits as the spirits of the dead, reached on independent grounds (Mouton 2020b).

r.col. 13’–14’: Calling the spirits of the dead by their respective names is a remarkable act, because it implies that a specific group of the nakkiu-spirits, presumably

CTH 762.3.5

Table of Manuscripts

A       KUB 60.36   Bo 1266

Transmission and Research History

This fragment belongs to a right column of a double-columned tablet. Its ductus is New Script. Its direct join with KBo 29.58, reported in Sasseville 2020c, 556, was refuted by the collation of the original tablet fragments. The indirect join is also unlikely, since the signs of the two fragments are of different size. Nevertheless, both fragments reflect the same scribal hand, sharing it with KBo 29.60 (CTH 762.3.3; see Fig. 2.25). Furthermore, KUB 60.36 and KBo 29.58 appear to refer to the same rite, so that these two fragments can be used for mutual restorations. Under these circumstances, one can advance a working hypothesis that we are dealing with two tablet series reflecting copies (or closely parallel versions) of the same text written by the same scribe (see typologically CTH 762.1 vs. CTH 762.2). If so, then KBo 29.60 may

Transliteration

§ 1’
Right column
A r.col. 1’  [...]x da-a-i
A r.col. 2’  [...] e]-’ep’-zi
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identified with specific deceased individuals, is held accountable for the misfortunes
of the ritual patron (on this point, see Puértolas Rubio 2022, 145). Elsewhere in the
Kuwattalla tradition, we find only the reference to the ritual patron called by name
(KUB 9.6+ i 39, CTH 759.1). The restoration of a-[aḫ-ša-am-m]i-in-zi ’separated’
follows H. Craig Melchert (pers. comm.).

**r.col. 16**: The reading p[ár-ra-an] is based on the collation of the original fragment
KUB 35.36.

**r.col. 18′–19′**: This clause and the preceding two are partially restored with the help
of the parallel version KBo 29.6(+ iv 7′–9′ (CTH 762.2).

belong to the same tablet series as either KUB 60.36 or KBo 29.58, but not to both. Since
the choice here cannot be reasonably made, we number all three fragments as if
they all belonged to different tablet series. The fragment KUB 60.36 was edited in
transliteration in Groddek 2006, 37–38. It was first explicitly linked to the Kuwattalla
tradition in van den Hout 1994, 123.

**Contents**

§§ 1′–2′ Patient’s moving back and forth effigies strung on a thread, with its Luwian
incipitation

§ 3′ Unclear

The fragment can be assigned to CTH 762 based on its phraseology (see commentary). The identification of the thread with the intertwined strands of wool mentioned in several other fragments suggests that the relevant rite belongs to the initial
part of the ritual.

**Translation**

§ 1′
Right column
1′ She takes/puts […].
2′ She [h]olds [...].
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Commentary

r.col. 4′–5′: This is the unique mention of a thread in the available corpus of the Kuwattalla tradition. It is arguably co-referential with the intertwined strands of wool that are attached to the ritual patron in KBo 9.147(+) ii 7′–10′ (CTH 761.2.1.a) and subsequently removed with the help of goddess Andaliya in KUB 35.48 iii 14′–22′ (CTH 760.4). See the explicit mention of the threads of blue wool and red wool in the Maštigga ritual (KBo 39.8 ii 5, Miller 2004, 69–70). Consequently, the figurines strung...
3’ She holds up [...] before [the ritual patron]n.
4’–6’ [The ritual patron move]s back and forth [the figurines] strung on a thread on this side and [on that] side.
6’–7’ and, at the same time, the Old Woman pronoun[nces] the following [words in Luwian]:

§ 2’
8’ [“(It) was chopped: judgment], curse,
9’ [perjury, maternal (or) pa]ternal,
10’ [of the brother (or) sister, of a male]
11’ [(or) female servant, of mountain-dwellers] (or) desert-dwelle[rs],
12’ of [an army of assembly]
13’ [...]!”

§ 3’
14’ [...]”

on the threads may be tentatively identified with the evil tongues, which are mentioned in KUB 35.48 iii 33’ shortly after the Andaliya episode. The movement back and forth seems to aim at making the figurines fall off and thus at neutralizing the miasma they represent.

r.col. 6’–7’: This turn of phrase is typical of CTH 762, see KBo 22.254(+) ii 2–3 and 5–6 (CTH 762.3.2).
## Transliteration

### § 1’

**Right column**

A r.col. 1’ EN’ ŠISKUR o o iš-ga-ra-an-da SIGšu-ú-i-li an-da
A r.col. 2’ du-wa-a-an d[ur-wa-an-na EGIS-pa-ra-a-ia]
A r.col. 3’ ni-ni-in-ki-[š-ke-ez-zi MIN[SU.GI-ma-kân]
A r.col. 4’ ud-da-a-ar lu-s’-[li an-da kiš-an me-mi-iš-ke-ez-zi]

### § 2’

A r.col. 5’ za-az-za-ra-a-ta[r[a-ta ta-pa-ru ta-ta-ar-ri-ia-ma-an]
A r.col. 6’ ’hi’-ru-ú-un a-an[n[i-ia-an ta-an-ti-ia-an]
A r.col. 7’ [S]ES[a]n NIN[a][n IR-li-ia-an]
A r.col. 8’ [GEME-I]l-ia-a[n lu-la-hi-ia-an ḫa-a-pi-ri-ia-an]
A r.col. 9’ [ku-wa-ar-ša-ajš-a-an tu-ú-li-ia-aš-ša-an]
A r.col. 10’ [...] x x [...] 

## Commentary

**r.col. 5’**: The likely stem of za-az-za-ra-a-ta[r[a-ta] is /tsatsara-/, based on the comparison with za-ra-a-i-mi-[n-zi], the participial form used with reference to the evil tongues in KBo 13.264 r.col. 9’ (CTH 763.2.8). The reconstruction of the medio-passive stem za-az-za-ra-a-ta(r) follows Sasseville 2020c, 95–96.
Translation

§ 1′
Right column
1′–3′ The ritual patron moves back and forth the figurines strung on a thread on this side [and on] that [side]
3′–4′ [and, at the same time, the Old Woman pronounces the following] words in Luwia[n]:

§ 2′
5′ "(It) was chopped: [judgment, curse],
6′ perjury, maternal (or) paternal,
7′ [of the brother]r (or) siste[r, of a male]
8′ [(or) female servant, of [mountain-dwellers (or) desert-dwellers],
9′ of [an army of assembly]
10′ [...]"

r.col. 6′–9′: Contrast the other occurrences of the same chain of merisms in CTH 760–761, which invariably feature the initial pair 'past (or) future'. This negative observation is compatible with grouping the present fragment under CTH 762.
A KIZZUWADNA RITUAL RELATED TO THE KUWATTALLA TRADITION
CTH 763.1.1

Table of Manuscripts
A KUB 35.8 Bo 4548

Transmission and Research History
This New Script fragment with unknown find spot contains the beginning of column one of what was likely a double-columned tablet and features the incipit of a ritual text. It was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 43 and interpreted as belonging to a Kizzuwadna ritual that is distinct from the Kuwattalla tradition.

Transliteration

§ 1
Obv. i
A i 1 [...]"KUR.""KU-IZ-ZU"^[WA-A]T[N][A]
A i 2 [...]"ra"-an nu lu-i-li
A i 3 [ki-iš-sa-an ḫu-uk-ki-[i]š-ke-mi

§ 2
A i 4 [...]n ma-na-a-ḥa a-ad-du-wa-li-[in]
A i 5 [MUNUS-in a-ad-du-w]a-li-in zi-ti-in

§ 3
A i 6 [...]x-da ši-wa-an-n[axpa-at-t[a ...]
A i 7 [...]x xpa-at-ta [x] a-an-da [...]n
A i 8 [...]x-ar UDU-iš GU-[iš u-wa-x[...]
A i 9 [...]-at-"ta"-ia-ti a-ri-[a-...]

Commentary

1: For the tendency to use the Sumerogram KUR as a determinative rather than logogram next to geographic names, see Kudrinski 2017b.
A KIZZUWADNA RITUAL RELATED TO THE KUWATTALLA TRADITION (CTH 763.1.1)

Contents

§ 1  Hittite incipit mentioning a ritual practitioner from Kizzuwadna
§ 2  Luwian incantation likely mentioning an evil man and evil woman
§ 3  Luwian incantation mentioning a sheep and a bovine

The animals mentioned in § 3 constitute the primary evidence for assigning the fragment under discussion to CTH 763.1, while the tandem of an evil man and evil woman indirectly supports the same conclusion (see the commentary). If the attribution of this piece indeed links it to the Kuwattalla tradition, the person hidden behind the “performer from Kizzuwadna” must be Šilalluḫi (see the discussion of the “performer from Ziluna” in CTH 760.2).

Translation

§ 1

Obv. i
1  [...] (of) the land of Kizzu[wa][tn[a]
2–3  [...]. I [conjus]re [thus] in Luwian:

§ 2

4  “I saw [...], an evil
5  [woman (or) an evi]l man.

§ 3

6  [...] šiwanna [...]
7  [...] in [...]
8  [...] sheep, bovine, […]
9  […]”

Commentary

i 5: See KUB 35.68:12’ (CTH 763.1.3.a) with the commentary to the translation for the likely reference to the tandem of the evil man and evil woman in the context of CTH 763.1.
The Luwian form ši-wa-an-na can hardly be separated from Hitt. šiwanna/i-, a noun of unknown meaning occurring in the texts of the Tunnawya tradition (CHD Š, 488a). Note the occurrence of the same Hittite noun in KUB 35.146 iii 8', a fragment

CTH 763.1.2

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.65 Bo 518

Transmission and Research History

This fragment preserves a part of the tablet adjacent to its right edge, with the final words of several lines of column two, which are frequently written on the edge, and more substantial portions of column three. The ductus of the tablet shows typical features of Middle Script and the same scribal hand as that of KUB 35.54 (CTH 758.1; see Fig. 2.1). The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 180–81 as belonging to an unspecified Old Woman ritual.

Transliteration

§ 1'

Obv. ii
A ii 1' [...]x
A ii 2' [...]x
A ii 3' [...]x
A ii 5' [...] n[U₄]A-MUNUS-MA 1 GLU-AB
A ii 6' [...] n[U₄]a-aš-ma 3 LÚMES
A ii 7' [...] 1GU₄[MAḤ ŠIR
A ii 8' [...] A-N[MAH] MUNUSMES, IA QA-TAM-MA-pát
A ii 9' [...] 1 UDU.'SIG+MUNUS' 1 UZ₆
A ii 10' [...] UDU.'SIG+MUNUS'₆A

§ 2'

A ii 11' [...] ma-an-ta-al-li-ia
A ii 12' [...] na-ak-ku-uš-ša-hj[i]-ti
A ii 13' [...]x-uš
A ii 14' [...]x-na-an-zı
featuring Luwian incantations and showing particular resemblance to the Tunnawiya tradition (see Vol. 2, Section 1.2).

Contents

§ 1’ Hittite passage enumerating animals
§§ 2’−4’ Unclear Hittite passages; mantalli- and scapegoat rites are mentioned
§§ 5”−6” Luwian incantation for the punishment of the “lords of offense and fault”
§§ 7”−9” Hittite passage describing a libation with kitchen pots, with its Luwian incantation
§ 10” Unclear

The attribution of this fragment to CTH 763.1 follows from the presence of the bovines among the animals of the ritual, the reference to the mantalli-rite, and the mention of ‘offense’ and ‘fault’, but not ‘judgment’ or ‘curse’, among the miasma. It seems likely that the fragment under discussion belongs to the initial part of the ritual.

Translation

§ 1’

Obv. ii

1’ […]
2’ […]
3’ […]
4’ […] for a man,
5’ [one bull …] but [f]or a woman, one cow
6’ […] o]r three men
7’ […] one b]ull, one ram
8’ […] fo]r women, exactly the same
9’ […] one e]we, one goat,
10’ […] ewes.

§ 2’

11’ […] to the man]talli-rite
12’ […] to the scapegoat]-rite
13’ […]
14’ They […]

© by authors
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A ii 15' [...] pa-a-an-zi
A ii 16' [...] 
A ii 17' [...]x 'tar²-na-an-zi

§ 3'
A ii 18' [...]x-zi
A ii 19' [...] na-ak-ku-š]a-a-hi-ti
A ii 20' [...] 
A ii 21' [...] 'e³-eš

A ii 22' [...] 
A ii 23' [...]x

§ 4'
A ii 24' [...] h]u-u³-ma³-an-da

§ 5'
Rev. iii
A iii 1' [...]x⁴-ti³-i[t-...]
A iii 2' [...] 'u-ti za³'an-da' x[...]
A iii 3' [...] ša[t]a³-na-aš ḥa-ra-at-na-aš³'-ši-in-za³'
A iii 4' [wa-aš-ku-li-im-ma-aš]-ši-in-za EN-an-za
A iii 5' [...] ia-aš a-a-aš
A iii 6' [...] išša-ri-iš a-an-da
A iii 7' [...]x a-aš-ta ḥa-an-na-a
A iii 8' [...] z]i-i-la du-ū-du-pa
A iii 9' [...]l]a ū-ut-ra šar-ra
A iii 10' [...]-ši

§ 6'
A iii 11' [...] a-pa]-a-ar-ha za-aš-ta-a-at-ta
A iii 12' [...] a-ar ma-an-ta-a-al-la
A iii 13' [...] t]a³ na-a-nu-um-pa na-na-a-at-ti
A iii 14' [u-wa-li-ia-at-ti] pa-an a-ap-pa ḥa-ra-at-na-an-ti-iš
A iii 15' [wa-aš-ku-li-im-ma-a]n-ti-iš ni-iš
A iii 16' [...] ma-a]l-ha-aš-aš-aš-ši-in EN-an

§ 7'
A iii 18' [...] h]u-u-uk-zi-m]a ki-iš-ša-an

§ 8'
A iii 19' [pa-ta ḥa-la-a-al a-aš-tu² du²]h]u-pu-wa-a-ia
A iii 20' [...] t]i hi-i-ru-ū-ta-ti
They go […]

They release [the scapegoat].

§ 3′

… to the scapegoat]-rite

§ 4′

… a][l]l […]

§ 5″

Rev. iii

“[…] down to the Storm-god

… the lords of offense (and) [fa]ult (acc.)!

… them, make them

… the h]and (nom.)

… judge them

… i)n the future, strike

… up

…

§ 6″

[Sun-god], you zašta-ed the [ab]ar.

You […]-ed slanderous […].

Now you bring [(and) kill …].

May offense [(and) fault] not [see the r]itual patron again!”

§ 7″

[Afterward, she … kitchen p]ots for libating

[a]nd [she conjures] thus:

§ 8″

"[May] the kitchen pots [be pure]

[From …] perjury,
A Kizzuwadna Ritual Related to the Kuwattalla Tradition (CTH 763)

A iii 21′ [ú-la-an-tal-li-ia-ti ḫu-u-it-wa]-li-ia-ti
A iii 22′ [pu-u-wa-ti-la-ti pa-ri-ia-na-a]-la-ti

§ 9′
A iii 23′ [ḫa-ni-ia-ti i-iš-ša-ra-ti] ḫa-ni-ia-ti
A iii 24′ [EME-tiʔ ...-aš]-ša-an-za-ti
A iii 25′ [...]

§ 10′
A iii 26′ [...]-a
A iii 27′ [...]
A iii 28′ [...]-x

Commentary

ii 7′: The mention of the bull and cow among the ritual implements separates this fragment from the rituals of the Kuwattalla tradition classified under CTH 759–762. Compare, in particular, the ritual inventories in KBo 29.3+ i 5–9 (CTH 760.2) and KUB 35.18(+) i 8–12 (CTH 760.1.a), which mention only sheep and goats among the animals of ritual, although several fragments of CTH 761 also refer to piglets. For parallels involving gender-specific assignment of animals in Hittite ritual texts, see Haas 1994, 893 fn. 118.

ii 11′: See the use of the adjective ma-an-ta-a-al-la in iii 12′ below. It is possible that the offerings listed in the preceding paragraph are related to the mantalli-rite. For this rite in general, see van den Hout 1998, 5–6 (with bibliography).

ii 12′: The restoration of the reference to the scapegoat rite, here and in line 19′, is facilitated by the reference to the mantalli-rite immediately above and the verb ṭar-na-an-zi, which is commonly used for the release of a scapegoat, in line 17′ below (see Mouton 2014a).

iii 3′–4′: The pair of miasma ‘offense (and) fault’ represents an obvious link between KUB 35.65 and certain rites in the Kuwattalla tradition; for the distribution of the relevant rites, see Vol. 2, Section 3.6. Note that the synonymous pair of Hittite cognates wa-aš-túl ḫa-ra-[a]-[tar] is attested in the Maštigga tradition (KBo 43.319 i 6′, Miller 2004, 136) but not in its best-preserved ritual against domestic quarrels (CTH 404.I). For additional instances of the same Hittite collocation, see Starke 1990, 445–46 fn. 1603.

iii 8′: It is obvious that the passage under discussion contains an incantation addressed to a deity and that the imperative predicates have ‘the lords of offense and fault’ as patients. The identity of the deity is more problematic. The Storm-god, directly mentioned in the preserved part of the incantation, would be the appropriate agent matching the predicate du-ū-du-pa ‘strike’, but his occurrence in the dative
case in line 2′ illustrates a different role from that of the divine addressee. There is a theoretical possibility to take ū-tp as a vocative form, but its vocalism would be difficult to explain given the assured vocative ti-wa-ta 'Sun-god' in KUB 32.10+. Tarḫunt- and Tiwad- are the only two consonantal stems of the common gender that are preserved in the Luwian language. Therefore, it seems more likely that another deity, lost in a lacuna, functions as the addressee of the imperative clauses. Given that § 6′ below finds a close counterpart in KUB 35.68:13′–15′ (CTH 763.1.3.a), an incantation addressed to the Sun-god, one can tentatively suggest that the same deity is also involved in our text, while the Storm-god is merely allotted here a certain role in the punishment of the evildoers.

iii 11′: The interpretation of this clause is very problematic. We take za-aš-ta-a-at-ta as a verbal form, because the next clause apparently features another verbal form ending in [...]-t[a?] (iii 13′). Given that the whole paragraph probably represents an incantation addressed to the Sun-god, as suggested by the parallel passage KUB 35.68:13′–15′ (CTH 763.1.3.a) and the 2sg.pres. form na-na-a-at-ti in line 13′, it seems likely that /-tta/ in za-aš-ta-a-at-ta is the ending of 2sg.pret. This, in turn, suggests that [a-pa]-a-ar-ḥa (restored on the basis of KUB 35.68:14′) functions as the object rather than subject in the clause under discussion. From the morphological viewpoint, one can analyze this segment as the additive clitic /=ya/ attached to an r-stem, which would match another r-stem functioning as the object of the next clause ([...]-a-ar in iii 12′).

iii 17′: The only other mention of the ḫupuwai-vessels in texts related to the Kuwat-talla tradition—namely, KBo 47.136 (CTH 763.2.13)—refers to their destruction rather than libations.

iii 23′: The adjective /xani(ja)i/- 'bad' is exceptionally used here instead of /attuwal(i/- 'evil', typical for this collocation. For the derivatives of this adjective in hieroglyphic transmission, predetermined by the sign MALUS₂, see Starke 1990, 387.
Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.68 381/b

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment was found in Building A of Büyükkale. There are insufficient clues to determine its position on a tablet. It was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 395 without being assigned to any specific composition.

Transliteration

§ 1’
A:1’ [...]’az’-[...]
A:2’ [...]-ki-[...]
A:3’ [...]-da-a-x[...]
A:4’ [...]’a’-ti ú-i-x[...]
A:5’ [...]xp-ni-i păr-na-[n-...]
A:6’ [...]x x x’pi³lu-pa-an a-ri-[n-...]
A:7’ [...]-ru-un-ni

§ 2’
A:8’ [...]’a’-ar-ri pár-ar-na zi-i-ia-ri [...] gēššû:a
A:9’ gēššû:a-ti za-áp]-pu-un-da!(MA) gēšku-up-pé-eš-ša gēšku-up-pî-[ša-ti]
A:11’ [...]-ša/t]a’-na-ti za-ap-pu-un-ta

§ 3’
A:13’ [...]’ti]-wa-za a-pa-ar-ḫa za-aš-ta-a-at-ta na-[...]
A:14’ [...]-a]r ú-up-na-al-la ma-a-an-ta-al-la [...] 
A:15’ [...] ’na’-a-nu-um-pa là-la-a-at-ti u-wa-li-ia-a[t-ti ...]
A:16’ [...] t]a-a-ti-iš ְ’ti]-wa-az za-am-ma-an-ta-at-x[...]
A:17’ [...] x x x x [...]x’-ru’]-wa du-uš-du-uš- [...]

§ 4’
A:18’ [...](-)’hu³-u-wa-an-t[ar-...]
A:19’ [...]-da-ša-a[n-...]
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Contents

§ 1’ Unclear Luwian passage
§ 2’ Luwian incantation mentioning the offering of furniture
§ 3’ Luwian incantation addressed to the Sun-god
§ 4’ Unclear Hittite passage

The identical ductus of this fragment and KUB 32.124 (CTH 763.1.3.b; see Fig. 2.26) is an argument for assigning it to CTH 763.1. Furthermore, a parallel, involving several lexical items in the incantation addressed to the Sun-god, links this fragment to KUB 35.65 (CTH 763.1.2), which in turn supports the same attribution to CTH 763.1.

Translation

§ 1’

1’ “[...]
2’ [...] 3’ [...] 4’ [...] 5’ [...] hous[e ...] 6’ [...] 7’ [...] we [...]”

§ 2’

8’ [...] lie the houses [...] 8’–9’ [We have tre]ated (ritually) [a stool from (among) the stools]. 9’–10’ [We have treated (ritually)] a footstool [from (among)] the footstools. 10’ [We] have treated (ritually) a table from (among) the tables. 11’ [We] have treated (ritually) [...] from (among) [...].

§ 3’

12’ [Whether it (is) a man, h]ere he (is). Whether (it is) a woman, [here she (is)]. 13’ [...] Ti[wad, you have also zašta-ed the abar-]. 14’ [You have [...] the upnalla- (and) slanderous [...]] 15’ [...] Now, you will take (and) kill [...]! 16’ [...] F]ather Tiwad, [...] the bewitched [...] 17’ [...] (v. to place around) [...]”

§ 4’

18’ [...] 19’ [...]
Commentary

7': The juxtaposition of 1pl.pres. ending /-unni/ in this paragraph and the 1pl.pret. ending /-unta/ in the paragraph to follow represents an important argument for determining the semantic value of the latter ending.

8'–11': This is the best-preserved passage dealing with the ritual treatment of items of furniture; the likely parallel is available in KBo 8.129 i 17'–20' (CTH 759.10.a) and inferentially also in KUB 35.54 ii 20'–22' (CTH 758.1); see already Starke 1990, 111. Since the paragraph under discussion is immediately followed by an incantation addressed to the Sun-god, one can hypothesize that the furniture under discussion represents an offering for the deity, which is consistent with the context in KUB 35.54, where the furniture certainly represents an offering to the Storm-god of the Open Country. It is not immediately obvious whether the expression 'X from (among) the X-es' denotes the best X available or merely one of the available X-es.

12': This pair of clauses, if correctly restored, appears to introduce the enemies of the ritual patron, man or woman, whom the Sun-god is expected to destroy(?). Presumably, they are represented by anthropomorphic figurines. The best available parallel here is KBo 29.3+ ii 18–27 (CTH 760.2), the incantation addressed to the Sun-god aimed at the submission of the ritual patron’s opponents, likewise represented by

CTH 763.1.3.b

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 32.124 741/b

Transmission and Research History

This fragment of a left edge of a tablet with the adjacent parts of column one and column four was found in Building A of Büyükkale. Its ductus suggests that it is a New Script copy of an older text. The piece was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 171–72 as belonging to an unspecified Old Woman ritual.
figurines. While the use of gender-specific figurines is attested in KBo 34.245+ (CTH 762.1.c), there is no evidence that they represent the opponents of the ritual patron. For a commentary on this part of the incantation and a parallel of a gendered curse against bewitchers, see Puértolas Rubio 2022.

13': Melchert 2023 (sub zāštā-) translates za-a-aš-ta-a-at-ta as 'you made present'.

14’–17’: This incantation finds a non-trivial parallel in the fragmentary passage KUB 35.65 iii 11’–14’ (CTH 763.1.2), which represents the principal argument for assigning the fragment under discussion to the same cluster. See the restored mention of the mantalli-rite in KUB 35.65 ii 11’. The restoration of u-wa-li-ia-a[t-ti] ‘you will kill’ is conjectural, but see ASSUR letter e § 10 [(MORI)]wa/i-ri+i-ta-ti ‘is dying’, a reduplicated stem derived from the Luwian root /wal-/ ‘to die’.

16’: See /tsammanta/ in KUB 35.54 ii 25’ vs. /tsappatta/ in KUB 35.54 ii 38’ (CTH 758.1, q.v.).

18’–19’: While the translation of this paragraph is currently impossible, the sequence [...](-) hu-[-wa-an-ta(-)] [...] is compatible with several Hittite restorations. Another factor that tips the scales in favor of treating it as a Hittite passage is the parallel with KUB 35.65 iii 17’–18’, where a Hittite passage follows a related incantation (CTH 763.1.2).

Contents

§ 1’–3’ Rite involving scapegoats
§ 4’ Fragmentary Hittite passage
§ 5’ Unclear
§ 6’ Luwian incantation for removing evil by means of an animal substitute
§ 7’ Fragmentary Hittite passage mentioning a sheep

The reference to a bovine in § 6’ and the overall similarity of the relevant incantation to the one in KBo 29.36 § 2’ (CTH 763.1.4) constitute sufficient reasons for assigning the fragment to CTH 763.1. The fragment belongs to the same tablet series as KUB 35.68 (CTH 763.1.3.a; see Fig. 2.26) and probably reflects a later point in the proceedings, since the scapegoat rites tend to be placed in the final part of the rituals within the Kuwattalla tradition.
Transliteration

§ 1′
Obv. i
A i 1′ $[na]-^*$ak-ku-$(uš)-ṣî-[uš ...]
A i 2′ lam-ni-ia-[a-ẕzl]

§ 2′
A i 3′ a-pé-e-da-aš-ma-k[âni ...]
A i 4′ $SUM-MÃ-TE-SU-NU \{\text{ḥal-za-a-i} ...\}
A i 5′ ku-i-uš EN SIS[KUR na-ak-ku-uš-ṣi-uš]
A i 6′ lam-ni-az-zî [...]  
A i 7′ ku-e-da-ni-ia A-[NA ...]

§ 3′
A i 8′ nu-uš-ṣa-an a-pu-u-[uš ...]
A i 9′ a-pé-e-da-ni [A-NA ...]
A i 10′ pé-ra-an kat-t[a ...]
A i 11′ kat-ta [...]  

§ 4′
A i 12′ $x \times 2$-[SU 7 [...]  
A i 13′ [...]x-"[hu"-r]-[...]  

§ 5′
Rev. iv
A iv 1′ $x \times [...]  

§ 6′
A iv 2′ GU₄-i[š-pa-ta o o pád-da-ia-i]
A iv 3′ UZIG[À-ti UZUNÍG.GIG-ti ḫa-a-ra-tar-ṣa]
A iv 4′ wa-aš-ku-[wa-al-li-im-ma-an-za ...]
A iv 5′ ḫi-i-ru-[ta-aš-ṣa-an-za]

§ 7′
A iv 6′ na-a[š ...]
A iv 7′ na-a[š ...]
A iv 8′ an- [...]  
A iv 9′ na- [...]  
A iv 10′ UDU [...]  
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§ 1
Obv. i
1′ [sc]apegoat[s ...]
2′ [...] assign[s]

§ 2′
3′–4′ [...] calls] their names.
5′–6′ (Those) whom the rit[ual] patron designates [as scapegoats]
7′ and to which [...].

§ 3′
8′–10′ [She places] down those [...] before that [...].
10′–11′ [...] down [...].

§ 4′
12′ Twice seven [...] 
13′ [...] 

§ 5′

Rev. iv
1′ [...] 

§ 6′
2′–3′ "The bovine [with] (its) hea[rt (and) liver is carrying off]
4′–5′ [the offense] (and) fau[l ... of] perj[ury]."

§ 7′
6′ She [...] .
7′ She [...] .
8′ [...] .
9′ [...] .
10′ sheep [...] .
Commentary

i 1’–2’: See the designation of a scapegoat in the Maštigga tradition (KBo 39.8 iii 38; Miller 2004, 91).

i 5’–10’: While the restoration of these lines must remain conjectural, one can advance a hypothesis that the animals assigned as scapegoats for specific deities are placed in front of the representations of the respective deities. The situation when the ritual patron, not the Old Woman, designates scapegoats might refer to his designation of the animals as his living substitutes.

CTH 763.1.4

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 29.36 457/w

Transmission and Research History

This Middle Script fragment contains a small portion of a left column of a double-columned tablet. The margin of the intercolumnium is partially preserved, but appears to be unusually slanted. The fragment was found in the area of Building D of

Transliteration

§ 1’
Left column
A l.col. 1’ [...]x-ia-an ʾḫu’-[it-wa-li-ia-an]
A l.col. 2’ [wa-a-la-a]n-ti-an ʾšēš-an’ N[IN-an ...]
A l.col. 3’ [pád-da-li-i]a-i pa-a-ta ma-a-u-wa-a’ ’ti’ [pa-ar-ta-ti]
A l.col. 4’ [ar-pu-w]a-na-ti ma-an-na-ku-na-a-ti pád-da-ʾli-ia’-i

§ 2’
A l.col. 5’ [pa-a-ta] SīG-ti pád-da-li-ia-i GU,iš-pa-ta [x]
A l.col. 6’ [...] pád-da-li-i-a-i ūZUŠAʾ-ti ūZUŠIG.GIG-ti
A l.col. 7’ [ha-a-ra-tar-ša w]a-ʾaš’-ku-[wa-al]-li-im-ma-an-za
A l.col. 8’ [... ʾhi-i-ru-t]a-ʾaš-ša-an-za’
iv 2′–5′: This paragraph is restored with the help of the parallel version KBo 29.36 lcol. 5′–8′ (CTH 763.1.4). The question that imposes itself but does not have a clear answer is whether this incantation refers to animal substitutes (Luw. /tarpassa-/), as demonstrably does its counterpart in KUB 35.43+ iii 24′–30′ (CTH 761.3.8), or more specifically to the scapegoats (nakkušši-) mentioned on the other side of the same fragment. In fact, one should probably contemplate the possibility that the animal substitutes are co-referential with the scapegoats in this context: they are simply kept alive and thus function as nakkusši-.

Büyük kale and published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 379 without being assigned any textual attribution.

Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Luwian incantations for removing evil by means of animal substitutes

The mention of a bovine together with an ovid constitutes the primary reason for attributing the fragment under discussion to CTH 763.1 (see under CTH 763.1.1).

Translation

§ 1′

Left column

1′–3′ "It is [carrying off ... of the] liv[ing or the dead, brother (or) sister, ...].

3′–4′ It is carrying it off with (its) four [legs, forehe]ad, snout.

§ 2′

5′ [It] is carrying [it] off with (its) wool. The bovine,

6′ is [... carry]ing it off with (its) [... heart (and) liver,

7′ [the offense (and) f]ault

8′ [...] of [per]jury."
Commentary

l.col. 1′–3′: There is little doubt that the object of this clause consists of some miasma, to be carried away by an animal substitute, as is expressed in l.col. 7′–8′. The implied subject of the clause is probably a sheep, given the reference to wool in the next paragraph, arguably in connection with the same subject.

l.col. 3′: The verb pád-da-li-ia-‘to carry’ must etymologically be related to pát-za-‘to carry’, which occurs in a functionally similar incantation in KUB 35.54 iii 9–11 (CTH 758.1; see further Yakubovich 2016a, 75–76). For the syntactic relationship between the two clauses of this paragraph compare another similar formula, KUB 35.43+ ii 10–15 (CTH 761.3.8).

l.col. 5′–8′: The reference to the bovine represents the primary reason for classifying this fragment under CTH 763.1. The form [ḫi-i-ru-t]a-⸢aš-ša-an-za⸣ is restored based...

CTH 763.1.5

Table of Manuscripts

A  KBo 29.47  39/q

Transmission and Research History

This tiny fragment was found in the area of Building K of Büyükkale. It contains a fragment of the intercolumnium and some signs to its left or right. The side of the tablet cannot be determined, and consequently one cannot establish the relative order of the left and right column; ordering §§ 3″–6″ after §§ 1″–2″ is a mere guess. The duc-

Transliteration

| § 1″  |
|---|---|
| Rev. iii? A iii? 1′  | x[...] |
| A iii? 2′  | UD[a]x[...] |
| A iii? 3′  | GU₄-t[a-...]| |

| § 2″  |
|---|---|
| A iii? 4′  | na-nu-[un ...] |
| A iii? 5′  | ḫu²-x[...] |
on the parallel version KUB 32.124 iv 5' (CTH 763.1.3.b). The expression '[the offense (and) fault ... of [per]jury', unique as it is in the preserved part of the Kuwattalla tradition, supports the contention that cleansing the ritual patron of the committed perjury represents the primary goal of this group of rituals.

l.col. 5': The restoration [UDU-ša-t]a is also formally possible, but it seems unlikely that the ritual activity of the sheep is described in one very short clause. The restoration [pa-a-t]a would imply that the clause under discussion logically belongs with the preceding paragraph. Compare the parallel incantation KUB 32.124 (CTH 763.1.3.b), where the paragraph line is more logically placed before the clause featuring the bovine as its subject.

tus of the fragment cannot be dated due to the lack of diagnostic signs. The right column was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 385 but not assigned to any specific text.

Contents

§ 1' Sheep and bovine are mentioned
§ 2' Fragmentary Luwian incantation
§§ 3''–6'' Unclear

The fragment is tentatively assigned to CTH 763.1 in view of the occurrence of the signs for sheep and bovine in the adjacent lines of § 1'.

Translation

§ 1'
Rev. iii?
1' "[...]
2' sheep [...]
3' bovine [...]  

§ 2'
4' No[w ...]
5' the Storm-god [...]
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Commentary

iii² 2–3; The sheep and the bovine mentioned next to each other constitute the only evidence for assigning the fragment under discussion to CTH 763.1. At the same time, the sequence GU₄-[…] is rather unexpected, and the Luwian language of the paragraph under discussion is not assured.

CTH 763.1.6

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 9.143 275/n

Transmission and Research History

This likely Middle Script fragment was found in Büyükkale in a secondary archaeological context. It contains fragments of columns two and three together with the
Commentary

iii

4′–5′: The na-nu-[un] is the only argument for treating the fragment under discussion as containing Luwian linguistic material. The mention of the Storm-god is not assured (contra Starke 1985, 385 and van Gessel 1998, 769), the reading DÎŠ[TAR] is also possible.

right edge of the tablet. It was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 121–22 and assigned to the dupaduparša-ritual.

Contents

§ 1′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation mentioning nailing down

§§ 2′–3′ Lifting of the “animal of the šarlatt-sacrifice”, with its Luwian incantation
A Kizzuwadna Ritual Related to the Kuwattalla Tradition (CTH 763)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 4’</td>
<td>Luwian blessing formula mentioning descendants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 5’</td>
<td>Hittite passage describing a rite probably still involving the “animal of the šarlatt-sacrifice”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 6’</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§§ 7’–9’</td>
<td>Fragmentary Luwian incantations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 10’</td>
<td>Fragmentary Hittite passage mentioning a gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 11’</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transliteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv. ii’</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ii’ 1</td>
<td>[...]-aš-ši’-iš aš-šu-ši-x[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ii’ 2</td>
<td>[...] ta]-ri-mi-iš-ti-t[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ii’ 3</td>
<td>[...] n-iš] ma-na-a-ti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A ii’ 5  | [nam-ma-at kat-ta da-a-i na-aš-ta] šar-la-at-ta-aš-šič’-i[i n an-da u-un-ni-an-zí] |
| A ii’ 6  | [na-aš-ta a-pu-u-un-na EN SÍSKUR a-ra-a-i-zí] |
| A ii’ 7  | [nu MUNUSŠU.GI ki-iš-ša-an te-ez]-zí |

| A ii’ 8  | [a-ri-it-ta-ta EN SÍSKUR ḥa-a-ra]-tar-ša wa-aš-ku-wa-al-li-im-ma-a[n-za] |
| A ii’ 9  | [...] a-a-ri-in wa-a-ar-ma]-a-un-ta na-a-nu-um-pa |
| A ii’ 10 | [...] šar-la-a-un-du] ta-a-ti-in DUTU-an |
| A ii’ 11 | [...] ’a’-u-wa-at-tar-ša |

| § 4’ | |
| A ii’ 12 | [...] EN SÍSKUR i-it-wa-ni-ti-ia-an-za |
| A ii’ 13 | [ma-am-ma-an-na-ad-du DUMÚMES-ti ḫa-am-ša-a-ti ḫa-am-šu-uk-kal-la-a-ti |
| A ii’ 14 | [a-ar-ra-a-ta uš-ša-a-ti ap-pa-r]a-an-ta-ti a-a-ra-ti ḫa-at-tu-u-la-a-hi-ta-ti |

| § 5’ | |
| A ii’ 16 | [...] ’a-pé’-e-ez-pát |
| A ii’ 17 | [...] p]é-en-ni-al[n-zi] |
| A ii’ 18 | [...] x |
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Column two of the tablet contains the description of the šarlatt-sacrifice, which is reminiscent of KUB 35.16(+) ii 16’–23’ (CTH 760.3.b). Nevertheless, the mention of the "Father Sun-god", also attested in CTH 763.1.2 but nowhere else in the Kuwattalla tradition, tips the scales in favor of assigning this fragment to CTH 763.1. For more details, see Vol. 2, Section 3.6.

Translation

§ 1′

Obv. ii′
1′ "[...] of the peg.
2′ The peg [...].
3′ [May] he [not] see [...]!”

§ 2′

4′ [The Old Woman carries] away [the liver (and) heart together with thick]
bread.
5′ [Then she places them down. They lead in] (the animal) of the šarlatt-sacrifice.
6′ [The ritual] [patron] lifts [that one as well]
7′ [and the Old Woman says] [thus]:

§ 3′

8′ "[The ritual patron has lifted off]ense (and) fail[t].
9′ [Previously, we performed [conjurations]. Now,
10′ [...] Let us praise] Father Sun-god!
11′ [...] eyesight

§ 4′

12’–13’ [...] may] the ritual patron [see] fertility, [with children, g]randchildren, great-
grandchildren,
14′ [long years, fut]ure time, health,
15′ [virility], favor (and) enlivenment of [the deities]!”

§ 5′

16′ [...] from that [...]?
17′ they lead out [...].
18′ [...]
§ 6″
A iii! 1’ [...]x-aš
A iii! 2’ [...]  
A iii! 3’ [...]  

§ 7″
A iii! 4’ [...]  
A iii! 5’ [...] E[N-aš]  

§ 8″
A iii! 6’ [...]pa-an
A iii! 7’ [...]an
A iii! 8’ [...]x-a-ti
A iii! 9’ [...]  

§ 9″
A iii! 10’ [...] ku-wa-a[n-zu-u$]
A iii! 11’ [...] u-ra-an-‘nu’-[un-du]
A iii! 12’ [...]a[n?]  

§ 10″
A iii! 13’ [...]x-zi
A iii! 14’ [...]Ka.GAL-aš
A iii! 15’ [...]x ke’e’[...]
A iii! 16’ [...] x x  

§ 11″
A iii! 17’ [...]tu [...]  
A iii! 18’ [...] x [...]  

Commentary

ii! 1’–3’: This incantation is parallel to KUB 35.16(+) i 11″-15″ (CTH 760.3.b), but it shows a different word selection. Presumably, it states that after the liver and heart of the evildoer are firmly nailed down, the ritual patron will no longer see misfortunes. The fragmentary form aš-šu?-[...] may belong to the Luwian stem /assu-/ ‘stone’, but this is uncertain.

ii! 4’–7’: This paragraph is restored based on the parallel passage KUB 32.8(+) iv 28″-30″ (CTH 759.10.b); see also KUB 35.16(+) i 16″-18″ (CTH 760.3.b). Note the implied reference to other animals lifted in the previous part of the ritual, for which we do not have independent textual evidence.
§ 6″
Rev. iii
1′ “[...]
2′ [...]
3′ [...]

§ 7″
4′ [...] 5′ [... ritual patron]

§ 8″
6′ [...] 7′ [...] 8′ from [...]
9′ [...] 10′ [... hear]vy
11′ May [...] be magnified!
12′ [...] 13′ [...] 14′ [...] the gate
15′ [...] this
16′ [...] 17′ [...] 18′ [...]

ii! 9′: The stem /warma-/ 'to perform conjurations' is restored here based on the parallel passage KUB 35.16(+) i 20″ (CTH 760.3.b, q.v.).

ii! 10′: For this epithet of the Luwian Sun-god, see Haas 1994, 378 fn. 500; van Gessel 1998, 878; and Hutter 2003, 224 (see also the commentary to KBo 9.141 i 18′–19″; CTH 761.2.4). Note the Hittite calque addaš ²UTU-uš in the Maštigga ritual text KBo 2.3+ i 33″; Miller 2004, 72 and Steitler 2017, 344 fn. 1111.

ii! 11′: The interpretation of 'aʼ-u-wa-at-tar-ša as /awattar-sa/ '(eye)sight' implying the comparison with Hitt. uwātar '(eye)sight' is necessarily tentative, since one cannot exclude that the beginning of this form is lost in the lacuna. Note, however, that
Hitt. *uwātar* may constitute a desirable quality sought from gods—for example, in the context of the Ambazzi tradition (Mouton 2019c, 163). If this interpretation holds, then Luw. *āwattar-sa* and Hitt. *uwātar* are probably derived as abstract nouns from the inherited verbal root "*au-*/*u-* 'to see, to appear", with the selection of different Ablaut grades.

ii' 12': The tentative meaning of *i-it-wa-ni-ti-ia-an-za* ‘fertility’ is proposed based on context. The blessing formula under discussion finds a rather precise counterpart in KUB 32.8(+) iv 32’–35’ (CTH 759.10.b) and a more remote parallel in KUB 32.10+ obv. 13’–15’ (CTH 761.1.b), where one lacks space for the restoration of *i-it-wa-ni-ti-ia-an-za*. It can be contrasted with a better attested-blessing formula, not mentioning the descendants of the ritual patron; see for example KUB 35.16(+) i 9’–13’ (CTH 760.3.b).
ii’ 16’–17’: The object here is presumably the animal of the šarlatt-sacrifice; contrast line ii’ 5’ above.

iii’ 11’–14’: The combination of the Luwian verbal form ‘to magnify’ and the Sumerogram for ‘gate’ finds a unique parallel in KBo 29.6 (+) KUB 35.70 i 31’ and ii 9, 11 respectively (CTH 762.2). The parallel is characteristic enough to surmise identical stages in the progression of the ritual, even though the two tablet series diverge from one another in many details. Judging by KBo 29.6(+), the relevant passage postdates the šarlatt-sacrifice, and so one can establish that the passage under discussion belongs to column three on our tablet, following column two containing the description of the šarlatt-sacrifice.
Table of Manuscripts
A Bo 4388 Bo 4388

Transmission and Research History
The full transliteration of the fragment was provided in Fuscagni 2007, 70–71 (with references to previous publications). We are grateful to Oğuz Soysal and Mine Çifçi, who granted us access to its unpublished photograph on behalf of the project "Unpublished Boğazköy-Fragments: Edition and Research".

Transliteration

| § 1' | A:1'  | [...] x [...] |
| A:2' | ša-ra-a a-ra-an'-ta'(-) [...] |
| A:3' | nu 4 UDUḪ-pat Û 1 MĀŠ.GAL [...] |
| A:4' | 1 UDU ik-ku-na-at-ta-aš 1 UDU [...] |
| A:5' | iš-ḫar-nu-ma-anzial 1 MĀŠ.GAL ma A- [...] |

| § 2' | A:6'  | na-ak-ku-uš-ši'-uš' [...] |

| § 3' | A:7'  | 1 SAH.TUR 1 UR.[TUR [...] |
| A:8' | [MU]SENḪ-[i]a iš[-] [...] |

| § 4' | A:9'  | 1 NINDA 'a-a-an' [...] |

Commentary

2': The content of this line is not sufficient to determine whether it belongs to the incipit of the main ritual, or introduces its variation performed under specific circum-
Contents

§§ 1’–4’ List of ritual implements

The similarity of the inventories in the fragment under discussion, on the one hand, and the (partially) preserved lists of ritual implements that assuredly belong to the Kuwattalla tradition, on the other hand, was stressed in Hutter 2019a, 340–41. At the same time, the existing differences between this fragment and its counterparts and contradictory textual clues (see the commentary) preclude its more precise identification.

Translation

§ 1’

1’ […]
2’ (v. to stand up) […].
3’ Only four sheep and one billy-goat […]
4’ one sheep of the ikkunatt-sacrifice, one sheep […]
5’ they smear with blood. One billy-goat fo[r …].

§ 2’

6’ The scapegoats […].

§ 3’

7’ One piglet, one pu[ppy …]
8’ and [b]irds […].

§ 4’

9’ One warm bread […]

stances or for specific patrons. An argument for the second hypothesis is the smaller number of sheep (four) than those mentioned in the incipits of CTH 760 (eight).
4′: The reference to the *ikkunatt*-sacrifice suggests that the fragment under discussion probably does not belong to the free-standing version of the Great Ritual. For the addition of the *ikkunatt*-sacrifice to the Great Ritual later on in the development of the tradition, see Vol. 2, Section 3.6.

CTH 763.2.2

Table of Manuscripts
A KBo 46.55 37/q

Transmission and Research History

This Middle Script fragment was found in Büyükkale in a secondary context. The fragment is partly preserved on both sides, but the obverse cannot be positively identified based on its physical features. It is likewise uncertain whether it belongs to a single-columned or a double-columned tablet. It was published in transliteration in Grodek 2015, 40–41.

Transliteration

§ 1′
Obv.
A obv. 1′ [...] x [...] 

§ 2′
A obv. 2′ [...]x-ia ar-ḫa x [...] 
A obv. 3′ [...] [erased signs]

§ 3′
A obv. 4′ [...]i-in ḫar-zi 
A obv. 5′ [...] GA]L.GIR₄ 'RI-QIQI 
A obv. 6′ [...] ud-da-a-a]r me-mi-iš-ke-[z-zi]
7': This is the only reliable reference to the ritual use of a puppy within the Kuwattalla tradition. See the tentative restoration of the Luwian word for ‘dog’ in KUB 35.28 i 7’ (CTH 761.3.2.b) and KUB 35.29 l.cold. 5’ (CTH 761.3.5.b). Note that the remaining references to the ritual use of a piglet within the Kuwattalla tradition all cluster in CTH 761.

8': Fuscagni 2007, 71 restores iš-[har-nu-ma-an-zi], presumably by analogy with line 5’.

### Contents

| §§ 1′–2′ | Unclear |
| §§ 3′–5′ | Hittite passages describing an ablution rite |
| §§ 6′–7′ | Hittite passage describing an unclear rite addressed to a Sun-deity |
| § 8′ | Unclear |
| §§ 9′–10′ | Fragmentary Hittite passage possibly describing a taluppi-rite |
| §§ 11′–12′ | Fragmentary Hittite passage mentioning a bull horn and the ritual patron |
| § 13′ | Fragmentary Hittite passage describing a taluppi-rite |

The set of the rituals and ritual objects mentioned in this fragmentary text provides a strong indication that it reflects the Kuwattalla tradition. The feature that sets it apart from other texts belonging to the same tradition is the apparent absence of Luwian incantations. One can hypothesize that the tablet contained the synopsis of the ritual, with most or all the incantations omitted, which would also be consistent with the absence of paragraphs of more than three lines in its preserved part. The precise version underlying the synopsis cannot be determined.

### Translation

| § 1′ |
| Obv. |
| 1′ | [...] |

| § 2′ |
| 2′ | [...] |
| 3′ | [...] |

| § 3′ |
| 4′ | He/she holds [...]. |
| 5′ | [...] an empty ceramic [cu]p. |
| 6′ | She pronounce[s ... word]s. |
§ 4’
A obv. 7’ [...]x a-pé-e-pát

§ 5’
A obv. 8’ [...] A-NA EN SÍ]SKUR
A obv. 9’ [pa-ra-a e-ep-zi [...] EN SÍSKUR QA-TI-ŠU a-a]r-ri
A obv. 10’ [...] 

§ 6’
A obv. 11’ [...] me-na-aḫ-ḫa-an-d]a US-[E-EN³]
A obv. 12’ [...] 

§ 7’
A obv. 13’ [...] ṣUTU-i
A obv. 14’ [...] 

§ 8’
A obv. 15’ [...] x [...] 

§ 9”
Rev.
A rev. 1’ [...] EN ]SÍSKUR’ x[...]
A rev. 2’ [...] 

§ 10”
A rev. 3’ [...]xMES-SU ki-an[...]
A rev. 5’ [...] 

§ 11”
A rev. 6’ [...] SI GU₄ A-NA EN ’SÍSKUR’ x x [...] 
A rev. 7’ [...] 

§ 12”
A rev. 8’ [...]x ’na’aš-ta EN SÍSKUR x[...]
A rev. 9’ [...] 

§ 13”
A rev. 10’ [...]x [MENUSU.GI iš’-na-an pár-ku-i’n ta-lu-up-pí-in [...] 
A rev. 11’ [...] x [...]
§ 4′
[...] those [...].

§ 5′
8′-9′ [She holds ... toward the ritual [patron].
9′ [The ritual patron washes [his hands].
10′ [...]  

§ 6′
11′ [He] bo[w in fron]t of [...].
12′ [...]  

§ 7′
13′ [...] to the Sun-deity
14′ [...].

§ 8′
15′ [...]  

§ 9″
Rev.
1′ [...] ritual [patron ...]
2′ [...]  

§ 10″
3′ [...] his [...] lie [...].
4′ [...] to] his [h]ead [and] body [...]
5′ [...]  

§ 11″
6′ [...] bull horn to the ritual patron [...]
7′ [...]  

§ 12″
8′ [...] the ritual patron [...]  
9′ [...]  

§ 13″
10′ The Old Woman [...] the pur[e taluppi-lump] (of) dough.
11′ [...]
Commentary

Obv. 6': The phrase uddār memiškezzi usually introduces direct speech in the texts of the Kuwattalla tradition. This text, however, does not appear to contain any Luwian incantations. Accordingly, one can envisage two possibilities. The following paragraph either contains the Luwian incantation translated into Hittite or is devoted to the next round of ritual manipulations. In the latter case, uddār memiškezzi should be understood as ‘pronounces (the same) words’, or something similar.

CTH 763.2.3

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 29.40 1910/u

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment was found in the area of Building A at Büyükkale. It contains a fragment of a right column adjacent to the edge of the tablet. Judging by the shape of the curve, it is likely to be column three. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 381 without being attributed to any particular composition.

Transliteration

§ 1′
Right column
A r.col. 1′ [...]x-zi' [...] 
A r.col. 2′ [...] iš-tu x[...]
A r.col. 3′ [...]k]e-ez-z[i]
A r.col. 4′ [...]z]i

§ 2′
A r.col. 5′ [...]x ti-ia-mi-i[s]
A r.col. 6′ [...] [UTU-az
A r.col. 7′ [...]a/i[a]ši-ta-ši-in-z[i]
A r.col. 8′ [...]−in-zi DINGIR[MEŠ− zi
A r.col. 9′ [...] DINGIR[MEŠ− zi
A r.col. 10′ [...]−in-zi
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Rev. 4': The usual context for the mention of the head and body in the texts of the Kuwattalla tradition is a taluppi-rite. A more explicit reference to the same rite can be reconstructed in § 13" below.

Rev. 6': The bull horn (Si GU₄), is otherwise mentioned in the list of ritual implements in KUB 35.18(+) i 6' (CTH 760.1.a), but see also the commentary to KBo 29.15:6' (CTH 761.1.e).

Rev. 10': The accusative form 'iš'-na-an, used here instead of the expected genitive case form, should be explained as an instance of partitive apposition.

Contents

§§ 1’–2’ Fragmentary Hittite passage, presumably accompanied by a Luwian incantation that features a list of deities
§ 3’ Unclear

The divine list finds several likely parallels in the Kuwattalla tradition, but we do not have enough data to prove this attribution or specify the version of the ritual. The incantation addressed to various gods may be situated at the very beginning of the ritual, but this is uncertain.

Translation

§ 1’
Right column
1’ [...]  
2’ [...] from [...]  
3’ she [...]  
4’ [she says]:

§ 2’
5’ [...] the earth  
6’ [...] the Sun-god  
7’ [...]  
8’ the gods [...]  
9’ [...] the gods [...]  
10’ [...]
A r.col. 11′ [...] 
A r.col. 12′ [...]x

§ 3′
A r.col. 13′ [...] x x x [...] 

Commentary

r.col. 5′–6′: For the mention of the earth alongside the Sun-god in a divine list in the Kuwattalla tradition, see KBo 22.254(+) iii 7′ (CTH 762.3.2).

CTH 763.2.4.a

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 29.42 Bo 69/147

Transmission and Research History

This fragment was found in the Temple I area. The order of the two sides remains uncertain and the fragment’s original location on the tablet cannot be determined either. The ductus of the tablet is Middle Script. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 382 without textual attribution. It probably belongs to the same tablet series as KBo 61.31 (CTH 763.2.4.b; see Fig. 2.27).

Transliteration

§ 1′
Obv.?  
A obv.? 1′ [...]-r]-i-in- [...] 
A obv.? 2′ [...]-(w)a-aš-ša-a[t-...]

§ 2′
A obv.? 3′ [...]-(n)a-aš-ša-a-li-in- [...] 
A obv.? 4′ [...]-(z)a?  c?PAN-an-za pî-i[a-...]
A obv.? 5′ [...] c?GAG.U.TAG.GA-in g[t87,...]
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r.col. 5’–9’: See KBo 29.55+ i (CTH 761.3.8) for localizing an incantation addressed to several deities within the context of the Great Ritual. Another suggestive parallel is KBo 29.45 (CTH 762.1.b).

Contents

§ 1’       Fragmentary Luwian incantation
§ 2’       Fragmentary Luwian incantation mentioning bow and arrow
§§ 3’–4’   Ritual shooting(?), with its Luwian incantation
§ 5’       Unclear
§ 6’       Fragmentary Luwian incantation featuring a list of deities

Since all the Middle Script fragments that belong to Kuwattalla tradition and mention the standard triad of miasma are otherwise assigned to CTH 760 or CTH 761, we assume the same options for both fragments. No further specification is possible. The fragment may belong to the first tablet of the ritual, if the purpose of ritual shooting is relocating evil away from the ritual patron (see the commentary to CTH 763.2.6).

Translation

§ 1’
Obv.?
1’  “[...]
2’  […]

§ 2’
3’  […]
4’  […] the bow […]
5’  […] the arrow [...].”
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§ 3′
A obv.? 6′ [... ĜAG.Ū.TAG.G]A² da-a-i na-at iš-ṭ[U ...]
A obv.? 7′ [...] ud-da-a-ar-ra lu-ū-[i-li ...]
A obv.? 8′ [...] ki-iš-ša-an me-[m]iš-ke-ez-zi

§ 4′
A obv.? 9′ [...] ma-’al’-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-si’- [...] 

§ 5″
Rev.? 1′ [...]-zi an’- [...] 

§ 6″
A rev.? 2′ [...] x-aš DINGIRMEŠ ḫa-[r[a’- [...] 
A rev.? 3′ [...] x-aš DINGIR x[...] 
A rev.? 4′ [...] ni-[zi’ [...] 
A rev.? 5′ [...] DINGIRMEŠ [...] 

Commentary

Obv.? 4′–5′: This is the only fragment mentioning a bow and arrow within the Kuwattalla tradition, although the likely reference to a “archer” in VBoT 43 ii 7′ (CTH 763.2.5) and shooting in KBo 29.48 ii 4 (CTH 763.2.6) may suggest that this fragment reflects a variation of the same rite.

CTH 763.2.4.b

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 61.31 Bo 69/723

Transmission and Research History

This fragment, found in the Temple I area, contains small portions of the end of the obverse and the beginning of the reverse, as well as a part of the lower edge of the tablet. Since the narrative of the reverse apparently does not continue that of the obverse, it stands to reason that we are dealing with columns one and four. The ductus of the fragment is Middle Script (see Fig. 2.27). Its identification as part of the Kuwatt-
§ 3′
6′ [...] takes [the arrow] and wi[th ...].
7′–8′ [At the same time, ... pro]nounces [the following] words in Lu[wian]:

§ 4′
9′ “[...] ritual patron ...”

§ 5′
Rev.7
1′ “[...]

§ 6′
2′ [...] the gods [...] 
3′ [...] deity [...] 
4′ [...] 
5′ [...] the gods [...]”

Obv.7 6′–8′: It seems likely that the ritual patron fires the arrow, while the Old Woman utters an incantation relating this gesture to the destruction of impurity. For the use of bow and arrow in ritual texts, see Haas 2003, 718–23.

talla tradition is that of Detlev Grodek (see Konkordanz sub KBo 61.31). There has been no available edition of the fragment until now.

Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Unclear
§ 3′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation mentioning a city
§ 4′ Fragmentary Hittite passage mentioning a mountain
§§ 5′–6′ Ritual spitting by more than one ritual patron, with its Luwian incantation
§ 7′ Fragmentary Hittite passage

For the attribution of the fragment, see the commentary to CTH 763.2.4.a.
Fragments of the Kuwattalla Tradition (CTH 763)

Transliteration

§ 1'

Obv. i
A i 1'  [... x [...]
A i 2'  [...-a]n [...]

§ 2'

A i 3'  [...]-iš a[n-...]
A i 4'  [...]-ni-iš-ti-[
A i 5'  [...]n]a-an-za ni-[

§ 3'

A i 6'  [...] URU-ri ni-[š? ...]
A i 7'  [...]-š]a'-an-na UR[ [...]
A i 8'  [...] LÚ.M]EŠDUGUD-la-an-z[a ...]
A i 9'  [...] a-wa-a[n ...

§ 4'

A i 10'  [...]x ḪUR.SAG-it-t[a [...]
A i 11'  [...]-ti-it-ta a'-ú'[ [...]
A i 12'  [...]a'-ti-it-ta [...]
End of col. i

§ 5'

Rev. iv
A iv 1  [... a]l-la-pa-ah-ža-a[n-z]i
A iv 2  [nu MUNUSŠU.GI te-e]z-z[ ...]

§ 6'

A iv 3  [a-ah-ra-an wa-ah-r]a-an tap-pa-[
A iv 4  [ta-pa-a-ru da-a-t]a-ri-ia-am-[
A iv 5  [hi-rù-ú-un ma-a-i]a-aš-ši-in E[ME-in]

§ 7'

A iv 6  [...]x-aš k[a'-...]
A iv 7  [...] te-e[z-z[ ...]

Commentary

i 1'–5': The language of these lines is impossible to determine; its transliteration as Luwian is a mere guess.

i 6'–9': The language of these lines is not easy to determine. The main argument in favor of its identification as Luwian is the form LÚ.M]EŠDUGUD-la-an-z[a, which can
Translation

§ 1′

Obv. i

1′–2′ “[…]

§ 2′

3′–5′ […]

§ 3′

6′ Ma[y ... not ...] to the town […]
7′ [...] to[wn ...]
8′ [...] to the DUGUD-official[s ...]
9′ [...]”

§ 4′

10′–12′ […] with the mountain […] and with […] and with […]

End of col. i

§ 5′

Rev. iv

1 [They s]pit […]
2 [and the Old Woman say]s:

§ 6′

3 “[They] spa[t (out) woe (and) pai]n,
4 [judgment, cu]rse,
5 [perjury], the to[ngue] of [the mult]itudes.”

§ 7′

6 […]
7 [… (and)] say[s]:

hardly be anything but a Luwian dat.pl. noun. In contrast, URU- ’in/to the town’ can be most easily analyzed as a Hittite form in view of the Late Luwian stem URBS+MI-n(i)-. Nevertheless, it is possible that a different stem for ‘town’, cognate with Hitt. ḫāppira-, was used in Luwian in the Empire period. The form a-wa-an likewise re-
ceives the most straightforward analysis as a Hittite preverb, yet one must assume that its cognate also existed in Luwian in view of Late Luwian /wanaxxa/ < *awan arxa (Yakubovich 2012). We are grateful to H. Craig Melchert for his discussion of these problems and the identification of the Sumerogram DUGUD in line i 8’ (pers. comm.).

CTH 763.2.5

Table of Manuscripts

A VBoT 43 CWCA 9

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment of undetermined find spot belongs to a lower part of a double-columned tablet and partially preserves the end of column two, the very beginning of column three, and the adjacent portion of the intercolumnium. A photograph of the fragment is not available and the original fragment could not be collated. The fragment was published in transliteration and implicitly attributed to the Kuwat-talla tradition in Starke 1985, 191–92.

Transliteration

§ 1

Obv. ii
A ii 1’ [a]r²-₇ ha’ [...] A ii 2’ a-ab-ha-ta(-)[-] [...] 

§ 2

A ii 3’ na-aš-ta [MENUS][SU,GI ...] A ii 4’ pa-ra-a pé-[e-da-i ...] 

§ 3

A ii 5’ EGI-R-an-da-ma [...] A ii 6’ na-aš-ta aš-ḫa-x[...] A ii 7’ ši-iš-ša-tal-[a-...] 

§ 4

A ii 8’ za-a-ú-i-in ši-x[...] End of col. ii
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iv 1: This is the sole instance of multiple ritual participants simultaneously performing spitting in the Kuwattalla tradition. Most likely, the implied subjects are the ritual patron and his wife. See the mention of BE-EL-TI SÍSKUR in DBH 46/2.33 (CTH 761.2.1.b), multiple ritual patrons in KUB 35.78(+) (CTH 759.3), and the option of multiple ritual patrons in KUB 9.6+ (CTH 759.1).

Contents

§ 1′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation
§ 2′ Possibly disposal of the implements used in the previous rite
§§ 3′–4′ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing a rite that possibly mentions an archer, with its Luwian incantation

If the fragment contains the rite of shooting away the miasma, its closest counterpart is KBo 29.42 (CTH 763.2.4.a), which mentions a bow and an arrow. Presumably, it belongs to the initial part of the ritual (see under CTH 763.2.6).

Translation

§ 1′
Obv. ii
1′ [...] away [...]  
2′ "[...] it away [...]"

§ 2′
3′–4′ The [Old] woman car[ries] out [...].

§ 3′
5′ Afterward, [...]  
6′–7′ [...] arch[er] [...]
7′ [...] says:

§ 4′
8′ "Here [...]"

End of col. ii
Rev. iii
A iii 1  ta-pa-‘a’-[ru ...]
A iii 2  x […]

Commentary

ii 1’–2’: The sequence of the Hittite local adverb and its Luwian equivalent is noteworthy. If the autograph contains no mistakes, this suggests that the first paragraph contains both the Hittite description of a ritual gesture and the accompanying Luwian incantation.

ii 7’: Although the Hittite noun šiššatalla- is not otherwise attested, from the formal viewpoint this is a regular agent noun derived from šišša- ‘to seal, shoot’ (CHD Š, 448). The mention of a bow and arrows in the fragment KBo 29.42 (CTH 763.2.4.a), which

CTH 763.2.6

Table of Manuscripts

A  KBo 29.48  264/q

Transmission and Research History

This Middle Script(?) fragment comes from the area of Building A at Büyükkale. This dating is urged by the geometric shape of the signs, which reminds us of other MS fragments of our corpus. It contains a corner of the tablet adjacent to its right side. The small portions of the cuneiform text are preserved both on the obverse and the reverse. The fragment is published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 385–86, without being attributed to any particular composition.

Transliteration

§ 1’
Obv. ii⁷  A ii⁷ 1–3  […]

§ 2’
A ii⁷ 4  […]  GAG.Ū.TAG.GAḪ(?  GISS)-ru-wa-aš ši-ia-an-zí
A ii⁷ 5  […]
A ii⁷ 6  […]
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likewise reflects the Kuwattalla tradition, motivates the preference for the translation ‘archer’. The reading ši-iš-ša-ri-[...] offered in Starke 1985, 192 is not conducive to a lexical identification.

**ii 8’– iii 2:** The Luwian incantation in § 4′ apparently cuts across the column division, because Luw. /tabaru-/ ‘ruling, judgment’ normally does not appear in sentence-initial position. It is possible that the incantation refers to sending away the miasma by way of shooting arrows. See also the commentary to CTH 763.2.6.

**Contents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1’</td>
<td>So far as preserved, empty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2’</td>
<td>Fragmentary Hittite passage describing shooting wooden arrows(?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§§ 3’–4’</td>
<td>Fragmentary Hittite passage featuring the libation(?) of beer, with its Luwian incantation mentioning high mountains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5’</td>
<td>Fragmentary Hittite passage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The content of §§ 3’–4’ allows us to assign them to the rite of removing impurity by way of shooting arrows (see the commentary). This in turn is conducive to a tentative conclusion that we are dealing with the first tablet of a ritual text belonging to the Kuwattalla tradition. Since the relevant rite is attested in both CTH 760.2 and CTH 761.2.1.a (q.v.), linking this fragment to a specific version appears to be impossible.

**Translation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1’</td>
<td>Obv. ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 2’</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>They [wo]oden [arrows [...].]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§ 3′
A ii? 7  
[..]ḫu’ 1 DUG-KU-UB KAŠ
A ii? 8  
[..]x-zi nu lu-ū-i-ši
A ii? 9  
[ki-iš-ša-an ...]

§ 4′
A ii? 10  
[..]p[a-r-t]a-ia-ti ḪUR.SAG-ti
A ii? 11  
[..]ḪUR.SAG-ti
A ii? 12  
[..]ta-pa-ru ta-ta-ri-am-ma]-an Ḫi-ru-ū-u[n]
A ii? 13  
[..] x [..]

§ 5″
Rev. iii? 1′  
[..]t]-it EME-it
A iii? 2′  
[..]iš-ḫa]-ah-ru-wa-az
A iii? 3′  
[..]x
End of col. iii?

Commentary

ii? 4: For the likely mention of shooting in the Kuwattalla tradition, see VBoT 43 ii 7′ (CTH 763.2.5, q.v.). Compare also the mention of bow and arrow in KBo 29.42 (CTH 763.2.4.a). The likely purpose of shooting is the removal of impurity (see below).

CTH 763.2.7

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.60 314/c

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment was found in Building A of Büyükkale. It contains the middle section of the lower part of the tablet, with the intercolumnia preserved on both sides. Adjacent to them are the tiny remains of the lower part of column one and two and the upper part of columns three and four. The fragment was edited in transliteration and implicitly attributed to the Kuwattalla tradition in Starke 1985, 177–78.
§ 3′
7 [...] and one jug of beer.
8–9 [she says thus] in Luwian:

§ 4′
10 [... from the [h][i][g]h mountain,
11 [... from the [m][o]untain,
12 [... judgment, curs[e], perjur[y],
13 [...]"

§ 5″
Rev. iii″
1′ [...] with the tongue,
2′ [...] from [t]ears,
3′ [...]"
End of col. iii″

ii″ 7: Note the reference to the jug of beer in KBō 29.3+ ii 11 (CTH 760.2), in a passage that arguably concludes the rite of removing miasma, the beginning of which is arguably fragmentarily preserved here.

ii″ 10–13: The reference to the high mountains in the ablative can be reconstructed in KUB 35.49(+) i 2′ (CTH 761.2.1.a), which also belongs to a rite for removing impurity.

Contents

§ 1′ Unclear
§ 2″ Luwian incantation mentioning miasma
§§ 3″−4″ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing a rite involving figurines, with its Luwian incantation
§ 5″ Unclear

The list of miasma supports the attribution of the fragment to the Kuwattalla tradition, while the rite with figurines represents a strong argument for assigning the fragment to the initial part of the ritual. Unfortunately, the small size of the fragment precludes any speculations about the specific version of the tradition that it represents.
Fragments of the Kuwattalla Tradition (CTH 763)

Transliteration

§ 1′
Obv. i?
A i? 1′  […] x x'-ga?-ar?*
A i? 2′  […]-mi
End of col. i?

§ 2″
Obv. ii?
A ii? 1′  [t]a-t[a]-a[r-ia-am-ma-an ḫi-ru-ū-un]
A ii? 2′  ma-ia-āš-ši-[n EME-in]

§ 3″
A ii? 3′  nu še-e-ne-e[šš, ...]
A ii? 4′  n[u-kā]n A-NA […]
A ii? 5′  nu [x] ki-iš-[ša-an ...]
End of col. ii?

§ 4″
Rev. iii?
A iii? 1  za-ú-i-na-ta x[…]
A iii? 2  pa-ri-i-ia-t[a ...]
A iii? 3  ‘zi-i-la-am’[…]

§ 5″
Rev. iv?
A iv? 1  […]x  ‘UZU?’

Commentary

iii? 1: The presentation formula probably refers to the figurines mentioned in the preceding paragraph, since it is included in the incantation associated with the rite described immediately above.
Translation

§ 1′
Obv. i?
1′ [...] 
2′ [...] 
End of col. i?

§ 2′
Obv. ii?
1′ “[c]ur[se, perjury],” 
2′ [the tongue] of the multitudes.”

§ 3′
3′ The figurines [...] 
4′ [...] to [...] 
5′ [... speaks] th[us]: 
End of col. ii?

§ 4′
Rev. iii?
1 “Here they [(have) appeared ...]
2 forth [...]. 
3 Afterward [...].”

§ 5′
Rev. iv?
1 [...] meat
Fragments of the Kuwattalla Tradition (CTH 763)

CTH 763.2.8

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 13.264 81/s

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment is not associated with a known find spot, and its position on a tablet cannot be determined either. The surface of the fragment is badly damaged. The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 373–74 and in Torri and Barsacchi 2018, 298–99, but it has not yet been associated with any specific text.

Transliteration

§ 1′
Right column
A r. col. 1′ [...] x [...] 
A r. col. 2′ [...] x'-iš' a-aš-du

§ 2′
A r. col. 3′ [...] x-ra- [...] i an-za-t[i-li-in-zi ...] 
A r. col. 4′ [...] z[i] EME’-z[a] a-ra-in-z[i [...]
A r. col. 5′ [...] x[10]-a-zA x [...] x[8] a-x[...]
A r. col. 6′ [...] a-a-ri'-ia' hi[i]-n-z[i] EME’
A r. col. 7′ [...] EME’

§ 3′
A r. col. 8′ [...] š/t]a-x[...] 'a'-ša-an-du URUDU-ia-ti [tar-ma-ti]
A r. col. 9′ [...] x-š-t[a] a-ta za-ra-a-i-mi-i[n-zi a-ša-an-du]

§ 4′
A r. col. 10′ [...] ad]-du-wa-[i]-n-z[i] EM[E’] [...] 
A r. col. 11′ [...] h'u-ul-mi-ti-in-za [...] 
A r. col. 12′ [...] an-za-[t]-li-i-[n-...]
A r. col. 13′ [...] 

§ 5′
A r. col. 14′ [...] ia-an-du [...] 
A r. col. 15′ [...] x-a KLMIN [...] 
A r. col. 16′ [...] x [...] 
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Contents

§ 1’  Fragmentary Luwian incantation
§ 2’  Luwian incantation featuring a list of evil tongues
§ 3’  Luwian incantation mentioning piercing the evil tongues
§§ 4’–5’  Fragmentary Luwian incantations

The status of the fragment as part of the Kuwattalla tradition cannot be regarded as fully assured, but this is the most likely hypothesis in view of a suggestive parallel in Maṣṭigga’s ritual against domestic quarrels (see the commentary). For the similarity in the repertoire of rites between the Kuwattalla and Maṣṭigga traditions, see in general Vol. 2, Section 5.2.

Translation

§ 1’
Right column
1’  “[…]
2’  May […] be […]!

§ 2’
3’–7’  […] of the ou[rs …] tongues […] of brothe[rs …] tongues of the šariyaḫi- […]
tongues.

§ 3’
8’  May […] be […] with copper [nail]!
9’  [So may] they [be] pierc[ed]!

§ 4’
10’  […] evil tongue[s …]
11’  […] hulmiliti-objects […]
12’  […] of the ou[rs …]
13’  […]

§ 5’
14’  May they […]
15’  […] ditto […]
16’  […]”
Commentary

r.col. 3’–7’: Although the mention of multiple evil tongues is common in Hittite rituals, the only specific parallel for this in the Kuwattalla tradition is KUB 35.49(+) iv 1–2 (CTH 761.2.1.a). For a possible parallel in the Maštigga tradition, see Vol. 2, Section 5.2. The adjective /antsadil(i)-/ ‘of the ours’ is tentatively reconstructed based on the comparison with Luw. /ants(a)/ ‘us’. In this context, it may refer to those in the intimate sphere of the ritual patron, such as his family. For the opposition between internal and external curses, see in general Mouton and Yakubovich 2019. For a tentative reconstruction of the šariyaḫi-people, see KBo 29.49.7 (CTH 770), where ša-a-ri-ia[-...] follow Luw. [b]ar-du-wa-at-ti-in-zi ‘descendants’ (H. Craig Melchert, pers. comm.).

CTH 763.2.9

Table of Manuscripts

A  KUB 35.73  Bo 6938

Transmission and Research History

The find spot of this New Script fragment is unknown. The available text appears to belong to one column of a double-columned tablet, while a more precise determination of its original position on the tablet appears to be impossible. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 100–101, where it is attributed to the Great Ritual.

Transliteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 1′</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:1′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:2′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:3′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:4′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:5′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:6′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:7′</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:8′</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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r.col. 9': The form za-ra-a-i-mi-i-[n-zl] need not be separated from ABoT 2.241+ ii 13 za'-ri-[i]-' du-wa'-t[a] in the Puriyanni tradition (CTH 758.3.1), which has the contextual meaning ‘to chop, crush’ (differently Sasseville 2020c, 95–96). From the formal viewpoint, it likely belongs to a participle derived from the stem /tsar(a)i-(di)/, although the non-geminated spelling of -m- represents a complication.

r.col. 11': Theḫulmiti-objects likely represent something negative, given the likely cognate KUB 35.107+ iii 22 ḫu-u-wa-al-mi-in-za (CTH 764.1); Steitler (2017, 392–93, 399) associates the latter term with ḫulani-/ḫuliyā-’wool’.

Contents

§§ 1’–3’ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing an unclear rite, with its Luwian incantation for removing the effects of binding and smiting, and restoring the integrity of the afflicted body parts

§ 4’ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing an unclear rite

Neither the content nor the paleography of this fragment supplies clues for attributing it to a specific version of the Kuwattalla tradition. Judging by better-preserved fragments featuring parallel formulae, it belongs to a substitution rite, possibly involving a white sheep. The descriptions of this rite, with incantations featuring references to ‘binding’ and ‘smiting’, are found in CTH 760, CTH 761, and CTH 762.

Translation

§ 1’
1’ [...]  
2’ [...] to the ritual patron  
3’ [...] and [conj]ures thus:

§ 2’
4’ [...]  
5’ [...]  
6’–7’ [...] through the one for binding.  
7’–8’ [May the ritual] patron [...] through the one for smiting.
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§ 3′
A:9′  [laʔ-laʔ-ad-du-pa-aš ú-i-ta-a-laʔ?ti šš-a-a-ḫu-i-ta-la-ti
A:10′  [da-ru-uš-ša mi-i-ša-an-za ḫa-aš-ša ḫa]-ḫal-za-a-ni-in
A:11′  [u-wa-a-ra-na-ḥi-ša i-ū-na-ḥi-ša ]l-a-al-pi-in

§ 4′
A:13′  [… pe]-e’-da-i
A:14′  [… a-a]p-pa ar-ḫa
A:15′  […] x x

Commentary

4′–12′: This incantation uses fairly common diction and finds a particularly close parallel in KBo 29.37:3′–7′ (CTH 763.2.10, § 2′), but the repeated mention of the stan-

CTH 763.2.10

Table of Manuscripts
A KBo 29.37 29/v

Transmission and Research History

This tiny New Script fragment was found in Temple I. Judging by the line length of the restored text, it belongs to one column of a double-columned tablet. It was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 380 and classified in Starke 1990, 606 as belonging to the “third ritual”.

Transliteration

§ 1′
A:1′  […] ḫaʔ-[…]  A:2′  […]-ša-ti […]

§ 2′
A:3′  [laʔ-laʔ-an-du ša-ḫu-i-t]a-la-ti ša-ḫu-i-[a-an-ta-an]
A:4′  [laʔ-laʔ-an-du ú-i-ta-a-l]a-ti ú-i-ta-[m-ma-an]
§ 3′

[Through the one for smiting], through the one for binding, [may he take (back)]

§ 4′

 […] brings […]

14′–15′ […] away […].

dard epithets for substitutes, ‘the one for binding’ and presumably ‘the one for smiting’, constitutes a peculiarity of the present fragment.

Contents

§ 1′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation
§ 2′ Luwian incantation for removing the effects of binding and smiting, and restoring the integrity of the afflicted body parts

The content of § 2′, in as far as its reconstruction is possible, closely corresponds to that of §§ 2′–3′ of KUB 35.73 (CTH 763.2.9). It must likewise belong to a substitution rite, possibly involving a white sheep, while its attribution to a specific version of the Kuwattalla tradition appears to be impossible.

Translation

§ 1′

1′–2′ “[…]

§ 2′

3′ [May they take the bo]nds through [the one for binding],

4′ [may they take] the blo[ws] through [the one for smiting]!
Fragments of the Kuwattalla Tradition (CTH 763)
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A  KBo 29.14  290/c

CTH 763.2.11

Transmission and Research History
This New Script fragment was found in the area of Building A of Büyükkale. Its position on the tablet cannot be determined. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 166, where it is attributed to the "third ritual".

Transliteration

§ 1′
A:1′  [...] wa-ra-an-na-a-ḫi-ša i]-ú-na'-[ḫi-ša ...]
A:2′  [...] ma-aš-ša-na-aš-ši-in KASKAL-[an]

§ 2′
A:3′  [...]x-ta a-ah-ša-a-pa-d[u ...]
A:4′  [...]x-an la-la-a i x[ ...]
A:5′  [...] UDÚ a-ar-[r]a-az-za-an ni-i- [...]
A:6′  [...]i [...]  

§ 3′
A:7′  [...]-ti?-[ ...]
May the ritual patron (take) (back his) shape, flesh, bone(s), joint(s), speech, mobility, eyelash, eyebrow(-hair), divine path!"

Commentary

3': Starke 1985, 380 reads ša-ḫu-i-⟨in⟩-zi‘. While the autograph of the tablet supports the reading ZI, the original tablet fragment rather points to TA over erasure.

5’–7’: The restoration of the standard list of the body parts follows KBo 29.3+ ii 22–24 (CTH 760.2, § 10').

Contents

§ 1’ Luwian incantation featuring a list of body parts and attributes
§ 2’ Luwian incantation for the removal of impurity

The fragment is written in the same hand as KUB 35.81(+) (CTH 759.3, see Fig. 2.10) but clearly belongs to a different tablet series, since the text of KBo 29.14 is not compressed. Consequently, the attribution of the fragment to the dupadubarša-ritual remains the most likely option on paleographic grounds, although there are no textual clues to support this. The mention of a white sheep, if correctly interpreted, defines the associated substitution rite.

Translation

§ 1’ 1’–2’ "[...] speech, mobility, eyelash, eyebrow(-hair), divine path.

§ 2’ 3’ [...] Separate from him [...]!
4’ [...] will take [...].
4’–5’ May [...] no[... wh]ite [sheep ...]
6’ [...]"

§ 3’ 7’ [...]"
Commentary


3′–4′: The general sense of this incantation is presumably the request for the separation of impurity from the body parts and attributes of the ritual patron, which will enable him to take them back under control. For the juxtaposition between the verb /ax(xa)ša-/ 'to remove, separate' and the standard list of body parts / attributes, see KUB 35.11 ii 8′–11′ (CTH 760.6); for the juxtaposition of the verb /lala- (i)/ 'to take' and the same list, see KUB 35.43+ ii 2′–4′ (CTH 761.3.8). The closest parallel to the incantation under discussion may be the fragmentary passage KUB 35.18(+ iv 2′–5′ (CTH 760.1.a).

CTH 763.2.12

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 55.99 1139/u

Transmission and Research History

This small fragment was found in the Temple I complex. It is adjacent to the left edge of the tablet; the tentative identification of the obverse and reverse follows the autographic edition. The ductus of the fragment is New Script and supports its 13th-century dating. It was described as part of an Old Woman ritual in Soysal 2016, 424. The attribution of this fragment to the Kuwattalla tradition is made by D. Sasseville (Sasseville 2021). No edition of the fragment has been available until now.

Transliteration

§ 1′

Obv.? 1′ na-ʼat’ [...]  

A obv.? 2′ nu EN SISK[UR ...]  

§ 2′

A obv.? 3′ ar-ḥa ṭuḥ-ša-a-an-n[a-i ...]  

A obv.? 4′ pa-ra-a pi-i-iš-ke-e[z-zí ...]  

A obv.? 5′ ḫar-zi-ia-al-la-ʼ aʼ-[an ...]
5': The sequence [...]x-az-za-an ni-i-[iš] is syntactically difficult, since one expects an accusative noun before ni-i-[iš], while the known Luwian lexemes in /-atsa-/ all function as adjectives in the second millennium BCE. The proposed tentative restoration [UDU a-ar-r]a-az-za-an ni-i-[iš] implies a heterographic word order, where the adjective follows a Sumerographic noun without a phonetic complement. One must assume that the white(?) sheep functions here as an animal substitute, the way it does in KBo 29.55+ (CTH 761.3.8). The definite restoration of the clause under discussion is impossible, but one possible interpretation is: “May [the ritual patron] no[t see the white] sheep again!”

Contents

§ 1′ Fragmentary Hittite passage
§§ 2′–3′ Hittite passage describing a rite that involves a harziyalla-animal, with its Luwian conjuration
§ 4′ Luwian blessing formula
§ 5′ Fragmentary Hittite passage
§ 6′ Unclear

The fragment belongs to the part of the ritual that focuses on the substitution rites. A mention of the harziyalla-animal is unique in the Kuwattalla tradition. The specific CTH number associated with this fragment cannot be determined.

Translation

Obv.? § 1′
1′ [...]  

§ 2′
2′–3′ The ritual patron cut[s] off [...].
3′–4′ He hand[s ...] over [...].
5′ [...] the salamander [...]
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A obv.? 6’ [h]u-u-uk-ki-iš-’ke-[e-z]i-…

§ 3’
A obv.? 7’ [z]a-’a’-ú-i-’ia’-[aš …]

§ 4’
Rev.? 1’ [wa-aš-ša-r]a-ḫi-i-ta-[t][i ḫu-i-tum-na-ḫi-i-ta-ti]

§ 5’
A rev.? 2’ […] ṭUMUSGI [a-…]
A rev.? 3’ [pa-ra-a] ’pe’-e-da-i [a-…]
A rev.? 4’ […] ṭUMUSGI [i-…]

§ 6’
A rev.? 5’ […]-’in’ […]

Commentary

Obv.? 3’: Compare the description of the ḥarziyalla-rite in Maštigga’s ritual against domestic quarrels (Miller 2004, 82–83), which involves wrapping blue and red wool around the animal. Presumably, the strands of wool symbolize impurity, which the ritual carrier is expected to take away. It seems probable that the other end of the wool strands was attached to the ritual patron or/and to the representations of miasma in our ritual—and therefore had to be cut off.

CTH 763.2.13

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 47.136 1264/v

Transmission and Research History

This Middle Script fragment was found in the area of Building M at Büyükkale. Its position on a tablet cannot be determined. The fragment was edited in transliteration in Grodek 2011a, 122–23 and then re-edited with comments in Sasseville 2019, 120, where it is also assigned to the Kuwattalla tradition. In contrast, Soysal 2004, 67 treated it as containing Hattian elements.
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6′ She conjures thus:

§ 3′ “Here [...].”

§ 4′ Rev.? “with the favor (and) enlivenment (of the gods).”

§ 5′ 2′–3′ [...] the Old Woman carries [...]
3′ and [...]
4′ [...] the Old Woman[...].

§ 6′ [...] 

Rev.? 5′: For various attempts to define the ḫarziyalla-animal, see HW² Ḫ, 387–88. While HW² prefers the meaning ‘rat’, the alternatives offered in the previous literature include ‘lizard’, ‘salamander’, and even ‘snail’.

Rev.? 1′: The blessing formula mentioning the favor and enlivenment of the gods is typically attested at the end of rites involving animal sacrifices.

Contents

§ 1′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation

§§ 2′–3′ Throwing the content of the kitchen pots into a hearth, with its Luwian incantation

The fragment contains the mention of miasma that are typical of the Kuwattalla tradition (CTH 759–762), while its archaic ductus is in favor of its attribution to CTH 760 or CTH 761. This is the sole specimen of a rite involving emptying the ḫupuwai-vessels (kitchen pots) into the hearth; for a likely parallel in the Mašṭigga tradition, see the commentary.
Transliteration

§ 1′
A:1′ [...] x a-t[a²-…]
A:2′ [...] x-im-ma-an [a-aš-tu ...]
A:3′ [...] ma-a-ia-aš-[i-iš EME-iš]

§ 2′
A:4′ [...] upu-[wa-a-i-i[a ...]
A:5′ [...] EGIS-an-da-ma [...]
A:6′ [...] ū-ha-a-an śe-ra-a[š-ša-an ...]
A:7′ [...] h[a-aš-ši-i an-da [...]]
A:8′ [...] n[u] NUMUN ħa-aš-ši-ṭ [...]
A:9′ [...] ki-iš-[ša-an]

§ 3′
A:10′ [...] x-ta pa-ah-h[ir-...]
A:11′ [...] ta-pa]-ru "ta"-[ta-ri-ia-am-ma-an ...]
A:12′ [...]-an-ti-[§² ...]
A:13′ [...] x [...]  

Commentary

2′–3′: It is very likely that these lines contain one clause organized as a proleptic construction. The clause predicate cannot be restored, but it is presumably coordinated with the preceding rites.

4′: See the mention of the ḫupuwai-vessels in KUB 35.65 (CTH 763.1.2). The closest parallel to the ritual sequence restored in this paragraph, however, is available in Maštigga’s ritual against domestic quarrels (Miller 2004, 88–89). The ḫupuwai-vessels are filled with wine, olive oil, honey, dates, raisins, sinew salt, and tallow, whereupon their content is thrown into the hearth, while the vessels are broken.
§ 1′
1′ "[...]
2′ [May it be ...]-ed, [...]
3′ [...] the tongue of] the multitud[es]!"

§ 2′
4′ [... k]itchen pots [...]
5′ [...] Afterward, [...]
6′ (is) [sc]attered. On top, [...]
7′ [...] into the [h]earth [...]
8′ [...] The seeds [burn] in the hearth.
9′ [The Old Woman says] thus:

§ 3′
10′ "[... May it] bur[...]
11′ [...] judg[...]ent, cur[...]se, [...]
12′ [...] 13′ [...]"

10’: The fragmentary verbal form pa-aḫ-ḫ[... cannot be separated from pa-aḫḫ-ḫi-ita-ru in KUB 35.49(+) iv 3 (CTH 761.2.1.a; Sasseville 2019, 120). Yet it is this context that provides the best evidence for its postulated lexical meaning ‘to burn’. The proposed interpretation is independently supported by Hitt. paḫḫur ‘fire’ and Luw. /paγur/ ‘fire’, which consequently emerge as derivatives of the Anatolian verbal root *pax- meaning ‘to burn’.
The provenance of this small fragment is unknown, while the lack of characteristic signs is not conducive to its paleographic dating. It was published in transliteration and implicitly attributed to the Kuwattalla tradition in Starke 1985, 178.

Transliteration

§ 1′
Left column
A l.col. 1′ [nu-k]án’ ‘kē’t-x[...]

§ 2′
A l.col. 2′ [e]-el-[el]-a-i-t[i ma-al-ḥa-aš-ša-aš-ši-iš EN-aš ta-pa-ru-wa-ti ta-ta-ri-ia-am-na-ti]
A l.col. 3′ [hi-t]u-ū-ta-ti [ir-ḥi-š-ke-et-ma ḥa-an-te-ez-zi pal-ši ma-aḥ-ḥa-an a-pa-a-at-ta]
A l.col. 4′ [QA-TA] ḫu-um-[a]-a-n[ir-ḥa-a-iz-zi]

§ 3′
A l.col. 5′ [EG]-an-da-ma-kán x[...]
A l.col. 6′ [na]-an MUNUS.GI [...]
A l.col. 7′ [na]m-ma-at’ x x[...]

Commentary

l.col. 2′–4′: Restored based on the parallel incantations in KUB 32.9(+) (CTH 761.1.f), KUB 27.26 (CTH 763.2.15), and KUB 35.51 (CTH 760.3.a). A specific common feature of this fragment and KUB 27.26 (CTH 763.2.15) is the use of the ablative-instrumental case for the list of miasma. It is furthermore possible to adduce KBo 29.3+ iii 2′–3′.
Contents

§§ 1′–2′ Fragmentary Hittite passage probably describing the ritual patron’s ablution, with its Luwian incantation

§ 3′ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing an unclear rite

The ablution rites are common to various versions of the Kuwattalla tradition, and the fragment does not have sufficient clues to determine its specific version. Ordering this fragment in the sequence of rites likewise appears to be impossible, since the ablution rites may occur several times in the course of the ritual.

Translation

§ 1′
Left column
1′ […]

§ 2′
2′ “[The ritual patron] is [w]ashing himself[ from judgment, curse],
3′ [per]jury.” [The way she treated (them) one by one the first time],
3′–4′ [she treats them] all [one by one in the same way].

§ 3′
5′ [Afterward, […]
6′ The Old Woman […] him.
7′ [Then […]

(CTH 760.2) as an additional likely parallel featuring a similar use of the ablative-instrumental, but the passage is very badly preserved. In contrast, KUB 35.51 ii7 15′–16′ (CTH 760.3.a) and the parallels in KUB 32.9(+) feature the miasma in the accusative case.
This fragment belongs to a right column of a double-columned tablet. Its provenance is unknown. The small size of the fragment and the lack of characteristic signs are not conducive to paleographic dating. It was published in transliteration and implicitly attributed to the Kuwattalla tradition in Starke 1985, 169–70.

Transliteration

§ 1
Right column
A r.col. 1’ a-x[...]
A r.col. 2’ zi-ik-ká[n-zi ...]

§ 2’
A r.col. 3’ A-NA EN SISKUR- ma [ú-i-te-na-aš GAL.GIR pa-ra-a]
A r.col. 4’ ap-pa-an-zi nu-z[ä EN SISKUR QA-TI-ŠU a-ar-rl]
A r.col. 5’ MUNUSŠU.GI-ma Q[A-TAM-MA ḫu-uk-zī]

§ 3’
A r.col. 6’ il-ḫa-ti [ma-al-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ši-iš EN-aš]
A r.col. 7’ ta-pa-ru-wa-ti [ta-ta-ri-ia-am-na-ti ḫi-ru-ū-ta-ti]
A r.col. 8’ [a]-pa-a-at-ta Q[A-TAM-MA ḫu-u-ma-an ir-ḫa-a-iz-zī]
A r.col. 9’ [h]a-an-te-ez-zī [pal-ši ma-aḫ-ḫa-an]

§ 4’
A r.col. 10’ [E]GIR-an-da-ma-kā[n ...]
A r.col. 11’ [n a]n MUNUSŠU.GI [... A-NA EN SISKUR še-er]
A r.col. 12’ [a]r[=]ḫa’ wa-a[ḫ-nu-uza-zī ...]
A r.col. 13’ [...] x [...]
Contents

§ 1′ Fragmentary Hittite passage
§§ 2′–3′ Ablution of the ritual patron, with its Luwian incantation
§ 4′ Ritual waving of an object over the ritual patron

The list of miasma defines this fragment as part of the Kuwattalla tradition. Since the ablution rites are typical of various versions of the Kuwattalla tradition and may occur several times in the course of the ritual, no further specification is possible.

Translation

§ 1′
Right column
1′–2′ [They] plac[e ...].

§ 2′
3′–4′ They hold [a ceramic cup of water toward] the ritual patron,
4′ so that [the ritual patron washes his hands].
5′ The Old Woman [conjures] in the s[ame way]:

§ 3′
6′ "[The ritual patron] is washing himself
7′ from judgment, [curse, perjury]."
8′ [She treats i]t [all one by one] in the s[ame way]
9′ [as] (she did) the [f]irst [time].

§ 4′
10′ [Afte]rward, [...].
11′–12′ The Old Woman wa[ves ... over the ritual patron].
12′–13′ [...]
Commentary

r.col. 3’–5’: Since the following paragraph clearly points in the direction of the ablution rite, this passage can be approximately restored based on KUB 35.51 ii7 12’–14’ (CTH 760.3.a, § 3’).

r.col. 6’: The non-reduplicated stem /ilxa-/(di)/ contrasts with the reduplicated stem /iliilxa-(i)/, used in similar contexts in KUB 32.9(+) (CTH 761.1.f) and KUB 35.62 (CTH 763.2.14).

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.161 Bo 7187

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment is not associated with a known find spot. There are no clues to determine its position on a tablet either. It was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 417, without being assigned to any particular composition.

Transliteration

| § 1’   | A:1’  | [...] ’i-ia’ [...] |
|        | A:2’  | [...] x’al’-i[... ] |
|        |       | § 2’         |
| A:3’   | [...] ma]-al-ḫa-aš-[a-... ] |
| A:4’   | [...] ū-ar-m]a-ḫa-a-[t[... ] |
| A:5’   | [...] la-a-[t-ta ... ] |
| A:6’   | [...] aš-ša-[a[n-... ] |
|        |       | § 3’         |
| A:7’   | [...] x x [...] |

DOI: 10.13173/9783447119955.1.406

This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC BY-SA 4.0 license. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/deed.en

The terms of the CC licence apply only to the original material. The use of material from other sources such as charts, illustrations, photographs and text extracts may require further permission for use from the respective rights holder.

© by authors
r.cor. 9': For a backward reference in the context of the ablution rite, one can compare KUB 35.34:12′–15’ (CTH 761.2.1.c), where the Luwian incantation, however, is not recorded.

Contents

§ 1′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation
§ 2′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation
§ 3′ Unclear

The diction of the Luwian incantation in § 2′, which might belong to a purification rite, less likely to a substitution rite, is conducive to assigning it to the Kuwattalla tradition, but it is impossible to say anything about its specific version.

Translation

§ 1′
1′ "[...]
2′ [...]"  

§ 2′
3′ [...] r)itu[a [...]  
4′ [...] from [the he]ad [...]  
5′ [...] too[k [...]
6′ [...]"

§ 3′
7′ [...]"
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Commentary

4’–5’: Taking the miasma from the head and other body parts of the ritual patron is the typical function of animal substitutes within the Kuwattalla tradition, see e.g. KUB 35.43+ ii 12–15 (CTH 761.3.8). Nevertheless, the relevant collocations normally deploy different verbal forms derived from the verb ‘to take’ than the one recon-

CTH 763.2.17

Table of Manuscripts

A  KBo 68.32  E 1070

Transmission and Research History

This small fragment comes from the Temple I area. The lack of characteristic signs precludes its paleographic dating, and its position on the tablet likewise cannot be determined. The identification of this fragment as part of the Kuwattalla tradition is due

Transliteration

§ 1′
A:1’ [...] ‘ta’-a-t[a-ri-ia-am-ma-na-aš-ši-in ...]
A:2’ [...] ma-a-ia-aš-ši-in] EME-i[n]

§ 2′
A:3’ [...] A-NA EN SÍS]KUR pa-r[a-а e-ep-зі]
A:4’ [...] al]-la-ap-p[a-аh-hі ...]

Commentary

1’–2’: The list of the miasma in the accusative case immediately before the spitting rite finds a parallel in KBo 29.3+ iii 17–19’ (CTH 760.2). Contrast KUB 35.46 iv 5–8’ (CTH 761.4.2), in which the nominative forms appear in the same position.
Commentary

structured here. A closer parallel might be KUB 32.8(+) iii 11’–12’ ḫa-r-ma-a-ḫa-ṭi-ti-ia-an-ta tap-pa-a-ni-in la-a-at-ta ‘he (the ritual patron) took a hair from his head’ (CTH 759.10.b). If so, then the passage under discussion probably belongs to a purification rite involving oil and honey.

to Jared Miller, who noted its similarities to KBo 29.3+ iii 18’–22’ (CTH 760.2; hethiter.net/hetkonk (v. 1.997)). There was no edition of the fragment available until now.

Contents

§ 1’ Fragmentary Luwian incantation featuring a list of evil tongues
§ 2’ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing a spitting rite

Since the spitting rite occurs in various versions of the Kuwattalla tradition, an attribution of this fragment to a specific ritual appears to be impossible.

Translation

| § 1’ | 1’ “[…] (the tongue) of cu[rse, …],
2’ the tongue [of the multitudes].” |
| § 2’ | 3’ [She holds …] towa[rd the ritual [patron],
4’ [so that he s]pit[s on it …]. |
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CTH 763.2.18

Table of Manuscripts

A  ABoT 2.239  AnAr 11621d + AnAr 11621g

Transmission and Research History

This set of two New Script fragments was found in Boğazköy, but no precise information about its find spot is available. Its position on a tablet cannot be determined. The fragments were edited in transliteration as a join and assigned to the Kuwattalla tradition in Akdoğan 2010, 119.

Transliteration

§ 1’
A:1’ 
[... x x [...]

§ 2’
A:2’ 
[... ’a’-ah-ra-an [wa-ah-ra-an ...]
A:3’ 
[... hi-ru-ú-u]n ma-a-ia-aš-[ši-in EME-in]

§ 3’
A:4’ 
[... MENG]ŠU,GI a-x[...]
A:5’ 
[... ha-ap-p]u-ri-ia-aš² x[...]
A:6’ 
[... kat²-t]a da-a-i [...]  

§ 4’
A:7’ 
[...p]i² ku-i-[...]
A:8’ 
[...š]a-an-x[...]
A:9’ 
[... x [...] 

Commentary

5’: Alternatively, one could attempt to restore, [p]u-ri-ia-aš ‘to the lips’, which would not be implausible in the context of a spitting rite.
The mention of the standard list of miasma and the Old Woman suggests beyond a reasonable doubt that the fragments belong to the Kuwattalla tradition, although there are no clues to specify its version. Interestingly, the scribal hand is the same as that of IBoT 3.96+, a tablet reflecting the Puriyanni tradition (CTH 758.3.1; see Fig. 2.4).

Translation

§ 1′
1′ [...]

§ 2′
2′ “[He spat (out)] woe (and) [pain …]
3′ […] perjur[y, [the tongue] of the multitud[es].”

§ 3′
4′ The Old Woman […]
5′ [… gr]eenery […].
6′ She places [dow]n […]

§ 4′
7′ “[…] which […]
8′ […]
9′ […]”
Transmission and Research History

This tiny fragment was found in Temple I. Neither its paleographic dating nor identifying its location on a tablet appears possible due to its small size. The fragment was published in transliteration and implicitly assigned to the Kuwattalla tradition in Starke 1985, 199.

Transliteration

§ 1’
A:1’ [...]x a²-aš-du [...]  
A:2’ [...] ad-du-wa-I]a-ti EME-ti x[...]  
A:3’ [...] ta-pa-ru-w]a-aš-ša-an-za-ti x[...]  
A:4’ [...]-ti wa-’la’-an-t[i-ia-ti]  
A:5’ [...]x-’ti’ [...]  

Commentary

4’: The adjective /walanti(ja/i)-/ ’of the dead’ appears in the merisms embedded in CTH 759, CTH 761, and CTH 763.1, one time each. In contrast, its synonym
Contents

§ 1′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation featuring a list of evil tongues

The closest parallel available for this list is KUB 35.24+ obv. 1′–4′ (CTH 761.1.c, § 1′); for an important difference, see the commentary to the translation. It seems probable that we are dealing with a purification rite, but the means of purification remain unclear.

Translation

§ 1′
1′ “May […] be […]
2′ […] from the [evil] tongue, […]
3′ […] from (the tongue) of [judgment], […]
4′ from […] (from that) of the dead,
5′ […] from […]”

/u(la)ntalli(ja/i)/ occurs many times in various tablets of CTH 761, but nowhere else in the Kuwattalla tradition.
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CTH 763.2.20

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.26 Bo 4105

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment contains part of a left column together with a portion of the intercolumnium. Its provenance is unknown. The fragment is published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 103–4 as part of the Great Ritual (for this attribution, see already Otten, KUB 35, II).

Transliteration

§ 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Left column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A l.col. 1’ […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A l.col. 2’ […]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 2
| A l.col. 3’ […]|x |   |
| A l.col. 4’ […] |   |
| A l.col. 5’ […]-ša[t]a-li-ia-’ti’ |   |
| A l.col. 6’ […]-ta-pa-ru]-wa-(aš)-ša-an-za-’ti’ |   |
| A l.col. 7’ […]-ta-ta-ri-ia-am-n]a-aš-ša-an-za-ti EME-ti |   |

§ 3
| A l.col. 8’ […]-ú]-i-ta-an-(ta)-al-li-[ia]-’ti’ |   |
| A l.col. 9’ […]-a-ad-d]u-wa-la-ti |   |
| A l.col. 10’ […]-t]a-al-li-ia-ti |   |
| A l.col. 11’ […]-aš-ša-a]n-za-ti |   |
| A l.col. 12’ […] |   |

Commentary

l.col. 5’–12’: The list of nouns and adjectives in the ablative-instrumental case is compatible with this being an incantation for the purification of the ritual patron from various miasma.
Contents

§ 1′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation
§§ 2′–3′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation featuring a list of miasma

Although the list as such has no direct parallels, all its items are fairly typical of the Kuwattalla tradition. Otten and Starke’s attribution of the fragment to CTH 761 does not appear to be backed up by probative evidence but remains a distinct possibility.

Translation

§ 1′

Left column
1′ “[…]”
2′ “[…]”

§ 2′
3′ “[…]”
4′ “[…]”
5′ “[…] from […]”
6′ “[from […] of [judg]ments,
7′ “[…], from the tongue of [curs]es,

§ 3′
8′ “[…] through (the one) for [s]miti[n]g,
9′ from the [ev]il […]
10′ from […]
11′ from […]
12′ “[…].”

l.col. 8’: Elsewhere ‘the one for smiting’ is consistently used as a designation of a substitute. Therefore, despite the fact that this noun shows the same case ending as all the other nouns in this fragment, we assign to it a different syntactic interpretation. See KUB 32.10+ obv. 7′–8′ (CTH 761.1.b) for a parallel use of the instrumental case.
CTH 763.2.21

Table of Manuscripts
A KBo 29.23 611/u

Transmission and Research History
This Middle Script fragment was found in the Temple I area. Most of its surface is worn away; only the lowest lines are preserved. There are no clues to identify the fragment’s position on a tablet. It was published in transliteration and implicitly identified as part of the Kuwattalla tradition in Starke 1985, 200.

Transliteration

§ 1’
A:1’ [...] x x [...]  
A:2’ [...] x [o] x ki-iš-š[a-an ...]  
A:3’ [...] pu-u-wa-ti-la]-ti ’na-a’-nu-un-tar-ri]-i[a-la-ti ...]  
A:4’ [...] ir-ḫu-wa-al-li-ia-t]i pa-ri-tar-wa-al-[i-ia-ti ...]  
A:5’ [...]x-li-’ia-ta’ x[...]  
A:6’ [...] ’A’” [...]  

Commentary

3’–4’: Judging by the other incantations with formulaic merisms in the ablative, one can tentatively restore ’May the ritual patron be pure from X, Y, and Z’ at the beginning of the clause. The problem of this restoration is that the end of line 2’ and be-
Contents

§ 1′  Fragmentary Hittite passage followed by a Luwian incantation with merisms

The archaic ductus of the tablet is compatible with assigning it to either CTH 760 or to CTH 761. From the content viewpoint, it probably belongs to a purification rite.

Translation

§ 1′

1′  […]
2′  […] thus:
3′  “[…] from [the past] (or) present (one), […]”
4′  from [the internal] (or) externa[l (one), […]
5′  […]
6′  […]”

ginning of line 3’ hardly supply space for the list of the miasma, which the bipartite merisms are expected to modify. Perhaps the Luwian incantation was abbreviated or partitioned by Hittite insertions.
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CTH 763.2.22

Table of Manuscripts

A KBo 46.254 116/n

Transmission and Research History

The fragment, found in Building A of Büyükkale, contains tiny portions of columns one, two, and four, including the colophon. Only remains of column four contain complete words. The small size of the fragment is not conducive to paleographic analysis. The fragment was edited in transliteration and classified as part of the Kuwattalla tradition in Groddek 2015, 187–88.

Transliteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§ 1</td>
<td>Obv. i</td>
<td>A i 1’</td>
<td>[...]‘́i’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 2’</td>
<td>Obv. ii</td>
<td>A ii 1</td>
<td>x[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 3”</td>
<td>Rev. iv</td>
<td>A iv 1’</td>
<td>[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ 4”</td>
<td>A iv 2’</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A iv 3’</td>
<td>[...] ta-ta-ri-i]a-am-ma-na-ti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A iv 4’</td>
<td>[...]x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A iv 5’</td>
<td>[...] ha-an-te-ez-z]i pal-ši ma-ah-ha-an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The restoration of a Luwian word for ‘curse’ tips the scales for assigning the fragment to the Kuwattalla tradition, but no further specification is possible.

Translation

§ 1
Obv. i
1′ [...] 

§ 2′
Obv. ii
1 [...] 

§ 3′
Rev. iv
1′ [...] 

§ 4′
2′ [...] 
3′ [...] from the [cu]rse 
4′ [...] .” 
4′–5′ [She does it in the same way] as (she did) the [firs]t time.

§ 5′
6′ [...] finished. 
7′–8′ [...]
Commentary

iv 2’–4’: On the basis of a comparison with the formulae in KUB 27.26 (CTH 763.2.15) and KUB 35.62 (CTH 763.2.14), one can tentatively reconstruct here an incantation accompanying a purification rite, but this is uncertain.

CTH 763.2.23

Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.76 175/a

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment was found in Building A of Büyükkakle. It contains a portion of the intercolumnium together with several signs immediately to its left and right. It was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 396–97 without textual attribution.

Transliteration

§ 1′
Left column
A l.col. 1′ [...]-ti
A l.col. 2′ [...] EME-ti

§ 2′
A l.col. 3′ [...] al-la-an
A l.col. 4′ [...] x-ta
A l.col. 5′ [...] a n’ da-a-i
A l.col. 6′ [...] x [...] 

§ 3″
Right column
A r.col. 1′ ’za’- [...] 
A r.col. 2′ na-aš- [...] 
A r.col. 3′ wa-a-x [...] 
A r.col. 4′ pa-a-du [...]
A r.col. 5′ a-a-aš-[du ...]
iv 4’–5’: Restored on the basis of KUB 35.34 iii7 10’ (CTH 761.2.1.c, § 3’) and similar passages.

iv 6’: See Waal 2015, 523. It is unclear from the colophon whether the text is finished or not finished.

Contents

§ 1’  
Fragmentary Luwian incantation with nouns in the ablative

§ 2’  
Fragmentary Hittite passage

§ 3’  
Fragmentary Luwian incantation

§ 4’  
Fragmentary Hittite passage

The mention of EME-ti in the list of ablative nouns prompts us to assign the fragment to the Kuwattalla tradition. We lack data, however, for specifying the ritual or identifying the preserved rites.

Translation

§ 1’
Left column

1’  “[… from [...],
2’  from the tongue [...].”

§ 2’

3’  […]
4’  […]
5’  She places […]
6’  […]

§ 3’
Right column

1’  “[…
2’  […]
3’  […]
4’  Then, to him […]
5’  may […] be […]!”
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§ 4′
A r.col. 6′ ‘EGIR’-[an-da ...]
A r.col. 7′ x[...]

Commentary

l.col. 1′–2′: It is likely, although unprovable, that the Luwian incantation in these lines contains a list of miasma in the ablative, ending with the ‘tongue of the multitudes’, or perhaps ‘evil tongue’.

CTH 763.2.24

Table of Manuscripts
A KUB 35.63 427/e

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment belongs to the left column of a double-columned tablet and preserves a small part of the intercolumnium. It was found outside the regular excavations, allegedly in the area of Temple I. It was edited in transliteration and implicitly recognized as a fragment of the Kuwattalla tradition in Starke 1985, 179.

Transliteration

§ 1′
Left column
A l.col. 1′ [...-a]t-‘ta’ x[...]

§ 2′
A l.col. 2′ [...](-)un-ni-ia
A l.col. 3′ [...-z]i pár-ra-an
A l.col. 4′ [...]

§ 3′
A l.col. 5′ [...x ar-ḫa
A l.col. 6′ [... ki-iš-š]a-an te-ez-zi
After[ward, ...]

The linguistic attribution of these lines is uncertain; they are interpreted as Hittite based only on the assumption that § 2′ is linguistically coherent.

It is likely, although unprovable, that these two lines reflect a single clause.

Contents

§ 1′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation
§ 2′ Fragmentary Luwian incantation
§§ 3′–4′ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing an unclear rite, with its Luwian incantation

The presence of [t]a-pa-a-ru in l.col. 7′ supports assigning this fragment to the Kuwattalla tradition, but a more precise attribution is impossible.

Translation

“[...]

[...] before [...]”

[...] away

[...] says [th]us:
§ 4’
A l.col. 7’ [..]t[a-pa-a-ru
A l.col. 8’ [..]x{-iš-ši-in’

Commentary

L.col. 2’: The form un-ni-ia, if interpreted as complete, may represent a 2sg.imper. derived from the hypothetical stem /unnija-/, a cognate of Hitt. unna-\(^{(b)}\) ‘to lead here’.
If one assumes that -un-ni-ia is the final part of a segment, this increases the likelihood of it being a noun or adjective endowed with the suffix /-(ja/i)/ (e.g. [kal-du]-un-ni-ia ‘thrashing’).
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Table of Manuscripts
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Transmission and Research History
This small fragment preserves a small part of the right edge of a tablet, together with the final signs of several lines. The fragment was found in the area of Temple I. Its dating is uncertain (but see the commentary). The fragment was edited in transliteration in Starke 1985, 393.

Transliteration

§ 1′
Right column
A r.col. 1′ [...]z)i
A r.col. 2′ [...]z)i

§ 2′
A r.col. 3′ [...]x A-NA BE-EL SÍSKU[R]
A r.col. 4′ [...]n QA-TAM-MA-pát

§ 3′
A r.col. 5′ [...]d-du-wa-a-al-za
A r.col. 6′ [...]x-du”-ni”-i”-[...]

Commentary

3′: While the small size of the fragment complicates its paleographic dating, the use of the heterogram BE-EL SÍSKU[R] represents an argument for its archaic or archaizing character (see Appendix II).
The form /attuwaltsa/ 'evil’ occurs otherwise only in the Puriyanni tradition, while
the abbreviation QA-TAM-MA-pát 'in exactly the same way’ is typical of the Kuwattalla
tradition. Consequently, a precise attribution of the fragment cannot be determined.
The ductus of the fragment is similar to that of CTH 758.3.1, which features, how-
ever, E[N SISKUR] as the designation of the ritual patron.

Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 1’</th>
<th>Right column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1’</td>
<td>‘[...]’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2’</td>
<td>‘[...]’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 2’</th>
<th>to the ritual patron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>‘[...]’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4’</td>
<td>‘[...] exactly in the same way’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§ 3’</th>
<th>‘[...] evil [...]’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5’</td>
<td>‘[...]’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6’</td>
<td>‘[...]’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of Manuscripts

A KUB 35.61 2004/g

Transmission and Research History

This New Script fragment was found in the Temple I area. It contains a part of a left column and a small portion of the intercolumnium. The upper part of the fragment seems to have been broken along one of the paragraph lines. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 394–95.

Transliteration

§ 1’
Left column
A l.col. 1’ [...]x
A l.col. 2’ [...](-)w]a-re-e-a
A l.col. 3’ [...]z]i

§ 2’
A l.col. 4’ [...]-ni/]n² tu-e-ek-ku-uš-šu-uš
A l.col. 5’ [... ki-]š-sa-an ḫu-u-uk-zi

§ 3’
A l.col. 6’ [...]x a-du-ut-ta [...] 
A l.col. 7’ [...]m]a-an a-aš-d[u?] ...
A l.col. 8’ [...]ta/š]a?(-)x [...] 

Commentary

l.col. 2: This translation is conjectural and solely based on the comparison with instr. wa-ri-i-a-ti in KUB 25.37+ iii 30 (see CLL, 259). There is a possibility that only
Contents

§ 1’ Unclear
§§ 2’–3’ Fragmentary Hittite passage describing an unclear rite that mentions the limbs, with its Luwian conjuration

The treatment of individual body parts of the ritual patron represents a shared feature of the Tunnawiya and Kuwattalla tradition. Since the Luwian incantations are much more common in the Kuwattalla rituals, we tentatively assign the fragment to this group, but the matter cannot be considered settled.

Translation

§ 1’
Left column
1’ “[...]
2’ [...] liquid
3’ [...]"

§ 2’
4’ [...] his body parts (acc.)
5’ [...] conjures [th]us:

§ 3’
6’ “[... to him [...]”
7’ may [...] be [...]-ed [...]
8’ [...]"

the final part of the word is preserved. Consequently, there is no certainty about the language of § 1’.

Lcol. 6’–7’: These two lines likely reflect the same clause, but this is uncertain.
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Transmission and Research History
This is a small fragment, which belonged to a New Hittite Script tablet and was found in Temple I. The fragment was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 389.

Transliteration

§ 1′
A:1′  [... a-a]d-du-w[a-...]
A:2′  [...-p]a a-ad-du-w[a-...]
A:3′  [... a-ta-at-ta [...]
A:4′  [...-d]u [...]

§ 2′
A:5′  [...(-)]m[\textsuperscript{m}]-ma-an(-)[...]

CTH 763.3.4

Table of Manuscripts
A  KBo 29.17    Bo 69/806

Transmission and Research History
This New Script fragment was found in Temple I. It contains a left edge of a part of column three (not column two, according to the autograph) together with the adja-
Contents

§ 1’ Fragmentary Luwian incantation

The fragment shows the same scribal hand as IBoT 3.96+ (CTH 758.3.1; see Fig. 2.4). Nevertheless, it cannot be attributed to this tablet with any certainty, because the fragment ABoT 2.239 (CTH 763.2.18), probably reflecting the Kuwattalla tradition, also shows the same ductus.

Translation

§ 1’
1’ “[… e]vi[…]
2’ […] evil […]
3’–4’ May […] him […]!”

§ 2’
5’ […]

cent portion of the intercolumnium. The piece was published in transliteration in Starke 1985, 197 as a fragment belonging to the Kuwattalla tradition.

Contents

§ 1’ Fragmentary Luwian blessing formula; Hittite line mentioning a figurine

The ritual use of figurines is attested in both Puriyanni and Kuwattalla traditions. The blessing formula is indeed reminiscent of the Kuwattalla tradition; but in view of its fragmentary character and the lack of precise parallels, we prefer not to prejudge the choice between these two options.
Transliteration

§ 1′
Rev. iii
A iii 1′  a[n-...]
A iii 2′  u-ra-ʾanʾ-n[u-...]
A iii 3′  an-da ma-an-n[i-...]
A iii 4′  bGUL-za-an b[...]
A iii 5′  ma-an-nu-uš-tar-ra-aš-ša-an-[za ...]
A iii 6′  an-na-rum-ma-ḫi-[ša ...]
A iii 7′  a-ar-ia-an-za [...]
A iii 8′  nu še-e-ʾnā-an′ [...]

Commentary

iii 1′: Or perhaps the determinative $^D$?

iii 2′–3′: Despite the partial preservation of the relevant forms, it is tempting to consider them as elements of a fixed formula comparable with KUB 17.10 i 11′ ša-al-ḫi-an-ti-en ma-an-ni-it-ti-en ‘growth and proliferation’ in the myth of Telipinu, a collocation adapted from Luwian. For the stem ma-an-ni- ‘to be fruitful, multiply’, see Rieken forthcoming.

Translation

§ 1′

Rev. iii
1′ “[...]
2′ gro[w ...]
3′ multi[ply ...]
4′ the fate-goddess, [...]  
5′ of fertility [...]  
6′ virilit[y ...]
7′ long [...]"
8′ [...] figurine [...]  

iii 5′: For Luw. /mannustarr(a/i)-/ ‘(possession of) potency’, a derivative of /mannu-/ ‘(male) potency’ or /mannaw(a/i-)/ ‘potent’, see Rieken forthcoming. See also the discussion of Luw. /mannawallaimm(a/i)-/ ‘strengthened’ in CTH 761.2.1.d.

iii 6′–7′: For the combination of ‘virility’ and ‘long years’ in a recurrent blessing formula, see for example KUB 35.16(+) i 11′–12′ (CTH 760.3.b). We lack, however, independent evidence that the phrase ‘long years’ can occur in the singular in Luwian. An alternative way to analyze a-ar-ra-ia-an-za is to take it as a dat.pl. form.