

YASEMİN ARIKAN

The blind in Hittite documents *

There is very limited information on the crippled persons¹ and the social status of the sufferers in the Hittite period Anatolia. The cases rarely presented in Hittite documents usually concern the blind or the deaf. Among them, while the blind were associated with the administrative issues, for example, in the letters and exchange lists, the deaf most often played a role in the cult life. This study discusses the case of the blinds in Hittites.

The Hittite laws have provided the most noteworthy information on blindness in Hittites' daily life. In the laws², the following articles on blindness have been mentioned: blinding of a free individual (paragraph = § 7); blinding of a free individual in a fight (§ V); blinding of a free individual by accident (§ V); blinding of a slave in a fight (§ VI) and blinding of a slave in some unknown way (§ 8). Each paragraph proposes various fines for the guilty causing the blindness of another individual.

As in many societies in history, in Hittites too, blinding was considered a crime to be punished.³ However, in *KUB* 13.9 II 11–15, a decree by Tuthaliya II⁴, we learn a strange juridical practice of Hittite jurisdiction, which entitles the person, whose property is stolen by a slave, to punish personally the thief. According to this interesting stipulation the suffering person can blind the slave thief, and this private act, obviously a result of personal revenge, is regarded as equivalency of a regular punishment by law, which is otherwise not attested in the law:⁵ “If a slave committed theft and he (= the person whose belonging was stolen) seizes him in flagrante, if he (the slave) was already blinded (by the stolen person during his seizure), he does not need to deliver him to him (= the person whose belonging was stolen or the court). If he (the slave) was not blinded, he delivers him to him (= the person whose belonging was stolen or the court)”.

* I extend my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Ahmet Ünal for his kind interest and support. Abbreviations follow the conventions of the CHD Volume P/3 [1997] VII ff.

¹ On this topic see H. A. Hoffner (2003), 84*–90*.

² The most recent study on the Hittite laws by H. A. Hoffner (1997).

³ H. A. Hoffner (1997), 175 and fn. 28.

⁴ Text edition by E. von Schuler (1959), 447–450; for earlier dating of the text see H. Otten (1979), 273–276.

⁵ Information supplied orally by A. Ünal.

Furthermore, based on the information from Maşat documents outside Boğazköy dated to Middle Hittite period, “blinding” was a punishment stipulated for the officials who did not (timely) execute the king’s order. Mst. 75/10 = HKM 14⁶ obv. 3–14: “As soon as this tablet arrives, rush to the presence of his majesty! Bring Maruua along, the man from Gagadduua! or else they will come by you and blind (you) right there”. Mst. 75/69 = HKM 16⁷ obv. 5–15: “As soon as this tablet arrives, rush to the presence of his majesty! or else they will come by you and blind (you) right there”. Mst. 75/103 = HKM 84⁸ obv. 19’: “Then they [will] blind you”. However, other than these short notes and above mentioned decree of Tuthaliya, there are no known documents thoroughly describing the punishment for blinding a person.⁹

In Hittite texts, ^(LÚ)IGI.NU.GÁL, a Sumerian word, is the most common term referring to “the blind (person)”. The term is composed of the elements of IGI “eye” and NU.GÁL “not present, absent” and means “his eye is not present = blind, sightless”.¹⁰ In Mesopotamia, however, to refer to a blind person ‘IGI.NU.DU₈’ and ‘IGI.NU.TUK’¹¹ are used as well as ‘IGI.NU.GÁL’. Hittites received ‘IGI.NU.GÁL’ alone into Boğazköy writing tradition. The Akkadian equivalent of ‘IGI.NU.TUK’ is *la nātilu*.¹² As a Hittite word, the verb *dašuuahḫ-* “blinding” and its derivation, a participle *tašuuahḫant-* “blinded”¹³ is recognized. Similarly, *daš(u)uant*, derived from the same verb in its *-nt-* extended form as a participle adjective¹⁴, means “blind”.¹⁵

The attestations of ^(LÚ)IGI.NU.GÁL are as follows (all are used without phonetic compliments):

Sg.N., A. IGI.NU.GÁL	<i>KUB</i> 43.22 I 25’; <i>HKM</i> 36 22; <i>HKM</i> 102 obv. 6, low. e. 13, rev. 15.
^{LÚ} IGI.NU.GÁL	<i>KBo</i> 19.32 7’; <i>KBo</i> 40.8 rev. 8’; <i>KUB</i> 43.10 2’; <i>IBOT</i> 1.29 rev. 39’; <i>HKM</i> 85 obv. 18’; <i>HKM</i> 102 obv. 4.
MUNUS ^{LÚ} IGI.NU.GÁL	<i>KBo</i> 6.34 III (2), 4 (// <i>KUB</i> 7.59 III 5, 7).
Sg.G., ^{LÚ} IGI.NU.GÁL[L- <i>aš</i> ’]	<i>KBo</i> 6.34 III 7.
[š]A’ ^{LÚ} IGI.NU.GÁL	<i>KUB</i> 7.59 III 10.
Pl.N., A. ^{LÚ} MEŠ IGI.NU.GÁL	<i>KBo</i> 8.35 I 2’; <i>KBo</i> 16.27 I 16’; <i>KBo</i> 17.48 obv. 3’; <i>KUB</i> 40.36 I 7’; <i>HKM</i> 58 obv. 14; <i>HKM</i> 59 obv. 5; <i>HKM</i> 102 obv. 11, upp. e. 22.
^{LÚ} MEŠ IGI.NU.GÁL ^{HLA}	<i>HKM</i> 58 obv. 6, 8.
Pl.G., šA ^{LÚ} MEŠ IGI.NU.GÁL	<i>HKM</i> 58 obv. 5.

⁶ Text edition by S. Alp (1991), 138–141 and 310. On the 336th page of the Hittite documents, general information on the blind has been provided.

⁷ Text edition by S. Alp (1991), 140–143.

⁸ Text edition by S. Alp (1991), 278–282.

⁹ However, a blinding case may have been described on a general sense at *KBo* 6.34 I 19’–20’ lines in a broken context. Text edition by N. Oettinger (1976), 6–7, 12–13.

¹⁰ HW 277; Labat 201 no. 449; Chr. Rüster and E. Neu, HZL 233 no. 288.

¹¹ AHw II 768a; CAD N II, 129a; R. Borger, Zeichenliste 172 no. 449.

¹² Labat, 201 no. 449; AHw II, 768a; CAD N II, 129a.

¹³ *KUB* 13.9 II 12, 14; see H. Ehelolf (1930), 394 fn. 4; for other possible documents see HEG III/9, 269.

¹⁴ EHS I, 265–266.

¹⁵ *KBo* 13.35 obv. III 3’; *KBo* 21.6 obv. 10; *KBo* 24.9 obv. 15’; *KUB* 12.62 rev. 7, 8, 12; *KUB* 36.12 II 12’.

In Hittite documents from various archives (Boğazköy, Maşat and Ortaköy) ^(LÚ)IGI.NU.GÁL's are usually encountered within the frame work of administrative issues. The blind had been mentioned by name in the slave and hostage exchange protocols set up with the enemy as well as via the news in some of the letter passages on their escape from the mills in which they were employed.¹⁶ A researcher has taken a further step and emphasized the probability that this type of punishment might have been applied only to Kaškaean leaders who violated the rules of the agreement they had made with Hittites. However, this point of view does not seem likely to be agreed upon.¹⁷ Very rarely do we witness a blind to be involved in religious duties.

1. The blind in social and administrative life

a) The blind mentioned at the time of hostage exchange:

The most important document on this issue has been known to be from Maşat Höyük. Let us review the related text:

Mş. 75/50 = HKM 102¹⁸

upp. e. 1 IGI^{HLA} uš-kán-zi

obv. 2 ŠA ^mTa-mi-ti-iš LÚ^{URU} Tá-g-ga-aš-ta ŠÁM

3 2 DUMU^{MEŠ} šu-ul-li-iš 1 LÚ

4 ^mŠu-na-DINGIR^{LIM} LÚ^{URU} IGI.NU.GÁL LÚ^{URU} Ga-aš-ta-ḫa-ru-ga

5 1 LÚ 1 MUNUS 1 DUMU 8¹⁹ GU^{HLA} 3 UZ^{HLA} ŠÁM

6 ^mPi-ḫi-na-aš IGI.NU.GÁL LÚ^{URU} Ku-tu-pi-ta-aš-ša

7 2 LÚ^{MEŠ} 3 GU^{HLA} ŠÁM-ŠU

8 ^mHi-mu-DINGIR^{LIM} LÚ^{URU} Ga-ma-am-ma IGI^{HLA} uš-kán-zi

9 2 DUMU.MUNUS^{MEŠ} [š]u-ul-la-aš 1 LÚ ŠÁM

10 ^mTu-ut-tu-uš L[Ú[?] URU] Z[a]-ni-pu-ra-aš²⁰

11 ^mTa-ku-ri-iš LÚ^{URU} Iš-ki-la 2 LÚ^{MEŠ} IGI.NU.GÁL

low.e. 12 ^mGa-pi-ia-aš EGIR pa¹-it-ta

13 ŠA ^mKu-[u]r-ru-ri IGI.N[U.GÁ]L LÚ^{URU} Iš-ki-l[a]

rev. 14 2 DUMU^{MEŠ} 8 GU^{HLA} 10 UZ^{HLA}

¹⁶ See H. A. Hoffner (2002), 67–70.

¹⁷ J. Siegelová (2002), 735–737.

¹⁸ For cuneiform edition of the text see S. Alp (1991), 100; text edition by G. F. del Monte (1995), 103–111.

¹⁹ G. F. del Monte (1995), 103: 6¹⁹ as read.

²⁰ G. F. del Monte (1995), 103: L[Ú^u]za-q[a]¹-pu-ra.

15 ^mGa-ša-lu-ua-a-aš LÚ^{URU} Ma-la-zi-ia IGI.NU.GÁL

16 ^mGa-pi-ia-aš EGIR pa-it-ta 1 DUMU.MUNUS šu-ul-li-in 1¹ L[Ú]

17 ta-at-ta

18 ŠA ^mPi-iš-ga-tal-li LÚ^{URU} Tá-g-ga-aš-ta 3 GU^{HLA} ŠÁM

19 9 LÚ^{MEŠ} URU^{URU} Qa-aš-ga EGIR-an pa-it-ta ŠÁM-ŠU-NU-ma

20 20 GU^{HLA} 13 UZ^{HLA} 6 LÚ^{MEŠ} 3 MUNUS^{MEŠ}

21 2 DUMU^{MEŠ} šu-ul-la-aš 3 DUMU.MUNUS^{MEŠ} šu-ul-la-aš

upp.e. 22 17 LÚ^{MEŠ} IGI.NU.GÁL e-eš-zi ku-it

“(Total) seventeen blind men, (or) the ones whose eyes can see. The price of Tamiti, the man from Taggašta: two hostage boys (and) one man. Šunaili, the man from Gaštaḫaruga, blind, his price: one man, one woman, one boy, eight¹ oxen, three goats. Piḫina, the man from Kutupitašša, blind, his price: two men, three oxen. Ḫimuili, the man from Gamamma, hi(s) eyes see, his price: two [h]ostage girls (and) one man. Tuttu, the ma[n] from Z[a]nipura, Takuri, the man from Iškila: two blind men. (You) Gapija returned (them). Kururi, the man from Iškil[a], bl[i]nd, (price): two boys, eight oxen, ten goats. Gašaluja, the man from Malazija, blind. (You) Gapija returned (him), you received one hostage girl (and) one ma[n]. The price of Pištağalli, the man from Taggašta: three oxen. You returned nine Kaškaean men, their price: twenty oxen, thirteen goats, six men, three women. Two hostage boys, three hostage girls.”

To our opinion, *HKT* in its cuneiform edition starts with the line copied as upper edge 22 and continues with upper edge 1 because the term IGI^{HLA} uškanzi on the 1st line of the upper edge does not fit a text introduction. If the comments offered here are taken into consideration, logically at the beginning of the text, first the total number of people has been provided as “the blind or thei(r) eyes see” and then the details such as which hostage is blind and which hostage can see are explained. As an exception in the 2nd and 18th lines, there is no information on whether Tamiti and Pištağalli, the men from Taggašta, were blind or could see. The cities mentioned in the text (Taggašta, Gaštaḫaruga, Kutupitašša, Gamamma, Zanipura, Iškila and Malazija) must have been in the bordering region of the northwest Maşat-Höyük and Kaška in the upper Yeşilirmak valley out of the boundaries of the Hittite domination.²¹ According to our text, nine Kaškaean men out of total 17 hostages had been returned. Six of them were blind and one could see, which is striking.

In Boğazköy texts, on the other hand, there are treaty-like texts referring to the blind again, but since almost all of these are highly damaged, no concrete evidence could be gathered on the issue. To provide an example, in *KBo* 16.27²², which involves the treaty

²¹ See S. Alp (1991), 14–16, 20, 22–23, 40–42, 46.

²² E. von Schuler (1965), 134–138 the text has been referred to with its old edition and inventory number (KUB XXXVI 115 + 117 + 1373/c + 2639/c + 2673/c). In addition, the dating of the text with Arnuḫanda III(?) reign has lost its validity. With its language features, the text will belong to the Middle Hittite period, i.e. Arnuḫanda I.

between the Hittite king Arnuwanda I and Kaškaens, right after the paragraphs on the exchanged hostages (I 7–15'), there is a new paragraph starting with ^{LÚ.MEŠ}IGI.NU.GÁL_{ia} – “the blind too” – but not clear enough to understand (I 16' ff.).²³ In another treaty, *KBo* 8.35 I 2', the blind has been referred to along with “Kaška” or “soldiers on foot”.²⁴ A duplicate of the same text, *KUB* 40.36 I 7', however, mentions the blind in a context involving “his majesty” (i.e. the Hittite king), “the man from Hattina” and “the soldiers from Kaška”. In addition, in the fragments of other treaties like *KBo* 17.48 3' refers to “the blind”, and *KBo* 40.8 (with Middle Hittite script characteristics) rev. 7'–8'th lines refer to the exchange of blind and seeing hostages.

As for the reasons why the hostages mentioned in the texts above were blind, the most logical explanation could be that either after their capture, the hostages were punished or they were prevented from escaping by blinding. Meanwhile, the blinding cases in war should not be disregarded. In Boğazköy and Maşat-Höyük documents, there are no clues as to the blinding of the war hostages right on the spot. The most tangible information on this issue –being out of Anatolia – is found in an inscription by Assyrian king Salmanassar (IAK XXI 1). In this inscription, Salmanassar has bragged about his defeating the enemy army, the army of the Hanigalbat king Šattuara, in which Hittites and Aramaeans were also engaged, then killing the soldiers, and blinding and exiling 14.400 of the survivors.²⁵ The largest detailed evidence on the number of blinded war hostages in the tribes of the ancient Near East has been provided by the New Assyrian sources.²⁶

b) The blind worked in the mills:

Despite their physical disabilities, the blind had been benefited from as a limited labor force (e.g. as musicians at the temples, and running errands at the mills), which has been documented in the old Mesopotamian sources.²⁷ Likewise is true for Anatolia of the Hittite period, and Maşat letters provide evidence on the blind being forced to work in the mills. From these letters, the evidence on the attempts of the blind to escape from the mills can also be gathered. Thus, their conditions may suggest that the tasks at the mills may have become drudgery for them, and the people referred to were the blind. The two examples of the attempts of escape by the blind from the mills are in the Maşat letters with *HKM* 58 and 59. In the first one, Kikarša, the sender of the letter, told to Taḫazzili, that all the blind were sent to the city of Šapinuwa, but ten blind men were left behind in the mills of the region where Kikarša lived, and that none of the blind who was previously asked about by Taḫazzili providing the names was there any longer, and for the issue of concern, the official in Šapinuwa, named Šarpa, should be contacted. The text is as follows:

²³ E. von Schuler (1965), 135.

²⁴ E. von Schuler (1965), 109–112.

²⁵ See along with the bibliography. S. Heinhold-Krahmer (1988), 79.

²⁶ See I. J. Gelb (1973), 87.

²⁷ See I. J. Gelb (1973), 87.

Mšt. 75/56 = *HKM* 58²⁸

obv. 5 ŠA ^{LÚ.MEŠ}IGI.NU.GÁL_{-mu ku-it ut-tar ḫa-at-ra-a-eš}
 6 nu-kán ^{LÚ.MEŠ}IGI.NU.GÁL_{ḫu-u-ma-an-te-eš}
 7 URU Ša-pí-nu¹-u²-ua ša-ra-a pé-e-ḫu-te-er
 8 ka-a-ma 10 ^{LÚ.MEŠ}IGI.NU.GÁL_{I-NA É^ḫIA NA⁴ARA₅^R[U]}
 9 ar-ḫa ta-a-le-e-er na-aš ka-a-ša pu-nu-uš-šu-un
 10 nu-mu zi-ik ku-i-e-eš lam-ni-it ḫa-at-ra-a-eš
 11 na-aš-ta NU.GÁL ku-iš-ki an-da
 12 nu-ma-a-an ḫa-at-ra-a-ši nu I-NA ^{URU}Ša-pí¹-nu¹-ua
 13 A-NA ^mŠa-ar-pa ḫa-at-ra-a-i
 14 [L]^U.MEŠ IGI.NU.GÁL ḫu-u-ma-an-du-uš a-pí-ia

“With regard to the issue you have written to me on the blind: all the blind men were transferred up to the city of Šapinuwa. Here, ten blind men were left in the mills and here I asked about them. None of (the blind) whose names you wrote to me is here. If you write, you should write to Šarpa in the city of Šapinuwa write. All the blind men are the(re).”

In the Maşat letter *HKM* 59 sent from the city of Šapinuwa, Šarpa has informed *bēl mad-kalti* “the military governor” and Tarḫuni on the escape of the blind men from the mill in the city of Šapinuwa and ordered to capture them. The text is as follows:

Mšt. 76/52 = *HKM* 59²⁹

obv. 4 [k]a-a-ša-kán ^{URU}Ša-pí-nu-ua-za
 5 [L]^U.MEŠ IGI.NU.GÁL
 6 [I]Š-TU É^{NA}AR[A₅]
 7 [p]a-ra-a ḫu-ua-a-ir
 8 [n]a-at a-pád-da ú-e-er
 low. e. 9 [nu-u]š-ma-aš ma¹-aḫ-ḫa-an
 10 [ka-]a-aš tup-pí-an-za
 11 [an-da ú-]e-mi-ia-zi
 rev. 12 [^{LÚ}.MEŠ IGI.NU.GÁL p]i-ra-an
 13 [e-ep-tén na-aš SI]G₅-in
 14 [EGIR-pa ú-ua-te-et-té]n

“[L]ook, blind [m]en escaped and are gone fro[m] the mi[ll] from the city of Šapinuwa. [T]hey came there. When [th]is tablet [re]ached [y]ou, [catch] [the blind men] [al]ive and well and [brin]g [them back].”

In the letters of *HKM* 36 (obv. 22) and *HKM* 85 (obv. 18'), the matters about (^{LÚ})IGI.NU.GÁL “the blind (individual)” may have been mentioned. Nevertheless, both of the texts are highly damaged.

²⁸ Text edition by S. Alp (1991), 228–231.

²⁹ Text edition by S. Alp (1991), 232–233.

2. The blind in religious life

Among the various people participating or on duty in the festive celebrations, an important part of Hittite religious life, only once has a blind man been mentioned. The festival concerned is EZEN *haššumaš* described in the text of *IBoT* 1.29. Accordingly, the blind person is undressed, beaten up, and taken to *hešta*- home during the rituals of the festival. The transcription and translation of the text are as follows:

IBoT 1.29³⁰

rev. 37' ... MÁŠ.GAL-*ma a-ra-aḥ-za pé-e-ḥu-da-an-zi*
 38' *nu-kán MÁŠ.GAL-an ar-kán-zi na-an ar-ḥa a-da-an-zi*
 39' KUŠ MÁŠ.GAL-*ma da-an-zi* I^{LÚ}IGI.NU.GÁL-*ma ni-ku-ma-an-da-ri-an-zi*
 40' *na-an ṽa-al-ḥa-an-ni-an-zi na-an* ^E*hé-eš-ta-a pé-ḥu-da-an-zi*
 41' *nu a-da-an-zi a-ku-ṽa-an-zi*

“... the male goat is taken outside, they slaughter the male goat and eat it up. They obtain the skin of the male goat. They undress a blind man, beat him up and take him to *°ešta*-home. (There) they eat and drink.”

The man referred to does not play an active role but is only humiliated by the people whose identities could not be determined. We do not know whether he should be regarded as any official in the festival or as a scapegoat or a person serving for amusement. The humiliations inflicted upon him are within the psychological context due to his being undressed and within the physical context due to his being beaten up. It is not possible to arrive at a definite interpretation based on the information in the text; however, this procedure must be a part of a symbolic ceremony or ritual with a religious meaning. Naked exposure; thus, psychological humiliation is a well-known method of punishment in Hittites. The undressing of an incompetent soldier or an official of a temple because of his negligence in his duties and then being forced to carry water while nude are the cases that have been documented twice.³¹ However, these cases are incomparable to the case of the blind man in *haššumaš* festival because there is no condition requiring punishment in the festival. The procedure in *haššumaš* festival resembles in part to a scene in KILAM festival (*KUB* 2.3 II 13–27)³², which reveals diverting aspect of the scene. On that occasion, two nude ^{LÚ}ALAM.ZU₉ “jesters” squat in a pool filled up with *marnuṽan*-drink and *marnuṽan*-drink is poured over their backs three times by a priest. Although an excessive physical humiliation or punishment is not realized in this procedure, the nudity of the officials and the interesting scene described (squatting in the pool of drink and the drink being poured over them) are striking. There may be partial humiliation mixed with a joke, and should have a religious meaning.³³

³⁰ Text edition by V. Haas – M. Wäfler (1977), 100–101; also see H. A. Hoffner (1967), 184; S. de Martino (1985), 258.

³¹ *KBo* 3.34 II 33–35; *KUB* 13.4 III 31–34; A. Süel (1985), 60–61.

³² For the text see I. Singer (1984), 64.

³³ For nudity and shame with ritual associations in the Hittite cuneiform documents see S. de Martino (1985), 253–262.

The concept of ‘blindness’ in Hittites has obviously been used in their maledictions along with the concept of ‘deafness’ with an attached meaning of undesired physical handicap. Despite the lack of an example related to daily life, in the oaths of the officials, the terms “blind” and “blindness” are provided as a model with the purpose of scaring; thus, securing the obedience of the officials to the king and the royal family. This is observed in the text of a military oath, *KBo* 6.34 + III 2 (// *KUB* 7.59 III 5ff), and in the rest of the text.³⁴ The part where a blind and deaf woman has been referred to is as follows:³⁵

III 2 *nu-uš-ma-aš-kán* MUNU[(S^{LÚ}IGI.NU.G)]ÁL^{LÚ}Ú.ḪÚB
 3 *pí-ra-an ar-ḥa* [(*pé-e*)]- *ḥu-da-an-zi*
 4 *nu-uš-ma-aš kiš-an* [(*te-ši*)] *ka-a-ša* MUNUS^{LÚ}IGI.NU.GÁL
 5 ^{LÚ}Ú.ḪÚB *nu-ṽa-ká*[(*n k*)]*u-iš A-NA LUGAL* MUNUS.LUGAL
 6 *ḪUL-lu ták-ki-iš-z*[(*i na*)]-*an NI-IŠ DINGIR*^{MEŠ} *ap-pa-an-du*
 7 *na-an LÚ-an* M[UNUS-*an i-ia-a*]*n-du na-an* ^{LÚ}IGI.NU.GÁL[*L-aš?*]
 8 *i-ṽa-ar da*[-*šu-ṽa-aḥ-ḥa-a*]*n-du* ŠA^{LÚ}Ú.ḪÚB-*ma-an*
 9 *i-ṽa-ar* [*du-ud-du-mi-i*]*a-an-du*

“They take a blind (and) deaf woman to the presence of them and to them (=to soldiers) say this: “Here, a blind (and) deaf woman. Whoever does wrong to the king (and) the queen, let him be caught by the oaths! May they turn him into a woman and make him blind like the blind, deaf like the deaf!”

‘MUNUS^{LÚ}IGI.NU.GÁL^{LÚ}Ú.ḪÚB’ on the second line of the text was translated as “a blind woman and a blind man” by J. Friedrich³⁶ and A. Götze.³⁷ In N. Oettinger’s³⁸ belief, on the other hand, this must be interpreted as “a blind (and) deaf” woman. In our text, ^{LÚ}IGI.NU.GÁL and ^{LÚ}Ú.ḪÚB are neutral and it should be acknowledged that it indicates “a blind person” rather than “a blind man”. The gender of the person concerned has been defined with the determiner of ‘MUNUS’ at the beginning of the sentence. In other words, the term ‘MUNUS’ belongs both to ^{LÚ}IGI.NU.GÁL and to ^{LÚ}Ú.ḪÚB. If the philological interpretation of N. Oettinger is correct, this contextual point should be emphasized: in this text of oath, often maledictions as to turning men and their belongings into women are encountered (II 48, III 1, III 6–7). Therefore, it can be understood that to frighten the soldiers, a woman model is used at first. If the woman is both blind and deaf, there is no need to talk about other (a man) people.

KUB 60.157 provides another example of a malediction in which the blind have been referred to. As a fragment of a text once published by H. Ehelolf in (*Bo* 2490) *KIF* 1 (1930) 396, the lines are as follows:

III 7 *nu* ^{MUNUS}ŠU.GI *ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i na-aḥ-šar-nu-uš¹-ki<-ir>-ṽa*[-*ra-an ku-i-e-eš*]

³⁴ Unlike E. von Schuler (1965), 113, here “an analogical magic” (Analogiezauber) is not expected because the passage in effect does not involve any ritual association.

³⁵ See N. Oettinger (1976), 12–13.

³⁶ J. Friedrich (1924), 166–167, 183.

³⁷ A. Götze (1969), 354a.

³⁸ N. Oettinger (1976), 12–13, 38 and fn. 72.

- 8 *ú-ri-te-nu-uš-ki<-ir>-ua-ra-an ku-i-e-eš nu-ua-aš-ma-aš* IGI^{HIA} [-*ua da-šu-ua-an-da-aš*]
 9 *da-at-tén* GEŠTU^{HIA} *ma-ua-aš-ma-aš du-ud-du-mi-ia-an-da-aš ta-a[t-tén]*
 10 GEŠTU-*it iš-ta-ma-aš-te-ni le-e* IGI-*it-ma-ua uš¹-k[at³⁹-te-ni le-e]*

“The old woman says so: “[whoever] scared [him] constantly, whoever frighten him, take their eyes [(similar to) the blind’s (like)!], ta[ke] their ears; (similar to) the deaf’s (like)! (and tell them so): ‘don’t hear with your ear(s); [don’t] se[e] with your eye(s)!’”

The anti-spell performed by the old woman aims to draw the negative position away from the person who is constantly being frightened and bothered by evil ghosts or the like. As a part of the spell process, a malediction wishing for the blindness and deafness is directed at those who harm or plan to harm the person in effect.

Another text that involves the concepts of “the blind” and “blindness” associated with religion rather than with maledictions is *KUB* 12.62 with a context of magic. We wish to present this text in its extended form produced by joint works of H. Otten and Chr. Rüster in *ZA* 63 (1973) 87–88:

KUB 12.62 + 1696/u

- rev. 7 *Ú.SAL-i* GİŠ *ši-ši-ia-am-ma ar-ta kat-ta-an-ma ta-aš-ua-an-za du-du-mi-ia-an-za*
 8 *a-ša-an-zi ta-aš-ua-an-za a-uš-zi le-e du-ud-du-mi-ia-an-za-ma iš-ta-ma-aš-zi*
 9 *le-e ik-ni-ia-an-za píd-da-i le-e* UH⁷ *A-aš-ša ud-da-na-qa-te-eš*
 10 EN.SISKUR *QA-TAM-MA le-e ú-ua-an-zi*
- 11 *Ú.SAL-i* GİŠ *ši-ši-a-am-ma ar-ta GAM-an da-aš-ua-an-za du-ud-d[u-mi-ia-an-za]*
 12 *[a-ša-an-zi]i ta-aš-ua-za a-uš-zi [le-e d]u-ud-du-mi-ia-an-za[-ma]*
 13 *[iš-ta-ma-aš-zi]i le-e ik-ni-[ia-an-za píd-da-]i <le-e> in-na-r[a²-*

“A *šišijamma*-tree⁴⁰ stands in the pasture. Under it, a blind (and) a deaf sit down. Let the blind not see, the deaf not hear, the cripple not walk! The words of spell, thus not arrive the lord of the sacrifice! A *šišijamma*-tree² stands in the pasture. Under it, a blind (and) a deaf [sit] down. Let the blind not se[e], the [d]eaf not [he]ar, the cri[pple wal]k <not>! ...”

In this text where the analogical magic has been involved, first, two people, a blind and a deaf person sitting under a tree, are depicted. Then, the person telling the words of the spell uses the inability of the blind to see, of the deaf to hear, and of the cripple to walk as a simile and wishes for the distraction of similar things from happening to the patient. All of these are repeated once again in the following paragraph and the rest of the text is broken in a way to make understanding of the text impossible. The common idea in this magical likeness should be as follows: like the unseeing of a blind, unhearing of a deaf, and the non-walking of a cripple is an unchangeable phenomenon, the words of the spell should definitely and invariably stay away from the lord of the sacrifice.

³⁹ For completion see H. Ehelolf (1930), 396 n. a).

⁴⁰ See S. Alp (1957), 30 fn. 24 “willow” or “poplar” makes the offer; also see H. Ertem (1974), 101–102.

Two more texts can be added to these types of documents with similar contexts: while there are lines with the expressions of “the blind” and “the deaf” ca(n’t)hear” in the 3’–6’ lines, forming the second paragraph of *KBo* 24.9 obv.² I. In *KBo* 21.6 obv. 10 (//*KBo* 25.193)⁴¹ constituting the fourth tablet of Tunnaqija ritual, “the blind” and “the deaf” have been cited.

Poorly preserved Boğazköy documents with various topics, from which it is not possible to derive definite inferences although the blind were talked about, are given below: on the 7th line of the document of land donation, *KBo* 19.32, a blind man and a man whose name was not protected have been listed among a household of 30 people. *KUB* 43.22 is a text, the content of which is not clearly understood, but seems to be related to the family law and on obv. 25th line, a dressed blind (IGI.NU.GÁL *uašpant-*) has been cited. Another fragment, *KUB* 43.10, however, refers to a blind man within the context of oracle procedures on the 2th line.

A letter of his majesty found among the many tablets of Ortaköy (= Şapinuşa) mentions of the blind. In this poorly preserved tablet partially introduced by A. Süel⁴², the Hittite king moves onto the issue of the blind right after a paragraph on weaving. Accordingly, the official who received the letter had already sent the king a letter about the blind. The text is broken apart afterwards. The important point here is the content wise resemblance of this evidence to the aforementioned issue of “the blind sent to the city of Şapinuşa” in Maşat letter Mšt. 75/56 = *HKM* 58.⁴³

In conclusion, according to Boğazköy texts “the blind (individu)als”, though rarely, played a role in the rituals and ceremonies and were talked about. Similarly, Boğazköy and Maşat documents show that they were also used in prisoner/hostage exchanges. Moreover, in the light of the cuneiform tablets excavated from Maşat-Höyük, the blind, as the people forced to work in the mills and benefited from as labor force, may be considered to have formed a certain social class. These types of slaves may also be non-Hittite, rather be foreigners held as war hostages and worked in drudgery. It is hoped that in the future, with the discovery of new documents related to this subject that may be found in Boğazköy and other Hittite sites, our knowledge of the blind in Hittite period should be enhanced.

Bibliography

- Alp, S., Zu den Körperteilnamen im Hethitischen, *Anatolia* 2 (1957), 1–47.
 Alp, S., Hethitische Briefe aus Maşat-Höyük, Ankara 1991.
 Ehelolf, H., Zum hethitischen Lexikon, *KlF* 1 (1930), 393–400.
 Ertem, H., Boğazköy metinlerine göre Hititler devri Anadolu’sunun Florası, Ankara 1974.
 Friedrich, J., Der hethitische Soldateneid, *ZA* 35 NF 1 (1924), 161–191.
 Gelb, I. J., Prisoners of war in early Mesopotamia, *JNES* 32 (1973), 70–98.
 Götze, A., Hittite Rituals, Incantations, and Description of Festivals, in: J. G. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*, Third Edition with Supplement, Princeton 1969, 346–361.

⁴¹ See M. Hutter (1988), 42–45.

⁴² A. Süel (1995), 275.

⁴³ See A. Süel (1995), 275.

- Haas, V. – Wäfler, M., Bemerkungen zu ^E*hešitā* (2. Teil), UF 9 (1977), 87–122.
- Heinhold-Krahmer, S., Zu Salmanassars I. Eroberungen im Hurritergebiet, AfO 35 (1988), 79–104.
- Hoffner Jr., H. A., Reviews of Books. Die Kaškäer: Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasien. By Einar von Schuler, JAOS 87 (1967), 179–185.
- Hoffner Jr., H. A., The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition, Leiden/New York/Köln 1997.
- Hoffner Jr., H. A., The Treatment and Long-Term Use of Persons Captured in Battle according to the Mašat Texts, in: K. Aslhan Yener and Harry A. Hoffner Jr., Recent Developments in Hittite Archaeology and History Papers in Memory of Hans G. Güterbock, Winona Lake/Indiana 2002, 61–72.
- Hoffner Jr., H. A., The Disabled and Infirm in Hittite Society, Eretz Israel 27 (Tadmor Volume) [2003] 84*–90*.
- Hutter, M., Behexung, Entsöhnung und Heilung: Das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königspaar aus mittelhethitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 – KUB IX 34 – KBo XXI 6), Freiburg/Göttingen 1988.
- Martino, S. de, Nudità rituale e senso del pudore nella letteratura Ittita, OA 24 (1985), 253–262.
- Monte, G. F. del, I testi amministrativi da Mašat-Höyük/Tapika, Orientis Antiqui Miscellanea 2 (1995) 89–138.
- Oettinger, N., Die militärischen Eide der Hethiter, StBoT 22, Wiesbaden 1976.
- Otten, H., Original oder Abschrift – zur Datierung von CTH 258, in: Florilegium Anatolicum: Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche, Paris 1979, 273–276.
- Siegelová, J., Blendung als Strafe für den Eidbruch, in: Anatolia Antica Studi in Memoria di Fiorella Imparati Tomo II (Eothen 11), Firenze 2002, 735–737.
- Singer, I., The Hittite KILAM Festival, StBoT 28, Wiesbaden 1984.
- Süel, A., Hitit kaynaklarında tapınak görevlileri ile ilgili bir direktif metni, Ankara 1985.
- Süel, A., Ortaköy'ün Hitit çağındaki adı, Belleten 59 (1995), 271–283.
- von Schuler, E., Hethitische Königserlässe als Quellen der Rechtsfindung und ihr Verhältnis zum kodifizierten Recht, in: R. von Kienle – A. Moortgat – H. Otten – E. von Schuler – W. Zaumseil, Festschrift Johannes Friedrich zum 65. Geburtstag am 27. August 1958 gewidmet, Heidelberg 1959, 435–472.
- von Schuler, E., Die Kaškäer. Ein Beitrag zur Ethnographie des alten Kleinasien, Berlin 1965.

Prof. Dr. Yasemin Arkan

Eskiçağ Dilleri ve Kültürleri Bölümü Hititoloji Anabilim Dalı

Ankara Üniversitesi

Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi

TR - 06100 Sıhhiye/Ankara