

## Subject Shifting in Hittite Magical Rituals\*

Giulia Torri (Firenze)

The aim of this article is to analyze cases of subject shifting in Hittite ritual literature. In particular, the changes from a third person singular form of the verb to the second person singular form will be addressed.

As J. Miller has lastly pointed out, a majority of rituals use the third person singular form, describing actions of the main actor. This is true for all compositions of the AZU-priests and for many of the ŠU.GIs. Notwithstanding a general regularity in the body of the text, however, the subject may sometimes shift to second person singular in an almost inexplicable way<sup>1</sup>, thus addressing a person instead of describing his actions.

I would like to focus on these subject shifts because attempting to determine why the scribes did not care to correct these grammatical “oddities” raises interesting questions<sup>2</sup>.

An initial explanation might be simply that sensitivity to the written word, as well as heeding the gap between written and spoken language, could have been significantly different in comparison with our own.

It is clear that we should distinguish between two main phases of the possible composition of these Hittite magical rituals. One is related to the acquisition of the magical material partly from other regions of Anatolia and from northern Syria<sup>3</sup>.

---

\* I am pleased to dedicate this article to Silvin Košak as a sign of gratitude for his constant support during the months I spent at the *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur* in Mainz. I would like to thank Professor Alfonso Archi for his useful comments and remarks on this paper. Many thanks also to Ms. Ann Cleary from Bartlesville, Oklahoma for her valuable stylistic suggestions regarding the English text.

1 J.L. Miller, *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*, StBoT 46, Wiesbaden 2004. In part. see pp. 485-492.

2 See what Jo Ann Scurlock says about: “But what, exactly, is an ‘anomaly’, and how is it to be recognized in fragmentary and not always completely understood context by an observer from a different culture at a remove literally of millennia?”, J.A. Scurlock, *Some Thoughts on Ancient Mesopotamian Magic and Religion*, BiOr 59 (2002), col. 468-481, in part. col. 472.

3 It might be that the influence of the southern areas of Syria and northern Mesopotamia arrived much sooner than the effective political involvement of the Hittites started. We have to be aware of the fact that each motif that we can recognize as foreign was adopted by people that not necessarily knew or cared about its supposed or real origin. In the case of the magical literature the criteria could have been whether an element was effective or not. About different methods

The second would consist of the processes of conservation, elaboration, and adaptation to contingent situations done by the scribes of Hattuša libraries. This second phase represents examples in which the work of the single redactor surely played an important role, especially in the adoption of motifs of different origin and the fusion of several similar rituals in the version that nowadays we can read<sup>4</sup>. I think that this work had the practical aim of adapting a magical ritual to the historical situation of the moment<sup>5</sup>.

The problem of the “subject shifting” is a part of this second stage. It can be considered an anomaly only from our point of view. It seemingly has several explanations: whether it was a part of a more discursive and colloquial way of writing these texts at the time of Hittite archives, or it was the record of several spoken and written traditions, or it was a product of Mesopotamian influence. In particular I would like to compare this rare Hittite anomaly with the most frequent use of the second person singular in Mesopotamian literature and in the Akkadian magical texts found in Hattuša<sup>6</sup>.

As I have shown elsewhere, the presence of analogous spells in rituals and prayers can be explained by the belief that some spoken and written expressions were more efficacious than others<sup>7</sup>. For this reason, the scribes may have adopted similar wording from different literary compositions, having them at hand in the libraries of Hattuša. The use of the second person singular could be seen with the same perspective: the Mesopotamian-Syrian magical texts in Hattuša represent a well attested source that could have provided the scribes not only with a model of the ritual content but also of the style of the written texts.

of elaborating similar traditions in different geographical areas see A. Archi, *Text Forms and Levels of Comparison. The Rituals of Emar and the Syrian Tradition*, in T. Richter/D. Prechel/J. Klinger, *Kulturgeschichten: Altorientalische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag*, Saarbrücken 2001, pp. 19-28 and compare Miller, *StBoT* 46, pp. 461-469 and pp. 506-511.

<sup>4</sup> See G. Torri, *Common Literary Patterns in Hittite Magical Rituals and Prayers*, *Or NS* 72 (2003), pp. 216-222.

<sup>5</sup> See for example the ritual of Allaiturahhi that is dedicated to Šuppiluliuma II (KUB 41.21 and dupl., CTH 781).

<sup>6</sup> Of course the transmission of these texts to Hittites could be connected with the Hurrian-Syrian and North-Mesopotamian milieu. D. Schwemer, *Akkadische Rituale aus Hattuša: Die Sammeltafel KBo XXXVI 29 und verwandte Fragmente*, *THeth* 23, Heidelberg 1998, pp. 50-52.

<sup>7</sup> About this matter see Torri, *Or NS* 72, pp. 216-222. Most recent contributions to the redactional history of the rituals are found in Miller, *StBoT* 46 and B. Christiansen, *Die Ritualtraditionen der Ambazzi. Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429 und CTH 463*, *StBoT* 48, Wiesbaden 2006.

Here I would like to present the examples that I found in Hittite ritual literature<sup>8</sup>. The most extensive passages are in the ritual of Irija, CTH 400<sup>9</sup>. The text KUB 30.35 + KUB 39.104 begins with the *incipit* in the first person singular: “Thus Irija, the augur: when I treat a city for an evidence of blood, broken oath (or) gossip, I act in the following way. They prepare the tools: a bronze hoe, a bronze spade, a bronze š., oil, honey, (and) a thin loaf of bread”. Immediately after the first paragraph line (that divides the introductory lines from the body of the text) it is written:

KUB 30.35 +, Obv. I (MH/LNH):

6 *nu ku-ya-pí ya-ap-pu-ū[a-ašIM<sup>LÚ</sup>].MEŠ* BĀḪAR<sup>7</sup> *im-ma da-aš-kán-zi*

7 *nu a-pád-da pa-i-ši nu ya-a[p-pu-u-i] kiš-an me-ma-at-ti*

“You go there, (to the place) where the potters go to gather [the clay of the river] bank, and to the [river] bank you speak as follows”.

The following is very fragmentary but the remaining lines of the obverse are expressed in third person singular. Part of the same ritual is in the tablet KUB 30.34 + KUB 60.75, the third and the fourth columns of which are partly preserved. In the fourth column there is a long magical prescription in which the third and the second person singular alternate<sup>10</sup>:

KUB 30.34 +, Rev. IV (MH/NH)<sup>11</sup>

10 ... *nu-uš-kán É-ri an-da ya-aḫ-nu-ši*

11 MUŠEN<sup>7</sup> HIA MÁŠ.GAL-an-na *nu-uš-kán IV ḫal-ḫal-du-ma-ri ya-al-aḫ-zi*

12 *nu* -uš-kán *pa-ra-a u-un-na-at-ti nu ḫa-a-ra-an*

13 *kal* -li-kal-li-in-na *ar-ḫa tar-na-at-ta*

14 *nu* *ya-a-tar EGIR-pa* GIŠŠEN *la-aḫ-ḫu-ut-ti*

15 *nu ki-i-ma EGIR-an ar-ta-aḫ-ḫi-ja la- aḫ* -ḫ[u-ut-ti]i

16 *nu te* -ez-zi *ki-i ya-a-tar GIM-an ar-ḫa ḫar-ak-zi*

17 *ki-i i-na-an e-eš-ḫar NI-IŠ DINGIR<sup>LIM</sup> pa-an-ga-u-ya-aš EME-aš*

18 *ḫu-u-ur-ki-il ar-ḫa QA-TAM-MA ḫar-ak-du*

19 [nu]kán MÁŠ.GAL-an *šu-u-ra-šu-u-ra-an-na URU-ri*

<sup>8</sup> Compare Miller, *StBoT* 46, pp. 508-509, who quotes just three examples: CTH 395, CTH 400 and CTH 780. See also J.L. Miller, *Von Syrien durch Kizzuwatna nach Hatti: Die Rituale der Allaiturahhi und Giziya*, in D. Prechel, *Motivation und Mechanismen des Kulturkontaktes in der späten Bronzezeit*, *Eothen* 13, Firenze 2005, pp. 129-144, in part. pp. 135-136.

<sup>9</sup> R. Francia, ‘Montagne grandi (e) piccole, (sapete) perché sono venute?’ (In margine a due recitativi del rituale di Irija CTH 400), *Or NS* 73 (2004), pp. 390-408.

<sup>10</sup> Note that in the third column the subject alternates as usual between the third person singular and the third person plural.

<sup>11</sup> The preceding lines (IV 1-9) seem to be a recitative.

20 <sup>ṛ</sup>is̄ -tar-na ar-ḫa pé-e-da-i na-aš-ta an-tu-uḫ-šū-uš  
 21 <sup>ṛ</sup>ku-e-ez̄ -za KÁ.GAL<sup>H1.A</sup> -za kat-ta ku-na-an-na  
 22 <sup>ṛ</sup>pé-ē -ḫu-da-an-zi a-pu-u-ša-kán a-pé-e-ez kat-ta  
 23 <sup>ṛ</sup>pí-da-at̄ -ti nu an-tu-uḫ-še-eš a-pí-ja ku-e-da-ni pí-di  
 24 <sup>ṛ</sup>a -ki-ir nu-uš a-pé-e-<da->ni pí-di pé-e-da-at-ti

“You make them turn into the house, the birds and the ram. At the four corners of the house he strikes them. You bring them outside. He sets the eagle and the hawk free. Then you pour water in a gutter.

Again you pour this into a canal and he speaks: ‘How this water disappears, let this illness, the blood, the broken oath, the gossip, the iniquity disappear too’. He carries away the ram and the bird š. through the city. You carry them (out) from that gate through which the men are brought for the *execution*. You carry them to the place where the men died”.

This passage seems to be the “author’s” prescription in which he addresses two interlocutors, speaking directly to one of them (‘you’), and indirectly to the other one (‘he’)<sup>12</sup>.

A further example was found in the so-called ritual of Ḫantitaššu from Ḫurma, CTH 395<sup>13</sup>. The tablet KBo 11.14 represents the main and better-preserved version of the ritual handed down in several copies from the imperial period<sup>14</sup>.

In the second column it is written:

KBo 11.14 Obv. II (MH/NH)

16 ..... la-a-a da-ri-ja-an-ta[-an]  
 17 tu-ri-ja-<sup>ṛ</sup>mā ṽa-ar-ši-ja-an-ta-a[n]  
 18 la-a-a <sup>ṛ</sup>da-rī -ja-an-<sup>ṛ</sup>tā -an tu-u-ri-ja-ma ṽa-ar-<sup>ṛ</sup>šī -ja-an-t[-a-an]  
 19 na-at III-ŠÚ te-ši

“Release the exhausted one, but yoke the rested one. Release the exhausted one, but yoke the rested one! And you say this three times!”

In a parallel text 2029/g (+) (NH), in fragmentary context, at line 4 there are the signs of a third person singular ([te-]ez-zī) which is a duplicate of the cited form (KBo 11.14 II 19). Of course it is not possible to state if the verb expressed in second person singular was later amended to third person singular or vice versa.

12 This passage could also be a direct speech (without particle -*ṽar*). Or the interlocutor could be just one: all the passage would be an alternation between descriptive parts and prescriptive speeches.

13 A. Ünal, *The Hittite Ritual of Ḫantitaššu from the City of Ḫurma against Troublesome Years*, Ankara 1996.

14 Several elements suggest a middle Hittite model. The text KBo 20.34 (MH) cannot be ascribed with certainty to the ritual of Ḫantitaššu.

For both these rituals, CTH 400 and CTH 395, J. Miller suggests a direct contact with the Southern Anatolia and Syrian cultural environment. In the case of Irija ritual CTH 400, the southern origin would be explained by the presence of the “Ancient Gods” and by the offers of birds; in the case of Ḫantitaššu ritual CTH 395, he claims the southern position of Ḫurma in direction of Kizzuṽatna<sup>15</sup>. These elements, of course, could have contributed to the presence of ‘you’ in the mentioned texts, but if so, how to explain the example found in the birth-ritual KUB 30.29 (CTH 430)? This is probably a middle-Hittite composition, characterized by a mythical narration in which Hattic deities are named.

In the obverse of the tablet there is an example of a verb expressed in second person singular:

KUB 30.29 Obv.

6 [nu-] <sup>ṛ</sup>za-an̄ MUNUS-za <sup>ḠIS</sup>ku-up-pí-iš-na-aš še-er e-šā MUNUS <sup>ḠIS</sup>ḫa-aš-nu-  
 pa-al-la-šā  
 7 [ki-iš-]šar-ta <sup>TUG</sup>ḫu-ṽa-am-ma-li-ja-an ḫar-zi  
 8 [nu ki-i]š-ša-an ḫu-uk-ki-<sup>ṛ</sup>iš̄ -ki-ši

“[Then] the woman seats herself on the stools and the midwife holds the receiving blanket with [ha]nds. You shall repeatedly conjure [as foll]ows: ...”<sup>16</sup>

It suggests that the Hittite rituals in the same Ḫattuša drew upon the Mesopotamian culture, and it is not necessary to look for a possible southern origin of the ritual itself<sup>17</sup>.

The rare use of the second person singular in the present tense is attested also in the so-called soldiers’ oath, CTH 427. The second tablet of the text is almost fully preserved even though the *incipit* is lost<sup>18</sup>. The text is an ensemble of several magical practices based on the analogic system. Using them, an unnamed magician binds the soldiers to the royal family<sup>19</sup>. From a formal point of view, each oath formula is circumscribed by paragraph-lines drawn on the tablet. The text is in general expressed in the third person singular. In the last part of the second column there is a paragraph in which the use of the ‘you’-form appears:

15 But Miller rightly rejects the Hurrian origin of CTH 395. See Miller, *StBoT* 46, pp. 447-452.

16 G. Beckman, *Hittite Birth Rituals*, *StBoT* 29, Wiesbaden 1983, pp. 22-23. About the shift to second person singular see pp. 26-27.

17 Assuming of course that the use of the second person singular is really a Mesopotamian feature and not a scribal mistake.

18 The colophon of KBo 6.34 +, IV 18-19 says: “When the troops are driven to the oath”. N. Oettinger, *Die militärischen Eide der Hethiter*, *StBoT* 22, Wiesbaden 1976.

19 On analogic magic in Hittite rituals see G. Torri, *La similitudine nella magia analogica ittita*, Roma 2003.

KBo 6.34 +, Obv. II (MH/NS, = KUB 7.59 (+), Obv. II 6-8)

42 *nu TÚG ŠÁ MUNUS* <sup>GIŠ</sup>*hu-la-a-li* <sup>GIŠ</sup>*hu-e-ša-an-na*

43 *ú-da-an-zi nu GI-an du-ya-ar-na-an-zi*

44 *nu-uš-ma-aš kiš-an te-ši ...*

“They bring a dress for woman, a distaff, and a spindle, they break an arrow shaft and you tell them (*i.e.* the soldiers) in the following way: ...”

The second person singular is also attested in the parallel version KUB 7.59 +. In the main version there is a gap:

KBo 6.34 +, Rev. III (= KUB 7.59 (+), Rev. III 5-7):

2 *nu-uš-ma-aš-kán* MU[(NUS <sup>LÚ</sup>IGL.NU.)]GÁL <sup>LÚ</sup>Ú.ĤÚB

3 *pí-ra-an ar-ḥa [(pé-e-)]hu-da-an-zi*

4 *nu-uš-ma-aš kiš-an [(te-ši)] ...*

“They drive away before them a blind (and) deaf woman. In the following way you tell them: ...”

A third example in CTH 427 is this:

KBo 6.34 +, Rev. III:

46 *nu-uš-ma-aš KUŠ SA<sub>5</sub> pa-it-ti nu te-ez-zi*

“You give them red leather and he says ...”

The presence of the subject shifting in this text is surely particular because of its formal regularity, as already explained. It is tempting to have the idea that this text was in origin completely expressed in the second person singular as collection of oaths and only later turned to the third person singular. In this case the few forms that break the regularity could simply be the survival of a former edition<sup>20</sup>.

A further passage was found in the text KUB 4.47 (CTH 432), in which Akkadian spells alternate with the description of the ritual written in Hittite language<sup>21</sup>. It contains three prayers. K. van der Toorn identifies two of them as *šigûs* and the third one is a prayer to the gods of the night<sup>22</sup>. Hittite prescriptive portions expressed in third person singular show that the spells had to be recited directly by the patient<sup>23</sup>. The last part of the text preserves a sentence in second person singular:

20 But of course this is just a hypothesis.

21 K. van der Toorn, *Sin and Sanction in Israel and Mesopotamia. A Comparative Study*, Assen/Maastricht 1985, pp. 124-133 (Ph.H.J. Houwink ten Cate made a translation of the Hittite portion). See also D. Schwemer, *Ein Akkadischer Liebeszauber aus Hattuša*, ZA 94 (2004), pp. 59-79, in part. pp. 78-79 with n. 58.

22 Van der Toorn, *Sin and Sanction*, p. 125.

23 See G. Torri, *A Hittite Magical Ritual to Be Performed in an Emergency*, JANER 4 (2004), pp. 129-141.

KUB 4.47 Rev.

31 [*nu a-p*]u-u-un *an-tu-uḫ-ša-an pá-r-ša-an-ti-nu-ši nu ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i*

“You make .... [th]at man and he speaks as follows....”

Unfortunately the meaning of the verb is unknown<sup>24</sup>. The style of this ritual recalls the *babili* ritual CTH 718 and many Hurrian compositions in which descriptive parts are expressed in Hittite, while the spells are in a foreign language<sup>25</sup>.

The use of the second person singular is also present in a tablet of Allaiturahḫi ritual CTH 780<sup>26</sup>:

KUB 45.21 lower<sup>1</sup> edge (MH)

22' [*nu k*]u-u-un *ŠI-IP-TA III-ŠU hu-uk-ši*

“You recite [t]his spell three times!”

The preserved part of this tablet is entirely written in Hurrian with the exception of this line.

About this J. Miller writes: “That the earliest Allaiturahḫi composition(s) may have been derived from texts already composed in northern Syria might find support, *inter alia*, in the second person verb form in the earliest, and nearly entirely Hurrian, text attributed to her”<sup>27</sup>. He believes that “it may perhaps have been (partially) translated directly from the Hurrian (and/or Akkadian) at this early stage of appropriation of the material from the Kizzuwatna archives”<sup>28</sup>.

This hypothesis could, of course, be valid, but I prefer to interpret this sentence more as a Hittite scribal insertion. If this line of the Allaiturahḫi ritual were a translation from Hurrian, we would have many more examples of the use of second person in this text; perhaps we would even find entire Hurrian compositions written with the use of ‘you’.

A last known example is in the text KBo 23.8 (MH?):

KBo 23.8 Obv.

9' *ma-a-an KASKAL-an na-an-na-at-ti*

10' *nu i-da-a-lu-un MUŠEN-in*

24 CHD P, p. 186b. I agree with this remark of CHD that the change to second person singular appears awkward here. Compare this line with KUB 4.47 Rev. 20 “He has him recite thus”, see. CHD M, p. 268a.

25 See for example the texts collected in V. Haas/I. Wegner, *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen* SALŠU.GI, ChS I/5.1, Roma 1988; R. Strauß, *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna*, Berlin/New York 2006, pp. 189-215.

26 Haas/Wegner, ChS I/5.1, Nr. 1, pp. 48-51. See also V. Haas, *Die hurritisch-hethitischen Rituale der Beschwörerin Allaiturah(h)i und ihr literar-historischer Hintergrund*, Xenia 21, Konstanz 1988, pp. 117-144.

27 Miller, StBoT 46, pp. 507-508.

28 Miller, StBoT 46, p. 508.

11' *a-uš-zi nu a-ra-aḫ<sup>1</sup>-za*<sup>29</sup>

12' [M]ÁŠ.GAL UR.TUR-*na pé-e-da-at-ti*

"If you are driving along the road, and one sees a bad bird, then you bring a [g]oat and a puppy outside ..." <sup>30</sup>

The rest of this short conjuration (ll. 13'-18') is in third person singular (Rev. 14', 15', 17', 18') or in third person plural (13'). Unfortunately the colophon does not preserve the name of the supposed author of the whole text<sup>31</sup>.

Commenting this fragment A. Kammenhuber wonders if instructions in second person singular can be found only in Hittite compositions translated from Akkadian<sup>32</sup>.

I would like to focus shortly on the wide collection of Mesopotamian documents from Hattuša<sup>33</sup>. The tablet KBo 36.29 (CTH 812) is a good example in which the actions of the magician are expressed in second person singular<sup>34</sup>. I wonder if the scribes could have used these kinds of texts as a stylistic source to insert the second person singular into rituals that were originally expressed in third person singular (and often had the *incipit* in first person singular).

KUB 4.17 (+) is a late Hittite copy of a Babylonian original composition<sup>35</sup>. At the second line the *verbum dicendi* "*qabû(m)*" is expressed in second person singular of the present tense (KUB 4.17 Rev. IV 2: *an-ni-tam ta-qâb-bi-ma*), while the following part of the ritual is in third person singular<sup>36</sup>.

Particularly interesting in this regard is the Mesopotamian magical text KUB 29.58 + (CTH 811)<sup>37</sup>. The ritual is entirely written in Akkadian. The first twenty-nine lines are expressed in second person singular and consist of several different actions that the magician had to perform in order to cure the patient. In the line 30 there is a sudden change of the subject to the third person singular: (I 30) <sup>LÚ</sup>*a-ši-pu ANA IGI* <sup>d</sup>UTU *ki-a-am i-qâb-bi* "The exorcist speaks so before the Sungod ...".

The same sentence is repeated in the fourth column after a long prescription in

29 S. V. Haas, *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica*, Berlin/New York 2003, p. 413 with n. 590.

30 Torri, JANER 4, p. 139.

31 KBo 23.8 lower side 23': [A-]U<sup>a</sup>A-AT<sup>m</sup>[ ]. None of the other incantations in the tablet are expressed in second person singular.

32 HW<sup>2</sup> (A), p. 258a: "Anweisungen in der 2. Singular finden sich im Heth. nur (?) bei Übers. aus dem Akkad."

33 See Schwemer, THeth 23, pp. 50-52. For a general view also G. Beckman, *Mesopotamians and Mesopotamian Learning at Hattuša*, JCS 35, pp. 97-114; Haas, *Materia Magica*, pp. 48-49.

34 Schwemer, THeth 23, pp. 84-108.

35 CTH 812, Schwemer, THeth 23, p. 13 (X<sub>15-16</sub>).

36 Schwemer, THeth 23, pp. 147-149. See also S. Maul, *Zukunftsbewältigung. Eine Untersuchung altorientalischen Denkens anhand der babylonisch-assyrischen Löserituelle (Namburbi)*, BaF 18, Mainz 1994, pp. 74, 102-106.

37 G. Meier, *Ein akkadisches Heilungsritual aus Boğazköy*, ZA 45 (1939), pp. 195-215.

second person singular. In line 15 the subject of the sentence is again the *āšipu*, but the verb is mistakenly expressed in second person singular: "*taqabbi*" instead of "*iqabbi*"<sup>38</sup>.

In later Mesopotamian ritual literature the dramatic shift in person (from 'he' to 'you') is commonly identified with a change of specialists<sup>39</sup>. When the *āšipu* fails, the use of 'you' marks the work of the *asû*: "The *āšipu* should continually do what he knows (to do). (You) rub him with marrow from the fibula [of a ram] ..." <sup>40</sup>.

J.A. Scurlock has pointed out that sometimes the shift in the subject "can hardly refer to a change in specialists"<sup>41</sup>, and, indeed, I agree that the shift is most likely a stylistic feature.

These rare examples are not significant enough to explain with certainty the origin and the use of this element. We do not know if it was the sign of an original Syrian composition, written in Syria<sup>42</sup>, or the result of imitation of a Mesopotamian-Syrian custom in Hattuša, or simply a casual insertion of the spoken language that survived in the written language. The Mesopotamian material at hand for the scribes in Hittite archives was a collection that could have been used as a model in bringing up-to-date every composition especially during the Middle Hittite but also in later periods<sup>43</sup>.

The use of the second person singular in the ritual of Hantitaššu KBo 11.14 and its duplicate (*teši/[te]zzi*) might suggest that in some cases the scribes tried to normalize and level the language of the rituals by getting rid of the second person singular<sup>44</sup>.

A good example of scribal attitude toward foreign texts is attested in a medical school tablet, CTH 808. The text is mainly written in Akkadian, but it is repeatedly glossed by a Hittite scribe, who noted down the explanation of the medical prac-

38 KUB 29.58 +, IV 15: ANA IGI <sup>LÚ</sup>*a-ši-pu* UR<sub>5</sub>.GIM *ta-qâb-bi-ma*.

39 See for example K.E. Ritter, *Magical Expert (āšipu) and Physician (asû): Notes on Two Complementary Professions in Babylonian Medicine*, in FS Landsberger, AS 16, Chicago 1965, pp. 299-321.

40 BAM 482 III 7-8. For this citation J.A. Scurlock, *Physician, Exorcist, Conjurer, Magician: A Tale of Two Healing Professionals*, in T. Abusch/K. van der Toorn, *Mesopotamian Magic. Textual, Historical, and Interpretative Perspectives*, (Ancient Magic and Divination I) Stix, Groningen 1999, pp. 69-79, pp. 70-71 with n. 9.

41 Scurlock in: *Mesopotamian Magic*, p. 71.

42 Even if this kind of explanation would suite well the ritual of Allaituraḫḫi, it seems to be artificial in the case of other compositions like the ritual of Hantitaššu and the ritual of Irija. See Miller, StBoT 46, pp. 508-509.

43 The text KUB 45.21 is surely a MH original; the texts KUB 30.29 and KBo 23.8 could be MH texts. The other passages were found in late copies of middle Hittite compositions. For this reason it is not possible to find out if insertions of the second person singular are just a MH feature or could have been used by the scribes also in later periods.

44 But in the Soldiers' Oath CTH 427 both versions maintain the use of the second person singular.

tices in Hittite and sometimes in Luwian language<sup>45</sup>. A line of the text might be an example:

KUB 37.1 Obv. 5-6<sup>46</sup>:

... GIM *ra-bi-ki*

*ta-ra-ab<-bak> :hu-qa-ar-ti-in* GIM-<sup>an</sup> *za-nu-uz-zi* LÚ *ša-šu*

*ta-ša-na-me[-ed]*<sup>47</sup>

(Akk.) "... You cook (the ingredients) as a decoction<sup>48</sup> – (Hitt.) "He cooks (the ingredients) as a decoction" – (Akk.) and you repeatedly bandage this man".

This text might indicate that the Hittite scribes were used to assimilating foreign traditions, adapting them to their own perceptions and consequently to their own style. The shift in the subject from the most common third person to the second person singular can be seen as a stylistic feature, possibly influenced by Mesopotamian ritual literature present in Hittite tablet collections, and not as the survival of a tradition far in the past from the actual work of Hattuša scribes.

## Notes sur le fragment à caractère historique KUB 31.45

Marie-Claude Trémouille (Rome)

Tout hittitologue se trouve, à un certain moment, confronté avec ce que l'on pourrait appeler les «entrées-valise» du *Catalogue des textes hittites*: 470, 670, 832, etc. Ce sont celles que l'on attribue à tous les fragments de faible extension dont l'appartenance à un groupe spécifique de textes est difficile à déterminer, même lorsque leur typologie est claire. C'est surtout le cas pour des fragments à caractère religieux qui composent les entrées 470, «Fragments de rituels», et 670, «Fragments divers (de fêtes)», ou encore ceux dont on ne sait vraiment pas à quelle typologie ils appartiennent, qui se voient attribuer l'entrée 832 «Varia»; mais cela est vrai aussi en ce qui concerne des textes historiques. Or, malgré leurs dimensions exiguës et l'absence de références ponctuelles à des événements ou des personnages précis, ces «Fragments» offrent parfois quelque élément utile à la reconstruction de périodes connues imparfaitement.

Parmi les textes énumérés sous CTH 212 «Traités (ou protocoles): fragments» figure un document qui, à mon avis, mérite quelque intérêt: KUB 31.45 (Bo 797). Ce fragment, qui provient des fouilles Makridi – Winckler et dont le lieu de trouvaille est inconnu, est aujourd'hui conservé au Musée d'Istanbul. Le Vorderasiatisches Museum de Berlin, que je remercie en la personne de J. Marzahn, m'en a fourni une excellente photo, tirée par Madame Ehelolf.

Mon attention sur ce texte a été attirée par la mention, selon van Gessel (1998, 381), du dieu Šarrumma au début de la ligne 3' de la colonne droite. Toutefois, l'incertitude dans la réelle lecture des restes de signe conservés m'a conseillé d'exclure cette attestation lors d'un article récent sur cette divinité (Trémouille 2006), surtout vu l'absence de contexte utile à la détermination des spécificités de ce dieu, ce qui était le sujet, précisément, de mon étude.

C'est avec plaisir que je dédie ces quelques lignes à Silvin Košak dont le *Konkordanz online* est devenu aujourd'hui un outil indispensable à nos travaux. Je renvoie d'ailleurs à son ouvrage pour toutes références et bibliographies relatives aux textes mentionnés dans cet article.

45 Haas, *Materia Magica*, pp. 120-121.

46 See already G. Beckman, *StBoT* 29, pp. 26-27.

47 F. Köcher, *Ein akkadischer medizinischer Schülertext aus Boghazköy*, *AfO* 16 (1952/3), pp. 47-56, in part. p. 53.

48 See CAD (R), p. 9a.