

leading to the conclusion that the first is as well. But see below in §21. Craig Melchert (in a personal communication) proposed a different restoration which van den Hout and I agree is more likely: either EZEN<sub>4</sub> *šum-ma-[ri-ya-u-wa-aš?]* or EZEN<sub>4</sub> *šum-ma-[ra-an-na-aš?]* « festival of pregnancy » (from the verbal *šumrai-* « to be pregnant »),<sup>35</sup> which has the advantage of a chronological sequence: pregnancy > labor pains > birth.

<sup>36</sup> The word occurs in a Hittite translation of an Akkadian *šumma izbu* omen: KUB 34.19 i 11' (*ŠUMMA IZBU* omens) *takku IZBU* <sup>UZU</sup>LI.DUR-in x[-.....]. The other occurrence in a Hittite text lacks the UZU determinative, because it refers to a representation in gold of the navel of the goddess Pirinkir as the night sky (KUB 29.4 i 13, translation by Collins in Hallo and Younger 1997, p. 173 « one gold navel »). An explanation of this gold image of Pirinkir as the night sky is given by Beckman, 1999, p.26 with footnotes. See also Beckman 1998, p.7 note 80. One is reminded of the Egyptian graphic representations of the (daytime and nighttime) sky as the frontal view of an adult female goddess, Nut, arched over the earth (see SHAFER, 1991, p.24, plate 13).

<sup>37</sup> A third option, which I do not consider plausible, is that DUMU here is the shorthand for DUMU LUGAL « prince » which one finds in some of the festival texts. This interpretation has been followed by Haroutunian, 2003.

<sup>38</sup> For this reading see *CHD* S 25 sub 1 b 3' a'.

## SOME THOUGHTS ON THE COMPOSITION KNOWN AS MURŠILI'S APHASIA (CTH 486)

### 1. Introduction and contents of the composition<sup>1</sup>

One of the most personal and fascinating documents in Hittite literature is the composition known as « die Sprachlähmung » or Aphasia of King Muršili II (c. 1318-1295 BC<sup>2</sup>). As Prof. René Lebrun, to whom I dedicate these thoughts along with my very best wishes, in his edition of 1985 rightly put it : « Ce texte, une fois publié, retint l'attention du public lettré à plus d'un égard ; son intérêt religieux mais aussi psychologique n'échappait à personne »<sup>3</sup>.

The composition has come down to us in fragments of four different manuscripts<sup>4</sup>. Except for perhaps ms. D (IBoT 4.26) which is, however, too small for a reliable dating, all copies are likely to postdate Muršili's reign on paleographical grounds. Despite its unique character and personal focus the composition as a whole is not without its problems. The use of tenses and the line of the narrative are at times rather confusing. Moreover, the two lists of offerings (see below) and the instructional character of the final paragraph seem inconsistent with the largely historiographic tenor of the document. Striking also is the use of paragraph lines : although consistent in all four copies<sup>5</sup> of the composition, their spread over the document looks uneven. Not counting the double paragraph line that separates off the colophon from the body of the composition, there are only three paragraph lines preserved dividing the text into four paragraphs or sections. It is these problems that I will address in the present contribution.

Muršili starts out in a first person past tense narrative, telling how on his way to Tell Kunnu a sudden thunderstorm

startled him to such a degree that his speech was affected and he partly lost his voice :

(Obv. 1-5<sup>6</sup>) Thus (speaks) My Majesty, Muršili, Great King : I was driving to Tell Kunnu and a thunderstorm broke out. Then the Stormgod started to thunder frightfully and I became afraid, so that the words in my mouth became small and words were coming up (only) somewhat little.

This affliction must have been only temporary, since he says he forgot about it or suppressed the matter until years later the event began to resurface in his dreams. This time « the hand of the god » touched him and his speech capabilities completely gave way. Oracle investigations made clear the Stormgod of Manuziya was responsible. As a result an ox as carrier<sup>7</sup> of the evil that had befallen the king, should be sent to Kummanni (also known as Kizzuwatna) in south-eastern Anatolia and burned there. Besides this ox, birds had to be burned as an offering as well, although it is not stated that this be done in Kummanni :

(Obv. 6-14) I completely forgot about that matter but when thereupon years passed by, that event happened to start appearing in my dreams. In the dream the hand of the god touched me and my mouth ceased to function<sup>8</sup>. I conducted an oracle investigation and the Stormgod of Manuziya was determined. I then conducted further oracle investigations concerning the Stormgod of Manuziya and it was determined that a substitute ox be given to him (and) burned in fire (and) that birds be burned<sup>9</sup>. I then conducted an oracle investigation concerning the substitute ox and it was determined that it be given on the spot in the land of Kummanni in the temple.

At this point (obv. 14) the narrative changes from the first to the third person. We are told how the ox was adorned, how the king laid his hand on the ox<sup>10</sup> and bowed after it while it was being escorted away to Kummanni :

(Obv. 14-17) So they adorned a substitute ox, His Majesty laid his hand on (it) and they sent it off to Kummanni while His Majesty bowed after (it).

Up to now the narrative was chronologically linear but from obv. 17 onwards four or five *excursus* follow adding information on what happened on the day of dispatching the substitute ox, the day before and in the days immediately following it. All are marked by the phrase *apēdani UD-ti* « on that day ».

The first *excursus* (obv. 17-21) tells us that Muršili refrained from sexual intercourse on the eve of « that day » (obv. 18), then bathed and in that state of purity layed his hand on the ox.

(Obv. 17-21) That day on which they adorned the substitute ox, His Majesty bathed himself and stayed clear of a woman during the night before. When in the early morning he had bathed himself, he laid (his) hand on the substitute ox.

In what may be called the second *excursus*, the narrative now jumps ahead and states that, after the ox has been led away to be presented to the deity in Kummanni, the king bathes (present *warpi* obv. 23 !) for seven days in a row<sup>11</sup>. Then from the eighth day onwards he did something in the past tense again which is unfortunately lost in a break of three lines. After that break all the birds as well as two lambs that were burned as prescribed by the oracle investigation (obv. 12), are enumerated (obv. 30-38) :

(Obv. 21-38) Now, when they had sent off the substitute ox, His Majesty bathed (!) himself ritually after (the dispatch of) the ox for seven days. Since (all activities) had been put on hold<sup>12</sup>, while they brought the substitute ox to Kummanni and [un]til th[ey had] given it, His Majesty did not wait any (longer). He had let those seven days go by, but from the eighth day onwards, when the seventh day had p[asse]d, His Majesty [...] whe[n on that da]y(?) [...] on [that(?)] day [...] <sup>13</sup>.

Thus (the?) birds he burned: One bird *enumaššiya*, one bird *ariya itarkiya*, one bird *ariya mudriya*, one bird *iniya iririya*, one bird *ilmiya parmiya*, one bird *iriltehiya*, one bird *ulaḥulziya*, one bird *duwantehiya*, one lamb *taḥasiya durusiya*, one bird *kibiššiya punuḥunšiya*, one bird *gameršiya*, one bird *tatiya duwarniya*, one bird *šerdihiya šerabihiya*, one bird *anišhiya bindihiya*, one lamb *zuzumakiya* to be burned in fire they were thus determined.

It is not exactly clear when these birds were burned: is this list still part of the second *excursus* indeed and did it therefore happen from the eighth day onwards after dispatching the ox and when the king had undergone the bathing ritual<sup>14</sup> or is this already a third *excursus* with no preserved indication of when this had been done? If the particle *-z(a)* preserved just before the break (obv. 27: [ma]hḥan-[m]a [(UD.7.KAM)] pā[i]t [nu]-za <sup>15</sup>UTU-ŠI [...] « [W]hen the seventh day had passed, His Majesty [...] ») goes with a form of the verb *warnu-* « to burn » to be restored, as it does immediately after the break (obv. 30: [(MUŠEN. H)I.A-ma-za kiššan wa)]r[(n)]ut « Thus he burned the birds », the former would be the case.

The following repeated sequence (obv. 38-41) of bathing, laying the hand on the ox, sending it away and giving it to the deity « on that day » (obv. 40) probably is already part of

the next *excursus*. Here offerings of sheep and oxen that were made on that day too (obv. 42-rev. 5) are mentioned and specified after the first paragraph line:

(Obv. 38-43) When [he/His Majesty had bathed] himself, he who was prescribed [to lay] (his) hand on the substitute ox<sup>15</sup>, th[u]s on tha[t day] they sent it off and g[ave] (it) to the deity. And that which was on the *anzai* table on [that] day, they gave (it) from [...].

16

(Rev. 1-5) For the Stormgod for *ambašši* one sheep *keldiya* [...], for the male gods for *ambašši* one sheep, for (the gods) Lelluri (and) Abari [...] one ox (and) one sheep, for the *anzai* table for *a[mbašši(?) ... (?)]*, for Lelluri one ox (and) one sheep, for [...].

Thus the narrative comes back, it seems, to the day of sending away the ox. It is not stated what happened to the sheep and oxen: were they given slaughtered and/or burned<sup>17</sup>?

The final *excursus* lists what was exactly sent (and what was not sent) to Kummanni along with the ox: the clothes he had worn and the chariots he had stood on, both on the day of the thunderstorm as well as on the day of sending the ox. This fourth or fifth *excursus* returns to a first person narrative:

(Rev. 6-22) The robes I wore on that day that I laid (my) hand on the substitute ox, when they sent it off, those robes too including the belt, sword (and) shoes with ... they sent off and they carried them away. Also the chariot harnessed with bow, quiver (and) horses they sent off and they drove them away. However, nothing was taken of the table I used to eat at nor of the cup I used to drink from nor of the bed I used to sleep in nor of the water basin I used to wash myself

from nor whatever item was mentioned in connection. Thus it was determined by the deity. (Just) the robes, chariot and horses were taken in this case. The robes I had worn on that day that the Stormgod had frightfully thundered and brought the thunderstorm, and the chariot I had stood on that day, these robes all together and the harnessed chariot, that too they took.

If we call the day of dispatching the ox « Day 1 » we get the following sequence of activities :

eve of Day 1	no sexual intercourse for the king
Day 1	the king bathes
	the ox is decorated
	the king lays his hand on the ox
	the ox is led away including the king's
	two sets of clothes and chariots
	the king bows after the ox
	sheep and ox offerings are made
Days 1-7	the king undergoes a bathing ritual
Day 8 and following	[break] birds are burned ?

The final section of the text has present tense throughout (rev. 23-31) and advises the people accompanying the ox in a very practical and at the same time very Hittite fashion, if it dies along the way – « since it is a long journey » – to take any other ox, to transfer the decorations and to burn the substitute of the substitute ox in Kummanni.

When they bring the substitute ox, just as the substitute ox ritual has been recorded on the old tablet, just as the regulation is written down for it and just as for the deity the *ambašši* and *keldi(ya)* ritual has been written down on the old tablet, thus they shall carry it out. But if the substitute ox die[s] after the journey – since it is a long [journey] – when they<sup>18</sup> shall [...] there

also, they shall drive another substitute ox ad[orned] with those decorations and they shall completely burn those decorations along with [t]hat substitute ox.

With this the composition comes to a rather sudden and somewhat unsatisfactory end<sup>19</sup>. With almost the entire document in the preterite we are still in a « historic mode » and are eager to know how it ended. On the other hand, the last section sounds like an instruction as if it had been written down while the ox still had to go to Kummanni. The latter seems to have been conclusive for dating the composition.

## 2. The date of the composition

The focus on the activities of Day 1 may have led Albrecht Goetze and Holger Pedersen in their *editio princeps* of 1934 to date the composition « am Tage der Entsendung des Sühne(?)-Rindes nach Kummanni »<sup>20</sup>. In this they are followed by Christian Zinko who supposes that Muršili dictated the text only after the deity responsible for his affliction and the « cure » had been determined<sup>21</sup>. Gary Beckman assumes the purpose of the document was « to explain to the religious authorities [in Kummanni] how to proceed »<sup>22</sup> which implies a tablet with this composition must have been handed to the people accompanying the animal on that same day<sup>23</sup>. Especially the present(-future) tense of rev. 23-31 seems to be decisive here : this implies that the officials bringing the ox away had not yet left. Whether the present tense of the verb *warpzi* (obv. 23) played any role in this, remains uncertain. All translators except for Goetze/Pedersen and Lebrun translate *warpzi* as a past tense<sup>24</sup>. A historical present can be ruled out, however. The use of a present tense to indicate an open-ended activity<sup>25</sup> might be possible here although the explicit indication that he did so « for seven days » (*INA UD.7.KAM*) makes it less certain. However that may be, the past tense continues in the following lines (obv. 25-26 *ištantait*, *ḫuškit*) including the reference to the seven-day « waiting » period (obv. 26-27 *pēdaš*, *pāit*) after the

ox was sent away and during which the king underwent the daily purification<sup>26</sup>. If the burnt offerings may be added as having happened on the eighth day, we should also add *warnut* (obv. 30). Unless one were to assume these are all epistolary preterites<sup>27</sup>, the continued past tense seems to argue against the proposed composition date and implies it postdates at least the week following the sending away of the ox. This means that the document in this form could not have been given to the company that went to Kummanni.

Another interesting point becomes evident through the remarks of Carol Justus and Christian Zinko : when Zinko says Muršili dictated (« diktiert hat ») the text, one may rightly wonder how he did this when he was still supposed to be suffering from his speech loss. The point was already made explicit by Justus : « At the end of the text the King had certainly not regained his speech, so one wonders how he dictated it to the scribe »<sup>28</sup>. The question is certainly justified : we may suppose that immediately after the second speech loss (as described in obv. 8-9 KAxU-*išš-a-mu-kan tapūša pait* « and my mouth ceased to function ») oracle investigations were started. There is no indication whatsoever that the king's condition improved while this was done and if it had, would they have continued with the entire procedure of sending an ox away ? This would lead to the interesting paradox that we have a personal statement by a king (cf. obv. 1 *UMMA* <sup>d</sup>UTU-ŠI etc.) who says his speech capabilities had left him. This means that the date of composition lies somewhere between at least eight days after the ox has been sent away and the end of Muršili's reign. These observations in turn have consequences for the purpose of the composition.

### 3. The purpose of the composition

In their edition Goetze and Pedersen carefully avoided a characterization of the composition in terms of genre. They only suggested it might have been a « Bericht » possibly given to the people bringing the ox and other items to Kummanni as a

kind of identification and legitimization while on their way and for the authorities in Kummanni. Zinko uses the term « resümierender Bericht »<sup>29</sup> while Gary Beckman calls it a « curious text » assigning it an instructional character as we saw<sup>30</sup>.

Others have been more specific but have circumvented the dating question. In keeping with Emmanuel Laroche's classification as CTH 486 among the *Rituels kizzouvatniens*, Lebrun takes it to be a ritual, although not specifically directed against speech afflictions. He proposes to rename it « Rituel de purification lorsque Tešub est irrité contre le roi »<sup>31</sup>. In the introduction to his translation Hans-Martin Kümmel called it a ritual but at the same time recognized it as a unique case in this genre because of the very specific event that is its point of departure<sup>32</sup>. According to Kümmel the ritual was specially created for this occasion which explains the preterite instead of the present tense usual in ritual scenarios. Only the final part about the ox serving as a carrier refers to an already existing ritual written on a wooden writing board or tablet. Although he does not say so explicitly, Kümmel probably meant this as an explanation for the present tense used throughout this part and probably supposed that this was an insert in or rather an addition to the text. In all this Kümmel is followed by Volkert Haas<sup>33</sup>. This view of CTH 486 as a ritual finds some support in the fact that ms. C (KBo 4.2) is a *Sammeltablet* where CTH 486 follows the ritual of a certain [H]ūwarlū (CTH 398), augur, performed by him in collaboration with an « Old Woman ».

It may be clear that after the remarks on the date of the composition above, the text in my opinion is unlikely to have been a document intended for the authorities in Kummanni. On the other hand, the use of the preterite tense throughout most of the composition is not favorable to its characterization as a ritual either. Hittite rituals are prescriptive documents, scenarios that would be pulled from the tablet collections whenever an occasion arose that called for its use. Normally, the present tense reflects this prescriptive character, although there are cases where preterites seem to be used quite randomly mixed with present tense forms<sup>34</sup>. Even those rituals for which a

specific cause is recognized are clearly prescriptive. If the text had been written down because a ritual was specially designed for this occasion, we have the choice between two options : either it was written down to serve as the script for that unique ritual still to be performed and we would expect present tense throughout or it was recorded after it was performed (which would be very rare!) and one would expect it to be in the preterite. But a combination of the two makes little sense. Given the fact that except for the present *warpzi* in obv. 23 and the last paragraph rev. 23-31, the rest of the document uses the preterite, the latter option seems more promising. But how to account for the parts in the present and the somewhat confusing chronological sequence of the narrative after obv. 21 as well as the lists of offerings that seem out of place ?

#### 4. The structure of the composition

Several elements in the text suggest that there may have been interpolations. We already noted that up to obv. 14 the narrative is in the first person singular, then changes to a third person to revert to the first person again as of rev. 6. In itself, a change from a first into a third person with the Hittite king (<sup>4</sup>UTU-ŠI) as its subject is well attested and not enough to warrant the assumption of different versions or redactions. However, in the beginning of this section starting at rev. 6 Muršili states :

*nu a[mmuk (<sup>TUG</sup>NÍG.LÁM.MEŠ apēd)]ani UD-ti  
waššan k[ue ḫarkun (nu-kan apē-ia <sup>TUG</sup>NÍG.  
LÁM.M)]EŠ ... parā nā[(ir)]*

The robes I wore on that day, those robes too ...  
they sent off.

That the « too » (*apē-ia*) means « in addition to the ox » is clear upon closer examination but since it comes almost 30 lines after the dispatch of the ox was last mentioned (obv.

23-24 *kuitm[(an-kan)] GU<sub>4</sub> pūḫ[(ugari)]n INA <sup>URU</sup>Kummanni arn[(u)er]*) this must have been largely lost on the contemporary reader/hearer. Moreover, this section about the robes and other things that accompanied the ox to Kummanni belongs with the part about the readying of the ox and its dispatch, not with the offerings that were made on that same day or during the week or so after. Actually, the place where rev. 6-22 fits most naturally, would be obv. 21 where the king is said to have laid his hand on the ox after having bathed in the early morning (*nu-kan ANA [(GU<sub>4</sub> pūḫug)]ari ŠU-an QĀTAMMA daiš*). At that point the text continues with what happened *after* that day. With rev. 6-23 inserted in obv. 21 we would get :

\* ... That day on which they adorned the substitute ox, His Majesty bathed himself and stayed clear from a woman during the night before. When in the early morning he had bathed himself, he laid (his) hand on the substitute ox. (*insert :*) The robes I wore on that day that I laid (my) hand on the substitute ox, when they sent it off, those robes too including the belt, sword and shoes with ... they sent off and they carried them away. Also the chariot ... , these robes all together and the harnessed chariot, that too they took. (*end insert*) Now, when they had sent off the substitute ox, His Majesty bathed (!) himself ritually afterwards for seven days. Since (all activities) had been put on hold, while they brought the substitute ox to Kummanni and until they had given it, His Majesty did not wait any (longer). He had let go by those seven days, but from the eighth day onwards, when the seventh day had passed, His Majesty [... (break of three lines) ...] Thus birds he burned. One bird ...

Apart from the subject this results in a completely natural and seamless sequence where the « too » as well as the use of the compound *parā nai-* refer back as they should.

Secondly, after the excursus on the burnt offerings and before the listing of sheep and ox offerings of rev. 1-5, a sequence very similar to obv. 20-21 (*[(karūwar)]iwar-ma-za mahḥan warpta nu-kan ANA [(GU<sub>4</sub> pūḥug)]ari ŠU-an QĀTAMMA daiš* « When in the early morning he had bathed himself, he laid (his) hand on the substitute ox ») is repeated without a clear function in obv. 38-40 and followed by the « on that day »-dating formula (*nu-za mahḥan [warpta (nu ITTI GU<sub>4</sub> pūḥugar)]i kuiš ŠU[-an(?)] tiyanna/tyauwanzi (gulšanza n-an QĀ)TAM]MA apēda[ni UD-ti (parā nāer AN)]A DINGIR-LIM-ma pi[er]* « When [he/His Majesty had bathed] himself, he who was prescribed [to lay] (his) hand on the substitute ox, thus on that day they sent it off and g[ave] it to the deity »). Both the listing of burnt birds and lambs of obv. 30-38 and the sheep and ox offerings of rev. 1-5 are by their very nature of being lists « Fremdkörper » in the narrative and likely to be insertions. At this point we may recall the (partial) double paragraph line before rev. 6 in ms. D (IBoT 4.26) which points at a major break in the text and which may have marked here the transition from the inserted text back to the core composition.

## 5. The insertions

The term insertions implies that either a new or an already existing piece of text is incorporated into an already existing text. Volkert Haas and Gernot Wilhelm have convincingly shown that scenarios for burnt offerings of birds (and lambs) including very similar listings with the accompanying Hurrian ritual terms were already in existence in later 15th century, that they were especially at home in the cult and cathartic rituals in Kummanni/Kizzuwatna and are of Hurrian origin<sup>35</sup>. The terms *ambašši* and *keldi* as well as the gods Abari, Lelluri and Teššub (the Hurrian « Stormgod ») strongly suggest a similar origin for the brief listing of the sheep and ox offerings in rev. 1-5<sup>36</sup>. Perhaps the term *anzāi* mentioned twice in connection with the offering table (obv. 42, rev. 4) is likewise Hurrian<sup>37</sup>. With such rituals already existing, it is

unnecessary for us to assume the Hittites created a special ritual for this occasion. As so often they could consult their archives and see what they had in store for such events. Moreover, rituals concerning thunderstorms from the Hittite-Palaic milieu are already well attested in Old Hittite<sup>38</sup>. If something was not specific enough for the case at hand, they would no doubt vary on an existing theme. It will have been from such rituals that they borrowed and inserted into the composition under discussion here. One of the newly published shelf list fragments even contains a reference to a *ḥaršiḥarši*-ritual (see §6). Supposing the entire passage obv. 21 (from *mahḥan-ma-kan* etc.) through rev. 5 to be an interpolation, this might also explain the present tense *warpzi* (obv. 23) as an original prescriptive present tense not changed into a preterite. This does not necessarily have to apply to the preceding *parā nāer*, since that may be a future perfect<sup>39</sup> already in the original document : « When they will have sent off the substitute ox, His Majesty will bathe himself for seven days ».

The most important question, however, in this context is : why were the two insertions made at this particular point ? Here my suggestions can only be of a speculative nature. If we assume that a paragraph line once separated obv. 21 (up to *QĀTAMMA daiš*) off from its original sequel rev. 6ff., this may have triggered the insertion here. Rev. 6ff. is an excursus by itself, the main narrative having come to a conclusion in obv. 21. The laying of the hand on the ox is the last act the king performs before it is sent off. Rev. 6ff. is an elaboration on what was sent off along with the ox. Moreover, the bathing by His Majesty in the early morning on the day of dispatching the animal in obv. 20 (*[(karūwar)]iwar-ma-za mahḥan warpta* « When in the early morning he had bathed himself ») may have been an additional argument for continuing with the insertion that started with the ritual bathing by the king during the week after and leading up to the burnt bird and lamb offerings. The latter may find some support in the second insertion (obv. 38-rev. 5) which was added to the first one. Here again reference is first made to the ritual early morning bathing of obv. 20 and the entire passage obv. 38-43 serves as a

somewhat clumsy transition to the real insert rev. 1-5. Except for the present tense *warpzi* that was left standing and some preterites that may already have been there in the original rituals (e.g. *parā nāer* obv. 22, *pāit* obv. 27) most verbs were changed into preterites to fit the rest of the text.

Given the difficulty of interpreting the final paragraph as the instruction given to the officials accompanying the ox to Kummanni as we saw earlier (§ 2) the consistent present tense of rev. 23 to the end of the composition seems best explained as stemming from an original ritual text as well. That such provisos were added to ritual instructions is well-known from, for instance, the prescription for the 13th day of the Hittite Royal Funerary Ritual. A total of thirty *lahhant*-/ *lahhanzana*-birds of wood, wool and dough are told to be manufactured in addition to which they should catch five or six live such birds. But in a rather reassuring manner the text then continues :

*mān laḥanza-ma U[L] meḥur nu MUŠEN*  
*ḪURRI<sup>tbl.A</sup> appanz[i]*

If, however, the *lahant*-bird is not in season, they will take *hurri*-birds<sup>40</sup>.

The position of the excursus rev. 23ff. at the very end of the document is not surprising : it refers to the chronologically most recent moment of the events narrated in the text. Two problems, however, remain. First of all, for the present tense forms *arnuwanzi* (rev. 23) and *ēšsanzi* (rev. 27) I have to assume that they were not changed into preterites just like *warpzi* (obv. 23). But it is especially hard to account for the part rev. 27ff. (from *mān*). The first two inserts discussed above can be seen as reports of things done by the king in the course of ritual acts demanded by the outcome of the oracle investigations and for which they used the original ritual scenarios changing some verbal forms. The same could be argued for rev. 23-27 : what the redactor wants to say, is that the officials accompanying the ox *did* (past tense) perform the ritual as prescribed by the « old tablets ». But what is the function of the

proviso added in rev. 27ff. ? Was the entire paragraph a quote and did they inadvertently copy along this last part ? Or did the ox that Muršili sent, die and do we have to read preterites here as well ?

\* But when the substitute ox died after the trip – since it is a long trip – when they [...]ed there also, they drove another substitute ox adorned with those decorations and they burned those decorations along with that substitute ox.

If so, this pushes the date of the composition back to after the death of the ox had been reported back to Ḫattuša which must have been several weeks if not months after the ox had left the capital.

## 6. Some conclusions and remaining questions

Starting from the observation that the date assumed for the Muršili *Sprachlähmung* by several scholars is difficult to maintain, I have suggested the composition may be rather a compilation of a core composition into which the parts referring to the rituals involved in the story were copied from regular ritual scenarios and incorporated with slight changes. This explains the present tense of *warpzi* and perhaps of the first two presents of rev. 23-27. It also makes the awkward presence of lists with technical Hurrian terms in the narrative more understandable. Since in this view the present tense forms can no longer be used as a dating mechanism, the date of the composition becomes far more general : it can have been anything in between the eighth day after the ox had been sent off or even the moment when the officials reported back from Kummanni and the end of Muršili's reign. This new date also avoids the possible paradox of a report dictated by a king who was unable to speak.

The final paragraph leaves mostly questions. Do we have to assume that all presents here were just left standing by a



careless redactor? Or that by a similarly sloppy scribe the last part should never have been copied into the document at all? In spite of all this, the colophon says the composition was « finished ». But the latter may mean little more than that nothing more was coming, not that it was perfect.

The composition reads like a historical report, a *Bericht*, indeed, by a king whom we know as the Hittite historiographer *par excellence*. Its purpose may well have been to testify to the divine help in curing the Great King and an engrossed copy with all the supposed deficiencies weeded out was perhaps to be deposited in the temple before the deity. The fact that the composition is combined on ms. C with the ritual of [Ḫ]ūwarlū does not plead against this and is open to various explanations. The two compositions do not seem to have more in common than that the first is a ritual and the second one refers to a ritual. Haas<sup>41</sup> sees « die unheilvollen Vögel » or *ḫatugauš* MUŠEN.ḪIA of KBo 4.2 i 16 and 18 as the link between the two. In his opinion they refer to the oracle investigations that Muršili mentions. It could also be that the augur [Ḫ]ūwarlū is the common denominator. He is known from an entry in one of the so-called shelf lists, KBo 31.4+KUB 30.50 v :

- 18 1 ṬUP-PU [Q]A-TI A-WA-AT<sup>m</sup>Ḫu-u-ya-a[r-  
l]u-ú  
19 LÚ MUŠEN.DÙ ma-a-<sup>1</sup>an<sup>d</sup>LAMMA<sup>1</sup> lu-  
<sup>1</sup>li[-mi-in]  
20 i-ia- [an-z]i

One tablet, [fi]nished, text (of) Ḫūwa[r]lū,  
augur : « When th[e]y celebrate LAMMA  
luli[mi] ».

The same composition is likely to be mentioned in another shelf list, KBo 31.10:1-2<sup>42</sup>. Interestingly, the continuation of this fragment mentions a ritual involving a thunderstorm :

- 1 [x ṬUP-PU A-WA-AT<sup>m</sup>Ḫu-u-]wa-ar-lu[-ú LÚ  
MUŠEN.DÙ]  
2 [ma-a-an<sup>d</sup>LAMMA]A<sup>1</sup>lu<sup>1</sup>-u-li-mi-in [i-ia-an-  
zi]  
3 [1 ṬUP-PU] ke-e-da-ni-ša-an [A-NA ṬUP-PI  
x ŠI-IP-TU<sub>4</sub>]  
4 [a-ni-i]a-an 2 ŠI-IP-TU<sub>4</sub> x[  
5 [1 ṬUP-PU ke-]e-da-ni-ša-an A-N[ṬUP-PI  
... ]  
6 [ x ḫar-ši-ḫar-ši(-)x[  
7 [ ke-e(?) ud-da-a-a]r me-ma-i[  
1-2 [x tablet(s), text (of) Ḫū]warlū, [augur :  
« When they celebrate LAMMA]A lūlimi ».  
3-4 [One tablet : on this [tablet x incantations  
have been recor]ded. Two incantations ...  
[ ... ].  
5-7 [One tablet : on t]his [tablet ...] ...  
thunderstorm [... these wor]ds he speaks.  
[... (?)].

Given the space no « author » is likely to have been mentioned in the entries 3-4 and 5-7. Can we assign them to Ḫūwarlū of line 1 and was the incantation mentioned here one of the sources for Muršili's Sprachlähmung?

Theo van den HOUT  
Oriental Institute, University of Chicago

<sup>41</sup> For abbreviations see GÜTERBOCK, H. G., HOFFNER, H. A., VAN DEN HOUT, TH. P. J. (edd.), *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (CHD), L-N, 1989, pp.xv-xxviii, P (1997) pp.vii-xxvi

and Š/1, pp.vi-viii. I am grateful to my colleague Harry Hoffner for his very valuable comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> For these dates see VAN DEN HOUT, TH. P. J., *ZA* 84, 1994, pp.85-88, for the possibility of Muṣili having reigned longer than 22 years see GRODDEK, D., *Gslmparati*, pp.329-338.

<sup>3</sup> *Hethitica* 6 (1985) p.103.

<sup>4</sup> For a listing see Prof. LEBRUN's edition, *Hethitica* 6, 1985, p.103, to which D. IBoT 4.26 (= KUB 43.51+KUB 12.31 (A) rev. 1-13) should be added. For a photo of C. KBo 4.2 iii 40-63 and the right hand end of col. iv see JUSTUS, C.F., *Visible Language* 15, 1981, p.381, fig. 4 and frontispice.

<sup>5</sup> It is of interest to note here the double paragraph line in ms. D (IBoT 4.26) between lines 4-5. The distance between the two paragraph lines is on the photo distinctly greater than given on the copy and seems to extend further to the left. There are also traces resembling Winkelhaken in the two lines but they are definitely more shallow than the wedges of signs otherwise in the fragment so that it remains doubtful whether they were deliberately written by the scribe or are mere scratches. For the possibility of one more paragraph line having been lost see the next footnote.

<sup>6</sup> For easy reference the line count follows Lebrun's edition, although as remarked by BECKMAN, G., *JNES* 47, 1988, p.143, an extra line may have to be inserted between the lines of ms. A obv. 29-30 given the space shown by ms. A = KUB 12.31 obv. 20-22. It has to be said, though, that the space available in the corresponding place in ms. B = KUB 15.36 obv. 21-23, does not immediately favor an extra line. Another possibility would be to assume a paragraph line here in both versions. Note that in ms. C = KBo 4.2 column iv 1 starts at exactly this point (MUŠEN.ĜI.A-ma-za kiššan warnut etc.) and that in ms. B = KBo 15.36 obv. 23 this same phrase starts at the beginning of a new line. A paragraph line here would parallel the one before A rev. 1, marking the beginning of a list of offerings.

<sup>7</sup> On the term « carrier » (properly Hurro-Hittite *nakkušši-*, s. CHD L-N s.v.) and its distinction from « substitute » (Hurro/Akkadian-Hittite *pūhugari-* s. CHD P s.v.) see JANOWSKI, B., WILHELM, G. in JANOWSKI, B. *et al.* (edd.), *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Kleinasien, Nordsyrien und dem Alten Testament*, Freiburg-Göttingen 1993 (henceforth referred to as *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen*), pp.134-136 w. lit. However, since in the text « ox » is each time modified by the Hurrian term *pūhugari*, a

derivative from the Akkadian loanword *pūhu* « exchange, substitute », we will further use the combination « substitute ox ».

<sup>8</sup> For this translation of *tapuša pai-* s. BECKMAN, G., *StBoT* 29, p.185, and CHD P pp.34-35. This means the affliction the king suffers from, is not necessarily a stroke laming one side of his face (cf. the suggestion in OPPENHEIM, A.L., *Dreams*, p.231).

<sup>9</sup> Instead of « to burn » the text uses lit. the verb « to burn » : see LEBRUN, R., *Hethitica* 6, 1985, p.114.

<sup>10</sup> For the practice of adorning a carrier animal by hanging all kinds of colored woollen threads on it and the laying of the hand on it by the « patient », see JANOWSKI, B., WILHELM, G., *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen* p.134 w. lit., pp.143-144, and HOFFNER, H. A. in HALLO, W., YOUNGER, K., *The Context of Scripture*, Vol. 3, Leiden-Boston-Köln, 2002, pp.xxxii-xxxiii.

<sup>11</sup> According to HAAS, V., *ChS* I/9, p.27, the text describes a ritual consisting of a seven-day substitution ritual involving an ox and a subsequent burning of birds. Whereas the exact moment in time of the bird offerings is ambiguous, the seven-day ritual starts *after* the ox has been sent off (cf. obv. 22-23) and only concerns a bathing ritual of the king with no ox involved as far as the text tells us.

<sup>12</sup> The translation of *ištantait* here depends on what one restores in the break immediately preceding the verb. I have tentatively followed LEBRUN, R., *Hethitica* 6 (1985), p.105, who assumes a simple [*nu*] resulting in an impersonal construction. It is also conceivable to restore [*na-aš*] and translate : « Since he had been idle/doing nothing, ... ».

<sup>13</sup> On the length of the break here and the possibility of a paragraph line see above n.5.

<sup>14</sup> Thus JANOWSKI, B., WILHELM, G., *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen*, p.145 ; HAAS, V., *ChS* I/9, p.27. A seven-day period is also observed in the royal substitution ritual KBo 15.2: see there rev. 29-30 (ed. KÜMMEL, H., *StBoT* 3, pp.62f.) and the commentary by KÜMMEL, *ibid.*, pp.93f.

<sup>15</sup> This is a fragmentary and very difficult passage and my translation of it is tentative. I follow BECKMAN, G. *apud* FRANTZ-SZABÓ, G., in Sasson *et al.*, *CANE* 3, p.2010 (« And when [His Majesty bathed] ») in assuming *warpta* could be restored here which at least matches the particle -za, that is still preserved. For the ŠU-sign preserved just before the break in KUB 43.51 obv. 2 (not yet known to Goetze/Pedersen) in this particular context I can see at

present no other explanation than taking it as the Sumerogram ŠU « hand » and referring to the laying of the hand on the ox. Although I am not aware of Akkad. *ITTI* used in this expression, it is occasionally used as standing for a Hitt. directional case, compare e.g. with GU<sub>4</sub> KUB 24.7 ii 55-56 (w. *mema-* « to speak to »); cf. also KUB 33.102+ iii 17 (w. *ar-/er-* « to reach »). Theoretically, the relative *kuiš* could agree with ŠU[-aš], but then it would be without any referent in the preceding or following clause.

<sup>16</sup> The end of the paragraph coincides in ms. A (KUB 43.51 obv.) with the end of the obv., but the scribe drew a double line there which may be interpreted as being the lower Randleiste plus the paragraph line. A certain doubt might be raised by the fact that ms. A seems to have been a ruled tablet and that therefore the extra line may be just another ruling which was not used and left standing. However that may be, the paragraph division is confirmed here by mss. B (between KUB 12.30 rev. 3-4) and C (between KBo 4.2 iv 15-16).

<sup>17</sup> The terms *ambašši* and *keldi* can occur with both food and burnt offerings, s. KÜMMEL, H., *StBoT* 3, p.40; HAAS, V., WILHELM, G., *AOATS* 3, pp.85-87.

<sup>18</sup> The mss. A (KUB 12.31 rev. 23), B (KUB 43.50 rev. 33) and C (KBo 4.2 iv 47) all have (n-)at here. This -at cannot refer to the ox, which is common gender throughout, and to refer back to the other items sent along with it, one would have expected more than a simple clitic pronoun. It might be better therefore to think of the pronoun as a pl.nom.c. referring to the people bringing the ox as the subject of an intransitive verb as GOETZE, A., PEDERSEN, H., *MSpr.*, pp.12-13, had originally restored it (*aranzi* « sowie sie da auch dorthin [gelangen] »).

<sup>19</sup> The following colophon confirms that the composition as a whole was indeed « finished ».

<sup>20</sup> *MSpr.*, p. 2.

<sup>21</sup> *Mitteilungen der Grazer Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 4, 1994, p.69.

<sup>22</sup> Apud FRANTZ-SZABO, G., in J. Sasson *et al.*, *CANE* 3, p.2010.

<sup>23</sup> JUSTUS, C., *Visible Language* 15, 1981, remains vague about the date but implicitly seems to adhere to the GOETZE-PEDERSEN dating: compare her remarks on p.398 commented on immediately below.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. KÜMMEL, H., *TUAT II (Rituale und Beschwörungen I)*, p.290, BECKMAN, G., *CANE* 3, p.2010.

<sup>25</sup> *ICH* 3, pp.416f. According to Melchert this use may have been productive in Old Hittite only but Harry Hoffner now tells me that Craig Melchert has reversed his position on this.

<sup>26</sup> It is for this reason that an interpretation of *warpi* as a future in the usual prescriptive way of rituals is very unlikely as well.

<sup>27</sup> Epistolary preterites are known in Hittite (cf. FRIEDRICH, J., *HE* 1, p.139, § 262) but their usage seems fairly restricted.

<sup>28</sup> *Visible Language* 15, 1981, p.398.

<sup>29</sup> *Mitteilungen der Grazer Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 4, 1994, p.69.

<sup>30</sup> Apud FRANTZ-SZABO, G., in J. Sasson *et al.*, *CANE* 3, p.2010. JUSTUS, C., *Visible Language* 15, 1981, p.374, stays close to defining the text as a historical account (« the King's own story of his speech loss ») but I cannot follow her further suggestion that the text « may well have had the more practical function of illustrating well-formed sentence structures »; cf. similarly *ibid.*, p.398 (« perhaps ... a school paradigm of Hittite syntactic structure »). OPPENHEIM, A. L., *Dreams*, pp.230-231, calls it both a « cultic text » and a « report ».

<sup>31</sup> *Hethitica* 6, 1985, p.134.

<sup>32</sup> *TUAT II (Rituale und Beschwörungen I)*, p.289 (with translation pp.289-292).

<sup>33</sup> *AoF* 23, 1996, pp.90-91; *ChS* I/9, pp.26-27.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. (FRANTZ-)SZABO, G., *THeth.* 1, p.83.

<sup>35</sup> *AOAT* S 3, pp.50-58 with a following catalogue and analysis of the Hurrian technical terms (*ibid.*, pp.59-142); see further JANOWSKI, B., WILHELM, G., *Religionsgeschichtliche Beziehungen*, pp.145-151, HAAS, V., *AoF* 23, 1996, pp.84-94.

<sup>36</sup> For the deities Abari and Lelluri see VAN GESSEL, B., *OHP* 1, pp.38-39 and pp.284-289, w. literature, to which should be added LEBRUN, R., *Hethitica* 6, 1985, p.120.

<sup>37</sup> With LEBRUN, R., *Hethitica* 6, 1985, p.119, this word might be connected to the Hurrian root *anz-* « to single out, designate, honor » vel sim., cf. LAROCHE, E., *GLH*, p.51 s.v. *anzannuḫ-*, WILHELM, G., *Or.* 54, 1985, p.490, WEGNER, I., *Hurritisch. Eine Einführung*, Wiesbaden, 2000, pp.215f. (« auszeichnen o.ä. »), GIORGIERI, M. in M. Liverani, *Le lettere di el-Amarna*, Brescia, 1999, pp.374-391 (*passim* « onorare(?) »). The entry « <sup>d</sup>Zai » in VAN GESSEL, B., *OHP* 1, p.570, would in that case have to be changed accordingly.

<sup>38</sup> See e.g. NEU, E., *StBoT* 12, esp. pp.44-49 with reference also to MSpr., and HW<sup>2</sup> H s.v. *ḫaršiḫarši-*.

<sup>39</sup> For the future perfect in Hittite see my forthcoming article.

<sup>40</sup> KUB 39.7 ii 13-14, ed. H. Otten, *HTR*, pp.36-37, KASSIAN, A. *et al.*, *Hittite Funerary Ritual sallīš waštaiš*, Münster, 2002 (= *AOAT* 288), pp.492-493.

<sup>41</sup> *ChS* I/9, pp.26-27.

<sup>42</sup> The entry recalls the beginning of the ritual of the priestess Ānniwiyani in VBoT 24 (CTH 393, MH/NS) which contains a ritual for the same deity LAMMA *lulimi*. Ānniwiyani is identified there (i 1-2) as the « mother of Ārmati, (who is the) servant of Ḫūrlū ». According to KRONASSER, H., *Die Sprache* 8, 1962, pp.98-100, Ḫūrlū is the same person as Ḫūwarlū. Despite the almost identical title, the composition by Ānniwiyani was apparently a different one (*contra* MASCHERONI, L., *FsPugliese Carratelli*, p.140), because she is the « author » here and not [Ḫ]ūwarlū. A better candidate for a shelf list entry reflecting VBoT 24 might be KUB 30.65+ ii 11 w. par. KBo 31.26 obv. 8, where she is mentioned with again a very similar title although this time the *innarawanteš* deities have been added. For LAMMA *lulimi* see also the label KBo 31.33:4-5.

## DER « SCHUTZGOTT DER FLUR » IN HIEROGLYPHEN-LUWISCHEN TEXTEN

Schutzgottheiten sind in der kleinasiatischen Religionsgeschichte ursprünglich im hattischen Milieu bezeugt<sup>1</sup> und haben davon ausgehend sowohl in den Formen der offiziellen Religionsausübung als auch im lokalen Rahmen in unterschiedlicher Weise bis in das erste Jahrtausend ihre Bedeutung bewahrt. Die ikonographische Verbindung dieses Gottheitentyps mit dem Hirsch ist bereits in der altassyrischen Glyptik aus Kültepe bezeugt,<sup>2</sup> wobei diese Darstellungsweise sich während der hethitischen Zeit fortsetzt und noch im Bildbestand der « syro-hethitischen Kunst » fassbar ist. Sowohl die unterschiedlichen Darstellungsarten dieser Gottheit auf Siegeln und Reliefs als auch die hethitischen Bildbeschreibungen,<sup>3</sup> die die verschiedenen Attribute und Gegenstände, die eine solche Gottheit halten kann, erwähnen, machen deutlich, dass es in der kleinasiatischen Religionsgeschichte eine große Zahl von Schutzgottheiten mit verschiedenen Funktionen gab, teilweise auf einzelne Orte bezogen, teilweise durch ein Epitheton auf eine bestimmte Funktion festgelegt oder einer weiteren Gottheit zugeordnet.<sup>4</sup>

Dieser Beitrag möchte ein paar Überlegungen zu Aspekten der Religionswelt Kleinasiens aus dem ersten Jahrtausend formulieren. Auch der Jubilar hat mehrfach seine Aufmerksamkeit darauf gelegt, wie Traditionen und Vorstellungen der hethitischen Zeit im ersten Jahrtausend bis in die griechische Epoche Kleinasiens weitergewirkt haben. Die Schutzgottheit gehört zu jenen Göttern, die in der luwischen Tradition des ersten Jahrtausends unter der Namensform