

A HITTITE MAGICAL RITUAL TO BE PERFORMED IN AN EMERGENCY*

GIULIA TORRI

Abstract

The Hittite magical ritual KUB 17.28 ii 33-61 iii 1-17 is part of a *Sammeltafel* in which rites of different character and content are collected. The aim of this paper is to show how the ritual under discussion was performed directly by the patient, without the guidance of any magician. The person acting out the ritual was a victim of a curse, expressed through the idiom *lalan karp-*, performed against him with malevolence. The ritual itself is characterized by actions mixed together with three oral rites: a magic analogy expressed through a simple simile, a short personal prayer, and a wish introduced by the verb *mald-*. In particular, the role of the second recitation in comparison with royal prayers like CTH 381 and CTH 385.10, both preceded by a ceremonial part, will be analysed. In conclusion, an attempt to reconstruct the possible method of composition of the whole *Sammeltafel* as well as to suggest how the scribe had most probably worked in bringing the rituals together will be undertaken.

Hittite magical rituals have been analysed in detail for many years in most aspects, e.g. from the religious point of view or for their linguistic structure. The scope of these rituals was usually the recovery of the ill person and his deliverance from physical or spiritual affliction.¹

Most of the magical rituals were performed by male or female practitioners coming from different regions of Anatolia and its surroundings, and whose origin was stated in the opening words of the

* I am grateful to Prof. Alfonso Archi who read an earlier draft of this paper and enriched it with several comments and remarks, to Dr. Jared Miller who made some useful suggestions.

¹ In general E.H. Engelhard, *Hittite Magical Practices*, Dissertation, Brandeis University 1971; V. Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, Leiden–New York 1994, pp. 876-911; M.C. Trémouille, “Les rituels magiques hittites: aspects formels et techniques” in *La Magie. Actes du Colloque international de Montpellier 25-27 Mars 1999*, Montpellier 2001, pp. 77-94; J. Klinger, “Reinigungsriten und Abwehrzauber. Funktion und Rolle magischer Rituale bei den Hethitern” in *Die Hethiter und ihr Reich. Das Volk der 1000 Götter*, Bonn 2002, pp. 146-149.

tablets. They were experienced masters in preparing medicines and in fulfilling the necessary rituals to cure sick people. For this reason the importance of their role has always been clearly emphasized in the analysis of Hittite magic.²

On the contrary, the EN.SISKUR, the “Lord of the ritual”, that is, the person who commissioned it, is believed to have played only a passive role that is generally considered of secondary importance and not decisive for the outcome of the ritual. He just had to follow the instructions of the magician or to undergo his actions.³

It is noteworthy to remark how the collection of rituals in Hittite archives was devoted not only to the royal family, but to every member of society. Although quite unusual, it is even possible to provide examples of rituals during which the actions were carried out directly by the patient, apparently a common person, not a member of the high ranks of Hittite society. He performed the ritual and uttered the magical spells himself, without the help of any magician, receiving assistance only during the slaughtering of animals and the cooking of the meat.⁴

The ritual KUB 17.28 ii 33-61 iii 1-17 (CTH 458.2B) pertains to this typology. It is part of a *Sammeltafel*, which collects rituals and conjurations with different development and aim.⁵

The colophon at the end of the tablet says:

² See for example V. Haas, *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica*, Berlin–New York 2003, pp. 28-32; G. McMahon, “Cultural Boundaries in Hittite Ritual” in G. Beckman, R. Beal, G. McMahon, *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr.*, Winona Lake 2003, pp. 265-280, in part. pp. 272-275.

³ An attempt to describe the function of the EN.SISKUR was carried out by G.F. del Monte. In particular he tried to explain why the patient was generically entitled EN.SISKUR in the majority of the rituals, while only rarely he was indicated by the term LUGAL (or MUNUS.LUGAL) and, in sparse occasions, called by name: G.F. del Monte, review of G. Szabó, *Ein Hethitisches Entsühnungsritual für das Königspaar Tuthaliya und Nikalmati*, OA 12 (1973), pp. 172-174.

⁴ Cfr. what is said by G. McMahon about the role of the practitioner as the only possible performer of the ritual before the community: G. McMahon in *Studies Hoffner*, pp. 273-275.

⁵ (1) i 1-64², (2) ii 1-6, (3) ii 7-32, (4) ii 33-iii 17, (5) iii 18-iv 44², (6) iv 45-56. About their content H.S. Schuster, *Die hattisch-hethitischen Bilinguen* (Teil I), Leiden 1974, p. 34 with footnote 125. The rituals (2) and (3) were published and discussed by G. Beckman, *Hittite Birth Rituals*, StBoT 29, Wiesbaden 1985, pp. 84-86 (except the spells in Hattic). Ritual (3), ll. ii 9-27 was discussed by G.F. del Monte, “Il mitologema di Katahziwuri” in O. Carruba, *Studia Mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata*, Pavia 1979, pp. 109-118, in part. pp. 114-115. Invocation (6) by O. Masson, “A propos d’un rituel Hittite pour la lustration d’une armée”, *RHR* 137 (1950), pp. 5-25.

iv

57 6 ŠI-PÁT QA-TI ma-a-an-na ^d30-aš ša-ki-ya-az-zi58 ma-a-an-na ERÍN^{MEŠ} LÚ KÚR-aš hu-ul-li-ya-az-zi59 ŠU ^mSA₅-pa-la

Six incantations finished. (Beginning with:) “If the Moon Gives an Omen”, (up to) “If the Enemy Defeats the Army”. Hand of SA₅-pala.⁶

In the final part of the tablet, the scribe wrote only the title of the first and of the last incantation. The performances and the spells reported in the tablet do not share any particular feature that would explain or justify their being collected together (although two of the rituals, the first (i 1-64²) and the fifth one (iii 18-IV 44³), are characterised by similar beginnings: “ma-a-an ^d30-aš ša-ki-ya-az-zi...”).⁷ The ritual (ii 33-61 iii 1-17) considered here was composed of acts and recitations fulfilled in order to repel the harmful effect of a curse against a person.

E. Laroche classified the ritual in CTH under 458.2B. Together with the main redaction, there are two other fragments, thus the text outline is the following:

A. KUB 17.28 ii 33-61 iii 1-17 (MH/NS)⁸

B. JCS 37 nr. 15, 4'-8' = A ii 33-41

C. KBo 37.10 rev. 1'-13' (MH/MS?)⁹ = A ii 58-iii 17

It is interesting to observe that fragments B and C were drawn up as a *Sammeltablet* too. Some similarities were also suggested for the small fragment IBoT 4.19 that, however, is too small to clearly establish if

⁶ The name of the scribe, composer of the *Sammeltablet*, is referred to in this text only. HZL, p. 136 *sub* 89, suggests for this name the reading *Maruwapala*, or a similar one.

⁷ Although it may appear reasonable that the scribe chose the title of the first and of the last incantation for the composition of the colophon, this point will be examined in more detail below.

⁸ Lines ii 33-39, 48-55 and III 4-14 were already translated by G.F. del Monte, “Bier und Wein bei den Hethitern” in Th.P.J. van den Hout-J. de Roos, *Studio Historiae Ardens, Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented To Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Istanbul 1995, pp. 211-224, in part. pp. 214-215.

⁹ J. Klinger, *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht*, StBoT 37, Wiesbaden 1996, p. 54.

this was a duplicate or a parallel version of the ritual under discussion, or even a completely different ritual.¹⁰

The main text, KUB 17.28 ii 33-61 iii 1-17, has a NH ductus, recognisable also on the autography because of the use of signs such as LI, IK, AZ, DU, SAG, for the presence of sumerographic forms like BAL (*šipant-*) and GIM-*an* (*maḥḥan, mān*), and for spellings like *me-em-ma-i* (ii 39, 55).¹¹ But the ritual itself was composed during the middle Hittite period, as demonstrated by the spelling and formation of several words: *pé-e-de-eš-ši* (ii 48), ^dUTU-*i* (voc. ii 56) and ŠÀ-*ta* (ii 56, 57).¹²

ii

33 [m]a-[⌈]a[⌋]-an an-[⌈]tu-uh[⌋]-š[⌈]i[⌋] LÚ TAP-PU-ŠU la-a-la-an kar-ap-zi

34 na-aš-ma-aš-š[⌈]i-š[⌋]-ša-an DINGIR^{MEŠ}-uš ú-e-ri-ya-az-zi

35 [⌈]nu[⌋] [k]i-i SISKUR-ŠU 1 NINDA.KUR₄.RA 1 ^{DUG}ḪAB.ḪAB
GEŠTIN

36 [⌈]a-ra-aḥ-za[⌋] ka-ri-ta-aš-ḥi¹³ pé-e-da-an-zi

37 [⌈]nu[⌋] [⌈]NINDA[⌋].KUR₄.RA GÜB-la-az pár-š[⌈]i-ya na-an da-ga-a-an

38 [⌈]da[⌋]-a-i KAŠ.GEŠTIN GÜB-la-az BAL-an-ti

39 [⌈]nu[⌋] [⌈]ki-iš[⌋]-ša-an me-em-ma-i^a

40 ku-iš DUMU.[⌈]LÚ[⌋].[⌈]U₁₉.LU[⌋]-[⌈]ya[⌋] la-a-la-an DINGIR^{MEŠ}-na-aš

41 pí-ra-an [k]ar-ap-ta ku-iš-mu-uš-ša-an DINGIR^{MEŠ}-uš

42 EGIR-an ú-e-ri-it nu [⌈]ka-a-aš[⌋] [⌈]ka-ri-an-za[⌋]

43 ma-aḥ-ḥa-an ḥa-ta-an-za a-pé-el-la e-eš-ša-ri

44 É-ŽU QA-TAM-MA ḥa-a-du nu-uš-š[⌈]i-š[⌋]-ša-an DINGIR^{MEŠ}-[⌈]uš[⌋]

45 LÚ.MEŠ^{BE-LU-TI-ya}¹⁴ i-da-a-lu IGI^{HL.A}-wa ú-wa-an-du

46 nu-za DUMU.NITA DUMU.MUNUS le-e ḥa-a-š[⌈]i nu-uš-š[⌈]i ḥal-ki-
iš

47 le-e ma-a-i

¹⁰ IBoT 4, p. 26.

¹¹ E. Rieken, *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*, StBoT 44 Wiesbaden 1999, p. 71

¹² H.C. Melchert, *Ablative and Instrumental in Hittite*, PhD. Diss., Harvard University 1977, p. 117. Version C is probably middle Hittite.

¹³ *karitašḥa-*: This word is present in this ritual only. Even though its meaning is not certain, it is reasonable to accept Puhvel's suggestion, HED (K), p. 80, that it translates as "grassland, lawn". There is actually affinity with the root *kariyant-* "grass", and a logical relationship with the expression *kāš kariyanza* in II 42: The demonstrative pronoun shows that the man is using the grass to perform his spell, so it is possible to assume that he went to the grassland. Also Tischler, HEG (a-k), p. 507.

¹⁴ DINGIR^{MEŠ}-uš LÚ.MEŠ^{BE-LU-TI-ya}: For the translation HW (a), p. 602.

Translation:

ii (33-39) If against a man his companion lifts the tongue,¹⁶ or if he invokes the gods against him, this is the ritual suitable for him: They bring out to the grassland a loaf of bread and a jug of wine.¹⁷ He breaks the loaf on the left and puts it on the ground, then he offers wine on the left, and speaks in the following way: (40-47) “Whatever person has lifted the tongue before the gods, whoever invoked the gods against me, as this grass is dry, let himself and his house in the same way go dry too. Let the gods and the lords look at him (with) evil eyes. Let him beget neither a son nor a daughter. Let his grain not grow!” (48-55) He puts the loaf on its place and shatters the jug. He washes his hands and goes away. Then he puts a small table before the Sun-god. He puts bread on it; he puts three loaves of bread on it. He sacrifices a ram to the Sun-god and they slaughter it. He offers beer (i.e. the wine KAŠ.GEŠTIN) and speaks in the following way: (56-61) “Oh Sun-god, you are looking constantly into man’s heart, but nobody is able to look in your heart. Who made a bad action, Sun-god, you were above (him). I was going through my good way. Whoever hurt me, Sun-god, look at him!

iii (1-3) [*Let myself and my house*] grow! Let [*people of my house*], cattle and sheep beget in a proper way and let my grain grow!”¹⁸ (4-7) They slaughter the sheep and he puts the meat, the entrails, the chest, its head and the feet before the table. They cook the entrails and they break the loaves. He puts one broken loaf of bread on the ground and recites: (8-14) “You, (the table)¹⁹ who stand in front of the Sun-god, keep speaking favourably (about me) across to the Sun-god!” He breaks two loaves of bread and puts them on the table, and puts the entrails on them. He offers wine, and they cook the fat meat and eat it. They drink three times, pick up the table (and go away). (15-17) If someone sacrifices for the Storm-god (and) in addition for whatever other god, this is one (possible) ritual and these are the wo[r]ds.

¹⁶ Following CHD (L-N), 25b.

¹⁷ See del Monte in *Fs. Houwink ten Cate*, pp. 211-224.

¹⁸ In this fragmentary spell the patient is wishing for himself just the opposite of what he asked for his enemies.

¹⁹ The fact that a patient could beg the table to intercede with the gods on his behalf has a parallel in KBo 17.105 ii 13-25 in which the hearth is asked to plead with the gods. See A. Archi, “Il culto del focolare presso gli ittiti”, *SMEA* 17 (1975), pp. 77-86, in part. pp. 85-86. CHD (P), 137a.

^aB 7': without paragraph line. ^bC 4': *mi-ya-a-ru*. ^cC 5': *-]du*. ^dC 6': UZU^UZAG.UDU. ^eC 6': ¹[SAG.DU²]. ^fC 7': *pár-ši-an-da*. ^gC 9': ¹[² NINDA.KUR₄.RA^{HLA} GIŠ[BANŠUR-]*i da-a-i*. ^hC 9': *še-e-ra-aš-ša-an*. ⁱC 10': *š]i-pa-an-ti*. ¹C 10': *nu a-ta-an-zi*. ^mC 10': without *nu*. ⁿC 12': DINGIR-*ni ši-pa-an-ti*. ^oC 13': *ke-e-pát*. End of the tablet.

This composition clearly represents an intervention against curses, even though the idiomatic expression *lalan karp-* is quite rare. The same form can be found in another magical ritual, KUB 60.144, but in this latter case it must be integrated in a gap of the text:

KUB 60.144 obv.² i

4' *nu* GIŠ¹*ha-ti-wa-aš pár-aš-du-uš*²⁰ *da-aḫ-ḫi* [*ku-iš-wa-mu*² EME-*an*]

5' *kar-ap-pa-an ḫar-zi nu ke-e* GIM-*an ḫ*[*a-da-an-zi na-aš*]

6' EME-ŠU QA-TAM-MA *ḫa-az-za-du nu-uš-ši*[]

7' *ku-u-uš-wa* GIM-*an ḫ*[*u*]-*u-wa-an-za pé-e-da*-[*i*]

8' QA-TAM-MA *pé-e-da-ú*

(4-8) I take the leaves of a *h*. tree (and I say): “That man that has lifted [the tongue against me²], like these leaves get dry, let his tongue in the same way go dry and him [...]. Like the wind carries them away, in the same way let it carry away [.....]!”²¹

The rationale for this integration lies in the consideration that both the material and the type of analogical magic used in this spell are very similar to those described in KUB 17.28 at lines ii 40-47.

A further example regarding this idiom can be proposed for the fragment IBoT 4.19 obv.:²²

5' *nu-za* UZU.HÁD.DU.A [GIM-*an.....a-pé-el-la.....*]

6' QA-TAM-MA *ḫa-a*-[*du* EME-*an* DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*na-aš pí-ra-an le-e*]

²⁰ About a possible different meaning of the term *paršdu-* as “flower” or “petal” see Haas, *Materia Magica*, p. 365. E. Neu, *Das Hurritische Epos der Freilassung I*, StBoT 32, Wiesbaden 1996, p. 212 suggests “Moosflechten”. CHD (P), pp. 190-191 (“leaf”). It is the author’s opinion that this last meaning is the most probable, considering the similar shape of leaves and of the tongue in popular imagery. Hittites could have established an analogous relationship too, as the simile adopted in this part of the ritual seems to prove.

²¹ Compare CHD (P), p. 191 and Haas, *Materia Magica*, p. 303.

²² The idiom *lalan karp-* in a similar context is present also in Bo 6526, 5'. According to Puhvel, *HED* (L), p. 41 the same expression is in the fragment KUB 36.49 i 7'-8', but see the remarks in CHD (L-N), p. 25b. The text was considered by Laroche as mythological composition, and set under the Nr. 370 of CTH.

7' *kar-ap-ṣ[i]*

[Like] the dried meat [*dried up*], in the same way let [his ...] go dr[y].
He shall not] lift [the tongue before the gods!]

The magical aim of the ritual under discussion can also be interpreted by comparing it with the ritual of Banippi, a ^{LU}MUŠEN.DÙ, partially preserved in the first column of KUB 30.36:²³

i

1 [*UM-MA* ^m]*Ba-ni-ip-pi* ^{LU}MUŠEN.DÙ *ma-a-an-ša-an*

2 [^{LU}*a-ra*]-*aš A-NA* ^{LU}TAP-PI-ŠU ^{TUG}še-ek-nu-un

3 [*UGU pi-ip*]-*pa-a-i nu-uš-ši-iš-ša-an* DINGIR^{MEŠ}

4 [*ú-e*]-*ri-ya-zi nu-uš-ši ki-i* SISKUR-ŠU

In the following way speaks Banippi, the augur: if a man turns up his robe at his companion, and invokes the gods against him, this is the ritual suitable for him.

Both rituals share the sentence “to invoke the gods (against someone)” (DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*uš weriya*-), and in both cases this is preceded by two idiomatic expressions, respectively *lalan karṣ-* (to lift the tongue),²⁴ and *šeknun UGU/šara pippa-* (to turn up the mantle, exposing oneself)²⁵ that, although different, refer to a harmful behaviour against someone, carried out with premeditation. This behaviour had the intent of drawing the god’s anger against the victim.²⁶ The power and the menace of the words spoken with bad intention is attested by several Hittite rituals against “(bad) tongues”: For example: “So speaks Uruwanda: if I deal with a problem of tongues”,²⁷ “If the

²³ This text is a *Sammeltafel*, in which at least one more ritual performed by Iriya, the ^{LU}HAL (see CTH 400) was preserved. Many thanks to Dr. Rita Francia for this observation. (A preview of her text about Iriya’s rituals is in print in *Orientalia*).

²⁴ About this expression already F. Sommer – A. Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I. (Labarna II.)*, Hildesheim 1974, pp 136-138.

²⁵ About this action, its meaning and other similar passages in Hittite literature H.C. Melchert, “Pudenda Hethitica”, *JCS* 35 (1983), pp. 137-145, in part. pp. 141-145, R. Francia, *Le funzioni sintattiche degli elementi avverbiali di luogo ittiti*, Roma 2002, p. 207 with n. 173.

²⁶ CHD (P), p. 271a, suggests the reading “DINGIR^{MEŠ} [*anda ka*]riyazi”. It is not possible to agree with this suggestion because a similar expression is never attested in Hittite ritual literature, but most of all because of the treatment of “(bad) tongues” in the following of the ritual, so that the verbal form *weriya-* appears as the most proper in this sentence.

²⁷ CTH 411: KBo 11.11 obv. i 1. See in general CHD (L-N), pp. 21-26.

tongues come to someone, the Old Woman performs in the following way”.²⁸ But the remarks of C. Melchert²⁹ about the act of turning up the mantle, and the parallelism mentioned above between this action and that of *lalan karp*-ing suggest that this last one did not mean simply “to speak bad words against a person”, but rather “to show the tongue” against someone else with malevolence. The choice of the verb *karp*- for example in KUB 33.93+ (CTH 345 1.A) iv 10’-11’ points out that this was apparently used to express the real motion of the body part: “Enlil lifted his eyes (IGI^{HLA}-*wa karafta*) and saw the child”,³⁰ so that it can be assumed that *lalan karp*- is more than a metaphoric phrase. In the present respect the meaning of the verb could have the particular nuance: “to lift something up, showing it to someone else”, as for instance in the “Tale of Appu” KUB 36.60 iii 5-6: “The nurse lifted (*karafta*) the son and transferred him to the knees of Appu”.³¹

Notwithstanding the poor state of preservation of KUB 30.36 i, it is clear that the two rituals don’t share any kind of magical practice or spell, therefore they represent to a certain extent two different ways of reacting against a similar threat. The ritual KUB 17.28 is very short and characterised by manual actions, accompanied by oral rites: a first one, consisting in a magical enchantment (ii 33-47), a second one, represented by a short prayer to the god (ii 51-iii 3) and a third one that has the form of a wish and, unlike the previous ones, is introduced by the verb *mald*- (iii 4-14).³²

The first recitation in KUB 17.28 ii 40-47 was expressed through a simple simile, comparable to the one uttered in KUB 60.144, in which the life of the enemy is put in analogical relationship with the dry grass of the meadow where the ritual was being performed. This kind of formula is based on a very easy construction, regarded as a comparison, typical of Hittite magical rituals.³³

As for the second spell (ii 56-61), it can be regarded as a short prayer, sharing some features with the invocation to the Sun-goddess of Arinna, CTH 385.10, and with the prayer of Muwatalli to the assembly of gods, CTH 381. In all these cases the prayers are

²⁸ CTH 390: KUB 7.1+ iv 13-14.

²⁹ C. Melchert, *JCS* 35, pp. 41-45.

³⁰ Puhvel, HED (K), p. 95. See also KBo 7.28 obv. 11: “Lift (*karaft*) (your) thousand eyelashes!”, CHD (L-N), p. 46a.

³¹ Beckman, *StBoT* 29, p. 6.

³² CHD (L-N), pp. 132-135.

³³ G. Torri, *La similitudine nella magia analogica ittita*, Roma 2003, pp. 44-51.

preceded by a ceremonial part, performed together with the oral invocation. The suppliant goes on the roof (of the temple), faces the rising sun, offers bread and makes libations, and then says the prayer.³⁴ It can be assumed that also this part of the ritual action preceding the prayer—(ii 51) “Then he puts a small table before the Sun-god”—similarly to these cited prayers, was performed on the roof of the temple of the deity, even though this is not explicitly stated. We just know that the performer (i.e., the sick person) had left the grassland where the first magical part of the ritual had been carried out (II 49-50): “He washes his hands and goes away”.

The similarity between the rites in these compositions and those described in the text analyzed above is especially interesting, in particular with respect to the general idea about the development of personal prayer from the simple spells and blessings, embedded already in old Hittite magical rituals. I. Singer acknowledges that many rituals contain short prayers and invocations to the gods.³⁵ Nevertheless he suggests that “The short Old Hittite request for blessing developed into larger invocations requesting the god(s) to protect the king from perjury or to grant him success and victory on the battlefield. These are rather general requests of well-being, still lacking reference to some concrete occasion, as is typical for later personal prayers”.³⁶ However, in the present author’s opinion it is not possible to draw the conclusion that magical charms evolved into royal personal prayers. The words spoken in the ritual KUB 17.28 ii 56-iii 3, evidently by a common person, are a real prayer, characterised by an *invocatio* (ii 56-57), by an *argumentum*, (ii 59-61) and by a *preces* (iii 1-3), containing requests addressed to the god.³⁷ This prayer, although short, may nonetheless be called “personal prayer”, because it had to be recited for an actual reason, as written in the opening words of the text (ii 33-34) and as expressed in the first oral rite (ii 40-47).³⁸

³⁴ I. Singer, *Hittite Prayers*, WAW 11, Atlanta 2002, pp. 12-13.

³⁵ Singer, *Hittite Prayers*, pp. 3-4.

³⁶ Singer, *op.cit.*, p. 13. See also I. Singer, “Kantuzili the Priest and the Birth of Hittite Personal Prayer” in P. Taracha, *Silva Anatolica. Anatolian Studies Presented to Maciej Popko on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Warsaw 2002, pp. 301-313. In part. at p. 311 he remarks: “...we know practically nothing about the ways the commoners supplicated their gods”.

³⁷ F. Graf, “Prayer in Magic and in Religious Rituals” in Ch.A. Faraone-D. Obbink, *Magika Hiera, Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, Oxford 1991, pp. 188-212, in part. p. 189.

³⁸ A magical spell indeed.

Undoubtedly the sick person was at the same time the performer of the magic. He was surely not alone, in view of the fact that several actions tied with the slaughtering, the cooking and the eating of the sacrificial animals were expressed by the scribe through the third person plural. This probably means that the performer was not able to butcher the animals by himself in a proper way, or that he was considered too contaminated to attend personally to the sacrifices for the deity. It is evident, however, that no magician, but the charmed individual himself was performing the main magical actions, and reciting the spells that have to be considered the core of the ceremony.

Examples of rituals carried out by a person without the help of any specialized practitioners seem to be uncommon in Hittite magic literature. The reason why a ritual was performed directly by the ill person can have a twofold explanation. First, he may have been too poor to pay a practitioner,³⁹ but this cannot be a reason in the case of KUB 17.28, since the performer was able to present a ram to the Sun-god and make offerings of food and drink.

A second possibility is that KUB 17.28 was an incantation performed in an emergency, in those circumstances when a magician could not easily be found, or as a first attempt to solve a problem. A short rite against a bad omen seen during a journey included in the text KBo 23.8 obv., may be a further possible example:⁴⁰

- 9 *ma-a-an KASKAL-an na-an-na-at-ti*
- 10 *nu i-da-a-lu-un MUŠEN-in*
- 11 *a-uš-zi nu a-ra-aḫ¹-za⁴¹*
- 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 goat and a puppy outside...

The existence of rituals performed without the help of any practi-

³⁹ About poor individuals as clients in magical rituals see for example CTH 390: KUB 7 1+ ii 9-10, CTH 425: KUB 7.54 iii 11-12. In general V. Souček, "Randnotizen zu den hethitischen Feldertexten", *MIO* 8 (1963), pp. 368-382, in part. Pp. 371-382; A. Archi, "L'humanité des Hittites" in *Florilegium Anatolicum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, Paris 1979, pp. 38-48.

⁴⁰ This text was mentioned to the author by Professor Volkert Haas whom I would like to express my thanks for his valuable advice (Letter: March 27, 2002). See also Masson, *RHR* 137, pp. 7-8.

⁴¹ Haas, *Materia Magica*, p.413 with n. 590.

tioner is clearly transmitted in the Hittite code. A very strict connection with the ritual described in KUB 17.28 can be recognized in the paragraph §169/*54 of the laws:⁴²

(KBo 6.13 i)

6 *ták-ku A.ŠA^{LAM} ku-iš-ki wa-a-ši ta ZAG-an pá-r-ši-ya*

7 「NINDA」 *har-ši-in da-a-i ta-an dUTU-i pá-r-ši-ya*

8 「GIŠ」 *el-zi-mi-it-wa tág-na-a ar-ši-ik-ke-et*

9 *nu te-ez-zi dUTU-uš dU-aš Ú-UL šu-ul-la-tar*

If anyone buys a field and violates the boundary, he takes a thick loaf and breaks it to the Sun-god (and says): “You *fixed* my scale into the ground”- And he speaks (as follows): “Sun-god, Storm-god, no quarrel (was meant)!”.⁴³

Of course these short incantations had completely different character and development in comparison with the longer rituals performed by specialized practitioners, but at the same time they disclose the existence of a popular and private religiousness, with the purpose of preventing or of remedying some misfortune in case of emergency.

In conclusion, it might be interesting to make some observations about the lines iii 15-17 of the ritual: “If someone sacrifices for the Storm-god (and) in addition for whatever other god, this is one (possible) ritual and these are the wo[rds]”. Why did the scribe not mention the Sun-god first, considering the fact that it is the only deity invoked in this ritual? In the author’s opinion, these lines were not tied just with it, but also with three preceding rituals as a kind of ending and summary to the first part of the *Sammeltafel* (i 1-iii 17). This would explain the reason for the Storm-god being cited in line iii 15, in spite of the fact that the main invocation in the ritual under analysis (ii 33-iii 17) is obviously dedicated to the Sun-god.

In the first incantation of the *Sammeltafel* the Moon-god is mentioned (i 1), in the second the Storm-god (ii 4),⁴⁴ and in the third one the Sun-god (ii 9 and 19), Kaḫuššu (ii 11 and 22), Kaneun (ii 13 and 24)⁴⁵ and Kataḫzipuri (ii 18). This variety of gods matches well the closing words in iii 15-17. It means that in the *Sammeltafel* KUB

⁴² Dupl. KUB 19.35 (+) iii 5-7; KBo 6.26 i 50-53. H.A. Hoffner, *The Laws of the Hittites*, Leiden–New York–Köln 1997, pp. 135-136 and 215-217.

⁴³ Hoffner, *op.cit.*, p. 136. See also HED (A), p. 174.

⁴⁴ Kammenhuber, “Hattisch pipiz(z)el- ‘Wind’—oder Tücken hattischer Textüberlieferung”, *MSS* 17 (1964), pp. 21- 27, in part. pp. 25-26.

17.28 two “colophons” had been written down: the first one, as mentioned in lines iii 15-17, and the second one at the bottom of the tablet with the signature of the scribe (iv 57-59).⁴⁶ This fact may indicate that SA₅-*pala* composed the tablet collecting the incantations of two different *Sammeltafel*, one including four incantations (i 1-iii 14) and a second one with two others (iii 18-iv 56).⁴⁷ He even copied the closing words of the first *Sammeltafel*, handed down in lines iii 15-17. The proof that he was working on two different tablets, but probably not simultaneously, is shown by the sequence of the rituals. Texts (1) and (5) are both dedicated to the Moon-god. It can be argued that SA₅-*pala* would have put them together, had he known their content in advance.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Klinger, *StBoT* 37, p. 180.

⁴⁶ The titles of the first and the last rituals are reported in the final colophon, as suggested in footnote 11. However it is also possible that the scribe wrote in this one the incipit of the two last texts [(5) iii 18-iv 44², (6) iv 45-56], copying them from the colophon of the original tablet in which these same texts were preserved, adding just the comprehensive number of the rituals included in his new copy.

⁴⁷ In general L. Mascheroni, “A proposito delle cosiddette *Sammeltafel* etee” in F. Imparati, *Studi di storia e di filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Caratelli*, Firenze 1988, pp. 131-145.

⁴⁸ This hypothesis is strengthened also by the fact that in the oldest version C, this ritual is the last of the *Sammeltafel* and the cited words (A iii 15-17 = C rev. 12'-13') represent in this case the closing sentence of the tablet. In the line 14' followed just the indication about the tablet and the name of the scribe, now lost in the gap.