C. Watkins,
I-E Background of a Luvian Ritual

## The Indo-European Background of a Luvian Ritual

Among the more or less fragmentarily preserved but extensive Luvian rituals (SISKUR) is one entitled *dupaduparsa* or *dupiduparsa*. The lengthy ritual against evil-doing and for purification took up at least nine tablets. following the colophon of KUB XXXV 40 + KBo XXIX 8 IV 6–8: DUB IX KAM *ŠA* SISKUR *dupidupar[sa AWAT /* <sup>f</sup>*Sillaluhi* <sup>SAL</sup>ŠU.GI / <sup>f</sup> <sup>f</sup>*Kuwattalla* <sup>SAL</sup>SUHUR.LAL "Ninth tablet of the *dupiduparsa* ritual: the words of <sup>f</sup>Sillaluhis the 'Old Woman' and <sup>f</sup>Kuwattallas the 'Hierodule'". The texts and the textual tradition are fully described and presented by F. Starke in StBoT 30, 79ff. and 104ff., *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. Starke notes that this ritual must go back to the 15th century B.C., as its composer <sup>f</sup>Kuwatalla the hierodule received a landgrant (KBo V 7) from the Middle Kingdom royal couple Arnuwanda and Asmunikal, and another ritual by the same woman is found in tablets paleographically datable to the 15th century. As a traditional composition of hieratic and strictly formulaic context the wording of this ritual certainly goes back to an even earlier period.

The title SISKUR *dupaduparsa / dupiduparsa* must mean 'Ritual of the Beating'. with 'case' in *-sa* (not. I think. with Starke 104 nominative plural neuter) to an abstract in *-(w)ar* from an intensive reduplication of *dup-* 'beat'. The action and the verb form a sort of leitmotiv of the ritual: Starke 104 n. 2 notes the 'beaten hand' *dūpaimin issarin* and 'beaten tongue' *dūpaimin* EME-*in* in one fragment, and 'they beat' *dupainti* in broken context in another. Another verb of similar semantics is *puwa-* 'pound' (cf. H. G. Güterbock, *Orientalia* 25, 1956, 123), occurring in broken context after the phrase *kuis-tar malhassassan* EN-*ya ādduwāl ānnūti. a-du-tta* ... 'whosoever does evil to the celebrant, to him ...'. We shall see the same phrase and the same theme in the passage to be studied *infra*; it is one of those which Starke (p. 106 and foldout) rightly focuses on as recurrent 'charakteristische Begriffe und Wendungen' of the 18 fragmentary tablets which are the basis of our text of the Ritual of the Beating.

Like most Luvian and Anatolian rituals the basic principle is sympathetic or homeopathic magic. We see the action unfold, and the action is *explained* in the bilingual ritual by the 'Old Woman', the <sup>SAL</sup>ŠU.GI, through the interaction of *word* (in Luvian) and *deed* (described in Hittite).

Let us look at a single "episode" in tablet three of this lengthy and rambling SISKUR *dupaduparsa*. I give the text as in Starke, StBoT 30, p. 115 (KBo IX 6 + [his I. 2] III 19"ff.): text in italics is Hittite, text in boldface is Luvian.

*ŠA GI-ma* II <sup>GIŠ</sup>PISÀN<sup>HI.A</sup> *A-NA* EN S[ISKUR *pa-ra-]a e-ep-zi*

*nu* II <sup>GIŠ</sup>PISÀN<sup>HI.A</sup> *ŠA GI ap-pi-iz-z[i-ia- ]az*
<sup>SAL</sup>ŠU.GI *har-zi* EN SISKUR-*ma-as-si-ya-as me-na-a[h-h]a-an-da*
*IŠ-TU QA-TI-ŠU e-ep-zi nu-us an-da*
*ú-e-su-ri-ya-an-zi nu-us ar-ha du-wa-ar-na-an-zi*
<sup>SAL</sup>ŠU.GI-*ma ki-is-sa-an me-ma-i*

**ku-is-tar ma-al-ha-as-sa-as-sa-an-za-an EN-ya**
**a-ad-du-ua-la a-an-ni-ti a-an DINGIR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-in-zi**
**a-ah-ha na-a-ta-at-ta ta-ta-ar-ha-an-du**
**ú-i-it-pa-ni-im-pa-an ú-i-da-a-in-du**
**a-du-w[a-a]n an-na-a-an pa-a-ta-an-za du-ú-wa-an-du**

*nu* <sup>SAL</sup>ŠU.GI<sup>HI.A</sup> *A-NA* EN SISKUR.SISKUR
*ŠA-PAL* GÌR<sup>MEŠ</sup>-*ŠU da-a-i nam-ma-as-si-ya-as*

'[The Old Woman] proffers two reed baskets to the celebrant.

The Old Woman holds the two reed baskets from the back; opposite her the celebrant takes them in his hands and they crush them by twisting (*anda wesuriyanzi*) and they break them apart (*arha duwarnanzi*). The Old Woman speaks as follows:

"Whosoever does evil to the celebrant, may the gods crush him (*tatarhandu*) like reeds, and may they smash him (*widaindu*) a *witpani-?*, and may they put him under his feet."

The Old Woman places the reeds under the celebrant's feet ...'

The Hittite passage was translated by O. Carruba in StBoT 2, 1966, 50, which I basically follow. The Hittite and Luvian passages and their interpretation have recently been discussed by H. C. Melchert, *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology* 157–8 (KZ Beiheft, Göttingen 1984). As the latter rightly notes, Luvian *tatarh-* is a reduplicated form of the root seen in Hittite *tarh-* 'overcome, overpower, compel', and in the Luvian name of the Storm God Tarhunzas, IE *terh₂-*. But the Luvian verb need not be exactly equated semantically with Hittite *anda wesuriya-*; the latter may mean 'press, oppress', but also carries the notion 'choke, strangle, throttle' (= Akkad. *hanāku* KBo I 42 II 40), which is I believe the image of the two participants' action: the natural way for two people to break reed baskets

they are both holding onto is by twisting them in opposite directions. The Hittite descriptions are precise and particular: the two baskets having been twisted, 'throttled in' (*anda wesuriya-*), are then 'broken apart' (*arha duwarna-*). But the Luvian curse is much more general: the evil-doer is to be crushed like reeds (not 'like baskets'), and we do not expect a specific verb (and preverb) like 'break apart' (*arha duwarna-*). Melchert *loc. cit.* for etymological reasons (Skt. *vi-dhā-* lit. 'put apart') would assign the Luvian verb *widāi-* a meaning 'divide'. But such is surely rather flat for a ritual imprecation with the gods as subject. Since the reed baskets in the ritual and the reeds of the Luvian simile are not 'divided' but utterly destroyed and trampled underfoot, we expect a more violent verb like 'smash'. I find it etymologically more reasonable to see in Luvian *widāi-* the same Indo-European root *$*\textyedh$-* which Melchert himself identified in Hitt. *wizzai* and Glossenkeil ⟨ *wi-ú-i-da-i*, ⟨ *wi-ú-i-ta-i* 'strikes, urges' KZ 93, 1979, 265ff., cf. *Stud. Hitt. hist. phonol.* 151. The root is well-known from Ved. *vádhīt* 'smote' (suppletive aorist of *han-*) and *vadhá-* 'weapon, cudgel'. The lengthened grade *$*\bar{e}$ appearing in Luvian *widāi-* (and ⟨ *wiwidai*) recall in formation the Gathic Avestan verb in Y.29.2 *yə drəguuō.dəbiš aēšəməm vādāiiōit* 'who would destroy the fury caused by the deceitful'. See J. Kellens, *Le verbe avestique* 15, 134 for alternative views. Luvian *witpani-* in our passage is obscure in form and meaning, but Melchert is perhaps right in taking it as making a real or imagined etymological figure with *widāi-*: 'smash him a smashing' or the like, cf. RV V 54.15 *yásya tárema tarasā* 'by whose crossing power may we cross' from the root *$*terh_2$-* of Luv. *tatarh-*.

In this brief episode of the Ritual of Beating the symbolism is plain enough, as is the interaction of word and deed. The ritual proceeds from the particular to the general, and analogizes from specific ritual acts, described in Hittite, to the generalized homeopathic ritual imprecation in Luvian.

Ritual utterances are by their nature traditional, frozen, and enduring. Ritual and myth are furthermore inextricably linked, in ancient Anatolian as elsewhere, where the narration of a myth is itself usually a ritual act, a single action as a part of a larger whole. The pattern is familiar to us from other traditions within and outside the Indo-European world. But where we can observe a set of verbal similarities with other Indo-European traditions in the domain of ritual and myth, then we may legitimately inquire whether we have to deal with manifestations of inherited common cultural tradition.

There exists an Indo-European dragon-slaying myth, as has been known since the 19th century. I have discussed elsewhere (*Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929–1985)*, ed. C. Watkins, to appear) its characteristic constituents (themes), verbal formulas, and lexical expression. The central theme and its vehicle, which I term the *basic formula* (boxed), is

HERO │ SLAY SERPENT (WEAPON)

as in Vedic *áhann áhim* (RV I 32.1 etc.). The basic formula transposes into the realm of myth the effective overcoming of adversaries and obstacles which is the business of the 'real' world of ritual. The lexical expression of this action, SLAY/SMASH/OVERCOME etc. typically involves not only the root *$*g^when$-* (Ved. *vṛtrahán-*) but also *$*terh_2$-* (Ved. *vṛtratúr-*) and *$*yedh$-* (Ved. *vádhīd vṛtrám vájreṇa* 'he smote Vṛtra with his cudgel' RV IV 17.3), and a roster of verbs of violent or forceful action like *$*bheid$-* (Ved. *bhid-* 'split', OEng. *bītan* 'bite [e. g. of weapons]') and *$*yaĝ$-* (Gk. ἄγνυμι 'break', Ved. *vájra-*, Av. *vazra-* [the weapons of Indra, Mithra]). Derivatives of the same root may fill different semantic slots in the *basic formula*. Compare the interchange of verb and instrument in *vádhīt ... vájreṇa* (above), *áhan ... vadhéna* (RV I 32.5), *vádhīt ... ghanéna* (RV I 33.4).

Recall now the key words and themes of our Luvian ritual. The actions are performed as it were in pantomime; it is in the symbolic transfer to the words of the spell that we find the true meaning of the acts, and it is the words we look for. The gods are adjured – in the 3rd person – to crush (*tatarh-*) the evil-doer like reeds (*ahha natatta*), to smash (*widāi-*) him, and to lay (*duwa-*) him beneath the celebrant's feet (*pad-*). Etymologically these Luvian lexemes are clear, and all inherited. To express their Indo-European exponents: the gods (HEROES) are to CRUSH (*$*terh_2$-*) the evil-doing ADVERSARY, with the simile like REEDS (*$*nedo$-*), to SMASH (*$*yedh$-*) him, and to lay (*$*dheh_1$-*) him under the celebrant's feet (*$*ped$-*).

As a semantic structure in its verbal expression, the Luvian imprecation is only an elaborated imperative variant of the *basic formula*.

At this point a specific comparison is in order. We have cited twice above the famous Indra hymn I 32, and noted that in the expression of the basic formula, key roots may appear in various semantic slots in the thematic structure. The first five verses of RV I 32 successively repeat, then elaborate the basic formula, then add a simile and a static image of the vanquished adversary:

1c   *áhann áhim*

　　'he slew the serpent'

2a   *áhann áhim*

　　'he slew the serpent'

3d   *áhann enam prathamajā́m áhīnām*

    'he slew him, the firstborn of serpents'

4a   *yád ... áhan prathamajā́m áhīnām*

    'when you slew the firstborn of serpents'

5a   *áhan vr̥trám ... vájreṇa ... **vadhéna***

    'he slew Vr̥tra with his cudgel, the weapon'

cd   *skándhāṃsīva kúliśenā vívr̥kṇā / áhiḥ śayate*

    'like branches lopped by an axe the serpent lies'.

The roots of the forms in boldface are successively *$g^{u}hen$-* 1–5, *$uedh$-* 5a, *$\widehat{kei}$-* 5d. The stage is set.

    The Luvian spell has *ahha **natatta tatarhandu*** 'crush him like reeds' ... ***widaindu*** 'smash him': 'like *$nedo$- *$terh_2$- ... *$uedh$-*'. Compare then the next three verses of RV I 32, of the beaten *ahi*- Vr̥tra:

6c   *nā́tārīd asya sámr̥tiṃ **vadhā́nām***

    'he did not withstand the onslaught of his weapons'.

We have the same sequence of roots *$terh_2$-* and *$uedh$-*, which continues with a verbal echo of the latter in

7cd  *... **vádhriḥ** ... / ... vr̥tró aśayat ...*

    ... the eunuch ... / ... Vr̥tra lay ...

The similarity of *vadh$^i$* and *vádhri-* – whether a real (*$uedh$-*) or a folk-etymology (cf. Mayrhofer, *KEWA* III 135–8) is immaterial – would hardly be lost on the Indian poetic mind. The root *$\widehat{kei}$-* 'lie' recurs twice more, again of the dead *ahi*- in another simile, this time exactly corresponding to the Luvian *ahha natatta* 'like *$nedo$-*'

8a   ***nadám** ná **bhinnám** amuyā́ **śáyānam***

    'lying that way like a broken reed'

with the simile 'like *$nedo$- *$bheid$- ... *$\widehat{kei}$-*'. The Luvian continues *a-duw--an annān **pātanza duwandu*** 'may they put him under his feet', *$ped$- ... *$dheh_1$-*. The Vedic strophe continues:

8d   *tā́sām áhiḥ **patsutahśír** babhū́va*

    'at the feet (of the waters) lay the serpent'

with the roots *$ped$-* and *$\widehat{kei}$-*, which functions as the passive of *$dheh_1$-*. The phrase *annān pātanza duwa-* 'place under the feet' is traditional in Luvian, and clearly attested in the 1st millenium B.C. Hieroglyphic Luvian royal inscriptions of local kings. (KARATEPE, SULTANHAN, cf. A. Morpurgo Davies, "'to put' and 'to stand' in the Luvian languages", forthcoming in *Studies ... Cowgill*.)

    The lexical expression of the thematic structures in the two languages may be juxtaposed, together with their respective reconstruction:

| | |
|---|---|
| *ahha natatta tatarh-* | *nā́tārīd ... vadhá-* |
| *widāi-* | *vádhri-* |
| | *nadáṃ ná bhinnám ... śay-* |
| *pata- ... duwa-* | *patsutahśi-* |
| like *$nedo$- *$terh_2$-* | *$terh_2$- ... *$uedh$-* |
| *$uedh$-* | *$uedh$- (?)* |
| | like *$nedo$- *$bheid$- ... *$\widehat{kei}$-* |
| *$ped$- ... *$dheh_1$-* | *$ped$- *$\widehat{kei}$-* |

Lying or being placed at or under the feet of the victor is of course a universal image of the vanquished. But the collocation of the remaining roots is in no way universal. On the dialectology of *$nedo$-* (first securely reconstructed by Bailey, TPS 1952.61–2) and its history in India see most succinctly Mayrhofer, *KEWA* II 127–9, III 742–3. Anatolian ritual and Indic myth, separated in time, space and genre, here preserve two enduring semantic and thematic structures which are ultimately the same.

    The Anatolian text is a hortatory magical ritual, while the Rigvedic hymn is a paean of mythological victory, whose use in the ritual we are largely ignorant of. But the Atharvaveda with its more homely world of black and white magic presents contexts which are much more similar in genre to Anatolian ritual. And here we find thematic, semantic, and lexical contexts which are directly comparable to the structures of our Anatolian ritual and Vedic mythical "episodes". The key theme is the simile of the *reed*, of which we have three examples in the Atharvaveda. AV(Ś) 4.19 = AV(P) 5.25 apostrophizes a plant (*oṣadhi-*) used for counter-magic against enemies and sorcerers. I am grateful to Michael Witzel for making available to me the Orissa mss. variants of the unpublished Paippalāda text. Compare the following:

1cd *utó kŕtyākŕtaḥ prajám* **naḍám ivá cchindhi** *vā́rṣikam*

> 'and cut off the offspring of the witchcraft-maker like a reed of the
> rainy season'

3cd *utá* **trātási** *pā́kasyā́tho* (Ppp. *pākasya trātāsy uta*) **hantási** *rakṣásaḥ*

> 'you are protector of the simple, likewise you are slayer of the
> demonic'

5    **vibhindatí́** *śatáśākhā* **vibhindán** *nā́ma te pitá́*
     *pratyág* **ví bhindhi** *tám tvám yó asmā́nr abhidā́sati*

> 'splitting apart, hundred-branched – "Splitting-Apart" by name is
> thy father; in return do thou split apart him who assails us'.

The word order *tam tvam* of 5c in the Orissa text (Ś reverses the two, K has
*vibhitam tvam*) confirms Whitney's note ad loc. Verse 1d *naḍám ivá́
cchindhi vā́rṣikam* is one syllable too long, and Whitney notes that 'The
Anukr. seems to sanction abbreviation to *'va'*. In view of RV I 32.8a *nadā́m
ná bhinnám* it is tempting to assume an early error, common to all our mss.,
for *naḍám ná (ná á) cchindhi*. In any case the thematic and verbal simila-
rity of the AV and RV passages is clear, and the rhyming *chindhi* and
*bhindhi* of the AV passage (1 and 5) together with the participles *vibhin-
datí́, vibhindán* explicate the root *\*bheid-* in RV *naḍám ná **bhinnám***. Finally
the Vedic coordinated imperative and relative clause 'split apart him who
assails us' exactly parallel the Luvian 'whosoever does evil to the cele-
brant, may the gods crush him . . .'. The rhyme *chindhi* : *bhindhi* is an index
of semantic equivalence, and we may regard as underlying 'transforma-
tional' syntactic equivalents the imperative *split/crush (him) like a reed!*
of the Luvian and Atharvavedic passages, and the participial-adjectival
*like a split reed* of the Rigvedic passage.

That the collocation of *\*nedo-* 'reed' and *\*bheid-* 'split' is a real cultural
semantic nexus, where 'split' is just a variant of the verb of the *basic
formula* (prototypically *\*gʷhen-*) is shown by another passage in the Athar-
vaveda. AV(Ś) 6.138 is an incantation to make a certain man impotent and
a eunuch. The concluding verses 4 and 5 are closely linked by phonetic
figures (*yé te nādyàu | yáthā naḍám*, repeated *amúṣyās . . . muṣkáyoḥ*) and
the phonetic and grammatical figures of the basic formula itself (*bhinadmi
śámyayā | bhindánty áśmanā*) and like positioning of the same or similar
words. The translation is Whitney's; that of pada d in both is very uncer-
tain, and the text unsound.

4    *yé te* **nā́dyàu** *devákŕte yáyos tíṣṭhati vŕṣṇyam*
     *té te* **bhinadmi śámyayā** *(a)múṣyā ádhi muṣkáyoḥ*

> "The two god-made tubes that are thine, in which stands thy
> virility, those I split for thee with a wedge, on yon woman's
> loins'

5    *yáthā* **naḍám** *kaśípune stríyo* **bhindánty áśmanā**
     *evá́* **bhinadmi** *te śépo* (Ppp. *muṣkau*) *(a)múṣyā ádhi muṣkáyoḥ*

> 'As women split reeds with a stone for a cushion,
> so do I split thy member (Ppp. testicles), on yon woman's loins'.

Verses 4 and 5 are respectively AVP 1.68.5 and 1, with variants 1d
*amuṣyādhi muṣk°* 'on yon man's testicles', 5d *tasmai tvām avase huve*
(= AVŚ 5.25.2d) 'for that I call thee for aid', which need not concern us
here further.

Beyond the vivid and arresting images of the Atharvan black magic we
may discern clearly the same semantic and thematic structures which we
found in the episodes of the Luvian ritual and the Rigvedic myth, the *basic
formula*. The central simile of each is that of the beaten ADVERSARY
likened to a broken *reed* (*\*nedo-*): the verb of violent action BEAT,
BREAK, SPLIT is variously a reflex of *\*terh₂-, \*uedh-, \*bheid-*, ultimately
equivalents of *\*gʷhen-*. In AV(Ś) 6.138.4–5 the object of the verb of the
basic formula is by synecdoche the ADVERSARY's body-part, and the
optional instrumental WEAPON or tool is present. Schematically, the two
verses may be reduced to a 'syllogism' of sorts:

> SPLIT (*\*bheid-*) *\*nedo-* BODY-PART  (WEDGE)
> as SPLIT (*\*bheid-*) *\*nedo-*                    (STONE)
> SPLIT (*\*bheid-*)  BODY-PART

Both the WEDGE and the STONE are entirely appropriate to the instru-
mental WEAPON slot in the basic formula in Vedic. Indra's *vájra-* is also
called *áśman-* 'stone' (RV IV 22.1, cf. K. Hoffmann, *Aufsätze* 395), and we
have the basic formula in a charm against poisonous insects in RV I 191.15
*takám bhinadmy áśmanā* 'I squash the little one with a stone'. For the
*śámyā-* 'wedge' we have even a collocation with the root *\*gʷhen-* in a
passage in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa: I 2.1.17 *tásmāc chámyayā samā́hanti*
'That is why he beats (the millstones) with the wedge'.

Finally what looks like a formulaic variant of both Śaunaka passages,
AVŚ 4.19.1 and 6.138.5, occurs only in the Paippalāda, AVP 5.32.10, a
verse absent from the corresponding AVS 4.16. In the Orissa text,

*ainam **chinatti** varuṇo **naḍaṃ** kaśipune **yathā***

'Varuṇa splits that one like a reed for a cushion'.

It remains to consider one further Vedic text: that giving the ritual corresponding to AV(Ś) 6.138. The corresponding ritual action is known to us from the Kauśika-Sūtra to the Atharvaveda. It is worth noting since it differs markedly in spirit and purpose from the Luvian ritual episode with which we began. Curiously the REED (*naḍá-*) is the only lexical item of the Atharvavedic spell retained.

> KauśS 48.32–4 *tvam vīrudhām iti mūtrapurīṣaṃ*
> *vatsaśepyāyāṃ kakuchair apidhāpya saṃpiṣya*
> *nikhaniti | śépyānaḍe | śepyāyām |*

Caland's translation (*Altind. Zauberritual*, Verhandelingen der K. Akad. van Wet. te Amsterdam, Afd. Lett. n. r., III, 2, 1900, p. 170) of the passage is as follows:

> '(The following performance is associated with) AV(Ś) 6.138. Urine and excrement (of a calf he puts) in the foreskin of a male calf, lays the testicles over it, crushes it together, and (while whispering the hymn) buries it (in a vulnerable place belonging to the man he wishes to make a eunuch). The foreskin (of a male calf) and a reed (he treats in the same way as the urine and excrement), (having put it) in the foreskin.'

We can agree with Bloomfield, *Hymns of the Atharva-Veda* 537, who characterizes the performance and the text as 'unsavory and obscure'. But I think contrary to Caland (170 n. 18) that the reed is not present merely because of AVŚ 1.138.5 'as women split reeds . . .' but rather that as in the AV and the Luvian the reed is an integral part of the magical 'reasoning': as the reed (is crushed and fecalised), so the testicles (of the calf) are crushed and fecalised (and therefore the testicles of the adversary will suffer the same fate).

However 'unsavory and obscure', we have in this sūtra only a very particular development of a ritual directed at an ADVERSARY that employed as central verbal magic a simile with a REED and a lexical thematic structure that was in the Sūtra period already millenia old.

Luvian ritual spell, Rigvedic epic narrative of mythological *drakonto-makhia*, and Atharvan white and black magical incantation alike continue in lexicon and syntax transformations of the same inherited semantic and thematic structure: a part of their common Indo-European cultural as well as linguistic patrimony.

The 15th century B.C. does know an Indo-Aryan presence in Eastern Anatolia, on which Professor Mayrhofer's publications have shed so much light. But the similarities between the Anatolian and Indo-Aryan data are only to be explained by common inheritance, not by contact. The differences in genre and in 'spirit' as well as the very different semantic slots occupied by related roots in thematic structures in the two languages are sufficient to exclude the hypothesis of borrowing or diffusion.

Harvard University                          Calvert Watkins
Department of Linguistics
Science Center 223
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
U.S.A.