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Luvian Language in “Luvian” Rituals in Hattuša

H. Craig Melchert*

In a recent article,1 I raised the issue of why there is such variability in the number of Luvianisms in Hittite rituals that appear to have a Luvian background, suggesting tentatively that the difference might be chronological. My implication was that we would expect more Luvian in later rituals than earlier ones. The question has now been cast in an entirely new light as a result of the studies of Miller and Yakubovich.2 Miller argues that the Luvian-based rituals as we have them are the product of a complex redactional history and casts serious doubt on the notion that they reflect dictation to a scribe by a practitioner.3 Yakubovich has shown that the Luvian incantations of rituals found in Hattuša reflect a koineized Kizzuwatna dialect, while Luvian forms scattered through Hittite texts belong to an Empire Luvian, another koine promulgated through Hittite texts for official purposes in the Empire period and reflected in the

* It is a great pleasure to offer this article as a modest tribute to Gary Beckman, a colleague and friend who has made so many lasting contributions to so many aspects of Hittitology: nu=šši namma dalugaēš MU.KAM.HI.A-eš ašandu!


3. Miller, Kizzuwatna Rituals, 469–511. See the similar heavily revisionist views of Birgit Christiansen (Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi. Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429 und CTH 463, StBoT 48 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006], 22–30), who arrives at similar conclusions.
later post-Empire Hieroglyphic Luvian texts. I will seek to take both of these findings into account in what follows.

**Definition**

Any discussion of “Luvian rituals” must be based on a reasonably clear and explicit definition of what one means by this term. I first of all take ritual here to refer to therapeutic or prophylactic rituals designed to address a particular instance of some problem—illness, strife, black magic, and the like. I thus exclude rites belonging to the state cult and rituals for the Hittite royal couple (CTH 771, 772, and 773, rituals and songs of Lallupiya and Ištanuwa, and CTH 752). Of the therapeutic rituals, “Luvian” includes first of all those with incantations as running text in “Kizzuwatna Luvian” as defined by Yakubovich (thus the bulk of the texts in StBoT 30, excluding those named above). A second group consists of rituals with Luvianisms used as technical terms, both those with strictly Luvian and those with Luvian and Hurrian (the latter both in Luvianized form and in purely Hurrian terms for types of rituals). Finally, there are rituals attributed to practitioners from western Anatolia (particularly Arzawa) that also show practices associated with Luvian and North Syrian areas (such as the use of scape-animals), but which contain no or extremely few Luvianisms.

**Chronology**

The first point to be made in regard to the chronology of the Luvian rituals as defined above is that none of them show any linguistic features that point to composition in the Old Hittite period (by which I mean through

---

5. See for these Frank Starke, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*, StBoT 30 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1985), 270–367 and 37–42. I likewise exclude the cult of the goddess Huwassanna (on which see E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire de la langue lour-vite* [Paris: Maisonneuve, 1959], 175–77). The very fragmentary Luvian incantation in KUB 17.24 ii 2–3 does not allow any conclusions about the dialect affiliation of this cult of a goddess of Hubesna (Kybistra).
Telipinu). There is no basis for regarding the ritual of Zuwi as “Luvian.”8 Miller offers compelling arguments that the ritual of Hantitaššu belongs to an old layer of Anatolian compositions.9 All available linguistic evidence of the Luvian rituals supports the assumption that their importation into Hattuša began in the “early MH” period, for historical reasons likely with the reign of Tuthaliya I.10

Secondly, however, it is equally important to stress that no extant version of any Luvian ritual dates from the “early MH” period (post-Telipinu through Tuthaliya I). This includes the manuscript Mašštiššu I.A (KBo 39.8), which is not only a copy11 but a very faulty one by a scribe who did not remotely control the language of the original composition (see the detailed discussion below).12 Since Luvian rituals of all kinds

---

7. I am among those who now doubt the usefulness of “Middle Hittite” as either a linguistic or historical period, but that complex issue cannot fully be addressed here. Let me stress first that my use of terms refers exclusively to linguistic periodization, not historical. Second, I use “Old Hittite” here to refer to the language used through the reign of Telipinu. Whether one wishes to label the language of the period from after Telipinu through Tuthaliya I as “early Middle Hittite” or regard it as a period of “late Old Hittite” (cf. Miller, Kizzuwatna Rituals, 450), what is important is that the language of this time lacks several characteristic features of (early) Old Hittite (such as the conjunction *ta*). Another set of changes distinguishes the period after Tuthaliya I through Šuppiluliuma I: one may label this “late Middle Hittite” or “early Empire Hittite”). In any case, New Hittite begins with Muršili II.


10. See Miller, Kizzuwatna Rituals, 450.

11. Thus correctly but too hesitantly ibid., 240, 244, 253.

12. I must stress this point, because the very poor quality of the (“late MH”) copy KBo 39.8 makes it wholly unsuited for drawing conclusions about the functions of “inverted word order” in Middle Hittite (contra Andrej V. Sidel’tsev, “Inverted Word Order in Middle Hittite,” in Anatolian Languages, ed. Vitalij Shevoroshkin and Paul Sidwell [Canberra: Association for the History of Language, 2002], 137–88) or the use of proleptic pronouns in translation literature (contra Elisabeth Rieken, “Verberstellung in hethitischen Übersetzungsstexten,” in Indogermanistik und Linguistik
were both copied and “redacted” (i.e., reshaped for new purposes and occasions) throughout the early Empire period and even later; it is quite impossible to establish any kind of relative chronology of composition of the extant texts based simply on the presence or absence of archaisms and innovations. All of our manuscripts (“late MH” = early Empire and later New Hittite) inevitably show a mixture of old and new.

However, it may be possible to distinguish mere copies from redactions by the fact that copyists have a strong tendency to hypercorrect, while several assured instances where old ritual material has been put to new uses conspicuously lack such errors: they show some correct old grammatical features alongside new ones that surely reflect their own speech. For the first, I may cite the frequent misuse by NH copyists of enclitic possessive pronouns (particularly the hypercorrect use of forms in -e/it for the vocative or dative-locative, their erroneous substitution of contrastive nongeminating -a by geminating -a “also,” and the use of the instrumental to express separation, which is not a genuine feature of any period of Hittite. On the other hand, the description of the ritual with the substitute (pūḫugari-) ox for Muršili II’s aphasia, obviously created for a specific occasion within the NH period, contains one correct older use of the instrumental (IZI-it wahnmanzi KUB 15.36+ Ro 12) along with equally correct innovative forms (ablative of means Vo 16–19 and the verb nannanzi Vo 35). Lines Vo 29–32 make explicit that the ritual for Muršili’s aphasia was created on the basis of older written ritual prescriptions.
We may likewise distinguish “late MH” (and NS) copies of “early MH” Luvian rituals from “late MH” ritual compositions that reuse older material. The MH copy KBo 39.8 of the Ritual of MaŠtigga is rife with errors: beside correct *apel UD-aš “of that day” (ii 13.19.iii 18) faulty *apedaš UD-aš (i 36.42.48–49);\(^\text{18}\) at i 45 -za…ḫalzai is incorrectly used for correct -za…ḫalziššanzi “they call (i.e., name)” in NS KUB 12.34+ i 6;\(^\text{19}\) at ii 24 KAxyU-it EME-it is used falsely for separation (“Be again pure from the mouth and tongue!”);\(^\text{20}\) at ii 37 there is a complete anacoluth KAxU-i EME-an ḫūrtaušš=a EGIR-an for correct KAxU-i EME-i ḫurtiyašš=a EGIR-an (as in NS KBo 2.3 i 48–49) “behind the mouth, tongue, and curses.”\(^\text{21}\) KBo 39.8 also sometimes shows innovative forms where NS copies preserve the more archaic forms of the original composition: ii 11 *duwarnai “breaks” vs. *duwarnizzi in KBo 2.3 i 25 and KUB 12.34 i 24; ii 26.35.iii 38 *ūnnanzi “they drive” vs. *ūnniyanzi in KBo 2.3 i 38.47. In other instances KBo 39.8 shows the older and newer forms beside each other: older *paršiya and newer *paršiyazzi (i 21 and iii 58); older transitive mediopassive *tulḫšari and *tulḫšaru (ii 10.13) and newer active *tulḫšandu (i 41).

On the other hand, the “Ritual of Šamuha” (CTH 480), also attested in a “late MH” manuscript (KUB 29.7), shows no grammatical errors, but a handful of correct older usages (DINGIR-LIM-aš parni andan “in the temple” Vo 17 vs. innovative locatival anda from late MH onward, *tuēkki=šši “in his body” Vo 24.38.48, correct instrumentals of means išnit

---

\(^{18}\) Contra Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 66, one cannot take the latter as plural, since the preceding context makes it clear that a single day is being referred to (cf. i 34–35 as antecedent to i 36).

\(^{19}\) The form in -šša- and the impersonal third plural are a fixed usage in the sense “is called Y,” contra Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 210.

\(^{20}\) The mouths and tongues are the means by which the ritual clients said evil things, along with the curses themselves. All three are what the clients must be purified of. The instrumental cannot possibly be taken as one of accompaniment, contra Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 73.

\(^{21}\) This passage is misunderstood and falsely translated by Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 75, based on the erroneous version of KBo 39.8. The postpositional phrase goes with the preceding: “For your persons, for all of your limbs the black sheep is the ritual substitute behind (= against) the mouth, tongue, and curses.” Again, the mouth, tongue, and curses are always in this ritual the evil things that must be warded off and are always conjoined. KBo 39.8 ii 29 is equally faulty (in this case also KBo 2.3 i 40), with two dative-locatives and one accusative.
This distinction between copies of older rituals and new ritual compositions reusing older material does not, of course, immediately solve the problem of chronology. However, further differences between the sets of texts in question are suggestive of a relative chronology. I have emphasized above the errors and innovations even in a “late MH” copy like KBa 39.8, but the Ritual of Maštigga also shows archaisms that do not appear in texts like the Ritual of Šamua: vocatives dUTU-i išša=mi “Sun-god my lord” (KBa 39.8 i 23), iterative haššikkedumat “you quarreled” to hašša– “make a complaint” (KBa 39.8 i 35; also active haššikketen in KBa 2.3 i 31), Pret2Sg memiškeš (KBa 2.3 i 8), [n=a]pa (KBa 9.106+ ii 47). Similarly, the Ritual of Zarpiya (CTH 757) has the transitive mediopassives hauiyanta “they draw” and hattanta “they prick” (KUB 9.31 i 40.44), the archaic instrumental śšanta “with blood” (ibid. i 46), and the older iškezzi “anoints” (HT 1 ii 11), alongside many innovations (iškiyaižzi KUB 9.31 ii 36, ablative of means GIŠ pūriyaz ibid. i 31) and redundancies that betray a copy: katti=ti=ma=tta “but with you” and katti=šši=ma=šš “but with him” (ibid. i 36 and 60), where the copyist has left the older enclitic possessive on the postposition, but added the enclitic dative of his own language. In contrast, in new ritual compositions reusing older material such as the Ritual of Šamua the archaisms involved form a very restricted set (listed here in rough order of frequency): (1) correctly used instrumental of means (alongside the new ablative of means); (2) limited use of enclitic possessive pronouns; (3) NSg antu(w)alhaš; (4) locatival andan; (5) occasional n=š alongside n=aš “et eos”; (6) first plural verbs in -wani.

I therefore venture to suggest that we can establish a relative chronology of a very few “early MH/late OH” Luvian rituals that were repeatedly copied and a much larger number of “late MH/early Empire” ritual compositions that reuse older material.22 Given that the former are likely all from the reign of Tuthaliya I, there are unsurprisingly very few of them extant: I would confidently list here only the already mentioned Rituals of Maštigga and Ritual of Zarpiya, plus those of Ambazzi (CTH 391 and

---

22. I do not of course mean to deny that the older rituals were also subject to redaction, as established by Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, for Maštigga and by Christiansen (*Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi*) for Ambazzi, but in these cases the redactions were relatively old and then each subject to copying (see the tentative stemma by Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 241).
429), if one follows Christiansen in taking the few Luvianisms found in the latter as enough to classify them as “Luvian.” 23 CTH 391 shows the striking archaism mān parna=ma “When he (comes back) home…” (iii 67), where it is not the allative, but the position of the focus particle -ma, that is remarkable. Other archaisms, such as a correct instrumental of means, an -uš for APIC of the enclitic pronoun, and correct contrastive nongeminating -a in šer=a=ššan (i 3), are less diagnostic. As a late copy, it predictably also has an erroneous instrumental of separation (i 20–21, iii 26–27) and innovative Pres3Sg hūittiyai “draws.” CTH 429 (NS) attests the particle -(a)pa (i 34), widespread use of enclitic possessives (including in a duplicate assimilated pera(š)=šit), n=uš, and transitive tuḫšari, alongside an instrumental of separation and several incorrect uses of the enclitic possessives.

The societal changes initiated by Tuthaliya I led both to significant changes in the Hittite language 24 and to a great number of ritual compositions that reused older material (likely available on tablets mostly in Hattuša, but in some cases in Kizzuwatna). These include the rituals with both Luvian and Hurrian elements traditionally labeled “Kizzuwatna rituals” 25 Ritual of Ammihatna (CTH 471); Ritual of Ammihatna, Tulbi, and Mati (CTH 472); Ritual of Palliya (CTH 475); Ritual of Papanikri (CTH 476); the purification ritual KBo 24.45+ (CTH 479.2); 26 the ritual KBo 21.37+ (CTH 479.3); Ritual of Šamuha (CTH 480); Expansion of the Cult of the Deity of the Night (CTH 481); Evocation Ritual for the Gods of the Cedar (CTH 483); Evocation Ritual for dMAH-HI.A and dGulšeš (CTH 484); ritual for Muršili’s aphasia (CTH 486); the birth ritual KBo 17.65 (CTH 489); 27 and the purification ritual KUB 43.58 (CTH 491). To

23. Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi, 321–22. Genuine Luvianisms in CTH 391 include, besides the names of the deities invoked, the terms ħūrtalli- (attested in the Luvian NPl ħūrtallinzi), also sCmariḫši-, and ġistarzu(wa)n- (for the inflection of the latter as Luvian see Melchert, “The Inflection of Some Irregular Luvian Neuter Nouns”). CTH 429 shows only the container name ġGIS paddur/paddun-. Other alleged Luvianisms cited by Christiansen are extremely dubious.


27. There is no basis either in the language or the content of the birth ritual KBo 17.62+63 to classify it as Luvian in any sense (cf. Gary Beckman, Hittite Birth Rituals.
these we may add on the basis of their contents and language the ritual for Hebat (CTH 702) and the šalli aniur “great ritual” of Kuwatalla (CTH 761). However, also surely composed in the early Empire period based on the criteria given above are several purely Luvian rituals containing significant passages in Kizzuwatna Luvian: Ritual of Tunnawiya (CTH 409), the healing ritual KUB 17.12 (CTH 431), Ritual of Puriyanni (CTH 758), the ritual dupaduparša (CTH 759), and a series of birth rituals (CTH 764, 765, 767, 770). On the separate problem of the chronology of Luvian rituals from western Anatolia (Arzawa) see section 6 below.

Distribution of Luvianisms

The distribution of Luvianisms in the two sets of texts established above does not remotely support my tentative idea of a growth in Luvianisms with the passage of time. It is true that the early Ritual of Zarpiya has only two Luvianisms (as contrasted with its incantations in Kizzuwatna Luvian): ḫuwallari- (defined in KUB 9.31 i 23) and the participle šakaltān (read thus in KUB 9.31 i 11), which must belong to the verb of the verbal noun šakaldamman “harm, destruction” (or similar). However, the very early Ritual of MaŠtigga in all its redactions attests half a dozen Luvianisms: nakkušši- “ritual substitute” (KBo 39.8 iii 38.41; ultimately from Hurrian, but an early loanword into Luvian), šarlant- “exalted” (epithet of the Sun God in KBo 39.8 iii 53), tānit- “cult stone” (KBo 2.3 iii 18 corrected on basis of KUB 10.76:6), tarpalli- “ritual substitute” (KBo 39.8 passim), tiššatwa (ritual object described in KBo 2.3 i 6 and KBo 39.8 i 45.47), and tiwariya “plant of the Sun God” (KBo 2.3 iii 40 and KBo 39.8 iv 17). This figure nearly matches that of the distinctly later Ritual of Tunnawiya, with effectively seven: SÍG eḫurati- “ear plug” (ii 44 and the

StBoT 29 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983], 36. To do so merely based on the name of the practitioner Tunnawiya I find quite unjustified. Even if, as Beckman suggests, the name refers to the same person (which is far from certain!), we have no assurance whatsoever in light of the investigations of Miller and Christiansen that the various rituals attributed to her actually have anything to do with each other. See also note 33.

28. The large number of errors makes one wonder whether the extant copy of the birth ritual KUB 44.4 + KBo 13.241 was made by a speaker of Empire Luvian with very poor control of Hittite (see note 12 regarding KBo 39.8).


30. On which see Frank Starke Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens, StBoT 31 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1990), 276–77.

derived verb i 16.18),  sóc-_ (i 46), the verbs tiyani- and elani- “stuff, cram” (ii 10.12.17), āštayaratar “spell” (passim), ḥuipayata- “act of cruelty (ii 60), ḥartūwaḥartuwa- “descendants” (iv 13).

The early Empire healing ritual KUB 17.12 (CTH 431) has many Luviainisms: the bread names NINDA alalun=za (ii 21.30), NINDA partanninzi (ii 21.33), and NINDA warmanninzi (ii 8)—note the Luvian form of the first and the fact that the last two are accusative plural, showing that the language here is Empire Luvian, not Kizzuwatna Luvian—a series of epithets for bread offerings šarladdaššiš, pihaddaššiš, and kuwanzuwanaššiš (ii 23–25), and the purely Luvian kuwaliti “turns” and waššări/waššaru “is/let be pleasing” (iii 13.14). However, the roughly contemporary ritual dupaduparša (by Kuwatalla, who is contemporary with Arnuwanda and Ašmunikal) has, in addition to the name of the ritual itself, only two: ikkūnaunašši- “of anointing?” and the epithet of the Sun God ḥiritalli- “by which one swears.”

The many early Empire rituals with Luvian and Hurrian elements (recall that none of these may be shown to have been composed in “early MH” in the reign of Tuthaliya I) generally show a very modest number of pure Luvianisms, while unsurprisingly containing a number of loanwords into Luvian from Hurrian and purely Hurrian terms for rituals. The Ritual of Ammihatna attests only the hybrid forms nišḫinzi šōntinnānzi (KBo 5.2 iii 29; AccPl!) and the loanword nakkuššahiti (iii 33). The Ritual of Ammihatna, Tulbi, and Mati shows just piddun=za “lump” (KBo 23.1 i 35) and likewise the very long Ritual of Papanikri only the technical term šūrita (described in KBo 5.1 iv 2.7). The purification ritual KBo 24.45+ has only ḫarwa- “path,” and KBo 21.37+ just GAD alalu-. The Ritual of Šamuha contains only the name of the gangati-plant (and derived verb), which is central to the ritual, a Hittitized form of šarlā(i)- “exalt,” and the Luvian verb arnamitti “?” The Expansion of the Cult of the Deity of the Night shows effectively the same three: gangată- “treat with the g.-plant,” šarlatt(a)- “(ritual of) exaltation,” and arnaminti “?” All other Luvian forms reflect loanwords from Hurrian. The evocation rituals CTH 483–484 again attest the gangati-plant and still another form of “exaltation” šarlamiš-. There are no Luvianisms in the ritual to treat Muršili’s aphasia, while the birth ritual KBo 17.65, in addition to the inevitable šarlatta “exaltation,” contains only kallar- “unfavorable” and the term of unknown origin kunzigannahit-. The purification ritual KUB 43.58 has merely the vessel name DUG kazzit- of unknown origin and the obscure and uncertain ammiyatiyaš (Hitt. GŚg.) in KUB 15.42 iii 7. Finally, the ritual for Hebat KUB 9.2 contains the solitary Luvian infinitive gulzāuna (i 6). In sum, the very extensive activity
in the early Empire of creating Luvo-Hurrian rituals does not seem to be associated with any growth in the use of Luvianisms in these exclusively Hittite-language rituals (i.e., with no incantations in Kizzuwatna Luvian).

**Relationship between the Luvo-Hurrian “Kizzuwatna” Rituals and Those with Kizzuwatna Luvian Incantations**

Miller claims that the Ritual of Tunnawiya (CTH 409) has no connections to Kizzuwatna, and Yakubovich suggests that the short Luvian incantation in it reflects the dialect of the “Lower Land.” But the diagnostic words in the passage (i 58–59) all agree with the dialect of Kizzuwatna as established by Yakubovich: “heaven” is tappaš- vs. Empire Luvian /tipas/- and “earth” is tiyamm(i)- vs. Empire Luvian /tag(a)m(i)/ (or more likely functionally rather /tasakura/). Available evidence thus argues that the dialects of the adjacent areas of Kizzuwatna and the Lower Land (south of the Tuz Gölü) were essentially the same. Since the ritual incantations in CTH 409 and other texts with purely Luvian incantations (and no Hurrian) all show the Kizzuwatna dialect, the label “Kizzuwatna” cannot sensibly be applied only to rituals that show a mixture of Hurrian and Luvian elements. Nor is the distinction between the two types of rituals an absolute one. The šalli aniur ritual attributed to Kuwatalla includes not only the Hurrian loanword for “ritual substitute” nakkušša/i-, but more importantly the

33. *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, 20. As called to my attention by the author, Ilya Yakubovich (“Anatolian Names in -wiya and the Structure of Empire Luvian Onomastics,” in *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*, ed. Alice Mouton and Ian Rutherford, forthcoming, note 19), based on his new analysis of feminine names in -wiya-, now suggests that Tunnawiya, characterized in KBo 21.1 i 1 as a practitioner of Hattuša, may have been a Luvian speaker, but native to Hattuša. However, I must insist that the incantation in CTH 409 shows the Kizzuwatna dialect, while the text KBo 21.1, whose author Tunnawiya is said to be from Hattuša, shows no elements pointing to its being a Luvian ritual. These facts can be interpreted in more than one fashion. First, it is not assured that all the rituals attributed to Tunnawiya refer to a single practitioner (contra Mandred Hutter, “Aspects of Luvian Religion,” in *The Luwians*, ed. H. Craig Melchert [Leiden: Brill, 2003], 247–49). Those with no Luvian elements could be attributed to the Tunnawiya of Hattuša (whose name does not require that she was a Luvian native speaker). Alternatively, the characterization of Tunnawiya in KBo 21.1 as “of Hattuša” could reflect precisely the move of a Luvian practitioner of Kizzuwatna or the Lower Land to Hattuša, as envisioned by Yakubovich (see below). Finally, it is again possible that some rituals attributed to Tunnawiya are creations of Hattuša scribes.
34. *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, 15–73.
purely Hurrian ritual term *keldi*- “well-being” (*KUB* 35.18 i 14 and *KBo* 29.3+4 i 8). However, there are no Hurrian elements in the extant parts of the *dupadupaša* ritual, also attributed to Kuwatalla, and with themes that find no mention in the *šalli aniur*.\(^3^5\) Even if we may be skeptical about putting too much weight on the notion of Kuwatalla as the “author” of these rituals, their common attribution to her would hardly have been plausible if the Hittite scribes in Hattuša had regarded them as belonging to entirely separate traditions.

It is true that none of the rituals with mixed Hurrian and Luvian elements can be shown to be older than the early Empire, while a few of those with Kizzuwatna Luvian incantations such as Zarpiya must have been composed in the early MH/late OH period. However, it is unlikely that the latter are from earlier than the reign of Tuthaliya I, and Kuwatalla is at least contemporary with Arnuwanda I and Ašmunikal (and perhaps even Tuthaliya I). Furthermore, several of the rituals with Kizzuwatna Luvian incantations also date from the early Empire period. There is thus no significant chronological difference in the two types of “Kizzuwatna” rituals.

Yakubovich plausibly suggests that the differences in the two types of rituals from Kizzuwatna reflect independent modes of transfer to Hattuša.\(^3^6\) For those with Hurrian elements, he accepts the scenario of Miller\(^3^7\) by which texts first recorded in Kizzuwatna were copied by Hittite scribes for use (and reuse) in Hattuša. Yakubovich stresses that all texts with references to “tablets of Kizzuwatna” are of the Hurro-Luvian type (*KBo* 21.37+ Ro! 14 and 17 = *CTH* 479.3, and the birth ritual *KBo* 17.65 Ro 38–39 and Vo 45–46 = *CTH* 489).\(^3^8\) However, Yakubovich argues that the rituals with incantations in Kizzuwatna Luvian but no Hurrian elements reflect migration of practitioners from Kizzuwatna to Hattuša, where these texts are first recorded. The rituals in the form we have them are the work of the Hattuša scribes and probably underwent considerable redaction. Furthermore, their existence in the state archives suggests that they belonged in some sense to the context of the royal court. I therefore hesitate to stress their “private” character,\(^3^9\) but the fundamentally
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38. Since the ritual of the *pūhugari*-ox for Muršili’s aphasia is performed in Kum-manni, it is virtually certain that the “ancient wooden tablet” referred to there (*KUB* 15.36+ Vo 29–30) is another Kizzuwatna tablet (see Miller, *Kizzuwatna Rituals*, 513).
correct and coherent grammar of the Kizzuwatna Luvian passages must ultimately reflect dictation by native speakers.\(^{40}\) That the incantations show some instances of “interference” from the Empire Luvian of the Hattuša scribes.\(^{41}\) is unsurprising. I stress that dictation at some point of the individual incantations does not mean that the rituals as a whole in the form that we find them represent dictation by the named practitioner as their opening phrases often imply.

### Luvian Rituals from Western Anatolia

As properly emphasized by Yakubovich,\(^{42}\) rituals from western Anatolia differ from both kinds of Kizzuwatna rituals. Aside from that ascribed to Ašhella of Hapalla (\(CTH\) 394), all are said to be from Arzawa, so I will for convenience refer henceforth to Arzawan rituals. It is hardly surprising that these contain no Hurrian elements, but they also contain no incantations in any form of Luvian and remarkably few Luvianisms. Yakubovich argues that the rituals we have reflect Arzawan practitioners in Hattuša\(^{43}\)—similar to the situation for Kuwatalla and other practitioners from Kizzuwatna—but he then finds it difficult to account for the fact that the Arzawan practitioners chose to “perform” in Hittite.\(^{44}\) Given that the “songs” from Ištanuwa and Lallupiya do contain Luvian incantations (almost certainly in a different dialect from that of Kizzuwatna or Empire Luvian), I find unconvincing the notion that the situation of the Arzawan rituals represents a fundamentally different attitude towards code-switching and the use of the local language to address local deities.

I suggest rather that the lack of any Luvian incantations and rarity even of isolated Luvian technical terms in “Arzawan” rituals reflects that knowledge in Hattuša of the ritual practices of Arzawa was very indirect. That is, the rituals we have that are attributed to Arzawan practitioners are entirely products of the scribes in Hattuša, based on secondhand knowledge at best of what was actually practiced in Arzawa. While Šuppiluliuma I already campaigned against Arzawa,\(^{45}\) we know that Arzawa was only conquered and made part of the Hittite Empire by
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40. Thus with Yakubovich, ibid. 280
41. E.g., ibid., 28–29.
42. Ibid., 100–104.
43. Ibid., 102–3.
44. Ibid., 104.
Muršili II. Hittite access to Arzawan ritual practices before the time of Muršili could hardly have been as profound and ongoing as that to the Kizzuwatna rituals (both kinds).

Nevertheless, the linguistic features of several of the rituals attributed to Arzawan practitioners are entirely parallel to those of Kizzuwatna. The much-copied ritual of Āllī shows some archaisms pointing to composition in the early MH/late OH period: \textit{n=ez} (KUB 24.9 i 26 and ii 6), particle \textit{-pa} (iii 8), Pret1Pl \textit{iššūen} (i 23), transitive mediopassives \textit{tuḫaša} (iii 4) and \textit{ḫandanda} (iv 12; thus for \textit{ḫaddanda} “they prick”). Other rituals clearly were composed in the early Empire period, before Muršili II. The Ritual of Paškuwatti shows one second-person nominal sentence without the reflexive \textit{-za} (KUB 9.27 ii 3–4) beside several with it, the older NSg \textit{antuwaḫaš} (ibid. ii 14), the older stem \textit{šaklin} (ibid. i 28.29), \textit{parna päiwani} (KUB 7.5 ii 4), the older shape \textit{išš}- for the iterative of “do, make” (KUB 7.5 ii 5.20.iv 21), and frequent use of enclitic possessive pronouns (though often redundantly doubled by the enclitic dative pronoun). One must conclude with Hoffner\cite{47} that the composition dates to the “pre-NH” or “MH” (i.e., “late MH/early Empire”) period. The Ritual of the augur Maddunani (\textit{CTH} 425.1) cannot be a NH composition, given the \textit{athematic} supine \textit{iššūwan} (KUB 7.54 ii 6 = KUB 54.65 + IBOT 4.16 ii 15).\cite{48} Other rituals attributed to western Anatolia show no diagnostic features of early Empire Hittite and could have been composed in New Hittite, although their transmission only in late copies may have eliminated any earlier features: Ašhella of Hapalla (\textit{CTH} 394), Uhhamuwa (\textit{CTH} 410), Tapalazunauli (\textit{CTH} 424), Dandanku (\textit{CTH} 425.2).

The suggested indirect and perhaps even remote connection to Arzawan ritual practice is also shown by the extremely low number of Luvianisms in any of these rituals. That attributed to Ašhella of Hapalla has not a single one. The very lengthy and relatively well attested Ritual of Āllī shows only the Luvian dative plural \textit{dMarwayanza} (KUB 24.11 ii 8; KUB 24.9 ii 27 is faulty). Paškuwatti’s Ritual has not a single Luvian appellative; only the name of the goddess appealed to is Luvian (\textit{dUliliyašši-}). Tapalazunauli has the solitary Luvian verb \textit{zuwānun} “I fed” (Hittitized Pret1Sg in KUB 41.17 ii 15). Finally, the Ritual of Maddunani contains the name of the ritual itself \textit{SÍSKUR mūran=za} (KUB 7.54 i 4) and a bread name \textit{NINDA ūulliti-} (i 6).

\footnote{46. Ibid., 188–92.}
\footnote{47. Paškuwatti’s ritual against sexual impotence (\textit{CTH} 406). \textit{AuOr} 5 (1987) 279–80.}
whose morphology shows it clearly to be Luvian. I contend that these very few Luvianisms do not reflect Arzawan practitioners' imitation of Hittite practice, but rather Hittite scribes' extremely limited knowledge of the Luvian of actual Arzawan ritual practice.

**Summation**

There is no evidence to support the idea that differences in the use of Luvian in various Luvian-based rituals in Hattuša are based on chronology. Current available facts argue that all three types of “Luvian” rituals attested in Hattuša (Kizzuwatna rituals with Hurrian elements, rituals with Kizzuwatna Luvian incantations but no Hurrian, and rituals attributed to Arzawan practitioners) date from what has traditionally been labeled “Middle Hittite.” More precisely, each of the three types attests a few rituals that must have been composed in the early MH/late OH period, on historical grounds surely in the reign of Tuthaliya I. However, a far larger number in each group were composed in the late MH/early Empire period (Arnuwanda I through Šuppiluliuma I), reusing older written materials. In the case of the Hurrian-influenced Kizzuwatna rituals, these materials probably originated in Kizzuwatna itself, being recopied and then reused by Hattuša scribes. The absence of any overt Hurrian elements and the largely grammatical form of the incantations in Kizzuwatna Luvian shown by the purely Luvian rituals from Kizzuwatna suggest that these reflect a much more direct interaction with the practitioners, probably in Hattuša itself—even if the texts in which they are embedded may have been considerably manipulated by the Hattuša scribes before reaching the form in which we have them. As to the Hattuša rituals attributed to Arzawa, one may reasonably doubt how much direct knowledge Hattuša scribes had of actual Arzawan ritual practices. Pending the happy discovery of relevant written materials from western Anatolia, we must take seriously the possibility that the extant “Arzawan” rituals were all composed in Hattuša by scribes whose knowledge of Arzawan rituals was based on indirect transmission, perhaps on little more than hearsay and general reputation.


50. Contra Yakubovich, *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, 104. Yakubovich himself (104–7) actually casts serious doubt on whether Arzawa was Luvian-speaking, raising the possibility of an early form of Carian instead.