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SHAPINUWA, THE HURRIANS, HURRIAN AND HITTITE RITUALS

(Torino, July 3, 2017 - University of Torino)
THE COMPOSITION AND TRANSMISSION OF THE ITKALZI RITUAL

1. Introduction

The project devoted to the publication of the Hurrian texts found at Ortaköy/Šapinuwa has given rise to a new impulse also in the research study of the itkalzi ritual. The archives at Building A in Šapinuwa preserved many tablets and fragments belonging to this ritual and some of them duplicate texts found in Ḫattuṣa and already published by V. Haas in the first volume of the Hurrian Corpus.1 V. Haas argued that there were two recensions of this ritual, namely a 22 tablet recension, which was quoted in the colophon of texts Chs I/1 7 and 8, but was not surely documented in any Boğazköy document, and a ten tablet version. According to V. Haas, tablets Chs I/1 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 belonged to the latter version, and Chs I/1 9 was the tenth and last tablet of said recension, as stated in the colophon.2

The discovery of a tablet at Ortaköy, whose colophon labels it as the eleventh tablet of the itkalzi, confirmed that a recension longer than the ten tablet edition actually existed.3 Upon re-examination of all the itkalzi tablets, striking is the division into two different groups:

1) some tablets explicitly mention Tutḫaliya II/Tašmi-Šarri and Tadu-Ḫeba as the ritual patrons; the incantations and also those portions of text describing the performed ritual actions and offerings are in Hurrian.

2) Other tablets contain long descriptive portions in Hittite, whereas only the incantations are in Hurrian. All the texts of this second group do not refer to Tutḫaliya II/Tašmi-Šarri and Tadu-Ḫeba, but to an anonymous ritual patron.4

2. The Recensions of the itkalzi Ritual

A cross-analysis of the best preserved tablets and colophons of the itkalzi supports the assumption that there were other recensions aside from the two editions recognized by V. Haas.5 Two aspects are common to all the colophons of this ritual: a) the lack of the name of the scribe who wrote the tablet; b) the sequence number of the tablet and the information whether or not the series is complete.6 A part the two aforementioned elements, the preserved colophons of the itkalzi do not follow a standard pattern, but among them, however, a few differences can be recognized.

2.1) The 22 Tablet Recension: the Ritual performed for Tašmi-Šarri and Tadu-Ḫeba.

Since the 22 tablet recension is the longest, it is presumably the original and most complete edition of the itkalzi. If we acknowledge this assumption, the 22 tablet recension should be the Hurrian text that records the ritual performed for King Tašmi-Šarri and Queen Tadu-Ḫeba.

The 11th tablet, which was found at Ortaköy and, clearly, does not belong to the 10 tablet recension, supports this assumption, in that it is written in Hurrian and refers to the aforementioned king and queen as the ritual patrons.7 If we consider these two aspects as markers of the original 22 tablet recension, one might identify other tablets as belonging to the same recension, namely, the 3rd tablet (Or 90/1494 and its duplicates), Chs I/1 20, Chs I/1 6 and the 11th tablet, although the sequence of the tablets that is presented here remains hypothetical.8

---

1 See de Martino, MURAT, SÜEL 2013.
2 See de Martino, SÜEL 2015, 15-17; de Martino 2016.
4 See Waal 2015, 525-528); the colophon of KUB 32 19 (Chs I/1 41), which W. Waal includes in her overview of the itkalzi colophons, in my opinion does not belongs to this ritual, see also Campbell 2016, 341 n. 17.
5 See de Martino, MURAT, SÜEL 2013.
6 See de Martino 2016.
The 3rd Tablet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>Colophon</th>
<th>Find Spot</th>
<th>Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Or 90/1494</td>
<td>preserved</td>
<td>Ortaköy Bd. A</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aBoT 37 + = Chs I/1 19</td>
<td>not preserved</td>
<td>Bog. Bk. Bd. A</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 20 124 = Chs I/1 23</td>
<td>not preserved</td>
<td>Bog. Bk r/16</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 14 136 = Chs I/1 21 + KBo 43 60 = Chs I/1 8 242</td>
<td>not preserved</td>
<td>Bog. Bk area of Bd. A</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 27 102 = Chs I/1 25</td>
<td>not preserved</td>
<td>Bog. Bk. Bd. A</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The colophon:
Or 90/1494

\[
\begin{align*}
28' & \text{DUB} 3^\text{KAM} \text{Ú-UL QA-T[I ŠA SISKUR]} \text{SISKUR} \text{it-kal-zı-ya-aš} \\
29' & \text{a-iš} \text{[š]}u-up-pi-yaf-[ă]-hu-wa-aš \text{A-N4 ÕTU}^{10} \text{-at-kän} \\
30' & \text{KAXU}-a_{z} \text{pa-ra-a} \text{[I-NA ÕRÜZi-it-ḫa-ra]} \\
31' & \text{I}-\text{N}^{\text{A}} \text{BURU}_{\text{a}a} \text{.a}_{z} \text{[ni-ya-u-en ]}
\end{align*}
\]

The 3rd tablet, which is written in Hurrian, contains a long incantation aimed at purifying Tadu-ḫeba’s body. The Queen is explicitly mentioned as the ritual patron. King Tutḫaliya/Tašmi-šarri’s name does not occur in this tablet, but we cannot exclude that it might have been present in the lost portions of the text. The ritualist, who declaimed said incantations, spoke of Tadu-ḫeba using the 3rd person singular. The preserved portions of the third tablet contain only incantations, and there are no descriptions of any actions performed.\(^9\)

Diagnostic signs recognizable in the manuscripts Or 90/1494 + , Chs I/1 19, Chs I/1 21 + and Chs I/1 25 show MH forms, whereas only Chs I/1 23 can be dated to the 13th century BC.\(^11\) Hence, the latter clearly belongs to a more recent set of tablets.

There are very few differences that can be recognized among the five manuscripts:

- a) Only the most recent manuscript, KBo 20 124 + (= Chs I/1 23) shows the name of Queen Tadu-Ḫeba, spelled as Dadu-Ḫeba.\(^12\) The same spelling of this queen’s name also occurs in the so-called Offering Lists,\(^13\) whereas, to my knowledge, it is not found in any other text or fragment of the itkalzi ritual. This might mean that the the 13th century scribe who wrote the tablet Chs I/1 23 ignored that the Hurrian obstruent /T/ was voiceless in a word-initial position.\(^14\)

- b) Text ABoT 37 +\(^14\) documents the expression za-ap-ka-u-šu, whereas KBo 14 136 + I 7’ has the form za-ap-Ku-ku-ša (sapk=ol=ó=sše=a). The latter, presumably, is the right one (< a verbal root sapk + ol+ the derivational suffix sše + the essive suffix); this passage is fragmentary and a full comprehension of this part of the text is unfortunately not possible.\(^15\)

- c) Manuscript ABoT 37 + diverges in another passage too; the verbal form šeg=al=o=l=ae=ž occurs in KBo 20 124 + I 14’, whereas ABoT 37 + preserves the expression šeg=al=o=l=ae=ž=nna.\(^16\) Said verbal expression does not appear with the enclitic pronoun -nna in any other analogous sentences of the text, where it usually occurs with two other verbs, namely, kažl=ó=æ/k=ážl=ó=æ=ž, eg(i)=ó=sše(i)=ó=æ=ž/k=ážl=ó=æ=ž.\(^17\)

Chs I/1 20\(^18\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Colophon</th>
<th>Find Spot</th>
<th>Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KUB 23 40 (+)</td>
<td>not preserved</td>
<td>Bog. Bk. Bd. A</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 20 133 =</td>
<td>not preserved</td>
<td>Bog. Bk. Bd. A</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The colophon of this fragmentary tablet written in Hurrian is not preserved; despite this, the discovery of the third tablet among the Hurrian texts found at Ortaköy supports the assumption that text Chs I/1 20 and the third tablet, as well, are part of the same recension of the itkalzi ritual. As a matter of fact, Chs I/1 20 contains an incantation aimed at purifying Tuttaliya’s body, which is almost identical to the one recorded in the third tablet. The same sentences and words occur in the incantations documented in both of the aforementioned texts. The third tablet and Chs I/1 20 can be considered twin texts, with the only difference that the third tablet refers to the queen, whereas Chs I/1 20 refers to the king.\(^19\)

---

\(^9\) See de Martino, Süel 2015.
\(^10\) See de Martino, Süel 2015.
\(^11\) Ibidem, 9-12.
\(^12\) See de Martino, Süel 2015, 89.
\(^13\) See Carruba 2008, 140.
\(^14\) Text AI 1 9’, de Martino, Süel 2015, 58.
\(^15\) See de Martino – Süel 2015, 38.
\(^16\) Text A 1 + 2 I 41’I 2’, de Martino, Süel 2015, 44.
\(^17\) See Campbell 2015a, 192-193 for these verbal forms.
\(^18\) See de Martino 2016.
\(^19\) See de Martino 2016.
The colophon: iv

34' [DUB x]KAM Ú-UL QA-TI ŠA SISKUR.SISKUR it-kal-zī,-ya-aš
35' [a-iš šu-úš-pí-pí-ya-aš-h[u-w]a-aš A-NA DUTUîš -at-kān
37' [a-ni-ya-u-]en nu-uš-ša-an ke-e-da-ni tup-p[i-]ya ū<-i>-te-na-aš
38' [hē-u-], wa-aš-ša, ÚDU xKam iv 33 [duB ˹x (= 2, 3 ??)~]

ChS I/1 6, written in Hurrian, is the last tablet, where rainwater is used as the magic substance, as stated in the colophon.20 The ritual patron is Queen Tadu-Ḫeba, whose name often occurs in this text. The mention of Tadu-Ḫeba as the ritual patron, the long incantations and the fact that the text is in Hurrian, support the assumption that this tablet might belong to a different set of tablets.

The wording and content of the colophon are the same in ChS I/1 6 and the third tablet, as well, but they are presumed to belong to two different sets of tablets, unless we suppose that they were part of the same set of tablets that would eventually end up in Ḥattuša and Sapinuwa.

The colophon:

iv 33 [DUB x]KAM Ú-UL QA-TI ŠA SISKUR.SISKUR it-kal-zī,-ya-aš
34 [a-iš šu-úš-pí-pí-ya-aš-h[u-w]a-aš A-NA DUTUîš -at-kān
36 [a-ni-ya-u-]en nu-uš-ša-an ke-e-da-ni tup-p[i-]ya ū<-i>-te-na-aš
37 [hē-u-], wa-aš-ša, ÚDU xKam iv 33 [duB ˹x (= 2, 3 ??)~]

The 11th tablet, written in Hurrian25, documents the tugalzi ritual.26 Said word refers to a purifying materia magica and to the rites performed using it, as well. Queen Tadu-Ḫeba is the ritual patron, but the name of her husband Tašmi-Sarri also occurs in this tablet. The purification of the queen’s body seems to be the main topic of this text too.27

The colophon differs from the one documented in the two aforementioned documents, namely, the third tablet and ChS I/1 6; thus, Or 90/393 might belong to a different set of tablets.

2.2) The Recension of the “Great itkalzi Ritual” for an Anonymous Ritual Patron:

The 2nd or 3rd (?) Tablet28

The colophon:

iv 33 [DUB x]KAM Ú-UL QA-TI ŠA SISKUR.SISKUR it-kal-zī,-ya-aš
34 [a-iš šu-úš-pí-pí-ya-aš-h[u-w]a-aš A-NA DUTUîš -at-kān
36 [a-ni-ya-u-]en nu-uš-ša-an ke-e-da-ni tup-p[i-]ya ū<-i>-te-na-aš
37 [hē-u-], wa-aš-ša, ÚDU xKam iv 33 [duB ˹x (= 2, 3 ??)~]

The Šapinuwa tablet Or 90/1473 and its duplicate ChS I/1 5 are labelled as belonging to the “Great itkalzi Ritual”. The expression “… tablet, not fini…” occurs only in the colophons of the two aforementioned texts. V. Haas (1984) gave a different reading of the first line of the colophon of ChS I/1 5: [DUB 2.KAM Ú-UL QA-TI it-kal-zī,-ya-aš-ma-aš and translated this passage as: “[Die 2. Tafel. nicht beendet (ist die serie)]”.

The Šapinuwa tablet Or 90/1473 and its duplicate ChS I/1 5 are labelled as belonging to the “Great itkalzi Ritual”. The expression “… tablet, not fini…” occurs only in the colophons of the two aforementioned texts. V. Haas (1984) gave a different reading of the first line of the colophon of ChS I/1 5: [DUB 2.KAM Ú-UL QA-TI it-kal-zī,-ya-aš-ma-aš and translated this passage as: “[Die 2. Tafel. nicht beendet (ist die serie)]”. However, I share W. Waal’s assumption (2015, 526) that the last visible sign on...
this line should be read as the logogram GAL. The colophon is fragmentary and the sequence number of the tablet is also partially damaged; it might be read as either “2” or “3”.30

Or 90/1473 and ChS I/1 5 are part of a “fill in the blanks” ritual, which could be performed for any ritual patron. The described rites are related to the pure water of the itkalzi of some deities. The tablet contains descriptive portions written in Hittite and recitations in Hurrian.31 A large Hurrian portion of this text (i 43-67) preserves an evocation of springs and rivers. Another long passage written in Hurrian contains an incantation aimed to summon all the gods, and rivers. Another long passage written in Hurrian contains descriptive portions written in Hittite and recitations in Hurrian.31 A large Hurrian portion of this text (i 43-67) preserves an evocation of springs and rivers. Another long passage written in Hurrian contains an incantation aimed to summon all the gods, and rivers. Another long passage written in Hurrian contains an incantation aimed to summon all the gods, and rivers.

Both manuscripts (Or 90/1473 and ChS I/1 5) date to the 14th century; only one discrepancy can be found in comparing them: the colophon of Or 90/1473 mentions the town Zit̠hara, whereas the place name Zitpar̠a is preserved in ChS I/1 5. Zitpar̠a might be a variant of Zidapar̠a, a town mentioned in two passages of the Deeds of Suppiluliuma I.32 However, since the former name Zit̠hara occurs in many other colophons of the itkalzi, Zitpar̠a might be a mistake, due to the fact that the scribe, writing down from dictation, misunderstood the right place name.33

2.3) The Ten Tablet Recension for Either a Male or a Female Anonymous Ritual Patron.

The Tenth and Last Tablet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Colophon</th>
<th>Find Spot</th>
<th>Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KUB 29 8 = ChS I/1 9 + KBo 33 43 + KBo 33 113 = ChS I/8 264</td>
<td>preserved</td>
<td>Bog. Bk. Bd. A</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The colophon:
iv 36 DUB 10th AM QA-IT ŠA SISKUR.SISKUR it-kal-zî-aš
37 a-îš šu-up-pî-ya-ah-hu-wa-aš
38 A-NA "UTU2"-ya-at-kān I-NA ḪUR.Zi-it-ḫa-ra
39 I-NA BURU14 KAXU-az pa-ra-a a-ni-ya-u-er

ChS I/1 9 is a long, well preserved tablet written in Hittite and Hurrian.31 It contains a ritual for an anonymous ritual patron. The expression “he/she pronounces the name of the ritual patron in a loud voice” occurs in three passages (iv 10, 18, 23), when the ritualist recites an incantation.

Said tablet has one distinctive and unusual feature in that it differs from all the other itkalzi texts; in fact, only this text provides the option to have either a man or a woman as the ritual patron (i 3, 6; 50, 51; ii 8, 9; see also i 31, 59). As J. Miller34 also observed, ChS I/1 9 is “one of the most blatantly prescriptive texts”; in fact, every rite can be performed for either a man or a woman and adapted according to the gender of the ritual patron.

The rites described in the tenth and last tablet of this recension of the itkalzi start when the ritualist finishes reciting in Hurrian the words of the warši. The meaning of this word is, unfortunately, unknown.35

The rites mentioned in the first column are performed near the fireplaces of some deities. Said fireplaces are aligned along, respectively, the right and the left side of the building hosting the ritualist, the patron and the whole ceremony. The right side is for the male deities and a male ritual patron, whereas the left side is for female deities and for a female ritual patron.36

The 1st column describes also the rite of beating, or striking the kupti-object; the word kupti might be of Hurrian origin37 and could refer either to a part of the fireplace or an accessory of same.38 The kupti-object occurs in Kizzuwatnean rituals and plays a significant role in the Ammiḫatna ritual.39

The presence of the kupti-rite in both rituals, namely ChS I/9 and the Ammiḫatna text, led R. Strauss40 to assume that the former ritual might have derived from the latter one. Since the colophon of ChS I/1 9 labels this text as part of the itkalzi and the Hurrian portions of it recall passages of said ritual, we can safely assume that the composition to which it belongs indeed derived from the itkalzi ritual and not from the Ammiḫatna ritual. Despite this, we can assume that both of these texts “derived from the common

30 DE MARTINO, SUEL 2017.
32 DE MARTINO, SUEL 2017.
34 See HAAS 1984, 65.
36 MILLER 2004, 504.
37 See HAAS 2003, 780.
38 See HAAS 2010, 166-167; A. ARCHI (2013, 9-10), commenting on this passage, argued that a division of the deities by gender seems to be innovation introduced by western Syrian Hurrians.
41 Ibidem, 79-92; MURAT 2008.
42 STRAUSS 2006, 187.
ritual tradition of Hurrian-North Syrian origin”, as P. Taracha argued.43

When the kupti-rite ends, a billy-goat, a goat and a calf are released as “scape-goats” in order to cast off the evil.44 The following part of the text (i 48-60) describes more ritual actions performed near the fire-places. This portion of the ritual distinguishes between a male ritual patron and a female one: the male ritual patron takes place on the throne of Tešob, whereas a female ritual patron sits on the footstool of Ḫebat. Ritual actions, which differ according to the gender of the ritual patron, are even mentioned in the ll. ii 6-11. The ritualist waves an eagle and other birds over the ritual patron, and then, if the latter is a man, he shoots an arrow, whereas a female ritual patron only puts her hand on the bow and the ritualist shoots the arrow.

The ritualist pours the water of purity onto the ritual patron and recites in Hurrian: “The water of Ḫebat shall purify you, that is, your body! Furthermore, your body (ii 29-31)”.45

Later on, the ritualist pronounces “(the words) of the water of Ḫebat” in the same way, but the text does not preserve said incantation (ii 32). It might have been omitted because it was very similar to the previous one, however, if this is the case, we cannot understand why the words of the water of Šaušga and Nabarbi occur in the following paragraph (ii 33-35), repeating exactly the same invocation as the one already mentioned in the ll. 29-31: “Furthermore, the waters of Šaušga and Nabarbi shall purify you, namely, your body”.46

After a long recitation in Hurrian that is preserved on the first lines of the third column, silver becomes the employed purifying substance and its cathartic power is invoked.47 The text explicitly says that the name of the ritual patron is pronounced, but no name is specified here, and this shows that the ritual was not performed for one specific ritual patron, but possibly for any patient. The invocation recited stresses the analogy between the natural purity of silver and the purification of the ritual patron: “as silver is pure/clear (and) strong ……… so/now you, the ritual patron” (i 53').

Passages of the 22 tablet recension of the itkalzi might have been learnt and memorized by the ritual expert or scribe to whom the text of the reduced recension according to their colophons, namely, Chs i/1 9 might have been written by scribes, who did not have a perfect knowledge of the Hurrian language.48

2.4) The Recension Reduced from the 22 Tablet Edition.

Three tablets might be considered as belonging to said recension according to their colophons, namely, Chs I/1 7, 8 and KBo 53 226.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taracha 2011</td>
<td>281.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton 2014</td>
<td>227; 260-261.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell 2015a</td>
<td>213.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell 2015a</td>
<td>213.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUB 32 51</td>
<td>KBo 27 92 (+) KBo 21 24 (+) KBo 20 142 (+) KBo 27 177 (= ChS I/8 265); this text shows a MH script.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell 2015a</td>
<td>214-215.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chs i/1 7 = the 4th Tablet

The colophon:

1' DUB 4 KAM [ŠA SISKUR.SIS][KUR it-kal-zi-ya-aš]
2' A-NA [UTU]57-ya-at-kán KAxU-az, [ ]
4' a-ni-ya-u-en Ū-UL QA-T[?]
5' DUB 22.KAM ku-it [URU]Ša-[pi-nu-wa-az ú-te-er]
6' na-as-ta ke-e [TUP-P]Aḫ[ia-pi-z-za ar-ḫa]
7' ḫa-an-te-u-ra-u-en

Chs i/1 7 is a very badly damaged tablet that preserves only nine lines (in Hurrian) on the first column and the colophon (in Hittite) at the end of the fourth column.

Chs i/1 8

The colophon:

7' [DUB] x KAM Ū-UL QA-TI ŠA SISKUR.SISKUR it<kal>-zi-[y][a-aš]
8' [A-NA] [UTU]57-ya-at-kán KAxU-az [URU]Zi-[i]-ḫa-ra] [I-N[A] BURU₄, pa-ra-a]
10' [tu]-[p]-pi-ya GIS*ERIN* GIS-pa-a-i-in-na-aš-ša
11' [me]-[j]-mi-ya-nu-[u]-š zi-in-[n]-a-an-te-[eš (one line blank)
12' [D]UB 22.KAM ku-it [URU]Ša-[pi-nu-wa-az ú-te-e-[e[r]
13' [n]-a-as-ta ke-e *TUP-P]Aḫ[ia-pi-z-za ar-ḫa]
14' [ar]-ḫa Ŧa-an-te-u-ra-u-en

Only part of the third column (in Hurrian) and the colophon on the fourth column are preserved in Chs i/1 8. V. Haas argued that the sign, which is almost totally damaged at the beginning of l. 7’, might be read as “5” and his opinion is shared by W. Waal. There are visible traces only of the head of a vertical wedge. Hence, it is not certain whether the sequence number is indeed “5”. Cedar and tamarisk are the magic substances mentioned in this colophon.

2.5) To sum up, I am of the opinion that different types of colophons did, indeed, correspond to different recensions of the itkalzi ritual. The “22 Tablet Recension” might record the ritual performed for Tutḫaliya ii and Tadu-ḫeba, and four tablets could be attributed to said series. The “Ten Tablet Recension” is documented in Chs i/1 9, which is the last tablet of this series. As was mentioned above, since said text has one distinctive feature, it makes me think that it may be part of a different version of the itkalzi. The “Great itkalzi Recension” is presumably another composition reduced from the original one and adapted for an anonymous ritual patron. In my opinion, the label “Great itkalzi” might even refer to a recension that, although derived from the complete edition of the ritual, might have been a more detailed version compared to the “Ten Tablet Recension.”

As was already said, Or 90/1473 and Chs i/1 5 are two manuscripts of the “Great itkalzi Recension”; in these texts there are portions that derive from similar passages documented in Chs i/1 6, which might have been part of the original 22 tablet edition. This is true of the long invocation of springs and rivers, which is
documented in the 1st column of ChS 1/1 6 and in the 1st column of text Or 90/1473 = ChS 1/1 5.

As to the comparison between the original itkalzi composition and the derived ones, I hereby quote an example, which is significant in my opinion. The mountain Lebanon (Lablahhi) occurs in ChS 1/1 6 ii 1-4, whereas said mountain name is wrongly spelled as Laḫlahhi in ChS 1/1 5 ii 23-25. As D. Campbell argued, "proper nouns represent a class of word forms that … have less canonical spelling, as they are not emphasised during scribal training". Hence, mistakes occurring in this place name, as well as in the case of Zitḫara and Zitparḫa (see § 2.2), might be a consequence of the fact that the scribe either wrote from dictation, or else inaccurately recalled texts he had learnt.

3) Who, Where, Why?

As is well known, starting with King Tutḫaliya I, the Hittite court shew a great interest in Hurrian culture. King Arnuwanda I encouraged the diffusion of Hurrian texts among the court circles, and the Hurrian tradition was given great prominence at the time of his follower, Tutḫaliya II.

King Tutḫaliya II/Tašmi-Šarri and Queen Taduhèba are the ritual patrons in the tablets belonging to the Hittite recension. This supports the assumption that said royal couple requested the Hurrian itkalzi purification ritual be performed for them for the first time.

It is generally assumed that the itkalzi might have derived from the Kizzuwatnean ritual tradition. A passage in a tablet catalogue (KUB 30 47 + KBo 31 25 i 7') mentions the word itkalzi. Said passage is fragmentary and we cannot say in which context it occurred, but the other entries in this catalogue refer to personages, deities and place names all related to Kizzuwatna, such as, King Piliya of Kizzuwatna (i 12'-13'), Šaušga of the Mount Amanus (i 5'), the Weather God of Kummani (i 13') and the ritualist Ammiḫatna (i 8').

The springs and rivers mentioned in the evocation preserved in ChS 1/1 6 and in the reduced recension documented in Or 90/1473 and ChS 1/1 5 refer to a wide geographical area, which comprehends the Tur-'Abdin region, the more southern region of the Lower Zab and the north-western territories of Syria. Said area corresponds to the whole extension of the Mittanian Kingdom; hence, the aforementioned evocation of springs and rivers presumably goes back to a literary and/or religious Mittanian tradition, which might have been known at the court of Kizzuwatna.

The possible scenario whereby Kizzuwatnean rituals reached the Hittite court has already been the subject of several in-depth analyses. J. Miller offered a comprehensive reconstruction of the processes of how the rituals of Kizzuwatnean tradition were first recorded at Ḫattuša; he assumed that the textual material, originally kept in the archives of Kummani, was used as the basis for ritual performances. Ritual experts might also have orally transmitted ritual repertoires that had no previous written tradition. The role played by the oral transmission of memorized literary and cult compositions, which P. Delnero assumed for some Sumerian texts, has also recently been argued with regard to Hittite documentation.

An oral transmission of, at least, part of the Kizzuwatnean ritual tradition might explain the fact that no original cuneiform tablet by Kizzuwatnean scribes was found in Ḫattuša. Anyway, Hittite scribes occasionally referred to tablets from Kizzuwatna, such as, KBo 21 37 + demonstrates. In a passage of said text, which records a ritual performed in Sapinuwa, it is stated that the offerings prescribed in an ancient tablet of Kizzuwatna (Šd urki Kizzuwatna annalli tuppí) were considered unsuitable (rev. 25).

The composition of the itkalzi ritual is not attributed to any particular expert, such as Mašṭigga, Ammiḫatna, Allaiturahji, Giziya, etc. In the preserved colophons there is no mention of the name of a ritualist to whom the “authorship” of the itkalzi may be attributed; hence, one might argue that the rites, offerings and incantations -not yet systematically part of one single ritual- were put together for the first performance of the itkalzi.

As was already said, the colophons of the itkalzi tablets document the following sentence: ANA oUtišur Aššu Lκa-ažur ŠI Zitḫara İ-NΑ BAr₃ parā anyauwen. The interpretation of the expression parā anyauwen has been an object of debate; in my opinion, it refers to the first performance of the ritual that occurred in Zitḫara. I argue that the ritual was also written down on that occasion. Reference was also made to the first performance of the ritual in the colophons of the reduced recension tablets. This, in my opinion, had the purpose of “certifying”...
that they did, in fact, derive from the original edition of the *itkalzi*.

As J. Miller71 and D. Campbell72 correctly argued, the expression KAXU=az/iššaz “from the mouth/ by dictation” cannot always be taken literally; in fact, to give an example in the case of the *itkalzi*, how can we assume that it was the king who dictated a composition to be written on 22 tablets? Said expression, instead, refers to the order given by the sovereign, who might have asked his experts to collect both the oral and written evidence that eventually was at the basis for the 22 tablet recension.

The long Hurrian incantations such as those preserved in the 3rd tablet, in ChS 1/1 20 and 6 are like doggerels, whereby certain words and sentences are repeated several times. The repetition of either same or similar sentences made learning them by heart much easier; said observation corroborates the assumption that at least some portions of the ritual might have derived from an oral tradition.

The purpose for which the *itkalzi* was performed for the first time is not yet surely known, but several clues suggest that it might have been related to the wedding of King Tuthaliya II and Tadu-Heba.73 D. Campbell74 recently proposed that the ritual might have been performed in order to increase the fertility of the royal couple. As is known, Tuthaliya II had two wives, namely, Šadandu-Heba and Tadu-Heba; the latter presumably was the mother of Henti, who married Šuppiluliuma I, whereas the former either died or was abandoned and her name was condemned to a kind of damnatio memoriae.75 I had assumed that Šadandu-Heba might have been the mother of Tuthaliya TUR;76 Šuppiluliuma’s coup d’état and the assassination of Tuthaliya TUR might, in my opinion, have been the cause of the Šadandu-Heba oblivion. Despite this, we cannot exclude that Tuthaliya TUR might have been one of the sons of the royal couple Tuthaliya II – Tadu-Heba, born after Henti, as P. Taracha argued.77

Accepting Taracha’s hypothesis, Šadandu-Heba might have been unable to have any offspring and for this reason she was possibly repudiated by her husband. Hence, when the king married his second wife, Tadu-Heba, the *itkalzi* might have been performed to give assurance that the royal couple would generate offspring. The *itkalzi* ritual indeed succeeded: Henti was born and, presumably, other children after her.78 Therefore, said ritual might have gained popularity to some extent.

The success of the performance of the *itkalzi* might explain the reason why it was also changed into a “fill in the blanks” ritual and transformed into a more simply ceremony, easier to perform, as documented in the reduced recensions. However, the purpose of the reduced recensions of the *itkalzi* cannot be determined. They might be prescriptive texts in preparation for the performance of the ritual upon request of a patron other than the royal couple, but they could also be the result of a scholarly interest in an “exotic” composition such as this one.79

As I have tried to demonstrate, there were at least three different recensions of the *itkalzi* but, as already stated, also a fourth one -preserved in texts ChS 1/1 7 and 8- might have existed. The “22 Tablet Recension” has arrived to us in at least five sets of tablets.80 All in all, the tablets belonging to said recension might have been, at least, 110. The “Great *itkalzi* Recension” is preserved in texts found in Ḫattuša and Šapinuwa; hence, they presumably belonged to two different sets of tablets. The ten tablet version is documented by ChS 1/1 9, the last tablet of this series.

In consideration of the preserved and identified three/four recensions and the chronologically different sets of tablets, one might assume that about 140 or 150 tablets labelled as *itkalzi* might have been produced between the 14th and the 13th century. The archives of Šapinuwa preserve several fragments that belong to the *itkalzi* ritual; the attribution of any small fragment to one particular recension of the *itkalzi* is, indeed, a hard task, especially when very few lines are preserved; in fact, very similar sentences occur in different tablets and portions of the ritual.

Despite the fact that there are many fragments yet to be studied, the texts of the *itkalzi* handed down to us are fewer than we had expected, especially if 140 or 150 tablets were actually produced. Moreover, none of the recensions are complete; hence, I wonder whether some parts of the ritual might have, indeed, been preserved up until the collapse of the Hittite kingdom, whereas other tablets might have been discarded already during the 13th century. The selection of the tablets to be preserved and also copied might have been carried out according to the interest in certain Hurrian incantations and recitatives still in circulation at the time of Ḫattušili II and Pudu-Heba, although the *itkalzi* ritual, presumably, was no longer known in its complete original form at that time.

71 Miller 2004, 476 and n. 797.
72 Campbell 2015b, 69.
73 See de Martino 2010, 96.
75 Taracha 2016.
76 Ibidem 2016.
77 Concerning the scholarly purpose for copying and writing ritual texts see Christiansen 2006, 29-30; Marcuson, van den Hout 2016.
79 The third tablet is documented by five different manuscripts.
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