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Speiseverbot (food prohibition/taboo).

B. Bei den Hethitern.

The best-known reference to a dietary taboo in the Bogazköy tablets is the self-exculpatory plea from the prayer of Kantuzzili*: "I never ate that which is sacred! consecrated (suppi) to my god and not proper (for me to eat), and did not (thereby) defile my body" (KUB 30, 10 obv. 13f.; CTH 373, cf. Singer 2002, 32). Not only is it unclear whether the food avoided here was inherently forbidden for human consumption or rather an ordinary comestible ritually dedicated to divine use, but the appearance of this claim in a text adapted from Mesopot. forerunners renders its relevance to actual life in Hatti uncertain.

More securely attested Hitt. dietary prohibitions might apply to individuals in particular circumstances. Thus the ritual of Ammibatna (Ritual* B. § 4.3.2) was intended for the purification of a person in a consecrated state (suppi - a priest?) who had consumed unholy (maršam) or bewitched bread or meat, bread of (intended for?), produced by? a mausoleum (ENA), or menstrual blood (KBo. 5, 2 i 3-9; CTH 471, ed. Strauß 2006, 220, 233; cf. Haas 2003, 136f.). In a pregnancy regimen (KBo. 17, 65+ KBo. 39, 45 obv. 17-19; CTH 489, ed. Beckman 1983, 134 [without join]), a woman in seclusion was allowed to dine with her husband, but was forbidden to consume any of his leftovers (aštanwar) or to eat TAPPINU-bread/flour or cress. The latter plant was presumably banned because of its symbolic association with barrenness (Cohen 2002, 69).

Temple personnel alone were permitted to partake of remains from the divine table, and only within three days. Distribution beyond the threshold of the temple was prohibited (KUB 15, 5 ii 6-10 and dupl.; CTH 264, ed. Taggar-Cohen 2006, 46f./73, 65f./83). Conversely, farmers and cowherds were expected to dedicate their first-fruits (büelpi) in the temple, while consuming them themselves was a (capital) crime ([SAG.DU-as] wasštu) (ibid. iv 3-8, 43-46; ed. Taggar-Cohen 2006, 64/82, 67/83f.).

Foodstuffs intended to nourish the dead (GIDIM) were strictly off-limits to the living. A liver oracle investigates an offense by which a number of persons ate up the bread and beer of a ghost (KUB 16, 16 obv. 24f.; CTH 570). A similar crime may be indicated in a damaged passage of a prayer of Muwattallı II (KBo. 11, 1 rev. 9'; CTH 382, cf. Bawanyepeck 2005, 159; Singer 2002, 84).

An unconditional taboo is seemingly reflected by the ritual of Walkui, which features the bloody sacrifice (zurki) of a fish on behalf of someone who just dreams of eating the urura-plant or pork (KBo. 32, 176 obv. 1f.; ed. Mouton 2004a; ead. 2004b, 165-167). Since this text belongs to the Kizzuwatnäen stratum of Hitt. culture, it is uncertain whether this restriction was equally felt by other elements of the population.

Finally, an entry in a catalogue text lists an unrecovered rite to be performed for an unconsecrated person (UN-as UL. šuppî) who should eat garlic (SUM.SIKIš), horse(?), meat from a kapištê-rodent, or [bread] of a mausoleum (HSM 3644+ KUB 30, 45 ii 8'-10'; ed. Dardano 2006, 130f.). The odd qualification of the patient here makes it difficult to discern whether these items were forbidden generally or only to those not enjoying a heightened state of purity.