

STUDI MICENEI ED EGEO-ANATOLICI NUOVA SERIE

5, 2019

STUDI MICENEI
ED EGEO-ANATOLICI
NUOVA SERIE

è una rivista del Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Roma

eISSN 2532-1757

eISBN 978-88-5491-015-7

Direttore / Editor

Anna D'Agata (ISPC, CNR, Roma)

Comitato Editoriale / Editorial Board

Marco Bettelli (ISPC, CNR, Roma); Maurizio Del Frio (ISPC, CNR, Roma);
Andrea Di Renzoni (ISPC, CNR, Roma); Yannis Galanakis (University of Cambridge);
Luca Girella (Università Telematica Internazionale Uninettuno, Roma); Anna Judson (University of Cambridge);
Françoise Rougemont (CNRS, Paris); Agnese Vacca (Università degli Studi di Milano)

Comitato Scientifico / Advisory Editorial Board

Mary Bachvarova (Willamette University, Salem, Oregon); Fritz Blakolmer (University of Vienna);
Harriet Blitzer (Buffalo State College, New York); John Bintliff (Leiden University);
Eva von Dassow (University of Minnesota); Birgitta Eder (Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna);
Fikri Kulakoğlu (University of Ankara); Maurizio Giangiulio (Università di Trento);
Carl Knappett (University of Toronto); Peter Pavúk (Charles University, Prague);
Jeremy B. Rutter (Dartmouth College); Recai Tekoğlu (Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir);
Andreas Vlachopoulos (University of Ioannina); Helène Whittaker (University of Gothenburg)

Stampa e distribuzione / Printing and distribution

Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon s.r.l.

Via Ajaccio 41-43 – 00198 Roma

tel. +39 0685358444, fax +39 0685833591

email: info@edizioniquasar.it

www.edizioniquasar.it

© Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche

Autorizzazione Tribunale di Roma nr. 288/2014 del 31.12.2014

SOMMARIO

<i>Oliver Dickinson</i> The Use and Misuse of the Ahhiyawa Texts	7
<i>Giampaolo Graziadio</i> Some Considerations on the Connections between Western Peloponnese and Cyprus in the Mycenaean Period	23
<i>Davide Nadali</i> Speaking Pictures, Writing Words: On the Interplay of Communication in Ancient Mesopotamia	47
<i>Laura Puértolas Rubio</i> How to Bewitch Someone: Bewitching Techniques According to Incantations in the Hittite and Luwian Ritual Texts	59
<i>Ester Salgarella</i> Non-Connective Behaviour of the Particle – <i>Qe</i> in the Linear B Documents from Pylos	71
POLITICAL BOUNDARIES AND CULTURAL CONTACTS DURING THE IRON AGE IN SOUTH-EAST ANATOLIA: CILICIA, AMUQ AND THE KARA SU VALLEY	
<i>Anna Lucia D'Agata</i> Misis (Ancient Mopsouestia) and the Plain of Cilicia in the Early First Millennium BC: Material Entanglements, Cultural Boundaries, and Local Identities	87
<i>Sabina Kulemann-Ossen, Hannah Mönninghoff</i> Hybridity of Styles: Iron Age Pottery from Sirkeli Höyük	111
<i>Marina Pucci</i> The Iron Age Sequence in the Amuq	147
<i>Sebastiano Soldi</i> The Iron Age Pottery of Zincirli Höyük: An Assemblage among Neighbouring Traditions	165

HOW TO BEWITCH SOMEONE: BEWITCHING TECHNIQUES ACCORDING TO INCANTATIONS IN THE HITTITE AND LUWIAN RITUAL TEXTS

Laura Puértolas Rubio

Summary

The purpose of this paper is to examine Anatolian religious discourses about witchcraft according to anti-witchcraft incantations in the Hittite and Luwian languages. The importance of this testimony resides in its uniqueness, given that no witchcraft rituals have been preserved from the Hittite kingdom. Consequently, these anti-witchcraft incantations constitute the most direct evidence about bewitching techniques. Through philological and contextual analysis, I will examine first the process of bewitchment, for which there was a great variety of techniques available to the bewitcher. Examples include the manipulation of anthropomorphic figurines representing the bewitched, rites of analogical magic, and curses. Second, I will address the different manners in which these anti-witchcraft texts describe witchcraft, showing the specificities of distinct local traditions and the variety of the ways in which ancient Anatolians conceived of witchcraft.

1. INTRODUCTION

No witchcraft rituals have been preserved from the Hittite kingdom.¹ The available information about bewitching techniques in Hittite Anatolia mostly comes, therefore, from anti-witchcraft ritual texts found in Hattuša and dated from the beginning until the end of the so-called Imperial Period (*ca.* 1400-1190 B.C.). Like most ritual texts, they are composed of a combination of gestures and incantations. In this paper, I will focus on incantations recorded in the Hittite and Luwian languages describing bewitching techniques. The importance of the anti-witchcraft incantations not only resides in their uniqueness as a primary source, but also in the fact that they transmit Anatolian religious discourses about witchcraft practices. Through the internal analysis of a selected group of incantations, I will address some of the ways in which ancient Anatolians conceive of witchcraft.

This paper is structured in three parts, following the three main approaches by which anti-witchcraft incantations counter bewitching techniques, which are: 1) Explaining the bewitcher's acts; 2) describing the manner in which the ritual expert returns the bewitchment against the bewitcher, and 3) quoting curses, usually against the bewitcher. These three approaches, while distinct, often appear in combination, so that incantations are not always easy to classify. Thus, this classification must remain a heuristic one for the sake of clarity.

2. ANTI-WITCHCRAFT INCANTATIONS I: DESCRIBING THE BEWITCHER'S ACTS

One of the most paradigmatic descriptions of a bewitching technique comes from the text of the substitution ritual for the king Tudhaliya, which states the following:

¹ A possible exception is the text of the ritual against the king's enemy (CTH 417.1), where a kind of voodoo practice seems to be described. Unfortunately, the text is barely preserved. A recent edition of this text can be found in Fuscagni 2016.

“[Since] a (hair from an) eyebrow, an eyelash (or a hair from the) beard was [*placed/fixed*] on Tudhaliya, (i.e.) a figurine of a young man, (so that) it (has been) bewitched, it was handed over to [you], Sun goddess of the [E]arth (...).”²

The bewitching technique described in this fragment follows the principles of voodoo.³ First, the bewitcher places some residue from the victim’s body on an anthropomorphic figurine representing the victim. This action serves to identify the figurine with the one whose likeness it bears, but it is not enough to bewitch the victim. The key resides in the handing over of the figurine to the Sun goddess of the Earth, who is the ruler of the Netherworld and the dead. This action is expressed by the verb *maniyab-* (CHD L-N, 163a; HEG II, 119; HED VI, 44; Kloekhorst 2008, 553), emphasizing the placement of the victim’s figurine under the responsibility of this goddess, which may be understood as a death sentence (Mouton 2019, 93-94). Therefore, to save the patient, the ritual expert has to retrieve the figurine together with the victim’s body residues.⁴ This ritual expert aims, in turn, to hand over the figurine to the Sun god of Heaven and the upper deities,⁵ in order to restore the natural order of the situation.

Other bewitching techniques widely attested in the Anatolian corpus are based on the principles of analogical magic. The next example from the ritual text of Šamuha presents two sequences of analogical magic that deserve our attention. In the first one, the comparison is made between the skins of an onion and a list of evil things which will be wrapped around the temple:

“Afterwards, they give him an o[nio]n and, at the same time, he speaks as follows: ‘If someone spe[ak]s in the presence of the deity in the following way: ‘Just as this onion (is) wrapped by skins, so that one (skin) does [n]ot l[e]ave the other, let also evil and perjury, curse and impurity keep wrapped that temple like (the skins of) an onion,’ now I have just peeled away this onion, [so that] I have only kept a *kāki*-stem. Likewise let him (i.e. the deity) peel away the evil thing, the perjur[y], the [c]urse (or) the impurity (from) [the prese]nce of the deit[y]! Let the deity and the ritual patron be pure from tho[se th]ings!’”⁶

In this extract, the bewitcher’s target is the temple and, consequently, the deity living in it.⁷ Also noticeable is the quotation of the bewitcher’s words. It is quite distinctive, and constitutes one of the most direct testimonies of a bewitching action. The incantation seems to be pronounced by the bewitcher while holding an onion in the presence of the deity, just like the ritual expert is doing now to counteract the bewitcher’s acts. The choice of the onion skins

2 [GIM²-a]n=wa=kan ANA ¹Tudhaliya ALAM ¹⁰GURUŠ [i]nniri laplapi zamankur [...-an] ēšta nu=war=at alwanzahhan [nu tuk K]I-aš ¹⁰UTU-i EGIR-pa maniyabhan ēšta (KUB 24.12+ ii 20-23; CTH 448.4.9.a; LNS; Taracha 2000, 88-89; CHD L-N, 167; Mouton 2019, 93). In the transcriptions, I apply the following conventions: i- or e- vocalism corresponds to the grapheme of choice in the tablet; the length marker on a vowel indicates a *scriptio plena*; the use of voiced/voiceless variant of stops follows the grapheme; the transcription for the Sumerian uncountable plural follows the convention applied by Alice Mouton, who chooses HÁ instead of H1.A, in order to attempt to introduce a coherent system within French Hittitology (see, for instance, Mouton 2016; for the readings HÁ/H1.A, see HZL, 259).

3 On this kind of bewitching technique, see Mouton 2010, 114-115. I have analyzed the role played by anthropomorphic figurines in witchcraft contexts in my contribution to the *10th International Congress of Hittitology*: “Men and Women in Wood: Representing Humans through Anthropomorphic Effigies in Hittite Rituals.”

4 nu=kan wanza pahhüenaš haš[šāš] ¹⁰Zal¹ipuraš kēdāš tarpaliuš arkammi[=ya] : mamannaten EN.SISKUR=ma=wa=mu ALAM ¹⁰GURUŠ haštāi [:] halbalzanan inniri laplipin zamankur haššaz EGIR-pa pešten, “Burning (god) of fire, [Zal]ipura [of] the heart[h], accept (pl.) these substitutes [and] (this) tribute but, from the hearth, give (pl.) me back the ritual patron, (i.e.) the effigy of the young man, (together with) the bone, the halbalzana-body part, the (hair from the) eyebrow, the eyelash (or) the (hair from the) beard!” (KUB 24.12+ iii 10’-14’; CTH 448.4.9.a; LNS; Taracha 2000, 90-91; CHD L-N 138; Mouton 2010, 114).

5 KUB 24.12+ ii 2-3, 33-34, iii 8’-9’ (Taracha 2000, 86-91).

6 EGIR-anda=ma=(š)ši š[uppiwašhar]ar^{SAR} pianzi anda=ma=kan kiššan memai mān=wa ANA PĀNI DINGIR-LIM kuiški kiššan mem[iškez]-zi kāš=wa mābhan šuppiwašhar^{SAR} hurpaštaz anda hūlaliyanza nu araš aran ar[ba U]L tarnai idālawwanzi=ya NĪŠ DINGIR-LIM=ya hurtaiš papranna[nz]aš=a ini É DINGIR-LIM šuppi[wašhan]aš iwar anda hūlaliyan hardu kinun=a kāša kūn šu[ppiw]ašhar^{SAR} arha šippanun [n=an=š] an katta 1 kākin dawanin kurkun idālu=ya uttar NĪŠ DINGIR-[LIM hu]rtaiš papratar ANA DINGIR-L[IM pera]n arha QĀTAMMA šippaid-du nu DINGIR-LUM EN.SĪSKUR=ya apē[z udd]ānaz parkuwaēš ašandu (KUB 29.7+ rev. 36-41; CTH 480.1; MS; Görke, Melzer 2016a, §18).

7 Bewitched deities also appear in the ritual of Pupuwanni (Bawanypeck 2005, 273-289).

metaphor, together with the use of the participle of the verb *hūlaliya*- “to wrap” (HW² III/II, 691b; HEG I, 278; HED III, 361; Kloekhorst 2008, 356) to depict the bewitching action, denotes the idea of witchcraft as a bond that captures and constricts the victim.⁸ This concept is reinforced by the verb *tarna*- “to release, to leave” (HEG III/I, 192; Kloekhorst 2008, 846) and the image of peeling away the bewitchment as the onion’s skins. The second sequence of analogical magic compares the “evil things” with a cord that has been twined to the left. In order to counteract the bewitchment, the ritual expert unties a cord to the right:

“If someone has do[ne] an evil thing, a perjury, a curse, or an impurity in the p[resen]ce of the deity, so that he has twined it as a cord, it has been twined to the [l]eft o[f the cord]. It is I (who) have just untied it to the right. Let the evil thing, the per[jury], the curse or the impuri[ty] not (be) in the presence of the deity nor in the ritual patron’s body anymore! [Let] the deity and the ritual patron b[e] pure from those things!”⁹

The symbolism of left and right in many traditions around the world in general and in the ancient Near East in particular is well known (Nussbaum 1962, 161; Needham 1973; Guinan 1996; Wirth 2010). In view of the negative connotation of the left side, to turn something to the left may be connected to bewitching acts, whereas to turn it to the right would have a positive meaning.¹⁰ Moreover, doing the same action in the opposite direction would also have the aim of undoing the bewitcher’s witchcraft (Mouton 2010, 121). The choice of the verbs *tarup*- “to twine, to join together” (HEG III/I, 240; Kloekhorst 2008, 850) and *la*- “to untie, to unbind” (CHD L-N, 1a; HEG II, 1; Kloekhorst 2008, 509) emphasizes the opposition between the bewitcher’s gestures and those of the ritual expert. Some scholars have compared these two sequences with the Mesopotamian *Šurpu* and *Maqlû* series and with the Namburbi rituals (Goetze 1947, 319; Strauss 2002, 326; 2006, 205-208; Haas 2003, 340; 2007b, 110-111), which present the same analogies.¹¹ Given the rarity of these kind of comparisons with the cord and the onion in the anti-witchcraft Hittite corpus and their use in Mesopotamian rituals, Rita Strauss (2006, 205-208) has suggested a Mesopotamian origin for these motifs.¹² However, at least one more example of this analogical rite with the cord is found in the text of Allaiturahhi’s ritual against witchcraft,¹³ where the Old Woman unties a cord in order to undo the bewitchment.¹⁴ The incantation preceding this gesture states:

“Whatever words the bewitching person uttered (and) twined, whatever (things) he spun, whatever (things) he did in whatever place, the bewitching person did not (properly?) know that. He built the bewitchment like

8 On the idea of the bewitchment as a bond, see Mouton 2010, 120-121 and Puértolas Rubio forthcoming. This conception also exists in Mesopotamian anti-witchcraft rituals (see Abusch, Schwemer 2011, 385 with bibliography).

9 *mān=wa A[NA PĀN]I DINGIR-LIM kuiški idālu uttar NĪŠ DINGIR-LIM hurtain papratar=(r)a i[yan] harzi n=at ŠU.SAR-aš iwar tarupta n=at A[NA ŠU.SAR G]ÜB-laz taruptat am[mug]=at kāša EGIR-pa ZAG-az lānun nu idālu uttar NĪŠ DINGIR-LIM hurtain paprā[tar]=(r)a namma ANA PĀNI DINGIR-LIM=ya lē ANA EN.ŠĪSKUR=ya=at tuēkki=(š)ši lē nu DINGIR-LUM EN.ŠĪSKUR=ya apēz uddanaz parkuwaēš aš[andu]* (KUB 29.7+ rev. 43-47; CTH 480.1; MS; Görke, Melzer 2016a, §19).

10 See, for instance, the following extract from the ritual of Maštigga against a family quarrel that shows the turning to the left of the curses and tongues as a way of destroying them: *kuit=[wa=za=kan] kuit ištarna hūzaketten kin[un=a=wa] apuš hūrtauš EME^{HÁ} DUTU-uš GÜB-l[a wahnuddu]*, “Whatever curses you spoke among you, [let] no[w] the Sun deity [turn] those curses (and) tongues to the lef[t].” (KBo 39.8 ii 1-3; CTH 404.1; MS; Miller 2004, 69; Mouton 2016, 386-387).

11 *Šurpu* V/VI 51-57, 60-72, 87-92 (Reiner 1958, 31-32); *Maqlû* II, 165 and V, 57-58 (Meier 1937, 19 and 36); Namburbi: Maul 1994, text VIII.1.2, 82 and VIII.1.4, x+7.

12 Note that the same text of Šamuha’s ritual includes a rite of sending away impurity on a boat, whose Babylonian influence has been pointed out for instance by Strauss (2006, 201-204) and Schwemer (2013, 151). On the use of onions and cords in the Hittite ritual context, see Haas 2003, 339-340 and 662-670.

13 This ritual comes from Mukiš, a kingdom of Northern Syria, so that the presence of the cord’s analogy in this ritual text is not in contradiction with its possible Mesopotamian origin (Strauss 2002, 325; 2006, 205-206).

14 *nu^{MUNUS} ŠU.GI ŠU.SAR dāi n=at GÜB-la lāi ZAG-na=ya=at lāi* “The Old Woman takes a cord. She unties it to the left and she unties it also to the right.” (KUB 17.27+ ii 37-38; CTH 780.II.Tf01.G; NS; Haas 2007a, 17, 26-27; CHD L-N, 2a).

a tower and he intertwined him like a cord. I *oppose*¹⁵ him. I have knocked down the bewitcher's words like a tower, I have untied him like a cord."¹⁶

The Old Woman admits that she does not know what bewitching techniques were employed by the bewitcher. Therefore, she refers to the bewitchment in general when she compares it with a tower and a cord. We find again the pairing of verbs *tarup-* "to twine" and *la-* "to untie" that shows the image of the bewitchment as a bond. Indeed, the sentence "he intertwined him like a cord", with the enclitic personal pronoun in the common gender, reveals that the victim is the one intertwined with the bewitchment. The verb *pippa-* "to knock down" (CHD P, 269b; HEG II, 613; HED IX, 77, Kloekhorst 2008, 676) stresses the physical character of the attack against the bewitcher's words, which will be completely destroyed like the tower.¹⁷

The next bewitching technique I will examine consists of speaking evil about someone before the deities. Proof that the Hittites considered this action to be witchcraft is clearly provided by the following extract from the text of the ritual against Ziplantawiya's witchcraft:

"The evil (things) that she (i.e. Ziplantawiya) said against Tudhaliy[a], Nikalmāti (and) their children, she [m]ade tongues for them, she said [evi]l (about) them over to the Sun deity of blood (and) the Storm-god, so that she bewitched them."¹⁸

The aim of this ritual is to pacify the Sun deity of blood and the Storm-god, who are angry with the king Tudhaliya and his family due to the evil things that Ziplantawiya has said about them to those deities. Moreover, the text explains that Ziplantawiya has made evil tongues, which are a widespread manifestation of witchcraft connected with curses and harmful words.¹⁹ The following passage from a ritual text against "tongue lifting" also associates the invocation of the deities with tongues:

"Whatever mort[al] lifted the tongue before the deities, whoever invoked the deities against me, as this grass (is) dry, let also his shape (and) his household in the same way dry out! Let the deities and the lords look at him (with) evil eyes! Let him beget neither a son nor a daughter! Let his grain not grow!"²⁰

The idiomatic expression *lalan karp-* "to raise the tongue" is quite rare. Giulia Torri (2004, 136-137) has stressed that it is more than a metaphorical phrase and suggested that it means "to show the tongue" against someone else with malevolence, rather than simply *to speak bad words against a person*.²¹ I agree with Giulia Torri (2004, 135), who believes that this ritual represents an intervention against something more significant than mere slander or def-

15 For this translation, see CHD L-N, 287b.

16 UH₇-naš UN-aš kue uddār memiešket taruppiyat kue malkiyat kue ēšēišta kuedani pedi nu apāt=(t)a UL IDE UH₇-naš UN-aš nu UH₇-tar AN.ZA.GÀR GIM-an wetešket n=an išhaminan GIM-an anda taruppešket n=an=kan IGI-anda ēpmi nu UH₇-naš uddār=šet AN.ZA.GÀR GIM-an arha pippahhun išhaminan=ma=an GIM-an arha lānun (KUB 17.27+ ii 28'-34'; CTH 780.II.Tf01.G; NS; Haas 2007a, 17, 26).

17 The Old Woman has previously created a tower with a clay vessel (KUB 17.27+ ii 25) and then she destroys it (KUB 17.27+ ii 35-36), Haas 2007a, 17, 26. On the use of the verb *pippa-* in the context of military conquest or military attacks, see CHD P, 269b-270a.

18 nu idālu kue ITTI¹Dudhaliy[a U¹]Nikalmāti ANA DUMU^{MEŠ}=ŠUNU mēmišket nu=šmaš EME^{HA} [išš]išta n=uš=kan išhanāš¹UTU-i¹IM-ni parānta [idal]u memišket n=uš alwanzabhišket (KBo 15.10+ i 18-21; CTH 443.1; MS; Görke 2013, §3; Mouton 2010, 113).

19 On this technique, see Mouton 2010, 112-114. Reichardt (1998, 17) considers that "evil tongues" refers to a simple defamation and that witchcraft is not involved. However, the ritual of Ziplantawiya cited above proves the contrary. Reichardt's idea is abandoned by Mouton 2010, 112 and Hagenbuchner-Dresel 2010, 155-157.

20 kuiš DUMU.LÚ.[U₁₉LU]=ya lalan DINGIR^{MEŠ}-naš peran [k]arapta kuiš=mu=(š)šan DINGIR^{MEŠ}-uš EGIR-an uerit nu kās karianza mahhan hatanza apel=(l)a ēššari É=ZU QĀTAMMA hādu nu=(š)ši=(š)šan DINGIR^{MEŠ}-uš¹LÚ.MEŠ BĒLŪTI=ya idālu IGI^{HA}-wa uwandu nu=za DUMU.NITA DUMU.MUNUS lē hāši nu=(š)ši halkiš lē māi (KUB 17.28 ii 40-47; CTH 730; NS; Torri 2012, §2).

21 To support her hypothesis, she compares *lalan karp-* with the idiomatic expression *šeknun* UGU/šarā *pippa-*; she also examines two passages from Ullikummi's myth (KUB 33.93+ iv 10'-11') and the "Tale of Appu" (KUB 36.60 iii 5-6) where this verb is apparently used to express the real motion of the body part (Torri 2004, 136-137).

amation (Mouton 2010, 111; *contra* Schwemer 2007, 269). The expression “to invoke the gods against someone” points in this direction and recalls the ritual against Ziplantawiya’s evil tongues, where the connection with witchcraft is clearly expressed. Additionally, the curse formula against the person who has “lifted the tongue” mentions the “evil eyes,” one of the manifestations of witchcraft (Mouton 2009).

The reference to “speaking evil against someone” also appears in the ritual text of Ambazzi.²² The aim of the ritual is to treat two supernatural entities, Zarniza and Tarpatassa, who are attacking the patient (Christiansen 2017, §1).²³ Many of the incantations from this ritual text ask for the removal of the evil from the patient. I would like to address one of these incantations in particular, which states:

[P]ull [a]way from him the evil ‘pulling’. From (his) head, (his) hands, (his) feet (and) [a]ll (his) limbs. [Give] it to the [e]vil [perso]ns, the enemies!”²⁴

The expression *idālu huittešsar* “evil pulling” is found only in this text. *Huittešsar* is an abstract noun built from the verb *huittiya*- “to pull” (HW² III/II, 672a; HEG I, 272; HED III, 343; Kloekhorst 2008, 349) and its meaning in this context has remained uncertain until now. Several scholars consider it to be a pathology or a disease’s symptom that would affect specifically the patient’s head, hands and feet (HW² III/II, 671b-672a; Ünal 1980, 490 n. 98; HED III, 349; Rieken 1999, 384; Zeilfelder 2001, 253; Christiansen 2006, 136). However, Alice Mouton (personal communication 23/03/2018) has put forward a different interpretation, whereby “evil pulling” would refer to the act of attracting a deity with an evil aim. Indeed, *huittiya*- expresses the physical action of pulling but also, in a metaphorical sense, the idea “to attract” (HW² III/II, 672a, 675b; HED III, 343). We find an example of this metaphorical use in invocation rituals, which serve precisely to attract deities.²⁵ The first element that is required to support Alice Mouton’s hypothesis is a human origin of the evil. As I have already pointed out, this can be deduced from a passage where the patient asks Alauwaima, another supernatural entity, to intercede in his favor before the deities “if another has spoken evil before.”²⁶ The human nature of the enemies can also be inferred from the expression *idālauwaš* (UN^{MEŠ}) *harpanalliyaš* “the evil persons, the enemies”.²⁷ Also, the ritual of Hebattarakki, on which I will comment in the next section of this paper, constitutes an additional piece of evidence that an evil person can provoke the attack of supernatural entities against someone. The method to do so is not described in Hebattarakki’s ritual, but the evidence seems to suggest that to speak evil about the victim before the deities can be a way to do it. It is also likely that, in order to speak before the deities, the first step would be to convince these deities to come, probably with an invocation ritual. The expression *idālu huittešsar* could refer to this practice. Finally, the fact that the “evil pulling” is seizing the patient’s body does not necessarily mean that it is a disease. For instance, the ritual against Ziplantawiya’s witchcraft shows that a manifestation of witchcraft as “evil tongues” can also seize the body of the patient,²⁸ just like the “evil pulling” is doing in the above extract.

In Luwian incantations, deities also play a central role regarding bewitching techniques. The ritual of *dupaduparša* provides one of these examples:

22 A critical edition and analysis of this text can be found in Christiansen 2006.

23 On these supernatural entities, see Christiansen 2006, 132-134.

24 [a]rha=(š)šī=kan *idālu huittešsar* [hu]ittiya{i} SAG.DU-it ŠU^{MEŠ}-it ĠIR^{MEŠ}-it [h]ūmantet UZU^UÚR-it n=at [id]ālauwaš [UN]^{MEŠ} *harpanalliyaš* [peški] (KUB 27.67+ i 19-22; CTH 391.1.A; NS; Christiansen 2017, §5).

25 See, for example, the invocation ritual for DINGIR.MAH and GUL-šeš (CTH 484; Fuscagni 2017, §1).

26 [m]ān *peran idālu damaiš* [mem]ai zik=az da[š]šūš kuit [nu=mu]=kan *hūmandaš* DINGIR^{MEŠ}-aš [peran] āššu *memiški*, “[I]f another [spe]aks evil before, since you (are) mi[g]hty speak well (about) [me before] all the deities!” (KUB 27.67+ ii 66-69; CTH 391.1.A; NS; Christiansen 2017, §28’). In this sense, see Christiansen 2006, 136-137.

27 KUB 27.67+ i 21-22, ii 21-22 and iii 27 (Christiansen 2007, §5, §16’ and §35’).

28 [ke] i[d]ālauēš EME^{HA} *hatešdāntēš nu* EGIR-paⁱ Zi. [QAD]U DUMU^{MEŠ}=[š]U *harkandu šer* SAG.DU=ZU *harkandu* ŠÀ=ŠU *genzu=šet* [k]ēnuš=šet QATI=ŠU ĠIR^{HA}=ŠU *harkandu*, “[These] e[v]il tongues (are) dried. May they hold back Zi(plantawiya) [together] with [h]er sons! Above, may they hold her head! May they hold her heart, her entrails, her [k]nees, her hands (and) feet!” (KBo 15.10+ Ro i 22-25; CTH 443.1; MS; Görke 2013, §4).

“Whoever cur[se]d (and/or) *was struck by the Sun deity*, now let them flow (as) wi[ne]y, honied, oily (and) [...]. Let [that] [be]come oil (and) [honey], the *manipulations*,²⁹ the [per]jury, [the curses], of the [d]ead (or) of the livi[ng], of the mother (or) of the fat[her], of the brother (or) of the sist[er], § of the mountain-dweller (or) of the des[ert-dweller, of the indiv]iduals (or) group[s, past (or) pres]ent.”³⁰

I will focus on the verb *tiwataniya-*, which is a derivative of the name of the Luwian Sun-god *Tiwat*. Many translations have been suggested for this word (HEG III/I, 398), among others, “to curse” (Melchert 1993, 230; Yakubovich 2007-) and “to swear”, literally “to take the deity as witness” (Giorgieri 2002, 303). As Calvert Watkins (1993, 470) has pointed out, this verb has both a negative and a positive connotation. In this sense, Mauro Giorgieri (2002, 303-304, 304 n. 15), following Carruba (1974, 153), considers that *tiwataniya-* can also be used to express the negative effects on someone who perjured himself or was the target of a curse before the Sun-god, which fits very well with this extract.

3. ANTI-WITCHCRAFT INCANTATIONS II: RETURNING THE BEWITCHMENT AGAINST THE BEWITCHER

As noted in the previous section, the ritual text of Hebattarakki for a bewitched person provides one example of the returning of the bewitchment against the bewitcher. After a list of paraphernalia, the Old Woman makes two figurines of dough, places them on the patient’s shoulders, presses a mix of medicinal herbs and dough against the patient and says:

“I have removed Agalmati (from) you. I have expelled Ānnamiluli from your head. I have [e]xtinguished the fire in your head and made it burn in the head of the bewitching person. I have dispelled from you the odor of the dog. I have burned as a fumigation the *excrements* of the dog, the flesh of the dog and the bones of the dog. § Whoever turned them up (as) evil upon you, now I pull (it) out (from) you, throw it away and throw it (back) upon the bewitching person.”³¹

The supernatural entities Agalmati and Ānnamiluli are mentioned only in this text (Van Gessel 1998, 7, 31), so that their nature and their function are difficult to determine. Nevertheless, they have been interpreted as demons personifying the bewitchment (Schwemer 2007, 267; Mouton 2010, 112) or even as miasma (Haas 2007b, 110). The mention of the fire in the head of the patient might indicate a fever that can be lit in a person’s head as a result of a bewitching technique (Mouton 2010, 115-116). More difficult to understand is the allusion to the “odor of the dog,” which seems to be another manifestation of the bewitchment. Unfortunately, it remains unparalleled in the Hittite anti-witchcraft corpus. In any case, the incantation clearly stresses that the origin of all these evil things is a bewitching person. The verbs employed in this incantation are also noticeable. They emphasize the motion of the bewitching action with verbs as *šarā pippa-* “to turn up” (CHD P, 270b; HEG II, 614; HED IX, 77) and *peššiya-* “to throw” (CHD P, 316b; HEG II, 581; HED IX, 27; Kloekhorst 2008, 670). On the other hand, the counterattacks are described with four other verbs (besides *peššiya-*) that introduce

29 For this translation, see Mouton, Yakubovich 2019, where other similar passages are also translated.

30 *kuiš hīrutani[yat]a tiwataniyatta [n]ānum=pa=ata ma[ddu]inzi mallitinzi dāninzi x[...]x-allanzi āršiyandu tāin=ti=(y)[ata malli ai]yaru tapāruwa [hīr]ūta [tatarrīyamna uw]alanteya hūitwa[lieya ānnīeya tāt]ieya nānīeya nānašri[eya] § lūlahīeya b[apirīeya kuwarš]aššan tūliyašša[n puwatil nanun]tariyāl (KUB 9.6+ i 23-31; CTH 759.2; LNS; Starke 1985, 112; Melchert 2006, 296).*

31 ¹ *Agalmatin=ta awan arha tittanunun* ² *Ānnamilulin=ma=ta=(k)kan* (dupl. ³ *Ānnalumin=ma=[(d)du]*) SAG.DU-az awan arha šuwanun ANA SAG.DU=KA=ma=(d)du=(š)šan pabbur [k]ištānunun n=at=šan alwa<an>zeni (dupl. *alwanz[eni]*) {nī} UN-ši SAG.DU-i warnunun ŠA UR.GI₇=ma=(t)ta waršulan awan arha parhun ŠA UR.GI₇=ma šalpaš (dupl. *šalpan*) UZU UR.GI₇^{UZU}GİR.PAD.DU UR.GI₇=ya šim-išīyanunun (dupl. *šimešenu[n]*) § n=uš=du=(š)šan idaluwatar kuiš šarā pippaš kinun=a=ta=(k)kan arha hūittiyanniškemi n=at arha peššiškemi n=at=šan šarā alwanzeni UN-ši peššiškemi (KUB 24.14 i 18-28; CTH 397.A; NS; with dupl. KUB 24.15+ i 17-26; CTH 397.B; NS; Görke, Melzer 2016b, §4-5).

different nuances: the first meaning of *tittanu-* is “to install”. Therefore, *awan arha tittanu-* means “to remove (someone) from (the place where he is installed)” (HEG III/I, 385; Kloekhorst 2008, 883). *Šuwai-* is used in legal contexts and can mean, among other things, “to divorce” and “to repudiate”. With the preverb *arha* its meaning is intensified, thus meaning “to abandon” and “to expel” (HEG II/V, 1220; Kloekhorst 2008, 795). For its part, *parh-* means primarily “to chase, pursue” or “hunt.” It is also used to express banishment and, in military contexts, “to attack” cities or lands (CHD P, 143a; HEG II, 451; HED VIII, 115; Kloekhorst 2008, 634). These three verbs share the nuance of imposing upon someone else the action described either in a physical or metaphorical sense. This notion is reinforced by the presence of *awan*, which serves to intensify the meaning of the verb. Additionally, the Old Woman also uses the verb *huittiya-*, “to pull” (with *arha* “to pull out”), which has already been commented on in the previous section.

A different way of returning the bewitchment against the bewitcher, this time by the handling of a figurine, appears in the ritual text of Allī from Arzawa against witchcraft:

“Whoever inebriated, bewitched this [mort]al, [now] I am completely removing [his] inebriation and I am inebriating [*the bewitching person*] by the figurines. Let the figurines seize [...]”³²

The most remarkable element of this extract is the verb *wiyanai-*, which is clearly a cognate of *wiyana-* “wine”, as pointed out by Liane Jakob-Rost (1972, 64) in her edition of the ritual text of Allī. The handling of the wine by the Old Woman just before uttering this incantation³³ and the contents of the incantation itself support the translation of this verb as “to inebriate” (Jakob-Rost 1972, 30-31 and 64; HEG IV, 564; Mouton 2016, 205). The inebriation is placed in parallel with the bewitchment. However, the connection between witchcraft and inebriation is not clearly expressed in the text. We know that someone can be bewitched by eating bewitched food, as shows the ritual text of Ammihatna, which mentions bewitched bread and fat among the possible causes of the patient’s impurity.³⁴ One possibility is to consider that in this context the wine used to inebriate the victim has been previously bewitched. On the other hand, the link between the inebriation and the bewitchment could simply be the harmful intent on the part of the one causing the inebriation. The myths of Illuyanka and Hedammu offer two parallel examples for understanding the sense(s) in which “to make someone drunk” can be used with malevolent intent. In the first myth, the goddess Inara invites the giant snake Illuyanka and his sons to a celebration, where they get drunk. Then, Inara and Hūpašiya (her human lover) take advantage of Illuyanka’s inebriation to tie him up, so that the Storm-god can easily kill him.³⁵ The myth of Hedammu is less well preserved, but it depicts Šaušga trying to seduce Hedammu in order to help her brother Teššub defeat him. One of the fragments from the passage containing the seduction says that Šaušga makes Hedammu drink, which strongly recalls the similar episode in the myth of Illuyanka.³⁶ Finally, a fragment from a historical text mentions inebriation as a way of weakening the enemy before attacking him.³⁷ In view of these examples, it seems clear that inebriation may be used to debilitate someone in order to make him manageable and vulnerable to further attacks.

32 [(*kuiš kūn*) DUMU.LÚ.U]₁₉.LU *uiyanišket alwazahbišket* [*kinun=a=(š)ši=ka*]n *arha uiyaniškemi n=at=šan* [(*katta*) UH₇-an UN-an]⁷ ANA ALAM^{HA} *uiyaniškemi* [...]e ALAM^{HA} *appandu* (KBo 21.8 ii 12-15; CTH 402.I; MS; with dupl. Bo 3582(+) ii 6'-10'; CTH 402.F; NS; Mouton 2016, 204-205).

33 KBo 21.8 ii 11 (Mouton 2016, 204-205).

34 (...) n[*aš*]ma=(š)ši NINDA-an ^{UZU} alwanzahban *kuiški adanna pāi*; “(...) [o]r someone gives him bewitched bread (or) fat to eat.” (KBo 5.2 i 5-6; CTH 471.A; NS; Strauss 2010, §2). On the possible ways of bewitching drinks and food, see Mouton 2010, 115, who also cites examples in Mari and ancient Greece.

35 KUB 17.5 i 6'-18' (Rieken *et al.* 2012, §9-12; Mouton 2016, 446-447).

36 KUB 8.66+ iii 6'-8' (CHD L-N, 446b; Siegelová 1971, 58-59).

37 KBo 16.34, 7-8 (CHD L-N, 446a).

4. ANTI-WITCHCRAFT INCANTATIONS III: CURSES

The last part of this paper is devoted to anti-witchcraft incantations that include curses against the bewitcher. The first example comes from the *dupaduparša* ritual text and states:

“Whoever does evil to the lord of the rituals, let the deities break him away (like) reeds! Let them strike him regarding (his) *testicles* and let them place him under their feet!”³⁸

The idea of being struck by a deity appears frequently in curses. These three violent actions, that is, to break someone like a reed, to strike him, and to trample him, recall a passage of the Song of Ullikummi. In this passage of the Hurrian myth, Kumarbi chooses the name of his son, Ullikummi, and determines his destiny as Teššub’s adversary. He wishes, among other things, that Ullikummi might strike and trample Teššub, and break Tašmišu (Teššub’s twin) like a reed.³⁹ Another example of a curse, in this case against a female bewitcher, is provided by the text of the ritual of Allī:

“Let the [b]ewitchment be [...] *dukanzi*! Let she (i.e., the female bewitcher) take it by (her) matrix! Let it escape from the pig’s stick! Let it go back to its owner!”⁴⁰

This incantation is connected with the previous paragraph of the ritual, where the bewitchment is to be transformed into different pieces of clothing that the female bewitcher puts on her body.⁴¹ I follow Craig Melchert (1999), who considers that this sequence has a similar structure to the preceding paragraph. First, the bewitchment is to be *dukanzi*, and then it has to be taken by the bewitcher’s reproductive organ.⁴² The translation of the word *dukanzi* suggested by Melchert (1999) is “cultivation, breeding”. Unfortunately, the interpretation of this sentence remains unclear, due to the lacuna. The reference to the “stick” in the last part of the curse is interpreted by Melchert (1999, 21) as an euphemism for “penis”. Thus, according to this suggestion, the female bewitcher is to be raped by the bewitchment in the form, or the manner, of a stud animal. The choice of pig could be explained by its unclean status (Melchert 1999, 22 n. 24).⁴³ Not only is the female bewitcher to endure a sexual assault, but the aberrant nature of this attack will contribute to the humiliation of the hapless bewitcher. The intent of humiliating the bewitcher is also present in the curse included in the last part of the following incantation from the text of the ritual of Allaiturahhi:

“I have vanquished them, the bewitcher’s words. My words, [whi]ch (are) sup[e]rior, have vanq[ui]shed them. I have twice cast off [h]is word(s), (namely) the bewitcher’s witchcraft. I have spit upon them and I have trampled them wi[th] (my) foot. ‘Let the donkey urinate (on) them! Let the ox defecate (on) th[em]! Let the mortal, who passes over (them), s[p]it upon (them)! Let th[em] b[e] spit, the wit[ch]craft’s words and the bewitching person[...].’”⁴⁴

38 *kuiš=tar malhaššaššan* EN-ya ādduwala ānniti a=an DINGIR^{MEŠ}-inzi ābha nātatta tatarhandu uītpanim=pa=an uidāindu pa=du=(w)[a]n annān pātanza dūwandu (KUB 9.6+ iii 25’-29’; CTH 759.2; LNS; Starke 1985, 115; Kloekhorst 2008, 838). I would like to thank I. Yakubovich (personal communication by e-mail dating from 30/06/2018) for suggesting me the reading PA for pa=du=(w)[a]n.

39 KUB 33.96+ iii 16’-25’. Mouton 2016, 502-505. I owe this parallel to A. Mouton (personal communication 29/06/2018).

40 [nu a]lwanzata dukanzi x[...] ēšdu n=an haššanit dāu [(ŠA)]H=ma=aš=kan ^{GIS}GAG-az išparzašdu n=at EGIR-pa BĒLĪ=ŠU paiddu (KBo 12.126+ i 20-21; CTH 402.A; NS; with dupl. KBo 59.6(+) i 20’; CTH 402.C; LNS; Mouton 2016, 196-197).

41 KBo 12.126 i 16-19 (Mouton 2016, 196-197). Craig Melchert (1999, 20-21) has already pointed out this connection in his interpretation of the curse.

42 This interpretation is also followed by Reichardt 1998, 140-141 and Mouton 2010, 118-119; 2012, 252; *contra* Jakob-Rost 1972, 23 and Haas 2003, 782.

43 On the conception of the pig as unclean, see Mouton 2004, 96-99. The exceptional sexuality of the pig is stressed in some Mesopotamian texts (Cooper 1996, 51 n.16; Biggs 1967, no. 12). I wonder if this conception of the pig could also play a role in its choice for this curse.

44 taruhhun=at=za UH₇-naš uddār [ku]e uddār ša[r]azzi n=at=za ammel uddanāntēš tar[hu]er uttar=[š]et 2-e=pat UH₇-naš UH₇-tar pešši-yanun nu=šmaš=kan šer allapahun n=at anda ĠIR-[i]t išparrabhun n=at=kan ANŠE-aš šeburreskeddu n=a[t]=kan GU₄-uš kammaršieskeddu DUMU.LÚ.U₁₉.LU=ma=(š)šan kui[š] šer arha iyattari nu=(š)šan šer a[l]lappabhiškeddu allappabhan=war=a[t] ēšdu U[H₇-n]aš uddār UH₇-naš=(š)a UN-aš [...] (KUB 17.27+ iii 8’-16’; CTH 780.II.Tf01.G; NS; Mouton 2010, 119; Lorenz, Taš 2012, 120).

The use of military vocabulary, as in the verb *tarh- /taruh-* “to vanquish” (HEG III/I, 157; Kloekhorst 2008, 835), and the structure of the incantation are also noticeable. The use of the preterit in the first part of the incantation may indicate that the following curse is a quote of the Allaiturahhi’s words (Mouton, personal communication 29/06/2018). These are the same words that Allaiturahhi previously refers to as “superior.” The Old Woman would be stressing the superiority of her power of convincing the deities to attack the bewitcher.

5. CONCLUSION

Through this contextual analysis of Anatolian anti-witchcraft incantations, several important features have arisen. The first remarkable element is the contrast between the vagueness of some descriptions of bewitching techniques and the precision of others. The use of general terms and ambiguity allows for the consideration of all possibilities when the ritual expert does not know the exact technique employed by the bewitcher. In other cases, the ritual expert’s accurate knowledge of the bewitching action is much more suggestive. This level of knowledge could be explained by the possibility that the ritual expert who counteracts witchcraft is the same individual who bewitches under command. This suggestion, if true, would corroborate the hypothesis of the ambivalent role played by these ritual experts, among whom is the Old Woman (Frantz-Szabó 1995, 2007; Haas 2001, 55; Mouton 2010, 108). Another feature that is deduced from the texts is the prominent presence of deities in the bewitching process. Deities are the ones who validate any ritual act. Therefore, the proper and effective functioning of both the bewitchment and the anti-witchcraft ritual depends on the approval of the deities.

In addition to the above features, the incantations that I have presented reveal several of the various ways in which ancient Anatolians conceived of witchcraft. The analysis of the vocabulary and the different motifs appearing in the incantations point to at least three conceptions:

1. Witchcraft is presented as a reversal of the proper order, a situation that puts the victim under threat of death. The dichotomy between the Upperworld and the Netherworld serves as a scene to illustrate this idea. The anti-witchcraft ritual aims to restore the previous situation and the natural order.
2. Witchcraft is also described in terms of control, manipulation, and restriction. The victim is wrapped and constrained by the bewitchment. He is also manipulated and weakened, remaining at the mercy of the bewitcher.
3. Frequently, witchcraft is conceived as a fight between the bewitcher and the contravening ritual expert for the power to convince deities to act on his behalf. The descriptions of physical attacks, the use of military vocabulary, and the aim of humiliating the adversary are examples of this.

In conclusion, although Anatolian anti-witchcraft incantations present many items in common, they also show a wide variety of motifs. The coexistence of different cultural traditions in Ancient Anatolia is brought to light by the richness of the witchcraft imaginary deployed in incantations.

Acknowledgements

This paper comes from the lecture with the same title given at the *64th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*, which took place between 16th-20th July 2018 in Innsbruck. This study is part of a broader doctoral research project on the practice of witchcraft in Hittite Anatolia, and is funded by a two-year grant from the Fundación Bancaria “la Caixa” (ID 100010434), whose code is LCF/BQ/EU16/11560012. Luwian incantations are studied in the context of the project “*Luwili*: Luwian Religious Discourse Between Anatolia and Syria” (ANR-17-FRAL-0007-01), which is a Franco-German research project funded by the ANR (Agence Nationale de la Recherche) and the DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft), co-directed by Alice Mouton and Ilya Yakubovich.

References

- Abusch T., Schwemer D. 2011, *Corpus of Mesopotamian Anti-Witchcraft Ritual I*, Leiden-Boston.
- Bawanypeck D. 2005, *Die Rituale der Auguren*, Heidelberg.
- Biggs R.D. 1967, ŠÀ.ZI.GA. *Ancient Mesopotamian Potency Incantations*, New York.
- Carruba O. 1974, Rev. of Neu E. 1968, *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen* (StBoT 5), Wiesbaden, OA 13, 149-153.
- Christiansen B. 2006, *Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi. Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualtexte CTH 391, CTH 429 und CTH 463*, Wiesbaden.
- Christiansen B. (ed.) 2017, Das Ritual der Ambazzi (CTH 391.1), hethiter.net/: CTH 391.1 (INTR 2017-02-07). Access date: 21 August 2018.
- Cooper J.S. 1996, Magic and M(is)use: poetic promiscuity in Mesopotamian Ritual, in Vogelzang M.E., Vanstiphout H.L.J. (eds), *Mesopotamian Poetic Language: Sumerian and Akkadian. Proceedings of the Groningen Group for the Study of Mesopotamian Literature 2*, Groningen, 47-57.
- Frantz-Szabó G. 1995, Hittite Witchcraft, Magic and Divination, in Sasson J.M. (ed.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East 3*, New York, 2007-2019.
- Fuscagni F. (ed.) 2016, Rituale contro i nemici del re (CTH 417.1), hethiter.net/: CTH 417.1 (INTR 2016-08-04). Access date: 21 August 2018.
- Fuscagni F. (ed.) 2017, Rituale di evocazione per le dee DINGIR.MAḪ, le dee *Gulšeš*, le dee DINGIR.MAḪ degli dei e le dee DINGIR.MAḪ delle parti del corpo degli uomini e per le dee Zukki e Anzili (CTH 484), hethiter.net/: CTH 484 (TX 07.10.2013, TRit 02.02.2017). Access date: 21 August 2018.
- Giorgieri M. 2002, Birra, acqua ed olio: paralleli siriani e neo-assiri ad un giuramento ittita, in De Martino S., Pecchioli Daddi F. (eds), *Anatolia antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati*, Florence, 299-320.
- Goetze A. 1947, Contributions to Hittite Lexicography, *JCS* 1, 307-320.
- Görke S., Melzer S. 2016a, Die zweite Tafel des Rituals von Šamuḫa (CTH 480.1), hethiter.net/: CTH 480.1 (INTR 2016-02-03). Access date: 21 August 2018.
- Görke S., Melzer S. 2016b, Das Ritual der Ḫepatarakki aus Zuḫaruwa (CTH 397), hethiter.net/: CTH 397 (INTR 2016-03-22). Access date: 21 August 2018.
- Görke S. 2013, Zwei Rituale zur Besänftigung von Sonnen- und Wettergott mit der Erwähnung von Ziplantawiya, Tuthaliya und Nikkalmadi (CTH 443), hethiter.net/: CTH 443.1 (INTR 2013-12-19). Access date: 21 August 2018.
- Guinan A.K. 1996, Left/Right symbolism in Mesopotamian divination, *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 10, 5-10.
- Haas V. 2001, Verfluchungen am hethitischen Hof und deren rituelle Beseitigung, in Albertz R. (ed.), *Kult, Konflikt und Versöhnung. Beiträge zur kultischen Sühne in religiösen, sozialen und politischen Auseinandersetzungen des antiken Mittelmeerraumes*, Münster, 53-71.
- Haas V. 2003, *Materia Magica et Medica Hethitica*, Berlin-New York.
- Haas V. 2007a, Notizen zu den Ritualen der Frau Allaituraḫi aus Mukiš, *AoF* 34/1, 9-36.
- Haas V. 2007b, Hittite rituals against threats and other diseases and their relationship to the Mesopotamian traditions, in Finkel I.L., Geller M.J. (eds), *Disease in Babylonia*, Leiden-Boston, 100-119.
- Hagenbuchner-Dresel A. 2010, Fluch (ḫurtai-) und Verfluchen (ḫu(wa)rt-) in der hethitischen Gesellschaft, in Fincke J.C. (ed.), *Festschrift für Gernot Wilhelm anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 28. Januar 2010*, Leiden, 155-174.
- Jakob-Rost L. 1972, *Das Ritual der Malli aus Arzawa gegen Behexung (KUB XXIV 9+)*, Heidelberg.
- Kloekhorst A. 2008, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden-Boston.
- Lorenz J., Taş I. 2012, Neue Zusatzstücke zur ersten Tafel der Rituale der Frau Allaituraḫi aus Mukiš, *ZA* 102, 115-129.
- Maul S.M. 1994, *Zukunftsbewältigung: eine Untersuchung altorientalischen Denkens anhand der babylonisch-assyrischen Löserituale (Namburbi)*, Mainz.
- Meier G. 1937, *Die assyrische Beschwörungssammlung Maqlû*, Berlin.
- Melchert H.C. 1993, *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*, Chapel Hill.
- Melchert H.C. 1999, Hittite *tuk(kan)zi-* "cultivation, breeding", *KTEMA* 24, 17-23.
- Melchert H.C. 2006, Indo-European verbal art in Luvian, in Pinault G.-J., Petit D. (eds), *La Langue Poétique Indo-Européenne. Actes du Colloque de travail de la Société des Études Indo-Européennes (Indogermanische Gesellschaft/Society for Indo-European Studies). Paris, 22-24 octobre 2003*, Leuven-Paris, 291-298.
- Miller J.L. 2004, *Studies in the Origins. Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals*, Wiesbaden.

- Mouton A. 2004, Le rituel de Walkui (KBo 32.176): quelques réflexions sur la déesse de la nuit et l'image du porc dans le monde hittite, *ZA* 94, 85-105.
- Mouton A. 2009, Le « mauvais œil » d'après les textes cunéiformes hittites et mésopotamiens, in Amir-Moezzi M.A., Dubois J.-D., Jullien C., Jullien F. (eds), *Pensée grecque et sagesse d'Orient. Hommage à Michel Tardieu*, Turnhout, 425-439.
- Mouton A. 2010, Sorcellerie hittite, *JCS* 62, 105-125.
- Mouton A. 2012, Le rituel d'Alli d'Arzawa contre un ensorcellement (CTH 402): texte et context, *Colloquium Anatolicum* XI, 247-266.
- Mouton A. 2016, *Rituels, mythes et prières hittites*, Paris.
- Mouton A. 2019, Beard and hair in Hittite religious texts, in Fudge B., Herzog Th., Volokhine Y. (eds), *Barbes et barbus. Symboliques, rites et pratiques du port de la barbe dans le Proche-Orient ancien et moderne*, Bern, 91-99.
- Mouton A., Yakubovich I. 2019, Internal or external evil: A merism in Luwian incantation, *BSOAS* 82, 209-231.
- Needham R. (ed.) 1973, *Right and Left: Essays in Dual Symbolic Classification*, Chicago.
- Nussbaum O. 1962, Die Bewertung von rechts und links in der römischen Liturgie, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 5, 158-171.
- Puértolas Rubio L. forthcoming, The body in Hittite witchcraft, in Mouton A. (ed.), *The Individual and His Body in the Ancient Mediterranean Basin*.
- Reichardt K.M. 1998, *Linguistic Structures of Hittite and Luvian Curse Formulae*, Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina.
- Reiner E. 1958, *Šurpu. A Collection of Sumerian and Akkadian Incantations*, Graz.
- Rieken E. 1999, *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*, Wiesbaden.
- Rieken et al. (eds) 2012, CTH 321 - Der Drachenkampf oder „Illuyanka“, hethiter.net/: CTH 321 (TX 2012-06-08 and TRde 2012-06-08). Access date: 21 August 2018.
- Schwemer D. 2007, *Abwehrzauber und Behexung. Studien zum Schadenzauberglauben im alten Mesopotamien*, Wiesbaden.
- Schwemer D. 2013, Gauging the influence of Babylonian magic: The reception of Mesopotamian traditions in Hittite ritual practice, in Cancik-Kirschbaum E., Klinger J., Müller G.G.W. (eds), *Diversity and Standardization. Perspectives on Social and Political Norms in the Ancient Near East*, Berlin, 145-171.
- Siegelová J. 1971, *Appu-Märchen und Hedammu-Mythus*, Wiesbaden.
- Starke F. 1985, *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*, Wiesbaden.
- Strauss R. 2002, Elemente mesopotamischer Ritualistik in hethitischen Texten. Das „Šamuḫa-Ritual“ CTH 480, in Blum, H., Faist, B., Pfälzner, P., Wittke, A.-M. (eds), *Brückenland Anatolien? Ursachen, Extensität und Modi des Kulturaustausches zwischen Anatolien und seinen Nachbarn*, Leiden, 323-338.
- Strauss R. 2006, *Reinigungsrituale aus Kizzuwatna. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung hethitischer Ritualtradition und Kulturgeschichte*, Berlin-New York.
- Strauss R. 2010, Das Ritual des Ammiḫatna (CTH 471), hethiter.net/: CTH 471 (TX 03.11.2010, TRde 03.11.2010). Access date: 21 August 2018.
- Taracha P. 2000, *Ersetzen und Entsühnen. Das mittelhethitische Ersatzritual für den Großkönig Tuthaliya (CTH *448.4) und verwandte Texte*, Leiden-Boston-Köln.
- Torri G. 2004, A Hittite magical ritual to be performed in an emergency, *JANER* 4, 129-141.
- Torri G. 2012, Rituale contro le cattive amicizie (CTH 458.2), hethiter.net/: CTH 458.2 (INTR 2012-12-20). Access date: 21 August 2018.
- Ünal A. 1980, Hitit Tibbinın Ana Hatları [Les traits essentiels de la médecine hittite], *Belleten* 44, 475-495.
- Van Gessel B. 1998, *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon I*, Leiden.
- Watkins C. 1993, Some Anatolian words and forms, in Meiser G. (ed.), *Indogermanica et Italica: Festschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag*, Innsbruck, 469-478.
- Wirth H. 2010, *Die linke Hand: Wahrnehmung und Bewertung in der griechischen und römischen Antike*, Stuttgart.
- Yakubovich I. 2007-, *Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts*, http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/index.php?interface_language=en. Access date: 21 August 2018.
- Zeifelder S. 2001, *Archaismus und Ausgliederung. Studien zur sprachlichen Stellung des Hethitischen*, Heidelberg.

Laura Puértolas Rubio
 Sorbonne University - UMR 8167
 Paris, France
laura.puertolas-rubio@etu.sorbonne-universite.fr

