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Chapter Three

Behavior of Witch: Verbal Adversaries and Witchcraft

A. Verbal Adversaries: Lines 4-12 and their Implications

1. Introduction

Although our examination thus far has not resulted in absolutely definitive conclusions, it has suggested the following interpretation of 21-28: the speaker takes an oath and establishes thereby his innocence of an accusation; this proof of his own innocence allows him to declare that the accusation made against him by the witch is false and is, therefore, disproved. In order to test this interpretation we should examine the initial description of the witch’s actions in lines 4-12 to see whether the nature of the harm inflicted on the speaker, as described in these lines, agrees with the interpretation suggested for his address to the judges in 21ff. Lines 4-12 read:

4 Because (aššu) kaššaptu ukaššipanni
5 elēnitu ubbiranni;
6 she has (thereby) caused my god and goddess to be estranged from me (and)
7 I have become sickening in the sight of those who behold me;
8 I am therefore unable to rest day or night;
9 qū imtanallū piya
10 upunti piya iprusu
11 mê maštitiya umaṭṭu;
12 my song of joy has become wailing and my rejoicing mourning, ....

For our understanding of 4, see below Sec. A, 3; for 5 see immediately below; for 9-11, see below Sec. A, 3. We take all verbs in 4-12 to be singular subjunctives dependent upon aššu in 4 (see below Sec. A, 3, and notes 76-77).
2. Denunciation of Victim (Mouth and Words): Line 5 and Parallel Lines

Meaning of Line 5. Lines 4-12 constitute a distinct unit which forms a *Kausalsatz* introducing 13-14, the request to the gods to take up the case. Lines 4-5, the opening section of the unit, contain a statement of the actions which have been performed against the speaker and which have led to the situation described in 6ff. Previous students of the text have translated 5 essentially in one of two ways:

(a) 4 weil die Zauberin mich bezaubert hat,
    5 der Alp mich gebunden hat; \(^{32}\)

(b) 4 because a witch has bewitched me,
    5 a deceitful woman has denounced me. \(^{33}\)

---

\(^{30}\)Contra Meier, *Maqlû*, p. 7, lines 4-5 should not be connected syntactically with 1-3. Lines 4-12 form a long *Kausalsatz* introduced by *aššu* in 4. See below Sec. A, 3, and note 77.

\(^{31}\)For this understanding of 6-7, see immediately below; for 9-11, see below Sec. A, 3.

\(^{32}\)So Meier, *Maqlû*, p. 7. Von Soden (who listed our line in *AHw* s. *abāru* III d 1 "umspannen") and Mendelsohn (who translated *ubbiranni* in our line as "... has paralyzed me" [*op. cit.*, p. 215]) agree with this translation.

\(^{33}\)So *CAD* E s. *elēnītu* A. Compare Landsberger, *Textbuch* \(^{1}\), p. 125: "... mich ... gebannt hat." Landsberger's translation should be interpreted in the light of his later comments. In his discussion of the relation of *nugguru* and *ubburu* (to denounce, accuse), Landsberger, *JCS* 9 124, pointed out that "the Sumerian correspondence of *ubburum* is ... lá, basically 'to tie,' that is, 'to inflict a ban on a person.'" It may be presumed that he uses both Germ. "bannen" and Engl. "to inflict a ban" in the sense of placing under a liability or restriction. The use of lá (cf. *ibid.* n. 19 on Lipit Ištar parag. 17): *ubburu* in the meaning "to accuse by words" does not derive from the act itself, but from the resultant state of the accused (in contrast to Engl. "to ban," which derives its legal force from the act of proclaiming or summoning [according to *The Oxford Universal Dictionary* \(^{2}\), s. Ban, v., Germanic "Bannant is formed from the root ba-, cognate with Greek *φα-, Latin fa-*, "to speak"]). This usage may perhaps be compared with Engl. "to bind" in the meaning "to constrain with legal authority," "to subject to a specific legal obligation" and it must certainly be compared with the idiom "to bind over for trial."
To decide which of these translations of line 5 is to be preferred, we may examine some of the effects of the actions described in 4-5. The following lines, 6-7, inform us of the first and main consequence of these actions: the alienation of the victim's personal gods and his loss of social stature. In texts concerned with witchcraft we often encounter a similar reaction on the part of a victim's superiors and/or equals. For the purposes of our present discussion, it is of the utmost importance and significance (1) that a number of these and related texts center on the activities of a bêl lemutti/dabâbi/amâti and frequently, implicitly or explicitly, construe the aforementioned consequences as resulting from a combination of witchcraft activity and verbal denunciations; and (2) that several of these texts contain ritual and incantation parallels to the first section of Maqlû.\(^{35}\)

\(^{34}\)See our analysis of KAR 26 in Part One, Chapter 3, and note the passages quoted there in the text and in notes 64-65 (KAR 26 obv. 37ff., AMT 87/1 rev. 1ff., BAM 315 II 42ff., 4 R 55/2 obv. 1ff., M IV 64, Afo 18 293:66ff., M I 109, II 86ff., KAR 80 rev. 6); among many additional examples, see the texts cited below in note 35, as well as M III 114ff., IV 64ff., V 73, STT 89:76-79, 87-90, 91-95 and STT 275 I 6'ff. (note that the units which follow this entry in STT 275 [I 16'ff., 20'] deal with kišpu, māmītu, zikurrudu and dibalu).  

\(^{35}\)An examination of the text type which has been called "Beschwörungen gegen den Feind" by Ebeling, ArOr 17/1 172ff., will suffice to demonstrate and document these statements. Examples of this type are 4 R 55/2 (ArOr 17/1 186ff.), Assur photo 4129 and VAT 13909 (ArOr 17/1 190ff.), STT 256 (already compared to the above texts by Gurney, STT II p. 12, no. 256) and probably VAT 13740:7ff. (ArOr 17/1 202f.), which is probably duplicated by K 2562:1ff. These texts normally describe the patient’s misfortunes in an opening statement introduced by summa and usually repeat them in an elaborate statement of purpose, which contains a description of the situation to be rectified and the positive goals to be attained. In trying to determine the real cause of the patient’s plight, the interpreter is hindered by the frequent absence of a distinct formal articulation of the aetiological diagnosis (e.g., NA.BI ...) and by the lack of syntactic coordination between the individual elements in the description of the misfortunes.  

I. Let us ignore, for the moment, the rare diagnosis and the accompanying rituals and only examine the remaining sections of these texts. This examination leads to the following observations (STT 256 and ArOr 17/1 190ff. are examined separately below in Section II, and the material in these texts is not frequently used in this section).  

1) The description of the patient’s plight centers on the social difficulties encountered by the patient and on his rejection by divine and human authorities (insofar as the patient’s own behavior is described, it can best be understood as a
reaction to what must have appeared to him to be an unjustified and calamitous situation), and the statement of purpose and prognosis essentially describe the social and religious rehabilitation of the patient.

2) The opening section of these texts (i.e., the description of the patient’s plight or, when this is missing, the statement of the purpose of the ritual) frequently begins with the mention of a \textit{bêl lemutti}. In the course of the description of misfortunes and of the statement of purpose this \textit{bêl lemutti} generally turns out to be a \textit{bêl dabâbi}; see, e.g., \textit{STT} 256 discussed below.

3) Standard witchcraft terms occur. An examination of these occurrences reveals the following:

a) Witchcraft may be the cause of rejection by authority: see, e.g., \textit{4 R 55/2:3-5} discussed below and cf. the texts listed above in note 34.

b) The use of witchcraft is explicitly imputed to the \textit{bêl dabâbi}; see \textit{VAT} 13740 (\textit{ArOr} 17/1 203):10 // \textit{K} 2562 obv. 3: \textit{upâšē bêl dabâbîśu} and cf., e.g., \textit{AMT} 89/1 II (= rev. VI) 16 // \textit{K} 249 + V! (\textit{KMI} 51f.) 14: \textit{DIŠ NA EN KA-šu} (\textit{K} 249 +: -šû) \textit{kîś-pi NIGIN-šû}; \textit{AMT} 89/1 II 19 // \textit{K} 249 + V! 17: \textit{DIŠ NA EN KA-šu} (\textit{K} 249 +: -šû) \textit{kîś-pi NIGIN-šû} (\textit{K} 249 +: -šû); \textit{KAR} 80 obv. 6ff. (\textit{A}) // \textit{K} 1853 + I 2'ff. (\textit{B}): \textit{LÜ.BI EN [KA].KA-šû} (\textit{B}: E)\textit{N KA-šû} \textit{f(x)-šû} \textit{(!= (?) [EGIR-šû])} \textit{kîś-pi NIGIN-šû} (-šû is from B) \textit{kîp-di lem[nûti ik-p]u-du-šû} \textit{ana kîś-pi šû} (\textit{B}: šû)-nu-ti \textit{BÜR-ri} ana \textit{IGI d'UTU NÎG.NA ŠIM.LI GAR-an mi-ih-ha BAL-qi NU US₁₂.ZU u (A: US₁₂.ZU! u!) MÎ.ÚŠ₁₂.ZU ... DÛ-ûš (B: +-ma) (see below note 37). Note that the use of witchcraft by the \textit{EN KA} is consistently expressed through the verb \textit{NIGIN} in the texts just quoted, as well as, e.g., in \textit{AMT} 87/1 rev. 1ff. // \textit{BAM} 315 II 42ff. This should suffice to prove that the \textit{bêl lemutti} = \textit{bêl dabâbi} in \textit{4 R 55/2} 1-5 (\textit{DIŠ NA EN HUL-tim TUK-ši} ... US₁₂ US₁₂ NÎG.AG.A.MEŠ HUL.MEŠ ina NU ZU NIGIN-šû DINGIR LUGAL ... KL-šû u-šà-àški-nu-ma ... ) is responsible for the use of witchcraft and is the understood subject of NIGIN-šû (and that \textit{kîspî}, etc., is in the oblique case [contra \textit{ArOr} 17/1 188, \textit{CAD} I 29 and \textit{ASW} 16 290]).

c) Furthermore, there is explicit evidence that the \textit{bêl dabâbi} will use witchcraft in order to bring about the aforementioned rejection: see especially \textit{4 R 55/2} quoted above and cf., e.g., \textit{AMT} 87/1 rev. 1ff. // \textit{BAM} 315 II 42ff. (It is within this context that we should interpret a text like \textit{STT} 271 I 7f.: DINGIR-šû KI-šû SILIM-im NA.BI UGU EN KA G[UJ]\text{[F]} (\textit{az ila} l.)

4) The victim is harmed not only by magical acts, but also by being maligned, accused and denounced. In \textit{4 R 55/2} obv. 1-2 we read:

1 \textit{DIŠ NA EN HUL-tim TUK-ši EME sah-[ ... ]-tu US₁₂ US-šû}

2 \textit{dib-šû i-dab-bu-bu INIM.MEŠ-šû us-tan-nu-û EME.SIG.MEŠ-šû KÚ.MEŠ.}

That the \textit{bêl dabâbi} is responsible for this is clear from a comparison of line 2 with the speech addressed to a \textit{bêl dabâbi} by his victim, as he renders the \textit{bêl dabâbi} harmless by depriving him of his powers of speech, in the following texts: \textit{VAT} 35:1-5 (see below note 59): [\textit{ašbat pâkî ... attasah lišún p[iki] anâ là dabâbî ša dibbiya anà là šunnê ša amâtiya}; \textit{ArOr} 17/1 191:4-6: \textit{ašbat pâka anà là qabê <(?)} ša amât > lemuttiiya (for our emendation, see below note 52) ... aktanak šaptêka [anà šá šulê ša šumiya].
The final words of this last text recur in a similar context in Afo 11 pl. V (A) and its duplicate Lku 27 rev. (B) which we have identified. (This text is an incantation addressed to a witch; A was previously edited in Afo 11 367f.)

A 10 presently reads: [xxx] šu-$ić-
ša šu-mi-ia

B 7 presently reads: ud is li i ša ba me išia

A comparison of these lines with each other and with ArOr 17/1 191:6 and a reconsideration of the context result in the reading: [a-na] šu-
ša ša šu-me (B: me)-ia. (Notes: A: The previous edition reads: [a-na] šu-
ša ša šu-me for ša ša šu-me [note that the same sign form recurs in B 6': ha-šul-ul-tú (cf. A: 11-12); we have assumed that the form is a slight error only because of the more standard form of šu in Lku 27 obv. 9; it can just as well be taken as a legitimate paleographic variant]. Note also that B 6' reads: a-na ub-ša-[ral]-[ki] and thus indicates that the beginning of A 9 must be restored: [a-na u]ša-ša-ki. Accordingly, disregard [a-na du-u]ša-ša-ki in the edition in Afo 11, as well as [ana dup]puruki in CAD § 9.)

The context of Afo 11 pl. V 10 // Lku 27 rev. 7' and of ArOr 17/1 191:6 indicates that the act referred to as šuma šulû is injurious to the bel dabûb's victim and that the bel dabûb's mouth is instrumental in its performance and suggests that šuma šulû here is to be translated: "to summon to court." (Cf. PN šulû, "to summon as a witness" [CAD E 127b] and PN elû, "to go to court" [E 119b] and "to start a lawsuit" [E 123b]. We know of no other example of this usage. Should šum DN/LUGAL šulû, "to take an oath by DN/king" [E 135] be compared? [Obviously one must not compare šuma ušû, "to exalt" (E 126b).])

We may conclude this part of our examination of this text type by quoting Afo 18 298:15-17 (for which we are able to suggest two important improvements: the reading E[N] KA-šu in 15 instead of the edition's "(ras) pû-šû" and the restoration la in 17; see Part One, note 69). This text sums up a few of the features which we have previously recognized: 15 [DIS NA] id-da-na-du-šu ša šu-šu ina kiš-pi E[N] KA-šu / 16 [iš]-1-na-šar-šu ina E.GAL GIN.GIN-ku / 17 [la ma]h-ra-šù ....

II. An examination of 1) STT 256 and 2) ArOr 17/1 190ff. confirms the observations made in Section I and leads to a somewhat sharper delineation of the situation described in our text type.

1) a) Gurney, STT II, p. 12, no. 256. has characterized STT 256 as a "ritual with incantation against 'hand of man' (qatt amēlātī, 11) i.e., calumny and hostility on the part of neighbours and the authorities." Most of the misfortunes enumerated in 1ff. describe social difficulties encountered by the patient. Those others which center on the patient's own behavior are best understood as reactions to persecution and rejection: 1ff.: [DIS NA] EN HUL-ši [TU] ŠA-ba-šu šu-šu-dur K[I ... ] INIM.MES-šu im-ta-na-diš-ši ..., "If a man has an enemy and, therefore, is afraid, [ ... ] stuttera (lit.: he continually forgets his words), ..." (Cf., e.g., STT 247 [edited JNES 26 190] where the statement that the patient ta-di-ša-ti ul-ta-DAR (4) follows a description of his rejection and of the spreading of rumors about him (1-3).)

b) Almost all of the entries in 1ff., the statement of the purpose of the ritual,
center on regaining the esteem and favor of the gods and of superiors. The
Verheissung found in line 40 seems to sum up the earlier statement of purpose (14-19)
with the prediction: KI-šú GI.NA.MEŠ i-tam-mu-ú. As we have shown elsewhere
(Part One, note 69), this means that the patient will find favor and that all of his
requests will be granted and become "established facts" (cf. 4 R 55/2:23 [ArOr
17/1 187]).

c) The enumeration of misfortunes is introduced by the statement "summa
amēlu bel lemutti [iraššî] (1), which would seem to imply that the bel lemutti
is ultimately responsible for the various misfortunes. This is confirmed by
the formal diagnosis which follows the enumeration of the misfortunes: NA.BI
ŠU.NAM.LÚ.U₂.LU [UGU]-[šú GÁL-šî] (11); for this diagnosis states explicitly
that the various misfortunes are due to machinations and activities performed by
another human being. (Note that this is the only example of a formally articu­
lated diagnosis found in the texts listed at the beginning of this note.) Within
the lengthy statement of purpose of the ritual we find the entry: UGU EN KA-šú
<ana> GUB-zi (17). This entry is the only one in the whole statement of pur­
pose which relates, not to the regaining of things lost, but to victory over an
opponent. It may, therefore, be presumed that this bel dabābi is responsible for
the various misfortunes, that the bel lemutti of line 1 is to be understood as bel
dabābi and that this adversary's actions are termed qāt amēlūti in the diagnosis.

Turning to the ritual, we find that the objects of the destructive part of the
ritual are none other than the warlock and the witch: 2 NU.MEŠ LÚ.U₁₂.ZU
u MI.USH₂SUMER.ŠU šá IM DÛ-[uš] (34). Since the warlock and the witch are referred
there as kūr.kūr: nakara in the accompanying incantation addressed to the fire god
(41ff. [cf. ArOr 17/1 191:25ff. and K 8107:1'ff.]), it is more than likely that the
bel dabābi (= bel lemutti) and the warlock are identified with each other in this
text. This situation is paralleled exactly by KAR 80 obv. 6ff. // K 1853 + I
2'ff., quoted above.

d) The situation, then, in STT 256 is that of a man who is rejected by his supe­
riors, who suffers losses, etc., because of the actions of an enemy (bel lemutti/qāt
amēlūti/bel dabābi/kāššāpu/nakru) who uses witchcraft against him.

e) Finally, it must be noted that the ritual in STT 256 is a miniature version
of several crucial acts in tablet I of Maqlû. Thus, after various preparatory rites
(20-28), the priest prepares statues of a warlock and witch (34), places an offering
before the gods of the night (šú muššiti, 35), destroys the statues (36; cf. M IX 85,
the text of which we have established in our "Textual notes to the ritual tablet
of Maqlû") and recites an incantation to the gods of the night (37 = 29ff.; cf., e.g., M I 1-36) and another to the fire god (37 = 41ff.; cf., e.g., M I 135ff.). (See below
Chapter 4, Sec. C, and note 115.)

2) We may now turn to ArOr 17/1 190ff. (The main text edited there is
Assur Photo 4129. Ebeling listed VAT 13909 as a duplicate, and cited variants
from it on p. 192.a-e [cf. also p. 195]. Note, however, that the two tablets have
different layouts. An examination of a rough mixed transliteration and handcopy
of the obverse of VAT 13909 [Geers] indicates the following correspondences: VAT
13909:1'-6' = ArOr 17/1 191:34-38; VAT 13909:7' cites the incantation ArOr
In view of these other texts, the emphasis in our incantation on the adversary's "mouth" (28, 31, 32 [see below]) and "word" (28 [cf. tù, 27], 32, 35), the close association in our text of the "word" and witchcraft (e.g., 31-35 [see below]) and the fact that the activities in 4-5 lead to the alienation of the victim's personal gods and to his loss of social stature strongly suggest that we should translate:

17/1 191 rev. 2-8 by incipit only; VAT 13909:8' (NU.BI [IL]1-ma! ana! 4UTU! [x][-]10 = ArOr 17/1 191 rev. 9 - 192 rev. 11. Here, after a dividing line, VAT 13909:11'-15', which Ebeling edited on p. 192 as a-e, follow. While these five lines [preparation and burning of statues and recital of an incantation to the fire god] are functionally equivalent to ArOr 17/1 191:15b-32, it is unclear whether they are part of the same ritual as the preceding lines on the tablet or whether they constitute the beginning of a new ritual. [The absence in these lines of any mention of such preliminaries as the setting up of the apparatus would seem to favor the former alternative.] In any case, it may be presumed that the concern with a bēl dabābī in VAT 13909:1'-10' extends to 11'-15'.

If the edition is correct, the text of Assur Photo 4129 begins with the statement of purpose of the ritual and does not contain a description of the situation. Central to this statement is the desire to achieve victory over an opponent and to regain the favor of the authorities. According to the Verheissung, the performance of the ritual results in victory over a bēl dabābī (192:12, 22-23; cf. 191:35 and rev. 2). That the bēl dabābī maligned the patient is clear from the ritual (191:35f.), which prescribes that the mouth of a statue of the bēl dabābī be sealed, and from the accompanying incantation (191 rev. 2ff. [see above 14]), which states that the reason for sealing the bēl dabābī's mouth is to stop him from maligning the patient. That the bēl dabābī also performed (or initiated the performance of) witchcraft against the patient is rendered probable by the fact that the ritual in ArOr 17/1 190ff. evidences a number of similarities to and connections with those in the witchcraft corpus, generally, and in Maqlū specifically. Thus: the preparation and burning of statues in 191:14ff. and in 192:a-d (= VAT 13909:11'-14') are in a form standard for the witchcraft corpus (cf., e.g., AfO 18 296:1ff. and KAR 80 [and duplicates] obv. 8ff. and rev. 15ff.); the incantation in 191:25ff. (/ / STT 256:41ff. // K 8107:1'ff. ) is directed against a witch (who is, thereby, identified with a kūr.kūr: nakara) in STT 256 (see above II 1 ) and mentions zikurrudū, a form of witchcraft; the function and formulation of the dousing of the fire in 191:33-35 (emend it-tu in 34 to it-tu-<hu>) are comparable with AfO 18 297:10 and M IX 86ff.; the incantation cited by incipit in 192:e (= VAT 13909:15') is identical with M II 19ff. = IX 29 (see already ArOr 17/1 195); the incantation addressed to the bēl dabābī in 191 rev. 2ff. and the corresponding ritual in 191:37 may be compared, for example, with M III 89ff. (for the reading of 89, cf. AfO 21 80 on IX 47) and IX 47f. (the ritual for III 89ff. [for 48, see CAD B 102 and A/2 301]) respectively. (In contrast to Maqlū and to STT 256, ArOr 17/1 190ff. did not contain an address to the gods of the night, because it was performed in the daytime [cf. 191:38].)
4 Because a witch has bewitched me,\textsuperscript{36}  
5 a deceitful woman has accused me (or: a denouncer has denounced me), ... \textsuperscript{37}

It must be emphasized that this translation of line 5 is based on established meanings of *elēnītu*, *elītu* and *ubburu*.\textsuperscript{38}

This understanding of line 5 is rendered certain by more explicit usages in other incantations and by the evidence of later sections of our own incantation.

**Evidence of Other Incantations.** Elsewhere in the witchcraft corpus we find the explicit association of *elēnītu*/*ubburu* with “words” (*amātu*/*qibītu*) and the concomitant occurrence in parallelism of *elēnītu*, *ubburu* and *amātu*/*qibītu* with *kaššaptu*, *epēšu* and *kišpū*/*rikšu*, respectively. Note especially the legal setting of *LKA* 154 rev. 8'-9' quoted below.

\begin{verbatim}
4 R 59/1 rev. 11-13:\textsuperscript{39}
ša MĪ.UŠ₂.ZU.MU GAZ KEŠDA-sa
ša e-le-ni-ti-ia₅ su-pi-hi INIM.MEŠ-sá
tir-ra kiš-pi-šá a-na me-he-e INIM.MEŠ-sá ana IM
(compare M I 34-35: kišrūša puṭṭurū īpsētūša hulluqā⁴⁰
cal amātūša malā šēra.)
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{36}For the meaning of *ukašsipanni* in this line, see below Sec. A, 3.
\textsuperscript{37}In view of the documented association of witchcraft, a legal adversary and *kipdū*/*kapādu* (see below and cf., e.g., *AMT* 89/1 II [= V!] 11-22 // K 249 + V! [KM] 51f.) 8-20; K 249 + V! 21-24), we consider such statements as *ša kiš-pi i-pu-šu-ni ik-pu-du-ni nū-ul-la-a-[ti] (4 R 17 rev. 20) or EN [K]A.KA-šū kiš-pi NIGIN-šu kip-di lem[nūti ik-p]u-du-šū (KAR 80 obv. 6f. and duplicate; for a fuller quote and for variants see above note 35) to be parallel formulations of M I 4-5 and of *LKA* 154 rev. 8'-9' discussed below. We would translate 4 R 17 rev. 20, for example, as “who has performed witchcraft against me and has conjured up baseless (charges) against me.” (Note further the final word in each of the lines 27-29 of this text: ... kip-di-[šū-nu] ... kiš-pe-e ... ʾ-il-ti.)
\textsuperscript{38}Cf. *CAD* E s. *elēnēti*, *elēnītu* A, *elītu* mng. 9 (for *elītu*, see also *Nabnītu* L:265 cited *CAD* A/2 29b), *JCS* 9 124 (*ubburu*, *ākil karṣṭi*) and *AHw* s. *abārū* III D 2 (for the lexical equation là, là.là = *ubburu* *ša amātī* cited there, see the translation of *Nabnītu* M:175f. in *CAD* A/2 29b and *ŠL* 481.2).
\textsuperscript{39}See below Chapter 4, Sec. C.
\textsuperscript{40}See below note 104.
M VI 44-48:
*e kaššaptiya elënitiya*

[...]

[u]sappah kišpiki u[ţár amātiki ana píki][41]

Sm 352 obv. 17':
[ša kaššapti hipį] [rį]-kis-sa šá eli-nîl (text: sa)-tí te-er INIM-sa
[ana] [piša]

*LKA* 154 rev. 8'-9':
...UŠ₁₂! DÙ-šú-ni ina qî'bitî
[u-tab/ub]-bi-ru-in-ni ÛTU ina di-ni-ka GAL-e di-na-ni-ma
UGU-šú-nu lu-ziz.

(Note the courtroom setting, and for UGU-šú-nu lu-ziz, see, e.g.,
*STT* 271 I 8: NA.BI UGU EN KA G[U]B-az; and compare *LKA*
154 rev. 8'-9' with *BWL* 200:16-17: eninna ina qibiti ubburat napištî /
dŠamaš ina dînîka murtudû aj ūṣî [also compare *LKA* 154 rev. 10'ff.
with *BWL* 200:18].)

**Other Lines in this Incantation: Lines 31-33, 34-35, 28.**

Our understanding of M I 5 as referring to the oral delivery of ac­
cusations or denunciations against the speaker is confirmed by lines
31-33, 34-35 and 28. Although the nature of the argument in each
 case is essentially identical, the reader will perhaps forgive us if we
 present each argument separately and in detail.

---

[41] The correctness of Meier's restoration of M VI 48 is apparent from a com­
parison with M V 4f. It is possible that V 53 should serve as the basis for
the restoration of VI 47; if so, read: [hašû ti'ut ma-a]-ti. In VI 45 Meier read:
"... a(?)-bu la taš-ku-ni tu-qu-un-tu." If Meier's reading "... a-bu" is correct, then
the mention of tuguntu and the association of these types of texts with those
relating to an adversary suggest the possibility that ayyâbu or, more probably, a
derivative should be restored.
a) Lines 31-33 read:

\[ pùša lu\ lü\ lišānu\ lu\ ṭabtu
ša iqbū amāt lemittiya kīma lipī littatuk
ša ippùšu kispi kīma ṭabti liharmiṯ(!) \]  

Before we can make use of these lines, we must correct the previous translations of 32-33. Recent students of these lines have assumed that the witch is the subject of 32-33. For example, Meier, *Maqlû*, p. 8, translates:

Ihr Mund sei Talg, ihre Zunge sei Salz:
Die die böse Zauberformel gegen mich gesprochen, wie Talg zergehe sie!
Die Zauberei gemacht hat, wie Salz löse sie sich auf!

However, this understanding is incorrect; for the subject of 32, represented by ša, is pù, “mouth,” mentioned in 31a, and the subject of 33, also represented by a ša, is lišānu, “tongue,” mentioned in 31b. Since the mouth is identified with fat in 31a and the tongue with salt in 31b and since the subjects of 32 and 33 are then compared to fat and salt respectively, it is, to say the least, rather unlikely that the subjects of 32 and 33 respectively could be anything but the mouth and the tongue. Furthermore, the actions ascribed to the subjects of 32 (ša iqbū amāt lemittiya) and 33 (ša ippùšu kispi)

---

\[ 42 \text{For this emendation, see AS 13 61f.} \\
\[ 44 \text{Below we indicate that the subjects of 32 and 33 are the mouth and tongue respectively. That Meier did not take these as the subjects (and, therefore, that he construed the witch as the subject) is evident from the feminine relative pronoun “die” and the feminine third person pronoun “sie” used in his translation of 32, since “Mund,” the correct subject of 32, is a masculine noun.} \\
\[ 45 \text{Our translation of these lines was communicated in February, 1969 to Prof. A.L. Oppenheim and was introduced into a draft of the dictionary article on kispu. [See now CAD K 455 a.]} \\
\[ 46 \text{Cf., e.g., *ArOr* 17/1 191:4: aṣbat pāka ana lā qabē <(?) ša amāt> lemittiya.} \]
express functions of these two organs rather well. Finally, the preserved part of the ritual for this section, S TT 83:12'-14', prescribes the recitation of lines 32-33, the placing of salt in the mouth of the statue and the application of a torch to it. The ritual thus assumes that these lines express the wish that the mouth and tongue of the witch, and not the witch herself, be destroyed and, therefore, that the subjects of 32-33 are these organs.

The speaker in lines 31-33 expresses the wish that the witch's mouth and tongue be destroyed. They are to be destroyed because these are the very organs which she used to harm him (ša iqbu amat lemuttiya ... ša i pušu kišpi) and which she may be expected to use again for the same purpose. Through this destruction the plaintiff is avenged for past harm and protected against future harm, since the witch is now rendered powerless and unable to initiate harmful actions. This should be compared not only with such passages as ArOr 17/1 191:4-6 and VAT 35:1-5, where the victim renders his bel dabābi harmless and unable to malign him by depriving him of his powers of speech, or with such others as M VII 109f. // 116f., but also with those laws which stipulate that an organ responsible for a damage is to be destroyed; it has already been said of paragraph 218

The reasons for our emendation are given below note 52.

47 The ritual, S TT 83:12'-14', reads:
12' 3-šá i pušu kišpi
13' šá iq-bu- u a-mat HUL-ti-ia i 〈qab〉- bi šá [i pušu kišpi
14' [x] [x] [x] MUN ina KA-šú GAR-nu/NU ina ap-pi GI.IZI.LA[L

The reasons for our reading of 13' will be found in our "Textual notes to the ritual tablet of Maqlû." Moreover, it is noted there that the ritual tablet has split our incantation into two parts and has prescribed a different set of ritual actions for each of these parts. The treatment of our incantation in the ritual tablet points up an important principle which should be kept in mind when reading incantations: An incantation describing progressive ritual actions may in fact have been accompanied by the performance of these very actions. An incantation of this type need not be static, and the action may progress step by step and achieve its intended result within the incantation itself. Accordingly, a later part of the incantation may express, assume or derive from the fulfillment of an earlier part. This dynamic is especially evident in our incantation. The reader will remember, for example, that the speaker in 21-24 requests that various plants cleanse and free him. In 25-26 he states that he has been cleansed. 25-26 assert that the earlier actions have been performed and that the hoped-for result is now an established fact. The later parts of the text then start from that result.

48 See above notes 35 and 46 and below Sec. A, 3.
of the Code of Hammurabi that:

If, however, either of the first two operations is unsuccessful and the patient dies or loses his eye, the doctor, if the patient is a free man, loses his hand and therewith his ability to remain in practice; he is punished in the offending organ for the satisfaction of the patient, and the general public is at the same time protected against future risk at his hands.\(^\text{49}\)

We have seen that the tongue and mouth of the speaker’s adversary are to be destroyed because they are the organs with which that adversary has harmed him. More specifically, the tongue has \(\text{ipušu kišpī} (33)\) and the mouth has \(\text{iqbū amāt lemuttiya} (32)\). We are now ready to return to lines 4-5. Since 4-5 describe the actions by which the speaker’s adversary originally harmed him, it may be supposed that 4-5 and 32-33 parallel each other and refer to the same actions (but see below Sec. B). Given this supposition, the sufficiently apparent parallelism between \(\text{lišānša ... sa ipušu kišpī} (31b.33)\) and \(\text{kaššaptu ukasšipanni} (4)\) and the association, established above, of \(\text{elēnītu} and \text{ubburu with amātu/qibītu}\) permit us to conclude that \(\text{puša ... sa iqbū amāt lemuttiya} of 31a.32 parallels elēnītu ubbiranni of 5\) and that both refer to the same action. Accordingly, 5 must refer to an action involving the spoken word, and \(\text{ubburu}\) here must be translated “to accuse/denounce.”

b) Lines 34-35 read:

\[
\text{kīsrūša puṭṭurū ipṣētūša hulruqā}
\text{kal amātūša malā šēra.}
\]

Since 4-5 describe the actions which the speaker’s adversary has performed against him and since 34-35 contain the court’s declaration that (the results of) these actions are nullified, it may be supposed that 4-5 and 34-35 parallel each other and refer to the same actions. Given this supposition, the sufficiently apparent parallelism between \(\text{kīsrūša puṭṭurū ipṣētūša hulruqā (34) and kaššaptu ukasšipanni (4)}\) (see below Sec. A, 3.) and the association of \(\text{elēnītu}\) and \(\text{ubburu}\)

\(^{49}\)Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, I, pp. 417f.
with \textit{amātu/qibītu} permit us to conclude that \textit{kal amātuša malā šēra} of 35 parallels \textit{elēnitu ubbiranni} of 5 and that both refer to the same action. Accordingly, 5 must refer to an action involving the spoken word, and \textit{ubburu} here must be translated “to accuse/denounce.”

c) Line 28 reads:

\begin{quote}
\textit{turrat amāssa ana pīṣa lišāna kāṣrat.}
\end{quote}

28 parallels 31-33 in that 28a and 31a.32 are directed against the witch’s mouth and word and 28b and 31b.33 are directed against the witch’s tongue. 28 also parallels 34-35 in that 34 nullifies an effect of an action performed by the witch and 28b causes that same effect to take hold of the witch (see below Sec. A, 3) and both 28a and 35 declare that a “word” spoken by the witch has been rendered ineffective. Accordingly, 28 also reflects the original actions of the witch. Since 4-5 describe the witch’s original actions (and since 4-5, 31-33 and 34-35 are parallel), it may be supposed that 4-5 and 28 parallel each other and refer to the same actions or types of actions. Given this supposition, the parallelism between 28b, 31b.33 and 34 and between 31b.33, 34 and 4 indicates that 28b parallels 4 (see below Sec. A, 3). The parallelism between 28b and 4 and the association of \textit{elēnitu} and \textit{ubburu} with \textit{amātu/qibītu} permit us to conclude that \textit{turrat amāssa ana pīṣa} of 28a parallels \textit{elēnitu ubbiranni} of 5 and that both refer to the same action. Accordingly, 5 must refer to an action involving the spoken word, and \textit{ubburu} here must be translated “to accuse/denounce.”

\textbf{Summary: Line 5 and Lines 21-28.} It may be considered as established that \textit{ubburu} in 5 means “to accuse/denounce,” that in this line the speaker states that orally delivered accusations or denunciations have been directed against him, and that these accusations are responsible for his having been rejected by god and man. This understanding of 5 confirms both our interpretation of \textit{amātu} in 28 (as well as in 32 and 35) as referring to an accusation which had been brought against the speaker and our interpretation of 21-26 as representing the speaker’s attempt to clear himself of an accusation by means of (a functional equivalent of) an ordeal or oath. Given this confirmation and the exegetical presumptions concerning
the relation of 21-26 to 27-28 and of 27 to 28 established earlier (see above Chapter 2), we may summarize our understanding of the inner logic of this part of the plaintiff’s address to the court as follows: The speaker-plaintiff has had an accusation brought against him by the witch (5: elēnītu ubbiranni). By clearing himself by means of an “oath” of the accusation (21-24: binu lûlîlannu ...), the speaker has demonstrated his innocence to the court (25-26: ina mahrikunu ētelil ... ētebib azzaku ...). If he is innocent, the accusation must be false and must have been motivated by evil intent. This being the case (27: tûša ša kaššapti lemutte), the accusation is disproved or rebutted (28a: turrat amâssa ana pîša), and the accuser is silenced and unable to press the charge (28b: lišānša kaṣrat).

For a convincing parallel to this situation, we need only remember that in the Code of Hammurabi the act referred to by the verb ubburu normally causes the accused to undergo some kind of ordeal in order to establish his innocence.⁵⁰

3. Silencing of Victim (Tongue): Lines 4, 9-11 and Parallel Lines

Silencing. In our text the speaker and the witch are to be viewed as legal adversaries (bēl dabābi) who harm each other by means of accusations and counter-accusations. In addition to accusations, there is a further component in a controversy of the type found in our text, and we must now turn to this component. In this type of confrontation the adversaries are understandably concerned with their opponent’s ability to speak, because it is this ability which allows one party to make the initial charge and the other to disprove it. For this reason, the parties not only accuse each other, but also attempt to silence each other. One may silence an opponent by presenting the evidence in a manner that will confound him and will thereby

⁵⁰ In connection with the occurrence in paragraphs 1-2 of the Code of Hammurabi of forms derived from ubburu, Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, I, p. 59, ask: “Does this mean that the man who brings the charge prosecutes the other man in a court of law or merely that he is publishing a defamatory statement about him?” They answer the question as follows:
force him to remain silent and/or by magically impairing his speech organs. (We should not see these as totally separate means, since the use of magic to silence an opponent is often no more than a concretization of the hope that the evidence will be so overpowering as to force him to keep silent.)

This silencing, however achieved, finds literary expression in statements involving the tongue and mouth of an adversary. In texts dealing with this type of conflict we have already encountered such statements as *anettepu lišānšu* (*utarra amāssu ana pišu*) (KAR 71 rev. 5f.) and *ushā lišān[ša] [ (K 8162:11), and we may also quote

The other passage where it is found is §131, which says that a woman’s husband ‘has charged her’ (Bab. *ūbbiršī*) with infidelity; and it seems that this charge must be brought in a court of law as the woman is required to purge herself by the ordeal by oath, which is a mode of proof frequently ordered by a court where there is no direct evidence. In §132, again, where the wife is accused by common report, she is required to undergo the ordeal; here, too, there must be a trial before some court which sends her to the ordeal. In §126, too, the proof before a god that nothing has been lost seems to require the order of a court, and in §127, which is in content not unlike §§1-2, the proceedings take place before the judges. It appears, then, that this verb in §1 implies an accusation before a court of law, and that in §2 the ‘man’ (Bab. *awīlum*) who brings the charge of witchcraft is also a prosecutor as he is called in 1. 44 the ‘accuser’ (Bab. *mūbbirum*). (ibid.)

Without necessarily rejecting this conclusion, we must take exception to the argument on which it is based. The argument boils down to this: since the act of *ubburu* leads to an ordeal or to some other court-instituted procedure, *ubburu* must refer to the bringing of a formal accusation before a court of law. However, the authors themselves compare paragraphs 131 with 132 and note that 132 also requires an ordeal. But, since the functional equivalent of *ubburu* in 131 is accusation “by common report” in 132, the comparison would seem to vitiate the argument because it indicates that a formal determination of innocence or guilt need not result only from a formal accusation brought before a court of law. Note, for example, that in the Middle Assyrian Laws, Tablet A, paragraph 17, Numbers ch. 5 and Deuteronomy 22:13ff. an initial non-formal suspicion and accusation led to an ordeal (the first two) or to a court investigation and decision (the last). It may be that in those communities in which these laws developed the distinction between a formal and informal accusation, which gave rise to the authors’ original question, was not significant and that both types of accusations would have had the same effect upon the accused’s standing in the community.

61 See above Chapter, 2, Sec. A.
from a patient’s address to his bel dababi (ArOr 17/1 191 rev. 2ff.) which he delivers as he magically impairs the speech organs of his bel dababi (cf. ibid. 35ff.):

šalam bel dababiyā attāma ...

ašbat pāka ana là qabē <(?)> ša amāt> lemuittiya ...
aktanak šapteka ana là šūlē ša šumiya.52

In our incantation we find the same idea expressed: after the plaintiff has proved his innocence and has established the presumption that the accusation brought against him is false, he states:

(turrat amāssa ana pīša) lišānša kaṣrat (28).

As we have seen, the plaintiff declares in this statement (a) that the witch’s accusation has been disproved (turrat amāssa ana pīša) and (b) that her speech organ has thereby been disabled (lišānša kaṣrat).

Meaning of Line 4. Since we may assume that the plaintiff’s (= the speaker) actions essentially parallel those of his detractor (= the witch) and reverse their effects, since one of the two components present in this type of conflict can be documented for both the detractor and the plaintiff, viz. the bringing of an accusation by the witch (elēnitu ubbiranni, 5) and its refutation by the speaker (turrat amāssa ana pīša, 28a), and since the other component can be documented for the plaintiff, viz. the silencing of the witch by the speaker (lišānša kaṣrat, 28b [cf. also 31a.32]), it is reasonable to surmise that also the detractor originally attempted to silence the plaintiff, that kaṣṣaptu ukasšipanni (4) refers to this attempt and is parallel to lišānša kaṣrat, and, therefore, that the witch’s initial action against the speaker would have involved not only the bringing

---

52 Our emendation of ašbat pāka ana là qabē lemuittiya to ... ana là qabē <ša amāt> lemuittiya is based on: the parallelism between this line and aktanak šapteka ana là šūlē ša šumiya; the structure (ana là + verb + ša + term for utterance (+ ...)) of the latter line and of such similar lines as VAT 35:4-5 quoted below; and the similarity in function as well as in linguistic content of the emended line to MI 32: ša iqbuš amāt lemuittiya (cf. M III 89f., for which see Ao 21 80 on M IX 47).
of an accusation, but also an attempt to impair his speech organs and to render him speechless.

To determine whether this is correct we must turn again to the description of the witch's actions. Several considerations indicate that 4 is in fact to be interpreted in the light of 28b and that it refers to the disabling of the speaker's speech organs by the witch for the purpose of ensuring the success of the accusation. We may refer in the first instance to the formal configuration of elements in our text. It may be taken as established that 28a (turrat amāssā ana piśa) parallels 35 (kal amātūša malā śērā), that both parallel (i.e., refer to the situation created in) 5 (elēṇītu ubbiranni) and that 34 (kišrūša puṭṭurū ipśētūša hūlluqā) parallels (i.e., refers to the situation created in) 4 (kaśṣaptu ukāṣṣipanni). From these equations and from the occurrence of forms of kašāru in 28b (lišānša kaśrat) and in 34 (kišrūša puṭṭurū), it may be inferred that 28b and 34 are parallel (i.e., 34 nullifies an effect of the witch's action, 28b causes that same effect to be imposed on her) and that, since 4 and 34 are parallel, 4 and 28b must also be parallel. It follows from these inferences, especially since the witch's kišrū in 34 must be due to that action of the witch referred to as ukāṣṣipanni in 4, that 4 refers to the same type of action as 28b, that an action which creates a state described by forms of kašāru must be understood as being subsumed under the statement kaśṣaptu ukāṣṣipanni and that this action had as its purpose the disabling of the speaker's speech organs so as to ensure the success of the accusation which was subsequently brought against him in 5.53

Lines 9-11. This interpretation of 4 is rendered certain by the continuation of the description of the plaintiff's state. In 9-11 we read:

9 qū54 imtanallū piya
10 upunti piya iprusu55
11 mé maštitiya umaṭṭū

53 See below Sec. B for the place of 31-33 in this configuration of elements.
54 qū-ū is to be preferred to qū-ū found in one MS. See below note 78. For the meaning of qū, see below.
55 The omission of a macron over the final u in iprusu is not inadvertent. See below.
These lines were translated by Meier, *Maqlû*, p. 7, as:

Mit Zauberknoten haben sie meinen Mund gefüllt, mit Mehl mir den Mund verschlossen,\(^{56}\) mein Trinkwasser verringert.

Let us leave 10-11 for later and concentrate on 9. According to von Soden,\(^ {57}\) "Die Übersetzung von Meier setzt anscheinend voraus, dass *im-ta-na-al-lu-û* ein Hörfehler für *um-ta-na-al-lu-û* 'sie füllen immer wieder' ist. Im I, l und I, 3-Stamm ist *malû* neutrisch (s. zu Z. 23). Der Text muss hier verderbt sein."\(^ {58}\) Underlying this translation and emendation of 9 are the incorrect assumptions that the *qu* had not been placed in the speaker's mouth prior to its mention in 9, that the function of 9 is to describe that placing, that the main purpose of placing it in his mouth was to prevent him from eating and drinking and that *imtanallû* is a plural verb whose grammatical subject is the witches.

In VAT 35,\(^ {59}\) a text which had as its purpose the victory over a legal adversary (see 18, the statement of purpose of the ritual: *ina muh-hi EN INIM-šû GUB-zu*; cf. 7: *NU EN da-ba-ba ... DÛ-"uš*), we find the speaker addressing a statue of his *bēl dabābi* as follows:

1 \[a\]š-bat KA-ki ú-tab-bil EME-[k[i]
2 aš-bat ŠU-[k]i ad-di qa-a a-na KA-[k[i]
3 ap-te-te KA-ki at-ta-sah EME K[A-k[i]
4 a-na la da-ba-ba šá dib-bi-ja a-na [lâ]
5 šu-un-ni-e šá a-ma-ti-jâ

---

\(^{56}\) Von Soden *apud* Meier, AF 21 71 now translates: "Das Mehl für meinen Mund hielten sie fern."

\(^{57}\) *Apud* Meier, AF 21 71.

\(^{58}\) Cf. *AHw* s. *malû* IV Gtn 2: "*qu* *im-ta-na-al-lu-û* pt-ja Maqlû I 9 (Fehler?)."

\(^{59}\) We learned of this text from quotations *a. CAD B St A* translation of the Ml text prepared by Prof. F. Köcher is in the possession of the Oriental Institute, and we quote from that transliteration. Most of the lines quoted below have already appeared in *CAD* (18: D 4; 7: D 3; 1: A/1 31, § 21; 4-5: A/2 31).
Lines 1-3 may be translated as follows:

Having seized your mouth (and) dried out your tongue, (and) having (then) seized your hands (and) placed a qu into your mouth,

I have now held your mouth open (and) torn out your tongue (i.e., having held your mouth open [by means of the qu],

I have now been able to tear out your tongue), ....

The text explicitly informs us that these operations on the bel dababi’s speech organs were carried out in order to silence him and thereby to prevent him from maligning and accusing the speaker. These operations include the insertion of a qu into the bel dababi’s mouth in order to force him to keep his mouth open, in order to prevent him from moving his tongue and in order to force his tongue into a position in which it may easily be grabbed and torn out.

However, if one inserts a qu into an adversary’s mouth, it is not really necessary to also tear out his tongue, because the qu by itself would achieve the desired result of silencing him. The insertion of a qu into an adversary’s mouth causes his tongue to be kasrat, “constricted,” and this physical condition makes it somewhat difficult to speak (cf. TDP 62:19: summa lišānšu ikkasîr dababa lā

60 For this translation of 1b, see CAD A/1 31 and AHw s. abālu I D 3.
61 For addresses to a bel dababi similar to the one in VAT 35, see above note 35 I 4). The sequence of actions in lines 1-3 can be best understood in the following way (we refer to the speaker as A and the bel dababi as B): A causes B’s tongue to be parched in order to force B to open his mouth. (It may also be that a parched tongue is more easily torn out than a moist one.) When B opens his mouth, A grabs B’s hands in order to prevent him from offering any resistance and inserts the qu into B’s mouth. (Consider that it would require both of A’s hands to grab B’s hands and to place the qu in his mouth. This left A with no hands free to hold B’s mouth open. Since the qu could only be inserted if B’s mouth was open, A had to resort to a means which would force B to keep his own mouth open, and so he first dried out B’s tongue.) The qu forces both B’s mouth to remain open and his tongue to be in an accessible position. A, then, tears out B’s tongue. See below note 63.
62 See already Kraus, AJO 11 226:66, who translates kasrat when said of the tongue as “zusammengesogen.” Cf. AHw s. kasāru G 6b and N 3 for further examples; kasāru in this usage is translated there as “verhärten” (G 6) or “gebunden, verkrampft werden” (N 3).
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illé and ZA 45 26:8: [l]išânšu ikṣurma atmā uł utarra). As the Mesopotamians were no less economical in their actions than we are, more often than not they would have placed a qu, or a similar device, into an adversary’s mouth and have left it at that. This is clear, for example, from the address to a witch in M VII 109f. // 116f.: piki lemnu epera limli (var.: limla) lišankī ša lemutti ina qē likkasīr or from the rubric STT 72:40 // 251:6': INIM.INIM.MA ki-šīr qa EN(bēl) DI(dini) DU₈-ri(putṭūrī), “to relax the constriction (of a tongue caused by) a qū (placed into the mouth by) a legal adversary.”

Contrary to accepted opinion, qu in these passages does not simply refer to a string with which the tongue was tied. Rather, it refers to some kind of gag or bridle, the mouthpiece of which was probably placed under the tongue and pushed as far back in the mouth as possible. qū should be compared, for example, with napsamu. Compare specifically addi qa ana pî[kš] (VAT 35:2) with ina pî ... iddi napsama (BWL 56:q) and lišānki ... ina qē likkasīr (M VII 110 // 117) with napsamu: makṣaru ša pî sīsī (the commentary to BWL 56:q).

Returning to our Maqlû incantation, we note immediately that kisrūša puṭṭūrū (M I 34) is exactly parallel to kisīr qā bēl dīni puṭṭūrī (STT 72:40 // 251:6') and that lišānša kāṣrat (M I 28b) is exactly parallel to lišānki ša lemutti ina qē likkasīr (M VII 110 // 117).

In view of the function of the qu just documented and of the association of qu, kāṣāru and lišānu in magical texts having a background similar to that of our incantation, the occurrence in our in-

---

63 VAT 35 (see above note 61) points to the possibility that dirt/dust (epru) was placed in the witch’s mouth in order to dry out her tongue and, thereby, to facilitate the insertion of the qu.

64 In STT 72 DI is immediately followed by DU₈-. In STT 251 there are traces between these signs, and we are uncertain whether these traces represent a damaged sign (in which case perhaps read DI.[KUD] or di-[nl?] in this MS) or an erasure. While we have disagreed with Reiner, JNES 26 191, who transliterated and partially translated the rubric as INIM.INIM.MA ki-šīr qa EN DI paṭāri, “incantation to undo a knot of ....” in taking DU₈-ri as puṭṭūrī, we have done so only because of kisrūša puṭṭūrū of M I 34, and it is still possible that paṭāri is correct.

65 E.g., Meier, Maqlû, pp. 7:9, 50:110, 51:117; AḤw s. kāṣāru N 3.

66 The underlying association of qu and kāṣāru is also evident in the phrase mušallītu qē lumni (cf. 4 R 17 rev. 17, RA 48 8:16, Iraq 18 62:18), since qē lumni is obviously comparable to kisīr lumni (e.g., 4 R 55/2:6).
cantation of *lišānša kašrat* (28b) and *kišrūša puṭṭurū* on the one hand and of *qū imtanallū piya* on the other clearly indicates that the *qū* in our incantation was placed in the speaker’s mouth in order to silence him and to deprive him thereby of his ability to defend himself against accusations. And we must compare this situation with the one described, for example, in lines 68-75 of the first tablet of *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi*:

Their hearts rage against me, and they are ablaze like fire.
They combine against me in slander and lies.
They have sought to muzzle my respectful mouth,
So that I, whose lips used to prate, have become like a mute.
My sonorous shout is [reduced] to silence,
My lofty head is bowed down to the ground,
Dread has enfeebled my robust heart.
A novice has turned back my broad chest.

The G (neutral) tn (iterative) form of *malū* (in contrast to a factitive non-iterative form of the verb) in the statement *qū imtanallū piya* in 9 excludes the possibility that this line describes the insertion of the *qū* into the speaker’s mouth, indicates that the verb is a singular whose subject is *qū* and requires that this line describe a continuous situation (“a *qū* continually fills my mouth”) which resulted from the aforementioned action. Therefore, the speaker in 9 must take this action for granted; the action must have taken place at a point prior to 9; and the description of the action must be implicit in one of the earlier lines in the text. Since there is no reason to assume that it is implicit in 1-3 or in 5-8, since we previously

---

67 Cf. M I 12.

68 Lines 68-69 and 71-75 are quoted from *BWL* 35, and line 70 is quoted from *ANET* 3 596.

69 See below where we show that the -u ending is a subjunctive morpheme.

70 That a description of this action is not implicit in 1-3 and 6-8 is too obvious to require comment. Moreover, we reject categorically the possibility that it is either explicit or implicit in 5 (*elēntu ubbiranni*). While we believe that our previous arguments relating to 4 and 5 are sufficient to establish this, the reader might be inclined to raise an objection from the rubric *AfO* 18 296:26-28, and, therefore, we must examine this rubric. The present edition and translation of this rubric read:
established the presumption from the parallelism between 4, 28b and 34 and between 5, 28a and 35 that the act of silencing was implicit in *kaššāptu ukaššipanni* of 4 and that this act created a state described by forms of *kašāru* (*kišru, kašrat*) and since we have also established that the main purpose of inserting the *qū* into the speaker’s mouth in our text was to silence him and that the state created by this use of a *qū* is also described by forms of *kašāru* (*kišru, nakšuru*), we are completely justified, and probably even required, to conclude that the act of inserting the *qū* into the speaker’s mouth in order

---

26 INIM.INIM.MA *kaššāpti* (MÍ.USH₁₂.ZU) šá *kiš-pi* ma⁻¹-du-tú *i-pu*-š[u]

27 *sahārim* (NIGIN)-ma *sā-ba-ti* šá *kaššāpti* (MÍ.USH₁₂.ZU) šá ru-he-e

   *i-pu*-š[u] *pi-i-[s]a

28 *ár-hiš ub-bu-ri*

Incantation for finding and seizing a sorceress who has performed much sorcery, for speedily binding the mouth of the sorceress who has performed charms against him.

We consider the text of this rubric to be corrupt. The present edition and translation of the duplicate, *ibid.* 8-9, read:

8 INIM.INIM.MA [ .. ] *kaš-šap-tu* ša *kiš-pi* ma⁻¹-[du-ti *ipuša* (DÜ-šá)]

9 *sahārim* (NIGIN)-ma *šabāti* (D[B] [šá ru]-he-e šá ru-se-e *ipuša* (DÜ-šá)

   *ū-še-pi-š[ā .. ]*

Incantation [ .. ] for finding and seizing a sorceress who [has performed much] sorcery, [who] has performed and has had performed [ .. charms and spells.

1) Since the duplicate reads *ipuša* (DÜ-šá) *ū-še-pi-[š]a* (9) instead of *i-pu*-š[u] *pi-i-[š]a* (27) and since lines 26-28 contain the only occurrence of *pá ubburu* known to us, it is probable that the original text did not have *piša* and that 27 should be emended to *i-pu*-š[u] *ū-še-pi-[š]a*.

2) Line 8 of the duplicate indicates that something has been omitted in 26 between INIM.INIM.MA and MÍ.USH₁₂.ZU. A glance at LKA 154 ( + ) 155 (not yet confirmed) // LKA 157 // K 3394 (Gray, SRT 7) + K 9866 (confirmed) is most instructive in this regard:

   LKA 157 I 21 // LKA 154 obv. 9(B):
   [kiš-pi e]p-šú-šú *sā-ha-rim* -ma ana DÜ-šú-nu ṣa-[ba](B: (?)++-[a])-ti(B: te);
   K 3394 rev. 15 // LKA 155 rev. 27:
   INIM.INIM.MA *kiš-pi* *sā-ha-rim*-[ma ana DÜ-šú]-nu ṣa-ba-ta.

These two passages, and especially the second, indicate that *kišpi* should be restored in 8 and inserted in 26. 26-27a should be translated “to cause <witchcraft> to turn and seize the witch (*kaššāpta*) who has performed much witchcraft.” (For the *sahāru/tāru-shabāti* motif in this meaning in witchcraft texts, cf., also, M VII 159f., 169, *AMTBB/1 II* 13f. // *BAM* 208 II 8f., K 2395:2.)

3) We leave open the question whether the first *ša* in 27 should be attached to *šabāti* or whether it was inserted after *ušēpiša* had been corrupted to *piša* and should, therefore, be eliminated.)
to silence him and to prevent him from rebutting the accusation is implicit in *kaššaptu ukasšipanni* in 4.

Our interpretation of 9 as describing a situation which resulted from an action of the witch, rather than the action itself, not only explains the Gtn form *imtanallu* and thereby eliminates the need of an emendation, but also allows us to remove a disturbing anomaly from lines 6-12. According to the previous translations of 9-11, these lines describe actions of the witch. However, since 4-5 describe actions of the witch and since 6-8 and 12 describe the effects of these actions on the victim, 9-11, as understood by these translations, do not fit into the sequence and create a structural and logical disturbance. By showing that 9 describes a situation which resulted from an earlier action, we have eliminated that part of the problem created by 9. But we are then left with the following interrelated questions about 9-11:

1) If the witches are not the subject of *imtanallu*, what is the function of the *-u* ending in this verb?

2) Since 9 describes a situation which resulted from an action whose purpose was to silence the speaker and since no mention is made of any speech impairment in this and the following lines, why does the speaker in 9 even bother to describe this situation?

3) If 9 describes an effect of an action performed in an earlier part of the text, should not 10-11 also describe such effects? The reader will recognize that if we can answer these questions satisfactorily, our interpretation of 4 and 9 will be further confirmed.

To answer these questions, we need only realize that the same *qû* which was placed in the speaker’s mouth in order to silence him would not have allowed him to close his mouth or to use his tongue and, therefore, would also have had the added effect of not allowing him to eat or to drink. The purpose of 9-11 is to describe this added effect. In presenting this description, the speaker first explains why it is that he is unable to eat or to drink, viz. *qû imtanallû piya*, and, thereby, also ascribes ultimate responsibility for this inability to the witch who had placed the *qû* in his mouth (4). However, it is not

---

the witch, but rather the qu (9) that is immediately responsible for the speaker's inability to eat and to drink (10-11). This immediate responsibility is implicit in the proximity of 9 to 10-11 and in the situation underlying our text. And we may again refer to a description of a comparable situation in Ludlul bēl nēmeqi, though this time found in tablet II (BWL 42:45:84-87):

A snare is laid on my mouth,\(^{72}\)
And a bolt bars my lips,
My 'gate' is barred, my 'drinking place'\(^{73}\) blocked,
My hunger is prolonged, my throat stopped up.

Moreover, the speaker in our incantation expressly describes the situation exactly as we have construed it. For, by using the preterite-specific form of the verb in 10-11 and by contrast the present-iterative form in 9, a usage which indicates that the events described in 10-11 are attendant upon the circumstance described in 9, the speaker also explicitly ascribes the immediate responsibility for his inability to eat and to drink (10-11) to the qu (9).

The verbs in 9-11 (imtanallû, iprusu, umaṭṭû) have been interpreted by the previous translators of 9-11\(^{74}\) as plural verbs whose subjects are the witches. The considerations presented thus far in our treatment reveal, however, that this interpretation is incorrect and that not the witches, but the qu is the subject of all three verbs in these lines. Moreover, the aforementioned considerations do not exhaust our reasons for contending that "the witches" cannot be the subject of these verbs. We may also introduce the -u ending in these verbs as further evidence in support of this contention; for if "the witches" (kaššaptu + elēnitu), a feminine plural referent, were the subject, the pronominal affix expressing the subject of these verbs should then have been -ā (*imtanallā, *iprusā, *umaṭṭā) and not -u. This -u ending is a subjunctive morpheme, and the subjunctive form of these verbs is due to aššu in 4, which word governs 4-12. This is

\(^{72}\) ina piya nahbal nadima. In the context of our discussion, note, for whatever it is worth, that nahbalu is translated qu nahbalim in MSL VI 76:98 and 79:43 (cited AHw s. nahbalu).

\(^{73}\) See below note 79.

\(^{74}\) See above note 71.
proved by the variant *am-ru-ṣu* in 7, since *amruṣu* obviously cannot be a plural verb and the -*u* must be the subjunctive morpheme. All the verbs in 4-12 are in the (singular) subjunctive form, and these lines form a *Kausalsatz* introducing 13-14.

The verbs in 9-11 are singular subjunctives whose subject is the *qū* mentioned in 9, and these lines are to be translated:

A gag(?) continually filling my mouth
has kept food distant from my mouth (and)
has diminished the (amount of) water (which passes through) my drinking (organ).

---

76 Thus, "the witch" and not the witches is the subject of *ušessû* (6). From the speaker's point of view, the *kaṣṣaptu* and *ešenîtu* of 4 and 5 are simply designations of a single opponent.
77 This, of course, proves that 4-5 are not a syntactically independent unit or syntactically connected to 1-3.
78 According to Meier, *Maqlû*, p. 66, an Assur MS has *qu-šu* instead of *qu-ú* in this line. Even if *qu-šu* were to be shown to be the better reading, our interpretation of 4 would not be essentially affected, since 9 would then be quite explicit in describing the speaker as being silent and would, therefore, still take a prior action of silencing for granted. (Also our interpretation of the verbs in 9-11 as singulars would remain unaffected, though the subject of 10-11 would then probably have to be the witch.) However, we consider *qu-ú* to be the better reading for a number of reasons. These reasons are all implicit in our discussion of 9-11 and their relation to other parts of the incantation, and here we need only summarize several of these reasons.
1) Texts like *BWL* 34f.: 68-75, quoted above, establish the association of maligning with silencing the accused by means of a mouthpiece.
2) In view of the association of *kaṣṣaru*, *lišānu* and *qū* in, e.g., M VII 110 // 117, the clear occurrence in our incantation of the first two (28b, 34) argues in favor of seeing the third in 9.
3) Since 9-11 deal with the mouth, it is a legitimate presumption that there is a close relationship between 9 and 10-11. *qū* fulfills the terms of this requirement and establishes a relationship between 9 and 10-11 identical with the one between *BWL* 42f.: 84 and 42-45: 85-87. *qūtu*, on the other hand, does not fulfill the terms of this requirement.
79 Since *upunti piya* (10) and *me mašittiya* (11) are parallel, *mašittiya* is best taken here as a term for the whole or part of the mouth. Compare the use of *mašqū’a* in *BWL* 42: 86 (*ba-bi e-di-il pi-hi maš-qu-u-a*), quoted above.
4. Lines 4-5: Summary and Further Illustration.

We have tried to show that lines 4-5 (*aššu kaššaptu ukaššipanni elēnītu ubbirannī*) are to be understood in the following way: In order to effectively denounce the speaker, the witch inserted a qû in his mouth and thereby constricted his tongue (*kašrat*; cf. 28b and 34) and silenced him. She then denounced him. We may conclude this part of our analysis by citing a bilingual incantation, edited without translation in *ZA* 45 25f. Not only does this incantation provide a parallel to the treatment suffered by the victim in M I 1-36 at the hand of his witch, but it also shares with it a number of linguistic usages. It will be sufficient for our purpose to quote and translate the Akkadian version of the first eight lines, and we may safely leave it to the reader to notice the similarities and to draw the necessary conclusions.

2 *kasšaptum ana tappē ubburi šalam ibni*
4 *[išān]šu mušāt ukarrik mešrētāšu uktesṣi*
6 *pišu išbatma pišu ul ipetti*
8 *[išān]šu ikšurma atmā ul utarra*

2 In order to denounce a comrade, a witch made a statue (of him).

---

80 A further duplicate of this incantation is Rm 491 obv. 1'-11'. These lines correspond to obv. 5 - rev. 7 of the edition. Note that the incantation in this MS seems to be unilingual. This MS provides several variants. (In listing these variants, we utilize Falkenstein’s alphabetic notations of variants whenever possible and repeat the information given there.)

obv. 12 *u-me-ni-si: Rm 491: u- for ū-.*
obv. 15 *ba-ni-ib-gi₄-gi₄: Rm 491: mu-un-ab-gi₄-.*
rev. 1 *note d: “Rm II 314 mu-na- für ba-.”; Rm 491: mu-un-na- for ba-.*
rev. 3 *kuš-ni-ta: Rm 491: ū- for kuš-.*
rev. 3 *note f: “Rm II 314 hat zi-zi für ba-an-zi.”; Rm 491: zi [ for ba-an-zi.*
rev. 6 *siga-ga: Rm 491: sig₄- for sig₄-.*

81 For intra-tappû denunciations, cf. *BWL* 34:86 and *JCS* 9 123. For a different translation of ubburi in this line, see *AHw* s. abāru III D 1 ("umspannen").
4. She gagged his tongue with wool combing\textsuperscript{82} (and) bound his members.
6. She seized his mouth so that he would be unable to open his mouth.
8. She constricted his tongue so that he would be unable to refute (her) accusation.\textsuperscript{83}

B. Two Images of Witchcraft

1. Tongue-Mouth/Words

For reasons which will become evident, we have refrained thus far from introducing lines 31-33 into our discussion of line 4. We previously showed that the speaker in 31-33 expresses the desire that the mouth (31a.32: \textit{pūša lū ĭpū \ldots ša iqbü amāt lemutiliya kīma līpi lītattuk}) and tongue (31b.33: \textit{lišānsa lū ŭābtu \ldots ša ĭpušu kišpī kīma ŭābti līharmīt(\ldots)}) of his opponent be destroyed. We need only compare these lines with 28: \textit{turraṯ amāssa ana piša lišānsa kāsrat} to notice that both 31-33 and 28 are concerned with the mouth and tongue of the adversary, that 28a (\ldots \textit{amāssa \ldots piša}) parallels 31a.32 (\textit{pūša \ldots amāt \ldots}), that 28b (\textit{lišānsa \ldots}) parallels 31b.33 (\textit{lišānsa \ldots}) and that both 28b and 31b.33 have as their purpose the disabling of the witch's tongue. Given the parallelism between 28 and 31-33 and between 28, 34-35 and 4-5, it may be supposed that 31-33 parallels 4-5. In view of the parallelism between 5 and 31a.32 (see above Sec. A, 2), it may be concluded that 4 and 31b.33 are also parallel. The mention of the witch's tongue in 31b supports, therefore, our interpretation of 4 as involving an action which disabled the speaker's tongue.

In terms of this interest in the tongue and mouth, the unit 31-33 fits with the other units in our text, and together they form the pat-

\textsuperscript{82} For this translation, see \textit{CAD} K 199 (correct "he" there to "she"; see below note 83).

\textsuperscript{83} Contrary to a previous translation of lines 7-8 (\textit{JCS} 15 10: "He (the demon) has bound his (the patient's) tongue so that he is unable to reply."), the subject of these lines is a witch and not a demon.
tern: 4-5 // 28 // 31-33 // 34-35. Each of these four units is made up of two components, one of which always centers on the tongue and the other of which always centers on the mouth and/or words (i.e. accusations):

A. the tongue
   4: the tongue of the speaker is harmed,
   28b: the tongue of the witch is harmed,
   31b.33: the tongue of the witch is harmed,
   34: the tongue of the speaker is healed.

B. the mouth and/or words
   5: the witch harms the speaker by uttering words (with her mouth),
   28a: the witch’s words are “turned back into her mouth,”
   31a.32: the witch’s mouth, which uttered the words, is harmed,
   35: the witch’s words are scattered to the wind.

In both A and B, the recipient of the action in the first and last units is the speaker (with the first describing the harm done to him and the last declaring that it has been undone), while the recipient in the middle two units is the witch. It is interesting that while the two units which center on the harm done to the speaker have the order A(4; 34) – B(5; 35), the two which center on the witch reverse this order and have B(28a; 31a.32) – A(28b; 31b.33). Both of these orders probably reflect, and are therefore probably due to, a speaker-oriented chronological perspective:
A-B: the actions performed against the speaker are described and their effects are eliminated in the order of their performance.
B-A: Those performed against the witch are given in an order which is determined by (1) the closeness to the speaker of the effect emanating from the organ to be harmed – for this reason, the witch’s tongue is harmed only after the “word” which “touches” the speaker is returned to the witch’s mouth or only after the mouth which utters this “word” is destroyed – and (2) the actual order of events – only by disproving the accusation is the speaker able to silence the witch.
2. Lines 31-33: Another Conception of Witchcraft

The tongue-mouth/word pattern constitutes the dominant theme in our incantation. However, while lines 31-33 fit into this pattern, the fit remains imperfect because of 31b.33: "may her tongue be salt, ..., may that (= the tongue) which performed 'witchcraft' (ša īpušu kišpī) dissolve like salt." Since the act described in 4 resulted in the constriction of the speaker's tongue, the destruction of the witch's tongue in 31b.33 can be understood as an "eye for an eye" type of revenge. But, whereas kaššaptu ukaššipanni (4) assumes that the witch manually manipulated the speaker's (statue's) mouth in order to disable his tongue (just as 31-33 assume that the speaker manually manipulated the witch's (statue's) mouth and tongue in order to disable them\(^{84}\)), lines 31b.33 assume that the witch's tongue is to be destroyed because it has īpušu kišpī, and, therefore, these lines also assume that the witch performed kišpī with her tongue and not with her hands.

This contradiction is symptomatic of the fact that our incantation contains an uneven mixture of two sets of images of the witch and witchcraft and that these images reflect two distinct situations: (a) the conflict with a witch and (b) the conflict with a legal adversary.

In much of the SB Akkadian and late Sumerian prayer and incantation tradition, experiences originally unrelated to law or the law court are perceived through, molded by and integrated into a view of reality generalized from the legal sphere of life and are expressed in images drawn from that sphere. Thus, for example, evil demons who "are forms given to the numinous power experienced in sudden illness and pain, or other situations of uniformly terrifying nature"\(^{85}\) are perceived as criminals, and the experience of being in conflict with a demon takes on the character of a conflict whose resolution lies not only in the realm of "sympathetic magic," but also in the law court.\(^{86}\) Where the gods were asked originally only for magical

---

\(^{84}\) The ritual tablet (\(ST T\) 83:12'-14'; see above note 47 and reference there) confirms this interpretation of 31-33, since it expressly prescribes such manipulations.


\(^{86}\) Cf. Frankfort et al., \(Before\ Philosophy\), pp. 221f. and Laessøe, \(Bit rimki\), pp. 87f.
assistance, the entreaty now becomes a lawsuit and the gods become judges. It is well known that the theme of turning to the god as judge and seeking a decision from him dominates many Akkadian prayers and incantations.

Central to the original perception of witchcraft was the witch’s spittle, and it is possible that this perception derives from the image of the witch as a (disturbed) woman who, among other things, slavered at the mouth. It is well known that the sign US₁₂ is composed of the elements KAₓÚŠ and represents not only the standard words for witchcraft, but also such others as imtu. A most revealing passage is BAM 318 II 38f.: DIŠ NA kis-pi u ru-mi-ka-ti ik-bu-us a-na kis-pi u ru-mi-ka-ti BÛR, “If a man steps in kis-pi or (lit.: and) in (discarded) washwater; in order to release the (effects) of (stepping in) kis-pi or (lit.: and) (discarded) washwater.” In view of rumikātu, it is not unlikely that also kis-pi in this passage refers to a liquid substance⁸⁷ and that this substance is spittle. It is possibly with this meaning of kis-pu in mind that the witch is said to give her victim bewitched food to eat and bewitched liquid to drink (i.e., food and drink mixed with spittle).⁸⁸,⁸⁹

---

⁸⁷It is possible, though in our opinion doubtful, that this inference is disqualified by JNES 15 142:43'-47'.

⁸⁸Cf., e.g., Laessøe, op. cit., p. 38:11ff. and n. 86, M I 103f., 4 R 59/1 obv. 15f. // K 9285 + 13861:2'f. (Note that Laessøe’s statement, op. cit., p. 15, n. 19, that ramāku in 4 R 59/1 obv. 16 refers to washing with beer is wrong, since it simply ignores the break in the middle of the line. This line must read: ina KAŠ lu! [iš-qu-šú ina A.MEŠ] lu ú-ra-me-ku-šú. The duplicate, K 9285 + 13861, has: [... ina KAŠ lu NAG-šú] ina A.MEŠ lu TU₅-šú.)

⁸⁹Note that the medical texts frequently associate symptom syndromes centering on the stomach, lungs and mouth with witchcraft diagnoses. Since some of these texts expressly state that the patient has eaten and drunk kis-pu (e.g., BAM 190:22ff. and the texts cited in BAM II p. XXI for these lines; AMT 87/1 obv. 8ff.; 48/4 rev. 8f.; STT 102:1ff.), this is probably also to be assumed for those others which simply say that kis-pu has seized the patient or that the patient is kašip (e.g., BAM 193 I 8'ff., 90:12'f., AMT 50/3 obv. 11, 55/2:4ff., 31/4:14ff., AJO 1 23:1ff.). Note BAM 90:5' (cf. AMT 48/2:13ff.): NA.BI lu-a-te KI NINDA KÛ u KAŠ [NAG].
3. Integration

While this perception of witchcraft and the witch remains alive throughout the life of the tradition, in many texts it has been placed into a legal setting, redefined in terms of this new setting and overlaid by, mixed with, and even submerged by images drawn from this new setting and sphere. This legal setting can be described as the conflict at law with an adversary. We need only examine the many anti-witch Šamaš incantations to see and appreciate the transformation. In these incantations the speaker addresses Šamaš, or one of his replacements, as a judge, refers to the witch by such terms as bēl ikkiya, bēl șirriya, bēl diniya, bēl amātiya, bēl dabābiya, bēl lemuttiya, etc., denounces the actions of the witch, claims that, while he has not harmed her, she has harmed him unjustly and asks the god to give a judgment in his favor.

In this new setting the witch and victim become legal adversaries and the conflict becomes a legal conflict. For our purposes it is necessary to emphasize that also the means normally used by legal adversaries are attributed to both the victim (i.e., the plaintiff) and the witch (i.e., the defendant). This development in the image of the witch is especially apt, because in both the older and younger conceptions one of the witch’s main instruments of harm is her mouth. For this reason, the development did not require that the older terminology used to describe the witch’s actions be eliminated or even that it undergo radical transformation. Often the addition of new terms and the subtle shift in meaning of older ones sufficed to create a literary idiom for the new conception. And perhaps it is not to be attributed to textual error that in the witchcraft incantation PBS 1/2 120(A) // Sm 275 + Rm 329 (confirmed)(B), ina pīša našāt

90 The fact that a witch might be called upon to assist a party to a “real” conflict may have contributed to this. Cf. JCS 23 29:20-26, where both the plaintiff and the defendant accuse each other of having been assisted by witches (see ibid., p. 28). (Note that the last paragraph on p. 27 is to be disregarded, because “le texte cité comme l’unique exemple de magie noire par Ebeling, Orientalia, NS, 20, 167 ss., n’est en vérité qu’un serment niant une dette ou l’accusation d’un détournement de fonds.” [Reiner in Le Monde du Sorcier, Source Orientales 7, p. 97, n. 10.])

91 Cf. e.g., M I 73ff., KAR 80, AfO 18 289ff. (A full list of the representatives of this incantation type will be presented elsewhere.) See below Chapter 4, Sec. D.
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amāt mar[u][s]ti (A obv. 4 // B 9') of the description of the witch's actions is paralleled by uski imāt HUL-ti ša pīki (A obv. 15 // B 16') of the speech to the witch.\(^9^2\)

This new conception of the witch pervades our incantation, and the conflict between her and her victim has taken on the guise of the type of legal conflict described earlier, to the extent that not only the victim but also the witch has recourse to the standard techniques, both magical and non-magical, used in this type of conflict. But even here, the older conception has not been completely eliminated and it finds particular expression in lines 31-33, and we should probably translate 31b.33 as: "her tongue ... which has made spittle ...."\(^9^3\)

\(^9^2\) We identified Sm 275 as a duplicate of PBS 1/2 120 on the basis of Geers' copy, and guessed that Rm 329 both duplicated PBS 1/2 120 and joined Sm 275 on the basis of Besold, Cat., p. 1604 s. Rm 329, where we came across the entry "One section begins: ÊN an-nu-ú šu-ú an-ni-tu ši-ši i-la-as-su-ma [\]." We communicated our surmise to Mr. C.B.F. Walker of the British Museum, who checked and confirmed the suggested join. Because a copy of Rm 329 was not available to us, Mr. Walker most graciously prepared a preliminary transliteration, and we wish to express here our deep-felt gratitude to him not only for this but for all his assistance. An edition of this text will be presented elsewhere.

\(^9^3\) Compare 31-33 with M III 89-92 (for the correct reading of 89, cf. AfO 21 80 on IX 47).