Volume 142 / Number 2 / March–June 2022
ISSN 0003-0279

Journal of the AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

Articles

DIETER GUNKEL, The First Person Singular of the Athematic Middle Optative in Vedic and Indo-Iranian 251

XIAODAN HU, LIDONG XIA, and LING CAO, A New Sogdian Fragment of the *Avalokiteśvaraikādaśamukhadhāraṇī* from the Tuyoq Grottoes in Turfan 267

ANDREW OLLETT, Non-Canonical Subjects in the Prakrit of Kōūhala's *Līlāvaī* 273

CHARLES SANFT, "Rhapsody on the Ershi General Spring" (Ershi quan fu 貳師泉賦) from Mogaoku, Dunhuang: Introduction and Translation 293

XIAO RAO, Humor under the Guise of Chan: Stories of Su Shi and Encounter Dialogues 311

ZHIYI YANG, An Alternative Lyric Modernity? Modern Classicism and Zhou Zuoren's Wartime Doggerels 335

W. RANDALL GARR, התהלך and Its Congeners 353

H. CRAIG MELCHERT and ILYA YAKUBOVICH, Binding and Smiting: One More Merism in Luvian Incantations 371

FOKELIEN KOOTSTRA, A Quantitative Approach to Variation in Case Inflection in Arabic Documentary Papyri: The Case of *ʾab* in Construct 387

GEORGE WARNER, One Thousand *ḥijaj*: Ritualization and the Margins of the Law in Early Twelver Shiʿi *ziyāra* Literature 415

Brief Communication

BILL HICKMAN, Eşrefoğlu's *Müzekki'n-nüfûs* 435

Review Articles

M. J. GELLER, The Fiction of a Jewish Hellenistic Magical-Medical *Paideia* 443

JONATHAN S. MILGRAM, Tractate *Temurah* and the Methodology of Talmud Text Criticism 455

Reviews 465

Brief Reviews 499

Binding and Smiting: One More Merism in Luvian Incantations

H. Craig Melchert
Carrboro, NC
and
Ilya Yakubovich
Russian Academy of Sciences

The purpose of this paper is to offer evidence for a set of related formulaic expressions meaning 'bond and blow', 'of binding and smiting', and 'the substitute for binding and smiting' in Luvian cuneiform texts of the second millennium BCE. The passages where the relevant formulae are attested have resisted a coherent interpretation thus far. Our argumentation is three-pronged. First, we resort to the combinatorial method to show that these formulae occur in the vicinity of other merisms, and therefore are likely to constitute the same figure of speech. Furthermore, we endeavor to demonstrate based on context that they denote something related to strong physical impact. The argument involves a great deal of restored text, but although voluminous, the contexts are so repetitive that the restorations appear warranted. Second, we use the etymological method in order to justify the claim that the roots supplying their reflexes to our formulae are Proto-Indo-European *seh_2 'to bind' and *wed^h 'to strike, smite'. The derivation of each of the derivatives occurring in the bipartite merisms under discussion is addressed in some detail, and additional evidence from a Luwian hieroglyphic inscription Kululu 1 is adduced to flesh out our hypothesis. Third, we provide typological discussion facilitating the interpretation of "binding" and "smiting" in the context of the Hittite-Luvian antiwitchcraft rituals. It turns out that hostile witchcraft has a potential to both "bind" (paralyze) and "smite" (cause to suffer) the body parts of its victim. As a whole, the paper represents a contribution to the ongoing decipherment of the Luvian language.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is a well-known fact that few, if any, cuneiform texts were composed entirely in the Luvian language. The majority of Luvian cuneiform passages available to us belong to esoteric incantations embedded in Hittite religious compositions. Because of their arcane subject matter, discontinuous character, and the fragmentary state of preservation, they are overall less well understood than the Luvian inscriptions in Anatolian hieroglyphic transmission. Recent progress in this domain has, however, been achieved in recent years within the framework of the eDiAna and Luwili projects.[1] An approach to the decipherment of the Luvian

Authors' note: Most of the results of this paper were gradually reached by the two authors in the process of a multi-year collaboration, which heavily relied on mutual feedback. Ilya Yakubovich and H. Craig Melchert took the primary responsibility for formulating its synchronic and diachronic conclusions, respectively. Its preliminary version was presented at the international linguistic online workshop on the occasion of August Leskien's 180th anniversary (Moscow State University, December 2020). Ilya Yakubovich conducted research on the topic of this paper under the auspices of the Luwili project (cf. the following note). We are grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

1. The Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Languages (eDiAna) project is sponsored by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) and headed by Olav Hackstein (Munich), Jared Miller (Munich), and Elisabeth Rieken (Marburg). The international project "Luwili: Luwian Reli-

incantations that has proved to be particularly fruitful involves the analysis of recurrent formulae, the structure of which furnishes a hint at the semantic relationship between their constituent elements. One example of this line of research is Mouton and Yakubovich 2019, where the concurrent application of combinatorial and etymological method yielded a new merism 'internal and external', used in combination with other merisms, such as 'dead and living' or 'past and future'.[2] In what follows we tackle another Luvian formula, or rather set of formulae, which can likewise occur in combination with merisms but heretofore have resisted interpretation.

The collocations under discussion feature the forms derived from the stem *ša-ḫu-i-t*° /saγʷid-/ and the root *ú-i-t*° /wid-/, respectively. The former stem was addressed in Laroche 1959: 84, where Luv. *šaḫuitala-* '?' and *šaḫuitara-*, supposedly 'regular, normal', are analyzed as cognates of Hitt. *šakuwaššara-*, and Hitt./Luv. *šaḫuiḫuišuwali-* 'legitimate'.[3] Yet the equation of Hitt. *šakuwaššara-* and Luv. *šaḫuitara-* was rejected as phonetically irregular in Melchert 1993: 184, while ***šaḫuiḫuiššuwali-* was dismissed as a ghost word in Košak 1996. Thus, for the time being, the derivatives of the stem /saγʷid-/ lack a plausible etymology.

The Luvian adjectives *witantalli(ya/i)-* and *witatt(a)-* are tentatively interpreted as derivatives of the word for 'water' and cognates of *wida-* 'watery' in Melchert 1993: 271–72. The context suggests, however, that the last lexeme is a noun occurring in a list next to 'mountains', 'rivers', and 'meadows' and thus also denoting a landscape feature (Yakubovich 2017: 11). Furthermore, it cannot be separated from the rare Hittite noun *wida-*, which may either represent a cognate of Luv. *wida-* or reflect its borrowing into Hittite. According to Kloekhorst (2008: 1015–16), this noun means 'water', but the meaning 'lake' or 'creek' would suit all the Hittite contexts cited there equally well, simultaneously drawing a bridge to the Luvian form.[4] While *witantalli(ya/i)-* and *witatt(a)-* are certainly fitting candidates for formal derivatives of the word for 'lake' or 'creek', this formal solution does not impose itself, since this is not the only Luvian stem that is fitting as the base of derivation.

A common feature of the proposals addressed in the previous paragraph is the reliance on the etymological method alone. The likely reason for this state of affairs is the fragmentary character of all the contexts containing the collocation under discussion, which has precluded its consistent identification. The segments /saγʷid-/ and /wid-/ are directly attested in adjacent positions only in examples (3), (6), and (7) below, which are structurally rather obscure, but even in those contexts they do not co-occur in the same lines. As for the passages (1), (2), and (4), which provide a better starting point for the analysis of the collocation, they have not been adequately restored up to now.

In fact, our treatment of (2) can be contrasted with the approach of Carruba (1982: 46), where [*ti-wa-t*]*a-an-ta-al-li-ya-an-za ú-i-ta-an-ta-al-li-ya-an-za* and [*ti-wa-t*]*a-an-ta-an ú-i-ta-at-ta-an* are restored in ll. 9 and 11, respectively. Carruba realized that the two formulae

gious Discourse between Anatolia and Syria" is co-directed by Alice Mouton and Ilya Yakubovich and funded by the Agence nationale de la recherche (France, ANR-17-FRAL-0007-01) and the DFG (Germany, YA 472/2–1).

2. The merism is a rhetorical device that consists of describing a particular thing or notion by way of listing two or more of its contrasting/complementary parts or subcategories. For additional examples of merisms in Hittite and other Indo-European languages, see, e.g., Watkins 1970: 270; Mouton and Yakubovich 2019: 210–11.

3. Here and below, Luvian forms may be cited in the sign-by-sign transliteration (e.g., *ša-ḫu-i-t*°), bound transliteration (e.g., *šaḫuit-*), or transcription (e.g., /saγʷid-/). Hittite forms are cited in both sign-by-sign and bound transliteration, but never in transcription.

4. Differently Yakubovich 2017: 11, where the Luv. *wid(a/i)-* is compared with Ger. *Weide* 'pasture' and its further Germanic cognates. This solution, however, is not supported through inner-Anatolian comparison and therefore remains inferior to the one proposed above.

contain merisms and are related to one another, but his philologically uninformed restoration led him to the translations 'of the day[?] and the year[?]' and 'the day[?] and the year[?]', respectively.[5] He frankly acknowledged the forced character of his interpretation: *wētt-* / *wītt-* is the Hittite word for 'year', while its Luvian counterpart is /uss(i)-/. More important, however, is the methodological lesson: one should not rush to provide etymologies of obscure forms occurring in fragmentary passages before exhausting the options of their combinatorial analysis.

The present paper has benefited from the systematic work on restoring fragmentary Luvian incantations that has been conducted as a part of the Luwili project. Our starting point was coping with a surprisingly large number of seemingly unrelated passages where two poorly understood stems emerge as belonging to stable collocations. In what follows we shall endeavor to demonstrate that the formulae featuring the derivatives of /saγ^{w}id-/ and /wid-/ refer to 'binding' and 'smiting' as two distinct effects that hostile witchcraft may have on its victims. In section 2, we intend to present the full dossier of contexts that feature the relevant collocations, ordering them in a way that is conducive to restricting their meanings. Section 3 will be devoted to the etymological analysis of the relevant lexemes: /wid-/ can be linked to the well-known Luvian verbal root denoting strong physical impact, while the analysis of /saγ^{w}id-/ is conducive to fleshing out the Early Proto-Indo-European root *seh_2 'to bind'. In the concluding section 4, we shall argue that 'binding' and 'smiting' were indeed perceived as different functions of witchcraft in Bronze Age Anatolia, and that therefore the formulae under discussion represent true merisms.

2. CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS

The evidence for the merism comes from the Hittite-Luvian ritual tradition associated with the temple attendant Kuwattalla and the Old Woman Šilalluhi (CTH 759–763). Two passages featuring the lexemes under discussion demonstrably occur in the texts of substitution rites involving a white sheep (UDU BABBAR), either a live animal or a figurine. It is appropriate to begin with passage (1), where the adjectives *šaḫuitantalli(ya/i)-* and *witantalli(ya/i)-* are juxtaposed with the pair *ulantalli(ya/i)-* 'dead' and *ḫuiduwali(ya/i)-* 'living', which form a natural merism and belong to several chains of merisms identified in Hittite-Luvian incantations and listed in Mouton and Yakubovich 2019: 211–12. Not all the bipartite merisms included in these chains denote naturally and thus quasi-universally complementary notions; some of them, like 'of mountain-dwellers and desert-dwellers' are culturally determined (see further examples in Watkins 1970, such as 'cattle and sheep' for domestic livestock). As we shall show, 'binding and smiting' is of the second type. If the restoration of [*ša-ḫu-i-da-a*]*n-ta-al-li-ya-an* is correct, this is a strong argument for identifying *šaḫuitantalli(ya/i)-* and *witantalli(ya/i)-* as yet another bipartite merism. Naturally, this tells us next to nothing about the lexical meaning of both adjectives beyond their denoting complementary notions.[6]

5. Our conviction that Carruba's restoration is demonstrably inferior to the alternative proposed in this paper not only stems from the comparison with examples (3), (6), and (7), but is also based on KUB 32.10+ obv. 7'–8': *š*[*a-ḫu-i-da-an-tal-li-ya-ti ú-i-t*]*a-*ˈ*an*ˀ*-tal-li-ya-ti* in (4), where the <ša> sign is fairly well preserved, except for the final vertical.

6. For the sake of making this paper more reader-friendly, we abstain from the "mystery story" presentation style and supply the final translation of each numbered passage, which is based on the holistic evidence presented in this paper. For the step-by-step combinatorial analysis, one should follow the commentaries to the relevant passages rather than their translations.

(1) KUB 35.43+ ii 1–3, NS, CTH 761
1. [ma-a-an ša-ḫu-i-da-a]n-ta-al-li-ya-an ku-i-ḫa ma-a-an ú-i-ta-an-ta-al-li[-a]n
2. [ku-i-ḫa ma-a-am-p]a ú-la-an-ta-al-li-ya-an ku-i-ḫa
3. [ma-a-am-pa ḫu-i-]du-wa{-la}-li-ya-an ku-i-ḫa
[Whether] anything (is) of [bind]ing, whether [anything] (is) of smiting, [whethe]r anything (is) of the dead, [whether] anything (is) of the [li]ving.

More clarity can be reached once we turn to the continuation of the same incantation introducing the white sheep as a ritual substitute.[7] The objects that it is expected to carry away from the ritual patron are called *šaḫuitant(a)-* (n.) and *witatt(a)-* (n.), the ostensive cognates of *šaḫuitantalli(ya/i)-* and *witantalli(ya/i)-*, respectively.[8] Since the function of substitute animals in ritual contexts consists in absorbing the miasma or other malign phenomena that plague the ritual patron, it stands to reason that *šaḫuitant(a)-* and *witatt(a)-* have negative denotations and/or connotations.

(2) KUB 35.43+ ii 7–11, NS, CTH 761
7. [ma-a-an t]a-a-ú-wa-ti ku-i-ḫa ma-a-na-ta {erasure} i-iš-ša-ra-ti ku-i-ḫa
8. [a-a-ya-t]a ma-a-an ta-wa-aš-ša-ti ku-i-ḫa tu-um-ma-an-te-et-ta
9. [ša-ḫu-i-t]a-an-ta-al-li-ya-an-za ú-i-ta-an-ta-al-li-ya-an-za
10. [na-nu-um-p]a za-aš pa-ra-ad-du a-ar-ra-az-za<-aš> ḫa-a-ú-i-iš
11. [ša-ḫu-i-t]a-an-ta-an ú-i-ta-at-ta-an
[Whether] (he = the ritual patron) saw anything with (his) eyes (or) [mad]e anything with (his) hands, whether (he) heard anything with (his) *ears*, that of [bin]ding or that of smiting, [now] may this *white* sheep carry (away) the [bo]nd and the blow!

While *witatt(a)-* and its cognate *witantalli(ya/i)-* are well attested in (1) and (2), *šaḫuitant*(*a*)- and its derivative *šaḫuitantalli(ya/i)-* represent a product of restoration in KUB 35.43. The parallel that is conducive to fleshing out the stem /saγʷid-/ in the merisms under discussion belongs to a different manuscript but also reflects a white sheep substitution rite embedded in the Kuwattalla tradition.

The relevance of the fragmentary incantation (3) was obfuscated for a long time by the natural but erroneous phonetic reading *lu-ut* instead of the Sumerogram UDU BABBAR (e.g., Starke 1985: 101). The equally fragmentary Hittite narrative preceding the incantation refers to the sheep fat (KUB 35.74: 2’ ^{UZU}Ì.UDU), presumably the raw material for fashioning the figurine of a substitute white sheep. Crucial for our purposes is the presence of *šaḫuitant*(*a*)- and *witatt(a)-* in the adjacent lines of the incantation, which indicates that the white sheep rite was expected to absorb both kinds of malign phenomena.

(3) KUB 35.74 5’–8’, NS, CTH 762
5’. [za-ú-i-na-aš] ú-i-ši-ta UDU BABBAR [...]
6’. [ša-ḫu-i-ta-a]n-tal-li-iš ⌜ú⌝[-i-ta-an-tal-li-iš]
7’. [la$^{?}$-a$^{?}$-la$^{?}$-at-t]a ša-ḫu-i-t[a-an-ta-an]
8’. [la$^{?}$-a$^{?}$-la$^{?}$-at-t]a ú-i-⌜ta⌝[-at-ta-an]

7. The interpretation of *a-ar-ra-az-za<-aš> ḫa-a-ú-i-iš* in (2) as ‘white sheep’ is debatable. Oettinger (2016) prefers ‘male sheep’ on etymological grounds. What is beyond doubt is the referential identity of this animal with UDU BABBAR ‘white sheep’, mentioned in the Hittite passage belonging to the same fragment and reflecting the same rite (KUB 35.43 ii 19).

8. For the interpretation and etymology of *pa-ra-ad-du* ‘may he carry’, see Melchert 2016: 203–6. The interpretation of *šaḫuitant(a)-* and *witatt(a)-* as neuter semi-vocalic stems remains tentative and is essentially projected from their semantics. The alternative stem assignment would be *šaḫuitanta-* (c.) and *witatta-* (c.).

[Here it emerged], white sheep of [... bind]ing (and) s[miting. [It too]k[?] bo[nds, it too]k[?] blo[ws].

The next two examples belong to a Middle Script manuscript, arguably the earliest available specimen of the Kuwattalla tradition. The long passage (4), despite the problems with its restoration, plays a crucial role in narrowing down the meaning of the negative notions under discussion. Here the restored pair of ablative-instrumental forms *š*[*a-ḫu-i-da-an-tal-li-ya-ti ú-i-t*]*a-*⸢*an*⸣*-tal-li-ya-ti* follows the form *du-*⸢*ú*⸣[*-pa-*]⸢*ni-ya*⸣*-ti* with the identical morphological structure KUB 32.10+ obv. 7'–8'. This form, in turn, cannot be separated from dat.sg. ⸢*du-ú-pa*⸣*-na* 'affliction' (vel sim.) attested in the same manuscript (KUB 35.24+ obv. 16').[9] Both ⸢*du-ú-pa*⸣*-na* and *du-*⸢*ú*⸣[*-pa-*]⸢*ni-ya*⸣*-ti* are surely related to the Luvian verb /tub(a)i-$^{(di)}$/ 'to strike', which increases the chances that the elements /saγ^{w}id-/ and /wid-/ likewise belong to the semantic domain of strong physical impact.

In fact, it is possible that /tub(a)i-$^{(di)}$/, the generic verb for this semantic field, functions as a hypernym for the concepts expressed by /saγ^{w}id-/ and /wid-/. Independent evidence for "striking" threatening the ritual patron comes from the Hittite context following incantation (4): here the ritual specialist unties from him an object made of paste, presumably in order to free him from its malicious influence (KUB 32.10+ obv. 11'; cf. Starke 1985: 162). While the relevant object is lost in a lacuna in the manuscript under discussion, we know from different texts of the Kuwattalla tradition that witchcraft is symbolized by the "evil" hand and tongue of paste, which are also called "down-striking hand" and "down-striking tongue" (cf. section 4 below).[10]

(4) KUB 32.10+ obv. 2'–10', MS, CTH 761

2'. [za-a-ú-]i-ya-ta ú-i-ši-ta d[u-ú-pa-ni-ya-an-za ša-ḫu-i-da-an-tal-li-ya-an-za]
3'. [ú-i-t]a-an-tal-li-ya-an-za p[a-a ma-a-an ša-ḫu-i-da-an-tal-li-ya-an ku-i-ḫa]
4'. [ma-a-a]n ú-i-ta-an-tal-li-ya-a[n ku-i-ḫa ma-a-an ta-a-ú-wa-ti ku-i-ḫa ma-na-a-ta]
5'. [ma-a-a]n iš-ša-ra-a-ti ku-i-ḫa [a-a-ya-ta ma-a-an ta-wa-aš-ša-ti ku-i-ḫa tu-um-ma-an-ti-it-ta]
6'. [ma-a-a]n u-wa-la-an-ta-li-ya-an k[u-i-ḫa ma-a-an h]u-⸢it⸣-wa-l[i-ya-an ku-i-ḫa]
7'. [x-x-]x-an-du-wa-ta DINGIR.MEŠ-zi du-⸢ú⸣[-pa-]⸢ni-ya⸣-ti š[a-ḫu-i-da-an-tal-li-ya-ti]
8'. [ú-i-t]a-⸢an⸣-tal-li-ya-ti
9'. [la-a-la-ad-]du-pa-aš ma-al-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ši-iš EN-aš d[a-a-ru-uš-ša mi-i-ša-an-za ḫa-a-aš-ša ḫal-ḫal-za-ni-in]
10'. [wa-ra-an-na-]⸢a⸣-ḫi-ša i-ú-na-ḫi-ša ⸢la⸣-al-pí-in [ku-wa-an-na-ni-in ma-aš-ša-na-al-li-in KASKAL-an]

[Her]e it emerged, [(one) of] s[triking, binding and sm]iting. Th[en, whether anything (is) of binding, whet]her [anything] (is) of smiting, [whether (he = the ritual patron) saw anything with (his) eyes, whe]ther (he) [made] anything with (his) hands, [whether

9. ⸢*du*[?]⸣*-ú-pa-na wa-al-za-am-mi-iš* "*walz*-ed into affliction" (KUB 35.24+ obv. 16') apparently represents an epithet of *wa-aš-ši-na-aš-ši-iš ḫar-ma-ḫa-aš-š*[*i-iš tar-pa-a-aš-ša-aš*] "[the substitute] of (his) body (and his) head" (KUB 35.24+ obv. 15').

10. With Goedegebuure 2010, the phrasal verb /tsanta tub(a)i-$^{(di)}$/, literally 'to strike down', cannot be separated from its Hittite equivalent *katta walḫ-*, which in particular appears in *katta walḫuwaš* SISKUR "the ritual of striking down" in KBo 29.3+ i 3 and KUB 35.18(+) i 5. At the moment of the ritual act, the malign influence is not yet fully overcome, which precludes the translations "oppressed tongue" and "oppressed hand" offered in Goedegebuure 2010 and necessitates the translation of /tubaimm(a/i)-/ as the active participle 'striking' (Elisabeth Rieken, pers. comm.).

(he) heard anything with (his) *ears*, whe]ther any[thing] of the dead, [whether anything of the] living, may the gods [...] it by/from one of s[tr]iking, b[inding and sm]iting. May the ritual patron [take (back his)] sh[ape, flesh, bones, joints, sp]eech, mobility, eyelashes, [eyebrows, divine path!]

The attribution of (4) and (5) to the same manuscript is supported by both paleographic similarities between the two fragments and the exceptional character of one-column tablets in the corpus of the Kuwattalla tradition. The comparison between the two incantations immediately yields the same final clause mandating the renewed control of the ritual patron over his affected body parts and physical/cognitive abilities.[11] On the strength of this observation, the derivatives of /saγʷid-/ and /wid-/ that are preserved in (5) and (4), respectively, complement each other, lending further support to the restoration of the merisms in both incantations. As a result, one approaches the comparison of their penultimate clauses, where the gods are apparently enjoined to neutralize the phenomena that plague the ritual patron. Example (5), however, adds an important nuance: the noun /saγʷid-al-/ occurs in the instrumental case in l. 8' while also displaying the morphological structure that is typical of a *nomen instrumenti* (cf. Starke 1990: 300–345). The apparent function of the "tool" referred to as /saγʷid-al-/ is assisting the gods in removing the malign phenomena.

(5) KUB 35.20 rev. 7'–10', MS, CTH 761
7'. x-x-x-x-x[(-) ... (-)]x DINGIR(-)x-x [...]
8'. [š]a-ḫu-i-da-a-la?-ti ša-ḫu-i[-ta-an-ta-an ú-i-ta-a-la-ti ú-i-ta-at-ta-an]
9'. [la-a-l]a-ad-du-pa-aš ma-al-ḫa-aš-š[a-aš-ši-iš EN-aš da-a-ru-uš-ša mi-i-ša-an-za ḫa-a-aš-ša ḫal-ḫal-za-ni-in]
10'. [ú-wa-ra-an-n]a-ḫi-š[a i-]ú-na-ḫi-š[a la-al-pí-in ku-wa-na-an-ni-in ma-aš-ša-na-al-li-in KASKAL-an]
[... may] the gods [*remove*?] bo[nds] through the substitute for binding, [blows through the substitute for smiting]! May the rit[ual patron ta]ke (back his) [shape, flesh, bones, joints, sp]eech, [mo]bility, [eyelashes, eyebrows, divine path]!

Although passages (6) and (7) belong to very badly preserved fragments, they can be restored through comparison with the preceding contexts, especially (5). We see again that the incantation for restoring the ritual patron's control of his body is preceded by the mention of /saγʷidal/ and /widal/, the ablative-instrumental nouns that are formed according to the pattern of instrumental nouns. Furthermore, one can reconstruct the etymological figure "May one *remove*? *šaḫuitatt(a)-* through *šaḫuital-*, may one *remove*? *witamman-* through *wital*'," where the malign phenomena appear in direct object position.[12] The nature of tools that are cognate with the negative notions but serve the designated goal of their removal can only be conjectured on the basis of what we know about the ritual practices of the Kuwattalla tradition. One possibility would be the symbolic object embodying the miasma, such,

11. For Luv. /mi(ja)s(a)-/ 'flesh', see now Rieken 2019. The noun /xalxalzan(i)-/ is tentatively interpreted as 'joint(s)', since it forms a natural pair with /xas(t)-/ 'bones' and in view of its perceived relation to Hitt. *ḫalḫaltumari-* 'corner, cornerstone'. We follow Sasseville 2020: 329 in interpreting /waranna*y*id-/ as 'speech, ability to speak' and ultimately a derivative of the verbal root /war-/ 'to speak'; for a different interpretation cf. Goedegebuure 2021. The "divine path" most probably designates the ability of a human being to relate to the supernatural (Hutter 2019: 345–46).

12. Note the contrast between *ú-i-ta-a*[*m-ma-an*] in (6) and *ú-i-ta-at-ta-an* in (2). This variation does not represent a problem for our analysis, because the Luvian suffix /-(m)man/ is quite productive in the formation of action nouns in the second millennium BCE (Starke 1990: 243–88). The rendering of *remove*? is supplied solely on the basis of context, since the verbal root occurring in the relevant formula is lost in the lacunae in (5), (6), and (7).

as for example, the figurine of the evil tongue, which is physically removed from the patient, as in the passage immediately following incantation (4). In this case, "medium for binding / smiting" would be the most appropriate translation. Another option is the substitute, either a live animal or its model, which transfers the specific miasma upon itself, as in (2). Since (4) and (5) occur in the same manuscript but apparently belong to different rites, the substitute interpretation is preferable for (5), and hence also for (6) and (7). We must, however, stress that the tentative choice between these two alternatives does not impact the analysis of the subsequent sections.

(6) KBo 29.37: 3'–7', NS, CTH 763
3'. [... -du ša-ḫu-i-t]a-la-ti ša-ḫu-i-t[a-an-ta-an]
4'. [... -du ú-i-ta-a-l]a-ti ú-i-ta-a[m-ma-an]
5'. [la-la-ad-du-pa-ta SISKUR-iš E]N-aš ALAM-ša m[i-i-ša-an-za]
6'. [ḫa-a-aš-ša ḫal-ḫal-za-ni-in] ⌜u⌝-ra-an-ni-ḫi-š[a? i-ú-ni-ḫi-ša]
7'. [la-al-pí-in ku-wa-an-na-ni-]⌜in⌝ ⌜ma-aš⌝[-ša-na-al-li-in KASKAL-an]
[May they *remove*?] bon[ds] through the substitute [for bin]ding, [may they *remove*?] blo[ws] through the substitute for [smi]ting. [May the ritual pa]tron [take (back his)] shape, fl[esh, bones, joints,] speech, [mobility, eyelashes, eyebro]ws, di[vine path!]

(7) KUB 35.73: 6'–12', NS, CTH 763
6'. [... -du] ša-ḫu-i-da-la-ti
7'. [ša-ḫu-i-da-an-ta-an ... -du] ú-i-ta-a-la-ti
8'. [ú-i-ta-at-ta-an ma-al-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ši-]iš EN-aš
9'. [la-a-la-ad-du-pa-aš ú-i-ta-a-la-ti š]a-a-ḫu-i-ta-la-ti
10'. [da-ru-uš-ša mi-i-ša-an-za ḫa-aš-ša ha]l-ḫal-za-a-ni-in
11'. [ú-wa-a-ra-na-ḫi-ša i-ú-na-ḫi-ša l]a-al-pí-in
12'. [ku-wa-an-na-ni-in ma-aš-ša-na-al-li-i]n KASKAL-an
[May the ritu]al patron [*remove*? bonds] through the substitute for binding, [(let him) *remove*? blows] through the substitute for smiting. Through the substitute [for smiting] and binding, [may (he) take (back his) shape, flesh, bones,] joints, [speech, mobility,] eyelashes, [eyebrows, divin]e path!

Summing up our provisional conclusions, the segments /saγʷid-/ and /wid-/ can occur together forming a variety of merisms.[13] Their derivatives can designate complementary malign phenomena of a ritually treatable sort, the attributes referring to such phenomena, sometimes apparently substantivized, or the objects used for their neutralization. Furthermore, it is likely that both belong to the semantic field of strong physical impact. In order to verify the proposed hypothesis and further constrain the meanings of the lexemes under discussion, one has to approach them from a different perspective.

3. ETYMOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Although previous attempts to find etymologies for /saγʷid-/ and /wid-/ were unsuccessful, we saw in section 1 that this was largely due to ignoring the limitations imposed by context. Now that the possible range of meanings has been defined in the previous section,

13. For the sake of completeness, one can also mention KUB 32.4 l.col. 6'–7' (CTH 762) [*ni-iš-du-wa-at-ta ku-wa-an-zu* GUN-*an k*]*a-al-du-ni-ya* [*ú-i-it-ta-ri ša-ḫu-i-ta-an-ta-an ú-i-ta*]-⌜*a*⌝*-at-ta-an* "[May the bond and bl]ow [not be experienced by him (as) a heavy burden (or) th]rashing!" This passage, however, implies a different level of restoration than those cited above, and therefore we do not wish to use it as a basis for our conclusions.

one can turn again to the search for the etyma incorporating the new knowledge. This immediately brings satisfactory results in the instance of /wid-/: The relevant root is attested in Luvian with the expected meaning of strong physical impact, as indicated by the following incantation, arguably the most frequently quoted one in the Luvian cuneiform corpus. The form *ú-i-da-a-in-du* is translated below as 'may they smite' essentially in order to distinguish the stem /wid(a)i-$^{(di)}$/ from /tub(a)i-$^{(di)}$/ 'to strike', mentioned in the previous section. What is essential is that /wid(a)i-$^{(di)}$/ refers here to a fairly graphic act of violence, whereas /tub(a)i-$^{(di)}$/ appears to be used in Luvian cuneiform texts as a generic verb for 'striking' or 'afflicting'.

(8) KUB 9.6 iii 25'–29', NS, CTH 759
25'. ku-iš-tar ma-al-ḫa-aš-ša-aš-ša-an-za-an EN-ya
26'. a-ad-du-wa-la a-an-ni-ti a-an DINGIR.MEŠ-in-zi
27'. a-aḫ-ḫa na-a-ta-at-ta ta-ta-ar-ḫa-an-du
28'. ú-i-it-pa-ni-im-pa-an ú-i-da-a-in-du
29'. ⌜pa⌝-du-w-[a-a]n an-na-a-an pa-a-ta-an-za du-ú-wa-an-du
Whoever causes evil to the ritual patron, may the gods tear him to pieces like reed!
May they smite his *witpan(i)*- and then put it under his feet![14]

Both /widatt(a)-/ in (2) and /widamman-/ in (6) are expected neuter action nouns '(act of) smiting, blow', but deriving them directly from the stem /wid(a)i-$^{(di)}$/ or /wida(i)-$^{(di)}$/ is problematic. There is, however, a possibility of a parallel root stem /wid-/, of which /wid(a)i$^{(di)}$/ would then be the historical iterative. Another possibility worth considering is a stem /wida-$^{(ti)}$/, competing with /wida(i)-$^{(di)}$/ according to the pattern addressed in Sasseville 2020: 78–79. The Istanuwa Luvian form *wi*$_5$*-ta-an-da* (KBo 4.11 obv. 30) may formally belong to either /wid-/ or /wida-$^{(ti)}$/. While the fragmentary context is not conducive to ascertaining its meaning, the preceding [GU]$_4$.MAḪ-*li* 'like a bull' is at least compatible with a verb of strong physical impact. The instrumental noun /widal-/ and historical participial form in /-ant(i)-/ (cf., e.g., Luv. *ú-la-an-ti-iš* 'dead') can likewise be derived from either /wid-/ or /wida-$^{(ti)}$/. Although the majority of the Luvian participles have the patient-oriented meaning, the phrase *za-an-da du-ú-pa-im-mi-in* EME-*in* "down-striking tongue," already cited in the previous section, shows that some of them were agent oriented. Therefore, a historical participle **widant*- with the active sense 'smiting', from which /widantalli(ja/i)-/ 'of smiting' may have been derived, would not be unexpected.

The PIE root of Luw. /wid(a)-/ is **wed*^{h} 'strike' seen in Skt. *vadhati* 'strikes, destroys', Gk. ἔθων 'striking, uprooting', etc. (cf. Rix 2001: 660, **u̯ed*^{h}*h*$_1$). For its reflexes in Hittite *wēzzai* 'strikes' and the *Glossenkeil* word :*wiwidāi* 'urges' see Melchert 1979: 262–68. Whether the latter is borrowed from Luvian (Oettinger 1986: 51 with false semantics) may be left open. One only need insist that Luvian shares with Hittite the raising of **ĕ* > *i* (or perhaps more accurately neutralization) between **w* and coronal consonant: cp. *winal*- 'stick', which, against Starke 1990: 314, patently is an instrumental noun in -*al*- derived from the reflex of **g*^{wh}*en* 'strike, beat', where a lengthened grade is implausible. In contrast, the stem /wid-/ may be derived from **wed*^{h} as well as **wēd*^{h}, while the derivation of the stem /wida-$^{(ti)}$/ is formally more complicated and would have to imply a secondary formation via a verbal noun. The dearth of evidence for the finite verb makes rehearsing the multiple formal

14. This translation implies that the *witpan(i)*- body part is separated from the perpetrator's body as a result of the smiting action and thrown under his feet. A different assignment of antecedents to anaphoric pronouns in the last clause yields an alternative interpretation, according to which the perpetrator is placed under the ritual patron's feet. According to Garrett and Kurke 1994, *witpan(i)*- means 'testicles'. We are grateful to Laura Puértolas Rubio for the restoration of the first sign in the sequence ⌜*pa*⌝-*du-w*[*a-a*]*n*.

reconstructions otiose. As for the meaning of **wed^h*, its reflexes listed above fully support reconstructing a verb pertaining to physical violence, which in turn perfectly fits the contextual analysis undertaken in the previous section.

The cognates of /saγ^{w}id-/ are less obvious, and therefore some preliminary morphological observations are required before turning to their discussion. The segment /saγ^{w}id-/ may be analyzed as a stem with the Luvian suffix /-id-/, which forms both concrete and abstract nouns (Starke 1990: 151–226). The derivative /saγ^{w}id-al-/ with concrete sense 'medium/substitute for X', paired with /wid-al-/ 'medium/substitute for smiting' suggests that X is an abstract noun. As parallels one can consider the Luvian stem /wask^w-id-/ 'offense' vs. Hitt. (loanword) *waška-* 'id.' (Starke 1990: 180–81; Melchert 1993: 265), or perhaps Luv. **warku-it-* 'anger' restored alongside Hitt./Luv. **warku-* 'angry' in Goedegebuure 2021: 133–34. This implies **sá̄yu-* < **sóh$_2$-u-* as the derivational base of /saγ^{w}id-/, with lenition after the accented *o*-grade by either the scenario of Kimball 1999: 397, followed by Melchert 2012: 177–79, or that of Kloekhorst 2006: 132. Semantically, Proto-Indo-European **sóh$_2$-u-* can be reconstructed as an adjective belonging to the Caland system, even though its early substantivization cannot be ruled out. For this type of *u*-stem adjective, cf. Hittite *dampu-* 'rough, dull' matching OCS *tǫpъ* 'blunt' and likely Luvian *aru-* 'high' (root etymology left open). Since the weak stem was surely leveled after **sá̄yu-* at some point, its original shape need not be debated here.

While the *u*-stem adjectives prototypically interact with the stative verbs within the Caland system, their coexistence with transitive verbs is also attested (cf., e.g., Ved. *tanú-* 'thin' containing the root *tan* 'to stretch'). The juxtaposition of /saγ^{w}id-/ and /wid-/ pleads for the transitive character of the verbal root underlying /saγ^{w}id-/. Fortunately, the Anatolian data do not prompt us to make a hard choice between different roots if we look for the shape **seh$_2$* which presumably constitutes the base of **sóh$_2$-u-*. According to Rieken 1999: 283–87, this root underlies Hitt. *šaḫḫan* 'service obligation' and, secondarily, *išḫanittar-* 'relative by marriage'.[15] As a neuter *n*-stem, *šaḫḫan* is a derivative of the *e*-grade **séh$_2$* and therefore shows no lenition of the **h$_2$*. The proposed common denominator of the two meanings is the concept of binding: The land tenants are "bound" (obliged) to perform services for the palace, while the relatives of the two spouses are brought together into one extended family by the bonds of their marriage. In view of this basic meaning, one could not agree more with Kloekhorst 2008: 691–92 that Hitt. *išḫ-āi-/išḫ-iya-*$^{(ḫi)}$ 'to bind' must ultimately belong to the same root **seh$_2$*.[16] Additional possible derivatives are Hitt. *šāḫ-*$^{(ḫi)}$ 'to block up, clog' (Kloekhorst 2008: 690–91) and Hitt. *šaḫeššar* 'fortification, stronghold' (Kloekhorst 2008: 692).[17]

Independent evidence for a reflex of **seh$_2$* 'to bind' in Luvian comes from the hieroglyphic passage (9). Against Hawkins 2000: 443, interpreting *sa-hi-zi-i* as a personal name is syntactically impossible in a clearly nominal sentence and contextually implausible. It

15. For the prehistory of the nasal suffix present in these two nouns, see Melchert 2007/2008: 188.

16. See Rix 2001: 544 for the reflexes of the *i*-extension in a variety of non-Anatolian Indo-European verbal forms attributed to this root. Although the archetype of Hitt. *išḫāi-/išḫiya-*$^{(ḫi)}$ is traditionally reconstructed as **sh$_2$ei* on the basis of Indo-European evidence, from the synchronic Hittitological viewpoint, *-āi-/-iya-* is merely one of the suffixes of the *ḫi*-conjugation (cf. Jasanoff 2003: 91–127). Accordingly, the generalization of the *i*-extension in this root must be treated as a Late Indo-European innovation, postdating the separation of the Anatolian languages.

17. One of the reviewers wonders whether these additional possible cognates are compatible with the alternative interpretation of the merisms under discussion as a reference to clogging and opening up. However, since there is no evidence at all in Luwo-Hittite rituals for body parts being "clogged" and being "opened up" by treatment, while Luw. *wid-* does not mean 'to open up', this semantic specialization is irrelevant for the derivation of the Luwian ritual terms treated here.

is rather an accusative of extent of time: "These houses were/had been ruined/ruins for *sa-hi-zi-i*, (and I (re)built them)."[18] It seems contextually likely that the author Ruwas would enhance his accomplishment by claiming (factually or not) that the sad state he remedied was of long standing. Thus, the translation 'for generations' comes inevitably to mind, as does a passing resemblance to Latin *saeculum* 'generation; lifespan' corresponding to Welsh *hoedl* 'lifespan'. Watkins (1995: 351) reconstructs both nouns as *seh_2*i-tlo-m*, a derivative of the root 'to bind', and plausibly interprets the attested sense as a metaphor by which human lifespans/generations are "links" in a chain.[19] This etymology has gained general acceptance, although the reconstruction *sh_2*ei-tlo-m* appears to be equally possible (cf. de Vaan 2008: 533).[20] As for HLuv. *sa-hi-zi-i*, the stem of this noun can be interpreted as /saγ(i)-/, which is compatible with the reconstruction of a thematic noun *$sóh_2$*-o-* or a stem *$sóh_2$*-i-* (possibly a Caland variant of *$sóh_2$*-u-*), since the phenomenon known as *i*-mutation led to a partial merger of these two classes in the history of Luvian (Yakubovich 2015: §6.2). In either case, the Luvian noun must have been formed independently from Latin *saeculum* and Welsh *hoedl*, but it can be traced back to the same root *seh_2* and the same metaphor was probably at play in its formation.

(9) KULULU 1, §2
|a-wa/i |za-ia [|]DOMUS-na-a [|s]a-hi-zi-i |á-sá-ta |ha-ta-ma
These houses were destroyed for generations.

If *$sóh_2$*-u-* is derived from *seh_2*, the transitive sense of the root makes likely its patient orientation 'bound'. This is, however, not essential for the forms treated in this article, because the secondary derivative /saγ^{w}id-/ probably functioned as the action noun 'binding' regardless of the orientation of its base.[21] Both *šaḫuidant(a)-* / *šaḫuidanta-* 'bond' and *šaḫuidantalli(ya/i)-* 'one for binding' presuppose an intermediate adjectival stem **saγwid-ant-* 'binding', with a denominative use of *-*ant-*. The substantivized stem *šaḫuidant(a)-* (n.) / *šaḫuidanta-* (c.) 'bond' was probably influenced by its pendant *widatt(a)-* (n.) / *widatta-* (c.) 'blow'. For the parallel *-nt-* and *-tt-* formations denoting action nouns, cf. *šalḫ(i)ant(i)-* / *šalḫitt(i)-* 'growth' (Melchert 1993: 186).

4. TYPOLOGICAL PARALLELS

In the preceding section, we tried to demonstrate that the Anatolian and Indo-European comparative data lend support to the contextual interpretation of collocations /saγ^{w}id-/ + /wid-/ and are furthermore conducive to their specification as referring to binding and smiting, respectively. The collocation *šaḫwidantan witattan* with the variant *šaḫwidantan witamman* can be provisionally translated as 'bond and blow', the pair of adjectives *šaḫwidantalliyan witantalliyan* arguably denotes 'one of binding and smiting', while the instrumental phrase

18. One may interpret /xattamma/ as the neuter nom.-acc. plural of either the participle of /xatta-/ 'to ruin' or a neuter noun /xattamman-/. Note that HLuv. (L464)*ha-tà-ma*, whatever its meaning, must be separated from *ha-ta-ma* on methodological grounds, since the signs <ta> and <tà> denote different sounds and normally do not interchange in the first millennium texts (Rieken 2008).

19. Michael Weiss (pers. comm.) offers the alternative that there is evidence for archaic use by Romans of knotted cords as a means of counting.

20. The older derivation of Lat. *saeculum* (Pokorny 1959: 890ff.) as **səi-tlom* to the root **sē(i)* /*seh_1(i)* 'throw, sow' is less than compelling semantically and violates modern rules for syllabification of such laryngeal sequences.

21. An independent piece of indirect support for the lexical meaning of /saγ^{w}id-/ 'binding' is furnished by a further derivative, the *Glossenkeil* word KUB 6.2 obv. 23 :*šaḫuidara-* (Melchert 1993: 184), which refers to an undesirable condition of the AN.TAH.ŠUM plant. We suggest that it may mean "knotted", i.e., 'not in bloom'.

šaḫwidalati witālati probably means "with the substitute for binding and smiting." What remains to be seen is whether the ideology of Hittite-Luvian rituals justifies the existence of the merisms under discussion by conceptualizing malign influence as including (among other things) binding and smiting.

As shown in section 1, examples (4), (5), (6), and (7) share not only the collocation /saγʷid-/ + /wid-/ but also a nontrivial list of the ritual patron's body parts and abilities that can be affected by malign phenomena. It may be, therefore, instructive to take a look at other Luvian incantations of the Kuwattalla tradition featuring the same list. Example (10) below contains a combination of the predicates *šaḫḫaniššatta* 'enslaved' and *ippatarriiššatta* 'distrained', which governs the same list as a direct object. The former predicate is transparently cognate with Hitt. *šaḫḫan* 'service obligation' and thus ultimately represents a derivative of the Early Indo-European root **seh*$_2$ 'to bind'. Presumably, a malevolent human agent had to assert his control over the patient's body before 'distraining' it by supernatural means. The idea that a victim of witchcraft can forfeit his body parts and physical/cognitive abilities is also encapsulated in incantation (11), likewise featuring the same list.[22]

(10) KUB 35.45 ii 21–24, CTH 760, MS
ku-i-ša-an ša-aḫ-ḫa-ni-iš-ša-at-ta ku-i-ša-an ip-pa-tar-ri<-iš>-ša-at-ta EN SÍSKUR-aš-ši-in ALAM-ša mi-i-ša-an-za ḫa-aš-ša ḫal-ḫal-za-ni-in ú-wa-ra-an-na-ḫi-ša i-ú-na-ḫi-ša la-al-pí-in ku-wa-an-na-ni-in ma-aš-ša-na-al-li-in KASKAL-an
Whoever enslaved it, whoever distrained it, the ritual patron's shape, flesh, bones, joints, speech, mobility, eyelashes, eyebrows, divine path ...!

(11) KUB 35.12 iii 1–4, CTH 762, NS, restored after KUB 35.11: 8'–11'
1. [(ni-iš-pa-aš a-a)]ḫ-ḫa-ša-a-mi-iš SÍSKUR-iš EN-aš
2. [da-a-ru-uš-ša] mi-ša$^{(e.)}$-an$^{(e.)}$-za {x} ḫa-a-aš-ša ḫal-ḫal-za-ni-in
3. [ú-wa-ra-an-n]a-a-ḫi-ša i-ú-na-a-ḫi-ša l[(a-a)l-pí-in]
4. [ku-wa-an-na-n]i-in ma$^{(e.)}$-aš-ša-na-a-al-l[i-in KASKAL-an]
[(May)] the ritual patron [(not)] (be) [(se)]parated (from his) [shape,] flesh, bones, joints, [sp]eech, mobility, ey[elashes, eyebrow]s, divin[e path]!

The combination *šaḫḫaniššatta ... ippatarriiššatta* in (10) can be regarded as another merism, segmenting the takeover of the victim's body into two distinct stages. Since *šaḫḫaniššatta* is ultimately cognate with *šaḫuidantan*, etc., one can argue that the group of merisms listed in (1)–(7) likewise refer to taking control of the victim's body with the purpose of subsequently tormenting it at will. Although the second components of merisms in (1)–(7) and (10) are genetically unrelated, this need not imply that two different types of malevolent witchcraft are referred to within the same ritual tradition in connection with the same list of body parts. It is more economical to assume that the incantation (10) focuses on the alienation of the victim's body, whereas (1)–(7) emphasize its practical consequences.

The role of binding as the perceived strategy of the evildoers is also highlighted elsewhere in the Kuwattalla tradition. Example (12) is of interest because it occurs in the same manuscript as (10), immediately preceding it in the text of a Luvian incantation. The relevant rite features manipulations of two figurines that symbolize the ritual patron's enemies. Therefore, we are reasonably certain that the possessive adjective *ḫišḫišaššinza* 'those of the traps' (vel sim.) refers to the same perceived ability of the enemies to bind the victim's body by super-

22. Although the translation of (11) below shows a slight refinement over the one offered in Yakubovich 2012: 332, that paper can still be consulted for the etymology of Luv. /ax(xa)sa-/ 'to separate'.

natural means, which also underlies *šaḫḫaniššatta* ‘enslaved’ in the following clause (10). The noun /xisxis(a/i)-/ ‘trap’ (vel sim.) is derived from the Luvian verb /xisxija-/ ‘to bind, tie’, a cognate of Hitt. *išḫāi-*/*išḫiya-*$^{(ḫi)}$ ‘id.’ and Hitt. *šaḫḫan* ‘service obligation’ addressed in the previous section. Thus, Luv. *ḫišḫišaššinza* and Luv. *šaḫḫaniššatta* are also cognate at the root level.

(12) KUB 35.45 ii 18–21, CTH 760, MS
ʳᵈUTU-taʾ EN-ya ti-waˀ-aʳliʾ-ya pí-ya-aš LÚ.KÚR.MEŠ-in-ʳziʾ kat-ta-wa-at-na-al-li-in-za ú-ut-na-aš-ši-in-za ḫi-iš-ḫi-ša-aš-ši-i[n-]za ta-pa-ru-wa-aš-ši-in-za
ta-a-ta-ri-ya-am-ma-na-aš-ši-in-za ḫi-i-ru-t[a-aš-]ši-in-za EN.MEŠ-an-za
O Sun-god, divine lord, hand over the enemies, the lords of vengeful words, traps, *taparu*-, curse, and perjury.[23]

Passage (13) is restored on the basis of the parallel incantations attested on the same tablet, which probably shares the manuscript with the fragments constituting the sources of (4) and (5). Yet it reflects an entirely different rite, namely, purification with the *taluppi*-lump. The verbal form *ḫapiti* belongs to the Luvian stem /xab(a)i-$^{(di)}$/ ‘to bind’, which is genetically unrelated to the lexemes treated above. This example shows that the concept of binding the victim through hostile witchcraft existed independently from a specific set of formulaic expressions.

(13) KUB 32.9+ obv. 7–10, CTH 761, MS, restored after obv. 26–29 and rev. 21’–24’
ni-i-ša-an ḫa-pí-ti ma-a[l-ḫa-aš-š(a-aš-ši-in)] EN-an a[(d-du-wa-li-iš EME-iš)]
ad-du-wa-li-iš i-iš-[ša-ri-iš (ta-pa-ru-wa-aš-ši-iš da-a-ta-ri-ya-am-na-aš-ši-iš EME-iš)]
ḫi-ru-ta-aš-š[i]-iš EME-i[š (MU.KAM-iš ad-du-wa-li-iš ITU.KAM-aš ad-du-wa-li-iš)]
wa-aš-pa-an-ta-aš-[š]i-in-zi e-[(er-ḫu-wa-an-zi ma-ya-aš-ši-iš EME-iš)]
May the e[(vil tongue)], the evil ha[nd, (the tongue of *taparu*-, curse)], the tongue of perjury, [(bad year, bad month)], the int([eriors)] of the shrouds, [(the tongue of the multitudes)] not bind the ri[tual] patron![24]

At the same time, example (13) is relevant as another link between the concepts of binding and smiting in the context of the Kuwattalla tradition. The list of hostile agents is headed there by the evil tongue and the evil hand, the models of which are deployed and eventually destroyed in multiple rituals attributed to Kuwattalla and Šilalluhi. As mentioned in section 2 above, the demonstration of the evil tongue probably accompanies the incantation cited in (4). We prefer to leave it open whether “one of striking, binding, and smiting” mentioned in this incantation is the description of the evil tongue or yet another substitute, as this ultimately depends on how the fragmentary passage (4) is restored. We gain, however, firmer ground with (14), where the evil hand and evil tongue are directly called “down-striking hand” and “down-striking tongue,” respectively.

(14) KUB 32.8+ iii 26’–29’, CTH 761
ta-a-in-ti-ya-aš a-a-ya-ru {erasure} ma-al<-li>-i-ti-ya<-aš> a-a-ya-ru
za-a[n-da] du-ú-pa-im-mi-i-iš ʳiš-šaʾ[-ri-iš] ʳza-anʾ-[d]a du-ú-pa-i[m-mi-iš EME-iš]
Let it become oil, let it become honey, the down-striking hand, the down-striking tongue!

23. For EN-*ya tiwāliya* ‘divine lord’, see Yakubovich apud Steitler 2017: 189 n. 606, and Melchert 2019: 244.
24. For the interpretation of the phrase *wašpantaššinzi ērḫuwanzi* as “the interiors of the shrouds,” see Mouton and Yakubovich 2019: 216–17.

It stands to reason that the evil hand and tongue can be both "binding", as in (12), and "down-striking", as in (13). This conclusion, obtained here by the combinatorial method, can be fleshed out with the help of another Hittite-Luvian incantation, this time belonging to the extended conjuration attributed to Pittei (cf. Bachvarova 2013: 137, 140). In the passage cited below, the evil tongues declare their intention to smite some objects and restrain others, as a prelude to affecting the child. While the specific atrocities to be inflicted upon the child are not specified, the inclusion of binding and smiting is a good contextual guess, which gains further support from the known habits of the evil tongue according to the Kuwattalla tradition.

(15) KUB 44.4+ rev. 22–24, CTH 520
EME.ḪI.A EME.ḪI.A *ku-wa-pí-wa pa-it-*˹*te*˺[*-ni*] ^{NA_4}*pé-ru-ni* :pal-ḫu-na *pa-a-i-ue-ni* {GAM AK NI} *A-NA* ^{NA_4}ZÚ :*du-wa-ar-nu-ma-a*[*n-zi p*]*a-a-i-u-e-ni* UR.MAH GIŠ-*ru-an-zi* KI.MIN UR.BAR.RA :pa-tal-ḫa-ú-na KI.MIN :˹za-am-ma-an˺-ti DUMU.NITA la-la-u-na KI.MIN
Tongues, tongues, where are you going? We are going to split the rock, we are going to break the obsidian, we are going to nail down the lion, we are going to fetter the wolf, we are going to take the bewitched child.

The detailed discussion of the effects of witchcraft on the human body reflected in Hittite texts proper clearly goes beyond the purview of this article. It is, however, comforting to acknowledge that their typology presented in a recent dissertation focusing on this topic is well compatible with our findings. The following verbs are listed in this survey: *(appa) ḫark-* 'to block', *dā-* 'to take', *ēp-*/*app-* 'to seize', *ḫamank-* / *ḫamenk-* 'to tie', *išḫāi-*/*išḫiya-* 'to bind', *kaleliye/a-* 'to tie up', *katta tarma(i)-* 'to nail down', *katta walḫ-* 'to strike down', *tamenk-* 'to affix', *taruwa(i)-* 'to fix' (Puértolas Rubio 2019: 120–34). While the emerging picture is clearly broader than the dichotomy of binding and smiting, both these meanings find their counterparts in the list. Accordingly, a Luvian merism referring to binding and smiting as two facets of affecting the body of a bewitched person agrees well with our typological expectations.

Beyond the empirical aspects of this research, we have striven to demonstrate how a combination of combinatorial, etymological, and typological methods can contribute practically to the decipherment of a small-corpus language. Although in this study we were surely lucky to have important cues in all three domains, we submit that many more riddles of ancient Anatolian texts can yet be solved by giving up one particular privileged method in favor of their concurrent application.

REFERENCES

Bachvarova, Mary. 2013. The Birth Ritual of Pittei: Its Occasion and the Use of Luwianisms. In *Luwian Identities: Culture, Language, and Religion between Anatolia and the Aegean*, ed. Alice Mouton et al. Pp. 135–57. Leiden: Brill.

Carruba, Onofrio. 1982. Beiträge zum Luwischen. In *Serta indogermanica: Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Johann Tischler. Pp. 25–51. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Garrett, Andrew, and Leslie Kurke. 1994. Pudenda Asiae Minoris. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 96: 75–83.

Goedegebuure, Petra. 2010. The Cuneiform Luwian Adverb *zanda* 'together, down'. In *Acts of the VIIth International Congress of Hittitology (Çorum, August 25–31, 2008)*, ed. Aygul Süel. Pp. 299–318. Ankara: Anıt.

———. 2021. The Fat and the Furious: **worĝ* 'fat, furious, strong' and Its Derivatives in Hittite and Luwian. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*, ed. David M. Goldstein et al. Pp. 121–35. Hamburg: Buske.

Hawkins, John David. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, vol. 1: *Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.

Hutter, Manfred. 2019. The Luwian Rituals of Kuwattalla: Thoughts on Their Rearrangement. In *Acts of the IXth International Congress of Hittitology (Çorum, September 08–14, 2014)*, ed. Aygül Süel. Pp. 335–58. Çorum: İl Kültür ve Turizm Müdürlüğü.

Jasanoff, Jay H. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Kimball, Sarah. 1999. *Hittite Historical Phonology*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2006. Čop's Law in Luwian Revisited. *Die Sprache* 46: 131–36.

———. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.

Košak, Silvin. 1996. Ein hethitisches *ghost word* entgeistert. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 23: 95–97.

Laroche, Emmanuel. 1959. *Dictionnaire de la langue louvite*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Melchert, H. Craig. 1979. Three Hittite Etymologies. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 93: 262–71.

———. 1993. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill: Self-Published.

———. 2007/2008. Neuter Stems with Suffix **-(e)n* in Anatolian and Proto-Indo-European. *Die Sprache* 47: 182–91.

———. 2012. Hittite *ḫi*-Verbs of the Type *-āC$_1$i*, *-aC$_1$C$_1$anzi*. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 117: 173–85.

———. 2016. New Luvian Verb Etymologies. In *Anatolica et indogermanica: Studia linguistica in honorem Johannis Tischler septuagenarii dedicate*, ed. Henning Marquardt et al. Pp. 203–12. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

———. 2019. Solar and Sky Deities in Anatolian. In *QAZZU warrai: Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Kazuhiko Yoshida*, ed. Adam A. Catt et al. Pp. 239–49. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.

Mouton, Alice, and Ilya Yakubovich. 2019. Internal or External Evil: A Merism in Luwian Incantations. *Bulletin of the SOAS* 82/2: 209–31.

Oettinger, Norbert. 1986. Anatolische "Kurzgeschichten." *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 99: 43–53.

———. 2016. Luv. *ārrazza-* und gr. ὄρχις 'Hode' (mit einer Bemerkung zu gr. ἔνδον). In *Anatolica et Indogermanica: Studia linguistica in honorem Johannes Tischler septuagenarii dedicata*, ed. Henning Marquardt et al. Pp. 231–39. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Pokorny, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.

Puértolas Rubio, Laura. 2019. Le corps entravé: Étude des pratiques de sorcellerie de l'Anatolie ancienne d'après les textes cunéiformes hittites et louvites. Diss., Sorbonne University.

Rieken, Elisabeth. 1999. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

———. 2008. Die Zeichen <ta>, <tá> und <tà> in den hieroglyphen-luwischen Inschriften der Nachgroßreichszeit. In *VI Congresso Internazionale di Ittitologia, Roma, 5–9 settembre 2005*, ed. Alfonso Archi and Rita Francia. Part 2, pp. 637–49 (= *SMEA* 50: 637–49).

———. 2019. On Several Old and New Etymologies and the Alleged Diphthongization of **ē > iya* in Hittite and Luwian. In *Luwic Dialects and Anatolian: Inheritance and Diffusion*, ed. Ignasi-Xavier Adiego et al. Pp. 215–26. Barcelona: University of Barcelona.

Rix, Helmuth. 2001. *Lexicon der indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. 2nd ed. In collaboration with M. Kümmel, Th. Zehnder, R. Lipp, and B. Schirmer. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Sasseville, David. 2020. *Anatolian Stem Formation: Luwian, Lycian, and Lydian*. Leiden: Brill.

Starke, Frank. 1985. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

———. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung der keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Steitler, Charles H. 2017. *The Solar Deities of Bronze Age Anatolia: Studies in Texts of the Early Hittite Kingdom*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

de Vaan, Michiel. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden: Brill.

Watkins, Calvert. 1970. NAM.RA GUD UDU in Hittite: Indo-European Poetic Language and the Folk Taxonomy of Wealth. In *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch: Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektologischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens*, ed. Wolfgang Meid und Erich Neu. Pp. 269–87. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

———. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Yakubovich, Ilya. 2012. The Reading of Luwian *ARHA* and Related Problems. *Altorientalische Forschungen* 39: 321–39.

———. 2015. The Luwian Language. *Oxford Handbooks Online* (October 21, 2015), http://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935345.013.18.

———. 2017. The Luwian Word for ‘Place’ and Its Cognates. *Kadmos* 56: 1–27.