

nym ^dZar-za-ru-um (gelesen ^dŠar¹-ša-ru-um) fragend mit *šaršaru* „eine große Schlange“. Da Z. eng mit der Muttergöttin assoziiert ist, ist zu erwägen, ob der Name auf eine (dialektale?) Form des sum. Wortes für „Gebärmutter“ (Uterus* § 1.1; normal-orthograph. šā-tūr; vgl. Muttergöttin* A. I. § 3.35 und Šassūru*) zurückgeht.

Falkenstein A. 1966: Die Inschriften Gudeas von Lagaš 1 (= AnOr. 30) 64, 114. – Selz G. J. 1995: Götterwelt 289.

M. Krebernik

Zarzī, Zarzian (cf. Iraq*, Vorgeschichte. § 2). The work conducted by the British archaeologist D. Garrod in the 1920s and 1930s in the Zagros* region of Iraqī Kurdistan led to the discovery of the Z. rock shelter and the first definition of the Zarzian cultural facies of the Epipalaeolithic (Garrod 1930). Z. is located 50 km to the NW of Sulaymānīyah at an elevation of 760 m.a.s.l. and overlooks a valley crossed by a small tributary of the Lesser Zab* River, which provided water and food to the site (Wahida 1981, 19, 31). The rock shelter has a height of 2.25 m and an area of about 16 m² (Garrod 1930, 13). Two layers were excavated by Garrod in 1928: Layer A consisted of mixed deposits ranging from the Zarzian to modern times; Layer B contained Epipalaeolithic material characterized by the typical Zarzian chipped stone assemblage dominated by microlithic elements such as bladelets, thumbnail scrapers, borers, micro burins and geometric forms such as scalene triangles. The site was also tested by G. Wahida in 1971 (Wahida 1981), who confirmed the shift to geometric microliths during the Zarzian observed by Garrod.

Since the excavations of Z. several important occupations pertaining to the Zarzian culture (ca. 18 000–10 000 cal BC; Olszewski 2012, 3, 5; Tsuneki 2013, 90) have been identified in the region on both sides of the Iraqī and Iran. Zagros at sites that, like Z., were interpreted as temporary camps, e.g. Warwasi, Pā Sangar, Paleara, Gar-i-Ĥar, Šanidar* Cave B2, Mār

Rūz and Mār Gorgalan Sarāb (for a review s. Olszewski 2012 with bibl.).

Palynology and archaeozool. analyses show that during the Zarzian the Zagros region was characterised by a cool, dry climate and dry steppe conditions (Olszewski 2012, 3–5). Zarzian groups occupied the region with seasonal movements between valleys, foothills, and mountains following a highly mobile hunter-gatherer strategy based mainly on the hunting of large mammals (gazelle, onager, wild boar, aurochs, red deer, wild sheep, wild goats, hare), tortoise, fish, shellfish, crustaceans, and land snails (Olszewski 2012, 4–6).

Garrod D. A. E. 1930: The Palaeolithic of southern Kurdistan: excavations in the caves of Zarzi and Hazar Merd, Bulletin of the American School of Prehistoric Research 6, 8–43. – Olszewski D. I. 2012: The Zarzian in the context of the Epipalaeolithic Middle East, International Journal of Humanities 19/3, 1–20. – Tsuneki A. 2013: Proto-neolithic caves and neolithisation in the southern Zagros, in: R. Matthews/H. Fazeli Nashli (ed.), The neolithisation of Iran, 84–96. – Wahida G. 1981: The re-excavation of Zarzi, 1971, Proc. Prehist. Soc. 47, 19–40.

D. Morandi Bonacossi

Zašḥapuna s. Zaḥ(a)puna.

Zauberei (witchcraft). A. In Mesopotamien.

§ 1. Definitions. – § 2. The witch. – § 3. Witch trials and accusations. – § 4. Specific methods and types of witchcraft. – § 5. Symptoms and diagnosis. – § 6. Anti-witchcraft therapies, rituals and incantations. – § 7. Prophylaxis.

§ 1. Definitions. W. is in Sum. uš₇- (KA×LI) or uš₁₁(KA×UŠ), also found syll. uš. The primary meaning of /uš/ is “spittle” (Akk. ru^{tu}, ru^{pu}stu, imtu); referring to practising w. the idiom uš_{7/11}-ri-a “to cast spittle” is often found. Rarely, w. is referred to as uḥ “phlegm”. In Akk. the main nouns for w. are *kišpu* (less frequent the abstract noun *kaššāpūtu*) from *kašāpu* “to bewitch”, *ruḥū* from *reḥū* “to pour” and *rusū* from *rusū* “to sully”, all logogr. rendered as UŠ₁₁. Other related nouns are *ipšū* “sorceries”, *upišū* “sorcerous devices”

and *upšāšū* (NĪG.AK.A) “machinations” from *epēšu* “to manipulate”. *kišpu* is rarely equated with nīg-ak(-a). Human agents are mainly responsible for w. and a frequent diagnostic description is *qāt amelūti* (ŠU NAM.LÚ.U₁₈.LU) “hand of mankind”.

Abusch/Schwemer 2011, 2–4; Schwemer 2007, 5–21; Thomsen 1987, 16–20.

§ 2. The witch is usually regarded as the illegitimate practitioner of magic (Magie* A), using a destructive force motivated with evil intent, and can be seen as the opposite of the *āšipu*, the incantation-priest (Priester* A. I. § 5.5). Although the witch could be both male (*kaššāpu*¹⁶UŠ₁₁.ZU) as female (*kaššāptu*¹⁶UŠ₁₁.ZU) in the Mesopot. perspective, the stereotypical witch is considered to be female. The identity of the witch is unknown. The enumerations within anti-w. incantations list a wide variety of possible evildoers, the general idea being that it could be anybody. It is not even necessary for a witch to be alive, she/he could be either human or demonic. The witch is frequently said to be of a foreign background, i.e. Elamite, Gutian, Lullubean, Sutean, Subarean or Ḥanigalbatian.

Other designations for the witch are the participial constructions *ēpišulēpištu* “sorcerer/sorceress” (*ēpiš lemutti* “one who practices evil”, *ēpiš kišpi* “one who practices w.”), *muppišulmuppištu* “sorcerer/sorceress”, *muštēpišulmuštēpištu* “(wo)man who instigates sorcery”, *sāhirul sāḥertu* “(wo)man who encircles”, *raḥū/raḥitu* (*raḥātu*) “r.-warlock/witch”. Frequent epithets of the witch are the *bēl(et) ikki* “ill-tempered (wo)man”, *bēl(et) šerri* “(fe)male enemy”, *bēl(et) ridi* “(fe)male persecutor”, *bēl(et) dīni* “(fe)male accuser”, *bēl(et) amāti* “(fe)male litigant”, *bēl(et) dabābi* “(fe)male adversary”, *bēl(et) egerrē* “(fe)male slanderer”, *bēl(et) lemutti* “(fe)male evildoer”, *bēl(et) tidaki* “(fe)male opponent” and *elenitu* (*eliyanitu*) “deceitful (?) one”. Less frequent epithets are *šabḥūṭu* “one who keeps attacking”, *šabburitu* “mutterer”, *bā^eertul/bayyartu* “hunter”, *ḥayyūṭu* “one who spies around”, *šayyuditu* “roaming one”, *dayyulitu* “prowling one”, *muttaliktu* “one who keeps moving”, *nērtānitu* “murderer”, *dā^eikuldā^eiktu* “murderous (wo)man”, *kāširul kāšertu* “tier (of knots?)”, *āriḥu* “destroyer”, *ayyābul ayyābtu* “enemy”. The female cultic professions *qadīštu* “q.-votary”, *naditu* “n.-priestess” (Priester* A. I. § 5.7), *ištāritu* “Ištar-votary”, *kulmašitu* “k.-votary”, *entu* “e.-priestess” (Priester* A. I. § 5.1), are identified, starting in the late 2nd mill., with the *kaššāptu*. Other professions related to w. are *kurgarrū* “cultic performer”, *eššebū/eššebūtu* “(fe)male

ecstatic”, *mušlabḥatu* “fem. snake-charmer” (Schlange* A. § 5), *agugillu/agugiltu* “a.-sorcerer/sorceress”, *naršindul/naršindatu* “n.-sorcerer/sorceress”, *qumqummatu* “q.-witch”, *āšiptu* “fem. incantation-priest”, *kuttimmatu* “fem. charcoal burner” and *qurqurratu* “fem. metal-worker”.

Deities connected to the witch belong to the circle of Ištar, who herself is explained as *bēlet kaššāpāti* “mistress of witches” in a *Maqlū* commentary (KAR 94 r. 33’–35’), the same epithet is found for Kanisurra* (*Maqlū* V 55f.).

Abusch 2002, 3–25; Abusch/Schwemer 2011, 4–7; Schwemer 2007, 69–86, 116f.; Thomsen 1987, 21–26; ead. 2001, 28–30.

§ 3. Witch trials and accusations. The witch poses a threat to the Mesopot. urban society and was considered an opponent and enemy of the human and cosmic order. Being a danger to the public interest, w. is found in various law codes as a criminal offense and individuals were obliged to report cases of w., i.e. CU § 13, CH § 2, MAL A § 47, NbGf § 7. Legal terms for w. are *kišpu* and *kašāpu*, with the exception of NbGf § 7 *nēpešu* “ritual” and *takpurtu* “purification rite”. The succession treaty of Esarhaddon (SAA 2, 6: 259–265) prohibits the use of w. against his successor. Implications and accusations of w. are also found in letters, i.e. Old Bab. (AbB 9, 268f.; AbB 14, 112; ARM 26/1, 249, 253; ARM 26/2, 314), Middle Bab. (PBS 1/2, 42), and Neo-Ass. (SAA 10, 371; 16, 63). An indication that w. could be commissioned is found in *Maqlū* III 116–120, but the one who commissioned w. is held accountable.

Abusch/Schwemer 2011, 7f.; Schwemer 2007, 118–127; Thomsen 1987, 26–29; ead. 2001, 25–28; Westbrook 2006.

§ 4. Specific methods and types of witchcraft. “To bewitch”, or “to perform w.” is denoted by *kašāpu*, *epēšu*, *šabāru*. The following specific types of w. exist: *zikurudū* (ZI.KU₅.RU.DA) “cutting-of-the-throat-magic”, *kadabbedū* (KA.DAB.BÉ.DA) “seizing-of-the-mouth”, *dibalū* (DI-BAL.A) “distortion-of-justice”, *zīru* (ḤUL-GIG) “hate-magic”. W. could be induced by various means upon the victim, i.e. by *Kontaktzauber* (bewitched food, potions,

bathwater, salves, and presents) and *Figurenzauber* (manufacturing a substitute figurine, *šalmu*, of the victim out of clay, dough or wax with the addition of identity-transferring objects such as hair, the hem of a garment, spittle, dust or mud of the victim's house; subsequently, the figurine was violently destroyed, i. e. burned/melted, dissolved in beer or urine, fed to dangerous animals, or buried in an ominous place). Other w. techniques are the utterance of the evil word (*amāt lemutti*), the tying of knots and directly seizing or harming various body parts of the victim.

Abusch/Schwemer 2011, 3f.; Schwemer 2007, 87–118; Thomsen 1987, 30–49; ead. 2001, 35–43.

§ 5. Symptoms and diagnosis. Although descriptions regarding w. concern, first and foremost, men, and to a lesser extent pregnant women and infants, according to Mesopot. belief anyone could be an intended victim of w. Typical symptoms for w. are headache, vertigo, paralysis, pain in the limbs, numbness, abdominal pain, vomiting, depression, anxiety and disorientation, excessive salivating, bleeding gums, and most prominently impotence. In therapeutic texts, the description of symptoms is introduced by *šumma amēlu* "if a man" followed by the diagnostic statement *amēlu šū kašip* "that man is bewitched" or *amēlu šū kišpū šabtūšu* "that man is seized by w."

Abusch 2002, 79–88; Schwemer 2007, 169–188; Thomsen 1987, 50–57; ead. 2001, 32–35.

§ 6. Anti-witchcraft therapies, rituals and incantations. The main group of anti-w. therapeutic texts consists of prescriptions for undoing w. (*ana pišerti kišpi*), for bewitched persons (*šumma amēlu kašip*), and for symptoms indicating w., or for specific w.-induced illnesses such as impotence. The most prominent anti-w. ritual is the series *Maqlū**, followed by a group of incantation rituals designated with the *kanim-ma uš₁₁-būr-ru-da* "it is the wording to undo w." subscript; the same subscript is also attested on tablets containing a single anti-w. incantation with integrated

ritual agenda. Additionally, there are rituals for specific types of w. such as *zikurudū*, *ka-dabbedū*, and *zīru*. The royal purification ritual *Bīt rimki* contains anti-w. sections, including a cycle of *Maqlū* incantations. The series *Maqlū* and *Šurpu**, in both of which burning is the principal technique, were regarded in antiquity as a pair; this connection may be explained by the similarity of symptoms of w. and the inducement of a *māmitu*-curse. Additionally, *uš₁₁-būr-ru-da* and *nam-érim-būr-ru-da* occur together in the *Exorcist's Manual* (KAR 44: 12).

Abusch/Schwemer 2011, 8–16; Schwemer 2007, 194–230; Thomsen 1987, 58–66; ead. 2001, 43–56.

§ 7. Prophylaxis. Detailed instructions for the manufacturing and consecration of apotropaia such as potions, salves, phylacteries or amulet necklaces are found in anti-w. rituals and therapeutic texts in the form of prescriptions. The prophylactic function is often designated with *lā teḫū* "(w.) will not approach (the person)". Various *Uš-burruda*-rituals, rituals indicating w. by evil omens and even *Maqlū* could be performed as a preventive measure against w.

Abusch/Schwemer 2011, 13–16; Schuster-Brandis 2008, 94–98; Schwemer 2007, 231–237; Thomsen 1987, 66–68; ead. 2001, 59–65.

Abusch T. 2002: Mesopotamian witchcraft: toward a history and understanding of Babylonian witchcraft beliefs and literature (= AMD 5). – Abusch T./Schwemer D. 2011: Corpus of Mesopotamian anti-witchcraft rituals 1 (= AMD 8/1). – Schuster-Brandis A. 2008: Steine als Schutz- und Heilmittel: Untersuchung zu ihrer Verwendung in der Beschwörungskunst Mesopotamiens im 1. Jt. v. Chr. (= AOAT 46). – Schwemer D. 2007: Abwehrzauber und Behexung: Studien zum Schadenzauberglauben im alten Mesopotamien. – Thomsen M.-L. 1987: Zauberd Diagnose und schwarze Magie in Mesopotamien (= CNIP 2); ead. 2001: Witchcraft and magic in ancient Mesopotamia, in: ead./F. H. Cryer (ed.), *Witchcraft and magic in Europe 1: Biblical and pagan societies, 1–95*. – Westbrook R. 2006: *Witchcraft and the law in the Ancient Near East*, Fs. R. Haase 45–52.

E. Zomer

Zauberei. B. Bei den Hethitern s. Magie und Zauberei. B.

Zaumzeug (und Geschirr). A. I. Philologisch. In Mesopotamien.

§ 1. Überblick. – § 2. Terminologie. – § 3. Materialien.

§ 1. Überblick. Das Z. dient dazu, ein Reit- oder Zugtier zu führen. Es besteht aus dem Kopfteil und den daran befestigten Zügeln. Das Z. kann ohne oder mit Gebiss ausgestattet sein. Das Geschirr dient dazu, Tiere vor Zuggeräte zu spannen, damit sie diese ziehen.

Das „Geschirr“ wird in der Sekundärlit. oft allg. statt „Ausrüstung“, die man für Equiden und Rinder benötigt, als auch für die Ausrüstung (ohne Sattel) von Packtieren verwendet. Letztere wird hier nicht behandelt, ebensowenig Verzierungen, Schmuck oder militärische Schutzausrüstung sowie rein astron. Termini.

§ 1.1. *Zaum*. Im 3. Jt. werden die Tiere an einer an einem Nasenring befestigten Leine (*šerretu*) oder nur an einer um das Maul gebundenen Leine (*šerretu²*) geführt; Kappzaum war sowohl für Rinder als auch Equiden bekannt. Im 2. Jt. wird sowohl gebissloses Z. (Kappzaum), aber auch Z. mit Gebiss/Trense, aus vergänglichem Material und Metall verwendet. Im 1. Jt. ist dann v. a. Z. mit Gebiss in Verwendung.

Littauer/Crouwel 1979; Salonen, HippAcc.; Potratz 1966; sowie Kampfwagen* B; Pflug*; Seil* und Schnur. A. § 4.4; Z.* B.

§ 1.2. *Geschirr*. Das Rind* war v. a. Zugtier vor Wagen*, Pflug* und Schlitten*. Es war mittels Joch (*šisudun*, *nīru*) oder (selten) Kummer (*su-da-nu*), die an der Wagendeichsel befestigt waren, mit dem Zuggerät verbunden, geführt wurde es traditionell über eine Leine (*šerretu*), die an einem Nasenring (Ring* A. § 2d; B. § 2) angebracht war (Rind* A und B. § 4). Equiden wurden ebenso vor den Wagen gespannt, bei ihnen erfolgte der Zug aber nicht über das Nackenjoch, da sie ja keinen Widerrist haben, sondern ungünstigerweise über das Band (*ḫullum²*), das um den Hals führte und an den Jochenden festgemacht war. Durch die unruhige Gangart der Equiden bewegte sich das Joch stark, ein Bauchgurt zu seiner besseren Fixierung ist erst im 9. Jh. auf den Reliefs Assurnasirpals II. bildlich nachzuweisen (Potratz 1966, 30–

36). Man hat aber nie versucht, das Halsband zwischen den Vorderbeinen des Tieres durch einen weiteren Gurt mit diesem Bauchgurt zu verbinden, und damit den Druck des Halsbandes von der Luftröhre auf die Brust umzulenken (ibid. 32). Es gab jedoch auch Ausführungen des Jochs, die sehr enge, schmale Gabel(auflage)n verwendeten, die es den Pferden u. a. erlaubten, die Wagen mit den Schultern zu ziehen (ibid. 44, Taf. XXVIII. Abb. 64f.).

§ 1.3. *Ausrüstung*. *unūtu* (aA, aB, nB), *udū* (nB), auch *ḫalluptu* (nA) sind Sammelbegriffe für Gegenstände aller Art, die man in Bezug auf das Z. für die Arbeit mit Reit-, Zug- und Packtieren benötigt, um sie zu führen, zu beladen oder anzuschirren, auch militärische Schutzausrüstung (z. B. *ḫalluptu*, *sariam*, *tillu*, *ziqirratum*, etc.) fällt darunter. Sie können daher auch, je nach Zusammenhang, für Teile dieser Ausrüstung stehen, ggf. auch für „Geschirr“ oder „Z.“ etc., sind aber kein eigener Terminus für diese (z. B. *ḫalluptu*, s. § 2.1).

§ 2. Die Terminologie für das Z. (Geschirr u. a.) ist in großen Teilen unklar bzw. unsicher; HippAcc. veraltet und überholt. Es wird im Folgenden daher nur eine Auswahl an Begriffen gegeben, die relativ sicher identifiziert bzw. einem Teil der Ausrüstung zuzuordnen sind.

§ 2.1. *Zuggeschirr* (s. a. Pflug* A. § 3).

šu₁-dul vs. *NIĜ-dul₁* (Ebla) „Joch für Rinder“ vs. „Joch für Equiden“ (= *ne-du-lum-lu-um*) s. M. Civil, ARES 4 (2008) 115f.

(*ḫullum*), (*ḫūl*) „Halsring/-band“, „Kummer“² oder „Brustblatt“², eher nicht Z. oder Leine, [kuš]-ul-an-še = *ullu* = *irtum* („Brust“; MSL 7, 150 Hg. zu Hh. XI 168; MSL 9, 199: 7), für Equiden (vgl. Littauer/Crouwel 1979, Abb. 6f.), „Halsband“ für Hunde; aus Leder oder Wolle; M. Krebernink, ZA 91 (2001) 249; J. Pasquali, NABU 1995/59 (Ebla und Mari); Arkhipov 2012, 8f. (Mari); P. Steinkeller, IrAnt. 37 (2002) 365 (zu *ḫūl* vs. *ul*); C. Woods, Fs. R. D. Biggs 329f. („reins, leash“).

su-da-nu (sem. Herkunft; Ebla) „Kummer“ für Equiden und Rinder; zu akk. *sūttinnu* (s. u.) zu stellen, s. H. Waetzoldt, NABU 1997/95.

šahumaš (kass.) mB „Zügelring“, war an Deichsel, Joch oder Wagen angebracht; PBS 2/2, 99: 9f. (*dušū*-Leder u. a. für 2 Paar š.), 49: 1 (Kauf beim Schmied von 2 Paar Bronze-š. mit einem Gewicht von 2,5 Minen um 10 Kor Gerste), 54: 14f. (Form: *išsu²* UDU.KUR.RA.MEŠ *ana muḫḫi šaḫtu* „Baum“ von