setzt: Es ist eine Zeit der Rebellionen, Überschwemmungen und Epidemien. Somit stehen die beiden Texte thematisch auf der gleichen Ebene wie die Mythen von Hedammu, Ullikummi und dem Silberdämon.

Der der Überlieferung nach älteste Notzeitmythos ist der altbabylonische Mythos vom Sturmvogel Anzu, denn auch sein Königtum stellt die kosmische Ordnung in Frage. Ursache oder Folge der Herrschaft des Anzu scheint (nach der neu-assyrischen Fassung) eine Bedrohung Babyloniens aus dem Norden zu sein, denn am Ende der 3. Tafel ist (in sehr zerstörtem Kontext) Hanigalbat genannt.

Da der Anzu-Mythos Teil der Mythenüberlieferung um den Landwirtschaftsgott Ningirsu bzw. Ninurta ist, wird wohl auch hier das gleiche Konzept wie im Ba'lu- und im Kumarbi-Mythenzyklus vorliegen.

An das Ende der literarischen Überlieferung der Notzeitmythen ließe sich Hesiods Theogonie stellen. Denn Hesiod läßt in altorientalischer Tradition auf den Sukzessionsmythos die Bestrafung der Menschheit folgen, die durch die Prometheus-Sage eingeleitet ist.

Sukzessionsmythen sind primär Kalendermythen. Die mit ihnen eng verbundenen Notzeitmythen erklären Katastrophen als eine Zeit, in der der natürliche Rhythmus des Jahreslaufes gestört ist und die kosmische Ordnung in das lichtlose uranfängliche Chaos zurückzusinken droht – eine großartige Einsicht, die den Krieg mit all seinen Folgen als die übelste Barbarei begreift. Dementsprechend ist einem mythologischen Fragment in hethitischer Sprache zufolge der Kriegsgott Zababa denn auch der Feind des Teššup, den er bekämpft und verflucht, da der Krieg die kosmische Ordnung – die Kultur und Humanität – außer Kraft setzt.

## Hittite immakku: "moreover" or "just now"?

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. (Chicago)

The Hittite word *immakku* was first treated by Goetze in ZA 36 (1925) 268. It was subsequently commented upon by Sommer, AU (1932) 265 and Friedrich, JCS 1 (1947) 302f. In his Hethitisches Wörterbuch (1952) Friedrich translated it "schliesslich noch" and "obendrein auch noch" ("in addition to everything else"). The most recent full treatment of the word *immakku* was by Jaan Puhvel, who could detect no difference in meaning between *imma* and *immakku* and assigned to both of them the meanings "moreover", "indeed", "even", "nevertheless" and "really"<sup>2</sup>.

Of course, since examples of *immakku* are fewer than those of *imma*, Puhvel does not cite *immakku* in all the meanings attributed to *imma*. In fact, so far as I can see, he only treats one occurrence of *immakku* (KBo 5.6 iii 7-8). In that one case, *imma* and *immakku* seem at first glance to have a similar force. I refer to a pair of historical passages written during the reign of Muršili II. The first is from his annals: ŠEŠ-YA BA.ÚŠ *imma* KUB 19.29 i 9 (AM 14) which Puhvel follows Gotze in traslating "moreover my brother died", and the second, from the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma,  $nu=\check{s}ma\check{s}=kan$  EN-ŠUNU kuit "Piphururiyaš immakku BA.ÚŠ KBo 5.6 iii 7-8 (DŠ frag.29) which, following Güterbock, he renders "because on top of everything their lord Tutankhamon had died on them". This interpretation looks good until one notices two things: (1) the first passage is in a badly broken context in which it is difficult to know what is meant beyond the simple statement that Muršili's brother, the King of Carchemish, had died, and (2) there are other acceptable translations of *immakku* in the second passage, including several of the other meanings proposed by Puhvel.

As for *imma* itself, the apparent diversity of meanings has more to do with translation than actual function. Although Puhvel is certainly right to use different English words for *imma* in different contexts, the word's function is essentially the same.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> J.Puhvel, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, Volume 2 (Berlin-New York-Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers, 1984), 359-361.

Mouton Publishers, 1964), 333-361.

2 Kronasser, EHS page 349 had proposed "schliesslich" for imma, and "schliesslich (sogar) noch" for immakku.

Particularly notable is its employment in pairs of clauses where it balances an adjacent negative statement with a positive affirmation.<sup>3</sup> And in negative rhetorical questions *UL imma* seeks a strongly affirmative answer: "Does he actually not...?" The usage following a relative (i.e., *kuis imma*) is, of course, something different. There the *imma* imparts a generalizing force: "whoever".

My own feelling about *imma* and *immakku* is that at the outset it is safer to ignore the apparent etymological relationship of the two words and concentrate on the actual occurrences of each. I have done that for *immakku*, as a start, and have discovered from the occurrences in contexts large enough to truly control the meaning that a translation "just now", unattested for *imma*, seems to work best.

The first example is taken from 154/u (published in hand copy by H. Otten as KBo 13.161) which is a one-sided fragment containing 18 lines of what was originally the righthand column of the reverse (i.e., column III) of a tablet excavated in the 1962 season in a secondary location in the area of the so-called House of the Slope. The fragment is not identified as to content in Otten's comments in the front matter of KBo 13. E. Laroche, who was usually very skillful in the identifying of small fragments, placed it under his catalogue number 832, which designates "fragments of unknown nature". To my knowledge no one since that time has written about this piece. Yet it is in this 18-line context that I believe we find the best single passage to elucidate the meaning of immakku, which occurs here twice.

EN SISKUR = za ANA dU arkuwar iy[azi] / dU EN-YA EGIR-pa=war=aš=mu pāi UMM[A dU-MA] / immakk[u]=war=as=mu pēšta / kinun=ma=war=aš=mu [E]GIR-pa wekiš[kiši] / nu=za EN SISKUR ANA dU arkuwar i[yazi] / pāi=war=aš=mu nu=wa=tta=kkan menaḥh[anda] / uškanzi t=aš=ši=aš dU-aš parā pēšta / EGIR-ŠU [A]NŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ GIŠGIGIR GIŠTUKUL INA URU Ari[nna] / ANA dU parā tittanuwanzi / nu=za EN SISKUR ANA dU arkuwar iy[azi dU EN-YA] / EGIR-pa=war=aš=mu pāi UMMA dU-M[A] / immakku=war=aš=mu pēšta k[inun=ma=war=aš=mu] / EGIR-pa IR-kiši nu=za EN SISKUR A[NA dU] / arkuwar iyazi p[āi=war=aš=mu] / nu=wa=mu É-ri pira[n arantari?...]

The following is my translation of that passage:

"[They set up certain cult objects in some city for the Stormgod;] the sacrificer make a plea [arkuwar] to the Stormgod: 'O Stormgod, my lord! Give them<sup>4</sup> back to me!' Thus says the [Storgod]: 'You just gave them to me! [Literally: 'You gave them to me immakku'] Are you now asking them back from me?' The sacrificer

makes a plea to the Stormgod: 'Give them to me, and they will always be (here) awaiting<sup>5</sup> you'. So (the Stormgod) gave them to him.

After this, they set up (representations of) horses, a chariot and a weapon in Arinna for the Stormgod, and the sacrificer makes a plea to the Stormgod: '[O Stormgod, my lord!] Give them (i.e., the horses, chariot and weapon) back to me!' Thus says the Stormgod: 'You just (immakku) gave them to me! Are you now asking them back from me?' The sacrificer makes a plea to the Stormgod: 'G[ive them to me, and they will stand(?)] in front of my house.' "KBo 13.161 rev. right col. 1-15.

It is unfortunate that the preceding context (at the end of the last column on the obverse?) has been lost. It seems from the repetitions that different sets of gifts are presented to the Stormgod, and each in turn is asked back by the sacrificer, on condition that they will still serve the god or be available to him. In any event, it seems clear that *immakku* cannot here bear any of the meanings attributed to *imma* ("indeed, really, moreover"), but that "just now" fits nicely.

A second clear example is found in King Tudhaliya IV's letter to Bāba-ah(a)-iddin of Assyria (KUB 23.103 rev. 11-13 w. dupl. KUB 23.92 rev. 11-12)<sup>6</sup>. There word has come to the Hittite king from Assyria: [ANA GID-AM=pat mahha[n...n(u kī memiškizzi)] / immakku ešat nu=šši UL ANA GUD-AM=pat mahha[n...n(u kī memiškizzi)] / iyami=man=pat=wa kuitki "(The new Assyrian king) has just sat down (lit. "has sat down immakku") on the throne of his father, and doesn't he have [eagerness to fight(?)] just like a bull has? And he says this: 'I want to do something!' "One could make do with a translation "he has indeed sat down on the throne of his father", but the situation is further described. Like a snorting, stamping bull, the new king is eager to charge into the battle field. Newly seated on the throne of his father, then he aspires to make a reputation for himself with exploits. In these circumstances what is called for is an expression indicating brevity of time. Alternate suggested translations such as "actually, really, moreover" are inappropiate.

This brings us to our **third** well-preserved context, the well-known passage in the Deeds of Suppiluliuma, KBo 5.6 iii 7-8, referred to above. There, a new translation of Muršili's words "Because their lord, Bibhururiya (Tutankhamon) had just died, the Egyptian queen, who was the Tahamunzu (Egyptian: "wife of the king"), sent a messenger to my father" fits very well. The point of the *immakku* is not that this death of the Egyptian king was "on top of" the Egyptian reverses in the battlefield (transating *immakku* as "moreover" or "on top of everything else"), but rather that, when her husband died, the queen acted promptly to assure a new king of her own choosing.

Five other occurrences of *immakku* are known to me, but all are in contexts too broken to prove anything. In four of these the finite verb is either lost in a lacuna or is – like the above three examples – a past tense: [...]x *immakku hatraiš* "he/you

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Many examples listed already by Puhvel. I would also include KUB 29.44 ii 41, which Kammenhuber conjecturally restored as *im-ma*[-ak-ku], but which is an obvious example of affirmative *imma* contrasting a previous negative statement: they don't give anything more to the strong horses, but they do cover them up.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The objects in question were probably mentioned at the end of the preceding column, now lost.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Cf. CHD menahhanda 10 a 1'. So far as I can see, not treated in  $HW^2$  I 618-620 (menahhanda  $au(\tilde{s})$ -).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Edited by Otten, AfO 19 (1960) 42f.

have just written [to me ...]" KBo 18.27 obv. 3 (letter fragment), [...]-ša<sup>7</sup>-at-ši-kán im-ma-ak-ku [...]... KBo 19.145 iii 6-7 (rit.); nu im-ma-ak-ku[...] KUB 29.54 i 9 (hippological); im-ma-ak-ku-uš[-sa-a]n / \[ \text{DUG} \] \[ \siu up-pa EGIR-pa da-i-\[ u \] -en "We (had) just replaced the šuppa vessel, (when the ... -bird did such-and-such)" KBo 32.123 obv. 8 (bird oracle, early NH or MH/early NS). The fifth, a context of quoted speech, preserves the verb dāi, which is most likely the present tense of the verb da- "to take": [...ki?]-\[ i? \] \[ \da-a im-ma-ku-wa-za da-a-i "Take [...]! (S)he is just taking". KUB 43.76 obv. 11 (fragment of a deposition).

What can we conclude from these three well-preserved passage? It seems that *immakku* does not have quite the same meaning as *imma* and properly should be kept separate. We should resist the temptation to translate according to components – combining the customary translations of *imma* "actually, moreover" + the correlative suffix -kku. A similar pair exists elsewhere in Hittite, namely, apiya and apiyakku<sup>8</sup>. Here the best preserved contexts<sup>9</sup> indicate for apiyakku a meaning like "only then (and not before)", 10 as opposed to simple "there" or "then" for apiya. This nuance seems to be to parallel *immakku*'s "only now", "just now" rather closely.

## An Image of the Dead? Some Remarks on the Second Day of the Hittite Royal Funerary Ritual\*

Theo van den Hout (Amsterdam)

1. Shortly after his edition of the Hethitische Totenrituale in 1958 Heinrich Otten published two important additional fragments in the journals Welt des Orients and Orientalistische Literaturzeitung respectively<sup>1</sup>. The first fragment consisted of a "Lieferungsliste", the second he termed a "Rollenbuch". On the basis of these more texts could be attributed with certainty to the composition that was known to the Hittite scribes under the title mān URUHattuši šalliš waštaiš kišari "When in Hattuša a great loss occurs" with the connotation: "When in Hattuša a royal loss occurs."

Following Otten<sup>3</sup> already before the final publication of KUB XXXIX in 1963, three groups of texts can be discerned within the text ensemble of the funerary rituals now collected under CTH 450: one group where either in the incipit or in the colophon the above title of the composition was explicitly mentioned, a second group where this title is not preserved, but which shares all or most of the characteristics of the first group, and a third one of a general funerary character but of uncertain attribution because none or not enough of the aforementioned characteristics show up. After the publication of KUB XXXIX relatively few fragments have been added to the composition, the most important being those recently published as KBo XXXIV 55-59.

The now available material enables us to reconstruct the organization of the

 $^{3}$  HTR 7-8.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> The  $\check{s}$  is probably the nominative case ending of some noun or indipendent pronoun lost in the preceding break.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Cf. HW<sup>2</sup> I 184f. sub apiyakku with literature.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> KBo 2.3 iv 10-13 (1Mašt.), 2Mašt. iv 30-31, KBo 8.35 ii 6-7 (MH treaty), KUB 2.2 + 48.1 ii 37-39,

 <sup>10</sup> Cf. Kronasser, EHS p. 349, Anmerkung 3. "(erst) bei der Gelegenheit". Von Schuler's (Kaškäer 109ff.) translation "eben dort" for KBo 8.35 ii 6-7 is close (cf. Puhvel, HED I 89 "even them"). But I would prefer "just" or "only" for the -kku rather than "even".

<sup>\*</sup> Research for this article was made possible by a fellowship of the Royal Dutch Academy of Arts and Sciences. I would like to express my sincere thanks to Prof. E. Neu (Bochum) for his valuable criticism.

<sup>1</sup> WO 2 (1954-1959) 477-479 and OLZ 57 (1962) 229-233.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For a detailed semantic and phonological analysis of the root underlying the verb wašt(a)- see J. Catsanicos, NABU 2; for a different opinion see J. Puhvel, HS 105 (1992) 4-8. As to šalli- "great" in the sense of "royal", there are a few combinations with this adjective, where a translation "royal" seems the most appropriate: šalli pedan "throne, kingship" and šalli haššatar "royal family".