

Jaan Puhvel, Los Angeles

Nach dieser Bemerkung kommen wir jetzt auf das erste hier angeführte Textfragment KBo 22.181 zurück. In SMEA 37, 69 hat J. Klinger KBo 22.181 in CTH *621, also in das AN.TAH.ŠUM-Fest, mit Fragezeichen eingeordnet. Nach ihm (l. c. 69 Anm. 9) schildert es die Reise im Frühjahr von Hattuša nach Arinna, und die Zeilen 14ff. betreffen die Königin, die, den "Outline"-Tafeln zufolge, wieder nach Hattuša zurückkehrt. Hätte Klinger Recht, so könnte man die erste ^{GIS}w.-Kultanlage dieses Textes, in der ^{UTU} und Mezzulla beopfert werden (vgl. Z. 3-8), mit jener von CTH *621.A¹³ Rs. IV 8ff. gleichsetzen und folglich als Kızılarkayası in Boğazkale identifizieren.¹⁴ Aber die Ähnlichkeiten zwischen KBo 22.181 und CTH *621 sind nur scheinbar und irreführend. In KBo 22.181 Rs. 1 erscheinen zwei Gesalbten, und diese Erwähnung läßt sich höchstwahrscheinlich mit einem Besuch des Königs in einer Verehrungsstätte in Verbindung setzen, von der er sich nach den zwei in Z. 3 und 10f. erwähnten ^{GIS}w.-Kultanlagen begibt. Mehr über jene erste Kultstätte hätte man in den vorangehenden Zeilen des Textes finden können, leider sind sie nicht erhalten. Wegen der Anwesenheit der zwei Gesalbten ist sie entweder in Arinna selbst oder in seiner Nähe zu suchen und wahrscheinlich als die *arhuzzana*-Kultanlage mit den Steinen und den *šura*-Gegenständen als Kultobjekten zu deuten. KBo 22.181 beschreibt also m. E. die Rückkehr des Königs von Arinna nach Hattuša, und die Zeilen 14ff. - seinen Aufenthalt in der Hauptstadt.¹⁵

In KBo 22.181 liegt eine bisher völligste Aufzählung der *a./GISw.*-Kultstätten zwischen Hattuša und Arinna vor. Ihre Liste ist sicherlich nicht erschöpft; zu erklären wäre z. B., wo die in KBo 21.69+ Vs. III-Rs. IV beschriebenen Kulthandlungen stattfanden. Aus dem hier gebotenen Überblick der Belege dürften die Unterschiede zwischen einzelnen Verehrungsstätten deutlich geworden sein. Sie kommen zum Ausdruck in den Namen der verehrten Gottheiten und Kultobjekten. Man kann auch bemerken, daß sich manchmal die Ausstattung einer Kultanlage im Laufe der Zeit verändert hat. Schließlich ist beachtenswert, daß alle drei bisher identifizierten Kultanlagen zwischen Hattuša und Arinna als *arhuz(z)na-/GISwarhuzna-* bezeichnet wurden. Vielleicht handelt es sich hier um einen allgemeinen Begriff für eine Verehrungsstätte im Freien, aber diese Frage bedürfte noch einer Erklärung.

¹³ Bezeichnung des Textes nach D. Yoshida, BMECCJ 6 (1992) 122ff.; dort auch Umschrift und Übersetzung.

¹⁴ Vgl. dazu S. Pierallini und Verf., Eothen 9 (1998) 126ff.

¹⁵ Zu dieser Deutung s. auch D. Yoshida, THeth 22, 102 und 183.

The numinosity of names runs from the dismissive (Shakespeare's "What's in a name?") to the foreboding (*nomen est omen*) to the sacred, where it preempts the bearer ("hallowed be thy name"). The legal and frequently religious import of names is common to all societies. Name embodies true identity. For name as collective marker we might recall the Roman *nomen Latinum*, or *Turskum numem* in Umbrian, or Sanskrit *āryam nāma* 'Aryan nation' in India. Individual naming has equally deep formulaic layers of terminology. Even as Vedic *priyām dhāma* matches in meaning *sva-dhā* 'one's own law, autonomy', and western etymological counterparts are Old English *frēodōm* 'freedom' and Old Latin *suodālis* 'freeman' on the "Lapis Satricanus", Vedic *priyām nāma* has a pendant in Old English *frēo nama* and a tertium comparationis in Latin *nōmen proprium* (if we duly credit Michel Bréal's old interpretation of *proprius* as hypostatic for **prō preivōd* and connect *prīvus* 'by oneself, single' with Old English *frēo* 'free'). The root **swe/o-* (as in Ved. *svadhā*) figures also in Greek *ἴδιος* 'one's own', dialectal *φῃδιο-* (< **swe/o-* + suffix *-idio-*, as in *κουρίδιος*), which Wulfila rendered by Gothic *swes*.

In the Vedic and Germanic instances the word implies fondness for "one's own", hence the extended sense 'dear' of Ved. *priyā-*, 'free' of Gothic *freis* and Welsh *rhydd*, 'to love', of Gothic *frijōn*, and 'dear, beloved' of Old Norse *swāss*.

Here a new tertium imposes itself, that of Greek *φίλος*. This well-known vocable is routinely glossed by 'dear' or 'friend', but the ancient scholiasts of Homer were still aware that *φίλον δὲ τὸ ἴδιον*. In Homer the standard rendering is well represented, but the old lexical fund points to a proto-meaning 'one's own', as an adjective of reflexive possession (of numerous studies, cf. especially H. B. Rosén, «Lingua» 8:264-293 [1959]), in many ways paralleling or substituting for the phonologically decomposing pronominal possessive adjective (ἐ)ός < **σ(ε)φός*. Thus Odysseus (*Iliad* 11.403) spoke "to his own great-hearted spirit" (*πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν*), but *ibid.* 406 he refers to "my own spirit" as *φίλος θυμός*. Idiomatically *φίλος* tends to be used to signify intrinsic, inherent belonging, rather than acquisitional possession. Just as English is apt to employ possessive pronouns with body parts, the Homeric text offers *φίλον ἦτορ* (*Iliad* 3.31

'his heart', 13.84 'their heart'), φίλα γυῖα (*Iliad* 13.85 'their limbs', *Odyssey* 18.242 'his limbs'), φίλον κῆρ (*Odyssey* 1.310 'thy heart'), ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισι (*Odyssey* 8.178 'in my breast'), φίλοις ἐπὶ γούνασι (*Odyssey* 21.55 'on her knees'), φίλον κατὰ λαυμόν (*Iliad* 12.209 'down my gullet'), φίλας χεῖρας (*Iliad* 7.130 'his hands'), φίλα βλέφαρα (*Odyssey* 23.17 'my eyelids'). Similarly *Iliad* 22.58 φίλης αἰῶνος means 'thy own life', and *Iliad* 17.325 φίλα φρεσὶ μῆδεα εἰδώς signifies simply 'having his wits about him' (rather than something florid like 'knowing fair counsels in his mind'). Here the traditional rendering might still work (albeit somewhat mawkishly) for 'dear heart' or 'dear life', but 'dear gullet' or 'dear knees' would sorely test toleration.

The other main category that φίλος possessively qualifies is family ties, be it φίλον πατέρα (*Iliad* 24.700 'her father'), φίλε κασίγνητε (*Iliad* 4.155 'my brother'), παῖδα φίλον (*Iliad* 16.460 'his son'), φίλα τέκνα (*Iliad* 2.315 'her offspring'), φίλοισι τέκεσσι (*Iliad* 5.71 'her own offspring', followed by πόσει ᾧ 'her husband'), φίλος υἱός (*Iliad* 2.564 '[own] son'), φίλον υἷα (*Odyssey* 4.765 'my son'), φίλον πόσιν (*Odyssey* 8.523 'her husband'), φίλον ἀκοίτην (*Odyssey* 5.120 'her bedmate'), φίλη ἄκοιτις (*Iliad* 3.138 'his wife'), ἄλοχοι φίλαι (*Iliad* 18.514 'their wives'), κουριδίῳ φίλοιο (*Odyssey* 15.22 'her wedded husband'), πατρός ἐοῖο φίλον μήτρωα (*Iliad* 2.662 'his father's maternal uncle'), φίλην τροφόν (*Odyssey* 22.480 'his wetnurse'), φίλοι ἐταῖροι (*Iliad* 18.233 'his comrades'), or ἑταῖρον φίλον (*Iliad* 19.345 'his comrade').

Here the semantic proclivities differ. Since a possessive pronoun applied to persons always has affective potential, whether sentimental ("my darling") or ironic ("my dear"), context could (and evidently did) favor a semantic slippage in the direction of 'dear', as when a wife laments her (φίλον) husband (*Odyssey* 8.523), or Penelope prays to Athena to keep her (φίλον) son safe (*Odyssey* 4.765), or a mother bird mourns her (φίλα) brood (*Iliad* 2.315). Once in place, this stock usage was applied indiscriminately even if no affection was intended, as when a suitor tells Telemakhos (*Odyssey* 2.88) that 'your mother (φίλη μήτηρ)' is to blame, or someone (*Iliad* 9.555) is 'angry at heart with his mother (μητρὶ φίλῃ)'. What happened to *priyā-* in Vedic and *swāss* in Old Norse, did with abandon overtake φίλος in Greek, so that the newer meaning is also rife in the Homeric text. Right after Achilles has referred to his and his men's spirit (*Iliad* 18.113 θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλον), the next line speaks of Hektor as φίλης κεφαλῆς ὀλετῆρα 'destroyer of the dear head' (viz. Patroklos; cf. Shelley's *Adonais*: "the frost which binds so dear a head"), and line 118 avers that Herakles was φίλτατος Διὶ 'most dear to Zeus'. The

proto-meaning 'one's own' of φίλος is clearest when referring to items outside the Homeric topical categories of vital parts and familiar associations. Thus Odysseus threatens to strip Thersites of his clothes (*Iliad* 2.261 ἀπὸ μὲν φίλα εἵματα δύσω), and Theocritean fishermen (21.20) wake up to their usual toil (φίλος πόνος).

These facts are clear without being overly concerned with the etymology of φίλος; in this regard Paul Kretschmer's adduction of the Lydian possessive adjective *bil(is)* 'one's own' («Indogermanische Forschungen» 45:267-271 [1927]) as a borrowing source remains a tantalizing possibility without serious competition. φίλος has the looks of a secondary thematization of a borrowed φίλ- seen in the derivatives φίλτερος, φίλαι, φίλατο etc. The borrowing may have occurred during a period of West Anatolian symbiosis with East Greeks in the Smyrna region during the Mycenaean period (cf. perhaps Myc. [Pylos] *pi-ro-pa-ta-ra*, *pi-ro-te-ko-to* ?), pointing to a specific Lydian presence there in addition to the Hittite and Luwian one.

Even apart from such etymological speculation, however, φίλος suggests further comparison with Anatolian vocabulary. In *Odyssey* 8.277, Hephaistos goes to his bedchamber in order to set a trap for Ares who has been defiling his bed with his adulterous wife Aphrodite. It is unclear exactly what connotations the φίλα δέμνια may have held for rhapsode and audience, whether 'his own bed' or 'marital bed' or 'love couch' (cf. φίλότῃ ὅτῃ μιγῆναι) or 'beloved bedstead', but it recalls the 'sweet bed' from which the hunter Kessis rose in the Hurrian-based Hittite tale (KUB XVII 1 II 14-15 *Kiššiš [šanezz] yaz šaštaš arāiš*, cf. J. Friedrich, ZA 49:238, 254 [1950]), and likewise the outstanding repose to be had in such venues (e.g. KUB XXX 10 Rs. 18 *šanezziš tešhaš* 'sweet sleep'; KUB XLI 29 III 2 and KUB XXXVI 90 Vs. 6 *šanizziyaz tešhaz* 'from sweet sleep'; KUB XXXVI 89 Rs. 57 *šanizzius tešhuš šuppariyanza ēšta* 'you had dreamt sweet dreams'). The adjective *šanezzi-* (or *šanizzi-*) is habitually rendered as 'good, fine, sweet, dear, distinctive, choice, exquisite, exclusive, appetizing, tasty, fragrant'. It can describe perfumed ointment, the aroma of cedar oil, incense, food of the gods, milky nutriment (*galaktar*), and aromatics and delicacies generally. But it also qualifies a festival ("which is *šanizzi* to behold"), a sacred ritual, and a message (*šanizzis halugaš* 'good tidings'; cf. Erich Neu, StBoT 32:506). Kumarbi so describes the divine capital Kummiya (URU-*an šanezzin*), which his rock-born son Ullikummi (whose Hurrian name somehow echoes it) is intended to destroy. The naming of Ullikummi takes place in the course of a birth ritual. In this topos, largely replicated in the Tale of Appu (StBoT 14), midwives place the newborn on

the father's knees (this act of legitimation making him a *genuinus* in Roman terms), who acknowledges him and names him, more verbatim *nu šanezzi ŠUM-an-šet peškiuwan dāiš* 'started to give (his) *šanezzi* name (*laman*)' (KUB XXXIII 93 III 14). This, incidentally, is a hapax expression, probably under Hurrian stylistic influence. The Tale of Appu more properly says *nu-šši-ššan šanizzi laman* ¹⁰ *HUL-lu dāiš* 'he set on him the *šanizzi* name Evil' (KUB XXIV 8 III 7 + XXXVI 60 III 8); *laman dai* 'set a name' has many idiomatic Indo-European parallels (Vedic *nāma dhā-*, Avestan *nāman dadāt* [Yasna 38.4], Gk. *τίθεσθ' ὄνομα* [Odyssey 19.406], Lat. *indere nōmen*, Toch. A *ñom tā-*).

Just what was a *šanezzi laman*? Even as early classicists like Passow and Pape saw traces of babytalk in *φίλη μήτηρ* (doubtless under the charm of Nausikaa's 'daddy dear' [*πάππα φίλε*] in *Odyssey* 6.57), hittitologists have tried to comprehend how someone could be given the "sweet name Evil". Hans Güterbock (JCS 5:153 [1951]) rendered it as 'dear name', Harry Hoffner (JNES 27:201-2 [1968]) toyed with the German "Kosename", the Egyptian *nfr* 'fair name', and the Greek hypocoristic, but thought it safest to stick with a frozen "stock epithet" of epic style, while Günter Neumann («Indogermanische Forschungen» 78:240 [1973]) preferred a nuance 'appropriate, fitting'. This latter is a step forward, while Hoffner's subsequent 'fine name' (*Festschrift H. Otten* 145 [1988]) was still wide of the mark.

It seems that *šanezzi laman* is a legal technical term for 'proper name', like Vedic *priyām nāma* or Old English *frēo nama*, or Latin *nōmen proprium*. This would fix the proto-meaning of *šanezzi-* as 'proper, individual, unique, by itself, apart, one of a kind'. From there the path to 'exclusive, exquisite' and generally 'dandy' is a short one. It does look like a (possibly originally colloquial) intruder into the semantic realm of 'good', overcharacterizing YÀ DÜG.GA which is already 'good oil', and competing with *āššus ḫalugaš* (KUB XXXVI 90 Vs. 4 and 6) and *miyuš ḫalugaš* (KUB XVII 10 IV 32) for 'good news' or 'gentle tidings'.

As with *φίλος*, the etymology of *šanezzi-* is a subordinate but nevertheless potentially illuminating issue. Johannes Lohmann's initial connection (IF 51:325-6 [1933]) is still the best: IE **sen(i)-*, *sen(u)-*, *sp-tér-* reflected by Skt. *sanutár* 'afar', Gk. *ἄτερ* (< **ἄτέρ*) 'without', Goth. *sundrō*, OHG *suntar* 'apart', German *sonder-*, Old Irish *sain* 'separate, special', Lat. *sine*, Toch. A *sne* 'without'. The Hittite parallels *hantezzi-*, *appizzi-* point to a derivation from *šani-*, the ill-attested and controversial numeral 'one and the same, single', which has been discussed since the 1930's (Albrecht Goetze, «Language» 11:185-190 [1935], «Archiv Orientální» 17.1.288-297

[1949]; E. Adelaide Hahn, «Language» 18:83-116 [1942]), and to which the akkadogram *ŠANI* (*šanū* 'second') adds philological ambiguity (cf. Heiner Eichner, in *Indo-European Numerals* 45-46 [ed. J. Gvozdanović, 1992]). Here the etymological lure of IE **sem-* 'one' has been hard to resist, but it is best to keep **sen-* and **sem-* apart. There are the further derivatives *šannapi* (cf. e.g. *kui- : kuwapi*) as an epanadiplosis adverb (KUB XIII 4 III 48 *mān INIM.IZI-ma šannapi šannapi kuitki* 'but if [there is] any burning matter in isolated spots'), *šannapili-* (cf. e.g. *karuili-*) 'lacking, deprived, empty(-handed), barren' (cf. Gk. *εὐνις*, Skt. *uná-*, Lat. *vānus*, Goth. *wans*), and *šanna-* 'withhold, secrete' (e.g. KBo V 3 I 28 *n-at-mu-kan mān šannati n-at-mu ŪL mematti* 'if you keep it secret from me and do not tell me'). All of these fit semantically better with IE **sen-* denoting apartness, oneness as separation, rather than **sem-* with the connotation of oneness as togetherness, Skt. *sám*, to which Karl Hoffmann («Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft» 23.29-38 [1968]) tried to connect Agni's vocative (unaccented) Rig-Vedic epithet *santya-* (type *nitya-*), OHG *sanfti* (German *sanft* 'mild, gentle'), and Hitt. *šanezzi-* under a semantic umbrella of 'fitting together, communal'. But since the meaning of Ved. *santya-* is truly inferential, and German *sanft* qualifies sleep just as appositely as Hittite *šanezzi-*, there is little to prevent their derivation from IE **sen-tyo-*. This is a superior solution without formal difficulties, whereas **smm^u* (Ved. *samá-* 'same') > Hitt. *šana/i-* and **sontiyo-* (Ved. *santya-*) > Hitt. *šanezzi-* require special pleading (neuter **sam* > *san* as in Gk. *ἐν*, with *n* spread through paradigm as in Gk. *ἐνός*; reshaping of **sanziya-* to *šanezzi* by analogy of *appezzi-*). Like Hittite *šani-* and derivatives, Vedic *santya-* and German *sanft* are best compared with Old Irish *sain* (< **sani-*) and German *sonder-*. The last word may still mean 'special' (even in a sinister sense), and Greek *ἴδιος* has pejorated into 'peculiar', but Old Irish *sain* (*sain-samail* 'excellent'), Hittite *šanezzi-*, and German *sanft* have evolved in *bonam partem*: 'sonderbar' has become 'wunderbar'.

Hittite name-magic lurks in such variation as *nu-kan antuḫšaš ZI-ŠU ḫalziḫḫi* 'I call the persons's soul' (KUB XII 63 Vs. 18), besides *ŠUM-ŠU ḫalziḫḫi* 'I call his name' (ibid. 13). *ŠUM-an-tit daššu* 'thy name (is) mighty' (KUB XXXI 141, 4) recalls *RV 1.33.8 gr̥nimási tvešám Rudrásya nāma* 'we praise the fearsome name of Rudra'. Libations are offered to the king's "name" (e.g. KUB XXX 41 IV 5 and 18 LUGAL-aš *lamni 1-ŠU [šipanti]* 'he libates once to the king's name'). The finding of a sanctioned term for *nōmen proprium* in Hittite chimes with other evidence for the numinosity of names in that culture.