



Marginal Notes on Recent Hittitological Publications

Hans G. Guterbock

Journal of Near Eastern Studies, Vol. 48, No. 4. (Oct., 1989), pp. 307-311.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-2968%28198910%2948%3A4%3C307%3AMNORHP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-1>

Journal of Near Eastern Studies is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MARGINAL NOTES ON RECENT HITTITOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS

HANS G. GÜTERBOCK, *University of Chicago*

I

RECENTLY, I was amazed to find, in three publications, the correct transliteration ^{LU}ALAN.ZÚ combined with the obsolete translation "Statuenanbeter" ("statue worshiper").¹ This interpretation was originally proposed, in 1931, by A. Goetze. He thought that the sign KA×UD, which is the Boğazköy form of the logogram for "tooth," might, in the combination with ALAM (ALAN), stand for KA×ŠU = *karābu*.² For a time the interpretation as ALAM.KA×KÁR, "statue worshiper," was accepted, *faute de mieux*, by most scholars,³ although with a question mark. The correct reading was found by B. Landsberger on the basis of variants in vocabularies writing ALAN.ZÚ for *aluzinnu* instead of the normal ALAN.ZU.⁴ Since KA×UD is the normal Boğazköy shape of KA with the reading zú = *šinnu* "tooth," it is obvious that the composite Hittite logogram is the Boğazköy form of ALAN.ZÚ, with a simple phonetic substitution of one homophone for another. It was therefore a surprise to find Landsberger's reading ALAN.ZÚ combined with Goetze's translation "statue worshiper."

Obviously, this return to the old translation was prompted by an article by E. Badali entitled "^{LU}ALAM.ZU_x: adoratore di statue o clown?"⁵ Before discussing the essence of the article let me comment on two minor points.

First, Badali is right in saying that since the sign KA×UD is not identical with simple KA = zú, one should distinguish it by writing ZU_x. I agree, and the *CHD* is using this transliteration.⁶

Second, I do not know whether the *aluzinnu* is a clown, a jester, an actor, or whatever else. We all know that the most frequent, but by no means only, of his

¹ E. Badali, "Una festa in onore di Zababa (CTH 612)," *Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente Antico* 2 (1985): 57 f., l. 14; M. Popko and P. Taracha, "Der 28. und 29. Tag des hethitischen AN.TAḪ.ŠUM-Festes," *AoF* 15 (1988): 88 and 92, l. 3; J. Friedrich and A. Kammenhuber, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*, 2d ed. (HW²), vol. 2 (Heidelberg, 1988), p. 18.

² A. Goetze, "Die Entsprechung der neuassyrischen Zeichen PÍŠ und KA+ŠU in der Boghazköi-Schrift," *ZA* 40 (1931): 65 ff., esp. 70–73. He thought he had evidence for KA×KÁR in the same meaning as KA×ŠU.

³ S. Alp, *Untersuchungen zu den Beamtennamen im hethitischen Festzeremoniell* (Leipzig, 1940), p. 66; J. Friedrich, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch (HW)* (Heidelberg, 1952–54), p. 264.

⁴ See my article, "Lexicographical Notes II: 4 ^{LU}ALAN.KA×UD = ^{LU}ALAN.ZÚ = *aluzinnu*," *RHA* 74 (1964): 95–97. I did not "propose" the reading and interpretation but only made known Landsberger's correct explanation. Proto-Lu 581 is now in *MSL* 12, p. 54 with variant, p. 72.

⁵ Badali, "^{LU}ALAM.ZU_x: Adoratore di statue o clown?," *Bibbia e Oriente* 139 (1984): 45–53.

⁶ On the other hand, the Boğazköy form of EZEN is really EZEN×ŠE, and early Hittitologists wrote thus until it was agreed that since everybody knew that shape we might just as well omit the ×ŠE. By the same token, ZÚ, as Popko and Kammenhuber (n. 1 above) write, instead of ZÚ×UD is also acceptable.

functions in the cult festivals is to speak (*memai*), sometimes to recite Hattic formulas;⁷ so one could call him “reciter.” E. Forrer’s “Vorbeter” was probably based on the same observation.⁸ In the following lines, I shall leave the word untranslated and sometimes abbreviate it “A.” The essential point is that the wrong reading KA×KÁR cannot serve as a basis for determining the meaning.

E. Badali’s argument rests on his interpretation of the passage *KBo* 20.33 obv. 15 f. (p. 47):⁹

[*hu*]itār šaminuanzi pērin šaminuanzi

[LÚ].MEŠALAN.ZU šaminuanzi kuršaš Ê-irza DINGIR.MEŠ uenzi

Actually the logogram is written here with the sign ZU₁; so far, this is the only occurrence known of the standard Babylonian form in a Hittite text.¹⁰

The author takes the verb *šaminu-* as “incensare” and translates as follows:

vengono incensate (le statue di) animali, vengono incensate (le statue di) uccelli; i LÚ.MEŠALAM.-ZU_x(!) incensano, gli dèi escono dalla casa del *kurša-* (p. 50).

An English rendering of the sense of the Italian, but closer to the Hittite construction with the verb in the active and the third person plural for the general subject, would be:

They provide the animal (statues) with incense, they provide the bird (statue) with incense, the A’s burn incense, the gods leave the house of the *kurša-*.

On the basis of this translation the author argues that incense burning is an act of worship, and since the A does it here for the images of animals and a bird, he is actually worshiping the statues!

My first point of criticism is that the verb *šamenu-*, for which I once found the meaning “to burn (as incense),” takes the material as direct object and the deity in the dative or with “in front of.” It is not used in the sense of “to provide a deity (acc.) with incense burning.”

The second point is that it is awkward, in three parallel, short clauses consisting of the same verb with three different nouns, to take two of the nouns as an object and the third as a subject. Since *pērin* is accusative, the nouns in the three parallel clauses must all be accusatives: “They *šaminu* the animal (figures), they *šaminu* the bird (figure), they *šaminu* the A’s,” leaving the verb for the present untranslated.

The passage quoted is from the “outline tablet” of the KI.LAM Festival. In the Old Hittite version of the full text of the festival the corresponding section is as follows:¹¹

[IŠTU Ê^d]Inar šuppešduwareš uenzi ħuitār šemenzi (var. *šamenzi*) pēriš uizzi

Out of the temple of Inar come the š.’s, the animal (figures) *šamen*, the *pēri* (figure) comes.

⁷ See F. Pecchioli Daddi, *Mestieri, professioni e dignità nell’Anatolia ittita* (Rome, 1982), pp. 275–89 and S. de Martino, “Il LÚALAN.ZU come ‘mimo’ e come ‘attore’ nei testi ittiti,” *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 24 (1984): 131–48.

⁸ E. Forrer, “Quelle und Brunnen,” *Glotta* 26 (1938): 186, quoted by Alp, *Untersuchungen*, p. 66.

⁹ I. Singer, *The Hittite KI.LAM Festival*, pt. 2, StBoT, vol. 28 (Wiesbaden, 1984), p. 89, text 3.a, an “outline tablet.”

¹⁰ Just here the author should have omitted the index x.

¹¹ Text I.h ii 15–16 (p. 34).

This is followed by the statement that, in contrast, on the second day there are no animals and no bird.

In the First Tablet of the festival, a New Hittite manuscript, a similar scene is described as follows:¹²

nuššan kuitman LUGAL-*uš* ^É*katapuzni ešzi kuitman -ma hūitār hūmanda uttanašš-a BĒLŪ*^{MES}
PANI LUGAL *šameyanzi* ^{LÚ.MES}ALAN.ZU_x-*ma tarwiškanzi palwiškanzi ḥazziškanzi-ya*

While the king is seated in the gate building and while all the animal (figures) and the “masters of the word” *šameya* before the king, the A.’s continually dance, clap hands, and play (musical instruments).

Whatever the meaning of the verbs and the relation of the stems *šame(ya)-* and *šamen-* to each other may be, the comparison of the three passages makes it clear that *šamenu-* is the causative of either or both of them. People can *šamenu* the animal figures and the bird figure, the animal figures and some persons can *šameya* before the king, and the animal figures can *šamen*, while the bird figure comes. The alternation with “come” in the last version shows that *samen-*, *same(ya)-* are also verbs of motion. Singer’s translation “to pass in review, parade” and the causative thereof is adequate.¹³ The passage in the First Tablet, furthermore, shows that the A.’s are engaged in activities also known from other festivals rather than in “burning incense”! Whether the use of *šamenu-* in the meaning “to burn something as incense” and that of *šamen-* in the laws, where it means “to be forced to renounce, to forfeit,” can ultimately be combined with the usage in the KILAM Festival or whether one has to posit different homonymous verbs cannot yet be decided.¹⁴

I hope to have shown that the passage adduced by Badali cannot be used to prove that the A “worships statues.” It seems necessary to stress again that “statue worshiper” and *aluzinnu* are not two proposals of equal value from which one can choose, but that the reading ALAN.ZU_x = Akkadian *aluzinnu* is the only correct interpretation of the logogram. If we cannot find a good translation for *aluzinnu*, we may follow the CAD and leave the term untranslated. Or we can use such noncommittal translations as “performer” or “reciter.” But let us rebury the “statue worshiper”!

II

KA×UD for zú is not the only Hittite innovation of this kind. As all Hittitologists know, there is also KA×U for ka = *pû* “mouth” and KA×GAG for kir₄ = *appu* “nose.” The inscribed signs were obviously chosen as optical help: babbar “white” for the teeth, u “hole” for the mouth, and gag “peg” for the nose. The first two of these are also attested in Amarna.¹⁵ This was one of the reasons why the late K. K.

¹² Text I.a iii 7–15 (p. 12).

¹³ Singer, *The Hittite KILAM Festival*, pt. 1, StBoT, vol. 27 (Wiesbaden, 1983), p. 95, n. 21.

¹⁴ N. Oettinger, “*(s)men- ‘gering sein’ verschwinden, in *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 35 (1976): 97–103, for the formal side. On the semantic side, one might try to find a basic meaning in the verb “to pass” in the laws, “to pass by, pass up, forgo,” and where *šamenu-* seems to mean “to

burn as incense”: “to cause to pass,” “cause to go up in smoke.” But I am aware of the danger of anglicisms and therefore offer these thoughts only tentatively and as a footnote.

¹⁵ O. Schroeder, *Die Tontafeln von El-Amarna*, Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin, vol. 12 (Leipzig, 1915), p. 76, column “Ägypten,” attested in his no. 198 = Knudtzon 14, a text written in Egypt.

Riemschneider thought that the Egyptian scribes learned the cuneiform script from their Hittite colleagues.¹⁶

The skepticism about KA×GAG expressed by K. Peckeruhn in her dissertation¹⁷ is unnecessary.¹⁸

III

In addition, Miss Peckeruhn's method of transliterating Hittite texts calls for a comment. The first principle in transliterating cuneiform has always been that a reader familiar with the system should know at first glance which cuneiform signs are meant. For that purpose the values most common throughout the whole system were chosen, even readings that pose problems in Hittite such as the signs containing š and z. Forrer's sign-list is still standard.¹⁹ The other Hittitologists introduced one arbitrary convention: in all cases where a sign is ambiguous concerning the voicing of stops, they opted for the voiceless; for example, *pí* for *bi*, *pát* for *bad*, etc. Everybody knows that this is only a convention and is irrelevant for phonology. Those signs, however, which in Akkadian begin with a voiced stop and those with a voiceless, are always rendered with only that value; for example, *da* and *ta*. What the arbitrary rendering of *all* stops by the voiced form, proposed and applied by Peckeruhn, should be good for is hard to see. Such renderings as *ga*₁₄ (for *ka*) or *gi*₅ (for *ki*) make immediate recognitions virtually impossible, and the whole system is irrelevant for phonology; how it is supposed to be "phonologisch möglichst genau" (p. 4) is impossible to understand. It is to be hoped that Miss Peckeruhn will not find imitators.

IV

One more recent innovation calls for comment: the proposal to read LÚ ME ŠE-DI for LÚ MEŠEDI.²⁰ Miss Hoffmann translates this "Hundert der Lebenskraft." In his review of her book,²¹ G. Beckman correctly characterized this as a "misconstrual of the semantic field of šēdu" and pointed out that ME as an Akkadogram for "hundred" in Hittite texts is always preceded by a numeral. R. Beal, in his unpublished dissertation,²² goes to great lengths to disprove every single point made by Hoffmann. On the other hand, T. R. Bryce²³ considers her interpretation "plausible"! In view of this, it must be stated unequivocally that her translation is totally impossible.

My derivation of MEŠEDI as coming from Akkadian *mašaddu*, *mešeddu* "wagon pole" was generally rejected (although it was accepted by the CAD). The question of

¹⁶ In an unpublished lecture.

¹⁷ Kerstin Peckeruhn, "Die Handschrift A der hethitischen Gesetze" (Ph.D. diss., University of Würzburg, 1988), pp. 149 f., n. 10.

¹⁸ She overlooked the reference to KUB 10.63 ii 21 given (by Götze) in ŠL 11/4, p. 1121 N(achtrag) 169. I do not know what a SAL.KIR₄ might be.

¹⁹ E. Forrer, *Die Boghazköi-Texte in Umschrift*, Vol. 1, *Die Keilschrift von Boghazköi*, WDOG 41 (1922; Osnabrück, 1969).

²⁰ Inge Hoffmann, *Der Erlass Telipinus*, THeth. 11 (Heidelberg, 1984), pp. 116–19 and passim. The

rendering of the sign ME, taken here to be the numeral 100, in Roman capitals is in accordance with CAD s.v. *meat*. Others have taken it to be an Akkadogram and have italicized it.

²¹ G. Beckman, review of Hoffmann, *Der Erlass Telipinus*, JAOS 106 (1986): 572.

²² R. Beal, "The Organization of the Hittite Military" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1986), pp. 268 f., n. 818.

²³ T. R. Bryce, review of Hoffmann, *BiOr* 43 (1986): 752.

whether the term for a bodyguard can be derived from the fact of his walking near the head of the royal chariot can now be laid to rest, since M. Civil²⁴ has shown that in some places *mašaddu/mešeddu* is a kind of spear (he uses the term “lance” in French). As H. A. Hoffner has pointed out in a note on Civil’s note, “man of the spear” is a good definition for a bodyguard.²⁵

The instruction for the *MEŠEDI*, however, mentions also the LÚ GÍŠŠUKUR (and special kinds of “spear men”),²⁶ contrasted with the *MEŠEDI*. A possible explanation might be that two different kinds of weapons are meant by the two terms. For a discussion of various kinds of spear-like weapons see the *CHD*, s.v. (GÍŠ)*māri*.

²⁴ M. Civil in “Notes brèves,” *RA* 81 (1987): 187 f.

²⁵ H. A. Hoffner, Jr., *ibid.*, pp. 188 f.

²⁶ Pecchioli Daddi, *Mestieri*, pp. 198–200.