



Das Beschworungsritual fur die Gottin Wisuriyanza

Review Author[s]:

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.

Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 88, No. 3. (Jul. - Sep., 1968), pp. 531-534.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-0279%28196807%2F09%2988%3A3%3C531%3ADBFDGW%3E2.0.CO%3B2-P>

Journal of the American Oriental Society is currently published by American Oriental Society.

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/aos.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.

tioned.] He goes beyond Levita to discuss in detail "La Massorah et ses problèmes." This section is valuable reading for anyone involved in these problems independent of an interest in Levita. They will find of particular use the extended passages from Qirqisāni's *Kitāb al-Anwār* translated from the Arabic. An appendix (344-380) contains the translation of the Introduction to Levita's unpublished Massoretic concordance *Zikhrōnōt*. Much of the material in this last chapter and the appendix is included in G.E. Weil, *Initiation à la Massorah*, Brill (Leiden, 1964).

The book contains a very detailed Bibliography (384-398) dealing with the various matters taken up in it. C. Roth (*JSS* X, 1965, 127-128) and F. Secret (*REJ* III, 1964, 222-225) have offered valuable corrections and supplementary items. I would add the following which were either overlooked by Weil or appeared after his work was published: 1) A. Berliner, "Beiträge zur hebräischen Typographie Daniel Bombergs," *JJLG* III, 1904, 293-308. [In Hebrew with additional notes by A.M. Habermann in A. Berliner, *Kētābīm Nibhārīm* (Jerusalem, 1949) 163-175]; 2) J. Bloch, *Venetian Printers of Hebrew Books*, N.Y. 1932; 3) N.B. Minkoff, *Elye Bokher un zayn Bove-Bukh* (N.Y., 1950); 4) Attilio Milano, *Storia degli ebrei in Italia*, Torino, 1963; 5) M.F. Martin, "The Palaeographic Character of Codex Neofiti 1" *Textus* III, 1963, 1-35 (done for Egidio da Viterbo under the supervision of E. Levita); 5b) G.E. Weil, "le Codex Neophiti I à propos de l'article de M. Fitzmaurice Martin," *Textus* IV, 1964, 225-228 (denying Martin's identification); 6) Benjamin Hrushovski, "The Creation of Accentual Iambs in European Poetry and their First Employment in a Yiddish Romance in Italy (1508-09)," *For Max Weinreich* (The Hague, 1964) 108-146 (an appreciation of Levita's poetic technique); 7) H. Yalon, "Mah bēn R. Šlomo Almoli leR. Eliyāhū Baḥūr," *Leshonenu* 27/28, 1964, 225-229; 8) H. Yalon, "R. Šlomo Almoli veR. Eliyāhū Baḥūr" in R. Šlomo Almoli, *Šeqel ha-Qodeš* (Jerusalem, 1965) 84-87; 9) H. Shmeruk, "*Ha-Shīr 'al ha-šrēfā bē-Venišiya lē-Eliya ha-Baḥūr*," *KOBEZ AL YAD* VI, 2, (Jerusalem, 1966) 345-368 (a dirge on the great fire of Venice in 1514). Weil has, at times,

not used the most recent edition of some of the works listed in the Bibliography, e.g. H. J. D. Azulai's *Shem ha-Gedolim* (p. 385): reference should have been to I. Ben-Jacob's Vilna edition of 1853. One would also have expected here a reference to H. Michael's *'Or ha-Ḥayim* (Frankfort a.M. 1891 [reprinted Jerusalem, 1965]) where Levita's works are discussed (pp. 166-170).

The volume is provided with very useful and detailed indices (pp. 399-426). An added feature is almost forty illustrations scattered throughout the text (listed on pp. 427-28) which add greatly to the interest and usefulness of the book. Prof. Weil has done students of Jewish literature, the Massorah and the rise of European Humanism a great service in providing a first rate biography and study of a figure all too little known. It will surely be the standard work on Levita for years to come.

JONAS C. GREENFIELD

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Das Beschwörungsritual für die Göttin Wišuriyanza. By ONOFRIO CARRUBA (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Heft 2). Pp. 71. Wiesbaden: OTTO HARRASSOWITZ, 1966.

In the brief space of two years (1965-66) there have now appeared two fine contributions to this new series produced under the aegis of the Commission for the Ancient Orient of the Academy of Sciences and Literature at Mainz. The first was an edition of Queen Puduḥepa's vow to the goddess Lelwani executed by the team of H. Otten and V. Souček. The second is a study of the new incantation ritual for the goddess Wišuriyanza by a student of Otten's, O. Carruba, who now teaches in Pavia, Italy. As the author has noted (p. 1), this incantation ritual by virtue of the locus of its action (*A-NA PA-NI ÍD* [obv 6]; *ÍD-i pí-ra-an* [obv 26]) belongs to the same general category as the incantation rituals for underworld deities and the Tunnawi ritual. Compare also the fire incantation (XVII 8 rev iv 22ff.) published in transliteration by E. Laroche

(RHA f.77 [1965] 167f.). As for the nature of the goddess Wišuriyanza, the author is probably correct in surmising (p. 21) that the epithet *nakkiš* ("heavy"), used of other deities (⁴U, ⁴UTU, ⁴Telepinu, ⁴Daḥaqawili, etc.) in a complimentary sense "important," possesses a more negative nuance here: "difficult, treacherous." Supporting this thesis is the appellation *ḫuwappaš* SAL-za applied to Wišuriyanza in obv. 34, although the same adjective is also applied to an unnamed deity in *Ḥatt.* I 40, IV 12-13 (^Δ*ḫuwappi* DINGIR^{LIM}). The connection of this goddess with the Mesopotamian cultic center Sippar rests upon the interpretation of the river name ^{1D}Zip-pira (obv 18) as "river of Sippar," an interpretation which will not be easy to defend precisely because Hittite possessed several other names for the Euphrates (Puratti, Puranti, Mala [pp. 25-6]). The etymology of the DN, including a definitive study of the verb *wišuriya-* "to press, squeeze, choke" is pursued on pp. 49-54. Supplementing these remarks is the observation made by Friedrich(?) in *HWb* Erg. 3 (1966) 37 that a goddess known from the Phoenician incantation from Arslan Taş is called ḤNQT 'MR "strangler (fem.) of the lamb." For the hand copies of the texts KBo XV 25, 26, and 27 we will have to await the publication of KBo XV, scheduled to appear sometime in 1967. They were not available to the reviewer at the time this review was submitted.

The author's translations are of a high quality. They can be questioned at only a few points. One must exercise particular care in rendering the constructions with *kaša* and *kašma*. In this text *ka-a-ša* is found in obv 8, 22, and 34, in the first two instances construed with the preterite tense and in the third with the present. The interjections *kaša* and *kašma*, when construed with the preterite, often convey the notion of the Greek perfect tense, i.e., stressing a situation existing as the result of a past action. The author's translation of obv 22 should be altered accordingly to "der Opferherr hat euch ein Opfer gegeben." Below is a brief classification of the verbal constructions with *kaša* and *kašma*:

A. The uses of *kaša*:

1. With the present:
 - a. "To be ready or prepared to": KUB I 16 ii 23.
 - b. "To be about to, on the point of": KUB I 16 iii 67; *Illuyanka* obv. i 7; *1st Plague Prayer of Mušš.*, obv. 5f.; *Tawag.*, i 17-18; KBo XV obv. 34f.
 - c. "To be planning to": *Illuyanka*, obv. i 21-22.
 - d. (With qualitative verbs) "to have become": *Disap. of Sun*, B i 24 ("has become hot").
 - e. (With *ki-* without *-kan*) "to have been (set out)": *1st Vers. of Telep. Myth*, A ii 13f.
 2. With the preterite:
 - a. "to have (done something)" (often followed by an imperative): *Madd.*, obv. 15, 19, 43; KUB XXX 19 + rev. iv 1-2; XXX 24a + obv. i 9-11; Bo 2327 + obv. ii 6-9, 14-17; KBo XV obv. i 8ff., 22f.
 - b. (Same as 2a, but not followed by imper.): *2nd Plague Prayer of Mušš.*, §6, line 3; *Tel. & daught. of Ocean*, A i 19-20; Bo 2327 + obv. i 22f.;
 - c. (With qualitative verbs): *Tel. Procl.*, ii 33 ("bloodshed has become widespread").
 3. With the imperative: KUB XXX 16 + obv. i 10-11.
- #### B. The uses of *kašma*:
1. With the present:
 - a. "Will have done something": *Kup.*, §15, etc.; *Targ.*, 4, 9, 13, etc.; ("you will have transgressed the oath of the gods").
 - b. (With *eš-* [act. & without *-za*, *-kan*, etc.]): *Kup.*, §10, C 13 ("[the city] is situated [on a river]").
 2. With the preterite:
 - a. Same as A 2b: Bo 2327 + obv. i 32-33 (cf. 22-23).
 - b. Same as A 2a: *Kup.*, §6, C 6; *Madd.*, obv 70f.

In the remainder of this review I will simply comment upon various aspects of Dr. Carruba's

Kommentar (pp. 8–57). The Arabic numerals at the beginning of each paragraph refer to the page number of Carruba's book to which my additions and corrections are directed.

8: On the composites in Anatolian GNs:

- 1) Containing *-hila-*: ^{URU}*Lum-na-hi-la* can equally well be read as ^{URU}SIG₄-*na-hi-la* (cf. Goetze, JCS 18, 1964, 92). This GN may in turn be interpreted phonetically as ^{URU}*Kal-pa-aš-ša-na-hi-la* (KBo X 10 obv iv 7). Does this equation yield the Hittite pronunciation of the Sumerogram SIG₄ "mud-brick"? Yet another reading for this sign has been proposed by Dietrich and Loretz, *WdO* 3 (1966), 228⁹⁷ (GUZ in ^{TRUG}GUZ.ZA, which is found at Boğazköy in XVII 14 rev iv 4; XXXV 133 obv i 20; XXXVIII 13 rev 13). Yet another GN in *-hila-* not in RHA f.69, 82 is: ^{URU}*Zi-hi-la* (XII 3:9).
 - 2) Containing *-h(a)pa-*: Add ^{URU}*Ha-ra-aš-ha-pa-aš* (KBo III 54 obv 13) and ^{URU}*Zu-uh-ha-pa* (JCS 10, 1956, 127).
 - 3) Perhaps also GNs in *-hari* (*hari-* "valley"): ^{URU}*Ha-ri-ya* (KBo X 23 vi 23).
 - 4) Perhaps GN in *-šakuwa* (*šakui-* "spring"?): ^{URU}*Ne-ni-ša-ku-wa* (VI 45 obv ii 62), nasalized ^{URU}*Ne-ni-ša-an-ku-wa* (KBo I 58:1). Also simple ^{URU}*Šankawa* and ^{URU}*Šankuša*.
 - 5) In *-luli-*: ^{1D}*Šu-up-pi-lu-li-ya* (XVII 20 rev iii 14; XXII 51 obv 11).
- 11: That a ^{DUG}HAB.HAB can have a long neck (GÚ.GÍD.DA) for purposes of pouring (a spout?) is clear from XX 50 rev 2 and 6. For another example of *iya-* with ^{GIŠ}ZA.LAM.GAR see V. Souček, MIO 9 (1963), 164–74, esp. obv i 24–5. Must we always translate ^{GIŠ}ZA.LAM.GAR as "tent" ("Zelt")? The ^{GIŠ}ZA.LAM.GAR of Elkunirša in XXXVI 35 obv i 7 most probably corresponds to the trellised arbor designated by *qrš* in Ugaritic (see the writer's remarks in RHA f.76 [1965] 8¹⁵). Then too we know of ^{GIŠ}ZA.LAM.GAR^{HA} ŠA GI ("reed huts") in XII 58 obv i 16 and XXXV 43 obv ii 32–33, rev iii 38–9.
- 18: With Sapalulme/Šuppiluliuma compare also Lubarna/Labarna. In RHA f.72 (1963), 34 (see also my further remarks in JAOS 87 (1967) 184) I have proposed yet another example of the *a/u* alternation: the verb *hapallašai-* "to injure (on the head)," which is a denominative verb (like *haršanallai-* from *haršanalli-*) based upon the noun **hapallaš-*, a variant of *huppallaš-* "skull" (HWb Erg. 2, 13).
- 20: Other examples of "cheese-bread" are to be found in: XXX 25+, obv 16 (*nu* 1 [NINDA] *a-a-an* 1 NINDA.KUR₄.RA GA.KIN.AG ^{UTU}*-i me-na-aḥ-ha-an-da pâr-ši-ya-an-zi*); XXX 24a+, obv i 6f. (*nu* 3 NINDA *a-a-an* 1 NINDA.KUR₄.RA GA.KIN.AG). Another example of the two being kept separate by the conjunction is KBo II 3 rev iii 12f (SAL ŠU.GI 1 NINDA.KUR₄.RA *tar-na-aš* GA.KIN.AG-*ya* [A-N]A EN.SISKUR *pa-ra-a e-ep-zi*).
- 21: On *piran takšanniya-* see also Goetze, JCS 16 (1962) 25. The expression *nu-šmaš kalmareš piran takšatniyantaru*, "before you (oh gods) let the mountains be levelled," is echoed almost seven centuries later in the biblical *topos* of Isaiah 40:4ff.
- 22: The analysis of the nouns in *-uzzi-* is most interesting. Undiscussed is (among others) *kattaluzzi-* "threshold." Could this be from *katta la-* "to put down" (opposite of *šara karp-* in XX 39 obv. ii 5)? The *intaluzzi-* shovel may derive from a Hurrian word which seems to be found at Mari. In ARMT XIII 101:26–29 the list of implements includes: 1 SAḪAR *in-te-la-am* (accus. sg.). This *intelû* might be the same root as our *intaluzzi-*.
- 23: Goetze's determination of *hali-* as "portion" finds some support in VII 17:16–8, where 1 *šaramnaš hališ* and 1 KU₆^{HA}-*an hali*[š] flank 1 ^{UZU}H.A.LA ("one portion of meat"). One might also cite those passages (XXXIX 78 obv i 24–5; 80:7) in which fish and birds are juxtaposed with respect to their habitations: KU₆ *I-NA* A.AB.BA MUŠEN *I-NAŠA-ME-E*. And finally, the use of the fish-catching method as a metaphor for the trapping of a felon (KBo VI 29+, ii 33–5), in this case

Ur̥hi-Tešub, is most interesting. Fishermen seem only to be mentioned in the Hurrian myth XXIV 7. In the ritual text designated as 2004 by the *Ugaritic Textbook*, lines 12–13, there is a mention of an offering of *dg ḥdīm* “fresh fish.” And the divine messenger of Asherah is called *Dgy*, “the fisherman” (UT, p. 384).

- 25: With the GN ^{HUR-SAG}Šuppinna one should compare ^{HUR.SAG}KÜ.GA of XVIII 20 obv 7, especially relevant in the light of the alternation ^mKÜ.GA-TÜL-ma and ^mŠuppi-luli-uma. I fail to see how the name Šuppinna can be connected with the West Semitic mountain name Šāpôn. If Šāpôn is derived from a root *špy*, the active participle of the basic stem would be *šôpiy(u)*, or something similar, but surely not *šôpin*! In all likelihood the name Šuppinna is simply an extension in -*na*- of the adjective *šuppi*- “holy”.
- 27: See Psalm 15:1; 43:3; etc. NINDA.Ī(E).DĒ.A is the Sumerian writing which corresponds to Akkadian *mersu(m)*, a cake made from oil, honey, dates, and even aromatics like cumin or coriander (*ARMT* IX, p. 278; *AHw*, 646 [and see *marāsu*, *AHw*, 609]). At Boğazköy it can be made from NINDA.KU₇, NINDA.KUR₄.RA BA-BA-ZA, and NINDA.KUR₄.RA *šep̄pit* (XX 92 rev vi 3), or from butter and milk (XXV 14 rev iv 10). In addition sheep fat was employed as an ingredient (6 PA-RI-SI Ī.UDU A-NA NINDA.Ī.E.DĒ.A; XXX 32 rev iv 13). NINDA^harzazu- was made from NINDA^dannaš- (KBo IV 13 obv ii 24, 26; X 8 obv i 30–31; XI 30 rev iv 28; XX 12 i 5, 6; XXV 18 iii 7), NINDA.KUR₄.RA (X 11 obv iii 6–7, 17–18), NINDA a-a-an (XX 59 rev v 17), ^{UTUL}hur-utel-, NINDA.KU₇ BA-BA-ZA, NINDA^puni-kiš BA-BA-ZA, and ANTA^ḤŠUM^{SAR} (KBo IV 13 obv iii 14–16). The ANTA^ḤŠUM was probably a type of onion (CADI, 139a sub *imtaḥšu*), so that NINDA^harzazu- like the Akkadian *mersu(m)* contained condiments. The bread name *pun(n)iki*- is to be connected with the Akkadian bread name *punigu*, as is NINDA^tappinu- with the Akkadian bread name

tappinnu “barley bread” (for both names see *RLA* III, 156).

- 37: Perhaps it is better (with Laroche) to keep *ḥat(ta)rai*- “to cross, send across” separate etymologically from *ḥattai*- “to pierce.” After all, *ḥattarai*- is not properly a verb which designates writing or marking. The root *gul*- may also be attested in the toponyms: ^{URU}Kukkulidaša (KBo X 10 rev v 18), ^{HUR.SAG}Ku-li-ku-li-ya (VII 23 obv 1, rev 8), ^{URU}Ku-ul-gul-li (XXVII 1 obv ii 63), and ^{URU}Kuliwišna/Kuliušna (XXVII 1 obv i 53, ii 50; VI 45 obv ii 3; etc.).
- 38: One must not overlook the use of *ḥuwappa*- with DINGIR (*ḥu-u-wa-ap-pt* DINGIR^{LIM}-ni) in *Hatt.*, I, 40, IV 12–13, where sorcery plays a considerable rôle.
- 42: The literal meaning of NINDA.ERĪN^{MEŠ} seems to have been “bread for the troops.” With this accords the NINDA^hališ ŠA ERĪN^{MEŠ} (“bread portion of the troops”) of XXXI 57 rev iv 11. This type of bread was well suited for rations; hence, it was allotted to lumberjacks going into the mountains (XXIX 1 rev iii 17, 20), and to plasterers (XXIX 1 rev iii 36). These loaves were delivered to cities by ship in XXXI 79 obv. *passim*.

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
WALTHAM, MASS.

Entzifferung verschollener Schriften und Sprachen.

By J. FRIEDRICH. Pp. 154. 1 map. Index.
Berlin: SPRINGER, 1966.

Geschichte der Schrift. By J. FRIEDRICH. Pp. 408. Heidelberg; WINTER, 1966.

I have the good pleasure of reviewing here two useful books by the same experienced and erudite scholar, Professor J. Friedrich of Berlin. A better choice could not have been made on the European scene to write a semi-popular monograph on ancient Oriental languages and writing systems. Friedrich's own scholarly publications include