

---

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.

Source: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 59, No. 4 (Oct., 2000), pp. 293-295

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/545792>

Accessed: 08/12/2010 07:42

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. 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/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucpress>.

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 a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*The University of Chicago Press* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*.

*Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon*. Vols. 1 and 2. By BEN H. L. VAN GESSEL. *Handbuch der Orientalistik, erste Abteilung der Nahe und Mittlere Osten*, Band 33, Heft 1–2. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998. Heft 1, pp. xxiii + 1–604; Heft 2, pp. xv + 605–1069.

The Hittites referred to their pantheon as “the Thousand Gods.” Actually the total number of divine names known in 1946 from their texts was already around 600. Today they number well over 1,000. To keep track of all those names is a major undertaking. To understand how each of those deities was conceived by the ancients themselves is an even more difficult task.

Since 1947, when E. Laroche produced the first comprehensive listing and categorization of the pantheon of ancient Hattuša (E. Laroche, *Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites* [Paris, 1947]), Hittitologists have had to enlarge his corpus with penciled-in additions. H. Otten and others who have published volumes of cuneiform tablets from Hattuša began about thirty years ago to include in the front matter of these volumes lists of proper names found in the volume: divine names, personal names, and geographical names. This helped individual Hittitologists to update their copies of Laroche. But even with that kind assistance it is a time-consuming and tedious task.

All the more welcome, therefore, is this new two-volume work, which attempts to list all divine names from Hittite texts.

The author was trained in Hittitology by Ph. H. J. Houwink ten Cate and was advised and encouraged by Th. van den Hout, I. Wegner, and V. Haas.

The corpus used by the author is KBo 1–30, 32–39, KUB 1–60, VS 28 (= NF 12), *HT*, *VBoT*, *IBoT* 1–4, *ABoT*, *FHG*, *AT*, *FHL*, *FHAC*, *HFPC*, *HKM*, *JCS* (Texts and Fragments), *StBoT* Beiheft 1, *ChS* Ergänzungsheft 1. More recently appearing volumes in the KBo series (e.g., KBo 40) are therefore not represented. This is an unavoidable gap in the coverage. But it is more difficult to understand why the letters in the archives of Hattuša written in Akkadian were not included, nor the hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions, including the rock sanctuary Yazılıkaya! The work is therefore not an *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon*, as titled, but a list of divine names occurring in cuneiform Hittite

texts. The difference may be numerically small but is conceptually significant.

And, although it is surely understandable why the author would consider it a huge task to include wherever possible information about the gender of the deities, their origin and functions, it is still disappointing to learn (p. x) that he decided against this procedure. I have often believed that it would be useful even to include lists of male and female deities. The scribal practice of failing to indicate biological gender of deities by means of a simple mechanism such as using both the divine and the female determinatives on goddesses' names makes it even more valuable to derive this information from contexts and publish it for others, which an author of a work such as this is best able to do.

Unlike Laroche, who in *Recherches* represented the names almost exclusively in bound transcription, the author wisely uses transliteration for greater precision and to allow deductions to be made about the relative dating of the spellings.

When the catalogued divine name occurs in a sequence of names, it is often of interest to know what names immediately precede or follow. The author uses a simple code (one or more < signs) to indicate this within a long sequence of citations, although when the number of < signs reaches 5 or higher, it is very difficult at a glance to determine the number! On p. 89, KUB 47.64 ii 37 is marked with a sequence of five followed by a small space and then three more. If one does not look very closely, it appears to have a string of eight!

The author orders the names strictly alphabetically by transliterated values, thus eschewing the use of ethnolinguistic categories (Kanishite, Luwian, Hattian, Hurrian, Sumerian, Palaic, “Asiatic,” etc.), even the simplified ones of Laroche. In view of this decision to proceed purely alphabetically, the author should at least have indicated more consistently the equivalence of the written name under consideration with other writings found elsewhere in his corpus. For example, <sup>d</sup>A-a (or <sup>d</sup>A.A) with <sup>d</sup>É.A. A correlation of the evidence for a given deity from all the spellings would yield a more coherent picture, for example, of the attested epithets. If one compares the author's treatment of <sup>d</sup>A-a and <sup>d</sup>É.A, one finds various writings of the standard epithet “lord (or king) of wisdom.”

It would also have been useful to indicate in a simple and clear way the text types in which a given DN occurs. Some, for instance, may appear in myths but not in the cult. Others may occur in oath-deity lists in the treaties but nowhere else. This kind of information is difficult to derive from a list of KBo's and KUB's without indication of genre.

The size of the two-volume set alone shows how much more raw data it contains than the slim 139-page work of Laroche. Yet, as with all Laroche's work, the *Recherches* has an elegant conciseness and a transparent and fully logical organization that makes it a joy to use.

Also because of its sheer size it is impossible for me to comment on all or even a large portion of its entries. As one does in a case like this, I shall merely browse the two volumes, picking out interesting entries and seeking by this means to give readers some idea of the completeness, accuracy, and usefulness of this set.

<sup>d</sup>A-a-aš. In noting sequences it would have been useful to indicate the position of this DN in the *Schwurgötterlisten* of the treaties: between the <sup>d</sup>LAMMA's and the <sup>d</sup>IŠTAR's (KBo 5.3 i 48 ff.).

The noting in bound transcription of items possessed by a deity (e.g., of <sup>d</sup>É.A on p. 618) need to be classified as to whether they are actually attested items in the god's temple(s) in Hatti (e.g., GUNNI, <sup>NA</sup>ZI.KIN) or are only things mentioned in passing in a mythological narrative (e.g., <sup>d</sup>É.A's <sup>GIS</sup>arašiyaš, <sup>GIS</sup>IG, and *huwan-huešni*, p. 618).

In the citing of literature it is an unnecessary waste of space to list every page in the detailed indexes of V. Haas, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion* (Leiden, 1994) and M. Popko, *Religions of Asia Minor* (Warsaw, 1995). A simple reference to "Haas, GhR indexes" would suffice. The reader can read the published index for himself. Alternatively, the author could spare us the labor of determining which of the many cited pages contains the main discussion of the deity.

It is well known that occasionally scribes added a divine determinative to the names of items of temple furniture or utensils. In listing such examples in the *Onomasticon* a false impression is created that these are full-fledged deities. I would have preferred it if the author had catalogued these examples separately, keep-

ing them distinct from actual deities. An example is <sup>d</sup>ahrušhi followed by <sup>d</sup>hubrušhi (p. 4).

Very helpful are the dummy entries at points in the alphabetic sequence where previous misreadings of names would appear, referring the reader to the correct entry. An example is Laroche's <sup>d</sup>Aištappallu[. . .] (p. 4), now corrected to <sup>d</sup>A-da!-al-lu[-ur] (p. 916). But this very example illustrates a flaw in the organization of *Onomasticon*. What are actually stem forms of proper names in Hittite contexts are considered as Akkadograms, so that some of these names (e.g., Adallur in KBo 10.2 ii 27) are listed in the second volume under Akkadian names! A proper name is Akkadian, if it is linguistically Akkadian, which Adallur clearly is not. Neither are <sup>d</sup>Arunitti, <sup>d</sup>GIBIL<sub>6</sub> or <sup>d</sup>URŠANABI Akkadian names (pp. 917 ff.).

Entries in the bibliographies for each entry are arranged in alphabetical order rather than in order of their date. This makes it difficult to determine who enjoys prior credit for discoveries. The CHD and HW<sup>2</sup> list from earliest to most recent, which is greatly to be preferred.

<sup>d</sup>Alalu, p. 15. One should certainly add: *ūk* <sup>d</sup>Kumarbin DUMU <sup>d</sup>A[lalu . . . . .] KUB 33.110 ii 11 (Hedammu myth) in view of <sup>d</sup>Kumarbi <sup>d</sup>Alaluwaš NUMUN-ŠU cited on p. 16.

<sup>d</sup>A(l)lanzu, pp. 20 ff. The cross-reference at the bottom of p. 21 should refer also to <sup>d</sup>Allanzunni (p. 22). And in that latter place notice should have been given that <sup>d</sup>Allanzunniš immediately follows 2 <sup>d</sup>LUGAL-manniš (i.e., <sup>d</sup>Šarrumanniš).

<sup>d</sup>Alauwaima/i, p. 22. The context of KUB 27.67 ii 63 shows that [<sup>d</sup>Alawai]mi there is a vocative.

<sup>d</sup>Allinašši, p. 25. <sup>NINDA</sup>allinašši- (see my *Alimenta Hethaeorum* [New Haven, 1974], p. 150) shows that a pastry was named after this deity.

<sup>d</sup>Ammamma, pp. 26 ff. To the genitive constructions cited add: [*hili*]štarniyaš <sup>d</sup>Ammammaš KUB 59.17 obv. 5.

<sup>d</sup>Andaliya, pp. 32 f. Cf. the city name <sup>URU</sup>Antaliya (e.g., KBo 10.10 iii/iv 26).

<sup>d</sup>Anzili, pp. 35 f. Cf. <sup>URU</sup>Anziliya = modern Turkish city Zile, near Tapikka/Maşat.

<sup>d</sup>Kammamma, pp. 215 ff. Cf. <sup>URU</sup>Kammamma.

<sup>d</sup>Appaluwa, p. 37. Cf. <sup>URU</sup>Appala.

<sup>d</sup>Abara/i, pp. 38 f. Cf. <sup>m</sup>Aparruš, a man from the northern city/land of Kalašma, KBo 16.17 iii 24 (AM 188 f.).

<sup>d</sup>Api, p. 43. Add to the bibliography my article "Second Millennium Antecedents to the Hebrew <sup>3</sup>OB," *JBL* 86 (1967): 385–401 and others on the noun *a-a-bi*.

<sup>d</sup>Āra, p. 45. Comparison with the predicate (UL) *āra* should lead one to presume a deified and personified quality or state. Although in the royal funerary ritual <sup>d</sup>Āra receives (sheep) offerings with <sup>d</sup>Allani, KUB 17.20 ii 7 shows <sup>d</sup>Āra in company with other obvious examples, some even without the DINGIR determinative: <sup>d</sup>Kelti, *ḫantantatar*, <sup>d</sup>Ḫingallu, *dušgarašza*. Since this passage was already cited in Laroche 45 but the conclusion not drawn, the author should have done so here, especially since no other bibliography is cited.

<sup>d</sup>Ariniddu, p. 46. Add <sup>d</sup>Arunitti (with *u* vocalization) in ABoT 14 iv 12, where the deity is explicitly related to the city Arinna. Cf. also EZEN<sub>4</sub> *arunitaš* discussed in HW<sup>2</sup> A 355 and remarks in my review of J. Friedrich and A. Kammenhuber, *Hethitisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1979–80) in *BiOr* 40 (1983): 407–17.

<sup>d</sup>Aršappa, pp. 47 f. Cf. <sup>m</sup>Iršappa, the pharaoh's envoy to the court of Arzawa, in VBoT 1 obv. 11. It should be noted that this is the Hurrian spelling of the West Semitic deity Rašap.

*Aruna*, pp. 48 f. Citing only a part of KUB 36.25 iv 1 gives a misleading impression of what is meant. I would state clearly that <sup>d</sup>Impaluri is the SUKKAL of Aruna, not vice versa.

<sup>d</sup>Elkunirša, p. 63. The note "<sup>d</sup>Elkunirša EN LIBIR" caught my attention and led me to check the cited passage in KUB 59.65 iii 7, 11. First, the divine name is preserved only as [<sup>d</sup> . . . -i]r-ta-aš, making a connection with <sup>d</sup>Elkunirša more than dubious. The author should have written [<sup>d</sup>El-ku-ni-i]r-ša!-aš. But more seriously, he has misread and misinterpreted "EN LIBIR." The text has rather EN Û "lord of dreams" and is also referred to as GE<sub>6</sub>-aš KI-aš DUMU-aš "child/son of the Dark Earth." Furthermore, the deity in question is invoked to deal with ḪUL-mu-uš Û-uš "bad dreams" (iii 11' = Akkad. *šu-nāti lemnāti*)! This is probably not Elkunirša, for whom we have no such evidence, but some chthonic deity of the Hurrian sphere.

<sup>d</sup>Ḫašammili, pp. 98–103. In this long entry, the most interesting feature of the god is unmentioned, the statement in Muršili II's annals that

he makes the king and his army invisible to the enemy. But on p. 102 an entire page is used just to transliterate six cult passages that tell us relatively little about the god.

There is no doubt that the author has done a service to Hittitology in compiling this huge catalogue. Within a few years, once a relatively complete transliterated text corpus of Hittite is put on line, such catalogues which only list and do not interpret will have relatively little value. It is a pity that the author, who obviously has files to enable him to compile this, did not go a step further and give us a carefully interpreted *Onomasticon*, drawing out of it all the pertinent facts about each deity. Perhaps he wished to defer to Haas and Popko. But, as good as those two volumes are, it seems to me that they do not obviate the need for a thoroughly and carefully interpreted catalogue of divine names. It is a pity that this very capable and hard-working scholar did not feel he could do this.

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

*The University of Chicago*

*Avraham Biran Volume*. Edited by E. STERN and T. LEVY. Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies, vol. 23. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992. Pp. x + 159 (English) + xvi + 382 (Hebrew) + 95 figs. \$90.

This volume in the Eretz-Israel series honors the long and distinguished career of Avraham Biran. It opens with two tributes to Biran, by A. Gottchalk and P. Steinberg, and contains forty-five Hebrew papers and another twenty-one in the non-Hebrew section. The chronological span of the articles is prehistory through the Second Temple period.

As always in the Eretz-Israel series, there are many short articles that serve to describe a single object or a group of objects. Fortunately, some of object-oriented discussions in this volume detail items that are inherently interesting (including P. de Miroschedji on an Egyptian fish-shaped palette and R. Gophna on a faience statuette from