

KLINGER, J., E. RIEKEN und C. RÜSTER (Hrsg.) — *Investigationes Anatolicae*. Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Band 52). Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2010. (24,5 cm, XIII, 357). ISBN 978-3-447-06383-8. ISSN 1613-5628. € 88,-.

The book reviewed contains 28 articles from 30 contributors and represents one of two tributes to the great linguist and Hittitologist Erich Neu published in 2010 to mark the tenth anniversary of his premature death (the other being *Hethitica XVI*, “*Studia Anatolica in memoriam Erich Neu dicata*”, ed. R. Lebrun). The volume opens with the editor’s foreword, followed by H. Hoffner’s tribute to Neu (s. below) and ends with a useful publication list of the honoree. The articles are equally distributed between Hittitology and Indo-European linguistics, mirroring Neu’s lasting impact on both fields; the volume features contributions in German, English and Italian. This review will briefly present their content, arranged by topic, as well as some remarks and observations within the limits of my competence.

Among the most relevant articles, some deal with *Hittite Grammar*. H. A. HOFFNER offers a groundbreaking “Grammatical Profile of the Middle Hittite Maṣat Texts”. Although the author modestly presents it as just “a useful starting point in understanding the language of these Middle Hittite letters”, it is instead an exceptional contribution both for the clarity of exposition and the great interest of the topic. Many of its ideas will doubtlessly receive future investigation and, of course, new issues remain to be addressed; for instance, it might be interesting to assess the effective existence of grammatical differences between the letters coming from Ḫattuša and those coming from the periphery. Most interesting is also that Maṣat letters often anticipate many lexical, morphological and even graphic elements which appear only later in the documents of the Boğazköy archives, which have a more formal nature. Among the phenomena which seem “to begin in MH and become fairly common in NH” there is the aplogical writing *-ma-aš* for *=ma=šmaš*, attested once in the Maṣat corpus (HKM 18 left edge 2, quoted by Hoffner on p. 135 § 155). To my knowledge, bibliography on this aplography is restricted to a 1936 note by Friedrich (OLZ 1936 Nr. 5, 309). I may add to Hoffner’s interesting remark that in *other* cases the writing *-ma-aš* seems to express simply *=šmaš* rather than *=ma=šmaš*. This is in my opinion the correct interpretation of the frequent expression DINGIR^{LUM} / DINGIR^{MEŠ}-*ma-aš-kán dušk(išk)anzi* “(they) entertain the deity / the deities”, recurring no less than 23 times among the Hittite cult inventories. Although differently interpreted by other scholars (cf. most recently Miller, ZA 95, 2005, 310), two exceptional occurrences should corroborate my view, namely (a) KUB 57.103 (CTH 525 [better: 530]) I 4’-5’: DINGIR^{LUM}-*ša-ma-aš-k[án ...] / duškiškan[zi]*; (b) Bo 6570 (CTH 626) II 3’: [DINGIR]^{LUM}-*ša-ma-aš-kán duškanzi* (cf. Fuscagni, HPMM 6, 2007, 144). If I am not mistaken, *=šmaš* has here the same function of the particle *=z(a)* and may be interpreted as *dativus ethicus*. I hope to offer a more accurate discussion of this and similar cases in the future.

Another important contribution pertaining to Hittite grammar is the analysis of the phraseological *pai-* and *uwa-* constructions offered by E. RIEKEN. The author presents a thorough philological evaluation of these constructions, based on the accurate discussion of a great number of relevant occurrences examined within their context. The Hittite documentation, it is argued, gives testimony to different stages of the grammaticalization process. Moreover, the author illuminates the difference between the two constructions, illustrating the reasons behind their almost complementary distribution. This analysis may be “complemented” by the study of Th. van

den Hout on the origin of these periphrastic constructions in the other 2010 *Gedenkschrift Neu* (*Hethitica XVI*, 191-204).

W. MEID discusses some basic arguments against the so-called *Schwundhypothese*, supporting his own views on the position of the Hittite language within the Indo-European linguistic family. In particular, the lack of the feminine gender and some aspects of the verbal system are dealt with. K. H. SCHMIDT presents some considerations about the ergative case in Hurrian and on the Hittite suffix *-ant*. One may note that the relevant bibliography could be expanded (e.g., the presence of the suffix *-ant* attached to names of the seasons is considered a “relict of an original active language”, but studies of Goetze and Melchert on this subject are not even mentioned, as well as (alternative) views on the split-ergativity in Hittite). J. BOLEY introduces a new interpretation of the Indo-European genitive ending **-s* which, as she notices, “if correct, radically alters the way we should regard PIE grammar”. Whether six pages are enough to ground such an undertaking, however, is open to debate.

Text Editions and General History. D. GRODDEK provides transliterations of two fragments of the *hišuwā* festival: KBo 47.50, pertaining to the fifth tablet of the composition, and KBo 47.56 which joins KBo 25.163, pertaining to the eleventh tablet. The positioning of these and other fragments within the frame of the composition is thoroughly discussed.

To J. SOUČKOVÁ we owe a new edition of an important edict (*išhiil*) issued by Tudḫaliya IV to regulate the month festival (EZEN₄ ITU^{KAM}) dedicated to the Storm God of Nerik. The manuscripts KBo 23.95 (B), KUB 56.49 (C) and KBo 2.4 (D), already published by Haas (*Der Kult von Nerik*, 1970, 278-299), are integrated with the further duplicate KUB 56.48 (A) which partially preserves the king’s genealogy. The transliteration is preceded by description of the fragments, discussion of their relationships and schematic presentation of the content. Some final observations conclude the article. On p. 285, fn. 10, the author proposes that GAL GIR₄ may render ^{DUG}*talaim(m)i-* (on this vessel s. now my note in NABU 2011/1, 25 Nr. 21). The equivalence is based on the interchange between GAL GIR₄ (A II 26, III 8’-9’, III 23’) and ^{DUG}*dalaimi-* (D I 3, 8-9, 14-15, A III 41’). In my opinion this hypothesis is conceivable, but most uncertain. At first sight, the alternance is striking, especially when one considers the correspondence between the number of GAL GIR₄ and ^{DUG}*talaim(m)i-* vessels prescribed from time to time in the quoted occurrences. However, the contexts are not identical: what follows the vessels’ mention is a Hattian song in the former case, the precisation about their disposing on the altar in the latter. Moreover, the fact that on I. A III 8’ three GAL GIR₄ are offered to the Storm God of Nerik (one of wine and two of beer) and in the following passage on II. III 23’-27’ the offering for Zahpuna consists of two GAL GIR₄ on the altar (one of wine, the other of beer) plus one *talaim(m)i-* vessel of beer on the ground in front of it, could also be seen to plead against the proposed hypothesis. Finally and most importantly, the great variety of vessels used within such celebrations, even in analogous contexts, calls for great caution when formulating such hypotheses. As an example, see the remarkable interchange between the well-known vessels ^{DUG}*huppar(a-)* and ^{DUG}*harši(-)* in the parallel passages KUB 11.21a+ (CTH 598) I 10 [*harši(-)* vessel] and KUB 25.6+ (CTH 592) V 12 [*huppar(a-)* vessel] (cf. already Gurney, AAA 27, 1940, 122 with fn. 3; Singer, StBoT 27, 1983, 162 fn. 34). Obviously, no one would

deduce from this alternance that these two terms are synonymous. Indeed, a systematic convergence of the relevant elements within a sufficient number of occurrences from different documents seems to be a precondition to establish this kind of equivalences.

Two of the articles consist of text editions with important historical implications. I. SINGER provides a new edition of the fragmentary letter RS 10.046 (= PRU III, 9-10). As he demonstrates through a masterly philological analysis, the sender Maḥḥaza is to be recognized as a so-far-unknown king of Amurru whose reign should date back to the late 13th century B.C.E., following Šaušgamuwa. Moreover, the author argues, the fragment RS 15.24+50 (= PRU III, 18) constitutes of a companion letter sent by Maḥḥaza's representative Abušgama to his counterpart in Ugarit. Singer's article is now also published in *Hethitica XVI*, 175-180.

J. KLINGER, instead, focuses on the cult of Ištar of Šamuḥa during the Middle Hittite age. At the core of his article there is an extensive analysis of the fragment KUB 32.130, inclusive of transliteration, translation and philological commentary (note also an ingenious hypothesis regarding the hole on the tablet, p. 161). As demonstrated by Klinger, this manuscript is to be dated back to the MH period and possibly to the reign of Tuḥaliya I. Moreover, the same dating may apply to other fragments, among which the oracle KBo 16.97+. This leads to far-reaching historical implications, which are discussed in detail. To the quoted bibliography on the city of Šamuḥa and its cults one may add de Martino, *Eothen* 16, 2008, 131-143 (cf. also Id., *RIA* 12, 1/2, 2009, 1-2).

Religion. St. DE MARTINO illuminates the difference between the so-called Hittite *šumma immeru* texts and the *šašt(a)*-oracles. While the former ones were probably only of "academic" interest, the latter are a rare kind of oracle texts, recording real mantic inquiries and displaying interesting peculiarities.

M. POPKO presents some observations on the fragment Privat 35, recently published by D. Schwemer and dated by Popko to the reign of Tuḥaliya III. In particular, the author questions that the large buildings found at Kuşaklı/Şarişša (*Nordterrasse, Gebäude C*) dating to the 16th century B.C.E. had the function of temples, and considers them instead of palatial nature. The goddess Ḫannaḥanna / DINGIR.MAḪ / ^dNIN.TU is the object of P. TARACHA's contribution. According to him, in most Hittite occurrences "the logogram stands in fact for the Mesopotamian Mother-goddess herself, whom the Hittites worshiped under the name/epithet of Ḫannaḥanna", whereas "there are no weighty arguments for the existence of an indigenous goddess Ḫannaḥanna".

G. WILHELM develops a hypothesis which he already advanced in 2002 (MDOG 134, 345): an extensive philological analysis of the pertinent sources, including the ritual text KuT 53, provides further validation to the assumption that the writing ^dIŠTAR-*li* is used in the Hittite texts to indicate the goddess Anzili (/ Enzili).

Poetics. P. DARDANO concentrates on the Old Hittite formula "to look at the eyes of the king" which has the metaphorical meaning "to be allowed to stay in the presence of the king" and is often paired to another figurative expression, *azzikke- akkuške-*. As convincingly argued by Dardano, this formula is an Akkadian loan - more precisely, a paleoassyrian one. As such, its origins can be traced back to the so-called "colony period" in Anatolia. I may recall here that

an analogous case could be the expression "son of one's heart" (Hittite *kardiyas̄ DUMU-ŠU*, Akkadian *mār šīt libbi, mār nabnit libbišu*). As I argued elsewhere (*Eothen* 14, 2006, 52-57), this expression seems to indicate in Hittite one's "own, real offspring" (as opposed to adoption or offspring in a figurative sense) and might be an Akkadian loan.

R. FRANZIA deals with the figures of speech occurring in the direct speeches of the Hittite version of the "Parables", in the so-called *Epos der Freilassung*. This useful listing provides ample evidence to the literary character of these parts of the translation, although we may wonder if e.g. repetition of the ending *-zi* in KBo 32.14 obv. II 7-8 or *-du* in ll. II 57-58 are indeed to be regarded as purposeful syllabic rhymes or if these endings are, at least partially, dictated by grammar.

C. WATKINS identifies an "a a b" triad by confronting Hesiod, *Op.* 514-516 with *RV* 4.17.2 and with a formulaic expression occurring in the Hittite *Bauritual* KUB 29.1 obv. I 28-30 and in the Annals of Muḥšili II (KBo 4.4 obv. II 11-13, KBo 2.5+ rev. IV 16-18). According to Watkins, there is a "stylistic and grammatical continuity between the 17th or 16th century Old Kingdom *Bauritual* [...] and the 14th century New Kingdom Mursili's" Annals. As far as Indo-European is concerned note that, since "the triad per se is probably a cognitive quasi-universal", the possibility of a real link with the above mentioned Greek and Vedic expressions is based solely on the hypothesis that the "climax verb" in these traditions may be a form of PIE **h₁erǵ^h-/h₁erg^h-*: but Watkins warns that this is not his claim.

Lexicography. J. L. GARCÍA RAMÓN presents a complex and in-depth investigation of Hittite *nakkī-*. He carries on an accurate philological analysis in order to illuminate its origin and semantic value as well as its relationship with other terms within the Indo-European family, in particular with Homeric φέριστος, φέρτερος, φέρτατος, Avestan [^o]bair-*išta-* and Latin *Ferter Resius*. J. H. JASANOFF focuses on the etymology of Lycian *sttati* "stands" (unfortunately misprinted as *statti* both in the title and in the Index). He convincingly reconstructs the "obvious" but problematic derivation from PIE **steh₂-* "stand (up)", showing that Lycian *sttati* corresponds to the Hittite reduplicated *hi*-verb *titta-* and his better known derivative *tittanu-*, which are in turn derived from **steh₂-* (and not **dheh₁-*) as well.

H. C. MELCHERT analyzes the verbal stems *ḫarp-*, *ḫarpiya-* and *ḫarpā(i)-* and their mutual relationship both from a diachronic and synchronic point of view. According to Melchert, the latter stem is to be considered a denominative stem from the noun *ḫarpa-* "pile, heap", which in turn derives from *ḫarp-* and probably had the original sense of "association, bringing together". Given Melchert's great philological mastery and clarity of exposition, it is really a pity that he doesn't take a stand on the interpretation of the names of the local festivals *ḫarpaš*, *ḫarpiyaš* and (SĒD) *ḫarpiya* (cf. in particular Carter, Diss. 1962, 180, 182; Archi, UF 5, 1973, 12 with fn. 30; Beckman, BiOr 42, 1985, 140; Puhvel, HED H, 183-184). In view of the functional equivalence of *ḫarp-* and *ḫarpiya-* and on the basis of the preserved occurrences, one would agree with Hoffner and the HW² in assuming that the names of the *ḫarpaš* and *ḫarpiyaš* festivals are derived from these two verbal stems rather than from Akkadian *HARPU* "(early) harvest", "summer", as supposed by other scholars. Therefore, their meaning would be something like "festival of the pile". If this is correct, what kind of pile is it? Hoffner

tentatively thought of “sheaves” (cf. RHA 25/80, 1967, 39, implicitly followed by Hazenbos, CM 21, 2003). However, one may also think of other “piles”, such as piles of grain left to dry on the threshing floor (as practiced still today in Turkey). To my knowledge, the only preserved description of this festival is to be found in KBo 2.8 obv. I 17-30. Here, the fact that a certain amount of different kinds of grain (both ZÍZ and ŠE) is taken out of the threshing floor “of the Palace” (IŠTU É.GAL KISLAḤ) might refer precisely to the “piles” which give the festival its name. But this is only a hypothesis. Note that there is another local festival concerning “piles of grain”, although this by no means forms an obstacle to the proposed interpretation: the “festival of the šeli-” (pile of threshed and winnowed grain, also a sort of granary: cf. Hoffner, AOS 55, 1974, 33; StBoT 45, 2001, 207), described in KUB 42.91 rev. III 10'-16' and KUB 56.39 obv. II 9'-32'.

On the other hand, I think that the (SÈD) *ḥar-pí-(i)-ya* festival is derived from a different stem (so already Hazenbos, CM 21, 2003, 171, 233). This hypothesis is supported by the regular graphic distinction from the quasi-homonymous *ḥarp(iy)aš* festival. See KBo 2.8 obv. I 14: SÈD *ḥar-pí-ya* (fragmentary description on ll. I 31-45); KUB 55.14 obv. 8': *ḥar-pí-ya*; KBo 18.78 obv. 6' and 9': *ḥar-pí-i-ya*; KUB 25.30 obv. I 13': ANA EZEN₄ *ḥar-pí-ya-ya-aš-ša-an*[...], which might be emended to *ḥar-pí-i'-ya-aš-ša-an* [*ḥarpīya=ššan*; alternatively *ḥarpiya=ya=ššan*). Its meaning and the exact value of SÈD in KBo 2.8 obv. I 14, however, are obscure. For a different interpretation s. HW² III, 334-335.

The contribution of N. OETTINGER aims at corroborating the etymology of Hittite *illuyanka-* from **ellui-* “eel” and **anga-* “snake” (< **ang^{wh}o-*, whence also Latin *anguis*), supporting in this sense a hypothesis made by J. T. Katz in 1998. Alternative views are discussed in detail.

F. PECCHIOLI DADDI focuses on the Hittite term *talla-*. This term denotes both an object and a vessel whose content, when specified, is always “fine oil”. The *talla-* could be made of various materials, including bread. After a useful and accurate overview of pertinent occurrences, the author suggests that the meaning of *talla-* might be “lower limb (with feet)”. According to this idea, there could be an etymological link with Latin *tālus* and Italian *tallone* “heel”. This hypothesis is based on the vows KUB 15.3 and Privat 73, in which the queen promises to the deity a gold *talla-* adorned with lapis lazuli in exchange for the healing of Ḥattušili's “burning (sensation) in his feet”. Another passage presented in support of this theory comes from the royal Hittite funerary ritual, where some of the loaves offered to the statue of the defunct are qualified as ^{NINDA}*talluš*. However, as the author herself notes, these rites take place *after* (and not during) the ritual related to the dead's feet (cf. KUB 30.19+ IV 9, misquoted as IV 1). In my opinion, this circumstance weakens the proposed link between *talla-* and feet, calling for greater caution.

J. PUHVEL provides a detailed analysis of five rare Hittite verbs: *paḥḫiya-*, *paknu-*, *pakkuš-*, *palahḫ-* and *palkuiya-*. J. TISCHLER deals with Hittite *ḥuratti-* and Luwian *pinta-*, provisionally interpreted as respectively “vigilance, attention” and “handle, knob”.

Others. N. BOLATTI GUZZO and M. MARAZZI examine some issues pertaining to “Anatolian hieroglyphic”. Among others, note the reading of the sign *461 as *ALA* and a supposed reconstruction of the first legend contained in the

Schimmel-rhyton as *á*(DEUS_x.FILIA). |*461| (pp. 20-21). N. BORETZKY focuses on the Slavism *beda/bedo* in Romany, a case which features interesting peculiarities within this language. V. HAAS and I. WEGNER provide a detailed discussion of two hypotheses pertaining to the Hurrian lexicon, which they already mentioned in the past. The infrequent attestation of Hurrian *itt-* “to go” likely suggests that there are other, analogous motion verbs waiting to be identified. According to the authors, one of these would be *ušš-*, translated as “to go, to march”. Their second suggestion concerns the verb *ašš-*, which, as they argue, is a transitive verb with a close connection with water and may be translated as “to wash”. J. SEEHER reconstructs some aspects of the Boğazköy excavations in the summer of 1907, based on unpublished photographs from the estate of Otto Puchstein. In particular, the author underlines the role of H. Kohl in drawing the map which was at the base of the Boğazköy plans until the 90s and illuminates the technique used to detach the famous “warrior relief” from the King's Gate.

G. TORRI's article deals with the peculiar scribal practice of using signs in old-fashioned shapes in colophons or personal remarks, as a *divertissement*. The author focuses on the sign AN. Among other interesting observations, it is noted that the school text or draft KUB 46.34 and the cult inventory KBo 26.178 were probably drawn by the same hand. With regard to the latter fragment, I fully agree with the proposed restoration *ḥa-an-da-a[-it']* on l. 9' and with the proposed reading SIXSÁ rather than KIN in the colophons of two other cult inventories: KUB 25.23(+) rev. IV 64' (so already Miller, ZA 95, 2005, 310; *contra* Carter, Diss. 1962, 163 & 176, followed by Hazenbos, CM 21, 2003, 35: KIN[?]-it); KUB 26.68 rev. IV 6' [now corresponding to KUB 42.100+ rev. IV 47'] (*contra* Haas, *Der Kult von Nerik*, 1970, 302: KIN-an-te-eš). Indeed, the reading KIN-an-te-eš would find a parallel in the colophon of the cult inventory KUB 7.24+ rev. IV 15': *a-ni-ya-an-te-eš* “(the deities so and so) are treated”. However, on the online photographs of the *Hethitische Portal Mainz* we can clearly see the horizontal wedge projecting to the left, about halfway up the sign, which is typical for SIXSÁ (cf. HZL #28) and, on the contrary, is absent in the various shapes of KIN (cf. HZL #47: note that in this case the left horizontal wedge, if present, is placed at the bottom of the sign). Such a “simplified” shape of SIXSÁ also occurs in my opinion in a third cult inventory colophon: KUB 38.27(+) left edge l. 4, as well as at obv. 33' in the indirect join KUB 38.26(+) (here in a slightly different shape; for the join between the two fragments and for the reading of the left edge, partially omitted in the hand copy, cf. Güterbock, *Oriens* 21-22 [1968/69], 383).

I want to conclude the review by mentioning the most beautiful contribution in the volume, “A TRIBUTE TO ERICH NEU” by H. HOFFNER. Masterfully written and away from traditional academic customs, these pages offer at the same time a fine appraisal of Neu's scientific work and a moving memory of his great human qualities. Like most students my age, I haven't had the opportunity of knowing Erich Neu personally, though I profit every day from his irreplaceable studies and research tools. It's a pleasure to read such nice memories of a scholar to whom we owe so much. This is one more reason to be grateful to the editors of this excellent volume.

Addendum — While reviewing the book the following misprints were noticed: p. VI *statti* read *stati*; p. 17 delete “A destra: l'impronta SHS BO 235”; p. 66 and 70 ḪUR.

SAG=*an* : HUR.SAG-*an*, ^dIM=*aš* : ^dIM-*aš*; p. 68 ^dIM : ^dIM;
 p. 69 ^dIM=*aš* : ^dIM-*aš*, -*man=an* : =*man=an*; p. 143 *statti* :
sttati; p. 158 beschütze du: beschütze Du, fn. 13 zukom-
 men,: zukommen.; p. 180 trasferische: trasferisce; p. 184
^mZidanza: ^mZidanza; p. 200 A IV 1: A IV 9, fn. 30 recent:
 recently; p. 226 Konstuktion: Konstruktion; p. 227 ^{URU}*šanti-*
mman : ^{URU}*šantimman*; p. 229 stellt wir: stellten wir; p. 238
 Hutter, M.: Hutter, Manfred; p. 270 add to the Bibliography
 “Puchstein, O., 1912. Boghazköi, die Bauwerke. Unter
 Mitwirkung von H. Kohl und D. Krencker (WVDOG 19),
 Leipzig.”; p. 306 fn. 23 hethiti-schen: hethitischen; p. 307
 [EZEN]₁: [EZEN]₄.

University of Naples
 December 2011

Michele CAMMAROSANO