

Kaniššuwār: A Tribute to Hans G. Güterbock on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday, May 27, 1983. Edited by HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR. and GARY M. BECKMAN. Assyriological Studies 23. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1986. Pp. vii + 203. \$30.

This collection of eighteen essays, presented to one of the truly towering figures of Hittite and Anatolian studies, reflects the diversity and breadth of the scholarly interests of the honoree. I am happy to report that the general quality of the contributions is also in keeping with the very high standards of Professor Güterbock's own work. My only cavil is that

the brevity of some offerings severely diminishes their significance. This problem and that of the delayed publication seem endemic to *Festschriften*.

Various aspects of ancient Anatolian culture receive attention in this volume. The visual arts are treated by K. Bittel (pictorial representations of Hattusili III in Egypt) and T. Özgüç (rare objects from the Karum of Kanish, including several types mentioned in Hittite texts). S. Košak gives an extremely useful compendium of Hittite textual evidence for the use of iron, on the basis of which he is skeptical about any notion of a special Hittite superiority in iron technology.

Social history is at the center of the discussions by K. Balkan (the childhood betrothal of girls in ancient Assyria and Anatolia) and G. Beckman (inheritance and royal succession among the Hittites). The latter argues forcefully that the Hittite kingship was inherited in the male line, with the reigning king able to choose his successor from among the eligibles. G. Kellerman and P. Houwink ten Cate each analyze a major Hittite text (the Myth of Telipinu and the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM Festival respectively), not only with respect to its internal structure but also to its historical development and role within Hittite culture. In addition to their main conclusions, which seem to me well supported, all of the articles just cited contain valuable philological information and insights.

The remaining articles deal with Hittite and Luvian philology and linguistics. H. Berman offers a summary of new joins and duplicates based on *KUB* LI, *KBo* XXVII, and the *Fragments hittites du Louvre (FHL)*. E. Neu cites important new evidence for what should be a definitive dating of the Hittite horse-training texts. Particularly welcome in this contribution to the dating controversy are the very explicit descriptions of the differences in sign shapes and the citation of crucial examples in texts by line number.

Several scholars present new texts or text editions: O. Gurney (Hittite fragments in private collections), A. Kammenhuber (*FHL* 68 and 106), L. Matouš (an Old Assyrian treaty from Kültepe Level I^b), and H. Otten (ritual of Ašdu, = *CTH* 490, as revised here).

Finally, we have studies of individual Hittite or Luvian words or grammatical features. H. Gonnet argues that the name of the well-known Mitannian king should be read as Mattiwaza based on the spelling of the same name on a Hieroglyphic seal. J. D. Hawkins and A. Morpurgo Davies give us revised interpretations of several Hieroglyphic Luvian passages (including *CARCHEMISH* A 12 complete), which, in turn, serve as the basis for new interpretations of several Luvian words. Of these, *walili-* 'plain', *tanata-* 'devastate', and *piyatarai/i-* 'giving, selling' seem to me solid. I am not fully persuaded by *titita/i-* 'brow' (?) and *warpi-* 'skill, knowledge'. O. Carruba's partial analysis of the difficult Luvian text *KBo* XIII 20 makes significant progress, and his interpretation of *-šan* (line ii 1 ff.) as an enclitic possessive 'his' is certainly correct (as also seen independently by others). However, *pariyam-ša* in line ii 11 is not likely to be 'before him' but is rather a neuter noun in the nom.-acc. sg. with the usual postposed particle *-ša*.

H. Hoffner gives a useful overview of the spelling and syntax of Hittite *natta* 'not' (see especially the evidence for a real OH variant *na-at!*). E. Laroche argues persuasively that the Hittite hapax *nakkuš* (*Laws*, §98) means 'harm, damage' and is the base of Hittite/Luvian *nakkušši-* 'living (ritual) substitute', which is not a Hurrian loanword as previously alleged. His etymological connection of *nakkuš*, etc., with the root of Latin *noxa* 'harm' is also convincing, but some details remain to be worked out. A neuter **us*-stem is not trivial, and the geminate *-šš-* of *nakkušši-* must be accounted for.

This volume is provided with a helpful index of lexemes and passages cited and also contains a valuable supplement to the bibliography of H. G. Güterbock. The editors are to be congratulated for producing a tribute fully worthy of its honoree which will be read with profit by all those interested in the languages and culture of ancient Anatolia.

H. CRAIG MELCHERT

University of North Carolina at
Chapel Hill