
This monograph, a revision of the author's Ph.D. dissertation, has two principal aims: (1) to analyze the Hittites' conception of "tuteary" deities (PLAMMA) and their role in the state cult; (2) to present a comprehensive and up-to-date philological treatment of the major festival texts involving these deities. The conceptual discussion seems to me generally judicious and well founded, but I will leave it to specialists in Hittite religion to make a final pronouncement on how well the author has achieved the first goal. The following remarks focus on the philological aspects.

McMahon has made a significant contribution to our understanding of the organization of the ritual texts concerning the tuteary deities. Everyone should take note of and adopt the revisions to L. (pp. 6 ff.). Particularly noteworthy is McMahon's division of the "Festival for All the Tuteary Deities" into two parts, group offerings and individual offerings (chap. 3).

The establishment of the texts is highly reliable and painstakingly detailed. The chronology of the texts and manuscripts is also mostly well founded, and the basis for its gratifyingly explicit (including an appendix with tables of characteristic sign shapes for several MSS). I express thanks for the citation of crucial signs by line number which I have elsewhere requested. I do find it surprising that McMahon offers no table of sign shapes or any detailed discussion for the one tablet which he claims to be an OH manuscript, KUB 53.11 (p. 256).

This is particularly problematic because in the published autographs the heads of vertical strokes do not show the "plait" characteristic of OH manuscripts, and the sign UH of lu-ul-ga-a-i (ii 18.21) is not in the OH form. Note also the unusual RA of ta-ra-a-ur (ii 14) with only two horizontals. Several linguistic features (such as the ablative ḫrub always in instrumental function, ii 16) also argue against an OH manuscript. I must therefore seriously doubt McMahon's claim.

The grammatical and lexical interpretation of the texts themselves is dramatically and disappointingly uneven. Chap. 4, which presents the "Festivals for Renewing the KUḪURASH" treat material never fully edited elsewhere. It cannot be accidential that this chapter has by far the most detailed line-by-line commentary and is the only one in which I found no errors in interpretation. One receives the distinct impression that McMahon concentrated his efforts on this set of texts, while his degree of attention varied widely in the case of previously edited texts and the fragmentary ones.

While some of the errors cited below involve subtle distinctions, others (such as the mistranslations of šinu- and QATAM d211) are very basic and would lead to serious misunderstandings on the part of readers who do not control the Hittite. It is also disturbing that McMahon does not seem to have had and understood some of the sources he cites (e.g., de Martino and Dressler). Therefore, despite its quite genuine contributions, I can only recommend chap. 1 and 4 of this work without qualification. Readers should use other chapters with caution.

Space limitations require that the following notes be limited to only the most serious errors and omissions affecting understanding of the texts and to the most important positive lexical contributions.

P. 41 etc.: Hitt. aṣṣar = KARAS means 'camp,' not 'army,' the word for which is hidden behind the logogram ER.LI.MES.

Pp. 50 and 59 with n. 26: warahza is dative singular of a Coneiform Luvian adjective meaning "sacred, sanctified" (see my article in HS 103 [1990]: 202).

P. 57: de Martino, Hethitica 5 (1983): 75 ff. (in the bibliography!), has shown convincingly that taršat-l₃- looks like "movable partition, screen."

P. 67, n. 58: the use of the -eša- form here and elsewhere is not iterative but distributive, as per Dressler, Plur. (1992), 186 ff.


Pp. 91 ff.: as the particle šan and the Akkadian accusative QATAM clearly show, šan QATAM d211 means "puts his hand by". This important and frequent attalant symbolizes the king's approval of and active participation in an action performed by some functionary.
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Pp. 95 ff.: menagardas is "opposite, facing." The consistent mistranslation "in front of" is sometimes harmless but, in some cases, seriously misleading. P. 109 n. 117 and p. 115, n. 160: the frequent lapsing into the nominative case in autographs is not due to scribal error but reflects the natural use of the nominative as the "zero" or unmarked case.

P. 117: the translation "striped" (of a carcass) for -piṭṭahwar- seems promising, but what is the basis for it?

P. 133: piḫiš šan is not an error for šan. The phrase is a nominalized participle in apposition to Dzulpin.Utilike aššarant in the preceding paragraph: "for Z., who stands before King Tubašiya" (lit. "the in-front-standing one of King T."). Thus LUGAL-šaṭ is not a genitive construction, but the postposition pera't and this criterion for an OH composition fails (cp. p. 140). An OH text remains likely.

P. 144, n. 3: I did not, of course, say in my dissertation (p. 92, n. 98) that the manuscripts was MH (I had no access to it) but merely that the composition was at least as old as MH.

P. 153 and pp. 255 ff.: pace Blaquit et al., the only plausible meaning for puštu is "clap." As McMahon himself notes, the alleged meaning 'to site' does not fit all passages. The fact that the "clapper" is holding something in his hands in a few instances is not a valid counterargument, as anyone who has attended a modern ceremony with refreshments can attest.

P. 209: the context of obl. 11 (d211, "puts + dative-locative") argues overwhelmingly for interpreting ammarnam-šan as aššar-šaṭ, not as -šaṭ-um with McMahon. Again then, this criterion for an OH text fails.

P. 241: since the breaking of a moist bread results in two šarror (ii 13-15), and the breaking of a šarror results in two "morsels" (parrayašši) (ii 11-13), šarror manifestly cannot mean "measuring vessel." The basic meaning is "handful." If one breaks a loaf of bread with two hands, one is left with half the loaf in each hand—clearly the meaning here.

Pp. 250 ff.: the meaning "basting bag" for KUḪURASH adopted from Glueck is convincing and important.

P. 258: likewise the new suggested meaning "be prescribed" for ḫukka.

Pp. 263-64: LUM.ĖS.UR.GI. EGER gAŠAB.I.LA.IA is merely a complete nominal sentence with the verb "to be" regularly omitted in the present tense: "the dogmen (are) behind the windows."
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