

4. E. Rieken et al. (ed.), *hethiter.net/*: CTH 370.I.11 (TX 2009-08-31).

5. Cf. e.g. KUB 17.10+ iv 24: UDU-uš SILA₄-ŠÚ pé-en-ni-iš-ta (probably corrupted from original *ga-ni-iš-ta*, as suggested in Pisaniello 2020: 374 fn. 6), KUB 33.29+ iv 20': UDU-uš SILA₄-ŠÚ KI.MIN, etc. (see the Appendix in Pisaniello 2020 for other parallel passages). The exact origin of the mistake is difficult to envisage: as a tentative hypothesis, we may perhaps assume that the scribe wrote QA-ZU under dictation in the model from which KUB 33.43 was copied, “corrected” to QA-DU in the latter. As an alternative solution, although unlikely in my opinion, one could explain DU as a phonetic complement indicating the Akkadian reading *puḫādu* ‘lamb’.

References

HUTTER-BRAUNTSAR, S. 2011: Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu den Texten über eine aus Zorn verschwundene Gottheit, in M. Hutter, S. Hutter-Braunsar (eds.), *Hethitische Literatur. Überlieferungsprozesse, Textstrukturen, Ausdrucksformen und Nachwirken. Akten des Symposiums vom 18. bis 20. Februar 2010 in Bonn* (AOAT 391), Münster, pp. 129-144.

PISANIELLO, V. 2020: É-er tuḫḫuiš wišuriyatati in the Hittite Myth of Telipinu, *AuOr* 38/2, pp. 373-391.

POLVANI, A.M. 1992: Su alcuni frammenti mitologici ittiti, in H. Otten, E. Akurgal, H. Ertem, A. Süel (eds.), *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Sedat Alp*, Ankara, pp. 445-454.

Valerio PISANIELLO <valerio.pisaniello@univr.it>
University of Verona (ITALY)

46) Šuwašuna: Some Remarks on an Anatolian Theonym — The Hittite cuneiform tablets containing the name of the god Šuwašuna always show the determinative DINGIR and full phonetic writing (even though the rendering of the geminate consonants is not entirely consistent). The attested occurrences of Šuwašuna occur in rituals related to a Luwian religious context:¹⁾ ^dŠu-wa-šu-na, -an KBo 4.11 obv. 5, rev. 45 (CTH 772);²⁾ ^dŠu-wa-aš-šu-un-na-a[n KUB 55.65 iv 30 (CTH 772);³⁾ ^dŠu-wa-aš-šu-un-na-an KUB 32.123+ iv 34' (CTH 772);⁴⁾ ^dŠu-wa-^raš-šu¹-u[n-na-an KUB 60.30 iv 8 (CTH 670);⁵⁾ ^dŠu-wa-aš-š]u-un-na-an KUB 51.9 rev. 8 (CTH 771);⁶⁾ ^dŠu-wa-šu[- KBo 14.85 ii 4 (CTH 640)⁷⁾; and ^dZu-u[- KBo 34.246, 6 (CTH 771).⁸⁾

More specifically, Šuwašuna is one of the deities of the Festrival (KUB 55.65 rev. iv 1–37 // KUB 32.123+ rev. iv 22'–37') carried out in the city of Ištuwa, which generally provides information about the Luwian pantheon and, in particular, about the figure and cult of the local Sun-goddess.⁹⁾ According to Steitler (2017, 382-3): “The first sequence [of the ritual] follows offerings that are presented to the Storm-god and the Sungoddess of Ištuwa and consists of a combination of drinking rites and other ritual activities performed for Tarwalliya, Winiyanta, the ‘pure inner chamber’ (É.ŠÀ-^rda²¹-an ^ršu-up-p^r-i[n]), the temple(?) of the Stag-god (^dKAL É-ir), Šuwašunna, Yarri, Šiuri, Iyašallašši, Wandu, Wištašši, the Sun-god of the gatehouse and finally the Storm-god. The second sequence (in KUB 35.132+) is similar to the first, but varies in the order of deities: ŠA É [...], ^dKAL of the inner chamber, the Sun-god of the gatehouse, Šuwašunna, Yarri, [Šiuri], Iyašallašši, [Wandu] and the Storm-god of the steppe”.

Geographically speaking, the name of ^{URU}Ištuwa is derived from the theonym ^dIštu.¹⁰⁾ Notwithstanding the Hattian origin of these names, and according to the amount of Luwian evidence we have, Ištuwa could reasonably be a Luwian-speaking city of the Middle-Late Bronze Age. Indeed, Watkins referred to the bilingual passage of KBo 4.11 rev. 45-46 (Hitt.: EGIR-ŠU ^dŠu-wa-šu-na-an-an e-ku-zi / Luw.: aḫ-ḫa-ta-ta a-la-ti a-ú-i-en-ta ú-i-lu-ša-ti) to ascribe ^{URU}Ištuwa, ^dŠuwasuna, and ^{URU}Wiluša to the context of the North-West and to prove the relation between (the Sun-god) Apollo and (W)Ilion.¹¹⁾ However, at present, the city has not been identified on the basis of unequivocal evidence, so its geographical position, which would be crucial for a full contextual reconstruction of the cultural and sociolinguistic environment, remains unknown. Nevertheless, the lack of Hurrian influence in the local pantheon¹²⁾ might be a further clue for localization in the (north-)western part of Anatolia somewhere between Wiluša and Ḫattuša.¹³⁾ According to Mouton, even the possibility that those Luwian rituals were performed in Ištuwa or the capital Hattuša cannot be excluded.¹⁴⁾ In the light of the broader Luwian context surrounding the name of Šuwašuna and the textual evidence connected to it, and since the name does not match formally any Hattian lexical element, one may wonder whether the deity was originally

Anatolian. Since no additional information is available on this god from the textual evidence, it is interesting to turn to the linguistic analysis of its name to try and answer that question.

Laroche (1947, 88) firstly traced back the root *suwa-* to the Luwian language, but he did not provide a translation of the form. Instead, Watkins, when examining the very theonym under discussion, suggested reading Šuwašuna as a “form of the Indo-European word for ‘sun’ (cf. Gothic *sunno*) with intensive or expressive reduplication, or conceivably an ancient compound with Indo-European **sue-* ‘own’ (cf. Hittite ^DŠiu(š)-šummiš ‘(our) own (Sun-)God’, **d̪ieys=suwo/i-*.”¹⁵) However, Watkins’s comparison with ^dŠiušummi involved a reverse order which seems quite speculative: if indeed the clitic possessive were a Hittite innovation (Šiu-šummiš “god+our”), it should be demonstrated both that Luwian developed it (or borrowed it from Hittite), and that Luwian placed it before the noun (Šuwa-šun-a “own+Sun”). As for now, this theory appears unlikely.

The *communis opinio* in the literature suggests that *šūwa-*ⁱ was the Luwian verb “to fill, swell up” (Hittite *šūwa-*^{(hi)ʔ} or *šūe/a-*^{zi} “to fill”),¹⁶ which can be traced back to Indo-European **sóyh₃-e₁ : *suh₃-énti*¹⁷) and is also attested in Hieroglyphic Luwian.¹⁸) This interpretation proves to be rather interesting because the second term of the compound is, in all likelihood, the Luwian verb **šunna-i* (Palaic *šuna-*, Hittite *šunna-*ⁱ, from Indo-European **su-nó-h_{1/3}-e₁/*su-n-h_{1/3}-énti*, “to make full, fill”),¹⁹ with causative *-n* suffix and attested both in cuneiform and Hieroglyphic Luwian.

These verbs, *šūwa-* and *šunna-*, are partially overlapping in meaning and etymologically related,²⁰ and seem to be the best candidates to explain the theonym, especially since the semantic sphere is perfectly acceptable also in a context connected with divine offerings. As a combination of the two forms, the divine name would be analyzable as a sort of *figura etymologica*, at least from a broad, Indo-European perspective, if not in Anatolian or Luwian specifically.²¹) However, the linguistic reconstruction seems problematic in the synchronic panorama of Anatolian compounds. Although exocentric compounds formed by two verbal stems are typologically well-known and can be recognized in several languages, they are not currently attested in either Hittite or Luwian.²²) Therefore, this reconstruction cannot be accepted as it is, and a more refined explanation is necessary.

For Šuwašuna to be convincingly analyzable as a compound name, it is necessary to propose a structural interpretation of the term as either a subordinate compound or as a coordinate compound contrary to the exocentric verb+verb form discussed above. The first step is, therefore, investigating whether one of the two elements of the name can be analyzed as something different from a verb.

According to the recent CHD Š/4, there is no attested occurrence for *šūwa* as a noun. However, a closer look at the available divine onomasticon points in a different direction. The element *šūwa-* evidently appears also in the following proper names: ^dŠuwa, ^dŠuwaliyat(ti), ^dŠuwala, ^dŠuwanzipa, and ^{URU}Šuwanzana²³). The first name²⁴) is, obviously, a primitive noun, which also occurs in the other forms, as outlined in the following list:

- Šuwaliyat(ti)²⁵) is a divinized form of an abstract noun with the suffix *-att-*, which Schwemer translates as “Fülle”;
- Šuwala²⁶) is a *nomen actoris* in *-ala-*. According to Schwemer, however, this may be a Hurrian deity whose name is not related to that of Šuwaliyat(ti), therefore it is uncertain whether it belongs in our equation;²⁷)
- Šuwanzipa²⁸) displays a first element related to *šūwa* (maybe a noun inflected as an ancient *-n* genitive), which combined with the Luwian suffix *-šepa/zipa-* can be translated as “Spirit of the *šūwa*”;²⁹)
- Šuwanzana is a morphologically obscure toponym that is likely to belong to this paradigmatic series, too.

In addition to these proper names, the Luwian common noun ^{DUG}*šūwattar*, referring to a storage jar, is also recorded, as well as the Palaic *šāwaya* “Becher”.³⁰) For this reason, and in view of the above, we can safely conclude that an Anatolian, possibly Luwian, substantive *šūwa* existed, even though it is not attested as such in the corpora. It was obviously related to the verb “to fill”, an explanation which is not only formally but also semantically convincing. From this observation, the following conclusions can be reached, on the theonomastic evidence listed above. ^dŠuwa was a divinized vessel. ^dŠuwala- was probably

a divinized profession related to the *realium*, while ^dŠuwaliatti- was formed from an abstract noun related to the semantic field of abundance. As for ^dŠuwanzipa, it can be interpreted as the genie of the *šuwa*. Finally, ^dŠuwašuna can be explained as a fully Anatolian compound theonym containing the substantive *šuwa* and the verbal element *šunmai-*, thus resulting in a subordinate exocentric structure such as “(s)he (who) fills the š.-vessel”.

Acknowledgment

This note is a result of *TeAI* “Teonimi e pantheon nell’Anatolia Ittita”, a project funded by the Italian Ministry of University, F.A.R.E. programme, and carried out at the University of Verona. I would like to thank Prof. F. Giusfredi who supported me throughout this work and Dr. V. Pisaniello for helping me with precious advice.

Notes

1. Particularly, the rituals of CTH 771, 772 refer to the cities of ^{URU}Lallupiya (RGTC 6, 242; 6/2, 92) and ^{URU}Ištanuwa (RGTC 6, 152; 6/2, 56), and since most of these texts involve Luwian singing, the corpus is often named as “the Songs” or “the Festivals” of Lallupiya-Ištanuwa. See Starke 1985, 294-353; Hutter 2003, 239-243; Mouton 2016, 119.
2. Starke 1985, 339-341; Yoshida 1996, 252.
3. Starke 1985, 314.
4. Starke 1985, 314 n. 93.
5. Groddek 2006, 30.
6. Starke 1985, 351; id. 1990, 605.
7. Mouton 2016, 122.
8. Yoshida 1996, 253-4.
9. See Starke 1985, 294-353; Haas 1994, 582-3; Yoshida 1996, 251-3; Hutter 2003, 239-243; Steitler 2017, 382.
10. Watkins 1987, 148; Haas 1994, 582.
11. Watkins 1987, 424-6; id. 1995, 149.
12. With the exception of the deity *hurlaš dInar* in KUB 35.135 IV 16’, see Starke 1985, 322 and Yakubovich 2008, 22.
13. See Haas 1994, 582; Yakubovich 2008, 22; Giusfredi 2020, 20.
14. Mouton 2016, 130.
15. Watkins 1995, 148-9. See also Watkins 1987, 426; Kloekhorst 2008, 782-3; HEG S/2, 1109-1113; CHD Š/4, 509-517a.
16. Carruba 1970, 71; Melchert 1993, 198; Starke 1990, 439, 465; Kloekhorst 2008, 797; Sasseville 2020, 434; HEG S/2, 1216-1220; CHD Š/4, 530a-539b.
17. Sasseville 2020, 434. See also Kloekhorst 2008, 797.
18. Starke 1990, 466 with nn. 1699-1701.
19. See HEG S/2, 1219; Carruba 1970, 70; Kloekhorst 2008, 785; and Starke 1990, 521-2 with n. 1927: “füllen”, where he also reported the similar *šunn(a)ji-* “umkehren, umstürzen”.
20. HEG S/2, 1217, 1219; CHD Š/4, 539.
21. For instance, KBo 42.6 obv. 9: *wepuš wepta*, see Kloekhorst 2008, 1001, and above all KUB 35.165 rev. 22’: *ša-a-wa-ya-ya šu-ú-na-at*, see Carruba 1970, 19.
22. Cotticelli 2020, 67-69 with literature.
23. RGTC 6, 371; RGTC 6/2, 150.
24. Van Gessel 1998, 417-419.
25. Van Gessel 1998, 421; Schwemer 2011, 251.
26. Van Gessel 1998, 419-421.
27. Schwemer 2011, 251, see also CHD Š/4, 542.
28. Van Gessel 1998, 421.
29. Laroche (1947, 88) interpreted ^dŠuwanzipa as “Spirit of (the city of) Šuwanzana”, a suggestion which now seems unlikely.
30. HEG S/2, 1220; CHD Š/4, 547; Carruba 1970, 69.

Abbreviations

CHD	The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Chicago 1980ff.
CTH	E. LAROCHE, Catalogue des textes hittites, Paris 1971.
CLL	H. MELCHERT, Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon, Chapel Hill 1993.
CollAn	Colloquium Anatolicum, Istanbul.
DBH	Dresden Beiträge zur Hethitologie, Dresden – Wiesbaden.
HdO	Handbuch der Orientalistik, Leiden.
HEG	J. TISCHLER, Hethititsches Etymologisches Glossar, Innsbruck 1977ff.
Hethitica	Hethitica, Louvain-la-Neuve 1972ff.
IEED	Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, Leiden.
KBo	Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi, Leipzig 1916-1923, Berlin 1954ff.

- KUB Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi, Berlin 1921ff.
 RGTC 6 G.F. DEL MONTE – J. TISCHLER, Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte, Wiesbaden 1978.
 RGTC 6/2 G.F. DEL MONTE, Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. Supplement, Wiesbaden 1992.
 RHA Revue hittite et asianique, Paris 1930-1978.
 StBoT Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Wiesbaden.
 THeth Texte der Hethiter, Heidelberg.
 ZVS Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen.

References

- CARRUBA, O. 1970. *Das Palaische. Texte, Grammatik, Lexikon* (StBoT 10), Wiesbaden.
 COTTICELLI, P. 2020. “Compounding and Underlying Syntax in Hittite between Indo-European Heritage and Language Contact”, in Benvenuto, M.C. et Alii, *Word formation, grammar and lexicology. Proceedings of the International Conference, Rome, February 6-8, 2019*, Hamburg: 61-83.
 GIUSFREDI, F. 2020. *A Study in the Syntax of the Luwian Language* (THeth 30), Heidelberg.
 GRODDEK, D. 2006. *Hethitische Texte in Transkription: KUB 60* (DBH 20), Dresden.
 HAAS, V. 1994. *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion* (HdO), Leiden.
 HUTTER, M. 2003. “Aspects of Luwian Religion”, in *HdO* 1/68: 211-280.
 KLOEKHORST, A. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, (IEED 5), Leiden.
 LAROCHE, E. 1947. “Recherches sur les noms des dieux hittites”, in *RHA* 7/46: 7-139.
 MELCHERT, H.C. 1993. *Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon* (CLL), Chapel Hill.
 MOUTON, A. 2016. “The Festivals of Lallupiya-Ištanuwa: Local Traditions or Part of the Religion of the Hittite State?”, in *StBoT* 60: 119-132.
 SASSEVILLE, D. 2020. *Anatolian Verbal Stem Formation. Luwian, Lycian and Lydian*, Leiden – Boston.
 SCHWEMER, D. 2011. “Šuwaliyatt: Name, Kult und Profil eines hethitischen Gottes”, in *CollAn* 10: 249-260.
 STARKE, F. 1980. “Das luwische Wort für «Frau»”, in *ZVS* 94: 74-86.
 STARKE, F. 1985. *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift* (StBoT 30), Wiesbaden.
 STARKE, F. 1990. *Untersuchungen zur Stammbildung des keilschriftluwischen Nomens* (StBoT 31), Wiesbaden.
 STEITLER, Ch.W. 2017. *The Solar Deities of Bronze Age Anatolia* (StBoT 62), Wiesbaden.
 VAN GESSEL, B.H.L. 1998. *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon. Part I*, Leiden – New York – Köln.
 WATKINS, C. 1987. “Questions linguistiques palaites et louvites cuneiformes”, in *Hethitica* 8: 423-426.
 WATKINS, C. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*, New York – Oxford.
 YAKUBOVICH, I. 2008. *Sociolinguistics of the Luwian Language* (Diss.), Chicago.
 YOSHIDA, D. 1996. *Untersuchungen zu den Sonnengöttern bei den Hethitern* (THeth 22), Heidelberg.

Livio WARBINEK <livio.warbinek@univr.it>
 Università degli Studi di Verona (ITALY)

47) Der assyrische Raub des *Enūma eliš* und weitere Überlegungen zur Textdatierung — In der Forschung zum *Enūma eliš* hat sich die Datierung von Wilfred G. Lambert (1964, 1984, 2013: 439-444) durchgesetzt. Demnach wurde das Werk unter dem babylonischen König Nebukadnezar I. am Ende des 12. Jh. v. Chr. im Umfeld der Rückführung einer Marduk-Statue aus Elam komponiert. Andere Forscher*innen haben (teils deutlich) frühere Zeitpunkte für die Komposition in Erwägung gezogen (bspw. von Soden 1933, 128f.; Jacobsen 1968, 107; Sommerfeld 1982, 175; Dalley 1997, 168f.). Im Folgenden möchte ich vor allem Lamberts These in den Mittelpunkt stellen und ihr eigene Überlegungen an die Seite stellen, die sich aufgrund meiner Forschung zum *Enūma eliš* ergeben haben.

Hierbei geht es zum einen um das mögliche Verhältnis zwischen der Rückführung des Götterbildes, deren Huldigung und der Werkentstehung (a). Zum anderen erlauben Befunde zum Selbstverständnis des Werkes und der raumzeitlichen Verteilung seiner Manuskripte die Skizzierung eines weiteren konkreten historischen Ereignisses, das für die Datierung bedeutsam sein kann (b). Anhand dieser Beobachtungen versuche ich abschließend, mögliche Zeitfenster für die Komposition des *Enūma eliš* zu skizzieren (c).

In dieser Notiz gehe ich von der Grundthese aus, dass das *Enūma eliš* in einem Guss komponiert wurde. Dies legen m.E. der Aufbau und die interne Verflechtung des Werkes nahe (vgl. Gabriel 2014).

a) Statuenrückführung und literarische Produktion

Lambert verortet die Entstehung des *Enūma eliš* etwas vage in einer „direkten Beziehung“ (“direct relationship”; 1964, 10) zwischen der Rückführung der Marduk-Statue und der Komposition des Textes.