

Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999. Edited by GERNOT WILHELM. Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten, vol. 45. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2001. Pp. xxiv + 759, 18 plates. €88.

This volume bringing together an international cross-section of scholars interested in the Hittites, their neighbors, predecessors, and immediate successors has something for everyone. In particular, there is much of historical interest.

Donbaz discusses some of the Old Assyrian tablets recently found in the merchant quarter of Kaneš. These contain four previously unattested *limmus* (year names), probably from the end of the Ib period, and mention a previously unattested merchant settlement (*kārum*) at Kuburnat. The most interesting text is addressed “To the gods and city (of Aššur) from the community of merchants (*tamkarrūtum*)” and explains the dangers of the journey.

Miller suggests a location for the country of Tikunani south of Ergani and discusses what is known about its relations with its neighbors, especially Šamši-Adad I of Assyria and Hattušili I of Hatti. Since much of his argument depends on the evidence from Šemšarra, it is frustrating that his map does not show its location. The map also correctly shows two rivers Habur, one the familiar tributary of the Euphrates and the other a tributary of the Tigris near Zakho. However, when mentioning the Habur, Miller should then specify which of the two rivers he means. On p. 413 we see Turukkean refugees flooding “toward the Habur” valley. Kuwari, who is at Šemšarra (far to the east of the Tigris), is supposed to control them or, failing that, to send them to Šubat-Enlil, which is located in the easternmost part of the (Euphratean) “Habur triangle.” But which Habur are they flooding towards? The Tigridian Habur is closer to Šemšarra and more or less between it and Šubat-Enlil, yet would this obscure Habur be referred to by an Assyriologist in this manner? I also fail to see where in the texts published by Eidem (his Text 911 is in *Iraq* 47 [1985]: 98) it says that these refugees are to be sent “as captive workers” or “as bond-servants” (p. 413). Eidem (*Shemshara Archives* 2, 21), without any evidence and rather out of the blue, mentions “a practice well known from later sources, that of mass deportation.” But in later periods this practice did not result in “captive workers” or “bond-servants,” but rather a resettled peasantry, a valuable developmental resource. In the very next sentence Eidem contradicts himself by saying that Kuwari and Šamši-Adad had to “contain and resettle the stream of refugees” which he had earlier called “the Turukkean exodus due to the Gutian war.” Judging from all of the Šemšarra texts, these Turukkeans seem not to have been a valuable resource desired and carried off by Šamši-Adad, but refugees, a dangerous nuisance to be kept in the border region if possible, and if not, carefully escorted to prevent them from getting into mischief. They were given places to settle—refugee camps(?)—only as a last resort (Eidem, *Iraq* 47 [1985]: 99: “Šamši-Adad and Kuwari . . . both wanted the displaced Turukkeans out of the way”).

A. Dinçol publishes the impressions of a joint seal of Kantuzzili, the GAL *MEŠEDI*, and Tudhaliya, the chief of the scepter bearers (MAGNUS.LITUUS). Dinçol suggests that this Kantuzzili is the otherwise known “Priest of Kuzzuwatna” and brother of Tudhaliya III. His seal also shows that the sign L283 is not ^{GI}ŠTUKUL but should be read *tuzzi*.

A. Süel publishes a letter from Ortaköy filled with well-known names: “To My Majesty, my lord, speak, thus Uḫḫamūwa, your servant. § Concerning that I wrote about the fact of the marching together of Kupanta-LAMMA, Tarḫunnaradu, and the town of Ḫappuriya. § Now a fugitive man of Marāša just came to the priest as a fugitive from Ḫappuriya. He told me: ‘Kupanta-LAMMA, Tarḫunnaradu and the sons of Kupanta-LAMMA, Mašduri, Piyamāradu, Kupantazalma and all of Ḫappuriya will arrive. Uḫḫawaranu, Ḫūliyanzalmanu and X-lišani the Pidaššan are with them.’” Kupanta-LAMMA and Tarḫunnaradu were kings of Arzawa contemporary with Hittite kings Arnuwanda I and Tudhaliya III. But a man known as Piyamaradu was a well-known thorn in the Hittite flesh much later, perhaps in Hattušili III’s reign, and he is more or less contemporary with a Kupanta-LAMMA, king of Mira; a Mašturi, king of Šeḫa-River Land; and a Tarḫunnaradu who briefly usurped the throne from Mašturi. It seems unlikely that redating of the latter group is possible, but rather that we have two sets of similar Arzawan names.

1/h
Hawkins publishes a seal impression which shows that Urḫi-Teššub had been designated crown prince (*tuḫkanti* and DUMULUGAL.GAL) before ascending the throne. He also suggests that L419 is to be read “*urḫi*.”

B. Dinçol discusses officials with multiple titles. For LÚ.MEŠSAG = “preeminent ones,” read rather “eunuchs” with Hawkins, RAI 47: ~~four~~ (2002): 217-233.

Özenir publishes drawings and pictures of the wonderful additional sculptures he has excavated from the Hittite sacred pool at Eflâton Pınar.

Gonnet publishes a newly discovered grotto with crude carvings of a stag, bull, eagle, and hare. Her judgment of its Hittite nature is based only on the facts that there are other Hittite sites in the general area and that these animals are portrayed elsewhere in Hittite art.

Van den Hout convincingly argues against the theory that more than one Hittite ruler with the title Great King existed simultaneously at peace with one another in the thirteenth century.

Orlamünde correctly notes that the great series of oracle questions concerning military campaigns against the Kaška and involving Nerik, *KUB* 5.1, cannot date to Ḫattušili of Ḫakpiš’s reconquest of Nerik, since the commander of the operation is called “His Majesty.” Furthermore, since one of the tokens is “the king of Tarḫuntašša,” the text must date to the Great Kingship of Ḫattušili III or later. She argues for the reign of Tudḫaliya IV, since the oracle text indicates that relations with Assyria were tense, which, she suggests, fits the period of Tudḫaliya IV, not that of Ḫattušili III.

Heinhold-Krahmer points out that a sealing of Tudḫaliya, the GAL *MEŠEDI*, confirms previously known documents showing that Tudḫaliya IV already bore this name before he became king and therefore throws into doubt that the Hurrian name X-Šarruma beside his name on his royal seals is his “birth name.” Unfortunately, my article, “The Hurrian Dynasty and the Double Names of Hittite Kings,” *Anatolia Antica: Studia in Memoria di Fiorella Imparati* (Florence, 2002), 55–71, appeared too late for consideration.

Singer joins *KUB* 26.25 (CTH 126.2) indirectly to *KBo* 12.30 (CTH 126.4), as well as *KUB* 26.33 (CTH 125) to *KBo* 13.225, and argues that the resultant texts are examples of treaties between Šuppiluliuma II and a king of Kargamiš, probably Talmi-Teššub. It would then appear that it was the king of Kargamiš who had helped Šuppiluliuma to the throne upon the unexpected death of his childless (half?) brother.

Jasink argues that “Great King” Ḫartapu’s additional title “man” was an abbreviation of the title “headman,” which when found in Šuppiluliuma II’s Südburg inscription refers to Ḫartapu. Thus Ḫartapu, like his uncle Kurunta, attempted to use a base in Tarḫuntašša to try to reclaim his ancestral throne, and he and his kingdom were subsequently eliminated by Šuppiluliuma II. Thus, in her opinion, no kingdom of Tarḫuntašša survived the fall of the Hittite Great Kingdom.

Seeherr, in what is perhaps the most important article for Hittite history in the volume, overturns the generally held theory that Ḫattuša’s end came through destruction at the hand of enemies. He points out that in such a case the buildings should be full of pottery, whereas Boğazköy’s buildings had been almost completely cleaned out, except for tablets, bullae, and massive pithoi (all empty!). Whereas some buildings did burn down, others nearby simply collapsed. None of the houses and workshops situated beside burned temples themselves burned. Therefore, it seems ~~likely~~ likely that sometime in the reign of Šuppiluliuma II, before the end of the empire, the capital was moved and Ḫattuša was at least partially abandoned.

Other articles include a contribution by Klengel on the system of Hittite government in Syria, by Klinger on historiography, by Otto and Pecchioli Daddi on “release” in Hittite, Hurrian and Hattic, by Rieken on the date of the Hittite “King of Battle” story, by Rutherford on “The Song of the Sea” as part of the Hurro-Hittite “Kingship in Heaven” cycle, by Alaura on the archives and libraries of Ḫattuša, by Hoffner on food and food production, by Hutter on Arzawan religion, by Richter on the Hurrian pantheon in Old Babylonian northern Mesopotamia, by Nakamura on the *Nutarriyašya*-festival, by Lebrun on the cities of Urikina, Ušša and Uda, and by Karasu on colophons.

Linguistic topics include Hittite figures of speech (deMartino and Imparati), grammar (Lühr on relative sentences, Mazoyer on the dative-locative, Neumann on the adverbial genitive), lexicography (Boley on intransitive *ḫark-*, Cohen on *natta āra*, Çoskun on pots, Melchert on *ararkiške-*, “copulate,” Oettinger on *-ima-*, Ofitsch on *ḫueša-*, Puhvel on ivory and elephant, Rikov on verbs in *-na-* and *-anna-*,

HJ

183
14.12.05

S. W. C. Dilla
✓

1/5

Sava^f on *aramni*- and ^{Gi}*arimpa*-, Y. Soysal [Arıkan] on Ú.ḪUB, "deaf," K. Yoshida on *nu-za*, Zeilfelder on abstracts, Zinko on plants), Luwian (Alp on the Trojan seal), Hurrian (Giorgieri on Ullikummi), Hattic (O. Soysal), and Phrygian (Gusmani). Nor is Anatolian archaeology neglected (V. Müller-Karpe, Ökse, Özşait, M. Süel, Yakar et al.). Finally, de Roos reports on the progress of the database "Treated Passages from Hittite Texts."

The editor and the contributors are to be congratulated for getting a handsome volume out just two years after the conference.

RICHARD H. BEAL
ORIENTAL INSTITUTE
