



Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Oguz Soysal

Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 123, No. 3 (Jul. - Sep., 2003), pp. 664-666

Published by: [American Oriental Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3217768>

Accessed: 08/12/2010 07:41

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=aos>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

moralistic and aggadic passages, to a greater degree than in the Mishnah, as a way of demarcating discrete literary units. In several passages, the author points out how the citation of relevant material from other tractates in the Mishnah (sometimes with additional interpretation) was intended to serve as an effective form of commentary.

Despite the above-mentioned weaknesses in the areas of bibliographical completeness and engagement with recent scholarship, the present volume recommends itself as the work of a major authority on tannaitic literature who has grappled through a long scholarly career with the complex challenges raised by the comparison between the Mishnah and Tosefta. Whether or not one accepts every one of Goldberg's theories, it is always clear that they are the products of profound erudition and imaginative engagement with the texts. *Tosefta Bava Kamma* is most profitably read as a companion to the corresponding volume of Lieberman's *Tosefta Ki-Fshutah* commentary, as Goldberg focuses on the broader issues of literary structure that were of peripheral concern to Lieberman. In a manner that is comparable to the Tosefta itself, Goldberg's monograph serves at once as a commentary and as a supplement to Lieberman's masterpiece.

ELIEZER SEGAL
UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

Kulturgeschichten: Altorientalistische Studien für Volkert Haas zum 65. Geburtstag. Edited by THOMAS RICHTER, DORIS PRECHEL, and JÖRG KLINGER. Saarbrücken: SAARBRÜCKER DRUCKEREI UND VERLAG, 2001. Pp. xxiv + 500, illustrations. €69.

His friends, colleagues, and pupils dedicated the *Festschrift* under review to Berliner Hittitologist Volkert Haas on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday. The volume includes thirty-seven articles submitted by forty-two scholars from various fields, including Mesopotamian archaeology (represented by R. Dittmann and A. Green and A. Hausleiter), Assyriology (H. Freydank, S. Lundström, M. S. Maul, J.-W. Meyer, H. Neumann, J. Renger, and G. J. Selz), and biblical studies (M. Köckert and H. Pfeiffer).

The largest number of contributions, however, focus on ancient Anatolian studies, primarily on Hittitology, as this has always been the main interest of the honoree of this volume. Among these, four articles address Anatolian archaeology: S. Alaura (pp. 1–17) reconsiders the terra-cotta fragments of bull figure(s) from H. Winckler's early excavations at Boğazköy / Hattuša and their unknown find spot, which the author believes to have been a storage room for "unfinished or damaged" cult objects in Hittite times (p. 2). She also refers to the Hittite written sources concerning damaged cult objects; cf. also O. Soysal, *Hethitica* 14 (1999): 131f., 132 n. 55a.

P. Neve's brief article (pp. 291–93) presents some thoughts on the architectonic structure of Eflatunpınar. Sadly, this famous spring-sanctuary situated in the modern town of Beyşehir had over the years been converted into part of a fish farm, but it has become of current interest thanks to the rescue and restoration excavations led by Turkish archaeologist A. S. Özenir, who also keeps the scholarly community informed with his systematic publications; see most recently *2000 Yılı Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi Konferansları* (Ankara, 2001), 35ff., and *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie*, ed. G. Wilhelm (= *StBoT* 45, Wiesbaden, 2001), 532ff. Recent interpretation of Eflatunpınar would indicate that it was one of the sacred pools or dams built in the time of the later Hittite kings Tuthaliya IV and Šuppiluliuma II (pp. 292f.). There is also a large mound situated near this sanctuary, and the find of a small fragment with hieroglyphic Luwian signs suggests that there was also a royal inscription at Eflatunpınar, like those found at Yalburt and elsewhere. Thus, current data, including the location of Eflatunpınar in the southwestern part of the Konya Plain, would indicate that the site is another geographical, or even possibly historical, link to the lost Kingdom of Tarhuntašša.

Additional studies on archaeological topics are contributed by B. Brentjes on the region of Urfa (pp. 59–72), and by H. Kühne on Gavur Kalesi near Ankara (pp. 227–43).

Philological contributions on diverse topics of Hittitology comprise a great deal of the *Festschrift*. Among the historical studies, G. M. Beckman (pp. 51–58) edits *CTH* 655 in transliteration and translation, with commentary. Although this composition is not of a historical nature, since the early years of Hittitology it has always been one of the most frequently referred-to sources for Old Hittite history. The join proposed here, *KBo* 3.63 + *HFAC* 40 (p. 54), is essential because of the mention of Mursili I and Hantili I in the same context (*HFAC* 40:2'–4'). This relates this text directly to Hantili I. Therefore, speculation about whether the king Hantili appearing in *CTH* 655 should be identified with the second ruler bearing this name is now definitely ruled out. The subject of the entire text seems to be a purification ritual against cultic impurities caused by Hantili I. Knowledge of this important composition can be furthered through some additional unpublished fragments. *Bo* 3243 was already cited by C. Kühne, *ZA* 67 (1977): 258. Further, three tiny pieces found in the Boğazköy excavations of 1967–69 have recently been identified as pertaining to *CTH* 655, and will be treated in a future issue of *ZA*.

H. Klengel summarizes and re-examines the role of the rulers of Ḫalab and Karkamiš during the New Kingdom (pp. 191–96). I. Singer discusses Hittite history of the thirteenth century B.C. in view of the fate of the Hittite capital Ḫattuša and the rising political power of Tarḫuntašša (pp. 395–403). P. Taracha deals with Mycenaeans, Aḫḫiyawa, and the Hittites and their relations to western Anatolia based on the royal letter to an Aḫḫiyawan king (*KUB* 26.91—*CTH* 183) (pp. 417–22).

Cult and Religion: A. Archi examines and compares the rituals of Emar that contain Anatolian elements with the rituals of Ḫatti (pp. 19–28). D. Bawanypeck and S. Görke treat the ritual for the Storm-god of the Meadow as part of *CTH* 652 (pp. 29–50). S. De Martino edits two small fragments of religious content from the Old Hittite milieu (*CTH* 650) (pp. 73–80). A. Gilan presents a detailed study of combat games in Hittite festivals, a topic that has attracted many scholars over the years since H. Ehelolf's first study in 1925 (pp. 113–24). M. Popko deals with the priests of Arinna, a leading city in the Hattian cult (pp. 327–31). M. Salvini and M.-C. Trémouille provide a photo, handcopy, and text edition of a new fragment of the Telipinu-Festival in Ḫanḫana and Kašša (*CTH* 638) from a private collection in Italy (pp. 377–82). R. Strauß proposes an interpretation of a Hurrian conjuration in the Ammiḫatna ritual *KBo* 5.2 ii 22–27 (*CTH* 471), the subject of her dissertation in progress (pp. 405–16).

The oracular institution as an essential part of the religious life of the Hittites is discussed here in two studies: J. Orlamünde investigates the system of KIN-oracles on the basis of the New Hittite text *KUB* 5.1+ (*CTH* 561), part of her current dissertation (pp. 295–311). The reviewer's publication in *ZA* 90 (2000): 85ff., a discussion of the system of KIN-oracles on the basis of the Old Hittite oracle report *KBo* 18.151 in letter format (*CTH* 827), seems not to have been available to her; on the other hand, Th. P. J. van den Hout has utilized it for his study of the older, mostly Middle Hittite, oracle records (pp. 423–40). He agrees with the Old Hittite dating of *KBo* 18.151, obviously the oldest sample of Hittite divination to date. He also discusses the divination outcome *italuwa bait* in rev. 19 of the same document, and argues that *italuwa* here may be taken, as elsewhere, as the very poorly attested pl. nom.-acc. neut. form **idāluwa* rather than as sg. *italu*, with the enclitic particle of direct speech *=wa*. However, another sentence expressing the result of a KIN-divination, from the Middle Hittite letter *KuT* 49 obv. 7–8: *idālu=wa dān nu=war=at=kan EGIR-pa Ḫalmaššuitti* “The evil has been taken and (given) back to Ḫalmaššuitti” still allows the possibility of interpreting *italu=wa bait* as “The evil has gone” in quoted speech (at least on the syntactical level), as maintained in *ZA* 90: 91. Most recently, a further Middle Hittite (bird) oracle fragment (*KBo* 22.263) has been identified by the same contributor in *NABU* 2002/42.

Focusing on society and economy, H. A. Hoffner contributes an informative summary of the role of merchants and trade in the Hittite Kingdom (pp. 179–89).

The second largest number of articles pertains to Hurritology, most treating the grammar and lexicography of Hurrian and Urartian: M. Giorgieri discusses the equation of Hurr. *telippa* and Hitt. *nu... maknut* in the bilingual *KBo* 32.14 iv 15–16 / iii 14–15 (pp. 125–38). Chr. Girbal comments on the independent pronouns of the 1. pers. sg. in Urartean (pp. 139–44). J. Hazenbos studies the syntax of some modal forms in Hurrian (pp. 171–77). In a non-linguistic essay, J. Klinger makes observations on the Hurrian tradition and on the Hurrian text corpus from Ḫattuša (pp. 197–208). As he points out (p. 202), the available written sources have not yet revealed any evidence for Hurrian influence in

Old Hittite times, either in traditional literature or in the state cult. The long-held speculation that one may detect an established cult of the Stormgod (= Teššob) of Ḫalab already during the Old Kingdom has been recently opposed also by D. Schwemer, *Wettergottgestalten Mesopotamiens und Nordsyriens im Zeitalter der Keilschriftkulturen* (Wiesbaden, 2001), 495. A similar view had already been maintained by the reviewer in *Hethitica* 14: 122f. n. 26.

In a long article, D. Prechel and T. Richter deliver some thoughts on Hurrian incantations in the Old Babylonian tradition (pp. 333–72). I. Wegner discusses the Hurrian words *šelli* “house” and *parḫi* “courtyard” (pp. 441–47). For *šelli* one should also see J. Fincke, *AoF* 21 (1994): 341f. with n. 30. The only useful information available about the obscure Hittite noun *šuwanti(ya)-* (pp. 445f.) is that it denotes an object which is a (body?) part of animals used in magic rituals. In the ritual of Šalašu against sorcery (*KBo* 19.145 iii 43–47—*CTH* *788) the *šuwanti(ya)-* is manipulated in connection with the “release of a bound person” (i.e., freeing a bewitched person from a spell). The expression *išḫiyandan lā-*—“to untie the bound one” (iii 45’f.) might reveal the function and nature of the *šuwanti(ya)-* that it probably serves to bind or to tie. After it was “taken (away?)” the bound persons can be released. Therefore, string-shaped body parts of animals like the tail, or better, intestine(s), are conceivable. Note also the phrase *ANA SA.GU₄ šūwanti[n . . .]* in *KBo* 24.110(+) iv 4’, in which *šuwanti(ya)-* stands in connection with SA “sinew.” G. Wilhelm deals with the Hurrian word *naip̄ti* “pasture” (pp. 449–53).

The only contribution on Hieroglyphic Luwian is offered by A. M. Dinçol and B. Dinçol (pp. 81–84), who determine the hieroglyphic sign for the cuneiform designation LÚ^{GIŠ}SUKUR. This spear- or lance-like sign appears on the seals *Bo* 84/573, *Bo* 85/385, and *Bo* 87/134; the authors propose to transliterate it with Latin LANCEA “lance,” and as part of a profession with LANCEARIUS “lance-man / lance carrier.” The other spear- or lance-like sign (L. 173) has already been identified by S. Herbordt as the equivalent of cuneiform ^{GIŠ}MEŠETU and has been named Latin HASTA “spear.” Since we usually translate ^{GIŠ}MEŠETU as “lance,” but ^{GIŠ}SUKUR as “spear,” it seems necessary to invert the proposed designations for these two hieroglyphic signs. The implement L. 173 “lance” is exactly the same as the one depicted on the Alacahöyük reliefs. By its shape it is not suitable for throwing, but rather for officials or royal guards to carry on for ceremonial occasions (cf. Latin *lancea*). The difference between the weapons can be clearly observed on one of the friezes of Alacahöyük where they appear together; see M. J. Mellink, *Anadolu / Anatolia* 14 (1970): 16f. (drawing) and pl. V, fig. g (photo). Further observations on (LÚ)^{GIŠ}MEŠETI and (LÚ)^{GIŠ}SUKUR are now in *BiOr* 60 (2003): 42–43.

As his bibliography (pp. xiii–xxiv) shows, since 1969 Volkert Haas has produced nearly two hundred publications (including books, articles, reviews, contributions to reference books, etc.), not only on Hittitology and Hurritology, but more broadly on ancient Near Eastern Studies as well. Therefore this well-done and nicely produced *Festschrift* is a fitting tribute to him, with its rich contents covering numerous ancient Near Eastern topics.

OĞUZ SOYSAL
THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, CHICAGO

Fingierte Welten in der ägyptischen Literatur des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr.: Grenzüberschreitung, Reise-motiv und Fiktionalität. By GERALD MOERS. Probleme der Ägyptologie, vol. 19. Leiden: BRILL, 2001. Pp. viii + 338. \$75.

This work was presented as a dissertation in 1996, the same year that saw the landmark publication of the collection of papers entitled *Ancient Egyptian Literature* (Probleme der Ägyptologie, vol. 10; Leiden: Brill). The introductory article by the volume’s editor, Antonio Loprieno, set up a number of criteria for the identification of specifically “literary” texts in the Egyptian corpus. These criteria serve as the backbone for Moers’ treatment of his subject.