

Sonderdruck aus

DIE WELT DES ORIENTS

Herausgegeben von

Heinz Halm und Wolfgang Röllig

BAND XXXIV · 2004

VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT IN GÖTTINGEN

DIE WELT DES ORIENTS

Herausgegeben von Heinz Halm und Wolfgang Röllig

Anschriften der Herausgeber

Prof. Dr. Heinz Halm, Orientalisches Seminar, Münzgasse 30, 72070 Tübingen
Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Röllig, Altorientalisches Seminar, Schloß, 72070 Tübingen
Manuskripte sind einzusenden an W. Röllig, Tübingen

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier
und mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft

Satz: Dörlemann-Satz, Lemförde
Druck- und Bindearbeiten: Hubert & Co., Göttingen

ISSN 0043-2547

S. 339, RS 19.26 mit Anm. 1245: Das Wort *maswatu* (~ ug. *mṯt*) ist auch mit „Ruder“ übersetzt worden (s. *KTU* 4.689 1 ff.: *spr. nps. any / tš^c. mṯtm / ...* „Liste über die Ausrüstung der Flotte: 9 Ruder ...“; vgl. ferner Xella, *WO* 13 (1982) S. 32 f. und Vita, *Aula Orientalis* 13 (1995) 139–41).

S. 339: Zu RS 19.35A 2': „v[illage de ...]du: 1 arc, 1 car[quois; ...]“ vielleicht „v[illage de Raq]du: 1 arc, 1 car[quois; ...]“; s. van Soldt, *SAU* 321 Anm. 138 und Belmonte, *RGTC* 12.2 s. v. Raqdu.

Ungeachtet dieser kleinen Bemerkungen sollten Altorientalisten und Dozenten der Alten Geschichte Sylvie Lackenbacher dafür danken, daß sie uns dieses unerläßliche Buch vorgelegt hat.

J. A. Belmonte Marin – Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha

ANONYMUS (Ed.): *La civiltà dei Hurriti*. La parola del passato. Rivista di studi antichi, Vol. 55 Napoli: Gaetano Macchiaroli, 2000, pp. 424

This remarkable volume offers the most complete and up-to-date review of Hurrian culture – combining a number of features that make it truly one of a kind in our discipline. On the one hand, the authors are all in the forefront of the research in the field, and they present a fresh and original approach to central issues, with the support of a full scholarly apparatus. And yet, on the other, the scope of the topics selected is such that the work can properly serve as a broadly based introduction to Hurrian civilization as a whole. There is, in other words, an overall conceptual unity in the way the contributions hold together as chapters of a book, while presenting at the same time a wealth of details such as one would otherwise find in individual monographic studies. Where else can one get a full-fledged grammar of the language together with an in-depth presentation of the historical development, or a thorough account of religious institutions together with an insightful analysis of artistic style? Clearly, this book is to remain a benchmark in the field for years to come.

The work is at the same time a tribute to the imposing development of the Italian school of Hurrian studies which has grown over the years, and which is centered in the Istituto per gli Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici, a unique institution in the field of ancient Near Eastern studies and a powerhouse of projects and initiatives, under the aegis of the Italian Consiglio Nazionale dell Ricerche. The most visible of these initiatives is the co-sponsorship, with the Institut für altorientalische Philologie of the Freie Universität in Berlin, of the “Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler,” a monumental publishing venture which numbers already eleven volumes. ISMEA (the acronym by which the Institute is known) is also the institutional center around which pivots the activity of all the authors represented in the volume, to begin with GIOVANNI PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, who took a leading role in the initial establishment of, and goal setting for, the Institute. He takes the lead with a brief foreword that is at the same time a dedication to the memory of FIORELLA IMPARATI. It is followed by an overall introduction by MIRJO SALVINI, who may be regarded as the editor of the volume, though bibliographically the volume remains, as it were, anonymous.

We can assign the topics treated in the volume to three major areas. The chronological and institutional development is covered in the first three chapters, respectively on the most ancient periods, on the kingdom of Mittani, and on the Late Bronze expansion in Western Syria. Here, too, belongs a comprehensive treatment of religion.

The linguistic dimension is represented by an exhaustive grammatical overview and an onomastic analysis. There are then two specialized studies on the bilingual about the destruction of Ebla and on the lexical lists from Ugarit. Also related to this topic is a chapter on the digitalization of Hurrian cuneiform texts.

Finally, there is a slender but insightful chapter on the archaeological and art-historical dimension.

A rich set of indices completes the volume – the only possible omission to which one could point being a comprehensive bibliography.

I will review first some of the broader issues which serve as the presupposition for the whole volume and are taken up on different occasions by the various authors, and then I will discuss the individual chapters with special emphasis on specific points to which the book has forcefully drawn our attention.

A key question is that about the *ethnic identity of the Hurrians*. It is a difficult question that entails not only a review of substantive data, but also, and perhaps especially, an explicit confrontation with methodological issues. Who were the Hurrians? This is answered only implicitly in the book, without reference to a theoretical framework aimed at defining ethnicity. Onomastics is used as a key criterion. Thus, for instance, the “chronological table of the Hurrians” (p. 67) simply assumes an equivalence between the names of the rulers and the ethnic consistency of the group. This rather nominalistic approach is standard in our field, where the presence of ancient terms that define social groups and that seem to neatly overlap linguistic groups provides an easy intellectual shortcut to more complex efforts at categorization. The vast body of data which is presented in the volume serves as a wonderful reservoir of information for an in-depth analysis of this issue. To this, we can also add now new material from our work at Urkesh. One that seems particularly germane and important is the identification of a monumental underground structure as an *ābi*, i. e., a uniquely Hurrian cultic place for conjuring netherworld deities so as to obtain personal responses. This is not only different from standard Mesopotamian practices of divination (which are, as it were, algebraic in nature, meaning that they rely on the systemic interpretation of recurring patterns of symbols). It is also indicative of a very different perception of the divine world: the deity is perceived as answering questions in ways that are totally unpredictable and thus much more personalized. In this we have an antecedent of two major strands of religious interaction which are totally at odds with the Mesopotamian world – the prophetic movement in ancient Israel and the mystery religions in ancient Greece. The link between the particularity of the ritual as known from the texts, the uniqueness of the monumental structure that can be associated with it, and the cluster of linguistic Hurrian features associated with Urkesh provide a firm case for what can properly be called a specific Hurrian ethnic identity. (Regarding the question of ethnicity see also below in my comments to the sections on religion and on art.)

The significance of the Urkesh evidence with regard to the *antiquity of Hurrian presence in Syro-Mesopotamia* is amply recognized in the volume, and is in fact highlighted by the use of the Louvre lion of Tish-atal on the front and back cover, but it is interesting to see how its full implications have not quite registered yet. For instance, Tupkish is not listed in the chronological table on p. 67, even though he is discussed at length in the text portion of the same article (pp. 34–46), and on the same table Ta<iš-atili of Azu<inum is listed instead as the earliest known Hurrian ruler. Or again, the royal title *endan* is said to occur only for Tish-atal (p. 204), whereas it is attested for other Urkesh rulers as well. – Giorgieri’s masterly presentation of Hurrian grammar refers to the Mittani letter of Tushratta as the only Hurrian document originating from a Hurrian scribal school (p. 180), but the third millennium Urkesh evidence argues for a much earlier

stage of precisely such a Hurrian scribal tradition. Not only the graphemic sophistication of the Tish-atal inscriptions indicates that Hurrian could not have been adapted overnight by Sumero-Akkadian scribes in the service of a Hurrian ruler, but the seal inscriptions of the Tupkish court also imply an independent Hurrian scribal tradition. This is suggested by the number of innovative peculiarities that pertain to the cuneiform legends, for instance the way in which (Hurrian) legends are closely correlated with the scenes, or the fact that the word for seal is used in the legend (a unique phenomenon in the third millennium, and otherwise found later in Old Assyrian glyptic). Even more significant is the possibility that the frequent use of a mirror image carving of the seals may have been introduced in order to reflect the Hurrian word order sequence, see *WZKM* 86 (1996) p. 68, n. 10; *Biblical Archaeologist* 60 (1997) p. 88f.

The chapter by MIRJO SALVINI on the *earlier periods of Hurrian history* (pp. 25–67) is a masterly contribution that combines with unique authority history and philology. Of the many original contributions, one deserves special attention. The two most recent editions of the Atal-shen's bronze tablet (*FAOS* 7, 1990, p. 383 and *RIME* 2, 1993, p. 461 f.) inexplicably omit one line of the text. Salvini not only points out the omission, but also provides a new photograph, autograph and commentary of this line, written on the edge, and collated against the original (pp. 36–38). The line gives the name of the bronze-caster who made the tablet, an individual named Šaum-šen. His qualification is DIM₂, which Salvini understands as meaning “the maker” (of the tablet), rather than “the architect” (of the temple described in the inscription). This is particularly significant, because such details are not within the tradition of ancient artistic production. A possible parallel, from the Old Akkadian period, is found in an inscription of Rimuš (*FAOS* 7, C1 = *RIME* 2, E2.1.2.4). In the third colophon, the text reads BUR.[GUL] Lu₂-Da-mu: as I have suggested in the Hallo Volume (M. E. Cohen *et al.*, *The Tablet and the Scroll*, Bethesda 1993, p. 60 with n. 8), this may be taken to refer to the “engraver,” i.e., the individual who carved in stone the long cuneiform text of what I understand to have been a single monumental display of five different inscriptions of Rimuš. This supports Salvini's interpretation: together, Lu-damu and Šaum-šen offer us an important witness of the significance attached to the carving of cuneiform on a medium other than clay. (See also the role of Šarruwa in the Idrimi inscription as mentioned by DE MARTINO p. 77, n. 44.)

Two chapters deal specifically with the *later periods*. – STEFANO DE MARTONIO's overview of the history of the kingdom of Mittani is quite extensive (pp. 68–102) and has the distinct merit of presenting a complex set of facts in a very lucid synthesis. Some of the new evidence will add even more to a definition of Hurrian identity in this period, in particular the archaeological excavation at Tell Hamidiya and the Hurrian glosses in the archive discovered at Qatna.

MIRJO SALVINI devotes a full chapter (103–113) to the Hurrian presence in Alalakh and Ugarit, with some interesting observations about the spread of Hurrian language and ethnicity (of particular significance in the letters from northwestern Syria found recently at Qatna is the use of Hurrian verbal forms in an Akkadian context, which is a strong marker of Hurrian being used as the primary spoken language). The strong conservative trend in onomastics noted for Hurrian names like Atal-šen (p. 105) may be compared to an equivalent trend in Semitic names, since the last king of Ugarit bears the name Hammurapi. It is in this chapter that we find (pp. 106–110) a good description of the important musical texts from Ugarit, that gave the notation for a Hurrian hymn. I would only give more prominence in this section to M. Duchesne-Guillemin's work (most recently republished in *Monumentum Marcelle Duchesne-Guillemin*, Louvain 1999, and also available online at the urkesh.org site) – see for instance her interpre-

tation of *uš-ta-ma-ri* as “thrill,” which is not too dissimilar from H.-J. THIEL’s understanding of this term (accepted by SALVINI) as a repeated note.

In the chapter on *religion* (pp. 114–170), MARIE-CLAUDE TRÉMOUILLE offers a comprehensive review of the subject, with an aim towards elucidating what is specifically Hurrian as distinct from Mesopotamian. For instance, she suggests (p. 126) that the tendency to use epithets as divine proper names (“the one who speaks righteously,” “the one of Kumar,” etc.) may be considered a specific Hurrian trait. As a contribution to her effort, I would like to cite here two additional elements based on Urkesh material (which were not available to her at the time of writing). The first is an important jar decorated with three snakes (and scorpions) in appliqué on the outside of the shoulders and rim, with the head of the snakes protruding over the rim in such a way that they appear to be peering inside the jar (the jar is now published in S. Bonetti, *Gli opifici di Urkesh. Urkesh/Mozan Studies 4*. Bibliotheca Mesopotamica 27, Malibu 2001, Fig. 6:11 and Ill. 6:9–10, 7:9). Even though this jar was not found in a temple context, I wonder if it may not be considered as an *altanni*, which TRÉMOUILLE describes (p. 147) as being used in divinatory rites in which the movements of snakes (or snake-like fish such as eels) were observed when immersed in water. The position of the appliqué snakes along the jar rims would have provided a point of reference in defining the precise scope of the animals’ movements within the jar. – The second element in favor of a specific Hurrian nature of the gods is the possibility that the mention of “Nergal” in the royal inscriptions from Urkesh may in fact be a logogram for Kumarbi. The use of logograms for Hurrian words is of course no surprise, and in fact in the Hurrian text of Tish-atal we have ^dUTU clearly standing for the Hurrian *Šimigan* (since it is written with the phonetic complement ^dUTU-ga-an). Similarly, the title of king Tupkish in the legends appears as either *endan* or LUGAL. The chthonic nature of Kumarbi is acknowledged (see TRÉMOUILLE, p. 141), as of course is the case for Nergal, and in the context of the Ullikummi myth the chthonic dimension may possibly be linked to a specific understanding of Kumarbi as representing the magma (from which issues Ullikummi, the lava that turns to basalt). If so, we would have in the two inscriptions of Tish-atal and Atal-shen *prima facie* evidence for a specific cultic setting (which in the case of Tish-atal may be linked with Temple BA excavated at the top of Tell Mozan) in honor of a chthonic deity whose character is quite at variance with what is otherwise common in Mesopotamia. It should be noted that the equation of Kumarbi with Dagan is late (TRÉMOUILLE, p. 140) and most likely secondary.

A second important aspect of Hurrian culture that is well treated in the book is the chapter by PAOLO EMILIO PECORELLA on art. It is a relatively brief (pp. 349–365) but very insightful contribution to a thorny topic that has attracted much attention in the literature, and it deals quite directly with the issue raised earlier about the very identity of the Hurrians. The author is rightly cautious in his assessment of the possibility of setting up a stylistic canon that may properly be called Hurrian, and warns against the “forsennato desiderio” (p. 360) of seeing Hurrian presence far and above where it can be legitimately recognized. The fluidity in the rendering of animal bodies, in particular the lions of Tish-atal and of Tupkish, are proposed as a possibly specific Hurrian trait.

The 124 pages of *grammatical and onomastic analysis* by MAURO GIORGIERI are a jewel of conciseness and richness, forming as they do an exhaustive and very lucid treatment of a difficult subject. The author brings a fine linguistic sense to an analysis which is at the same time fully controlled philologically. An important feature is the relatively extensive treatment of the syntax, and one cannot fail to appreciate the care with which the vast syntactical documentation is glossed so as to show the precise func-

tion of each phrase element. It is impossible to do justice to his treatment in this review, nor do I have the competence. But I would like to mention at least one point of detail. GIORGIERI's reluctance to accept the term "anti-passive" (p. 250 f., with n. 220; see also p. 285), and his preference for "de-transitivizer" is well justified. To support his line of argument, one may consider ergativity and transitivity as two contrasting ways of treating a two-case construction. Ergativity favors the first case, in the sense that the first case is loaded with a marker pointing to the second: in *`alli Lubadag=až šagr=o=in* "him Lubadag may protect" the subject Lubadag is loaded with the ergative morpheme *až* that points to the object *`alli*. ("First" and "second" case refer here to a logical sequence, not to word order.) With an example that uses English categories, one might say *I-him see, he* for "I see him": *I-him* represents the ergative, i.e., the case of the subject that points to the object, while *he* (the object) remains unmarked. The proper English version is of course *I see him*: since English is a transitive language, the first case (the subject) is not marked with a built-in pointer to an object, rather the subject and object are individually marked with the nominative and accusative case respectively. We can say then that ergativity is an asymmetrical two-case system that privileges (or overloads) the first case, whereas transitivity is a symmetrical two-case system that distributes evenly the markers between the two cases. The so-called anti-passive reflects a situation in which the object of a transitive verb is deleted (the examples quoted by GIORGIERI, p. 251 f., seem to be all lexical deletions). In this case, the subject is appropriately *not* in the ergative case, because it does not point to an expected object. Using again English categories, we would say *I see* (meaning "I understand"), and not **I-it see*: the object is deleted, and thus the verb appears to be "pseudo-intransitive" (the other term that can be used to refer to the anti-passive).

Two chapters deal with *specific texts*. The one by STEFANO DE MARTINO on the "Song of Liberation" gives a thoughtful analysis of the bilingual found at Boghaz-köy, with a translation of several key passages. What emerges clearly is the Hurrian dimension of the text. It is not only the fact that the original must have dated back to the beginning of the second millennium and that it was written in Hurrian, but also the emphasis on themes that we can recognize more and more as specifically linked to Hurrian landscape and customs, such the role of the chthonic deities (see esp. pp. 302–9) or the importance of the hearth as the central symbol of civic identity (p. 313; the hearth reminds us of the andirons frequently found in private houses). The fable about the smith as maker of a copper vessel (p. 317 f.), with the distinct emphasis that it places on the relevance of the manufacturer, may be seen as reflecting the interest in retaining the attribution of the craftsman as in the case of Šaum-šen briefly discussed above.

BÉATRICE ANDRÉ-SALVINI and MIRJO SALVINI present an edition of a recently discovered (1994) trilingual lexical text (S^a), with a new photograph that accompanies the text. It may be appropriate to remember that the first example of the presence of Sumerian lexical lists in a Hurrian context in the Urkesh tablet with an extract from the LU E series, found in the service wing of the Royal Palace (about 2250 B.C., publication by the reviewer forthcoming in *JCS*) – in which case the text is monolingual (Sumerian). Most interesting is the commentary in which the two authors highlight the impact of the new discovery: they describe in detail the range of improvements that the readings make possible in our knowledge of Hurrian lexicography. In one case (p. 343 f.) the beneficiary is the Akkadian lexicon, since the Akkadian expression *mahiru damqu* is translated with a Hurrian expression that refers to "light" – suggesting the translation "a clear price" rather than "a good price" (as would normally translate the expression). This would refer to a concern for the need, otherwise often voiced in Mesopotamian contracts, to avoid recriminations after the sale, with regard for instance to possible encumbrances that might obscure the title of the goods sold.

One more treatment of textual data is found in a technical chapter by NEDA PARMEGIANI, which presents in very clear terms the status and ultimate goals of the *digitation of Hurrian texts* undertaken in conjunction with the publication of the “Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler.” It is an important project, conceived in support of the publication on paper, with some very wise editorial decisions, such as retaining a fully ASCII structure for the primary input. This will facilitate the transfer of the data to other systems of coding and protocols of analysis. The data bank will serve the purposes of higher level interpretation, and in particular of distributional analysis (“metodo combinatorio”, p. 374) which only the computer can make possible for a vast amount of data such as is contained in the Hurrian Corpus. The chapter is tantalizing for what it promises – a promise that we trust will be fulfilled as a follow-up to all the wealth of information and insight that this volume already offers us.

Giorgio Buccellati – Los Angeles

GERNOT WILHELM (Hrsg.): *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie* Würzburg, 4.–8. Oktober 1999, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag 2001, XXIV, 759 Seiten, 18 Tafeln (ISBN 3-447-04485-3).

Der vierte Internationale Kongreß für Hethitologie schien zunächst unter keinem guten Stern zu stehen. Geplan für Bochum von E. Neu, mußte nach dessen schwerer Erkrankung, die am 31. 12. 1999 zum unzeitigen Tode führte, kurzfristig umdisponiert werden. Es ist das große Verdienst von G. Wilhelm, daß er eingeschungen ist und den Kongreß im Oktober 1999 in Würzburg abhielt. Durch die Publikation der Akten, Erich Neu in memoriam zugeeignet, ist nunmehr ein würdiger Abschluß erreicht. Der stattliche Band vereinigt insgesamt 64 durchgehend gewichtige Beiträge in sich, – eine Zahl, die nicht erlaubt, eine detaillierte Einzelbesprechung zu geben, die jeden Rahmen sprengen würde.

Auf p. 1–11 findet sich der Eröffnungsbeitrag von E. Neu „Hethitologie heute“, der einen guten Überblick über Stand und Aufgaben des Faches gibt, leider nicht mehr, wie geplant, um Fußnoten erweitert werden konnte. Der in den Beiträgen behandelte Zeitraum erstreckt sich von der altassyrischen Zeit (V. Donbaz, *Some Recently Discovered Kārum 1-b Tablets and Related Observations*, p. 106–114, und – bezüglich der Diskussion um die Lage von Zalpa besonders wichtig – V. Müller-Karpe, *Zur frühhethitischen Kultur im Mündungsgebiet des Maraššantija*, p. 430–442) bis in die Eisenzeit (R. Gusmani, *Altphrygisches*, p. 161–166, und E. Laflı, *Geschichte und Perspektiven der archäologischen Erforschung des eisenzeitlichen Kilikien*, p. 308–325).

Schwerpunkte des Bandes bilden zahlreiche Beiträge zu Geschichte und Fragestellungen der Sprache der Hethiter, wobei angemerkt sei, daß eine Klassifizierung unter einem schwerpunktmäßigen Gesichtspunkt den meisten Beiträgen natürlich nur bedingt gerecht wird, da e.g. Beiträge zur Historie ja auch von Texten ihren Ausgang nehmen oder Beiträge zum Lexikon die Realienkunde mitberücksichtigen. Bezüglich der Geschichte der Hethiter als relevant einzustufen wären S. Alp, *Das Hieroglyphensiegel von Troja und seine Bedeutung für Westanatolien*, p. 27–31; A. M. Dinçol, *Ein interessanter Siegelabdruck aus Boğazköy und die damit verknüpften historischen Fragen*, p. 89–97; B. Dinçol, *Bemerkungen über die hethitischen Siegelinhaber mit mehreren Titeln*, p. 98–105; D. Hawkins, *Urhi-Tešub, tuhkanti*, p. 167–179; S. Heinhold-Krahmer, *Zur Diskussion um einen zweiten Namen Tuḫaliyas IV.*, p. 180–198; Th. van den Hout,