

SONDERDRUCK aus:

ARCHIV FÜR ORIENTFORSCHUNG

Internationale Zeitschrift
für die Wissenschaft vom Vorderen Orient

Begründet von Ernst Weidner, fortgeführt von H. Hirsch

Herausgegeben von

Hermann Hunger, Michael Jursa und Gebhard J. Selz

Redaktion: Michaela Weszeli

BAND LIII

2015

Selbstverlag des Instituts für Orientalistik der Universität Wien
Druck: F. Berger & Söhne G.m.b.H., Horn

cette inscription, mais une répartition en deux groupes, NaplC11/A et NaplC11/B, fut nécessaire, étant donné que le groupe NaplC11/B apporte des indications topographiques quant à l'emplacement du mur d'enceinte, à l'inverse de NaplC11/A.

Le corpus de Amēl-Marduk compte six documents: une brique, quatre vases et une pierre de pavement, trouvée *in situ* dans le palais Nord (ou *Hauptburg*) de Babylone, AMPS 1. Ce pavé porte l'intéressante mention «*ekal Amēl-Marduk*», démontrant que le Palais Nord est utilisé après la mort de Nabuchodonosor, bien que l'on ne sache pas à quelle fin (privée ou administrative). En outre, le Palais Nord n'apparaissant plus dans les inscriptions royales postérieures au règne de Nabuchodonosor II, ce document revêt par conséquent une importance particulière.

Enfin, le corpus de Nériglissar compte neuf inscriptions: deux briques (dont l'une ne peut être ni transcrite, ni traduite), six cylindres et un vase du même modèle que ceux de Amēl-Marduk. Le principal apport provient du corpus de Nériglissar, qui compte trois nouveaux documents (trois cylindres) transcrits et traduits par R. Da Riva: le premier raconte les travaux sur le canal Libil-hegalla (NeglC22), le deuxième met l'accent sur la reconstruction d'un temple ou d'une ziggurat dédié à Šamaš (NeglC021), et le troisième est consacré à la ziggurat de Sippar (NeglC022). Auparavant NeglC021 ne pouvait être attribué avec certitude à Nériglissar, mais grâce au travail entrepris sur l'intertextualité, R. Da Riva propose qu'il se rapporte bien à Nériglissar, eu égard aux ressemblances que ce texte partage avec NeglC022 (p. 23-24 et 138-143).

Le traitement des textes est remarquable et très exhaustif, il convient de saluer le travail épigraphique, philologique et historique effectué par R. Da Riva. Cet ouvrage de précision se termine par de très utiles index, parmi lesquels un glossaire (sur le modèle de celui que l'auteur avait réalisé dans son ouvrage sur les inscriptions de Wadi Brisa en 2012)⁷, et est fourni avec un très précieux CD-ROM contenant les photographies de quinze textes étudiés.

On ne peut que remercier R. Da Riva pour cette publication, qui, par sa présentation raisonnée de la documentation et par son approche méticuleuse et originale des textes, deviendra un outil indispensable à la connaissance de l'époque néo-babylonienne. On ne peut qu'espérer que l'auteur livrera, un jour prochain, un volume dédié aux inscriptions de Nabuchodonosor II, et clôturera ainsi son travail entrepris sur les inscriptions royales néo-babyloniennes.

Paris.

Laura Cousin.

⁷) R. Da Riva, *The Twin Inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar at Brisa, AfO Beih.* 32, Vienne, 2012.

G.F. Del Monte, *Le gesta di Suppiluliuma. L'opera storiografica di Mursili II re di Hattusa*, vol I. XXXVIII + 197 S. Pisa, Edizioni Plus – Pisa University Press, 2008. € 18,-. ISBN 978-88-8492-610-4.

The edition of the Deeds of Suppiluliuma (DS) by H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10, 1956, 41-68, 75-98, 107-130, to whom Del Monte's volume is dedicated, was characteristically concise¹ and of extraordinary quality. By the appearance of this new volume in 2008, however, significant progress had been made in many aspects of the composition's reconstruction² and elucidation, fully warranting a new treatment. Del Monte's volume is in many ways a worthy successor to a very tough act to follow, even if some imperfections somewhat dampen one's enthusiasm.

Del Monte has succeeded in designing his edition to be a very usable and user-friendly reference work. The Introduction contains an overview of Hittite historiography and annalistic (vii-xvi) as well as a synopsis of the DS themselves (xvi-xx). It then continues with an extremely useful and well-considered catalogue of all texts and fragments of the DS as arranged in the volume (xx-xxvi), including, among other gems, cross references to Güterbock's numbering and photograph numbers from the archive of the Academy of Science and Literature in Mainz. A separate list provides the findspots of all fragments with known provenience (xxvi-xxviii), while a third summarizes all the preserved colophons (xxviii-xxx). These are followed by three equally valuable concordances linking the fragments as grouped in the volume with (1) the copy editions, (2) Güterbock's DS numbers and (3) Laroche's CTH entries (xxxi-xxxiii). Following the text treatments themselves is an exhaustive glossary (pp. 167-197), which even includes preverbs with the verbs, the only significant drawback of which is its listing of entries according to their edition numbers rather than their numbers in the volume at hand, so that once one finds the sought after attestation, one must then search in one of the concordances at the beginning of the book before one finally lands at the text in question.

The text edition itself is also presented in an exemplary format. The first five chapters treat the primary texts of the DS grouped according to the main events and/or theatres of action within them. A sixth chapter treats the isolated and dubious fragments, a seventh and final chapter those fragments narrated in the first person and therefore assumed to represent the bitterly fragmented annals of Suppiluliuma himself as opposed to the DS composed by his son Mursili II. The texts themselves are presented

¹) It included, e.g., indices of Personal and Geographical Names but no glossary.

²) Košak's online *Konkordanz* (<http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/HPM/hethportlinks.html>, Version 1.7, May 2010), e.g., lists no fewer than 49 fragments not included in Güterbock's edition.

in each chapter in isolation and again in *partitura*,³ the latter format offering the transliterations on the *verso*, the translations on the *recto*, all greatly appreciated features.⁴

Areas that could have been improved upon are above all the unsettling number of errors and inaccuracies and a tendency to obsequiously follow previous treatments, primarily Güterbock's understandably authoritative work, rather than approaching the texts in an unencumbered fashion. A number of suggestions and corrections are therefore offered here, touching first on points where a reassessment of Güterbock's edition would have been in order, followed by further suggested readings and corrections.

Del Monte follows previous treatments in assigning fragments to the (beginning of the) DS, *inter alia*, on the basis "alla espressione, tipica della Gesta, 'le truppe nemiche furono sterminate in massa'" (p. 1). This is hardly robust grounds for such a determination, however, as a glance at the entry *pangarit* in CHD P, 87f., makes clear. The fact that the phrase occurs often enough in the DS and therefore may be seen as "typical" of it, certainly does not allow the conclusion that any given fragment containing the phrase should be attributed to the DS. He recognizes (p. 2, n. 5), e.g., that Güterbock's restoration of I.F (KUB 23.2) is highly doubtful, but instead of striking it from the DS as should be done, it is included as if it witnessed an otherwise unattested prologue to the composition. At best it should be relegated to the "frammenti isolati e dubbi" of Ch. VI.⁵ Del Monte also attributes KUB 14.22 (p. 4f.) to the beginning of the composition (I.C), though there seems to be no reason to do so. Arziya (obv. 8'), e.g., cannot serve as grounds for the attribution, as the only other (supposed) occurrence of Arziya in the DS, itself highly doubtful,⁶ is in IV.1.A ii 6, the 7th tablet; further, there is

³) Unfortunately, variants among versions are not highlighted in any way, and the variants of one version are chosen for the *partitura* with no indication of any reasoning behind the choice; see e.g., p. 32 at II.3.F 15' ([-aš-ma] vs. a-pu-u-uš-ma in II.3.G 11' and a-[pa-a]-aš-ma in the *partitura*; p. 74 at III.a.1.A 12' (without -kán) vs. III.c.1.C 5' (with -kán). Sometimes if two versions don't seem to agree, both are simply inserted into the *partitura* one after the other, such as on p. 34, where ^ux[]-^a-^a-[]-^a-^a-[]x[] at the end of II.3.G i 18' and ^una-aḫ-ḫu-ri-i[a in II.3.F iv 23' somehow become ^u[...] ^una-aḫ-ḫu-ri-ia in the *partitura*, though such is quite impossible at least in II.3.G.

⁴) If I may be allowed one quibble in this area, it would be the lack of line numbers within the translations.

⁵) The ascription of KUB 31.25 (IV.2) to the DS can likewise surely be questioned, but Groddek's, GM 218, 2008, 41, n. 27, arguments for eliminating it do not convince.

⁶) Though the Ar- in the copy seems clear, the photo casts doubt on the reading. And the copy and photo agree that the last sign cannot possibly be -i]a, but should rather be read -a]t, -l]a, -m]a or similarly (see already Güterbock, JCS 10, p. 92, n. 25). In fact, the traces of the latter two signs could well be read -g[a-mi]š, whereby the tails of the heads of the inset verticals would appear as horizontals; those traces following URU could perhaps be ^rKar¹⁷-, though if so, then they are set too close to URU. I suspect that we have here a writing ^{URU}Kar¹⁷-g[a-mi]š, whereby the Kar- was muddled, prompting the scribe to rewrite it at the beginning of the following line. Perhaps the writing KUR

no particular reason to assume that Kantuzzili in I.C, 6' should be a personage of the early part of the reign of Suppiluliuma rather, e.g., than the middle or latter part, in which case he might have been the same person as attested during the early part of Mursili II's reign. Similarly, there is no conceivable reason to include KUB 31.34⁷ (p. 7) in the DS, but, presumably because it was incorporated by Güterbock, it is by Del Monte as well. Güterbock undoubtedly included it because Tuttu (ii 6')⁸ occurs several times in the fragment that he had placed just before it (KUB 31.33), but even this tenuous link must be given up, since the latter is now considered to belong to the treaties with the Gasga, as Güterbock (p. 122) noted already among his *addenda* and *corrigenda*.⁹ In the translation of I.B Ro. I (p. 6) Del Monte reads Tudḫal]ija, though in n. 11 he gives convincing reasons why the restoration and reading are extremely unlikely. He follows Güterbock, though dropping his judicious question mark, in restoring KASKAL in II.1.A ii 3 (pp. 12, 24), making no mention of collation of photos or of the original, which might have dispelled worries about the trace in the copy that hints at a vertical and therefore speaks decidedly against the reading. Del Monte restores [ZI]-IA in II.1.A ii 4 (pp. 12, 24), again omitting Güterbock's question mark, though restoring [EN]-IA as in the previous line would surely be more convincing. Following Güterbock (see also *GrHL* § 22.6), Del Monte translates II.3.F iv 26'-28' // II.3.G i 22'-23' as "Il giorno dopo mio padre muove (con i carri) giù da Tiwanzana nella regione e alle spalle lo sostengono i suoi aurighi con 6 tiri di cavalli" (p. 35), but EGIR-an-na-an ... ḫarzi can hardly be understood as "it/they supported him" and seems otherwise to be unattested as such (HW² A, 160a; H, 286b; HED A, 91, zu EGIR-pa-ma GN ḫarta; HED H, 145, 153, zu KBo 4.4 iv 29-31). Perhaps one should understand, "In the [morn]ing, though, my father drove from Ti[(wanzana down)] into the [(country)], and thereafter [(his charioteers)] and six teams of horses held it (i.e. the city)." Also grammatically sound would be "and his [(his charioteers)] and six teams of horses held him (i.e. Suppiluliuma) back," but this would be contextually quite unexpected. Del Monte adopts wholesale Güterbock's rather adventurous restorations of III.a.2.A i 23-31 (p. 53, 60f.), but these can be regarded as speculative at best, as Güterbock himself warned,¹⁰ even quite unlikely. In fact, unfortunately, some items

⁷URU Kar-ga-miš URU Kar-ga-miš in l. 9 (of the Vorlage) influenced the copying scribe, all of which remains very hypothetical. That Arziya here would also be geographically odd is noted by Richter, CDOG 6, 2008, 191, n. 66.

⁸) The piece should probably be labelled sjh. (e.g., KI in l. 4'), not jh. as in the *Konkordanz*.

⁹) In addition to the attestations noted by Laroche, *Les noms des Hittites*, 1966, 192; *Hethitica* 4, 1981, 46, also in KUB 56.13 Vo 9; HKM 98 Ro 12; HKM 100 Vo 18; HKM 102 Ro 10; HKM 103 Vo 30; HKM 106 Ro 4; KBo 31.50 Vo III 7; KBo 31.74 Ro 10; KuSa I/1 3 Vo 9; KBo 50.63 Vo IV 10', 12'; KBo 50.64 r. 2'[-; KBo 50.67 Ro II 25']; KBo 50.70 r. 3'; Bo 86/299 IV 40. Thanks are due to M.-C. Trémouille and M. Marizza, who have selflessly shared their prosopographical indices, the former's available at <http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetonom/>. I would also like to thank Boaz Stavi, who kindly shared with me a number of observations on Del Monte's volume.

¹⁰) Del Monte's (p. xxxii) assignation of the fragment to CTH 236.2 follows Laroche, but this is no longer current; see *sub* CTH 140 in the *Konkordanz*.

¹¹) "Free restoration" (p. 80, n. 4); "Restorations in 24-31 are tentative" (n. 6).

even suggest that Del Monte has often enough simply copied Güterbock's transliterations, giving them little further thought, such as *pi-ra-an-pa-ra-an* in IV.1.A ii 31 (p. 88 and glossary, p. 178), which echoes Güterbock's (p. 93) "*pi-ra-an-pa-ra-an* (sic!)," apparently an oversight on his part, as there is a clear space between them visible on the photo. Obviously CHD P, 303b, where correct *pé-ra-an paran* is found, was not consulted by Del Monte either. In IV.1.A i 29 Güterbock's restoration *A-B[U-I(A ma)-ah]-ha-an*, followed by Del Monte (p. 100), must be abandoned in favour of *ma-az-za-aš-t[a nu-kán ma-ah]-ha-an*: first, *-kan* is required with *kuen-*, so that *A-BU/BI-IA* is already excluded for lack of space; moreover, the]x *ma-* in IV.1.E₁ i 1, which Güterbock (p. 91 and ns. 5-6) took for *-]A ma-* and which he restored accordingly in IV.1.A i 29, is more likely to be read *[nu-ká]n⁷ ma-[ah-ha-an*. (Neither can *A-B]I-IA-ma* in IV.1.C ii⁷ 1 be used to fill the gap, as it corresponds to the end of IV.1.A i 28.) In IV.1.E₃ iii 19 (p. 118) *pa-iš* is restored following Güterbock rather than *pa-iš-ta* as found in IV.1.E₃ iii 11 (p. 116). Following Güterbock *taninut* is restored in IV.1.E₃ iii 21 (p. 118), but this verb is never attested in the DS with the reflexive particle (see attestations in the glossary, p. 180) nor in HEG, s.v., nor in any attestation yielded by a search for "*d/taninu*" in the CHD and *GrHL* volumes. On p. 123 Del Monte, following Güterbock but dropping his question mark, translates "[siete venuti]" for the beginning of IV.1.E₃ iv 3, but *ú-wa-a]t-tén* would be much too short for the available space, assuming that the edge should be restored according to the relatively secure restorations of, e.g., *[UM-MA mH]a-* in 13 and *[ma-ah-ha-a]n* in 5.

A few further suggestions and corrections include reading (from the photo) *ú-wa-nu-u[n¹¹* in I.A ii 9' and *[nu] ÉRIN^{ME5}* in I.C, 12' (p. 4); *ke-e-ez-za-}aš}-ma-at*-š¹²* in I.B¹³ ii 8 (p. 5). In II.2.D i 16' (p. 14) read *NA-RA-A-RU*. Numerous brackets have been omitted in the transliteration of II.3.G (p. 21ff.),¹⁴ including *ᵀ[UTU UR]^U* in i 4', *nu-k[án]* in i 7', *[na]-an* in i 15', *Ti-[wa]-an-za-na* in i 20', *[pá]r-}i-i[š-ke-et* in iv 11', *pa-an-g[a]-ri-it* in iv 23', *A-B[U-I]A* in the *partitura* to II.1.A ii 2 and B, 5' (p. 24); *ku-it* rather than *ku]-it* in the *partitura* of II.1.A ii 7 and B, 11'. There is nowhere near enough room in the break for Del Monte's suggested *LÚ[KUR-ma-za p]d-* in II.3.F iv 37' (p. 20 and n. 16, p. 36f. and n. 59), even when one pulls 1651/c a few millimetres away from 1472/c and 1694/c as opposed to how it is joined to them in photos N13212-13214 (s. *Konkordanz*), assuming that the restorations of *ᵀUT[U UR]^UA'-ri-in-na* (32') and *m[a-a-a]n*

¹¹) This would speak against including the fragment in the DS, as 1st sg. verbs are unexpected; it could, of course, be a case of quoted speech, so that the possibility of the attribution cannot be entirely ruled out. On other grounds as well its ascription to the DS is quite shaky, as Del Monte notes (pp. 2, 4, n. 7).

¹²) As Güterbock also omitted the *-aš-* without comment, this presumably represents a further example of Del Monte's depending on his transliteration without consulting photos or even the published copy.

¹³) Several URUs and above all the KI in ii 11 suggest that one might want to date the fragment sjh. rather than jh. as in the *Konkordanz*.

¹⁴) Unfortunately this, as well as the mismatching of brackets in the transliteration *vis-à-vis* those in the *partitura* and the translation, is in fact an all too common problem throughout the volume. One also finds the occasional discrepancy between the reading in the individual transliterations and the reading of the same line in the *partitura*, e.g., in II.3.G i 31' on p. 22, *[nam-m]a²-an EGIR-pa* vs. *[HUR.SA]G²-an EGIR-pa* on p. 36.

(36') are correct and that they establish the spacing. A few overly ambitious restorations are to be found, such as "Il nemico di Arzawa" (p. 27), which is supposed to have transported the Gassgaeans to Washaniya. In II.3.F iii 6' (p. 28) read *ku-it-ki* for *ku-iš-ki*. One also often sees the bad habit of restoring text in the translation but no corresponding Hittite in the transliteration (e.g., p. 30f.).¹⁵ In II.3.G i 36' (p. 36) *m[a-ah-ha-a]n* would seem to be a good bit too long for the space available, and *m[a-a-a]n* is likely preferable. In the same line the reading *ša-a-ru⁷-w[a ar-ha] iš-hu-wa-iš* should be abandoned in favour of *ša-a-ru⁷ a[r-ha] iš-hu-wa-iš* since there is some space between *-ru⁷* and *a[r-* and since there is insufficient room for an additional *-wa*, which renders obsolete the discussions by Güterbock (p. 76b, n. i), CHD Š, 296a, and Del Monte (p. 37, n. 57). In II.3.F iv 37' (p. 36) there is no space for *EGIR-pa*, the reading in II.3.G i 31' far from certain, leaving perhaps *HUR.[SAG-an]* as the best restoration. In II.3.F iv 39' (p. 36) read *wa-a[l-h]u-wa-ar* due to lack of space for the *-ah-*. Read *[I]Š-⁷TU LÚKUR har-ni-in-ga⁷-an* instead of *[I]Š-⁷TU LÚKUR-ŠU⁷ h[ar-g]a-an* in II.2.D i 12' (p. 40); *hark-* "andare in rovina" can thus be struck from the glossary (p. 170) and Ünal's table, SMEA 24, 1984, 82, updated accordingly. In II.2.D iv 3 (p. 40) *nu pait* must indicate a phraseological construction and the translation should therefore begin "dopo questo"; "quindi", i.e. "daraufhin" (see now Rieken, *StBoT* 52, 2010, 217-239). Rather than *pa-an-[ga-ri-it* in II.2.D iv 9, "Quando mio padre [arrive in] forze" (p. 40f.), read *pa-an-[ku-un LÚKUR kuenta]*, or similar, since *pangarit* is consistently used for "the enemy died en masse" (sometimes "the enemy came", e.g., IV.4.A iv 14', p. 98), while *pankun* is used for the enemy in the accusative (see indices). As Boaz Stavi notes (pers. comm.), a reported conversation between two enemies as largely reconstructed in III.a.4 i 1-9 (p. 63) would be quite singular, so that Del Monte's restoration, especially considering that he wilfully reads against the traces (n. 26), is inadvisable. In III.c.1.A ii 20' (p. 78) and in the *partitura* read *nu-wa e-hu nu-wa ...* Del Monte's restorations of IV.4.A iv 9'-20' (p. 98) should be abandoned in favour of Groddek's, RANT 5, 2008, 111, more circumspect attempt. The second *nu-kán* in IV.1.A ii 10 (p. 106) is surely a scribal dittography and must be deleted, as seen, e.g., by CHD Š, 198a. It would have been better to indicate that **IT-TI** is erased at the end of IV.1.A ii 12 (p. 106) than to omit the *IT-TI* at the beginning of 13 (without any indication thereof), since this is a clear case of scribal aversion to separating an Akkadian preposition from its referent. Del Monte's reading of IV.1.A iii 31 (p. 114), *UD.[1.KA]M k[at²-ta*,¹⁶ cannot be correct. Following the crack¹⁷ are tails of two wedges, shown also in the edition, then traces of the head of a horizontal. The first wedge is

¹⁵) Another example is seen on p. 40f., where Del Monte transliterates merely *p[a-* at the end of II.2.D i 12' but translates "[Tutto l'esercito] nemico ...", obscuring the fact that Güterbock's restoration *p[a-an-ku-uš(?)]* (p. 63) is surely insufficient and that one would expect, e.g., *ÉRIN^{ME5} ŠU-TI* (cf. II.2.D i 6') as well. On the same pages Del Monte translates "[... del? Paese] Alto [...]" for II.2.D i 19, glossing over the fact that Güterbock's *[ŠA(?) KUR]* at the beginning of the line is far too long, leaving *[nu KUR]* as perhaps the only viable possibility.

¹⁶) Which, incidentally, becomes *UD.[1].KAM kat-[ta* in the *partitura*.

¹⁷) On either side of the crack on one photo are traces that would seem to represent the head of the numeral, probably a 1, but this is quite uncertain and may be just a function of the lighting of this particular photo.

presumably KAM, the second could conceivably be the tail of a KAM with the additional “BE” following the cluster of wedges (*i.e.* HZL 355, No. 6), but this is unlikely, as the variant is found nowhere else on this tablet. The first wedge could perhaps be a 10, but it would seem to be positioned a bit too far from the UD, even after correcting for the present gap between them. The second wedge is probably not the upper wedge of KAM, since, judging from several KAM in the preceding lines, one would expect to see some trace of the lower wedges. Maybe one should not even take for granted that a number stood here; perhaps it is an adjective for the day. On p. 117 alone, on which a mere 6 1/2 lines of translation appear, the following words should be (partially) bracketed, but are not: vin[to], [mio padre, avendo], tim[ore], av[vicinarsi], [tempio], pre[se], popola[zione]; unfortunately, this error rate is not exceptional in the volume. The ^{URU}ha-at-t[u- in IV.1.E₃ iii 15 (p. 116) is omitted from the *partitura*, and the translation given, which simply follows Güterbock, is doubtful, as one would presumably expect ^{URU}LU^{MES} ^{URU}GN if it were the subject of the verb *uwate-*; therefore perhaps ^{URU}ha-at-t[u-*ši-ia-az* NAM.RA^{MES}] / *ku-in ú-wa-te-et* (*cf.* ll. 13-14), “[and the captives] which he brought to Ḫatt[usa], ...” In IV.1.E₃ iv 1 (p. 122) one might consider [*am-mu-uk-w*]a-za š[u-me-e-e]š. At the beginning of IV.1.E₃ iv 3 (p. 122) [*za-aḫ-ḫi-ia-a*]t-tén would fit quite well, as would some spellings of *dameskatten*, *e.g.*, *dameš-ka₄-at-tén*, but it is surely wiser to leave the break as it is. It seems quite doubtful that [*ar-ḫa da-a*]ḫ-ḫu-un could fit into the space at the beginning of IV.1.E₃ iv 4 (p. 122); a tantalizing alternative would be [*ar-wa-a*]ḫ-ḫu-un, which also takes *-kan*, but it does not seem to be attested in the sense of freeing a vassal from an overlord. Read ^h[a-a-ni-MA rather than *-ma* in IV.1.E₃ iv 13 (p. 122). At the beginning of IV.1.E₃ iv 14 (p. 122) a restoration [*ŠA DAM BE-LI-NI a*]n-ze-el would seem not unlikely. In IV.1.E₃ iv 15 (p. 122) there is significantly too much space in the break for just DUMU.LUGAL, so Del Monte’s solution must be discarded. Güterbock’s suggestion, [DUMU.LUGAL-*wa*] would fit the space, but one would expect (-)*ma-an*, not *ma-a-an*, to follow, and there is far too much space for just (-)*ma-[a]n-na-aš*. Since on the photos there seems to be the trace of a horizontal before *-ma*, not shown on the copy, a restoration [DUMU BE-LI-NI]l-*ma-[an-wa-a]n-na-aš*, which indeed fits the space and traces nicely, should be preferred; *cf.* also usage in ll. 17, 19, 20 as well as CHD L-N, 142a. In IV.1.E₃ iv 16 (p. 122) one should presumably take seriously the *plene* writing *ma-a-an* (*cf.* simplex twice in 15) and treat it as a conditional rather than an *irrealis*, thus “But had there been a [son of ou]r l[ord] anywhere, would we have come to [an]other land **when we searched** for a lord for ourselves?” Rather than Del Monte’s *mi-iz-z[a-r]i-wa* in IV.3 i 10' (p. 124), the traces visible on the photos would seem to suggest *mi-i[z-r]i-wa* (see already Miller, ZA 98, 2008, 118); in any case, if the reading/restoration in l. 12' (*iš-ta-ma'-[aš]-šu'-un*) is correct, then there is certainly no space for *-z[a-* in 10'. As Groddek, RANT 5, 2008, 116, has shown,¹⁸ VI.a.9 (p. 154) duplicates II.3.D iv 9ff.

Typographical corrections include IV.4.B instead of IV.5.B on p. xxxi for *KBo* 22.9; III.a) 2.A, III.a) 2.B, III.a) 3 and III.a) 4 on p. xxxiii for 40.III.18.Aff.; instead of “padre” read “non-

no” on p. 7, l. 2 (I.B iii 12'); all the paragraph dividers have been omitted from II.3.G (p. 22); insert “mio padre” before “distrusse” in the second line of the translation on p. 33; in the translation of II.3.G iv 14'-23' (p. 39) begin a new paragraph following “Parkala”. On p. 83 at the end of the list of joins for Text 3, read *Bo* 7744 instead of *Bo* 7444. In V.1.A i 23' (p. 138) read ^{URU}Ha-, as in the translation.

Pointing out these shortcomings should certainly not overshadow the fact that Del Monte has contributed significantly to improvements in the reconstruction and understanding of the composition at numerous points. He suggests, for instance, a reordering of the fragments of Ch. II, the reasoning for which, based primarily on military and geographical considerations, is found on p. 9-11. He opts for assuming that II.2.E (KUB 19.10) represents the 4th tablet in the series, whereas Güterbock had treated it as the 3rd. This results, according to Del Monte, in a reading order II.1.B i, II.1.B ii // II.1.A ii // II.1.C, II.1.A iii, II.3.F iii, II.3.F iv // II.3.G i, II.3.G ii, II.3.G iv, II.2.D i, II.2.D iv // II.2.E i, II.2.E iv as opposed to Güterbock’s order II.1.B i (DS 9), II.2.D i (DS 10), II.1.A ii (DS 11) // II.1.B ii (DS 11) // II.1.C (DS 11), II.1.A iii (DS 12), II.2.D iv (DS 13) // II.2.E i (DS 13), II.2.E iv, II.3.F iii (DS 14), II.3.F iv (DS 15) // II.3.G i (DS 15), II.3.G ii (DS 16), II.3.G iv (DS 17). That II.2.E is the 4th tablet may well be correct, though the uncertainty of the reading of II.2.E iv 1' remains. Assuming that Del Monte is indeed correct, it seems that a further slight adjustment is advisable at one point. Instead of reading II.3.G i, II.3.G ii, II.3.G iv, II.2.D i, II.2.D iv one should read II.3.G i, II.3.G ii, II.2.D i, II.3.G iv, II.2.D iv. The reason is simple. Del Monte’s reconstruction assumes that II.3.G and II.2.D would both be a 3rd tablet in the series. If so, it is unlikely that all four columns of II.3.G should be read before the four columns of II.2.D, as in Del Monte’s reconstruction. And indeed, between II.3.G ii and II.3.G iv there is a gap of ca. 2 columns, into which the ca. 1 col. of text of II.2.D i would fit nicely. The ca. half col. of text of II.3.G iv would in turn fit comfortably into the ca. 2-col. gap between II.2.D i and II.2.D iv. The military and geographical consequences of the adjustment are unremarkable. After Suppiluliuma’s campaigns near Tuwanuwa and Ḫal- (p. 36f.), the campaign against Ḫayasa and the return to Samuḫa would have followed before the Upper Land is mentioned (p. 40f.). Only then come the escape of the Gaseans Takuri and Ḫimuili, Suppiluliuma’s advance upon Anziliya and the enemy attack on Parkala, Ḫatina and Ḫa- (p. 38f.).

Also important is Del Monte’s suggestion that the grandfather in the text, *i.e.* Suppiluliuma’s father, Tudḫal-*iya* III, was alive up through III.b.1 (Güterbock’s Frags. 21, 23), though the last certain reference to him is in II.3.F iii 38' (Güterbock’s Frag. 14). This, it seems to me, is supported even more by the *Ú-UL paimi=pat=wa* in III.b.1 iii 18' (p. 69) and above all by]x-wa *pāimi UM[MA* in III.b.2, 12' (p. 69; *cf.* II.3.F iii 9f., but also V.1.A i

¹⁸) His suggestion that *KBo* 50.14 joins KUB 19.10 still does not convince (see *KBo* 50, p. V, *sub* 14). AN.ZA.GĀR in 6' is only about half as long as the restorations in 3'-5', and his restorations in these 3 lines require that their content be squished into about the same space as available for *a-pé-el* in 5' and AN.ZA.GĀR in 4'.

18') than by Del Monte's restoration of *A-BI A-BI-]A* in III.b.1 ii 11 (p. 68). This would potentially compound the problem – if in fact Nibḫururiya = Akhenaton and if indeed Haremhab's ascension falls after Mursili II's years 7-9 (see Miller, *AoF* 34, 2007, esp. 273, n. 91, 277, 279 n. 117) – of a large portion of the DS describing only a few years toward the end of Suppiluliuma's life following the *taḫamunzu* affair (ca. 5 tablets for ca. 5-6⁷ years) while a similar or slightly smaller portion would describe the many years before the *taḫamunzu* affair (ca. 4-5 tablets for ca. 15+⁷ years). On the other hand, it is entirely uncertain where these fragments should be placed within the DS, in some cases whether they belong to the composition at all, so that any conclusions based upon them must remain extremely tentative.

One wonders if the mention of ships (G^{IS}MÁ^{H^{LA}}) in IV.1.E₂ ii² 10' (p. 110) might perhaps be linked to the occurrence of ships in Kp 06/154 Rs. 6' and 10' (Rieken, *Studia Asiana* 5, 2005, 121f.), a MH letter fragment from Kayalıpınar, likely Samuḫa. Though entirely speculative, the idea is enticing when one considers that (a) ships are not mentioned very often in Hittite texts,¹⁹ (b) even less in the context of war (12') and the king of another land (11'), and that (c) Suppiluliuma and his father Tutḫaliya III staged their reconquest of the Hittite heartland from Samuḫa.

Fragments IV.1.C and IV.3 show a very similar hand and other external features, and I suspect that they belong to the same tablet or at least stem from the same scribe. At first glance, though, there would seem to be a serious difficulty with the suggestion that they belong to the same tablet, namely, IV.1.C obv. certainly comes significantly before IV.3 contextually, but if they belong to the same tablet, IV.3 i would appear to come either before IV.1.C obv. if seen as col. ii, only slightly after it if IV.1.C obv. represents the top of col. i. The difficulty is easily resolved, however, when one realizes that the determination of obv. and rev. of IV.3 goes back to Otten's copy, *i.e.* *KBo* 19.45, which is provided with a "Vs." and "Rs. nicht erhalten." This is clearly a mistake, though, as the writing on the edge shows. Such writing on the left edge of a tablet is, as a rule, added when the tablet is placed obv. down, so that the bottoms of the verticals on the edge point toward the obv. As can be seen on the photos of *KBo* 19.45, however, the heads of the verticals on the edge are closest to the written face of the tablet, which therefore must be

¹⁹) From somewhat more than a dozen attestations, only five show ships in the pl.: *KUB* 31.79 obv. 10', 15', 19', a mh. letter that could conceivably be related to Kp 06/154 (s. Samuḫa in obv. 16'); *KBo* 12.38 iii 5', 7', a text of Suppiluliuma II concerning the conquest of Alašiya; and *KBo* 18.135 rev. 8' a jh. letter also mentioning Aḫḫiyawa; *KUB* 23.107 Rs.² 17', also a jh. letter, mentioning Piyamaradu (7'), your brother (12') and my brother (18'); *KBo* 41.5 Vs.² 8', a ritual fragment.

the rev. iv.²⁰ Hence, if IV.1.C and IV.3 indeed belong to the same tablet, there would seem to be (at least) two possibilities: If IV.1.C preserves the top of col. ii and the bottom of col. iii, as it would seem from the photos perhaps to be the case, then the scrap of text of col. iii, which seems to deal again with the Gasga, would probably have fit into the unwritten gap in IV.1.A following ii 46, which would mean that the text from IV.1.A i 41 through to ii 46+ would fill in the space between IV.1.C ii 9 and iii 1'. It does not necessarily seem, however, that the text missing from the gap following ii 46 in IV.1.A would have returned to the Anatolian scene, from what little can be gathered from the preceding and succeeding context and the hints from 1.E₂, which very partially fills the gap. The alternative, then, would be to assume that IV.1.C represents the beginning of col. i and the end of col. iv (which would thus lack a colophon); that the whole of IV.1.A i 41 to iv 15 precedes IV.3, which in turns precedes IV.1.C iv, suggesting that the scene switched back to Anatolia soon after the end of the *taḫamunzu* affair related in IV.3, as Groddek, *RANT* 5, 2008, 113f., has sought to demonstrate on related grounds.

Finally, I would like to tentatively suggest that *KUB* 19.7 (III.d.1) may indirectly join *KBo* 19.48 (V.5), with only a few millimetres. between them. If so, it would result in a colophon reading [DU]B.12.KAM / ŠA [mŠu-up-pi-lu]-ú-li-u-ma / LUGAL.GA[L UR.SAG] LÚ-na-an-na-aš. This suggestion must remain quite hypothetical, since there are so few signs preserved for the purpose of comparing scripts, and since the two pieces are stored in Istanbul and Ankara, respectively. Still, those few hints available would seem to speak for it, such as NA with the wedges aligned horizontally one next to the other (i 7', 8', 9', iv 3'), the Ú with 4-5 verticals (i 9', iv 2'), as well as the tails of the wedges stretching conspicuously up and to the right, the blocky triangular heads of the horizontals and the rather smooth surfaces of rev. iv. If this suspicion should prove correct, it would seem to increase the likelihood that this tablet 12 is indeed the last tablet of the DS, since the space in which one might restore Ú-UL QA-TI or NU.TIL is reduced considerably. Incidentally, due to the space between the preserved signs in the third line, it would also suggest that it, too, should be restored to include UR.SAG, as attested in II.2.E iv 3' and VII.1 iv 13'.

If this proposal turns out to be correct, it would also have some further implications for the reconstruction of the events of Suppiluliuma's career. *KUB* 19.7 is the only fragment – along with *KBo* 22.8, surely included in the DS merely because of its similarity to *KUB* 19.7 – in which Kinza appears in the DS apart from the narrative of the Egyptian attack on Kinza (pp. 108f.; IV.1.A ii 21, 23), said to have taken place shortly before the siege of Karkamiš, and again in Suppiluliuma's complaint to Hani

²⁰) This must be corrected also in my treatment of the joins (Miller, *ZA* 98, 2008, 118).

concerning the same attack (pp. 122f.; *KBo* 14.12 iv 3), all of which is recounted in the 7th tablet. KUB 19.7 also contains the only attestation in the DS for Nuḥḥašše. This further mention of, perhaps alternation with, Kinza and Nuḥḥašše would thus seem to belong to the very end of the composition and hence toward the end of the life of Suppiluliuma. This would thus constitute welcome, even if pitifully fragmentary evidence concerning the years between Suppiluliuma's conquest of the last Syrian outpost, Karkamiš, and the next available mention of Kinza and Nuḥḥašše, *i.e.* as part of the rebellions of Mursili II's 7th and 9th years. Apparently Kinza and Nuḥḥašše were worthy of mention sometime between the siege of Karkamiš at the time of the death of Nibḥururiya – be he Akhenaten or Tutankhamun – and the end of Suppiluliuma's life, however long this period of time might have been. Between the 7th and 12th tablets of the DS only the 9th tablet (V.1.B) and perhaps its supposed duplicate (V.1.A)²¹ can be securely situated; the other fragments attributed to this gap could belong almost anywhere. In any case, it now seems likely that the rebellion of Kinza and Nuḥḥašše assumed on the basis of the introduction to Mursili II's treaty with Duppi-Teššub of Amurru (Del Monte, *OA* 22, 1983, 231) may well have occurred very late in Suppiluliuma's reign, if indeed it is recorded here in the first column of the last of the 12 tablets of his Deeds.

With this volume Del Monte has provided the Hittitological community with a highly valuable resource for the study of the DS, for which he must be heartily thanked. The reader must remain mindful, however, of the high number of errors and infelicities and should not neglect to refer to the copies and photos while using the edition.

München.

Jared L. Miller.

J.G. Dercksen (ed.), *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old-Assyrian Period*. X + 251 S. Leiden, Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2008 (= *OAAS* 3, *PIHANS* 111). € 27,50. ISBN 978-90-6258-322-5.

Le présent volume regroupe la plupart des communications présentées à l'occasion d'un colloque organisé à Leiden en décembre 2005, dont l'intitulé est repris en titre de l'ouvrage. Il comporte, outre une brève introduction par l'éditeur J.G. Dercksen, onze articles substantiels, écrits par des spécialistes reconnus de la période durant

²¹) It is not at all certain that V.1.B iv 1'-6' in fact duplicate V.1.A ii 28"-33". The only certain correlation is *zi-ik-ma-* in 28"/1'; *I-NA KUR URUḪ[ar²- (30")* is likely not duplicated by *nu KUR URUḪar-ra-a[n² (3')*, not only because *Ḫ[ar-* in 30" is far from certain, but also because *I-NA* is surely not superfluous; also *KUR URUW[a-* (32") is not necessarily paralleled by *URUWa-* in 5', though this is less discomfoting.

laquelle le commerce assyrien fut florissant en Anatolie (XX^e-XVIII^e s. av. n. è.). Si l'essentiel des contributions porte sur les tablettes découvertes au *kārum* de Kültepe/Kaneš, le grand mérite de l'ouvrage est sa volonté de ne pas limiter l'étude au seul corpus paléo-assyrien, mais au contraire d'élargir les perspectives en s'appuyant sur les archives contemporaines ou très légèrement postérieures retrouvées en Anatolie et en Haute-Mésopotamie, ainsi que sur les textes hittites et l'archéologie. Cette approche multi-disciplinaire et trans-périodes s'avère particulièrement pertinente en matière de géographie historique, principal objet du colloque et logiquement au cœur de la plupart des contributions: pas moins de huit contributions sur onze, si l'on inclut l'article de P.M. Goedegebuure, qui grâce à l'analyse linguistique offre une stimulante proposition sur le peuplement anatolien au début du deuxième millénaire av. n. è. Seuls les trois derniers articles du volume s'éloignent de la géographie historique et proposent des études sur le droit (S. Démare-Lafont) et la société (C. Michel, G. Kryszat). En ce qui concerne les études de géographie historique, le partage est inégal entre les deux régions mentionnées en titre de l'ouvrage et qui en structurent l'organisation: l'Anatolie se taille la part du lion, avec cinq articles (ceux de M. Forlanini, G. Barjamovic, S. Dönmez/A.Y. Beyazıt, P.M. Goedegebuure et G. Wilhelm), tandis que la Djéziré (syrienne) est au cœur des trois articles qui ouvrent le volume (par K.R. Veenhof, J. Eidem et M. Guichard).

L'article de K.R. Veenhof [KRV], «Across the Euphrates» (pp. 3-29) est une étude détaillée des points de passage sur l'Euphrate, que les caravanes effectuant le trajet Aššur-Kaneš devaient franchir à l'aller comme au retour. Outre les documents comptables qui enregistrent les dépenses faites pendant le trajet (pour lesquels l'auteur rejette, à juste titre, l'appellation usuelle d'itinéraires), le passage du fleuve est mentionné dans plusieurs lettres paléo-assyriennes, tandis que les villes situées de part et d'autre de l'Euphrate se retrouvent en partie dans les archives de Mari et Šeḫnā. La logique qui prévaut à la constitution des différentes archives fait cependant apparaître des différences notables: certains toponymes de la Djéziré, fréquemment mentionnés dans les textes paléo-assyriens, sont inconnus des archives contemporaines de Haute-Mésopotamie, et réciproquement. Plus encore, les tentatives de localisation des différents toponymes antiques sur des sites modernes restent encore en grande partie hypothétiques et contradictoires, ce qui rend tout travail de synthèse particulièrement délicat. Pour illustrer son article, l'auteur propose une carte de la zone étudiée (p. 4), où sont reportés essentiellement des toponymes modernes. On regrette que celle-ci n'offre pas de visualisation des suggestions de localisation suivies par KRV pour les différents toponymes antiques, ainsi que des itinéraires retenus pour les caravanes assyriennes, ce qui aurait grandement facilité la lecture de l'article. On y trouvera une analyse des principaux points de franchis-