

Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie

Herausgegeben von
Walther Sallaberger
in Verbindung mit
A. Cavigneaux · T. van den Hout · U. Seidl

Band 96 · 2006



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

ein Fragezeichen beigelegt. Zu erwägen wäre auch ^mZu-ú ũ [^mPN; cf. ^mZu-u-uš HKM 72:34. Falls die Erwähnung der Stadt Ḫakmiš als Hinweis auf eine Datierung in die Regierung Ḫattušiliš III. aufgefasst werden kann, und die Z. 7'-8' (ABI ABI^dUTU-ŠI=za=ka[n GIM-an?]) LUGAL-izmanni eš[at] „[Als?] der Großvater der Majestät den Thron best[ig]e“) einen Hinweis auf dessen Thronbesteigung enthalten, so wäre der Text in die Zeit Šuppilulijamas (II.) zu datieren. Wenn die Z. 7'-8' im Sinne der *shelf lists* nur als Angabe des Inhalts der in Z. 4' erwähnten(?) Schreibtafel gemeint sind, so gilt das nur für jene Tafel.

THEO VAN DEN HOUT – Chicago

NAKAMURA, MITSUO: Das hethitische *nuntarriyašha*-Fest. (PIHANS 94). Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2002. xi, 439 pp. 19.5 × 26.5 cm. ISBN 90-6258-095-5. Price: € 65.00.

With this volume,¹ Nakamura presents a revised version of his Würzburg doctoral dissertation of 1993. It is especially welcome, as proportionally so few of the major festival complexes have thus far been presented in a comprehensive edition, and, as anyone who has studied any of the festival texts and fragments knows, bringing order to the chaos is especially difficult, due, among other reasons, to the near impossibility of ascribing smaller fragments to specific festivals, as they may be duplicate or parallel to passages of several different celebrations.

It is also therefore quite understandable that questions of redactional history, the relation between text and practice,² historical geography, etc. take a back seat to the primary philological treatment. These questions, and many more, can now be addressed on the basis of Nakamura's thorough philological edition. One might have expected, however, at least a brief analysis of the tablets' findspots,³ as this surely belongs to the most basic philological level.

The volume begins with a general overview of Hittite festivals and the history of research on the *nuntarriyašha*-festival. After discussing the manuscripts of the corpus, Nakamura addresses issues such as the name, length and locations of and participants in the festival. He then presents the entire corpus of outline tablets (Übersichtstafeln) in one chapter, leaving the tablets prescribing the individual days of the festival for a separate one. The transliterations, which are quite reliable,⁴ and translations are provided with

¹ Another review of this monograph, by A. Mouton, appeared recently in JANER 4.

² See e.g. the incipit to 5.T.I.(1).1 (pp. 172–174), where the normal royal titulature “Tudhaliya, Great King, ..., son of ...” is subject of the predicate “goes for the *nuntarriyašha*-festival to Arinna.” Also the relationship between the tablets of the *nuntarriyašha*-festival and CTH 568 and 629, both mentioned occasionally (KUB 25.27 partially transliterated pp. 76–77; see short notes on pp. 4, 69, 74 and 130 and *passim*) and discussed several times in other studies (e.g. Houwink ten Cate, Fs. Otten² [1988] 167 ff.), could be thoroughly analysed.

³ For starters, it may be noted that 11 tablets come from Temple I vs. 16 for both Bk. and HaH, the possible significance of which might have been explored.

⁴ I found not a single error in the transliterations of ũ.1 and ũ.3. If one really wanted to split hairs, one could note missing half brackets at several points as well as a couple of

copious philological commentary. Another chapter is devoted to a reconstruction of the overall course of the festival, while yet another painstakingly details each of its 34 days. A final chapter presents related texts, and this is followed by a list of abbreviations, a bibliography, an index to the texts presented, a comprehensive glossary and, finally, a schematic diagram of the geography of the towns visited and a table presenting the manuscripts preserved for each station on the journey.

The *nuntarriyašša*-festival represents an outlier of sorts, in that it is dubbed an EZEN₄ by the Hittite scribes, but is celebrated – assuming the indications in the colophon are to be taken literally – not at a set annual or seasonal date, but when the king returns from his summer military campaigns (p. 10). The logistical difficulties of celebrating a major festival in such an ad lib manner must have been enormous. Further, presumably the king did not return from campaign each and every summer, and the question thus arises if the *nuntarriyašša*-festival was indeed celebrated every autumn or not.

Nakamura stresses (pp. 11–12, 109) that the *nuntarriyašša*-festival touches only central Anatolian cities in close proximity to Ḫattusa, contra earlier assumptions. The references to north Anatolian cities, primarily Nerik, concern festivities for the deities of those cities celebrated elsewhere, in central Anatolian towns. Also emphasized in Nakamura's work is his assessment that the *nuntarriyašša*-festival is in many ways a mirror reflection of the spring AN.TAḪ.ŠUM-festival, especially in its itinerary (p. 14 and *passim*).

It is striking and of great interest that this massive text complex for a 34-day festival contains hardly a trace of Hurrian-Syrian influence (p. 13; cf. p. 131 sub 1.2.2 and p. 266), and this at a time (the 13th century, at least as far as the preserved recensions are concerned) which is often considered to witness a great potpourri of religious heterogeneity at Ḫattusa. While some mixing certainly did occur – indeed a great deal of it in some spheres – Nakamura's observation would seem to support an initial hypothesis that I have expressed elsewhere,⁵ i.e. that much of Anatolian religion would have remained largely regionally homogenous, the great conglomerate at Ḫattusa being in part a reflection of an archive that contained materials from many cultural spheres as opposed to an actual religious practise which incorporated elements from every corner of the empire.

Three more specific observations may be noted: (1) My collation of the photos in Mainz (no photo of KUB 51.15 available) confirms Nakamura's observations (p. 58) concerning EZEN₄.ŠAḪ vs. EZEN₄.G¹⁵TIR. To the list of attestations for EZEN₄.ŠAḪ can now be added KBo 47.282 r. Kol. 4'. (2) Though Nakamura dates 53/s to the reign of Tudḫaliya IV due to the name of the scribe, Anuwanza (p. 172), Klünger, StBoT 37, 1996, 38f., and van den Hout, StBoT 38, 1995, 242, have shown that Anuwanza was active also during the entire reign of Ḫattusili III and likely already during that of Muwatalli II. (3) It would be tempting, of course, to restore Gassul(iy)ajwiya in KUB 11.8+9 v 10' (p. 273) and Mursili]⁶ in the preceding line. Taki-Šarruma and Ašmu-Šarruma are restored in 13' and 14', and it should have been noted in the commentary that this is done on the basis of KUB 11.10, 8'–11'.

If one compares the corpus of texts and fragments treated by Nakamura with what is now available in S. Košak's Konkordanz at www.hethiter.net, one sees that there remains

places (e.g. Ṫ.1 i 33) where the restoration does not fit the break. One would also like to see the transliteration ^d10 rather than ^dU.

⁵ CRRAl 47 (2002) 427f.

⁶ In the photo I can see no trace of a L1 following the break.

further material for studies complementary to Nakamura's,⁷ which in turn highlights just what a fundamentally important reference tool the Konkordanz has become, as well as just how difficult and uncertain assigning smaller fragments to a particular festival can be. That said, it may be noted that:

KUB 44.37 was attributed to 626.V by Hoffner, JCS 28 (1976) 248, and Badali, TdH 14/1 (1991) 96, though the fragment duplicates Bo 3461, which in turn duplicates KUB 29.5 v 8 (see Rüster, Fs. Otten² [1988] 298 and n. 15), assigned to CTH 634 along with its parallel piece, KBo 45.56; IBoT 4.54 has been joined to KUB 11.34 (626.6.T.III.1.A); KUB 60.165 was joined to Bo 3604 by Popko and duplicates KBo 8.117(+)/KBo 44.137, both of which have been attributed to CTH 626; KUB 58.105(+)/KUB 59.41 (van den Hout, BiOr. 48 [1991] 584) duplicates KUB 58.45+KUB 59.42 (626.VI.6; s. Groddek, DBH 14 [2004] 72); Bo 4697 duplicates KUB 9.16++ and hence can be booked as 626.Ü.1.E; Bo 7689 duplicates KUB 9.16++, and Groddek has suggested that it might belong to the same tablet as KUB 59.2+; KBo 39.64 has been assigned to 626 on the basis of parallels with KUB 25.12 (s. Groddek, DBH 11 [2004] 85); KBo 39.66+KBo 24.85(+)/KBo 24.67 has been joined together and identified as a MH fragment of 626 (Groddek, AoF 25 [1998] 234f.; Nakamura, StBoT 45 [2001] 445); KBo 30.182 duplicates KUB 11.34 v 34ff. (626.6.T.III.1.A) and IBoT 2.101 v 11ff.; KBo 44.128 has been joined to KBo 11.73 (626.4.T.I.1.C; s. Groddek, AoF 31 [2004] 79ff.); I had suggested that KBo 46.181 might belong to the same tablet as KBo 34.161 (626.6.T.III.1.K), and this seems to be confirmed by collation of the originals in Ankara; 1166/v duplicates KUB 9.16++ I 8–13; 386/q has been joined to KBo 11.30 (626.6.T.III.1.B); KBo 14.32 (626.6.T.III.2.C) has been joined to KBo 46.135a and c; 121/s ii 1–9 duplicates KBo 30.50, 4'–14'; KBo 45.40 parallels KUB 11.34+IBoT 4.54 iii 4ff. (626.6.T.III.1.A); KBo 45.110 duplicates KBo 30.98+ Vs.' ii 10'ff. (626.4.T.I.1.E); KBo 45.38 parallels KBo 45.37 (53/s; 626.5.T.I.(2)); 104/t was joined by R. Strauß to 245/t and assigned to 626; KBo 45.36 parallels KUB 56.58 (626.VI.5); KBo 45.35 Rs. duplicates KUB 44.9 iv 5ff. (626.6.T.III.1.I); it has been suggested that KUB 20.94 and KBo 39.59 belong to the same tablet as KBo 21.78++ (626.18.T) and that Bo 68/91 and 68/231 belong to the same tablet as KBo 39.62 (626.VI.11; s. Groddek, DBH 11, 78ff.); and finally, Bo 3635, Bo 6818, 1282/u+Bo 69/435, 1285/u (tentatively), Bo 69/840, Bo 97/12, KBo 31.172 (Popko, AoF 30 [2003] 16 and n. 20), KBo 39.65, KBo 42.54 and KBo 45.41 (s. Groddek, DBH 11, 86) have been attributed to CTH 626.

Finally, a short note regarding modern publishing and formatting: As many a harried scholar has experienced in recent years, the camera-ready formatting of a manuscript, previously carried out by the publisher, has become in the computer age a task expected of the author, often with negative consequences for the appearance of many a publication, including the present one.⁸ It is, of course, in the interest of both authors and publishers

⁷ See, e.g. Nakamura himself in StBoT 45 (2001) 443–445.

⁸ Some are merely the occasional typographical errors, some are of a more systematic nature; cf. e.g. the orphaned lines and/or section headings on pp. 21, 65, 84, 115, 117, 139, 171, 186, 259 and *passim*; the widely varying spacing between the line numbers and the text on p. 31 f. and *passim*; the conflict between the diacritics and the paragraph dividers on pp. 77 and 241 and elsewhere; the very large spaces between words on p. 87, ll. 9–10 and elsewhere; the lack of justification at the right margin on p. 101; the end of the line of transliteration slipping into the duplicate text apparatus on p. 61; widely varying font sizes among the duplicate text apparatus on p. 17 and elsewhere.

to work together to avoid such aesthetic missteps, and it may be hoped that this matter receives more attention in the future.

These few quibbles aside, M. Nakamura can be commended for presenting a thorough edition of a large and difficult festival corpus, a genre that has thus far received considerably less attention than it deserves.

JARED L. MILLER – Mainz

MELCHERT, H. CRAIG (Hg.): *The Luwians*. (Handbook of Oriental Studies, Section 1: The Near and Middle East 68). Leiden/Boston: Brill 2003. xx, 388 S. : 48 ill. 16 × 25 cm. ISBN 90-04-13009-8. Preis: € 94,00.

Unsere Kenntnis des bronzezeitlichen Kleinasien ist in den letzten Jahrzehnten deutlich gewachsen. Immer klarer zeichnet sich ab, dass das hethitozentrische Bild einer differenzierteren Vorstellung weichen muss. Dazu trägt auch der vorliegende Sammelband bei, der eine schmerzliche Lücke schließt. Denn er vermittelt zum ersten Mal eine umfassende Übersicht zu Geschichte, Quellen, Sprache, Religion und Kultur der Luwier, die das spätbronze- wie früheisenzeitliche Anatolien entscheidend geprägt haben.

Eine Annäherung an das Phänomen der Luwier kann nur behutsam erfolgen – was der Herausgeber und Sprachhistoriker H. C. Melchert in seiner „Introduction“ (S. 1–7) zu Recht unterstreicht. Zwar bezeugen uns bereits die frühesten Primärquellen – die hethitischen Gesetze – die Existenz eines „Landes“ *Luwija <Lu-ú-i-ja>* im zweiten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend. Doch sie lassen offen, ob es sich dabei um einen geographischen, politischen oder ethnischen Begriff handelt. Bei unvoreingenommener Vorgehensweise bleibt so für den Sammelbegriff „Luwier“ beziehungsweise „luwisch“ nur eine linguistische Definition möglich: „With all due reserve we will here use ‚Luwians‘ effectively to mean ‚Luwian-speaking population groups‘.“ (S. 3). Die Vorteile dieser Definition liegen auf der Hand: Sie verknüpft den in vagen Kontexten verwendeten Begriff „Luwier; luwisch“ mit einem klaren materiellen Befund: den luwischen Sprachresten, die sich einerseits durch Verweise in den Primärquellen (vgl. heth. *lu-ú-li* „auf Luwisch“), andererseits durch linguistische Charakteristika eindeutig festlegen lassen.

Folgerichtig konzentriert sich H. C. Melchert im zweiten Kapitel „Prehistory“ (S. 8–26) darauf, die Vorgeschichte der luwischen Sprache nachzuzeichnen. Abgesehen von den unumstrittenen Eckpfeilern – z.B. die Zugehörigkeit der luwischen Sprachen zum proto-anatolischen Zweig der Indogermania – bleibt naturgemäß vieles im Dunkeln. So etwa die Frage, ob die Aufsplitterung des Proto-Anatolischen in einen nordostanatolischen (hierzu das Hethitische und das Palaische) und einen westanatolischen Zweig (hierzu das Luwische) auf kleinasiatischem Boden oder bereits in der früheren Heimat der Proto-Anatolier erfolgte. Es ist Melcherts Verdienst, diese Frage von S. 23–26 umsichtig zu diskutieren. Der Rezensent hält dabei das von Melchert präferierte Szenario (S. 26) für durchaus plausibel: In der Wende des vierten zum dritten vorchristlichen Jahrtausend treffen die Proto-Anatolier (also die Sprachträger des Proto-Anatolischen) aus dem Balkan über den Bosphorus in Kleinasien ein. Nach einer Phase gemeinsamer Sprachentwicklung im Nordwesten läutet die Abwanderung der Vorhethiter und -palaer nach Nordosten die sprachliche Differenzierung ein. Verbindlichere Aussagen lassen sich für das zweite Jahrtausend v. Chr. machen, wo Melchert anhand neuer Forschungsergebnisse zweierlei eindrücklich darlegt: Erstens erstreckt sich das luwische Sprachgebiet bereits im