

**Mouton, Alice / Rutherford, Ian / Yakubovich, Ilya (Hg.):** *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean.* Leiden/Boston: Brill 2013. VII, 604 S. m. Abb. 8° = Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 64. Hartbd. € 192,00. ISBN 978-90-04-25279-0.

Besprochen von **Gary Beckman:** Ann Arbor / USA  
E-mail: sidd@umich.edu

<https://doi.org/10.1515/olzg-2018-0007>

Spurred by the work of David Hawkins, particularly his masterful edition of the “Neo-Hittite” Luwian inscriptions (*CLHI I*), as well as by the collective volume *The Luwians*,<sup>2</sup> a conference was held in Reading in June 2011 on the language, history, and archaeology of the “other” major people of Late Bronze and Early Iron Age Anatolia.<sup>3</sup> This volume presents the proceedings of that gathering: nineteen essays (all in English) plus an introduction by the editors. As is to be expected, the contributions vary in quality, and while most focus on the cuneiform cultures of the second millennium, a number deal primarily with the interaction of the later speakers of Anatolian languages with their Greek neighbors.<sup>4</sup> I will comment here on those that most caught my attention as a Hittitologist.

In his article, David Hawkins presents what is essentially a review of Ilya Yakubovich’s revised dissertation,<sup>5</sup> taking issue with the latter’s challenge to the received view that the far west – a region referred to as Arzawa during later Hittite history – was the original home of the Luwians in Anatolia. A key piece of evidence here is the replacement of the geographic term “Luwiya” in § 19 of the older manuscript of the Hittite Laws by “Arzawa” in a later copy. Hawkins demonstrates that Yakubovich’s attempt to dismiss this equation is based upon a series of misunderstandings of modern commentators on the damaged ancient tablet.<sup>6</sup>

Stephen Durnford presents a discussion of ethnonyms in ancient Anatolia, concentrating on *Luwi(ya)*. He claims that the use of the determinative URU, “settlement,” with this term despite the fact that no town Luwi(ya) is attested, shows that the Hittite scribes recognized the Luwian region as a “full polit[y]” (p. 48).<sup>7</sup> This is disproven by their regular usage of (KUR) URU *Kaška* for the territory of their troublesome northern neighbors, who definitely belonged to a pre-state society. The Hittites referred to their own polity as */Hattusas (utne)/*, “(Land of) Hattusa,” written (KUR) URU *Ḫattušaš/Hatti*.<sup>8</sup> That is, the state could be given the same name as its capital city. From this very frequently encountered sequence of signs arose the scribal practice of regularly prefixing names of political entities with KUR URU; thus KUR URU *Mizri*, “Egypt,” or KUR URU *Kaška*.

It has often been maintained that by the time of the Empire period, Luwian had become the dominant tongue in Hatti, with Nesite (Hittite) relegated to a language of administration.<sup>9</sup> Mark Weeden approaches this matter through an analysis of the Luwian and Hittite onomastica as represented by the Hieroglyphic seal impressions. After observing that the corpus of names presented here does not correspond very closely to those documented in the cuneiform texts,<sup>10</sup> he determines the linguistic affinity of these personal names, demonstrating that the Luwian monikers greatly outnumber the Hittite (p. 83). This, along with the increasing number of Luwian lexemes and even grammatical formants found in Hittite documents of the thirteenth century, suggests that the state language was indeed losing currency as the vernacular.<sup>11</sup>

In the longest essay in the volume, Rostislav Oreshko argues for the existence of a “distinctive scribal school outside Hatti” (p. 388) employing the Hieroglyphic Luwian script, adducing a significant number of differences in the inscriptions of western Anatolia from those found in Hattusa and elsewhere in central Hatti (pp. 400 f.). He

1 J. D. Hawkins, *The Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions of the Iron Age* (Berlin 2000).

2 H. C. Melchert, ed., *The Luwians* (Leiden 2003).

3 Hawkins himself refers to this meeting and its publication as “another milestone in Luwian Studies” (p. 39).

4 See for example, the essays of Alan M. Greaves on the ivories excavated at the Artemesion at Ephesus and of Alexander Herta on Carians in Greek sources. For a list of all contributions, see the table of contents: [http://www.brill.com/luwian-identities#TOC\\_1](http://www.brill.com/luwian-identities#TOC_1).

5 *Sociolinguistics of the Luwian Language* (Leiden 2010).

6 For his part, Yakubovich replies in an appendix to his contribution to this book (pp. 108–21). While not rebutting Hawkins’ explanation of the history of study of § 19 of the Laws, he now maintains that the

interchange of place names is not in any case crucial to his larger argument about the early distribution of Luwian settlement (pp. 112–14).

7 His mention of a “nation state” is anachronistic.

8 See A. Kammenhuber, *Alt kleinasiatische Sprachen* (Leiden 1969), 122–27.

9 See, for example, H. Klengel, *Geschichte des Hethitischen Reiches* (Leiden 1999), 309.

10 Of the 459 identifiable non-royal names on seal(ing)s, 269 are not found on tablets (p. 75).

11 In her contribution here Susanne Görke shows that the instructions newly composed for worship in the city of Nerik (CTH 671, 672) after its recovery by the Hittites in the early thirteenth century reveal extensive Luwian linguistic influence, in the form of *Glossen-keilwörter*.

even suggests that the Hittites were not the original “propagators” of this writing system. A conclusion on this question awaits the discovery of additional evidence.

In an art-historical contribution, Sanna Aro compares the sculpture and accompanying Hieroglyphic inscriptions from Carchemish dating to the Late Bronze to those of the Early Iron Age, demonstrating that while the rulers of the tenth-century Suhi-Katuwa dynasty made use of artistic traditions developed under the earlier Anatolian empire, they also adopted elements of local northern Syrian origin for their monuments. Within the strictly local context there is not much earlier material with which to approach this problem, since Late Bronze Age Carchemish seems not to have been located beneath the Iron Age levels excavated by the British (pp. 249–52). Nonetheless, on stylistic grounds Aro identifies a number of older relief slabs that had later been reused (pp. 252–53). Her most interesting idea is that the absence of cuneiform inscriptions in first-millennium Carchemish may indicate that her rulers had abandoned the use of this medium (p. 260).<sup>12</sup>

Finally, I mention two further archaeological pieces. Meltem Doğan-Alparslan and Metin Alparslan publish a newly-discovered Hieroglyphic inscription on a rock face near the village of Tanır in Kahramanmaraş province. The text is largely illegible, but the authors suggest that it is somehow connected to a stream or spring in the immediate vicinity.

And Nicolas Postgate and Adam Stone report on a structure uncovered during their excavations at Kilise Tepe in the Göksu valley in Cilicia. Dubbed the “Stele Building” after a large shattered stone found therein, the edifice was destroyed about the time of the collapse of Hatti (c. 1200 B.C.E.). It seems to have served primarily as an administrative center, but various foundation deposits—including an entire tortoise shell (p. 197) – suggest that it also had a cultic function (as a “Luwian Shrine”).

The editors are to be congratulated on the high standard of editing and proof-reading on display in this lengthy and often very technical volume. It should be acquired by research collections with a focus on the ancient Near East, but its exorbitant price argues against its purchase by individual scholars.

<sup>12</sup> Her assertion that the practice of adding inscriptions to reliefs on walls or rock faces “*must* be something that the Hittites *probably* took over from Egypt” (p. 239, my italics), is – besides confusing – uncertain, since one can easily imagine this development as an independent innovation.

**Bartl, Peter Vinzenz:** *Die Ritzverzierungen auf den Relieforthostaten Assurnasirpals II. aus Kalḫu*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 2014. XXVI, 191 S., 49 Abb., 3 Tab., 46 Taf. 4° = Baghdader Forschungen 25. Lw. € 79,90. ISBN 978-3-8053-4843-0.

Besprochen von **Eva-Andrea Braun-Holzinger**, Frankfurt/Main / Deutschland, E-Mail: ebraun@uni-mainz.de

<https://doi.org/10.1515/olzg-2018-0008>

Ritzverzierungen auf den Reliefs des Assurnasirpal II. aus dem Nordwest-Palast von Nimrud wurde seit ihrer Entdeckung einige Aufmerksamkeit geschenkt; so hat schon der Ausgräber Layard 1849 (Mon. Nin. I) viele in Umzeichnungen vorgelegt und beschrieben. Auf die Problematik dieser keineswegs getreuen Zeichnungen, auf die sich seither jegliche Behandlung dieser Verzierungen stützte, hat jedoch erst 1971 J. V. Canby (Iraq 33, 31–35) aufmerksam gemacht; 2005 hat Vf. (Iraq 67, 17–29) dann ebenfalls einige Zeichnungen Layards eigenen Neuaufnahmen gegenübergestellt und minutiös dargelegt, wie sehr Layard verändert und rekonstruiert hat.

Vf. hat nun, fußend auf seiner Magisterarbeit, eine Monographie vorgelegt, die zwar, wie er hervorhebt, bei weitem nicht alle Ritzzeichnungen berücksichtigen konnten; jedoch hatte er Zugang zu einem großen Teil der Reliefs in europäischen und amerikanischen Museen, konnte dort neue Umzeichnungen anfertigen, teilweise selbst fotografieren und auch auf schon vorhandene Photographien zugreifen. So ist es auch, wenn man diesen Band aufschlägt, zunächst der Abbildungsteil, der fasziniert: ausgezeichnete Detailaufnahmen und auch exakte Umzeichnungen. Gerne hätte man mehr als diese 46 Tafeln gesehen.

Tabelle I bietet einen sehr informativen Kompakt-katalog aller Orthostaten, der zwar weitgehend auf den Katalogen von J. Meuszyński<sup>1</sup> und S. M. Paley / R. P. Sobolewski<sup>2</sup> fußt, jedoch zusätzlich genaue Informationen zu den Ritzzeichnungen bietet.

In der **Kurzfassung** (S. XXIII f.) wird das, was üblicherweise in der Einleitung und der Zusammenfassung steht, sehr präzise formuliert: Fragestellung, Vorgehensweise und die wichtigsten Ergebnisse: Bei der Textildekoration stand nicht die realistische Wiedergabe im Vordergrund, sondern die Bedeutung/Wirkung der Ver-

<sup>1</sup> J. Meuszyński, Die Rekonstruktion der Reliefdarstellungen und ihrer Anordnung im Nordwestpalast von Kalḫu (Nimrūd) (1981).

<sup>2</sup> S. M. Paley / R. P. Sobolewski, The Reconstruction of the Relief representations and their Positions in the Northwest Palace at Kalhu (Nimrūd) II (1987).