Stephen Durnford presents a discussion of ethnonyms in ancient Anatolia, concentrating on Luwya(ya). He claims that the use of the determinative URU, “settlement,” with this term despite the fact that no town Luwya(ya) is attested, shows that the Hittite scribes recognized the Luwian region as a “full polity” (p. 48). This is disproven by their regular usage of (KUR) uRuKaška for the territory of their troublesome northern neighbors, who definitely belonged to a pre-state society. The Hittites referred to their own polity as /Hattusaššu (ume), “(Land of) Hattusa,” written (KUR) uRuHattusaššu/Hatti./ 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 uRuMišri, “Egypt,” or KUR uRuKaška.

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. Mark Weeden approaches this matter through an analysis of the Luwian and Hittite onomastics 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, 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 forms found in Hittite documents of the thirteenth century, suggests that the state language was indeed losing currency as the vernacular.

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, adding 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

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.


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

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

11 In her contribution here Susanne Götte shows that the instructions newly composed for worship in the city of Nesik (CTH 671, 672) after its recovery by the Hittites in the early thirteenth century reveal extensive Luwian linguistic influence, in the form of Glossenwörter.
even suggests that the Hittites were not the original "propaguators" 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).

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 Tamr 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.

---

12 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.