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John David Hawkins was born on September 11th, 1940 in Exmouth, Devon, as the eldest of the three children of John Alexander Sneyd Hawkins and Audrey Joan Spencer. His parents had met and married in India, where John Hawkins served as an officer in the Royal Artillery, and came back to England shortly before David’s birth. In 1948, John Hawkins, who had studied at Cambridge, bought a farm in Devon where David was brought up. It was an old and distinguished family which had a multiplicity of interests both cultural and practical. David’s friends were impressed by the casual and tolerant atmosphere which prevailed at home. In the Hawkins household there was no snobbishness or insularity; all sorts of people mingled and the vagaries of the British upper classes were looked at with affectionate irony. These qualities have been perpetuated by David, as anyone who has known him even briefly can readily confirm. Cats were a great source of amusement in the family and David expanded on his father’s eccentric way of talking to them. Probably David’s first linguistic achievement was the composition of the *Official Cat Phonology*, which is still put to use when stray cats occasionally visit his village house. There was no television in the Hawkins home, so reading aloud in the evenings in front of a roaring fire was the norm, preferably Dickens, Tolkien and Agatha Christie. The latter was a not-too-distant neighbour and David used to visit her and her husband Sir Max Mallowan, the renowned Mesopotamian archaeologist, from time to time. Could these visits have sparked his first interest in the ancient Near East?

David was educated at a local private school, Upcott House, and at the age of 13 he went to Bradfield College, Berkshire, a renowned school with a good tradition of Greek and Latin teaching. He excelled in his studies and took an active part in the school plays, especially Greek drama, for which Bradfield was famous. One of his teachers was the classicist David Raeburn, who authored a number of translations of the classics and books on the performance of classical plays. David has remained in touch with him ever since.

From 1958 David studied, on a state scholarship, Classics and Philosophy (Literae Humaniores or ‘Greats’) at University College, Oxford. He was lucky in his tutors: A.E. (Freddie) Wells for classical languages and literature, George Cawkwell for ancient history and P.F. Strawson and G. Paul for philosophy. His natural inclination was clearly for the linguistic and textual subjects and he finished that part of the course (Honour Moderations) with a First. He received his BA in 1962 and his MA in 1965.

From 1962 he worked for a postgraduate diploma in Western Asiatic Archaeology at the Institute of Archaeology in London. He studied archaeology with Seton Lloyd, history with Peggy Drower, Ancient Hebrew with Raphael Loewe and Akkadian with Harry Saggs and Donald Wiseman. He obtained his diploma with distinction in 1964 and won the Gordon Child Prize. By this time he had already switched his interests from Classics to the Ancient Near East, apparently under the strong impression left on him by the Gilgamesh Epic.

In 1964 he became a Research Fellow in Akkadian at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, and then remained in the Near and Middle East Department where he taught until his retirement in 2005. In 1993 he was appointed to a personal chair in Ancient Anatolian Languages. He also contributed courses in archaeology to the Institute of Archaeology where he became an Honorary Visiting Professor.
In 1993 David was elected a Fellow of the British Academy, and in 1998 a Foreign Member of the American Philosophical Society. Most recently (2009) his old Oxford college, University College, made him an Honorary Fellow. He served as the honorary secretary of the British School of Archaeology in Iraq from 1976 to 1986 and edited its journal *Iraq* from 1970 to 1995. Concomitantly he sat on the council and on the executive committees of the British School of Archaeology at Ankara.

In the 1960s David started to go regularly from London to Oxford to study Hittite with Oliver R. Gurney and there got involved in a seminar on the so-called Hieroglyphic Hittite inscriptions led by Leonard Palmer and attended, among others, by Anna Morpurgo Davies and Jill Hart; this is the subject on which he eventually focused and which he revolutionized. His friendship and scientific cooperation with Morpurgo Davies continues to play an important role in his life. In the country cottage at Minster Lovell near Oxford, which he shares with his life partner, Geoff Ryman, a well known writer, she and countless other friends and colleagues are always welcome for a good chat on professional matters and a hearty drink and meal. David’s culinary capacities are only surpassed by his scholarship, and as a devoted gardener he proudly makes use of his self-grown freshly picked vegetables in his perfect cuisine, which puts pay to the myth that there is no independent British cooking.

From 1965 onwards David traveled regularly to Turkey, Syria and Iraq in order to inspect Hieroglyphic monuments in museums and open-air sites. He immediately realized how inaccurate and incomplete the available drawings and publications were and consequently initiated an ambitious project of copying and obtaining good photographs of the entire corpus of inscriptions. This Sisyphean enterprise was crowned by the publication in 2000 of the three parts of his monumental *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Vol. I, The Iron Age Inscriptions*, exactly a hundred years after the pioneering enterprise of L. Messerschmidt’s *Corpus Inscriptionum Hettititarum*. He also played an instrumental role in the definitive publication of the Hieroglyphic text of the Karatepe bilingual by Halet Çambel as *Volume II* of the Corpus. A third volume in preparation will include *Addenda* to the Iron Age material, the Empire period inscriptions, and a general Signary, Glossary and Grammar of Hieroglyphic Luwian.

David’s enormous black briefcase containing the full documentation for the Corpus travelled with him everywhere and miraculously has never been lost or damaged even in dire situations (see H. Gonnet’s contribution to this volume). His idiosyncratic handwriting and neat hand copies can be traced back to two of his greatest talents, drawing and close scrutiny: 1. From his early days he developed an interest in political cartoons and for a while even contemplated turning this skill into a profession. 2. His talent for drawing is enhanced by a remarkable ability to notice even the minutest details and changes in other peoples’ appearance or outfit. Many a detail in an inscription or on a seal that went unnoticed by others has immediately been detected and recorded by David. His spectacular decipherment of the Karabel inscription, a western Anatolian monument which was previously visited by countless travellers and specialists, may serve as a notable example. He never gets tired of inspecting a worn down inscription in different lighting conditions, not even the hopeless Nişantaş rock in Boğazköy which he is about to publish shortly.

In tandem with his strenuous efforts to produce an accurate documentation of the Hieroglyphic materials, David is one of the greatest contributors to Anatolian philology, history and culture. Suffice it to mention here, as notable examples, the new interpretation of four wrongly deciphered signs in the early 1970s (in collaboration with Anna Morpurgo Davies and Günter Neumann) which brought about the elucidation of the language and the (re)unification of Cuneiform Luwian and Hieroglyphic Hittite (now Hieroglyphic Luwian); the discovery in 1975 of the signs for the negatives which had been confused with the relatives and which suddenly made sense of countless texts; the demonstration in the 1980s of
the continuity of the royal house of Bronze Age Carchemish in the Iron Age genealogy at Malatya; the
decipherment of the inscription at the sacred pool complex at Boğazköy in 1995 and its Underworld
connections; the refinement of western Anatolian geography in 1998 through the identification of the
figure depicted at Karabel as a king of Mira. Recently he has been working on the spectacular discovery
of the Aleppo citadel inscriptions and their far-reaching historical implications. As anyone who has
collaborated with David will readily confirm, he is a most generous colleague always ready to offer
his expertise and cooperate in publication projects, e.g., his recent involvement in the publication of the
enormous glyptic corpus from Nişantepe in Boğazköy.

As a token of our long friendship, I hope that this Festschrift presented to David by his students
and friends, will serve as an appropriate tribute to this incomparable individual and scholar. A parallel
Festschrift with non-Anatolian articles appears in the journal *Iraq* 2010, edited by Dominique Collon
and Andrew George. I wish to express my gratitude to several persons who have provided assistance
in the preparation of this volume: Sanna Aro, Natalia Bolatti-Guzzo, Donald Easton, Shirley Gassner,
Graciela Gestoso-Singer, Sivan Kedar, Anna Morpurgo Davies, Denzil Verey and Mark Weeden.

The Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University is congratulated for exceptionally accepting
this volume in its Monograph Series. This book was published with the support of the Israel Science
Foundation.
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MISCELLANEOUS


OBITUARIES

Because dreaming is a biological function of the human brain (Zgoll:507-510), all men and women participate in this activity; it is a universal of human existence. Understanding of the experience of dreaming, however, differs in various cultures. Today most Westerners consider dreams to be the product of the mind of the dreamer him- or herself, conditioned by life experiences both immediate and long past, and perhaps, following Freud (1954), expressing conflicts hidden from the conscious mind. But this view is not typical of pre-modern societies, which tend to regard dreams rather as visions received by a sleeping individual from an external source. Indeed, given that the sleeper may well dream of persons who have died, or of deities with whom contact in a waking state is exceptional, dreams are held in many cultures to be a mode of contact with realms of existence beyond the ordinary human sphere. This was most certainly the general conception of dreams in the ancient Near East, a phenomenon that was masterfully treated by Oppenheim (1956) and has attracted renewed interest recently (Zgoll 2006; Noegel 2007; Mouton 2007). Here I will be concerned solely with the role of dreams in the civilization of the Hittites.

A Hittite sleeper is not said ‘to dream’ or ‘to have a dream,’ but rather ‘to see a dream’ (tešhani/zašhain auš-), ‘to see in a dream’ (tešhi/zašhiya auš-), or ‘to see by means of a dream’ (tešhit/tešhaz/zašhiyaz auš-). He or she might also ‘make a vow’ (-za tešhi/zašhiya ANA DN KARÂBU), ‘present a gift’ (tešhaz pâi-), or ‘deliver a defence for his or her conduct’ (tešhi/zašhiya arkuwar iya-) to a god in a dream.

More frequently in Hittite discourse, the dreamer is indicated in the dative case, while a deity ‘appears in a dream’ (tešhaniya-), ‘presents him/her with a dream’ (tešhan ANA PN parâ ep-), or communicates in various ways ‘in or by means of a dream’ (tešhi/zašhiya/tešhit/tešhaz/zašhiyaz mema-, kaneš-, wek-). Rarely, a matter or concern itself may be the subject of the sentence and thus ‘appear in a dream’ (memiaš tešhaniškuwan dâi). (For details, see Mouton 2007:8-9.)

Well over 100 dreams are recorded in Hittite texts, not including those contained in literary sources such as the Tale of Appu or the Epic of Gilgameš (Stefanini 1969), but the attested dreamers themselves represent only a rather narrow stratum of the society of Ḫatti, namely the king and queen, the wider royal family, and members of the court. This reflects the general character of the Hittite documentation: Almost all cuneiform texts left by this civilization were produced by the royal bureaucracy with the aim of facilitating the activities of the monarch, who was the high priest of all the gods, chief judge and administrator of human society on behalf of its divine masters, and commander-in-chief of the military forces. Therefore, among the many aspects of the lives of ordinary Hittites of which we remain sadly ignorant are their dreams. But we may assume, I think, that neither the night visions of commoners in Ḫatti, nor the interpretation of their significance, differed in any major way from those of their betters.

Since, as I have just mentioned, the Hittite Great King was responsible for worshipping the gods as well as governing the population of Ḫatti, he occupied a crucial position in the Hittite universe: He was the linchpin who joined the divine and human levels of the cosmos. He represented the human community
before the gods and the pantheon before the Hittite people. In order properly to fulfil his functions, the
king needed to receive and transmit information and commands both within the human sphere and
between the world of men and that of the gods. This was simple enough within human society. Letters in
the Hittite archives present reports to the ruler from the members of the extensive Hittite administrative
bureaucracy as well as orders dispatched by His Majesty for the regulation of local affairs. Instruction
texts set forth the duties and responsibilities of such officials as the mayor of the capital (CTH 257),
provincial governors (CTH 261), and religious functionaries (CTH 264).

When it was necessary for the king to convey information or represent his subjects to the gods, he
spoke directly to them in the course of worship. We possess the texts of numerous artfully composed
prayers documenting this communication. By the very nature of things, however, deities rarely spoke
directly to any human being. Discerning divine complaints and desires normally involved the application
of special techniques. This situation may be illustrated by an excerpt from a prayer addressed to the
gods by king Muršili II after an epidemic had been raging for years in Ḫatti (CTH 378.II). Recognizing
that the disease must have been inflicted on the Hittites by their gods as punishment for some serious
infraction, the king adduces several possible offences committed by the community and relates the
compensation that his people has made for each of them. But in case he and his advisors have not come
upon the true causes of the plague, he implores his divine masters:

[Or] if people have been dying because of some other matter, let me either see it in a dream,
or [let] it [be discovered] by means of an oracle, or let a prophet speak of it. Or the priests
will sleep long and purely (in an incubation rite) in regard to that which I convey to all of
them. (KUB 14.8 rev. 41’-44’ and dupl.; for full translation, see my contribution to Hallo
1997:157-159)

The means suggested for divine-human communication in this passage fall into two basic categories:
first, there are techniques by which humans actively seek information from the gods. We may refer to this
group collectively as oracles. Types of oracle attested in Hittite texts include, among others, extispicy (the
examination of the entrails of sacrificed animals), augury (the observation of the flight and other behaviour
of birds), the so-called KIN (“implement”)-oracle (an obscure procedure in which lots—or perhaps some
small animals—personifying various personages, qualities, and activities interact with one another), and
incubation.

The second group of techniques features an unsolicited message from the divine world, a type
of communication we may call omens. In Hittite sources we encounter ominous celestial events such as
lunar eclipses as well as meteorological phenomena such as lightning strikes. Here too belongs the direct
appearance—and frequently even the speech—of a god or goddess through a human medium. These visitations
might come to persons in a waking, if altered, state, that is, to a person whom I have referred to in my
translation above as “prophet,” but whose literal designation is ‘man of god’ (LÚ.DINGIRLIM-niyant-).
We
know disappointingly little about the activities of such figures in Hittite society. Much more often, a deity
might send a dream, perhaps even appearing in it him- or herself, in order to convey a message.

Note that dreams may thus belong to either genre of divine communication: If they are actively sought
through instructing an individual to sleep in a temple or other sanctified location and to await a night vision,
they constitute incubation, a type of oracle. If dreams come ‘out of the blue’ to the monarch or other responsible
person, then they must be categorized as omens.

Let us first consider incubation. The Arzawan woman Paškuwatti composed a ritual to cure a man
who ‘has no reproductive power or who is not a man vis-à-vis a woman’ (CTH 406). In the course of this
ceremony, the patient exchanges symbols of femininity (spindle and distaff) for those of masculinity (bow and arrows), and the goddess Uliliyašši is addressed with incantations and offerings. Then the efficacy of the procedure is verified. A bed is made before the offering table, and

[t]he patient lies down (to experience) if in a dream he will see the goddess in her body, (if) she will go to him and sleep with him. Throughout the three days in which [I (Paškuwatti)] entered the goddess, he reports whatever dreams he sees, whether the goddess shows her eyes to him, (or) whether the goddess sleeps with him. (KUB 7.5 iv 1-10, ed. Hoffner 1987: 276, 279)

Thus if the patient has an erotic dream, he has been cured. This procedure is reminiscent of the practice known from the classical world in which a sufferer sleeps in a sanctuary of a deity, most often the god Asklepius, hoping to be healed as a consequence of a visit from the deity in a dream (Näf 2004: 114-123).

But as mentioned earlier in Muršili’s prayer, the usual form of incubation oracle practiced among the Hittites involved instructing one or more priests about a question and then having them ‘sleep purely’ (šuppa šeš-) in anticipation of a dream that would convey from the gods information useful in resolving the matter at hand.

Much more frequent in the Hittite sources, however, are unsolicited, or ominous, dreams. Perhaps the best known nocturnal visions from Ḫatti are those related by king Ḫattušili III in his so-called ‘Apology’ (CTH 81). This text, which is formally a dedication to his patron goddess of spoils confiscated from a defeated enemy, serves to justify Ḫattušili’s usurpation of the Hittite throne from his nephew Urḫi-Teššup (Muršili III). Crucial to Ḫattušili’s argument are manifestations of divine support for his cause, and prominent among these manifestations are dreams sent by his patron goddess Šaušga. So, already in his youth,

Šaušga, My Lady, sent Muwatalli, my brother, to Muršili, my father, through a dream (saying): ‘Ḫattušili’s years are short; he doesn’t have long to live. Hand him over to me so that he will be my priest and will live.’ (Otten 1981: 4, i 13-17)

Of course, the deity’s wishes were respected, and Ḫattušili began his beautiful career in her service and under her protection. When as an adult he has been subjected to slanderous accusations,

Šaušga, My Lady, appeared to me in a dream, and through the dream she said this to me: ‘I will entrust you to (a favourable) deity. Do not be afraid!’ And through the deity I was acquitted. (Otten 1981: 6, i 36-39)

Upon his marriage to Puduḫepa,

Then the goddess, My Lady, appeared to me in a dream (saying): ‘Become my servant [along with] (your) household,’ so I did become the [ser]vant of the goddess, along with my household. (Otten 1981: 16, iii 4-6)

When Ḫattušili raises his revolt,

[at] that moment, Šaušga, My Lady, appeared to my wife in a dream (saying): ‘I will march before your husband and all of Ḫattuša will go over to your husband’s party. Since I have elevated him, I have never exposed him to an unfavourable trial or an evil deity. Now too I will take him up and install him in priesthood for the Sun-goddess of Arinna (that is, I will make him Great King).’ (Otten 1981: 24, iv 8-15)
Finally, the goddess also appeared in a dream to the nobles whomUṛhi-Teššup had sent off somewhere (saying): ‘You are summoned in the strongest terms, (for) I have turned all of the lands of Ḫatti over to Ḫattušili.’ (Otten 1981: 24, iv 19-23)

These dreams demonstrate that Ḫattušili’s ultimate triumph corresponded to the divine will. Justification of the ruler and his actions as divinely ordained is indeed the primary function of dreams in Hittite historical texts.

In Ḫattušili’s ‘Apology’ dreams are visited upon sundry persons. Throughout the Hittite sources the most frequently named recipients of dreams are the monarch, the queen, and other individuals close to them. Figures appearing in dreams include gods or goddesses, human relatives of the dreamer, and ancestral ghosts. The messages conveyed through nocturnal visions are most various: A deity expresses his anger at an offence, or demands a new temple, sumptuous gifts, or rites. A future ruler is told whom he should marry, and a king is warned against travelling to a particular town. A queen receives advice as to how her husband might be cured of various afflictions.

A special type of dream found, to my knowledge, only in Hittite sources is the vow of splendid gifts made to a deity by an important person while dreaming (de Roos 1984; 1998; 2008). We know of such promises primarily from administrative records documenting the fulfilment of—or the reneging upon—these benefactions. (See Otten and Souček 1965).

At least as they are reported in the texts, some dreams, like those of Ḫattušili discussed above, seem to have been sent ‘in clear,’ that is, they are ‘in plain Hittite’ and do not require decoding or interpretation. More frequently, however, insufficient detail has been provided to the dreamer, or the burden of the vision has been conveyed through symbols.

Clarification of ambiguous or overly laconic dreams might be sought through oracles. Indeed, our single most generous source for Hittite dreams is the corpus of reports delivered to the administration by divination experts. In such texts, a series of yes-or-no questions is posed to a deity, who indicates a response through the results of extispicy, augury, KIN-oracle, etc. For example,

Was it the Storm-God of (the city of) Nerik who [presented] the queen with this dream? If so, let the extispicy be unfavourable. [There follow the details of the examination of the exta.] Result: favourable. (That is, the answer is ‘no.’)

Was it (the god) Zawalli who presented the queen with [this dream]? If so, let the extispicy be [un]favourable. [Details of the examination of the exta.] Result: unfavourable. (That is, the answer is ‘yes.’)

Was it only Zawalli who presented the queen with [this] dream? If so, let the extispicy be favourable. [Details of the examination of the exta.] Result: unfavourable. (That is, the answer is ‘no.’)

[If] it was (also) [Šaušga] of (the city of) Lawazantiya, let the extispicy be unfavourable. [Details of the examination of the exta.] Result: unfavourable. (That is, the answer is ‘yes.’)

[If] it was only Zawalli and Šaušga of Lawazantiya who presented the queen with this dream, let [the extispicy] be favourable. [Details of the examination.] Result: favourable. (That is, the answer is ‘yes,’ and the identity of the divine authors of the dream is thereby established.) (KUB 52.72 obv. 5-12)
Additional questions addressed through this procedure include: Is the deity who sent a dream angry, and if so, what measures will mollify this anger? What are the particulars of the ceremonies requested by a god in a dream? Will His Majesty recover from an illness announced in a dream, and what are the best means with which to treat this malady? Will an individual whom a dream has revealed to be the victim of witchcraft die? And so on.

Symbolic dreams are normally recounted in records of their own. That is, they are not included within texts of another genre—historical narrative, oracle report, letter, etc. Presumably these visions were set down so that they might be presented to expert interpreters for analysis. Although we have discovered a couple of fragments of oneiromantic texts among the Hittite tablets at Boğazköy (KUB 29.9, dupl. KUB 29.10 [CTH 536.1]; KUB 43.11 (+) KUB 43.12 [CTH 558]), these seem to be translations of Mesopotamian works and not portions of handbooks utilized by Hittite dream interpreters. Note that interpretive manuals are also lacking in the Boğazköy texts for other types of Hittite divination—augury, KIN-oracles, and so on.

In any event, no symbolic dream is ever provided with an exegesis in Hittite sources. It remains a remote possibility, however, that dreams whose import is described in a straightforward fashion, such as those concerning Ḫattušili in his ‘Apology,’ had originally come to their recipients in symbolic form, but that only the results of their interpretation have been presented to the reader.

I now translate a symbolic dream reported by a Hittite queen. Unfortunately, the beginning has been lost. The queen herself, probably Puduḫepa, wife of Ḫattušili III, is speaking:

[ … ] Perhaps the horses would trample me. I, the Queen, seated myself on the ground and began to cry. The charioteers laughed at me, and then they led those horses away from me, so that none of them trampled on me or urinated on me. As I then got ready to go, I said as follows: ‘Won’t the personnel of the ass stables flee? The grooms will (certainly) run away!’ Then [(so-and-so)] said to me: ‘Because the gods recognize your voice, you ought not to curse so wholeheartedly!’ I, the Queen, answered: ‘I only talk about that which I know and him whom I [ … ] May the gods not turn them (the horses’) over to him!’ In the palace someone like (the woman) Zamuwatti asked for some horses, and a team of horses was given to Zamuwatti. A team of horses was also given to (the woman) Uwa. One of the horses given to Uwa was white on his croup. (KUB 60.97 +? KUB 31.71 ii 1’-34’, ed. van den Hout 1994: 309-310).

Here the account ends. I have no idea what this dream might have meant, although I suspect that it had more to do with a desire for prestigious modes of travel than with repressed sexual urges. What is immediately apparent, however, is the attention given to detail—even the colour of the rear end of the horse is registered. Presumably the queen and the scribe who recorded her vision, being uncertain as to what details might be of importance, included anything she happened to retain in her memory. This suggests that the science of Hittite dream analysis was as complex as that of the later Hellenistic and medieval worlds (Artemidorus 1975; Oberhelman 1991). Unfortunately, we shall probably never be able to confirm this suspicion.

In any event, I believe that I have demonstrated that dreams and their interpretation were—as we might have expected—most serious matters to the Hittites.
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