

words and formulaic expressions, either as new formations attested only in the texts under analysis, or as pre-existing words which are re-sematized in the context of the cult inventories, taking on a specialized meaning. The author claims that other elements that seem to hint at technical jargon are the frequent use of formulaic expressions, and the presence of particular syntactic phenomena, analysed as strategies of language compression. The cult inventories also display a consistent system of very specific orthographic conventions, which leads the author intriguingly to suggest the existence of a specific scribal training, perhaps reflected in the work of a particular class of Hittite scribes specialized in the production of wooden waxen tablets written in cuneiform. This idea is fascinating, but certainly needs to be further investigated, requiring specific research which goes beyond the scope of the book.

Chapter 4 relates to the nature of local pantheons, and the “visible presence” of the gods in the form of cult images of different sizes and materials, generally housed in shrines and temples, or located by open-air sanctuaries (sacred springs, mountains). Particular attention is given to the iconography of the divine representations described in the cult inventories (with a useful overview of the cult image descriptions attested in the texts published in the second section). The historical-religious analysis of the cult inventories continues, in chapter 5, with a systematic investigation of the festivals attested in the cult inventories, their nature, their position within the Hittite cult calendar, and their function.

The sixth and final chapter of the first section aims to analyse socio-economic aspects of local festivals, with a short metrological study of the measures attested in the sources, a survey of the different types of vessels used during the ceremonies, and an overview of the officials and groups of people responsible for delivering cult supplies.

The second section of the book (chapter 7) is a philological edition of 17 Hittite texts, selected as particularly representative of the genre of cult inventories. The documents are presented in transliteration and translation, and are supplemented by an introduction and a short philological commentary. The text edition is a remarkable philological work, which has benefitted greatly from a direct collation of the original manuscripts and the possibility of using 3D models of the tablets. A system of cross-references between the first section and the text editions allows one to connect the discussion of relevant problems with the published sources, allowing a very productive use of the book.

The number of topics treated, the variety and originality of the insights, and the philological accuracy of the editions makes this book a valuable and most welcome contribution to our understanding of Hittite religion. Not only experts, but all those interested in the mechanics of ancient cult practices should be grateful to the author.

**Francesco G. Barsacchi**

Università degli Studi di Firenze

HASAN PEKER:

*Texts from Karkemish I: Luwian Hieroglyphic Inscriptions from the 2011–2015 Excavations.*

(OrientLab Series Maior, Vol. 1.) Bologna: Ante Quem, 2016.

ISBN 978 887849111 3.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X19000715

The first volume in the new OrientLab Series Maior is dedicated to new inscriptions found at Karkemish in the recent excavations from 2011–15. This handsome, much

anticipated, publication delights with the careful study of newly found Anatolian Hieroglyphic (henceforth: AH) inscriptional material. The volume is introduced by the excavation's director and series editor Nicolò Marchetti (p. 3) and his Turkish colleague Belkıs Dinçol (pp. 5–6). The introductory section concludes with a preface by the author, who sets out the content of the volume: full text editions with drawings by the author based on latex or tracing paper copies, or photographs. Peker also gives a summary account of early and current excavation history, noting that between 2011 and 2015, 290 AH inscriptions and inscription fragments were found. As the current volume contains only 31 catalogue entries of newly found inscriptions, this suggests that the number of fragments and the amount of re-discovered inscriptional material is very high.

The main body of the volume consists of three chapters: “The archaeological contexts of the epigraphic finds”; “Catalogue and edition of the inscriptions”; and “New data on the chronology of the Iron Age rulers of Karkemish”. These are followed by a glossary, a list of inscriptions cited, a concordance of excavation numbers with catalogue numbers, and some remarks on the iconography of YU.12.O.3 by Marchetti. The volume concludes with a list of abbreviations, bibliography, and 36 illustration plates, showing the inscriptions presented plus a GIS distribution map.

Chapter 1 discusses find spots and layers of inscriptions found at Karkemish and Yunus, listed in Table 1 (pp. 11–12) with information on the area of find spot, catalogue number (1–31), excavation number, stratigraphic context and date. Some of this information is repeated in Appendix 3 which contains a concordance of excavation and catalogue numbers with area of origin. Generally speaking, the majority of finds lack a meaningful archaeological context, as they were either found on the surface or in early Islamic layers. With the exception of one scaraboid seal (Cat. 23), finds from Neo-Assyrian layers are never contemporary but rather attest to large-scale destruction and dismantling of Late Hittite monumental complexes in this period. Very few finds come from contexts dating to before the Neo-Assyrian period (Iron Age III). Locations of find spots are shown in the GIS distribution map at the end of the volume (pl. XXXVI), and discussed in this chapter. Apart from surface finds, find locations include the so-called Hilani area, area C, the Water Gate area and the South-East Quarter of the city, as well as a pomegranate orchard near the cemeteries at Yunus.

The second chapter is the heart of this volume, and of vital interest to the philologist. It contains a catalogue and editions of the newly found inscriptions and inscription fragments from Karkemish (ch. 2.1) and Yunus (ch. 2.2). Each specimen is introduced with information on date, general description, its dimension, find context, UTM co-ordinates, current location, and bibliography. This is followed by a drawing, transliteration, translation and commentary. Numbering does not follow the system adopted by CHLI (David J. Hawkins, *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions, Volume I: Inscriptions of the Iron Ages*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000), but indicates catalogue and excavation number. It is a little surprising that this issue is not addressed when other new names for inscriptions are introduced in passing, e.g. SİLSİLE 1 = A15a. Another point of criticism is that there is no indication of sign damage; the transliteration only knows undamaged vs. restored signs. Inscriptions are roughly arranged by date, from early (1330 BC) to late (eighth century BC). Many catalogue entries comprise small fragments containing only a few signs or words, often echoing parallel phrases from other Karkemish inscriptions.

The most striking find of the renewed campaigns is without doubt the stela by Sui I (Cat. 2), which runs largely parallel to a previously known inscription, KARKAMIŞ A4b – except for the final clause naming the dedicator. It is the earliest

securely dateable Iron Age inscription from Karkemish, and it provided the long-awaited name of Ura-Tarhunza's father, Sapaziti (damaged in the parallel version). The first edition was published ahead of this volume by the author in collaboration with A. and B. Dinçol, J.D. Hawkins and N. Marchetti (OrNS 83, 2014, 143–53). The new publication differs slightly from the earlier one. The drawing of the inscription has been amended to include three further signs in the middle of line 4, identified with the help of new collations. Like most of the inscription, they echo the text of A4b. Interesting is the inclusion of a drawing of the latter inscription to scale – also with some emendations based on new collations – so that the different dimensions of both stelae are readily visible.

The transliteration provides the text of both inscriptions. Unfortunately, the layout choice of indicating the new stela's text with bold line numbers only is less than ideal. It works for short, parallel clauses but creates chaos as clauses get longer, and especially with the final, divergent clause, where visual clues as to which line of text belongs to which inscription are sadly lacking (in §7, the following lines belong together: 1 + 3 + 4 + 5 vs. 2 + 6 + 7). In contrast to the 2014 publication, §2 is now confidently read like in A4b, and the author has achieved a convincing interpretation for §5. His suggestion to identify the sign L466 as the logogram for *sunī-*, “to pour, libate”, a verb elsewhere determined with the sign L69, can be further strengthened by the iconic shape of the two signs, which one might interpret as libation vessel (L466) vs. a libating hand (L69). However, the proposed syllabic value *su<sub>x</sub>*, while possible, remains entirely hypothetical and finds no application in the logographic writing in the passage under consideration. Note that in §7, the transliteration of A4b misses the “word divider” before (DEUS)Ku + AVIS. A further small comment on Cat. 23: the arrangement of this small fragment does not seem to leave enough space for the restored sign INFANS.

While most catalogue entries fall into the category of writing on stone, the collection includes two seals, a bronze cylinder seal dated to the tenth–ninth century BC (Cat. 8), and a rock crystal stamp seal, dated to the seventh century BC (Cat. 25). A small pithos fragment (Cat. 24), which seems to show a logogram indicating vessel type, followed by some vertical strokes, is also interesting. While the author prefers an interpretation of the latter as the sign DOMINUS, I consider his third option, that the strokes indicate numerals, more likely. If the fragment belonged to a very simple list, the word order might well break with what one would expect in sentences, and depict (rather than write) container + number for some kind of measure. Additionally, fragments such as Cat. 10, which is a direct join to an inscription long known, KARKAMIŠ A11a, or Cat. 31, which Marchetti convincingly suggests is an indirect join to A15b (cf. app. 4; pl. 35) show that current campaigns improve on our previous knowledge of Karkemish inscriptions.

On the premise that the epigraphic usage attested within the previously known text corpus from Karkemish holds, let me offer the following observations on dating. Significantly, the combination of the four most frequently attested syllabic signs (*wa/i*, *sa*, *na*, *ti*) shows patterns with no overlap between individual rulers, or the later non-royal inscriptions. Cat. 12 (and Cat. 16): the variant of the sign *wa/i* in this fragment is attested only under Yariris, Kamanis (who also uses a related variant, the “hook” with circular side elements), and Pisiri. It is not attested in the later, non-royal inscriptions. The variant of the sign *sa*, however, is attested only until Yariri; after his reign, the archaizing simple arch shape was used. Epigraphically, the fragment should therefore date to the reign of Yariris. Contextually, the missing verb of line 2 should be sought in the semantic area of “protect; restore” or similar. Cat. 13: the shape of the sign *sa* in this fragment would support a date up to the reign of Yariris. Cat. 14: the variant of the sign

*wa/i* used in this fragment is otherwise only attested in the inscriptions of Kamanis. Cat. 21: the combination of the two variants of *wa/i* shown in this fragment dates it securely to the reign of Kamanis. Cat. 30: the combination of sign *wa/i* and *na* in this fragment dates it to the reign of Kamanis. A27u (p. 48–9): the proposed new ruler Suhis III could, again, be related to an epigraphic style limited to him, i.e. using the variant of *wa/i* so far attested until his predecessor Katuwas, the *sa* attested up until the period of Yariris, and the variant of *ma* previously understood to be starting with Yariris.

Chapter 3 begins with a discussion of new text sources and re-interpreted inscriptions, as attributed to the respective dynasties. This section also contains transliteration and translation, without drawings, of several new inscriptions/fragments, including an important new join to the Kubaba stele KARKAMIŠ A31+, found in 2015 and – presumably for limits of time – not included in chapter 2 (pp. 47–8); further, there is a tantalizing preview of the beginning of a confiscated smuggled inscription, SİLSİLE 2 (p. 48). The author proposes a new restoration of the fragment A27c which restores the genealogy of Kamanis, naming his father Astiru and grandfather Kuwalana-muwa (see below).

However, the chapter falls short of its aim to present new data and interpretation (p. 47). There are historical considerations that deserve comment such as the implication of not naming the grandfather in Kamanis' genealogy of the newly found top to KARKAMIŠ A31+ (KH.15.O.690), or – though possibly not covered by the permission granted to include the beginning of SİLSİLE 2 in this publication (cf. p. 48 n. 12) – the position of the Ruler Taya. While the author provides a table of the ruling houses of Karkemish (p. 49), disappointingly, there is no discussion at all of the newly reconstructed dynasties, nor of the data on which they are based. This would be desirable. For instance, nothing is made of the restoration of Sapaziti's name with the help of the major inscription from this volume (Cat. 2), and it is far from obvious that the proposed ruler Suhi III is newly identified by the author, based on his convincing analysis of the two text sections preceding the table (pp. 48–9). Or that Isarwila-muwa is likewise a new addition from KH.15.O.690 (p. 47). On the other hand, the tabular presentation of rulers suggests a level of certainty that the inscriptional material does not easily support, e.g. the ruler Kuwalana-muwa is based solely on a reconstruction of fr. KARKAMIŠ A27c. While possible, there are also arguments against the proposed reading EXER]CITUS-mu-wa/i-sa (p. 48), namely that the sign EXERCITUS never appears without the (part) oval shape in the Karkemish corpus (cf. KÖRKÜN §6; Suhi Stele and A4b §3) – this might give preference to a reading of L462 instead, as per Hawkins (2000: 171); or that spacing for the reconstructed FILIUS.NEPOS would be somewhat tight, if the small preserved semi-circular shape should be understood as the right corner of NEPOS.

The appendices comprise several useful tools, a glossary (Appendix 1), a list of inscriptions cited (Appendix 2), the above-mentioned concordance (Appendix 3), and Marchetti's remarks on the iconography of YU.12.O.3 (Appendix 4). The tripartite glossary (Appendix 1) records lexemes with translation including forms attested in this volume, with grammatical analysis, in the following order: 1. (Logogram +) full phonetic writing, 2. Log. (+ phonetic complementation) in alphabetical order followed by logograms only identified by their sign list number, 3. List of proper names. Note that known Luwian words are only normalized if attested phonetically in the inscriptions of this volume. The list contains only a few new words. I remain doubtful of *amuri-*, “funeral feast”, which occurs as the only readable word of a fragment (Cat. 5) and is elucidated on the basis of the determinative, PANIS. PITHOS; however, the proposed meaning would lead to a peculiar sentence in KULULU 1 §11. Note further that the second determinative is iconically markedly

different from all other attestations of the compound PANIS.PITHOS (CEKKE §§10, 11; KARKAMIŠ A4a §11; KARKAMIŠ A1a §35).

Transcribing the hieroglyph L402 with only its sign list entry number is unfortunate, as it suggests that reading and usage of the sign are unknown. But despite the fact that it occurs in front of a break, there can be no doubt about the reading. Peker's translation and commentary correctly indicate that the sign represents SA<sub>4</sub> as the determinative of *sani*-, "to overturn". One might add to Peker's observation that the sign is not attested with syllabic value in word-initial position, that the usage as determinative of *sani*- is ludic. The two most obvious reading strategies for the sequence SA<sub>4</sub>-SA-NI- will fail the reader: the initial sign neither acts as a syllabogram nor encodes a lexical meaning in the icon, the picture of a seal. If one attempts the wrong syllabic reading /*sasani*-/ this suggests the word for seal, *sasan*-, thus pointing back at the initial seal-shaped sign, forcing the reader to go back to the starting point and try again. This determinative functions on the basis of homoiophony, an inexact similarity of sound – and a deliberate iconic frame provided for the wrong reading. This ludic determinative is particularly long lived, attested from the eleventh century BC to 774 BC.

Appendix 2 consists of a list of other AH inscriptions with reference to the respective catalogue number where they were cited. Unfortunately, this list is not complete, missing e.g. ALIŠAR, HAMA fr. 6, ALTINTEPE, KARKAMIŠ sherd (cited under Cat. 24). Likewise, the concordance of Appendix 3 is limited in that it does not include equations/joins with known other AH inscriptions – for these, consult Appendix 2. Last but not least, in Appendix 4, N. Marchetti addresses the iconography of Cat. 31, the fragment of a hand-holding some kind of staff, a symbol of power, found at Yunus. His idea of a possible indirect join with KARKAMIŠ A15c is illustrated on pl. XXXV, interestingly superimposed on another, similar inscription with a ruler figure.

To conclude, despite minor points of criticism, the author must be thanked for making this highly interesting material available to the scholarly community in a generally very clear and precise manner. It is only fitting that this publication will mark the beginning of renewed excavations at Karkemish, and, one may hope, the beginning of many new exciting text finds.

**Annick Payne**  
University of Bern

STRAHIL V. PANAYOTOV and LUDEK VACIN (eds):

*Mesopotamian Medicine and Magic: Studies in Honor of Markham J. Geller.*

(Ancient Magic and Divination.) xiv, 936 pp. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2018. €204. ISBN 978 90 04 36806 4.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X19000727

This book is a hefty, somewhat haphazard, collection of essays gathered under the theme of its title, *Mesopotamian Medicine and Magic*. Declaring itself the largest edited volume on the topic hitherto published, it presents a wide-ranging menu of contributions reflecting M.J. Geller's catholic interests. The eclecticism, and length, of the book is also its primary weakness: the papers are presented in alphabetical order by first author. This gives the book a meandering quality: at one moment we are reading a literary history, next a detailed textual edition. Readers and contributors would have benefitted from a broadly thematic organization,