

الشرق

Ash-sharq

Bulletin of the Ancient Near East
Archaeological, Historical and Societal Studies

Vol 2 No 1 2018



ISSN 2513-8529

Archaeopress Journals

Ash-sharq
Bulletin of the Ancient Near East
Archaeological, Historical and Societal Studies

Vol 2 No 1 2018

ISSN 2513-8529
eISSN 2514-1732

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR

Laura Battini

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Silvana Di Paolo
Yagmur Heffron
Barbara Helwing
Elif Koparal
Marta Luciani
Maria-Grazia Masetti-Rouault
Valérie Matoïan
Béatrice Muller
Tallay Ornan
Adelheid Otto
Jack M. Sasson
Karen Sonik
StJohn Simpson
Pierre Villard
Nele Ziegler

Ash-sharq is a Bulletin devoted to short articles on the archaeology and history of the Ancient Near East. It is published twice a year. Submissions are welcome from academics and researchers at all levels. Submissions should be sent to Laura Battini
(laura.battini@college-de-france.fr)

PUBLISHED BY ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD

Subscriptions to the **Bulletin of the Ancient Near East** should be sent to
Archaeopress Publishing Ltd, Summertown Pavilion, 18-24 Middle Way, Summertown, Oxford OX2 7LG
Tel +44-(0)1865-311914 Fax +44(0)1865-512231
e-mail info@archaeopress.com
<http://www.archaeopress.com>

Opinions expressed in papers published in the Bulletin are those of the authors and are not necessarily shared by the Scientific Committee.

© 2018 Archaeopress Publishing, Oxford, UK.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Ash-sharq
Bulletin of the Ancient Near East
Archaeological, Historical and Societal Studies

Vol 2 No 1 2018

Contents

- The Path to Urbanism. Exploring the Anatomy and Development of Early Urbanism in Northern Mesopotamia. Five Years of Investigations by the Danish Archaeological Expedition to Iraq.** 1
Tim Boaz Bruun Skuldbøl and Carlo Colantoni
- The Assyrian Eastern Frontier. Girdi Gulak, a Fortified Settlement in the Zagros Foothills. Preliminary Results of the Danish Archaeological Expedition to Iraq.** 13
Carlo Colantoni, Martin Makinson and Tim Skuldbøl
- Archaeological Discoveries in the Ancient State of Lagash: Results from the Italian Excavations at Tell Zurghul/Nigin in Southern Iraq** 24
Davide Nadali and Andrea Polcaro
- Consented Violence in Mesopotamia: from Factuality to Representation.** 50
Laura Battini
- Phenomenology of the Replica: Exploring Sameness and Difference in Seals and Sealing Practices** 77
Silvana Di Paolo
- New Proposal for the Location of Ancient Turanu (URU *tu-ra-nu*)** 83
Adonice-Ackad Baaklini
- Art, History and Material Culture. A Study of Mesopotamic Cylinder Seals**.....85
Katia Maria Paim Pozzer
- The Hippodamian Plan: a Mesopotamian Origin?** 94
Laura Battini
- Stamp-Seals and Sealings from Tell Dothan** 102
Adam E. Miglio
- Water and the Gods: Ponds and Fountains in the Hittite State Cult according to Hittite Textual Evidence** 112
Alice Mouton
- The Recipient of the Bronze Bowl from Kınık** 121
Zsolt Simon

The Recipient of the Bronze Bowl from Kınık

Zsolt Simon

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Taprammi, a high-ranking Hittite dignitary, is known from many sources (see the analysis of Peled 2013: 790-794 with refs.¹). One of them is a bronze bowl decorated with hunting scenes, found in the neighbourhood of Kınık in Northern Anatolia (published in Emre – Çınaroğlu 1993: 864-701, the bowl and its inscriptions are also known as ‘Kastamonu’). The bowl shows a dedicatory inscription of Taprammi, the meaning of which is basically clear (Hawkins 1993, here in updated transliteration,² and without translating the problematic phrase BONUS₂.VIR₂ [a title? a blessing?, see the critical discussion in Massi 2009 with refs.]):

*zi/a CAELUM.PI (or SCUTRA) DEUS.SCRIBA BONUS₂.VIR₂ EUNUCHUS₂ LEPUS+ra/i-mi
BONUS₂.VIR₂ EUNUCHUS₂ PONERE*

‘Taprammi, the eunuch placed this bowl to DEUS.SCRIBA.’³

The meaning of the phrase DEUS.SCRIBA and thus the recipient of the bowl are unclear. The editor saw two possibilities (Hawkins 1993: 176): the phrase refers either to a deity of scribes, ‘Scribe-God’ (thus to the recipient) or to a type of scribes, ‘god’s scribe’, whatever it would mean precisely (and thus it would be yet another of Taprammi’s titles). However, he rightly underlines that these terms are otherwise not attested in Hittite or Luwian,⁴ and although Taprammi was mentioned being a scribe, he was not a ‘god’s scribe’ (Nişantepe No. 408; SBo II No. 92; RS 17.231). Based on the parallel text of the BABYLON 3 inscription mentioning a god as a recipient, Hawkins finally

¹ Needless to say, not all of these sources necessarily refer to a single individual, but this problem has no relevance here.

² On CAELUM.PI (or SCUTRA) instead of CAELUM-*pi* of the editor see Bolatti Guzzo - Marazzi 2010: 21-22 and Simon 2016.

³ T The traditional rendering ‘eunuch’ of EUNUCHUS₂ was maintained here, since the problematic issue whether the logogram EUNUCHUS₂ indeed referred to eunuchs has no relevance to this paper. For critical discussions see most recently Hawkins 2002; Mora 2010, and Giusfredi 2010: 138-139, 142-143.

⁴ For the types of scribes see Payne 2015: 145-151. Hawkins 1993: 716 claimed that only the god Nabû is invoked by an Arzawan scribe once (EA 32 obv. 15), but this is to be read as ^DÉ!A (Archi 1993: 32 n. 23, see now also Rainey 2015: 330-331). In fact, ^DAG (Nabû) is attested in the Hittite corpus, but, according to Archi 1993: 32, restricted to the celebrations in the temple of Ea in Hattuša on the 29th day of the AN.TAH.ŠUM^{SAR} festival, as a member of Ea’s circle, and his presence only indicates the Hittite scribes’ knowledge about the Babylonian pantheon. Although this deity also appears in the ritual of CTH 492.1 (KBo 13.193, 11’ and KUB 47.59, 13’; cf. van Gessel 1998-2001/1: 606), it does not change Archi’s conclusions since the context is again that of the circle of Ea.

opted for the translation ‘Scribe God’ (and mentioned only this possibility in his later publications [Hawkins 1997: 11/2005: 196; Çifçi – Hawkins 2016: 242]).

However, the parallelism with BABYLON 3 does not require that the recipient is a deity: in similar dedicatory inscriptions among the recipients we find once a king (ANKARA 2 [Simon 2009: 248-250 with refs. *contra* Durnford 2010: 68, see the criticism in Simon 2013: 829]), and once a dignitary (ANKARA 3, see the re-interpretation by Simon 2017 and Poetto 2017, both with refs.). Nevertheless, the interpretation of DEUS.SCRIBA as a title can indeed be excluded: unlike the other title, EUNUCHUS₂ (and unlike BONUS₂.VIR₂), it is not written antithetically and thus it does not refer to Taprammi. Moreover, if it were a title, then the recipient is not mentioned in the fully preserved inscription, which is not only unusual and makes no sense, but also contradicts to the practice of dedicatory inscriptions in Hieroglyphic Luwian literacy, since the recipients of such bowls are always clearly stated (BABYLON 2, BABYLON 3 [cf. Hawkins 2000: 395, 397, resp.]; ANKARA 2; ANKARA 3 [for the latter two cf. above]).

Thus the only remaining option would be the name of a deity. However, it is not very probable that a previously unknown Hittite deity would appear, precisely in that culture from where literally hundreds of divine names are known (see the collection in van Gessel 1998-2001), and this previously unknown deity is the deity of an especially important and relatively well-known profession. This possibility cannot be *a priori* excluded of course, but it remains highly hypothetical.

There is, however, one more possibility, not taken into consideration by the editor: the recipient is not a deity, but an acquaintance of Taprammi (for a parallel see above the case of ANKARA 3). In other words, DEUS.SCRIBA would refer to the personal name of the recipient together with his title / profession. The recipient would be thus a scribe (SCRIBA), whose name was DEUS. The Luwian reading of DEUS is *massan(i)*⁵ and it indeed was used as a personal name, see the attestations in ACLT s.v. *Massani(ya)*-:

1. KULULU lead fragment 1, side i, 1.1 ¹DEUS-*ni-sa* (nom. sg.)
2. KULULU lead fragment 1, side ii 1.1 ¹DEUS-*ni-sa* (nom. sg.)
3. KARATEPE 4 §2 ¹DEUS-*ní-i-sá* (nom. sg., also a scribe, but only a namesake due to chronological difference)
4. KULULU lead strip 1, 55 ¹DEUS-*ni-ia* (dat. sg.)⁶

⁵ Following Rieken 2017 the vowel of the *i*-mutation is spelled here short.

⁶ Note that Oreshko 2013: 359 would read a personal name DEUS-*na-i(a)* /*Massanaya*/ in SURATKAYA Graffito 3, but this depends upon whether his collation and re-reading can be confirmed (furthermore, he argues for another, highly problematic case too, 2013: 371-373). An anonymous reviewer claimed that it is ‘very risky’ to identify DEUS of KINIK as a personal name, since all other occurrences show the personal marker ¹ and phonetic complements ‘in order to avoid confusion with the very frequent term DEUS’. However, this claim is a complete misunderstanding of Hieroglyphic Luwian orthography. The parallel passages are Iron Age Hieroglyphic Luwian texts and this period is characterised by the very high number of phonetic complements and phonetic spellings. KINIK is, however, an Empire Period Hieroglyphic Luwian text and this period is characterised by the lack or very low number of phonetic complements.

To sum up, the KINIK bronze bowl would represent the gift of a dignitary to a scribe, a perfectly parallel case to ANKARA 3, which is a bronze bowl gifted to an official by another non-royal person (noteworthy is the coincidence of the material of the bowls with the rank of the recipients: bronze for officials [KINIK, ANKARA 3], silver for a ruler [ANKARA 2] and stone for deities [BABYLON 2, BABYLON 3]). Finally, the KINIK-inscription can be translated as follows: ‘Taprammi placed this bowl for Massani, the scribe’.

Acknowledgements

The research on this note was conducted as part of the project ‘*Digitales philologisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der altanatolischen Kleinkorpussprachen*’ funded by the DFG.

References

- ACLT = Yakubovich, I.: *Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts*. <http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/> (last accessed: 4 December 2017)
- Archi, A. 1993. The God Ea in Anatolia. In M. J. Mellink, E. Porada and T. Özgüç (eds), *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors. Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç. Nimet Özgüç’e Armağan: 27-33*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Bolatti Guzzo, N. and Marazzi, M. 2010. Note di geroglifico anatolico. In J. Klinger, E. Rieken and Ch. Rüster (eds), *Investigationes Anatolicae. Gedenkschrift für Erich Neu*. (StBoT 52): 11-28. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Çifçi, M. and Hawkins, J. D. 2016. A New Inscribed Bowl in the Ankara Museum. *Colloquium Anatolicum* 15: 239-246.
- Durnford, S. P. B. 2010. How old was the Ankara Silver Bowl when Its Inscriptions were Added? *AnSt* 60: 51-70.
- Emre, K. and Çınaroğlu, A. 1993. A Group of Metal Hittite Vessels from Kınık - Kastamonu. In M. J. Mellink, E. Porada and T. Özgüç (eds), *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors. Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç. Nimet Özgüç’e Armağan: 675-713*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- van Gessel, B. H. L. 1998-2001. *Onomasticon of the Hittite Pantheon I-III*, HdO 33. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill.
- Giusfredi, F. 2010. *Sources for a Socio-Economic History of the Neo-Hittite States* (THeth 28). Heidelberg
- Hawkins, J. D. 1993. A Bowl Epigraph of the Official Taprammi. In M. J. Mellink, E. Porada and T. Özgüç (eds), *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors. Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç. Nimet Özgüç’e Armağan: 715-717*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Hawkins, J. D. 1997. A Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription on a Silver Bowl in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara. *Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi 1996 Yılığ*: 7-24 (re-

The same goes for the personal marker: it does not appear in the Empire Period inscriptions, its single attestation in this period would be KIZILDAĞ 1 (Payne 2017: 224 n. 8), whose dating is highly controversial and there are good arguments for a post-Empire dating (cf. Hawkins 2000: 434-435 and most recently Oreshko 2017, both with refs.). In other words, this is a purely chronological-orthographical question.

- published with addenda: A Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription on a Silver Bowl. *Studia Troica* 15, 2005: 193-204).
- Hawkins, J. D. 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions I. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Hawkins, J. D. 2002. Eunuchs among the Hittites. In S. Parpola and R. M. Whiting (eds), *Sex and Gender in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 47th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Helsinki, July 2-6, 2001*: 217-233. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project.
- Massi, L. 2009. The Meaning and Derivation of Anatolian Hieroglyphic BONUS₂VIR₂ in the Second Millennium B.C. *SEL* 26: 1-13.
- Mora, C. 2010. Seals and Sealings of Karkamiš, Part III: the Evidence from the Nişantepe-Archives, the Digraphic Seals and the Title EUNUCHUS₂. In I. Singer (ed.): *ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis. Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*: 170-181. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology.
- Oreshko, R. 2013. Hieroglyphic Inscriptions of Western Anatolia: Long Arm of the Empire or Vernacular Tradition(s)? In A. Mouton, I. Rutherford and I. Yakubovich (eds), *Luwian Identities. Culture, Language and Religion Between Anatolia and the Aegean* (CHANE 64): 345-420. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Oreshko, R. 2017. Hartapu and the Land of Maša. A New Look at the KIZILDAĞ-KARADAĞ Group. *AoF* 44: 47-67.
- Payne, A. 2015. *Schrift und Schriftlichkeit. Die anatolische Hieroglyphenschrift*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Payne, A. 2017. Determination in the Anatolian Hieroglyphic Script of the Empire and Transitional Period. *AoF* 44: 221-234.
- Peled, I. 2013. Eunuchs in Hatti and Assyria: a Reassessment. In Ll. Feliu et al. (eds), *Time and History in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 56th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Barcelona*. 26-30 July 2010: 785-797. Winona Lake: Eisenbraun.
- Poetto, M. 2017. The Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription ANKARA 3: A New Exegetic Approach. *N.A.B.U.* 2017/2: 88-90 (Nr. 50).
- Rainey, A. F. 2015. *The El-Amarna Correspondence. A New Edition of the Cuneiform Letters from the Site of El-Amarna based on Collations of all Extant Tablets I* (HdO 110). Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Rieken, E. 2017. Word-Internal Plene Spelling with <i> and <e> in Cuneiform Luwian Texts. *Journal of Language Relationship* 15: 19-30.
- Simon, Zs. 2009. Die ANKARA-Silberschale und das Ende des hethitischen Reiches. *ZA* 99: 247-269.
- Simon, Zs. 2013. Wer war Großkönig I(a)+ra/i-*TONITRUS* der KARAHÖYÜK-Inschrift? In Ll. Feliu et al. (eds), *Time and History in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 56th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Barcelona*. 26-30 July 2010: 823-832. Winona Lake: Eisenbraun.
- Simon, Zs. 2016. Zum hieroglyphen-luwischen Zeichen CAELUM (*182). *N.A.B.U.* 2016/4: 159-162 (Nr. 96).
- Simon, Zs. 2017. Philologische Bemerkungen zur hieroglyphen-luwischen Inschrift ANKARA 3. *N.A.B.U.* 2017/2: 86-88 (Nr. 49.)