

Book Reviews

The Royal Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal (668–631 BC), Aššur-etel-ilāni (630–627 BC), and Sin-šarra-iškun (626–612 BC), Kings of Assyria, Part 1. By Jamie Novotny and Joshua Jeffers. The Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period Volume 5/1. University Park, MD: Eisenbrauns, 2018. Pp. xxxiii + 449 + 23 figures. \$89.95 (cloth).

REVIEWED BY JOHANNES BACH, *University of Helsinki*

The first part of the fifth volume of the Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period (RINAP) series (directed by Grant Frame as editor-in-chief) is the result of the collaborative work of Jamie Novotny and Joshua Jeffers. Volume 1 of RINAP 5 comprises only inscriptions of Ashurbanipal that are not recorded on clay tablets, but rather on other text carriers such as clay prisms. Most of the inscriptions edited in RINAP 5/1 come from Nineveh and Kalḫu, and only a small number of texts originate from other sites. The remaining Ashurbanipal texts on clay tablets and all of the Babylonian inscriptions, as well as the inscriptions of Aššur-etel-ilāni and Sin-šarra-iškun, will be published in RINAP 5/2. The texts published in RINAP 5/1 are arranged according to their site of origin as well as the text carrier. There are twenty texts on clay prisms, one on a clay cylinder, forty-seven on various types of stone slabs, two on paving stones, one on a stone tablet, one on a lapis lazuli tablet, one on a statue, one on a bull colossus and slab, three on seal impressions, three on stone vessels, and one on a glazed brick. For RINAP 5/1, the editors and numerous collaborators collated over 700 objects in total. The relatively long history behind the volume reviewed here is recaptured by Novotny and Jeffers in

the preface, where they give great detail about the production process as well as due credit to previous works by numerous Assyriologists such as Maximilian Streck, Theo Bauer, Rykle Borger, and others. Editorial notes are provided by Grant Frame. Fortunately, the volume is largely free of typographical errors, though some minor mistakes are both rare and unavoidable for a volume of this size. One of a very few examples occurs in the section “The North and Northeast” where one should read “657” (BC) instead of “667” (BC) at the end of the first paragraph (p. 19).

The general introduction to the volume stands out for its conciseness. A detailed overview of the texts and their carriers adds to the reader’s understanding of the inscriptions’ textual structure and poetic makeup. A short, yet detailed discussion of modern labeling for the texts transmitted on clay prisms (e.g., “annals,” “*res gestae*”) highlights recurring problems in our categorization attempts of Assyrian royal inscriptions. The overview of the edited pieces, noting their structural features and variations, is highly appreciated by the reviewer. More than five pages are devoted to the long and complicated history of editing Ashurbanipal’s inscriptions. This meticulous overview greatly facilitates the work of anyone interested in the history of Neo-Assyrian studies.

The historical section of the introduction generally deserves praise. The entire section is comprehensively written. A very low number of minor formulation

© 2020 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved. For permission to reuse a book review in this section, please contact journalpermissions@press.uchicago.edu.

mishaps should be noted (e.g., the given sequence of events in Ashurbanipal's first year on p. 14, which might elicit the impression that Šamaš-šumu-ukīn became king of Babylon even before the Marduk statue was returned), but these do not lessen its high quality. The authors Novotny and Jeffers rightfully point to the difficulties in writing a historical overview of Ashurbanipal's reign, highlighting the major problem of the mixed annalistic-display type of royal inscriptions introduced during the reign of Esarhaddon. The sketch presented rests mainly on the older works of A. Kirk Grayson and Jill Ruby.¹ Admittedly, there are not many other concise accounts for Ashurbanipal's reign available, and more recent scholarship (up to 2012, rarely later) that discusses specific topics such as Ashurbanipal's family is indeed cited mainly in the footnotes.² The major achievement of this section of the introduction is the provision of a concise and reliable account of Ashurbanipal's reign, as well as a tentative chronology of his military endeavors. Elaborations on specific choices and dating suggestions can be found in the footnotes of the pertinent subsections. The historical introduction also entails a meticulous evaluation of the general chronology as derived from the king lists and the extent eponym lists (up to Ashurbanipal's twentieth regnal year). The utilization of not only the inscriptions edited in RINAP 5/1 and the previous RINAP volumes, but also of the numerous letters and other texts edited in the relevant State Archives of Assyria (SAA) volumes, bolsters this carefully reconstructed historical outline. It should be used as a go-to account for teaching.

My criticisms of the historical overview provided in RINAP 5/1 are minor and pertain to very specific questions and problems, which understandably cannot be addressed in full in such a limited format as that of an introduction to a text edition. As an example, when discussing the Egyptian campaigns, it could have been pointed out that the identification of Psammetichus with Nabū-šēzibanni, present in RINAP 5/1 (p. 17),

is not universally accepted.³ In addition, nowhere in Ashurbanipal's inscriptions is it outright stated that Psammetichus was "installed" (RINAP 5/1, p. 17) as the ruler of Sais (and Memphis?) after the defeat of Tunatamon, although one could certainly come to that conclusion. On the one hand, the fact that Assyrian influence on Egyptian politics is not mentioned at all after the fall of Thebes in 664 BC could indicate Psammetichus' own initiative. On the other hand, inscription Asb. 11 (most likely written between 644–642 BC) refers to Psammetichus by his Egyptian name and qualifies him as someone who had "cast off the yoke" of Assyrian rulership, implying his prior subordination to the Assyrian king. However, both the duration and the extent of that relationship remain unclear. It might be that Psammetichus was indeed made ruler of Sais and then parted ways with the Assyrians. Alternatively, Psammetichus' autonomous takeover of power in Sais (and Memphis?) could very well have ended a previously existing dependence.

Another example occurs in the section "Elam, Gambulu, and Babylon," where no sufficient distinction is made between Tammarītu, ruler of Hīdālu, and the Elamite king Tammarītu in the main text body (pp. 22–25). While the Indabibi episode is discussed in note 141 on pp. 22–23, a clearer identification of Tammarītu, king of Elam, and a distinction from Tammarītu of Hīdālu would have been appreciated. For example, Tammarītu of Hīdālu and Tammarītu, king of Elam, are implicitly conflated on p. 24 in an unfortunate way ("Tammarītu was reinstated as king in Susa rather than at Madaktu or Hīdālu"). According to Matthew Waters, Andreas Fuchs, and Wouter Henkelmann,⁴ Tammarītu of Hīdālu and Tammarītu, king of Elam, should be considered as different persons. Furthermore, Tammarītu, the king of Elam, is mentioned in a statue inscription that Ashurbanipal carried off to Assyria after the sack of Susa (cf. Asb. 11/"Rassam Cylinder," iv 55–56: ⁵⁵ALAM *tam-ama-ri-tu* EGIR-ú ⁵⁶ša ina qī-bit AN.ŠAR u ^d15 e-pu-šū ARAD-u-ti

¹ A. Kirk Grayson, "The Chronology of the Reign of Ashurbanipal," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 70 (1980): 227–45; A. Kirk Grayson, "Assyria 668–635 B.C.: The Reign of Ashurbanipal," in *The Cambridge Ancient History III/2*, ed. John Boardman, et al. (Cambridge, 1980, 2nd ed. 1991), 143–55; Jill Ruby, "Aššur-bāni-apli II. The Political History of Ashurbanipal's Reign," in *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire I/1*, ed. Karen Radner (Helsinki, 1998), 163–68.

² E.g., Jamie Novotny and Jennifer Singletary, "Family Ties: Ashurbanipal's Family Revisited," *Studia Orientalia Electronica* 106 (2009): 167–78.

³ Cf. Dan'el Kahn, "The Assyrian Invasion of Egypt (673–663 B.C.) and the Final Expulsion of the Kushites," *Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur* 34 (2006): 251–67.

⁴ Matt Waters, *A Survey of Neo-Elamite History* (Helsinki, 2000), 56ff.; Matt Waters, "Elam, Assyria and Babylonia in the Early First Millennium BC," in *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Iran*, ed. Daniel Potts (Oxford, 2013), 481; Andreas Fuchs, "Review of Waters, Matt: A Survey of Neo-Elamite History," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 93 (2003): 134ff.; Wouter Henkelmann, "Tammaritu," in *Reallexikon der Assyriologie* 13.5/6 (Berlin, 2012), 432–33.

“the statue of Tammarītu the later who by the command of Aššur and Ištar performed servanthood”). The rare designation *arkû* “the later (or: second; following)” indicates that this Tammarītu was (at least) the second king of this name (cf. the designation of Sargon II as *arkû* “the later” in Nabû-zuqup-kēna’s colophons).⁵ However, this mystery must be solved at another time.

One further detail concerning the Egyptian wars is worth mentioning. RINAP 4/Esh. 1019, a tentatively attributed royal inscription very likely dealing with spoils from an Egyptian campaign,⁶ mentions the skin color of an Egyptian ruler, whose name is not preserved, and his family as being “black as pitch” (l. 23: [šá] *ki-ma šá-šú-ma* GIM ESIR *šal-mu* UZU.MEŠ-^ršú-[*nu*. . .] “. . . whose skin, like his, was as black as pitch”). A very similar expression appears in rev. 10 of the “Underworld Vision of an Assyrian Prince” (VAT 10057/SAA 3, no. 32), a text most likely authored during the reign of Esarhad-

⁵ For attestations, see: Natalie May, “Administrative and Other Reforms of Sargon II and Tiglath-pileser III,” in *Change in Neo-Assyrian Imperial Administration: Evolution and Revolution*, ed. Natalie May and Saana Svärd (Padova, 2015), 103 n. 118.

⁶ Wilfred Lambert, “Booty from Egypt?,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982): 65–66.

don. Notably, skin color is (generally) never spoken of in Ashurbanipal’s inscriptions, therefore increasing the likelihood that RINAP 4/Esh. 1019 should indeed be attributed to Esarhaddon.

Virtually no criticism can be brought forward regarding the main part of RINAP 5/1, the text editions. Major variants between individual manuscripts and the master text are given in the pertaining footnotes, and minor variations are listed at the back of the volume. The concise recounting of decisions regarding line counts, restorations, and other editorial matters, as well as the occasional provision of photos of text carriers, further facilitate working with the material. The general quality of the very apt English translations is high and the convenient structuring of the translations into short episodes facilitates reading not only for scholars, but also for non-professionals and a broader interested audience.

The publication of RINAP 5/1 will without doubt be fundamental for future research on the reign of Ashurbanipal. The entire RINAP series has already greatly facilitated Assyriological research and the physical publication of RINAP 5/2, whose content is largely already available on ORACC, is eagerly awaited. The reviewer wishes to thank and congratulate the authors of RINAP 5/1 for their excellent and diligent work.

Warriors of Anatolia: A Concise History of the Hittites. By Trevor Bryce. London, New York: I. B. Tauris, 2019. Pp. xii + 288. \$27.00 (cloth).

REVIEWED BY JAMES M. BURGİN, *University of Würzburg*

Reading Trevor Bryce’s new popular history of the Hittites, *Warriors of Anatolia*, caused me to reminisce about my own introduction to Hittitology. In the summer of 2003, I had just finished my first year of college. My course of study included an introductory linguistics course, taught by none other than Craig Melchert, where I learned about the Indo-European language family. I was enchanted by the antiquity and the obscurity (to me) of its ancient members, with names such as Tocharian, Old Church Slavonic, Sanskrit, and oldest of all, Hittite. Back home on summer break, I scoured course catalogs and made plans to study these languages when I returned to school, resolving to read what I could on the peoples and cultures behind the names while I waited. In the region of my home in western North Carolina, the selection of books on ancient Indo-European peoples was limited, to say the least. My search for information on the Hittites turned up only a single book in the library of the local state university: *The Secret of the*

Hittites, by the mid-20th century German popular author C. W. Ceram.¹ How such an obscure book on the Hittites got there, I still have no idea. Even with my limited knowledge at the time, I could see that the book was full of suspect, non-scientific claims. It was not until I took my first Hittite class two years later, however, that I realized how outdated and just plain wrong the book was, even for its time. Now I think of how much better my introduction to the field would have been if my local university had owned a copy of the book presently under review.

Warriors of Anatolia offers, in its author’s own words, “a reliable introduction to Hittite history and civilisation, one which touches on many features of the Hittite world, explores some of them in more depth

¹ C. W. Ceram, *The Secret of the Hittites: The Discovery of an Ancient Empire* (New York, 1955), trans. Richard and Clara Wilson from Ceram’s *Götter, Gräber und Gelehrte* (Hamburg, 1949).