This monumental volume begins with a brief introduction to the materials presented and the history of research on similar finds (ch. I). It continues with a thorough description of their find spots and a reconstruction of their contexts (II); penetrating sections on sealing practices (III), typology and iconography (IV), all by Herbordt; commentaries on the inscriptions and the persons and occupations attested in them (V), by Bawanypeck, as well as on the Luwian hieroglyphic readings and their implications for the reconstruction of the Hittite dynasty (VI), by Hawkins; chemical analyses (VII) by G. Schneider; an exhaustive catalogue (VIII) by Bawanypeck and Herbordt; concordances (Herbordt) and indexes (IX–X); and finally, 60 plates documenting the material with excellent drawings and photos. Every section contains a thorough presentation and discussion of its aspects of the finds, accompanied by numerous exceedingly informative charts, graphs and illustrations. (Cf. now reviews by T. Bryce, Ancient Near East Studies 49, 2012, 222–5; A. Payne, Orientalische Literaturzeitung 2013/3, 162–4).

The sealed finds from the excavations of 1990–91 near Nişantepe, nearly 3,430 objects (p. 1) from within and around the so-called Westbau, are with this second major volume, following Herbordt’s presentation of the Prinzen- und Beamtenseiegel (BoHa 19, 2005), now fully published, a laudable accomplishment in itself. The tome under review presents 2,095 impressions of 191 royal seals, many of them not previously attested. Represented are all the kings of the Empire Period as well as three earlier named kings and queens (along with anonymous Tabarna and Tawannanna sealings), the greatest part of them from the reigns of Muwattalli II and his son and successor Mursili III / Urhi-Teššub (p. 8). The publication of further royal and administrative sealings from various other excavations in the rest of the upper city is to follow (p. 3 and n. 32).

The volume is far too rich in material, and judicious presentation and analysis, for this brief note to continue showering it with accolades. Instead, I will address one of the volume’s suggestions with which one might take issue and quickly note a very few of its most important finds.

Herbordt (e.g. p. 4 and ch. III in general; followed e.g. by Neve, p. IX and Bryce in his review, pp. 226 f.) continues to advocate the hypothesis that the greater part of the sealings would have been attached to the wooden writing boards so well known from their frequent mention in the cuneiform sources and their rare discovery in archaeological contexts (W. Waal, “Writing in Anatolia”, Altorientalische Forschungen, 39/2, 2013, 287–315); more specifically, that the far less numerous cone-shaped bullae would have been hung on strings attached to clay tablets, while further varied forms would have sealed “Beutel, Taschen oder Hüllen” (p. 4) containing wooden writing boards. While there is little reason to doubt that some (perhaps rather small) portion of the sealings might have been attached to wooden writing boards, there is no reason to assume that most or all of them did and every reason to believe that the greater portion of them sealed a wide assortment of objects. To supplement the arguments against Herbordt’s suggestion provided by
C. Mora (OrNS 79, 2010, 92–7) and Th. van den Hout (JAOS 127, 2007, 339–48) in their reviews of Herbordt’s Prinzen- und Beamensiegel, one can point to the large and significant collections of sealings from Late Neolithic Sabi Abyad or fourth millennium Arslantepe (cf. K. Duistermaat [13–27] and P. Ferioli et al. [353–64] in M. Perna (ed.), Administrative Documents in the Aegean and their Near Eastern Counterparts, Turin, 2000), which, though obviously evincing differences from the collection treated in this volume, are in many ways comparable, though they were obviously not attached to inscribed objects of any sort. Indeed, seals and sealing are known from much of the ancient Near East long before writing was introduced, and the sealing of any number of different objects presumably did not stop in Ḫattusa with the introduction of clay or wooden writing boards. Herbordt’s assertion (e.g. pp. 7, 10 f.; presented in more detail in her Prinzen- und Beamensiegel, 25–39) that the distribution of the sealings, which belies to some extent a pattern that can be correlated with particular rulers, does not in any way lend support to the thesis. Goods of various types can just as well be stored according to ownership as can written tablets. Neither do the mentions of sealing in the cuneiform sources support the supposition, as they pertain to the whole range of goods (e.g. Th. van den Hout, OrNS 79, 2010, 265; further refs in Mora’s review). The question of sealing practices and the use to which the finds presented in this volume were put should thus remain open and be further investigated.

As is so often the case, this new material answers a number of long-debated questions and raises others, issues discussed primarily in the section by Hawkins, which presents an exceptionally judicious and current overview of the evidence and arguments on which reconstructions of the Hittite dynasty are based. To mention only a few points of interest revealed and/or confirmed by the material in question (some presented already in studies appearing before this volume), it is now known from these sealings that Suppiluliuma I’s queen Ḫenti was a daughter of a great king, complicating anew the question of this king’s paternity (pp. 86–91). Another is the veritable plague of sealings naming several Kantuzzilis with various titles (pp. 87–9). Important new readings include L.271-na L.292-la, enabling the discovery of “Tawannanna (of) Babylon” and therewith the jettisoning of the suggested reading Ma-al-ni-ga-al of SBo I 84 (p. 90). It has become clear (pp. 91–5) that Tanuḫepa was indeed Mursili II’s second wife, and that she outlived not only Mursili II but also the subsequent king, Muwattalli II, during whose reign she and her sons were “ruined”, in spite of which she appears as Tawannanna during the subsequent reign of Urḫi-Teššub/Mursili III, a curious set of circumstances that I have recently discussed as well (Miller, Acts of the 8th Congress for Hittitology, Warsaw 2011, in press). It is demonstrated that Muwattalli II also bore the name Šarri-Teššub, and this not only before his reign as king, but during it (pp. 94–5), toppling the earlier “personal” vs. “throne” name explanation of Hittite double names. Finally, Tūdḫaliya IV is likewise attested as Tašmi-Šarri.

This publication is an excellently crafted volume full of absolutely invaluable material, on which researchers will be nibbling for many years to come.
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