

- Maidman, Maynard P. 1976. A Socio-Economic Analysis of a Nuzi Family Archive. Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Pennsylvania.
- _____. 1981. The Office of *halšuhlu* in the Nuzi Texts. In *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians in Honor of Ernest René Lacheman*, ed. M. A. Morrison and D. I. Owen. Pp. 233–46. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- _____. 1992. Review of J. N. Postgate, *The Archive of Urad-Šerūa and His Family: A Middle Assyrian Household in Government Service*. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 49: 153–61.
- _____. 2005. *The Nuzi Texts of the Oriental Institute: A Catalogue Raisoné*. Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians, vol. 16. Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press.
- _____. 2014. An Important New Early-Middle-Assyrian Letter. *Cuneiform Digital Library Bulletin* 2014/2: 5 pages.
- _____. 2018. Mittanni Royalty and Empire: How Far Back? *The Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies Journal*.
- Pedersén, Olof. 1998. *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500–300 B.C.* Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press.
- Postgate, J. N. 1988. *The Archive of Urad-Šerūa and His Family: A Middle Assyrian Household in Government Service*. Rome: Roberto Denicola Editore.

Die assyrischen Königstitel und -epitheta vom Anfang bis Tukulti-Ninurta I. und seinen Nachfolgern.
By VLADIMIR SAZONOV. State Archives of Assyria Studies, vol. 25. Helsinki: THE NEO-ASSYRIAN TEXT CORPUS PROJECT, 2016. Pp. xiii + 139. \$59 (paper). [Distributed by EISENBRAUNS, Winona Lake, IN]

This short volume treats the royal titles and epithets from the first rulers of Assur to the end of the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I, with particular emphasis on the historical development of titles which imply claims of universal rule. The work continues Cifola's *Analysis of Variants* (1995), which had already covered much of the same ground.

Following an introduction (pp. 1–5) and brief sketch of Old and Middle Assyrian history and royal ideology (pp. 7–18), the individual chapters provide an overview of the titles used in succeeding periods: from the Old Akkadian to the end of the Old Assyrian period (chapter 2, pp. 19–36), from Aššur-uballit I to Shalmaneser I (chapter 3, pp. 37–62) and Tukulti-Ninurta I (chapter 4, pp. 63–100). The last section offers the longest excursus into other periods and regions in sketching the history of the titles *šar šarrāni* “king of kings” and *šar kiššati* “king of the universe” up to the Achaemenids. The study ends with the immediate successors of Tukulti-Ninurta I up to Aššur-rēša-iši I (chapter 5, pp. 101–4).

The main argument re-affirms the presumption that the titulary reflects political status and royal ideology. The modest titles of the earliest rulers, largely borrowed from southern Mesopotamia, are interrupted only by the grander pretensions of Samsī-Addu I's short-lived Kingdom of Upper Mesopotamia. Middle Assyrian changes are already perceptible under Aššur-uballit I, gain pace with Adad-nērarī I's campaigns, and culminate in the adoption of traditional Babylonian titles following Tukulti-Ninurta I's Babylonian conquest. The subsequent abandonment of most of these reflects the presumed collapse of the Middle Assyrian state.

The author's work redirects focus onto the importance of the earlier periods of Assyrian history in shaping Neo-Assyrian ideology. Unfortunately, the work seldom goes beyond the superficial observations noted above. While Cifola herself (1995: 5) had pointed to the need for a more detailed analysis of the relationship between Assyrian and Babylonian royal titulary, Sazonov's comparison is mostly relegated to general assertions of Hurrian, Hittite, and Babylonian influence (e.g., pp. 17, 19). Most attempts at further analysis are problematic. The astonishing claim that Tukulti-Ninurta I was deified (p. 86), based solely on the epithet *šamaš kiššat nišē* “sun(god) of all peoples” (“Sonnen(gott)” on p. 85) and a reference to the god Enlil as father, fails to draw the basic distinction between the inherent sacralization of kingship and deification.

The sources used are mostly confined to the royal inscriptions already cited by Cifola. Transcriptions and translations are sometimes unreliable: the shepherd king (*rē'û*), for example, also variously *rē'u* (p. 60), *rē'ûm* (p. 61); *nišit Aššur* (likely derived from *ina našû* “to look upon with desire”) is the “anointed of Aššur” (“Gesalbte von Aššur,” p. 67), *nišit Aššur u Šamaš* “the favorite of Aššur and Šamaš” (“der Günstling von Aššur und Šamaš,” *ibid.*), *migir Anim u Enlil* (“granted consent (by the gods)”) again the “anointed of Anu and Enlil” (“der Gesalbte,” *ibid.*).

Despite Babylonian influence in usage, the title *šarru* “king” is certainly not a “Babylonian loanword” (“babylonisches Lehnwort,” p. 18), just as the logographic writing LUGAL KALA.GA for *šarrum dannum* “mighty king” is hardly a “Sumerian variant” (“sumerische Variante,” p. 29). Remarks on the distribution of Adad-nērārī I’s epithets (pp. 55f.) fail to acknowledge that the RIMA 1.0.76.1 (= Grayson 1987) is an artificial composite of introductory sections. Similarly, the statement that style and composition of the inscriptions of Adad-nērārī I and Shalmaneser I are “almost completely identical” (“fast völlig identisch,” p. 57) misses the important shift from lengthy military epithets incorporated into the introduction under Adad-nērārī I to independent campaign narratives following the introductory section under Shalmaneser I. Evidence cited for titles of Shalmaneser I includes numerous inscriptions of his son and successor Tukulti-Ninurta I (e.g., p. 61 nn. 482–92).

In general, Sazonov’s analysis would have benefited from a critical examination of the contexts of individual titles and epithets. As Larsen (2015: 106) notes, “although there are clear traces of very ancient ideas in the Old Assyrian political and religious system, we cannot simply assume that they retained the original meaning and significance.” For example, the functions of royal titles in the Old Assyrian period are summarized on p. 22: *išši'ak Aššur* “steward of the god Assur” is the “basic” title (“Grundtitel”), (*w)aklu* “overseer” is used in letters, while *rubā'um* “prince” and *bēlum* “lord” are used for other persons and not the king himself. Comparison with Larsen’s discussions of kingship in Assur (Larsen 2015: 105–11), not cited by Sazonov, clearly shows the limits to Sazonov’s approach. The title of *išši'ak* “steward” is only “basic” in the sense that it sets the king’s building activities in direct relation to the god of the city. *Rubā'u* “prince” highlights the king’s role as head of the royal lineage and is used, as is *bēlu*, in judicial contexts. *Waklu* “overseer” connotes the king’s role as head of the city’s administration and of the assembly in particular.

Sazonov, again citing Cifola (1995: 20), concludes that Aššur-uballiṭ I restored the use of Old Assyrian (*w)aklu* (p. 40: “diesen alten Titel wiederhergestellt”) and thus shifts focus for the rest of the discussion to more overtly universalistic epithets. A more careful review of Middle Assyrian sources again yields a more nuanced picture. As Sazonov concedes, the king continues to bear the title (*w)aklu* in his administrative and legal functions, as does already Aššur-bēl-niēšû in the pledge contract *KAJ* 162, and in letters. The same title is also used for the king in his status as eponym, beginning at least with Enlil-nērārī (MARV 9, 83 rev. 10'; Freydank and Feller 2010). However, in contrast to the Old Assyrian period, as both the assembly itself and the role of the city as a political institution diminish, the title *aklu* can no longer be primarily defined by the relationship to either.

Sazonov’s claim of a “restoration” misrepresents the evidence. Earlier *waklu* was never used as a standard title in the royal inscriptions, but mostly confined to the Old Akkadian ruler Ititi (RIMA 1.0.1001, 2) and to two copies of an inscription of Erišum from Kanesh (RIMA 1.0.33.1, 1). In the latter, the exact interpretation of PA in PA *A-šûr* is disputed; the addition of the divine name rather suggests an abbreviated form of ÉNSI(PA.TE.SI). Similarly, *aklu* is never incorporated as a standard title in the Middle Assyrian inscriptions. It is attested on bricks from the embankment wall of Adad-nērārī I’s palace (RIMA 1.0.76.40), bricks from the palace of Adad-nērārī (RIMA 1.0.76.43), and in an inscription on both a brick and a copper axehead belonging to the palace of Adad-nērārī (RIMA 1.0.76.45), all of which suit the king’s secular roles. Three final attestations are provided by short epigraphs on jar fragments, recently discussed by Pongratz-Leisten (2015: 393–94). Two of these, RIMA 1.0.76.27 and RIMA 1.0.77.27, derive from the area of the Assur-temple and are explicitly associated with the *tākultu*-ritual. It is tempting to connect the Aššur-uballiṭ I label RIMA 1.0.73.7 with the ritual as well, though it is not mentioned in the inscription and the archeological evidence is more ambiguous.

The *tākultu*, first associated with Assyria under Samsī-Addu I, later developed into a major state ritual during which all the gods of Assur and its provinces were invoked and offered sacrifices, with

a strong spatial component affirming the ties between center and imperial periphery. The texts which detail the ritual are all dated to the later Neo-Assyrian period, and, as already noted by Postgate (1988: 145), several attestations for *tākultu* should be read in a secular sense (e.g., BATSH 9, 69 = Röllig 2008, dated 29/Ša-kēnāte). Evidence does, however, suggest that the Middle Assyrian *tākultu* had already acquired many of its later connotations. The celebration was duplicated in some form in provincial and local centers (Wiggermann in Duistermaat 2008: 560) and these same centers participated by supplying provisions for the celebration (BATSH 9, 101; 20/Ḫibur/Aššur-da”ān). The title of “overseer” is thereby directly associated with the king’s role in a ritual which bears exactly the sort of universalistic implications Sazonov means to examine.

While Sazonov’s work thus provides a convenient overview of royal epithets and titles from early Assyrian history, it also misses the opportunity for a more reliable and critical contribution to the topic.

CHRISTIAN W. HESS
FREIE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN

REFERENCES

- Cifola, B. 1995. *Analysis of Variants in the Assyrian Royal Titulary from the Origins to Tiglath-pileser III*. Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale.
- Duistermaat, K. 2008. *The Pots and Potters of Assyria: Technology, Organisation of Production, Ceramic Sequence and Vessel Function at Late Bronze Age Tell Sabi Abyad, Syria*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Freydank, H., and Barbara Feller. 2010. *Mittelassyrische Rechtsurkunden und Verwaltungstexte IX*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Grayson, A. K. 1987. *Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC (to 1115 BC)*. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press.
- Larsen, M. T. 2015. *Ancient Kanesh: A Merchant Colony in Bronze Age Anatolia*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Pongratz-Leisten, B. 2015. *Religion and Ideology in Assyria*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Postgate, J. N. 1988. Middle Assyrian Texts (Nos. 99–101). In *Tablets, Cones, and Bricks of the Third and Second Millennia B.C.*, ed. Ira Spar. Pp. 144–48. Cuneiform Texts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art 1. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Röllig, W. 2008. *Land- und Viehwirtschaft am Unteren Ḫābūr in mittelassyrischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

The Splintered Divine: A Study of Ištar, Baal, and Yahweh Divine Names and Divine Multiplicity in the Ancient Near East. By SPENCER L. ALLEN. Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records, vol. 5. Berlin: WALTER DE GRUYTER, 2015. Pp. xxi + 457. €102.76.

Spencer Allen’s *The Splintered Divine* analyzes the phenomenon in which ancient Near Eastern deities are identified by two-component names: what he calls the “first name,” representing a common divine name like Ištar, Baal, or Yahweh, and the “last name,” providing a specifying, often geographically based, marker or epithet, such as Nineveh, Şapun, or Teman. Whereas previous scholarship has often understood gods and goddesses with geographic “last names” to be local manifestations of an overarching deity, this book argues that Ištar and Baal figures with different “last names” were, in their respective Neo-Assyrian and Levantine worlds, treated as distinct deities. Additionally, Allen demonstrates that the biblical and inscriptional evidence provides less clear answers to the question of the individuality of Yahwehs in Israel. The nature of the divine has been the subject of numerous recent studies. Allen adds to this discussion a wide range of data that will be of interest to students and scholars alike.

The Splintered Divine is comprised of six chapters, an introduction and conclusion, and over eighty pages of annotated tables that reflect the author’s 2011 dissertation research on god lists. An inadver-