

Ankara Arkeoloji Muzesinde bulunan Bogazkoy tabletleri

Review Author[s]:
Albrecht Goetze

Journal of Cuneiform Studies, Vol. 2, No. 3 (1948), 235-237.

Stable URL:

http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-0256%281948%292%3A3%3C235%3AAAMBBT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-7

Journal of Cuneiform Studies is currently published by The American Schools of Oriental Research.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/asor.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Kemal Balkan. Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy tabletleri. Millî Eğitim Basımevi, Istanbul, 1948. XI+36 pp.

In the ruins near Boğazköy fragments of Hittite clay tablets are frequently picked up by peasants. It is gratifying to know that, thanks to the efficiency of the Department of Antiquities of the Turkish Government, they are brought to the Museum in Ankara and still more gratifying to observe that those among them which seem to deserve it are competently published. We owe the present publication (ABoT) to the labor of Dr. Kemal Balkan who was aided by Prof. Hans Gustav Güterbock.

To the remarks which the author has given in his preface (Turkish and German) I add a few observations of my own.

No. 2: The colophon recalls XX 74 where after the title of the tablet queen Puduhepa (this doubtless the correct restoration) is likewise mentioned.

No. 5: The gods worshipped are no doubt ${}^{D}_{Hu}$ - u_{1} - u_{1} - u_{2} , ${}^{D}_{Te}$ - u_{2} - u_{3} , ${}^{D}_{ZA}$ - u_{3} - u_{4} -

No. 6: 18ff. is duplicate of IBoT I 12 1ff.

No. 12: This fragment with its three times repeated $LU.MES_{5a-ah-ta-tal-le-e-es}$ gives occasion to correct a mistake I committed JCS I 9C. There I restored the same word in IBoT I 19 3 incorrectly; cf. furthermore XX 53 V 3, 7,12,17. The last mentioned text shows that in ABoT 12 9 (and consequently also in 11. 4 and 14) $LU.MES_{5a-ah-ta-tal-le-e-es}$ is -ha-mi-ia-an-zi "The s.men sing" must be read. There is reason for the belief that the word denotes an official who otherwise appears in ideographic disguise. If it were not for the consistent spelling with ta-tal one might think of the possibility to read sa-ah-tatal-le-e-es and to combine the word as a nomen actoris with the verb sah-"sweep". In that case we might gain the phonetic reading of the LUSU.I (cf.JCS 183 fn. 13).

No. 13: The obverse can be restored from parallels in X 3; X 54; X 17 and X 18. For the reverse compare X 54 IV and X 56.

No. 20: No. 32 may belong to the same tablet.

No. 21: Is perhars 25 part of the same tablet?

No. 28 is obviously part of No. 29: 28 6= 29 II 23.

No. 29: KUB XXX 38 is part of the same tablet: XXX 38 I 3 = ABoT 29 I 22. Beginning

with XXX 38 I 4 the fragment ABoT 30 is a duplicate. In all probability KUB XXX 38a (1.1 there=XXX 38 I 12 = ABoT 29 I 31) and KUB XXX 38b (1.2 there = XXX 38 I 19) belong to the latter.

No. 31 is a duplicate of No. 29 II: 31 3 29 6. It helps substantially in the reconstruction of the text. Note that instead of wa-ah-nu-wa-a[n-zi] 31 6 we read wa-ar-nu-an-zi in 29 10; for the interchange between h and r see Goetze-Pedersen, Muršilis Sprachlähmung 28ff.

No. 32: see above remark to No. 20.

No. 37 is composed in Hurrian. The fragment is valuable because it can almost completely be restored. Not only is obv. 15-36 parallel with rev. 17-38 and not only but are XXVII 42 and XXIX 8 similar texts, there also exist straight duplicates: (1) obv. 20-24 is duplicated by XXXII 40 2-5 which, after a diverging paragraph from 1.14 on, also parallels ABoT 37 obv. 28-31; (2) rev. 16-27 is duplicated by XXXII 37; (3) obv. 37-43 is duplicated by IBoT II 40 rev. 3-11; (4) it seems as though obv. 36-42 is also duplicated by XXXII 25 IV 5'-11' (1.1'= ABoT 37 obv. 31?). As in the structurally similar texts KUB XXIX 8 and XXVII 42 the characteristic feature of the new text is the following sets of forms

(a ₁)	(b)	(c)	(d)
šeha la	šeha luš	šeņa lulaeš	
gašla	gašluš	kašlulaeš	ka š luše l lant i n
itkula		itkulaeš	it kuše llant in
ekušša	ekuššuš	e ku ššu la e š	e kušše llantin

The forms under (a) are predicative adjectives (see RHA fasc. 35 106f.), those under (b) another form of the same adjectives. Under (c) we have forms of the meaning "let it be what the adjective indicates" (see RHA fasc.35 107). The forms of the final column (d) are all preceded by ergatives in the plural, and when the context is considered it becomes clear that they must be third persons plural imperative of (transitive) verbs "let them make (him/them) what the adjective indicates". This is not the place to go into further details; it may however be pointed out that (1) the text offers the following forms of the same type ašušellantin, hausellantin, uluhušellantin, parellantin, and that (2) we have of hau-"take" the following forms

ha-a-u-ši-el-la-an-ti-in ABoT 37 obv. 20, rev. 21;

hu-u-ši-el-la-an-ti-in XXIX 8 III 38.

hu-ši-in-na-an-ti XXVII 42 rev. 19.

hu-ši-el-la-a-in XXIX 8 IV 13.

The fourth form *bu-Si-in-na-a-in which is not actually attested can safely be reconstrued from the variation between ni- mu_u -u-Si-el-la-an-ti-in XXIX 8 III 42 and ni-bu-u-Si-in-na-a-in XXVII 42 rev. 22. It seems clear that the form in -ain is the corresponding third person singular. For the ll and nn elements see Speiser, Introduction \$188; however, his explanation as determinatives of aspect leaves some doubt.

The further remark may be added that the expression ashusikkunni SALTaduhepa (or its "genitive") "the above mentioned Taduhepa" appears in ABoT 37 in a context where XXIX 8 inserts in Hittite na-as-ta (or nu-kan) EN.SISKUR.SISKUR sum-an hal-sum-a-i "and here he mentions the sacrificer's name". Is Taduhepa a real person or simply a typical name like "John Doe"?

No. 44: It is gratifying to see KUB XXXI 127 so substantially rebuilt, the more so as it is a text of literary merit.

No. 56: The name of the author of this inscription and his genealogy can hardly be reconstructed different from Mr. Balkan's proposal (p. IX). For various reasons I would, then, assume that Arnuwandaš who figures now as the last king of Hatti before its downfall around 1200 was succeeded by a brother who bore the name of his great forebear Šuppiluliumaš.

At the end of the volume (Nos. 61-65) Güterbock autografhs a small fragment to be added to KBo III 6, one of the main copies of the "Apology of Hattušiliš", a small duplicate of KBo V 8 (Muršiliš Annals) from the museum at Kayseri, a fragmentary letter from the excavations at Alacahöyük (so far the only Hittite text found there), and the letter from Maşat which he had published before in a place not easily accessible.

The collection of Hittite tablets here published shows clearly that excavations at the Hittite capital still promise results to the epigraphist. When visiting Boğazköy in 1948 I was told that tablets are being plowed up particularly in the fields on the summit of Büyükkaya. The Department of Antiquities of the Turkish Government would earn the gratitude of international science, were it to test the respective places by a trial excavation.