



Fig. 2 - KBo 21.37 + Verso (croquis A. Mancini)

ANOTHER VIEW OF HITTITE LITERATURE

Theo van den Hout, Chicago

1. The combination "Hittite literature" as has been pointed out already years ago by Hans Güterbock poses a double problem of definition: what exactly do we mean by "Hittite" and what by "Literature"?¹

The "Hittite" problem can be solved in a satisfactory way. It is commonly acknowledged that Hittite society was a melting-pot of cultures: when somewhere in the third millennium Indo-Europeans settled in central Anatolia, they merged with the then local population that we refer to as Hattians. Moreover, these Indo-Europeans were not a uniform group: they split up into people speaking Palaic and Luwian with their own beliefs and customs. In the historical period a strong Hurrian influence was added to this. In their turn these Hurrians were the major intermediary for passing Mesopotamian culture on to the Hittites. So it seems best to adhere to the definition which was given already decades ago by that same Hans Güterbock: by "Hittite" we refer to this mixed culture that arose out of the assimilation of indigenous (Hattic) and Indo-European elements and that in the course of its history incorporated other (Hurrian, Mesopotamian) elements.² It is important to add, however, that this definition of Hittite society can only claim validity for the highest echelons of that society given the exclusively royal focus of our sources.

The "literature" problem is more difficult. If we interpret "literature" in the traditional sense of "high literature" of authors like Goethe, Dostoyevsky, Joyce, or Dante, only Hittite historiography, myths, prayers and wisdom literature might come into consideration.

¹ See H.G. Güterbock's contribution "Hethitische Literatur" to W. Röllig (ed.), *Altorientalische Literaturen* (= *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*, Band 1, Wiesbaden 1978), 211-212, as well as his older article "A View of Hittite Literature", *JAOS* 84 (1964) 107-115. For further abbreviations see *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (CHD), edd. H.G. Güterbock-H.A. Hoffner, L-N (1989) xv-xxviii, and P (1997) vii-xxvi. The beginnings of this article go back to a paper I read at the Huishoudelijk Congres van het Oosters Genootschap in Nederland, Leiden 1-2 juni 1995. An adapted version was read at the Oriental Institute in Chicago on October 25, 1999.

² See H.G. Güterbock, «Oriens» 10 (1957) 233-239.

Were we to maximalize our definition and take “literature” simply as everything written by the Hittites, we would have to include even the most prosaic administrative records.

It is clear that while we can get around the “Hittite” problem, neither understanding of the term “literature” seems to fit our purposes. Up to now this question seems to have been approached mainly from either a modern angle, narrowing down Hittite sources to historiography, hymns, prayers and mythological tales, or from the angle of Hittite organizational remains, i.e., the shelf lists and labels. Although fully justified both approaches have their flaws: the former applies modern criteria that are not necessarily the ancients’, the latter suffers from a lack of good material. Ideally the material should speak for itself: what did the Hittites themselves consider important? Importance in this context is defined as that which they stored in their tablet collections for the long term, that is, what they wanted to preserve for future generations. Restricting myself to the material from the Hittite capital Ḫattuša, I would like to explore this question in the following paragraphs from a somewhat different and more general angle. In the course of my remarks I will also venture to say something on the difficult issue of archives and libraries.

During her long career Fiorella Imparati has devoted her numerous and influential publications to many Hittite texts whether historiographic, religious, legal or administrative. In recent years she and her impressive legacy of students have combined efforts on a history of Hittite literature. Thinking of that last undertaking I dedicate the following thoughts to her memory.

2. Archaeologically, the Hittites left clear traces of systematic ways to store their written heritage. When in 1906 the German Hugo Winckler started the excavations at Boğazköy, now Boğazkale, the site of the former Hittite capital Ḫattuša, he found in several spots a situation which might have been ideal: working his way upwards on the west slope of the acropolis Büyükkale he found ever larger pieces, the higher one came, “bis schließlich stellenweise die großen Tafeln vollkommen erhalten und mehrfach beieinander gelagert bloßgelegt wurden”.³ Clearly, when Building E, as we now call it, standing on the edge of the acropolis collapsed, many tablets rolled down the slope and those that kept rolling broke into more and more pieces. Even better seems to have

³ H. Winckler, MDOG 35 (1907) 12.

been the situation in the Lower City where the great Temple stood. One of the assisting archaeologists later wrote that in storage room 11 “ganze, klar geschichtete Reihen schräg liegender, ganz erhaltener Tontafeln lagen”.⁴

Unfortunately, however, Winckler is said to have been preoccupied with just reading the tablets and a wealth of information was lost⁵: of the approximately ten thousand tablets and fragments unearthed during the first four campaigns conducted between 1906 and 1912 we hardly know of any find spot, let alone the order of the tablets in these “ganze, klar geschichtete Reihen”. The exact circumstances could have told us something of what sort of tablets were kept in the temple and what sort up in the palace area of which Building E was a part. They might have given us invaluable information on the system or order the Hittites used in putting tablets on a shelf. It might even have become clear if, for instance, the building consisted of more floors, what tablets were kept “upstairs” and what “downstairs”.

Although equally ideal circumstances do not seem to have occurred after that, the resumed excavations after 1931 did compensate for this lost information to some extent. Larger and smaller tablet collections came to light on the acropolis in and around Buildings A, B-C, D, G, H,

⁴ L. Curtius quoted by H. Otten, «Das Altertum» 1 (1955) 72.

⁵ The same is said to be true of Th. Makridi, cf. H. Klengel in H. Klengel/W. Sundermann (edd.), *Ägypten, Vorderasien, Turfan. Probleme der Edition und Bearbeitung altorientalischer Handschriften* (Berlin 1991), 76-77; for Winckler's diaries see Klengel, *FsNeve* 511-516, see also id., *Die Keilschriftarchive von Boğazköy - Probleme der Textüberlieferung und der historischen Interpretation* (Berlin 1987), 5-6. If it is true that information about findspots was lost when boxes with tablets were sent to Berlin (cf. R. Beal, *CoS* 2, 82, and in L. Cirola-J. Seidel (edd.), *Magic and Divination in the Ancient World*, Leiden forthcoming, 60 n. 6) our judgement of Winckler and Makridi may be too harsh. This may also perspire in the remarks by Emil Forrer in his famous 1922 article on “Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Ḫatti-Reiches” (*ZDMG* 76/NF 1 (1922) 174-269), who still seemed to know the findspots of groups of tablets in general but implies that this information was lost early in the process: “Inhaltlich besteht zwischen den drei Fundstellen (i.e., A = Build. E, B = Temple I, C = slope beneath Build. E; TvdH.) keine scharfe Trennung, doch sind die meisten historischen Inschriften, Königsgebete usw., dagegen fast gar keine Festbeschreibungen in B gefunden worden, während letztere die Hauptmasse der Texte von A ausmachen. Leider ist eine genaue Trennung der Tafeln nach Fundstellen jetzt vielfach kaum mehr möglich. Nur mehrere Hundert Bruchstücke der Gruppe C enthalten kurze Berichte über Lieferungseingänge oder dergleichen und zeigen durch ihre flüchtige unregelmäßige Schrift, daß sie Aufzeichnungen des täglichen Lebens sind; sie haben auch meist ein kleines handliches Format. Alle übrigen Tafeln sind Bibliotheks-Stücke und sehr sauber und gleichmäßig geschrieben.” (177f.).

and K, in the area between here and the Great Temple in the so-called *Haus am Hang*, and in several of the temples of the Upper City. The size of these collections varies greatly, but the collection housed in Building A stands out in several respects. First of all because of the sheer number of fragments found there: some 5000. Secondly, the archaeological context contains important indications: charcoal traces point to the existence of shelves which might have rested on a ledge running alongside the walls.⁶ Also, throughout the room small pillars can be seen at regular intervals probably once supporting freestanding shelves as well.⁷ The room would thus offer us the familiar sight of a library or archive.⁸ This is more or less what archaeology has to offer us concerning tablet collections and the system according to which these were kept.

3. Turning to philology, the so-called shelf lists and labels (*Etikette*) are a potentially valuable source of information. The latter are small, sometimes oval shaped tablets with the title of a composition on them. These labels are thought to have lain on a shelf right in front of the tablets constituting the composition mentioned. However, only few of these labels have been found and their information value is limited.⁹ The shelf lists form inventories of tablets present or which should be present on the shelves. For each composition the title, mostly the first line of a text, is given, sometimes the “author”, the number of tablets of the whole composition, and whether or not the composition as it stands on the shelf is complete. Such shelf lists have been found in and around Buildings A, C, E, G, H, K and M as well as in Temple I and the *Haus am Hang*.¹⁰ Since in a number of cases fragments of tablets that were

⁶ See the description by K. Bittel, *Hattuscha* 24-25; for a similar layout in Building K see Bittel, MDOG 91 (1958) 57-61.

⁷ So P. Neve, *Bauwerke* 106.

⁸ Cf. K. Veenhof, 30. CRRAI (Leiden 1983), 12-13. We will come back to the terms library and archive below §9.

⁹ They are collected under CTH 283, with additional material in KBo 32.134, KBo 36.112, and among KBo 31.31-39 at least the nos. 33-35, and 37. On labels in general see K. Veenhof, 30. CRRAI (Leiden 1983), 16-18 with lit.

¹⁰ Cf. E. Laroche, CTH pp. 153-193, and H.G. Güterbock, AfO 38-39 (1991-1992) 134-135. For the latest addition to the shelf lists see KBo 31.1-30, some of which were already known to Laroche at the time he wrote his Chapter XIV: Débris de fichier in his CTH. Within the new material KBo 31.28, 4'-5' might indirectly join KUB 8.70 ii 10'-11'. For Building M see KBo 31.18 (“westl. vor Geb. M”); for KBo 31.2, v-w/17-18 is given as the findspot which would be in or around Building N, but this may not be its original locus. This seems certain for KBo 31.30 which was found on Büyükkaya

referred to in shelf lists were found in the same building as the shelf list, it has always seemed a reasonable assumption that these lists refer to tablets in the building or room where they were found.¹¹ The lists mention approximately two hundred compositions: mainly incantation rituals, and in addition to these, festival descriptions, celestial omens, a list of edicts and four state treaties. But historiography, for instance, does not figure in them. With the shelf lists from Building A in hand we would have the opportunity to see exactly what Building A housed and even in what order tablets were kept. Building A is dated to the (second half of the) 13th century and paleographically most shelf lists are from that same period.¹²

Unfortunately, the situation is rather more complicated. As pointed out by Emanuel Laroche¹³ approximately only one-seventh of the compositions listed match texts that were actually found, whereas we have close to two hundred titles from the same genres that do not figure at all in the shelf lists. Another problem is the presence of a small group of older, so-called Middle-Hittite, shelf list fragments dating to about 1400 B.C.¹⁴ At least one - likewise older - text listed there was also found in Building A.¹⁵ Since Building A dates from the later 13th century, both

(348/414) but for the Hittite fragments unearthed there see most recently J. Seeher, KBo XLII viii (“Beim bisherigen Grabungsstand darf man davon ausgehen, daß es auf Büyükkaya in hethitischer Zeit keine Tontafelsammlung gegeben hat”).

¹¹ Compare for instance H. Otten, MDOG 91 (1958) 75, and 30. CRRAI (Leiden 1983), 189, H. Güterbock, AfO 38-39 (1991-1992) 132-137. However, Otten's remark (MDOG 91, 75), that one piece found in Building K joins several other pieces that stem from Building A (for details see Otten, HTR 78, S. Košak, StBoT 42, 46 sub 642/c with *Joinskizze* on p. 176-177), shows how cautious we should be; see further S. Košak, *FsHouwink ten Cate* 175.

¹² Hardly any shelf list can be dated historically. Without the join piece 1963/c the list KUB 30.53(+)KBo 7.73++ (CTH 276+277.2; for a join sketch see S. Košak, StBoT 39, 116-117) was one of the few that seemed to contain a clue with the mentioning of Ur[hiteššub and “the father of His Majesty” in KBo 7.73 rev. 8' and 6' respectively (cf. E. Laroche, NH 1443, A. Ünal, THeth. 3, 174) but the publication of 1963/c as KBo 31.4 (vi 29") now shows this to be impossible. Probably inadvertently this text is included among the Middle Script fragments in KBo 31 Inhaltsübersicht iv.

¹³ CTH p. 192-193.

¹⁴ Cf. H. Otten, 30. CRRAI (Leiden 1983) 84-190, for KUB 30.52 (CTH 278)(+?)68 (CTH 282.5); for other Middle Script fragments see now KBo 31.1-3, 11, 12. Also, note the mention of an “old” tablet in the small (single-column with edges inscribed) shelf list KUB 30.62+KBo 31.7, 8-9 (ed. E. Laroche, CTH p. 168, cf. H. Güterbock, AfO 38-39 (1991-1992) 134, and S. Košak, *FsHouwink ten Cate* 175 with n. 14).

¹⁵ Cf. H. Otten, 30. CRRAI (Leiden 1983) 189; for a list of all Old and Middle Hittite “entries” in this building see S. Košak, *FsHouwink ten Cate* 175-177.

the older text and the old shelf list as well as perhaps even all pre-Tuthaliya IV tablets must have been moved there when the previous building was torn down or otherwise destroyed. But was the entire collection moved or only some of its items? The relation between shelf lists and tablets actually stored in Building A would thus become obscured. It is also conceivable that the “reorganization” of the collections resulting from the move led to a less orderly storage than before.¹⁶

As far as the contents of these shelf lists allow us to draw conclusions about the storage system, this does not always look favorably upon the Hittite collection keepers. It has been noticed more than once that sometimes very different compositions are mentioned together whereas compositions which one would expect to be mentioned next to one another appear on different shelf lists. As for a system, fragments belonging to the Egyptian-Hittite correspondence from the period of the thirteenth century Great Kings Hattušili III and Tuthaliya IV were found at three locations: the Great Temple and the Buildings A and E on the acropolis. One may rightly wonder how scribes found their way around if they had to find a specific piece. This led Elmar Edel to characterize the alleged system as “ein mittleres Durcheinander”.¹⁷ On the other hand, the almost complete absence of treaties in the Büyükkale shelf lists has been mentioned as hinting at a system: treaties are expected to have been kept in the temple. Indeed, except for one entry mentioning the treaty of king Telipinu with Išpudahšu of Kizzuwatna in the numerous shelf list from Büyükkale,¹⁸ one of the three fragments of shelf lists found in the Temple I area so far, lists three treaties.¹⁹ The observation that hardly any fragments of the palace and temple administration, i.e., those of which find spots are known, have been found in Building A and only few in the Temple I area as opposed to the bulk originating from Buildings D and E on the acropolis speaks again in favor of some kind of organization.²⁰ As does the fact, for instance, that according to a Middle Hittite shelf list the two main series of the KILAM festival stood side by side.²¹

¹⁶ Cf. K. Bittel, NHF 120-121.

¹⁷ ÄHK II 20.

¹⁸ KUB 30.42+(KBo 31.8) iv 21-24.

¹⁹ KBo 19.35; the other two fragments are KBo 22.101 and 102.

²⁰ See J. Siegelová, *Verw.* 7-10.

²¹ Cf. I. Singer, StBoT 27, 37-39. See further the remarks by Forrer quoted above n. 5.

Another complicating factor is the question of what happened to the tablets at the time of the end of the Hittite empire shortly after 1200. In his paper read at the Fourth International Congress of Hittitology in Würzburg the director of the Boğazköy expedition Jürgen Seeher stated that it now seems that the city was systematically and deliberately cleared and evacuated by the Hittites. It had always been assumed that a major destruction ending in one great fire struck Hattuša. The new insights offered by Seeher explain why so little inventory was found in the buildings. It would also explain why so few tablets of the last known Great King, Šuppiluliyama (II), came to light although he may have reigned for two decades or more. As was suggested some years ago by Heinrich Otten in an interview, the Hittites might have taken with them only the most recent and most important documents from their tablet collections.²²

Finally, it has been suggested that the Hittites at times dumped old tablets, using them as landfill for the construction of new walls or buildings. This practice is well attested for the Ancient Near East and is likely to have existed during the Hittite empire but whether the evidence adduced so far for Hattuša is really valid remains to be seen.²³

4. With the shelf lists and labels as sources of only limited value for an appreciation of what the Hittites themselves may have considered “literature”, a more trustworthy expression of what was deemed worthy of keeping for future generations might be a more general approach of which genres of texts were copied and which were not. In view of the enormous number of duplicates we have, the copying of older compositions must have been daily scribal routine. Many tablets bear the sign of such activity in the form of a colophon stating the scribe’s name, sometimes his genealogy up to three generations, the number of the tablet in the entire series and the supervising scribe’s name. In this way

²² Damals 29/2 (1997) 29: “Aus den letzten 30 Jahren der hethitischen Hauptstadt existieren in Boghazköy keine Archive. Die Grabung zeigt keine Zerstörung der Stadt, sondern alle Anzeichen eines Verfalls. So spricht vieles dafür, daß die letzten Archivalien, die ja wichtig waren für die Verwaltung eines Großreiches, aus der Hauptstadt abtransportiert worden sind.”

²³ Cf. for instance H.G. Güterbock, MDOG 72 (1933) 51-52, *ibid.* 73 (1935) 32, for Building E, KBo XVIII Vorwort iii, for Büyükkale p-q/10-11) but the situation for Building E may now have to be judged differently (see S. Alaura, AOF 25 (1998) 193-214) whereas the Phrygians might be responsible for the situation in p-q/10-11. The dumping of tablets by the Hittites on Büyükkaya is probably very late and may not be representative of a regular practice (J. Seeher, KBo XLII viii-ix).

numerous compositions were meant to be passed on to later generations and kept for centuries in the collections and/or copied over and over again. Yet, this is not the case for all genres alike. It is evident that at least among the upper echelons the Hittites were a highly bureaucratic society where many facets of life were strictly regulated and laid down in writing. Much of this material belonged to the purely administrative realm which in time lost its relevance: such records were after a certain period discarded and never copied. If we roughly divide the Hittite material along that principle we arrive at the following division:

A. *Texts with duplicates*

historiography, treaties, edicts (CTH 1-147, 211-216)
instructions (CTH 251-275)
laws (CTH 291-292)
celestial oracle theory (CTH 531-560)

hymns and prayers (CTH 371-389)
festivals (CTH 591-721)
rituals (CTH 390-500)
mythology (Anatolian and non-Anatolian) (CTH 321-370)
Hattic, Palaic, Luwian, Hurrian texts (CTH 725-791)
lexical lists (CTH 299-309)
Sumerian and Akkadian compositions (CTH 310-316, 792-819)

B. *'unica'*

letters (CTH 151-210)
title deeds (CTH 221-225)
hippological texts (CTH 284-287)
court depositions (CTH 293-297)
non-celestial oracle theory and oracle practice (CTH 561-582)
vows (CTH 583-590)
administrative texts:
- palace and temple administration (CTH 231-250)
- cult inventories (CTH 501-530)
- tablet collection shelf lists (CTH 276-282)
- tablet collection labels (CTH 283)

The above dichotomy is based on the texts and fragments collected in Laroche's invaluable *Catalogue des textes hittites* of 1971 with supplements published in 1972 and 1974 to which most texts edited to date have been added. Although it is unclear just how many pieces have been unearthed, the total number of published and unpublished fragments may be somewhere between 30,000 and 35,000. Obviously, the total number of complete tablets was far less. Silvin Košak counts a ratio of approximately ten fragments to a tablet, which would leave us

with 3000 to 3500 tablets in all.²⁴ Considering all lost or destroyed fragments the ultimate number must have been higher.²⁵ However that may be, with this number we can assume we have a representative sample of what the Hittite tablet collections housed. New finds seldom add real surprises in terms of new genres or even new compositions,²⁶ although the find of the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual in the early eighties showed that this is still possible.

Fortunately, in the last three decades sources from outside the capital have begun to flow. The texts published to date from these sites seem to confirm the representative character of collections from the capital. In the following we will briefly discuss the groups A (§5) and B (§6), and finally look at some interesting exceptions (§§7-8) before drawing some conclusions (§§9-10).

5. Most of the texts under A can be characterized as *prescriptive*: instructions, laws, celestial oracle theory, festivals and rituals including the Hattic, Palaic, Luwian and Hurrian festival or ritual texts which were taken out of the tablet rooms whenever necessary. That is, whenever a group of functionaries had to be instructed or put under oath, when certain celestial signs had to be interpreted, when it was that time of the year that a certain festival had to be performed or when the occasion arose to carry out a ritual. It is in this group that we find practically all older tablets, i.e., either in Old or Middle Script, next to younger copies. These compositions are not only prescriptive by their contents but also by their form. Over the centuries they often went through several redactional stages and often a text was adapted or a new one compiled on the basis of older texts.²⁷ Hymns and prayers were kept for similar reasons to serve as models for new ones. The indigenous Anatolian myths formed an integral part of rituals. Also for texts issuing political decisions such as treaties or edicts there was besides a historical interest

²⁴ *FsHouwink ten Cate* 174, cf. similarly already E. Forrer, ZDMG 76/NF 1 (1922) 176 ("mindestens 5 bis 10, ja 20 und mehr Bruchstücke [ergeben] erst zusammen eine ganze Tafel").

²⁵ The elusive wooden tablets (for which see most recently M. Marazzi, *FsBelardi* 131-160 with lit.) are kept out of consideration here.

²⁶ Cf. E. Laroche, CTH p. 192.

²⁷ Note the regular references to "old tablets" in these texts. With F. Pecchioli Daddi, AoF 27 (2000) 355 n. 30, we may assume that the copying and making of new redactions of these tablets was carried out from a purely practical point of view.

(see below) a practical reason to hold on to the original exemplars or old tablets as examples for similar occasions that might arise in the future.²⁸

Prescriptive in another sense are the texts that may have played a role in the training of scribes: this may be the case with the lexical lists and Sumerian and Akkadian compositions. This is not to say that they did not influence Hittite literary expression: famous is the explicit allusion to Sargon's crossing of the Taurus by the Old Hittite king Hattušili I. Historical interest may thus have played a role here too in keeping the Mesopotamian epic in the collections.²⁹ Similarly, Gernot Wilhelm has shown, that the motif of the Sun god on his cart drawn by four horses, is not as was hitherto supposed an Anatolian element but was probably borrowed from Mesopotamia since it occurs in a Sumerian-Akkadian prayer (*Gebetsbeschwörung*), fragments of which have been found at Boğazköy.³⁰

Whether such "academic" use was true for the adaptations of non-Anatolian myths and epics is wholly conjectural: together with the purely historiographical texts they are the only ones that might be entitled to our modern predicate "literary". A no doubt propagandistic aspect - which comes close to being prescriptive in a political sense - cannot be denied for many of the texts labeled as "historiography", although it is not easy to envisage how effective this was in a society where the ability to read cuneiform was restricted to a relatively small group. There is some evidence that texts were regularly and also at certain occasions read out loud to an audience.³¹ For the so-called instruction texts this must have been the case just as with the admonitory kind of texts which we refer to as the Palace Chronicles. The famous "Testament" of Hattušili I, a decree issued to formally present his successor Muṣṣili I, explicitly stipulates that it should be read out monthly to the young king.³² One is also reminded of Šuppiluliuma I's order to fetch and read aloud solemnly the old treaty tablet with Egypt concerning the population of Kuruštama

²⁸ Compare, for instance, H. Otten, ZA 84 (1994) 254-255.

²⁹ See G. Beckman in D. Kuhn/H. Stahl (edd.), *Die Gegenwart des Altertums. Formen und Funktionen des Altertumsbezugs in den Hochkulturen der Alten Welt* (Heidelberg 2001) 85-91.

³⁰ See G. Wilhelm in W. Burkert-F. Stolz (edd.), *Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich* (Freiburg-Schweiz, Göttingen 1994), 65-66.

³¹ Cf. H. Cancik, *Grundzüge der hethitischen und alttestamentlichen Geschichtsschreibung* (Wiesbaden 1976), 53-55 with n. 182 on p. 89, H. Hoffner, Or. 49 (1980) 325.

³² KBo 1.16+ iii 56-57, ed. HAB 14-15, for a new translation of this text see G. Beckman, CoS 2, 79-81.

when he had finally decided to comply with Egypt's request for a son to marry the widow of the deceased pharaoh.³³ It is especially in the decrees that we must seek the roots of Hittite historiography: when promulgating decisions, kings seem to have had an urge to justify new rules by looking at the past. If that in itself is not surprising, the manner in which they did so certainly is. Half of Telipinu's Edict, which issues new succession rules and an administrative reorganization of the country, is taken up by an historical prologue meant to persuade the reader/listener of the need for and rightness of his decree. Here prescriptive and historic overlap. Eventually, this led to some works which come close to true historiography: a recounting of the past on the basis of older written sources and composed as an entity. This interest in their own past may have been an important incentive by itself for keeping certain records in the tablet collections.³⁴ Muṣṣili II could never have written works like the Deeds of Šuppiluliuma I, his father, or his Annals without consulting the tablet collections. The ultimate goal of these compositions is also likely to have been propagandistic as is already evident from the Hittite word for "manly deeds" or *res gestae*: *pešnatar* "lit. 'manhood, virility'".³⁵ The fact that the text of the Deeds was meant to be made into a bronze tablet suggests some kind of public display and the recent discoveries of historical narrative in Hieroglyphic Luwian of the YALBURT and SÜDBURG inscriptions by Tuḫaliya IV and Šuppiluliyama (II) respectively added to the already known ones from EMIRGAZI (i.e., Block "V" by Tuḫaliya IV) and NIŞANTEPE (Šuppiluliyama) are prime examples of public display and strengthen the idea of propagandistic purposes.

The only area where a propagandistic or prescriptive element seems absent, is that of the non-Anatolian myths: were they meant for sheer pleasure?

6. The texts under B, of which in general we have one exemplar only, can be characterized as *descriptive* and almost always date to the second half of the 13th century. Their generally temporary character is obvious in the case of, for instance, the palace and temple administration judging by the sloppy handwriting or the lesser quality of the clay. Of

³³ KBo 14.12+ iv 26-39, ed. H.G. Güterbock, JCS 10 (1956) 98.

³⁴ Cf. K. Veenhof, 30. CRRAI (Leiden 1983) 6, see also W. van Soldt, *ibid.* 202 for the texts from the long period between Niqmaddu II and Niqmaddu III kept on an upper level in the Central Archive in Ugarit.

³⁵ Cf. G. del Monte, TVOa 4.2, 12-17.

importance here may also be the observation that roughly one sixth of the palace and temple administration was written on one-column tablets, an unusual high percentage for a coherent group of documents.³⁶ Also the larger compilatory tablets with a three-column format show signs of a less careful layout.³⁷

The court depositions were used as the necessary documents during trials. In some cases the sloppy handwriting is evidence for recording on the spot during an interrogation. Larger multi-column tablets in a more careful hand were probably compiled on the basis of such records.³⁸ The use of such documents is described in the instruction for the Royal Bodyguard IBoT 1.36 iii 1-11 (§§30-31):

“[The gu]ard who [brings in] the defendants [takes his stand] behind the gold-spear-man. [When] the king asks for a case (to be tried), the guar[d picks] it [out] and p[uts] it into the hand of the chief-of-guards and tells the chief-of-guards [what] case [it is] while the chief of guards [tells the king]. § Then the chief-of-guards goes, and two offici[als stand/walk] behind him - whether they are chief(s)-of-chariot-fighters or commander(s)-of-ten - they stand [behind] the chief-of-guards. And one (man) holds the outside - whether he is a gu[ard or] some (other) official. Then the same guard who brings in the defendants, runs back; he goes and takes his stand with the gold-spear-man and they pick out the next case”.³⁹

Among the oracle texts we see the same mix of “originals”, i.e., records made on the spot and larger more carefully written compilations.⁴⁰

Likewise completely administrative are the records dating to the cult reorganization carried out under the auspices of Tuthaliya IV (c. 1240-1210 BC). Interesting here are the several layers of the recording process that can be distinguished: the initial assessment of the local situation, and the interim and final reports.⁴¹ The vows, most of which have been dated to the reign of Hattušili III (c. 1267-1240 BC), record the vows

made and probably served as records against which the later fulfillments could be checked. The shelf lists and labels were already discussed above (§3). We will come back to the title deeds (*Landschenkungsurkunden*) and hippological texts below. The only genre of records in this group, which is not so much administrative in itself but was kept for administrative purposes, are the letters.

Although all text genres in group B share the characteristic that, as a rule, only one copy existed in the tablet collections, many of these, however, were or could be the result of a long bureaucratic process as is evident in the compilatory tablets. In this process there may have existed duplicates or partial duplicates but they were probably immediately disposed of once a final copy or compilation had been made. There was no use in keeping the underlying records. The final products were then filed in the tablet collections for a certain period. Of course, it is difficult to determine for exactly how long they were kept but we can make an estimate. If we disregard the title deeds and hippological texts for the moment (see §7), the corpus of palace and temple administration including the depositions can generally be dated on mainly prosopographical grounds to the period of Hattušili III and especially that of his son and successor Tuthaliya IV, i.e., roughly the second half of the 13th century. Except for two or three exemplars that must be dated to Muwatalli II. (c. 1295-1274 BC) and Muršili III/Urhitešsub (c. 1274-1267 BC) most vows have to be ascribed to the same two kings.⁴² The letters, too, generally have to be dated to the second half of the 13th century. Of course, every group has its exceptions (see below §§7-8), but these do not change the overall chronological picture.

The upper chronological boundary seems to be the reigns of Hattušili III-Tuthaliya IV, although it is difficult to establish an exact boundary with confidence. One might, for instance, argue that his predecessor, Muršili III/Urhitešsub, had no real time in his short and eventful term to build a substantial administration. Moreover, the relative scarcity of contemporaneous documents that could have been assigned to group B from the reign of Muwatalli II might be related to his decision to move the capital to Tarhuntašša in the south. The lack of such texts from the period of his father Muršili II (c. 1318-1295 BC) constitutes with certainty the ultimate upper limit for storing older texts in the Hittite tablet collections. Historically the lower limit should be the last known Hittite king Šuppiluliyama but none of the texts of group B

³⁶ On these matters see J. Siegelová, *Verw.* 4, for single-column tablets see also StBoT 38, 9 n. 19.

³⁷ Cf. J. Siegelová, *Verw.* 1.

³⁸ Cf. R. Werner, StBoT 4, 1.

³⁹ Ed. H.G. Güterbock-Th. van den Hout, AS 24, 22-25.

⁴⁰ Cf. forthcoming RIA Orakel. B.

⁴¹ On this see J. Hazenbos, Diss. 167-172.

⁴² Cf. J. de Roos, Diss. 51-65.

has been dated to his reign. This observation lends credibility to Otten's and Seeher's theory that the capital was not razed to the ground but systematically abandoned and cleared by the last generation (see above §3). As might be expected, they took with them the immediately relevant administration but not more than that. As a result, one might say that in a normal situation tablets of group B were kept for one or two generations before being systematically discarded.⁴³ That the texts written in Old and Middle Script fall overwhelmingly into category A is a logical corollary of these observations.

7. Where we occasionally do have older fragments belonging to the early empire or even the Old Kingdom in category B this is due either to archaeological chance or some special interest attached by the Hittites themselves to a particular text.⁴⁴ The former seems, for instance, to account for the Old or Middle Hittite oracle tablet KBo 18.151. The existence of the few Old and Middle Script exemplars found in Building A requires special attention which falls outside the scope of this general survey.⁴⁵ The only true exceptions in this group are the title deeds (*Landschenkungsurkunden*), the hippological texts, and the non-celestial oracle theory: the two former groups are consistently older (for the Kikkuli text see below); the third group shows a mix of older and younger exemplars.

⁴³ The limited time span of the Hittite tablet collections was basically already recognized by Emil Forrer, (cf. also J. Papritz, «Archivalische Zeitschrift» 55 (1959) 18) when he said: "So wie die Tafeln uns vorliegen, haben wir es also nicht mit einem Archiv, sondern mit einer Bibliothek zu tun, die etwa um 1300 v. Chr. gegründet wurde und während der letzten 120 Jahre des Hatti-Reiches zugleich als Archiv gedient hat". His use of the terms "Archiv" and "Bibliothek" may not be shared by us today but his general chronological conclusion was correct.

⁴⁴ Cf. K.R. Veenhof, 30. CRRAI (Leiden 1983) 7: "The occasional presence of older documents without any apparent practical use may simply be due to the failure to take such measures (i.e., thrown away or put to secondary use as, for instance, building material, TvdH) on the part of the responsible scribes, e.g. when there was no lack of space to store them."

⁴⁵ See the listing in S. Košak, *FsHouwink ten Cate* 175-177. The only OS fragment there pertaining to category B would be KBo 16.57 (CTH 238), MS fragments are KBo 12.62, KBo 18.66 and 69 (all CTH 209), KBo 16.59 and KUB 34.45+KBo 16.63 (both CTH 295). For pre-New Hittite oracle texts see 423-440 *FsHaas*, for older letters, except for the ones in Building A just mentioned, cf. KBo 18.51 (cf. J. Klinger, ZA 85 (1995) 92 with n. 71), KBo 18.54 (cf. StBoT 38, 170-171), KUB 19.20+KBo 12.23 (ed. ZA 84 (1994) 60-88). The Mašat letters, of course, constitute a separate, closed corpus not from Boğazköy.

The title deeds constitute a very specific group both in wording, outer appearance and place of storage: they record in a fixed Akkadian formulary the granting of considerable portions of land to persons, who were probably members of the extended royal family. They are "signed" in the center of the obverse with a large royal seal threatening death to anyone who might infringe on its wording. These deeds are found in two specific buildings (Building D on the acropolis⁴⁶ and the so-called *Westbau* in the Upper City⁴⁷) in conjunction with clay bullae bearing seal impressions as well. Both groups are chronologically roughly complementary: the title deeds are attested up to and including Arnuwanda I (c. 1400 BC) whereas the sealed bullae start with Šuppiluliuma I (c. 1350 BC). It has been suggested that the bullae were originally attached to wooden tablets.⁴⁸ It is highly plausible that as long as a certain deed was valid, a copy of it had to be kept in the tablet rooms. For these reasons they were kept for several hundreds of years at special locations but there was no need to copy them.⁴⁹ In these cases we are truly dealing with archives in the modern sense of the word.

The hippological treatises consist of three different series two of which were written down in the early Empire period while the third one is a later copy.⁵⁰ Both because these treatises are a kind of instructions and are in all likelihood translations, one would expect duplicates. Surprisingly, only one single duplicate fragment has been recognized for the younger copy (the so-called Kikkuli-text).⁵¹ The duplicate itself also stems from the 13th century.⁵² We thus have no fragment of the supposed Middle Hittite forerunner of the Kikkuli text. Do we have to transfer the hippological texts to group A just because of this one tiny fragment or do we have to infer that perhaps these texts were not very important to the Hittites, that they led a relatively dormant existence in

⁴⁶ Cf. K. Bittel, JKF 1 (1950-1951) 164-173.

⁴⁷ Cf. P. Neve, *Hattuša* 30, 52-58, H. Otten, *Das hethitische Königshaus*, and Chr. Rüster, *FsNeve* 63-70 with Tf. 5.

⁴⁸ Cf. K. Bittel, JKF 1 (1950-1951) 171-172.

⁴⁹ For title deeds and the long periods over which they could be kept see K. Veenhof, 30. CRRAI (Leiden 1983), 30.

⁵⁰ Ed. A. Kammenhuber, *Hipp.heth.*, for the text constitution see ibid. 40-52. For the date of the series see E. Neu, *FsGüterbock* 2, 151-163.

⁵¹ KUB 1.11//KUB 29.47, cf. A. Kammenhuber, *Hipp.heth.* 40: "Bedeutsam mag sein (nach Otten), daß bisher nur ein Duplikat, und zwar zum 'Kikkuli-Text', gefunden wurde."

⁵² Cf. E. Neu, *FsGüterbock* 2, 158 n. 22.

the tablet collections and that the Hittites satisfied themselves with having one copy in their collections at a time?

Finally, the non-celestial omen compendia. The Hittite omen texts are divisible into two groups: the celestial and non-celestial omen compendia, categorized above under A and B respectively. The latter group comprises, for instance, teratological, calendrical, and medical omina or those concerning extispicy (e.g. liver models), dreams or phenomena like earthquakes. Judged by the fact that, with few exceptions, texts of the second group seem to have been kept in single copies only and sometimes for several centuries, and that they show no signs of adaptation, interest in them may have been largely "academic."⁵³ Their existence in the Hittite tablet collections may have been as dormant as that of the hippological texts. The compendia of celestial omina, on the other hand, were regularly copied, translated from the Akkadian and sometimes adapted to the Hittite situation. Moreover, some other texts suggest that the Hittites occasionally used the compendia of celestial signs.⁵⁴ The latter thus fit the "prescriptive" label that was assigned to them above.

8. Apart from the title deeds and the hippological texts which form special cases as a whole, more interesting are the exceptions in other genres within group B, that is, texts like letters, oracles, or administrative texts of which we do have duplicates occasionally. Since we are so used to the existence of duplicates in general, often not enough attention is paid to duplicates in cases where one does not expect them. These cases require an explanation, and the fact that those compositions were copied, already lends them a special position within their genre. As it turns out, such texts often differ in more respects than their having one or more duplicates. In the following we will briefly review some examples.

The only real exception concerning duplicates among the letters is the one from Tuthaliya IV to the high Assyrian court official Babu-ahū-

⁵³ Note the identification of KUB 4.53 as a school tablet by G. Wilhelm, StBoT 36, 5 n. 28, 73-74.

⁵⁴ Compare the solar eclipse(?) in KUB 14.4 iv 24-26 (ed. St. de Martino, Eothen 9, 30-31, 38-39, Th. van den Hout, *Purity* 42-44, or the lunar and Venus signs in KUB 8.27 i.e. a-b (ed. Th. van den Hout, *Purity* 216-217, with commentary 167-168), and the royal substitution ritual KUB 24.5+ on account of lunar omina (cf. obv. 9', ed. H. Kümmel, StBoT 3, 8-9, and s. U. Koch Westenholz in (ed.) H. Galter, *Die Rolle der Astronomie* 239-240, H. Hunger/D. Pingree, HdO I/44, 26.

idinna, KUB 23.103//92//KUB 40.77 (CTH 178.1).⁵⁵ Not only do we have duplicates here but it is also a Hittite translation of, or draft for a letter that must have been sent in Akkadian. Moreover, the first two are with certainty preserved on Sammeltafeln only. The other letters on the same tablets likewise belong to the correspondence with the Assyrian king. What we have here is the "Assur dossier" kept in the tablet collection of the Hittite chancellery for ready reference in a time of high tension between the two countries.⁵⁶

Another interesting case concerns the famous vow of Puduhepa, edited by Heinrich Otten in StBoT 1. Whereas all other texts that we call vows exist in a single copy only, we have evidence of at least six copies of the Puduhepa-vow. However, if we compare this text to the other vows, it turns out to be very atypical. The detailed listing of households must in some way be connected with the exceptional number of exemplars, and an explanation for it must be sought in that direction.

Similarly there is the Šahurunuwa-Urkunde, the only title deed having a duplicate: we know of two copies but both were found in the Great Temple. The findspot is in keeping with the remark in the text itself (rev. 35) that the document should be deposited in the Temple of the Storm god of Hatti but very uncharacteristic for all other title deeds, as we saw earlier. The (Hittite!) wording of this text also differs radically from its Middle Hittite predecessors.

Among the oracle texts the one known as CTH 568 clearly stands out: the oracle investigation was probably carried out in connection with a revision of the Hittite cult calendar under Muršili II.⁵⁷ In fact, the text itself, of which there exist at least four exemplars, is rather a list of results than a real "classic" oracle text with all the detailed descriptions of the mantic techniques. The divinely approved changes affected at any rate the two great festivals of spring and autumn and gave rise to new redactions. In this way they again have a more prescriptive nature, and it is conceivable that the reason for the existence of more than one copy

⁵⁵ See A. Hagenbuchner, THeth. 15, 9 n. 17, and ed. THeth. 16, 249-260 with lit.

⁵⁶ The phenomenon of the parallel letter in the two-track correspondence with Egypt which may be used as a duplicate for our modern purposes is, of course, different from that of the ancient duplicate. The two texts KBo 8.16 and KBo 28.54 presented by A. Hagenbuchner, THeth. 15, 9 n. 17, as duplicates, probably also constitute such a parallel pair, see KBo XXVIII Inhaltsübersicht. The duplicates KUB 8.79//KUB 26.92 (cf. Hagenbuchner, *ibid.*) do not display any features characteristic of letters as Hagenbuchner herself remarks (Theth. 16, 403). Their being duplicates may even plead against the identification as letters.

⁵⁷ Cf. Houwink ten Cate, *FsGüterbock* 2, 97-98, 108-109.

has to be sought in that direction. Occasionally, duplicates have been identified among other oracle records, although, given the complex text tradition, they may not always be actual duplicates.⁵⁸

Sometimes it is very difficult to see what the reason for duplicates might have been within a group where we normally do not encounter them. Among the fragments of the palace and temple administration there are some texts with duplicates.⁵⁹ In one instance (KBo 18.170(+)//KUB 42.43), a case could be made that the smaller of the two originally had been a separate document later incorporated in a larger one. One of the other texts is perhaps special in the sense that it registers the contents of a series of containers in connection with the crowning ceremony of a king and queen. Using a combination of paleographical and historical considerations, Jana Siegelová⁶⁰ suggests that Hattušili III and Puduhepa were the royal couple in question. Besides these two pairs of duplicates, there is a group of four duplicate texts that originally must have formed two consecutive tablets. They distinguish themselves from the other administrative texts in that they are constantly labeled *ŠA KASKAL(-N)* or *INA KASKAL NAŠŪ*: Siegelová tentatively interprets them as transport lists and suggests they may have been drawn up in connection with an “einmaliges, bedeutsames Geschehen”.⁶¹

Also among the cult inventories we encounter occasional duplicates: CTH 510, 516, 517 and 530.⁶² In one of these (CTH 517), concerning the cult of the Tutelary Deity of Karahna, it is clear that exemplar A has been copied from another tablet since the scribe twice mentions he was not able to read his “Vorlage”. Whether the latter was our copy B we cannot tell. In the case of CTH 516 we not only have duplicating fragments but one of the two dates back to the Middle Hittite period as well.⁶³ Perhaps a new younger copy was ordered under the

⁵⁸ Cf. H. Berman, JCS 34 (1982) 124, and Th. van den Hout, *Purity* 14.

⁵⁹ KUB 42.18//20 (ed. J. Siegelová, *Verw.* 48-51), KUB 42.27(+)//KBo 18.179 (ed. *ibid.* 32-44), KBo 18.153(+)//KUB 26.66 (ed. *ibid.* 96-108), and KBo 18.170(+)//KUB 42.43 (ed. *ibid.* 482-488). For KUB 12.1(+) and KBo 18.166 as alleged duplicates see J. Siegelová, *Verw.* 7 with n. 10.

⁶⁰ *Verw.* 34-35.

⁶¹ *Verw.* 397; KUB 60.112 has been identified as another fragment belonging to this group by S. Košak, ZA 84 (1994) 289.

⁶² For CTH 530 see KBo 19.126//IBOT 4.39//KUB 57.74, cf. BiOr. 47 (1990) 428.

⁶³ This is ms. B (KUB 12.36+KUB 60.9), cf. BiOr. 51 (1994) 121, S. Košak, ZA 84 (1994) 288, for an ed. see J. Hazenbos, Diss. 117-118.

reorganization by Tuthaliya IV. All four cases belong in all likelihood to the category of final report (see above §6) describing the changes in the cult. In that sense, again, these texts are prescriptive, and duplicates may be expected. However, if so, we would have expected more duplicates among the cult inventories.

Finally, we may return to the tablet collections and the shelf lists. Among the latter texts there are two pairs of duplicates.⁶⁴ One of these is traditionally presented as duplicates, both found in Building A: KUB 30.51+//KBo 14.68+.⁶⁵ But a closer examination of the texts shows that both versions differ in quite a few points. They are indeed inventories of the same shelves but one cannot have been copied from the other. It seems rather that an inventory was made of the same shelves twice. Either two scribes independently performed the same task, not being aware that an inventory had already been taken, or after a certain lapse of time (and changes?) the need for a new inventory was felt.⁶⁶

9. Concluding, we can observe a dichotomy in the Hittite textual material which we have tentatively termed “prescriptive” versus “descriptive”, i.e., texts which regulated the political and religious tradition throughout the centuries, which were kept and copied for future reference and use, as opposed to texts registering the daily life of the ruling elite which could be disposed of as soon as a new administrative cycle was set in motion. Of the latter we have only, as a rule, the most recent exemplars. The difference between the two, therefore, was, in my opinion, not one of “practicality”⁶⁷ but duration. Almost all compositions of both categories A and B had a practical purpose but that of A has a long-term and that of B a short-term purpose. The presence of historical texts in the prescriptive group is not surprising in view of the unique quality of Hittite historiography. Hittite historiography arose out of the urge to justify present behavior or new rules, history was the foundation of the present and was meant to be learned from and thus falls under the heading “prescriptive.” This same

⁶⁴ KBo 31.5+//KBo 31.26 (see already CTH p. 40 n. 1) and KUB 30.51+//KBo 14.68+.

⁶⁵ E. Laroche, CTH p. 157-161; for Building A as the findspot of both (contra Laroche CTH p. 157) see H.G. Güterbock, AfO 38-39 (1991-1992) 134.

⁶⁶ Exemplar B makes an older impression paleographically, e.g. about 1300 BC, whereas A stems from a later period of the same century. A similar explanation was put forward for two overlapping shelf lists from Nippur by M. Weitemeyer, «Libri» 6 (1955-1956) 231-232.

⁶⁷ That seems to be the view of R. Francia, «Archivi e Cultura» 29 (1996) 127, 132.

“historical” approach determined the basic Hittite attitude towards divination: whatever “signs” - whether *impetrativa* or *oblative* - occurred, they were associated much more with the past than with the future and, as a consequence, the Hittites were interested in clarifying that past as a sound basis for future behavior much more than in merely predicting that future. In a way, the divination texts of group B can be seen as administrative records of their research into the past practice.

Approaching the end of our brief survey of the contents of the Hittite tablet collections, an interesting question is whether the more ephemeral texts, i.e., those of category B, were also included in the shelf lists. A look at those lists (see above §3 with n. 10) shows that (almost?) exclusively compositions of category A are attested there:⁶⁸ rituals, incantations, festivals, (celestial) omens, medical treatises, treaties, and edicts. This is an important observation to which we will have to return below. An important question (which cannot be answered here) is why other genres of category A are not represented: historiography, laws, hymns and prayers, non-Anatolian mythology and other translated/adapted texts, and lexical texts.

10. Up to now, I avoided the terms “library” and “archive” and spoke of “tablet collections” only. The distinction between and definition of the two is notoriously difficult.⁶⁹ In his recent monograph on archives and libraries in the Ancient Near East, O. Pedersén gives the

⁶⁸ An exception might be those few cases where it seems that non-celestial omens are listed, although they may as well refer to rituals for when such signs had occurred. Compare KUB 30.55 (ed. E. Laroche, CTH p. 174-175) where we find a few listings of non-celestial omens among celestial ones. We read there, for instance, 1 *TUPPU ŠA MUŠ G[ISKIM KUB 30.55, 2’* (“One tablet: s[igns] of the snake”), for a snake see also KUB 8.70 ii 4’-5’ and KBo 31.24, 10’. However, as observed by A. Ünal, BiOr. 44 (1984) 486, we have a ritual against a snake entering a house in KUB 55.57. So instead of being a list of omens concerning the constellation going by this name, it seems to be a list of rituals for the eventuality of omens concerning the movements of a real snake or reptile; for this shelf list see A. Kammenhuber, THeth. 7, 75-78, and H. Güterbock, AfO 38-39 (1991-1992) 136-137. For the entry *GU₄-aš GISKIM-aš* “sign(s) of the ox” (ibid. 11’) Kammenhuber also suggests reference to a ritual.

⁶⁹ For several definitions and discussions within the field of Ancient Near Eastern studies see e.g. M. Weitemeyer, «Libri» 6 (1955-1956) 218, J. Papritz, «Archivalische Zeitschrift» 55 (1959) 11-51, E. Posner, *Archives in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA, 1972) 4f., K. Veenhof, 30. CRRAI (Leiden 1983) 7, 9, H. Otten, ibid. 184-185, J. Black/W. Tait, CANE 4, 2197, 2202, 2206, R. Francia, «Archivi e Cultura» 29 (1996) 119 n. 1 (with lit.), J. du Toit, 43. CRRAI (Prague 1996), 389-395, and O. Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500-300 B.C.* (Bethesda, MD 1998), 3.

following definition: “The term ‘archive’ here, as in some other studies, refers to a collection of texts, each text documenting a message or a statement, for example, letters, legal, economic and administrative documents. In an archive there is usually just one copy of each text, although occasionally a few copies may exist. ‘Library’, on the other hand, denotes a collection of texts normally with multiple copies for use in different places at different times, and includes, e.g. literary, historical, religious, and scientific texts. In other words, libraries may be said to consist of the texts of tradition”.⁷⁰ This definition is exclusively subject oriented⁷¹ but rightly avoids the term “literary” in the main description of what a library contained, and speaks of “the texts of tradition” instead. This definition fits the Hittite material remarkably well in that compositions from category A could be classified as “library” material and those from category B as “archive” (or “archival”) material.

However, the terms library and archive also presuppose an organizational or spatial component. Of most texts it can relatively easily be determined whether we would put them in an archive or library. But the question is: did the ancients treat them accordingly, that is, did they consciously store them in different places? In Hattuša, as elsewhere, library and archive materials have come to light side by side in practically every building housing a fair-sized tablet collection.⁷² Forcing the modern notions of “library” and “archive” onto the ancient material makes little sense if tablets of both categories stood next to one another on the shelves. In that respect it seems better to refrain from statements about any building being a “palace library” or “temple archive” or the like.⁷³

Was there no organization whatsoever then? The answer to this question should come primarily from archaeology. We already have hints at some form of organization in the preponderance, for instance, of certain document genres in certain buildings (cf. §3). However, the very idea of shelf lists, if we assume it was a stock taking of tablets standing right next to one another on a shelf, paired with the fact that we find

⁷⁰ *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500-300 B.C.* (Bethesda, MD 1998), 3.

⁷¹ See the criticism by J. du Toit, 43. CRRAI (Prague 1998), 391.

⁷² Cf. R. Francia, «Archivi e Cultura» 29 (1996) 138.

⁷³ So already K. Bittel, NHF 120 n. 2. For Building A in Hattuša as a palace library see recently H. Otten apud S. Košak, StBoT 34, 8, as well as Košak, *FsHouwink ten Cate* 177, as opposed to M. Giorgieri, ZA 87 (1997) 158 with n. 3 who thinks it was more of an archive.

only category A material in these lists - and only certain specific genres of that category, at that -, points to the existence of separate spaces for the storage of “library” and “archive” material. Since archival material was also among the thousands of tablets in Building A, this would mean that, although stored in the same building, there must at least have been a distinction between shelves, rooms and/or floors.

11. Let us return to our initial question of how to define “literature” in the combination “Hittite literature”. Above, we rejected literature in our modern sense of “high literature”. On the other hand, this traditional “high literature” is what survived the ages: we still read Homer, Cervantes, Mann and Proust. Their works were preserved for us by previous generations and we do the same. If we apply that criterion to the categories A and B, category A might deserve the label “literature”.

SOME INDO-EUROPEAN LOGS

Calvert Watkins, Harvard University

In the course of preparation of a recent communication delivered at Oxford, Harvard, and Paris (C.R.A.I. 2000.3, 1143-1158 [2001]) I had occasion to bring together the Anatolian vanishing god myths, like those of Telipinus or the Storm God of Kuliwisna, and the Greek tale of Meleager. The themes of *Wrath*, *Fire*, and *Fate* are singularly prominent in both these cultural manifestations, Anatolian and Greek, and I argued there that the details were such as to suggest diffusion from Anatolia into Greece as the explanation of the similarity. Among these details is the manipulation of *Fire* in each tradition, Anatolian and Greek: a burning log, stick of wood, or firebrand is first extinguished, then brought away, and finally burnt up.

In the “Vanishing God” myth and ritual of the Storm God of Kuliwisna¹ the action is particularly clearly set forth. Indeed, the dramatic climax of the ritual is formed by the thrice-repeated (KUB 51.22 = I.C vo. 1-4 etc.)

GIŠwaršamušš=a kištanuzi n=aš=kán parā parni pedāi
n=aš=šan ḫašši išḫuwāi n=aš arḫa warnuzi

and he extinguishes the kindling (GIŠwaršamaš, as translated by Hoffner²),

and brings it home,
and then he shakes it on the fire altar, and burns it up.

This manipulation of *Fire* is the magical means by which the *Wrath* of the Vanishing God is *stopped*: the formula is *karpin* (*kartimmiyattan*, *šāuwar*) *arai-*, with numerous syntactical and lexical variants, presented as litanies in the Telipinu myth.

Now in the Greek tale of Meleager, as narrated by Bacchylides and Aeschylus, the hero’s life was linked at birth by the *Fate* (Μοῖρα) to a

¹ See the exemplary edition of Jürgen Glocker, *Das Ritual für den Wettergott von Kuliwišna*, Eothen 6 (Firenze 1997: LoGisma).

² *Hittite Myths*, translated by Harry A. Hoffner, Jr. and edited by Gary M. Beckman (Atlanta 1990¹, 1998²: Scholars Press).